

Eve-Marie Becker

Κράζειν and the Concept of “Emotional Prayer” in Earliest Christianity: Rom 8:15 and Acts 7:60 in Their Context(s)

1 Κράζειν and the language of “emotional prayer”

In current scholarship, there are various ways of studying emotions and emotionality in and beyond the field of *rhetorical criticism*. In fact, “emotions” and “emotionality” have now become central themes within the humanities and social studies, and they provide a congenial meeting place for various academic disciplines, such as neurobiology, psychology, anthropology, history and philosophy.¹ It could, however, be argued that these themes remain largely absent from Early Christianity scholarship. In 2011, Stephen C. Barton referred to “emotions” as a “missing element in the study of early Christianity”² (even though Adolf Harnack [1908] had already addressed the topic³). And, although some preliminary work has been carried out on “emotional criticism”,⁴ it is undoubtedly the case that current and future scholarship in early Christianity could benefit from innovative⁵ research in this area. This also applies to the exegesis of New Testament and Early Christian literature.⁶ In this paper, which concentrates on a particular motif from Rom 8 and Acts 7, I wish to demonstrate that research on emotions and emotionality can also provide fresh insights into Pauline and Lukan studies. I will suggest reading a particular lexeme, κράζω,

1 Cf., e.g.: Plamper, *Geschichte*; Shantz, Paul.

2 Barton, *Eschatology*.

3 Cf. Harnack, *Exkurs*, 207–210.

4 Cf., e.g.: Becker, *Tränen*, 361–378; Wischmeyer, *1 Korinther*.

5 For instance, Shantz, Paul, 110. facilitates a renewed view of the ecstatic dimensions of Paul’s life and religious thought.

6 This includes reflections on the topic within commentaries, as we find it, for instance, in: Schlier, *Brief*, 198–199, and recently in Jewett, *Romans*, 497. Cf. recently Kornarakis, *Depths*, 437–460.

together with its lexematic variants – for example, κραυγάζω and κραυγή – as a reflection of ancient Greek emotional language.

While κράζω κτλ. rarely occurs in Greek-Hellenistic literature, its semantic significance develops in the Septuagint as well as in Early Christian writings. It is therefore no coincidence that κράζω gains its most important meaning in the context of Jesus's death on the cross. According to Matthew's – and arguably Mark's⁷ – account, it is the crucified Jesus who, just before his death, cries out loudly: “And Jesus cried again with a loud voice and yielded up his spirit” (Matt 27:50: ... πάλιν κράξας φωνῆ μεγάλης ἀφῆκεν τὸ πνεῦμα).⁸ In Matthew 27, Jesus's crying on the cross, which is the second (πάλιν as reference to v. 46) and final cry, could *de facto* be understood as a cry within an ultimate *prayer call* („Gebetsruf“).⁹ This prayer is very much styled according to the Psalms (see v. 46 and its reference to Ps 22:2) and, indeed, in the LXX κράζω κτλ., is often used as a translation for: קָרָא.¹⁰ Matt 27:50 also appears to fit this tradition of Psalm prayers.¹¹ On the cross, Jesus appears as the paradigmatic person praying, and uttering his prayer emphatically, i.e. with emotional expression and insistence.

This first observation relates to the passion narrative(s). I would, however, at this point, like to continue by asking the following questions: Despite an obvious line of tradition that may be traced back to the Psalms, is it typical for prayers to be “cried out”? How is it that κράζω κτλ. can actually relate to the emotional semantics of prayer? What kinds of lexicon are at play here? As we shall soon see, κράζω κτλ. refers to the phenomenology of ancient *emotional prayer*. Let us begin by examining the lexeme's *etymology*: κράζω, κραυγάζω is clearly an *onomatopoeitic* word that invokes the voices of crows (κόραξ; Lat. *corvus*), ravens, frogs or even dogs (*Lyrice Adespota* 135). We could best translate κράζω, κραυγάζω into English as “croaking” (Hebrew: קָרָא; Latin: *crocio*; German: “krächzen”) or “crying” (German: “kreischen”).¹² Interestingly, neither lexeme is well attested in pagan Greek literature, but they are both found

7 Cf. Mark 15:39 – according to: A, C, K, N, W, Γ, Δ, Θ, I¹,¹³, 28, 33, 565, 579, 700, 1241, 1424, 2542^s, I 844 (κραξας), *Mehrheitstext*, Lat., Syr., and D (κραξαντα).

8 Translation according to: second edition of the Revised Standard Version.

9 For various other Jesuanic “prayer calls”, see von Severus, *Gebet*, 1171: Mark 14:36 par; 15:34; Matt 27:46; Luke 23:46; 23:34*; John 12:27–28; Heb 5:7; Matt 11:25–26; John 11:41–42.

10 Otherwise κράζω translates (cf. Muraoka, *Index*, 71), for instance: שׁוּע, קרא, רוע, צעק, נהק, נהק, עקע.

11 Grundmann, *κράζω κτλ.*, 900–901, though, sees a reference to Isa 42:2 (see also Matt 12:19).

12 Similar: LSJ, 989 and 992. For the Latin equivalents, see Gemoll, *Schul- und Handwörterbuch*, 450.

frequently among Septuagint and New Testament writings. How can we explain this difference?

(a) There are only few references in Greek-Hellenistic literature¹³ that contain a *negative connotation* (Juvenal, *Sat.* 12:112; Porphyry, *Abst.* 2:34; Tatian, *Or. Graec.* 25:2).¹⁴ Κράζω κτλ. appears in the context of magic (see below), which, in general, is perceived negatively until late antiquity (see differently: Greek Magical Papyri; Hermetic writings):¹⁵ In the Graeco-Roman world, magic is an ambiguous, if not a “doubtful”, concept since it is frequently seen as a “manipulative strategy to influence the course of nature by supernatural (‘occult’) means ...”; “‘manipulative (coercive or performative) strategy’ ... refers rather to a difference from religion.”¹⁶ In modern scholarship, however, such a definition of magic “as coercive and instrumental” has itself become questionable.¹⁷ A better starting point for approaching the phenomenology of Graeco-Roman magic is “the discussions of magic (and its relation to religion) in the writing of Romans themselves”, such as the Elder Pliny (*Nat.* 30:1–18) or Lucian (*Phal.* 6:413–830). Here, an opposition is indeed proposed “between religion and magic”, even if magical practice “and the fear of magic were ... symbiotic”.¹⁸ In general, contemporary scholarship offers afresh a proper scientific theory of magic,¹⁹ according to which κράζω κτλ. would belong to the category of „objekt-sprachliche Terminologie“. Until now, however, current scholarship has not conducted a thorough investigation into the “emotional language” used in ancient magic, either in terms of „Objektsprache“ or „Metasprache“ (emotional

13 Thesaurus Linguae Graecae (26.01.2014) provides 3.032 instances for κράζω κτλ. – mostly in LXX, NT and among patristic authors (Epiphanius, Athanasius, Johannes Chrysostomus).

14 References in Grundmann, κράζω κτλ., 898–899. Grundmann’s article is still relevant even if his political attitude in Nazi-Germany is highly problematic; see Arnhold, Entjudung, and the review by Niebuhr, in: ThLZ 138 (2013) 1369–1371.

15 Cf. Versnel, Magic, 908–910, explains this change in late antiquity by the shift in cosmology and world-view.

16 Versnel, Magic, 909. Cf. also: „Der antike Mensch, sowohl der Griechen als auch der Römer, haben weithin diese Art von Schreien für etwas den Göttern gegenüber Unpassendes, für etwas Barbarisches gehalten“ (Grundmann, κράζω κτλ., 899).

17 Cf. Beard, Religions, 219.

18 Beard, Religions, 219 and 221.

19 Cf. Frenschkowski, Magie, 873: „Eine gegenwärtige Theorie der M(agie) muss ... auf jeden Fall präzise zwischen objekt- u(nd) metasprachlichen Bestimmungen unterscheiden, also zwischen der Untersuchung der antiken Begriffe u(nd) Konzepte einerseits u(nd) der definierenden Ausbildung einer modernen kulturwissenschaftlichen Terminologie andererseits“ (873).

language).²⁰ With this in mind, it is necessary to re-examine κράζω κτλ. As an expression of the phenomenon of emotional praying, it must have caused suspicion in the ancient world. In Graeco-Roman literary discourses, it was seen as a “performative strategy” that could contradict religion; it was therefore rejected by Greek philosophers (cf., e.g. Plato) as much as by Roman authors.²¹ In contrast, gospel writers do not seem to share this fear of contact with the phenomenon of “emotional prayer”.

(b) In Greek-Hellenistic history-writing and/or narrative prose literature, there are some references where a prefix-form like ἀνα-κράζω is used neutrally, or in only a slightly negative sense. This occurs in the context of explicative proclamations – as, for example, the articulation of the *vox populi* that demands public execution – or in various types of public acclamations. In every case, we could speak of a “declarative function” (Lat.: *clamare, exclamare*; cf., e.g.: Xenophon, *Anab.* 6:4:22; see also Josh 6:5; Philo, *Flacc.* 144; 188; cf. also NT: Matt 12:19 [LXX]; Mark 11:9; 15:13–14; Luke 23:18; Acts 7:57; 19:28, 32, 34; 21:28, 36; 22:23), which, in regard to the synoptic Gospels and Acts, may also serve as a mode of prophetic announcement (Matt 25:6; Luke 1:42; see also Josephus, *Ant.* 2.117). That is to say, the vocabulary may even reflect how the group of Jesus’s disciples or apostles articulates itself (Matt 21:9, 15; 27:23; Luke 19:40; Acts 14:14; 23:6; 24:21). Within the synoptic Gospel writings, these public proclamations may also express the acclamation of Jesus as “Son of David” (cf. Matt 9:27; 15:22–23; 20:30–31; 21:9, 15; Mark 10:47–48; Luke 18:39). In an analogous way, we occasionally find references in the Greek-Hellenistic context where κράζω κτλ. labels the manner in which the hierophant in Eleusis announces mysteries (*Hipp.* 5:8:40).

(c) Despite these occasional references, however, the phenomenology of κράζω κτλ. primarily occurs outside Greek and Hellenistic prose literature. The phenomenology of “crying out”, rather than the lexeme, can be found in a *cultic or ritual* context or in texts that deal with *magic*²² (Robert W. Daniel and Franco

²⁰ This also applies to Frenschkowski, *Magie*, especially in his presentation of the New Testament material (917–925). Cf. some attempts to investigate various kinds of soundings, in Dieterich, *Mithrasliturgie*, 39.

²¹ Cf. Versnel, *Magic*, 909. There are some works with a critical reflection of magic, as e.g.: Apuleius, *Apol.*; Theophrastus (satirical works); Lucian, *passim*.

²² We do not have a wide variety of textual material from magic itself – i.e., magical papyri – where κράζω κτλ. occurs; as a “communicative language” initiating the prayer; we rather find terms like: κληίζω (e.g., PGM III:210; IV:455; 1171); (ἐξ-)ὄρκίζω (e.g., PGM III:72; IV:1240; cf. also: SM [Supplementum Magicum] 52:2, s. below); (ἐπι-)καλέω (e.g., PGM IV:1181; 1207; 1599f.; 1209), cf.: Preisendanz, *Papyri*. There are also, however, a few instances where κράζω κτλ.

Maltomini see a “juridical connotation” here²³). In these texts, κράζω κτλ. generally relates to “the field of the Demonic”;²⁴ gods of the netherworld are “invoked” by magicians (Lucian, *Men.* 9), much as wizards or even demons or demoniacs themselves “cry”²⁵ (cf. also NT gospel writings: Matt 8:29; 15:22–23; Mark 1:23; 3:11; 5:5, 7; Luke 4:33, 41; 8:28; 9:39; Acts 16:17). In these texts, we might say that “crying” – as “utterance” and “performance”²⁶ – is considered to be a substantial part of the magic technique, which was frequently perceived as a “manipulative strategy”. Does this also apply to the gospel writings and, in particular, to synoptic exorcism accounts? In any case, we can observe here that the actors’ contact with the demonic is enlarged by the group of *suppliants* requesting Jesus’s activity as an exorcist (Mark 9:24, 26). The semantic connotations of κράζω κτλ. as magic and rituals are strong; they are still visible in early Christian times (cf. Hippolytus, *Haer.* 5:8), when, for instance, Ignatius or Tatian relate the semantic field of κράζω, κραυγάζω – albeit now in an allegorical or polemical sense – to the field of μυστήρια (Ignatius, *Eph.* 18:2–19:2;²⁷ Tatian, *Or. Graec.* 17:2).

In general, we may describe the *semantic profile* of κράζω κτλ. as follows: In the Greek-Hellenistic world, the lexicon of κράζω κτλ. arouses suspicion, since it is related to the field of magic. As well as this, it can be an expression for the “mysterium tremendum” (Rudolf Otto); some instances in the gospel writings also indicate this (cf. in the context of epiphanies: Matt 14:26; Mark 6:49). More generally speaking, κράζω κτλ. refers to a *religious phenomenology* that interferes with the sphere of the demonic or spiritual and that can enter the public arena; here it can have a declarative function. Both dimensions – the interference with the demonic and the declarative function – are also visible in the synoptic Gospels and Acts. Interestingly, the earliest Christian writers are less cautious in their usage of κράζω κτλ. than their Hellenistic-Roman contempo-

occurs; cf. Muñoz Delgado, *Léxico*; see also: <http://dge.cchs.csic.es/lmpg>, with reference to: SM 49:69: “with a terrible voice the shouting goddess leads the stranger (?) to the god” (φωνῆ βαρβαρεον κράζουσα ...), translation according to Daniel/Maltomini, *Supplementum I*, 198. – Cf. in general on the magical papyri Betz, *Papyri*.

23 Cf. SM 52:8: “... Senblynpnos. Cry out to Hades, do not allow the gods in Hades to sleep ...” (... κράζον εἰς τὸν Ἅδην ...), translation according to Daniel/Maltomini, *Supplementum II*, 4: “Crying out in accusation”, probably has a “juridical nuance” (Daniel/Maltomini, *Supplementum II*, 5), with reference to Ameling, Hilferuf, 157–158.

24 Grundmann, κράζω κτλ., 899.

25 References, again in Grundmann, κράζω κτλ., 899.

26 Versnel, *Magic*, 909–901.

27 Other references to κράζω, κραυγάζω, κραυγή among the so-called Apostolic Fathers: 1 Clem. 22:7; 34:6; Barn. 3:1; 10:3; Ign. *Phld.* 7:1; 19:1.

aries, since there are many more instances of κράζω κτλ. within earliest Christian writing, particularly among the gospel narratives and Acts, i.e. among the historiographical writings of the New Testament.

The picture changes slightly when we look at Early Christian writers of the second century and beyond. At first, authors of the second century are much more reluctant to use κράζω κτλ.,²⁸ since they view it as an expression of *religious emotionality* in the pagan world (Tatian, *Or. Graec.* 24:1). From the third century CE until the late Byzantine period, however, Christian authors make more use of this lexicon: κράζω κτλ. occurs in monastic texts or exegetical literature, but primarily in *martyr-literature* (apocryphal Acts of the Apostles; Pionios-martyrdom, 15/7; cf. already 1 Macc 9:46) as well as in a *liturgical context*. This fact is by no means accidental: Early Christian authors continue a line of tradition that dates back to the Septuagint and, more particularly, to the Psalm literature. As we have already seen in the crucifixion scene in Matthew, κράζω occurs frequently in the context of prayers (Lat.: *clamo*) that are framed by a narrative account.

This evidence calls for further explanation, since it does not relate exclusively to the reception history of Psalm literature. As we shall see – first in Paul and then in Acts –, κράζω is used in a specific way from earliest Christianity onwards. When conceptualizing “emotional prayer”, Paul and Luke only partly continue a Psalm motif; they also develop a new, more extended concept based on a complex set of motifs and narrative framings, which, from here onwards, embeds itself in Early Christian literature.

2 Paul’s concept of “emotional prayer”: Rom 8:15 and Gal 4:6

In the Pauline letters, κράζω κτλ. is used only in a few instances (Rom 8:15; 9:27; Gal 4:6). Besides a prophetic and declarative meaning in Rom 9 (v. 27), all of these instances, again, suggest an interrelation with prayer.²⁹ κράζω and prayer

²⁸ Cf. in general: Lampe, *Lexicon*, 974, with references to: “cry aloud” (Hippolytus, *Haer.* 4:28; 5:8); “to God in a prayer” (Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* 7:7); “proclaim aloud/preach”, either as apostle, prophet or through spirit (Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* 7:9; Origen, *Hom. Jer.* 16:1; Origen, *Cels.* 2; Methodius of Olympus, *Symp.* 1:3; Theodoret, *Affect.* 7).

²⁹ Paulsen, *Überlieferung*, 88–94, has modified Seeberg’s idea of a tradition about prayer in Rom 8:15b (Katechismus, 240) by claiming that ἀββὰ ὁ πατήρ is a formula and that the phrase

thus tend to build up a *constitutive motific construct*. How does this construct come into being, and how does it work? In Paul, κράζω refers to a necessary attitude that the person praying should have; we could even say that κράζω κτλ. stands for the emotional expression that resembles the urgency, insistence, strength and intimacy of praying. At first glance, we can trace a line of tradition back to the Psalms and their communicative use of κράζω κτλ. (see above).³⁰ Here, the person praying is *per definitionem* seen as a person “crying out with a loud voice” (Pss 26:7 and 27:1LXX). The Hebrew אָרַף essentially aims at “attracting [God’s – E.-M.B.] attention to oneself”.³¹ In the Psalms – somehow differently from Greco-Roman magic – such a communicative, or rather expressive, mode of utterance is never understood as a “manipulative strategy”, since the person praying cannot be certain about the actual result of his praying; his/her prayer is partly answered (Ps 54:17LXX) but partly not (Ps 21:3LXX).³² “Crying” thus primarily resembles the *communicative* situation in which the Psalmist acts *coram Deo*.

While Paul in his usage of κράζω (אָרַף) certainly and primarily has in mind this idea of “making insistently contact between God and the person praying”, he nevertheless suggests a more complex connotation. In contrast to the Psalms, there are two striking motifs that reveal how Paul speaks about “emotional prayer”. First, his prayer call focuses on an acclamation of God as “Father”; secondly, praying appears as an „inspiriertes Schreien”³³ which overcomes “fear” (φόβος); it is essentially conceptualized as a pneumatic, most likely an ecstatic, experience. In Rom 8:15 (cf. also Gal 4:6), Paul claims:

For you did not receive the spirit of slavery to fall back into fear (φόβος), but you have received the spirit of sonship. When we cry (κράζομεν), “Abba! Father!” it is the Spirit himself bearing witness with our spirit that we are children of God ...³⁴

According to Rom 8, *crying, spirit, sonship and praying* are directly interrelated motifs. “Crying” and “prayer” necessarily relate to “sonship” and “spirit”, and

appears rather as an acclamation than a prayer (Paulsen, Überlieferung, 91): „Paulus überliefert so in Röm 8,15 mit dem ἀββὰ ὁ πατήρ eine geisterfüllte Akklamation.”

30 In contrast, Käsemann, Römer, 220: „In die Irre führte, daß man κράζειν in Analogie zu den Ausrufen im Psalter selbstverständlich und primär auf das Gebet bezog ..., statt es als technischen Terminus der Akklamation zu erkennen.“

31 Cf. Labuschagne, אָרַף, 668: „... Die Grundbedeutung ... ist anscheinend; durch den Laut der Stimme die Aufmerksamkeit jemandes auf sich ziehen, um mit ihm in Kontakt zu kommen.“

32 References again in: Grundmann, κράζω κτλ., 899–900.

33 Schlier, Brief, 198.

34 Translation according to: second edition of the Revised Standard Version.

vice versa. The Pauline construct of “emotional prayer” consists of these four motifs. This is also approved by Gal 4:6.³⁵ Here, the role of the “spirit” for the praying person becomes even more evident; indeed, Paul claims it is the πνεῦμα of Jesus Christ itself, sent by God into the hearts of believers, which cries: ἀββὰ ὁ πατήρ.

And because you are sons, God has sent the Spirit of his Son into our hearts, crying, “Abba, Father!”³⁶

But how does Paul reach this most complex claim? How can “crying”, “prayer”, “sonship” and “spirit” converge in such a motific construct?³⁷ If we do not wish simply to assume a Pauline *theologumenon* or invention here, we might appeal to a tradition. But then our next question becomes: whence did Paul acquire this tradition? I will now therefore proceed to explore the notion of *Motivgeschichte*. By doing so, I hope to not only provide parallels to each motif,³⁸ but to explain how the “motific construct” of emotional prayer in Paul as such came into being as a *pre-Pauline motif*.

In Rom 8 and Gal 4, it appears as though Paul combines various *motifs* that are all related to “prayer” or “plea”. We know these motifs from the *synoptic*

³⁵ Paulsen, *Überlieferung*, 96, considers Rom 8:15 to be the „überlieferungsgeschichtlich jüngere Stufe“.

³⁶ Translation according to: second edition of the Revised Standard Version.

³⁷ Do we understand this construct better by reconstructing its *Überlieferungsgeschichte* and its *Sitz im Leben*? This is the traditional approach among Pauline scholars – cf., e.g., Paulsen, *Überlieferung*, 93: „Paulus übernimmt in 8,15b eine Akklamation ... hellenistisch-judenchristlicher Gemeinden. Diese Akklamation hatte ihren Sitz im Leben in der Taufe; überlieferungsgeschichtliche Verbindungen zur Tradition von der Taufe Jesu bei den Synoptikern mögen bestanden haben, sind aber nicht mehr genau erkennbar.“

³⁸ It is possible to identify some parallels to single motifs: for instance, the acclamation of God’s name resembles how in pagan liturgy (Mithras) the appeal to names functions as incantation, cf. Lietzmann, *Römer*, 84, – with reference to Dieterich, *Mithrasliturgie*, 39–40; in early rabbinic literature, there are no parallels to be found for the motif of the *spirit being involved in the prayer* (Strack/Billerbeck, *Briefe*, 243), although we find a variety of references where the emotional activity of the spirit (references, in Strack/Billerbeck, *Evangelium*, 134–138) can also be connected to κράζω and its Semitic equivalents (*šwh*): Strack/Billerbeck, *Briefe*, 571. On the other hand, the “Abba”-acclamation in general is attested, although it is rather used collectively (“our father”) than individually (“my father”), Strack/Billerbeck, *Evangelium*, 49–50. Strack/Billerbeck explain the preferred use of the “Father”-acclamation in a collective sense by way of the rabbinic attitude to religious emotions such as awe: „Der einzelne fürchtet, mit der Anrede ‚mein Vater‘ Gotte (sic!) gegenüber allzu familiär zu werden u(nd) dadurch die Ehrfurcht zu verletzen; bei der Mehrzahl tritt dies Empfinden zurück“ (Strack/Billerbeck, *Evangelium*, 50).

tradition: (1) It is said in several exorcism accounts that different πνεύματα – deriving from demons – are contacting Jesus (e.g., Mark 1:23); πνεῦμα and κράζω are thus part of a common lexicon where a request to Jesus is uttered and, thereby, demoniacs are treated as slaves by the demons. (2) In his most expressive prayer to God in the garden of Gethsemane, Jesus addresses God as ἀββὰ ὁ πατήρ (Mark 14:36). Here, the attitude of urgently praying to God includes addressing him with strong emotion directly as “Abba Father”; this syntagm might also allude to the Lord’s prayer (Q 11:2b–4). In terms of its intimacy, this exceeds Hellenistic-Jewish salutatory addresses such as κύριε πάτερ (Sir 23:1, 4).³⁹ (3) As mentioned above, in Matt 27:50, Jesus’s attitude of intimately praying to God in an ultimate situation on the cross is explicitly described as κράζειν. (4) Finally, all synoptic gospels agree that, immediately before the final prayer cry on the cross, Jesus cites Ps 22/21LXX;⁴⁰ interestingly, Ps 22/21LXX is continuously filled with the lexematics of κράζειν (vv. 3, 6, 25b), which, in the LXX-version, serves the translation of various Hebrew lexemes.⁴¹ In other words, in the crucifixion scene, Ps 22 reveals itself as *the* paradigm of “emotional prayer”.

It is not necessary to interpret Paul as dependent on the synoptic tradition in literary terms.⁴² Instead, we may view the synoptic tradition as a “motific reservoir” that generated traditions which were available to Paul and which somehow centered on the passion narrative. *What we find here is that Jesus’s activity, already as exorcist, but rather more as the suffering son of God who is preparing for his violent death on the cross, is characterized by an emotional fight over πνεύματα as well as by a devotion to God in an emotional prayer; Psalmist experience of praying helps to interpret the crucifixion scene but cannot entirely illuminate Jesus’s praying attitude.*

Against this background of a highly complex *Motivgeschichte*, we understand Rom 8 and Gal 4 in a different light. Paul actually claims that sonship – mediated *via* the appropriate pneumatic gift – enables the group of believers to enter the intimate sphere of praying, which Jesus himself has initialized and explicated (cf. also Q 11:2b–4). In this way, Paul takes Jesus as a paradigm of emotional prayer (cf. Rom 8:17), just as he conceptualizes Jesus as an *exemplum* to his communities elsewhere (cf. Phil 2:5–11).⁴³

³⁹ In contrast: Sir 51:1. Cf. in general: Strotmann, Vater; Gilbert, Prayer, 117–135; Reiterer, Gott, 137–170.

⁴⁰ Mark 15:34 and Ps 22:2; Matt 27:46 and Ps 22:2; Luke 23:34 and Ps 22:19.

⁴¹ V. 3: אָרָץ; v.6: קָעַץ; v. 25: עָוֶשׂ.

⁴² For a general discussion of this question, see the recent publications: Wischmeyer, Paul; Becker, Mark.

⁴³ On this, cf. Becker, Ethik.

In Paul, κράζω as an expression of “emotional prayer” combines *confrontational* (see action and reaction in the sphere of the demonic), *acclamatory* (see acclamation) and *eschatological* (see prayer call on the cross) language.⁴⁴ With this crucial insight, we may *de facto* mediate in a highly aporetic scholarly discussion where “ecstatic” and “pneumatic” readings of κράζω are contrasted. Ernst Käsemann and Robert Jewett claim that κράζω, in part, means an “ecstatic cry”.⁴⁵ Colleen Shantz shares this opinion. Shantz considers Rom 8 as a “discourse of someone for whom ecstatic religious experience is a significant biographical element”, and thus concludes, “In the first place the use of κράζω ... in Rom 8:15 is conspicuously ecstatic.”⁴⁶ With this, she rejects a pneumatic or eschatological interpretation of the phenomenon, an interpretation which Henning Paulsen (among others) has favoured⁴⁷ and which is intended to repel the recognition of ecstasy in Paul.

If, however, we consider κράζω to be an expression of “religious emotionality” that traces back to exorcisms as well as acclamations and prayer calls (on the cross), we can overcome the contrast between pneumatology and ecstasy: religious emotionality consists of pneumatic as well as ecstatic experience. Shantz herself identifies this connection when she emphasizes how κράζω refers back to the “emotional and exuberant character of the worship that includes shouting.”⁴⁸ Indeed, charismatic experience and ecstasy might be two sides of the same coin, called *religious emotion*.⁴⁹ We might therefore best understand κράζω along the lines of religious emotionality, which is rooted in pneumatic as well as ecstatic experience.

Consequently, κράζω κτλ. constitutes emotional semantics which have most effectively been related to the ritual of prayer by Paul. On the basis of Rom 8 and Gal 4, “prayer” may then be conceptualized as an “emotional practice”

44 Käsemann, Römer, 219, identifies this idea in a similar way: „In einer gottfeindlichen Welt gewährt der Geist der Gemeinde die Möglichkeit des Rufes Abba ...“

45 Rom 8:15; Gal 4:6 as „der ekstatische Schrei“: Käsemann, Römer, 219. Jewett, Romans, 499. Jewett traces this form of ecstasy back to the phenomenon of “charismatic language”: “Since the Spirit impels believers to utter their prayers directly to their Abba, this is a powerful, experiential confirmation of their status as children of God” (500).

46 Shantz, Paul, 128–129. – For an enthusiastic interpretation, cf. Löhr, Formen, 115–132, 125–126.

47 Paulsen, Überlieferung, 96: „Das κράζειν ordnet sich ... dem Aussageinhalt der jeweiligen Äußerung unter.“

48 Shantz, Paul, 130.

49 “In general, religious experience is marked by numinosity, or awe, which is a particular complex of more basic emotions and cognitive states. Religious emotion is characterized by a feeling of euphoria or elation combined with ‘mild to moderate fear’ ...” (Shantz, Paul, 114).

(Monique Scheer)⁵⁰ which itself helps to express religious emotionality. For Paul, such an emotional practice would even have served to generate a “sense of shared identity. This experience [= ecstatic religious, E.-M.B.] creates in Paul the ‘inner’ resources that make the death of Jesus a transformative force in Paul’s own life.”⁵¹ What Shantz reiterates here causes us to rethink again the results of earlier *Motivgeschichte*: Paul’s construct of “emotional prayer” in Rom 8 and Gal 4 in fact combines various synoptic traditions about κράζειν and “prayer”; in doing so, it applies the current paradigm of Jesus’s emotional prayer to Paul’s and his communities’ own lives.

3 Luke’s re-shaping of “emotional prayer” in history-writing: Acts 7:60

To conclude, let us look at the way in which Luke connects and transforms the line of interpretation that is rooted in the synoptic tradition and utilized within Paul’s concept of prayer. Luke’s account of Stephen’s martyrdom (Acts 6:8–7:60) appears to be *the* relevant passage here:⁵²

Now when they heard these things they were enraged, and they ground their teeth against him. But he, full of the Holy Spirit (πλήρης πνεύματος ἁγίου), gazed into heaven and saw the glory of God, and Jesus standing at the right hand of God; and he said, “Behold, I see the heaven opened, and the Son of man standing at the right hand of God.” But they cried out with a loud voice (κράζαντες δὲ φωνῇ μεγάλῃ) and stopped their ears and rushed together upon him. Then they cast him out of the city and stoned him; and the witness laid down their garments at the feet of a young man named Saul. And as they were stoning Stephen, he prayed (ἐπικαλούμενον), “Lord Jesus (κύριε Ἰησοῦ), receive my spirit (τὸ πνεῦμά μου).” And he knelt down and cried with a loud voice (ἔκραξεν φωνῇ μεγάλῃ), “Lord (κύριε), do not hold this sin against them.” And when he said this, he fell asleep.⁵³

Since this is an eminent part of Luke’s narrative account in Acts, several questions of interpretation arise. We could analyze this passage by referring to how

⁵⁰ For the concept: Plamper, *Geschichte*, 313. – With reference to: Scheer, *Emotions*, 193–220.

⁵¹ Shantz, *Paul*, 143.

⁵² To select only Acts 7:54–60 may also be appropriate in literary terms since historiography, as such as well as historiographical accounts in particular, are best read against their narrative ending. Since we should understand Luke’s concept of writing missionary history against its focus on Paul’s successful arrival in Rome, we should read the narrative account of Stephen’s fortune against the description of his death that we find in Acts 7:54–60.

⁵³ Translation according to: second edition of the Revised Standard Version.

it necessarily fits into the macro-structure of Acts,⁵⁴ or we could focus on certain motifs that are elementary for the Lukan conceptualization of prayer; for instance, the “kneeling down”,⁵⁵ the “falling asleep”,⁵⁶ and the twofold praying appellation to the *kyrios*, who must be one time Jesus (v. 59) and the other time God himself (v. 60): the divine subjects shift.⁵⁷ I would, however, like to concentrate on the question of whether and how Luke in this account connects and transforms the synoptic concept of “emotional prayer” that was likewise adapted by Paul.

The semantics of κράζω also plays a crucial role in Acts. But does the Lukan account about Stephen’s martyrdom resemble the synoptic and Pauline constructs of “emotional prayer”? And, if so, how? It has frequently been argued that Acts 7 is created in conformity with the passion narrative in Luke 22–23 (e.g., Richard I. Pervo; Jacob Jervell). So, are Jesus and Stephen, in equal terms, portrayed by Luke as “emotional prayers”? In a formal sense, both stories present various narrative elements in a similar manner; for example, in the doubling of prayer.⁵⁸ With regard to lexematics, however, we can also identify substantial

54 After demonstrating how the early missionary history directly succeeds Jesus’s ascension (Acts 1:1–26) and the nature of the community’s beginning in Jerusalem (Acts 2:1–5:42), Luke in his *Acta Apostolorum* extensively depicts the first stage of the spread of the church: various commentators on Acts thus take 6:1–9:31 as a literary unit; cf. Roloff, *Apostelgeschichte*, 13. Within this literary unit, Stephen’s fate (Acts 6:8–7:60) plays a dominant role within Luke’s overall narrative concept. Indeed in various ways: (a) the accusations against Stephen (blasphemy: 6:11) resemble the accusations against Jesus, and thus connect Luke’s gospel and Acts; (b) Stephen’s speech (Acts 7:1–53) is one of the most comprehensive speeches in Acts, and thereby reflects its author’s twofold interest in using speeches as a method of history-writing: speeches function as interpretive tools for the narrative account, and, at the same time, they provide a comprehensive historical retrospect („Geschichtsrückblick”) in order to present “history” as a continuum of personal *exempla* – from Abraham to Moses and Solomon; (c) the narrative about Stephen’s fate and martyrdom also acts as a narrative link to the story about Paul (Acts 8:1–3), which will be in focus from chapter 13 onwards.

55 Is this a reaction to the stoning, or the gesture of praying? Cf. Roloff, *Apostelgeschichte*, 128.

56 Euphemism: Roloff, *Apostelgeschichte*, 128.

57 Cf. also v. 56 where the “Son of Man” and God are mentioned together – a similar motif may be found in Luke 22:69; Pervo, *Acts*, 197, sees the saying derived from Luke 22:69; Roloff, *Apostelgeschichte*, 127, however, points at the singularity of Acts 7:56 (only here “Son of Man” is not used as a self-designation), and thus emphasizes the differences between both sayings; because of the singularity, Jervell, *Apostelgeschichte*, 252, assumes that Luke is using a “source” in Acts 7.

58 Pervo, *Acts*, 195: Pervo detects six narrative elements that are shared in the Lukan passion narrative and in Acts 7: “the absence of a formal sentence” (Luke 22:71), “a climatic Son of Man saying” (Luke 23:68; Acts 7:56), “a reference to garments” (Luke 23:54; Acts 7:56), “the final

differences that are frequently overlooked in textual exegesis. These differences reveal a deliberate conceptual variation in Acts 7, a variation that cannot be traced back to source material, or to the tradition that Luke utilizes here.⁵⁹ Rather, it is Luke himself who intentionally creates the narrative variants between Luke 22–23 and Acts 7.

In contrast to Acts 7 (vv. 57 and 60), Luke does not use the lexematics of κράζω κτλ. in Luke 22–23. It appears as if Luke’s choice of emotional vocabulary in both books leads us closer to the narrative portrayal of his literary figures. In Luke 22–23, Luke depicts the crucified Jesus as detached from “emotional prayer”, while, in Acts, he relates Stephen – the first Christian martyr – explicitly to it. Luke obviously distinguishes between Jesus’s and Stephen’s fates by marking a difference in their praying attitude. “Emotional prayer” is now most evidently restricted to the group of martyrs. By making this conscious distinction, Luke takes into account that, by his time, κράζω had radically developed its meaning – especially in the context of prayer (see Revelation) – among Christ-believers. At the same time, the *Auctor ad Theophilum* might be aware of Hellenistic-Roman literary suspicion about the phenomenon. For Luke, therefore, the lexematics of κράζω κτλ. had to be used carefully in order to portray, in an appropriate fashion, Jesus as the Christ. The concept of “emotional prayer” had to be transformed. By assigning the attitude of emotional prayer so intensely to the Stephen figure, Luke makes a remarkable shift. Consequently, he prepares a narrative pattern that will impact significantly on the development of early Christian literature: κράζω κτλ. will increasingly become part of emotional prayer in the context of martyriology.

words in a loud voice and a prayer” (Luke 23:46; Acts 7:60), “the prayer for forgiveness of enemies” (Luke 23:34; Acts 7:60), and the “burial by ‘devout’ person(s)” (Luke 23:50–53; Acts 8:2); Jervell, *Apostelgeschichte*, 254. – Roloff, *Apostelgeschichte*, 128, is, however, more hesitant about exposing this parallelism, and instead characterizes Jesus’s passion as „konkretes Strukturmodell ..., das auf den Weg und das Geschick der Zeugen ... prägend wirkt“.

59 The debate about sources in Acts 7 continues: While Pervo, *Acts*, 196, is fairly hesitant in finding any source material – as, e.g., in v. 55 – and tends only to describe the tradition, Roloff, *Apostelgeschichte*, 111 and 126, suggests a tradition that contained a narrative about a lynching (vv. 57, 58a) and that was redacted by Luke in the direction of a trial that ended in an execution (vv. 58b; 8:1a). According to Roloff, the pre-Lukan narrative would thus consist of vv. 55a, 56–58a, 59–60; 8:2 (*Apostelgeschichte*, 127). – I would like to thank Sarah Jennings (Aarhus) and stud. theol. Anna Bank Jeppesen (Aarhus) for copy-editing the English text of this paper and helping to prepare it for publication.

Abstract

In this article, the lexematic field of κράζω κτλ. in Hellenistic literature – pagan, early Jewish and early Christian – is investigated. While the Jewish-Christian texts carefully make use of κράζω κτλ. in the frame of “emotional prayer” (esp. PsLXX; Paul; Matthew and Acts), the so-called pagan notion of the lexeme and the phenomenology of emotional prayer refers to magic which, in literary discourse, is valued negatively, at least ambiguously. In their reference to κράζω κτλ., Paul and Luke partly take up Psalm language, but partly need also to reshape the concept of “emotional prayer” by interpreting it on the basis of the Jesus paradigm (cf. Matt 27:50 etc.). Slowly, the language is linked to martyr literature.

Bibliography

- Ameling, W., Ein Hilferuf bei Polybios: ZPE 70 (1987) 157–158.
- Arnhold, O., „Entjudung“ – Kirche im Abgrund. Die Thüringer Kirchenbewegung Deutsche Christen 1928–1939 und das „Institut zur Erforschung und Beseitigung des jüdischen Einflusses auf das deutsche kirchliche Leben“ 1939–1945, 2 vols. (Studien zu Kirche und Israel 25/1, 25/2), Berlin: Institut Kirche und Judentum, 2010.
- Barton, S.C., Eschatology and Emotions in Early Christianity: JBL 130 (2011) 571–591.
- Beard, M., et al., Religions of Rome, vol. 1: A History, Cambridge: Univ. Press, 1998.
- Becker, E.-M., Mimetische Ethik im Philipperbrief: Zu Form und Funktion paulinischer *exempla*, in: Horn, F.W. et al. (eds.), Metaphorische – Narrative – Mimetische – Doxologische Ethik im frühen Christentum (WUNT), Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, (forthcoming).
- Becker, E.-M., Die Tränen des Paulus (2Kor 2,4; Phil 3,18): Emotion oder Topos?, in: Egger-Wenzel, R./Corley, J. (eds.), Emotions from Ben Sira to Paul (DCLY 2011), Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter, 2012, 361–378.
- Becker, E.-M. et al. (eds.), Mark and Paul, Comparative Essays Part II. For and Against Pauline Influence on Mark (BZNW 199), Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter, 2014.
- Betz, H.D. (ed.), The Greek Magical Papyri in Translation. Including the Demonic Spells, Chicago, IL/London: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1986.
- Daniel, R.W./Maltomini, F. (eds.), Supplementum Magicum, vol. I (Suppl. Mag. I) (Papyrologica Coloniensia 16.1), Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1990.
- Daniel, R.W./Maltomini, F. (eds.), Supplementum Magicum, vol. II (Suppl. Mag. II) (Papyrologica Coloniensia 16.2), Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1992.
- Dieterich, A., Eine Mithrasliturgie, Stuttgart: Teubner, 1966.
- Frenschkowski, M., Magie: RAC 23 (2010) 857–957.
- Gemoll, W., Griechisch-deutsches Schul- und Handwörterbuch, München: Oldenbourg Verlag, 1991.

- Gilbert, M., *Prayer in the Book of Ben Sira. Function and Relevance*, in: Egger-Wenzel, R./Corley, J. (eds.), *Prayer from Tobit to Qumran (DCLY 2004)*, Berlin/New York: De Gruyter, 2004, 117–135.
- Grundmann, W., κρᾶζω κτλ.: ThWNT 3 (1938) 898–904.
- Harnack, A. (ed.), *Exkurs III. Lukas und die Freude*, in: *Beiträge zur Einleitung in das NT, III. Die Apostelgeschichte*, Leipzig: Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1908.
- Jervell, J., *Die Apostelgeschichte (KEK 3)*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998.
- Jewett, R., *Romans. A Commentary (Hermeneia)*, Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 2007.
- Käsemann, E., *An die Römer (HNT 8a)*, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1980.
- Kornarakis, K., “Out of my depths I cried to you Lord” (Ps 129,2LXX): Models of Crying and St. John Chrysostom’s Positions on the Origins of Human Cry as Prayer. An Ethical Analysis, in: Klein, H. et al. (eds.), *Das Gebet im Neuen Testament. Vierte europäische orthodox-westliche Exegetenkonferenz in Sambata de Sus 4.–8. August 2007 (WUNT 249)*, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009, 437–460.
- Labuschagne, C.F., אָרָן: THAT 2 (1993) 666–674.
- Lampe, G.W.H., *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1961.
- Lietzmann, H., *An die Römer (HNT 8)*, Tübingen: Mohr, 1933.
- Löhr, H., *Formen und Traditionen des Gebets bei Paulus*, in: Klein, H. et al. (eds.), *Das Gebet im Neuen Testament. Vierte europäische orthodox-westliche Exegetenkonferenz in Sambata de Sus 4.–8. August 2007 (WUNT 249)*, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009, 115–132.
- Muñoz Delgado, L., *Léxico de magia y religión en los papiros mágicos griegos*, Madrid: Inst. De Filología, 2001.
- Muraoka, T., *A Greek-Hebrew/Aramaic Two-Way Index to the Septuagint*, Louvain etc.: Peeters, 2010.
- Paulsen, H., *Überlieferung und Auslegung in Römer 8 (WMANT 43)*, Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1974.
- Pervo, R.I., *Acts. A Commentary (Hermeneia)*, Minneapolis, MI: Fortress Press, 2009.
- Plamper, J., *Geschichte und Gefühl. Grundlagen der Emotionsgeschichte*, Siedler: München, 2012.
- Preisendanz, K. (ed.), *Papyri Graecae Magicae. Die Griechischen Zauberpapyri*, vols. 1–3, Leipzig/Berlin: Teubner, 1928/1931/1941 (vols. 1–2: 1973/1974).
- Reiterer, F.V., *Gott, Vater und Herr meines Lebens. Eine poetisch-stilistische Analyse von Sir 22,27–23,6 als Verständnisgrundlage des Gebetes*, in: Egger-Wenzel, R./Corley, J. (eds.), *Prayer from Tobit to Qumran (DCLY 2004)*, Berlin/New York: De Gruyter, 2004, 137–170.
- Roloff, J., *Die Apostelgeschichte (NTD 5)*, Göttingen/Zürich: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991.
- Scheer, M., *Are Emotions a Kind of Practice (and Is That What Makes Them Have a History)? A Bourdieuan Approach to Understanding Emotion: History and Theory 51 (2012) 193–220*.
- Schlier, H., *Der Brief an die Galater (KEK 7)*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989.
- Seeberg, A., *Der Katechismus der Urchristenheit*, Leipzig: Deichert, 1903.
- von Severus, E., *Gebet I*, in: RAC 8 (1972) 1134–1258.
- Shantz, C., *Paul in Ecstasy: The Neurobiology of the Apostle’s Life and Thought*, Cambridge: Univ. Press, 2009.
- Strack, H.L./Billerbeck, P., *Die Briefe des Neuen Testaments und die Offenbarung Johannis (Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch III)*, München: Beck, 1954.
- Strack, H.L./Billerbeck, P., *Das Evangelium nach Markus, Lukas und Johannes und die Apostelgeschichte (Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch II)*, München: Beck, 1956.

Strotmann, A., „Mein Vater bist Du!“ (Sir 51,10). Zur Bedeutung der Vaterschaft Gottes in kanonischen und nichtkanonischen frühjüdischen Schriften (Frankfurter theologische Studien 39), Frankfurt: Knecht, 1991.

Versnel, H.S., Magic, in: *OCD* (2002)³ 908–910.

Wischmeyer, O., 1 Korinther 13. Das Hohelied der Liebe zwischen Emotion und Ethos, in: Egger-Wenzel, R./Corley, J. (eds.), *Emotions from Ben Sira to Paul* (DCLY 2011), Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter, 2012, 343–359.

Wischmeyer, O., et al. (eds.), *Paul and Mark, Comparative Essays Part I. Two Authors at the Beginnings of Christianity* (BZNW 198), Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter, 2014.