[*JGRChJ* 20 (2024) 37-73]

PETER'S VISION IN ACTS 10.1–11.18, THE *BOOK OF DREAMS* IN *1 ENOCH* AND LUKE'S SUBVERSION OF JEWISH PURITY LAWS[1]

Zachary K. Dawson
Regent University School of Divinity, Virginia Beach, VA, USA

Introduction

In a manner similar to the Apostle Peter himself, New Testament scholars today continue to grapple with the meaning of his rooftop vision during the episode of Cornelius's conversion in Acts 10.1–11.18. There are several features of Peter's vision that invite interpreters to investigate their collective significance for the message they articulate in the book of Acts, including the recurrence of the vision itself, the peculiar association of what is 'common' and what is 'unclean' in the repeated phrase κοινὸν καὶ/ἢ ἀκάθαρτον (10.14; 11.8), the near-identical repetition of lists of animals (10.12; 11.6), and the use of apocalyptic tropes and symbolic levels of meaning.[2] There have been some recent attempts to make interpretive inroads regarding the intertextual relationship between Peter's vision and texts that share co-thematic features, especially texts that belong to Jewish apocalyptic literature, to determine ele-

1. This article has been revised from Chapter 4 of Zachary K. Dawson, *The Message of the Jerusalem Council in the Acts of the Apostles: A Linguistic Stylistic Analysis* (LBS, 22; Leiden: Brill, 2022), pp. 133-73.

2. See, for example, Ronald D. Witherup, 'Cornelius Over and Over and Over Again: "Functional Redundancy" in the Acts of the Apostles', *JSNT* 49 (1993), pp. 45-66; Mikael C. Parsons, '"Nothing Defiled *and* Unclean": The Conjunctions Function in Acts 10:14', *PRSt* 27 (2000), pp. 263-74; Richard Bauckham, 'James, Peter, and the Gentiles', in Bruce Chilton and Craig A. Evans (eds.), *The Missions of James, Peter, and Paul: Tensions in Early Christianity* (NovTSup, 115; Leiden: Brill, 2005), pp. 91-142.

ments of the literary genre of Peter's vision and contextual features that shed light on how Peter's vision makes meaning.[3] In this essay, I aim to take this discussion a step further. By means of a linguistically-informed intertextual approach, I argue that the nature of the intertextual relationship between Peter's vision and other apocalyptic texts has not been fully understood and that the vision functions to subvert the value positions promoted in the *Book of Dreams* in *1 Enoch* as the most contextually relevant intertext for Peter's vision in Acts 10:1–11:18. This argument goes beyond observing the commonalities of Peter's vision with other apocalyptic texts to show how the author of Acts positions his readers in relation to the ideological and theological beliefs of a prominent intertext and the tradition it carries.

Intertextual Thematic Analysis as Means to Identifying Value Orientations

Intertextual approaches in New Testament scholarship have surged over the past few decades with varying definitions of 'intertextuality' spanning the hermeneutical spectrum regarding the roles that the author, text, and reader play in the interpretive process. Due to space, I will simply explain the explicit orientation and necessary definitions of the approach I employ in this essay and put aside any discussion of where this approach fits into the wider field of intertextual studies in New Testament scholarship, except to say that my approach locates meaning with the author's intentional literary composition and how the original intended audience would have understood the text in light of their cultural, religious, and literary environments.

Intertextual Thematic Analysis is a systemic-functional linguistic model developed by Jay L. Lemke that systematizes the ways in which texts use recurrent patterns of words and phrases to ally with, oppose, or otherwise dialogically engage the value orientations of other thematically-related texts against their heteroglossic backdrop. Lemke's model, which he developed and articulated over the span of several publications, owes much of its theoretical basis regarding intertextuality to Mikhail Bakhtin, including the con-

3. See, for example, John R.L. Moxon, *Peter's Halakhic Nightmare: The 'Animal' Vision of Acts 10:9–16 in Jewish and Graeco-Roman Perspective* (WUNT, 2/432; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2017); Jason A. Staples, '"Rise, Kill, and Eat": Animals as Nations in Early Jewish Visionary Literature and Acts 10', *JSNT* 42 (2019), pp. 3-17.

cepts of dialogism and heteroglossia.[4] Dialogism is a term that is roughly interchangeable with intertextuality and is defined according to a sociocultural functional theory of language. Dialogism entails the theory that when language users speak or write, their words mean against the heteroglossic backdrop (that is, a language community's various socially defined discourse types) in that every utterance (that is, an instance of text production) acts as a reaction to other utterances, whether former or potential, in a way that allies with, opposes, presupposes, or in some way takes them into account.[5] Upon creating an utterance, a unique meaning arises in relation to both the present context and the heteroglossic backdrop whereby the language user anticipates the audience's response.[6] Heteroglossia, a related concept to dialogism, entails the diversity of socially defined discourse types in a language community that encompasses and relates the multitude of other voices that express all the various ideological points of view in a society.[7] These two concepts are

4. See Jay L. Lemke, 'Discourses in Conflict: Heteroglossia and Text Semantics', in James D. Benson and William S. Greaves (eds.), *Systemic Functional Approaches to Discourse: Selected Papers from the 12th International Systemic Workshop* (Norwood, NJ: Ablex, 1988), pp. 29-50; *idem*, 'Interpersonal Meaning in Discourse: Value Orientations', in Martin Davies and Louise Ravelli (eds.), *Advances in Systemic Linguistics: Recent Theory and Practice* (OLS; London: Pinter, 1992), pp. 82-104; *idem*, 'Intertextuality and Text Semantics', in Peter H. Fries and Michael Gregory (eds.), *Discourse in Society: Systemic Functional Perspectives: Meaning and Choice. Studies for Michael Halliday* (Norwood, NJ: Ablex, 1995), pp. 85-114; *idem*, 'Intertextuality and the Project of Text Linguistics: A Response to de Beaugrande', *Text* 20 (2000), pp. 221-25; *idem*, 'Semantics and Social Values', *Word* 40 (1989), pp. 37-50; *idem*, 'Text Structure and Text Semantics', in Erich H. Steiner and Robert Veltman (eds.), *Pragmatics, Discourse and Text* (London: Pinter, 1988), pp. 158-70; *idem*, *Textual Politics: Discourse and Social Dynamics* (Critical Perspectives on Literacy and Education; London: Taylor & Francis, 1995).

5. Mikhail M. Bakhtin, 'The Problem of Speech Genres', in Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist (eds.), *Speech Genres & Other Late Essays* (trans. Vern W. McGee; Austin: University of Texas Press, 1986), pp. 60-102 (91).

6. Mikhail M. Bakhtin, 'Discourse in the Novel', in Michael Holquist (ed.), *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays* (trans. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist; Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981), pp. 259-422 (280); *idem*, 'Problem of Speech Genres', p. 94.

7. Bakhtin, 'Discourse in the Novel', pp. 289-90.

foundational to the sociolinguistic orientation of Intertextual Thematic Analysis.

Over the past decade, Intertextual Thematic Analysis has begun to be productively applied in New Testament studies, beginning with the work of Xiaxia Xue on Romans, but adapted and applied by others as well, including Stanley E. Porter, Zachary K. Dawson and, most recently, Doosuk Kim.[8] Detailed accounts of Lemke's model and its interpretive potential can be found in their respective works, but for present matters I wish to provide a brief description of the concepts needed for the purpose of this essay accompanied with a procedure by which these concepts can be used to analyze and interpret intertextual relations at play in Acts 10.1–11.18.

The first key concept of Lemke's Intertextual Thematic Analysis is the notion of the *thematic formation*. Thematic formations refer to patterns of semantic relations among similar or identical words and phrases that recur regularly in texts in a linguistic community, and even within a single text (text-specific thematic formations).[9] They play a prominent role in how writers or speakers present meaning in texts since the repetition of thematic words or phrases create important meaning relationships in the text's subject matter. When thematic formations recur across texts in a linguistic community in a way that invoke specific value orientations, Lemke designates such forma-

8. See Xiaxia E. Xue, *Paul's Viewpoint on God, Israel, and the Gentiles in Romans 9–11: An Intertextual Thematic Analysis* (Carlisle: Langham Monographs, 2015); *eadem*, 'An Intertextual Discourse Analysis of Romans 9:30–10:13', in Stanley E. Porter, Gregory P. Fewster, and Christopher D. Land (eds.), *Modeling Biblical Language: Selected Papers from the McMaster Divinity College Linguistics Circle* (LBS, 13; Leiden: Brill, 2016), pp. 277-308; *eadem*, 'An Analysis of James 2:14-26, with Special Reference to the Intertextual Reading of Abraham and Ahab', in James D. Dvorak and Zachary K. Dawson, *The Epistle of James: Linguistic Exegesis of an Early Christian Letter* (LENT, 1; Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2019), pp. 127-54; Stanley E. Porter, 'Pauline Techniques of Interweaving Scripture into his Letters', in Florian Wilk and Markus Öhler (eds.), *Paulinische Schriftrezeption: Grundlagen— Ausprägungen—Wirkungen—Wertungen* (FRLANT, 268; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2017), pp 23-55; Zachary K. Dawson, 'The Books of Acts and *Jubilees* in Dialogue: A Literary-Intertextual Analysis of the Noahide Laws in Acts 15 and 21', *JGRChJ* 13 (2017), pp. 9-40; *idem*, *Message of the Jerusalem Council*; Doosuk Kim, *The Intertextuality of Paul's Apocalyptic Discourse: An Examination of its Cultural Relation and Heteroglossia* (LBS, 24; Leiden: Brill, 2023).

9. Lemke, 'Text Structure and Text Semantics', p. 165.

tions as *intertextual thematic formations*.[10] Intertextual thematic formations are thus defined as regularly recurring lexical choices and semantic patterns in thematically related texts insofar as they matter for particular social values and beliefs. They play a prominent role in how writers and speakers orient a text's meaning to the ideological (and theological) stances present within a linguistic community. Elsewhere, Lemke summarizes these concepts as follows:

Words have meaning *potential*, a range of possible meanings that we abstract from all their actual uses, but their relevant meaning potential in a given text is always severely restricted by the *pattern* of presentational or orientational meanings they help to express. Their actual, specific meaning for the reader of a given text depends critically on that pattern. These patterns, which in the case of presentational meanings I call *thematic patterns* or *thematic formations*, are fundamentally intertextual. The same patterns recur from text to text in slightly different wordings but are recognizably the same, and each wording can be mapped onto a generic semantic pattern that is the same for all. I take these thematic patterns as the irreducible units of text meaning; they are appropriately modified or subclassified where necessary to take into account the dependence of presentational meaning on the orientational stance of the discourse (in which case I will call them *heteroglossic discourse formations* or voices [or intertextual thematic formations]).[11]

In the following analysis, I will identify thematic formations in Acts 10.1–11.18 based on their status of meeting each aspect of Lemke's description; thematic formations are identifiable based of the repetition of similarly patterned expressions of lexical and phrasal choices in texts in a community. Then, based on their identification, I will assess the potential status of thematic formations as intertextual thematic formations based upon the meaning relationships they share and how their value orientations relate to similar co-thematic texts in the literary environment of the book of Acts.

Identifying Thematic Formations in Peter's Vision

One evident thematic formation that is readily identifiable in Peter's vision in Acts 10 and its reiteration in Acts 11 is the list of animals that Peter sees

10. Lemke, 'Intertextuality and the Project of Text Semantics', p. 223.
11. Lemke, *Textual Politics*, p. 42.

as being lifted down on a sheet: πάντα τὰ τετράποδα καὶ ἑρπετὰ τῆς γῆς καὶ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ/τὰ τετράποδα τῆς γῆς καὶ τὰ θηρία καὶ τὰ ἑρπετὰ καὶ τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανου (10.12; 11.6). The repetition of this list establishes its status as a text-specific thematic formation for this episode in Acts. However, this thematic formation extends beyond this text to other texts in the literary environment of Acts. Lists of various kinds of animals abound in Jewish literature, not least in the Old Testament. According to Craig S. Keener, there are more than forty instances in the LXX where 'birds of the air' is combined with 'creeping things' in contexts he describes as 'summaries of creation, Gen. 1:20, 26, 28, 30; and of a destructive reversal of creation, 6.7; 7.23; Hos. 2.12 (LXX 2.14), 18 (LXX 2.20); 4.3; Ezek. 38.20'.[12] He goes on to add, 'Likewise, the LXX often defines "creepers" (ἑρπετά) or (more often) "beasts" (θηρία, Acts 11.6) as "of earth"'.[13] Then he notes that 'the LXX frequently lists "beasts" with "birds" and "creepers"' together (Gen. 1.30; 7.14, 21; 8.1, 17, 19; Ps. 148.10; Hos. 2.14, 20; 4.3; Ezek. 38.20).[14] Here Keener compiles references that share co-thematic elements, and he even provides a contextual constraint for their co-appearance—they appear in texts that pertain in some way to God's creation, including its doing and undoing. However, in his subsequent discussion he does not, I argue, go as far as is necessary to organize the data he has compiled with respect to its relationship to the lists in Acts.

First, in many of the references Keener cites (and in some he omits), other thematic elements that do not appear in Peter's vision are used in similar lists of animals. These include the collocation of ἑρπετόν with πετεινόν in Gen. 1.20-21 without the mention of other kinds of animals and where ἑρπετόν refers not to creeping things upon the earth but, rather, to creatures that teem in the water. Other similar thematic formations that closely resemble these include the more explicit mention of fish (ἰχθύς) in Gen. 1.26 and 1.28. Further, in 1 Kgs 5.13, the mention of fish occurs alongside cattle (κτήνη), birds (πετεινόν), and creeping things (ἑρπετόν) in the context of praising Solomon for all of the great things he spoke of in his great wisdom. Additionally, in Hos. 4.3, the thematic element 'fish of the sea' (ἰχθύες τῆς θαλάσσης) is the final element in the four-fold list 'with the wild beasts of the field and with the creeping creatures of the earth and with the birds of the sky and the fish

12. Craig S. Keener, *Acts: An Exegetical Commentary* (4 vols.; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2012–2015), II, p. 1768.

13. Keener, *Acts*, II, p. 1768.

14. Keener, *Acts*, II, p. 1768.

of the sea' (σὺν τοῖς θηρίοις τοῦ ἀγροῦ καὶ σὺν τοῖς ἑρπετοῖς τῆς γῆς καὶ σὺν τοῖς πετεινοῖς τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ οἱ ἰχθύες τῆς θαλάσσης) in the context of their perishing due to the lack of faithfulness in the land of Israel. A similar description of God's judgment with these same four elements is found in Ezek. 38.20. We thus find various lists of animals throughout the LXX, some resembling the lists found in Peter's vision, but more is needed to disambiguate which of these texts, which themselves address various contexts, may in fact be relevant in identifying an intertextual thematic formation.

Second, it is too selective and even misleading to state that 'the LXX often defines "creepers" (ἑρπετά) or (more often) "beasts" (θηρία, Acts 11.6) as "of earth,"' when in multiple places ἑρπετά is, in fact, used to refer to animals that live in the sea (Gen 1.20, 21), live on the earth (Gen. 7.8, 14, 21), and fly in the air (Lev. 11.20, 21, 23; Deut. 14.19).[15] The reason that this is misleading is because it diverts attention away from two important elements: (1) the genitive modifier τῆς γῆς, which functions as a qualifier of ἑρπετά in Acts 10.12 but not in 11.6 where it qualifies τετράποδα—a clear instance of deviation making it a foregrounded feature; and (2) the clarification this modifier provides with respect to its collocation with another thematic formation: 'common and/or unclean' (κοινὸν καὶ/ἢ ἀκάθαρτον). I will explain both of these in more detail. As for the first of these, the genitive modifier functions to limit the various texts to which Peter's vision can be related, and therefore guides the reader to what other texts are being engaged and what value positions and thematic meanings are thus in play. Due to ἑρπετά being modified in the first iteration of Peter's vision, possible meanings are reduced as the number of potential intertexts are excluded, such as some of those related to the creation narrative in Genesis as well as some of the purity laws in Leviticus and Deuteronomy. When combined with the absence of fish in Peter's vision, the likelihood that Peter is invoking the creation story diminishes further, and this possibility is virtually eliminated when the recurring co-thematic element of 'common and unclean' is factored into the analysis, which is not a thematic element of the Genesis creation narrative at all but does invoke systems of cleanliness and purity that recur across important religious texts in the literary environment of Acts.[16] The relation of the list of

15. Keener even cites some of these examples.

16. Also, the formation of the lists of animals as they occur in Hosea includes the use of θυρίον, ἑρπετόν, πετεινόν, all with their respective genitive modifiers: τὰ θηρία τοῦ ἀγροῦ, τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, τὰ ἑρπετὰ τῆς γῆς (Hos. 2.14 [LXX]; 2.20

animals with the thematic formation of 'common and unclean' thus needs to be considered more fully.

When considering both thematic formations—that is, the list of animals and the 'clean/unclean' formation (κοινὸν καὶ/ἢ ἀκάθαρτον), the texts Keener identifies as God's destruction of creation emerge as more relevant, though this may not be the best way to characterize this group of instances because they all belong to the Noah story, and other 'destruction of creation' texts can include other items in their respective animal lists (e.g. Hos. 4.3) not included in Peter's vision. I also note that it is probably best, then, not to group various lists of animals under the general rubric of creation, which includes both its doing and undoing, because lists in creation accounts often have the addition of other creatures, such as fish, which are missing from the Noah story, a story that entails creation's destruction. What we find, then, is that Peter's vision reflects the lists of animals thematic to the Noah story more than any other group of instances in these so-called 'creation' texts. These include the following verses:

> καὶ εἶπεν ὁ θεὸς ἀπαλείψω τὸν ἄνθρωπον ὃν ἐποίησα ἀπὸ προσώπου τῆς γῆς ἀπὸ ἀνθρώπου ἕως κτήνους καὶ ἀπὸ ἑρπετῶν ἕως τῶν πετεινῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ὅτι ἐθυμώθην ὅτι ἐποίησα αὐτούς ('And God said, "I will wipe out humanity, which I made, from the face of the earth, from humanity as far as animals and from creeping things as far as the birds of the sky, because I have become angry that I made them"') (Gen. 6.7 LXX).

> καὶ ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν κτηνῶν καὶ ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν ἑρπετῶν καὶ ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν θηρίων καὶ ἀπὸ πάσης σαρκὸς δύο δύο ἀπὸ πάντων εἰσάξεις εἰς τὴν κιβωτὸν ἵνα τρέφῃς μετὰ σεαυτοῦ ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ ἔσονται ('And from all of the animals and from all of the creeping things and from all of the wild beasts and from all flesh, two by two, you will bring all into the ark, so that you can keep them alive with you; they will be male and female') (Gen. 6.19 LXX).

[LXX]). This thematic formation takes place in the context of God's laying to waste his creation (Hos. 2.14 [LXX]) in addition to the establishment of a new covenant (Hos. 2.20 [LXX]). However, the co-thematic element of 'clean/unclean' does not appear in these locations.

ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν ὀρνέων τῶν πετεινῶν κατὰ γένος καὶ ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν κτηνῶν κατὰ γένος καὶ ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν ἑρπετῶν τῶν ἑρπόντων ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς κατὰ γένος αὐτῶν δύο δύο ἀπὸ πάντων εἰσελεύσονται πρὸς σὲ τρέφεσθαι μετὰ σοῦ ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ ('From all of the birds according to their kind, and from all of the animals according to their kind, and from all of the creeping things of the earth according to their kind, two by two, from every kind will enter with you, to keep them alive with you, male and female') (Gen. 6.20 LXX).

καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν πετεινῶν καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν κτηνῶν τῶν καθαρῶν καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν κτηνῶν τῶν μὴ καθαρῶν καὶ ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν ἑρπετῶν τῶν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ('And from all of the birds, and from all of the animals that are clean, and from all of the animals that are not clean, and from all of the creeping things of the earth') (Gen. 7.8 LXX).

καὶ πάντα τὰ θηρία κατὰ γένος καὶ πάντα τὰ κτήνη κατὰ γένος καὶ πᾶν ἑρπετὸν κινούμενον ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς κατὰ γένος καὶ πᾶν πετεινὸν κατὰ γένος ('And all wild beasts according to kind, and all animals according to kind, and all creeping things that move upon the earth according to kind, and all birds according to kind') (Gen. 7.14 LXX).

καὶ ἀπέθανεν πᾶσα σὰρξ κινουμένη ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς τῶν πετεινῶν καὶ τῶν κτηνῶν καὶ τῶν θηρίων καὶ πᾶν ἑρπετὸν κινούμενον ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς καὶ πᾶς ἄνθρωπος ('And all flesh died that moved upon the earth, of birds, and animals, and wild beasts, and all creeping things which move upon the earth, and all mankind') (Gen. 7.21 LXX).

καὶ ἐξήλειψεν πᾶν τὸ ἀνάστημα ὃ ἦν ἐπὶ προσώπου πάσης τῆς γῆς ἀπὸ ἀνθρώπου ἕως κτήνους καὶ ἑρπετῶν καὶ τῶν πετεινῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ ἐξηλείφθησαν ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς καὶ κατελείφθη μόνος Νωε καὶ οἱ μετ' αὐτοῦ ἐν τῇ κιβωτῷ ('And he wiped out everything in existence which was on the face of all the earth, from mankind as far as animals, and creeping things, and birds of the sky, and they were wiped out from the earth and only Noah was left and those with him in the ark') (Gen. 7.23 LXX).

καὶ ἐμνήσθη ὁ θεὸς τοῦ Νωε καὶ πάντων τῶν θηρίων καὶ πάντων τῶν κτηνῶν καὶ πάντων τῶν πετεινῶν καὶ πάντων τῶν ἑρπετῶν ὅσα ἦν μετ' αὐτοῦ ἐν τῇ κιβωτῷ καὶ ἐπήγαγεν ὁ θεὸς πνεῦμα ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν καὶ ἐκόπασεν τὸ ὕδωρ ('And God remembered Noah and all of the wild beasts and all

> of the animals and all of the birds and all of the creeping things which were with him in the ark, and God brought a wind upon the earth and the water subsided') (Gen. 8.1 LXX).

> καὶ πάντα τὰ θηρία ὅσα ἐστὶν μετὰ σοῦ καὶ πᾶσα σὰρξ ἀπὸ πετεινῶν ἕως κτηνῶν καὶ πᾶν ἑρπετὸν κινούμενον ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἐξάγαγε μετὰ σεαυτοῦ καὶ αὐξάνεσθε καὶ πληθύνεσθε ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ('And all the wild beasts which are with you and all flesh from the birds as far as animals and all creeping things that move upon the earth, lead out with yourself and increase and multiply upon the earth') (Gen. 8.17 LXX).

> καὶ πάντα τὰ θηρία καὶ πάντα τὰ κτήνη καὶ πᾶν πετεινὸν καὶ πᾶν ἑρπετὸν κινούμενον ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς κατὰ γένος αὐτῶν ἐξήλθοσαν ἐκ τῆς κιβωτοῦ ('And all the wild beasts and all the animals and all the birds and all the creeping things that move upon the earth, according to their kind, exited the ark') (Gen. 8.19 LXX).

There are a few observations that can be drawn from the above passages. First, in the Genesis story of Noah, animals are repeatedly listed in relatively consistent fashion, and this establishes a thematic formation. There is some variation with the inclusion of θυρία; it is omitted in Gen. 6.7, 20 and 7.8, but then is used in every instance following 7.8. The pattern of variation regarding the replacing of θυρία is one maintained in the two lists of Acts 10 and 11, where it is omitted in the first list but then included in the second.

Secondly, within this group of instances, Gen. 7.8 is particularly important, since it introduces the element of 'clean/unclean'. This is the only instance where the distinction between clean and unclean animals is made explicit, though it can then be considered implicit throughout by means of πᾶς words in each instance.

Thirdly, one difference to note between the Noah story and Peter's vision is that whereas the Noah story consistently makes use of the lexeme κτῆνος, the lists in Acts substitute the near-synonym τετράποδα. It is possible that this lexical selection in the Acts account is motivated, since κτῆνος, though it can be used to refer inclusively to domesticated animals as a class (e.g. Zech. 14.15 [LXX]) as well as a range of domesticated animals (e.g. cattle, donkeys, horses and the like),[17] it can also be used to refer more specifically to cattle (compare Rev. 18.13) and thus might be interpreted in light of its association

17. E.g. Lk. 10.34; Acts 23.24; 1 Cor. 15.39; Rev. 18.13.

with clean animals. The term τετράποδα in Acts 10.2 and 11.6 would thus help to emphasize the problem of cleanliness because Leviticus (LXX) uses τετράποδα in contexts that exclusively address uncleanliness (7.21; 18.23; 20.15; 27.27), whereas κτῆνος refers to animals that can be sacrificed and eaten (7.26; 11.2 [2x]) and is the lexeme used when differentiating which animals are clean and unclean (11.3, 26; 20.25). The rationale for this motivated substitution will become clearer after identifying the proper heteroglossic backdrop of Peter's vision, but suffice it now to say that cattle represent a specific status in the *Animal Apocalypse*, which, as I will show, is contextualized within the Noah story in *1 Enoch*'s *Book of Dreams* and is intertextually relevant for understanding the meaning of Peter's vision.[18] Cattle, in the *Animal Apocalypse* (see below for more explanation), are the types of animals that symbolize humanity before the Flood and after the transformative act of the 'leader' at the end of the vision, where all of the unclean and wild animals are returned to their former state as cattle. Therefore, the selected use of τετράποδα helps to maintain clarity around Peter's predicament of not wanting to eat anything unclean.

In light of these observations, the Noah story in Genesis is an appropriate biblical text to bring into dialogue with Peter's vision, since it shares the repeated co-thematic elements in Peter's vision. The interpreter, however, should not be so hasty as to conclude that Peter's vision is meant strictly to invoke the Noah story as it is narrated in Genesis or that this is the only intertext to consider. This is because the Noah story in Genesis is only one account of a more complex Noahic tradition (or traditions) that existed in the first-century world, where other important Jewish literary texts contained modified versions of the Noah story that did not necessarily promote the same val-

18. Cattle are referred to many times throughout the *Animal Apocalypse* both as a collective group of animals and as more specified kinds, such as bulls, cows, heifers, and calves (see, e.g., *1 En.* 85.6, 9; 86.2, 3; 89.1, 5, 6, 12). Admittedly, the existing Greek fragments of *1 Enoch* do not contain any words for cattle, so the words used in *1 Enoch* can only be guessed (see Patrick A. Tiller, *A Commentary on the Animal Apocalypse of 1 Enoch* [EJL, 4; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993], p. 227). However, whether *1 Enoch* used κτῆνος or the more probable βόες when referring to cattle, the word choice is inconsequential for the intertextual analysis, since words do not have to be exact from text to text but, rather, must have a semantic overlap in which similar words and phrases are used in a way to engage value positions.

ue orientations as found in the Genesis account.[19] Notable texts of this sort include *1 Enoch*—the *Book of Dreams* in *1 Enoch* in particular—as well as the book of *Jubilees,* among others. Moreover, I have yet to consider the importance of the 'clean/unclean' thematic formation and the fact that the vision uses patterns of meaning-making resembling Jewish apocalyptic writings, both of which are relevant to interpretation of Peter's vision.

As for the clean/unclean component of Peter's visions, we can note that ostensibly Peter's vision concerns dietary laws, as the vision pertains to the consumption of animals, and Peter, at first, understands the vision in light of such laws when he is commanded to kill and eat. Another relevant text to consider, then, is Lev. 20.25:

> And you will make a distinction between the clean animal [τῶν κτηνῶν τῶν καθαρῶν] and the unclean animal [τῶν κτηνῶν τῶν ἀκαθάρων], and between the clean bird [τῶν πετεινῶν τῶν καθαρῶν] and the unclean bird [τῶν ἀκαθάρτων]; you will not defile yourselves by animal [τοῖς κτήνεσιν] or by bird [τοῖς πετεινοῖς] or by anything with which the ground teems [τοῖς ἑρπετοῖς τῆς γῆς], which I have set apart for you in uncleanliness.

This text shares multiple co-thematic ties with Peter's vision and Peter's response to the voice that comes to him. The value orientations promoted in this passage are those to which Peter adheres as a Jew, making his response intelligible and consistent with his beliefs and values. However, the intertextual relationship that Peter's vision shares with Lev. 20.25 and the values it promotes is not one that can be clearly identified as either allying or opposing since the text indicates that Peter's objection to the voice (Acts 10.14) is based on his misunderstanding of the vision's meaning. Thus, the value positions

19. Certain scholars have erred in this regard. Edward Gordon Selwyn, for example, argues that Peter's vision came to be associated with baptism because it invokes the Flood. He believes that the sheet that came down from heaven resembles sails, since Peter was on the roof of a house by the sea and the sails that he would have been able to see inspired the vision and represented Noah's ark (*The First Epistle of St. Peter: The Greek Text with Introduction, Notes, and Essays* [London: Macmillan, 1947], p. 333). Such an interpretation stretches the imagination to force a simple intra-canonical interpretation while failing to account for how Peter's vision relates more closely to other texts in the broader literary environment.

the Leviticus text promotes need to be considered in a dialogical manner with Peter's later apprehension of the vision's meaning.

Luke guides his readers in how to interpret the role the clean/unclean intertextual thematic formation plays in relation to Peter's perspective. First, the voice responds to Peter's refusal by directing him not to make common what God has made clean (Acts 10.15; 11.9). Then, after pondering the vision and encountering Cornelius's men, Peter grasps the meaning of his vision: 'God has instructed me to say no person is common or unclean' (10.28). Therefore, we can conclude that Peter failed initially to comprehend his vision because he did not employ the proper interpretive matrix by which to discern its symbolic meaning. He, at first, interpreted the vision with respect to the literal particularities of what he saw, which is how one would reasonably expect a Jew to interpret such a vision in light of Torah. But Peter realizes he did not apprehend the vision's intended message, which was communicated through a kind of symbolic articulation characteristic of the Jewish apocalyptic mode of communication, not the kind of communicative mode of a legal register. Therefore, the purpose for creating the intertextual relationship between Peter's vision and the Levitical purity laws is not to establish a direct allying or opposing position between them but rather to use the intertextual relationship as the matrix through which to create an instance of defamiliarization—that is, to make the text strange or contrary to expectation so as to elicit a new perspective.[20] Purity laws regarding clean and unclean animals, then, play an integral role in understanding Peter's vision in light of the genre they invoke. Since relying on Lev. 20.25 and the genre of law fails to satisfy the interpretative questions Peter's vision elicits, we need to look elsewhere to find out how Peter makes the jump from his literal misinterpretation to his eventual, correct understanding.

In a 2019 article on Peter's vision, Jason A. Staples argues, 'throughout early Jewish visionary literature, to have a vision of animals was to see the

20. The notion of defamiliarization was first introduced by the Russian formalist Viktor Shklovsky in his 1917 article titled 'Art as Technique', which became the opening chapter in his seminal book *Theory of Prose* (trans. Benjamin Sher; Normal, IL: Dalkey Archive Press, 1990 [1925]), p. 6. It is a foundational theoretical concept in stylistics, or the linguistic analysis of literature. See Leslie Jeffries and Daniel McIntyre, *Stylistics* (CTL; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), p. 2.

nations in symbolic form.'[21] Since the relationship between animals, food and nations was one used in Jewish apocalyptic literature and was part of the Jewish symbolic world, Jewish readers especially would have recognized Peter's vision as participating in a known discursive practice, and this would have had an effect on how this vision would have been interpreted. John Moxon, however, argues against 'making an overly strong connection to so-called "apocalyptic ideas"', and instead argues that Peter's vision should be interpreted as 'didactic or halakhic', making the following statement: 'Although the opened heaven is often said to be an apocalyptic motif, these creatures are not mythical beasts but recognisable animals with an essentially didactic purpose. This may also mean that the descent from heaven might be a halakhic rather than an apocalyptic device.'[22] Staples, however, convincingly refutes Moxon's argument, stating that Moxon's distinction is artificial and based on modern sensibilities of what does or does not constitute 'apocalyptic ideas' and pointing out that 'nothing precludes apocalyptic literature from having a halakhic or didactic function; a halakhic vision is still revelatory—the very definition of the word "apocalyptic"'.[23] Moreover, Staples goes on to show that apocalyptic literature is not limited to mythical beasts as Moxon mistakenly claims, but 'rather regularly features recognizable, mundane animals',[24] citing the *Animal Apocalypse* of *1 Enoch* as the ostensive text that exemplifies the nations-as-animals trope with recognizable animals resembling the nations.[25] His article thus makes a significant contribution to the

21. Staples, '"Rise, Kill, and Eat"', p. 5. Staples cites others who concur that the symbolic use of animals readily invokes the history of nations. See, for example, John E. Goldingay, who writes regarding Daniel 7 that 'The use of animal symbols already suggest [*sic*] that it is the history of nations that unfolds before us' (*Daniel* [WBC, 30; Waco, TX: Word, 1989], p. 185).

22. Moxon, *Peter's Halakhic Nightmare*, pp. 119, 170.

23. Staples, '"Rise, Kill, and Eat"', p. 6.

24. Staples, '"Rise, Kill, and Eat"', p. 6.

25. Staples summarizes the *Animal Apocalypse*, highlighting the resolution of its plot where all unclean animals are turned into white bulls. However, because his study is purely comparative, he does not see the important intertextual relationship between these two texts; in other words, the *Animal Apocalypse* can help us understand Peter's vision because it shows how Jewish apocalyptic literature used animals to resemble humans and to address the religious values of clean and unclean animals

role of the generic backdrop of Peter's vision, but upon further examination there are some issues that arise, especially as we examine the intertextual features of Peter's vision.

Perhaps the biggest problem Staples creates in his study occurs when he tries to make too much out of the similarities between the voice's command to Peter (Acts 10.13) and the second beast's emerging from the sea in Dan. 7.5 who was instructed to 'rise and consume much flesh', going as far as to claim that Peter's vision depends on this earlier Jewish apocalyptic description.[26] While sharing some lexical and grammatical similarities, a more delicate linguistic analysis of the vision does not support the view that the sentence 'Rise, kill and eat' (Acts 10.13) is an intertextual thematic formation—that is, it is not a thematic formation that elicits a clear relationship of value orientations between texts. This claim is supported by identifying a number of the weaknesses in Staples's argument.

First and foremost, Staples leverages English translation to create a back door into his argument. In Greek, the command to Peter is a two-fold direc-

and their association with Jew-Gentile social dynamics, but he does not go the additional step to show how Luke responds to such texts as the *Animal Apocalypse*.

26. Compare the article's abstract (Staples, '"Rise, Kill, and Eat"', p. 3), which indicates the dependency of Acts 10 on Daniel 7, with the statements Staples makes on p. 7 regarding the significance of the connection between these two texts. Staples also discusses other instances in Jewish apocalyptic literature that employs the animals-as-nations trope, including *4 Ezra* 11.1–12.39; *T. Naph.* 5.6-8; and the *Animal Apocalypse*, as well as other non-apocalyptic examples, such as Isa. 11.6; 65.23; Jer. 5.6; Ezek. 34; 39.17-18, but his strongest argument is based on the dependency of Peter's vision on the book of Daniel. Keener also comments that it is common in Jewish apocalyptic literature for animals to symbolize various nations, and then refers to numerous texts, including most of those cited by Staples and some others: Dan. 7.3-8; 4 Ezra 11.39-40; Rev. 9.3-10; 13.2, as well as *1 En.* 89–90 from the *Animal Apocalypse* (*Acts*, II, p. 1766). However, the *Animal Apocalypse* stands out as the most different among these examples, because while the first four references from Daniel, 4 Ezra and Revelation refer to specific empires or major powers, with the animals depicted in these texts as having fantastical features, the *Animal Apocalypse* is the only text where Israelites/Jews are represented as contrasting sets of clean animals against the unclean beasts and birds that refer to many different nations. A more comparable instance to the *Animal Apocalypse* than those just listed would be Jesus' use of the sheep and the goats to distinguish between the blessed and cursed people at the final judgment (Mt. 25.31-46), a text that neither Staples nor Keener cites.

tive—θῦσον καὶ ἔφαγον ('kill and eat', Acts 10.13). This directive is modified by the participle ἀναστάς, which construes the *manner* in which Peter is commanded to kill and eat and does not grammaticalize its own semantic feature of directive attitude.[27] This is obscured in many translations, where the participle is translated as if it were an imperative (e.g. NASB, NRSV, NIV, ESV, KJV, NAB, among many others), which gives the appearance of a closer co-thematic tie between Acts 10.13 and Dan. 7.5 than actually exists.

Secondly, the process of 'rising' relates to different contexts in the two respective texts and thus has different connotations (i.e. coming up out of the sea in Dan. 7.5 and getting up from praying in Acts 10.13), and so it makes little contextual sense to correlate Peter to the second beast of Daniel 7.

Thirdly, the participle ἀναστάς seems to assume a special stylistic function in Acts 10 to characterize the actions of Peter. The same participle is used to describe the manner in which Peter is directed to go down to Cornelius's men (10.20) and the manner in which he traveled with Cornelius's men (Acts 10.36), and this creates a cohesive lexical chain around Peter's responses concerning his interaction with Gentiles. Its stylistic role, therefore, serves as an independent feature at the level of the discourse rather than as a constituent of an intertextual thematic formation with the two imperatives it modifies.

Fourthly, there are closer parallels to the structure of the voice's two-fold directive in the *Animal Apocalypse*, where killing and eating/devouring collocate repeatedly in contexts where the element of clean and unclean animals also plays an integral role in the scheme of the narrative (*1 En*. 86.5; 87.1; 89.55-58, 65-66, 69, 74; 90.2, 8, 11). It is surprising that Staples fails to make this observation, given the direct references he makes to the *Animal Apoca-*

27. I understand that Greek grammars discuss the category of an imperatival participle, but these discussions relate to the independent usage of the participle (i.e. not dependent upon a verb). See Stanley E. Porter, *Idioms of the Greek New Testament* (BLG, 2; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2nd edn, 1994), pp. 185-86; David L. Mathewson and Elodie Ballantine Emig, *Intermediate Greek Grammar: Syntax for Students of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2016), pp. 220-21. The use of the participle in Acts 10.13, however, is grammatically dependent as it is rank-shifted down from the level of clause to word group to function as a modifier of the finite verb θῦσον. Moreover, it is more to the point that participles paradigmatically do not decline for verbal mood and so any imperatival sense is conditioned by context (i.e. discourse semantics in Systemic Functional Linguistics, or what other linguistic models would account for under pragmatics).

lypse in his article, including references to its clean/unclean motif and nations-as-animals trope to refute the argument of Moxon's study.

In summation, Staples does well to criticize others' problematic views of Peter's vision and to rightly relate Peter's vision to Jewish apocalyptic literature, but his lack of methodological procedure leads him to entertain inappropriate connections that confuse the intertextual relations Peter's vision creates within its literary environment.

The conclusion to be drawn from this examination of intertextual thematic options is that Peter's vision does not simply relate intertextually to texts that thematically pertain to creation or the various forms of its undoing as Keener suggests, nor simply to passages in the book of Leviticus that share certain co-thematic themes related to clean and unclean animals, nor simply to Jewish apocalyptic texts that share tropes of animal symbolism. Rather, the lists of animals orients more specifically to the story of Noah, which consistently omits the inclusion of fish from its thematic lists of animals and which also includes the co-thematic content of clean and unclean animals, an element that is missing from the other creation texts and the other various texts that have such lists. However, the use of Jewish apocalyptic tropes and the matter of clean and unclean animals being extended beyond its literal, Levitical meaning leads the reader to look beyond the Noah story as it is told in Genesis to a wider tradition regarding this story. At first, it may seem like this results in an intertextual impasse, since no one solution has been put forth that satisfies all these criteria. What text concerns the story of Noah, an emphasis on the thematic element of clean/unclean, and the Jewish apocalyptic trope of nations symbolized by animals? When one considers the *Book of Dreams* in *1 Enoch*, a clear answer presents itself. This is because the *Animal Apocalypse*, often discussed on its own, is part of a two-dream sequence in the so-called *Book of Dreams*, where the first dream foresees the Flood and thus orients the *Book of Dreams* not only to Jewish apocalyptic literature, but also to the broader Noahic tradition. As already indicated above, the thematic element of clean/unclean plays a major role in this text as well. The aligning of all of these thematic elements warrants a much fuller consideration than it has received to date. I will now turn to *1 Enoch*'s *Book of Dreams* to account for the co-thematic ties it shares with Peter's vision and attempt to identify the dialogical relationship Luke creates between Peter's vision and the *Book of Dreams*.

The Book of Dreams in 1 Enoch and its Value Orientations

Relevant Questions of Redaction and Literary Form

First Enoch is a composite of several books compiled over the course of the third and second centuries BCE, reflecting various social contexts but nevertheless eventuating in a logical and coherent literary form. The *Book of Dreams* is the fourth book of *1 Enoch* (83–90).[28] Although *1 Enoch* is a text that circulated in many versions, including Greek, Aramaic, Syriac, Coptic, Ethiopic and Latin, and although no complete Greek version of the book exists, nor can a complete Greek edition even be eclectically compiled,[29] scholars have reconstructed various aspects of the development of the corpus with a good degree of confidence so as to explain the steps that led from the earliest known Aramaic manuscripts found at Qumran (4QEn^{a-g}) to the more developed form we find in the complete Ethiopic Book of Enoch.[30] For present matters, it is necessary to discuss the issue of the state of the *Book of Dreams* as it would have been known to first-century Jews and Christians. The relevant aspects of this issue include the critical scholarship on the book's redaction history, the textual evidence that supports this history, and the significance of its final literary form.

The scholarly consensus is that the *Book of Dreams* is also a composite text comprised of two traditions—the *Flood Vision* (83–84) and the *Animal*

28. For one view of the development of the corpus, see George W. E. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch Chapters 1–36; 81–108* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 2001), pp. 25-26 and the various discussions of the dates for each book throughout the commentary. The books are the *Book of the Watchers* (1–36), the *Book of Parables* (37–71), the *Book of the Luminaries/Astrological Book* (72–82), the *Book of Dreams* (83–90), the *Epistle of Enoch* (92–105), the *Birth of Noah* (106–7) and chapter 108, which is an appendix that alludes to another book of Enoch. There is still another book, the *Book of Giants*, fragmentary evidence of which is only extant in Qumran Aramaic manuscripts. Cf. Michael A. Knibb, *Essays on the Book of Enoch and Other Early Jewish Texts and Traditions* (SVTP, 22; Leiden: Brill, 2008), pp. 36-55.

29. Nickelsburg estimates that only about twenty-eight percent of *1 Enoch* has been preserved in Greek manuscripts. His count is based on a line-by-line comparison using R.H. Charles, *The Ethiopic Version of the Book of Enoch* (Anecdota Oxoniensis; Oxford: Clarendon, 1906).

30. See Michael A. Knibb, 'Christian Adoption and Transmission of Jewish Pseudepigrapha: The Case of 1 Enoch', *JSJ* 32 (2001), pp. 396-415 (411).

Apocalypse (85–90), which have been combined by a redactor at a certain stage in the book's development.[31] James C. VanderKam argues that this stage was likely precipitated by a change in historical circumstances, since the *Book of the Watchers* and the *Book of Luminaries*, which very likely date further back to the third century BCE, do not contain 'predictions' of what will transpire in sacred history.[32] The production of apocalyptic traditions, such as the two found in the *Book of Dreams* as well as the *Apocalypse of Weeks* (*1 En*. 91.11-17; 93.1-10), may have resulted from 'the rise of an aggressive Hellenizing movement in Judea in the early second century B.C.E.'—the same Hellenistic forces that prompted the famous Maccabean revolt (after 166 BCE).[33] While the production of much apocalyptic literature is traced back to the period when the Seleucid prohibitions of Jewish religious practices were in full effect—especially literature that incorporates visions, such as Dan. 7–12[34]—this does not explain why the *Flood Vision* and the *Animal Apocalypse* were combined. Moreover, Philip L. Tite notes that the relationship between these two visions is underappreciated and not much has been done to understand the reason behind their connection in the *Book of Dreams*.[35] As the state of scholarship currently stands, most studies on the *Book of Dreams* simply privilege the latter of these two visions, with some hardly giving passing consideration to the *Flood Vision*.[36]

31. Philip L. Tite, 'Textual and Redactional Aspects of the Book of Dreams (1 Enoch 83–90)', *BTB* 31 (2001), pp. 106-20 (106).

32. James C. VanderKam, *Enoch: A Man for All Generations* (Studies on Personalities of the Old Testament; Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1995), pp. 60-61.

33. VanderKam, *Enoch*, p. 61.

34. VanderKam, *Enoch*, p. 61.

35. Tite, 'Textual and Redactional Aspects', p. 106.

36. See, for example, VanderKam, *Enoch*, pp. 70-72; Tiller, *Commentary on the Animal Apocalypse*; Ida Frölich, 'The Symbolical Language of the Animal Apocalypse of Enoch (1 Enoch 85–90)', *RevQ* 14 (1990), pp. 629-36; A.F.J. Klijn, 'From Creation to Noah in the Second Dream-Vision of the Ethiopic Enoch', in T. Baarda, A.F.J. Klijn and W.C. van Unnik (eds.), *Miscellanea Neotestamentica, Volume 1* (NovTSup, 47; Leiden: Brill, 1978), pp. 147-59; Matthew Thiessen, 'Paul, the Animal Apocalypse, and Abraham's Gentile Seed', in Lori Baron, Jill Hicks-Keeton and Matthew Thiessen (eds.), *The Ways That Often Parted: Essays in Honor of Joel Marcus* (ECL, 24; Atlanta: SBL 2018), pp. 65-78.

Tite argues that the visions belong to two separate traditions that have been joined by a redactor, the evidence of which is seen, argues Tite, in the shifts in voice in *1 En*. 85.1-2.[37] A more linguistically precise explanation, however, is that this shift is not a result in voice but rather in grammatical person.[38] The first two verses of the second vision construe two different perspectives, the first being the first-person perspective of Enoch and the second being the third-person perspective of the narrator who then introduces Enoch's perspective through direct discourse: '[1] After this I saw a second dream, and I will show all of it to you, my son. [2] And Enoch lifted up [his voice] to his son Methuselah, "To you I speak, my son"' (*1 En*. 85.1-2).[39] As Tiller points out, 'If 85.1 is left off, the *An*[*imal*] *Apoc*[*alypse*] begins with a third-person narrative introducing Enoch's dream as direct discourse. However, 85.1, which ties the *An*[*imal*] *Apoc*[*alypse*] to the first dream-vision, disturbs the context so that a third-person introduction of Enoch's discourse follows Enoch's first-person narrative.'[40] This one 'disturbance', as Tiller describes it, constitutes the only textual evidence that there is editorial activity in the combining of the two visions. Tiller even admits that the final verse of the *Animal Apocalypse*, which assumes both visions ('That night I remembered the *first* dream …' [90.42]) 'has less certain marks of redactional activity'.[41] It would seem that the view of *1 Enoch*'s redaction history that the *Book of Dreams* is the text where two traditions are made to come together for the first time essentially rests on the shift of a single grammatical feature apart from other ways that scholars have sought to determine the situational background of each respective vision. From a linguistic point of view, the shift in grammatical person could be explained as a simple deictic shift to introduce a new discourse unit—that is, the transition from one dream-vision to the

37. See Tite, 'Textual and Redactional Aspects', p. 107.

38. It appears that Tite uses the term 'voice' in the non-technical sense of perspective or point of view while 'person' is used as a grammatical term, but this leads to some potentially confusing statements about the grammar in his article. At one point he states, 'A shift in voice occurs at 85.1-2 from first person to third person and then back to first person' ('Textual and Redactional Aspects', p. 115).

39. I use here the translation in Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, p. 364. For an explanation of his method of translation and how he prioritizes textual evidence, see pp. 3-4 of his commentary.

40. Tiller, *Commentary on the Animal Apocalypse*, p. 98.

41. Tiller, *Commentary on the Animal Apocalypse*, p. 98.

next.[42] In fact, this is how a discourse analysis of the *Book of Dreams* would describe this juncture in the text, and so arguing that the shift in person indicates the work of a later redactor who combined two visions without considering that they may have also belonged to a single tradition is too presumptuous without other corroborating evidence. In other words, while the two visions may have once existed independently, there is no strong linguistic argument to be made that they did not belong to a single tradition before their inclusion in *1 Enoch*. If the argument that the visions belong to independent traditions is to be advanced, it must be done on other grounds.

Tite makes the additional point that the independence of the two sections comprising the *Book of Dreams* is supported by the Qumran fragments of *1 Enoch*, which only contain sections from the *Animal Apocalypse*.[43] The problem here, however, which Tite himself acknowledges, is that there are only four short fragments, and these only attest to portions of *1 En*. 86, 88, and 89: 4QEn^{c} (*1 En*. 89.31-37); 4QEn^{d} (*1 En*. 89.11-14, 29-31); 4QEn^{e} (*1 En*. 88.3–89.6, 7-16, 26-30); and 4QEn^{f} (*1 En*. 86.1-3).[44] Thus, since the beginning of *1 En*. 85 and the end of ch. 90 are not attested in the Qumran manuscripts, it is impossible to show from these fragments, which attest to the state of *1 Enoch* from only one community around the third quarter of the second century BCE to the last third of the first century BCE,[45] that the two visions were

42. See Porter, *Idioms*, p. 301, who, in his discussion on discourse boundaries says that 'shifts in grammatical person (e.g. first to third person, and so forth) are often useful indicators of the closing of one discourse unit and the beginning of another'.

43. Tite, 'Textual and Redactional Aspects', p. 107.

44. For translations and orthographical introductions to each of these fragments, see J.T. Milik, *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments from Qumrân Cave 4* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976). Cf. Maxwell J. Davidson, *Angels at Qumran: A Comparative Study of 1 Enoch 1–36, 72–108 and Sectarian Writings from Qumran* (JSPSup, 11; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992), p. 96. In what appears to be a typographical error, Tite erroneously attributes the fragments of 4QEn^{c} to 4QEn^{e}.

45. Paleographers date 4QEn^{c} (4Q204) and 4QEn^{d} (4Q205) to the last third of the first century BCE, 4QEn^{e} (4Q206) to the first half of the first century BCE, and 4QEn^{f} (4Q207) to the third quarter of the second century BCE. See Peter W. Flint, 'Noncanonical Writings in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Apocrypha, Other Previously Known Writings, Pseudepigrapha', in Peter W. Flint with Tae Hun Kim (eds.), *The*

not already included together, provided they came from two different traditions to begin with.

The argument that the visions come from different traditions is also made on the basis that they have different functions. Tiller claims the 'function of the *An*[*imal*] *Apoc*[*alypse*] seems to be to promote a certain political stance and to encourage those that already adhere to it. The function of the first dream-vision seems to be to legitimate the heirs of the Enochic traditions over against other possibly competing groups.'[46] Putting aside the accuracy of Tiller's assessment of the functional role of each vision, his assessment about the respective functions of each vision carries with it the apparent assumption that they cannot address the same situation and have a unified aim. The political stance Tiller identifies in the *Animal Apocalypse* entails support for the violent resistance against Hellenization that characterized the Maccabean Revolt, which he contrasts with other stances, such as nonviolent resistance as represented in the story of Daniel who received the death penalty for openly maintaining loyalty to the Law, or other positions, such as compliance, flight or inaction.[47] He concludes, 'The *Animal Apocalypse*, being against all foreign domination of Israel and in support of Judas Maccabeus, would doubtless have been among the violent resistance to the new Hellenistic constitution.'[48]

It is surprising that scholars readily assume the *Flood Vision* belongs to another tradition rather than considering the possibility that the pair of visions are a contextually-bound, mutually supporting set and thus function to create coherence from the preceding books of *1 Enoch* through the *Animal Apocalypse*. Since the *Animal Apocalypse* represents a different historical situation than the *Book of the Watchers*, which preceded it by some time, an effective way to develop the corpus of *1 Enoch* would be to stage the *Animal Apocalypse* as the second vision that follows the thematic bridge provided by the first vision, which textually ties the Enochic corpus together. To advance this argument, I will use Tiller's own words, who goes on to explain that the *Flood Vision*

Bible at Qumran: Text, Shape and Interpretation (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001), pp. 96-97.

46. Tiller, *Commentary on the Animal Apocalypse*, p. 99.
47. Tiller, *Commentary on the Animal Apocalypse*, pp. 102-3.
48. Tiller, *Commentary on the Animal Apocalypse*, p. 103.

> alludes to and thereby incorporates many of the distinctive Enochic traditions: the course of the sun and moon and their regularity (83.11; cf. the *Astrological Book* and 2.1); the sin of the Watchers (84.4; cf. the *Book of the Watchers*); Enoch the intercessor (83.8, 10; 84; cf. 13.4-7); the destruction of the earth in judgment (*passim*). It appropriates these traditions as a legitimation of the heirs of the Enochic tradition by having Enoch intercede on behalf of a remnant which is characterized as Enoch's posterity on earth (84.5), 'the flesh of righteousness and uprightness', and 'a plant of the eternal seed' (84.6). Therefore, the first dream-vision sees the community that it represents as the righteous remnant for which Enoch intercedes, distinct from the rest of Israel.[49]

This description shows a number of ways in which the *Flood Vision* contextualizes the *Book of Dreams* within *1 Enoch* and sets the stage for the *Animal Apocalypse*. The typology of the Flood invokes the tradition of the Noah story, and the motifs of final judgment and the remnant constrain how the *Animal Apocalypse* is to be interpreted, since the *Animal Apocalypse* concludes with a selection of sheep that remained (akin to a remnant) that were being worshiped by all the other animals at the time of the judgment (90.30) and before the last white bull (i.e. the Messiah) is born and all the animals are transformed into cattle (90.37). Therefore, The *Flood Vision*'s role in contextualizing the *Animal Apocalypse* considered alongside the lack of evidence of their textual redaction (see above) suggest a relationship more akin to a common tradition than a composite of two visions with separate origins. Such a possibility for understanding the relationship between the two visions challenges the consensus that the visions belong to separate traditions and speak to differrent situational contexts. Rather, it provides an explanation for the addition of the *Book of Dreams* to the Enochic corpus that suggests a unified function of the two visions.

Regardless of the accuracy of Tiller's argument or my own re-evaluation of the evidence, what matters for the sake of this essay is the literary form of *1 Enoch* as it existed and as it was used in Jewish as well as Christian communities in the first century CE. From the discussion above, there is good reason to believe that the *Book of Dreams* existed in the first century in the form we know it from the later version of *1 Enoch*, since for the *Animal Apocalypse* to maintain coherence in the Enochic corpus, the *Flood Vision* is necessary to provide a thematic bridge.

49. Tiller, *Commentary on the Animal Apocalypse*, p. 99.

We also know that *1 Enoch* was a text known and used widely by Greek-speaking Christian communities throughout the first century. This knowledge is gathered in part from the quotation of *1 En*. 1.9 in Jude 14-15, the Enochic material used in Revelation, and the reference to the 'spirits in prison' in 1 Pet. 3.19-22, which refers to the *Book of the Watchers*.[50] In light of this evidence, there is little reason not to assume that the version of *1 Enoch* known among first-century Jewish and Christian communities contained the content of the *Book of Dreams* and occupied a prominent place in the literary environment and religious context of Luke's audience.

The next question, then, concerns the value orientations the *Book of Dreams* served to promote or demote in a first-century context, where it would have been interpreted anew and not necessarily with the same objects in mind as previous generations of interpreters in Judea where the *Book of Dreams* probably originated in response to Antiochus IV.[51] Therefore, I turn now to a summary of the two visions before considering in more detail the thematic elements and value orientations that share strong co-thematic ties with Peter's visions in Acts 10.

Enoch's First Vision: The Flood

The *Book of Dreams* relates two visions that the antediluvian patriarch, Enoch, has when he is a youth—that is, before he took a wife (83.2)—while staying in the house of his grandfather, Mahalalel. In the first of these visions, Enoch, while lying down, sees heaven being thrown down upon the earth and the earth being swallowed up in the great abyss (83.3-4). Mahalalel then interprets the vision as a valid prediction of the impending flood God will bring upon the earth as judgment for the sin of its inhabitants (83.7-9). Enoch then prays to God, first blessing God and then seeking supplication for a human remnant that God would spare in the wake of his destructive judgment (83.10–84.6). His prayer is written down 'for the generations of eternity'

50. See Cynthia Long Westfall, 'The Relationship between the Resurrection, the Proclamation to the Spirits in Prison and the Baptismal Regeneration: 1 Peter 3:19-22', in Stanley E. Porter, Michael A. Hayes and David Tombs (eds.), *Resurrection* (JSNTSup, 186; RILP, 5; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), pp. 106-53.

51. See Tiller, *Commentary on the Animal Apocalypse*, p. 101.

(83.10). David R. Jackson explains that this implies 'an ongoing need for such a prayer in future manifestations of the paradigm'.[52]

George Nickelsburg states, 'The relevance of this narrative lies in its typology between the flood and the final judgment … The narrative functions like the Noachic stories' that are narrated in *1 En.* 106–7 and 65–67.[53] He goes on to explain, 'The major tendency evident in this author's reuse of earlier materials is an emphasis on elements that are appropriate to a fictive setting in Noachic times.'[54] However, a difference in this reuse of elements, such as with the plant of ever-enduring seed (10.3, 16; 84.6), is that the emphasis shifts from depicting the remnant as being saved from the sin of the angels (i.e. the Watchers) and the violence of the giants (see *1 En.* 6–11; cf. Gen. 6.1-4) to the wrath of God's universal judgment.[55] This modification, however, is still consistent with the backstory of *1 En.* 6–11, where the revelation of forbidden secrets (see 7.1; 8.1-3; 9.8; 10.8) characterizes the essence of the angelic rebellion and was the cause of all subsequent defilement and violence. The significance in this change, however, as Nickelsburg sees it, is that it serves a function in its context as a complement to Enoch's second vision. Supporting this, he writes,

> Together they emphasize, each in its own way, the typology between the flood and the final judgement. In addition, they state what has not been said hitherto in the corpus with respect to the texts' fictive setting. Already 'in the days of Jared', at the time of the angelic rebellion, the divine Judge was prepared to deal with sin. The flood was waiting in the wings more than a millennium before it happened, and Enoch knew this. Moreover, in God's purview, revealed in the second dream vision, this primordial judgment long anticipated its antitype in the eschaton.[56]

Enoch's first dream vision, according to Nickelsburg, is thus shaped from traditional material from the story of the Watcher's rebellion and the story of Noah 'for the purpose of providing a companion piece to what is now the sec-

52. David R. Jackson, *Enochic Judaism: Three Defining Paradigm Exemplars* (LSTS, 49; London: T. & T. Clark International, 2004), p. 36.

53. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, p. 347.

54. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, p. 347.

55. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, p. 347.

56. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, p. 347.

ond dream vision',[57] where the motifs of sin, judgment, and remnant are expanded through an allegory of Israel's history and future.

Enoch's Second Vision: The Animal Apocalypse

The *Animal Apocalypse* (*1 En.* 85–90), the second of Enoch's two visions in the *Book of Dreams*, is presented as an extended allegorical dream that begins with Adam as a white bull in *1 En.* 85.3 and progresses to the Maccabean Revolt (90.9-19), which is thought to be around the time when this portion of *1 Enoch* was composed (ca. 165 BCE).[58] The vision, as the name indicates, is about animals—cattle, sheep, and various unclean and scavenging beasts and birds that prey on the sheep. Each type of animal has a historical referent that it symbolizes. The sheep in the story always represent Israel; the cattle symbolize different groups throughout the vision, including the pre-Israelite people from the time of Adam down to Noah, certain Shemites, and the restored humanity in the final stage of the vision; and the various beasts and birds throughout the vision represent the enemies of Israel, that is, the Gentile nations. The boars symbolize the Edomites and Amalekites, the wolves the Egyptians, the dogs the Philistines, the foxes the Ammonites, the lions the Assyrians, the leopards the Babylonians, the hyenas the Syrians (?), the eagles the Macedonian Greeks, the vultures the Ptolemaic Egyptians, the ravens the Seleucid Syrians, and the kites are uncertain.[59] Other elements in the vision also function symbolically as well: the stars represent the Watchers, which play a substantial role in the earlier books of *1 Enoch*, and humans are angels, with the lone exception of the owner of the sheep, who represents God.[60]

The vision is divided into three time periods: the distant past, the relative present,[61] and the eschatological future.[62] Each begins with a single patriarch,

57. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, p. 347.

58. However, Nickelsburg notes that an earlier version may date to the end of the third century or the beginning of the second century (*1 Enoch 1*, pp. 8, 360-61).

59. See Bauckham, 'James, Peter, and the Gentiles', p. 106.

60. Tiller, *Commentary on the Animal Apocalypse*, p. 3.

61. This title is perhaps an oversimplification that verges on misrepresentation, as the second major historical period spans from the postdiluvian era to the final judgment, which the author saw as imminent.

62. That the *Animal Apocalypse* is divided into three beginnings, which present the vision's organizing principle of history, is argued by several Enochic scholars.

the first being Adam, then Noah, and finally an unnamed eschatological patriarch, all of whom are represented by a white bull. The first age begins with a white bull emerging from the earth (85.3), which then takes a female calf that subsequently bears a black and a red calf. Little imagination is needed to realize that these refer to Adam and Eve and the birth of their first two sons, Cain and Abel. Jackson remarks that it is significant that 'the events of Genesis 3 are completely omitted,' and that 'the first sin of the *A*[*nimal*] *A*[*pocalypse*] is Cain's murder of Abel.'[63] The significance of this feature for this study relates back to the discussion above where it was demonstrated that seeing the lists of animals in the creation story and the Noah story as one thematic formation conflates two traditions and problematizes the intertextual character of Peter's vision. It is also clear from the outset that colors serve as evaluative cyphers.[64] White is good; the bull representing Adam is unblemished, and during this age the white bulls, following the lineage of Seth until Isaac, are those singled out for divine approval. Black is bad; it is the color associated with Cain's figure, who murdered his brother, and all of the various unclean animals listed throughout the *Animal Apocalypse* descend from a black ancestor. Red is neither good nor bad but of another quality; Abel's figuration as the red bull is an inconsequential character, serving only to move the plot along as the object of the black bull's evil act.[65]

Also occurring in the first age, stars, symbolizing the Watchers, fall from the sky. The first of these represents Asael, who corrupts the cattle, and the stars that follow mate with the black cattle, who then bear elephants, camels and donkeys, symbolizing the Gibborim, Nephilim and Elioud—the three classes of giants. These offspring start a cycle of violence among the cattle.[66] At the end of this age, seven white men, symbolizing angels from heaven, come to earth. Three of these accompany Enoch to heaven; three imprison

See Devorah Dimant, 'החבשי פה–צ ההיסטויה על–פי חזון החיות (חנוך)' [History According to the Vision of the Animals (Ethiopic Enoch 85–90)]', ירושלים מחשבת ישראל מחקרי [*Jerusalem Studies in Jewish Thought*] 1 (1982), pp. 18-37 (23); Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, pp. 364-408; Tiller, *Commentary on the Animal Apocalypse*, pp. 15-18.

63. Jackson, *Enochic Judaism*, p. 37.

64. Colors are used in other Old Testament passages in a similar evaluative way to symbolize cleanliness. See Ps. 51.7; Isa. 1.18; Dan. 7.9; Rev. 17.4; 19.8, among other examples.

65. VanderKam, *Enoch*, p. 73.

66. See Tiller, *Commentary on the Animal Apocalypse*, p. 16.

the stars and cause the elephants, camels and donkeys to fight amongst themselves; and one announces a mystery to a white bull, who symbolizes Noah, who then builds a boat to survive the flood along with three additional bulls, who represent Noah's three sons, Shem, Ham and Japheth.

The second age begins following the Flood and continues to the final judgment. Of the three bulls that represent Noah's sons only the black one spawns other various kinds of predatory animals. The remainder of this age is characterized by all kinds of predatory animals killing and devouring the sheep who symbolize the nation of Israel. At the end of this age, a horned ram, who symbolizes Judas Maccabeus, leads the sheep into battle against the other animals. The sheep win the battle due to the intervention of the owner, who symbolizes God. Judgment of the stars and shepherds as well as the blind sheep follow, and they are all thrown into the abyss, leaving only the sheep who have sight. A time of peace follow these events.[67]

The third age begins in 90.37-38 with the birth of a white bull. This white bull has no traditional referent like Adam and Noah from the previous eras. VanderKam refers to this figure as the Messiah and as a second Seth, as opposed to a second Adam, because this white bull, like the one symbolizing Seth, is said to be large.[68] The white bull brings the whole world under its dominion, and then all of the various unclean animals are transformed into white cattle, symbolizing a single race existing again in creation's original Edenic conditions.

The value orientations of this extended allegory are construed in a number of different ways. The *Animal Apocalypse* does not consistently attribute the violence the sheep experience to their own disobedience (symbolized by blindness; cf. *1 En.* 89.41-42), but the *Flood Vision*, with its recapitulation of motifs from the *Book of the Watchers*, attests that God's response to cultic

67. Tiller, *Commentary on the Animal Apocalypse*, pp. 16-17. Another motif in the *Animal Apocalypse* based on contrastive opposition similar to that of black and white is sight and blindness. This motif is used to describe the sheep (Israel), where blindness or closed eyes is representative of Israel's disobedience and opens them up to being easily devoured by predators. For a recent article exploring the significance of this motif, see Daniel Assefa, 'The Animal Apocalypse (*1 Enoch* 85–90) in the Light of Ethiopian Traditional Commentary: The Case of "Open and Closed" Eyes', in Philip F. Esler (ed.), *The Blessing of Enoch: 1 Enoch and Contemporary Theology* (Eugene, OR: Cascade, 2017), pp. 61-69.

68. VanderKam, *Enoch*, p. 84.

impurity is punishment through the forms of violence and exile/imprisonment. Nevertheless, the eschatological belief the *Book of Dreams* communicates—or *reveals*, as is more appropriate to the apocalyptic genre—is the message that despite harsh punishment for cultic impurity, God will restore humanity through a faithful remnant. Tiller, as discussed earlier, has also shown that the *Animal Apocalypse* promotes the violent response against the forces of Hellenization that characterized the Maccabean Revolt. The further away one removes the *Book of Dreams* from the situational context in and for which it was composed, the more it will lose the particularities of the way it was interpreted among its first readers and the more it will be interpreted according to the ways its thematic patterns orient to new situational contexts. For first-century CE Jewish and Christian communities, the stark distinctions between white and black, sight and blindness, and clean and un-clean become the major motifs by which the value orientations of *1 Enoch* as a living literary text get identified and applied. One of these is more relevant than the others for this article, and so I now turn to discuss Peter's vision according to its intertextual engagement with the value orientations of clean and unclean set forth in the *Animal Apocalypse* as it is contextualized in the *Book of Dreams* alongside the *Flood Vision*.

Peter's Vision, the Book of Dreams, and their Intertextual Relationship

In an essay discussing the Cornelius Story, Richard Bauckham observes that the *Animal Apocalypse* makes a striking 'association between forbidden animals and Gentiles' and that 'the account of the multiplication of the nations after the Flood is an interesting parallel to Peter's vision of "all species of four-footed animals and reptiles and birds of the air" (Acts 10.12).'[69] If the above analysis shows anything, it is that Bauckham understates these parallels. To begin, he makes no further comment on any potential meaningful relationships that Peter's vision might share with this other text. He also does not discuss the similarity in language that ties the list of animals in Peter's vision to the Noahic tradition (Bauckham's mention of the Flood is a reference to this event as it occurs in the *Animal Apocalypse*, not in the *Flood Vision*), which happens to be the tradition, as construed through the *Flood Vision*, that contextualizes the *Animal Apocalypse*. The list of animals in Peter's vision,

69. Bauckham, 'James, Peter, and the Gentiles', p. 106.

which constitutes an intertextual thematic formation steeped in the Noahic tradition as shown above, with the accompanying thematic formation of clean and unclean animals as well as the symbolic extension of these animals to the nations, find an unparalleled relationship with the *Book of Dreams*.

Moreover, there are additional co-thematic ties between Peter's vision and the *Book of Dreams* that need mentioning. First, apart from the fact that Peter and Enoch both experience visions, there is the element of heaven opening up and objects coming down from heaven in both sets of visions. This co-thematic tie contributes to orienting Peter's vision to Jewish apocalyptic literature, where the interaction between heaven and earth is a prevalent trope. But I argue that this intertextual element contributes to the more specific goal of orienting Peter's vision to the value positions promoted or demoted by first-century interpretations of *1 Enoch*, especially the *Book of Dreams* and the Noahic tradition therein. Second, a tenuous co-thematic tie, which would enhance but is in no way crucial to my argument, might also be observed in the role of the number three. Peter experiences his vision three times, and this may invoke the structure of the history of Israel with each of the three ages beginning with a white bull (that is, a patriarch). Finally, there is the cleansing of all the animals at the end of each set of visions. There are indeed significant parallels between the *Animal Apocalypse* and Peter's vision in the way this occurs, but there are also marked differences, and these will need to be evaluated for their intertextual function. Based on all these co-thematic ties with the major features of the visions sharing apocalyptic symbolism and elements of the Noahic tradition, we can now consider the intertextual nature of these two texts in light of the value orientations they negotiate.

The first century saw great conflict between Jewish and Gentile Christians over issues related to Jewish purity codes. Jewish believers, who would have sought to maintain adherence to the Mosaic Law, experienced tension over these issues as the book of Acts makes plain throughout, and especially in the Cornelius story (Acts 10.1–11.18), the Jerusalem Council (Acts 15.1-29), and when Jews accuse Paul of teaching against the Law (Acts 21.17-26). We also see the importance for Jews to maintain their purity in various Second Temple literary texts, and the systems of common/holy and moral purity even become

conflated among Diaspora Jewish communities, where Jews' mere social proximity to Gentiles jeopardized their moral status (compare *Jub*. 22.16).[70]

Moreover, the Noahic tradition, which addresses this issue, plays no small role in Second Temple literature. In fact, it contributed to the maintenance of ethnic boundaries as evidenced in its uses in multiple Second Temple documents. Before focusing on its function in *1 Enoch*, its thematic use to promote ethnic purity can be further established by identifying its role in another important text—the book of *Jubilees*. In the book of *Jubilees*, we find a rewritten account of the Noah story in which the terms of God's unconditional covenant with Noah to never again destroy the earth in a flood get revised as a conditional covenant bearing the stipulation that his people must maintain purity under the Law of Moses,[71] and this entails Jews' total separation from Gentiles (*Jub*. 22.16-18). We also find in *1 Enoch* that the Noah story was used to support the belief that salvation would ultimately come through a faithful remnant, as Enoch's prayer in *1 En*. 84.5-6 following the vision of the Flood is answered in the final judgment episode at the end of the *Animal Apocalypse* (90.20-27). In *1 Enoch*, following the symbolic events of the *Animal Apocalypse*, not all Israel will be saved but only those sheep who have sight. The blind sheep along with the stars and shepherds found to be sinners are all subjected to God's judgment and are thrown into the fiery abyss (90.24-27). After this, the sheep whose eyes are open are gathered to their new house (that is, the new Jerusalem) where they are worshiped by all of the other unclean animals. Following this event, the white bull symbolizing the Messiah appears and transforms all of the unclean animals into white cattle. The conclusion to the *Animal Apocalypse* is worth reproducing here at length:

> And I stood up to see, until that old house was folded up—and they removed all the pillars, and all the beams and ornaments of that house were folded up with it—and they removed it and put it in a place to the

70. See Michael Newton, *The Concept of Purity at Qumran and in the Letters of Paul* (SNTSMS, 53; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), pp. 10-25; Florentino García Martínez and Julio Trebolle Barrera, *The People of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Their Writings, Beliefs and Practices* (trans. Wilfred G.E. Watson; Leiden: Brill, 1995), pp. 139-57; John C. Poirier, 'Purity beyond the Temple in the Second Temple', *JBL* 122 (2003), pp. 247-65 (256-59). Cf. Dawson, *Message of the Jerusalem Council*, pp. 137-45.

71. See apGen 5.29 and *T. Levi* 10.10, which refer to a book of Noah that affirms this claim.

> south of the land. And I saw until the Lord of the sheep brought a new house, larger and higher than that first one, and he erected it on the site of the first one that had been rolled up. And all its pillars were new, and its beams were new, and its ornaments were new and larger than (those of) the first one, the old one that he had removed. And all the sheep were within it. And I saw all the sheep that remained. And all the animals upon the earth and all the birds of heaven were falling down and worshiping those sheep and making petition to them and obeying them in every thing … And all those sheep were white, and their wool was thick and pure. And all that had been destroyed and dispersed by all the wild beasts and all the birds of heaven were gathered in that house. And the Lord of the sheep rejoiced greatly because they were all good and had returned to that house. And I saw until they laid down that sword that had been given to the sheep; they brought it back to his house and sealed it up in the presence of the Lord. And all the sheep were enclosed in that house, but it did not contain them. And the eyes of all were opened, and they saw good things; and there was none among them that did not see. And I saw how that house was large and broad and very full. And I saw how a white bull was born, and its horns were large. And all the wild beasts and all the birds of heaven were afraid of it and made petition to it continually. And I saw until all their species were changed, and they all became white cattle (90.28-38a).[72]

The major motifs of the *Animal Apocalypse*, including sight and blindness, white and black, clean/pure animals and unclean/impure animals, all coalesce here at the end of the vision in which salvation is attained as a result of the faithfulness of the remnant. The role of the white bull in transforming all the animals is accomplished only after the new house is built and all the other animals have submitted to the sheep.

There is an allying intertextual relationship between the books of *Jubilees* and *1 Enoch* regarding their use of the Noahic tradition, which involves the matter of the separation of Jews and Gentiles. Their shared value orientation, however, is realized in different ways. The judgments regarding the moral impurity of the nations in *Jubilees* in the re-telling of the Noah story overtly establish the value position of remaining separated from them. This implies a negative view of showing hospitality toward Gentiles. In *1 Enoch*, however, the Noahic tradition is contextualized in an apocalyptic genre, where the Jews

72. The translation is from Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, p. 402.

(or Israelites) are symbolically represented as clean animals who suffer at the hands (or claws, talons, etc.) of unclean animals. However, the faithful remnant of sheep will experience the eventual transformation of all other blind, black, and unclean animals, which results in their reunification with the white sheep in the house. The necessity for separation until this time, however, is necessary to remain white and pure and, thus, part of the remnant. We thus see a consistency in the way the Noahic tradition was used in Second Temple texts such as *1 Enoch* and *Jubilees*, which supports the argument that this tradition and its concomitant value orientations would have held significant social capital among Jews in the first century.

There is too much evidence demonstrating the co-thematic ties between Peter's vision and the *Book of Dreams* to dismiss their opposing relationship as accidental. Therefore, after exploring the various intertextual options for the proper backdrop of Peter's vision, finding that the *Book of Dreams* in *1 Enoch* shares the co-thematic elements of the peculiar features in Peter's vision, and locating the value orientations of the *Book of Dreams* in light of its consistent use of the Noahic tradition with concurrent Jewish literary texts, a conclusion can be drawn. Keeping in mind the consistency of the Noahic tradition in the Jewish literary texts discussed above, there is a striking contrast when we find that the intertextual relationship between Acts and *1 Enoch* does not orient in the same manner as it does between the books of *Jubilees* and *1 Enoch*. In fact, with some additional consideration of the value orientations of both texts in view and the construal of the manner in which Gentiles will finally be brought back into the house of God, there is good reason to interpret Luke as actively subverting a certain value orientation of the *Book of Dreams*—namely, the belief about the eschatological transformation of the Gentiles resulting from the Jewish remnant's maintenance of its ethnic purity.

The strong value position to maintain purity is expressed through the voice of Peter, who utters that nothing common or unclean has ever entered his mouth. The phrase, κοινὸν καὶ ἀκάθαρτον, as explained above, assumes the status of a thematic formation in Acts 10.1–11.18. Its status as an intertextual thematic formation is demonstrated by is collocation with the thematic list of animals and by the way that these two thematic formations relate together in the culture in other texts that address similar value positions. Identifying the *Animal Apocalypse*, with all the animals representing the Gentile nations, as

an invoked text gives clear explanation for Peter's response.[73] As is apparent in Peter's use of language, he sees the systems of purity and holiness as bound up together in his effort to maintain purity. This is significant, since there is evidence in Second Temple literature that the profane status of Gentiles became conflated with the view that they were morally impure, including especially examples where the Noah story was used to promote this value position and prohibit the interaction of Jews with Gentiles. This value position is thus subverted in Peter's vision by the symbolic extension of animals to represent Gentiles along with the thematic formations that invoke the Noahic tradition. Consequently, Peter's vision intertextually opposes the stance that Jews necessarily incur moral impurity from associating with Gentiles, or at least certain God-fearing, believing Gentiles, in the overt theological statement: 'What God has made clean, you do not make common' (Acts 10.15; 11.9).

In following the message of the *Book of Dreams*, a text that contextualizes the history of Israel and the Eschaton in light of the story of Noah, the importance in maintaining ethnic purity is essential for the preservation of the rem-

73. Identifying the *Animal Apocalypse* as a decisive intertext of Peter's vision as well as Luke's use of the animals-as-nation trope characteristic of the Jewish apocalyptic visionary genre to which Peter's vision conforms challenges much previous scholarship on Acts, since Dibelius believed that Peter's vision originally addressed matters of Levitical dietary laws and that Luke had redacted the material to make the vision about Jews' social contact with Gentiles. See Martin Dibelius, *Studies in the Acts of the Apostles* (ed. Heinrich Greeven; trans. Mary Ling; New York: Scribner's Sons, 1956), pp. 111-12; Mark A. Plunkett, 'Ethnocentricity and Salvation in the Cornelius Episode', *Society of Biblical Literature 1985 Seminar Papers* (SBLSPS, 24; Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1985), pp. 465-79; Hans Conzelmann, *Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles* (ed. Jay Eldon Epp with Christopher R. Matthews; trans. James Limburg et al.; Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987), pp. 80-82; Alfred Wikenhauser, *Die Apostelgeschichte* (RNT, 5; Regensburg: Pustet, 4th edn, 1961), p. 120. François Bovon represents this view well when he states, 'The vision of Peter (Acts 10.9-16), by itself and apart from the context, indicates, in my opinion, only one possible meaning. By this strange appearance, God orders Peter, and through him all Christians, to pass over the dietary prescriptions of the Law (Lev. 11) and to no longer distinguish pure animals from impure' (François Bovon, *New Testament and Christian Apocrypha* [WUNT, 237; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009], pp. 110-28 [119]).

nant through which salvation will come.[74] Based on the way the *Animal Apocalypse* ends, with the throwing of the stars, sinful shepherds, and the blinded sheep into the fiery abyss before the unclean animals are transformed by the last white bull, the only hope for the Jews in this allegory is made plain: they must maintain their purity. Between the two events of God's judgment and the transformation of the animals, there are also the events of the new house's construction—that is, the establishment of the New Jerusalem—and the gathering of all kinds of uncleans animals to the new house to worship the sheep. Considering eschatological beliefs about Israel and the Messiah, we find yet another subversion of this important Jewish apocalyptic text in light of the theological statement that God has declared all animals—and, through symbolic extension, all people—clean. This subversion is that the Messiah has already come and not after the final judgment and triumph of the faithful remnant of Israel. Rather, God has given the same gift of repentance to the Gentiles who believe upon the Lord Jesus Christ (Acts 11.17-18). The 'transformation' of the Gentiles from their unclean state challenges the view that salvation would result from the righteous few of Israel. This intertextually opposes the Jewish value position that their salvation is yet to be accomplished by means of their deliberate separation from Gentiles.

Accordingly, the intertextual relationship Luke establishes between the thematic patterns of Peter's vision and the *Book of Dreams* is one of intertextual opposition. Luke subverts the value orientations of the *Animal Apocalypse* by demonstrating that God has dissolved the distinctions of cultic purity along ethnic lines. Key to this subversion is the role that the Jews and the Messiah figure play in the *Animal Apocalypse*. In Enoch's eschatological vision, the pure and faithful remnant experience unprecedented prosperity; the Lord of the sheep builds them a new house, and so they become the object of worship of all the other animals. Related to this is that the final white bull, the Messiah, comes later and establishes dominion over all nations through fear, which results in their transformation into harmless cattle.[75] Luke sub-

74. Nickelsburg states the message of the *Animal Apocalypse* in very similar terms, though he does not consider the role that Enoch's first vision plays in the overall message of the *Book of Dreams* (*1 Enoch 1*, pp. 355-56).

75. Nickelsburg addresses two factors that seemingly exclude the possibility of the white bull as the Messiah. He writes, 'First, the white bull is depicted as not doing anything, other than "becoming" a leader and a large animal with large horns. He is not described as carrying out functions usually associated (in the scholarly mind?)

verts this eschatological vision in the course of narrating the Cornelius episode. The idea that the Jews would experience such sociopolitical elevation as a result of their ethnic purity and thereby become the object of the surrounding people's adoration is rejected in this episode in a couple of different ways. First, when Cornelius, a Gentile, attempts to fall down at Peter's feet and worship him, Peter immediately redirects him to stand up because he is merely a man (10.25-26). While it may seem that Peter is simply correcting Cornelius's attempt to worship him because worship is only properly directed toward God, when viewed in intertextual relation to the *Animal Apocalypse*, the belief that Gentiles would become the worshippers of the remnant of Israel is rejected. Second, this belief is also subverted because the ultimate result of all people 'coming into the fold' of God's people in Enoch's vision finds its counterpart in God showing no partiality and declaring all peoples clean through Peter's vision. Jews were experiencing no such status under the rule of the Roman Empire, so the hope of the Jews' sociopolitical future as projected in the *Animal Apocalypse* is thus undermined in Peter's vision. The Messiah plays no small role in this message as well. Whereas the white bull in the *Animal Apocalypse* emerges after the height of the sheep's prosperity as one who is the object of the other animals' fear and petition, Peter's vision is predicated on the belief that the Messiah has already come, and it is through 'the good news of peace through Jesus Christ' that 'every nation who fears him [God] and practices righteousness is acceptable to him' (Acts 10.35-36a). We find that Luke plays off the universalist portrayal of the Eschaton by explaining that God has offered the same gift of repentance to all, but it is not a result of a faithful remnant, who have maintained their purity and have become the object of worship of the nations, but rather because God is not one

with a messianic king, viz., military activity, ruling, and judging.' But Nickelsburg corrects this perception: 'This appraisal of the situation is somewhat misleading, however. The wild animals' reaction to the bull indicates that he does hold a position of authority, or at least power. That the bull does not wage war is a function of the transformation of the wild animals. They, like the sheep, become white [cattle], and so there is no longer enmity in the human race. The powers that threatened Israel have been completely and permanently eradicated. Finally, there is a contemporary analogy to this text in Daniel 7. The heavenly son of man receives the power to reign, all nations are said to be subservient to him, and because this is the permanent state of affairs, there is no need to describe him waging war or doing anything, for that matter' (*1 Enoch 1*, pp. 406-7).

who shows favoritism and considers acceptable anyone who fears him and practices righteousness (Acts 10.34c-35).

Conclusion

The ways in which Luke orients Peter's vision as intertextually opposed to the *Book of Dreams* establish a new value orientation associated with the Noahic tradition at work in this intertextual complex. In Jewish literary texts, including the book of *1 Enoch* as the most intertextually relevant text for Peter's vision, the Noahic tradition factors heavily in promoting the value of Jewish ethnic purity, which is tied to the theological belief that the Jews' prosperity is contingent upon remaining pure. We even see this tradition involved in the *Book of Dreams*, which contains an eschatological vision that ends symbolically with the conversion of the Gentile nations. Luke's engagement with this tradition, however, subverts the values and beliefs associated with Jewish ethnic purity in Peter's vision, where Peter received a message from a heavenly voice, comprised of the language of the Noahic tradition (that is, lists of animals) along with Jewish apocalyptic tropes (that is, animals symbolizing nations and the interaction between heaven and earth) that overturns the status of Gentiles as impure and promotes the value position of hospitality between believing Jews and Gentiles.