Kosman, Admiel. (1999; 1995). **Adam gave names to the creatures and to woman in light of Aggadic and modern interpretations@.** In Aaron Demskey (ed.) Volume 2 (pp. 79-103, Hebrew section). Refs. Ramat Gan: Bar-Ilan University Press. English summary, p. 180. A preliminary version of this article was abstracted in English and Hebrew in the program of The Jewish Name: A Multi-Disciplinary Discussion (Second International Onomastic Conference on What=s in a Jewish Name), 1995. Bar-Ilan University. n.p. Proposes that Adam in name-giving had two types of relationship: (1) an instrumental and (2), an expressive. Modern commentators find three approaches: (1) showing ownership (animals named or toward the woman, (2) distinguishing A . . . between giving names to animals and giving a name to a woman as a sign of friendship, and (3) name-giving as showing Adam=s efforts to discover his place in the world. These approaches are used to explain the midrash in Genesis Rabba.

For Hades as current source of evil (contested by Bauckham), see Apoc. Peter (Rainer frag.): "rules the west and who...is in hades..."

See Ginzberg, *Legends,* 1.166 for notes on Hebrew as original unifying language, in which God spoke creation into being ("tongue of creation").

**Creation through "word":** Melito, *Pascha,* 47

God naming things: Psa 147[LXX 146]:4: ὁ ἀριθμὸν πλήθη ἄστρων, καὶ πᾶσιν αὐτοῖς ὄνοματα καλῶν.

**Isis aretalogies—isis as giver of language**

"we do find there a doctrine of the creative Word of Atum, as supreme god, which gives all entities, divine and human, their existence, as well as their names." Clarke, Dillon, Hershbell, Iamblichus *On the Mysteries,* xlv. Citing Rundle Clark, R.T. Myth and Symbol in Ancient Egypt (London: Thames and Hudson, 1959), 63-64, 79).

For being stored up "by the same word": Pseudo-Hilary, *Commentary on 2 Peter 3:7* [McNally 106]: *id est verbo Dei quo dixit: Fiat firmamentum,* "it is the word of God by which he said, 'Let there be a firmament'" (Gen 1:6).

Cf. also in 1 *Clement 27:4: Ἐν λόγῳ τῆς μεγαλοπρεποῦς αὐτοῦ συνεστήσατο τὰ πάντα, καὶ ἐν λόγῳ δύναται αὐτὰ καταστρέψαι. "By his majestic word he created all things, and by his word he can destroy them."

In the *Kerygma Petri,* Frag. 2a Cambe (Clement, *Strom.* 6.5.39.1-3): "Who made everything by his mighty word" (λόγῳ δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ). [For P. Nautin, "Les citations de la 'Prédication de Pierre' dans Clément d'Alexandrie, Strom VI.V. 39-41,' *JTS* 25 (1974): 98-105, this would be "by his mighty word, that is, his Son"; discussion in Cambe, *Kerygma Petri,* 217-21] *Epistula Apostolorum* 3:
For "hule" as what God created with his speech, see Origen, *Princ.* 2.1; 4.6.

The epistle of James makes proper speech a central concern. The types of speech addressed are, for the most part, commonplace. For instance, the superiority of silence (James 1:19), and hesitation about oaths (James 5:12), or the destructive potential of cursing are widely attested themes in Jewish and Christian, Greek and Roman sources. The treatment of speech in James is extraordinary not for the content of its advice, but for the way it places the tongue at the center of a cosmic battle. [Handout 1] James states that the religious person must bridle the tongue lest his religion be worthless. And he then defines true religion as keeping oneself unstained by the world ([1:27]). James later explains that it is the tongue—which itself is "the world of unrighteousness"—that stains the body ([3:6]). These are the only two uses of the spil- ("stain") root in James.

Here James's language departs from the hackneyed Hellenistic warnings about the advantages of silence or the importance of being honest. [Handout 2, James 3:5] When Plutarch, for instance, speaks of the paradox that such a small part of the body can ignite such a large fire, he means simply to say that "loose lips sink ships."1 But when James likens the potency of this little part of the body to the spark and the forest fire (James 3:5), something more sinister is in view. The goal of religion is to maintain purity against a world that threatens it. James's shocking news is that that inimical world is already present in the human body in the form of the tongue. And the stakes run higher than one's own purity, for, the tongue sets on fire "the cycle of nature" and is itself "set on fire by hell" (phiλογιζομενη υπο της γεννης, 3:6).

Why is the tongue the thing through which "the world" defiles people? Obviously James recoils at the thought that the tongue that is sanctified by blessing God should be profaned by cursing human beings. [Sirach and Philo say similar things]

But the idea of chaos is also lurking here, for James says that the tongue is the one thing on earth that has not yet been tamed. The tongue, unlike the animals (!), has not come under human control in accordance with God's design for the world. The beasts are now subject to human nature; the tongue, however, cannot be mastered by humankind (3:7-8). Unlike the rest of creation, this little piece of flesh, built into human bodies, is immune to domestication. If the tongue could be stopped, a person would be perfect, gaining control over the entire body (3:2). As it stands, people are alienated from themselves. Their body is not under their own control; Hell uses their tongues to set Creation on fire, and their bodies are defiled as the flame passes through their mouths.

James 3:1-9 underscores the tongue's power by using several phrases that invoke God's creation of the world—the creation that God spoke into being.

---

1 Cf. Plutarch, *Mor.* 507B.
What the tongue sets afire is not simply the community or the sinners who speak wrongly—as we have it in the Psalms of Solomon or in Ben Sira—but rather the "wheel of creation" (τὸν πρόσωπον τῆς γενέσεως). Whatever one conclude about the precise background and meaning of this expression, James is describing the whole course of life, and the use of the noun γένεσις invokes God's creative act (cf. James 1:23, "the face of his birth or being" τὸ πρόσωπον τῆς γενέσεως).

That creation was achieved by the word of God was a source of interest for many ancient thinkers. Cf. also in 1 Clement 27:4: Ἐν λόγῳ τῆς μεγαλοσύνης αὐτοῦ συνεστήσατο τὰ πάντα, καὶ ἐν λόγῳ δύναται αὐτὰ καταστρέψαι. "By his majestic word he created all things, and by his word he can destroy them."

Cf. Kerygma Petri, Frag. 2a Cambe (=Clement, Strom. 6.5.39.1-3): "Who made everything by his mighty word" (λόγῳ δυνάµεως αὐτοῦ). [For P. Nautin, "Les citations de la 'Prédication de Pierre' dans Clément d'Alexandrie, Strom VI.V. 39-41,' JTS 25 (1974): 98-105, this would be "by his mighty word, that is, his Son"; discussion in Cambe, Kerygma Petri, 217-21]

In addition, in his image of the spark and the forest fire, James' choice of the word ὕλη is multivalent. It is a good enough word for a growth of trees, which may be its primary sense here. But by far the most common meaning of ὕλη is "matter"—which is to say, according to many ancient cosmologies, it is the word for that unformed material to which God brings order with his logos.

---

2 I think the use of γένεσις in Pseudo-Clementine Homilies 14.3-4 is instructive, where Simon insists "there is neither God nor providence, but everything I subjected to γένεσις." The realm of random coming into being.

4 Not only did the world come into being in response to the cognate verb ( ), but Moses' first book was known by this Greek title (XX).

5 Frequently in the LXX for forests (Job 38:40, plural) or wood, in particular, wood as fuel: Isa 10:17; Sir 28:10: κατὰ τὴν ὕλην τοῦ πυρὸς οὕτως ἐκκαυθήσεται

6 BDAG s.v. 3: "material, matter, stuff":

7 Wis 11:17: God created "the world from formless matter" (τὸν κόσμον ἐξ ἀμώρφου ὕλης). On this passage, see in particular, C. Larcher, Sagesse 1985, 676-680. For the Stoics, there was θέος and ὑλή, ποιοῦν and πάσχον (See Long and Sedley, Hellenistic Philosophers, 1.268-72).

8 On God's speaking the world into being more broadly, cf. Psalms 148:5: ὃτι αὐτὸς ἔπεσεν, καὶ ἐγεννήθησαν, αὐτὸς ἐνετείλατο, καὶ ἐκτίσθησαν (cited by Origen, Princ. 2.1.5); Psalms 33:6: "By the word of the Lord the heavens were made, and all their host by the breath of his mouth"

For the philosophical opinion that ὕλη is "an inanimate and indifferentiated body, which is of itself inert
The human mind and soul are the allegorical meaning that before this world was made visible and its raw material was completely formed by Reason, it was put to the test by Nature and brought forth of itself the first creation imperfect" (Babbitt, LCL [slightly adjusted]). The human mind and soul are the ύλη ordered by logos (Mor. 374E)

and inactive" (ἀψυχόν τι σώμα καὶ ἀποινὸν ἄργον τε καὶ ἀπρακτὸν ἐξ ἑαυτοῦ), see Plutarch, Mor. 374E (he does not endorse the view): ὅταν οὖν ὑλὴν λέγομεν, οὐ δὲ πρὸς ἔνιον φιλοσοφῶν δόξας ἀποφερομένως ἀψυχόν τι σώμα καὶ ἀποινὸν ἄργον τε καὶ ἀπρακτὸν ἐξ ἑαυτοῦ διανοεῖσθαι· καὶ γὰρ ἔλαιν ὑλὴν μιρὸν καλοῦμεν καὶ χρυσὸν ἄγαλματος, οὐκ ὡς τὰ πάσας ἔρημα ποιότητος· αὐτὴν τε τὴν ψυχὴν καὶ τὴν διάνοιαν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ὡς ὑλὴν ἐπιστήμης καὶ ἀρετῆς τῷ λόγῳ κοσμεῖν καὶ ῥυθμίζειν παρέχομεν, τὸν τούς ἐνιοῦ τόπον εἰδώλον ἀπεφίλησαν καὶ τῶν νοστῶν ὀνοῦ ἐκμαγεῖον. Cf. D.L. 7.134:

For Plutarch's own view, see following note.

9 For logos ordering ύλη so as to create the world, cf. Plutarch, Isid. (Mor 373B): λεγομένη χένεις Ἀπόλλωνος αἰνίται τὸ πρὶν ἐκφανῇ γενόσθαι τόνδε τὸν κόσμον καὶ συντελεῖσθαι τῷ λόγῳ τὴν ύλην φύει ἐλεγχομένην ἐπ’ αὐτὴν ὑπελή την πρῶτην γένεσιν ἐξενεγκέιν, "The birth of Apollo … has the allegorical meaning that before this world was made visible and its raw material was completely formed by Reason, it was put to the test by Nature and brought forth of itself the first creation imperfect" (Babbitt, LCL [slightly adjusted]). The human mind and soul are the ύλη ordered by logos (Mor. 374E)

Justin, Exhortation to the Greeks 15 (quoting Orpheus); Clem. Protr. 7.74 (look up these fragments in HOladay).

] [Handout: Tatian] If read with the sense of "matter," James 3:5 virtually states that the human tongue ignites the ύλη that God's speech set in order. God adorned, ordered the formless matter by speaking; human speech, God's gift, ignites the very matter.  

This is exactly what James is saying in verse 9, where the reference to the Creation account is unmistakable: James say that destructive language attacks precisely what God's word created, for we curse "people made in the likeness of God" [3:9]—an explicit reference Genesis 1:26.

And I would submit that James has already had Genesis 1:26 in mind when discussing the fact that every type of animal has been brought under human control. To contrast the wild and unruly tongue to the domestication of animals is striking enough as an illustration of the tongue's boisterous nature—and it coheres nicely with the language of the tongue's need for a "bit" or "bridele" (itself something of cliché in discussions of the control of the lips) (cf. Mark 5:4 "nobody could tame" the Gerasene demoniac). But the domestication of animals is an especially apt illustration of the power of speech. On the one hand, thinkers such as Philo and Clement of Alexandria noted that it was by God's word that the wild animals were brought under control [Handout].

[animals brought into being by word (of God): 1 Clem. 33.]

[Aristobulus Frag. 4=Eusebius, Praep. ev. 13.12.3: Δεῖ γὰρ λαμβάνειν τὴν θείαν φωνήν οὐ ρητὸν λόγον, ἄλλ᾽ ἐργὸν κατασκευάζεις, καθὼς καὶ διὰ τῆς νομοθεσίας ἡμῶν ὄλην τὴν γένεσιν τοῦ κόσμου θεοῦ λόγους εἰρήκης ὁ Μωσῆς. συνεχῶς γάρ φησιν ἑρ᾽ ἐκάστου· ‘καὶ εἶπεν ὁ θεὸς, καὶ ἐγένετο.’: "Just so has Moses called the whole genesis of the world words of God in our Law. For he continually says in each case, 'And God spoke and it came to pass.'" (trans. Collins, OTP 2.840).
Clement, *Paed.* 3.12.99.2: "But man is transformed by the Word, by whom wild beasts are tamed…."

For animals becoming "tame instead of savage" by music (in a discussion of their understanding human speech), see Porphyry, *Abst.* 3.6.2: "Deer and bulls and other animals are calmed by music, and become tame instead of savage" (σωφρονίζονται δὲ καὶ μέλεσιν καὶ ἠμεροὶ ἑξ ἀγρίων γίγνονται ἐλαφοὶ καὶ ταῦροι καὶ ἐτερα ζῴα).

Clement, *Protr.* 1.4: states that his "minstrel" has alone "ever tamed the most intractable of all wild beasts—men!" (μόνος γοῦν τῶν πῶποτε τὰ ἄργαλεώτατα θηρία, τοὺς ἄνθρωπους, ἐτιθάσευεν). Clement goes on to state that the "new song" (τὸ ἄσμα τὸ καινὸν; cf. Psa 33[32]:3; 40:3 [39:4]; etc.) has created men from stones and beasts (Ὅρα τὸ ἄσμα τὸ καινὸν ὅσον ἔκαστον ἐκόσμησεν ἐκ λίθων καὶ ἄνθρωπους ἐκ θηρίων πεποίηκεν [Protr. 1.4]); the same word that tamed men from beasts created and adorned [ἐκόσμησεν] the universe (Protr. 1.5: "Furthermore, it is this [song] which composed the entire creation into melodious order, and tuned into concert the discord of the elements, that the whole universe might be in harmony with it" (Τοῦτο τοι καὶ τὸ πᾶν ἐκόσμησεν ἐμελελῶς καὶ τῶν στοιχείων τὴν διαφωνίαν εἰς τάξιν ἐνέτεινε συμφωνίας, ἵνα δὴ ὅλος ὁ κόσμος αὐτῷ ἁρμονία γένηται).

But the more subtle issue is the fact that this human mastery of creatures is first exhibited in Genesis by a linguistic act, namely, by Adam's naming of the animals ([Handout: Gen 2:19-20]). For later authors such as Philo, this was a passage of profound importance for the nature of language. [Quest. in Gen.; *Pseudo-Clementine Homilies* 3.21.1: "He, who alone is the true prophet, has, in the place of the creator, given a suitable name to every living thing according to the measure of its nature; for if he gave a name to anything, then that was also the name given it by him who had created it." οὗτος αὐτὸς μόνος ἄληθῆς ὑπάρξεως προφήτης ἐκάστῳ ζῷῳ κατ’ ἀξίαν τῆς φύσεως, καθὼς ὁ πεποιηκὼς αὐτὸν, οἰκείως τέθεικεν τὰ ὄνοματα. εἰ τι γὰρ ἐπωνόμασεν, τούτῳ ἦν καὶ ἐκ τοῦ πεποιηκότος ὄνομα τῷ γεγενημένῳ.

(hence he didn't need to eat of tree to know good and evil: he actually stood in the place of the creator here: his naming is as surrogate for God's):
; Hom. 3.42.5: "How could he [Adam] be blind in mind who, before he ate of the fruit and with the approval of his Creator, gave appropriate names to all living thing?" (Hom 3.42.7 speaks of Adam's prescient names for his sons)

see Ginzberg, Legends, 1.59-63, for various later Jewish traditions about Adam's naming the animals. This was variously taken to display Adam's wisdom; his possessing the holy spirit so he could prophesy (he names even God accurately); inventing all seventy human languages; and finally, (Legends, 1.62-63), there was even a contest between Adam and Satan, in which Adam's superiority is shown by his ability to name the animals with their real names. Legends 1.512: Adam named the beasts in all seventy languages; Legends 1.69: animals knew human language; 1.70n58]

If in Genesis the distinction of human from other animals is marked by the human's naming them, this bears a certain homology with ancient Greek thought, in that the capacity for speech marks the boundary between animals (ἄλογα ζῷα: living beings devoid of logos) and human. From Hesiod onward, we have tales of the age when the animals could speak,10

10 On animal speech, see
For ongoing animal speech: Apollonius of Tyana ()
Talking Asses. ;
Gera
Janet E. Spittler, animal speech
Christopher Matthews, on animal speech in apocryphal acts.
Sorabji, Animal Minds and Human Morals.

Origen forcefully denies Celsus' claim that animals and humans could communicate (Cels. 4.97), but Christian chronologists maintained that they could communicate (see Ginzberg, 1.70n58; Charles, Jub. 3.28 note in ATOP; Philo, Quaest. Gen. 1.22
and although the myths vary in detail (who taught humans speech? etc.), they agree on the fact that the animals' loss of speech was concurrent with the beginning of human consumption of animal flesh\textsuperscript{11}—that is, it was only when humans had speech as something greater than animals, that speech marked humans as different. The question of whether humans were the sole possessors of language continued to preoccupy ancient thinkers; for instance, in the debates about vegetarianism, the question of the propriety of eating meat was typically felt to hinge on whether animals had logos,--more broadly reason, but quite often whether they had language.\textsuperscript{12} In other words, in a wide variety of ways, speech was felt to be the most salient division between animal and human. It is speech that marks human capacity for community, fellowship, civilization. Note the link between Isis as giver of language and giver of laws, of the cooking of food, in short, of all that marks human transcendence over beast.

Hence it is almost ironic that in James, it is by God's solemn utterance "Let us make" that humans were set above the animals\textsuperscript{13} and able to tame them, and the outworking of this taming of animals to human φύσις was achieved by that "implanted" human speech (cf. James 1:21: ἐµφυτος λόγος). Yet the human capacity for speech that marks the boundary between human and animal remains resistant to the domestication it achieved. Speech remains outside of human control even as it was the means by which the Divine Word set animals beneath humans and marked their distinction.

\textsuperscript{11} Note Ginzberg, \textit{Legends}, 2.767-68 (on the speech of Balaam's ass), but especially 2.767: "It is out of consideration to mankind, also, that God has \textit{closed the mouth of animals, for were they to speak, man could not well use them for his service....}" This implies prior speech.

\textsuperscript{12} Plutarch, \textit{Esu carn.} 994d-3; \textit{Soll. anim.} 959f-963f;

Porph., \textit{Absten.} 1.13-25; 3.2 cites Stoic denial of animal logos, and in 3.3.1-7, gives a spirited defense of animal's having logos based on their communicative abilities (speech and human comprehension of it)

Gera, \textit{Ancient Greek Ideas on Speech, Language, and Civilization}, 58 and n. 133.


\textsuperscript{13} Note the nice connection between humans as λογικος and God's creative Word in Clement, \textit{Protr.} 1.6.4: τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου τὰ λογικὰ πλάσματα ἤµεῖς.
Like the sea in the Hebrew Bible, the tongue remains an oddity in Creation, as closely linked to the realm of gehenna as to the realm of *genesis*. In James it is as though the future fiery judgment is already beginning the cosmic dissolution.

Both taming (δαμάζειν) of horses and guiding ships are together as examples in Philo, *Leg. Al.* 2.104.

**Aggressive speech in the Struggle for Honor**
**Tool of the rich.**
[See notes on 1QH]

In an effort to think about how James' rhetorical configuration of speech might have functioned, I want to reflect briefly on the ways that aggressive, abusive speech was deployed in the ancient world.

It is not accidental that Plato, when describing an ideal state, included laws regulating public abuse. Verbal attacks were a prominent and potent feature of life. According to a host of witnesses, it was the threat of mockery and abuse that enforced common mores. Demosthenes said that average people took care to avoid wrongdoing not because of the state's laws but because of the fear of shaming insults. Seneca and Aelius Aristides say that people live in dread of "everyone's laughter, everyone's tongue" (*Const.* 19.2). Abuse was a primary means of influencing matters public or private. Of special relevance to James, with its depiction of the rich as those who prey upon the poor, is the fact that the standard way for money lenders to get a debt repaid was to surround the debtor and heap him with ridicule. [There is evidence of this in Jewish texts as well: Sirach 29:28 says it is hard to bear the "insults of the money lender."] Slaves and clients might be expected to shout out abuse against the opponents of their owners or patrons. The prevalence of abuse presented a philosophical problem for Seneca, who saw as one of the challenges facing a Stoic the question of how to retain equanimity while being "hooted through the forum by the vile words of a foul-mouthed crowd."

In the verbal jousting, one of the chief weapons was the charge of effeminacy, and quite often, the charge of an *os impurum*, a mouth polluted by sexual acts.

In both Latin and Greek, among the most virulent vocabulary of scorn and derision were words threatening oral penetration. In Latin, it was *irrumatio*, made most famous by Catullus 16 [HANDOUT 6], who threatens his "pathic" and "cinaedic" opponents with anal and oral rape. He does so because they thought his love poems were "a little soft," and thought him "not much of a man." Catullus aims to remove any doubts about his virility by threatening a contemptuous sexual assault. But abusive and angry use of *irrumere* extended to disapproval of all sorts. Similarly in Greek, the verb λακαζεῖν, was so often used in expressions of disdain that it had passed into Latin as a loanword, and where we find it being

---

14 For Jewish speculation about the ass's capacity for speech, see Ginzberg, *Legends*, 2.767n739: her mouth was created in the twilight between the sixth day and the first Sabbath of creation—a liminal zone, barely belonging to creation proper.
uttered by such distinguished person as one of Petronius's freedman in the Satyricon, who dyspeptically tells the cold weather to "go blow." The expression "to tell someone to λαίκαζειν" was so common that it could abbreviated with its first letter of this word: "To say the lambda to someone" ("to tell them to eff off").

As Amy Richlin has demonstrated, the dynamics of this coarse sexual invective are virtually embodied in the nasty garden guardian Priapus. Priapus was the ithyphallic god whose statues were placed in gardens and orchards to ward off thieves. In the Priapea, a book of epigrams dealing with Priapus, potential thieves were warned in witty, filthy epigrams that Priapus would assault their every orifice. In lieu of actual activity, the god attacks with his lusty and shameless words. Richlin suggests that the obscene verbal attacks are similar: their words are a sort of sexual assault, meant to humiliate and degrade their victims.

With this in view, let's turn back to James' depiction of the tongue as the unrighteous world.

"Friendship with the world is enmity with God" (James 4:4). For all of James's hostility to "the world," the letter does not suggest an anxiety about interaction with unbelievers. James does not show any desire to erect social barriers. He is not trying to persuade his readers to withdraw from the world; he is trying to stop them from boasting, fighting, and cursing. In James' view, such angry speech represents the invasion of the world into their bodies. The dangerous and defiling "world" is not "out there" where the godless live; it is, to borrow a phrase from Moses, ''near you—in your mouth." The addressees are chastised for their friendship with this world (4:4), for their laughter and happiness (4:9), for thinking about the pleasures of life (4:3). Laughter and cursing are treated almost like sexual activities, constituting a "friendship" with the world that James views as adultery (4:4). In a sense, James has rhetorically configured "the world," "true religion," and "the tongue" in such a way that to use the tongue abusively is to reveal that "the world" has access to one's mouth. Thus the male and female addressees are alike chastised as "adulteresses" (μοιχαλίδες). In James's cosmology, abusive language is no longer the mark of a manly brio (Catullus 16), but rather a sexual humiliation. The moment one shouts an abusive irrumabo, one suffers irrumatio.

In the rhetoric of self-mastery, displaying mastery of one's own passions was part of displaying one's right to rule others. Central to rhetoric of mastery was mastery of the tongue. Inscribed on Anacharsis's statue was, "Bridle the tongue, the belly, the genitals." Philo lists the same three areas of the body—slightly more discreetly: "Now philosophy teaches us the control of the belly and the parts below it, and control also of the tongue." And Musonius Rufus lists these three areas of temptation when he promised that philosophy would engender self-controlled. Theophrastus defined garrulity as akrasia of speech. James effectively takes speech out of the repertoire of self-mastery.

The self-presentation that was so much a part of achieving high status depends on "boasting." Getting debts repaid, putting opponents in their place requires cursing. Such are
the ways of the world.

In James, the language of boasting is linked with status. James 1:9 says it is the poor person who should boast. James 4:13-16 spells out what is meant by "boasting," it is clearly people of means whom he chides: "Come now, you who say, 'let us go to such-and-such a city and engage in business and make a profit'…. All such boasting is evil."