

Echoes from the Caves: Qumran and the New Testament

EDITED BY

FLORENTINO GARCÍA MARTÍNEZ

BRILL

Echoes from the Caves:
Qumran and the New Testament

Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah

Edited by

Florentino García Martínez

Associate editors

Peter W. Flint

Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar

VOLUME 85

Echoes from the Caves: Qumran and the New Testament

Edited by
Florentino García Martínez



BRILL

LEIDEN • BOSTON
2009

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Echoes from the caves : Qumran and the New Testament / edited by Florentino Garcia Martinez.

p. cm. — (Studies on the texts of the desert of Judah, ISSN 0169-9962 ; v. 85)

“This volume contains a revised form of the contributions to an “experts meeting” held at the Catholic University of Leuven on December 2007”—ECIP data view.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-90-04-17696-6 (hardback : alk. paper)

1. Dead Sea scrolls—Congresses. 2. Dead Sea scrolls—Relation to the New Testament—Congresses. I. García Martínez, Florentino. II. Title. III. Series.

BM487.E25 2009

296.1'55—dc22

2009012558

ISBN 978 90 04 17696 6

Copyright 2009 by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands.
Koninklijke Brill NV incorporates the imprints Brill, Hotei Publishing,
IDC Publishers, Martinus Nijhoff Publishers and VSP.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Koninklijke Brill NV provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910, Danvers, MA 01923, USA.
Fees are subject to change.

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

CONTENTS

Qumran Between the Old and the New Testament	1
FLORENTINO GARCÍA MARTÍNEZ	
Towards a Description of the Sectarian Matrix	7
TIMOTHY H. LIM	
The Pre-sectarian Jesus	33
GEORGE J. BROOKE	
The Interpretation of Psalm 2	49
JOHN J. COLLINS	
Interpretation of Psalm 2 in <i>4QFlorilegium</i> and in the New Testament	67
ERIC F. MASON	
Interpreting Scripture through Scripture: Exegesis Based on Lexematic Association in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Pauline Epistles	83
FRIEDRICH AVEMARIE	
“Spiritual People,” “Fleshly Spirit,” and “Vision of Meditation”: Reflections on <i>4QInstruction</i> and 1 Corinthians	103
EIBERT TIGCHELAAR	
<i>4Q521</i> and Luke’s <i>Magnificat</i> and <i>Benedictus</i>	119
STEPHEN HULTGREN	
Marriage and Creation in Mark 10 and CD 4–5	133
LUTZ DOERING	
Temple, Sacrifice and Priesthood in the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Dead Sea Scrolls	165
LAWRENCE H. SCHIFFMAN	

Learning from Sectarian Responses: Windows on Qumran Sects and Emerging Christian Sects	177
JUTTA JOKIRANTA	
Wealth and Sectarianism: Comparing Qumranic and Early Christian Social Approaches	211
EYAL REGEV	
Family Relationships in <i>4QInstruction</i> and in Eph 5:21–6:4	231
JEAN-SÉBASTIEN REY	
Priests on Earth as in Heaven: Jewish Light on the Book of Revelation	257
TORLEIF ELGVIN	
Revelation's Plague Septets: New Exodus and Exile	279
BENJAMIN G. WOLD	
Belief in Resurrection and its Religious Settings in Qumran and the New Testament	299
ALBERT L.A. HOGETERP	
Index of References	321
Index of Modern Authors	344

QUMRAN BETWEEN THE OLD AND THE NEW TESTAMENT

Florentino García Martínez
K.U. Leuven

Upon my arrival at the Catholic University Leuven I started a research project, supported by a grant from the K.U. Leuven Research Fund (BOF) and by a grant from the Fund for Scientific Research-Flanders (FWO-V), intended to explore in detail the relationship between the Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament.¹

The topic was by no means new, on the contrary. The books and articles dedicated to ascertaining the relationship between these two literary corpora could fill a whole library.² But I was convinced that, in spite of these considerable efforts, the research had still not been able to find an acceptable explanation for the common points or for the differences and that a new way to look at the relationship between the two corpora was needed.

One of the main reasons the public has been fascinated by the Dead Sea Scrolls since their discovery in 1947 is precisely in the expectation that the new materials could illuminate the dark regions in our knowledge of the origins and development of early Christianity in the second half of the first century.

This hope was well founded. Both entities (the group or groups that copied and preserved the Dead Sea Scrolls and the group or groups that produced the New Testament) shared the same general chronological time frame and certainly co-existed until the year 68 of the first century, when the settlement of Qumran was destroyed; they were geographically close: Christianity developed in Jerusalem, about 15 miles from the shore of the Dead Sea, where the settlement was located; both developed in the same Palestinian society in a crisis situation. The New Testament and the Dead Sea Scrolls are the product of two similar Jewish reform movements, both guided by a strong charismatic leader, both interpreting

¹ Respectively IOT/03.01 of the BOF and G.0119.04 of the FWO-V.

² See, as an indication, the selection of studies put together by J.A. Fitzmyer, *A Guide to the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature: Revised and Expanded Edition* (Grand Rapids-Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2008), 264–273.

the Scripture in an actualizing way, applying its prophecies to their present situation, both with very strong eschatological expectations, whose members shared the conviction that they were the chosen remnant of the true Israel, the New Covenant at the end of days. The hope thus that the manuscripts found in caves between 1947 and 1956 could illuminate the origins of early Christianity and the New Testament's formation were logical and well founded indeed.

But the results have been disappointing and, in spite of the thousands of books written on the matter during the fifties and sixties, no real consensus among scholars was reached. The quest has been practically abandoned, and the relationship between the two corpora is only sporadically treated.³

The reasons for this lack of success are not difficult to fathom, since the research until the nineties suffered from three fundamental shortcomings:—it was based only upon a small fraction of the manuscripts found at Qumran (basically the manuscripts from Cave 1 and some preliminary publications of manuscripts from Cave 4);—it considered all these manuscripts as the product of the Essenes, who were identical with the people of Qumran;—and it assumed that there were direct connections between the two literary corpora, the Scrolls and the New Testament, or between the Essenes and the early Christians.

Now, the situation is completely different.⁴ Since 1992 we are no longer dependent exclusively on the manuscripts from Cave 1, but thanks to the complete publication of all the scrolls we can assess the collection as a whole.⁵ The availability of all the scrolls has given rise

³ In the bibliography edited by B. Jongeling, *A Classified Bibliography of the Finds in the Desert of Judah 1958–1969* (STDJ 7; Leiden: Brill, 1971) a specific section “Qumran and the New Testament. Qumran and Christianity” took up pages 111–129; in F. García Martínez and D.W. Parry, *A Bibliography of the Finds of the Desert of Judah 1970–95* (STDJ 19; Leiden: Brill, 1996) about 70 entries were recorded under the keyword “New Testament”; but in spite of the notable increase of studies on the Scrolls recorded in A. Pinnik, *The Orion Center Bibliography of the Dead Sea Scrolls (1995–2000)* (STDJ 41; Leiden: Brill, 2001) there are only 45 entries under the subject “New Testament,” and even less in R.A. Clements and N. Sharon, *The Orion Center Bibliography of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature (2000–2006)* (STDJ 71; Leiden: Brill, 2008).

⁴ For a summary of the changes in this research, see F. García Martínez, “Qumrán, 60 ans après la découverte,” *The Qumran Chronicle* 15 (2007): 111–138, particularly 112–117.

⁵ The two latest volumes of the DJD Series (Hartmut Stegemann and Eileen Schuller, *Qumran Cave 1.III: 1QHodayot^a: With Incorporation of 4QHodayot^{a-f} and 1QHodayot^b* (DJD 40) and Emile Puech, *Qumran Grotte 4.XXVII: (4Q550–4Q583) Textes en Araméens, deuxième partie* (DJD 37) appeared last November at the Clarendon.

to a set of questions quite different from those that dominated research until the nineties and has forced us to “revisit” the different caves and our understanding of their deposits.⁶ In the fifties and sixties, scholars, impressed by the contents of Cave 1, assumed without further reflection that the texts found in the caves were all sectarian, and that all the texts were the product of the people who lived at Qumran. Now that the totality of the manuscripts is available to us, however, both these assumptions have been proven wrong. Only a small fraction of the texts can be considered sectarian or pre-sectarian, and only a fraction can be considered as having been penned at Qumran. The majority of the texts representing prayers, hymns, wisdom texts, para-biblical compositions, pseudepigraphic writings, etc., do not have any sectarian characteristics at all. They amount to a total that is roughly equal to or even more than all the biblical and sectarian compositions taken together. Of course, this does not make the collection a random sample of Second Temple literature (since very noticeable absences point to a clear focus in the collection), but its diversity affords us a unique glimpse of the developments that took place in Palestinian Judaism before the first century of the common era in many different strands of thought, and not only within the narrow marginal group represented by the community of Qumran. Many of the theological developments (such as messianic expectations, belief in bodily resurrection, divine sonship, replacement of the sacrificial cult, eschatological scenarios, etc.), a large number of the halachic disputes (on the sabbath, on purity, etc.), and several different structures of community organization, previously attested in Judaism only from within the New Testament, are now documented in these non-sectarian writings.⁷ These manuscripts not only alleviate

⁶ I have done this for Cave 1: “Reconsidering the Cave 1 Texts Sixty Years After Their Discovery: An Overview,” in E. Tigchelaar (ed.), *Proceedings of the Sixth Meeting of the IOQS Ljubljana 2007* (STDJ; Leiden: Brill, 2009) (forthcoming) and for Cave 11: “Cave 11 in Context,” in Ch. Hempel (ed.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Texts and Contexts* (STDJ; Leiden: Brill, 2009) (forthcoming).

⁷ There were the three main sectors to be investigated in the project as test cases of the core hypothesis. The first has led to the publication of the monograph by Albert L.A. Hogeterp, *Expectations of the End: A Comparative Traditio-Historical Study of Eschatological, Apocalyptic and Messianic Ideas in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament* (STDJ 83; Leiden: Brill, 2009), who has worked as a post-doc of the project. The third is dealt with in the dissertation by Dries Somers, “Community Functionaries in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the New Testament,” which will soon be defended. On Sabbath and Purity see now the contribution by Friedrich Avemarie, “Jesus and Purity” and by Lutz Doering, “Sabbath Laws in the New Testament,” in R. Bieringer

part of our ignorance of Judaism during the Roman period, but they also show us the intersection and interrelation, the appropriation and transformation, of non-sectarian forms of discourse by the sectarian communities.⁸ Besides, the different redactions of several sectarian compositions now available reveal to us some of the developments within the group that collected and preserved the manuscripts, and may also help us to grasp the different developments within early Christianity shown in the different writings of the New Testament better.

The collection of writings we call the Dead Sea Scrolls appears now as a collection of Jewish religious writings more or less authoritative and possessing a certain coherence, through which, for the first time, we have access to the developments that had happened within Judaism before the birth of Christianity, and we can see how the religious writings that later will become “Bible” have given rise to other religious writings which would become normative for other communities.⁹ And this is the main reason why the students of the New Testament should also be interested in the Scrolls and learn from them.

The Dead Sea Scrolls explicitly present themselves as based on the Hebrew Bible but clearly differ from it in a great many theological and legal aspects. It is logical then to consider these differences as documenting the evolution of the theological ideas and the legal norms reflected in the Hebrew Bible that had already taken place within Judaism during the two centuries, at least, which elapsed between the writing of the last book of the Hebrew Bible and the deposit of the manuscripts in the caves around Qumran.

Since the New Testament also presents itself as based on the Old Testament but is clearly different in many theological and legal aspects from it, it is logical to consider also these differences as witnesses of the evolution and changes which took place in Judaism during the same period.

And since there is no proof of any direct relationship between the two corpora of writings (the core texts of the group that collected Qumran and the writings which form the New Testament), a genetic relationship

et al., (eds.), *The New Testament and Rabbinic Literature* (JSJS; Leiden: Brill, 2009) (forthcoming).

⁸ The topic on which worked the other post-doc of the Project, Mladen Popović. See now F. García Martínez and Mladen Popović (eds.), *Defining Identities: We, You and the Other in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (STDJ 70; Leiden: Brill, 2008).

⁹ See F. García Martínez, “¿Sectario, no-sectario, o qué? Problemas de una taxonomía correcta de los textos qumránicos,” *RevQ* 23/91 (2008): 383–394.

or a direct influence of one corpus on the other does not most logically explain the similarities or the differences we find between them. Therefore, I consider the relationship between these two corpora in terms of different evolutionary phases starting from a common ground (the Hebrew Bible) and I see both corpora as different expressions of the multiform reality that was Palestinian Judaism.

Both the Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament reveal that many and various developments did take place in Judaism and were written from the same basic source: the religious authoritative writings that would later become the Hebrew Bible. And although we will never have a full picture of all these developments because the evidence preserved in the Scrolls is not only fragmentary but partial and purely accidental, we are now able to consider the commonalities and the differences between the two corpora. This is not an easy task, because, as George Brooke says: “[c]oncern with differences as well as similarities makes comparison both more complicated as well as in the end more fruitful.”¹⁰

In order to analyze and to try to understand both the similarities and differences as evolving from the common shared ground, the Hebrew Bible, I convened an “experts meeting” in Leuven at which a small group of specialists, interested both in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the New Testament, were to reflect and discuss on the changes that appear, for example, in the use the biblical text itself as a proof text in both corpora; in different legal interpretations explicitly or implicitly deduced from the same texts of the Hebrew Bible; in the biblical foundations of the community structures and functionaries at Qumran and in the New Testament; in the different theological conclusions extracted from the same passages of the Hebrew Bible; in short, on the commonalities and differences between the two corpora when one looks at the common ground from which they developed.

The meeting was held in the Theological Faculty of the Catholic University of Leuven on December 3rd to 6th 2007 and produced lively discussions, which were the most fruitful part of the meeting, since they were free from the constrains of a tight time schedule which handicap many such meetings. Both the Dean of the Faculty, Prof. M. Lamberigts and the Rector of the University, Prof. M. Vervenne, addressed the

¹⁰ George J. Brooke, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005), xviii.

participants at the beginning and the end of the meeting, which was also attended by the colleagues of the Department of Bible of the K.U. Leuven and by some of our doctoral students.¹¹ The present volume contains a revised form of most of the contributions and the answers of the participants. The voices of the experts are as varied and multiple as are the voices of the Scrolls or of the New Testament. Some of the studies, like the ones by Lim, Brooke, or Jokiranta, are programmatic and propose a general understanding of the relationship. Other studies are more like test cases, which apply the general framework to concrete texts. But all of them clearly follow the directions indicated by George Brook in the conclusion of his “Introduction”:

Those concerned to appreciate some of the exegetical details preserved in the Dead Sea Scrolls would do well not to omit the evidence of the New Testament in their search of contemporary Jewish literature which might help in the explanation of challenging fragmentary passages. New Testament Scholars in turn should recognize that the value of the Dead Sea Scrolls for the better appreciation of the Jewish background of much in the New Testament does not lie exclusively in particular matters of organization or messianic belief, but much more broadly in the way in which Jews contemporary with Jesus and Paul constructed their own self-understanding and identities through highly intricate and sophisticated interpretations of inherited traditions, interpretations which gave life to texts written in earlier generations.¹²

It is hoped that the publication of these studies here will not only prove the well founded hypothesis fundamental to the Leuven research project but help many other scholars of both the Scrolls and the New Testament, to understand the relationship between the two corpora better.

¹¹ I want to thank particularly Sydney Palmer, who has helped to edit the manuscript and has prepared the Indexes.

¹² G. Brooke, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament*, xxii.

TOWARDS A DESCRIPTION OF THE SECTARIAN MATRIX*

Timothy H. Lim
University of Edinburgh

Over the past sixty years, several models have been used in studying the Qumran Scrolls and the New Testament. Geza Vermes summarizes them as follows: “Qumran Essenism and Palestinian Christianity can be related in three different ways. They are either identical, the Community being the Church and Jesus the Teacher of Righteousness. Or Christianity is an off-shoot of Essenism. Or Essenism and Christianity both spring from the same common stock, the Judaism of that period.”¹ Vermes considers the first two models unlikely and proceeds to discuss how Essenism and Christianity both originate from the Judaism of the time. Like Vermes, I do not think that either of the first two models is to be followed, and this is not the place to offer a critique of them. What I should like to do here is to focus on the third model and to discuss how the notion of the “same common stock” could be usefully explored.

The paradigm that I have advanced over several years is that of the sectarian matrix:

It seems to me that there is a better model and that is to regard the Essenes, the Qumran community of the yahad, the urban sectarians, the Jerusalem church and the Pauline congregations as distinct groups that shared a common sectarian matrix. There were other groups beside. This sectarian matrix includes separation from the majority, organization into groups, religious ideas, and the choice of favourite biblical proof-texts that legitimize a sect’s existence. The groups drew inspiration from the Hebrew Bible or Old Testament; in doing so, they shared this common heritage

* I want to thank Florentino García Martínez for the invitation to present an earlier version of the paper at the Leuven conference on the Scrolls and the New Testament, and to offer my hearty congratulations to him on his recent knighthood. I also want to thank John Collins for offering his characteristic, incisive comments on a draft of this paper.

¹ Geza Vermes, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Qumran in Perspective* (rev. ed.; London: SCM Press, 1997), 191. See also his republished article “The Qumran Community, the Essenes, and Nascent Christianity” in *Scrolls, Scripture and Early Christianity* (London: T&T Clark, 2005), 42–43.

with other Jews in the late Second Temple period. But they were also sectarians... and as such they held to a similar, yet distinct, set of beliefs. They focused on certain scriptural passages, like Isaiah 40, Jeremiah 31 and Habakkuk 2:4, but they drew different lessons from them.²

The English loan word “matrix”³ is borrowed from Latin where it literally means “a mother in respect to propagation” or “a breeding-animal”.⁴ As I have used it, the “matrix” takes on its typological or figurative sense as a “source, origin or cause”. It also has the added semantic value, derived from mathematical usage,⁵ of an intertwined arrangement of quantities or symbols that serves here as the source of sectarian religious practices and beliefs. What I should like to do is to develop this model by sketching out some of the main elements of this sectarian matrix. Before doing so, let me offer some methodological reflections.

1. The model of sectarian matrix has, to its credit, several advantages, not least in constraining the search for literary parallels. It makes it much more difficult to privilege one corpus of writings over another, such as has been done with the New Testament. In theory, the hunting for parallels could be applied in either direction: one could just as readily seek New Testament passages to illustrate the Qumran scrolls. Apart from one or two exceptions, however, the chase runs primarily in one direction: the scrolls are scrutinized for features that might illuminate this or that aspect of the New Testament. This scholarly interest, while legitimate in itself, could lead to the invidious and unscrupulous using the scrolls as proof-texts, just as it has done for rabbinic literature.

² Timothy H. Lim, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A Very Short Introduction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 111–2. See also, the conception of the Edinburgh conference in Timothy H. Lim et al. *The Dead Sea Scrolls in their Historical Context* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2000), 1.

³ See my “Studying the Qumran Scrolls and Paul in their Historical Context” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls as Background to Postbiblical Judaism & Early Christianity: Papers from an International Conference at St. Andrews in 2001* (ed. James R. Davila; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 151–6.

⁴ *A Latin Dictionary* (ed., Charlton T. Lewis and Charles Short; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), 1119. This view was anticipated by among others Geza Vermes, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Qumran in Perspective* (London: SCM Press, 1982), 212, who states: “The third possibility presupposes that the Qumran sectarian writings and the New Testament represent two independent movements in pursuit of similar ideals. But even here, the question of a direct Essene influence on the early Church is possible, but arises only when their common features cannot be otherwise explained.”

⁵ *The Shorter Oxford English Dictionary on Historical Principles* prepared by William Little, H.W. Fowler and Jessie Coulson and revised by C.T. Onions. (3d ed.; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986), 2: 1290.

I do not object to the method on a theoretical level, but I am concerned that it too easily admits bad practice. The matrix model makes such a questionable practice much more difficult to execute, since it postulates a common source of Jewish sectarianism from whence both the Qumranians and Christians arose.⁶

2. Another advantage of the sectarian matrix model is that it postulates intertwined sets of religious practices, beliefs and scriptural passages that are not so general as to hold no potential value. In this model, the Qumran-Essene and Christian communities are not only described as belonging to late Second Temple Judaism generally, as Vermes has done, but also a subset of that world which we have described *faute de mieux* as sectarian.

Ed Sanders' 1992 monograph, *Judaism: Practice and Belief 63 B.C.E.–66 C.E.*⁷ is a landmark in the study of ancient Judaism. In some six hundred pages, Sanders describes in detail the history, practices and beliefs of what he calls "common Judaism" and the sects of the Sadducees, Essenes and Pharisees. The book has been criticized, unfairly in my opinion, for having transformed "the Judaea of the prefects and procurators into a kind of idyllic society".⁸ To be sure, Sanders downplays the revolutionary elements in the period before the First Jewish Revolt, but it is because he does not hold to the view of escalating tension. For him, the Judaea of the first century was "not working itself up for war," and the revolt took everyone "by surprise".⁹

The more telling criticism is levelled against Sanders' description of ancient Judaism, with its marginalization of the apocalyptic tradition over against the institution of the Temple cult. Martin Hengel and Ronald Deines disapprove, stating that "the selective manner of

⁶ See my discussions of these issues in "Studying the Qumran Scrolls," 135–156, and "The Legal Nature of P. Yadin 19 and Galatians 3:15" in *When Judaism and Christianity Began: Essays in Memory of Anthony J. Saldarini* (ed. Daniel J. Harrington, Alan J. Avery-Peck and Jacob Neusner; 2 vols.; Leiden: Brill Academic Publishers, 2004), 2: 361–376.

⁷ Ed Sanders, *Judaism: Practice and Belief 63 B.C.E.–66 C.E.* (London: SCM Press, 1992).

⁸ Martin Hengel and David Smith, *The Zealots: Investigations into the Jewish Freedom Movement in the Period from Herod I until 70 A.D.* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1989), xviii. See also Martin Hengel and R. Deines, "E.P. Sanders' 'Common Judaism', Jesus and the Pharisees" *JTS* 46 (1995): 1–70.

⁹ Sanders, *Judaism: Practice & Belief*, 35–36. See also Martin D. Goodman, *Rome & Jerusalem: The Clash of Ancient Civilizations* (London: Penguin Books, 2007), 383–444.

presentation is also shown by the little attention given to the eschatological expectation as compared with the thorough coverage of the temple, the cult and the priesthood.”¹⁰

What is also lacking in Sanders’ treatment of Jewish sectarianism is any discussion of the New Testament and early Church, or an explicit comparison of the various sects. It is odd in a book that deals with common and sectarian Judaism to leave out the earliest followers of Jesus. It is odd moreover because he is undoubtedly one of the most prominent exponents of the Jewishness of Jesus and one of the foremost New Testament scholars.

Nonetheless, I accept Sanders’ description of the practices and beliefs of Jews, his “common Judaism,” as forming the religion of Second Temple Judaism generally. The sectarian matrix that is being articulated here is a corner, subset or subsection of this religious framework, one of the essential traits of a sect being its separation from a larger group (see below). Moreover, within this corner of the whole, there is an overlay of threads (representing the crisscrossing paths followed by the Pharisees, Sadducees, Essenes, *yahad*, urban sectarians, Jerusalem church, Pauline churches, etc.) that wind inwardly towards the middle of the tapestry (meaning the essential¹¹ source of the biblical texts) as well as outwardly, dangling beyond the edges (representing non-biblical traditions). Each thread or sectarian path, therefore, is made up of religious practices and beliefs and is established by the intertwining of biblical traditions that other non-sectarian Jews shared, biblical traditions that only other sectarian Jews shared, and distinctive traditions (biblical and non-biblical) that no other Jew shared.

3. The sectarian matrix model, as I have defined it, is not monolithic in any sense. On the one side, it views groups such as the Essenes, the *yahad*, and the urban community as overlapping, yet different.¹² I do not harmonize the groups into an undifferentiated “Qumran Essenism.” On the other side, it is not a comparison with “Palestinian Christianity”, but with the Jerusalem church and the Pauline congregations dispersed in various corners of the Mediterranean world. Early Christianity was no

¹⁰ Hengel and Deines, “E.P. Sanders”, 54.

¹¹ Not all biblical texts were equally authoritative; Deut, Isa, and the Pss, for instance, were particularly important for the scrolls and the New Testament.

¹² It is in fact more complicated. See, for instance, John J. Collins, “The Yahad and ‘The Qumran Community,’” in *Biblical Traditions in Transmission: Essays in Honour of Michael A. Knibb* (ed. Charlotte Hempel and Judith M. Lieu; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 81–96.

more monolithic than its Qumran-Essene counterparts. Moreover, from the earliest times it developed in various places outside of Palestine.

COMPARING THE SCROLLS AND THE NEW TESTAMENT

Terminology

How might one begin to describe the sectarian matrix that both the Qumran and Christian communities shared? One starting point is the meaning of the English word “sect.” The *Concise Oxford English Dictionary* (COED) defines it as 1) “a religious group or faction regarded as heretical or as deviating from orthodox tradition” (often derogatory); and 2) “a group with extreme or dangerous philosophical or political ideas.” Both contemporary meanings are related to the ancient sense of the word “sect,” but they are not exact, linguistic equivalents.

The term “sect” derives from the Latin *secta*¹³ and is a common English translation of several Greek words, most notably (but not exclusively)¹⁴ *proairesis* and *hairesis*. Thus Philo calls the Therapeutae *proairesis* (*Contempl.* 29, 32 and 67) and *hairesis* (*Contempl.* 29), and the Essenes *proairesis* (*Hypoth.* 11.2). The basic meaning of both cognate nouns is that of “taking” or “choosing.”¹⁵ Thus, those who are described as belonging to a *proairesis* or *hairesis* have chosen a particular way of life or follow a philosophy. Philo, emphasizing the philosophical quality of virtue and philanthropy, describes the Essene’s recruitment in a manner that reveals its essential character: “Their enlistment (*prohairesis*) is not due to race—the word ‘race’ is unsuitable where volunteers are concerned—but is due to zeal for the cause of virtue and

¹³ The Latin *secta* “following, party” from the stem *sequi* “to follow”; it is also used as a synonym for *ratio* (“account, reckoning, calculation”) and *via* (“way”). Pliny, using the Greek loan word, describes the *Esseni* as *gens sola* (*Nat.* 5.17.4.73), meaning either “people unique of its kind” or “solitary people”, the former emphasizing the distinctive characteristics of the Essenes and the latter their remote desert location.

¹⁴ Other terms translated as “sect” are *genos* (another designation for the Therapeutae, *Contempl.* 11) and *thiason* (refers to Chaldean philosophers, *Her.* 99; Pythagoreans, *Prob.* 2).

¹⁵ Josephus uses *proairesis* and *hairesis* eighty and thirty times respectively in his works, denoting, for instance, its plain sense of ‘choice’ of various kinds (of land, *A.J.* 1.169; punishment, *A.J.* 6.71; king, *A.J.* 6.91; men, *A.J.* 15.6; authority, *B.J.* 1.199; of return, *C. Ap.* 2.289; inclination, *A.J.* 1.54; *C. Ap.* 1.214); ‘election’ (kings, *A.J.* 7.321; of God *A.J.* 4.109); ‘taking’ (of a city, *A.J.* 7.160; of Babylon, *A.J.* 10.79, 10.247, 12.363; of a fortress *A.J.* 13.233; captives *B.J.* 6.352; men alive *B.J.* 7.326); and ‘siege’ (of a city, *A.J.* 13.231).

an ardent love of men.” (*Apologia pro Iudaeis* [in Eusebius *Praeparatio evangelica* 8.6–7] 2–3).

Implied in the “enlistment” or “selection” of one path is the rejection of other paths. It is possible to think of the sectarian choosing one path amidst a plurality of paths; in this reconstruction, Jewish religiosity is characterized by diversity, and there is no one Judaism but a plurality of “Judaisms.”¹⁶ But such an historical reconstruction does not take account of the majority, the ordinary Jews whose piety centered on the home, synagogue and Temple. 4QMMT preserves a clear reference to Jewish society in general when it states that ‘we have [se]parated from most of the people מרוב העם [ש; 4Q397 14–21, 7). At an early stage in the history of the Qumran community, the “we-party” stated how its biblically based teachings on impurities differed from those held by most of the people. The verb פָּרַשְׁנוּ “we have separated” could be understood in the sense of deviating from the majority, but it is in the nature of sects to consider its own “take” as truth and all others as deviations. Thus, it is better to render the verb by the neutral translation “we have separated.”

It is this “majority” that constitutes the framework within which ancient sects chose their distinctive paths. It seems to me, therefore, that it is a preferable to presuppose the presence of a shared set of beliefs and practices (following Sanders’ description of “common Judaism”) from which a sect separates. This common Judaism was the religion of the people of the land (*amme ha-arets*), ordinary farmers, herders, craftsmen, and vintners, whose varying degrees of piety centered on the home and the Temple with its cultic service. Those who live too far away from the Temple or in the diaspora would also have had some form of communal assembly, most notably the synagogue.¹⁷

Josephus uses *hairesis* to describe a political group that opposed King Adonijah in his paraphrase of the biblical account (*A.J.* 7.347), the followers of Judas (*B.J.* 2.118), and, of course, the Pharisees, Sadducees, and Essenes (*A.J.* 13.171; 13.288; 13.293; 20.199; *B.J.* 2.122; 2.137; 2.142; 2.162). In the New Testament, *hairesis* is used nine times to mean

¹⁶ I am here thinking, of course, of Jacob Neusner’s well-known emphasis upon the diversity of Judaism.

¹⁷ Evidence of synagogues before 70 C.E. is scarce, but see Anders Runesson, Donald D. Binder and Birger Olsson, *The Ancient Synagogue from its Origins to 200 C.E.: A Source Book* (Leiden: Brill, 2008) and Anders Runesson, *The Origins of the Synagogue: A Socio-Historical Study* (Leiden: Brill, 2001).

“factions” or “parties” within the churches of Corinth and Galatia (1 Cor 11:19; Gal 5:20). It is also used to mean “sect,” the latter referring to the Sadducees (Acts 5:17), Pharisees (Acts 15:5; 26:5) and the followers of Jesus or “the Way” (Acts 24:5, 14).

A complicating factor is that the Greek word *hairesis* is the etymological root of our term “heresy” which the *COED* defines as 1) “belief or opinion contrary to orthodox religious (especially Christian) doctrine;” and 2) “opinion profoundly at odds with what is generally accepted.” The first meaning is unsuitable for the study of nascent Christianity, since “orthodoxy” had not yet been established. In this regard, 2 Peter 2:1 (dated perhaps to 100 C.E.) probably comes closest to the meaning of “heresy” in the first sense, an incipient meaning of “heresy” within an emerging Christian “orthodoxy”: “But false prophets also arose among the people, just as there will be false teachers among you, who will secretly bring in destructive heresies (*haireseis*).” The second meaning is generic. One could, of course, argue that ancient Jewish groups before 70 followed “heresies,” in the sense that their opinion was at odds with what was generally accepted in Jewish society. This would presuppose a generally accepted set of beliefs. However, it is probably best to avoid the word “heresy” altogether, even in its generic sense, because it conjures up too many unwarranted, theological associations.

The basic meaning of “take” or “choice” defines what a sect is (*proairesis* and *hairesis*) in ancient sources: it is a group that has, in modern parlance, its own “take” on life and how one should live or follow a philosophy. The Essenes, Therapeutae, Sadducees, Pharisees and Christians were all described as “sects.” Conceptually, it is easier to presuppose a generally accepted set of beliefs from which the various sects disagreed. Without this commonality it would be more difficult to conceive how these groups had their own “take”.

These sects did not disagree with all the accepted beliefs, just some of them. For instance, the Qumran sectarians took as authoritative the emerging bipartite canon of the Bible, consisting of the books of the torah and some of the prophets,¹⁸ as well as other books that were eventually included in the canon (most notably the Psalms). The majority of the Jews also accepted these books as authoritative. Moreover, the Qumranians cited passages from *1 Enoch*, *Jubilees* and the *Temple*

¹⁸ See my “An Alleged Reference to the Tripartite Division of the Hebrew Bible” *RevQ* 77 (2001): 27–37.

Scroll as they did from other biblical books; the New Testament did the same with *1 Enoch* (Jude 14–15). But these books were not generally recognized and eventually were not included in the canon of the Hebrew Bible. The Qumranians also had legal and exegetical traditions not preserved in the biblical texts.¹⁹ Biblical laws, as many as they are, do not cover all aspects of life; they require interpretation and supplementation. For instance, the Pharisee’s oral torah, which the Sadducees rejected (Josephus, *A.J.* 13.297), is just such a supplement. The Essenes too had their own distinctive practices, such as the wearing of the white garment (*J.W.* 2.123, 137), the avoidance of going to toilet on Sabbath (*J.W.* 2.147), and the use of a hatchet to dig a hole to relieve themselves in a remote place (*J.W.* 2.148–9).

Defining a Sect

It is useful to complement the lexical discussion with a consideration of the nature of sectarianism from a sociological perspective. Shaye Cohen provides a helpful, short characterization of a sect from a sociological perspective.

A sect is a small, organized group that separates itself from a larger religious body and asserts that it alone embodies the ideals of the larger group because it alone understands God’s will.²⁰

I am not concerned here to defend Cohen’s definition over against other social scientific alternatives. I have suggested, for instance, that

¹⁹ Extra-biblical traditions are already evident in the Hebrew Bible itself. For instance, there is no precept in the Torah about the wood offering of Neh 10:35 and 13:31.

²⁰ Shaye Cohen, *From the Maccabees to the Mishnah* (2nd ed.; Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2006), 120–9. Cohen also discusses proto-sects in the Rechabites of Jer 35, the “servant” and “chosen” of Isa 55–66, and “those who separated themselves from the peoples of the lands to adhere to the laws of God” in Neh 10:29. The Rabbinic term is *cat*. Carol Newsom, “The ‘Sectually Explicit’ Literature from Qumran” in *The Hebrew Bible and its Interpreters* (ed. William H. Propp, Baruch Halpern and David Noel Freedman; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990), 167–88, showed that the term sectarian is variously defined according to authorship, audience and/or use. The application of sociological approaches to the study of sectarianism is found in A. Baumgarten’s *The Flourishing of Jewish Sects in the Maccabean Era: An Interpretation* (Leiden: Brill, 1997), which emphasized boundary marking mechanisms and the causes of sectarianism in the rise of literacy, increased urbanization, and the eschatological expectation of the end. See now Jutta Jokiranta, *Identity on a Continuum: Constructing and Expressing Sectarian Social Identity in Qumran. Serakhim and Pesharim* (Ph.D. diss., University of Helsinki, 2005), Eyal Regev, *Sectarianism in Qumran: A Cross-Cultural Perspective* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2007), and David J. Chalcraft, ed. *Sectarianism in Early Judaism: Sociological Advances* (London: Equinox, 2007).

it could be qualified by drawing distinctions between exclusivist sects, like the Qumran-Essene communities, and the reformist parties, like the Pharisees, that want the larger community to agree with its distinctive, party teachings.²¹ I also find it difficult to see how the Sadducees would fit in to this definition of sect. Cohen is inspired by the typology of Brian Wilson and is following the lead of the ancient sources, and I find it a useful place to start discussing the distinctive features of sectarianism.

I want to focus especially upon the features of size, organization, boundaries and religious ideals. Cohen himself defines the terms that are worth summarizing here. A sect must be of small size, have an organized structure, and must have seceded from a larger religious body. It must also maintain exclusivist claims that “it alone embodies the ideals of the larger group” which means that it considers itself the “true Israel”. The separation of a sect can take various forms; members of the sect might physically remove themselves to some isolated place, like the desert, or “they might live among, but not with, their non-sectarian co-religionists”.²² They create taboos or boundaries that hamper the social interchange with outsiders. How porous these social barriers were Cohen does not specify.

Size. It is evident that both the Qumran-Essene and Christian communities comprised only a small minority of the Jewish population, estimated between half a million and two and a half million people.²³ The two sects were comparable in size and location only at the very beginning. The number of inhabitants of Khirbet Qumran has been estimated at no more than two hundred and as few as thirty individuals. Although Pliny states that the volunteers of the Essene community were “in great numbers” (*Nat.* 5.73), this seems an exaggeration and not based upon any source. Both Philo and Josephus indicate that there were four thousand Essenes spread throughout Judaea. Leaving aside its relationship to the Therapeutae sect by the Mareotic Lake in

²¹ Lim, *Dead Sea Scrolls. A Very Short Introduction*, 79–80.

²² Cohen, *From the Maccabees to the Mishnah*, p. 121.

²³ The standard discussion for over a hundred years has been J. Beloch’s *Die Bevoekerung der Griechisch-Roemischen Welt* (Leipzig: Duncker & Humbolt, 1886). See recently, the cautionary notes in Brian McGing, “Population and Proselytism. How many Jews were there in the ancient world?” in *Jews in the Hellenistic and Roman Cities* (ed. John R. Barlett; London and New York: Routledge, 2002), 88–106.

Egypt,²⁴ there is no evidence that the Qumran-Essene communities lived anywhere apart from Judaea.

The Christian community too, as estimated by Keith Hopkins, started off small, “scarcely a few dozen, perhaps rising to two hundred, literate adults, dispersed throughout the Mediterranean basin.”²⁵ The Christian sources, like Pliny, inflate numbers: writing in the middle of the first century C.E., Paul exclaims that “your faith is proclaimed in the whole world” (*kosmos*; Rom 1:8); in the Acts of the Apostles, James the brother of Jesus is reported to have said that “many tens of thousands (*muriades*) of the Jews have believed” in Christ (21:20). However, the Christian population did increase rapidly. Following Adolf Harnack, Hopkins suggested that there were in 100 C.E. approximately fifty Christian communities, each with an average membership of one hundred and forty people, totalling some seven thousand. Hopkins posited an increase of three point four per cent per year, so that by the time of Origen (ca. 185–254), he conservatively assumes that forty in every one thousand people in the Roman Empire were Christians. In the second century C.E., the Roman Empire was at its apex, with population estimates of between fifty and sixty million people. This would make the Christian population between two million and two point four million people.²⁶ One cannot take these educated guesses as factual,²⁷ but they broadly indicate that the scale of the Qumran-Essene communities is not comparable to Christianity except at the very beginning.

²⁴ The relationship between the Therapeutae and Essenes was suggested long ago by Geza Vermes on the basis of an etymological argument of “healers.” It is also a feature of Florentino Garcia Martinez and the late Adam van der Woude’s Groningen Hypothesis that postulated an Egyptian daughter sect of the Essenes. Compare now Joan E. Taylor’s discussion of the therapeutridae as cultic attendants in *Jewish Women Philosophers of First-Century Alexandria: Philo’s ‘Therapeutae’ Reconsidered* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003).

²⁵ Keith Hopkins, “Christian Number and its Implications” *J ECS* 6 (1998): 185.

²⁶ Earlier Rodney Stark, *The Rise of Christianity: A Sociologist Reconsiders History* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996), 5–11, offered a similar estimate which has been accepted by Thomas M. Finn, “Mission and Expansion” in *The Early Christian World* (ed. Philip F. Esler; London: Routledge, 2000), 1: 295–6. According to this tally, there were about 33.9 million Christians by 350 C.E. For cautionary notes on such population estimates, see Robert M. Grant, *Early Christianity and Society: Seven Studies* (London: Collins, 1977), 7–8.

²⁷ Hopkins blankly states that “my methods are frankly speculative and exploratory” (“Christian Numbers and its Implications”, 184).

Organization

There are some notable similarities between the various Qumran-Essene and Christian communities as regards institutional organization.

Vermes states:

The most likely domain of Qumran influence on Christianity is that of organization and religious practice. After all, the Qumran sect was already a well-trying institution when the Judaeo-Christian church was struggling to establish itself, and it would have been only sensible for inexperienced men of the fellowship of Jesus to observe and imitate existing patterns.²⁸

Specifically, there was what Vermes terms a “monarchic government”, namely the oversight of the spiritual and material well-being of the Pauline churches by a group of elders with Paul being in overall charge. For Vermes, this was similar to the “Essene pattern of a Guardian as pastor of each individual camp, with Paul himself playing the part of the ‘Guardian of all the camps’”.²⁹

Although Vermes does not say so, the comparison is, of course, with the urban sectarians of the *Damascus Document* where the leader of the camp was the *mebaqqer* who was “like a shepherd of his flock” (CD XIII, 9), a description that echoes what is said about Jesus as “a shepherd and guardian of...souls” in 1 Peter 2:25. Vermes holds that the same Guardian was in charge of the *yahad*, a *paqid* who functioned as a teacher, president and spiritual assessor. In 1QS, he is also called the Maskil, and he instructed the members according to the “rule of the community” (1QS I, 1, V, 1 and IX, 21) and the doctrine of the two spirits; he presided over the assemblies (1QS VI, 11–13); and he examined the spiritual development of the men and ranked them in order (1QS VI, 14, 21–22). But of the two communities, it is the organization of the urban sectarians that is comparable to the leadership of the Pauline churches. Josephus and Philo’s descriptions of the two orders of the Essenes, with its various officials and administrators, superiors, procurators and elders, are also closer to the community of the *Damascus Document* than 1QS.³⁰

²⁸ Vermes, *Qumran in Perspective*, 199.

²⁹ Vermes, *Qumran in Perspective*, 199.

³⁰ There various administrators in charge of collecting the salary (Philo, *Apologia* 10; Josephus, *J.W.* 2.123, *J.A.* 18.22). There are “superiors” and “procurators” who look after community discipline (Josephus, *J.W.* 2.134), obedience to “elders”, “the majority” and the quorum of ten men (Josephus, *J.W.* 2.146), but can exercise discretion on the subject of aid and pity (*J.W.* 2.134).

To me, what stands out as being very different is the hierarchy in the Qumran and Essene communities. There is simply no counterpart among the Christian groups to the strict hierarchy of the *yahad* (1QS VI, 8), the pedagogic role of the priest learned in the book of meditation (CD 13), or the Essene division into four lots according to the duration of their discipline (Josephus, *J.W.* 2.150). I would suggest, therefore, that even in matters of organization it is difficult to postulate direct influence. Nevertheless, the organizational likeness does have to be explained, and I would suggest that the model of sectarian matrix, identifying a subset of ancient Jewish practice, better explains the proverbial similarities and differences.

Vermes discusses two other features of influence, communal sharing of goods and asceticism. I see asceticism as part of the religious ideals and practices and shall discuss it below. On the possession of goods through private or communal ownership, he points out that in both Essenism and Early Christianity, there was a range of views spanning the two poles of “an absolute renunciation of possessions and a retention of personal wealth”.³¹ But the distinctive feature of a sharing of goods is a “system of religious communism or quasi-communism identical with that of Qumran in the Jerusalem church”.³² Acts 2:44–45 states:

All who believed were together and had all things in common; and they sold their possessions and goods and distributed them to all, as any had need.

Vermes goes on to compare the infraction and punishment of Ananias and Sapphira in Acts 5:1–11 with the Qumranian, year-long barring of the offending member from the pure meal of the congregation and the penance of one quarter reduction of food (1QS VI, 24–25). We do not in fact know the nature of the Qumranian violation; it refers only to lying about wealth or property (אם ימצא במ איש אשר ישקר בהון). Vermes simply assumed that it was comparable to the Christian couple’s intentional withholding of part of the proceeds of a property sale. But that is not necessary; lying about material goods could involve a number of other theoretical possibilities, such as, say, falsifying ownership of another member’s property, so that it would be registered to his account (cf. 1QS VI, 20). Moreover, the nature of the punishment is also differ-

³¹ Vermes, *Qumran in Perspective*, 197.

³² Vermes, *Qumran in Perspective*, 197.

ent; the Qumranian penal code requires a temporary exclusion order (רבים יבדילהו מתוך טהרת) and cutback of food provisions (נענשו את), whereas the man Ananias and his wife Sapphira in turn “fell down dead” (Acts 5:5, 10), an unnatural act that was attributed to divine sentence.

Again, it seems to me that suggesting Qumranian influence on the Jerusalem church here is unwarranted. Both the infraction and the punishment are not directly comparable. Nevertheless, the pooling of individual resources into a communal pot was a distinctive practice not found among ancient Jews generally, the Pharisees, Sadducees or Zealots. Put another way, the general practice of communal collection of property looks similar from afar but turns out to be ambiguous or rather different upon closer examination. It seems to me that this example illustrates well a methodological issue that I would call “distance focalization”. In comparing the similarity of distinctive features between two sects, the distance—or level of abstraction, if you like—from the characteristics under focus directly affects our perception of its similarity and dissimilarity.

Taboos or boundaries

The issue of distance focalization also affects the study of the sectarian boundaries. To be sure, in early Christianity there is no comparable, multi-year initiation procedure, such as one finds prescribed for the *yahad* and Josephus’ Essenes.³³ Yet, there is one practice that has been compared from the beginning of Qumran scholarship and that is the Qumran-Essene ritual bathing and John’s baptism. From a distance, the practice is distinctive on the broad canvas of late Second Temple Jewish religious life. The ritual bathing or baptism was done in an eschatological context; there was an appeal to the proof-text of Isa 40:3; and Josephus’ description of the baptism of John converges with his account of the purification of the Essenes. A closer examination of baptism, however, reveals significant differences: Mark portrays John’s immersion as a “baptism for the repentance of sins”, whereas the Qumran community, the Essenes and Josephus’ portrayal of John’s baptism required repentance before the ritual act.³⁴

³³ See John J. Collins, “Essenes,” *ABD* 2:632.

³⁴ Timothy H. Lim, “Paul, Letters of,” *EDSS* 2:638–9.

Recently, Jonathan Klawans has contributed to the discussion from a different angle.³⁵ He too argues that John, as did Paul after him, understood baptism as an act of repentance, but the ritual was considered to have some power. Otherwise, John would have considered repentance as such to be sufficient for effecting atonement, without the necessity of performing a ritual act. This is different from the Qumranian purificatory rite that considered sin as a source of defilement.

To understand the contrast better, one must realize that for Klawans the Hebrew Bible knows of two distinct forms of ritual and moral impurity. Leviticus 11–15 and Numbers 19 describe the contagious, yet impermanent, form of defilement. These ritual impurities include menses, discharges, and contact with natural sources (childbirth, corpse defilement) and sickness (leprosy). It is not a sin to contract these impurities, in fact it is unavoidable in daily life, and the contagion may be removed by a rite of purification. By contrast, the Holiness Code of Leviticus 17–26 and other passages from Numbers describe what Klawans calls “moral impurity”. These are morally reprehensible behaviours, considered to be such grave sins that they are thought to defile the Israelite, chief among these are sexual sins (Lev 18:24–30), idolatry (Lev 19:31; 20:1–3) and bloodshed (Num 35:33–34). These moral impurities are long-lasting and are purified not by rites but by punishment and atonement.

In ancient Judaism, there were different post-biblical conceptions of the relationship between these two forms of impurities. The tannaitic literature compartmentalized the two as distinct and separate. Klawans believes that Paul, as a Pharisee, probably did the same. The Qumran sectarians, however, “melded” the two into a ritual defilement of sin as evidenced by their view that all outsiders, meaning non-sectarian Jews and Gentiles alike, are sinful and therefore sources of ritual defilement. Similarly, fellow members who sin are banned from the pure food, because like outsiders they are thought to defile the community ritually (e.g., 1QS VI, 24–VII, 25). Klawans describes these ritual boundaries (he eschews the loaded term “taboo”) as follows:

At Qumran, sin was considered to be a source of ritual impurity. . . . That idea is very much connected to their sectarian ideology: If you view the constant maintenance of ritual purity as a desideratum, and you view sin

³⁵ Jonathan Klawans, *Impurity and Sin in Ancient Judaism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000).

as a source of ritual defilement, and you view most of your neighbors as sinners, then you have little choice but to remove yourself from the general populace that you view as sinful. And if you view sin as a source of ritual defilement, you also have little choice but to ostracize or banish the sinner.³⁶

I believe that Klawans has directly contributed to a description of the social and ritual boundaries of the Qumran-Essene and Christian communities, even while his aim is to discuss the relationship between sin and impurity in ancient Judaism. There are a few points that I would like to raise about his work.

First, he over-interprets the characteristically ambiguous language of the Habakkuk Peshar as a melding of ritual and moral impurity. In 1QpHab XII, 6–9 and VIII, 8–13, for instance, Klawans notes the sectarian juxtaposition of terminology associated with moral and ritual impurity: “abominable deeds” (מעשי תועבות) with defilement (טמא); and “ways of abomination” (דרכי תועבות) and “with every sort of unclean impurity” (בכול נדה טמאה) respectively.³⁷ Referring to the former passage, he admits that “[t]hese charges are vague indeed.”³⁸ Nonetheless he feels able to argue that the sectarians combined moral and ritual impurity. The occurrence of abomination (תועבה) and defilement (טמא) terminology is not decisive, since the latter is used in both moral and ritual impurity, as he himself notes.³⁹ There is no occurrence of “pollute” (חנף). In other words, the pesharist’s rant against the Wicked Priest’s abominable deeds and defilement of the sanctuary appears to be ambiguous at best. Given that the passage also condemns bloodshed, violence done to the land, and robbery, what seems to be at issue is moral impurity alone and not ritual impurity.

On 1QpHab VII, 8–13, Klawans (following Brownlee) adds the further argument that the Wicked Priest’s לבו רם should be interpreted via Prov16:5, equating arrogance with ways of abomination (דרכי תועבות). Yet the terminology in the biblical text is not the same:

תעבת יהוה כל גבה לב יד ליד לא ינקה

Literally: An abomination of the Lord is everyone haughty of heart; a hand to a hand he will not be blameless.

³⁶ Klawans, *Impurity and Sin*, 133.

³⁷ Klawans, *Impurity and Sin*, 77–78.

³⁸ Klawans, *Impurity and Sin*, 69.

³⁹ Klawans, *Impurity and Sin*, 26.

The phrase “a hand to a hand” is unclear and the LXX is no help as it translates the phrase as “he that unjustly strikes hands with a hand will not be guiltless”. In any case, there are lexically closer biblical passages in Deut 8:14 and Ezek 31:10, both using the phrase רַם לֵב. Moreover, in this passage the arrogance of the Wicked Priest is not related to grave sins, as it is in XII, 6–9, but to rebellion through abandoning God and betraying the statutes for the sake of wealth.

Second, his discussion of the CD as both a non-sectarian and sectarian text is arbitrary. To be sure, form-critically speaking, the CD is a composite text, but the whole of it has been shown by the Qumran copies to be a reliable text and as such functioned wholly as a sectarian text; he discusses this in chapter 2 with other texts, including Ezra, Nehemiah, *Jubilees* and the *Temple Scroll*. It is thus odd that Klawans considers the climax of the Admonitions sections of CD, with its well-known exegesis of the three nets of Belial in Isa 24:17, as non-sectarian. He sees this passage as a question of moral impurity, even though it looks as if the text itself is corrupt with the exegesis of only two forms of fornication. The CD is entirely sectarian and Klawans would need to modify his view that the Qumran community did not wholly conflate the categories of ritual and moral impurity.

The final point is a comment rather than a criticism of Klawans. The issue of food laws seemed to have served as some form of boundary for the Judaeo-Christian group, as evidenced by the apostolic council in Acts 15:28 and Paul’s letter to the Gal (2:11–13). For his own reasons Klawans leaves out the food laws in his discussion, but it seems to me that that would need to be examined as a form of boundary.

Religious ideals

Sanders outlines the beliefs and practices of common Judaism as follows: all Jews believed in 1) one God who is sovereign and who alone is worthy of worship; 2) the covenantal relationship between God and Israel; and 3) the theological economy of transgression, repentance, punishment and forgiveness. For Sanders, these beliefs formed “the core of Jewish ‘orthodoxy’”.⁴⁰ But Judaism is also a religion of “orthopraxy” and Jews are required to 1) worship or serve God; 2) circumcise their male offspring; 3) observe the Sabbath and keep it holy by doing no

⁴⁰ This is most clearly stated in his discussion of ‘Judaism as a Religion’ in *The Historical Figure of Jesus* (London: Penguin, 1993), chapter 2.

work; 4) avoid certain foods such as pork and shellfish; and 5) purify themselves from various contagions. What made Judaism distinctive in the context of the Graeco-Roman religions of the Mediterranean world is that Jewish law was all encompassing. It was not simply the observance of feasts and offerings, which many other pagan religions likewise required, but the application of divine precepts to all of life: “The most striking point about Jewish law is that it brings the entirety of life, including civil and domestic practices, under the authority of God.”⁴¹

In my view, what the various Jewish and Christian sects held in addition to or as a qualification of these beliefs and practices include:

1) An understanding of itself as the ‘true Israel’ (מוסד אמת לישראל) לִיחַד בְּרִית עוֹלָם 1QS V, 5; בית תמים ואמת בישראל VIII, 9; τὸν Ἰσραὴλ τοῦ θεοῦ Gal 6:16), expressed in terms of remnant theology (שאיִרִית CD I, 4; 4Q174 1.3 II, 2; τὸ ὑπόλειμμα Rom 9:27 and λείμμα Rom 11:5). The Christian communities, following dominical logia, believed in the new covenant (ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη Lk 22:20; 1 Cor 11:25; 2 Cor 3:6; Heb 8:8; 12:24), in the sense that through the blood of Jesus a new dispensation had been inaugurated. The old covenant was now superseded (Heb 8:13; 9:15). The *yahad* and the urban communities, by contrast, considered their movements to be a renewal of the old covenant that was given to their fathers (כברית אשר חקים אל לראשנים CD IV, 9; VI, 19; VIII, 21; XX, 12; 1QSb III, 26; V, 5; V, 21; 1QpHab II, 3). It was a renewed more than a new covenant.⁴² The council of the *yahad*, moreover, considered itself the embodiment of the temple (בית קודש לישראל) 1QS VIII, 510 [4Q259 II, 18]; 4Q174 1 2 I.6) just as the Pauline communities considered themselves (ναὸς θεοῦ 1 Cor 3:16–17; 2 Cor 6:16), both even citing the same proof-text from Isa 28:16 that described “the tested wall” and “precious cornerstone.” They differed in their understanding of what the wall and cornerstone signified, a “stumbling stone” (λίθον προσκόμματος) and “rock of offence” (πέτραν σκανδάλου) in Rom 9:33 or a sure foundation (יזרעעו יסודותיהו) in 1QS VIII, 8. The urban community of the *Damascus Document* did not express such a view; one can only suppose that living amongst non-sectarians in “camps” (מחנות CD VII, 6) they de-emphasized the identification of

⁴¹ Sanders, *Historical Figure of Jesus*, 37.

⁴² Shemaryahu Talmon, “The Community of the Renewed Covenant: Between Judaism and Christianity” in *The Community of the Renewed Covenant* (ed. Eugene Ulrich and James VanderKam; Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1994), 3–26.

the community with the Temple, which was important to the *yahad*, since they appeared to have continued to sacrifice, as implied in the Sabbath prohibition (אל יעל איש למזבח בשבת CD XI, 17).

The Essenes are not described by the classical sources as the true Israel, remnant, or embodiment of the Temple, but this may be due to the bias of the sources. Both Philo and Josephus portray the Essenes as a philosophical group. Philo, influenced by Stoic philosophy on morality and freedom, depicts the Essenes as “athletes of virtue” (ἀθλητὰς ἀρετῆς *Prob.* 88) and Josephus compares them to the Pythagoreans (*A.J.* 15.371) and Dacians (*A.J.* 18.22). For Josephus, however, there may be an additional reason. Josephus’ Essenes recognize the Temple, sending but not themselves bringing sacrifices to it (στέλλοντες θυσίας), for they purify themselves differently from what is expected and thus are excluded from the court. Consequently, they perform their own sacrifices (ἐφ’ αὐτῶν τὰς θυσίας ἐπιτελοῦσιν *A.J.* 18.19). This qualified recognition of the Temple and its cultic sacrifice may be a contributing factor; like the urban community of the *Damascus Document* they did not maintain a strong anti-Temple stance and did not consider their community a replacement for the cultic center.

2) Views regarding human actions (περὶ τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων πραγμάτων *A.J.* 13.171–3). Josephus states that Pharisees believed that “some but not all” (τινὰ καὶ οὐ πάντα) human actions are the work of fate; Essenes considered fate “the mistress of all things” (πάντων τὴν εἰμαρμένην κυρίαν); and the Sadducees denied that there was such a thing (οὐδὲν εἶναι ταύτην ἀξιοῦντες), assuming all actions to originate within humans, who are the sole cause of good and evil. The Essenes and Sadducees were on either side of the fate and freewill debate, whereas the Pharisees figured somewhere in between. Josephus’ statement must be considered as broad generalizations.

The *yahad* too appeared to have believed in determinism of some sort as evidenced by the “doctrine of the two spirits” in which the Maskil teaches all the sons of light about the “genealogy” (תולדות) of mankind (1QS III, 13–IV, 26). The term *toledot* is an allusion to the creation account and its meaning is the spirit of men (מיני רוחותם), their character (אותותם) and deeds (מעשיהם). The strict determinism is expressed in the ultimate design of God: “from the God of knowledge all things came to be and will be (מאל הדעות כול הווה ונהייה) and before they come to be he has already ordered their design (ולפני היותם הכין כול) מחשבתם 1QS III, 15.” Even the existence of the Prince of Light and Angel of Darkness governing the two camps was determined: “And it

was He who created both the Spirits of light and darkness” (והואה ברא ורוחות אור ורושך 1QS III, 24). This sectarian view of fate was closely tied up with the election of Israel in a covenantal relationship, but it further specified of the selection of “the Israel” within “Israel.”

Like most strict views about determinism, those of the *yahad* would not have been consistent. Despite the divinely determined separation of the sons of light and darkness, there was in the Angel of Darkness the power to corrupt the sons of righteousness (ובמלאך חושך תעות) כול בני צדק 1QS III, 21–2), to seduce them, as it were, to “the dark side.” The further statement that God allowed the temporary seduction to occur (“according to the mysteries of God until His end”, 1QS III, 23) was evidently a rationalization that accounted for the reality that all men, even the sons of light, sin and stumble.

There is nothing explicit in the two spirits passage about human responsibility. The passage is written from the perspective of divine pre-determinism. If God had preordained everything, then all human actions take place accordingly: a strict view of fate would preclude human culpability. Again, it is difficult to see how this could have been so, given the repeated exhortation to obey and do the divine commands, the presence of the penal codes that punish transgressions, and the possibility of apostasy. The sectarians must have allowed, if tacitly and unreflectively, a degree of human freewill to complement their strict determinism.

The passage of the two spirits is a source of 1QS III–IV; it most likely had a life of its own outside of the text. In two recensions of the *Rule of the Community*, represented by 4QS^b and 4QS^d, this teaching of the two spirits is missing. While it is too soon to reconstruct historical communities behind each of the recensions of the *Rule of the Community*, it is probably safe to say that the two spirits passage was not always (or did not remain) authoritative.

The New Testament too has several notable passages on determinism, but none so important as those found in Paul’s letter to the Romans. Like all Jews, Paul held a view of election and predestination that God had chosen Israel as His special people: He foreknew (προέγνω) his people Israel (11:2). However, Paul redefined “Israel” by paradoxically making the term more specific and general. Like other sectarians, Paul qualified the idea of the people Israel by the notion of a true Israel: “for not all those of Israel are Israel (οὐ γὰρ πάντες οἱ ἐξ Ἰσραὴλ οὗτοι Ἰσραὴλ), nor are the seed[s] of Abraham all his children” (οὐδ’ ὅτι εἰσὶν σπέρμα Ἀβραάμ πάντες τέκνα 9:6–7). Rather, he argues that it

is the children of the spirit, not of the flesh, whom he calls “the children of the promise” (τὰ τέκνα τῆς ἐπαγγελίας), who are “counted as descendants” (λογίζεται εἰς σπέρμα 9:8).

The argument used to support this redefinition appears, at first glance, odd: the real children of Israel are not “according to the flesh” (κατὰ σάρκα 9:3), the seed of Abraham; “the children of the flesh are not the children of God” (οὐ τὰ τέκνα τῆς σαρκὸς ταῦτα τέκνα τοῦ θεοῦ 9:8). Instead, they are children of the promise through Isaac. But was Isaac not Abraham’s son? Of course he was, but not according to the flesh, as Paul understood it. Paul’s understanding of Isaac’s conception and birth is that they were enacted through God’s word of promise: “for the word of promise is this: ‘at this time I will come and a child will be born to Sarah’” (9:9). The biblical proof-text quoted is a conflation of Gen 18:10, 14, and it captures the essence of the story.⁴³ Paul places the emphasis of the birth narrative upon the promise of God rather than on Isaac’s biological lineage.

After this, Paul goes on to provide further arguments, based on biblical stories, about the inversion of the rights of primogeniture and the fairness of God, concluding that “Israel” includes not only Jews but also Gentiles: “whom he called, not only us of the Jews, but also of the gentiles” (Οὓς καὶ ἐκάλεσεν ἡμᾶς οὐ μόνον ἐξ Ἰουδαίων ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐξ ἐθνῶν 9:24). God’s election of Israel is enduring, but Gentiles have also been included (Rom 11).

There is much more that can be said about this important Pauline concept and how it developed in the Deutero-Pauline letters. However, it will suffice for our present purposes. In redefining “Israel,” Paul has paradoxically made the term more specific and general, the true Israel consisting of Jews, not all of them, and some of the Gentiles. Moreover, his view of determinism not only involves God’s foreknowledge of Israel but also all believers in Jesus: “whom he foreknew (προέγνω), he predestined (προώρισεν) to conform to the image of his Son” (8:29).

3) Asceticism in following a severe discipline of daily life and celibacy. According to Josephus, the Essenes had a reputation for an austere form of discipline (σεμνότητα ἀσκεῖν); they turned away from pleasure since it is a source of evil; and they supposed self-control with respect to emotions to fall under the category of virtue (*B.J.* 2.119–120). Some of the Essenes disdained (ὑπεροψία) marriage, guarding against the sensual-

⁴³ Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *Romans* (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1992), 561.

ity and promiscuousness of women (*B.J.* 2.120–121).⁴⁴ Philo similarly reports that Essenes viewed women with suspicion (*Apologia* 14–17). This misogynistic view of women was widely shared in the ancient world. For Josephus, there was a second order of Essenes, however, who believed marriage to be necessary for the continuation of the sect (*B.J.* 2.160). These Essenes did not marry for pleasure (μη δι' ἡδονήν), but for propagation, as evidenced by the fact that they ceased associating with their wives sexually when they were pregnant (*B.J.* 2.161).

The Essene life was characterized by frugality and strict discipline. They worked in various occupations, especially in agriculture as farmers, shepherds and beekeepers, and in crafts (Philo, *Prob.* 76; *Apologia* 8–9). They were not interested in money (Philo, *Prob.* 76; Pliny, *Nat.* 5.73; Josephus, *B.J.* 2.122; *A.J.* 18.22) or possessions (Philo, *Apologia* 4), but in using only what was needed and sharing all things with other members of the community. Philo describes them as “lovers of frugality” (ὀλιγοδείας ἐρασταί) and “those who shun extravagance” (πολυτέλειαν ἐκτρεπόμενοι *Apologia* 11), using a thick coat for winter and an inexpensive tunic for the summer. Josephus states that they did not change their garments and shoes even when they were worn through and torn (*B.J.* 2.126).

The Essenes regime was unchanging (Philo, *Apologia* 11–12). Josephus compares their lifestyle to that of the Pythagoreans (*A.J.* 15.371) and describes their daily routine (*B.J.* 2.128–133). The day began before sunrise, during which time they prayed before going to work until the fifth hour. They then reassembled for a meal, but not before purifying themselves with washing, wearing clean garments, and blessing God as the ‘giver of life’. Bread was served to all according to rank and each member was only allowed one bowlful of one dish. After the meal, they changed back into their work clothes and applied themselves to their tasks until evening when they reassembled for dinner in the same manner.

The Pharisees and Sadducees did not practice asceticism; the limited sources that survive from this period indicate that they lived lives very much like other Jews of this period. The *yahad*, however, was strict. Like the Essenes the group described in the *Rule of the Community* followed a severe discipline, as evidenced by the penal code. The document is silent about marriage: the phrase “producing offspring”

⁴⁴ Pliny reported that the Esseni were *sine ulla femina* (*Nat.* 5.73).

(פרות זרע) in 1QS IV, 7 is surely figurative language based on the admonition “to be fruitful and multiply” in the book of Genesis (1:22, 28; 8:17; 9:1, 7), and not about raising offspring as such. The urban sectarians of the *Damascus Document* also followed a severe discipline; however, they were married and children were very much part of the community (CD VII, 6–8; XV, 5–6).

As for early Christianity, Jesus lauded those who made themselves “eunuchs for the kingdom of God” (εἰσὶν εὐνοῦχοι οἵτινες εὐνούχισαν ἑαυτοὺς διὰ τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν Matt 19:12), meaning those who have forsaken their biological family for the spiritual life (Luke 14:26; 18:29). Paul too seemed to have advocated the single life (“there is neither male nor female” Gal 3:28), given the imminence of what he regarded as the end-time (1 Cor 7:29), but he too made concessions for human need and the avoidance of sexual immorality (1 Cor 7:1–7). Celibacy was not for everyone, except the most devout, and evidently early Christianity did not hold this ascetic practice as normative.

4) A belief in the afterlife. The concepts of resurrection and immortality were not widely held among ancient Jews. In Jewish literature, these ideas are found here and there, but especially in Hos 6:2, Pss 16; 73, and 84, Ezek 37, Sir 41:4, *1 Enoch* and Dan 12.⁴⁵ The sectarians, however, held various views about the afterlife.

Josephus relates that the Essenes believed in afterlife and immortality; they held that while fleshly bodies are perishable the souls are incorruptible and remain forever (τὰς δὲ ψυχὰς ἀθανάτους ἀεὶ διαμένειν *B.J.* 2.154). This teaching concurs with the Greeks who declared that the souls of the just have a dwelling beyond the Ocean. As such, this Essene teaching says nothing about the resurrection. In his *Refutation of all Heresies*, however, the church father Hippolytus (170–236), states that the Essenes had a doctrine of the resurrection that taught that “the flesh will rise up” (9.27). Hippolytus’ account of the Essenes, which is largely dependent on Josephus’ report in *Jewish War* book 2, contains

⁴⁵ See John J. Collins, *Daniel* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993), 394–8; Emil Puech, *La croyance des Esséniens en la vie future: immortalité, résurrection, vie éternelle? Histoire d’une croyance dans le judaïsme ancien* (2 vols.; Paris: Gabalda, 1993); N.T. Wright, *The Resurrection of the Son of God* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2003); Alan F. Segal, *Life After Death: A History of the Afterlife in the Religions of the West* (New York: Doubleday, 2004); and George W.E. Nickelsburg, *Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism and Early Christianity* (expanded edition; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2006).

a substantial section that has been conflated from his sources. But this passage on the resurrection seems genuinely independent.

Among the scrolls, only 4Q521 speaks of a resurrection, “he will revive the dead” (וּמְתִים יַחֲיֶה), but there is no clear indication that this reflected the sectarian viewpoint. The scroll belongs to the Qumran library, but it does contain any explicit reference to any characteristic, sectarian theme. Among the explicitly sectarian scrolls, there is no mention of resurrection. After-life, however, is implied in the reward of the sons of light with “everlasting life” (בְּחַיֵּי נֶצַח) (1QS IV, 7–8), although the concept is not well developed. The *Hodayot* have several references that may imply a continuation of life after the grave, but they are couched in poetic language and are characteristically vague.

In a well-known incident recounted in the book of Acts 23:1–10, Paul stood up in the Sanhedrin and divided his opposition of Sadducees and Pharisees by claiming that he, as a Pharisee, was being questioned for his hope and belief in the resurrection of the dead. This strategy worked, causing a great dissension between the two groups, because Pharisees believed in the resurrection of the dead whereas the Sadducees denied that this was true. Josephus’ report in *A.J.* 18.12 and 16 corroborates what is learned about the respective teachings of the two sects in Acts.

It hardly has to be said that in the early Church the concept of resurrection and afterlife takes central stage. Paul, for instance, states the clear implication of resurrection for the gospel and Christian faith: “for if the dead are not raised then Christ has not been raised. If Christ has not been raised, our faith is futile and you are still in your sins” (RSV 1 Cor 15:16–17).⁴⁶

And 5) The use of similar scriptural texts with different interpretations. The study of the biblical texts is not sectarian. It is enjoined on all Israel to meditate on them day and night, and to observe all that is written in them (Josh 1:8). Philo describes the Essenes as engaged in the study and application of ancestral laws and biblical texts for ethics (*Prob.* 80). What is distinctive in Jewish and Christian groups is the interpretation of the same texts, such as Jer 31, Hab 2.4, Deut 21, Amos 5, Ezek 40–48, and many others. But their interpretation and

⁴⁶ See Hans Cavallin, *Life After Death: Paul’s Argument for the Resurrection of the Dead in 1 Cor 15, Part I. An Enquiry into the Jewish Background* (Lund: Gleerup, 1974).

the lessons that they drew from them were different.⁴⁷ Additionally, they used traditions that developed elements of the biblical texts as, for instance, in the deliberations about Melchizedek (11QMelch and Hebrews 7) and the New Jerusalem (4Q554-5, 5Q15, 2Q24, 4Q232, 11Q18, Rev 19-21).

The scrolls and the New Testament enumerate a number of terminological and conceptual parallels as a consequence of this focus on the same texts: “the sons of light” (1 Thess 5:4-9); Eph 5:8; 1QS I, 9-11; II, 16-17; 1QM I, 1, 3, 9,11, 13; XIII, 5-6); there is no corresponding “sons of darkness” but see “we are not of the night or of the darkness” (1 Thess 5:5; cf. John 17:12); “works of the torah” (Gal 2:16; Rom 3:20; 3:27-8; 4Q174 1-2 I, 7; 4Q396 29); “righteousness of God” (Rom 3:21-24; 1QS XI, 12); community as living temple (1 Cor 3:9; 3:16-17; 1QS VIII, 1-16); ethical division of humanity into camps of good and evil (1 Thess 5:4-8; 1QS III, 13-VI, 26); interpretation of impalement of a corpse in Deut 21:22-23 as means of killing (by strangulation or crucifixion; Gal 3:13; 4Q169 3-4 I, 7; 11Q19 LXIV, 6-13) and the list of vices (Gal 5:19, 23; 1QS III, 13-IV, 26). It is striking that these literary parallels do exist; however, it is equally notable that the terminological and conceptual similarities are not to be found in the deeper meaning of the texts.⁴⁸

EPILOGUE

By qualifying the title of this paper with the preposition “towards”, I am signalling that this is an initial attempt to describe both the conception and content of the sectarian matrix within Second Temple Judaism. I have suggested that the essential feature of the terminology of a “sect” is its “take” on Jewish practice and beliefs. A sect is, moreover, characterized by its small size, organization, boundaries or taboos, and religious ideals. The Qumran-Essene communities are comparable to

⁴⁷ “It is striking how many parallels can be drawn between the terminology and concept used in the Qumran scrolls and Pauline letters. Yet these parallels, when examined in context often turn out to be rather limited.” Timothy H. Lim, *Pesharim* (London: Continuum, 2001), 83.

⁴⁸ See recently, George J. Brooke’s collected essays in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament* (London: SPCK, 2005) and Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Christian Origins* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000). Still useful is *The Scrolls and the New Testament* (ed. K. Stendahl; New York: Crossroad, 1957).

Christianity only at its earliest stage; Christianity's phenomenal rise in membership means that before long it outgrew the mother community of Judaism. Organizationally, there are limited comparisons between the sharing of common property among the *yahad* and the Jerusalem church. Purity, whether of the ritual and/or moral kind, was an effective boundary marking mechanism, as were the ritual immersions of the initiation procedures. There was diversity in the execution of these and divergence in the theological significance that has been drawn. As for religious ideals, five beliefs or doctrines were identified as sectarian; these vary from one to the next, but they deal with the same topics: 1) an individual sect's perception of itself as representing the "true Israel"; 2) the various sectarian understandings of fate and freewill; 3) the view that a severe form of discipline, often times including celibacy, constitutes a legitimate form of piety; 4) a belief in the afterlife, involving a bodily resurrection or just the immortality of the soul; and 5) a "cherry picking" of certain biblical passages that, while they are part of the general Jewish heritage of the Hebrew Bible, are little used by other Jews.

A general value of the sectarian matrix model that has been advanced is that it identifies the source of the religious practice and beliefs of the various communities of the Essenes, *yahad*, urban sectarians, the Pauline and other Christian churches within Second Temple Judaism. These sectarians were not ordinary Jews, but peculiar types who, while sharing the common Judaism of their co-religionists, also had distinctive teachings and followed certain practices that were held in common only between them.

THE PRE-SECTARIAN JESUS

George J. Brooke
University of Manchester

I. INTRODUCTION

In 1968 William H. Brownlee wrote: “The Qumran literature tells us much about the background of primitive Christianity, but it can tell us nothing directly about Jesus.”¹ He went on to explore how what had been published up to that time from the eleven Qumran caves might illuminate for New Testament scholars and others various themes in the New Testament, most of which clearly belong to how the first and second generations of Christians came to express their views about Jesus, rather than what Jesus himself might have said and done. Though some interpreters have tried to associate Jesus more closely with the Qumran community or the wider movement of which it was a part, it is still not uncommon to come across opinions which are but minor variations on Brownlee’s statement.

A significant illustration of this is to be found in the writings on Jesus by Geza Vermes. Perhaps more than anyone, not least because of beginning his study ahead of the pack and because of his strikingly memorable title, Vermes’ portrait of Jesus the Jew is remarkable for just how little reference there is in it to the scrolls from Qumran—and that from a scholar who knows the scrolls as well as anybody.² There are, of course, a string of reasons as to why this might be the case.³

¹ William H. Brownlee, “Jesus and Qumran,” in *Jesus and the Historian: Written in Honor of Ernest Cadman Colwell* (ed. F. Thomas Trotter; Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1968), 52.

² See especially Geza Vermes, *Jesus the Jew: A Historian’s Reading of the Gospels* (London: Collins, 1973).

³ Vermes himself has stated that “if the Qumran Scrolls are invaluable in shedding new light on early Christianity, rabbinic literature skilfully handled, is still the richest source for the interpretation of the original message, and the most precious aid to the quest for the historical Jesus”: “The Impact of the Dead Sea Scrolls on the Study of the New Testament,” *JJS* 27 (1976): 116; repr. in *The Gospel of Jesus the Jew* (Riddell Memorial Lectures; Newcastle upon Tyne: University of Newcastle upon Tyne, 1981), 17 n. 65.

Jesus was a Galilean,⁴ a northerner, whereas those behind the sectarian scrolls were Judeans, southerners with much to say about Jerusalem. Jesus was apparently from an artisan family, not much better off than the subsistence farmer, whereas the Qumran sectarians were probably predominantly only voluntarily poor. Jesus was apparently not a priest, whereas those connected with the Qumran community were either priests, or Levites, or thought of themselves in priestly ways, even as “a sanctuary of men (*mqdsh 'dm*)” (4Q174 IV, 6). In his adult life Jesus seems to have addressed the disenfranchised and marginalized and to have kept an open table, whereas the movement epitomized by Qumran could afford to disenfranchise itself and restrict access to its pure things in a strictly hierarchical fashion,⁵ even using such access as a means of punishment within the group. For the members of the Qumran community purity was a central issue,⁶ for Jesus purity rules were not allowed “to intervene with social network, table fellowship and community, and his eschatological outlook made impurity subordinate to the kingdom.”⁷ The Essenes are not named as such in the New Testament; Jesus is not named in the scrolls, some of which may come from the mid-first century C.E. Thus, while acknowledging Jesus’ Jewishness, it is nevertheless readily possible to draw a picture of Jesus that distinguishes him from the sectarian community at Qumran and the wider movement of which it was a part.⁸

For the period before the general release of all the unpublished Cave 4 and Cave 11 manuscripts in 1991, it is interesting to note that in the writings of a scholar such as James H. Charlesworth, who appeared determined to find both some possible positive as well as some negative influence between the Essenes and Jesus, the number of examples

⁴ See, e.g., Sean Freyne, *Jesus: A Jewish Galilean* (London: T&T Clark International, 2004).

⁵ This distinction between the “open commensality” of the historical Jesus and the “hierarchy, precedence, and the order of dignity” of the Qumran *Rule of the Community* and *Rule of the Congregation* is the only comparison, and that a negative one, between Jesus and Qumran made by John D. Crossan in his summary *Jesus: A Revolutionary Biography* (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1994), 179–81.

⁶ James D.G. Dunn, *Jesus Remembered* (Christianity in the Making 1; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), 604–605, views Jesus’ attitude on purity, particularly in relation to table fellowship, as deliberately formulated against the views of Essenes and Pharisees.

⁷ So concludes Thomas Kazen, *Jesus and Purity Halakhah: Was Jesus Indifferent to Impurity?* (ConBNT 38; Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 2002), 347.

⁸ This distinction between Jesus and the sectarian community of the Scrolls is largely the case also in Heinz-Wolfgang Kuhn, “Jesus,” in *EDSS*, 404–408.

to be brought to the discussion is remarkably few. Twenty years after Brownlee, Charlesworth, still working with a scrolls corpus only slightly larger than that which Brownlee had before him, expected to find echoes of Essenism in the teaching of Jesus. For negative influence he cited Jesus' attitude to the Sabbath, "the Sabbath was made for man, not man for the Sabbath" (Mark 2:27)⁹ and juxtaposed this with the view known from the *Damascus Document* (CD X, 14–XI, 18) concerning strict observance of the Sabbath, a juxtaposition justified through the more precise negative influence discernible in the various answers to the issue concerning the animal that has fallen into the pit on the Sabbath (CD XI, 13–14; Matt 12:11; Luke 14:5).¹⁰ Charlesworth wisely urged caution: "there is at least one example of probable (or at least possible) negative influence upon Jesus from the Essenes."¹¹ For positive influence Charlesworth again cited just one example, the use of "poor" in the opening macarism of the Beatitudes and the use of the label "poor of (in) spirit" in the *War Scroll* (1QM XIV, 7).¹² He later added to this by recalling the apparent similarity of Jesus' condemnation of divorce in Mark 10:2–12 with a similar implied prohibition in the *Temple Scroll* (11QT^a LVII, 17–18).¹³

Four years after the release of all the scrolls the important 1996 summary presentation on the historical Jesus by Gerd Theissen and Annette Merz still offers little more on the scrolls than had been known

⁹ This saying is omitted by Matthew and Luke and might be as early and authentic as anything in Q; see, John S. Kloppenborg, *The Formation of Q: Trajectories in Ancient Wisdom Collections* (SAC; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987), 82 and n. 141.

¹⁰ The Qumran view of the Sabbath is one of just three Qumranian issues that James Dunn perceives may be alluded to in the Jesus tradition: James Dunn, *Jesus Remembered*, 568 n. 110. The second is possibly a similarly negative view of the Qumran outlook, namely on the attitude to one's enemies (1QS I, 10–11; Matt 5:43–48; Luke 6:27–28, 32–36), about which Dunn remains non-committal, acknowledging that several scholars have seen the matter as part of a much wider discourse in the ancient world: Dunn, *Jesus Remembered*, 587 n. 194. The third is the matter of purity in relation to table fellowship mentioned above. For Dunn the scrolls are so insignificant that he sees no need to index his few references to them.

¹¹ James H. Charlesworth, *Jesus within Judaism: New Light from Exciting Archaeological Discoveries* (New York: Doubleday, 1988; London: SPCK, 1989), 67.

¹² David Flusser provided an excellent study of parallels between the sectarian scrolls and the Matthean form of the opening beatitudes, but he was overly optimistic about what might be attributable to Jesus: "Blessed are the Poor in Spirit..." *IEJ* 10 (1960): 1–13; repr. in *Judaism and the Origins of Christianity* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1988), 115–25. Charlesworth is similarly convinced that the use of "poor" can ultimately be attributed to Jesus: *Jesus within Judaism*, 70.

¹³ Charlesworth, *Jesus within Judaism*, 72.

for the previous forty years.¹⁴ Their use of the materials is slightly more subtle as they weave the data from the Qumran scrolls into the broader fabric of their overall descriptions of the various forms of Judaism with which Jesus was contemporary, but they fail to distinguish between non-sectarian (or pre-sectarian) and sectarian Qumran sources.

Although the distinction between Jesus and the Jews at Qumran is easy to make, the distinction is just that, between Jesus and the Qumran sectarians. I want to suggest in this presentation that the publication of the whole collection of manuscripts from Qumran forces reconsiderations of many kinds, not least a reconsideration of how the kinds of Judaism reflected in the largely non-sectarian (even pre-sectarian) or quasi-sectarian compositions might illuminate the modern understanding of Jesus. And the illumination is two-way, since I would like to propose that in aligning Jesus with some of the motifs of the non-sectarian or pre-sectarian compositions found in the Qumran caves, we may discover not only a broader Jewish background against which to appreciate Jesus, but also, in seeing Jesus himself as pre-sectarian, may have a tool for appreciating why such compositions are to be found in a sectarian library and how a trajectory in the direction of sectarianism could be built on the basis of such non-sectarian views. The time has come for using the non-sectarian (or pre-sectarian) compositions in the Qumran library to assist in the understanding of Jesus, both as they might illuminate his activities and teaching and also as to how they might indicate tendencies in both his deeds and words that might have been readily picked up by subsequent generations in a particular sectarian way. The non-sectarian or pre-sectarian compositions are not just the residue of Judaism generally, but inasmuch as they are preserved in the Qumran library, they are indicative of sectarian tendencies in embryonic form. Some things are obviously revised or even discarded in the later or fully developed worldview of the sectarians, but most is carried forward. The same goes for Jesus and the Jesus movement— aspects of the teaching and example of Jesus were rejected and modified, but much was taken up by later Christians in their new contexts.

The challenge of my proposal is that there is both a phenomenological and a traditio-historical comparison to be made between Jesus and the

¹⁴ Gerd Theissen and Annette Merz, *Der historische Jesus: Ein Lehrbuch* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996; trans. by John Bowden; London: SCM Press, 1998).

scrolls. Phenomenologically, the juxtaposition of three or four modes¹⁵ of texts with the New Testament might enable some fresh insights both into what Jesus might have been about and into how those who followed him took what he said and did in the direction that they did. I am calling those modes (1) non-sectarian or pre-sectarian, (2) quasi-sectarian (within which there can be nascent sectarian tendencies), and (3) full-blown sectarian; (4) a fourth mode follows in many instances, when institutionalized sects fragment and rejuvenate. Sometimes these modes are discernible in chronological order, but it is also possible for them to exist contemporaneously, though perhaps not without some tension.

Traditio-historically, comparison between Jesus and the non-sectarian or pre-sectarian compositions found in the Qumran library may indicate, from the only surviving Jewish literary sources in Aramaic and Hebrew from the two and a half centuries before the fall of the Temple, how a Palestinian Jew from Galilee might have begun to construct his view of the world, albeit that he was influenced by many other factors as well. In both cases these comparisons have really only been significantly enabled since the publication of all the non-sectarian compositions found in the Qumran library.

II. THE DEEDS OF JESUS

The one item from the early publications of non-sectarian compositions that finds its way into many descriptions of Jesus is the mention of the Jewish healer who forgives sins in the so-called *Prayer of Nabonidus* text.¹⁶ It is seldom explicitly noted by Jesus scholars that this is a non-sectarian composition and that the status of the Jewish protagonist in the fragment should be considered first in terms of the ongoing development of Danielic traditions. In addition to the healing activity of this Jew, the other compositions in which such activities are noted are

¹⁵ After an insightful conversation with Maxine Grossman, I use the term “mode” rather than “stage” in order to allow for the phenomenological approach to be suggestive both synchronically and diachronically.

¹⁶ See John J. Collins, “242. 4QPrayer of Nabonidus ar,” in *Qumran Cave 4.XVII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 3* (ed. James C. VanderKam; DJD XXII; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), 83–93. In his edition of 4Q242 Collins has noted that “In the Gospel narrative, Jesus forgives the sins of the paralytic before he heals him (Matt 9:2; Mark 2:5; Luke 5:20)” (p. 91).

clustered in pre-sectarian or quasi-sectarian compositions found in the Qumran library, notably in the former category the healing activities of Tobias in *Tobit*¹⁷ and in the latter category the depiction of Abraham as healer and exorcist in the *Genesis Apocryphon*.¹⁸ In addition a number of quasi-sectarian compositions, such as 11Q11,¹⁹ refer to apotropaic or healing activities. Furthermore, the list of activities referred to in the quasi-sectarian 4Q521 includes healing the wounded and making the dead live.²⁰ These all lead in a trajectory towards the kinds of statements to be found in 4Q510, the *Songs of the Sage*, in which there is explicit reference to the humiliation of the sons of light (*t'nywt bny 'wr*).

This exorcising and therapeutic material is commonly used by New Testament scholars to provide evidence for the general context of popular practices in Judaism at the time of Jesus. For example, Pieter Craffert refers to the practice of laying-on of hands in Abraham's healing of Pharaoh according to the *Genesis Apocryphon* as attestation of a general knowledge of such things.²¹ Thirty-five years earlier Geza Vermes had made similar general deductions from the *Genesis Apocryphon* and the *Prayer of Nabonidus* in drawing a picture of Judaism into which Jesus and a number of other Jewish charismatics with various skills might fit.²² The logic of the construction of a general context is clear: in such a context, Jesus looks decidedly skilled, but not unusual.

There are exceptions to this scholarly juxtaposition. Hartmut Stegemann, whose knowledge of the scrolls was extremely thorough, argued nevertheless that Jesus' healings and especially his exorcisms were of a very different sort from those of his contemporaries. For Stegemann it is remarkable that "Jesus never performed like the exorcists. He used

¹⁷ See, e.g., Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *Tobit* (Commentaries on Early Jewish Literature; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2003), 243, in relation to the exorcism of demons with New Testament parallels.

¹⁸ For how the *Genesis Apocryphon* informs some healing descriptions in the New Testament, see Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave 1 (1Q20): A Commentary* (BibOr 18B; Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 2004), 213.

¹⁹ For 11Q11 see Florentino García Martínez, Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar and Adam S. van der Woude, *Qumran Cave 11.II: 11Q2-18, 11Q20-31* (DJD XXIII; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998), 181-205.

²⁰ As used by James D.G. Dunn, *Jesus Rememebred*, 669.

²¹ Pieter F. Craffert, *The Life of a Galilean Shaman: Jesus of Nazareth in Anthropological-Historical Perspective* (Matrix, The Bible in Mediterranean Context 3; Eugene: Cascade Books, 2008), 294. Craffert bases his observations on those of David Flusser, "Healing through the Laying-on of Hands in a Dead Sea Scroll," *IEJ* 7 (1957): 107-108; repr. in *Judaism and the Origins of Christianity*, 21-22.

²² Vermes, *Jesus the Jew*, 65-69.

neither the names of God nor those of angels, neither magical prayers nor magical rites, neither Davidic nor Solomonic texts of conjuration, and he needed no equipment such as magic bowls or rings. The miracle accounts of the Gospels show that perfectly clearly.²³ For Stegemann, the distinctiveness of Jesus' activity is that his miracles "are rather miracles *of God*,"²⁴ events of Jesus' own area of experience that then gave rise to his teachings about the reign of God. "The Essenes were of no recognizable importance here."²⁵ This view rings with Christological certainty, even though it is meant to be a depiction of the historical Jesus. The logic of the matter for Stegemann is clear: out of context, Jesus looks decidedly different.

Which way should the evidence of healings and exorcisms in the pre-sectarian and non-sectarian compositions from Qumran be played? As depictions of general aspects of Jewish culture into which Jesus can be fitted, or as practices from which he needs to be distinguished? My suggestion is that caution is required. At the time Josephus wrote his *Jewish War*, he was able to single out the Essenes as those who were interested in matters to do with "the welfare of soul and body" and "the treatment of diseases" (*B.J.* II, 136). Why mention such concerns if they were not a feature of Essene identity, rather than being very widely known and practised? Although, of course, there is some textual evidence for the depictions of Jewish charismatics and Pseudo-Philo can assign to David a song composed to keep Saul's evil spirit at bay,²⁶ we probably need to avoid too great a generalization from such data as do survive. In other words the scrolls from the Qumran library may most suitably be understood as providing illumination for one trajectory within Judaism in which healings and exorcisms played a role. Jesus seems better understood against the backdrop of the earlier positions on such a trajectory, rather than the later ones; later Christian developments of Jesus' healings and exorcisms display more of the explicit marks of what had been practised later on the Qumran trajectory. In a way Stegemann may be correct, but not in the way he intended: "The Essenes were of no recognizable importance here."

²³ Hartmut Stegemann, *The Library of Qumran: On the Essenes, Qumran, John the Baptist, and Jesus* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans; Leiden: Brill, 1998 [German original 1993]), 237.

²⁴ Stegemann, *The Library of Qumran*, 238 (italics his).

²⁵ Stegemann, *The Library of Qumran*, 238.

²⁶ *LAB* 60:2-3.

That is, the latest point on the trajectory, which is clearly Essene, may indeed not be where one looks for phenomenological illumination of Jesus' deeds; rather, it is the earlier points on the trajectory, such as the *Prayer of Nabonidus*, which illuminate best the practices of Jesus and which indicate how Jesus' activity could be developed in similar ways in Christianity, as had been possible within Essenism on the basis of traditions preserved in pre-sectarian compositions now to be found in the Qumran library.

III. THE SAYINGS OF JESUS

As Jesus research of the last twenty years or more has shown, the search for the authentic Jesus has to be carried out both through the texts in which he is portrayed and memorialized, and through the study of the contexts with which he may be most plausibly associated. For the former the approach is to peel back the layers of editorial and ecclesial concern to discover, in particular, what might be the earliest source to have memorialized echoes of the authentic Jesus, namely Q (with Mark),²⁷ and then to reach behind even that, perhaps by paying attention to how one might provide an Aramaic retro-translation of some Q sayings.²⁸ For the latter the geographical, social, political and religious worlds of early first century Galilee and Judea are reconstructed through a variety of means and the authentic Jesus is the one that resonates most satisfactorily within such a reconstruction with some part of it or some combination of parts.²⁹ In both cases continuities and discontinuities have to be handled with sensitivity.

To my mind such sensitivity requires the adoption of a model for understanding the materials both from the Qumran caves and in the New Testament such as I am proposing in this presentation. The problem with Stegemann's approach, and possibly that of others, is that, even though he knew about the full range of compositions in the

²⁷ In North America this has been essentially the approach taken in the Jesus Seminar.

²⁸ E.g., Maurice P. Casey, *Aramaic Sources of Mark's Gospel* (SNTSMS 102; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998); idem, *An Aramaic Approach to Q: Sources for the Gospels of Matthew and Luke* (SNTSMS 122; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002).

²⁹ Again, in North America this has been the focus of the aptly named Contexts Group.

Qumran library, he did not distinguished clearly between the three (or more) modes attested in the literature there, namely the pre-sectarian or non-sectarian, the quasi-sectarian, and the full-blown sectarian.³⁰ For the first of these modes there are a number of compositions which can commonly be seen as developments of scriptural traditions but which have no clear sectarian identity markers. For the second mode, there are texts that could have had a wide appeal, but which are beginning to show some non-exclusive nascent sectarian features. Amongst this group of texts the most well-preserved member is the book of *Jubilees*, but a large number of other texts can be allocated here too, such as the *Apocryphon of Jeremiah* with its jubilee chronology. In the third mode belong the sectarian compositions which Qumran scholars are now beginning to differentiate yet further in order to try to show what might have been the history of the Qumran group and the movement of which it was a part.³¹ There is much work yet to be done in understanding all the pre/non-sectarian compositions from Qumran, but as for Jesus' deeds, largely as exorcist and healer, so in words and teaching Jesus most obviously seems to reflect the pre-sectarian or possibly quasi-sectarian compositions in the library. Let me illustrate this by considering both macro-characteristics and micro-characteristics of the literature.

At the macro level I refer to two matters in particular. In most of the many presentations of the teaching of Jesus there are certain common themes, notably his attention to the reign of God (whatever that might mean), his prophetic stance, his interest in developing certain aspects of wisdom tradition, his eschatology. So, firstly, for Jesus as prophet, it is now becoming increasingly clear that there is a wealth of material in the Qumran scrolls of relevance. Alex Jassen bases his reconsideration of prophecy and revelation in the scrolls on three pillars: that the majority of the Qumran community's engagement with prophecy and revelation can be found in "the rewriting of the ancient prophetic experience"; that the community believed "the eschatological age would usher in a new period of prophetic experience"; and that the

³⁰ I consider that there are probably more modes of sectarianism than these three. In particular the full-blown sectarian mode often leads to fragmentation and rejuvenation in sects, a mode that can take place for one sectarian sub-group at the same time as non-sectarian compositions are rediscovered.

³¹ Thus some scholars have tackled the redactional and recensional history of the *Rule of the Community* in order to try to show how the community changed from one thing to another.

community viewed itself as the heir to the ancient prophetic tradition.³² Jassen deliberately considers all the materials from the Qumran library as an integrated whole which limits the usefulness of his work for our purposes, but his considerations of the eschatological prophet from both juridical and consoling perspectives has immediate resonance with the view of Q as prophecy put forward by Mikago Sato in 1988.³³ Though in some respects, for example in seeing Q as most akin to the Book of Amos, Sato overstated his case, his view of Q as prophecy anticipated the way Jesus himself has been so understood in some recent scholarship, not least in the light of Q.³⁴ It is a desideratum that the new view of prophecy that is emerging from the consideration of the whole Qumran corpus be reviewed more historically and with the non-sectarian Jesus in mind.

Secondly, for providing a paradigm for Jesus as a teacher of eschatological revealed wisdom in relation to the kingship of God, I turn to two compositions from the Qumran caves that need to be juxtaposed. On the one hand there is *Mûsâr l'êMêvîn* (*Instruction*); this is now widely agreed to be a pre-sectarian composition from the second century B.C.E. or even earlier. A significant feature of this composition would strongly suggest that it should also be considered as reflecting a type of wisdom literature that does not belong in a single straight trajectory from the earliest scriptural sources to the later Jewish compositions such as are now extant in the Apocrypha; its eschatological character marks it out as somewhat distinctive. The work seems to begin by promoting a particular theological framework of cosmology and judgement for the rest of the wisdom instructions that follow. Parallel fragments in the various manuscripts seem to develop this further by urging “meditation on God’s awesome mysteries and on his rewards and punishments for human actions in the past, present, and future.”³⁵ The partly future orientation of the *raz nihyeh*, the major underlying principle of the composition, creates the possibility of taking seriously

³² Alex P. Jassen, *Mediating the Divine: Prophecy and Revelation in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Second Temple Judaism* (STDJ 68; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 5–6.

³³ M. Sato, *Q und Prophetie: Studien zur Gattungs- und Traditionsgeschichte der Quelle Q* (WUNT 2/29; Tübingen: Mohr, 1988).

³⁴ See, e.g., Dale C. Allison, *Jesus of Nazareth: Millenarian Prophet* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1998); Ben Witherington III, *Jesus the Seer: The Progress of Prophecy* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1999).

³⁵ John Strugnell and Daniel Harrington, *Qumran Cave 4.XXIV: Sapiential Texts: Part 2* (DJD XXXIV; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999), 9.

the eschatological character of this wisdom composition. John Collins has moved the discussion forward in this respect: “with the publication of *4QInstruction*, however, we now have a bona fide example of a wisdom text of the traditional type in which eschatological expectations play a significant part.”³⁶ For 4Q416 1 10–16 Collins has drawn attention to the way the text “implies a judgement scene in the tradition of the theophany of the divine warrior, where the appearance of the deity is greeted by convulsions of nature.”³⁷ For the most part the eschatological terminology and outlook of the composition seem primarily directed at future fulfilment, as Collins has stressed, but as Matthew Goff has also noted “*4QInstruction*’s eschatology encourages people to improve their conduct in this world. The text’s apocalyptic worldview cannot be separated from its practical advice. *4QInstruction*’s ethical teachings are rooted in an eschatological perspective.”³⁸ Goff’s reading of the composition entails him arguing suitably that the “text envisions the elimination of the wicked while promising eternal life with the angels to the righteous.”³⁹

The eschatological character of *Mūsār lēMēvîn* needs to be set alongside the sapiential traditions associated with Jesus. Nowhere in the New Testament is Jesus called a σοφός,⁴⁰ but in the past generation New Testament scholars have indeed increasingly drawn attention to the sapiential character of several of the Jesus traditions. This emerged principally out of the detailed analysis of the parables as a form of wisdom instruction, but it has been pursued as a way into appreciating the teaching associated with Jesus and even to be a significant part of his authentic voice, not least by some of those who have spent their time analysing the traditions that might be assigned to Q.⁴¹ A corrective to the general lack of consideration by Jesus scholars of the Qumran sapi-

³⁶ John J. Collins, “The Eschatologizing of Wisdom in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *Sapiential Perspectives: Wisdom Literature in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the Sixth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 20–22 May 2001* (ed. J.J. Collins, G.E. Sterling and R.A. Clements; STDJ 51; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 49–61, here 50.

³⁷ Collins, “The Eschatologizing of Wisdom in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 52.

³⁸ Matthew J. Goff, *The Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom of 4QInstruction* (STDJ 50; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 215.

³⁹ Goff, *The Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom of 4QInstruction*, 171.

⁴⁰ Casey, *An Aramaic Approach to Q: Sources for the Gospels of Matthew and Luke*, 17.

⁴¹ See, e.g., Ronald A. Piper, *Wisdom in the Q-tradition: The Aphoristic Teaching of Jesus* (SNTSMS 61; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989).

ential texts and of *Mûsâr l̥Mêvîn* in particular has now been provided from the side of Qumran scholarship by Matthew Goff, whose 2005 article provides extensive bibliographical information on the whole topic, from the understanding of *Mûsâr l̥Mêvîn* to the sapiential character of Q.⁴² Goff is particularly but cautiously attracted by parts of the reading of Q provided by John Kloppenborg who has suggested that Q moves away from a traditional wisdom of “order” towards a “wisdom of the kingdom.”⁴³ Goff notes the phrase the “mystery of the kingdom of God” (Mark 4:11; Matt 13:11; Luke 8:10) as one place where *Mûsâr l̥Mêvîn*’s attention to the *raz nihyeh*, “the mystery that is to be”, might inform a particular view that Jesus’ teachings, according to Q, might be understood as heavenly revelations, though the Gospel texts never state this explicitly in so many words.

Concern with the “wisdom of the kingdom” means that alongside the eschatological wisdom of *Mûsâr l̥Mêvîn* must be set the work from Qumran which is most explicit about God’s sovereignty, namely the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*, which I take to be a quasi-sectarian composition.⁴⁴ In the 1999 edition of the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* Carol Newsom has commented on the portrayal of God in the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* in several ways. She elaborated on the depiction of God as king with the following words:

The prominence of the motif of God as king in the *Sabbath Songs* is striking and distinguishes this work from much contemporary literature. In keeping with the heavenly focus of the work, it is God’s kingship over angelic beings rather than earthly powers that is described (4Q400 frg. 1 2.7–14; 4Q403 frg. 1 2.23–24). Terminology such as מלך and מלכות and the representation of God as king had an important place in the Temple theology of pre-exilic Israel (see, e.g., Pss 24, 29, 93, 96; Isa 6) and in Second Temple hymnody (e.g., Pss 103:19–22, 145:10–13; Dan 3:53|55 [LXX]). The liturgical context of the *Sabbath Songs* allows the humans

⁴² Matthew J. Goff, “Discerning Trajectories: 4QInstruction and the Sapiential Background of the Sayings Source Q,” *JBL* 124 (2005): 657–73.

⁴³ John S. Kloppenborg, *The Formation of Q: Trajectories in Ancient Wisdom Collections*; idem, *Excavating Q: The History and Setting of the Sayings Gospel* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2000).

⁴⁴ It does not contain any exclusively explicit sectarian terminology, but its structural reflection of thirteen Sabbaths echoes the same kind of emerging particularity as can be found in the book of *Jubilees*.

who worship by reciting them to experience the present reality of God's heavenly kingship as a sort of realized eschatological experience.⁴⁵

The most significant study of the character of God as king as portrayed in the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* remains that of Annie M. Schwemer.⁴⁶ She has concluded entirely justifiably that the frequent use of "king" (מֶלֶךְ) and "kingdom" (מַלְכוּת) in the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* makes them the most important pre-Christian Jewish source for understanding Jewish views about God's sovereignty, but unfortunately she insisted that the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* were exclusively about the heavenly realm with little to say to the present human condition. Nevertheless, against those who would distance the compositions found in the Qumran library from the historical Jesus, she has argued that the implications of her analysis have significant ramifications for the understanding of the teaching of Jesus: "Jesus Botschaft von der Gottesherrschaft setzt die liturgische Sprache seiner Zeit und das kultische Verständnis der βασιλεία voraus, da doch die großen Tempelfeste jedermann vertraut waren."⁴⁷ She suggests that without the liturgical force of the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* it is difficult to appreciate the scandal of what Jesus had to say about the Jerusalem temple, scandal that led to his death.

Schwemer's analysis of kingship in the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* must now be set alongside Devorah Dimant's and Björn Frennesson's more nuanced understandings of the way the songs undermine the differentiation between worship in heaven and on earth.⁴⁸ Furthermore, since it has become clear in the several studies of *Mūsār l' Mēvîn* mentioned above that the reward for the right behaviour of the righteous

⁴⁵ Carol A. Newsom, *Angelic Liturgy: Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* (Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project 4B; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck; Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1999), 6. (The volume is co-edited by James H. Charlesworth.)

⁴⁶ Annie M. Schwemer, "Gott als König und seine Königsherrschaft in den Sabbatliedern aus Qumran," in *Königsherrschaft Gottes und himmlischer Kult im Judentum, Urchristentum und in der hellenistischen Welt* (ed. Martin Hengel and Annie M. Schwemer; WUNT 2/55; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1991), 45–118.

⁴⁷ Schwemer, "Gott als König und seine Königsherrschaft in den Sabbatliedern aus Qumran," 118.

⁴⁸ Devorah Dimant, "Men as Angels: The Self-Image of the Qumran Community," in *Religion and Politics in the Ancient Near East* (ed. Adele Berlin; Studies and Texts in Jewish History and Culture; Bethesda, MD: University Press of Maryland, 1996), 93–103; Björn Frennesson, "In a Common Rejoicing": *Liturgical Communion with Angels in Qumran* (Studia Semitica Upsaliensia 14; Uppsala: Uppsala University, 1999).

is life with the angels, it can be securely proposed that there is a direct correspondence between the Qumran community's liturgical practices (which are remarkably non-sectarian, apart from the calendar) and their ethical behaviour. *Mûsâr l'êMēvîn* is pre-sectarian and the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* do not contain explicit sectarian markers, but their presence in the Qumran library during the first centuries B.C.E. and C.E. may possibly rest in their assertion of divine judgement and sovereignty over against any form of human sovereignty, whether Hasmonean, Herodian or Roman; such poor exercises in kingship would one day be outshone by the coming of the kingly messiah who would represent God's sovereignty on earth aright.

Can these two paradigms be combined? A significant recent essay by Daniel Marguerat on Jesus as both sage and prophet seems to imply that such is possible;⁴⁹ sadly his work makes no reference at all to the Dead Sea Scrolls which would have provided a Jewish background for the very sound opinion he expresses on the required balance needed for viewing simultaneously Jesus as sage and Jesus as prophet. Maurice Casey has also hinted at something similar when he asserts that teaching about the kingdom of God did not require Jesus or the collectors of his sayings "to be in wisdom, apocalyptic or prophetic mode, since all these could be combined."⁵⁰ So perhaps part of the proposal here is simply a matter of common sense.

At the level of individual traditions of teaching I offer but two further examples, one positive and one negative. The positive example takes us back to 4Q521,⁵¹ the so-called *Messianic Apocalypse*.⁵² John Collins, for one, has wisely noted that "it is not certain whether 4Q521 should be regarded as a product of the Dead Sea sect."⁵³ For my money this composition is pre-sectarian or quasi-sectarian. The list of the works of

⁴⁹ Daniel Marguerat, "Jésus le sage et Jésus le prophète," in *Jésus de Nazareth: Nouvelles approches d'une énigme* (ed. D. Marguerat, E. Norelli and J.-M. Poffet; Le Monde de la Bible 38; Genève: Labor et Fides, 2003), 293–317.

⁵⁰ Maurice Casey, *An Aramaic Approach to Q: Sources for the Gospels of Matthew and Luke*, 30.

⁵¹ I have discussed this in more detail in George J. Brooke, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament* (London: SCM; Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2005), 79–82.

⁵² For 4Q521, the so-called Messianic Apocalypse, see Émile Puech, *Qumrân Grotte 4.XVIII: Textes hébreux (4Q521–4Q528, 4Q576–4Q579)* (DJD XXV; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998), 1–38. Puech considers that the text was probably composed by an Essene (p. 38), but I prefer to agree with John Collins on the non-sectarian character of the work, for all that it is consistent with much that is explicitly sectarian.

⁵³ John J. Collins, "The Works of the Messiah," *DSD* 1 (1994): 106.

the messiah (or of God through him) has some striking correspondences with a saying of Jesus and Collins goes on to say that “it is quite possible that the author of the Sayings source knew 4Q521; at the least he drew on a common tradition.” Whatever is made of the precise unity of Q 7:18–23, in the words of Frans Neiryck, “the parallel in 4Q521 can be helpful as an example of the *topos* of a description of the time of salvation.”⁵⁴ In this Neiryck seems to be sympathetic to John Kloppenborg’s point that while 4Q521 “bears an uncanny resemblance to the deeds of Jesus listed in Q 7:22,” “one cannot even be sure that the wonders to which Q alludes were meant to be understood as Jesus’ own works,” and “nothing in Q 7:22; 10:13–14 or 10:23–24 requires that Jesus was the only performer of wonders.”⁵⁵ Nevertheless the juxtaposition with 4Q521 implies a non-sectarian outlook for the declaration of the eschatological activity of God.

The negative example is to be seen in the pre-sectarian *Mūsār l’Mēvîn*. In 4Q416 2 III, 3–5 and 4Q418 9 there is a passage that describes what a person should do who is entrusted with something, probably money: “[you shall not stretch out] your hand to [it, lest you be scorched and your body be burned by its fire. As] you have received it, th[us give it back, and you will have joy if you are innocent from it].”⁵⁶ To me this wise advice indicates that whatever is deposited or loaned should be returned in pristine condition as soon as possible and should not become a source of temptation. Strugnell and Harrington align the instruction with wisdom tradition on pledges and loans more generally: “These *stichs* contain the frequent sapiential topic of pledges or loans and how they should be given back to the original owner (cf. Sir 8:12; 45:16; and Prov 22:7) rather than left unpaid.”⁵⁷ In the so-called parable of the talents (Matt 25:14–30; Luke 19:11–27) Jesus seems to exhort just the reverse, namely that anything deposited should be multiplied so that by the time the owner returns to collect what is his, there is suitable profit or interest all round. When these two pieces of wisdom are set side by side the difference in attitude between them is striking. How might this be explained? Is this just another example of the reversal

⁵⁴ Frans Neiryck, “Q 6,20b–21; 7,22 and Isaiah 61,” in *The Scriptures in the Gospels* (ed. Christopher M. Tuckett; BETL 131; Leuven: Peeters—University Press, 1997), 62.

⁵⁵ John S. Kloppenborg, “The Sayings Gospel Q and the Quest of the Historical Jesus,” *HTR* 89 (1996): 307–44.

⁵⁶ Cited from the restored version in 4Q418 translated by F. García Martínez and E. Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*, 2.865.

⁵⁷ Strugnell and Harrington, *Qumran Cave 4.XXIV: Sapiential Texts: Part 2*, 114.

that is characteristic of some of the teaching of Jesus? Though seldom assigned to Q, the overlaps between Matthew and Luke make it clear to Ulrich Luz that “the wording of the story was already relatively stable in the oral tradition.”⁵⁸ Is this an independent piece of Jesus tradition whose differences in its two canonical forms are explicable in terms of performance variation?⁵⁹ The motif of impending judgement would seem to suggest strongly that here is a parable whose kernel goes back to Jesus himself. Part of the story is a typical eschatological reversal of previously known wisdom tradition.

Thus at the macro-level of wisdom, eschatology and divine sovereignty and at the micro-level in relation to particular items of the teaching of Jesus, the pre-sectarian or non-sectarian compositions from the Qumran caves offer fresh illumination of the message of Jesus.

IV. CONCLUSION

I have argued that a differentiation of the compositions in the Qumran scrolls between pre- or non-sectarian, quasi-sectarian, and sectarian enables various trajectories to be drawn so that the pre- or non-sectarian materials are not seen simply as typical of third, second or first century B.C.E. Judaism more broadly, but are no doubt in the library because their general ethos fitted with perspectives that were later or elsewhere honed in a sectarian manner. The phenomenology of this observation allows for a similar set of trajectories to be proposed for Jesus and early Christian tradition. Since the Jesus tradition is ultimately unknowable, the juxtaposition of the differentiated Qumran library, especially its pre-sectarian contents, with the differentiated New Testament materials, especially the elements that might be reconstructed as reflecting the authentic Jesus, allows for suggestions to be made about the kinds of deeds and words the exorcist, healer, prophet and sage might have said and done. For those who saw and heard Jesus those pre-sectarian deeds and words could then have provoked the kinds of recollections with increasingly sectarian tendencies that the New Testament now contains.

⁵⁸ Ulrich Luz, *Matthew 21–28* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2005), 248.

⁵⁹ Dunn, *Jesus Remembered*, 421 n. 210.

THE INTERPRETATION OF PSALM 2

John J. Collins
Yale

At the beginning of the Epistle to the Hebrews, the author is concerned to establish the superiority of Christ over the angels. He does this by stringing together a series of quotations, beginning with verses from Ps 2 and 2 Sam 7:

For to which of the angels did God ever say,
'You are my son; today I have begotten you'? (Ps 2:7)

Or again,

I will be his father, and he will be my son (2 Sam 7:14).¹

In his commentary on Hebrews, Harold Attridge notes that "the form of this material resembles the catenae or florilegia found at Qumran, which share some of the texts found here."² He suggests that "such collections of messianic proof texts probably circulated in early Christian circles and it is likely that the author used such a traditional collection at this point."³

One of the texts that Attridge had in mind as a model for Hebrews is the so-called *Florilegium*, 4Q174.⁴ This is not simply a catena, but a thematic interpretation of various passages from Deut 33, 2 Sam 7, and Pss 1, 2, and 5.⁵ The extant fragment of the passage dealing with 2 Sam 7 begins with 2 Sam 7:10–11a, which is interpreted using phrases

¹ The passage goes on to cite Deut 32:43 (LXX), Ps 104:4; Ps 45:6–7; Ps 102:25–7; and Ps 110:1.

² Harold W. Attridge, *Hebrews: A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1989), 50. He refers here to 4Q*Florilegium* and 4Q*Testimonia*.

³ Ibid.

⁴ Annette Steudel, *Der Midrasch zur Eschatologie aus der Qumrangemeinde (4QMidrEschat^{a,b})* (STDJ 13; Leiden: Brill, 1994) argues that 4Q174 is part of a longer work, of which another part is found in 4Q177. George Brooke, "Florilegium," *EDSS* 1:197 points out that there is no textual overlap between the two manuscripts and prefers to regard them as separate compositions.

⁵ See the reconstruction by Steudel, *Der Midrasch zur Eschatologie*, 23–33.

from Exod 15:17 and Deut 23:3–4.⁶ This is followed by the citation and interpretation of 2 Sam 7:11a^b. Then there is an abbreviated citation of 2 Sam 7:11b–14a, concluding with the passage cited in Hebrews: “I will be a father to him, and he will be a son to me.” This, we are told, refers to the Branch of David, who will arise with the Interpreter of the Law at the end of days, and this interpretation is supported from Amos 9:11 (“I will raise up the booth of David which is fallen”). At this point there is a vacat, and a new section is introduced: “Midrash of ‘Happy is the man who has not walked in the council of the wicked’” (Ps 1:1). In this case the interpretation is introduced by the technical term *peshet*, which was not used in the interpretation of 2 Sam 7. Only the opening half verse of Ps 1 is cited, and it is interpreted with phrases drawn from Isa 8:11 and Ezek 37:23. Then the first two verses of Ps 2 are cited. Only fragments of the interpretation are preserved.

The question arises whether there is any intrinsic relationship between the two passages that are cited, other than the fact that both are given an eschatological interpretation. George Brooke has argued that “consideration of the content of the interpretations themselves” suggests there was a closer relationship.⁷ The opening verses of the two psalms, according to Brooke, function as *incipits*, which imply the rest of the psalm. The final section of the interpretation of 2 Sam 7:14 refers to the Branch of David, the kingly messiah. “The subsequent implied citation of the whole of Psalm 2 makes the interpretative purpose clear, since from Psalm 2.2 it is obvious that the son of Psalm 2.7 also refers to the Messiah, the kingly one, as Psalm 2.6 makes clear.”⁸ He concludes that 4Q174 “seems to offer citations and interpretations of 2 Samuel 7 and Psalm 2 which show that the two scriptural passages are mutually interdependent.”⁹ The intertextual relationship is confirmed by the citations in Heb 1. It may also be noted that in Acts 13:33–34 the citation of Ps 2:7 is followed by a partial quotation of Isa 55:3: “I will give you the holy promises made to David,” which entails an indirect allusion

⁶ Fragments 1, 21, 2. Steudel, *Der Midrasch zur Eschatologie*, 25, assigns this material to column 3 of her reconstructed text.

⁷ George J. Brooke, “Shared Intertextual Interpretations in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005), 70–94, here 75. This article originally appeared in *Biblical Perspectives: Early Use and Interpretation of the Bible in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. M.E. Stone and E.G. Chazon; STDJ 28; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 35–57.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 76.

⁹ *Ibid.*

to 2 Sam 7. While the two citations in the *Florilegium* are separated by a citation from Ps 1, it must be borne in mind that Pss 1–2 were often regarded as one in antiquity, as attested by rabbinic tradition and the western text of Acts.¹⁰ That would appear to be the case here too. There is no introductory formula before the citation from Ps 2.

Brooke's argument has been challenged vigorously by Annette Steudel, who argues that the fact that these two passages are both cited in 4Q*Florilegium* is coincidental.¹¹ In part, the disagreement concerns the structure and purpose of 4Q174, but it also has broader implications for the understanding of Ps 2 and of messianic expectation in late Second Temple Judaism. The messianic interpretation of Ps 2 is well established in the New Testament, notably in connection with the baptism of Jesus,¹² and in connection with his exaltation,¹³ and his role as messianic judge.¹⁴ Steudel argues, however, that it is poorly attested in Second Temple Judaism, apart from *Pss. Sol.* 17, and she suggests that while a messianic interpretation of the psalm as a whole is not impossible, a collective interpretation of Ps 2 is implied in 4Q174.¹⁵

THE RELATION BETWEEN 2 SAM 7 AND PS 2 IN 4Q174

A number of considerations weigh against the view that the passages from 2 Sam 7 and Ps 2 are juxtaposed in 4Q174 as messianic prooftexts. Steudel notes significant differences from the citations in Hebrews.¹⁶ The Qumran text cites 2 Sam 7:10–14, not just 2 Sam 7:14, and cites

¹⁰ Paul Maiberger, "Das Verständnis von Psalm 2 in der Septuaginta, im Targum, in Qumran, im frühen Judentum und im Neuen Testament," in *Beiträge zur Psalmenforschung: Psalm 2 und 22* (ed. Josef Schreiner; FB; Würzburg: Echter, 1988), 85–151 (85–9); H.L. Strack and P. Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch* (6 vol.; München: Beck, 1924, 1989), 2:725; *Ber.* 9b; J.A. Fitzmyer, *The Acts of the Apostles* (AB 31; New York: Doubleday, 1998), 516.

¹¹ Annette Steudel, "Psalm 2 im antiken Judentum," in *Gottessohn und Menschensohn: Exegetische Paradigmen biblischer Intertextualität* (ed. Dieter Sänger; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2004), 189–97: "Das gemeinsame Auftreten von Teilen von 2 Sam 7 und Ps 2 innerhalb von 4Q174 ist im Grunde zufälliger Natur."

¹² Matt 3:16–17; Mark 1:10–11; Luke 3:21–2.

¹³ Acts 13:33–34.

¹⁴ Rev 12:5; 19:15 rod of iron, cf. Ps 2:9. On the use of Ps 2 in the New Testament see further Maiberger, "Das Verständnis," 113–18.

¹⁵ Steudel, "Psalm 2," 197.

¹⁶ Steudel, "Psalm 2," 195.

Ps 2:1–2 rather than Ps 2:7.¹⁷ There are formal differences between the two passages.¹⁸ The interpretation of Ps 1 is introduced as a “midrash.” The phrase *פֶּשֶׁר הַדָּבָר* is used in the interpretation of the psalms, but not of 2 Sam 7. Messianic expectation is only one theme among many in 4Q174. In his article in the *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, Brooke sums up the concerns of the text as follows:

Overall, this sectarian composition is concerned with the way various unfulfilled blessings and prophecies are being and will be fulfilled in the experiences of the community... The principal fragments are primarily concerned with the sovereignty of God himself and with the character of the community as the eschatological Temple in anticipation and as the elect of Israel who are enduring a time of trials. There is also some interest in the Davidic messiah.¹⁹

Stuedel sees the composition as a midrash on the “end of days.”²⁰ Moreover, the section dealing with the psalms is marked off as a separate section by the heading “Midrash,” and preceded by a *vacat*. Stuedel may be right that this section of the composition is “eine Art Psalmen-Kommentar.”²¹

Moreover, as Brooke has also noted in his earlier work, the word *מְשִׁיחוֹ* in Ps 2:2 is apparently taken as a plural and referred to “the elect ones of Israel.” He concludes the passage quoted above by qualifying the interest of the composition in the Davidic messiah: “though ‘his messiah’ of Psalm 2:2 is interpreted to refer to ‘the elect ones of Israel,’ the community itself, rather than the Davidic messiah.”²² Admittedly, the word *מְשִׁיחוֹ* is not actually preserved, but it would seem to be the only possible antecedent for the “elect ones.”

¹⁷ The latter difference could be discounted if Brooke is right that the whole psalm is implied by the incipit.

¹⁸ Maiberger, “Das Verständnis,” 100–1. W.R. Lane, “A New Commentary Structure in 4QFlorilegium,” *JBL* 78 (1959): 343–6 suggested that two different works had been juxtaposed in 4Q174.

¹⁹ Brooke, “Florilegium,” 298.

²⁰ Stuedel, *Der Midrasch der Eschatologie*, 214.

²¹ Stuedel, “Psalm 2,” 196. In *Der Midrasch der Eschatologie*, 129–34, she suggests that 4Q174 + 4Q177 comments on selected psalms from the “Davidic psalter” (Pss 1–41). Cf. also Emile Puech, *La Croyance des Esséniens en la Vie Future: Immortalité, Résurrection, Vie Éternelle* (Paris: Gabalda, 1993), 573, n. 20.

²² Brooke, “Florilegium,” 298. So also G.J. Brooke, *Exegesis at Qumran. 4QFlorilegium in its Jewish Context* (JOTSUP 29; Sheffield: JSOT, 1985), 148f.; Johannes Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte aus Qumran* (WUNT 2/104; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998), 110; Stuedel, “Psalm 2,” 197.

Steudel recognizes that the correlation of the word משיחו with “elect ones” does not rule out an interpretation of Ps 2 in terms of an individual messiah. It is clear from the interpretation of 2 Sam 7 that the author had a place for the Davidic messiah at the end of days. Several lines are missing from the end of column 4 as reconstructed by Steudel,²³ so it is quite possible that the “midrash” included a reference to the messianic king.²⁴ In the words of George Brooke: “It is just possible that ‘his anointed’ (Ps 2:2) is taken up in reference to a messianic figure who will reign on the Lord’s holy hill and that this is done in terms of Exod 34:29, but nothing conclusive can be said on this score.” The extant interpretation of Ps 2, however, does not address verses 6–7. The focus of the interpretation is on the time of upheaval and its implications for the community. But this does not imply a collective interpretation of the entire psalm.²⁵ We simply do not have an interpretation of the entire psalm in the extant fragments.

THE MESSIANIC INTERPRETATION OF PS 2

It is generally recognized that Ps 2, or at least Ps 2:1–9, is of pre-exilic origin,²⁶ and that in its original context it was not messianic in the eschatological sense, but reflects the ideology of the Judahite kingship in Jerusalem.²⁷ The oracle addressed to the king, “you are my son; today

²³ Steudel, *Der Midrasch zur Eschatologie*, 32.

²⁴ Brooke, *Exegesis at Qumran*, 158. Maiburger, “Das Verständnis,” 100–1, argues against this possibility.

²⁵ Pace Steudel, “Psalm 2,” 197: “Die Interpretation des Zitats von Ps 2,1f deutet jedenfalls eher auf ein kollektives Verständnis des Gesamt-Psalms durch den Verfasser hin.”

²⁶ See Hans-Joachim Kraus, *Psalms 1–59: A Continental Commentary* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993); transl. of *Psalmen 1. Teilband, Psalmen 1–59* (5th ed.; BK; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1978), 126; Eckart Otto, “Psalm 2 in neuassyrischer Zeit. Assyrische Motive in der judäischen Königsideologie,” in *Textarbeit. Studien zu Texten und ihrer Rezeption aus dem Alten Testament und der Umwelt Israels. Festschrift für Peter Weimar* (ed. Klaus Kiesow and Thomas Meurer; AOAT 294; Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2003), 335–49; idem, “Politische Theologie in den Königspsalmen zwischen Ägypten und Assyrien. Die Herrscherlegitimation in den Psalmen 2 und 18 in ihrem altorientalischen Kontexten,” in “*Mein Sohn bist du*,” (Ps 2,7): *Studien zu den Königspsalmen* (ed. E. Otto and E. Zenger; SBS 192; Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 2002), 33–65; Mark W. Hamilton, *The Body Royal: The Social Implications of Kingship in Ancient Israel* (Leiden: Brill, 2005), 60–1.

²⁷ J.A. Fitzmyer, *The One Who Is To Come* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007), 20; S.E. Gillingham, “The Messiah in the Psalms,” in *King and Messiah in Israel and the Ancient Near East* (ed. John Day; JSOTSup 270; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 212.

I have begotten you,” is taken from an enthronement ceremony and finds its closest parallels in Egyptian texts of the New Kingdom period.²⁸ Presumably, the Davidic kingship had taken over some of the rhetoric of kingship current in pre-Israelite Jerusalem, which had been under Egyptian control in the second millennium.²⁹ Some scholars, mainly German, date the psalm to the postexilic period, and argue that it was composed as a messianic, eschatological psalm.³⁰ This is unlikely. It makes far better sense in a context where the monarchy was still intact.³¹ It is quite likely, however, that the psalm would have been read as messianic in the post-exilic period.

Arguments about how the psalms would have been read, however, are tenuous unless they are supported by changes in the text or by explicit interpretations. Brevard Childs argued that Ps 2 “has been given an eschatological ring, both by its position in the Psalter and by the attachment of new meaning to the older vocabulary through the influence of the prophetic message... Indeed, at the time of the final redaction, when the institution of kingship had long since been destroyed, what earthly king would have come to mind other than God’s Messiah?”³² Christoph Rösel argues that Ps 2 was the introduction to a “messianic psalter,” which ended with Ps 89, which picks up the theme of the king/messiah as “son of God” (Ps 89: 26–7).³³ Sue Gillingham, in contrast, argues that during the editorial process in the postexilic “psalmody was

²⁸ See especially Otto, “Politische Theologie” (above n. 23); Klaus Koch, “Der König als Sohn Gottes,” in *Mein Sohn bist du*, (Ps 2,7): *Studien zu den Königpsalmen* (ed. E. Otto and E. Zenger; SBS 192; Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 2002), 11–15.

²⁹ The Canaanite background of Judahite kingship is reflected in Ps 110, where the king is said to be a priest forever after the order of Melchizedek. See John Day, “The Canaanite Inheritance of the Israelite Monarchy,” in *King and Messiah in Israel and the Ancient Near East* (ed. John Day; JSOTSup 270; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 72–90.

³⁰ E.g. Erhard S. Gerstenberger, *Psalms: Part One, with an Introduction to Cultic Poetry* (FOTL XIV; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988), 48. For an overview of the debate about the date of the Psalm see Friedhelm Hartenstein, “‘Der im Himmel thront, lacht’ (Ps 2,4),” in *Gottessohn und Menschensohn: Exegetische Studien zu zwei Paradigmen biblischer Intertextualität* (ed. Dieter Sänger; Biblisch-Theologische Studien 67; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2004), 158–88, here 160. Hartenstein allows that v. 7 is taken from a pre-exilic enthronement ritual (161).

³¹ I discuss this further in Adela Yarbro Collins and John J. Collins, *King and Messiah as Son of God* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008), 1–24.

³² B.S. Childs, *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979), 515–7 (516).

³³ Christoph Rösel, *Die messianische Redaktion des Psalters: Studien zu Entstehung und Theologie der Sammlung Psalm 2–89** (Stuttgart: Calwer, 1999).

still understood at this time more in terms of its orientation backwards, into the time of the Davidic dynasty, rather than forwards, in terms of some great and glorious Messianic kingdom.”³⁴ Following the argument of J. Clinton McCann, she argues that “the placing of strategic royal psalms . . . gives the Psalter a sequence of critical events in the life of the monarchy—first, the inauguration of the covenant with David (Ps 2), then the statement about the responsibilities of the Davidic king (Ps 72), and finally the account of the downfall of the dynasty (Ps 89).”³⁵ This explanation of the role of Ps 2 is not entirely persuasive. (Unlike Ps 89, Ps 2 does not speak of a covenant with David). But in fact any explanation of the placement of psalms is speculative, and cannot bear much weight in an argument.

Arguments based on the Greek translation of the Psalter have more evidence to support them, in cases where the translation departs from the Hebrew original. Joachim Schaper has shown that at least in some cases the figure of the king is enhanced.³⁶ For example, Ps 110 (LXX 109) imputes pre-existence to the (messianic) king by saying that God has begotten him before the Day-Star.³⁷ But there is no such embellishment in Ps 2.³⁸ The decree of the Lord, “you are my son, today I have begotten you,” is rendered straightforwardly. There is no attempt to evade the declaration that the king is son of God, and certainly no hint of a collective interpretation, either here or in Ps 2:2, but the literal translation does not necessarily tell us how the psalm was understood. The fact that there are some signs of messianic interpretation elsewhere in the Septuagint lends support to the assumption that Ps 2 was also understood messianically, but this remains a matter of inference.

³⁴ Gillingham, “The Messiah in the Psalms,” 225–6.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, 227. Cf. J. Clinton McCann, “Books I–III and the Editorial Purpose of the Hebrew Psalter,” in *The Shape and Shaping of the Psalter* (ed. J. Clinton McCann; JSOTSup 159; Sheffield: JSOT, 1993), 93–107.

³⁶ Joachim Schaper, *Eschatology in the Greek Psalter* (WUNT 2/76; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1995); *idem*, “Der Septuaginta-Psalter als Dokument jüdischer Eschatologie,” in *Die Septuaginta zwischen Judentum und Christentum* (ed. Martin Hengel and Anna Maria Schwemer; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1994), 38–61.

³⁷ Schaper, *The Eschatology*, 102.

³⁸ On the LXX of Ps 2 see Maiberger, “Das Verständnis,” 89–91. Holger Gzella, *Lebenszeit und Ewigkeit: Studien zur Eschatologie und Anthropologie des Septuaginta-Psalter* (BBB 134; Berlin: Philo, 2002), 337, argues that the translation strengthens the messianic character of v. 6, because the king rather than God is cast as the speaker, but it is not apparent why this change should bespeak messianic consciousness.

PSALM 2 IN THE PSEUDEPIGRAPHA

The strongest evidence for the interpretation of Ps 2 as messianic in Second Temple Judaism is found in the Pseudepigrapha. In her discussion of the reception of Ps 2, Steudel acknowledges only three texts among the Pseudepigrapha that make use of this psalm: the *Psalms of Solomon*, especially *Ps. Sol.* 17, *Sib. Or.* 3:664–8 and *T. Levi* 4:2. In *T. Levi*, the patriarch tells his sons that the Lord has heeded “your prayer . . . that you should become a son to him, as minister and priest in his presence.” This is an allusion to 2 Sam 7 rather than to Ps 2, and it involves a reinterpretation of the promise to apply it to the priesthood. The passage in *Sib. Or.* 3 speaks of an attack of the nations on Jerusalem and the temple, but does not speak of a messianic figure. It is of interest here insofar as it shows that an allusion to Ps 2 in an eschatological context does not necessarily entail a messiah. *Psalms of Solomon* 17 is an important text for the interpretation of Ps 2, but Steudel overlooks two other major pseudepigraphic texts: the *Similitudes of Enoch* (1 En. 48:10) and *4 Ezra* 13.

The Psalms of Solomon

The seventeenth Psalm of Solomon is a plea for deliverance in the wake of the conquest of Jerusalem by Pompey in 63 B.C.E. The Roman general is identified as “a man alien to our race” and a “lawless one” who laid waste the land and expelled rulers to the west (17:11).³⁹ But Pompey is not the only villain of the story. The psalmist begins by affirming the kingship of God, but recalls that “Lord, you chose David to be king over Israel, and swore to him about his descendants forever that his kingdom should not fail before you” (17:4). Right kingship, then, is based on the covenant with David, as reported in 2 Sam 7. But this had already been violated before Pompey arrived on the scene:

sinners rose up against us, they set upon us and drove us out. Those to whom you did not (make the) promise . . .

With pomp they set up a monarchy because of their arrogance;
They despoiled the throne of David with arrogant shouting” (7:5–7).

³⁹ Kenneth Atkinson, *I Cried to the Lord; A Study of the Psalms of Solomon's Historical Background and Social Setting* (JSJSup 84; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 135–6.

The reference is to the Hasmoneans, who had usurped the throne although they were not of the line of David, and had brought upon Judea punishment in the form of the Romans.

The psalmist calls on the Lord to remedy this situation by raising up a Davidic messiah:

See Lord, and raise up for them their king,
the son of David, to rule over your servant Israel (17:21).

His task would be “to purge Jerusalem from gentiles.” The description that follows draws heavily on Ps 2:

in wisdom and righteousness to drive out sinners from the inheritance;
to smash the arrogance of sinners like a potter’s jar;
to shatter all their substance with an iron rod;
to destroy the unlawful nations with the word of his mouth;
At his warning the nations will flee from his presence.

Compare Ps 2:8–9:

Ask of me, and I will make the nations your heritage...
You shall break them with a rod of iron,
And dash them in pieces like a potter’s vessel.

In the background of the whole passage is the motif of the assault of the nations on Jerusalem, as envisioned in Ps 2. The use of the plural “nations” echoes the psalm, and their discomfiture and flight alludes to a related formulation of the mythology of Zion in Ps 48. Finally, the statement in *Ps. Sol.* 7:32: “and their king shall be the Lord messiah,” which should probably be emended to “the Lord’s messiah,”⁴⁰ also echoes the reference to “the Lord and his anointed” in Ps 2:2.

Psalm of Solomon 17 is not an exercise in exegesis. It weaves together motifs from various passages in its description of the messiah.⁴¹ The motifs of wisdom and righteousness, and the word of his mouth, echo Isa 11:1–5.⁴² The statement in *Ps. Sol.* 17:33 that “he will not rely on

⁴⁰ See H.E. Ryle and M.R. James, *Psalms of the Pharisees: Commonly Called the Psalms of Solomon* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1891), 141–3. The phrase occurs again in *Ps. Sol.* 18:7.

⁴¹ See Kenneth Atkinson, *An Intertextual Study of the Psalms of Solomon Pseudepigrapha* (Lewiston, NY: Mellen, 2001), 336–41.

⁴² On the description of the messiah, see further Gene Davenport, “The ‘Anointed of the Lord’ in Psalms of Solomon 17,” in *Ideal Figures in Ancient Judaism* (ed. G.W.E. Nickelsburg and J.J. Collins; SBLSCS 12; Chico: Scholars Press, 1980), 67–92 (72).

horse and rider and bow, nor will he collect gold and silver for war” echoes the law of the king in Deut 17.

The psalm is very clear that the messianic king is dependent on God: “The Lord himself is his king, the hope of the one who has a strong hope in God” (17:34). At the same time, he is endowed with semi-divine qualities of wisdom, strength and righteousness.⁴³ While his weapon is the word of his mouth, he is a violent warrior, as is typical of descriptions of the messiah in this period.⁴⁴

Psalm of Solomon 17:27 says that when the messianic king gathers the holy people “he shall know them that they are all children of their God.” Steudel suggests that a collective interpretation of “sonship” is implied, or at least not excluded, here.⁴⁵ It is true that the messianic king is not explicitly called “son of God” here, as we might expect in view of the allusions to the Davidic covenant and to Ps 2. But even if the sonship is “democratized,” so to speak, and extended to the holy people, the status of the king is not thereby diminished. Paul speaks of the plural children of God, who are “conformed to the image of his son, in order that he might be the firstborn within a large family” (Rom 8:29), but the special status of Christ is not diminished thereby. There is no question of collective messianism in the *Psalms of Solomon*. The restoration of the people is accomplished through the agency of the messiah.

The Similitudes of Enoch

Psalm 2 is cited with reference to a very different kind of messiah in the *Similitudes of Enoch*. The *Similitudes* consist of three “parables” (chs. 38–44; 45–57; and 58–69), which are actually visions.⁴⁶ There is an introductory chapter (37) and two epilogues in chs. 70–71. The second and third parables are dominated by a figure variously called

⁴³ See further G.W.E. Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature Between the Bible and the Mishnah* (rev. ed.; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005), 242.

⁴⁴ See further J.J. Collins, *The Scepter and the Star* (New York: Doubleday, 1995), 49–72

⁴⁵ Steudel, “Psalm 2,” 197, n. 29.

⁴⁶ G.W.E. Nickelsburg, “Discerning the Structure(s) of the Enochic Book of Parables,” in *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man* (ed. Gabriele Boccaccini; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007), 23–47 and M.A. Knibb, “The Structure and Composition of the Book of Parables,” in *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man* (ed. Gabriele Boccaccini; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007), 48–64. Citations from the *Similitudes* follow G.W.E. Nickelsburg and J.C. VanderKam, *1 Enoch. A New Translation* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2004).

“the Chosen One,” “the Righteous One,” or “that Son of Man,” who is also mentioned but not seen in the first parable.⁴⁷ The scene in which he is introduced, in *1 En.* 46, is clearly modeled on Dan 7, although the older scene is adapted freely. Enoch sees “one who had a head of days, and his head was like white wool. And with him was another, whose face was like the appearance of a man; and his face was full of graciousness like one of the holy angels” (46:1). In the third parable, this figure sits on the throne of glory, and presides over the judgment. Despite his human appearance, he is not a man, at least in the usual sense of the word. He is “like one of the holy angels” (46:1). While he is distinguished from other angels (Michael in 60:4–5; 69:14; 71:3; the four archangels in 71: 8,9,13), his rank is higher than theirs.⁴⁸

Much of the recent discussion of the Son of Man in the *Similitudes* has been concerned with his apparent identification with Enoch in *1 En.* 71:14, where Enoch is greeted on his ascent to heaven with the words: “You are that (or: a) son of man who was born for righteousness...” We need not rehearse that debate here.⁴⁹ It must suffice to say that this passage occurs in a second epilogue and is almost certainly a secondary addition. In the body of the *Similitudes* there is no hint that the figure Enoch sees in his visions is actually himself. Rather, he is a supernatural, heavenly figure, although Enoch and other earthly righteous people are conformed to him to some degree.

The exalted nature of the Son of Man is especially in evidence in 48:2–3: “And in that hour that son of man was named in the presence of the Lord of Spirits, and his name before the Head of Days. Even before the sun and the constellations were created, before the stars of heaven were made, his name was named before the Lord of Spirits.” The passage continues in 48:6: “For this (reason) he was chosen and hidden in his presence before the world was created and forever.” While

⁴⁷ J.C. VanderKam, “Righteous One, Messiah, Chosen One, and Son of Man in 1 Enoch 37–71,” in *The Messiah* (ed. J.H. Charlesworth; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992), 169–91.

⁴⁸ On the transcendent character of the Son of Man see Christoph Böttrich, “Kon-turen des ‘Menschensohnes in äthHen 37–71,’” in *Gottessohn und Menschensohn: Exegetische Studien zu zwei Paradigmen biblischer Intertextualität* (ed. Dieter Sänger; Biblisch-Theologische Studien 67; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2004), 76–9; H.S. Kvanvig, “The Son of Man in the Parables,” in *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man* (ed. Gabriele Boccaccini; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007), 179–215, here 189.

⁴⁹ See my discussion in *The Apocalyptic Imagination* (rev. ed.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 187–91, and in Yarbro Collins and Collins, *King and Messiah as Son of Man* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008), 90–94.

the context of *1 En.* 48: 2 is either eschatological or the time of Enoch's ascent, 48:6 seems to state unequivocally that the Son of Man existed before the world was created.⁵⁰ Similarly, in *1 En.* 62:7 we read:

For from the beginning the son of man was hidden,
and the Most High preserved him in the presence of his might,
and he revealed him to the chosen.

It would seem that the *Similitudes* here have developed the identity of the Son of Man well beyond anything that we found in Daniel, by applying to him language that is elsewhere used of wisdom. Another significant parallel is found in the LXX translation of Ps 110 where the king/messiah is begotten "before the Day Star."

The *Similitudes* also develop the role of the Son of Man beyond what was found in Daniel in other significant ways. Besides the association with wisdom, he is said to be "the light of the nations" like the servant in Second Isaiah.⁵¹ Of special interest for our present inquiry are passages that associate the Son of Man with the Davidic messiah, although there is no hint of Davidic lineage.⁵² The spirit of wisdom and insight that dwells in him (49:1–4) recalls the messianic oracle in Isa 11.⁵³ He is also installed on a glorious throne and takes over the function of eschatological judge (51:3; 55:4; 61:8; 62:2; 69:29). The motif of enthronement is reminiscent of Ps 110. Here again he functions in a manner reminiscent of the traditional messiah: "and the spirit of righteousness was poured out upon him, and the word of his mouth will slay all the sinners" (62:2).

Moreover, the kings of the earth are condemned in 48:10 for having denied "the Lord of Spirits and his Anointed One." As Johannes Theisohn recognizes, this is a clear allusion to Ps 2:2.⁵⁴ Again in 52:4, Enoch is told that all that he has seen "will serve the authority of his Anointed One." Again, the subjugation of the nations to the Lord and

⁵⁰ Gottfried Schimanowski, *Weisheit und Messias: Die jüdischen Voraussetzungen der urchristlichen Präexistenzchristologie* (Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1985), 153–94.

⁵¹ For other allusions to the servant passages in Second Isa, see Johannes Theisohn, *Der auserwählte Richter* (SUNT 12; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1975), 114–126; VanderKam, "Righteous One," 189.

⁵² Stefan Schreiber, *Gesalbter und König: Titel und Konzeptionen der königlichen Gesalbtenwartung in frühjüdischen und urchristlichen Schriften* (BZNW 105; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2000), 338.

⁵³ Theisohn, *Der auserwählte Richter*, 138.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, 56: "Die Zeile klingt deutlich an Ps 2,2 an." Cf. also Schreiber, *Gesalbter und König*, 331.

his Anointed in Ps 2 forms the conceptual background. It is not suggested in the *Similitudes* that the Son of Man is a human descendent of David, but he is the Anointed, or Messiah, of the Lord, who takes over the functions of the Davidic king vis-à-vis the nations.

The *Similitudes* is one of a number of texts from around the turn of the era that attest to an exalted notion of the messiah, as a pre-existent, supernatural figure. These texts include the LXX translations of Ps 110 and Isa 9, where the royal “child” is called an *angelos*, which should be understood as “angel.”⁵⁵ Another important witness to this trend, from a slightly later time, can be found in *4 Ezra* 13.

4 Ezra 13

Fourth Ezra is a complex apocalypse, containing three dialogues and four visions.⁵⁶ The messiah figures prominently in the third dialogue and in the second and third visions.⁵⁷ Our present concern is with the third vision, in ch. 13. There Ezra reports that “after seven days I had a dream in the night. I saw a wind rising from the sea that stirred up all its waves. As I kept looking, that wind brought up out of the depths of the sea something resembling a man and that man was flying with the clouds of heaven...”

The image of the man flying with the clouds of heaven is a clear allusion to Dan 7. There is also an explicit reference to Dan 7 in the preceding chapter, *4 Ezra* 12, where the interpreting angel tells Ezra explicitly: “The eagle you observed coming up out of the sea is the fourth kingdom that appeared in a vision to Daniel your brother. But it was not interpreted to him in the same way that I now interpret it to you” (*4 Ezra* 12:11). Moreover, the interpretation in chapter 13 provides a clear allusion to Dan 2, when it says that the mountain on which the man takes his stand was “carved out without hands.” This detail was not mentioned in the vision.

The allusions to Daniel in *4 Ezra* 13 are woven together with echoes of other sources. Anyone who hears the voice of the man from the sea

⁵⁵ See further Yarbro Collins and Collins, *King and Messiah as Son of God*, chapter 3.

⁵⁶ For introductory matters see M.E. Stone, *Fourth Ezra: A Commentary on the Book of Fourth Ezra* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990), 1–35; Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination*, 195–210.

⁵⁷ M.E. Stone, “The Question of the Messiah in *4 Ezra*,” in *Judaisms and Their Messiahs* (ed. J. Neusner, W.S. Green and E. Frerichs; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 209–24.

melts like wax before a fire. (Compare the effect of the theophany in Mic 1:4, for the motif of melting like wax). Most importantly, a great host comes to make war on the man. He carves out a mountain for himself and takes his stand upon it. Then he destroys the onrushing multitude with the breath of his lips. The onslaught of the multitude recalls Ps 2. The mountain is Zion, the holy mountain (Ps 2:6). The breath of his lips is the weapon of the messianic king in Isa 11:4. Taken together, these allusions suggest that the man from the sea has taken on the role traditionally ascribed to the messianic king.

This impression is strengthened in the interpretation that follows, where the man is identified, in the Latin and Syriac versions, as “my son” (13:32, 37).⁵⁸ The messiah is also called “my son” in *4 Ezra* 7:28.⁵⁹ Michael Stone has argued that the Greek original in these passages read *παῖς* rather than *υἱός* because of variations in some of the versions and suggested that the Hebrew original was “servant” rather than “son.”⁶⁰ But even if the Greek did read *παῖς*, the word can also mean child or son—compare Wis 2: 13, 16, where the righteous man claims to be *παῖς* of God and boasts that God is his father. In *4 Ezra* 13, in any case, the context, the assault of the nations against Mt. Zion, strongly suggests an allusion to Ps 2, so the meaning is “son” rather than “servant.”⁶¹ The reference to “my son the messiah” in *4 Ezra* 7:28 is also most easily understood against the background of Ps 2, although such a reference could also be derived from 2 Sam 7.

Even though the messiah in *4 Ezra* appears to be pre-existent, he is nonetheless identified as a descendent of David, in *4 Ezra* 12:32: “this is the messiah whom the Most High has kept until the end of days, who will arise from the posterity of David.” He is human, although he is endowed with supernatural powers. In chapter 7:29, he is said to die after a reign of 400 years. The apocalypse does not explain why a descendent of David should arise from the sea on clouds. In the judgment of Michael Stone, his Davidic ancestry is “a traditional element and not at all central to the concepts of the book.”⁶² What is important

⁵⁸ See further Collins, *The Scepter and the Star*, 184–5.

⁵⁹ Schreiber, *Gesalbter und König*, 349, raises the possibility of Christian tampering with the text, but there is little other evidence for this in *4 Ezra*.

⁶⁰ Stone, *Fourth Ezra*, 207–13 (“Excursus on the Redeemer Figure”).

⁶¹ Cf. M. Knibb and R.J. Coggins, *The First and Second Books of Esdras* (CBC; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979) on 7:28.

⁶² M.E. Stone, *Features of the Eschatology of Fourth Ezra* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989), 131–32; compare Schreiber, *Gesalbter und König*, 351.

is that he takes over the functions traditionally associated with the Davidic messiah.

Together with *Ps. Sol.* 17 and the *Similitudes of Enoch*, *4 Ezra* constitutes a significant body of evidence for the messianic interpretation of Ps 2 in Jewish texts around the turn of the era. There is some variation in the ways that the psalm is used. *Ps. Sol.* 17 and *4 Ezra* explicitly associate the messiah with the line of David. The *Similitudes* does not. In *Pss. Sol.* and *4 Ezra* he is human, however exalted. In the *Similitudes* he has a human form, but is higher than the angels. Only *4 Ezra* emphasizes his divine sonship. Both *4 Ezra* and the *Similitudes*, however, see him as a pre-existent figure, who will be revealed in the eschatological age. They testify to a tendency in the late Second Temple period to regard the messiah as a supernatural, heavenly figure, although this understanding of the messiah was by no means uniform or standard.

THE SCROLLS

It remains true, as Steudel has noted, that Ps 2 is not among the texts commonly cited in the messianic passages in the Dead Sea Scrolls.⁶³ The most common, by far, are Balaam's Oracle and Isa 11, while the common messianic title *צמח דוד*, may allude either to Jeremiah or to Zechariah.⁶⁴ Other passages (Gen 49 in 4Q252, Isa 9 in 1QH^a 11) are cited rarely. Even 2 Sam 7 is only adduced as a messianic reference in the *Florilegium*. We should not conclude that because a passage is not commonly cited it was not understood messianically at all. It is remarkable, however, that the Scrolls seldom if ever appeal to the royal psalms in this regard.

There are, however, some notable if controversial exceptions.⁶⁵ The *Rule of the Community* specifies the order of assembly for the occasion "when God begets the messiah with them" (1QSa 2:11–12). The reading *יוליד* (begets) is unclear in the manuscript and has been endlessly disputed.⁶⁶ The scholars who examined the manuscript in the 1950s agreed that the manuscript reads *יוליד* although Milik and Cross

⁶³ Steudel, "Psalm 2," 192.

⁶⁴ Collins, *The Scepter and the Star*, 64–67.

⁶⁵ These are noted by Steudel, "Psalm 2," 191, but she does not take them seriously.

⁶⁶ Maiburger, "Das Verständnis," 101–5.

favored emending it to **וּלְיָד** (causes to come).⁶⁷ Geza Vermes, who has vacillated on the reading, claims that “it seems to be confirmed by computer enhancement.”⁶⁸ The statement that God begets the messiah “with them” is odd, however, and gives some pause. If the reading is correct, it is simply picking up and endorsing the language of the Psalms. Indeed, Jan Willem van Henten states unequivocally: “This passage alludes to Psalm 2.”⁶⁹

An even more controversial case is provided by 4Q246, the so-called “Aramaic Apocalypse” or “Son of God” text, which refers to a figure who will be called “Son of God” and “Son of the Most High.” I have argued at length elsewhere for the messianic interpretation of this text and will not repeat the arguments here.⁷⁰ Steudel subscribes to the view originally proposed by Milik, that the figure who is called “Son of God” is a negative figure, and argues that the future hope in this text rests collectively with the people of God.⁷¹ I find this interpretation highly unlikely. By far the closest parallel to the titles in question is explicitly messianic. In Luke 1:32 the angel Gabriel tells Mary that her child “will be great, and will be called the Son of the Most High, and the Lord God will give to him the throne of his ancestor David. He will reign over the house of Jacob forever, and of his kingdom there will be no end.” In 1:35 he adds: “he will be called the Son of God.” The Greek titles “Son of the Most High” and “Son of God” correspond exactly to the Aramaic fragment from Qumran. Both texts refer to an everlasting

⁶⁷ P.W. Skehan, “Two Books on Qumran Studies,” *CBQ* 21(1959): 74, cites “the testimony of half a dozen witnesses, including Allegro, Cross, Strugnell, and the writer [Skehan], as of the summer of 1955,” that the text reads **וּלְיָד**.

F.M. Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran* (3rd ed.; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995) 76, n. 3. The reading d(wy, “will be assembled,” originally proposed by Theodore Gaster and Jacob Licht, and accepted by L.H. Schiffman, *The Eschatological Community of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (SBLMS 38; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989), 54, is emphatically rejected by Cross on palaeographic grounds. Emile Puech, “Préséance sacerdotale et messie-roi dans la Règle de la Congrégation (1QSa ii 11–22),” *RevQ* 16 (1993–1995): 361, proposes to read **יְהוֹגֵלָה** “will be revealed.”

⁶⁸ G. Vermes, *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English* (revised ed.; London: Penguin, 2004), 161.

⁶⁹ J.W. van Henten, “The Hasmonean Period,” in *Redemption and Resistance. The Messianic Hopes of Jews and Christians in Antiquity* (ed. M. Bockmuehl and J.C. Paget; New York/London: T&T Clark, 2007), 22.

⁷⁰ Collins, *The Scepter and the Star*, 154–72; Yarbro Collins and Collins, *King and Messiah as Son of God*, 65–74. See also Johannes Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte aus Qumran* (WUNT 2/104; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998), 128–69.

⁷¹ Annette Steudel, “The Eternal Reign of the People of God—Collective Expectations in Qumranic Texts,” *RevQ* 17(1996): 507–25.

kingdom. The fact that these parallels are found in the New Testament does not lessen their relevance to the cultural context of the Qumran text. No significance can be attached to the fact that he said to *called* rather than to *be* the son of God. In the Hellenistic ruler cults, divine titles were honors, conferred in appreciation for acts of beneficence.⁷² If the author wished to imply that the titles were not appropriate, we should expect that the one so called would be subject to judgment, just as Daniel leaves no doubt that the hybris of Antiochus Epiphanes leads to his downfall. The fact that the people of God arises, or is raised up, in the latter part of the text in no way excludes a role for the messianic king, any more than the collective interpretation of משיחו excludes a role for the Branch of David in 4Q174, or the exaltation of Israel excludes a role for Michael in 1QM 17:7, which reads: “to exalt the sway of Michael above all the gods, and the dominion of Israel over all flesh.” In part Steudel is misled by a mistaken collective interpretation of Dan 7, where the “one like a son of man” is not a collective symbol for Israel, but its heavenly leader, as is clear from the parallel with ch. 12.⁷³ The restoration typically involves a role for a leader who is God’s agent in the end-time.

If then it is the messianic king who is called “son of God” in 4Q246, the most obvious basis for that title is found in Ps 2. The Aramaic text does not cite the psalm directly, but the psalm may well inform not only the titles but the entire depiction of the turmoil of the nations.

Florentino García Martínez has argued that the “son of God” in 4Q246 is “a heavenly being similar to Melchizedek of 11QMelch or the Son of Man of Dan 7 . . . He is thus a messiah, an almost divinized messiah, similar to Melchizedek and the heavenly Son of Man.”⁷⁴ I do not think the title “son of God” necessarily implies a heavenly being. He could be imagined along the lines of the messiah in the *Pss. Sol.* 17. But García Martínez is certainly right that the messiah was sometimes viewed as a heavenly figure. We have seen that Ps 2 was applied to a heavenly messiah in the *Similitudes of Enoch* and *4 Ezra*. The widely recognized echoes of Daniel in 4Q246 lend some support to the

⁷² See Yarbro Collins and Collins, *King and Messiah as Son of God*, 48–54.

⁷³ John J. Collins, *Daniel: A Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993), 304–310.

⁷⁴ Florentino García Martínez, “Two Messianic Figures in the Qumran Texts,” in idem, *Qumranica Minora II. Thematic Studies on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (STDJ 64; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 13–32, here 24.

possibility that that the messiah in this text is also a heavenly figure. But in any case I would argue that this text too is a witness to the widespread messianic interpretation of Ps 2.

THE FLORILEGIUM AGAIN

None of this necessarily determines the way Ps 2 is interpreted in 4Q174. If the word משיחו is interpreted as a collective reference to the elect of Israel, then the interpretation offered in the psalm is unusual in any case. But despite the best efforts of Joseph Fitzmyer, messianic expectation cannot be reduced to the use and interpretation of the word משיח.⁷⁵ Despite the collective interpretation of משיחו, the *Florilegium* still has an explicit role for the Branch of David in the end of days, as Steudel also recognizes. The author did not find it necessary to exploit every possible exegetical opportunity to make this point. In view of the common messianic interpretation of Ps 2, and the fact that it explicitly addresses the king as son of God, I, like George Brooke, find it difficult to believe that the juxtaposition of 2 Sam 7 and Pss 1–2 is coincidental. To be sure, messianic expectation is not the primary focus of the *Florilegium*, and it is not a catena of messianic texts, but the fact that both texts were associated with the kingship of God and his messiah may still explain explain why these two texts are juxtaposed in this midrash on the end of days.⁷⁶

⁷⁵ Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The One Who Is To Come* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007).

⁷⁶ Brooke, *Exegesis at Qumran*, 169–74, has made the interesting suggestion that the texts cited in the *Florilegium* were associated liturgically, perhaps at the Feast of Tabernacles.

INTERPRETATION OF PSALM 2 IN *4QFLORILEGIUM*
AND IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

Eric F. Mason
Judson University, Elgin, Illinois USA

Interpretation of texts from the Jewish Scriptures was vitally important both in the non-biblical writings found among the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the books of the Christian New Testament. Even a cursory examination of both corpora reveals that their respective authors drew a disproportionate number of their citations or allusions from a handful of scriptural books, with Psalms a preeminent source in both cases.¹ As is to be expected, however, the ways these texts were utilized could vary significantly in the DSS and in the NT, and consideration of interpretation of Ps 2 provides an interesting example. As will be evident below, both Qumran and early Christian interpreters were attracted to the Davidic nature of the psalm and to its promise of divine retribution against those who opposed God's "anointed." The text was interpreted as speaking of Jesus as God's messiah by a number of New Testament authors, and it also was addressed in a Qumran pesher. The latter, however, provides a rather unexpected interpretation of the "anointed" of Ps 2:2.

This paper addresses that surprising issue and unfolds as follows. First, attention is given to Ps 2 as it stands in the Hebrew Bible. Next, the discussion departs from the expected chronological order and considers how this psalm is utilized in the New Testament, with emphasis on its use in Acts and Hebrews. Then focus turns to the textual evidence and use of Ps 2 in the Dead Sea Scrolls. Finally, a proposal is offered for why the text was interpreted in *4QFlorilegium* as it was.

¹ The significance of Psalms for the Qumran community is also demonstrated by the extant biblical scrolls, as noted by Peter Flint: "Among the Dead Sea Scrolls the *Book of Psalms* is represented more frequently than any other work, which is indicative of the importance of the Psalter for the Qumran community." See Peter Flint, "Psalms, Book of," *EDSS* 2:702-07, esp. 702.

I. PSALM 2 IN THE HEBREW BIBLE

Psalm 2 normally is classified among the “royal psalms” (along with Pss 18, 20, 21, 45, 72, 89, 101, 110, 132, and 144), and it is positioned along with Ps 1 as a double introduction to the canonical arrangement of the book.² The psalm itself consists of twelve verses as preserved in the MT, structured in four strophes of three verses each with a final line later attached for liturgical use. The first addresses the revolt of the nations against Yahweh and his anointed one; the second gives the divine response of derision toward these helpless foes; the third proclaims God’s selection and empowerment of the king in Zion; and the fourth offers words of warning to any who might oppose God and God’s king. A macarism was appended to the final stanza at some point, and scholars debate its appropriateness. Briggs calls it a “liturgical addition”; Terrien more forcefully decries it as “a note of piety that seems to jar with its royal liturgy.”³ Kraus identifies the last line of verse 2—which includes the reference to Yahweh’s “anointed one”—as a secondary insertion intended in part to explain the plural possessive suffix of “their cords” in v. 3.⁴

In 1990 John T. Willis could survey three major approaches to understanding the origins of this particular psalm. One approach is to understand the psalm in what Willis called “the fully eschatological and Christian sense,” i.e., as originally intended as a text about Jesus as the messiah.⁵ This approach particularly appealed to Christian interpreters of earlier generations because of the frequent citations of the psalm in the NT. Willis rightfully notes that the approach “will not bear the scrutiny of critical exegetical examination.”⁶

² Hermann Gunkel is usually credited with “recognition of a distinct class of *bona fide* royal psalms,” though a number of earlier scholars had identified various psalms as such. See Scott R.A. Starbuck, *Court Oracles in the Psalms: The So-Called Royal Psalms in their Ancient Near Eastern Context* (SBLDS 172; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1999), 2. See Starbuck, *Court Oracles*, 19–66 for a survey of scholarly discussion of the royal psalms since the nineteenth century. On the position of Ps 2, see James Limburg, “Psalms, Book of,” *ABD* 5:522–36, esp. 533.

³ Charles Augustus Briggs, *The Book of Psalms* (ICC; 2 vols.; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1906), 11; Samuel Terrien, *The Psalms: Strophic Structure and Theological Commentary* (Eerdmans Critical Commentary; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002), 80.

⁴ Hans-Joachim Kraus, *Psalms 1–59: A Commentary* (CC; Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1988), 124.

⁵ John T. Willis, “A Cry of Defiance—Psalm 2,” *JSOT* 47 (1990): 33–50, esp. 33.

⁶ Willis, “Cry of Defiance,” 34.

A second option is to find in Ps 2 what Willis calls “part of a cult drama connected with the enthronement of a king of Israel or Judah.”⁷ Among recent major commentators, the strong (but not unanimous) consensus is that the psalm was used at the inauguration of a Davidic king and/or in an “annual enthronement ritual,” with Kraus offering conspicuous dissent but still ultimately suggesting the similar contexts of an “annual enthronement festival” or a “royal Zion festival.”⁸ Some proposing an enthronement ritual have inferred the existence of such from the sparse description of the stealth coronation of the young Joash in 2 Kgs 11:12–20.⁹ On the basis of this and the installation of Solomon described in 1 Kgs 1:32–48, Roland de Vaux proposed a detailed reconstruction of the elements of Judah’s coronation rites and copiously drew upon information from parallel rites in other ancient Near Eastern monarchical traditions.¹⁰ For most interpreters such is an example of a cultural pattern shared by most ancient Near Eastern societies, all of whom understood their monarch as himself possessing some level of divine authorization or, in many cases, divine identity.¹¹ On the other hand, a few scholars (Samuel Terrien, following T.H. Gaster) argue that the psalmist instead *mocks* the assumptions of those other states by parodying their claims to have divine kings.¹²

A third option is that the psalm arose in an actual historical setting and then was preserved for use in similar situations later.¹³ This is preferred by Willis because of the intensity of the language in the psalm. Though he readily admits that certainty for identifying the

⁷ Willis, “Cry of Defiance,” 36.

⁸ Kraus, *Psalms 1–59*, 126.

⁹ Terrien, *Psalms*, 83.

¹⁰ Roland de Vaux, *Ancient Israel: Its Life and Institutions* (Biblical Resource Series; New York: MacGraw-Hill, 1961; repr., Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 102–07; Kraus, *Psalms 1–59*, 130. De Vaux proposed the following as the elements of Judah’s coronation rites: a gathering at the religious sanctuary; investiture with the insignia of kingship, specifically the crown and the עֲדוּת (*edûth*), often emended to read “bracelets” but perhaps best understood as some sort of written text (cf. the כִּקֹּף [*khof*], “enactment,” of Ps 2:7 according to Kraus); an anointing with oil; public acclamation with horn blasts and cheers of the people; enthronement in the palace; and acts of homage by the high officials.

¹¹ See especially the survey of Kraus, *Psalms 1–59*, 130–32, comparing the sonship language here with that in other ancient Near Eastern cultures and evaluating the statement in 2:7 as an announcement of adoption.

¹² Terrien, *Psalms*, 80–81: “Affinities with royal liturgies of the ancient Near East suggest that the poet or the editor intended to parody these ceremonies to show the illusion of the sacrality of the neighboring kings.”

¹³ Willis, “Cry of Defiance,” 38.

original situation is impossible to attain, he proposes that the psalm arose in an unsettled time of kingship transition in Jerusalem and later was reused along with other rituals when Judah's armies prepared for battle, especially if enemies were rebelling against the Judean king.¹⁴ While times of royal transition offered vassal states prime opportunities to break free from their oppressors, some scholars question whether a king in Jerusalem was ever powerful enough to exert such authority over neighboring states and instead find here pompous hyperbole.¹⁵

II. INTERPRETATION OF PSALM 2 IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

New Testament authors made frequent use of Ps 2 LXX, and they were most attracted to the language of three particular verses—v. 2 (which mentions plotting and opposition to “the Lord and his anointed”); v. 7 (where the Lord decrees “You are my son, today I have begotten you”); and v. 9 (where the one established by God is said to break his enemies with “a rod of iron” and to “dash them in pieces like a potter’s vessel”). The compilers of the index of biblical citations and allusions in the Nestle-Aland 27th edition of the Greek New Testament list six direct quotations of portions of Ps 2 by NT authors, two each in Acts, Hebrews, and Revelation (Ps 2:1–2 in Acts 4:25; Ps 2:7 in Acts 13:33; Heb 1:5, 5:5; and Ps 2:9 in Rev 2:26–27; 19:15). In addition, they note twelve allusions, some much more convincing than others.¹⁶

¹⁴ Willis, “Cry of Defiance,” 45.

¹⁵ Against the latter approach see Kraus, *Psalms 1–59*, 133 (commenting on 2:10–12): “This admonition is not spoken by some overenthusiastic ruler who has become too big for his boots, but by Yahweh’s king, to whom all power is given.” Some scholars defend more theological motivations in the language, reading the psalm as ultimately intended to affirm the universal power of Yahweh rather than the actual political power of a king of Israel or Judah. See, for example, the discussion of Kraus, *Psalms 1–59*, 127–28. Like many commentators, Kraus seems inclined to read NT Christology back into the psalm as the legitimate key to resolving these issues.

Starbuck (*Court Oracles*, 167) also argues for historical roots for the psalm but on different grounds. He proposes origins in the era of Solomon: “In favor of this supposition is the psalm’s silence regarding the Davidic covenant. The Solomonic period was perhaps the only period in Judah’s history where the monarch’s filial relationship to Yahweh was so conspicuous by the nation’s prosperity and domination, that appeals to Davidic lineage with the aim of securing covenant blessings would have seemed superfluous.”

¹⁶ Proposed allusions not discussed below include the following: Ps 2:2 in John 1:41; Ps 2:7 in John 1:49.

The strongest allusions in the gospels appear at the baptism of Jesus where he is proclaimed son by the divine voice (Matt 3:17, cf. 4:3; Luke 3:22). These accounts draw on the divine decree of Ps 2:7, though the term “beloved” appears in both baptism passages but is absent from the psalm. The only proposed allusion in the Pauline literature concerns Ps 2:11 in 2 Cor 7:15, but it consists merely of the terms “fear” and “trembling.”

In contrast, Revelation is very fertile ground for use of the psalm. Explicit quotations of Ps 2:9 concerning rule with a rod of iron appear in Rev 19:15, describing Jesus’ reign over the nations, and in Rev 2:26–27, where Jesus offers to the faithful in Thyatira that sort of authority that he received from his Father. Power over the nations, reflecting Ps 2:8, also is promised to the faithful in Rev 2:26. Another very clear appropriation of Ps 2:9 occurs in Rev 12:5, where the woman threatened by the dragon gives birth to a male child destined to rule the nations with a rod of iron.

Three allusions to Ps 2:2 in Revelation also are noted in Nestle-Aland, two of which might be overlooked if not for the importance of this psalm elsewhere in the book. The harlot of Rev 17:18 rules over her allied “kings of the earth”; the beast and the “kings of the earth” are arrayed against Jesus in Rev 19:19, a passage appearing in the immediate context of an explicit quotation noted above of the iron rod language; and an angel announces in Rev 11:15 that “the kingdom of the world has become the kingdom of our Lord and of his *Christ*,” or “anointed one,” presumably reflecting Ps 2:2’s “the Lord and his anointed one.” If so, they have now triumphed over those protesting their rule in the psalm itself.

Though use of the imagery of Ps 2 clearly is important in Revelation, the most significant uses of the psalm for the present study appear in Acts and Hebrews. In Acts 13:33, Paul quotes Ps 2:7’s declaration “You are my son, today I have begotten you” in a sermon at Antioch of Pisidia and finds there an affirmation of Jesus’ resurrection. Some scholars have additionally proposed that 2 Sam 7 contributes to this context; though no formal citation is present, numerous words and phrases from 2 Sam 7:11–16 LXX appear in Acts 13:33–37, seemingly implying a tradition of interpreting those passages in tandem.¹⁷

¹⁷ George J. Brooke, *Exegesis at Qumran: 4QFlorilegium in Its Jewish Context* (JSOT-Sup 29; Sheffield: JSOT, 1985), 209, following D. Goldsmith, “Acts 13:33–37: A *Pesher* on II Samuel 7,” *JBL* 87 (1968): 321–24; and E. Lövestam, *Son and Saviour: A Study*

Another direct quotation, this time of Ps 2:1–2 in Acts 4:25, concerns the array of enemies against God’s anointed one. In this prayer after the release of Peter and John from an interrogation for preaching, Jesus clearly is identified as the “anointed,” and the psalmist’s array of enemy “nations” and “peoples” is interpreted as those participating in Jesus’ crucifixion, here described as Herod and Pontius Pilate with ἔθνεσιν καὶ λαοῖς Ἰσραήλ, “the *Gentiles* and the *peoples* of Israel.” (Acts 4:27) This passage is striking in that it identifies Jesus as God’s “anointed one” and transforms the rebellious but subjugated foes of Ps 2:2 into those responsible for Jesus’ passion.

Similarly important, though for different reasons, is use of Ps 2 in the Epistle to the Hebrews. The anonymous author of this book may allude to the inheritance language of Ps 2:8 when the Son is identified as “heir of all things” in Heb 1:2. Clearly, though, the author twice cites Ps 2:7’s declaration “You are my son, today I have begotten you.” This first occurs in Heb 1:5 at the beginning of a catena of biblical citations that concludes with citation of Ps 110:1 (“sit at my right hand”). It should also be noted that the quotation of Ps 2:7 is combined there with citation of 2 Sam 7:14, the promise in Nathan’s oracle that God will be “father” to David’s dynastic successor. In Heb 1:5, both Ps 2:7 and 2 Sam 7:14 are presented as divine decrees made uniquely to Jesus as Son and not to angels.

Psalms 2:7 is cited again in the crucial passage Heb 5:5–6. The implied logic in the argument is that because Jesus has been established in Heb 1:5–14 as the Son addressed in both Ps 2:7 and Ps 110:1, in Heb 5:5–6 that Son must also be the one granted an eternal priesthood like Melchizedek’s in Ps 110:4. Further elaboration on how Jesus’ priesthood resembles Melchizedek’s is nevertheless delayed for two chapters until Heb 7.¹⁸

A number of NT uses of Ps 2 have now been surveyed very briefly, and admittedly some distinctive uses of the psalm were noted. Nev-

of Acts 13,32–37: With an Appendix, ‘Son of God’ in the Synoptic Gospels (ConBNT 18; Lund: Gleerup, 1961), 39. Among recent commentators on Acts, C.K. Barrett (*Acts* [vol. 1; ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994]) and Joseph A. Fitzmyer (*The Acts of the Apostles* [AB; New York: Doubleday, 1998]) both are aware of the bibliography on the issue but do not see fit to address the possible use of language from 2 Sam 7.

¹⁸ See Eric F. Mason, *‘You Are a Priest Forever’: Second Temple Jewish Messianism and the Priestly Christology of the Epistle to the Hebrews* (STDJ 74; Leiden: Brill, 2008), 14–19, 23–25, for further discussion of Heb 1:1–14 and 4:14–5:10.

ertheless one may summarize the broad parameters of use of Ps 2 in the NT as follows:

- a. if identified, the rebellious nations and peoples of Ps 2:1–2 are opponents of Jesus; this is true for the discussion of those who physically killed Jesus in Acts and Revelation’s less concrete discussions;
- b. Jesus as messiah is the “anointed one” of Ps 2:2;
- c. Jesus as Son of God is the begotten “son” of Ps 2:7;
- d. Jesus ultimately will triumph over his foes and rule with the iron rod of Ps 2:9, or else he can delegate this authority.

Attention now turns to interpretation of Ps 2 in the Qumran texts.

III. INTERPRETATION OF PSALM 2 IN THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS

Textual evidence for Ps 2 unfortunately is quite meager at Qumran, where portions of the psalm survive in only two biblical manuscripts.¹⁹ Enough remains from the middle portion of a column in 11QPs^c (11Q7) to verify that it records Ps 2:1–8, and parts of Ps 2:6–7 survive in 3QPs (3Q2).²⁰ In both cases the extant text is in accord with the textual tradition that later became the MT.

More significant for the present study is the quotation of Ps 2:1 in one non-biblical text found among the scrolls. Most commonly called *4QFlorilegium*, 4Q174 was classified as an “eschatological midrash” by its original editor, John Allegro.²¹ While numerous other scholars also

¹⁹ David L. Washburn, *A Catalog of Biblical Passages in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Text-Critical Studies; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2002), 86. Washburn’s data is consistent with that presented in Martin Abegg, Jr., Peter Flint, and Eugene Ulrich, eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible* (New York: Harper San Francisco, 1999), 512.

²⁰ The standard editions of these texts are found in DJD XXIII and DJD III, respectively.

²¹ The *editio princeps* is that of John M. Allegro in DJD V, 53–57 and pls. XIX–XX. He used the term “eschatological midrash” in an earlier publication, John M. Allegro, “Fragments of a Qumran Scroll of Eschatological *Midrašim*,” *JBL* 77 (1958): 350–54. Allegro’s edition has been much criticized, especially in John Strugnell, “Notes en marge du volume V des ‘Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan,’” *RevQ* 7 (1969–70): 163–276 and pls. I–VI, esp. 220–25. A new DJD edition of the text is in preparation. The text was edited in the Princeton edition by Jacob Milgrom, *PTSDSSP* 6b, 248–263; and an edition of the text is provided in Émile Puech, *La Croyance des Esséniens en la Vie Future: Immortalité, Résurrection, Vie Éternelle?* (2 vols.; EBib NS 21–22; Paris: Gabalda, 1993), 2:572–91. Major monographs on the text include Brooke, *Exegesis at Qumran*; and Annette Steudel, *Der Midrasch zur Eschatologie aus der Qumrangemeinde (4QMidrEschat^{ab}): Materielle Rekonstruktion, Textbestand, Gattung und traditions-*

have described it as some sort of midrash, most scholars today instead classify the text as a pesher.²² The poorly-preserved text incorporates numerous passages of Scripture, including materials from Deut 33; 2 Sam 7; and Pss 1, 2, and 5. It is represented by 26 fragments dating to the second half of the first century B.C.E.²³ Because of the poor state of preservation, most editors have been content to reconstruct one column and about a third of the next column without proposing theories of the precise arrangement of the remaining fragments.²⁴

As noted above, one of the psalms addressed in this text is Ps 2. As in Heb 1, the author of *4QFlorilegium* interprets Ps 2 in the context of discussion of 2 Sam 7. Indeed, the extant text of *4QFlorilegium* opens with a citation of 2 Sam 7:10b–11a: “And no enemy will oppress him anymore, and no son of deceit shall afflict him again, as formerly, from the day that I appointed judges over my people Israel” (I, 1–2).²⁵ The interpretation that immediately follows, though, is disconcerting—it addresses not the identity of the favored figure of 2 Sam 7:10b–11a but instead the “house” that God will build in the latter days, with further elaboration on the “sanctuary” via a citation of Exod 15:17b–18.

As the text stands, this elaboration is not what one would expect from this citation; no “house” language has been quoted in the extant text. One may assume, however, that “house” language was introduced in the previous (and sadly, lost) column or columns and that this is a

geschichtliche Einordnung des durch 4Q174 ('Florilegium') und 4Q175 ('Catena A') repräsentierten Werkes aus den Qumranfunden (STDJ 13; Leiden: Brill, 1994). For a brief overview, see Brooke, “Florilegium,” *EDSS* 1:297–98.

²² Timothy H. Lim, *Pesharim* (Companion to the Qumran Scrolls 3; London: Sheffield Academic, 2002), 48–51. See also his earlier article “Midrash Pesher in the Pauline Letters,” in *The Scrolls and the Scriptures: Qumran Fifty Years After* (ed. S.E. Porter and C.A. Evans; JSPSup 26; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1997), 280–92, in which he specifically critiques claims that *4QFlorilegium* is a “midrash pesher.”

²³ Brooke, “Florilegium,” 1:297.

²⁴ Important, but beyond the purview of the present discussion, is the recent proposal by Steudel that this manuscript is part of a longer work also extant in 4Q177. See Steudel, *Der Midrasch*; and Annette Steudel, “4QMidrEschat: ‘A Midrash on Eschatology’ (4Q174+4Q177),” in *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid 18–21 March, 1991* (2 vols.; ed. J. Trebelle Barrera and L. Vegas Montaner; STDJ 11; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 2:531–41. Steudel argues that col. I–VI of the manuscript are preserved in 4Q174 and col. VIII–XII in 4Q177 (“4QMidrEschat,” 2:532). For earlier considerations of this connection, see Strugnell, “Notes en marge,” 237. See Steudel, *Der Midrasch*, 152–57; and Steudel, “4QMidrEschat,” 2:536 on the possibility that three other manuscripts (4Q178, 4Q182, and 4Q183) also preserve the same text, though admittedly there is no extant textual overlap among these manuscripts.

²⁵ The reconstructed translations of 4Q174 are those of Milgrom.

dominant theme in this peshet. Furthermore, the commentator is more concerned with his eschatological discussion than with understanding the “house” language in a manner consistent with the context of 2 Sam 7, where it is the son of David, not God, who will build a temple as “house” (2 Sam 7:13). In *4QFlorilegium* the “house” that Yahweh will build is not the Davidic dynasty, as in 2 Sam 7 itself, but instead appears to be an eschatological temple, to appear in the coming days when Israel is no longer oppressed by its enemies.

Eight lines later (line 10)—and after explaining the “rest” promised in 2 Sam 7:11b—the commentator again addresses the expected topic of God building a “house” for David. Now the approach clearly is messianic. The author presents a conflated quotation of 2 Sam 7:11c with selected parts of vv. 12–14 in lines 10–11: “And Yahweh declares to you that he will build you a house [2 Sam 7:11c]. And I will raise up [והקימותי] your offspring after you [2 Sam 7:12b], and I will establish his royal throne forever. I will be a father to him, and he shall be a son to me [2 Sam 7:13b–14a].”

For the exegete of *4QFlorilegium*, all three of these citations point to the “shoot of David” [צמח דוד], who will be accompanied by the “interpreter of the Torah” (line 11). The former is further understood as the “booth of David” of Amos 9:11, which God “will raise up” [והקימותי].²⁶ The dynasty has fallen, but the coming figure will restore the dynasty and thus also Israel.

Introduction of the language “shoot of David” is significant because it does not appear here by means of a biblical quotation in the extant materials of col. I. Rather, the interpreter clearly is interpreting the favored offspring of 2 Sam 7 in light of Davidic messianic expectations evidenced elsewhere in the Qumran literature in 4Q161, 4Q252, and 4Q285. Géza Xeravits, while denying that the major thrust of *4QFlorilegium* is to describe this messianic figure (or, in his terms, a “positive eschatological protagonist”), still finds this passage extremely significant:

It is nevertheless clear that he considered at least 2 Sam. 7:12–14 as a biblical passage open to a “messianic interpretation,” i.e. prophesying the arrival of a positive eschatological protagonist (belonging to the house

²⁶ As noted by Milgrom, PTSDSSP 6b, 252 n21, this differs from the readings in the MT of Amos 9:11 and Mur 88 VIII, 26, which instead have אקים. See also Beate Ego, Armin Lange, Hermann Lichtenberger, and Kristin De Troyer, eds., *Minor Prophets* (Biblia Qumranica 3B; Leiden: Brill, 2005), 67.

of David). In doing so, the author made an interpretative step that was unfamiliar in the previous literature of Judaism.²⁷

Xeravits further notes that in 4Q252 V, 3–4 the “shoot of David” is also identified as the “righteous messiah” [משיח הצדק].²⁸ Though the latter phrase is not extant in 4QFlorilegium, the term משיח figures prominently in Ps 2:2 and appears in 4Q174 I, 19.

A *vacat* and an introductory formula (containing the word “midrash”) indicate that a new section begins in 4Q174 I, 14, with the first line of Ps 1:1 being the focus. In the subsequent discussion both the positive (“happy is the man”) and negative (“counsel of the wicked”) elements of the verse are addressed, utilizing Isa 8:11 (on avoiding ill paths) and Ezek 37:23 (read as describing the people of Ps 1:1 who are resolved against idols). Rather than addressing the positive element of this verse (“happy is the man”), attention turns to the evil way there rejected, “the counsel of the wicked.” The psalms’ “two ways” clearly have become those of the community as opposed to the ways of its opponents.

This approach to Ps 1:1 sets the stage perfectly for the citation of Ps 2:1–2 in lines 18–19. The opponents of the community are the raging nations and plotting peoples, arrayed against Yahweh and “his anointed” [משיחו]. The latter term is assumed to have been present in the lacuna at the beginning of line 19, the last line of this column, and its restoration seems certain given the contents of the citation in the previous line. Two parts are also missing from the rest of the line, but the interpretation anticipated above is present—the exegete finds here two opposing groups in the eschaton. Yahweh’s “anointed” are “the chosen ones of Israel in the latter days,” and the opening lines of the next column clarify that Belial leads the opposition, i.e., the revolting opponents of Ps 2:1–2, in an eschatological context.

Admittedly a direct connection in the peshet of line 19 between “his anointed” and “the chosen ones” is not extant, but the amount of space in the lacuna almost certainly must be filled with identification of the two groups found by the exegete in Ps 2:1–2. This is the case whether one assumes a direct correlation between “the chosen ones of Israel” (which is extant in the latter part of line 19) with a reconstructed reference to the “anointed,” or an alternate designation drawn

²⁷ Géza Xeravits, *King, Priest, Prophet: Positive Eschatological Protagonists of the Qumran Library* (STDJ 47; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 154–59, esp. 156.

²⁸ Xeravits, *King*, 156.

from elsewhere in Psalm 2, as George Brooke suggests with the phrase “those who take refuge in him” (from Ps 2:12).²⁹ Ultimately, though, the exegete is identifying “his anointed” of Ps 2:2 since that is the term being contrasted by the psalmist with the “nations.”

The exegete likely was not troubled by the shift from a singular “his anointed” in Ps 2:2 to a collective understanding of the “anointed” in his pesher, thereby taking the term in the corporate sense for the community. In support of this collective interpretation is the observation that a similar thing occurred earlier in line 14 with the interpretation of Ps 1:1. There the subject in the quotation is singular, admittedly speaking of a paradigmatic righteous person, yet the subsequent interpretation given to this figure is collective, thus the numerous plural terms used for the righteous through line 17. This seems clearly to set the stage for interpretation of “his anointed” in line 19 also as a collective. The interpretation of Ps 1:1 draws a clear contrast between two groups, one faithful and the other wicked; so the extant text of line 19 also implies a similar contrast between the rebellious nations and God’s anointed. Regardless of whether the term “anointed” is restored in the latter part of line 19, still functionally the group opposed by the nations must correspond to “his anointed.” Admittedly one cannot demonstrate that “anointed” is used of the community elsewhere in the Qumran corpus, but it is also the case that the term need not and does not exclusively refer to messianic figures, as for example it can be used in the plural to refer to biblical prophets collectively.³⁰

If this reading is correct, the exegete of 4Q174 has read Ps 2:2 to describe the eschatological struggle between the community and those led by Belial. Interesting, though, is that “his anointed” here seems *not* to be a messianic figure, though the text clearly knows two such figures, the “shoot of David” and the “interpreter of the Torah,” both of whom were mentioned earlier in the column and who seem to be in view in the remaining fragments of this text. (Also, it has been noted above that in 4Q252 the “shoot of David” is also called the “righteous messiah,”

²⁹ Brooke, *Exegesis at Qumran*, 93, 120–23.

³⁰ Brooke notes the absence of evidence elsewhere in the Qumran literature for understanding “his anointed” as a reference to the community, and he appears to reject the possibility of a collective interpretation of the term (*Exegesis at Qumran*, 120), though he later affirmed that approach (“Florilegium,” 1:298; see below). Xeravits has conveniently summarized the uses of מָשִׁיחַ in chart form in *King*, 132. Elsewhere (*King*, 55–59) it is evident that he does not find a messianic interpretation of Ps 2:2 here.

but that connection is not made here.) One may thus conclude that nothing extant in 4Q174 points to a messianic identification of Ps 2's "his anointed" by this interpreter. It is true that arguing that something is not present in lost lines is not the ideal path toward a valid thesis, but text is extant through line six of the next column, and by that point the association of one of these figures (one would expect the Davidic "shoot") has not been made with Ps 2:2. Instead, the exegete seems much more motivated to find there further talk of last days opposition to God's people.

George Brooke's treatment of this issue in his book *Exegesis at Qumran* and subsequent writings illustrates well the surprising nature of this passage. It should be noted first that Brooke is convinced that 2 Sam 7 and Ps 2 commonly were read together in the exegetical traditions of Second Temple Judaism, as evidenced here and in Heb 1:5. Brooke finds this "intertextual exegetical tradition" as the explanation for this pattern, not literary influence of *4QFlorilegium* on the author of Hebrews.³¹ This approach has been questioned—chiefly by Steudel, who denies that Ps 2 was interpreted as a messianic text in Second Temple Judaism—but Brooke's broader thesis is sound and is defended by John J. Collins in another essay in the present volume.³² There nevertheless remains a tension in Brooke's treatments of the interpretation of "his anointed" in *4QFlorilegium*, both in his earlier and recent writings on the subject.

In *Exegesis at Qumran*, Brooke offered the following comments about the unexpected nature of the exegete's treatment of "his anointed": "Surprisingly the pesher does not develop the figure of the king in Psalm 2 in terms of the messianic prince but, rather, it is absorbed in seeing how the psalms presage the condition of the community in the eschatological age."³³ Later, writing on this text in the *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, Brooke was even more explicit: "There is also some interest in the Davidic messiah, though 'his messiah' of Psalm 2:2 is interpreted to refer to 'the elect ones of Israel,' the community itself,

³¹ This approach is clearly articulated in Brooke's recent book *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005), 74–77.

³² See especially Annette Steudel, "Psalm 2 im antiken Judentum," in *Gottessohn und Menschensohn: Exegetische Studien zu zwei Paradigmen biblischer Intertextualität* (ed. Dieter Sänger; Biblisch-Theologische Studien 67; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2004), 189–97, and John J. Collins' contribution above.

³³ Brooke, *Exegesis at Qumran*, 156.

rather than the Davidic messiah.”³⁴ Yet in *Exegesis at Qumran*, Brooke also had found an *implied* messianic interpretation for the “anointed” of this verse. As noted above, Brooke argues that 2 Sam 7 and Ps 2 were read together as messianic texts via what he later called “intertextual exegetical tradition”; at this point he roots their association (along with the other texts cited in *4QFlorilegium*) in a shared liturgical context, perhaps related to the feast of Tabernacles.³⁵ Because of this existing tradition, the author of *4QFlorilegium* could evoke this full tradition simply by citing the opening lines of Ps 2 as an incipit.³⁶ Since Ps 2:6–7 speaks of a Davidic king and this was read messianically in conjunction with 2 Sam 7, Brooke implies that Ps 2:2 must also be understood similarly when it is cited in the pesher:

The pesher of Psalm 2 most likely continues in this vein [discussion of the whole community] with a description of the testing of the chosen ones of Israel in the latter days at the hands of the nations... The latter days are a time of refining, but a remnant, which we may suppose to be the community, will survive, purified and refined—to use the terms of the quotations from Daniel. It is just possible that “his anointed” (Ps 2:2) is taken up in reference to a messianic figure who will reign on the Lord’s holy hill and that this is done in terms of Exod 34:29, but nothing conclusive can be said on this score.³⁷

In a later publication Brooke made the point more explicitly:

Although there is little or nothing individualistic about the interpretation which survives at the top of 4Q174 IV, it seems likely not only that *mšyhw* is understood to refer to an individual, but also that it is a major part of the link between the midrash on Psalms 1 and 2 and the exegesis of Nathan’s oracle in 2 Samuel 7.³⁸

Ultimately Brooke is concerned to explain why 2 Sam 7 and Ps 2 are discussed together in multiple contexts, but this can be affirmed without demanding that “his anointed” in *4QFlorilegium* *must* have a messianic interpretation because of the traditional connection of the cited texts, even when the immediate context rules out such a meaning. It is preferable instead to assert that the traditional connection between

³⁴ Brooke, “Florilegium,” 1:298.

³⁵ Brooke, *Exegesis at Qumran*, 164, 174.

³⁶ Brooke, *Exegesis at Qumran*, 147.

³⁷ Brooke, *Exegesis at Qumran*, 158–59.

³⁸ Brooke, *Dead Sea Scrolls*, 75. Note that Brooke considers the first extant column with substantive manuscript evidence to be the third column of the text.

2 Sam 7 and Ps 2 almost certainly contributes to the citation of both in *4QFlorilegium* and is extremely fitting in the context of talk of the “shoot of David,” yet on this occasion the author of the pesher has not followed the expected interpretation of the key phrase in Ps 2:2.

This lack of explicit correlation between the “anointed” of Ps 2:2 in 4Q174 is particularly striking when it is compared with how this verse is interpreted in the New Testament texts cited above, particularly Acts 4:25 and Heb 1:5. Both of these NT interpretations share a key element with 4Q174 but depart on the identification of the “anointed.” In Acts 4:25, the enemy nations become those who violently oppose the “anointed,” a motif also found in the scrolls, but in Acts the opposition is to Jesus as the particular person understood as the “anointed one” of the psalm. In Heb 1:5, Ps 2:7 is read in conjunction with 2 Sam 7:14, and because the author displays in Heb 5:5–6 that he finds absolute consistency in the identification of the figures addressed in Pss 2 and 110, allowing him to find the same figure addressed in verses 1 and 4 of Ps 110, by extension it is safe to assume that he also understands Jesus as the “anointed” of Ps 2:2 though he does not cite that particular verse. In the NT, Jesus is that Davidic messianic figure, whereas in *4QFlorilegium* the eschatological faithful are the “anointed.”

As admitted above, any proposal for the interpretation of “his anointed” in 4Q174 must remain tentative because so much of the text has been lost. One might consider some further issues, though, that would support the reading proposed here.

It should be obvious that the New Testament associations of Jesus with the “anointed” are fitting for early Christian theology. Jesus becomes the figure specially associated with God and the Davidic messiah of the tribe of Judah. The early church can read Jesus’ passion into the opposition of Ps 2:1 when helpful, or it too can find in this psalm an eschatological struggle as does the author of Revelation. The former especially is understandable because Jesus’ identity and mission as messiah are inseparable from his death in mainstream Christian theology. Even in Revelation, where one might see the closest parallels to the interpretation of Ps 2 in *4QFlorilegium*, still the understanding of Jesus is dominated by the imagery of “the lamb who was slain.”

As for the Qumran community, such a conception will not work. Certainly many scholars have been rightly cautious in warning against the ideas that messianic conceptions reflected in the scrolls are static, consistent, or uniform. The question goes beyond asking how messianic ideas changed over time to asking if there even was such a thing

as an “orthodox” view on messianism in the community.³⁹ Regardless, the question that must be asked in light of the present discussion is whether one can ever speak of an “oppressed” Davidic messiah at Qumran? Such a question must immediately be nuanced in two ways. First, the “messiah” under consideration is only the royal, militaristic figure, so questions about a possible suffering priest in 4Q541 are not relevant to this discussion. Second, “oppressed” may not be the ideal term for this discussion, though it is appropriate for the use of Ps 2:2 in *4QFlorilegium*. Ultimately the point is that at Qumran the Davidic figure is sent by God or arises to *deliver* God’s people from oppressors; suffering is not part of the royal messianic job description at Qumran as it is in the New Testament.

In *4QFlorilegium*, the “oppression” theme is developed by the exegete; it is implied in the citations of 2 Sam 7:10b–11a and Ps 2:1–2, and it is explicit in the explanation of the latter in II, 1–2, which speaks of a “time of refining.” Also, it should be noted that in *4QFlorilegium*, the Davidic ‘messianic’ interpretation of 2 Sam 7 is linked not with Ps 2 but with Amos 9:11, a passage also cited in the context of messianic discussion in CD VII, 16 but used differently there (where it refers to the restoration of the books of the prophets). The closest thematic link between 2 Sam 7 and Ps 2 in the extant text of *4QFlorilegium* concerns oppression by enemies; admittedly relief from God is promised in I, 7–11, but God is said to act, with no mention of a messianic agent yet introduced at that point.

Since Ps 2:2 is not elsewhere quoted in the extant Qumran corpus, unfortunately one may not say more about patterns of its interpretation in the scrolls. One might consider its use in Jewish texts outside Qumran, however, as potentially illustrating Jewish as opposed to distinctively Christian interpretations of the passage. *Sibylline Oracles* 3.663 allows such an opportunity.⁴⁰ Though this text is significantly later and is the product of Egyptian Judaism, the similarities with Qumran thought in this particular section may be instructive.

In a time of eschatological woes, the sibyl writes that God will send a “King from the sun” (line 652) who will intervene in the chaos. John

³⁹ See Mason, ‘*You Are a Priest Forever*,’ 70–82, for reflection on these issues.

⁴⁰ This possible allusion is cited in Steve Delamarter, *A Scripture Index to Charlesworth’s The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2002), 23. See also the introduction, translation, and notes in the edition of John J. Collins, “Sibylline Oracles,” in *OTP* 1:317–472.

J. Collins argues that this is not to be understood as a Jewish messianic figure but rather as a Ptolemaic king, portrayed in a way akin to the presentation of Cyrus in Second Isaiah.⁴¹ More relevant, though, is the sibyl's discussion of the final assault of Israel's foes. Perhaps alluding to Ps 2:1–2, the author writes that the kings are angry (but with each other) and launch an attack against “this land,” i.e. Israel, its people, and specifically against the temple (lines 660–68), prompting God's verbal response and use of overwhelming force (here without a messianic intermediary).

This is not a certain allusion, but if it be deemed dependent on Ps 2, then one might find two important parallels to use of Ps 2:2 in *4QFlorilegium* as argued above: an emphasis on the oppression motif against God's people (echoing interpretation of “his anointed” in *4QFlorilegium*), but identification of the “anointed” with God's people and *not* with a messianic figure.

⁴¹ John J. Collins, *The Scepter and the Star: The Messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Ancient Literature* (ABRL; New York: Doubleday, 1995), 38–40. One might still be intrigued, though, by the language of lines 655–56: “he will not do all these things by his private plans but in obedience to the noble teachings of the great God” (*OTP* 376). This comment is reminiscent of the statement in Isa 11:1–5 and interpreted in 4Q161 that the Davidic messiah “will not judge by what his eyes see” but instead will depend on the spirit of Yahweh.

INTERPRETING SCRIPTURE THROUGH SCRIPTURE:
EXEGESIS BASED ON LEXEMATIC ASSOCIATION IN THE
DEAD SEA SCROLLS AND THE PAULINE EPISTLES

Friedrich Avemarie
Philipps-Universität Marburg

I. INTRODUCTION: *GEZERAH SHAVAH* IN PRE-RABBINIC EXEGESIS?

The famous “Thirteen *Middot*” of R. Yishmael, a catalogue of exegetical techniques of the early rabbinic tradition, contains in second place the *gezerah shavah*.¹ The literal meaning of this expression seems to be something like “equal ordinance,” and technically it designates a specific type of inference by analogy. Information on legal peculiarities that is lacking from the wording of a given biblical injunction can be supplied from a remote biblical text if there is some literal overlap between the two passages, which warrants the assumption that they are concerned with analogous or identical legal matters.²

In today’s biblical scholarship, it is quite customary to use the term *gezerah shavah* to cover a much broader range, which, departing from

¹ *Sifra Wayyiqra*, Prologue 1 (1a Weiss). A list of seven middot attributed to Hillel, which likewise includes the *gezerah shavah*, is recorded in *t. Sanh.* 7:11 (427 Zuckermann).—For proofreading my English, I wish to thank my student Mr Andrew Doole.

² Cf. S. Bialoblocki, “Hermeneutik,” *Encyclopaedia Judaica [German]* 7: 1181–94; 7:1187–89; L. Jacobs, “Hermeneutics,” *Encyclopaedia Judaica [English]* 8:366–72; 8:367f.; G. Stemmer, *Einleitung in Talmud und Midrasch* (8th ed.; Munich: Beck, 1992), 28f. All of these authors mention also several restrictions which the rabbis imposed on the application of *gezerah shavah* (conclusions derived by *gezerah shavah* must be supported by oral tradition; the word on which the inference is based must be semantically superfluous in its immediate scriptural context). These restrictions seem to be of amoraic origin and therefore comparatively late (cf. Jacobs, *op. cit.* 368), but they give an impression of how much the rabbinic employment of this technique was formalized, and thus caution against an indiscriminate application of the term to non-rabbinic forms of exegesis.—On the similarities and differences between *gezerah shavah* and *heqqesh* see Bialoblocki, *op. cit.* 1184, and Jacobs, *op. cit.* 368. The reason why biblical scholarship (see below) preferred to borrow the term *gezerah shavah* rather than the term *heqqesh* seems to be that unlike the *gezerah shavah*, the *heqqesh* does not figure among the thirteen (and seven) *middot*. For further references, see P.S. Alexander, “Rabbinic Judaism and the New Testament,” *ZNW* 74 (1983): 237–246, here 242, n. 6.

rabbinic literature, encompasses also the New Testament, the Qumran texts and other early post-biblical writings, despite the obvious anachronism.³ In fact, George Brooke's seminal monograph on *4QFlorilegium*, published in 1985, devoted a whole chapter to showing that some of the basic interpretive techniques of the rabbis were already familiar to Jewish exegetes of the late Second Temple period, despite of their lack of a pertinent technical terminology,⁴ and Brooke's insights were widely welcomed in the scholarly world.⁵ True, Qumran scholarship has nowadays become much more cautious about borrowing rabbinic or other foreign terminology than it was a generation ago.⁶ However, there must have been a reason, some striking similarity, which prompted the impression that patterns of interpretation such as the *gezerah shavah* were already current among pre-rabbinic exegetes. This striking similarity is the pivotal point of the question which the present contribution

³ It may suffice here to say that two doctoral dissertations which I reviewed this summer as external assessor employed the term *gezerah shavah* as if this were a matter of course; one of them with respect to the epistles of Paul and the other one, a study in reception history, in reference to the Dead Sea Scrolls. For further references see below n. 32.

⁴ G.J. Brooke, *Exegesis at Qumran: 4QFlorilegium in its Jewish Context* (JSOTSup 29; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985), 1–79.

⁵ Cf. S. Holm-Nielsen, review of G.J. Brooke, *Exegesis at Qumran: 4QFlorilegium in its Jewish Context*, *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 111 (1986): 416f.; J. Murphy-O'Connor, review of G.J. Brooke, *Exegesis at Qumran: 4QFlorilegium in its Jewish Context*, *Revue Biblique* 94 (1987): 296f. (“convincingly”); J.C. VanderKam, review of G.J. Brooke, *Exegesis at Qumran: 4QFlorilegium in its Jewish Context*, *CBQ* 48 (1986): 554; H.G.M. Williamson, review of G.J. Brooke, *Exegesis at Qumran: 4QFlorilegium in its Jewish Context*, *Vetus Testamentum* 36 (1986): 374f. A rather critical stance on Brooke's approach is, however, taken by J.A. Fitzmyer, review of G.J. Brooke, *Exegesis at Qumran: 4QFlorilegium in its Jewish Context*, *JBL* 107 (1988): 130–131, mainly for the reason that Brooke derives his own interpretive framework from other sources rather than from *4QFlorilegium* itself. My thanks are due to George Brooke for having drawn my attention to these early reactions to his work.

⁶ Personal communication by virtually all the senior participants of the Leiden meeting, including Professor Brooke himself. That the same caution should be applied when taking Qumran terminology as a heuristic device in the assessment of the biblical exegesis of, e.g., New Testament authors, is rightly emphasized concerning the term *peshet*, by T. Lim, *Holy Scripture in the Qumran Commentaries and Pauline Letters* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), 123–139. However, in reference to 11QT^a LI 17–18, where the death penalty for a judge who accepts bribes is apparently inferred from a combination of Deut 1:17 with Deut 18:22, M. Bernstein can speak of “linguistic analogy (similar to the rabbinic *gezerah shavah*),” see M.J. Bernstein, “Interpretation of Scripture,” *EDSS* 1:376–383: 381. In treating the same passage, L.H. Schiffman, *The Courtyards of the House of Israel: Studies on the Temple Scroll*, (ed. F. García Martínez; STDJ 75; Leiden: Brill, 2008), 468, prefers to speak more generally and cautiously of “the classic form of midrash”. My thanks to Professor Schiffman for this reference.

pursues: What precisely is it that makes a Pauline or a Qumran exegesis resemble a *gezerah shavah*, and how far does this similarity extend?

For the purpose of clarification, let us first briefly turn to the rabbinic employment of *gezerah shavah*. The example by which this technique is illustrated in the list of the “Thirteen *Middot*” deals with a problem concerning the laws of deposit and custody. The biblical basis of these laws is found in Exod 22:6–14, a section which specifies the extent of a depositary’s liability in case the deposited object has been damaged, stolen or lost. According to rabbinic understanding, the former part of this section refers to an “unpaid depositary” (שומר חנם, vv. 6–7), whereas the latter deals with a “depositary who receives payment” (שומר שכר, vv. 11–14). For both types of deposit, the biblical legislation provides that in specific cases the depositary can evade the liability of repayment of a damaged or stolen object by testifying on oath that it was not him who caused the loss. However, the relevant wording in Exod 22 is not wholly identical in both cases. Whilst the unpaid depositary must be “brought before the Lord, as to whether he has not laid his hand on his neighbour’s property” (v. 7), it is said in the case of a paid depositary that “an oath of the Lord must be taken between the two of them (i.e., the depositary and the owner), as to whether he has not laid his hand on his neighbour’s property” (v. 10). The crucial difference lies in the words “between the two of them” (בין שניהם) in the case of the paid depositary, since from here the rabbis infer that only the owner of the object in question is entitled to receive restitution, but not his heirs.⁷ This, however, leads to the question of whether in the case of an unpaid depositary the heirs might, in fact, have a legitimate claim to restitution. According to the “Thirteen *Middot*” tradition, this question can be denied on the basis of *gezerah shavah*:

(An inference by) *gezerah shavah*, how (does it work)? It is said in the case of a depositary who is paid, *whether he has not laid his hand on his neighbour’s property* (Exod 22:10), and it is said in the case of an unpaid depositary, *whether he has not laid his hand on his neighbour’s property* (Exod 22:7). Just as a depositary who is paid—in whose case it said, *whether he has not laid his hand*—is exempt from (claims of) the heirs,

⁷ This inference is made explicit in *Mekhilta de-Rabbi Yishmael*, Nez. 16, on Exod 22:10 (303 Horovitz/Rabin): “*Between the two of them*—this excludes the heirs.”

also an unpaid depositary—in whose case it is said, *whether he has not laid his hand—must be exempt from* (claims of) the heirs.⁸

The logic of the argument is evident. The identical portions in the wording of v. 7 and v. 10 allow the inference that the detail absent in the former verse must be considered to be implied on account of its occurrence in the latter.

This exegetical procedure seems to involve two important presuppositions: first, that there is a far-reaching coherence within the text of the Torah, and second, that Scripture expresses itself economically and therefore tends to avoid redundancies. On the former assumption, the rabbis could combine scriptural passages which treated cognate subject matter even if they occurred at rather distant places, and on the latter, they could fill the informational lacunae they perceived in the wording of a given passage by recourse to other, sufficiently explicit biblical formulations.

As regards the Dead Sea scrolls and the New Testament, the combination of different scriptural passages on the basis of lexematic overlaps is found in both bodies of literature, and occasionally, conspicuous changes in the wording of a passage show very clearly that the lexematic association was made consciously. As we shall see, however, these combinations of biblical quotations could serve quite different purposes, the filling of a semantic gap being just one function besides others. And this seems to me the main reason for which one should avoid applying the term *gezerah shavah* to Qumran and New Testament exegesis—apart from the fact that the rabbinic use of *gezerah shavah* was essentially limited to halakhic exegesis⁹ whereas the Qumran and Pauline texts to which we shall now turn deal, rabbinically speaking, with haggadic matters. We shall therefore prefer to speak more generally of exegesis which is based on “lexematic association.”¹⁰

⁸ *Sifra Wayyiqra*, Prologue 4 (1c Weiss). For a similar translation, see G.A. Porton, *Sifra: An Analytical Translation* (ed. J. Neusner; BJS 138; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988), 1:52.

⁹ On the debate about whether there is a “halakhic midrash” in the Qumran texts at all, see A. Shemesh, “Scriptural Interpretations in the Damascus Document and their Parallels in Rabbinic Midrash,” in *The Damascus Document: A Centennial of Discovery* (ed. J.M. Baumgarten, E.G. Chazon, A. Pinnick; STDJ 34; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 161–175.

¹⁰ Similar terminological suggestions are made by Bernstein, “Hermeneutics,” 380f. (“thematic association,” “linguistic analogy”) and G.J. Brooke, “Biblical Interpretation in the Qumran Scrolls and in the New Testament,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years after their Discovery* (ed. L.H. Schiffman, E. Tov and J.C. VanderKam; Jerusalem: Israel

II. ASSOCIATIVE EXEGESIS IN THE WRITINGS OF THE QUMRAN COMMUNITY¹¹

George Brooke, who in his monograph on *4QFlorilegium* did not yet have any reservations about terminological borrowings, considered *gezerah shavah* to be in fact the most important exegetical device in this fragmentary piece of “Qumran midrash.”¹² Within the one-and-a-half best-preserved columns of the manuscript, he counted no less than six instances,¹³ and pointed to a good many more cases noticed by others in further writings of the *yahad*, such as *11QMelchizedek*, the *War Scroll* and the *Damascus Document*.¹⁴

Admittedly, the lexematic associations which were assumed to underlie these combined quotations are not always explicit, and in some cases it seems even doubtful whether at all they played a role in exegetical reasoning. Nevertheless, the core of the material seems to provide evidence of sufficient clarity. We will discuss here a selection of these instances in order to determine to what extent the lexematic associations in the respective Qumran writings can in fact be compared to the rabbinic *gezerah shavah*.

1) Quotations of 2 Sam 7:11–14 and Amos 9:11 in 4QFlor I 10–13

[And] the Lord [de]clares to you that he will build you a house (1Sam 7:11b), and I will raise up (והקימותי) your seed after you (7:12aβ), and I will establish the throne of his kingdom [for ev]er (7:12b+13b). I shall be a father to him and he shall be a son to me (7:14a). This (refers to) the branch of David, who will arise with the Interpreter of the Law who

Exploration Society, 2000), 60–73, here 70f. (“exegesis through catchword,” “catchword techniques”).

¹¹ To maintain a clear focus, I shall limit myself to writings which are commonly attributed to the *yahad*; therefore, other texts, such as the *Genesis Apocryphon* and *Temple Scroll*, will not be treated here.

¹² Cf. Brooke, *Exegesis*, 140 and 166; for Brooke’s suggestion to define the genre of 4QFlor as “Qumran midrash” cf. *ibid.* 149–156, and the explicit use of the word מדרש in 4QFlor I 14.

¹³ Cf. *ibid.* 166 and 134–149.

¹⁴ Cf. *ibid.* 279–323, *passim*. 4QMMT, which was not yet published at that time, contains a combination of Lev 19:19 and Deut 22:9 (both relating to laws of *kilayim*) in B 77–78 and possibly a combination of Deut 31:29 with another verse not preserved in the fragments in C 11–12; cf. G.J. Brooke, “The Explicit Presentation of Scripture in 4QMMT,” in *Legal Texts and Legal Issues: Proceedings of the Second Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Cambridge 1995, published in Honour of J.M. Baumgarten* (ed. M. Bernstein, F. García Martínez and J. Kampen; STDJ 23, Leiden: Brill), 67–88: 75–77.

[will rise up] in Zi[on in] the [l]ast days, as it is written: *And I shall raise up (והקימותי) the fallen hut of David* (Amos 9:11aβ). This (refers to) *the fallen hut of David*, which he will set up to save Israel.¹⁵

The biblical basis of the two quotations in this passage is easily identifiable, but their wording differs considerably from the MT, and the possibility cannot be dismissed that it differed also from the text of the Bible scrolls used by the Qumran community.¹⁶ The omission of 2 Sam 7:12aγ, “*who will come forth from your body*,” probably has theological reasons, as its obvious reference to Solomon is at odds with the *Florilegium’s* eschatological concern. Theological reasoning may also account for the omission of 2 Sam 7:13a, “*He shall build a house for my name*,” for it corresponds to the *Florilegium’s* tendency to accord the decisive eschatological activity to God rather than to the messiah. The fusing of 2 Sam 7:12b with 13b and further omissions, such as that of 2 Sam 7:12aα, “*When your days are full and you lie down with your fathers*,” and Amos 9:11aα, “*On that day*,” are perhaps simply due to scribal economy.¹⁷

Within the wording that is positively taken from Amos 9:11, the most conspicuous divergence from the MT (and the only difference which amounts to more than a spelling variant) is the one which also provides the strongest clue for a conscious lexematic association behind the two quotations. It is the form וְהִקְיִמוֹתִי (instead of the אָקִים in MT and MurXII VIII 26), which in identical spelling appears also in 2 Sam 7:12 as quoted before. To be sure, we cannot know whether it was *ad hoc* that the author of the *Florilegium* introduced this grammatical variant.¹⁸ Since the same form occurs also in the quotation of Amos 9:11 in CD VII 16, it seems possible that this was simply the wording of

¹⁵ The translation is taken, with some minor modifications, from F. García Martínez and E.J.C. Tigchelaar, eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* (2 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 1:353.

¹⁶ The possibility of a ‘Verwendung älterer Texttraditionen’ is, however, admitted by Annette Steudel, *Der Midrasch zur Eschatologie aus der Qumrangemeinde (4QMidrEschat^{a,b}): Materielle Rekonstruktion, Textbestand, Gattung und traditions-geschichtliche Einordnung des durch 4Q174 (“Florilegium”) und 4Q177 (“Catena A”) repräsentierten Werkes aus den Qumranfunden* (STD) 13; Leiden: Brill, 1994), 137.

¹⁷ Cf. Steudel, *Midrasch*, 140.

¹⁸ W.M. Schniedewind, “The Davidic Dynasty and Biblical Interpretation in Qumran Literature,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years after their Discovery* (ed. L.H. Schiffman, E. Tov and J.C. VanderKam; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2000), 82–91, here 88, assumes that the variant “comes from a familiarity with 2 Sam 7:12.”

the Bible text that was familiar to the Qumran community.¹⁹ However, even in this case the occurrence of the same form in both quotations is significant, as the notion of ‘raising up’ is central to the message which the *Florilegium* draws from these texts.

As to the question of early analogies to the rabbinic *gezerah shavah*, the present passage seems to make quite a good case, for in juxtaposition with 2 Sam 7:11–14, Amos 9:11 does not merely give some additional illustration of a topic that could be as easily developed without such a further citation. There is indeed a surplus of meaning in Amos 9:11 which corresponds to a deficit in the quotation of 2 Sam 7, a deficit which by the very combination of the two quotations becomes apparent. Whereas 2 Sam 7:11–14 contains a promise, and nothing but a promise, Amos 9:11 additionally covers the possibility that circumstances may emerge which jeopardize the promise, and affirms that even then the promise remains valid: Even if the “throne of his kingdom,” which was established “for ever,” “has fallen,” God will nevertheless “raise it up.” The *Florilegium* emphasises this by adding the explicit notion of Israel’s “rescue” (להושיע את ישראל).²⁰

2) Quotations from biblical war legislation in 1QM X 1–8

[...] our camps (מחנינו) and to k[e]ep ourselves from any immodest nakedness (מכול ערות דבר רע, Deut 23:10, 15b). And also he told us that you will be in our midst (בקרבנו, Deut 7:21b α), great and terrible God (7:21b β), to plunder all our enemies before us (אויבינו לפנינו), Deut 23:15a). And he taught us from ancient times for our generations, saying: When you approach (בקרבתכם) for battle, the priest is to stand up and speak to the nation (Deut 20:2) saying: Listen, Israel, today you are approaching (קרבים) the battle (למלחמה) against your enemies (20:3a). Do not be afraid, and may your heart not fail; do not fe[ar and do no]t tremble in front of them (20:3b), for your God goes with you to do battle (להלחם) for you against your enemies (אויביכם) to save (להושיע) you

¹⁹ It should be noted, however, that וְהַקִּימוֹתֵי in Amos 9:11 would be incompatible with the words בְּיוֹם הַהוּא, by which אֲקִים is preceded in the MT (MurXII: הוּא אֲקִים). In the Qumran caves, Bible manuscripts covering Amos 9:11 unfortunately have not been preserved; see B. Ego, A. Lange, H. Lichtenberger, K. De Troyer, eds., *Minor Prophets* (Biblia Qumranica, vol. 3B; Leiden, 2005), 67.

²⁰ It would be tempting to try to reformulate this piece of exegesis according to the pattern of a rabbinic midrash, proceeding perhaps from the question of whether the promise of 2 Sam 7 is still in force in view of the fact that the throne of David has been overthrown. I am not going to embark on such an exercise, but I think one could easily come to a result that would very much look like a *gezerah shavah*, except that 4QFlor is not concerned with halakhah but with the “end of days.”

(20:4). Our [of]ficers shall speak to all those in readiness for battle, so that they strengthen those with resolute hearts through God's power, and that those whose heart melts return, and that they strengthen the concord among all the intrepid heroes. For this is what you s[aid] by Moses' hand, saying: *When there is a war (מלחמה) in your land against the foe (הצר) who oppresses you, you shall blo[w] the trumpets and you shall be remembered before God, and you shall be saved (נושעתם) from your enemies (מאויביכם, Num 10:9).*²¹

This text brings together quite a number of citations and allusions. The most obvious ones are the passages from Deut 20:2–4 in lines 2–4 and from Num 10:9 in lines 6–8. In both cases the sources of the citation can easily be discerned, and the deviations from the textual tradition of the Hebrew Bible are insignificant.²² Words that conspicuously occur in both quotations are מלחמה, “battle,” אויב, “enemy,” and הושיע, “save,” which makes it seem likely that the combination is based on lexematic association. However, nothing suggests that they are meant to clarify each other mutually. The notion of God's saving intervention in Israel's warfare, which is the focal idea in this text, is present in both quotations. Further prominent motifs are that of the priestly encouragement in Deut 20:2–4 and that of the sounding of the trumpets in Num 10:9. The juxtaposition of the quotations would seem to offer an occasion to intertwine these two motifs, so as to interpret, for instance, the sounding of the trumpets as a means to strengthen Israel's hearts. But there are no such allusions in the text. The purpose of the lexematic association seems to be a simple accumulation of biblical materials illustrating a common topic, viz. God's saving presence in Israel's battle. Closer resemblance to the rabbinic *gezerah shavah* pattern is not discernible.

The *first two lines* of the passage contain a brief quotation of Deut 7:21, which is introduced as a speech of either God or Moses,²³ along with fragmentary allusions to the laws concerning the purity of the war camp as specified in Deut 23:10–15. The phrase מכול ערות דבר רע is a blending of מכול דבר רע in Deut 23:10 and ערות דבר in Deut 23:15,

²¹ The translation is adopted, with minor modifications, from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*, 1:129.

²² Cf. P.R. Davies, *IQM, the War Scroll from Qumran: Its Structure and History* (BibOr 32; Rome: Biblical Institute, 1977), 93.

²³ ‘On ne sait pas qui sont ceux qui devront prononcer les premières lignes’, J. van der Ploeg, *Le rouleau de la guerre, traduit et annoté, avec une introduction* (STDJ 2, Leiden: Brill, 1959), 135.

and the requirement of keeping the camp free from defilement, which is pointedly expressed by this phrase, is also the central topic in line 1 of column X. With the origin of the quotations (or allusions) thus clearly identifiable, one might have the impression that Deut 7:21 is adduced here in order to explore the purity requirement from a *theological* angle, as God's presence in the camp would obviously provide a strong reason for banishing defilement, and then one might, here again, ponder the possibility of an exegetical pattern similar to *gezerah shavah* being involved. However, in order to introduce the notion of God's presence it would not have been necessary to quote Deut 7:21, for that notion appears also in Deut 23:15. The same holds for the motif of the enemies' defeat. Hence, the quotation of Deut 7:21 adds nothing that could not have been gained from Deut 23:15 itself. So here again we may conclude that in all likelihood the combination of citations is not intended to uncover hidden implications in the biblical text. What remains is once more an accumulation of pertinent biblical materials for the purpose of illustration. Additional lexematic associations with the subsequent quotations in column X are established by the root קרב (Deut 7:21) and the noun אויב (Deut 23:15).

3) Quotations of Ps 1:1 and Isa 8:11 in 4QFlor I 14–16

Midrash of *Blessed [the] man who does not walk in the counsel of the wicked* (Ps 1:1). The interpretation of this wor[d: they are] those who turn aside from the path (סרי מדרך) of [the wicked,] as it is written in the book of Isaiah, the prophet, for [the] last days: *And it happened that with a strong [hand he turned aside me aside (ויסירני) from walking of the path (בדרך) of] this people* (Isa 8:11).²⁴

The first quotation in this passage is almost identical with the MT of the first hemistich of Ps 1:1, whilst the second, even though barely half-preserved, can be clearly identified as originating from Isa 8:11. Unfortunately, the damaged wording cannot be reconstructed with certainty, but the length of the lacuna in line 15 suggests that it cannot have differed very much from the MT and from 1QIsa^a.²⁵ The use of the participle סרי in the interpretive clause which links the two quotations

²⁴ Translation according to García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*, 1:353–355.

²⁵ Cf. Steudel, *Midrasch*, 47. Brooke, *Exegesis*, 116, suggests a restoration according to 1QIsa^a on the basis of the spelling of בחזקת, which in 4QFlor and 1QIsa^a is identical. However, the MT has the same spelling.

furthermore allows the conjecture that the verb which in the quotation designated the activity of God was rather a *hiph'il* form of סור, like יִסְרְנוּ in 1QIsa^a,²⁶ than a *qal* form of יסר, as יִסְרְנִי in the MT. And if that much, at least, can be said about the text of this quotation, it follows that its wording cannot have overlapped at any point with that of the preceding citation of Ps 1:1, whereby the possibility of a lexematic association at first sight seems slight.

Surprisingly enough, though, a connection by lexematic association can nevertheless be assumed to underlie the present exegesis, for a crucial expression in the Isaiah quotation, the noun דרך, belongs to the *second* hemistich of Ps 1:1, which is not cited here, but an allusion to which may easily be implied. The importance of this expression for the present exegesis is manifest by its employment in the interpretive clause which connects the two quotations. Apparently, the exegete in this case felt free to dispense with a full citation of his biblical text and preferred to hint at a lexematic association by mere implication.

Furthermore, Isa 8:11 seems to contain a surplus of meaning over against Ps 1:1 and thus may have offered itself for an understanding of hidden implications in the latter verse, so that here again the exegetical approach may have been analogous to that of a *gezerah shavah*. Whilst Ps 1:1, at least on the surface, speaks only of a person who *keeps himself afar* from the sinners and the wicked, Isa 8:11 conveys that this state is the result of a *removal* of this person from the sinners and the wicked at the hands of God, i.e., theologically speaking, the result of repentance or conversion. Thus, by quoting Isa 8:11 as interrelated with Ps 1:1 on the basis of the common notion of “the path (of the wicked),” *4QFlorilegium* is able to show that Ps 1:1, too, refers to “those who turn aside from the path of the wicked,” as it says in the bridging comment which follows the quotation. The underlying exegetical operation is not just an accumulation of similar biblical materials, but an attempt to uncover a hidden meaning of a given verse by the help of another.

²⁶ The transcription of M. Burrows (ed.), *The Isaiah Manuscript and the Habakkuk Commentary* (DSSMM; 2 vols.; New Haven: ASOR, 1950), viii, reads יִסְרְנִי, but the reading in the manuscript is clearly יִסְרְנוּ, cf. Brooke, *Exegesis*, 235, n. 97.

4) *Quotations of Amos 5:26–27, Amos 9:11 and Num 24:17 in CD VII 13–21*

But those who held firmly (to the covenant) escaped to the land of the north, as he said, *And I will expel your king's booth* (סכות מלככם) *and the kiyyun of your images* (Amos 5:26a) *from my tent*²⁷ (to) *Damascus* (5:27aβ). The books of the Torah are the 'booth of the king' (סוכת המלך), as he said, *I will raise up the fallen booth of David* (סוכת דוד, Amos 9:11aβ). The 'king' is the assembly, and the 'kiyyun of images' are the books of the prophets, whose words Israel despised. And the 'star' (והכוכב) is the interpreter of the Torah who came to Damascus, as it is written: *A star* (כוכב) *stepped forth out of Jacob and a staff* (שבט) *arose out of Israel* (Num 24:17a). The 'staff' is the prince of all the congregation, and when he arises, *he will destroy all the sons of Seth* (24:17βb).²⁸

Lexematic overlap establishes here quite a conspicuous link between Amos 5:26 and Amos 9:11, and it lies also behind the subsequent citation of Num 24:17. The letters of סכות in Amos 5:26 (which in all likelihood was the name of a Babylonian deity)²⁹ are rearranged to form סוכת,³⁰ and סוכת המלך opens the way for the association with סוכת דוד in Amos 9:11. The "star," which provides the clue for adducing Num 24:17, does not appear in the foregoing quotation of Amos 5:26–27, but figures in a section that has been omitted from it, viz. v. 26b (*"the star of your God . . ."*). By mentioning the "star" the *Damascus Document* indeed refers to something implied in the preceding scriptural passages³¹ and evident from the deictic introductory formula והכוכב הוא וכו', where the article signals that it expects its readers to know which "star" is being discussed.

However, the juxtaposition of these various quotations does not seem to be inspired by an attempt at mutual interpretation. The exegetical technique that is applied is allegory, and nothing else. Since both Amos 9:11 and Num 24:17 are texts which strongly draw on metaphorical

²⁷ Note the reading of מאהלי instead of the MT's מהלאה.

²⁸ Translation by J.M. Baumgarten and D. Schwartz, quoted with minor modifications from J.H. Charlesworth, ed., *Damascus Document, War Scroll, and Related Documents* (The Dead Sea Scrolls, 2 vol.; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1995), 2:27.

²⁹ Cf. M. Stol, "Sakkuth," *DDD* 1364f.

³⁰ The same rearrangement also informs the Septuagint's rendering (τῆν σκιαν τοῦ Μολοχ).

³¹ Cf. J.G. Campbell, *The Use of Scripture in the Damascus Document 1–8, 19–20* (BZAW 228; Berlin: De Gruyter, 1995), 149.

language and therefore offer themselves for an allegorical reading, it is possible that they were used in order to show that Amos 5:26–27 (where the crucial catchwords “booth” and “star” recur) should be read allegorically as well. In this particular sense, the two citations would of course contribute towards an adequate interpretation of Amos 5:26–27, but the function of a hermeneutical model or guideline which they would assume in this case would rest on a logic which is entirely different from that of the *gezerah shavah*'s way of supplying missing information.

For a short summary of what can be shown from this choice of Qumran texts, we may note that lexematic association indeed plays a role in the exegesis of the *yahad*, and that it can serve very different purposes, such as accumulative illustration (as in IQM X), hermeneutical guidance (as in CD VII) or inferential clarification of implicit meaning (as in 4QFlor I 10–13 and 14–16). It is, however, only the last of these functions which may be in a proper sense regarded as analogous to that of the rabbinic *gezerah shavah*. It need not therefore be emphasized again that simply borrowing this rabbinic term as a designation for any kind of pre-rabbinic exegesis would be ill-advised.

With this in mind, we turn to the apostle Paul.

III. ASSOCIATIVE EXEGESIS IN THE PAULINE EPISTLES

Among the Pauline writings commonly regarded as authentic, Romans, Corinthians, and Galatians all contain biblical quotations. Combinations of two or more quotations occur in eight chapters of Romans (3, 4, 9–11, 12, 13 and 15), three chapters of 1 Corinthians (3, 9 and 15), two chapters of 2 Corinthians (6 and 9) and two chapters of Galatians (3 and 4). For the most part, the biblical materials within these clusters have been chosen on account of their thematic pertinence. Lexematic associations are not very frequent; roughly estimated, there is perhaps half a dozen instances. In some of these cases, however, previous scholarship has indeed assumed that the exegesis follows the pattern of *gezerah shavah*. Since the foremost example is Rom 4:3–8,³² we shall

³² Cf. F. Siegert, *Argumentation bei Paulus, gezeigt an Röm 9–11* (WUNT 34; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1985), 158 and 243 n. 11, who stresses that Paul had no acquaintance with rabbinic hermeneutics, but is inclined to make an exception for a *gezerah shavah* exegesis in Rom 4:3–8. See also D.A. Koch, *Die Schrift als Zeuge des Evangeliums: Untersuchungen zur Verwendung und zum Verständnis der Schrift*

treat this text first, and then consider two further passages in order to obtain a somewhat more comprehensive view.

1) *Quotations of Gen 15:6 and Ps 32:1–2 in Rom 4:3–8*

(4:3) For what does the scripture say? *Abraham believed God, and it was reckoned* (ἐλογίσθη) *to him as righteousness* (Gen 15:6).

(4) Now to one who works, wages are not reckoned (λογίζεσθαι) as a gift but as something due.

(5) But to one who without works trusts him who acquits the ungodly, such faith is reckoned (λογίζεσθαι) as righteousness.

(6) So also David speaks of the blessedness of the man to whom God reckons (λογίζεσθαι) righteousness irrespective of works:

(7–8) *Blessed are those whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are covered; blessed is the man against whom the Lord will not reckon* (λογίσηται) *sin* (Ps 32,1–2a = 31,1–2a LXX).³³

The two quotations in this section are separated from each other by a detailed explanation following the former and an equally detailed introduction preceding the latter; but their inner connection is nevertheless obvious. The association is based on the verb λογίζομαι, “to reckon,” which is the one term common to both quotations, and the fact that it appears also in each of the three verses in-between shows that it plays a decisive role in the present exegetical argumentation.

The central idea is that whereas human reckoning demands the proportionality of work and recompense (κατὰ ὀφείλημα, v. 4), there is a divine economy which dispenses with this proportionality and rests on

bei Paulus (Beiträge zur historischen Theologie 69; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1986), 221, on Rom 4:3–8 and 1Cor 9:9–10; R.B. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven, London: Yale University Press, 1989), 55, on Rom 4:3–8; C. Plag, “Paulus und die *Gezera schawa*: Zur Übernahme rabbinischer Auslegungskunst,” *Judaica* 50 (1994): 135–140, on Rom 4:1–8, 1Cor 3:19f., 1Cor 9:9f. and Gal 3:(6–14); H.-J. Eckstein, *Verheißung und Gesetz: Eine exegetische Untersuchung zu Galater 2,15–4,7* (WUNT 86; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996), 99, on Rom 4:3–8; M. Müller, “The New Testament Reception of the Old Testament,” in *The New Testament as Reception* (ed. M. Müller and H. Tronier; JSNTSup 230, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002), 1–14: 10, on 2Cor 3:3; S. Moyise, “Quotation,” in *As It Is Written: Studying Paul’s Use of Scripture* (ed. S.E. Porter and C.D. Stanley; SBL Symposium Series 50; Atlanta: SBL, 2008), 15–28:19. For lexematic associations in Rom 9 see F. Wilk, *Die Bedeutung des Jesajabuches für Paulus* (FRLANT 179; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998), 120. Brooke, “Biblical Interpretation,” 70, points to the catena in Rom 3:10–18 as a fine example of “catchword association” in the New Testament.

³³ Translation adopted with minor modifications from the NRSV.

faith as the sole basis of reckoning, which allows Paul the provocative statement that God can even declare the wicked to be righteous.³⁴ The example of Abraham in Gen 15:6 is used to demonstrate the positive side of this statement, *viz.* that the criterion of God's reckoning is faith. However, since Paul, being a pious Jew, could hardly conceive of Abraham as lacking in good works or having sinned, he had to gather evidence for the negative side of the statement, i.e. disregarding a person's deeds, from elsewhere. It is provided by Ps 32:1–2, which shows that God's reckoning can pass over human sinfulness, and is supported by the example of David as a sinner whose wrongdoings God had forgiven. Thus, in illuminating the opposite sides of one and the same central idea, the quotations of Gen 15:6 and Ps 32:1–2 complement one another.

However, there is nothing to suggest that Paul exploited the juxtaposition of the two quotations in order to discover hidden implications in the biblical text itself. Since Abraham was not a sinner, a reading of Gen 15:6 in the light of Ps 32:1–2 would have been pointless anyway; but nor is there an attempt to read Ps 32:1–2 conversely in the light of Gen 15:6 in order to demonstrate, e.g., that God's forgiveness of sins is based on the *criterion of faith*. Hence, it cannot be said that the exegetical reasoning underlying Rom 4:3–8 is comparable to that of *gezerah shavah*. Paul does not adduce these verses in order to interpret each by the other, but in order to substantiate, from two different angles, a theological claim of his own.³⁵

³⁴ If understood according to the traditional Augustinian and Protestant reading of Romans, this statement is directed against a view which regards divine acquittal as dependent on the performance of the commandments. If read in terms of the "New Perspective on Paul," it opposes the conviction that salvation depends on being a member of the God's covenant people. The latter reading gains strong support from the contrasting of Jews and Gentiles in Rom 3:29–30, but in view of the example of David and the notion of the forgiveness of sins, which are introduced by the quotation of Ps 32:1–2 in Rom 4:7–8, the former, traditional reading seems to be in fact preferable. Cf. S.J. Gathercole, *Where is Boasting? Early Jewish Soteriology and Paul's Response in Romans 1–5* (Grand Rapids, Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2002), 216–251; F. Avemarie, "Die Wiederkehr der Werke: Neuere Verschiebungen im Umkreis der 'New Perspective on Paul'," *Jahrbuch für Evangelikale Theologie* 19 (2005): 123–138: 133–135.

³⁵ More suitable, therefore, seems the classification of Rom 4:3–8 as an inference of a "general principle from two verses" by E.E. Ellis, *The Old Testament in Early Christianity: Canon and Interpretation in the Light of Modern Research* (WUNT 54; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1991), 89.

2) Quotations of Deut 27:26, Hab 2:4, Lev 18:5 and Deut 21:23
in Gal 3:10–12

(3:10) For those who are by works of the law are under a curse; for it is written, *Cursed* (ἐπικατάρατος) is everyone who does not abide by all which is written in the book of the law in order to do (ποιῆσαι) it (Deut 27:26).

(11) However, it is evident that by the law nobody is deemed righteous before God, for *the righteous will live* (ζήσεται) by faith (Hab 2:4).

(12) But the law is not from faith, but *who does* (ποιήσας) *them will live* (ζήσεται) by them (Lev 18:5).

(13) Christ has ransomed us from the curse of the law by becoming a curse instead of us, for it is written, *Cursed* (ἐπικατάρατος) is everyone who has been hanged on a tree (Deut 21:23).³⁶

The four quotations in this short chain of exegetical reasoning are interrelated by three different lexematic associations. Deut 27:26 in v. 10 links with Lev 18:5 in v. 12 by ποιέω, “to do”; it also links with Deut 21:23 in v. 13 by ἐπικατάρατος, “cursed”;³⁷ and Lev 18:5 in v. 12 links with Hab 2:4 in v. 11 by ζήσεται, “will live.”

Since the exegetical argument which is developed from these quotations is complex and intricate, it should be noted beforehand that many exegetes try to make the whole, and particularly the negative statements about the law, a bit more palatable by assuming that Paul presupposes that no human being is in fact *capable* of an adequate observance of the commandments.³⁸ However, since anthropological considerations

³⁶ Translation mine, with borrowings from the NRSV.

³⁷ It should be noted that Paul seems to have adopted the form ἐπικατάρατος in v. 13 from the quotation of Deut 27:26 in v. 10, since the LXX of Deut 21:23 reads κεκατηραμένος. If Paul had chosen the latter reading, the association between the two verses would have been sufficiently clear, too, but by the assimilation of the wording of Deut 21:23 to that of Deut 27:26 he gives it additional emphasis and thus shows beyond doubt that the association is an essential component of the present exegesis.

³⁸ This incapacity can in turn be explained by the perfectionism that seems to be required by the Torah or, alternatively, by its purpose to provoke sin; for the former view, see e.g. H.-J. Schoeps, *Paulus: Die Theologie des Apostels im Lichte der jüdischen Religionsgeschichte* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1959), 184f.; F. Mußner, *Der Galaterbrief* (HTKNT 9; Freiburg: Herder, 1974), 225; R.N. Longenecker, *Galatians* (WBC 41; Dallas: Word Books, 1990), 118; P. Lampe, “Reticentia in der Argumentation: Gal 3,10–12 als Stipatio Enthymematum,” in *Das Urchristentum in seiner literarischen Geschichte* (ed. U. Mell and U.B. Müller; BZNW 100; Berlin: De Gruyter, 1999), 27–39; for the latter view see H.D. Betz, *Galatians* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979), 146; for further references see F. Vouga, *An die Galater* (HNT 10; Tübingen: Mohr

of the kind found in Rom 7 do not play any role in Gal 3, it seems preferable not to assume any implications of this kind. Hence, the quotation of Deut 27:26 in v. 10 should not be taken to demonstrate that “those who are by works of the law” are actually *condemned*, but only to state that they are under a permanent *menace*. Nor should Lev 18:5 in v. 12 be understood as a promise of eternal life (which in view of universal human sinfulness would never come true), despite the fact that soteriological readings of Lev 18:5 were quite common in ancient Judaism;³⁹ within the context of Gal 3, this is precluded by the intimation of v. 21 that the Torah cannot “make alive.” It is more likely that Paul took ζήσεται in Lev 18:5 to refer to the present earthly existence of those “who are by works of the law,” and understood the passage as a normative description of their way of life: “living” by the commandments means “doing” them.

That Paul does not think here of a soteriological understanding of Lev 18:5 is also suggested by the fact that his focus is indeed on the “doing” rather than on the “living.” This becomes apparent from the negative statement by which he introduces the quotation: since the law requires “doing,” it does *not* require “faith.” And this in turn explains the connection of Lev 18:5 with Hab 2:4 in the previous verse, since the very faith which is absent from Lev 18:5, and hence from the observance of the law, is in Hab 2:4 the object of a *positive* statement: faith is the basis of the life of the righteous.⁴⁰ It would seem easy to recast this chain of exegetical reasoning into a formal logical conclusion: Righteousness comes through faith, but the law requires doing rather than faith; therefore, the law does *not* lead to righteousness.⁴¹ The latter is precisely what Paul states in his introduction to the quotation of Hab 2:4.

Siebeck, 1998), 74; M. Mayordomo, *Argumentiert Paulus logisch? Eine Analyse vor dem Hintergrund antiker Logik* (WUNT 188; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005), 143.

³⁹ Cf. S.J. Gathercole, “Torah, Life and Salvation: Leviticus 18:5 in Early Judaism and the New Testament,” in *From Prophecy to Testament: The Function of the Old Testament in the New* (ed. C.A. Evans, J.A. Sanders; Peabody: Hendrickson, 2004), 131–150; F. Avemarie, “Paul and the Claim of the Law according to the Scripture: Leviticus 18:5 in Galatians 3:12 and Romans 10:5,” in *The Beginnings of Christianity* (ed. J. Pastor and M. Mor; Jerusalem: Yad Ben-Zvi, 2005), 125–148; 127–129; P.M. Sprinkle, *Law and Life: The Interpretation of Leviticus 18:5 in Early Judaism and in Paul* (WUNT 2:241; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 2008), 25–129.

⁴⁰ On the problems of Hab 2:4’s syntax in Gal 3:11, see Eckstein, *Verheißung und Gesetz*, 143f.; Lim, *Holy Scripture*, 52.

⁴¹ Cf. J. Vos, *Die Kunst der Argumentation bei Paulus: Studien zur antiken Rhetorik* (WUNT 149, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002), 119 (with further references).

Quite obviously, the logic which informs this exegetical argument, the employment of lexematic association notwithstanding, is entirely different from that of the rabbinic *gezerah shavah*. The connection which Paul establishes between the two quotations does not aim at a mutual enrichment in meaning, it is simply disjunctive. Rather than disclosing what Lev 18:5 conveys implicitly, Hab 2:4 states what Lev 18:5 does not convey at all.⁴²

Closer resemblance to *gezerah shavah* lies in the connection between Lev 18:5 (or rather, the result of the *combination* of Lev 18:5 with Hab 2:4) on the one hand and Deut 27:26, as quoted in v. 10, on the other. Deut 26:27 states that those who do *not* “do” the commandments will be cursed, but leaves open the question of what will happen to those who actually perform them. The answer is gained from Lev 18:5 as read under the angle of Hab 2:4, and it consists of the insight that even the “doing” of the commandments will not lead to righteousness, since righteousness comes through faith. Or, to make the pattern (though not the content) sound a bit more rabbinical, “If the *doing* that is spoken of in Lev 18:5 is without faith and righteousness, then also the *doing* that is spoken of in Deut 27:26 is without faith and righteousness.” Hence, what is wrong with the law is not that it cannot be fulfilled but that it “does not spring from faith.”⁴³ If this is the underlying logic of Gal 3:10–12, it comes indeed very close to that of a rabbinic *gezerah shavah*.

The third scriptural link which Paul establishes on the basis of Deut 27:26 is that with Deut 21:23 in v. 13. It is indicated by the repetition of the word ἐπικατάρατος, which Paul may have purposely inserted in order to establish a lexematic association, since the Septuagint of Deut 21:23 uses here the synonym κεκατηραμένος.⁴⁴ However, it is not the wording of the quotation which in Gal 3:13 carries the weight of the argument but the preceding statement of the vicarious intervention of Christ, who takes the curse of Deut 27:26 upon himself and thus ransoms those depending on him from its menace. Deut 21:23 is adduced for additional support of this idea, as it links the motif of the curse with that of the hanging of the body of a convicted criminal and thus can be

⁴² This is what Vos, *Kunst der Argumentation*, 118f., terms a ‘hermeneutische Antinomie’.

⁴³ J.L. Martyn, *Galatians: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 33A, New York: Doubleday, 1997), 311.

⁴⁴ See n. 36.

taken as an allusion to Christ's vicarious death on the cross. A reasoning analogous to *gezerah shavah* does not seem to be involved.⁴⁵

3) *Quotations of Ps 18:50, Deut 32:43, Ps 117:1 and Isa 11:10
in Rom 15:8–12*

(15:8) For I tell you that Christ has become a servant of the circumcised on behalf of the truth of God in order that he might confirm the promises given to the patriarchs,

(9) and in order that the Gentiles (τὰ δὲ ἔθνη) might glorify God for his mercy. As it is written, *Therefore I will confess you among the Gentiles* (ἐν ἔθνεσιν), *and sing praises to your name* (Ps 18:50 = 17:50 LXX);

(10) and again he says, *Rejoice, O Gentiles* (ἔθνη), *with his people* (Deut 32:43);

(11) and again, *Praise the Lord, all you Gentiles* (πάντα τὰ ἔθνη), *and let all the peoples praise him* (Ps 117:1 = 116:1 LXX);

(12) and again Isaiah says, *The root of Jesse shall come, the one who rises to rule the Gentiles* (ἐθνῶν); *in him the Gentiles* (ἔθνη) *shall hope* (Isa 11:10).⁴⁶

Despite the weighty content of this passage, little needs to be said about its exegetical technique. The four quotations assembled here are linked not only thematically by a series of verbs denoting vivid expressions of happiness, such as singing praise, rejoicing and hope,⁴⁷ but also lexematically by the noun ἔθνη, "Gentiles,"⁴⁸ and they serve to illustrate a sequence of topics which are already introduced by the statements of vv. 8–9a: The Gentiles render praise to God; in their praise of God they are united with the people of Israel;⁴⁹ and together with Israel, they are ruled by the Davidic messiah. The text of the four quotations is taken at face value, and it does not seem that their juxtaposition aims at anything more subtle than the joint display of what each of them

⁴⁵ For a different understanding of the relationship between Deut 27:26 and Deut 21:23 see Plag, "Paulus und die *Gezarah schawa*," 139f.

⁴⁶ Translation according to the NRSV.

⁴⁷ Cf. J.R. Wagner, *Heralds of the Good News: Isaiah and Paul in Concert in the Letter to the Romans* (NovTSup101; Leiden: Brill 2002), 311.

⁴⁸ For additional lexematic overlaps between Rom 15:9–12 and Isa 11:11–12:6, cf. Wilk, *Bedeutung*, 214.

⁴⁹ This point is rightly emphasized by Wilk, *Bedeutung* (n. 32), 214f., and Wagner, *Heralds* (n. 46), 314f.

contributes to the central topic of the salvation of the Gentiles on the foundations of Israel's election. In their particular content, the four verses of course differ to a certain extent, and since, for instance, Ps 18:50 is lacking an explicit reference to Israel, one might feel tempted to take the subsequent quotation of Deut 32:43, which mentions Israel, as a hint of implication in Ps 18:50. Indeed, such a line of thought would be undeniable if the two quotations were linked by a deictic transition as in 4QFlor I 11 and 14 ("this is/they are... as it is written"), perhaps something like: "This refers to Israel, with whom the Gentiles will rejoice, as it says..." However, neither is Deut 32:43 introduced in such manner, nor would the subsequent quotation of Ps 117:1 be suited in turn to uncover any implications in Deut 32:43. Therefore, it seems best to describe the exegetical procedure underlying this catena as a mere accumulation of pertinent scriptural evidence for the purpose of illustrating a given set of interrelated ideas.

In sum, the discussion of these Pauline passages has yielded a result which by and large corresponds to that of the foregoing analysis of Qumran materials, except for a further possible function of lexematic association, which surfaces in Gal 3:11–12, *viz.* the disjunctive opposition of the verses that are quoted together.

CONCLUSION

Our observations may be summarized in three points.

1) Combinations of scriptural evidence involving lexematic overlaps are not incidental; in general, they can be regarded as a conscious selection. This is apparent from the fact that occasionally authors change the wording of a given biblical text in order to assimilate it to that of another quotation and to make the overlap clearly visible (as is presumably the case with *הקימותי* in 4QFlor I 12 and with *ἐπικατάρατος* in Gal 3:13).⁵⁰

⁵⁰ This liberty vis-à-vis the biblical text seems to be a general characteristic of such early Jewish exegesis; cf., e.g., G. Brooke on the compilers of 4QMMT: Their "attitude to scripture... was not bound by its precise letter but... was very careful to fit it suitably, in its own phraseology, to the context of the debate"; Brooke, "The Explicit Presentation of Scripture," 85.

2) Combinations of quotations based on lexematic association can serve a variety of purposes: accumulative enhancement of scriptural evidence (as in 1QM X 1–8 and Rom 15:8–12); support for a particular hermeneutical approach (as, perhaps, in CD VII 13–21); contrasting of divergent biblical messages (as in Gal 3:11–12); illustration of two complementary sides of a given topic (as in Rom 4:3–8); exploration of implicit meaning by inference from a related biblical verse (as in 4QFlor I 10–16 and, perhaps, in Gal 3:10–12); and since we treated here only a modest selection of pertinent materials, it seems quite possible that by a more comprehensive scrutiny further functions may be discerned. In view of this diversity—to say it once more—the casual borrowing of the term *gezerah shavah* as a designation for pre-rabbinic types of exegesis does justice neither to the rabbis nor to their predecessors.

3) However, what seems to be common to all of these exegetical approaches is the conviction that the writings of Moses and the prophets form a coherent whole,⁵¹ held together by the authority of the one God, who had revealed these writings to his chosen people. This conviction is inevitably presupposed even when passages from entirely different parts of this whole can be used in order to support and complement one another. Regardless of which and how many individual writings this whole may have included in the eyes of Paul or the Qumran exegetes, their very approach was a “canonical” one. As it seems, they shared the belief that Scripture was able to interpret itself.

⁵¹ A fine example for this is the combination of citations from Pss, Deut and Isa in Rom 15:8–12, regardless of whether this is due to an awareness of a developing tripartite canon or not.

“SPIRITUAL PEOPLE,” “FLESHLY SPIRIT,” AND “VISION
OF MEDITATION”: REFLECTIONS ON 4QINSTRUCTION
AND 1 CORINTHIANS

Eibert Tigchelaar
Florida State University

The most famous section of the Qumran sapiential text 4QInstruction is undoubtedly 4Q417 1 i 13–18, the unit which, for the sake of convenience, has sometimes been referred to as the *Vision of Hagu* pericope. The most thorough and helpful, but often terse discussion of this pericope is still that of the editors, John Strugnell and Daniel Harrington, in their official edition of 4QInstruction.¹ However, both before and after their edition, the pericope has been the subject of many longer studies,²

¹ John Strugnell, Daniel J. Harrington, S.J., and Torleif Elgvin, *Qumran Cave 4 XXIV. Sapiential Texts, Part 2: 4QInstruction (Mūsār lē Mēvīn): 4Q415ff. with a Re-edition of 1Q26 (DJD 34; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999)*, 9 (general analysis), 154 (transcription), 155 (notes on reading), 156 (translation), 163–66 (comments). Henceforth: *DJD* 34.

² Substantial treatments are, in chronological order: Armin Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination: Weisheitliche Urordnung und Prädestination in den Textfunden von Qumran* (STDJ 18; Leiden: Brill, 1995), 45–92, esp. 50–53, 80–90; Daniel J. Harrington, S.J., *Wisdom Texts From Qumran* (London: Routledge, 1996), 52–56; Torleif Elgvin, “The Mystery to Come: Early Essene Theology of Revelation,” in *Qumran between the Old and the New Testaments* (ed. Frederick H. Cryer and Thomas L. Thompson; JSOTSup 290; Copenhagen International Seminar 6; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 113–150 at 139–47; idem, “An Analysis of 4QInstruction” (Ph.D. diss., Hebrew University Jerusalem, 1998), 85–94; John J. Collins, “In the Likeness of the Holy Ones: The Creation of Humankind in a Wisdom Text from Qumran,” in *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues* (ed. Donald W. Parry and Eugene Ulrich; STDJ 30; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 609–18; Crispin H.T. Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam: Liturgical Anthropology in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (STDJ 42; Brill: Leiden, 2002), 113–18; John J. Collins, “The Mysteries of God. Creation and Eschatology in 4QInstruction and the Wisdom of Solomon,” in *Wisdom and Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Biblical Tradition* (ed. F. García Martínez; BETL 168; Leuven: Peeters, 2003), 287–305; reprinted in idem, *Jewish Cult and Hellenistic Culture: Essays on the Jewish Encounter with Hellenism and Roman Rule* (JSJSup 100; Leiden: Brill, 2005), 159–80; Matthew J. Goff, *The Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom of 4QInstruction* (STDJ 50; Brill: Leiden, 2003), 80–126; Cana Werman, “What is the Book of Hagu?” in *Sapiential Perspectives: Wisdom Literature in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. John J. Collins, Gregory E. Sterling, and Ruth A. Clements; STDJ 51; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 125–40; Benjamin G. Wold, *Women, Men and Angels: The Qumran Wisdom Document Musar le Mevin and its Allusions to Genesis Creation Traditions* (WUNT 201; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck,

and shorter discussions and/or translations.³ In this article, I first will present the Hebrew text and a translation which reflects the majority understanding of the text. I then will comment on some interpretations of this passage, and consider the possibility of an alternative

2005), 124–49; Matthew Goff, *Discerning Wisdom: The Sapiential Literature of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (VTSup 116; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 29–36; Grant Macaskill, *Revealed Wisdom and Inaugurated Eschatology in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity* (JSJSup 115; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 77–83; Jean-Sébastien Rey, *4QInstruction: sagesse et eschatologie* (STDJ 81; Leiden: Brill, 2009), 277–306, esp. 278–83, 292–303; Matthew Goff, “Genesis 1–3 and Conceptions of Humankind in 4QInstruction, Philo and Paul,” in *Early Christian Literature and Intertextuality* (ed. C. Evans and H.D. Zacharias; London: T&T Clark, 2009), 114–25; idem, “Adam, the Angels and Eternal Life: Genesis 1–3 in the Wisdom of Solomon and 4QInstruction,” in *The Book of Wisdom and Jewish Hellenistic Philosophy* (ed. Géza G. Xeravits; Leiden: Brill, forthcoming).

³ Shorter discussions and/or translations and/or transcriptions of the pericope, or parts of it, can be found in: Ben Zion Wacholder, “Introduction,” in *A Preliminary Edition of the Unpublished Dead Sea Scrolls. The Hebrew and Aramaic Texts from Cave Four. Fascicle Two* (ed. Ben Zion Wacholder and Martin G. Abegg; Washington, D.C.: Biblical Archaeology Society, 1992), xi–xvi, at xiii; *ibid.*, 66 (transcription); F. García Martínez and A.S. van der Woude, *De Rollen van de Dode Zee. Ingeleid en in het Nederlands vertaald. Deel 1* (Kampen: Kok, 1994), 413 [transl. van der Woude]; Florentino García Martínez, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated. The Qumran Texts in English* (Leiden: Brill, 1994), 387; Johann Maier, *Die Qumran-Essener: Die Texte von Toten Meer. Band II* (Uni-Taschenbücher 1863; München: Reinhardt, 1995), 440–41; André Caquot, “Les textes de sagesse de Qoumrân (Aperçu préliminaire),” *RHPPhR* 76 (1996): 1–34, at 16–19; Michael Wise, Martin Abegg, and Edward Cook, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Translation* (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1996), 381 (p. 484 in the revised 2005 edition) [transl. Cook]; Geza Vermes, *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1997), 409; Florentino García Martínez and Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition. Vol. 2, 4Q274–11Q31 1* (Leiden: Brill, 1998; 2d ed. 2000), 858–59; Jörg Frey, “Die paulinische Antithese von Fleisch und Geist und die palästinisch-jüdische Weisheitstradition,” *ZNW* 51 (1999): 45–77, esp. 62–63, 65; Torleif Elgvin, “Wisdom With and Without Apocalyptic,” in *Sapiential, Liturgical and Poetical Texts from Qumran: Proceedings of the Third Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies Oslo 1998* (ed. Daniel K. Falk, Florentino García Martínez, and Eileen M. Schuller; STDJ 35; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 15–38, at 25–26; Jörg Frey, “The Notion of ‘Flesh’ in 4QInstruction and the Background of Pauline Usage,” in Falk et al., eds., *Sapiential, Liturgical and Poetical Texts*, 197–226, at 217–19; Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning for the Understanding Ones: Reading and Reconstructing the Fragmentary Early Jewish Sapiential Text 4QInstruction* (STDJ 44; Leiden: Brill, 2001), 52–54; George Brooke, “Biblical Interpretation in the Wisdom Texts from Qumran,” in *The Wisdom Texts from Qumran and the Development of Sapiential Thought* (ed. C. Hempel, A. Lange, and H. Lichtenberger; BETL 159; Leuven: Peeters, 2002), 201–20, at 212–14; Jörg Frey, “Flesh and Spirit in Palestinian Jewish Sapiential Tradition and in the Qumran Texts: An Inquiry into the Background of Paulinian Usage,” in Hempel et al., eds., *The Wisdom Texts from Qumran*, 367–404, at 392–96; Claude Coulot, “L’image de Dieu dans les écrits de sagesse 1Q26, 4Q415–418, 4Q423,” in *Wisdom and Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Biblical Tradition* (ed. F. García Martínez; BETL 168; Leuven: Peeters, 2003), 171–81, at 173–75; Émile Puech, “Apports des textes apocalyptiques et sapientiels de Qumrân

understanding of the crucial terms found in this pericope. Finally, I will draw some comparisons with 1 Cor 2.

TEXT AND SOME INTERPRETATIONS OF 4Q417 1 i 13–18
(THE “VISION OF HAGU”)

In spite of some areas on the skin that are severely abraded, most of the text is relatively well preserved. The text may be transcribed as follows:⁴

וְאֵהָּ מִבֵּין 14 רֹשׁ פִּעֲלַתְכֶּה בִּזְכוּרֹן הָעֵלְתָּ כִּי בֵּא
 חֲרוֹת הַחֹקֶה (כֹּה) וְחֹקֶה כּוֹל הַפְּקוּדָה
 15 כִּי חֲרוֹת מִחֹקֶה לֹאֵל עַל כּוֹל עַ[ו]נֵּי[ו]ת בְּנֵי שֵׁת
 וּסְפָר זְכוּרֹן כְּתוּב לִפְנֵי 16 לְשֹׁמְרֵי דְבָרוֹ
 וְהָאָה חֲזוֹן הַהֲגֹתָ לְסֹפֵר זְכוּרֹן
 וַיִּנְחִילָהּ לְאִנּוּשׁ עִם עִם רוּחַ
 כִּי[י] אֵ 17 כְּתַבְנִית קְדוּשִׁים יִצְרוּ
 וְעוֹד לֹא נָתַן הַגִּי' לְרוּחַ בֶּשֶׁר
 כִּי לֹא יָדַע בֵּין 18 [טו]ב לְרַע כְּמִשְׁפַּט [ר]וּחַ

The following translation serves as a reflection of most recent translations, and as a background for the discussion of the scholarly interpretations of the pericope (below I will present my own interpretation):⁵

à l'eschatologie du judaïsme ancien," García Martínez, ed., *Wisdom and Apocalypticism*, 133–70, at 137–38; Michael Wise, Martin Abegg, and Edward Cook, *The Dead Sea Scrolls. A New Translation* (rev. ed.; San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 2005), 484 [with some revisions vis-à-vis the 1996 edition]; Daniel J. Harrington, "Recent Study of 4QInstruction," in *From 4QMMT to Resurrection: Mélanges qumraniennes en hommage à Emile Puech* (ed. Florentino García Martínez, Annette Steudel, and Eibert Tigchelaar; STDJ 61; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 106–23, at 108–9, 113.

⁴ There is relatively little discussion about the readings. In line 14 read רִישׁ or רוֹשׁ, or emend to דְּרוֹשׁ; after בִּזְכוּרֹן, the following reconstructions have been suggested: הָעֵלְתָּ (Preliminary Concordance; followed by Lange, Elgvin, and Werman), הָעֵלְטָ (Elgvin 2000), הָעֵלְוֹ (Goff), הַשְׁלֹם (DJD 34), and הַקְּנֵי (Rey); in line 15 the word before בְּנֵי has been reconstructed differently, such as עֲוֹלוֹת, [ע]וֹלוֹת, or עֲוֹלוֹתָ, but the idea of “iniquities” is generally accepted (cf. DJD 34:163); in line 16 the end of the editors’ reading הַהֲגֹתָ is uncertain, and one may perhaps read, with Puech, and as discussed in DJD 34, a feminine form הַהֲגוֹתָ; in my opinion the ל before סְפָר is doubtful, and the apparent stroke of a lamed is possibly a discolouration on the abraded area of the skin (cf. especially PAM 41.918); the suffix in וַיִּנְחִילָהּ has been disputed, but is certain (cf. below); in line 17 Puech and Rey want to read חֲזוֹן (or הַחֲזוֹן) in stead of הַגִּי, but to me all letters of הַגִּי seem clear.

⁵ Most recent translations are largely based on the DJD 34 translation, and the earlier translations by García Martínez (1994), Van der Woude (1994), Lange (1995), Maier (1995), Cook (1996), Vermes (1997), and Elgvin (1998) display a larger (and interesting!) variety of understandings.

And you, understanding one 14 search/inherit⁶ your reward, remembering the ti[me (or: the end) for] it is coming.⁷

Engraved is the {your} statute, and ordained is all the punishment, 15 for engraved is that which is ordained by God against all the in[iquities of] the sons of S(h)eth/perdition.⁸

A book of remembrance is written before him 16 of/for those who keep His word.

And that is the vision of the meditation (and/of/on)⁹ a book of remembrance.

And He bequeathed it to Enosh/Man/humanity together with a spiritual people,

f[or] 17 according to the pattern of the holy ones is his fashioning (or: did He fashion him/it)

And moreover, meditation has not been given (or: not did He give) to a/the fleshly spirit

for it does/did not distinguish between 18 [go]od and evil according to the judgment of its [sp]irit.

This “baffling passage”¹⁰ bristles with problems, most of which are described extensively in the official edition. It may be noted that contrary to most preceding and subsequent studies, the editors rarely committed themselves to one specific interpretation, but rather tried to present the entire gamut of possible understandings. The most difficult issue is the connection between the first and the second part of the pericope, culminating in the question of the identity of the “book of remembrance” and “vision of meditation,” the relation between them, and the question what has been (or: will be?) bequeathed to Enosh/Man/humanity.

As pointed out by for example Collins, the context of the passage concerns eschatological retribution (e.g. 4Q417 1 i 7).¹¹ An eschatological reading of the first part of our pericope therefore seems to be

⁶ Cf. *DJD* 34:161–62 for alternative interpretations of רשׁו.

⁷ While generally it is easy to distinguish the boundaries between the different clauses, it is (also due to the lacuna in the text) not clear to which clause בִּא belongs. For example, Rey, *4QInstruction*, 294 (following Puech, “Apports des textes,” 137) takes כִּי בִּא חֲרוֹת הַחֹק as a separate clause: “[car] le destin vient, gravé.” Cf. further below.

⁸ Referring either to Num 24:17, without it being clear why these are singled out, or, preferably, understanding שִׁית as another possible spelling of שָׂאת, “devastation,” “perdition” (?) (Lam 3:47).

⁹ Both the reading and the meaning of ל before סִפֵּר are uncertain. The relation between “vision of the meditation” and “book of remembrance” therefore is unclear.

¹⁰ Harrington, “Recent Study,” 108.

¹¹ Collins, “The Mysteries of God,” 303.

warranted through the use of פֶּעֶלָה (one of the meanings of which is “reward”) and פְּקֻדָּה (“visitation” or “punishment,” though the word also can mean “appointment”), as well as by the reference to Mal 3:16 (“and before him was written a book of memorial of those who fear the Lord and consider his name”), where the “book of remembrance” is also mentioned in an eschatological context. There is some discussion about the “statute” that is engraved, whether it refers to the laws of nature, or to the destiny of all living beings, including the punishment of the sons of Sheth/perdition. Likewise, in the “book of remembrance” might be recorded the acts of all individual persons, or perhaps their names and destinies.

Collins proposed an interesting and influential interpretation of the second part of the pericope, arguing that the name Enosh actually refers to Adam, who was fashioned in the likeness of the holy ones. In Collins’ reading the text is based upon an exegesis of the two creation accounts of Genesis, and presents two different types of humanities: Adam/Enosh and the spiritual people, described in terms that are reminiscent of Gen 1:27, and the “fleshly spirit,” which represents the humanity without knowledge of good and evil, created in Gen 2. Collins adduces comparative materials from the *Two Spirits Treatise* (1QS III–IV), Philo, and the Wisdom of Solomon for the idea of contrasting types of humanities. He does not spell out in detail how the two sections of the pericope are related, but claims that the “Vision of Hagu and the book of remembrance contain the destiny of those who keep God’s word,” and suggests that the giving of this vision to Enosh/Adam therefore implies the granting of immortality.¹² In his dissertation Goff elaborates on Collins’ understanding and deals with this relation more specifically: “the vision of Hagu contains wisdom inscribed in a heavenly book that is available to the elect. The vision refers to the revelation of heavenly wisdom... [and] includes knowledge about the imminent judgment against the wicked... also seems to provide the knowledge of good and evil.”¹³ Later he discusses the terms “book of remembrance” and “vision of Hagu” in more detail, suggesting those are one and the same, and claiming that this book and vision emphasize the theme of judgment.¹⁴

¹² Cf. especially Collins, “Mysteries of God,” 301 and 303. This interpretation is not yet expressed in Collins, “In the Likeness of the Holy Ones.”

¹³ Goff, *The Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom*, 94.

¹⁴ Goff, *Discerning Wisdom*, 31–33.

Whereas there seems to be an explicit link missing in Collins' argument, Goff paraphrases the text in a coherent manner, without, however, explaining the crucial details of the text. For example, Goff concedes that the term "vision of Hagu" is obscure, but assures that the author probably assumed that his audience knew what the "vision of Hagu" meant.¹⁵ Also, the relation between the "book of remembrance" and this "vision of Hagu" remain unclear, Goff simply stating that they are equated. Other terms that are not really explained by Goff, or, for that matter, by most other scholars are the terms "spiritual people" and "fleshly spirit." Of course, it is generally observed that the term "people of spirit" is unique, and that in this pericope it denotes a type of humanity opposed to the "fleshly spirit," a somewhat strange term which is only used in *4QInstruction* and the *Hodayot*. The question should also be why the author uses those specific terms.

Before Collins and Goff, Frey had followed up on a suggestion of Lange,¹⁶ and argued that some kind of negative notion of "flesh" is to be found in *4QInstruction*, where the "spirit of flesh," does not merely denote human frailty, as in the *Hodayot*, but an entity which is opposed to the "sons of heaven" (in 4Q416 1 10), to the elect addressees (in 4Q418 81 1-2), and to the "spiritual people" in the pericope we are now discussing.¹⁷ For Frey, the "fleshly spirit" denotes "sinful humanity," as opposed to the elect or pious ones, but one may respond that in our pericope, the issue is not sin, but rather that the "fleshly spirit" suffers from ignorance.¹⁸ Since Frey followed Lange in assuming that the "people of spirit" were angelic, he did not really contrast "spirit" and "flesh" in our pericope. Goff combined Frey's suggestion with Collins' thesis of two types of humanities, by relating the two groups of the *4QInstruction* pericope to Paul's distinction between fleshly (σαρκίνοι) and spiritual (πνευματικοί) types of people, as in 1 Cor 3:1, as well as the distinction between ψυχικός and πνευματικός in 1 Cor 15:42-49. Irrespective of whether Paul's conceptual framework can be compared to that of *4QInstruction*, the 1 Corinthians examples seem to have in

¹⁵ Ibid., 32.

¹⁶ Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination*, 86-87.

¹⁷ Cf. all three articles by Frey mentioned above in note 3.

¹⁸ I briefly discussed Frey's position in Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning*, 186-88; cf., more extensively, Rey, *4QInstruction*, 299-303 who argues that the basic distinction between the "fleshly spirit" and the "spiritual people" is that the former do not observe the mystery of existence.

common with 4QInstruction that different kinds of people or humanities are described in anthropological terms.¹⁹

Werman offered a rather different interpretation of our pericope, by claiming that “vision” (חזון) “refers not to revelation, but to the intellectual effort of looking and studying,” while הגוי qualifies this “sight” as “cognitive insight.” She describes the term which others refer to as the “vision of Hagu” as “a mental concentration on the course of predestined history... The ability to look with the mind’s eye was not given to all but only to the one who was created with a spirit patterned after the angels.”²⁰ While Werman explains the “Book of Memorial” as “the heavenly book of the predestined plan,”²¹ it must be noted that she does not refer to Mal 3:16, which seems to lie behind the wording of our pericope. In other respects, too, Werman exhibits an independent approach to the text.²² Thus, she reads the words עם עם רוח as an attributive of אנוש, and translates “humanity, a people with a spirit,”²³ in contrast to most scholars who take the first עם as the preposition “with” and the second עם as the noun “people.”²⁴ Also, with her comment “with a spirit patterned after the angels,” she appears to take the object suffix of יצרו as referring to “spirit,” even though in her translation she renders “He created him.”²⁵

REVISITING THE PERICOPE

My explanation of the pericope starts with the very end, which states that the “fleshly spirit” does not distinguish between good and evil, “according to the ‘judgment’ of his/its spirit” (כמשפט רוחו). Unfortunately, apart from a rather terse comment by the editors,²⁶ no-one seems to have discussed these words. One issue is whether to translate משפט

¹⁹ Goff, “Genesis 1–3 and Conceptions of Humankind,” 122.

²⁰ Werman, “What is the *Book of Hagu*?” 137–38.

²¹ *Ibid.*, 136.

²² This independence is in part due to the lack of interaction with other literature. For example, Werman did not seem to know Collins’ article “In the Likeness of the Holy Ones,” or the interpretation expressed in it.

²³ Werman, “What is the *Book of Hagu*?” 137.

²⁴ Exceptions are the early translations of Van der Woude (“a man of the people with spirit”), García Martínez (“the weak of the people”), and Maier (“mit <mit> einem Geist”).

²⁵ *Ibid.*, 138, resp. 137.

²⁶ *DJD* 34:166: “With בן דע כמשפט has the sense of a criterion, or of the *miqṭal*, an act of judging.”

with “judgment,”²⁷ or with “rule,” “regulation,” or “manner.”²⁸ For those who render “judgment” is it unclear whether one regards “its spirit” in the genitive construction as expressing the subject of the action of “judging” (when its spirit judges, it does not distinguish between good and evil), or its object (it does not distinguish between good and evil, as has been judged [by God?] with regard to its spirit).²⁹ Within the argument, the statement that its spirit judges is rather redundant, and if one takes “its spirit” as the object, than one could also render *משפט* with “regulation” or “manner.” The latter would indicate that the pericope not only distinguishes two groups of people, or types of humanities, but also different kinds of (human) “spirits,” the one being explicitly connected with “flesh” (the “spirit of flesh,” or “fleshly spirit”), the other not being specified (“spirit” in the clause “people of spirit” or “spiritual people”).³⁰ In the *Hodayot*, the only other composition that uses the expression “spirit of flesh,” the term “spirit of flesh” denotes humanity in general, but it is also opposed to God’s spirit (cf. 1QH^a V 30–33, compared to 35–36),³¹ and one wonders whether in our pericope the same distinction is implied, between a “human” or “fleshly” spirit, and an angelic or divine spirit (as that of the holy ones). At the same time, it may also reflect an attempt towards a theological or philosophical anthropological distinction between different kinds of spirits. In view of the other comparisons which Collins and Goff have made between *4QInstruction* and later Philonic (and Pauline) view of kinds of man, one should consider whether we have here something that is a second-

²⁷ Thus the vast majority of scholars.

²⁸ Both Caquot, “Les textes de sagesse,” 17, and Coulot, “L’image de Dieu,” 173, render “selon la règle de son esprit”; Maier, *Die Qumran-Essener*, 441, and Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination*, 53 “gemäß dem Gesetz seines Geistes”; the *Dictionary of Classical Hebrew* gives for this place “regulation” or “manner.”

²⁹ It is not even certain to whom the suffix refers. One would be inclined to think it refers to the *רוח בשר*, or, perhaps more probably, to *בשר* only. The rendering by Cook in *The Dead Sea Scrolls. A New Translation*, “according to the judgment of His spirit,” gives another interpretation and seems to indicate that God’s spirit has judged that they did not know the difference between good and evil. Note also, that even though many scholars interpret the beginning of the pericope as referring to the understanding of eschatological judgment, it is not clear to me how one could understand this clause eschatologically.

³⁰ For an alternative understanding, cf. below.

³¹ Cf. most recently on the “spirit of flesh” in the *Hodayot*, Rey, *4QInstruction*, 299–301.

century B.C.E. attempt to express in Hebrew a distinction such as Philo and Paul later made between *pneuma* “spirit,” and *psyche* “soul.”³²

This statement needs elucidation. The differences between Philo and Paul, both much later than *4QInstruction*, already indicate that there was no fixed conceptual relation between “spirit” and “soul.” Also, both authors reshaped Greek philosophical anthropological concepts by their Jewish understanding, and on the basis of the creation stories, which accounts for their introduction of the concept of *pneuma* in addition to *psyche*. One may also note that even though the LXX usually uses ψυχή to render Hebrew נֶפֶשׁ, apparently this Hebrew word, which covers a rather wide semantic range, was not considered to be an exact anthropological term.³³ This suggestion, that “spirit” without further specification reflects *pneuma*, and “spirit of flesh” *psyche*, raises the question what has been given to Enosh? Here we may return to Werman’s suggestion that the term חֲזוֹן הַרְגוּי refers to the ability or faculty to meditate, or, perhaps more generally to cognitive insight; if this is the case, then we have here a concept which corresponds largely to Greek νοῦς (*nous*). The sparse use of the word νοῦς in the Septuagint translations of Hebrew books shows that the Greek concept had no corresponding word in Hebrew, and I propose that חֲזוֹן הַרְגוּת or הרְגוּי are attempts to express this concept.

I therefore understand the clause the phrase “And he bequeathed it³⁴ to ‘Enosh,’” to indicate that God bestowed a special kind of insight

³² My thoughts on this topic were triggered by George H. van Kooten, “The Two Types of Man in Philo of Alexandria and Paul of Tarsus: The Anthropological Trichotomy of Spirit, Soul and Body,” in *Philosophische Anthropologie in der Antike* (ed. Christoph Jedan and Ludger Jansen; Themen der Antiken Philosophie/Topics in Ancient Philosophy; Frankfurt: Ontos Verlag, forthcoming). I thank the author for sending me a version of his article before its publication.

³³ Note that Goff, *The Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom*, 98–99, though making a different argument, suggests that “fleshly spirit” “perhaps paraphrases the phrase נֶפֶשׁ חַיָּה from Genesis 2:7.”

³⁴ The form and the antecedent of the suffix in “he bequeathed it” have been much discussed, mainly because of the comments of the editors. We may note that in the Preliminary Concordance Strugnell recorded וַיְנַחֵלָה, with no indication at all that the *he* was uncertain. Indeed, on the basis of PAM 41.918 and 41.942 this is an undisputed reading. However, a shadow in PAM 42.578 suggest a basestroke, and hence a *nun*, which has given rise to the implausible suggestion by the editors that a second hand has changed the first reading. In Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning*, 20–21, I have argued that in quite a number of cases the original transcriptions of Strugnell, based on study of the manuscripts, are preferable to those of *DJD* 34 which are based on interpretations of the photographs. One may add that with multiple images of different resolutions, better software, and better screens, it has become much easier to interpret photographs.

upon Man/humanity.³⁵ The following words may be understood in different ways. The editors pointed out that the reading of the first hand, which only reads **עם רוח**, could mean “He bequeathed it (רוח הַגּוֹי ‘meditation’), together with the Spirit to Enosh (or to humanity).”³⁶ If this is the case, then we have here an anthropological statement that *nous* has been given together with *pneuma*. A special connection between *nous* and *pneuma*, be it more complex, is expressed in some of Philo’s treatments of the issue, such as in *Heir* 56 (though Philo is not consistent throughout his writings).³⁷ The corrected text, with a second **עם** inserted supralinearly by a second scribe,³⁸ is usually interpreted to say that God bequeathed it (insight) both to Enosh/humanity and to “a people of spirit.” The spiritual people might be a reference to the angels (He bequeathed insight both to humanity and the angels),³⁹ but in view of the anthropological oppositions rather to a special category

Thus, on the image of PAM 42.578 on the Third Volume of the Brill Dead Sea Scrolls Electronic Library, it is much clearer that the alleged basestroke of *nun* is the shadow of the edge of the skin than on the image of the same photograph in the First Volume of the Dead Sea Scrolls Electronic Library. After consulting all these photographs, I recall my own older reading וינחילנו in *To Increase Learning*, 52. The feminine suffix in וינחילה would require a feminine antecedent, and hence I prefer, with e.g. Puech and Rey, to read three words earlier הרהגות, even though הרהגו is palaeographically probably easier. Cf. for full discussion of those reading *DJD* 34:165.

³⁵ It is remarkable that virtually no-one has considered a future meaning of וינחילה, “and He *will* bequeath it.” A future meaning would of course be incompatible with a past tense (perfect) interpretation of יצרו (he fashioned him) and of נתן (he has; or: it was given), but יצרו can be a noun with suffix, and נתן a *Niphal* participle. It is irrelevant whether the stative ידע is a perfect or participle. Only Van der Woude (1994) translated a future (“Hij zal het doen beërven”), which makes sense in view of the eschatological setting of Mal 3:16.

³⁶ *DJD* 34:164 and again 165. Note that they also refer to the grammatically possible reading “and a ‘Spiritual People’ bequeathed it to Enosh/humanity.” Puech, “Apport des textes,” 138 seems to ignore the second hand addition when translating “à l’homme d’un peuple spirituel.”

³⁷ Cf. discussions in Van Kooten, “The Two Types of Man in Philo of Alexandria and Paul of Tarsus.”

³⁸ Because of the repeated omission of words by the first scribe of 4Q417, which are then supplied by a second hand, it is more likely that the scribe omitted a word (through haplography), which was then corrected by a subsequent scribe, than that the second scribe offered an interpretative correction.

³⁹ Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination*, 88–89 interpreted the “people of spirit” as a heavenly people, but this has been dismissed by subsequent scholars, though largely on the basis of unsatisfactory arguments. The fact that nowhere else does “people” refer to angels is irrelevant in the case of a text which develops a new idiom; the argument that angels would not be in need of a book or a vision is not valid anymore if one interprets הרהגות as “insight”; the objection that in the following clause there is a reference to Man’s being fashioned according to the pattern of the holy ones does not exclude that angels are referred to differently in the preceding clause.

of humankind (He bequeathed insight to Enosh as well as the spiritual people). Both readings (that of the first scribe, or the corrected one by the second scribe) fit with the clause on the “fleshly spirit.” One may interpret that “insight” (*nous*) has been given⁴⁰ together with spirit (*pneuma*), but not to the irrational “fleshly spirit” (= *psyche*). Alternatively, the text might refer to a type of humanity characterized by the irrational *psyche* (we might anachronistically call them *psychikoi*) as opposed to those characterized by *pneuma*.⁴¹

The next question is how those anthropological comments relate to the first part of the pericope. The crucial clause is the one that links the “vision of meditation” or “insight” to the “book of remembrance.” The question to what **וְהוֹאֵה**, “and that is,” refers has been answered differently, and often ignored. The editors stated that it should rather refer to the whole preceding scene (“a book or remembrance was written in His presence”), than taken as referring to “book of remembrance” only, since the latter would make the explanation repetitious,⁴² whereas Werman, unconvincingly, takes “And this is” to refer “to the repeated demands to seek, to examine carefully.”⁴³ The clue is that the author in part quotes, in part paraphrases a scriptural verse, Mal 3:16, and that we may read “And that is” as the marker of an explanation.⁴⁴ Contrary to the editors’ statement, however, the explanation does not refer back to the scene (of writing the book), but to the entire clause, specifically

⁴⁰ Read either *Qal* perfect “he has given,” *Niphal* perfect “has been given,” or even *Niphal* participle, with either a completed or uncompleted meaning.

⁴¹ Wold, *Women, Men and Angels*, 140–41 raised (against Collins and Goff) the question whether the text describes a primordial and creational distinction between two types of humanities (a double creation) or rather a present one, describing categories of humanity based on their present behaviour (cf. also Rey, *4QInstruction*, 302, n. 81), and discussed the problematic use of **וְעוֹד לֹא**. Wold suggests that the phrase **וְעוֹד לֹא** means “no more,” which would indicate “that at one time all humanity had access to wisdom and Haguy” (141). However, since Wold does not distinguish between **לֹא** followed by **וְעוֹד**, and the phrase here **וְעוֹד לֹא**, his thesis has no grammatical basis. A translation “no more” might be based on the poetic Job 24:20 **עוֹד לֹא יִזְכָּר**, “he is no more remembered,” but we have no single example of **וְעוֹד לֹא** with either perfect or participle. Puech, “Apports des texts,” 138, renders “n’a pas encore été donnée,” apparently implying that the fleshly spirit has “not yet” received insight.

⁴² *DJD* 34:164. For incomprehensible and repetitious translations cf. for example: “that is, the vision of Haguy for the book of remembrance,” “it is a vision of Haguy for a book of memorial.”

⁴³ Werman, “What is the *Book of Haguy*?” 137.

⁴⁴ A nice parallel, though with only **וְהוֹאֵה** instead of **וְהוֹאֵה** is 4Q174 1–2 i 11, where **וְהוֹאֵה** refers back to the entire quotation of 2 Sam 7:11b, 12b, 14a.

with the addition, which was not quoted by the editors, “for⁴⁵ those who keep His word(s).”⁴⁶ The exegetical question for the author(s) of *4QInstruction* is: what does it mean that a book of remembrance was written for those who keep His words? Their explanation is: the verse is actually dealing with insight into this book of remembrance, which insight is given to Enosh/humanity and the Spiritual people, but not to the “fleshly spirit.”

For the interpretation of the term “book of remembrance” one is inclined to look at its intended meaning in Mal 3:16, the only earlier occurrence of the term. One may point to heavenly writings, containing either divine laws, the course of history, or registers on the good and bad deeds of individuals,⁴⁷ or, instead memorial-writings of the Persian period, as referred to, e.g. in Esth 6:1 (“the book of records”) or Ezra 4:15. However, even though *4QInstruction* uses the language of Mal 3:16, it may not have shared the exact same concept. The partial quotation of Mal 3:16 in this pericope should be related to the occurrence of the same word “remembrance” at the beginning of the pericope. Due to the loss of some letters, the reading, structure, and meaning of the first phrase (רֹשׁ פִּעֲלַתְכֶּם בְּזִכְרוֹן הָעוֹשׂ/קֶ] is not certain, and many translators treat זִכְרוֹן here as a verbal noun, “(while) remembering,” it being unclear what the object would be. Although “remembering” does not concern exclusively past events (cf. e.g. Eccl 11:8), one may consider whether here there may be a semantic expansion of “remembrance” and “memory” to what is remembered, namely “events” or “history,” or, according to the suggestion of Werman “span of time.”⁴⁸ The term “book of remembrance” may then refer to a heavenly, mythological book which contains the entire course of past and future history, but also, more abstract, to the predestined plan of history itself.⁴⁹ The references to engraving, ordaining, and writing in the first lines, then all refer to the determination of the laws that rule history, and the first part of the pericope admonishes the “understanding one” to

⁴⁵ Depending on the interpretation of Mal 3:16, the preposition ל may there also express a genitive, that is, “a book of remembrance of those...”

⁴⁶ Actually, *4QInstruction* reads “for those who keep his word(s),” against the tradited text of Malachi which has “for those who fear the Lord and think on his name.”

⁴⁷ Cf., for example, Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination*, 69–79.

⁴⁸ Werman, “What is the *Book of Hagu?*” 135, connects זִכְרוֹן, “remembrance” with that which is predestined, and hence translates רֹשׁ פִּעֲלַתְכֶּם with “the span of time.”

⁴⁹ In a sense analogous to the term “Book of Nature,” which does not refer to an actual book, but to revelation visible in nature.

examine one's place in that predestined plan.⁵⁰ The words **פעלתכה כול הפקודה** are ambiguous, either referring to “your reward,” and “all the punishment,” perhaps in an eschatological context, or to “your work” resp. “the entire task.”⁵¹

The end of the first clause of the pericope remains problematic. Most scholars take **בא** as the end of the first clause, and reconstruct **בא** [כי, “for it comes/has come,” but then it is not clear what has (or will) come.⁵² Alternatively, one may consider taking **בא** [כי as the beginning of the next clause, just like the other **כי**-phrases introduce clauses in this pericope. Puech and Rey suggest “for the {your} decree comes, engraved,”⁵³ whereas Werman emends **בא** to **בו**, which results in the completely sensible reading “since in it (*sc.* [the book of] predestined history) the law is engraved.”⁵⁴ Though solutions based on emendations are always questionable, I slightly favour this reading.

⁵⁰ While **פעלתכה** **ריש**, with **ריש** as an imperative of **ירש**, “inherit,” is in itself grammatically possible, it is not clear how one should understand this. Goff, *Discerning Wisdom*, 30–31, reads it as: “(live in an upright way so that you will) inherit your ‘reward’ (that God has established for you).” This is not impossible, but rather stretches the meaning of “inherit.” Also, the implied command to live in a certain way stands out in the larger context which overall admonishes to study and consider. Note that the rendering of *e* with *yod* is uncommon in most Dead Sea Scrolls (unless from *ay*), and not attested in 4Q417, indicating that a reading **ריש** reflecting *reš* is very unlikely. The editors therefore considered the possibility that **רוש** represented an unattested *u*-form of the imperfect/imperative (next to the *i*- and *a*-forms attested in the Masoretic manuscripts). The suggestion by the editors, to assume that **רוש** is an error for **דרוש**, “seek,” “examine,” is easier. Omission of letters (later added supralinearly) by the scribe of 4Q417 is also attested in 2 i 10, 13, 15, and cannot therefore be ruled out.

⁵¹ On **פעלה** cf. *DJD* 34:161; on **פקודה** as “responsibility,” “task,” “assignment,” cf. Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning*, 240.

⁵² Cf. discussions by the editors, *DJD* 34:161, who substituted Strugnell’s original reading **הע** [ת] by (the too long reconstruction) **הש** [לום] (because **ע** generally is feminine and would not fit masculine **בא**); Goff’s tentative reconstruction **הע** [זו] though providing a masculine word, is awkward and does not really make sense (cf. discussion in Goff, *The Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom*, 85–86). The reconstruction **הק** [ן] would provide a masculine noun, but Rey does not take this together with **בא**. Note also that **הבא** is unlikely, since the unwritten area before **בא** does not belong to the abraded section of the skin.

⁵³ In translation this solution is elegant, but an adverbially used (passive) participle placed in between the verb and the subject is not quite common, and would usually belong to the same semantic field as the verb. Cf. e.g. Prov 24:34 **מתהלך רישך**.

⁵⁴ Werman, “What is the *Book of Hagu?*” 135–36; similarly Elgvin, “Wisdom With and Without Apocalyptic,” 25. Note that one cannot argue that **בא** is an orthographic variant of **בו**. Whereas some scribes render final *o* with the digraph **וא**, also in forms like **לו** (= **לו**) and **בוא** (= **בו**) (as in 1QIsa^a), there is no certain case where a mere **א** represents the *o* of the third masc sing suffix. The reading **לא** in 4Q270 6 iv 1 (for **לו**) is too uncertain to serve as evidence. In 4Q162 II 6 **בא** in the quotation of Isa 5:14

The pericope thus comments on the previous one which includes the admonition to meditate and to study (4Q417 1 i 6). Our pericope specifies the source which one should study (predestined history), and explains the origin and nature of the meditation, namely that this is the special cognitive insight bequeathed by God to those who keep His words. Here we must discuss briefly one of the remaining issues: if the second part of the pericope explains the Mal 3:16 quotation, how should we interpret the opposition between “spiritual people” and those characterized as “fleshly spirit” (*psyche*)? The explanation seems to equate “those who keep His word” with “humanity with the spiritual people.” My interpretation results in some form of ambiguity: the text describes two types of humanities, along with their corresponding anthropological distinctions, as founded in some form of double creation; at the same time, this double anthropology seems to be based in behaviour. It would mean that obedience to His words is a prerequisite for receiving the full ability of understanding one’s place in the predestined plan of history. Or, put differently, the types of humanities represent potentialities.

A FEW COMMENTS ON 4QINSTRUCTION AND 1 CORINTHIANS

Frey’s suggestion that the use of “fleshly spirit” in *4QInstruction* may shed some light on Paul’s negative view on “flesh,” as apparent in his anthropological dichotomy between “flesh” and “spirit” should be modified, and the opposition between the two types of humanities in *4QInstruction* should not be compared with the distinction in 1 Cor 3:1 between fleshly (σαρκίνοι) and spiritual (πνευματικοί) types of people. The distinction should be compared more profitably with the opposition of physical (ψυχικοί) and spiritual (πνευματικοί) kinds of people. This is not to say that we should draw direct or indirect connections between Paul’s anthropology and that of *4QInstruction*, or that the latter might clarify Paul. Rather, the anthropological arguments and concepts used by Philo and Paul have suggested a new layer of interpretation of this pericope of *4QInstruction*.

In a study on 1 Cor 2:6–16, Kuhn, while acknowledging the complex history-of-religions perspectives of the text, focuses on correspondences

corresponds to MT **בָּרָה**, but a scribe who listened may actually have interpreted *bā* as the verbal form **בָּרַח**, parallel to the preceding **וַיִּרְד**.

between this sapiential poem and the Qumran texts, especially on the clustering of the elements of “wisdom,” “spirit of God,” “mystery,” and “revelation” in this Pauline poem and in some hymns of the *Hodayot* and in 1QS XI.⁵⁵ When Kuhn gave this paper (in Oslo in 1998), the *DJD* 34 volume had not yet been published, and Kuhn does not discuss any of 4QInstruction passages. Nonetheless, it is exactly those *Hodayot* passages which Kuhn refers to that are closely related to 4QInstruction.⁵⁶ The most interesting is perhaps 1QH^a V (already referred to above) which in the context of a description of predestined history, continues to ask “But what is the spirit of flesh that it might understand all these things?” (1QH^a V, 30–31). In contrast, “And I, your servant, know by the spirit which you placed in me...” (1QH^a V, 35–36). The poetical thanksgivings and confessions in the *Hodayot*, primarily in the Community Hymns, which credit God for having bestowed “through a/the spirit which You placed in me,” knowledge and understanding, and having revealed his mysteries, show a large correspondence with the descriptions and admonitions of 4QInstruction. If we directly compare 1 Cor 2:6–16 to 4QInstruction, in particular the pericope we studied, then we recognize several general parallels. We notice the basic dichotomy in 1 Cor 2 between the *psychikoi* (2:14) and the *pneumatikoi* (2:15), the first of which “do not receive what is of the spirit of God,” and who “cannot understand it,” (2:14) whereas the latter “have received... the spirit that is from God” (2:12). Most striking is the end of this passage, where Paul quotes the Greek version of Isa 40:13 “who has known the mind (νοῦν) of the Lord,” and responds with the statement “we have the mind (νοῦν) of Christ.”

The first part of the 1 Corinthians wisdom passage (2:6–10) refers to “God’s wisdom, hidden in a mystery, which God decreed before the ages” (2:7). Regardless of Paul’s specific interpretation of the content of this wisdom (relating to Jesus Christ), the general vocabulary is reminiscent of 4QInstruction’s description of God’s predestined plan of history, a mystery which has been revealed only to some. In this article I have not intended to demonstrate Paul’s connections to a Jewish Palestinian

⁵⁵ Heinz-Wolfgang Kuhn, “The Wisdom Passage in 1 Corinthians 2:6–16 Between Qumran and Proto-Gnosticism,” in Falk et al., eds., *Sapiential, Liturgical and Poetical Texts*, 240–53.

⁵⁶ The most extensive comparison is by Matthew J. Goff, “Reading Wisdom at Qumran: 4QInstruction and the *Hodayot*,” *DSD* 11 (2004): 263–88.

sapiential tradition, as present in *4QInstruction* (general parallels are evident, but need more specific analysis), but rather to read *4QInstruction* from the perspective of anthropological dichotomies (or rather trichotomies) as are found in Philo and Paul.

4Q521 AND LUKE'S *MAGNIFICAT* AND *BENEDICTUS*

Stephen Hultgren

Department of Theology, Fordham University

The purpose of this paper is to compare the fascinating text in 4Q521 2 II 1–15 with Luke's *Magnificat* and *Benedictus* in order to discern whether the Dead Sea Scrolls text and the New Testament texts might illumine each other. At first glance such a comparison may not seem obvious. I shall attempt to show, however, that the comparison is worthwhile and that the comparison may help us in particular to understand better the origins of Luke's canticles, a question that continues to be of interest to New Testament scholars.¹ If the comparison is successful, it may also give us new insight into Palestinian Judaism and Palestinian Jewish Christianity.

There are three presuppositions about Luke's canticles that will not be defended at length here but that need to be stated at the outset. The first is that the *Magnificat* and the *Benedictus* are pre-Lukan canticles that Luke has inserted into his narrative; they were not composed by Luke himself, nor by the New Testament figures to whom they are attributed. While there are still those today who might defend Lukan composition, the evidence is overwhelmingly against it. The fact that the canticles do not fit well into their narrative contexts is especially difficult to harmonize with the assumption of Lukan composition.²

The second presupposition is that the *Benedictus* consists of two distinct parts. The first part, in Luke 1:68–75, blesses God for raising up a messiah from the house of David. The second part, in 1:76–79, where the language suddenly changes to second person address from the third person speech of 1:68–75, is an originally separate birth song for John the Baptist that puts John in a subordinate relationship to the

¹ I treat the problem of the origin of 4Q521 2 II 1–15 in detail in my article, "4Q521, the Second Benediction of the *Tefilla*, the *ḥāsīdīm*, and the Development of Royal Messianism," *RevQ* 91 (2008): 313–40.

² See further Raymond E. Brown, *The Birth of the Messiah* (rev. ed.; New York: Doubleday, 1993), 348–49, 377, 378–79, and references there.

work that God will do through the coming of the (Davidic) messiah.³ The clearly (Davidic) messianic motifs in 1:69 make it very difficult to regard the *Benedictus* as a hymn that was written wholly in reference to the Baptist. That is not to say that the *Benedictus* could not have already existed as a unity when it came to Luke,⁴ nor to deny the possibility that the two parts come from the same author or circle. But there is reason to believe that 1:68–75 has a prehistory that precedes its being joined to 1:76–79. While there are clear messianic elements in 1:78–79, which agree with 1:69, the new focus in 1:76–77 on the child John's future role as forerunner, which one might expect rather to follow directly upon 1:66–67, suggests that all of 1:76–79 represents a secondary expansion of 1:68–75. The correctness of this analysis is not actually essential to the argument of this paper. I mention it because, when we come to discuss the *Benedictus* in relationship to 4Q521, our attention will be almost exclusively on 1:68–75. Moreover, 1:68–75 as a unit can be seen to have roots in pre-Christian Jewish liturgical tradition,⁵ whereas 1:76–79 is likely a Christian composition more or less from the beginning.

The third presupposition is that the *Magnificat* and the *Benedictus* come from the same or similar circles. This cannot be proven with certainty, but it is made likely by four observations. First, the canticles probably draw on some of the same biblical passages, for example, Ps 107:9–10 (cf. Luke 1:53 and 1:79),⁶ Ps 111:9 (cf. Luke 1:49 and 1:68), and, most prominently, 1 Sam 2:1–10 (cf. Luke 1:53 and 1:69). Second, as we shall see, both hymns show some affinities to the Jewish daily prayer (*Tefilla*). Third, both stress God's acting in remembrance of his

³ It is unnecessary to argue with Brown (*ibid.*, 381, 389–90), Pierre Benoit, "L'enfance de Jean-Baptiste selon Luc 1," *NTS* 3 (1956–57): 169–94, here 184, and others (see Benoit, *ibid.*, n. 10, for references) that Luke 1:76–77 is a Lukan insertion, while 1:78–79 is the original end of the hymn in 1:68–75. The whole of 1:76–79 makes sense as retrospective reflection (from early Christian tradition) on the significance of John's ministry as forerunner in light of the salvation through the forgiveness of sins that was won through Jesus the Messiah (cf. Acts 10:36–43; 13:23–41). Cf. Joachim Gnilka, "Der Hymnus des Zacharias," *BZ* 6 (1962): 215–38, here 219–20, 231, 233–34. Albert Vanhoye, "Structure du 'Benedictus,'" *NTS* 12 (1955–56): 382–89, here 383, divides the canticle into two parts consisting of 1:68–72 and 1:73–79, based on a concentric literary analysis. But this analysis bypasses the obvious change to second person address in 1:76 and the likely differences in origin of 1:68–75 and 1:76–79. His concentric analysis also does not account for 1:79 (see p. 387).

⁴ Cf. Gnilka, *ibid.*, 219, 227.

⁵ In agreement with Gnilka, *ibid.*, 223–24.

⁶ Cf. Brown, *Birth*, 391.

covenantal commitment to Israel (cf. Luke 1:54–55 and 1:72). Fourth, they share much of the same vocabulary.⁷ Once again, this presupposition is not essential to the argument of this paper, but if the canticles do come from the same or similar circles, that would explain why we find so much that is similar in them and why they appear to share a common background.

On the assumption that the *Magnificat* and the *Benedictus* are pre-Lukan, there have been numerous attempts to determine their origin. Among the many hypotheses, there is overwhelming agreement that the canticles come from Palestinian Jewish Christianity or that the canticles were taken over by Christians from Palestinian Jewish circles. There has been disagreement, however, in determining more exactly to which circles of Palestinian Judaism they stand closest. Paul Winter thought that the canticles were originally Maccabean war songs that came to Luke by way of a Jewish Christian adaptation of a Baptist document.⁸ Feliks Gryglewicz and Pierre Benoit have been content to trace their origin (Benoit: the origin of the *Benedictus*) to Palestinian Jewish Christianity without further specification.⁹ Douglas Jones has argued that they are close to the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, the *Psalms of Solomon*, and the Qumran literature but does not attempt further specification.¹⁰ Joachim Gnilka notes parallels between the *Benedictus* and many different branches of Jewish literature, but he concludes that the canticle comes from Jewish Christian circles that stand close to the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (he does not express an opinion on whether the *Testaments* are of Palestinian or extra-Palestinian provenance).¹¹

There have been attempts to connect the canticles with the Qumran community and/or the Dead Sea Scrolls with greater specificity. David Flusser points out some similarities in language between the canticles in Luke and prayers and hymns in columns XI, XIV, and XVIII of the

⁷ See the list in Feliks Gryglewicz, "Die Herkunft der Hymnen des Kindheitsevangeliums des Lucas," *NTS* 21 (1974–75): 265–73, here 267 (see also p. 269).

⁸ Paul Winter, "Magnificat and Benedictus—Maccabean Psalms?" *BJRL* 37 (1954–55): 328–47. While Winter makes some interesting comparisons between the canticles and other late biblical and post-biblical Jewish poetry, his claim that the *Benedictus* is non-messianic is untenable, and the canticle can hardly be considered suitable for a Maccabean battle.

⁹ Gryglewicz, "Herkunft," 269, 273; Benoit, "L'enfance," 187–88.

¹⁰ Douglas Jones, "The Background and Character of the Lukan Psalms," *JTS* 19 (1968): 19–50, here 43.

¹¹ Gnilka, "Hymnus," 237–38 (cf. also 230).

War Scroll. On that basis he argues that both of the canticles draw on an older “Jewish militant hymn,” more specifically a “Baptist militant hymn,” that was similar to a hymn in the *War Scroll*.¹² The Baptist and his followers were themselves “activistic and revolutionary,” and from there is explained the “militant tune of the Magnificat and the Benedictus.”¹³ Flusser’s hypothesis is inspired in part by Paul Winter. While Flusser makes many valuable observations, it is difficult to start with his presupposition that the canticles come from Baptist circles. As mentioned above, we cannot regard the *Benedictus* as stemming from Baptist traditions because of its Davidic messianic elements. As for the *Magnificat*, Flusser follows those who regard it as a song of Elizabeth rather than of Mary on the basis of the variant reading in Luke 1:46 and concludes from that that the canticle “could have originated in Baptist circles.”¹⁴ But quite apart from the text-critical question, there is nothing in the hymn that would suggest special connections with Baptist circles. Moreover, the hypothesis that Luke’s canticles have a military background, while not impossible, is made difficult by the fact that, as Flusser himself notes, the canticles make no mention of military action.¹⁵ The canticles tell of God overturning the social order and of giving the people of Israel freedom, but they are less clear on how exactly these changes come about.

Raymond E. Brown argues that the canticles came from Jewish Christian ‘*ānāwīm*, who were related to the Qumran community. He suggests that the Qumran community arose out of the *ḥāsīdīm*, who were a subgroup of the ‘*ānāwīm*. He writes that the Qumran ‘*ānāwīm*

would have differed from other Jewish Anawim in having their own interpretation of the Law (given by the Teacher), in their withdrawn communitarian existence, in their opposition to the Jerusalem Temple, and in their shifting the messianic hopes over to a Messiah from the House of Aaron (Levi), alongside the Davidic Messiah. But their communal sharing of goods, their intense piety, and their sense of persecution were certainly features common to Anawim thought.¹⁶

¹² David Flusser, “The Magnificat, the Benedictus and the War Scroll,” *Judaism and the Origins of Christianity* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1988), 126–49, here 128, 131, 133–40.

¹³ *Ibid.*, 141.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 128.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 140; cf. 142.

¹⁶ Brown, *Birth*, 352.

As evidence Brown points to a number of texts from the Dead Sea Scrolls in which the term “poor” is used either of an individual or of the group (e.g., 1QH^a X,34–35 [Suk. II,34–35]; 4QpPs^a [4Q171] 1–2 II 9; 1+3–4 III 10). Brown suggests that “Luke got his canticles from a somewhat parallel community of Jewish Anawim who had been converted to Christianity, a group that unlike the sectarians at Qumran would have continued to reverence the Temple and whose messianism was Davidic.”¹⁷ To support the hypothesis that there were *‘ānāwīm* among the early Christians Brown points to the descriptions of communal life of the early church in Acts 2:43–47 and 4:32–37, as well as other indications of the poverty of the early Jerusalem church (Gal 2:10; Rom 15:25–26).¹⁸

There is indeed evidence that early Palestinian Christians regarded themselves (or were regarded by others) as the poor, and the church’s communal life portrayed by Luke in the early chapters of Acts, which, although it is idealized, surely has some basis in history, is certainly evocative of Qumran. Moreover, it cannot be denied that the Qumran sectarians used the term “poor” to describe themselves. There are, however, some difficulties with Brown’s hypothesis. First, I regard it as unlikely that the origins of the Qumran community are to be traced back to a group of *‘ānāwīm* or *ḥāsīdīm*. I cannot enter into the topic here, but in previously published work I have argued that the origins of the Qumran community have nothing to do with the *ḥāsīdīm* of the Maccabean era but reach back into a renewal movement in Palestine in the pre-Maccabean era.¹⁹ Second, it strikes me that the usage of the term *‘ānāwīm* in *community* texts from Qumran is not primary in the sense of describing the essential social identity of the group that first formed the Qumran community. Although ענוה (humility) appears as a community virtue, the term “poor” is nowhere used to describe the members of the community in 1QS. Rather, the term “poor” seems to be a term that the community came to apply to itself at a later time, partly on the basis of biblical texts that the community learned to apply to itself (e.g., 4QpPs^a [4Q171] 1–2 II 9–10, 16; cf. further 4QpPs^a [4Q171]

¹⁷ Ibid., 352, 378.

¹⁸ Ibid., 354, 363.

¹⁹ See Stephen Hultgren, *From the Damascus Covenant to the Covenant of the Community: Literary, Historical, and Theological Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (STDJ 66; Leiden: Brill, 2007), chapters 3 and 4.

1+3–4 III 10; 1QH^a VI,3 [Suk. XIV,3]).²⁰ Third, there is other Palestinian literature, such as the *Psalms of Solomon*, where the authors use the term “poor” for themselves but where there is no reason to assume a connection with the Qumran community. Thus Brown’s hypothesis that Luke’s canticles come from Palestinian Jewish Christian *‘ānāwīm* who were related to the Qumran community is intriguing but remains unproven and is probably unprovable. It may be that at the birth of Christianity the Qumran community was referring to itself as the “poor,” but it is doubtful that the *‘ānāwīm* form a definable enough group to make such a derivation meaningful.

In the continuing search for the origins of Luke’s canticles, I suggest that 4Q521 2 II 1–15 may help us to move forward. In an article recently published in the *Revue de Qumrân*,²¹ I argue that 4Q521 2 II 1–15 comes from circles of Palestinian *ḥāsīdīm* who were instrumental in the development of the liturgy of the Palestinian synagogue and who stood close to the circles from which the *Psalms of Solomon* originate. I suggest that the Jewish Christian(s) who authored the *Magnificat* and the *Benedictus* came ultimately from the same circles. The modest goal of this article is to demonstrate that, if my location of 4Q521 in these circles is correct, it may shed some light on the background of the Jewish Christian(s) who stand(s) behind the canticles.

There are two texts that are helpful in illuminating the relationship between 4Q521 and Luke’s canticles. The first is the Song of Hannah in 1 Sam 2:1–10. The second is the Jewish daily prayer (known as the *Tefilla*, the *Amida*, or the Eighteen Benedictions). Before we come to discuss those texts, however, it will be helpful to note in a general way some of the parallels between 4Q521 and Luke’s canticles. Both highlight a messianic figure (4Q521 2 II 1 [I believe that this is a Davidic messiah; see below]; Luke 1:69). Both show a special concern for the poor or the humble (4Q521 2 II 6, 12; Luke 1:52). Both emphasize the service of God (4Q521 2 II 3; Luke 1:74). But now we turn to the specific texts mentioned above.

(1) That the *Magnificat* (especially) and the *Benedictus* have been deeply influenced by the language and the overall conceptuality of

²⁰ For use of the term “poor” in regard to individuals, see 1QH^a X,32, 34 [Suk. II,32, 34]; XIII,13, 14 [Suk. V,13, 14]. The term “poor” is also used collectively in 1QM XI, 9, 13; XIII,14; XIV,7, but in these places it is not necessarily referring to the Qumran community.

²¹ See n. 1.

the Song of Hannah in 1 Sam 2:1–10 is clear. The parallels between the *Magnificat* and the Song of Hannah are obvious and have long been observed. The conceptual framework of the Song of Mary—that God is the one who through his might brings down the arrogant and the mighty and lifts up the lowly, who enriches the poor and sends the wealthy away empty—is basically the same as that of the Song of Hannah.²² Even Mary's introduction to the song ("my soul magnifies the Lord, my spirit rejoices in God my savior") is reminiscent of the beginning of the Song of Hannah ("my heart exults in the LORD, my strength is exulted in the LORD, my mouth derides my enemies, because I rejoice in your salvation"), even if some of the language in Luke 1:47 also alludes to other OT passages (e.g., Pss 34:3–4; 35:9; Hab 3:18). As far as the *Benedictus* is concerned, the declaration that God has "raised up a horn of salvation for us in the house of David his servant" is probably an allusion to 1 Sam 2:10, along with other OT texts (Ezek 29:21; Pss 18:3; 132:17).

In 4Q521 also we find significant allusions to the Song of Hannah. First, when the author says that the Lord will "honor the pious upon the throne of an eternal kingdom" (4Q521 2 II 7), that alludes both to 1 Sam 2:8, which says that God raises the poor so that they may sit with princes and inherit a "throne of honor," and to 1 Sam 2:9, where the "pious" (or devout) are the recipients of God's favors. The declaration in 4Q521 2 II 13 that God "will enrich the hungry" is probably an allusion to 1 Sam 2:5, 7, which speak of God as the one who "makes rich" and who causes the "hungry" to be fed. In short, both the *Magnificat* and 4Q521 emphasize God's acting to save the poor and the devout within a framework provided by the Song of Hannah.

(2) The second set of texts that are helpful in illuminating the relationship between 4Q521 and Luke's canticles are texts from the Jewish liturgy. Building on the work of David Flusser, I have shown in my abovementioned *Revue de Qumrân* article that 4Q521 has profound parallels with the second benediction of the daily Jewish prayer. Both texts affirm that God is the one who gives (or will give) life to the dead. Both texts speak of God as the one who releases the captives. Both texts speak of God as the one who heals (or will heal) the sick

²² Brown, *Birth*, 337, mentions that the Song of Hannah "has a more logical balance in contrasting the hungry and the full, the poor and the rich," but that is a minor point.

or the wounded. Both texts speak of God as the one who upholds the weak, although with different words. The second benediction calls God the “upholder of those who fall.” 4Q521 2 II 8 calls God the one who “raises up those who are bowed down.” Although these two expressions differ verbally, they are in Ps 145:14 in synonymous parallelism with each other (cf. also Ps 146:8), which indicates that we may take them as conceptual parallels. Finally, as we have already noted that 4Q521 contains allusions to 1 Sam 2:1–10, so we note that the second benediction does also (cf. *ממית ומחיה* in the second benediction with the same expression in 1 Sam 2:6).

What is striking is that Luke’s canticles also show parallels to the *Tefilla*, including the second benediction.²³ First, Mary calls God “the mighty one” (ὁ δυνατός) (Luke 1:49). δυνατός is one of the translations for גבור in the OT. The epithet δυνατός is rarely used for God in the LXX, but it does appear in Zeph 3:17 and in Pss 23:8 and 77:65 as a translation of גבור (it also appears in LXX Ps 88:9, but the Hebrew does not have גבור there). But גבור is prominent as an epithet for God in the *Tefilla*, appearing in the first and second benedictions (it also appears in certain versions of the benedictions of the *Shema*).²⁴ Given the rarity of its use in the OT, it is possible that the use of ὁ δυνατός in Luke 1:49 is an echo of the *Tefilla* as much as it is an echo of the OT itself.

There may be further evidence for the influence of the *Tefilla*. The whole of 1:49a reads, “for the mighty one has done great things (μεγάλα) for me.” The second benediction has as its main focus praise of God’s mighty deeds, his גבורות, which in OT idiom most often refers to God’s mighty deeds for Israel in the exodus. It is possible that μεγάλα in Luke 1:49 is an allusion to the same topic. μεγάλα is the usual translation of גדולות rather than גבורות in the OT, but גדולות is also a word that is frequently used in the OT for God’s mighty deeds in the exodus (Deut 10:21; Ps 106:21 [LXX 105:21]). The adjective μέγας translates גבורה used as an adjective in a different context in Sir 48:24 (MS B).²⁵ Reflection on the exodus was an important formative ele-

²³ Gnllka, “Hymnus,” 223–24, also notes parallels between (the first part of) the *Benedictus* and the *Tefilla*.

²⁴ See Hultgren, “4Q521,” 319–20.

²⁵ Note also that τὰ μεγαλεῖα translates גבורה in Sir 42:21 (MS M) (cf. also Sir 43:15 MS M). There is a variant reading in Luke 1:49a with μεγαλεῖα in place of μεγάλα. See also Jones, “Background,” 24–25, where he notes the freedom in the Greek of Luke’s canticles vis-à-vis the LXX. Luke’s μεγάλα (or μεγαλεῖα) could represent a Hebrew גבורות.

ment in the development of Jewish prayer, especially in the first and second benedictions of the *Tefilla*. It is perhaps no surprise, then, that we find other echoes of reflection on the exodus in Mary's song. For example, the declaration that God "has shown strength with his arm" (Luke 1:51a) draws on language from exodus traditions (Exod 6:6; 15:16; Deut 4:34; Isa 51:9–10; 2 Kgs 17:36; Ps 136:12–13 [LXX 135:12–13]).²⁶ In the *Benedictus* we also have allusions to the exodus. The declaration that God has acted to save his people "from our enemies and from the hands of all who hate us" comes from recollection of the exodus in Ps 106:10 (LXX 105:10). That God saves the people in order that they "might serve him in holiness and righteousness" points to the goal of the exodus with allusion to Josh 24:14. That early Christian hymns would have such a focus on the exodus is easily explained when we see that they are steeped in the language of Jewish liturgy.²⁷

There are two other possible allusions to the *Tefilla*. Luke 1:49b reads, "and holy is his name" (καὶ ἅγιον τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ). Usually commentators identify Ps 111:9 as the source of these words, and that is not incorrect, but the words also echo the third benediction of the *Tefilla*. The third benediction is on the holiness of God and of God's name and includes the words, "holy is your name" (וְשִׁמְךָ קָדוֹשׁ). Interestingly, Luke 1:49b on the holiness of God's name follows immediately upon the identification of God as ὁ δυνάτοζ (=גבור) in 1:49a, just as the third benediction on the holiness of God's name immediately follows upon the second benediction's declaration of God as the גבור (=ὁ δυνάτοζ). Finally, the declaration that God "has raised up for us a horn of salvation in the house of David his servant" in Luke 1:69 is reminiscent of the fifteenth benediction (Babylonian version) of the *Tefilla*, the prayer that God would "cause the offspring of David your servant to sprout," and that God would "exalt his [David's] horn in your salvation." There

²⁶ Ps 118:15 ("the right hand of the LORD has shown strength") does not come directly in the context of reflection on the exodus, but 118:14 echoes the song of triumph at the sea (cf. Exod 15:2).

²⁷ George J. Brooke, "Songs of Revolution: The Song of Miriam and its Counterparts," *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2005), 272–81, here 277, has pointed out another important parallel to the song of Mary in the song of Miriam in 4Q365 6 II 3, where Miriam calls God "great" and a "savior" within the context of the exodus. While no direct dependence of Luke on 4Q365 can be shown, it would come as no surprise if the Jewish Christian author of the *Magnificat* wrote his song of Mary (Miriam) in conscious reflection of a song such as this one sung by another Miriam. I am grateful to Prof. Brooke for personally calling this parallel to my attention.

is an allusion to this same prayer in the second benediction, which blesses God as the one who “causes salvation to sprout.”²⁸

The first three benedictions are regarded as among the oldest of the Eighteen Benedictions, and it is nearly certain that in their core they go back to the Second-Temple period, perhaps as far back as the Macca-bean era.²⁹ The antiquity of the fifteenth benediction, the prayer for the exaltation of the horn of David, is confirmed by the psalm interpolated between Sir 51:12 and 51:13 in the Hebrew MS B, which reads, “Give thanks to the one who causes a horn to sprout for the house of David.” This psalm probably comes from the second century B.C. if not earlier.³⁰ Thus we are justified in detecting the possible influence of the *Tefilla* on these parts of Luke’s canticles.

Given the fact that both 4Q521 and Luke’s canticles show dependence on 1 Sam 2:1–10 and possible connections with the *Tefilla*, we are led to ask what might account for the parallels. Can we perhaps trace 4Q521 and Luke’s canticles back to similar circles? In my *Revue de Qumrân* article I have argued that 4Q521 makes sense as an expression of the piety of Palestinian *ḥāsīdīm* of the late second and early first centuries B.C. The question of the identity of the *ḥāsīdīm* is a complex one, into which I cannot enter at length here. It must suffice to say that I do not regard the *ḥāsīdīm* as having formed a party or sect (much less as being the forerunners of the Qumran community) but rather as having constituted a socially identifiable group of devout Jews within the *mainstream* of Palestinian Judaism. I would define them as devout Jews who were (among other things) instrumental in the development of the Jewish liturgy of the synagogue of mainstream Judaism. That they played a role in the development of the liturgy is made likely, on the one hand, by the fact that 4Q521, which has roots (in part) in the language of the

²⁸ The statement that God “has looked upon the humiliation of his servant,” besides being an allusion to Hannah’s childlessness in 1 Sam 1:11, could also be an allusion to the people Israel’s affliction in Egypt (cf. Exod 4:31). It is worth noting in this connection that the request that God “look upon our affliction” appears in the seventh benediction of the *Tefilla*. One should also note the parallels between the *Benedictus* and the *musaf* prayer for New Year’s (see S. Singer, *The Authorized Daily Prayer Book* [9th American ed.; New York: Hebrew Publishing Co. [1931], 251–52).

²⁹ Kaufmann Kohler, *The Origins of the Synagogue and the Church* (New York: Macmillan Co., 1929), 66–67; M. Liber, “Structure and History of the *Tefillah*,” *JQR* 40 (1950): 331–57, here 335–42, 354.

³⁰ See Alexander A. Di Lella, *The Hebrew Text of Sirach: A Text-Critical and Historical Study* (London: Mouton & Co., 1966), 101–05, and further references there; and Kohler, *ibid.*, 75.

Jewish liturgy, has a particular focus on the *ḥāsīdīm* (2 II 5, 7), and, on the other hand, by the fact that the Jewish liturgy itself asks for God's compassion on the *ḥāsīdīm* in the thirteenth benediction.³¹

One of the major points of interest for the *ḥāsīdīm* seems to have been their hope for the coming of a Davidic messiah. This can be seen in the fifteenth benediction, as well as in the echo of the fifteenth benediction in the second benediction. Historically this fervent hope for the coming of a Davidic messiah makes sense as particularly characteristic of the late second and early first centuries B.C., when anti-Hasmonean sentiment was at its height and when devout Jews regarded the Hasmonean monarchy as an illegitimate usurpation of the Davidic house's legitimate claim to the throne of Israel. We find precisely this outlook among the devout in the *Psalms of Solomon*. Scholars have for a long time noted certain similarities between the *Psalms of Solomon* and the *Tefilla*, which has led to the hypothesis that the *Psalms of Solomon* come from the same or similar circles as the earliest benedictions of the *Tefilla*. The devout (Greek ὁσιοί= *ḥāsīdīm*) appear prominently in the *Pss. Sol.* (2:36; 3:8; 4:1, 6, 8; 8:23, 34; 9:3; 10:6; 12:4, 6; 13:10, 12; 14:3, 10; 15:7; 17:16). They are opponents of the Hasmonean monarchy and pray that God would bring the Davidic messiah. It is on the basis of the hypothesis that 4Q521 2 II 1–15 comes from circles of such *ḥāsīdīm* that I have argued that the messiah of 4Q521 2 II 1 is a Davidic messiah, not a priestly or prophetic messiah.³²

It is striking that there are many conceptual and verbal parallels between the *Psalms of Solomon* and the *Magnificat* as well:³³ those who fear God (Luke 1:50; *Pss. Sol.* 2:33; 3:12; 4:23; 15:13); Israel as God's servant (Luke 1:54; *Pss. Sol.* 12:6; 17:21); the offspring of Abraham (Luke 1:55; *Pss. Sol.* 18:3); arrogance (ὑπερηφάνια) (Luke 1:51; *Pss. Sol.* 2:1–2, 31; 17:13, 23); the contrast between rich and poor (Luke 1:53; *Pss. Sol.* 5:11); humiliation (Luke 1:52; *Pss. Sol.* 11:4); the mercy of God (Luke 1:50; *Pss. Sol.* 10:3); the arm of God (Luke 1:51; *Pss. Sol.* 13:2); the power of God (Luke 1:51; *Pss. Sol.* 17:3); the verbs ἐπιβλέπω (Luke 1:48; *Pss. Sol.* 18:2); ἀντιλαμβάνομαι (Luke 1:54; *Pss. Sol.* 16:3, 5);

³¹ For further details, see Hultgren, "4Q521," esp. 322–36.

³² See further Hultgren, *ibid.*, 330–38.

³³ I follow the list in François Bovon, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas* (3 vols.; EKKNT 3; Zurich/Neukirchen-Vluyn: Benziger Verlag/Neukirchener Verlag, 1989), 1:82–83. The list could also include parts of the *Benedictus*.

and μὴ σκωμῶμαι (Luke 1:54; *Pss. Sol.* 10:1, 4); the verb λαλέω in the Semitic sense of promise (Luke 1:55; *Pss. Sol.* 11:7).

All of this suggests that we may be able to trace the origins of both 4Q521 and the author(s) of Luke's canticles back to the *ḥāsīdīm* of the Palestinian synagogue. The Song of Hannah was of particular interest to both the author of 4Q521 and the author(s) of the canticles in Luke because it speaks of God's raising up of his messiah and speaks of God's special concern for the *ḥāsīdīm*. The antiquity of the *Magnificat* and its proximity to circles of the Jewish devout are evident in the fact that there is nothing explicitly Christian in the hymn. Any devout Jewish woman who had experienced an act of God's salvation on her behalf could sing the *Magnificat*, and it is only the hymn's present place in Luke that gives it a Christian coloring. The first part of the *Benedictus* (1:68–75) presupposes that the messianic promises have been fulfilled (see esp. 1:69), but even its language is thoroughly Jewish and remains within the orbit of nationalistic Jewish hope. The author or authors of these hymns were so steeped in traditional Jewish liturgical and hymnic language that they could freely create new hymns echoing the biblically saturated phraseology of Jewish liturgy and hymnody but without imitating precisely any one previous model.³⁴ The author or authors of Luke's canticles were converted *ḥāsīdīm* who believed that in Jesus the Davidic messiah had come. It is possible that the death and resurrection of Jesus was the first motivation for the hymns.³⁵ In that case, the "great things" (Luke 1:49) that God has done by the "strength" of his "arm" (1:51) refers to God raising Jesus from the dead, thereby "raising" a horn of salvation in the house of David (1:69).³⁶ In recognition of the resurrection and in celebration of God's victory over the worldly rulers who had put Jesus to death (as well as in anticipation of the full coming of the kingdom when Jesus would return), the author(s) could praise God for bringing down the powerful from their thrones and for raising up the lowly (1:52, 71). By bringing and exalting the Davidic messiah, God had kept his promises of old and had shown faithfulness to his covenant with Israel (1:54–55, 72–73). Alternatively, it is possible that

³⁴ Jones, "Background," 21, 24, 25, 43–44, 47, points out that much of the language in Luke's canticles has echoes and allusions to Scripture but often cannot be tied to any specific passage.

³⁵ Cf. Brown, *Birth*, 363.

³⁶ Cf. Benoit, "L'enfance," 187.

the canticles were written by early Christians intentionally in praise of the birth of Jesus the messiah.³⁷

One of the other striking things about 4Q521, of course, is that the list of wondrous works that God is expected to do in the time of salvation agrees very closely with the report of Jesus' miraculous deeds in his answer to John the Baptist in Matt 11:2–6//Luke 7:18–23. In 4Q521 these deeds are not said to be deeds of the messianic figure of 2 II 1 but rather of God himself. If the messiah of 2 II 1 is a Davidic messiah, as I have argued, then it will not have been a large step from saying that the marvelous deeds enumerated in this piece are deeds that God will do in the messianic era to saying that these are deeds that God will do through a Davidic messianic agent. That is apparently how Jesus interprets what is happening in his own ministry. Through him the marvelous acts of God for the messianic era that are discussed in 4Q521 are happening. If there were *ḥāsīdīm* in the Palestinian synagogues at the time of Jesus who had an outlook such as that witnessed by 4Q521, then it would be no surprise if they, upon witnessing in Jesus' ministry the kinds of things of which 4Q521 speaks, may have been among the first persons to come to believe in Jesus as messiah. Perhaps it is persons such as these who stand behind the canticles of Luke.³⁸ The appearance of the title "Son of David" in some synoptic accounts of Jesus' miracles (e.g., Matt 12:23; 21:14–15; Mark 10:47) suggests that there were indeed Jews who regarded Jesus' miracles as testifying to his status as Davidic messiah.

In conclusion: 4Q521, together with the *Tefilla* and the *Psalms of Solomon*, gives us evidence for the kinds of circles of the devout in existence in the first and second centuries B.C. as well as at the time of Jesus who may have written songs such as the *Magnificat* and the

³⁷ See Ulrike Mittmann-Richert, *Magnifikat und Benediktus: Die ältesten Zeugnisse der judenchristlichen Tradition von der Geburt des Messias* (WUNT 2/90; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1996), 133–53. Mittmann-Richert observes that the language of the *Magnificat* makes good sense as intended originally for the mouth of Mary as the mother of the messiah. She considers it possible that the canticles come from the early Jerusalem Christian community (pp. 131–32).

³⁸ In this regard it is worth noting that Luke (4:16–30) portrays Jesus as preaching in a Galilean synagogue on Isa 61, about how God has anointed him to preach good news to the poor, to proclaim release to the captives, and to open the eyes of the blind—three of the acts of God mentioned in 4Q521—and as saying that these words of Isaiah were being fulfilled in the people's hearing. If there is anything historical in this account (and there probably is), then it is an indication that the kinds of messianic expectations to which 4Q521 points may well have been alive at the time of Jesus' ministry.

Benedictus. They were devout Jews, deeply steeped in the liturgical and poetic traditions of Palestinian Judaism, with an intense hope for the coming of the Davidic messiah. To this extent, Brown's hypothesis that the origins of the *Magnificat* and the *Benedictus* are to be sought among Jewish Christian *ʿānāwīm* related to the Qumran community and Flusser's hypothesis that they come from Essene circles should be modified.³⁹ The Jewish Christian circles in which these canticles originated turn out to be closer to the devout (*ḥāsīdīm*) of mainstream Judaism as practiced in the synagogue than to the Essenes or the Qumran community.⁴⁰

³⁹ Mittmann-Richert, *Magnifikat und Benediktus*, 90, finds no direct connection between hymns and prayers from Qumran and Luke's canticles.

⁴⁰ That is not to deny that the canticles share characteristics of poetry in the Dead Sea Scrolls, as pointed out by Flusser, or of other post-biblical poetry, as argued by Winter. On the former see also Maurya P. Horgan and Paul J. Kobelski, "The Hodayot (1QH) and New Testament Poetry," *To Touch the Text: Biblical and Related Studies in Honor of Joseph A. Fitzmyer, S.J.* (ed. M.P. Horgan and P.J. Kobelski; New York: Crossroad, 1989), 179–93 (although some of their examples are not compelling).

MARRIAGE AND CREATION IN MARK 10 AND CD 4-5

Lutz Doering
King's College London

1. INTRODUCTION

The Markan divorce pericope in chapter 10 and the passage in CD 4-5 on marriage are prime examples of “parallels” extensively referred to in both New Testament and Dead Sea Scrolls scholarship. The relationship between the two passages has been perceived to be especially close, and the invocation of Gen 1 in both texts to be very similar.¹ However, both the individual texts and their cross-comparison are fraught with problems. For Mark, the relation between the quotations from Gen 1 and Gen 2 is debated, but a further problem is the apparently composite nature of the pericope: Mark 10:6-8, due to their conformance with the Genesis Septuagint, are widely considered a product of early Christian reflection, whilst v. 9 is often attributed to Jesus; in addition, vv. 11-12 appear to stand in tension with vv. 6-8 in forbidding only remarriage after divorce. On the side of the *Damascus Document*, determining the precise topic is still a problem: Does taking “two wives in their lifetime” demand a single marriage? Does it prohibit divorce or only polygamy? Debated is also how the three quotations in CD function and how CD relates to a passage in the Temple Scroll dealing with the king’s marriage. Accordingly, different constellations for the comparison of the two texts emerge, with individual, exegetical decisions and general, interpretative presuppositions decisively pushing the overall argument into one or the other direction. The following is an attempt to contribute to the clarification of some of these problems, to appreciate both similarity and difference in the two texts, and to suggest some ramifications for the conceptualisation of their respective teaching on marriage and creation.

¹ Cf., e.g., J. de Waard, *A Comparative Study of the Old Testament Text in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the New Testament* (STDJ 4; Leiden: Brill, 1965), 30-34.

2. MARK 10:2–12

The Markan divorce pericope can be sub-divided into two parts of different genre: vv. 2–9 are a conflict story between Jesus and “the Pharisees”, whereas vv. 11–12 are a double saying joined by the hinge of v. 10 which makes them an internal teaching for the disciples after retiring to the house.² Verse 2 has “the Pharisees” ask Jesus whether it “is permissible for a man to divorce [his] wife”; the reference to the Pharisees is lacking in Codex Bezae and other witnesses, and the shorter form is considered by some “the earliest recoverable reading”.³ It is debated whether the question itself would make sense in Second Temple Judaism. Some have asserted this, pointing to the *de facto* exclusion of divorce in the *Temple Scroll* (see further below) or to the strict approach of the House of Shammai, according to which “divorce is only a result of adultery, which at any rate forbids the wife to her husband”.⁴ However, even if this points to a very negative view of divorce and the divorced woman—an issue to which we shall come back later—it does not deny that the Shammaites accepted the institution of divorce as such. There may have been some further criticism of divorce (e.g., Mal 2:16 MT [?]),⁵ but, as we shall see, no other Second Temple

² Cf. only R. Bultmann, *Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition* (FRLANT 29; 9th ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979), 25f, 140.

³ A. Yarbro Collins, *Mark: A Commentary* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress, 2007), 457; cf. the minority opinion of Metzger and Wikgren in B.M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (2nd ed.; Stuttgart: Dt. Bibelgesellschaft, 1994), 88.

⁴ I. Rosen-Zvi, “‘Even if he found another one more beautiful than her’: A Fresh Look at the Reasons for Divorce in Tannaitic Literature,” *JSIJ* 3 (2004): 1–11: 2 (in Hebrew). According to Rosen-Zvi, the connection of Shammaite and Hillelite views with a different interpretation of Deut 24:1 (see below) is a secondary development: *ibid.* 1–5.

⁵ The interpretation of this verse is extremely difficult. The Minor Prophets scroll from Qumran, part of the LXX manuscripts, the Vulgate, and *Tg. Ps.-J.* render the beginning of the verse as “if you hate (her), send (her) away,” thus condoning and even recommending divorce under certain circumstances; 4QXII^a: כִּי־אִם שְׂנֵאתָּהּ שְׁלַח. (DJD 15, 224); LXX^{W1}: ἄλλ’ ἐὰν μισήσῃς ἐξάποστείλον; V: *cum odio habueris, dimitte*; *Tg. Ps.-J.*: אַרְי אִם סְנִית לָהּ פִּטְרָהּ. In contrast, MT *might* be read as a *critique* of divorce. However, Gordon Paul Hugenberger has convincingly argued that, compared with an interpretation (and possibly emendation) of MT כִּי שְׂנֵאתָּ שְׁלַח in terms of God’s rejection of divorce (“for I hate divorce”), a sense of the text is to be preferred that is directed against divorce on account of mere aversion to the woman (“for if he hates [her] and [therefore] sends [her] away”): G.P. Hugenberger, *Marriage as Covenant: A Study of Biblical Law and Ethics Governing Marriage, Developed from the Perspective of Malachi* (VTSup 52; Leiden: Brill, 1994), 48–83, esp. 76.

Jewish text generally prohibits divorce to ordinary Jews; thus, the question in Mark 10:2 might indeed seem odd. David Instone-Brewer has therefore suggested to mentally supply “[sc. divorce] for any reason”,⁶ bringing the pericope in line with the Matthean parallel (Matt 19:3) and the famous debate between the Houses of Hillel and Shammai on the interpretation of עֲרֻוֹת דְּבָר (Deut 24:1; *m. Git.* 9:10), but I do not think that there is sufficient warrant for this: “for any reason” (κατὰ πᾶσαν αἰτίαν) in Matt 19:3 correlates with the famous exception clause in v. 9 “except for sexual indecency” (μὴ ἐπὶ πορνείᾳ) and is most probably a Matthean clarification (see also αἰτία in v. 10). In my view, it seems more likely that the indeterminate wording in Mark serves to prepare Jesus’ own position as developed subsequently;⁷ the possible absence of “the Pharisees” from the earliest text form perhaps underlines the lack of historical context. The interlocutors’ answer in v. 4 shifts to the vocabulary of concession: “Moses conceded (ἐπέτρεψεν)⁸ to write a certificate of annulment and to divorce [one’s wife]” (cf. Deut 24:1). The juxtaposition of “command” and “concede” language has the effect that the interlocutors classify divorce not as a commandment but as a concession,⁹ a notion Jesus takes up in v. 5: “Because of your hardness of heart” Moses wrote the provision for the *get*. As Morna Hooker comments, “Jesus does not dispute the validity of the Deuteronomic rule, but sees it as concessionary: it was introduced because of man’s weakness.”¹⁰

⁶ Cf. D. Instone-Brewer, *Divorce and Remarriage in the Bible: The Social and Literary Context* (Grand Rapids [Mich.]: Eerdmans, 2002), esp. 159, 175–77.

⁷ Cf. R. Pesch, *Das Markusevangelium* (2 vols.; HTK 2/1–2; Freiburg: Herder, 1991), 1:212.

⁸ Cf. for the language of personal concession esp. Matt 8:21 par.; also Mark 5:13 par.

⁹ But note that in the parallel in Mt 19:7–8 there is a different distribution of the verbs ἐντέλλειν and ἐπιτρέπειν, with the interlocutors asking, “Why then did Moses *command* one to give a certificate of annulment and to divorce [one’s wife]?” and Jesus answering, “For your hardness of heart Moses *conceded* you to divorce your wives...”.

¹⁰ M. Hooker, *The Gospel According to St Mark* (BNTC; London: A & C Black, 1991; repr., London: Continuum, 2001), 236. Some scholars point out that the reference to Moses implies that this concession is “merely” Mosaic and does not reflect God’s will; e.g., S.D. Fraade, “Moses and the Commandments: Can Hermeneutics, History, and Rhetoric Be Disentangled?”, *The Idea of Biblical Interpretation: Essays in Honor of James Kugel* (ed. H. Najman and J.H. Newman; JSJSup 83; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 399–422: 417; Collins, *Mark*, 468. However, although the text does contrast the Mosaic rule with God’s order here, I would like to caution that “Moses” is not consistently used in such a contrasting way in Mark; see Mark 7:10, where “Moses” is referred to for Decalogue commandments and clearly belongs to the side of “God’s commandments” mentioned in the preceding verse.—On “hardness of hearts” see further below, (at) n. 101.

In Mark 10, the concession is contrasted (vv. 6–8) with the original institution of marriage, whilst v. 9 concludes for human praxis, in the third person imperative.

(Mark 10:6) ἀπό δὲ ἀρχῆς κτίσεως ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ ἐποίησεν αὐτούς· (7) ἕνεκεν τούτου καταλείψει ἄνθρωπος τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ καὶ τὴν μητέρα [καὶ προσκολληθήσεται πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ],¹¹ (8) καὶ ἔσονται οἱ δύο εἰς σάρκα μίαν· ὥστε οὐκέτι εἰσὶν δύο ἀλλὰ μία σὰρξ. (9) ὁ οὖν ὁ θεὸς συνέζευξεν ἄνθρωπος μὴ χωριζέτω.

(Mark 10:6) But from the beginning of creation, ‘Male and female he made them.’ (7) ‘For this reason a man will leave his father and mother [and be joined to his wife], (8) and the two will become one flesh.’ Thus, they are no longer two, but one flesh. (9) So then, what God has joined together, let man not separate.

The core of vv. 6–8 is a combination of two passages from the creation account, Gen 1:27c (= 5:2aa)¹² and 2:24. They are linked “so that a

¹¹ The words in brackets are missing in \aleph B ψ 892*. 2427 sy^s, but here it is possible that the best witnesses have fallen victim to *homoioteleuton* (at καί); thus also W. Loader, *Sexuality and the Jesus Tradition* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005) 100 (henceforth: Loader, *Sexuality*). The only way to get around the possibility that—without these words—“οἱ δύο in ver. 8 could be taken to refer to the father and the mother” (Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 89) would be to assume that v. 7 ἄνθρωπος refers to *both man and woman* (thus Pesch, *Markusevangelium*, 2:123f). But note that such an inclusive notion is *absent* from Gen 2:24 LXX, since it mentions the “wife” separately. Together with the transcriptional argument this suggests that one should not overemphasize the use of ἄνθρωπος here, since it most probably simply refers to the “man”; cf. T. Holtz, “Ich aber sage euch”, *Jesus und das jüdische Gesetz* (ed. I. Broer; Stuttgart et al.: Kohlhammer, 1992), 135–145: 140: “Ἀνθρώπος gibt in LXX überaus häufig $\psi\aleph$ wieder.” Cf. also M. Rösel, *Übersetzung als Vollendung der Auslegung: Studien zur Genesis-Septuaginta* (BZAW 223; Berlin: De Gruyter, 1994), 72. Equally, v. 9 ἄνθρωπος most likely refers only or predominantly to the man in the early stages of tradition history; see below.

¹² It is unclear whether the repetition in Gen 5:2 plays a role in the argumentation or was even originally targeted. Here, in God’s subsequent naming the man and the woman, the name “Adam” (thus here also in LXX, diff. Gen 1:27a LXX!) is referred to *both* man and woman (\aleph ψ \aleph , τὸ ὄνομα αὐτῶν). In rabbinic tradition this has been related to marriage, which is said to make for a complete human being; cf. *Gen Rab.* 17:2 [152 Theodor & Albeck; cf. *Qoh. Rab.* 9:9]: “Whoever has no wife... is no complete human being (\aleph ψ \aleph)” (R. Chijja b. Gamda or Gomdi); *b. Yebam.* 63a: “Everyone (\aleph) without a wife is no human being (\aleph)” (R. Eleazar). It is therefore not impossible that this connection of Gen 5:2 with marriage in one strand of Jewish tradition would also be of relevance for the connection with the quotation of Gen 2:24 in Mark; cf. also A. Schremer, *Male and Female He Created Them: Jewish Marriage in the Late Second Temple, Mishnah and Talmud Periods* (Jerusalem: Merkaz Shazar, 2003), 71–72 (in Hebrew). We note, however, that in the Hebrew of *MT* Gen 5:2aa deviates slightly from Gen 1:27c, see below, n. 80.

single conclusion can be drawn from it.”¹³ The text of the Genesis quotations conforms to the Septuagint.¹⁴ However, it is another question whether—as some have claimed—the argumentation would work *only* in this textual form, a question on which the following will suggest a negative answer.

Apparently, the argument is syncretical,¹⁵ with each of the proof-texts offering one “hook”, on both of which it rests. It culminates, however, in the final statement of Gen 2:24 on becoming “one flesh.” This is underscored by the conclusion, introduced by ὥστε, in v. 8b, “Thus, they are no longer two, but one flesh.” The two hooks of the argument then are as follows, and we shall discuss them one after the other: (1) God created the first human beings ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ, “male and female.” What this means is debated. It would be attractive to see here a reference to the androgyne myth, because that could allow for an overarching framework accommodating both marriage and celibacy. Proposed by David Daube, Paul Winter, Kurt Niederwimmer, and recently Bernard Jackson,¹⁶ this theory argues that humankind was

¹³ Instone-Brewer, *Divorce and Remarriage*, 137.

¹⁴ Cf. W. Loader, *The Septuagint, Sexuality, and the New Testament: Case Studies on the Impact of the LXX in Philo and the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004), 80 (henceforth Loader, *Septuagint*).

¹⁵ Cf. K. Berger, *Die Gesetzesauslegung Jesu. Ihr historischer Hintergrund im Judentum und im Alten Testament I* (WMANT 40; Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1972), 548–50, but different in detail.

¹⁶ Cf. D. Daube, *Rabbinic Judaism and the New Testament* (Jordan Lectures 1952; London: Athlone Press, 1956), 71–86; P. Winter, “Šadoqite Fragments IV 20, 21 and the Exegesis of Genesis 1 27 in Late Judaism,” *ZAW* 68 (1956): 71–84: 78–84; idem, “Genesis 1 27 and Jesus’ Saying on Divorce,” *ZAW* 70 (1958): 260–61; K. Niederwimmer, *Askese und Mysterium: Über Ehe, Ehescheidung und Eheverzicht in den Anfängen des christlichen Glaubens* (FRLANT 113; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1975), 45–49; B.S. Jackson, “‘Holier than Thou’? Marriage and Divorce in the Scrolls, the New Testament and Early Rabbinic Sources,” idem, *Essays on Halakhah in the New Testament* (JCP 16; Leiden: Brill, 2008), 167–225: 184–87, 197, 224–25.—Cf. for this myth in Jewish sources: Philo, *Opif.* 76; cf. *Alleg. Interp.* 2:13; *Gen. Rab.* 8:1 [55 Theodor & Albeck]; *b. Ber.* 61a; *b. Erub.* 18a; *M. Tehar.* on Ps 139:5 [528 Buber]. *Gen. Rab.* 8:11 [64 Theodor & Albeck], *Mekh. Y., Pisha Bo* 14 on Exod 1:40 [50 Horovitz & Rabin], and *y. Meg.* 1:11(8) [71d] claim that one of the passages “written for Talmi” (i.e. alleged alterations in the Greek translation) was זכר ונקוביו ברא אותם “as a male and his female parts he created them”; but it is debated whether נקוביו really means “his female parts,” thus M. Jastrow, *A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature* (2 vols., New York: Pardes, 1950), [2:]930, but see J.B. Schaller, “Gen 1.2 im antiken Judentum: Untersuchungen über Verwendung und Deutung der Schöpfungsaussagen von Gen 1.2 im antiken Judentum” (PhD diss.; University of Göttingen, 1961), 153; F.G. Hüttenmeister (transl.), *Megilla: Schriftrolle* (Übersetzung des Talmud Yerushalmi 2/2; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1987), 56: “seine

created in an androgynous fashion, to be recovered in the eschaton, either by proper marriage or by celibacy—the latter being available only to the elect who embody the androgyne already.

However, there are a few problems with this interesting theory: First, it is unclear whether or to which extent the eschaton in other early Christian texts indeed involves recovery of the androgyne. Several nuances seem to have co-existed. There is, on the one hand, the expectation of a post-resurrection state “like the angels” (ὡς ἄγγελοι, Mark 12:25); this does not suggest an androgyne status but to the contrary one of *unambiguous gendering*, in which the good angels—as opposed to the bad ones—*restrain their sexuality*¹⁷ because it is inappropriate for holy space.¹⁸ Angels are normally male gendered in early Jewish literature;¹⁹ whether the saying reckons also with female gendered ones, views post-resurrection women as male gendered as well, or simply disregards women is difficult to tell. On the other hand, there are expectations that gender differences will become *irrelevant*:

Gal 3:28: οὐκ ἐνὶ Ἰουδαίῳ οὐδὲ Ἑλλήν, οὐκ ἐνὶ δοῦλος οὐδὲ ἐλεύθερος, οὐκ ἐνὶ ἄρσεν καὶ θήλυ· πάντες γὰρ ὑμεῖς εἷς ἐστε ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ
There is no longer Jew or Greek, there is no longer slave or free, there is no longer male and female, for you are all one in Christ Jesus.

2 Clem. 12:2 (par. Gos. Th. 22 par. Gos. Eg. [apud Clem. Strom. 3:92]):
ἐπερωθεὶς γὰρ αὐτὸς ὁ κύριος ὑπὸ τινος, πότε ἤξει αὐτοῦ ἡ βασιλεία, εἶπεν· Ὅταν ἔσται τὰ δύο ἓν, καὶ τὸ ἔξω ὡς τὸ ἔσω καὶ τὸ ἄρσεν μετὰ τῆς θηλείας, οὔτε ἄρσεν οὔτε θήλυ.

Öffnungen”; b. Meg. 9a has the variant בראו ונקבה זכר “male and female he created him.” These texts are normally deemed to depend on Aristophanes’ speech in Plato, *Symp.* 189d–192c; according to Schaller, *ibid.*, 94–95, 153–55, Philo and the Rabbis represent two (independent) Jewish adaptations.

¹⁷ Cf. 2 Bar. 56:14 “But the rest of the multitude of angels, to whom there is (no?) number, *restrained themselves*” (אסבלו).

¹⁸ Cf. Loader, *Sexuality*, 223–26 with further references.

¹⁹ Cf. 1 En. 6:2–7:1 (the Watcher angels are male and sleep with terrestrial women); 15:7 (no women were made for the Watchers); *Jub.* 15:27 (the upper classes of angels are circumcised); cf. further the activities of guarding, delivering messages from God (both widespread), fighting (cf. 2 Macc 10:29–30 and the presence of the “holy angels” in the war camp, 1QM 7:6) or acting as travel companion (Tob) etc., which all conform to “male” construed activity in antiquity. However, note the figure of heavenly Metanoia in *Jos. Asen.* 15:7–8, who is presented as *sister* of the heavenly visitor, *daughter* of the Most High, and *virgin*; but the statement “all the angels respect her” (v. 8) implies a slight distinction between her and “the angels.” Cf. also K. Sullivan, “Sexuality and Gender of Angels,” *Paradise Now: Essays on Early Jewish and Christian Mysticism* (ed. A. De Conick; SBL SymS 11; Atlanta: SBL, 2006), 211–228.

For the Lord Himself, being asked by a certain person when his kingdom would come, said, “When the two shall be one, and the outside as the inside, and the male with the female, neither male or female.”²⁰

Even here, the irrelevance of gender differences does not necessarily mean that the future state was either androgynous or unsexed, as Judith Gundry-Volf has argued in a critique of Daniel Boyarin’s reading of Gal 3:28: While Boyarin claims that through incorporation into Christ, i.e. in baptism, “all the differences that mark off one body from another as Jew or Greek . . . , male or female, slave or free, are effaced, for in the Spirit such marks do not exist,”²¹ Gundry-Volf takes Gal 3:28, within Paul’s line of theological argumentation, to refer to a new *differentiated* equality and unity *in Christ* as opposed to the previous sameness of all in their imprisonment *to sin* which pretended that differences were salvifically relevant.²²

Second, the proponents of the theory that Mark 10:6–8 is about the androgynous cannot make much of the subsequent use of Gen 2:24 in this text²³ which, as we shall see, presupposes that the first couple were distinct beings. And third, we note that the first quotation is limited to *that* very part of the verse that is formulated in the *plural* (see αὐτούς), i.e. Gen 1:27c, focusing on humankind in its differentiated duality, ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ, which must mean *either* “male” or “female” here.²⁴ Moreover, both terms show a tendency towards nominalisation in our sources, both Greek and Hebrew,²⁵ so that the text can be understood to speak

²⁰ On this agraphon see Loader, *Sexuality*, 199–207 (referring to other recent discussions, particularly of *Gos. Thom.* 22); T. Baarda, “2 Clement 12 and the Sayings of Jesus,” *idem*, *Early Transmission of Words of Jesus: Thomas, Tatian and the Text of the New Testament* (ed. J. Helderman & S.J. Noorda; Amsterdam: VU Boekhandel/Uitgeverij, 1983), 261–88.

²¹ D. Boyarin, *A Radical Jew: Paul and the Politics of Identity* (Berkeley et al.: University of California Press, 1994), 23. Cf. also *ibid.* 180–91.

²² Cf. J.M. Gundry-Volf, “Christ and Gender: A Study of Difference and Equality in Gal 3:28,” *Jesus Christus als Mitte der Schrift: Studien zur Hermeneutik des Evangeliums* (ed. C. Landmesser, H.-J. Eckstein & H. Lichtenberger; BZNW 86; Berlin: De Gruyter, 1997), 439–79; esp. 457–9, 474–6. She lists *op. cit.*, 458 n. 40 other critics of an interpretation of Gal 3:28 in terms of the androgynous.

²³ According to Daube, *Judaism*, 78 it was attached secondarily. This has justly been questioned by Schaller, “Gen 1.2,” 69–70. Niederwimmer, *Askese*, 44 simply assumes that the androgynous myth was the original (!) background of both Gen 1:27 and 2:24.

²⁴ Note that nothing in this brief citation suggests that it operates on the basis of Philo’s interpretation of Gen 1:27 in terms of a purely *spiritual* androgynous, as discussed by Boyarin, *Radical Jew*, 187–91.

²⁵ Cf. for the NT Gal 3:28 (see above); Luke 2:23 πᾶν ἄρσεν διανοίγον μήτραν ἄγιον; generally Plato, *Resp.* 454d–e τὸ μὲν θῆλυ τίκτειν, τὸ δὲ ἄρσεν ὀχεύειν (= covers). For

about one “male” and one “female.” We conclude that what is meant in Mark is that God created one man and one woman.

(2) The second passage, Gen 2:24, is adduced here in a form that represents a certain tradition of interpretation, emphasizing that the man and his wife are exactly *two*. Accordingly, these words are added in Gen 2:24: “and *the two* shall become one flesh.” This interpretation is not only found in the Septuagint (and the Vulgate) but also in the Samaritan Pentateuch,²⁶ the Peshitto, *Targum Ps.-Jonathan* and *Neofiti* (as well as in the quotations in 1 Cor 6:16; Eph 5:31),²⁷ but it is absent

CD cf. C. Rabin, *The Zadokite Documents* (2nd ed.; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1958), 17 n. 21⁴.

²⁶ With the peculiar wording **והיה משניהם לבשר אחד** (one ms has **והיו**): A. von Gall, *Der hebräische Pentateuch der Samaritaner* (Gießen: Töpelmann, 1918), *ad loc.* (the Samaritan Targum is here only attested in ms. A showing a later textual development, with the Hebraising phrase: **והיו משניהם לבשר אחד** A. Tal, *The Samaritan Targum of the Pentateuch: A Critical Edition I* [Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv University, 1980], 9). The only attestation of the passage in the Qumran texts, a very fragmentary quotation in two manuscripts of 4QInstruction [*Musar le-Mevin*], 4Q416 2 IV, 1 par. 4Q418 10 4–5, does not seem to leave enough room for reconstruction of “the two”; cf. J. Strugnell & D.J. Harrington, *Qumran Cave 4. XXIV: Sapiential Texts, Part 2: 4QInstruction* (Mûsar l’Mêvin): 4Q415 ff. (DJD 34; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999), 123, 236 (Text) and 127 on reconstruction of the lacuna in 4Q416 2 IV, 1: “to add, with G, **ושניהמה** after **והיו** would almost certainly be too long to fit in the lacuna.” Nevertheless the passage 4Q416 2 III, 20–IV, 7 presupposes monogamous marriage; cf. H. Lichtenberger, “Schöpfung und Ehe in Texten aus Qumran sowie Essenerberichten und die Bedeutung für das Neue Testament,” *Judaistik und neutestamentliche Wissenschaft: Standorte—Grenzen—Beziehungen* (ed. L. Doering, H.-G. Waubke & F. Wilk; FRLANT 226; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2008), 279–88: 283–85. See further below, at nn. 33–34.

²⁷ Cf. also *Jub.* 3:7, where a number of mss. preface the paraphrase of Gen 2:24 with: “For this reason a man and a woman are to become one.” This is absent from the best mss., though perhaps due to *homoioteleuton*, see twice *ba’enta-ze* “for this reason” in the verse; J.C. VanderKam wonders whether *za*, which most mss. lacking the above-quoted text have instead, “is a remnant of the second instance” of *ba’enta-ze*: idem (transl.), *The Book of Jubilees* (CSCO.Ae 88; Leuven: Peeters, 1989), 17 *ad loc.* Nevertheless, the longer reading is considered secondary by some, cf. K. Berger, *Das Buch der Jubiläen* (JSHRZ 2/3; Gütersloh: Mohn, 1981), 333 n. a *ad loc.*; M. Kister, “Divorce, Reproof and Other Sayings in the Synoptic Gospels: Jesus Traditions in the Context of ‘Qumranic’ and Other Texts,” *Text, Thought, and Practice in Qumran and Early Christianity: Proceedings of a Joint Symposium by the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature and the Hebrew University Center for the Study of Christianity, 11–13 January, 2004* (ed. D.R. Schwartz & R.A. Clements; STDJ; Leiden: Brill, forthcoming), n. 42 (I wish to thank Professor Kister for making his valuable article available to me in advance of its publication).—The reading “the two” in Gen 2:24 might also be reflected in *Tob.* 8:6 Codex Sinaiticus (ἐξ ἀφοπτέρων; Schaller, “Gen 1.2,” 59, 192 n. 12, 205 n. 2) = so-called 2nd text form of *Tob.*, here supported by the Old Latin Bobiensis and the 3rd text form (Greek recension *d* and the majority of Syriac mss.); cf. the apparatus in R. Hanhart, *Tobit* (Septuaginta [...]); Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1983), *ad loc.*

from the Masoretic Text and *Targum Onqelos*. This broad tradition apparently reflects a tendency in Second Temple Judaism to prefer monogamy to polygamy.²⁸ Certainly, also Mark 10 presupposes that the marriage in view is monogamous.

What constitutes the joining between man and woman is not explicitly stated. However, both προσκολληθήσεται and σάρξ make one think of sexual union; thus, Paul can relate Gen 2:24 to the union with a prostitute (1 Cor 6:16). But in view of the use of Gen 2:24 in Eph 5:31 it seems to be wise to avoid too narrow a usage and to allow for other levels of marital union as well.²⁹ The contrast with father and mother, then, points to the new “kin” established by husband and wife in marriage. Whether the Hebrew text stresses more the latter, whereas the Greek text highlights more the sexual side, as recently claimed by William Loader (following Klaus Berger), seems however questionable.³⁰ That it is *God* who joins the couple is clear from the following v. 9 and the link with God’s creational act, v. 6. It is sometimes claimed that this emerges also from the use of προσκολληθήσεται, which proponents of this view take as a divine passive;³¹ however, it should be noted that this verb, frequent in Koine Greek, is normally used with an intransitive meaning; thus, it is likely that καὶ προσκολληθήσεται in fact says more or less the same as MT קבבן.³² Even so, it remains true that the *whole process* outlined in vv. 6–8, particularly in light of v. 9,

²⁸ Cf. Instone-Brewer, *Divorce and Remarriage*, 61.

²⁹ Cf. Loader, *Septuagint*, 40: “The focus includes sexual union and living together which would be assumed to entail marriage,” although one should beware of importing modern notions of romantic marriage into the text.—In contrast, the interpretation of “one flesh” referring to common offspring (thus e.g. G. von Rad, *Das erste Buch Mose: Genesis* [ATD 2/4; 5th ed.; Göttingen; Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1958], 68) does not do justice either to the semantics of Gen 2:24, focusing on the couple, or the application of the quotation in Mark 10:7–8. In my view, even the peculiar formulation of the Samaritan Pentateuch (above, n. 26) is not necessarily to be taken as referring to the offspring, *pace* Kister, ‘Divorce’; adopted by Collins, *Mark*, 467.

³⁰ Cf. Berger, *Gesetzesauslegung*, 551, claiming: “wo man unter בשר ‘Verwandtschaft’ versteht, übersetzt man [in LXX—LD] anders.” But the references listed by Loader, at which עצם and בשר (MT) are used “of a permanent relationship” (*Septuagint*, 41–42 with n. 43; *Sexuality*, 100–01 with n. 121), clearly attest for LXX rendition with (sometimes plural) forms of ὁστούν and σάρξ (Gen 29:14; Judg 9:2; 2 Sam 5:1; 19:13, 14; one could also add 1 Chr 11:1).

³¹ E.g., Loader, *Septuagint*, 81–2; *Sexuality*, 100.

³² Cf. for intransitive use of the passive only Galen, *Meth. med.* 10:297; Athenaeus, *Deipn.* 6:258b; *Test. Ben.* 8:1; Philo, *Alleg. Interp.* 2:49; *QE.* 2:3; Josephus, *J. A.* 7:309; 9:18; also LXX, e.g., Deut 11:22; 13:18; ψ 72:28 and esp. Lev 19:31 LXX καὶ τοῖς ἐπαιδοῖς οὐ προσκολληθήσεσθε “and do not adhere to the wizards.” Therefore, *the form as such* can hardly be claimed for God’s action (as divine passive).

must be seen as divinely caused. In this, these verses are particularly close to a Qumran text that features a strong reference to Gen 2:24 as well—4QInstruction, where it is stated that God (“he”) “will separate your daughter for another one, and your sons for the daughters of your neighbours.”³³ Though emphasis and details of this passage differ from Mark 10, God’s activity in joining the couple is highlighted in both.³⁴

Mark 10:8b then *draws the conclusion* for the *status* of the joined couple: “Thus, they are no longer two, but one flesh.” Note the temporal references in this argument: Here we have reached the present tense; v. 6, referring to creation, is in the imperfect; and vv. 7–8a, in the perspective of the first couple, are formulated in the future tense. The whole argument thus creates a link between *then* and *now*. In this respect, it is remarkable that creation as “male and female” is said to have happened ἀπὸ δὲ ἀρχῆς κτίσεως “from the beginning of creation.” The force of the preposition ἀπό seems to be that creation as “male and female” is not restricted to the one couple in Eden but has become an inherent order of creation relevant for current praxis. We shall return to this later. Similarly, v. 9, an aphoristic, antithetical statement linked by the particle οὖν,³⁵ presents *another conclusion*, this time for *human praxis*: “Therefore what God (θεός) has joined together (sc. in Eden and since), let man (ἄνθρωπος) not separate.” The statement has imperatival force (therefore does not exclude that “man” *might* separate), but the double antithesis “God, join” vs. “man, separate” implies so stark a contrast that it points to the utter inappropriateness of separation. In fact, the ἄνθρωπος under the command recalls the ἄνθρωπος of Gen 2:24, that is, “man” in its original, creational state, and in the present context in Mark is contrasted with man represented by the second person plural (v. 3, 5) plagued by “hardness of heart.” Morna Hooker is probably right when she views the ἄνθρωπος as male gendered in both instances; “man” in v. 9 thus refers “to the husband,”³⁶ who in most instances in ancient

³³ לך לְבָשָׁר אֶחָד בְּתִכָּהּ לְאַחַר יִפְרִיד וּבְנִיכָהּ] לְבָנוֹת רַעִיכָה 4Q416 2 IV, 4, with parallels from 4Q418 10b (underline) and 4Q418a 18 (bold). Reconstruction according to E.J.C. Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning for the Understanding Ones: Reading and Reconstructing the Fragmentary Early Jewish Sapiential Text 4QInstruction* (STDJ 44; Leiden: Brill, 2001), 48.

³⁴ Cf. particularly Kister, “Divorce,” at n. 43.

³⁵ Cf. BDR § 451.1. Cf. also J.D. Denniston, *The Greek Particles* (2nd ed.; Oxford: Clarendon, 1954), 425: “The particle expresses *post hoc* and (more frequently) *propter hoc*, or anything between the two.”

³⁶ Hooker, *Mark*, 236.

Judaism—some female forms of initiative notwithstanding—enacted any divorce. In addition, however, one might hear here overtones that point to the contrast between God and *Moses* as conceding the divorce certificate with respect to human “hardness of heart.”³⁷ Moreover, it is possible that the contrast between the verbs in v. 9 echoes the contrast between man’s “*cleaving*” (προσκολληθήσεται, דבק) in Gen 2:24 and the Hebrew name for the bill of divorce, “bill of *cutting*” (סִפְרֵ כְרִיתָת), in Deut 24:1.³⁸

However, the typical view of vv. 6–9 as “scriptural” argument³⁹ does leave this passage underdetermined in my view. For, as the use of ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς κτίσεως in Mark 13:19 (and 2 Pet 3:4) shows,⁴⁰ the expression in Mark 10:6 should be taken as referring to a cosmic reality presented in temporal perspective and not *merely* to the creation narrative. Similar usage (“from the beginning of creation” or “from the creation”) is also attested by a number of ancient Jewish texts,⁴¹ and one can also compare the expression “from the beginning”, as far as it implies the

³⁷ Cf. Collins, *Mark*, 468; also Fraade, “Moses,” 417, but see on Fraade’s too far-reaching claim regarding this contrast above, n. 10.

³⁸ Cf. Kister, “Divorce,” at n. 54; adopted by Collins, *Mark*, 468. We note that this antonymic relation is somewhat lost in the LXX’s label of the divorce certificate as βιβλίον ἀποστασίου.

³⁹ Many authors consider the verses a scriptural argument, cf., *inter multos alios*, B. Schaller, “Die Sprüche über Ehescheidung und Wiederheirat in der synoptischen Überlieferung” [1970], idem, *Fundamenta Judaica: Studien zum antiken Judentum und zum Neuen Testament* (ed. L. Doering & A. Steudel; SUNT 25; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2001), 104–24: 116 n. 45: “Verweis auf die Schrift”; M.C. Moeser, *The Anecdote in Mark, the Classical World and the Rabbis* (JSNTSup 277; London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002), 223: Mark 10:2–9 is a “brief debate” that “embodies a legal principle of Jesus arrived at by his interpretation of scriptural verses, that is, his use of an argument from authority, the authority being Scripture.”

⁴⁰ Cf. in the NT also ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς κόσμου ἔως τοῦ νῦν Matt 24:21; ὁ ἦν ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς 1 Jn 1:1.

⁴¹ Cf. *Jub.* 1:27 (*em-qadāmi fetrat*, restored in 4Q216 [= 4QJub^a] IV, 7 by the editors as [... מן הבריאה הראשית הבריאה...]: DJD 13, 11); 4Q217 (= 4QJub^b?) 2 2 (מן הבריאה] ה); *Pss. Sol.* 8:7 (ἀπὸ κτίσεως οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς); Josephus *J.W.* 4:533 (ἀπὸ τῆς κτίσεως μέχρι νῦν); *1 En.* 69:17; 71:15 (*em-fetrat ’alam*); *2 Bar.* 56:2 (סִפְרֵ כְרִיתָת; the sg. סִפְרֵ כְרִיתָת is conjectural: the Milan ms. has the pl. סִפְרֵ כְרִיתָת); probably also *Wis* 6:22 (ἀπὸ ἀρχῆς γενέσεως; cf. D. Georgi, *Weisheit Salomos* [JSRZ 3/4; Gütersloh: Mohn, 1980), 423 [n. c. *ad loc.*]). For Latin references see the following note.

beginning of creation.⁴² We could therefore perhaps say that in Mark 10:6 *scripture records a cosmic reality*.⁴³

The well-established *temporal* sense of ἀρχή in the Greek references given in nn. 40–42, often construed with the preposition ἀπό, with some of them clearly translating forms derived from Hebrew שרא or Aramaic קדמ, does not support the view that ἀρχή κτίσεως in Mark 10:6 originally signified the “*principle* of creation” and translated a phrase like יסוד הבריאה (cf. CD 4:21, see discussion below, section 4), either in the full form ἀπὸ δὲ ἀρχῆς κτίσεως, understood as “according to the principle of creation” (thus J. de Waard),⁴⁴ or in a form without ἀπό that was only “changed in Mark to ἀπὸ ἀρχῆς κτίσεως” (thus M. Kister).⁴⁵ The term ἀρχή never denotes “principle” in the abstract sense elsewhere in the New Testament, and even in Rev 3:14 (and Col 1:18), where some have seen it come close to such a meaning, retains a personal and temporal connotation.⁴⁶ De Waard refers to

⁴² Cf. (ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς in the Greek sources unless otherwise noted) the Matthean parallel to Mark 10:6, Matt 19:4 (no Lukan parallel here); further Qoh 3:11 LXX (MT: מראשׁ); Wis 9:8; 12:11; 14:13; Sir 15:14 (LXX: ἐξ ἀρχῆς; Hebrew ms. A: מבראשית [!]; ms. B: שרא, marginal reading מבראשית [מבראשית]; 16:26 [24] (Hebrew ms. A: מראשׁ); 24:9 (no Hebrew text); 39:25 (Hebrew ms. B: מראשׁ); 1 En. 2:2 (*em-qadāmi*; reference unclear, Milik restores מן קדמיה for 4QEn^a 1 II,2, מן קדמיא for 4QEn^c 1 I, 20, which might be “the first” of the works of creation; see J.T. Milik, *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumrān Cave 4* [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976], 146–47, 184–85). Whether 1 En. 83:11 (*diba qadāmi* “at the beginning,” textual variants) belongs here is unclear; cf. S. Uhlig, *Das äthiopische Henochbuch* (JSRZ 5/6; Gütersloh: Mohn, 1984) 676 (n. c *ad loc.*). Cf. also the Latin references *Vit. Ad.* 44:4; *L.A.B.* 7:4; 32:7; 4 *Ezra* 4:30; 6:38; 10:10 (but textual-critically unsure); 10:14; 14:22; *As. Mos.* 1:13, 14, 17; 12:4 (cf. J. Tromp, *The Assumption of Moses: A Critical Edition with Commentary* [SVTP 10; Leiden: Brill, 1993], 143), although Latin *ab initio* might in some of these passages mean “in the beginning”; cf. for this possibility P.G.W. Glare (ed.), *Oxford Latin Dictionary* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982), 2 (no. 12); K.E. Georges, *Ausführliches lateinisch-deutsches Handwörterbuch [...]* (14th ed.; 2 vols.; Hannover: Hahn, 1976), 1:3 (no. II. A. 1: “sogleich nach, unmittelbar nach”); cf. only 4 *Ezra* 6:38: *ab initio creaturae in* [!] *primo die dicens*.

⁴³ Cf. J. Gnlika, *Das Evangelium nach Markus* (EKKNT 2; 2 vols., Zürich & Neukirchen: Benziger & Neukirchener Verlag, ⁵1998–99 [1978–79]), 2:72: The expression “kennzeichnet die beiden folgenden Schriftargumente aus Gen 1,27 und 2,24 über Schriftzitate hinaus als Äußerungen des in die Schöpfung hineinverfügten Gotteswillens”; W.R.G. Loader, *Jesus’ Attitude toward the Law: A Study of the Gospels* (WUNT 2/97; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997), 89: “more than citing one scripture against another”; cf. Harvey, “Genesis versus Deuteronomy?”, *passim*.

⁴⁴ De Waard, *A Comparative Study*, 33 (cf. 32–33). But where would ἀπό denote “according to”?

⁴⁵ Kister, “Divorce”, at n. 23. Such a change remains speculative.

⁴⁶ Cf. D.E. Aune, *Revelation 1–5* (WBC 52; Dallas: Word, 1997), 256; [G.] Delling, “ἄρχω κτλ.,” *TWNT* 1 (1933), 476–88: 482–83; *BDAG* 137–38.

1 En. 15:9 (Ge'ez *qadāmitomu wa-qadāmi mašarrat*), where the Greek version attested in Codex Panopolitanus and in Syncellus has ἡ ἀρχὴ τῆς κτίσεως αὐτῶν καὶ ἀρχὴ θεμελίου. Nickelsburg in his commentary reckons now with the possibility of double rendering in Greek (and translates a hypothetical “the origin of their creation”),⁴⁷ but whatever the original wording of this passage was, I fail to see how it would yield de Waard’s “principle” (other than by inferring the meaning of ἀρχὴ from that of θεμέλιος “foundation”, which I would deem erroneous).⁴⁸ The most straightforward interpretation of the phrase in Mark 10:6 is therefore a temporal one.

In sum, the argument of vv. 6–9 views matrimony as a lifelong joint between one man and one woman. It claims that this is God’s intent in creation and was so “from the beginning of the world”. It concludes that marriage must not be terminated. Exceptions are not considered. There is no abrogation of “Mosaic” Law, but the provision of Deut 24:1 is seen as an emergency ruling that was not intended and is now no longer expected to be needed. On the other hand, Jesus does not merely negotiate between two scriptural passages but refers to a normative order in force since creation and calls for restoration of a practice that conforms to this order.

It is debated whether vv. 6–9, at least in their general thrust, can lay claim to going back to Jesus. Some scholars claim that Jesus would not have argued with Scripture; thus only v. 9, due to its virtually unique stance in Second Temple Judaism, could possibly be authentic, while vv. 6–8 derive from the early community.⁴⁹ This is sometimes connected

⁴⁷ G.W.E. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch, vol. 1: Chapter 1–36, 81–108* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001), 267 (translation), 268 (textual note).

⁴⁸ Kister, in a footnote, seems to suggest that both Mark 10:6 and CD 4:21 should also be taken as speaking of “the origin of creation” (“Divorce”, n. 23). Apart from the question how this relates to the proposed notion of “principle,” I find it semantically difficult for CD 4:21, as well as for a hypothetical “Markan” text without ἀπό: “Male and female he created them” is hardly the *origin* of creation.

⁴⁹ Cf., e.g., Schaller, “Ehescheidung und Wiederheirat,” 116 n. 45; H. Hübner, *Das Gesetz in der synoptischen Tradition [...]* (2nd ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986), 61–62 (Mark 10:9 and Matt 5:32 authentic); A.J. Hultgren, *Jesus and His Adversaries [...]* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1979), 121; Loader, *Jesus’ Attitude*, 39–55, 518–19; *Sexuality*, 95. Different particularly Berger, *Gesetzesauslegung*, 577 (claims “frühnachösterlich-hellenistischen Ursprung” for the whole passage). Niederwimmer, *Askese*, 15–20, claims a reconstructed form of the synoptic sayings (see below), not Mark 10:6–9, as authentic.

with the observation we have also made that vv. 6–8 are directly dependent on the Septuagint.⁵⁰ However, that Jesus would not have argued with Scripture is a *petitio principii*. Why should Jesus be denied what other Jews in the Second Temple period clearly practised—i.e. argue points of marital law with reference to Gen 1 and/or 2?⁵¹ Further, we have seen that Mark 10:6–8 is not only a reference to Scripture but also to a creational reality. Moreover, the conclusion in v. 9 needs something to be based upon, and since it takes up “two” and “one flesh” from Gen 2:24, it is likely that this is close to the original flow of the argument. Finally, the wording of the scriptural passage could have been brought in line with the Septuagint by Mark or the tradition Mark picks up, since in their Greek speaking context this version could be expected; I was unable to register a single feature *only* in the Septuagint that is crucial for the argument. Thus I would cautiously argue that Mark 10:6–9, also in its reference to Gen 1 and 2, captures the thrust of Jesus’ stance on lifelong marriage. Our further discussion (below, § 4) will suggest that the context of the debate on marriage and divorce in Mark references what was probably crucial already for Jesus’ own view on marriage: the kingdom of God.

How does the continuation in vv. 10–12 relate to the preceding passage? Asked by his disciples in the house again about this matter (v. 10), Jesus answers:

(Mark 10:11) . . . ὃς ἂν ἀπολύσῃ τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ καὶ γαμήσῃ ἄλλην μοιχᾶται ἐπὶ αὐτῆν. (12) καὶ ἐὰν αὐτὴ ἀπολύσασα τὸν ἄνδρα αὐτῆς γαμήσῃ ἄλλον μοιχᾶται.

(Mark 10:11) . . . Whoever divorces his wife and marries another one commits adultery against her; (12) and if she divorces her husband and marries another one, she commits adultery.

This saying takes a somewhat different stance from the previous argumentation, since it seems to acknowledge factual divorce (although

⁵⁰ Berger, *Gesetzesauslegung*, 539, claims: “Der Schriftbeweis in Mk 10,3–8 ist nur auf Grund des LXX-Textes möglich” (cf. 575). So also Gnllka, *Markus*, 2:73; Pesch, *Markusevangelium*, 2:124. Somewhat more cautious Loader, *Septuagint*, 124; *Sexuality*, 95 with n. 101.

⁵¹ Cf. Tob 8:6 (and details above, n. 27); Sir 25:26 LXX (cf. Schaller, “Gen 1.2,” 56–57; Kister, “Divorce,” after n. 47); as well as the passages from the *Damascus Document* and *4QInstruction* discussed in the present article. Cf. for the wider context the (in part, later) texts referred to above, nn. 12, 16, as well as *b. Ketub.* 8a (cf. Schaller, “Gen 1.2,” 171–72).

without directly qualifying it as either acceptable or problematic) and apparently limits its objection to the subsequent remarriage of either husband or wife, whose actions are expressed in almost symmetrical terms. In my view, this is clearly a secondary development. This is corroborated by the situation of the synoptic parallels here. The synoptic interrelations are too complex⁵² to be analysed in detail in the confines of this paper; it must here suffice to say that traditio-historically speaking the older form is represented by the saying in Q (Matt 5:32 par. Luke 16:18), and here—in this I agree with scholars like Heinrich Greeven, Ulrich Luz, and recently Bill Loader⁵³—particularly the form in Matt 5:32, albeit without the later *porneia* clause:

(Matt 5:32) ... πᾶς ὁ ἀπολύων τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ παρεκτός λόγου πορνείας ποιεῖ αὐτὴν μοιχευθῆναι, καὶ ὃς ἐὰν ἀπολελυμένην γαμήσῃ, μοιχᾶται.

(Matt 5:32) ... Everyone divorcing his wife, except for a matter of sexual indecency, makes that she commits adultery, and whoever marries a divorced woman commits adultery.

In contrast to both Mark 10:11–12 and Luke 16:18, this version of the saying takes a Jewish perspective of potential polygyny, since a marriage can only be broken with reference to another man. The causation of adultery is implied in divorce insofar as the natural assumption is that the divorced woman will remarry. The second half of the verse has precisely such a case in view. At any rate, the divorce here is *invalid*, and the marriage bond factually continues to exist. It is possible that the stance in Matt 5:32, similar to Mark 10:6–9, comes close to Jesus’

⁵² Cf. Schaller, “Ehescheidung und Wiederheirat,” 104–24 (literature until 1970 at 104 n. 2); D. Catchpole, “The Synoptic Divorce Material as a Traditio-Historical Problem,” *BJRL* 57 (1974/75): 92–127; Niederwimmer, *Askese*, 13–24; Hübner, *Gesetz*, 42–65; J. Nolland, “The Gospel Prohibition of Divorce: Tradition History and Meaning,” *JSNT* 58 (1995): 19–35; Instone-Brewer, *Divorce and Remarriage*, 147–77; Loader, *Sexuality*, 61–93 (with recent literature); and see the commentaries.

⁵³ Cf., e.g., H. Greeven, “Ehe nach dem Neuen Testament,” *NTS* 15 (1968/69): 365–88; 382–84; Niederwimmer, *Askese*, 17–20; Hübner, *Gesetz*, 46–47; U. Luz, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus* (EKKNT 1; 4 vols.; Zürich & Neukirchen-Vluyn: Benziger & Neukirchener Verlag, ³2002 [³1992], ⁴2007 [²1996], 1997, 2002), 1³:358 (1³:269–70); and the careful discussion in Loader, *Sexuality*, 83–88. Contra, e.g., J. Gnllka, *Das Matthäusevangelium* (HTK 1; Freiburg: Herder, 1986, 1988), 1:165–66; Nolland, “Gospel Prohibition of Divorce,” 27; and the reconstruction in *The Critical Edition of Q* (ed. J.M. Robinson, P. Hoffmann & J.S. Kloppenburg; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2000), 470–71. Davies & Allison see Matt 5:32 closer to the Q form than Luke 16:18, which they see influence by Mark 10:11–12, but withhold judgment on whether Q or Mark represents the older tradition: W.D. Davies & D.C. Allison, *Matthew* (ICC; 3 vols.; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988, 1991, 1997 [reprint London, 2004]), 1:528.

position on the matter.⁵⁴ In my view, Paul's advice in 1 Cor 7:11 that if the woman "does separate, let her remain unmarried or else be reconciled to her husband" (ἐὰν δὲ καὶ χωρισθῆ, μενέτω ἄγαμος ἢ τῷ ἀνδρὶ καταλλαγήτω) reflects, like Mark 10:11–12, an early development beyond the original prohibition of divorce that had arisen within the first two decades after the ministry of Jesus.

3. ESTABLISHING THE TOPIC OF CD 4:20–5:2

Let us now examine afresh the much-discussed passage CD 4:20–5:2:⁵⁵

הם ניתפשים בשתים בזנות לקחת ... (CD 4:20)
 שתי נשים בחייהם ויסוד הבריאה זכר ונקבה ברא אותם (21)
 (5:1) ובאי התבה שנים שנים באו אל התבה ועל הנשיא כתוב
 (2) לא ירבה לו נשים ...

- (CD 4:20) ... They are caught by two (snares). By unchastity, (namely,) taking
 (21) two wives in their lives, while the foundation of creation is "male and female he created them".
 (5:1) And those who entered (Noah's) ark "went two by two into the ark". And of the prince it is written,
 (2) "Let him not multiply wives for himself".

The text deals with the entrapment of the "builders of the wall" (cf. CD 4:19), most likely "a rival group, but a group which is considered as representative of the whole Israel outside the community."⁵⁶ Here is not the place for detailed comments on the difficult phrase **הם ניתפשים בשתים בזנות**, which some have taken as "they have been caught twice in unchastity"; for the purpose of the present article I shall simply follow Schwartz's translation and interpretation, according to which "they have been caught in two (sc. of the three nets of Belial, 4:15–18):

⁵⁴ Similarly Hübner, *Gesetz*, 61–62 (see above, n. 49).

⁵⁵ Text and translation (the latter with slight adjustment) follow *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations, Vol. 2: Damascus Document, War Scroll, and Related Documents* (ed. J.H. Charlesworth et al.; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1995), 18–21. Responsible for this section is D.R. Schwartz.

⁵⁶ Thus F. García Martínez, "Man and Woman: Halakhah Based upon Eden in the Dead Sea Scrolls," *Paradise Interpreted: Representations of Biblical Paradise in Judaism and Christianity* (ed. G.P. Luttikhuisen; Themes in Biblical Narrative 2; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 95–115: 103.

(first,) by unchastity.”⁵⁷ Let us instead concentrate on the “unchastity” that is dealt with here: “taking two wives in their lifetime (בחיייהם).” The precise meaning of this phrase is famously debated. Basically three interpretations are offered:⁵⁸

(1) The first one, argued above all by Jerome Murphy-O’Connor, Philip Davies, Florentino García Martínez and the late Hartmut Stegemann,⁵⁹ relates the masculine suffix in בחיייהם to the men and thus views any second marriage of a man under the verdict of “fornication” (“once-in-a-lifetime” marriage, *Einzigehē*). Recently, Bernard Jackson has advocated a similar interpretation in light of eschatology: “marriage, where permitted, is itself a concession, required for pragmatic reasons in order to support the eschatological project. That concession is itself to be strictly confined; the ideal remains celibacy.”⁶⁰ However, it emerges now from a cave 4 fragment of the *Damascus Document*, 4Q271 (= 4QD^f) 3 10–12, with further parallels from cave 4,⁶¹ that a *widow* is unacceptable as a prospective bride *only* if she “has been slept with since she was widowed” (אשר נשכבה מאשר התארמלה), line 12), which implies that widows who have led a *blameless* life in their widowhood would be *suitable* candidates for marriage. Judging from the reciprocity of sexual relations assumed in the Scrolls elsewhere (see CD 5:9–10 and *Jub.* 41:25–26), we can with some confidence assume that remarriage would generally be possible for the *widower* as well.

⁵⁷ García Martínez, “Man and Woman,” 104 notes an important point that might support this second view: The pairing מזה—בזה “[escapes] from this—[trapped] in that” (CD 4:18–19) relates to individual “nets,” and thus one should also understand בשתים—hence, “in two” (sc. nets) and not “twice.”

⁵⁸ Geza Vermes, in a foundational article (“Sectarian Matrimonial Halakhah in the Damascus Rule,” *JJS* 25 [1974]: 197–202), mentions four, although the additional one, a ban on divorce only, seems unsubstantiated: He attributes it to R.H. Charles, but see against this attribution J.A. Fitzmyer, “Divorce Among First-Century Palestinian Jews,” *ErIsr* 14 (1978): 103*–10*: 108* n. 24.

⁵⁹ J. Murphy-O’Connor, “An Essene Missionary Document? CD II, 14–VI, 1,” *RB* 77 (1970): 201–29: 220; P. Davies, *Behind the Essenes: History and Ideology in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (BJS 94; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987), 73–85; H. Stegemann, *Die Essener, Qumran, Johannes der Täufer und Jesus: Ein Sachbuch* (4th ed.; Freiburg: Herder, 1994), 269–70; García Martínez, “Man and Woman.” Earlier proponents of this view were K.G. Kuhn, “Qumran. 4,” *RGG*³ 5 (1963): 749; J. Hempel, *ZAW* 68 (1956): 84 (in an appendix to Winter’s article); Isaksson, *Marriage and Ministry*, 57–63.

⁶⁰ Jackson, “Holier than Thou?”, 181.

⁶¹ Text in J.M. Baumgarten, *Qumran Cave 4. XIII: The Damascus Document (4Q266–273)* (DJD 18; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), 175. Parallels: 4Q270 5 17–19; 4Q267 7 14; 4Q269 9 4–6.

To be sure, remarriage after the death of the spouse is affirmed in the passage on the marriage of the king in 11QT^a LVII,17–19:⁶²

ולא יקח עליה אשה אחרת כי ... (11QT^a LVII,17)
 היאה לבדה תהיה עמו כול ימי חייה ואם מתה ונשא (18)
 לו אחרת מבית אביהו ממשפחתו... (19)

- (11QT^a LVII,17)... And he shall not take upon her another wife, for
 (18) she alone shall be with him all days of her life. But should she die,
 he may take
 (19) unto himself another (wife) from the house of his father, from his
 family.

Jackson has cautioned that this passage may deal with a prerogative of the king, who must not “die without issue”, since then “the eschatological leadership would disappear with him.”⁶³ Whilst the difference between the law of the king and the rules for common Israelites should methodologically be observed, it may not be substantial in the case of remarriage, as suggested by the evidence for remarrying widows in the 4QD fragment. I deem it therefore difficult to interpret CD IV,20–21 in terms of “once-in-a-lifetime” marriage.⁶⁴

(2) Another view, argued for example by Larry Schiffman,⁶⁵ takes the suffix inclusively: As long as both husband and wife are alive, the husband may not take another wife. Therefore, *both* polygyny *and* remarriage after divorce, as long as the ex-spouse is still alive, are forbidden.

⁶² Text and translation follow Y. Yadin, *The Temple Scroll* (3 vols.; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society et al., 1983, 1977), 2:258.

⁶³ Jackson, “Holier than Thou?,” 181.

⁶⁴ Neither Jackson nor García Martínez—both writing after the publication of DJD 18 and Shemesh’s pertinent article mentioned below, n. 68—addresses the evidence of 4Q271 frg. 3 with respect to our issue.

⁶⁵ L.H. Schiffman, “Laws Pertaining to Women in the *Temple Scroll*,” *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research* (ed. D. Dimant & U. Rappaport; STDJ 10; Leiden: Brill; Jerusalem: Magnes & Yad Ben-Zvi, 1992), 210–28: 217 [repr. in idem, *The Courtyards of the House of the Lord: Studies on the Temple Scroll* (ed. F. García Martínez; STDJ 75; Leiden: Brill, 2008), 519–40: 527]; for earlier proponents of this view see Winter, “Sadoqite Fragments,” 76–78, who sides with it as well and vigorously claims that the solution to the problem does not lie in the scriptural references adduced in the text but only in the use of *בחייהם* (as if the meaning of the latter were patent!); J.A. Fitzmyer, “The Matthean Divorce Texts and Some New Palestinian Evidence,” idem, *To Advance the Gospel: New Testament Studies* (New York: Crossroad, 1981), 79–111: 96; similarly J.M. Baumgarten, “The Qumran-Essene Restraints on Marriage,” *Archaeology and History in the Dead Sea Scrolls [...]* (ed. L.H. Schiffman; JSPSup 8; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990), 13–24: 15, who however assumes that the ban on remarriage after divorce was not in force for “common,” not particularly scrupulous members. See also the article by Shemesh, below, n. 68.

Indeed, the *Damascus Document* knows of divorce, as has been finally clarified by 4Q266 (= 4QD^a) 9 III, 4–7, but apparently closely monitors its application since it rules that a community official, the *mevaqquer*, must advise a man planning to divorce his wife (compare וכן למגרש in the parallel CD 13:17, also 11QT^a LIV,4–5; LXVI,8–11).⁶⁶ Now, is there any evidence suggesting that one must await the death of the spouse before remarriage? The *Temple Scroll's* interest in the duration of the king's marriage until the death of his wife might be a point in reference, but then it is a special case and is not about divorce (which does not seem possible here).⁶⁷ More to the point, Aharon Shemesh has drawn attention to a peculiarity of the fragment 4Q271 3 mentioned earlier: There, two classes of generally marriageable women are mentioned, who are however disqualified in case of extramarital sexual activity: the *unmarried* still living with her parents and, as we saw, the *widow*; but another class of women is conspicuously missing—the *divorcee*. Shemesh concludes, “the halakhah's omission of the divorcee attests that sectarian halakhah outlawed remarriage subsequent to divorce as long as a former spouse was still living.”⁶⁸ In a forthcoming book, Shemesh argues more broadly that according to the sectarians, on the one hand, every couple has been made for one another in the blueprint of creation but, on the other hand, all are free to remarry after the death of a partner, which would apply equally to a divorced couple.⁶⁹

It needs to be admitted that much of this relies on *argumentum ex silentio*. Vered Noam has alternatively suggested to explain the divorcee's absence in this fragment by pointing to relics of an old view of the divorcee in rabbinic texts, close to Shammaite interpretation of Deut 24:1, according to which every divorcee has the image of an adulteress—

⁶⁶ Cf. C. Wassen, *Women in the Damascus Document* (Academia Biblica 21; Leiden: Brill, 2005) 116–17, 159–64; previously G. Brin, “Divorce at Qumran,” *Legal Texts and Legal Issues [...]* (ed. M.J. Bernstein, F. García Martínez & J. Kampen; STDJ 23; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 231–44. Also an amended interpretation of 4Q159 2–4 9–10 points to affirmation of divorce, although it is excluded in the case of an unjustly slandered woman discussed there. For the reading of Mal 2:16 in 4QXII^a, allowing divorce, see above, n. 5.

⁶⁷ Pace T. Holmén, “Divorce in CD 4:20–5:2 and 11QT 57:17–18: Some Remarks on the Pertinence of the Question,” *RevQ* 18/71 (1998): 397–408: 404–07, who does not pay sufficient attention to the specifics of the current passage when he infers from 11QT^a LIV,4–5; 66:8–11 the option of divorce for the king as well.

⁶⁸ A. Shemesh, “4Q271.3: A Key to Sectarian Matrimonial Law,” *JJS* 49 (1998): 244–63: 246.

⁶⁹ A. Shemesh, *Halakhah in the Making: From Qumran to the Rabbis* (Berkeley: University of California Press, forthcoming) chapter 4.

since according to this view she would have been divorced only for adultery—and is thus an inappropriate candidate.⁷⁰ So far there is no clear evidence to suggest that a divorcee, according to the Scrolls, had to wait for the ex-spouse's death in order to remarry. It may also be noted that the assumption of divorce without the possibility of timely remarriage contradicts the “essence” of the Jewish *get* (cf. *m. Git.* 9:3 גופו של גט), which—as broadly attested—declares the woman explicitly *free* to remarry.⁷¹ To be sure, the position assumed by Schiffman, Shemesh and others has early explicit parallels in 1 Cor 7:11 and Mark 10:11–12; but I have also said that these reflect in my view a development beyond the earliest tradition evident in the gospels.⁷² For Qumran, this remains an *ex silentio* argument, and although it is a possible solution, I note that at least one of the proof texts adduced in the passage in CD matches better the third possible suggestion.

(3) This third interpretation relates בחייהם to the women only. That would require taking בחייהם as orthographic variant of feminine בחייהן; but there are several examples of such variants in the Scrolls, as noted by Elisha Qimron.⁷³ In this perspective, CD 4:20–21 would object to

⁷⁰ V. Noam, “Divorce in Qumran in Light of Early Halakhah,” *JJS* 56 (2005): 206–223. She refers to texts demanding *witnesses* of the adultery of the wife to be divorced or discussing their role (*Sif. Bem.* §§ 7, 19; *m. Sotah* 6:3; *b. Git.* 89a, 90a), which is in line with Shammaite interpretation of ערות דבר (cf. *m. Git.* 9:10); even in a (lengthy) baraita attributed to R. Meir the view of the divorcee as *transgressor* can be detected (*t. Sotah* 5:9).—That the fragment of 4Q271 represents a list of *unsuitable* candidates does not sufficiently become clear in Noam, “Divorce,” 220, 223 (“list of candidates for marriage”). Also, her assertion that “the sect denounced marriage to a divorcee, just as Jesus denounced it” (222–23) somewhat simplifies the New Testament evidence.

⁷¹ Cf. Josephus, *Ant.* 4:253 (λάβοι [sc. the woman] γὰρ ἂν οὕτως ἐξουσίαν συνοικεῖν ἐτέρῳ); Mur 19 recto 5–7 (cf. 17–19; this is a *Doppelurkunde*): P. Benoit, J.T. Milik & R. de Vaux: *Les grottes de Murabba'at (Texte)* (DJD 2; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1961), 105–06 (גבר יחודי די תצבין) translated by the ed. “que tu es libre pour ta part de t'en aller et de devenir femme de tout homme juif que tu voudras”; *m. Git.* 9:3 (גופו של גט הררי את מותרת לכל אדם) “The essence of the *get*: lo, you are allowed to any man”, and thereafter in Aramaic “to go and be married to any man you wish”).

⁷² Cf. the discussion in Loader, *Sexuality*, 88–92, with further literature.

⁷³ Cf. E. Qimron, *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (HSS 29; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986), 62: “the forms (ה)מה-, (ה)ם-, (ה)ם- are also used as feminine suffixes.... (ה)ם- occurs 8 times (5 doubtful), e.g. אחריהם [1Q] M 2: 13” (see also op. cit. 63 n. 79); cf. idem, “A Grammar of the Hebrew Language of the Dead Sea Scrolls,” (PhD diss.; Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1976), 248 (in Hebrew), with further references. Based on Qimron, Annette Steudel claims “viele grammatische Parallelen” to replacement of feminine with masculine suffix: “Ehelosigkeit bei den Essenern,” *Qumran kontrovers: Beiträge zu den Textfunden vom Toten Meer* (ed. J. Frey & H. Stegemann; Paderborn: Bonifatius, 2003), 115–24: 124.

taking two wives in the wives' lifetime. The issue is therefore polygyny, a view held in a considerable number of recent studies.⁷⁴ To be sure, the text could still be read as a prohibition of “successive polygyny” whilst the former partner is still alive. However, already Louis Ginzberg has suggested that the expression *בַּחִיָּהּ* alludes to Lev 18:18: “And you shall not take a woman as a rival⁷⁵ to her sister, uncovering her nakedness while her (sister is) alive (*בַּחִיָּהּ*).” This could be understood as a ban on concurrent polygyny when “sister” was taken as “fellow Israelite.” This catchword allusion to Lev 18:18 may align CD IV,20–21 with *concomitant* polygyny rather than successive and may be similarly at work in the expression “all days of her life” (*כֹּל יְמֵי חַיֶּיהָ*) in 11QT^a LVII,18.⁷⁶ In addition, that CD IV,20–5:2 is about concomitant polygyny might also be suggested by the reference to the marriage of the king, “Let him not multiply wives for himself” (Deut 17:17), as well as from the following example of David, whose problem with regards to this law was that he had several wives *simultaneously*, not that he did not wait until the death of one of his spouses to enter a new marriage (cf. only 2 Sam 3:2–5; 5:13).⁷⁷

García Martínez has criticised this solution, urging that “two basic methodological points” be heeded in the interpretation of the passage:

⁷⁴ Polygyny only has already been argued by L. Ginzberg, *Eine unbekannte jüdische Sekte, Erster Teil* (New York, 1922; repr. Frankfurt: Georg Olms Verlag, 1972), 24–26; further by Rabin, *Zadokite Documents*, 17; E. Lohse, *Die Texte von Qumran: Hebräisch und Deutsch* (4th ed.; Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1986), 288; G. Vermes, “Sectarian Matrimonial Halakhah,” 197–202; D. Instone-Brewer, “Nomological Exegesis in Qumran ‘Divorce’ Texts,” *RevQ* 18/72 (1998): 561–579; idem, *Divorce and Remarriage*, 65–72; Holmén, “Divorce,” 399–404; Schremer, “Qumran Polemic,” 147–160; Steudel, “Ehelosigkeit,” 123–24; Wassen, *Women*, 114–118; and chiefly because of the proof texts use, I.C. Werrett, *Ritual Purity and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (STDJ 72; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 82–85.

⁷⁵ *לְצַרָּר* “producing rivalry”; thus J. Milgrom, *Leviticus 17–22: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 3A; New York et al.; Doubleday, 2000), 1549.

⁷⁶ One should distinguish for CD IV,20–5:2 between this *catchword allusion* and the following *quotations*. At times, the impact of Lev 18:18 is overestimated (this tendency in Instone-Brewer, *Divorce and Remarriage*, 68–72, who also incorrectly claims that according to Ginzberg *בַּחִיָּהּ* does not need to be emended). For 11QT^a LVII,18, D.D. Swanson, *The Temple Scroll and the Bible: The Methodology of 11QT* (STDJ 14; Leiden: Brill 1995), 138 considers the possibility that *כֹּל יְמֵי חַיֶּיהָ* can also be seen in light of Deut 17:19 (with reference to Torah) or Prov 31:12 (to the “capable wife”, here with respect to her watchfulness). In terms of semantics, however, none of these texts fully matches the passage in 11QT^a; thus, it cannot be shown that this passage emphasises *only* the watchfulness of the king’s consort (contra Holmén, “Divorce,” 404–407).

⁷⁷ Cf. Lichtenberger, “Schöpfung,” 280–81.

first, “the text of CD as it stands yields perfect sense,” and second, “every text should be interpreted on its own.”⁷⁸ As to the second point, I have avoided to let the passage about the king in the *Temple Scroll* set the agenda for the passage in the *Damascus Document* and have noted both similarity (on remarriage after the death of the spouse, see above on 4Q271 frg. 3) and difference (on divorce, see above on 4Q266 frg. 9). As to the first point, it should be noted that considering **בחייהם** an *orthographic variant* of **בחיין** does take the text as it stands, since assuming an attested variant is not the same as emending the text.⁷⁹ Taking all aspects of the discussion together, I conclude that while interpretation no. 2 cannot be ruled out, I see a slight advantage for no. 3, particularly on account of the third proof text and perhaps also the possible intertextual relation to Lev 18:18, with the spelling of **בחייהם** not being an obstacle for this interpretation.

4. COMPARISON AND TENTATIVE CONCEPTUALISATION

The difference in topic established for CD IV,20–5:2 and Mark 10:6–9 has important consequences for the comparison of these two texts, which suggests a more nuanced discussion than sometimes found in scholarship. First, let us compare the *repertoire of quotations*. The first one is apparently the same in CD and in Mark, namely Gen 1:27c.⁸⁰ Thus, “male and female he created them” could be invoked for rejection of either polygyny (CD) or divorce (Mark). However, the next two quotations in CD move into a different direction. The first half of CD V,1 quotes an abbreviated form of Gen 7:9a:

ובאי התבה שנים שנים באו אל התבה (CD V,1a)
(CD V,1a) And those who entered (Noah’s) ark ‘went two by two into the ark’.

שְׁנַיִם שְׁנַיִם בָּאוּ אֶל־נֹחַ אֶל־הַתֵּבָה זָכָר וּנְקֵבָה כְּאֲשֶׁר צִוָּה אֱלֹהִים אֶת־נֹחַ
(Gen 7:9a, b)
(Gen 7:9a, b) Two by two they went to Noah, (in)to the ark—male and female, as God had commanded Noah.

⁷⁸ García Martínez, “Man and Woman,” 107.

⁷⁹ Thus also Kister, “Divorce,” n. 26.

⁸⁰ In CD this conforms to MT, except for *plene* spelling of **אותם**. For the possibility that Mark 10:6 refers to Gen 5:2aα (alongside or instead of Gen 1:27c?), see above n. 12. In Gen 5:2aα, MT has the suffixed form **בראם**.

This is probably a case of (later so-called) *gezerah šawah*, since beyond the quoted words Gen 7:9(b) continues, like Gen 1:27c, with “male and female” (זכר ונקבה).⁸¹ Whilst in Mark Gen 2:24 is referred to for an argumentation favouring *lifelong marriage* of the (two) spouses, the quotation in CD highlights the match of “two each” or “in pairs,” i.e., no more than two; this would seem to apply irrespective of whether one opts for concomitant or successive polygyny as denounced in CD. The third quotation in CD, Deut 17:17, prohibiting the king from multiplying wives, is, as we saw, best seen as directed against concomitant polygyny. In contrast to the *Temple Scroll* (11QT^a LVI,18–19; LVII,17–19), where monogamy is required of the *king*, CD draws on this verse in favour of general monogamy. These differences speak strongly against Instone-Brewer’s thesis that Gen 1:27 in “popular exegesis” was “normally linked with Genesis 7:9” and that the later quotation has merely “been lost in the abbreviated argument” in Mark 10.⁸² Instead, we see here *related but sufficiently different* forms of how in Second Temple Judaism marriage laws could be aligned with antediluvian incidents. We need this term, “antediluvian,” here to accommodate the second quotation in CD, from Gen 7:9, while in Mark 10:6–8 *both* quotations are from Gen 1 and 2, thus relate to the “supralapsarian” first couple. In contrast, CD supplements the references to Genesis by the Deuteronomic law of the king, the only quotation explicitly introduced as such (כתוב, CD V,1).⁸³

The differences in the range of quotations in CD and Mark match another, albeit subtler difference in the reference to creation that is often overlooked.⁸⁴ To be sure, that both texts explicitly refer to “creation” (κτῆσις, בריאה)⁸⁵ reflects a similarity in topic. However, syntactically and

⁸¹ As far as I am aware, this has first been spotted by Schaller, “Gen 1.2,” 70–71.

⁸² Instone-Brewer, *Divorce and Remarriage*, 139. To be sure, he admits, “the text of Genesis 7:9 is not, strictly speaking, necessary for understanding the force of Jesus’ argument.” Indeed not.

⁸³ See also, in the following apology for David’s polygyny, the statement that David was unable to *read* the regulation of the matter in “the sealed book of the Torah which was in the Ark (of the Covenant), for it was not opened in Israel since the day of the death of Eleazar and Joshua and the elders” (CD V,2–4).

⁸⁴ See Instone-Brewer, *Divorce and Remarriage*, 138: “semantically identical”; cf. H. Muszynski, *Fundament—Bild und Metapher in den Handschriften aus Qumran* (AnBib 61; Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1975), 141–2. More cautious is Berger, *Gesetzesauslegung*, 546–47.

⁸⁵ On the nominal form בריאה in the Qumran texts, which in the Hebrew Bible is scarcely attested and hardly reaches the level of abstraction, e.g., of rabbinic usage (only Num 16:30 “Neugeschaffenes, Wunderbares,” thus Gesenius¹⁸; cf. Sir 16:16 בריאות

semantically these references are realised differently. Whilst in Mark ἀπὸ δὲ ἀρχῆς κτίσεως is construed as a temporal adverbial phrase qualifying God's action, ויסוד הבריאה is most probably a nominal sentence, whose "predicative noun" is the quotation of Gen 1:27c. The syntactic evidence ties in with a semantic difference: Whereas the phrase "from the beginning of creation" in Mark carries a clear temporal notion and refers to *the beginning and the time elapsed since then*, as we have argued above,⁸⁶ CD IV,21 "the foundation of creation" (יסוד הבריאה) suggests rather a *pattern*, something like a blueprint for creation or a principle of creation, without temporal notion and certainly without the aspect of elapsing time.⁸⁷ This pattern can then be retrieved also outside the context of the Creation and Eden stories: in the entry into the ark in pairs and in the Torah's requirement of the king's monogamous marriage. The term יסוד denotes something like "foundational law" also in other passages in the Scrolls.⁸⁸

One might object that we need to assume a temporal notion for another, albeit fragmentary and restored, reference to יסוד בדיאה: In 4Q320 1 I, 2–3, the editor of this text, Shemaryahu Talmon, has reconstructed ה[הבריאה] ביסוד; according to his translation, some heavenly body—whether moon or sun is debated—is said "[to]sh[ine] [in] the middle of the heavens at the foundation of [Creatio]n from evening until morning...".⁸⁹ Crucial for this reconstruction is Talmon's read-

"creatures"), cf. F. García Martínez, "Creation in the Dead Sea Scrolls," *The Creation of Heaven and Earth* [...] (ed. G.H. van Kooten; Themes in Biblical Narrative 8; Leiden; Brill, 2005), 49–70; denotes "both the creative act by God (the singular noun בריאה, the creation) and the results of this creative act (its plural בריאות, the creatures)" (53). On κτίσις as theological achievement of Greek-speaking Judaism cf. the brief but excellent remarks in R. Feldmeier, "Die Wirklichkeit als Schöpfung: Die Rezeption eines frühjüdischen Theologoumenons bei Paulus," *Judaistik und neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* (ed. Doering, Waubke & Wilk), 289–96; 289–93; as well as E. Adams, *Constructing the World: A Study in Paul's Cosmological Language* (Studies of the New Testament and its World; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2000), 77–81.

⁸⁶ See above, at nn. 40–48.

⁸⁷ Thus also Schremer, *Male and Female*, 48 n. 58, and in particular García Martínez, "Creation in the Dead Sea Scrolls," 62–63: "Creation is not seen here as a temporal marker of the beginning of mankind, but as an expression of its nature."

⁸⁸ E.g. in 1QH^a 20:10–11 (12:8–9 Sukenik) קץ יסודי עת מולדי עת יסודי or CD X,6 תמיד בכול מולדי עת יסודי ששה מבההים בספר ההג' Cf. Muszynski, *Fundament*, 136–168; cf. also 1Q34bis 2:7 (here sometimes יסורי is read); CD XIX,4; 1QS VI,26; VII,18; VIII,8,10.

⁸⁹ Cf. Talmon et al., *Qumran Cave 4. XVI: Calendrical Texts* (DJD 21; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2001), 42–43, 44–45. Talmon comments that הבריאה and יסוד virtually form a *hendiadyoin*: "Conjoined in an A + B structure the two nouns connote 'Creation' (not 'foundation of the creation' or 'of the firmament')", and he renders the expression in CD 4:21 with "(the essence of) Creation", while for 4Q320 he assumes "a temporal

ing of the last letter, the only one surviving from the second word, as *he*. However, García Martínez has justly pointed out that, regarding the remains of the letter in question, “in the oldest photograph of the fragment (PAM 40.611), the first stroke joins the second at a clear angle, making the reading of the remains as an *ayin* the most logical solution.” García Martínez suggests restoring *ביסוד [הרק]ע* “at the base of the [vault]”, a reading already proposed in the *Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*.⁹⁰ It is thus very likely that the alleged attestation of *יסוד הבריאה* with temporal connotation should be discarded.

In contrast, the notion of a pattern of creation ties in rather well with other evidence in the Scrolls, according to which halakhah follows the natural state of affairs. Daniel Schwartz has labelled this Qumran’s “realism” as opposed to what he sees as Pharisaic-rabbinic “nominalism.” Although aspects of Schwartz’s theory have met criticism and call for some refinement, I deem it helpful for understanding the Qumran approach to halakhah.⁹¹ The first passage to mention in this respect is at the same time another reference to a non-temporal use of *בריאה* in the *Damascus Document*:⁹² According to CD XII,14–15, locusts are to be thrown alive into water or fire, “since this is the rule of their creation” (*כי הוא משפט בריאתם*). The creational “nature” of these insects allowed for consumption determines the mode of their preparation, different from other edible animals. Linguistically speaking, the term *משפט* in

not a spatial signification” and “refers to the luminaries” function of giving light on earth throughout the entire (fourth) day (of Creation)” (op. cit., 44–45).

⁹⁰ García Martínez, “Creation in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 61; cf. *DSSSE* 2:678–79.

⁹¹ See D.R. Schwartz, “Law and Truth: On Qumran-Sadducean and Rabbinic Views of Law,” *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research* (ed. D. Dimant & U. Rappaport; STDJ 19; Leiden: Brill; Jerusalem: Magness & Yad Ben-Zvi, 1992), 229–40. For criticism cf., e.g., J.L. Rubenstein, “Nominalism and Realism in Qumran and Rabbinic Law: A Reassessment,” *DSD* 6 (1999): 157–83; E. Regev, “Were the Priests all the Same? Qumran Halakhah in Comparison with Sadducean Halakhah,” *DSD* 12 (2005): 158–88. Cf. also L. Doering, “Überlegungen zum halachischen Ansatz der Qumrantexte,” *Qumran kontrovers* (ed. Frey & Stegemann), 89–113 (based on a paper given in 1998), where I proposed the term “voluntarism” instead of the problematic label “nominalism” (108). Schwartz has in the meantime defended and refined his view; see his “‘Qal va-Homer’ Arguments as Sadducean Realism,” *Massekhet* 5 (2006): 145–56 (in Hebrew). Cf. also his “On Pharisees and Sadducees in the Mishnah: From Composition Criticism to History,” *Judaistik und neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* (ed. Doering, Waubke & Wilk), 133–45, where Schwartz argues for the historical probability of attributing a “realist” approach to the Sadducees and a “nominalist” one to the Pharisees.

⁹² Cf. García Martínez, “Creation in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 63–64.

this passage stands in paradigmatic relation⁹³ with **טוֹד** of CD IV,21. While this does not suffice for assuming synonymous expressions,⁹⁴ it certainly suggests semantic similarity: both terms denote some kind of norm or standard with respect to creational reality. Another example of such “realism” might be seen in *Jub.* 12:25–7, 21:10, according to which Enoch and Noah read the halakhah off from creation, into which the creator’s Hebrew word has been engraved.⁹⁵ Perhaps we can add also the reference in Jubilees to laws who seem to be written on Heavenly Tablets, not as a response to events in the times of the Patriarchs, but conversely rather as a blueprint for these events, as has been argued by Cana Werman.⁹⁶

The denial of polygyny in the *Damascus Document* is thus a law that was instituted in creation and can be read off from reality and scripture. There is no indication that the instituted order had *generally* been disturbed or has only recently been recovered; the impression is that the group responsible for CD has preserved the law, and it is the opponents who have been caught in the “nets” of Belial. Essential is the correct interpretation of the Torah, which captures creational reality: since David did allegedly not have access to the book of the Torah, his polygamy can be excused.

With a different slant, the Markan text refers to the elapsing of time, ἀπὸ δὲ ἀρχῆς κτίσεως. Within the passage in Mark, the reference points to a discrepancy between the instituted order and the “Mosaic” concession, given “because of your hardness of heart.” The late Hartmut Stegemann suggested that what we encounter here is a model of restoration of paradisiacal conditions in the kingdom of God, an *Urzeit-Endzeit* correlation.⁹⁷ For Stegemann, Satan’s removal from power, as

⁹³ Cf. W. Egger, *Methodenlehre zum Neuen Testament: Einführung in linguistische und historisch-kritische Methoden* (Freiburg: Herder, 1987) 111–12; ET: *How to Read the New Testament: An Introduction to Linguistic and Historical-Critical Methodology* (Peabody [Mass.]: Hendrickson, 1996), 102–03.

⁹⁴ Note that **בְּרִיאָתָם** is construed with a suffix and therefore directly related to the “locusts,” whereas CD IV,21 speaks more generally of “the creation,” which allows for inclusion of more than those reproached, such as those entering the ark or the king.

⁹⁵ K. Müller, “Die Hebräische Sprache der Halacha als Textur der Schöpfung: Beobachtungen zum Verhältnis von Tora und Halacha im Buch der Jubiläen,” *Bibel in jüdischer und christlicher Tradition: FS J. Maier* (ed. H. Merklein, K. Müller & G. Stemberger; BBB 88; Frankfurt: Hain, 1993). 157–76.

⁹⁶ Cf. C. Werman, “The תּוֹרָה and the תְּעוּדָה Engraved on the Tablets,” *DSD* 9 (2002): 75–103: 85–89.

⁹⁷ H. Stegemann, “Der lehrende Jesus: Der sogenannte biblische Christus und die geschichtliche Botschaft Jesu von der Gottesherrschaft,” *NZStTh* 24 (1982), 3–20.

reflected in sayings such as Luke 10:18 or Mark 3:23–27, enables not only the casting out of demons but more broadly the restoration of primordial conditions. Thus, in the kingdom of God, whose inauguration is announced by Jesus, the couple would indeed regain lifelong partnership instituted “from the beginning of creation” but eclipsed for long by “hardness of hearts,” on account of which Moses gave the concession of Deut 24:1, which is now no longer needed.

I think Stegemann’s theory has something to commend. The general demand of lifelong marriage without the loophole of divorce amounts to what A.E. Harvey has called “strenuous commands,”⁹⁸ difficult demands running counter common experience and requiring efforts widely deemed *unattainable* elsewhere in ancient Judaism, even according to the Qumran texts. This begs the question of the *conditions* of such an ethics, and Stegemann is probably right in pointing to the importance of the notion of the *kingdom of God* for Jesus’ stance. The nexus with the kingdom is retained in the context of the divorce pericope in Mark, which is dominated by the conditions of discipleship (Mark 8:27–10:52) and virtually framed by numerous references to the βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ⁹⁹—“a larger concentration than in any other part of the gospel.”¹⁰⁰ Moreover, while the motif of “hardness of hearts” is generally related to rebellion against God’s commandments,¹⁰¹ the opening chapters of *First Enoch* with their announcement of divine intervention and judgment more specifically contrast those accused of being “hard of heart” (1 En. 5:4)¹⁰² with the divinely appointed *creational order*

⁹⁸ A.E. Harvey, *Strenuous Commands: The Ethic of Jesus* (London & Philadelphia: SCM & Trinity Press, 1990).

⁹⁹ Mark 9:47 (cf. 35–37, 43); 10:14, 15, 23, 24, 25 (cf. 29–31).

¹⁰⁰ R.T. France, *The Gospel of Mark [...]* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002), 386; F.J. Matera, *New Testament Ethics: The Legacies of Jesus and Paul* (Louisville [Ky.]: Westminster John Knox, 1996), 29.

¹⁰¹ MT and the books of LXX show varying terminological equivalence here: σκληροκαρδία translates עֲרֻלָּה לֵב at Deut 10:16; Jer 4:4; σκληροκαρδῖος renders (in the plural) קִשְׁי־לֵב at Ezek 3:7 and (in the singular) עֲקֻשׁ־לֵב at Prov 17:20. Cf. further 1 En. 5:4 (see presently); 16:3 (directed at the Watchers); 98:11 (reconstruction debated); 100:8. Cf. also the related (see Deut 10:16; 1 En. 98:1) term σκληροτράχηλος; Exod 33:3, 5; 34:9; Deut 9:6, 13; Prov 29:1 (translating [מ]קִשְׁה־עָרִי); Sir 16:11; Bar 2:30. In the NT cf. Acts 7:51 σκληροτράχηλοι καὶ ἀπερίτμητοι καρδίας καὶ τοῖς ὤσιν. K. Berger, “Hartherzigkeit und Gottes Gesetz: Die Vorgeschichte des antijüdischen Vorwurfs in Mk 10,5,” ZNW 61 (1970): 1–47, has gathered the material but tends to synthesise vastly disparate sources.

¹⁰² Ge’ez: *yebusāna lebb*; Cod. Panopolitanus: σκληροκαρδῖοι; Milik, *Books of Enoch*, 146, reconstructs קִשְׁי לֵב in 4QEn^a 1 II,14.

visible in nature (1:9–5:4): the “hard of heart” have not “acted according to his commandments” and have “turned aside” (5:4), whereas God’s works “do not alter their paths” (2:1). The statement about “hardness of hearts” in Mark is similar in that it also references a deviation from the creational status.¹⁰³ That the Mosaic concession is now dispensed with points to a restoration of that status.

However, two major criticisms seem in order: First, Stegemann overshoots the mark in the extent to which this theory is applicable. For him, virtually all items of the Mosaic Torah are replaced by a so-called “Creation Torah” (*Schöpfungstora*).¹⁰⁴ However, the Gospels mention only divorce and Sabbath as legal issues in which primordial conditions are invoked. Thus, apart from divorce, Jesus states in Mark 2:27 that “the Sabbath has become (ἐγένετο) for humankind, not humankind for the Sabbath.” As I read this text, it implies that provisions for people in need are allowed for on the Sabbath—people who are hungry, as perhaps implied in the scene of the plucking of corn, or chronically sick, as in the other Gospel Sabbath pericopae. The basis for this is the relationship between Sabbath and human beings established in creation but—this is the implicit claim—eclipsed in the halakhah of Jesus’ disputants.¹⁰⁵ But I do not see further signs of such reasoning in the Gospels. For example, the attitude towards purity laws in Mark 7 par. Matt 15 is not coupled with a reference to creation.¹⁰⁶ In other

¹⁰³ Here with Berger, “Hartherzigkeit,” 25, who points out (37) that transgression of creational boundaries is also referred to in *1 En.* 16:3, where the Watchers’ revelation of the mystery to the terrestrial women is credited to “hardness of hearts.”—There is some debate whether the law in *1 En.* 1–5 is the Mosaic Torah or the law of nature; see A. Bedenbender, *Der Gott der Welt tritt auf den Sinai: Entstehung, Entwicklung und Funktionsweise der frühjüdischen Apokalyptik* (ANTZ 8; Berlin: Institut Kirche und Judentum, 2000), 228–29, but Bedenbender, who—against J.J. Collins—favours the former, admits that the text is ambiguous and suggest a rapprochement of Enochic and Mosaic notions of Torah. While the text might allude to the Mosaic Torah (mainly through the reference to Sinai in 1:4), it maintains the agreement of law and created nature, from which the “hard of heart” deviate.

¹⁰⁴ This has subsequently been developed by Stegemann’s pupil J. Sauer, *Rückkehr und Vollendung des Heils: Eine Untersuchung zu den ethischen Radikalismen Jesu* (Regensburg: Roderer, 1991).

¹⁰⁵ Cf. at greater length L. Doering, *Sabbat: Sabbathalacha und -praxis im antiken Judentum und Urchristentum* (TSAJ 78; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999), 408–32, 441–56, and idem, “Much Ado about Nothing? Jesus’ Sabbath Healings and their Halakhic Implications Revisited,” *Judaistik und neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* (ed. Doering, Waubke & Wilk), 217–41: 236–41.

¹⁰⁶ Contra U. Schnelle, “Jesus, ein Jude aus Galiläa,” *BZ NS* 32 (1988): 107–113, who argues that Mark 7:15 aims at restitution of primordial conditions, since “von Anfang der Schöpfung an bestand die Unterscheidung Rein—Unrein nicht. Erst in Gen 7,2

words, the Jesus tradition claims restoration of paradisiacal conditions with legal ramifications only where there is *explicit warrant* for such conditions and ramifications in the creation and Eden narrative.¹⁰⁷

The second criticism that I would level at Stegemann's theory is that restoration of primordial conditions is not an entirely fair description of the eschaton in the Jesus tradition. What about the element of perfection? I can only hint at the problem here: Apparently, lifelong marriage is not the only option in the Jesus tradition. There are "eunuchs who have made themselves eunuchs for the sake of the kingdom of heaven" (Matt 19:12).¹⁰⁸ Jesus himself seems to have remained unmarried, which is most likely somehow related to the eschatological urgency of his ministry.¹⁰⁹ Marriage is a provisional, or to speak with Dietrich Bonhoeffer, a "penultimate" order, since in the resurrection from the dead "they neither marry or are given in marriage but are like the angels in heaven" (Mark 12:25 parr.).¹¹⁰ It is plausible, as Luke 20:35 suggests, that some wished to anticipate this βίος ἀγγελικός under the impression of the inaugurated kingdom. How do these two options, lifelong marriage and celibacy, then relate to one another? Dale B. Martin, in his recent book *Sex and the Single Saviour*, has suggested that Jesus raised the standard of marriage so high as to discourage it: "Jesus forbade divorce

erfolgt unvermittelt die Trennung von reinen und unreinen Tieren" (113). But the Markan text does not reference this; apart from this, the relevance of the distinction between clean and unclean animals for other aspects of the system of purity and impurity (e.g., hand washing, Mark 7:2–5) is problematic. Neither does Luke 11:40–41 (cf. *Gos. Thom.* 89), with clear reference to the act of creation, suggest primordial indifference between pure and impure; it rather urges interior *purity*, whilst taking its argumentative cue from exterior purity. Note also that according to Rev 21:27 "nothing impure" (πᾶν κινόν) will enter the New Jerusalem, so that at least here a notional distinction between pure and impure is upheld in eschatological expectation. Similarly, I deem it difficult to see references in the gospels to paradisiacal conditions for criticism of family ties, fasting, and the temple, as claimed by Sauer, *Rückkehr*, 149–212, 344–62, 426–59.

¹⁰⁷ The approach by Stegemann, Sauer, Schnelle et al. has been strongly criticised by M. Ebner, *Jesus—ein Weisheitslehrer? Synoptische Weisheitslogien im Traditionsprozess* (Herders Biblische Studien 15; Freiburg: Herder, 1998), esp. 15–16, but Ebner is mistaken in disregarding the references to the creation and Eden narrative relative to Sabbath and marriage.

¹⁰⁸ Cf. Davies & Allison, *Matthew*, 3:21–25; Luz, *Matthäus*, 3:108–111; A.E. Harvey, "Eunuchs for the Sake of the Kingdom," *HeyJ* 48 (2007): 1–17.

¹⁰⁹ P. van der Horst, "Celibacy in Early Judaism," *RB* 109 (2002): 390–402, explains (398): "Das Gebot der Stunde" carries more weight than 'das Gebot der ersten Stunde' in Gen 1."

¹¹⁰ However, one must not confuse the resurrection with the kingdom of God, as does Greeven, "Ehe," 374.

in order to destroy marriage.”¹¹¹ However, this probably takes the doubtless family-critical tones in Jesus’ ministry too far.¹¹² According to the context of the pericope in Mark, Jesus valued children too much (Mark 9:36–37; 10:13–16) to be likely to put their existence or at least their well-being at risk by the destruction of marriage, and we know from 1 Cor 9:5 that even the apostles’ “leaving everything” (cf. Mark 10:28)—if historical—did not end in general termination of marriages. It may be considered that the key to a solution lies in a *two-tiered eschatology* and corresponding lifestyles in the Jesus tradition: The kingdom of God has been inaugurated, but the resurrection is yet to come. The kingdom enables the restoration of primordial conditions, thus the renewal of marriage modelled by the first marriage, but resurrection will lead to perfection, thus to an angelic life of sexual restraint, which is already anticipated by some.

I am aware that for a fully rounded comparative picture we would also have to carry out an assessment of the complex issue of celibacy in the Scrolls. However, this would require a paper in its own right. For the time being, it should merely be noted that even if texts such as CD 7:4–5 or 1QS 8–9 indeed implied celibacy, it would not affect our argument regarding the reference to creation in CD 4–5, since the focus of the latter is to show what is wrong with “taking two wives in their lives.”

CONCLUSION

Mark 10 and CD 4–5 invoke Gen 1:27c “male and female he created them” for different problems, Mark to denounce divorce, the *Damascus Document* to ban polygyny, perhaps concomitant, although consecutive polygyny cannot be excluded. Both texts combine this proof-text with

¹¹¹ D.B. Martin, *Sex and the Single Savior: Gender and Sexuality in Biblical Interpretation* (Louisville [Ky.]: Westminster John Knox, 2006), 147.

¹¹² For these tones cf. Mark 3:20–21; 3:31–35 parr.; 6:1–6a parr.; 10:28–31 parr. It needs to be conceded, however, that Martin, *Sex*, 137–38, might be right for *Luke*: Taking together the lack of a parallel to Mark 10:2–9, the possibility that Luke 16:18 allows divorce and prohibits only remarriage (like Mark 10:12–12, see above), and the inclusion of the “wife” among those to be hated (as a condition of discipleship: Luke 14:26, different Matt 10:37; *Gos. Thom.* 55, 101) and to be left for the sake of the kingdom of God (Luke 18:29, different Mark 10:29; Matt 19:29, where uncials B and D preserve the better [shorter] text; contra Greeven, “Ehe,” 374 with n. 2) might suggest that marriages could be dissolved for the sake of the kingdom.

other ones, but these differ according to the respective focus in the texts quoting them: in CD 4–5, Gen 7:9a and Deut 17:17 are referred to alongside Gen 1:27c; in Mark 10, it is Gen 2:24. In both texts these proof-texts do not only function as passages from scripture but also capture creational reality. The way this is achieved, however, is somewhat different: In the *Damascus Document*, we have a foundational principle that can be retrieved in reality as interpreted by scripture, whereas in Mark, it appears, the high standard of lifelong marriage as recovery of the initial marriage is attainable in light of the inaugurated kingdom, in the horizon of which the “Mosaic” concession becomes superfluous. While the wider context of references to marriage and creation in Second Temple texts needs to be kept in view,¹¹³ the comparison between Mark 10 and CD 4–5 remains extremely important, since it shows most clearly a common interpretative horizon, in which issues pertaining to marriage law are addressed by reference to texts from Gen 1–2 (and, in CD, other Pentateuchal passages) and by appeal to creation. Pointing out differences as well as communalities, as we have done, only reinforces the importance of comparison, allowing us to see nuances in the compared texts and to relate them to conceptual emphases in each of them.

¹¹³ See above, n. 51.

TEMPLE, SACRIFICE AND PRIESTHOOD IN THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS AND THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS

Lawrence H. Schiffman
New York University

INTRODUCTION

Ask any Dead Sea Scrolls scholar about Hebrews, and you will immediately get a one word response—Melchizedek. This alleged parallel, and a number of supposed others, triggered various exaggerations regarding the relation of Hebrews to the scrolls. Since the fundamental issues of the authorship and audience of Hebrews, not to mention its literary form and *Sitz-im-Leben*, remain undecided, the scrolls appeared to some to be a panacea. Indeed, Hebrews has been subjected in modern times to a string of such panaceas, as Philo,¹ the scrolls,² and Gnosticism³ has each been used to develop mega-theories that have, in turn, been the basis of scholarly commentaries. Recently, more sober approaches have become the norm.⁴ Qumran scholars may be surprised to learn that parallels that they take as a given have been either rejected or severely nuanced as a result of detailed study by New Testament colleagues not part of the Qumran cabal.⁵ In fact, little remains of the way-overstated relationship that was assumed in our field.⁶

Nonetheless, I have decided to devote a study to the questions of temple, sacrifice, and priesthood in this text. We will not seek to find direct influence but rather to compare the approaches of Hebrews to those of the scrolls, and to see what can be learned about the knowledge, understanding and interpretation of sacrificial worship by the author

¹ L.D. Hurst, *The Epistle to the Hebrews, Its Background of Thought* (SNTSMS 65; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 7–42.

² Hurst, *Epistle*, 43–66.

³ Hurst, *Epistle*, 67–75.

⁴ H. Attridge, *Hebrews: A Commentary to the Epistle to the Hebrews* (Hermeneia Commentary Series; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1989), 28–31.

⁵ Much of the debate swirls around Y. Yadin, “The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Epistle to the Hebrews,” *ScrHier* 4 (1958): 36–55.

⁶ Cf. H. Attridge, “Hebrews,” in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. L.H. Schiffman and J.C. VanderKam; New York: Oxford, 2000) 1:345–6.

of Hebrews. We are interested here not so much in his interpretation of Christianity, but rather in his interpretation of the Judaism that in his view Christianity superseded. After investigating these issues, we will see how they relate to the general views of eschatology in Hebrews and the scrolls.

1. TEMPLE

Hebrews concentrates on the notion of a heavenly sanctuary paralleling the earthly, indeed as a kind of model reflected in the earthly (8:2, 5). Jesus is pictured as officiating in the true heavenly sanctuary (9:24), representing the people before God. For Hebrews, reference is always to the desert Tabernacle, not to the First or Second Temples. We will return to this feature below.

The command to build the Tabernacle is found in the Torah, called here the “first covenant” (9:1). The Tabernacle is described in Hebrews (9:1–5) as consisting of two tents: the outer with the menorah and table for the showbread, known as the holy place (*qodesh*). The second, inner tent was the Holy of Holies (*qodesh ha-qodashim*),⁷ separated from the first by a curtain (cf. 10:20) enclosing the golden altar of incense and the ark of the covenant, covered in gold, that itself contained a golden urn of manna (Exod. 16:33–34), Aaron’s blossoming rod (Num. 17:23), and the Tablets of the Law (the Ten Commandments; Exod. 25:16; Deut. 10:2). The Cherubim were above the ark. The author also mentions the “mercy seat,” *kaporet*, the cover of the ark, using the term *hilasterion*, literally “that which expiates.”⁸ A fragmentary Leviticus Targum from Qumran reads *kasya*’ for the “mercy seat” indicating that, like the medieval Jewish commentaries, the Qumran Targum takes it as “cover,” not connecting it with acts of expiation.⁹ According to Hebrews, priests are permitted regularly in the outer chamber, but only the high priest enters the inner Holy of Holies once yearly on the Day of Atonement, and then only with the blood of the offering for himself and the errors of the people (9:6–7, 25; cf. Lev. 16:11–16). The statement that sacrifices

⁷ These terms are curiously reversed in Hebrews. See Attridge, *Hebrews*, 230, 233–4.

⁸ F. Büchsel, “hilasterion,” *TDNT* 3:320.

⁹ See M. Kasher, “Appendix,” to J.T. Milik in *Qumrân Grotte 4.II, Part 2: Tefillin, Mezuzot et Targums (4Q128–4Q157)* (DJD VI; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977), 92–93.

on the Day of Atonement only provide atonement for inadvertent sins seems to be following Talmudic tradition.¹⁰

The author of Hebrews asserts that the Christians have an altar from which the Temple priests may not eat, apparently a reference to the sacrifice of Jesus, efficacious only for those who believed in him. Since Jesus was killed outside the city, our author notes that although the blood of the sin offering was offered in the sanctuary, the sacrifice was burned outside. While making this comparison, he refers to these sacrifices as being offered by the high priest (13:10–12). This is most probably an allusion also to the Yom Kippur sacrifice (Lev. 16:27). After Jesus' atoning death, in the author's view, the fruit of the lips is a substitute for sacrifice (Heb. 13:15) as are good deeds (13:16).

The notion of a sacrifice of praise, the fruit of the lips (Heb. 13:15), has a parallel in the scrolls. The gift of the lips is spoken about in 1QS IX 4–5 and similar expressions are found in other Second Temple texts, such as Ben Sira 34:18–35:11, *T. Levi* 3:5–6, *Pss. Sol.* 15:3 (cf. *1 En.* 45:3).¹¹ Indeed, this is an image found in the Hebrew Bible (Hos 14:3) and this verse served the rabbis as well in their understanding of prayer as a replacement for sacrifice after the destruction.

The concept of the heavenly sanctuary is also found in later rabbinic aggadah¹² and Hekhalot literature and is a well-developed motif in the Qumran Angelic Liturgy texts, *Serekh Shirot 'Olat ha-Shabbat*. There angels are termed *kohane qorev*, "priests who draw near" (4Q400 1 I, 17) as they serve in an imagined heavenly temple of God. The priesthood and worship in our world are considered inferior to those of the heavenly realm (4Q400 1 II, 5–7). "Holy of Holies," is mentioned in Mas1K I, 10 but it is not clear if this refers to a part of the Temple. The heavenly holy temple is referred to (*miqdash qodsho*) in Mas1K II, 25//4Q403 1 I, 11 and 1 I, 42.¹³ This text speaks also about a multiplicity of temples (line 46).¹⁴ The text also refers to the Tabernacle, in the phrase *mishkan rosh rum kevod malkhuto*, "The uppermost exalted

¹⁰ Contra Philo (Attridge, *Hebrews*, 239).

¹¹ Attridge, *Hebrews*, 400 n. 140.

¹² A. Aptovitzer, "Bet Miqdash shel Ma'alah 'al pi ha-Aggadah," *Tarbiz* 2 (1930/1): 137–53.

¹³ Cf. Carol Newsom, "Shirot 'Olat HaShabbat," in *Qumran Cave 4.VI: Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part 1* (ed. E. Eshel, et al.; DJD XI; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998), 262–3.

¹⁴ For parallels, see Newsom, DJD 11:278.

tabernacle, the glory of His kingdom" (4Q403 1 II, 10),¹⁵ which is followed by *devir*, "the shrine," of the Temple. This latter term occurs several times (see line 11 and *passim*). The "*devir* of [His] holiness" also appears (line 16).¹⁶ Even a curtain is mentioned (*parokhet*), the veil of the shrine of the King (4Q405 15 II 16, 3, cf. *parokhet*, line 5). The Tabernacle also appears in 4Q405 20 II 21–22, 7 along with the *merkavah*, God's Chariot-throne.

The earthly temple is but a reflection of the heavenly temple in *Jubilees* in which the "angels of the presence" worship God (*Jub.* 15:27, 31:14). *1 Enoch*, the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, and Dead Sea Scrolls literature all describe the worship that takes place in heaven amongst the angels. In *1 En.* (39:3), *2 En.* (21:3), and *Apoc. Ab.* (18:2) the angels in heaven recite "Holy, holy, holy" at the core of their liturgy. This idea of how the angels praise God is based on Isa 6:3. Angels as heavenly intercessors appear in *1 Enoch*, *Tobit*, *Daniel*, *Greek Bar.*, and *Apoc. Zeph.* In *T. Levi* 3, the angels actually perform sacrifices that do not involve blood on behalf of sinners. In the Angelic Liturgy from Qumran, an elaborate description of the service that takes place in heaven, the angels ask God to forgive human sin. Texts such as these testify to a tradition of heavenly priesthood of angelic figures and open the way to Metatron and Michael,¹⁷ and for Hebrews, Jesus.

However, when we compare this material we find a very fundamental difference. Hebrews deals with the Tabernacle, not with an actual temple. Continuity of the new order with the long obsolete Tabernacle heightens the author's message. The celestial temple of Qumran, however, seems to represent both Tabernacle and temple as one entity, reflecting the Jewish notion of continuity from Tabernacle to First Temple to Second Temple.¹⁸ Yet the notion of a heavenly sacrificial service in a supernatural sanctuary is common to both Hebrews and the scrolls.

¹⁵ Trans. Newsom, DJD 11:282.

¹⁶ Cf. the phrases occurring together in 4Q405 14–5 I, 7.

¹⁷ Cf. G. Scholem, *Jewish Gnosticism, Merkabah Mysticism and Talmudic Tradition* (New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1960), 43–55.

¹⁸ Cf. L.H. Schiffman, "Architecture and Law: The Temple and its Courtyards in the *Temple Scroll*," in *From Ancient Israel to Modern Judaism: Intellect in Quest of Understanding: Essays in Honor of Marvin Fox* (ed. J. Neusner, E.S. Frerichs, and N.M. Sarna; 4 vols.; BJS 159; Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1989), 1:267–84.

Beyond the obvious Christological issues, one of the most prominent differences between Hebrews and the various scrolls texts relates to the fundamental question of sacrificial worship and its role in the end of days. In this case, we deal with both sectarian materials and with sources they had inherited from earlier Sadducean/Zadokite circles.

In a general sense, we can look at Hebrews and the scrolls as in inverse relation to one another from the point of view of their “cultic chronology.” Whereas the early Christians, during their most formative years, both before and after Jesus’ death, participated in sacrificial worship, after the coming of the Christian messiah the author of Hebrews assumes that sacrifice is no longer efficacious and has been superseded by other forms of worship. The sectarians, on the other hand, abstained from sacrificial worship while the Temple stood, believing that it was being conducted in an illegitimate manner under high priests from the wrong family, but expected the full restoration of sacrifice in the future age.

CD VI 11–14 had prohibited participation in the Temple, based on Mal 1:10. One of the cardinal transgressions of the Temple authorities was to “render the Temple impure” (CD IV 17–18). Only the sectarians, identified with the sons of Zadok, had abstained from this transgression and, hence, removed themselves from Temple worship. Even the Essenes of Josephus were said to worship at the Temple, but eating their offerings in a special chamber to maintain their particular standards of purity.¹⁹

This critique of the present-day Hellenistic period Temple, which no doubt extended also into the Roman period, did not dampen in the slightest the eschatological yearnings for the restoration of the Temple.²⁰ The sectarians expected that the sacrifices would be conducted according to sectarian rulings and, according to the Temple Scroll, that it would even be built according to their rules.²¹ From 4QFlor I 1–6 we learn of the expectation, similar to some rabbinic teachings, that a divinely-built Temple will replace the man-made Temple at the end of

¹⁹ A.J. 18.19.

²⁰ Cf. L.H. Schiffman, *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls: The History of Judaism, the Background of Christianity, the Lost Library of Qumran* (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society, 1994; paperback ed., Anchor Bible Reference Library; New York: Doubleday, 1995), 391–4.

²¹ On the Temple plan of the scroll, see Y. Yadin, *The Temple Scroll* (3 vols.; Jerusalem: The Israel Exploration Society and the Shrine of the Book, 1983), 1.177–276.

days. The author of the sacrificial festival calendar of the *Temple Scroll* expected that even the idealized, gargantuan Temple foreseen in the *Temple Scroll* was expected to be replaced by a new, divinely constructed one at the dawn of the eschaton (11QT^a XXIX 8–10).

2. SACRIFICE

Hebrews argues against the efficaciousness of the offerings in the sanctuary. In the author's view, these offerings cannot perfect the conscience of the one who offers them as they are physical. Jesus' priesthood supersedes this physical Tabernacle through his own sacrifice that truly purifies (9:8–14). Jesus' death is a sort of one-time, permanent Day of Atonement, obviating future sacrifice (9:24–28). Further, the sacrificial system cannot be efficacious as otherwise it could cease to be necessary as humans would be purged of sin (10:1–4; cf. 10:5–18). Specifically, we hear of the blood of goats and calves, and sprinkling of defiled people with that blood as well as with the ashes of the red heifer for the "purification of the flesh" (9:12–13). It seems that 10:26 indicates that sacrifices did not atone for purposeful transgressions.²² In his sermon on faith, the author of Heb (11:28) mentions the offering of the Paschal sacrifices and sprinkling of the blood.

Hebrews refers (9:18–20) to the inauguration of the covenant at Sinai. The author assumed a public reading of the Torah including every commandment. The Torah does not mention this reading. We are told that Moses took the blood of the sacrificial calves, with water, scarlet wool and hyssop and sprinkled the book itself—the Torah—and the entire people. In Exod 24:6–8 the blood is sprinkled, half on the altar and half on the people. The remaining details—the water, wool and hyssop—are not mentioned. The hyssop appears in Num 19:18 where it is dipped in the water of the ashes of the red heifer and then sprinkled. Lev 14:4–6 uses cedar wood, scarlet wool and hyssop in purifying the *metsora*' (a person afflicted with a certain skin disease). There is no parallel in the Hebrew Bible to the sprinkling of the book itself.

Again we have an inverse relationship. The Qumran sectarians believed that sacrifice, when conducted according to their halakhic system, was indeed efficacious. They would have disputed the very

²² But cf. Attridge, *Hebrews*, 292–3.

principle on which the author of Hebrews seems to base his opposite argument. Hebrews sees sacrifice as a physical act, and no doubt would have looked at Jewish ritual immersion in the same way. To the scrolls, as one sees in a variety of passages, the mechanical rituals alone were of no validity, and it was precisely the religious meaning of the acts—the transformation of conscience from feelings of guilt and impurity to those of freedom and purity, that made these acts worthwhile. Indeed, the entire theological understanding of Jewish sacrificial worship in the scrolls is totally at variance with that of Hebrews. It is not that the scrolls argue for the efficacy of meaningless acts. Rather, they argue for the deep spiritual meaning of those acts.

But there is another essential element. The apocalyptic vision of the scrolls and related material calls for a perfection of purity and worship through a Temple operated according to the correct halakhic rulings. For Hebrews, the coming of the messiah is freedom from supposedly superseded acts. For the Qumran sect, the true bond of heaven and earth is through sacrificial worship, the perfection of which can only come in the messianic era.

Heb 9:22 indicates that Moses had sprinkled the Tabernacle and all the sacrificial implements (*kele qodesh*) with blood, which according to the law (so he says) is the only way to effect purification (or remission of sin). No such thing is mentioned in the Torah. Exod 40:9 tells us that the Tabernacle was anointed. It is possible that the text's understanding of the dedication of the Tabernacle has been influenced in the author's view by the installation of the priests (*milluim*).²³ In Lev 8:24 the blood of the ram of installation (*milluim*) is sprinkled on the altar and is used in consecrating Aaron and his priestly vestments.²⁴

The emphasis here on atonement by blood is based on the author's beliefs regarding Jesus' role in salvific history. The text states that, according to the Torah, "about everything" is purified with blood, and there is no forgiveness without blood (9:22).²⁵ The author was aware that there are non-animal offerings, so he qualified his view with "almost." This point is also made in 9:13. The blood of Jesus becomes the ultimate permanent expiation and purification offering.

²³ Attridge, *Hebrews*, 258.

²⁴ See the notes of Attridge, *ibid*.

²⁵ Cf. Attridge, *Hebrews*, 258–9 who cites rabbinic parallels in n. 62.

3. PRIESTHOOD

Hebrews 2:17 tells us that the purpose of the high priest was to make expiation for the sins of the people. Jesus, according to 3:14–16, is like his brethren in having faced temptation and, hence, can sympathize with their weaknesses. In the Epistle to the Hebrews, we can trace several epithets for Jesus reflecting his greatness. He is referred to as the eternal and exalted son, the suffering son, the savior. Among these names is “the merciful and faithful high priest” (2:17). This epithet calls to mind the Jewish notion of angelic beings functioning in a priestly role in the heavenly sanctuary.

Jesus’ priesthood is understood as attaining the throne of God and piercing the curtain of the holy of holies. As priest, he opens the covenantal community to believers. His high priestly work includes his own crucifixion. According to this text, only Melchizedek’s priesthood, as embodied in Jesus, can lead to atonement and salvation. As high priest, Jesus transcends the work of a regular high priest.

The high priest is appointed to act on behalf of the people before God, to offer gifts and sacrifices of expiation (5:1–2). Since he is also imperfect, he offers sacrifice to expiate his own sins (5:2–3). He must be called by God (5:4). Jesus is such a high priest, appointed by God, part of the order of Melchizedek (5:5–6, 10; 6:20) who is identified as an eternal priest of God, to whom Abraham could give a tithe (7:2–4, 21).

The author presents a complex argument for the superiority of Jesus to the Aaronide priests. The descendants of Levi are commanded to take tithes (7:5). Melchizedek was not a Levitical priest (7:6). Since the Levites are children of Abraham, and he gave tithes to Melchizedek, Melchizedek is superior to the Levites (7:6–10). Hence, the author elevates Jesus above the priests who are descendants of Aaron by associating Jesus with Melchizedek. In 7:1–19 he points out that the priesthood of Melchizedek is superior to that of the biblical Levites. With the coming of Jesus, the priesthood no longer resides with Levi (7:11–14) and is no longer dependent on bodily descent (7:15–16). Jesus becomes a priest “by the power of an indestructible life” (7:16), that is, by his own essence, and his priesthood is permanent.²⁶ Regular priests took no oath, but Jesus is in office after an oath of God (7:21). Earthly priests, who serve for life (7:23), are charged with intercession before

²⁶ Attridge, *Hebrews*, 202.

God (7:25); high priests offer sacrifices daily, for their own sins and for those of the people, but Jesus' own sacrifice makes this no longer necessary (7:27). Jesus is pictured as seated at the right hand of the throne, but ministering in the divine Tabernacle in heaven (8:1-2).

Hebrews 3:1-7:28 explains the role of Jesus as the eschatological priest.²⁷ Jesus provides the Deuteronomic "rest" (cf. Deut 12:9) promised but never accomplished until now. Jesus brings about this rest by granting atonement to his followers and defeating the devil and death itself (2:14-15; 10:11-12). All this he achieves without adherence to the law of the "old covenant." In Jesus' case the sacrificial animal is the priest himself. In this way, the Hebrew biblical idea of sacrifice comes to an end. His blood replaces that of the animal's. The true sacrifice is the fulfillment of God's word in human life. Just as the high priest passes through the courtyards into the Holy of Holies, Jesus passes into heaven, and God's presence is now available to humanity. Priest and God are united on the throne as was Melchizedek with God in Ps 110:4, and Jesus is enthroned. Now the old system of sacrifice and its previous priests must be abandoned forever.

The issue at hand is the nature of "true" worship of God. In the absence of a temple, the Jewish point of view was that adherence to the Mosaic law was paramount. This was certainly true of the Qumran sectarians who had removed themselves from Temple worship. To the author of Hebrews, true worship could be attained based on the atonement of Jesus rather on the observance of the biblical law. Therefore, Hebrews dissociates Melchizedek from the priests of Aaron since the Old Testament priesthood is now obsolete. The Dead Sea Scrolls, however, await the deliverance of Melchizedek since he represents the fulfillment of the priestly role according to the Hebrew Bible.²⁸ For the author of Hebrews, the messiah has already come, granting rest to the faithful on earth, and there has already dawned a messianic age in heaven through the arrival of Jesus. Worship under these new conditions creates a spiritual heavenly tabernacle.

A fundamental difference between Hebrews and the Qumran scrolls is in regard to the displacement of the Aaronide priests. According to Hebrews, the Aaronides have been totally superseded by Jesus, of the order of Melchizedek. The Qumran sect had many complaints against

²⁷ C.M. Pate, *Communities of the Last Days: The Dead Sea Scrolls, the New Testament, & the Story of Israel* (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 2000), 119-22.

²⁸ 11QMelch, 1QM XVII 1-9, CD VI 2-6, 1QSa 2 (Pate, *Communities*, 208-9).

non-Zadokite priests, and even with Zadokites who served in the Jerusalem Temple under the Hasmoneans. Nonetheless, they saw the Aaronide priesthood as the only legitimate priesthood and expected it to function in the end of days under the leadership of the eschatological priest, the Aaronide messiah. Under this leadership, the Temple would be conducted according to the Torah and serve as the spiritual center of an ideal society.

CONCLUSION

The sectarians still awaited the eschatological war of the future in which Belial and the enemies of the sect would be defeated. In the meantime, the Rule of the Community (8:1–10) specified that the Council of fifteen men shall preside in perfection over the administration of truth and justice which will be a “pleasant aroma” like the sacrifices of Aaron. This administration of the sect will be a replacement for the sacrifices that are no longer offered in the Temple. In this interim period, the holy life of the sect will be the means to bring about atonement. The perfection of the sect will allow the commencement of the eschatological war in which all evil will be wiped out. Then the physical, earthly Temple will once again be rebuilt upon the principles encoded in the Dead Sea Scrolls, and Levitical sacrifice will be renewed.

In the late Second Temple period, the idea of the priestly messiah appears, especially in the Qumran scrolls and the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*. This notion is, to some extent, a reaction against the Hasmonean priest-kings. The Dead Sea Scrolls speak of two messiahs, of Aaron and Israel as well as an eschatological prophet. The dual messiahs were each confined to their roles as priest and royal leader. Some texts, however, envisage only one leader who combines both these roles. The scrolls occasionally also give evidence of an angel who leads the forces of good, possibly Michael, in the pattern of Melchizedek. He is called “anointed of the spirit,” a messianic designation, although it is not necessarily priestly. Angels are depicted as performing priestly service in the heavens, and Melchizedek in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the priestly messiah of the *T. Levi* 18 are both superhuman figures.²⁹

²⁹ Cf. L.H. Schiffman, “Messianic Figures and Ideas in the Qumran Scrolls,” *The Messiah, Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity*, (ed. J.H. Charlesworth; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992), 116–29 and idem, *Reclaiming*, 323–6.

The *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* shares its messianic expectations with the Dead Sea Scrolls although it is not part of the sectarian literature. Levi and Judah as the ancestors of the priests and kings of Israel have special eschatological roles, and they also appear as dual messianic figures. The *Testament of Levi* in particular ascribes to Levi the power to defeat evil, vanquishing Belial, reward the righteous, sit in judgment, and bring the knowledge of God to humanity.³⁰ These functions parallel those of Melchizedek in 11QMelch.

Hebrews depicts Jesus as a high priest but does not ascribe to him the functions of judgment or revelation. The *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* does not expect the messianic figures to intercede with God in heaven or to perform self-sacrifice, two of the functions of Jesus in the New Testament. Early Christian texts regard Jesus as intercessor and self-sacrificing. Hebrews extends this idea to include the Yom Kippur ritual as having been fulfilled by Jesus' self-sacrifice. Thus, Jesus is the high priest based on the Jewish notion of priestly angelic figures that worship God in heaven.

Thus, both the authors of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the author of Hebrews each believed themselves to be the true Israel, the elect of God, the inheritors of the spiritual legacy of the Hebrew Bible in their time, and the holders of the true covenant. Each held that through their faith and obedience to what they saw as God's will, they could redeem the world and bring all the blessings promised in the messianic age. Thus, we are left with the question—who is the high priest who serves in the true Temple? For the sect, it is the priestly messiah who leads his people in the end of days by his adherence to the true interpretation, whose work continues that of the Teacher of Righteousness who had been a priest. For Hebrews, it is Jesus who brings the ultimate restoration of true worship in the true sanctuary.³¹

The self-sacrifice and death of Jesus is seen in Christian theology as similar to the sacrifice of the high priest on Yom Kippur, bringing perfect atonement. This sacrifice inaugurates a new era that begins with a new covenant. Like the Qumran doctrine of the two Messiahs, the theology of the Epistle is also rooted in eschatological expectations in which there is a priestly Messiah. The Qumran sect believed that the

³⁰ J. Liver, "The Doctrine of the Two Messiahs in Sectarian Literature in the Time of the Second Commonwealth," *HTR* 52 (1959): 149–85.

³¹ Pate, *Communities*, 208–13.

eschatological era was soon to dawn, but for the Epistle to the Hebrews, the eschatological event had begun with the arrival of Jesus, calling on all others to follow in his ways.

The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews uses his knowledge of the temple and sacrificial rituals to prove that the priestly duty to offer blood sacrifices was superseded by the blood of Jesus. Therefore, the Temple cult became obsolete. Jesus becomes the priest who ministers in the heavenly Tabernacle, the intercessor between humanity and God. Through his perfection and self-sacrifice, humanity can be redeemed.

The Dead Sea Scrolls remained rooted in Jewish law, believing that the ultimate redemption was soon to dawn. On the eve of the eschatological war, it was the task of all humanity to join the sect in its perfection and in battling all the evildoers who did not observe the sect's interpretation of the law, or else be destroyed in the end of days. When the messianic era dawned, the Temple would be rebuilt and its service would be reinstated according to the ways of the sect.

Hebrews is, therefore, diametrically opposed to the cultic theology of the Qumran sect. Radically differing views of Temple, sacrifice, and priesthood are intimately tied to issues of messianism and eschatology. Despite its ritual theme, Hebrews is Christian; despite its apocalyptic messianism, the Qumran scrolls are Jewish.

LEARNING FROM SECTARIAN RESPONSES:
WINDOWS ON QUMRAN SECTS AND EMERGING
CHRISTIAN SECTS*

Jutta Jokiranta

Helsinki Collegium for Advanced Studies, University of Helsinki

There is a wide acknowledgement of the role of *innovation* in religious traditions. Religions always contain conflicts, small-groups, and novel beliefs that challenge them to reform, renew, and reinvent. Religious movements are rightly called *movements*: they are part of a constant and ongoing movement in religions whereby religions react to and effect cultural changes. To approach the study of Qumran and early Christian groups from this perspective is to study groups that resisted or promoted religious and cultural change, and were part of the “normal” flow that takes place in all traditions—which are in fact necessary for the traditions to stay alive. Scholars have noted a particular rise of sectarian movements in Second Temple Judaism, and while religious movements may, at a certain period, appear more rapidly and be more numerous, the process is continuous.¹

* I wish to thank Petri Luomanen for his valuable comments on this contribution.

¹ Cf. the statement in The Religious Movements Site (retrieved Dec 2007 Online: <http://religiousmovements.lib.virginia.edu/welcome/welcome.htm>): “At some point, every religion was new. There are no exceptions. And every vital religion is more or less constantly experiencing movement from within and pressures from the outside to change and adapt. Thus, movement activity is ubiquitous to all religions, and the concept religious movement is central to scholarly inquiry about religion” [in May 2008, Online: http://www.suite101.com/links.cfm/new_christianity]. Several studies have drawn attention to sectarian tendencies before the actual flourishing of sects, e.g., Shemaryahu Talmon, “The Emergence of Jewish Sectarianism in the Early Second Temple Period,” in *Ancient Israelite Religion: Essays in Honor of Frank Moore Cross* (eds. Patrick D. Miller Jr., Paul D. Hanson, and S. Dean McBride; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987), 587–616; Philip R. Davies, “Sect Formation in Early Judaism,” in *Sectarianism in Early Judaism: Sociological Advances* (ed. David J. Chalcraft; BibleWorld; London: Equinox, 2007), 133–55; Pierluigi Piovanelli, “Was There Sectarian Behaviour before the Flourishing of Jewish Sects? A Long-Term Approach to the History and Sociology of Second Temple Sectarianism,” in *Sectarianism in Early Judaism: Sociological Advances* (ed. David J. Chalcraft; BibleWorld; London: Equinox, 2007), 156–79.

“WILSONIAN” SECTARIANISM

One of the most popular sect typologies utilized in both Qumran and New Testament scholarship has been that of the sociologist Bryan R. Wilson (1926–2004).² Wilson became known for his vast surveys of non-Christian religious sects and various patterns of sectarianism.³ In his early scholarship, Wilson concentrated on modern Christian groups and provided lists of typical sectarian characteristics for them. Many biblical scholars have utilized these lists of attributes. As Lester Grabbe notes, “these various lists of attributes are the sort of thing that non-sociologists tend to latch onto and try to apply to a quite different context.”⁴ However, the attributes are never identical for every group analyzed. In order to find more universal applicability, Wilson distanced himself from the traditional church-sect typology: a sect is not a protest against the church but against the greater society.⁵ Sects

² The Weberian sociology of sects has been much less utilized. However, see Talmon, “The Emergence of Jewish Sectarianism,” and most substantially, David Chalcraft’s contributions in David J. Chalcraft, ed., *Sectarianism in Early Judaism: Sociological Advances*, (London: Equinox, 2007): “The Development of Weber’s Sociology of Sects: Encouraging a New Fascination” (26–51); “Weber’s Treatment of Sects in *Ancient Judaism: The Pharisees and the Essenes*” (52–73); “Towards a Weberian Sociology of the Qumran Sects” (74–105); “A Weber Bibliography” (106–111). Chalcraft makes a strong argument for the potential in Weberian sociology and notes that Weber is not to be equated with Wilson. Weber’s idea of charisma and its routinization have been widely adopted (e.g., John Gager, *Kingdom and Community: The Social World of Early Christianity* [Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1975], and Bengt Holmberg, *Paul and Power: The Structure of Authority in the Primitive Church as Reflected in the Pauline Epistles* [Lund Gleerup, 1978]).

³ Bryan R. Wilson, “An Analysis of Sect Development,” in *Patterns of Sectarianism: Organization and Ideology in Social and Religious Movements* (ed. Bryan R. Wilson; London: Heinemann, 1967), 22–45; *ibid.*, *Religious Sects: A Sociological Study* (London: World University Library, 1970); *ibid.*, *Religion in Sociological Perspective* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1982); *ibid.*, *Magic and the Millennium: A Sociological Study of Religious Movements of Protest among Tribal and Third-World Peoples* (London: Heinemann, 1973); *ibid.*, “Methodological Perspectives in the Study of Religious Minorities,” *BJRL (Bulletin of the John Rylands Library Manchester)* 70 (1988): 225–40; *ibid.*, *The Social Dimension of Sectarianism: Sects and New Religious Movements in Contemporary Society* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990). See also Donald E. Miller, “Sectarianism and Secularization: The Work of Bryan Wilson,” *Religious Studies Review* 5, no. 3 (1979): 161–74.

⁴ Lester L. Grabbe, “When Is a Sect a Sect—or Not? Groups and Movements in the Second Temple Period,” in *Sectarianism in Early Judaism: Sociological Advances* (ed. David J. Chalcraft; BibleWorld; London: Equinox, 2007), 124–25.

⁵ Wilson, *Religious Sects*, 22–35. However, the list of sectarian characteristics follows along in Wilson’s work. Chalcraft, “Sectarianism in Early Judaism: Sociological Advances? Some Critical Sociological Reflections,” in *Sectarianism in Early Judaism: Sociological Advances* (ed. David J. Chalcraft; BibleWorld; London: Equinox, 2007), 8,

stand in *tension* with their socio-cultural environment but they are not necessarily similar in other areas, like their doctrine, their organization, their origins, and so on.⁶

This definition makes the Qumran movement and the early Christian groups seem very similar especially when compared to the Pharisees or Sadducees who, for example, seem to have been closer or identical to the circles that held power, at least occasionally, and participated in defining the norms in Second Temple Judaism. The Qumran and early Christian groups were groups in tension with their society.⁷ This paper investigates one aspect of Wilson's work more closely, namely, the responses to evil.

Wilson's sectarian responses

To facilitate comparative study across non-Christian movements, Wilson designed seven different "responses to evil in the world" in sects.⁸

notes that when one works in the "Wilsonian mode," a set of sectarian features are implied in the concept of "sect."

⁶ E.g., Wilson, *The Social Dimension of Sectarianism*, 46–47: "Whereas once 'sect' was seen as explicitly an opposition to 'church', today, in a secularized society where the major denominations have grown closer together, the sect is seen more sharply as a challenge to society at large. The challenge is not to conventional religious beliefs so much as to general, secularized social mores." In biblical scholarship, any repetition of lists of sect characteristics taken for granted rather than as a point of inquiry is useless. Confusion in biblical scholarship has also been produced by working, on the one hand, with the church-sect distinction and presuming that a sect is a sect in comparison to the religious parent body, and adopting, on the other hand, tension toward the wider environment and allowing for plurality in the Judaism of this period. Some scholars appropriate the term "sect" for a group which had separated from the Jewish establishment, assuming development from reform movement/faction to sect, whereas others use the term "sect" for one faction among other Jewish factions/parties. To make these models distinct requires clarity.

⁷ It has been remarked that Judaism itself was in tension with the world and, in a way, sectarian: Davies, "Sect Formation," 134, 142, following Weber's notion of a "pariah" religion. This can be true at a certain level of abstraction but is not a valid point in every circumstance. The pariah concept has also been applied to the Qumran movement: according to Talmon, "The Emergence of Jewish Sectarianism," 607, "the Qumran Commune displays all or most of the qualities by which Weber sought to define the pariah character of the postexilic Jewish confessional community—foremost ritualistic segregation, enmity towards nonmembers and in-group morality, sectarian economic structure and lack of political autonomy."

⁸ Originally, Wilson formulated four sub-types of sects (four "types of mission") in contemporary Christianity (Wilson, "An Analysis," 22–45); later on, he expanded this to seven (Wilson, *Religious Sects*); and to non-Christian contexts ("responses to evil;" Wilson, *Magic and the Millennium*; Wilson, *Religion in Sociological Perspective*). The responses were independent of the list of attributes for Christian sects, as Wilson explains: "It was possible to distinguish among a wide variety of movements with

Evil is anything perceived to be bad or wrong in the world. Various responses are thus various kinds of religious answers to the perceived evil.⁹ “Introversionists” seek a purified community; “conversionists” seek a transformed self; “manipulationists” seek a transformed perception of evil; “thaumaturgists” seek specific dispensations and miracles; “reformists” seek to reform or change the world; “revolutionists” seek a world transformed (by God); and “utopians” seek a reconstruction of the world (by men).¹⁰ The discourses in these responses are of three kinds:¹¹

The “objectivists” say:

God will overturn it (revolutionists);
 God calls us to abandon it (introversionists);
 God calls us to amend it (reformists);
 God calls us to reconstruct it (utopians).

The “subjectivists” say:

God will change us (conversionists).

The “relationists” say:

God calls us to change perception / to manipulate the world with extraordinary means¹² (manipulationists);
 God will grant particular dispensations and work specific miracles (thaumaturgists).

It is important to note that the responses are ideal types, according to Wilson—they are not found in pure forms and yet, for Wilson, these types included sufficient analytical power to distinguish between various “new religious movements,” both Christian and non-Christian. Wilson’s typology sought to *explain* the conditions in which these types are most likely to arise, how they develop, and what influences they have.

respect to their own conception of evil and the way in which evil was to be surmounted, without postulating all the various specific characteristics that are true for Christian sects” (Wilson, *Religion in Sociological Perspective*, 103). He discusses, in particular, exclusivity and conscious maintenance of a separate organization, which are not always characteristic of non-western sects (101–3; for thaumaturgical sects: Wilson, *Magic and the Millennium*, 72). Furthermore, also in a Christian context, Wilson allows that conversionist sects, for example, are not exclusive but may admit that salvation is found in other groups besides themselves (Wilson, *Religious Sects*, 42). These qualifications should also be made concerning some other attributes, such as being egalitarian: egalitarianism or a strong sense of fellowship is characteristic of conversionist sects but not necessarily of introversionist sects, for example. In later studies, Wilson tends to work without any sub-types (Wilson, *The Social Dimension of Sectarianism*, esp. 47).

⁹ In addition to the seven sectarian responses, the eighth, the dominant response in society, is acceptance of the world (Wilson, *Magic and the Millennium*, 21).

¹⁰ Wilson, *Magic and the Millennium*, 21–27.

¹¹ Wilson, *Magic and the Millennium*, 27.

¹² Wilson, *Religious Sects*, 39.

Table 1: Selection of scholars who have labeled ancient movements according to Bryan Wilson’s “responses.”

	Qumran movement/ Essenes	Jesus movement	Early Christian groups
introversionist	Grabbe, Regev, Saldarini, Baumgarten, Piovanelli, Esler		Esler (Johannine community)
revolutionist	Grabbe?, Regev, Saldarini, Piovanelli	Grabbe? (messianic groups), Piovanelli	Robbins (discourse in Mark)
reformist		Saldarini	
utopian		Piovanelli?	
conversionist	Piovanelli	Piovanelli?	Saldarini, Piovanelli, Elliott (1 Peter), Esler (Luke-Acts), MacDonald (Pauline and Deutero-Pauline congregations)
manipulationist	Piovanelli		Robbins (discourse in Mark)
thaumaturgical	Grabbe, Piovanelli	Grabbe, Piovanelli	Grabbe, Saldarini, Robbins (discourse in Mark)

Labeling ancient movements according to responses

Previously, Pieter Craffert has collected applications of Wilson in NT studies, and his study, although critical towards Wilson’s usefulness, is a useful source of information, including the identification of the various purposes behind scholars’ adoption of Wilson’s typology.¹³ The following table does not include all of the scholars Craffert included but does include some—again not all—of the more recent.

Concerning Qumran sects and texts, scholars have identified more than one response in them. All agree that the Qumran movement displays the introversionist response. Some would add reformist, some

¹³ Pieter F. Craffert, “An Exercise in the Critical Use of Models: The ‘Goodness of Fit’ of Wilson’s Sect Model,” in *Social Scientific Models for Interpreting the Bible: Essays by the Context Group in Honor of Bruce J. Malina* (ed. John J. Pilch; Leiden: Brill, 2001), 21–46. Craffert’s article is also useful for its critical view of the confusion between the traditional church-sect model, the attributes of “sect,” and Wilson’s responses. Craffert points out some inconsistencies in Wilson’s approach. I do not, however, accept Craffert’s call for abandoning all of Wilson’s work because of the critical questions he raises (see below).

degree of revolutionist, and perhaps conversionist and manipulationist. The thaumaturgical response has been dropped by some scholars as being indistinguishable among groups in antiquity. The utopian response is left without many adherents.

Lester Grabbe sees in the Qumran sect the introversionist response, perhaps also revolutionist, if he identifies Qumran as an apocalyptic or messianic group. He also sees the thaumaturgical response, i.e., humans must call on divine or magical powers, in “most or all of the Second temple period groups.”¹⁴

Eyal Regev identifies in the Qumran documents the introversionist response, marked by segregation, and the revolutionist response, marked by messianism.¹⁵ Regev also notes that “Wilson’s definition of the introversionist response is overly broad and does not adequately define factors that distinguish between an introversionist sect and standard sectarian separatism,” and he further suggests that introversionism is identified by the degree of boundaries of separation, and by the role of these boundaries in the sect’s ideology.¹⁶

Anthony Saldarini distinguishes between the Qumran group and the Essenes who lived in towns. Concerning the Qumran group, he sees in it the introversionist and revolutionary responses. The “Essene groups that lived in towns may have been more reformist and instrumental in their orientation.” The reformist response can be identified in the Jesus movement (along with the Pharisees and the Sadducees) whereas the conversionist and thaumaturgical responses can be identified in early Christian groups.¹⁷ By definition, a reformist type of sect is considered more interactive with outsiders than an introversionist one, or, as Albert Baumgarten expresses it, “...in terms of walls a group erects around itself, those of an introversionist sect are higher, wider, and less perme-

¹⁴ Grabbe, “When Is a Sect a Sect,” 128.

¹⁵ Eyal Regev, *Sectarianism in Qumran: A Cross-Cultural Perspective* (RelSoc 45; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2007), 43.

¹⁶ Regev, *Sectarianism in Qumran*, 49.

¹⁷ Anthony J. Saldarini, “Sectarianism,” *EDSS* 2: 853–57. Concerning the Qumran sect, Saldarini stated: “...its response to society is marked by withdrawal and apocalyptic expectation of divine intervention and thus may be typed as an introversionist, revolutionary (to a limited extent) sect with an alienative, expressive response to society.” See also Anthony J. Saldarini, *Pharisees, Scribes and Sadducees in Palestinian Society: A Sociological Approach* (Wilmington, DE: Glazier, 1988), 71–73, 286–87; Anthony J. Saldarini, *Matthew’s Christian-Jewish Community* (CSJH; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994), 114.

able, while those of a reformist group are the opposite.”¹⁸ Baumgarten identifies the reformist response in the case of the Sadducees and Pharisees, and the introversionist response in the Qumranites.

The responses have been applied to discourses in texts. Cecilia Wassen and I saw a potential in the *Rule of the Community* for many kinds of responses to evil: to abandon the world and to cultivate their own holiness (introversionist), to overturn the world (revolutionist), to “convert” individuals (conversionist), to view one’s life in a new positive light (manipulationist),¹⁹ and even to reform and reconstruct it (reformist, utopian).²⁰ Vernon Robbins interprets every response as a type of social rhetoric. In his view, the Gospel of Mark contains thaumaturgical and revolutionist discourse, and a “significant amount of gnostic-manipulationist discourse.”²¹

Pierluigi Piovanelli sees not only the introversionist but also revolutionist, conversionist, manipulationist, thaumaturgical and “spiritualist” responses in the Qumran movement. In the Jesus movement, Piovanelli identifies the revolutionist/utopian and conversionist and thaumaturgical responses, although notes that missionary activity—and thus conversionist response—was not the primary concern of the Jesus movement, unlike later among the Hellenist and Pauline circles.²² The revolutionist and probably utopian responses are, according to him, to be seen in the “millennialist” groups such as that of John the Baptist and Jesus of Nazareth, as well as the Hasidim and the Zealots. These latter two were directly involved in armed struggle, but it is to be noted that, according to Wilson, the revolutionist response is not the same

¹⁸ Albert I. Baumgarten, *The Flourishing of Jewish Sects in the Maccabean Era: An Interpretation* (JSJSup 55; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 13.

¹⁹ A “manipulationist” aspect can be seen in the Discourse of the Two Spirits, which powerfully transforms the members’ perception of the world; evil is ultimately outside and will eventually be annihilated.

²⁰ Cecilia Wassen and Jutta Jokiranta, “Groups in Tension: Sectarianism in the Damascus Document and the *Rule of the Community*,” in *Sectarianism in Early Judaism: Sociological Advances* (ed. David J. Chalcraft; London: Equinox, 2007), 208–09.

²¹ Vernon K. Robbins, *Exploring the Texture of Texts: A Guide to Socio-Rhetorical Interpretation* (Valley Forge, Pennsylvania: Trinity Press International, 1996), 72–75. In addition, Mark contains elements that could evoke a utopian, a reformist, an introversionist, or a conversionist response. Furthermore, Robbins suggest that John 9 contains thaumaturgical and gnostic-manipulationist “topics” (92).

²² Piovanelli, “Was There Sectarian Behaviour,” 171, n. 20, notes that the missionary response could in theory “be attributed to the historical Mary of Magdala.”

as revolutionary: in other words, sectarians do not usually initiate the transformation of the world themselves.²³

The conversionist response is seen to characterize many of the early Christian groups. According to John Elliott, the letter of 1 Peter was written to evoke the conversionist response: the addressees share the view that the world is corrupt because humanity is corrupt—if humans can change, then the world can be changed. The members of these congregations remain distinct in their identity towards outsiders, yet attractive to them.²⁴ Philip Esler sees the conversionist response as dominant behind Luke-Acts, and the introversionist response behind the Johannine community as well as behind the Qumran *Rule of the Community*.²⁵ Margaret MacDonald identifies the conversionist response both in Pauline and Deutero-Pauline congregations.²⁶

What to do with the mixture?

Together with Cecilia Wassen, I have previously employed the sect model by Rodney Stark and William Sims Bainbridge for analyzing sectarianism in the Qumran rule documents. We have been critical towards Wilson's "responses" since these did not provide sufficient analytical tools for *comparing* sectarian tension between texts and did not pay attention to the "counterpart" of the sect, the socio-religious

²³ Wilson, *Religious Sects*, 38. Piovaneli, "Was There Sectarian Behaviour," 162, also distinguishes between primary and secondary sectarian phenomena: formation of a sect can be a conscious and deliberate act, expressing the belief that "we are different and better than they are"—this characterizes the Matthean and Johannine communities—whereas it can also be a consequence of discrimination and outside pressure, reflecting the outsider belief that, "they are different and worse than we are"—this characterizes the Lukan and Valentinian communities. Piovaneli does not explain where these would be placed in Wilson's typology.

²⁴ John H. Elliott, *A Home for the Homeless: A Sociological Exegesis of 1 Peter, Its Situation and Strategy* (London: SCM Press, 1981), 75–78.

²⁵ Philip F. Esler, *Community and Gospel in Luke-Acts: The Social and Political Motivations of Lucan Theology* (SNTSMS 57; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987); Philip F. Esler, *The First Christians in Their Social Worlds: Social-Scientific Approaches to New Testament Interpretation* (London: Routledge, 1994). Esler identified the community behind the *Damascus Document* as a reform movement and the community of the *Rule of the Community* as an introversionist sect. However, this distinction seems to work with the "parent movement-sect" distinction rather than the "(sectarian) reformist response-(sectarian) introversionist response" distinction.

²⁶ Margaret Y. MacDonald, *The Pauline Churches: A Socio-historical Study of Institutionalization in the Pauline and Deutero-Pauline Writings* (SNTSMS 60; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988).

environment.²⁷ Each sect model is designed for specific purposes and thus sheds light on slightly different issues. *This paper seeks to find the positive heuristic value of Wilson's work, without neglecting its possible restrictions.* There are two reasons for this. In words of Bryan Wilson himself,

it is a futile occupation to spend time on deciding whether a particular movement should be called a "sect" or not. Ideal types are not empty boxes into which the sociologist drops appropriate cases; they are, rather, to be used to make us aware of the specific historical, organizational, compositional, or other features of a sect that depart from our hypothetical system of logical relationships. *The type should always turn us back to historical or empirical data so that we can explain those features of a case that contradict our hypothesized common-case assumptions.*²⁸

Applications of Wilson's typology have drawn the critical attention of biblical scholars.²⁹ Most notably, Pieter Craffert attacks the whole

²⁷ Wassen and Jokiranta, "Groups in Tension," 205–45. Wilson seems to define the counterpart of sect ("the world") ambiguously. There is also some ambiguity in the level of analysis—the responses may refer either to an individual or a group—and it remains up to the investigator where he/she finds the responses (in ideology, activities, teaching, goals). The differences between the *Damascus Document* and the *Rule of the Community* are, in our view, are not really different types of sects. In order to compare the tension reflected in and promoted by these texts, three elements, antagonism, difference, and separation, were identified as the components of tension, following Rodney Stark and William Sims Bainbridge, *The Future of Religion: Secularization, Revival and Cult Formation* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985). For a critique of Wilson's work by sociologists, see the overview by Bengt Holmberg, *Sociology and the New Testament: An Appraisal* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990), 110–14. Most of these critiques are prior to the developed forms of Wilson's typology of sects and deal with Wilson's modifications of the traditional church-sect model, not the responses as such.

²⁸ Wilson, *Religion in Sociological Perspective*, 105. Italics mine.

²⁹ E.g., Holmberg, *Sociology and the New Testament*, 77–117, presents a useful review of biblical studies that employ different sect models. Wilson's sociology of sects is considered both helpful and imperfect, and sometimes also badly applied. Petri Luomanen, "The 'Sociology of Sectarianism' in Matthew: Modeling the Genesis of Early Jewish and Christian Communities," in *Fair Play: Diversity and Conflicts in Early Christianity. Essays in Honour of Heikki Räisänen* (eds. Ismo Dunderberg, Christopher Tuckett, and Kari Syreeni; Leiden: Brill, 2002), 107–30, finds applications of Wilson's typology ambiguous in their definitions of the "world" and considers Stark and Bainbridge's definition of sect more fitting, since it presents sects in relation to religion, rather than to society-at-large. Philip A. Harland, *Associations, Synagogues, and Congregations: Claiming a Place in Ancient Mediterranean Society* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2003), 189–212, sees problems in applications of sectarian models, especially concerning the relationship of the minority group to the society: an overly coherent view of both the minority groups and the society is presumed, and the model can dictate which evidence is taken into account in the first place.

idea of using the sociology of sectarianism as ethnocentric and anachronistic.³⁰ He argues that the principle of “goodness of fit” has been forgotten. New Testament scholarship seems to have taken up these responses and labeled their observations with them, but neglected the cultural conditions involved in the model. For example, an individualized culture is, according to Wilson, a prerequisite to “conversionist” and “manipulationist” responses, but such individualism hardly existed in ancient societies. Moreover, Craffert raises the question of how the responses would look if the society’s dominant way of dealing with evil is itself one of the seven responses, e.g., “thaumaturgical” or “revolutionist.” This is a relevant question in an ancient setting where belief, for example, in magical powers is the norm, and therefore a certain amount of “thaumaturgical” response is present in all strands of society. However, the responses are not just about attitudes and beliefs but social manifestations of those beliefs. Wilson himself clearly explains that the thaumaturgical response is more common in non-developed societies where beliefs in spirits is a norm, and when the society develops a certain degree of complexity, new thaumaturgical *movements* can occur.³¹ The heuristic value of sect typologies is still great. However, scholars should not be too fond of any typology,³² and especially in applications to a context quite far removed from the original context of the case study.³³ There is a need to turn back to the data and explain why the cases fit or do not fit the types.

³⁰ Craffert, “Critical Use of Models,” 21–46. See also Pieter F. Craffert, “More on Models and Muddles in the Social Scientific Interpretation of the New Testament: The Sociological Fallacy Reconsidered,” *Neotestamentica* 26, no. 1 (1992): 217–39.

³¹ Wilson, *Magic and the Millennium*, 54.

³² Wilson, *Religion in Sociological Perspective*, 111, also acknowledges that the seven types might not be the only possible ones, and notes: “It is important not to become too much attached even to an ideal-type formulation that has done good service in the past.”

³³ My point of departure is the distinction between *emic* and *etic* concepts. *Emic* concepts are those found in the insider descriptions where as *etic* concepts are the outsider perspective. I regard “sect” and “sectarianism” as *etic* concepts, which, at least at the outset, have very little to do with the *emic* descriptions of ancient Jewish groups, e.g., either in the Qumran sources, Josephus, Philo, or the NT. In the NT, *haireisis* is used of Pharisees, Sadducees and Nazarenes (Christians), indicating that these were considered as distinct schools, groups, or teachings in Judaism (e.g., Acts 5:17; 15:5; 24:5). The term is also used for schisms and heresies among Christians (1 Cor 11:19; Gal 5:20; 2 Pet 2:1). Josephus thinks highly of the Jewish *haireseis* and regards them as representative of Jewish thought and practice. Cf. Grabbe, “When Is a Sect a Sect,” 126–27.

A second impetus for this paper comes from contributions to the recent book edited by David Chalcraft, *Sectarianism in Early Judaism: Sociological Advances*, many of which refer to Wilson's responses. Several responses are characteristically identified in a single movement, as seen above.³⁴ Chalcraft does not find this state of affairs quite satisfactory and notes in his introduction that,

further sociological advances, based on Wilson's work, depend upon a close examination of the ideal types and the logic of a complex of attributes, and the degrees of importance to be granted to certain features within the array of attributes, before deciding under which ideal-typical heading the particular sectarian movement, (and to boot, at which stage of its development) is best placed to aid classification.³⁵

This suggests that turning to Wilson's types and his data is necessary if these types should prove useful in an ancient context. The *mixture*, not only among scholars, but within the many responses to the texts studied, must not hinder us from using the typology *if* it leads us to study the movements more closely.³⁶ According to Chalcraft, the mixture calls for some critical questions, especially at the level of the analysis: since Wilson's types are responses to evil, they can be understood largely in soteriological (and thus theological or ideological) terms, and few scholars have analyzed the sociological factors *per se*.³⁷ Identifying certain responses in a *document* does not, however, mean that all of these responses had sociological relevance in the movement.³⁸ I cannot go into an in-depth-analysis of Wilson's scholarship here, but I hope

³⁴ Grabbe, "When Is a Sect a Sect," 126–28; Piovanelli, "Was There Sectarian Behaviour," 158–62; Eyal Regev, "Atonement and Sectarianism in Qumran: Defining a Sectarian Worldview in Moral and Halakhic Systems," in *Sectarianism in Early Judaism: Sociological Advances* (BibleWorld; London: Equinox, 2007), 181–83; Wassen and Jokiranta, "Groups in Tension," 208–09.

³⁵ Chalcraft, "Some Critical Sociological Reflections," 6–7.

³⁶ Chalcraft, "Some Critical Sociological Reflections," 7, thinks that if the ancient Jewish movements elude Wilson's types, the "development of new ideal types is likely to be helpful." See also p. 11.

³⁷ Chalcraft, "Some Critical Sociological Reflections," 12. Occasionally, Wilson also presents the responses in ideological terms: "The sectarian defines his need for salvation, as salvation from evil apparent in the world. How that salvation will be vouchsafed, and how and when it operates, are significant differences *in beliefs* among sects" (Wilson, *Religious Sects*, 37), italics mine.

³⁸ Cf. criticism by Craffert, "Critical Use of Models," 43–33, and also his critique in understanding differences in patterns of religion as sociological differences: Pieter F. Craffert, "The Pauline Movement and First-Century Judaism: A Framework for Transforming the Issues," *Neot* 27 (1993): 233–62.

to present some observations on the responses and their heuristic value: the reformist, conversionist, introversionist, and revolutionist responses in particular.

REFORMIST ORIENTATIONS IN THE QUMRAN AND JESUS MOVEMENTS?

A reform of some kind is an inherent part of groups in protest. Even if the reform is articulated primarily in religious terms, this should not keep us from appreciating the related (or even religiously legitimized) political and social interests. But can such reformist orientations indicate a reformist response in Wilson's sense?

According to Wilson, the reformist response is a rare and a special type of response in which rational procedures are justified by religious inspiration. The world can be emended. Changes to be made are revealed to people who are open to supernatural influence. All in all, Wilson is not particularly interested in this response. His one example is developed forms of Quakerism which mutated from a revolutionist response to introversionist and then to social reform—it is thus a secondary or tertiary response.³⁹ Such a sect is in less tension with the world, and it does not concentrate on recruiting people: the sect “hopes to influence the world more by leavening the lump than by winning members for itself.” Wilson notes that introversionist and revolutionist sects too can include social concerns towards outsiders but that it is not their primary interest. Furthermore, it is unlikely, according to Wilson, for a sect to be born with the reformist response since “social reform is itself essentially secular.”⁴⁰ Wilson sees social reform as basically humanitarian work; whether it could also be a “political” program meant to overturn the power structures is not quite clear.

Wilson's understanding of the reformist response as secondary and basically secular should not be overlooked. The response is not equal to what biblical scholars might describe as a reform movement or pre-sectarianism. The *secular* understanding of the reform consider-

³⁹ For example, the sect could justify its acquired wealth by charity work.

⁴⁰ Wilson, *Religious Sects*, 40, 46, 177–81; Wilson, *Magic and the Millennium*, 25, 37–38.

ably complicates the application in an ancient context.⁴¹ Even the very socio-political interpretations of the early Jesus movement acknowledge the deeply religious nature of its outlook.⁴² Gerd Theissen identifies a conversionist element in it: it demanded repentance of sins whereas many other prophetic movements proclaimed only liberation from gentile rule.⁴³ Moreover, the movement adopted an eschatological framework, marked by divine miracles, and looked towards a decisive cosmic end, and in this regard, its response is perhaps better aligned with the revolutionist or thaumaturgical response (see below).⁴⁴

⁴¹ Of course, “secular” is not a helpful notion if it leads to juxtaposing “religious” and “political/social” in the ancient context since these were very much intertwined. Wilson’s reformist response presumes that a sect interferes with the tasks of secular institutions. However, the non-existence in antiquity of “secular” institutions in the modern sense would then compel a revision of the concrete manifestations of Wilson’s reformist response to something like “an attempt to improve the conditions of as many lives as possible.”

⁴² E.g., Gerd Theissen, *Social Reality and the Early Christians: Theology, Ethics, and the World of the New Testament* (trans. Margaret Kohl; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1992); Gerd Theissen, “The Political Dimensions of Jesus’ Activities,” in *The Social Setting of Jesus and the Gospels* (eds. Wolfgang Stegemann, Bruce J. Malina, and Gerd Theissen; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2002), 225–50; Richard A. Horsley, *Sociology and the Jesus Movement* (New York: Continuum, 1994). The interpretations of the early Jesus movement are bound to the interpretations of Jesus’ self-understanding: if he expected to bring about a new kingdom, under which conditions would this take place and what would this kingdom be like? This again depends on which sayings of the gospels are seen as authentic and how other NT materials testify to the Jesus movement, and no definite results are possible. According to Theissen, Jesus’ sayings tradition is characterized by an “ethical radicalism:” homelessness, giving up family ties, and renunciation of wealth—but the extent to which this marked the social reality is another question. Horsley is critical towards functionalism in Theissen’s theory. According to Horsley, “the Jesus movement involved not abandonment or lack but intense commitment to the renewal of traditional values” (153), and the evidence is not sufficient to show that the Jesus movement was completely or mainly composed of “wandering charismatics” (45–46).

⁴³ Theissen, *Social Reality and the Early Christians*, 86. However, it would be wrong to call the earliest Jesus movement a conversionist movement in Wilson’s terms: salvation was not realized mainly by an inner renewal of humanity but, according to Theissen’s reconstruction, by following a symbolic socio-religious program. The kingdom of God was not to be brought about by force—God would establish his kingdom but humans could participate in it by realizing ideals of righteous governance. This ideal rulership contained, according to Theissen, “The Political Dimensions,” 239–43, loving one’s enemy, ruling by serving others and humility. According to Horsley, *Sociology and the Jesus Movement*, 122–25, 54, freedom, justice, social spontaneity, creativity, and reciprocal generosity marked the Jesus movement and its new social order. See also E.P. Sanders, *Jesus and Judaism* (London: SCM Press, 1985), 319.

⁴⁴ In contrast, Horsley’s presentation of the Jesus movement is sometimes more like one of a reformist response, releasing the “energy” of poor peasants “for more creative use.” This reformist response did not attack political structures but was very grassroots

The reform desired by the Qumran movement was very much religious in nature. Incorrect practices abounded in the Temple, a false calendar was followed, purity and Sabbath laws were ignored, illegitimate sexual relations were widespread, and the poor were exploited by the Temple establishment. The righteous remnant, the movement itself, provided the divinely authorized “kingdom” where remedies to these flaws were anticipated and fulfilled. The Qumran movement created a subculture of its own, criticizing the government but not devoting itself to an open confrontation.⁴⁵

It is important to keep in mind that Wilson’s responses are not purely ideological.⁴⁶ From a methodological point of view, identifying beliefs does not directly translate into Wilson’s responses—reformist-sounding beliefs can be purely ideological, or a side issue. Many political and social colors, however, were woven into the Qumran movement’s discourse and possibly also into part of its activity.⁴⁷ By creating a welfare system for helping those in need, the movement potentially attracted impoverished people and made a difference, at least in their

activity, based among ordinary people and popular culture (Horsley, *Sociology and the Jesus Movement*, 127).

⁴⁵ This difference was not, however, due to different forms of communities or places of residence as such, as Horsley, *Sociology and the Jesus Movement*, 119, understands: he sees the “Qumranites” far removed in a utopian community whereas “the Jesus movement not only remained in their residential communities, but attempted to revitalize local community life.” However, the Qumran movement was—to a certain extent, or at least during some stages of its history—located in Palestinian towns and villages.

⁴⁶ Wilson, *Magic and the Millennium*, 20, states that the responses are found not only in theology and doctrines but in ideology, activities, lifestyle and association. The response may, according to Wilson, *Magic and the Millennium*, 38, change without change in the doctrine: this can happen as a result of changes in society or changes in internal matters such as the maturing of the second generation, or disappointment in the initial expectations of the sect.

⁴⁷ E.g., the *Rule of the Community* employs the symbolism of twelve tribes, suggestive of some kind of national restoration, but, in addition to this, it includes the symbolism of the three priests (based on Num. 3:17) as an essential part of the government and leadership (1QS VIII, 1). The rule documents show a keen interest in insuring a sufficient number of priestly authorities in the assemblies, protecting the order of speakers, and defining the proper age of the leaders, e.g., 1QS VI, 3–9; CD XIII, 2–7; XIV, 3–11. For the symbolism of the twelve and the three, see Sarianna Metso, “Whom Does the Term Yahad Identify?” in *Biblical Traditions in Transmission: Essays in Honour of Michael A. Knibb* (eds. Charlotte Hempel and Judith M. Lieu; JSJSup 111; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 230–32; Charlotte Hempel, “Emerging Communal Life and Ideology in the S Tradition,” in *Defining Identities: We, You, and the Other in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the Fifth Meeting of the IOQS in Groningen* (eds. F. Garcia Martínez and M. Popović; STDJ 70; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 54.

lives.⁴⁸ Its assemblies could make an impact on local village life by its particular customs and halakhic observance.⁴⁹ The whole concern for the temple in the *Damascus Document* and in 4QMMT can be taken to imply that someone at some stage believed that reform could or would be possible.⁵⁰

The *secondary* nature of Wilson's reformist response, however, can be taken to suggest that a sect in the making needs strong "glue" in order to create the necessary cohesion within it: a "purely" humanitarian cause, argued on religious grounds, is not sufficient for this.⁵¹ Divinely inspired individuals who feel the desire to offer help to those in need first have to form a well-defined social identity in order to be a sect with continuity and persistence. But once the sect is established and has a stable organization, its response can change towards this more "secular" direction. Such "secular" responses do not, however, seem to be the direction taken by the Qumran movement and the early Christian groups.

But how do Wilson's responses relate to the many, well-argued suggestions that in the Qumran movement and early Christian communities the sects' desire to reform the world slowly fades away or evolves into a milder form as the need to keep watch on its own members grows? In the beginning, when the group first distinguishes itself, the group

⁴⁸ CD XIV, 12–16; 1QS V, 3. See Catherine M. Murphy, *Wealth in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Qumran Community* (ed. F. García Martínez; STDJ 40; Leiden: Brill, 2002). Baumgarten, *Flourishing of Jewish Sects*, 64–65, suggests people joined during the times of crisis, such as famines.

⁴⁹ The idea that the community would bring atonement for the *land* (1QS VIII, 5–10) expresses one expectation among the members that the community will have wider importance than its immediate members: 1QS VIII, 5–10. Note, however 1QS V, 6–7, where atonement is only for those who join the *yahad*. Cf. Hempel, "Emerging Communal Life," 55–57.

⁵⁰ Besides the Temple, John C. Collins, "The Construction of Israel in the Sectarial Rule Books," in *Judaism in Late Antiquity, Part 5: The Judaisms of Qumran: A Systemic reading of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, (eds. Alan J. Avery-Peck, Jacob Neusner, and Bruce Chilton; vol. 1 of *Theory of Israel*; Leiden: Brill, 2001), 41, sees that national restoration was expected. Collins also calls this movement a reformist movement (but not referring to Wilson) and states: "The goal is to reform Israel in accordance with a strict interpretation of the Torah, especially in matters of purity and holiness, but not to replace it."

⁵¹ Cf. George J. Brooke, "Justifying Deviance: The Place of Scripture in Converting to the Qumran Self-Understanding," in *Reading the Present: Scriptural Interpretation and the Contemporary in the Texts of the Judean Desert* (eds. Kristin De Troyer and Armin Lange; Atlanta: SBL, 2005), 78, and the suggestion based on John Lofland and Rodney Stark's theory of conversion that converts must believe that the "tensions in their lives are neither psychiatric, nor political or socio-political, but rather religious."

addresses its protest more to the outside society. Later on, it focuses its protest on the insiders: outsiders are not blamed for their deeds but for not joining the group, and insiders are monitored lest they challenge group identity or simply leave. According to Catherine Murphy's study on wealth in the Qumran texts, the social criticism was stronger at first, before the community itself became the locus of salvation.⁵² At a later stage, members occupied themselves with matters concerning the wayward and the expelled. Philip Davies interprets the polemic in the *Damascus Document* to be against Jews in general whereas, in the *Rule of the Community*, it was more ambiguously against the "world."⁵³ Elliott sees that the protest of "factions" against perceived economic and societal repression slowly turns to concerns for the insiders and "unbelievers" in the "sect."⁵⁴ Michael White sees Pauline movements (as cults) as milder in their tension towards gentiles and stricter towards inside defectors.⁵⁵ Therefore, if this tendency is true of a variety of movements forming and establishing their boundaries, we may perhaps appreciate the seemingly more moderate reformist orientation in later texts partly as a change in the discourse after the group has grown or when its setting has changed: protest about issues has become protest about people. This need not mean change in its overall response to evil. For example, an established introversionist sect that sees its membership as an essential response to the perceived evil, no longer has to justify its existence to outsiders (by drawing attention to the incurable evils in the world) but rather to insiders (by underlining who qualifies as a member). A similar process seems to happen in many kinds of sects. Wilson's responses do not distinguish groups on the basis of *what* the perceived evil is. Whether the evil is found in religious institutions or rather in political and social structures is not of primary importance;

⁵² Murphy, *Wealth*, 162, comparing D and S.

⁵³ Philip R. Davies, "The Judaism(s) of the Damascus Document," in *The Damascus Document: A Centennial of Discovery. Proceedings of the Third International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 4–8 February, 1998* (eds. Joseph M. Baumgarten, Esther G. Chazon, and Avital Pinnick; STDJ 34; Leiden: Brill, 2000).

⁵⁴ John H. Elliott, "The Jewish Messianic Movement: From Fraction to Sect," in *Modelling Early Christianity: Social-Scientific Studies of the New Testament In Its Context* (ed. Philip F. Esler; London: Routledge, 1995), 81. Similarly, L. Michael White, "Shifting Sectarian Boundaries in Early Christianity," *Bulletin of John Rylands Library* 70 (1988).

⁵⁵ White, "Shifting Sectarian Boundaries," 7–24. Holmberg, *Sociology and the New Testament*, 104, sees that the more the Christian groups separated from the Jewish context, the more they opened to the world outside Judaism.

it is the nature of the response that matters. Therefore, the reduction of concerns for the outer world must be interpreted in light of the main response of each sectarian case.

Finally, reformist ideas may also be at home in another response, namely, the utopian. It is striking that the utopian response—humans rebuilding the world themselves—is not suggested by either Qumran or NT scholars.⁵⁶ According to Wilson, the utopian response is neither withdrawal from the world nor a desire to overturn it but to return to the basic principles by which the creator intended people to live. The choice of ends is defined by acquaintance with the supernatural.⁵⁷ This response seeks to “rediscover the model for the way of life for all men,” and thus the community is not a defense mechanism for preserving its own piety.⁵⁸ The community is not so much a *location* for salvation but an *agency* for salvation, a vehicle facilitating the response. According to Wilson, the response always involves colony building and, usually, communal economy. In comparison, introversionist sects have also been colony builders but for other reasons: they wanted to get away from the world. The utopian response has been a way to come to terms especially with an alien society, such as the case of migrants.⁵⁹

It seems to me that colony building could be a way for a sect to establish itself, to leave something behind. If Khirbet Qumran served as the Qumran movement’s buildings (for whatever purposes: annual assemblies? study center? manufacturing? residence of inner group?

⁵⁶ However, Regev, *Sectarianism in Qumran*, 44, makes statements in this direction while describing introversionist sectarianism: “The retreat from the world to an inner social realm is not the ultimate aim of the introversionist sect, but rather a preliminary stage of development where members attempt to live in accord with the divine will, while waiting to *fulfil their truly utopian life in the world to come*,” and: “In order to establish a *utopian* or moral community, it is necessary to achieve absolute social integration, limit social relations with outsiders, and establish a nearly self-sufficient economic unit.” Similarly, Horsley, *Sociology and the Jesus Movement*, 119: “The Qumranites had left their hometown or city in order to join a ‘*utopian*’ community of other priests and intellectuals” (yet the term “utopian” is not used in Wilson’s sense; italics mine).

⁵⁷ Wilson, *Religious Sects*, 40. The response has been expressed by a great variety of groups. Some have been more deviant in their values, some less. The Oneida Community in the nineteenth century United States considered itself a continuation of primitive Christianity: the community was sinless and opposed selfishness in the world. This manifested itself in common ownership of property—understood to extend to wife and children: the community practiced sexual communism, controlled by the community (182–84). The Qumran movement had different ideas about common property, but it too saw itself as a “colony” of some kind: it was a continuation of the wilderness community of the past.

⁵⁸ Wilson, *Religious Sects*, 47.

⁵⁹ Wilson, *Religious Sects*, 181–84.

teaching of converts?), the existence of such buildings was in itself a mark and a statement. The theology of withdrawal into the wilderness should not be mistakenly reduced to isolation as an objective; it could mean preparation for something, a means to acquire revelation. The view of the Qumran movement displaying an introversionist response could be complemented by the investigation into what extent it thought it could make a difference in the wider society. A colony or a building, perhaps investment in some communal property, would not go unnoticed by at least some in the outside. The Essenes (possibly a later development of the Qumran movement) certainly did make a difference, at least through the idealized presentation by Josephus.

CONVERSIONIST CHRISTIANITY AND INTROVERSIONIST QUMRAN?

Based on Wilson's typology, we might detect a basic difference between the Qumran movement and the early Christian movements, expressed by many in the distinction between the introversionist and the conversionist response:⁶⁰ the Qumran movement found the pure community as the guarantee of salvation, whereas the Jesus-believers looked upon the Christ-event and their personal encounter with it as the way of overcoming evil.

⁶⁰ Others might use the distinction between "sect" and "cult" for a similar purpose. According to Rodney Stark and William Sims Bainbridge, *A Theory of Religion* (Toronto Studies in Religion; New York: Peter Lang, 1987), a cult is a religious movement with novel beliefs in its environment. For Rodney Stark who has made use of the sociological theorizing in biblical studies, the followers of Jesus formed a sect movement within Judaism, but when the belief in Jesus' resurrection arose, these groups turned into cult movements; Rodney Stark, "The Class Basis of Early Christianity: Inferences from a Sociological Model," *Sociological Analysis* 47, (1986): 216–25; Rodney Stark, *The Rise of Christianity: How the Obscure, Marginal Jesus Movement Became the Dominant Religious Force in the Western World in a Few Centuries* (San Francisco, CA: HarperSanFrancisco, 1997), 33–45. Meeks did not use the term "cult" but he argued that Pauline groups were never a splinter from Judaism. Rather they "organized their lives independently from the Jewish associations of the cities where they were founded, and apparently, so far as the evidence reveals, they had little or no interaction with the Jews;" Wayne A. Meeks, "Breaking Away: Three New Testament Pictures of Christianity's Separation from the Jewish Communities," in *"To See Ourselves as Others See Us": Christians, Jews, "Others" in Late Antiquity* (eds. Jacob Neusner and Ernest S. Frerichs; Studies in the Humanities; Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1985). On the other hand, others have argued that Jewish synagogues were also house-based communities in Greco-Roman cities and thus Pauline communities and synagogues competed largely for the same religious market; Craffert, "The Pauline Movement," 243.

According to Wilson, the conditions where the conversionist response arises have a high degree of individuation.⁶¹ Individuals are detached from their kinred. The belief in people's free choice is highly intensified. Uprooted people with similar circumstances join together despite their differences in cultural backgrounds. Wilson himself suggests that such may have been the conditions of the early spread of Christianity.⁶² Detached people are drawn into a new "synthetic community of love." The conversion experience, the divinely transformed self, is the only way to salvation: all other ideals and activities are subject to it. This is also the reason for a certain amount of pluralistic beliefs: conversion can, in principle, take place in other movements (similar to one's own). Belonging to one particular group is not a prerequisite for salvation.⁶³

In the nineteenth century Christian context, the conversionist sects often arose, according to Wilson, against evangelical traditions which, in principle, held conversionist beliefs but had become more concerned with settled leadership and organizational matters. The new sect consciously crossed social and religious barriers and invited people from all denominations to be united and to share the new life experience.⁶⁴ In the Methodist tradition, movements appeared in the United States that believed in the entire sanctification of humans: people could be completely holy and demonstrate this in their lives. Conversionist groups in general emphasized the gifts of the Spirit, available to all, and because of the "priesthood of all believers," women could also have influential positions.⁶⁵ Doctrines and rituals were of minimal importance, although, later on, highly emotional expressions were justified theologically, such as when the Pentecostal movement functionalized emotional behavior by advocating a special, charismatic baptism.⁶⁶

⁶¹ Wilson, *Religious Sects*, 48–49. Theissen, *Social Reality and the Early Christians*, 60–93, analyzes reasons for social uprooting. This era could not, however, be characterized as individualistic in the modern sense. On the one hand, Wilson, *Magic and the Millennium*, 28, sees the conversionist response possible in less-developed societies, in addition to the revolutionist and thaumaturgical (which are the most likely responses in these societies) since all of them see the supernatural as the active agency. On the other hand, Wilson presents the conversionist response as individualistic, and thus more likely in more advanced societies (39).

⁶² Wilson, *Magic and the Millennium*, 38.

⁶³ Wilson, *Religious Sects*, 41–42.

⁶⁴ Wilson, *Religious Sects*, 52–54 studies Disciples of Christ and the Campbellites in the nineteenth century United States as conversionist sects that soon accommodated to denominational stance.

⁶⁵ Wilson, *Religious Sects*, 54–65.

⁶⁶ Wilson, *Religious Sects*, 66–68.

Interestingly, social charity work was marked as one means to spiritual renewal in the Salvation Army—a conversionist sect can incorporate within it reformist visions and activities.⁶⁷

It seems that this conversionist response of nineteenth-century Christian sects was similar to the one seen among the first-century Christians in several aspects: they defied social barriers dominant in the society, welcomed converts and emphasized spiritual renewal and emotional experiences. They empowered the powerless, including women. However, there are differences. Early Christian groups were house-based, and the stress was never quite on the conversion of an individual but rather of a household.⁶⁸ Christians in an urban context did not promote the traditional religious values of their environment but imported a *new* belief. The stress on conversion as a response to evil was not targeted against the routinized and institutionalized religiosity (as in many nineteenth-century sects) but rather the other way around: when the Jesus-followers set off outside Palestine, the message of wandering charismatics leaving their homes was not the best one to be proclaimed—forms and structures had to be created that could work in an urban environment.

In the ideology of the nineteenth-century Christian sects, personal conversion and the consequently transformed self were understood to imitate the original, authentic Apostolic era. In order to live a true Christian life and bear witness to works of the Spirit amongst them, they turned to the authentic Christianity of the early days. In contrast to this, the early Christian congregations themselves did not have such a glorious conversion experience to look back on. Rather, the conversionist response—the emphasis on inner change—was a way of looking to the future and expansion. According to Elliot, the addressees of 1 Peter were not called upon to accommodate the world, nor to close themselves off from it, but rather to accentuate the struggle, to stand fast and trust that the struggle will bring about positive results. In order to succeed in converting others, the sect had to be attractive to outsiders and yet remain distinct from them. The emphasis on the congregation as the *oikos* of God within the world offered the means

⁶⁷ Wilson, *Religious Sects*, 61–63.

⁶⁸ Cf. Carolyn Osiek and David L. Balch, *Families in the New Testament World: Households and House Churches* (The Family, Religion and Culture; Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1997).

to this.⁶⁹ The emphasis on conversion and on new life in Christ and a strong feeling of fellowship were perhaps the best ways to take in order to survive and grow in foreign cities.⁷⁰

In comparison, the Qumran movement grew in a different setting and was very much opposed to its *domestic* rulers and religious practices. But rather than welcoming anyone and openly inviting converts, it had strict qualifications for admission. The response to evil was not primarily conversionist. However we can again detect conversionist beliefs in many texts. The individual had to “convert” (turn back to the Law) voluntarily and prove to be “converted” by his or her righteous deeds.⁷¹ The “converts” joined together in a community of humility, love, and truth.⁷² In the light of the final hymn in the *Rule of the Community* and the rich *Hodayot* material, it was only God that changed the fragile and sinful human being, so in spiritual devotion, it was acknowledged that God is responsible for changing the human being through his knowledge. The conversion experience can also be seen repeated and recalled in the annual renewal of the covenant, which probably aroused emotions when one heard the curses and blessings recited and concurred with them.⁷³ Moreover, the desire to recruit and teach others can be seen in some of the *Hodayot*.⁷⁴

⁶⁹ Elliott, *A Home for the Homeless*, 102–18, 48–50, 228–30. The sense of conflict contributed to group cohesion and offered a means to endure the tension with the world: being rejected by the world was proof of acceptance by God, (112–18). For a review of Elliott, see Holmberg, *Sociology and the New Testament*, 92–95, and Susan R. Garrett, “Sociology of Early Christianity,” *ABD* 6:95; and recently, for a challenge of Elliott’s model, see Harland, *Associations, Synagogues, and Congregations*, 189–212.

⁷⁰ The introversionist response in such a setting would have caused too much tension, or the group would have withered away. The revolutionist beliefs were always part of Christianity, but the revolutionist response would have been politically suspicious. Thaumaturgical elements (glossolalia, healings, prophecies) were part of the every-day life of early Christians, and, according to Wilson, *Magic and the Millennium*, 129–31, 47, the conversionist movements have indeed offered the best organizational base for the thaumaturgical response, which otherwise would not have been so organized. In the association with the conversionist response, miracles and wonders become more of a subjective reality than an objective event, and the community itself becomes a miracle.

⁷¹ 1QS III, 1; V, 1, 4b–5. For the terminology of conversion and its justification by scriptural language, see Brooke, “Justifying Deviance,” 73–87.

⁷² 1QS II, 24–25; V, 24b–25; CD VI, 20b–VII, 1a.

⁷³ 1QS II–III. Cf. Wilson, *Religious Sects*, 38: “The experience may need frequent recollection, and the emotions attendant upon it might be rekindled in circumstances in which the converted meet to offer praise and thanksgiving.”

⁷⁴ 1QH^a IV, 15ff.

The hierarchical structure in the Qumran movement and the reliance on superiors for counsel, revelation, and guidance overran the emphasis on the conversion experience as such. It was thus primarily conversion to the movement rather than conversion as an individual, self-contained experience. If Albert Baumgarten, however, is right, the period was marked by urbanization and social uprooting,⁷⁵ and this should have been fruitful for conversionist sects. For Wilson, each response was born in specific cultural conditions. Roughly outlined,

sudden social dislocation, as experienced in urbanization and industrialization, appears to be a frequent circumstance in which conversionist sects emerge, while adventists [revolutionists] and introversionist have arisen in the midst of longer persisting deprivation.⁷⁶

(Introversionist sects) do not arise quickly, their development depends on sustained conditions of religious toleration. Some come into being in the expectation of attaining salvation in other ways and become introversionist by disappointment. Others...evolved within eighteenth-century Pietist tradition. At times they have established themselves as isolated communities...when frontiers were expanding, when land was available and diligent settlers were needed.⁷⁷

This scenario calls for the further inquiry into the circumstances behind the Qumran movement. Many scholars have seen sudden changes, especially the actions by Antiochus Epiphanes at the center of the crisis or the disappointment in the following Hasmonean state behind the sectarianism. Baumgarten prefers the terminology of “rapid social change” to that of (relative) deprivation.⁷⁸ However, urbanization and growth of literacy took place more gradually, as a result of a higher birth rate and technological innovations that had already begun under the Persian empire.⁷⁹ Perhaps the sectarian forerunners provided the necessary long-term preparation for introversionism in the case of the Qumran movement.

⁷⁵ E.g., Baumgarten, *Flourishing of Jewish Sects*, 137–51.

⁷⁶ Wilson, “An Analysis,” 31.

⁷⁷ Wilson, *Religious Sects*, 44. See also 122–123: conversionist sects could lose their “evangelistic fervour” and turn inwards.

⁷⁸ Baumgarten, *Flourishing of Jewish Sects*, 30.

⁷⁹ Baumgarten, *Flourishing of Jewish Sects*, 143. On the other hand, other scholars have argued that true urbanization began in fact only later, at the time of Herod and his sons: Alexei M. Sivertsev, *Households, Sects, and the Origins of Rabbinic Judaism* (JSJSup 102; Leiden: Brill, 2005), 7.

Furthermore, the emphasis on conversion is, according to Wilson, one orientation which favors denominationalism.⁸⁰ Recruitment of large numbers calls for aftercare and later, for professional ministries, which again have to make compromises with the world. On the other hand, the revolutionary response, the belief that God will soon overturn the world, and the introversionist response, the belief that evil can only be avoided by withdrawal into a sanctified community, do not easily lead to denominationalism and abandoning some of the sectarian tension. This point of view seems to fit well with the differences found in the Qumran movement if it was an introversionist or revolutionary sect: it maintained a high level of tension whereas the early Christian groups recruited large numbers and developed more towards a denominational stance.⁸¹

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN REVOLUTIONIST/THAUMATURGICAL AND INTROVERSIONIST RESPONSES IN THE QUMRAN MOVEMENT

The revolutionist response is, according to Wilson, not the same as revolutionary. In other words, revolutionist sects do not usually resort to violence. Their worldview and operation are characterized by a sense of urgency: the culmination of time is coming, and truth must be proclaimed before this.⁸² Some of the sects Wilson studied had precise predictions of the end, some more vague. It is significant that even after a disappointment—an end that did not come—Christian sects found means to explain this and still rely on new revelations and visions through which the revolutionist response was maintained.

⁸⁰ Note that schisms in conversionist sects are more often caused by a power struggle among charismatic leaders and their followers than by doctrinal disagreements; Wilson, *Religious Sects*, 78.

⁸¹ However, Harold Remus, "Persecution," in *Handbook of Early Christianity: Social Science Approaches* (eds. Anthony J. Blasi, Jean Duhaime, and Paul-André Turcotte; Walnut Creek: Altamira, 2002), 434, states: "Conversionist sects, such as early Christianity was in many aspects, will likely stand in greater tension with the wider society as a result of their recruitment efforts than will introversionist groups that purposely isolate themselves from the outside world." This is perhaps true as regards the early phases of the conversionist sect, but once it has a following and exceeded a critical number of members, it cannot be ignored, and society comes to accept it. The introversionist sect can, in certain circumstances, be ignored because of its separation, but in comparison to other sectarians, they are in high tension with the world. Tension is not the same as conflict.

⁸² Wilson, *Religious Sects*, 94.

The imminent coming of the savior prevented any major attempts to change the world as such. Evil in the world was seen as a marker of the fulfillment of time.⁸³

In colonial settings, sects arose that proclaimed the coming end of the colonizers, or sects migrated in the expectation of a supernatural deliverance to a land without any evil. These sects were usually short-lived.⁸⁴ Sometimes such religious movements were associated with military action: a prophet might give counsel to a military leader, or a prophetic message might unite disparate tribes in a military action. Some movements wished to restore the past, some proclaimed a new message.⁸⁵

Wilson saw the revolutionist and thaumaturgical responses as closely connected. He studied these carefully in non-western societies.

The thaumaturgical response is a refusal to accept the testimony of the senses and natural causation as definitive. It is the belief in, and demand for, supernatural communications and manifestations of power that have immediate personal significance.⁸⁶

Movements expressing this response are preoccupied with various miraculous acts, such as healing, relief from spirit possession or witchcraft, purification rites, ecstasy, i.e., acts that provide personal spiritual aid.⁸⁷ They have special thaumaturges, who sometimes claim to be messiahs. These do not promise any future bliss but a relief of present ills.⁸⁸ It is the primary and persisting response among less-developed peoples whereas the revolutionist response is more spontaneous and not long-lasting. These responses seem to alternate, thus inspiring the title of Wilson's 1973-work: *Magic and the Millennium*. For example, when indigenous people came into contact with a Western culture, thought to be superior and more powerful than theirs, these people expected

⁸³ Wilson, *Religious Sects*, 99–108, 233, 349.

⁸⁴ Wilson, *Magic and the Millennium*, 196, 208–12.

⁸⁵ Wilson, *Magic and the Millennium*, 269–71.

⁸⁶ Wilson, *Magic and the Millennium*, 70. In more advanced societies, the manipulationist response often is “the developed equivalent of the thaumaturgical religion of simpler societies” (71). Such manipulationist sects may promise control of the human mind, entry into cosmic consciousness, a peaceful mental state (104). Thaumaturgical sects have emerged, however, in a Christian context, e.g., in Brazil.

⁸⁷ Wilson, *Magic and the Millennium*, 58. “What is needed to destroy evil is not a programme, a policy, or a prophecy of transformation, but only repeated performances, *ad hoc* and *ad hominem*” (101).

⁸⁸ Wilson, *Magic and the Millennium*, 133–36.

to gain some of that power, the “magic.” But when this failed, more dramatic and extreme revolutionist ideas gained ground.⁸⁹ The personal thaumaturgical, rather than the collective revolutionist, response, then returns again when the short-lived revolutionist dream failed.⁹⁰

The introversionist response, on the other hand, seeks to maximize withdrawal from the world. Holiness is characteristic of both individual members and the community life; individual holiness depends on community holiness. The members deal with each other as ends to the “insulated sanctity.” The community is the only road to salvation. History is preordained, and the world can no longer be saved. Outsiders and potential converts are treated suspiciously and as potentially contaminating.⁹¹ Those introversionist sects that had not withdrawn into colonies insulated themselves by other means: rules about associating with outsiders, distinctive dress, manner of speaking, endogamy, particular professions.⁹²

For Wilson, the revolutionist and introversionist responses emerged in very different cultural conditions. A revolutionist response is also found frequently in less-developed societies whereas introversionism requires the idea that religion is a private commitment. “Withdrawal is a possible reaction for individuals or groups only when social institutions have achieved a certain degree of autonomy one of another [*sic*], and when religious expression and practice have ceased to be a necessarily public performance for all members of the wider society.”⁹³ He sees that the introversionist response became possible in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries but the change in general conditions in the twentieth century made its primary occurrence less likely.

However, Wilson also identified the introversionist response among less-developed peoples. There the introversionist response may not display an exclusivism similar to Christian sects, but rather borrow from

⁸⁹ Wilson, *Magic and the Millennium*, 216–19, 72.

⁹⁰ Wilson, *Magic and the Millennium*, 292. Wilson’s seminal argument for these revolutionist sects among Third World countries was their impact on secularization: once people adopt the interpretation that their ills are not caused by spirits and their own actions but by deficiencies in social structures, they can expect a communal transformation in these structures. When this expectation, the dream, is not fulfilled, people turn again to their own “effort to work out salvation,” but this can be the forerunner of more rational ideas about opportunities for structuring the new world, Wilson, *Magic and the Millennium*, 7, 348–49.

⁹¹ Wilson, *Religious Sects*, 43, 118–19, 414.

⁹² Wilson, *Religious Sects*, 120.

⁹³ Wilson, *Magic and the Millennium*, 43.

tribal or ethnic structure.⁹⁴ It can be a secondary response, following the revolutionist, after a disappointment. But it can also occur independently: “It may be withdrawal from the wider society of a group of people who share a similar sense of disenchantment with the world.” Often it then relies on a prophet who has a compelling message but does not color this with a sense of urgency and makes no promises of an imminent, miraculous change. North American Indians had movements aiming at preserving their distinct way of life and native values that were considered inappropriate for others. The past could not be recaptured; therefore, previous war leaders were given up, and new leaders established new spiritual powers. The claim was ethnic; however, over time, voluntary choice became the basis. Such movements offered accommodation to changed circumstances.⁹⁵

Regev applies both the revolutionist and the introversionist responses to the Qumran sects. He rightly notes that both had ideological roots in the Hebrew Bible: introversionist tendencies found a springboard in wisdom traditions and their ethical dualism between the wicked and the righteous; revolutionary tendencies found support from the cosmic dualism in apocalyptic traditions.⁹⁶ But which response was primary for the Qumran movement? Shemaryahu Talmon seems to make a case paralleling Wilson’s model from revolutionist to introversionist:⁹⁷ the Teacher of Righteousness and his group only emerged in the second stage of the Qumran movement’s history, after profound disappointment in the early group’s expectation of the imminent onset of the “millennium.”⁹⁸ Regev makes the case for the reverse. Even though

⁹⁴ Wilson, *Magic and the Millennium*, 386. For this reason, the change from the revolutionist response to the introversionist may not have been so easy to detect since the boundaries of these ethnic groups were not rigid and the exact members were difficult to determine.

⁹⁵ Wilson, *Magic and the Millennium*, 410–12.

⁹⁶ Regev, *Sectarianism in Qumran*, 68.

⁹⁷ However, according to Wilson, the revolutionist response does not always develop into the introversionist response. It can also wither away when individuals leave after the disappointment or, after arousing rebellion, move on to political action and make compromises with the world, or just keep waiting for the end and recruit more people for whom the vision is new. The turn to the thaumaturgical response is typical of many cases (Wilson, *Magic and the Millennium*, 35–38, 364–67, 84–87; Wilson, *The Social Dimension of Sectarianism*, 106–10).

⁹⁸ Shemaryahu Talmon, *The World of Qumran from Within* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1989), as phrased according to Lloyd K. Pietersen, “‘False Teaching, Lying Tongues and Deceitful Lips’ (4Q169 frgs. 3–4 2.8): The Pesharim and the Sociology of Deviance,” in *New Directions in Qumran Studies: Proceedings of the Bristol Colloquium on the*

we find eschatological expectations, a periodic view of history, and calculations of the end in the Qumran documents, the separation is not explained by millennial disappointments. Instead, the separation in itself was a successful response to the evil experienced in the world: it met the members' immediate need for an environment where salvation could be realized. However, such separation was not easy to maintain in the long run, and the idea that *this separation is only temporary* was a logical consequence. Regev claims then that, "while it is possible to point to millennial movements that did not withdraw from the outer society, it is more difficult to identify introversionist movements who develop no expectations about the future."⁹⁹

I am sympathetic towards this view. The revolutionist beliefs and periodization of history were so inherent in the Jewish traditions of the time that they were part of the make-up of the movement. The revolutionist response is perhaps by nature more short-lived, and all eschatological beliefs we find in texts cannot be taken as evidence of this response.¹⁰⁰ Comparatively speaking, if the primary response of some early Christian congregations was conversionist, this did not prevent them from having expectations of the end in the near future. The absence of any pronounced mentions of the expected end in much

Dead Sea Scrolls, 8–10 September (eds. J.G. Campbell, W.J. Lyons, and L.K. Pietersen; London: T&T Clark International, 2005). Compare this to the spontaneous emergence of the sect around a charismatic leader, envisioned by S.R. Isenberg, "Millenarism in Greco-Roman Palestine," *Religion* 4 (1974): 26–46: the Teacher of Righteousness was such a "millenarian prophet." "A Millenarian prophet is one who is able to transform and rechannel tradition in such ways that new rules and new assumptions about power can be seen to derive directly from the ultimate power sought by the community" (36). According to Isenberg, millenarian revelation is descriptive, predictive and prescriptive. It describes the situation in which the group finds itself, predicts a new coming change to that situation and prescribes requirements for participation in the new order. The Teacher was the founder of the group who was seen as receiving special revelation and establishing new rules (37–38).

⁹⁹ Regev, *Sectarianism in Qumran*, 72.

¹⁰⁰ Such as the limitation of deceit: in the future, God will remove all evil (1QS V, 10–13a). This is of course the theme of much of the *War Scroll* material. The "last generation" is an important concept, as well as the "latter days," but these can be fairly abstract and non-specific. According to John J. Collins, "Apocalypticism and Literary Genre in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*. (eds. Peter W. Flint and James C. VanderKam; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 2:424–27, many of the Qumran documents show a tendency to stress realized eschatology.

of the Qumran rulebook material and in hymns seem to suggest that at least they did not rely on the urgent demand to prepare for the end.¹⁰¹

If some of the *War Scroll* (M) material was written shortly after Daniel's visions, these texts have to be interpreted against the general anticipation of divine help in difficult times. According to Jean Duhaime, the purpose of the *War Scroll* material may have changed with different recensions:

Despite the utopian character of the recension represented by 1QM, one cannot completely rule out the possibility that its material, or at least part of it, was once used by priests standing alongside real troops and trying to determine how they should be prepared and motivated according to the Torah requirements for military operations interpreted as holy war. But the priests play such a pre-eminent role in the scroll that they apparently take precedence over the civilian authorities; this suggests that the document was perhaps meant as a claim by a particularly orthodox group of religious leaders to oppose what they considered an inappropriate way for civilian authorities of their days to conduct war. However, in the context of the Qumran community, ... the most likely function of this utopian tactical treatise was to support its members in the belief that they would soon be joined by the heavenly hosts for the war of the end-time, resulting in the annihilation of the forces of evil.¹⁰²

On the other hand, if the Qumran movement's main response was introversionist but it at some stage inclined towards the revolutionist response (with the expectation of an imminent end) and was disappointed by some end-time calculations, as has been suggested,¹⁰³ it could then be argued that, by being compelled to endure longer, the movement had to pay more attention to what was happening around it and ways in which to keep its members.

¹⁰¹ Cf. Richard A. Horsley, "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Historical Jesus," in *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. (ed. James H. Charlesworth; vol. 3 of *The Scrolls and Christian Origins*; Waco, Texas: Baylor University Press, 2006), 42–44, who speaks about "imminent fulfilment" expected and participated in by both the Qumran and the Jesus movement, but he supposedly sees that this is realized in (non-urgent) activities, such as common meals; exodus in the wilderness; dedication to covenant law.

¹⁰² Jean Duhaime, *The War Texts: 1QM and Related Manuscripts* (Companion to the Qumran Scrolls 6; London: T&T Clark, 2004), 59–60.

¹⁰³ E.g., Annette Steudel, "אחרית הימים" in the Texts from Qumran," *RevQ* 16 (1993): 225–46.

CONCLUSION

This paper attempted to offer glimpses into Bryan Wilson's rich studies by of sects in the modern era, in order to correctly appreciate his conceptions of the seven "responses to evil." I could not go into details of specific cases; each reader is invited to do so him/herself. The typology was then used as a suggestive but not definitive window (rather specifically colored windows!) on questions and issues concerning the Qumran movement, the Jesus movement, and early Christian groups.

Wilson's attempts to create the *logically possible* alternatives for responses to evil. His purpose is not classifying sects but ideal-typification of sects.¹⁰⁴ The responses are thus abstractions, not real cases. If the typology is valid, it suggests one primary response for *most* existing movements, although some can also be mixed types, and some movements may be not be very clear regarding their response. In applications to ancient contexts, the typification is not the end point but the starting point for turning back to the historical data, especially to those features that depart from our initial hypotheses, and also to Wilson's analysis of the types themselves.

When based on studies of the sociological setting rather than discourses and beliefs in texts, *a particular response seems to also suggest itself as the prominent one for the movements in antiquity.* My suggestions remain general, making abstractions of the Qumran movement, the Jesus movement and early Christian groups themselves and relying on earlier suggestions about them. The reformist response is not the main response in any of these movements: it is a secondary, "secular" response with less tension towards the world. The differences between these movements, according to the suggested abstractions, could be conceptualized somewhere along the lines of introversionist, revolutionist/thaumaturgical, and conversionist responses. The Qumran movement and earliest Christianity were born in similar cultural conditions but developed in different directions. As an introversionist sect, the Qumran movement was able to maintain a high tension with the world whereas many Christian congregations with the conversionist response sought expansion and developed towards less tension with the world. This does not mean that the introversionist response was not found among early

¹⁰⁴ Miller, "Sectarianism and Secularization," 164.

Christians; it probably was, but not on a very large scale. The Qumran movement did not present a clear revolutionist response; if this was its main response at some stage (in the beginning?), it quickly changed its response towards the introversionist one, or perhaps also the utopian response, and the future expectations took a more tranquil form. It is another task to consider the time span: what might it mean that the Qumran movement maintained its mainly introversionist response for well over hundred years in comparison to the rapid mutation from revolutionist/thaumaturgical to conversionist responses in the Jewish-Christian cases?

In the end, the usefulness of typologies can be a matter of personal preference. Some people like to think in typologies, even mixed ones, that focus attention on large-scale differences—others prefer to use different terminology, such as “theocratic movements,” “resistance movements,”¹⁰⁵ and “prophetic movements,” which similarly have to be defined. There does not seem to be a short-cut to the easy use of any concepts and typologies. My conviction is that other typologies as well as completely different theoretical approaches are also needed. Concepts structure our thinking, and a good typology works well to aid scholarly work—until someone comes up with a new reconstruction, in other circumstances.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Baumgarten, Albert I. *The Flourishing of Jewish Sects in the Maccabean Era: An Interpretation*. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 55. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- Brooke, George J. “Justifying Deviance: The Place of Scripture in Converting to the Qumran Self-Understanding.” Pages 73–87 in *Reading the Present: Scriptural Interpretation and the Contemporary in the Texts of the Judean Desert*. Edited by Kristin De Troyer and Armin Lange. Atlanta: SBL, 2005.
- Chalcraft, David J. “Sectarianism in Early Judaism: Sociological Advances? Some Critical Sociological Reflections.” Pages 2–23 in *Sectarianism in Early Judaism: Sociological Advances*. Edited by David J. Chalcraft. BibleWorld. London: Equinox, 2007.
- , ed. *Sectarianism in Early Judaism: Sociological Advances*. London: Equinox, 2007.
- Collins, John C. “The Construction of Israel in the Sectarian Rule Books.” Pages 25–42 in *Judaism in Late Antiquity, Part 5: The Judaisms of Qumran: A Systemic Reading of the Dead Sea Scrolls, Vol. 1: Theory of Israel*. Edited by Alan J. Avery-Peck, Jacob Neusner and Bruce Chilton. Leiden: Brill, 2001.

¹⁰⁵ Horsley, *Sociology and the Jesus Movement*, 56–57.

- Collins, John J. "Apocalypticism and Literary Genre in the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 403–30 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment. Vol. 2*. Edited by Peter W. Flint and James C. VanderKam. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- Craffert, Pieter F. "An Exercise in the Critical Use of Models: The 'Goodness of Fit' of Wilson's Sect Model." Pages 21–46 in *Social Scientific Models for Interpreting the Bible: Essays by the Context Group in Honor of Bruce J. Malina*. Edited by John J. Pilch. Leiden: Brill, 2001.
- . "More on Models and Muddles in the Social Scientific Interpretation of the New Testament: The Sociological Fallacy Reconsidered." *Neotestamentica* 26 (1992): 217–39.
- . "The Pauline Movement and First-Century Judaism: A Framework for Transforming the Issues." *Neotestamentica* 27 (1993): 233–62.
- Davies, Philip R. "The Judaism(s) of the Damascus Document." Pages 27–43 in *The Damascus Document: A Centennial of Discovery. Proceedings of the Third International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 4–8 February, 1998*. Edited by Joseph M. Baumgarten, Esther G. Chazon and Avital Pinnick. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 34. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- . "Sect Formation in Early Judaism." Pages 133–55 in *Sectarianism in Early Judaism: Sociological Advances*. Edited by David J. Chalcraft. BibleWorld. London: Equinox, 2007.
- Duhaime, Jean. *The War Texts: IQM and Related Manuscripts*. Companion to the Qumran Scrolls 6. London: T&T Clark, 2004.
- Elliott, John H. *A Home for the Homeless: A Sociological Exegesis of 1 Peter, Its Situation and Strategy*. London: SCM Press, 1981.
- . "The Jewish Messianic Movement: From Fraction to Sect." Pages 75–95 in *Modeling Early Christianity: Social-Scientific Studies of the New Testament In Its Context*. Edited by Philip F. Esler. London: Routledge, 1995.
- Esler, Philip F. *Community and Gospel in Luke-Acts: The Social and Political Motivations of Lucan Theology*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 57. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- . *The First Christians in Their Social Worlds: Social-Scientific Approaches to New Testament Interpretation*. London: Routledge, 1994.
- Gager, John. *Kingdom and Community: The Social World of Early Christianity*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1975.
- Garrett, Susan R. "Sociology of Early Christianity." Pages 89–99 in *The Anchor Bible Dictionary. Vol. 6*. Edited by David Noel Freedman, Gary A. Herion, David F. Graf, John David Pleins and Astrid B. Beck. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
- Grabbe, Lester L. "When Is a Sect a Sect—or Not? Groups and Movements in the Second Temple Period." Pages 114–32 in *Sectarianism in Early Judaism: Sociological Advances*. Edited by David J. Chalcraft. BibleWorld. London: Equinox, 2007.
- Harland, Philip A. *Associations, Synagogues, and Congregations: Claiming a Place in Ancient Mediterranean Society*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2003.
- Hempel, Charlotte. "Emerging Communal Life and Ideology in the S Tradition." Pages 43–61 in *Defining Identities: We, You, and the Other in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the Fifth Meeting of the IOQS in Groningen*. Edited by Florentino García Martínez and Mladen Popović. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 70. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- Holmberg, Bengt. *Paul and Power: The Structure of Authority in the Primitive Church as Reflected in the Pauline Epistles*. Lund: Gleerup, 1978.
- . *Sociology and the New Testament: An Appraisal*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990.
- Horsley, Richard A. "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Historical Jesus." Pages 37–60 in *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls. Volume Three: The Scrolls and Christian Origins*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. Waco, Texas: Baylor University Press, 2006.

- . *Sociology and the Jesus Movement*. New York: Continuum, 1994.
- Isenberg, S.R. "Milleniarism in Greco-Roman Palestine." *Religion* 4 (1974): 26–46.
- Luomanen, Petri. "The 'Sociology of Sectarianism' in Matthew: Modeling the Genesis of Early Jewish and Christian Communities." Pages 107–30 in *Fair Play: Diversity and Conflicts in Early Christianity. Essays in Honour of Heikki Räisänen*. Edited by Ismo Dunderberg, Christopher Tuckett and Kari Syreeni. Leiden: Brill, 2002.
- MacDonald, Margaret Y. *The Pauline Churches: A Socio-historical Study of Institutionalization in the Pauline and Deutero-Pauline Writings*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 60. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- Meeks, Wayne A. "Breaking Away: Three New Testament Pictures of Christianity's Separation from the Jewish Communities." Pages 93–115 in "To See Ourselves as Others See Us": *Christians, Jews, "Others" in Late Antiquity*. Edited by Jacob Neusner and Ernest S. Frerichs. Studies in the Humanities. Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1985.
- Metso, Sarianna. "Whom Does the Term Yahad Identify?" Pages 213–35 in *Biblical Traditions in Transmission: Essays in Honour of Michael A. Knibb*. Edited by Charlotte Hempel and Judith M. Lieu. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 111. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- Miller, Donald E. "Sectarianism and Secularization: The Work of Bryan Wilson." *Religious Studies Review* 5 (1979): 161–74.
- Murphy, Catherine M. *Wealth in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Qumran Community*. Edited by Florentino García Martínez. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 40. Leiden: Brill, 2002.
- Osiek, Carolyn and David L. Balch. *Families in the New Testament World: Households and House Churches*. The Family, Religion and Culture. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1997.
- Pietersen, Lloyd K. "'False Teaching, Lying Tongues and Deceitful Lips' (4Q169 frgs. 3–4 2.8): The Pesharim and the Sociology of Deviance." Pages 166–81 in *New Directions in Qumran Studies: Proceedings of the Bristol Colloquium on the Dead Sea Scrolls, 8–10 September*. Edited by J.G. Campbell, W.J. Lyons and L.K. Pietersen. London: T&T Clark International, 2005.
- Piovanelli, Pierluigi. "Was There Sectarian Behaviour before the Flourishing of Jewish Sects? A Long-Term Approach to the History and Sociology of Second Temple Sectarianism." Pages 156–79 in *Sectarianism in Early Judaism: Sociological Advances*. Edited by David J. Chalcraft. BibleWorld. London: Equinox, 2007.
- Regev, Eyal. "Atonement and Sectarianism in Qumran: Defining a Sectarian Worldview in Moral and Halakhic Systems." Pages 180–204 in *Sectarianism in Early Judaism: Sociological Advances*. BibleWorld. London: Equinox, 2007.
- . *Sectarianism in Qumran: A Cross-Cultural Perspective*. Religion and Society 45. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2007.
- Remus, Harold. "Persecution." Pages 431–52 in *Handbook of Early Christianity: Social Science Approaches*. Edited by Anthony J. Blasi, Jean Duhaime and Paul-André Turcotte. Walnut Creek: Altamira, 2002.
- Robbins, Vernon K. *Exploring the Texture of Texts: A Guide to Socio-Rhetorical Interpretation*. Valley Forge, Pennsylvania: Trinity Press International, 1996.
- Saldarini, Anthony J. *Matthew's Christian-Jewish Community*. Chicago Studies in the History of Judaism. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994.
- . *Pharisees, Scribes and Sadducees in Palestinian Society: A Sociological Approach*. Wilmington, DE: Glazier, 1988.
- . "Sectarianism." Pages 853–57 in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Lawrence H. Schiffman and James C. VanderKam. 2. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Sanders, E.P. *Jesus and Judaism*. London: SCM Press, 1985.
- Sivertsev, Alexei M. *Households, Sects, and the Origins of Rabbinic Judaism*. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 102. Leiden: Brill, 2005.

- Stark, Rodney. "The Class Basis of Early Christianity: Inferences from a Sociological Model." *Sociological Analysis* 47 (1986): 216–25.
- . *The Rise of Christianity: How the Obscure, Marginal Jesus Movement Became the Dominant Religious Force in the Western World in a Few Centuries*. San Francisco, CA: HarperSanFrancisco, 1997.
- Stark, Rodney and William Sims Bainbridge. *The Future of Religion: Secularization, Revival and Cult Formation*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985.
- . *A Theory of Religion*. Toronto Studies in Religion. New York: Peter Lang, 1987.
- Stuedel, Annette. "אֶהְרִית הַיְמִים in the Texts from Qumran." *Revue de Qumran* 16 (1993): 225–46.
- Talmon, Shemaryahu. "The Emergence of Jewish Sectarianism in the Early Second Temple Period." Pages 587–616 in *Ancient Israelite Religion: Essays in Honor of Frank Moore Cross*. Edited by Patrick D. Miller Jr., Paul D. Hanson and S. Dean McBride. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987.
- . *The World of Qumran from Within*. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1989.
- Theissen, Gerd. "The Political Dimensions of Jesus' Activities." Pages 225–50 in *The Social Setting of Jesus and the Gospels*. Edited by Wolfgang Stegemann, Bruce J. Malina and Gerd Theissen. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2002.
- . *Social Reality and the Early Christians: Theology, Ethics, and the World of the New Testament*. Translated by Margaret Kohl. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1992.
- Wassen, Cecilia and Jutta Jokiranta. "Groups in Tension: Sectarianism in the Damascus Document and the Community Rule." Pages 205–45 in *Sectarianism in Early Judaism: Sociological Advances*. Edited by David J. Chalcraft. London: Equinox, 2007.
- White, L. Michael. "Shifting Sectarian Boundaries in Early Christianity." *Bulletin of John Rylands Library* 70 (1988): 7–24.
- Wilson, Bryan. *Religion in Sociological Perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1982.
- Wilson, Bryan R. "An Analysis of Sect Development." Pages 22–45 in *Patterns of Sectarianism: Organization and Ideology in Social and Religious Movements*. Edited by Bryan R. Wilson. London: Heinemann, 1967.
- . *Magic and the Millennium: A Sociological Study of Religious Movements of Protest among Tribal and Third-World Peoples*. London: Heinemann, 1973.
- . "Methodological Perspectives in the Study of Religious Minorities." *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library Manchester* 70 (1988): 225–40.
- . *The Social Dimension of Sectarianism: Sects and New Religious Movements in Contemporary Society*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990.
- Wilson, Bryan R. *Religious Sects: A Sociological Study*. London: World University Library, 1970.

WEALTH AND SECTARIANISM:
COMPARING QUMRANIC AND EARLY CHRISTIAN
SOCIAL APPROACHES

Eyal Regev
Bar-Ilan University

INTRODUCTION

In the early days of the Dead Sea Scrolls scholarship, the communal property ownership of the Yahad and its self portrayal as “the poor” attracted attention as Jewish parallels and background for the community of goods in Acts and the theology of poverty in the New Testament.¹ Since then, a growing number of scholars have become interested in the social aspects of early Christianity, especially the socio-economic approach of Jesus and the gospels. Major studies of wealth in the New Testament include general treatments by Martin Hengel, David Mealand, and Wolfgang Stegemann, as well as more specific discussions focusing on a specific gospel or epistle.² Dead Sea Scrolls scholars have also paid more attention to the subject. In 2002 Catherine Murphy surveyed the treatment of wealth in the scrolls at

¹ S.E. Johnson, “The Dead Sea Manual of Discipline and the Jerusalem Church of Acts,” in *The Scrolls and the New Testament* (ed. K. Stendhal; New York: Harper & Bros., 1957; repr., New York: Crossroad, 1992), 129–142; J.A. Fitzmyer, “Jewish Christianity in Acts in the Light of the Qumran Scrolls,” in *Studies in Luke-Acts* (ed. L.E. Keck and J.L. Martyn; London: SPCK, 1966), 233–257 (241–244); L.E. Keck “The Poor among the Saints in Jewish Christianity and Qumran,” *ZNW* 57 (1966): 54–78.

² M. Hengel, *Property and Riches in the Early Church* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1974); D.L. Mealand, *Poverty and Expectation in the Gospels* (London: SPCK, 1981); W. Stegemann, *The Gospel of the Poor* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1981); E. Bammel, “πτωχός,” *TDNT* 6:888–915; L.T. Johnson, *The Literary Function of Possessions in Luke-Acts* (SBLDS 39; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1977); P.F. Esler, *Community and Gospel in Luke-Acts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 164–200; M.H. Crosby, *House of Disciples: Church, Economics and Justice in Matthew* (Maryknoll NY: Orbis, 1988); F. Belo, *A Materialist Reading of the Gospel of Mark* (Maryknoll NY: Orbis, 1981); D. Georgi, *Remembering the Poor: The History of Paul’s Collection for Jerusalem* (Nashville: Abington, 1992); W.A. Meeks, *The First Urban Christians: The Social World of the Apostle Paul* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1983), 51–73; B. Malina, “Wealth and Poverty in the New Testament and Its World,” *Interpretation* 41 (1987): 354–367; H. Moxnes, *The Economy of the Kingdom: Social Conflicts and Economic Relations in Luke’s Gospel* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1988).

length.³ It is therefore time to reassess the similarities and differences in the attitude towards wealth in both movements.

Social scientists recognise that capital creates and shapes social relations.⁴ This requires a more sophisticated approach to wealth in social history, beyond mere economy and social status. With regard to Qumran and the New Testament, I will try to demonstrate that wealth is not merely a matter of social conditions or social reality concerning the relationship between the rich and the poor in society. Attitudes towards wealth express a more general social ideology. The conceptions of wealth embody information concerning the manner in which social relations are envisioned and perceived. Ideologies concerning wealth are also a matter of social identity and social relationships between people and groups.

I would like to present some of the approaches towards wealth in the Qumran sects and the early Christian communities. My discussion will be selective due to the enormous variety and variations in the treatment of wealth throughout the New Testament and early Christian apocryphal writings (such as the *Gospel of Thomas* and the *Didache*). My intention is to point to similarities and significant differences between the Qumranic and early Christian approaches. I will try to show that certain approaches to wealth and its conceptualisation as a social boundary are markers of sectarian ideology. In doing so I am following my own treatment of the subject in my book *Sectarianism in Qumran: A Cross-Cultural Perspective*.⁵ Hence, it is possible to observe whether the early Christians adopted sectarian approaches to wealth, quite similar to the Qumran sects, or were they rather more conformist in relation to the surrounding society.

³ C.M. Murphy, *Wealth in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Qumran Community* (STDJ 40; Leiden: Brill, 2002).

⁴ On the manner in which exchange of possession creates social networks and commitment, see already M. Mauss, *The Gift: Form and Functions of Exchange in Archaic Societies*, (trans. I. Cunnison; Paris, Alcan, 1925; repr., London: Cohen & West, 1969), esp. 31–37. Cf. M. Bloch, *Marxism and Anthropology: The History of Relationship* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1983). For a post-marxist and post-structural approach, cf. P. Bourdieu, *Distinction. A Social Critique of Judgment and Taste* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1984); idem, “The Forms of Capital”, in *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education*, (ed. J.C. Richardson; New York: Greenwood, 1986), 241–258. On the history of the (negative) conceptualization of wealth, see J. Parry and M. Bloch, eds., *Money and the Morality of Exchange* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989).

⁵ Eyal Regev, *Sectarianism in Qumran: A Cross-Cultural Perspective* (RelSoc 45; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2007).

PART I: WEALTH AND SECTARIAN IDEOLOGY IN THE QUMRAN SECTS

1. *Corrupt Wealth: Wealth as a Boundary*

The *yaḥad* and the *Damascus Document* regarded the wealth of their foes as defiled and polluting. In their minds, wealth conveys the evil character of its owners and users. In *Pesher Habakkuk*, the Wicked Priest is harshly reproached because he “betrayed the laws for the sake of wealth. And he robbed and hoarded wealth from violent people... and he seized public money.” He also “plundered the possessions of the poor” (perhaps referring to the *yaḥad*).⁶ Similarly, this *Pesher* accuses “the last priests of Jerusalem who accumulate wealth and loot from plundering the nations. But in the last days their loot will be given into the hands of the army of the Kittim [i.e., the Romans].”⁷

The wealth of the “Men of the Pit” is so destructive that the author of the Community Rule is ready to renounce certain financial resources in order to avoid contact with these men.⁸ In the *Damascus Document*, corrupt wealth is the fate of the outside society that resists the sect’s teachings. “The traitors who remained,” and did not follow the sect’s laws, became corrupt. They “have defiled themselves by paths of licentiousness and with wicked wealth... and bragged about wealth and gain,” and also resented and hated each other.⁹

Viewing the money and possessions of the wicked as both corrupt and impure led the *yaḥad* and the *Damascus Document* to draw extremely strict boundaries between insiders and outsiders. The wealth of the “men of injustice” was considered impure by *yaḥad* standards, and members were also not permitted to eat, drink or take anything from their possession without payment.¹⁰ This separation seems to include a ban on commerce: “and the wealth of the men of holiness who walk

⁶ 1QpHab VIII, 10–12; XI, 10, respectively. Unless noted otherwise, translations follow F. García Martínez and E.J.C. Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scroll Study Edition* (2 vols.; Leiden, Grand Rapids and Cambridge: Brill and Eerdmans, 2000).

⁷ 1QpHab IX, 4–8.

⁸ “[T]o leave to them (the Men of the Pit) wealth and goods like a servant to his master and like man oppressed before someone domineering him” (1QS IX, 22–23). My interpretation of this passage is based on its context, which deals with social separation.

⁹ CD VIII, 5–7; XIX, 17–19.

¹⁰ 1QS V, 16–17.

in perfection must not be mixed with the wealth of the men of deceit who have not cleansed their way to separate from injustice.”¹¹

In CD VI, 14–16, evil wealth is given as a reason to avoid the Temple. Here, the “Sons of the Pit” (*benei ha-shaḥat*) are mentioned in relation to evil wealth, which is associated with impurity. Moreover, the passage orders members to set themselves apart from the evil wealth of the “vows and bans” (*neder* and *ḥerem*, that is, money donated to the Temple) and the wealth of the Temple. The authors also accuse “them” (apparently the Sons of the Pit) of robbing the poor and widows. Hence, immoral conduct concerning wealth not only leads to separation from corrupt people but can also ruin the credibility of the Temple cult.

Provisions in the *Damascus Document* prohibiting members from sharing their possessions with former members (expelled due to their transgressions), and probably referring to any association with them, indicate that expulsion may not have completely severed all social ties between banished members and their former comrades. “No one should associate with him (the expelled member) in wealth or work, for all the holy ones of the Most High have cursed him.”¹² “One who eats from their (the expelled members) riches...his sentence will be written down by the overseer.”¹³

How should this separation from the wealth of the wicked be explained? Bearing in mind the Qumranic dualistic worldview and sensitivity to moral impurity (namely, the idea that sin defiles),¹⁴ I suggest that the Qumranic attempt to avoid contact with the wealth of the outside society was a means to withdraw socially from evil. As I will suggest below, communal property ownership was one far-reaching mechanism towards achieving that goal. The strict *yahad* rules prohibiting private property may be explained by their desire to prevent the corruption of the self occasioned by ownership and personal connection

¹¹ 1QS IX, 8 (my translation, E.R.). The rationale for such a separation is provided in 1QS V, 14–15 “lest he (the man of injustice) lend him guilty iniquity” (my translation, E.R.).

¹² 4QD^a XI, 14–16; 4QD^d XVI, 12–15. A similar concept of separation from the wealth of expelled members is found in 1QS III, 2–3. Prohibitions on merging the wealth of the “men of holiness” with the wealth of a person who betrays the Torah and is thus expelled are also mentioned in 1QS VII, 21–24. According to 1QS VII, 24–25, one who mixes his pure food or wealth with an expelled member is also expelled.

¹³ CD XX, 6–8.

¹⁴ See E. Regev, “Abominated Temple and A Holy Community: The Formation of the Concepts of Purity and Impurity in Qumran,” *DSD* 10 (2003): 256–278.

to material possessions. The *Damascus Document*, which also identified the wealth of the wicked as taboo, maintained different (and more flexible) boundaries of separation from corrupt wealth, and condoned private possessions and occupations.

2. *Condemning the Accumulation of Wealth*

Not only did the Qumranites believe that the wealth of the outside world is corrupt and therefore requires being kept separate, but wealth *per se* and the private accumulation of property and riches are bad, immoral and ungodly pursuits in principle.¹⁵ In CD IV, 15–18 wealth (*hin*, which should be amended to *hon*)¹⁶ is one of the “three nets of Belial,” together with fornication and the impurity of the Temple.

The author of the *Hodayot* is very explicit in contrasting wealth with the service or discipline of God. “I do n[ot] exchange your truth for wealth, or for a bribe all your judgment. Quite the reverse, to the deg[ree...] [I lov]e him and to the extent that you place it [namely, wealth] far off, I hate it.”¹⁷ “You have fashioned the sp[irit of your servant... You have not placed my support in robbery (*beṣah*), nor in wealth... nor you have placed the inclination of the flesh as my refuge. The strength of heroes lies in the abundance of luxuries, [... the abundance of grain wine and oil; they take pride in their belongings and possessions....] The soul of your servant loathes wealth and robbery, and in the affluence of luxuries he does not...”¹⁸ The author of the *Hodayot* does not believe that wealth could ever be good or just. This belief resonates with the Qumranic self-portrayal as “the poor ones,” discussed below.

Philo’s presentation of the Essene lifestyle reflects a similar disparagement of wealth. He argues that the Essenes did not hoard silver and gold, did not acquire vast estates, but produced only what was essential. They lived without goods, property, or commerce, and rejected anything

¹⁵ This view is already found in Prov 30:7–9. However, the general attitude to wealth in Prov is positive, although the superiority of wisdom over wealth is stressed (interestingly, in Prov 8:10–21 wealth is a result of wisdom!) See R.N. Whybray, *Wealth and Poverty in the Book of Proverbs* (JSOTSup 99, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1990). Similar approaches can be found in Ben Sira 10:31–11:1; 26:28–27:3; 31:1–11.

¹⁶ Murphy, *Wealth*, 38 and bibliography.

¹⁷ 1QH^a 6[Sukenik 14]:20–21.

¹⁸ 1QH^a 18[10]:22–25, 29–30.

that might have evoked greed.¹⁹ The Essenes scorned riches and pleasure, and were committed to frugality, simplicity and modesty. In this respect, Philo also praises their communal life.²⁰ The Essenes are sometimes described as ascetics,²¹ in a manner that is nowhere attested to in the scrolls.

A similar dismissal of wealth is common to other introversionist sects, such as the early Anabaptists, Puritans, Quakers, Shakers, and the *Bruderhof* movement (which later joined the Hutterites). All these sects regarded wealth itself and its accumulation as negative. Wealth is associated with materialistic pleasures, the temptation of sin, greed, lust, selfishness, and is considered an obstacle to the service of God. Wealth was the ultimate symbol of all things in the world from which these sects sought to distance themselves in their efforts to become as close as possible to the divine.²²

3. *Helping the Poor / Being the Poor*

Members of the *Damascus Document* contributed specified amounts of their income to the sect. They donated a minimum tax of two days' salary (eight percent), which was distributed by the "overseer of the Many (*rabbim*)" and the judges to "the injured, poor and destitute, the old man who is bound down, the afflicted persons, captives held by the gentiles, young women without supporting relatives or husbands, and helpless youth," who may have been members of the Covenant, or somehow associated with members.²³ This ruling contains both dimensions of care: economic assistance to fellow sectarians and humanitarian care for the poor. Both are typical of other introversionist sects, such

¹⁹ Philo, *Quod omnis probus liber sit* 76–79. They also condemned slavery for the same reason.

²⁰ Philo, *Prob.* 84. Idem, *Hypothetica* (apud. Eusebius, *Praeparatio evangelica* VIII 11) 11:11–13. Josephus adds that they despise riches and that neither the humiliation of poverty nor the pride of wealth were evident among them (*J.W.* 2:122).

²¹ Cf. also their simplicity of dress and restrictions on food consumption in *J.W.* 2:126, 130, 133.

²² Regev, *Sectarianism in Qumran*, 335–350.

²³ CD XIV, 12–17; 4QD^a 10 I, 5–10 (with some additions). The conclusion of the rule (4QD^a 10 I, 9–10) refers to donations for "all [the service of the association (*heber*, or perhaps associate, *haber*)], and the house of the association shall not be deprived of its means" (Murphy's translation should be preferred: "will not be cut off from among them," see Murphy, *Wealth*, 83). Note that Philo mentioned that the Essenes' rationale for their economic union was mutual assistance (*Prob.* 87–88). Josephus also noted that they help one another and offer food to the needy (*J.W.* 2:134).

as the early Anabaptists, Old Order Mennonites, the Hutterites, Amish, Puritans, Quakers and Shakers.

I think that this concern for the poor and needy is based on more than humanitarian grounds and is related to a general conception of wealth. If wealth is bad, the poor, who are not afflicted by its immorality, are the just ones. They are the closest to the ideal of the sectarians who disdain riches. The destitute suffer due to the destructive power of wealth and should cooperate and unite in order to overcome poverty by spiritual means and not by gaining wealth of their own.

In light of the sectarian care for the poor, the self-designation of both the *yahad* and the *Damascus Document* as “the poor” has special significance. In CD XIX, 9, “those who revere Him are ‘the poor ones of the flock’” (Zech 11:11). In the Pesharim, the sectarians (probably the *yahad*) refer to themselves as “the congregation of the poor ones (*‘evyonim*), who volunteer to do the will of God.”²⁴ In the *Hodayot*, the members of the community are repeatedly described as the poor, and especially “poor in spirit, refined by poverty and purified in the crucible, [those who keep the]ir nerve until the time of Your judgment.”²⁵

This self-denomination has hardly anything to do with the sectarians’ actual economic situation.²⁶ It is a positive self-designation which implies that its owners are uncontaminated by the power of wealth. This positive association of the poor as the just and pious can be traced back to Psalms. The poor (*a‘navim* as well as several other designations) are frequently mentioned in Psalms as those who place their faith in

²⁴ 4QpPs^a(4Q171) I, 21. For other references to “the poor ones” see 4QpPs^a II, 10; III, 10; 1QpHab XII, 2–6.

²⁵ 1QH^a 4[14]:20–21. Cf. also 1QH^a 10[2]:32–34; 1QH^a 11[3]:25; 1QH^a 12[5]14–16; 4QH^a(4Q427) 7 II, 7–9; 4QBarkhi *Nafshi*^a (4Q434) 1 I, 1–3.

²⁶ For economic resources during famine according to 4QpPs^a III, 2–5 see, D. Flusser, “Qumran and the Famine during the Reign of Herod,” *Israel Museum Journal* 6 (1987): 7–16. The fact that the most common punishment in the *Community Rule* is a decrease of one-fourth of one’s daily portion of food for up to two years proves that the *yahad*’s regular diet was more than sufficient. See L.H. Schiffman, *Sectarian Law in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Courts, Testimony and the Penal Code* (BJS 33; Chico: Scholars, 1983), 109 n. 88; idem, “4Q Mysteries: A Preliminary Translation,” in *Proceedings of the Eleventh World Congress of Jewish Studies* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1993), 201 n. 173. The ostraca from Kh. Qumran, that may attest to the transfer of property, including a slave, from a joining member to the *yahad* official (F.M. Cross and E. Eshel, “Ostraca from Khirbet Qumran,” *IEJ* 47 (1997): 17–28, may also point to relative affluence.)

God rather than in money.²⁷ “The ‘poor’ are those who have nothing themselves, and hope to receive everything from God.”²⁸

4. *Rules for the Moral Conduct of Wealth*

Several rules and prohibitions which restrict private economic occupations appear in the *Damascus Document*. The members of the Covenant who do own private property are ordered to inform the local overseer of their actions in economic matters: “And no one should make a deed of purchase or of sale without informing the overseer of the camp. He shall proceed in consultation lest they err.”²⁹ This supervision of economic activities is probably designed to ensure that members avoid commercial ties with the wicked and refrain from exploiting others or acting deceptively.

Members of the *Damascus Covenant* were also prohibited from buying and selling to fellow members (“Sons of Dawn”), with the exception of “hand in hand,” that is, only on the basis of exchange and mutual trust without seeking to profit from these commercial relations.³⁰ The use of money was thus limited to commerce with outsiders, reducing the use of wealth and the possibility of its accumulation. The omission of wealth in intra-sectarian economic ties was probably symbolic, but is consistent with the negative characteristics ascribed to wealth. Similar regulations were also posed by the early Hutterites and the Old Order Mennonites.

²⁷ E.g., Ps 14:6; 25:9; 40:18; 72:4. Some scholars viewed the poor as a definite religious community (which included the Psalmist himself) of united worship. Since Mowinkel, the more accepted view is that the poor include all who are slandered by their enemies, the helpless, oppressed, powerless, etc., who plead for God’s intervention. The poor are therefore associated (also in several other places in the Hebrew Bible) with those who call for justice, lack social status, and whose protector is God. Their troubles drive them to rely exclusively on God. They are certain of their salvation and become witnesses of God’s gracious presence (e.g., Ps 9:17–21; 149:4–5). See J. Kraus, *Theology of the Psalms* (trans. K. Crim; Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1986), 150–154.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, 152.

²⁹ CD XIII, 15–16; 4QD^a 9 III, 1–10.

³⁰ CD XIII, 14–15. See the reading and interpretation of J.M. Baumgarten, “The Sons of Dawn’ in CD 13:14–15 and the ban on Commerce among the Essenes”, *IEJ* 33 (1983): 81–85.

These rules imply the tendency to eliminate the negative affects of wealth, in both the community's contact with outsiders, as well as with fellow members. Some rules are based on a reciprocal exchange of goods and their general aim is to limit the impact of the outside world's free economy on the community and its members.

Other rules attest to the Qumran sectarians' sensitivity to the immorality of wealth. Lying about money warrants punishment in both the *yaḥad* and the *Damascus Document*.³¹ The fact that this rule opens the penal codes of the *Damascus Document* and the *Community Rule*, as well as its relatively severe penalty attest to its significance either as very common, or, more plausibly, as a symbol of behavioral fidelity to sectarian values.³² Additional laws in the *Damascus Document* address additional related situations: lost/stolen and found property, demanding an oath or confession for dismissing any guilt regarding the acquisition of property;³³ jurisprudence concerning wealth and the number of witnesses required³⁴ and prohibitions about dedicating to the altar or donating to priests anything taken by force (*'anus*).³⁵

5. The Yaḥad's Communal Property Ownership

The *Community Rule* declares that the *yaḥad* is unified not only in mind, Torah and efforts, but also in property.³⁶ Members should "bring all their knowledge, strength and wealth into the community of God" and should "marshal... their wealth in accordance with His just counsel."³⁷ After the first year of probation, the converts' property was registered, and their property and production were completely merged with the community's property after their final acceptance following their second

³¹ 1QS VI, 24–25; CD XIV, 20–21; 4QD^a 10 I, 14–II, 1 4QD^d 11 I, 4–5. The punishment includes separation from the sect's purity for a year and a "penalty," namely, reduction of food, for sixty days.

³² Cf. Murphy, *Wealth*, 53.

³³ CD IX, 8–16. See Murphy, *Wealth*, 48–52.

³⁴ CD IX, 22–X, 3.

³⁵ CD XVI, 13–14. The section includes additional restrictions on such dedications. See Murphy, *Wealth*, 61–66.

³⁶ 1QS I, 11–12; III 2; V, 1–4.

³⁷ 1QS I, 11–13.

year of probation.³⁸ The Essenes also maintained communal property ownership (*koinōnia*).³⁹

Communal property ownership was also practiced for ideological reasons by the early Anabaptists, Hutterites, Shakers as well as by hippie communes in the US in the 1960s and 1970s. In all these instances it functioned as a means of resistance and group solidarity. The main motivation for this unusual social practice is, I believe, related to other ideas and practices we have already discussed. Wealth is corrupting and serves as a threat to the true worship of God. Accumulation of wealth also leads to cooperation with the outside world and symbolizes the readiness to embrace the unrighteous ethos of the sons of darkness. Economic communion, on the other hand, excludes materialistic distractions to religious (“spiritual”) life. Establishing communal property was one of several ideological and practical mechanisms designed to overcome this threat.

For the *yahad*, the practice of communalism was designed to eliminate the role of wealth and its negative consequences in society. In these communities wealth had no place in daily life or in the interactions between members. Not only did social equality replace commercial relations, but members also had no reason to devote any thought to money or possessions. The basic conception of communal property was therefore a boundary built to provide protection against wealth’s corrupting power especially in the outside society and against the very notion of accumulating wealth.

³⁸ 1QS VI, 21–23. For the practical aspects of the distribution of wealth, see Murphy, *Wealth*, 155–161. C. Rabin, *Qumran Studies* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1957), 22–36 claimed that private property existed not only in the *Damascus Document* but also in the *Community Rule*. His best argument is the law concerning “deceiving in the wealth of the *yahad*” (1QS VII, 6–8), which requires members to pay back money. However, even in communities that practiced communalism there are cases of stealing and misappropriating money. There were many instances in which members had access to the communal goods and treasury (in the context of trading with others, processing the donations and possessions of new members or candidates who still held their own money separately), and may have had an opportunity to appropriate such goods or funds. For discussing and rejecting Rabin’s suggestions, see D.L. Mealand, “Community of Goods at Qumran,” *TZ* 31 (1975): 129–139.

³⁹ *Hypoth.* 10:11–13; *Prob.* 85–88 (Philo described practical arrangements, including the transfer of daily wages to the group); *J.W.* 2:122; *A.J.* 18: 20. Pliny the Elder, *Naturalis historia* V, 73 argued that they have “no money.”

PART II: NEGATIVE APPRECIATION OF WEALTH IN THE
NEW TESTAMENT

My discussion of the early Christian sources is limited, for the sake of brevity, to Mark, Luke and James, as well as the communal property ownership in Acts. My intention is to survey the general ideas about wealth and consequently to uncover the major trends of the social ideology embedded in these passages. In the following discussion I will not engage in historical questions such as the original views of the historical Jesus and the development of the attitudes towards wealth in early Christianity. My concern here is the characteristics that are common to the different texts and the manner in which they form a general perception of wealth and cultural values.

In Favor of Poverty

In the Sermon on the Plain Jesus pronounced: “Blessed are you who are poor, for yours is the kingdom of God. Blessed are you who are hungry now, for you will be filled” (Luke 6:20–21). In comparison, he also professed his opposition to the wealthy: “woe to you who are rich, for you have received your consolation. Woe to you who are full now, for you will be hungry” (Luke 6:14–25; cf. *Gos. Thom.* 54).⁴⁰

Elsewhere Jesus taught: “do not worry about your life, what you will eat, or about your body, what you will wear. For life is more than food, and the body more than clothing... Do not keep striving for what you are to eat and what you are to drink, and do not keep worrying” (Luke 12:22–23, 29).

When Jesus sent the twelve apostles or the seventy-two wandering charismatics, he ordered them to take nothing for their journey except a staff—no bread, no bag, no money in their belts, but to wear sandals and not to put on two tunics (Mark 6:7–9; Luke 10:4–7).

In a similar vein, Jesus praised the poor woman who offered two small coins as a donation to the Temple (Mark 12:41–44//Luke 21:1–4).

⁴⁰ Stegemann, *Gospel of the Poor*, 27–28, characterized the poor not only as the blind and the lame (cf. Luke 4:8–19; 7:22; 14:13, 21) but also as sick, naked, hungry and, of course, destitute. Many scholars interpreted this as a messianic self-consciousness of the poor, hoping that the poor would be saved, which also includes an acknowledgement that the poor are beloved by God (Matt. 11:5; Luke 4:18–19). See, Stegemann, *Gospel of the Poor*, 22–23; Mealand, *Poverty and Expectation*, 63–65, 82, following Bultmann.

A similar approach is also manifested in the letter of James. Jas 1:10–12 prefers poverty to wealth, believing that wealth eventually vanishes (cf. also Jas 4:13).⁴¹

The Criticism of Wealth and Riches

The preference for the poor and poverty naturally leads to an attack on the wealthy. This approach is expressed in Jesus' famous aphorism: "how hard it is to enter the kingdom of God! It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for someone who is rich to enter the kingdom of God." (Mark 10:24–25; Luke 18:24–25). Here piety and religious discipline of the rich are called into question and the accumulation of wealth is defined as an obstacle to salvation. Renunciation of wealth is a condition of belonging to the pious.

In his parables, Jesus criticized in detail men of means, and spoke of the destitute as potentially more righteous than the rich and treated wealth unfavorably. The foremost examples are the parable of the rich fool (Luke 12:16–21), the parable of the rich man and Lazarus (Luke 16:19–31).⁴²

The idea that wealth and materialism lead one astray from the true worship of God and from moral behavior is expressed in another aphorism of Jesus: "No one can serve two masters. . . . You cannot serve God and *Mammon*" (Matt 6:24//Luke 16:13).⁴³

⁴¹ Certain scholars suggested that the Jerusalem Church designated itself as "the poor." This view was rejected by L.E. Keck, "The Poor among the Saints in the New Testament," *ZNW* 56 (1965): 100–129; *idem*, "The Poor among the Saints in Jewish Christianity and Qumran."

⁴² Mealand, *Poverty and Expectation*, 44–50 understood such parables as implying that in the new age God will reverse the good fortune of the prosperous. J.D. Crossan, *The Historical Jesus: A Life of a Mediterranean Jewish Peasant* (New York: HarperCollins, 1991), 268–292 interpreted the Jesus traditions of poverty and criticism of the rich as a sapiential kingdom of "here and now".

⁴³ See H.D. Betz, *The Sermon on the Mount, Including the Sermon on the Plain* (Matthew 5:3–7:27; Luke 6:20–49) (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995), 454–459. For moral corruption associated with money, see 1 Tim 6:10; Richard H. Hiers, "Friends by Unrighteous Mammon," *JAAR* 38 (1970): 30–36; P.W. Van der Horst, "Mammon," *Dictionary of Deities and Demons* (Leiden: Brill; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1999), 542–543, with bibliography. This idea is attested to in Qumranic and rabbinic teachings. See S. Safrai and D. Flusser, "The Slave of Two Masters," *Immanuel* 6 (1976): 30–33; repr. in D. Flusser, *Judaism and the Origins of Christianity* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1988) 169–172.

Hence, according to the gospels, “to live a life of luxury and affluence was incompatible with salvation.”⁴⁴

A systematic criticism of the rich and their treatment of the poor are expressed in the letter of James. Jas 2:2–4 demands that the poor be treated in the same manner as the rich. James reveals a strong socio-economic tension and clearly prefers the poor to the rich: “Has not God chosen the poor in the world to be rich in faith and to be heirs of the kingdom that he has promised to those who love him? But you have dishonoured the poor. Is it not the rich who oppress you? Is it not they who drag you into court? Is it not they who blaspheme the excellent name that was invoked over you?” (Jas 2:5–7). The rich are condemned: it is argued that their wealth will disappear, and they will be punished. They are accused of fraudulently withholding the wages of the labourers in their fields (Jas 5:1–4): “The wages of the labourers who mowed your fields, which you kept back by fraud” (Jas 5:4).

Therefore we can conclude that the perception that wealth corrupts is reflected by a number of independent early Christian traditions, including Mark, Luke (and possibly also Q), and the Epistle of James, as well as other texts that were not discussed here. Common to all is the resentment towards the rich due to their unjust behavior. This may have even prompted a certain idealization of poverty.⁴⁵

⁴⁴ Mealand, *Poverty and Expectation*, 48. In the present paper I do not attempt to provide a coherent explanation for this line of thinking, which deserves a broader discussion, but I believe that Crossan, *Historical Jesus*, 268–292 pointed in the right direction. In the same vein, W. Stegemann, “The Contextual Ethics of Jesus,” in *The Social Setting of Jesus and the Gospels* (ed. W. Stegemann, B.J. Malina and G. Theissen; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2002), 47 concluded that Jesus proclaimed the “reversal of the present (unjust) social relations” and “expected God to intervene soon in favor of the poor.”

⁴⁵ For communalism and the collection for the poor in the Jerusalem community as reactions against commercialism, see John D. Crossan, *The Birth Of Christianity* (New York: HarperCollins, 1998), 469–76. For the Epistle of James’s moral contrast between rich and poor as well as its egalitarian outlook, see Jas 1:9–11; 2:5–7; 5:1–3; L.T. Johnson, *The Letter of James* (AB 37A; New York: Doubleday, 1995), 82–83, 224. On Luke, see Esler, *Community and Gospel in Luke-Acts*, 164–200. For Q, see Luke 6:20b–21; 14:16–24; and compare John S. Kloppenborg Verbin, “Discursive Practices in the Sayings Gospel Q and the Quest of the Historical Jesus,” in *The Sayings Source Q and the Historical Jesus* (ed. A. Lindemann; Leuven: Peters, 2001), 179–86 with bibliography (also regarding Thomas). See also 1 Cor 1:27–29. For the reordering of possessions on behalf of the poor, see *Did.* 13:4–7; Crosby, *House of Disciples*, esp. 42–43, 205–8. Note, however, that such ideological assertions do not necessarily indicate the actual economic situation within these communities. In Luke’s community, for example, there were both rich and poor members; see Esler’s comment in *Community and Gospel*, 183.

Care for the Poor

Notwithstanding all these critical assertions about wealth and its accumulation, the gospel's actual affect on the lives of the poor remained quite limited. It seems that the attitudes of Jesus and his followers in favor of the poor served to justify a current situation rather than to elevate the material status of the poor or oppressed. It is a shift in a state of mind rather than an attempt to change social conditions.

However, sympathy for the poor and displeasure with the wealthy had significant practical implications on the life of the early Christians. From the very beginning of the Christian movement, members were called upon to help the poor and needy, both financially and spiritually.

John the Baptist ordered his followers: "Whoever has two coats must share with anyone who has none, and whoever has food must do likewise" (Luke 3:11). Jesus also ordered one of his followers: "Go, sell what you own, and give the money to the poor, and you will have treasure in heaven (Mark 10:21. cf. Luke 14:33; *Gos. Thom.* 63–65).

A similar attitude is attributed to Jesus in the parable about the creditor who cancelled a debt (Luke 7:41–43) and in Jesus' call to loan money to those who are incapable of paying back (Luke 6:34–35). Care for the poor may also be implied in the miracles in which Jesus fed a multitude of people (Mark 6:30–44; 8:1–10 and par.). Jesus also called upon his disciples to sell their possessions and give alms so as to get for themselves an unfailing treasure in heaven (Luke 12:33–35). Care for the poor and debt cancellation are also recommended in the parable of the dishonest manager (Luke 16:1–7).

Common Property Ownership

The most extreme act of renouncing wealth is undoubtedly the equal sharing of all goods by the community members. Common property ownership is mentioned only in Acts. In its very beginning, the Jerusalem community led by Peter practiced an economic communion. "All who believed were together and had all things in common. They would sell their possessions and goods and distribute them to all, as any had need. Day by day, as they spent much time together in the Temple, they broke bread at home (or: from house to house) and ate their food with glad and generous hearts" (Acts 2:44–46).

The manner in which the community shared its resources is further related in Acts 4:32–35 in detail: "the whole group of those who believed were of one heart and soul, and no one claimed private ownership of any

possessions, but everything they owned was held in common... There was not a needy person among them, for as many as owned lands or houses sold them and brought the proceeds of what was sold. They laid it at the apostles' feet, and it was distributed to each as any had need."⁴⁶ The text continues to describe how a rich person like Barnabas sold his field and gave the money to the apostles.

The motive for this community of goods is implied in Acts 6:1–3 in relation to the tension between the Hellenist and Hebrew members of the Jerusalem community.⁴⁷ It turns out that the community regulated the daily distribution of food for widows and the needy. Thus, the sharing of property aimed to help poor members and apparently also erase socio-economic differences among members. Here Jesus' blessing for the poor and his social criticism of accumulating wealth and of the impiety of the rich were realized, creating a new type of society.

The early Christian community of goods was also exceptional in its successful appeal for donations from the Hellenistic world, both Jews and gentiles, to the so-called Pauline collection. Paul's references to the collection's support open an interesting window to the self-conception of the community. Paul collected money from the Christian communities throughout the Greco-Roman world for "the poor ones" (Gal 2:10) or "holy ones" (I Cor 16:1–4; cf. II Cor 8:4) in Jerusalem. In Acts, Paul implicitly refers to the collection, calling it "alms to my nation" (Acts 24:17).⁴⁸

These donations probably had both religious and social motivations.⁴⁹ On one occasion Paul referred to the collection as creating a "balance" (*isotēs*) between those donating and those accepting the donations.⁵⁰

⁴⁶ For a defense of the historicity of these passages against the view that they derive from Luke's idealization, see S.S. Bartchy, "Community of Goods in Acts: Idealization or Social Reality?", in *The Future of Early Christianity: Essays in Honor of Helmut Koester* (ed. B.A. Pearson; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991), 309–318; B. Capper, "The Palestinian Cultural Context of Earliest Christian Community of Goods," in *The Book of Acts in its Palestinian Setting* (ed. R. Bauckham; Carlisle: Paternoster; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 323–356.

⁴⁷ Hengel, *Property and Riches*, 32–33 followed the view that this motivation stemmed from eschatological expectations of the coming Son of Man.

⁴⁸ For the historical development of the collection and the related vision of belief in Christ and the perception of the church, see Georgi, *Remembering the Poor*, 84–91.

⁴⁹ According to Stegemann, *Gospel of the Poor*, 53, the collection was supposed to assist the poor among the "saints" in Jerusalem (Rom 15:26) but was also an act of solidarity of the poor (*penētes*) with those even poorer (*ptōchoi*). This collection too was envisioned as a balance which creates a community (*koinōnia*).

⁵⁰ II Cor 8:13–14. Cf. Georgi, *Remembering the Poor*, 84–92.

This ideology of a certain socio-economic equality, I suggest, may also be applied to the very notion of the Jerusalem church's collection: establishing a community of goods on a large scale, with an international financial support network which served, in a certain sense, as an alternative to the socio-economic system in Jerusalem. Like a huge kibbutz in a capitalistic urban setting, the Christian community of goods challenges the never-ending tension between the rich and the poor. It appeals to the poor but also to those who seek social justice and social renewal. It is a community where human efforts are focused on piety and spirituality instead of materialism. It may be viewed as a full-fledged fulfillment of Jesus' call to worship God and denounce Mammon.

PART III: COMPARING QUMRANIC AND EARLY CHRISTIAN SOCIAL APPROACHES TOWARDS WEALTH

At first glance, the two movements appear to have had rather similar approaches. Both condemned the accumulation of wealth which led to impiety, criticised the wealthy, helped the poor, perhaps even regarded themselves (probably metaphorically) as "the poor", and under certain circumstances, enacted communal property ownership. Of course, the social circumstances behind their views are different, since, among other things, the scrolls represent the Hasmonean period whereas the gospels were written in the late first century C.E.

Historians tend to explain these views as a response to the social conditions which the Qumranites or the early Christians were facing.⁵¹ My approach is quite different. Without denying the role of real economic conditions in shaping ideas concerning property and poverty, I think that we should recognize that both corpora represent an ideology, a conceptualization of cultural traits that were not directly related to the actual economic status of the ancient writers. To demonstrate this assertion, I note that Barnabas, Ananias and Sapphira who joined Peter's community of goods were relatively rich. They were ready to give away their possessions in order to join a new religious movement. Similarly,

⁵¹ G. Theissen, *Sociology of Early Palestinian Christianity* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987), 34, 39–40, 46 proposed the background of members of an upper class whose position has been undermined. Mealand, *Poverty and Expectation*, esp. 38–40, 46, 87, discussed economic drives such as hunger, immigration and the Great Revolt. On p. 42 Mealand followed Weber and the relative deprivation theory in suggesting that the gospels express resentment of suffering and a hope for divine retribution.

William Penn, the Quaker leader, wrote a long treatise “Of luxury... and the mischief of it to mankind”, in his *No Cross No Crown*, calling for a life of simplicity and plainness, although he literally owned Pennsylvania (and many of the later Philadelphia Quakers were rich businessmen). I also think that it is improbable that Jesus, Mark, Luke and James all favored poverty and were critical of the rich simply because they suffered poverty or any other common social condition.

Instead of looking for the economic circumstances under which approaches to wealth and poverty originated, I prefer to analyse the social aims they were trying to fulfill.⁵² And here, I believe, lie several significant differences between the Qumran sects and the early Christian groups.

First of all, while the Pesharim and the *Damascus Document* condemn economic suppression carried out by specific figures, the Wicked Priest and the wealth of the “Men of the Pit”, hostility towards the rich in the gospels and James is rather general and less harsh. The rich is “the other”, who should be rebuked and delegitimized.

Second, the New Testament passages regarded wealth as an obstacle and encouraged the poor, foreseeing that they would be saved before the rich. However, in the *Community Rule* and the *Damascus Document* wealth serves as a concrete threat to the community, since it was conceptualised as transmitting moral impurity and evil forces. The problem in Qumran was not merely being rich (or being concerned with the material world), but having contact in any manner with the wealth of the outside world. Simply put, in the scrolls wealth is much more dangerous. It symbolised strict social and religious division between the righteous and the wicked.

Third, the *Community Rule* and the *Damascus Document* consisted of several strict laws that require separation from the wealth of outsiders. In the *yahad* the money of outsiders is taboo, and in the *Damascus Document* there are several restrictions and inspection mechanisms concerning commerce with non-members. The negative association with wealth directed the members’ daily life and was part of their social

⁵² See note 4 above. Even scholars who engage in reconstructing the economic situation that led to the early Christian treatment of poverty do not regard it as a direct reflection of experiencing poverty. According to Stegemann, *Gospel of the Poor*, 32–34, none of the later, urban, early Christian communities was destitute or comprised of actual beggars. Some beggars are referred to as outsiders; some are voluntarily poor (cf. Luke 6:20–31).

seclusion from the outside world. In the gospels and perhaps also in James there is no economic separation. The rich seem to be an integral part of the social system and this seems to be the reason why the juxtaposition of wealth and poverty is so common in the New Testament. The early Christians coped with the problem of social inequality and the relationship between the poor and the rich, while the *yaḥad* retreated from the social system and the *Damascus Document* limited social-economic encounters.

Indeed, it seems that the Jerusalem community of goods enhanced the boundary denouncing social inequality and the accumulation of wealth, although this was a notable exception in early Christianity. But unlike the *yaḥad*, the early Christian communion was very much concerned with the wealth of the outside society. The collection of donations from Hellenistic gentiles (and actually, the willingness to accept gentiles, “the ultimate others,”) implies that the Jerusalem community was much less segregated than the *yaḥad*.

CONCLUSIONS: QUMRANIC SECTARIANISM AND EARLY CHRISTIAN SOCIAL CRITICISM

While the Qumran sects and the early Christians were sensitive to similar flaws in society and were concerned with the same problems of wealth and poverty, they treated them in different ways. The Qumran sects typically handled wealth in black-and-white terms. They regarded money as defiling and its accumulation as an antithesis to the worship of God. They kept economic contacts with the outside world to a minimum (the *yaḥad*) or limited them following the inspection of the overseers (the *Damascus Document*). The early Christians did not limit contacts with the rich. They preferred preaching to self-exclusion. Their socio-economic discourse took place within the general society, and it was not solely addressed to the social margins. The Qumran sects detached themselves from the Jewish society, believing that the mishandling and perhaps also accumulation of wealth were reasons why society’s sinfulness should be abandoned.

Without repeating the social-scientific definitions of sectarianism and the different types of sectarianism detailed in my book,⁵³ I would

⁵³ Regev, *Sectarianism in Qumran: A Cross-Cultural Perspective*, 33–57.

like to conclude by maintaining that the Qumranic approach to wealth is sectarian *par-excellence*, whereas the early Christian one expressed social criticism but was not sectarian.⁵⁴ The Qumranic self-segregation is very different from the early Christian social-criticism, which at times also aimed to reform society from within.

I think that this comparison may also illustrate that when isolated passages that seem similar from a literary point of view are treated from a more conceptual and social perspective (namely, reconstructing the social ideology that connects several passages), the differences become bolder and more significant. But without having both corpora, a scholar would struggle to observe and discern their exact character. Indeed, this is a good methodological reason for us to study the Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament together. They are so similar but also so different.

⁵⁴ This conclusion does not accord with the common view that early Christianity was a sectarian movement. See, e.g., R. Scroggs, "The Earliest Christian Communities as Sectarian Movement," in *Christianity, Judaism, and Other Greco-Roman Cults* (ed. J. Neusner; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1975), Part 2, 1–23; J.H. Elliott, "The Jewish Messianic Movement: From Faction to Sect," in *Modelling Early Christianity: Social-Scientific Studies of the New Testament and Its Context* (ed. P.F. Esler; London and New York: Routledge, 1995), 75–95. In the future, I hope to explore the question of sectarianism in the New Testament.

FAMILY RELATIONSHIPS IN 4QINSTRUCTION
AND IN EPH 5:21–6:4¹

Jean-Sébastien Rey
Université de Metz

From the beginning of the 1960s, the connections between the texts of Qumran and the Epistle to the Ephesians have been highlighted by biblical scholars.² Indeed, a good number of expressions, stylistic elements and theological themes characteristic of Qumran's vocabulary are to be found in the Epistle.³ J. Murphy-O'Connor has even suggested that the author of the Epistle may have been a colleague of Paul who was influenced by Essene ideas.⁴ In considering the relationship between the literature of Qumran and the New Testament, I will concentrate on one text in particular: the family code (*Haustafeln*) of Eph 5:21–6:9.

Most scholars are of the view that the origins of family codes are to be found in Aristotle⁵ or Stoic morality⁶ via Judeo-Hellenistic

¹ I wish to thank Professor George J. Brooke for his valuable comments, Benjamin G. Wold for our fruitful discussions, and Jill Husser-Munro for her English translation.

² K.G. Kuhn, "Der Epheserbrief im Lichte des Qumrantexte," *NTS* 7 (1961): 334–346; J. Coppens, "Le 'mystère' dans la théologie paulinienne et ses parallèles Qumrâniens," in *Littérature et théologie pauliniennes* (ed. A. Descamps; Louvain: Desclée, 1960), 142–165; F. Mussner, "Contributions made by Qumran to the Understanding of the Epistle to the Ephesians," in *Paul and Qumran* (ed. J. Murphy-O'Connor; Melbourne: Priory Press, 1968), 159–178; P. Benoit, "Qumran and the New Testament," in *Paul and Qumran* (ed. J. Murphy-O'Connor; Melbourne: Priory Press, 1968), 1–30.

³ In addition to the articles of K.G. Kuhn and F. Mussner, a list of similarities is given in the introduction of most recent commentaries on the Epistle, see for example: J.-N. Aletti, *Saint Paul épître aux Éphésiens* (EBib 42; Paris: Gabalda, 2001), 34–37; M. Barth, *Ephesians 1–3* (AB 34; New York: Doubleday, 1986), 405–406; Chantal Reynier, *L'épître aux Ephésiens* (Commentaire biblique: Nouveau Testament 10; Paris: Cerf, 2004), 39.

⁴ J. Murphy-O'Connor, "Who Wrote Ephesians?" *Bible Today* 8 (1965): 1202.

⁵ *Politica* I 1253b–1255b; *Ethica nichomachea* VIII 1160a 23–1161a 10; V 1134b 9–18.

⁶ Seneca, *Epistolae morales* 94,1. The first comparisons with Aristotle and Stoic morality go back to M. Dibelius, *An die Kolosser, Epheser, an Philemon* (HNT 12; Tübingen: Mohr, 1912), and his disciple K. Weidinger, *Die Haustafeln. Ein Stück urchristlicher Paränese* (UNT 14; Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1928). See also K. Thraede, "Zum historischen Hintergrund der 'Haustafeln' des NT," in *Pietas, Festschrift B. Kötting* (ed. E. Dassmann and K. Suso Franck; JAC Erg. vol. 8; Münster: Aschendorff, 1980),

literature.⁷ However, despite the obvious similarities, scholars also agree that there are fundamental differences between the New Testament family codes and texts originating in the Hellenistic tradition. In particular, the texts' motivations differ. Some are essentially ethical, economic or political, while others are theological or Christological.

The publication of *4QInstruction*⁸ may shed new light on the family code of Eph 5:21–6:9 and on the controversial origins of this text. *4QInstruction* is a Wisdom text which most likely was written in the second century B.C. Originating in the Judaism of Palestine, it is close to the book of Sirach, both in language and content. Columns three and four of 4Q416 contain two pericopes on the relationships between parents and children, and husbands and wives. These merit comparison with Eph 5:21–6:4.

First, the author of *4QInstruction* comments on the fifth commandment of the Decalogue (4Q416 2 III 15–19). Then he writes at some length about the relationship between spouses (4Q416 2 III 20–IV 13). As in Eph 5:21–6:4, the author draws on two quotations from the Pentateuch to justify the order of family relationships: Deut 5:16 (Exod 20:12) and Gen 2:24.

The author of the Epistle to the Ephesians presents things the other way round: first comes the teaching about the relationship between husbands and wives in Eph 5:21–33, and then the teaching about parent-child relationships in 6:1–4. Most scholars agree that Eph 5:21–6:9 is dependent on the parallel text, Col 3:18–4:1. There are significant differences, however, between the two texts, differences which scholars

359–368; D.L. Balch, *Let Wives Be Submissive. The Domestic Code in I Peter* (SBLMS 26; Chico: Scholars Press, 1981).

⁷ Philo, *Hypothetica* 7,1–14; *De Decalogo* 165–167; *De posteritate Caini* 181; Flavius Josephus, *Contra Apionem* II 22–28 §§ 190–210; Pseudo-Phocylides, *Sententiae* 175–227. J.E. Crouch distances himself from the hypotheses of M. Dibelius and K. Weidinger by linking the family codes of the New Testament with Judeo-Hellenistic literature (J.E. Crouch, *The Origin and Intention of the Colossian Haustafeln* (FRLANT 109; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1972). K.H. Rengstorf and D. Schröder argue that the family codes are a purely Christian creation, but this hypothesis has not received the support of scholars (see K.H. Rengstorf, “Die neutestamentlichen Mahnungen und die Frau, sich dem Manne unterzuordnen,” in *Verbum dei manet in aeternum, Festschrift für O. Schmitz* (ed. W. Foerster; Witten: Luther-Verlag, 1953), 131–145; D. Schröder, *Die Haustafeln des Neuen Testament: ihre Herkunft und theologischer Sinn* (Ph.D. diss., Hamburg University, 1959).

⁸ J. Strugnell, D.J. Harrington, T. Elgin, *Qumran Cave 4 XXIV, Sapiential Texts, Part 2* (DJD XXXIV; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999). Then, in abridged form, in DJD XXXIV.

fail to justify either from New Testament sources or from sources in Hellenistic or Judeo-Hellenistic literature.

In this paper, I will follow the order of the pericopes in *4QInstruction*. I will begin, therefore, with the text about honouring one's parents in 4Q416 2 III 15–19 and in Eph 6:1–4. Then, I will consider the pericope about the relationship between husband and wife in 4Q416 2 III 19–IV 13 and in Eph 5:21–33. Finally, I will try to draw some conclusions from this comparative study.

HONOURING ONES' PARENTS IN 4Q416 2 III 15–19 AND EPH 6:1–4

1. 4Q416 2 III 15–19

Lines 15 to 19 of column three deal with the fifth commandment of the Decalogue. 4Q416 2 III 15–19 overlaps with 4Q418 9 + 9a–c 17–18 + 4Q418 10a–b 1–2 (underlined in the text).

15 תביט ואז תדע מה מר לאיש ומה מתוק לגבר^a כבוד^b אביכה ברישכה
 16 ואמכה במצעריכה כי כאב^a לאיש כן אביהו וכאדנים לגבר כן אמו כי
 17 המה כֹּזֵר הוֹרִיכָה וְכֹאשֶׁר הַמְשִׁילָמָה^a בכה ויצו על הרוח כן עובדם
 וכאשר
 18 גלה אוזנכה ברז נהיה כבדם למען כבודכה וב^b] הדר פניהמה
 19 למען חייכה וארוך ימיכה vacat ואם רש אתה כשהו []

15^a 4Q418 9 16 vacat | ^b 4Q418 9 17 כבד • 16^a 4Q418 9 17 כאל •
 17^a 4Q418 9 18 המשיל{כה}ם

15 (...) Honour⁹ your father in your poverty
 16 and your mother in your lowliness.¹⁰
 For as God¹¹ is to a human being, so is his father

⁹ Preferably read כבד with 4Q418 9 17 (cf. Exod 20:12; Deut 5:16; Sir 3:8^(A)) rather than כבוד with 4Q416 2 III 15, since the *Qal* imperative of כבד is unknown.

¹⁰ Strugnell and Harrington (DJD XXXIV) read במצעדיכה “in your steps”, in 4Q416 2 III 16 (as does A. Caquot, “Les textes de sagesse de Qoumrân (Aperçu préliminaire),” *RHPR* 76 (1996): 13–14, who translates: “Que l’honneur de ton père soit sur ta tête et l’honneur de ta mère sur tes pas”). However, the reading במצעריכה “in your lowliness”, is paleographically possible and is in keeping with 4Q418 9 17. This reading is therefore preferable, especially since the construction, based on parallelism, encourages the reader to understand מצער as a synonym for ברישכה: “Honour your father in your poverty and your mother in your lowliness”.

¹¹ 4Q416 2 III 16 reads כאב while 4Q418 9a–c 17 reads כאל. The second reading is preferable for three reasons: (1) כאב poses the problem of meaning unless it is a divine epithet. However, there is no equivalent to this name for God before the New Testament period. (2) The reading כאל makes sense and כאב can be explained as a

and as the Lord¹² is to a man, so is his mother.
 For 17 they are the crucible¹³ which taught you.¹⁴
 According to how he has given them dominion over you and how he
 ordered the spirit,¹⁵
 in this way serve them.¹⁶
 And according to how 18 he revealed to your ears the mystery of
 existence,¹⁷
 honour them for your glory's sake and for [your...]¹⁸
 Venerate their faces 19 for the sake of your life and the length of your
 days.
Vacat

Lines 15 to 19 are an independent unit, defined by a *vacat* between
 מתוק לגבר and כבד אביכה visible in 4Q418 9 16 and after “length of
 days” visible in 4Q416 2 III 19. The unity of the pericope is reinforced
 structurally by a quotation from Deut 5:16 at the beginning and the

scribal error induced by the אביהו which follows. (3) Finally, the reading כאל high-
 lights the parallel structure of the pericope (אל being parallel to באדנים, איש to גבר
 and אביהו to אמו).

¹² For אדונים as a name for God, cf. Mal 1:16 and the formula אדני האדנים in Deut
 10:17; Ps 136:9; 1Q19bis 2 5. I disagree with B.G. Wold, “Reconsidering an Aspect of
 the Title Kyrios in Light of Sapiential Fragment 4Q416 2 iii,” *ZNW* 95 (2004): 149–160,
 who sees the term as a name for angels.

¹³ For the image of the “crucible” or “furnace”, with respect to giving birth, compare
 with 1QH^a XI 9.11.13 (= III 8.10.12).

¹⁴ The term הוריקה (ou הורוכה) may come from the root הרה, “give birth” or from
 ירה “teach”. Two interpretations are therefore possible: (1) “for they are the crucible,
 they gave you birth (הוריקה)” (*Qal* participle of הרה), cf. Isa 33:11; Sir 3:7^{LXX} and Sir
 7:28^{LXX}; (2) or “for they are the crucible which taught you (הוריקה)” (third masc. sing.
hip'il of ירה) or finally “for, they are the crucible, they taught you (הורוכה)” (third
 masc. pl. *hip'il* of ירה).

¹⁵ Editors have read ויצר and translated “And fashioned (*thee*) according to the spirit”.
 There are two weaknesses in this reading: (1) for the space available, the letter *rêš* is too
 long and would touch the *ayin* of על; (2) there is no evidence of יצר accompanied by
 the preposition על. For palaeographical reasons, it is preferable to read ויצו. The verb
 צוה is often associated with the preposition על in the sense “to order someone” or “to
 order [something] as regards someone”. The phrase can therefore be understood thus:
 “and according to how he ordered the spirit” or “and according to how he ordered
 things concerning the spirit” (cf. CD XV 14 // 4Q266 8 I 5 // 4Q270 6 II 7).

¹⁶ The meaning of רוח in this context is not quite clear, especially since it is rarely
 used with the article (in 4QInstruction only 4Q418 34 2; 4Q418 172 2).

¹⁷ Same expression in 1Q26 1 4; 4Q416 2 III 18 // 4Q418 1a–b 1; 4Q418 184 2;
 4Q418 190 2.

¹⁸ This lacuna is sufficiently large to be able to restore two words. Editors suggest
 the following “and with [reverence] venerate their persons”. This restoration seems too
 short, unless there was a *vacat*. It would also be possible to restore a second noun,
 beginning with *bêt* (“Honour them for your glory's sake and for [your...and] venerate
 their face for the sake of your life and your...”)

end, forming an inclusion. To use a musical metaphor, lines 15 to 19 ornament the fifth commandment.

In poetic terms, the text is carefully constructed by a series of parallelisms:¹⁹

		בריִשְׁכָּה	אביכה	כבוד	.1
		במצעֲרִיכָה	ואמכה		
	כֵּן אַבְיָהוֹ	לְאִישׁ	כָּאֵב	כִּי	.2a
	כֵּן אִמּוֹ	לְגַבֵּר	וּכְאֲדָנִים		
		הַמָּה כֹּזֵר הוֹרִיכָה		כִּי	.2b
		וְיֵצֵא עַל הָרוּחַ	הַמְשִׁילָמָה בְּכֶה	וּכְאֲשֶׁר	.3
		כֵּן עוֹבְדִים			
		וּכְאֲשֶׁר גָּלָה	אוֹזֹנְכָה בְּרַז נְהִיָּה		
[לְמַעַן כְּבוֹדָכָה וּבִ]־	לְמַעַן חַיִּיכָה	וְאֲרוּךְ יְמִיכָה	כְּבֹדִם	
		הַדֶּרֶךְ פְּנִיָּה־מָה			

Honour your father in your poverty
 and your mother in your lowliness.
 For as God is to a human being, so is his father
 and as the Lord is to a man, so is his mother.
 For they are the crucible which taught you.
 According to how he has given them dominion over you and how he ordered
 in this way serve them. the spirit,
 And according to how he revealed to your ears the mystery of existence,
 honour them for your glory's sake and for [your...]
 Venerate their faces for the sake of your life and the length of your
 days.

The text is structured by three elements:

(1) The first element, introduced by an imperative, pronounces the injunction (“honour your father in your poverty and your mother in your lowliness”). The author draws on the text of Deut 5:16 (Exod 20:12) and add the motifs of poverty and lowliness, which are characteristic of *4QInstruction*.²⁰ As George J. Brooke has shown, this may be described as rewriting through expansion. The same technique is evident in 1QS II 2–4, which quotes and expands on each statement in Num 6:24–27.²¹

¹⁹ See E.D. Reymond, “The Poetry of 4Q416 2 iii 15–19,” *DSD* 13 (2006): 177–193.

²⁰ The term מצער, however is a *hapax* in *4QInstruction*.

²¹ Cf. G.J. Brooke, *Exegesis at Qumran. 4QFlorilegium in its Jewish Context* (JSOTSup 29; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1985), 295–301.

(2) The second element is constituted by two causal propositions introduced by **כִּי־א**, which explain the motives for the preceding imperative. According to the author, one should honour one's parents for two reasons: (a) because they are to their children what God is to a man; and (b) because parents have instructed their children or given them life.

(a) The first motive is based on the comparison between God's relationship with mankind and the relationship between parent-child.

כִּי כֹאֵל לְאִישׁ כֵּן אֲבִיהוֹ וְכֹאֲדָנִים לְגִבֹּר כֵּן אִמּוֹ

For as God is to a human being, so is his father
and as the Lord is to a man, so is his mother.

Now, if the image of God as father is well known in the Old Testament,²² it usually works the other way round; it is usually the father's relationship with his children which illustrates God's love for mankind.²³ Conversely, in *4QInstruction*, it is God's love for humanity which illustrates the parent's love for his child. It is because of this love, analogous to divine love, that children must honour their parents. An identical comparison is to be found in the Epistle to the Ephesians of the relationship between man and woman: the relationship between Christ and the Church is presented as a model for the relationship between husband and wife: "the husband is head of the wife as Christ is head of the Church" (Eph 5:23).

(b) The term **הוֹרִיכָה** makes the second motive ambiguous. The phrase **כִּי הִמָּה כוֹר הוֹרִיכָה** can be translated in two ways: either by honour them "because they are the crucible which taught you" or honour them "because they are the crucible, they gave you birth".²⁴ In the first instance, the motive is instruction, transmission by means of education. In the second, it is the transmission of life. Both interpretations are grammatically possible and neither can be excluded. The author plays on the polysemy of the term **הוֹרִיכָה** and brings together in one phrase two traditional motifs: the need to honour one's parents because

²² See, among others, Exod 4:22–23; Deut 1:31; 8:5; Mal 1:6; 3:17; Ps 103:13; Prov 3:12. To call God father is attested in Western Semitic societies: *'il'ib* or *'il'ab* in Ugarit, *DINGIR a-bi* in Akkadian (Mari), cf. K. van der Toorn, "Ilib and the 'God of the Father'," *UF* 25 (1993): 379–387; É. Puech, "The Canaanite Inscriptions of Lachish and Their Religious Background," *TA* 13 (1986): 13–25; É. Puech, "Dieu le Père dans les écrits péritestamentaires et les manuscrits de la mer morte," *RevQ* 20 (2001): 287–310.

²³ See for example Ps 103:13: "As a father pities his children, so YHWH pities those who fear him".

²⁴ Cf. *Supra*, note 14.

they give life—and in creating, act in the image of the creator—,²⁵ and because they hand on instruction.²⁶ Whichever translation is preferred, transmission is expressed in terms of a metaphor of suffering, the crucible. There is a striking parallel in 1QH^a XI 9,11,13 (= III 8,10,12) (see also Sir 7:27–28).

(3) The third element is constituted by two sentences introduced by **וכאשר**, “and according to how”, which give more details about the motives. The author reminds the reader that on the one hand, God has given parents dominion over their children, which is why it is the child’s duty to serve them. On the other hand, God has revealed to his disciple “the mystery of existence”, which is why he must honour and venerate his parents. In so doing, he will obtain glory and a happy and long life: “for your glory’s sake [...] of your life and the length of your days”. The concept underlying this promise is the traditional theory of earthly retribution, which assumes that the just man, who honours his parents will be rich and live to a good age (cf. 1 Chr 29:28; Job 42:16–17). This long-term goal is developed more fully in *4QInstruction* than in the Decalogue. In the former, the author adds the promise of glory, life and a fourth element lost in a lacuna. The two expressions “for your glory’s sake” and “for the sake of your life” may be the reformulation of the promise of happiness attested in Deut 5:16 or in the Greek versions of the Decalogue. Indeed, “for the sake of your life” is to be understood as “so that you might be happy” (cf. Deut 4:1; 30:6,16,19).

2. Eph 6:1–4

The pericope in Eph 6:1–4 about parent–child relationships is most likely inspired by Col 3:20–21, whose binary structure it retains: “Children,

²⁵ This idea is not unique in ancient Judaism, cf. Philo, *De Specialibus Legibus* II §§ 224–225: “I am at my fifth article about the honour due to parents. As I demonstrated in a commentary especially devoted to the subject, we are here at the very border between human and divine things. [225] Indeed, parents are midway between human and divine nature and participate in both: in human nature, obviously because they are born and have to die; in divine nature because they have procreated and brought non-being into being. Parents are to their children, I think, what God is to the world; as God gave existence to non existence, they too, imitating divine power as far as is humanly possible, bring immortality to our species.” (trans. Suzanne Daniel; Paris: Cerf, 1975); cf. also *Decal.* § 107.

²⁶ This idea appears several times in ancient Judaism (see Deut 4:10; Philo, *Spec.* II § 228, *b. Ber.* 28b; *b. Pesah.* 117a; *b. Qidd.* 30a; *b. Sanh.* 19b).

obey your parents” and “Fathers do not provoke your children.” The pericope is divided into two: verses 1 to 3 are addressed to children and verse 4 to fathers.

¹ Children, obey your parents [in the Lord]²⁷ for this is right

² *Honour your father and (your) mother,*

this is the first commandment with a promise

³ *that it may be well with you, and you may live long on the earth*

⁴ And you, fathers, do not provoke your children to anger,
but bring them up in discipline and instruction of the Lord.

Two elements in the text catch our attention: the quotation from the Decalogue and the presentation of parents in the role of instructors of their children.

2.1. *Motive and end: quotation from Deut 5:16 (Exod 20:12)*

The first imperative invites children (τὰ τέκνα)²⁸ to obey (ὑπακούετε)²⁹ their parents. This imperative is then backed up by the phrase “for this is right”. In Col 3:20³⁰ the justification given is rather different. According to most commentators, the term δίκαιον should be understood in

²⁷ The expression ἐν κυρίῳ is missing in a number of ancient texts and in certain patristic quotations (B D* F G it^{d,s} Marcion Clement Tertullian, Cyprian, Ambrosiaster). Since the two readings are justified, it is difficult to come to a decision (cf. E. Best, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Ephesians* (ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998), 564 and Bruce M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, ¹1994), 541; evaluated {C} by the committee).

²⁸ The term τέκνον gives no information as to the age of the children, but simply indicates the family relationship (cf. Matt 10:21; 21:28; Mark 2:5); consequently, the term can be used metaphorically to refer to people of any age (cf. Matt 3:9; 23:37; Mark 7:27; Luke 7:35). In Wisdom literature, it is also used to denote the disciple in relation to his teacher. In Sir 3:1, there is a telling parallel: ἐλεγμὸν πατρὸς ἀκούσατε, τέκνα, “Pay attention to the reprimand of your father, children” (according to the text restored by J. Ziegler, *Septuaginta vol. XII,2, Sapientia Iesu Filii Sirach* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1965)). The Syriac version of this verse, translated from the Hebrew original, is even more revealing: כִּנְיָא דִּמְ לִבְיָא דִּמְ לִבְיָא, “Therefore, son, listen to your parents”, note the plural לִבְיָא “fathers” to denote parents, as in Eph 6:4. In fact, in ancient Judaism, the fifth commandment is not intended exclusively for young children but for adults with aging parents. This is particularly clear in Sir 3:1–16 since the author insists on being helpful to one’s parents in their old age.

²⁹ Certain commentators note the distinction between submission (ὑποτάσσω) in Eph 5:21 and obedience (ὑπακούω) in Eph 6:1,5. For example, Aletti, *Éphésiens*, 269–270. Best disagrees; he claims that the term has not been chosen intentionally by the author but has been lifted directly from its source, Col 3:20 (*Ephesians*, 565: “no significance should be attached to AE’s change of verb”).

³⁰ τούτο γὰρ εὐάρεστόν ἐστιν ἐν κυρίῳ “for this pleases the Lord”. The object κατὰ πάντα which appears in Col 3:20 is absent in Eph 6:1.

moral terms, without any particular religious connotation.³¹ However, T. Moritz links the term to obedience to the law: whatever is just is in the law. Consequently, he links the formula “for this is right” to what follows and sees it as an introductory formula to the quotation from the Decalogue.³² If this is the case, τοῦτο is to be understood as proleptic and the quotation from Deut 5:16 (Exod 20:12) directly justifies the obedience due to one’s parents. This quotation from the Decalogue, absent from Col 3:20–21, has been met with astonishment by scholars. J.-N. Aletti comments, “Recourse to the fifth commandment of the Decalogue is surprising. Could Paul not have found more Christological reasons, on a par with those formulated for spouses?”³³ However, this quotation is perfectly appropriate when the text is set in the context of Palestinian Judaism: Sir 3:1–16 and 4Q416 2 III 15–1 also take the fifth commandment as the fundamental basis for the definition of the relationship between parents and children.

It is not easy to know whether the author cites the text in the Greek version of Exod 20:12 or of Deut 5:16. Most scholars opt for Exod 20:12.³⁴ They rely on A.T. Lincoln’s³⁵ interpretation, even though his arguments are weak and few in number.³⁶ Moreover, there is variant from the LXX

³¹ Cf. Epictetus, *Dissertationes* 1,22,1: τίς δ’ ἡμῶν οὐ τίθησιν ὅτι τὸ δίκαιον καλὸν ἐστὶ καὶ πρέπον “Who among us does not accept that what just is fine and fitting”, see also 2,17,6.

³² T. Moritz, *A Profound Mystery: The Use of the Old Testament in Ephesians* (NovTSup 85; Leiden: Brill, 1996), 171–172. He refers in this case to *Ant.* I, 158; VI, 165; VIII, 208; *C. Ap.* II, 293.

³³ Aletti, *Éphésiens*, 295. Reynier makes a similar comment in *Éphésiens*, 186: “The author then introduces a quotation, that of Exod 20:12 (LXX), parallel to or inspired by Deut 5:16 (LXX). This is all the more surprising since he rarely uses quotations to argue a case”. Reynier’s comment is also surprising because the author of the Epistle has just quoted Gen 2:24 in Eph 5:31.

³⁴ Thus, for example, A.T. Lincoln, “The Use of OT in Ephesians,” *JSNT* 14 (1982): 16–57; Best, *Ephesians*, 565–566; Moritz, *A Profound Mystery*, 154–155; E.E. Ellis, in *Paul’s Use of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1957), 152, 185, argued the very opposite.

³⁵ Lincoln, “The Use of OT in Ephesians”, 37.

³⁶ Two arguments support the theory that the quotation is from Exod 20:12 rather than Deut 5:16: (1) the absence of the pronoun σου after μητέρα. This cannot be the determining factor since pronouns often fluctuate in manuscript tradition (*Vaticanus cor.* Quoted by A. Rahlfs and H.B. Swete) and in quotations of the fifth commandment (cf. for example Matt 15:14; 19:19; Philo, *Spec.* II, 261; *Det.* 52 which have no pronouns); see also the different accounts in Mark 10:19 and Luke 18:20), especially since the omission of personal pronouns seems to be characteristic of the author, cf. the quotation of Gen 2:24 in Eph 5:31, like 5:25, 33; (2) the absence of the phrase ὄν τρόπον ἐνετείλατό σοι κύριος ὁ θεός σου present only in Deut 5:16; there again the

in the text, namely the shift from ἵνα... γένη to ἔσῃ, which is attested neither in the Greek version of Exodus nor in that of Deuteronomy.³⁷ While it is difficult to come to a firm conclusion, it may be noted that (1) the phrase “so that it may be well with you” links the formula to the Hebrew text of Deut 5:16 in the Masoretic version; (2) the insertion of the formula “this is the first commandment with a promise”³⁸ after μητέρα reminds us of the structure of Deut 5:16, which also includes a commentary at this point; (3) finally, the Jewish authors of the Second Temple prefer to quote the text of the Decalogue from the version in Deuteronomy rather than from the version in Exodus. This preference is evident in the harmonization of versions and ancient copies on the text of Deut 5:16.³⁹ The same is true of Sir 3:1–16 and *4QInstruction*, which both seem to refer to the tradition of Deuteronomy rather than that of Exodus. Each integrates the promise of happiness, without depending on the Septuagint. This being so, whichever text is cited, it should be noted that the author of the Epistle to the Ephesians, like that of 4Q416 2 III 15–16, curtails the quotation from Exod 20:12 by omitting the promise of the land (“in the land which the Lord your God gives you”).⁴⁰ The perspective of both authors is no longer bound by the importance of the promise of the land. The significance of the promise is universal; it is no longer limited to happiness and long life in the land of Israel, but is a promise that can be realised anywhere.

2.2. *Parents as educators*

The first imperative in v. 4, concerning fathers,⁴¹ is taken up in Col 3:21 (“Fathers, do not provoke your children, lest they become

argument is weak, since the quotation is adapted to the context and there is no longer any real need for such a phrase.

³⁷ Several textual testimonies and quotations from Exod 20:12 confirm the existence of such a lesson, J.W. Wevers, *Septuaginta, II,1, Exodus*, (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991).

³⁸ This complement to the commandment has given rise to numerous interpretations. The most obvious is that Exod 20:12 is indeed the first commandment accompanied by a promise, since Exod 20:6 does not qualify as a promise (cf. Aletti, *Éphésiens*, 295).

³⁹ See, for example, the LXX of Exod 20:12, Papyrus Nash, the phylacteries at Qumran all contain the text of the Decalogue in the version found in Deuteronomy. 4Q158 7–8 uses the Decalogue from Exodus but quotes a version close to that of Deuteronomy.

⁴⁰ The same is true of Sir 3:1–16.

⁴¹ Aletti, *Éphésiens*, 295, notes that the noun πατέρες can refer to the father or to the two parents (as in Heb 11:23), but since the author uses γονεὺς in v. 1, it is probable that here he addresses fathers only. It should be noted that there is no equivalent to

discouraged”).⁴² The author of the Epistle counters the negative tone of this injunction by adding a more positive element, related to instruction and upbringing, “but bring them up in the discipline and instruction of the Lord”.

The verb ἐκτρέφω⁴³ is qualified by two nouns παιδεία and νοουθεσία. The difference in meaning between the two terms is not entirely clear.⁴⁴ If παιδεία is rare in the NT (Eph 6:4; 2 Tim 3:16; Heb 12:5.7.8.11), it is often used in the Septuagint, particularly in Wisdom literature, where it means “instruction” in the broad sense of the term (it generally translates the Hebrew מוֹסֵר). It is often associated with wisdom⁴⁵ and can, in some cases, designate corporal punishment. νοουθεσία only appears three times in the NT, where it refers to the transmission of knowledge (1 Cor 10:11; Eph 6:4 and Titus 3:10). It only appears once in the Septuagint, in Wis 16:6, as a “warning” or “caution” to children.⁴⁶ As for the genitive κυρίου, it qualifies both παιδεία and νοουθεσία and may indicate either the origin of instruction, “instruction comes from the Lord”, or qualify it, “instruction concerning the Lord”. Whichever option is preferred, the instruction here clearly is religious in character. Parents have the duty to transmit to their children teaching concerning the Lord. This same idea is expressed in 4Q416 2 III 17 by means of the term הוֹרֵי כִּה and the theme of the “mystery of existence” strangely present in the text.

3. Conclusion

Comparison of the texts shows that if Eph 6:1–4 depends on Col 3:20–21, the differences between the two texts are to be found in 4Q416 2 III 15–19. The most striking parallel is the quotation of Deut 5:16 (Exod 20:12) at the heart of the family code. 4QInstruction and Eph 6:1–4 quote the same text and both abridge it by omitting mention of

γονεύς in either Hebrew or Aramaic. To designate parents, either “fathers” or “fathers and mothers” is used.

⁴² The shift from ἐρεθίζω (Col 3:21) to παροργίζω (Eph 6:4) is difficult to explain (cf. Best, *Ephesians*, 568).

⁴³ ἐκτρέφω only appears twice in the New Testament in Eph 5:29 and Eph 6:4. It can mean “feed” or “bring up” (27 instances in LXX).

⁴⁴ They also appear together in Philo in a commentary on the fifth commandment (*Spec.* II.239; IV.96).

⁴⁵ See for example: Sir 1:27; 4:24; 6:18.

⁴⁶ Like παιδεία, the term can sometimes denote corporal punishment, cf. Josephus, *Ant.* III,311–312.

“the land which God gives you.” Finally, both texts mention the duty of parents to instruct their children in heavenly things.

The text of *4QInstruction* goes further than the text of the Epistle to the Ephesians in developing the theological dimension of the commandment, since it establishes an analogy between the parent-child relationship and the relationship between God-man. However, as we have seen, this analogy is to be found in the Epistle to the Ephesians a few verses earlier, where the husband-wife relationship is likened to the relationship between Christ-Church (Eph 5:21–33). This will be the subject of the following analysis.

THE HUSBAND-WIFE RELATIONSHIP IN 4Q416 2 III 20–IV 13
AND IN EPH 5:21–33

4QInstruction and the Epistle to the Ephesians both develop the theme of the relationship between husband and wife. In *4QInstruction*, it follows the pericope about parents, but in the Epistle to the Ephesians, it precedes it. I will first present the text in *4QInstruction*, then in Eph 5:21–33.

1. 4Q416 2 III 20–IV 13

This pericope immediately follows the pericope about parents⁴⁷ and partly overlaps with 4Q418 10 5–10 (underlined in the text)

[]	למען חייכה וארוך ימיכה vacat ואם רש אתה כשהו	19
[]	בלוא חוק vacat אשה לקחתה ברישכה קח מולדין	20
		מרו נהיה בהתחברכה יחד התהלך עם עזר בשרכה [ככתוב על כן	21
		יטוב איש]	
		<i>bottom margin</i>	
		את אביו [ו]את אמו זרבו [ק באשתו והיו לבשר אחד]	1
		אותכה ^a המשיל בה ותש [מע בקולכה	2
		לא המשיל בה מאמה הפרידה ואליכה [תשוקתה ותהיה]	3
		לך לבשר אחד בתכה לאחר יפריד ובניכה]	4
		ואתה ליחד עם אשת חיקכה כי ^b היא שאר ער [ותכה]	5
		ואשר ימשול בה זולתכה הסיג גבול חייהו ב [רוחה]	6

⁴⁷ The end of line 19 and beginning of line 20 are difficult to reconstruct. Does the pericope on the relationship between man and woman begin in the *vacat* of line 19 or in the *vacat* of line 20? It is probable that lines 19–20 marked the transition between two pericopes.

[הַמְשִׁילֶךְ לְהַתְּלֵךְ בְּרִצּוֹנְכָה וְלֹא לְהוֹסִיף נָדָר וְנִדְבָ[ה]	7
[הַשֵּׁב רוּחְכָה לְרִצּוֹנְכָה וְכָל שְׁבוּעַת אִסְרָה לְנִדְוֹ נִדְוֹ[ר]	8
[הַפֵּר עַל מוֹצֵא פִיכָה וּבְרִצּוֹנְכָה הַנִּיא[ה]	9
[שְׁפַתִּיכָה סֹלַח לָהּ לְמַעַנְכָה אֶל תִּרְבֵּ[]	10
[כְּבוֹדְכָה בְּנַחֲלָתְכָה]	11
[בְּנַחֲלָתְכָה פִּן vacat]	12
[אִשְׁתְּ חִיקְכָה וְחִרְפֵּ[]	13
[ל[]	14

2^a 4Q418 10 5 וְאוֹתְכָה • 5^a 4Q418 10 7 כִּיא

Vacat And if you are poor, like he who [...] ⁴⁸

20 without decree. *vacat* You have taken a wife in your poverty, take her (the/your) offspring⁴⁹

[for fear that you depart]⁵⁰ **21** from the mystery of existence.

When you are united, together (cf. Gen 2:24),

Walk with the help of your flesh (Gen 2:18)

[for it is written:

“Therefore a man leaves”⁵¹ **1** his father [and] his mother and clea[ves to his wife

and they will become one flesh” (Gen 2:24)].

2 He has given you dominion over her (Gen 3:16)

and she will [obey your voice...⁵²

To her father⁵³] **3** he has not given dominion over her.

From her mother, he has separated her (Gen 2:24)

And towards you [shall be her desire (Gen 3:16)

And she will become] **4** for you one flesh (Gen 2:24).

He will separate your daughter for another (Gen 2:24),

and your sons [will rule over their wives (?)]

⁴⁸ For the problems posed by this lacuna, see DJD XXXIV, 122–123.

⁴⁹ Read מוֹלְדָה or מוֹלְדִיה. “Take her offspring,” or “welcome her family” (cf. 4Q415 II 11). The formulation may refer to the father’s recognition of his children’s legitimacy (see A. Tosato, *Il matrimonio israelitico. Una teoria generale* (AnBib 100; Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1982), 167 and R. de Vaux, *Les institutions de l’Ancien Testament. Vol. I. Le nomadisme et ses survivances, institutions familiales, institutions civiles* (Paris: Cerf, 1958), 89–91).

⁵⁰ On the basis of מִן in line 21, the following reconstruction is proposed “for fear that you turn aside (פִּן תִּסוֹר) from the mystery of existence” (cf. Deut 17:11; 28:14; Josh 1:7).

⁵¹ The change from the second person to the third person singular indicates that Gen 2:24 is quoted here. An introductory formula such as כִּאֲשֶׁר אָמַר or כְּכַתּוּב may have been found in the lacuna.

⁵² We agree with the editors, DJD XXXIV, 127, who propose the following reconstruction: וְתִשְׁמַע בְּקוֹלְכָה “and she will obey your voice.”

⁵³ The reconstruction “his father” proposed by the editors, although found nowhere else, offers a coherent parallel with the following stich.

5 And you, you will be one with the wife of your bosom⁵⁴ (cf. Gen 2:24; Deut 13:7),
 for she is the flesh of [your] *na[kedness]* (Gen 2:21–25).
 6 And whoever seeks to have dominion over her, apart from you (Gen 3:16),
 will displace the boundary of his life.
 Over [her spirit] 7 he has given you dominion
 So that she might walk according to your will.
 So as not to let her continue to make vows and voluntary offer[ings,]
 8 bring her spirit back to your will
 and any oath or commitment which she has made,
 9 cancel-(it) by whatever leaves your mouth
 and according to your will, disclaim [her] (cf. Num 30:7–9).

The author structures his argument around three texts from the Pentateuch: two taken from the second creation narrative (Gen 2:18, 24 and 3:16) and one from the book of Numbers (Num 30:7–9). Lines 21 to 7 multiply references to the second creation narrative, while lines 7 to 9 comment on Num 30:7–9. Only the first part parallels Eph 5:2–33. Three ideas developed by the author will be considered here: the unity of the couple, woman as man’s “flesh,” and man’s dominion over woman.

1.1. *Theme of unity*

The author strongly insists on the unity of the couple. The idea is expressed four times: “when you are united, together (בהתחברכה) (יחד)” (line 21); “they will become one flesh ([והיו לבשר אחד]), (line 1)”;
 “and she will become] for you one flesh (ותהיה [לך לבשר אחד]),” (lines 3–4); “And you, you will be one with the wife of your bosom, for she is the flesh of [your] *na[kedness]* (ואתה ליחד עם אשת חיקכה) (כי היא שאר ער[ותכה])” (l. 5).

The formula “when you are united, together (בהתחברכה יחד)” at the end of line 21, should not be understood in sexual terms⁵⁵ but as an expression of marital union more generally. Indeed, the *hitpa’el* of חבר never describes carnal union, but means “to establish an alliance with someone” or “to associate with someone”. It is therefore used to designate marriage in Sir 7:25^[A] and in Mal 2:14.⁵⁶ In bringing together

⁵⁴ The expression אשת חיקכה “the wife of your bosom” is found in Deut 13:7; 28:54,56 and in Sir 9:1^[A].

⁵⁵ Despite the editors who insist that the expression has a sexual connotation (DJD XXXIV, 123).

⁵⁶ Sir 7:25^[A]: הוצא בת ויצא עסק ואל נבון גבר חברה “Send away your daughter and your worry will disappear, marry her to an intelligent man”; Mal 2,14: והיא חברה: והיא חברה.

יחד and חבר, the author highlights the unity which must characterize the couple's life together: they are "one".

On two occasions, the author uses the phrase "they will become one flesh" (והיו לבשר אחד) taken from Gen 2:24. This text is never quoted in the Old Testament, nor in the literature of Qumran.⁵⁷ Maurice Gilbert has shown that in Gen 2:24, the expression describes marital union in its fullness: "that is to say, the commitment, founded on faithfulness and love, of man and woman, a commitment which links them more deeply than any other contract between human beings and which binds them to each other with every fibre of their being, even more strongly than the bonds of filiation".⁵⁸ It is this same interpretation which is given in Mal 2:14–15, Tob 8:7 and in Sir 25:26^[LXX, Syr]. It is, generally speaking, in these terms that the author of 4QInstruction understood marital union also. The sexual interpretation of the expression only appears later in post-biblical Judaism.⁵⁹ It is however implied by Paul in 1 Cor 6:16, who quotes the phrase from Gen 2:24, "they will be one flesh," to describe the carnal act committed with the prostitute.⁶⁰ On the contrary, in Eph 5:31, as in 4QInstruction, the expression does not describe the carnal act but rather the unity of the couple in a broader sense.

1.2. Woman, man's flesh

In line 5, the author mentions that woman is man's flesh, "and you, you will be one with the wife of your bosom, for she is the flesh of [your] na[kedness] (ותכה) ער" (לִיחַד עִם אִשְׁתְּ חִיקְכָה כִּי הִיא שֶׁאֵר שֶׁאֵר)”. This original interpretation deserves special attention because it is found in Eph 5:21–30. Despite the ambiguous form לִיחַד,⁶¹ the sense is clear: man

⁵⁷ ואִשְׁתְּ בְרִיתְךָ, "She is your companion and the wife of your union" (cf. also Prov 21:9 and 25:24).

⁵⁷ Certain late authors allude to this (Mal 2:14–15; Tob 8:7; Sir 25:26^[LXX, Syr]).

⁵⁸ M. Gilbert, "Une seule chair (Gn 2,24)," *NRT* 100 (1978): 88.

⁵⁹ *b. Yebam.* 63a, *y. Qidd.* I,1, *b. Sanh.* 57b–58b, Philo, *De opificio mundi*, 151–152, *Quaestiones et solutiones in Genesisim* 1,29. The Targums seem to imply this since they translate "he will leave the house of his father" by "he will leave the bed of his father".

⁶⁰ In the New Testament, Gen 2:24 is quoted four times: in Matt 19:5; Mark 10:7; 1 Cor 6:16; Eph 5:31. In Matt 19:5 and in Mark 10:7, the quotation from Genesis is used to justify the indissolubility of marriage (except in the case of πορνεία in Matt).

⁶¹ The construction לִיחַד is difficult to interpret. It is only found in late Hebrew: once in the biblical corpus in 1 Chr 12:18 and 32 times at Qumran (essentially in 1QS and parallel). As the editors note (DJD XXXIV, 128), it is possible to read: (a) either a name, לִיחַד עִם (s.e. ואתה (תהיה) "and you (will form) a community with..."; (b) or an adverb, "you will be together with...", cf. 1QM XII 4, 1QH^a XIV 16 (= VI 13), but

must be united or form a community with his wife. Justification for this unity lies in the fact that woman is “the flesh of man’s nakedness.” Editors suggest that the text be restored as follows: שאר ערֹותכה. This expression, which has no equivalent in Hebrew literature, is thought to be a variant of the formula שאר בשרו, found in biblical Hebrew and in Qumran and which designates blood or family ties (Lev 18:6; 25:49; CD VII 1 // 6Q15 4 4; VIII 6; XIX 19 // 4Q266 3 IV 4 // 4Q269 6 2; 4Q387 A 2; 4Q477 2 II 8). In the context of the creation narrative, it is surprising to find שאר rather than בשר here. Nevertheless, the text seems to refer to the original unity of man and woman; since woman was taken from his flesh, she becomes “flesh of his flesh” (cf. Gen 2:21–25). For the author, the conjugal union expressed in Gen 2:24 is the logical consequence of Gen 2:23 (“this at last is bone of my bones and flesh of my flesh”). For him, the unity of the couple restores the original unity of man and woman, since woman is taken from man’s flesh.

1.3. *The motif of domination*

To define the relationship between husband and wife, the author of *4QInstruction* brings together two quotations from the creation narrative of Gen 2–3: Gen 2:24 to illustrate marital union and Gen 3:16 to justify the husband’s rule over his wife. The author insists on this motif, repeating it four times:⁶² “He has given you dominion over her” (line 1); “To her father] he has not given dominion over her” (line 2); “And whoever seeks to have dominion over her, apart from you, will displace the boundary of his life” (line 6); “Over her spirit, he has given you dominion” (lines 6–7). The *hip’il* of מִשַׁל is rare and seems to be a linguistic characteristic of *4QInstruction*.⁶³ Its form underlines the divine character of this order of things: it is God who gives man the right to rule over woman, and this, as a consequence of the fall in Gen 3: “To

if this is the case, it is difficult to explain the preposition *lamed*; (c) either, and most likely, it is the *nip’al* infinitive of the verb חָדַד written phonetically (לְחַדֵּד in place of לְחַדֵּד) or the *piel* infinitive, which is more rare. A similar written form is found in 1QS III 7 (// 4Q257 3 10) and perhaps in 4Q418 172 3. We should therefore translate as follows: “and you, you have been one with...” or “and you, you must be one with...” (for the nuance of the imperative of the infinitive with *lamed* in late Hebrew, see E. Qimron, *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (HSS 29; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986), § 400.02 and P. Joüon, § 124l).

⁶² The insistence of the author is all the more marked in that the idea is also expressed in another fragment of the scroll (4Q415 9).

⁶³ In biblical Hebrew, the *hip’il* of מִשַׁל is found four times (Job 25:2; Ps 8:7; Isa 46:5; Dan 11:39) and four times in Sirach (Sir 30:11a^[B]; 30:28b^[E]; 45:17b^[B]; 47:19b^[B]). At Qumran, it appears 32 times, of which 18 are in *4QInstruction*.

the woman, he said: I will greatly multiply your pain in childbearing; in pain you shall bring forth children. Yet your desire will be for your husband, and he shall rule over you (וְהוּא יִמְשָׁל בָּךְ) (Gen 3:16). The author's insistence on man's domination of woman is reinforced by the paraphrase of Num 30:7–9 in lines 6 to 9. The author diverges from his source in several respects: (a) he changes the casuistic law in the third person singular into an apodictic commandment in the second person singular; (b) he makes the text of Num 30 more radical by eliminating any exceptional circumstances: the husband must override the wishes of his wife, whatever they be.⁶⁴ Together these elements give us some idea of the situation of women within the family in Palestine in the second century B.C.⁶⁵ It should be noted that in the previous pericope, parents dominate their children (4Q416 2 III 17). After marriage, the father does not rule over his daughter. Rather, he ceases to rule over her. Through marriage, domination passes from the father to the husband.

2. Eph 5:22–33

In the Epistle to the Ephesians, unlike *4QInstruction*, the recommendations to husbands and wives precede those addressed to parent and child. The text can be divided in two parts: verses 22 to 24 concern the woman, while verses 25 to 32 concern the man. Verse 33 concludes the pericope as a whole, which considers following relationships: Christ—Church and man—woman.

Be subject to one another out of the fear of Christ,

²² Wives, unto your husbands
as unto the Lord.

²³ For the husband is head of (his) wife,
as Christ also is head of the Church, being himself the saviour of
the body.

²⁴ But as the Church is subject to Christ,
so let wives be also, in everything, to (their) husbands.

²⁵ Husbands, love your wives,

⁶⁴ The same rereading of Num 30 is to be found in CD XVI 10–12 and in 11QT LIV 2–3, though in more moderate terms.

⁶⁵ 4Q415 11 6–10 gives further information about the marriage of the daughter. Marriage terms are akin to a financial transaction (cf. also 4Q267 7 12–14 // 4Q269 9 1–8 // 4Q270 5 14–15 // 4Q271 3 8–9). The situation of women in society in the ancient world was not uniform and varied much according to region and social class. It is probable that the women in Asia Minor fared less well than their counterparts in the Greco Roman world or within Judaism, cf. Best, *Ephesians*, 532–533.

even as Christ also loved the church, and gave himself up for it;
²⁶ that he might sanctify it, having cleansed it by the washing of
 water with the word,
²⁷ that he might present the Church to himself a glorious Church,
 not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing;
 but that it should be holy and without blemish.
²⁸ Even so ought husbands [also] to love their own wives
 as their own bodies.

He that loves his own wife loves himself:
²⁹ for no man ever hated his own flesh;
 but nourishes and cherishes it,
 even as Christ also the Church;
³⁰ because we are members of his body.

³¹ For this cause:
 shall a man leave [his] father and [his] mother
 and shall cleave to his wife,
 and the two shall become one flesh.

³² This mystery is great
 I speak of Christ and of the church.

However, each one of you:
 Let each of you love his wife as himself,
 and let the wife see that she fears her husband.⁶⁶

Since this excerpt from the Epistle to the Ephesians raises many problems of interpretation, in this article I will only discuss those elements that relate to the text of *4QInstruction*, that is, man's domination of woman, a husband's love for his wife, and woman as flesh of man according to Gen 2:24.

2.1. *The motif of domination*

Three elements in the text underline man's domination of woman: use of the verb ὑποτάσσω in verses 21 and 24, the description of man as "head of woman" (κεφαλή τῆς γυναικός) in verse 23 and the fear (φοβέομαι) in which woman must hold her husband at the conclusion of the pericope (v. 33).

⁶⁶ Translation based on RSV with some modifications.

a) ὑποτάσσω

Since v. 22 does not possess a verb, the participle ὑποτασσόμενοι of verse 21 is understood.⁶⁷ The position of v. 21 is not clear and makes delimitation of the pericope ambiguous. For E. Best, the passage begins in v. 22, because of the succession of participles which depend on the imperative in v. 18b and the collective character of v. 21.⁶⁸ Gregory W. Dawes however, puts forward a convincing argument for beginning the pericope in v. 21.⁶⁹ Indeed, in terms of syntax, v. 22 is linked to v. 21 and is incomprehensible without it;⁷⁰ the participle ὑποτασσόμενοι must be read as an imperative (cf. 4:2.25), unlike the preceding participles which depend on the imperative in v. 18b; moreover, v. 20 displays some of the characteristics of a conclusion: “giving thanks to God in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ”; furthermore, in the parallel text, the Epistle to the Colossians, the demarcation is clear: Col 3:17, which parallels Eph 5:20, marks the end of a pericope and in Col 3:18, the verb ὑποτάσσω belongs to the pericope concerning the relationship between husbands and wives (αἱ γυναῖκες ὑποτάσσεσθε τοῖς ἀνδράσιν); finally, there is the inclusion formed by φόβος in v. 21 and φοβέω in v. 33. Whichever structure is preferred, it is clear that v. 21 is a turning point; it concludes the series of participles dependant on the imperative in v. 18b and opens the pericope about wives and husbands. If the Christian ethic is to submit to one another (vv. 15–21), paradoxically, this applies more especially to women in relation to their husbands.

⁶⁷ Verse 22 is syntactically linked to v. 21 which itself is linked to the verses which precede it by a series of participles dependant on the imperative in v. 18 (“be filled with the Spirit, addressing one another (...) in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs (...), singing and making melody to the Lord (...), giving thanks in the name of the Lord (...), being subject one to another, out of fear of God, wives to your own husbands, as to the Lord”). Verse 21 thus plays a key role and establishes a link between Christians submitting to one another and wives submitting to their husbands (cf. Aletti, *Éphésiens*, 269, n. 9).

⁶⁸ Best, *Ephesians*, 517; M. Barth, *Ephesians 4–6* (AB 34; New York: Doubleday, 1986), like NA²⁷ make the break before v. 21; Aletti does not come to a decision on this.

⁶⁹ G.W. Dawes, *The Body in Question: Metaphor and Meaning in the Interpretation of Ephesians 5:21–33* (Biblical Interpretation Series 30; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 18–21.

⁷⁰ Unless one accepts the textual reading which picks up the verb ὑποτάσσω in v. 22 (ὑποτάσσεσθε or ὑποτασσεσθήσαν, either after γυναῖκες, or after ἀνδράσιν). Most reject this (cf. Best, *Ephesians*, 531; the committee attributes note {B} to the short text, see Metzger, *A Textual Commentary*, 541). The long text can be explained easily as a clarification of the text or a harmonisation based on Col 3:18.

The next question is how to understand the verb ὑποτάσσω. This verb is frequently used in the Epistles of the New Testament. According to J.-N. Aletti, it refers to submission. This “consists in recognizing the superior status of another, and in acting in accordance with one’s inferior status, as determined by the rules effective within the social group to which one belongs: family, army, town, state, Church etc.”⁷¹ In Eph 5:21, it does not seem to be a synonym for ὑπακούω (as in 1 Pet 3:5–6),⁷² the term used in 6:1.5 for the attitude of children and slaves. Rather, it is the social status of women which is defined here, not simply obedience. The same idea underlies the *hip’il* of *לשמ* in *4QInstruction*. However, an important difference should be noted. In 4Q416 2 III–IV, it is man who dominates woman, while in Eph 5:22, woman is invited to submit to her husband. The difference in expression is significant; for the author of the Epistle to the Ephesians, woman has decision-making authority.⁷³

b) Social status is illustrated by use of the term κεφαλή in v. 23. The term has a fairly broad meaning in the New Testament:⁷⁴ literally, it refers to the head as part of the physical body; metaphorically it denotes authority, the top, source or origin of something. “Source” or “origin” seem unlikely in this context.⁷⁵ “Head”, in the sense of “representa-

⁷¹ Aletti, *Éphésiens*, 270. See also E. Kamlah, “Υποτάσσεσθαι in den neutestamentlichen ‘Haustafeln’” in *Verborum Veritatis, Festschrift G. Stählin* (ed. O. Böcher and K. Haacker; Wuppertal, Theologischer Verlag, 1970), 239–240. For the distinction between submission and obedience, see also Aletti, *Éphésiens*, 266–267.

⁷² Thus, Aletti, *Éphésiens*, 269–270; Barth, *Ephesians* 4–6, 708–712; Reynier, *Éphésiens*, 180.

⁷³ There is also an interesting parallel in 4Q415 2 II, where the author of 4QInstruction most likely addresses a woman in the second person. If this is so, it is unique in Wisdom Literature.

⁷⁴ Literature on the use of κεφαλή in this text is abundant, W. Grudem (“The Meaning of κεφαλή (‘Head’): a Response to Recent Studies” in *Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood. A Response to Evangelical Feminism* (ed. J. Piper and W. Grudem; Wheaton: Crossway Books, 1991), 425–468) contains summaries of the major publications on this subject between 1985 and 1990. There is also a review of scholarship on the subject in Dawes, *The Body in Question*, 122–149, and a bibliography in Best, *Ephesians*, 193.

⁷⁵ This interpretation has been defended, for example, by S. Bedale, “The meaning of κεφαλή in the Pauline Epistles”, *JTS* 5 (1954): 211–215; R.S. Cervin “Does κεφαλή mean ‘Source’ or ‘Authority Over’ in Greek Literature?,” *Trinity Journal* 10 (1989): 85–112; C.C. Kroeger, “The Classical Concept of *Head* as ‘Source’” in *Equal to Serve* (ed. G.G. Hull; London: Scripture Union, 1987), 267–283. Most scholars, however, understand the term to refer to authority (e.g. Best, Aletti, and Dawes).

tive of authority”, “social superior”, is more appropriate here (cf. the Hebrew **שׂרר**, translated by *κεφαλή* in the LXX, for example Judg 11:11; 2 Sam 22:44). The chiasmic structure of verses 23–24 strengthens this message:

- A—²³ For the husband is the head of the wife,
 B—as Christ also is the head of the church, being himself the saviour of the body.
 B’—²⁴ But as the church is subject to Christ,
 A’—so let the wives also be to their husbands in everything.

It is because her husband is her “head” or “chief,” that the wife must submit to him in every respect.

c) One last indication of woman’s subordination is to be found at the conclusion of the pericope in v. 33. If the husband must love his wife as his own self, she must fear him. The expression is surprising. It is not stated that the woman must love her husband. Verse 33 picks up the motif of fear expressed in v. 21 and substitutes the notion of fear for that of submission. In the New Testament, the verb *φοβέομαι* most often means “fear” or “terror”. In 10 cases out of 95, it means “honour” or “respect”, but always in the context of man’s relationship with God,⁷⁶ never in an interpersonal relationship. Fear is a notion present in the relationship between superiors and their subordinates. In Eph 6:5, slaves must obey with “fear and trembling (*μετὰ φόβου καὶ τρόμου*)” (cf. Rom 13:3,4,7). Are we, therefore, to understand the wife’s relationship with her husband in terms of “honour”, “respect” and “reverence” or in terms of “fear” and “trepidation” as towards a superior? The notion of reverence should not be excluded. It may be justified by the well developed comparison of her husband to Christ. By analogy, the woman should fear her husband, as she fears God (cf. v. 21). However, the idea of fear with regard to authority is also legitimate, especially since this is the most common meaning of *φοβέω* in the context of interpersonal relationships.

⁷⁶ The situation is similar in biblical Hebrew where in 80% of cases, the object of fear is God. There are however some exceptions, one of which should be noted, Lev 19:3. This verse picks up the commandment to honour one’s parents, replacing the verb **כבד** with the verb **אירא**.

2.2. *The husband's love for his wife*

If wives are exhorted to submit to their husbands in every respect, the latter are invited to love (ἀγαπάω) their wives, an exhortation which is repeated three times (vv. 25, 28 and 33). Two similes develop this motif: husbands must love their wives (1) as Christ loves the Church and (2) as their own bodies.

The simile which compares man's love for his wife with Christ's love for the Church is all the more powerful in that Christ's love is exemplified by total self-giving on the cross. An exhortation of this kind is extremely rare in ancient Jewish literature⁷⁷ and contrasts strongly with the recommendations to husbands in *4QInstruction* and in Ben Sira.

2.3. *The motif of unity and the quotation from Gen 2:24: woman as man's flesh*

Verses 28c to 31 logically form a single unit,⁷⁸ beginning with the statement that woman is "man's own flesh (τὴν ἑαυτοῦ σάρκα)" (v. 29) and concluding with a quotation from Gen 2:24, affirming that man and woman will be one flesh (καὶ ἔσονται οἱ δύο εἰς σάρκα μίαν).

In the first statement, "he who loves his wife, loves himself, for no one has ever hated his own flesh," the wife is identified metaphorically with "man's own flesh." Σάρξ does not have a negative connotation here, and, as in 4Q416 2 IV 5 ("and you, you will be one with the wife of your bosom for she is the flesh of [your] na[kedness]"), scholars agree that the expression "his own flesh" is an allusion to Gen 2:23: "This at last is bone of my bones and flesh of my flesh."⁷⁹ Consequently, the implicit quotation of Gen 2:24 in v. 31 is justified.

As in Deut 5:16 (Ex 20:12), the author quotes Gen 2:24 from the Septuagint: "and the two will be one flesh" (Eph 5:31), while the Masoretic text reads "and they will be one flesh."⁸⁰ It seems fairly

⁷⁷ Best, *Ephesians*, cites Ps.-Phoc. 195–197 which uses στέργω and not ἀγαπάω and *Yebam.* 62b.

⁷⁸ V. 28ab concludes the pericope (25 to 27), forming an inclusion with the affirmation in v. 25ab. We find exactly the same construction in the section about women, where v. 22a is taken up, almost literally, in the form of an inclusion, in v. 24b.

⁷⁹ Cf. Aletti, *Éphésiens*, 284; At the end of v. 30, several manuscripts add ἐκ τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐκ τῶν ὀστέων αὐτοῦ. This reading, even if it is not our choice, confirms that the ancient writers did indeed understand Eph 5:28c–30 in the light of Gen 2:23.

⁸⁰ See Moritz, *A Profound Mystery*, 117. It should be noted that the author of the Epistle to the Ephesians omits personal pronouns "his father and his mother," even though these are attested in the Masoretic text and in the LXX. The same happens

clear that the quotation applies to the human couple and not to Christ and the Church.⁸¹ Indeed, this quotation concludes the development (vv. 28c–30) of the motif of woman as “flesh” of man. As J.-N. Aletti⁸² points out, the first part of the quotation, “man will leave his father and mother,” cannot be applied to the relationship between Christ and the Church. The author of the Epistle understands the expression “one single flesh” to refer to marital union in the broadest sense, like the author of *4QInstruction*, and unlike Paul in 1 Cor 6:16. By means of this quotation, the emphasis is no longer on the subordination of woman or on the husband’s love of his wife but on the unity of the couple. By quoting Gen 2:24, the author shows that man and woman are called to rediscover the original unity of creation. Men and women are invited to become “one” once more, as in *4QInstruction*.

CONCLUSION

4QInstruction and Eph 5:21–6:4 both present a series of instructions concerning family relationships: parent-child and husband-wife. The Epistles to the Ephesians and Colossians add recommendations concerning masters and slaves (Eph 6:5–9; Col 3:22–4:1). *4QInstruction* addresses the same question in the previous column of the scroll in 4Q416 2 II 7–15, but the latter is not adjacent to the other two.

As regards the exhortation to honour one’s parents, we have noted that where Eph 6:1–4 differs from Col 3:20–21, it has similarities with 4Q416 2 III 15–19. We have noted the following:

(a) Deut 5:13 (Exod 20:12) is cited as the basis of the parent-child relationship. Both authors abridge the text in the same way, omitting mention of the land (ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς [τῆς ἀγαθῆς] ἧς κύριος ὁ θεός σου δίδωσίν σοι).

when Deut 5:16 (Exod 20:12) is quoted in Eph 6:2. In Greek, the definite article can serve as a personal pronoun, provided that there is no ambiguity. The author of the Epistle seems to be familiar with this practice. (see v. 25 “husbands, love (*your*) wives” or v. 33, “let the wife fear (*her*) husband”).

⁸¹ Jerome had already made a similar observation: “Let’s imagine that the phrase ‘For this cause shall a man leave his father and his mother’ refers to Christ, as a way of saying that he abandoned his father in heaven to unite with the Church of nations. If this is the case, how should we understand what follows ‘and his mother?’” (*Commentary on Jonah* I,3).

⁸² Aletti, *Éphésiens*, 286.

(b) There is a strong link between the honour due to one's parents and parental instruction: "for they are the crucible which taught you" in *4QInstruction*, "Fathers, do not provoke your children to anger, but bring them up in discipline and instruction of the Lord" in Eph 6:4.

We have also noted that in 4Q416 2 III 15–16, the relationship between God and man serves as the model for the parent-child relationship. A similar comparison is to be found in Eph 5:21–33, where the relationship between Christ and the Church serves as the model for the husband-wife relationship. It should be noted that apart from these two texts, there is no evidence of any other use of this metaphor.

As regards the husband-wife relationship, we have noted the following:

(a) the two texts insist greatly on man's superiority: man dominates his wife in *4QInstruction* and the woman submits to her husband in Eph 5:22. However, this is not confined to these two texts. Similar motifs are to be found throughout the literature of the Near East and, to lesser extent, in Hellenistic culture.

(b) More original is the affirmation by both authors that woman is "the flesh" of man and that she is therefore like him. The origin of this idea is the second creation narrative, which describes woman as being drawn from man's side: "This at last is bone of my bones and *flesh* of my *flesh*" (Gen 2:23).

(c) Another important element is the quotation of Gen 2:24. Both authors understand the expression "one single flesh" as an invitation to unity in marriage rather than as an allusion exclusively to sexual union (as in 1 Cor 6:16). By associating Gen 2:23 with Gen 2:24, both show that in marriage, man and woman are invited to leave the family home to restore a lost unity. Indeed, they become "one flesh" once more.

(d) One last element, which has not been discussed in this analysis, is the use of the term $\mu\upsilon\sigma\tau\acute{\eta}\rho\iota\omicron\nu$ in Eph 5:32 and of the term רָב in *4QInstruction*. It appears 45 times in *4QInstruction* and six times in Ephesians.

(e) Among the differences, the exhortation to husbands to love their wives in the Epistle to the Ephesians should be noted. Any such consideration is totally absent from *4QInstruction* and from the book of Ben Sira.

We can therefore affirm that the differences between Eph 5:21–6:4 and Col 3:18–21 have parallels in the text of *4QInstruction*. The two quotations from Gen 2:24 and Ex 20:12 are critical to this argument. They have intrigued commentators, who claim that they seem out of

place in the Epistle.⁸³ Nevertheless our two authors, writing in the same context, use the same two quotations in succession to make similar arguments.

To conclude, it would be difficult to prove that the text of the Epistle to the Ephesians depends textually on *4QInstruction*. Nor is it my intention to do so. However, certain parallels are undeniable and shed new light on the question of the origin and formation of the family code of Eph 5:22–6:4. It seems clear and well founded that the text is inspired by Col 3:18–21 or by a closely related text. The author also draws on another source, however, which is close to, or in the same vein as the text of *4QInstruction*. This affirmation is justified by the numerous parallels noted between the Epistle to the Ephesians and the texts of Qumran. Palestinian Judaism's Wisdom Literature had an undoubtedly strong influence on the Judaism of the first centuries and consequently also the first Christian communities. The recent publication of Wisdom texts from Qumran opens up new fields for investigation and enables us to better appreciate this influence.

⁸³ Cf. Reynier, Aletti and Moritz comment that, in view of the author's negative opinion of the Torah in Eph 2:13–17, it is surprising to find a reference here to the Pentateuch as the basis of human marriage and the relationship between parents and children.

PRIESTS ON EARTH AS IN HEAVEN:
JEWISH LIGHT ON THE BOOK OF REVELATION

Torleif Elgvin
Evangelical Lutheran University College, Oslo

In this paper I will analyze motifs related to the temple and priesthood in the Book of Revelation and bring in Jewish traditions that may illuminate this peculiar voice within early Christianity. I will also bring some tentative suggestions to its tradition history and the socio-religious background of the author. Aune's suggestion that the book's corpus reflects the experiences of a Jewish Christian prophet in Judea during the Jewish revolt will be given particular attention.

As an apocalypse with a profiled anti-Roman attitude,¹ Revelation is unique within the New Testament. It advocates a vigilant and concrete eschatology where the believers are promised that they will rule over the earth. The book shows an intense preoccupation with the heavenly temple and conceives of an immediate contact between earth and heaven, between earthly visionaries below and the angelic community above.

David Aune's view of the background of Revelation can be summarized as follows:² Revelation is the product of an apocalyptically oriented Judean who migrated to the province of Asia in Asia Minor during or after the great Jewish revolt. At some stage in his career he joined the Jesus movement, and he was recognized as a Christian prophet by congregations in Asia. Part of the introduction (1:7–12a) and most of the corpus (4:1–22:5*) were composed in the 50s and 60s. A first edition of the book appeared around 70 C.E., based on the painful experience of the great Jewish revolt. As an edited whole the book postdates 80 C.E. and probably belongs to the 90s or the turn of the first century. The book reflects a lengthy process of literary growth

¹ In contrast, Rom, 1 Pet, and the Pastoral letters advocate a respectful relation to the Roman authorities.

² D. Aune, *Revelation 1–5* (WBC 52; Dallas: Word, 1997), xlix–lxx, cxx–cxxxii. For an evaluation of Aune's hypothesis of a three-stage composition of Revelation, see G. Biguzzi's review of D. Aune, *Revelation 1–5*, *Bib* 79 (1998): 582–5.

with one primary author/redactor, who may have included some passages not his own.

It is possible to follow Aune in seeing Jerusalem and Judea of the 50s and 60s as the background of the author, without accepting his suggestion of a first edition in the aftermath of the Jewish revolt. For Bauckham, Revelation is a literary unity. The author is indebted to Jewish apocalyptic tradition and early Christian prophecy in Syria and Asia Minor. He drew upon his own experience as a Christian prophet and was influenced by Jewish refugees from Judea after the great revolt, who brought with them ideas of eschatological war against Rome, ideas reflected both in Qumran writings and the Zealot movement.³

John (a name that for Aune may be a pseudonym)⁴ is not alone in the office of Jewish Christian prophet toward the end of the first century. *Did.* 10–13 and the *Martyrdom and Ascension of Isaiah* testify to Christian prophets and prophetic groups in Syria in the period 80–120 C.E. While these milieus could include gentiles, Jewish Christian prophets played a vital part when biblical and Jewish tradition was reinterpreted in light of the Christ event.⁵ Rev 18:20; 22:6, 9 refer to Christian prophets with a central role in the churches in Asia Minor.

Qumran literature helps us to understand this particular voice within the choir of early Christian literature.⁶ Alexander has pointed to lines of

³ R. Bauckham, *The Climax of Prophecy: Studies in Revelation* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1993), 1–2, 38–91, 233.

⁴ Aune, *Revelation* 1–5, xlix.

⁵ For the ascription of both sections of *Mart. Ascen. Isa.* (1–5/6–11) to a consecutive milieu of Christian prophets in Syria in the period A.D. 80–120, see R.G. Hall, “The Ascension of Isaiah: Community Situation, Date, and Place in Early Christianity.” *JBL* 109 (1990): 289–306; J. Knight, *The Ascension of Isaiah* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 21–6; M.A. Knibb, “Isaianic Traditions in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha,” in *Writing and Reading the Scroll of Isaiah: Studies of an Interpretive Tradition* (ed. C.C. Broyles, C.A. Evans; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 633–50 [p. 637, in part changing his previous position in *OTP* 2:143–55]; E. Norelli, *Ascensio Isaiae. Commentarius* (Corpus Christianorum, Series Apocryphorum 8; Turnhout: Brepols, 1995), 37–44; idem, *Ascension du prophete Isaie* (Turnhout: Brepols, 1992), 12–29, 66–78; R. Bauckham, *The Fate of the Dead: Studies on the Jewish and Christian Apocalypses* (Leiden: Brill, 1998), 363–90. On Christian prophecy in this period, see further Bauckham, *Climax of Prophecy*, 83–91; C.M. Robeck Jr., “Prophecy, Gift of,” *Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements* (ed. S.M. Burgess and G.G. McGee; 6th ed.; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1993), 728–40, here 732–7.

⁶ For the relation between Qumran literature in general and Rev, see H. Braun, *Qumran und das Neue Testament* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1966), 307–25; O. Böcher, “Die Johannes-Apokalypse und die Texte von Qumran,” (ed. W. Hase; ANRW II 25.5; Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 1988), 3894–3898. For themes common to the ShirShabb and Rev, see J. Davila, *Liturgical Works* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000),

similarity between the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* (hereafter ShirShabb) and Rev 4–5. Ulfgard has recently elaborated on the relation between ShirShabb and Revelation. He sees both writings reflecting the same priestly and mystical milieu, and asks tentatively if Revelation could have been authored by a former Essene or Qumran member, who joined the Jesus movement in the turmoil of the great revolt. Ulfgard thus seems to regard ShirShabb as *sectarian* songs, while Alexander regards them as sectarian adaptations of earlier liturgies. I view them as liturgies from the pre-Maccabean temple, only slightly adapted for use in the *yahad*, cf. the ascription of the songs to the *Maskil*.

Following Levenson I have argued that the tradition of liturgical and visionary contact with the heavenly sanctuary was treasured by priestly and levitic temple circles all through the second temple period.⁷ The hope for visions of the heavenly realms connected to God's presence in the temple and his servants sojourning there were kept alive in these circles. Rabbinic tradition testifies to the hope that the high priest would be given a vision or concrete experience of the divine presence in the Holy of Holies during the Yom Kippur liturgy.⁸ Also Josephus reports revelations to high priests: Jaddus at the time of Alexander the Great (*A.J.* 11.326–8) and Yochanan Hyrcanus (*A.J.* 13.282–3).⁹ It is not accidental that NT texts locate visions and revelations on the temple or temple mount, cf. Luke 1:8–22; 2:25–35; Acts 7:55f. Stephen's vision took probably place in *lishkat hagazit*, which was in or adjacent to the temple mount.

This temple theology was essential when the dissident *yahad*, consisting of priests and laymen, understood its own community as a temple in liturgical communion with the angels. Its angelic communion, described in texts such as the *War Scroll*, 4QBerakot, and ShirShabb, provided

91; P. Alexander, *The Mystical Texts* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2006), 140f; H. Ulfgard, "The Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice and the Heavenly Scene of the Book of Revelation," forthcoming in *Northern Light on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. A. Kloostergaard Petersen). A shorter version of Ulfgard's paper (with the same title) appeared in *Mishkan 44* (2005): 26–36.

⁷ T. Elgvin, "Temple Mysticism and the Temple of Men," forthcoming in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Text and Context* (ed. C. Hempel); cf. J. Levenson, "The Jerusalem Temple in Devotional and Visionary Experience," *Jewish Spirituality* (ed. A. Green; 2 vol.; London: SCM, 1989), 1:32–61.

⁸ A tradition connected with Shimon the Righteous in *t. Sotah* 13.8: *y. Yoma* 5.2; *Lev. Rab.* 21.12; *b. Yoma* 39b; *b. Menahot* 109b.

⁹ Robert Gnuse, "The Temple Theophanies of Jaddus, Hyrcanus, and Zechariah," *Bib 79* (1998): 457–72.

a venue where lay Israelites could partake in temple mysticism that had been safeguarded within levitic tradition. The liturgical use of the *Hodayot* would have creative power: A member's identification with the praying "I" in the Teacher hymns and the Self-Glorification hymn would give the faithful access to the source of mystical revelation and communion with God.¹⁰ The spiritualization of temple ideology in the *yaḥad* opened for a democratisation of mystical experience previously cherished by levites. But the *yaḥad* remained a priestly dominated community,¹¹ and the growing S tradition evidences a steadily more hierarchic structure as time and community go on.¹²

A ROYAL PRIESTHOOD WITH ACCESS TO HEAVEN

In contrast to the priestly-led community of the *yaḥad*, for Revelation the new community of the Messiah realizes the priesthood of all believers (Exod 19:6; Isa 61:6, cf. 1 Pet 2:5; Eph 2:21f).¹³ Different from the *yaḥad*, a leadership by priests or levites is not needed to establish the new priestly ministry. The introductory greeting states that Christ "has made us a kingdom, priests for God his father" (1:6). Revelation 5:10 recalls this proclamation; Christ has "made them a kingdom, priests to God," and adds that the priestly believers shall "rule on the earth," a

¹⁰ Cf. C. Newsom, *The Self as Symbolic Space: Constructing Identity and Community at Qumran* (STDJ 52; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 287–346; Alexander, *Mystical Texts*, 101–119. On the formative power of liturgy, see e.g. R.L. Grimes, *Beginnings in Ritual Studies* (rev. ed.; Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1995), 51–53.

¹¹ Kugler notes that the community has an atoning function, its prayers are like priestly sacrifices, the members follow priestly purity rules and are destined to be like angels. But "the community distinguishes between priests and laity; the use of titles, the assignment of tasks and authority, and the division of the community into Israel (holy) and Aaron (holy of holies) demonstrate the separation of two classes": R.A. Kugler, "Priests," *EDSS* 2:688–93, here 691.

¹² Kugler, "Priests," 691f; idem, "The Priesthood at Qumran: The Evidence of References to Levi and the Levites," *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues* (ed. D. Parry, E. Ulrich; STDJ 30; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 465–79; M. Bockmuehl, "Redaction and Ideology in the Rule of the Community," *RevQ* 18 (1998): 541–60; S. Metso, "The Redaction of the Community Rule," *Proceedings of the International Congress 'The Dead Sea Scrolls': Fifty Years After Their Discovery* (ed. L.H. Schiffman, E. Tov, J.C. VanderKam; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2000), 377–84; idem, *The Serekh Texts* (LSTS 62; London: T&T Clark, 2007), 15–19.

¹³ G. Stevenson, *Power and Place: Temple and Identity in the Book of Revelation* (Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 2001), 239–50, 286–93.

promise that will be realized in the millennium: “They shall be priests with him and rule with him for 1000 years” (20:6).

According to Ulfgard, the acknowledgement of John’s realized eschatology opens for a realized interpretation of the multitude in 7:9–17. This vision describes every believer partaking in the heavenly worship.¹⁴ This multitude serves God night and day in his temple, similar to the service of levitic singers who served God in praise day and night in the temple (Pss 134; 135:1f).¹⁵

Revelation 5:8 and 8:3f describe the prayers of the holy ones (viz. the believers on earth) as incense rising before God’s heavenly throne, conveyed through the censers of heavenly beings. The priests’ offering of incense before the veil of the Holy of Holies is a colourful image from second temple Judaism.¹⁶ The silence in heaven (8:1) signifies the time during which the angel burns the incense on the altar to accompany the prayers of the saints. The same thought is found in rabbinic tradition: when Israel comes to pray, the angels are silent. The temple is the starting point both for John and the rabbis: during the morning and evening service of the temple incense was burned while the community (as well as Jews elsewhere in the land) was praying outside the temple (Exod 30:1–10; Jdt 9:1; Luke 1:10; Acts 3:1).¹⁷ The ascending smoke of incense symbolized and assisted the ascent of prayers to God in heaven. The association of prayer with incense goes back to OT times,

¹⁴ H. Ulfgard, *Feast and Future: Revelation 7:9–17 and the Feast of Tabernacles* (ConBNT 22; Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1989), 61–8, 100–104. For other scholars, 7:9–17 describes the heavenly existence of the martyrs or every dead Christian at the time John receives his vision on earth. Alternatively, it may be a proleptic vision of the future salvation: Aune, *Revelation 6–16*, 445–7; Stevenson, *Power and Place*, 240.

¹⁵ A. Büchler, *Die Priester und der Cultus im letzten Jahrzehnt des Jerusalemischen Tempels* (Wien: Verlag der Israel.-theol. Lehranstalt, 1895), 125–32.

¹⁶ For this subject matter, see J. Milgrom, “The Burning of Incense in the Time of the Second Temple” (Hebrew), *Studies in Bible and the History of Israel* (Fs. Ben-Zion Luria; Jerusalem: Kiryat-Sepher, 1979), 330–34; R.A. Briggs, *Jewish Temple Imagery in the Book of Revelation* (New York and Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1999), 74–85. According to the priestly *Jub.* that conceives of Eden as a sanctuary, Adam performs the morning incense offering and Enoch that of the evening (*Jub.* 3:27; 4:25); J.C. VanderKam, “Adam’s Incense Offering (Jubilees 3:27),” *Meghillot. Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls V–VI* (2007): *141–156. *T. Levi* 3:5–6 describes the angels of presence offering a bloodless sacrifice of pleasant odor in the heavenly Holy of Holies. In 8:10 an angel fills Levi’s hands with incense for his priestly ministry.

¹⁷ Bauckham, *Climax of Prophecy*, 70, 83; Aune, *Revelation 6–16*, 511–15.

cf. Ps 141:2 “Let my prayer be counted as incense before you,” and this continues in Hebrews and Revelation.¹⁸

Bauckham states, “John’s eschatological perspective is such that he reserves for the New Jerusalem the church’s participation in the angelic liturgy in the face-to-face presence of God.”¹⁹ This statement needs some qualification, as the texts in chs. 5 and 8 show an intimate relation between the believers’ praise and prayers and the burning of incense in the heavenly temple (cf. Ulfgard’s view of 7:9–17, see above). In my opinion, the believers’ priestly ministry is connected with the heavenly realms both in John and Hebrews (cf. Heb 4:14–16; 9:11–12; 10:19–22). Bauckham admits that some of the angelic praises in the book were sung in the congregations in Asia. If John conceives of the angels singing the same hymns as the congregations in Asia, there is already now a union between the heavenly and earthly singers.²⁰ The particular interest in the songs of the angels is among those features that might point to a levitic background both for John the seer and ShirShabb. If John came from a levitic background and was at home in the watches where God’s servants praised him (God) night and day, it is easy to understand that he conceives of an unending priestly ministry with the prayers of the church steadily rising in the heavenly sanctuary.

Hebrews conceives of prayer in a similar way: “Let us offer up a sacrifice of praise to God” (13:15). The same feature is reflected in the *Yaḥad*’s conception of prayers as “deeds of todah-offering” (מעשי תודה, Q174 2 I 7),²¹ cf. the restored [תודה] זבחי in 4Q371 2 2/4Q372

¹⁸ *y. Abod. Zar.* 4.4 and *Tanhuma*, Ahare Mot 14 (ed. Buber, Ahare Mot 9) interprets the incense burning of Mal 1:11 as the minhah prayer: “R. Ammi asked R. Samuel bar Nahman: Is it correct that ‘in every place incense is offered to my name’ (Mal 1:11)? . . . This is the prayer of the minhah. Incense can only be the prayer of the minhah, since it is stated ‘Let my prayer be counted as incense before you’ (Ps 141:2)”. We do not know who is the first NT author to perceive prayers as sacrifice, John or the author of Hebrews (cf. Hebr 13:8). If Rev 5:8 belongs to an early *Grundschrift*, Hebrews could have taken this idea from John the seer, or both reflect the same tradition. See also note 27 below.

¹⁹ Bauckham, *Climax of Prophecy*, 140.

²⁰ M. Weinfeld finds evidence for this concept in biblical psalms, in Qumran, and NT writings: “The Heavenly Praise in Unison,” *Festschrift für Georg Molin an seinem 75. Geburtstag* (I. Seybold, ed.; Graz: Akademische Druck- und Verlagsanstalt, 1983), 427–37, repr. in M. Weinfeld, *Normative and Sectarian Judaism in the Second Temple Period* (LSTS 54; London: T&T Clark, 2005), 45–52.

²¹ The correct reading is מעשי תודה and not מעשי תורה. See T. Elgvin, “An Incense Altar from Qumran,” with S.J. Pfann, *DSD* 9 (2002): 20–33, here 28, n. 33.

(4QNarrative and Poetic Composition) 1 24 “what pleases my Creator, to offer sacrifices [of thanksgiving].”

John’s description of angelic priestly ministry is indebted to the Jewish tradition treasured by levites and priests.²² The angels’ priestly ministry is elaborated in the visions of the sanctuary in chs. 4–5 and 8:1–4. Further on, angels come out from the altar before they are sent out to minister on earth (8:5; 14:18; 16:7; cf. 9:13). The image of angels being sent out from the altar could owe their inspiration to the levitic temple guard, which under the command of the high priest’s deputy (סגן הכהנים, στρατηγός), was responsible for checking the inventory of the temple and guarding the temple precincts.²³ The line of deduction would thus be “as on earth so also in heaven.” The conceptions of the Jerusalem temple as a microcosm and the navel of the world (Ezek 5:5; *Jub.* 8:19) could support this suggestion. The instruction to measure the temple and the altar (11:1f) may reflect the same background.

In chs. 7:3 and 9:4 God’s servants on earth are sealed with the name of the Lamb on their foreheads (cf. 14:1; Ezek 9:4). This feature may be connected to their priestly ministry. In the ancient Near East priests could be marked with the name of their God on their foreheads, cf. the inscription over Aaron’s forehead, ‘Sanctified to the Lord,’ Exod 28:36f.²⁴ Houses or sanctuaries could be dedicated, through an inscription on the doorpost, to the king or the godhead.²⁵ The believers, who openly before the eyes of the world are sanctified to the Lamb, are thus fulfilling Deut 6:8, where the words of God on the foreheads manifest the priestly prerogative of every Israelite male in the time of the exile, a time without temple.²⁶

²² The books of *1 En.* have been attributed to scribal and priestly circles: G.W.E. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1. A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch, 1–36; 81–108* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001), 65–7; B.G. Wright III, “Putting the Puzzle Together: Some Suggestions Concerning the Social Location of the Wisdom of Ben Sira,” *SBLSP* 35 (1996): 133–49.

²³ A. Büchler, *Die Priester und der Cultus*, 103–124; B.T. Viviano, “The High Priest’s Servant’s Ear: Mark 14:47,” *RB* 96 (1989): 71–80. Cf. Mark 14:47; Luke 22:4, 52; Acts 4:1; 5:24, 26.

²⁴ O. Keel, “Zeichen der Verbundenheit. Zur Vorgeschichte und Bedeutung der Forderungen von Deuteronomium 6, 8f. und Par.,” *Mélanges Dominique Barthelemy: études bibliques offertes à l’occasion de son 60e anniversaire* (P. Casetti, O. Keel, A. Schenker, eds.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck&Ruprecht, 1981), 159–240, pp. 193–217.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, 183–92. Cf. the inscription to YHWH of Teman over the doorpost of the late ninth century sanctuary at Kuntillet Ajrud: *ABD* 4:107.

²⁶ T. Elgvin, *Hør Israel! Ved disse ord skal du leve. Tekster og tider i 5 Mosebok* (Oslo: Norsk Luthersk Forlag, 2000), 41.

Revelation 22:3f describes the ultimate service before God's throne where the elect serve God with his name on their foreheads, not any more the name of the Lamb—as there is no more need for the open witness to the Lamb before the world. This feature also shows that the Lamb is subordinate to God in the eschaton, cf. 1 Cor 15:24–28.

As in Paul's writings, the believers on earth are here designated τῶν ἁγίων "the saints," "the holy ones" (5:8; 8:3; 11:8 passim). In the Bible as well as intertestamental literature קדושים regularly refers to angels. But in some text this usage is extended to those elect and sanctified. "Holy ones" are used for the elect in the *Epistle of Enoch* (1 En. 97:5; 100:5; 108:3) and once in 4QInstruction (4Q418 81 12). Some *yahad* texts use "the holy ones" or similar expressions about the eschatological community (1QM X 10; XIV 12; 4Q174 2 I 4 קדושי שם; 4Q177 12 קדושי שמו) or the priests (1QM VI 6; IX 8; XVI 2; 4Q428 [4QH^b] 14 2; 1QS^b IV 27).

Furthermore, all priestly service was sanctified to God. The particular use of "holy ones" within the early Christian community may be explained through an eschatological democratization of priestly prerogatives to all believers, at least this seems to be the case in Revelation.²⁷ If Aune is right in his dating of the book's corpus to the 50s and 60s, this usage would be contemporary with that of Paul.

In 15:2–4 the victorious ones are portrayed standing on the sea of glass and fire, singing with harps. The sea of glass and fire is reminiscent of the firmament below God's throne in Exod 24:9–11 and Ezek 1:24. But the designation "sea" also recalls the "sea" for purification purposes in the Jerusalem temple, 1 Kgs 7:23–25, 39, 44. The victorious ones of Rev 15:1–4 are according to other passages those who have purified themselves by the blood of the Lamb. So this passage merges traditions of visions of the divine throne with the concept of purification. The firmament of the heavenly sanctuary recurs in ShirShabb (4Q403 1 I, 42; 4Q405 6 3; 19 3; 20 II, 22 8).

Regev has analyzed the attitude to the temple in various NT writings. Only in the Gospel of John, Hebrews, and Revelation can he identify a denial of the validity of the Jerusalem temple. But this denial is primarily

²⁷ Paul uses priestly terminology without explicitly combining this with the notion of "saints": Rom 12:1 admonishes one to present one's body as a living sacrifice to God. Phil 4:18 compares the gift of the Philippians with the odor of a sacrifice well-pleasing to God. For the concept of earthly deeds as sacrifice, cf. Mic 6:8; 1QS VIII 1–3, *Avot* 1.2.

a theoretical one, as all three compositions are written after the fall of the temple and respond to this new reality. Regev notes that Revelation replaces the physical temple with the heavenly one and the new Jerusalem (and both are Jewish concepts).²⁸

PURIFICATION AND PRIESTLY CLOTHING

The ideas of purification and being clothed in new robes permeate Revelation. The faithful have purified themselves and stand before the throne in white robes, performing a priestly service (7:9–15). He who is victorious shall be clothed in white (3:4f). The lukewarm believer will get a white robe to cover his shame (3:18). The martyrs are given white robes (6:9–11). Toward the end of the book the thundering angelic choir shouts that the bride of the Lamb has received a robe of pure linen—the deeds of the righteous (19:6–8). Only those wearing purified garments will have the right to enter the eternal city (22:14).

White robes are a common image both in Israelite and gentile sources. They can convey connotations of purity, removal of guilt, priestly or scribal dignity, heavenly existence, wealth, celebration (e.g. Yom Kippur and Rosh Hashanah), victory, and eschatological reward.²⁹ For Revelation, which stresses the priesthood of all believers, the investiture of *kohanim* with white clothing carries great symbolic significance. According to Edersheim, Rev 3:5 reflects knowledge of acceptance procedures

²⁸ E. Regev, “A Kingdom of Priests or a Holy (Gentile) People: The Temple in Early Christian Life and Thought” (Hebrew), *Cathedra* 113 (2004): 5–34, here 26–29. According to Regev, John the seer replaces the physical temple service of the Jewish people with the spiritual one of the gentile believers in communion with the heavenly temple. Such a categorization downplays the thoroughly Jewish character of Revelation. “Those who say they are Jews but are not” (2:9; 3:9) is intra-Jewish polemic. Similar to Paul, John includes members of all tribes and tongues (7:9) into the renewed Israel of the end-times.

²⁹ “There are almost limitless possibilities if one looks for people clothed in white in antiquity”: M. den Dulk, “The Promises to the Conquerors in the Book of Revelation,” *Biblica* 87 (2006): 516–22, here 520. Cf. *TDNT* 4:241–50; J. Luzaragga, *Las tradiciones de la nube en la biblia y en el judaismo primitivo* (AnBib 54; Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1973), 196f, 231; Aune, *Revelation 1–5*, 222f, 259; idem, *Revelation 6–16*, 468, 474; Ulfsgard, *Feast and Future*, 81–5. For the relevant Jewish material, see S. Krauss, *Talmudische Archäologie* (3 vols.; Leipzig: Fock, 1910), 1:130, 133, 144f, 168, 525f n. 52, 550 nn. 211–212. Bauckham sees the white robes of 7:9 as festal garments of victory celebration (cf. 2 Macc 13:51, Tertullian, *Scorpiace* 12): *Climax of Prophecy*, 225, and connects the washing of the robes in 7:14 with ritual purification (cf. Num 19:19; 31:19f; IQM XIV, 2–3): *Ibid.*, 226–9. Josephus notes the white liturgical robes of the Essenes: *J.W.* 2.137.

for priests in second temple times. When a kohen was to be accepted for temple service, his genealogy would be checked as would his body for any physical defects. If he passed the test, he would be clothed in the white priestly clothes. A candidate that could not prove his genealogy would be covered by a black veil (*m. Mid.* 5.5).³⁰

Other Jewish sources with priestly flavour share these images. According to *T. Levi* 8, Levi sees seven angels clothed in white who invest him with priestly clothing. Also Aramaic *Levi* 5.4³¹ and *Jub.* 32:2 describe Levi's reception of priestly vestments. Ben Sira, a staunch supporter of the Jerusalem priests,³² puts great weight on Aaron's magnificent vestments (45:7–10). *ShirShabb* describe the vestments of the serving angels: "All their crafted garments are splendidly purified, crafted by the weaver's art. These are the leaders of those who are wondrously clothed to serve." (4Q405 23 II 10). *1 En.* 87:2 and 90:21 refer to the snow-white clothing of the angels.

The theme of purification runs all through the book, from the letters to the churches and through the last chapter. No other NT book returns so often to this theme—which may be another indication of the author's background. Purification in Revelation may be compared with purity concepts in Qumran and with the purity-oriented table fellowship of Pharisaic *haburot*. In both communities priestly purity was extended to lay Israelites by having them submit to priestly procedures.

Hebrews and Revelation do not need such procedures since their authors share a realized eschatology. Hebrews states that the believers "have come to the heavenly Jerusalem, to thousands of angels" (12:22), they have been given access to the heavenly sanctuary (10:19). Both the opening of Revelation and the first vision of the heavenly sanctuary state that the believers *have been made* a kingdom and priests for God (1:5; 4:10). The Lamb has already overcome (5:5). And the seal on the foreheads of the believers (7:3f) signify that they are already (priestly) servants of God.

³⁰ A. Edersheim, *The Temple: Its Ministry and Services as They Were at the Time of Jesus Christ* (London: Religious Tracts Society, n.d.), 95.

³¹ References to Aramaic *Levi* with chapter and verse follow J.C. Greenfield, M.E. Stone and E. Eshel, *The Aramaic Levi Document. Edition, Translation, Commentary* (SVTP 19; Leiden: Brill, 2004).

³² B.G. Wright III, "Fear the Lord and Honor the Priest'. Ben Sira as Defender of the Jerusalem Priesthood," in *The Book of Ben Sira in Modern Research: Proceedings of the First International Ben Sira Conference 28–31 July 1996 Soesterberg, the Netherlands* (ed. P.C. Beentjes; BZAW 255; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1997), 189–222.

This realized eschatology may be compared with 4Q215a Time of Salvation. 4Q215a is probably a pre-sectarian writing,³³ but our copy is Herodian, bringing it closer to NT times. The main fragment describes the eschaton as already having arrived.

For the period of wickedness has been completed
and all injustice will ha[ve an e]nd.
[For] the time of righteousness has come
and the land has been filled with knowledge
and glorification of God in [His] be[auty].
For] the age of peace has come
and the laws of truth and the testimony of justice, to instruct [every
man]
in the ways of God[and] His mighty deeds [and knowledge of Him]
forever.
Every ton[ogue] will bless Him
and every man will bow down to Him,
[and they will be] of on[e hea]rt.
...For the dominion of good has come,
and the throne of [righteousness] shall be exalted and very high.
Insight, prudence and sound wisdom are tested by [His] holy pl[a]n.
(4Q215a 1 II, 4–8, 10–11)

It is significant that in the lines preceding the coming of the new age 4Q215a describes the purification of the remnant through trials (lines 2–4).

[They will pass through affliction]
and distress of (the) oppressor and trial of (the) pit.
And through these they shall be refined to become the elect of righteousness,
and all their sins will be wiped out
because of His loving kindness.

The purification of the remnant before restoration is a well-known biblical theme. Also Revelation knows of the suffering and trials of the remnant that through purification has come to partake of the age to come. 4Q215a continues even further: God's throne will be lifted up (cf. Rev 4:2; 20:11), God will be glorified in his beauty (cf. Isa 33:17;

³³ T. Elgvin, "The Eschatological Hope of 4QTime of Righteousness," in *Wisdom and Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Biblical Tradition* (ed. F. García Martínez; BETL 168; Leuven: Peeters, 2003), 89–102; Å. Justnes, *The Time of Salvation: An Analysis of 4QApocryphon of Daniel ar (246), 4QMessianic Apocalypse (4Q421 2), and 4QTime of Righteousness (4Q215a)* (Ph.D. diss., MF Norwegian school of Theology, 2007), 240, 310–14.

Rev 4:3), and all peoples will bow down before the throne (cf. *1 En.* 10:21; Rev 4:10; 5:8; 7:9).

In 19:6–8 the shout is heard that “the time has come” for the wedding of the Lamb. This call echoes Jesus’ opening proclamation “The time has come, the kingdom of God has drawn near” (Mk 1:15). It has also clear parallels in 4Q215a (quoted above): “[For] the time of righteousness has come... [For] the age of peace has come... For the dominion of goodness has come.”

Revelation repeatedly refers to purification by blood, and specifically to purification by the blood of Christ (7:14). In a similar way Hebrews stresses purification by blood as the only means of atonement and forgiveness (9:18–28). Hebrews and Revelation could be a continuation of priestly temple theology in contrast to the more lay oriented Pharisaic movement. These two writings may reflect Sadducean theology centred on temple, altar, and sacrifice.³⁴ It can be compared to the early priestly saying ascribed to the high priest Shimon II: “On three things the world stands: on torah, on (temple) service, on loving kindnesses” (על התורה ועל גמילות חסדים ועל העבודה ועל המילות חסדים, *Avot de Rabbi Nathan* 4; *Avot* 1.2).

The priestly theology of John the seer is close to that of Hebrews. For Hebrews, the ultimate high-priestly sacrifice of Jesus made further atoning sacrifices, such as Yom Kippur, superfluous. With the enthroned Lamb (Rev 5) there is for John no more need for the daily sacrifice of lambs in the *Tamid* offering. The Lamb has opened a new way. There is no need for pure *ḥaburot* or priestly purification rites, only purification through the blood of the Lamb (1:5; 7:14).

TEMPLE SYMBOLISM

Revelation is more permeated by temple symbolism than any other first century Jewish writing.³⁵ Only some aspects will be considered here.

³⁴ The angelology of Revelation should not be judged as a non-Sadducean feature. Acts 23:8 has been interpreted as a Sadducean denial of the existence of angels. But this verse should be translated in the following way “the Sadduceans do not believe in any resurrection, neither as angels nor spirits”: D. Daube, “On Acts 23: Sadducees and Angels,” *JBL* 109 (1990): 493–7; B. Viviano, J. Taylor, “Sadducees, Angels, and Resurrection,” *JBL* 111 (1992): 496–8. As a party that stressed the authority of the Pentateuch, the Sadduceans could not deny the existence of angels.

³⁵ Briggs, *Jewish Temple Imagery*, 53–110, 215–24; Stevenson, *Power and Place*, 223–301; R.D. Davis, *The Heavenly Court Judgment of Revelation 4–5* (Lanham, MD:

Many images have parallels in ShirShabb.³⁶ The promise that the faithful will become a pillar in God's temple (3:12, cf. 1 Kgs 7:21; Isa 22:15) can be compared to the thresholds of the temple that partake in the praise of the King in ShirShabb (4Q403 1 I, 41). The believer portrayed as a temple pillar may be a derivation of the community seen as a spiritual temple, a concept well known from the *yahad* (1QS VII 5–10; 4Q174 1–3 I, 6–7) that recurs in NT epistles (1 Pet 2:5–10; Eph 2:20–22).³⁷

In 4:1 and 11:19 God's temple in heaven is opened (4:1 “had been opened”), cf. the opened door before the believer in 3:20. Aune notes that the opening of the door to the sanctuary was a religious concept well known in the ancient world.³⁸ Of particular importance is the rabbinic tradition that the doors of the temple were opened forty years before its destruction, and a similar incident reported by Josephus.³⁹ In all three texts the opening of the doors is related to (eschatological) judgement. Cfr. further the ceremonial opening of the great door into the outer room of the temple during the *Tamid* offering (*m. Tamid* 3.7). Hebrews uses related, but different terminology—the way through the curtain to the inner sanctum has been opened by Christ himself (6:19; 4:14–16), which itself has an echo in the tearing of the veil in Matt 27:51.

The seer notes that there is still a covenantal ark in the heavenly sanctuary (11:19). As long as the holy ones on earth lift up their prayers as incense rising before God's throne, there must be a sanctuary above with an altar (6:9; 8:3,5; 9:13; 11:1; 14:18; 16:7). But in the end there is *no temple*, only God's throne (20:11), a temple source (22:1f), and God's

University Press of America, 1992), 118–43; J. Paulien, “The role of the Hebrew Cultus, Sanctuary, and Temple in the Plot and Structure of the Book of Revelation,” *AUSS* 33 (1995): 245–64; R. Dalrymple, “The Use of καί in Revelation 11,1 and the Implications for the Identification of the Temple, the Altar, and the Worshipers,” *Bib* 87 (2006): 387–94.

³⁶ Ulfgard, “Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice and the Heavenly Scene,” (forthcoming).

³⁷ On interpretations of the believer as a pillar in 3:12, see Briggs, *Jewish Temple Imagery*, 67–73; Stevenson, *Power and Place*, 63–7, 243–51. Stevenson's own suggestion [following M. Kiddle, *The Revelation of St. John* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1940)] is that John refers to the Greco-Roman custom of sculpting human figural pillars in sanctuaries. But a Jewish author such as John would hardly perceive a human-shaped pillar in a sanctuary as a positive image, cf. the relative strict interpretation of the second commandment in second temple times.

³⁸ Aune, *Revelation 6–16*, 676f.

³⁹ *B. Yoma* 39b. Josephus reports that the brass doors to the priestly court opened by themselves immediately before the destruction of the temple by the Romans: *J.W.* 6.293–4.

city, the new Jerusalem (ch. 21, cf. 4 *Ezra* 10:27). God the Almighty and the Lamb are their temple (21:22f).

Jeremiah 3:16f may be behind chs. 21–22, as this passage on the restoration of Israel describes Jerusalem, gentiles coming to Zion, the Lord's throne, but no ark of the covenant. In its description of the end-times Zion without a temple, Revelation differs from other Jewish writings which speak of an expected, restored temple in the end-times (*Jub.* 1:17; 1 *En.* 90:28–37; 11QT XXIV 8–9; 1QM II 1–6; 11QNew Jerusalem; *Apoc. Ab.* 29:17–19, cf. 2 *Bar.* 12:2–4).⁴⁰ In the following generation rabbi Akiva would ardently strive for rebuilding the temple and support Bar Kochba's messianic fight to restore Jerusalem. A central prayer that found its way into the Pesach Haggada is ascribed to him in *m. Pesahim* 10.6:

Therefore, O, Lord our God and the God of our fathers, bring us in peace to the other set feasts and festivals that are coming to meet us, while we rejoice in the building-up of your city and rejoice in worshipping you, and may we eat there of the sacrifices and of the Passover-offerings whose blood has reached with acceptance the wall of your altar, and let us praise you for our redemption and for the ransoming of our soul. Blessed are you, O Lord, who redeems Israel!

In 15:5–8 the heavenly temple is opened and the temple filled with the smoke of God's glory and power. Here again we encounter priestly terminology, albeit belonging to the all-Israelite scriptures. The Priestly source of the Pentateuch treasured the memory of a visible revelation of the cloud of God's glory at sacred moments in the Jerusalem temple, modelled upon God's theophanic presence at Sinai (Exod 40:34; 1 Kgs 8:10–11, cf. Exod 24:16; Isa 6:4).

In 7:17; 21:6, and 22:1f we encounter the temple source with living water, running water. The image of the temple source with paradise-like connotations goes all through the Hebrew Bible, cf. Gen 2:10–14; Ps 46:5; Ezek 47:1–12; Joel 4:18; Zech 13:1; 14:6, and is often connected to end-time scenarios. This tradition continues in the *Hodayot* and

⁴⁰ It has, however, affinities with the contemporary 4 *Ezra*, see below. In 2 *Bar.* the eschatological, heavenly Zion cannot be imagined without a temple. The *Apoc. Ab.* combines the idea of a lasting heavenly sanctuary with a renewed temple for Israel in the end-time. The Enochic *Animal Apocalypse* probably includes a temple in the eschatological city: Stevenson, *Power and Place*, 200–210, 189–91. The Jewish traditions behind *T. Levi* 18 probably foresaw the eschatological priest officiating in a physical temple, cf. the image of the end-time priest in the Levi apocryphon 4Q541 9. The second century Christian edition connects this priest only to the heavenly sanctuary.

4QInstruction. Both writings testify that the ‘opened fountain’ of Zech 13:1 is a reality in the end-time community (4Q418 81 1; 1QH^a IX 4; X 18; XIII 10, 12, 13; XIV 17–18; XVI 8; XVIII 31, cf. Sir 24:23–33).

In 7:15 God will raise his dwelling over the martyrs. The biblical background of this image may be found e.g. in Isa 4:5f, a promise that God will spread over Zion a cover, a *huppah*. But we also recall Ps 84 of the levitic sons of Korah, who long to dwell in the temple and gaze upon God in his precincts (cf. Ps 11:4–7).⁴¹

WAR IDEOLOGY, PERSECUTION AND ANTAGONISM

Revelation is the most vigilant writing in the NT. War is breaking out in heaven (12:7), and there are both heavenly and earthly antagonists, as in the *War Scroll*.⁴² In 2:9 and 3:9 we encounter the “synagogue of Satan” in Smyrna and Philadelphia, those who say they are Jews but are not. The “synagogue of Satan” is usually understood as a designation of the Jewish community.⁴³

A possible parallel to this designation may be found in 4Q390 (apoc-Jer C) frgs. 1 and 2. H. Eshel has questioned Dimant’s sorting of all the 4Q485–4Q390 fragments into *two* pre-sectarian compositions. According to Eshel, 4Q390 1 designates the rule in the last jubilee before the Hasmoneans as a rule by “the angels of Mastemot,” where the people turn to do evil before God and walk in the stubbornness of their heart (4Q390 1 11–12). When Eshel connects the description of history in frg. 1 with that in frg. 2 col. I he reads a continuous description of the 490 years of history based on the seventy years of Jer 25:11f; 29:10, and Dan 9:2, 24–27, which ends describing the period of the Hasmoneans as the last seventy year period of the 490 years. This last seventy year period is characterized by the rule of the angels of Mastemot, by civil

⁴¹ Levenson describes the expectations of pilgrims and those seeking asylum in the temple who could be forced to stay there for years: “The apogee of the spiritual experience of the visitor to the Temple was a vision of God... Psalm 11 asserts a reciprocity of vision: YHWH, enthroned in His Temple, conducts a visual inspection of humanity, and those found worthy are granted a vision of his ‘face’”: “Jerusalem Temple in Devotional and Visionary Experience,” 43: Cf. in particular v 7 ישר יחזו פנימו 7 “the upright shall gaze upon his face.”

⁴² For this theme, see in particular Bauckham, *Climax of Prophecy*, 210–37.

⁴³ Aune compares the expression with עדת בליעל in 1QH^a II 22 and 1QM IV 9, and 1QS V 1–2 ועדת אנשי העול: *Revelation 1–5*, 164f.

strife and gathering of ill-gotten wealth.⁴⁴ Eshel dates this composition to the civil war in Judea in the 90s B.C., and argues that it was written by Janneus' opponents in this brutal war. These anti-Hasmoneans (perhaps Janneus' Pharisaic antagonists) saw themselves living in the last jubilee, and the Hasmoneans as agents of the angels of Mastemot. The lines in question run as follows:

First, on the last seven years before the Hasmoneans coming to power:

and the rule of Belial shall be over them, to hand them over to the sword for a week of (seven) years [...In] that jubilee they shall be violating all my laws and all my commandments which I shall command t[hem as sent by the han]d of my servants the prophets. (4Q490 2 I, 3–5)

and then on the following seventy years (Eshel: from 164, 152 or 143 B.C.):

And they shall begin to contend with one another for seventy years from the day that they violate the covenant. Thus I shall give them [into the hand of the ang]els of Mastemot and they shall govern them... [They shall fors]ake me and do evil before me. In that which I do not desire, they have chosen to enrich themselves by ill-gotten wealth and illegal profit... they will rob, oppress one another, and they will defile my temple, [they will profane my sabbaths,] they will for[ge]t my [fest]ivals, and with fo[reign]ers [t]he[y] will profane their offspr[ing.]. Their priests will commit violence [(4Q390 2 I, 6–10)

If Eshel is right in his dating of these texts, two Jewish writings with a two hundred year gap between them describe their Jewish opponents as representing the chief evil angel(s). Perhaps in both cases Jewish opponents had persecuted the pious group. In the seven cities of Rev 2–3, Jews might have instigated opposition by Roman authority officials. A number of passages in the corpus refer to the persecution of believers (7:14; 12:11; 14:13; 16:6; 17:6).⁴⁵ These passages probably refer primarily to Christians suffering under Nero and to the Roman crushing of the great revolt, which certainly was experienced by Jewish Christians in Judea.⁴⁶ But the letters to the churches also refer to the suffering of believers in the 90s, where Jewish antagonists could have played a role.

⁴⁴ Eshel, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Hasmonean State* (Hebrew) (Jerusalem: Yad ben-Zvi, 2004), 22–25 (English edition, Eerdmans, 2008).

⁴⁵ Aune, *Revelation 1–5*, cxxx–cxxxii.

⁴⁶ Aune, *Revelation 1–5*, lxiv–lxvii. The “great tribulation” (7:14) refers to persecution and probably to martyrdom, cp. Dan 12:1; Matt 24:21; R. Dalrymple, “These Are the Ones... (Rev 7),” *Bib* 86 (2005): 396–406, here 404f.

The Jewish leaders of Smyrna and Philadelphia could easily see the Jewish Christians as traitors who, in their fraternizing with gentiles, had left the fold. John's designation of them as "synagogue of Satan" probably plays on the meaning of Hebrew *satan* "antagonist": by opposing the true congregation of Israel's Messiah they have revealed themselves as a congregation of antagonists, allied with the great opponent.

According to Harland, the persecution referred to in Revelation is no reaction to Christian refusal to participate in emperor worship. It rather reflects local opposition to the vocal monotheism of the Christians, which was perceived as a threat to other gods with a special relation to the city in question. Christian monotheism could therefore be perceived both as a religious and a political threat.⁴⁷ Other scholars have added to this by pointing to Domitian's building projects in Ephesus around A.D. 90: a new temple dedicated to Vespasian, Titus and himself, and a sports ground for games periodically celebrated in honour of the emperor. These interventions in the urban structure of Ephesus coloured the writing of Revelation. Here John had seen the imperial idolatry with his own eyes and could therefore define Domitian as the beast.⁴⁸ Friesen argues that the competition between the Asian cities from the early 90s was articulated in terms of worship of the emperor.⁴⁹

The sporadic persecution of Christians under Domitian can hardly be responsible for Revelation's repeated references to the suffering of the believers and its vigilant war ideology. These features are more easily understood if the author was a personal witness to the fate of Jewish Christians in Judea during the great revolt and had close information on the persecution of Christians by Nero.⁵⁰ Following the lead of Dan 10–11 he could see personified evil forces behind the empire that had subdued and persecuted both the people of Israel and the church for thirty years.

⁴⁷ P.A. Harland, *Associations, Synagogues, and Congregations: Claiming a Place in Ancient Mediterranean Society* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2003), 239–64.

⁴⁸ G. Biguzzi, "Is the Babylon of Revelation Rome or Jerusalem?" *Bib* 87 (2006): 271–86; T.B. Slater, "On the Social Setting of the Revelation to John," *NTS* 44 (1998): 232–56.

⁴⁹ "In the late first century, Asia was on the cutting edge of the worship of emperors": S. Friesen, "The Cult of the Roman Emperors in Ephesus," *Ephesos: Metropolis of Asia* (ed. H. Koester; Valley Forge, PA: Trinity, 1995), 245–50, here 245.

⁵⁰ Cf. A.Y. Collins, *Crisis and Catharsis: The Power of the Apocalypse* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1984), 46–49, 99–102. On the figure of Nero in Revelation, see Bauckham, *Climax of Prophecy*, 385–452.

Bauckham argues that Revelation recasts Jewish eschatological tradition on the militant Messiah and his army. For the lion-like lamb and his followers these hopes are transformed and fulfilled through the sacrificial death of the lamb.⁵¹ The 144,000 of 7:3–8; 14:1–5 represent the end-time army of this Messiah, those who are following him faithfully, even unto death. Revelation uses holy war language while transferring it to non-military means of triumph over evil. From a heavenly perspective the martyrs are not victims, but victors.⁵² John's martyrology is related to that of 4 Maccabees, which describes the suffering of the martyrs in the language of holy war (4 Macc 1:10f; 9:24–30; 16:12–16).

The concept of war in heaven with repercussions on earth has parallels in the early 4QVisions of Amram (ca. 200–150 B.C.) and the later 11QMelchisedeq, both preserving priestly traditions with dualistic features, cf. the mention of "Melchi]zedek, priest in the assemb[ly of God" in ShirShabb (4Q401 11 III). In the Visions of Amram, the ruler of darkness, Melchiresha, is connected with death and annihilation. His counterpart is Melchisedeq, the ruler of the sons of light, who will redeem men from the power of darkness. These concepts were elaborated within the *yaḥad* in the Melchisedeq peshet from the first half of the first century B.C.⁵³ Here Melchisedeq is a chief angel situated as God's viceroy and called *elohim*. He performs atonement ritual in the heavenly sanctuary and is presented as the end-time judge of Belial and his army. And he will redeem those belonging to him in the great year of jubilee and freedom. The parallels to the ruling Lamb as well as the rider on the white horse (19:11–21) are many. Both Hebrews and John the seer are indebted to priestly traditions on Melchisedeq as God's vigilant viceroy.⁵⁴ To this line of tradition belong rabbinic texts that describe Michael or Moses as heavenly priests.⁵⁵

⁵¹ Bauckham, *Climax of Prophecy*, 229–32.

⁵² *Ibid.*, 232–6.

⁵³ A. Steudel dates 11QMelchizedeq to the last decades before the Roman conquest: "Dating Exegetical Texts from Qumran" in FAT (eds. D. Dimant, R. Kratz; second vol.; forthcoming at Mohr Siebeck).

⁵⁴ A. Aschim, "Melchizedek and Jesus: 11QMelchizedek and the Epistle to the Hebrews," in *The Jewish Roots of Christological Monotheism: Papers from the St. Andrews Conference on the Historical Origins of the Worship of Jesus* (ed. C.C. Newman, J.R. Davila, G.S. Lewis; JSJSup 63; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 129–147.

⁵⁵ See B. Ego, "Der Diener im Palast des himmlischen Königs. Zur Interpretation einer priesterlichen Tradition im rabbinischen Judentum," *Königsherrschaft Gottes und himmlischer Kult im Judentum, Urchristentum und in der hellenistischen Welt* (ed. M. Hengel, A.M. Schwemer; WUNT 55; Tübingen: Mohr, 1991), 361–84.

These Jewish texts illuminate Revelation's royal terminology, where both God and Christ are designated with royal titles. In 11:14–19 God himself has taken on kingship.⁵⁶ In 1:5 Jesus is the Lord over the kings of the earth, and in 19:16 he is proclaimed "King of Kings and Lord of Lords." Those who belong to him have themselves been made royal priests.

The warlike Messiah in Revelation also recalls the image of the vigilant Levi in the Shechem episode (Gen 34) in the priestly writings Aramaic Levi (2:1) and *Jub.* (30:4, 18–20). *T. Levi* 5:3–4 demonstrates that these Levi traditions were active at the time of John the seer and into the second century.

Another feature of the book's war ideology is the conviction that the priestly believers shall "rule the earth" or "rule the land." The declaration of the believers as royal priests in the introduction (1:6) probably refers to believers who shall rule the land, as is explicitly stated in 5:10. In the letter to Laodicea the victorious believer shall sit with the Lord on his throne (3:21), and in the previous letter to Thyatira the victorious one will rule the gentiles *with an iron rod* (2:26f), similar to the description of the end-time Messiah in the corpus (12:5; 19:15f). As the enthroned Messiah shall rule by an iron rod, so shall his church. These verses should be interpreted in connection with the millennium of ch. 20, a limited time where the Messiah rules on earth together with the faithful: "They shall be priests with him and rule with him for 1000 years" (20:6).

The concepts of royal believers ruling the land may be indebted to the painful loss of the land in the years 67–70, a recent memory for John the seer. Furthermore, "priests ruling the land" would for a Jewish reader recall the rule of the Hasmonean priests. 4QapocrJer C describes three bad priests that did not walk in God's ways (4Q387 3 4), probably Jason, Menelaus, and Alcimus, during the years 174–163 B.C. These three priests as well as the Hasmoneans could be anti-types for the end-time priests who shall rule in the name of the Lamb-like Messiah. The loss of the land in the great revolt as well as the OT background suggest that we should first read these passages as "ruling the land," and only secondarily as "ruling the earth." The wider universal dimension

⁵⁶ God as King recurs in the ShirShabb. See A.M. Schwemer, "Gott als König und seine Königsherrschaft in den Sabbatliedern aus Qumran," *Königsherrschaft Gottes und himmlischer Kult*, 45–119.

shows how the seer's eschatology developed during the decades following the great revolt.

Jerusalem still occupies a central role for the author. Towards the end of the millennium Satan and his earthly allies will encircle the "beloved city" of Jerusalem (20:9). This city is also called "the camp of the holy ones," recalling *ירושלים העדה* in 1QM III 11 and "Jerusalem, who is the holy camp" and "capital of the camps of Israel" (*ראש מחנות ישראל*), *מחנה הקדש*, 4QMMT B 60–62). Chapters 21–22 show the eschatological fulfilment as Jerusalem created anew. A similar hope is articulated in the contemporary Jewish apocalypse *4 Ezra*: the pre-existent, hidden Jerusalem will appear and be rebuilt for the world to come (7:26; 8:52; 10:39, 44). But in the messianic kingdom, which precedes the world to come, God's Messiah will rebuild the City of Zion (13:29–50). *4 Ezra* does not mention any temple in the messianic millennium (7:26–28), only the Torah will abide forever (9:31–37).⁵⁷

The Messiah ruling the gentiles with an iron rod is an image from the messianic Ps 2, which recurs in *Ps. Sol.* 17:23f "to smash the arrogance of sinners like a potter's jar; to shatter all their substance with an iron rod; to destroy the unlawful nations with the word of his mouth."

In the generation following another war lost, that of Bar Kochba, Jewish Christians would again raise the hope of an earthly millennium around Zion, as evidenced in the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* and *Lives of the Prophets*. Jervell has argued for a Jewish Christian interpolator of a *Grundschrift* in the testaments.⁵⁸ Whether there is a Jewish Christian interpolator or a Christian redactor behind the testaments in their final form, Jewish Christian theology permeates these writings.⁵⁹ Riessler and Jervell have connected the same Jewish Christian interpolator at work in the testaments to some of the Christian interpolations in the *Lives of the Prophets*.⁶⁰ Also here we find the hope that redeemed Israel will return to the land.⁶¹

⁵⁷ Cf. Stevenson, *Power and Place*, 195–200.

⁵⁸ J. Jervell, "Ein Interpolator interpretiert. Zu der christlichen Bearbeitung der Testamente der Zwölf Patriarchen," *BZNW* 36 (1969): 30–61.

⁵⁹ T. Elgvin, "Jewish Christian Editing of the Old Testament Apocrypha," *Jewish Believers in Jesus: The Early Centuries* (ed. O. Skarsaune, R. Hvalvik; Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2007), 278–304.

⁶⁰ P. Riessler, *Altjüdisches Schrifttum ausserhalb der Bibel. Übersetzt und erläutert*, (Freiburg/Heidelberg 1928, repr. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1966), 1321; Jervell, "Ein Interpolator," 59, note 94.

⁶¹ See *Vit. Ezek.* 3.5; 4:19f; *Vit. Dan.* 4:19f; *Vit. Hag.* 14.2; *T. Jud.* 23:5; *T. Iss.* 6:4; *T. Zeb.* 10:2; *T. Ash.* 7:7.

Revelation, *the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* and *Lives of the Prophets* reflect the outcome of two different Jewish revolts with a messianic flavour (66–70 and 132–135). After both of them, Jewish Christians looked forward to a true messiah that would rule the land in a millennial kingdom.

TRADITION HISTORY—A PRIESTLY PROPHET?

There are reasons to support Aune's suggestion that John personally experienced the turmoil of the great revolt in the Land of Israel: his existential occupation with persecution of the faithful, his concept of Rome as the enemy of God's people, the simplicity of his Greek that is permeated with Hebraisms.

Could the author be a priest or levite who had resided in the land? Temple theology and priestly traditions belong to the heritage of Israel at large, it is not the property of priestly circles alone. But the cumulative evidence of priestly traditions that has set its stamp on John the seer forces the question: Is John a priest or levite who transforms the traditions that framed him in light of the Christ event?⁶² Paulien notes the many parallels between Rev 1–8 and the *Tamid* services as described in *m. Tamid*.⁶³ Knowledge of such procedures was the domain of priests and levites.

The many links between Revelation and ShirShabb⁶⁴ are easier to understand if these songs go back to a common temple liturgy known in Judean circles beyond the *yahad*. Ulfgard asked if Revelation could have been authored by an ex-Qumranite. However, the links between Revelation and Qumran literature can be explained better by a common Israelite background, and in particular by priestly strands represented in the *yahad*, in Levi traditions from Aramaic Levi to *T. 12 Patr*, in Hebrews and Revelation. John the seer represents a priestly or levitic milieu with much in common with the frustrated theologians of the *yahad*. In the 50s and 60s they are, as members of the Jesus camp, at odds with the Sadducean leadership of the temple.

⁶² Acts 4:36 and 6:7 refer to the levite Barnabas and 'many priests' who joined the Jesus camp.

⁶³ Paulien, "The Role of Hebrew Cultus," 252–7. Paulien notes the "cultic intricacies of the author's conceptual world," and suggests "that the ideal reader of the book is one who, through shared competence in the texts and liturgical practices of the Hebrew cult, is enabled to enter more deeply into the world of the text": *Ibid.*, 263.

⁶⁴ Ulfgard, "Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice and the Heavenly Scene."

The visions in the corpus from ch. 4 onwards show John's struggle with theodicy and the quest for understanding God's hidden plans, the *nistarot* (cf. Deut 29:29) during and after the great revolt, in the aftermath of the Neronian persecutions. The visions of the enthroned Lamb give meaning to the destruction of the temple and the end of sacrifices. The same is true for the interpretation of the prayers of the believers as incense rising before the divine throne. The visions in the corpus and the later vision of the ruling Christ in 1:9–18 assure John and his circles that the Jesus movement is the legitimate successor of the temple with its divine presence on earth. Opposition from Jewish leaders in Smyrna and Philadelphia in the 90s confirm for John that Israel is now divided on the issue of the lion-like Lamb and Messiah.

Can there be a connection between the milieus that framed Hebrews and the Book of Revelation? Hebrews knows of the heavenly temple, but the proceedings of this sanctuary are treated in the form of a treatise with scriptural exegesis, not in the form of a visionary writing or apocalypse. However, Hebrews also proclaims to the believers: "you have come to the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, to thousands of angels, to a holy convocation, to the church of the firstborn who are written down in heaven" (13:22f). This author shares a realized eschatology like that of John of Patmos. While Revelation has access to heavenly liturgies and revelations on how God's plan for history and his people is unveiled in the present and the future, Hebrews is interested in the central liturgical event in the heavenly temple, the ultimate high-priestly sacrifice of Christ prefigured by the Yom Kippur sacrifices. Revelation conveys more than Hebrews about the *consequences* of Christ's sacrifice for the church in the world. For John, the primary image for Christ is the Lamb, not the ultimate high priest, although 1:12–18 depicts Christ as the royal high priest.⁶⁵ Hebrews also knows the priestly ministry of every believer, since Christ has opened a road through the curtain into the heavenly sanctuary (4:14–16; 10:19–22).⁶⁶ Hebrews and Revelation may derive from priestly milieus that were able to produce both theological treatises and apocalyptic visions.

⁶⁵ H.B. Swete, *Commentary on Revelation* (1911, repr. Grand Rapids: Kregel, 1977), 16; Paulien, "The role of Hebrew Cultus," 249; H. Kraft, *Die Bilder des Offenbarung des Johannes* (Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1994), 47.

⁶⁶ A relevant background for these statements in Hebrews is 1QSb III–IV and the Self-Glorification Hymn that see an officiating priest on earth serving simultaneously among the angels in the heavenly sanctuary.

REVELATION'S PLAGUE SEPTETS:
NEW EXODUS AND EXILE¹

Benjamin G. Wold
Trinity College, Dublin

Interpreters of John's Apocalypse have long struggled to understand his three plague septets: the opening of seals (6–8), blowing of trumpets (8–11), and pouring out of bowls (16). Traditions derived from Daniel, Zechariah, Ezekiel, Isaiah, and Jeremiah are among the most influential on these chapters. While there are no formal citations of scripture in the Apocalypse, the book forms a rich tapestry of allusions and creative adaptations of biblical traditions. And John is most certainly influenced by and familiar with much more than just the "Old Testament," as commentators have shown distinctive parallels with, for example: Enochic literature, *Wisdom of Solomon*, *4 Ezra*, and *2 Baruch*.

The book of Exodus and traditions derived from it also shape John's three plague septets. In contrast to allusions to Exodus, significant attention has been given to exploring resonances of these prophetic works in the Apocalypse. The purpose of this paper is to explore how traditions related to Exodus may have informed and shaped John's theological world.

Interpreters of New Testament writings have increasingly identified and argued for the presence of exile motifs. More recently, Matthew Thiessen, suggested that the book of Hebrews "renarrates Israel's history as an extended exodus which comes to an end as a result of Christ's high priesthood."² In light of the growing recognition that the continuing exile of God's people is formative in early Jewish and New Testament literature, the issue arises whether allusions to Exodus traditions in Revelation may evoke perceptions of exile and return.

¹ I would like to express my sincere gratitude to the *Alexander von Humboldt-Stiftung* for making this research possible.

² M. Thiessen, "Hebrews and the End of the Exodus," *NovT* 49 (2007): 353.

I. NEW EXODUS AND THE THREE SEPTETS

Exodus plague traditions exert significant influence on the three plague septets. Allusions to seven of the Exodus plagues appear in reference to: blood (8:8; 16:3–4), frogs (16:13), pestilence (6:8), boils/sores (16:2, 11), hail/fire (9:17–18; 16:8–9, 21), locusts (9:3–5), and darkness (8:12; 9:2; 16:10).³ Not only is there a clear precedent for the application of Egyptian plagues on new foes in the end-times (see esp. *Apoc. Ab.* 30.14–16), but there is also evidence in the Hebrew Bible and early Jewish literature that the ten Exodus plagues were shortened to seven.⁴ Psalms 78:44–51 and 105:28–36 each recount the plagues, however they are presented in various orders and list only seven.⁵ This abbreviation of the Exodus plagues from ten to seven also occurs in Artap. 3.27–33 (third to second centuries B.C.E.) and Wis 11–18. Furthermore, there are also several septets of plagues that are not related to Exodus (Amos 4:6–11; 3 *Bar.* 16:3; *m. 'Abot* 5:8–9).

Allusions to Exodus in Rev 5:9–11 introduce the plague septets with imagery of a new exodus. The image of the Lamb being slain evokes memory of the Paschal Lamb and Israel's exodus and liberation from Egypt. Schüssler Fiorenza comments that the death of Christ who is the Lamb depicts the liberation of Christians from *universal enslavement*. Thus, the "new song" in 5:9–10 is a depiction of redemption which uses political imagery in portraying an event analogous to the exodus. Allusion to the Church (= Israel) occurs when the Christian members are referred to as a kingdom of priests (5:10; cf. Exod 19:6). The original exodus resulted in Israel becoming a special nation of priests and so too in the Apocalypse Christian election leads to them becoming a new kingdom of priests. If the new Israel is victorious, they will exercise their kingship actively on earth in the eschatological future. In the new

³ Exodus plagues of lice, swarms and death of firstborn are absent. In regard to the latter, an allusion in Rev 1:5, where Christ is the "firstborn of the dead," may be present.

⁴ David Aune, *Revelation 6–16* (WBC 52; Nashville: Nelson, 1998), 2:498–517 is the most extensive discussion on the reception of Exodus plague traditions in early Judaism. A theme possibly related to exile that this article will not explore is that of the judgmental reversal of creation. That is, the shortening of the plagues from ten to seven may intend to depict return from exile as also a type of "new creation."

⁵ Ps 78 omits lice, boils and darkness; whereas Ps 105 has lice, but omits pestilence and boils. Ps 78:44 begins with blood while 105:28 with darkness, etc.

song, John no longer describes redemption simply from personal sins, but rather deliverance is out of bondage in "Babylon."⁶

Imagery of Israel and Moses at the time of the exodus may also be found in Rev 12. Here, a woman clothed with the sun and the moon at her feet (12:1–6) gives birth to a son. Waiting to devour the child when it is born is a great red dragon. However, the dragon does not succeed in consuming it, the child born is described as one who is to rule the nations with a rod of iron, a reference to Jesus (cf. Rev 2:27, 19:16; Ps 2:9), and is caught up to God and his throne. Although throne scenes evoke imagery of much more than Sinai, reference to Moses in this passage is likely.

Following the description of the child, the woman flees to the wilderness and the dragon is cast down to earth, whereupon he pursues the woman (12:13) who is led to the wilderness (12:14). In his hunt for the woman the dragon pours forth a river of water to sweep the woman away, but the earth swallows up the water to rescue her, which is an eschatological application of Israel's deliverance from Egypt at the Red Sea. Although this passage may find a number of resonances, the woman may be seen as a depiction of Israel. The child born is a polyvalent character, referring to Jesus and reminding one of Moses.

Revelation 15:2–4 is equally as pivotal in understanding the plague septets as part of a new exodus theme. Chapter 15 opens with a depiction of those who conquer the beast standing beside a sea of glass, which is mingled with fire, and there they sing the "song of Moses" (v. 3). This is likely a non-explicit use of the Song of the Sea (Exod 15), which occurs in Revelation just before the final septet of bowls.⁷ The three septets, in alluding to the exodus plagues, suggest memory of the exodus and deliverance from Egyptian bondage in Exod 15.⁸ The series of plagues in the Apocalypse are an eschatological application of Egyptian plagues to depict judgment upon the kingdom of the Beast/Babylon.

⁶ E. Schüssler Fiorenza, *The Book of Revelation: Justice and Judgment* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985), 73–6.

⁷ Aune, *Revelation 6–16*, 863 comments that the reference to the song of Moses in Revelation is reminiscent of the second exodus motif in Isa 12.

⁸ G.R. Beasley-Murray, *The Book of Revelation* (London: Oliphants, 1974), 233 observes that "the judgments of the Lord on the land of Egypt are but pale anticipations of the greater judgments which are to fall on the kingdom of the beast, and the emancipation from Egypt is far surpassed by the redemption of the Lamb.... The duality of exodus as judgment and redemption is maintained in chapters 15–16, and to ensure that this is understood by the reader, the positive element of redemption is placed first."

That the plague septets are to be read as condemnation of Babylon is clear, however identifying the cryptogram “Babylon” straightforwardly as “Rome” may still be questioned. Regardless of how one reads “Babylon” it is possible that, *vis-à-vis* Exodus allusions, one is also reminded of Egypt.⁹ Therefore, when “Babylon” has exodus-like plagues sent upon her, prefaced with a paschal lamb and concluded with a song at the sea, there may be undercurrents that she is also “Egypt.” The discussion to follow seeks to support this theory by examining a few Qumran scrolls which may display tendencies to conceive of ongoing exile in reference to Egypt and the exodus.¹⁰

II. “EGYPTIAN” EXILE IN THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS

God’s deliverance of the Israelites from Egyptian bondage through a series of wonders receives significant attention in Jewish literature from the Hellenistic period. However, there is relatively little surviving material in the Qumran library that interprets the exodus. Most noticeable is 4Q422 (*Paraphrase of Genesis and Exodus*), which is a poetic retelling of the Exodus plagues. Although the manuscript is fairly fragmentary one may discern that nine (rather than ten) of the plagues are recollected in a series of *distichoi* and *tristichoi*.¹¹ Outside of 4Q422, none of the other scrolls preserve references to individual Egyptian plagues.

While מִצְרַיִם (“Egypt”) occurs nearly sixty times in the Dead Sea Scrolls, decipherable contexts rarely survive.¹² At times, deliverance from Egypt is recollected along with Lev 26. Not only does Lev 26 remember

⁹ G.K. Beale, *The Book of Revelation: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (Grand Rapids/Cambridge: Eerdmans, 1999), 787 comments “...the ‘seven last plagues’ could correspond to the ten plagues God brought against Egypt. *Pesiq. Rab Kah.* 7.11 affirms that the same plagues God set against Egypt will be sent against Rome and Gog...”; Cf. *Lev. Rab.* 6:6 where the plague of darkness is applied to Rome.

¹⁰ The “great city,” a description used on other occasions in the Apocalypse in reference to the cryptogram “Babylon,” is used of Jerusalem in 11:10. The “great city” in 11:10 is also described as “spiritually [πνευματικῶς] called Sodom and Egypt.” 13:10 suggests that the worship of the beast is like being led into captivity.

¹¹ There are three other known traditions that recount nine plagues: Ezek. Trag. 133–48; *Ps.-Philo* 10.1; and Josephus (*Ant.* 2.293–314).

¹² The following discussion is not entirely comprehensive, but a selection from a longer work in progress. 4QPseudo-Ezkekiel, in D. Dimant, *Qumran Cave 4.XXI: Parabiblical Texts, Part 4: Pseudo-Prophetic Texts*, (DJD XXX; Oxford: Clarendon, 2001), has a number of references to Egypt. Cf. 4Q185 (“*Sapiential Work*”) mentions the wonders done in Egypt as well and reads: “... (13) and now listen to me my people, and gain wisdom (14) from me simple ones, they shall be amazed from the might of

God's actions in leading Israel out of Egypt, but it also contains a prolonged warning that disobedience will lead to the desolation and exile of Israel. Noteworthy for the present discussion is the forewarning in Leviticus, which is formulated with four sets of "seven" punishments/plagues (Lev 26:18, 21, 24, 28).¹³

The *Damascus Document, Narrative and Words of the Luminaries*^a each make individual contributions for understanding the reception of biblical traditions related to the bondage and deliverance from Egypt. Captivity or ongoing exile may be formed with reference to exodus and Egypt, which on one occasion may be remembered not only as a time when God delivered Jacob, but also a prototype for exile that has or may reoccur.

A. *Egypt and Exile in the Damascus Document*

In the beginning columns of the *Damascus Document* are exhortations framed within recollections of God's saving plan in history. Remembrance of Egypt is part of understanding the past for the present. The author(s) recounts how God preserved a remnant, beginning in column I line 2 with a statement that: God has a dispute with all flesh and will judge the unfaithful. And indeed, God has carried out judgment throughout history, but has always preserved a remnant among the children of Israel. Remembrance of the generations and deliverance of the elect is introduced with: He remembered the covenant with the forefathers and preserved a remnant.¹⁴

In the *Damascus Document*, the generations of the Babylonian captivity (I, 6), the generation of Noah (III, 1), and the children of those delivered from Egypt and who wandered in the wilderness because of the stubbornness of their hearts, are each recalled (III, 5). God estab-

our God; remember the miracles He did (15) in Egypt! His wonders in the land of Ham! Your hearts shall fear from before His dread...".

¹³ Seven individual plagues are not listed in Lev 26, שבע here means "many times," and is not to be taken literally as seven times, which would be expressed as שבעותים.

¹⁴ Cf. Lev 26:36, 39 where הנשארים ("the remaining ones") are mentioned after phases of the remediation process. The 1QM ("War Scroll") (I, 6; IV, 2; XIII, 8; XIV, 5, 8-9) uses remnant language to describe the righteous more than the CD, except for these two works there are few references to the שארית; see for example 1QM XIII, 7-9 where the establishment of a covenant from the time of the forefathers until eternity is described and God's mercies among the remnant (שארית) are remembered, these are the survivors of the covenant. 4Q185 may also be concerned with remnant theology (1-2 ii 2).

lished his covenant with those who remained faithful and revealed to them “secret things” (III, 14), which are related to the observance of the proper calendar.

Columns II–VI of the *Damascus Document* are the subject of much controversy. What community lies behind this document and within which social milieu should its theology be located? Michael Knibb’s argument that the *Damascus Document* reflects an ongoing exile, similar to other early Jewish literature, is plausible.¹⁵ Knibb suggests a “Palestinian reform movement” within which similar theological patterns are shared. Counted among this movement would be the *Apocalypse of Weeks* (1 En. 93:8–10), which in its presentation of seven periods of history gives no account of return from exile. Instead, the author condemns the apostate post-exilic generation and tells of a righteous remnant that will arise (93:10 “there shall be elected the elect ones of righteousness”) from the eternal plant of righteousness.¹⁶

The *Damascus Document* recounts deliverance from Egypt and appears to associate it with exile. Language of exile coincides with a negative view of the Jerusalem cult and her priests. Significant for the present conversation, column V describes a “first” deliverance from Egypt which seems to imply a second exodus. Also in this column, lines 17–19 tell of a nation that lacks understanding and is “devoid of counsel,” which is followed by an account of former times when Moses and Aaron were raised up by the Prince of Lights. Belial in his mischief, however, raised up Jannes and his brother at the time of the first deliverance of Israel.

This scene of Moses and Aaron encountering a twin nemesis is compared in the lines to follow (20–21) with a period of the destruction of the land. This is a time when boundary shifters who caused Israel to stray came. The extra-biblical characters Jannes and his brother Jambres are Pharaoh’s magicians who oppose Moses and Aaron in the story of the plagues. They are described in 2 Timothy 3:8 as fools who defied the truth.¹⁷ The period of the “destruction of the land” is likely an allusion to captivity and perhaps more specifically to Lev 26:32. Although devastation as a consequence of rejecting the covenant is known elsewhere

¹⁵ M.A. Knibb, “Exile in the Damascus Document,” *JSOT* 25 (1983): 99–117.

¹⁶ For this and other references to exile in early Jewish circles, see M.A. Knibb, “Exile in the Literature of the Intertestamental Period,” *HeyJ* 17 (1976): 253–72.

¹⁷ See e.g. *Jannes and Jambres* in J.H. Charlesworth (ed.) *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, vol. 2 (Doubleday: New York, 1985), 427–42.

in the Hebrew Bible, it is especially to be associated with Leviticus (cf. 26:40–41, Israel is warned that defiance will lead to exile).

Hanan Eshel's suggestion that the *Damascus Document* portrays the Teacher of Righteousness as a Moses-like guide who takes his group into the wilderness is compelling. A parallel is drawn between "the followers of the Teacher of Righteousness and those followers of Moses who accepted the spies' testimony concerning the land of Israel causing Moses and his people to wander forty years in the desert." Once Moses and his betrayers have died the sons of Israel are prepared to enter the land. The followers of the Teacher of Righteousness should be understood as having to wait forty years in the wilderness until the enemies of the Teacher of Righteousness and his adversaries have perished. At the end of this period they will return to Jerusalem and restore Israel.¹⁸

In the *Damascus Document* the comparison of Moses and Aaron with Jannes and Jambres helps contrast his group, raised up by the Prince of Lights, with the group in Jerusalem, which was established by Belial. These figures serve as referents to the author's own group and his opponents while portraying the present situation *vis-à-vis* a second exodus typology. Although new exodus motifs are well-known in Deutero-Isaiah, in the *Damascus Document* the exiled are depicted as a remnant who is *theologically estranged* from other apostate Jews.

B. 4Q462 ("Narrative"): "Given to Egypt a Second Time"

4Q462 ("Narrative") is a 19 line manuscript which does not share distinctive characteristics that would associate it with core Essene documents. The date of the text's composition is unknown and there are no clear historical referents to help locate it, however the script indicates a copy or composition date of *circa* 50–25 B.C.E.¹⁹ If the interpretation to follow is convincing, this fragment would be the most explicit among the Dead Sea Scrolls for establishing "Egypt" as a label for later exile.

¹⁸ H. Eshel, "The Meaning and Significance of CD 20:13–15," in *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues* (ed. D.W. Parry and Eugene Ulrich; Leiden: Brill, 1996), 330–336.

¹⁹ Smith, in M. Broshi et al. (eds.), *Qumran Cave 4.XIV: Parabiblical Texts, Part 2* (DJD XIX; Oxford: Clarendon, 1995) 196, says on palaeography: "4Q462 exhibits a formal script dating to the transition from the late Hasmonean to the early Herodian period with some semi-formal features. The script resembles that of 4QSam^a, which F.M. Cross dates to c. 50–25 B.C.E."

The events described in the lead up to the phrase “they were given to Egypt a second time” appear to recount selected portions of Israel’s history until the present time. This fragment reads:²⁰

- (2) את שם וא[ת חם ואת יפת
 (3) [יעקוב ויא[] יזכור]
 (4) [ים לישראל] vac [בכך יאמר]
 (5) [ים רוקמה הלכנו כי לוקח]
 (6) [לעבדים ליעקוב בא"ב]ה
 (7) [תנה לרבים לנחלה ... המישל]
 (8) [כבודו אשר מאחד ימלא את המים ואת הארץ]
 (9) [ל] את הממשלה לכדו עמו היה האור עמהם ועלינו היה]
 (10) עבר ק[ץ החושך וקץ האור בא ומשלו לעולם על כן יואמר]?
 (11) [ל] ישראל כי בתוכנו היה עם החביב יעקוב]
 (12) [יהמה ויעבודו ויתקימו ויזעקו אל ...]
 (13) [והנה נתנו במצרים שנית בקצ ממלכה ויתקימו]
 (14) [יושבי פלשת ומצרים לבזה וחורבה יועמידוה]
 (15) [מיר לרומם לרשע בעבור תקבל טמ]אה/את
 (16) [ה ועז פניה יתשנה בזיוה ועדה ובגדיה]
 (17) [ים ואת אשר עשתה לה כן טמאת העם]
 (18) [גשנאתה כאשר היתה לפני הבנותה]
 (19) vac [יזכור את {ישראל} ירושלם]

- (2) Shem,] Ham and Japhet[]
 (3)] for Jacob,
 and He des[troyed them and he cried ou]t²¹
 and He remembered [his word which He spoke (?)²²]
 (4) [] for Israe[l] vac
 then it shall be said[]
 (5) [] an embroidered garment,²³ we went,
 for taking[]

²⁰ Transcription of these lines, without full diacritical markings, is from Smith, *DJD XIX*, 198; see also his, “4Q462 (Narrative) Frg. 1: A Preliminary Edition,” *RevQ* 15 (1991): 57.

²¹ There are approximately 6–7 letter spaces available for reconstruction, the final letter after the damage point on the left side can only be a *nun* or *kaf*. Perhaps then: ויא[ברם וזעק]

²² Reconstructing from 4Q463 (“Narrative D”) frag. 1, 1: דברו אל את דברו.

²³ Smith, *DJD XIX*, 199: “... *waw* is the preferred reading.” However רקמה (“embroidered garment”) in the *plene* would be ריקמה, in which case one might also translate “their *being* empty”; however, a preposition would also be expected -ב-. Smith, *DJD XIX*, 201 refers to Ezek 16:10, 13 and 18 where Jerusalem is clothed in a ריקמה. 4Q161 (*pIsa*^a) 8–10 l. 19 awaits that the shoot of David in the end time will be crowned and given embroidered clothes (בגדי ריקמות). In Esth. Rab. to 3.1 Haman makes an image and places it on his embroidered garment (מרוקם). The *Targumim* translate Joseph’s garment (Gen 37:3; כתנת פסים) as פרגוד.

- (6) [] for slaves,
 for Jacob with lov[e]
 (7) [it] was given²⁴ to many for an inheritance,
 the Lord²⁵ rules [(8)] His glory,
 which *from Jacob* he will fill the waters and the earth[]
 (9) [] the power is with him alone,
 the light was with them and [darkness] was upon us²⁶
 (10) [but behold,] the per[iod] of darkness is [passed],
 and the period of light come,
 and it will reign forever,
 therefore let them sa[y: (11)] to I[s]rael,
 for among us was the people of the *beloved one*, Jaco[ob]²⁷
 (12) [] and they laboured (*worshipped?*),
 and arose and cried to the Lord []
 (13) [] and behold they were given to Egypt a second time,
 in the period of the kingdom,²⁸
 but they will ar[ise]
 (14) [in]habitants of Philistia and Egypt [will return] to a spoil and
 a ruin,
 they will raise her *up*²⁹[(15)] to the heights,
 to wickedness,
 in order that she receive uncleanness[]
 (16) [] and her impudence (*harlotry?*),
 and will be changed to splendour,
 and her menstruation,
 and her clothes []
 (17) [] and what she did to her,
 so is the uncleanness of the c[ity]³⁰

²⁴ Perhaps וינתנה, Smith does not reconstruct but translates: “he will give it”. See Smith, “4Q462,” 64–5 for discussion on converted and unconverted imperfects.

²⁵ The *Tetragrammaton* is represented twice in this fragment with four dots (lines, 7, 12).

²⁶ לבדו rather than ממשלה לכדו (“they seized power”) makes more sense with עמו, the absence of a conjunction in the first part of this line allows for a number of renderings. Reconstructing הושך at the end of the line.

²⁷ חביב occurs only here in the Dead Sea Scrolls. It is a *hapax legomenon* in the Hebrew Bible, Deut 33:3 uses the verb חבב “to love.” Jastrow on חביב offers “beloved, dear, precious, favored, and privileged.” Smith, *DJD XIX*, 203 comments on Deut 33:3 (“truly He [God] loves [חבב] His people”) that it “refers to Israel, just as line 11 apparently refers to Jacob.”

²⁸ “Period” (קץ) occurs twice in line 10 in reference to the periods of darkness and light. If the “period of the kingdom” here refers to a time of a new Egyptian exile, then it must align itself with the period of darkness. The phrase does not occur elsewhere, cf. קץ ממשל in 1QM I 5; 4Q180 I l. 4; and 4Q510.

²⁹ Reconstructing: ויחזרו יו[ן]שבי.

³⁰ Reconstructing: הע[יר]ה.

- (18) [] she hated as she was before she was built³¹]
 (19) [] *vac* and He shall remember {Israe} Jerusalem the[

4Q462 1–12 appear to provide a summarization of Israel's past. Lines 2–4 clearly refer to the descendents of Noah and then Jacob. In lines 5–6 reference to an embroidered robe followed by slavery may recall an interpretation of Joseph and the original suffering of Israel in Egypt. Line 7a could refer to the inheritance (i.e. the Land and/or God) promised to Israel after being led out of Egypt at the time of the original exodus (e.g. Num 26:53, 35–36; Deut 4:20–21, 18:1–2, 19:10–16). Line 7b extols God and is immediately followed in line 9 with a description of a period of darkness for the author(s) and his audience. It is noteworthy that this darkness in line 9 is upon “us” (עלינו) while light is with “them” (עמהם). The “us” and “them” language continues in later lines. Those who experience a period of light appear to be an adversarial group, however in line 9 it is not clear who “they” are.

In line 10 the situation is reversed and the period of darkness passes for the descendants of Jacob. Indeed, not only has light come upon them, but has come and will remain forever.³² It is unclear, due to the column's damaged condition, what occurs in the first colon at the end of line 10 and beginning of line 11. In the second colon of line 11 a time is recounted when the “the people of the beloved one” (ההביב) are said to still dwell among “us.”³³ The author does not include himself among this group, but rather uses pronouns which clearly distinguish them as being “other.” This period of dwelling together with them, however, does not continue and “they” (l. 13) are delivered over to Egypt a second time. To be sure, a distinct group within Israel (perhaps a remnant or minority group) is *not* led into a second Egyptian captivity while other Israelites are. These others appear to be the people of

³¹ Smith, *DJD XIX*, 205 prefers the *Nip'al* שְׂנֵאתָהּ [נ] to the 3rd fem. sing. *Qal* perfect. Contextually both are confusing and the *Qal* perfect has precedence (l. 17).

³² Smith, *DJD XIX*, 200 translates imperfects in the future, see Florentino García Martínez and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar eds, *Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* (2 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 2:941–2 who translate in the past tense.

³³ Smith, *DJD XIX*, 200 translates lines 11–12 as “[to (?) [I]srael, for among us was the people of the beloved one, Jac[ob] their [] and they will serve as they will endure and they will cry to YHWH[.]” Jacob is of concern in this column, occurring three times (ll. 3, 6, 11). “Jacob” in line 11 appears to begin the following colon and one cannot state unequivocally that the “people of the beloved one” are to be identified with Jacob. What seems to be clear is that the people of the beloved one are distinct from the authors group. For Jacob with negative connotations, 4Q185 1–2 ii, 3–4 I suggest the reconstruction: “listen to me my children and do not rebel, do not walk [in the way of the sons of]]acob, but the path he set forth for Isaac.”

the beloved one and, as a group set over and against the author, could also be those who experienced a period of light while the author and his group experienced darkness (l. 9).

Line 12 may describe a life of slavery in Egypt. In the first broken colon "they," perhaps the unfaithful of Israel, are said to serve, perhaps, their captors (Exod 1:13–14). In the following colon "they" arise and may cry out to God (Exod 2:23). That this description in line 12 precedes a statement of being given into a second Egyptian captivity is not necessarily an issue. As early as lines 9b–10a exile may be in view; the author's period of darkness is passed and, therefore, the unfaithful of Israel may now be in darkness. After all, in line 11 the people of the beloved one transition from being among the author's group to being, by implication, outside of it. On the one hand, lines 9–13 would portray the events of the author's community who suffered darkness but is now living in eternal light. This group is not given into a new exile. On the other hand, the people of the beloved one have strayed; they no longer enjoy the light and are given over to Egypt. The explicit mention of being given into Egypt in line 13 seems to describe a state of exile already depicted with imagery of light and darkness in previous lines 9–10. Line 12 describes Egyptian captivity before it is explicitly described as such in line 13.

Lines 2–8 may be viewed as recounting the biblical past while lines 9–13 the community's own history in relation to apostate Jews. Lines 14–19 appear to turn to the subject of future restoration. Those who are given to Egypt a second time, perhaps imagery used by the author(s) to describe the exilic state of his adversary, figuratively abide in Philistia and Egypt. Thus, line 14 describes expectation of the exiles return. In 4Q462 we find that when the exiles return (line 14) their land has become a spoil and ruin. Prophetic literature describes the result of exile with language of desolation (esp. Lev 26; Ezek 5:14). So too, Israel playing the harlot (l. 16?) and being impure (lines 15, 17) is language used by the prophets for wayward Israel (Isa 1:21; Jer 3:3; Ezek 16:30, 22:5).

Final line 19 describes a future time when God will remember Jerusalem. Smith suggests that the text may describe the future restoration of the Jewish people either from a general Diaspora setting, or perhaps Egypt itself, which culminates in the transformation of Jerusalem.³⁴

³⁴ Smith, *DJD XIX*, 208.

However, *pace* Smith, the author may not be awaiting the restoration of Israel in such a straightforward manner, but rather the opponents of the author maybe viewed as dwelling in a state of Egyptian-like captivity while his group abides in eternal light and non-captivity. One may conceive of this fragment as fitting within an apocalyptic worldview in which the author is awaiting the restoration of Jerusalem which has gone astray and is impure.³⁵ A setting for this piece may then be suggested: a dispute exists over the purity of Jerusalem and those who participate in this impurity are figuratively in exile. The author's orthodox group is awaiting the restoration of an unorthodox group, likely located in Jerusalem, which is discussed with the imagery of impurity.³⁶

C. 4Q504 1-2 V ("Words of the Luminaries")

Even if language related to Egypt and the exodus occur in association with exile, for an investigation of the plague septets in the Apocalypse it is also helpful to investigate the place of Lev 26 in such reflection. To this end, liturgical manuscript 4Q504 1-2 V ("Words of the Luminaries") is particularly important because of its sustained reflection on Lev 26.³⁷ Elsewhere in this work the wonders done in Egypt are alluded to as well (e.g. 1-2 ii 11-12, "you remembered your נפלאות which you did before the eyes of the nations"). *Words of the Luminaries*^a dates to approximately the mid- to late second century B.C.E., pre-dates the Essene group and may stem from a different sociological setting altogether.³⁸ It is a liturgical work structured around prayers given on each

³⁵ J.J. Collins, *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (London/New York: Routledge, 1997), 6 "Perhaps the most momentous difference between apocalyptic and prophetic eschatology concerns the final goal of history. The apocalypses usually, though not always, envisage the restoration of Israel on earth in some form."

³⁶ Cf. Rev 11:8-10 after beast makes war, conquering and killing: "and their dead bodies will lie in the street of the great city [Jerusalem]" which is also called "Egypt."

³⁷ M. Baillet, *Qumran grotte 4.III (4Q482-4Q520)*, (DJD VII; Oxford: Clarendon, 1982), 145-47. *Words of the Luminaries* is a liturgical work that was likely used daily at sunrise or sunset to mark the changing of heavenly luminaries. Days of the week also appear in it as do many issues related to calendar and Sabbaths.

³⁸ Baillet, *DJD VII*, 137 on the date of the 4Q504: "L'écriture est une calligraphie asmonéenne, qui peut dater des environs de 150 avant J.-C."; see also E.G. Chazon, "Is *Divrei Ha-me'orot* a Sectarian Prayer?" in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research* (ed. D. Dimant and U. Rappaport; Leiden: Brill, 1992) 3-17; and Daniel Falk, *Daily, Sabbath, and Festival Prayers in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (STDJ 27; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 61-3. Baillet, *DJD VII*, 137 on the provenance of *Word of the Luminaries*: "L'absence de caractère 'sectaire', la date de copie et la découverte à Qumrân font alors penser au mouvement assidéen, dont les Esséniens furent les héritiers spirituels"; Chazon,

of the days of the week: “this is the prayer for the first day”; “this is the prayer for the second day”; etc. Column V of 4Q504 1–2 reads:³⁹

- (2) מקור מים חיים א [] [] שם...
 (3) ויעבדו אל נכר בארצם וגם ארצם
 (4) שממה על אויביהמה היא [נש] פכה חמתך
 (5) וחרני אפכי באש קנאחכה להחריבה
 (6) מעובר ומשב בכול זואת לוא מאסחה
 (7) בזרע יעקוב ולו געלתה את ישראל
 (8) לכלותם להפר בריתכה אתם היא אתה
 (9) אל חי לבדכה ואין זולתכה ותזכור בריתכי
 (10) אשר הוצאתנו לעיני הגוים ולוא עזבתנו
 (11) בגוים ותחון את עמכה ישראל בכול
 (12) [ה] ארצות אשר הדחתם שמה לחשיב
 (13) אל לבבם לשוב עודך ולשמוע בקולכה
 (14) [כ] כול אשר צויתה ביד מושה עבדכה
 (15) [כי] א יצקתה את רוח קודשכה עלינו
 (16) [לה] ביא ברכיכה לנו לפקודכה בצר לנו
 (17) [ולל] חש בעקון מוסרכה •• ונבואה בצרות
 (18) [ונגי] עים ונסויים בחמת המציק היא גם
 (19) [הו] גענו א^ל בעווננו העבדנו צור בחט[תנו]
 (20) [ולוא] העבדתנו להועיל מדרכי[נו] בד[רך]
 (21) [אשר נלך] בה [ו] לוא הקשבנו א[ל מצוותיכה]

- (3) and they worshiped a foreign god in their land,
 and their land also is (4) a desolation because of their enemies,
 For your rage was poured out,
 (5) and your destroying anger in your zealous fire,
 to lay it waste (6) from either passing through or dwelling.
 In all this you did not reject (7) the seed of Jacob,
 nor⁴⁰ despise Israel (8) to destroy them or to invalidate your covenant
 with them.
 For you (9) are a living God,
 you alone, and there is none beside you.
 Remember your covenant!
 (10) For you brought us forth in the eyes of the nations,
 and did not abandon us (11) among the nations.
 (12) You acted mercifully towards your people Israel,

“Sectarian Prayer,” 15–16 observes that nothing in the document is incompatible with “Yahad” origins and yet no distinct terminology point to this community; and Falk, *Daily, Sabbath*, 157 concludes that it did not originate with the “parent group” of the “Yahad” and suggests, plausibly, a socio-liturgical setting with connection to levitical circles and *ma’amadot* services.

³⁹ Transcriptions, without all diacritical markings, taken from *DJD VII*, 145–6; translation, stichoi and (noted) reconstructions mine throughout.

⁴⁰ Reading ולוא.

- among all (13) [the] lands to which you banished them,
 changing their hearts to return to you again and to listen to your
 voice
 (14) [according] to all that which you commanded by the hand of
 Moses your servant.
 (15) F[or] you have poured out your holy spirit upon us,
 (16) [to br]ing your blessings upon us,
 to heed you in our trouble
 (17) [and to wh]isper in the chastening⁴¹ of your instruction,
 for we came to hardships (18) [and pl]agues⁴² and trials by the wrath
 of the oppressor,⁴³
 for we too (19) [wea]ry God with [our] iniquities:
 we *struck* (lit. forced)⁴⁴ *the* rock in our sin,
 (20) [but you]⁴⁵ *forced* us to leave [our] ways;
 in the p[ath] (21) [which we went],
 [and] paid no attention to yo[ur commandments...]

This column is concerned with interpreting and retelling the exodus from captivity to wandering in the wilderness. The beginning lines of this column share a similar interpretation of the exodus with Ezekiel 20:5–17. Ezekiel 20:8–9 describe idolatry as the original cause of Israel suffering in Egypt, even though in the book of Exodus itself they are spared the plagues. Ezekiel’s interpretation of exile in Egypt is intended to parallel the destruction of Judea by Babylon, which was also caused by idolatry. Note that Lev 26 frames remembrance of Egypt within a warning against future idolatry. Leviticus 26:43–46, which promises that even when desolation has come God will remember his remnant and covenant, is also alluded to here.

The reformulation of Leviticus in *Words of the Luminaries*^a 1–2 V, especially lines 3–9, serves at least two purposes. First, it is an important framework for giving thanks to God. Whereas in Leviticus these words

⁴¹ Cf. Isa 26:16.

⁴² Cf. Korah’s Rebellion (Num 16:48–9).

⁴³ This may be a multivalent reference to both the exodus and a more recent event in the life of the community; cf. CD I, 13–14 “like a wayward cow has Israel strayed, when the man of mockery arose and poured out...waters of lies and wandered in the void...”

⁴⁴ Reading in lines 19–20 the *Hifil* הִעֲבִיד (Jastrow; to enslave, oppress), as an allusion to Moses striking the rock (Num 20:1–13), followed in the next colon with a reference to God’s punishments on Israel for disobedience. Baillet, *DJD VII*, 147 translates “nous avions asservi (le) Rocher par [notre] péché[hé]. [Mais], pour notre profit, Tu [ne] nous as [pas forcés], comme des esclaves...”

⁴⁵ Reading הַרְוֵנוּ not וְלוֹא, see also García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *DSSSE*, 2:1016.

are made as a promise by God to Israel, in these lines the author(s) uses the passage to recount God's faithfulness when the people have been unfaithful.⁴⁶ Second, and more importantly, fragment 1–2 V is a prophetic fulfilment of Lev 26:43: “the land shall be forsaken (הארץ תעזב) by them, making up for its Sabbath years by being desolate (בהשמה; cf. שממה in l. 4) of them, and they shall make up for their iniquity, because my statutes they rejected (מאסו) and my laws their souls (נפשם) despised (גאלה).”⁴⁷

Leviticus 26 looks to the future on the one hand, while on the other it considers God's redemptive work in the past. Leviticus 26:44–45 continue: “yet, even then, when they are in the land of their enemies (בהיותם בארץ איביהם), I will not reject or despise them (לא-מאסתים), so as to destroy them (לכלתם), to invalidate My covenant with them (להפר בריתי אתם), for I am the Lord their God; and I shall remember (וזכרתי) in their favour the covenant with the ancients (ראשונים), who I brought forth (הוצאתי-אתם) from the land of Egypt in the eyes of all nations (לעיני הגוים).” *Words of the Luminaries*^a envisages that everything Lev 26 forewarns has come to pass, but God will redeem an elect group just as he redeemed Israel from Egypt. The author(s) represents those who undoubtedly enter into the role of the ושארים (“remaining ones”; Lev 26:39; cf. CD I, 1–5), who confess their sins and are “rotting away” (ימקו) because of their iniquities, which caused the desolation of their land.

The final lines of 1–2 V appear to interpret Israel's time in the wilderness (17–20). One may speculate whether lines 19–20 hold an allusion to Num 20:1–13 (vs. 11 ויך את הסלע במטהו) and corporate responsibility for *striking* (העבדנו) the rock? In Numbers Moses errs

⁴⁶ Elsewhere in 4Q504, in a column that recounts the mighty acts of God, language is used that likely alludes to acts like those wrought by God in Egypt. 1–2 VI: lines 6–7 “we have not rejected your trials and plagues (בנסוייכה ובנגיעכה);” line 9 “so that we might tell of your mighty deeds (גבורתכה);” and line 10 “since you do wonders (נפלאות) from eternity to eternity.”

⁴⁷ *Tg. Neof.* on Lev 26:44 reads: “... when they were exiled in the land of their enemies I did not loathe them in the kingdom of Persia, to break my covenant with them...”; and *Tg. Ps.-J.* “...I will love them with my Memra when they will be exiled in the land of their enemies. I will not spurn them—in the kingdom of Babylon—and my Memra will not reject them—in the kingdom of Media—so as to wipe them out—in the Kingdom of Greece,—so as to break my covenant with them—in the kingdom of Edom—for I am the Lord their God—in the days of Gog.” M. McNamara, R. Hayward and M. Maher, *Targum Neofiti 1: Leviticus and Pseudo-Jonathan: Leviticus* (AB 3; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994).

when he hits the rock with his staff rather than speaking to it; an example of disobedience that *Words of the Luminaries*^a may recount in the first person plural (l. 19 “we struck”). This interpretation would make sense of the unusual use of the same verb in parallel, line 20 then would depict God *forcing* (העבדתנו) the Israelites to leave their wicked ways by means of forced remediation.

Throughout this column the author(s) recounts the exodus and, significantly, views his own community as participating in the biblical narrative. He conceives of his own more recent history not only as a fulfilment of prophecy, but the Bible is rewritten to describe a more recent exile.⁴⁸

III. LEVITICUS 26 AND REVELATION’S PLAGUE SEPTETS

In Revelation, plagues occur within a broader, running allusion to a new exodus theme. Egypt and the exodus, in some of the Qumran scrolls, may be read in association with exile. Being led into captivity may be interpreted on one occasion with language of return to Egypt. When investigating these texts scholars have observed that Lev 26 is often in view. This chapter forewarns that a sequence of four plagues, described figuratively as “seven,” will be visited upon Israel to turn her away from idolatry should she stray.⁴⁹ The final “seven” tells of exile, but promises that God will keep his covenant and preserve a remnant.

Only a few scholars have suggested that Rev 6–16 patterns its plagues on Lev 26. When this connection is suggested, it is based upon the occurrence of the numbers four and seven in relation to divine punishment. Indeed, “seven plagues” are mentioned nowhere else in the Hebrew Bible and New Testament outside of Rev 15:6 (οἱ ἑπτὰ ἄγγελοι

⁴⁸ Smith, *DJD XIX*, 207 comments concerning this tendency, noting that particularly in later apocalyptic literature, the Babylonian exile was explicitly recalled in its historiographical surveys of past events (e.g. *1 En.* 89–90; *2 Bar.* 10–11; *Sib. Or.* 3.196–294; *Tg. 1 Sam* 21–10) and applied as prototype for understanding the situation of Israel long after return (*T. Mos.* 3; cf. *T. Jud.* 23.5; *Lad. Jac.* 5.16–17). *3 Macc* 6 recounts a prayer on the lips of the priest Eleazar, where Egyptian slavery and captivity in the book of Daniel and Jonah are precursors to an allusion to Lev 26:44. This allusion to Lev is formulated as a plea to God “to show the Gentiles (δειχθήτω πᾶσιν ἔθνεσιν)”, followed shortly thereafter by: “just as you said, ‘not even when they were in the land of their enemies did I neglect them’”.

⁴⁹ Although allusions to Ezek may at times be found in addition to Lev, Ezek is frequently reading, interpreting and alluding to Lev 26 (e.g. Ezek 4–6).

οἱ ἔχοντες τὰς ἑπτὰ πληγὰς) and Lev 26:21 (LXX προσθήσω ὑμῖν πληγὰς ἑπτὰ). That they should be viewed as a series of “plagues” is evident in *Targums Pseudo-Jonathan* and *Onkelos* where they are individually and explicitly described as *מח* (“plague”; cf. Lev 26:21, *מכה* describes only the second punishment).

Richard Bauckham goes the furthest in relating John’s Septets to Lev 26. He notes that there are in fact four septets of plagues in Revelation, not just three. In addition to the three septets of seals, trumpets and bowls, one should also include the septet of thunders (10:3–7), which is found in between the trumpets and bowls. In the case of the thunders, although John is not permitted to write down what he witnesses, it appears to be a series of seven plagues (ἑπτὰ βρονταί). Bauckham convincingly argues that the significance of the plagues’ pattern is that it depicts, like Lev 26, a perfect judgment enumerated as four sets of seven. Gregory Beale, in his evaluation of numbers in the Apocalypse, suggests Bauckham’s theory would be strengthened by Philo’s discourse on the significance of the numbers three, four and seven (Philo, *Opif.* 97–106).⁵⁰

In addition to the correlation of numbers in Lev 26 and the Apocalypse, a few other allusions to individual plagues may occur in chs. 6–7. First, when the third seal is opened the rider of the black horse carries a scale (ζυγόν) and measurements of wheat and barley are sold at excessive prices (6:5–6). This may allude to the third seven in Lev 26:26 which is a punishment of famine described as a time when food will be weighed (משקל). Second, the Septuagint translation of the plague of pestilence (דבר) is θάνατος. Although “pestilence” occurs variously in the Hebrew Bible, in both Rev 6:8 (θάνατος) and Lev 26:25 (דבר, LXX θάνατος) it is given in a list of plagues. A third allusion, though not to a plague, may be found in Rev 7:15 and 21:3–7 to Lev 26:11–12 where God and the elect are depicted as dwelling together.

Although John is heavily indebted to a number of prophetic traditions, surprisingly little has been written on exile in the Apocalypse. In light of the scrolls considered here, the new exodus in Revelation suggests that exile may be a more important theme than often considered by others. While Bauckham and Beale are convinced that Lev 26

⁵⁰ G.K. Beale, *The Book of Revelation: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), 60.

stands behind the septets, they do not relate it to exilic motifs in the Apocalypse.

In the latter chapters of the Apocalypse the destruction of Babylon and establishment of a New Jerusalem are themes that depict return from exile. In Rev 7:17, just before the seventh seal is opened, an allusion to Jer 31:16 also recalls return from exile. The Lamb in Rev 7:17 is a shepherd who will guide the saints to living water and “wipe away every tear from their eyes.” In Jer 31:16, the Israelites are exhorted to cease their weeping and shed no more tears for they shall return to their own land. Exile in the Apocalypse is in the present world and the new exodus motif is that of being led into the Kingdom of Christ. This is made clear when the seventh trumpet sounds (11:15) and a heavenly voice proclaims: “the kingdom of the world has become the kingdom of our Lord and his Christ.”⁵¹

Leviticus 26 promises that a remnant will survive the plagues and God will be faithful to his covenant. Remnant theology in Leviticus appears to attract Jewish communities who conceived of themselves as theologically in exile (i.e. the elect of the elect). In Rev 7:5–8 the twelve tribes of Israel are likely to be viewed as depicting the “true” Israel (= Christian Church) and this, in turn, evokes remnant imagery (cf. Rom 9:27–29, 11:4–6). David Aune comments that the twelve tribes of Rev 7, in light of Ezek 48:1–29, suggest that a characteristic of remnant ideology is the reunification of Israel at the time of the *eschaton*. Elsewhere in early Jewish literature are expectations that the ten tribes will return from exile in the east at the end of time (4 Ezra 13.39–50; *T. Mos.* 4.9; *2 Bar.* 77.17–26; *Sib. Or.* 2.171).⁵² The numbering of the tribes in Rev 7 may be understood as the gathering of a remnant who returns from exile.

⁵¹ S. Pattemore, *The People of God in the Apocalypse: Discourse, Structure, and Exegesis* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 157 “[In Rev 7:16–17] the story of the crowd (and by extension, of John’s audience) is depicted in colours drawn from the palette of Deutero-Isaiah’s vision of a New Exodus [cf. Isa 25:8, 49:10]. This ensures that the Exodus motifs already discerned are to be understood less in terms of Israel’s original and particularist journey from Egypt to Canaan via Sinai than in terms of the second, reconstitutive journey out of captivity, from Babylon to Jerusalem, with its internationalist implications.” See also R. Mounce, *The Book of Revelation* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 175.

⁵² Aune, *Revelation* 6–16, 461.

IV. CONCLUSION

The three plague septets in the Apocalypse of John allude to the Egyptian plagues, which are enumerated in later traditions as seven rather than ten. The plagues in Rev 6–16 alone recall deliverance from exile. In addition to the plagues, John's heavy reliance upon allusions to prophetic literature, which is centred upon exile and return, further underscores the theological significance of the theme in the Apocalypse.

Deliverance from exile in John is from Babylon, a cryptogram which may encompass more than just Rome. Although ch. 17 reveals the mystery that Babylon is Rome, the cryptogram may be multivalent. Chapter 18 describes the fall of Babylon, but the ultimate conclusion of the Apocalypse is the establishment of a New Heaven, New Earth and a New Jerusalem.⁵³ If in John's Apocalypse an extended exodus is in view and plague septets instrumental in concluding Israel's history, one should consider following the new exodus to its final end: Jerusalem's restoration is Edenic.

The Dead Sea Scrolls preserve an interpretive tradition, which may have been widespread, wherein ideas about exile and Egypt appear to merge. Even before the Qumran materials were surveyed one could speculate that in the Apocalypse new exodus themes occur in conjunction with Leviticus imagery based upon a 4×7 pattern. Awareness that exile and return may be a part of John's theology could reinforce the view that Lev 26 is an influential passage in Rev 6–16. Even if the Leviticus plagues are only remotely in the background, the plagues may be seen to evoke imagery already present in preceding traditions wherein a remnant awaits deliverance from perceived "exile."

An intertextual reading of Revelation is one way to begin exploring the possible presence of an ongoing exile motif. Biblical history, which John intends to conclude, could be seen as bringing an ongoing exile to an end. Indeed, if this is the case then allusions to Exodus plague traditions function in part to draw the reader's attention to deliverance from "Egypt" through a new exodus.

⁵³ Pattemore, *The People of God*, 216 concludes "so the story of the new people of God can be told in colours not only of the original Exodus from Egypt, but even more of the New Exodus from Babylon. This journey occupies the whole of the book, and their destiny is thus described in terms of a New Jerusalem, the dwelling place of God."

BELIEF IN RESURRECTION AND ITS RELIGIOUS SETTINGS IN QUMRAN AND THE NEW TESTAMENT

Albert L.A. Hogeterp
Katholieke Universiteit Leuven

1. INTRODUCTION

This article focuses on the belief in resurrection from the dead in Qumran texts and the New Testament, with a comparative interest in conceptualization and the religious setting in which resurrection figures.¹ In the course of my evaluation, I will aim to highlight points of convergence and difference and attempt to provide a traditio-historical explanation for them. Resurrection is mentioned in early Enochic writings (*1 En.* 24–25; 90:33; 91:8–10; 103:4; 104:2.4.6)² as well as biblical tradition represented by Dan 12:1–3. The subject of resurrection thereby presupposes a general setting of eschatological expectation, and I will not go into discussion about biblical revivification miracles and heavenly assumptions or interim states after death voiced through post-mortem visions and appearances.³

Why would comparative study of Qumran literature and New Testament writings with regard to resurrection tradition add to our understanding of this subject? Qumran literature provides first-hand evidence of pre-70 C.E. strands of Jewish thought and practice, whose completely published evidence has yet to be integrated into our picture of Palestinian Judaism in the two last centuries B.C.E. and the first

¹ This article represents some lines of argument derived from chapter four of my Leuven post-doctoral manuscript, a traditio-historical study on the development of eschatological, apocalyptic and messianic ideas in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament.

² The “Book of Watchers” (*1 En.* 1–36), the “Dream Visions” (*1 En.* 83–90), and the “Epistle of Enoch” (*1 En.* 91–105) have been respectively dated to mid- or late third century B.C.E., 200–160 B.C.E., and the second century B.C.E.; see G.W.E. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch. 1. A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch, Chapters 1–36, 81–108* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis, Fortress Press), 7–28; and G.W.E. Nickelsburg and J.C. VanderKam, *1 Enoch. A New Translation Based on the Hermeneia Commentary* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2004), 3, 9–10, 12.

³ Cf. Gen 5:24; 1 Kgs 17:21–23; 2 Kgs 2:11; Sirach 48:5.

century C.E.⁴ Since the 1990s, the enormous increase in published evidence mainly from Qumran cave 4 has also led to an ongoing process of rethinking the relation between texts and social settings. Earlier studies on Qumran and the New Testament still worked with the assumption that Qumran literature reflects the setting of the sectarian Qumran community, sometimes supposing a comparison in terms of genetic relationships.⁵

Yet the great number of Qumran texts which do not present clearly identifiable sectarian community terminology⁶ are difficult to relate to this same sectarian setting. In individual cases, non-sectarian Qumran texts may be considered “adopted texts,” but the question of social settings and origins of compositions in a time span antedating any chronology of the Qumran community’s establishment is open to debate. Among the texts, whose social setting and traditio-historical place merits further exploration, are compositions of key importance to the subject of resurrection, namely 4QPseudo-Ezekiel and 4Q521. The monumental two-volume study *La croyance des Esséniens en la vie future* by Émile Puech in 1993 still worked with the supposition that these two texts as well as 4QVisions of Amram would originate from the sectarian setting of the Qumran Essene community.⁷ In an article of 2000, Devorah Dimant observed about Pseudo-Ezekiel and 4Q521 that “their origin and background as well as their precise relationship to the Qumran community are still a matter of debate.”⁸

⁴ Pending the official edition of the Aramaic texts 4Q550–582 in the Discoveries in the Judaean Desert series, volume 37, by É. Puech, the publication of the scrolls fragments from Qumran has reached semi-completion.

⁵ E.g. K. Stendahl, ed., *The Scrolls and the New Testament* (London: SCM, 1958); W.S. LaSor, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1972). See recently, J.H. Charlesworth, “John the Baptizer and the Dead Sea Scrolls,” *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls. 3. The Scrolls and Christian Origins* (ed. J.H. Charlesworth; Waco: Baylor University Press, 2006), 1–35 at 35 who suggests that the Baptizer “most likely... had been almost fully initiated into the *Yahad*.”

⁶ All of the Qumran texts and fragments under discussion in this paper, 4QVisions of Amram^f, 4QpsEzek, 4QpsDan^c ar, 4Q521, and 4Q434a (4QBarki Nafshi or “Grace after Meals”), were classified under the rubric of “Literary Works without Terminology Connected to the Community” by D. Dimant, “The Qumran Manuscripts: Contents and Significance,” in *Time to Prepare the Way in the Wilderness* (ed. D. Dimant and L.H. Schiffman; STDJ 16; Leiden: Brill, 1995), 23–58 at 47–8 and 53.

⁷ É. Puech, *La croyance des Esséniens en la vie future: Immortalité, resurrection, vie éternelle? Histoire d’une croyance dans le judaïsme ancien. II. Les données qumraniennes et classiques* (EBib² 22; Paris: Gabalda, 1993), 532, 669, and 703.

⁸ D. Dimant, “Resurrection, Restoration, and Time-Curtailing in Qumran, Early Judaism, and Christianity,” *RevQ* 19 (2000): 527–48 at 529.

The challenge which the evidence of apocryphal, pseudepigraphical, parabiblical, and biblical scrolls and fragments presents to previous theories of the Dead Sea Scrolls as, by and large, products of the Qumran community, may at the same time provide opportunities for traditio-historical study. In his article on "Qumran sectarian writings," Jonathan Campbell noted that the overlaps between sectarian and non-sectarian works "make it difficult to view the sectarian literature in isolation."⁹ In cases of overlaps with biblical, apocryphal, and pseudepigraphical works known outside Qumran, broader traditio-historical connections may be supposed which could also bring the Palestinian Jewish matrix in touch with emerging Christianity.

In what follows, I will first turn to my own reinterpretations of longer discussed Qumran texts along with some new Qumran evidence, then pay attention to a number of New Testament texts, and finally turn to comparative evaluation. My selection of passages from Qumran literature focuses on most explicit evidence of resurrection in texts not clearly sectarian. This is not to deny the evidence of sectarian Qumran texts, like the *Serek Hayahad* and the *Hodayot*, a place in this discussion, whose imagery of eternal life, everlasting light and the raising of those who sleep in the dust may not all be hermetically closed to the idea of resurrection.¹⁰ However, generally speaking, it is from a broader matrix of Essene and apocalyptic-minded circles that traditio-historical comparison may be expected to yield new insights about Jewish eschatological expectations amidst the early Jesus-movement.

While resurrection in the New Testament is a broad field of study, I will single out a few passages with possible traces of Jewish resurrection

⁹ J.G. Campbell, "The Qumran Sectarian Writings," in *Cambridge History of Judaism. III. The Early Roman Period* (ed. W. Horbury, W.D. Davies, and J. Sturdy; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 798–821 at 801.

¹⁰ Several commentators, like G.W.E. Nickelsburg, *Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism* (HTS 26; Cambridge: Harvard University Press – London: Oxford University Press, 1972), 144–67; H.C.C. Cavallin, *Life After Death. Paul's Argument for the Resurrection of the Dead in 1 Cor 15. Part 1. An Enquiry into the Jewish Background* (ConBNT 7/1; Lund: Gleerup, 1974), 60–5; J.J. Collins, *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (The Literature of the Dead Sea Scrolls; London and New York: Routledge, 1997), 115–23; P.R. Davies, "Death, Resurrection, and Life after Death in the Qumran Scrolls," in *Judaism in Late Antiquity. 4. Death, Life-after-death, Resurrection and the World-to-come in the Judaisms of Antiquity* (ed. A.J. Avery-Peck and J. Neusner; HO I/49; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 189–211 have demonstrated scepticism about the more ambiguous evidence for resurrection in the sectarian Qumran texts as compared to literature known outside Qumran and Qumran texts not clearly sectarian.

tradition in the Synoptic Gospels and Paul. In view of the timeframe of this paper, my observations about these passages will have to serve as side glance about the Jewish matrix to gospel traditions about Jesus' resurrection.

2. QUMRAN EVIDENCE AS PART OF SECOND TEMPLE JEWISH LITERATURE

2.1. *4QVisions of Amram*

4QVisions of Amram^f ar (4Q548) 1 II, 2 9b–14 comprises the following passage, whose evidence may be potentially relevant for the subject of resurrection.¹¹

	[ארו כל בני נהורא]	9b
	נהירין להוון [וכל בני חשוכא חשיכין להוון א]רו בני נהורא	10
	ישתכלון(?)	
	[ובכל מנדעהון [צדיקין ל]הוון בני חשוכא יתעדון ו]	11
	ארו כל סכל ורש[יע חשי]ך וכל[חכי]ם קשיט נהיר [ארו כל בני	12
	נהורא]	
	לנהורא לשמח[ת עלמא ולח]דות[א יהכו]ן וכל בני חשוכא לחש[וכא	13
	למותא] ¹²	
	[ולאבדנא יהכון [ביומא דגה תנה]ר לעמא נהירותא ואחוי [להון די	14

9b Behold all the sons of light 10 will be bright [and all the sons of] darkness will be dark. Because the sons of light will consider (?) 11 and in all their understanding they [will] be [righteous]. But the sons of darkness will vanish [and] 12 For every fool and wicked one (will be) dark and each wise and truthful person (will be) bright. [Behold all the sons of light [will go]o 13 to the light, to [eternal] glad[ness and]joy and all the sons of darkness will go to the (place of) dark[ness, to death 14 and to destruction. [On that day] light will shine for the people and I will show to [them that]].

¹¹ Text from É. Puech, *Qumrân grotte 4. XXII: Textes araméens, première partie. 4Q529–549* (DJD XXXI; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2001), 394 except for line 13 of this fragment, on which see note 12 below. The translation is my own.

¹² Hebrew text of line 13 is taken from the editions of text and translation as presented by J.T. Milik, *4QVisions de 'Amram et une citation d'Origène*, in *RB* 79 (1972): 77–99 at 90; F. García Martínez and E.J.C. Tigchelaar, eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Study Edition 2. 4Q274–11Q31* (Leiden: Brill, 2000) 2:394. The reconstruction of 4Q548 1 II, 2 13 by Puech, DJD XXXI, 394 runs as follows: [לנהורא ל]תמימותא[>נעימתא <] ולשלמא [א רבא [יהכו]ן וכל בני חש[וכא לחשוכא למותא [ב.דינ[א רבא [יהכו]ן וכל בני חש[וכא לחשוכא למותא

4QVisions of Amram^f ar has been dated to the second half of the first century B.C.E.¹³ In view of its arguable relation to the other manuscripts of Visions of Amram, the composition Visions of Amram at large has been dated to the second century B.C.E.¹⁴ Since the preliminary publication of part of this fragment by J.T. Milik in 1972, its imagery of light and darkness has been considered typical of “two ways theology.” Cavallin included this fragment among evidence of Qumran Essene beliefs in his 1974 study,¹⁵ while Puech deemed the passage part of Qumran Essene reflections of the figure of Melchizedek, the antonym Melchiresha, and the final age.¹⁶ However, the composition of Visions of Amram seems too fragmentary to ascertain the relation between manuscript F and the figure of Melchiresha in one of the other manuscripts (4Q544 (4QVisions of Amram^b ar) 2 3).¹⁷ In recent studies, Visions of Amram is often considered as a non-sectarian parabiblical text. The “two ways theology” in manuscript f probably appealed to the Qumran sectarian community’s interest and hence their adoption of it, but this theology cannot be limited to the Qumran community (cf. *T. Levi* 19:1; 4Q213 3+4 8–11; *T. Ash.* 1:3–5:4).

The reading of imagery of light, eternal gladness, and joy for the sons of light by J.T. Milik may be retained in view of the literary parallelism with [מחא]ש in line 5 of the same fragment, comparable lists of verbal equivalents in 1QS IV 7 and 12–14, and the resulting length of the reconstructed Hebrew line. In my opinion, the imagery which occurs in lines 12–13 can be related to comparable imagery in *1 En.* 104:2, *Dan* 12:3, *Pss. Sol.* 3:12, and Pseudo-Philo’s *Biblical Antiquities* 51.5 and may thereby imply one resurrection as heavenly transformation analogous to light and heavenly luminaries. This passage presupposes a point beyond death, and the eschatological setting is expressed through

¹³ Puech, DJD XXXI, 393.

¹⁴ Puech, *La croyance des Esséniens en la vie future*, 2:532 with reference to the second-century B.C.E. date assigned to the earliest manuscript, 4QVisions of Amram^b, by J.T. Milik, “4QVisions de ‘Amram et une citation d’Origène,” *RB* 79 (1972): 77–99 at 90. Puech, DJD XXXI, 391 further builds on Milik’s article for the identification of 4Q548 as a copy of a “Testament de ‘Amram.”

¹⁵ Cavallin, *Life After Death. Part 1*, 64.

¹⁶ Puech, *La croyance des Esséniens en la vie future*. 2:515–62, especially 537–40.

¹⁷ Conceptual points of correspondence between light and darkness imagery (4Q548; 4Q543 VI 3–5; 4Q544 I 13–14, II 5–6, and 3 1 (כּוֹל בְּנֵי נְהוּן־רָא)), teaching to sons (4Q543 I 1–2 // 4Q545 I 1 1–2; 4Q548 I 5 and 7–9) concerning ‘eternal generations’ of Israel (4Q543 III 4; 4Q548 I 6) as well as analogous vocabulary ([תתק]רה in 4Q543 III 1 and [תתק]רון in 4Q548 I II, 2 8; לעמד in 4Q543 7 I, 8 2 and לעמא in 4Q548 I II, 2 14) may connect 4Q548 with the other manuscripts, 4Q543–547.

the teleological sense of the imperfect tenses יתעדון (l. 11) and יהבון (lines 13–14).

There is more to this fragment, which differentiates it from “two ways theology,” as we encounter it in the “Two Spirits Treatise” incorporated in the sectarian *Serek Hayahad*. Line 14 of this fragment comprises the phrase: “and light will shine for the people and I will show them [that].” This phrase may be paralleled by prophetic tradition, represented in MT Isa 9:1. In translation, this verse reads: “The people who walked in darkness have seen a great light; those who dwelt in a land of deep darkness, on them has light shined” (RSV).

The collective setting of light shining for the people, העם in MT Isa 9:1 and לעמא in line 14 of our fragment, is that which further connects 4QVisions of Amram^f as a parabiblical non-sectarian text with biblical tradition. Finally, a general analogy may be noted with the Daniel tradition. Daniel 12:1–3 begins with the general setting of the people, עמך, and then focuses on resurrection, specifying the fate of the righteous and the wicked. However, it is with strands of biblical tradition from both Isaiah and Daniel that our fragment interrelates.

2.2. 4QPseudo-Ezekiel

The next Qumran composition which is one of the focal points for scholarly discussion of resurrection in the Dead Sea Scrolls is Pseudo-Ezekiel from Qumran cave 4. The most extensively preserved fragment which elaborates on Ezek 37 is fragment 2 of 4QpsEzek^a (4Q385), which in previous discussion has by and large been taken to stand for Pseudo-Ezekiel’s evidence of resurrection. However, more manuscripts need to be taken into account, and my comments will focus on fragment 1 of psEzek^b (4Q386) which has three successive columns. 4Q386 frg. 1 col. I overlaps with fragment 2 of psEzek^a, but 4Q386 frg. 1 col. II is unparalleled. The palaeographical dates of 4QpsEzek^{a-d} (4Q385, 4Q386, 4Q385b, 4Q388) and unidentified fragments in 4Q385c, to the second half of the first century B.C.E., and of 4QpsEzek^e (4Q391) to the second half of the second century B.C.E., have led Dimant to argue a date of composition to around the mid-second century B.C.E. Connections between dialogue form (4Q391 frg. 36 and 4Q385 2, 4Q386 1 I–II, 4Q388 7) may further relate the manuscripts.¹⁸ My re-interpretation of

¹⁸ D. Dimant, *Qumran Cave 4. XXI: Parabiblical Texts, Part 4: Pseudo-Prophetic Texts* (DJD XXX; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2001) 7–16, mentions the setting of the

Pseudo-Ezekiel focuses on psEzek^b and highlights its theological setting in relation to the issue of elaboration on the biblical text. The text of 4Q386 1 I-II with translation is quoted below.¹⁹

4Q386 1 I (// 4Q385 2 2-10, 4Q388 7 4-7)

top margin

[אמרה יהוה ראיתי רבים מישראל אשר אהב]ו את שמך	1
[וילכו בדרכי לבך ואלה מתי יהיו]ו הכה ישתלמו חסדם	2
<i>vacat</i> ויאמר יהוה אלי אני אראה א[ת בני ישראל וידעו	3
[כי אני יהוה <i>vacat</i> ויאמר בן אדם הנ]בא על העצמות	4
[ואמרת ויקרבו עצם אל עצמו]ו[פרק אל פרקו ויהי	5
[כן ויאמר שנית הנבא ויעלו עליהם גדי]ם ויקרמו עור	6
[עליהם מלמעלה ויקרמו עור ויע]ל[ו] עליהם גדים	7
[ורוח אין בם ויאמר אלי שוב הנבא]על ארבע רחות	8
[השמים ויפחו בם ויעמדו על רג]ל[יהם ע]ם רב אנשי[ם]	9
[ויברכו את יהוה צבאות אשר חים] <i>vacat</i> []	10

4Q386 1 ii

top margin

[אר]ץ וידעו כי אני יהוה <i>vacat</i> ויאמר אלי התבונן	1
בן אדם באדמת ישראל ואמר ראיתי יהוה והנה חרבה	2
ומתי תקבצם ויאמר יהוה בן בליעל יחשב לענות את עמי	3
ולא אניח לו ומשרו לא יהיה והמן הטמא זרע לא ישאר	4
ומנצפה לא יהיה תירוש ותזיז לא יעשה דבש [] ואת	5
הרשע אהרג במף ואת בני אוציא ממף ועל ש[א]רם אהפך	6
כאשר יאמרו היה השל[ו]ם והשדך ואמרו תה[י]ה הארץ	7
8 כאשר היתה בימי [] קדם בכך אעיר עליהם חמ[ה]	8
9 מ[א]רבע רחות השמי[ם] []ל[] את []	9
10 [כא]ש בערת כ[]	10
11 []	11

4Q386 1 I

1 [And I said: 'O Lord! I have seen many (men) from Israel who have love]d your Name 2 [and have walked in the ways of your heart. And these things when will they come to be and] how will they be recompensed for their piety?' 3 [*vacat* And the Lord said to me: 'I will make (it) manifest to th]e children of Israel and they shall know 4 [that I am the Lord.' *vacat* And He said: 'son of man, prop]hesy over the bones 5 [and speak and let them be joined bone to its bone and] joint to its joint.' And it was 6 [so. And He said a second time: 'Prophesy and let arterie]s [come upon them] and let skin cover 7 [them from above.' And

Ezekielian *Merkabah* vision in both 4Q385 6 (*olim* frg. 4) and 4Q391 frg. 65 6-8, and the lack of allusion to any first-century B.C.E. event in 4Q386.

¹⁹ Text from Dimant, DJD XXX, 60-62. Translation of 4Q386 1 I from Dimant, DJD XXX, 61; translation of 4Q386 1 II my own.

they were co]ve[red with skin and] arteries came upon them, 8 [but there was not breath in them. And He said to me: 'Prophecy once again] over the four winds 9 [of heaven and let them blow into them.' And] a large [cro]wd of peop[le stood on their f]e[et] 10 [and blessed the Lord Sebaot who had given them life] *vacat* [] .

4Q386 1 II

1 [la]nd and they will know that I am the Lord *vacat* and he said to me: consider, 2 son of man, the land of Israel. And I said, I have seen, Lord, but behold, it is a desolated place 3 and when will you assemble them? And the Lord said: a son of Belial will mean to oppress my people, 4 but I will not allow him and of his leader(ship) there will not be (anyone), nor will any offspring remain of the impure one. 5 And of the caperbush there will not be any wine, nor will a bee make honey. 6 But I will slay the wicked one in Memphis and I will bring my children out of Memphis and turn the reverse way concerning their remnant. 7 As they will say, 'peace and quiet have come,' they will (also) say, 'the land will be 8 as it was in days [] of old.' After this I will arouse wrath against them 9 from the four quarters of the heavens[] ◦ [] [] 10 [like] a burning [fi]re, like ◦[] 11 [] ◦◦[] .

Various terms from Ezekiel's vision of the valley of dry bones (Ezek 37:3, 4, 7, 10) recur in column 1 of this fragment, but the physical imagery of resuscitation clearly has a setting of expectation of reward for the righteous in Israel. This expectation is voiced in the question by the prophetic protagonist in lines 1–2 and in the divine answer that "these things," אלה, probably the redeeming acts of God, including the giving of the (renewed?) covenant (4Q385 2 I), as well as the divine reward for piety will be made manifest. While the subsequent prophetic vision of the resuscitation of the dry bones is narrated in the past tense, the narration is a response to eschatological expectation of theodicy and vindication of those "who have loved the Lord's name and have walked in the paths of his heart."

This horizon of eschatological expectation is further elaborated in column II of 4Q386 1 through juxtapositions between contemporary experience of desolation and future assembly of the people (lines 1–3), between threats of representative figures of evil and the deliverance of a remnant (lines 3–6), between the state of the land (of Israel) in peace, quiet and like days of old and divine wrath against those involved in evil against God's people (lines 7–10).²⁰ (cf. lines 3–4). The term ארבע

²⁰ It seems most likely to associate a collectivity of evil ones, of whom lines 3, 4, and 6 name individual leader figures, with the third person plural object of divine wrath "like burning fire" in 4Q386 1 II 8–10. This association follows from the con-

רחות השמים, occurring in both 4Q386 1 I 8–9 (// 4Q385 2 7) and 4Q386 1 II 9, could reflect two respective sides of theodicy, divine vindication of the righteous through resurrection and divine wrath against evildoers. This may be an additional apocalyptic feature of the text, as it appears from the two columns of 4QpsEzek^b (4Q386) fragment 1. Analogous contrasts in terms of vindication through resurrection and divine wrath occur in the traditions of Enoch and Daniel (1 *En.* 22–27, 91:9–10; Dan 12:2).

Contrary to previous scholarship which emphasized the loose connection or disconnection between 4Q386 1 II and the biblical text of Ezekiel,²¹ I think that several points of correspondence between 4Q386 1 II and the biblical text of Ezekiel may be discerned. First of all, the consideration of the ‘land of Israel,’ אדמת ישראל, whose state of desolation is contrasted to an expected time of assembling in 4Q386 1 II 2–3 has a clear analogy in Ezek 37:12, in which the same term, אדמת ישראל, occurs in the context of resurrection imagery being applied to the return to the land of Israel. The prophetic protagonist’s anticipating question, ‘when will you gather them together?’, מתי תקבצם (4Q386 1 II 3), is paralleled by MT Ezek 36:24 (וקבצתי אתכם) and 37:21 (וקבצתי אתם), which both envision a gathering in terms of divinely aided return from exile. The individual leader figures representing wickedness in 4Q386 1 II 3–4 and 6 may constitute a contemporizing element of parabiblical elaboration, but the ‘slaying of the wicked one in Memphis’ (4Q386 1 II 6) could still have a general parallel in an Ezekiel passage (Ezek 30:13). These examples of textual dialogue indicate that elaboration on Ezek 37:1–14 together with surrounding passages in the book of Ezekiel²² was in view in the composition of Pseudo-Ezekiel.

The importance of the first two columns of fragment 1 of 4Q386 (4QpsEzek^b) consists in the space which this sequence of text leaves

trast between the respective fates of God’s people (cf. line 3), God’s children and their remnant (line 6) on the one hand and of the individual representatives of evil forces (lines 3–4, 6) on the other.

²¹ M. Brady, “Biblical Interpretation in the ‘Pseudo-Ezekiel’ Fragments (4Q383–391) from Cave Four,” in M. Henze, ed., *Biblical Interpretation at Qumran* (Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 88–109 at 107: 4Q386 1 II “has no close connection to any biblical passage”; D. Dimant, “Resurrection, Restoration, and Time-Curtailing,” 527–48 at 534: “the vision recorded in 4Q386 1 ii–iii is non-biblical.”

²² See the general comment by Dimant, “Resurrection, Restoration, and Time-Curtailing,” 534 who proposes to read 4Q386 1 II–III against the background of Ezek 37:15–38:24.

to explore the relation between resurrection and elaboration on the biblical text of Ezekiel, in particular Ezek 37:1–14, in further detail. My analysis of both columns argues that Pseudo-Ezekiel’s apocalypticization of Ezek 37 in terms of eschatological resurrection does not substitute the supposed original sense of the biblical text in terms of restoration of Israel and return from exile (Ezek 37:11–14), but works along with it. That is, the apocalyptic vision of resurrection for the righteous and wrath against evildoers inscribes itself in the prophetic setting of restoration theology.

2.3. 4QPseudo-Daniel^c ar

4QPseudo-Daniel^c ar (4Q245) fragment 2 comprises the following extant text.²³

]oo[1
למסך רשעא	2
אלן בעור וטעו	3
א[לן אדין יקומו	4
ק[דיש[ת]א ויתובון	5
רשעא o[6

1].. [2]to exterminate wickedness 3]these in blindness, and they have gone astray 4 [th]ese then will arise 5 [the [h]oly [], and they will return 6]. wickedness

My comments on 4QpsDan^c ar frg. 2 will be brief. An eschatological setting in the text of this fragment is generally supposed, but the scholarly debate has been divided about the issue whether or not the passage voices belief in resurrection.²⁴ If only compared to the book of Daniel, the verb יקומו is not paralleled in Dan 12:1–3 which includes

²³ Text and translation from J.J. Collins and P.W. Flint, *Qumran Cave 4. XVII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 3* (DJD XXII; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), 162–63.

²⁴ Cavallin, *Life After Death. Part 1*, 64–5 deems resurrection to be explicit in this passage; F. García Martínez, *Qumran and Apocalyptic: Studies on the Aramaic* (STDJ 9; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 137–61; Puech, *La croyance des Esséniens en la vie future*, 2:568–70, reads the passage as evidence of the two ways, resurrection and destructive judgement; P.W. Flint, “The Daniel Tradition at Qumran,” in C.A. Evans and P.W. Flint, eds., *Eschatology, Messianism, and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 41–60 at 53 rather compares the setting with that of CD-A I 11–15; Collins, *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 124–5 argues that context and meaning of the verb יקומו do not necessarily point to resurrection; *editioprinceps* of 4QpsDan^{a-c} ar (4Q243–245) by Collins and Flint, DJD XXII, 95–164.

the imperfect יקיצו (from the verb קיץ). However, the revivification imagery in Isa 26:19 does include the same verb form יקומו. The juxtaposition between lines 3, which mentions a group which went astray in blindness, and 4, about a group which shall arise, should take into account the difference between perfect tense in line 3 and imperfect tense in line 4.

In view of the vision of extermination of wickedness, the arising in line 4 and the return in line 5 could perhaps voice a horizon of expectation of resurrection for the holy ones and return to the land. While the fragmentary nature of the extant passage makes a definitive conclusion impossible, my reading of this fragment favours the inclusion of the possibility that resurrection was in view in Pseudo-Daniel's composition.

2.4. 4Q521

The third composition for discussion is 4Q521, of which I have cited the two relevant fragments of text, 4Q521 2 II+4 1–15 and 7 1–8 + 5 II 7–16, below.²⁵

4Q521 2 II + 4	
	<i>top margin</i>
1	כי השמים והארץ ישמעו למשיחו
2	[וכל אש]ר במ לוא יסוג ממצות קדושים
3	התאמצו מבקשי אדני בעבדתו <i>vacat</i>
4	הלוא בזאת תמצאו את אדני כל המיחלים בלבם
5	כי אדני חסידים יבקר וצדיקים בשם יקרא
6	ועל ענוים רוחו תרחף ואמונים יחליף בכחו
7	כי יכבד את חסידים על כסא מלכות עד
8	מתיר אסורים פוקח עורים זוקף כפופים
9	ול[ע]לם אדבק [במ]יחלים ובחסדו י []
10	ופר[י] מעש[ה] טוב לאיש לוא יתאחר
11	ונכבות שלוא היו יעשה אדני כאשר ד[בר]
12	כי ירפא חללים ומתים יחיה ענוים יבשר
13	ו[דל]ים ישב[יע] [נתושים ינהל ורעבים יעשר
14	ונב[ונים] (?) [וכלם כקד[ושים]?
15	וא]

²⁵ Texts from É. Puech, *Qumrân grotte 4. XVIII: Textes hébreux (4Q521–4Q528, 4Q576–4Q579)* (DJD XXV; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997), 10 and 23; translations after F. García Martínez and E.J.C. Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition. 2. 4Q274–11Q31* (Leiden: Brill – Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 1045 and 1047 with some additions of my own, in italics, in cases of additional reconstructed text in Puech's edition.

1 [for the heav]ens and the earth will listen to his anointed one, 2 [and all th]at is in them will not turn away from the precepts of the holy ones. 3 Strengthen yourselves, you who are seeking the Lord, in his service! *Blank* 4 Will you not in this encounter the Lord, all those who hope in their heart? 5 For the Lord will consider the pious, and call the righteous by name, 6 and his spirit will hover upon the poor, and he will renew the faithful with his strength. 7 For he will honour the pious upon the throne of an eternal kingdom, 8 freeing prisoners, giving sight to the blind, straightening out the twis[ted.] 9 And for[e]ver shall I cling [to those who h]ope, and in his mercy *he will*[] 10 and the fru[it of] *a good [dee]d for humankind will* not be delayed. 11 And the Lord will perform marvellous acts such as have not existed, just as he sa[id,] 12 [for] he will heal the badly wounded and will make the dead live, he will proclaim good news to the poor 13 and *he will make the [poo]r who[le]*, lead *those who are uprooted* and enrich the hungry. 14 *and those who have under[standing (?)]* ◦ and all of *them like the ho[ly ones?]* 15 *And I will*

4Q521 7 1-8 + 5 ii 7-16

[ראו]ת כל א[שר עשה]	1
אדני האר[ץ] וכל אשר בה ימים] וכל	2
אשר כם] וכל מקוה מים ונחלים (vacat)	3
[כ]ל[כם] העושים את הטוב לפני אדני]	4
מברכים ולו]א כאלה מקלל[ים] ולמות יהי]ו כאשר	5
יקי]ם המחיה את מתי עמו (vacat)	6
[ונ]ו]דה ונגידה לכם צדקות אדני אשר]	7
[בנ]י תמ]ותה ופתח] קברות-	8
[ופ]תח(?)	9
[ו]	10
[וגי מות ב]	11
[וגשר תה]ומ- (ו]ת)	12
[קפאו ארור]ים	13
[וקדמו שמים]	14
[וכ]ל מלאכים]	15
[ל]	16

1 see all th[at the Lord has made:] 2 [the ear]th and all that is in it, *Blank* the seas [and all] 3 [they contain,] and all the reservoirs of waters and torrents. *Blank* [just as (is the case)] for[you] who do the good before the Lor[d] 5 [you praise God and no]t like these, the accursed. And [they] shall b[e] for death [As] 6 he who gives life [rais]es the dead of his people. *Blank* 7 And we shall [gi]ve thanks and announce to you *the acts of justice of the Lord who* [] 8 *tho[se who are appointed to dea]th* and opens [the tombs of] 9 and o[pens] 10 and [] 11 *the valley of death in* [] 12 and the bridge of the abys[ses] 13 the accur[sed] have coagulated [] 14 and the heavens have met [] 15 [and a]ll the angels[] 16] [

4Q521 plays an important role in discussions about both resurrection and messianism. The widespread designation of this text is that of

“Messianic Apocalypse,”²⁶ even though the messianic identification of the passage in question where the Hebrew term משיח occurs, is subject to divergence of scholarly argument. Since the eschatological notion of resurrection of the dead in the two relevant fragments of 4Q521 is recognized by most scholars,²⁷ I will focus on the theological setting in which resurrection occurs.

It should be noted from the outset that both fragments of 4Q521, in their respective contexts, present resurrection of the dead as a divine activity of the Lord. Yet in 4Q521 2 II+4 11 the activity is characterized as ‘marvellous acts,’ נכבות, thereby highlighting the aspect of glorification of God who also honours the pious (cf. יכבד in l. 7). In 4Q521 7 6, the activity of raising the dead is further specified as resurrection of the dead of God’s people, מתֵי עמו. In this passage, resurrection figures in a context which draws attention to the ‘acts of justice of the Lord’ and thereby focusing on eschatological vindication for those ‘who do the good before the Lord’ and judgement of the accursed.

The intertextuality with passages in Isaiah, among which Isa 26:19 and Isa 61, and Ps 146:7–8, and their possible interrelationship with passages in Matt 11:2–6 and Luke 7:18–23, has been extensively studied, so that I will not go into this aspect of the passage at this point.

²⁶ É. Puech, “Une apocalypse messianique (4Q521),” *RevQ* 15/60 (1992): 475–522; idem, *Qumrân grotte 4. XVIII: Textes hébreux (4Q521–4Q528, 4Q576–4Q579)* (DJD 25; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998), 1–38 (“521. 4QApocalypse messianique”); Collins, *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 126; Garcia Martínez and Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*, 2:1044–5 (“4Q521. 4QMessianic Apocalypse”); G.G. Xeravits, *King, Priest, Prophet: Positive Eschatological Protagonists of the Qumran Library* (STDJ 47; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 98–110 (“Messianic Apocalypse (4Q521)”); D.W. Parry and E. Tov, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader. 6. Additional Genres and Unclassified Texts* (Leiden: Brill, 2005), 158–65 (“4Q521 (4QMessianic Apocalypse)”).

²⁷ Puech, *La croyance des Esséniens en la vie future*, 2:627–92; J.D. Tabor and M.O. Wise, “4Q521 ‘On Resurrection’ and the Synoptic Gospel Tradition: A Preliminary Study,” *JSP* 10 (1992): 149–62; Collins, *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 126; G.J. Brooke, “Shared Intertextual Interpretations in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament,” in *Biblical Perspectives: Early Use and Interpretation of the Bible in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (eds. M.E. Stone and E.G. Chazon; STDJ 28; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 35–57. P.R. Davies, “Death, Resurrection, and Life After Death in the Qumran Scrolls,” in *Judaism in Late Antiquity. 4. Death, Life-after-Death, Resurrection and the World-to-Come in the Judaisms of Antiquity* (ed. A.J. Avery-Peck and J. Neusner; HO I/49; Leiden, Brill, 2000), 189–211 at 208–9 takes into account the possibility that resurrection belief is attested in 4Q521, but is more sceptical of Puech’s overall thesis. Differently from all other scholarly proposals, the terms of resurrection in 4Q521 are taken as metaphorical language by H. Kvalbein, “The Wonders of the End-Time: Metaphoric Language in 4Q521 and the Interpretation of Matthew 11:5 par.,” in *JSP* 18 (1998): 87–110.

Some comments should be made about the theological setting of 4Q521 2 II+4. The passage begins with the statement that “the heavens and the earth will listen to his anointed one and all that is in them will not turn away from the precepts of the holy ones” (4Q521 2 II+4 1).²⁸ An influential interpretation, argued by John Collins and shared by Geza Xeravits,²⁹ takes this anointed figure to be an eschatological prophetic protagonist, modelled after Elijah. This interpretive connection is made with the aid of 4Q521 2 III 2, which mentions the return of fathers to the sons, analogously with Mal 3:24. Luke 4:16–30, which includes citation of Isa 61, presents a dispute between Jesus and people in the synagogue of Nazareth with references to the prophetic role of Elijah. In other Gospel passages, such as Mark 6:14–15, the “Elijah redivivus” theme plays a role in the evangelist’s portrayal of expectations surrounding Jesus.³⁰

While I see the point of intertextual relations with Mal 3:24 and Sir 48:10, I am not sure whether the prophetic inspiration of the “Messianic Apocalypse” should exclude a messianic setting for resurrection in this Qumran text. The extant text **ואתר אותם** of 4Q521 2 III 1 seems to parallel the activity of setting free, **מתיר**, in 4Q521 2 II+4 8 as a divine activity, while 4Q521 2 III 2 relates eschatological circumstances of “fathers returning to their sons.” Malachi and Sirach do not seem to attribute the listening of heaven and earth to the prophetic authority of Elijah nor designate the prophet as “the anointed one.”³¹ The one fragment in Qumran literature which includes reference to the sending of Elijah, **לבן אשלה לאליה**, 4Q558 frg. 2 line 4, does not give a further epithet to the prophet. 1QS IX 11 envisages a final age with the “coming of the prophet, and the Messiahs of Aaron and Israel,” thereby making a distinction between prophetic and messianic figures. In fact, other fragments of 4Q521 further include “anointment” terminology. 4Q521 frg. 8 line 9 mentions a plural **משיחיה** in connection with the priesthood,

²⁸ Translation from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*, 2:1045.

²⁹ J.J. Collins, *The Scepter and the Star: The Messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Ancient Literature* (ABRL; New York: Doubleday, 1995), 116–22; Xeravits, *King, Priest, Prophet*, 98–110. J. Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte aus Qumran. Königliche, priesterliche und prophetische Messiasvorstellungen in den Schriftfunden von Qumran* noted: “ob und inwiefern jedoch Gott das Heil durch *Elia redivivus* bzw. eine (andere) messianische Gestalt wirkt, bleibt offen.”

³⁰ Collins, *The Scepter and the Star*, 116–22.

³¹ In contrast to references to anointment in the age of Samuel, Saul, and David, I have not been able to find a biblical reference to the activity of anointment in connection with Elijah.

while fragment 9 line 3 includes another, possibly singular, reference to משיח, which is preceded by mention of “the servant of the Lord,” [ע] [א] [דני] בד in line 2. In my view, the eschatological setting to resurrection in the composition at large is prophetically inspired, intertextually drawing on expectations of restoration surrounding the figure of Elijah. This setting possibly includes a horizon of messianic expectation whose personified role is not further specified than a divinely sanctioned role of confirming the “precepts of the holy ones” and encouraging those who “hope in their heart” (4Q521 2 II+4 4).

If 4Q521 attests to a setting of messianic expectation to the divine activity of resurrecting the dead, its evidence adds to late evidence of a messianic setting to resurrection, including *1 En.* 51:1–5, *4 Ezra* 7:26–44, and *2 Bar.* 30:1–2. 4Q521 itself is palaeographically dated to the first quarter of the first century B.C.E., while its composition has been dated to the second half of the second century B.C.E. The difference with the other evidence, which further describes messianic activity, is that the horizon of messianic expectation in 4Q521 does not further specify acts of the ‘anointed one’ apart from the authoritative and paraenetic role attributed to him.

2.5. 4QGrace after Meals (4Q434a)

The last Qumran passage to which I turn, before discussing resurrection in the New Testament from a comparative perspective, is 4Q434a, which is also known as ‘Grace after meals’ in comparison with rabbinic passages.³² I will make a few comments on this passage, of which text and translation are quoted below.³³

4Q434a (4QGrace after Meals) = 4Q434 frg. 2	
] [כה] כה להנחם על אבלה עניה ה]
חדש [] גיים ל[ש]חת ולאומים יכרות ורשעים]
	3 מעשי שמים וארץ ויגילו וכבודו מלוא] כל הארץ בעד אש]מתם
	4 יכפר ורב <ט> טוב ינחמם טוב הש]
vacat [] vacat פריה וטובה 5

³² Preliminary publication by M. Weinfeld, “Grace after Meals in Qumran,” *JBL* 111 (1992): 427–40; M. Weinfeld, *Qumran Cave 4. XX: Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part 2* (DJD XXIX; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999), 279–81 (Frg. 2 of 4Q434) at 280–1; the “verbal and thematic similarities” with rabbinic literature are mainly from the treatise *Berakhot* in the Palestinian and Babylonian Talmuds (*y. Ber.* 1:9, 3d and *b. Ber.* 44a, 46b, 48b).

³³ Text and translation from M. Weinfeld and D. Seely, DJD XXIX, 279–80.

כַּאִישׁ אֲשֶׁר אָמוּ תִנְחַמְנֵנוּ כִּן יִנְחַמֶּם בִּירוּשָׁלַיִם כַּחַתָּן] עַל כֻּלָּה עֲלֵיהּ	6
[לְעוֹלָם יִשְׁכּוּ] כִּי אֶכְסָאוּ לְעוֹלָם וְעַד וּכְבוֹדוֹ ° [] וְכָל גּוֹיִם	7
[] לֹא וְהָיָה בּוֹ צַב[אֵל הַשָּׁמַיִם וְ] אֶרְצָם חֲמֻדָּה	8
[] עַד תִּפְאָר[ת] ש[] ד אֲבֵרְכָה אֶת	9
[] בְּרֹךְ שֵׁם עֲלֵיו] <i>vacat</i> []	10
[] חֲסֵדְךָ עָלַי [] בְּרַכִּי	11
[] לְתוֹרַת הַכִּינּוּתָהּ	12
[] דְּסֵפֶר חֻקֶּיךָ	13

1 [] so that (the) poor woman may be comforted for her mourning [2 to [de]stroy peoples and cut down nations and wicked [] renew 3 the works of heaven and earth, and let them rejoice, and his glory to fill [all the earth] to atone [for] their [guil]t. 4 And the one abounding in goodness will comfort them. Goodness [] to eat 5 its fruit and goodness. *vacat* [] *vacat* 6 As a person whom his mother comforts, so he will comfort them in Jerusal[em as a bridegroom] on a bride, on her 7 he will dwell[] forever [fo]r his throne is forever and ever and his glory [] and all peoples 8 [] to him and the hos[t of heav]en will be in it, and their desirable [] and 9 [] glor[y] [] I will bless 10 [] Blessed be the name of the highe[st] *vacat* 11 [] Bless[] your grace upon me 12 [] for the Torah you established 13 [] the book of your laws.

This passage mentions the renewal of the “works of heaven and earth” (lines 2–3) combined with rejoicing and glory (line 3) in the context of consolation about mourning (line 1), presumably mourning of the dead. This passage appears to interrelate the consolation of the individual figure of a poor woman with a collective setting of consolation in line 4. The language in which it is couched, destruction of the wicked on the one hand and rejoicing and glory on the other, could well be eschatologically oriented. The renewal of creation is also an issue in Isa 65:17–18. Line 6 furthermore makes a simile between a “person whom his mother comforts” and God’s consolation of a third person plural in Jerusalem. This simile is followed by Isaianic imagery (Isa 62:5), possibly about Jerusalem as eternal dwelling place.

The localization of future consolation (יְנַחֵם) in Jerusalem, surrounded by imagery of God’s eternal dwelling, eternal throne and glory, could have parallels in *1 En.* 25–27, which analogously mentions the throne of God, the rejoicing of the righteous and pious, and judgement against the cursed. In view of the theme of consolation about the dead, the future-eschatological perspective and the mention of the renewal of the “works of heaven and earth” in this Qumran passage, a notion of afterlife if not resurrection could be within the mental horizon of “Grace after meals.”

3. RESURRECTION OF THE DEAD IN NEW TESTAMENT WRITINGS

Given the above discussion of possible and certain indications of belief in resurrection in the Dead Sea Scrolls, I will now turn to a few New Testament passages, with more or less explicit starting points for comparison with contemporary Jewish tradition.

3.1. *Mark 9:9–13*

The first passage which I will treat is Mark 9:9–13, which has a parallel in Matt 17:9–13 but not in Luke. The Marcan passage is quoted below in translation.

9:9 And as they were coming down the mountain, he charged them to tell no one what they had seen, until the Son of man should have risen from the dead. 10 So they kept the matter to themselves, questioning what the rising from the dead meant. 11 And they asked him, ‘Why do the scribes say that first Elijah must come?’ 12 And he said to them, ‘Elijah does come first to restore all things; and how is it written of the Son of man, that he should suffer many things and be treated with contempt? 13 But I tell you that Elijah has come, and they did to him whatever they pleased, as it is written of him.’ (Mark 9:9–13, RSV)

The discussion about resurrection of the dead and the expectation of the coming of Elijah among some of Jesus’ disciples comes after the Transfiguration, which narrates the transfiguration of Jesus and the appearance of Elijah and Moses (Mark 9:2–8 / Matt 17:1–8 / Luke 9:28–36). I will take the Marcan passage as a starting point for discussion.

Within the narrative strategy of Mark, the instruction of silence in Mark 9:9, fits into a pattern of such instructions (cf. Mark 1:34.43–44, 3:12, 5:43, 8:30), traditionally related to the Marcan “messianic secret,” which could be seen as a reader-oriented deferral of one’s associations with and expectations of Jesus to the end of the passion narrative.³⁴ In the narration of Mark 9:9–13, the intra-narrative audience of the disciples Peter, James and John reacts to Jesus’ reference to the resurrection of the dead and poses the question about what it means in relation to scribal assertions that “first Elijah must come” (Mark 9:10–11). The eschatological expectation of Elijah’s coming can be related to Mal 3:23 and Sir 48:10—texts we came across as intertextual background in

³⁴ R. Fowler, *Let the Reader Understand. Reader-Response Criticism and the Gospel of Mark* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991), 86.

4Q521 frg. 2 col. 3—, while the early rabbinic Mishnah-treatise *Sotah* 9:15 explicitly voices the idea that “the resurrection of the dead shall come through Elijah of blessed memory.”³⁵ The disciples do not react directly to Jesus’ application of resurrection to himself as the “Son of man,” while the sequence of statements about Elijah and the Son of man in Jesus’ subsequent reply has been called “cryptic.”³⁶ The first part of Jesus’ reply first confirms the eschatological expectation about Elijah, adding that “Elijah does come first to restore all things” (Mark 9:12, RSV). The expectation of Elijah’s restorative role is implicit in Mal 3:23–24 and Sir 48:10. As we have seen in the case of 4QpsEzek^b, resurrection and restoration could be interrelated in Palestinian Jewish eschatological expectations.

The intricate sequence of comments and rhetorical questions in Jesus’ reply in Mark 9:12–13 suggests that Elijah and the Son of man serve as a typology for the precursory role of John the Baptist and then Jesus as the Messiah. This impression may find further support in Mark 6:14–16 and in the Matthean editorial comment that the “disciples understood that he was speaking to them of John the Baptist” (Matt 17:13).

Sometimes Qumran literature has been drawn into exegetical discussion arguing that early Jewish literature would not know a prophetic figure as eschatological precursor comparable to Gospel traditions about John the Baptist.³⁷ While this observation can be considered historically true, the argument that Second Temple Jewish literature does not know any precursor figure to an expected Messiah or to expected messianic protagonists should not be taken to imply that there were no distinctions between prophetic and messianic roles. In fact, 1QS IX 11 clearly distinguishes prophetic and messianic figures through

³⁵ Translation from H. Danby, *The Mishnah* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1933), 307.

³⁶ R.T. France, *The Gospel of Mark. A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans – Carlisle: Paternoster, 2002).

³⁷ H. Stegemann, “Erwägungen zur Bedeutung des Täufers Johannes im Markusevangelium,” in *Das Ende der Tage und die Gegenwart des Heils. Begegnungen mit dem Neuen Testament und seiner Umwelt* (ed. M. Becker and W. Fenske; FS H.-W. Kuhn; AGJU 44; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 101–16 at 105: “Sofern man diese Ansage (Mark 1:7–8 par.) des ‘Stärkeren’ auf den historischen Täufer zurückführt, kann er—*religionsgeschichtlich* betrachtet—damit niemand anderen gemeint haben als nur *Gott*. ‘Der Messias’ hat im Judentum vorchristlicher Zeit *nie* einen Vorläufer oder Wegbereiter.” See also the statement by Xeravits, *King, Priest, Prophet*, 110: “the author of 4Q521 did not distinguish between two eschatological figures, ‘the messiah’ and his precursor prophet. This distinction becomes an important aspect only in the beginnings of Christian preaching.”

the eschatological expectation of the coming of “the prophet and the Messiahs of Aaron and Israel.” If my analysis of evidence from 4Q521 is correct, this composition may also attest to a horizon of prophetic and messianic expectations. The question of John addressing Jesus in Luke 7:19 and Matt 11:3, “Are you he who is to come, or shall we look for another?” could perhaps be taken to voice a diffuse notion of messianic identity next to other prophetic and eschatological expectations in first century C.E. Palestinian Judaism and the early Jesus-movement. It was in early Christian tradition that John the Baptist, held to be a prophet by the people according to Mark 11:32, was represented as precursor to Jesus as the Messiah.

3.2. Q 7:18–23

The Lucan and Matthean passages, with John’s question about Jesus’ messianic identity and Jesus’ answer, are the texts to which I will now turn in my discussion. I have cited Luke 7:18–23 and Matt 11:2–6 in translation below.

7:18 The disciples of John told him of all these things. 19 And John, calling to him two of his disciples, sent them to the Lord, saying, ‘Are you he who is to come, or shall we look for another?’ 20 And when the men had come to him, they said, ‘John the Baptist has sent us to you, saying, ‘Are you he who is to come, or shall we look for another?’” 21 In that hour he cured many of diseases and plagues and evil spirits, and on many that were blind he bestowed sight. 22 And he answered them, ‘Go and tell John what you have seen and heard: the blind receive sight, the lame walk, lepers are cleansed, and the deaf hear, the dead are raised up, the poor have good news preached to them. 23 And blessed is he who takes no offense at me. (Luke 7:18–23, RSV)

11:2 Now when John heard in prison about the deeds of the Christ, he sent word by his disciples 3 and said to him, ‘Are you he who is to come, or shall we look for another?’ 4 And Jesus answered them, ‘Go and tell John what you hear and see: 5 the blind receive their sight and the lame walk, lepers are cleansed and the deaf hear, and the dead are raised up, and the poor have good news preached to them. 6 And blessed is he who takes no offense at me.’ (Matt 11:2–6, RSV)

Since Matthew and Luke share a considerable portion of the Greek text, it originates in the sayings source Q. The Lucan passage does not describe resurrection among Jesus’ activities (Luke 7:21), but includes this in the reply of Jesus along with the preaching of good news to the poor (Luke 7:22). This could imply that some of the deeds, in particular

the raising of the dead, are future-oriented in the narrative, presupposing a setting of inaugurated eschatology.³⁸ The Matthean version, on the other hand, appears to provide a further focus on the relation between deeds and words in the interest of Jesus' messianic identity, by stating at the outset that John "heard in prison about the deeds of the Christ" (Matt 11:2). The Greek τὰ ἔργα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, which has the article before Χριστός may differentiate it from the usage Ἰησοῦς Χριστός and could also be rendered as "the deeds of the Messiah," thereby taking Χριστός as translational term for משיח (cf. John 1:41).

Most of the deeds enumerated have been exegetically related to passages in Isaiah as intertexts; the raising of the dead being related to Isa 26:19 and the preaching of good news to the poor to 61:1. These two deeds are also mentioned in this order in the "Messianic Apocalypse," 4Q521 2 II+4 line 12. Even without messianic identification, this intersection in intertextual traditions voices a horizon of eschatological expectations about divine engagement with human history, among which is the resurrection of the dead. A preceding Lukan passage about the raising of a widow's son at Nain (Luke 7:11–17) also builds up to this expectation by reference to the glorification of God, God's visitation of his people and the consideration of Jesus' role as a 'great prophet' (Luke 7:16).

3.3. Romans 11:13–15

The last text which I will discuss in my survey is a Pauline passage from the apostle's Letter to the Romans. This passage makes part of the larger section of Romans 9–11 with Paul's theological discourse about Israel. Romans 11:13–15 is quoted in translation below.

11:13 Now I am speaking to you Gentiles. Inasmuch then as I am an apostle to the Gentiles, I magnify my ministry 14 in order to make my fellow Jews jealous, and thus save some of them. 15 For if their rejection means the reconciliation of the world, what will their acceptance mean but life from the dead? (Rom 11:13–15, RSV)

The quoted verses make part of a larger unit which uses *de minus ad maior* type formulations. Romans 11 ultimately turns to an eschatologi-

³⁸ In Luke 4:21, Jesus announces the fulfilment of Scripture (Isa 61:1–2); cf. Luke 11:20. The alleged "eschatological tension" between realized and future eschatology, apparently reflected in Luke 17:20–21 on the one hand and Luke 17:22–37, 21:8–36 on the other, might be explained with inaugurated eschatology in proleptic terms.

cal vision of all Israel's salvation (Rom 11:25–32). It may therefore be expected that “life from the dead,” ζωὴ ἐκ νεκρῶν, in Romans 11:15 builds up to this and constitutes a verbal equivalent for the eschatological resurrection.³⁹ The Pauline notion which interrelates acceptance of Israel and resurrection of the dead has its background in the contemporary Jewish tradition of which the “Messianic Apocalypse” probably also constitutes a part. While Rom 11 ends with a doxological section glorifying God (Rom 11:33–36), this concludes the vision of all Israel's salvation. Perhaps analogously, the “Messianic Apocalypse” successively mentions the raising of the dead of God's people and a collective, first person plural setting of thanksgiving addressing the Lord.

4. EVALUATION AND CONCLUSIONS

In conclusion, I would like to draw some comparative lines of evaluation. The traditio-historical study of resurrection has sometimes laid one-sided stress on the development of a resurrection belief in apocalyptic, Daniel tradition or in Pharisaic circles.⁴⁰ In my view, the Qumran texts that I have surveyed attest to a more pluriform spectrum of resurrection traditions, which also includes parabiblical and liturgical texts.

The heavenly vindication of the righteous martyred in 2 Maccabees has been considered a relevant Jewish dimension to the New Testament accounts of Jesus' resurrection.⁴¹ The setting of persecution and

³⁹ Cf. J.D.G. Dunn, *The Theology of Paul the Apostle* (London and New York: T&T Clark – Continuum, 1998), 524.

⁴⁰ With regard to focus on a Daniel tradition, see e.g. Puech, *La croyance des Esséniens en la vie future*. 1 who presupposes a formative influence of Dan 12 on, among other texts, 2 Macc (pp. 91–2), *T. Jud.* 25 (p. 123), *Pss. Sol.* 3 (p. 126), 2 *Bar.* 29–30 (p. 137), of which some texts, like 2 *Bar.* 29–30 are graphically compared with regard to verbatim agreement, while several other texts are compared with Dan 12 in a broader sense of corresponding imagery; cf. Puech, DJD XXXI, 397 who relates the term לְעַמָּא in 4Q548 1 ii-2 14 to עַמָּא in Dan 12:1. This tendency to relate all terms to a Daniel tradition leaves unexplained the fact that Dan 12:1 only describes the deliverance of “your people” from tribulation, but lacks the imagery of light in direct connection with עַמָּא. With regard to focus on Pharisaic tradition, see e.g. J. Schaper, *Eschatology in the Greek Psalter* (WUNT, II/76; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1995), 47–8 where he explains resurrection terminology in LXX Ps 1:5 against a background of second-century B.C.E. proto-Pharisaic circles, with reference to Josephus' *J.A.* 18.14, 2 Macc 7:9.14.36, 12:44f. and *m. Sanh.* 10.

⁴¹ U. Kellermann, *Auferstanden in den Himmel. 2 Makkabäer 7 und die Auferstehung der Märtyrer* (SBS, 95; Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1979).

vindication is also an issue in other apocalyptic texts, but a variety of conceptualisations of resurrection in earthly or heavenly terms runs through the Enochic tradition. Qumran texts also attest to a variety of conceptualisations of afterlife with imagery of light (4Q548), Ezekiel-like imagery of the revivification of dry bones (*4QPseudo-Ezekiel*), life for the dead (4Q521), and the renewal of works of creation (4Q434a).

Different settings for belief in resurrection may be distinguished in Qumran evidence: vindication of the righteous and destruction of wickedness in the two-way theology (4Q548); restoration for God's people and its remnant to the land of Israel (4QpsEzek^b); messianically inspired hope and thanksgiving for God's righteous deeds (4Q521); and consolation (4Q434a).

These diverse settings for belief in resurrection may all have their relevance as traditio-historical backgrounds in a comparative evaluation with the New Testament. The most explicit case of traditio-historical interrelations, as we have seen, is that of the "Messianic Apocalypse" and Q 7:18–23. Expecting a restoration connected with eschatological resurrection also played a part in the early Jesus-movement, as we have seen in the passage of Mark 9:9–13, which also refers to Elijah as the one to restore all things. However, emerging Christianity came to focus its resurrection belief on the resurrection of Jesus Christ as "first fruits," to be followed by resurrection "at his coming (of) those who belong to Christ" (1 Cor 15:23). The proclamation of Jesus' resurrection in Acts begins with a statement about the geographical spreading of the gospel mission and appears to disregard expectations about Jesus as a messianic figure who would 'restore the kingdom to Israel' (Acts 1:6–7).

INDEX OF ANCIENT SOURCES

A. HEBREW BIBLE

Genesis		20:12	232, 233 n. 9, 235, 238–241, 251, 253, 254
1	161 n. 109		
1–2	133, 146, 155, 163	22	85
1:22	28	22:6–14	85
1:27	107, 136, 139, 144	22:7	86
	n. 43, 154–156, 162,	22:10	86
	163	24:6–8	170
1:28	28	24:9–11	264
2	107	24:16	270
2:7	111, 160	25:16	166
2:10–14	270	28:36f	263
2:18	244	30:1–10	261
2:21–25	244, 246	33:3	159 n. 101
2:23	252, 254	33:5	159 n. 101
2:24	136, 137, 139, 140,	34:9	159 n. 101
	141–144 n. 43,	34:29	53, 79
	155, 163, 232, 239	40:9	171
	nn. 33, 36, 243 n. 51,	40:34	270
	244–246, 248, 252–254		
3:16	244, 246, 247	Leviticus	
5:2	136, 154 n. 80	8:24	171
5:24	299 n. 3	11–15	20
7:9	154, 155, 163	14:4–6	170
8:17	28	16:11–16	166
9:1	28	16:27	167
9:7	28	17–26	20
15:6	95, 96	18:5	96–99
29:14	141 n. 30	18:6	246
34	275	18:18	153, 154
37:3	286 n. 23	18:24–30	20
49	63	19:3	251 n. 76
		19:19	87 n. 14
		19:31	20, 141 n. 32
Exodus		20:1–3	20
1:13–14	289	25:49	246
1:40	137	26	282, 289, 290, 292, 293–297
2:23	289		
4:22–23	236 n. 22	26:11–12	295
4:31	128	26:18	283
6:6	127	26:21	283, 295
15:2	127 n. 26	26:24	283
15:16	127	26:25–26	294
15:17	50	26:28	283
15:17b–18	74	26:32	284
16:33–34	166	26:36	283 n. 14
19:6	260, 280	26:39	283 n. 14, 293
20:6	240 n. 38		

26:40–41	285	18:1–2	288
26:43	293	18:22	84 n. 6
26:43–46	292	19:10–16	288
26:44	293 n. 47, 294 n. 48	20:2–3	89, 90
26:44–45	293	20:4	90
		21	29
Numbers		21:22–23	30
3:17	190 n. 47	21:23	96, 97, 98
6:24–27	235	22:9	87 n. 14
10:9	90	23:3–4	50
16:30	155 n. 85	23:10	89
16:48–49	292 n. 42	23:10–15	90
17:23	166	23:15	89, 90, 91
19	20	24:1	134, 135, 143, 145, 151, 159
19:18	170		
19:19	265 n. 29	26:27	99
20:1–13	292 n. 44, 293	27:26	96, 97, 99
24:17	93, 106 n. 8	28:14	243 n. 50
26:53	288	28:54	244 n. 54
30	247	28:56	244 n. 54
30:7–9	244, 247	29:29	278
31:19f	265 n. 29	30:6	237
35:33–34	20	30:16	237
35–36	288	30:19	237
		31:29	87
Deuteronomy		32:43	100, 101
1:17	84 n. 6	33	49, 74
1:31	236 n. 22	33:3	287 n. 27
4:1	237		
4:10	237 n. 26	Joshua	
4:20–21	288	1:7	243 n. 50
4:34	127	1:8	29
5:13	253	24:14	127
5:16	232, 233 n. 9, 234, 235, 237–241, 252, 253 n. 80	Judges	
6:8	263	9:2	141 n. 32
7:21	89, 90, 91	11:11	251
8:5	236 n. 22		
8:14	22	1 Samuel	
9:6	159 n. 101	1:11	128
9:13	159 n. 101	2:1–10	120, 124–126, 128, 130
10:2	166		
10:16	159 n. 101	2 Samuel	
10:17	234 n. 12	3:2–5	153
10:21	126	5:1	141 n. 30
11:22	141 n. 32	5:13	153
12:9	173	7	49–52, 56, 62, 63, 66, 74, 75, 78, 79, 81
13:7	244	7:10–11	49, 74, 80
13:18	141 n. 32	7:10–14	51
17	58	7:11–14	50, 75, 87, 89, 113 n. 44
17:11	243 n. 50	7:11–16	71
17:17	153, 155, 163		
17:19	153 n. 76		

7:12-13	88	62:5	314
7:13	75	65:17-18	314
7:14	49, 50, 72, 80		
19:13-14	141 n. 30	Jeremiah	
22:44	251	3:3	289
		3:16f	270
1 Kings		4:4	159 n. 101
1:32-48	69	25:11f	271
7:21	269	29:10	271
7:23-25	264	31	29
7:39	264	31:16	296
7:44	264		
8:10-11	270	Ezekiel	
17:21-23	299 n. 3	1:24	264
		3:7	159 n. 101
2 Kings		4-6	294 n. 49
2:11	299 n. 3	5:5	263
11:12-20	69	5:14	289
17:36	127	9:4	263
		16:10	286 n. 23
Isaiah		16:13	286 n. 23
1:21	289	16:18	286 n. 23
4:5f	271	16:30	289
5:14	115 n. 54	20:5-17	292
6	44	22:5	289
6:3	168	29:21	125
6:4	270	30:13	307
8:11	50, 76, 91, 92	31:10	22
9	60, 63	36:24	307
9:1	304	37	28, 304, 308
11	60, 63	37:1-14	307, 308
11:4	62	37:3-4	306
11:1-5	57, 82 n. 41	37:7	306
11:10	100	37:10	306
11:11-12:6	100 n. 47	37:12	307
22:15	269	37:21	307
25:8	296 n. 51	37:23	50, 76
24:17	22	37:15-38:24	307 n. 22
26:16	292 n. 41	40-48	29
26:19	309, 311, 318	47:1-12	270
28:16	23	48:1-29	296
33:11	234 n. 14		
33:17	267	Hosea	
40:3	19	6:2	28
40:13	117	14:3	167
46:5	246 n. 63		
49:10	296 n. 51	Joel	
51:9-10	127	4:18	270
55:3	50		
55-66	14 n. 20	Amos	42
61	131, 311	4:6-11	280
61:1	318	5	29
61:1-2	318 n. 38	5:26-27	93, 94
61:6	260	9:11	50, 75, 81, 87-89, 93

Jonah	294 n. 48	5	49, 74
		8:7	246 n. 63
Micah		9:17–21	218 n. 27
1:4	62	11:4–7	271
6:8	264 n. 27	14:6	218 n. 27
		16	28
Habakkuk		17:21	57
2:4	29, 96–99	17:34	58
3:18	125	18	68
		18:3	125
Zephaniah		18:50	100
3:17	126	20	68
		21	68
Zechariah		23:8	126
11:11	217	24	44
13:1	270, 271	25:9	218 n. 27
14:6	270	29	44
		32:1–2	95, 96
Malachi		34:3–4	125
1:6	236 n. 22	35:9	125
1:10	169	40:18	218 n. 27
1:16	234 n. 12	45	68
2:14	244	72	55, 68
2:14–15	245	72:4	218 n. 27
2:16	134, 151	73	28
3:16	107, 109, 112 n. 35, 113, 114, 116	77:65	126
3:17	236 n. 22	78:44–51	280
3:23	315, 316	84	28, 271
3:24	312, 316	88:9	126
		89	54, 55, 68
		89:26–7	54
Psalms		93	44
1	49, 51, 52, 68, 74	96	44
1:1	50, 76, 77, 91, 92	101	68
1:5	319	103:13	236 nn. 22, 23
1–2	51, 66, 79	103:19–22	44
1–41	52	105:28–36	280
2	49–66, 67–82, 276	106:10	127
2:1	73, 80	106:21	126
2:1–2	52, 70, 72, 73, 76, 81, 82	107:9–10	120
2:1–8	73	110	54 n. 29, 55, 60, 61, 68
2:1–9	53	110:1	72, 80
2:2	50, 52, 53, 55, 57, 67, 70–73, 77–80, 82	110:4	72, 80, 173
2:6	50, 55, 62	111:9	120, 127
2:6–7	73, 79	117:1	100, 101
2:7	49, 50, 52, 68, 70–73, 80	118:14–15	127 n. 26
2:8	71, 72	132	68
2:8–9	57	132:17	125
2:9	51, 70, 71, 73	134	261
2:11	71	135:1f	261
2:12	77	136:9	234 n. 12
		136:12–13	127
		139:5	137 n. 16

141:2	262	Esther	
144	68	6:1	114
145:10-13	44		
145:14	126	Daniel	60, 168, 294
146:7-8	311	2	60
146:8	126	3:53/55	44
149:4-5	218 n. 27	7	59, 61
		9:2	271
Job		9:24-27	271
24:20	113 n. 41	10-11	273
25:2	246 n. 63	11:39	246 n. 63
42:16-17	237	12	28, 319 n. 40
		12:1	272 n. 46, 319 n. 40
Proverbs		12:1-3	299, 304, 308
3:12	236 n. 22	12:2	307
8:10-21	215 n. 15	12:3	303
16:5	21		
17:20	159 n. 101	Ezra	
21:9	245 n. 56	4:15	114
22:7	47		
25:24	245 n. 56	Nehemiah	
29:1	159 n. 101	10:29	14 n. 20
30:7-9	215 n. 15	10:35	14 n. 20
31:12	153	13:31	14 n. 20
Ecclesiastes/Qohelet		1 Chronicles	
3:1	144 n. 42	11:1	141 n. 30
11:8	114	12:18	245 n. 61
		29:28	237

B. APOCRYPHA AND PSEUDEPIGRAPHA

Apocalypse of Abraham		56:14	138 n. 17
18:2	168	77.17-26	296
29:17-19	270		
Apocalypse of Zephaniah	168	3 Baruch	
		16:3	280
Assumption of Moses		1 Enoch	13, 14, 28, 168,
1:13	144 n. 42		263 n. 22
1:14	144 n. 42	1:4	160 n. 103
1:17	144 n. 42	1:9-5:4	160
12:4	144 n. 42	1-5	160 n. 103
		1-36	299 n. 2
Baruch	168	2:2	144 n. 42
2:30	159 n. 101	5:4	159 n. 101
2 Baruch		6:2-7:1	138 n. 19
10-11	294 n. 48	10:21	268
12:2-4	270 n. 40	15:9	145
29-30	319 n. 40	16:3	159 n. 101
30:1-2	313	22-27	307
		25-27	314

37	58	Ezekiel the Tragedian	
38-44	58	133-48	282 n. 11
39:3	168		
45-57	58	4 Ezra	63, 65, 270
45:3	167		n. 40
46	59	4:30	144 n. 42
46:1	59	6:38	144 n. 42
48:2-3	59, 60	7:26-28	276
48:6	59, 60	7:26-44	313
48:10	56, 60	7:28	62
49:1-4	60	7:29	62
51:1-5	313	8:52	276
51:3	60	9:31-37	276
52:4	60	10:10	144 n. 42
55:4	60	10:14	144 n. 42
58-69	58	10:27	270
60:4-5	59	10:39	276
61:8	60	10:44	276
62:2	60	12	61
62:7	60	12:11	61
69:14	59	12:32	62
69:17	143 n. 41	13	56, 61, 62
69:29	60	13:29-50	276
70-72	58	13:39-50	296
71:3	59	14:22	144 n. 42
71:8-9	59		
71:13	59	Gospel of the Egyptians	138
71:14	59		
71:15	143 n. 41	Gospel of Thomas	212
83:11	144 n. 42	22	138, 139
83-90	299 n. 2	54	221
87:2	266	55	162 n. 112
89-90	294 n. 48	63-65	224
90:21	266	89	161 n. 106
90:28-37	270	101	162 n. 112
90:33	299		
91:8-10	299	Joseph and Aseneth	
91:9-10	307	15:7-8	138 n. 19
91-105	299 n. 2		
93:8-10	284	Jubilees	13, 22, 41, 44
97:5	264		n. 44
98:1	159 n. 101	1:17	270
98:11	159 n. 101	1:27	143 n. 41
100:5	264	3:7	140 n. 27
100:8	159 n. 101	3:27	261 n. 16
103:4	299	4:25	261 n. 16
104:2	299, 303	8:19	263
104:4	299	12:25-7	158
104:6	299	15:27	138 n. 19,
108:3	264		168
		21:10	158
2 Enoch		30:4	275
21:3	168	30:18-20	275

31:14	168	3:12	129, 303
32:2	266	4:1	129
41:25–26	149	4:6	129
		4:8	129
Judith		4:23	129
9:1	261	5:11	129
		7:32	57
L.A.B. (Ps.–Philo)		8:7	143 n. 41
7:4	144 n. 42	8:23	129
10.1	282 n. 11	8:24	129
32:7	144 n. 42	9:3	129
51.5	303	10:1	130
		10:3	129
Ladder of Jacob		10:4	130
5.16–17	294 n. 48	10:6	129
		11:4	129
Lives of the Prophets	276, 277	11:7	130
Vita Daniel		12:4	129
4:19f	276 n. 61	12:4	129
Vita Ezekiel		12:6	129
3.5	276 n. 61	13:2	129
4:19f	276 n. 61	13:10	129
Vita Haggai		13:12	129
14.2	276 n. 61	14:3	129
		14:10	129
2 Maccabees	319	15:3	167
7:9	319 n. 40	15:7	129
7:14	265 n. 29, 319 n. 40	15:13	129
		16:3	129
7:36	319 n. 40	16:5	129
10:29–30	138 n. 19	17	51, 56, 57, 63, 65
12:44f	319 n. 40	17:3	129
13:51	265 n. 29	17:4	56
		17:11	56
3 Maccabees		17:13	129
6	294 n. 48	17:16	129
		17:21	129
4 Maccabees		17:23	129, 276
1:10f	274	17:27	58
9:24–30	274	17:33	57
16:12–16	274	18:2	129
		18:3	129
Martyrdom and Ascension of Isaiah		18:7	57 n. 40
1–5/6–11	258 n. 5		
		Sibylline Oracles	
Psalms of Solomon	121, 124, 131	2.171	296
2:1–2	129	3	56
2:31	129	3.196–294	294 n. 48
2:33	129	3.652	81
2:36	129	3.663	81
3	319	3.664–8	56
3:8	129		

Sirach			
1:27	241 n. 45	Testament of Asher	
3:1-16	238 n. 28, 239, 240	1:3-5:4	303
3:7	234 n. 14	7:7	276 n. 61
3:8	233 n. 9	Testament of Benjamin	
4:24	241 n. 45	8:1	141
6:18	241 n. 45	Testament of Issachar	
7:25	244	6:4	276 n. 61
7:27-28	237	Testament of Judah	
7:28	234 n. 14	23:5	276 n. 61, 294 n. 48
8:12	47	25	319
9:1	244 n. 54	Testament of Levi	
10:31-11:1	215 n. 15	3	168
15:14	144 n. 42	3:5-6	167, 261 n. 16
16:11	159 n. 101	4:2	56
16:16	155 n. 85	5:3-4	275
24:9	144 n. 42	8	266
24:23-33	271	18	174, 270 n. 40
25:26	146 n. 51, 245	19:1	303
26:28-27:3	215 n. 15	Testament of Zebulun	
30:11	246 n. 63	10:2	276 n. 61
30:28	246 n. 63	Testament of Moses	
31:1-11	215 n. 15	3	294 n. 48
34:18-35:11	167	4:9	296
39:25	144 n. 42	Tobit	38, 168
41:4	28	8:6	140 n. 27, 146 n. 51
42:21	126 n. 25	8:7	245
43:15	126 n. 25		
45:7-10	266	Vit. Ad.	
45:16	47	44:4	144 n. 42
45:17	246 n. 63		
47:19	246 n. 63	Wisdom of Solomon	107
48:5	299 n. 3	2:13	62
48:10	312, 315, 316	2:16	62
48:24	126	6:22	143 n. 41
51:12-13	128	9:8	144 n. 42
		11-18	280
Testaments of the	121, 168, 174,	12:11	144 n. 42
Twelve Patriarchs	276, 277	14:13	144 n. 42
XI	121	16:6	241
XIV	121		
XVIII	121		

C. NEW TESTAMENT

Matthew		8:21	135 n. 8
3:9	238 n. 28	9:2	37
3:16-17	51	10:21	238 n. 28
3:17	70	10:37	162 n. 112
4:3	70	11:2	318
5:32	145 n. 49, 147	11:2-6	131, 311, 317
5:43-48	35 n. 10	11:3	317
6:24	222	11:5	221 n. 40

12:11	35	10	133–163
12:23	131	10:2	135
13:11	44	10:2–12	35, 134
15	160	10:6–12	133
15:14	239 n. 36	10:7	245 n. 60
17:1–8	315	10:8	137
17:9–13	315	10:19	239 n. 36
17:13	316	10:21	224
19:3	135	10:24–25	222
19:4	144 n. 42	10:47	131
19:5	245 n. 60	11:32	317
19:7–9	135 n. 9	12:25	138, 161
19:12	28, 161	12:41–44	221
19:19	239 n. 36	13:19	143
19:29	162 n. 112	14:47	263 n. 23
21:14–15	131		
21:28	238 n. 28	Luke	
23:37	238 n. 28	1:8–22	259
24:21	143 n. 40, 272 n. 46	1:10	261
25:14–30	47	1:32	64
27:51	269	1:35	64
		1:46	122
Mark	19	1:46–55	119, 121, 124, 129–132
1:10–11	51		120, 126, 127
1:15	268	1:49	127
1:34	315	1:51	120, 124
1:43–44	315	1:52	121, 130
2:5	37, 238 n. 28	1:54–55	119–121, 124, 130,
2:27	35, 160	1:67–79	132
3:12	315		127
3:20–21	162 n. 112	1:69	121
3:23–27	159	1:72	124
3:31–35	162 n. 112	1:74	139
4:11	44	2:23	259
5:13	135 n. 8	2:25–35	224
5:43	315	3:11	51
6:1–6	162 n. 112	3:21–2	70
6:7–9	221	3:22	221 n. 40
6:14–15	312	4:8–19	131, 312
6:14–16	316	4:16–30	318
6:30–44	224	4:21	37
7	160	5:20	221
7:2–5	161 n. 106	6:14–25	221, 223 n. 45
7:10	135 n. 10	6:20–21	227 n. 52
7:15	160 n. 106	6:20–31	35 n. 10
7:27	238 n. 28	6:27–28	35 n. 10
8:1–10	224	6:32–36	224
8:27–10:52	159	6:34–35	318
8:30	315	7:11–17	317
9:2–13	315	7:19	317
9:9–13	320	7:21	221 n. 40, 317
9:12–13	316	7:22	238 n. 28
9:36–37	162	7:35	224
9:47	159	7:41–43	

8:10	44	5:17	13, 186 n. 33
10:4-7	221	5:24	263 n. 23
10:18	159	5:26	263 n. 23
11:20	318	6:1-3	225
11:40-41	161 n. 106	6:7	277 n. 62
12:16-21	222	7:18-23	311
12:22-23	221	7:51	159 n. 101
12:29	221	7:55f	259
12:33-35	224	13:23-41	120
14:5	35	13:33	70, 71
14:13	221 n. 40	13:33-34	50, 51
14:16-24	223 n. 45	13:33-37	71
14: 18-19	221 n. 40	13:36-43	120
14:21	221 n. 40	15:5	13, 186 n. 33
14:26	28, 162 n. 112	15:28	22
14:33	224	21:20	16
16:1-7	224	23:1-10	29
16:13	222	23:8	268 n. 34
16:18	147, 162 n. 112	24:5	13, 186 n. 33
16:19-31	222	24:14	13
17:20-37	318 n. 38	24:17	225
18:20	239 n. 36	26:5	13
18:24-25	222		
18:29	28, 162 n. 112	Romans	257 n. 1
19:11-27	47	1:8	16
20:35	161	3:4	94
21:1-4	221	3:9-11	94
21:8-36	318	3:10-18	95
22:4	263 n. 23	3:12	94
22:52	263 n. 23	3:13	94
22:20	23	3:15	94
		3:20	30
Luke-Acts	184	3:21-24	30
		3:27-28	30
Q	43, 44	3:29-30	96 n. 34
7:18-23	317	4:1-8	95 n. 32
		4:3-8	94, 95
John	19	4:7-8	96 n. 34
1:41	70, 318	7	97
1:49	70	8:29	26, 58
17:12	30	9:3	26
		9:6-7	25
Acts		9:8	26
1:6-7	320	9:9	26
2:43-47	123	9:24	26
2:44-46	224	9:27	23
3:1	261	9:27-29	296
4:1	263 n. 23	9:33	23
4:25	70, 72, 80	9-11	318
4:32-35	224	11	26
4:32-37	123	11:2	25
4:36	277 n. 62	11:4-6	296
5:5	19	11:5	23
5:10	19	11:13-15	318

11:15	319	3:10–12	96, 99, 101
11:25–32	319	3:11	98 n. 39
11:33–36	319	3:11–12	101
12:1	264 n. 27	3:13	30, 99, 101
13:3	251	3:28	138, 139
13:4	251	4	94
13:7	251	5:19	30
15:8–12	100, 102 n. 50	5:20	13, 186 n. 33
15:9–12	100 n. 47	5:23	30
15:25–26	123	6:16	23
15:26	225 n. 49		
1 Corinthians		Ephesians	
1:27–29	223 n. 45	2:13–17	255
2:6–16	116, 117	2:20–22	269
3	94	2:21f	260
3:1	108, 116	4:2	249
3:3	95 n. 32	4:25	249
3:9	30, 95 n. 32	5:2–33	244
3:16–17	23, 30	5:8	30
3:19f	95 n. 32	5:20	249
6:16	140, 141, 245, 253, 254	5:21	238 n. 29, 250, 251
7:1–7	28	5:21–30	245
7:11	148, 152	5:21–33	242
7:29	28	5:21–6:4	231–255
9	94	5:21–6:9	232
9:5	162	5:22–23	250
9:9–10	95 n. 32	5:22–33	247
10:11	241	5:22–4:1	253
11:19	13, 186 n. 33	5:22–6:4	255
11:25	23	5:23	236
15	94	5:23–24	251
15:16–17	29	5:25	239 n. 36, 252
15:23	320	5:25–31	252
15:24–28	264	5:29	241 n. 43
15:42–49	108	5:31	140, 141, 239 nn. 33, 36, 245
16:1–4	225	5:33	239 n. 36, 249, 251, 252
2 Corinthians	105	6:1–4	237, 238, 241, 250
3:6	23	6:2	253 n. 80
6	94	6:4	241
6:16	23	6:5	250, 251
7:15	71	6:5–9	253
8:4	225	Philippians	
8:13–14	225 n. 50	4:18	264 n. 27
9	94	Colossians	
Galatians		1:18	144
2:10	123, 225	3:17–18	249
2:11–13	22	3:18–21	254, 255
2:16	30	3:18–4:1	232
3	94, 97, 98	3:20–21	237, 238, 239, 241, 253
3:6–14	95 n. 32	3:21	240

1 Thessalonians		10:19	266
5:4-9	30	10:19-22	262, 278
		10:20	166
1 Timothy		10:26	170
6:10	222 n. 43	11:23	240 n. 41
		11:28	170
2 Timothy		12:5	241
3:8	284	12:7	241
3:16	241	12:8	241
		12:11	241
Hebrews		12:22	266
1	74	12:24	23
1:2	72	13:8	262 n. 18
1:5	70, 72, 78, 80	13:10-12	167
1:5-14	72	13:15	262
2:14-15	173	13:15-16	167
2:17	172	13:22f	278
3:1-7:28	173		
3:14-16	172	Titus	
4:14-16	262, 269, 278	3:10	241
5:1-6	172		
5:5	70	James	
5:5-6	72, 80	1:9-11	223 n. 45
5:10	172	1:10-12	222
6:19	269	2:2-4	223
6:20	172	2:5-7	223
7	30, 72	4:13	222
7:1-19	172	5:1-4	223
7:2-4	172		
7:21	172	1 Peter	184, 196, 257 n. 1
7:23	172	2:25	17
7:25	173		
7:27	173	2 Peter	
8:1-2	173	2:1	13, 186 n. 33
8:2	166	2:5	260
8:5	166	2:5-10	269
8:8	23	3:4	143
8:13	23		
9:1-5	166	1 John	
9:6-7	166	1:1	143 n. 40
9:8-14	170		
9:11-12	262	Jude	
9:13	171	14-15	14
9:15	23		
9:18-20	170	Revelation	257, 277
9:18-28	268	1:5	266, 268, 275, 280
9:22	171		n. 3
9:24	166	1:6	260, 275
9:24-28	170	1:7-12a	257
9:25	166	1:9-18	278
10:1-4	170	1:12-18	278
10:5-18	170	1-8	277
10:11-12	173	2:9	265 n. 28, 271

2:26	71, 275	9:3-5	280
2:26-27	70	9:4	263
2:27	281	9:13	263, 269
2-3	272	9:17-18	180
3:4f	265	10:3-7	295
3:5	265	11:1	263, 269
3:9	265 n. 28, 271	11:8	264
3:14	144	11:8-10	290 n. 36
3:12	269	11:10	282 n. 10
3:18	265	11:14-19	275
3:20	269	11:15	71, 296
3:21	275	11:19	269
4	278	12	281
4:1	269	12:1-6	281
4:2	267	12:5	51, 71, 275
4:3	268	12:7	271
4-5	259, 263	12:11	272
4:1-22:5	257	12:13	281
4:10	266, 268	12:14	281
5	262, 268	13:10	282 n. 10
5:5	266	14:1	263
5:8	261, 262 n. 18, 264, 268	14:1-5	274
5:9-11	280	14:13	272
5:10	260, 275	14:18	263, 269
6:5-6	295	15	281
6:8	280, 295	15:2-4	281
6:9	269	15:3	281
6:9-11	265	15:1-4	264
6-7	295	15:5-8	270
6-8	279	15:6	294
6-16	294, 297	15-16	281 n. 8
7	296	16:2	280
7:3	263, 266	16	279
7:3-8	274	16:3-4	280
7:5-8	296	16:6	272
7:9	265 n. 28, 268	16:7	263, 267
7:9-15	265	16:8-9	280
7:9-17	261, 262	16:10	280
7:14	268, 272	16:11	280
7:15	271, 295	16:13	280
7:16-17	296 n. 51	16:21	280
7:17	270, 296	17	297
8	262	17:6	272
8:1	261	17:18	71
8:1-4	263	18	297
8:3	264, 269	18:20	258
8:3f	261	19:6-8	265, 268
8:5	263	19:11-21	274
8:8	280	19:15	51, 70, 71, 275
8:12	280	19:16	275, 281
8-11	279	19:19	71
9:2	280	19-21	30
		20	275

20:6	261, 275	21-22	270, 276
20:9	276	22:1f	269
20:11	267, 269	22:6	258
21:3-7	295	22:9	258
21:27	161 n. 106	22:14	265

D. DEAD SEA SCROLLS

<i>CD (Damascus Document)</i>		XIII, 14-15	218 n. 30
	87, 149, 152 n. 70,	XIII, 15-16	218 n. 29
	154, 184 n. 24, 185	XIII, 17	151
	n. 27, 191, 192,	XV, 14	234 n. 15
	213, 214, 218, 219,	XIV, 3-11	190 n. 47
	220 n. 38, 227, 228,	XIV, 12-16	191 n. 48
	283, 285	XIV, 12-17	216 n. 23
I, 4	23	XIV, 20-21	219 n. 31
I, 1-5	293	XVI, 10-12	247 n. 64
I, 6	283	XVI, 13-14	219 n. 35
I, 11-15	308 n. 24	XIX, 4	156 n. 88
I, 13-14	292 n. 43	XIX, 9	217
II-VI	284	XIX, 17-19	213 n. 9
III	150, 151, 154	XX, 6-8	214 n. 13
III, 1	283	XX, 12	23
III, 5	283	4QD ^a (4Q266)	
III, 10-12	149	9 III, 1-10	218 n. 29
III, 14	284	10 I, 5-10	216 n. 23
IV, 9	23	10 I, 14-II, 1	219 n. 31
IV, 15-18	215	11 I, 4-5	219 n. 31
IV, 17-18	169	XI, 14-16	214 n. 12
IV, 20-5:2	148ff, 153	XVI, 12-15	214 n. 12
IV, 21	144, 145 n. 48, 146		
	n. 51, 156, 158	<i>Damascus Document</i>	
IV-V	133-163	See CD	
VI, 2-6	173 n. 29	<i>Genesis Apocryphon</i>	
VI, 11-14	169	(1QapGen ^{ar})	38, 87 n. 11
VI, 14-16	214	<i>Apocryphon of Jeremiah</i>	41
VI, 19	23	<i>Hodayot</i>	
VI, 20b-VII, 1a	197 n. 72	(1QH ^a)	29, 63, 108, 110,
VII	94		117, 197, 260, 301
VII, 1	246	4[14]:20-21	217 n. 25
VII, 4-5	162	6:20-21	215 n. 17
VII, 6	23	10[2]:32-34	217 n. 25
VII, 13-21	93, 101	11[3]:25	217 n. 25
VII, 16	81	12[5] 14-16	217 n. 25
VIII, 21	23	18[10]:22-25	215 n. 18
VIII, 5-7	213	18: 29-30	215 n. 18
IX, 8-16	219 n. 33	III, 8.10.12	234 n. 13, 237
IX, 22-X, 3	219 n. 34	II, 22	271 n. 43
X, 14-XI, 18	35	IV, 15ff.	197 n. 74
XI, 13-14	35	V	117
XI, 17	24	V, 30-31	117
XII, 14-15	157		
XIII, 2-7	190 n. 47		
XIII, 9	17, 18		

- | | | | |
|------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------|
| V, 30–33 | 110 | X, 6–8 | 90 |
| V, 35–36 | 110, 117 | X, 10 | 264 |
| VI, 3 | 124 | XI, 9 | 124 n. 20 |
| VI, 13 | 245 n. 61 | XI, 13 | 124 n. 20 |
| IX, 4 | 271 | XII, 4 | 245 n. 61 |
| X, 18 | 271 | XIII, 5–6 | 30 |
| X, 32 | 124 n. 20 | XIII, 7–9 | 283 n. 14 |
| X, 34 | 124 n. 20 | XIII, 8 | 283 n. 14 |
| X, 34–35 | 123 | XIII, 14 | 124 n. 20 |
| XI, 9.11.13 | 234 n. 13, 237 | XIV, 2–3 | 265 n. 29 |
| XIII, 10 | 271 | XIV, 5, 8–9 | 283 n. 14 |
| XIII, 12 | 271 | XIV, 7 | 35, 124 n. 20 |
| XIII, 13 | 124 n. 20, 271 | XIV, 12 | 264 |
| XIII, 14 | 124 n. 20 | XVI, 2 | 264 |
| XIV, 16 | 245 n. 61 | XVII, 1–9 | 173 |
| XVI, 8 | 271 | | |
| XVIII, 31 | 271 | 1QpHab | 213 |
| XX, 10–11 | 156 n. 88 | II, 3 | 23 |
| | | VII, 8–13 | 21 |
| 4QH ^a (4Q427) | | VIII, 8–13 | 21 |
| 7 II, 7–9 | 217 n. 25 | VIII, 10–13 | 213 n. 6 |
| | | IX, 4–8 | 213 n. 7 |
| <i>Rule of the Community</i> | | XI, 10 | 213 n. 6 |
| See 1QS | | XII, 2–6 | 217 n. 24 |
| | | XII, 6–9 | 21, 22 |
| <i>Temple Scroll</i> | | | |
| See 11QT | | 1QS (Rule of the Community) | |
| | | | 27, 34, 41 n. 31, |
| 1QIsa ^a | 91, 92 | | 123, 184, 185 n. 27, |
| | | | 190 n. 47, 192, 197, |
| 1QM | | | 219, 220, 227, 245 |
| (<i>War Scroll</i>) | 87, 122, 203 | | n. 61, 301 |
| | n. 100, 204, 259, | 8:1–10 | 174 |
| | 271 | 8–9 | 162 |
| 7:6 | 138 n. 19 | I, 1 | 17 |
| 17, 7 | 65 | I, 9–11 | 30 |
| I, 1 | 30 | I, 10–11 | 35 n. 10 |
| I, 3 | 30 | I, 11–12 | 219 n. 36 |
| I, 5 | 287 n. 28 | I, 11–13 | 219 n. 37 |
| I, 6 | 283 n. 14 | II, 2–4 | 235 |
| I, 9 | 30 | II, 16–17 | 30 |
| I, 11 | 30 | II, 24–25 | 197 n. 72 |
| I, 13 | 30 | II–III | 197 n. 73 |
| II, 1–6 | 270 | III, 1 | 197 n. 71 |
| II, 13 | 152 n. 73 | III, 2 | 219 n. 36 |
| III, 11 | 276 | III, 2–3 | 214 n. 12 |
| IV, 2 | 283 n. 14 | III, 7 | 246 n. 61 |
| IV, 9 | 271 n. 43 | III, 15 | 24 |
| VI, 6 | 264 | III, 21–2 | 25 |
| IX, 8 | 264 | III, 23 | 25 |
| X | 94 | III, 24 | 25 |
| X, 1 | 91 | III–IV | 2, 107 |
| X, 1–8 | 89, 101 | III, 13–IV, 26 | 24, 30 |
| X, 2–4 | 90 | IV, 7 | 28, 303 |

IV, 7-8	29	1Q19bis	
IV, 11	304	2 5	234 n. 12
IV, 12-14	303		
IV, 13-14	303	1Q26	
V, 1	17, 197 n. 71	1 4	234 n. 17
V, 1-2	271 n. 43		
V, 1-4	219 n. 36	1Q34 bis	
V, 3	191 n. 48	II, 7	156 n. 88
V, 4b-5	197 n. 71		
V, 5	23	3Q2 (3QPs)	73
V, 6-7	191		
V, 10-13a	203 n. 100	4QBerakot	259
V, 14-15	214 n. 11		
V, 16-17	213 n. 10	4QEn ^a	
VI, 3-9	190 n. 47	1 I, 20	144 n. 42
VI, 8	18	1 II, 2	144 n. 42
VI, 11-12	17	1 II, 14	159 n. 102
VI, 14	17		
VI, 20	18	4QPseudo-Ezekiel	282 n. 12, 316
VI, 21-22	17, 220 n. 38		
VI, 24-25	18, 219 n. 31	4QSam ^a	285
VI, 24-VII, 25	20		
VI, 26	156 n. 88	4Q82 (4QXII ^a)	134, 151 n. 66
VII 5-10	269		
VII, 6-8	220 n. 38	4Q158	
VII, 16	88	7-8	240 n. 30
VII, 18	156 n. 88		
VII, 21-24	214 n. 12	4Q159	
VII, 24-25	214 n. 12	2-4 9-10	151 n. 66
VIII, 1	190 n. 47		
VIII, 1-3	264 n. 27	4Q161 (pIsa ^a)	75, 82 n. 41
VIII, 1-16	30	8-10 I, 19	286 n. 23
VIII, 5-10	191 n. 49		
VIII, 8	23, 156 n. 88	4Q162	
VIII, 9	23	II, 6	115 n. 54
VIII, 10	156 n. 88		
VIII, 510	23	4Q169	
IX, 4-5	167	3-4 I, 7	30
IX, 8	214 n. 11		
IX, 11	312, 316	4Q171 (4QpPs ^a)	123
IX, 22-23	213 n. 8	1-2 II, 9	123
IX, 21	17	1-2 II, 9-10	123
XI	117	1-2 II, 16	123
XI, 12	30	1+3-4 III, 10	123, 124
		I, 21	217 n. 24
1QSa		II, 10	217 n. 24
2	173 n. 29	III, 2-5	217 n. 26
2:11-12	63	III, 10	217 n. 24
1Q Sb		4Q174 (Florilegium)	49-52 n. 21,
III, 26	23		63, 65-67,
III-IV	278 n. 66		73-75, 78, 80,
IV, 27	264		82, 84 n. 5,
V, 5	23		87-89, 92, 109,
V, 21	23		110, 111

1-2 I, 7	30	4Q245 (Pseudo-Daniel ^c ar)	
1-2 I, 11	113 n. 44	2	308
1-3 I, 6-7	269	2 3-5	309
2 I, 4	264		
2 I, 7	262	4Q246	64
l. 3 II, 2	23		
l. 2 I, 6	23	4Q252	63, 75, 77
I, 1-2	74	V, 3-4	76
I, 1-6	169		
I, 7-11	81	4Q257	
I, 10-13	87, 94	3 10	246 n. 61
I, 10-16	101		
I, 11	101	4Q259	
I, 12	101	II, 18	23
I, 14	76, 77, 101		
I, 14-16	91, 94	4Q266	
I, 17	77	3 IV, 4	246
I, 19	76, 77	8 I, 5	234 n. 15
II, 1-2	81	9	154
IV	79	9 III, 4-7	151
IV, 6	34		
VIII-XII	74	4Q267	
		7 14	149 n. 61
4Q175 (Testimonia)	49 n. 2	7 12-14	247 n. 65
4Q177	52	4Q269	
12 2	264	6 2	246
VIII-XII	74 n. 24	9 1-8	247 n. 65
		9 4-6	149 n. 61
4Q178	74 n. 24		
		4Q270	
4Q180		5 14-15	247 n. 65
1 4	287 n. 28	5 17-19	149 n. 61
		6 II, 7	234 n. 15
4Q182	74 n. 24	6 IV, 1	115 n. 54
4Q183	74 n. 24	4Q271	
		3 8-9	247 n. 65
4Q185			
1-2 II, 2	283 n. 14	4Q285	75
1-2 II, 3-4	288 n. 33		
13-14	282 n. 12	4Q320	
		1 I, 2-3	156
4Q213			
3+4 8-11	303	4Q365	127 n. 27
		6 II, 3	127 n. 27
4Q216 (4QJub ^a)			
IV, 7	143 n. 41	4Q371	
		2 2	262
4 Q217 (4QJub ^b)			
2, 2	143 n. 41	4Q372	
		1 24	262
4Q242 (4QPrNab ar)	37, 38, 40		
		4Q385 (Pseudo-Ezekiel)	320
4Q243-245	308 n. 24	2	304

2 7	307	4Q403 (ShirShabb ^d)	
2 I	306	1 2.23-24	
2 2-10	305	1 I, 11	167
6	305 n. 18	1 I, 41	269
		1 I, 42	167, 264
4QpsEzek ^{a-e}	304	1 I, 46	167
		1 II, 10-11	168
4Q386		1 II, 16	168
1	307	Mas1K II, 25	167
1 I, 8-9	307		
1 I-II	304-305, 306	4Q405 (ShirShabb ^f)	
1 II	305, 307	6 3	264
1 II, 1-10	306	14, 5 I, 7	168 n. 16
1 II, 2-3	307	15 II-16, 3	168
1 II, 3-4	307	19 3	264
1 II, 6	307	20 II, 21-22, 7	168
1 II, 9	307	20 II, 22 8	264
1 II-III	307 nn. 21, 22	23 II, 10	266
4Q387		4Q415 (4QInstruction ^a)	
A 2	246	2 II	250 n. 73
3 4	275	9	246 n. 62
		11 6-10	247 n. 65
4Q388	304	II, 11	243 n. 49
7	304		
7 4-7	305	4Q415a	268
		1 II, 4-8, 10-11	267
4Q390 (apocrJerC)	275	2-4	267
1-2	271		
1	271	4Q416 (4QInstruction ^b)	
1 11-12	271	1 10	108
2 I, 6-10	272	1 10-16	43
		2 II, 7-15	253
4Q391		2 III, 3-5	47
36	304	2 III, 15	233 n. 9
65 6-8	305	2 III, 15-1	239
		2 III, 15-16	240, 254
4Q396		2 III, 15-19	232, 233, 234,
29	30		235, 241, 253
		2 III, 16	233 nn. 10
4Q397			and 11
14-21, 7	12	2 III, 17	241, 247
		2 III, 19-IV, 13	233
4Q400 (ShirShabb ^a ,	44-46, 258 n. 6,	2 III, 20-IV, 7	140 n. 26
Songs of the	259, 262, 275	2 III, 20-IV 13	232, 242
Sabbath Sacrifice)	n. 56, 277	2 III-IV	250
1 2.7-14	44	2 IV, 1	140 n. 26
1 I, 17	167	2 IV, 4	142 n. 33
1 II, 5-7	167	2 IV, 5	252
Mas1K I, 10	167		
		4Q417 (4QInstruction ^c ;	112 n. 38, 115
4Q401 (ShirShabb ^b)		Vision of Hagu)	n. 50
11 III	274	1 I, 6	116

1 I, 13-18	103, 105	4Q477	
2 I, 10	115	2 II, 8	246
2 I, 13	115		
2 I, 15	115	4Q485-4Q490	271
4Q418 (4QInstruction ^d)	42-47, 108, 114, 116-118, 146 n. 51, 231-255	4Q490 2 I, 3-5	272
1a-b 1	234 n. 17	4Q504 (Words of the Luminaries ^a)	283
9	47	1-2 II, 11-12	290
9+9a-c 17-18	233	1-2 V	290, 291, 292, 293
9a-c 17	233 n. 11	1-2 V, 17-20	293
9 16	234	1-2 V, 19-20	294
9 17	133 nn. 9 and 10	1-2 VI, 6-7	293 n. 46
		1-2 VI, 9-10	293 n. 46
10a-b 1-2	233		
10b	142	4Q510	38, 287 n. 28
10 4-5	140 n. 26		
10 5	243	4Q521 (Messianic Apocalypse)	29, 38, 46, 47, 119, 120, 124-126, 128, 130, 131, 300, 310, 311, 313, 317, 320
10 5-10	242		
10 7	243		
34 2	234 n. 16		
81 1	271		
81 1-2	108	2 II, 1	129, 131
81 12	264	2 II+4	312
172 2	234 n. 16	2 II+4 1-15	309
172 3	246 n. 61	2 II+4 4	313
184 2	234 n. 17	2 II+4 8	312
190 2	234 n. 17	2 II+4 11	311
4Q418a		2 II, 5	129
18	142	2 II, 7	125, 129
		2 II, 8	126
4Q422 (Paraphrase of Genesis and Exodus)	282	2 II, 13	125
		2 II, 1-15	119, 124, 129
4Q428 (4QH ^b)		2 III	316
14 2	264	2 III, 1	312
		2 III, 2	312
4Q434 (Barkhi Nafshi ^a)	300 n. 6, 313, 320	7 1-8+5 II, 7-16	309, 310
		7 6	311
1 I, 1-3	217 n. 25	8 9	312
2	313, 314	9 2-3	313
4Q462 (Narrative)	283	4Q541	81
1-12	288	9	270 n. 40
2-19	289	4Q543	
13	288	7 I, 8 2	303 n. 17
19	285	III, 1	303 n. 17
		III, 4	303 n. 17
4Q463 (Narrative D)		VI, 3-5	303 n. 17
1 I	286 n. 22		

4Q543-547	303 n. 17	6Q15	
		4 4	246
4Q544 (Visions of Amram ^b ar)		VIII, 6	246
2 3	303	XIX, 19	246
3 1	303 n. 17		
I, 1-2	303 n. 17	11Q7 (11QPs)	73
I, 13-14	303 n. 17		
II, 5-6	303 n. 17	11Q11	38
4Q545		11Q13 (11QMelch)	30, 65, 87, 173 n. 29, 175, 274
1 I, 1-2	303 n. 17		
4Q548 (Visions of Amram ^f ar)	300 (and n. 6), 303 nn. 14, 17, 304, 320	11Q18 (11QNew Jerusalem)	30, 270
1 5	303 n. 17	11Q19 (11QTemple Scroll ^a , 11QT ^a)	13, 22, 87 n. 11, 134, 154
7-9	303 n. 17	XXIV, 8-9	270
1 II, 2 8	303 n. 17	XXIX 8-10	170
1 II, 2 9b-14	302	LI, 17-18	84 n. 6
1 II, 2 13	302 n. 12	LIV, 2-3	247 n. 64
1 II, 2 14	303 n. 17, 319 n. 40	LIV, 4-5	151
I, 6	303 n. 17	LVI, 18-19	155
4Q550-582	300 n. 4	LVII, 17-18	35
4Q554-5	30	LVII, 17-19	150, 155
		LVII, 18	153
4Q558		LXIV, 6-13	30
2 4	312	LXVI, 8-11	151
4QpsDan ^c	300 n. 6	Mur	
		VIII, 26	88
4QMMT	12, 87 n. 14, 101 n. 49, 191, 276	XII	88, 89 n. 19
B 60-62		Mur 88	
4QPseudo-Ezekiel	300 (and n. 6)	VIII, 26	75
5Q232	30	PAM	
		40.611	157
		41.918	105 n. 4, 111 n. 34
		41.942	111 n. 34
		42.578	111 n. 34

E. APOSTOLIC AND CLASSICAL AUTHORS

Aristotle		Athenaeus	
<i>Nicomachean Ethics</i>		<i>Deipnosophistae</i>	
V 1134b 9-18	231 n. 5	6:258b	141 n. 32
VIII 1160a			
23-1161a 10	231 n. 5	Clement of Alexandria	
<i>Politics</i>		<i>Stromata</i>	
I 1253b-1255b	231 n. 5	3:92	138

2 Clement		18.12	29
12:2	138	18:14	319 n. 40
		18.16	29
Didache	212	18.19	24, 169 n. 20
10–13	258	18.20	220 n. 39
13:4–7	45 n. 45	18.22	17 n. 30, 24, 27
		20.199	12
Epictetus			
<i>Dissertationes</i>		<i>Jewish War (B.J.)</i>	
1,22,1	239 n. 31	1.199	11 n. 15
		2.118	12
Eusebius		2.119–120	26
<i>Preparation for the Gospel</i>		2.120–121	27
8.6–7	12	2.122	12, 27, 216
			n. 20, 220 n. 39
Galen		2.123	14, 17 n. 30
<i>Meth. med.</i>		2.126	27, 216 n. 20
10:297	141 n. 32	2.128–133	27
		2.130	216 n. 21
Hippolytus		2.133	216 n. 21
<i>Refutation of all Heresies</i>		2.134	17 n. 30, 216
9.27	28		n. 23
		2.136	39
Jerome		2.137	12, 14, 265
<i>Commentary on Jonah</i>			n. 29
I, 3	253	2.142	12
		2.146	17 n. 30
Josephus		2.147	14
<i>Jewish Antiquities (A.J.)</i>		2.148–9	14
1.54	11 n. 15	2.154	28
1.169	11 n. 15	2.160	27
2.293–314	282 n. 11	2.161	27
4.109	11 n. 15	2.162	12
6.71	11 n. 15	4:533	143 n. 41
6.91	11 n. 15	6.352	11 n. 15
7.160	11 n. 15	6.283–4	269 n. 39
7.309	141 n. 32	7.326	11 n. 15
7.321	11 n. 15	<i>Against Apion</i>	
7.347	12	1.214	11 n. 15
9:18	141 n. 32	2.22–28	232 n. 7
10.79	11 n. 15	2.289	11 n. 15
10.247	11 n. 15		
11.326–8	259	Origen	16
12.363	11 n. 15		
13.171	12	Plato	
13.171–3	24	<i>Republic</i>	
13.231	11 n. 15	454d–e	139 n. 25
13.233	11 n. 15	<i>Symposium</i>	
13.282–3	259	189d–192c	138 n. 16
13.288	12		
13.293	12	Philo	
13.297	14	<i>Allegorical Interpretation</i>	
15.6	11 n. 15	2.13	137 n. 16
15.371	24, 27	2.29	141 n. 31

<i>Apology for the Jews</i>	12, 17 n.30	<i>On the Posterity of Cain</i>	
4	27	181	232 n. 7
8-9	27	<i>Questions and Answers on Exodus</i>	
11	27	2.3	141 n. 32
11-12	27	<i>Questions and Answers on Genesis</i>	
14-17	27	I, 29	245 n. 59
<i>Contemplative Life</i>		<i>That the Worse Attacks the Better</i>	
11	11	52	239 n. 36
29	11	<i>On the Special Laws</i>	
32	11	2.224-225	237 n. 25
67	11	2.261	239 n. 26
<i>On the Creation of the World</i>		<i>Who Is the Heir?</i>	
76	137 n. 16	56	112
97-106	295	99	11
I, 29	245 n. 59		
<i>On the Decalogue</i>		Pliny	16
165-167	232 n. 7	<i>Natural History</i>	
<i>Every Good Person</i>		4.73	11
2	11	5.17	11
76	27	5.73	15, 27, 220 n. 39
76-79	216 n. 19		
80	29	Pseudo-Phocylides	
84	216 n. 20	<i>Sententiae</i>	
85-88	220 n. 39	175-177	232 n. 7
87-88	216 n. 23		
88	24	Seneca	
<i>Hypothetica</i>		<i>Epistolae morales</i>	
7, 1-14	232 n. 7	94,1	231 n. 6
10:11-13	220 n. 39		
11:2	11	Tertullian	
11:11-13	216 n. 20	<i>Antidote for the Scorpion's Sting</i>	
		12	265 n. 29

F. RABBINIC LITERATURE

Ahare Mot		Middot	
9	262 n. 18	5:5	266
14	262 n. 18	Pesahim	
Avot		10.6	270
1.2	264 n. 27,	Sanhedrin	
	268	10	319 n. 40
5:8-9	280	Sotah	
Avot of Rabbi Nathan		6:3	152 n. 70
4	268	Tamid	277
Mekhilta de-Rabbi Yshmael		3:7	269
Nez. 16	85 n. 7	M. Tehar.	137 n. 16
Bo. 14	137 n. 16		
Mishnah		Midrash Rabbah	
Gittin		Genesis	
9:3	152 n. 71	8:1	137 n. 16
9:10	135, 152 n. 70	8:11	137 n. 16
		17:2	136 n. 12

Leviticus		Pesach	
6:6	282 n. 9	117a	237 n. 26
21.12	259 n. 8	Qiddushin	
Esther		30a	237 n. 26
3.1	286 n. 23	Sanhedrin	
Qohelet		19b	237 n. 26
9:9	136 n. 12	57b–58b	245 n. 59
Pesiqta of Rab Kahana		Yevamot	
7:11	282 n. 9	62b	252 n. 77
Sifra		63a	136 n. 12, 245 n. 59
Bemidbar		Yoma	
7, 19	152 n. 70	39b	259 n. 8, 269 n. 39
Wayyiqra		Palestinian (Jerusalem) Talmud	
Prologue 1	83 n. 1, 86 n. 8	Avodah Zarah	
Sukkah		4.4	262 n. 18
II, 32	124 n. 20	Berakot	
II, 34	124 n. 20	1:9	313 n. 32
II, 34–35	123	3d	313 n. 32
V, 13	124 n. 20	Megillah	
V, 14	124 n. 20	1:11 (8)	137 n. 16
XIV, 3	124	Qiddushin	
Babylonian Talmud		I, 1	245 n. 59
Berakhot		Yoma	
28b	237 n. 26	5.2	259 n. 8
44a	313 n. 32	Tanhuma	262
46b	313 n. 32	Targum	
48b	313 n. 32	Neofiti	140, 293 n. 47
61a	137 n. 16	Onqelos	141, 295
Eruvin		Pseudo-Jonathan	134 n. 5, 140, 293 n. 47, 295
18a	137 n. 16	1 Samuel 21–10	294 n. 48
Gittin		Tofseta	
89a	152 n. 70	Sanhedrin	
90a	152 n. 70	7:11	83 n. 1
Ketubbot		Sotah	
8a	146 n. 51	5:9	152 n. 70
Megillah		13.8	259 n. 8
9a	138 n. 16		
Menahot			
109b	259 n. 8		

INDEX OF MODERN AUTHORS

- Abegg, M. 73 n. 19, 104 n. 3, 105 n. 3
 Adams, E. 156 n. 85
 Aletti, J.-N. 231 n. 3, 238 n. 29, 239,
 240 nn. 38, 41, 249 n. 67, 250, 252
 n. 79, 253, 255 n. 83
 Alexander, P.S. 83 n. 2, 258, 259,
 260 n. 10
 Allison, D.C. 42 n. 34, 147 n. 53, 161
 n. 108
 Allegro, J. 73
 Aptovitzer, A. 167 n. 12
 Aschim, A. 274 n. 54
 Atkinson, K. 56 n. 39, 57 n. 41
 Attridge, H. 49, 165 n. 4, 166 n. 7, 167
 n. 10, 170 n. 23, 171 n. 24, 172 n. 27
 Aune, D. 144 n. 46, 257, 258, 261
 nn. 14, 17, 265 n. 29, 269 n. 38,
 271 n. 43, 272 nn. 45 and 46, 277,
 280 n. 4, 281 n. 6, 296 n. 51
 Avemarie, F. 3 n. 7, 96 n. 34, 98 n. 38

 Baarda, T. 139 n. 20
 Baillet, M. 290 nn. 27, 38
 Bainbridge, W.S. 184, 185 n. 27, 194
 n. 60
 Balch, D.L. 196 n. 68, 232 n. 6
 Barrera, J.T. 74 n. 24
 Barrett, C.K. 72 n. 17
 Bartchy, S.S. 225 n. 46
 Barth, M. 231 n. 3, 249, 250
 Bauckham, R. 258, 261 n. 17, 262,
 265 n. 29, 271 n. 42, 273 n. 50, 274,
 295
 Baumgarten, A. 14 n. 20, 181–183, 191
 n. 48, 198
 Baumgarten, J.M. 93 n. 28, 149 n. 61,
 150 n. 65, 218 n. 30
 Beale, G.K. 282 n. 9, 295
 Beasley–Murray, G.R. 281 n. 8
 Bedale, S. 250 n. 75
 Bedenbender, A. 160 n. 103
 Belo, F. 211 n. 2.
 Beloch, J. 15 n. 23
 Benoît, P. 120 n. 3, 121, 130 n. 36,
 152 n. 71, 231 n. 2
 Berger, K. 137 n. 15, 141, 145 n. 49,
 146 n. 50, 155 n. 84, 159 n. 101. 160
 n. 103
 Bernstein, M. 84 n. 6, 86 n. 10
 Best, E. 238 n. 27, 239 n. 34, 241 n. 42,
 247 n. 65, 249, 250, 252 n. 77
 Betz, H.D. 97 n. 37, 222 n. 43
 Bialoblocki, S. 83 n. 2
 Bieringer, R. 3 n. 7
 Biguzzi, G. 257 n. 2, 273 n. 48
 Billerbeck, P. 51 n. 10
 Binder, D.D. 12 n. 17
 Bloch, M. 212 n. 4
 Bockmuehl, M. 260 n. 12
 Bonhoeffer, D. 161
 Bordieu, P. 212 n. 4
 Böcher, O. 258 n. 6
 Böttrich, C. 59 n. 48
 Bovon, F. 129 n. 33
 Boyarin, D. 139
 Brady, M. 307 n. 21
 Braun, H. 258 n. 6
 Briggs, C.A. 68
 Briggs, R.A. 261 n. 16, 268 n. 35, 269
 n. 37
 Brin, G. 151 n. 66
 Brooke, G.J. 5 n. 10, 6 n. 12, 30 n. 48,
 46 n. 51, 49 n. 4, 50, 51, 52, 53, 66,
 71 n. 17, 73 n. 21, 74 n. 21, 77, 78,
 79, 84, 86 n. 10, 87, 91 n. 25, 95, 101
 n. 49, 104 n. 3, 127 n. 27, 191 n. 51,
 231 n. 1, 235, 311 n. 27
 Brown, R.E. 119 n. 2, 120 n. 6, 122,
 123, 125 n. 22, 120 n. 35, 132
 Brownlee, W.H. 21, 33, 35
 Bultmann, R. 134 n. 2, 221 n. 40
 Burrows, M. 92 n. 26
 Büchler, A. 261 n. 15, 263 n. 23
 Büchsel, F. 166 n. 8

 Campbell, J.G. 93 n. 31, 301
 Capper, B. 225 n. 46
 Caquot, A. 104 n. 3, 109 n. 28, 233
 n. 10
 Casey, M.P. 40 n. 28, 43 n. 40, 46
 Catchpole, D. 147 n. 52
 Cavallin, H. 29, 301 n. 10, 303, 308
 n. 24
 Cervin, R.S. 250 n. 75
 Chalcraft, D.J. 14 n. 20, 178 n. 2, 187
 Charles, R.H. 149 n. 58

- Charlesworth, J.H. 34, 35, 93 n. 28,
284 n. 17, 300 n. 5
- Chazon, E.G. 290 n. 38
- Childs, B. 54
- Clements, R.A. 2 n. 3
- Coggins, R.J. 62 n. 61
- Cohen, S. 14, 15 n. 22
- Collins, J.J. 10 n. 12, 19 n. 33, 28 n. 45,
37 n. 16, 43, 46, 58 n. 44, 62 n. 58, 63
n. 63, 64 n. 70, 73, 78, 82, 103 n. 2,
106, 107, 108, 109 n. 22, 110, 160
n. 103, 191 n. 50, 203 n. 100, 290
n. 35, 301 n. 10, 308 nn. 23, 24, 311
nn. 26, 27, 312
- Collins, Y. 59 n. 49, 61 n. 55, 64 n. 70,
65, 134 n. 3, 135 n. 10, 141 n. 29, 143
nn. 37 and 38, 273 n. 50
- Cook, E. 104 n. 3, 105 nn. 3 and 5,
110 n. 29
- Coppens, J. 231 n. 2
- Coulot, C. 104 n. 3, 110 n. 28
- Craffert, P. 38, 181, 185–187 n. 38, 194
n. 60
- Crosby, M.H. 211 n. 2, 223 n. 45
- Cross, F.M. 64 n. 67, 217 n. 26, 285
n. 19
- Crossan, J.D. 34 n. 5, 222 n. 42, 223
n. 43
- Crouch, J.E. 232 n. 7
- Dalrymple, R. 269 n. 35, 272 n. 46
- Danby, H. 316 n. 35
- Daube, D. 137, 139 n. 23, 268 n. 34
- Davenport, G. 57 n. 42
- Davies, P.R. 90 n. 22, 149, 177 n. 1,
179 n. 7, 192, 301 n. 10, 311 n. 27
- Davies, R.D. 268 n. 35
- Davies, W.D. 147 n. 53, 161 n. 108
- Davila, J. 258 n. 6
- Dawes, G.W. 249, 250 n. 74
- Day, J. 54 n. 28
- Delamarter, S. 81 n. 40
- Delling, G. 144 n. 46
- Den Dulk, M. 264 n. 29
- Denniston, J.D. 142 n. 35
- De Troyer, K. 75 n. 26, 89 n. 19
- Deines, R. 9, 10 n. 10
- Dibelius, M. 231 n. 6, 232 n. 7
- Di Lella, A.A. 128 n. 30
- Dimant, D. 45, 271, 282 n. 12, 300,
304, 307 nn. 21, 22
- Doering, L. 3 n. 7, 157 n. 91, 160
n. 105
- Duhaime, J. 204
- Dunn, J.D.G. 34 n. 6, 35 n. 10, 38
n. 20, 48 n. 59, 319 n. 39
- Ebner, M. 161 n. 107
- Eckstein, H.-J. 95 n. 32, 98 n. 39
- Edersheim, A. 265, 266 n. 30
- Egger, W. 158 n. 93
- Ego, B. 75 n. 26, 89 n. 19, 274 n. 55
- Elgvin, T. 103 n. 1, 104 n. 3, 105
nn. 4 and 5, 115 n. 54, 232 n. 8, 259
n. 7, 262 n. 21, 263 n. 26, 267 n. 33,
276 n. 59
- Elliott, J. 181, 184, 192, 196, 197
n. 69, 229 n. 54
- Ellis, E.E. 239 n. 34
- Eshel, E. 217 n. 26, 271, 272
- Eshel, H. 285
- Esler, P. 181, 184, 211 n. 2, 223 n. 45
- Falk, D. 290 n. 38, 291 n. 38
- Feldmeier, R. 156, n. 85
- Finn, T.M. 16 n. 26
- Fitzmyer, J.A. 1 n. 2, 26 n. 43, 30
n. 48, 38 n. 17, 51 n. 10, 66, 72, 84
n. 5, 149 n. 58, 150 n. 65, 211 n. 1
- Fletcher-Louis, C.H.T. 103 n. 2
- Flint, P. 67 n. 1, 73 n. 19, 308 nn. 23,
24
- Flusser, D. 35 n. 12, 38 n. 21, 121, 122,
125, 132, 217 n. 26, 222 n. 43
- Fowler, R. 315 n. 34
- Fraade, S.D. 135 n. 10, 143 n. 37
- France, R.T. 159 n. 100, 316 n. 36
- Frennesson, B. 45
- Frey, J. 104 n. 3, 108, 116
- Freyne, S. 34 n. 4
- Friesen, S. 273
- Gager, J. 178 n. 2
- Gall, A. von 140 n. 26
- Garcia-Martinez, F. 2 n. 3, 3 n. 6, 4
nn. 8 and 9, 16 n. 24, 38 n. 18, 47
n. 56, 65, 88 n. 15, 90 n. 21, 91 n. 24,
104 n. 3, 105 n. 5, 109 n. 24, 148
n. 56, 149, 150 n. 64, 153, 154 n. 78,
156 n. 85, 157, 213 n. 6, 292 n. 45,
302 n. 12, 308 n. 24, 309 n. 25, 311
n. 26, 312 n. 28
- Garrett, S.R. 197 n. 69
- Gaster, T. 64 n. 67, 69
- Gathercole, S.J. 96 n. 34, 98 n. 38
- Gerstenberger, E.S. 54 n. 30
- Georges, K.E. 144 n. 42
- Georgi, D. 143 n. 41, 211 n. 2, 225 n. 48

- Gilbert, M. 245 n. 58
 Gillingham, S.E. 53 n. 26, 54, 55 n. 34
 Ginzberg, L. 153
 Glare, P.G.W. 144 n. 42
 Gnilka, J. 120 n. 3, 121, 126 n. 23, 144 n. 43, 146 n. 50, 147
 Gnuse, R. 259 n. 9
 Goff, M. 43, 44, 103 n. 2, 104 n. 2, 107, 108, 109 n. 19, 110, 111 n. 34, 115 n. 50, 117 n. 56
 Grabbe, L. 178, 181, 182, 186 n. 33, 187 n. 34
 Grant, R.M. 16 n. 26
 Greeven, H. 147, 161 n. 110
 Greenfield, J.C. 266 n. 31
 Grimes, R.L. 260 n. 10
 Grudem, W. 250 n. 74
 Gryglewicz, F. 121
 Gundry-Volf, J. 139
 Gunkel, H. 68 n. 2
 Gzella, H. 55 n. 38

 Hall, R.G. 258 n. 5
 Hamilton, M.W. 53 n. 26
 Hanhart, R. 140 n. 27, 197 n. 69
 Harland, P.A. 185 n. 29, 273
 Harnack, A. 16
 Harrington, D. 42 n. 35, 47, 103, 105 n. 3, 106 n. 10, 140 n. 26, 232 n. 8, 233 n. 10
 Hartenstein, F. 54 n. 30
 Harvey, A.E. 144 n. 43, 159, 161 n. 108
 Hayward, R. 293 n. 47
 Hempel, J. 149 n. 59, 190 n. 47, 191 n. 49
 Hengel, M. 9, 10 n. 10, 211, 225 n. 47
 Henten, J.W. van 64
 Hiers, R.H. 222 n. 43
 Hogeterp, A.L.A. 3 n. 7
 Holmberg, B. 178 n. 2, 185 n. 27, 192 n. 55, 197 n. 69
 Holmen, T. 151 n. 67, 153 n. 74
 Holm-Nielsen, S. 84 n. 5
 Holtz, T. 136 n. 11
 Hooker, M. 135, 142
 Hopkins, K. 16
 Horgan, M.P. 132 n. 40
 Horsley, R.A. 189 n. 42, 190 n. 44, 193 n. 56, 204 n. 101, 206 n. 105
 Horst, P. van der 161 n. 109, 222 n. 43
 Hübner, H. 145 n. 49, 147 n. 52, 148 n. 54
 Hugenberg, G.P. 134 n. 5
 Hultgren, A.J. 145 n. 49
 Hultgren, S. 123 n. 19, 126 n. 24, 129 n. 31
 Hurst, L.D. 165 n. 1
 Husser-Munro, J. 231 n. 1
 Hüttenmeister, F.G. 137 n. 16

 Instone-Brewer, D. 135, 137 n. 13, 141 n. 28, 147 n. 52, 153 n. 74, 155
 Isaksson, A. 149 n. 59
 Isenberg, S.R. 203 n. 98

 Jackson, B. 137, 149, 150
 Jacobs, L. 83 n. 2
 James, M.R. 57 n. 40
 Jassen, A. 41, 42
 Jastrow, M. 137 n. 16
 Jervell, J. 276
 Johnson, L.T. 211 n. 2, 223 n. 45
 Johnson, S.E. 211 n. 1
 Jokiranta, J. 14 n. 20, 183 n. 20, 185 n. 27
 Jones, D. 121 n. 10, 130 n. 34
 Jongeling, B. 2 n. 3
 Joüon, P. 246 n. 61
 Justnes, Å. 267 n. 33

 Kamlah, E. 250 n. 71
 Kashner, M. 166 n. 9
 Kazen, T. 34 n. 7
 Keck, L.E. 211 n. 1, 222 n. 41
 Keel, O. 263 n. 24
 Kellermann, U. 319 n. 41
 Kiddle, M. 268 n. 37
 Kister, M. 140 n. 27, 141 n. 29, 142 n. 34, 143 n. 38, 144, 145 n. 48, 146 n. 51, 154 n. 79
 Klawans, J. 20, 21, 22
 Kloppenborg, J.S. 35 n. 9, 44, 47 n. 55
 Knibb, M.A. 58 n. 46, 62, 258 n. 5, 284
 Knight, J. 258 n. 5
 Kobelski, P.J. 132 n. 40
 Koch, D.A. 94 n. 32
 Kohler, K. 128 nn. 29 and 30
 Kooten, G.H. van 111 n. 32, 112n. 37
 Kraft, H. 278 n. 65
 Kraus, H.-J. 53 n. 26, 68, 69, 70 n. 15, 218 n. 27, 265 n. 29
 Kroeger, C.C. 250 n. 75
 Kugler, R.A. 260 n. 11
 Kuhn, H.-W. 34 n. 8, 116, 117, 149 n. 59, 231 n. 2
 Kvalbein, H. 311 n. 27
 Kvanvig, H.S. 59 n. 48

- Lange, A. 75 n. 26, 89 n. 19, 103 n. 2,
105 nn. 4 and 5, 108, 110 n. 28, 112
n. 39, 114 n. 47
- Lane, W.R. 52 n. 18
- LaSor, W.S. 300 n. 5
- Levenson, J. 259, 271 n. 41
- Liber, M. 128 n. 29
- Licht, J. 64 n. 67
- Lichtenberger, H. 75 n. 26, 89 n. 19,
140 n. 26, 153 n. 77
- Lim, T.H. 8 n. 2, 13 n. 18, 15 n. 21, 19
n. 34, 30 n. 47, 74 n. 22, 84 n. 6, 98
nn. 39 and 41
- Lincoln, A.T. 239
- Liver, J. 175 n. 31
- Loader, W. 136 n. 11, 137 n. 14, 138
n. 18, 139 n. 20, 141, 144 n. 43, 145
n. 49, 146 n. 50, 147, 152 n. 72
- Lofland, J. 191 n. 51
- Lohse, E. 153
- Longenecker, R.N. 97 n. 37
- Luomanen, P. 177, 185 n. 95
- Luz, Ulrich 48, 147, 161 n. 108
- Luzaragga, J. 265 n. 29
- Macaskill, G. 104 n. 2
- McCann, J.C. 55
- MacDonald, M. 181, 184
- McNamara, M. 293 n. 47
- Maher, M. 293 n. 47
- Maiberger, P. 52 n. 18, 55 n. 38, 63
n. 66
- Maier, J. 104 n. 3, 105 n. 5, 109 n. 24,
110 n. 28
- Marguerat, D. 46
- Martin, D.B. 161
- Martyn, J.L. 99 n. 42
- Mason, E.F. 72 n. 18, 81 n. 39
- Matera, F.J. 159 n. 100
- Mauss, M. 212 n. 4
- Mayordomo, M. 97 n. 37
- McGing, B. 15 n. 23
- Mealand, D. 211, 220 n. 38, 221 n. 40,
222 n. 42, 223 n. 44, 226 n. 51
- Meeks, W.A. 194 n. 60, 211 n. 2
- Merz, A. 35, 36 n. 14
- Metso, S. 190 n. 47, 260 n. 12
- Metzger, B. 134 n. 3, 136 n. 11, 238
n. 27, 249 n. 70
- Milgrom, J. 73 n. 21, 74 n. 25, 75
n. 26, 153 n. 75, 261 n. 16
- Milik, J.T. 64, 144 n. 42, 152 n. 71, 159
n. 102, 302 n. 12, 303
- Miller, D.E. 178 n. 3, 205 n. 104
- Mittmann-Richert, U. 131 n. 37, 132
n. 39
- Moeser, M.C. 143 n. 39
- Montaner, L. V. 74 n. 24
- Moritz, T. 239, 252 n. 80, 255 n. 83
- Mounce, R. 296 n. 51
- Mowinkel, S. 218 n. 27
- Müller, K. 158 n. 95
- Müller, M. 95 n. 32
- Murphy, C.M. 191 n. 48, 192, 211,
212 n. 3, 215 n. 16, 216 n. 23, 219
n. 32, 220 n. 38
- Murphy-O'Connor, J. 84 n. 5, 149, 231
- Mußner, F. 97 n. 37, 231 n. 2
- Muszynski, H. 155 n. 84, 156 n. 88
- Neiryneck, F. 47
- Neusner, J. 12 n. 17
- Newsom, C. 14 n. 20, 44, 45 n. 45, 167
n. 13, 168 n. 15, 260 n. 10
- Nickelsburg, G.W.E. 28 n. 45, 58 n. 43,
145, 263 n. 22, 299 n. 2, 301 n. 10
- Neiderwimmer, K. 137, 139, 145 n. 49,
147 nn. 52 and 53
- Noam, V. 151, 152 n. 70
- Norelli, E. 258 n. 5
- Nolland, J. 147 n. 52
- Olsson, B. 12 n. 17
- Osiek, C. 196 n. 68
- Otto, E. 53 n. 26, 54 n. 28
- Parry, D.W. 2 n. 3, 311 n. 26
- Parry, J. 212 n. 4
- Pate, C.M. 173 n. 28, 175 n. 32
- Pattimore, S. 296 n. 51, 297 n. 53
- Paulien, J. 268 n. 35, 277 n. 63
- Pesch, R. 135 n. 7, 136 n. 11, 146 n. 50
- Pietersen, L.K. 202 n. 98
- Pinnik, A. 2 n. 3
- Piovanelli, P. 177 n. 1, 181, 183, 184
n. 23, 187 n. 34
- Piper, R.A. 43 n. 41
- Plag, C. 95 n. 32, 99 n. 44
- Ploeg, J. van der 90 n. 23
- Popovic, M. 4 n. 8
- Porton, G.A. 86 n. 8
- Puech, E. 28 n. 45, 46 n. 52, 52 n. 21,
64 n. 67, 73 n. 21, 104 n. 3, 105 n. 4,
106 n. 7, 112 nn. 34 and 36, 115, 236
n. 22, 300, 302 n. 11, 303, 308 n. 24,
309 n. 25, 311 nn. 26, 27, 319 n. 40
- Qimron, E. 152, 246 n. 61

- Rabin, C. 140 n. 25, 153, 220 n. 38
 Rad, G. von 141 n. 29
 Rahlfs, A. 239 n. 36
 Regev, E. 14 n. 20, 157 n. 91, 181, 182,
 187 n. 34, 193 n. 56, 202, 203, 212
 n. 5, 214 n. 14, 216 n. 22, 228 n. 53,
 264, 265
 Remus, H. 199 n. 81
 Rengstorf, K.H. 232 n. 7
 Rey, J.-S. 104 n. 2, 105 n. 4, 106 n. 7,
 110 n. 31, 112 n. 34, 115
 Reymond, E.D. 235 n. 19
 Reynier, C. 231 n. 3, 250 n. 72, 255
 n. 83
 Riessler, P. 276
 Robbins, V. 181, 183
 Robeck, C.M. 258 n. 5
 Rösel, C. 54
 Rösel, M. 136 n. 11
 Rosen-Zvi, I. 134 n. 4
 Rubenstein, J.L. 157 n. 91
 Runnesson, A. 12 n. 17
 Ryle, H.E. 57 n. 40
- Saffrai, S. 222 n. 43
 Saldarini, A. 181, 182
 Sanders, E. 9, 10, 12, 22, 23 n. 41, 189
 n. 43
 Sato, M. 42
 Sauer, J. 160 n. 104
 Schaller, J.B. 137 n. 16, 138 n. 16,
 140 n. 27, 143 n. 39, 145 n. 49, 146
 n. 51, 147 n. 52, 155 n. 81
 Schaper, J. 55, 319 n. 40
 Schiffman, L.H. 64 n. 67, 84 n. 6, 150,
 217 n. 26
 Schimanowski, G. 60 n. 50
 Schnelle, U. 160 n. 106
 Schniedewind, W.M. 88 n. 18
 Schreiber, S. 60 n. 52, 62
 Schremer, A. 136 n. 12, 153 n. 74
 Schröder, D. 232 n. 7
 Schoeps, H.-J. 97 n. 37
 Scholem, G. 168 n. 18
 Schuller, E. 2 n. 5
 Schüssler Fiorenza, E. 280, 281 n. 6
 Schwartz, D. 93 n. 28, 148, 157
 Schwemer, A.M. 45, 275 n. 56
 Scroggs, R. 229 n. 54
 Seely, D. 313 n. 33
 Segal, A.F. 28 n. 45
 Seigert, F. 94 n. 32
 Sharon, N. 2
- Shekan, P.W. 64 n. 67
 Shemesh, A. 86 n. 9, 150 n. 64, 151,
 152
 Singer, S. 128 n. 28
 Sivertsev, A.M. 198 n. 79
 Slater, T.B. 273 n. 48
 Smith, D. 9, 285 n. 19, 286 nn. 20, 23,
 287 nn. 24, 27, 288 nn. 31, 32, 33,
 290, 294
 Somers, D. 3
 Sprinck, P.M. 98 n. 38
 Starbuck, S.R.A. 68 n. 2, 70 n. 15
 Stark, R. 16 n. 26, 184, 185 n. 27, 191
 n. 51, 194 n. 60
 Stegemann, H. 2 n. 5, 38, 39, 40, 149,
 158, 159, 160, 161, 316 n. 37
 Stegemann, W. 211, 221 n. 40, 223
 n. 44, 225 n. 49, 226 n. 52
 Stemberger, G. 83 n. 2, 158 n. 95
 Stendahl, K. 300 n. 5
 Steudel, A. 49 n. 4, 51, 52, 53, 58 n. 45,
 63, 64 n. 71, 66, 73 n. 21, 74 n. 24,
 78, 88 n. 16, 91 n. 25, 152 n. 73, 153
 n. 74, 204 n. 103, 274 n. 53
 Stevenson, G. 260 n. 13, 268 n. 35, 269
 n. 37, 276 n. 57
 Stol, M. 93 n. 29
 Stone, M.E. 61 n. 56, 62, 266 n. 31
 Strack, H.L. 51 n. 10
 Strugnell, J. 42 n. 35, 47, 73 n. 21, 103,
 111 n. 34, 115 n. 52, 140 n. 26, 232
 n. 8, 233 n. 10
 Swanson, D.D. 153 n. 76
 Swete, H.B. 239 n. 36, 278 n. 65
- Tabor, J.D. 311 n. 27
 Talmon, S. 23 n. 42, 156, 177 n. 1, 178
 n. 2, 179 n. 7, 202
 Taylor, J.E. 16 n. 24, 268 n. 34
 Terrien, S. 68, 69
 Theisohn, J. 60
 Theissen, G. 35, 36 n. 14, 189, 195
 n. 61, 226 n. 51
 Thiessen, M. 279 n. 2
 Thraede, K. 231 n. 6
 Tigchelaar, E. 3 n. 6, 47 n. 56, 88
 n. 15, 90 n. 21, 91 n. 24, 104 n. 3, 111
 n. 34, 115 n. 51, 142 n. 33, 213 n. 6,
 292 n. 45, 302 n. 12, 309 n. 25, 311
 n. 26, 312 n. 29
 Toorn, K. van der 236 n. 22
 Tromp, J. 144 n. 42
 Tosato, A. 243 n. 49
 Tov, E. 311 n. 26

- Uhlig, S. 144 n. 42
Ulfgard, H. 259 n. 6, 261, 262, 265
n. 29, 269 n. 36, 277
Ulrich, E. 73 n. 19
- VanderKam, J.C. 58 n. 46, 59 n. 47,
60 n. 51, 84 n. 5, 140 n. 27, 261 n. 16,
299 n. 2
Vanhoye, A. 120 n. 3
Vaux, R. de 69, 152 n. 71, 243 n. 49
Verbin, J.S.K. 223 n. 45
Vermes, G. 7 n. 1, 8 n. 4, 9, 16 n. 24,
17, 33, 38, 64, 104 n. 3, 105 n. 5, 153
n. 74
Viviano, B.T. 263 n. 23, 268 n. 34
Vouga, F. 97 n. 37
- Wacholder, B.Z. 104 n. 3
Waard, J. de 133 n. 1, 144, 145
Wagner, J.R. 100 nn. 46 and 48
Washburn, D.L. 73 n. 19
Wassen, C. 151 n. 66, 153 n. 74, 183,
184, 185 n. 27
Weber, M. 179 n. 7, 226 n. 51
Weidinger, K. 231 n. 6, 232 n. 7
Weinfeld, M. 262 n. 20, 313 nn. 32, 33
Werman, C. 103 n. 2, 105 n. 4, 109,
111, 114, 115, 158
Werrett, I.C. 153 n. 74
- Wevers, J.W. 240 n. 37
White, M. 192
Whybray, R.N. 215 n. 15
Wilk, F. 95 n. 32, 100 nn. 47 and 48
Willis, J.T. 68, 69, 70 n. 14
Williamson, H.G.M. 84 n. 5
Wilson, B. 178–188, 190–195, 196
n. 67, 197 nn. 70 and 73, 198–202,
205
Wikgren, A. 134 n. 3
Winter, P. 121, 122, 132, 137, 150
n. 65
Wise, M. 104 n. 3, 105 n. 3, 311 n. 27
Witherington, B. 42 n. 34
Wold, B.G. 103 n. 2, 231 n. 1, 234
n. 12
Woude, A.S. van der 16 n. 24, 104
n. 3, 105 n. 5, 109 n. 24, 112 n. 35
Wright, B.G. 263 n. 22, 266 n. 32
Wright, N.T. 28 n. 45
- Xeravits, G. 75, 76, 77, 311 n. 26, 312,
316 n. 37
- Yadin, Y. 150 n. 62, 165 n. 5, 169 n. 22
- Ziegler, J. 238 n. 28
Zimmerman, J. 52 n. 22, 64 n. 70, 312
n. 29

