

# The Dead Sea Scrolls and Pauline Literature

*Edited by*

**JEAN-SÉBASTIEN REY**

BRILL

## The Dead Sea Scrolls and Pauline Literature

# Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah

*Edited by*

George J. Brooke

*Associate editor*

Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar

VOLUME 102

# The Dead Sea Scrolls and Pauline Literature

*Edited by*  
Jean-Sébastien Rey



BRILL

LEIDEN • BOSTON  
2014

This publication has been typeset in the multilingual “Brill” typeface. With over 5,100 characters covering Latin, IPA, Greek, and Cyrillic, this typeface is especially suitable for use in the humanities. For more information, please see [www.brill.com/brill-typeface](http://www.brill.com/brill-typeface).

ISSN 0169-9962

ISBN 978-90-04-22703-3 (hardback)

ISBN 978-90-04-23007-1 (e-book)

Copyright 2014 by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands.

Koninklijke Brill NV incorporates the imprints Brill, Global Oriental, Hotei Publishing, IDC Publishers and Martinus Nijhoff Publishers.

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.

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

To Friedrich Avemarie

גויתם בשלום נאספה  
ושמם חי לדור ודור  
חכמתם תשנה עדה  
ותהלתם יספר קהל  
Sir 44:14-15



## CONTENTS

Introduction .....	ix
2 Corinthians 6:14–7:1 again: A Change in Perspective .....	1
<i>George J. Brooke</i>	
Les manuscrits de la mer Morte et l'épître aux Galates : quelques cas d'interdiscursivité .....	17
<i>Jean-Sébastien Rey</i>	
Galatians 3:10–14 in the Light of Qumran .....	51
<i>Florentino García Martínez</i>	
4QMMT and the Letters of Paul: Selected Aspects of Mutual Illumination .....	69
<i>Lutz Doering</i>	
<i>Hesed</i> dans la Règle de la Communauté et <i>charis</i> dans l'épître de Paul aux Galates .....	89
<i>Jan Dušek</i>	
Philippiens 3,21–4,1 et 1QS iv 6–8 .....	109
<i>Christian Grappe</i>	
La première épître de Paul aux Thessaloniens à la lumière des manuscrits de la mer Morte .....	123
<i>Claude Coulot</i>	
« Les œuvres de la Loi » : mariage et divorce à Qumrân et dans les lettres de Paul .....	143
<i>Émile Puech</i>	
Body and Sin Romans and Colossians in Light of Qumranic and Rabbinic Texts .....	171
<i>Menahem Kister</i>	
Image of God and Image of Christ: Developments in Pauline and Ancient Jewish Anthropology .....	209
<i>Friedrich Avemarie †</i>	



Paul's View of the Spirit in the Light of Qumran .....	237
<i>Jörg Frey</i>	
Paul and the Jerusalem Church: Light from the Scrolls on Graeco- Semitic Language Contacts and Ethics of Gospel Mission .....	261
<i>Albert L. A. Hogeterp</i>	
Israel and the Community in Paul (Rom 9–11) and the Rule Texts from Qumran .....	277
<i>Jutta Leonhardt-Balzer</i>	
Ends Meet: Qumran and Paul on Circumcision .....	295
<i>Daniel R. Schwartz</i>	
Overlapping Ages at Qumran and "Apocalyptic" in Pauline Theology .....	309
<i>Loren T. Stuckenbruck</i>	
Index of Ancient Sources .....	327
Index of Modern Authors .....	349

## INTRODUCTION

The lectures printed in this volume were given during the Second International Symposium on Jewish and Christian Literature from the Hellenistic and Roman Period, held at the University of Lorraine, center of research "Ecritures" (EA3943), in June 2011, with the collaboration of Florentino García Martínez from the Katholieke Universiteit Leuven and Jörg Frey from the University of Zürich. This publication gives me the opportunity to thank them warmly for their precious scientific help and the financial support of Zürich University. This meeting had as its object the explicitation and exploration of comparisons between the Jewish texts discovered near the Dead Sea and Pauline literature, the earliest written testimony of ancient Christianity.

The discovery of the Dead Sea scrolls from 1947 on has immensely sharpened and renewed our knowledge of Judaism in Hellenistic and Roman times. These documents generated great interest immediately on their discovery, because they raised the hope that they might shed new light on the appearance of Christianity in the first century CE. Since then research has been pursued for more than fifty years, and there is no doubt that this additional documentation has overturned many paradigms in the study of Judaism and ancient Christianity, be it in Hebrew linguistic, history of biblical texts, formation of the canon or even research on the historical Jesus and what has been called the "third quest." Pauline studies have also been affected, for Paul's letters occupy a crucial position inside the relevant literature, since they represent the earliest writings from the new movement that will become Christianity, and, in addition, the author, who never disavowed his Jewish origin, engage in dialogue with the Judaism of his time, asking fundamental questions about the very idea of Jewish identity.

Soon after the first discoveries, similarities in Paul and Qumran drew researchers' attention. They examined carefully the parallels between the two corpora to see if they might shed light on each other. Suffice it to mention the article by D. Flusser, "The Dead Sea Sect and Pre-Pauline

Christianity” or the work of H. Braun,<sup>1</sup> and the many contributions by Heinz-Wolfgang Kuhn.<sup>2</sup> Pauline studies have, of course, been profoundly influenced by Ed Parish Sanders’ ground-breaking book,<sup>3</sup> and the numerous studies by James D. G. Dunn.<sup>4</sup> Attention given to the Dead Sea manuscripts in Pauline research has been a major stimulant to better understanding of Paul’s Jewish identity and its origin in Palestinian Judaism. However, the first comparative studies could only use what was available in the years 1950–1970, i.e., essentially the manuscripts from cave one. Since then the acceleration and completion of the publication of the entire corpus in the years 1990 to 2010 have changed our perception of the collection, raised new questions and substantially broadened the issues involved. It now seems proven that this library does not simply present the thought of one isolated and independent group, but rather that it includes a wide variety of texts reflecting Palestinian Judaism from the 3rd century B.C.E. to the 1st century C.E. This point is fundamental for estimating the value of this collection for identifying relations between these texts and contemporaneous Jewish and Christian writings. One must, of course, remember that as yet we know neither how widely the truly Qumran texts were diffused, nor what impact their contents may have had within Palestinian Judaism in the 1st century C.E. For this question Paul’s testimony may prove quite enlightening.

In spite of the interest inherent in this research and the number of published articles, excepting the collection of articles produced by J. Murphy O’Connor in 1970,<sup>5</sup> studies on the links between the Qumran texts and Paul are dispersed in various collections consecrated either to Paul’s letters or to the manuscripts, and researchers dispose of no synthesis or formulation of the problematic involved in the contacts between these two corpora. Filling this gap was one of the objects of this volume, even

---

<sup>1</sup> H. Braun, *Qumran und das Neue Testament* (2 vols.; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1966).

<sup>2</sup> See the bibliography in the article by J. Frey in this volume, p. 241 n. 8.

<sup>3</sup> E. P. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism. A Comparison of Patterns of Religion* (London: SCM Press, 1977).

<sup>4</sup> Especially J. D. G. Dunn, *Jesus, Paul and the Law: Studies in Mark and Galatians* (London: SPCK, 1990); *The Theology of Paul the Apostle* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998); and *The New Perspective on Paul. Revised Edition* (WUNT 185; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008).

<sup>5</sup> J. Murphy-O’Connor, ed., *Paul and Qumran* (Chicago: Priory Press, 1968); see also, more recently, T. G. Casey and J. Taylor, eds., *Paul’s Jewish Matrix. With an Introduction Essay by Karl P. Donfried* (Roma: Gregorian & Biblical Press; Mahwah: Stimulus Books, 2011).

though an exhaustive account of research is not what was desired. Our goal is multiple; in addition to offering syntheses of results obtained in these last decades, we hope to open up perspectives for future work by trying to understand better and to conceptualize the relationships between the texts found in the Qumran caves and Paul's letters, composed in Greek in diverse regions of the Mediterranean basin.

From a methodological point of view, early research often concentrated on collecting meaningful parallels between the two corpora, and these first studies mostly remain quite valid. We are, however, convinced that cataloguing is not enough. As J. Frey says, "The task is no more simply collecting parallels, nor determining literary dependence, but rather contextualizing texts by means of other texts, putting them in perspective, and reconstructing discourses not only between Jews and Jesus-followers, but rather within a wider Jewish framework in which the early Christian tradition emerged."

This book is meant to invite readers to a wider vision and so open new paths in the study of contacts between the different literary corpora which appeared in Palestine in the first century. Studying the relations between Judaism and Christianity or defining genetic relations between diverse corpora no longer suffice; one must take into consideration the circulation of ideas, concepts, expressions, modes of representation and processes of interpretation in the different texts. Then it may become possible to show more clearly how these statements form a complex net of relations and meanings, how each speech is built on former ones and maintains complex links, which should be evaluated, with those going before and which constitute it. The concept of dialoguism developed by M. Bakhtin seems to us to be pertinent here for developing a theory of this phenomenon. It is a question of trying to define more precisely how to consider comparisons between diverse corpora and how to follow and comprehend more precisely transfers, be they cultural, ideological, semantic or conceptual, between the different communities in first century Palestine.

The articles in this volume touch on different questions. The first concentrate on one letter or with one specific text, while the following are concerned with more thematic and transversal problems.

George Brooke speaks once more of 2 Cor 6:15–7:1. He demonstrates that contacts between this text and the scrolls need not be read as indicating a direct or indirect line of tradition; rather, it seems reasonable to consider that such parallels indicate that both sets of literature are part of

a broad spectrum of Jewish literature in the Graeco-Roman world. In fact, 2 Cor 6:15–7:1 helps us to see that the Qumran texts themselves, sectarian or non sectarian, belong to and were part of a geographically widespread set of Jewish ideas.

In my own contribution, I try to show how the concept of dialoguism elaborated by M. Bakhtin could clarify our vision of the relationships between the Qumran texts and Paul's letters, and also, more generally, the rapports between different corpora within Jewish literature of the Hellenistic and Roman period. The polemical style of the Epistle to the Galatians is especially adapted to this kind of interdiscursive relations, as several examples can show, it uses the *topos* of the opposing speech, is ironic about it, builds a counter-speech and performs semantic redefinitions.

Florentino García Martínez continues the study of the links between the manuscripts and the Epistle to the Galatians with two examples of the language and terminology used by Paul (the mention of the works of the Law in Gal 3:10 and the question of the crucifixion in Gal 3:13), as well as a central topic of his theology, the question of justification by faith via the quotation of Hab 2:4 in Gal 3:11. García Martínez shows that the Qumran manuscripts help us to understand better both the Judaism from which Paul comes and his deep originality. The study ends with some reflections on the way to assume the relationship between Paul and the manuscripts, not by an improbable genetic relationship or literary dependence, but by common use of the same source, the Hebrew Scriptures. The idea thus emerges that Paul's thought was formed by reading the biblical text, just as the ideas found in the Qumran manuscripts were forged by reading those same scriptures.

The study by Lutz Doering looks at the mutual links between 4QMMT et Paul's letters. The first part shows how 4QMMT might shed light on the discussion about the "works of the Law," the second part to what extent Paul's letters could illuminate the literary style of 4QMMT. Doering shows that the syntagm "works of the Law," present in both corpora, touches in each the limits of the semantic spectrum of the expression; Paul could even have inflected its meaning. He shows in this way that Paul's letters, as well as the other letters of the New Testament, could also shed light on the literary style of 4QMMT.

Remaining with the Epistle to the Galatians, Jan Dusek shows—through the notions of *hesed* and *charis*—how this epistle and the Rule of the Community stand vis-à-vis the concept of grace. He recognizes strong correspondences in the two corpora, but also points out their divergent

goals. He asserts that the author of the Rule and the Apostle seem to draw from the same source for imagination in Palestinian Judaism, in a similar literary framework and with comparable concepts.

Christian Grappe is interested in the association of the terms joy and crown in Phil 3:21 (cf. 1 Thess 2:19) and in 1QS IV 6–8. He highlights the fact that, although it is important to retain parallels of terms and expressions, one must never neglect the representational universe inherent in the various corpora; in the present case, for example, both manifest tension between a present (or anticipated) eschatology and a future one. Grappe also opens perspectives for future inquiry on the notion of the building of the body in 1QS IV 20 and the use of a body metaphor in Paul, especially in 1 Cor 3:17 and 6:19.

Claude Coulot explores the essentially semantic contacts between 1 Thessalonians and the manuscripts, continuing in one sense work already begun by H.-W. Kuhn. For Coulot, in one way or another, Paul had become acquainted with Qumran thought, and was interested by it, since he used it continuously in this letter.

The remaining articles tackle more transversal themes in Paul's letters and the Qumran writings. Émile Puech considers marriage and divorce in the manuscripts and in Paul's letters. He starts with the analysis of the expression "works of the Law" in 4QMMT and in Paul. After having specified what the Law prescribes in the Bible concerning marriage and divorce, Puech looks at the Essenian et Pauline positions, comparing them with what stands in the synoptic Gospels. The results show that Essensians, Paul and the synoptic Gospels agree that divorce and remarriage during the wife's lifetime is forbidden, in contradiction with the position in the Bible, upheld by Pharisaic Judaism.

Albert Hogeterp aims to analyse traces of Graeco-Semitic language contacts in Paul's linguistic repertoire and to evaluate how this influences our understanding of the discussion concerning gospel mission standards in the light of Semitic data from the Scrolls. This comparison reveals not only fundamental dividing lines but also common grounds of thought in emerging Christianity and early Judaism. This study is especially pertinent wherever the letters show traces of the first missionaries, those coming from bilingual Graeco-Semitic communities.

The contribution of Menahem Kister treats the notion of body and sin in the Epistles to the Romans and to the Colossians in relation to Qumran and rabbinic literature. Kister shows that the innovative character of Paul's language in Rom 6 can be better appreciated if it is compared with

Jewish patterns and traditions. Although it is not possible to prove literary dependence on any specific text, there are nonetheless obvious affinities between Paul and Jewish literature. The transformation of the human body, the freedom from sin gained by the Holy Spirit, the battle and the vestment imagery are documented in the scrolls as well as in other Jewish texts. But although Paul combines patterns and concepts present in Jewish literature, he builds something new on this foundation, an edifice influenced by Pauline Christology and by the exclusive role of Christ in the process of salvation. By working with a larger corpus, including not only the Qumran texts, but also both Hellenistic Jewish and rabbinic literatures, Kister shows it is possible to obtain clearer ideas about certain ambiguities, tensions or incoherences in Paul's work, which sometimes only reflect tensions already present in various existing traditions.

Jutta Leonhardt-Balzer looks at the concept of "Israel" in the Rule texts from Qumran (1QS and CD) and in Rom 9–11. She shows that Paul and Qumran use the concept of Israel in a similar way. However, she observes that the fundamental difference concerns the fate of those who do not convert. For Qumran, obstinate Israelites deserve to perish along with the nations; in Paul's vision, if unbelieving Jews are classified as Gentiles, and if Gentiles are to be saved, then unbelieving Jews must also be saved at the end of time.

The article by Daniel R. Schwartz examines Pauline and Qumran perspectives on circumcision and Jewish identity. Schwartz starts with the idea that in Antiquity, Jewish identity was defined by descent, with no provision for conversion, with or without circumcision. Circumcision was a rite practised by Jews, but not one that could make non-Jews into Jews. Such a point of view, that posits a group with impermeable borders, is assumed to be the opposite of a universalistic point of view, which says, with Paul, that "there is no difference [in Christ] between Jew and Greek" (Rom 10:12; Gal 3:28; Col 3:11). In fact, Schwartz suggests and argues that, paradoxically, these opposite positions can come to the same conclusion—in this case, a very universalistic one.

Friedrich Avemarie looks into the developments of the image of God (and of Christ) in Paul's anthropology and in ancient Jewish literature. Genesis 1:26 seems to have received little attention in Paul's letters, but does that mean that the Pauline concept of *Imago Dei* and *imago Christi* are completely independent of Gen 1:26–27? It is the purpose of Avemarie's contribution to show that this is not the case. The tradition-historical connection between the biblical creation account and Paul's

εἰκῶν-Christology is, however, indirect and can be retrieved only through a network of references and allusions to Genesis 1 scattered over a wide range of ancient Jewish Literature. Avemarie concludes that Paul's imago christology is a direct offshoot of the reception of Gen 1:26–27 in ancient Judaism. In that way, he shows that one of the most refined ideas within Paul's "participation" discourse, the expectation of an eschatological transformation into the image of Christ, is deeply rooted in the traditions of Judaism, both Alexandrian and Judaeae.

Jörg Frey wants to clarify Paul's conception of the "spirit" with the aid of the Qumran manuscripts. Although Paul probably never consulted the sectarian writings, there are noteworthy parallels concerning the notion of spirit, not only in the non sectarian texts but also in those coming from the community. These parallels shed light on the background of Paul's vision of the spirit a place it firmly in the Palestinian Jewish tradition. One may even consider that this is a specific contribution of Judaism to early Christianity. However, it remains that Pauline pneumatology is strongly influenced by Paul's experience of Christ, for which no analogy can exist in the Qumran texts.

Finally, taking the "eschatological tension" attributed by scholars to Pauline theology as a point of departure and noting that it is often regarded as an important contribution of Paul's thought to early Christian understanding of the world and interpretation of the significance of Jesus, Loren Stuckenbruck explores the degree to which analogous forms of eschatological tension may be apparent among the Dead Sea texts.

With the help of these studies, some clear lines of conclusion can be drawn. I shall repeat here, with some slight adaptation, the remarks which García Martínez formulated at the end of the Symposium.

Both Paul and Qumran need to be contextualized with other literatures of the period, be they Hellenistic, Judeo-Hellenistic or rabbinic. They are both witnesses of the Mediterranean Judaism of the period. The building blocks they use can be illuminated by other literary corpora. Paul and Qumran share a starting point; they reflect the sacred scripture of Israel which each develops in its own way, but often sharing similar interpretative processes. Qumran can indeed help to understand Paul, but Paul can also help to understand Qumran, as does the later rabbinic literature. Paul and Qumran share imaginary sources, inter-text, and even inter-discourse. Qumran ideas are not exclusive, nor are Paul's. Both would have remained within the boundaries of ethnicity and genealogy, and both are under the influence of Hellenism. For both, voluntary ad-



hesion is more important than descent. And the cumulative value of the contacts is very much more important than any single one of them.

Finally, I wish to thank Florentino García Martínez and George Brooke again for accepting to publish this volume in the collection *Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah*. I also wish to thank Gladys Gordon-Bournique, who reread all the articles in English with unequalled precision and dedication. This book is dedicated to the memory of Friedrich Avemarie; may it be a final tribute to him as well as the fruit of our gratitude.

2 CORINTHIANS 6:14–7:1 AGAIN:  
A CHANGE IN PERSPECTIVE

George J. Brooke

*University of Manchester*

The purpose of this short paper is to revisit a topic that has interested me since my doctoral work. My study of early Jewish exegesis in 4Q174, the so-called *Florilegium* or *Eschatological Midrash*, now named *Eschatological Commentary A*, was completed in the late 1970s; it embraced exegetical issues in several related compositions too, including 2 Cor 6:14–7:1.<sup>1</sup> Looking back I can now see that my work came at something of a turning point in the way that New Testament scholars set about considering the relevance and irrelevance of the Scrolls for the better understanding of the New Testament. In brief one might say that during the first thirty years after the discovery of the first Dead Sea Scrolls in 1947 the concern of many New Testament scholars was to consider in detail the parallels between the two literary corpora to see how they might be mutually illuminating for the better understanding of the emergence and development of minority sectarian and quasi-sectarian groups in early Judaism, one of which was eventually to become a full-blown largely independent religion in its own right. The publication of the *Temple Scroll* in 1977<sup>2</sup> was emblematic of the parting of the ways: despite the work of E. P. Sanders on the theology of the *Hodayot*,<sup>3</sup> or perhaps because of it in the way he drew a sharp distinction between Qumran and Paul, Qumran and its scrolls were recognized as more concerned with the Law and its interpretation and practice than had previously been thought. The result of that seems to have been that many New Testament scholars became emboldened to

---

<sup>1</sup> G. J. Brooke, "4QFlorilegium in the Context of Early Jewish Exegetical Method" (Ph.D. diss., The Claremont Graduate School, 1978); this was extensively revised for publication as *Exegesis at Qumran: 4QFlorilegium in its Jewish Context* (JSOTSup 29; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985; reprinted Atlanta: SBL, 2006).

<sup>2</sup> Y. Yadin, *Megillat HaMiqdas* (Jerusalem: Institute of Archaeology of the Hebrew University, the Shrine of the Book, 1977) [Hebrew].

<sup>3</sup> E. P. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism* (London: SCM Press, 1977).

assert that the Scrolls were of only indirect interest at best for the understanding of the New Testament writings and that if there was anything to be considered as Jewish in the New Testament, it was most likely dependent on or to be thought of as some part of Hellenistic Judaism, rather than Palestinian Jewish.<sup>4</sup>

Thus several studies before the publication of my revised doctoral thesis as well as my own work had tried to work out just how the interpolated passage of 2 Cor 6:14–7:1 came to be the way it was,<sup>5</sup> with particular sympathy being given to parallel material from the Scrolls.<sup>6</sup> However, in the last thirty years or more the concern has more often than not been to look for other settings to explain the passage or to assert its Pauline authorship. There is a very large literature on this unit of text, so I can only cite a few works by way of example. The swing of the pendulum away from seeing Qumran as providing the background for the better understanding of 2 Cor 6:14–7:1 seems to have begun with a detailed study by Hans-Dieter Betz.<sup>7</sup> Betz aligned the theology of the interpolated paragraph with that of the Judaizers of Galatia. He did not address the question whether or not such ideas or people or both might stem from Qumran or an Essene source. Then Margaret Thrall offered a study arguing for the Pauline au-

---

<sup>4</sup> Part of the discussion comparing the Scrolls and the New Testament has gone in another direction, namely expressing a greater interest in the place of the Law in the teaching of Jesus and the Gospels' representation of it, and in realigning the discussion of Paul and the Law.

<sup>5</sup> J. A. Fitzmyer, "Qumran and the Interpolated Paragraph in 2 Cor 6:14–7:1," *CBQ* 23 (1961): 271–80; reprinted in *Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament* (London: G. Chapman, 1971), 205–17; J. Gnilka, "2 Kor. 6, 14–7, 1 in Lichte der Qumranschriften und der Zwölf-Patriarchen-Testamente," *Neutestamentliche Aufsätze: Festschrift J. Schmid* (ed. J. Blinzer et al., Regensburg: F. Pustet, 1963), 86–99; idem, "2 Cor 6:14–7:1 in the Light of the Qumran Texts and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs," in *Paul and Qumran* (ed. J. Murphy-O'Connor; Chicago: Priory Press, 1968), 48–68; B. Gärtner, *The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament: A Comparative Study in the Temple Symbolism of the Qumran Texts and the New Testament* (SNTSMS 1; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965), 49–56; G. Klinzing, *Das Umdeutung des Kultus in der Qumrangemeinde und im Neuen Testament* (SUNT 7; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971), 175–82.

<sup>6</sup> The identification of the content of 2 Cor 6:14–7:1 as reflecting an Essene background has been continued by a few scholars; see, for example, H.-W. Kuhn, "The Impact of the Qumran Scrolls on the Understanding of Paul," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research* (ed. D. Dimant and U. Rappaport; STDJ 10; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 328, 331, 335–36; A. Paul, *Qumrân et les Esséniens: l'éclatement d'un dogme* (Paris: Cerf, 2008), esp. ch. 6, "Sources judaïques du théoricien Paul de Tarse," 105–11.

<sup>7</sup> H.-D. Betz, "2 Cor 6:14–7:1: An Anti-Pauline Fragment?" *JBL* 92 (1973): 88–108. Betz is supported by C. Heil, "Die Sprache der Absonderung in 2 Kor 6,17 und bei Paulus," in *The Corinthian Correspondence* (ed. R. Bieringer; BETL 125; Leuven: Peeters, 1996), 717–30.

thorship of the piece, a perspective she reiterated in her later commentary on 2 Corinthians.<sup>8</sup> Slightly later, perhaps stimulated antipathetically by Joachim Gnilka's study that he had edited for its publication in English, Jerome Murphy-O'Connor argued that the passage was most certainly by Paul and that if anything, it reflected the kind of Judaism to be observed in the writings of Philo, rather than that in the Palestinian sectarian Judaism of the Scrolls.<sup>9</sup> We are all creatures with particular skills and reading strategies, but it is notable that Betz, an expert on Graeco-Roman religions and cultures, found the background of the passage in Judaizers from such a context, while Thrall, a New Testament exegete par excellence, saw that the passage was integral to the New Testament text of which it was a part, and that Murphy-O'Connor, a student of Paul and early Judaism, found a Hellenistic form of Judaism akin to that of Paul to explain the Pauline character of the passage.

I shall return to some of the discussion of 2 Cor 6:14–7:1 in the last sixty years as this study proceeds, but already this introduction allows me to set up my presentation in the following terms. First, it is worth addressing some of the recent scholarly thinking on this passage of 2 Corinthians and its immediate and wider context to see where the debate now stands in relation to the issue of whether or not 2 Cor 6:14–7:1 is an interpolation. Second, in the light of that debate, we can reconsider some aspects of the form and exegetical content of the passage. Then third, in the light of that descriptive exercise we can think about the parallels with the whole corpus of Scrolls from the eleven caves at and near Qumran, not least as the publication of the whole of the fragmentary corpus might allow us to think of the relationship between the Scrolls and some parts of the New Testament with a new perspective in a more nuanced way than has generally been the case in recent analysis.

---

<sup>8</sup> M. E. Thrall, "The Problem of II Cor. vi. 14–vii. 1 in Some Recent Discussion," *NTS* 24 (1977–78): 132–48; eadem, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Second Epistle to the Corinthians. Volume I: Commentary on II Corinthians I–VII* (ICC; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1994).

<sup>9</sup> J. Murphy-O'Connor, "Philo and 2 Cor. 6:14–7:1," *RB* 95 (1988): 55–69; a position reiterated and worked through theologically in *The Theology of the Second Letter to the Corinthians* (New Testament Theology; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 66–74. See also his study "Relating 2 Corinthians 6.14–7.1 to Its Context," *NTS* 33 (1987): 272–75.

## A. 2 CORINTHIANS 6:14–7:1: AN INTERPOLATION?

When considering whether 2 Cor 6:14–7:1 is an interpolation, it is important to discuss in the first place how the passage fits with its context. Sometimes those who have written on the passage jump directly to the question of whether or not the passage is Pauline, as if asserting that it is indeed Pauline will solve the issue as to whether or not it is an interpolation. Thus Murphy-O'Connor in his defence of Pauline authenticity of the passage begins boldly by noting that “for many scholars 6:14–7:1 is non-Pauline; some assert that Paul is here citing material which he did not write himself, while others maintain that it was inserted into Letter A by the editor who has combined this letter with Letter B to create the present 2 Corinthians.”<sup>10</sup>

A more careful approach is taken by Jan Lambrecht who has been concerned to argue for the authenticity of the passage as non-interpolated.<sup>11</sup> After detailed consideration of the immediate context of the passage he has concluded as follows:

It should now be evident that vi 11–13 and vii 2–4 are closely related to one another. 2 Cor. vi 14–vii 1, on the other hand, is different. The tone of this unit is parenetical. The author calls for separation from unbelievers (see vi 14, 17 and vii 1) and, in a more positive way, for holiness (cf. vii 1). The fact that “they” (the author and the addressees: “we”) are God’s temple (vi 16b) and God’s people (vi 16def) entails that there cannot be any fellowship between light and darkness (vi 14b–16a).

It has become apparent that vi 11–vii 4 contains three sub-units: vi 11–13; vi 14–vii 1 and vii 2–4, and that the central unit looks like a sudden interjection between vi 11–13 and vii 2–4.<sup>12</sup>

Having noted how 2 Cor 6:14–7:1 interrupts the flow of the argument, Lambrecht then proceeded to suggest that this was a result of a deliberate structuring of the passage by Paul so that 2 Cor 6:11–13 and 7:2–4

<sup>10</sup> Murphy-O'Connor, *The Theology of the Second Letter to the Corinthians*, 68.

<sup>11</sup> Followed largely by E. Nathan, “Fragmented Theology in 2 Corinthians: The Unsolved Puzzle of 6:14–7:1,” delivered at EABS, August 2006; I am grateful to Emmanuel Nathan for sharing his paper with me and I am indebted to him for some of the references to recent secondary literature mentioned below. Nathan has used 2 Cor 6:14–7:1 as an example in “Truth and Prejudice: A Theological Reflection on Biblical Exegesis,” *ETL* 83 (2007): 281–318.

<sup>12</sup> J. Lambrecht, “The Fragment 2 Corinthians 6,14–7,1: A Plea for its Authenticity,” in *Miscellanea Neotestamentica II* (ed. T. Baarda, A. F. J. Klijn and W. C. van Unnik; NTSup 48; Leiden: Brill, 1978), 143–61; reprinted in *Studies on 2 Corinthians* (ed. R. Bieringer and J. Lambrecht; BETL 112; Leuven: Peeters, 1994), 531–49 (here pp. 534–35).

functioned as an envelope to enfold the interruption. Has Lambrecht conceded too much that challenges his own reading of the text or has he demonstrated that the envelope structure indicates that the passage was integral to this section of 2 Corinthians from the outset?

On the basis of an analysis of the history of scholarship until 1994 Reimund Bieringer has shown that the majority of scholars has questioned either the authenticity or the integrity of 2 Cor 6:14–7:1 or both. Those wanting to argue for the authenticity and integrity of the passage are outnumbered by about two to one.<sup>13</sup> I have not undertaken a thorough survey of all those who have written on the passage since Bieringer completed his study in 1994, but amongst the studies I have consulted it seems to be the case that there is still a slight majority opinion in favour of seeing the passage as an interpolation, even if the tradition it represents can nevertheless be seen as part of the Pauline heritage.<sup>14</sup> Some examples can be cited briefly to display the parameters of the debate.

First, in favour of the growing but still minority view in support of the authenticity of the passage there is the comprehensive analysis by Werner Kleine.<sup>15</sup> Kleine has undertaken a thorough syntactic, semantic and discourse analysis to conclude that the passage continues and takes forward the peroration begun in 6:11–13. Although the passage has its own dynamic argument leading to an insistence on purification (7:1), its central and pivotal comment is in 6:16b, “we are the temple of the living God,” a comment that Kleine understands as a promise that reflects Paul’s overall purpose in the first part of the letter (2 Cor 1–9).<sup>16</sup> Thus Kleine represents the ongoing minority opinion that it is entirely possible to construe 2 Cor 6:14–7:1 as an integral and authentic part of the letter, even though one might concede that it has some distinctive rhetorical dynamic.<sup>17</sup>

---

<sup>13</sup> R. Bieringer, “2 Korinther 6,14–7,1 im Kontext des 2. Korintherbriefes,” in Bieringer and Lambrecht, *Studies on 2 Corinthians*, 551–70; see especially the chart of the history of scholarship since 1840 on p. 559.

<sup>14</sup> As in the study by S. J. Hultgren, “2 Cor 6.14–7.1 and Rev 21.3–8: Evidence for the Ephesian Redaction of 2 Corinthians,” *NTS* 49 (2003): 39–56.

<sup>15</sup> W. Kleine, *Zwischen Furcht und Hoffnung: Eine textlinguistische Untersuchung des Briefes 2 Kor 1–9 zur wechselsitigen Bedeutsamkeit der Beziehung von Apostel und Gemeinde* (BBB 141; Berlin: Philo Verlagsgesellschaft, 2002), 324–37.

<sup>16</sup> Kleine, *Zwischen Furcht und Hoffnung*, 337.

<sup>17</sup> Some aspects of Kleine’s arguments were anticipated by J. D. H. Amador, “Revisiting 2 Corinthians: Rhetoric and the Case for Unity,” *NTS* 46 (2000): 92–111, who has argued that the passage is a rhetorical peroration. Kleine does not seem to have read Amador’s work.

Second, in favour of the view that the passage is a non-Pauline interpolation there is the study by William Walker that begins by asserting the *a priori* probability of interpolations in the Pauline letters, then explains away the absence of direct text-critical evidence for passages being readily identified as interpolations, and then proceeds to discuss various passages. Within the context of the long scholarly debate about 2 Cor 6:14–7:1, Walker has argued once again for the passage being a non-Pauline interpolation.<sup>18</sup> He builds his argument cumulatively on the basis of seven points of view. (1) Some of the text-critical variants in the passage, even in a manuscript as early as P<sup>6</sup>, might be considered to be indications of attempts by scribes to adjust the passage towards Paul's thought.<sup>19</sup> (2) The contextual evidence indicates interpolation; Walker's distinctive observation is that when 6:11–13 are reunited with 7:2–3, they can be construed as forming a "perfect chiasmus" of assurances of affection (6:11::7:3b), disclaimers of responsibility for alienation (6:12::7:2b–3a), and appeals for affection (6:13::7:2a).<sup>20</sup> (3) There is linguistic evidence for the passage being taken as an interpolation, both in terms of the scriptural citations and how they are introduced, in terms of the poetic parallelisms, and in terms of vocabulary with eight items not found elsewhere in the authentically Pauline corpus, indeed six of them nowhere else in the New Testament. (4) There is ideational evidence for interpolation: the ideas of separation from heathens, the necessity for obedience, and the notion of defilement of flesh and spirit all seem un-Pauline, even anti-Pauline. (5) The comparative evidence for interpolation is strong, whether with texts outside the New Testament or with the pseudo-Pauline letters. (6) The situational evidence for interpolation suggests it was addressed to Jews not Gentiles. (7) Some scholars have offered sound reasons as to why the digression might have been included here, thus offering motivational and locational evidence for interpolation.<sup>21</sup>

<sup>18</sup> W. O. Walker, *Interpolations in the Pauline Letters* (JSNTSup 213; London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), 199–209; see also W. O. Walker, "2 Cor 6.14–7.1 and the Chiasmic Structure of 6.11–13; 7.2–3," *NTS* 48 (2002): 142–44.

<sup>19</sup> E.g., in P<sup>6</sup> 2 Cor 6:16 reads "for you are God's temple," perhaps an assimilation towards 1 Cor 3:16, "you are God's temple."

<sup>20</sup> Walker, *Interpolations in the Pauline Letters*, 202.

<sup>21</sup> Walker, *Interpolations in the Pauline Letters*, 208, even uses the work of W. J. Webb, *Returning Home: New Covenant and Second Exodus as the Context for 2 Corinthians 6.14–7.1* (JSNTSup 85; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993), to argue against Webb that the more one can plausibly explain how the passage might fit, the more one is actually acknowledging the passage to be an interpolation.

Third, beyond the debate about interpolation, there is the ongoing proposal by some scholars of the possibility of accidental displacement. This has been neatly put recently, for example, in a pair of suggestions by Bruno Corsani.<sup>22</sup> Corsani has noted how the passage is an interruption to the line of thought that precedes and follows it and that it has a different style and purpose, being exhortatory compared with the apologetic character of its context.<sup>23</sup> Corsani has wondered whether the passage has been incorporated when a page of manuscript was displaced or possibly that the displacement occurred when two manuscripts were sorted and a page from a non-Pauline one ended up in the midst of the pages of 2 Corinthians.

Lastly, a suitably English solution might be to adopt an agnostic position. This has been well-expressed by Anthony Harvey.

The short passage which follows (6.14–7.1) interrupts the argument. This much is agreed by scholars; but they agree on little else. The diversion from the main line of thought, the number of words and expressions unexampled in Paul, the similarity of thought to that found in Qumran, and above all the apparently un-Pauline sectarianism, aiming at creating a pure and exclusive community—all these add up to a formidable case against Paul having been the author. Yet all these points are capable of being answered: there are other instances of Paul introducing a parenthesis or digression and then returning to his main point; his vocabulary is strikingly original in other passages; he may well have shared some ‘Essene’ ideas without actually having to borrow them; and the apparent exclusiveness he was recommending may have been no more than a particular emphasis, required by the circumstances, or by that need for clear standards and boundaries which will be encountered at some stage by every Christian community. . . . The matter remains mysterious and is probably insoluble.<sup>24</sup>

Overall it seems that the majority of scholars decide for a variety of reasons that 2 Cor 6:14–7:1 is an interpolation. Whatever one decides, the methodological issue seems to be whether the passage fits well with its immediate context in 2 Corinthians or whether it is the background or separate function of the passage that controls its meaning. Thus there is

---

<sup>22</sup> B. Corsani, *La seconda lettera ai Corinzi: Guida alla lettura* (Piccola collana moderna, Serie biblica 83; Turin: Claudiana, 2000), 116.

<sup>23</sup> Displacement is also argued for by T. Schmeller, “Der ursprüngliche Kontext von 2 Kor 6.14–7.1. Zur Frage der Einheitlichkeit des 2. Korintherbriefs,” *NTS* 52 (2006): 219–38; Schmeller thinks the passage was originally between 2 Corinthians 9 and 10.

<sup>24</sup> A. E. Harvey, *Renewal through Suffering: A Study of 2 Corinthians* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1996), 75–76.



still an ongoing need for the very careful analysis and assessment of the form and content of the pericope, topics to which I now turn.

## B. THE FORM AND EXEGETICAL CONTENT OF THE PASSAGE

The question remains whether there is anything particularly distinctive about the form, the content or the purpose of 2 Cor 6:14–7:1, anything distinctive that would enable one to situate it. The most significant debates about the passage commonly can be reduced to whether the modern scholar looks at the details in a cumulative fashion as building up an overall picture that might disclose some kind of pattern of association, or whether each item is dealt with in its own terms and seen as not necessarily in itself unrepresentative of Paul's thought.

Various proposals have been made concerning the form of 2 Cor 6:14–7:1. Betz's description of the parenesis of the passage as "very carefully constructed" has been highly influential.<sup>25</sup> Such a simple statement can be verified from many commentaries that lay out the argument in detail. The point is that if the form strongly suggests something carefully woven together and built up distinctively, then the logic of the modern analysis should be to work with the data cumulatively, not item by item. I am very sympathetic to this line of argumentation, since it is easy to limit the significance of any one item by isolating it.<sup>26</sup> Betz's understanding of the structure was that it has two parts: (1) the basic parenetical statement in 6:14a, "Do not be mismatched with unbelievers"; and (2) a four-part set of theological foundations for such instruction: an ontological orientation (6:14b–16a), a confessional self-definition of the congregation (6:16b), a quotation of the divine promise (6:16c–18), and a concluding general parenesis (7:1).

Lambrecht has proposed a four-part structure, in effect combining Betz's fourth and fifth subsections. (1) First, in 2 Cor 6:14a, there is the same introductory clause "that formulates in metaphorical language the main prohibition."<sup>27</sup> (2) Second, in 2 Cor 6:14b–16a, linked to the first sub-

<sup>25</sup> Betz, "2 Cor 6:14–7:1: An Anti-Pauline Fragment?" 89.

<sup>26</sup> I am grateful to Timothy Lim for asking me to clarify the logic of this point, since all cumulative arguments are of necessity based on the consideration of individual items. My perspective is simply that single points should not be isolated, forgotten and dismissed, but be set alongside other points to be allowed to create a joined up perspective on a text.

<sup>27</sup> Lambrecht, "The Fragment 2 Corinthians 6,14–7,1," 536–37; Lambrecht translates the Greek very neatly as "Do not become unequally yoked with unbelievers."

section by the logical use of γάρ, there is a set of five parallel questions each beginning with τίς and each rhetorically structured to present five pairs of opposites.<sup>28</sup> (3) Third, in 2 Cor 6:16b–18c, again linked to the previous section by the logical use of γάρ and the repetition of the marker ναός θεοῦ (from 16a), there is a catena of scriptural quotations designed to demonstrate the meaning of 6:16b: “For we are the temple of the living God.” Three citation formulae are used, one at the beginning, “as God said” (6:16c), one in the middle of the central reordered citation, “says the Lord” (6:17b), and one at the end of the chain, “says the Lord almighty” (6:18c = 2 Sam 7:8).<sup>29</sup> Thus within a well-structured parenesis there is evidence of even more precise arrangement of materials. Lambrecht highlights how the three citations, Lev 26:12 adjusted, Isa 52:11 reordered, and 2 Sam 7:14 adjusted and made inclusive, are also carefully ordered so that the reader or hearer is taken from the existing covenant, through the implications of the covenant for distinctive behaviour, to the eschatological promise to David. (4) Fourth, in 7:1, the consecutive οὖν connects the conclusion to what precedes; the conclusion, however, is no mere reiteration of the opening parenesis, but is a call to action in the light of the definitions of identity contained in the scriptural promises.

In particular when attention is paid to the developments in the passage from one statement to another and when verbal patterns are highlighted in detail, some such analysis as that by Lambrecht seems highly suitable. Such overall tightly argued coherence of 2 Cor 6:14–7:1 is widely supported by scholars of all persuasions. As such it seems to me that the passage should be treated as a whole and not be subjected to such dissection that each item is explained away as not that unusual for Paul. The cumulative weight of the items in the passage is more important than their individual standing. Although Lambrecht sees such a whole as not uncharacteristic of Pauline style,<sup>30</sup> the majority view is to see that cumulatively the passage has echoes of things other than those of immediate concern to Paul.

<sup>28</sup> Murphy-O'Connor, “Philo and 2 Cor 6:14–7:1,” 57, cites several examples of lists of questions in the Pauline correspondence, not least 1 Cor 4:7; 7:16 and 9:7, in support of the Pauline authenticity of this section of the passage.

<sup>29</sup> It is this catena of quotations alone that is understood as pre-Pauline by A. L. A. Hogeterp, *Paul and God's Temple: A Historical Interpretation of Cultic Imagery in the Corinthian Correspondence* (Biblical Tools and Studies 2; Leuven: Peeters, 2006), 372–73; like Lambrecht, Hogeterp regards the whole of 2 Cor 6:14–7:1 as Pauline, “at least in its end-redaction.”

<sup>30</sup> Lambrecht, “The Fragment 2 Corinthians 6,14–7,1,” 549, has concluded that because of “the complete manuscript support for the passage and the characteristics of Pauline style, a rather conservative attitude in this matter is certainly to be preferred.”

The content of this parenetic material concerns inappropriate mixtures, being yoked with the wrong kind of people, namely the unfaithful. The laws against inappropriate mixtures that lie behind the metaphor are those of Lev 19:19 and Deut 22:9–11: vineyards should not be sown with secondary crops, the ox and the ass should not be yoked together, clothes should not be made of wool and linen woven together. The five pairs of contrasts listed in the series of questions lay out what should not be mixed. The catena of scriptural citations is in fact more than the three base citations that we have just mentioned (Lev 26:12; Isa 52:11; 2 Sam 7:14). The first citation opens with a brief phrase from Ezek 37:27, “I shall dwell with them,” before moving on to the covenantal passage of Lev 26:12. Ezekiel 37:24–28 in fact is programmatic for much in the catena, since it mentions the Davidic covenant, to which the adapted 2 Samuel 7 refers, the gift of the land to Jacob, the covenant with whom is mentioned in Leviticus 26, and also the sanctuary (*mqdšy*, rendered unsuitably but understandably in the LXX as τὰ ἄγια) that seems to be explaining the concern with the ναὸς θεοῦ. The phrasing of Ezek 37:27 can be blended with that of Lev 26:12 easily, though the pronouns of 2 Cor 6:16–17 remain those of Ezek 37:27: “They will be my people.” Furthermore Ezek 37:28 declares that the nations will know that the Lord sanctifies Israel; this concept could have influenced the shift to Isa 52:11 whose context is also concerned with what the nations shall see. Although the catena is intricately constructed with all kinds of minor and not so minor adjustments to the string of texts, in fact once one starts in Ezek 37:24–28, most of the other texts suggest themselves to somebody who is well versed in the scriptures. We will return to this issue in the third part of what I wish to say. The concluding developed parenetic exhortation takes some of its terminology from the scriptural chain and develops it further.

At the first international symposium of the Orion Center of the Hebrew University, I presented a paper on various exegetical combinations of texts including the combination of Ezekiel 37 and Leviticus 26 in 4Q119 (4QLXXLeva), 11Q19 (the *Temple Scroll*), and 2 Corinthians 6.<sup>31</sup> I noted

---

This line is supported by J. A. Adewuya, *Holiness and Community in 2 Cor 6:14–7:1: Paul's View of Communal Holiness in the Corinthian Correspondence* (SBL 40; New York: Peter Lang, 2001); and by Hogeterp, *Paul and God's Temple*, 375–77, who sees the disjunction between idolatry and worship (6:16), the concern with cultic separation (6:17), and the issue of defilement (7:1) as entirely coherent with other parts of Paul's letters where he has used cultic imagery to make his points.

<sup>31</sup> 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*

there that the intertextual echoes of the phrasing of Ezek 37:26 in 4Q119 could not readily be explained by deliberate textual borrowing in an effort to create some kind of textual harmonisation, though an activity like that might occasionally be the case.<sup>32</sup> Rather there is intertextual cross-fertilisation; those who know certain scriptures well naturally make connections without having to be aware of the way other people might be making very similar connections. This is borne out when the same phenomenon can be seen in 11Q19 XXIX 7–8 (literally: “They will be to me for a people and I will be to them for ever”) for which the closest parallel is Ezek 37:23, though it seems as if Lev 26:12 is also in mind as also possibly Jer 31:33. There are indeed clear differences between these texts as to how the textual juxtaposition is being created and represented, so there is no single interpretative trajectory. The same can be said for 4Q174, *Eschatological Commentary A*: certain themes and phrases from Ezek 37 are found in close proximity to an extensive exposition of 2 Samuel 7, not unlike 2 Cor 6:14–7:1.<sup>33</sup>

In these passages what seems to be present is intertextual cross-fertilisation, not strictly an exegetical tradition or traditions. In fact the differences in the presentation of the varieties of texts speaks against any single exegetical trajectory. The same or similar passages are cited in different ways, in different orders and for different purposes; what they have in common seems self-evident. Although it might seem likely that the general setting of eschatological debate about the democratisation of the temple within turn of the era Palestinian Judaism contributed to what might have been found useful in all these exegetical instances, in fact it is quite likely that the juxtaposition of Ezekiel 37 and Leviticus 26

---

*of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Proceedings of the First International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 12–14 May, 1996* (ed. M. E. Stone and E. G. Chazon; STDJ 28; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 35–57, especially 52–54; updated slightly in “Interprétations intertextuelles communes dans les manuscrits de la Mer Morte et le Nouveau Testament,” in *Intertextualités: La Bible en échos* (ed. D. Marguerat and A. H. W. Curtis; Monde de la Bible 40; Geneva: Labor et Fides, 2000), 97–120.

<sup>32</sup> The possibility of the influence of the phraseology of Ezek 37:26 in 4Q119 was first suggested by E. C. Ulrich, “The Septuagint Manuscripts from Qumran: A Reappraisal of Their Value,” in *Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Writings: Papers Presented to the International Symposium on the Septuagint and Its Relations to the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Writings (Manchester, 1990)* (ed. G. J. Brooke and B. Lindars; SBLSCS 33; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992), 58–59. In the principal edition of 4Q119 the presence of an echo of Ezekiel here was not mentioned: P. W. Skehan, E. Ulrich and J. E. Sanderson, *Qumran Cave 4.IV: Paleo-Hebrew and Greek Biblical Manuscripts* (DJD IX; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992), 161–65.

<sup>33</sup> Brooke, *Exegesis at Qumran*, 211–17.

was so obvious that it could have come to mind independently in each case. It is almost as if the more two or more texts (i.e., 4Q119, 11Q19, 4Q174 and 2 Cor 6:14–7:1) seem to have in common, the less likely it is that there is any kind of literary or other dependence. The process of scriptural associations was sufficiently common in the circles with which the author of this passage of 2 Corinthians moved that he could exploit the method to create his own line of argument.

Thus, what I have argued all too briefly in this section of my study is the following set of three items. First, I have laid out that 2 Cor 6:14–7:1 has a readily recognisable coherence, notably in its form and exegetical content. Scholars of all opinions concerning its relation to its epistolary context and whether it is Pauline all acknowledge that to be the case. Second, because of that coherence it is logically important to take the passage as a whole and not to attempt to dismiss single items that look distinctive one by one. The cumulative argument is what counts in trying to appreciate the passage. Third, despite its widely acknowledged coherence the question remains concerning how the exegetical strategy and the content of the exegesis should best be understood. My proposal is that the presentation has many similarities with what can be found elsewhere, but also several distinctive elements. Overall, because there are similarities and differences between the exegesis in 2 Cor 6:14–7:1 and other more or less contemporary compositions, the exegesis in the passage seems to come under the rule of thumb that the greater the apparent similarities to other texts, the less likely there is to be direct literary dependence. We end up with the need to start the next step of the investigation by acknowledging the independent coherence of the passage, an independence that could well mean that it resists being linked too closely with any one group or individual. For some interpreters this would strongly suggest that rather than multiplying authors, the conclusion should be drawn that Paul compiled the passage, perhaps using sources that he had come across in other contexts. Nevertheless, for the moment I wish to reserve judgment on that point.

### C. THE PARALLELS

Thus far I have argued for the rich coherence of the entire digression and that it must be analysed as a whole. My suggestion about the exegetical material in the catena of adjusted scriptural citations is that methodologically such chains might be expected in any number of contexts, and that

they could indeed involve the same or similar texts without there being any need to postulate literary dependence.

I think that Jerome Murphy-O'Connor has made a similarly convincing argument about possible parallels in Philo to the antitheses in the five questions.<sup>34</sup> “We should honour equality and hate inequality, for the former is the source and fountain of justice, the latter of injustice. The former is akin to light the latter to darkness” (*Spec. Leg.* 2:204); “the law does not admit of lawlessness or light of darkness” (*Spec. Leg.* 1:279); “the people have run after lawlessness; they have fashioned a god, the work of their hands” (*Mos.* 2:165); “to distrust created being, which in itself is wholly unworthy of trust (*apistos*), to trust in God, and in him alone, even as he alone is truly worthy of trust (*pistos*), that is a task for a great and celestial understanding” (*Her.* 93).<sup>35</sup> Murphy-O'Connor has not wished to argue that the passage in 2 Corinthians is dependent on Philo, but that when taken as a whole at a certain level of general abstraction, then much of the pericope contains detailed echoes of what can be found in Philo.

My point in this third brief section of my presentation is that this digression in 2 Corinthians reflects the language and ideas of several Jewish contexts of the late Second Temple period. Despite being an enthusiast for the Pauline authenticity of the passage, Murphy-O'Connor has also acknowledged that the quality of the parallels between the Qumran scrolls and 2 Cor 6:14–7:1 “is not in dispute.”<sup>36</sup> Developing the work of others, especially that of Joseph Fitzmyer, Stephen Hultgren has categorized the parallels under six headings: (1) the dualisms of righteousness/lawlessness, light/darkness, and Christ/Beliar;<sup>37</sup> (2) the issue of idolatry; (3) the distinction of the community and its separation from others; (4) the related topics of the cleansing of the flesh and perfection in holiness; (5) the citation formulae and the chain of scriptural quotations; and (6) the notion of the temple as a community.<sup>38</sup> Jan Lambrecht, a proponent of Pauline authorship who somewhat surprisingly but presumably deliberately confines his discussion of the parallels with the Qumran composi-

<sup>34</sup> Murphy-O'Connor, “Philo and 2 Cor 6:14–7:1,” 59–62.

<sup>35</sup> Murphy-O'Connor, “Philo and 2 Cor 6:14–7:1,” 60–61.

<sup>36</sup> Murphy-O'Connor, “Philo and 2 Cor 6:14–7:1,” 59.

<sup>37</sup> On the reflection of *bly'l* of Nah 2:1 [Heb.] in both Mark 1:24 and 2 Cor 6:15 see M. Pérez Fernández, “Textos fuente y textos contextuales de la narrativa evangélica,” in *Flores Florentino: Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish Studies in Honour of Florentino García Martínez* (ed. A. Hilhorst, É. Puech and E. Tigchelaar; JSJSup 122; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 607.

<sup>38</sup> Hultgren, “2 Cor 6.14–7.1 and Rev 21.3–8,” 39–56, esp. 41.

tions to a footnote, has commented in sum that “one simply cannot deny the affinities between 2 Cor vi 14–viii 1 and the Qumran documents.”<sup>39</sup>

Alongside the several parallels in the writings of Philo and in the sectarian scrolls, some scholars have suggested the need to think of other forms of Judaism too. Although focussing especially on the Qumran parallels, Joachim Gnilka noted succinctly some of the parallels between 2 Cor 6:14–7:1 and the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, most obviously the use of Belial as the divine opponent. “Choose between light and darkness, either the law of the Lord or the works of Belial” (*T. Levi* 19:1); “Then is the Lord with you in light and Belial in darkness with the Egyptians” (*T. Jos.* 20:2).<sup>40</sup> It has become apparent since the availability of all the scrolls that the figure of Belial does indeed feature in the non-sectarian and pre-sectarian compositions such as 4Q386 (*Pseudo-Ezekiel*<sup>b</sup> 1 II 3) and 4Q390 (*Apocryphon of Jeremiah C*<sup>c</sup> 2 I 4). In addition to Belial there are parallels such as “leave all unrighteousness and cleave to the righteousness of God” (*T. Dan* 6:10).

In the light of all this I am inclined to think that the parallels between 2 Cor 6:14–7:1 and Paul’s own thinking, as these have been amassed in particular by proponents of the Pauline authenticity of the passage, could also be used to demonstrate the way in which Paul was the heir of a rich diversity of Jewish tradition and variously used it to make his arguments work in a range of contexts.<sup>41</sup> Lambrecht has also made the important point that those who wish to assert the non-Pauline authorship of 2 Cor 6:14–7:1 often presuppose that Paul’s thought is systematically more monolithic and distinctive than it probably was.

<sup>39</sup> Lambrecht, “The Fragment 2 Corinthians 6,14–7,1,” 548 n. 43.

<sup>40</sup> Gnilka, “2 Cor 6:14–7:1 in the Light of the Qumran Texts and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs,” 66.

<sup>41</sup> As argued, for example, by A. Piñero, “On the Hellenization of Christianity. One Example: The Salvation of Gentiles in Paul,” in *Flores Florentino: Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish Studies in Honour of Florentino García Martínez* (ed. A. Hilhorst, É. Puech and E. Tigchelaar; JSJSup 122; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 667–83; Piñero (p. 669) uses the whole of 2 Cor 2:14–7:4 to make his point about Paul’s cultural context. This point should not be used to suggest that the various forms of Judaism in Palestine and elsewhere at the end of the Second Temple period all had more in common than distinguished them. As Daniel Schwartz rightly indicated in his comment on this paper, the Essenes and those going to Qumran had some very particular concerns and viewpoints that need to be acknowledged by scholars.



## D. CONCLUSION

In this study I have argued first that nearly all scholars recognize the need to differentiate 2 Cor 6:14–7:1 from its immediate and wider contexts in 2 Corinthians. On the spectrum of ideas at one end it is a Pauline rhetorical digression, and at the other it is a non-Pauline fragment that has accidentally been included in the redacted Epistle. Whilst acknowledging the secondary character of 2 Cor 6:14–7:1 in its present context, I am inclined to think that the background (whether Pauline or not) of some of the ideas in the passage controls its principal significance, rather than that its immediate context provides the key to its meaning.

Second, it is widely agreed by scholars of all persuasions that the pericope should be taken as a well-wrought unit of text. As a result I have argued that it should be considered as such and that those who discuss the pericope should not dissociate this or that item of the text from various parallels in order to avoid the effect of the cumulative argument about the passage. Strong arguments for the better understanding of the text should be based on reading it as a whole, not on the exclusion of one or other item in the text. As such the passage can be recognized as especially replete with motifs also found in other more or less contemporary Jewish literature.

Third, I have displayed some reluctance to decide firmly what might be the precise background of the text. Its scriptural citations indicate that it could have been put together in any number of places, even by Paul himself. Parallels can be found in a wide range of literature; let them stand without cutting out any of them as impossible historical influences, direct or indirect on the author of this pericope, whether Paul or another. All this might seem to be somewhat inconclusive and restrained, but there is a larger point to be made, namely that the close parallels between 2 Cor 6:14–7:1 and the Qumran literature should not be read as indicating a direct or indirect line of tradition; rather, it is better to suppose that such parallels demonstrate most closely how both sets of literature, the collection of scrolls and the letters of Paul, are part of a broad spectrum of Jewish literature of the Graeco-Roman world.

In sum, what I am proposing briefly is that 2 Cor 6:14–7:1 as a whole helps us to see that the wider background thought of the non-sectarian compositions amongst the Scrolls, as indeed of the sectarian ones, not least *Eschatological Midrash A* (4Q174), reverberates with items also to be found elsewhere in Jewish self-expressions in the Greco-Roman Mediter-



anean world and possibly even beyond.<sup>42</sup> 2 Cor 6:14–7:1 helps us to see that the Qumran texts themselves, though often with a particular perspective, belong to and were part of a geographically widespread set of Jewish ideas. Thus our conclusion should be that perhaps we can use the New Testament, and Paul in particular, to help us recognise that much in the corpus of compositions from the eleven caves at and near Qumran was part and parcel of Hellenistic Jewish culture, variously adapted in particular contexts.

---

<sup>42</sup> I am grateful to Florentino García Martínez for also pointing out in commenting on this paper that scholars of the Scrolls need also to keep in mind the eastern origin of several features of Jewish thought and culture that are to be found in the sectarian and non-sectarian compositions found in those eleven caves at and near Qumran.

LES MANUSCRITS DE LA MER MORTE ET L'ÉPÎTRE AUX GALATES :  
QUELQUES CAS D'INTERDISCURSIVITÉ<sup>1</sup>

Jean-Sébastien Rey

*Université de Lorraine, Metz*

Parmi les textes du Nouveau Testament qui ont reçu un éclairage nouveau grâce à la publication des textes de Qumran, l'épître aux Galates tient une place particulière<sup>2</sup>. Les chercheurs ont noté de nombreux rapprochements. À titre d'exemple, il suffit de mentionner : la question de la justification évoquée en Ga 2,16 et dans l'hymne final de la *Règle de la Communauté* (1QS XI) ; la citation de Dt 21,22–23 en lien avec la crucifixion en Gal 3,13, 4Q196 3–4 I 6–8 et 11Q19 LXIV 6–13 ; la citation de Gn 15,6 en Ga 3,6–9, 4Q225 2 i 7–8 et 4QMMT (4Q398 14–17 ii 7) ; la citation d'Habakuk 2,4 en Ga 3,11 et en 1QpHab VIII 1–3 ; le catalogue des vices et des vertus en Ga 5,16–26 et en 1QS IV 6–8.11–14 ; et enfin la fameuse expression les « œuvres de la loi » en Ga 2,16 et en 4QMMT C 27. Ces exemples sont suffisamment nombreux et pertinents pour que les chercheurs s'interrogent sur leur origine. Tenter d'explicitier ces rapprochements en terme de dépendance littéraire n'est certainement pas approprié et il paraît plus juste d'envisager, comme l'a proposé Timothy Lim<sup>3</sup> et d'autres<sup>4</sup>, une matrice juive commune. Il paraît néanmoins pos-

---

<sup>1</sup> I wish to thank warmly Hindy Najman for our deep discussions and her help in the finalization of this article. May this contribution be dedicated to her.

<sup>2</sup> H.-W. Kuhn, « Die Bedeutung der Qumrantexte für das Verständnis des Galaterbriefes aus dem Münchener Projekt: Qumran und das Neue Testament », in *New Qumran Texts and Studies. Proceedings of the First Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Paris 1992* (ed. George J. Brooke ; STDJ 15 ; Leiden : Brill, 1994), 169–222. Voir aussi H.-W. Kuhn, « The Impact of the Qumran Scrolls on the Understanding of Paul », in *The Dead Sea Scrolls. Forty Years of Research* (ed. D. Dimant and U. Rappaport ; STDJ 10 ; Leiden : Brill, 1992), 327–39.

<sup>3</sup> T. Lim, « 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. J. R. Davila ; STDJ 46 ; Leiden : Brill, 2003), 135–56.

<sup>4</sup> T. G. Casey and J. Taylor, eds., *Paul's Jewish matrix* (Mahwah : Paulist Press ; Roma : Gregorian & Biblical Press, 2010).

sible de préciser la compréhension des rapports entre ces deux corpus et de tenter de montrer comment les textes de Qumrân sont susceptibles d'éclairer le discours paulinien.

L'épître aux Galates se présente comme un discours de controverse. Paul réagit face à un discours adverse qui nous fait cruellement défaut et dont la reconstruction reste sujette à caution<sup>5</sup>. Pourtant, les manuscrits de la mer Morte offrent aux chercheurs la possibilité de confronter le discours de Paul à d'autres discours potentiellement représentatifs d'un certain nombre de discours juifs circulant au tournant de notre ère. On montrera alors que les lettres de Paul, et plus particulièrement l'épître aux Galates, entretiennent avec ces derniers une relation non pas génétique, mais de type dialogique, selon la terminologie développée par M. Bakhtine<sup>6</sup>. Ce concept prend en considération le fait que tout discours se construit sur la base d'autres discours qui le précèdent. Au point que le discours devient *dyphonique*, ou bivocal<sup>7</sup>. Dans le cas de la polémique, Bakhtine note :

« Le discours d'autrui reste en dehors du discours de l'auteur, mais ce dernier en tient compte et se rapporte à lui. Ici, le discours d'autrui n'est pas reproduit avec une nouvelle interprétation mais il agit, influence et, d'une façon ou d'une autre, détermine le discours de l'auteur — tout en lui restant extérieur. »<sup>8</sup>

Dans les années soixante-dix, sur la base du dialogisme bakhtinien, les analystes du discours ont théorisé le concept d'interdiscursivité<sup>9</sup>. Juliette

<sup>5</sup> J. M. G. Barclay, « Mirror-Reading a Polemical Letter: Galatians as a Test Case », *JSNT* 10 (1987) : 73–93.

<sup>6</sup> Voir T. Todorov, *Mikhaïl Bakhtine — Le principe dialogique suivi de Écrits du Cercle de Bakhtine* (Paris : Seuil, 1981). Pour l'application des théories Bakhtiniennes aux textes de Qumrân, voir l'introduction éclairante de C. A. Newsom, *The Self as Symbolic Space. Constructing Identity and Community at Qumran* (STDJ 52 ; Leiden : Brill, 2004), en particulier le chapitre 1 : « Communities of Discourse », 1–21.

<sup>7</sup> Todorov, *Mikhaïl Bakhtine*, 110.

<sup>8</sup> M. Bakhtin, *Problemy tvorcestva Dostoievskogo* (Problèmes de l'œuvre de Dostoïevski (Leningrad, 1929), 121, cité par Todorov, *Mikhaïl Bakhtine*, 111.

<sup>9</sup> Voir M. Pécheux, *Les vérités de La Palice. Linguistique, sémantique, philosophie* (Paris : Maspero, 1975), puis plus récemment D. Maingueneau, *L'analyse du discours. Introduction à la lecture de l'archive* (Paris : Hachette, 1997). Le concept d'interdiscursivité manque de précision et a reçu bon nombre de définitions. Par interdiscursivité, j'entends que « tout discours est traversé par l'interdiscursivité, il a pour propriété constitutive d'être en relation multiforme avec d'autres discours, d'entrer dans l'interdiscours » (P. Charaudeau et D. Maingueneau, dir., *Dictionnaire d'analyse du discours* [Paris : seuil, 2002], 324). En ce sens l'interdiscursivité englobe un champ plus large que l'intertextualité. L'interdiscursivité implique une autre perspective qu'une analyse des filiations des textes. Cela concerne « un jeu de renvois entre des discours qui ont eu un support textuel

Rennes a montré comment ce concept pouvait s'employer à profit pour analyser les processus en jeu dans les discours de controverse<sup>10</sup> en particulier dans ce qu'elle appelle les controverses d'égalité. L'épître aux Galates se situe précisément dans ce champ discursif : une controverse avec une revendication égalitaire qui vise à attribuer aux juifs et aux non-juifs des droits identiques (« il n'y a plus ni juifs ni grec, il n'y a plus ni esclave ni homme libre, il n'y a plus ni homme ni femme ; car tous vous ne faites qu'un dans le Christ Jésus » (Ga 3,28). Juliette Rennes note que l'interdiscursivité peut se répercuter

« à l'échelle du mot aussi bien qu'à celle de l'unité discursive, renvoie aux traces variées d'un discours « autre » au sein du texte analysé. Dans un discours particulier émanant d'une formation idéologique donnée, il peut s'agir de la présence d'un registre lexical, de métaphores, d'arguments qui traversent l'ensemble de la production discursive de cette formation idéologique ou celle de formations idéologiques apparentées. Cette présence peut être aussi celle du discours adverse, convoqué à travers des procédés de réfutation, de concession, de citation, ou dans les retraductions polémiques de sa rhétorique : pastiche, parodie, dérision, démystification... Il peut s'agir encore du discours doxique sur un sujet donné à travers cette convocation méconnue du déjà dit que sont les "lieux communs" et les formes variées de la présupposition. De ces exemples, il ressort que l'altérité discursive peut aussi bien être explicite – signalée par l'usage des citations, de guillemets ou du discours rapporté – qu'implicite : la reprise de lieux communs ou de lieux idéologiques intervient généralement sans mention d'une "hétérogénéité discursive" (Authier-Revuz, 1982). »<sup>11</sup>

De fait, le discours de Paul présente, en de nombreux lieux, de telles caractéristiques, soit par l'évocation de lieux communs (« nous savons que... » Ga 2,16), soit en poussant à l'extrême le discours adverse sous la forme de l'ironie (« qu'ils se mutilent donc tout à fait, ceux qui vous bouleversent... » Ga 5,12). À ces éléments, J. Rennes ajoute ce qu'elle appelle les « figures de la contrainte ». Dans le discours de controverse, les arguments adverses sont constamment présents à l'horizon de l'argumentation. Dans la mesure où une controverse « constitue la cristallisation

---

mais dont on n'a pas mémorisé la configuration ; par exemple, dans le slogan "Maggi fait le potage de vos grands-mères", c'est l'interdiscours qui permet des inférences du genre "les grand-mères font la cuisine de façon traditionnelle en restant des heures devant les fourneaux". En revanche, l'« intertexte » serait un jeu de reprise de textes configurés et légèrement transformés. » *Ibid.*, 325.

<sup>10</sup> J. Rennes, « Analyser une controverse. Les apports de l'étude argumentative à la science politique », in *Analyse du discours et sciences humaines et sociales* (ed. S. Bonnafous et M. Temmar ; Les chemins du discours ; Paris : Ophrys, 2007), 91–107.

<sup>11</sup> Rennes, « Analyser une controverse », 92–93.

d'un conflit de hiérarchies de valeurs, lesquelles disposent chacune d'une légitimité comparable », alors « tout plaider pour que telle valeur ait la préséance sur telle autre doit prendre en compte la hiérarchie des valeurs adverses »<sup>12</sup>. Le discours antagoniste devant nécessairement être pris au sérieux, on peut considérer que Paul est *contraint*, dans son discours, de tenir compte du discours de l'autre et de la hiérarchie des valeurs qu'il propose.

Concernant l'épître aux Galates, nous ne disposons pas du discours antagoniste sinon à travers les quelques traces que Paul en laisse percevoir. Mon intention n'est pas de reconstruire hypothétiquement ce discours, mais de chercher à percevoir comment le discours de Paul se situe et interagit face à d'autres discours antérieurs, ou plus ou moins contemporains, qui présentent une thématique commune et qui sont susceptibles d'être représentatifs de ce discours autre.

#### A. GAL 2,14 ET L'IRONIE DU DISCOURS ADVERSE

En conclusion d'un premier développement de type autobiographique, Paul rapporte les faits d'un incident qui l'a opposé à Pierre sur une question de commensalité. Il constate que Pierre et les autres juifs (οἱ λοιποὶ Ἰουδαῖοι) « *ne marchent pas droit* selon la vérité de l'évangile (οὐκ ὀρθοπονοῦσιν πρὸς τὴν ἀλήθειαν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου). Le sens de l'*hapax* néotestamentaire ὀρθοποδέω mérite une brève remarque. Selon C. Spicq le verbe ne devrait pas avoir une connotation morale (« agir avec droiture ») mais devrait être l'antonyme du grec χαλεύω, « boiter ». Il faudrait alors le rendre par « avoir une marche ferme » ou, en négatif, « avoir une démarche oscillante », « clocher des deux côtés » (cf. Hb 12,13)<sup>13</sup>. D'autres insistent

<sup>12</sup> Rennes, « Analyser une controverse », 93.

<sup>13</sup> C. Spicq, *Lexique Théologique du Nouveau Testament* (Paris : Cerf ; Fribourg : Presses Universitaires de Fribourg, 1991<sup>2</sup>), 118–9. Spicq appuie son argumentation sur l'attestation de deux papyri (p. Mil. 24,2 daté de 117 de notre ère [cf. C. H. Roberts, « A Note on Galatians II,14 », *JTS* (1939) : 55–56] et p. Mich. Inv. 337 [J. G. Winter, « Another Instance of ὀρθοποδεῖν », *HTR* 34 (1941) : 161–62 ; republié par H. C. Youtie, « P. Mich. Inv. 337 », *ZPE* 22 (1976) : 63–68] et d'une attestation chez Nicandre de Colophon (*Alexipharmaca*, 419). En réalité les attestations de p. Mil 24,2 et de Nicandre emploient la forme nominale, respectivement ὀρθοποδία et ὀρθόπους, seule l'attestation de p. Mich. Inv. 337 emploie, comme chez Paul, la forme verbale, or, ce papyrus d'origine chrétienne est largement plus tardif (IVe s.) et pourrait se ranger avec les nombreuses attestations de la forme dans la littérature patristique. L'emploi de la forme verbale, à preuve du contraire, trouve donc son attestation la plus ancienne chez Paul. C. H. Roberts et J. G. Winter donnent au verbe le sens de « avancer, progresser, grandir » sans connotation morale.

davantage sur la dimension éthique de l'expression et la rapprochent de la notion de *halakha* : « an alternative expression for living [« walking »] according to God's law/ways/statutes/ordinances, that is living according to the *halakha* (or the law as understood and applied by the legal authorities of the Jewish community) »<sup>14</sup>. Roy E. Ciampa considère que « la vérité de l'évangile » serait un nouvel équivalent de תורה et l'expression serait à rapprocher du syntagme מעשי התורה de Ga 2,16, tous deux étant des expressions qui refléteraient le concept de *halakha* à cette époque<sup>15</sup>.

Dans la mesure où nous ne connaissons pas d'attestation de la forme verbale ὁρθοποδεύω dans la littérature grecque antérieure ou contemporaine à Paul, il est légitime de s'interroger sur un possible enracinement sémitique de l'expression. F. Mussner note que l'équivalent hébreu du grec ὁρθοποδεύω correspondrait au *piel* de ישר<sup>16</sup> qui a clairement un sens éthique, moral, et qui, en hébreu tardif, renvoie à l'observance de la loi (cf. Ps 119,128 : כל ישרתי כל-פקודי כל-ישרתי)<sup>17</sup>. C'est en particulier le cas dans la quasi-totalité des emplois de la racine ישר à Qumrân, que ce soit pour l'emploi de la forme verbale (cf. 1QH<sup>a</sup> XV 16–17 [כל] מודיכה ותיכן לבי [כל] מודיכה ותיכן לבי « Tu as établi mon cœur [selon] ton [en] seignement et selon ta vérité pour rendre droit mes pas vers les sentiers de justice » ; 1QH<sup>a</sup> XX 34 ; 4Q219 II 11–12 [Jub 21,15] שְׁמֹר אֶת הַמִּצְוָה הַזֹּאת [וְעָשָׂה אֹתָהּ בְּנֵי לְמַעַן תִּישָׁר בְּכֹל מַעֲשֵׂיכָהּ] « Garde ce commandement et pratique-le, mon fils, afin que tu marches droit dans toutes tes œuvres »), ou encore de façon plus particulière pour l'adjectif. On ne trouve pas, dans la Bible hébraïque, de parallèles fermes à l'expression de Ga 2,14 ; la formulation la plus proche se trouverait en Pr 14,2 : « Qui marche dans sa droiture (הוֹלֵךְ בְּיֶשֶׁרָיו | ὁ πορευόμενος ὁρθῶς) craint Yahvé, qui dévie de ses chemins le méprise »<sup>18</sup>. Mais dans cet exemple, ישר est le complément de הוֹלֵךְ (introduit par ב) et serait donc comme un équivalent de πρὸς τῆν ἀλήθειαν dans notre texte<sup>19</sup>. Dans les manuscrits de Qumrân, en revanche,

<sup>14</sup> R. E. Ciampa, *The Presence and Function of Scripture in Galatians 1 and 2* (WUNT II/102 ; Tübingen : Mohr Siebeck, 1998), 169–70 qui s'appuie sur J. D. G. Dunn, « Echoes of Intra-Jewish Polemic in Paul's Letter to the Galatians », *JBL* 112 (1993) : 459–77 (462).

<sup>15</sup> Ciampa, *The Presence*, 170.

<sup>16</sup> F. Mussner, *Der Galaterbrief* (HTKNT 9 ; Freiburg/Basel/Wien : Herder, 1977), 144 n. 46.

<sup>17</sup> H. Ringgren and L. Alonso-Schökel, « ישר », *TDOT* 6 : 463ss.

<sup>18</sup> À cet exemple, il faudrait ajouter Mi 2,7 (הִישָׁר הוֹלֵךְ | ὁρθοὶ πεπόρευνται), mais dont le texte hébreu semble être corrompu, voir B. Renaud, *La formation du livre de Michée. Traduction et actualisation* (EB ; Paris : Gabalda, 1977), 92–93.

<sup>19</sup> L'emploi de πρὸς a posé quelques difficultés. Selon Lagrange, il devrait s'agir ici d'un équivalent de κατά.

on trouve plusieurs parallèles frappant, notamment à travers l'expression *הולכי ישר*, « ceux qui marchent droit » (participe suivi de l'emploi adverbial de *ישר*), calque parfait du verbe *ὀρθοποδεῖω*. La construction est attestée deux fois pour désigner les justes, les membres de la communauté (4Q184 1 15 et 4Q403 1 i 17<sup>20</sup>). Le premier exemple, 4Q184 1 15 (4QWiles of the Wicked Woman), est certainement le plus convaincant, le poète énonce à travers une série de constructions participiales et de propositions infinitives les méfaits que la « femme » est susceptible d'attirer sur les justes fidèles<sup>21</sup> :

ואישׁ [ע]צום ותכשילהו	לראו[ת]לא]ישׁ צדיק ותשיגהו
ולבחירי צדק מנצור מצוה	ישרים להטות דרך
והולכי ישר להשנות ח[ו]ק	סמוכי י[צ]ר להביל בפחו
ולהטות פעמיהם מדרכי צדק	להפשיע ענוים מאל
בל ידרוכו במעגלי יושר	להביא זד[ו]ן ב[לב]במה

Pour voi[r l'hom]me juste et l'atteindre,  
 et l'homme[ f]ort et le faire trébucher,  
 et infléchir la voie de ceux *qui sont droits* (ישרים),  
 et pour empêcher les élus de justices de garder le(s) précepte(s),  
 et pour faire tomber dans l'effronterie ceux qui sont fermes de pe[nch]ant  
 et pour détourner du dé[cr]et *ceux qui marchent droit* (הולכי ישר),  
 pour faire se détourner de Dieu les pauvres,  
 pour infléchir leur pas hors des chemins de la justice,  
 pour faire venir l'orgueil dans leur cœur,  
 et qu'il ne progressent pas dans des pistes de droiture (יושר).

La construction en parallélisme synonymique des propositions permet de rapprocher l'expression *הולכי ישר* « ceux qui marchent droit » des notions « d'homme important » (אישׁ [ע]צום), « de ceux qui sont droits » (ישרים), « des élus de justice » (בחירי צדק), « de ceux qui sont fermes de penchant » (סמוכי י[צ]ר), autant de désignations qui renvoient à une catégorie de justes. L'association de cette catégorie avec les notions de « voie », « de précepte » et de « décret » permet de situer l'expression « ceux qui

<sup>20</sup> Dans ce texte fragmentaire, tiré des *Chants pour l'holocauste du Sabbat* ([Le quatrième] parmi les [chef des pri]nces bénira au no[m] de la maj[esté] du r[oi] pour to[us] ceux qui marc[hent dr]oit (שר [י]הולכי [י]שר ou הולכי [י]שר, cf. DJD XI, 264) avec [sep]t paroles de maj[esté]), il n'est pas totalement clair si « ceux qui marchent droit », destinataires de la bénédiction, désignent les anges ou les membres de la communauté ou, comme c'est souvent le cas à Qumrân, les deux, à savoir les membres de la communauté en tant qu'ils se considèrent comme appartenant à la communauté angélique (voir C. Newsom, DJD XI, 262).

<sup>21</sup> Pour l'édition du texte, voir E. J. C. Tigchelaar, « The Poetry of the Wiles of the Wicked Woman (4Q184) », *RevQ* 25 (2012) : 632–33

marchent droit » dans une relation étroite à la pratique de la loi et désigne alors clairement ceux qui ont une pratique juste selon une interprétation de la loi reconnue par l'auteur du texte, c'est-à-dire, les membres de la communauté qumranienne. Quelle que soit l'interprétation que l'on donne à ce texte et en particulier à la figure métaphorique de la « femme » — métaphore d'une secte rivale pour J. Carmignac<sup>22</sup> —, cette dernière cherche à détourner l'homme de ce que l'auteur considère comme la juste pratique de la loi de « ceux qui marchent droit » (הולכי ישר).

À cet exemple, il faudrait également ajouter les nombreux emplois de l'adjectif pluriel ישרים. C'est par exemple le cas en 1QS III 1 (// 4Q257 1 a iii 2) où ceux qui ont rejeté « les instructions de la connaissance, les lois de justices » (יסורי דעת משפטי צדק), c'est-à-dire l'interprétation de la loi propre à la communauté, ne seront pas comptés parmi les « hommes droits » (ישרים) : « Car son âme a rejeté les instructions de la connaissance, il n'a pas affermi les lois de justices pour convertir sa vie, de sorte qu'avec les hommes droits, il ne sera pas compté. »

Ces exemples montrent que le verbe ὀρθοποδέω trouve dans la racine hébraïque ישר et, en particulier, dans l'expression הולך ישר un excellent arrière-fond sémitique<sup>23</sup>. La construction הולך ישר désigne clairement, tout au moins à Qumrân, ceux qui pratiquent fidèlement la loi selon la *halakha* propre à la communauté. Un tel sens s'applique parfaitement au contexte de Ga 2,14. La formule paulinienne prend alors le ton de l'ironie, ton confirmé par le verset 15 comme l'ont déjà noté la plupart des chercheurs à travers la sentence « Ἡμεῖς φύσει Ἰουδαῖοι καὶ οὐκ ἐξ ἔθνων ἀμαρτωλοί » qui radicalise le discours adverse. En effet, en refusant toute commensalité, Pierre et les autres juifs cherchent à « marcher droit » selon l'interprétation de la loi commune dans le judaïsme palestinien du temps. Paul reprendrait alors ce discours adverse pour le retourner ironiquement : « ceux qui prétendent marcher droit » selon la loi, « ne

<sup>22</sup> J. Carmignac, « Poème allégorique sur la secte rivale », *RevQ* 5 (1965) : 345–74. Selon Carmignac, la « femme » serait une métaphore de la secte rivale, peut-être le judaïsme associé au temple et au sacerdoce illégitime : « L'auteur voulait stigmatiser la secte rivale et condamner ses interprétations édulcorées de la Loi, qui étaient un tel danger pour les rigoristes de Qumrân que, dans les Hymnes V,22–32, on se plaint de défections nombreuses. (...) En définitive, il entendait composer un poème satirique contre la secte rivale, sous l'allégorie d'une courtisane » (374). Si cette interprétation est correcte, 4Q184, serait un texte polémique, au même titre que 4QMMT, est dont la problématique serait bien proche de celle de l'épître aux Galates.

<sup>23</sup> Sur cette problématique, voir l'article de A. Hogeterp dans ce volume.



marchent pas droit » selon la vérité de l'évangile, selon ce nouvel ordre moral, éthique, que Paul perçoit et qu'il voudrait voir imposer.

## B. GAL 2,15–16 ET LE TOPOS DU DISCOURS ADVERSE

Le discours que Paul adresse à Pierre glisse subtilement vers l'exposition de la thèse qui sera démontrée dans les chapitres trois et quatre de la lettre<sup>24</sup> :

<sup>16</sup> εἰδότες [δὲ] ὅτι οὐ δικαιοῦται ἄνθρωπος ἐξ ἔργων νόμου  
 ἐὰν μὴ διὰ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ,  
 καὶ ἡμεῖς εἰς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν ἐπιστεύσαμεν,  
 ἵνα δικαιωθῶμεν ἐκ πίστεως Χριστοῦ καὶ οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων νόμου,  
 ὅτι ἐξ ἔργων νόμου οὐ δικαιωθήσεται πᾶσα σὰρξ.

« Nous savons cependant que l'homme n'est pas justifié à partir des œuvres de la loi,

mais seulement à travers la foi de Jésus Christ ;

nous avons cru, nous aussi, en Jésus Christ,

afin d'être justifiés à partir de la foi du Christ et non à partir des œuvres de la loi,

parce que à partir des œuvres de la loi, aucune chair ne sera justifiée. »

L'affirmation de la justification par la foi de/en Jésus Christ est encadrée, sous la forme d'une inclusion, par deux affirmations parallèles :

« Nous savons cependant que l'homme n'est pas justifié à partir des œuvres de la loi (...)

parce que à partir des œuvres de la loi, aucune chair ne sera justifiée. »

Trois motifs de cette double formule d'encadrement trouvent à Qumrân des rapprochements éclairants : (1) l'idée que nul n'est juste devant Dieu ; (2) l'idée que l'homme n'est justifié que par la grâce divine et non par ses propres œuvres ; et enfin (3) l'expression topique « œuvres de la loi ».

### 1. La citation du Ps 143(142), 2

La formule οὐ δικαιωθήσεται πᾶσα σὰρξ a été identifiée comme une allusion au Ps 143(142),2<sup>25</sup>. Le fait qu'elle soit également attestée en Rm 3,20

<sup>24</sup> Pour la fonction de ces versets, et en particulier du verset 16, dans l'épître aux Galates, voir J.-N. Aletti, « Galates 1–2. Quelle fonction et quelle démonstration ? », *Biblica* 86 (2005) : 305–23.

<sup>25</sup> Voir également la formule de Ga 3,11 : ὅτι δὲ ἐν νόμῳ οὐδεὶς δικαιοῦται παρὰ τῷ θεῷ δῆλον.

montre qu'elle fait preuve d'une certaine fixité dans l'argumentation paulinienne<sup>26</sup> :

Ps 143,2 : וְיִשְׁפָּטֵנִי יְיָ אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל כִּי אֵין עֹשֶׂה חַיּוֹת לִפְנֵי פָנֶיךָ

« N'entre pas en jugement avec ton serviteur, car aucun vivant n'est juste devant toi. » (TOB)

Ps 142,2 LXX : καὶ μὴ εἰσέλθῃς εἰς κρίσιν μετὰ τοῦ δούλου σου ὅτι οὐ δικαιωθήσεται ἐνώπιόν σου πᾶς ζῶν

« N'entre pas en jugement avec ton serviteur, car aucun vivant ne sera justifié devant toi. »

Ga 2,16 : ὅτι ἐξ ἔργων νόμου οὐ δικαιωθήσεται πᾶσα σὰρξ

« Puisque par la pratique de la Loi aucune chair ne sera justifiée. »

Paul reprend la formulation négative au futur attestée également dans la Septante et rend l'hébreu חַי כֹּל par le plus commun πᾶσα σὰρξ (voir également Gn 8,21 où חַי כֹּל est traduit par πᾶσαν σάρκα ζῶσαν)<sup>27</sup> plutôt que par πᾶς ζῶν comme le fait la Septante. Enfin, Paul ajoute l'expression ἐξ ἔργων νόμου sur laquelle nous reviendrons. L'idée qu'aucun homme n'est juste devant Dieu est sporadiquement attestée dans les textes tardifs de la Bible hébraïque (voir, par exemple, Job 4,17 ; 9,2 ; Esd 9,15), mais jamais en se fondant sur la base du Ps 143(142),2 comme le fait Paul. En revanche, les textes de Qumrân présentent plusieurs exemples significatifs qui méritent donc d'attirer l'attention<sup>28</sup> :

<sup>26</sup> Rom 3,20 renforce cette allusion du Ps 143,2 en ajoutant ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ.

<sup>27</sup> L'expression חַי כֹּל n'apparaît que sept fois dans la bible hébraïque et est diversement rendu dans la Septante (πᾶσαν σάρκα ζῶσαν en Gn 8,21 ; πάντα ἄνθρωπον en Jb 28,21 ; παντὶ θνητῷ γῆ en Jb 30,23 ; πᾶν ζῶον en Ps 145,16). Le syntagme πᾶς ζῶν n'est attesté que neuf fois dans la Septante (dont six fois dans les deutérocanoniques) contre 62 attestations pour πᾶσα σὰρξ). Dès lors, il ne paraît pas nécessaire de sur-interpréter l'emploi de σὰρξ par Paul dans ce passage pour y voir une allusion à la circoncision (ainsi J. L. Martyn, *Galatians. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* [AB33A ; New York : DoubleDay, 1997], 253 ; R. Jewett, *Paul's Anthropological Terms. A Study of their Use in Conflict Settings* [AGJU 10 ; Leiden : Brill, 1971], 98, 112), une allusion à Gn 6,17 (B. Corsani, *Lettera ai Galati. Commentario Storico ed Esegético all'Antico e al Nuovo Testamento* [Genoa : Marietti, 1990], 170 ; H. Hübner, *Die Theologie des Paulus und ihre neutestamentliche Wirkungsgeschichte* [Biblische Theologie des Neuen Testaments 2 ; Göttingen : Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993], 65) ou encore une préparation du dualisme entre « chair » et « esprit » évoqué plus loin en Ga 5 (Ciampa, *The Presence*, 184).

<sup>28</sup> Voir J. A. Fitzmyer, « Pauline Theology », in *New Jerome Biblical Commentary* (ed. R. E. Brown, J. A. Fitzmyer, and R. E. Murphy ; London : Chapman, 1989), 1397 ; J. A. Fitzmyer, « Paul and the Dead Sea Scrolls », in *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years. A Comprehensive Assessment. Volume Two* (ed. P. W. Flint and J. C. Vanderkam, with the Assistance of A. E. Alvarez ; Leiden : Brill, 1999), 602–604. J. A. Fitzmyer, ed., *To advance the Gospel: New Testament studies* (The biblical resource series : Eerdmans, 1998) ; Lim, « Studying the Qumran Scrolls », 147–51.

1QH<sup>a</sup> XV 31 (// 1QH<sup>b</sup> 1 // 4QH<sup>b</sup> 9 // 4QpapH<sup>f</sup> 12)

כִּי מִי כְמוֹכָה בְּאֵלִים אֲדוֹנֵי וּמִי כְּאִמְתְּכָה וּמִי יִצְדֵּק לַפְּנִיכָה בְּהַשְׁפֹּטוֹ<sup>29</sup> וְאִין 31  
 לְהִשִּׁיב עַל תּוֹכַחְתְּכָה כּוֹל צַבְעֵי רוּחַ וְלֹא יוֹכֵל כּוֹל לְהִתִּיצֵב לַפְּנֵי חַ(ב)מִתְדָּה וְכוּל בְּנֵי 32  
 אִמְתְּכָה תְּבִיא בְּסִלְיָחוֹת לַפְּנִיכָה לְטָהָרִם מִפְּשְׁעֵיהֶם בְּרֹב טוֹבָכָה וּבְהִמּוֹן רְחֻמֵיכָה 33  
 לְהַעֲמִידִם לַפְּנִיכָה לְעוֹלְמֵי עַד כִּי אֵל עוֹלָם אֵתָהּ וְכוּל דְּרַכִּיכָה יְכוֹנוּ לְנֹצַח 34  
 נְצֻחִים וְאִין זֹלְתְּכָה 35

31 Car, qui est comme toi parmi les dieux, Adonaï ?

Qui est comme ta vérité ? (Ex 15,11)

Et qui serait juste devant toi lorsqu'il est jugé ? (Ps 143,2 ?)

Personne 32 ne peut répliquer contre ton accusation (Hab 2,1 ; Prov 1,23),

Toute <sup>splendeur</sup> est du vent,

Et nul ne peut subsister devant ta colère.

Mais tous tes fils 33 fidèles, tu les fais venir aux pardons devant toi,

Pour les purifier de leurs péchés par l'abondance de ta bonté et par la richesse de ta compassion (Ps 31,20 ; 145,7 ; Is 63,7)

34 pour les placer devant toi pour les éternités de toujours (Is 45,17).

Car toi, tu es un Dieu éternel,

Et toutes tes voies sont affermies pour la perpétuité 35 des perpétuités (Gn 21,33 ; Pr 4,26 ; Is 34,10 ; Si 51,20),

Et il n'y a rien excepté toi.

Dans ce poème composé sur la base de différentes évocations bibliques, la formule « et qui serait juste devant toi lorsqu'il est jugé » reformule la sentence du Ps 143,2 sous la forme d'une question rhétorique qui invite à répondre « personne » (s.e. כִּי ... לֹא). L'auteur de l'hymne oppose la splendeur divine au péché de l'homme et affirme sa confiance totale en Dieu qui accueille ses fils fidèles en vertu, non de leur propre justice, mais de ses pardons (בְּסִלְיָחוֹת), de l'abondance de sa bonté (בְּרֹב טוֹבָכָה) et de la richesse de sa compassion (בְּהִמּוֹן רְחֻמֵיכָה). Le motif du jugement (בְּהַשְׁפֹּטוֹ ou בְּהַשְׁפֹּטְכָה en 1QH<sup>b</sup> 1 2), déjà présent dans le premier stique du Ps 143,2, prend dans cet hymne une coloration eschatologique absente du Psaume 143, elle est renforcée par le thème de l'éternité évoqué aux ll. 34–35 (לְעוֹלְמֵי עַד ... לְנֹצַח נְצֻחִים). Cette dimension eschatologique est également sous-entendue dans la formule paulinienne.

Un même constat est posé en 1QH<sup>a</sup> XVII 14–17 où l'homme espère en la miséricorde divine, car il sait, selon le Ps 143,2 que nul n'est juste face au jugement divin.

1QH<sup>a</sup> XVII 14–17

וְאֲדַעָהּ כִּי [י] יֵשׁ מְקוּהָ בְּחִסְדֵיכָה וְתוֹחֵלָה בְּרֹב כּוֹחָכָה כִּי לֹא יִצְדֵּק 14  
 כּוֹל בְּמִשְׁפָּטְכָה וְלֹא יִזְכֶּה [ה] בְּרִיבְכָה... 15

<sup>29</sup> בְּהַשְׁפֹּטְכָה dans 1QH<sup>b</sup> 1 2.

« Je sais qu'il y a de l'espoir dans ta grâce,  
 Et de la confiance dans l'abondance de ta force,  
 Car personne ne sera juste lors de ton ju[ge]ment (Ps 143,2)  
 Ni inno[cent dans ]ton procès »

Comme dans l'exemple précédent, le Ps 143,2 est associé au motif du jugement (בְּמִשְׁפָּטָה)<sup>30</sup>. L'emploi de משפט accompagné du pronom suffixe de la deuxième personne renforce la visée eschatologique de la formule. Là encore, l'incapacité de l'homme à être juste est opposée à la grâce (בַּחֲסִדִּיכָה, l. 14) et au pardon divin (בְּסִלְיָחוֹת, l.13).

À ces deux exemples, il faut également ajouter la formule de 1QH<sup>a</sup> VIII 29, également forgé sur la base du Ps 143,2, et dont le contexte est éclairant :

« Et je sais que nul n'est juste en dehors de toi (וְאִדְעָה כִּי לֹא יִצְדַק אִישׁ) (מִבְּלִעְדִּיךָ) et j'ai apaisé ta face par l'esprit que tu as mis en moi pour concilier 30 tes faveurs envers ton serviteur pour[ touj]ours, pour me purifier par ton esprit de sainteté et pour me faire approcher par ton bon plaisir selon tes grandes grâces (בְּרִצְוֹנְךָ כְּגִדּוֹל חֲסִדִּיךָ) que tu as faites 31 à mon égard et pour [faire] ten[ir mes pas en] tout lieu de [ton bon] plaisir que tu as [ch]oisi pour ceux qui t'aiment et qui gardent [tes] commandements [pour tenir] 32 devant toi pour toujours (...) 34 (...) Et je sai[s que toi tu es un Dieu ]plein de pitié et de tendresse, lent à la colère et riche en grâce et en fidélité qui pardonne l'offense et l'infid[élité ] 35 et qui a pitié de t[oute l'iniquité de] ceux qui t'[aim]ent et qui garde [tes] commandement[s, ceux] qui reviennent vers toi par la fidélité et un cœur parfait. »

L'auteur oppose là encore l'incapacité de l'homme à être juste à la miséricorde, la bonté que Dieu met en œuvre en sa faveur : חֲסִד (l. 27), וְתַחֲוֹנֵנִי (l. 27), בְּרוּחַ רַחֲמֶיךָ (« tu as eu pitié de moi par ton esprit de tendresse », l. 27), כְּגִדּוֹל חֲסִדִּיךָ (l. 30). La suite du texte montre que cette faveur divine est réservée à « ceux qui l'aiment et qui gardent ses commandements » repris deux fois dans cet Hymne (l. 33 et 35), selon la formule topique d'Ex 20,6 ; Dt 5,10 ; 7,9 ; Neh 1,5 ; Dn 9,4<sup>31</sup>. Aussi, cet homme, pour qui la justice est inaccessible, est aussi celui qui aime Dieu et qui garde ses préceptes, expression qui lors de sa deuxième occurrence est liée au motif de la conversion par la fidélité (אֲמוּנָה, l. 35) terme équivalent à la notion de πίστις chez Paul.

La même allusion au Ps 143,2 est également attestée dans la colonne V de 4Q176 (4QTan<sup>h</sup>) reconstruite à partir des fragments 16, 17, 18, 22, 23,

<sup>30</sup> Voir en particulier la variante de 1QH<sup>b</sup> 112 בְּהַשְׁפָּטָה.

<sup>31</sup> À Qumrân, elle est également attestée en 4Q176 V 5 (cf. infra), en 4Q393 3 2, en CD XIX 2 et, parallèle éclairant, pour caractériser Abraham en CD III 2 (// 4Q266 2 ii 22) : יִיעֵל אוֹהֵב בְּשִׁמְרוֹ מִצְוֹת אֵל.

33, 51, 53. Le texte a été édité par J. Alegro en 1968<sup>32</sup>. En 1970, J. Strugnell proposa une mise en place des fragments<sup>33</sup> repris par F. García Martínez et E. Tigchelaar<sup>34</sup>, puis par H. Lichtenberger<sup>35</sup>, et enfin récemment révisé par Jesper Høgenhaven<sup>36</sup>. Sans entrer dans le détail de la reconstruction, nous pouvons noter que l'allusion au Ps 143,2 (ll. 1–2) — « car [personne] ne sera juste 2 dev[ant lui] ([ מְלֵאֲפִינִי 2 כּוֹל אִישׁ ] [כִּי לֹא יִצְדַק] )<sup>37</sup> » — est liée à un discours relatif à la création et à l'ordonnement du monde et est suivie d'une allusion au jugement : « il a visité tout homme et selon son mystère, il a fait tomber le sort pour chacun » ([פְּקִי אֵל כּוֹל אִישׁ וְכֹל] (רְזוּ הַפִּיל גּוֹרֵל לְאִישׁ)<sup>38</sup>. Comme en 1QH<sup>a</sup> VIII 29ss, la perspective de salut semble être réservée à « ceux qui aiment Dieu et qui gardent ses commandements (עַל אוֹהֲבוֹ וְעַל שׁוֹמְרֵי מִצְוֹתָיו) », « ceux qui pratiquent la loi (עַל שְׂוֵת הַתּוֹרָה) » (l. 7) ». Høgenhaven note que ces références devraient impliquer l'existence d'un autre groupe qui n'aime pas Dieu et qui ne pratique pas la loi, ce qui semble être confirmé par les lignes 7–8 qui évoquent ce(ux) que Dieu hait (שֵׁנְאָתָה, l. 7) et qu'il destine à la destruction (בְּלוֹתָם, l. 8). Le texte semble ainsi avoir une visée eschatologique. Malheureusement, le texte est trop fragmentaire pour laisser percevoir l'articulation entre l'allusion au Ps 143,2, la question de la pratique de la loi évoquée dans les lignes 5 et 7 et la question du jugement dont il semble être question aux lignes 7 à 8<sup>39</sup>. On remarquera que ces trois éléments s'articulent également en 1QH<sup>a</sup> VIII 29ss et en Ga 2,16.

<sup>32</sup> J. Allegro, *Qumran Cave 4 : I (DJDJ 5* ; Oxford : Clarendon, 1968), 60–67.

<sup>33</sup> J. Strugnell, « Notes en marge du volume V des “Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan” », *RevQ* 7 (1970) : 235 et 258 ; voir également C. D. Stanley, « The Importance of 4QTanḥumim (4Q176) », *RevQ* 15 (1991–1992) : 569–82.

<sup>34</sup> F. García Martínez et E. J. C. Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* (Paperback edition ; Leiden : Brill, 2000), 361.

<sup>35</sup> H. Lichtenberger, « Consolations (4Q176 = 4QTanḥ) », in *The Dead Sea Scrolls. Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations. Volume 6B. Pesharim, Other Commentaries, and Related Documents* (ed. J. H. Charlesworth ; Tübingen : Mohr Siebeck / Louisville : John Knox, 2002), 329–49, 344.

<sup>36</sup> J. Høgenhaven, « The Literary Character of 4QTanḥumim », *DSD* 14 (2007) : 99–123 ; J. Høgenhaven, « 4QTanḥumim (4Q176) : Between Exegesis and Treatise? », in *The Mermaid and the Partridge: Essays from the Copenhagen Conference on Revising Texts from Cave Four* (ed. G. J. Brooke and J. Høgenhaven ; STDJ 96 ; Leiden : Brill, 2011), 151–67.

<sup>37</sup> Il est tout aussi possible de restaurer כּוֹל חַי comme en Ps 143,2 que כּוֹל אִישׁ proposé par Høgenhaven (Strugnell restaure juste אִישׁ).

<sup>38</sup> Restauration de Høgenhaven, Strugnell propose une restauration légèrement plus longue qui ne change pas fondamentalement le sens de la proposition אֵל כּוֹל אִישׁ [פְּקִי אֵל כּוֹל אִישׁ וְכֹל] [רְזוּ הַפִּיל גּוֹרֵל] [לְאִישׁ] בּה. [וְכֹל רְזוּ הַפִּיל גּוֹרֵל] [לְאִישׁ].

<sup>39</sup> Sans noter cette allusion commune au Ps 143,2 en 4Q176 et en Ga 2,16, Stanley (« The Importance of 4QTanḥumim (4Q176) », 581–82) remarque des liens de parenté

Enfin, à cette série d'exemples, il faut ajouter l'allusion en 4QInstruction<sup>40</sup>. Le contexte de la formule mérite d'être noté : comme à plusieurs reprises dans le rouleau, l'auteur articule conseils de sagesse et conséquence eschatologique. Aussi dans ce passage, l'idée qu'aucun homme ne peut être juste devant Dieu et que l'homme ne peut être justifié sans le pardon divin est articulé avec des conseils de sagesse. C'est dire que Dieu sera miséricordieux si l'homme pratique la sagesse :

« Et alors Dieu verra et sa colère se détournera  
Et il passera sur tes péchés [ca]r devant [sa colère vac.] nul ne tiendra.  
Et qui serait juste dans son jugement (ומי יצדק במשפטו)<sup>41</sup> ?  
Et sans pardon, comment [chaque] pauvre [serait-il justifié] ? »  
4Q417 2 i 15-17

Comme dans le rouleau des Hymnes, l'auteur de 4QInstruction présente la formule du Ps 143,2 sous la forme d'une question rhétorique et l'associe au motif du jugement divin. Le texte de 4QInstruction présente un intérêt particulier dans la mesure où l'auteur n'articule pas la question du salut avec la pratique des commandements, mais plutôt avec la pratique des conseils de sagesse et l'adhésion au « mystère de l'existence » (רז נהיה). Cette nouvelle catégorisation pourrait présenter un parallèle intéressant, bien que difficile à préciser avec la vision de Paul.

Ces quelques exemples sont suffisamment explicites et nombreux<sup>42</sup> pour montrer que Paul, en affirmant « nous savons que... nul n'est juste devant Dieu », en Ga 2,16, pose les bases de son argumentation sur un *topos*, sur un discours doxique largement répandu dans le judaïsme du second temple et, en toute vraisemblance, accepté de tous et en particulier de ses adversaires. Ce type de rhétorique est caractéristique de la controverse, où la démonstration doit pouvoir reposer sur une base acceptable pour l'opinion adverse. La formule « nous savons que » renforce cette assomption (cf. Rm 3,28). La formule doit recevoir l'agrément de tous, non seulement du fait qu'elle repose sur un argument scripturaire, mais également parce que son interprétation en contexte eschatologique est traditionnelle. Il faut néanmoins noter que Paul biaise la formule doxique. En effet, la plupart des références associent l'allusion au Ps 143,2 à la pratique de la loi : la miséricorde divine est réservée à ceux qui gardent sa parole et

---

entre cette composition et l'argumentation de Paul.

<sup>40</sup> Lim, « Studying the Qumran Scrolls », 150.

<sup>41</sup> En 4Q418 7a 2 : ומי יצדק במשפטו.

<sup>42</sup> Voir aussi 4Q525 10 5 (voir A. Hogeterp, p. 274 dans ce volume).

ses commandements, élément face auquel Paul prend une position radicalement opposée.

## 2. Gal 2,16 et 1QS

Dès les premières découvertes de la grotte 1 de Qumrân, l'affirmation de Paul selon laquelle l'homme est justifié par la grâce seule et non par ses propres facultés, a été mise en relation avec l'hymne final de la Règle de la Communauté<sup>43</sup>. Je me contenterai de mettre en valeur deux éléments : les questions sémantiques liées aux racines צדק et שפט et les tensions de cet hymne avec les colonnes III et IV de la règle<sup>44</sup>.

À partir de la ligne 2 de la colonne XI de la Règle, l'hymne prend un ton plus introspectif organisé en trois sections introduites par וַאֲנִי כִּי אֲנִי ou וַאֲנִי (XI 2–9 ; 9–11 ; 11–15). Les deux premières parties jouent sur des antithèses fortes — avec un effet rhétorique certain — qui mettent en valeur, d'un côté, des élus à qui Dieu donne une possession éternelle et qu'il associe à la communauté des fils des cieux et, d'un autre côté, l'auteur qui confesse son impiété et qui s'identifie avec « l'homme impie et à l'assemblée de la chair de perversion ». Ce dernier met alors toute sa confiance en Dieu qui le « justifiera » en vertu de sa bonté, de sa grâce :

וַאֲנִי אִם 12 אֲמוֹט	11 Mais moi, si 12 je chancelle,
חֲסִדֵי אֵל יִשׁוּעָתִי לְעַד	la grâce de Dieu sera mon salut pour toujours.
וְאִם אֲכַשׁוּל בְּעוֹוֹן בָּשָׂר	Et si je trébuche par l'iniquité de la chair,
מִשְׁפָּטִי בְצַדִּיקָת אֵל תַּעֲמוּד לְנִצְחִים	ma justification viendra par la justice de Dieu qui subsiste éternellement.
13 (...) בְּרַחֲמָיו הִגִּישָׁנִי	(...) 13 Par ses miséricordes Il m'a fait approcher,
וּבְחֲסִדָּיו יָבֹוא 14 מִשְׁפָּטִי	et par sa grâce il introduira 14 ma justification.
בְּצַדִּיקָת אֲמָתוֹ שְׁפָטֵנִי	Par sa justice fidèle, il m'a justifié,
וּבְרֹב טוֹבוֹ יִכְפַּר בְּעַד כּוֹל עוֹוֹנוֹתַי	par l'abondance de sa bonté, il ira jusqu'à pardonner tous mes égarements,
וּבְצַדִּיקָתוֹ יִטְהַרְנִי מִגְדַּת 15 אָנוּשׁ	et par sa justice, il me purifiera de la souillure 15 humaine

<sup>43</sup> Voir D. Flusser, « The Dead Sea Sect and Pre-Pauline Christianity », in *Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. C. Rabin and Y. Yadin ; ScrHier IV ; Jerusalem : The Hebrew University Magnes Press, 1958), 225–27 ; E. P. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism. A Comparison of Patterns of Religion* (London : SCM Press, 1977), 307–312 ; 546 ; J. A. Fitzmyer, « Paul and the Dead Sea Scrolls », in *The Dead Sea Scrolls after fifty years. A Comprehensive Assessment. Volume Two* (ed. P. W. Flint, J. C. Vanderkam and A. E. Alvarez ; Leiden : Brill, 1999), 602–603 ; J. D. G. Dunn, *The New Perspective on Paul. Revised Edition* (WUNT 185 ; Tübingen : Mohr Siebeck ; Grand Rapids : Eerdmans, 2008), 3–4.

<sup>44</sup> Voir également la contribution de Florentino García Martínez dans ce volume.



וחטאת בני אדם et du péché des fils d'Adam,  
 להודות לאל צדקו pour rendre grâce à Dieu de sa justice  
 ולעליון תפארתו et au Très-Haut de sa magnificence ».

Le rapprochement entre cet hymne et la pensée de Paul, en particulier avec Ga 2,16, est non seulement thématique mais également sémantique par l'emploi des racines צדק et שפט qui renvoient au domaine de la justice. Alors que dans la bible hébraïque ces termes ne sont jamais explicitement liés à la notion de « justification », c'est clairement cette notion que le texte présuppose, non en vertu d'une pratique juste, mais en vertu de la seule miséricorde divine<sup>45</sup>. Cela montre que le passage de l'idée de « justice » et de « jugement » vers la notion de « justification » est bien attesté à Qumrân avant qu'elle devienne un élément fondamental de la pensée et de l'argumentation de Paul. Cela montre aussi que sur cette question là, Paul construit également son argumentation sur la base d'une donnée solidement attestée dans le judaïsme ancien, ou tout au moins dans les textes de Qumrân, et qui devrait donc être acceptable pour ses opposants.

Le second élément qui mérite d'attirer l'attention, est la tension entre cette notion d'une justification par la seule grâce de Dieu en 1QS XI, indépendante des œuvres (« Et moi j'appartiens à l'homme d'impiété et à l'assemblée charnelle de perversité [... ] », 1QS XI 9 et 1QS XI 11–15, cité plus haut) et le catalogue de vices et de vertus en 1QS IV 2–18 qui conditionne l'issue du jugement à une pratique éthique rigoureuse (1QS IV 6–8.11–14). Ceux qui marchent (הלך, 1QS IV 6) dans l'esprit de fidélité sont destinés à « la joie éternelle dans la vie perpétuelle » (1QS IV 7) tandis que ceux qui marchent (הלך, 1QS IV 12) dans l'esprit de perversité sont destinés à « une

<sup>45</sup> Voir en particulier l'analyse de E. Zurli, « La giustificazione 'solo per grazia' in 1QS X, 9–XI e 1QH<sup>a</sup> », *RevQ* 20 (2002) : 445–77 ; E. Zurli, *La giustificazione « solo per grazia » negli scritti di Qumran. Analisi dell'inno finale della Regola della comunità e degli inni* (Napoli : Chirico, 2003) ; voir également l'analyse de F. García Martínez dans ce volume ; P. Garnet, *Salvation and Atonement in the Qumran Scrolls* (WUNT II/3 ; Tübingen : Mohr Siebeck, 1977), 70–71. Certains auteurs ont voulu nuancer ce rapprochement. Ainsi P. Guilbert remarque que la traduction de שפט par « justification » « est possible, à condition toutefois de ne pas lui donner la profondeur de sens théologique que ce terme revêt chez S. Paul » (*Les textes de Qumrân traduits et annotés. 1. La Règle de la communauté. La Règle de la guerre. Les Hymnes* (par J. Carmignac et P. Guilbert) ; Paris : Letouzey et Ané, 1961), 76–77, n. 124. Fitzmyer va dans le même sens en notant qu'on ne trouve aucun équivalent à la notion de justification développée par Paul ni dans l'Ancien Testament, ni dans les textes de Qumrân (Fitzmyer, « Paul and the Dead Sea Scrolls », 604–605).



destruction éternelle par l'ardente colère du Dieu des vengeances » (1QS IV 11–12)<sup>46</sup>.

Selon C. Newsom, cette tension chercherait à théoriser une problématique qui aurait été laissée de côté par la tradition sapientielle : pourquoi y a-t-il tant de résistances à parvenir à pratiquer la sagesse même parmi les instruits ? Pourquoi certaines personnes semblent naître folles et qu'inversement d'autres semblent pratiquer la sagesse avec aisance<sup>47</sup> ? Cette tension est formalisée dans l'instruction sur les deux esprits par le motif de l'inimitié et du combat entre les deux esprits en 1QS IV 17–18 : « il a établi une inimitié éternelle entre leurs catégories ויתן איבת עולם בין מפלגותם ». Le texte prolonge cette opposition dans le cœur de l'homme par le motif du conflit : « une ardente querelle (קנאת ריב) (oppose) toutes leurs décisions, car ils ne marchent pas ensemble » (IV 17–18) et encore à la ligne 23 : « Jusqu'à ce moment, les esprits de fidélité et de perversité sont en conflit (יריבו) dans le cœur de l'homme ».

Or, une même tension est également perceptible dans l'épître aux Galates entre l'affirmation de la justification par la foi en Ga 2,16 et 3,11 et le catalogue des vices et des vertus en Ga 5,16–26 où Paul précisément formalise la tension entre chair et esprit par le motif du conflit : « Car la chair convoite contre l'Esprit, et l'Esprit contre la chair ; entre eux, c'est l'antagonisme (γὰρ ἀλλήλοισι ἀντίκειται) ; aussi ne faites-vous pas ce que vous voulez ». Le verbe ἀντίκειμαι est un bon équivalent sémantique de l'hébreu אֵיבָה, אֵיבָה (cf. Est 9,2 ; Is 66,6), rendant ainsi palpable le parallèle frappant avec 1QS IV 17–18 : « il a établi une inimitié éternelle entre leurs catégories ויתן איבת עולם בין מפלגותם ». Comme dans 1QS, la pratique des « œuvres de la chair » ou des « fruits de l'esprit » conditionne l'issue du jugement eschatologique : « Ceux qui font de telles choses n'hériteront pas du royaume de Dieu » (Ga 5,21).

Les rapprochements entre le catalogue de Ga 5,16–26 et celui d'1QS IV 6–8.11–14 ont été souligné par les chercheurs dès les années 1952<sup>48</sup>.

<sup>46</sup> Pour l'articulation entre conseil de sagesse et conséquences eschatologiques, voir 4QInstruction (entre autres J.-S. Rey, *4QInstruction : sagesse et eschatologie* (STDJ 81 ; Leiden : Brill, 2009).

<sup>47</sup> C. Newsom, *The Self as Symbolic Space. Constructing Identity and Community at Qumran* (STDJ 52 ; Leiden : Brill, 2004), 132–33. Cette problématique nous paraît néanmoins être déjà abordée de manière subtile en Ben Sira (cf. Si 15,11ss et Si 33,7–15).

<sup>48</sup> Partiellement par K. G. Kuhn, « Πειρασμός – ἀμαρτία – σάρξ im Neuen Testament und die damit zusammen-hängenden Vorstellung », *ZThK* 49 (1952) : 200–222 ; trad. et révision en anglais dans « New Light on Temptation, Sin, and Flesh in the New Testament », in *The Scrolls and the New Testament* (ed. Krister Stendahl ; London : SCM Press, 1958), 94–113 ; Flusser, « The Dead Sea Sect », 261–63 ; W. D. Davies, « Paul and the Dead Sea

S'il est clair que ce genre littéraire est attesté dans la littérature hellénistique et hébraïque de l'époque hellénistique et romaine<sup>49</sup>, il reste que nos deux textes présentent des singularités qui leur sont propres comme, par exemple, le motif du combat entre deux puissances antithétiques et l'articulation du catalogue de vices et de vertus avec les conséquences eschatologiques.

Mais les correspondances entre les deux textes ne se limitent pas à ces deux éléments. Des similarités sont également constatables au niveau de la structure des deux péricopes : (a) une introduction générale qui souligne l'opposition entre deux catégories opposées (esprits de lumières et de ténèbres, esprits de fidélité et de perversité, chair et esprit) ; (b<sub>1</sub>) une introduction de la première catégorie, (b<sub>2</sub>) suivie du premier catalogue, (b<sub>3</sub>) puis une description des conséquences eschatologiques ; (c<sub>1</sub>) une introduction de la seconde catégorie, (c<sub>2</sub>) suivie du deuxième catalogue opposé, (c<sub>3</sub>) puis, en 1QS, une description des conséquences eschatologiques et, en Ga, une conclusion sur l'agir des croyants<sup>50</sup>.

Les catégories opposées dans les deux textes ne sont certes pas totalement similaires. On ne retrouve pas en Galates l'opposition entre « esprits de fidélité et de perversité » (רוחות האמת והעול, 1QS III 18–19) ou entre « esprits de lumière et de ténèbres (אור וחושך, 1QS III 25) », mais plutôt l'opposition entre « les œuvres de la chair » (ἔργα τῆς σαρκός) et « les fruits de l'esprit » (καρπὸς τοῦ πνεύματός). Néanmoins, les concepts ne sont pas réellement éloignés si l'on compare, par exemple, les expressions parallèles en Eph 5,8–11 qui joue, comme en 1QS, sur l'opposition entre lumières et ténèbres : « œuvres de ténèbres (τοῖς ἔργοις τοῖς ἀκάργοις τοῦ σκότους) » et « fruits de lumières (καρπὸς τοῦ φωτός) ». Il convient également de noter qu'en 1QS IV 6, « l'esprit de fidélité » est désigné, comme chez Paul, de manière absolue : « Voici les conseils de l'esprit pour les fils fidèles ». Enfin, il faut noter que dans ce passage (voir également Rm 8,5–8), Paul associe le terme σάρξ à la notion d'iniquité et le conçoit comme

---

Scrolls: Flesh and Spirit », in *The Scrolls and the New Testament* (ed. K. Stendahl ; London : SCM Press, 1958), 157–82 ; S. Wibbing, *Die Tugend- und Lasterkataloge im Neuen Testament und ihre Traditionsgeschichte unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Qumran-Texte* (Berlin : Alfred Töpelmann, 1959), 44–76 ; 110–11 ; E. Kamlah, *Die Form der katalogischen Paränese im Neuen Testament* (WUNT 7 ; Tübingen : Mohr Siebeck) ; Kuhn, « Die Bedeutung der Qumrantexte », 182–86.

<sup>49</sup> A. Vögtle, *Die Tugend- und Lasterkataloge im Neuen Testament: Exegetisch, religions- und formgeschichtlich untersucht* (NTA 16, 4/5 : Münster, 1936) ; Wibbing, *Die Tugend- und Lasterkataloge*, 14–23.

<sup>50</sup> Voir Kuhn, « Die Bedeutung der Qumrantexte », 182.



tique éthique ne paraît pas être une singularité paulinienne. Là encore, il paraît légitime d'envisager une forme de dialogisme. Paul construit son argumentation sur la base de conceptions communes, attestées parmi les textes de Qumrân, et qui témoignent donc d'un certain développement dans le judaïsme palestinien de l'époque hellénistique et du début de l'époque romaine.

### 3. Les « œuvres de la loi »

L'affirmation qu' « aucune chair ne sera justifiée », basée sur le Ps 143,2 et fondée sur une donnée commune du judaïsme palestinien, reçoit un complément qui en modifie radicalement : « aucune chair ne sera justifiée en vertu des œuvres de la loi ». Ce syntagme « œuvres de la loi » (cf. Gal 3,2.5.10 et Rm 3,20.28), qui revient à trois reprises dans ce verset, en opposition à la « foi du Christ », fait lui aussi référence à une donnée connue du judaïsme de ce temps ou tout au moins, en toute vraisemblance, des opposants auxquels Paul répond. Le fait que l'expression, absente de la Bible hébraïque, soit attestée en hébreu à Qumran permet de le montrer<sup>54</sup>. Je me limiterai à reprendre quatre points de contact entre 4QMMT et l'épître aux Galates déjà mis en valeur par les chercheurs :

1. 4QMMT se présente comme une lettre polémique relative à des questions d'interprétation de la loi. Ces questions d'interprétation présentent une telle importance qu'elle justifie la séparation du groupe qui les présuppose du reste du peuple : « vous savez] que nous nous sommes séparés [nous-mêmes] de la majorité du peuple (יודע[ים ש[אנחנו [פרשו] מרוב העם] » (4Q397 14–21 7). Ce motif de la séparation en raison d'une interprétation de la loi divergente ne peut pas ne pas rappeler la formule de Ga 2,12 « En effet, avant que soient venus des gens envoyés par Jacques, il prenait ses repas avec les païens ; mais, après leur arrivée, il se mit à se dérober et se sépara (ἀφώριζεν ἑαυτόν), par peur des circoncis », bien qu'ἀφωρίζω ne traduise jamais פרוש dans la Septante, le rapprochement est ici probant<sup>55</sup>.

2. En 4QMMT, les œuvres de la loi renvoient aux interprétations de la loi discutées dans la première partie du document. La pratique de ces « œuvres » est une condition nécessaire pour obtenir la justification.

<sup>54</sup> Voir également les contributions de F. García Martínez, É. Puech et L. Doering dans ce volume.

<sup>55</sup> Voir J. W. Doeve, « Paulus der Pharisäer und Galater i 13–15 », *NT* 6 (1963) : 170–81.

C'est ce que permet de comprendre l'épilogue de 4QMMT C 25–32 (4Q397 23 2–7 // 398 14–17 ii // 4Q399 1 ii 2–5)<sup>56</sup> :

« Souviens-toi de David qui fut un homme de bienfaits et aussi 2 il fut délivré de grands malheurs et il lui fut pardonné. Et aussi nous t'avons écrit nous-mêmes 3 au sujet de quelques œuvres de la Loi que nous estimons pour ton bien et pour (celui de) ton peuple, car nous nous attachons 4 avec toi à<sup>57</sup> (/car nous avons vu 4 que tu as/<sup>58</sup>) la prudence et à la connaissance de la Loi. Considère toutes ces choses et supplie-Le qu'Il fortifie 5 ta volonté et qu'Il éloigne de toi les pensées (/le dessein/<sup>59</sup>) du mal et le{s} dessein{s} de Bélial, 6 de sorte que tu te réjouisses à la fin du(/es) temps, en trouvant (quelques uns)<sup>60</sup> de nos dires (être) fondés ; 7 et cela te sera compté comme justice, quand tu fais ce qui est droit et ce qui est bon en Sa présence, pour ton propre bien 8 et pour celui d'Israël<sup>61</sup>. »

3. La formulation « et cela te sera compté comme justice (ונחשבה לך לצדקה), quand tu fais ce qui est droit et ce qui est bon en sa présence » d'une part fait référence aux interprétations de la loi que l'auteur vient d'énoncer (מקצת דברינו) et, d'autre part, appuie le propos de l'auteur par une allusion à Gn 15,6 (voir aussi Ps 106,31). Nous reviendrons sur cette allusion à Gn 15,6 dans l'argumentation de Paul en Ga 3,6 (voir aussi Rm 4,3).

4. La péricope qui précède l'épilogue de 4QMMT, joue sur l'opposition entre bénédictions et malédictions prévues pour la fin des jours, sur la base de Dt 30,1–2 : « et il est écrit : 'Et il arrivera que viendront sur toi toutes ces choses à la fin des jours, la bénédiction et la malédiction, mais en la prenant à cœur, tu peux revenir vers lui de tout ton cœur et de toute ton âme, à la fin des jours' » (4Q397 14–21 ii 12–15). L'auteur, comme dans l'hymne final de la Règle de la communauté, espère dans le pardon divin dispensé en faveur des hommes pieux (4Q397 14–21 ii 16–17) : « souviens toi de David qui fut un homme de bienfaits et aussi il fut délivré de grands malheurs et il lui fut pardonné ». Comme l'a noté Dunn, l'argumentation rejoint partiellement celle de Gal 3,8–14 :

« With considerable subtlety Paul contrives a fresh variation on this interplay, by integrating the Abrahamic blessing into the Deuteronomic pattern

<sup>56</sup> Pour l'édition du texte, voir désormais, É. Puech, « L'épilogue de 4QMMT revisité », in *A Teacher for All Generations. Essays in Honor of James C. VanderKam. Volume One* (ed. E. F. Mason and al. ; JSJS 153/1 ; Leiden/Boston : Brill, 2012), 309–339.

<sup>57</sup> Ainsi 4Q398 14-17 ii 3.

<sup>58</sup> Ainsi 4Q399 1 i 11.

<sup>59</sup> Ainsi 4Q399 1 ii 2 qui ommet בליעל וועצת.

<sup>60</sup> Absent de 4Q399 1 ii 3.

<sup>61</sup> Trad. É. Puech, « L'épilogue de 4QMMT », légèrement modifiée.

of blessing and curse, thereby switching the emphasis from the thought of Gentile cursing to that of Gentile blessing. »<sup>62</sup> (p. 342).

En conclusion, on peut donc constater que dans l'affirmation dense de Ga 2,16, Paul emploie différentes stratégies discursives caractéristiques de la controverse. Tout d'abord, Paul enracine son argumentation sur une donnée commune du judaïsme palestinien du tournant de notre ère : nul ne peut prétendre être juste devant Dieu, la capacité à justifier l'homme n'appartenant qu'à Dieu seul. L'ajout du complément « en vertu des œuvres de la loi » donne à la proposition une tournure radicalement polémique. En effet, le texte de 4QMMT témoigne du fait que dans le judaïsme palestinien du tournant de notre ère la pratique des « œuvres de la loi » était étroitement liée à la question de la justification même si cette dernière, au final, relève de la seule grâce divine en vertu de l'alliance. En filigrane du discours de Paul, se dessine prudemment le discours adverse qui devait être proche des considérations de 4QMMT. Paul pose alors un contre discours, en imposant une dissociation radicale entre les « œuvres de la loi » et la justification aboutissant ainsi à une distorsion d'une réalité, somme toute, complexe. L'argumentation de Paul consiste à reprendre des lieux communs du judaïsme du second temple, et probablement du discours adverse, pour les pousser à l'extrême et en dégager une signification nouvelle.

### C. GN 15,6 ET LE CONTRE-DISOURS

La citation que Paul fait de Gn 15,6 en Ga 3,6–9 correspond au texte de la LXX, mais également à la citation qui en est faite en 4Q225 2 i 7–8<sup>63</sup>. Cette constatation permet de conclure que l'usage de Gn 15,6 dans le Nouveau Testament (Rm 4,3,9 ; Gal 3,6 et Jc 2,23) ne s'enracine pas nécessairement

<sup>62</sup> J. D. G. Dunn, « 4QMMT and Galatians », in *The New Perspective on Paul. Revised Edition* (ed. J. D. G. Dunn ; WUNT 185 ; Tübingen : Mohr Siebeck ; Grand Rapids : Eerdmans, 2008), 342 initialement publié dans *NTS* 43 (1997) : 147–53.

<sup>63</sup> Cf. R. Mosis, « Gen 15,6 in Qumran und in der Septuaginta », in *Gesammelte Aufsätze zum Alten Testament* (FzB 93 ; Würzburg : Echter Verlag, 1999), 95–118 ; J. A. Fitzmyer, « The Interpretation of Genesis 15:6: Abraham's Faith and Righteousness in a Qumran Text », in *Emanuel : Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov* (ed. S. Paul et al. ; VTSup 94 ; Leiden : Brill, 2003), 257–68 ; F. García Martínez, « The Sacrifice of Isaac in 4Q225 », in *The Sacrifice of Isaac: the Aqedah (Genesis 22) and its Interpretations* (ed. E. Noort and E. J. C. Tigchelaar ; ThBN 4 ; Leiden : Brill, 2002), 44–57, ici 48.

dans la Septante, mais plutôt dans une tradition textuelle hébraïque similaire à celle de 4Q225 2 i 7-8<sup>64</sup>.

Ga 3,6 : Ἀβραάμ ἐπίστευσεν τῷ θεῷ, καὶ ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην  
 TM : דְּרָקָה לֹא צָדִיק בְּיֵהוָה וַיִּשְׁבַּח לֹא צָדִיק  
 LXX : καὶ ἐπίστευσεν Ἀβραὰμ τῷ θεῷ, καὶ ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην  
 4Q225 2 i 7-8 : דְּרָקָה לֹא צָדִיק בְּיֵהוָה וַיִּשְׁבַּח לֹא צָדִיק

Plusieurs auteurs ont noté que Paul réfutait ici une argumentation développée par ses adversaires à partir de cette même citation de Gn 15,6 en la reprenant dans son propre sens<sup>65</sup>. Simon Légasse s'oppose à une telle vue par manque de preuve formelle, dans la mesure où Paul n'y fait aucune allusion<sup>66</sup>. Cependant, sans avoir à supposer hypothétiquement le discours des opposants, il est possible de montrer là aussi que Paul entretient un rapport dialogique avec d'autres discours topique du judaïsme de son temps. Il est parfaitement clair que la figure d'Abraham — en particulier à partir de la citation de Gn 15,6 — tient une place importante dans les discours juifs de l'époque. L'exemple le plus probant est certainement la citation de ce même verset dans l'épître de Jacques (2,21-24) :

« Abraham, notre père, n'est-ce pas aux œuvres qu'il dut sa justice, pour avoir mis son fils Isaac sur l'autel ? Tu vois que la foi coopérait à ses œuvres, que les œuvres ont complété la foi, et que s'est réalisé le texte qui dit : Abraham eut foi en Dieu et cela lui fut compté comme justice, et il reçut le nom d'ami de Dieu<sup>67</sup>. Vous constatez que l'on doit sa justice aux œuvres et pas seulement à la foi. » (TOB)

Sans entrer dans les rapports possibles entre ce texte et celui de Paul, il nous suffit de constater que les deux discours dépendent d'une tradition commune sur Gn 15,6 et dont on trouve également des traces dans

<sup>64</sup> Pour une analyse précise de l'utilisation de Gn 15,6 chez Paul et son enracinement dans le judaïsme voir l'étude de B. Schliesser, *Abraham's Faith in Romans 4* (WUNT 2 R. 224 ; Tübingen : Mohr Siebeck, 2007).

<sup>65</sup> Voir par exemple, Barclay, « Mirror-reading », 87 ; Martyn, *Galatians*, 296 ; J. D. G. Dunn, *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians* (Black's New Testament Commentaries ; London : A & C Black, 1993), 159-60.

<sup>66</sup> S. Légasse, *L'épître de Paul aux Galates* (Lectio Divina Commentaires 9 ; Paris : Cerf, 2000), 221.

<sup>67</sup> Pour Abraham désigné comme ami de Dieu en conséquence de sa fidélité, voir Jub 19,9 : « Puisqu'il fut trouvé fidèle, c'est comme ami de Dieu qu'il fut inscrit sur les tables célestes » ; et encore CD III 2-4 : « et il fut compté comme ami (de Dieu) (אורב) », parce qu'il observa les commandements de Dieu et ne choisit pas le bon plaisir de son esprit », voir aussi 4Q252 II 8 : Dn 3,35 (grec) : ApAb 9,6 : 10,5 : Test. Ab A 1,6 : 2,3 : etc.



les textes de Qumrân<sup>68</sup>. Je souhaiterais attirer l'attention sur trois textes : Si 44,19–21, 4Q225 2 i 8 et l'épilogue de 4QMMT. Le texte de Si 44,19–21, attesté dans le manuscrit B de la Guénizah du Caire, servira de fils conducteur.

- |      |                      |                      |     |
|------|----------------------|----------------------|-----|
| דופי | :לא נתן בכבודו מום*: | אברהם אב המון גוים   | .19 |
|      | :ובא בברית עמו:      | אשר שמר מצות עליון   | .20 |
|      | :ובניסוי נמצא נאמן:  | בבשרו כרת לו חק      |     |
|      | :לברך בזרעו גוים:    | על כן בשבועה הקים לו | .21 |
|      | :ומנהר ועד אפסי ארץ: | להנחילם מים ועד ים   |     |
19. Abraham (fut) père d'une multitude de nations (Gn 17,4),  
il n'a infligé à sa gloire aucune tare,
20. (lui) qui a gardé les commandements du Très Haut,  
et (qui) est entré en alliance avec lui.  
Dans sa chair, il a coupé avec lui le commandement,  
et dans l'épreuve, il fut trouvé fidèle.
- 21 C'est pourquoi, par un serment, il l'a établi,  
pour bénir par sa descendance les nations.  
[LXX add : Pour les multiplier comme la poussière de la terre  
Pour les exalter comme les étoiles]
- 22 Pour leur donner en héritage : de la mer jusqu'à la mer,  
et du fleuve jusqu'aux extrémités de la terre.

Ce texte rassemble en quelques propositions très denses de nombreux *topoi* relatifs à Abraham caractéristiques du judaïsme du second temple<sup>69</sup>. Quatre éléments méritent d'attirer l'attention :

### 1. Abraham et la loi

Ben Sira établit un lien étroit entre Abraham et l'obéissance à la Loi. Il n'est pas nécessaire de voir dans l'expression « il n'a infligé à sa gloire aucune tare » une allusion au pseudo-mensonge d'Abraham à propos de Sarah comme le propose Alexander Di Lella<sup>70</sup>. D'un point de vue syntaxique, il faut certainement voir le pronom relatif אשר qui débute le v. 20 comme introduisant une proposition causale<sup>71</sup>, le v. 20 venant expliciter le verset 19 : si Abraham n'a infligé aucune tare à sa gloire c'est, d'abord, parce qu'il

<sup>68</sup> On trouvera une présentation récente et mesurée des textes qui témoignent de cette tradition dans Schliesser, *Abraham's Faith*.

<sup>69</sup> Pour une analyse de ce passage et ses échos dans la tradition juive, voir B. Gregory, « Abraham as the Jewish Ideal: Exegetical Traditions in Sirach 44:19–21 », *CBQ* 70 (2008) : 66–81.

<sup>70</sup> P. Skehan and A. A. Di Lella, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira* (AB 39 ; New York : Doubleday, 1987), 505 et la critique de Gregory, « Abraham as the Jewish Ideal », 68.

<sup>71</sup> Voir Joüon-Muraoka, §170e.



a gardé les *mitsvot* du Très Haut et, ensuite, parce qu'il a fait alliance avec lui. Ben Sira nous décrit ainsi Abraham comme le modèle du juif fidèle à la loi<sup>72</sup>. Il fonde certainement cette affirmation sur le texte de Gn 26,4-5 :

« Je ferai proliférer ta descendance autant que les étoiles du ciel, je lui donnerai toutes ces terres et, en elle, se béniront toutes les nations de la terre, parce qu'Abraham a écouté ma voix et qu'il a gardé mes observances (מִשְׁמַרְתִּי), mes commandements (מִצְוֹתַי), mes décrets (חֻקֹּתַי) et mes lois (וְתוֹרֹתַי). »

Ce texte résolument anachronique est très certainement un ajout postérieur, outre le fait qu'il comporte quatre *hapax* de la Genèse (מִשְׁמַרְתִּי, מִצְוֹתַי, חֻקֹּתַי, וְתוֹרֹתַי)<sup>73</sup> qui font référence à la loi de Moïse en des termes fortement deutéronomiste ou sacerdotaux (תּוֹרָה), c'est le seul texte qui fait allusion à l'*aqedah* dans la Bible hébraïque<sup>74</sup>, à travers la formule עֲקַב אֶשְׁר־שָׁמַע אֲבִרְהָם בְּקוֹלִי « Parce que Abraham a écouté ma voix »<sup>75</sup>. Cet ajout vise à rattacher la figure d'Abraham à l'observance de Loi mosaïque.

Cette conception d'Abraham comme archétype du juif fidèle à la Torah est attestée dans le judaïsme postérieur à Ben Sira. Outre la traduction de la Septante qui rend de façon inhabituelle l'hébreu מצוה par le grec νόμος et la citation de l'épître de Jacques, on peut mentionner le *Document de Damas* III 2 : « Abraham ne marcha pas en cela, et il fut compté comme ami (de Dieu), parce qu'il observa les commandements de Dieu et ne choisit pas le bon plaisir de son esprit » (אברהם לא הלך בה ויעל אֹהֶב בְּשִׁמְרוֹ) « 3 ברחון רוחו (מצות אל ולא בחר 3 ברצון רוחו). Une telle conception se prolonge clairement dans le judaïsme rabbinique, comme en témoigne la finale du traité *Qiddushin* de la *Mishnah*<sup>76</sup> :

<sup>72</sup> Noter que la LXX rend le pluriel מצות par le singulier νόμος. Or, νόμος traduit habituellement l'hébreu תורה, tandis que מצוה est habituellement rendu par ἐντολή. Aussi, le traducteur grec prend bien soin de clarifier le texte hébreu : Abraham a bien gardé la Torah du Très Haut.

<sup>73</sup> Cf. Dt 11,1 avec la séquence ומצותיו ומשפטיו וחקתיו ומשמרתו ; voir aussi 1 R 2,3. Pour le pluriel תורה, absent de Dt 11,1, voir Lv 26,46.

<sup>74</sup> J. D. Levenson, « The Conversion of Abraham to Judaism, Christianity and Islam », in *The Idea of Biblical Interpretation. Essays in Honor of James L. Kugel* (ed. H. Najman and J. H. Newman ; VTSup 83 ; Leiden : Brill, 2004), 3-40, 20.

<sup>75</sup> Cf. Gn 22,18 : עֲקַב אֶשְׁר־שָׁמַעַת בְּקוֹלִי. B. Gregory note que l'ensemble des éléments de Gn 26,4-5 se retrouvent en Si 44 : la multiplication de la descendance comme les étoiles, la possession de la terre, la bénédiction des nations (cf. v. 21), l'obéissance d'Abraham (v. 20), l'occurrence des termes מצות et חק. À cette liste il faut ajouter l'allusion à Gn 22 également présente en Si 44,20, cf. *infra*.

<sup>76</sup> Pour le rapprochement voir, entre autre, Levenson, « The Conversion of Abraham », 21-22 ; J. L. Kugel, *Traditions of the Bible: A Guide to the Bible as It Was at the Start of the Common Era* (Cambridge : Harvard University Press), 706.

C'est ainsi qu'il est dit à propos d'Abraham notre père : « Et Abraham était vieux, avancé en âge et Yahvé bénit Abraham en tout » (Gn 24,1). Nous remarquons qu'Abraham notre père a accompli toute la Torah tout entière avant même qu'elle ne soit donnée, c'est ainsi qu'il est dit : « Parce qu'Abraham a écouté ma voix et qu'il a gardé mes observances, mes commandements, mes décrets et mes lois » (Gn 26,5) (*m. Qidd.* 4,14).

La formulation varie suivant les témoins. Tandis que les manuscrits de Kaufmann (Ms A 50), de Parme (De Rossi 138) et de Cambridge (Add. 470) attestent la leçon *את התורה ששימר את אברהם באבינו מוצא את מוצא*, le manuscrit de Munich (codex 95) et l'édition d'Albeck renforcent la proposition *כל התורה כולה* (ומצאנו (מצינו) שקיים (שעשה) אברהם אבינו את כל התורה כולה. Le point focal de cette variante est l'emphase de l'objet : *כל התורה כולה*, si le Seigneur a béni Abraham en toutes choses, c'est parce qu'il a accompli *toute* la loi *dans son entier*<sup>77</sup>. On peut encore mentionner la belle formule du *Midrash de Genèse Rabbah* 61,1 : « Rabbi Shimé'on : un père ne lui a pas enseigné (la Torah) et il n'avait pas de rabbin (ורב לא היה לו). D'où fut enseignée la Torah (à Abraham) ? Voici : le Saint béni soit-il lui a assigné deux de ses reins comme deux rabbins (שני רבנים) et ils furent débordants, lui enseignant la Torah et la sagesse »<sup>78</sup>.

Ces quelques exemples témoignent d'une ligne d'interprétation établie dans différents milieux du judaïsme du tournant de notre ère. Il est alors légitime de supposer qu'ils constituaient une partie de l'argumentation du discours adverse en Galatie. Or, face à une telle ligne d'interprétation, dont témoigne Si 44,20 et CD III 2, Paul construit un contre discours en opposant la foi d'Abraham à la pratique de la loi. Le type d'argument soulevé par Paul est particulièrement intéressant dans le contexte du judaïsme de l'époque. C'est un argument d'ordre chronologique : Abraham n'a pas pu être justifié par la loi, puisque la loi n'a été donnée que 430 ans plus tard (Ga 3,17 ; voir l'argumentation similaire en Rm 4,9–13). À ma connaissance, un tel argument ne semble pas avoir de parallèle bien que les auteurs anciens ne doivent pas l'avoir ignoré puisqu'ils prennent soin de justifier qu'Abraham eut une connaissance de la Loi avant même qu'elle ne soit donnée<sup>79</sup>. C'est, par exemple, ce que pourrait laisser supposer l'Apocryphe de la Genèse lorsqu'il précise qu'Abraham a reçu une connaissance particulière à travers le livre des paroles d'Hénoch (« Et je

<sup>77</sup> Texte tiré de M. Krupp (ed.), *Die Mischna Textkritische Ausgabe mit deutscher Übersetzung und Kommentar. Kidduschin* (Jerusalem : Lee Achim Sefarim, 2004), 35. Voir aussi *m. Ned.* 3,10 ; *b. Sanh.* 56a ; *b. Yoma* 28b ; Rashi sur Gn 26,5.

<sup>78</sup> Voir encore *Gen. Rab.* 64,4.

<sup>79</sup> Voir Kugel, *Traditions of the Bible*, 706.

lus devant eux le livre des paroles d'Énoch » *מְלִי לְסִפְרֵי קוּדְמִיָּהוּן* (1QapGen XIX 25)<sup>80</sup> ; Le livre des Jubilées rend la chose plus explicite en mentionnant d'abord qu'Abraham fut instruit par un ange :

« Je lui (Abraham) ouvris la bouche, les oreilles et les lèvres, et je commençai à converser avec lui en hébreu, langue de la création. Il prit les livres de ses pères qui étaient écrits en hébreu. Il les copia et commença dès lors à les étudier. Je lui fis connaître moi-même tout ce qu'il ignorait. Il étudia les (livres) pendant les six mois d'hiver. » *Jub.* 12,25–27 (Trad. A. Caquot)

Les livres des pères, écrits en hébreu, doivent faire référence à la Loi, comme cela est confirmé en *Jub.* 21 où Abraham récite à son fils Isaac des passages du *Lévitique*, des *Nombres* et du *Deutéronome*, concluant son discours ainsi : « C'est en effet ce que j'ai trouvé écrit dans les livres de mes pères, dans les paroles d'Hénoch et dans celles de Noé » (*Jub.* 21,10). La même idée se retrouve chez Philon d'Alexandrie (*De Abrahamo* 5–6) qui précise que la loi qu'Abraham a suivie est celle de la nature ou encore dans l'Apocalypse syriaque de Baruch (2 *Bar.* 57,1–2) qui mentionne que la loi non écrite existait déjà<sup>81</sup>. Ce besoin de justifier une connaissance de la Loi avant la révélation du Sinaï<sup>82</sup> témoigne de ce besoin de résoudre cette difficulté chronologique sur laquelle Paul fait reposer son argumentation.

## 2. La fidélité d'Abraham

Un second élément distingue Paul des interprétations anciennes de Gn 15,6. En effet, la plupart associent le motif de la fidélité d'Abraham, non pas à une croyance, ni même à une obéissance à la Loi, mais à une fidélité à la parole divine au moment de l'épreuve. C'est ce que fait, parmi d'autres, Ben Sira. La formulation de Si 44,20d résulte de la confluence de trois citations bibliques<sup>83</sup> :

Gn 15,6 : *וְהֵאֱמַן בְּיְהוָה וַיַּחְשְׁבֶהָ לוֹ צְדָקָה* « il crut en Yahvé et il le lui compta (comme) justice »

Gn 22,1 : *וְהֵאֱלֹהִים נִסָּה אֶת אַבְרָהָם* « et Dieu éprouva Abraham »

Neh 9,8 : *וּמִצָּאת אֶת לְבָבוֹ לְאֱמֹן לְפָנָיו וּכְרוֹת עִמּוֹ הַבְּרִית* « Tu as trouvé son cœur fidèle envers toi et tu as fait alliance avec lui. »

<sup>80</sup> D. A. Machiela, *The Dead Sea Genesis Apocryphon. A New Text and Translation with Introduction and Special Treatment of Columns 13–17* (STDJ 79 ; Leiden : Brill, 2009), 72 ; J. A. Fitzmyer, *The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave 1 (1Q20): a Commentary* (BibOr 18B ; Roma : Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 2004), 191.

<sup>81</sup> Voir également *m. Qidd.* 4,12 et *m. Ned.* 3,10.

<sup>82</sup> Voir encore G. Anderson, « The Status of the Torah Before Sinai. The Retelling of the Bible in the Damascus Covenant and the Book of Jubilees », *DSD* 1 (1994) : 1–29.

<sup>83</sup> Gregory, « Abraham as the Jewish Ideal », 73.

Si 44,20 : ובניסוי נמצא נאמן « et dans l'épreuve, il fut trouvé fidèle »

Ben Sira associe la « fidélité d'Abraham » (נמצא נאמן, cf. Ne 9,8) à l'épreuve (בניסוי) qui fait allusion à Gn 22. Or, en Gn 22, la fidélité d'Abraham n'est à aucun moment évoquée et inversement la notion d'épreuve n'apparaît pas en Gn 15,6 ou en Neh 9,8. Ce lien entre la fidélité d'Abraham et l'épreuve de l'*aqedah* est clairement marqué dans le judaïsme antérieur ou contemporain de Paul. L'exemple le plus convaincant est certainement la formule de 1 M 2,52 : « Abraham n'a-t-il pas été fidèle dans l'épreuve, et cela ne lui a-t-il pas été compté comme justice ? (Αβρααμ οὐχὶ ἐν πειρασμῷ εὐρέθη πιστός καὶ ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην) » (1 Mac 2,52). Mais la même association est également attestée dans la formule déjà citée de Jc 2,21, Hb 11,17–19 ou encore *Jub.* 17,15–18 :

« Le Seigneur savait qu'Abraham avait été fidèle en toutes ses adversités, car il l'avait mis à l'épreuve en son pays, et par la famine. Il l'avait mis à l'épreuve au moyen des trésors des rois. Il l'avait encore mis à l'épreuve par l'intermédiaire de sa femme quand elle fut enlevée, et par la circoncision. Il l'avait mis à l'épreuve par l'intermédiaire d'Ismaël et de Hagar sa servante, lorsqu'il les renvoya. En toutes ces épreuves, (Abraham) avait été trouvé fidèle. Son esprit n'était ni rebuté ni hésitant à agir : il était fidèle et aimant le Seigneur. » (Trad. A. Caquot)

Le Pseudo-Jubilé (4Q225 2 i-ii) établit une même association : (1) d'abord à travers l'organisation même du texte, puisque la promesse faite à Abraham en Gn 15 est directement suivie par la naissance d'Isaac puis par l'*aqedah* (4Q225 2 i 5–12) ; (2) ensuite, par l'explicitation de la finalité de l'épreuve au moment du sacrifice (4Q225 2 ii 7–8).

[שמים ואומרים עכשו יאבדו]בכול זה ינסה שר המשטמה אם	7
[בריהם לאלוהים ויקרא]א ימצא נאמן ואם לא ימצא כחש ואם לא	8

7. Ils se réjouirent et dirent : « Maintenant, il va périr » et en tout cela le prince Mastéma éprouvera si 8 il sera trouvé déviant ou si A[braham] ne sera pas trouvé fidèle »

L'état fragmentaire du texte ne permet pas de définir avec précision le sujet des expressions *ימצא נאמן* et *ימצא כחש* d'autant que la formulation fait défaut du texte biblique. Mais en toute vraisemblance, il s'agit d'Abraham<sup>84</sup>. C'est en tout cas ce que J. C. VanderKam propose de restaurer à la

<sup>84</sup>García Martínez, « The Sacrifice of Isaac in 4Q225 », 44–57, 55 propose de voir Isaac comme sujet des deux expressions. L'argument repose sur le fait que l'objet de la ligne précédente (l. 7) est clairement Isaac et que la ligne 8 semble poursuivre le discours des anges de Mastema. La formule serait alors un autre écho de celle de Jdt 8,26 : « Rappelez-vous ce qu'il a fait à Abraham et toutes les épreuves d'Isaac ».

cassure de la ligne 8, bien que la trace de lettre lue comme un *aleph* ne soit pas totalement claire. Cette proposition s'accorderait parfaitement avec le contexte de la citation de Gn 15,6 énoncé à la colonne précédente, la formule *לא ימצא נאמן* paraît être forgée sur la base de Ne 9,8 (comme en Si 44,20), enfin elle forme un excellent parallèle à la sentence de 4Q226 7 1 : *נמצא אברהם נאמן לאלהים* : « *Abraham a été trouvé fidèle envers Dieu* ».

Là encore, ces exemples témoignent d'une ligne d'interprétation notablement uniforme dans le judaïsme antérieur ou contemporain de Paul. La fidélité d'Abraham en Gn 15,6 y est comprise comme une obéissance à la parole divine — laquelle va jusqu'à lui demander de sacrifier son fils unique — plutôt que comme un acte de foi, une croyance en la promesse divine. En contraste avec ces discours, Paul ne retient pas le lien avec Gn 22 et affirme que la justice d'Abraham n'est pas due à son obéissance, mais à sa foi en tant que croyance en la promesse, en totale indépendance des œuvres<sup>85</sup>. Cependant, il est important de noter que Paul fonde son argumentation sur cette même citation de Gn 15,6. Alors que dans les discours évoqués plus haut elle servait d'argument scripturaire pour montrer l'obéissance d'Abraham en la parole divine, Paul s'en sert pour fonder une interprétation radicalement différente. On voit, là encore, comment l'interdiscours entre en jeu et comment il façonne le discours paulinien.

### 3. *La bénédiction des nations et la paternité d'Abraham*

L'argumentation de Paul se poursuit en Galates 3,6–9 pour mettre l'accent sur la paternité d'Abraham envers « ceux qui croient » (οἱ ἐκ πίστεως οὗτοι υἱοὶ εἰσὶν Ἀβραάμ) et sur la bénédiction qui, par Abraham, touche toutes les nations : Ἐνευλογηθήσονται ἐν σοὶ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη. La citation que Paul fait de Gn 12,3 diffère de celle de la Septante par l'emploi de τὰ ἔθνη, comme en Gn 18,18b ou 22,18, plutôt que αἱ φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς. Dans la mesure où l'hébreu *משפחה* n'est jamais rendu par ἔθνος dans la Septante, on peut légitimement considérer que cette variante est intentionnelle ce qui se justifie bien par le contexte de la lettre.

Les textes de Qumran ne présentent aucune attestation de la réception de Gn 12,3. Bien que l'état fragmentaire de la collection ne nous permette pas d'aboutir à des conclusions fermes, M. Popovic a cherché à montrer

<sup>85</sup> Schliesser, *Abraham's Faith*, 419.

que cette absence était probablement intentionnelle<sup>86</sup>. L'exemple le plus parlant est certainement le Commentaire de la Genèse A (4Q252)<sup>87</sup> qui passe sous silence l'épisode de Gn 12,1–3 (4Q252 II 8–10 évoque le départ d'Abram pour Canaan puis passe directement à l'alliance de Gn 15 à la ligne 11 : « Abram demeura cinq années à Harân, et après [Abram] sortit [vers] le pays de Canaan. Soixa[nte...] la génisse, le bélier et la chè[vre...] »). En outre, ce texte présente une réelle tension envers les nations hellénistiques en 4Q252 II 5–8. L'auteur y relit le texte de Gn 9,27 sans mentionner Japheth au sein des tentes de Sem et en y faisant plutôt résider Dieu, sur cette terre que Dieu a donnée à Abraham son ami<sup>88</sup>. Cette absence de la réception de la bénédiction des nations ne se limite pas aux seuls textes de Qumrân mais touche l'ensemble de la littérature juive de cette période, puisque les seules mentions se limitent à Si 44,19–21, *Jub.* 12,23<sup>89</sup> et Philon d'Alexandrie<sup>90</sup>. Dans le cas de Ben Sira, les nations sont évoquées à deux reprises : au v. 19 par une reprise de Gn 17,4 et au v. 21 qui combine Gn 22,18, le Ps 72,8 et Zac 9,10 constituant ainsi une inclusion de la péripécopie consacrée à Abraham. (1) En Ben Sira, ׀ׁׂ׃ désigne les peuples, mais pas nécessairement les non-juifs (cf. Si 44,4). Aussi la formule de Siracide pourrait se comprendre soit dans une perspective universalisante<sup>91</sup>, l'expression tirée du Ps 72,8 renvoyant à l'ensemble du monde habité selon une conception cosmologique qui voit le monde habité délimité par le monde aquatique ; soit dans une perspective plus particulariste, les na-

<sup>86</sup> M. Popović, « Abraham and the Nations in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Exclusivism and Inclusivism in the Texts from Qumran and the Absence of Reception History for Gen 12,3 », in *Abraham, the Nations, and the Hagarites. Jewish, Christian, and Islamic Perspectives on Kinship with Abraham* (ed. M. Goodman, G. H. van Kooten and J. van Ruiten ; ThBN 13 ; Leiden : Brill, 2010), 77–103.

<sup>87</sup> Voir récemment É. Puech, « 4Q252 : "Commentaire de la Genèse A" ? ou "Bénédictions patriarcales" », *RevQ* 26 (2013), à paraître.

<sup>88</sup> Voir G. J. Brooke, « The Thematic Content of 4Q252 », *JQR* 85 (1994) : 33–59 : "The change probably reflects an anti-Greek exclusivism (the descendants of Japheth including Javan) which is characteristic of Jubilees and is explicit in some of the community texts from Qumran". Voir aussi G. J. Brooke, "Commentary on Genesis", in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 300–301.

<sup>89</sup> Voir J. T. A. G. M. van Ruiten, « Abraham and the Nations in the Book of Jubilees », in *Abraham, the Nations, and the Hagarites. Jewish, Christian, and Islamic Perspectives on Kinship with Abraham* (ed. M. Goodman, G. H. van Kooten and J. van Ruiten ; ThBN 13 ; Leiden : Brill, 2010), 105–116.

<sup>90</sup> Voir Philon, *Migr.* 1.118, 122 ; P. Makiello, « Abraham and the Nations in the Works of Philo of Alexandria », in *Abraham, the Nations, and the Hagarites. Jewish, Christian, and Islamic Perspectives on Kinship with Abraham* (ed. M. Goodman, G. H. van Kooten and J. van Ruiten ; ThBN 13 ; Leiden : Brill, 2010), 139–61.

<sup>91</sup> Voir R. Havrelock, « The Two Maps of Israel's Land », *JBL* 126 (2007) : 649–67.

tions désignant les juifs non judéens et l'expression du Ps 72,8 renverrait au territoire idéal délimité par les deux fleuves, Nil et Euphrate et par la méditerranée et la mer Rouge, selon une cartographie attestée en Gn 15,18 ou encore en Ex 23,31 (Gn 15,18 : « C'est à ta descendance que je donne ce pays, du fleuve d'Égypte jusqu'au grand fleuve, le fleuve d'Euphrate » ; Ex 23,31 : « J'établirai ton territoire de la mer des Joncs à la mer des Philistins et du désert au fleuve. »). (2) La bénédiction des nations se trouve à plusieurs reprises dans la Genèse sous deux formes : en Gn 12,3 et en 18,18 les nations/familles de la terre sont bénies en Abraham (וַיְבָרֶכְנוּ בְךָ/בו) ; en Gn 22,18 (// 26,4 ; 28,14) les nations sont bénies par *ta* descendance (וְהַתְּבָרְכֵנוּ בְזַרְעֶךָ). Tandis que la première formulation a une dimension universelle, la seconde conditionne la bénédiction des nations à la descendance d'Abraham, c'est-à-dire les juifs<sup>92</sup>. Paul s'appuie sur la première formulation, tandis que Ben Sira s'appuie sur la seconde<sup>93</sup>. (3) L'ajout de la version grecque au v. 21 qui s'appuie sur la promesse d'une descendance à Abraham (cf. Gn 13,16 ; 28,14), établit une connexion claire entre les *nations* et la descendance d'Abraham ; les nations désignant alors clairement les descendants d'Abraham, c'est-à-dire les juifs. Ces éléments invitent à conclure que pour Ben Sira, la bénédiction des nations vise d'abord les descendants d'Abraham, c'est-à-dire les juifs répandus au sein des différentes nations. Ben Sira mettrait l'accent non pas sur la géographie, mais sur la notion ethnique de la généalogie.

En reprenant ce motif de la bénédiction des nations sur la base de Gn 12,3, Paul propose un argument innovant pour le judaïsme de l'époque. Non seulement il ouvre cette bénédiction aux non-juifs, mais encore il redéfinit la notion de paternité d'Abraham. Si les « fils d'Abraham » désignent habituellement les juifs<sup>94</sup> en s'appuyant sur un critère ethnique, Paul redéfinit le modèle d'appartenance en définissant les fils d'Abraham non pas sur la base d'un critère ethnique, mais sur la base d'une adhésion, d'une croyance : οἱ ἐκ πίστεως οὗτοι υἱοὶ εἰσὶν Ἀβραάμ. Cette redéfinition des critères d'appartenance n'est pas totalement inconcevable dans le judaïsme de la diaspora hellénistique où les caractéristiques qui défi-

<sup>92</sup> B. van der Lans, « Belonging to Abraham's Kin: Genealogical Appeals to Abraham as a Possible Background for Paul's Abrahamic Argument », in *Abraham, the Nations, and the Hagarites. Jewish, Christian, and Islamic Perspectives on Kinship with Abraham* (ed. M. Goodman, G. H. van Kooten and J. van Ruiten ; ThBN 13 ; Leiden : Brill, 2010), 307–18, 315.

<sup>93</sup> J. D. G. Dunn a également noté que Paul s'appuie sur le texte de Gn 12,3 / 18,18 plutôt que sur Gn 22,18 et parallèles (Dunn, *Epistle to Galatians*, 164).

<sup>94</sup> Voir Flavius Josèphe, AJ 1.122–153 ; Pss. Sal. 9,9 ; 18,3 ; 3 Macc 6,3 ; T. Levi 8,15 ; Lc 19,9 ; Ac 13,26.



nissent le judaïsme, à savoir la généalogie, le lieu et la loi, ont tendance à être assez malléables<sup>95</sup>. Ces mêmes critères fluctuent également à Qumran où la seule circoncision ne suffit plus pour définir « les justes ». Il faut enfin noter que dans la formulation, Paul n'est pas beaucoup plus universaliste que Ben Sira dans la mesure où l'expression ne concerne pas toutes les nations de la terre quelle qu'elles soient, mais seulement les croyants.

#### 4. Gn 15,6 et l'eschatologie

Le dernier point que je voudrais soulever est l'eschatologisation de Gn 15,6. Paul cite clairement ce verset dans une perspective eschatologique : la question du salut pour les non-juifs qui adhèrent à Jésus Christ mort et ressuscité. Il va de soi qu'en Gn 15,6 cette référence au salut est totalement absente du texte. En revanche, elle est également présente en 4QMMT : « de sorte que tu te réjouisses à la fin des temps<sup>96</sup>, en trouvant quelques-uns de nos dire être fondés et cela te sera compté comme justice ». Aussi, le lien entre la justice de Gn 15,6 et la question du salut n'est pas une innovation paulinienne, c'est là encore un élément qu'il reprend vraisemblablement de discours qui le précèdent et qui construisent le judaïsme de l'époque hellénistique et du début de l'époque romaine.

En abordant la figure d'Abraham à travers la citation de Gn 15,6, il n'est pas exact d'affirmer que Paul construit une figure d'Abraham totalement nouvelle et rigoureusement contraire aux traditions juives contemporaines. Paul reprend des traditions fermement attestées dans le judaïsme ancien, mais construit dessus une sorte de contre discours. On pourrait qualifier cette dimension dialogique d'*antanaclase*<sup>97</sup> : Paul reprend des concepts, des figures, pour leur attribuer un sens polémique. C'est ce que Paul semble faire en détachant le terme πιστις de Gn 15,6 de sa notion de fidélité, d'obéissance au commandement divin pour le centrer sur la notion de croyance, d'adhésion. Il en va de même pour la question de l'identité des fils d'Abraham, Paul reprend une notion clairement attestée dans le judaïsme de son temps pour lui donner un sens nouveau, les fils d'Abraham ne sont pas les juifs en tant qu'ethnie, mais en tant que

<sup>95</sup> D. R. Schwartz, « On the Jewish Background of Christianity », in *Studies in Rabbinic Judaism and Early Christianity: Text and Context* (ed. D. Jaffé ; AJEC 74 ; Leiden : Brill, 2010), 87–106, en particulier 94–95.

<sup>96</sup> Voir A. Steudel, « אחרית הימים » in the Texts from Qumran, *RevQ* 16 (1993) : 225–46.

<sup>97</sup> Rennes, « Analyser une controverse », 95.



croyants. Paul cherche à imposer ses propres désignations contre celles de l'adversaire afin de faire valoir sa prédéfini-tion de la question. Ainsi en citant Gn 15,6, Paul argumente en reprenant un discours autre pour lui donner un sens qui soutient sa thèse : l'égalité entre juif et non-juif dans la foi en Jésus Christ.

#### D. CONCLUSION

Dans la présente étude, à partir de trois exemples paradigmatiques, j'ai cherché à montrer comment la notion de dialogisme établie par M. Bakhtine était susceptible d'éclairer sous un jour nouveau les rapports qu'entretiennent les manuscrits de la mer Morte et la littérature paulinienne. Il ne s'agit plus d'envisager les contacts entre les différents corpus en termes de rapports génétiques, ou même d'intertextualité, mais plutôt de chercher à illustrer et à comprendre comment les différents discours qui circulent dans la Palestine du 1<sup>er</sup> siècle s'interpénètrent à travers une étroite dialectique pour créer un réseau complexe. Chaque discours se construit et est façonné, déterminé, influencé par des discours antérieurs, autres, tout en étant extérieur à ces discours. On se situe dans un rapport plus complexe et subtil que celui de la simple citation. Il n'est pas nécessaire d'envisager des contacts littéraires directs — d'imaginer ou de montrer que Paul aurait pu lire et intégrer des textes comme 1QS ou 1QH — pour constater des transferts culturels, conceptuels, sémantiques entre ces différents discours. La notion de dialogisme développée par Bakhtine permet de théoriser de manière plus précise, mais aussi de manière plus fluide, les rapports et les contacts directs ou indirects qui travaillent les différents corpus littéraires dans l'antiquité, indépendamment de la notion de genre ou de canonicité.

Dans le cas de l'épître aux Galates, cette notion fait clairement ressortir la dimension dyphonique ou bivocal de l'œuvre paulinienne : à travers la lettre de Paul on perçoit aisément, en filigrane, les discours autres qui façonnent son argumentation que ce soit à travers des procédés de réfutation, de concession, de parodie ou d'ironie, ou encore à travers des redéfinitions sémantiques de concepts. Les manuscrits de Qumrân permettent d'identifier et de mieux comprendre ces rapports dialogiques. Cela ressort, entre autres :

(1) *par l'emploi ironique du discours adverse*. Les manuscrits de la mer Morte permettent de comprendre sous un jour nouveau le sens du verbe ὀρθοποδέω (Ga 2,14) en lien avec le syntagme הולכי ישר comme désigna-

tion de ceux qui pratiquent fidèlement la loi, qui « marchent droit ». La reconfiguration ironique du syntagme apparaît alors subtilement dans le discours paulinien.

(2) *par l'emploi d'un discours doxique.* L'utilisation de la citation du Ps 143,2 permet à Paul de fonder son argumentation sur un discours doxique constitutif d'un discours autre (« nous savons que... »). L'argument selon lequel la justification n'appartient qu'à Dieu seul en vertu de sa seule grâce est également attesté dans les textes de qumrân et doit donc être considéré comme une sorte de *topos*, de lieu commun, dans le judaïsme du 1<sup>er</sup> siècle. Paul pose ainsi comme fondement de sa démonstration un argument qui doit être acceptable aussi pour ses opposants.

(3) *enfin, par la construction d'un contre discours, d'une reconfiguration sémantique, ou ce que J. Rennes appelle une « bataille désignative ».* L'emploi du syntagme *מעשי התורה* dans un contexte radicalement opposé à celui de 4QMMT est un bon exemple de ce contre discours. Tandis qu'en 4QMMT la pratique des œuvres de la loi est étroitement liée à la justification, Paul dissocie radicalement ces deux éléments. Il en est de même à travers la figure d'Abraham. Les traces de dialogisme sont frappantes, mais dans le sens d'une redéfinition de la figure patriarcale. Alors que le judaïsme du 1<sup>er</sup> siècle voit unanimement en Abraham celui qui a pratiqué intégralement la loi et dont la « foi » (*πίστις*) se perçoit essentiellement en terme de fidélité à la parole divine, Paul met l'accent non pas sur celui qui a pratiqué la loi, mais sur celui qui a cru en la parole divine. Paul redéfinit ainsi sémantiquement la notion de *πίστις* ou la notion de filialité, « fils d'Abraham » est désormais compris en terme de communauté de foi plutôt qu'en terme d'ethnicité. Loin de rejeter ces éléments constitutifs du judaïsme ancien, il en propose plutôt une reconfiguration sémantique.



## GALATIANS 3:10–14 IN THE LIGHT OF QUMRAN

Florentino García Martínez

*K.U. Leuven*

As early as the Second Letter of Peter the difficulty of some passages in the letters of Paul was emphasized: “In all his letters there are of course some passages which are hard to understand” (2 Pet 3:16). It thus seems sensible to use all available means to obtain a better understanding of Paul, including recourse to the texts from Qumran.<sup>1</sup> For this reason I shall study at Gal 3:10–14 in the light of Qumran, even though I thereby run the risk that this incursion into the field of Pauline studies might call down upon myself the warning that follows the words just quoted, “and these are the ones that uneducated and unbalanced people distort, in the same way as they distort the rest of scripture—to their own destruction.”<sup>2</sup>

If I am not completely mistaken, the greatest achievement of the research on Paul of the last thirty years has been a better understanding of Paul’s Jewish identity thanks to the Dead Sea Scrolls. For example, on the Christian side, the work of Sanders<sup>3</sup> and Dunn,<sup>4</sup> and the discussions around what Dunn has termed “The New Perspective on Paul”<sup>5</sup> and, on

---

<sup>1</sup> This has been done, among others, by J. A. Fitzmyer, “Paul and the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment* (ed. P. W. Flint and J. C. VanderKam; Leiden: Brill, 1999) 2:599–621, and by H.-W. Kuhn on his studies of the different letters of Paul in the light of Qumran.

<sup>2</sup> According to the translation of The New Jerusalem Bible.

<sup>3</sup> E. P. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion* (London: SCM Press, 1977), and his later *Paul, the Law, and the Jewish People* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1983).

<sup>4</sup> J. D. G. Dunn, *Jesus, Paul and the Law: Studies in Mark and Galatians* (London: SPCK, 1990) and *The Theology of Paul the Apostle* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998).

<sup>5</sup> J. D. G. Dunn, “The New Perspective on Paul,” *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 65 (1983): 95–122, and his more recent collection of articles on the topic *The New Perspective on Paul* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007). See the bibliography collected on the web page “The Paul Page dedicated to the New Perspective on Paul”, <http://www.thepaulpage.com/>.

the Jewish side, the works of Segal<sup>6</sup> or Boyarin.<sup>7</sup> Not that this Jewish identity was ever doubted, since Paul himself asserts it forcefully many times, for instance, in 2 Cor 11:22: “Are they Hebrews? So am I. Are they Israelites? So am I. Are they descendants of Abraham? So am I.” Or in Phil 3:5–6: “Circumcised on the eighth day of my life, I was born of the race of Israel, of the tribe of Benjamin, a Hebrew born of Hebrew parents. In the matter of the Law, I was a Pharisee; as for religious fervour, I was a persecutor of the Church; as for the uprightness embodied in the Law, I was faultless.”

So let us now look at Gal 3:10–14 in the translation of the New Revised Standard Version:

<sup>10</sup> For all who rely on the works of the law are under a curse; for it is written, “Cursed is everyone who does not observe and obey all the things written in the book of the law.” <sup>11</sup> Now it is evident that no one is justified before God by the law; for “The one who is righteous will live by faith.” <sup>12</sup> But the law does not rest on faith; on the contrary, “Whoever does the works of the law will live by them.” <sup>13</sup> Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law by becoming a curse for us—for it is written, “Cursed is everyone who hangs on a tree”— <sup>14</sup> in order that in Christ Jesus the blessing of Abraham might come to the Gentiles, so that we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith.

I shall start with two examples of Paul’s language and terminology from a Qumran perspective, move to a central topic of Paul’s theology, and end with what I think better explains the relationship between Qumran and Paul: neither an improbable genetic relationship nor literary dependence, but the common use of the same source: the Hebrew Scriptures.

#### A. GAL 3:10: THE WORKS OF THE LAW

It is well known that until the publication of 4QMMT we did not have an exact Hebrew or Aramaic equivalent of the expression used by Paul in Galatians (Gal 2:16, 3:2.5.10) and in Romans (Rom 3:20.28): *erga nomou* (ἔργα νόμου) “the works of the law.” The Greek expression could be translated into Hebrew by *ma’ase torah* (מעשי תורה), because the LXX translates מעשה with ἔργα most of the time, and תורה by νόμος. And, in fact, the traditional translation of the New Testament in Hebrew uses the

<sup>6</sup> A. Segal, *Paul the Convert: The Apostolate and Apostasy of Saul the Pharisee* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990).

<sup>7</sup> D. Boyarin, *A Radical Jew: Paul and the Politics of Identity* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994).

phrase *ma'ase torah* to translate the Pauline sentence.<sup>8</sup> But until the publication of 4QMMT in 1994 the phrase was not attested in Hebrew, with the exception of a very dubious case in 4Q174.<sup>9</sup> 4QMMT is a composition partially preserved in six manuscripts (4Q394–398), all of them found in Cave 4. The expression appears in the final exhortation (C 27)<sup>10</sup> or epilogue of the composition and was used by the editors as the title of the whole composition: *Miqsat ma'ase hatorah* “Some of the works [for the Editors: “precepts”] of the Law.”<sup>11</sup> Obviously, as soon as the text was published, its importance for understanding Paul’s expression was quickly recognized, and the text has been the object of many studies which reach very different conclusions.<sup>12</sup> My own interpretation is based on the meaning that the expression has in 4QMMT when this document is read within a Qumran context.<sup>13</sup>

<sup>8</sup> But the Hebrew version of the New Testament by Y. Zalkinsan and D. Ginsburger, distributed by “The Society for the distribution of the Sacred Scriptures to the Jewish” (London, without year) uses מצות התורה.

<sup>9</sup> The editor, J. M. Allegro, reads the phrase on 4Q174 1–2 i 7 (DJD V, 33), but the reading was already questioned by J. Strugnell on *RevQ* 7 (1967–69): 123, was corrected by G. Brooke (*Exegesis at Qumran: 4QFlorilegium in its Jewish Context* [JSOTSup 29; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985], 108), and definitely discarded by the palaeographic analysis of E. Puech (*La croyance des Esséniens en la vie future : immortalité, résurrection, vie éternelle ? Histoire d'une croyance dans le judaïsme ancien. Tome 2 : Les données qumraniennes et classiques* [EBib 22; Paris: Gabalda, 1993], 578) and of Kuhn (“Die Bedeutung der Qumran-texte für das Verständnis des Galataterbriefes aus den Münchener Projekt: Qumran und das Neue Testament,” in *New Qumran Texts and Studies: Proceedings of the First Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Paris 1992* [ed. G. J. Brooke and F. García Martínez; STDJ 15; Leiden: Brill, 1994], 169–221, 205).

<sup>10</sup> According to numbering of the editors E. Qimron – J. Strugnell, *Qumran Cave 4.V: Miqsat ma'ase hatorah* (DJD X; Oxford: Clarendon, 1994), 62. It correspond to the manuscript 4Q398 14–17 3.

<sup>11</sup> The most recent study of the epilogue is H. Von Weissenberg, *4QMMT: Reevaluating the Text, the Function, and the Meaning of the Epilogue* (STDJ 82; Leiden: Brill, 2009).

<sup>12</sup> The bibliography is too voluminous to be quoted in full. As examples of the different positions, see J. D. G. Dunn, “4QMMT and Galatians,” *NTS* 43 (1997): 147–53 and “Noch einmal ‘Works of the Law’: The Dialogue Continues,” in *Fair Play: Diversity and Conflicts in Early Christianity: Essays in Honour of Heikki Räisänen* (ed. I. Dunderberg et al., NovTSup 103; Leiden: Brill, 2002), 273–90; M. G. Abegg, “4QMMT C27, 31 and ‘Works of Righteousness,’” *DSD* 6 (1999): 139–47 and “4QMMT, Paul, and ‘Works of the Law,’” in *The Bible at Qumran: Text, Shape, and Interpretation* (ed. P. Flint; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001), 203–16; M. Bachmann, “Rechtfertigung und Gesetzeswerke bei Paulus,” *TZ* 49 (1993): 1–33 and “4QMMT und Galatierbrief, *ma'ase hatorah* und ERGA NOMOU,” *ZNW* 89 (1998): 91–113; N. T. Wright, “4QMMT and Paul: Justification, ‘Works,’ and Eschatology,” in *History and Exegesis: New Testament Essays in Honor of Dr. E. Earle Ellis for his 80th Birthday* (ed. S.-W. A. Son; New York: T&T Clark, 2008), 104–30.

<sup>13</sup> F. García Martínez, “4QMMT in a Qumran Context,” in *Reading 4QMMT. New Perspectives on Qumran Law and History* (ed. J. Kampen and M. Bernstein; SBLSymS 2; At-

As far as we can conclude from the *recovered contents*, the composition is a systematic tractate of the legal disputes which have originated once a group has separated itself from another group that follows different practices and which later rabbinic tradition will label “pharisaic.” As far as we can reach conclusions about the *formal characteristics* of the composition, it is a legal code which closed with an exhortation to observe these laws (as is the case with Deuteronomy). In this exhortation, where the expression “works of the law” is used, it is expressly stated that the group has broken with the rest (“we have segregated ourselves from the multitude of the people” (4Q397 14–21 7) in order to remain faithful to its concrete interpretation of the Mosaic law, and the opposing party is exhorted to study carefully all the Scriptures (“the books of Moses and the books of the Prophets and David” (4Q397 14–21 10) in order to discover there that the interpretation of the legal aspects offered in the first part of the document is the only correct interpretation. This interpretation pertains not just to legal aspects, but also extends to the history of the people, since it refers to the blessings and curses that have happened or will still happen. Thanks to this interpretation, the group that wrote the document has discovered that the blessings and curses announced in Scripture have already happened and that they are now living in the “last days.” The passage in question is the end of the composition, completely preserved in 4Q398 and partially in 4Q399, and can be translated thus:

And also we have written to you some of the works of the Torah which we think are good for you and for your people, for we s[a]w that you have intellect and knowledge of the Law. Reflect on all these matters and seek from him that he may support your counsel and keep far from you the evil scheming[s] and the counsel of Belial, so that at the end of time, you may rejoice in finding that some of our words are true. And it shall be reckoned to you as justice when you do what is upright and good before him, for your good and that of Israel.<sup>14</sup> (4Q398 2 ii 2–8)

The “works of the Law” to which the text refers are the interpretations discussed in the first part of the document, of which around twenty have been preserved. They concern norms for protecting the ritual purity of the Priests, the people and the city Jerusalem, together with elements of the sacrificial cult, the Temple and the Priests. The correct interpretation of these norms is considered so important that it justifies the separation

---

lanta: Scholars Press, 1996), 15–27, esp. 23–26.

<sup>14</sup> Translation from F. García Martínez and E. J. C. Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Study Edition (=DSSSE)* (Leiden: Brill; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000) 2: 802.

of the group author of the document from the rest of the people who do not accept this interpretation. The addressee of the document, supposed to be an expert in the Law, is exhorted to study them in order to understand that they are true, and to observe them which assures divine salvation. It is clear that in the document the “works of the Law” are considered positively, and that following them is a necessary condition to achieve justification.

In his first use of the expression, in Gal 2:16 (where the expression appears three times), Paul asserts exactly the reverse:<sup>15</sup>

[Y]et we know that a person is justified not by the works of the law but through faith in Jesus Christ. And we have come to believe in Christ Jesus, so that we might be justified by faith in Christ, and not by doing the works of the law, because no one (literally “all flesh” *πᾶσα σὰρξ*) will be justified by the works of the law.

The precise meaning of the expression “works of the Law” in Paul’s letters has often been discussed, both before and after the discovery of the text from Cave 4, and the opinions of Pauline scholars are very diverse.<sup>16</sup> But if we consider the context of its first use in Galatians, after the two conflicts to which Paul has alluded before, the incident in Jerusalem (in Gal 2:2–4: the problem of circumcision) and the incident in Antioch (in Gal 2:11–14: the problem of the dietary laws), it seems clear that Paul uses the expression to refer to the practice of those laws that Peter and other observant Jews consider so important that they force them to separate from the people who accord less importance to these laws, be they Christians of Gentile origin who are not circumcised, or Christians of Jewish origin who have abandoned the dietary laws, as Peter did before chang-

<sup>15</sup> According to the translation of the New Revised Standard Version.

<sup>16</sup> See the classical monographs: R. K. Rapa, *The Meaning of “Works of the Law” in Galatians and Romans* (Studies in Biblical Literature 31; New York: Peter Lang, 2001) and C. A. Amadi-Azuogu, *Paul and the Law in the Arguments of Galatians: A Rhetorical and Exegetical Analysis of Galatians 2,14–6,2* (BBB 104; Weinheim: Beltz Athenäum, 1996). Among more recent publications, a great variety of opinions is to be found. See, for example, J. K. Hardin, *Galatians and the Imperial Cult* (WUNT 2.R 237; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008); M. Hietanen, *Paul’s Argumentation in Galatians: A Pragma-Dialectical Analysis* (Library of New Testament studies 344; New York: T&T Clark, 2007); A. du Toit, *Focusing on Paul: Persuasion and Theological Design in Romans and Galatians* (ed. C. Breytenbach and D. S. du Toit; BZNW 151; Berlin: De Gruyter, 2007); P. C. Onwuka, *The Law, Redemption and Freedom in Christ: An Exegetical-Theological Study of Galatians 3,10–14 and Romans 7,1–6* (Tesi Gregoriana Serie teologia 156; Roma: Editrice Pontificia Università Gregoriana, 2007); T. A. Wilson, *The Curse of the Law and the Crisis in Galatia: Reassessing the Purpose of Galatians* (WUNT 2.R 225; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007).



ing his opinion. What this means is that for Paul, as for the authors of 4QMMT, the “works of the Law” are concrete norms, whose practice or refusal to practice, is considered essential for the identity of the group, forcing those who practice them to separate from those who do not practice them or who interpret them in a different way. In 4QMMT it is the practice of these “works of the Law” which leads to justification. In Paul precisely the opposite: it is faith in Christ, and not the “works of the Law” that justifies. But I believe that the Qumran text makes clear what Paul the Jew understood by “works of the Law” and helps us in this way to understand the text of the Apostle better.

### B. GAL 3:13: THE CURSE OF THE LAW

A little further, in Gal 3:13, Paul quotes a text from Deut 21:23<sup>17</sup> as proof that Christ had redeemed us through his crucifixion:

Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law by becoming a curse for us— for it is written, “Cursed is everyone who hangs on a tree”— ἐπικατάρατος πᾶς ὁ κρεμάμενος ἐπὶ ξύλου

The quote does not correspond exactly with the Hebrew, whose text does not have “on a tree,” and explicitly uses the divine name and employs a causal particle (כִּי קָלַלְתָּ אֱלֹהִים יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ); but with the use of the adjective ἐπικατάρατος Paul’s text retains the ambiguity of the Hebrew<sup>18</sup> without the interpretation of the Greek or Latin versions which consider God as subject (“God’s curse is on everybody hanged on the tree,” ὅτι κεκατηραμένος ὑπὸ θεοῦ πᾶς κρεμάμενος ἐπὶ ξύλου, *maledictus a Deo est qui pendet in lingo*), or without considering God as the object (“the one who curses God will be hanged”) as does the Syriac Version and the Aramaic Targum Onqelos. The commentators of Galatians have some difficulty understanding the quote within Paul’s argument, since what the biblical text specifies is that a condemned person, once dead, should be hanged to be exposed, but buried before nightfall so as not to contaminate the earth. The text of

<sup>17</sup> See A. Caneday, “Redeemed from the Curse of the Law’: The Use of Deut 21:22–23 in Gal 3:13,” *TrinJ* 10 (1989): 185–209.

<sup>18</sup> A quick look at different modern versions shows clearly this ambiguity: ESV: “for a hanged man is cursed by God”; TNK: “For an impaled body is an affront to God”; NJB: “since anyone hanged is a curse of God”; NRSV: “for anyone hung on a tree is under God’s curse.”

Deut 21:22–23, is generally interpreted<sup>19</sup> in the way the LXX understood it, where it is clear that the law has nothing to do with crucifixion, but pertains to the shaming exposure of the condemned person upon the tree.<sup>20</sup> Since Paul uses ἐπι ξύλου as does the LXX, his understanding of the text of Deuteronomy as referring to crucifixion is most surprising. In fact, crucifixion is not one of the four traditional ways to carry out capital punishment in Judaism,<sup>21</sup> and it was generally thought that this form of capital punishment so common among the Romans was foreign to the Jewish world. That is it was so thought, until a fragment from the *Temple Scroll* from Cave 11 (11Q19) provided proof that this text from Deuteronomy could be interpreted as referring to crucifixion and another Qumran text from Cave 4 gave evidence that crucifixion was practiced in the Jewish world long before the arrival of the Romans.

The fragment from the *Temple Scroll* in question was published by Yadin in 1971, long before the publication of the whole manuscript.<sup>22</sup> Although his interpretation was disputed by other scholars,<sup>23</sup> the full publication of the text showed without any doubt that the text from Cave 11 considered crucifixion as one of the possible forms for carrying out capital punishment, and that these old interpretations of the biblical text were thus completely different from later rabbinical interpretation.<sup>24</sup> The *Temple Scroll*, which quotes the same Deuteronomic text as Paul, inverts the order of the two verbs used (the condemned is first hanged and then dies), thus making it clear that here it is not a question of exposure so as to shame someone already dead, but rather a way of carrying out capital

<sup>19</sup> For example E. Nielsen, *Deuteronomium* (HAT 1/6; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1995); R. D. Nelson, *Deuteronomy: A Commentary* (OTL; Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2002); U. Rüterswörden, *Das Buch Deuteronomium* (Neuer Stuttgarter Kommentar. Altes Testament 4; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 2006).

<sup>20</sup> See the comments of M. Harl in C. Doigneux and M. Harl, *La Bible d'Alexandrie: 5 Le Déutéronome* (Paris: Cerf, 1992), 248–49.

<sup>21</sup> M. Hengel, *Crucifixion in the Ancient World and the Folly of the Message of the Cross* (Philadelphia, Fortress Press, 1977); J. A. Fitzmyer, "Crucifixion in Ancient Palestine, Qumran Literature, and the New Testament," *CBQ* 20 (1978): 493–513.

<sup>22</sup> In an article dealing more specifically with the *peshet* Nahum, Y. Yadin, "Peshet Nahum (4QpNahum) Reconsidered," *IEJ* 21 (1971): 1–13.

<sup>23</sup> J. M. Baumgarten, "Does TLH in the Temple Scroll Refer to Crucifixion?" *JBL* 91 (1972): 215–25 and "Hanging and Treason in Qumran and Roman Law," *Eretz Israel* 16 (1982): 7–16. D. J. Halperin, "Crucifixion, the Nahum Peshet, and the Rabbinic Penalty of Strangulation," *JJS* 32 (1981): 32–46.

<sup>24</sup> See M. Bernstein, "KY QLLT 'LHYM TLWY (Deut 21:23): A Study in Early Jewish Exegesis," *JQR* 74 (1983): 21–45.

punishment in the two concrete instances of treason and defection to the enemy:<sup>25</sup>

If it happens that a man has committed a capital offence and he escapes amongst the nations and curses his people /and/ the children of Israel, he also you shall hang on a tree and he will die (תליתמה גם אותו על העץ) (וימות). And their corpse shall not expend the night on the tree; instead you shall bury them that day because those hanged on a tree are cursed by God and men (כי מקוללי אלוהים ואנשים תלוי על העץ); thus you shall not defile the land which I give you for inheritance. (11Q19 64:9–13)<sup>26</sup>

The text has not been preserved on the other copy of the *Temple Scroll*, from Cave 11 (11Q20),<sup>27</sup> but appears partially on the copy from Cave 4 (4Q524 14), although without the concluding quotation of Deut 21:23.<sup>28</sup> But the way Deut 21:23 is referred to in 11Q19 leaves no doubt that it is interpreted as referring to crucifixion. The substantive קללה has been changed to a participle and has been pluralized (“those hanged”), the addition of “men” makes clear that both “god and men” are the ones who curse, and the specification “on the tree” indicates that crucifixion is intended as a capital punishment, as in the preceding line.

The evidence of the text as relying on Deuteronomy to designate crucifixion thought clear, might perhaps not be considered as wholly conclusive, because between the two cases on lines 8 and 10–11 in which the Qumranic text inverts the order of the verbs of the biblical text (dying and hanging to hanging first and dying only afterwards), we do find a third reference (in line 9) where the order is that of the biblical text: first the accused is put to death and afterwards is hanged upon the tree. But the way Deut 21:23 is interpreted makes perfectly understandable Paul’s expression “Cursed is everyone who hangs on a tree,” as meaning “cursed is everyone who is crucified.”

<sup>25</sup> Hebrew Text: Y. Yadin, *Megillat ham-Miqdaš – The Temple Scroll* (Jerusalem, 1977). Other editions: E. Qimron, *The Temple Scroll: A Critical Edition with Extensive Reconstructions. Bibliography by Florentino García Martínez* (Judean Desert Studies; Beer-Sheva - Jerusalem, 1996); *DSSSE 2*: 1228–89, and A. Steudel, *Die Texte aus Qumran II* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2001).

<sup>26</sup> *DSSSE II*, 1287.

<sup>27</sup> Text edited by F. García Martínez, E. J. C. Tigchelaar, A. S. van der Woude, *Qumran Cave 11. II: 11Q2–18, 11Q20–31* (DJD 23; Oxford: Clarendon, 1998), 357–409, pl. XLI–XLVII; *DSSSE 2*: 1290–1304.

<sup>28</sup> Text edited by E. Puech, *Qumrân Grotte 4. XVIII: Textes Hébreux (4Q521–4Q528, 4Q576–4Q579)* (DJD 25; Oxford: Clarendon, 1998), 100. For a detailed study see E. Puech, “Notes sur 11Q19 LXIV 6–13 et 4Q524 14,2–4. A propos de la crucifixion dans le Rouleau du Temple et dans le Judaïsme ancien,” *RevQ* 18/69 (1997): 109–24.

The most conclusive proof that crucifixion was used in Judaea before the arrival of the Romans, is that provided by the already quoted *peshet* Nahum, because the expression used there is to hang *living* people (יתלה) (אנשים חיים) on the tree (על העץ), which only can refer to crucifixion:

[And concerning what he says: “he fills] his cave [with prey] and his den with spoils.” (Nah 2:13) Its interpretation concerns the angry Lion [who filled his cave with a mass of corpses, carrying out revenge against those looking for easy interpretations, who hanged living men [from the tree, committing an atrocity which have not been committed] in Israel since ancient times, for it is [hor]rible for the one hanged alive from the tree. (4Q169 3–4 I 6–8)<sup>29</sup>

This text was published by Allegro in 1956<sup>30</sup> and since then has been the subject of many studies.<sup>31</sup> In spite of its fragmentary state,<sup>32</sup> and the use of nicknames (as כפיר החרון “angry Lion” to designate Alexander Janneus or דורשי החלקות to allude to the Pharisees), this *peshet* Nahum is considered a manuscript with many historical allusions that have been decrypted and are generally accepted. Among them we find the episode of the invasion by Demetrius III Eucarios during the reign of Alexander Janneus, to which is applied the text of Nah 2:12: “Its interpretation concerns Deme]trius, King of Yavan, who wanted to enter Jerusalem on the advice of those looking for easy interpretations, [but he did not enter, for God had not given Jerusalem] into the hand of the kings of Yavan from Antiochus up to the appearance of the chiefs of the Kittim.” This episode of the history of Israel is recounted in detail by Flavius Josephus,<sup>33</sup> who narrates that Janneus, once free from Demetrius, took vengeance and crucified some 800 of those who collaborated with him, a fact reflected in the *peshet* Nahum, where crucifixion is designated as “hanging living men on a tree.”

<sup>29</sup> DSSSEI, 337.

<sup>30</sup> J. M. Allegro, “Further Light in the History of the Qumran Sect,” *JBL* 75 (1956): 89–95 and “More Unpublished Pieces of a Qumran Commentary on Nahum (4QpNah),” *JJS* 7 (1962): 304–8. The *editio princeps* is by Allegro in *Qumran Cave 4. 1* (4Q158–4Q186) (DJD 5; Oxford: Clarendon, 1968), 37–42, pl. XII–XIV.

<sup>31</sup> The two most recent monographs are by G. L. Doudna, *4QPeshet Nahum: A Critical Edition* (JSPS 35; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001) and by S. L. Berrin, *The Peshet Nahum Scroll from Qumran: An Exegetical Study of 4Q169* (STDJ 53; Leiden: Brill, 2004), both with full bibliography.

<sup>32</sup> The reconstruction of this translation is based on study I published in 1979. See, F. García Martínez, “4QpNah y la Crucifixión. Nueva hipótesis de reconstrucción de 4Q169 3–4 i 4–8,” *EstBib* 38 (1979–80): 221–35. Hebrew Text in DSSSE 1: 334–40.

<sup>33</sup> *Ant.* 13.377–381; *B.J.* 1.92–98.

This text proves that crucifixion was practiced in the Jewish world before the arrival of the Romans (here called Kittim). The *Temple Scroll* proves that Deut 21:23 could be applied to crucifixion. And this allows us to understand the use by Paul of the same reference to the biblical text: the cursed one, hanged on a tree, is the one who rescues us from the curse of the Law.

C. GAL 3:11: "THE ONE WHO IS RIGHTEOUS WILL LIVE BY FAITH."

Few other concepts are as characteristic of Paul's theology as that of "justification by faith."<sup>34</sup> During the Reformation one of the key issues between Lutherans and Catholics was precisely this concept, whose "discovery" was attributed to Paul, a dispute which in the Protestant world was summarized by the formula "solus Christus, sola fide, sola gratia."<sup>35</sup> With the publication of the Cave 1 manuscripts of the *Community Rule* and of the *Hodayot* it became clear that the concept of *sola gratia* had its precedents.<sup>36</sup> Comparing the text that we will quote later on with Rom 3:24, H.-W. Kuhn wrote:

The רך ("only") of *Hodayot* XIII 16 is especially interesting, because this is also what Paul means. In Romans 3:28, in his German translation of the Greek New Testament, Martin Luther added such an "alone" ("allein"), as opposed to the Roman Catholic interpretation of his time, and now we find this correct Pauline interpretation in Qumran! As far as I can determine, apart from the polemic "not by faith alone" in Jas 2:24, in all ancient Jewish

<sup>34</sup> Among the many older studies on the topic, see P. Stuhlmacher, *Die Gerechtigkeit Gottes bei Paulus* (FRLANT 87; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966) and K. Kertelge, "Rechtfertigung" bei Paulus. *Studien zur Struktur und zum Bedeutungsgehalt des paulinischen Rechtfertigungsbegriffs* (NTAbh 3; Münster: Aschendorff Verlag, 1967). A more recent collection of articles has been edited by D. A. Carson et al., *Justification and Variegated Nomism: 1 The Complexities of Second Temple Judaism* (WUNT 2 R 140; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001), 2. *The Paradoxes of Paul* (WUNT 2 R 181; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004).

<sup>35</sup> O. H. Pesch, *Die Theologie der Rechtfertigung bei Martin Luther and Thomas von Aquin* (Mains: Matthias-Grünewald, 1967), 169.

<sup>36</sup> Among the specific studies on the topic, see the articles by S. Schulz, "Zur Rechtfertigung aus Gnaden in Qumran und bei Paulus," *ZThK* 56 (1959): 155–85, by O. Betz, "Rechtfertigung in Qumran," in *Rechtfertigung. Festschrift E. Käsemann zum 70. Geburtstag* (ed. J. Friedrich and al.; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1976), 17–36 and the more recent by E. Zurli, "La giustificazione 'solo per grazia' in 1QS X,9–XI e 1QH<sup>a</sup>," *RevQ* 20 (2002): 445–77, as well as the monographs by J. Becker, *Das Heil Gottes: Heils und Sündenbegriffe in de Qumrantexten und im Neuen Testament* (SUNT 3; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1964) and by E. Zurli, *La giustificazione "solo per grazia" negli scritti di Qumran* (Napoli: Chirico, 2003).

and Christian literature this is the only literary “only” concerning justification. Paul and, in a negative way, James are speaking of justification by faith. So the *sola gratia* is Jewish, too, while the *sola fide* (“alone by faith”), of course, is specially Pauline.<sup>37</sup>

“Justification” is generally understood as the action with which God in his justice declares or makes just (justifies) human beings by his grace, as Paul says in Rom 3:23–24: “since all have sinned and fall short of the glory of God; they are now justified by his grace as a gift.”

The vocabulary of the semantic field of “justice” in the Hebrew Bible is expressed through the verb **צָדַק**, the substantives **צֶדֶק** and **צְדִיקָה**, and the substantive and adjective **צַדִּיק** on one side, and through the verb **שָׁפַט** and the substantive **מִשְׁפָּט** on the other. The semantic field of “grace” is covered by the substantives **רַחֲמִים**, **רַחֲמֵי** and the adjective **רַחוּם**, as well as those derived from the root **יָשַׁע**, **יְשׁוּעָה**, **יִשְׁע** and **תְּשׁוּעָה**. The semantic field of fidelity is rendered by the substantives **אֱמוּנָה**, **אֱמֻנָה** and **אֱמוּנָה**, and by the verb **אָמַן**. A detailed analysis of the occurrences of all these terms in the Hebrew Bible allows one to conclude that the idea of justification as a gracious act of God is present only implicitly, in so far as God’s mercy prevails upon judgment (Exod 34:4–6), without ever being explicitly asserted,<sup>38</sup> not even in the two texts which Paul will use to express his idea of justification: Gen 15:6 and Hab 2:4. Gen 15:6 is quoted by Paul in Rom 4:3 and in Gal 3:6, but with a sense different from that it has in Hebrew. A literal translation of the Hebrew text (confirmed by the parallel of Ps 106:30–31 which applies the same expression to Phinehas), would be, “and he trusted Yahweh, and He reckoned it to him (as) justice” (**וַיִּהְיֶה אֱמוּנָה לְיְהוָה וַיִּחְשְׁבֶהָ לְאֵלֹהֵי אֱמֻנָה**). The Greek text of Paul, who here follows the translation of the LXX (**καὶ ἐπίστευσεν Ἀβραμ τῷ θεῷ καὶ ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην**),<sup>39</sup> says: “Abraham believed God, and it was reckoned to him as righteousness.” For Paul, Abraham was “justified” because of his faith

<sup>37</sup> H.-W. Kuhn, “The Impact of the Qumran Scrolls on the Understanding of Paul,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls : Forty Years of Research* (ed. D. Dimant and U. Rappaport; STDJ 10; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 323–24.

<sup>38</sup> See H. G. Reventlow, *Rechtfertigung im Horizont des Alten Testaments* (BEvt 58; München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1971) and M. A. Seifrid, “Righteousness Language in the Hebrew Scriptures and Early Judaism,” in *Justification and Variegated Nomism*, 1:415–42.

<sup>39</sup> See the two studies by R. Mosis, “‘Glauben’ und ‘Gerechtigkeit’ – zu Gen 15,6,” and “Gen 15,6 in Qumran und in der Septuagint,” collected in his *Gesammelte Aufsätze zum Alten Testament* (FB 93; Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1999), 55–93 and 95–118. The differences between the LXX and MT could be explained by another form of the Hebrew text, which we have now partially recovered in 4Q225. This manuscript preserves the first verb not in a *hip’il* perfect, but in a future with *waw*, and the second verb in a *nip’al* form.

in God, while for the Hebrew text trusting God is how one is a righteous man.

The same happens with the quote of Hab 2:4 in Rom 2:4 and Gal 3:11, which also moves from אָמוּנָה to πίστις and ignores the original context of the Hebrew text, as we will see later on. Even the well-known text of Isa 53:11 (יִצְדִּיק צְדִיק עַבְדֵי לְרַבִּים), which is the closest we come to the idea of justification in the Hebrew Bible, can be perfectly translated by “my just servant shall do justice to many.” I think we can conclude that Paul’s idea of justification by God’s grace, while certainly rooted in the Hebrew Bible, had not yet reached its full development there.

The situation in the Dead Sea Scrolls is quite different. In both the *Community Rule* and in the *Hodayot*, the idea is clearly formulated. We can read in 1QS:

However, I belong to evil humankind,  
to the assembly of unfaithful flesh;  
my failings, my iniquities, my sins, [...] with the depravities of my heart,  
belong to the assembly of worms  
and of those who walk in darkness.  
For to man (does not belong) his path,  
nor can a human being steady his step;  
since the judgment belongs to God,  
and from his hand is the perfection of the path.  
By his knowledge everything shall come into being,  
and all that does exist he establishes with his calculations  
and nothing is done outside of him.  
As for me, if I stumble, the mercies of God shall be my salvation (חסדי אל) (ישועתי) always;  
and if I fall in the sin of flesh,  
in the justice of God, which endures eternally,  
shall my judgment be; (משפטי בצדקת אל)  
if my distress commences,  
he will free my soul from the pit  
and make my steps steady on the path;  
he will draw me near in his mercies,  
and by kindnesses set in motion my judgment; (בחסדיו יביא משפטי)  
he will judge me in the justice of his truth, (בצדקת אמתו שפטי)  
and in his plentiful goodness always atone for my sins; (וברוב טובו יכפר בעד) (כול עוונותי)

---

See F. García Martínez, “The Sacrifice of Isaac in 4Q255,” in *The Sacrifice of Isaac* (ed. E. Noort and E. Tigheelaar; TBN 4; Leiden: Brill, 2002), 48.



in his justice he will cleanse me from the uncleanness of the human being  
 ( בצדקתו יטהני מנדת אנוש )  
 and from the sin of the sons of man, ( והטאת בני אדם )  
 so that I can give God thanks for his justice  
 and The Highest for his majesty. (1QS XI 9–15)<sup>40</sup>

In this poem, of which I have quoted only a small part, the author presents himself not only as righteous,<sup>41</sup> but also as someone to whom God has revealed his secrets<sup>42</sup> because he is one of God's elect. At the same time, as we have seen in the fragment quoted, he is also a sinner, someone who belongs "to those who walk in darkness," and is in no way different from the rest of the sons of men. It is human nature that is essentially an "assembly of worms." It is in this context that the text forcefully asserts that it is God's grace that saves him, purifies him, transforms him – in short, justifies him. The author of the poem uses all the words and expressions of the semantic fields of justice, mercy and salvation in order to express this idea, but gives them a very strong and radical meaning. He also uses expressions such as *בצדקת אל* which are not found in the Hebrew Bible, but correspond exactly to the *δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ* used by Paul.

In the *Hodayot*<sup>43</sup> we find numerous expressions similar to those in the *Serekh*, which come from the same context and contain the same idea: it is divine favor, his grace, which justifies human beings and rescues them from their sinful condition. I will quote only two examples:

Who is just before you when he goes to court?  
 No spirit can replay to your reproach,  
 No /host/ can stand up against your anger.  
 All the sons of your truth /you bring/ to forgiveness in your presence,  
 You pu[rify] them from their offences by the greatness of your goodness,  
 And by the abundance of your com[p]assion,

<sup>40</sup> DSSSE 1, 97-99.

<sup>41</sup> "As for me, to God belongs my judgment; in his hand is the perfection of my behaviour with the uprightness of my heart; and with his just acts he cancels my iniquities." (1QS XI 2–3)

<sup>42</sup> "My eyes have observed what always is, wisdom that has been hidden from mankind, knowledge and prudent understanding (hidden) from the sons of man, fount of justice and well of strength and spring of glory (hidden) from the assembly of flesh." (1QS XI 6–7)

<sup>43</sup> *Editio princeps* by E. L. Sukenik, *The Dead Sea Scrolls of the Hebrew University* (Jerusalem 1955), followed by many other editions. I follow the edition and translations of the DSSSE, but updating the numbering of the lines to the recent edition by H. Stegemann and E. Schuller, *Qumran Cave 1.III: 1QHodayot<sup>a</sup>: With Incorporation of 4QHodayot<sup>a-f</sup> and 1QHodayot<sup>b</sup>* (DJD 40; Oxford: Clarendon, 2008).



To make them stand in your presence, for ever and ever. (1QH<sup>a</sup> XV 31–34)<sup>44</sup>

And I said: “For my offences I have been barred from your covenant”.

But when I remembered the strength of your hand

And the abundance of your compassion

I remained resolute and stood up;

my spirit kept firmly in place in the face of affliction.

For I leaned on your kindnesses and the abundance of your compassion.

For you atone iniquity and cle[anse] man of his guilt through your justice.

(1QH<sup>a</sup> XII 36–38)<sup>45</sup>

But the strongest and most explicit expression of justification by grace is found in the following fragment, which (as I already mentioned) specifies that it is only divine grace that justifies humankind:

What is someone born of a woman among all your awesome works?

He is a structure of dust fashioned with water,

His counsel is the [iniquity] of sin,

Shame and dishonor and sou[rce of] impurity,

And a depraved spirit rules over him.

If he acts wickedly, he will be an eternal [sign], a portent for generations,

Shame [for all] flesh.

Only for your goodness is man acquitted,

[purified] by the abundance of [your] compa[ssion].

You embellish him with your splendor,

You install [him over abun]dant of pleasures,

With everlasting peace and length of days.

For [you are the truth, and] your word does not depart (1QH<sup>a</sup> V 31–35)<sup>46</sup>

As in the *Serekh*, the poet insists that humans are nothing; as in the *Serekh*, the author employs the vocabulary of the semantic field of justice, grace, and salvation; but differently from the *Serekh*, where the exclusivity of the grace in justification was implicit, in this *Hodayah* the author express it clearly: “Only for your goodness is man justified, (רק בטובך יצדק, אִישׁ וברוב רחמִיד) [purified] by the abundance of [your] compa[ssion] (דְּיִטְהֵר).”

I think it is clear that the theological development expressed by Paul in the letters to the Romans and Galatians is already attested within the group represented by the Qumran texts. But Paul continues the text in which he puts forward his understanding of “justification by faith” with the fundamental assertions that nobody is justified by the Law (“For we

<sup>44</sup> DSSSE 1, 179 (XV 28–31).

<sup>45</sup> DSSSE 1, 171 (XII 35–37).

<sup>46</sup> DSSSE 1, 151 (V 20–24).

hold that a person is justified by faith apart from works prescribed by the law,” Rom 3:28) but rather by Christ’s redemption (“they are now justified by his grace as a gift, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus,” Rom 3:24). Evidently, in the Dead Sea Scrolls there is no trace of these two assertions. In the formulation of Rom 5:1–2: “Therefore, since we are justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ, through whom we have obtained access to this grace in which we stand.”<sup>47</sup>

There is a text that helps one to understand that the development of Paul’s thought goes much further than Qumran; it is the interpretation of the quote of Hab 2:4b: *וְצַדִּיק בְּאִמּוּנָתוֹ יַחִיָּה* that we find both in Paul (in Gal 3:11 and in Rom 1:17) and in 1QpHab.<sup>48</sup> In the Qumran *peshet* the quote has been lost at the end of column 7, but its interpretation has been entirely preserved at the beginning of column 8:

Its interpretation concerns all observing the Law in the House of Judah, whom God will free from the house of judgment on account of their loyalty to the Teacher of Righteousness. (1QpHab viii 1–3).

The first part of Hab 2:4 is problematic and has been variously interpreted.<sup>49</sup> But it is not important here, since it is clear that the commentator (as Paul will also do) has separated this first part of the verse from the second and has provided both with their interpretations, isolating them in this way from the biblical context. The *peshet* interpretation of the first part is (as far as it has been preserved) that “they will double upon them [...and] find [no mercy] at being judged.” This punishment in judgment in the first part of the verse is offset by clemency in judgment toward “those observing the Law in the House of Judah” in the interpretation of

<sup>47</sup> See the study by W. Grundmann, “Der Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit von Qumran und die Frage nach der Glaubensgerechtigkeit in der Theologie des Apostels Paulus,” *RevQ* 2/6 (1960): 237–59, translated into English in “The Teacher of Righteousness of Qumran and the Question of Justification by Faith in the Theology of the Apostle Paul,” in *Paul and Qumran: Studies in New Testament Exegesis* (ed. J. Murphy O’Connor; Londres: Geoffrey Chapman, 1960), 85–114.

<sup>48</sup> *Editio princeps* by M. Burrows, *The Dead Sea Scrolls of St Mark’s Monastery. Volume I. The Isaiah Manuscript and the Habakkuk Commentary* (New Haven, 1951). The text has been frequently re-edited. I follow the edition and translation in the *DSSSE* I: 10–24. Among the numerous commentaries, see K. Elliger, *Studien zum Habakuk-Kommentar vom Toten Meer* (BHT 15; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1953); W. H. Brownlee, *The Midrash Peshet of Habakkuk* (SBLMS 24; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1979); M. Horgan, *Pesharim: Qumran Interpretations of Biblical Books* (CBQMS 8; Washington: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1979); B. Nitzan, *Peshet Habakkuk: A Scroll from the Wilderness of Judaea* (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1986) (Hebrew).

<sup>49</sup> See P. J. M. Southwell, “A Note on Habakkuk ii 4,” *JTS* 19 (1968): 614–17.

the second part of the verse. Those who are observant will be freed in the last days. The reason for this liberation of the “house of judgment” can be interpreted in many ways. What I have translated as “on account of their toil” (בעבור עמלם) can as well be translated by “on account of their suffering” which is another meaning of *‘amal*, and what I have translated by “loyalty to the Teacher of Righteousness” can equally be translated by “faith in the Teacher of Righteousness,” because the word in question has been written defectively (ואמנתם) and can be vocalized as *be’emunatam* (by their fidelity) as Lohse does,<sup>50</sup> or as *ba’amanatam* as Habermann has.<sup>51</sup> In both interpretations we can observe a development regarding the text of Habakkuk, since the words of the Prophet, atomized and separated from their context, do not refer anymore to the circumstances to which they referred in the oracle of the Prophet; their interpretation shows that they are now related to the life of the Community living in the last days,<sup>52</sup> specifically to loyalty to, or faith in, a concrete person, the Teacher of Righteousness, to whom the words of the Prophets are applied. 1QpHab ii 6–10, interpreting Hab 1:5 is vividly explicit on the matter:

The interpretation of the word [concerns the trai]tors in the last days. They are the violator[s of the coven]ant who will not believe when they hear all that is going [to happen t]o the final generation from the mouth of the Priest whom God has placed wi[thin the Communi]ty to foretell the fulfillment of all the words of his servants, the prophets, [by] means of whom God has declared all that is going to happen to his people Is[rael] (1QpHab ii 6–10).<sup>53</sup>

The divine revelation contained in the words of the Prophets is what will happen to the last generation. For this reason, all the history of the community can be read within the biblical text as its true interpretation. For this reason, those who have been faithful to the Teacher of Righteousness will be free from the house of the judgment.

Paul’s interpretation of Hab 2:4b is more radical than the one of the *peshet*. Paul uses πίστις from the LXX,<sup>54</sup> removing the ambiguity between

<sup>50</sup> E. Lohse, *Die Texte aus Qumran* (München: Kösel Verlag, 1971), 236.

<sup>51</sup> A. M. Habermann, *Megilloth Midbar Yehuda* (Israel, 1959), 46.

<sup>52</sup> On this way to interpret the Prophets, see F. García Martínez, “Escatologización de los escritos proféticos en Qumrán,” *EstBib* 44 (1986): 101–16.

<sup>53</sup> *DSSSE* I, 13.

<sup>54</sup> The LXX gives a version of the first part of the verse quite different from the MT, and its version of the second part has an essential modification, changing the third person pronoun to a first person: באמנותי is translated by ἐκ πίστεώς μου. Some manuscripts of the LXX put the pronoun in a different place: δικαίος μου “my righteous,” but no manuscript keeps the third person pronoun of the Hebrew.

fidelity and faith, and deletes the personal pronoun of the third person in order to make faith an absolute proclamation: it is by faith that the righteous will live, and gives to this “living” a new dimension, since it is now living in Christ. Yet, fundamentally, Paul does two things the author of the *peshet* has already done. The words of Habakkuk have no relationship to the historical context in which they were originally addressed and can therefore be applied to the present situation of the Christian community where faith in Christ is the source of life. Thus, like the author of the *peshet*, Paul frees the quote from its original context. Again like the author of the *peshet*, Paul applies the meaning of the Habbakuk text to the present situation of the community. Finally, also as the author of the *peshet* does, Paul refers the words of the Prophet to a specific person. I think it is clear that both interpretations, different as they are, are a development of ideas which were already in the biblical text. This leads me to conclude with what I think is the key to understand the relationship between Paul and Qumran.

Both Paul and the Dead Sea Scrolls develop, each in their own ways (and often reaching opposite conclusions), seminal ideas of the Scriptures which are considered authoritative by both corpora of writings. Since before the discoveries of the Dead Sea Scrolls many of the developments in the Jewish Scriptures were unknown to us, we were not able to appreciate several of the ideas that Paul expressed in his letters written in Greek. Now, since we do have access to a part of the literature in which these developments in the Jewish sacred writings were recorded, we are able to understand Paul’s interpretation of these sacred writings and to see both the similarities and the differences. Paul is a Jew, a Greek and a Roman, and thanks to Qumran we can better understand his Judaism (his dependence on the Jewish Scriptures) and his profound originality: making Jesus Christ the center of all his theology.

The three topics of Gal 3:10–14 on which I have commented (the works of the Law, the curse, and the justification by grace) show clearly how Paul’s thought has been informed by his reflection on the biblical text to which he refers four times in these five verses, two of them introduced explicitly by “for it is written,” in a way similar to how the thought reflected in the Dead Sea Scrolls has been informed by reflection on the same Scriptures. But all these references are placed by Paul in the service of his central message: faith in Christ. And it is this that makes the difference.



4QMMT AND THE LETTERS OF PAUL:  
SELECTED ASPECTS OF MUTUAL ILLUMINATION

*Lutz Doering*

*Durham University*

When 4QMMT became more widely known in the late 1980s and early 1990s<sup>1</sup> it was, inside the New Testament guild, among Pauline scholars, that it aroused the strongest interest. What drove this interest was the recognition that MMT could finally provide a “parallel” to one of the most vexed expressions in Paul’s letters: ἔργα νόμου, “works of (the) law.” This came at a time when scholars associated with the “New Perspective” on Paul were attempting to redefine this phrase.<sup>2</sup> It is therefore hardly surprising that New Perspective scholars capitalised on the new evidence during the 1990s and the first years of the new millennium: James Dunn, N. T. Wright and, as a German with great sympathy for the New Perspective, Michael Bachmann.<sup>3</sup> There were also a few contributions by schol-

---

<sup>1</sup> Preliminary publication: E. Qimron & J. Strugnell, “An Unpublished Halakhic Letter from Qumran,” in *Biblical Archaeology Today: Proceedings of the International Congress on Biblical Archaeology Jerusalem, April 1984* (ed. J. Amitai; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1985), 400–407; eidem, “An Unpublished Halakhic Letter from Qumran,” *Israel Museum Journal* 4 (1985): 9–12; DJD publication: eidem, *Qumran Cave 4. V: Miqsat Ma’ase ha-Torah* (DJD 10; Oxford: Clarendon, 1994).

<sup>2</sup> Cf. e.g. J. D. G. Dunn, “Works of the Law and the Curse of the Law (Gal. 3.10–14),” *NTS* 31 (1985): 523–42; idem, *Romans 1–8* (WBC 38A; Waco, Tex.: Word Books, 1988), 1:153–58, 192–93.

<sup>3</sup> I am noting only the most important contributions; for a fuller bibliography, see Bachmann, “Keil oder Mikroskop,” 100–101, n. 5 (see below); J. D. G. Dunn, “Yet Once More—‘The Works of the Law’: A Response,” *JSNT* 46 (1992): 99–117; idem, “4QMMT and Galatians,” *NTS* 54 (1997): 147–53; idem, “Noch einmal ‘Works of the Law’: The Dialogue Continues,” in *Fair Play: Diversity and Conflicts in Early Christianity* (ed. I. Dunderberg et al.; FS H. Räisänen; NTSup 103; Leiden: Brill, 2002), 273–90; N. T. Wright, “4QMMT and Paul: Justification, ‘Works,’ and Eschatology,” in *History and Exegesis* (ed. S.-W. A. Son; FS E. E. Ellis; New York: T&T Clark, 2006), 104–32; M. Bachmann, “4QMMT und Galaterbrief, מעשי התורה und ΕΡΓΑ ΝΟΜΟΥ,” *ZNW* 89 (1998): 91–113; idem, “Keil oder Mikroskop? Zur jüngeren Diskussion um den Ausdruck ‘Werke des Gesetzes,’” in *Von Paulus zur Apokalypse—und weiter: Exegetische und rezeptionsgeschichtliche Studien zum Neuen Testament (samt englischsprachigen summaries)* (ed. M. Bachmann; NTOA/SUNT 91; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011), 99–159; idem, “Bemerkungen zur Auslegung zweier

ars who work on the Scrolls (at least as one major field of their research), most notably an early study by Martin Abegg as well as remarks by Heinz-Wolfgang Kuhn and John Kampen.<sup>4</sup> But the bulk of the debate occurred among trained Paulinists. In recent years it has become a little quieter about the “works of the law.” This may have to do with the extent to which the New Perspective has come under criticism. Old Perspective scholars tend to dismiss or ignore the evidence of MMT; and scholars who go “beyond the New Perspective” pay only limited attention to this text or to recent research on it.<sup>5</sup> Nevertheless, the last decade or so has seen a few more contributions: Dunn has responded to some critics with “Noch einmal ‘Works of the Law,’” Bachmann has justified his approach in a lengthy article entitled “Keil oder Mikroskop?” and Jacqueline de Roo finally published her 2002 PhD thesis as *Works of the Law at Qumran and in Paul*.<sup>6</sup>

On the other hand, MMT has been increasingly studied by Qumran scholars. High quality research has been produced to elucidate the various halakhic and interpretative issues raised by this text.<sup>7</sup> Another line

---

Genitivverbindungen des Galaterbriefes: ‘Werke des Gesetzes’ (Gal 2,16 u.ö.) und ‘Israel Gottes’ (Gal 6,16),” in *ibid.*, 277–95.

<sup>4</sup> Initial consideration came from M. G. Abegg, “Paul, ‘Works of the Law,’ and MMT,” *BAR* 20 (1994): 52–55; P. Grelot, “Les œuvres de la loi (à propos de 4Q394–398),” *RevQ* 16 (1994): 441–48; H.-W. Kuhn, “Die Bedeutung der Qumrantexte für das Verständnis des Galaterbriefes. Aus dem Münchener Projekt: Qumran und das Neue Testament,” in *New Qumran Texts and Studies: Proceedings of the First Meeting of the IOQS, Paris 1992* (ed. G. J. Brooke and F. García Martínez; STDJ 15; Leiden: Brill, 1994), 169–221, especially 209–13; D. Flusser, “Die Gesetzeswerke in Qumran und bei Paulus,” in *Geschichte—Tradition—Reflexion* (ed. H. Cancik, H. Lichtenberger and P. Schäfer; 3 vols.; FS M. Hengel; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996), 1:395–403; J. Kampen, “4QMMT and New Testament Studies,” in *Reading 4QMMT: New Perspectives on Qumran Law and History* (ed. J. Kampen and M. J. Bernstein; SBLSymS 2; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996), 129–44, especially 138–44.

<sup>5</sup> Thus, S. J. Gathercole, *Where Is Boasting? Early Jewish Soteriology and Paul’s Response in Romans 1–5* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002) devotes little over a page to “4QMMT Itself” (93–95). Similarly, the revised edition of F. Watson, *Paul, Judaism and the Gentiles: Beyond the New Perspective* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007) deals only briefly with 4QMMT (89–91). Note, however, his article, “Constructing an Antithesis: Pauline and Other Jewish Perspectives on Divine and Human Agency,” in *Divine and Human Agency in Paul and His Cultural Environment* (ed. J. M. G. Barclay and S. Gathercole; LNTS 335; London: T&T Clark, 2006), 99–116, which discusses 4QMMT (esp. *ibid.*, 103–108), 4 Maccabees and Galatians (thanks to Robbie Griggs for mentioning it to me in the present context).

<sup>6</sup> For Dunn and Bachmann, see above, n. 3. J. C. R. de Roo, *Works of the Law at Qumran and in Paul* (New Testament Monographs 13; Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2007).

<sup>7</sup> See the various chapters in Kampen and Bernstein, eds., *Reading 4QMMT*. Some other important research has been published in Modern Hebrew, e.g. Y. Sussmann, “The History of the Halakha and the Dead Sea Scrolls: Preliminary Talmudic Observations on *Miqsat Ma’ase ha-Torah* (4QMMT),” *Tarbiz* 59 (1989/90): 11–78 (abbreviated ET in Qimron

of research has addressed the genre and tried to clarify how the halakhic section and the epilogue relate to one another. In this respect, recent scholarship has expressed severe doubts about the classification of MMT as a letter—a classification that has been accepted by most of the New Testament scholars mentioned, as far as I can see. These doubts can, of course, be traced back to John Strugnell's "Second Thoughts" about MMT and its genre in the very year DJD 10 appeared.<sup>8</sup> Early on George Brooke had already questioned the label "letter" (though not "epistle" or "treatise" with epistolary epilogue).<sup>9</sup> Since then, most notably Steven Fraade has challenged what he calls an "extra-mural" reading of the text, that is, as a missive sent outside the community. Maxine Grossman follows him to some extent when she privileges a reading of the text as a "treatise" or "historicizing document." Most recently, Hanne von Weissenberg has suggested that MMT represents a mixture of genres but has reached ambiguous conclusions about the epistolary status of the text.<sup>10</sup> In my view, these studies are on the one hand salutary in pointing away from the focus on a narrow historical placement of MMT; but, on the other hand, dismissing it, as does von Weissenberg, as a "personal letter" does not necessarily mean that MMT is not epistolary.<sup>11</sup> It is my suggestion that the letters of Paul can in turn illuminate aspects of the genre of MMT and the text's early reception.

My contribution will thus consist of two main parts: Section 1 will reconsider the question of how MMT might illuminate the discussion about "works of law" and related issues, section 2 will examine what Paul's letters might contribute to the debate on the genre of MMT. "Illumination" in my usage entails not only the highlighting of similarities but also of differences. Recognizing such differences can also be illuminating. I am

---

& Strugnell, DJD 10, Appendix 1 [179–200]); M. Kister, "Studies in 4QMiqṣat Ma'āse Ha-Torah and Related Texts: Law, Theology, Language and Calendar," *Tarbiz* 68 (1998/99): 317–71.

<sup>8</sup> J. Strugnell, "MMT: Second Thoughts on a Forthcoming Edition," in *The Community of the Renewed Covenant: The Notre Dame Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. E. Ulrich and J. C. VanderKam; Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1994), 57–73.

<sup>9</sup> G. J. Brooke, "The Significance of the Kings in 4QMMT," *Qumran Cave IV and MMT: Special Report* (ed. Z. J. Kapera; Cracow: Enigma Press, 1991), 109–13.

<sup>10</sup> S. D. Fraade, "To Whom It May Concern: 4QMMT and Its Addressee(s)," *RevQ* 19 (2000): 507–26; M. L. Grossman, "Reading 4QMMT: Genre and History," *RevQ* 20 (2001): 3–22; H. von Weissenberg, *4QMMT: Reevaluating the Text, the Function and the Meaning of the Epilogue* (STDJ 82; Leiden: Brill, 2009).

<sup>11</sup> See the argumentation in L. Doering, *Ancient Jewish Letters and the Beginnings of Christian Epistolography* (WUNT 298; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012), 194–214.



not primarily concerned with historical dependence; rather, I am interested in the insights that a *comparison* of these texts may provide.

#### A. “WORKS OF LAW” AND RELATED ISSUES

Abegg and Dunn have noted that MMT shares at least three “points of comparison”<sup>12</sup> with Paul’s letter to the Galatians, two of which recur in his letter to the Romans: (a) the phrase *מעשי התורה* (MMT C 27 [C iii (1)]),<sup>13</sup> which provides the first clear linguistic parallel to Greek *ἔργα νόμου* (Gal 2:16 [*trīs*]; 3:2, 5, 10; Rom 3:20, 28); (b) the statement on something being “reckoned as righteousness” (C 31 [C iii 6]), to which Paul’s quotation of Gen 15:6 regarding Abraham’s faith (*ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην*) can be compared (Gal 3:6; Rom 4:3; cf. 4:9, 22); and (c) the reference to the blessings and curses in MMT C 13–17 (C ii 12–15), to which Paul’s invocation of the Deuteronomic blessings and curses in Gal 3:10–14 may be compared. Dunn also mentions the famous separation statement in MMT C 7 (C ii 7) and compares it to Peter’s withdrawal from table fellowship at Antioch, but the statement in MMT has recently come under scrutiny regarding its reading and interpretation,<sup>14</sup> so that it seems to me wise not to base far-reaching conclusions on it. The presence of the three comparative elements in each of the texts is probably not arbitrary but seems to follow some logic. I shall focus on points (a) and (b) in what follows.<sup>15</sup>

As mentioned, it should be appreciated that MMT C 27 (C iii [1]) provides the first clear linguistic parallel to the Greek *ἔργα νόμου*. All the other references in the Scrolls are either differently construed (for example, 1QS V 21; VI 18 *ומעשיו בתורה*) or ought to be dismissed on palaeographical

<sup>12</sup> Thus Dunn, “4QMMT,” 147; cf. Abegg, “Paul.”

<sup>13</sup> For the purpose of this article, I retain the line numbering according to DJD 10. However, I refer in parentheses to the numbering of the alternative reconstruction of the composite text of section C, the so-called “Epilogue” of MMT, by É. Puech, “L’épilogue de 4QMMT revisité,” in *A Teacher for All Generations* (ed. F. Mason et al.; 2 vols.; JSJSup 153; Leiden: Brill, 2012), 1:309–339.

<sup>14</sup> For different recent attempts at understanding this statement, cf. C. Hempel, “The Context of 4QMMT and Comfortable Theories,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Texts and Context* (ed. C. Hempel; STDJ 90; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 275–92, esp. 286–289; E. A. Bar-Asher Siegal, “Who Separated from Whom and Why: A Philological Study of 4QMMT,” *RevQ* 25 (2011): 229–56.

<sup>15</sup> For the blessings and curses in the context of Gal 3:10–14, cf. the contribution by F. García Martínez in the present volume.

grounds (so especially 4Q174 1–2 i 7 *מעשי תורה*; *contra de Roo*).<sup>16</sup> However, this linguistic—more precisely, grammatical—parallel does not yet tell us whether the two equivalent phrases are also *semantic and pragmatic* parallels. In terms of methodology, I am surprised that this question is not posed and pursued more clearly in the works of Abegg, Dunn, de Roo and—partly—Bachmann<sup>17</sup>; but even such a fine Qumran scholar as Florentino García Martínez, in his 1996 article on “4QMMT in a Qumran Con-

<sup>16</sup> As already suggested by J. Strugnell, “Notes en marge du volume V des ‘Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan,’” *RevQ* 7 (1970): 163–276, here 221. De Roo, *Works of the Law*, 11–16, has recently affirmed the reading *מעשי תורה* for 4Q174 1–2 i 7; she lists (*ibid.*, 11, nn. 30–31) proponents of both readings and thinks that the question cannot be decided on palaeographical grounds, so that “in this particular case context should be the main guide” (*ibid.*, 12; cf. also Gathercole, *Where is Boasting*, 95). However, it is questionable whether palaeography should be dismissed so quickly. First of all, as Brooke comments, “All those who have recently studied the actual manuscript together with the photographs are agreed that *daleth* should be read” (G. J. Brooke, “Miqdash Adam, Eden and the Qumran Community,” in *Gemeinde ohne Tempel / Community without Temple* [ed. B. Ego, A. Lange and P. Pilhofer; WUNT 118; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999], 285–302, here 288, n. 13). These include Brooke himself: G. J. Brooke, *Exegesis at Qumran: 4QFlorilegium in its Jewish Context* (JSOTSup 29; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985), 108; as well as A. Steudel, *Der Midrasch zur Eschatologie aus der Qumrangemeinde (4QMidrEschata, b)* (STDJ 13; Leiden: Brill, 1994), 44; Kuhn, “Bedeutung,” 205–6; and É. Puech, *La croyance des Esséniens en la vie future: immortalité, résurrection, vie éternelle?* (EtB 22; Paris: Gabalda, 1993), 578, n. 34. This qualifies the earlier assertion by J. A. Fitzmyer that “a glance at Plate XIX [sc. of DJD 5 = PAM 41.807; LD] reveals that Allegro had read the phrase correctly, *ma’aseh torah*; the letter is *resh*, not *daleth*” (*According to Paul: Studies in the Theology of the Apostle* [New York: Paulist, 1993], 20). In fact, traces of the small “sling” in the right corner characteristic of *daleth* but not of *resh* can be seen on both PAM 41.807 (= B-280225) and PAM 43.440 (= B-284474), which can now be accessed and sufficiently magnified at <http://www.deadseascrolls.org.il/explore-the-archive/image/B-280225> and <http://www.deadseascrolls.org.il/explore-the-archive/image/B-284474>, respectively (accessed 7 June 2013). According to Brooke, “Miqdash Adam,” 288, by writing *תורה*, the scribe did not “entirely exclude the possibility of the audience appreciating that he was punning the phrase *מעשי תורה*,” especially since in the next column “he goes on to describe the way in which the elect in the community will perform the whole law (*ועשו את כול התורה*)” (see 4Q174 1+3 ii 3). In contrast, Puech (*ibid.*, 578) has pointed out that the phrase as attested in 4QMMT carries the article; there is consequently no clear attestation of the phrase without the article in Hebrew, which raises questions regarding the suggested pun.

<sup>17</sup> To be sure, Bachmann spends several pages (esp. “Keil oder Mikroskop,” 128–140) on an elucidation of the syntagmatic and paradigmatic analysis of *ἔργα νόμου* in *Paul*, but he does much less in the way of linguistic analysis of the phrase in MMT (however see *ibid.*, 156–58 and idem, “4QMMT und Galaterbrief,” 100–105). Bachmann’s main purpose is to establish the “monosemisation” of the term as he perceives it (i.e. denoting precepts). At least, Bachmann is well aware of the relevant linguistic approaches; see below, n. 21, and idem, “Keil oder Mikroskop,” 112–13.

text” that touched upon the phrase מעשי התורה,<sup>18</sup> does little in the way of its semantic analysis. I am not so much concerned by N. T. Wright’s critique that the two *referents* are different: “post-Biblical” purity *halakhah* in MMT and “Biblical” laws such as circumcision and Sabbath in Paul.<sup>19</sup> Such a distinction may be anachronistic for Second Temple Judaism, and the focus on different aspects of the law may not make a categorical difference, although the specificity of the laws invoked should surely be kept in view.<sup>20</sup> My point is rather that the term “works of the law” might mean and do slightly different things in each context.

Methodologically speaking, I suggest that we pay more attention to the *syntagmatic* and *paradigmatic* relations in which the expressions occur.<sup>21</sup> In MMT C 26–27 (C iii [1]), the phrase מקצת מעשי התורה is the direct object of “and we have indeed written to you.”<sup>22</sup> *Syntagmatically*, “works of the law” are thus something that *can be written*. In addition, the phrase is qualified by a relative clause, either merely שחשבנו “which we have reckoned” or, as Fraade has suggested,<sup>23</sup> the whole phrase לך טוב ולעמך “which we have reckoned for your welfare and that of your people.” In both readings, the sentence explains the *written* “works of the law.”<sup>24</sup> *Paradigmatically*, it appears from B 1 (אלה מקצת דברינו) note the forward-pointing demonstrative pronoun (אלה) and probably also from C 30 (C iii 6: במצאך מקצת דברינו) that the phrase מקצת מעשי התורה is a rough paradigmatic equivalent to מקצת דברינו (for the latter passage, 4Q399 has מדברינו). There is no need for that latter phrase to mean *exactly* the same as מקצת מעשי התורה; however, as a “heading” that, at the very least,

<sup>18</sup> F. García Martínez, “4QMMT in a Qumran Context,” in *Reading 4QMMT: New Perspectives on Qumran Law and History* (ed. J. Kampen and M. J. Bernstein; SBLSymS 2; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996), 15–27, especially 23–26.

<sup>19</sup> So Wright, “4QMMT and Paul,” 124–26. Cf. idem, “When Paul Shuns the ‘Works of the Law,’ Is He Referring to the Very Works Commended by the Dead Sea Scroll Known as MMT?,” *Bible Review* 14 (1998): 18, 54.

<sup>20</sup> Cf. Watson, “Constructing an Antithesis,” 108, who warns against generalising MMT’s regulations and viewing such generalised law from the perspective of Paul’s “hermeneutics of faith.”

<sup>21</sup> This is of course a central tenet of Saussurian semantics, as further developed by R. Barthes, “Éléments de sémiologie,” *Communications* 4 (1964): 91–135; for its application in Biblical Studies cf. W. Egger and P. Wick, *Methodenlehre zum Neuen Testament* (6th, completely rev. ed.; Freiburg: Herder, 2011), esp. 165–66.

<sup>22</sup> Or: for you. See below.

<sup>23</sup> Fraade, “To Whom It May Concern,” 80, n. 35.

<sup>24</sup> The alleged parallel with C 31 (C iii 6) לצדקה לך ונחשבה should be treated with caution, since חשב לטוב and חשב לצדקה imply different things: in the first case, something written is considered to be for one’s benefit, in the second, one’s behaviour is reckoned as righteousness, see below.

includes the “list of rulings”<sup>25</sup> following in section B, it very likely has a categorical affinity with this term, which in turn looks back at the rulings in the Epilogue.<sup>26</sup> Qimron and Strugnell have also suggested that the term **מְעָשִׂים** [ה] in B 2, within only a few words of the phrase **אֵלֶּה מִקְצַת דְּבָרֵינוּ**, is short-hand for **מְעָשֵׁי הַתּוֹרָה**,<sup>27</sup> although the passage is too fragmentary to allow definitive conclusions. Thus, it seems difficult to deny that the phrases **מִקְצַת דְּבָרֵינוּ** and **מִקְצַת מְעָשֵׁי הַתּוֹרָה** stand in *some* relationship of affinity: both refer to the contents of the composition, one with a deictic “these are,” the other with the statement, “written for you.” In addition, I agree with the suggestion that **מְעָשֵׁי הַתּוֹרָה** in **מְעָשֵׁי הַתּוֹרָה** and in other syntactic correlations does not necessarily convey the same meaning.<sup>28</sup> Most importantly, the “deeds” of the kings in C 23 (C i [16]: **בְּמַעֲשֵׂיהֶמָּה**) might not shed light on the understanding of the term **מְעָשֵׁי הַתּוֹרָה**.<sup>29</sup> Meaning does not reside in lexemes but is generated from their being in specific syntagmatic and paradigmatic relations.<sup>30</sup>

In sum, I think that **מְעָשֵׁי הַתּוֹרָה** in MMT denotes “precepts of the Torah” or perhaps “required practices as prescribed by the Torah.” I do not agree with Bachman that the text does not refer to the actual practice of

<sup>25</sup> Thus Qimron & Strugnell, DJD 10, 46, referring for comparison to the headings of similar lists in *t. Shab.* 1:16 and *m. Ed.* 4:1, as well as to the heading in Deut 1:1.

<sup>26</sup> This is disputed by de Roo, *Works*, 90–91, although she concedes: “The phrase **מִקְצַת דְּבָרֵינוּ** does not refer merely to the cultic rulings, even though they are included” (90). However, in a puzzling manner, she writes only a few lines later: “In short, the phrase **מִקְצַת דְּבָרֵינוּ** does not refer to the rulings in section B” (91).

<sup>27</sup> See Qimron & Strugnell, DJD 10, 47, where the translation “[the] precepts (of the Torah)” is offered. However, their comments, *ibid.* 46, are problematic: there, it is claimed that **מְעָשִׂים** [ה] is a “synonym of **דְּבָרִים**,” and reference is made to 1QS VI 18. However, the latter passage quite clearly distinguishes between “his affairs” (**דְּבָרָיו**) and “his works in / according to the law” (**וּמַעֲשָׂיו בַּתּוֹרָה**). In addition, this last phrase ought to be distinguished from **מְעָשֵׁי הַתּוֹרָה**; here, I agree with de Roo, *Works*, 72–74.

<sup>28</sup> Cf. Bachmann, “Keil oder Mikroskop,” 155–58, cf. 151, n. 231.

<sup>29</sup> For **מְעָשִׂים** [ה] in B 2, see above.

<sup>30</sup> Contra de Roo, *Works*, 85–94, who argues that “in Qumran literature the word **מְעָשִׂים** always carries the meaning ‘works performed’ rather than ‘works prescribed.’” But there is no such thing as the “word **מְעָשִׂים**,” apart from the relations in which it occurs: it might be that **מְעָשֵׁי הַתּוֹרָה** does provide a specific semantic range that is not referenced in other relations of **מְעָשִׂים**. A glaring example of a specific denotation in a specific context is the Rabbinic **מַעֲשֵׂה בְּ** (usually in the syntagmatic relation **בְּ-מַעֲשֵׂה**), which is a halakhically relevant anecdote, a meaning not borne out by other occurrences of the term in either singular or plural in Rabbinic literature. I cannot, in principle, see any reason why such an instance of differentiated meaning should not occur “in Qumran literature” as well.

these precepts, that is, that MMT speaks only on a meta-ethical level.<sup>31</sup> This is suggested by the reference in the context to the phrase “reckoned as righteousness” (C 31 [C iii 6]), a formulation that is found twice in the Hebrew Bible, at Gen 15:6 (Abraham) and at Ps 106:31 (Phineas). In MMT, where most likely both texts are echoed, what is reckoned as righteousness is a particular *behaviour* of the addressee: “to do what is right (4Q398: and good) before him.” This is the practical implementation of the “works of the law.” It should be noted that 4QMMT, against the claim made by Gathercole,<sup>32</sup> does not link this reckoning as righteousness with the Day of Judgment. The “end of time” (בְּאַחֲרֵית הָעֵת) (C 30 [C iii 5])<sup>33</sup> is most likely the time of probation before the end, as is now widely agreed, albeit with nuances, among Qumran scholars.<sup>34</sup> It is a time in which the addressee, having repented, may “find” that “some of our (= our few?) words are true”; it is a time in which the *halakhah* as outlined in the text confirms itself.<sup>35</sup>

If we look at the passages in Paul, we shall see that they are construed somewhat differently. The Apostle to the Gentiles uses the phrase ἔργα νόμου eight times altogether: thrice in Gal 2:16, and once each in Gal 3:2, 5, 10, and Rom 3:20, 28. In most of the cases the wording is ἐξ ἔργων νόμου “from works of (the) law”; only Rom 3:28 has χωρὶς ἔργων νόμου “without works of (the) law.” Five times the governing verb is δικαιοῦσθαι “to be justified.”<sup>36</sup> Only Gal 3 shows other predicates: τὸ πνεῦμα ἐλάβετε “did you receive the Spirit” (3:2); ἐπιχορηγῶν . . . τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ ἐνεργῶν δυνάμεις “does God supply you with the Spirit and works miracles” (3:5); and εἰσίν

<sup>31</sup> So Bachmann, “Keil oder Mikroskop,” 155–58. He hastens to add, *ibid.*, 158, “Regelungen sind natürlich auf Handlungen (bzw. Unterlassungen), auf Erfüllung (bzw. Übertretung) hin angelegt”; but the immediate denotation of the phrase, according to Bachmann, has been “monosemised” in terms of precepts.

<sup>32</sup> Gathercole, *Where is Boasting*, 94.

<sup>33</sup> Puech reconstructs for the corresponding passage in 4Q397 23(?) 2 (?) בְּאַחֲרֵית הַיָּמִים because of the line length (Puech, “L'épilogue,” 327). The phrase בְּאַחֲרֵית הַיָּמִים (ב) appears in C 14 (C ii 13) and C 21 (C i 14), too; it is also reconstructed for C 16 (C ii 14–15) by Puech.

<sup>34</sup> Cf. in particular A. Steudel, “אַחֲרֵית הַיָּמִים in the Texts from Qumran,” *RevQ* 16 (1993): 225–46, especially 227–31. J. J. Collins, “Eschatology,” *The Eerdmans Dictionary of Early Judaism* (ed. J. J. Collins and D. C. Harlow; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), 591–97, here 596, gives this recent summary of his thinking about the term: “It is the time of testing, but it is also a time of incipient salvation.” He points to the notion of distress connected with this period in some texts (e.g. Daniel) but also at the expectation of the coming of the messiahs (e.g. 1QSa).

<sup>35</sup> This ought to be considered when MMT is taken as an example of an eschatological understanding of Gen 15:6, as suggested by J.-S. Rey in his contribution to this volume.

<sup>36</sup> Or, to keep the etymological link with the corresponding adjective in English, “to be righteoused.”

“they are [sc. from works of (the) law]” (3:10). Except for Rom 3:20, the phrase always occurs in juxtaposition with πίστις: Gal 2:16 has διὰ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ and ἐκ πίστεως Χριστοῦ,<sup>37</sup> Gal 3:2, 5 ἐξ ἀκοῆς πίστεως “from the hearing of faith”, Gal 3:9–10 ἐκ πίστεως “from faith,” and Rom 3:28 juxtaposes πίστει “out of faith.”

The problems for the interpretation of these passages and particularly Gal 2:16 are too vast to be discussed in detail here. A sketch of my understanding of major aspects will suffice for the purpose of this article. I am convinced by those who argue that πίστις Χριστοῦ in Gal 2:16 should be taken as an *objective* genitive: faith *in* Christ. This is, in my view, supported by the insertion of the phrase καὶ ἡμεῖς εἰς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν ἐπιστεύσαμεν “and we have come to believe in Christ Jesus.”<sup>38</sup> It is also confirmed by the occurrence of simple ἐκ (ἀκοῆς) πίστεως or πίστει, which contextually can hardly refer to Christ’s own faith. Further, I am intrigued by Francis Watson’s suggestion that Paul would have derived his use of ἐκ πίστεως in these contexts from Hab 2:4 ὁ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως ζήσεται (Gal 3:11).<sup>39</sup> This would imply that the strong focus on the preposition ἐκ in relation to ἔργα νόμου might in fact have developed from the contrast with ἐκ πίστεως. So, “works of (the) law” in Paul are largely something “from (or by)” which a person is not justified, in opposition to “faith,” “from (or by)” which he or she is. I find some merit in Robert Brawley’s suggestion that the coupling with ἐκ is an equivalent to a genitive of origin.<sup>40</sup> Now, this syntactic-semantic aspect achieved by ἐκ is reflected nowhere in MMT. Bachmann is mistaken in taking 𐤓𐤅𐤒𐤓 for comparison, which he considers an Aramaism replacing 𐤓 (as in 4Q399 at C 30 [C iii 6]), because the preposition is clearly used in a *partitive* sense in MMT:<sup>41</sup> the text spells out *some* and not

<sup>37</sup> For my understanding of these terms, see presently.

<sup>38</sup> Cf. on this point B. Matlock, “The Rhetoric of πίστις in Paul: Galatians 2.16, 3.22, Romans 3.22, and Philippians 3.9,” *JSNT* 30 (2007): 173–203, especially 197–99.

<sup>39</sup> Cf. F. Watson, “By Faith (of Christ): An Exegetical Dilemma and its Scriptural Solution,” in *The Faith of Jesus Christ: Exegetical, Biblical, and Theological Studies* (ed. M. F. Bird and P. M. Sprinkle; Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2009), 147–63.

<sup>40</sup> Cf. R. L. Brawley, “Meta-Ethics and the Role of Works of Law in Galatians,” in *Lutherische und Neue Paulusperspektive: Beiträge zu einem Schlüsselproblem der gegenwärtigen exegetischen Diskussion* (ed. M. Bachmann with J. Woyke; WUNT 182; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005), 135–59, esp. 151–57.

<sup>41</sup> Cf. Bachmann, “Keil oder Mikroskop,” 152–53. Bachmann acknowledges R. Bergmeier’s translation of 𐤓𐤅𐤒𐤓 in a partitive manner (“von” or “an”: R. Bergmeier, *Das Gesetz im Römerbrief und andere Studien zum Neuen Testament* [WUNT 121; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000], 39–40), but does not seem to be prepared to accept the full force of this rendering (Bachmann, *ibid.*, 153, n. 240: “Ob das zwingend ist, kann man indes fragen”—although he does not give any grounds here on which this should be questioned).



all of the “works of the law.” I would not, however, go so far as François Vouga who claims that MMT provides “keine sachliche Parallele.”<sup>42</sup> Yet, our discussion suggests there are important semantic and pragmatic differences between MMT and Paul at least in their nuances: while the focus in MMT is on the precepts (only these can be written and reckoned as beneficial for the reader), in Paul the prevailing juxtaposition of ἐξ ἔργων νόμου and ἐκ πίστεως, and the connection with δικαιόσθαι, in my view, require a *realised* human relation and therefore focus on precepts that are *appropriated* by human beings and imagined as *acted upon*.<sup>43</sup>

Thus, the expressions “works of (the) law” in MMT and in Paul represent two different ends of a common spectrum of meaning.<sup>44</sup> Paul may

---

<sup>42</sup> F. Vouga, *An die Galater* (HNT 10; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998), 58: “keine sachliche Parallele zu den paulinischen Formulierungen.” Similarly U. Schnelle, *Apostle Paul: His Life and Theology* (Waco, Tex.: Baylor University Press, 2005), 282, n. 56: 4QMMT C 27 “is not really a parallel” (German: *Paulus: Leben und Denken* [Berlin: De Gruyter, 2003], 306, n. 56: “keine wirkliche Parallele”).

<sup>43</sup> *Pace* the extended argumentation to the contrary by Bachmann, “Keil oder Mikroskop,” 121–140. In particular, despite its eloquence, I find Bachmann’s refutation (*ibid.*, 125–128) of the two arguments in favour of the practical implementation of the law summarised by Dunn rather weak. According to Dunn, the contrast with ἐκ (or διὰ) πίστεως requires that the issue in “works of (the) law” is “not simply the *halakhah* but its observance seen as necessary” (“Noch einmal,” 284, n. 38); and since Paul emphasises praxis in the co-text it can be inferred “that the phrase *also* refers to the implementation of these regulations in daily living” (“Noch einmal,” 284).

<sup>44</sup> Bachmann’s claim of strict “monosemisation,” wielded rigorously at Dunn’s affirmation that the phrase is subject to a “spectrum of meaning” and that “two disconnected and separate meanings” should not be claimed (so Dunn, “Noch einmal,” 281), is unwarranted. Notably, the semantic affinities between the two meanings “precepts” and “precepts imagined as acted upon”—as I would put it—are much greater than in the examples of polysemy invoked by Bachmann, e.g.: “Sandemann is a port (in a bottle), but not a port (with ships)” (“Keil oder Mikroskop,” 122 [following Geeraerts; partly italics]). Here, we have (accidental) homonyms—philosophically speaking, “equivocations”—which originate in *different* (or, at least, differently mediated) morphemes (“port,” *via* French *port* from Latin *portus*, over against “port,” from the Portuguese seaside city *o Porto*, a name derived from the Latin name [!] *Portus Cale*). This kind of homonym is typically invoked in the German game *Teekesselchen* (*viz.* in the American variant *Teapot*). However, there are also polysemes (favourites in *Teekesselchen* as well) in which there is a historical connection between the two meanings (e.g. due to *pars pro toto*). These polysemes show varying degrees of semantic affinity; compare e.g. *Schloss* (“castle,” “[pad-] lock”), where the affinity is small and punctual, with *Lehre* (“teaching,” “apprenticeship,” or “lesson”), where it is much broader. Closer to the issues at stake in Paul and MMT, *law* can mean a normative system, an individual regulation, or the system / regulation as practiced. Especially instructive in this respect are the differentiated but yet interrelated meanings of Hebrew *halakhah*. As Jaffee has shown for Mishnah and Tosefta, it may refer to “an orally transmitted report concerned with normative behavior in a particular sphere of activity” or “the *entire complex of norms* deemed active within the community

draw on a discourse similar to that in MMT, but I am not sure we can say that what Paul attacks in Galatians is precisely the kind of Judaism evident in MMT. In particular, MMT is about *disagreement in halakhic opinion*, whereas Paul addresses the question *whether Gentiles are*, in the first place, *obliged to observe halakhah or not*. If the argument about the formative role of *ἐκ πίστεως* holds, Paul must be seen as having *creatively* adapted the phrase to fit a new discourse, inspired by his reading of Scripture.

## B. COMMUNICATION AND DISCOURSE

I have already mentioned that one of the semantic specificities in MMT is that the “works of the law” are written to, or for, the addressee. This brings us to the debate about the genre of MMT.<sup>45</sup> One of Fraade and Weissenberg’s doubts about the epistolary genre of the text<sup>46</sup> is the assertion that *כתבנו אליך* in C 26 (C iii [1])<sup>47</sup> may mean “we have written on your behalf,” not “to you,” an option already evoked by the editors.<sup>48</sup> However, given MMT’s sustained structure of communication between one party (“we”) to another party (“you”) that also addresses the relationship with a third party (“they”), it is difficult, in my view, to imagine a text type fitting this dialogical structure *and* to assume that the author writes merely “for the benefit” of the second person narratee. How and where would this information be stored? What assumptions about its genre does MMT want us to make? The only Biblical example of *אל כתב* “write for the benefit of,” Judges 8:14, indicates what I perceive as problem: there, the young man of Succoth is writing “for the benefit of” Gideon—listing, *in Gideon’s pres-*

---

of the Sages” (M. S. Jaffee, *Torah in the Mouth: Writing and Oral Tradition in Palestinian Judaism, 200 BCE – 400 CE* [New York: Oxford University Press, 2001], 75 [italics original]). In addition, Jaffee points out that in some contexts *halakhah* denotes “a problem requiring judicial attention” (*ibid.*, 76–77) rather than a judicial pronouncement (so *t. Parah* 7:4). A further notion of *halakhah* is evident in yet another set of passages showing that Sages “determine the *halakhah* by their acts, and disciples pass that determination into custom” (*ibid.*, 78). Subsequent usage of the term *halakhah* may focus on its *practical implementation* (so in the phrase *הלכה למעשה* [NB!]; e.g. *b. B.Q.* 130b). In sum, Bachmann’s categorical distinction in terms of “Regelungen” versus “Handlungen” appears too rigid in light of these analogies.

<sup>45</sup> For greater detail and context of research, see the contribution mentioned above, n. 11.

<sup>46</sup> Cf. Fraade, “To Whom It May Concern,” 513–14, n. 9, 517; von Weissenberg, *4QMMT*, 165–67.

<sup>47</sup> Cf. also restored *כתבנו אליך* in C 10 (C ii 10).

<sup>48</sup> Qimron & Strugnell, DJD 10, 85.



ence, the names of officials and elders of his town. In contrast, the absent reader of MMT needs first of all to *receive* the text. This does not have to be in the form of a letter actually despatched, but I contend that the dialogical discourse structure of MMT deploys at several points aspects of the epistolary form. Several such aspects can be highlighted by comparison with Pauline and other New Testament letters. I wish to discuss three of these aspects here.

### 1. *The Epilogue of MMT and New Testament Letter Closings*

Lines C 25–32 (C ii 16–iii 7), at least, form something like a resumptive epilogue within the so-called Epilogue, which may be compared with New Testament letter closings, e.g. 1 Thess 5:23–28 or Gal 6:11–18.<sup>49</sup> As Reinhard Kratz has recently argued,<sup>50</sup> this section advances the discourse by suggesting that those who are able to read Moses and the Prophets correctly and to interpret them along the lines of section C will also consent to the *halakhah* developed in section B. Moreover, like in epistolary epilogues we find here a *concluding exhortation* deploying imperatives: “Study all these (matters) and seek from him that he would [straighten] your plans and remove from you evil thought and the counsel of Belial” (C 28–29 [C iii (3)–5]). The ethos of both narrator and narratee is enhanced (“some of our words are true,” C 30 [C iii 6]; “for we have seen that you have intelligence and knowledge of the law,” C 27–28 [C iii (2–3)]). As Franz Schnider and Werner Stenger have argued,<sup>51</sup> the concluding exhortation of New Testament letters continues the epistolary presence into the future, which is precisely what this passage of MMT does with respect to both the halakhic instruction and the approach to scripture.

Another notable feature in MMT is the reference to the act of writing in C 26 (C iii [1]) כתבנו אליך, and similarly in C 10 (C ii 10) כתב[נו] אליך. For von Weissenberg, this reference is “not a sufficient indicator of the epistolary genre.”<sup>52</sup> But it is not only the reference as such that MMT shares with many letters, it is also the position and the function of this reference: in documentary letters, such references tend to occur at either the

<sup>49</sup> Cf. H.-J. Klauck, *Ancient Letters and the New Testament: A Guide to Context and Exegesis* (Waco, Tex.: Baylor University Press, 2006), 250–51.

<sup>50</sup> Cf. R. G. Kratz, “Moses und die Propheten: Zur Interpretation von 4QMMT C,” in *From 4QMMT to Resurrection* (ed. F. García Martínez, A. Steudel and E. J. C. Tigchelaar; FS É. Puech; STDJ 61; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 151–76.

<sup>51</sup> W. Schnider and W. Stenger, *Studien zum neutestamentlichen Briefformular* (NTTS 11; Leiden: Brill, 1987), 92.

<sup>52</sup> Von Weissenberg, *4QMMT*, 166.

beginning or the conclusion.<sup>53</sup> References of this kind summarise the letter for the addressee and allow for certain qualifications about the letter to be made. Significantly, a reference to the act of writing is found in the closing of several New Testament letters,<sup>54</sup> and also in the Jewish letter in 2 Macc 2:16. It may be important to note that even Hebrews, which does not label itself a “letter” but a “word of encouragement” (λόγος τῆς παρακλήσεως), contains such a reference in the epistolary closing (Heb 13:22), which points to widespread use of this epistolary device. In this respect, it might be suggested that the *perfect tense* in C 26, 10 (C iii [1], 10) is an *epistolary perfect*, as attested in the older Hebrew and in Aramaic letters.<sup>55</sup> Its equivalent in Greek is the frequent epistolary aorist or perfect, among Jewish letters notably the aorist ἐγράψαμεν in 2 Macc 2:16.<sup>56</sup> In several New Testament letters, the reference to the act of writing is in the epistolary aorist,<sup>57</sup> and in some of these it is also connected with a statement about the brevity of the letter, which serves to suggest the writer’s modesty, as in Rom 15:15 ἔγραψα ὑμῖν ἀπὸ μέρους “I have written to you in part”, Heb 13:22 διὰ βραχέων ἐπέστειλα ὑμῖν “I have sent to you briefly”, and 1 Pet 5:13 ὑμῖν . . . δι’ ὀλίγων ἔγραψα “I have written to you with few [words].” One might also consider תצקמ in C 26 (C iii [1]), and particularly C 30 (C iii 6; 4Q399: 7m), as expressions of modesty; for the latter it would explain why the addressor hopes that ‘some’ of his words are true.<sup>58</sup>

It has often been remarked that a proper Hebrew closing salutation is missing in MMT, though it could have been dropped in the process of copying or may have been omitted in the first place. A New Testament example of a letter lacking a closing salutation is the Letter of James, and in the Jewish epistolary tradition there are several examples of Diaspora

<sup>53</sup> For Aramaic letters, cf. D. Dempsey, “The ‘Epistolary Perfect’ in Aramaic Letters,” *BN* 54 (1990): 7–11, especially 8–9; for Greek letters cf. M. Trapp, ed., *Greek and Latin Letters: An Anthology, With Translation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 36 (references to the “process of correspondence itself” near the beginning, and to “the length of one’s own letter” near the end).

<sup>54</sup> Rom 15:15–16; 1 Pet 5:12; 2 John 12; 3 John 13; 1 John 5:13.

<sup>55</sup> Cf. D. N. Pardee, “The ‘Epistolary Perfect’ in Hebrew Letters,” *BN* 22 (1983): 34–40; Dempsey, “Epistolary Perfect’ in Aramaic Letters,” *passim* (note the one or two later specimens from the Bar Kokhba letters especially).

<sup>56</sup> According to D. R. Schwartz, *2 Maccabees* (CEJL; Berlin: De Gruyter, 2008), 140, 2 Macc 1:7 γεγράφαμεν is an epistolary perfect. Schwartz also affirms that 4QMMT C 26 is evidence for the epistolary perfect in Hebrew.

<sup>57</sup> Gal 6:11; Phlm 21; 1 John 5:13.

<sup>58</sup> Cf. already B 1?

letters that do not have such a salutation.<sup>59</sup> It is debated whether in these cases salutations have been omitted due to the inclusion of these letters in collections or in their literary context, or whether they might simply have had no such final greetings in the first place.<sup>60</sup> However, in the case of MMT it may be considered that the hortatory closing “for your good and that of Israel” (לְטוֹב לְךָ וּלְיִשְׂרָאֵל, C 31–32 [C iii 7]) is an allusion to a bipartite epistolary salutation as found in the Bar Kokhba letter Mur 42:7 (בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל “be [in] peace, [you] and the whole House of Israel”).<sup>61</sup> Paul’s famous conditional peace wish in Gal 6:16 may similarly allude to such a salutation (εἰρήνη ἐπ’ αὐτοὺς καὶ ἔλεος καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰσραὴλ τοῦ θεοῦ “peace upon them and mercy, and upon the Israel of God”).

## 2. עַל (אָ)וּ and περὶ δέ

The editors have already observed that the frequent use of עַל / וְעַל resembles the use of περὶ δέ in Paul’s letters.<sup>62</sup> Von Weissenberg has challenged the relevance of this observation and maintains that this “is not specifically a formal feature of letters.”<sup>63</sup> She refers to Charlotte Hempel’s observation that עַל also introduces legal statements in the Damascus Document, in 4Q159 and in 4Q251, and in fact “seems to have been the standard way of compiling strings of halakhic statements or expositions

<sup>59</sup> See 2 Bar. 78–86 (Epistle of Baruch); 4 Bar. 6–7; 2 Macc 1:1–10a; 1:10b–2:18; the letters by Rn. Gamaliel according to *t. San.* 2:6.

<sup>60</sup> Discussing Jas 5:20, Klauck *Ancient Letters*, 339, asserts that the abrupt ending “without any standard letter components would speak against the epistolary character of James if we took only private letters and Pauline letters as our standard, but matters already look somewhat different in literary and doctrinal letters.” According to C. Burckhard, *Der Jakobusbrief* (HNT 15/1; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000), 8, there is a theoretical possibility that an eschatocol was deleted from James when the letter was included in a collection, “aber mehr spricht nicht dafür.” Cf. also von Weissenberg, *4QMMT*, 163: “however, even the lack of a proper epistolary conclusion is not unusual in Semitic epistolography.”

<sup>61</sup> Cf. already Qimron & Strugnell, DJD 10, 113; G. J. Brooke, “Luke-Acts and the Qumran Scrolls: The Case of MMT,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament: Essays in Mutual Illumination* (ed. G. J. Brooke; London: SPCK, 2005), 158–76, especially 167. Von Weissenberg, *4QMMT*, 163, demurs; but while she is correct to observe that the closing formulae of the Bar Kokhba letters are stable and that שְׁלוֹמִים is missing in MMT, her judgment that the passage in MMT “does not resemble” these closing formulae seems to be too dismissive: there is a fair amount of resemblance in the wish as well as in the direction to a second person singular and to Israel.

<sup>62</sup> Qimron & Strugnell, DJD 10, 113–14; this was probably Qimron’s observation.

<sup>63</sup> Von Weissenberg, *4QMMT*, 163.

in the late Second Temple period.<sup>64</sup> However, there is an important difference between the use of the preposition in the Damascus Document and in MMT, noted already by the late Joseph Baumgarten: while “these headings appear to be rubrics in D they introduce single statements in MMT.”<sup>65</sup> That is, the discursive structure in MMT is different from the Rule texts mentioned. Rather than giving rubrics, MMT introduces new halakhic subjects by connecting them with the preceding discourse, which is why we find *we-* “and” here. In addition, some of the issues thus introduced are qualified either by formulations like “we think” or “we say” (B 8 [rec.], 55, 64, 72) or “it is written” (B 76, 77 [rec.]). This is indeed similar to the discursive structure of  $\text{περὶ δέ} + \text{genitive}$  in some of Paul’s letters, notably 1 Thessalonians and 1 Corinthians, where the particle  $\text{δέ}$  links and contrasts with the preceding context,<sup>66</sup> and where sometimes phrases like “we know” (1 Cor 8:1; cf. 7:25; 12:1; 1 Thess 4:9) qualify the topic introduced. There is ample evidence for similar use of  $\text{περὶ δέ} + \text{genitive}$  in Greek documentary letters,<sup>67</sup> as well as in embedded letters in Jewish literature.<sup>68</sup> Both the Hebrew and the Greek formulations indicate that the topic thus initiated is generally familiar to the addressees, since it needs no long introduction, though it is in need of further precision.

<sup>64</sup> C. Hempel, “The Laws of the Damascus Document and 4QMMT,” 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* (ed. J. M. Baumgarten, E. G. Chazon and A. Pinnick; STDJ 34; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 69–84, here 73.

<sup>65</sup> Baumgarten in a private communication to Hempel, see Hempel, “The Laws,” 73, n. 16. Cf. idem, “The Laws of the Damascus Document—Between Bible and Mishnah,” 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* (ed. J. M. Baumgarten, E. G. Chazon and A. Pinnick; STDJ 34; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 17–26, here 24, n. 10.

<sup>66</sup> 1 Cor 7:1, 25; 8:1; 12:1; 16:1, 12; 1 Thess 4:9; 5:1; cf. 1 Cor 8:4; 1 Thess 4:13  $\text{περὶ} + \text{gen.}$ ; 2 Cor 9:1  $\text{περὶ μὲν γάρ}$ .

<sup>67</sup> Cf. P.Hib. I 40, lines 2–6 (261–260 BCE); P.Eleph. 13, lines 4–5 (222 BCE); PCZ III 59412, lines 10, 22 (mid-3rd c. BCE); P.Yale I 42, lines 22–23, 32 (187 BCE); P.Tebt. III,1 768, line 21, 25 (115 BCE); BGU IV 1141, lines 31, 40 (14–13 BCE?); BGU IV 1097, lines 5, 11 (41–67 CE); P.Amh. II 130, lines 9, 12–13 (70 CE); P.Oxy. XXXIV 2725, lines 2, 9, 17 (71 CE); P.Oxy. III 520, lines 2–4 (2nd c. CE); P.Tebt. II 423, lines 2–4 (3rd c.); P.Oxy. VIII 1159, lines 10, 14 (late 3rd c.); PSI III 236, lines 15, 34, 35 (3rd / 4th c.). Cf. Arzt-Grabner et al., *1. Korinther* (PapKNT 2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2006), 243–45.

<sup>68</sup> Examples are the official letter by the Romans about a treaty with the Judaeans in 1 Macc 8:2–32, 31  $\text{καὶ περὶ} + \text{genitive}$ ; the letter by the Spartan king Arius to the high priest Onias in 1 Macc 12:20–23, here 21  $\text{περὶ τε} + \text{genitive}$ ; 22  $\text{περὶ} + \text{genitive}$ ; Eupolemus Frg. 2:  $\text{περὶ δὲ ὧν γράφεις μοι}$ ; on these letters, cf. Doering, *Ancient Jewish Letters*, 142–43, 232–41.

### 3. *Preserving, Copying, and Rereading, Or: What Kind of Letters?*

A final point of similarity between Paul's letters and MMT should be mentioned here. The letters of Paul are not straightforwardly private (or personal) letters. Even the Letter to Philemon is in fact not a private letter. It is addressed "To Philemon our dear friend and co-worker, to Apphia our sister, to Archippus our fellow soldier, and to the church in your house," all of whom are included in the greeting (Phlm 1–3). While Philemon is the singular addressee for much of the letter body, the members of the congregation remain present, resurface at the end (22, 25) and play an important role in the persuasive strategy of the letter.<sup>69</sup> The change from plural to singular "you" in MMT might be considered in the light of this *double audience*. The plural of the *addressor* of MMT is often taken as *pluralis maiestatis*, but it may similarly point to a *corporate* addressor or author. Paul's letters need to be considered one by one in this respect: not all letters in which co-senders are mentioned (that is, all homologoumena except for Romans) are also co-authored, although there are those, notably 1 Thessalonians, where plural verbs referring to the authorial team introduced in the prescript predominate.<sup>70</sup> It may not be irrelevant that, of the surviving<sup>71</sup> Jewish letters from the Second Temple and early Rabbinic period, many are issued by political, military or religious leaders<sup>72</sup> and a good number of these letters are corporate. In my opinion, Paul's own epistolary praxis, that shares much with corporate and quasi-official letters, was conversely informed by this tradition of Jewish letters—an aspect that is regularly overlooked in much of research into New Testament epistolography.<sup>73</sup>

Paul used his letters within a network of communities. The letters were to be read out to the congregation gathered (1 Thess 5:27); following Klaus Thraede, greeting of "all brothers" with the "holy kiss"<sup>74</sup> can be regarded

<sup>69</sup> See in greater detail Doering, *Ancient Jewish Letters*, 383–84.

<sup>70</sup> Only 1 Thess 2:18; 3:5; 5:27 refer to Paul as the leader of the team in this letter.

<sup>71</sup> Be it as documents or embedded in literary compositions or as self-contained literary letters.

<sup>72</sup> Cf. C. Hezser, *Jewish Literacy in Roman Palestine* (TSAJ 81; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001), 253–90, esp. 288–90. However, this does not necessarily provide a fair sample of the overall letter writing activities in ancient Judaism; see my remarks on the specific climate and find contexts in Doering, *Ancient Jewish Letters*, 10.

<sup>73</sup> My discussion in Doering, *Ancient Jewish Letters*, 383–406, seeks to correct this lack.

<sup>74</sup> 1 Thess 5:26; cf. Phil 4:19–20; Rom 15:13; 2 Cor 13:11b; 2 Thess 3:16a; for other New Testament letters, see Heb 13:20–21; 1 Pet 5:10–11; Jud 24–25.

as an intensified epistolary greeting that has community-building function.<sup>75</sup> Colossians, a letter that—if not authentic—is probably still closely related to Paul's ministry, advises the addressees to exchange letters with the Laodiceans (Col 4:16). We see here something of the reading of "others' letters" in early Christianity,<sup>76</sup> that is, of considering a letter to be of interest beyond the first addressees because the other addressees are deemed to be in an analogous situation and belong to the same network. Paul himself may have recognised that his letters were meant for a wider circle than the initial addressees and furthered this by keeping copies of his letters.<sup>77</sup> In addition, Paul may have edited and arranged some letters directed to the same church, such as 2 Corinthians, in the form of an authorised recension (*Autorenrezension*).<sup>78</sup> Letters to different churches may have initially been put together by Paul himself<sup>79</sup> or, perhaps more likely, by some of his contemporaries;<sup>80</sup> the initial collection or collections would have been supplemented by further letters during the course of time. It has been suggested that the author of Colossians would have had an early collection of Paul's letters, probably because he was or had

<sup>75</sup> Cf. K. Thraede, "Ursprünge und Formen des 'Heiligen Kusses' im frühen Christentum," *JAC* 11/12 (1968/69): 124–80, especially 132.

<sup>76</sup> Cf. L. Hartman, "On Reading Others' Letters," in *Christians among Jews and Gentiles* (ed. G. W. E. Nickelsburg and G. W. MacRae; FS K. Stendahl; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986), 137–46. Reprinted in: idem, *Text-Centered New Testament Studies* (WUNT 102; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997), 167–77.

<sup>77</sup> See Hartman, "On Reading Others' Letters," 139, 141.

<sup>78</sup> There are numerous theories about the number of letters within 2 Corinthians. For a suggestion connected with the assumption of an *Autorenrezension*, cf. D. Trobisch, *Die Entstehung der Paulusbriefsammlung: Studien zu den Anfängen der christlichen Publizistik* (NTOA 10; Fribourg: Universitätsverlag; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989), 123–28.

<sup>79</sup> According to the more recent, simplified version of Trobisch's theory, Paul collated an authorial recension of Romans, 1–2 Corinthians and Galatians with Rom 16 as cover note to Ephesus, unified by the theme of the Collection for Jerusalem; see D. Trobisch, *Paul's Letter Collection: Tracing the Origins* (Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress, 1994), 55–96.

<sup>80</sup> E.g. H. Y. Gamble, *Books and Readers in the Early Church: A History of Early Christian Texts* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995), 95–101, assumes that some of Paul's pupils were responsible for collating his letters. Trobisch, *Entstehung*, 117–19, 128–31, originally thought that the church in Ephesus, having received copies of Romans and 2 Corinthians from Paul, created the initial collection of Romans, 1–2 Corinthians and Galatians, while another collection, including 1 Corinthians, Romans, Ephesians and Hebrews, was aimed at a more general ("catholic") readership. Klauck, *Ancient Letters*, 332–33, criticises Trobisch for building his theories on a slim textual basis and holds that "the development of the Pauline corpus may have worked in a more complex and multifaceted way, beginning with small local letter collections." In this he takes up a suggestion by K. Aland, "Die Entstehung des Corpus Paulinum," in *Neutestamentliche Entwürfe* (ed. K. Aland; TB 63, Munich: C. Kaiser, 1979), 302–50.

been close to Paul. The author of 1 Peter might have reacted to an early, partial collection,<sup>81</sup> while some collection of Pauline letters is undeniably in view in 2 Peter.<sup>82</sup>

MMT may or may not have been a letter that was actually sent. And if it *was* sent, it is unclear whether it was sent to someone outside the “community” of the addressor. As Adele Reinhartz has argued, MMT may resemble Paul’s letters in that it was sent to remote members of the same “community.”<sup>83</sup> Alternatively, it might be fruitful to compare MMT with epistolary treatises, that is, literary texts in which a topic is developed either addressing a dedicatee or within an epistolary framework;<sup>84</sup> in particular those epistolary treatises in which the epistolary domain permeates the entire treatise would be relevant for comparison. Be this as it may, the extant six copies of MMT attest to a process of preservation, copying, and rereading that is similar to that involving the letters of Paul. There is even the strong possibility that one copy of MMT (4Q394) is, in this respect, a kind of *Sammelhandschrift* as the calendrical section A 19–21<sup>85</sup> was, it seems, secondarily prefixed to section B, without any tangible form of redactional connection.<sup>86</sup> This means that MMT in this manuscript is set next to a new text with which it was to be read: this is clearly an example of a secondary use of a text. It is possible that in this process MMT lost its prescript (at least in this manuscript);<sup>87</sup> it should be

---

<sup>81</sup> So M. Hengel, *Der unterschätzte Petrus: Zwei Studien* (2nd ed.; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007), 18.

<sup>82</sup> Cf. 2 Pet 3:15–16.

<sup>83</sup> A. Reinhartz, “We, You, They: Boundary Language in 4QMMT and the New Testament Epistles,” in *Text, Thought, and Practice in Qumran and Early Christianity: Proceedings of the Ninth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, Jointly Sponsored by the Hebrew University Center for the Study of Christianity, 11–13 January, 2004* (ed. R. A. Clements and D. R. Schwartz; STDJ 84; Leiden: Brill, 2009), 89–105.

<sup>84</sup> Cf. Doering, *Ancient Jewish Letters*, 211–13. Cf. the classification of MMT as “Epistolary Treatise Concerned with Religious Law” by A. Lange and U. Mittmann-Richert, “Annotated List of the Texts from the Judaean Desert,” in *The Texts from the Judaean Desert: Indices and an Introduction to the Discoveries in the Judaean Desert Series* (ed. E. Tov; DJD 39; Oxford: Clarendon, 2002), 115–64, here 133.

<sup>85</sup> That is, 4Q394 3–7 i 1–3 (= A 19–21). It is clear that 4Q394 1–2 belongs to a different document, 4QCalendrical Document D; see S. Talmon, J. Ben-Dov and U. Glessner, *Qumran Cave 4. XVI: Calendrical Texts* (DJD 21; Oxford: Clarendon, 2001), 2, 157–66.

<sup>86</sup> Pace J. C. VanderKam, “The Calendar, 4Q327, and 4Q394,” *Legal Texts and Legal Issues: Proceedings of the Second Meeting of the IOQS, Cambridge 1995* (ed. J. M. Baumgarten et al.; STDJ 23; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 179–94, especially 184.

<sup>87</sup> The claim that 4Q395 preserves the right margin of the text and thereby attests to an opening with section B (see Qimron & Strugnell, DJD 14; Strugnell, “Second Thoughts,”



recalled that Hartmut Stegemann assumed that about one third of MMT is missing in the beginning.<sup>88</sup>

In short: Paul's letters move from historically despatched ones to literary ones, yet they remain letters nonetheless, being reread and set in new literary co-texts by new audiences. MMT might have experienced a similar process.

### C. SUMMARY

We have looked at two different areas of "mutual illumination." First, MMT does shed some light on the phrase "works of (the) law" in Paul, and the comparison sharpens the profile of MMT's own contribution. It is clear that this phrase cannot be taken in the sense of "works righteousness," as the Old Perspective on Paul would have it. Paul probably takes the term up from previous Jewish discourse. But MMT and Paul represent different ends of the semantic spectrum of the phrase: MMT focuses on the side of precepts, which can be written, though corresponding practice that is "reckoned as righteousness" is also in view. Paul, in contrast, develops the phrase in juxtaposition with the term ἐκ πίστεως as a praxis-focused concept "by which" a human being is justified. A further shift in Paul is that the question is no longer "*which halakhah*" but rather "*whether halakhah*" is required for Gentiles.

Second, the letters of Paul and other New Testament epistles can, conversely, shed some light on MMT's genre. Though the outright classification as a "letter" will remain debated, these texts point to significant aspects of "epistolarity" in MMT: the epilogue with reference to the act of writing and final exhortation; the structure of the discourse by וְאֵל וְעַל / עַל; similarities in the corporate audience and authorship; and continuing relevance beyond the first readership, through copying and re-reading. Paul's letters show that an "either letter or treatise" approach to MMT's genre might be misguided.

---

61) has been questioned by VanderKam, "The Calendar," 184, who suggests that the distance could equally reflect the width between columns here (but see n. 86 above for the argumentative context in which VanderKam makes this statement). If this is apposite, there will be no conclusive evidence that any of the manuscripts of MMT would have started directly with section B.

<sup>88</sup> Cf. A. Steudel, "4Q448—The Lost Beginning of MMT?," in *From 4QMMT to Resurrection* (ed. F. García Martínez, A. Steudel and E. J. C. Tigchelaar; FS É. Puech; STDJ 61; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 247–63, here 248, n. 9, 257.





*HESED* DANS LA RÈGLE DE LA COMMUNAUTÉ  
ET *CHARIS* DANS L'ÉPÎTRE DE PAUL AUX GALATES<sup>1</sup>

Jan Dušek

*Université Charles à Prague*

L'étude des parallèles entre les manuscrits de Qumrân et le Nouveau Testament a déjà une place incontestable dans la recherche<sup>2</sup>. De nombreux parallèles entre les écrits qumraniens et les épîtres de Paul ont été mis en évidence et analysés dans de nombreuses études<sup>3</sup>. Les chercheurs ont mis en valeur la manière dont les textes qumraniens illuminent la théologie de Paul, même si un rapport direct entre Paul et Qumrân reste conjectural.

L'objectif de cette étude est de comparer les concepts théologiques et les idées religieuses qui sous-tendent les termes de  $\tau\omicron\pi$  et  $\chi\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\varsigma$  dans la *Règle de la Communauté* (1QS) et dans l'épître aux Galates. Dans la mesure où la terminologie employée dans 1QS est liée à celle de la Bible hébraïque, nous commencerons par un bref résumé de la signification de  $\tau\omicron\pi$  dans cet ensemble littéraire. Nous procéderons ensuite à l'analyse de la signification de  $\tau\omicron\pi$  dans la *Règle de la Communauté* et de son rapport aux textes vétérotestamentaires. Finalement, après avoir examiné le sens

---

<sup>1</sup> Cette étude a été réalisée dans le cadre du projet de recherche GAČR 404/09/0162 « Centre ou périphérie ? – Histoire et Culture de la Syrie-Palestine (3.000–300 av. J.-C.) ».

<sup>2</sup> On trouvera un état dans J. Frey, « The Impact of the Dead Sea Scrolls on New Testament Interpretation: Proposals, Problems, and Further Perspectives », in *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls. Volume Three: The Scrolls and Christian Origins* (ed. J. H. Charlesworth; Princeton Symposium on Judaism and Christian Origins 2; Waco, Texas: Baylor University Press, 2006), 407–471.

<sup>3</sup> Mentionnons entre autres: J. Murphy-O'Connor (éd.), *Paul and Qumran. Studies in New Testament Exegesis* (Chicago, Illinois: The Priory Press, 1968); E. P. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism. A Comparison of Patterns of Religion* (London: SCM Press, 1977); J. A. Fitzmyer, « Paul and the Dead Sea Scrolls », in *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years. A Comprehensive Assessment* (ed. P. W. Flint and J. C. VanderKam; Leiden/Boston/Köln: Brill, 1999), Vol. 2: 599–621; H.-W. Kuhn, « The Impact of Selected Qumran Texts on the Understanding of Pauline Theology », in *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls. Volume Three: The Scrolls and Christian Origins* (ed. J. H. Charlesworth; Princeton Symposium on Judaism and Christian Origins 2; Waco, Texas: Baylor University Press, 2006), 153–185.

de χάρις dans l'épître aux Galates, nous étudierons les relations entre ces deux lexèmes.

#### A. *ḤESED* DANS LA BIBLE HÉBRAÏQUE

Le sens de **חסד** dans la littérature vétérotestamentaire a déjà été analysé dans plusieurs études<sup>4</sup> et les auteurs ont souvent souligné la difficulté de traduire ce terme dans les langues modernes.

H. J. Zobel distingue deux champs de signification : l'un, séculier, qui concerne les rapports entre les êtres humains, et l'autre, religieux, qui renvoie au **חסד** que Yahweh manifeste envers les hommes<sup>5</sup>. Dans son emploi séculier, Zobel propose de traduire **חסד** par « bonté », « grâce » ou « bienveillance »<sup>6</sup> et de le qualifier par trois adjectifs : actif, social et durable<sup>7</sup>. En effet, **חסד** implique toujours une activité en faveur de la vie. Son aspect social ressort du fait qu'il concerne toujours les relations entre les humains, souvent en contexte familial ou clanique. La notion de pérennité du concept de **חסד** dans une communauté ou une famille est indispensable pour que cette dernière puisse assurer sa fonction de protection.

Au niveau religieux, lorsque le terme concerne les rapports entre Yahweh et les personnes individuelles, les communautés ou les sociétés plus larges (y compris Israël ou le monde entier), Zobel note que **חסד** renvoie au même réseau sémantique que dans son emploi séculier, mais l'accent est mis sur la grâce et la patience divines<sup>8</sup>. La dimension sociale du terme **חסד** se trouve renforcée dans la mesure où le **חסד** de Dieu envers l'homme oblige chaque homme à se comporter de la même manière envers autrui.

<sup>4</sup> Par exemple H. J. Stoebe, « Die Bedeutung und Geschichte des Wortes *ḥāsād* im Alten Testament », *VT* 2 (1952) : 244–54 ; A. Jepsen, « Gnade und Barmherzigkeit », *KuD* 7 (1961) : 261–71 ; N. Glueck, *Hesed in the Bible* (trans. A. Gottschalk, with an introduction by G. A. Larue, edited by E. L. Epstein ; Cincinnati : The Hebrew Union College Press, 1967) ; K. Doob Sakenfeld, *The Meaning of Hesed in the Hebrew Bible : A New Inquiry* (Harvard Semitic Monographs 17 ; Missoula, Montana : Scholars Press, 1978) ; G. R. Clark, *The Word Hesed in the Hebrew Bible* (JSOTSupp 157 ; Sheffield : Sheffield Academic Press, 1993).

<sup>5</sup> H.-J. Zobel, « **חסד** *ḥesed* », in *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*, Vol. V : יהוה – חמר – יהוה *ḥmr* – *YHWH* (ed. G. J. Botterweck and H. Ringgren ; Grand Rapids : Michigan, 1986), 44–64. Récemment, une analyse de la signification de **חסד** dans les manuscrits de Qumrân a été publiée par B. Schlenke, « **חֶסֶד** *ḥæsæd* », in *Theologisches Wörterbuch zu den Qumrantexten*. Band I : חתם – אב (ed. H.-J. Fabry and U. Dahmen ; Stuttgart ; Kohlhammer, 2011), 1026–33.

<sup>6</sup> En anglais : « goodness », « grace », « kindness ».

<sup>7</sup> Zobel, « **חסד** *ḥesed* », 51–54.

<sup>8</sup> Zobel, « **חסד** *ḥesed* », 62–63.

B. *HESED* DANS LA RÈGLE DE LA COMMUNAUTÉ

Plusieurs manuscrits de la Règle de la Communauté ont été retrouvés à Qumrân<sup>9</sup> dans les grottes 1, 4 et 5<sup>10</sup>, le mieux préservé demeurant celui de la grotte 1 (1QS). Un fragment de la grotte 11 pourrait également correspondre à une copie de la Règle de la communauté<sup>11</sup> et des textes en lien avec la Règle ont été retrouvés dans les grottes 1, 4 et 5<sup>12</sup>. La copie la plus ancienne (4QpapS<sup>a</sup>) doit dater de la fin du II<sup>e</sup> s. av. J.-C.<sup>13</sup> et le manuscrit le plus complet (1QS) est approximativement daté du premier quart du I<sup>er</sup> siècle av. J.-C. Le texte a peut-être commencé à se constituer vers le milieu du II<sup>e</sup> siècle av. J.-C.<sup>14</sup>. Le terme  $\text{TDN}$  est attesté en 1QS (et parallèles) et c'est sur ce manuscrit que nous allons appuyer notre analyse<sup>15</sup>.

La Règle de la Communauté est un texte qui décrit et définit les règles d'une communauté particulière qui, au vu de ses références, semble bien ancrée dans le judaïsme de l'époque. Le cadre référentiel est clairement délimité par des renvois à la Loi de Moïse et aux Prophètes<sup>16</sup>, à Aaron<sup>17</sup>, Sadoq<sup>18</sup>, aux Lévites<sup>19</sup>, au texte d'És 40,3<sup>20</sup>, etc. Cependant, certains accents

<sup>9</sup> S. Metso, *The Textual Development of the Qumran Community Rule* (STDJ 21; Leiden : Brill, 1997); P. S. Alexander and G. Vermes, *Qumran Cave 4 : XIX. Serekh Ha-Yahad and Two Related Texts* (DJD 26; Oxford : Clarendon Press, 1998); S. Metso, *The Serekh Texts* (Companion to the Qumran Scrolls 9 – Library of the Second Temple Studies 62; London : T&T Clark, 2007), 1–6.

<sup>10</sup> 1QS; 4QpapS<sup>a</sup> (4Q255); 4QS<sup>b</sup> (4Q256); 4QSpap<sup>c</sup> (4Q257); 4QS<sup>d-j</sup> (4Q258–264); 5QS (5Q11).

<sup>11</sup> 11QFragment Related to Serekh ha-Yahad (11Q29).

<sup>12</sup> 1QS<sup>a</sup>; 1QS<sup>b</sup>; 4Q265; 4Q266 frg. 10; 4Q270 frg. 7; 4Q477; 4Q275; 4Q279; 4Q477; 4Q502 frg. 16 et 5Q13.

<sup>13</sup> F. M. Cross, « Appendix : Paleographical Dates of the Manuscripts », in *Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations. Vol. 1 : Rule of the Community and Related Documents* (ed. J. H. Charlesworth and al.; Tübingen : Mohr Siebeck / Louisville : Westminster John Knox Press, 1994), 57. Cette date est également respectée dans Alexander and Vermes, *Serekh Ha-Yahad and Two Related Texts*, 29.

<sup>14</sup> E. Qimron and J. H. Charlesworth, « Rule of the Community (1QS; cf. 4QS MSS A–J, 5Q11) », in *Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations. Vol. 1 : Rule of the Community and Related Documents* (ed. J. H. Charlesworth and al.; Tübingen : Mohr Siebeck / Louisville : Westminster John Knox Press, 1994), 2.

<sup>15</sup> 1QS I 8.22; II 1.4.24; IV 4.5; V 4 (= 4Q256 IX 4); X 25 (cf. 4Q258 II 4); VIII 2; X 4 (= 4Q256 XIX 3 et 4Q257 IX 1); X 16 (= 4Q260 IV 2); X 26; XI 12.13;  $\text{TDN}$  se lit peut-être une fois dans 1QSb II 24.

<sup>16</sup> 1QS I 3.

<sup>17</sup> 1QS V 6.21; VIII 6.9; IX 6.7.11.

<sup>18</sup> 1QS V 2.9.

<sup>19</sup> 1QS I 19.22; II 4.11.20.

<sup>20</sup> 1QS VIII 14; IX 19–20.

dans la Règle démontrent qu'il s'agit d'un groupe dont le regard sur l'histoire, sur les hommes et sur le temps est très exclusif au sens propre de ce terme.

La communauté concernée par ce texte envisage un monde habité par des hommes animés par l'Esprit de Vérité et par l'Esprit de Perversité<sup>21</sup>. Ces deux Esprits sont présents de façon égale dans le cœur des hommes où ils luttent sans cesse. Ce combat est situé dans un monde qui fait partie de l'empire de Perversité et qui, du point de vue de la *Règle de la Communauté*, est le temps présent de ses lecteurs ; le *présent* de ce texte est un temps de la domination de Bélial<sup>22</sup>. Le monde est situé dans une perspective historique : le temps présent est sous l'emprise de ce qui est négatif et mauvais, mais l'histoire dirige l'humanité vers un temps final qui mettra fin à la domination du négatif. Ce dernier temps est caractérisé par le jugement décisif de Dieu ; ce sera le Jour de la Visite de Dieu dans le monde, un moment caractérisé comme un « renouvellement »<sup>23</sup>. Ce dernier temps sera marqué par la venue du Prophète et des « Oints » — les Messies d'Aaron et d'Israël<sup>24</sup>.

Dans ce monde, la communauté est désignée comme la « Maison de Sainteté pour Israël » et le « Saint des Saints pour Aaron »<sup>25</sup>. C'est une communauté qui contraste avec le monde mauvais, dans lequel elle vit, par l'importance qu'elle donne à la Loi de Moïse, aux règles, aux prescriptions et à la justice. La communauté est sensée représenter, sous l'autorité des prêtres de Sadoq<sup>26</sup>, un îlot de Loi, de sincérité et de justice dans le monde du chaos et de la perversion, et cela, jusqu'au jugement de Dieu et la venue des deux Messies.

Le caractère légal de la communauté est mis en valeur dès le début du séjour de l'adepte dans la communauté : de tout son cœur et de toute son âme, l'adepte, issu d'Israël, doit se convertir à la Loi de Moïse et à la vérité<sup>27</sup>, il doit s'attacher aux prescriptions de la communauté, se soumettre à l'autorité des prêtres<sup>28</sup> et se séparer de la perversion. La sincérité de cette conversion est une des conditions indispensables lors de la cérémonie

<sup>21</sup> 1QS III 13–IV 26.

<sup>22</sup> Par exemple 1QS I 18.23–24 ; II 19 etc.

<sup>23</sup> 1QS IV 18b–23a ; IV 25.

<sup>24</sup> 1QS IX 11.

<sup>25</sup> 1QS VIII 5–6.

<sup>26</sup> 1QS V 2.9.

<sup>27</sup> 1QS V 8 ; VI 15.

<sup>28</sup> Sur les conditions d'admission des nouveaux membres : 1QS I 16–18 ; V 1–20 ; VI 13b–23.

d'entrée dans l'Alliance ; ceux qui y entrent sans sincérité sont maudits de façon comparable aux hommes de Bélial. L'entrée dans la communauté implique une séparation radicale du monde mauvais qui existe en dehors de la communauté.

Cette communauté de Loi, de vérité et de justice a une hiérarchie très stricte<sup>29</sup>. La place au sein de cette hiérarchie est attribuée aux hommes en fonction de leur intelligence et de leurs œuvres relatives à la Loi et peut être modifiée en fonction de la variation de ces paramètres : intelligence, conduite, fautes.

Nous avons donc là une image d'une communauté avec des règles et une hiérarchie très strictes, dont l'identité se définit par la Loi de Moïse et la justice, qui existe sous l'autorité sacerdotale, et qui se distingue ainsi du reste du monde, lequel est sous la domination de la perversion, du mensonge et du mal. Où, donc, chercher un quelconque חסד dans cette communauté pétrie de légalité ?

Cela peut sembler paradoxal, mais cette communauté est aussi pénétrée de la grâce. Le terme חסד apparaît dans la Règle seize fois<sup>30</sup>, depuis le début jusqu'à la fin, et semble représenter un des principes fondamentaux du fonctionnement de la Communauté.

Il est possible de distinguer trois usages du terme חסד répartis dans différentes parties de 1QS<sup>31</sup> : le premier, en 1QS I 8, détermine le contexte dans lequel le terme est utilisé dans l'ensemble du texte ; le second caractérise la relation de Dieu envers les hommes ; et, enfin, le troisième concerne les rapports entre les hommes. Nous allons aborder ces trois usages dans le texte qui suit.

### 1. *Ḥesed dans l'introduction de la Règle*

Tout d'abord, le terme חסד apparaît dans le syntagme ברית חסד « Alliance de grâce » en 1QS I 8, dans l'introduction de l'ensemble du texte (I 1–15). Cette introduction définit brièvement ce qu'est la Communauté (*Yahad*) et résume les principes de base de son fonctionnement. Elle est une « Alliance de grâce » (ברית חסד) dont les membres sont les « volontaires ». Elle est gouvernée par deux principes : la volonté de Dieu communiquée par les textes écrits et une vision dualiste du monde.

<sup>29</sup> 1QS V 20bff.

<sup>30</sup> Ce terme apparaît quinze fois dans 1QS et peut-être une fois dans 1QSb ; voir M. G. Abegg, J. E. Bowley, and E. M. Cook, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Concordance. Vol. 1: The Non-Biblical Texts from Qumran [Part One]* (Leiden – Boston : Brill, 2003), 270.

<sup>31</sup> Nous adoptons la division du texte de Metso, *The Serekh Texts*, 7–14.

Le premier des deux principes — les textes écrits — comprend la Loi de Moïse et les Prophètes (I 3), donc les textes constitutifs du judaïsme antique, avant la fixation du canon à la fin du premier ou au début du deuxième siècle après J.-C.<sup>32</sup>.

Le second principe instaure une vision dualiste du monde où les valeurs positives et négatives sont déterminées par Dieu. Les volontaires dans la Communauté doivent ainsi suivre les préceptes de Dieu, aimer ce que Dieu a élu et haïr ce qu'il a rejeté ; ils doivent pratiquer la vérité, la justice et le droit sur la terre, aimer les fils de lumière et haïr les fils de ténèbres, etc.

Ainsi, dès le préambule, cette Communauté, avec son regard dualiste sur le monde et dont l'identité se définit par les textes constitutifs du judaïsme de l'époque, est définie comme une « Alliance de grâce » (ברית חסד ; I 8). C'est-à-dire une Alliance que Dieu a conclue comme une manifestation de sa grâce (חסד) avec les membres de la Communauté qui, en retour, doivent observer ses commandements. Il convient de noter le caractère réciproque de cette Alliance qui consiste en la manifestation de la grâce divine envers les hommes et de leur observation des préceptes divins.

Le syntagme ברית חסד « Alliance de grâce » n'est pas attesté dans les textes vététotestamentaires en tant que tel. Mais on peut constater que l'association de « l'Alliance » (ברית) de Dieu et de sa « grâce » (חסד) se retrouve clairement dans la Bible hébraïque notamment à travers l'expression שמר הברית והחסד « (Dieu) qui garde l'Alliance et la grâce » envers ceux qui observent ses préceptes, selon Dt 7,9.12, Ne 1,5 et Dn 9,4<sup>33</sup>. Ce concept biblique contient la même réciprocité. Un tel rapprochement entre ברית et חסד, où la grâce est devenue le contenu de l'Alliance, est, selon H.-J. Zobel, caractéristique de la théologie postexilique<sup>34</sup>. La Règle de la Communauté s'insère ainsi comme un témoin tardif de ce développement initié dans la Bible hébraïque.

<sup>32</sup> Voir la mention de la Loi et des Prophètes dans le prologue du Siracide et dans Flavius Josèphe, *C. Ap.* I, 37–41.

<sup>33</sup> Cf. aussi 1 R 8,23 et 1 Ch 6,14 ; Ne 9,32. Pour d'autres parallèles entre « alliance » et « grâce », cf. Es 54,10 ; Ps 89,29 et 106,45.

<sup>34</sup> Zobel, « חסד *hesed* », 60–64.

2. *Le Ḥesed de Dieu envers les hommes*

Alors que, dans la Bible hébraïque, le terme חסד est généralement utilisé au singulier<sup>35</sup>, la Règle de la Communauté emploie une forme plurielle sept fois sur les quinze occurrences de חסד dans 1QS<sup>36</sup>. Ces sept attestations, plus deux au singulier<sup>37</sup>, concernent la « grâce » ou les « grâces » de Dieu envers les membres de la Communauté. Ces attestations apparaissent dans trois parties différentes de la Règle : dans la liturgie du renouvellement de l'Alliance (I 16–III 12), dans l'instruction sur les deux Esprits (III 13–IV 26) et dans l'hymne de conclusion de 1QS (IX 26b–XI 22).

a) *La liturgie du renouvellement de l'Alliance (I 16–III 12)*

Dans cette partie de 1QS, le terme חסד apparaît trois fois :

- 1QS I 22 : כול חסדי רחמים « toutes les grâces de la miséricorde ». L'expression apparaît dans le contexte de la liturgie qui doit accompagner la cérémonie durant laquelle les nouveaux membres sont acceptés dans la Communauté. Lors de cette cérémonie, les prêtres doivent — entre autres — proclamer « toutes les grâces de la miséricorde » que Dieu a fait pour Israël.
- 1QS II 1 : רחמי חסדו « les miséricordes de sa grâce ». Ce syntagme fait partie du discours des membres accueillis dans la Communauté et fait suite à celui des prêtres. Les nouveaux membres confessent « les miséricordes de sa grâce » que Dieu leur manifeste en tout temps. Les groupes génitifs des termes חסד « grâce » et רחמים « miséricorde » tel qu'ils apparaissent en 1QS I 22 et II 1, ne sont pas attestés dans l'Ancien Testament. Ils peuvent cependant être rapprochés des versets bibliques où רחמים est utilisé en parallélisme avec חסד lorsqu'il concerne le divin<sup>38</sup> ou les relations entre les hommes<sup>39</sup>.
- 1QS II 4 : וישא פני חסדיו לכה « et qu'il lève vers toi sa face gracieuse ». Lors de la cérémonie du renouvellement de l'Alliance, les prêtres doivent bénir les hommes du lot de Dieu par une bénédiction contenant l'expression « face gracieuse » (1QS II 2b–4a). Cette bénédiction est en fait une paraphrase de Nb 6,23–26 où Aaron et ses fils doivent

<sup>35</sup> Selon Zobel, חסד apparaît seulement 18 fois au pluriel dans la Bible hébraïque du total de 245 attestations. See Zobel, « חסד *hesed* », 45.

<sup>36</sup> I 22 ; II 4 ; IV 5 ; X 4.16.12.13.

<sup>37</sup> 1QS II 1 et IV 4.

<sup>38</sup> Ps 25,6 ; Es 63,7 ; Jr 16,5 ; Lm 3,22.

<sup>39</sup> Za 7,9.



bénir les fils d'Israël : 1QS II 2b–4a présente la même séquence de verbes qu'en Nb 6,23–26<sup>40</sup>.

*b) L'instruction sur les deux Esprits (III 13–IV 26)*

Selon l'instruction sur les deux Esprits, l'Esprit de Vérité que Dieu a attribué à l'homme, le soutient par רוב חסדו « l'abondance de sa grâce (= celle de Dieu) » (1QS IV 4) et offre רוב חסדים « l'abondance des grâces » (1QS IV 5) en faveur des fils de vérité<sup>41</sup>.

*c) L'hymne final (IX 26b–XI 22)*

Dans l'hymne final de 1QS, le terme חסד est utilisé quatre fois :

- 1QS X 4 : למפתח חסדיו « pour ouvrir ses grâces ». Le terme apparaît dans la section relative au calendrier qui introduit l'hymne final.
- 1QS X 16 : על חסדיו « sur ses grâces ». Celui qui chante l'hymne confesse que les grâces de Dieu lui servent d'appui tous les jours.
- 1QS XI 12 : אל חסדי « les grâces de Dieu ». Les grâces de Dieu représentent le salut pour celui qui chante l'hymne dans les moments où il chancelle. On trouve une expression parallèle אל חסד « la grâce de Dieu » en Ps 52,3 et d'autres parallèles où le terme est construit avec *Jhwh* ou *Elohim* sont attestés dans les textes vétérotestamentaires<sup>42</sup>.
- 1QS XI 13 : בחסדיו יבוא משפטו « dans/par ses grâces viendra mon jugement ». Ici, celui qui chante l'hymne affirme que par les grâces de Dieu il a la certitude d'avoir droit au (juste) jugement.

3. *Hesed dans les relations entre les hommes*

L'emploi de חסד, lorsqu'il concerne les relations entre les hommes, est attesté cinq fois en 1QS et chaque fois sous la forme stéréotypée אהבת חסד « gracieux amour », ou, selon la traduction d'André Dupont-Sommer, « affectueuse charité »<sup>43</sup>. Cette expression se lit dans les parties de 1QS suivantes :

<sup>40</sup> Il s'agit des verbes dans l'ordre suivant : ברך « bénir » – שמר « garder » – אור « illuminer » – חנן « être gracieux » – נשא « lever ».

<sup>41</sup> Les deux variantes du groupe génitif רוב חסד « abondance de grâce » trouvent des parallèles dans certains livres de l'Ancien testament : Ne 13,22 ; Ps 5,8 ; 69,14 ; 106,45 ; Es 63,7 ; Lm 3,32.

<sup>42</sup> חסדי יהוה : Ps 89,2 ; 107,43 ; Es 63,7 ; Lm 3,22. חסד אלהים : 2 S 9,3 ; Ps 52,10.

<sup>43</sup> C'est ainsi qu'A. Dupont-Sommer traduit אהבת חסד dans « Règle de la Communauté », in *La Bible : Écrits intertestamentaires* (éd. A. Dupont-Sommer et al. ; Bibliothèque de la Pléiade ; Paris : Gallimard, 1987), 3–46.

Dans la Liturgie du renouvellement de l'Alliance (I 16–III 12). En II 24, l'expression אהבת חסד apparaît dans la partie relative au recensement annuel où la Communauté y est décrite comme une Communauté de vérité (אמת), de vertueuse humilité (ענות טוב), de gracieux amour (אהבת חסד), de scrupuleuse justice (מחשבת צדק) et où tout le monde prend soin de l'autre.

Dans la Règle de la vie de la Communauté (V 1–VI 23). En V 4, אהבת חסד apparaît parmi les valeurs qui doivent gouverner le comportement des membres de la Communauté : la vérité en commun (לעשות אמת יחד), l'humilité (ענוה), la justice (צדקה), le droit (משפט), le gracieux amour (אהבת חסד), la modestie de conduite (הצנע לכת). Selon 1QS V 25, les membres de la Communauté doivent se réprimander mutuellement dans la vérité (אמת), l'humilité (ענוה) et le gracieux amour à l'égard de chacun (אהבת חסד לאיש).

Dans le « Manifeste » (VIII 1–IX 26a). En VIII 2, אהבת חסד apparaît au milieu d'autres valeurs comme la vérité (אמת), la justice (צדקה), le droit (משפט) et la modestie de conduite l'un envers l'autre (הצנע לכת איש עם). Ce sont les valeurs que doivent pratiquer les seize membres du conseil de la Communauté versés dans la Loi.

Dans l'hymne final (IX 26b–XI 22). En X 26, le chantre affirme qu'il manifestera la justice (צדק) et un gracieux amour (אהבת חסד) envers les vaincus/découragés. Dans ce texte, il n'est pas totalement clair si son comportement vise exclusivement les membres de la Communauté ou s'il a une portée plus large. Cependant, l'hymne semble être prononcé par un membre de la Communauté.

Toutes ces occurrences démontrent que « le gracieux amour (אהבת חסד) » est un des principes de base du fonctionnement de la Communauté. Il doit déterminer le comportement des membres les uns envers les autres en association avec des valeurs comme la vérité, la justice, le droit et la modestie de conduite. Cette liste de valeurs fondamentales qui doit gouverner le comportement du peuple de Dieu, trouve son modèle vétérotestamentaire en Mi 6,8. Ce passage prophétique mentionne l'essentiel de ce que le Seigneur exige de son peuple à la place de nombreux sacrifices, à savoir : le droit, le gracieux amour et la modestie de conduite avec le Dieu<sup>44</sup>. Les textes de 1QS cités plus haut ne sont que des paraphrases

<sup>44</sup> Mi 6,8 : הגיד לך אדם מה־טוב ומה־יהוה דורש ממך כי אִם־עשות משפט ואהבת חסד « On t'a fait connaître, ô homme, ce qui est bon, ce que le Seigneur exige de toi : rien d'autre que de pratiquer le droit, le gracieux amour et la modestie de conduite avec ton Dieu ».

du verset de Mi 6,8 au même titre que Mt 23,23 où Jésus fait de Mi 6,8 un principe de base du comportement entre les hommes et le considère comme l'essentiel de la Loi<sup>45</sup>.

#### 4. *Ḥesed dans 1QS : synthèse*

Nous avons vu que la Règle de la Communauté utilisait souvent un langage inspiré par les textes de la Bible hébraïque. Cependant, ces expressions, empruntées au vocabulaire théologique des écrits en usage dans le judaïsme de l'époque, ne communiquent pas exactement les mêmes valeurs que les expressions de ces textes sources. Ce langage de 1QS est employé dans un contexte nouveau et exclusiviste lié à la description du fonctionnement de la Communauté. Dès les premiers passages de 1QS, on peut constater une forte affirmation de la vision dualiste du monde où la Communauté représente l'unique bonne alternative face à Bélial. C'est ce nouveau contexte qui détermine la signification de **דסח** dans la Règle de la Communauté comme l'a déjà bien souligné W. Zimmerli<sup>46</sup>. La Communauté est une « Alliance de grâce » où Dieu manifeste sa grâce en faveur de ses membres qui, en retour, doivent respecter et suivre ses commandements et ses préceptes. Les membres de la Communauté — de l'Alliance de grâce — reçoivent les grâces et les miséricordes de Dieu et, en conséquence, doivent pratiquer le « gracieux amour » envers les membres de la Communauté. Ce « gracieux amour » qui représente un des principes fondamentaux du fonctionnement de la Communauté, est réservé exclusivement aux relations entre ses membres, à l'exception peut-être de X 26 où le destinataire du gracieux amour n'est pas clairement déterminé. Le fait que **דסח** concerne presque exclusivement les membres de la Communauté contraste avec la portée de ce terme dans les textes de la Bible hébraïque où il a une signification plus universelle<sup>47</sup>.

<sup>45</sup> « Malheureux êtes-vous, scribes et Pharisiens hypocrites, vous qui versez la dîme de la menthe, du fenouil et du cumin, alors que vous négligez ce qu'il y a de plus grave dans la Loi : le droit (*κρισις*), la grâce/la compassion (*ἔλεος*) et la fidélité (*πιστις*) ; c'est ceci qu'il fallait faire, sans négliger cela ».

<sup>46</sup> W. Zimmerli, « **דסח** im Schrifttum von Qumran », in *Hommages à André Dupont-Sommer* (éds. A. Caquot, M. Philonenko ; Paris : Librairie d'Amérique et d'Orient Adrien Maisonneuve, 1971), 439–449.

<sup>47</sup> « The history of Yahweh's people, past, present, and future, the life of the individual Israelite — in fact, the entire world — is the stage for the demonstration of Yahweh's kindness (= **דסח**). Yahweh has decided in favor of Israel ; he has promised life, care, alleviation of distress, and preservation — indeed, he has filled the whole earth with his kindness (= **דסח**) » (Zobel, « **דסח** *ḥesed* », 62).

𐤛𐤓𐤏 n'est pas un terme fréquent dans la Règle de la Communauté, mais il y joue un rôle important. En effet, dans cette perspective, la vie dans « la grâce » (𐤛𐤓𐤏) est une vie sous la Loi, dans la vérité, après le jugement juste de Dieu et après la purification des péchés lors de l'admission du disciple dans l'Alliance. La Règle de la Communauté présente cette vie dans la grâce comme la seule bonne alternative dans le monde de perversité dominé par Bélial jusqu'au temps du jugement décisif pour le reste du monde et la venue des prophètes et des Messies d'Aaron et d'Israël.

En fait, la Communauté se considère en quelque sorte comme un précurseur du monde futur, bon et juste, qui existera après le jugement du monde mauvais : ses membres ont *déjà* été jugés par Dieu<sup>48</sup>, ils vivent *déjà* dans la Communauté de justice, de droit et de la miséricorde mutuelle, affranchis de leurs péchés. En revanche, seul le monde de Bélial, contemporain de la Communauté, attend ce jugement. La Communauté représente donc une sorte de microcosme gouverné par la Loi, le bien et la justice, sans péchés au milieu du monde mauvais ; un microcosme qui attend que le jugement final établisse les valeurs exigées par Dieu dans le monde extérieur, alors même qu'elles sont *déjà* pratiquées au sein de la Communauté.

### C. CHARIS DANS L'ÉPÎTRE AUX GALATES

Dans cette troisième partie, nous allons nous concentrer sur la signification du terme χάρις dans l'épître aux Galates afin de déterminer s'il y a des rapprochements possibles avec la signification de 𐤛𐤓𐤏 dans la Règle de la Communauté. Au premier regard, un tel rapprochement ne semble pas évident lorsqu'on examine les équivalents grecs de 𐤛𐤓𐤏 dans la Septante. Dans la plupart des cas, le terme y est rendu par ἔλεος (213 fois) et seulement deux fois par χάρις<sup>49</sup>. C'est également le cas, par exemple, en Mt 23,23 cité précédemment où, dans l'allusion à Mi 6,8, l'auteur utilise ἔλεος comme équivalent de 𐤛𐤓𐤏 et non pas χάρις. En outre, dans la Septante, χάρις correspond généralement à des dérivés de la racine 𐤍𐤏<sup>50</sup>.

<sup>48</sup> 1QS I 26.

<sup>49</sup> Les autres mots qui dans la Septante traduisent 𐤛𐤓𐤏 sont ἐλεημοσύνη (6 fois), ἐλεήμος (2 fois), δικαιοσύνη (8 fois), δίκαιος (1 fois), δόξα (1 fois), ἐλπίζ (1 fois), τάξις (1 fois), τὰ ὄσια (1 fois), ὀικτιρμός (1 fois), ἀντιλήπτωρ (1 fois), δικαιοσύνηκαὶ ἔλεος (1 fois). Selon Zobel, « 𐤛𐤓𐤏 *hesed* », 45.

<sup>50</sup> W. Zimmerli, « χάρις κτλ. B. Old Testament », in *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. Vol. IX: Φ-Ω* (ed. G. Friedrich ; trad. and ed. G. W. Bromiley ; Grand Rapids, Michigan : Eerdmans, 2006 [1<sup>st</sup> ed. 1974]), 376-387, notamment 376ff. Voir aussi T. Mura-

T. Muraoka traduit  $\chi\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\varsigma$  par « outward beauty », « charming or attractive quality », « kindness », « favourable estimation » ou « sens of gratitude »<sup>51</sup>.

Cependant, dans les textes néotestamentaires, en dépit de Mt 23,23 et de l'usage de la Septante, le terme  $\chi\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\varsigma$  semble souvent se rapprocher du concept de  $\tau\omicron\pi$  et devrait être compris à partir de la signification de ce dernier<sup>52</sup>. Notre objectif est donc d'examiner la signification de  $\chi\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\varsigma$  dans l'épître aux Galates et de déterminer s'il y a un rapport possible avec le sens de  $\tau\omicron\pi$  dans la Règle de la Communauté.  $\chi\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\varsigma$  est attesté quatre fois dans l'épître : en Ga 1,6.15 ; 2,9 ; 2,21 et 5,4.

Cette lettre paulinienne peut être datée vers le milieu du 1<sup>er</sup> siècle, probablement vers 54 ou vers 56<sup>53</sup>. Comme la Règle de la Communauté, elle puise ses arguments dans les textes de référence de l'époque, reconnus quelques décennies plus tard comme faisant partie du canon de la Bible juive. Mais l'univers dans lequel elle se situe et son enjeu diffère de celui de la Règle de Communauté à plusieurs égards. Cette lettre est écrite par Paul à l'église de Galatie dans une situation où il se sent obligé de leur expliquer pourquoi eux, en tant que païens, n'ont pas besoin de se faire circoncire et d'accepter la Loi.

Après les salutations, l'introduction de la lettre (Ga 1,1–10, en particulier Ga 1,6–10) détermine clairement cet enjeu, son thème central et la raison pour laquelle elle a été écrite : les Galates ne doivent pas se détourner du véritable évangile auquel ils ont été appelés par la grâce du Christ ( $\chi\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\varsigma$  ; Ga 1,6), pour aller vers un faux évangile.

Dans la première partie (Ga 1,11–2,21) Paul rapporte les événements de sa conversion, comment il a été appelé par la grâce de Dieu ( $\chi\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\varsigma$  ;

---

ka, *A Greek – Hebrew/Aramaic Two-Way Index to the Septuagint* (Louvain/Paris/Walpole, MA : Peeters, 2010), 127.

<sup>51</sup> T. Muraoka, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint* (Louvain/Paris/Walpole, MA : Peeters, 2009), 729.

<sup>52</sup> « (...) But the warning may be given that the word is not to be understood primarily from the Greek but from its lively Semitic background ; Greek  $\chi\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\varsigma$  was a happy find for translation, but it was not the whole of *hesed*. Every word has its own personality ; a translation is but a mask. » Citation de J. A. Montgomery, « Hebrew *Hesed* and Greek *Charis* », *HTR* 32 (1939) : 97–102, notamment 101. Walther Zimmerli présente des arguments allant dans le même sens : « The present treatment of  $\tau\omicron\pi$  is also suggested by the consideration that in the later speech of the Old Testament there is a remarkable merging of  $\eta\pi$  and  $\tau\omicron\pi$  in which  $\tau\omicron\pi$  loses its earlier distinctiveness in favour of the meaning of  $\eta\pi$ , and furthermore that the later translators with increasing firmness connect  $\tau\omicron\pi$  and  $\chi\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\varsigma$  », Zimmerli, «  $\chi\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\varsigma$  κτλ. B. Old Testament », 381.

<sup>53</sup> P. Pokorný et U. Heckel, *Einleitung in das Neue Testament. Seine Literatur und Theologie im Überblick* (UTB 2798 ; Tübingen : Mohr Siebeck, 2007), 228.

Ga 1,15) à révéler le Christ aux païens<sup>54</sup>. Il décrit ensuite sa rencontre avec les apôtres à Jérusalem lesquels ont alors reconnu la grâce (χάρις ; Ga 2,9) qui lui a été donnée pour aller vers les païens<sup>55</sup>. Enfin, Paul rapporte le conflit concernant la duplicité de Céphas qui, circoncis, se comportait lors de sa visite à Antioche comme un païen<sup>56</sup>. Ce développement autobiographique culmine en Ga 2,15–21 dans un discours où Paul expose sa doctrine sur la justification (δικαιοῦν « rendre justice », « justifier ») non par les œuvres de la Loi, mais par la foi du Christ. Il indique ainsi en quoi consiste la grâce : la grâce de Dieu a du sens seulement si l'on obtient la justice (δικαιοσύνη) par la mort du Christ (Ga 2,21). Si, par contre, on pouvait être justifié par les œuvres de la Loi même après la mort du Christ, qui serait alors inutile, on aurait rejeté la grâce de Dieu.

Dans la deuxième partie de l'épître aux Galates (Ga 3,1–5,12) Paul développe et explique sa position en s'appuyant sur les textes constitutifs du judaïsme de l'époque : la Torah et les Prophètes. Il approfondit l'opposition entre Loi et foi par l'ajout de l'opposition entre chair — du côté de la Loi — et Esprit — reçu par les Galates à partir de l'écoute du message de la foi<sup>57</sup> —. Tout en continuant de puiser ses références dans la Torah et les Prophètes<sup>58</sup>, il explique ensuite pourquoi les païens qui ont la foi, sont eux aussi justifiés par la foi en tant que fils d'Abraham. La Loi, qui est venue après Abraham et qui rendait les gens captifs, a eu un rôle provisoire de surveillant (παιδαγωγός), jusqu'à la venue du Christ qui a accompli la promesse de justification par la foi donnée à Abraham et sa descendance avant le don de la Loi. Le Christ a ainsi rendu la Loi inutile et a fait des païens la descendance d'Abraham, destinataire de la promesse de Dieu concernant la justification par la foi. C'est pourquoi les Galates n'ont plus revenir à la Loi — donc à la servitude — puisqu'ils sont fils de Dieu et héritiers de sa promesse<sup>59</sup>. Paul développe ensuite les thèmes de la chair et de l'Esprit avec de nouveaux renvois aux textes de la Torah et des Prophètes<sup>60</sup>. Il évoque notamment Abraham et ses deux femmes, l'une esclave et l'autre libre, pour conseiller aux Galates de ne pas se soumettre à la Loi asservissante, mais de se tourner vers la liberté<sup>61</sup>.

<sup>54</sup> Ga 1,11–24.

<sup>55</sup> Ga 2,1–10.

<sup>56</sup> Ga 2,11–14.

<sup>57</sup> Ga 3,1–5.

<sup>58</sup> Gn 12,3 ; 15,6 ; Lv 18,5 ; Dt 21,23 ; 27,26 ; Ha 2,4.

<sup>59</sup> Ga 4,1–20.

<sup>60</sup> Gn 16,15 ; 21,2.10 ; Es 54,1.

<sup>61</sup> Ga 4,21–31.

Cette deuxième partie de l'épître se termine par une exhortation à la liberté et à ne plus revenir à l'esclavage en acceptant la circoncision<sup>62</sup>. En Ga 5,4, Paul reprend les thèmes de la justification et de la grâce évoqués en Ga 2,21 : celui qui place sa justice dans la Loi, rompt avec le Christ, et tombe en dehors de la grâce (τῆς χάριτος ἐξέπεσατε). Cela implique que, pour Paul, être dans la grâce de Dieu, c'est être en Christ, exposé à l'Esprit, dans la foi par laquelle on est justifié. Paul introduit ici une nouvelle valeur impliquée par « l'être dans la grâce » : c'est l'amour (ἀγάπη) par laquelle la foi agit (Ga 5,6). Ce thème de l'amour est par la suite développé dans les conclusions de la lettre.

Enfin, dans la partie finale (Ga 5,13–6,18), Paul définit le principe de base du fonctionnement de la communauté : l'amour doit déterminer les relations interpersonnelles parce que c'est l'amour du prochain comme soi-même qui représente l'accomplissement de la Loi tout entière<sup>63</sup>. C'est donc cette Loi — la Loi du Christ (Ga 6,2) — qui doit désormais gouverner les relations entre les hommes dans ce que Paul appelle la « nouvelle création »<sup>64</sup>. Les membres de la communauté — les Galates — doivent être guidés par l'Esprit qui comporte les valeurs positives, dont la première est l'amour et les autres sont la joie, la paix, la patience, la bonté, la bienveillance, la foi, la douceur, et la maîtrise de soi<sup>65</sup>. L'Esprit garantit la liberté, la non-soumission à la Loi et fait éviter les œuvres de la chair liés à la Loi<sup>66</sup>.

L'univers de Paul, tel qu'il est décrit dans l'épître aux Galates, s'étend entre deux Lois : la Loi de Moïse et la Loi du Christ. C'est en expliquant le rapport entre ces deux pôles et les valeurs qu'ils comportent que Paul donne la réponse aux Galates quant à leur écart de l'Évangile.

Dans cette épître, on trouve les traces d'une sorte de bipolarité entre le mal et le bien, comme l'indique le texte de Ga 1,3 : le monde actuel est mauvais, mais nous en avons été arrachés selon la volonté de Dieu. Mais la tension principale de cette lettre n'est pas tant entre le *mal* et le *bien*, parce que nous avons été *déjà* arrachés au mal, qu'entre ce qui est *vrai* et ce qui est *faux*.

La vérité et la réalité consistent dans le sacrifice du Christ et la reconnaissance par les hommes de ce sacrifice comme une grâce de Dieu en

<sup>62</sup> Ga 5,1–12.

<sup>63</sup> Ga 5,13b–14.

<sup>64</sup> Ga 6,15.

<sup>65</sup> Ga 5,16.22–25.

<sup>66</sup> Ga 5,17–21.

faveur de l'humanité. La mort du Christ a accompli la Loi qui désormais perd sa valeur de surveillant du comportement humain ; cette mort a ouvert la voie de liberté dans laquelle le comportement humain doit être guidé par l'Esprit et dans laquelle les relations interpersonnelles doivent être gouvernées par l'amour. Désormais, la justice ne vient plus de la Loi mais de la foi. Telle est donc la réalité du monde selon Paul après la mort du Christ.

Cette conception du vrai après le Christ change le rôle de la Loi de Moïse. Avant la venue du Christ, la Loi avait du sens en tant que surveillant (παιδαγωγός) et guide du comportement humain. Cependant, après le Christ, ce rôle s'avère inutile et faux parce que dépassé par le sacrifice du Christ. Donc, insister sur la Loi et, en particulier, sur la circoncision représente dans le monde tel que Paul le conçoit, un anachronisme dont il accentue la fausseté à plusieurs reprises<sup>67</sup>.

Quel est donc le rôle de la grâce (χάρις) de Dieu dans cet univers ? La grâce ouvre et conclut l'épître dans les formules de salutations (Ga 1,3 et 6,18). À l'exception de ces deux occurrences, la grâce joue un rôle important dans la diffusion de la vérité :

- Paul a été appelé par la grâce de Dieu pour qu'il révèle en lui son Fils aux païens (Ga 1,15).
- Les apôtres ont reconnu la grâce qui a été donnée à Paul (Ga 2,9).
- Les Galates qui sont des païens, ont eux aussi été appelés par la grâce de Dieu à la vérité de l'Évangile (Ga 1,6).
- La grâce de Dieu n'a du sens que si l'on reconnaît que la justice a été rendue par la mort du Christ. Dès lors, on n'obtient plus la justice par la Loi (Ga 2,21).
- Si on place la justice dans la Loi, on tombe en dehors de la grâce (Ga 5,4).

La grâce est ainsi une activité de Dieu envers les hommes dont l'événement constitutif est la mort du Christ. Ce dernier implique à la fois l'accomplissement de la Loi et la libération de la Loi. Cette grâce se répand par la reconnaissance de cette vérité proclamée par Paul. La grâce constitue le milieu dans lequel vivent ceux qui ont été appelés par Dieu et qui ont reconnu la valeur libératrice de la mort du Christ.

D'après l'épître aux Galates, la grâce correspond à l'état de simple reconnaissance de la réalité *après* la venue du Christ et de l'acceptation de cette réalité. On est dans la grâce si l'on accepte que l'on ne peut pas être

---

<sup>67</sup> Par exemple l'affirmation de la vérité de l'unique Évangile en Ga 1,6–7 ou le constat que même les circoncis qui doivent observer la loi et encourager les autres à la suivre, ne l'observent pas (Ga 6,13).



justifié par la Loi mais par la foi. Dans cette épître, Paul considère que seul cet état des choses est vrai. Si on ne l'accepte pas, on se détourne de ce qui est vrai et réel et on tombe dans le faux et l'irréel ; on tombe sous la Loi, en dehors de la grâce.

La vie dans la grâce doit être guidée par l'Esprit et le principe de base des relations entre les hommes dans la grâce est l'amour : l'amour du prochain comme soi-même. Cet amour est désormais la nouvelle Loi dans laquelle l'ancienne Loi se trouve accomplie.

#### D. CONCLUSION

Nous avons constaté une forte affiliation de la terminologie utilisée dans la Règle de la Communauté avec le vocabulaire de certains écrits vétérotestamentaires : le texte contient des termes, des expressions, tirés de ces écrits, voire même des paraphrases de ces textes. Cependant, dans 1QS, tout ce vocabulaire est utilisé dans de nouveaux contextes. Il est reformulé et son sens se trouve déplacé par rapport aux textes originaux pour exprimer la vision dualiste liée à un certain exclusivisme de la communauté.

Nous pouvons également constater que le vocabulaire théologique que l'on trouve dans l'épître de Paul aux Galates ressemble beaucoup à celui de la Règle de la Communauté, même si — et nous le soulignons — la visée des deux textes est bien différente. Ces deux textes contiennent un certain nombre de parallèles frappants et le concept de la grâce en représente un parmi d'autres.

Les deux textes enracinent leur discours sur la Loi et les Prophètes. Tous deux contiennent un discours sur l'Esprit. 1QS parle de l'Esprit de Vérité qui illumine le cœur de l'homme et de l'Esprit de Perversité qui comporte les valeurs négatives ; chacun de ces deux Esprits est caractérisé par une liste de valeurs qui lui appartiennent<sup>68</sup>. Dans l'épître aux Galates, on trouve une opposition comparable entre l'Esprit et la chair qui sont également caractérisés par des listes de valeurs qu'ils impliquent<sup>69</sup>.

---

<sup>68</sup> 1QS III 13–IV 26. Pour les listes des valeurs positives (humilité, longanimité, miséricorde, éternelle bonté, entendement, intelligence, etc.) et négatives (cupidité, relâchement au service de la justice, impiété, mensonge, orgueil, fausseté, tromperie, etc.), voir notamment 1QS IV 2–14.

<sup>69</sup> Ga 5,19–24. Les fruits de l'Esprit sont amour, joie, paix, patience, bonté, bienveillance, etc. Les œuvres de la chair sont libertinage, impureté, débauche, idolâtrie, magie, etc.

En ce qui concerne la grâce, elle joue un rôle important dans les deux textes. Dans la Règle de la Communauté, Dieu manifeste sa grâce (דסח) aux membres de la communauté et eux, en retour, respectent les commandements de Dieu. La Communauté, qui abrite ses membres devant le monde extérieur de Bélial, est explicitement appelée « Alliance de grâce ». C'est une communauté basée sur la Loi / le droit (טשפמ), la justice (צדקה) et le gracieux amour (דסהבא חסד); ces valeurs sont parmi les principes les plus importants de son fonctionnement.

Dans l'épître aux Galates, Paul décrit l'impulsion de la grâce (χαρις) de Dieu qui répand sur les hommes — ceux qui reçoivent la grâce divine — la justification par la mort du Christ. Cette justification est la pierre de touche de la nouvelle communauté chrétienne. La grâce représente un espace communautaire de justice (δικαιοσύνη) établi par la mort du Christ; c'est un milieu de vie duquel on peut tomber si l'on conteste cette réalité. Dans ce texte, le commandement de l'amour (ἀγάπη) représente une nouvelle Loi.

Le concept de la grâce de Dieu qui crée une sorte d'espace communautaire de justice, est donc commun à 1QS et à l'épître aux Galates. L'amour entre ceux qui partagent la foi selon Paul est également comparable au gracieux amour qui constitue un des principes de base de la Règle de la Communauté. Nous pouvons même observer une filiation de ce thème qui trouve sa source en Mi 6,8 avec un accent mis sur le droit, le gracieux amour et la modestie de conduite, exigés par Dieu à la place des sacrifices. Dans 1QS, nous retrouvons une paraphrase de cette liste appliquée à la vie de la Communauté<sup>70</sup>. En Mt 23,23, dans le discours de Jésus contre les pharisiens, Jésus considère la justice, la grâce et la foi comme une essence de la Loi. Enfin, chez Paul, nous pouvons la discerner à travers la notion d'amour et à travers le commandement d'aimer son prochain comme soi-même (Ga 5,14) qui, selon Paul, est l'accomplissement de la Loi entière. Ici, Paul omet visiblement la justice parce que dans sa théologie cette dernière ne vient plus de la Loi, mais a été rendue par la mort du Christ.

En dépit de ces parallèles, la visée de la Règle de la Communauté est différente de celle de l'épître aux Galates. Selon 1QS, l'élément constitutif de la Communauté est la Loi qui représente déjà un îlot de droit, de justice et de gracieux amour dans un monde mauvais qui attend encore la venue des Messies (d'Aaron et d'Israël). Cette Communauté est une Alliance de grâce qui se positionne par rapport au monde mauvais qui l'englobe et

<sup>70</sup> 1QS V 4; VIII 2; cf. II 24; V 25; X 26.

dans lequel elle représente une sorte de précurseur du monde futur qui sera établi après le jugement. Le conflit de base est donc entre le *mal* et le *bien* où le bien dépend essentiellement de la Loi.

En revanche, selon Paul, l'élément constitutif de la communauté chrétienne est la venue et la mort du Messie davidique, le Christ, qui a accompli et dépassé la Loi. C'est une communauté qui ne se positionne plus contre le monde mauvais puisqu'elle en a *déjà* été arrachée par la mort du Messie, mais elle doit se situer en opposition à la Loi qui désormais perd sa valeur et son sens. Les chrétiens sont ainsi la communauté de grâce qui prend sa position en opposition à ce qui a perdu son sens, ce qui est devenu faux. Le conflit de base, résolu dans ce texte se situe donc entre ce qui est *vrai* (la vie dans la valeur de la mort du Christ avec toutes ses implications) et ce qui est *faux* (la vie sous la Loi).

Ces points représentent le pivot qui fait basculer les valeurs entre la Règle de la Communauté et l'épître aux Galates et qui donne au vocabulaire et aux thèmes communs une nouvelle perspective. Cette perspective détermine le discours sur la Loi, sur ce qu'il faut considérer comme vrai, sur la justice et aussi sur la grâce. Les deux textes ont au centre une Loi : la Loi de Moïse dans la Règle de la Communauté et la Loi du Christ dans l'épître aux Galates laquelle accomplit et dépasse la Loi de Moïse. Les deux textes parlent des œuvres de la Loi : la Règle les accentue tandis que l'épître écarte leur signification qu'elle considère comme dépassée<sup>71</sup>. Selon la Règle de la Communauté, la vie dans « l'Alliance de grâce » *avant* la venue des messies était uniquement possible *sous* la Loi et dans un cadre hiérarchique très strict. En revanche, chez Paul, la venue du Messie/Christ a accompli la Loi et la vie dans la grâce est désormais possible à condition d'accepter cette réalité avec toutes les conséquences. Pour Paul, la vie dans la grâce *après* la venue du Messie, dans la nouvelle création, est contraire à la Loi, elle consiste en la vie *libérée* de la Loi et *sous* la conduite de l'Esprit.

Tous ces parallèles montrent que l'auteur de la Règle de la Communauté et l'apôtre Paul semblent avoir puisé dans le même imaginaire du judaïsme palestinien, dans un cadre littéraire très similaire, et que les deux textes contiennent des concepts comparables. Nous ne voulons absolument pas prétendre que Paul a connu la Règle de la Communauté. D'ailleurs, les Messies dans la Règle de la Communauté et dans l'épître aux Galates ne sont pas les mêmes. Cependant, la lecture de ces deux textes

---

<sup>71</sup> 1QS V 21 ; VI 18 ; Ga 2,16.

laisse penser que l'épître aux Galates se positionne par rapport à l'univers et aux concepts décrits par la Règle de la Communauté. Néanmoins, Paul les développerait et les reformulerait dans une nouvelle perspective historique déterminée par la venue et la mort du Christ.



## PHILIPPIENS 3,21-4,1 ET IQS IV 6-8

Christian Grappe

*Université de Strasbourg*

Les versets de l'épître aux Philippiens qui vont retenir plus particulièrement notre attention se situent au terme d'une section dans laquelle Paul met en garde les destinataires de sa missive tout en les invitant à l'imiter dans leur compréhension de l'existence (3,1b-4,1).

Cette section commence par une mise en garde contre les faux circonscis qui se confient en eux-mêmes et non pas en Jésus-Christ (3,2-3). Paul fait valoir alors qu'il aurait eu, quant à lui, toutes les raisons de se confier en soi-même (3,4-6), mais qu'il a appris à les considérer comme des pertes, précisément en regard du bien et du gain suprêmes que représente la connaissance du Christ (3,7-8). De fait, c'est en Christ que résident la justification de Dieu par la foi (3,9) et la puissance de la résurrection tant dans le cheminement présent que dans l'au-delà (3,10-16), le présent et l'avenir se trouvant liés, entre souffrances endurées dans le quotidien et résurrection future (3,10-11), dans une tension féconde vers l'avant que l'apôtre exprime en jouant sur les deux verbes διώκω et καταλαμβάνω et en recourant ainsi aux deux métaphores de la quête et de la saisie (3,12-14). Dès 3,15, l'apôtre passe de la première personne du singulier à celle du pluriel pour inciter les destinataires à se comporter comme lui. C'est donc tout naturellement que l'on arrive, en 3,17, à l'appel à l'imitation, imitation non pas de ceux qui se comportent en ennemis de la croix du Christ (3,18) et dont le seul horizon est constitué par les réalités terrestres (3,19 : τὰ ἐπίγεια), mais de ceux qui, à l'exemple de Paul, sont tournés vers la cité céleste et s'en remettent en la puissance salvatrice du Crucifié-Ressuscité (3,20), seul capable de transfigurer « notre corps d'humilité » en le conformant à son corps de gloire (3,21).

Concrètement, Paul ponctue son propos en ces termes : « <sup>20</sup> [...] notre cité, à nous, est dans les cieus, d'où nous attendons également [en tant que] sauveur le Seigneur Jésus-Christ, <sup>21</sup> qui transfigurera notre corps d'humilité pour le conformer à son corps de gloire avec la force qui le met aussi en capacité de se soumettre toutes choses (<sup>20</sup> ἡμῶν γὰρ τὸ πολίτευμα

ἐν οὐρανοῖς ὑπάρχει, ἐξ οὗ καὶ σωτήρα ἀπεκδεχόμεθα κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν,<sup>21</sup> ὃς μετασχηματίζει τὸ σῶμα τῆς ταπεινώσεως ἡμῶν σύμμορφον τῷ σώματι τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν τοῦ δύνασθαι αὐτὸν καὶ ὑποτάξει αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα).

Il enchaîne alors avec une exhortation dans laquelle, par une succession, qui finit par être redondante, d'apostrophes et d'appositions, il montre tout le prix qu'il accorde aux destinataires (4,1) : « Ainsi, mes frères bien-aimés et [ardemment] désirés, vous, ma joie et ma couronne, tenez ferme de cette façon dans le Seigneur, bien-aimés (Ὡστε, ἀδελφοί μου ἀγαπητοὶ καὶ ἐπιπόθητοι, χαρὰ καὶ στέφανός μου, οὕτως στήκετε ἐν κυρίῳ, ἀγαπητοί) ». Non seulement il s'adresse — à deux reprises — aux frères, en les appelant bien-aimés, mais il affirme aussi, au terme d'un développement qui revêt, depuis le verset 19, une tonalité résolument eschatologique, qu'ils sont sa joie et sa couronne !

L'association des deux termes *χαρὰ* et *στέφανός* n'apparaît qu'à un autre endroit dans le Nouveau Testament, en 1 Th 2,19, dans un contexte assez similaire. Paul s'y adresse en effet aux destinataires d'une autre de ses épîtres en leur disant : « Qui est [...] notre espérance, ou notre joie, ou la couronne dont nous nous enorgueillissons (τίς γὰρ ἡμῶν ἐλπίς ἢ χαρὰ ἢ στέφανος καυχήσεως) ? N'est-ce pas vous aussi, devant notre Seigneur Jésus, lors de sa parousie ?<sup>20</sup> Oui, vous êtes notre gloire et notre joie (ὁμοίως γὰρ ἐστε ἡ δόξα ἡμῶν καὶ ἡ χαρὰ).

Plus nettement encore que dans le contexte de Ph 3,20–4,1, l'horizon sur lequel la communauté constitue pour l'apôtre sa joie et sa couronne apparaît eschatologique, ce que reconnaissent la plupart des auteurs<sup>1</sup>, encore que certains insistent, à bon droit d'ailleurs, sur le fait que pareille

<sup>1</sup> W. Grundmann, « στέφανος, στεφανώω », *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament* (Hrsg. von G. Friedrich ; Band III ; Stuttgart : Kohlhammer, 1964), 615–35 [ici, 628–29 (= *TDNT VII*, 630)], et E. Lohmeyer, *Der Brief an die Philipper. Übersetzt und erklärt* (KEK IX/1 ; Göttingen : Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1964 [1928]), 164, le reconnaissent déjà. Voir aussi, notamment, J. Gnllka, *Der Philipperbrief* (HTKNT X/3 ; Freiburg : Herder, 1968), 220, J.-F. Collange, *L'épître de Saint Paul aux Philippiens* (CNT Xa ; Neuchâtel : Delachaux & Niestlé, 1975), 124 ; C. A. Wanamaker, *The Epistle to the Thessalonians. A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC ; Grand Rapids/Carlisle : Eerdmans/Paternoster Press, 1990), 124 ; A. J. Malherbe, *The Letters to the Thessalonians. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 32B ; New York : Doubleday, 2000), 185 ; J. Reumann, *Philippians. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 33B ; New Haven/London : Yale University Press, 2008), 606.

lecture eschatologique ne doit pas occulter le fait que, dès à présent, les Philippiens sont, pour Paul, un sujet de fierté et d'honneur<sup>2</sup>.

Cela étant, la joie et la couronne, tout en étant associées dans ces deux passages, font le plus souvent l'objet d'un traitement dissocié de la part des commentateurs.

Ceux-ci font valoir que la joie a toute sa place dans un contexte eschatologique et renvoient, en ce sens, à d'autres passages du Nouveau Testament, tels Rom 14,17 ; 15,13, ou bien encore Lc 1,14 ; 2,10 et 1 P 1,8<sup>3</sup>. Ils signalent aussi que cette dimension eschatologique de la joie est déjà présente avant le Nouveau Testament, notamment dans la littérature quimrânienne, mais en n'étant pas toujours très soucieux de vérifier les références<sup>4</sup>. Ils pourraient encore renvoyer aux trois passages du livre d'Ésaïe dans lesquels on rencontre l'expression שִׂמְחַת עוֹלָם<sup>5</sup>.

Pour ce qui est de la couronne, les explications sont parties et partent encore dans des directions assez diverses vu les nombreux usages et la riche symbolique de cet objet, auxquels Karl Baus a pu consacrer toute une monographie<sup>6</sup> et qui sont traités de manière circonstanciée et systématique dans le *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*<sup>7</sup>. Grundmann énumère ainsi les nombreux domaines dans lesquels intervenaient des couronnes dans l'Antiquité : le culte, notamment lors de l'investiture des prêtres ; la délivrance d'oracles, la couronne étant alors un gage d'authenticité ; les processions, les fêtes, voire la vie quotidienne, dans lesquelles leur était attribué un rôle protecteur, voire salutaire ; les mystères, où elles pouvaient, entre autres fonctions, être portées par les mystagogues lors de l'initiation ; la vie politique, dans laquelle elles contribuaient

<sup>2</sup> Ainsi G. F. Hawthorne, *Philippians* (WBC 43 ; Waco : Word Books, 1983), 178, suivi par R. P. Martin, dans la version révisée de son commentaire (Nashville : Thomas Nelson, 2004), 240, et P. T. O'Brien, *The Epistle to the Philippians. A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC ; Grand Rapids/Carlisle : Eerdmans/Paternoster Press, 1991), 475–76, qui privilégie, quant à lui, cette dimension présente.

<sup>3</sup> Malherbe, *Thessalonians*, 185.

<sup>4</sup> Malherbe, *Thessalonians*, 185 renvoie ainsi à IQS I 8, alors qu'il n'y est pas question de joie eschatologique, ni tout simplement de joie, contrairement à ce qui se passe en IQS IV 7 ; 1QM I 9 ; IV 14 ; XIII 16 ; XIV 4 ; XVII 7 ; 1QH<sup>a</sup> V 23 ; XXIII 16 ; XXVI 30 ; 4Q417 1 i 12 ; 4Q427 7 i 17 ; 4Q428 14 6 ; 4Q491 1–3, 5, des passages comme 1QH<sup>a</sup> XVII 24 ; XIX 26 pouvant encore être adjoints à la liste car ils évoquent une joie pérenne consécutive à un relèvement ou à une guérison qui revêt une dimension proprement eschatologique.

<sup>5</sup> Es 35,10 ; 51,11 ; 61,7.

<sup>6</sup> K. Baus, *Der Kranz in Antike und Christentum. Eine religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung mit besonderer Berücksichtigung Tertullians* (Theophaneia 2 ; Bonn : Hanstein, 1940).

<sup>7</sup> Grundmann, *TWNT VII*, 615–35 (= *TDNT VII*, 615–36).



à distinguer les principaux dignitaires ; les jeux, olympiques notamment, où elles revenaient au vainqueur ; la sphère militaire, où elles pouvaient servir de porte-bonheur, en quelque sorte, après l'effectuation d'un sacrifice, ou venir aussi célébrer le vainqueur ; la vie privée, où elles pouvaient être signe de joie et de respect ou intervenir lors des noces ou lors de *symposia* ; le culte et la manière d'honorer les morts<sup>8</sup>.

En fonction de cette très riche symbolique, on comprend que les hypothèses aient pu fuser.

Certains sont plus sensibles à un usage profane et évoquent soit la coutume qui consistait à poser une couronne sur la tête des invités lors d'un banquet<sup>9</sup>, soit le cérémoniel en vertu duquel, dans la partie orientale de l'Empire romain, on présentait le souverain coiffé d'une couronne d'or quand il était amené à faire une visite dans une cité. Deissmann, qui est à l'origine de ce rapprochement, faisait d'ailleurs valoir que cette visite elle-même était désignée par le terme technique *parousia*, que Paul emploie précisément, qui plus est en 1 Th 2,19, pour parler de la venue ultime du Seigneur, sa « parousie »<sup>10</sup>. Cela étant, en dehors de ce rapprochement de vocabulaire, la situation évoquée par Paul semble bien éloignée de ce type de cérémoniel<sup>11</sup>.

Considérant que l'on avait là un cadre beaucoup plus proche et convaincu que l'épître aux Philippiens dans son ensemble a pour horizon la perspective du martyr, Ernst Lohmeyer a proposé quant à lui de comprendre la couronne dont il est question comme celle des martyrs, dont on peut estimer qu'il est question dès Ap 2,10 et qui est fréquemment attestée dans la littérature chrétienne ancienne<sup>12</sup>. D'autres ont préféré

<sup>8</sup> Grundmann, *TWNT VII*, 617–22 (= *TDNT VII*, 617–24).

<sup>9</sup> Ainsi M. R. Vincent, *Philippians and Philemon* (ICC ; Edinburg : Clark, 1897), 129 ; Hawthorne, *Philippians*, 178, suivi par Martin, *Philippians*, 240. Ces auteurs citent notamment à l'appui Platon, *Banquet* 212e et pourraient ajouter les références que produit Grundmann, *TWNT VII*, 621–22 (= *TDNT VII*, 622–23).

<sup>10</sup> A. Deissmann, *Licht von Osten. Das Neue Testament und die neuentdeckten Texte der hellenistisch-römischen Welt* (vierte, völlig neubearbeitete Auflage ; Tübingen : Mohr, 1923), 315.

<sup>11</sup> Ainsi notamment V. C. Pfitzner, *Paul and the Agon Motif. Traditional Athletic Imagery in the Pauline Literature* (NovTSup 16 ; Leiden : Brill, 1967), 104 ; Hawthorne, *Philippians*, 178, suivi par Martin, *Philippians*, 240.

<sup>12</sup> On pourra se reporter au dossier de textes présenté par Grundmann, *TWNT VII*, 632–33 (= *TDNT VII*, 633–34). Au cours du colloque, Daniel Schwartz nous a suggéré que le nom que porte, dans les Actes des Apôtres, le premier martyr, Στέφανος, ait pu lui être attribué par l'auteur à Théophile, précisément parce qu'il était mort en tant que martyr. L'hypothèse, ingénieuse, nous semble toutefois peu vraisemblable, vu le respect habituel de l'auteur à Théophile envers le nom des personnages qu'il trouve dans ses sources. Cela

penser au chef militaire qui se voyait remettre une couronne, une fois la victoire acquise, ou bien encore à l'empereur divinisé, en passe de faire l'objet d'un couronnement, comme l'illustre la *Gemma Augustea* conservée au Kunsthistorisches Museum de Vienne<sup>13</sup>.

Outre cet usage profane, un cadre liturgique a été envisagé, essentiellement à la lumière des pratiques des cultes à mystères. Cette dernière hypothèse, proposée initialement par Reitzenstein<sup>14</sup>, peut notamment s'appuyer sur le fait que, selon le témoignage de Tertullien dans son *De Corona*, dans le culte mithriaque, le mystagogue était amené à affirmer : « Mithra est ma couronne »<sup>15</sup>. Mais Heinrich Kraft, envisageant quant à lui un parallèle entre l'expérience du myste et celle de Paul, a fait valoir que l'apôtre, convaincu d'être proche de la mort, se trouve en fait dans une situation à bien des égards comparable à celle du mystagogue qui « se couronnait lui-même avec une couronne quand, durant l'initiation aux mystères, il expérimentait par anticipation sa propre mort et s'approchait de son dieu durant la célébration du mystère »<sup>16</sup>.

Nous avons laissé de côté jusqu'ici un autre arrière-plan possible et souvent envisagé<sup>17</sup>, celui que peuvent fournir le monde et la métaphore

---

étant, comme nous l'a indiqué Émile Puech qui a traité de la question (É. Puech, « Un mausolée de Saint Étienne à *Khirbet Jiljil* – *Beit Gimal* », *RB* 113 (2006) : 100–126 [ici, 121]) le rapprochement entre le nom d'Étienne et le concept de couronne a bel et bien été fait, ainsi que l'atteste le nom de *Kirbet Jiljil* (dérivé de *Galgal* et finalement de כָּלִיל) qui a été donné à un mausolée de Saint Étienne sis à proximité de *Beit Gimal* et qui remonte au ve siècle. Comme nous aurons l'occasion de le signaler plus loin (n. 26), cette correspondance, établie en milieu araméen, entre Étienne, Στέφανος et la racine du mot כָּלִיל corrobore le fait que ce dernier est un équivalent et un substrat hébreu possible de στέφανος.

<sup>13</sup> Ainsi encore E. Krentz, « Paul, Games, and the Military », in *Paul in the Greco-Roman World. A Handbook* (ed. J. P. Sampley ; Harrisburg : Trinity Press International, 2003), 343–83 (ici, 362), qui associe les deux arrière-plans. En faveur de l'interprétation militaire, on peut mentionner encore T. C. Geffrion, *The Rhetorical Purpose and the Political and Military Character of Philippians: A Call to Stand Firm* (Lewiston : Mellen Biblical Press, 1993).

<sup>14</sup> R. Reitzenstein, *Die hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen nach ihren Grundgedanken und Wirkungen* (Stuttgart : B. G. Teubner, 1956 [1927<sup>3</sup>]), 42–46.

<sup>15</sup> Tertullien, *De Corona* 15. Reumann, *Philippians*, 606, tout en envisageant en fait plusieurs hypothèses, mentionne celle-ci.

<sup>16</sup> H. Kraft, « στέφανος, ου, ό ; στεφανώω », in *Exegetisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament. Band. 3 παδιγγεύω – ώφέλιμος. Register* (ed. H. Balz and G. Schneider ; Stuttgart : Kohlhammer, 1983), col. 654–6 (ici, col. 655) (= *Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament* 3, 273–74 [ici, 274]).

<sup>17</sup> Ainsi, par exemple, F. F. Bruce, *1 & 2 Thessalonians* (WBC 45 ; Waco : Word Books, 56) ; Hawthorne, *Philippians*, 178, suivi par Martin, *Philippians*, 240 ; G. L. Green, *The Letters to the Thessalonians* (Pillar New Testament Commentary ; Grand Rapids/Leicester : Eerdmans/Apollos, 2002), 154.

athlétiques. Le vainqueur aux jeux se voyait remettre une couronne et Paul recourt souvent à la métaphore athlétique dans sa correspondance, au point que deux monographies d'importance, dues respectivement à Victor Pfitzner et à Martin Brändel, ont déjà été consacrées à ce thème<sup>18</sup>. Mais, de manière symptomatique, ces deux auteurs, qui l'ont étudié de manière approfondie et systématique, renoncent à considérer qu'il puisse fournir l'éclairage le mieux adapté en vue de la compréhension de Ph 4,1 et de 1 Th 2,19<sup>19</sup>.

Ils préfèrent se tourner vers un arrière-plan juif et relèvent que l'expression *στέφανος καύχησης*, qui apparaît en 1 Th 2,19, se rencontre déjà, et à trois reprises, dans la Septante (Pr 16,31 ; Ez 16,12 ; 23,42)<sup>20</sup>. Brändel, dans celle des deux monographies qui est la plus récente, va plus loin que son devancier. Il constate que, en Pr 17,6 et en Si 1,11 ; 25,6, *στέφανος* et *καύχημα* sont employés en parallèle<sup>21</sup>, et que, en Est 8,15–17 et Ps 20,4–7 LXX, *στέφανος* et *χαρά* apparaissent dans un même contexte<sup>22</sup>. Il relève encore que la couronne de gloire (*στέφανος δόξης*), dont il est déjà question en Jr 13,18 et Lam 2,15 LXX, « peut décrire tant la gloire originellement conférée par Dieu (Lam 2,15) que, [dans la littérature intertestamentaire], la gloire à venir promise pour le temps du salut (*TestBenj* 4,1 ; *2 Baruch* 15,8 ; 1QS IV 7 ; 1QH<sup>a</sup> XVII 24) »<sup>23</sup>. Tout en étant à notre connaissance, l'auteur qui va le plus loin dans la prise en compte des parallèles vétérotestamentaires et intertestamentaires que l'on peut effectuer avec nos deux passages et, plus particulièrement, avec Ph 4,1<sup>24</sup>, il ne va pas, selon nous, jusqu'à exploiter tout l'intérêt des parallèles qu'il produit.

De fait, l'association que l'on rencontre, en Ph 4,1 et 2 Th 2,19, des deux termes « joie » et « couronne » nous semble pouvoir être éclairée par le passage de la *Règle de la Communauté* sur lequel Brändel et ses quelques

<sup>18</sup> Ainsi V. F. Pfitzner, *Paul and the Agon Motif. Traditional Athletic Imagery in the Pauline Literature* (NovTSup 16 ; Leiden : Brill, 1967) ; M. Brändel, *Der Agon bei Paulus. Herkunft und Profil paulinischer Agonmetaphorik* (WUNT II/222 ; Tübingen : Mohr Siebeck, 2006).

<sup>19</sup> Pfitzner, *Paul and the Agon Motif*, 104–6 et 153–4 ; Brändel, *Der Agon bei Paulus*, 321–22.

<sup>20</sup> Pfitzner, *Paul and the Agon Motif*, 105 ; Brändel, *Der Agon bei Paulus*, 321.

<sup>21</sup> Brändel, *Der Agon bei Paulus*, 321.

<sup>22</sup> Brändel, *Der Agon bei Paulus*, 321, n. 154.

<sup>23</sup> Brändel, *Der Agon bei Paulus*, 321–22.

<sup>24</sup> T. Holtz, *Der erste Brief an die Thessaloniker* (EKKNT 13 ; Zürich/Düsseldorf ; Neukirchen/Vluyn : Benziger Verlag ; Neukirchener Verlag, 1986), 118, n. 566, citait déjà presque les mêmes textes que lui et qu'il pouvait donc reprendre. Voir aussi Malherbe, *Thessalonians*, 185.

prédécesseurs ne se sont appuyés que pour éclairer l'expression « couronne de gloire », qui n'est directement présente dans aucun des deux textes. Or, en 1QS IV 6–8, il est question, dans un contexte résolument eschatologique, à la fois de joie et de couronne, et de plus encore, si bien qu'il y a là de quoi permettre, nous semble-t-il, d'éclairer d'un jour quelque peu nouveau 2 Th 2,19 et surtout Ph 3,20–4,1. Le texte est le suivant :

ופקודת כול הולכי בה  
 Et quant à la Visite de tous ceux qui marchent en cet (Esprit)  
 למרפא  
 elle consiste en la guérison  
 ורוב שלום באורך ימים  
<sup>7</sup> et une abondance de paix dans la longueur de jours,  
 ופרות זרע  
 et une florissante postérité  
 עם כול ברכות עד  
 ainsi que toutes les bénédictions sans fin  
 ושמחת עולמים בחיי נצח  
 et la joie éternelle dans la vie perpétuelle,  
 וכליל כבוד  
<sup>8</sup> et la couronne glorieuse,  
 עם מדת הדר באור עולמים  
 ainsi que le vêtement de majesté dans la lumière éternelle<sup>25</sup>.

On pourra noter en guise de préalable que les deux termes que nous avons respectivement traduits de l'hébreu par joie (שמחה) et couronne (כליל) peuvent avoir pour équivalents grecs χαρά et στέφανος que l'on rencontre en Ph 4,1 et en 1 Th 2,19. De fait, χαρά peut traduire שמחה dans la Septante, ce qu'attestent 1 Chr 29,22 ; Esd 8,17 ; 9,22 ; Ps 20[21],6 ; Pr 14,13 ; Jon 4,6 ; Jr 15,16. Quant au mot στέφανος, il y traduit deux fois כליל (Lam 2,15 ; Ez 28,12), le terme le plus couramment rendu par ce vocable grec étant cependant עטרה (au moins 23 fois). Il est vrai que כליל désigne d'abord ce qui à un caractère de totalité, d'entière et évoque la complétude, voire la perfection, ou encore une offrande totale, complète, telle que l'holocauste, avant de désigner ce qui fait le tour de la tête, la couronne. C'est dans l'expression כליל כבוד que כליל prend l'acception spécifique de couronne<sup>26</sup>.

<sup>25</sup> On notera la soigneuse construction du passage qui énumère, sous la bannière générale de la guérison, deux séquences successives de bienfaits reliés par deux « et » (1) et un « ainsi que » (עם).

<sup>26</sup> Comme nous l'avons signalé plus haut (n. 12), le fait que le nom de *Kirbet Jiljil* a été donné, au v<sup>e</sup> siècle, à un mausolée de Saint Étienne situé près de *Beit Gimal* atteste qu'une

Mais revenons au passage que nous venons de citer. Il appartient à l'Instruction sur les deux Esprits (1QS III 13–IV 26), évoque, dans le contexte eschatologique de la Visite (פקודה)<sup>27</sup>, les récompenses qui seront allouées aux justes : guérison (מרפא) ; abondance de paix (רוב שלום) ; florissante postérité (פרות זרע) ; bénédictions (ברכות) sans fin ; joie éternelle (שמחת עולמים) ; couronne glorieuse (כליל כבוד) ; vêtement d'honneur (מדת הדר)<sup>28</sup>. On y retrouve donc bien la joie et la couronne qu'évoque Paul en Ph 4,1 et en 2 Th 2,19.

Il nous semble tout particulièrement intéressant de se souvenir ici que l'Instruction sur les deux Esprits est caractérisée, comme Ph 3,1b-4,1, par une tension entre présent et avenir. Certes, le genre littéraire des deux textes les distingue profondément et on ne saurait assimiler la tension envisagée par Paul entre réalités présentes et à venir et l'horizon cosmologique de l'Instruction. Elle embrasse, quant à elle, un espace temps qui englobe la Création, la mise en place des deux Esprits, les économies qui en résultent, le conflit qui les oppose et, ultimement, l'issue de ce conflit, marquée par la Visite et le triomphe de la Vérité sur la Perversité. Un triomphe qui se manifeste selon des modalités que décrit 1QS IV 6–8 et qu'évoquera encore 1QS IV 19–23 en faisant notamment valoir qu'à l'horizon dernier toute la gloire d'Adam (כול כבוד אדם) reviendra aux parfaits de voie. Cela n'empêche pas que Paul raisonne ailleurs en terme de nouvelle création, libérée de l'esclavage de la corruption et ayant part à la liberté et à la gloire des enfants de Dieu (Rm 8,21), et qu'il lui arrive de mettre en œuvre une typologie des deux Adam (Rm 5,12–21 ; 1 Co 15,21–22.45–48). On ne saurait donc exclure que les deux passages se meuvent dans un univers de représentations assez semblable.

---

correspondance pouvait être établie, en milieu araméen, entre Étienne, Στέφανος, et la racine du mot כליל.

<sup>27</sup> Sur ce concept de la Visite, voir notamment M. G. Abegg, « Visitation, Day of », in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Volume 2*, (eds. L. H. Schiffman and J. C. VanderKam ; Oxford : Oxford University Press, 2000), 958–59.

<sup>28</sup> Ainsi que le relève, É. Puech, *La croyance des esséniens en la vie future : immortalité, résurrection, vie éternelle ? Histoire d'une croyance dans le judaïsme ancien. II. Les données qumraniennes et classiques* (EBib NS 22 ; Paris : Gabalda, 1993), 398, en envisageant que les deux passages puissent être dépendants l'un de l'autre ou avoir le même auteur, « les biens essentiels promis aux fils de lumière lors de la Visite en 1QS iv 6–8 : guérison [מרפא], paix [שלום], bénédiction [ברכה], lumière [אור] et gloire [כבוד] » se retrouvent en 4Q427 7 ii 4–7.11–13 (qu'il numérote pour sa part 1QH xxvi 23.24.30). On peut ajouter à la liste de ces biens communs aux deux textes, la joie (שמחה), seules la métaphore du vêtement et la notion de prospérité manquant à l'appel.

Il peut être intéressant de noter à cet égard que l'Esprit en lequel marchent les fils de vérité (1QS IV 6) est l'Esprit de vérité (1QS IV 2) et que, dans la *Règle de la Communauté*, cet Esprit est notamment caractérisé comme esprit d'humilité (עֲנוּוָה רִוּחַ) (1QS III 8 = 4Q255 2 2), et cela jusqu'au cœur de l'Instruction sur les deux Esprits (1QS IV 3). L'humilité y est, avec la longanimité (1QS IV 3), la droiture et la connaissance, l'une des principales caractéristiques de l'Esprit de vérité au bénéfice duquel se trouvent les « fils de lumière » (1QS III 25).

Il n'est peut-être pas fortuit que Paul, en Ph 3,21, parle précisément du corps d'humilité (τὸ σῶμα τῆς ταπεινώσεως ἡμῶν) — et c'est là l'unique occurrence de l'expression dans sa correspondance —, corps d'humilité que le Christ a vocation à transfigurer pour le conformer à son corps de gloire.

On a remarqué que, dans ce passage, Paul recourt non pas à une anthropologie au sein de laquelle le corps de péché serait opposé au corps de gloire, si bien qu'une création radicalement nouvelle serait nécessaire pour que ce dernier puisse advenir, mais à une représentation plus se-reine, au terme de laquelle serait attendue une transformation de l'ancienne corporéité, limitée par la mort et par tout ce qui participe, en quelque sorte, de l'humilité, pour accéder à la vie plénière et à la gloire<sup>29</sup>.

Ce constat, apparemment étonnant, se trouve corroboré par le texte lui-même, du fait des nombreux échos que trouve l'hymne de Ph 2,6–11 en 3,20–21. Ces correspondances ont été mises en évidence de longue date et un tableau comparatif les fait fort bien apparaître<sup>30</sup>.

<sup>29</sup> En ce sens, notamment, E. Güttgemanns, *Der leidende Apostel und sein Herr. Studien zur paulinischen Christologie* (FRLANT 90; Göttingen: Vandenoek & Ruprecht, 1966), 245–46; Hawthorne, *Philippians*, 172, suivi par Martin, *Philippians*, 233; Gnlika, *Philippierbrief*, 209; M. Silva, *Philippians* (Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament; Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1992), 215; Reumann, *Philippians*, 599.

<sup>30</sup> Tableau repris de Hawthorne, *Philippians*, 169, suivi par Martin, *Philippians*, 229. On trouve déjà un tableau, moins complet, chez Güttgemanns, *Der leidende Apostel*, 241, car il ne signale pas la récurrence des deux motifs de l'humilité et de la gloire. N. Flanagan, « A Note on Philippians 3, 20–21 », *CBQ* 18 (1956): 8–9, avait antérieurement insisté sur la parenté entre les deux passages qui est aussi soulignée par Collange, *Philippiens*, 123, et par Silva, *Philippians*, 215, auteurs qui tous deux signalent également une parenté avec 3,10–11.

## Philippiens 2,6–11

ἐν μορφῇ : 2,6.7 (en [à la] forme)  
 ὑπάρχων : 2,6 (appartenant [à la  
 forme divine])  
 σχήματι : 2,7 (quant à l'aspect, à la  
 figure)  
 ἐταπείνωσεν : 2,8 (s'est humilié)  
 πᾶν γόνυ κάμψη : 2,10 (tout genou  
 fléchisse)  
 κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός : 2,11  
 δόξαν : 2,11 (gloire)

## Philippiens 3,20–21

σύμμορφον : 3,21 (conforme)  
 ὑπάρχει : 3,20 (notre cité appartient  
 aux cieux)  
 μετασχηματίζει : 3,21 (transfigurer)  
 ταπεινώσεω : 3,21 ([corps d']humilité)  
 τοῦ δύνασθαι αὐτὸν καὶ ὑποτάξαι αὐτῷ  
 τὰ πάντα : 3,21 (avec la force qui le  
 met aussi en capacité de se soumettre  
 toutes choses)  
 κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν : 3,20  
 δόξης : 3,21 (gloire)

Elles suggèrent à leur tour que le corps d'humilité dont il est question ici est à comprendre dans la même perspective que l'abaissement dont il est fait état en 2,8, la condition des croyants étant conçue, comme celle du Christ à laquelle elle a vocation à se conformer, dans une tension féconde entre humilité et gloire, à la lumière du contraste entre mort et résurrection et d'une commune appartenance à la sphère céleste<sup>31</sup>.

Que Paul ait, en fonction des correspondances entre 3,20–21 et 2,6–11, utilisé un matériau hymnique préexistant<sup>32</sup>, ou bien qu'il ait façonné lui-même un passage au caractère hymnique affirmé (3,20–21) à partir d'un tel matériau<sup>33</sup>, ou bien encore qu'il ait composé librement 3,20–21 en écho à 2,6–11<sup>34</sup>, le résultat est le même : les deux passages sont en résonance et proposent une vision de la destinée des croyants qui n'est pas sans évoquer celle des fils de lumière dans l'Instruction sur les deux Esprits. Dans les deux cas, couronne et joie sont promises à l'horizon eschatologique, tandis que, dans le présent, l'existence est placée notamment sous le sceau de l'humilité.

Ajoutons avant de conclure que, au sein de la documentation qumrânienne, un autre texte au moins illustre encore la perspective envisagée ici et la pertinence possible d'un rapprochement avec Ph 3,21–4,1 et 1 Th 2,19.

<sup>31</sup> Dans cette perspective, notamment, M. D. Hooker, « Interchange in Christ », *JTS* 22 (1971) : 349–61.

<sup>32</sup> C'est là une hypothèse défendue notamment par Güttgemanns, *Der leidende Apostel*, 242.

<sup>33</sup> Tel est par exemple le point de vue de Gnilka, *Philippenerbrief*, 209.

<sup>34</sup> O'Brien, *Philippians*, 467–72, parvient à cette conclusion, tout en s'inscrivant dans la ligne des travaux de Hooker, « Interchange in Christ », 356–57.

Il s'agit de 1QH<sup>a</sup> XVII 24, que nous replacerons dans le contexte des lignes 23 à 26 :

כי אתה אלי למ [...] ]  
 Car toi, mon Dieu, [...] ]  
 תריב ריבי  
 Tu plaideras ma cause  
 כי ברז חכמתכה הוכחתה בי  
 car, dans le mystère de Ta sagesse, tu m'as réprimandé,  
 ותחבא אמת לקץ [...] ] מועדו  
 24 Tu as caché la vérité pour le temps [...] jusqu'à] son terme [son temps fixé]  
 ותהי תוכחתכה לי לשמחה וששון  
 Et ta réprimande est devenue pour moi joie et allégresse ;  
 ונגיעי למרפא עולם  
 25 et mes afflictions, une guérison éternelle ;  
 ונצח ובוז צרי לי לכליל כבוד  
 [...] ] et le mépris de mes adversaires, une couronne de gloire ;  
 וכשלוני לגבורת עולם  
 et mon trébuchement, une force 26 éternelle.

On y retrouve la joie (שמחה) et la couronne de gloire (כליל כבוד) associées à une restauration, conçue elle-même comme une guérison éternelle (מרפא עולם). Toutefois, la restauration en question semble avoir pour cadre la vie même du psalmiste, ce que confirme la suite de la composition hymnique. Celle-ci célèbre l'intervention divine avec éclat et semble bien la comprendre comme une anticipation de la manifestation ultime de l'Esprit de vérité et de lumière. Eschatologie présente (ou anticipée) et eschatologie future sont bien ainsi conçues dans une tension féconde qu'illustrent aussi à leur manière les deux textes de Paul.

Nous voici parvenu au terme de notre bref parcours. Et il est temps désormais de conclure.

Il nous semble que, si l'approche que nous avons proposée a quelque pertinence, elle permet de revisiter les textes de Qumrân en fonction de l'éclairage qu'ils peuvent apporter au Nouveau Testament en général, et aux épîtres pauliniennes en particulier, en étant attentif non seulement à des parallèles de termes et d'expression, encore que nous y avons été sensible, mais aussi à l'univers de représentation inhérent aux textes, ici par exemple à la tension qui leur est commune entre une eschatologie présente (ou anticipée) et une eschatologie future, par delà une façon,



elle aussi comparable, de se représenter ces deux formes d'eschatologie<sup>35</sup>. Il nous semble, on l'aura compris, que les parallèles terminologiques se trouvent renforcés par ceux qui touchent à cet univers, plus fondamental, de représentation.

Sans que nous ayons eu le temps de le développer, il nous est apparu aussi, au détour de notre propre enquête, que la métaphore de la bâtisse du corps de chaque homme, présente selon toute vraisemblance en 1QS IV 20<sup>36</sup>, pourrait éclairer aussi, quant à elle, certaines représentations pauliniennes. Promise à être épurée définitivement à l'horizon eschatologique, cette bâtisse du corps de chaque homme pourrait, au niveau individuel, servir de pendant à des représentations communautaires qui recourent elle aussi à la métaphore de la construction. En effet, la Communauté est assimilée à l'assemblée du saint édifice, qui se trouve en communion avec les fils du ciel (1QS XI 8), et à la demeure de gloire, refusée à l'assemblée de la chair mais donnée par Dieu aux élus en possession éternelle (1QS XI 7). Le Conseil de la Communauté lui-même se trouve assimilé à la fois, dans sa composante laïque, à la Maison de sainteté pour Israël, et, dans sa

<sup>35</sup> Notre contribution a ainsi des incidences qui viennent corroborer le propos de Loren Stuckenbruck, aux pages p. 309–p. 325 de ce volume.

<sup>36</sup> Deux compréhensions sont ici possibles de מְבִנֵי אִישׁ au sein de l'expression מְבִנֵי אִישׁ. Soit on y discerne un mot unique, désignant la construction ou la bâtisse (de l'homme) (ainsi, notamment, A. Dupont-Sommer, *Les écrits esséniens découverts près de la mer Morte* [quatrième édition revue et augmentée; Bibliothèque historique; Paris: Payot, 1980], 97; J. Maier, *Die Texten vom Toten Meer. Band I: Die Texten aus Höhlen 1–3 und 5–11* [UTB 1862; München/Basel: Reinhardt Verlag, 1995], 176 [« den Bau »]; G. Vermes, *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English*, complete edition [London: Penguin, 1997], 103 [« The Human Frame »]; F. García-Martínez and E. J. C. Tigchelaar, eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls. Study Edition. Volume One 1Q1–4Q273* [Leiden/New York /Köln: Brill, 1997], 79 [« the structure »]) que viendra épurer Dieu, par l'Esprit de Sainteté à l'horizon eschatologique, soit on y voit un ensemble מְבִנֵי מ-בְּנֵי désignant les fils de l'homme (ainsi J. H. Charlesworth, ed., *The Dead Sea Scrolls. Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek Texts with English Translation. Volume 1. Rule of the Community and Related Documents* [Tübingen/Louisville: Mohr/Westminster John Knox Press, 1994], 19; F. Raurell, *Regla de la Comunitat de Qumran. introducció, text revisat, traducció i notes de Frederic Raurell* [Literatura intertestamentària. Literatura qumrànica 3; Barcelona: Institut Cambò, 2004], 140 et 141), et on comprend que Dieu purifiera les fils de l'homme. P. von der Osten-Sacken, *Gott und Belial. Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zum Dualismus in den Texten aus Qumran* (SUNT 6; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1969), 178, n. 3, nous paraît bien résumer les arguments qui plaident en faveur de la première lecture, à commencer par la fréquence de la désignation de l'homme comme une construction, une bâtisse, dans la documentation qumrânienne (E. Lohse, *Die Texte aus Qumran Hebräisch und Deutsch mit masoretischer Punctuation. Übersetzung, Einführung und Anmerkungen herausgegeben von E. Lohse* [München: Kösel-Verlag, 1971], 15 et 284, n. 29, signale les deux compréhensions possibles du passage).

composante sacerdotale, à la Demeure de Suprême sainteté pour Aaron (1QS VIII 4-10), soit au Saint et au Saint des Saints, qui constituaient les deux pièces du Sanctuaire. Au sein de la métaphore de la construction, bâtisse individuelle du corps de chacun et vocation collective à être communauté sanctuaire se trouveraient elles aussi conçues dans une tension féconde. Et cette tension féconde n'est pas sans évoquer celle que l'on peut observer, en 1 Co, entre 6,19 où Paul rappelle individuellement aux destinataires que leur corps est le Temple du Saint Esprit (qui réside) en eux et 3,17, où il leur affirme, collectivement cette fois, que le Temple de Dieu est saint et que ce Temple de Dieu, c'est eux. On pourrait trouver là, non seulement une illustration d'une réinterprétation similaire de la métaphore de la construction et du sanctuaire mais encore un autre exemple de la hardiesse des développements auxquels a pu conduire l'élaboration d'une eschatologie future en tension avec une eschatologie réalisée, dès lors que, sur le plan spatial, les mondes terrestre et céleste ont vocation à communiquer.



LA PREMIÈRE ÉPÎTRE DE PAUL AUX THESSALONICIENS  
À LA LUMIÈRE DES MANUSCRITS DE LA MER MORTE

Claude Coulot

*Université de Strasbourg*

Dans la brève présentation d'un projet élaboré à l'Université de Munich « Qumran und das Neue Testament », H.-W. Kuhn avait relevé l'intérêt des textes de Qumran pour la compréhension de la première épître de Paul aux Thessaloniens<sup>1</sup>. En particulier, il avait souligné que des passages, des termes ou des expressions de l'épître pouvaient être compris à la lumière de quelques textes des manuscrits de la mer Morte :

- 1 Th 1,5 // 1QH XV 9–10 (= 1QH VII 6–7) : la puissance de Dieu et l'Esprit saint,
- 1 Th 2,7–8.11 // 1QH XV 23–25 (= 1QH VII 20–22) : les figures de la nurse et du père utilisées pour illustrer la relation du leader et de la communauté,
- 1 Th 2,16 ; 5,9 // 1QS II 11–15 ; IV 12–13 : la colère de Dieu,
- 1 Th 3,5 // 1QS III 20–25 : la mise à l'épreuve par Satan,
- 1 Th 5,4–9 // 1QS III 13–IV 26 : l'expression « fils de lumière » en contexte dualiste et eschatologique,
- 1 Th 5,15 // 1QS X 17–18 : ne pas rendre le mal pour le mal, mais rechercher le bien.

A ces six passages, il conviendrait d'ajouter :

- 1 Th 1,4 // 1QS IV 22 ; XI 7 : l'élection,
- 1 Th 3,13 // 4Q400 1 i 2.3.19.24 ; 4Q400 1 ii 6 ; 4Q403 1 i 24.31 : οἱ ἄγγελοι, קדושים, compris des anges ou des êtres célestes,
- 1 Th 4,4 // 4Q416 2 ii 21 : σκεῦος, כלי, compris de la femme ?
- 1 Th 4,13–17 // 4Q521 7,1–8 + 5 ii 7–16 : un scénario de résurrection.

---

<sup>1</sup> H.-W. Kuhn, « Die Bedeutung der Qumrantexte für das Verständnis des Ersten Thessalonicherbriefes. Vorstellung des Münchener Projekts : Qumran und das Neue Testament. The Impact of the Qumran Scrolls on the Understanding of Paul's First Letter to the Thessalonians. Presentation of the Munich Project on Qumran and the New Testament », in *The Madrid Qumran Congress. Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls. Madrid 18–21 March, 1991* (ed. J. Trebolle Barrera et L. Vegas Montaner ; STDJ 11,1 ; Leiden/New York/Köln/Madrid : Brill/Editorial Complutense, 1992), 339–53.

Dans cette conférence, je proposerai d'abord une lecture des passages, des termes ou des expressions de la première lettre aux Thessaloniens en lien avec les textes parallèles des manuscrits de la mer Morte.

Les rapprochements qui peuvent être établis entre quelques textes des manuscrits de la mer Morte et la première lettre de Paul aux Thessaloniens posent la question de la relation de Paul, issu de la diaspora, formé aux pieds de Gamaliel, avec le milieu sadocite : comment expliquer les rapprochements qui ont été établis ? Je tenterai d'y répondre en conclusion de mon propos.

#### A. 1 TH 1,4 // 1QS IV 22 ; XI 7 : L'ÉLECTION

En 1 Th 1,4, Paul déclare que les Thessaloniens, bien-aimés de Dieu, sont désormais bénéficiaires de l'élection divine<sup>2</sup>. Il perçoit leur intégration au peuple de Dieu dans leur conversion. Celle-ci révèle en effet que l'annonce de l'évangile par les missionnaires ne relevait pas du simple discours, mais que leur parole fut efficiente, grâce à l'action puissante de Dieu qui opérait par l'Esprit saint. Les Thessaloniens sont désormais intégrés au peuple de Dieu, ce qui était jadis le privilège d'Israël.

Selon la Règle de la communauté, les sadocites considèrent aussi qu'ils ont été choisis par Dieu : « Il (Dieu) fera jaillir sur lui l'esprit de vérité comme des eaux lustrales pour nettoyer toutes les abominations mensongères, — il s'y était vautré par un esprit de souillure —, et pour faire comprendre aux hommes droits la connaissance du Très-Haut, et enseigner la sagesse des fils du ciel à ceux dont la voie est parfaite. Car Dieu les a choisis pour une alliance éternelle (1QS IV 21–22<sup>3</sup>). »

Ainsi, les sadocites, comme les chrétiens pour Paul, ont désormais le privilège de l'élection accordé jadis à Israël, mais Paul et les sadocites le considèrent différemment. Pour leur part, les sadocites pensent qu'ils sont désormais les seuls élus, et que le reste d'Israël, impie, sera châtié, tandis que Paul, qui a des paroles sévères contre Israël dans sa lettre (1 Th 2,15–16), déclare dans son épître aux Romains que Dieu n'a pas rejeté son peuple (Rm 11,2) et que tout Israël sera sauvé (Rm 11,26). Pour lui, le privilège accordé à Israël est étendu désormais à tous ceux qui croient en Jésus-Christ mort et ressuscité.

<sup>2</sup> Pour désigner le choix de Dieu, Paul utilise le substantif ἐκλογή, qui a le sens de choix, d'élection et de levée d'hommes. Le verbe ἐκλέγομαι correspondant à ἐκλογή désigne l'acte par lequel Israël a été choisi par Dieu (Dt 7,7 ; Ps 134,4 (LXX) ; Is 41,8.9).

<sup>3</sup> Cf. encore : 1QS XI 7 ; 1QH VII 36 (= 1QH XV 23).

B. 1 TH 1,5 // 1QH XV 9–10 (= 1QH VII 6–7):  
LA PUISSANCE DE DIEU ET L'ESPRIT SAINT<sup>4</sup>

Lorsque Michée s'oppose aux prophètes qui délivrent des oracles à la mesure des pots-de-vin qu'ils reçoivent, il se présente en prophète fidèle proclamant la vérité, et il déclare qu'il est rempli de puissance — avec l'esprit du Seigneur — d'équité et de vaillance (Mi 3,8).

En 1QH XV 9–10, dans un hymne qui lui a été attribué, le Maître de Justice semble s'être inspiré des propos du prophète lorsqu'il déclare : « Je te rends grâce, Seigneur, car tu m'as soutenu par ta force, et ton esprit de sainteté, tu l'as répandu en moi pour que je ne chancelle pas... » Comme il en fut pour le prophète, la force accordée par Dieu et l'effusion de l'Esprit lui ont permis d'être fidèle à la Loi et à son alliance.

Pour sa part, en 1 Th 1,5, Paul reprend les motifs de la force ou de la puissance divine en lien avec l'action de l'Esprit pour l'appliquer à l'annonce de l'évangile : « L'évangile ne fut pas pour vous en simple parole, mais en puissance et en Esprit saint et en beaucoup de plénitude... » Ici, à la différence du Maître de Justice, Paul ne se considère pas comme celui qui a reçu la force de Dieu et son esprit. Il affirme clairement que l'annonce de l'évangile faite à Thessalonique ne relevait pas du simple discours, mais que la parole des missionnaires fut efficiente, grâce à l'action puissante de Dieu qui opérait par l'Esprit saint<sup>5</sup>.

C. 1 TH 2,7–8.11 // 1QH XV 23–25 (= 1QH VII 20–22):  
LES FIGURES DE LA NURSE ET DU PÈRE UTILISÉES  
POUR ILLUSTRER LA RELATION DU LEADER ET DE LA COMMUNAUTÉ<sup>6</sup>

La figure du père, ou de la nurse, utilisée pour illustrer la relation du leader et de la communauté, apparaît dans la bouche de Moïse lorsqu'il se défend d'avoir conçu, enfanté et porté sur son cœur le peuple comme un nourricier, ou une nourrice (אֹמֵן)<sup>7</sup>, porte un petit enfant (Nb 11,12).

<sup>4</sup> Kuhn, « Die Bedeutung der Qumrantexte », 342–43.

<sup>5</sup> En 1 Co 2,4, Paul appliquera de nouveau les motifs à sa propre parole et à sa prédication qui furent une démonstration faite par la puissance de l'Esprit pour que la foi des Corinthiens ne soit pas fondée sur la sagesse des hommes, mais sur la puissance de Dieu.

<sup>6</sup> Voir Kuhn, « Die Bedeutung der Qumrantexte », 343–44.

<sup>7</sup> La forme masculine אֹמֵן signifie celui qui nourrit, le nourricier, le féminin אֹמֵנָה la nourrice. Toutefois le masculin pourrait aussi signifier nourrice. Voir Kuhn, « Die Bedeutung der Qumrantexte », 343.

Le psalmiste de Qumran recourt aussi à la figure, mêlant celle du père et celle de la mère, ainsi que le laisse apparaître le mot אֹמֵנִין au pluriel : « Tu as fait de moi un père pour les fils de la grâce et comme un nourricier pour les hommes du présage : et ils ont ouvert la bouche comme le nourris[son ] et comme l'enfant qui se délecte dans le sein de ses nourriciers (1QH XV 23–25). »

Le passage a été rapproché de 1 Th 2,7–8.11<sup>8</sup> où Paul reprend les figures de la nurse et du père, mais de façon plus explicite, pour rappeler aux Thessaloniens comment les missionnaires se sont comportés à leur égard. D'abord, il mentionne l'image de la mère : « comme une nourrice choie ses enfants, ainsi pleins d'affection pour vous, nous étions décidés à vous communiquer non seulement l'évangile de Dieu, mais encore nos propres vies. »

La littérature grecque a véhiculé une image favorable de la nourrice, connue pour sa tendresse et sa générosité, et les inscriptions funéraires mentionnent sans ambiguïté l'attachement de la nourrice pour l'enfant qui lui a été confié et la gratitude de celui-ci à l'égard de celle qui l'a allaité. Toutefois, il n'était pas d'usage pour un maître dans l'Antiquité d'adopter pour lui-même la métaphore de la nourrice et c'était parfois dépréciatif pour ses élèves<sup>9</sup>.

L'image de la nurse peut cependant renvoyer à la métaphore de la maternité spirituelle dont on trouve des traces dans les religions à mystère pratiquées à Thessalonique<sup>10</sup>. Paul qui puise aux Écritures pourrait y avoir eu recours et utiliser aussi une métaphore connue de ses correspondants du monde païen.

Puis, il l'a fait suivre, quelques lignes plus loin dans sa lettre, de l'image du Père éduquant ses enfants : « comme vous savez que, chacun de vous

<sup>8</sup> G. Jeremias, *Der Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit* (SUNT 2 ; Göttingen : Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1963), 192 ; H. Braun, *Qumran und das Neue Testament* (2 vols. ; Tübingen : Mohr Siebeck, 1966), 1:234 ; T. Holtz, *Der erste Brief an die Thessalonicher* (EKK XIII ; Zürich/Einsiedeln/Köln/Neukirchen-Vluyn : Benziger/Neukirchener, 1986), 83, n. 342 ; Kuhn, « Die Bedeutung der Qumrantexte », 343–44 ; S. Legasse, *Les épîtres de Paul aux Thessaloniens* (LD Commentaires 7 ; Paris : Cerf, 1999), 125–27 ; D. Marguerat, « Imiter l'apôtre, père et mère de la communauté (1 Th 2,1–12) » in *Not in the Word Alone. The First Epistle to the Thessalonians* (ed. M. D. Hooker ; Monographic Series of « Benedictina » 15 ; Rome : «Benedictina» Publishing, 2003), 46–50.

<sup>9</sup> Marguerat, « Imiter l'apôtre, père et mère de la communauté (1 Th 2,1–12) », 46.

<sup>10</sup> K. P. Donfried, « The Cults of Thessalonica and The Thessalonian Correspondence », in *Paul, Thessalonica and Early Christianity* (Grand Rapids/Cambridge : Eerdmans, 2002), 21–48 ; Marguerat, « Imiter l'apôtre, père et mère de la communauté (1 Th 2,1–12) », 47.

comme un père pour ses propres enfants, nous vous exhortions, encouragements et adjurations (1 Th 2,11). » Alors qu'en 1QH XV 23–25, les figures de la mère, ou de la nourrice, et du père étaient mêlées pour illustrer l'attachement du Maître de Justice aux membres de la communauté qu'il cajolait, en 1 Th 2,7–8.11, Paul fait appel à elles pour illustrer deux aspects de sa relation à la communauté : d'une part une relation affective à l'image de la nourrice, et d'autre part une relation pédagogique à l'image du père qui éduque ses enfants.

D. 1 TH 2,16 ; 5,9 // 1QS II 11–15 ; IV 12–13 : LA COLÈRE DE DIEU<sup>11</sup>

A la fin de propos très durs à l'égard des juifs en 1 Th 2,14–16, Paul écrit que la colère les a atteints finalement et dans une exhortation à la vigilance dans l'attente du jour du Seigneur en 1 Th 5,9, il déclare : « Dieu ne nous a pas destinés à subir sa colère, mais à posséder le salut par notre Seigneur Jésus Christ... » Il met en œuvre, dans les deux passages, un motif des Écritures, « la colère de Dieu », présent aussi dans les manuscrits de la mer Morte, mais peut-être compris d'une autre manière.

Dans les manuscrits de la mer Morte, le motif de la colère apparaît principalement en contexte dualiste<sup>12</sup> : il s'agit de la colère divine qui s'abattra à la fin des temps sur les impies et qui frappera ceux des ténèbres qui ne suivent pas les commandements divins : « Ils ont excité la colère en vue du jugement et l'exercice de la vengeance par les imprécations de l'Alliance au point d'attirer sur eux de grands châtiments pour une extermination éternelle, sans reste (1QS V 12–13). » La colère divine tombera aussi sur les membres de la communauté qui auront été infidèles pour les anéantir : « Maudit, dans les abominations de son cœur enclin à transgresser, celui qui entre dans cette alliance alors qu'il s'attache au faux pas qui l'égare... La colère de Dieu et ses jugements ardents s'enflammeront contre lui pour une destruction éternelle (1QS II 11–15). »

Paul utilise le substantif « colère » dans le même sens en 1 Th 5,9, dans son exhortation à la vigilance dans l'attente du jour du Seigneur où il oppose les chrétiens, fils de la lumière, à ceux des ténèbres. Dans le verset, comme dans les manuscrits de la mer Morte, en contexte eschatologique, la colère est celle que Dieu manifesterà lors du jugement de ceux qui sont

<sup>11</sup> Voir Kuhn, « Die Bedeutung der Qumrantexte », 344–46.

<sup>12</sup> 1QS II 15 ; IV 12 ; V, 12 ; 1QM III 9 ; IV 1.



dans les ténèbres et qui n'ont pas adopté le comportement des fils de lumière.

Cependant, il semble plus difficile de comprendre de la même manière la parole de Paul à la fin de sa polémique antijuive en 1 Th 2,16 « Mais la colère les a atteints finalement. » En 1 Th 2,14–16, celle-ci conclut des propos sévères de Paul qui ont été considérés par certains comme une interpolation dans la lettre<sup>13</sup>. Il conviendrait alors de la comprendre en référence à la ruine du temple de Jérusalem en 70 de notre ère. Cette thèse a été discutée<sup>14</sup>. Avec d'autres auteurs<sup>15</sup>, il convient de regarder comme authentiques les propos de Paul. Comment alors interpréter la parole de 1 Th 2,16 calquée sur une phrase du Testament de Lévi<sup>16</sup>? En « mais la colère de Dieu les a atteints (ἐφθασεν) finalement (ἐς τέλος) », il convient de comprendre l'expression ἐς τέλος dans le sens de finalement<sup>17</sup>. Par ailleurs, l'emploi de l'aoriste ἐφθασεν n'invite pas à penser qu'il s'agit du jugement eschatologique. Le verbe pourrait renvoyer à un événement récent comme la famine de 46 (Ac 11,28) ou bien l'édit de bannissement des juifs de Rome par Claude en 49 (Ac 18,2)<sup>18</sup>. Cependant, il faut reconnaître qu'il est difficile de discerner dans la parole de quel événement il s'agit.

C'est pourquoi on a suggéré de comprendre le verbe ἐφθασεν comme un « aoriste complexif » indiquant des actions répétées dans le passé, ou comme un « aoriste gnomique » exprimant des « événements typiques ». D'autres auteurs l'interprètent comme un aoriste prophétique ou comme un aoriste indiquant que le châtement est décidé et sur le point de se produire<sup>19</sup>. Il conviendrait peut-être simplement de penser que si la colère de

<sup>13</sup> Par exemple B. A. Pearson, « 1 Thessalonians 2,13–16 : A Deutero-Pauline Interpolation », *HTR* 64 (1971) : 79–94.

<sup>14</sup> Voir R. F. Collins, « A propos the Integrity of 1 Thess », in *Studies on the First Letter to the Thessalonians* (BETL 66 ; Leuven : Leuven University Press, 1984), 69–114.

<sup>15</sup> Par exemple C. J. Schlueter, *Filling up the Measure. Polemical Hyperbole in 1 Thessalonians 2.14–16* (JSNTSup 98 ; Sheffield : JSOT Press, 1994) ; E. W. Stegemann, « Remarques sur la polémique antijuvaïque dans 1 Thessaloniciens 2,14–16 », in *Le déchirement. Juifs et chrétiens au premier siècle* (ed. D. Marguerat ; Le monde de la Bible 32 ; Genève : Labor et Fides, 1996), 105.

<sup>16</sup> « Mais la colère de Dieu les a frappés à jamais » (VI 11).

<sup>17</sup> L'expression ἐς τέλος peut avoir deux significations : le sens chronologique « enfin, finalement » ou le sens modal « complètement, définitivement » (cf. Legasse, *Les épîtres de Paul aux Thessaloniciens*, 154). Toutefois, en Rm 11,2, Paul déclare que Dieu n'a pas rejeté son peuple et, en Rm 11,26, que tout Israël sera sauvé. Aussi, il ne convient pas de comprendre l'expression ἐς τέλος dans le sens de complètement, définitivement.

<sup>18</sup> Voir Schlueter, *Filling up the Measure*, 19–20.

<sup>19</sup> Pour la discussion sur l'aoriste ἐφθασεν : voir Legasse, *Les épîtres de Paul aux Thessaloniciens*, 154–55.

Dieu, selon Paul, a atteint les juifs, c'est qu'ils sont finalement sous le coup de cette colère. Pourtant, cela ne signifie pas qu'Israël sera définitivement anéanti puisque Paul écrira aux chrétiens de Rome que Dieu n'a pas rejeté son peuple (Rm 11,2) et que tout Israël sera sauvé (Rm 11,26). Certes, en 1 Th 2,14–16, Paul, qui est polémique, a des propos sévères. Mais si l'on tient compte de ce qu'il écrit aux chrétiens de Rome au sujet d'Israël, il est plausible de penser que pour lui, si Israël est sous le coup de la colère de Dieu, comme les écritures peuvent en témoigner, celui-ci peut faire advenir une épreuve salutaire pour l'amener à la conversion afin de le sauver. Ici Paul a un point de vue différent de celui de la communauté sadocite pour qui l'Israël infidèle sera anéanti.

E. 1 TH 3,5 // 1QS III 20–25 : LA MISE À L'ÉPREUVE<sup>20</sup>

Dans sa lettre aux Thessaloniens, lorsque Paul fait part à ses correspondants de son désir de retourner à Thessalonique et qu'il évoque qu'après plusieurs tentatives, il n'a pas pu effectuer le voyage, il attribue l'échec à Satan, l'adversaire de Dieu qui se dresse sur sa route et contrecarre ses projets (1 Th 2,18). Il rappelle ensuite qu'il a envoyé Timothée, l'un de ses compagnons de voyage, et il communique ce qui a motivé cet envoi : lors du séjour des missionnaires à Thessalonique, il avait déjà annoncé aux chrétiens qu'ils auraient à affronter des épreuves. Celles-ci sont arrivées. Inquiet, car il sentait la jeune communauté fragile, il écrit : « C'est pour cela que n'y tenant plus, j'ai envoyé prendre des nouvelles de votre foi dans la crainte que le Tentateur ne vous ai tentés et que notre peine ne soit perdue (1 Th 3,5). » Dans ses propos, Paul laisse percevoir que celui qu'il appelle Satan ou le Tentateur (ὁ πειράζων) est celui qui s'oppose à la réussite de la mission et il voit dans les difficultés rencontrées par les Thessaloniens une mise à l'épreuve par le tentateur qui aurait pu la faire échouer.

Il reprend ici le motif de la mise à l'épreuve avec l'intention de nuire ou de faire tomber. Celui-ci ne pas semble apparaître dans les Écritures où la mise à l'épreuve est généralement une initiative de Dieu qui entend éprouver la fidélité de son peuple ou d'un homme, comme Abraham<sup>21</sup>. Par contre, on le retrouve dans une exhortation du *Testament de Dan* en 5,1–4,

<sup>20</sup> Kuhn, « Die Bedeutung der Qumrantexte », 346–47.

<sup>21</sup> H. Seemann, « πείρα κτλ. », *ThWNT VI* (1959) : 23–37.

rédigée selon un cadre dualiste, où l'auteur oppose Satan, l'Ennemi, et ses esprits à l'ange de la paix, médiateur entre Dieu et les hommes<sup>22</sup>.

Le motif est encore mis en œuvre dans l'instruction sur les deux esprits en 1QS III 20–25 : « Dans la main du prince des ténèbres est la domination des fils de perversion : ils marchent dans des voies de ténèbres. Par le prince des ténèbres est provoqué l'égarément de tous les fils de justice : toutes leurs fautes, leurs péchés, leur culpabilité, et les transgressions de leurs œuvres se font sous sa domination, conformément aux mystères de Dieu, jusqu'à son terme. Et toutes leurs afflictions, et les moments de leur détresse (se passent) sous sa domination hostile. Et tous les esprits de son lot, font trébucher les fils de lumière, mais le Dieu d'Israël et son ange de vérité viennent en aide à tous les fils de lumière... ».

Lorsque Paul écrit aux chrétiens de Thessalonique en 1 Th 5,1–11, il les exhorte en ayant recours à un cadre de pensée dualiste. Dans ces versets, il oppose « les fils de lumière, les fils du jour » à ceux qui sont dans les ténèbres, et il les invite à veiller comme un soldat en faction, revêtus de la cuirasse de la foi et de l'amour, avec le casque de l'espérance du salut. Quand il rédige le passage de 1 Th 3,5 sur la mise à l'épreuve des Thessaloniciens, il le fait en référence à ce cadre dualiste, percevant en Satan ou le Tentateur celui qui s'oppose à la réalisation du dessein divin et qui peut mettre à l'épreuve les Thessaloniciens pour le faire échouer.

Le rédacteur sadocite utilisait le motif de la mise à l'épreuve dans l'instruction sur les deux esprits pour attirer l'attention des membres sur les agissements du Prince des ténèbres et des esprits de son lot dans le but d'égarer les membres de la communauté qui se considéraient comme la maison de perfection et de fidélité en Israël. Pour sa part, Paul y fait appel pour expliquer les obstacles rencontrés lors de la mission à Thessalonique et les épreuves endurées par les chrétiens.

---

<sup>22</sup> « Et maintenant, craignez le Seigneur, mes enfants, et prenez garde à Satan et à ses esprits. Approchez-vous de Dieu et de l'ange qui intercède pour vous, car c'est un médiateur entre Dieu et les Hommes et, pour le salut d'Israël il résistera à l'empire de l'Ennemi. C'est pourquoi l'Ennemi se hâte de faire trébucher tous ceux qui invoquent le Seigneur. Car il sait qu'au jour où Israël se convertira, l'empire de l'Ennemi prendra fin. Car l'ange de la paix lui-même soutiendra Israël pour qu'il ne tombe pas au plus profond du mal. » (Traduction de M. Philonenko, in *La Bible. Ecrits intertestamentaires* [ed. A. Dupont-Sommer et M. Philonenko ; Bibliothèque de la Pléiade ; Paris : Gallimard, 1987]).

F. 1 TH 3,13 // 4Q 400 1 I 2.3.14.19 ; 4Q400 1 II 6 ; 4Q403 1 I 24.31 :  
 ΟΙ ΑΓΙΟΙ, קְדוּשִׁים, COMPRIS DES ANGES OU DES ÊTRES CÉLESTES

A la fin de la première partie de sa lettre, Paul achève ses souhaits aux Thessaloniens en les calquant sur une annonce du prophète Zacarie en Za 14,5 qui évoquait la venue du Seigneur Dieu avec tous ses saints : « Que le Seigneur vous fasse croître et abonder dans l'amour les uns pour les autres et pour tous, comme nous pour vous afin d'affermir vos cœurs irréprochables en sainteté devant notre Dieu et Père en vue de la venue de notre Seigneur Jésus avec tous ses saints (1 Th 3,12–13). » Comme le substantif קְדוּשִׁים en Za 14,5, en 1 Th 3,13, le mot ἄγγελοι désigne les anges qui constituent l'escorte divine.

Déjà, dans les Ecritures et les pseudépigraphes, les substantifs ἄγγελοι ou קְדוּשִׁים étaient utilisés au sujet des anges<sup>23</sup>. Dans les manuscrits de la mer Morte, le mot קְדוּשִׁים est l'une des nombreuses désignations des êtres célestes utilisées particulièrement dans les chants pour l'holocauste du Sabbat<sup>24</sup> : « Célébrez [...] Dieu de tout(es) choses, saints d'entre les saints (קְדוּשִׁים קְדוּשִׁים). Dans sa divinité [...] par les saints de toujours, saints d'entre les saints (קְדוּשִׁים קְדוּשִׁים), et ils sont devenus pour lui des prêtres [...] ministres de la face dans son sanctuaire glorieux, dans l'assemblée de tous les dieux de [...] (4Q400 1 i 2.3) »<sup>25</sup>.

Ainsi l'auteur des chants pour l'holocauste du Sabbat, comme Paul dans sa lettre aux Thessaloniens, utilise les termes ἄγγελοι ou קְדוּשִׁים pour désigner les anges dans un sens déjà rencontré dans les Ecritures et les pseudépigraphes.

G. 1 TH 4,4 // 4Q416 2 II 21 : ΣΚΕΥΟΣ, בְּלִי, COMPRIS DE LA FEMME ?

P. Benoit<sup>26</sup> avait déjà fait remarquer par oral que le passage de 4Q416 2 ii 21 « Et aussi ne méprise pas le vase (בְּלִי) de ton [s]ein » pourrait permettre de lire 1 Th 4,4 : « Telle est la volonté de Dieu : votre sanctification, vous

<sup>23</sup> Ps 89,6.8 ; Si 42,17 ; Jb 5,1 ; 15,15 ; Dan 7,27 ; 8,13. Cf. aussi Tob 12,15 ; T. Lévi 3,3 ; 1 Hén 12,1 ; 14,24 ; 39,3 ; 49,4 ; 60,4 ; 61,10 ; 71,1 ; 81,5).

<sup>24</sup> C. Newsom, *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice : A Critical Edition* (Harvard Semitic Studies 27 ; Atlanta : Scholars Press, 1985), 23–38.

<sup>25</sup> Voir encore 4Q400 1 i 2.3.14.19 ; 4Q400 1 ii 6 ; 4Q403 1 i 24.31 (C. Newsom, *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*, 24). Cf. aussi 1QS XI 8 ; 1QH XI 23.

<sup>26</sup> J. Strugnell et D. J. Harrington, édés., « 416. 4QInstruction<sup>b</sup> (*Mūsār l<sup>e</sup> Mēvîn<sup>b</sup>*) », in *Qumran Cave 4. XXIV Sapiential Texts, Part 2, 4QInstruction (*Mūsār l<sup>e</sup> Mēvîn*)* : 415ff (ed. J. Strugnell, D. J. Harrington et T. Elgvin ; DJD XXXIV ; Oxford : Clarendon, 1999), 109–10.

abstenir de la débauche, à savoir, garder chacun son « vase » (σκαῦος) dans la sanctification et dans l'honneur... »

Toutefois l'interprétation de l'un et l'autre passages reste discutée. Sui-  
vi par plusieurs auteurs<sup>27</sup>, J. Strugnell<sup>28</sup>, qui s'appuie sur une expression  
parallèle אשת חיקבה en 4Q416 2 iv 5, considère la tournure כלי חיקבה  
comme une métonymie pour désigner la femme. Il conviendrait dès lors  
de traduire : « Ne méprise pas la femme de ton sein ».

Pour T. Elgvin<sup>29</sup>, l'expression כלי חיקבה est un euphémisme désignant  
les parties génitales. Il propose deux arguments en faveur de cette lec-  
ture : si l'auteur voulait parler de la femme, il aurait utilisé l'expression  
אשת חיקבה qu'il emploie ailleurs ; le substantif כלי n'est jamais utilisé  
pour désigner la femme alors qu'en 1 S 21,6 il désigne l'organe sexuel.

Enfin M. Kister, qui suggère une autre lecture du manuscrit, traduirait  
ainsi la sentence : « Ne sois pas déshonoré en ne (vivant) pas selon la part  
qui t'a été prescrite.<sup>30</sup> » Toutefois sa lecture du manuscrit serait impos-  
sible<sup>31</sup>. Par ailleurs, en fonction du contexte, la traduction par « organes  
génitaux » devrait être exclue alors que le sens de « femme, épouse » se-  
rait concevable<sup>32</sup>.

L'interprétation du terme σκαῦος en 1 Th 4,4 est tout aussi délicate. Paul  
emploie le mot dans une exhortation aux Thessaloniens (1 Th 4,3–8)  
dans laquelle il rappelle que la volonté de Dieu est qu'ils vivent dans la  
sainteté et qu'ils s'abstiennent de la débauche. En 1 Th 4,4, le substan-  
tif σκαῦος est complément du verbe κατᾶσθαι qui signifie « posséder »,  
« avoir », et qui peut avoir aussi le sens de « maîtriser ». Selon ce der-  
nier sens, σκαῦος pourrait alors être compris du corps de l'homme. Ainsi  
Paul exhorterait les Thessaloniens à maîtriser leurs corps et à ne pas

<sup>27</sup> B. G. Wold, *Women, Men and Angels, The Qumran Wisdom Document Musar leMe-  
vin and its Allusion to Genesis Creation Traditions* (WUNT 201 ; Tübingen : Mohr Siebeck,  
2005), 205–11 ; W. Loader, *The dead Sea Scrolls on Sexuality, Attitudes towards Sexuality  
in Sectarian and Related Literature at Qumran* (Grand Rapids/Cambridge : Eerdmanns,  
2009), 304–6 ; J.-S. Rey, *4QInstruction : sagesse et eschatologie* (STDJ 81 ; Leiden/Boston :  
Brill, 2009), 157–166.

<sup>28</sup> Strugnell et Harrington, « 416. 4QInstruction<sup>b</sup> (*Mûsâr lē Mēvînb*) », 108–9.

<sup>29</sup> T. Elgvin « 'To Master His own Vessel'. 1 Th 4,4 in Light of New Qumran Evidence », *NTS* 43 (1997) : 604–19. Il est suivi par J. E. Smith, « Another Look at 4Q416 2 ii.21, a Critical Parallel to First Thessalonians 4:4 », *CBQ* 63 (2001) : 499.

<sup>30</sup> M. Kister, « A Qumranic parallel to 1 Thess 4:4 ? Reading and Interpretation of 4Q416 2 ii 21 », *DSD* 10 (2003) : 365.

<sup>31</sup> Rey, *4QInstruction : sagesse et eschatologie*, 159.

<sup>32</sup> Rey, *4QInstruction : sagesse et eschatologie*, 166.

se laisser aller à la débauche comme le font les païens<sup>33</sup>. Mais, le verset doit être interprété en fonction de la suite de l'exhortation en 1 Th 4,6. Dans ce verset où il demande aux chrétiens de ne pas causer de dommage à leurs frères en ce domaine, Paul semble viser l'adultère<sup>34</sup>. Aussi, il apparaît que *σκευός* devrait être compris au sujet de la femme comme כְּלִי en 4Q416 2 ii 21. Ainsi Paul exhorterait chaque Thessaloniciens à avoir sa femme, comme il le recommandera plus tard aux Corinthiens (1 Co 7,1–6).

Il est encore intéressant de noter qu'en 1 P 3,7, le mot *σκευός* est utilisé dans des recommandations faites au mari d'avoir des égards envers son épouse. Par ailleurs, le sens de « femme » pour כְּלִי est attesté dans la littérature rabbinique<sup>35</sup>. Et on retrouve dans la littérature patristique le mot *σκευός* comme métaphore de la femme<sup>36</sup>. En 4Q416 2 ii 21 et en 1 Th 4,4, l'emploi de *σκευός*, et de כְּלִי comme métonymie pour désigner la femme correspond à un usage de l'époque.

#### H. 1 TH 4,13–17 // 4Q521 7,1–8 + 5 II 7–16 :

##### À PROPOS DE LA RÉSURRECTION

Dans le commentaire général d'une apocalypse messianique (4Q521), É. Puech rapproche deux fragments 4Q521 7 1–8 + 4Q521 5 ii 7–16 du passage sur la résurrection des morts en 1 Th 4,13–17<sup>37</sup>.

Pour É. Puech, dans ces deux fragments (4Q521 7 1–8 + 4Q521 5 II, 7–16), l'auteur reprend visiblement la conception de la résurrection véhiculée par la Bible et les textes juifs les plus anciens selon lesquels les impies périront et les justes du peuple ressusciteront et se réjouiront<sup>38</sup> :

« <sup>4</sup> [Réjouissez-vous (vous vous réjouirez) vous to]us qui faites le bien devant le Seigneur[r,  
<sup>5</sup> les bénis et no]n comme ceux-ci, les maudit[s],  
 car ils seront pour la Mort

<sup>33</sup> Ainsi B. Rigaux, *Saint Paul, les épîtres aux Thessaloniens* (EB 41; Paris/Gembloux : Gabalda/Duculot, 1956), 504–6; W. Marrxen, *Der erste Brief an die Thessalonicher* (ZBK NT 11.1; Zürich : Theologischer Verlag, 1979), 60–61; L. Morris, *The First and second Epistles to the Thessalonians* (NICNT; Grand Rapids : Eerdmans, 1991), 121.

<sup>34</sup> Rigaux, *Saint Paul, les épîtres aux Thessaloniens*, 510.

<sup>35</sup> *b. Meg.* 12b, *b. Sanh.* 22b : Rey, *4QInstruction : sagesse et eschatologie*, 160–61.

<sup>36</sup> Rey, *4QInstruction : sagesse et eschatologie*, 161–63.

<sup>37</sup> É. Puech, *La croyance des Esséniens en la vie future : immortalité, résurrection, vie éternelle ? Histoire d'une croyance dans le judaïsme ancien. Vol. II : Les données qumranien-nes et classiques* (EB NS 22; Paris : Gabalda, 1993), 687.

<sup>38</sup> Puech (*La croyance des Esséniens en la vie future*, 2:685–686) cite : Is 26,14.19; Si 48,11; Dn 12,1–3; 4Q245 (Pseudo-Dn<sup>c</sup>) ; 4QVis<sup>c</sup>Amr<sup>f</sup> 1 ii 12–14; 1 Hén 22.

[lorsque] <sup>6</sup> le Vivificateur [ressus]citera les morts de Son peuple. (vac)  
<sup>7</sup> Alors nous ren[d]rons grâce  
 et nous vous annoncerons les actes de jus[t]ice du Seigneur  
 qui [ a délivré/ressuscité ? ] <sup>8</sup> les fil[s] de la m]ort  
 et a ouvert [leurs tombeaux/ les tombeaux des (justes) ? ) ]<sup>39</sup> »

Selon É. Puech<sup>40</sup>, dans ces lignes, la résurrection ne semble pas être générale. Elle ne concernerait pas les impies voués à la mort, ni tous les justes. Seuls, les justes du peuple de Dieu déjà morts ressusciteront. En outre, il est possible, et même probable, que les justes vivants à ce moment-là ne passeront pas la mort. Dans les fragments, ils semblent désignés par l'emploi de la première personne du pluriel en 7,7 « nous ren[d]rons grâce et nous vous annoncerons ». Les justes seraient transformés et illuminés. Enfin, selon la reconstitution de la ligne 14 proposée par É. Puech « Et les cieus *sont allés au devant de(s) [ont accueilli [ les justes ( ? ) ...* », les « cieus », c'est-à-dire les habitants des cieus, les anges seraient allés au devant des justes. Le scénario serait dès lors le suivant : résurrection des justes décédés, transformation des vivants et rencontre avec les habitants des cieus.

Dans sa parénèse en 1 Th 4,13–17, Paul précise d'abord que la résurrection concerne les morts en Christ, et non tous les morts, et que les vivants, vraisemblablement les chrétiens désignés par le pronom ἡμεῖς, seront enlevés. Il esquisse ensuite un scénario analogue à celui de 4Q521 7,1–8 + 5 ii 7–16 : il mentionne d'abord la résurrection des morts, ensuite l'enlèvement au ciel des vivants et la rencontre avec le Seigneur dans les airs : « car lui-même, le Seigneur, au signal donné, à la voix de l'archange et au son de la trompette de Dieu, descendra du ciel : alors les morts en Christ ressusciteront d'abord ; ensuite nous, les vivants, qui seront restés, nous serons enlevés avec eux sur les nuées, à la rencontre du Seigneur... » En outre, Paul précise que la résurrection concerne seulement les morts en Christ, non tous les morts, et il mentionne ceux qui ne sont pas chrétiens désignés par οἱ λοιποί, mais il n'apporte aucune précision sur le sort qui leur est réservé (1 Th 4,13). Sur ce point il diffère de l'auteur de l'apocalypse messianique pour qui les impies sont voués à la mort.

Enfin, dans sa catéchèse en 1 Th 4,13–17 introduite par une confession de foi (1 Th 4,14) et basée sur une parole du Seigneur (1 Th 4,15), Paul combine avec le scénario analogue à 4Q521 7,1–8 + 5 II, 7–16, des motifs théophaniques qui apparaissent dans le récit de la théophanie au Sinaï en

<sup>39</sup> Traduction de Puech, *La croyance des Esséniens en la vie future*, 2:651.

<sup>40</sup> Puech, *La croyance des Esséniens en la vie future*, 2:686.



Ex 19,10–25 : la descente du Seigneur, la voix, la trompette, la nuée, la rencontre. Il paraît ainsi rédiger sa parénèse en écho à la théophanie sinaïtique. Au Sinaï, il s'agissait du rassemblement du peuple et de la rencontre avec Dieu en vue de l'Alliance et du don de la Loi. En 1 Th 4,13–17, une nouvelle rencontre se profile pour la fin des temps celle du nouveau peuple de Dieu avec son Seigneur, le Ressuscité, rassemblant définitivement autour de lui les morts qui ressusciteront et les vivants qui seront transformés<sup>41</sup>. Paul propose ainsi une toute autre vision de la résurrection que celle de l'auteur de l'apocalypse messianique.

I. 1 TH 5,1–11 // 1QS III 13–IV 26:  
L'EXPRESSION « FILS DE LUMIÈRE »  
EN CONTEXTE DUALISTE ET ESCHATOLOGIQUE<sup>42</sup>

A la fin de sa lettre aux Thessaloniens, dans une exhortation à la vigilance en 1 Th 5,1–11, Paul leur déclare : « Tous vous êtes des fils du jour, des fils de la lumière (1 Th 5,5). » Il leur recommande de ne pas dormir, d'être sobres et d'être vigilants comme un soldat en faction qui monte la garde, revêtus de la cuirasse de la foi et de l'amour, avec le casque de l'espérance du salut. Dieu en effet n'a pas destiné les chrétiens à subir sa colère, mais à posséder le salut par Jésus-Christ (1 Th 5,10).

En interpellant les Thessaloniens par « Fils de lumière », Paul emploie une expression très rare dans le judaïsme contemporain des origines chrétiennes<sup>43</sup>. Elle apparaît par contre dans quelques manuscrits de la mer Morte, principalement dans la première colonne de la Règle de la guerre (1QM I 1,3.9.11.13) et dans la première partie de la Règle de la communauté (1QS I 9 ; II 16 ; III 13.24–25)<sup>44</sup>.

Celle-ci comporte, en 1QS III 13–IV 26, l'instruction sur les deux esprits avec laquelle l'exhortation de Paul en 1 Th 5,1–11 présente quelques ressemblances. Les deux passages sont rédigés dans une perspective eschatologique et selon un cadre de pensée dualiste. Ils font mention de la colère divine qui châtie (1QS IV 12 ; 1 Th 5,9), et d'une promesse de vie

<sup>41</sup> C. Coulot, « À la venue du Seigneur (1 Th 4,13–18) », *RevScRel* 80 (2006) : 499–509.

<sup>42</sup> Kuhn, « Die Bedeutung der Qumrantexte », 347–52.

<sup>43</sup> Dans le *Testament de Job*, un écrit daté de la fin du premier siècle de notre ère, ou du début du second, il y a un parallèle à l'expression « fils de lumière » : il est dit d'Élihou qu'il « est fils des ténèbres et non de la lumière ». Cf. Kuhn, « Die Bedeutung der Qumrantexte », 350.

<sup>44</sup> Elle se retrouve encore en 4Q174 (4QFlor) 1–2 i 8–9 ; 4Q177 (4QCat A) 12–13 7 ; 4Q510 (4QShir<sup>a</sup>) 1 6–7.



(1QS IV 7 ; 1 Th 5,10). Ils opposent deux groupes de personnes : « les fils de lumière » (1QS III 13.24.25 ; 1 Th 5,5) et les « fils de perversité » ou ceux de la nuit et des ténèbres (1QS III 21 ; 1 Th 5,5-7). Ils mentionnent aussi un comportement à choisir dans la perspective de la fin (1QS IV 2-14 ; 1 Th 5,5-8), en fonction de la visite de Dieu (1QS IV 18-19) ou du jour du Seigneur (1 Th 5,1-2).

L'emploi de l'expression « fils de lumière » dans les manuscrits de la mer Morte et dans la lettre aux Thessaloniens avait soulevé la question fort débattue d'une dépendance de Paul envers la littérature qumranienne<sup>45</sup>. Les ressemblances relevées entre l'instruction sur les deux esprits en 1QS III 13-IV 26 et l'exhortation de Paul en 1 Th 5,1-11, posent une question plus précise, celle d'une dépendance de Paul envers l'instruction sur les deux esprits.

Toutefois, l'exhortation de Paul en 1 Th 5,1-11, qui est courte, présente aussi des divergences par rapport à l'instruction sur les deux esprits. Paul y combine avec les motifs dualistes d'autres éléments ou images. En effet, lorsqu'il rappelle que la venue du Seigneur sera subite et inévitable (1 Th 5,2-4), il se sert pour cela d'images apocalyptiques : le voleur qui vient de nuit (Mt 24,43-44), les motifs de se croire en paix et en sécurité et de la ruine qui arrive soudainement (Jr 6,14 ; Ez 13,10.16), l'évocation de la fausse sécurité de la génération du déluge (Mt 24,37-39), l'image des douleurs de la femme enceinte qui marque le caractère inéluctable de ce qui va arriver (Es 13,8-9). Quand il caractérise ceux des ténèbres comme ceux qui s'enivrent la nuit, il fait peut-être écho à Is 5,11 ; il se réfère surtout à la vie ordinaire<sup>46</sup> en faisant allusion aux débordements des festins antiques qui avaient lieu la nuit<sup>47</sup>. Il décrit l'équipement du chrétien appelé à la vigilance et mettant en pratique les trois vertus de foi, de charité et d'espérance en écho à Is 59,17 ou à Sg 5,17-20. Enfin, lorsqu'il rappelle que Dieu a destiné les chrétiens à posséder le salut par l'intermédiaire de leur Seigneur, Jésus Christ, mort pour qu'ils vivent unis à lui, il reprend des éléments du kérygme chrétien. Certes en 1 Th 5,1-11, Paul met en œuvre des éléments d'une doctrine dualiste, mais en les combinant à d'autres motifs ou images, il les adapte à sa parénèse.

Il faut encore noter qu'il y a quelques motifs d'une pensée dualiste dans des écrits proches de ceux de Qumran, en *Test. Levi* 19,1 ; en *Test. Jos.* 20,2

<sup>45</sup> Voir Kuhn, « Die Bedeutung der Qumrantexte », 350-51.

<sup>46</sup> Rigaux, *Saint Paul, les épîtres aux Thessaloniens*, 565.

<sup>47</sup> H. Schürmann, *La première lettre aux Thessaloniens* (Parole et prière ; Paris : Desclée 1967), 96.

et en *Test. Dan* 5,1–6,8. Certes, ces écrits sont peu nombreux, mais ils révèlent que la doctrine dualiste a été véhiculée par d'autres canaux.

Par ailleurs, il convient d'observer que les milieux chrétiens ont également transmis des éléments d'une doctrine dualiste. La parole de Jésus sur la porte étroite et la porte large (Mt 7,13–14 // Lc 13,23–24) est un écho à la doctrine des deux voies. L'auteur de l'épître aux Ephésiens, une lettre deutéro-paulinienne, utilise l'antithèse « ténèbres/lumière » et l'expression « fils de la lumière » en Ep 5,7–12. La rédaction johannique fait appel à un cadre de pensée dualiste dans son évangile. Il en est de même avec les auteurs des épîtres johanniques. Enfin, la *Didachè* oppose la voie de la vie et celle de la mort (*Didachè* 1,1–6,3 ; 5,1–2). Il apparaît ainsi que la tradition chrétienne a montré un intérêt pour la doctrine dualiste.

Toutes ces observations laissent supposer que la doctrine dualiste, exploitée dans les écrits de la mer Morte, a pu circuler par divers canaux, avant de parvenir dans les milieux chrétiens qui ont montré pour elle un intérêt certain. Paul semble en être le premier témoin. C'est par l'intermédiaire de l'un ou de plusieurs de ces canaux qu'il a pu la connaître et s'en s'inspirer dans une exhortation à la vigilance adressée aux Thessaloniens. Dans l'instruction sur les deux esprits intégrée dans la Règle, le rédacteur avait exposé la doctrine dualiste afin de poser le fondement théologique de la vie communautaire et de donner un sens à l'engagement dans la communauté<sup>48</sup>.

J. 1 TH 5,15 // 1QS X 17–18 :

NE PAS RENDRE LE MAL POUR LE MAL, MAIS RECHERCHER LE BIEN

A la fin de la Règle de la communauté en 1QS X, 17–18, le psalmiste écrit : « Je ne rendrai à personne la rétribution du mal, (mais) par le bien je poursuivrai chacun. » Bien que H.-W. Kuhn considère qu'il conviendrait mieux de lire le passage en relation avec Rm 12,17–20<sup>49</sup>, il me semble qu'il est aussi possible de le rapprocher d'une exhortation adressée par Paul aux Thessaloniens en 1 Th 5,15 : « Veillez à ce que personne ne rende le mal pour le mal, mais toujours poursuivez le bien les uns envers les autres et envers tous. »

Le propos du psalmiste, comme celui de Paul, relève de la sagesse. Dans le livre des Proverbes, le sage ne mentionnait que l'élément négatif :

<sup>48</sup> C. Coulot, « L'instruction sur les deux esprits (1QS III 13–IV 26). Structure et genèse », *RevScRel* 82 (2008) : 160.

<sup>49</sup> Voir Kuhn, « Die Bedeutung der Qumrantexte », 341.

« Ne dis pas : 'Je rendrai le mal qu'on m'a fait (Pr 20,22)'.<sup>50</sup> ». Mais la sagesse orientale comportait déjà l'interdiction de rendre le mal pour le mal et sa contrepartie positive : « Mon fils, si ton adversaire vient au-devant de toi pour le mal, va au devant de lui pour le bien.<sup>51</sup> » Il apparaît ainsi que le psalmiste et Paul reprennent, chacun à leur manière en l'adaptant à son propos, une sentence sapientielle de leur époque. Le psalmiste en fait pour lui un engagement. En 1 Th 5,15, il s'agit d'une exhortation adressée à des chrétiens qui doivent apprendre à vivre en communauté.

Les passages de la première lettre de Paul aux Thessaloniens qui ont été lus en lien avec les textes parallèles des manuscrits de la mer Morte sont relativement nombreux et sont répartis tout au long de la lettre. Leur nombre<sup>52</sup> et la lecture qui en a été proposée laissent présumer que Paul connaissait le milieu de pensée sadocite.

Certes, Paul, comme les sadocites, emploie des mots comme ἄγιοι (1 Th 3,13), קדושים (4Q400 1 i 2.3.19.24) compris des anges, ou σκευος (1 Th 4,4), כלי (4Q416 2 ii 21) comme métonymie de la femme, dans une signification qu'ils ont à leur époque. Paul peut aussi comprendre un terme ῥα, ὀργή, dans le même sens que les sadocites (1 Th 5,9 ; 1QS II 11–15), à savoir la colère de Dieu qui s'abattra sur ceux des ténèbres à la fin des temps. Mais il utilise aussi ὀργή avec une acception différente en 1 Th 3,16 où Dieu manifestera sa colère dans une épreuve salutaire à Israël pour l'amener à la conversion.

En outre, Paul peut avoir recours à un motif ou à une figure présents dans les manuscrits de la mer Morte, mais il les réinterprète en fonction de la compréhension de la mission auprès des chrétiens de Thessalonique. Ainsi, alors que les sadocites se considèrent comme les seuls élus de Dieu (1QS IV 22 ; XI 7), pour Paul, le privilège de l'élection accordé à Israël est étendu aux chrétiens (1 Th 1,4). Le Maître de Justice, comme le prophète Michée (Mi 3,8), déclarait avoir été soutenu par la force de Dieu et avoir

<sup>50</sup> Voir aussi Pr 24,29 : « Ne dis pas 'Comme il m'a fait, je lui ferai ; je rendrai à chacun selon son œuvre' ».

<sup>51</sup> Sagesse d'Ahiqar 3,28 : voir Legasse, *Les épîtres de Paul aux Thessaloniens*, 325 et n. 2.

<sup>52</sup> Il faut ajouter aux passages de la première lettre aux Thessaloniens que j'ai lus, celui de 1 Th 2,19–20 qui présente des motifs communs (la joie et la couronne de gloire) à 1QS IV 6–8 et 1QH<sup>a</sup> XVII 23–26 (= 1QH IX 23–26) : voir la contribution de C. Grappe « Philippiens 3,2–4,1 et 1QS 4,6–8 » dans ce même volume.

reçu son esprit (1QH XV 9–10), Paul perçoit l'action puissante de Dieu opérant par l'Esprit saint dans la prédication des missionnaires et la conversion des Thessaloniens (1 Th 1,5). Quand Paul illustre avec les figures de la nurse et du père la relation qu'il a eue, lors de la mission à Thessalonique, avec les Thessaloniens (1 Th 2,7–8.11), il reprend une figure déjà présente en Nb 11,12, mais il la développe plus que le Maître de Justice en 1QH XV 23–25. Et lorsque Paul invite les Thessaloniens à ne pas rendre le mal pour le mal et à poursuivre le bien (1 Th 5,15), il s'inspire d'une sentence sapientielle (Pr 20,22) que le psalmiste de 1QS X 17–18 s'engageait à suivre.

L'auteur de l'Apocalypse messianique qui reprenait des conceptions sur la résurrection déjà véhiculées par les Ecritures (Is 26,14.19 et Si 48,11) avait esquissé en 4Q521 7 1–8 + 5 ii 7–16, un scénario de résurrection. Lorsque Paul écrit en 1 Th 4,13–17 que les morts ressusciteront d'abord, que les vivants seront ensuite enlevés pour aller à la rencontre du Ressuscité, il suit un scénario analogue, mais il élabore sa parénèse, basée sur une formule kérygmatique et une parole du Seigneur, en faisant aussi appel à divers motifs de la théophanie au Sinäi.

Enfin, Paul, comme les sadocites, fait appel à des éléments d'une doctrine dualiste. D'une part, dans l'instruction sur les deux esprits, un exposé de doctrine dualiste, le rédacteur de la Règle de la communauté mettait en garde contre les agissements de l'Ange des ténèbres et des esprits de son lot cherchant à faire trébucher les fils de lumière (1QS III 20–25). Paul reprend le motif, mais il perçoit en Satan celui qui fait obstacle à sa mission, et dans le Tentateur, celui qui peut mettre à l'épreuve les Thessaloniens (1 Th 2,17–3,5). D'autre part, les sadocites se considéraient eux-mêmes comme des fils de lumière (1QS III 13–IV 26); de son côté, Paul déclare aux Thessaloniens qu'ils sont eux aussi fils de lumière dans une exhortation à la vigilance (1 Th 5,1–11). Celle-ci présente des affinités avec l'instruction sur les deux esprits en 1QS III 13–IV 26 où le rédacteur posait le fondement théologique de l'entrée et de la vie en communauté sadocite. Comme cela a été relevé, en 1 Th 5,1–11, Paul reprend les motifs dualistes, mais il les combine avec d'autres pour exhorter les chrétiens à être vigilants dans l'attente de la venue de leur Seigneur Ressuscité.

Ainsi Paul montre qu'il connaît la pensée dualiste. Il y puise des éléments qu'il relit en fonction de sa foi, de la mission à Thessalonique et de la situation de la communauté chrétienne. Tout au long de l'épître, il les combine avec d'autres qu'il trouve dans d'autres milieux de pensée. Ainsi, lorsqu'en 1 Th 1,6, il écrit aux Thessaloniens qu'ils ont accueilli la

parole en pleine détresse, avec la joie de l'Esprit Saint, il met en œuvre un thème qui lui est cher, qui n'a pas d'antécédent biblique et qui pourrait remonter à la littérature de martyr (4 M 10,20–21)<sup>53</sup>. Quand en 1 Th 2,1–7, il fait allusion aux comportements de certains philosophes itinérants, Paul se sert des lieux communs de la polémique anti-philosophique ou anti-magicienne grecque<sup>54</sup>, et quand il rappelle que les missionnaires ont été « éprouvés » par Dieu, Paul utilise un vocabulaire employé pour le choix de ceux à qui on confie une charge<sup>55</sup>. S'il fait appel à l'image de la nurse et celle du père pour illustrer sa relation avec les Thessaloniens, il ne reprend pas seulement une figure scripturaire, mais il fait peut-être appel à la métaphore de la maternité spirituelle dont on a des traces dans les religions à mystère. Lorsque dans la polémique antijuive en 1 Th 2,15, il écrit : « ils ne plaisent pas à Dieu et sont ennemis de tous les hommes », il reprend des slogans antijuifs greco-romains<sup>56</sup>. Et dans sa catéchèse sur la résurrection des morts, comme cela a été relevé, il utilise des images de la révélation au Sinaï pour esquisser un scénario de la parousie<sup>57</sup>. Enfin en 1 Th 5,2, quand Paul rappelle aux Thessaloniens que le jour du Seigneur vient comme un voleur dans la nuit, et que, quand les gens diront « Quelle paix, quelle sécurité ! », c'est alors que soudain la ruine fondra sur eux comme les douleurs sur la femme enceinte, et qu'ils ne pourront y échapper, il se sert d'images apocalyptiques<sup>58</sup>.

De telles observations montrent que le milieu de pensée de Paul est étendu et couvre plusieurs domaines. Né à Tarse, de la diaspora juive, formé aux pieds de Gamaliel, pharisien, converti au christianisme, apôtre du Seigneur ressuscité, Paul a beaucoup voyagé : à Jérusalem où il a été formé, à Damas où il se rendait pour des représailles contre les chrétiens et où il a été baptisé, en Arabie où il a fui, à Antioche d'où il est parti pour une première tournée missionnaire, à Chypre, en Asie mineure, en Grèce. Il sera entré en contact avec des groupes humains aux cultures et aux doctrines variées. Il aura eu ainsi, d'une manière ou d'une autre, la possi-

<sup>53</sup> Legasse, *Les épîtres de Paul aux Thessaloniens*, 92, n. 5.

<sup>54</sup> Marguerat, « Imiter l'apôtre, père et mère de la communauté (1 Th 2,1–12) », 40.

<sup>55</sup> Rigaux, *Saint Paul, les épîtres aux Thessaloniens*, 409.

<sup>56</sup> Tacite, *Annales* 15,44 ; Flavius Josèphe, *Contre Apion* 2,121 ; Diodore de Sicile, *Bibliothèque historique* 34,1.

<sup>57</sup> Coulot, « À la venue du Seigneur (1 Th 4,13–18) », 499–509.

<sup>58</sup> Le voleur qui vient de nuit : Mt 24,43–44 ; l'espérance de se croire en paix et en sécurité et la ruine qui survient soudainement (Jr 6,14 ; Ez 13,10.16) ; le rappel de la fausse sécurité de la génération du déluge (Mt 24,37–39) ; l'image de la femme enceinte qui marque le caractère inéluctable de ce qui arrivera (Es 13,8–9).

bilité de prendre connaissance de la pensée sadocite et il y aura accordé un intérêt certain puisqu'il y fait appel tout au long de sa première lettre aux Thessaloniens.



« LES ŒUVRES DE LA LOI » : MARIAGE ET DIVORCE  
À QUMRÂN ET DANS LES LETTRES DE PAUL

Émile Puech

*CNRS-Paris – EBAF-Jérusalem*

Dans cette note, « les œuvres de la Loi » en *4QMMT* et dans les lettres de Paul sont examinées sous un aspect particulier traité de part et d'autre, à savoir comment chacun des auteurs a compris, pour leurs communautés respectives, les exigences de la Loi au sujet du mariage et du divorce pour avoir part au salut promis par Dieu au fidèle. Il importe d'abord de définir ce que recouvre l'expression « les œuvres de la Loi » dans ces compositions. Puis ayant précisé ce que prescrit la Loi au sujet du mariage et du divorce dans la Bible et noté quelques applications dans l'histoire du peuple, sont passées en revue les positions des Esséniens et de Paul reprenant les ordres de Jésus, confrontées aux données évangéliques. Si Paul accorde une place différente aux « œuvres de la Loi » dans le salut du fidèle, en revanche les positions sont proches dans l'application de la loi sur le mariage et le divorce, contrairement à la pratique du judaïsme contemporain. Des deux côtés, les fidèles sont appelés à observer les exigences de la Loi dans l'appel à la sainteté.

A. LES ŒUVRES DE LA LOI

Dans tout le Nouveau Testament, l'expression (τὰ) ἔργα (τοῦ) νόμου « les œuvres de la Loi » n'est connue que des lettres pauliennes et uniquement dans des contextes particuliers où il est question de la 'justification', de savoir si et comment les croyants des nations païennes peuvent bénéficier de la promesse et de l'héritage d'Abraham. Ce sont des passages parallèles de Ga 2,16 (3x) et 3,2.5.10(.11) et Rm 3,20.27.28. On doit y joindre l'expression au singulier de Rm 2,15 : τὸ ἔργον τοῦ νόμου γραπτὸν ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις αὐτῶν « l'œuvre (= la mise en pratique) de la loi inscrite dans leurs cœurs » qui reprend la formulation plurielle abrégée de 2,14 τὰ (ἔργα) τοῦ νόμου ποιῶσιν, où il est dit que οἱ ποιηταὶ νόμου δικαιωθήσονται « les observateurs de la loi (= ceux qui la mettent en pratique) seront justifiés » (Rm 2,13,



et Ga 3,12 citant Lv 18,5)<sup>1</sup>. Toutefois, l'ajout de ἐξ ἔργων νόμου à la citation de Ps 143(142),2 « nul vivant ne sera justifié (δικαιωθήσεται - קָדַשׁ) devant Lui » en Rm 3,20 (voir Ga 2,16 et 3,11), explicite ce point important de la théologie paulinienne dans l'emploi de cette expression : « L'homme n'est pas justifié par les œuvres de la Loi, mais par la foi au Christ Jésus ».

Si « les œuvres de la Loi » désignent ce que la Loi réclame du peuple de la Loi comme obligation imposée au peuple de l'alliance, c'est-à-dire plus précisément l'acte ou le résultat de « la mise en pratique de la Loi » comme il en est en 1QpHa VII 17-VIII 1-3<sup>2</sup>, et non les préceptes eux-mêmes, désormais pour Paul c'est la foi qui justifie, « car par les œuvres de la Loi personne ne sera justifié » (Ga 2,16, Rm 3,20). Tous les hommes sont pécheurs, juifs et païens. Et Paul de raisonner ainsi en Ga 3,10-11 :

<sup>10</sup>Tous ceux qui se réclament des œuvres de la Loi encourent une malédiction, car il est écrit : 'Maudit soit quiconque ne persévère pas dans tout ce qui est écrit dans la Loi de Moïse pour le pratiquer' (Dt 27,26). "Or il est évident que personne n'est justifié devant Dieu par la Loi, car 'le juste par la fidélité vivra' (Ha 2,4).

La Loi est un ensemble de préceptes qui règlent le comportement de l'homme et qui précisent les œuvres à accomplir. Mais dans la nouvelle économie du salut, Paul sait que « les œuvres de la Loi » ne sauvent pas, elles ne peuvent pas rendre juste le croyant. « Je ne peux annuler la grâce de Dieu : car si la justice vient de la Loi, alors Christ est mort pour rien » (Ga 2,21). Tous les hommes ont été sauvés par le Christ Jésus, tous seront justifiés par la foi au Christ. Les juifs ne sont pas justifiés par la circoncision ni par la foi d'Abraham, ni par les œuvres de la Loi, tout comme Abraham n'a pas été déclaré juste par les œuvres de la Loi (χωρίς ἔργων), mais par la foi (Ga 3,6, voir Gn 15,6) et par le pardon de Dieu (Rm 3,21-30 ; 4,6-8). La justification vient de la foi seule, à l'exemple d'Abraham qui eut foi en la promesse divine faite à sa descendance. Paul compare promesse et loi laquelle est postérieure, donc seconde et non essentielle dans le plan divin du salut, puisque, révélant les péchés, la Loi ne peut pardonner et donner la vie, mais elle conduit au Christ qui seul justifie (Ga 3,16-29). Tel est l'évangile de Paul aux Galates et aux Romains, leur

<sup>1</sup> À ces exemples, on doit ajouter des emplois de ἐξ/χωρίς ἔργων sans le complément νόμου sous-entendu : Rm 4,2.6 ; 9,12.32 ; 11,6.

<sup>2</sup> « *Le juste par sa fidélité vivra*. Ceci s'interprète au sujet de tous ceux qui pratiquent la Loi (כול עושי התורה) dans la Maison de Juda, que Dieu délivrera de la Maison du Jugement à cause de leur peine et de leur fidélité au Maître de Justice ». Il s'agit ici de la fidélité à l'interprétation de la Loi donnée par le Maître.

annonçant le salut par la foi au Christ Jésus et non par les œuvres de la Loi contrairement à l'opinion de judéo-chrétiens. Il prend l'exemple de la foi d'Abraham, et leur annonce que son descendant « le Christ nous a rachetés de la malédiction de la Loi afin de recevoir la promesse de l'Esprit par la foi » (Ga 3,1–14, voir Rm 3,21–31). Ainsi dans ces deux lettres de Paul, l'expression « les œuvres de la Loi » ne désigne pas « les préceptes de la Loi », mais « les œuvres » que l'homme accomplit (ποιεῖν) en mettant en pratique les commandements de la Loi. Ces emplois relativisent le rôle des « œuvres de la Loi » dans le plan divin de salut. Le croyant converti n'a pas à observer la circoncision ni les lois sur le pur et l'impur auxquelles les juifs et des judéo-chrétiens attachaient en particulier la justification par « les œuvres (de la Loi) ».

Dans ces lettres pauliniennes du milieu du 1<sup>er</sup> siècle de notre ère, l'expression (τὰ) ἔργα (τοῦ) νόμου « les œuvres de la Loi » ou ἐξ ἔργων νόμου « par les œuvres de la Loi » qui ne se trouve pas dans l'Ancien Testament, — bien que l'observance des prescriptions de la Loi soit une notion bien présente dans l'Écriture<sup>3</sup>, — n'est pas pour autant comme telle une création paulinienne, ni une expression isolée et unique. Les manuscrits de Qumrân en ont révélé maintenant les plus anciennes attestations<sup>4</sup>. Toutefois, contrairement à l'édition *princeps*, il est impossible de lire la séquence מעשי תורה en 4Q174 1–2+21 i 7 commentant 2 S 7,10b–11<sup>5</sup>. Tout d'abord on attendrait logiquement dans cette phrase מעשי התורה, avec l'article, comme aux lignes 11 et ii 2. Ensuite, le sens obtenu dans la phrase est étrange : ויואמר לבנות לוא מקדש אדם להיות מקטירים בוא לוא ! לפניו מעשי תורה מעשי תודה<sup>6</sup> « des œuvres de louange »<sup>7</sup>. Cette

<sup>3</sup> L'expression n'est pas attestée non plus dans la littérature apocryphe péritestamentaire, autant qu'il soit possible d'en juger.

<sup>4</sup> La séquence ומעשי בתורה en 1QS V 21 n'entre pas ici en ligne de compte.

<sup>5</sup> J. M. Allegro, *Qumran Cave 4.1 (4Q158–4Q186) (Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan V ; Oxford : Clarendon, 1968)*, 53.

<sup>6</sup> Même en suivant l'explication d'A. Dupont-Sommer, *Les écrits esséniens découverts près de la mer Morte* (Paris : Payot, 1959), 325, repris dans *La Bible. Écrits intertestamentaires* (Bibliothèque de la Pléiade ; Paris : Gallimard, 1987), 410 : pour cette lecture on attend l'orthographe pleine et l'article : מעשי התורה, même si on peut lui comparer Rm 2,13–14 (et Ga 3,12). En effet, ce verbe est habituellement employé pour les actes du culte, tout comme עבד en araméen. J. Carmignac, *Les textes de Qumrân traduits et annotés*, vol. 2 (Paris : Letouzey et Ané, 1963), 281–82, lit un substantif « les œuvres de la Loi », avec une explication justificative embarrassée.

<sup>7</sup> Comme je m'en suis expliqué longuement dans *La croyance des Esséniens en la vie future : immortalité, résurrection, vie éternelle ? Histoire d'une croyance dans le judaïsme ancien*, vol. 2 (EB NS 22 ; Paris : Gabalda, 1993), 574 et 578, avec les renvois bibliogra-

lecture qui s'impose, s'oppose à l'attestation d'offrandes sacrificielles par les Esséniens au temple ni ailleurs comme on a pu l'écrire ; elle y voit l'offrande de louanges (= des Hymnes) à Dieu, la prière de louange étant assimilée à la fumée de l'encens au cours des sacrifices sanglants, avec l'emploi métaphorique de *מקטירי* par les membres du « temple d'homme (= la Communauté) », voir déjà Ps 141,2. Ce sens culturel est corroboré par le culte spirituel de la Communauté en 1QS IX 4–5 :

... pour expier pour la culpabilité de la faute et l'iniquité du péché et pour (obtenir) la Bienveillance (divine) sur le pays, sans la chair des holocaustes ni la graisse des sacrifices, et l'offrande <sup>5</sup>des lèvres (sera) pour le jugement comme une bonne odeur de justice, et la perfection de conduite comme le don d'une offrande agréable. (Voir encore CD XI 21 : mais la prière des justes est comme une oblation de délices.)

La composition ou 'Lettre' dénommée *Miqṣat Ma'asē ha-Tôrah* (= *MMT*) qui date du milieu du II<sup>e</sup> siècle avant J.-C.<sup>8</sup>, de quelque deux siècles antérieure aux lettres de Paul, est partiellement conservée par six manuscrits (4Q394–399) dont les copies les plus tardives datent du tournant de notre ère. *MMT* offre le plus ancien et le seul exemple en hébreu<sup>9</sup> de cette expression dans la séquence *מקצת מעשי התורה* « de quelques œuvres de la Loi » dans 'l'épilogue' en 4Q398 14–17 ii 3, voir aussi la séquence *והתבונן*

---

phiques. Les photographies PAM 43.440 et surtout 41.807 ne permettent pas l'hésitation, lecture confirmée par l'observation de l'original ; lecture retenue par P. Grelot, « Les œuvres de la Loi. (A propos de 4Q394–398) », *RQ* 63 (1994) : 441–48, 444–45. (Je ne pouvais alors exploiter les exemples de *Miqṣat Ma'asē ha-Tôrah* en attente de publication par l'éditeur officiel). Contrairement aux affirmations répétées et récentes de J. C. R. de Roo, *'Works of the Law' at Qumrân and in Paul* (Sheffield : Phoenix Press, 2007), 11–16 et *passim*, reprenant les arguments de « David's Deeds in the Dead Sea Scrolls », *DSD* 6 (1999) : 44–65, 51–56, l'original et les photographies (les reproductions des planches ne peuvent être mises en compétition) ne laissent à l'épigraphiste compétent aucun doute de lecture du *dalet* (tête en partie conservée malgré une petite écaille de la surface), et on n'a jamais trouvé d'autel ni d'autel à encens dans les ruines ! Le vocabulaire et le contexte (un temple d'homme) favorisent autant, sinon beaucoup mieux, cette lecture ; en outre est irrecevable l'argument d'une majorité d'auteurs s'efforçant d'expliquer une lecture erronée.

<sup>8</sup> Nous acceptons une datation au tout début de la Communauté, sans suivre les conclusions de C. Hempel, « The Contexte of 4QMMT and Comfortable Theories », in *The Dead Sea Scrolls : Text and Context* (ed. C. Hempel ; STDJ 90 ; Leiden/Boston : Brill, 2010), 275–92.

<sup>9</sup> D'après D. Flusser, « Die Gesetzeswerke in Qumran und bei Paulus », in *Geschichte-Tradition-Reflexion : Festschrift für Martin Hengel zum 70. Geburtstag, Band I – Judentum* (hrsg. H. Cancik, H. Lichtenberger, und P. Schäfer ; Tübingen : Mohr Siebeck, 1996), 395–404, 397, l'expression *מעשי התורה* ne se trouve pas davantage dans le judaïsme ancien ni dans la littérature rabbinique, uniquement dans ce texte qumranien.

במעשיהמה « et réfléchis sur leurs œuvres » en 4Q398 11–13 7, et dans la ‘partie halakhique’ en 4Q394 3–7 i 1–2 : « שהם מן קצת דברי ה[מעשים] : qui, eux, sont que[ques préceptes] des œuvres (de la Loi) »<sup>10</sup>. Dans ce contexte en rapport avec la conduite des rois David et Salomon qui ont été délivrés des malheurs et malédictions et qui furent comblés des bénédictions promises par la Loi parce qu’ils craignaient la Loi et qu’ils l’ont cherchée, le substantif pluriel מעשים désigne certainement des « œuvres » prescrites par la Loi, le contenu des préceptes à mettre en œuvre pour bénéficier des bénédictions promises et de la réjouissance eschatologique, et non ‘les préceptes eux-mêmes’ à la suite de plusieurs auteurs. Dans cette composition il est important de noter encore que ce sont les observances de ces préceptes, « les œuvres de la Loi », qui rendront juste devant Dieu le juif fidèle :

... de sorte que tu te [réjouisses *toi-même* à la fin des *jours* (/du temps), lorsque ]tu [trouveras qu’une parti[e de nos dire]s (est) fondée. Et cela te sera compté comme justice (לצדקה) quand ]tu[ fais ce qui est droit et ce qui est bon en Sa présence, pour ton propre bien et pour celui d’Israël. (finale du manuscrit : texte de 4Q397 complété par 4Q398 et 399).

La justice escomptée « par les œuvres de la Loi » est ici étroitement liée à la fidélité dans l’accomplissement des préceptes de la Loi correctement interprétés selon la tradition reçue et transmise par le Maître<sup>11</sup>. Cette « ‘justice’ par les œuvres de la Loi » est à l’opposé de la conception de Paul de la justification par la foi dans les emplois de cette formule<sup>12</sup>. Pour lui

<sup>10</sup> On ne peut traduire avec les auteurs « which are [some of the rulings according to the] precepts (of the Torah) », E. Qimron and J. Strugnell, *Qumran Cave 4.V. Miqsat Ma’asê ha-Tôrâh* (DJD X ; Oxford : Clarendon, 1994), 47 : ‘precepts’ traduit דברי ou חוקי mais certainement pas מעשי ; cette remarque a été faite en premier par Grelot, « Les œuvres de la Loi », 446–47, généralement suivi par les auteurs, voir par exemple J. D. G. Dunn and J. H. Charlesworth, « Qumran’s *Some Works of Torah* (4Q394–399) [4QMMT] and Paul’s Galatians », in *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls. The Second Princeton Symposium on Judaism and Christian Origins, Volume Three, The Scrolls and Christian Origins* (ed. J. H. Charlesworth ; Waco : Baylor University Press, 2006), 187–201, 188, 193–95. Voir aussi J. D. G. Dunn, « 4QMMT and Galatians », *NTS* 43 (1997) : 147–53. Une étude des fragments de 4QMMT a révélé des traces de lignes supplémentaires et un changement dans les numérotations et les séquences de l’épilogue, voir É. Puech, « L’épilogue de 4QMMT revisité », in *A Teacher for All Generations : Essays in Honor of James VanderKam* (ed. E. F. Mason, S. I. Thomas, A. Schofield, and E. Ulrich ; JSJS 153/1 ; Leiden : Brill, 2012), 309–339.

<sup>11</sup> Comme l’a compris la génération suivante en 1QpHa VIII 1–3, voir note 2.

<sup>12</sup> On ne peut sans précaution traduire le « jugement » divin à la fin des temps par « justification » à la suite de certains auteurs, le fidèle essénien avance dans la voie droite en observant la Loi, mais il n’est pas justifié pour autant, il ne sera déclaré juste que lors du jugement, alors que le croyant au Christ mort et ressuscité est justifié dans le sacrifice d’expiation du Fils unique et il chemine dans la foi sous l’emprise de l’Esprit du

le croyant est rendu juste par la seule foi au Christ Jésus, ce qui n'exclut évidemment pas « les œuvres » de la loi inscrite dans les cœurs, loi qui ne répond pas aux mêmes exigences que la Loi mosaïque ; vivant sous la loi de l'esprit, le croyant est affranchi de la loi du péché et de la mort. Toutefois, puisque tous les hommes sont pécheurs et que la Loi ne fait que donner la connaissance du péché (Rm 2,12–16 ; 3,20), Paul rejoint par là la pensée du Maître et des livres bibliques sur la condition humaine et l'indispensable pardon de Dieu qui seul rend juste celui qui Le craint :

À la fin des jours, les fautes seront pardonnées, et aux pieux seront pardonnées les fautes. Souviens-toi de David qui fut un homme de bienfaits et aussi qui fut délivré de grands malheurs et qu'il lui fut pardonné. (4Q398 14–17 i 9–ii 2 et parallèles).

Ce pardon divin est attendu par le fidèle essénien comme il est clamé ailleurs, en particulier dans des hymnes, car le jugement sera en définitive l'œuvre de Dieu dans sa justice miséricordieuse, et pas seulement le fruit des « œuvres » de l'homme cependant nécessaires dans une justice rétributive :

<sup>14</sup>... Dans Sa justice fidèle Il m'a justifié et par l'abondance de Sa bonté Il pardonnera tous mes égarements et par Sa justice il me purifiera de la souillure de <sup>15</sup>l'homme... (1QS XI 1–15, de même 1QH<sup>a</sup> XII 30–38, etc.).

Ou encore dans l'*Apocalypse messianique* lors du jugement eschatologique en 4Q521 2 ii+4 10 :

et le fruit d'une œuvre bonne ne sera différé pour personne.

et 4Q521 7 4–6 :

<sup>4</sup>[Réjouissez-vous, vous to]us qui faites le bien devant le Seigneu[r, <sup>5</sup>les bénis et no]n comme ceux-ci les maudit[s,] car ils seront pour la mort, [lorsque] <sup>6</sup>le vivificateur [ressus]citera les morts de son peuple.

De même Paul demande aux croyants de vivre de la loi de l'Esprit en mettant en pratique le commandement de l'amour et de produire des « œuvres bonnes ».

En définitive, que ce soit en *MMT* ou sous la plume de Paul, « les œuvres de la Loi » ne désignent pas 'des préceptes' mais leur mise en œuvre par l'homme. Pour l'essénien, ces observances de la Loi sont indispensables pour faire partie du groupe des justes et bénéficier des bénédictions,

---

Christ, voir P. Benoit, « Qumrân et le Nouveau Testament », *NTS* VII (1960–1961) : 276–96, 292–95, repris dans « Qumran and the New Testament », *Paul and Qumran* (ed. J. Murphy O'Connor ; London : Geoffrey Chapman, 1968), 1–30, 24–29.

en attendant le pardon divin et la justification lors du jugement. Pour Paul, la justification vient de la foi au Christ mort et ressuscité, et non des « œuvres de la Loi » en tant que signes d'appartenance à l'ancienne alliance. La même conception se retrouve en Jn 6,28–29 : « Que nous faut-il faire pour travailler aux œuvres de Dieu ? L'œuvre de Dieu, répondit Jésus, c'est que vous croyiez en celui qu'Il a envoyé ». Mais le croyant n'est pas pour autant affranchi de la loi ; Paul ne condamne pas toutes « les œuvres » comme telles, car Dieu récompensera et châtiara chacun « selon ses œuvres » *κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ* (Rm 2,1–11). S'adressant à des experts en matière de loi en Rm 7, Paul donne son avis sur le bien-fondé de la loi et de son rôle, et il décrit le déchirement intérieur dans son être de chair entre le service de la loi de Dieu et la loi du péché. Prenant l'exemple du statut légal de la femme par rapport à son mari, le cas de l'adultère dans un couple du vivant des époux, et celui du remariage lorsque la mort de l'un d'eux affranchit du lien précédemment contracté, — l'adultère et la convoitise sont eux aussi visés dans le Décalogue (Ex 20,14.17, Rm 7,2–3.7, voir aussi 2,22) —, il conclut que Dieu qui a justifié le croyant en Son Fils, l'a introduit dans la loi de l'Esprit qui le rend capable d'accomplir l'esprit de la Loi dans l'amour.

En *MMT*, le Maître s'adresse à son opposant, très vraisemblablement le grand prêtre Jonathan et à ceux qui le suivent, d'observer tous ces préceptes pour leur bien et celui du peuple ; cela leur sera compté comme justice et comme source de bénédictions. Dans la partie halakhique, outre le calendrier cultuel de 364 jours, le culte sacrificiel et la pureté rituelle, la composition comprend aussi des lois relatives au mariage : les mariages non conformes au droit et les impuretés contractées, B 39–49, 75–76, 80–82<sup>13</sup>. L'état très lacuneux de plusieurs de ces passages permet uniquement de connaître des interdictions de mariages de prêtres avec des femmes hors de leurs clans ou familles et de mariages d'Israélites avec des femmes étrangères ou appartenant à certains groupes précisés. À cela fait encore référence un passage de l'épilogue [זנות אבדן] כוהנים בהרבה [?] מקומות « et la 'fornication/adultère' a perdu [des prêtres en de nombreuses (?)] places[ » (4Q397 14–21 ii 5–6), ce qui semble repris dans la finale de l'exhortation : « Et cela te sera compté comme justice quand [tu] fais ce qui est droit et ce qui est bon en Sa présence, pour ton propre bien et pour celui d'Israël » (4Q398 14–17 ii 7–8), dont la phraséologie hébraïque reprend celle de Ps 106,31 וְנַחֲשֵׁבָה לְךָ לְצַדִּיקָה ou la formulation grecque (passive) de

<sup>13</sup> Voir DJD X, 158–60 et 171–75.

Gn 15,6, bien connue aussi de 1 M 2,52 et du NT. Le psalmiste loue Pinhas d'avoir tué l'israélite et la femme madianite introduite dans la communauté (Nb 25,6–18), ce qui est inacceptable pour un israélite et combien plus pour des prêtres. Le même aveu au sujet du péché commis en épousant des femmes étrangères était déjà formulé en Esd 9,15. Aussi dans des traditions juives contemporaines, Abraham est présenté comme le patriarche à l'origine de la lignée sacerdotale, donnant ses instructions à Jacob et à ses fils, de ne pas souiller leur race avec des femmes étrangères ou aux statuts hors normes (*Testament de Qahat* [4Q542], *Testament de Lévi* [4Q213a 3 + Geniza, §§ 16–18, 62, 73, 75, voir *Testament XII Patriarches Lévi* 9,9–10], *Jubilés* 20,3–4 et 22,20–22).

L'emploi de l'expression « les œuvres de la Loi » limitée à *MMT* et à deux lettres pauliniennes, à la définition identique mais à la finalité contrastée quant à la justification, est-il dû à un rapprochement fortuit, ou trouvons-nous d'autres points de rencontre dans la pratique de la Loi ? Il est intéressant de comparer les positions des Esséniens et de Paul (et de Jésus) en matière de mariage et de divorce (et de fornication), puisque ces points ont été évoqués de part et d'autre à ce propos.

## B. MARIAGE, SÉPARATION, ADULTÈRE ET DIVORCE

### 1. Ancien Testament et littérature juive

Un bref rappel de la loi de Moïse sur le sujet est nécessaire, puisque tous les documents, le Nouveau Testament et les autres textes, y renvoient<sup>14</sup>. Le passage de la loi est exposé dans une forme casuistique à la troisième personne (protase – apodose) en Dt 24,1–4 :

<sup>14</sup> Un acte de répudiation daté de 111 ap. J.-C. rappelle encore cet usage כְּדִין מִשֶׁה וְיִהוּדָאִי « selon la loi de Moïse et des Judéens », Murabba'ât 19 8.21 (en corrigeant la lecture de ces lignes) : « Je divorce et répudie, de mon propre gré, aujourd'hui, moi, Joseph... toi, Mariam..., qui étais ma femme auparavant, de telle sorte que tu es libre pour ta part de t'en aller et de devenir la femme de tout homme juif que tu voudras. Et puis, voici de ma part l'acte de répudiation et la lettre de divorce selon la loi de Moïse et des juifs... » ; un acte de mariage de 117 ap. J.-C., Murabba'ât 20 3 ... כְּדִין מִן יוֹשֶׁה : « <sup>6</sup>... Au cas où tu di[vo]cerais, je te rendrai l'argent de ta dot... », voir J. T. Milik, « Textes hébreux et araméens », in *Les grottes de Murabba'ât* (ed. P. Benoit, J. T. Milik et R. de Vaux ; DJD II ; Oxford : Clarendon Press, 1960), 104–14, [deux exemples de divorce, de la part du mari et de la femme et de remariage du vivant du conjoint], et encore une *ketubba* du second mariage de Babatha (entre 122 et 125), voir Y. Yadin, J. C. Greenfield, and A. Yardeni, « Babatha's *Ketubba* », *IEJ* 44 (1994) : 75–101. Cette formulation reprend celle du contrat de mariage juif « selon la loi de Moïse », voir Tb 7,13.



<sup>1</sup>Si un homme prend une femme et l'a épousée, et qu'il arrive, si elle ne trouve pas grâce à ses yeux parce qu'il lui a trouvé quelque chose de honteux, qu'il rédige à son endroit un acte de séparation, le lui remette en main propre et la renvoie de sa maison,

<sup>2</sup>et (si) elle sort de sa maison, s'en va et appartient à un autre homme,

<sup>3</sup>et (si) cet autre homme la répudie, rédige à son endroit un acte de séparation, le lui remet en main propre et la renvoie de sa maison, — ou si meurt cet autre homme qui l'a prise pour femme —,

<sup>4</sup>son premier mari qui l'a renvoyée, ne pourra pas la prendre pour qu'elle soit à nouveau sa femme après qu'elle a été souillée, car c'est une abomination devant Yahvé, et tu ne chargeras pas d'un péché le pays que Yahvé ton Dieu te donne en héritage.

Si le motif de répudiation semble laissé à la décision du mari<sup>15</sup>, la femme ne peut retourner à son premier mari car, ayant quitté la maison, elle a pu entre temps épouser un autre homme. Et remariée, elle est devenue impure pour son premier mari<sup>16</sup>. L'interdiction de la reprise en mariage formulée dans la Loi est le refus de légaliser l'adultère, et de préserver l'essentiel : la pureté du pays, voir à ce sujet la même position dans la métaphore d'Is 50,1 et Jr 3,1–13 mais avec le pardon divin pour la reprise de l'«épouse» infidèle.

Après l'exil et les recommandations d'Esdras de répudier les femmes étrangères et d'agir selon la Loi (Esd 9–10), Ml 2,10–16 condamne lui aussi l'infidélité de Juda par son idolâtrie à l'aide de la métaphore de l'infidélité conjugale et du renvoi, tout en dénonçant à la fois les mariages illégitimes de Judéens avec des étrangères, mariages contractés après la répudiation de leurs épouses juives : « la femme de ta jeunesse » avec qui le judéen n'avait fait qu'un seul être de chair en vue d'une postérité (vv. 14–15a, citant Gn 2,24). Le prophète demande de respecter au mieux cette première union et de ne pas recourir au divorce, vv. 15–16 :

<sup>15</sup>N'a-t-il pas fait un seul être qui est chair et esprit, et cet être unique que cherche-t-il ? Une postérité (donnée par) Dieu ! Préservez donc votre décision. Et envers la femme de ta jeunesse, qu'il n'y ait pas de perfidie, <sup>16</sup>parce

<sup>15</sup> Semblent cependant certainement visés les cas de Dt 22,25–28 et de Lv 13,7.13–15, puisque dans les autres cas (Dt 22,13–20.29) l'homme ne peut pas répudier sa femme.

<sup>16</sup> Un contrat de mariage juif d'Éléphantine du v<sup>e</sup> s. avant J.-C. énumère explicitement les motifs de répudiation et de divorce à l'initiative des deux conjoints indistinctement : l'adultère de l'un ou l'autre des époux (la femme ne peut avoir de rapport sexuel avec un autre et le mari ne peut prendre en mariage une autre femme), ainsi que le manquement à l'obligation mutuelle du devoir conjugal, voir E. G. Kraeling, *The Brookling Museum Aramaic Papyri: New Documents of the Fifth Century B. C. from the Jewish Colony at Elephantine* (New Haven : Yale University Press, 1953), n<sup>o</sup> 7.21–28.30–40, voir n<sup>o</sup> 2 7–10, = P. Grelot, *Documents araméens d'Égypte* (LAP0 5 ; Paris : Cerf, 1972), n<sup>os</sup> 48 et 43.



que haïssant, il renvoie, dit Yahvé le Dieu d'Israël, 'et il étale l'injustice sur son vêtement', dit Yahvé Sabaôt. Préservez votre décision et ne commettez pas de perfidies ! » (TM).

Ce verset a été l'objet d'importantes variantes dans la transmission textuelle du v. 16<sup>17</sup>. Le manuscrit 4QXII<sup>a</sup>, daté du troisième quart du II<sup>e</sup> s. avant J.-C., porte une lecture plus limpide, peut-être originelle<sup>18</sup> : « Si tu répudies, renvoie', dit Yahvé le Dieu d'Israël, 'qu'on étale l'injustice sur son [vête]ment', dit Yahvé Sabaôt... »<sup>19</sup>. À la suite de la tradition de Dt 24<sup>20</sup>, le passage prophétique connaîtrait la pratique du renvoi sous prétexte de « haine », sans autre précision, mais il demande avant tout de respecter la première union contractée. Ce serait un manquement à la fidélité aux commandements, tout comme de servir des dieux étrangers en épousant des femmes étrangères, car Dieu a fait l'homme une seule chair (voir *infra* NT). Aussi demande-t-il de se garder du mensonge dans l'intention décisionnelle, c'est dire que le mari ne doit pas répudier, et ce pour n'importe quel motif selon la Loi.

Ce n'est pas exactement la position des sages qui conseillent de ne pas se séparer d'une épouse bonne mais de répudier la femme méchante et adultère, Pr 5,18–20 ; 18,22 ; 30,23, Qo 7,26 ; 9,9, Si 7,26 ; 25,13–26,18<sup>21</sup>. Le divorce ou renvoi avec certificat de répudiation avait pour finalité de

<sup>17</sup> *Kî s̄ānē šallah* (TM), *litt.* « si haïssant (= s'il y a de la haine [soit si tu hais mais plus difficilement si je[?] hais]), renvoie ». LXX<sup>WT</sup> ἀλλ' εαν μισησης εξαποστειλον, « mais si tu hais, renvoie », de même Vulgate et Targum Jonathan; ἀλλ' εαν μισησας εξαποστειλις, « mais si haïssant, tu as renvoyé » LXX<sup>BVQ</sup>, puis « il a étalé l'injustice sur son vêtement » (TM).

<sup>18</sup> Ou une recension parallèle. Mais voir G. Brin, « Divorce at Qumran », in *Legal Texts and Legal Issues: Proceedings of the Second Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Cambridge 1995* (ed. M. Bernstein, F. García Martínez and J. Kampen; STDJ 23; Leiden/New York/Köln: Brill, 1997), 231–44, 234–36.

<sup>19</sup> R. Fuller, « 76. 4QXII<sup>a</sup> », in *Qumran Cave 4.X. The Prophets* (DJD XV; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997), 221–32, 224–26, col. II 4–7: *כִּי אַם שְׂנֵאתָ שְׁלַח יָדְךָ וְרִשְׁתָּ* mais lire [לְבוֹן] שׁו (non [לְבוֹן] שׁוּ) de l'édition) avec l'appui de plusieurs versions. Le verbe שְׁנֵא est celui de la répudiation aussi bien de la part de la femme que du mari devant un notaire juif dans les papyri d'Éléphantine, A. Cowley, *Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B. C.* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1923), n<sup>os</sup> 15 23.27, 9 8, etc., = Grelot, *op. cit.*, n<sup>os</sup> 38 et 9, et דָּרַךְ celui du renvoi. Pour l'injustice, voir Dt 22,17.

<sup>20</sup> Avec Dt 24,1–4, Jr 3,1–5, Is 50,1, Nb 30,10, Lv 21,7, Ez 44,22 qui admettent la possibilité du divorce: loi deutéronomique et code sacerdotal à la fois.

<sup>21</sup> À propos de la femme méchante, Si 25,26 (grec) écrit: « Si elle ne se conduit pas selon ta main, coupe-la de ta chair, (donne [le contrat] et renvoie[-la], ms 248) », suivant l'interprétation de Gn 2,24 de l'union de l'épouse à son mari et de sa domination sur elle, mais pour inconvenance, le mari peut couper le lien conjugal (moyennant le certificat de divorce).

mettre fin au contrat de mariage et de rendre la liberté à la femme pour qu'elle ne soit pas accusée d'adultère, et qu'elle ne soit passible de châtement. Dans le *de specialibus legibus* III §§ 30–31, Philon d'Alexandrie reprend Dt 24,1–4 et spécifie que le mari peut divorcer « pour n'importe quel motif » ; il interprète « quelque chose de honteux » ערות דבר comme visant apparemment l'adultère, la stérilité, l'indécence, la calomnie, etc. ; mais le mari qui accepterait de reprendre la femme après les deux mariages, serait adultère et la femme commettrait une abomination ; aussi Philon ajoute-t-il à Dt 24,1–4 que les deux doivent être mis à mort. Pour Flavius Josèphe (*Antiquités* IV § 253), le mari peut répudier sa femme « pour n'importe quel motif, — et il peut y avoir de multiples raisons chez les humains — » (= École de Hillel), mais il doit rédiger un certificat de divorce, pour que la femme retrouve ses droits de contracter un second mariage, et il ne peut plus la reprendre chez lui.

Si des textes autorisent le divorce, ils interdisent en principe le retour de l'épouse souillée par un autre mariage<sup>22</sup>. Telle est la situation dans l'Écriture et d'autres textes de la pratique juive aux derniers siècles avant J.-C., à l'époque des manuscrits de Qumrân et du Nouveau Testament.

## 2. *Manuscrits de Qumrân : CD, RT et Instruction*<sup>23</sup>

Flavius Josèphe rapporte qu'il existait un groupe d'Esséniens mariés (*Guerre* II §§ 160–161), ce que confirment certains manuscrits, à propos

<sup>22</sup> Mais voir un papyrus grec de Murabba'ât 115, daté de 124 ap. J.-C., qui est un contrat juif valide de remariage : le mari qui avait répudié et renvoyé sa femme pour cause de vie commune (texte abîmé) est d'accord de se réconcilier à nouveau et de reprendre la même Salomé comme femme légitime, mais rien n'indique un mariage légal ou pas de Salomé entre temps, voir DJD II, *op. cit.*, 243–54. Pour d'autres répudiations et remariages au I<sup>er</sup> s. ap. J.-C., voir note 14.

<sup>23</sup> Les études récentes font de l'*Instruction* une composition essénienne, tant par le vocabulaire spécifique que par les parallèles avec la *halakha* essénienne, voir en particulier M. Kister, « Physical and Metaphysical Measurements Ordained by God in the Literature of the Second Temple Period », in *Reworking the Bible : Apocryphal and Related Texts at Qumran, Proceedings of a Joint Symposium by the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associate Literature and the Hebrew University Institute for Advanced Studies Research Group on Qumran, 15–17 January, 2002* (ed. E. G. Chazon, D. Dimant and R. A. Clements ; STDJ 58 ; Leiden/Boston : Brill, 2005), 151–76, 166–76 ; M. Kister, « Divorce, Reproof, and Other Sayings in the Synoptic Gospels : Jesus Traditions in the Context of 'Qumranic' and Other Texts », in *Text, Thought, and Practice in Qumran and Early Christianity* (ed. R. A. Clements and D. R. Schwarz ; STDJ 84 ; Leiden/Boston : Brill, 2009), 195–229. Ayant noté les parentés de vocabulaire et d'autres rapprochements avec 1QS et 1QH, J.-S. Rey, *4QInstruction : sagesse et eschatologie* (STDJ 81 ; Leiden/Boston : Brill, 2009), 22–32, situe la composition de l'*Instruction* dans un milieu proche et de peu antérieur à celui des grands rouleaux qumraniens, mais il verrait « la communauté

de l'âge requis et des interdits d'accès au sanctuaire en 1QSa I, CD VII 6–9 (XII 1–2, XVI 10–12, voir 11QRT XLV 1–2, LXV–LXVI), et 4Q502 (*Rituel de mariage* ?)<sup>24</sup>. Le *Document de Damas* (= CD/D), est daté de la deuxième moitié du 11<sup>e</sup> s. et ca 100 av. J.-C. pour la composition finale. Un passage polémique contre des opposants pris au piège de la luxure sur deux points importants : les lois du mariage, l'inceste et les unions illégitimes à la suite de *Lévitique* 18 et d'Ex 20,14, et Dt 5,18 sur l'adultère. CD (IV 19 – V 11) rapporte :

Les bâtisseurs de muraille qui ont marché derrière le *Saw*, — le *Saw* est un baveur <sup>20</sup>dont il a dit : 'baver ils baveront' —, sont attrapés sur deux points dans la luxure en prenant <sup>21</sup>deux femmes de leur vivant, alors que le principe de la création est 'mâle et femelle Il les créa'. V 'Et ceux qui entrèrent dans l'arche : 'deux par deux ils entrèrent dans l'arche'. Et au sujet du prince il est écrit : <sup>22</sup>'Il ne multipliera pas pour lui les femmes'. David n'avait pas lu dans le livre scellé de la Loi qui <sup>3</sup>était dans l'arche, parce qu'il n'avait pas été ouvert en Israël depuis le jour de la mort d'Éléazar <sup>4</sup>et de Josué et des Anciens qui servirent les 'Astartés', et il resta caché <sup>5</sup><<et ne fut pas>> révélé jusqu'à l'avènement de Sadoq. Et on exalta les œuvres de David excepté le meurtre d'Urie, <sup>6</sup>mais Dieu les lui remit. En outre ils souillent le sanctuaire en ce qu'ils ne <sup>7</sup>se tiennent pas à l'écart, selon la loi, mais ils couchent avec celle atteinte d'un flux de sang. Et ils épousent <sup>8</sup>chacun la fille de son frère, ou la fille de sa sœur. Or Moïse a dit : 'De <sup>9</sup>la sœur de ta mère tu ne t'approcheras pas : c'est la chair de ta mère'. La loi des incestes, c'est pour les mâles <sup>10</sup>qu'elle a été rédigée mais elle vaut également pour les femmes, et si la fille du frère découvre la nudité du frère de <sup>11</sup>son père, alors qu'elle est <<sa>> chair.

Les 'bâtisseurs de murailles' doivent désigner les opposants, prêtres et docteurs pharisiens avec leurs traditions orales et allègements déviants de la Loi. Par ces citations, polygamie à l'exemple du prince et remariage après divorce du vivant des époux ainsi que l'inceste sont ici clairement

---

essénienne comme destinataire de l'ouvrage » (133, de même 335–36), et S. L. Adams, « Rethinking the Relationship Between *4QInstruction* and *Ben Sira* », *RQ* 96 (2010) : 555–83, estime que *l'Instruction* a exercé une influence sur des compositions esséniennes, 1QH, 1QS, ..., et qu'elle est plus éloignée de *Ben Sira*, mais elle n'est pas une composition essénienne ; l'auteur ne distinguant pas essénien et qumranien, cette conclusion ne s'impose pas.

<sup>24</sup> Sur le genre de ce document, voir les remarques de M. J. Bernstein, « Women and Children in Legal and Liturgical Texts from Qumran », *DSD* 11 (2004) : 191–211, 205–206 : une cérémonie pour des gens mariés dans des groupes esséniens ou cérémonie de mariage ?

condamnés<sup>25</sup>. Il en est de même dans le *Rouleau du Temple* (11QRT LVII 15–19) à propos du roi (voir Dt 17,17) :

Il ne prendra pas femme parmi <sup>16</sup>les filles des nations, mais de la maison de son père il prendra pour lui une femme, <sup>17</sup>dans le clan de son père, et il ne prendra pas une autre femme en plus, mais <sup>18</sup>celle-là seule sera avec lui tous les jours de sa vie, et si elle meurt, il en prendra <sup>19</sup>une autre dans la maison de son père, dans son propre clan.

Le *Rouleau du Temple*, autre composition essénienne datée *circa* la fin du troisième quart du I<sup>e</sup> s. av. J.-C.<sup>26</sup>, comprend aussi ces mêmes lois sur l'inceste et les unions illégales, en plus de détail encore, qui occupent le deuxième point de luxure du passage de CD (voir RT LXV 11–17 + 4Q524 fragments 15–22), et CD V 7–8 au sujet des mariages oncle-nièce, neveu-tante (contrairement aux pratiques pharisiennes)<sup>27</sup>.

Ces deux compositions à la datation si rapprochée et comprenant ces deux ensembles de lois parallèles peuvent difficilement donner des interprétations divergentes sur ces mêmes sujets. Ils interdisent la polygamie pour le prince<sup>28</sup> et sans doute aussi pour tout homme, contrairement à Dt 21,15–17. La formule *בזנות לקחת שתי נשים בחייהם* « dans la luxure/adultère en prenant deux femmes pendant leur vie » a paru ambiguë à certains par la forme orthographique du suffixe *הם*, qu'ils rapportent au sujet masculin « les bâtisseurs » ; cette solution en faveur de la monogamie exclut aussi un remariage après divorce, puisque un homme ne peut avoir qu'une femme à la fois de son vivant, le lien charnel du mariage étant artificiellement rompu par le divorce d'une part et, d'autre part, ce

<sup>25</sup> Kister, « Divorce, Reproof, and Other Sayings », 202–203, estime plus vraisemblable que CD IV ne traite que de l'interdiction de la polygamie, non du divorce, contrairement à A. Shemesh, « 4Q271.3 : A Key to Sectarian Matrimonial Law », *JJS* 49 (1998) : 244–63, qui comprend le divorce comme permis mais non le remariage. Puisque CD XIII permet le renvoi et que le divorce est la condition de la légitimité du remariage, spécialement pour l'épouse, CD ne s'opposerait pas au remariage, conclut Kister.

<sup>26</sup> E. Puech, *Qumrân grotte 4. XVIII. Textes hébreux (4Q521–4Q528, 4Q576–4Q579)* (DJD XXV ; Oxford : Clarendon Press, 1998), 87–88 : la plus ancienne copie du RT, voir aussi C. Elledge, *The Statutes of the King : The Temple Scroll's Legislation on Kingship (11Q19 LVI 12–LIX 21)* (CahiersRB 56 ; Paris : Gabalda, 2004), 37–45, qui l'estime un peu plus ancien que CD qui, lui, connaît la mort du Maître. Cette datation est de loin la plus probable, en particulier pour ces dernières colonnes. Le RT n'a rien d'une composition utopique comme le prétendent certains auteurs, il s'adresse à une restauration future avant l'eschaton, où Dieu « créera lui-même son temple ».

<sup>27</sup> Voir aussi 4Q251 (*4QHalakha A*) 17 pour des mariages interdits.

<sup>28</sup> Si Dt 17,17 pouvait se comprendre d'un nombre réduit de femmes pour le prince (Hérode a eu dix épouses), la citation ici est certainement à prendre au sens restrictif de monogamie après CD IV 21.

qui est dit pour le roi à la mort de l'épouse en RT devrait *a priori* valoir aussi pour tous, ce que sous-entend la citation même de Dt 17,17 à propos du prince<sup>29</sup>. Mais dans l'hébreu biblique tardif et l'hébreu qumranien, la forme grammaticale הַח- est aussi employée pour le féminin<sup>30</sup>. Dans ce cas sont visés également non seulement la monogamie, mais encore l'interdiction de remariage après séparation/divorce du vivant de l'épouse. Toutefois cette formulation ne dit rien sur la pratique essénienne du divorce dont la seule fin est de légitimer un remariage. Observateurs stricts de la Loi, les Esséniens ne s'opposent pas à une simple séparation *de facto*; le renvoi n'est donc pas formellement interdit<sup>31</sup>, il est légitimé en Dt 24,1 et permis en Ml 2,16 (4QXII et LXX, mais non dans le TM). Et de fait parmi les instructions que CD XIII 12–22 (à compléter avec 4Q266 9 iii 4–15) donne à l'intendant (מבקר), figurent des cas où la séparation peut être permise après consultation et autorisation :

16 למבקר אשר במחנה ועשה בעצה ולא יע[וה] וכן לכל לוקח אשה  
17 והוא [יבן] א[ו]ת[ו]ת[ו]ב[עצה] וכן למגרש והוא ייס[ר את בני]ה[ם]

<sup>29</sup> Mais non *a fortiori*, car en RT le divorce n'est pas envisageable pour le roi, alors qu'il peut l'être pour d'autres, voir LIV 4–5 à propos des vœux comme en CD à la suite de Nb 30,10, et à propos du viol d'une vierge, LXVI 8–11 comme en CD, voir Dt 22,29. Contrairement à J. Murphy O'Connor, « An Essene Missionary Document ? CD II, 14–VI, 1 », *RB* 77 (1970) : 201–29, 220, qui estime avoir à faire à une interdiction d'un autre mariage après divorce et même après la mort de l'épouse, et la réponse de Y. Yadin, « L'attitude essénienne envers la polygamie et le divorce », *RB* 79 (1972) : 98–99, J. Murphy O'Connor, « Remarques sur l'exposé du Prof. Y. Yadin », *ibid.*, 99–100, suivi par P. Davies, H. Stegemann, F. García Martínez. Voir T. Holmén, « Divorce in CD 4:20–5:2 and 11QT 57:17–18. Some Remarks on the Pertinence of the Question », *RQ* 71 (1998) : 397–408, malgré D. Instone Brewer, « Nomological Exegesis in Qumran 'Divorce' Texts », *RQ* 72 (1998) : 561–79, estimant seule interdite la polygamie mais non le remariage après divorce pour le commun des mortels (le roi excepté), comme il en est de la pratique rabbinique contemporaine ! En outre, ce passage ne dit rien du remariage après la mort de l'épouse, contrairement à l'opinion de certains auteurs.

<sup>30</sup> Voir P. Joüon, *Grammaire de l'hébreu biblique* (Institut biblique pontifical : Rome, 1923), § 149b, 457–58, P. Joüon-T. Muraoka, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew* (Subsidia Biblica 27 ; Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico : Roma, 2008), § 149b, 516, et E. Qimron, *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Harvard Semitic Studies 29 ; Atlanta : Scholar Press, 1986), 62–63. On n'a donc pas à faire appel à une correction, ni à considérer que le masculin s'applique à la fois au mari et à la femme pour interdire le mariage après divorce, voir L. H. Schiffman, « Law Pertaining to Women in the Temple Scroll », in *The Dead Sea Scrolls : Forty Years of Research* (ed. D. Dimant and U. Rappaport ; STDJ 10 ; Jerusalem : Magnes Press/Izhak Ben Zvi ; Leiden : Brill, 1992), 210–28, 216–18.

<sup>31</sup> Contrairement à l'opinion de J. J. Collins, « Marriage, Divorce, and Family in Second Temple Judaism », in *Families in Ancient Israel* (ed. L. G. Perdue ; Louisville : Westminster/John Knox, 1997), 104–62, 129, et de J. A. Fitzmyer, « The Matthean Divorce Texts and Some New Palestinian Evidence », in *To Advance the Gospel* (Grand Rapids/Cambridge UK : Eerdmans, 1998), 79–111, 110–11, n. 104.

- 18 [ובנותיהם ברו]ח ענוה ובאהבת חסד אל יטור להם (ב)ל(ב)בו  
 19 [באף וע(בר ע)ל פ]שעיהם (וא)ת אשר איננו (נק)ש(ר בעד)תו לא  
 20 [ישפוט במ]שפטיהם (vacat) וזה מושב המחנות (ל)כל ז[רע] ישראל  
 21 [ואשר לא יחזקו ב]אלה לא יצליחו לשבת בארץ ו[לא ינצלו]  
 22 [ממצוקו(תיהם vacat ו]אלה השופטים(?) למשכיל

Que personne ne fasse de contrat d'achat ou de vente sans le faire savoir <sup>16</sup>à l'intendant du camp qui donnera son avis et il ne fau[te]ra pas. Et de même pour quiconque qui prend une femme, <sup>17</sup>lui-même [le gui]de[ra avec] conseil, et de même pour celui qui renvoie. Lui-même édu[quera leu]r[s] fils <sup>18</sup>et leurs filles (et leurs bébés) avec un esp[rit] d'humilité et avec une charité bienveillante. Il ne doit pas garder rancune à leur égard[ dans son cœur <sup>19</sup>par colère, mais il passera sur ]leurs[ p]léchés, et avec celui qui n'est pas lié dans sa congr[egation] il ne <sup>20</sup>jugera pas selon] leur[s] jugements. *vac.* Tel (est) le séjour des camps pour toute la ra[ce d'Israël <sup>21</sup>et ceux qui ne persévéreront pas dans] ces (comportements), ne réussiront pas à habiter dans le pays et [ils n'échapperont pas] <sup>22</sup>à (leurs) détresses(. *vac.* Et] celles-ci seront les décisions) pour le sage [(...)]<sup>32</sup>

Le cas d'une séparation avec autorisation exige de l'intendant qu'il prenne la place des pères dans l'éducation des familles séparées : fils et filles (et bébés — 4Q266), tout comme il doit veiller aux entrées dans 'sa' congrégation, aux transactions commerciales avec l'extérieur ainsi qu'aux actes d'achat et de vente dans 'sa' congrégation. Le mot מגרש désigne celui qui renvoie. Le RT LIV 4–5 connaît également ce genre de situations à propos des vœux de la veuve ou de la femme répudiée (גרופשה) citant Nb 30,10 et des cas de fornication : LXVI 10–11 // 4Q524 15–22 1–2 citant Dt 22,28–29 לזא יכול לשלחה כול ימיו « il ne pourra pas la renvoyer tous les jours de sa vie » ; le cas de la séduction d'une vierge laisserait-il supposer que le divorce est possible dans d'autres situations<sup>33</sup> ? La faute de « celui qui for-

<sup>32</sup> Les lectures de CD XIII sont assurées : ligne 16 : ישןה au lieu de ישונו de 4Q266, ligne 17 : א[ותו] בעצה וכן יבן a une inversion en 4Q266 וכן יבן בעצה וכן, ligne 18 : l'espace manque pour lire ובנותיהם וטפם de 4Q266 9 iii 6–7, puis en fin de ligne lire très probablement בלבבו avec les traces de 4Q266 non lues dans l'édition, et באף à la ligne 19 ; en fin de ligne lire sans doute לא בעד[תו] לא (voir ll. 10 et 13), et pour l'espace ישפוט au début de la ligne 20. 4Q266 aide à restaurer le reste, on se demande si la lecture השופטים/ה(?) de la ligne 22, n'est pas une métathèse pour השופטים ? On ne peut suivre les lectures de E. Qimron, « The Text of CDC », in *The Damascus Document Reconsidered* (ed. M. Broshi ; Israel Exploration Society/The Shrine of the Book/Israel Museum : Jerusalem, 1992), 35, ni toutes ses restaurations *apud* Kister, « Divorce, Reproof, and Other Sayings », 220 : ונשיהם וטפם est impossible dans l'une et l'autre copie, et ne sont pas lues les traces de 4Q266 9 iii 8 ; Dieu seul pardonne les péchés (Am 7,8 ; 8,2, Mi 7,17), voir Pr 19,11 où l'homme pardonne des offenses.

<sup>33</sup> Voir Brin, « Divorce at Qumran », 239, mais en corrigeant et en y ajoutant 4Q524 15–22 = la finale du RT que j'ai publiée en DJD XXV en 1998.

niquerait (יִקְרַב לְזוֹנוֹת) avec sa femme contrairement à la loi, doit partir et ne plus revenir » (4Q270 7 i 12–13 // 4Q267 9 vi 4–5) se réfère à une répudiation en rapport avec « quelque chose de honteux », עֲרוֹת דָּבָר de Dt 24,1 (voir aussi l'École de Shammaï, *Mishna Gittîn* IX 10 : divorce permis uniquement en cas d'acte sexuel indécent)<sup>34</sup>.

La pratique d'une séparation chez les Esséniens vivant dans « les camps » (les Qumraniens menaient un autre genre de vie)<sup>35</sup> ne peut être niée, mais le *Document* ne dit mot de la cause ni d'un remariage de la femme ou du mari, toutefois on peut en saisir des bribes. L'incise sur le mariage d'une veuve semble confirmer l'interdit du remariage après renvoi (simple séparation ou répudiation/divorce ?). Des copies du *Document* (4Q271 3 7–15 // 4Q270 5 14–21 // 4Q269 9 4–8) envisagent implicitement le remariage d'un veuf du fait qu'ils interdisent d'épouser une veuve qui a eu des relations sexuelles du temps de son veuvage<sup>36</sup> :

Et si <sup>8</sup>un homme donne sa fille à un hom]me, il doit lui rapporter tous ses défauts pour que ne revienne pas sur lui le jugement de <sup>9</sup>[la malédiction comme il est dit : « (Maudit) celui ]qui égare un aveugle en chemin, et il ne doit pas lui donner quelqu'un qui ne lui convient pas, car<sup>10</sup>[ce n'est pas assorti (comme labourer avec) un bœ]uf et un âne, ou revêtir de la laine et du lin ensemble. *vac.* Qu'un homme n'introduise pas <sup>11</sup>[dans la congrégation sa]inte [une femme] qui a connu une expérience sexuelle, qu'elle ait connu <sup>12</sup>[l'expérience dans la maison de] son père ou une veuve qui aurait couché une fois veuve ; et toute <sup>13</sup>[femme de ]mauvaise [répu]tation dans sa jeunesse dans la maison de son père, un homme n'épousera qu'après <sup>14</sup>[un examen par des femmes ]de confiance et expertes sur ordre de l'intendant qui préside sur <sup>15</sup>[les Nombreux/Doctes ; après ]quoi il peut l'épouser, et l'épousant, il doit se comporter selon la loi, [mais il ne pourra pas ]déclarer à son sujet[ qu'il ne lui a pas trouvé les signes de sa virginité...

<sup>34</sup> De même en Ml 2,16 d'après 4QXII<sup>a</sup>, voir *supra*.

<sup>35</sup> Parmi les listes parallèles de fautes en 1QS VII 12–21 et 4Q270 7 i, font défaut les cas de fornication et de renvoi, ce que confirment nombre d'autres indices à Qumrân en faveur du célibat de la Communauté, en plein accord avec les seuls squelettes d'hommes du cimetière principal, les notices de Philon (*Apologie* §§ 14–17), Flavius Josèphe (*Guerre* II §§ 120–121, *Ant.* XVIII § 21), de Pline l'Ancien et d'Hippolyte, une forme de célibat est requise des membres du temple d'hommes et lors de la Guerre eschatologique, voir 1QSa et 1QM.

<sup>36</sup> Lire pour l'espace à la ligne 11 בעדת non בברית. Voir J. Kampen, « A Fresh Look at the Masculine Plural Suffix in CD iv 21 », *RQ* 61 (1993) : 91–97, 93 ; il s'agit de relations hors remariage, comme adultère, non d'une interdiction de remariage, malgré B. S. Jackson, « Marriage and Divorce : From Social Institution to Halakhic Norms », in *The Dead Sea Scrolls : Text and Context* (ed. C. Hempel ; STDJ 90 ; Leiden/Boston : Brill, 2010), 339–64, 349, qui comprend d'une virginité avant et après.



Le passage donne des conseils pratiques dans trois cas sur la conduite à tenir dans les mariages, respecter les promesses et ce qui convient entre rang et condition, pour éviter des disharmonies et conflits ou haine dans le couple mal assorti, de simples conseils, évitant ici le terme זנות et ses conséquences légales que l'on retrouve en MMT B 75–82 (= 4Q396 1–2 iv 4–11) à propos de mariages de prêtres de race sainte avec des filles du peuple en utilisant les mêmes images כלאים<sup>37</sup>.

Enfin, l'interprétation de « prendre deux épouses de leur vivant » ressort également de l'enchaînement des citations bibliques Gn 1,27 et 7,9 en CD IV 21-V 1 qui soulignent expressément la monogamie. Ces passages de CD rejoignent RT LVII 15–19 à propos du roi où il n'y a pas d'ambiguïté possible. Et même si cette loi imposée au roi peut avoir subi l'influence de la loi lévitique pour le grand-prêtre (Lv 21,14), l'interdiction semble s'appliquer *a priori* aussi à tout israélite en CD. Les deux compositions ont beaucoup de points en commun.

*L'Instruction* contient un passage sur le couple selon Gn 2,18.24 (4Q416 2 iii 19–iv 7)<sup>38</sup> :

19 ואם רש אתה כשהת[הלכתה תמים/בתורה לוא תהיה] vac.....  
 20 בלוא חוק vac. אשה לקחתה ברישכה קח מולדי[ה למען לוא תכרת]  
 21 מרו נהיה בהתחברכה יחד התהלך עם עזר בשרכה] על כן יעזוב איש

*marges inférieure et supérieure*

1 את אביו [ו]את אמו ודב[ק באשתו והיו לבשר אחד]  
 2 (ו)אותכה המשיל בה ותש[מ]ע[ב]ק[ולכה ומהיום אביה]

<sup>37</sup> Voir P. Heger, « Qumran Marriage. Prohibition and Rabbinic Equivalents », *RQ* 95 (2010) : 441–51.

<sup>38</sup> Ma reconstruction à compléter en partie avec 4Q418 10 5–8 et 4Q418a 18 1–4. Les compléments des autres manuscrits sont soulignés ici indistinctement. Voir Rey, *4QInstruction*, 166–76, qui ne retient pas le fragment 4Q418a 18 1–4, et Kister, « Divorce, Reproof, and Other Sayings », 202–208, qui a inséré ce dernier, mais la proposition בשובתה, ligne 1 (ici ligne 3), est exclue, et il ne lit pas des lettres, ligne 1. La restauration de ככתוב, ligne 21 (Rey), n'est pas indispensable pour le sens et surtout pour la longueur de la ligne, voir Mc 10,6–8. À la ligne 2, la restauration ומהיום אביה [ב]ק[ולכה ומהיום אביה] s'impose par les restes de *ain* et de *qof* et par la longueur. Dans *L'Instruction* מולד קח désigne généralement les origines, l'horoscope, les signes de naissance d'une personne (4Q415 2 ii 7–9,...), on peut hésiter ici étant donné la suite de la phrase (« ses descendants », mais ceux-ci ne sont-ils pas communs au couple ?), « ses enfantements » serait plus approprié ; puis lire למען לוא תכרת] pour le sens, comparer 1Q27 1 i 4 ; le mari est appelé par là à accepter la condition de son épouse dans la totalité de son être. Cette instruction suit une autre observation (lignes 19–20) qui prépare apparemment cette compréhension en adoptant la restauration proposée ici pour l'espace et le sens, comparer 4Q569 1–2 8, E. Puech, *Qumrân Grotte 4.XXVII. Textes araméens Deuxième partie* (DJD XXXVII ; Oxford : Clarendon Press, 2009), 358.



3 לא המשיל בה מאמה הפרידה ואליכה (]בט(ח)ו(תהיה)  
 4 לך לבשר אחד בתכה לאחר יפריד ובניכה [לבנות רעיכה]  
 5 ואתה ליחד עם אשת חיקכה כי(א) היא שאר ער[ותכה]  
 6 ואשר ימשול בה זולתכה הסיג גבול חייהו ב[רוחה]  
 7 המשילך להתהלך ברצונכה

<sup>19</sup>... vac. Et si tu es pauvre, selon que [tu] as[ marché (dans) la perfection/selon la Loi, tu n'es pas]

<sup>20</sup>sans droit. vac. Tu as pris une femme dans ta pauvreté, accepte [ses] 'origines/descendants'[ pour que tu ne sois pas exclu]

<sup>21</sup>du mystère à venir. Une fois que tu seras marié, marche avec l'aide de ta chair [; « C'est pourquoi l'homme quittera]

<sup>1</sup>son père et sa mère et il s'atta[chera à sa femme et ils seront une seule chair » (Gn 2,24).]

<sup>2</sup>(Et) Quant à toi, Il (t')a donné pouvoir sur elle et [elle] ob[é]i[ra à ta ]v[oix, et depuis ce jour, à son père]

<sup>3</sup>Il n'a plus donné pouvoir sur elle (Gn 3,16). De sa mère Il l'a séparée et à toi [Il l'a confiée, et elle sera]

<sup>4</sup>pour toi une seule chair. Ta fille Il séparera pour un autre, et tes fils[ pour les filles de tes compagnons.]

<sup>5</sup>Et toi, tu formes une union avec la femme de ton sein, car elle est la chair de [ta] nudi[té].]

<sup>6</sup>Et celui qui dominerait sur elle, à part toi, déplacerait la frontière de sa vie<sup>39</sup>. Sur [son esprit]

<sup>7</sup>Il t'a donné pouvoir pour qu'elle se conduise selon ta volonté...

Dans la ligne des allusions en Ml 2,14–15, ce passage sur l'union des époux cite littéralement Gn 2,24 et met au centre Dieu créateur de l'homme et de son aide (Gn 2,18), en en faisant un commandement divin sur la validité et la pérennité du mariage, puisque Dieu a uni les conjoints en une seule chair (voir aussi CD IV 21) et qu'il a donné à l'homme pouvoir sur sa femme (Gn 3,16). L'homme ne peut donc séparer ce que Dieu a uni, deux points connus et repris par Jésus en Mc 10,6–9 et Mt 19,4–6 (le créateur y est explicité) montrant par là le fort enracinement palestinien de cette controverse de Jésus dans les évangiles<sup>40</sup>.

Un autre passage traite de situations diverses en cas de séparation, 4Q415 11 :

11 (8) עם משקל תכונה רוחם ביח[ד ותהיה לו לאישה ויקחה לביתו וימשיל בה כי]

<sup>39</sup> Allusion sans doute à une faute majeure contractée par cet adultère coupable de peine de mort. Le Sage conseille de vivre toujours uni avec sa femme sans penser à divorcer sa vie durant, voir Tb 8,7.

<sup>40</sup> Il en est de même en ce qui concerne les vœux, etc., mais dans la suite de l'*Instruction* sur les vœux reprenant Nb 30, l'union peut être brisée, le cas de la femme répudiée est mentionné en Nb 30,10.

- [ו]א יכשול בה ואם ינגף ב[ה יפרד מנה].....וישלחה מביתו] (9) 12  
 [ו]אם נפרדה בהרותכה קח מו[לדיה בנחלתכה (10) 13  
 (11) 14 התהלכה התבונן מואדה אם נפרד[ה ויצאה מביתו והיתה לאיש אחר ובית  
 (12) 15 מכוגיה לוא תמצא באלה בחנהה] מ[אז ת]לקחה

<sup>11</sup>Avec un poids, mesure leur esprit dans l'harmo[nie, alors elle sera son épouse, il pourra la prendre dans sa maison et dominer sur elle( ?), de sorte qu']

<sup>12</sup>il ne chancellera pas à cause d'elle. Mais s'il trébuche à cause d'[elle, il s'en séparera, ..., et la renverra de sa maison( ?),]

<sup>13</sup>et si elle est séparée étant enceinte de toi, prends [ses] des[cendants dans ton héritage, éduque ses fils et ses filles( ?), et comment]

<sup>14</sup>elle se conduit observe attentivement. Si elle est sépar[e, qu'elle quitte sa maison et qu'elle appartient à un autre homme( ?), le lieu de]

<sup>15</sup>ses résidences tu ne trouveras pas. En ces choses-là éprouve-la[ dès] lors que tu[ l'auras épousée( ?) ...

Bien que mal conservées, les restaurations données *ad sensum* à l'aide des passages correspondants permettent de saisir le contenu global de ces lignes<sup>41</sup>. Après des conseils donnés au beau-père en vue du mariage de sa fille, est envisagée la possibilité que le mari puisse se séparer de sa femme dans des cas où elle le ferait trébucher, sans en expliciter les vrais motifs, mais il a la garde des enfants, de même CD XIII 16–18 et par. Si la femme séparée épousait un autre homme, le premier mari en perdrait alors la trace, ce qui importe en vue d'une possible réconciliation<sup>42</sup>.

Ces règles strictes sur la monogamie et l'interdiction de remariage après séparation du vivant du conjoint s'écartent de la permissivité pharisaïque qui autorise le roi à avoir jusqu'à dix-huit femmes (*Mishna Sanhédrin* II 4, voir Hérode et ses dix épouses), ou le divorce pour n'importe quel motif (École de Hillel), mais pour les seuls motifs d'indécence ou impudicité (École de Shammaï) (*Mishna, Giṭṭîn* IX 10).

<sup>41</sup> Pour les lectures et la restauration de ces lignes et de l'ensemble du passage, voir E. Puech, « Les relations familiales en 4QInstruction », in *Family and Kindship in the Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature. Congress of the International Society of Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature, Palermo, 2011* (ed. A. Passaro ; Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature ; Berlin : W. de Gruyter, à paraître).

<sup>42</sup> Ce passage de l'*Instruction* est le seul qui autoriserait le divorce, si on devait restaurer à la ligne 12 *e.g.* « et il lui donnera un acte de répudiation », ויתן גט בידה, dans la ligne de Dt 24,1–4.

### 3. *Le Nouveau Testament*

Le thème du mariage-divorce a été abordé par Jésus au cours de son ministère comme le rapportent les évangiles synoptiques ainsi que Paul en 1 Co 7 et Rm 7.

#### 3.1. *1 Co 7,10–11 et Rm 7,2–3.*

Répondant à une question des Corinthiens dans les années 50, Paul donne son avis en même temps que l'enseignement de Jésus. Traitant des états de vie dans la situation présente, il fait d'abord l'éloge du célibat tout en reconnaissant, pour éviter la débauche, la légitimité du mariage en insistant alors sur l'égalité et le partage des droits et devoirs des partenaires dans leur marche vers la sainteté ; chacun doit suivre son charisme. Quant aux célibataires et aux veuves, si le célibat devient intenable, il vaut mieux se marier que de brûler, voilà sa position d'apôtre (λέγω, 7,1–9).

Concernant les personnes mariées, Paul ne donne plus son avis, mais l'ordre de Jésus lui-même sur la question du divorce 7,10–11 :

<sup>10</sup>Quant aux personnes mariées, j'ordonne (παράγγελλω), non pas moi mais le Seigneur :

que la femme ne doit pas se séparer (μη χωρισθῆναι) de son mari,

<sup>11</sup> —mais si elle venait à se séparer, qu'elle reste non-mariée ou qu'elle se réconcilie avec son mari—,

et que le mari ne renvoie pas (μη ἀφιέναι) sa femme.

Paul rappelle la position de Jésus, en Palestine juive : l'interdiction de divorcer de la part du mari, sous aucun prétexte, ainsi que l'obligation de l'épouse au cas où elle viendrait à se séparer : pas de remariage, ou réconciliation<sup>43</sup>.

<sup>43</sup> Même si à Corinthe gouvernée par la loi romaine la femme libre avait le droit de divorcer, il paraîtrait assez logique que Paul rappelle, dans cet ordre, l'enseignement de Jésus dans le contexte juif de sa mission, plutôt qu'une adaptation corinthienne. Certains traduisent par un passif l'infinifitif aoriste passif χωρισθῆναι, la leçon originale, voir e.g. Fitzmyer, « The Matthean Divorce Texts », 81 et 102 n. 7, suivi par J. Murphy O'Connor, « The Divorced Woman in 1 Corinthians 7:10–11 », in *Keys to First Corinthians. Revisiting the Mayor Issues* (Oxford : University Press, 2009), 32–42 = *JBL* 100 (1981) : 601–6, + 'Postscript'. « que la femme ne doit pas être séparée..., mais si elle venait à être séparée... ». Je signale que l'usage de l'infinifitif à valeur modale de « pouvoir/devoir » est bien connu en araméen (aramaïsme de la formulation palestinienne de l'ordre de Jésus qui ne serait pas à attribuer à Paul, même s'il donne la séquence inhabituelle : femme-mari en raison d'une situation particulière à Corinthe, comme l'estiment les auteurs). Bien des auteurs optent pour le passif à sens réfléchi, sens bien connu du grec classique (Platon, Polybe) et 2 M 10,19 par ex. ; on évite alors un doublet avec v. 11b (si le mari ne peut renvoyer sa femme, il n'y a pas d'épouse séparée !), d'autant que des cas de séparation de femmes

Puis aux vv. 12–16 Paul donne son propre avis au sujet de mariages mixtes, entre partenaires croyant et non croyant : la séparation (χωρισζέσθω v. 15)<sup>44</sup> de la partie croyante est permise s'il n'y a pas d'intente, car le frère ou la sœur ne sont pas liés<sup>45</sup>, et Dieu les a appelés à vivre en paix, laissant ouverte la possibilité d'un remariage pour le conjoint chrétien<sup>46</sup>. Mais aucun divorce n'est possible dans le couple chrétien, car ils sont liés (7,39) conformément à l'enseignement de Jésus, et si une séparation se présentait, il existe deux solutions : interdiction de remariage, ou réconciliation. Ce qui importe c'est d'observer les commandements de Dieu. Ainsi le rappelle-t-il encore à des experts en loi en Rm 7,1–3 :

<sup>1</sup>Ou bien ignorez-vous, frères, — je parle à des experts en fait de loi —, que la loi ne s'impose à l'homme que durant sa vie ? <sup>2</sup>C'est ainsi que la femme mariée est liée par la loi au mari tant qu'il est vivant ; mais si l'homme meurt, elle est dégagee de la loi du mari. <sup>3</sup>C'est donc du vivant du mari qu'elle portera le nom d'adultère, si elle devient la femme d'un autre homme ; mais si le mari meurt, elle est affranchie de la loi, au point qu'elle n'est pas adultère en devenant la femme d'un autre homme.

Les époux croyants sont liés pendant leur vie, et le remariage de la femme après séparation/divorce du vivant du mari est adultère ; mais après la mort du mari, la femme peut légitimement se remarier ; il en est de même pour le mari.

---

juives sont attestés, voir Mc 10,12 et Murabba'ât 20 (voir note 14, et Éléphantine, Cowley n° 15 = Grelot 38, Kraeling n°s 2 et 7 = Grelot n°s 43 et 48, voir notes 16 et 19). Dans la société juive de l'époque, le divorce n'est certes pas exclusivement réservé au mari, même si c'est le plus habituel, comme l'atteste 4Q415 11 12–15 (ci-dessus), malgré l'affirmation de Murphy O'Connor, « The Divorced Woman », 33. Le papyrus Murabba'ât 115, daté de 124 ap. J.-C., un contrat juif valide de remariage, rapporte qu'après séparation, le mari a été d'accord de se réconcilier et de reprendre la même Salomé comme femme légitime. Sans le préciser, Paul exclut le remariage du mari qui aurait renvoyé sa femme, et suppose pour lui la même obligation incombant à l'épouse séparée.

<sup>44</sup> La forme passive est employée ici au sens actif, « Si la partie croyante veut se séparer, qu'elle se sépare », avec J. P. Meier, *Un certain juif Jésus. Les données de l'histoire. IV – La loi et l'amour* (Lectio Divina ; Cerf : Paris, 2009), 82–83, 465–67.

<sup>45</sup> N'étant pas liés (ὁ δεδούλωται) au sens fort de ברית, « alliance », (voir Ml 2,14, Ez 16,8, Pr 2,17 et 4Q415 2 ii 4.7), il n'y a alors pas rupture définitive d' 'alliance/lien' au sens strict du terme, mais simple séparation, voir Esd 9–10 et Ml 2,10–16 à propos des femmes étrangères par opposition aux femmes juives, conduite que Paul applique à la situation des parties croyante et non croyante au cas où il y aurait mésentente, tout comme Jésus s'adressait à des compatriotes juifs pour l'interdiction du divorce.

<sup>46</sup> Cette position de Paul (privilege paulin) rejoint celle d'Esdras : le mariage avec un conjoint de religion différente ne crée pas de lien indissoluble.

3.2. *Les évangiles synoptiques : Mt 5,31–32 // Lc 16,18 // Mc 10,11–12*

Dans le premier discours en Mt 5,31–32, Jésus oppose son interprétation de la Loi à celle des docteurs de son temps, alors que le même *logion* est isolé en *Luc* 16, ou se trouve en fin d'une controverse en *Marc* 10 :

<i>Mt 5</i>	<i>Lc 16</i>	<i>Mc 10</i>
<sup>3</sup> Il a été dit : 'Celui qui répudie sa femme doit lui remettre un acte de divorce'. <sup>32</sup> Eh bien moi je vous dis : 'Quiconque répudie sa femme, <i>hormis le cas de fornication</i> , la livre à être adultère, et celui qui épouse une répudiée commet un adultère'.	<sup>18</sup> Quiconque répudie sa femme et en épouse une autre, commet un adultère, et celui qui épouse une répudiée par son mari commet un adultère.	<sup>11</sup> Celui qui répudie sa femme et en épouse une autre, commet un adultère envers elle, <sup>12</sup> et si elle, ayant répudié son mari, en épouse un autre, elle commet un adultère.

Malgré des différences, principalement dans la clause additionnelle de Matthieu, il y a, comme chez Paul, un accord fondamental sur l'interdiction du remariage et même du divorce, l'adultère étant condamné par la loi mosaïque (7<sup>e</sup> commandement). Hormis cette addition, Mt 5,32a est aussi proche du sens de Mc 10,11 que de Lc 16,18a. Alors qu'en Matthieu et Luc le *logion* est rédigé strictement du point de vue du mari, comme on l'attend généralement dans la tradition juive, il est élargi en Marc et formulé du double point de vue (10,12)<sup>47</sup>. Mais sous quelque forme qu'il soit, le *logion* qui rejette le divorce, parce qu'il implique l'adultère comme suite logique, d'où la clarification « et en épouse un(e) autre », interdit par le fait même le remariage du vivant de l'un ou l'autre conjoint, et il fait porter logiquement, dans cette culture, la faute sur le mari qui rédige l'acte et répudie<sup>48</sup>. Comme le divorce n'annule pas le premier lien contracté, ce

<sup>47</sup> Mc 10,12 entend l'interdiction de celui qui répudie dans une société où même la femme pouvait répudier, voir déjà des juifs à Éléphantine (ci-dessus et Murabba'ât 20, etc.). C'est aussi le cas de Paul en 1 Co 7,13 : « qu'elle ne renvoie pas son mari », sans avoir à l'expliquer par un développement tardif reflétant un milieu grec, comme l'écrit Murphy O'Connor, « The Divorced Woman », 33 et n. 7.

<sup>48</sup> Malgré Meier, *Un certain juif Jésus*, 89 et 93, la forme du *logion* en Mt 5,32ab (sans l'addition sans doute à l'origine de la suppression « et en épouse une autre » mais c'est le sens sous-entendu) en accord général avec Mc 10,11 a beaucoup plus de chance d'être la forme primitive sémitisante que celle, isolée, de Lc 16,18a qui supprime ou ajoute (18b) à sa convenance, contrairement au raisonnement très casuistique de l'auteur. La source Q et sa formulation grecque n'est pas une preuve d'antiquité, Jésus n'ayant pas utilisé ce langage. En effet, « la livre à être adultère » (Mt 5,32a) sous-entend qu'ayant rompu le

serait le cas de bigamie/polygamie, condamnée aussi par CD IV et déjà Lv 18,18.

*Mt 19,3-9*

<sup>3</sup>Et des pharisiens s'approchèrent de lui et, pour le mettre à l'épreuve, ils lui dirent : 'Est-il permis à un homme de renvoyer sa femme pour n'importe quel motif ?'

<sup>4</sup>Il répondit : 'N'avez-vous pas lu que le créateur dès l'origine les fit mâle et femelle', <sup>5</sup>et dit : 'À cause de cela l'homme quittera son père et sa mère et s'attachera à sa femme, et les deux ne feront qu'une seule chair ?

<sup>6</sup>Ainsi ils ne sont plus deux mais une seule chair. Donc ce que Dieu a uni, l'homme ne peut le séparer.' <sup>7</sup>Ils lui dirent : 'Pourquoi donc Moïse a-t-il commandé de donner un acte de divorce et de la renvoyer ?' <sup>8</sup>Il leur dit : 'C'est à cause de la dureté de votre cœur que Moïse vous a permis de renvoyer vos femmes, mais à l'origine, il n'en était pas ainsi'.

<sup>9</sup>Et je vous dis : 'Quiconque renvoie sa femme, excepté pour fornication/indécence, et en épouse une autre, commet un adultère.'

*Mc 10,2-12*

<sup>2</sup>Et s'approchant, des pharisiens lui demandèrent, pour le mettre à l'épreuve : 'Est-il permis à un mari de renvoyer sa femme ?'

<sup>3</sup>Il leur répondit : 'Que vous a commandé Moïse ?' <sup>4</sup>Ils dirent : 'Moïse a permis de rédiger un acte de divorce et de renvoyer.' <sup>5</sup>Alors Jésus leur dit : 'En raison de la dureté de votre cœur il écrivit pour vous ce commandement. <sup>6</sup>Mais à l'origine de la création Il les fit mâle et femelle.

<sup>7</sup>À cause de cela l'homme quittera son père et sa mère [et s'attachera à sa femme,]<sup>49</sup> <sup>8</sup>et les deux ne feront qu'une seule chair. Ainsi ils ne sont plus deux mais une seule chair.

<sup>9</sup>Donc, ce que Dieu a uni, l'homme ne peut le séparer.'

<sup>10</sup>Et une fois à la maison, les disciples l'interrogèrent de nouveau sur ce sujet. <sup>11</sup>Et il leur dit : 'Quiconque renvoie sa femme et en épouse une autre, commet un adultère envers elle ; <sup>12</sup>et si elle renvoie son mari et en épouse un autre, elle commet un adultère.'

Voulant mettre Jésus à l'épreuve, des Pharisiens posent à Jésus une question juridique sur la légitimité du divorce de la part du mari<sup>50</sup>. Et Jésus

lien avec sa femme, il est de fait adultère envers elle (= Mc 10,11b), tout comme il l'est en épousant une répudiée vis-à-vis de son premier mari, en lésant des droits matrimoniaux.

<sup>49</sup> Cette formulation absente dans quelques manuscrits, sans doute par homoiotéleuton, et présente en Mt 19,5 et déjà dans un contexte comparable en 4QInstruction, 4Q416 2 iv 1, devrait être originelle, malgré e. g. B. Standaert, *Évangile selon Marc. Commentaire. Deuxième partie Marc 6,14 à 10,52* (Études Bibliques NS 61 ; Pendé : Gabalda, 2010), 726. Le grec suit les LXX, la Vulgate, le Samaritain, la Peshiṭta, les targums Ps.-Jonathan et Neofiti en portant la leçon « les deux », absente du TM et du targum Onquelos, mais présente aussi en 1 Co 6,16 et Ep 5,31 (et Tb 8,6 [gr2]).

<sup>50</sup> Une telle question est tout à fait possible dans la vie de Jésus, sans devoir retenir un cadre littéraire artificiel de controverse dans l'évangile de Marc et la communauté chrétienne, Jésus a dû débattre sur ce sujet pour clarifier et affirmer sa position, tout comme

de continuer sur le même registre par une autre question : « Que vous a commandé Moïse ? » Et eux de répondre : « Moïse a permis de rédiger un acte de divorce et de répudier ». Le dialogue a glissé du commandement de Dieu à une permissivité, au point que Jésus accepte de la considérer comme « un commandement (τὴν ἐντολὴν ταύτην Mc 10,5, mais ἐπέτρεψεν « permet » Mt 19,8) pour vous à cause de votre cœur dur », assimilant ses interrogateurs aux Israélites rebelles de la génération du désert, mais l'ordre de Moïse témoigne en fait contre eux. Un tel commandement (/permission) devrait être superflu d'après le principe de la création, puisqu'il ne va pas dans le sens de la création originelle quand Dieu fit l'homme, mâle et femelle, qui ne forment qu'un, citant Gn 1,27 // 5,2<sup>51</sup> associé à 2,24 compris comme un commandement divin<sup>52</sup>. Et Jésus de répondre à la question juridique : « Donc, ce que Dieu a uni, l'homme ne peut séparer », opposant la volonté divine du mariage monogame indissoluble à la tentative humaine de défaire le principe de la création, voir 1 Co 7,10b.11b<sup>53</sup>. Une même position de Jésus sur le lien du mariage que le divorce ne peut rompre, se lit en Jn 4,16–18 dans la discussion avec la Samaritaine qui a eu cinq maris et ce dernier n'est pas son mari. La formulation en Mc 10,11–12 confirme ce refus du divorce, d'autant que le mariage après divorce

---

les Esséniens avec leur opposants et l'auteur de MMT face aux siens. Des rapprochements avec CD IV 21 et 4*QInstruction* (4Q416 2 iii 20-iv 10 + 4Q418a 18, 4Q415 11) appuient très fortement cet enracinement palestinien.

<sup>51</sup> Cet argument est déjà au centre de la condamnation de la polygamie et du mariage après séparation/divorce (?) chez les Esséniens en Palestine, CD IV 21 : ἀπὸ δὲ ἀρχῆς κτίσεως traduisant à sa manière temporelle יסוד הבריאה « le principe de la création » de ce passage avec la préposition ἀπὸ, qui opère un léger glissement de sens « à l'origine/au commencement de la création », mais déjà avec *bet* en 4Q320 1 i 2–3 : ה[בריאה] ב[יתוד], *hé* de lecture certaine avec l'éditeur (PAM 41.700 cuir déplié) « à la fondation de [la création] » (malgré F. García Martínez, « Creation in the Dead Sea Scrolls », in *The Creation of Heaven and Earth : Re-interpretations of Genesis I in the Context of Judaism, Ancient Philosophy, and Modern Physics* (ed. G. H. van Kooten; Themes in Biblical Narrative 8 ; Leiden : Brill, 2005), 49–70, 61 : *ain* totalement exclu ; voir aussi Tb 8,6, avec Kister, « Divorce, Reproof, and Other Sayings », 202, malgré les nuances de L. Doering, « Marriage and Creation in Mark and CD 4–5 », in *Echoes From the Caves : Qumran and the New Testament* (ed. F. García Martínez ; STDJ 85 ; Leiden/Boston : Brill, 2009), 133–63, 144 et 155–58.

<sup>52</sup> Avec les éditeurs et Kister, « Divorce, Reproof, and Other Sayings », 203–208, comparant 4*QInstruction* (4Q416 2 iii 20-iv 10 + 4Q418a 18) lignes 21–27, qui commente Gn 2,24 où Dieu lui-même est sujet des verbes, à Mc 10,9 ; on n'a plus à faire à une explication étiologique mais à un commandement divin concernant le mariage. Les mêmes exégèses (palestiniennes) se retrouvent curieusement de part et d'autre et les vv. 5–9 intrinsèquement liés doivent remonter à Jésus, avec Doering, « Marriage and Creation », 145–46.

<sup>53</sup> Non seulement dans la Loi, *Genèse* précède *Deutéronome*, mais encore l'ordre de la création l'emporte sur une loi mosaïque permissive de *Deutéronome*. L'interdiction pure et simple du divorce évite de traiter le cas du mariage après divorce.

contrevient à son tour aux commandements sur l'adultère et la convoitise (Ex 20,14.17).

La controverse de Mc 10,2–12 où Jésus interdit le divorce, est-elle plus proche des arguments esséniens que Mt 19,3–12 ? L'incise indiquant une exception « hormis la fornication »<sup>54</sup> (Mt 5,32 παραεκτός λόγου πορνείας et 19,9 μή ἐπὶ πορνείᾳ), absente de Marc (10,2–12) et de Luc (16,18) ainsi que de Paul en 1 Co 7,10–11 mais en lien avec la variante ἐπέτρεψεν, interprète Dt 24,1 dans une ligne parallèle au *Document* (4Q270 7 13 = 267 9 vi 4), et lui correspondrait du point de vue de l'épouse cette fois :

Et l'homme qui approche sa femme pour fornicuer, ce qui n'est pas conforme à la Loi, devra sortir et ne plus jamais revenir.

Un même conseil est repris en 1 Co 6,12b-18 au sujet de la fornication et de l'union d'un homme avec une femme.

<sup>13</sup>...Mais le corps n'est pas pour la fornication. <sup>16</sup>Ou bien ne savez-vous pas que celui qui s'unit à la prostituée n'est avec elle qu'un seul corps ? Car il est dit : 'Les deux ne seront qu'une seule chair'. ... <sup>18</sup>Fuyez la fornication ! Tout péché que l'homme peut commettre est extérieur à son corps ; celui qui fornique pêche contre son propre corps.

L'incise matthéenne pourrait relever d'une influence des règlements esséniens (voir aussi 4Q397 14–21 ii 5–6) sur les judéo-chrétiens dans la tradition de l'église primitive, et ne pas remonter à Jésus, d'autant qu'en Mt 5,32 et 19,9 elle répond aussi à la question du 'divorce pour n'importe quel motif' de Mt 19,3 et qu'elle explicite la permissivité mosaïque.

Contrairement à la pratique juive majoritaire à son époque, en rejetant le divorce, Jésus rejoint la position essénienne reprochant à leurs opposants le divorce, qui plus est, pour n'importe quel motif. En effet, nulle part la Loi n'en fait un commandement divin, elle l'autorise dans quelques cas uniquement, et la pratique essénienne connaît à son tour des cas de séparation sans remariage, et celui qui enfreint les commandements s'exclut du groupe. Jésus réagit fortement contre la liberté des docteurs pharisiens dans l'interprétation libérale des motifs, alors que la Loi interdit formellement l'adultère (Ex 20,14.17, Dt 5,18.21) ; or le divorce conduit à l'adultère et au remariage adultère. Comme les Esséniens qui

<sup>54</sup> Le sens de ce mot n'est pas clair, il traduit certainement l'hébreu/araméen זנוה, interprétant sans doute Dt 21,4, ערוה דבר, dans le cadre de l'adultère, voir CD IV 17, « le premier des trois filets de Bélial » : luxure, fornication, voir MMT B 75–82 et C 5, CD VIII 5–7, VII 1–2, 4Q270 7 13 = 267 9 vi 4, Jub 20,3–4, mais le sens peut être plus large. Voir aussi le soupçon de Joseph le juste en Mt 1,18–19 comme motif de répudiation.



connaissent des cas de séparation<sup>55</sup>, Jésus interdit le divorce qui conduit à un remariage du vivant de l'épouse ou du conjoint, divorce qui s'oppose au plan divin de la création (Gn 1,27 et 2,24). Seul Matthieu insère une exception pour la séparation (sans aborder le cas de remariage : adultère ? voir 1 Co 7,11 ?). À la suite de Ml 2,16, le renvoi à la création en *Genèse*, à Qumrân et par Jésus en faveur de la monogamie et contre le divorce, relève d'une même exégèse palestinienne contemporaine. Là, comme au sujet de la loi du sabbat fondée elle aussi sur le récit de la création en Ex 20,8–11 et en Mc 2,27, Jésus en appelle à l'autorité divine de la création avant celle du législateur Moïse.

Comparé à la Loi de Moïse, le *Rouleau du Temple* interdit le renvoi en cas de viol, assimilé au rapt de la fille, étant donné que le viol a déjà créé le lien du mariage, et qu'on ne peut prendre deux femmes à la fois durant leur vie (même idée en 1 Co 6,16). Il en est de même dans un autre manuscrit essénien, 4Q159/*Ordonnances* 2–4 8–10 :

<sup>8</sup>Si un homme diffame une vierge d'Israël, s'il parle le [jour de] son mariage, des femmes de confiance <sup>9</sup>l'examineront, et s'il n'a pas menti à son sujet, elle sera mise à mort, mais s'il a témoigné fau[ssément] contre elle, il sera redevable de deux mines [et il ne] <sup>10</sup>pourra pas (la) répudier de toute sa vie<sup>56</sup>.

La peine de mort tient au mensonge de la femme déjà liée à un homme, ne faisant plus qu'une seule chair avec son premier mari. La coupable est adultère et punissable de mort selon la loi. À ce sujet, Jésus prend une position différente. S'il est plus strict que ses contemporains, dans sa position contre le divorce et la polygamie, il est aussi plus ouvert en s'opposant à l'exécution de la femme adultère (Jn 8,2–11)<sup>57</sup>.

En conclusion, Paul ne condamne pas les « œuvres » comme telles, au contraire il encourage à bien agir (2 Co 9,8, Col 1,10), car le jugement final récompensera « les œuvres bonnes » (Rm 2,6–10, 2 Co 5,10) comme il en est de la théologie vétéro-testamentaire et essénienne. L'évaluation négative par Paul des « œuvres de la Loi » étroitement liée à la compréhension

<sup>55</sup> 4Q415 11 12–15 pourrait être un passage où le divorce serait autorisé, si l'homme remet à son épouse un acte de répudiation, mais la lacune ne permet pas de s'en assurer.

<sup>56</sup> Ce passage est mal lu et donc mal interprété par Brin, « Divorce at Qumran », 239–42 : il n'est pas question d'exclusion du groupe.

<sup>57</sup> Ce n'est pas le seul point sur lequel Jésus prend position contre la Loi de Moïse, et ce n'est pas « un non-sens d'imaginer le juif Jésus abrogeant ou annulant des points de la Loi mosaïque », malgré Meier, *Un certain juif Jésus*, 108, lui seul pouvait d'autorité en donner une autre approche. Les Esséniens interdisaient aussi le remariage après divorce du vivant du conjoint !

juive et essénienne n'est pas à comprendre comme une dénonciation de pratiquer la Loi en général, mais d'en faire la référence du salut, comme c'est le cas en MMT selon l'interprétation de la pratique de la Loi par le Maître. Il n'est pas demandé au chrétien qui a reçu l'Esprit, de judaïser en se conformant à la façon de vivre des croyants juifs, — ce serait un retour à l'esclavage de la Loi, et Paul est mort à la Loi (Ga 2,19) —, mais il est demandé de croire en Jésus messie sauveur, à la justification par la grâce non par les seules « œuvres ». C'est la critique de Paul en Rm 9,32 : « Parce qu'au lieu de recourir à la foi, ils (Israël) comptaient sur les 'œuvres' » méconnaissant la justice de Dieu. Cependant Paul ne sépare pas la conduite selon l'Esprit d'un type d'obéissance à la Loi, et il ne dispense pas d'accomplir « les œuvres de la Loi » ; au contraire il le recommande à propos de l'interdiction du divorce et du remariage du vivant du conjoint en rappelant l'ordre du Seigneur, ordre identique à celui de Jésus dans les évangiles. L'obéissance aux commandements de Dieu est la marche vers la sainteté à Qumrân et dans le Nouveau Testament. La justification par la foi ne dispense pas de la pratique des « œuvres de la Loi », pratique prise non au sens restrictif (pratiques rituelles qui distinguent le juif du non-juif) mais au sens large du commandement de l'amour du prochain comme soi-même, à la manière du Christ (voir *Galates* 5), car respecter la création, c'est aimer Dieu créateur et son prochain, ainsi que le recommande la *Lettre* de Jacques à sa communauté : la pratique des œuvres amène la foi à sa perfection<sup>58</sup>. La formule « les œuvres de la Loi » appartient à une tradition du judaïsme ancien (MMT) mais adaptée par Paul à la Loi nouvelle.

---

<sup>58</sup> Voir E. Puech, « La Lettre de Jacques et Qumrân », *Rivista Biblica* 59 (2011) : 29–55.



BODY AND SIN  
ROMANS AND COLOSSIANS IN LIGHT  
OF QUMRANIC AND RABBINIC TEXTS

Menahem Kister

*The Hebrew University of Jerusalem*

*In memory of Friedrich Avemarie*

Paul was an original and revolutionary thinker, but his thinking did not emerge *ex nihilo*. This obvious truth raises a number of questions. To what extent was Paul acquainted with Jewish Palestinian modes of thought and influenced by Hebrew idioms? Can his sources of inspiration be traced back to specific Jewish themes and expressions—and how did Paul shape them to fit his own theology (and why)? In particular—and notwithstanding the tension between the centrality of the Torah and that of the Christological notions fundamental to Paul's theology—what does Paul's thought owe to the Jewish notions of Torah-theology, however much he may have struggled against them?

In exploring this major issue, the affinities between Paul and the Dead Sea Scrolls have to be considered. Indeed, some connection between the two was first suggested some time ago, a few years after the publication of the main scrolls of Cave 1.<sup>1</sup> But the conclusions of these earlier scholars ought to be refined and corroborated in the light of subsequent research, as well as examined in connection with material from Qumran published subsequent to these early studies. The parallels between Paul and the scrolls (written prior to Paul), even when striking, do not suggest,

---

<sup>1</sup> See, e.g., K. G. Kuhn, "New Light on Temptation, Sin, and Flesh in the New Testament," in *The Scrolls and the New Testament* (ed. K. Stendahl; London: SCM, 1958), 94–113, 265–70; W. D. Davies, "Paul and the Dead Sea Scrolls: Flesh and Spirit," *ibid.*, 157–82; J. Murphy-O'Connor (ed.), *Paul and Qumran: Studies in New Testament Exegesis* (Chicago: Priority Press, 1968); D. Flusser, "The Dead Sea Sect and Pre-Pauline Christianity," *Scripta Hierosolymitana* 4 (1958): 215–66 (reprinted in *idem, Judaism and the Origins of Christianity* [Jerusalem: Magnes, 1988], 23–74). Needless to say, throughout the years an abundant literature concerning Qumran and Paul has emerged.

of course, that the writers of these scrolls had any sympathy for quasi-Pauline, anti-nomistic notions; the similarities imply rather that Paul's thinking made use of existing theological and anthropological ideas that had been employed in a totally different religious context. In the search for Paul's debt to the Scrolls one should not lose sight of other possible sources of Paul, Jewish and non-Jewish, including Jewish traditions later documented in rabbinic literature.<sup>2</sup> Not infrequently, Paul seems to have woven together ideas of different provenances, which he modified and adapted into his theology. In this essay I will try to investigate the setting of some central Pauline ideas in both the Dead Sea scrolls and other Jewish writings. The coin is two-sided: on the one hand, which Jewish elements may have had a role in shaping Paul's ideas, and how were they woven together? On the other hand: what is *unique* to Paul's writings, when seen against the foil of the Jewish sources?

Romans 6:1–14, which is so central for Paul's religious thought (as well as for later Christian theology), has received considerable scholarly attention. Numerous attempts have been made to explain the broad outlines of Paul's views as expressed in this passage as well as the specific interpretation of various details in its wording.<sup>3</sup> The cultural setting of the passage has also been a subject of debate: is Romans 6 (as well as other Pauline passages) related to Hellenistic thought and especially to pagan Mystery religions or, alternatively, is it mainly derived from Jewish notions?<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> See W. D. Davies, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism: Some Rabbinic Elements in Pauline Theology* (New York: Harper and Row, 1967), in addition to the material in P. Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch: Die Briefe des Neuen Testaments und die Offenbarung Johannis* (Munich: C. H. Beck, 1926; volume 3) and in the various entries in *TDNT*.

<sup>3</sup> Some comprehensive recent commentaries on Romans in English are: C. E. B. Cranfield, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans: Volume I: Introduction and Commentary on Romans I-VIII* (ICC; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1975); D. Moo, *Romans 1–8* (WEC; Chicago: Moody Press, 1991); J. A. Fitzmyer, *Romans: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 33; New York: Doubleday, 1993); J. D. G. Dunn, *Romans 1–8* (WBC 38A; Dallas Texas: Word Books, 1988); R. Jewett, *Romans: A Commentary* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007). These commentaries contain reviews of prior scholarly opinions.

<sup>4</sup> For a discussion of this problem see A. J. M. Wedderburn's monograph, *Baptism and Resurrection: Studies in Pauline Theology against Its Graeco-Roman Background* (WUNT 44; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1987). Especially useful for the purposes of the present study are the chapters "Paul's Use of Traditional Material" (37–69; especially 54–69) and "The Spiritualizing of 'Resurrection'" (164–232), in which much of the traditional Jewish material is discussed. For a different treatment of this subject see H. D. Betz, "Transferring Ritual: Paul's Interpretation of Baptism in Romans 6," in *Paul in His Hellenistic Context* (ed. T. Engberg-Pedersen; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995), 84–118.

The following sections of the present article deal with the transformation described in Romans 6, and other related passages in Pauline and deutero-Pauline epistles, in the light of Jewish texts. Each section is entitled by the theme and the major Jewish texts discussed in it.

*The Text: Romans 6:3–14*<sup>5</sup>

3. Do you not know that all of us who have been baptized into Christ Jesus were baptized into His death?
4. We were buried therefore with him by baptism into death, so that as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, we too might walk in newness of life.
5. For if we have been united (σύμφυτοι) with him in the likeness of His death, we shall also (be united with him) in a resurrection (like His).
6. We know that our *old man* was crucified with Him so that the body of sin might be annulled (καρραγήθη), and we might no longer be enslaved to sin.
7. For he who has died is justified (δεδικαιώται) from sin.
8. And if we have died with Christ, we believe that we shall also live with Him.
9. For we know that Christ, being raised from the dead, will never die again; death no longer has dominion over him,
10. he who died, died to sin once and for all, but he who lives, lives to God.
11. So you also must consider yourselves dead to sin and alive to God in Christ Jesus.
12. Let not sin therefore reign in your mortal bodies, to make you obey their passions.
13. Do not yield your members to sin as armor (ὄπλα) of wickedness, but yield yourselves to God as men who have been brought from death to life, and your members to God as armor (ὄπλα) of righteousness.
14. For sin will have no dominion (οὐ κυριεύσει) over you, since you are not under law but under grace.

#### A. BODY OF SIN, TRANSFORMED BODY, AND ESCHATOLOGY

##### *Serekh ha-Yahad*

What Paul describes in this passage is a total transformation of the believer through baptism. The “old man” (v. 6) ceases to exist. The “body of sin” is annulled (v. 7): the bodily members cease to serve sin, which no longer has dominion over the believer who is *with* Christ and *in* Christ. The start-

---

<sup>5</sup> The translation is based on the RSV, with several modifications. In some cases I wished to preserve the literal sense, and therefore used the King James translation.

ing point of Paul's anthropology has a rather negative view of the body:<sup>6</sup> in chapter 7 of the same epistle Paul says: "I know that nothing good dwells within me, that is, in my flesh" (Rom 7:18) and explains: although the "inward man" is delighted in the Law, "I see in my members another law at war with the law of my mind and making me captive to the law of sin which dwells in my members... I of myself serve the law of God with my mind (νοός), but with my flesh (σάρξ) I serve the law of sin" (7:22–25); the body is called in Romans 7 "the body of death" (7:24),<sup>7</sup> and the law in the members is "the law of sin." In the present passage, however, it is manifest that the bodily members, if they undergo transformation, may be the armor of righteousness in the battle between good and evil (6:13).<sup>8</sup> This total transformation takes place, according to this passage, through baptism into the death of Christ (6:3).<sup>9</sup>

According to a well-known and much-cited passage in *Serekh ha-Yahad*, an absolute purification of body from evil will take place in the time of the eschaton:

Then God will sift through all men's deeds in His truth, and will refine for Himself the structure of man<sup>10</sup> by smelting out (לטהרם)<sup>11</sup> any spirit of injus-

<sup>6</sup> E. Schweizer, *TDNT* 7.1060–1066 s.v. σῶμα; R. H. Gundry, *Soma in Biblical Theology with Emphasis on Pauline Anthropology* (SNTSMS 29; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976). D. Flusser, "The 'Flesh-Spirit' Dualism in the Qumran Scrolls and the New Testament," in idem, *Judaism of the Second Temple Period* (Grand Rapids, Michigan, 2007), 1.283–92; J. Frey, "Flesh and Spirit in the Palestinian Jewish Sapiential Tradition and in the Qumran Texts: An Inquiry into the Background of Pauline Usage" in *The Wisdom Texts from Qumran and the Development of the Sapiential Thought* (ed. C. Hempel, A. Lange & H. Lichtenberger; BETL 159; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2002), 367–404; this article includes a useful survey of scholarship (the term רוּחַ בִּשְׂרָר in 4QInstruction and the sapiential conceptions of "flesh" discussed in this article need further investigation).

<sup>7</sup> Referring mostly to spiritual death; see Moo, *Romans*, 495; Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 436 (ad 6:6).

<sup>8</sup> It seems significant that according to Paul the eschatological resurrection is not conceived of as a non-bodily event but rather the bodies of the deceased are transformed into "spiritual bodies" (1 Cor 15:44); for a rabbinic parallel to the Pauline conception, see M. Kister, "'First Adam' and 'Second Adam' in 1 Cor 15:45–49 in the Light of Midrashic Exegesis and Hebrew Usage," in *The New Testament and Rabbinic Literature* (ed. R. Bieringer et al.; JSJS 136; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 351–65, esp. 356–59.

<sup>9</sup> In another Pauline passage baptism is not mentioned, at least not explicitly: "those who belong to Christ Jesus have crucified the flesh with its passions and desires" (Gal 5:24).

<sup>10</sup> The expression מִבְּנֵי אִישׁ must be interpreted as a different orthography of מְבִנֵּה אִישׁ; the alternative suggestion, to interpret it as מִן + בְּנֵי אִישׁ is highly improbable.

<sup>11</sup> I.e., God will smelt out (like dross) the spirit of injustice. For this verb in the scrolls and in the Bible see M. Kister, "5Q13 and the Avodah: A Historical Survey and Its Signifi-

tice from the bodily members (Hebrew: תכמי)<sup>12</sup> of his flesh, and purify him of every wicked deed with the holy spirit (ברוח קודש)<sup>13</sup> from every wicked deed. He will sprinkle over him the spirit of truth like waters of lustration (in order to cleanse him) from all the abominations of deceit and (from) the defilement of the spirit of impurity, in order to instruct the upright ones with knowledge of the Most High, and to make those of perfect behavior understand the wisdom of the Sons of Heaven... and to them (will be granted) all the glory of humankind (Hebrew: *adam*).<sup>14</sup>

This passage describes the purification of the human body as part of the eschatological transformation of the righteous. The “spirit of impurity” resides in the bodily members of human beings, but at the *eschaton* God will purify the bodies by the “holy spirit” and the “spirit of truth,” and remove from them “all spirit of injustice” and “spirit of impurity.” As has been observed, the wording of this passage of the *Serekh* is related to Ezek 36:25–27:

I will sprinkle clean water upon you and you will be purified from all your uncleanness... A new heart I will give you, and a new spirit I will put within you, and I will take out of your flesh the heart of stone and give you a heart of flesh. And I will put My spirit within you, and cause you to walk in My statutes.

The concept of the new heart given after Israel is purified by God was extended in the *Serekh* to refining and purifying the whole human body and its renewal.<sup>15</sup> The shift from Ezekiel’s description to the one in the *Serekh* is certainly substantial: the emphasis on body and flesh as causing one to sin in the *Serekh* changes the whole sense of the eschatological scenario and of the theological concepts concerning human beings in

---

cance,” *DSD* 8 (2001): 139.

<sup>12</sup> The exact meaning of this noun and its etymology are unclear. Its general meaning, however, is apparent from the context of the sentences in which it occurs.

<sup>13</sup> I prefer not to use capital letters in translating “spirit” or “holy spirit” in Jewish texts. On the other hand, I use the conventional capitalizing in texts from the New Testament, although there is no substantial difference between the two usages.

<sup>14</sup> QS IV 20–23: ואז יברר אל באמתו כול מעשי גבר וזקק לו מבני איש להתם כול רוח עולה: ומתכמי בשרו וטהרו ברוח קודש מכול עלילות רשעה ויז עליו רוח אמת כמי נדה מכול תועבות שקר והתגולל ברוח נדה להבין ישרים בדעת עליון וחכמת בני שמים להשכיל תמימי דרך... ולהם כל כבוד אדם. The translation of this passage, as most other Qumranic passages in this article, is based on F. Garcia Martinez & E. J. C. Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* (Leiden: Brill, 1997), with many alterations.

<sup>15</sup> Exegetically, this idea may be derived from the “purification from uncleanness” mentioned in Ezek 36:25, interpreted as referring to the uncleanness of the body that will be purified by God. Such a putative interpretation of the biblical verse is based on the ideological presuppositions of the exegete concerning human nature.



general (for Ezekiel “flesh” is a positive term!). The “holy spirit” by which humans are purified according to the *Serekh* is the spirit of God mentioned in Ezek 36:27 (“My spirit”).<sup>16</sup> Similar notions echo also in the Pauline epistles. Paul, however, does not refer to “purification” in the present passage, but according to v. 19, the bodily members that serve “impurity and iniquity” are transformed to yield to righteousness “through sanctification (ἁγιασμός).”<sup>17</sup> The transformation takes place through baptism, but for Paul baptism has Christological significance, and it is not referred to in this context as a rite of cleansing.<sup>18</sup> A much discussed problem is whether the transformation described by Paul refers to baptism as a one-time rite of initiation, or whether being baptized to Christ is a figurative expression.<sup>19</sup>

Elsewhere Paul asserts concerning the eschatological resurrection, that the dead will be resurrected in an incorruptible “spiritual” body (1 Cor 15:35–53; note esp. v. 44), and the believers living in the time of the eschaton will be “changed” (v. 51). Similar ideas concerning the resurrection occur in various circles. Paul’s assertions have a striking parallel in rabbinic literature.<sup>20</sup> A book written in a different milieu, 2 *Baruch* 49–50, also considers the bodily members as “being (set) in evil and through which evil is done,” and envisions a transformation of the bodies of the righteous *after resurrection* into luminous bodies.<sup>21</sup> Josephus summarizes the Pharisees’ position in the following words: “Although every soul is imperishable, only that of the good passes over to a different body, whereas those of the vile are punished by eternal retribution.”<sup>22</sup> This seems to be a

<sup>16</sup> See J. Licht, *The Rule Scroll* (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1965), 103 (in Hebrew). Cf. Recently J. A. Bertone, “*The Law of the Spirit: Experience of the Spirit and Displacement of the Law in Romans 8:1–16*” (Studies in Biblical Literature 86; New York: Peter Lang, 2005), 110–11. See also J. R. Levison, *Filled with the Spirit* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009), 202–21, 271–72.

<sup>17</sup> The antonyms ἀκαθαρσία – ἁγιασμός (Rom 6:19) occur also in 1 Thess 4:7, where Paul immediately goes on to state that “[God] gives us His holy spirit to you” (v. 8), alluding to Ezek 36:27, of which see below.

<sup>18</sup> In spite of Paul’s rhetoric in 1 Cor 6:9–11.

<sup>19</sup> For a thorough discussion and a suggested solution see Dunn, *Baptism* (e.g., 143); the question is discussed in detail in the commentaries.

<sup>20</sup> *Sifre Deut.* 306 (ed. Finkelstein, 340f–41), see Kister, “‘First Adam’ and ‘Second Adam,’” 356–59.

<sup>21</sup> E. Schweizer, “Die Sünde in den Gliedern,” in *Abraham unser Vater: Festschrift für Otto Michel zum 60. Geburtstag* (AGAJU 5; Leiden: Brill, 1963), 437–39.

<sup>22</sup> Josephus, *J.W.* 2.163. Similar statements occur also in *J.W.* 3.375; *C. Ap.* 2.218 (Wedderburn, *Baptism and Resurrection*, 184 n. 4).

formulation of the Pharisaic doctrine of resurrection,<sup>23</sup> that it is deemed to take place in a different and better body. It seems that when heretics took advantage of this view for their polemic against resurrection, the rabbis (and 2 *Baruch* 49:2) insisted that resurrection could take place only in the former, earthly body of the deceased.<sup>24</sup> Existence in heavenly bodies means absence of the carnal nature of human beings.<sup>25</sup> For the purpose of our discussion it is important to note that the transformation into non-carnal existence will take place only in the time of the eschaton according to sources written in various Jewish circles, including the *Serekh*.

## B. THE NEWNESS OF LIFE AND RESURRECTION

*Barkhi Nafshi; Hodayot*

Another debated issue is how “the newness of life” (v. 4) is related to the resurrection (v. 5) as an eschatological event.<sup>26</sup> There is an apparent am-

<sup>23</sup> S. Mason, *Flavius Josephus: Translation and Commentary: Volume 1B: Judaeae War 2* (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 133.

<sup>24</sup> On these polemics see Y. Monnickendam, “I Will Put to Death and Bring to Life, I will Smite and Heal: Two Versions on the Resurrection of the Dead,” *Tarbiz* 76 (2008): 329–52, esp. 333–43 (in Hebrew).

<sup>25</sup> See also Mark 12:23 = Matt 22:30 = Luke 20:33; *b. Ber.* 17a, where a similar angel-like existence is described.

<sup>26</sup> Bultmann reads this passage as teaching that the future resurrection guaranteed by baptism should be understood “as an already present resurrection which realizes itself in ethical conduct” (R. Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament* [London: SCM, 1965], 140, §13); R. C. Tannehill, *Dying and Rising with Christ: A Study in Pauline Theology* (BZNW 32; Berlin: A. Töpelmann, 1967), 10–12; E. Käsemann, *Commentary on Romans* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980), 166–67; see also Jewett’s assertion: “In contrast to some interpreters who wish to restrict the gift of life to its eschatological dimension, Paul wants believers to act in God’s behalf as persons already redeemed from the realm of earthly domination” (Jewett, *Romans*, 411); see also Moo, *Romans*, 404. On the other hand see Dunn, *Romans*, 330–3 and his earlier book J. D. G. Dunn, *Baptism in the Holy Spirit: A Re-examination of the New Testament Teaching on the Gift of the Spirit in Relation to Pentecostalism Today* (London: SCM, 1970), *passim* (e.g. 143). In his commentary, Cranfield wrote: “In the NT the word *καίνωσις* is particularly associated with eschatological hope... The newness of life, of which Paul speaks here, is a foretaste of the final renewal.” (Cranfield, *Romans*, 305); a more nuanced discussion of Romans 6 by the same author is emphatically summarized: “Those first faint signs of newness of life should not be mistaken for the eschatological glory,” (C. E. B. Cranfield, “Romans 6.1–14 Revisited,” in *On Romans and Other New Testament Essays* [ed. C. E. B. Cranfield; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1998], 23–31). Commentators differ in their interpretations of the grammatical future tense in “we shall also” (v. 5), “we shall also live” (v. 8): according to one opinion this means the real future, whereas according to another what is meant in these two verses is a general assertion and the future tense is employed only for rhetorical reasons; for a

biguity in Paul's conceptions, regardless of the difficult question of how exactly Paul himself has reconciled them. This ambiguity in Paul, I contend, can best be explained by the dynamics of these ideas, and their various forms, in Jewish literature prior to Paul. Thus, while according to the passage of the *Serekh* the transformation will take place in the time of the eschaton, according to other Qumranic texts—some of them using strikingly similar wording to the *Serekh*—the transformation happens when one joins the Community, and it is referred to in the past tense: a Qumranic text known as *Barkhi Nafshi* (with which I will deal more thoroughly in Section H) reads: “haughtiness of heart and arrogance of eyes *You have smelted out* (like dross; *התמותה*) *from me; a spirit of deceit You have destroyed...*” The wording of this text is a striking parallel to the passage cited above from the *Serekh*: “*smelting out* (*להתם*) *any spirit of injustice from the bodily members of his flesh... He will sprinkle over him the spirit of truth like waters of lustration (in order to cleanse him) from all the abominations of deceit.*”<sup>27</sup> Notwithstanding the striking similarity in wording, in *Barkhi Nafshi* the transformation happened when the poet joined the Community, rather than being an eschatological event in the future. The elevation of human beings and their union with the angels, which are features of the eschatological future in the *Serekh*, take place according to the *Hodayot* upon joining the Community (as we shall presently see). It seems, therefore, that the ambiguity in the Pauline passage concerning the new body in this world and the body in the eschaton, namely the eschatological “resurrection” and this-worldly “newness of life,” reflect a more general Jewish dynamics, a shift from the eschatological future to the present. It is therefore interesting to note that the *Hodayot* reinterpret Ezekiel's eschatological picture of God's holy spirit being given to the Israelites (Ezek 36:27) as referring to the founding of its own community: God's spirit has already been given to its members:<sup>28</sup> the poet thus thanks God for “the spirit that You have put in me;”<sup>29</sup> likewise Paul speaks elsewhere of “God who gives us His holy Spirit” (1 Thess 4:8).<sup>30</sup>

---

review of this problem from another perspective see Wedderburn, *Baptism and Resurrection*, 1–6.

<sup>27</sup> See above, p. 175.

<sup>28</sup> Licht's differentiation between different notions of “holy spirit” in Qumran, related to the present and to the eschatological period (Licht, *The Rule Scroll*, 57–76, 103) misses the intrinsic dynamic of the conception of the holy spirit and its evolvment.

<sup>29</sup> 1QH<sup>a</sup> V 35–36; VIII 20–21; XX 14–15.

<sup>30</sup> For other verses in the Pauline epistles that refer to the “holy Spirit” as given to the believers and its relation to Ezek 36–37, see Levison, *Filled with the Spirit*, 253–55.



The sinfulness of human beings stressed in this passage is inseparable from the abominable state of their bodies. The Pauline term “body of sin” (σῶμα τῆς ἀμαρτίας, v. 6) is strikingly similar to “structure of sin” (מבנה) (החטא) in the *Hodayot* (1QH<sup>a</sup> IX 24). According to the *Hodayot*, God may elevate humans from their abominable state; when He purifies them, they become angel-like beings:

I give You thanks, my God, because You have done wonders with dust, and with a creature of clay You have acted very powerfully . . . For the sake of Your glory, You have purified man from offence, so that he can make himself holy for You from every impure abomination and guilt of unfaithfulness, to become united wi[th] the sons of Your truth and with Your Holy Ones, to raise from dust the worms of the dead<sup>35</sup> to an [everlasting?] essence,<sup>36</sup> and from a depraved spirit (You have raised him) to Your knowledge, and to stand in Your presence with the everlasting host and [eternal] spirits, so that he be renewed with everything that e[xists and w]ill exist.<sup>37</sup>

The indignity of humans as “creatures of clay” is replaced by the highest dignity and they are “renewed,” after being purified by God. The relevance of this passage to Paul has been suggested, and its meaning intensively debated.<sup>38</sup> The *Hodayot* passage mentions explicitly the idea of the

<sup>35</sup> See below, n. 39.

<sup>36</sup> Or: community ([סוד עין] or [מתכה]; the reading is uncertain).

<sup>37</sup> 1QH<sup>a</sup> XIX 6, 13–17: . . . אודכה אלי כי הפלתה עם עפר וביצר חמר הגברתה מודה מודה . . . ולמען כבודכה טהרתה אנוש מפשע להתקדש לכה מכול תועבות נדה ואשמת מעל להיחד עם בני אמתך ובגורל עם קדושיכה להרים מעפר תולעת מתים לסוד עין] ומרוח נעוה לבניתכה ולהתיצב במעמד לפניכה עם צבא עד ורוחון] עולם] ולהתחדש עם כול ה]ויהי[ וניהה ועם ידיעים ביחד רנה.

<sup>38</sup> See, e.g., H. W. Kuhn, *Enderwartung und gegenwärtiges Heil* (SUNT 4; Göttingen: Vanderhoeck & Ruprecht, 1964), 78–88; idem, “The Impact of Selected Qumran Texts on the Understanding of Pauline Theology,” in *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Second Princeton Symposium on Judaism and Christian Origins* (ed. J. H. Charlesworth; Waco, Texas: Baylor University Press, 2006), 3.153–58, esp. 158–60. For the question of resurrection in the Qumran texts see, e.g., É. Puech, *La Croyance des Esséniens en la vie future: Immortalité, résurrection, vie éternelle? Histoire d'une croyance dans le Judaïsme ancien* (EBib Nouvelle Série 21; Paris: Gabalda, 1993) 2.372ff.; Wedderburn, *Baptism and Resurrection*, 223–30; J. J. Collins, *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (London: Routledge, 1997), 119–23; H. Lichtenberger, “Auferstehung in dem Qumranfunden,” in *Auferstehung – Resurrection: The Fourth Durham – Tübingen Research Symposium on Earliest Christianity and Judaism* (ed. F. Avemarie and H. Lichtenberger; WUNT 135; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001), 79–91; G. W. E. Nickelsburg, *Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism and Early Christianity* (Cambridge Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2006), 177–93; G. J. Brooke, “The Structure of 1QH<sup>a</sup> XII 5 – XIII 4 and the Meaning of Resurrection,” in *From 4QMMT to resurrection: mélanges qumraniens en hommage à Émile Puech* (ed. F. García Martínez, A. Steudel and E. Tigchelaar; STDJ 61; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 15–33; M. Popović, “Bones, Bodies and Resurrection in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *The*

righteous being renewed. I tend to interpret the crucial expression תולעת מתים as “worm-eaten dead.”<sup>39</sup> The text would describe, then, dead people brought to life by God. This text, or a similar one,<sup>40</sup> *could be read* already in Antiquity as referring to resurrection, but it seems likely to me that the “dead” mentioned here should be interpreted figuratively, as people who were wicked by their human nature to whom God gave *spiritual* life. The giving of new life to the dead is perhaps not “resurrection” in the strict sense of the term (because, unlike resurrection, life is not *restored* to those “dead” people), but the notions seem to be close enough.<sup>41</sup> The phraseology of bringing people to life and eschatological renewal of the world is employed in this passage of the *Hodayot* to describe the transformation of the elect, i.e., those joining the Community.<sup>42</sup>

---

*Human Body in Death and Resurrection* (ed. T. Niclas, F. V. Reiterer and J. Verheyden; DCL Yearbook 2009; Berlin: De Gruyter, 2009), 226–29.

<sup>39</sup> The words תולעת מתים are based on Isa 41:14: אֵל תִּירָאִי תוֹלַעַת יַעֲקֹב מִתֵּי יִשְׂרָאֵל. It is disputed whether in the *Hodayot* the word מתים should be interpreted “humans” (MT, which is the plain meaning of the verse) or should be vocalized מְתִים and be interpreted as “dead” (LXX; cf. 1QIsa<sup>a</sup>: וּמִיִּתִי). The same expression, as has been noted, occurs also in 1QH<sup>a</sup> XIV 37, where it seems related somehow to שׁוֹכְבֵי עֶפֶר, quite likely “the dead.” “Worm” is apparently, then, a metonymy for “dead.” Precisely the same metonymy (“worm” for “worm-eaten”) occurs in 11QPs<sup>a</sup> XIX 1: תִּסְפֹּר חֲסֵדְכָהּ: כִּי לֹא רִמָּה תוֹדָה לִכְהָ וְלֹא תִסְפֹּר חֲסֵדְכָהּ: חֵי חַי יוֹדָה לִכְהָ וְלֹא רִמָּה תוֹדָה לִכְהָ וְלֹא תִסְפֹּר חֲסֵדְכָהּ, literally: “Surely a maggot cannot praise You, nor a grave-worm recount Your loving-kindness, but the living praise You...” (J. A. Sanders, *The Psalms Scroll of Qumran Cave 11* [DJD 4; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965], 40, 78).

<sup>40</sup> I assume that the poetic texts of the *Hodayot* are only a remnant of a vast literature that included similar literary units; see M. Kister, “Some Observations on Vocabulary and Style in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *Diggers at the Well: Proceedings of a Third International Symposium on the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Ben Sira* (ed. T. Muraoka and J. F. Elwolde; STDJ 36; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 159–65 (the table on p. 160 became garbled in publication).

<sup>41</sup> Compare the passages in *Joseph and Aseneth* cited below, n. 43.

<sup>42</sup> Cf. Nickelsburg’s statement: “Upon his entrance into the community, he passed from the sphere of death into the realm of life . . . In the author’s view, the decisive eschatological event has already happened; he is already sharing in the new life.” (*Resurrection*, 190). I for one doubt whether joining the community was perceived as an *eschatological* event in the strict sense of the word. Nor can I subscribe to Nickelsburg’s assertion that if one feels redeemed “he need not contemplate future death and resurrection because he is already participating in the blessings and privileges of the new life” (193). I do agree that the emphasis on the ontological metamorphosis that takes place in this world is at the expense of the eschatological transformation; I attribute it, however, mainly to a competing trajectory known already from the Hebrew Bible and continuing into rabbinic literature, as suggested above (p. 179). What has been said concerning Paul, that “he uses resurrection imagery in a powerful way . . . in order to show its transforming effect . . . but with a primarily metaphorical reference” (A. Chester, “Resurrection and Transformation,” *Auferstehung – Resurrection*, [above n. 38, 47–77, esp. 76] may also apply, *mutatis mutandis*, to the *Hodayot*. Belief in immortal life (which could well be part



C. SPIRITUAL DEATH AND DEATH TO THE WORLD  
*Philo; Joseph and Aseneth; Rabbinic Literature; Qumran*

The figurative usage of “dead” for the wicked or outsiders was quite widespread in ancient Judaism (as well as the notion of becoming alive by conversion).<sup>43</sup> The perception of life before conversion as death is present in the Pauline passage cited above. It reads: “yield yourselves to God as men who have been brought from death to life” (v. 13). This conception of spiritual death caused by iniquity is in tension with the notion dominant in this passage, namely the death of the believers with Christ as the key for their redemption (e.g. vv. 4–5). As Wedderburn puts it: “In this verse death is the state from which we must be saved . . . earlier in the chapter death is a saving event, for it is death with Christ to sin.”<sup>44</sup> Interestingly, the paradox that (real) life is gained by being “dead” also occurs in several sources of different provenance. A tradition preserved in the Baby-

---

of the author’s worldview) could contribute to undermine the total distinction between life and death.

<sup>43</sup> In a passage of the Jewish-Hellenistic work *Joseph and Aseneth* that is often cited as a parallel to the Pauline passage, Aseneth’s conversion is conceived of as becoming alive: “God . . . who gave life to everything and called them . . . from death to life . . . You, Lord, bless this virgin, renew her by Your spirit, refashion her by Your hidden hand, make her alive again by Your life” (8:9, 15:5, 20:7 [C. Burchard, ed., *Joseph und Aseneth kritisch herausgegeben* [PVTG 5; Leiden: Brill, 2003], 118–121; 15:5 [ibid., 188]; 20:7 [ibid., 254]). For a discussion of these passages see R. D. Chesnutt, *From Death to Life: Conversion in Joseph and Aseneth* (JSPS 16; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 145–49; 172–76 (where rabbinic parallels are discussed), 239. Chesnutt is right that the wording in *Joseph and Aseneth* is akin to rabbinic conceptions, and should not be construed as a ritual act and of initiation through which the whole personality is changed, and that it should be distinguished from pagan mystery rites. I think, however, that his conclusion, that “renewal” and “rebirth” are mere “metaphor” and “imagery,” downplays the sharp dichotomy between the two states of existence as perceived in these passages; some ontological change was conceived of as taking place in conversion. Jewish conceptions of conversion such as that of *Joseph and Aseneth* should not be confused with the Pauline ones, but the latter owe much to the former. Similar notions were widespread in divergent quarters of the Jewish world: they are found in rabbinic literature, as well as in the Gospels and at Qumran; see M. Kister, “Leave the Dead to Bury their Own Dead,” in *Studies in Ancient Midrash* (ed. J. L. Kugel; Harvard: Harvard University Press, 2001), 43–56; idem, “Divorce, Reproof, and Other Sayings in the Synoptic Gospels: Jesus Traditions in the Context of Qumranic and Other Texts,” in *Text, Thought, and Practice in Qumran and Early Christianity* (ed. R. A. Clements and D. R. Schwartz; STDJ 84; Leiden: Brill, 2009), 198–99. For an earlier discussion of the notion in rabbinic literature see E. Sjöberg, “Wiedergeburt und Neuschöpfung im palästinischen Judentum,” *Studia Theologica* 4 (1951/2): 44–85. According to the Jewish passages the rite of initiation *as such* (be it immersion or circumcision) is not of any particular ontological-soteriological significance, unlike Christian baptism.

<sup>44</sup> Wedderburn, *Baptism and Resurrection*, 44–45.

lonian Talmud: “What should one do to live? . . . Mortify himself . . . What should one do to die? . . . Keep himself alive.”<sup>45</sup> Another tradition, in *Avot de-Rabbi Nathan Version B* states: “If you wish not to die, die before you die. If you wish to live, do not live before you live (i.e., are resurrected);”<sup>46</sup> a similar paradox is discernible in Philo’s assertion (based on Greek and Hellenistic thought) that “in order to live, they die.”<sup>47</sup> Jews made use of both paradoxes of death: (a) *spiritual death*, before becoming a believer and (b) *death to the world* as describing the real life of the believer, are not unknown to Jewish sages.<sup>48</sup> The two distinctive, and somewhat conflicting, figures of death occur elsewhere in Pauline (and deutero-Pauline) writings.<sup>49</sup> Looking at the Pauline passage through this lens, one may conclude that in this case Paul merged two well-known metaphors concerning paradoxical conceptions of death and life that had existed in the Judaism of his time to function in a new context: for Paul, salvation is not merely the coming from death to life, nor is it merely dying to the world, but rather dying *with Christ* and participating in *His* resurrection. The tension in Paul’s phraseology is intelligible when considered not in isolation but as a result of weaving together two distinct paradoxical figures.

<sup>45</sup> *B. Tamid* 32a. מה יעביד איניש ויחיה? — ימית עצמו. מה יעביד איניש וימות? יחיה את. עצמו. In this tradition, the questions are put in the mouth of Alexander the Great and the answers are attributed to “Elders,” but it is quite likely that this dialogue is based on a proverb put in the form of questions and answers. For a similar paradox of death and life, following a saying of Herakleitus, see Philo, *Alleg. Interp.*, 1.108. For a possible parallel in the Gospels (Matt 16:25; 10:39; Mark 8:35; Luke 9:23–24; John 12:25) see Kister, “Leave the Dead,” 53.

<sup>46</sup> *Avot de-Rabbi Nathan Version B*, ed. Schechter, 71. See M. Kister, “Leave the Dead,” 52.

<sup>47</sup> Philo, *On Flight and Finding*, 59.

<sup>48</sup> I do not think that “Paul’s insistence on the death of an individual as a precondition of his true conversion” are related to some trajectory linking repentance with death (pace S. Ruzer, “The Death Motif in Late Antique *Teshuva* Narrative Patterns: With a Note on Romans 5–8,” in *Transformations of the Inner Self in Ancient Religions* (ed. J. Assmann and G. G. Stroumsa; SHR 83; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 151–65).

<sup>49</sup> E.g. Rom 8:10–11, 13; see Dunn, *Baptism*, 110; Col 2:12; See E. Schweizer, *The Letter to the Colossians: A Commentary* (London: SPCK, 1982), 144 n. 31. The use of an image by Paul with two different meanings in the same passage is not confined to this image or this theme; in 1 Thess 5:5–6, 10 Paul uses the image of “being asleep” in two different senses in juxtaposed verses: in vv. 5–6 it means to neglect piety, whereas in v. 10 it means to die; both senses are drawn from earlier usages of language, and Paul is not deterred by the inconsequence of the usage of this imagery in the same passage (see E. Best, *A Commentary on the First and Second Epistles of the Thessalonians* [BNTC; London: Adam and Charles Black, 1979], 218–19).



## D. BAPTISM, THE SPIRIT, AND BECOMING SONS OF GOD

*Serekh; Jubilees; Testament of Judah*

Paul refers in v. 3 to baptism as the point of transformation; elsewhere (e.g. Rom 8:1–2) he refers to “the Spirit” as transforming the believers in Christ. It has been argued that the purification and the bestowal of the Spirit in baptism were secondarily interpreted as an initiation sacrament of dying and rising in Christ.<sup>50</sup> This view is corroborated by a comparison of Paul’s assertions to the “sprinkling of the spirit of truth” (*Serekh*) used metaphorically of the eschatological purification. For Paul, baptism is not a purification rite per se, but rather baptism into Jesus Christ: becoming united with Jesus’ death and resurrection. This is another example of the dominance of Christological aspects in Pauline theology.

In Rom 8:11–14 we read:

(11) If the Spirit of him who raised Jesus from the dead dwells in you, he who raised Christ Jesus from the dead will give life to your mortal bodies also through His Spirit which dwells in you . . . (13) For if you live according to the flesh you will die, but if by the Spirit you put to death the deeds of the body you will live. (14) For all who are led by the Spirit of God are sons of God. (15) For you . . . have received the Spirit of adoption as sons (*υιοθεσία*), when we cry, ‘Abba! Father!’”

In Galatians 3:26–4:6 Paul states:

(3:26) In Christ Jesus you are all sons of God, through faith, (27) for as many of you as were baptized into Christ have put on Christ . . . (4:4) But when the time had fully come, God sent forth His Son, born of woman, born under the law, to redeem those who were under the law, (5) so that we might receive adoption as sons (*υιοθεσία*). (6) And because you are sons, God has sent the Spirit of His Son into our hearts, crying, “Abba! Father!”

There are several important differences between these two passages, including the role of the Spirit, its precise relationship to Christ, the manner in which it is received and the cry “Father”—none of these is quite the same in both passages. From the perspective of the present article, however, a similar phenomenon is evidenced in both: a Jewish structure is adapted to Paul’s Christological theology, as we shall presently see.

<sup>50</sup> Cf. R. Bultmann, *Theology*, 1.140–141 (§13). His thesis that this idea emerged in the Hellenistic Church on the basis of an analogy with pagan mystery religions is disputed in scholarship. But even if this thesis is rejected, his observation concerning the different interpretations of baptism seems valid.

A passage in the *Book of Jubilees* (1:15–25) supplies the evidence for the Jewish substrate for Paul's passages in Romans and Galatians:

They will return to me . . . with all (their) minds and all (their) souls . . . I will create a holy spirit for them and will purify them in order that they may not turn away from me from that time forever . . . I will become their father and they will become My sons. All of them will be called sons of the living God.<sup>51</sup>

According to this passage, sonship will be attained by the holy Spirit of God. The words "I will create a holy spirit for them and will purify them in order that they may not turn away from me from that time forever" are modeled after Ezek 36:25–27.

The granting of the holy spirit, according to the *Book of Jubilees*, will enable the transformation of the Jews and the bestowal of the status of God's sons upon (some of) the Jews.<sup>52</sup>

The passage of the *Book of Jubilees* has a striking parallel<sup>53</sup> in the *Testament of Judah*,<sup>54</sup> as can be seen in the following table, in which the two texts are compared:

---

<sup>51</sup> The translation here (and elsewhere in this article) is based on J. C. VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees: Translation* [CSCO 511 = SÆ 88; Leuven: Peeters, 1989], 5, with alterations.

<sup>52</sup> I do not agree with Charles' statement in his notes on *Jub.* 1:24, "Israelites are God's children according to our author by virtue of their physical descent from Jacob" (R. H. Charles, *The Book of Jubilees or Little Genesis Translated from the Editor's Ethiopic Text* [London: Adam and Charles Black, 1902], 7 [note to *Jub.* 1:24]); rather, sonship of God is conferred on Israel because of their repentance, the holy spirit, and their observance of the commandments. Charles also writes (*ibid.*): "In 2 Cor. vi 18 St. Paul takes directly these words of 2 Sam vii 14 and applies them to all Christians. In the text [= *Jubilees* – M. K.] they embrace all Israelites." For the allusion to 2 Sam 7:14 see below, n. 58. I intend to discuss 2 Cor 6:18 elsewhere.

<sup>53</sup> For a comparison between the two passages with a result different from the one suggested here, see J.M. Scott, *Adoption As Sons of God: An Exegetical Investigation into the Background of υιοθεσία in the Pauline Corpus* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1992), 109–17.

<sup>54</sup> M. de Jonge, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Critical Edition of the Greek Text* (Leiden: Brill, 1978), 76–77. The translation is based on M. de Jonge & H. W. Hollander, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Commentary* (SVTP 8; Leiden: Brill, 1985), 225–28. See the commentary of R. H. Charles, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs Translated . . . with Introduction, Notes and Indices* (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1908), 95.

*Testament of Judah* 23–24

(23:5) Until you return to the Lord with *perfect heart*, repenting and walking in the commandments of God, the Lord will visit you with mercy and bring you up from captivity among your enemies.

(24:1) And after these things a star will arise to you from Jacob in peace and a man will arise from my seed like the son of righteousness, walking with the sons of men in meekness and righteousness, and no sin whatever will be found in him. (24:2) And the heavens will be opened for him to pour out the blessings of the spirit of the holy Father,

*and he will pour out the spirit of grace upon you,*

(24:3) *and you will be sons to him in truth,*

and you will walk in His commandments, first and last.

*Book of Jubilees* 1

(1:15) . . . they will return to me from among the nations with *all their hearts* . . .<sup>55</sup>

Then I will gather them from among the nations . . .

(1:23) . . . they will return to Me . . . with *all their hearts* . . .<sup>55</sup>

*I will create a holy spirit for them and will purify them . . .*

(1:24–25) . . . they will perform My commandments.

*I will become their father and they will become My sons.*<sup>56</sup> *All of them will be called sons of the living God . . .*<sup>57</sup> *They will know that they are My sons and that I am their father in truth and in justice*<sup>58</sup>

<sup>55</sup> Both the *Testament of Judah* and the *Book of Jubilees* are based on Deut 30:1–8: “And when all these things come upon you . . . (2) and [you] return to the Lord your God . . . and obey his voice . . . with all your heart and with all your soul; (3) then the Lord your God . . . will gather you again from all the peoples . . . (5) and the Lord your God will bring you into the land . . . (6) And the Lord your God will circumcise your heart and the heart of your offspring, so that you will love the Lord your God with all your heart . . . (8) And you . . . shall keep all his commandments which I command you this day.”

<sup>56</sup> Both passages are based on Ezek 36:26–28: “A new heart I will give you, and a new spirit I will put within you; and I will take out of your flesh the heart of stone and give you a heart of flesh (27) And I will put My spirit within you, and cause you to walk in My statutes and be careful to observe My ordinances. (28) You shall dwell in the land which I gave to your fathers; and you shall be My people, and I will be your God;” cf. Deut 30:6; see also below, n. 52.

<sup>57</sup> The last phrase is based on Hos 2:1 (1:10): “Instead of what was said to them, ‘You are not My people,’ it shall be said to them, ‘Sons of the living God.’”

<sup>58</sup> In Ge’ez: *baret’ wabašedq* (J. C. VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees: A Critical Text*, 6. VanderKam translates freely: “in a just and proper way” (J. C. VanderKam, *The Book of Ju-*

The comparison between the two passages is revealing for elucidating the complex problem concerning the redaction of the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* and discerning its layers: as it is most likely that the two passages represent the same structure, it may be inferred that *Test. Judah* 24:1–2a is a messianic passage,<sup>59</sup> plausibly Christian,<sup>60</sup> interpolated into a Jewish text.<sup>61</sup>

The Pauline passages shift this structure—in two different variations—into a specifically Christological one:<sup>62</sup> Christology dominates pneumatology; the role of the holy Spirit in these passages is essentially inherited from Judaism.<sup>63</sup> Whereas in the Jewish passages the eschato-

---

*bilees: Translation*, 5). The expression “they are My sons and I am their father in truth and justice” in Jub. 1:25 is stylistically very similar to “you will be sons to Him in truth” in *Test. Judah* 24:3 (Hollander and de Jonge note *Test. Levi* 18:8, and remark: “In truth’ stresses the reliability of the promise” [*Testaments*, 228]). The expression in Jub. 1:25, however, is apparently based on Zech 8:8: “and they shall be My people and I will be their God in truth and in justice” (*be-emet u-bi-šedaqa*). This is corroborated by the parallel passage, Jub. 1:17: “I will become their God and they will become My true and righteous people.” The sentence “they will know that they are My sons and I am their father” (Jub. 1:25) was perceived in scholarship as alluding to 2 Sam 7:14: “I will be his father, and he will be My son” (referring to a king of David’s dynasty); see Charles, *The Book of Jubilees Translated*, 7 (note to Jub. 1:24); Scott, *Adoption*, 96–117. To my mind it is questionable, however, whether Jub. 1:25 does indeed allude to 2 Sam 7:14, which is not related to the sonship of Israel; I would tend to assume that it is a combination of Ezek 36:28 + Zech 8:8 and the similar formula in Hos 2:1 (see above, n. 57). The Davidic and messianic component in this passage is doubtful.

<sup>59</sup> The words “he will pour out the spirit of grace” refer in the original text to God, while in the present context they seem to refer to Christ.

<sup>60</sup> The possibility that these verses contain a radical messianic reworking of a basic text which was quite different from the present text cannot be altogether excluded (e.g., that the words “no sin whatever will be found in him” could theoretically be a reworking of similar wording concerning the state of the people in the eschatological period), but such a reconstruction is too hypothetical without further evidence, and it does also interrupt the neat parallel between *Testament of Judah* and the *Book of Jubilees*. Be that as it may, it should be noted that the Christian adaptation of this passage was *not* formulated according to Pauline passages.

<sup>61</sup> Contrast on the one hand Jürgen Becker’s suggestion that the whole passage, 24:1–4, is a Christian interpolation (J. Becker, “Die Testamente der zwölf Patriarchen” [JSHRZ 3; Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1974], 77 n. 4c), and on the other hand Scott (*Adoption*, 112), who argues for the integrity of the whole passage and for its authenticity as Jewish tradition.

<sup>62</sup> While the similarity in motifs has been noted, together with other Greco-Roman parallels (e.g., Jewett, *Romans*, 496–97), it has not been recognized, to the best of my knowledge, that the Pauline passages adapt and profoundly change a Jewish structure. This recognition is crucial for understanding the setting of Paul’s thinking.

<sup>63</sup> On Paul’s pneumatology and its background in the Hebrew Bible and in the Jewish writings of the Second Temple period, see J. A. Bertone, “*The Law of the Spirit*”: *Experience of the Spiritual and Displacement of the Law in Romans 8:1–16* (New York: Peter Lang,

logical bestowal of the status of sonship is related to the observance of the commandments, in Gal 4:4–5 it is explicitly stated that “those who were under the law” are not redeemed by the law, but rather by the sending of Christ. I do not suggest that Paul necessarily made use of the *Book of Jubilees*, but rather that he adapted a preexisting cluster of ideas for his theological thinking.<sup>64</sup>

In Romans, putting to death the deeds of the body is related to the idea of dying with Christ, whereas in Gal 3:26–27 it is baptism into Christ; the Spirit is, according to Galatians, “the Spirit of His Son.” Thus the idea of becoming sons of God is identified—in different nuances—with becoming one with Christ the Son of God.<sup>65</sup>

#### E. DOMINATION OF EVIL, THE HUMAN BODY, AND THE TORAH *Rabbinic Literature and its Antecedents; Damascus Covenant*

Linking of the human body with evil, an idea present in the *Serekh* and the *Hodayot*, is not exclusive to the Qumran sectarians, nor is it necessarily the product of a dualistic dichotomy in which the body is conceived of

---

2005). This interesting book contains a thorough analysis of Pauline passages (some of them dealt with in the present article) and their background. His general thesis is: “Pauline scholarship must give Pneumatology an equal place of prominence with Christology. It cannot simply be considered an appendage or shadow of Paul’s Christology” (316). From the specific perspective of the present article, however, Christology seems to be dominant over pneumatology.

<sup>64</sup> Schweizer’s suggestion that another Jewish structure was used in Gal 4:4 should also be taken into account (E. Schweizer, “Zum religionsgeschichtlichen Hintergrund der ‘Sendungsformel’: Gal 4:4f, Rm. 8:3f., Joh 3:16f, I Joh 4:9,” *ZNW* 57 [1966]: 199–210).

<sup>65</sup> For this idea and its background, see B. Byrne, ‘*Sons of God*’ – ‘*Seed of Abraham*’ (AnBib 83; Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1979). Byrne stresses that Paul’s *υιοθεσια* emerges out of the biblical notion of Israel’s sonship rather than from the Greek term for “adoption.” It should be noted, however, that Israel’s sonship is closely related to the concept of adoption (see S. M. Paul, “Adoption Formulae: A Study of Cuneiform and Biblical Legal Clauses,” in *Divrei Shalom: Collected Studies of Shalom M. Paul on the Bible and the Ancient Near East* [ed. S. M. Paul; CHANE 23; Leiden: Brill, 2005], 109–19. Note especially the Accadian counterpart adduced in this study [Paul, 118] to the expression *בניִים שמתנו לך* in 4QDivre ha-Me’orot [M. Baillet, *Qumran Grotte 4.III* (DJD 7; Oxford: Clarendon, 1982), 141]). Much of Scott, *Adoption As Sons of God*, is devoted to this subject. See also J. L. Kugel, “4Q369 ‘Prayer of Enosh’ and Ancient Biblical Interpretation,” *DSD* 5 (1998): 121–48, esp. 123, 126–31. This does not exclude the possibility that Paul himself, and certainly his addressees, thought also about “adoption” as known to them in the Roman world (E. W. Watson, *Paul, His Roman Audience, and The Adopted People of God: Understanding the Pauline Metaphor of Adoption in Romans as Authorial Audience* [Lewiston NY: Edwin Mellen Press, 2008]). For a discussion of *Jub.* 1:24–25 in the Jewish context, see Byrne, ‘*Sons of God*’, 30–31; Scott, *Adoption*, 107–109; Bertone, *The Law of the Spirit*, 196.

as evil. A similar linkage is attested in rabbinic literature and elsewhere as well.<sup>66</sup> Thus we read in *Avot de-Rabbi Nathan Version B*: “The evil inclination dwells at the entrance to the heart. When he [i.e., the evil inclination] wishes to commit a sin he forces all the bodily members of which he is a king (to sin).”<sup>67</sup> In a similar vein we read in another midrash: “(The Children of) Israel are immersed in sin because of the evil inclination *in their body*; but they repent and God forgives their sins every year, and He creates their hearts anew to fear Him, as it is said, ‘I will give you a new heart’” (Ezek 36:26).<sup>68</sup>

Sin, the evil power, or *yeseher ha-ra'* has dominion over humans.<sup>69</sup> The Hebrew verb used for this is שלט, the equivalent of the Greek verb κατατέω used by Paul. Thus we read in a tannaitic midrash: “I created for you *yeseher ha-ra'*. . . if you are engaged in the words of the Torah, he does not have dominion over you” (היו עסוקים בדברי תורה ואינו שולט בכם; *Sifre Deut.* 45, ed. Finkelstein 103). The Masoretic text of the biblical verse פעמי כן באתך ואל תשלט בי כל און (Ps 119:133) should probably be rendered “Keep my feet firm *by Your word*,<sup>70</sup> and let no sin gain dominion over me.”

<sup>66</sup> S. Ruzer, “The Seat of Sin in Early Jewish and Christian Sources,” in *Transformations of the Inner Self in Ancient Religions* (ed. J. Assmann & G. G. Stroumsa; SHR 83; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 367–91. Some of Ruzer’s arguments seem to me more relevant than others.

<sup>67</sup> *Avot de-Rabbi Nathan Version B*, ch. 17 (ed. Schechter, 36). See also the parallel in *Avot de-Rabbi Nathan Version A*, ch. 16 (ed. Schechter, 62–63); the latter passage was discussed in relation to Paul by Schweizer, “Die Sünde,” 438; Ruzer, “Seat of Sin,” 380. Elsewhere I have demonstrated that the rabbis’ *yeseher ha-ra'* internalizes a demonic power causing humans to sin (M. Kister, “Body and Purification from Evil: Prayer Formulas and Concepts in Second Temple Literature and Their Relationship to Later Rabbinic Literature,” *Meghillot* 8–9 [2010]: 243–284 [in Hebrew]). See also below, n. 69.

<sup>68</sup> *Ex. Rab.* 15:6 (this part of *Exodus Rabbah* belongs to the *Tanḥuma* literature): כך ישראל משתקעין בעונות מיצר הרע שיש בגופן וחוזרין בתשובה. Note that the renewal of Israel is not related here (as in the proof-text of Ezek 36:26) to eschatology, but rather to the annual atonement of Israel’s sins on the Day of Atonement; sin continues to exist even after the hearts are created anew by God.

<sup>69</sup> For the comparison of this rabbinic tradition concerning *yeseher ha-ra'* to Paul see, e.g., W. D. Davies, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism*, 23–24; H. P. Rieger, “Hieronymus, die Rabbinen und Paulus: Zur Vorgeschichte des Begriffspaares ‘innerer und äusserer Mensch,’” *ZNW* 68 (1977): 132–37.

<sup>70</sup> The word אמתך serves in Ps 119 both for the Torah (vv. 11, 50, 67, 103, 140, 148, 158, 162) as well as for God’s promise (vv. 41, 58, 76, 116 [לאמתך] 82, [כאמתך]). In the *Vorlage* of the Septuagint the reading was probably כאמתך (i.e., according to Your promise); The Psalms Scroll from Qumran reads לאמתך (“keep steady my step to Your word [i.e., Torah]”, J. A. Sanders, *The Psalms Scroll from Qumran Cave 11* [DJD 4; Oxford: Clarendon, 1965], 33). The latter reading should be interpreted as a supplication that God himself will guide the believer to the Torah; this is the reading on which 1QS III 9 is based.

The idea that Torah (both observance of the Torah's commandments and its study) is an antidote for sin is common and natural in Judaism. Against this background Paul's wording in v. 14 is startling: "Sin will have no dominion (ὁὐ κυριεύσαι) over you, since you are *not* under the Law [i.e., the Torah]." This wording of Paul is a precise inversion of the then-current Jewish Torah-theology.<sup>71</sup>

The principle that Torah is an antidote for sin gains another dimension when the (correct) observance of the Torah is possible only by joining a community. In this case, the initiation into the community becomes of crucial importance for the role of the Torah. Thus, according to the *Damascus Covenant*, after joining the Community, "on the day when a man takes upon himself by oath to return to the law of Moses [i.e., join the Community], the angel Mastema [i.e., the Devil] will turn away from him if he fulfills his words."<sup>72</sup> This means that, in contradistinction to the situation before joining the Community, sin (personified here as the Angel of Evil) has no more hold on a member of the Community as long as "he fulfills his words."<sup>73</sup> The idea that sin has no dominion on a person if he observes the Torah is applied in this assertion to the initiation rite into the Community, a rite that marks an ontological change.<sup>74</sup> The accent here is not on the *innate* transformation, but rather on a factual change, so to speak, that accompanies the event of joining the Community in which salvation is achieved. These statements are two sides of the same coin. Paul stresses the role of baptism to Christ (Rom 6:3), and it seems that the absence of sin's dominion (6:14) is related to it.

#### F. DEATH AND FREEDOM FROM SIN

##### *Biblical Antiquities and Rabbinic Literature*

Paul makes it clear that by being dead with Christ, the believers are free from sin, "for he who has died is justified from sin" (v. 7); furthermore, because the believers are "dead to sin" (v. 11), death has no dominion over

<sup>71</sup> For similar inversions of Torah-theology in Paul's epistles see M. Kister, "Romans 5:12–21 against the Background of Torah-Theology and Hebrew Usage," *HTR* 100 (2007): 391–424.

<sup>72</sup> CD XVI 4–6.

<sup>73</sup> Interestingly, no similar restriction is mentioned in the Pauline text.

<sup>74</sup> M. Kister, "Demons, Theology and Abraham's Covenant (CD 16:4–6 and Related Texts)," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls at Fifty: Proceedings of the 1997 Society of Biblical Literature Qumran Section Meetings* (ed. R. A. Kugler and E. M. Schuller; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1999), 167–84.



them (v. 14). Apparently this argument relies on another set of Jewish concepts. After death, says a Jewish author who might be (roughly) Paul's contemporary, "the desire for sinning (*cupiditas peccandi*) will cease, and the evil inclination (*plasmatio iniqua*; *yeşer ha-ra'*) will lose its power" (*Biblical Antiquities* 33:3). Similar statements are found in midrashic literature concerning the dead: according to one passage, "as long as a human being lives, he is a slave . . . of his Creator and of his evil inclination (*yeşer*) . . . when he is dead, he is set free."<sup>75</sup> Another midrash on the words **יְשֵׁר בְּמַתִּים חַפְשֵׁי** (Ps 88:6) is strikingly similar to verses Rom 6:6–7:<sup>76</sup>

"As a slave is set free when his tooth or his eye is injured (Exod 21:26–27), a human being<sup>77</sup> is set free from sin by dying, through the loss of his 248 bodily members."<sup>78</sup>

<sup>75</sup> *Ruth Rabbah* 3:1: עבד ליוצרו [אדונים], עבד ליוצרו: האדם הזה כל זמן שהוא חי הוא עבד לשני יצרים . . . מת יצא לחרות, ועבד חפשי מאדניו ועבד ליצרו. The symmetry that is created in the first part of the saying, between God and the evil inclination is false, and the ideal is to become free from the evil inclination, but not from God. See D. Flusser, "Paul's Paulinism," in idem, *Jewish Sources in Early Christianity* (Tel Aviv: Sifriyyat Po'alim, 1979), 377 (in Hebrew) for the relationship between this saying and Paul; idem (with S. Safrai), "The Slave of Two Masters," in idem, *Judaism and the Origins of Christianity*, 169–72 (concerning Matt 6:24, Luke 16:13, and the readings of the midrash).

<sup>76</sup> The fact that rabbinic literature in general, and this midrash in particular, are centuries later than Paul should not deter us from comparing the passages, or from considering the midrash as helpful in interpreting Paul's background. It has been demonstrated time and again that much of the material in rabbinic literature is ancient, and that very early material is found in later rabbinic compilations. In our case the possibility of Christian influence can be excluded: the idea is documented in Jewish sources; moreover, even without knowing the specific aggadah, a reader of Paul could assume that he adapts such a notion to the purposes of his own Christological theology.

<sup>77</sup> As in many general sayings in rabbinic literature, a Jew is meant here.

<sup>78</sup> *Tanḥuma Noah* 13. The medieval work *Gen. Rabbati* (ed. Albeck, 63) preserves another, probably early version of this midrash, perhaps from another unknown recension of the *Tanḥuma* (which may well represent a more ancient wording): ר' יעקב עבד ליה: הפטרה: ומה אם עבדו קנין כספו אדם סמא את עינו או הפיל את שנו אמר הב"ה יצא לחירות בגלל שהכהו ועשה בו מום, אדם שמת אין דין שיצאו ר"מ אבריו לחירות מן העונות, דכתיב במתים חפשי (for the term הפטרה see P. Mandel, "Customs of Lament and Condolences in Babylonia and in the Land of Israel in the Talmudic Period," in *Studies in Talmud and Ancient Midrashic Literature in Memory of Tirzah Lifshitz* [ed. M. Bar-Asher, J. Levison and B. Lifshitz; Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 2005], 397–400 [in Hebrew]). For a similar statement, albeit with a different message, see *b. Ber.* 5a: "Tooth and eye are only one limb of a person, and still a slave is set free if they are injured; how much more so with painful sufferings which torment one's whole body," מה שן ועין שהן אחד מאבריו של אדם עבד יוצא, בהן לחירות, יסורין שממרקין כל גופו של אדם על אחת כמה וכמה 3.232) failed to note the illuminating parallel to Rom 6:7 in the *Tanḥuma*. Many scholars have connected Paul's statement in v. 7 to the atonement achieved by death according to sayings in rabbinic literature (following K. G. Kuhn, "Röm 6:7," *ZNW* 30 [1931]: 305–10 see, e.g., Dunn, *Romans* 1–8, 320–21; Fitzmyer, *Romans*), while others express reservations



Whereas according to this midrash the deceased are free from the power of evil, according to Paul the believers have *already* died to sin *in their lives* through the death of Christ. This move is in close juxtaposition to Paul's assertion "Do you not know . . . that the law is binding on a person only during his life?" (Rom 7:1)—an assertion that is related to a midrash on the very same verse (Ps 88:6)<sup>79</sup>—which is applied by Paul to the believers who "have died to the law through the body of Christ" (7:4). A new Christological shift is given in this passage to the Jewish notions according to which death *per se* changes the human condition and sets one free from sin (as well as from observing the law): one is dead to sin and to the law by dying *with Christ*.

G. THE BATTLE WITH WICKEDNESS,  
TRANSFORMATION OF THE BODY, AND LAW  
*Qumran Fragments*

According to some other fragmentary texts from Qumran the limbs, that had belonged to the realm of darkness and in which wickedness had resided, were transformed when God put knowledge and understanding in one's heart and limbs. Two of these fragments include military imagery of the battle in which one participates, and in which the bodily members take part, against the forces of evil. Thus we read in 4Q444 1–4 i:

ואני מיראי אל בדעת אמתו פתח פי ומרוח קודשו ] <sup>o</sup>	1
אִמְתָּ לְכָן] אל] ויהיו לרוחי ריב במבניתי חוק]י אל	2
] בתכמי בשר ורוח דעת ובינה אִמְתָּ וצדק שם אל בל]בבי	3
] זה ותתחזק בחוקי אל ולהלחם ברוחי רשעה ולזא ] <sup>o</sup>	4

1 And I, God's exorcist,<sup>80</sup> He opened my mouth by the knowledge of His truth, and by His holy spirit [

2 . . . and they became spirits of combat (ריב) in my structure (= body, מבניתי), the law[s of God ]

(e.g., Wedderbrun, *Baptism and Resurrection*, 64). I do not think that this idea is related to Paul's statements in this passage (For different interpretations of v. 7, see Käsemann, *Romans*, 170; R. Scroggs, "Romans 6:7," *NTS* 10 [1963]: 104–108).

<sup>79</sup> *b. Šabb.* 30a; *y. Kil.* 9:4 (32a). See also E. E. Urbach, *The Sages: Their Concepts and Beliefs* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1975), 297. I am not convinced by the ingenious reconstruction of the Christological midrashic interpretation of Ps 88:6, according to the Septuagint, that underlies Paul's thinking (W. Diezinger, "Unter Toten Freigeworden: Eine Untersuchung zu Röm. III – VIII," *NT* 5 [1962]: 268–98), although the biblical verse might have been part of the setting for Paul's thinking.

<sup>80</sup> The word מיראי is probably מירא (pronounced: *meyyare*), exorcist; see: J. A. Baumgarten, "The Qumran Songs against Demons," *Tarbiz* 55 (1986): 444–45 (in Hebrew).

- 3 [                    in] the organs of flesh (תכמי בשר), and spirit of knowledge and understanding, truth and justice, God put in my he[art]  
 4 [                    ] it is strengthened in the laws of God, and fights the spirits of iniquity<sup>81</sup>

Two damaged fragments of another text, 4Q511, similar in terminology and setting to 4Q444, should also be mentioned here.

One fragment (4Q511 28–29) reads:

- |  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
|  | כִּי־אֵל לְמַעַן כְּבוֹדָהּ   | 2 |
|  | [ש]מֵתָה דַעַת בְּסוֹד עִפְרֵי לָהּ [לְלֹכָה] וְאֵנִי מִצִּירּוֹק יֵצֵר               | 3 |
|  | [חֲמֵר] קִוְרָצְתִּי וּמַחוּשָׁךְ מִגִּבְּרֵי [הֵ] הֵּ [וְעוֹלָה בְּתַכְמֵי בְּשָׂרִי | 4 |

- 2                    For, for the sake of Your glory  
 3 You have [p]laced knowledge in my foundation of dust in order to p[raise You]; and I am a formation of ???<sup>82</sup>  
 4 [from clay?] I am molded, and of darkness is my knea[ding], ... and iniquity in the organs of my flesh (בשרי תכמי)<sup>83</sup>

Another fragment (4Q511 8–49) reads:

- |  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
|  | כִּי־אֵל בְּתַכְמֵי   | 3 |
|  | בְּשָׂרֵי יִסּוּדֵי דֹסֵ] וּבִגְוִיֵּתִי מִלְחַמּוֹת חוֹקִי | 4 |
|  | אֵל בַּלְבָּבִי   | 5 |
- 3                    for in the organs  
 4 of my flesh (בשרי) is the foundation of [    and in] my body wars, the laws  
 5 of God in my heart<sup>84</sup>

In these fragments we encounter several terms and notions reminiscent of Paul. The “flesh” and “the bodily members” were the residence of sin (4Q511 28–29 4) and were initially created “from darkness.” In these bodily members “God put spirit” (4Q444 1–4 3), by all probability to be identified with “the holy spirit” (*ibid.*, l. 1). If the body (before it undergoes transformation) belongs to the realm of darkness (4Q511 28–29 4) it might be considered as obeying “the laws of darkness,” mentioned in a different context in 1QM XIII 12.<sup>85</sup> This would form an analogy to the Pauline

<sup>81</sup> E. Chazon, “444. Incantation”, in *Qumran Cave 4.XX: Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part 2* (ed. E. Chazon et al.; DJD 29; Oxford: Clarendon, 1999), 372–77.

<sup>82</sup> The Hebrew word מצירוק is unintelligible.

<sup>83</sup> M. Baillet, *Qumrân Grotte 4.III (4Q482–4Q520)* (DJD 7; Oxford: Clarendon, 1982), 235.

<sup>84</sup> M. Baillet, *Qumrân Grotte 4.III*, 243.

<sup>85</sup> וכל רוחי גורלו מלאכי חבל בחוקי חושך יתהלכו. To be sure, the confrontation between the law(s) of God and the “laws of darkness” mentioned in 1QM is certainly not the innate confrontation in one’s personality.

concept of “the laws of sin in the members” opposing the law of God in Rom 7:22–23. The battle with wickedness also plays an important role (4Q444 1–4 i 4; 4Q511, 48–49 4). The battle in these fragments is between the “evil spirit(s)” and the “holy spirit,” while the “laws of God” are placed in the heart of the believer and probably also in his bodily members; in Paul the battle is between “the law of sin in the members” and “the law of God” (Rom 7:22–23), while the “law of the Spirit of life in Christ” (Rom 8:2) wins the battle and sets the captive free (Rom 7:23, 8:2). The similarity in terminology and structure between Paul and the scrolls is no less significant than the remarkable dissimilarity between them. It should be emphasized, of course, that the term “law” has quite a different meaning in each system.

The battle imagery occurs in Romans 6, albeit implicitly: “Do not yield your members to sin as weapons (ὄπλα) of wickedness, but yield . . . your members to God as weapons (ὄπλα) of righteousness” (v. 13). The translocation “weapons, armor” for ὄπλα (rather than “instruments”) is evident when comparing our passage to others, such as Rom 13:12–14.<sup>86</sup> The latter passage is clearly dualistic:<sup>87</sup> the believers are called to “put on the armor (ὄπλα) of light” (13:12) as against “put off (or: cast off)<sup>88</sup> the works of darkness” (13:12) and these are described in detail in the next verse (13:13); so far the “weapons of light” in 13:12–13 might have been interpreted, then, works of light<sup>89</sup> (cf. the imperative in Rom 6:13). In the verse that immediately follows, however, Rom 13:14a, we find the imperative “put on the *Lord Jesus Christ*.” This phrase constitutes the shift towards Christology in a context that might very well be otherwise inherited.

A military imagery similar to the last line of the 4Q444 quoted above occurs also in the Epistle to the Ephesians (usually considered deutero-Pauline), ch. 6. The theological setting of the epistle is a dualistic worldview, of a war between God and the devil, darkness and light (Eph 5:8; cf. Rom 13:12–13). At the end of this epistle we read:<sup>90</sup>

<sup>86</sup> See, e.g., Käsemann, *Romans*, 177. Cf. 1 Thess 5:8.

<sup>87</sup> The parallel in 1 Thess 5:8 is also of a dualistic nature; see Best, *Commentary on First and Second Thessalonians*, 212–18.

<sup>88</sup> These are two readings of the text: ἀποθώμεθα (“put off”), and ἀποβαλώμεθα (“cast off”). For the purposes of the present article we do not have to determine which of the two readings is original.

<sup>89</sup> Such a reading would cohere with Rom 13:14b: “make no provision for the flesh, to gratify its desires;” cf. Rom 6:12.

<sup>90</sup> Similarities between Qumranic writings and the Epistle to the Ephesians were noted long ago. See, e.g., K. G. Kuhn, “The Epistle to the Ephesians in the Light of the Qumran Texts,” in *Paul and Qumran: Studies in New Testament Exegesis* (ed. J. Murphy-

Finally, be strong (ἐνδυναμοῦσθε)<sup>91</sup> in the Lord and in the strength of his might. Put on the whole armor (πανοπλίαν) of God, that you may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil... against the spiritual hosts of wickedness...<sup>92</sup>

A comparison of Rom 6 with Rom 13 teaches us that vestment imagery is plausibly implied also in Rom 6:13: the believer should put on new armaments.<sup>93</sup> The words “put on the Lord Jesus Christ” (Rom 13:14) are closely related to Paul’s assertion elsewhere: “For as many of you as were baptized into Christ have put on Christ” (Gal 3:27).

#### H. PUTTING ON THE SPIRIT AND THE TRANSFORMATION OF THE BODILY MEMBERS AND CHARACTER *“Prayers of Transformation” in Barkhi Nafshi and Another Qumran Fragment*

The imagery of “putting on Christ” has a striking parallel in another fragment from Qumran, describing the transformation of someone who has joined the community. It occurs in the work called in scholarship *Barkhi Nafshi*, which refers to a community that seems to have a character similar to that of the *Serekh* and the *Hodayot*.<sup>94</sup>

According to a fragmentary passage of this work,<sup>95</sup> God is described as removing from the elect the evil spirit (“the spirit of calamity”) and putting on him “the spirit of salvation”:

---

O'Connor; London: Chapman, 1968), 115–131; F. Mussner, “Contributions made by Qumran to the Understanding of the Epistle to the Ephesians,” *ibid.*, esp. 174–76.

<sup>91</sup> Compare: אל ותתחזק ברוחי אל (4Q444 i 4).

<sup>92</sup> Eph 6:10–12.

<sup>93</sup> Note that such an imagery could well be interpreted, at least in some passages (not necessarily in all), as related to wearing armor rather than to wearing a new robe or clothes. This is not elaborated in C. H. Kim, *Clothing Imagery in the Pauline Corpus* (London: T & T Clark, 2004).

<sup>94</sup> I think it is quite likely (judging both by content and phraseology) that this work is “sectarian;” contrast G. J. Brooke, “Body Parts in Barkhi Nafshi and the Qualifications for Membership of the Worshipping Community,” in *Sapiential, Liturgical and Poetical Texts from Qumran* (ed. D. K. Falk, F. García Martínez and E. Schuller; STDJ 35; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 79–94, esp. 79–81. Unlike Brooke, I see no good reason to connect the description of the bodily members in *Barkhi Nafshi* with Qumranic texts related to physiognomy and physiology.

<sup>95</sup> A composite text of 4Q438 4a ii b-d 4 and 4Q437 4 ii (see M. Weinfeld and D. R. Seely, “Barkhi Nafshi,” in *Qumran Cave 4.XX: Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part 2* [ed. E. G. Chazon et al.; DJD 29; Oxford: Clarendon, 1999], 322 and Qimron’s forthcoming edition).

ותעב[ר ממני א]ת[ר]ח[ה]מחותה ורוח ישועות הלבשתני

You remo[ved from m]e [the spi]rit of calamity, and put on me the spirit of salvation.

The expression “to wear (God’s) spirit” occurs in the Hebrew Bible (e.g., 2 Chr 24:20), as does the expression “to wear/clothe with salvation” (e.g., Isa 59:17, 61:10). The expression רוח ישועות הלבשתני (“You clothed me with the spirit of salvation”) combines the two biblical expressions. It seems also to be related to Isa 26:18–19: הרינו חלנו כמו ילדנו רוח ישועת בל נעשה: ארץ ובל יפלו ישבי תבל. יחיו מתיד נבלתי יקומו הקיצו ורננו שכני עפר (according to the punctuation of MT the two words רוח and ישועות do not belong together, but they were read as a construct phrase in the Septuagint, which seems secondary). One may wonder whether the transformation described here is related to the resurrection in Isa 26:19, but the wording of Isa 26:18 is so obscure<sup>96</sup> that any suggestion to this effect would be hypothetical. Be that as it may, in *Barkhi Nafshi* the transformation is expressed as putting on the “spirit of salvation.” As we have seen, for Paul the transformation is “to put on Christ,” (Gal 3:27). Christ is related in Paul’s thinking to the Spirit,<sup>97</sup> and thus “putting on the Spirit” can be easily reshaped to “putting on Christ.”<sup>98</sup> Comparing Paul’s writings to passages of the Second Temple period corroborates time and again the dominance of Christ and Christology in the Pauline theology, to which other conceptions are assimilated.

In another fragment of the same work (*Barkhi Nafshi*) there is a detailed description of the transformation of the individual who has joined the Community. It reads:<sup>99</sup>

- להתבונן..... 2  
 בעלילותיכה אשר עשיתה בשני קדם שני דור ודור שכל עולם אשר 3  
 [שמת] ה לפני ותנצור תולתכה לפני ובריתכה אמנתה לי ותחזק על לב 4  
 .5 [עבדכה] ללכת בדרכיכה. לבי פקדתה וכליותי שננתה בל ישכחו חוקיכה.

<sup>96</sup> For this reason I have not attempted to render the verse in English.

<sup>97</sup> The exact relationship is notoriously ambiguous in the Pauline epistles. The details are much debated in scholarship (for a short survey of the Holy Spirit in the Pauline oeuvre see recently T. Paige, s.v. “Holy Spirit,” *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters* [ed. G. F. Hawthorne and R. P. Martin; Downers Grove, Illinois, 1993], 404–13).

<sup>98</sup> “[Paul] would probably equate putting on Christ with receiving the Spirit of Christ . . . The coming of the Spirit in terms of enclothing is found in both the Old Testament and in early Christian thought” (Dunn, *Baptism*, 110; see the references cited there). The vestment imagery in *Barkhi Nafshi* is even closer: the latter, like Paul, uses this imagery to describe the effects of the initiation to the community.

<sup>99</sup> 4Q436 1 i 2 – ii 4 reconstructed with the help of 4Q435 2 i. Some readings and restorations are according to Qimron’s forthcoming edition.

6. [על לבי כתב] אֵה תורתכה וכליותי פתחתה. ותחזק עלי ( ) לרדוף אחרי דרכיך[ה]  
 7. [לעשות כול רצון] זכנה. ותשם פי כחרב חדה ולשוני פתחתה לדברי קודש, ותשם  
 8. [עליהמה שבט] מוסר בל יהגו בפעולות אדם בשחת שפתי. רגלי חזקתה  
 9. [ללכת בדרכיך]ה ובידכה החזקתה בימיני ותשלחני בשׁ[ע].  
 10. [לב האבן ג] ערתה ממני ותשם לב טהור תחתיו. יצר רע גער[תה] מ...].  
 1. [ורוח קוד]ש שמתה בלבבי. זנות עינים הסירותה ממני ותבט עׁ[יני אל]  
 2. [דר]כיכה. עזרף קשה שלחתה ממני ותשם ענוה. זעף אף הסירותה [ממני]  
 3. ותשם לי רוח ארוך אפים. גבה לב ורום עינים התמותה ממני רוח שקר  
 4. אבדת ] [ה ולב [נד]כה נתתה לי. יצׁר]

i.2. to gain an understanding of

3. Your deeds which You performed in years gone by, years of ages past; (to meditate on) the eternal wisdom which  
 4. [Yo]u [have set] before me; and You have preserved Your Torah for me, and have confirmed Your covenant to me. And You have fortified the heart  
 5. [of Your servant], so that he may walk in Your ways. You have commanded my *heart*, and my *kidneys*<sup>100</sup> You have taught well, lest they<sup>101</sup> neglect Your statutes.  
 6. [On my heart] You [have written] Your Torah; my *kidneys* You have opened (to it); and You have strengthened my *feet*<sup>102</sup> so that I may pursue You[r] ways,  
 7. [and perform whatever pleases] You. And You have made my *mouth* like a sharp sword, and my *tongue* You have set loose to (utter) holy words. And You have set  
 8. [upon them a staff] of reproof<sup>103</sup> lest they meditate upon the deeds of mankind, upon the destruction (emerging from) his *lips*.<sup>104</sup> My *feet* You have strengthened,  
 9. [to walk in Your ways] and with Your hand You have taken hold of my right *hand*, and You have set me free [?]. In the [  
 10. [The heart of stone] You have [dri]ven<sup>105</sup> from me, and have set a pure *heart* in its place. The evil mind [יצר רע] [You] have driven [from...]  
 ii.1. [and ?????]<sup>106</sup> You have set in my *heart*. Adulterousness of the *eyes* You have removed from me, (so that) my e[yes] might behold

<sup>100</sup> A more idiomatic translation to English would be: "my inner parts," but in Hebrew "kidneys" play an important role in human psychology. The writer refers here to specific organs, like heart and kidneys. The literal translation is therefore retained here.

<sup>101</sup> The pronoun "they" refers to the "kidneys."

<sup>102</sup> The Qumran manuscript reads עלי. I suggest that this word is a graphic error for רגלי.

<sup>103</sup> Cf. Sir 23:2.

<sup>104</sup> The translation of the last words is uncertain.

<sup>105</sup> See below, n. 110.

<sup>106</sup> Reconstructing ש[ורוח קוד] is possible, but is no more than a guess.

2. [Your w]ays.<sup>107</sup> The stiffness of *neck* You have taken off<sup>108</sup> from me, and You have made it into humility. Wrath (רַעַף רַעַף)<sup>109</sup> You have removed [from me]
3. and have set in me a patient spirit. Haughtiness of *heart* and arrogance of *eyes* You have smelted (like dross) from me; A spirit of deceit
4. You have destroyed and a [con]trite *heart* You have given to me. [You... ] mind

The absolute change of one's character is described here by referring to the body parts in each verse. In lines 4–9, parts of the body are mentioned in a positive context, whereas in line 10 and in the following lines of the next column the text describes the replacement of wicked parts by better ones. As we saw above (p. 178), the wording of *Barkhi Nafshi*, “haughtiness of heart and arrogance of eyes *You have smelted out* (like dross; התמותה) *from me; a spirit of deceit You have destroyed . . .*” is a striking parallel to the wording of the *Serekh* (IV 20–21). In *Barkhi Nafshi*, as in Paul, the transformation takes place in the present (or the past), by joining the body of believers. According to *Barkhi Nafshi*, “eternal wisdom” (שכל עולם) is made available by God's grant to (some) human beings, who can properly study God's statutes and understand His deeds; this is the cause of the transformation these human beings undergo. In this passage, a part of the transformation is the removal of *yeşer ra'*, here probably in the sense of evil mind that is compared to evil spirit,<sup>110</sup> and “the spirit of deceit” (רוח שקר).

*Barkhi Nafshi* is a thanksgiving hymn to God for the transformation bestowed by Him. Elsewhere in Qumran we have supplications for such a transformation. God is asked to grant the elect new and pure bodily

<sup>107</sup> The expression “Adulterousness of the eyes” is used at Qumran in the sense of inappropriate understanding of God's commandments according to human opinions, in contradistinction to walking in God's way.

<sup>108</sup> Or: “sent away.” The Aramaic (and perhaps also the Hebrew) root שלח has also the meaning of “take off,” which is more suitable in the present context.

<sup>109</sup> Literally: “Wrath of nose.” Although רַעַף certainly has the metaphorical meaning “anger,” it has also the basic meaning of “nose” (related in biblical Hebrew to the conception of anger).

<sup>110</sup> On the various meanings and divergent conceptions of *yeşer ra'* see Kister, “Body and Purification” The verb *ga'ar* used here for *yeşer ha-ra'* is common for exorcism; see Kister, “Body and Purification,” 273 n. 140; E. Tigchelaar, “The Evil Inclination in the Dead Sea Scrolls, with a Re-Edition of 4Q468,” in *Empsychoi Logoi: Religious Innovations in Antiquity: Studies in Honour of P. W. van der Horst* (ed. A. Houtman, A. de Jong and M. Misset van de Weg; AJEC 73; Leiden: Brill, 2008), 351. The formula יצר (ה)רע occurs in later rabbinic prayers, see N. Wieder, *The Formation of Jewish Liturgy in the East and the West* (Jerusalem: Yad Ben-Zvi, 1998), 131 n. 27 (in Hebrew). For the continuation of liturgical formulae from Antiquity to the Middle Ages, see Kister, “Body and Purification,” 244–49.

members, but in fact (as in *Barkhi Nafshi*) the granting of virtuous characters is expressed by idioms and expressions in which the bodily parts are included.

Another fragmentary prayer found at Qumran reads:<sup>111</sup>

[ב]לב נדכה התחנן לו ]  
 [ ורום עינים לב ערל ]  
 [ ם רום לבב זאף אף ה]

With] a contrite heart supplicate to him [  
 ] and arrogance of *eyes* uncircumcised *heart* [  
 ] haughtiness of *heart*, wrath (ףאף אף)<sup>112</sup>

Such supplications occur not only in Qumranic compositions, in which a strong belief in predestination may be expected, but also in later rabbinic prayers, as we shall see in section J.

#### I. COLOSSIANS 3 AND THE "PRAYER OF TRANSFORMATION" IN BARKHI NAFSHI

A striking parallel to the transformation described in *Barkhi Nafshi* occurs in the Epistle to the Colossians. Many scholars doubt its Pauline authorship, while others accept it; but even if this epistle is not genuine, it clearly elaborates on Pauline ideas at a date not much later than Paul's own lifetime. There, a transformation similar to the one in Romans 6 is described:

5. Put to death therefore your bodily members which are earthly: fornication, impurity, passion, evil desire, and covetousness, which is idolatry . . .
8. But now put them all away: anger, wrath, malice, slander, and foul talk from your mouth.
9. Do not lie to one another, seeing that you have taken off the old man with its practices
10. and have put on the new (one), who is being renewed in knowledge after the image of its creator.
11. Here there cannot be Greek and Jew, circumcised and uncircumcised, barbarian, Scythian, slave, free man, but Christ is all, and in all.

<sup>111</sup> 4Q184 2 4–6 (J. M. Allegro, *Qumran Cave 4.I* [DJD 5; Oxford: Clarendon, 1968], 84. Fragments 2 and 3 were combined by Licht, followed by Qimron in his forthcoming edition. The suggestion that the two fragments should be combined seems to me appealing, but for our purpose we may deal only with fragment 2.

<sup>112</sup> Literally: "Wrath of *nose*."



12. Put on then, as God's chosen ones, holy and beloved, compassion, kindness, lowliness, meekness, and patience,
13. forbearing one another and, if one has a complaint against another, forgiving each other; as the Lord has forgiven you, so you also must forgive.
14. And above all these put on love, which binds everything together in perfect harmony. (Col 3:5–14)

The affinities of this text to the second fragment cited above from *Barkhi Nafshi* (above, p. 196) are clear. As has been observed by commentators of the New Testament, the conjunction of the list of vices with the term “members” in v. 5a is rather abrupt, and various attempts have been made to ease the difficulty.<sup>113</sup> In the Qumran texts cited above in the previous section of the present article, virtues and vices are expressed by Hebrew idioms containing parts of the body. David Seely rightly stated concerning the passage of *Barkhi Nafshi*: “the range of bodily parts alluded to creates a sense of God changing the entire person.”<sup>114</sup> The “entire person” does not have a specific term in the Qumran text; the “entire person” in Colossians is “the old man”, mentioned already in Rom 6:6, and its antonym, “the new one,” that is mentioned in Col 3:10, while in vv. 8 and 12 putting off of vices and putting on of virtues is specifically described.<sup>115</sup> Perhaps this is what Paul called *καὶνὴν ἀτίσις*, (literally “new creation,” but its Hebrew equivalent, *בריאָה* [בריה] *חדשה*, also means “new creature” and “new man.”)<sup>116</sup> Vestment imagery is employed to express the transformation of

<sup>113</sup> See P. T. O'Brien, *Colossians, Philemon* (WBC 44; Waco, Texas: Word Books, 1982), 177; for the whole discussion see *ibid.* 176–78. Many translations render verse 5a freely; for instance: “Put to death therefore what is earthly in you” (RSV); “So put to death whatever in your nature belongs to the earth” (NET).

<sup>114</sup> D. R. Seely, “Implanting Pious Qualities as a Theme in the *Barkhi Nafshi* Hymns,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years after Their Discovery: Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20–25, 1997* (eds. L. H. Schiffman, E. Tov and J. C. VanderKam; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society & The Shrine of the Book, 2000), 331.

<sup>115</sup> For a suggestion that the expressions “putting off the old man” and “putting on the new man” have their origin in Greek philosophical terminology, see P. W. van der Horst, “Observations on a Pauline Expression,” *NTS* 19 (1972/73): 181–87, in which previous suggestions and parallel expressions in Greek and Hebrew are also reviewed.

<sup>116</sup> The expression occurs in 2 Cor 5:17 and Gal 6:15. “The pair ‘old man’ – ‘new creation’ might be antithetically related” (M. V. Hubbard, *New Creation in Paul's Letters and Thought* [SNTSMS 119; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002], 100; for a discussion of the term “the old man” in Rom 6 see *ibid.*, 97–100; for a discussion of *καὶνὴν ἀτίσις* see *ibid.* 222–32). While many scholars assume that the term *καὶνὴν ἀτίσις* refers to an eschatological new creation, others opt for its interpretation through the Hebrew expression (for a review of former suggestions see Hubbard, *New Creation*; also Foerster, *TDNT* s.v. *καίλιω*, 3.1034–35). The expression *בריאָה חדשה* is attested only in rabbinic literature (for a survey of the passages see Sjöberg, “Wiedergeburt und Neuschöpfung”). In other cases Paul creates an antonym to an existing term (e.g., “last Adam” as an an-

characters and behavior for the better. It has been noted that this imagery in Colossians may be related to similar imagery in the Hebrew Bible;<sup>117</sup> in *Barkhi Nafshi* this imagery is employed for describing the transformation of the initiated, and thus the similarity to Colossians is striking, although I by no means suggest any specific link between the two texts. The passage in Colossians may be influenced by Jewish conceptions and expressions, however; it may even be hypothesized that the passage seeks to express in Greek the relationship between the bodily members and the personal characteristics so natural in Hebrew. This does not exclude the possibility that Hellenistic notions also played a role in this imagery. One thing that can be inferred from the Qumranic passage is that the vestment imagery is at least not *necessarily* related to pagan mystery religions (nor is it necessarily related to wearing new clothes after baptism).<sup>118</sup>

J. "PRAYERS OF TRANSFORMATION:" FURTHER MATERIAL  
*Barkhi Nafshi; Hodayot; Rabbinic Liturgy*

In this section I will deal mainly with more material from Qumran and later rabbinic literature in which similar ideas to those of *Barkhi Nafshi* (above, section H) are reflected. Eventually, this discussion will be of some significance also for the comparison of the Pauline passages and the material from Qumran.

---

tonym to "first Adam;" *ἕαυτὸν ἐκέκωσεν* [Phil 2:7] – perhaps an antonym to *πλήρωμα* [G. G. Stroumsa, "Form(s) of God," *HTR* 76 (1983): 283]. The word *בריאה*, or *בריה*, in the sense of "creature," "human being" is attested already in Qumran (*בריאות הבשר* [4Q287 2] = "creatures of flesh;" *בריאות ה[ב]רואות* [ה]לך *ערום לפני* [ה]לך, if the reading is correct, in 4Q466 10 ii 10 probably means "human beings"). In a medieval rabbinic biblical commentary a mule is called *בריה חדשה*, "a new creature": it is a mixture of a horse and a donkey, but it is neither (*Leqah Tov Genesis* 36:24). This usage could fit Gal 6:15 ("For neither circumcision counts for anything, nor uncircumcision, but a new creation"), but this usage is not documented in earlier layers of Hebrew.

<sup>117</sup> See, e.g., van der Horst, "Observation," 182.

<sup>118</sup> Contrast Wedderburn's statement, in which he concedes the influence of the mystery religions (in spite of his general reluctance towards this view): "It seems to me undoubtedly true that the widespread convention of attiring priests and worshippers in the manner of their deities would have made this particular New Testament usage a great deal more intelligible in the Graeco-Roman world, and may indeed have suggested to early Christians this step beyond the language of the Septuagint which speaks of a metaphorical wearing of moral and religious qualities like righteousness. For all around them they saw the adherents of the various pagan cults, 'putting on' their deities, dressing up as them and imitating their actions" (Wedderburn, *Baptism and Resurrection*, 339).

We have noted that in *Barkhi Nafshi* the transformation experienced by the convert is described as a transformation of bodily parts. This is clear also from another passage of the work in which this experience is described:

In the abundance of His mercy He has favored the needy and has opened their *eyes* so that they may see His paths, and their *ears* so that they may hear His teaching. He has circumcised the foreskin of their *heart* and has saved them because of His grace and has set their *feet* firm on the path.<sup>119</sup>

This description is quite similar to three passages in the *Hodayot* that complement each other:

[Yo]u, O my God, have set my *feet* in the way of Your heart. And You have disclosed to my *ear* reports [of Your wonders], and (have given) my *heart* to understand Your truth. For an *ear* is closed to Your teachings until [You open it], and an [erring spirit devoid of] knowledge. You expelled from my *bodily members* (תכמי), and hardne[ss of heart and . . . will not be] anymore a stumbling-block of iniquity for me.<sup>120</sup>

My *eyes* are shut to the sight of evil, and my *ears* (closed) to the shedding of blood, my *heart* is laid waste to the thought of evil . . .<sup>121</sup>

[Ho]w can I see if You do not open my *eyes*, and hear if You do not open my *ears*? [. . .] my [*he*]art is laid waste. For to someone who had been of uncircumcised *ear*, speech has been disclosed, and [. . .] *heart* [shall conceive (God's) wo]nders.<sup>122</sup>

In these three passages the opening of the eyes, the ears and the heart are described: their opening to Godly matters is simultaneously their becoming closed to evil. In the first passage, the “feet” are also mentioned in the usual figurative context. In the second and the third passages, two verses from Isaiah are used. The first verse used is השם לב העם הזה ואוזניו יבין ושב ורפא לו “Lay waste the heart of this people, make their ears heavy and make their eyes shut, so that they may see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and understand with their hearts, and repent and be healed” (Isa 6:10 according to 1QIsa<sup>a</sup>); this verse is interpreted positively (contrary to the plain sense of the biblical passage): the ears, the eyes and the heart are indeed

<sup>119</sup> 4Q434 frg. 1 i 3–4.

<sup>120</sup> 1QH<sup>a</sup> XV 40 – XVI 3 reconstructed with the help of parallel manuscripts from Qumran (Schuller, DJD 40.199, 216; Qimron, I, 81–82).

<sup>121</sup> 1QH<sup>a</sup> XV 5–6.

<sup>122</sup> 1QH<sup>a</sup> XXI 5–6.

<sup>123</sup> ישמעו בלבבו in 1QIsa<sup>a</sup>.

closed—being closed to evil; one’s (spiritual) blindness and deafness are indeed merits, for they mean being blind and deaf to evil and devoid of evil in one’s heart; the negative idiom “my heart was laid waste” becomes a positive one, namely: there is no evil in the heart.<sup>124</sup> The second verse used in the *Hodayot* is *ברע עיניו מראות ברע ועצם עיניו מראות ברע* “who seals his ears from hearing of bloodshed, and shuts his eyes from looking upon evil” (Isa 33:15).

Interestingly, this pattern of prayer occurs far beyond the boundaries of “Qumranic literature,” the “Qumran community” or “sectarianism.” A prayer of “a certain student” (ההוא תלמידא) is recorded in some manuscripts of the *Babylonian Talmud* (but absent in others):<sup>125</sup>

עצום עיני מראות ברע  
ואזני מלשמוע דברים בטלים  
ולבי מלהרהר בדבר רע  
וכליותי מלחשוב עבירה  
והדרך רגלי אל מצותיך ואל צדקותיך  
ויפנו רחמך עלי  
להיות מן הנותרים והנשארים לחיים בירושלם

Close my eyes so that they do not see evil  
And my ears so that they do not hear idle talk  
And my heart (so that it does not have) evil thought  
And my kidneys (so that they do not) devise transgression  
And lead my feet to Your commandments and Your righteousness  
And may Your mercy be turned towards me  
So that I will be among those who are left and survive in Jerusalem  
(*b. Ber.* 17a, according to MS Munich 95)

This prayer, like 1QH<sup>a</sup> XV 2–3, is deeply influenced by Isa 33:15, but unlike the biblical verse the rabbinic prayer clearly belongs to the pattern of “prayers of transformation.” According to this prayer, as in 1QH<sup>a</sup> XV 2–3, the transformation, described by reference to the bodily members, takes place by means of God’s mercy.

The words “be among those who are left and survive in Jerusalem” allude to Isa 4:3–4: “and he who is left in Zion and survives in Jerusalem will be called holy, everyone who has been recorded for life in Jerusalem, when the Lord shall have washed away the filth of the daughters of Zion and cleansed the bloodstains of Jerusalem from its midst by a spirit of

<sup>124</sup> See W. H. Brownlee, *The Meaning of the Qumran Scrolls for the Bible* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1964), 186–87. I differ from the translation suggested by Brownlee.

<sup>125</sup> The prayer is absent in several manuscripts of the *Babylonian Talmud*, including some Genizah fragments; one cannot be sure therefore that it is original in the Talmud.

judgment and by spirit of burning.” Reading together verses 3 and 4 yields a remarkable similarity to the notion of the cleansing of the bodily members in the scrolls. Although the prayer is mainly concerned with the existential transformation of the supplicant, at the end of the prayer there is also an eschatological allusion, much like Paul’s ambiguity concerning the relationship between the inner transformation and the eschaton.

Another prayer that belongs to this pattern is recited in prayers for the Day of Atonement (and other occasions). The different versions of this prayer in Jewish liturgy need further study.<sup>126</sup> The final wording of the prayer might be medieval, but it is quite possible that this form of the prayer was constructed in Late Antiquity. Be that as it may, this prayer belongs to the literary pattern discussed here, in which the worshipper asks God to purify his body from every evil. It says:<sup>127</sup>

וכוף את יצרינו להשתעבד לך  
והכניע ערפינו לשוב אליך  
חדש כליותנו לישמור פיקודיך  
ומול את לבבינו ליראה את שמיך  
ככ>תוב< בת>ורתך< ”ומל ה’ אלהיך את לבבך ואת לבב זרעך...“

Subdue our (evil) inclination (*ysrenu*) to be enslaved to You  
And subjugate our [stiff] necks to return to You  
And renew our kidneys to observe Your commandments  
And circumcise our hearts to revere Your name,  
As it is written in the Torah: “And the Lord Your God will circumcise your heart and the heart of your offspring” etc. (Deut 30:6)

This is a supplication for a transformation in the present, in spite of the eschatological verse quoted at its end, Deut 30:6. As I have noted above (p. 179), the use of biblical eschatological verses for non-eschatological situations is much broader than in Qumran and Paul.

The pattern of prayers concerning the purification and renewal of the bodily members is well attested not only in Qumran, but also in rabbinic prayers. The theological framework for the expressions in *Barkhi Nafshi* and in the *Hodayot* should by no means be identified with their counterparts in rabbinic prayers, but nevertheless they share a similar pattern of prayer. Likewise, the general assumptions concerning the human

<sup>126</sup> For preliminary notes see Kister, “Body and Purification from Evil,” 276–77 nn. 154–158. Some manuscripts add the words: “and purify our body from every bad thing, thought of transgression, and sin” (וטהר את גויתנו מכל דבר רע הרהור עבירה ועון).

<sup>127</sup> J. Mann, “Genizah Fragments of the Palestinian Order of Service,” *HUCA* 2 (1925): 331.

condition underlying the prayers also seem to be similar: the possibility of transformation and purification of the human body from the evil that normally abides in it.

One important distinction between the Pauline passages and the Jewish prayers, both Qumranic and rabbinic, is that the Pauline (as well as the deutero-Pauline) passages are exhortations for the believers (including many imperatives), whereas the Jewish material (from various Jewish quarters) is in the form of supplications or thanksgiving prayers. To some extent, the difference between the Jewish prayers (in Qumran and elsewhere) and the exhortations in the Pauline epistles might be explained by the different genres. Yet, the *lack* of a supplication or direct thanksgiving in the Pauline oeuvre seems remarkable; it might point towards a different religious experience.

#### CONCLUSION

With the help of the Dead Sea scrolls and other material, including midrashic literature (in which many ancient traditions are recorded), we may better recognize the Jewish matrix of Paul's assertions and thought. The revolutionary character of the Pauline passage in Romans 6 (and elsewhere), as well as of deutero-Pauline passages, may be better appreciated against the foil of the Jewish motifs and traditions. To be sure, there is no decisive proof in this case that Paul (or the deutero-Pauline passages) used a specific Jewish text. There is, however, a highly interesting pattern of affinities between Paul and Jewish texts, both Qumranic and rabbinic. If these were the building blocks for the Pauline text, they were used to construct a new edifice: each of the elements was put into the new Christological soteriology, so essential to Paul. The transformation of the human body of the elect and the freedom from sin that is gained by the holy spirit are documented in the scrolls (and in other Jewish texts); so is the battle and the vestment imagery. It should be noted that the passages of the Dead Sea Scrolls describe the transformation of an individual; the striking parallel between these passages and the Pauline epistles makes the interpretation of the latter as referring not to individuals but rather to a collective entity less appealing.<sup>128</sup> These ideas are merged with the notion of freedom from the domination of evil that is attained through

---

<sup>128</sup> Contrast, e.g., Tannehill, *Dying and Rising*, 24–30, 50–51, followed by many scholars.

death, an idea that occurs in rabbinic literature and is creatively applied by Paul to those who are “dead to the world through Christ.” In the Pauline passages, the transformation of the believer is achieved not by immersion as a purification rite but rather by being baptized into Jesus Christ and thus dying and gaining new life with Him.

A detailed description of the transformation that takes place while joining the community is found in the Qumran text *Barkhi Nafshi*, which has important similarities not only to Romans 6 but also to Colossians 3. The transformation described in this text, as well as in other Qumranic works, could be thought of at first glance as the product of a closed community to which one has to convert in order to gain entry. A broader look, however, proves that this is not the case: the same pattern of prayer was employed in rabbinic liturgy for hundreds of years after Qumran. What unites these compositions is not only their literary form, but also their underlying, basic assumptions concerning the human condition: the possibility of transforming the human body from its status as the seat of evil into a more purified form. These wide-ranging ideas were adopted and adapted by the Qumran community, and later by early Christianity, to the circumstances of specific communities that claimed a new state of existence for those who had joined them. I do not however suggest a necessary dependence of the early Christian material on works from Qumran.

New discoveries open new horizons for comparison. The texts that have been preserved are only a small segment of the religious works of ancient Judaism. Notwithstanding the great importance of the new material from Qumran, rabbinic material often illuminates both Qumran writings and Paul’s epistles as much as it is illuminated by them. Although rabbinic compilations should be dated hundreds of years after Qumran and Paul, they preserve many ancient traditions, doctrines and ideas.

Although biblical passages like Ezek 36 heavily influenced the ideas discussed in this article, one may discern in the post-biblical material new sensitivities, notably the relation to the human body. The interrelationship between similar ideas in different religious contexts is essential to our discussion. The present article has dealt with the evolution of different works, most remarkably the *Testament of Judah*. Comparison with passages of the literature of the Second Temple period and analysis of clusters of biblical verses embedded in the work provide clues for isolating its original layer.

The Pauline passages, while weaving together earlier Jewish ideas and phrases, reshape them time and again and create them anew by subordinating them to Paul's Christology (e.g., the role of the holy spirit) and by stressing the exclusive role of Christ in salvation.

By comparing Paul to the Jewish texts of various corpora (Qumran, Pseudepigrapha, rabbinic literature), one may gain a new perspective for considering ambiguities, tensions and incoherence in the Pauline oeuvre: sometimes they reflect a tension present in different Jewish trajectories, or ideas competing within Judaism prior to Paul. This perspective should be acknowledged before starting the elusive, if necessary, search for Paul's coherent theology.





IMAGE OF GOD AND IMAGE OF CHRIST:  
DEVELOPMENTS IN PAULINE  
AND ANCIENT JEWISH ANTHROPOLOGY<sup>1</sup>

Friedrich Avemarie †

*University of Marburg*

A. DIVERGING VIEWS IN GENESIS AND PAUL

From a Christian perspective, it is a fundamental—and highly audacious—tenet of biblical anthropology that humankind was created “in God’s image and according to God’s likeness” (cf. Gen 1:26). However, within the Bible itself this tenet is affected by a strange discontinuity, an irritating discrepancy between the Old and New Testaments or, more precisely, between the book of Genesis and the letters of Paul.<sup>2</sup>

The book of Genesis anchors the notion of God’s image in its creation account. Through narration it links the idea to the making of the first human couple, and it does so in a way that includes their entire offspring, thus giving it universal scope.<sup>3</sup> In Gen 1:26–27 it furthermore connects the idea to the distinction between male and female, the capacity of procreation and the dominion of humankind over both earth and animals.

---

<sup>1</sup> A German version of this paper was presented at Tübingen in May 2010; it was translated into English for the conference at Metz in June 2011 and has been revised and expanded for publication. My thanks go to both audiences for inspiring discussions and to Dr Andrew Doole for his invaluable help in improving my English.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. S. Vollenweider, “Der Menschgewordene als Ebenbild Gottes: Zum frühchristlichen Verständnis der Imago Dei,” in idem, *Horizonte neutestamentlicher Christologie: Studien zu Paulus und zur frühchristlichen Theologie* (WUNT 144; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002), 53–70 (55); M. Gielen, “Grundzüge paulinischer Anthropologie im Licht des eschatologischen Heilsgeschehens in Jesus Christus,” *Jahrbuch für Biblische Theologie* 15 (2001): 117–47 (134–35).

<sup>3</sup> This is clearly presupposed in the prohibition of homicide in Gen 9:6. It is also suggested by the plural forms in the mandate of multiplication and stewardship in Gen 1:26–28. The New Testament too reflects such an understanding, as in Jas 3:9 and 1 Cor 11:7 (see below). Gen 5:1–3 however is ambiguous; cf. A. Schüle, “Made in the ‘Image of God’: The Concepts of Divine Images in Gen 1–3,” *ZAW* 117 (2005): 1–20 (8).

This last, by the way, also comes to mind when considering the ancient Near Eastern background of the term **םלצ**.<sup>4</sup>

Paul however does not speak of *primordial man* but of *Christ* being God's image, and as a pattern for *humankind* he advances the notion of an "image of Christ." This image of Christ, furthermore, is in his view not part and parcel of humankind's original nature but an effect of the believers' *eschatological transformation* into, or *conformation* with, Christ. The outstanding results of this conformation he expects to be glory and immortality rather than dominion, gender or procreation.

Christ is said to be God's image in 2 Cor 4:4. Paul here explains that the unbelievers are prevented by the devil "from seeing the light of the gospel of the glory of Christ (τῆς δόξης τοῦ Χριστοῦ), who is the image of God (εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ)."<sup>5</sup> The context shows that the idea of Christ being the image of God is in Paul's view closely related to the expectation of the believers' transformation into the image of Christ, as this transformation is mentioned only a few verses before in 2 Cor 3:18. Here too the motif of glory (δόξα) plays a prominent role, as it does throughout the whole of 2 Corinthians 3:

And all of us, seeing with unveiled faces, seeing the glory of the Lord (τὴν δόξαν κυρίου) as though reflected in a mirror (κατοπτριζόμενοι), are being transformed (μεταμορφούμεθα) into the same image (τὴν αὐτὴν εἰκόνα) from one degree of glory to another (ἀπὸ δόξης εἰς δόξαν); for this comes from the Lord, the Spirit.<sup>6</sup>

While Paul often speaks of himself when he uses the first person plural, ἡμεῖς δὲ πάντες at the beginning of this verse clearly refers to a group, and this group in all likelihood includes (at least) himself and his addressees,<sup>7</sup> which in turn implies that what he says holds for Christian believers in

<sup>4</sup> Cf. W. Groß, "Gen 1,26.27; 9,6: Statue oder Ebenbild Gottes? Aufgabe und Würde des Menschen nach dem hebräischen und dem griechischen Wortlaut," *Jahrbuch für Biblische Theologie* 15 (2001): 11–38, *passim*; B. Janowski, "Die lebendige Statue Gottes. Zur Anthropologie der priesterlichen Urgeschichte," in *Gott und Mensch im Dialog*, (ed. M. Witte; FS O. Kaiser; BZAW 345; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2004), vol. 1, 183–214, *passim*; Schüle, "Made in the 'Image,'" 5–7.

<sup>5</sup> Translations of biblical quotations follow the NRSV unless otherwise indicated.

<sup>6</sup> The understanding of the genitive πνεύματος as apposition seems reasonable especially in view of the preceding v. 17, where κύριος and πνεῦμα are identified with each other. Further possibilities are discussed by M. E. Thrall, *2 Corinthians 1–7* (ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2004), 287; T. Schmeller, *Der zweite Brief an die Korinther*, vol. 1 (EKKNT 8/1; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, Ostfildern: Patmos, 2010), 229.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Schmeller, *Der zweite Brief*, 224–25.

general.<sup>8</sup> The “image” into which they are said to be transformed is qualified as the “same,” which sounds like a reference to a previous mention of this image; however, since the preceding context does not explicitly mention an εἰκών, the image that is referred to is probably implied in what is here most likely to imply such a notion, namely the verb κατοπτρίζομαι,<sup>9</sup> which denotes the reflection of a mirror or, as in the present context, the perception of its reflection.<sup>10</sup> That the image reflected from this mirror must be the image of Christ is apparent not only from similar statements concerning eschatological transformation in Rom 8:29 and 1 Cor 15:49 (see below) but also from 2 Cor 4:6. For even though it may be difficult to establish whether δόξα κυρίου in 3:18 refers to the glory of *God* (as is suggested by Paul’s Old Testament background<sup>11</sup>) or to the glory of *Christ* (which may seem preferable in view of δόξα τοῦ Χριστοῦ in 4:4<sup>12</sup>), Paul’s mention in 4:6 of “the light of the knowledge of the glory of God (τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ) in the face of Jesus Christ”<sup>13</sup> shows that even for perceiving the glory of *God* he considers Christ the medium *par excellence*. Hence, if 3:18 attaches the vision of the “glory of the Lord” to an “image,” this image is in

<sup>8</sup> Cf. Thrall, *2 Corinthians 1–7*, 282.

<sup>9</sup> I am following here the argumentation of J. Lambrecht, “Transformation in 2 Cor 3,18,” *Bib* 64 (1983), 243–54 (244–45). Whether the metaphor calls for an (allegorical) identification of the “mirror” seems doubtful to me; for a variety of possible readings, see however B. C. Blackwell, *Christosis: Pauline Soteriology in Light of Deification in Irenaeus and Cyril of Alexandria* (WUNT 2/314; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 186–87.

<sup>10</sup> For discussions of the possible meanings of κατοπτρίζομαι in the present context, see Thrall, *2 Corinthians 1–7*, 290–92; Gielen, “Grundzüge,” 138–39; A. Weissenrieder, “Der Blick in den Spiegel. II Korinther 3,18 vor dem Hintergrund antiker Spiegeltheorien und ikonographischer Abbildungen,” in *Picturing the New Testament* (ed. A. Weissenrieder et al.; WUNT 2/193; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005), 313–43 (316–31).

<sup>11</sup> Cf. e.g. Thrall, *2 Corinthians 1–7*, 283. S.S. Lee, *Jesus’ Transfiguration and the Believers’ Transformation: A Study of the Transfiguration and Its Development in Early Christian Writings* (WUNT 2/265; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009), 76, wants to rule out this possibility on the basis of his assumption that “ὁ κύριος in Paul refers to Christ as a technical title, with an exception of quotations” (*ibid.*, 74, cf. 45). However, even if this rule should allow no other exceptions, the argument is pointless regarding 2 Cor 3:18 as Paul may have used δόξα κυρίου as a conscious allusion to biblical language.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. e.g. Schmeller, *Der zweite Brief*, 227.

<sup>13</sup> Paul seems to refer here to a past experience of his own, presumably his Damascus experience; cf. C. Dietzfelbinger, *Die Berufung des Paulus als Ursprung seiner Theologie* (WMANT 58; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 2nd ed., 1989), 62–64; G. Dautzenberg, “Überlegungen zur Exegese und Theologie von 2 Kor 4,1–6,” *Bib* 82 (2001): 325–44 (329–33); Schmeller, *Der zweite Brief*, 248; H.-J. Eckstein, “So haben wir doch nur einen Gott: Die Anfänge trinitarischer Rede von Gott im Neuen Testament,” in idem, *Kyrios Jesus: Perspektiven einer christologischen Theologie* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 2010), 3–33 (20).

all likelihood the image of Christ. Thus, being the effigy of God, Christ is at the same time the mould for our own conforming. And as appears from 2 Cor 4:7–12, this conforming includes participation not only in the glory that emanates from the image of Christ—which is possibly expressed by ἀπὸ δόξης εἰς δόξαν in 3:18<sup>14</sup>—but also in his suffering and death.<sup>15</sup>

In Rom 8:29–30 Paul's line of thought is less complicated:

For those whom he (i.e. God) foreknew he also predestined to be conformed (συμμόρφους) to the image of his Son, in order that he might be the firstborn among many siblings<sup>16</sup>. And those whom he predestined he also called; and those whom he called he also justified (ἐδικαίωσεν); and those whom he justified he also glorified (ἐδόξασεν).

Here conforming to Christ is said to entail that all believers become his siblings. A brief chain argument then enumerates a series of further consequences, the climax of which is, again, the bestowal of divine glory. While 2 Cor 3:18 speaks of transformation in the present tense (μεταμορφούμεθα), Rom 8:29–30 has the finite verbs in the aorist, which seems to suggest that what God preordained has already become reality.<sup>17</sup> Whether this variation in tenses should be taken as suggestive of an extended process<sup>18</sup> or, perhaps, as indicative of a change in Paul's views need not be decided here. At any rate, either possibility would be consonant with 1 Cor 15:49, which, being chronologically the earliest reference to the image of Christ in the Pauline epistles, envisages the conforming to this

<sup>14</sup> This seems to me the most natural reading of this expression: glory that comes “from” the image of Christ turns “into” glory of ourselves. For a similar reading see Blackwell, *Christosis*, 190. It is the same idea as in Phil 3:21: Christ “will transform the body of our humiliation so that it may be conformed to the body of his glory (σύμμορφον τῷ σώματι τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ).” Most exegetes however take ἀπὸ δόξης εἰς δόξαν to refer to the processual or incremental character of the transformation; cf. NRSV (as quoted above); Gielen, “Grundzüge,” 140; J. Lambrecht, “From Glory to Glory (2 Corinthians 3,18): A Reply to Paul B. Duff,” *ETL* 85 (2009): 143–46; Schmeller, *Der zweite Brief*, 228 (with further references).

<sup>15</sup> This is a main point in S. Lorenzen, *Das paulinische Eikon-Konzept: Semantische Analysen zur Sapientia Salomonis, zu Philo und den Paulusbriefen* (WUNT 2/250; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), esp. 211–56. See also Blackwell, *Christosis*, 188–89 (and the index, s.v. “suffering”).

<sup>16</sup> NRSV: “firstborn within a large family.”

<sup>17</sup> Cf. e.g. R. Jewett, *Romans: A Commentary* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007), 529; J. R. Harrison, *Paul and the Imperial Authorities at Thessalonica and Rome: A Study in the Conflict of Ideologies* (WUNT 273; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 157; on 2 Cor 3:18 also Vollenweider, “Der Menschgewordene,” 59 (“dass diese künftige Herrlichkeit schon in die Gegenwart hereinstrahlt”).

<sup>18</sup> As argued in detail by Gielen, “Grundzüge,” 141–44.

image as an element of the expected eschatological resurrection of the dead and hence as a *future* event:

Just as we have borne the image of the man of dust (i.e. Adam), we shall [or: should<sup>19</sup>] also bear the image of the man of heaven (i.e. Christ).

The difference between the image of Adam and the image of Christ is the difference between our present, earthly and “psychic” body that will perish, and the future, heavenly, pneumatic and imperishable body of our resurrection. It has been suggested that the idea of “bearing” these images is inspired by the carrying of statues in cultic processions in Paul’s pagan environment;<sup>20</sup> but as he certainly does not want to intimate that the image of Adam has been carried around by us like a statue, he presumably does not want to present the bearing of the image of Christ as the carrying of a statue either. The metaphor is rather comparable to that of “clothing oneself with Christ” in Gal 3:27 (cf. also 1 Cor 15:53–54), and what Paul means is apparently an *endowment* with a particular kind of bodily nature, the very endowment he describes as a conforming in Rom 8:29.

Phil 2:6 may perhaps be counted as a further reference in Paul’s undisputed letters to the idea of Christ being God’s image.<sup>21</sup> Although he does not speak here of God’s εἰκὼν but of his μορφή (“form”), his use of μεταμορφούμεθα in 2 Cor 3:18 and συμμόρφους in Rom 8:29 shows that μορφή and its derivatives for him had a distinct affinity to the concept of εἰκὼν. It has even been suggested that by ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ Phil 2:6 alludes to Gen 1:26–27 and therefore deals with Christ’s earthly humanity rath-

<sup>19</sup> The grammatical form is problematic. What is to be expected is the future tense φορέσομεν, “we shall bear”; the conjunctive φορέσωμεν, “we should bear,” is however clearly better attested. Hence one must either reckon with orthographical negligence, facilitated by the levelling of the vowel quantities in Koine Greek (cf. F. Blass, A. Debrunner, F. Rehkopf, *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch* [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 17<sup>th</sup> ed., 1990], § 28; W. Schrage, *Der erste Brief an die Korinther*, 4. Teilband [EKKNT 7/4; Düsseldorf: Benziger, Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 2001], 312, n. 1532) or one must assume a hortatory digression within Paul’s line of thought in 1 Cor 15:42–52, which otherwise is entirely in the indicative (cf. e.g. C. Janssen, *Anders ist die Schönheit der Körper: Paulus und die Auferstehung in 1 Kor 15* [Gütersloh: Gütersloher, 2005], 219–21. Cf. *ibid.* and Schrage, *loc. cit.*, n. 1532 and 1533, for further references).

<sup>20</sup> Cf. G. van Kooten, *Paul’s Anthropology in Context: The Image of God, Assimilation to God, and Tripartite Man in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity* (WUNT 232; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 72–73.

<sup>21</sup> A very explicit reference is of course Col 1:15, but I would here side with those who regard Colossians as Deutero-Pauline. The question of whether Paul was the author of the Philippians hymn may remain open for the present purpose, although I am inclined to believe he did.

er than with his pre-existence.<sup>22</sup> However, as in view of Paul's idea of an eschatological *transformation* into the image of Christ it seems rather unlikely that at the same time he considered created humankind to be *inherently*, and in its entirety, endowed with *imago Dei*,<sup>23</sup> such an assumption, while not impossible,<sup>24</sup> by no means imposes itself.<sup>25</sup> Furthermore, while according to 2 Cor 4:4 Christ "is" (ἐστίν) the image of God, Phil 2:6 says that he was "in" (ἐν) the form of God. This rather cautions against taking εἰκὼν θεοῦ and μορφὴ θεοῦ as synonymous, even if *au fond* it may have been one and the same idea that Paul referred to by these expressions.

The Old Testament idea of *imago Dei* as a natural endowment of all humankind plays only a marginal role in Paul's thinking. In those of his letters that have come down to us he refers to it only once, and only with a modification likely to appear to modern readers as a sexist distortion. In connection with his claim that women should veil their heads when praying and prophesying, he explains in 1 Cor 11:7–9:

For a man ought not to have his head veiled, since he is the image and glory (εἰκὼν καὶ δόξα) of God; but woman is the glory of man. Indeed, man was not made from woman, but woman from man. Neither was man created for the sake of woman, but woman for the sake of man.<sup>26</sup>

Paul here connects the concept of God's image from Genesis 1 with the creation of woman as man's helper according to Genesis 2. This allows him to infer a difference between man and woman suitable to legitimise a gender-related dress code for Christian gatherings. His argumentation draws exclusively on the biblical creation stories; mediation through Christ does not play a role.<sup>27</sup> This distinguishes 1 Cor 11:7–9 fundamental-

---

<sup>22</sup> Cf. e.g. G. Howard, "Phil 2:6–11 and the Human Christ," *CBQ* 40 (1978): 368–87. Further proponents of such a reading are discussed in J. Habermann, *Präexistenzaussagen im Neuen Testament* (Europäische Hochschulschriften 23/362; Frankfurt am Main: Lang, 1990) 141–47. (My thanks go to my student Marie Henkys for having drawn my attention to this discussion.)

<sup>23</sup> On 1 Cor 11:7 as a (partial) exception see below.

<sup>24</sup> In this case, τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ must of course be seen as *res rapienda* rather than *res raptā*. The whole of 2:6–8 can then be paraphrased as follows: "Christ, although by birth he was in God's image, in distinction from Adam and Eve did not aspire to "be like God" (cf. Gen 3:5) but chose for himself the fate of a slave—confining himself to his human nature, he humiliated himself to the point of dying on the cross," etc.

<sup>25</sup> Against the background of Philo's Logos speculation (see below), it seems quite possible—and indeed likely—that Paul not only assumed Christ's pre-existence but considered also the pre-existent Christ the image of God.

<sup>26</sup> Translation adapted from the NRSV, with "glory" in both cases replacing "reflection."

<sup>27</sup> This holds regardless of the reference in 1 Cor 8:6 to Christ's mediation of creation.

ly from all other Pauline texts mentioned so far. It is however—as Phil 2:6 should in all likelihood be ruled out—the only passage in Paul that deals with a universal creational *imago Dei*.

Does this mean that Paul's concepts of *imago Dei* and *imago Christi* are essentially independent of Gen 1:26–27, “daß ... Gen 1, 26f mit den eigentlichen paulinischen Eikon-Aussagen nichts zu tun hat”<sup>28</sup>? It is the purpose of the present contribution to show that this is not the case. The tradition-historical connection between the biblical creation account and Paul's εἰκὼν-Christology is however indirect.<sup>29</sup> It can be retrieved only through a network of variegated references and allusions to Genesis 1 scattered over a wide range of ancient Jewish literature. The primary key to this connection lies in the Genesis interpretation of the Jewish Middle-Platonist Philo of Alexandria.<sup>30</sup>

## B. PAUL AND PHILO

If we address the details, Philo's notion of *imago Dei* admittedly differs from that of Paul. There are however two features in his interpretation of the biblical creation account which *mutatis mutandis* strikingly recur in Paul's discourse on conforming to the image of Christ.

First, according to Philo man is not the *immediate* image of God. Rather, the image proper is the divine Logos as an intermediate between God and humankind. The Logos is God's εἰκὼν while man is only a copy,

<sup>28</sup> This was emphatically stated by P. Schwanz, “Der Wandel in der Gottebenbildlichkeits-Vorstellung vom Neuen Testament zur frühen Patristik,” *Kairos* 16 (1974): 268–94 (278).

<sup>29</sup> Pace Blackwell, *Christosis*, 195.

<sup>30</sup> The hypothesis of a gnostic *anthropos* myth as part of the common background of Paul and Philo need not be discussed here. In former scholarship it was quite a popular requisite in explaining Paul's εἰκὼν-Christology; cf. F.-W. Eltester, *Eikon im Neuen Testament* (BZNW 23; Berlin: Töpelmann, 1958); J. Jervell, *Imago Dei: Gen 1,26f. im Spätjudentum, in der Gnosis und in den paulinischen Briefen* (FRLANT 76; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1960); E. Brandenburger, *Adam und Christus: Exegetisch-religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zu Röm. 5,12–21 (1 Kor. 15)* (WMANT 7, Neukirchen: Neukirchener, 1962), 64–67; Schwanz, “Wandel.” However, the assumption that this myth is of pre-Christian origin has long since proven untenable; see C. Colpe, *Die religionsgeschichtliche Schule: Darstellung und Kritik ihres Bildes vom gnostischen Erlösermythos* (FRLANT 78; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1961), 171–93. For more recent comparisons concerning εἰκὼν in Philo and Paul see G. E. Sterling, “The Image of God: Becoming Like God in Philo, Paul, and Early Christianity,” in *Portraits of Jesus* (ed. S. E. Myers; WUNT II/321; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012), 157–73; J. D. Worthington, *Creation in Paul and Philo: The Beginning and Before* (WUNT II/317; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 138–64.



a replica of this εἰκών. Philo bases this view on a literal understanding of the rendering of Gen 1:27 in the Septuagint: man was created κατ' εἰκόνα, which means *according to* the image but not *as* the image.<sup>31</sup> This is quite obviously analogous to the εἰκών-relationship between God, Christ and the believers as seen by Paul: Christ is the image proper of God, and humankind participates in God's image only in so far as it is conformed to Christ.

Secondly, the twofold account in Genesis of the creation of humankind allows Philo to infer that God created two, rather than one, prototypes of humankind. Gen 1:26–27 in his reading deals with the creation of an ideal, non-material, “intelligible,” heavenly man, which he also calls the “soul” (ψυχή) or the “mind” (νοῦς). The creation of the earthly man, who consists of both spiritual and material elements, is reported in Gen 2:7, where God is said to have shaped man from the dust of the earth and breathed into him the breath of life.<sup>32</sup> And since the earthly man par-

<sup>31</sup> Cf. *Her.* 230–231: There are two *logoi*, one of them being “the archetypal (ἀρχέτυπον) above us, the other the copy (μίμημα) of it which we possess. Moses calls the first the ‘image of God,’ the second the cast (ἐκμαγεῖον) of that image. For God, he says, made man not ‘the image of God’ but ‘after the image.’ And thus the mind (νοῦς) in each of us, which in the true and full sense is the ‘man,’ is an expression (τύπος) at third hand from the Maker, while the intermediate is a pattern (παράδειγμα) for the former (i.e. the human mind) and an effigy (ἀπεικόνισμα) of the latter (i.e. God)” (trans. adapted from Colson/Whitaker, LCL).

<sup>32</sup> Cf. above all *Opif.* 134: “God formed man by taking clay from the earth, and breathed into his face the breath of life (Gen 2:7). By this also he (i.e. Moses) showed very clearly that there is a vast difference between the man thus formed (πλασθέντος) and the man that came into existence earlier after the image of God (τοῦ κατὰ τὴν εἰκόνα θεοῦ γεγονότος): for the man so formed is an object of sense-perception, partaking already of such or such quality, consisting of body and soul, man or woman, by nature mortal; while he that was after the (Divine) image was an idea or type or seal, an object of thought (only), incorporeal, neither male nor female, by nature incorruptible” (trans. Colson/Whitaker, LCL). In *Her.* 230–231 (see above) and *Det.* 83–84 Philo identifies the man who was made “after the image” with human mind and reason, and in *Leg.* 1:31–32 he explains that it is the divine breath of life which makes this earthly mind a living soul. Cf. also *Spec.* 1:81: “For if the priest’s body, which is mortal by nature, must be scrutinized to see that it is not afflicted by any serious misfortune, much more is that scrutiny needed for the immortal soul, which we are told was fashioned after the image of the Self-existent. The image of God is the Word (λόγος) through whom the whole universe was framed” (trans. Colson/Whitaker, LCL). For an examination of these and further passages, see G. Sellin, *Der Streit um die Auferstehung der Toten* (FRLANT 138; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986), 101–44; J. R. Levison, *Portraits of Adam in Early Judaism: From Sirach to 2 Baruch* (JSPSup 1; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1988), 63–88; R. Schwandt, *Gesichte der Herrlichkeit* (HBS 50; Freiburg: Herder, 2007), 89–92. It must be emphasised that Philo’s interpretation of Gen 1:26–27 and 2:7, which are found above all in *Opif.*, *Leg.* and *QG*, do not form a coherent and systematic whole.

ticipates in the sphere of spirit and imperishability no less than in that of matter and decay, both of these spheres are within his reach,<sup>33</sup> which entails that he can freely choose between death and immortality.<sup>34</sup> That the wrong choice Adam had made<sup>35</sup> might in any way affect everyone else's capacity for attaining the better would not occur to Philo; he shows as little anticipation of Augustinian scruples as do the early eastern fathers.<sup>36</sup> The way that leads to immortality is virtue and asceticism.<sup>37</sup>

In Paul, the distinction between an earthly and a heavenly Adam is found in 1 Corinthians 15, while the idea of a human second-remove participation in the *imago Dei*, as we have seen, takes shape in 2 Corinthians 3 and 4. However, even a superficial glance at these texts reveals, apart from agreement on the idea that human existence is determined by two prototypes rather than one, also a number of striking differences, so striking that some in fact have concluded that Philo is of no help at all in explaining Paul's Adam-Christ typology.<sup>38</sup> First, in Paul's view the earthly prototype is the former of the two while the heavenly is the "second man"

<sup>33</sup> According to *Opif.* 135, humankind, being a mixture of body and reason, is a commutator between mortality and immortality. See also *Mos.* 2:61. Cf. D. M. Hay, "Philo's Anthropology, the Spiritual Regimen of the Therapeutae, and a Possible Connection with Corinth," in *Philo und das Neue Testament* (ed. R. Deines and K.-W. Niebuhr; WUNT 172; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004), 127–42, esp. 133–34.

<sup>34</sup> Cf. *Plant.* 45 (see below n. 89).

<sup>35</sup> See below, section F.

<sup>36</sup> For the idea of a free choice between good and bad, and hence eternal reward and punishment, see 2 *En.* 30.10; Irenaeus, *Adv. haer.* 4.4.3; Theophilus, *Ad Autolyicum* 2.27. On the Jewish background of the passage in Theophilus, see M. Kister, "'First Adam' and 'Second Adam' in 1 Cor 15:45–49 in the Light of Midrashic Exegesis and Hebrew Usage," in *The New Testament and Rabbinic Literature* (ed. R. Bieringer et al.; JSJSup 136; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 351–65. For the reception of Philo's interpretation of Gen 1:27 and 2:7 in Clement of Alexandria and Origen, see R. McL. Wilson, "The Early History of the Exegesis of Gen. 1.26," in *Studia Patristica I* (ed. K. Aland and F. L. Cross; TU 63; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1957), 420–37 (433–36); on Clement and Irenaeus, see Schwanz, "Wandel," 286–94; on Origen and Gregory of Nyssa, see C. Tietz, "Ebenbildlichkeit. Vom androgynen Menschen zum zweigeschlechtlichen Gott. Die Rezeption von Gen 1,27 in der Geschichte der christlichen Dogmatik", in *Männlich und weiblich schuf Er sie: Studien zur Genderkonstruktion und zum Eherecht in den Mittelmeerreligionen* (ed. M. Morgenstern et al.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011), 119–38 (121–23).

<sup>37</sup> Cf. *Agr.* 100 (*καρτερία*); *Ebr.* 140 (*παιδεία*); *Her.* 35 (*ἀρετή*); *Somn.* 1:218 (worship of God); *Fug.* 56 (taking refuge and praying to God). On the attainment of immortality through the contemplation of God, see *QE* 2:39; cf. Sellin, *Streit*, 141. The virtuous gain immortality as soon as they leave their mortal body at their physical death; cf. *Sacr.* 5 (Abraham); *Fug.* 59 (Nadab and Abihu). For the "doctrine" of the immortality of the soul, see *Somn.* 1:181; *QG* 3:11a.

<sup>38</sup> Cf. S. Hultgren, "The Origin of Paul's Doctrine of the Two Adams in 1 Corinthians 15.45–49," *JSNT* 25 (2003): 343–70, esp. 344–57; B. Schaller, "Adam und Christus bei Pau-

and “last Adam” (v. 47, 45), a reversal<sup>39</sup> which may perhaps be ascribed to Paul’s apocalyptic worldview.<sup>40</sup> Secondly, only this heavenly prototype is said to be imperishable while the earthly is considered inescapably mortal. Thirdly, it is neither through free choice nor through virtue and asceticism that humankind can attain the imperishability of the heavenly Adam, but only through “bearing” his image, or, in the words of 2 Cor 3:18 and Rom 8:29, through transformation and conformation.<sup>41</sup> And fourthly, if participation in the *imago Dei* can be gained only through the mediation of Christ, it follows that it cannot have been part of humankind’s endowment from creation.<sup>42</sup>

Moreover, whether and how closely Paul was at all acquainted with Philo’s thinking is impossible to determine with any certainty, as unequivocal references to Philo’s works are absent from the Pauline corpus. A more detailed and thorough analysis of Philo’s reading of the biblical creation narrative would not help us either, for Paul’s grasp of what he may have read or heard of Philo could have been even vaguer than the admittedly rather simplified and schematic synopsis of Philo’s views given above.<sup>43</sup> However, the point to be made here by comparing Paul and Philo

---

lus: oder, über Brauch und Fehlbrauch von Philo in der neutestamentlichen Forschung,” in *Philo und das Neue Testament*, 143–53.

<sup>39</sup> It has been doubted that this can be aptly called a “reversal”; cf. H. Merklein, “Christus als Bild Gottes im Neuen Testament,” *Jahrbuch für Biblische Theologie* 13 (1998): 53–75 (62), and Hultgren, “Origin,” 350, who observes that Philo calls the earthly rather than the heavenly man ὁ πρῶτος ἄνθρωπος. In a cosmological sense, however, the heavenly man according to Philo is clearly prior to the earthly. Paul’s “reversal” does not only affect the numerical order but indicates also a switch from cosmology to eschatology. Cf. Vollenweider, “Der Menschgewordene,” 58.

<sup>40</sup> A further difference between Paul’s and Philo’s views can likewise be explained by Paul’s eschatological perspective: according to Philo, humankind is simultaneously determined by both prototypes, that of Gen 1:27 and that of Gen 2:7. In 1 Corinthians 15 however the two prototypes are assigned to different aeons: in the past we bore the image of the earthly Adam, in the future we will bear the image of the heavenly pneumatic Adam. (If however 2 Cor 4:16–18 is related to this “image of Christ” complex, Paul seems to have assumed an overlap of the two determinations in the transitional world of the present. This would also explain the present tense of μεταμορφούμεθα in 2 Cor 3:18.)

<sup>41</sup> It seems indeed more appropriate to speak of “transformation” (as a radical change in what already exists) rather than of a “new creation” (as the fabrication of something that so far had not existed even in part). Paul however explicitly speaks of a “new creation” in 2 Cor 5:17.

<sup>42</sup> The idea that Adam and Eve prior to their fall had already possessed all qualities that Christ will bestow on the believers in the eschaton is incompatible with 1 Corinthians 15. See below.

<sup>43</sup> For more solid accounts, see Levison, *Portraits of Adam*; Sellin, *Streit*; Hultgren, “Origin.”

is in any case more modest than a claim of literary dependency. What I want to say is that if Paul was indeed influenced by an anthropology of the Philonic type, his idea of an eschatological conforming to the image of Christ is ultimately—the obvious dissimilarities notwithstanding—an offshoot of the Old Testament notion of *imago Dei*.

The weak resemblance between the Pauline idea and its purported Old Testament origin cannot however be ignored. Should we then conclude that even if it is true that these two concepts were genetically interrelated, this connection would nevertheless have left no traces in Paul's thinking, so that the notion of the "image of Christ" had for him simply nothing to do with what his Bible said about the "image of God"?

My contention is that this is not the case, and this leads me to the second part of my argument. For Paul's "image of Christ" discourse shows points of contact not only with the Genesis interpretations of Philo but also with those in the Dead Sea scrolls, the Old Testament pseudepigrapha and rabbinic literature, and in part these contacts relate to aspects very different from those that can be observed in Philo. I am therefore inclined to believe that Paul developed his "image of Christ" concept in conscious interaction with Palestinian-Jewish *imago Dei* traditions. This would imply that he was quite aware of the specific Old Testament background of his discourse—and would also enhance the likelihood that he was in fact familiar with Philo's reading of Genesis 1. I am going to highlight four such common motifs: glory, righteousness, childship to God and immortality.<sup>44</sup>

### C. GLORY

What Paul associates most often and most conspicuously with the "image of Christ" is δόξα, "splendour" or "glory." According to 2 Cor 3:18, we see the reflection of the "δόξα of the Lord" when we behold the image of Christ that we are transformed into. The chain argument of Rom 8:29–30, which sets out from the believers' predestination to be conformed to Christ, leads climactically to their δόξαι, their glorification. In the context of 1 Cor 15:49 the notion of δόξα likewise appears: according to 15:43 it is one of the differences between our earthly and our heavenly-pneumatic body

---

<sup>44</sup> In Rom 8:29–30 three of these motifs are united in splendid completeness. This passage thus provides the most convincing evidence for the connections between Paul's "image of Christ" discourse and the reception of the biblical *imago Dei* idea in ancient Judaism.

that the former “is sown in ἀτιμία, dishonour,” while the latter “is raised in δόξα, glory.”<sup>45</sup>

The idea that glory is an endowment of humankind from creation is already attested in Ps 8:5–6, where God is praised for having accorded “glory” and “honour” (כְּבוֹד, הֵדָר) to “man” (בֶּן-אָדָם) as a crown (עֹטֶר *hi.*). In synonymous parallelism it says that he made him only slightly lower than a deity. This is obviously meant as a statement of fundamental anthropological universality.

In similar words, the Hebrew book of Ben Sira in 49:16 speaks of the “splendour of *’ādām*” (תְּפִאֶרֶת אָדָם), which surpasses “every living being” (עַל כָּל חַי).<sup>46</sup> It seems quite possible that this wording is an early allusion to Ps 8:5–6,<sup>47</sup> as this would easily explain a number of conspicuous overlaps in vocabulary: the verb פָּקַד, the noun אֲנוּשׁ (whether used as a name or generic term) and the name Seth, which corresponds to בֶּן אָדָם in Ps 8:5. However, an anthropological statement is not intended in Sir 49:16, for just like Shem, Seth and Enosh, the other forefathers mentioned in this verse, Adam figures here as an individual in Israel’s prehistory (LXX: Αδὰμ).<sup>48</sup> The notion of *imago Dei* as an anthropological datum, on the oth-

<sup>45</sup> In 15:41 this distinction is made plausible by a comparison from nature; for it is plainly visible that God endows his creatures with very different kinds or degrees of δόξα, the sun e.g. being of much stronger radiance than the moon and the stars. Perhaps one should not therefore overly much accuse Paul of contradicting himself when on the other hand he states in 11:7 that the earthly man is God’s δόξα—pace W. Schrage, *Der erste Brief an die Korinther*, vol. 2 (EKKNT 7/2; Solothurn: Benziger; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 2001), 511. On the scale of 1 Cor 15:41 this natural δόξα of man would then be so faint that in comparison to that of the heavenly σῶμα it would appear as ἀτιμία.

<sup>46</sup> For the text, see P. C. Beentjes, *The Book of Ben Sira in Hebrew: A Text Edition of all Extant Hebrew Manuscripts and a Synopsis of all Parallel Hebrew Ben Sira Texts* (VTSup 68; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 88. For the interpretation, cf. M. Z. Segal, *ספר בן-סירא השלם* (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 4<sup>th</sup> printing, 1997), 340.

<sup>47</sup> Cf. J. Doehhorn, *Die Apokalypse des Mose: Text, Übersetzung, Kommentar* (TSAJ 106; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005), 361.

<sup>48</sup> Cf. P. W. Skehan and A. A. Di Lella, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira: A New Translation with Notes, Introduction and Commentary* (AB 39; New York: Doubleday, 1987), 545; Levison, *Portraits of Adam*, 45; J. Marböck, *Gottes Weisheit unter uns: Zur Theologie des Buches Sirach* (ed. I. Fischer; HBS 6; Freiburg etc.: Herder, 1995), 140; Harrison, *Paul and the Imperial Authorities*, 238. For the suggestion that by תְּפִאֶרֶת אָדָם Adam is characterised as a prototypical high priest, see J. A. Aitken, “The Semantics of ‘Glory’ in Ben Sira—Traces of a Development in Post-Biblical Hebrew?,” in *Sirach, the Scrolls, and Sages* (ed. T. Muraoka and J. F. Elwolde; STDJ 33; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 1–24 (4–9). C. H. T. Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam: Liturgical Anthropology in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (STDJ 42; Leiden: Brill, 2002), conversely argues that according to Sir 50:1 the high priest Simon “during the liturgy . . . embodies the Glory of God” (73) and thus “is the true Adam, the image and physical embodiment of Israel’s one God.” While statements of this kind risk overstrain-

er hand, occurs in Sir 17:3–4, where it is not however associated with glory or splendour, but, closer to the intention of Gen 1:27, with strength (ἰσχύς) and dominion over “beasts and birds” (κατακυριεύειν θηρίων καὶ πετεινῶν).<sup>49</sup>

The earliest known association of glory and *imago Dei* is found in a prayer text from Qumran, *Paroles des Luminaires*, where God is praised for the creation of humankind: “. . . our [fat]her you fashioned in the likeness of [your] glory (בדמות כבוד [כה])” (4Q504 8 4).<sup>50</sup> The noun דמות alludes to Gen 1:26 and thus leaves no doubt that the phrase refers to Adam.<sup>51</sup> As it attaches Adam’s “likeness” to God’s glory rather than God himself, the wording in a way seems to step back from Gen 1:26. At the same time, however, the insertion of “glory” serves to indicate what is thought to be the informing principle of Adam’s *imago Dei*. Adam, according to this reading of Gen 1:26, *participated* in God’s glory, which presumably implies that he was indeed *endowed* with it. Unfortunately the text is too fragmentary to betray whether what it says concerning “our father” applies also to his descendants.<sup>52</sup> In this case it would be a positive counterpart of Paul’s claim in Rom 3:23 that “all . . . fall short of the glory of God.”

Israel’s praise, “You created us לַכְבוֹדִיכָה,” in another fragment of this manuscript (4Q504 1–2 III 4) does not solve the problem,<sup>53</sup> as ברא following ל- following in the Dead Sea scrolls usually has a dative or final or temporal sense but

---

ing the catchword link תפארת creates between 49:16 and 50:1, another inference from the juxtaposition of Adam, the high priest Simon and those other primeval fathers seems better grounded, *viz.* that Ben Sira, unlike later Jewish authors, did not think that Adam due to his disobedience was divested of his glory. Such an idea would simply go against the grain of his *laus patrum*.

<sup>49</sup> Cf. Levison, *Portraits of Adam*, 37; O. Kaiser, “Was ist der Mensch und was ist sein Wert? Beobachtungen zur Anthropologie des Jesus Sirach nach Sir 16,24–18,14,” in idem, *Gott, Mensch und Geschichte: Studien zum Verständnis des Menschen und seiner Geschichte in der klassischen, biblischen und nachbiblischen Literatur* (BZAW 413; Berlin, New York: de Gruyter, 2010), 290–304 (295–97). On the motif of mortality in Sir 17:2, see below, section F. For a comparison between Sir 17:1–4 and the motif of Adam’s dominion over Paradise in 4Q504 8 6, 4Q422 I 8 and 4Q423 1–2 i 2, see E. Glickler Chazon, “The Creation and Fall of Adam in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *The Book of Genesis in Jewish and Oriental Christian Interpretation* (ed. J. Frishman and L. van Rompay; Traditio Exegetica Graeca vol. 5; Leuven: Peeters, 1997), 13–24.

<sup>50</sup> Text according to, and translation adapted from, *DSSSE* 2:1008–9 (where “Adam” is supplied in brackets before “our father”).

<sup>51</sup> Cf. Glickler Chazon, “Creation and Fall,” 14–15; D. K. Falk, *Daily, Sabbath, and Festival Prayers in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (STDJ 27; Leiden: Brill, 1996), 67.

<sup>52</sup> Since Gen 9:6 repeats only צלם and not דמות, “likeness” (in distinction from “image”) could on the basis of Gen 1:26 and 5:1 be taken to be an individual feature of the first human couple.

<sup>53</sup> Pace Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory*, 94.



nowhere expresses identity.<sup>54</sup> לַכְבוֹדָהּ בְּרַתְנוּ means: “You created us *for* your glory,” not: “You created us *as* your glory.”

A *collective* participation in Adam’s glory is envisaged in three writings of the Qumran community: the *Damascus Document*, the *Serekh ha-Yahad* (in a passage from the pre-Essene “Teaching of the Two Spirits”) and the *Hodayot*. However, these texts do not attribute כְּבוֹד אָדָם, as they call it (by an expression unattested in the Hebrew Bible), to humankind as a whole but only, apparently as an eschatological gift, to a chosen group, namely their own community:<sup>55</sup>

“And he built for them a safe home in Israel . . . Those who remain steadfast in it are destined for eternal life, and all the glory of Adam is theirs.” (CD III 19–20)

“For God has chosen them for an everlasting covenant, and theirs is all the glory of Adam.” (1QS IV 22–23)

“. . . for those who serve you loyally [so that] their posterity [may] be before you for all the time . . . [ . . . ] transgression and casting out all their iniquities and giving them an inheritance in all the glory of Adam for long life.” (1QH<sup>a</sup> IV 27)

The restriction of the bestowal of כְּבוֹד אָדָם to the members of the community suggests that this glory, in conspicuous distinction from Ps 8:5, is not considered an element of humankind’s natural endowment. This means that אָדָם indeed should not here be taken as a generic term but as a proper name,<sup>56</sup> implying that only the first of humankind possessed

<sup>54</sup> For the dative sense, see 4Q392 1 4; 4Q408 3+3a 3; 4Q495 2 1; cf. Ps 51:12. For the final sense, see 1QS III 17; 1Q34 3 i 7; 4Q487 1 ii 2; cf. Isa 43:7; 54:16. For the temporal sense, see 1QH<sup>a</sup> VII 17; 4Q377 2 ii 12. Identity is usually expressed by an object complement, as in 4Q408 3+3a 9–10. The difference can easily be seen from 4Q495 2 1: אֵל בְּרַתְנוּ לַכְּ [אֵתָהּ] עִם עוֹלָמִים, “[You,] God, created us *for* y[ou] *as* an eternal nation” (restored according to 1QM XIII 9).

<sup>55</sup> Translations according to *DJD* 40:73 (1QH<sup>a</sup>) and adopted from *DSSSE* 1:79 (1QS) and 1:555 (CD). Cf. also 4QpPsa III 1–2, where the followers of the group are promised “all the inheritance of Adam” (כּוֹל נַחֲלַת אָדָם).

<sup>56</sup> Cf. H. Lichtenberger, *Studien zum Menschenbild in Texten der Qumrangemeinde* (SUNT 15; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1980), 225; Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory*, 96; for earlier references see P. Wernberg-Møller, *The Manual of Discipline* (STDJ 1; Leiden: Brill, 1957), 87, n. 80. J. M. Baumgarten and D. R. Schwartz render כּוֹל כְּבוֹד אָדָם in CD III 20 as “all (human) glory,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations* (ed. J. H. Charlesworth, vol. 2; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1995), 17. Both translations, “all the glory of Adam (or: of humankind),” are accepted as possible by M. Kister, “In Adam: 1 Cor 15:21–22; 12:27 in their Jewish Setting,” in *Flores Florentino: Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish Studies* (ed. A. Hilhorst et al.; FS F. García Martínez; JSJSup 122; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 685–90 (685).

the “glory of Adam” from the outset while all other human beings do not, although they are obviously regarded as potential recipients of it. The eschatological attainment of Adam’s status is obviously granted only to God’s chosen community.

That Adam due to his disobedience *lost* his glory is nowhere mentioned in the Dead Sea Scrolls, although scholars have surmised it to be implied in the texts here cited.<sup>57</sup> The *Testament of Abraham* for example—unfortunately a work of rather uncertain date—seems to presuppose that Adam’s glory was everlasting.<sup>58</sup> However, several generations after the heyday of the *yahad*, and presumably some time after the ministry of Paul, the idea that the first human couple was divested of its glory as a punishment surfaces in the Greek *Life of Adam and Eve*.<sup>59</sup> According to this narrative elaboration of Genesis 3, Adam and Eve had barely tasted from the forbidden fruit when first she and then also he were “estranged” from their δόξα (20.2 and 21.6: ἀπαλλοτριώω); it was “great glory” (μεγάλη δόξα, 21.2), nay, “the glory of God” (δόξα τοῦ θεοῦ, 21.6),<sup>60</sup> from which the insinuations of the serpent “brought us down.”<sup>61</sup> As regards the effects

---

However, how could this glory be characterised as “human” if the larger part of humankind is characterised by their lack of it?—That “glory” was a particular characteristic of Paradise may likewise be implied in the expression “Eden of glory” (כבודן עֵדֶן) in 1QH<sup>a</sup> XVI 21 (Stegemann/Schuller, *DJD* 40:224: “a glorious Eden”); cf. Harrison, *Paul and the Imperial Authorities*, 239.

<sup>57</sup> Cf. e.g. Wernberg-Møller, *Manual of Discipline*, 87, n. 80; A. Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination: Weisheitliche Urordnung und Prädestination in den Textfunden von Qumran* (STDJ 18; Leiden: Brill, 1995), 162–63 (“Das verheißene eschatologische Heil entspricht dem Heilszustand des Menschen vor dem Sündenfall [כבוד אדם]”); Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory*, 97 (“the community . . . returned to the pre-lapsarian world of Eden”).

<sup>58</sup> Cf. *T. Ab.* A 11:8–9: When Abraham in heaven beholds Adam seated on a golden throne, he asks the archangel Michael, “My lord Commander-in-chief, who is this most wondrous man, who is adorned in such glory . . . ?,” whereupon Michael answers, “This is the first-formed Adam who is in such glory . . .” (trans. E. P. Sanders in *OTP* 1:888). Regarding the date, the suggestions listed by Sanders range from 200 B.C.E. to the 2<sup>nd</sup> century C.E. (*OTP* 1:874–875).

<sup>59</sup> Dochhorn, *Apokalypse des Mose*, 172 and *passim*, dates the writing to the late 1<sup>st</sup> or early 2<sup>nd</sup> century C.E. On the δόξα motif in Chapter 20–21, see *ibid.*, 359–63, and Levison, *Portraits of Adam*, 169.

<sup>60</sup> While Adam calls his glory δόξα τοῦ θεοῦ (21.6), Eve speaks of δόξα μου (20.2); this does not however seem to signal a substantial distinction; cf. Dochhorn, *Apokalypse des Mose*, 360. To what extent the notion of δόξα is related to the *imago Dei* idea is difficult to determine. There would be no connection at all if Dochhorn were right in his observation that the narrative, which in 33.5 and 35.2 (and hence perhaps also in 10.3 and 12.1–2) uses εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ in reference to Adam, thereby implicitly denies the *imago Dei* to Eve (*ibid.*, 282–84). This inference does not however seem to be necessary.

<sup>61</sup> Translations by M. D. Johnson, *OTP* 2:281. Similar ideas are attested also in rabbinic texts; for the loss of “radiance” (רִיאַ) see e.g. *Gen. Rab.* 11.1 and 12.6 (88 and 102 Theodor/



of the incident upon their descendants, Adam reproaches Eve for having “brought great wrath upon us, which is death ruling over all our race” (14.2).<sup>62</sup> Whether this presupposes that humankind originally was destined not only for eternal life but also for endowment with glory remains uncertain. However, the text clearly lends itself to such a reading.<sup>63</sup>

The writings of the *yahad* and the Greek *Life of Adam and Eve*, each in their own respect, come in fact quite close to Paul. Like the authors of the *yahad*, Paul considers glory an (eschatological) gift rather than part of humankind’s original nature, even though he differs from the *yahad* regarding the means by which this gift is imparted. And as in the *Life of Adam and Eve*, Paul views the deprivation of glory as a consequence of sin, although he widens his angle from Adam and Eve to the whole of humankind, as in Rom 3:23: “All have sinned and fall short of the glory (δόξα) of God.”

What Paul however notably fails to exploit is the obvious possibility of identifying the eschatological glory of the image of Christ with the primordial glory which Adam and Eve lost through their fall.<sup>64</sup> Rather, the earthly “first Adam” of 1 Cor 15:43 appears to be void of glory by his very nature, as he was already “sown” in “dishonour” (ἀτιμία). The claim in Rom 3:23 of humankind’s universal lack of divine glory admittedly seems to play on the idea of Adam being invested with such glory.<sup>65</sup> This does not however mean that Paul cherished such an idea. He may as well have deemed it pointless, and that this is in fact more likely is suggested by Rom 1:23, which by its contrast of “the glory of the imperishable God” and

---

Albeck); *Tanḥ. B Bereshit* 18 (7a Buber); *Tg. Ps.-J. Gen 2:25* (“And the two of them were wise, Adam and his wife, but they did not remain in their glory”; trans. M. Maher, *ArBib* 1B:25). For further references, see *Apoc. Sedr.* 6.5; Vollenweider, “Der Menschgewordene,” 59, n. 18.

<sup>62</sup> On the sexist bias of 14.2 see A. Standhartinger, “Das Testament der Eva,” in *Kunst der Deutung – Deutung der Kunst: Beiträge zu Bibel, Antike und Gegenwartsliteratur* (ed. A. Standhartinger et al.; FS S. von Blumenthal; Münster: LIT, 2007), 73–85 (76).

<sup>63</sup> That the biblical Paradise narrative is open in this regard to quite a variety of readings shows also in 3 *Bar.* 4.16, where drunkards are cautioned that by their vice they “withdraw from the glory of God (τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ δόξης μακρὰν γίνονται)” and “procure themselves eternal fire” just as Adam “was stripped of God’s glory (τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ ἐγυμνώθη, cf. *Apoc. Mos.* 20.1)” when he sinned. This obviously presupposes that Adam’s fall affected only his own endowment with divine glory but not that of his descendants.

<sup>64</sup> Cf. Schwanz, “Wandel,” 276; Harrison, *Paul and the Imperial Authorities*, 258.

<sup>65</sup> Cf. Gielen, “Grundzüge,” 136; E. Lohse, *Der Brief an die Römer* (KEK 4; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2003), 131; Jewett, *Romans*, 280. For further references see K. Haacker, *Der Brief des Paulus an die Römer* (THKNT 6; Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1999), 88.

“the likeness (ὁμοίωμα) of an image (εἰκόν) of a perishable human being”<sup>66</sup> alludes to Gen 1:26 almost parodistically, and certainly rules out that any human being ever participated in the glory of God.

Curiously enough, in 1 Cor 11:7 Paul is nevertheless able to speak of a general original glory of (male) humankind that appears to be entirely unaffected by sin. So it seems he had no difficulty in simultaneously entertaining two completely different notions of glory: on the one hand the eschatological glory of the image of Christ, of which humans as sinners according to Rom 3:23 are devoid, and on the other hand the original glory of the image of God, with which (male) humans are endowed by nature. 1 Corinthians 15 shows however that as compared to the eschatological glory of the image of Christ, this original glory of natural (male) humankind is soteriologically meaningless to Paul as it cannot mitigate his candid statement that present human existence is “in dishonour.”<sup>67</sup>

Such a far-reaching curtailment of Adam’s original glory is attested elsewhere, as far as I can see, only in rabbinic literature. A lucid example is a passage in *Deuteronomy Rabbah* 11.3, where Adam’s כבוד is not outweighed by some kind of eschatological glory but by the glory of Moses:<sup>68</sup>

Adam<sup>69</sup> said to Moses: “I am greater than you, for I was created in the image of the Holy One, blessed be he, as it says, *And God created Adam in his image* (Gen 1:27).” Moses said to him: “I was raised higher than you; the glory (כבוד) that you were given was taken from you, as it says, *And Adam shall not rest in his honour* (קַר, Ps 49:13), but as to me, the radiance of [my] face (זיו הפנים) which the Holy One, blessed be he, bestowed on me is with me, as it says: *His eye was not dim, nor had his lustre (לְחָה)*<sup>70</sup> abated (Deut 34:7).”

While Adam’s glory, presumably due to his transgression,<sup>71</sup> was rather short-lived, the glory of Moses is lasting, and compared to this, the fact that Adam had been created in God’s image seems trivial. It is this boldness of conceiving of something higher than the glory of humankind’s *imago Dei* at creation that the rabbis share with Paul.

<sup>66</sup> Translation mine.

<sup>67</sup> Cf. above n. 45.

<sup>68</sup> Fol. 118d. The passage is framed as an exposition of Prov 31:29: “*Many women have done excellently, but you surpass them all.*” This verse speaks of Moses, for he was raised higher than all. How so? . . .”

<sup>69</sup> Literally: “The first Adam.”

<sup>70</sup> The translation of לְחָה follows *Tg. Onq.* (“radiance of the glory of his face”).

<sup>71</sup> Cf. below n. 102. For rabbinic traditions relating to Adam’s glory, cf. R. Scroggs, *The Last Adam: A Study in Pauline Anthropology* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1996), 35–36, 48–49.

## D. RIGHTEOUSNESS

In early Jewish literature the idea of Adam's glory is often connected to the notions of righteousness and freedom from sin. In 1QS IV 21–23 the promise of כבוד אדם comes with the announcement that iniquity and all “works of deceit” will vanish and that God will sprinkle the “spirit of truth like purification water” to purge out “all abominations of falsehood.” In CD III 18 the bestowal of כבוד אדם is associated with atonement and the removal of iniquity, and in 1QH<sup>a</sup> IV 27 with the cleansing of all sins (כול עוונותם, *DJD* 40:63). A negative counterpart is provided again by the Greek *Life of Adam and Eve*: After the fall Eve bemoans not only the loss of her δόξα but also the fact that she is now “naked” of her “righteousness” (γυμνη) . . . τῆς δικαιοσύνης, 20.1).<sup>72</sup> Righteousness, it seems, is regarded here as an essential ingredient of Eve's glory, which may explain why disobedience entails the immediate loss of this glory.<sup>73</sup>

Various rabbinic examples also testify to the association of righteousness and the *imago Dei*. In *Midrash Tanhuma* we read: “The Holy One, blessed be he, who is called righteous, created man in his image for the sole purpose that he should be as righteous and upright as himself.”<sup>74</sup> *Targum Ps.-Jonathan* on Gen 1:27 associates the creation of humankind in God's image with the 248 limbs and 365 sinews of the human body<sup>75</sup> in correspondence to the division of the 613 commandments of the Torah into 248 imperatives and 365 prohibitions.<sup>76</sup> Neither text however regards righteousness as an original quality of humankind; it rather appears as a goal to be attained through living in accordance with the requirements of

<sup>72</sup> The translation follows Dochhorn, *Apokalypse des Mose*, 325. For the motif of nakedness, cf. above n. 63.

<sup>73</sup> Levison, *Portraits of Adam*, 169, even speaks of an “identification of glory with righteousness.” Similarly also Standhartinger, “Das Testament der Eva,” 80.

<sup>74</sup> *Tanḥ. Bereshit* 7; cf. F. Avemarie, “Adam, das Kunstwerk Gottes: Rabbinische Deutungen der Gottebenbildlichkeit,” in *Kunst der Deutung* (see n. 62), 63–72 (68). Quite similarly, 1 *Clem.* 33.1–7 deduces the obligation of doing good from God's creation work and humankind's *imago Dei*, and concludes, “Let us accomplish the work of righteousness with our whole strength!”

<sup>75</sup> According to the text of the Rabbi's Bible חמשה חומשי תורה ועליהם תרגום אונקלוס ותרגום יונתן וכו', vol. 1 (Tel Aviv: Schocken, 1958), fol. 8a (“And Jah created Adam in his image, in the effigy Jah created him, with 248 members and 365 sinews, and he covered him with skin and filled him with flesh and blood.” MS London erroneously counts 665 rather than 365 sinews; cf. *Targum Palaestinense in Pentateuchum*, vol. 1 (ed. A. Diez Macho; Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1977), 9.

<sup>76</sup> Cf. F. Avemarie, *Tora und Leben: Untersuchungen zur Heilsbedeutung der Tora in der frühen rabbinischen Literatur* (TSAJ 55; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996), 51.

the Torah. This comes close to Philo's idea that the earthly Adam, rather than being righteous by nature, disposed of the *capacity* of choosing and achieving what is good.

A notion of *factual* righteousness being attached to Adam's *imago Dei* could underlie a passage in *Avot de-Rabbi Nathan*.<sup>77</sup> Adam figures here in a list of biblical characters all of whom were purportedly born circumcised. This exceptional feature is inferred for each of them from a biblical quotation that testifies to his moral perfection. And since the evidence for Adam and Seth is obtained from the *imago Dei* motif in Gen 1:27 and 5:3, it seems quite possible that righteousness is taken here to be *implied* in the *imago Dei*.

In Rom 8:29–30, righteousness figures alongside glory as one of the eschatological blessings which in Paul's chain argument follow one's conforming to Christ: "... and those whom he called he also *justified* (ἐδικαίωσεν); and those whom he justified he also *glorified*." That prior to one's conforming to Christ one is devoid of righteousness is undoubtedly implied, in line with the general assumption of humankind's utter sinfulness in Pauline soteriology. This idea is expressed in a variety of ways above all in Romans 3. Drawing on the wording of Ps 14:1, Rom 3:11 states most prominently: "There is no one who is righteous, not even one."

It is more difficult to ascertain whether Paul thought that there was a primordial righteousness Adam and Eve had been endowed with but through their transgression gambled away. This might be suggested above all by Rom 7:9, especially if one shares the assumption that Paul formulated these words as though spoken by Adam or Eve themselves:<sup>78</sup> "I was once alive apart from the law, but when the commandment came, sin revived." This phrasing is however of remarkable vagueness in precisely those respects that concern us here. For neither does it say that this life "apart from the law" was life in *righteousness*,<sup>79</sup> nor does the larger context intimate that justification by faith means a return to this primordial apartness from the law. On the contrary, the subsequent chapter, Romans 8, clearly shows that Paul expected life "in Christ" to consist of essentially

<sup>77</sup> *Avot de-Rabbi Nathan A* 2.51 (46–47 Becker). For a translation, see J. Goldin, *The Fathers According to Rabbi Nathan* (Yale Judaica Series 10; New Haven: Yale University Press, 1955), 23.

<sup>78</sup> Cf. H. Lichtenberger, *Das Ich Adams und das Ich der Menschheit: Studien zum Menschenbild in Römer 7* (WUNT 164; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004), 125–35; S. Krauter, "Eva in Röm 7," *ZNW* 99 (2008): 1–17; A. Busch, "The Figure of Eve in Romans 7.7–25," *BibInt* 12 (2004): 1–36 (*non vidi*).

<sup>79</sup> Does he perhaps refrain from doing so because forensic justification would be impossible without a valid law?

more than just ignorant innocence. Rather than freedom from the law, it would entail the fulfillment of its requirements in the spirit (Rom 8:4).

It seems therefore that Paul may well have been aware of righteousness being a crucial element of the traditional Adam haggadah. As he did with the motif of glory, however, he extricated it from its connection with Adam's primordial *imago Dei* in order to incorporate it into his idea of an eschatological conforming to the image of Christ.

#### E. CHILDREN OF GOD

According to Rom 8:29–30, conforming to the image of Christ entails not only glorification and justification but also the election of the believers and their designation as children of God: Those whom God foreknew he “predestined to be conformed to the image of his Son, in order that he might be the firstborn (πρωτότοκος) among many siblings.”<sup>80</sup>

For an analogous association in early Judaism of election with Adam's glory, we may once more adduce the *Serekh ha-Yahad*, which says of the prospective recipients of “the glory of Adam” that God “has chosen” (בחר) them “for an everlasting covenant” (1QS IV 22–23).<sup>81</sup> In *Paroles des Luminaires*, it is the election of Israel that is described in terms of both creation and adoption: “. . . and for your glory you created us, and you appointed us (your) children (ובנים שמתנו) before the eyes of all nations” (4Q504 1–2 III 4–5). It does not however seem that this is meant to allude to the creation of Adam, let alone to the notion of *imago Dei*.

More telling in regard to Rom 8:29–30 is a rabbinic saying attributed to R. Akiva in *Mishnah Avot* 3.14.<sup>82</sup> It deals with Israel's state of election as compared to the creation of humankind:<sup>83</sup>

Beloved is humankind, for they were created in the image. Even greater love—it was made known to them that they were created in the image, as it says, *For in the image of God he made man* (Gen 9:6).

Beloved are the Israelites, for they are called children of the Omnipresent (בנים למקום). Even greater love—it was made known to them that they are

<sup>80</sup> Translation slightly deviating from NRSV (see n. 16).

<sup>81</sup> Translation according to *DSSSE* 1:79.

<sup>82</sup> In the parallel in *Avot de-Rabbi Nathan* 39.10–12 (276–77 Becker) the attribution is to R. Akiva's pupil R. Me'ir.

<sup>83</sup> The subsequent translation follows MS Parma 138 (114 v.), which in this case offers the most consistent text. On the problems of the textual transmission, see Avemarie, *Tora und Leben*, 532–34.

called children of the Omnipresent, as it says, *You are children of the Lord your God* (Deut 14:1).

Beloved are the Israelites, for they were given a precious instrument. Even greater love—it was made known to them that they were given the precious instrument by which the world was created, as it says, *For I give you good teaching, do not forsake my Torah* (Prov 4:2).

What this saying conveys is not general rabbinic doctrine. According to a tradition attested in the targums and early midrashim the Torah was not only revealed at Mount Sinai but already given to Adam in Paradise in order that he should study and practise the commandments.<sup>84</sup> That Adam could also, from an early Jewish perspective, be regarded as God's child is apparent from the genealogy of Jesus in Luke 3:38.<sup>85</sup> However, *Mishnah Avot* 3.14, which considers Adam's descendants rather than Adam himself, denies them both the Torah and the status of children of God in order to present these as insignia of Israel's election.

This emphatic dissociation of *imago Dei* and childship to God corresponds to the connection Rom 8:29 establishes between siblingship to Christ and the eschatological conforming to Christ's image. The idea that the chosen ones are children to God is traditional; it is found not only in *Paroles de Luminaires* but also already in Deut 14:1. Paul and *Mishnah Avot* 3.14 however go further by relating it negatively to the *imago* motif of the biblical creation narrative, the *Mishnah* by opposing it to Adam's *imago Dei*, and Paul by attaching it to the image of Christ.

## F. IMMORTALITY

Just like "glory," so "imperishability" belongs to what 1 Corinthians 15 associates with bearing the image of Christ. And just like glory, so imperishability is viewed here as a quality of the eschatological existence that will ensue from the resurrection of the dead. In 15:42 Paul thus opens a series of contrasts between the believers' present and future with the

<sup>84</sup> Cf., e.g., *Frg. Tg. Gen.* 2:15; *Sipre Deut.* 41 (87 Finkelstein). For discussion and further references, see Lichtenberger, *Das Ich Adams*, 225–40; Avemarie, *Tora und Leben*, 140, 148–51.

<sup>85</sup> Cf. F. Bovon, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*, vol. 1 (EKKNT 3/1; Zurich: Benziger, Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1989), 187: "eine ... besondere Art Gottessohnschaft."

statement: “So it is with the resurrection of the dead: It is sown in decay (ἐν φθορᾷ), it is raised in imperishability (ἐν ἀφθαρσίᾳ).”<sup>86</sup>

However, while the resurrection of the dead is commonly imagined as a dynamic event, ἀφθαρσία is essentially a static concept, which suggests that 1 Corinthians 15 amalgamates ideas that are ultimately heterogeneous. This corresponds to the fact that *imago Dei* was associated with rather different notions of eternal life in Palestinian Judaism and in the Greek-speaking diaspora.

As a characteristic example for the latter we may adduce the didactic poem of *Ps.-Phocylides*. It states in l. 105 that the human soul does not suffer harm from death, and in l. 106 substantiates this with the idea that the “spirit (πνεῦμα)” —which is here synonymous with “soul (ψυχή)” —is “a loan from God to mortals, and his image (εἰκὼν).”<sup>87</sup> Eternal life is thus claimed only for the immaterial part of the human being. For the very same reason however it can also be attributed to humanity’s natural endowment and, therefore, associated with the notion of *imago Dei*.

Philo likewise regarded as “immortal (ἀθάνατος)” and “by nature incorruptible (ἀφθαρτος φύσει)” only the ἄνθρωπος who according to Gen 1:27 was fashioned κατ’ εἰκόνα, i.e., the human soul, while the man whose creation from the earth is reported in Gen 2:7 in his view was “mortal (θνητός).”<sup>88</sup> However, at the same time he could also say that the choice between good and bad which God in Paradise set before the human mind was ultimately a choice between “death (θάνατος)” and “immortality (ἀθανασία),”<sup>89</sup> which, albeit certainly consonant with Genesis 3, is logically at odds with a neat distinction between mortal man and the immortal soul. Thus what from the cosmological side of Philo’s anthropology looks

<sup>86</sup> NRSV: “What is sown is perishable, what is raised is imperishable.” While this is clearly the central message of v. 42b, it does not cover the whole semantic span of Paul’s wording.

<sup>87</sup> Text and translation according to P. W. van der Horst, *The Sentences of Pseudo-Phocylides: With Introduction and Commentary* (SVTP 4; Leiden: Brill, 1978), 189. For the context and cultural background see *ibid.*, 188–90.

<sup>88</sup> *Opif.* 134 and *Spec.* 1:81 (cf. above n. 32). In *Opif.* 135 the man of Gen 2:7, as combining earthly substance and divine breath, is said to be “border area (μεθόριον)” between mortality and immortality. Cf. also *Mos.* 2:61; Levison, *Portraits of Adam*, 69–70, 73–74; Hay, “Philo’s Anthropology,” 133–34. For the δόγμα of the imperishability of the soul see *Somn.* 1:181.

<sup>89</sup> *Plant.* 45: God “set in the garden, or the whole universe, the middle or neutral mind (τὸν μέσον νοῦν), played upon by forces drawing it in opposite directions and given the high calling to decide between them, that it might be moved to choose and to shun, to win fame and immortality should it welcome the better, and incur a dishonourable death should it choose the worse (trans. Colson/Whitaker, LCL).”



like an unalienable status turns out to be a dual potentiality if seen from an ethical perspective. Under the ethical angle, Adam by his transgression not only exchanged death for eternal life but also offended against his *imago Dei*:

Though he had God for his father, “whose image (εἰκῶν) he was in a sense in virtue of the ruling mind in his soul (κατὰ τὸν ἡγεμόνα νοῦν ἐν ψυχῇ),” he did not keep “that image undefiled (ἀκηλίδωτον)” but “was quick to choose the false, the base and the evil and spurn the good and honourable and true, with the natural consequence that he exchanged mortality for immortality (θνητὸν ἀθανάτου βίον ἀνθυπηλλάξατο), forfeited his blessedness and happiness and found an easy passage to a life of toil and misery.”<sup>90</sup>

As has already been pointed out, Philo did not however think that by the disobedience of the first couple their descendants were likewise prevented from attaining eternal life. In his view, immortality could be achieved through virtue and asceticism by every human being.<sup>91</sup> It will be imparted to the virtuous at their physical death when they leave their mortal bodies behind.<sup>92</sup>

Turning to the traditions of Judaeo-Christianity, we encounter the earliest reflection associating the *imago Dei* with the span of human life in a brief passage on the creation of humankind in Sir 17:1–4. This text stands out in the reception history of Gen 1:27 as it openly opposes the idea that the notion of *imago Dei* implies an enhancement of life. In accordance with the priestly creation narrative it connects the *imago Dei* idea to human dominion over the animals (17:3),<sup>93</sup> yet in keeping with Ben Sira’s general outlook on human life<sup>94</sup> it states in the same breath that God “gave them a fixed number of days” (17:2). Although this could be merely an exegetical inference from Gen 3:22,<sup>95</sup> it would be striking even in this case that of all motifs of the biblical Paradise story this one alone has been chosen for an elaboration of the *imago Dei* idea. It would not seem unlikely therefore that Sir 17:2 already presupposes a contrary view, a view which associates *imago Dei* with everlasting life, and which Ben Sira feels necessary to re-

<sup>90</sup> *Virt.* 205 (trans. Colson/Whitaker, LCL).

<sup>91</sup> See above n. 37. For the reception of Philo’s understanding in the pre-Augustinian fathers see above n. 36.

<sup>92</sup> Cf. *Sacr.* 5 (Abraham); *Fug.* 59 (Nadab and Abihu); see also *QG* 3:11a.

<sup>93</sup> Cf. above n. 49.

<sup>94</sup> Cf., e.g., Sir 17:30; 18:9; Levison, *Portraits of Adam*, 38–40.

<sup>95</sup> The death threat in 2:17, however, possibly implies original immortality; cf. E. Blum, “Von Gottesunmittelbarkeit zu Gottähnlichkeit: Überlegungen zur theologischen Anthropologie der Paradieserzählung,” in *Gottes Nähe im Alten Testament* (ed. G. Eberhardt and K. Liess; SBS 202; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 2004), 9–29 (23).



ject. A further, indirect, reflex of such a view would then be the notorious misogynist attack on Eve in Sir 25:24: “From a woman sin had its beginning, and because of her we all die.”<sup>96</sup>

Early traces of such a view have been preserved in the writings of the *yahad*, particularly in the *Damascus Document*, which connects the promise of כבוד אדם for the adherents of the “safe home in Israel” to the explicit prospect of “eternal life”: “Those who remain steadfast in it are destined for eternal life (חיי נצח), and all the glory of Adam is theirs.”<sup>97</sup> Whether one takes חיי נצח to imply the expectation of immortality or the resurrection of the dead or merely to refer to a blissful earthly existence that is continued in the lives of one’s progeny will depend on how far one reckons with an Essene belief in the afterlife in general, which is subject to debate.<sup>99</sup> At any rate, however, it is evident that this “eternal life,” just like כבוד אדם, is regarded not as a part of humankind’s natural inheritance but as an eschatological gift.

In the *Greek Life of Adam and Eve*, Adam reproaches his consort with having brought death over the human race by eating of the forbidden fruit (14.2), which obviously implies that originally humankind had been

<sup>96</sup> It has been doubted that this verse refers to Eve’s transgression; cf. P. Schäfer, “Adam in der jüdischen Überlieferung,” in *Vom alten zum neuen Adam: Urzeitmythos und Heilsgeschichte* (ed. W. Strolz; Freiburg: Herder, 1986), 69–93 (72), and the sharp-witted argumentation in J. R. Levison, “Is Eve to Blame? A Contextual Analysis of Sirach 25:24,” *CBQ* 47 (1985): 617–23. However, although Sir 25:13–26 deals with the topic of “the evil wife” in general, the expression ἀρχὴ ἀμαρτίας and the association of sin with universal death in v. 25 are suggestive of something clearly more specific than just the global observation that sinful deeds of men usually in some way or the other originate from their wives—which by the way would be rather at odds with the praise of the good wife in Sir 26:1–27. 4Q184 1 9 (adduced by Levison, *ibid.*, 622) fails to convince as a parallel as it lacks the aspect of the universality of death.

<sup>97</sup> CD III, 20 (translation adopted from *DSSSE* 1:555).

<sup>98</sup> On the use of חיי נצח and similar expressions in the Dead Sea Scrolls, see A. Schofield, “חַיִּי,” in *Theologisches Wörterbuch zu den Qumrantexten* (ed. H.-J. Fabry and U. Dahmen; vol. 1; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2011), 951–57 (953–54).

<sup>99</sup> For a positive judgement, see above all É. Puech, *La croyance des Esséniens en la vie future: Immortalité, résurrection, vie éternelle?* (EBib 21, 22; Paris: Gabalda, 1993), but also M. Hengel, “Das Begräbnis Jesu bei Paulus und die leibliche Auferstehung aus dem Grabe,” in *Auferstehung – Resurrection* (ed. F. Avemarie and H. Lichtenberger; WUNT 135; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001), 119–83 (170). Cautious and skeptical views however prevail; cf. e.g. G. W. E. Nickelsburg, “Resurrection,” in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. L. H. Schiffman and J. C. VanderKam; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 2:764–67 (766); H. Lichtenberger, “Auferstehung in den Qumranfunden,” in *Auferstehung – Resurrection* (see above), 79–91; A. L. A. Hogeterp, “Belief in Resurrection and its Religious Settings in Qumran and the New Testament,” in *Echoes from the Caves: Qumran and the New Testament* (ed. F. García Martínez; STDJ 85; Leiden: Brill; 2009), 299–320.

destined for immortality. It seems likely that this original immortality is thought to be intimately connected with the glory which Adam and Eve likewise forfeited by disobeying the divine command.<sup>100</sup> To what extent it is also related to the notion of *imago Dei* is however difficult to say, as εἰκλὼν τοῦ θεοῦ for one thing is nowhere used in context with glory or eternal life (or the loss of either) and for another is applied to Adam even after the fall (33.5; 35.2).<sup>101</sup>

The rabbinic Adam haggadah sees a clear connection between the creational *imago Dei* of humankind and the prospect of eternal life. It ethicises this connection in basically the same way as does Philo, although it expresses this in mythical imagery rather than philosophical abstraction. Thus *Bereshit Rabbah*, after explaining that Adam due to his being created “in the image and in the likeness” resembled the “superior beings,” adds a further consideration to humankind’s intermediate status between angels and animals:

R. Tiph dai said in the name of R. Aḥa: The Holy One, blessed be he, said: “If I create him [as one] of the superior beings he will live and not die, but if [I create him as one] of the inferior beings he will die and not live. Behold, I shall rather create him [as one] of the superior beings *and* [as one] of the inferior beings, [so that] if he sins he will die, and if he does not sin he will live.”<sup>102</sup>

Since the first couple did not live up to the expectations that were placed in them, it does not come as a surprise that *Bereshit Rabbah* elsewhere lists “his life (יִיחַי)” together with “his splendour (יִיבֵר)” among the things which Adam by his disobedience came to lose.<sup>103</sup> However, the word “life” seems open here to double entendre: as characterising the status of the angels it of course denotes “immortality,” but at the same time implicitly also hints at what continues to be a prospect for Adam’s mortal descendants, namely the eternal postmortal life that the righteous will inherit at the resurrection of the dead.<sup>104</sup>

<sup>100</sup> Cf. Levison, *Portraits of Adam*, 169.

<sup>101</sup> In 10.3 and 12.1–2 εἰκλὼν τοῦ θεοῦ apparently alludes to the dominion of humankind over the animals, which due to the fall has been reversed. Cf. also 29.9, which is however not included in Dochhorn’s text. On Dochhorn’s assumption that the narrative denies Eve a share in Adam’s *imago Dei*, see above n. 60.

<sup>102</sup> *Gen. Rab.* 8.11 (65 Theodor/Albeck); cf. Avemarie, “Adam, das Kunstwerk Gottes,” 68. Kister, “‘First Adam’ and ‘Second Adam,’” 356–57, discusses a parallel in *Sipre Deut.* 306 (340–41 Finkelstein), which however lacks a reference to the idea of *imago Dei*.

<sup>103</sup> *Gen. Rab.* 12.6 (102 Theodor/Albeck); cf. *Tanḥ. Bereshit* 18 (7a Buber).

<sup>104</sup> This holds all the more as rabbinic anthropology has a clear tendency of ascribing the individual death to everyone’s individual sin rather than to the fall of Adam and Eve;

Returning to the notion of imperishability in 1 Cor 15:42–54, we may then conclude once again that a motif which originated in the ancient Jewish Adam haggadah was taken out of this context by Paul in order to present it as an essential result of the eschatological conforming of the believers to the image of Christ. While the use of ἀφθαρσία (rather than ζωὴ αἰώνιος) betrays his affinity to Jewish-Hellenistic thinking, the reference to resurrection shows him at the same time firmly rooted in Judaeian beliefs.

Whether in keeping with the tradition he believed that Adam and Eve themselves had originally been destined for immortality is not so easy to discern. It could be implied in Rom 5:12, where it says that death came into the world only through sin. However, the depiction in 1 Cor 15:42–49 of the first Adam made from dust in connection with the image of sowing in decay, disgrace and weakness rather tells against a Pauline *doctrina de statu originali*.<sup>105</sup> As we already saw in our discussion of the motif of righteousness, Paul apparently was simply not interested in speculations about a blissful past preceding the advent of sin and death. What he was interested in was overcoming present misery through the power of justification and resurrection.

### G. CONCLUSION

Having begun with the observation that the idea of a person being an image plays a central role in Paul's soteriology while references in his letters to the *imago Dei* concept of the priestly creation narrative are marginal at best, we can say now that the reason for Paul's modest interest in the priestly *imago Dei* concept lies in his eschatological line of vision. In his view what was to be expected from the believers' eschatological transformation into the image of Christ would exceed by far what Adam and Eve ever possessed. His perception of the first humans almost exclusively focuses on their disobedience and ensuing death.<sup>106</sup>

---

cf. Scroggs, *The Last Adam*, 36; Schäfer, "Adam in der jüdischen Überlieferung," 73–76.

<sup>105</sup> See the related considerations regarding Adam's original glory and Rom 1:23 and 3:23 in section C above. Cf. also Harrison, *Paul and the Imperial Authorities*, 258; Lohse, *Römer*, 175 ("Der Apostel spekuliert nicht über einen Urstand . . ."). For the role of this doctrine in the history of Christian dogmatics, see W. R. Dietz, "Urstand III. Dogmatisch," *RGK*, 4<sup>th</sup> ed., vol. 8 (2005): 843–48.

<sup>106</sup> Cf. Gielen, "Grundzüge," 135.

However, Paul was clearly also familiar with the positive aspects of the Jewish Adam haggadah, for amazingly much of what he attributes to the new existence of those who are conformed to the image of Christ—such as endowment with glory, justification, childhood to God and everlasting life—recurs in a broad range of ancient Jewish texts dealing with Adam and Eve, even if there it is only indirectly or—as in the writings of the *yahad*—not at all related to the idea of *imago Dei*. The notion of εἰκῶν itself is, of course, part of these borrowings,<sup>107</sup> as well as the pivotal idea that the *imago* can be imparted from a prototypical figure to an unlimited number of other human beings. In a way also 1 Cor 11:7, as Paul's one and only non-Christological reference to *imago Dei*, testifies to this familiarity.

All this shows that Paul's *imago* Christology is a direct offshoot of the reception of Gen 1:26–27 in ancient Judaism. The face of Christ therefore is not only the reflection that shows the believers the flashing glory of God, but unmistakably also bears the traits of Adam and Eve.

One last point that is worth mentioning relates to an old dichotomy in Pauline scholarship. As early as 1872, Heinrich Lüdemann observed that Paul uses justification language only in Romans and Galatians, where he interacts with Christians who firmly hold to traditional Jewish views, particularly concerning Torah and salvation, while in his Corinthian correspondence he is free to develop a soteriology of his own, which, essentially independent of Jewish concerns, is based on the idea of participation in Christ.<sup>108</sup> If, however, the present investigation has not been altogether misleading, we may now say that even one of the most refined ideas within Paul's "participation" discourse, the expectation of an eschatological transformation into the image of Christ, is deeply rooted in the traditions of Judaism, both Alexandrian and Judean.

---

<sup>107</sup> A point not treated in this contribution is the old assumption that Paul's *imago* Christology was substantially influenced by Hellenistic Jewish wisdom theology (cf. the description of σοφία as εἰκῶν of God's goodness in Wis 7:26 and as ἀρχή καὶ εἰκῶν καὶ ὄρασις θεοῦ in Philo, *Leg.* 1:43). While the possibility of such influence should not be denied, our findings certainly caution against taking it as the primary, let alone only, source of Paul's *imago* concept.

<sup>108</sup> H. Lüdemann, *Die Anthropologie des Apostels Paulus und ihre Stellung innerhalb seiner Heilslehre* (Kiel: Universitäts-Buchhandlung, 1872).



# PAUL'S VIEW OF THE SPIRIT IN THE LIGHT OF QUMRAN<sup>1</sup>

Jörg Frey

*Universität Zürich*

## A. PRELIMINARIES:

### 'PAUL AND QUMRAN' AND CHANGES IN SCHOLARSHIP

'Paul and Qumran' has been a classical topic of scholarship from the earliest years after the discovery of the first Qumran Scrolls.<sup>2</sup> We can silently pass over the more questionable speculative ideas, e.g. the view that Paul the apostle had his 'conversion' not near Damascus but actually at Qumran<sup>3</sup> or that he might be alluded to in one of the figures mentioned in the

---

<sup>1</sup> The present paper is part of a larger project "The Historical Origins of the Holy Spirit," launched by myself together with Prof. John R. Levison (Seattle Pacific University) and jointly funded by the German Alexander-von-Humboldt Foundation and the American International Catacomb Society (cf. the website of the pneumatology project: <http://www.christianpneumatology.com/index.html>). In this project, a team of specialists from different fields explores the historical origins of the early Christian notion of the Spirit by evaluating different, early Jewish and Greco-Roman textual corpora, in particular the Dead Sea Scrolls, Jewish mystical traditions, Hellenistic Judaism, Greco-Roman divination, Greco-Roman philosophy, and Ancient Medical Texts. The publication of the papers from a conference held in Leiden, Sept. 1–3, 2011, is in preparation for the series 'Ekstasis' with de Gruyter publishers (J. Frey and J. R. Levison [eds.], *The Historical Origins of the Holy Spirit* [Berlin: de Gruyter, 2013]). This interdisciplinary project demonstrates that only such a broad and multiperspective inquiry can put together all the relevant aspects for an appropriate historical understanding of the early Christian notion of the Spirit. The Scrolls are only one part of that multi-dimensional web, albeit an important one. This should be kept in mind, whenever we analyse Qumran texts with regard to the New Testament. I am deeply indebted to my colleague Jean-Sébastien Rey for the invitation to participate in and even co-organize the symposium at the University of Metz and also for the continuing dialogue on the relevance of Qumran for the understanding of New Testament texts. I am also grateful to John R. Levison for reading my article and for numerous suggestions.

<sup>2</sup> The compendium by H. Braun, *Qumran und das Neue Testament* (2 vols.; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1966), gives a concise summary of the early discussion. An important collective volume of the early period is J. Murphy-O'Connor, ed., *Paul and Qumran: Studies in New Testament Exegesis* (Chicago: Priory, 1968).

<sup>3</sup> Thus even recently the Jewish author P. Lapide, *Paulus zwischen Damaskus und Qumran. Fehldeutungen und Übersetzungsfehler* (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus,

Qumran texts, such as the 'wicked priest' or the 'man of lie'.<sup>4</sup> Unlike such daring speculations many observations made by scholars of the early period, mostly from a New Testament background,<sup>5</sup> are still valuable. The predominant fields of comparison were scriptural interpretation, messianism and eschatology, the awareness of sin and justification and the expression of dualism, flesh and spirit, light and darkness, God and Belial.<sup>6</sup> Scholars were fascinated by what they perceived to be remarkable theological depth, e.g. in the Hodayot, and so arrived at a very positive view of Qumran piety, or even 'theology,' at a time when many New Testament scholars were still strongly influenced by traditional paradigms of contrasting Jewish and early Christian texts and thought.

Methodologically, earlier research was largely occupied with assembling parallels, thus running the risk of what Samuel Sandmel once called 'parallelomania'.<sup>7</sup> The catena with parallels to the whole New Testament assembled from early research by Herbert Braun is still the most comprehensive collection of the insights from the first 15 years after the discovery, but it is, of course, limited to those texts available at that time. In

---

1993), based on a widespread misinterpretation of the "new covenant in the land of Damascus" mentioned in the Damascus Document as background of Acts 9:2.

<sup>4</sup> Thus already in the 1950s J. L. Teicher who considered the Scrolls to be later Jewish-Christian documents, thus interpreting the 'wicked priest' as a reference to Paul (cf. Braun, *Qumran*, 1.159); cf. recently the constructions of Robert Eisenman, who also considered the Scrolls to be an allegory of early Christian history and identified the 'Teacher of Righteousness' with 'James the Just,' the brother of Jesus, and, consequently, James' opponent Paul with the 'wicked priest.' Cf. R. H. Eisenman, *Maccabees, Zadokites, Christians and Qumran: A New Hypothesis of Qumran Origins* (StPB 34; Leiden: Brill, 1983); idem, *James the Just in the Habakkuk Peshet* (StPB 35; Leiden: Brill, 1986); idem, "Theory of Judeo-Christian Origins: The Last Column of the Damascus Document," in *Methods of Investigation of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Khirbet Qumran Site: Present Realities and Future Prospects* (ed. M. O. Wise et al.; New York: Academy of Sciences, 1994), 355–70; idem, *James the Brother of Jesus: The Key to Unlocking the Secrets of Early Christianity and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York: Viking, 1996). These identifications are, however, quite falsified by the dating of the texts which in the meantime has been confirmed by scientific investigations; these results had to be ignored by scholars who wanted to advocate a late post-Christian setting of the texts.

<sup>5</sup> It is an interesting fact that the early discussion of Qumran was almost dominated by scholars from a New Testament background. For German-speaking scholarship I have discussed this in my article: J. Frey, "Qumran Research and Biblical Scholarship in Germany," in *Qumran Research and Biblical Scholarship: A History of Research* (ed. : D. Dimant with the assistance of I. Kottsieper; STDJ 99; Leiden: Brill, 2012), 529–64 (531–35). From other scholarly contexts mention should be made of W. D. Davies, M. Black, J. A. Fitzmyer, R. E. Brown, and J. H. Charlesworth.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. the account in Braun, *Qumran*, 2.165–80.

<sup>7</sup> S. Sandmel, "Parallelomania," *JBL* 81 (1962): 1–13.

continuation of Braun's work, it has been the life-long effort of my predecessor in Munich, Heinz-Wolfgang Kuhn, to collect parallels between Qumran and the genuine Pauline epistles from the increasing number of texts published and to evaluate them more accurately than others did before.<sup>8</sup> These parallels, some of which precisely match Pauline expressions (such as *δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ*, *ἔργα νόμου* et al.), are a strong reminder that Paul draws intensely on Jewish sources and discussions. And although writing in Greek and adopting paradigms and terms also from his diaspora context, he cannot be understood correctly apart from the conceptual background in Scripture and interpretation via Palestinian Judaism. It is to a great extent due to the Qumran discoveries that Pauline scholars

---

<sup>8</sup> The number of lengthy papers discussing parts of the evidence or single topics is impressive, cf. e.g. H.-W. Kuhn, "The Impact of the Qumran Scrolls on the Understanding of Paul," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research* (ed. D. Dimant and U. Rappaport; STDJ 10; Leiden: Brill and Jerusalem: Magness Press and Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi, 1992), 327–39; idem, "Die Bedeutung der Qumrantexte für das Verständnis des Ersten Thesalonicherbriefes," in *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid, 18–21 March 1991* (ed. J. Trebolle Barrera and L. Vegas Montaner; STDJ 11.1–2; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 2.339–53; idem, "Die Bedeutung der Qumrantexte für das Verständnis des Galaterbriefes aus dem Münchener Projekt: Qumran und das Neue Testament," in *New Qumran Texts and Studies: Proceedings of the First Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Paris 1992* (ed. G. J. Brooke and F. García Martínez; STDJ 15; Leiden: Brill 1994), 169–221; idem, "A Legal Issue in 1 Corinthians 5 and in Qumran," in *Legal Texts and Legal Issues: Proceedings of the Second Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Published in Honour of J. M. Baumgarten* (ed. M. J. Bernstein, F. García Martínez, and J. Kampen; STDJ 23; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 489–99; idem, "Qumran und Paulus: Unter traditionsgeschichtlichem Aspekt ausgewählte Parallelen," in *Das Urchristentum in seiner literarischen Geschichte* (FS Jürgen Becker; ed. U. Mell and U. B. Müller; BZNW 100; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1999), 227–46; idem, "Qumran Texts and the Historical Jesus: Parallels in Contrast," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Fifty Years after Their Discovery. Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20–25, 1997* (ed. L. H. Schiffman, E. Tov, and J. C. VanderKam; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2000), 573–80; idem, "The Qumran Meal and the Lord's Supper in Paul in the Context of the Graeco-Roman World," in *Paul, Luke and the Graeco-Roman World: Essays in Honour of Alexander J. M. Wedderburn* (ed. A. Christophersen et al.; JSNTSup 217; London and New York: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002), 221–48; idem, "The Impact of Selected Qumran Texts on the Understanding of Pauline Theology," in *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls. The Second Princeton Symposium on Judaism and Christian Origins*, Vol. 3: *The Scrolls and Christian Origins* (ed. J. H. Charlesworth, Waco: Baylor University Press, 2006), 153–85; idem, "'Gemeinde Gottes' in den Qumrantexten und bei Paulus unter Berücksichtigung des Toraverständnisses," in *Das Gesetz im frühen Judentum und im Neuen Testament* (FS C. Burchard; ed. D. Sänger and M. Konrad; NTOA 57; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2006), 153–69. However, the enormous increase of texts since the 1990s has made the task immense. We can only hope that Kuhn will be able to publish his thorough comparisons on all Pauline epistles, although comprehensiveness is becoming more and more impossible.



now increasingly acknowledge that the apostle's language and thought is predominantly shaped by his Jewish background.<sup>9</sup> In contrast to the tendency in scholarship of the 1950s and 1960s, which was still shaped by a traditionally Protestant view of the fundamental contrast between law and gospel (as derived from Galatians), Pauline scholarship today can more easily acknowledge that Paul still acted and preached within a Jewish context. Paul's Jewish identity as such is not a major problem any more; the question of how we can determine more precisely his position within the Judaism of his time is more so. Again, the Qumran texts are a major tool for discussing these issues—together with other contemporary Jewish texts from the Palestinian tradition or from the diaspora.

Scholarship has changed considerably since the early Qumran discoveries, of course, especially in the field of Qumran studies. After periods of initial fascination and others of temporary stagnation,<sup>10</sup> the release of all the previously unknown manuscripts since the 1990s now enables us to draw a new picture on the basis of the full range of the material and also to appreciate the variety of interpretations, genres and viewpoints within the Scrolls. It is obvious now that the library of Qumran is not merely a collection of sectarian texts but includes a wide variety of writings from the literary production in Palestinian Judaism between the third century BCE and the first century CE. This is of crucial relevance for the methods and patterns of relating the Qumran discoveries to early Christian (and other early Jewish) texts. The task is no longer simply collecting parallels, nor determining literary dependence, but rather contextualizing some writings by means of other texts, putting them in perspective, and reconstructing discourses not only between Jews and Jesus-followers, but rather within a wider Jewish framework from which the early Christian tradition emerged.

Although Paul presumably was never able to read the 'sectarian' texts from Qumran, as they were only accessible to the members of the commu-

---

<sup>9</sup> Cf. my discussion in J. Frey, "Paul's Jewish Identity," in *Jewish Identity in the Greco-Roman World. Jüdische Identität in der griechisch-römischen Welt* (ed. J. Frey, D. R. Schwartz, and S. Gripentrog; AJEC 71; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 285–321, more comprehensively idem, "The Jewishness of Paul," in *Paul: Life, Setting, Work, Letters* (ed. O. Wischmeyer; London and New York: T & T Clark, 2012), 57–95. See most recently the collection of articles by T. G. Casey and J. Taylor (eds.), *Paul's Jewish Matrix* (Bible in Dialogue 2; Rome: Gregorian and Biblical Press, 2011).

<sup>10</sup> On the periods in discussion see J. Frey, "The Impact of the Dead Sea Scrolls on New Testament Interpretation: Proposals, Problems, and Further Perspectives," in *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 407–61 (408–19).

nity, he may have come in touch with scriptural interpretations, sapien-  
tial traditions, liturgical formulae and halachic viewpoints as expressed  
in some of the Scrolls from the Qumran library. Based on this wide varie-  
ty of texts we can now better evaluate what was imaginable, debatable or  
acceptable in the time of Jesus and his early followers—since we are able  
to glimpse into the vibrant debates and creative interpretations within  
Palestinian Judaism of that period.

So, after the release of all the previously unpublished texts, it is time  
for a fresh discussion of these matters.<sup>11</sup> It is also time for an improved and  
more balanced method of comparison—in contrast to earlier, often one-  
sided or overstated approaches. This means, we should no longer simply  
collect parallels and must be very careful in evaluating the parallels and  
in relating them to others, also from Josephus, Philo, Rabbinic traditions,  
and also from Greco-Roman literature. Questions in the history of reli-  
gions require an interdisciplinary discourse, with specialists of the dif-  
ferent textual corpora, and perhaps also from different scholarly contexts  
and traditions.

For the New Testament scholar with his primary focus on a relatively  
small book such a wide perspective is even more needful. As my academ-  
ic teacher Martin Hengel repeatedly phrased it: 'A New Testament schol-  
ar who only knows the New Testament, knows nothing about the New  
Testament.'<sup>12</sup> Thus, for my own discipline, it is of crucial importance to  
take into consideration the insights from Qumran, and especially those  
that can be gained from the full access to the material.<sup>13</sup> The benefit is  
manifold. We can hope to understand better some of Paul's enigmatic  
texts, in a fresh manner and somewhat detached from traditional and  
dogmatic paths of interpretation, and we can try to learn from the dif-  
ferent scholarly perspectives. We can hope to find some of the ideas that  
shaped his views and also to meet some of his partners in dialogue, being

---

<sup>11</sup> Cf. also the introductory article by F. García Martínez, "Qumran between the Old and the New Testament," in *Echoes from the Caves: Qumran and the New Testament* (ed. F. García Martínez; STDJ 85; Leiden: Brill, 2009), 1–6.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. M. Hengel, "Aufgaben der neutestamentlichen Wissenschaft," *NTS* 40 (1994): 321–57 (321); reprinted in idem, *Theologische, historische und biographische Skizzen. Kleine Schriften 7* (ed. C.-J. Thornton; WUNT 253; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 242–78 (242); see also the abbreviated English version: "Tasks of New Testament Scholarship," *BBR* 6 (1996): 67–86 (67). See also idem, "Eine junge theologische Disziplin in der Krise," in *Theologische, historische und biographische Skizzen*, 279–91 (280–81).

<sup>13</sup> Some of the insights for Jesus research and Pauline studies are sketched in my programmatic inaugural lecture: J. Frey, "Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und Antikes Judentum: Probleme—Wahrnehmungen—Perspektiven," *ZTK* 109 (2012): 445–71.

however aware that other contemporaries exist and await us in Corinth, or Alexandria, or wherever the journey will finally take us.

## B. EARLY EXPERIENCES OF THE SPIRIT AND THE DEVELOPMENT AND BACKGROUND OF PAUL'S VIEWS

Turning now to the origins of early Christian views of the Spirit,<sup>14</sup> we should be aware that some kind of experience, rather than theology, was at the origin of the early Christian notion of 'the Spirit,' whereas concepts, taken from the Scriptures, from early Jewish and—somewhat later—also Hellenistic Jewish and Greco-Roman thought were used to describe and to understand these experiences.<sup>15</sup>

### 1. *The Earliest Jesus Movement*

The first early Christian author to develop a *theology* of the Holy Spirit, however, is Paul. Earlier experiences of the spirit are mirrored in some early post-Easter confessions and partly reported in Acts, although it is often difficult to distinguish them from the later viewpoint of Luke. Apparently, the earliest followers of Jesus shared the view that the spirit which had empowered the earthly Jesus to act and preach (cf. Isa 61:1f.), had now been given to his followers, empowering them and dwelling

---

<sup>14</sup> For the following passages, cf. my more extensive discussion of the material in J. Frey, "Vom Windbrausen zum Geist Christi und zur trinitarischen Person: Stationen einer Geschichte des Heiligen Geistes im Neuen Testament," in *Der Heilige Geist* (Jahrbuch für Biblische Theologie 24 [2009]; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2011), 121–54 (esp. 134–37).

<sup>15</sup> The priority of experience over theology was one of the distinctive views of the history-of-religions school around 1900, in which a number of important works on the Spirit originated: H. Gunkel, *Die Wirkungen des heiligen Geistes nach der populären Anschauung der apostolischen Zeit und nach der Lehre des Apostels Paulus* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1888); H. Weinel, *Die Wirkungen des Geistes und der Geister im nachapostolischen Zeitalter bis auf Irenäus* (Freiburg: Mohr, 1899); M. Dibelius, *Die Geisterwelt im Glauben des Paulus* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1909); P. Volz, *Der Geist Gottes und die verwandten Erscheinungen im Alten Testament und im anschließenden Judentum* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1910); in the English speaking world E. de Witt Burton, *Spirit, Soul, and Flesh* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1918). Recently, John Levison has pointed to the fundamental truth in this experience-based approach of the history-of-religions school, which was subsequently suppressed by other theological currents. Cf. J. R. Levison, *Filled with the Spirit* (Grand Rapids/Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2009); see also idem, "Assessing the Origins of Modern Pneumatology: The Life and Legacy of Hermann Gunkel," in *Christian Body, Christian Self: Concepts of Early Christian Personhood* (ed. C. K. Rothschild and T. W. Thompson; WUNT 284; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 313–31.

among or even within them.<sup>16</sup> The expression of such views is often held to be part of baptism *formulae*, but the connection of the gift of the spirit to the act of baptism may be a secondary development.<sup>17</sup> The view that the spirit that had empowered Jesus was now given to the believers can be considered one of the earliest and most crucial ideas among early Jesus-followers, probably caused by strong experiences of newness and by the vibrant dynamics that characterized the movement in its first period.

At a very early stage, Jesus' resurrection was attributed to the power of the divine spirit, so that it could be considered the beginning of a new period of God's eschatological salvation and the manifestation of the spirit of the end of time. This is still visible in an early Christological formula preserved in Rom 1:4 which attributes Jesus' resurrection and exaltation to the power of the 'spirit of holiness.'<sup>18</sup> This view is rooted in the Scriptures, especially in Ezekiel 37 where the resurrection of Israel is attributed to the Spirit, and the reception of Ezekiel 37 in postbiblical Judaism uses that passage as support for the hope of individual resurrection of the dead,<sup>19</sup> which can now be considered a work of the divine spirit in the eschatological period.

The visions of the risen Christ, interpreted in the context of the common belief in the eschatological resurrection of the dead, could therefore be conceived of as a sign that the eschatological period of restitution and salvation had now begun. Based on such an interpretation of the Easter experiences, the earliest Christian mission started and spread in the conviction that God's eschatological salvation had started and that the Spirit of God that had empowered the Messiah was now dispensed to his disciples and the community of believers (cf. Acts 2:3).

---

<sup>16</sup> "God has given us the Spirit" (cf. Rom 5:5; 2 Cor 1:22; 5:5; 1 Thess 4:8; Acts 5:32; 15:8 etc.); those who believe have "received the Spirit" (cf. Rom 8:15; 1 Cor 2:12; 2 Cor 11:4; Gal 3:2, 14; 1 John 2:27) or "The Spirit of God dwells within you" (cf. Rom 8:9; 1 Cor 3:9).

<sup>17</sup> Cf. F. Hahn, "Das biblische Verständnis des Geistes," in idem, *Studien zum Neuen Testament 2* (ed. J. Frey and J. Schlegel; WUNT 192; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 2006), 61–77 (69–70).

<sup>18</sup> The phrase sounds thoroughly Semitic, so the formula probably originated in the early Aramaic speaking community.

<sup>19</sup> Here, the most important insights can be gained from the Pseudo-Ezekiel text preserved fragmentarily in the Qumran library: On 4Q385 frg. 2 see A. L. A. Hogeterp, "Resurrection and Biblical Tradition: Pseudo-Ezekiel Reconsidered," *Biblica* 89 (2008): 59–69.

## 2. *The Question for the Development and Background of Paul's Views*

But apart from those early experiences, partly preserved in a few brief confession formulae, Paul was the first Christian mind to reflect the Spirit and its (or his<sup>20</sup>) work theologically.<sup>21</sup> His views are, however, hard to systematize, for different reasons. First, they are still fluid, developing, depending on his own experiences and also phrased in reaction to the phenomena he had to deal with in his communities, e.g., in Corinth. Furthermore, some of the aspects expressed in his letters are presumably taken from the views and experiences of his partners in dialogue. They might therefore be influenced by other preachers or by the views Paul's addressees had adopted from their pre-Christian background. But Paul himself was, from the beginning of his mission, part of the spirit movement, acting himself as a 'charismatic.' Paul was well-acquainted with phenomena such as prophecy (1 Thess 5:19) and ecstatic speech (glossolalia; 1 Cor 14:18), and he could validly claim that his preaching was accompanied by 'signs and wonders' (1 Thess 1:5–6; Gal 3:5; Rom 15:18–19). He had visions (2 Cor 12:1) and auditive experiences (2 Cor 12:4), and his calling, interpreted as an encounter with the risen Christ (1 Cor 9:1) can even be considered as such.<sup>22</sup> So we should study his views with sensitivity for such experiences and, of course, with the background of his Jewish education and categories. Paul's pre-Christian views are influential in his ministry and theology, and we can only understand the apostle if we also consider the Jewish Paul and his Palestinian and diaspora Jewish concepts.

---

<sup>20</sup> Here, the language already indicates a problem, because the notion of a 'personal' character of the spirit develops initially in Paul and then, more strongly, in Johannine theology, cf. J. Frey, "Vom Windbrausen zum Geist Christi und zur trinitarischen Person," 137–43 and 146–53.

<sup>21</sup> On Paul's view of the Spirit cf. also M. Wolter, "Der heilige Geist bei Paulus," in *Der Heilige Geist*, 93–119; U. Schnelle, *Theologie des Neuen Testaments* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2007), 244–50; see also the thorough work by G. D. Fee, *God's Empowering Presence: The Holy Spirit in the Letters of Paul* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1994); and most recently Levison, *Filled with the Spirit*, 253–316.

<sup>22</sup> On these phenomena, see B. Heininger, *Paulus als Visionär* (Herders Biblische Studien 9; Freiburg: Herder, 1996); C. Meier, *Mystik bei Paulus: Zur Phänomenologie religiöser Erfahrung im Neuen Testament* (TANZ 26; Tübingen and Basel: Francke, 1998); B. Kollmann, "Paulus als Wundertäter," in *Paulinische Christologie* (FS H. Hübner; ed. U. Schnelle and T. Söding; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000), 76–96.

### 3. *Some Distinctive Features of Paul's Concept of the Spirit*

What is distinctive in Paul's view of the spirit? This is a difficult question because at first Paul has so much to say about the spirit. John R. Levison phrases it nicely: "Antiquity has bequeathed to us no writer more enamored of the spirit than the Apostle Paul whose letters are awash in the spirit, so much so that isolating a single point of entrée is a monumental task."<sup>23</sup>

But if we take a historical approach, starting with Paul's earliest letter which is often viewed as a window into Paul's early theology,<sup>24</sup> we can already see in 1 Thessalonians a distinctive view of the spirit. It includes the claim that Paul's own preaching happened in power and the Holy Spirit, i.e. with accompanying signs and miracles (1 Thess 1:5), that the spirit of prophecy is active in the community and should not be quenched (1 Thess 5:19f.) and that God gave (or even in the present tense: 'gives') his Holy Spirit to the Thessalonians (1 Thess 4:8). The letter to the Galatians<sup>25</sup> also presupposes that the addressees initially experienced the manifestation of the spirit (Gal 3:2–5) and—even as Gentiles—received 'the promise of the spirit' (Gal 3:14) when they came to believe. The phrase 'the promise of the spirit' points to the Scriptures, to the prophetic expectation that the spirit will be poured out in the end of time (cf. Ezek 36:26f.) on Israel—or, in Paul's view, not only on Israel, but now even on Gentiles.<sup>26</sup> From the scriptural background one could also infer that this bestowal of the Spirit was expected to be linked with visionary and prophetic phenomena (Joel 3:1–5). Ezekiel and Joel are—apart from some passages in Isaiah—the main sources for this view of the eschatological bestowal of the Spirit upon people.<sup>27</sup> Paul adopts this idea in a wider sense, now also

<sup>23</sup> Cf. Levison, *Filled with the Spirit*, 253.

<sup>24</sup> Cf., e.g., U. Schnelle, *Apostle Paul: His Life and Theology* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2005), 171–91. The problem of such a pattern of theological development in Paul is, however, that the epistles preserved are from a relatively short period of his ministry, after Paul had already lived as a follower of Jesus and worked as an apostle for more than 15 years. Thus the most important developments were probably in those 'unknown' early years; cf. especially M. Hengel and A. M. Schwemer, *Paul Between Damascus and Antioch: The Unknown Years* (London: SCM, 1997), 11–15.

<sup>25</sup> The dating of Galatians is particularly difficult. It might be Paul's second letter, although some interpreters locate it close to Romans, for merely thematic reasons. Cf. J. Frey, "Galatians," in *Paul: Life, Setting, Work, Letters*, 199–222.

<sup>26</sup> On Paul's adoption of Ezekiel's vision see also Levison, *Filled with the Spirit*, 253–63.

<sup>27</sup> Cf. F. Philip, *The Origins of Pauline Pneumatology* (WUNT II/194; Tübingen, 2005), 34–76; see also Wolter, "Der Heilige Geist bei Paulus," 95–96.

related to the Gentiles, and with the implication that it is the spirit which purifies or sanctifies the Gentiles for God (Rom 15:16).

In the Pauline epistles we can discern a number of consequences or effects of the eschatological gift of the spirit as interpreted by Paul.

a) Quite prominent among the Corinthians was the manifestation of ecstatic speech (glossolalia) which could be interpreted by the Corinthians, and possibly also by Paul himself, as “tongues of the angels” (1 Cor 13:1) which were now given to the believers for God’s praise (1 Cor 14:2). But since outsiders could consider these phenomena a kind of maniac behaviour, known in paganism, especially in Dionysiac circles, Paul decisively stresses the prophetic, revelatory function of the spirit, distinct from the ‘tongues.’ This distinction was not customary in other early Christian circles. It occurs for the first time in 1 Corinthians 14, and it seems to be introduced by Paul himself, in reaction to the Corinthian situation, whereas his addressees probably regarded those phenomena as part of ‘prophecy.’ But as the decisive aspect in the early Christian gatherings is the message that people attending the community meetings should understand in order to repent and believe (1 Cor 14:24–25), Paul puts all the weight on the aspect of comprehensibility, on speaking in clear and understandable words (1 Cor 14:5, 12, 14–19). In this manner, in notable difference to his addressees and other early Christian circles, Paul subordinates extraordinary manifestations of the spirit to its revelatory function.

b) In critical dialogue with the Corinthian group particularly appreciating wisdom and wisdom speech or rhetoric, possibly influenced by Alexandrian traditions, introduced by Apollos (1 Cor 1:18–4:21), Paul adopts the concept of the hidden wisdom of God (1 Cor 2:6–16). He explicitly states that this kind of wisdom is pronounced through the spirit (1 Cor 2:10, so that it can be understood by those who have the Spirit, or even by ‘spiritual’ beings, whereas the creatural being is incapable of understanding (1 Cor 2:13–16). Like Lady Wisdom in some traditions of Jewish wisdom theology (esp. Wis 7–9), it is ultimately the Spirit, which (or who) conveys the true meaning of the Scriptures and reveals the hidden plan of God’s work. So it is ultimately the Spirit that communicates the message of the cross and leads humans to repentance and salvation.

c) Because the spirit dwells in the community, the community is a temple of God (1 Cor 3:16). The sanctity of the community (and of single believers) which is implicit in this concept, has ethical implications. Paul is concerned with the purity of the communities, especially with regard to serious sins, and including sexual behaviour. Thus the community mem-



ber in Corinth who lived in an incestuous relationship must be excluded by a ritual act, which is commanded by Paul in his 'spiritual' presence (1 Cor 5:1–5). The aspect of sanctity is also stressed with regard to the individual community members who are called 'temple of the holy spirit' (1 Cor 6:19) since the Spirit is thought to be present in every single member. This is again phrased with ethical consequences in view, especially with regard to the body and bodily (sexual) relations (1 Cor 6:20).<sup>28</sup>

d) A distinctive function of the spirit, based on Ezekiel 37, is that it brings life or brings to life. Paul can even speak of the "life-giving Spirit."<sup>29</sup> Based on the conviction that God raised Jesus from the dead through the spirit, it is also the spirit that assures the believers of their resurrection from the dead (Rom 8:11). So the spirit can be called ἀρραβών (pledge: 2 Cor 1:22; 5:5) or ἀπαρχή ('first born' or 'first fruit': Rom 8:23; 1 Cor 15:20, 23), it guarantees the expected eschatological fulfilment. This idea is, of course, strongly dependent on the basic structure of early Christian eschatology which is shaped by the tension between "now" and "not yet" (between Easter and the parousia).<sup>30</sup>

e) Another tendency that can be observed in Paul is that the work of the Spirit is increasingly in parallel with the work of the exalted Christ: The Spirit is sent (Gal 4:6) as Christ was sent (Gal 4:4), the Spirit represents the believers before God (Rom 8:26) as does Christ (Rom 8:34), liberates from the deathly power of the law (Rom 8:2) as did Christ (Gal 5:1), gives gifts to anyone "according to his will" (1 Cor 12:11; cf. 12:6), and the Spirit has its own 'intention' (φρόνημα Rom 8:6, 27).<sup>31</sup> These analogies increasingly lead to understanding the Spirit as a 'personal' figure. Paul can even say: "The Lord is the Spirit" (ὁ δὲ κύριος τὸ πνεῦμά ἐστιν, 2 Cor 3:17). This does not mean that the Spirit and the risen Christ are identical, but that there is a parallel, insofar as the reign of the Spirit is expressed in analogy with the lordship of Christ.<sup>32</sup>

<sup>28</sup> The concern for sexual purity is already present in 1 Thess 4:8f.

<sup>29</sup> πνεῦμα ζωοποιούν: 1 Cor 15:45; cf. Rom 8:11; 2 Cor 3:6.

<sup>30</sup> On this, cf. J. Frey, "Eschatology in the New Testament: An Introduction," in *Eschatology in the New Testament and Some Related Documents* (ed. J. G. van der Watt; WUNT II/315; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 3–32 (15–20).

<sup>31</sup> Cf. Frey, "Vom Windbrausen zum Geist Christi und zur trinitarischen Person," 141–43.

<sup>32</sup> The tendency is strengthened in later writings, e.g. in the Gospel of John (cf. John 16:13–15), and finally leads to the Christian idea of the Spirit as a divine being and part of the Trinity. But this is, of course, still far beyond Paul's own views. Cf., on the later development, Frey, "Vom Windbrausen zum Geist Christi und zur trinitarischen Person," 143–53.



#### 4. *Qumran and the Issue of Methodology*

The primary source of Paul's (and more generally the early Christian) views of the Spirit is certainly Scripture. Some aspects may come from ideas of the Greco-Roman world, and certain elements of early Christian pneumatology are distinctively Christian developments. It is, therefore, a methodological task to consider cautiously where and how Qumran texts can be introduced into the discussion. How can we evaluate adequately parallels from Qumran, from either the non-sectarian or the sectarian writings? Due to the fact that these texts all point to particularly Jewish concepts, or more precisely: to *Palestinian* Jewish concepts, we can probably identify some additional (and non-biblical) Jewish elements Paul could draw on when developing his own views. In case there are parallels with distinctively Qumran sectarian ideas, we will have to discuss further how they can be explained – given the fact that Paul was not directly acquainted with the sectarian texts.

#### C. THE NOTION OF SPIRIT IN QUMRAN

Qumran usage of the term רוח is, with some specific differences, in continuity with the usage in the Hebrew Bible.<sup>33</sup> There, the range of meanings is rather wide, from the physical meaning of wind or breath through the anthropological meaning of mindset or spiritual condition down to the meaning of 'spirit' as God's spirit or even the 'holy spirit'.<sup>34</sup> Notably, the expression 'holy spirit' occurs in Hebrew only in two rather late passages (Isa 63:10–11; Ps 51:13) and in Aramaic in two passages in Daniel (Dan 5:12; 6:4). However, it is increasingly clear that God's spirit is connected with God's own 'holiness,' and can thus be called not only 'God's spirit' but also

<sup>33</sup> Cf. basically H.-J. Fabry, "רוח VII: Qumran," *TWAT* 7:419–25 (419). The work by A. E. Sekki, *The Meaning of Ruah at Qumran* (SBLDS 110; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989) is outdated.

<sup>34</sup> Apart from the relevant dictionary articles, see M. Dreytza, *Der theologische Gebrauch von Ruah im Alten Testament: Eine wort- und satzsemantische Studie* (Giessen and Basel: Brunnen, 1990); R. Koch, *Der Geist Gottes im Alten Testament* (Frankfurt a.M.: Peter Lang, 1991); A. H. J. Gunneweg, "Aspekte des alttestamentlichen Geistverständnisses," in *Sola scriptura: Beiträge zu Exegese und Hermeneutik des Alten Testaments* (ed. P. Höffken; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1975), 96–106; J. Schreiner, "Wirken des Geistes Gottes in alttestamentlicher Sicht," in *Der eine Gott Israels: Gesammelte Schriften zur Theologie des Alten Testaments*, Vol. 2 (ed. E. Zenger; Würzburg: Echter, 1992), 83–136, and K.-D. Schunck, "Wesen und Wirksamkeit des Geistes nach der Überlieferung des Alten Testaments," in *Altes Testament und Heiliges Land: Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament und zur biblischen Landeskunde*, Vol. 1 (Frankfurt a.M.: Peter Lang, 1989), 137–51.

'holy spirit'.<sup>35</sup> This term is, then, much more frequent in postbiblical literature, including Qumran,<sup>36</sup> but most interestingly, it is absent in Philo and Josephus and also in non-Jewish Greek literature.<sup>37</sup> From this, we may conclude that the concept of *the* 'holy spirit' (or a 'holy spirit'), sharing in and conveying God's holiness, is most probably a concept rooted and developed within the Palestinian Jewish tradition. The remarkable fact that this term becomes so frequent in the New Testament, can only be explained from the Palestinian Jewish (although not specifically Qumranian) background, and it shows that the experiences of and reflections on the spirit stem from the experiences and interpretive concepts of the earliest community of Jewish Jesus-believers in Jerusalem and its vicinity.

As in the Hebrew Bible, the notion of רוח in Qumran is broad and multi-faceted.<sup>38</sup> A detailed investigation based on all the texts now accessible is still a *desideratum*, but we can say that רוח roughly covers the same range of meanings as in the Hebrew Bible, but with some changes and extensions. The most important extension is that the word is very often used for personal 'spirits,' i.e. angels and demons, most prominently in the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice. This is a development linked with the rise of angelic motifs and dualistic concepts, e.g. in the Enochic tradition and, then, in major traditions of postbiblical Judaism. However, for the present purpose, we can leave aside all those references, and focus on the texts that help to understand the idea of the divine or holy spirit. For the sake of convenience, we will limit the investigation to a discussion of some elements in the Treatise on the Two Spirits in 1QS, and then, more closely, to the Hodayot in which the expression 'holy spirit' occurs most frequently.

<sup>35</sup> Cf. Wolter, "Der Heilige Geist bei Paulus," 93–94.

<sup>36</sup> Cf., e.g., in the Daniel tradition in the LXX: Dan 5:12; 6:3 LXX (and more instances in the Theodotion version); cf. also Sus 34 (θ'). On these passages, see Levison, *Filled with the Spirit*, 127–30; Cf. also Wis 1:5; 7:22; 9:17; *Pss. Sol.* 17:37; *Jub.* 1:21–23; *L.A.B.* 18:11; 28:6; 32:14; 60:1; 62:2; *T. Levi* 3:6 (Greenfield/Stone/Eshel); *T. Ab.* 20:15; *T. Job* 51:2; *Apoc. Zeph.* (in Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* 5:77:2); some passages in the *As. Mos.* might be Christian. In Qumran cf. 1QS III 7; IV 21; VIII 16; IX 3; 1QS<sup>b</sup> II 24; 1QH<sup>a</sup> IV 38; VI 24; VIII 20, 21, 25, 30; XV 10; XVI 13; XVII 32; XX 15; XXIII 29, 33; CD II 12–13; V 11; VII 4; 4Q270 2 ii 11; 4Q287 10 13; 4Q213a 1 13; 4Q416 2 ii 6 par 4Q418 8 6; 4Q418 76 1–3; 4Q422 1:7; 4Q444 1–4 1+5 1; 4Q504 1+2 v recto 11–18; 4Q504 4 5 par 4Q506 131–132 11; 1Q39 1 6; 4Q434 1 i 11. A related expression, "spirits of the holiest holiness," used in the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice (4Q400–407; 11Q17), refers to angelic beings. I am grateful to my colleague Eibert Tigchelaar for a collection of relevant texts I could use for my research.

<sup>37</sup> Cf., however, in Latin, Seneca, *Epist.* 41:2: "*sacer intra nos spiritus sedet.*"

<sup>38</sup> Cf., for an overview, Fabry, "רוח VII: Qumran," which, however, does not cover the texts released since the 1990s.

Finally, some aspects will be added from other texts, before we enter into a comparison with Pauline views.

1. *The Treatise on the Two Spirits and the Holy Spirit*<sup>39</sup>

Let me start with some brief remarks on the document which has dominated the discussion since the beginning of the Qumran debate: the so-called Treatise on the Two Spirits (1QS III 13–IV 26). This prominent text is often erroneously considered foundational for the Qumran sectarian worldview: yet it should be interpreted as originally independent, a sapiential passage of pre-sectarian origin which was incorporated into the manuscript 1QS (but not in all 4QS manuscripts<sup>40</sup>) as an appendix to the preceding liturgical section.<sup>41</sup> The instruction was probably composed before the constitution of the *yahad*<sup>42</sup> in sapiential circles, and in this context it aims at explaining why even the pious and wise can stumble and fall. That is, the instruction provides an explanation of the presence and power of evil, not only in the world in general, but especially in its influence on the pious, and expresses an ultimate perspective of hope for the final extinction of evil and the purification of the righteous. In spite of some inconsistencies in the text, I am reluctant to subscribe to suggestions of a multi-stage development of the text, and even redactional adaptations are difficult to ascertain.<sup>43</sup>

<sup>39</sup> On the interpretation of this text, see my discussion in J. Frey, "Different Patterns of Dualism in the Qumran Library," in *Legal Texts and Legal Issues*, 275–335 (289–300).

<sup>40</sup> Apart from 1QS, it is attested only in the preserved parts of one other manuscript (4QS<sup>c</sup>), while it was definitely not contained in 4QS<sup>d</sup> and 4QS<sup>e</sup>, see S. Metso, *The Textual Development of the Qumran Community Rule* (STDJ 21; Leiden: Brill, 1997). In language and content, it is closely related to pre-sectarian sapiential texts from the Qumran Library (*Instruction; Book of Mysteries*) in which sapiential and apocalyptic ideas are combined and a dualistic worldview is developed.

<sup>41</sup> Cf. Frey, "Different Patterns of Dualistic Thought," 289–90.

<sup>42</sup> The text lacks most of the significant terms in the writings from the *yahad* and introduces other terms instead, e.g. 'Angel of Darkness' for the opposing power instead of 'Belial.' The observance of the Torah is not even mentioned in the catalogue of virtues, and, most distinctively, the 'covenant' is not understood as a present reality (as in the *yahad* texts, e.g. 1QS I 1–III 12) but as a future reality to be established in the end (1QS IV 22). Terminological links exist with the pre-sectarian wisdom texts where we can find earlier traces of dualistic thought and the idea of a predestined world order expressed most clearly in this treatise. Cf. A. Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination: Weisheitliche Urordnung und Prädestination in den Textfunden von Qumran* (STDJ 18; Leiden: Brill, 1995), 126–32; A. Lange and H. Lichtenberger, "Qumran," *TRE* 28:45–79 (56–57), and Frey, "Different Patterns of Dualistic Thought," 295–300.

<sup>43</sup> Cf., e.g., C. Hempel, "The Teaching on the Two Spirits and the Literary Development of the Rule of the Community," in *Dualism in Qumran* (ed. G. Xeravits; LSTJ 76;

From the very beginning, scholars have discussed whether the two 'spirits' mentioned at the beginning of the instruction (1QS III 18) are merely human attitudes and ethical orientations,<sup>44</sup> or rather angelic beings that have power over humans. In view of other Qumran texts such as the *War Rule* (1QM) or especially the *Shirot Olat haShabbat*, there can be little doubt that contemporary readers saw an angelic reality behind the two spirits, as is especially suggested by the fact that the 'spirits' are later called "Prince of Light" and "Angel of Darkness" (1QS III 20f.). A second question concerns the relationship between the 'Spirit of Truth' (1QS III 18–19) and the 'holy spirit' mentioned in 1QS IV 21, especially since the terms are used interchangeably for the same figure, the 'paraclete,' in the Gospel of John.<sup>45</sup> As the text stands, however, the holy spirit introduced in 1QS IV 21 is not identical with the 'Spirit of Truth,' set in dominion over his lot of humans. It differs, since it is not described as a primordial figure, put in charge of his dominion with the creation, nor as a figure acting within human history, but only as an eschatological means of purification,<sup>46</sup> expected to purify humans (or their inner parts) at the time of visitation. But on the other hand, the 'holy spirit' is closely paralleled with the 'Spirit of Truth.' The text reads (1QS IV 20–23):<sup>47</sup>

"Then God will purify by his truth<sup>48</sup> all the works of man and purge for himself the sons of man. He will utterly destroy the *spirit of deceit* from the veins of (21) his flesh. He will purify him by the *Holy Spirit* from all ungodly acts and sprinkle upon him the *Spirit of Truth* like waters of purification, (to purify him) from all the abominations of falsehood and from being polluted (22) by a *spirit of impurity*, so that upright ones may have insight into the knowledge of the Most High and the wisdom of the sons of heaven, and the perfect in the Way may receive understanding. For those God has chosen for an eternal covenant, (23) and all the glory of Adam shall be theirs without deceit. All false works will be put to shame."

---

London and New York: T & T Clark, 2010), 102–20.

<sup>44</sup> Thus, e.g., P. Wernberg-Møller, "A Reconsideration of the Two Spirits in the Rule of the Community (1QSerek III,13 – IV,26)," *RevQ* 3 (1961/62): 413–41 (419).

<sup>45</sup> "Spirit of Truth": John 14:17; 15:26; 16:13; "Holy Spirit": John 14:26; cf. 1:33 and 20:22.

<sup>46</sup> Cf. also Sekki, *The Meaning of Ruah at Qumran*, 207f., who notes the advocates of the different views.

<sup>47</sup> Translation according to E. Qimron and J. H. Charlesworth, "Rule of the Community," in *Rule of the Community and Related Documents* (The Dead Sea Scrolls. Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations 1; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck and Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1994), 1–52 (19), slightly adjusted.

<sup>48</sup> Or, his faithfulness.

Before the appointed time of the eschatological visitation, humans have a share in the 'positive' 'Spirit of Truth' and also a portion in the 'negative' spirit, and the two spirits struggle within every human heart, even within the pious and wise one (1QS IV 23).<sup>49</sup> But it is not said that they share a portion of the holy spirit. Only in the end is the acting of God's own spirit (as holy spirit) mentioned, and it is imagined that an exchange is supposed to take place: the spirit of deceit in human veins (i.e. his inner self) is to be destroyed, and (the) holy spirit purifies the human being from all impurity. Furthermore, it opens up insight into divine knowledge and heavenly wisdom (1QS IV 22).<sup>50</sup> Thus, in addition to its purifying function, the holy spirit shall also have a revelatory function to make the way of the chosen ones perfect. It is the eschatological revelation of the true meaning of the Torah, which is expected to be conveyed through the holy spirit—still in the future, at the time of the 'visitation.'

To be more precise, when the 'holy spirit' is introduced in this passage, it seems to be quite different from the angelic beings called 'Spirit of Truth' or 'Prince of Lights' in III 18–19. A few lines later, however, it comes rather close to the 'Spirit of Truth,' especially in the parallelism in 1QS III 21:

"He will purify him by the Holy Spirit from all ungodly acts and sprinkle upon him the Spirit of Truth like waters of purification . . ."

But rather than simple identification, it seems wise to maintain a distinction between the primordial 'Spirit of Truth' in 1QS III 18–19, set in dominion over humans, and the eschatological spirit introduced with the same term, but sprinkled over humans like purifying water.<sup>51</sup> What is expressed here as a hope for the end of time is very similar to what the sectarian texts claim to be realized in the *yahad* community: Knowledge of the divine mysteries, increased purity and a place in the community of the angels is claimed to be fulfilled within the *yahad*, but only hoped for in the Treatise on the Two Spirits.

---

<sup>49</sup> This is probably the most important difference from the Qumran sectarian view in which the demarcation between the realm of light and the realm of darkness is viewed much more clearly at the borders of the community. The idea that the human is in itself divided and that there are two opposed powers fighting within the human heart, is never adopted in the sectarian compositions.

<sup>50</sup> On the background for these views in biblical texts, esp. Ps 51, cf. A. Klein, "From the 'Right Spirit' to the 'Spirit of Truth': Observations on Psalm 51 and 1QS," in *The Dynamics of Language and Exegesis at Qumran* (ed. D. Dimant and R. G. Kratz; FAT II/35; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009), 171–91.

<sup>51</sup> Cf. Sekki, *The Meaning of Ruah at Qumran*, 208f., who points to the very different conceptual framework.

## 2. *The Hodayot*

Turning now to the typically sectarian views, I will focus, for the sake of convenience, on the text in which the term רוח occurs most frequently, the Hymns Scroll or Hodayot (1QH<sup>a</sup>).<sup>52</sup> The concordance of the new DJD edition of the text lists 82 occurrences of רוח,<sup>53</sup> including only those which are preserved in the manuscript 1QH<sup>a</sup> or its 4Q-parallels. This text, therefore, uses the term רוח even more densely than Paul does in his letters. The range of meanings is, however, remarkably broad and covers roughly all the meanings רוח can have in the Hebrew Bible and in Qumran.

- There are instances where רוח means wind (1QH<sup>a</sup> VI 41; XIV 26; XV 26; XVIII 34; XXI 26) or breath (IX 30–31; XV 32).
- There are passages where it is used for angelic beings (1QH<sup>a</sup> V 25; IX 13; XVI 13; XIX 16) and also for demons (XXV 6, 8, 23 [?]).
- It is also used for human spirits or the mindset of the human spirit as in the expression “the humble in spirit” (1QH<sup>a</sup> VI 14; cf. XXIII 16).
- רוח can also simply mean creature (1QH<sup>a</sup> XVIII 24).
- The mention of the human spirit (1QH<sup>a</sup> IX 17, 34) can be linked with positive (VIII 24: a spirit of understanding; VIII 28) or negative (VIII 16: a stubborn spirit) ethical orientations.
- The negative expression occurs sometimes in the specific form of confessions of sinfulness (1QH<sup>a</sup> V 32; VIII 16; IX 24; XI 22).
- Some passages directly adopt the teaching of the Treatise on the Two Spirits that God has fashioned every spirit and determined the humans' fate according to their spirits (1QH<sup>a</sup> VI 22; VII 26, 35).
- Interestingly, the human is also called a “spirit of flesh” (i.e. a fleshly being which cannot stand before God: 1QH<sup>a</sup> IV 27; V 14, XV 30).
- A number of passages also speak of the spirit as God's spirit or his “holy spirit.”

But we can observe here, that the number of passages that refer to God's spirit is much smaller than in the Hebrew Bible where roughly a third of

---

<sup>52</sup> I will refer to this document according to the new reconstruction and edition by Hartmut Stegemann, completed posthumously by Eileen Schuller: H. Stegemann and E. Schuller, *1QHodayot<sup>a</sup> with Incorporation of 1QHodayot<sup>b</sup> and 4QHodayot<sup>a-f</sup>* (Qumran Cave 1 III; DJD 40; Oxford: Clarendon, 2009). All earlier editions, especially the *editio princeps* by E. L. Sukenik (according to which most earlier scholars referred to the text) and also the editions that changed the counting of columns correctly but kept the counting of the lines according to the *editio princeps*, are now outdated.

<sup>53</sup> See Stegemann and Schuller, *1QHodayot<sup>a</sup>*, 323–402 (391–92).

the instances of רוח refers to God's spirit. This shows that the Hodayot are more concerned with anthropology than the average Hebrew Bible texts. But whereas the expression 'holy spirit' is very rarely used in the Hebrew Bible (and only slightly more frequently in the LXX), most of the Hodayot passages mentioning God's spirit use the term 'holy' to characterize it.

A number of texts and some relevant parallels are especially interesting. In 1QH<sup>a</sup> IV 38 the speaker prays: "Blessed are you, God Most High, that you have *spread your holy spirit upon* your servant and have purified . . . his heart."<sup>54</sup> Similarly in 1QH<sup>a</sup> XV 9 "I thank you, O Lord, . . . that you have *spread your holy spirit upon* me so that I am not shaken . . ." An individual can praise God for sprinkling or dispensing his holy spirit upon him (i.e. from above) with the effect of purification of the heart, or, as in the other passage, of strengthening him in his struggles against wickedness. As in the final passage of the Treatise on the Two Spirits, the image is that of sprinkling purification water, but the purification is considered fulfilled, not simply expected in the eschatological time of 'visitation.'

In a somewhat fragmentary passage of col. VIII, the speaker praises God for having changed his inner being. First he speaks of a "perverted spirit" (1QH<sup>a</sup> VIII 18) that ruled over a "vessel of dust," then we can read "from dust" and "righteousness" (1QH<sup>a</sup> VIII 19), and in the end "by means of *your holy spirit which you placed in me*" (1QH<sup>a</sup> VIII 20). In the light of other similar passages, the interpretation is rather clear: God's holy spirit is the means of exaltation of the human being from dust, the means of removing the 'perverted spirit,' or even the means of 'justification,' and it is stated explicitly that humans as such cannot achieve it by themselves, but only by an action of God's grace.

Not all similar passages use the adjective 'holy,' others express the same ideas without it. For instance, a few lines later in the aforementioned passage, it is said: "I entreat you with the *spirit that you have given to me*" (1QH<sup>a</sup> VIII 29). A similar phrase, focusing on knowledge, occurs in 1QH<sup>a</sup> V 36: "and I, your servant, know by means of the *spirit you have given me*," or similarly in 1QH<sup>a</sup> XXI 34: "I know by the *spirit that you have placed in me* . . ." The last two passages refer to knowledge, or revelation. But all three hymns use the image that God has given his spirit to (or into) a human being. And the spirit meant is undoubtedly the 'holy spirit' as in 1QH<sup>a</sup> VIII 20.

---

<sup>54</sup> All translations follow C. Newsom.



In 1QH<sup>a</sup> VIII 29–30 we even learn of a ‘two stage’ process: “I entreat you with the *spirit that you have given to me* that you make your kindness to your servant complete forever, *cleansing me by your holy spirit* and drawing me nearer by your good favour.” The cleansing expressed here is not imagined as an eschatological cleansing (as hoped for in 1QS IV:21–23), but rather a continuous process of growing closeness to God which is granted by his kindness and favour. God has chosen to favour those who love him, has given them his spirit, and in the spirit they pray for further purification and fulfilment, in order to get still closer to him.

Thus the spirit also enables one to pray—an important aspect also for Paul—, and it enables one to know and choose the truth: Thus 1QH<sup>a</sup> VI 36 says: “you have favoured me with the *spirit of knowledge* to choose truth.” God’s spirit furthermore brings joy, as XVII 32 phrases: “in your holy spirit *you have made me rejoice.*” 1QH<sup>a</sup> XX 13–17 is the most explicit passage:

And I, the Instructor (*Maskil*), *I know you, my God,*  
*by the spirit that you have placed in me.*  
 Faithfully have I heeded your wondrous secret counsel.  
 By your holy spirit you have opened up knowledge within me  
 through the mystery of your wisdom and the fountainhead of your power  
 in the midst of those who fear you, for abundant kindness . . .

Here we can find a number of important aspects that are closely connected. The text mentions the ‘holy spirit’ and the ‘spirit’ synonymously, it uses the metaphor that God gave or placed the spirit into the human individual, and the effect of that gift is the revelation of God’s mysteries and, even more, knowledge of God himself.

Apart from purity, the spirit primarily grants knowledge, as was expected for the future in the pre-sectarian Treatise on the Two Spirits. Here, the knowledge and revelation about God’s mysteries or even about God himself is considered a present gift, obtainable within the community. The divine spirit is further described as the power that draws the individual closer to God, changes the fundamental orientation of life, or elevates the human from dust into the community of angels. It motivates prayer and strengthens for the struggle against evil and causes joy. With such a concept of the ‘holy spirit’ we are quite close to many of the early Christian and, especially, Pauline views.

One question, however, cannot be totally clarified. Is it ‘the’ spirit or ‘a’ spirit from God? The singularity of that spirit, together with its ‘personal’ character, is not totally clear in the passages from the Hodayot. 1QH<sup>a</sup> VI 24 can say: “I know . . . that through your goodwill toward a person *you mul-*



*tiplly his portion in your holy spirit.*” According to this phrase, a portion of God’s holy spirit can be increased or strengthened. The degree of sharing in the holy spirit is at stake, and there is no clear-cut distinction between the human spirit, which may have some portion of the divine spirit or of the ‘Spirit of Truth,’ and the divine power of God’s spirit. Even if the Qumran sectarians confess that God gave his holy spirit to them or placed it in them, there might be some uncertainty about the portion given or about the ‘totality’ of the gift. But this may also concur with some expressions in early Christian texts according to which the spirit (given to the believers) can be hindered or quenched (1 Thess 5:19).

A certain lack of clarity is also illustrated by another sectarian text, the closure of the liturgical section in 1QS III 6–9. Here, the ‘spirit’ is related to the atonement of sins. This is said to happen “by the spirit of the true counsel of God” (1QS III 6) or, in the parallel line “by the holy spirit of the community” (1QS III 7) or, “by an upright and humble spirit” (1QS III 8) or “by humbling his soul” and “sprinkling with waters of purification” (1QS III 8–9). As we can see, there is no contrast here between spirit and ritual, no clear-cut distinction between the human spirit, the spirit considered present in the community, and the spirit that belongs to God. These distinctions are clearer in Paul where there is less confidence in a divine portion of the human spirit or the ethical facilities of the human nature or ‘soul,’ and the ‘gift’ of the spirit is considered to be totally new.

Another aspect which should finally be mentioned is how the revelation of the spirit is conceptualized. It is most remarkable that there is no reference to the prophetic spirit, nor any mention of ecstatic or otherwise altered states of consciousness in the Qumran texts. Instead, revelation is described as an aid to choosing the truth and to proceeding in the perfect way, in life according to God’s commandments. We may, therefore, conclude that the revelation of the spirit is primarily conceived of as interpretation of the Scriptures or of the true meaning of the Scriptures, basically the law. This matches the insight stated elsewhere that the Qumran sectarian texts do not show any traces of mantic practices or of the interpretation of dreams and visions. Within the Qumran community, such religious practices, quite widespread in Second Temple Judaism, appear to be replaced by the interpretation of Scripture; the term “interpretation” (*peshet*), which refers to dreams and visions in other early Jewish texts, is only evoked for Scripture in the texts from the community.<sup>55</sup> So

---

<sup>55</sup> Cf. A. Lange, “The Essene Position on Magic and Divination,” in *Legal Texts and Legal Issues*, 377–435.

the revelatory work of the holy spirit should be seen as the revelation of the true meaning of the Scriptures.

#### D. PAUL, QUMRAN AND THE SPIRIT: SOME CONCLUDING PERSPECTIVES

Having focused on a limited number of Qumran texts, and—in the preceding paragraphs—on some texts originating within the Qumran community, we should now again address the methodological issues. How can we compare the two textual corpora adequately and evaluate the observations, the parallels and also the differences?

Although Paul probably never read the sectarian writings from Qumran, it is noteworthy, that, regarding the notion of the spirit, there are interesting parallels not only to non-sectarian documents but also to those originating in the Qumran community. The concepts found, e.g., in the *Hodayot* cannot prove any direct dependence of Paul on them or on the Qumran community, but they may help to explain the background of Paul's view of the spirit in the Palestinian Jewish tradition. On the other hand, there is no need to stress that some aspects of Pauline pneumatology are so strongly shaped by Paul's Christian experience that we cannot expect to find analogies at Qumran. But in spite of these differences, often emphasized in the early periods of the Qumran debate,<sup>56</sup> striking conceptual parallels can be noted. In the following passages, I will focus on some examples where the Qumran background matches or helps to explain aspects of the Pauline (or wider early Christian) views:

a) A first aspect may be important. At the very beginning of the early Christian tradition—or rather in its background, there was the preaching of John the Baptist who announced a “baptism” in or with the Holy Spirit (Mark 1:8; Matt 3:11 par. Luke 3:16). At least in the New Testament context,

---

<sup>56</sup> While some scholars tried to explain for instance the frequency of the term ‘Holy Spirit’ in the New Testament from Qumran usage—some even arguing that it was mediated by John the Baptist (for instance the article by F. F. Bruce, “Holy Spirit in the Qumran Texts,” *Annual of Leeds University Oriental Society* 6 [1966/68]: 49–55)—, others emphasized the basic difference, e.g. that the Qumranians did not yet know of ‘the’ Holy Spirit but only of ‘a’ holy spirit (cf. J. Coppens, “Les documents du désert de Juda et les origines du christianisme,” *Analecta Lovaniensia Biblica et Orientalia* 2.39 [1953]: 23–39), or that the ‘personal’ concept of the Spirit or even more his ‘trinitarian’ understanding was still lacking in Qumran (cf. G. Graystone, “The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament,” *The Irish Theological Quarterly* 22 [1955]: 214–30; 23 [1956]: 25–48; F. Nötscher, *Zur theologischen Terminologie der Qumran-Texte* [BBB 10; Bonn: Hanstein, 1956], 42).

the spirit mentioned here is primarily understood as the spirit that empowers the ‘stronger one,’ an agent of God, an anointed one or, rather, the Messiah (cf. Isa 11:1f.; 61:1; cf. *Pss. Sol.* 17:37 etc.). But the comparison with the water of John’s immersion rite also shows that the spirit is understood as an eschatological means of purification (based on Ezek 36:25–27). Uttered by the Baptizer, an eschatological prophet probably unrelated with the Qumran community,<sup>57</sup> this is not a particularly Qumranian concept, but the Qumran parallels show that the view of the spirit as an eschatological means of purification was widespread within contemporary Palestinian Judaism and formed one of the earliest ideas of the Jesus movement. The background of Ezekiel 36–37 also explains the view (e.g., in Rom 1:3–4) that Jesus’ resurrection was effected by God in the power of his holy spirit, or—phrased in a Semitic fashion frequently attested at Qumran—through “the spirit of holiness.” Thus the Pauline view of the spirit as life-giving spirit and the idea that the spirit purifies and sanctifies the Gentiles, can be linked to this background. It is paralleled in Qumran (cf. 1QS III 6–8; IV 20–23), of course without any reference to the Gentiles, which is, then, a central part of the Pauline reception of the idea. The Hodayat texts adopt the idea of the gift of the spirit to express revelation of wisdom and incorporation into the community of the godly beings (the community and the angels). This is not far from Paul’s use of the spirit language to express the vivification of humans by faith.

b) A second aspect is also quite well-known but often rather neglected. The gift of the spirit sanctifies the community as well as individuals, making both the community and the body of any believer a temple. The parallels between the Qumran view of the community as a temple (1QS V 5–6; VIII 5–6; IX 3–6 etc.) and some Pauline views (cf. 1 Cor 3:16) are often noticed. In Qumran, the idea that the community is a temple is certainly not understood as meaning a replacement of the Temple, but the Qumran community with its high standards of purity does represent the sanctity of the temple. The same is true for Paul. Although the relevance of the Jerusalem Temple was very limited for Paul’s diaspora communities, the Temple is not meant to be replaced by the community, but the metaphorical application of temple imagery to the community expresses an ethi-

---

<sup>57</sup> Cf. the discussion in J. Frey, “The Impact of the Dead Sea Scrolls on New Testament Interpretation: Proposals, Problems and Further Perspectives,” in *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 407–61 (443–50); idem, “Critical Issues in the Investigation of the Scrolls and the New Testament,” in *Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. J. J. Collins and T. Lim; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 517–45 (528–30).

cal challenge. In 1 Thess 4:3–8 it is stressed that the dwelling of the Holy Spirit within the believers has ethical consequences (cf. also 1 Cor 6:19). Paul reminds his addressees to follow a life of sanctity which has especially to do with sexual control, regardless of how *σκεῦος* = 'vessel' is to be translated. The term may point either to the wife or to the sexual organ, but to "use one's vessel" not as the Gentiles, not in impurity but in holiness, refers to a lifestyle which is different from the manner characterized as 'gentile,' particularly regarding sexual matters. So we should not only note the possible verbal parallel of 'vessel' (Hebr. כֵּלִי) for the sexual organ or the wife in 1 Thess 4:4 and the Instruction from Qumran (4Q416 2 ii 21)<sup>58</sup> but the broader view that the gift of the spirit demands ethical behaviour. This is a particularly Jewish idea.<sup>59</sup>

c) Although in Paul the distinction between the natural human spirit and the Holy Spirit given to believers is much stricter than, e.g., in the *Hodayot*, there are some rather hidden traces that (a or the) Holy Spirit was also considered as a virtue or linked with virtues. As John R. Levison correctly points out, we can observe particular vestiges of a view which is much more broadly attested in Qumran. 2 Cor 6:6–7 provides a traditional list of virtues in which the Holy Spirit is included: "by purity, by knowledge, by patience, by kindness, by (a) holy spirit, by genuine love, by truthful speech, and by the power of god." In this list, the holy spirit may refer to the human spirit which is pure and holy,<sup>60</sup> and the exhortation shows the conviction that the human spirit in a Christian believer "can become holy by the practice of virtue" or "by a process of self-cleansing (2 Cor 7:1)."<sup>61</sup>

d) Of course, Paul's view of the Holy Spirit cannot be explained fully by Qumran usage. It is strongly shaped by other experiences and encounters. Apart from all particular linguistic parallels or more or less specific similarities of ideas, the Qumran parallels share the view that the gift of the spirit or the possession of the spirit is "not merely an experience of euphoria or anguish, an entrée to ecstasy, a sequence of actions or emotions" but—now put in Christian terms—"the way in which the values of

<sup>58</sup> Cf. T. Elgvin, "To Master his own vessel. 1 Thes 4.4 in the Light of New Qumran Evidence," *NTS* 43 (1997): 604–19.

<sup>59</sup> Cf. Levison, *Filled with the Spirit*, 263–67.

<sup>60</sup> Cf. Levison, *Filled with the Spirit*, 238–39, who mentions two other passages: 1 Cor 5:5: "that his spirit may be saved . . ." and 2 Cor 7:1: cleanse themselves "from every defilement of body and of spirit, making holiness perfect in the fear of God."

<sup>61</sup> Levison, *Filled with the Spirit*, 239.

the gospel are concretized.<sup>62</sup> The spirit reveals God's will, wisdom and plan; that acts verbally and leads to a bodily life in accord with the insight gained. The spirit inserts into the community. These elements can now be characterized as the particularly Jewish contribution to the early Christian notion of the Holy Spirit. Of course, early Judaism and especially its Hellenistic traditions were not totally lacking visionary, ecstatic and enthusiastic elements linked with the spirit. But the fact that Paul—much more so than some of his addressees—stresses the verbal and revelatory functions of the spirit can be regarded as a special parallel to the Qumran (sectarian) ideas and as a distinctively Jewish element.

---

<sup>62</sup> Levison, *Filled with the Spirit*, 269.

PAUL AND THE JERUSALEM CHURCH:  
LIGHT FROM THE SCROLLS ON GRAECO-SEMITIC  
LANGUAGE CONTACTS AND ETHICS OF GOSPEL MISSION

Albert L. A. Hogeterp

*Tilburg University*

Since the early days of Scrolls scholarship much attention has been focused on whether and how Qumran literature illuminates aspects of the Jewish environment to the Jesus-movement in Jerusalem. The book of Acts was a traditional focus of attention as regards the Jerusalem church.<sup>1</sup> Acts 6:1 relates the bilingual Graeco-Semitic composition of the Jerusalem church, consisting of Hebrews and Hellenists. Paul's letters constitute the earliest documents of Christianity, antedating the Acts of the Apostles by decades. Reading Paul's Letter to the Galatians, one gets the impression of a heated discussion and polemics about standards of missionary purpose and commitment between Paul and circles within the Jerusalem church.

This paper aims to analyse traces of Graeco-Semitic language contacts in Paul's linguistic repertoire and to evaluate how this influences our understanding of the discussion concerning gospel mission standards. Our attention is not so much focused on the well-known Pauline epithets about his Jewish background in terms of descent, being a Hebrew born of Hebrews (Phil 3:5) and of education in the ancestral traditions (Gal 1:14), but rather on language usage that arguably reflects a Semitic background.

Well-known examples of transliterated Aramaic words in Paul's letters are  $\mu\alpha\rho\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha$   $\theta\acute{\alpha}$  (1 Cor 16:21),<sup>2</sup>  $\acute{\alpha}\beta\beta\acute{\alpha}$   $\acute{\omicron}$   $\pi\alpha\tau\acute{\eta}\rho$  (Gal 4:6; Rom 8:15), and the proper name  $\text{Κηφῶς}$  for Simon Peter (1 Cor 1:12, 3:22, 9:5, 15:5; Gal 1:18, 2:9.11.14).

---

<sup>1</sup> See e.g. S. E. Johnson, "The Dead Sea Manual of Discipline and the Jerusalem Church of Acts," and B. Reicke, "The Constitution of the Primitive Church in the Light of Jewish Documents," in *The Scrolls and the New Testament* (ed. K. Stendahl; London: SCM Press, 1958), 129–42, 143–56.

<sup>2</sup> See recently J.-C. Moreau, "Maranatha," *RB* 118 (2011): 51–75, who argues for the reading  $\text{מְרַאֲנָן אֲתָנָא}$  "our Lord has come" rather than  $\text{מְרַאֲנָנָא תָא}$ , "our Lord, come." Apart from Qumran literature and targumim, Moreau's survey of literature does not touch directly on documentary Aramaic evidence from *Nahal Hever* published in the 1990s; about the morphological existence of the form  $\text{מְרַאֲנָנָא}$  in documentary Aramaic, note P. Yadin

Paul further employs *σάββατον* rather than *ἑβδομάς* as term for week in 1 Cor 16:2.

A grammatical example of semitized Greek concerns the use of *υἶός* as a noun of relationship which figuratively expresses a relation other than genealogy, citizenship or lineage. Paul's First Letter to the Thesalonians comprises the examples of "sons of light" and "sons of the day" (1 Thess 5:5). These terms form part of the apostle's language of admonition and encouragement of his addressees that, belonging to the day, salvation rather than darkness should be their lot.

The Dead Sea Scrolls contain many exact Hebrew and some Aramaic parallels of the term "sons of light," בני (ה)אור, and בני נהורא.<sup>3</sup> An approximate equivalent to "sons of the day" could be בני שחר, denoting sons of morning dawn, early morning, in CD-A XIII 14 and 4Q298 I 1.<sup>4</sup>

An example of conceptual transfer is the much debated Pauline expression "works of the law," *ἔργα νόμου* (Rom 3:20.28; Gal 2:16, 3:2.10). This constitutes a specimen of linguistic repertoire, unattested in Acts 15, that in general overlaps with the Hebrew מעשי התורה in 4QMMT. I will return to *Miqṣat Ma'ase ha-Torah*, when discussing Gal 2:15–16. At this point, it may be noted that a further example of a cognate expression occurs in the *Serekh ha-Yahad*, as part of an enumeration of criteria for community membership and upward mobility of membership. 1QS V 20–22 introduces reference to one's deeds according to Torah, מעשיו בתורה,<sup>5</sup> as follows:

And when someone enters the covenant to behave in compliance with all these decrees, enrolling in the assembly of holiness, they shall examine (21) their spirits in the Community, one another, in respect of his insight and of his deeds in law, under the authority of the sons of Aaron, those who freely volunteer in the Community to set up (22) his covenant and to follow all the decrees which he commanded to fulfill, and under the authority of

7 paralleled by *κυριακον* in XHev/Se 64 recto frg. a, inner text, line 10 (Cotton & Yardeni, DJD 27, 1997, 207, 209–10). Cf. מרא עלמא [ה]א מרנא רבא in 4Q202 (4QEn<sup>b</sup>) III 14.

<sup>3</sup> Hebrew: 4Q266 (4QD<sup>b</sup>) 1a-b 1; 1QS I 9, II 16, III 13 and 24–25; 1QM I 1, 3, 9, and 13; 4Q174 1–2 I 8–9; 4Q177 10–11 (col. II) 7; 4Q177 12–13 7 and 11 (col. IV 12 and 16); 4Q280 (4QCurses) 2 1; 4Q510 (4QShir<sup>a</sup>) 1 7; 11Q13 (11QMelch) II 8. Aramaic: 4Q548 1 9, 10, 12, 16.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. M. K. M. Tso, *Ethics in the Qumran Community. An Interdisciplinary Investigation* (WUNT II/292; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 181 who agrees with J. M. Baumgarten in *IEJ* 33 (1983): 81–85 that the "label 'sons of dawn' is synonymous with the more common 'sons of light'".

<sup>5</sup> For the translation of the preposition ב as "according to," cf. KBL, 103 rubric 7. Note the third person masculine plural suffix in בתורה מעשיהם in the parallel text 4QS<sup>d</sup> II 1, but similar references to the authority of the sons of Aaron, בני אהרון, and the majority of Israel, רוב ישראל, (4QS<sup>d</sup> II 1–2), over against a notable difference of authority in 4QS<sup>d</sup> I 2, הרבים, and in 1QS V 1, בני צדוק, respectively.

the majority of Israel, those who freely volunteer to return within the Community to his covenant.<sup>6</sup>

New members are examined regarding the spirit of their way of life with respect to their insight in and deeds according to Torah, לְפִי שְׂכָלוֹ וּמַעֲשָׂיו, בתורה, a phrase which recurs in abbreviated manner in 1QS VI 14 and 17 and in full in 1QS VI 18.

In comparative linguistics, the semantic range of ἔργα by itself includes deeds, tasks, matters, but in connection with νόμου, it also refers to deeds required or prescribed by the Law. Note also the singular τὸ ἔργον τοῦ νόμου in Rom 2:15, translated in the Revised Standard Version as “what the law requires.” Thus, there is a substantial semantic overlap with מַעֲשֵׂי הַתּוֹרָה, which may also denote precepts of the Law.

From a socio-linguistic point of view, the comparative evidence for the concept “works of the law” indicates ongoing discussions in Early Judaism in Israel and suggests language contact with groups for whom this legal expression was of axiomatic importance. In this regard, the setting of Paul’s first reference to the expression, Gal 2:16, clearly points to the apostle’s confrontation with the standpoint of circles around James from the Jerusalem church. ἔργα νόμου form part of a religious discourse which does not occur in works of Jewish Hellenism by Philo and Josephus. Josephus uses terms such as “orderly life under law,” ζῆν νομίμως (*Ag. Ap.* 2.152), instruction by precept, λόγος, and practical exercise, ἀσκησις, of the character (*Ag. Ap.* 2.171). Philo preferably employs terms such as τὰ ῥήματα τοῦ νόμου, “the expressions of the law” (*Alleg. Interp.* 3.236), or τοῦ νόμου παραγγέλματα, “injunctions of the law” (*Spec. Laws* 2.82).

Where do the Scrolls come into the picture, when we take a broader view on the question of Graeco-Semitic language contact? I will first briefly survey factors of importance in the Dead Sea Scrolls as evidence for the study of Graeco-Semitic bilingualism. Then I will turn to a comparative study of Pauline passages, mainly from the Letter to the Galatians and, to a lesser extent, from Paul’s Letter to the Romans.

---

<sup>6</sup> Translation by F. García Martínez and E. J. C. Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition. 1. (1Q1–4Q273)* (Leiden: Brill – Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 81, 83.



A. THE SCROLLS AND THE STUDY  
OF GRAECO-SEMITIC BILINGUALISM

The Qumran scrolls provide crucial evidence on the Semitic side of Graeco-Semitic bilingualism. The use of Aramaic as a literary language near the time of Christian origins is documented by the first-century C.E. palaeographical dating of several Qumran texts. 11QTargum of Job and Aramaic Pseudo-Daniel fragments (4Q243–245) are examples. Qumran literature extends the possibility of tracing possible translation profiles of Greek apocrypha and pseudepigrapha back to Aramaic. Aramaic fragments of Tobit, 4Q196–199, and the Aramaic Levi Document constitute important evidence in this regard.

Apart from non-biblical Qumran literature, biblical texts from Qumran sometimes contain Aramaisms, which could provide indications of Aramaic as it was in use at the time of the scribe or copyist. Examples of Aramaisms have been identified by Skehan, Ulrich and Flint in the Aposrophe to Zion in 4Q88 (4QPs<sup>f</sup>) columns VII 14–VIII 15 (at VIII 2–3, 8, 13).<sup>7</sup>

Documentary texts from the Dead Sea region, such as those from *Naḥal Ḥever* of the early second century C.E., attest to the use of both Greek and Aramaic.<sup>8</sup> The Aramaic documents furnish examples of legal formulations and administrative language, but also instances of Aramaic and Greek signatures (e.g. XḤev/Se 50 frgs. d+e). There is also a Greek documentary text with an Aramaic signature from the early second century C.E. (XḤev/Se 60).

Concerning the Semitic side of Graeco-Semitic language contact, it should be noted that in the New Testament the terms Ἑβραῖοι, Ἑβραῖς διάλεκτος and Ἑβραῖστί predominate. In this regard, the Scrolls provide evidence not only of the high status of Hebrew as the language of Scripture, of which Qumran Hebrew would arguably comprise a language-conservative continuation.<sup>9</sup> The Scrolls further contain several apocrypha and

<sup>7</sup> P. W. Skehan, E. C. Ulrich, and P. W. Flint, *Qumran Cave 4. XI: Psalms to Chronicles* (DJD 16; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000), 96–100 at 100 refer to זנה instead of זה in 4Q88 (4QPs<sup>f</sup>) VIII 2–3, to תשובותך in 4Q88 VIII 8 as “the normal Aramaic *taqtult*-formation of an essentially Aramaic word,” and to עליכי in 4Q88 VIII 13, whose longer form “reflects Aramaic influence on the poem.”

<sup>8</sup> H. M. Cotton and A. Yardeni, *Aramaic, Hebrew, and Greek Documentary Texts from Naḥal Ḥever and Other Sites, with an Appendix Containing Alleged Qumran Texts* (DJD 27; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997).

<sup>9</sup> Cf. the recent argument about Qumran Hebrew as “anti-language” with archaizing features made by G. A. Rendsburg, “Qumran Hebrew (With a Trial Cut [1QS]),” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls at 60. Scholarly Contributions of New York University Faculty and Alumni*

pseudepigrapha in Hebrew, such as *Jubilees* and Pseudo-Ezekiel, and Hebrew prayer texts, such as Festival Prayers. Also, outside of Qumran, texts in Hebrew not necessarily of a “yaḥad origin” have been identified, an example being the so-called “eschatological hymn” with a Herodian date from Naḥal Ḥever.<sup>10</sup>

Perhaps because of the major importance of Hebrew as the language of ancestral biblical tradition, terms related to it predominate in the New Testament, even if Aramaic as a spoken language is admitted. Recent studies on evidence for a small extent of documentary use of Hebrew and on Hebraisms in Aramaic Qumran texts confirm the importance of Hebrew.<sup>11</sup> The rewritten Greek Bible, of which the Greek Minor Prophets Scroll from Naḥal Ḥever provides a major example,<sup>12</sup> further underlines an Early Jewish orientation toward Hebrew Scriptures as source and model for Greek Bible translation.

Now if we turn to the question of Graeco-Semitic language contact, various types of Graeco-Semitic bilingualism may be discerned.

1. Deficient or problematic Greek which would be difficult to understand for native Greek speakers apart from an Aramaic background.

An example of this in documentary texts is the Greek papyrus 64 from Naḥal Ḥever, described by Cotton and Yardeni as “singularly ungrammatical and non-idiomatic” and dependent on “an Aramaic *Urtext*,” that is, P. Yadin 7.<sup>13</sup>

Apart from whole sentence structures and idiomatic expressions, unexplained Semitic terms are attested at the smaller level of words in other

---

(ed. L. H. Schiffman and S. Tzoref; STDJ 89; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 217–46 at 246; this is an argument which constitutes a much more language-ideological viewpoint, as compared to the description of Qumran Hebrew by S. Morag as a literary variety with “non-LBH features, possibly Old Hebrew isoglosses.”

<sup>10</sup> M. Morgenstern, *Miscellaneous Texts from the Judaean Desert* (DJD 38; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000), 193–200 (“XḤev/Se 6. Eschatological Hymn”).

<sup>11</sup> G. W. Nebe, “Die hebräische Sprache der Naḥal Ḥever Dokumente 5/6Hev 44–46,” in *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Ben Sira* (ed. T. Muraoka and J. F. Elwolde; STDJ 26; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 150–57; H. Eshel, “On the Use of the Hebrew Language in Economic Documents from the Judaean Desert,” in *Jesus’ Last Week. Jerusalem Studies in the Synoptic Gospels – Volume One* (ed. R. S. Notley, M. Turnage, and B. Becker; JCP 11; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 245–58; C. Stadel, *Hebraismen in den aramäischen Texten vom Toten Meer* (Schriften der Hochschule für jüdische Studien Heidelberg 11; Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter, 2008).

<sup>12</sup> E. Tov, *The Greek Minor Prophets Scroll from Naḥal Ḥever (8ḤevXIIgr)* (DJD 8; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990).

<sup>13</sup> DJD 27, 1997, 206–7, 209–10.

Greek documentary texts from the Judaeen desert. Examples of these are ἀσωφῆρ in a Murabba'at fragment, presenting the Hebrew word for scribe in Greek, and γανναθ and νααρος in fragments from Naḥal Ḥever, presenting the Aramaic word for garden and the Hebrew word for young man in Greek.<sup>14</sup>

2. Proficient alternation between general Greek usage and Semitic language use.

This may be illustrated by transliterations of Semitic words and phrases, which are explained or separately introduced in their immediate context.

2a. An epigram of the first-century B.C.E. poet Meleager of Gadara gives an example of alternation between spoken language of greetings in Greek, Phoenician, and Aramaic: ἀλλ' εἰ μὲν Σύρος ἐσσί, σαλαμί' εἰ δ' οὖν συ γε Φοῖνιξ, ναιδιος' εἰ δ' "Ἐλλην, χαίρε, "but if you are Syrian, *salam*; if, then, you are Phoinician, *naidios*, if (your are) Greek, greetings."<sup>15</sup>

2b. A phrase in the Marcan passage on the raising of Jairus' daughter, Mark 5:41 contains transliterated Aramaic words of Jesus with a Greek explanation: ταλιθα κουμ, ὃ ἐστὶν μεθεμνηνυόμενον τὸ κοράσιον, σοι λέγω, ἔγειρε, "Talitha cum'; which means, 'Little girl, I say to you, arise' (RSV)

3. Literary code-switching between general Greek usage and a semitized Greek register.

This point has been sustained by J. M. Watt concerning the language of Luke-Acts.<sup>16</sup>

The conceptualization of linguistic traces of Graeco-Semitic language contact in Paul's letters might take profit from modern linguistic discussion. Bilingualism is described by J. Edwards with reference to its capacity to expand one's linguistic repertoire in interlanguage use. From this

<sup>14</sup> For Murabba'at, see DJD 2, 1961. For γανναθ (𐤆𐤁𐤅), see XḤev/Se 62 b,6 and c-m,10; XḤev/Se 64a, 8r and 10r, and b,27r and 31r; for νααρος (𐤒𐤏𐤁), see XḤev/Se 62 c-m, 17; XḤev/Se 64b,30r.

<sup>15</sup> Quotation from K. Beyer, *The Aramaic Language: Its Distribution and Subdivisions* (trans. J. F. Healey; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986), 35 n. 35 with reference to A. S. F. Gow and D. L. Page, *The Greek Anthology. Hellenistic Epigrams* (Cambridge: University press, 1965).

<sup>16</sup> J. M. Watt, *Code-Switching in Luke and Acts* (Berkeley Insights in Linguistics and Semiotics 31; New York: Peter Lang, 1997).

point of view, a good analytical term without behavioral connotations is that of “transfer(ence),” while only in the case of defective language use does the term “interference” come into view. It has further been argued by Edwards that linguistic threads of the membership of “more than one speech community” may identifiably differ from those of a monoglossic speech setting.<sup>17</sup>

On the basis of these considerations, it is time to turn to Paul’s Letters, in particular his Letter to the Galatians, in order to examine the issue of language contact between Paul and the Jerusalem church.

#### B. ΙΣΤΟΡΗΣΑΙ ΚΗΦΑΝ (GAL 1:18)

The most detailed information about Paul’s contacts with apostolic leaders from the Jerusalem church is the narration of events in Galatians 1:11–2:14. The apostle Paul sets out to remind his addressees about his troubled past as former persecutor of the church as well as about his calling to preach the gospel among the Gentiles (Gal 1:13–16). Even though Paul emphasises that his calling and apostolic mission are based on revelation (Gal 1:11–12.15–17, 2:1), he also provides indications of the high repute of the Jerusalem church (Gal 2:2.6.9) on whose commitment he somehow depended, lest, writes Paul, “somehow I should be running or had run in vain” (Gal 2:2).

The first occasion when contacts of Paul with the Jerusalem church come into the picture is three years after his itinerary into Arabia, presumably Nabataean towns, and return to Damascus (Gal 1:17).<sup>18</sup> Galatians 1:18 introduces the fact that Paul “went up to Jerusalem to visit Cephas, and remained with him fifteen days” (RSV). The first instance in Galatians where Paul mentions a major apostle in the Jerusalem church, namely Simon Peter, is in Gal 1:18 where he calls him by the Aramaic name Κηφᾶς. Also when personally confronting the behaviour of groups from Jerusalem who had come to Antioch, in Gal 2:11–14, Paul consistently refers to Peter by this Aramaic name (Gal 2:11.14). By way of contrast, the book of Acts nowhere refers to Simon Peter as Cephas. The only Gospel which refers to Κηφᾶς, John 1:42, deems it necessary to explain this as meaning

<sup>17</sup> J. Edwards, “Foundations of Bilingualism,” in *The Handbook of Bilingualism* (ed. T. K. Bhatia and W. C. Ritchie; Blackwell Handbooks in Linguistics 15; Oxford: Blackwell, 2006), 7–31 at 15–20 (“Bilingualism and Intelligence”) and 23–4.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. e.g. J. Murphy-O’Connor, *Paul. A Critical Life* (Oxford: University Press, 1996), 81–90.

Πέτρος, rock. The Aramaic appellation may also suggest a Semitic aspect in Graeco-Semitic language contact. Greek-Aramaic bilingualism is also indicated by Paul's reference to ἀββᾶ ὁ πατήρ (Gal 4:6; Rom 8:15) as a collective expression of religious invocation, possibly prayer, if not the Our Father or "Lord's Prayer" (Matt 6:9–15 at v. 9 Πάτερ ἡμῶν // *Didache* 8:2; Luke 11:2–4 at v. 2 Πάτερ).<sup>19</sup>

The name Κηφᾶς also appears in First Corinthians in passages where Paul relates apostolic practices (1 Cor 9:5) and cites Peter as a principal apostolic witness to the appearance of the risen Christ (1 Cor 15:5). In addition to revelation, Paul speaks of traditions in First Corinthians (1 Cor 11:2, 15:3).

If the Greek verb for visiting Cephas, ἱστορήσαι Κηφᾶν in Gal 1:18 encompasses acquaintance not just with Cephas as an individual, but with Cephas as reputed apostle of the Jerusalem church, Paul's visit may not have been unrelated to verifying the purpose and credentials of his gospel mission.<sup>20</sup> After all, according to Gal 2:1–2, it was for the purpose of laying the gospel mission to the Gentiles before those of repute in the Jerusalem church that Paul went up to Jerusalem after fourteen years. Some sense of relations would also be understandable in the early missionary period given the social dimensions of Paul's entrance into the missionary Jesus-movement. Gal 1:13–14.23–24 recounts that the change from Paul's former persecuting activity was learnt by the community and reports its praise that destructive intent had given way to commitment to the faith (Gal 1:13–14.23–24). At the same time, 1 Cor 15:9 clearly indicates the difficulty of such social dimensions, in that Paul states about himself: "For I am the least of the apostles, unfit to be called an apostle, because I persecuted the church of God" (RSV). Nevertheless, in Gal 2:1–10, Paul does relate an initial missionary agreement at Jerusalem; this agreement recognized grace in Paul's gospel mission to the Gentiles and it was confirmed by "the right hand of fellowship," δεξιᾶς κοινωνίας (Gal 2:9). Paul's point about the initial missionary agreement will now be considered in further detail.

<sup>19</sup> Cf. J. D. G. Dunn, *The Epistle to the Galatians* (BNTC 9; London: A&C Black, 1993), 221–22, who refers to "Abba" as a "characteristic prayer form of Jesus himself."

<sup>20</sup> Cf. Dunn, *The Epistle to the Galatians*, 73, "the element of 'inquiry' in the 'visit' is usually hard to exclude;" Murphy-O'Connor, *Paul. A Critical Life*, 90–91 on ἱστορήσαι as a deliberately "ambiguous term" in the Pauline interest of showing "complete independence of Jerusalem."

C. THE INITIAL MISSIONARY AGREEMENT:  
REMEMBER THE POOR (GAL 2:10)

Paul ends his narration of the initial missionary agreement with the one reminder of the obligation to remember the poor, after having emphasized at length the lack of compulsion on the part of the leader of the Jerusalem church.<sup>21</sup> Galatians 2:10 contains Paul's wording of the initial missionary agreement. The Greek, μόνον τῶν πτωχῶν ἵνα μνημονεύωμεν, ὃ καὶ ἐσπούδασα αὐτὸ τοῦτο ποιῆσαι, is phrased as a *casus pendens*, literally denoting "only of the poor that we should remember them, the very thing which I also made every effort to do".

In Gal 2:10 μνημονεύειν denotes a sense of social commitment or solidarity, rather than a general notion of remembering or making mention of something. It has been pointed out in a commentary on Galatians that μνημονεύειν also incorporates "a consideration for others which is larger than financial," even though this would be explicitly included.<sup>22</sup> Then, in Rom 15:25–27, Paul speaks concretely about a collection for the aid of the saints in Jerusalem (Rom 15:26), meaning a contribution for the poor, τοὺς πτωχοὺς, among them. A very pressing background to poverty in Judaea and Jerusalem, at the time of the mid-first-century, was a famine related in Acts 11:28 and identified in Josephus' *Antiquities* 20.51 and 20.101 as having occurred in Judaea under procurator Tiberius Alexander (46–48 C.E.).<sup>23</sup>

The sense of μνημονεύειν τῶν πτωχῶν could have a general setting of benefaction to the poor in the Graeco-Roman world. However, the precise usage of the term appears different. If we compare, for instance, the vocabulary of the Greek *Testament of Job*, a presumably Jewish pseudepigraphon dated between the first century B.C.E. and the first century C.E., the verbs concerned in benefaction to the poor, τοῖς πτωχοῖς, are εὐεργεσίας ποιεῖν (*T. Job* 44.2), εὐποιεῖν (*T. Job* 45.2), διδόναι τοῖς πτωχοῖς (*T. Job* 11.9, 25.4; cf. *T. Job* 30.5; cf. *Sib. Or.* 2.78), and διακονῆσαι τοῖς πτωχοῖς ἐν τῇ σῆι τραπέζῃ

<sup>21</sup> It is beyond the scope of this paper to provide a survey of socio-economic issues involved in the injunction to remember the poor; for a recent comprehensive treatment, see B. W. Longenecker, *Remember the Poor. Paul, Poverty, and the Greco-Roman World* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), whose comparison with Jewish tradition in Israel, as far as Qumran literature is concerned, does not really go beyond previously known sectarian Qumran literature, namely the *Damascus Document* (109–15).

<sup>22</sup> Cf. Dunn, *The Epistle to the Galatians*, 112.

<sup>23</sup> Cf. J. A. Fitzmyer, *The Acts of the Apostles. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 31; New York: Doubleday, 1998), 481–82.

(*T. Job* 12.1). No exact parallel for  $\mu\nu\eta\mu\omicron\nu\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\epsilon\iota\nu\ \tau\acute{\omega}\nu\ \pi\tau\omega\chi\acute{\omega}\nu$  occurs in either Septuagintal Greek, Philo's Greek or Josephus' Greek.

An obligation to "remember the poor," as Paul formulates the initial missionary agreement in Gal 2:10, constitutes a socio-religious orientation which would not have been unrelated to early Jesus-tradition. Luke 4:18 and the Synoptic sayings source (Luke 7:22 / Matt 11:5) tell of Jesus preaching in prophetic terms that good news is announced to the poor (Isa 61:1; cf. 4Q521 2 ii 12).

The Scrolls contain evidence which could illustrate a Semitic background to the Graeco-Semitic missionary agreement to "remember the poor." The recently published text *4QAramaic proverbs*, manuscript 569 from Qumran cave 4 (4Q569), provides a close parallel in Aramaic to the Greek  $\mu\nu\eta\mu\omicron\nu\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\epsilon\iota\nu\ \tau\acute{\omega}\nu\ \pi\tau\omega\chi\acute{\omega}\nu$ . The relevant line 8 in fragments 1–2 of 4Q569, as reconstructed by Professor É. Puech, runs as follows:

דכור עני בד[יל די מש]פטא להוא[לה ב(יום) דינא (רבא)]  
 "1–2 8 Souviens-toi du pauvre par[ce que] le [dr]oit sera[ en sa faveur au  
 (jour du)/(grand)jugement]."<sup>24</sup>

The text has been palaeographically dated to the last third of the second century B.C.E.<sup>25</sup> The maximally reconstructed Aramaic text, as cited above from Puech's edition, provides an eschatological orientation to the injunction to remember the poor.

The Aramaic injunction דכור עני indicates that an ethical and religious concern to remember the poor was part of a Jewish world of thought which the "Hebrews" in the Jerusalem church may well have had in common with other people in Jewish society at the time. The close parallel  $\mu\nu\eta\mu\omicron\nu\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\epsilon\iota\nu\ \tau\acute{\omega}\nu\ \pi\tau\omega\chi\acute{\omega}\nu$  / דכור עני is indicative of a Jewish common ground found in Graeco-Semitic missionary contacts between Paul and Barnabas on the one hand and James, Cephas, and John on the other.

However, from early on the initial agreement was under pressure, as Paul indicates in Gal 2:4–5: "But because of the false brethren secretly brought in, who slipped in to spy out our freedom which we have in Christ Jesus, that they might bring us into bondage – to them we did not yield submission even for a moment, that the truth of the gospel might be preserved for you" (RSV). In Gal 2:11–14, Paul subsequently recounts open confrontation rather than a tension that could still be negated as

<sup>24</sup> É. Puech, *Qumrân grotte 4. XXVII: Textes araméens, deuxième partie. 4Q550–4Q575a, 4Q580–4Q587 et appendices* (DJD 37; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2009), 358.

<sup>25</sup> É. Puech, DJD 37, 353–61 at 354.



peripheral to the missionary agreement. It is this controversy involving self-definition and otherness, whose wording will now be examined by comparison with the Dead Sea Scrolls.

#### D. CONTROVERSY AROUND LANGUAGE OF SELF-DEFINITION AND OTHERNESS

The section which introduces open confrontation, Gal 2:11–14, is quoted below.

But when Cephas came to Antioch I opposed him to his face, because he stood condemned.<sup>12</sup> For before certain men came from James, he ate with the Gentiles; but when they came he drew back and separated himself, fearing the circumcision party.<sup>13</sup> And with him the rest of the Jews acted insincerely, so that even Barnabas was carried away by their insincerity.<sup>14</sup> But when I saw that they were not straightforward about the truth of the gospel, I said to Cephas before them all, 'If you, though a Jew, live like a Gentile and not like a Jew, how can you compel the Gentiles to live like Jews?' (Gal 2:11–14, RSV)

The location in Gal 2:11–14 has shifted to Antioch, as compared to Jerusalem in Gal 2:1–10. According to Josephus, Syrian Antioch had a thriving Jewish community before the Jewish war against Rome. Josephus writes in his *Jewish War* 7.45 that the Antiochian Jews had attracted many Greeks to their religious ceremonies and incorporated them in some way into their community.<sup>26</sup> Thus, the fact that Paul notes Cephas' initial association with the Gentiles, sharing table fellowship with them, would perhaps not have been totally distinct from the reality of the day in an Antiochian Jewish perspective. Yet Paul's description of the influence of "certain men from James" brings in the Judaean point of view of certain groups of the Jerusalem church which made Cephas change from his initial association with the Gentiles to withdrawal and dissociation out of fear of those of the circumcision (Gal 2:12).

Paul presents his confrontation of Cephas' changed social behaviour in terms of a juxtaposition between being straightforward about the truth of the gospel (ὀρθοποδέω, Gal 2:14) and insincerity (ὑπόκρισις, Gal 2:13). The apostle further mentions his own isolation even from his fellow missionary, Barnabas (Gal 2:13; cf. Gal 2:1.9).

<sup>26</sup> *J.W.* 7.45 τε προσαγόμενοι ταῖς θρησκευαίαις πολὺ πλῆθος Ἑλλήνων κάκεινους τρόπῳ τινὶ μοίραν αὐτῶν πεποιήντο.



The polarization between perceived truthfulness and insincerity which Paul describes in Gal 2:11–14 is in terms of a change of social behaviour in an atmosphere of fear and compulsion. It appears that Paul wants to overcome polarization among Christ-believers from various backgrounds in Antioch by confronting the idea of self with that of the other. In Gal 2:15–16, Paul sets out his idea of self-definition. Below, I have outlined its structure in Greek.

2:15

- a Ἡμεῖς φύσει Ἰουδαῖοι  
b καὶ οὐκ ἐξ ἔθνῶν ἁμαρτωλοί

2:16

- a εἰδότες  
b ὅτι οὐ δικαιοῦται ἄνθρωπος ἐξ ἔργων νόμου  
c ἐὰν μὴ διὰ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ,  
d καὶ ἡμεῖς εἰς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν ἐπιστεύσαμεν,  
e ἵνα δικαιωθῶμεν ἐκ πίστεως Χριστοῦ  
f καὶ οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων νόμου  
g ὅτι ἐξ ἔργων νόμου οὐ δικαιωθήσεται πᾶσα σὰρξ.

The idea of the self starts in Gal 2:15 with the phrase “we ourselves, who are Jews by birth and not Gentile sinners.” This idea begins with a juxtaposition of Jews and Gentiles, but is followed by another juxtaposition in Gal 2:16.

Let me first comment on Gal 2:15. This juxtaposition would have resonated among members of the Jerusalem church whom he addressed in preceding passages. The first person plural perspective of this “we” over against Gentile sinners may be compared with Semitic evidence from the Dead Sea Scrolls.

Two less outspokenly sectarian-oriented examples of texts from Qumran may be considered. First, fragment 1 column 1 of the Book of Mysteries from Qumran cave 1 (1Q27 [*1QMysteries*]), a text without clear sectarian community terminology, gives indications about a perspective on sin and justice with reference to nations.

Lines 5–6 first say that “When those born of sin, מולדי עולה, are locked up, evil will disappear before justice as [da]rkness disappears before light.” This gives a general impression of those born of sin. Lines 8–9 speak of all nations (העמים), who loathe sin (עול), but add that it is about by the hands of all of them.<sup>27</sup> This presentation is also general and refers to sin among people in general.

<sup>27</sup> Text and translation by García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*, 1, 66–69.

The Qumran text 4Q504, *Dibre Hame'orot* or *Words of the Luminaries*, fragment 6 is a second example. This text has been associated with pre-sectarian Judaism by E. G. Chazon in the early 1990s.<sup>28</sup> Fragment 6 line 9 states in the first person plural: “we remain aloof and one does not count us among the nations (בגוים).”<sup>29</sup>

In these two texts the problem of sin in the world is general, and *Dibre Hame'orot* elsewhere refers to iniquities in the first-person plural, but where *Dibre Hame'orot* speaks in the first-person plural, addressing God as being “in our midst” (4Q504 6 6–10), it is also in contradistinction to the Gentiles, גוים.

Paul makes a distinction between “we Jews by birth” and “not Gentile sinners” that probably concerns an opposition between Jewish covenantal entrustment with the oracles of God (cf. Rom 3:2, 9:4–5) and Gentile sin through ignorance or unbelief (cf. 1 Cor 8:1–13, 12:2).

Yet Paul gives the notion of self and otherness a different direction in the subsequent verse, Gal 2:16. I have structured this verse by subdividing its constituent parts, numbering them from *a* to *g* (see above). What is in *b* is clearly paralleled at the end in *g*. “No man/human being is justified by works of the law” parallels “from works of the law no flesh is justified.” Parts *b-c* state that a human being is not justified by works of the law but through faith in Jesus Christ, while conversely parts *e-f* state the aim of being “justified from faith in Christ and not from works of the law.” Part *g* repeats the idea with which the statement of knowledge started in a slightly different wording. In the middle of this sentence, in part *d*, is an emphatic first-person plural statement of belief in Christ Jesus.

A slightly comparable formulation in Romans 3:20 parallels that in Gal 2:16. The Greek text of Rom 3:20 runs as follows: διότι ἐξ ἔργων νόμου οὐ δικαιοθήσεται πᾶσα σὰρξ ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ, διὰ γὰρ νόμου ἐπίγνωσις ἁμαρτίας. Romans 3:20 treats the same subject as Gal 2:16 and agrees in terminology with the end of Gal 2:16, referring to πᾶσα σὰρξ.

Two terms which a Semitic language context may shed light on are “works of the law” and the negative statement about “justification of all flesh.” It is beyond the scope of this paper to dwell extensively on the term “works of the law,” but I will try to discuss its combined occurrence with

<sup>28</sup> 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; STDJ 10; Leiden: Brill – Jerusalem: The Magnes Press, the Hebrew University, and Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi, 1992), 3–17.

<sup>29</sup> García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*. 2, 1009.

the negative statement about “justification of all flesh.” Let me first begin with the latter item, and then return to “works of the law.”

The New Testament grammar by Moulton and Howard, with their appendix on Semitisms, linked the statement that no one is justified by works of the law to the Septuagintal Greek of LXX Ps 142:2b, οὐ δικαιοωθήσεται ἐνώπιόν σου πᾶς ζῶν. The corresponding MT Ps 143:2b reads יְהוָה לֹא יִצְדַּק לְפָנָי כָּל־חַי.<sup>30</sup> The biblical text has כָּל־חַי in the MT and πᾶς ζῶν in LXX as the subject of justification. Yet Paul’s Greek refers to ἄνθρωπος once (Gal 2:16b) and to πᾶσα σάρξ twice (Gal 2:16g, Rom 3:20).

Qumran literature provides an intriguing parallel to this language usage. That is, 4*QBéatitudes* (4Q525) 10 5, [וְכֹל בֶּשֶׂר אֵל יִצְדַּק אֵל], relates that “no flesh will God declare righteous.” This statement could indicate God’s impartiality, since it is preceded by a reference to enemy and friend, אֹיֵב וְאוֹהֵב. At the same time, line 6 of this fragment emphasizes that one’s deeds are not without consequences: “if you act right, he will act right toward you.”

When Paul emphasizes that no flesh will be justified by works of the law, the apostle appeals to a notion of God’s impartiality also well-known on the Semitic side of Graeco-Semitic missionary contacts in the early Christian movement. However, Paul’s application of justification is underpinned by the reading of Scripture about Abraham’s faith in Gen 15:6, as is known from Gal 3:6 and 4:3. The Greek expression λογίζεσθαι εἰς δικαιοσύνην has a Hebrew parallel in the epilogue of *Miqsat ma’aseh ha-Torah*, C 31: וְנִשְׁחַבְּהָ לָךְ לְצִדְקָה. In MMT, however, the accounting to righteousness is related to upright and good practices in conformity with the precepts of the Torah according to the epistolary authors’ decision.

It is a new sense of justification and a different understanding of the application of works of the law to Christian congregations that divided Paul from the groups around James in the Jerusalem church.

A secondary source of information, Acts 21:17–25, also clearly indicates how Paul’s position had been perceived by James and the elders in Jerusalem. That is, in Acts 21:20–21 the following words are addressed to Paul: “You see, brother, how many thousands there are among the Jews of those who have believed; they are all zealous for the law, and they have been told about you that you teach all the Jews who are among the Gentiles to forsake Moses, telling them not to circumcise their children or observe the customs” (RSV).

<sup>30</sup> J. H. Moulton and W. F. Howard, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek. II. Accidence and Word-Formation* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1919–1929), 411–85 at 434.

## E. EVALUATION AND CONCLUSIONS

It is time to draw conclusions. In my analysis of Paul's position with regard to the missionary pact and self-understanding in relation to others, agreements as well as fundamental differences with circles in the Jerusalem church have been noted. The Dead Sea Scrolls constitute important Semitic evidence for a Jewish world of thought in early Roman period Israel. Our understanding of the Jewish orientation of the Jerusalem church may be contextualized by this evidence. The injunction to remember the poor is an example of conceptual harmony in a context of Graeco-Semitic language contact between Paul and the Jerusalem church.

With regard to Paul's understanding of spiritual blessings, which the apostle attributes to the saints of Jerusalem in Rom 15:26, the Scrolls also provide countless examples of Jewish thought context. 4Q417 2 i 16 refers to a "people of the spirit" or "spiritual people," while the literary protagonist of *Barki Nafshi*, addressing God, claims that "with the spirit of salvation you have clothed me," *ישעות הלבשתני ורוח* (4Q438 [4Q*Barki Nafshi*<sup>c</sup>] 4 ii + 5 3, . This figurative language of clothing appears somehow comparable to Paul's language, when he envisions that "the perishable puts on the imperishable, and the mortal puts on immortality" in 1 Cor 15:54 and refers to clothing, giving the Spirit as guarantee in 2 Cor 5:1-5.

A fundamental point of disagreement between Paul and members of the Jerusalem church concerned the way justification and works of the law were perceived in relation to each other.

What Paul may have wanted to get across to his addressees, the churches in Galatia, could be the point that an exclusive focus on works of the law would amount to the idea that "Christ died to no purpose" (Gal 2:21; cf. Gal 3:13). Yet Paul's idea of the law is not that it should be assigned to a sense of exclusivism, because in Gal 5:14 he observes that "the whole law is fulfilled in one word, 'you shall love your neighbour as yourself'" (RSV). It is the sense of exclusivism which Paul attributed to his missionary opponents that informs his discussion of works of the law in Galatians.

My comparative discussion has aimed at suggesting a picture of Graeco-Semitic language contacts and standards of missionary ethics in the light of Semitic data from the Scrolls. This comparison highlights not only fundamental dividing lines but also common grounds of thought in emerging Christianity and Early Judaism.



ISRAEL AND THE COMMUNITY IN PAUL (ROM 9–11)  
AND THE RULE TEXTS FROM QUMRAN

Jutta Leonhardt-Balzer

*University of Aberdeen*

The concept of “Israel” is not monolithic. In the Torah and prophets the term Israel is already used in a number of ways. Israel is the name Jacob received after he fought the divine, and in consequence it is used for the 12 sons of Jacob and their descendants. In the course of the history of the monarchy it is also used merely for the northern state or for the united entity of Israel and Judah. Beyond the political it has an ideological claim: it is the name of the Jews as the people of God.<sup>1</sup> By Second Temple times this ideological use has replaced the political meaning: the term occurs frequently and it was rarely used to describe the contemporary political entity; as such it had been replaced by “Judeans” or related terms. At that time, references to “Israel” as the political Jewish people constitute an archaic use of language implying a turning away from contemporary constellations and a return to the nation’s covenant relationship with God.<sup>2</sup> But, as Collins points out, in many Second Temple texts, and especially in Qumran, the ideological use has brought about a “tension between Israel as it existed and Israel as it ought to be.”<sup>3</sup> When applied to contemporary Jews in Second Temple times, the term describes the national election, but also more specifically it refers to the people of God *in contrast to* the question of ethnicity.<sup>4</sup> In the Bible already, ethnic Israel, although the people of God, has not always been obedient to God. As term for the

---

<sup>1</sup> Cf. J. J. Collins, “The Construction of Israel in the Sectarian Rule Books,” in *Judaism in Late Antiquity 5: The Judaism of Qumran: A Systemic Reading of The Dead Sea Scrolls 1: The Theory of Israel* (ed. A. J. Avery-Peck, J. Neusner and B. D. Chilton; Handbook of Oriental Studies I 56; Leiden: Brill, 2001), 25–42, esp. 25–26.

<sup>2</sup> On the messianic use of the term in the first and second revolt, cf. D. Goldblatt, “From Judaism to Israel: Names of Jewish States in Antiquity,” *JSJ* 29 (1998): 1–36, esp. 10–13.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. J. J. Collins, “Israel,” 26.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. J. Willitts, “The Remnant of Israel in 4QpIsaiah<sup>a</sup> (4Q161) and the Dead Sea Scrolls,” *JJS* 57 (2006): 11–25, esp. 11.

people of God, “Israel” is a challenge for Paul and his mission to the Gentiles. The relationship to Israel was important for the self-definition of the new entity that was to become Christianity.

Fundamentally Paul uses “Israel” as an ethnic term for the descendants of the twelve tribes: in Phil 3:5f Paul defines himself as a genuine Jew using the words: “having been circumcised on the eighth day, from the people of Israel, the tribe Benjamin, Hebrew out of Hebrews, according to the Law a Pharisee, according to zeal a persecutor of the congregation, according to the righteousness in the Torah flawless.” (περιτομῇ ὀκταήμερος ἐκ γένους Ἰσραήλ, φυλῆς Βενιαμίν, Ἑβραῖος ἐκ Ἑβραίων, κατὰ νόμον Φαρισαῖος, κατὰ ζήλος διώκων τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, κατὰ δικαιοσύνην τὴν ἐν νόμῳ γενόμενος ἄμεμπτος). Here ethnic Israel and observance of the Jewish traditions are identified. The perfection of his state in the Jewish life is expressed by descent, life and the willingness to defend the proper observance of the Torah. Yet Paul does not always simply identify Israel with the Jews, and this causes additional problems for him.

In 1 Cor 10:18 Paul uses the “Israel according to the flesh” (Ἰσραήλ κατὰ σάρκα) and the communion shared at the altar in the Temple by those participating in and sharing the meat of the sacrifices as positive example for the Christians. In an argument *a minore ad maius* he points out that if even “Israel according to the flesh” can have such a communion, how much more does Christian communion create a bond which should not be defiled. “Israel” here is not derogatory.<sup>5</sup> Likewise in Gal 6:16 Paul concludes the letter with a blessing on all those who abandon the distinction between circumcision and being uncircumcised and “on the Israel of God” (ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰσραήλ τοῦ θεοῦ), here clearly referring to the Christian community of Jews and gentiles,<sup>6</sup> “those who believe.”<sup>7</sup> In these contexts he extends the relationship between “Israel” as the people of God and the Christian community, while still showing awareness of the special status of ethnic Israel in God’s plan.<sup>8</sup> That Paul does not simply remove the

<sup>5</sup> G. Harvey, *The True Israel: Uses of the Names Jew, Hebrew and Israel in Ancient Jewish and Early Christian Literature* (AGJU 35; Leiden: Brill, 1996), 226–27.

<sup>6</sup> For the inclusive interpretation of “Israel”, cf. G. K. Beale, “Peace and Mercy Upon the Israel of God. The Old Testament Background of Galatians 6,16b,” *Biblica* 80 (1999): 204–23.

<sup>7</sup> Harvey, *Israel*, 226

<sup>8</sup> Cf. H. Räisänen, “Paul’s and Qumran’s Judaism,” in *Judaism in Late Antiquity 5: The Judaism of Qumran: A Systemic Reading of the Dead Sea Scrolls 2: World View, Comparing Judaisms* (ed. A. J. Avery-Peck, J. Neusner and B. D. Chilton; Handbook of Oriental Studies I 57; Leiden: Brill, 2001), 173–200, esp. 193–94.

status of the Jews and transfers it on the Christians can be seen from the extensive treatment of the special position of the Jews in God's plan in Rom 9–11. While there are numerous studies which have looked at the issue of Israel either in Qumran or Paul or both together,<sup>9</sup> opinions are still divided about what, exactly, Israel means for Paul when he concludes in Rom 11:26: "And thus all Israel will be saved."

In this contribution the Qumran texts are compared to Paul's approach to Israel focussing on the three questions: What is Israel in each text? Against which background is it used? And how does it function within the argument of the text?

### A. ISRAEL IN THE QUMRAN RULES

Among the genuine sectarian texts the rules explicitly define the people from Qumran and are therefore particularly useful in the quest for Qumran's Israel. This study will not only consider the rules for the present community 1QS and CD but also the rule texts 1QSa and 1QM, which show the community's eschatological expectation regarding Israel. They thus provide data comparable to Paul in Rom 9–11.

#### 1. *Israel in 1QS*

At the beginning of 1QS, Israel does not play a part in the description of the community. The concept there is the יִהָד (1QS I 1), not "all Israel." Israel appears in the covenant ceremony, and there only under the aspect of its failure as God's people. Parallel to the Deuteronomic blessings and curses (Deut 27–28) the priests are called on to recite the powerful deeds of God (1QS I 21–22) before they bless the people of God. "Then the Levites shall recite the iniquities of the sons of Israel and all their guilty offences and their sins under the rule of Belial" (I 22–24),<sup>10</sup> after which they proceed by cursing the people belonging to Belial. Israel is *not* identified with the community, it is the whole nation from which the community separates itself by swearing allegiance to the *yahad*.<sup>11</sup> The people entering the community then confess their sins, thus marking themselves as a separate

<sup>9</sup> E.g. J. M. Scott, "'And then All Israel will be Saved' (Rom 11:26)," in *Restoration: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Perspectives* (ed. J. M. Scott; JSJSup 72; Leiden: Brill, 2001), 489–526, esp. 500–515; J. J. Collins, "Israel," 25–42.

<sup>10</sup> והלויים מספרים את עוונות בני ישראל וכול פשעי אשמתם וחטאתם בממשלת בליעל

<sup>11</sup> Pace P. R. Davies, "'Old' and 'New' Israel in the Bible and the Qumran Scrolls: Identity and Difference," in *Defining Identities: We, You, and the Other in the Dead Sea Scrolls:*



part of this Israel as opposed to those who do not do so. The non-community Israel is defined as under the influence of the evil power of Belial.

The (non-sectarian) Instruction on the Two Spirits mentions Israel only once in 1QS III 25: “the God of Israel,” who with the “angel of his truth” will destroy all the effects of the angel of darkness. “Israel” is the term of the people with whom God has associated himself in a special way, it defines the elect.

In the actual rule section the contrast between the community and Israel is addressed again: The “order for the men of the community” (הסרכ) (לאנשי היחד, V 1) defines the men who separate themselves from the “men of deceit” (אנשי העול, V 2). The way in which this separation is done is described in the subsequent section: they shall circumcise their desires “in order to lay a *foundation of truth for Israel* for a community of an eternal covenant, in order to atone for all who show themselves willing *for the sanctuary in Aaron and for the house of the truth in Israel*, and for those who join them for the community and for strife and judgment to condemn all those who have transgressed the decree” (V 5–7).<sup>12</sup> The community as elite of Israel is described in terms of Temple metaphors as well as in terms of their Torah observance.

Again, the people entering the community who are to be examined by the overseer are described as a sub-group of Israel in 1QS VI 13–14: “everyone from Israel who is willing to join the council of the community” (וכולה מתנדב מישראל להוסיף על עצת היחד), the council of the community being the community itself.<sup>13</sup> The entry into the community is characterised as voluntary.<sup>14</sup> Israel is the nation from which the community takes its members, and whose covenant it claims as its own. In 1QS VIII 1–4 the council of the community is established “in Israel” (1QS VIII 4), separated from the unrighteous.

Israel is also the group which does not have the full understanding of God’s matters. Within Israel, however, there is the “house of truth” (בית) (בית קודש בישראל, 1QS V 6) or “house of holiness in Israel” (בית תמים ואמת) (בית תמים ואמת, 1QS VIII 5–6), “a house of perfection and truth in Israel” (בית תמים ואמת, 1QS VIII 8–9) all of which are specifically sectarian, non-biblical

*Proceedings of the Fifth Meeting of IOQS in Groningen* (ed. F. García Martínez and M. Popović; STDJ 70; Leiden: Brill, 2008), 33–42, esp. 38–39.

<sup>12</sup> ועורפ קשה ליסד מוסד אמת לישראל ליחד ברית עולם לכפר לכול המתנדבים לקודש באהרון ולבית האמת בישראל והגלוים עליהם ליחד ולריב ולמשפט להרשיע כול עוברי חוק

<sup>13</sup> J. J. Collins, “Israel,” 32–33.

<sup>14</sup> Collins, “Israel,” 31.

expressions<sup>15</sup> for a sanctuary whose sacrificial worship pleases God, because they know how to do God's will.

For this they have specialists in theology, such as the Interpreter, whose office has the specific purpose of researching exegesis: "And any matter which was concealed from Israel and was found by the Interpreter [lit: the man who searches], he shall not keep it hidden from them [the council of the community] for fear of a spirit of desertion"<sup>16</sup> (1QS VIII 11–12). Israel is thus characterised as having an inferior knowledge of the Scriptures.

The community's priestly and sacrificial function as atonement for Israel's sins is emphasised once again in 1QS IX 3-6: "When this happens in Israel according to all these decrees for a foundation of the holy spirit for eternal truth . . ." <sup>17</sup> (1QS IX 3–4). At this point the Temple metaphor serves to distinguish the community and Israel in the same way as priests and laypeople. The atonement does not indicate that the community serves to save the rest of Israel. Rather that they regarded themselves as the people who observe the strict rules of God, "a holy house of Aaron, to be united as holy of holies and house of the community for Israel, who walk in perfection"<sup>18</sup> (1QS IX 6). They atone for previous sins, but not in a representative capacity for non-community Israel. They are the remnant of Israel, and their perfect observance of God's rules continues "until the coming of the prophet and the messiahs of Aaron and Israel" (עד בוא נביא) (ומשיחי אהרון וישראל, 1QS IX 11).

## 2. *Israel in 1QSa*

Unlike in 1QS the term Israel occurs already in the heading 1QSa I 1–3: "This is the rule for the whole assembly of Israel in the last days, when they gather to walk according to the judgment of the sons of Zadok, the priests and the men of the covenant, who have turned away from walking on the way of the people."<sup>19</sup> The rules are extended to "everyone born in Israel" (לכול האזרח בישראל), (1QSa I 6), expecting all Israel to join the

<sup>15</sup> Cf. M. Philonenko, "Sur les expressions 'Maison fidèle en Israël', 'Maison de vérité en Israël', 'Maison de perfection et de vérité en Israël' (Contribution à l'étude du socio-lecte esséno-qoumrânien)," in F. García Martínez, A. Steudel, E. Tigchelaar (eds), *From 4QMMT to Resurrection: Mélanges qoumraniens en hommage à Émile Puech* (STDJ 61; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 243–46.

<sup>16</sup> וכול דבר הנסתר מישראל ונמצאו לאיש הדורש אל יסתרהו אלא מיראת רוח נסוגה

<sup>17</sup> בהיות אלה בישראל ככול התכונים האלה ליסוד רוח קודש לאמת עולם

<sup>18</sup> בית קודש לאהרון להיחד קודש קודשים ובית יחד לישראל ההולכים בתמים

<sup>19</sup> וזה הסרך לכול עדת ישראל באחרית הימים בה[א]ספם [ליחד להתה]לך על פי משפט בני צדוק הכהנים ואנושי בריתם אשר סר[ו] מלכת ב[דרך] העם

community.<sup>20</sup> 1QSa clearly aims to lay out the expectation for all Israel, not a sub-group.

Yet this Israel is identified with the community. This can be seen when the community council is called the “council of the community in Israel” (לעצת היחד בישראל, 1QSa II 2).<sup>21</sup> Israel reappears in the text in 1QSa II 20, where there is a reference to “the messiah of Israel” (משיח ישראל). The promises and expectations of Israel seem to have been transferred completely to the community. In the eschaton *the difference between Israel and the community collapses*, the community is Israel.

### 3. *Israel in CD*

The Admonition section of the Damascus Document begins with the contrast of those who know righteousness and those who reject God. Israel has broken faith with God, CD A I 3, and because of his *covenant* with their *ancestors* God has left a *remnant* in Israel (ובזכרו ברית ראשנים) (השאר שרירית לישראל, CD I 4–5). After the 390 years of wrath he let a “root of the plant” grow “from Israel” (ויצמח מישראל ומאהרן שורש מטעת) (CD A I 7–8). This plant consists of those people who repent of their misdeeds. The plant metaphor, taken from Is 60:21; 61:3, emphasises both the concept of a selected set of descendants of the patriarchs and the promise of the land, as a plant needs soil to grow.<sup>22</sup> The true heirs of Israel are not the ones who will inherit the land, but only those who follow the community’s teaching.<sup>23</sup> “Israel” is continuously referred to as the people of the covenant who have failed their God.

The Persian restoration of Esra/Nehemia is not mentioned.<sup>24</sup> Quoting Hos 4:16 it is emphasised that “Israel was stubborn” (סרר ישראל), when “the scoffer” (איש הלצון) preached to “Israel” (לישראל, CD A I 14). They deserted the divine statutes (CD A I 20). God detests the generations of Israel because of their works, and hides from them (CD A II 9). The biblical history of Israel is described as a history of desertion. Isaac and Jacob are

<sup>20</sup> Cf. G. Holtz, “Inclusivism at Qumran,” *DSD* 16 (2009): 22–54, esp. 26–27.

<sup>21</sup> Pace H. Räisänen, “Paul’s and Qumran’s Judaism,” 196.

<sup>22</sup> Cf. T. Elgvin, “Wisdom at Qumran,” in *Judaism in Late Antiquity 5: The Judaism of Qumran: A Systemic Reading of the Dead Sea Scrolls 2: World View, Comparing Judaisms* (ed. A. J. Avery-Peck, J. Neusner, B. D. Chilton; Handbook of Oriental Studies I 57; Leiden: Brill, 2001), 146–69, esp. 159.

<sup>23</sup> L. H. Schiffman, “The Concept of Restoration in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *Restoration: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Perspectives* (ed. J. M. Scott; JSJSup 72; Leiden: Brill, 2001), 203–21, esp. 206.

<sup>24</sup> Collins, “Israel,” 28.

named as recipients of the commandments of God from Abraham and as friends of God (CD A III 2–4) while Jacob's sons are accused of disobedience (CD A III 4–7). Those who kept God's will and observed his commandments form a remnant with whom God forms "his eternal covenant for Israel" (בריתו לישראל עד עולם, CD A III 13). This group who remained faithful is most likely the parent group of the Qumran community.<sup>25</sup> To them the Sabbaths and observances are revealed which Israel deviated from (CD A III 14). Yet the covenant is aimed at all Israel, even if only the community fulfils it; they are not one group within Israel, they represent "all Israel," i.e. the true Israel.<sup>26</sup>

"For them [God] built a firm house in Israel" (ויבן להם בית נאמן בישראל) (CD A III 19). This firm house is a metaphor for the community, described with Ez 44:15 as the eschatological Temple.<sup>27</sup> The priests, Levites and sons of Zadok are identified as those who watched over God's Temple when the "children of Israel" went astray (IV 1).<sup>28</sup> These priests are the "returning ones of Israel" (שבי ישראל, CD A IV 2), the root שוב combining the metaphor of return from the exile with the aspect of repentance referring to the "converts" who turn away from their previous disobedience.<sup>29</sup> They are the "chosen ones of Israel," called in the last days (בחירי ישראל, IV 3–4). Thus the "root from Israel" of CD A I 7–8 is characterised as priestly in origin.<sup>30</sup> Based on the parallel to CD A III 18–18, these priestly converts originally referred to the parent movement of the community, but in later generations the term could also be applied to anyone who entered the community.<sup>31</sup> CD envisages that at the fulness of times these

<sup>25</sup> Cf. A. L. A. Hogeterp, "Eschatological Identities in the Damascus Document," in *Defining Identities: We, You, and the Other in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the Fifth Meeting of IOQS in Groningen* (ed. F. García Martínez and M. Popović; STDJ 70; Leiden: Brill, 2008), 111–30, esp. 117–18, based on C. Hempel, "Community Origins in the Damascus Document in the Light of Recent Scholarship," in *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls. Technological Innovations, New Texts, & Reformulated Issues* (ed. D. W. Parry and E. Ulrich; STDJ 30; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 316–29.

<sup>26</sup> Cf. Holtz, "Inclusivism," 37–42. The community did not advocate the separation from "all Israel" (*ibid.*, 44), yet this is not, as Holtz argues, a sign of inclusivism but of the transferral of the privileges of Israel to the community with its interpretation of the tradition.

<sup>27</sup> Cf. Hogeterp, "Eschatological Identities," 121–23.

<sup>28</sup> Harvey, *Israel*, 194.

<sup>29</sup> On the translation of this term, see e.g. Hogeterp, "Eschatological Identities," esp. 119–21; Collins, "Israel," 28, emphasising the aspect of repentance, Schiffman, "Concept of Restoration," 207–8, emphasising the aspect of return from exile.

<sup>30</sup> Collins, "Israel," 29.

<sup>31</sup> Cf. Hogeterp, "Eschatological Identities," 120–21.

conversions “to the house of Judah” (לְבֵית יְהוּדָה) will cease and those who have not converted will remain where they are (CD A IV 11). Throughout history Belial is described as set loose against Israel (CD A IV 13.16) and Israel is the people of God as a target for Belial’s attacks. These attacks are the explanation of Israel’s fall (CD A VI 1). The guilt for Israel’s disobedience lies with them and their association with Belial.

Yet God does not let this development go unchecked: “God remembered the covenant with their ancestors *vacat* and raised men of knowledge from Aaron and wise men from Israel”<sup>32</sup> (CD A VI 2–3). The emphasis is not on the discontinuity between the old and the new covenant, but on that between the disobedient people and those who turn around to observe God’s will.<sup>33</sup> Although obedience is limited to a small group, God’s remembering the covenant with the ancestors creates an explicit continuity between the community and Israel. The “new covenant in the land of Damascus” (הַבְּרִית הַחֲדָשָׁה בְּאַרְץ דַּמַּשְׁק, CD A VI 19; cf. CD A VIII 21; CD B XIX 22–34) is not a new covenant, but the renewed covenant which according to Jer 31:31 is written into the Israelites’ hearts.

The remnant of Israel is once again identified with the community who left the land of Judah to go into exile of Damascus (CD A VI 5). Israel is not a uniform entity, it is composed of “two houses” (שְׁנֵי בְתֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל), Ephraim and Judah, and the separation of Ephraim from Judah in Is 7:17 is seen as desertion (CD A VII 11–13). The term “Israel” is then used to describe the people which despised the testimony of the prophets (CD A VII 18), but the concept of Israel also carries eschatological hope: in the community there is the eschatological expectation of the rising of the star of Jacob (Num 24:17) and a “sceptre rises from Israel” (וְקֶמֶט מִיִּשְׂרָאֵל, CD A VII 19–20), which expresses the expectation that Israel as the people of the covenant will be the origin of eschatological renewal. Thus throughout the historical section the Damascus Document uses Israel to denote the people of God who fell away from him, his commandments and his covenant. Consequently God chose a remnant to replace them. The passage is full of Scriptural allusions.<sup>34</sup>

In the rule section of CD the community is once again part of Israel: the ten judges are described as four from Levi and Aaron, i.e. priests, and

<sup>32</sup> ויזכר אל ברית ראשנים *vacat* ויקם מאהרן נבונים ומישראל חכמים

<sup>33</sup> Pace Davies, “‘Old’ and ‘New,’” esp. 33–34.

<sup>34</sup> Passages such as CD I 18–II 1 with their sermonlike use of the second person plural create and reinforce identity by drawing the audience into a game of recognising sectarian use of Scripture, cf. Grossman, “Cultivating Identity,” 6–7.

six “from Israel” (ומישראל, CD A X 5), i.e. lay people. The “company of Israel” (חבור ישראל, CD A XII 8) refers to the congregation entitled to pass judgments. The “towns of Israel” refer to the legitimate places of habitation of the people (XII 19). The “seed of Israel” (זרע ישראל, CD A XII 22) are the descendants of the promise who are called to observe God’s will. Israel’s status as God’s people is also expressed in the expectation that an “anointed one from Aaron and Israel” will come (משוח אהרון וישראל, CD A XII 23–XIII 1; XIV 19). Once again the expectation of future salvation is related to the ancient name.<sup>35</sup> The name Israel is closely linked to God’s covenant with Israel and the gift of the Torah (CD A XV 5.9). Israel is the people of the covenant, which must be free from blemish (CD A XVI 1). But there is a time of “blindness of Israel” (לעורון ישראל, CD A XVI 2–3). Those who were preserved will be protected and saved in the final time of reckoning, while the others will be destroyed “when the messiah from Israel and Aaron comes” (בבוא משיח אהרון וישראל, CD B XIX 10–11; cf. XX 1). Here it is clear that the judgment is going to destroy all those who have transgressed, those who never joined the community as well as those who parted from it, and only the pure remnant will remain.

#### 4. *Israel in 1QM*

In the War Scroll the basic distinction is not between Israel and the nations but between the “sons of light” and those “of darkness.”<sup>36</sup> The first use of the name does not refer to the people but to the “God of Israel” (אל ישראל), before whom the war between the sons of darkness/Kittim etc. and the sons of light is fought (1QM I 9–10). The term occurs again when the priests are described as praising “the God of Israel” (אל ישראל, 1QM XIII 1–2), again in the prayer of praise for God on the battlefield after the victory (1QM XIV 4), and then in the priestly praise before the final battle (1QM XVIII 6). The “God of Israel” is contrasted with “Belial” in 1QM XV 16. God and Israel define each other, reflecting biblical usage, where the “God of Israel” appears some 250 times<sup>37</sup> and where there is a frequent contrast between the God of Israel and the gods of others.

This relationship defines the idea of Israel in the War Scroll. The rules relating to the heads of the families state that they come “from all the tribes of Israel” (מכול שבטי ישראל, 1QM II 7). The commandments are

<sup>35</sup> Cf. Hogeterp, “Eschatological Identities,” esp. 111

<sup>36</sup> Cf. Willitts, “Remnant,” 19–20.

<sup>37</sup> Harvey, *Israel*, 167–174.

specifically for Israel. This can be seen from the fact that any military preparations cease during the seventh year, “for it is a Sabbath of rest for Israel” (ביא שבת מנוח היאה לישראל) (1QM II 8–9). The first of the military signs bears the inscription “people of God, and the name Israel” (עם לישראל) (אל ואת שם ישראל) (1QM III 13). The final victory is proclaimed using the prophecy about the “star out of Jacob” (כוכב מיעקוב) and the “sceptre out of Israel” (שבט מישראל) (1QM XI 6), who will destroy all enemies of God. Israel is going through a period of oppression during the war but those of God’s lot can expect salvation, while those belonging to deceit will be destroyed (XV 1–2). The distinction between the sons of light and those who violate the covenant (1QM I 2) and are part of the host of darkness shows that the true people of Israel are only the members of the sect.<sup>38</sup> In the same way Israel and the community are identified in 4QSM 8 1–11 par. 11QSM 1 ii 2–15.<sup>39</sup>

### 5. *Israel in Qumran*

In 1QS and CD, the rules which relate to the present of the community, Israel is the term of the people of God, which, although given unique privileges, fails God by not observing the commandments of God. Israel is *not* perfect, and it is not identified with the community.<sup>40</sup> By contrast, the rule texts relating to the eschatological future, 1QSa and 1QM, focus on Israel as the people with the special relationship to God. “Here the ambiguity about Israel’s identity disappears.”<sup>41</sup> Israel is defined as those who do not fail God. Here Israel is limited to the community, but the community expects non-community Israelites to join them in considerable numbers.<sup>42</sup> The sons of light, although they are implicitly identified with Israel, do not include all Israelites but they do not contain gentiles either.<sup>43</sup> The idea of the remnant “did not replace Israel—it was not a new Israel—but was the elect from among Israel with whom and through whom God will ultimately fulfil his covenant promises.”<sup>44</sup> The community does not have any problems with the idea that those of Israel who do not follow the community’s interpretation of God’s will will be destroyed. The remnant,

<sup>38</sup> Cf. Schiffman, “Restoration,” 210.

<sup>39</sup> Cf. Holtz, “Inclusivism,” 29–30.

<sup>40</sup> Pace Davies, ““Old” and “New” Israel,” esp. 33.

<sup>41</sup> Thus correctly Davies, ““Old” and “New” Israel,” 39.

<sup>42</sup> Collins, “Israel,” 38.

<sup>43</sup> Collins, “Israel,” 37–38.

<sup>44</sup> Willitts, “Remnant,” 25.



chosen by God in faithfulness to the covenant with Israel, is the fundamental tool to explain the experience that so many Jews do not agree with the community's truth.

Qumran has been described as a "reformist movement," whose "basic identity" is in the concept of Israel.<sup>45</sup> After the review of the material in this section this concept can be defined more precisely as consisting of the following features. 1. Israel is an ethnic concept. 2. It refers to the "children" of the ancestors with whom God had a special relationship ("God of Israel"). 3. This relationship is described as covenant. 4. Correct Torah observance plays a major part in correct covenant behaviour. 5. Temple imagery is used to describe those who observe the Torah correctly. 6. The expectation of a future messiah is linked to the concept of Israel. 7. On the other hand, this ideal of Israel is contrasted with the present disobedience of Israel. There is no "old" and "new" Israel, there is only the Israel that is faithful to God and those from Israel who are not.<sup>46</sup> These seven features are categories which define the function of the concept of Israel in Qumran defining the community's identity in continuation of and separation from non-community Jews. The same function is served by the concept of Israel in Rom 9.

#### B. ISRAEL IN RM 9-11

Paul begins his discussion of the function of Israel in God's plan with a statement of his distress at his compatriots', his relatives', refusal to believe in Christ (Rom 9:1-3): They, "who are Israelites, whose is the sonship, the glory, the covenants, the legislation, the worship and the promises, whose are the fathers and from whom the Christ is according to the flesh . . ." <sup>47</sup> (Rom 9:4-5). Paul summarises the special position of Israel by adding up the different gifts to Israel. They are children of the ancestors (see above A 5: category 1) and have a special relationship with God; they are therefore children of God himself (category 2). According to F. Avemarie's contribution, Paul's reference to "glory" may also refer to the Adamic glory similar to "the glory of Adam" for those whom "God has chosen" for "an everlasting covenant" (1QS IV 23, cf. CD III 20; 1QHa IV 27). This text combines glory with God's election. If Paul's reference to glory draws on

<sup>45</sup> Collins, "Israel," 41.

<sup>46</sup> Pace Davies, "'Old' and 'New' Israel," 33-42.

<sup>47</sup> οἵτινες εἰσιν Ἰσραηλῖται, ὧν ἡ υἰοθεσία καὶ ἡ δόξα καὶ αἱ διαθήκαι καὶ ἡ νομοθεσία καὶ ἡ λατρεία καὶ αἱ ἐπαγγελίαι, ὧν οἱ πατέρες καὶ ἐξ ὧν ὁ Χριστὸς κατὰ σάρκα . . .



similar ideas it would parallel the “God of Israel” concept (category 2) as well as hinting at that of covenant (category 3). This corresponds to Paul’s subsequent reference to “covenants” in the plural, which probably also indicates that the Jews for Paul participate in God’s glory by virtue of the covenants of Abraham and Moses (category 3). Paul then lists the gift of the Torah as divine law and plan (category 4), their Temple worship as the only place in which God chose to receive sacrifices (category 5) and the promises of God’s lasting presence with them, not only the promise to Abraham, but especially that of the coming of the Messiah (category 6). The disobedience of Israel is expressed in their lack of faith in Christ (category 7). As in CD Paul draws on the patriarchs as examples of a successful relationship with God. They are the ancestors of the nation, and even Jesus Christ as the Messiah, far from weakening the Jews’ position as people of God, serves to affirm it. Thus all the categories observed in Qumran reappear in this highly condensed list introducing the problem of Israel and the people of God.

Now the question arises whether the election of the Christians from the gentiles invalidates the promises and gifts to Israel (Rom 9:6). If God can change his mind about his people once, he might do so again. Therefore Paul must demonstrate that God’s election of the gentiles is not a deviation from his prior behaviour but a continuation and confirmation of it: “For it is not the case that God’s word has run aground, for not all who are from Israel are Israel”<sup>48</sup> (Rom 9:6). Yet the first example Paul uses is not related to Jacob’s descendants but to Abraham’s. Paul refers to God’s promise of the birth of Isaac versus Ishmael, which shows that not all descendants of Abraham are chosen. Only then does he mention Jacob versus Esau, which serves as example that not even all biological descendants of Abraham’s promised child are Israel (Rom 9:6–13). God’s election chooses from Jews and Gentiles (Rom 9:14–26). The elect have not rejected the gospel, the people who rejected the gospel were never truly elect.<sup>49</sup> While this does not seem to agree with Paul’s overall argument in Rom 9–11, it is a deeply rooted conviction in Jewish Wisdom literature that God’s sovereignty and wisdom expresses itself in the freedom of his election (e.g. Sir 33:8.11).<sup>50</sup> Yet Paul does not end his argument here and he does not use Wisdom material to argue his case. Instead he quotes

<sup>48</sup> οὐχ οἶον δὲ ὅτι ἐκπέπτωκεν ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ, οὐ γὰρ πάντες οἱ ἐξ Ἰσραὴλ οὗτοι Ἰσραήλ.

<sup>49</sup> This is emphasised by Räisänen, “Paul’s and Qumran’s Judaism,” 194.

<sup>50</sup> Cf. G. Schmidt Goering, *Wisdom’s Root Revealed: Ben Sira and the Election of Israel* (JSJSup 139; Leiden: Brill, 2009), 61.

Ex 9:16 on Pharaoh's hardening in Rom 9:17. Israel's refusal to believe is not attributed to obstinacy or the influence of evil powers, it is God himself who hardens Israel. This opens the way for the gentiles. Referring to Hosea without mentioning Israel directly Paul states in Rom 9:26 that God calls those who are not his people his people, they call him their God (Hos 2:1,25), and Paul combines this with Isa 10:22. "But Isaiah cries out about Israel: If the number of the sons of Israel were like the sand at the sea, still only a remnant will be saved"<sup>51</sup> (Rom 9:27).<sup>52</sup> Thus Paul uses the idea of a remnant to explain why not all Jews believe in Jesus, while many gentiles do.

Referring to Isaac and Jacob, Paul at first uses the Torah's way of expressing the election of Israel in a narrative as a historical event.<sup>53</sup> Yet he also adds a wisdom reference to the election at man's creation using the potter metaphor immediately afterwards in Rom 9:19–21. While wisdom traditions such as Sir 5 regard Israel's function in the divine plan as instrumental in supporting the created order and demonstrating to the nations the wisdom of the God of Israel and inciting them to piety, Paul inverts this function: Israel is the people of God, yet they do not serve to incite the nations to piety. Instead the faith of the nations is going to incite Israel's piety. Paul gives the reason for the rejection of a large part of Israel: "although Israel pursued the law of righteousness, it did not reach the law" (Ἰσραὴλ δὲ διώκων νόμον δικαιοσύνης εἰς νόμον οὐκ ἔφθασεν, Rom 9:31). The reason for this is that they sought righteousness from works, not from faith (Rom 9:32). Paul deplores that they have zeal for God but no insight, although Scripture gives evidence of Christ (Rom 10:1–12). Yet even their lack of faith and the gentiles' faith has been foretold by Scripture (Rom 10:11–21): "But I say: Did Israel not understand? First Moses says: I will make you jealous of a non-people, and I will make you angry at a foolish people. [...] He [Isaiah] says to Israel: All day I have stretched out my hands to a *disobedient* and *obstinate* people"<sup>54</sup> (Rom 10:19,21). It has been observed that the development of thought in Rom 9-11 resembles that of Deut 32: God elects Israel and looks after it (Deut 32:6–14); Israel

<sup>51</sup> Ἡσαΐας δὲ κράζει ὑπὲρ Ἰσραὴλ· ἐὰν ἦ ὁ ἀριθμὸς τῶν υἰῶν Ἰσραὴλ ὡς ἡ ἄμμος τῆς θαλάσσης, τὸ ὑπόλειμμα σωθήσεται.

<sup>52</sup> Isaiah refers to the return of the exiles, but Paul does not, against Scott, "All Israel," 519–520, as the contrast to the gentiles' faith which saves them, shows.

<sup>53</sup> *Ibid.*, 62–62.

<sup>54</sup> ἀλλὰ λέγω, μὴ Ἰσραὴλ οὐκ ἔγνω; πρῶτος Μωϋσῆς λέγει· ἐγὼ παραζηλώσω ὑμᾶς ἐπ' οὐκ ἔθνει, ἐπ' ἔθνει ἀσυνέτω παροργιῶ ὑμᾶς . . . πρὸς δὲ τὸν Ἰσραὴλ λέγει· ὄλην τὴν ἡμέραν ἐξεπέτασα τὰς χεῖρας μου πρὸς λαὸν ἀπειθοῦντα καὶ ἀντιλέγοντα.

rebels against God (Deut 32:15–18; 21:5), God judges them (Deut 32:19–35), in particular he causes them to be jealous of a “non-people” (Deut 32:21, cf. Rom 15:10) and delivers them at the end of times (Deut 32:36–43), with the gentiles also being called to praise him (Deut 32:43, quoted in Rom 15:10f). Using Deuteronomy, Rom 9:30–10:8 thus creates a reversal of traditional Jewish expectations in that the gentiles, not the Jews, have attained righteousness, and the contrast between righteousness by faith and obedience to the law is a reversal of the Deuteronomic blessings and curses.<sup>55</sup> Even the concept of divine hardening of Israel is taken from Deut 29. Thus the approach to Israel in Deuteronomy is fundamental for Paul’s own perspective.

Israel’s lack of faith leads Paul to the possibility that Israel has been rejected completely by God: “Therefore I say, has God rejected his people? That may not be. For I am also an Israelite, from the seed of Abraham, of the tribe of Benjamin. God did not reject his people, which he once chose.”<sup>56</sup> (Rom 11:1–2). God’s answer to Elijah’s complaint that the people killed God’s prophets (1 Kings 19) is quoted as evidence that God chooses a remnant of people who did not commit idolatry. Paul reads the protection from idolatry as sign of God’s grace (Rom 11:3–6). “What now? What Israel sought this it did not obtain, but the elect have obtained, the others have been hardened.”<sup>57</sup> (Rom 11:7). Paul does not say explicitly that *Israel* was hardened, he just refers to “Israel’s” failed desires, the success of the elect and mentions the hardening of the non-elected Israelites obliquely as that of “the others.” In Rom 11:8–19 Paul quotes Deut 29:3–4, which emphasises that God does not let his people see or hear or understand his actions and Isa 29:10 concerning the “spirit of deep sleep” which God gives and which closes the peoples’ eyes. This he combines with Ps 68:23, which does not refer to God’s people but to the enemies of the psalmist and which prays for their eyes to be darkened. By implication Paul presents Israel’s obstinacy as caused by God. In the same way Paul does not explicitly refer to the stumbling of Israel in Rom 11:11, he merely asks using the third person singular pronoun: “Did they stumble so that they should fall? By no means” (μη̄ ἔταισαν ἵνα πέσωσιν; μη̄ γένοιτο). The purpose of

<sup>55</sup> Cf. C. M. Pate, “The Reverse of the Curse: Justification According to the DSS and Paul” in *Communities of the Last Days: The Dead Sea Scrolls, the New Testament & the Story of Israel* (ed. C. M. Pate; Leicester: InterVarsity Press, 2000), 155–178, esp. 170–173.

<sup>56</sup> λέγω οὖν, μη̄ ἀπόσατο ὁ θεὸς τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ; μη̄ γένοιτο· καὶ γὰρ ἐγὼ Ἰσραηλίτης εἰμί, ἐκ σπέρματος Ἀβραάμ, φυλῆς Βενιαμίν. οὐκ ἀπόσατο ὁ θεὸς τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ ὃν προέγνω.

<sup>57</sup> τί οὖν; ὃ ἐπιζητεῖ Ἰσραὴλ, τοῦτο οὐκ ἐπέτυχεν, ἢ δὲ ἐκλογὴ ἐπέτυχεν· οἱ δὲ λοιποὶ ἐπωρώθησαν.

their stumbling is to open a way to salvation for the gentiles, and Israel's stumbling is not permanent (Rom 11:11–16). The olive tree metaphor also serves to emphasise that the gentiles *participate* in Israel's salvation, they do *not* replace them (Rom 11:17–24). The salvation of the gentiles is not the ultimate goal, the real goal is the “vision of reconciliation of the world.”<sup>58</sup> In spite of the difference in concept it is noteworthy that Paul, like CD, uses a growth metaphor to describe the relationship between Israel and the elect.

Paul then emphatically introduces his final paragraph on the eschatological salvation with the confidence that Israel will not remain in disbelief: “For I do not want you to be ignorant, brothers, of this mystery, so that you may not think yourselves understanding: for hardening has happened to a part of Israel until the fullness of the gentiles has come in, and thus all Israel will be saved . . .”<sup>59</sup> (Rom 11:25–26), and he quotes Is 59:20–21 and 27:9 concerning the redeemer from Zion who will take away the godlessness from Jacob (Rom 11:26–27). This time Paul himself does not identify with the remnant but with the Israel which has been turned into an enemy of the faithful, and which will ultimately receive God's mercy (Rom 11:28–32).

Paul introduces the expectation of Israel's salvation as “mystery.” In Jewish apocalyptic wisdom speculation the term ἔνigma or μυστήριον refers to aspects of the plan of God, which at present are inscrutable (e.g. the existence and success of evil), but which are expected to be explained and remedied in the eschatological future.<sup>60</sup> Although οὕτως can have a temporal meaning (“and then”) and has been read in this way by many church fathers the modal reading is to be preferred: “and thus,”<sup>61</sup> as Paul has previously argued that the nations' faith will incite Israel's jealousy, thereby becoming the mode of Israel's salvation. The pilgrimage of the nations is not only the precursor,<sup>62</sup> it is the means of Israel's restoration. All

<sup>58</sup> A. L. A. Hogeterp, “The Mystery of Israel's Salvation: A Re-Reading of Romans 11:25 in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *Flores Florentino: Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish Studies in Honour of Florentino García Martínez* (ed. A. Hilhorst, É. Puech and E. Tigheelaar; JSJSup 122; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 654–66, esp. 661–66.

<sup>59</sup> οὐ γὰρ θέλω ὑμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν, ἀδελφοί, τὸ μυστήριον τοῦτο, ἵνα μὴ ᾗτε [παρ'] ἑαυτοῖς φρόνιμοι, ὅτι πῶρως ἀπὸ μέρους τῷ Ἰσραὴλ γέγονεν ἄχρι οὗ τὸ πλήρωμα τῶν ἐθνῶν εἰσέλθῃ καὶ οὕτως πᾶς Ἰσραὴλ σωθήσεται . . .

<sup>60</sup> Cf. Scott, “All Israel,” 489–527, esp. 489; Hogeterp, “Mystery,” 653–66.

<sup>61</sup> Pace Scott, “All Israel,” 490–6, referring to *Ant.* 4.287; 5.209; 6.83; 7.366 etc.; for evidence for a temporal reading, see P. W. van der Horst, “Only Then Israel Will Be Saved: A Short Note on the meaning of καὶ οὕτως in Romans 11.26,” *JBL* 119 (2000): 521–39.

<sup>62</sup> Thus Scott, “All Israel,” 492–4.

this is based on God's being faithful to the covenant with Israel's fathers (cf. CD A I 4–5; 4Q185 1–2 II 14–15; Rom 11:29).<sup>63</sup> J. M. Scott describes the use of “all Israel” (as opposed to just Israel) in the Old Testament for the 12 tribes of Israel (Exod 18:5; Deut 27:8), for Israel and Judah united under the monarchy (2 Sam 8:1; 1 Kgs 4:1), for those who remained in the land during the exile (1 Chr 9:1; 2 Chr 20:1–9; Dan 9:11), for representatives of the 12 tribes of Israel, to the divided kingdom (e.g. 2 Kgs 3:6; 18:16), for the people in exile (Dan 9:7) or Judah (Ezr 2:70; 8:35), emphasising the tribal structure of Israel. The term “all Israel” in Second Temple literature is rarer than in the bible; it is mainly a “collective” term, referring to a “corporate identity.”<sup>64</sup> For Rom 11:25–26 it is certainly possible that “all Israel will be saved” refers to “Israel” as a corporate concept and not to every individual. Yet Paul argues that God is at the root of Israel's hardening, and thus every Jew who does not come to believe in Christ must be a thorn in Paul's flesh, proof that God can indeed discard Israel, which “may not be!”

### C. ISRAEL IN PAUL AND QUMRAN

Thus Paul and Qumran use the concept of Israel in a very similar way. Formally both use Israel in combination with a high density of Scriptural quotations, which frequently refer to similar topics, even similar biblical books or chapters, but rarely the same verses.

The content of the definition of Israel is identical in both. Even its function is the same: both struggle with the contrast between the ideal of Israel and the people's actual behaviour, the continuity between the people of God and their own “new” group. Both use the same means to solve this tension: the remnant idea. Both times the new group's specific interpretation of scripture serves to define the new identity. Both times the entry into this community is described as “repentance,” “turning away” from a previous life, a conversion. Both times, however, this conversion is not a turning to something new, it is an expression of the old covenant between God and his people. This is the expression of the conviction that God is faithful and does not renege on his promises. Thus Paul knows that as an Israelite who believes in Christ he represents the remnant of Israel which confirms the validity and permanence of God's promise.

<sup>63</sup> Hogeterp, “Mystery,” 663.

<sup>64</sup> Cf. Scott, “All Israel,” 518.

The fundamental difference between Paul and Qumran, is the fate of those who do not convert. The answer in Qumran is: "Let them rot!" The war metaphors even envisage a certain active contribution of the community in the destruction of the obstinate Israelites. The obstinate Israelites belong to the nations and therefore deserve to perish along with them. It is precisely at this point that Paul differs from this approach. For Paul the nations' fate is not to be annihilated. His scriptural reading of Deut 32 leads him to all those prophecies of salvation for the gentiles: For Paul salvation comes through faith in Christ—there cannot be any doubt about that; yet if the non-believing Jews must be counted among the gentiles and the gentiles are saved, then the non-believing Jews must also be saved at the end of days.

The question remains: if the idea of Israel's sin and obstinacy could be used by certain Jews to exclude other Jews from those who are finally saved, why did not Paul do the same? It would have saved him a lot of trouble if he could just have ended his argument after Rom 9 with a statement that the hardening is part of God's plan and that they deserved it. But Paul does not end here. For the difference between Paul and Qumran lies in the concept of *God's* hardening of Israel, and in His doing so *for the sake of the gentiles*.<sup>65</sup> It is not Israel's fault that they refuse to believe, neither is any evil spiritual influence involved; it is God himself who hardens his people for a specific purpose. By contrast, in Qumran all non-members of the sect are under the influence of Belial. In Qumran and Paul, Israel's stubborn reaction is influenced by an external power, but while Qumran's explanation allows them to discard those who are "lost" as unimportant, Paul's does not.

Ultimately it is Israel's purpose which marks the fundamental difference between Qumran and Paul. For Qumran Israel's purpose is to save Israel, for Paul it is to save the world. Paul's universalism and Qumran's particularism, both equally radical,<sup>66</sup> stem from the same root and the same reasoning, it is Paul's fundamental conviction of the salvation of the gentiles which lies at the root of his ultimate turn in the opposite direction by means of the radical idea of Israel's being hardened by God himself. For Paul, the arrival of Christ turns the fundamental rites of Judaism,

---

<sup>65</sup> The contrast in their attitude towards the Jewish rites exists, but it is merely the result of their contrasting views on the function of Israel's failure to see God's will, *pace* Räisänen, "Paul's and Qumran's Judaism," 199.

<sup>66</sup> Paul's universalism and Qumran's particularism have been contrasted by Räisänen, "Paul's and Qumran's Judaism," 173.

esp. circumcision, into metaphors, symbols of the true faith in Christ. This faith opens Israel's specific relationship with God to the gentiles.<sup>67</sup>

Finally it is instructive to apply these results to the function of Israel for the two communities. According to M. L. Grossman, "sectarian identity formation" occurs in a juxtaposition of "separatist ideology" as a "distinctive marker of sectarian movements," versus "intensified versions of a shared mainstream culture."<sup>68</sup> For Second Temple Judaism it is pointed out that the "insider status-construction" frequently occurs by means of "textual interpretation and scriptural language."<sup>69</sup> With this perspective the function of Israel in Paul and Qumran is to serve as a cipher summarising those scriptural texts which provide the background of the "shared mainstream culture" against which the sectarian identity is developed. Israel is not just an "ideological" term, it is a quotation itself, summarising what is important in the "mainstream" written tradition.

---

<sup>67</sup> Cf. Räisänen, "Paul's and Qumran's Judaism," 199.

<sup>68</sup> M. I. Grossman, "Cultivating Identity: Textual Virtuosity and 'Insider' Status," in *Defining Identities: We, You, and the Other in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the Fifth Meeting of IOQS in Groningen* (ed. F. García Martínez and M. Popović; STDJ 70; Leiden: Brill, 2008), 1–11, esp. 1–2.

<sup>69</sup> *Ibid.*, 4.

## ENDS MEET: QUMRAN AND PAUL ON CIRCUMCISION

Daniel R. Schwartz

*The Hebrew University of Jerusalem*

Discussions of ancient Judaism usually take circumcision for granted, both as a rite practiced by Jews and as a necessary part of the process of conversion. As Matthew Thiessen recently noted, even hefty volumes on ancient Jewish practice give it very little attention, the brevity bespeaking the belief that “circumcision was universally important in early Judaism.”<sup>1</sup> As Thiessen argues, however, there is room to challenge that assumption.

Of course, everyone knows that there is evidence for Jews who did not practice circumcision, or who tried to eradicate it, most notably in the days of Antiochus Epiphanes in the second century BCE and in the days of Hadrian in the second century CE.<sup>2</sup> Philo even argued, in an oft-cited passage (*Migr.* 89–93), with some Jewish allegorists who apparently thought that, just as concerning other Jewish rites, so too concerning circumcision one need only retain the symbolic meaning of the rite, but not actually practice it. However, texts such as these are usually taken as referring only to people who did so due to fear of anti-Jewish persecution or as an aspect of willful apostasy, so their behavior was understood by themselves, and by others, as violating the rules of Judaism. So too concerning the point that interests us more particularly here, namely, the relationship of circumcision to conversion: while one can point to such texts as Acts 15 and Josephus’ Adiabene story in *Antiquities* 20, in which some Jews demanded that Gentiles who wish to worship the true God be

---

<sup>1</sup> M. Thiessen, *Contesting Conversion: Genealogy, Circumcision, and Identity in Ancient Judaism and Christianity* (Oxford: Oxford University, 2011), 5, referring to E. P. Sanders, *Judaism: Practice and Belief, 63 BCE – 66 CE* (London: SCM, 1992), 213–14.

<sup>2</sup> For the former, see esp. 1 Macc 1:15; 2:46; for the latter, *t. Shab.* 15:9 (ed. Lieberman, 71, with parallels in *b. Yeb.* 72a and elsewhere), along with P. Schäfer, “The Bar Kokhba Revolt and Circumcision: Historical Evidence and Modern Apologetics,” *Jüdische Geschichte in hellenistisch-römischer Zeit. Wege der Forschung: Vom alten zum neuen Schürer* (Schriften des Historischen Kollegs: Kolloquien, 44; ed. A. Oppenheimer; München: Oldenbourg, 1999), 119–32.



circumcised and some did not (see esp. *Ant.* 20.41), one cannot, it seems, point to any direct evidence for the view that a male Gentile can become a Jew without circumcision. Rather, both Acts and the Adiabene story testify to the view that a Gentile need not be circumcised in order to worship God. But Gentiles who worship God are not Jews.<sup>3</sup>

Perhaps many might think that the issue was put to rest thirty years ago, with John Nolland's response to Neil J. McEleney's suggestion that some ancient Jews held that a male Gentile could convert to Judaism without circumcision. Nolland refuted that suggestion by reviewing each of the putative proof texts in detail, and he seems clearly to have had the last word.<sup>4</sup>

However, the conclusion that no Jews thought a male Gentile can become a Jew without circumcision does not at all mean that all Jews thought a non-Jewish Gentile can become a Jew via circumcision. Indeed, all the recent attention to "Who is a Jew?" issues in antiquity, which features a good bit of focus on the ethnic as opposed to the religious element of being a Jew, has come along with the realization that Jewish birth might in fact have been, at least for some Jews, a *sine qua non*.<sup>5</sup> In the eyes of those who adhered to such a view it would simply have been impossible for non-Jews to become Jews, no matter what commitments they undertook and no matter what rites they performed, even circumcision.

Such a position should have been quite at home in the Second Temple period. For that was a period of Jewish history defined by the central role played by the Temple of Jerusalem; both by default, given the absence of monarchy, and positively, the Temple was the central institution of the Jewish world. Accordingly, the fact that the Temple was administered by priests, who were defined solely and irrevocably by their descent from Aaron, will have implied that descent is definitive. Acceptance of the notion that descent is the exclusive criterion for deciding which members

---

<sup>3</sup> See my "God, Gentiles, and Jewish Law: On Acts 15 and Josephus' Adiabene Narrative," in: *Geschichte - Tradition - Reflexion: Festschrift für Martin Hengel zum 70. Geburtstag*, I (ed. P. Schäfer; Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1996), 263–82. One should be cautious about using the term "sympathizers" for such people, as if they were coming near to Judaism although not yet becoming Jews. Rather, the clear point of Acts 15, and the position bespoken by one voice in the Adiabene story as well, is that the route to worshipping God need not go via the Jews or Judaism.

<sup>4</sup> See N. J. McEleney, "Conversion, Circumcision and the Law," *NTS* 20 (1974): 328–33, and J. Nolland, "Uncircumcised Proselytes?" *JSJ* 12 (1981): 173–94.

<sup>5</sup> This is the point of Thiessen's *Contesting Conversion*, which builds upon the work of various predecessors, esp. S. J. D. Cohen, *The Beginnings of Jewishness: Boundaries, Varieties, Uncertainties* (Hellenistic Culture and Society 31; Berkeley: Univ. of California, 1999).

of the community will be the most sacred and have the most access to the sacred will have implied that, more generally as well, birth defined a person with finality, insofar as religion and access to sanctity were concerned. If there was nothing a non-priest could do to gain the right to enter the Temple's inner precincts or participate in the priestly offices, why should there have been anything a non-Jew could do to gain access to whatever privileges, in this world or the next, being Jewish entailed? Or, to put that as a matter of human inclinations: If my descent defines me as a priest and that gives me prestige and access to the sacred, I will probably tend to reject the notion that Gentiles by birth could become Jews, because if they could the implication would be that birth matters little and where would that leave me?

Thus, for a central example, we should not be surprised to see that the same book, Ezra, that reports in ch. 2, on the one hand, that would-be Jews and priests were excluded from the rolls because they could not document their descent (Ezra 2:59–62), and introduces Ezra in ch. 7, on the other hand, as the sixteenth-generation descendant of Aaron the priest, thereby justifying his status and authority, goes on, in ch. 9, to condemn intermarriage of Jewish men and non-Jewish women. The reason for that, according to Ezra 9:2, was the insistence that such intermarriages constitute defilement of the “sacred seed.” If “seed” is the criterion, there is no room for conversion, for whatever commitments people might undertake, they cannot change their descent.

Apart from consideration of the status of priests in the Second Temple period, another route as well seems to lead to the conclusion, or rather to bespeak the premise, that non-Jews cannot become Jews. That is the fact that there is nothing in the ancient sources about how a non-Jewish woman can become a Jew.<sup>6</sup> We do read, of course, about intermarriage of Jewish men and non-Jewish women, something which some approved and practiced while others such as Ezra and Nehemia disapproved, and we also hear of non-Jewish women who adopt Jewish beliefs and practices. But various modern paraphrases notwithstanding, we never hear, in pre-rabbinic sources, in so many words, of a non-Jewish woman becoming a Jew, much less of any rite to allow that to happen.<sup>7</sup> While various explana-

---

<sup>6</sup> For this argument, see already E. J. Christiansen, *Covenant in Judaism and Paul* (AGAJU 27; Leiden: Brill, 1995), 100–101.

<sup>7</sup> See my “Doing like Jews or Becoming a Jew? Josephus on Women Converts to Judaism”, *Jewish Identity in the Greco-Roman World: Jüdische Identität in der griechisch-römischen Welt* (ed. J. Frey, S. Grippentrog, and D. R. Schwartz; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 93–109.

tions for that are possible, one obvious one is that it was not thought to be possible, no more than a priest could become a non-priest, or a non-priest a priest, or, for that matter, a woman a man or a dog a cat. But if non-Jewish women could not become Jews, why should it be possible for non-Jewish men? Or, put the other way around: If circumcision made Gentile men into Jews, shouldn't there have been something similar available to Gentile women? The fact that there was not will have implied, concerning circumcision, that it is something that Jewish law required of Jewish males, but not something that could make non-Jewish men into Jews.

Thus, Thiessen's new volume, with the somewhat polemic title *Contesting Conversion*, is a welcome addition to scholarly literature. It argues, on the basis of a variety of sources, that such a strict genealogical view of being Jewish was alive and well throughout the Second Temple period and went hand in hand with the priestly view that circumcision was a rite practiced by Jews but not one that could make non-Jews into Jews.

Such a point of view, that posits a group with impermeable borders, is normally taken to be quite particularistic. What I just characterized blandly as a "strict genealogical view" seems, in fact, to correspond to what we usually consider racist. Whether or not we condemn it, it is assumed to be the opposite of universalistic points of view that hold with Genesis or Jefferson that all men are created equal, or with Paul that "there is no difference [in Christ] between Jew and Greek" (Rom 10:12; so too Gal 3:28, echoed in Col 3:11). What I suggest in the present paper is that, in this instance as in others, it can happen that the extremes meet and, each by its own route, come to the same conclusion—in this case, a very universalistic one. Specifically, my point is that whether one claims, as in priestly Judaism, that circumcision *cannot* turn a Gentile into a Jew, or, rather, as for Paul, that circumcision could do that but there is no reason to do it because becoming a Jew is irrelevant to one's salvation, the result will be the same. I will not claim that Paul came to his conclusions because Qumran came to it. Rather, it seems that similar circumstances and the need to deal with a similar textual heritage can beget similar conclusions.

Four Qumran texts, and one loud bit of Qumran silence, point to the conclusion that Gentiles cannot become Jews:<sup>8</sup>

According to *4QFlorilegium* (4Q174), the future Temple will remain pure, for it will not be entered by *gerim* and *b'nei nekhar*. Alongside *b'nei*

---

<sup>8</sup> The following brief discussion of this point may be supplemented by that in my "Yannai and Pella, Josephus and Circumcision," *DSD* 18 (2011): 352–56.

*nekhar*, which means “foreigners” plain and simple, *gerim* denotes foreigners who have become more like, or closer to, Israelites: sojourners in our midst or perhaps even “proselytes,” those who have come to join us. Whatever nuance we moderns prefer, the fact that the ancient text makes no distinctions suggests that it assumed that foreigners remain foreigners, even if they come to join us. A *ger* is not a Jew.

According to *Damascus Document* XIV 3–6, members of the sect are to be registered, to be seated at assemblies, and to speak, according to a fixed order reflecting their respective castes—of which the first three are clearly defined by their descent (they are priests, Levites, and Israelites) and the fourth is “the *ger*.” *Gerim* are there in the assembly, they are there in the sect, but their differential descent means they are not Israelites.

The *Temple Scroll*, in columns 39–40, distinguishes clearly between Israelites and *gerim* with regard to entering the Temple.<sup>9</sup>

Turning now to a text which was very popular at Qumran, the Book of Jubilees,<sup>10</sup> I would note two passages that relate to our issue. On the one hand, Jub 15:26, following but intensifying Gen 17, insists that Jews must be circumcised but at the same time excludes the possibility that any Gentile circumcised later than the eighth day could become a Jew: “Anyone who is born, the flesh of whose private parts has not been circumcised by the eighth day, does not belong to the people of the pact which the Lord made with Abraham but to the people (meant for) destruction.”<sup>11</sup> On the other hand, when Jub 30 retells the story of Gen 34, namely, the rape of Jacob’s daughter, Dinah, and the way her brothers punished the Shechemites, it omits a very central element of the biblical story. According to Gen 34:13–17 Jacob’s sons promised the Shechemites that if they promised to be circumcised “and become like us” (Gen 34:15) there would be peace and intermarriage between them; the Shechemites agreed and underwent the operation; but then Jacob’s sons massacred them while they were still debilitated by the operation. Although that element of the story figures very prominently in Gen 34, and although the story of Gen 34 is reproduced at length in Jub 30, nothing about circumcision appears in Jubilees’ version of the story. This is not to be explained by any

<sup>9</sup> Although it apparently limits the foreign status of the *ger* to the first three generations. See J. M. Baumgarten, “Exclusions from the Temple: Proselytes and Agrippa I,” *JJS* 33 (1982): 215–25.

<sup>10</sup> See J.-D. Hopkins, “The Authoritative Status of Jubilees at Qumran,” *Hen* 31 (2009): 97–104.

<sup>11</sup> For the full passage from which this is cited see Thiessen, *Contesting Conversion*, 73, along with the discussion *ibid.*, 72–78.

apologetic orientation of the author, as if he were embarrassed by Jewish perfidy. The author of Jubilees does not seem to be bothered by such issues. Writing in Hebrew, he probably did not consider what Gentiles would think of the story, and he is so antagonistic to Gentiles in general<sup>12</sup> that he probably would not have minded if the story offended them if they knew of it. Rather, the obvious explanation for Jubilees' failure to mention circumcision in its version of this story is that the author wanted to avoid giving the impression that circumcision could have allowed the Shechemites to become Jews.<sup>13</sup>

Moreover, given the assumption that most readers of Jubilees will have been at least as familiar with Genesis as we are, it seems to me that the author of Jubilees was making quite a polemic statement about circumcision—perhaps responding to others—by omitting that salient element of the story. Here, that is, I would note, with an eye to methodology, that discussions of rewritten Bible might profitably devote more effort to determining whether readers of rewritten Bible narratives should be supposed to be familiar with the biblical version and so part of the point of the rewritten version is implicit in the way it deviates from that other text. In the present case, I assume that since the circumcision of the Shechemites is such a prominent and racy element in the biblical story, its absence from the Jubilees version, and the point made by that absence, will have been noticed by readers.

Alongside these four texts, which indicate a Qumran belief that birth defines a person immutably so Gentiles will forever remain Gentiles no matter what they do or undertake to do, I would point to a major silence of Qumran texts. In all the hundreds of manuscripts that have been found and published, there is virtually no allusion to circumcision of the flesh. Apart from several metaphorical references to the “circumcision”

---

<sup>12</sup> See esp. I. Shatzman, “Jews and Gentiles from Judas Maccabaeus to John Hyrcanus according to Contemporary Jewish Sources,” *Studies in Josephus and the Varieties of Ancient Judaism: Louis H. Feldman Jubilee Volume* (ed. S. J. D. Cohen and J. J. Schwartz; Leiden 2007), 258–65.

<sup>13</sup> So too Christiansen, *Covenant in Judaism and Paul*, 100: “. . . circumcision is not a rite of entry, but of affirmation. I propose therefore that the reason why Jubilees did not mention that the Shechemites underwent circumcision in Jub 30, is that the author does not recognize circumcision as valid when practised outside Israel.”

of one's evil urges (1QS V 5) or heart (1QS V 26; 1QpHab XI 13; 4Q434 1 1 4; 4Q504 4 11),<sup>14</sup> there is next to nothing to mention.<sup>15</sup>

The closest one comes to anything that sounds like it might require circumcision of the flesh is the admonition in the *Damascus Document* (XII 11) that one may not sell one's slave or maidservant to Gentiles אשר באו עמו בברית אברהם—“because they have entered into the covenant of Abraham with him.” This text is usually taken as if it refers to circumcision, as if it insists that one may not sell a slave because, via circumcision, he has become a member of the community. As such, this text clearly takes its place alongside other ancient Jewish texts that preach that one should not sell Jewish slaves to Gentiles. Thus, for example, at *Antiquities* 16.1–5 Josephus reports that Jews were enraged at Herod's decision to sell abroad, as slaves, Jews convicted of theft.

However, although it is the case that ancient Jewish law, beginning with Gen 17:13, 23, insists that household slaves be circumcised, for two reasons I am not sure that we may assume that law for Qumran. First, from the point of view of the textual context of *Damascus Document* XII 11, the fact that it refers not only to males but also females as having entered the Abrahamic covenant places quite a serious question mark alongside the assumption that it refers to circumcision. Perhaps, that is, the author assumes one can join the Abrahamic covenant without circumcision. After all, already Gen 12:5 refers to Abraham as “making souls,” which is taken by ancient Jewish tradition as a reference to proselytizing,<sup>16</sup> long before the introduction of circumcision in Gen 17.

Moreover, note in this connection that, apart from this text, the use of “covenant of Abraham” as specifically denoting circumcision is first found in the Mishnah (m. *Avot* 3:11)—a much later text. Indeed, Solomon Zeitlin, as part of his general resistance to the antiquity of the scrolls in the decades after they were discovered, pounced upon the use of the phrase in the *Damascus Document* as evidence that the latter composi-

<sup>14</sup> See D. R. Seely, “The ‘Circumcised Heart’ in 4Q434 *Barkhi Nafshi*,” *RevQ* 17 (1996): 527–35, and G. J. Brooke, “Body Parts in *Barkhi Nafshi* and the Qualifications for Membership of the Worshipping Community,” *Sapiential, Liturgical and Poetical Texts from Qumran* (ed. D. K. Falk, F. García Martínez, and E. M. Schuller; STDJ 34; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 82.

<sup>15</sup> For a survey of references to circumcision in Qumran texts, see A. Blaschke, *Beschneidung: Zeugnisse der Bibel und verwandter Texte* (TANZ 28; Tübingen/Basel: Francke, 1998), 150–69. For two texts into which circumcision was introduced by improbable emendation, see my “Yannai and Pella,” 353, nn. 42 and 44.

<sup>16</sup> See M. Goodman, *Mission and Conversion: Proselytizing in the Religious History of the Roman Empire* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1994), 145.

tion should be dated no earlier than the rabbinic period.<sup>17</sup> While we now know we should not go as far as that, concerning the interpretation of this text the point does reinforce the question mark we just now posited due to the reference to women.

Apart from this text there seems to be only one more Qumran text that requires discussion: *Damascus Document* XVI 4–6, which establishes some sort of a parallelism between the way a person who commits himself to follow Mosaic law, and keeps his word, is saved that same day and the way Abraham was circumcised on the day he “had knowledge.” The sense of this text’s argument is not readily evident, and as Blaschke explains there are, apart from emendation, two possible interpretations: either acceptance of Mosaic law, in the post-Moses era, is said to accomplish what circumcision did in the pre-Moses era, or else Abraham’s alacrity and wholeheartedness with regard to circumcision (Gen 17:26!) is cited as an example of the alacrity and wholeheartedness expected of those who undertake to observe Mosaic law.<sup>18</sup> One way or the other, the text clearly distinguishes between Abraham, who was circumcised, on the one hand, and those who accept Mosaic law, on the other. While this should not be pressed to the conclusion that it excludes circumcision in Qumran, just as we should not turn the Qumran preference for the circumcision of the heart into a denial of the need to circumcise the foreskin, such a lack of interest in the latter, in such a large corpus of texts, requires an explanation.

While it might be explained to some degree by the assumption that no babies were born in Qumran, given the references to *gerim* there we must assume either that these texts take the *gerim*’s circumcision for granted or that they assume they are *gerim* without circumcision. Although the former possibility cannot be excluded, the way *Jubilees* rewrites Gen 34 suggests that the latter is in fact more likely. So, moreover, does the fact that Exod 12:48 assumes that one can be a *ger* without circumcision, although such a *ger* cannot participate in the Temple cult. If, that is, for rabbinic Jews *gerim* are people who become Jews and the act of circumcision removes the outward sign that formerly they were not Jews, it makes sense that those who hold that non-Jews cannot become Jews should not expect, or even desire, such non-Jews who join their community to re-

---

<sup>17</sup> S. Zeitlin, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Modern Scholarship* (JQRMS 3; Philadelphia: Dropsie College, 1956), 62.

<sup>18</sup> Blaschke, *Beschneidung*, 161–64.



move such outward signs. It would not accomplish anything, only confuse things.

However, if we conclude that the Qumran sectarians thought Gentiles could not become Jews and therefore saw no reason for those Gentiles who joined their community to be circumcised for anyway it would not turn them into Jews, we must immediately go on and underline our main point: “particularistic” or “racist” do not seem to be appropriate adjectives for the Qumran sectarians. They counted such non-Jewish *gerim* as part of their community, they sat in the same councils and were listed in the same rosters—merely in a separate category, just like priests, Levites, and plain Israelites were listed separately. What this means is that while the fact that Gentiles were unalterably Gentiles was taken to be a fact of nature, it did not entail moral conclusions. Indeed, *precisely because* Gentiles were Gentiles by nature and not by choice it was simple for Jews who held that view to view Gentiles as partners. It would have been much harder to be so open to non-Jewish *gerim* if they had a choice to become Jews and chose to refuse it.

Thus, paradoxically enough—and that paradox is the point of this paper—the point of view that considers the distinction between Gentiles and Jews an unalterable fact of nature can turn out to be one that ascribes little ultimate significance to that distinction. Just as we normally assume, today, that people who are tall or short or blonde or redhead can all be our partners and members of our groups because such factors are irrelevant and anyway not a matter of choice, but we have serious issues about other others who choose to be dishonest or to hold political views of which we do not approve, so too, I suggest, a priestly view of identity could engender, *for priests who did not function in the Temple so there was relatively little to endow their being priests with special importance*, a view that belittles the importance of being Jewish or non-Jewish. Indeed, given the fact that the Qumran sect was a *sect*, a group that had broken off from others who were basically like them, especially genealogically, it stands to reason that it could not ascribe much serious significance to genealogy. If, to borrow the terms of *Pesher Habakkuk*, the Wicked Priest and “the last priests of Jerusalem” were wicked, despite the fact that they were priests by descent just as were the good priests of Qumran, it follows that differential descent, while a fact of life, was not a very significant way to categorize people. Other ways, such as viewing them as good or bad, or as what Qumran called Sons of Light or Sons of Darkness, are more meaningful.



True, we cannot know how many members of the sect drew such conclusions, nor how quickly they did so or how consistently or radically they pressed them. Nevertheless, it stands to reason that the longer the sect existed, which means the longer the sectarian priests had no access to the Temple, access which would have endowed their being priests with real practical significance, the hollower the distinction between priests and non-priests will have been. And that means that the distinction between Jews and *gerim* too will have lost a good bit of its significance. This is the kind of development which, eventually, would result in someone like John the Baptist, who is best understood on the background of Qumran thought, expressing scorn for genealogical distinctions—telling his audiences that it is not justified to depend upon being sons of Abraham, since God can even make stones into sons of Abraham, if He so chooses (Luke 3:8 // Matt 3:9).

Turning now to Paul, we find ourselves on very similar turf, but by a simple and non-convoluted route. Here too we find, first of all, several times (Rom 10:12; Gal 3:28; Col 3:11), the recognition that there are natural differences between people, such as those between Jew and Greek or man and woman, and other differences that are just as unalterable, such as that between free and slave. But those same passages bespeak the insistence that those differences do not matter, for basically all are, or can be, one. And that oneness is expressed as the oneness of the sons of Abraham, who share faith but need not share their national customs. Each nation can remain the way it was precisely because Abraham was meant, as Genesis puts it, to be a father of many peoples—as Paul notes at Rom 4:17 and Gal 3:8. As for circumcision, Paul's attitude seems to be that it is basically irrelevant to what should interest religious people; as he puts it in 1 Cor 7:18, people who are circumcised when they join the Church should remain circumcised, while people who were not circumcised should not be circumcised. The whole issue is, for Paul, irrelevant to the real concerns of religious people, for Abraham is the father of the circumcised and the uncircumcised, if they have faith (Rom 4:9–12), “For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision nor uncircumcision is of any avail, but faith working through love” (Gal 5:6), “For neither circumcision counts for anything, nor uncircumcision, but a new creation” (Gal 6:15).

What I am suggesting, so far, is that the view that the natural differences among peoples are unalterable need not lead to racist abomination of others. Rather, it can lead to the marginalization of those differences precisely because they are not the responsibility of the individuals in

question and, precisely for that reason, do not matter much. If we wonder why this works sometimes one way and sometimes the other, there is, of course, room for different reasons in different cases. I will point to four factors that may well have played a role for Qumran and for Paul.

First of all, I would point to a common Hellenistic attitude that viewed people as having bodies and what we call souls (*nous, pneuma, psychē* or whatever), of which the latter are more important than the former. But to the extent bodies lose their significance, so does the question whether a given male body was or was not circumcised. This certainly played an important role for Paul, who grew up in an important Hellenistic city and spent his career moving around the Hellenistic world. But we may also assume that people at Qumran were affected by such Hellenistic notions, and not only because Hellenism was in the air, in the *Zeitgeist*. Rather, we may also guess that, since they were there by choice, many of the Qumran sectarians, who seem to have been looking for something, may have been elsewhere too before settling in that isolated community.<sup>19</sup>

A second point is that both Paul and the Qumran community were involved in inner-Jewish hostilities: Paul persecuted the early Jewish Christians (Gal 1:13; Acts 9:1–2; 22:3–5; 26:9–11) and later had his troubles with Jews, both in Judea and abroad, and the Qumran community had its troubles with the Wicked Priest, as esp. *Pesher Habakkuk* reports. Given the common descent of people on both sides of these struggles, the implication would have been all too clear: descent does not matter much. Contrast, for example, the case of the First Book of Maccabees, where Jews persecute those of other descent and they persecute Jews; thus, for example, 1 Macc 5:1–3 reports that the peoples (*ta ethnē*) roundabout began to exterminate the *genos* of Jacobs so Judas and his men made war against the sons of Esau. For a book like that, which as a book about a high-priestly dynasty history anyway places a high premium on pedigree, recognition of such differences easily and naturally begets hatred and contempt—and allows for no possibility of conversion. Jews are Jews and

---

<sup>19</sup> Apart from evidence for ancient peripatetic seekers of religious or philosophical truth I would point, especially for Qumran, to the interesting observation by M. Broshi and H. Eshel that the approximately 100,000 words of the Qumran corpus include no Greek or Latin loanwords; see their “A Messiah Before Jesus Christ,” *Tarbiz* 70 (2000/01): 136 (in Hebrew). As they note, this is so different from what is usual in ancient Aramaic and Hebrew that it implies a concerted effort to avoid such borrowing, and that in turn, I would add, implies a high level of familiarity with Greek.

non-Jews are non-Jews, with what Ephesians (2:14) calls a wall of hostility between them.<sup>20</sup>

Yet another factor, different from the preceding one although not unrelated, pulled in the same direction. The Qumran sect was just that: a sect, a group of people who decided to join together and accept a certain doctrine and discipline. They must have taken their membership in this sect very seriously, and they must have been very aware of the fact that it resulted not from their birth, but was rather despite their birth; they had a detailed and intensive process of accepting candidates on the basis of their qualities and commitments. As Morton Smith pointed out long ago, however, that basic orientation was already characteristic of the community depicted in the Book of Nehemiah, where we read of Jews who, although they shared the same descent, considered it more important to bind themselves together by signing a charter, a list of obligations (Neh 10); he who signed was in, he who did not, was not, despite his descent.<sup>21</sup> This is a major move toward a willingness to allow others, who did not share the same descent, to sign in nevertheless.

Moreover, the members of Ezra and Nehemiah's community characterized themselves as "the congregation of the exiles" (Ezra 10:8) or "the returned exiles" (see 4:1; 6:16, 21; 9:4; Neh 1:3; 7:6; etc.); their self-understanding, that is, derived from their common experience in the Diaspora, as opposed to the "peoples of the land." Indeed, the notion that one is a Jew by choice, by decision, is one that is very natural for Jews of the Diaspora: while in Judea one might think a person is Jew (or: Judean) by default, in the Diaspora one is a Jew despite the natural conditions which would make one a Persian in Susa or a Roman in Rome—or a Cilician in Tarsus. By which I mean that Paul too grew up in a context in which being a Jew was not natural but, rather, a matter of choice—just as it was also an environment in which Jews lived alongside Gentiles and may well have noticed that they were not all that different. Such conditions contributed to a universalism that typified the Hellenistic world, just as much as, as we have seen, something similar developed in Qumran as well, despite its originally priestly orientation.<sup>22</sup>

---

<sup>20</sup> On this theme in 1 Maccabees, and its implications for the dating of the work before the Hasmoneans began to convert conquered peoples to Judaism, see S. Schwartz, "Israel and the Nations Roundabout: 1 Maccabees and the Hasmonean Expansion," *JJS* 42 (1991): 16–38.

<sup>21</sup> M. Smith, "The Dead Sea Sect in Relation to Ancient Judaism," *NTS* 7 (1961): 347–60.

<sup>22</sup> For Qumran Judaism as a variety of diaspora Judaism, see N. Hacham, "Exile and Self-Identity in the Qumran Sect and in Hellenistic Judaism," *New Perspectives on Old*

Finally, I would underline the fact that Jews in exile, whether in Qumran or in Tarsus, were removed from the Temple. But it was the Temple, to which entrance was limited to those of Jewish descent, and to which entrance to its internal precinct was limited to those Jews who were of priestly descent, that underwrote the significance of the priesthood; it was the Temple that endowed descent with its importance. Outside the Temple, while priestly descent could retain its negative importance, namely, that one could not have it if not born that way, there was little to endow it with positive importance, to make it much more important than being tall or short or blond.

Whatever the differences between large Hellenistic cities and a small ascetic settlement by the Dead Sea, the types of Judaism characteristic of both were exilic and tended to spiritualize. Therefore, however surprising it is, it is not at all anomalous that a single movement, Christianity, could emerge out of currents that derive from both, personified for us by Paul and John the Baptist; these two poles of the Jewish world had much in common.<sup>23</sup> In this paper I have suggested that, concerning circumcision too, their attitudes tended in the same direction.

---

*Texts: Proceedings of the Tenth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 9–11 January, 2005* (ed. E. G. Chazon, B. Halpern-Amaru, and R. A. Clements; STDJ 88; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 3–21.

<sup>23</sup> See my “On the Jewish Background of Christianity,” *Studies in Rabbinic Judaism and Early Christianity* (ed. D. Jaffé; AJEC 74; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 87–105.



OVERLAPPING AGES AT QUMRAN  
AND “APOCALYPTIC” IN PAULINE THEOLOGY

Loren T. Stuckenbruck

*Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München*

In the following discussion, we focus on a topic whose significance is often taken for granted in Pauline studies: apocalyptic thought and time. After all, scholars have been asking questions about what is “apocalyptic” in Paul’s thought for well over a hundred years. Such questions include the following: How is the “apocalyptic” dimension of Paul’s thought related to Jewish tradition?<sup>1</sup> To what extent can the theological shape of the apostle’s ideas be traced back to or be conceptualized within a Jewish matrix of tradition that developed from the time of Alexander the Great down to the 1<sup>st</sup> century CE? What *is* “apocalyptic” to begin with, and how much can we meaningfully invest in this term? Such matters have played a role not only in broad-based attempts to account for Paul’s theology but also in treatments of several (often overlapping) themes within Paul’s undisputed letters, including the Torah,<sup>2</sup> messianic language and

---

<sup>1</sup> Early on, it was Albert Schweitzer who posited and adopted the category of “apocalyptic” (in the sense of its focus on eschatology and mystical participationism distinguishable from Rabbinic Judaism) as the best way to understand Paul’s thought; cf. idem, *The Mysticism of the Apostle Paul* (trans. W. Montgomery; Baltimore, Md: Johns Hopkins Press, 1998, repr. from 1931). Schweitzer’s influential discussion, however, could not endure since “apocalyptic” for him was a function of a Hellenistic Diaspora Judaism. The view that Jesus’ death could not be “apocalyptic”—a term reserved for the future—resulted in what has been called “consistent eschatology,” i.e. consistent with Jewish apocalyptic eschatology. This view, which emphasized the coming of a future messianic age in line with Jewish expectation, was picked up by Martin Werner in his *The Formation of Christian Dogmas: An Historical Study of Its Problem* (trans. S. G. F. Brandon; London: A. & C. Black, 1957, from German 1941) and has left traces in the thought of J. Christiaan Beker (on whom see below).

<sup>2</sup> S. K. Davis, *The Antithesis of the Ages: Paul’s Reconfiguration of Torah* (CBQMS 33; Washington DC: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 2002).

ideas,<sup>3</sup> eschatology,<sup>4</sup> cosmology,<sup>5</sup> attitudes towards Gentiles,<sup>6</sup> covenant,<sup>7</sup> the interpretation of sacred traditions,<sup>8</sup> and theological anthropology.<sup>9</sup> In examining these areas of Pauline thought, one may ask whether or not the apostle Paul could have known this or that tradition or thematic complex and whether or not he may have drawn directly on, significantly modified, or attempted to counter it altogether. Quite understandably, the crucial differences between Paul and the contemporary Jewish traditions with which his thought is compared are time and again exposed and identified by scholars, especially when a Christological point of departure in Paul's argument is recognized.

The broader question is, of course, the nature of Paul's religion. To put the problem dialectically, was Paul's thought "Christian" in the sense that he, perhaps inspired by the Jesus tradition itself, can be regarded as having placed the theological terrain of the fledgling Jesus movement on a course that essentially broke with its mother religion? Or, for all their particularity, is it possible to locate and interpret Paul's theological ideas within a complex Jewish theological framework, a framework that enabled the apostle to make sense of how the God who called Israel in the wilderness and gave them the Torah could be seen to have so recently acted anew in the death and resurrection of Jesus? In any given comparison between Jewish tradition and Paul's writings, one way of responding to such a question has been to focus on minutiae in which texts of the one are placed alongside texts of the other to ascertain concretely where the

---

<sup>3</sup> See L. J. Kreitzer, *Jesus and God in Paul's Eschatology* (JSNTSS 19; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1987); M. Zetterholm, "Paul and the missing Messiah," in *The Messiah: in Early Judaism and Christianity* (ed. M. Zetterholm; Minneapolis: Fortress press, 2007), 33–55; and see recently M. Novenson, "Christ language in Paul and Messiah language in ancient Judaism" (Ph.D. Diss., Princeton Theological Seminary, 2010) and J. A. Waddell, *The Messiah: A Comparative Study of the Enochic Son of Man and the Pauline Kyrios* (JCCLS 10; London: T. & T. Clark, 2011).

<sup>4</sup> See Kreitzer, *Jesus and God* (n. 3 above).

<sup>5</sup> For a recent work that compares Rom 8:19–22 with motifs associated with creation in Jewish apocalyptic literature, see H. A. Hahne, *The Corruption and Redemption of Creation* (LNTS 336; London: T. & T. Clark, 2006), esp. 210–26.

<sup>6</sup> D. B. Garlington, *Faith, Obedience, and Perseverance: Aspects of Paul's Letter to the Romans* (WUNT II/79; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1994).

<sup>7</sup> See e.g. B. W. Longenecker, *Eschatology and the Covenant: A Comparison of 4 Ezra and Romans 1–11* (JSNTSS, 57; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991); N. T. Wright, *Climax of the Covenant* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1991).

<sup>8</sup> Cf. S. E. Porter and C. D. Stanley, eds., *As It Is Written: Studying Paul's Use of Scripture* (SBLSS 50; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008).

<sup>9</sup> H. Lichtenberger, *Das Ich Adams und das Ich der Menschheit: Studien zum Menschenbild in Römer 7* (WUNT I/164; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004).

similarities and differences lie.<sup>10</sup> Another way, which is more difficult to get at, nevertheless remains vital: to consider the *structures* of Pauline thought, not so much by identifying straightforwardly certain traditions that the apostle may or may not have used as, more profoundly, by discerning whether or not a *framework* in which he articulated his “gospel” marked something essentially new. It is primarily within the latter frame of questioning that discourse about Jewish “apocalyptic” in relation to early Christian notions, including that of Paul, has primarily taken shape.

Here, in considering “apocalyptic” as a feature of Paul’s theology, we are aware of the vast amount of scholarly attention devoted to this topic, especially with regard to the organization and understanding of time. While it is taken as axiomatic that Paul was interested in time and that the organization of time for him was shaped by his conviction that Jesus’ death and resurrection represented a definitive moment (of God’s activity) in history, how clear is it that this amounted to a paradigmatic shift or even departure from Judaism, as many argue or assume? In my opinion, the often uncontested notion that Paul’s understanding of time is a significant modification of Jewish tradition is in need of a corrective, or at least a marked degree of nuancing. In this particular area Pauline scholarship has adopted well-worn paths of ideologized research regarding how Jews from the Second Temple period, especially those associated with an “apocalyptic” perspective, regarded the unfolding of time. On the other hand, some who have engaged in close readings of the sources may find themselves rethinking the issue in another way.

#### A. THE TWO AGES IN PAULINE SCHOLARSHIP

If we ask specialists in Pauline theology from the last fifty years how time is structured, we should not be surprised to encounter more than one answer; nevertheless, there is a remarkable convergence. That convergence, however, has less to do with what is being claimed for Paul himself than for the way Jewish apocalyptic thinking against or upon which Paul’s thought is understood has been portrayed. Drawing on influential studies

---

<sup>10</sup> So e.g. H. Braun, *Qumran und das Neue Testament* (2 vols.; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1966), 1:169–240 and 2:165–180; H.-W. Kuhn, “The Impact of Selected Qumran Texts on the Understanding of Pauline Theology,” in *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls. The Second Princeton Symposium on Judaism and Christian Origins. Volume 3: The Scrolls and Christian Origins* (ed. J. H. Charlesworth; Waco, Texas: Baylor University Press, 2006), 153–85.



of ancient Jewish “apocalyptic” literature,<sup>11</sup> Pauline scholars have regarded a “doctrine of the two ages,” in which one age *follows* or *succeeds* upon the other, as the essential Jewish framework with which Paul’s gospel was involved.<sup>12</sup> The two ages Paul is thought to have modified consist, respectively, of the present and the future, the eschatological age to come. The former is marked by evil manifested through suffering and wrongdoing within the created order; the latter will see the establishment of divine rule when evil is obliterated and all wrongs and injustices are put to right, in line with God’s purposes for the created order. Of course, it has been recognised that construals of time in Second Temple Jewish literature cannot be simplified into such a scheme.<sup>13</sup> It has been noted, for example, that the age to come could be understood in some sense as a return to primordial time and would thus not merely be an unprecedented future age.<sup>14</sup> Moreover, Pauline scholars could observe that some texts depict the

---

<sup>11</sup> See, for example, R. H. Charles, *Eschatology. The Doctrine of a Future Life in Israel, Judaism, and Christianity: A Critical History* (New York: Schocken Books, 1963 repr.); H. H. Rowley, *The Relevance of Apocalyptic: A Study of Jewish and Christian Apocalypses from Daniel to Revelation* (New York/London: Lutterworth, 1963); P. Vielhauer, “‘Apocalyptic’ and ‘Apocalyptic in Early Christianity,’” in *New Testament Apocrypha* (ed. E. Hennecke and W. Schneemelcher; rev. by G. Strecker; 2 vols.; Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1990–1992), 2:581–600 and 2:608–42 respectively (originally published in 1964); D. S. Russell, *The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic* (London/Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1964); P. Hanson, *The Dawn of Apocalyptic: The Historical and Sociological Roots of Jewish Apocalyptic Eschatology* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979, rev’d ed.). In his important history of scholarship on apocalyptic thought, J. M. Schmidt, “apokalyptische Äonenlehre” recurs as a feature that characterizes much of research of apocalyptic between 1870 and 1947; idem, *Die jüdische Apokalypitik: Die Geschichte ihrer Erforschung von den Anfängen bis zu den Textfunden von Qumran* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1969), 157–317.

<sup>12</sup> In addition to the works discussed below, see E. M. Caudill, “The Two-Age Doctrine in Paul: A Study of Pauline Apocalyptic” (Ph.D. Diss., Vanderbilt University, 1972); Kreitzer, *Jesus and God in Paul’s Eschatology*; B. R. Matlock, *Unveiling the Apocalyptic Paul: Paul’s Interpreters and the Rhetoric of Criticism* (JSNT Supplements 127; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996); S. M. Lewis, *What Are They Saying about New Testament Apocalyptic?* (New York: Paulist Press, 2004), 38–52 (chapter on “Paul’s Apocalyptic Gospel”).

<sup>13</sup> See J. J. Collins, “Apocalyptic Eschatology as the Transcendence of Death,” *CBQ* 36 (1974): 21–43, who questioned the casually used formulations of “a definitive end” and “the distinction of two periods” as central features of apocalyptic eschatology. Aside from a further possibility to be discussed below, we can note periodization of history (including the periodization of the eschaton) and the progression of time through cycles. Though none of the alternatives do away with a notion of the present world versus a future world, they suggest that the movement from one to another could be conceived in complex ways.

<sup>14</sup> See G. W. E. Nickelsburg, “Eschatology, Early Jewish,” *Anchor Bible Dictionary* (ed. D. N. Freedman; 6 vols.; Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1992), 2:579–594.

future *within the present world order* as the unfolding of a series of events usually catastrophic and sometimes with the advent of a messianic figure which will herald the conclusion of this age in anticipation of the divine act that will inaugurate the eschaton.<sup>15</sup>

Certainly there is no need to question the existence of the notion of a distinction in Jewish apocalyptic and related literature between a present age and a future world order ordained by God. There is also no need to question whether this understanding of time can be nuanced in the ways just mentioned. However, it is helpful to discuss two points: (i) what it means to talk about the way Paul has appropriated such an outlook and, in view of this, (ii) whether, in fact, more can be said about how some Jewish writers—here, we note the Enochic tradition and its re-use in related literature extant in the Dead Sea materials—could think about time.

First, we shall look at what the positing of two aeons as the major way of understanding Jewish apocalyptic thought has meant for four influential Pauline interpreters: (A) Ernst Käsemann,<sup>16</sup> (B) J. Christiaan Beker,<sup>17</sup> (C) J. Louis Martyn,<sup>18</sup> and (D) James D. G. Dunn.<sup>19</sup> Acknowledging the risk of oversimplifying the differences between these scholars and the nuanced arguments each has brought to his readings of Paul,<sup>20</sup> I think it

<sup>15</sup> See W. D. Davies, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980, 4<sup>th</sup> ed.), esp. 285–320. This, of course, is consistent with the influential “Systematic Presentation of Messianism” found in E. Schürer, *The history of the Jewish people in the age of Jesus Christ* (rev’d and ed. by G. Vermes, F. Millar and M. Black; 3 vols.; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1979), 2:514–47 (in organization of content, essentially unchanged from Schürer’s two-volume work originally published in 1890–1896).

<sup>16</sup> See e.g. E. Käsemann, “The Beginnings of Christian Theology,” in idem, *New Testament Questions of Today* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1969, repr. from 1960), 82–107. This essay is foundational for the perspective Käsemann worked out in his *Commentary on Romans* (trans. G. W. Bromiley; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980, 4<sup>th</sup> ed.).

<sup>17</sup> J. C. Beker, *Paul the Apostle: The Triumph of God in Life and Thought* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984) and idem, *The Triumph of God: The Essence of Paul’s Thought* (trans. L. Stuckenbruck; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990).

<sup>18</sup> Cf. J. L. Martyn, “Epistemology at the Turn of the Ages: 2 Corinthians 5.16,” in *Christian History and Interpretation: Studies Presented to John Knox* (ed. W. R. Farmer, C. F. D. Moule, and R. R. Niebuhr; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967), 269–87, repr. in idem, *Theological Issues in the Letters of Paul* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1997), 87–110. These studies shaped the framework adopted by Martyn in *Galatians: A New Translation and Commentary* (AB 33A; New Haven: Yale University Press, 2010, repr. from 1997).

<sup>19</sup> See e.g. in J. D. G. Dunn, *The Theology of Paul the Apostle* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998).

<sup>20</sup> See Matlock, *Unveiling the Apocalyptic Paul*, for a fuller engagement with these (especially Käsemann) and others’ ways of placing “apocalyptic” in service of constructing Pauline theology, though the critical approach taken here shall move in a different direction.

is possible to identify a common thread in relation to the apocalyptic undercurrent which shaped their work. Having sketched this, I shall be less concerned with what Jewish traditions influenced these New Testament scholars than with the assumptions they have made regarding what these traditions *could not* have included.

### 1. *Ernst Käsemann*

Ernst Käsemann's views on "the righteousness of God" in Paul as the invading power of God<sup>21</sup> and his claim that "Apocalyptic was the mother of all Christian theology" are well known. Serving as background to these claims is "the apocalyptic ideal of the two aeons," which Paul presupposed.<sup>22</sup> Exegetically, Paul's adaptation of this scheme is vividly illustrated in Rom 5:12–21, in which Adam and Christ are antithetically juxtaposed. Whereas the Jewish apocalyptic scheme known to Paul consigned "salvation" to the future, the advent of Christ and, in particular, Christ's death makes it possible for this to be realized through the present "obedience of those who are waiting for this moment, who hear and accept the prophetic proclamation of the standards of the Last Judgment and pass it on to the whole world."<sup>23</sup> What in Jewish apocalyptic is kept remote, has in the Christ event already begun. Paul's reception of the two aeons schema involved a serious modification of "the dominant Jewish view," resulting in a new form of apocalyptic, in which we have a distinctive worldview capable of speaking about "eschatological salvation" and "life" in the present.<sup>24</sup> Instead of a Jewish scheme, which contrasted between primordial time (Adam and the sin and death that passed through him to all humans in the present) and the end-time (the final judgment), the present age of death is in Paul's view confronted by Christ, who is "the author and representative of the new aeon." In other words, for Paul "the end-time has already begun."<sup>25</sup>

For Käsemann it is appropriate to speak about "Jewish apocalyptic" in relation to Paul's theology in two ways: it is a perspective that (i) remains

<sup>21</sup> See Käsemann, "The Righteousness of God in Paul," 168–82.

<sup>22</sup> Käsemann, *Romans*, 92 (comment on Rom 3:21–26).

<sup>23</sup> Käsemann, "The Beginnings of Christian Theology," 105.

<sup>24</sup> Käsemann, *Romans*, 142.

<sup>25</sup> This understanding of time picked up Oscar Cullmann's description of early Christian thought as life between a "D-Day" (the event of the cross that was a decisive battle) and a "Victory Day" (the future when the new age comes into force); cf. O. Cullmann, *Christ and Time* (trans. F. V. Filson; Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1964, rev'd ed., from the German publication of 1946), 83–84.

nourished by eschatology (so that Paul's modifications of this stand out in the sharpest relief) and (ii) views the cosmos as a place in which divine power, the power not anticipated by Jews until the coming of the eschaton, has broken into the world. The present, then, is one of conflict between the power that comes with the gospel and death that is shared by humanity. Käsemann did not allow the logic of an antithetical typology of Adam and Christ to be decisive for Paul; the advent of Christ did not do away with the ongoing power of death in this world. Against what Käsemann refers to as "the Hellenistic enthusiasts" of Corinth, Paul's thought retained an eschatological edge. Christ inaugurated the end-time, but the ultimate conclusion of things remains outstanding (so that Paul can refer to "the present evil aeon" in Gal 1:4), a reality that could be placed in service to "primitive Christian paraenesis"<sup>26</sup> and would do so for Paul. The "universal realization" of the advent of life through Christ (Rom 5:12–21) is now (Rom 6:1–11) a summons for Christians "to confirm in their personal life the change of aeons that has been effected."<sup>27</sup> Käsemann acknowledges in principle the complexity of Jewish apocalyptic thought; however, Paul's language draws from the eschaton into the present the conflict between death and life in a way, presumably, that did not have any real precedent in existing Jewish paradigms. Käsemann did not explicitly claim that Paul's adaptation of Jewish apocalyptic eschatology (as Käsemann understood it) was not anticipated, perhaps because it is precisely this aspect of Paul's indebtedness to Jewish tradition that distinctively shaped his theology. However, inasmuch as Paul worked out the significance of Christ in relation to his Jewish heritage, what distinguishes Käsemann's Paul from Jewish apocalyptic thought is nothing less than radical and, indeed, innovative in terms of the history of religions.

## 2. *J. Christiaan Beker*

J. Christiaan Beker's work on Paul drew from Käsemann the significance of "apocalyptic" as a key to understanding the theology of the apostle. He too accepted that Paul had shifted the tone of Jewish apocalyptic thought, so that the "Christ event" (i.e. the view of both Jesus' death and resurrection as a coherent act of God) could function as a proleptic event that anticipates God's ultimate triumph over sin and death. The Christ event in Paul's gospel lent the eschaton a certitude that has no equal in Jewish

<sup>26</sup> Käsemann, *Romans*, 142; Käsemann, "The Beginnings of Christian Theology," 105.

<sup>27</sup> Käsemann, *Romans*, 159.

tradition. Therefore, it “is the apocalyptic turning point of history.”<sup>28</sup> Unlike Käsemann, however, Beker gave more emphasis to the eschaton in Paul’s thought as the time of God’s definitive triumph over evil. In this sense, Beker understood himself as engaging in a theological reading that could take seriously the presence of ongoing evil in the lives of Christians, thus toning down the ethical imperative that had emerged from Käsemann’s more conflict-orientated interpretation. Indeed, “[t]he death and resurrection of *Christ in their apocalyptic setting* constitute the core of Paul’s thought”<sup>29</sup> and “signify that the cross is God’s judgment of the world and that the resurrection is the beginning of the ontological renewal of creation that will come to completion in God’s new age.”<sup>30</sup> Despite Beker’s difference in emphasis from that of Käsemann, his understanding of apocalyptic thought in Jewish tradition remains much the same: it divided time into two ages, and represented a distinction that Paul deliberately blurred in order to allow the significance of the Christ event in Paul’s recent past to play a teleological role in the divine schema. Though in Beker’s reading Paul’s thought is made to approximate Jewish apocalyptic eschatology more than many other Pauline interpreters would allow, Beker could not escape the view that Paul’s gospel was shaped by an impulse, a frame of thinking, that could not be more fully described by sustaining a *constructive* conversation with Second Temple literature.

### 3. *J. Louis Martyn*

Käsemann and Beker’s understanding of “apocalyptic” in Paul, while drawing heavily on its eschatological component, nevertheless reflects a use of the term which, when employed casually, begins to take on a life of its own. Apocalyptic in Käsemann could thus refer to a worldview in which powers are in conflict, while for Beker it implied a view of the world in which hope has a key role to play, especially since the complexities of sin, suffering and death are neither vanquished nor necessarily find any tangible reckoning. J. Louis Martyn’s understanding of “apocalyptic” takes the matter one step further in further; for him it operates as a key to epistemology. Rather than allowing the term simply to denote the eschatological future, Martyn draws on the fundamental meaning behind the word (“to reveal” or “uncover”) to emphasize the recognition

---

<sup>28</sup> Becker, *Paul the Apostle*, 205.

<sup>29</sup> Becker, *Paul the Apostle*, 207 (emphasis my own).

<sup>30</sup> Becker, *Paul the Apostle*, 211.

of a (divine) disclosure that pertains to *both* the present age and the age to come; the perception of the one necessarily involves a perception of the other. If history as Paul knew it is to be brought to an end by God, it is because the present world order is being comprehended as essentially “evil” (Gal 1:4). Apocalyptic is thus “the conviction that God has now given to the elect true perception both of present developments (the real world) and of a wondrous transformation in the near future”; it involves “a new way of knowing both present and future.”<sup>31</sup>

It follows for Martyn that the revelatory solution in Paul’s thought, if it is to be a solution at all, does not lie in the future (as with Jewish apocalyptic) but rather in the present. Therefore, it is possible for the death of Jesus to be regarded as a moment of divine unveiling that confronts and, in turn, unmask the world as it now exists. This frame of understanding provided Martyn with a way of interpreting Paul’s thought as a whole and, in particular, could help explain why, in contrast to Beker, he could read a letter like Galatians, with its Christo-centric orientation, as no less fundamentally apocalyptic than the other writings of the apostle.<sup>32</sup> Thus even less so than for either Käsemann or Beker, Martyn’s approach to apocalyptic does not obligate the interpreter to find any essential continuity with comparable or contrasting Jewish paradigms. Once God has disclosed God’s self in the Christ event as a new way of knowing, all that came before becomes functionally irrelevant, not only for Paul but even for Paul’s interpreters. Such an epistemology, a way of knowing that involves divine disclosure within the bounds of the created order as we know it, may arguably be a way of construing the thinking of Paul, but does this also have to mean that Jewish writers did not think about divine disclosure in any analogous way?

---

<sup>31</sup> J. L. Martyn, “Apocalyptic Antinomies in the Letter to the Galatians,” in *Theological Issues in the Letters of Paul*, 111–23 (123); *Galatians: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, 97–105.

<sup>32</sup> For a sensitive treatment of eschatology in Paul that largely adheres to Martyn’s reading, see M. de Boer, “Paul and Apocalyptic Eschatology,” in *The Encyclopedia of Apocalypticism. Volume 1: The Origins of Apocalypticism in Judaism and Christianity* (ed. J. J. Collins; New York/London: Continuum, 2000), 345–83. See also the earlier essay by R. Sturm, “Defining the Word ‘Apocalyptic’: A Problem in Biblical Criticism,” in *Apocalyptic and the New Testament: Essays in Honor of J. Louis Martyn* (ed. J. Marcus and M. L. Soards; JSNTSS 24; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989), 17–48.

4. *James D. G. Dunn*

James D. G. Dunn is the last interpreter of Paul to whom we draw attention. Perhaps more than those whose readings of Paul are already described, he has attempted to bring Jewish tradition into direct conversation with what he says about Paul. This is true in particular when it comes to Dunn's view of "the works of the law" which in several publications he regards as an expression that had currency amongst Jews in relation to practices that set them apart from Gentiles.<sup>33</sup> What, however, of the function of Jewish apocalyptic thought in the way Dunn reads Paul? Of the several areas he covers, it is in the sixth chapter of his *Theology of Paul the Apostle* entitled "The Process of Salvation" that his discussion of the two ages in Judaism and Paul's thought is most explicit.<sup>34</sup> The chapter opens with a sub-chapter (paragraph 18), the title of which, "The eschatological tension," sums up the particular emphasis in Paul's modification of Jewish apocalyptic theology.<sup>35</sup>

Before we address what Dunn identifies as the Jewish tradition behind Paul, it is helpful to observe that it is the context of Pauline scholarship that more immediately determines the position Dunn articulates rather than his engagement with the Second Temple Jewish literature itself. Over against readers for whom Pauline "justification by faith" translates into God's gracious, unmerited pronouncement of "righteousness" upon individuals,<sup>36</sup> Dunn stresses that soteriology, rather than being a given, denotes a lifetime *process* in which persons of faith negotiate between the power of the Spirit in their lives and the inevitable failures and sufferings that will always accompany them. This "eschatological tension" is known not just by anyone, but is emblazoned on the consciousness of believers whose participation in the power of the gospel exposes the problems that beset the human being in this age. Now Dunn presupposes, along with most interpreters of Paul, a Jewish schema of two ages in relation to which the particularity of the apostle's thought can be understood. Dunn takes for granted the view that Paul has modified this schema by noting a provisional transition from the present age to the age to come in the *pa-*

<sup>33</sup> See e.g. J. D. G. Dunn, *Romans 1–8* (WBC 38A; Dallas, Texas: Word Books, 1988), 183–94 (on Rom 3:27–31) and idem, *The Theology of Paul*, 354–79.

<sup>34</sup> Dunn, *The Theology of Paul the Apostle*, 461–98.

<sup>35</sup> This is illustrated by Dunn's charts in *The Theology of Paul the Apostle*, 464–65 and 475.

<sup>36</sup> See, e.g., P. Stuhlmacher, *Paul's Letter to the Romans* (trans. S. J. Hafemann; Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1994), 114–16, to which Dunn responds in *The Theology of Paul the Apostle*, 474–75, n. 62–63.



*rouisia* of Christ; being “in Christ” is language that describes the position of believers who participate in this transition. This existence in a new state of being is not in itself, however, account for what makes Paul different. The realism of Paul’s view of life did not permit him to indulge in the “already” of the Christ event (in contrast, for example, to the “strong” in Corinth). Neither could Paul retain an eschatology that he had espoused before his apostolic call:

... the distinctive feature of Paul’s theology ... is *not* the eschatology, but the *tension* which his revised eschatology sets up. Eschatological hope was a common feature of Paul’s religious heritage. But an eschatology split in this way between such a decisive “already” and yet still a “not yet” was a new departure. . . Paul’s gospel was eschatological not because of what he still hoped would happen, but because of what he believed had already happened.<sup>37</sup>

The old and new ages overlap. The old, present aeon extends from Adam until the age to come; during this time death, sin, and suffering remain undeniable realities. The new, future aeon is no longer entirely consigned to the future (as in Jewish tradition), but has had its beginning in Christ (especially his resurrection) in such a definitive way that the future reality of judgment is guaranteed. The resulting overlap is the time in-between, that is, it defines life “in Christ” and extends from the Christ event until the eschatological judgment that inaugurates the creation of a new cosmos.

Dunn’s understanding of the way Jewish apocalyptic influenced and was modified by Paul exemplifies what, for all their different emphases, is also true for the other interpreters we have considered here. Taking as the point of departure his conviction about God’s defining act in the death and resurrection of Jesus, the apostle has radically modified the notion of two successive ages. This modification represents not only Paul’s particular contribution to early theologies that were emerging among followers of and adherents to Jesus, but is also an innovation that is specifically “Christian” and, by implication, is unimaginable for Second Temple Jewish apocalyptic tradition. The point to evaluate here is not to determine which of the construals reviewed above is the more probably with regard to Paul’s thought, but rather to reflect on whether or not a myopic focus on Pauline theology has resulted in a reductionistic comprehension of what some Jewish writers could articulate about God’s activity in creation with respect to the past within the space and time of this age and

---

<sup>37</sup> Dunn, *The Theology of Paul the Apostle*, 465.



to the imminent future in an age essentially other. If we recognise the obvious specificity surrounding claims made about the significance of the Christ event, would one be correct to infer that Jewish tradition could *not* have envisaged definitive activity against evil in the past on the part of Israel's God that, at the same time, functions as a guarantee of divine triumph in the future?

B. MODELS OF ESCHATOLOGY  
IN SECOND TEMPLE "APOCALYPTIC" THOUGHT

Thus far the present discussion has indulged in using the term "apocalyptic" rather casually. This is in large part due to the often imprecise application of the word by the Pauline scholars we have reviewed. It is impossible within the space of this contribution to sketch in detail how problematic this expression has been for those attempting to offer a definition, not only in relation to a purported literary genre called "apocalypse" but also with regard to the adjective "apocalyptic" itself.<sup>38</sup> A very brief overview, however, can help us locate just where the problem lies with simplistic paradigms such as the two ages scheme attributed to Jewish traditions which were both antecedent and contemporary to Paul.

As is well known, much of the scholarly discussion of an apocalyptic world view (as well as of "apocalypse" as a literary genre) was dominated during the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> centuries by a model oriented around the future, conceived as divine judgment that will eradicate evils in the present world. To espouse an apocalyptic world view in Jewish tradition involves, in essence, living life in anticipation of God's rule that has yet to be manifested.<sup>39</sup> This understanding of apocalyptic thought has served New Testament scholarship as a convenient way not only to describe, for example, theological accents in the historical Jesus that mark a shift away

---

<sup>38</sup> The currency of this problem is reflected in the use of the adjective—without any real discussion in the book—in the subtitle by D. Campbell, *The Deliverance of God: An Apocalyptic Rereading of Justification in Paul* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009). After his thorough review of 20<sup>th</sup> century scholarship on Paul, Matlock joins a chorus of those who question the casual use of "apocalyptic" and counsel, where possible, against the use of the term at all; so Matlock, *Unveiling the Apocalyptic Paul*, 247–316. The critique, however justified, draws us to focus more specifically on literature and texts that contain terms which, whether as verbs or substantives, communicate something about divine "disclosure" or "revelation" to humanity.

<sup>39</sup> Such a framework assumed a certain prominence of ways to read works such as Daniel, John's Apocalypse, 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch.

from Judaism (for example in the thought of C. H. Dodd<sup>40</sup>) but also—as we have seen here—to identify and elaborate on distinctive features of Paul's thought. As we have noted with the scholars reviewed above, comparison with borrowings from Jewish tradition (sometimes simplistically received) both helped explain Pauline ideas as they are and encouraged attempts to describe what makes them distinctive. In relation to Jesus, some scholars have found that a two-age framework provides a platform for understanding Jesus within a “thoroughgoing eschatology” (in contrast, e.g. to Dodd), a view that amounts to an attempt to take Jesus' place within apocalyptic Jewish ideology (as one who focused on the future) seriously.<sup>41</sup> For other scholars, it is in Jesus' activity, both as the Synoptic Gospels present him and perhaps even in the way Jesus understood himself, that God's rule is seen as breaking into this world in a definitive way, a moment after which “history” could no longer be the same.<sup>42</sup> If we shift the focus to Paul, the Christ event marks God's breaking into the confines of history to alter perception of reality at a fundamental level.

---

<sup>40</sup> See C. H. Dodd, *The Parables of the Kingdom* (London: Nisbet, 1936, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed.); idem, *Apostolic Preaching and its Developments* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1936); and idem, *History and the Gospel* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1964, rev'd ed. from 1938).

<sup>41</sup> So the well known work of A. Schweitzer, *The Quest of the Historical Jesus: From Reimarus to Wrede* (trans. W. Montgomery; London: Black, 1954, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). For a more recent take-up of this perspective, see D. C. Allison, “A Plea for Thoroughgoing Eschatology,” *JBL* 113 (1994): 651–68 and *Jesus of Nazareth: Millenarian Prophet* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1998), whose argument is formulated against the “unapocalyptic” reconstruction of Jesus put forth by members contributing to the Jesus Seminar (esp. M. Borg, J. D. Crossan, B. Mack); on the latter, see R. W. Funk and R. W. Hoover, *The Five Gospels: The Search for the Authentic Words of Jesus* (New York/Toronto: Macmillan, 1993), 34–38 and 137.

<sup>42</sup> See e.g. C. H. Dodd, in addition to the works mentioned in n. 40, in *The Founder of Christianity* (New York: Macmillan, 1970); cf. further N. Perrin, *Jesus and the Language of the Kingdom: Symbol and Metaphor in New Testament Interpretation* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1976), 204; J. D. G. Dunn, *Jesus and the Spirit: A Study of the Religious and Charismatic Experience of Jesus and the First Christians as Reflected in the New Testament* (London: SCM Press, 1975), 41–67 and idem, *Christianity in the Making, Volume I: Jesus Remembered* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), 478–84; and T. P. Rausch, *Who Is Jesus? An Introduction to Christology* (Collegeville, Minnesota: Liturgical Press, 2003), 77–93. A similar move is frequently made to underscore the distinctiveness of Pauline theology. Influential advocates of such an understanding of Paul have included W. Kümmel, “Paulus,” in idem, *Heilsgeschehen und Geschichte: Gesammelte Aufsätze 1933–1964* (Marburg: Elwert, 1965), 439–56; E. Käsemann, e.g. in *Commentary on Romans* (trans. G. W. Bromiley; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980), 139–59 (on Rom 5:12–21); J. C. Beker, *Paul the Apostle and J. D. G. Dunn*, e.g. in *Jesus and the Spirit*, 308 (“[t]he most characteristic feature of Christian experience”) and *The Theology of St. Paul the Apostle* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 461–98 (esp. 462–77); cf. recently T. R. Schreiner, *New Testament Theology: Magnifying God in Christ* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2008).

Scholarship has, of course, observed the shortcomings of a one-dimensional future orientation of Jewish apocalyptic thought, especially since the earliest recoverable apocalypses seem just as interested in a spatial understanding of the world made possible through revealed knowledge and in the disclosure of esoteric wisdom as in the anticipated transformation of the present into a future cosmos.<sup>43</sup> Along the lines of esoteric revelation, the advent of Jesus, including his death, could make certain sense for Paul (cf. Rom 3:21–26; 1 Cor 1:18–2:16).

While the sapiential and cosmological dimensions of apocalyptic thought have enriched the way some have reflected theologically on the significance and impact of the Christ event, the temporal framework within Jewish tradition has not received adequate attention, specifically as it relates to what Pauline theologies have assumed about it. Beyond contrasting present and future reality, some writers of apocalyptic texts demonstrated a concern with divine activity as a constant that shaped the unfolding story of Israel as a way of understanding and asking questions about the present.<sup>44</sup> Furthermore, an influential way of understanding the temporal dimension of apocalyptic thought has been the correspondence found in some of the writings between *Urzeit* and *Endzeit*, a framework construed as a means to re-enforce eschatology<sup>45</sup>: here vari-

---

<sup>43</sup> So the often repeated definition by J. J. Collins, “Introduction: Towards the Morphology of a Genre,” in *Apocalypse: The Morphology of a Genre* (ed. J. J. Collins; Semeia 14; Missoula, Montana: Scholars Press, 1979), 1–20 (here 9) and *The Apocalyptic Imagination* (Grand Rapids and Cambridge: Eerdmans, 1998<sup>2</sup>), 2–11, esp. 4–9. Here, the critique by Christopher Rowland of the one-dimensionally eschatological reading of Jewish apocalyptic literature, if somewhat one-sided, remains valuable; see idem, *The Open Heaven: A Study of Apocalyptic in Judaism and Early Christianity* (New York: Crossroad, 1982), 9–72. The disclosure of esoteric wisdom as emphasized by Rowland has not gone lost, for example, on de Boer, “Paul and Apocalyptic Eschatology,” 352–54 (with several points of critique) and Matlock, *Unveiling the Apocalyptic Paul*, esp. 258–62 and 282–87.

<sup>44</sup> So esp. the so-called “historical apocalypses” (Animal Apocalypse of *1 En.* 85–90; Apocalypse of Weeks, *1 En.* 93:1–10 and 91:11–17; *4 Ezra*, cf. ch. 14). This perspective is underscored by N. T. Wright, *The Climax of the Covenant: Christ and the Law in Pauline Theology* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1991), for whom the Sin-Exile-Return framework enables a reading that regards Paul’s gospel as formulated to exhort Israel to return from a present state of being in “spiritual exile.” Wright handles Jesus tradition similarly in *Jesus and the Victory of God* (London: SPCK, 1996), e.g. 193–97 and 226–29; referring to Jesus’ logion in Luke 11:20/Matt 12:28 (“if by the finger of God I cast out demons, then the kingdom of God has come upon you”), Wright concludes that Jesus’ exorcisms are “clear signs” that the God of Israel is beginning to defeat the enemy that has “held Israel captive” (here, 228).

<sup>45</sup> The most important 3<sup>rd</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> century B.C.E. documents which draw on this correspondence between beginning and end include the Enochic Book of Watchers (*1 En.* 1–36), the Dream Visions (*1 En.* 83–84 and 85–90), Apocalypse of Weeks (*1 En.* 93:1–10 and 91:11–17), Exhortation (*1 En.* 91:1–10, 18–19), Birth of Noah (*1 En.* 106–107), Simili-

ous moments out of the primordial past served as a repository of images, symbols and motifs that helped apocalyptic writers to imagine the future. Paradisical existence, once lost, will be restored (Rev 2:7); a messianic “white bull” concludes a story that began with an Adamic “white bull” (Animal Apocalypse, *1 En.* 85 and 90; cf. Rom 5:12–21); eschatological judgment draws on imagery from the Great Flood (*1 En.* 10; 84; 91; 106–107); and Noah’s rescue prefigures the salvation of God’s people at the end of history.

A basis for reconfiguring primordial images, however, is not all that the sacred past has to offer. And so, *within the framework of temporality, there is another emphasis that has been neglected, not only by New Testament scholars but also by specialists in ancient Jewish apocalyptic literature.*<sup>46</sup> In addition to helping describe deteriorating conditions in the world and how the God of Israel will inaugurate a new age, language about the *Urzeit* also functioned to provide *a basis for being confident about such an outcome.* God’s definitive activity is not only a matter for the future; rather, it is God’s invasive presence to defeat evil *in the past* (e.g. at the time of the Great Flood) that guarantees its annihilation in the future (*1 En.* 10; 15–16; 91:5–10; 106:13–107:1; *Jub.* 5–10; *Book of Giants* at 4Q530 2 ii + 6–7 + 8–12, lines 4–20). Thus in essence, evil, however rampant and overwhelming in the present age, *is but a defeated power whose time is marked.* Divine victory in the sacred past could even be understood as an expression of God’s royal power (*1 En.* 84:2–6; *Book of Giants* at 4Q203 9 and 10; cf. the angels’ address of God as “king of kings” in *1 En.* 9). Since God’s rule has asserted itself in the cosmos on a global scale (e.g. through the Great Flood or, as in Exod 15, in the Song of the Red Sea that celebrates the rescue of Israel from inimical destruction), the “present era” is then a time when those who are pious can proceed with some confidence in dealing with the effects of demonic power, knowing that although it cannot be gotten rid of altogether before the ultimate end of things, it is nevertheless possible to address, curtail or manage its effects. This understanding of sacred

---

tudes (*1 En.* 37–71), *Book of Giants* and *Jubilees*. Except for the Similitudes, the impact of the perspectives upheld by these works in Second Temple literature (including writings among the Dead Sea Scrolls and Jewish literature composed in Greek) was significant.

<sup>46</sup> For an excellent overview of recent scholarship on Jewish “apocalyptic” thought and literature and its implications for New Testament scholarship, see J. Frey, “Die Apokalyptik als Herausforderung der neutestamentlichen Wissenschaft. Zum Problem: Jesus und die Apokalyptik,” in *Apokalyptik als Herausforderung neutestamentlicher Theologie* (ed. M. Becker and M. Öhler; WUNT, II/214; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006), 23–94, though Frey does not press towards the emphasis of the present discussion.

past and imminent future was not simply a matter of charting how time works; it was a way of defining what it means to be God's people in the present and it could manifest itself in terms of theological anthropology that negotiated the relentless uncertainties of life with the certainty of victory under the covenant.

The "already" of evil's defeat principle and the "not yet" of its manifest destruction was an existing framework that Paul could take for granted. Though the overlap between the present and future age is occasioned for Paul by a recent breakthrough in history, we would not be mistaken to think that there were pious Jews who understood themselves as living in an eschatological tension, inspired by confidence of concrete moments of divine activity in the past. It is simply misleading, if not wrong, to infer, with several Pauline scholars, that such religiosity is merely the domain of early adherents of Jesus, not least Paul.

One storyline that guaranteed the establishment of God's eschatological rule in the cosmos has been briefly mentioned above. Motifs traceable to the Deluge are discernible, for example, in references to the "bastard" spirits in the Dead Sea materials (so 4Q510 1 4–8 par. 4Q511 10 1–6); these *mamzerim*, spirits that were thought to have emanated from the giants whose physical bodies had been destroyed in the Flood (cf. 1 En. 10:9), are powers of the present age which in the *Songs of the Maskil* is described as follows:

... a time of the dominion [of] wickedness and in the eras of the humiliation of the sons of lig[ht] in the guilt of the times of those plagued by iniquities, not for an eternal destruction, [but] for the era of the humiliation of transgression (4Q510 1 6b–7 par. 4Q511 10 4–5)

In the document, it is by declaring the splendour of God's radiance and in the acclamation of God's power that the activities of a catalogue of malevolent forces can be curbed. The Maskil's declarations about God, told in the third person (i.e., they are not in the form of a second-person prayer addressed to God), are here presumed to be sufficiently potent to diminish or counteract demonic powers that are at work in the present order of things ("the dominion [of] wickedness"). Although the text does not furnish a prayer for divine protection against these demons, it reflects a framework that holds two concurrent things in tension: (a) the existence of a community of those who are unambiguously "righteous" and "upright," and (b) the characterization of the present age as "a time of the dominion [of] wickedness." The Maskil's song about God (in the third person), addressed to the righteous, functions as an expedient measure that

neutralizes threats associated with demonic powers until the present age of wickedness is brought to an end.

This is, of course, not the only way powers in the present age are dealt with. In some the more explicitly community orientated and *Yahad* texts curses are pronounced again against a chief angel (cf. *4QBerakot* at 4Q286 7 ii 3, 7) and Belial (*Serek ha-Yahad* at 1QS I 16–III 11; cf. *Serek ha-Milhamah* at 1QM XIV 9–10 par. 4Q491=4QM<sup>a</sup> 8–10 i 6–7 and *4QCatena A* at 4Q177 III 8). In other words, the chief power is cursed, not exorcised. The pronouncements against Belial and his lot bring together and merge several evolving features that in their specificity are partly lost yet whose conceptual framework is preserved within a new form. The eschatological framework found in earlier Enochic pronouncements of doom against the fallen angels, exorcisms (11Q11, 4Q560), and hymns of protection, is retained in the community's treatment of a chief figure at the top. In the *Serek ha-Yahad*, curses against Belial adapt language from the Aaronic blessing (Num 6:24–27) and should be understood in relation to the larger context of covenant blessings and curses found in Deuteronomy (cf. Deut 28–30). If we may read the liturgy near the beginning of 1QS in tandem with the hymn at the end (1QS X–XI), the way of dealing with Belial presupposes the community's present communion with "the sons of heaven" (cf. 1QS XI 6–8); in "the council of the flesh" God has already granted them participation in an eternal possession. Traditions that are pivotal in receiving Enochic tradition and paving the way for the *Yahad* way of dealing with Belial may be seen not only in the *Songs of the Maskil*, as we have just shown, but also in *Jubilees*. The *Book of Jubilees* presents demonic activity under the leadership of Mastema as an inevitable characteristic of this age until the final judgment (ch. 10). Thus, in *Jubilees* not only do angels reveal remedies to Noah (and his progeny) for the warding off or neutralizing the effects of evil spirits (*Jub.* 10:10–13), but also the patriarchs—Moses (1:19–20), Noah (10:1–6), and Abraham (12:19–20)—are made to utter prayers of deliverance against them (cf. also 11Q5 XIX). There is no formal denunciation or curse against any of the malevolent powers. The traditions just reviewed are "the tip of the iceberg". They are not unusual or aberrant from much of Jewish tradition in their understanding of time, but rather articulate their approach to evil and God's ultimate triumph over it in a way that is deeply rooted in Israel's self-perception as the people of God.

## C. CONCLUSION

In sketching briefly the eschatological tension discernible among some of the Dead Sea materials as they relate to malevolent powers, we have not come upon traditions that can, I think, be simplistically said to have influenced Paul directly. However, we do have to do with traditions that run counter to the impression a number of Pauline theologians, in their enthusiasm to recover the theological genius of Paul, have left their readers to infer about apocalyptic Jewish thought. Significantly, demonic powers, however conceived (i.e. whether they are a group or groups of "spirits" or a chief demonic being at the top), are not thought to be destroyed so much as they can be managed by pious Jews who already could understand themselves as living in a time between God's proleptic establishment of control over evil and the effective defeat of it at the end. This is a pattern that is not so remote from the realism which, for example, Beker and Dunn attribute to Paul's understanding of life under faith.

## INDEX OF ANCIENT SOURCES

### HEBREW BIBLE

Genesis		21:10	101
1:26	209, 221, 225	21:33	26
1:26–27	209, 213, 215–16, 235	22:1	42
1:26–28	209	22:18	40, 44–45, 46
1:27	159, 166, 168, 216, 217–18, 221, 225–27, 230–31	24:1	41
2:7	216–18, 230	26:4	46
2:17	231	26:4–5	40
2:18	159–60	26:4–5	40
2:24	159, 166, 168, 151–52, 160, 166	26:5	41
3:5	214	28:14	46
3:16	160	34	299, 302
3:22	231	34:13–17	299
5:1	221	34:15	299
5:1–3	209	Exodus	
5:2	166	9:16	289
5:3	227	12:48	302
6:17	25	15	323
7:9	159	15:11	26
8:21	25	18:5	292
9:6	209, 221, 228	20:6	27
9:27	45	20:14	149, 154, 167
12:1–3	45	20:17	149, 167
12:3	44–46, 101	20:8–11	168
12:5	301	21:26–27	191
13:16	46	23:31	46
15:6	17, 36–39, 42–44, 47–48, 61, 72, 76, 101, 144, 150, 275	34:4–6	61
15:18	46	Leviticus	
16:15	101	13:7	151
17	301	13:13–15	151
17:4	39, 45	18:5	101, 144
17:13	301	18:18	165
17:23	301	19:19	10
17:26	302	21:7	152
18:18	44–46	21:14	159
21:2	101	26:12	9, 10, 11
		26:46	40
		Numbers	
		6:23–26	95, 96
		6:24–27	325



11:12	125, 139	1 Kings	
24:17	284	2:3	40
25:6-18	150	4:1	292
30	160	8:23	94
30:10	152, 156-57, 160	19	290
Deuteronomy		2 Kings	
1:1	75	18:16	292
5:10	27	1 Chronicles	
5:18	154, 167	6:14	94
5:21	167	9:1	292
7:7	124	29:22	115
7:9	27, 94	2 Chronicles	
7:12	94	20:1-9	292
11:1	40	24:20	196
14:1	229	Ezra	
17:17	155-56	2:59-62	297
21:4	167	2:70	292
21:5	290	4:1	306
21:15-17	155	6:16	306
21:22-23	17, 56, 57	6:21	306
21:23	56-58, 60, 101	8:17	115
22:9-11	10	8:35	292
22:17	152	9-10	151, 163
22:29	151, 156	9:2	297
22:13-20	151	9:4	306
22:25-28	151	9:15	25, 150
22:28-29	157	9:22	115
24:1	156, 158, 167	10:8	306
24:1-4	150, 152-53, 161	Nehemiah	
27-28	279	1:3	306
27:8	292	1:5	27, 94
27:26	101, 144	7:6	306
28-30	325	9:8	42-44
29:3-4	290	9:32	94
30:6	186, 204	10	306
30:1-2	36	13:22	96
30:1-8	186	Esther	
32:6-14	289	8:15-17	114
32:15-18	290	9:2	32
32:21	290	Job	
32:36-43	290	4:17	25
32:43	290	5:1	131
34:7	225	9:2	25
Judges		15:15	131
8:14	79	28:21	25
24-25	84	30:23	25
1 Samuel			
21:6	132		

Psalms		Qoheleth	
5:8	96	7:26	152
8:5	220, 222	9:9	152
8:5-6	220	Isaiah	
14:1	227	4:3-4	203
20:4-7	114	5:11	136
25:6	95	6:10	202
31:20	26	7:17	284
49:13	225	10:22	289
51	179, 252	11:1	258
51:12	179, 222	13:8-9	140
51:13	248	26:14	133, 139
52:3	96	26:18	196
52:10	96	26:18-19	196
68:23	290	26:19	133, 139, 196
69:14	96	27:9	291
72:8	45-46	29:10	290
88:6	191-92	33:15	203
89:2	96	34:10	26
89:6	131	35:10	111
89:8	131	40:3	91
89:29	94	41:8	124
106:30-31	61	41:9	124
106:31	36, 76, 149	41:14	181
106:45	94, 96	43:7	222
107:43	96	45:17	26
119:128	21	50:1	151-52
119:133	189	51:11	111
134:4	124	52:11	9, 10
141:2	146	53:11	62
142:2b	274	54:1	101
142:2LXX	25	54:10	94
143:2	25-29, 35, 49, 274	54:16	222
145:7	26	59:17	136, 196
145:16	25	59:20-21	291
Proverbs		60:21	282
1:23	26	61:1	242, 258, 270
2:17	163	61:3	282
4:2	229	61:7	111
4:26	26	61:10	196
5:18-20	152	63:7	26, 95, 96
14:2	21	63:10-11	248
14:13	115	66:6	32
16:31	114	Jeremiah	
17:6	114	3:1-5	152
18:22	152	3:1-13	151
19:11	157	6:14	136, 140
20:22	138-39	13:18	114
24:29	138	15:16	115
30:23	152	16:5	95
31:29	225		

31:31	284	Hosea	
31:31-34	179	1:10	186
31:33	11	2:1	186-87, 289
Lamentations		4:16	282
2:15	114-15	Joel	
3:22	95-96	3:1-5	245
Ezekiel		Amos	
13:10	136, 140	7:8	157
13:16	136, 140	8:2	157
16:8	163	Jonah	
28:12	115	4:6	115
36	179, 206	Micah	
36:25	175	2:7	21
36:25-27	175, 179, 185, 258	3:8	125, 138
36:26	189, 245	6:8	97-99, 105
36:26-28	186	7:17	157
36:27	176, 178	Nahum	
36:28	187	2:1	13
37	243, 247	2:12	59
37:23	11	2:13	59
37:24-28	10	Habakkuk	
37:26	11	1:5	66
37:27	10	2:1	26
37:28	10	2:4	17, 61-62, 65-66, 77, 101, 144
44:15	283	Zechariah	
44:22	152	7:9	95
36-37	178, 258	8:8	187
Daniel		9:10	45
3:35	39	14:5	131
5:12	248-49	Malachi	
6:3	249	2:14	163
6:4	248	2:10-16	151, 163
7:27	131	2:14-15	160
8:13	131	2:16	156, 158, 168
9:4	94, 27		
9:11	292		
12:1-3	133		

## NEW TESTAMENT

Matthew		11:5	270
1:18-19	167	12:28	322
3:9	304	16:25	183
3:11	257	19:3	167
5:31-32	164	19:3-9	165
5:32	164, 167	19:3-12	167
6:9-15	268	19:4-6	160
6:24	191	19:5	165

19:8	166	Acts	
22:30	177	2:3	243
23:23	98-100, 105	5:32	243
24:37-39	140	6:1	261
24:43-44	140	9:1-2	305
Mark		9:2	238
1:8	257	11:28	128, 269
1:24	13	13:26	47
2:27	168	15	295
8:35	183	15:8	243
10:2-12	165, 167	18:2	128
10:5	166	21:17-25	274
10:6-8	159	21:20-21	274
10:6-9	160	22:3-5	305
10:9	166	26:9-11	305
10:11	165-64	Romans	
10:11-12	164, 166	1:3-4	258
10:12	163-64	1:4	243
10:39	183	1:17	65
12:23	177	1:23	224, 234
Luke		2:1-11	149
1:14	111	2:4	62
2:10	111	2:6-10	168
3:8	304	2:12-16	148
3:16	257	2:13	143
3:38	229	2:13-14	145
4:18	270	2:14	143
7:22	270	2:15	143, 263
9:23-24	183	2:22	149
11:2-4	268	3:2	76, 273
11:20	322	3:5	76
16:13	191	3:10	77
16:18	164, 167	3:11	227
19:9	47, 167	3:20	24-25, 35, 52, 72, 76-77, 143-144, 148, 262, 273-274
20:33	177	3:21-26	314, 322
John		3:21-30	144
1:33	251	3:21-31	145
1:42	267	3:22	77
3:16	188	3:23	224, 225, 234
4:16-18	166	3:23-24	61
6:28-29	149	3:24	60, 65
8:2-11	168	3:27	143
12:25	183	3:27-31	318
14:17	251	3:28	29, 35, 52, 60, 65, 72, 76-77, 143, 262
14:26	251	4:2	144
15:26	251	4:3	36-37, 61, 72
16:13	251	4:6	144
16:13-15	247		
20:22	251		

4:6-8	144	8:34	247
4:9	38, 72	9-11	279
4:9-12	304	9:1-3	287
4:9-13	41	9:4-5	273, 287
4:17	304	9:6	288
4:22	72	9:6-13	288
5:1-2	65	9:12	144
5:5	243	9:14-26	288
5:12	234	9:17	289
5:12-21	116, 190, 314, 315, 321, 323	9:19-21	289
6:1-11	315	9:26	289
6:3	174, 190	9:27	289
6:6	174, 200	9:30-10:8	290
6:6-7	191	9:31	289
6:7	190-92	9:32	144, 169, 289
6:11	190	10:1-12	289
6:12	194	10:11-21	289
6:13	174, 194-95	10:12	298, 304
6:14	190-91	10:19	289
6:19	176	10:21	289
7	149, 162	11:1-2	290
7:1	192	11:2	124, 128-29
7:1-3	163	11:3-6	290
7:2-3	149, 162	11:6	144
7:4	192	11:7	290
7:7	149	11:8-19	290
7:9	227	11:11	290
7:18	174	11:11-16	291
7:22-23	194	11:17-24	291
7:22-25	174	11:25	291
7:23	194	11:25-26	291-92
7:24	174	11:26	124, 128-29, 279,
8:1-2	184		291
8:2	194, 247	11:26-27	291
8:3	188	11:28-32	291
8:4	228	11:29	292
8:5-8	33	13:12	194
8:6	247	13:12-13	194
8:9	243	13:12-14	194
8:10-11	183	13:13	194
8:11	247	13:14	194-95
8:11-14	184	14:17	111
8:15	243, 261, 268	15:10	290
8:19-22	310	15:13	84, 111
8:21	116	15:15	81
8:23	247	15:15-16	81
8:26	247	15:16	246
8:27	247	15:18-19	244
8:29	211, 213, 218, 229	15:25-27	269
8:29-30	212, 219, 227, 228	15:26	269, 275

1 Corinthians

1:12	261
1:18–2:16	322
1:18–4:21	246
2:4	125
2:10	246
2:12	243
2:6–16	246
2:13–16	246
3:9	243
3:16	6, 246, 258
3:17	121
3:22	261
4:7	9
5:1–5	247
5:5	259
6:9–11	176
6:12b–18	167
6:16	165, 168
6:19	121
6:19	247, 259
6:20	247
7:1	83
7:1–6	133
7:1–9	162
7:10b	166
7:10–11	162, 167
7:11	168
7:11b	166
7:13	164
7:16	9
7:18	304
7:25	83
7:39	163
8:1	83
8:1–13	273
8:4	83
8:6	214
9:1	244
9:5	261, 268
9:7	9
11:2	268
11:7	209, 214, 220, 225, 235
11:7–9	214
12:1	83
12:2	273
12:6	247
12:11	247
13:1	246
14:2	246

14:5	246
14:12	246
14:14–19	246
14:18	244
14:24–25	246
15:3	268
15:5	261, 268
15:9	268
15:20	247
15:21–22	116, 222
15:23	247
15:35–53	176
15:41	220
15:42	229
15:42–49	233
15:42–52	213
15:42–54	234
15:43	219, 224
15:44	174
15:45	247
15:45–49	116, 174, 217
15:49	211–12, 219
15:53–54	213
15:54	275
16:1	83
16:2	262
16:12	83
16:21	261

2 Corinthians

1:22	243, 247
1–9	5
2:14–7:4	14
3:6	247
3:17	247
3:18	210–13, 218–19
4:4	210–11, 214
4:6	211
4:7–12	212
4:16–18	218
5:1–5	275
5:5	243, 247
5:10	168
5:17	200, 218
6:6–7	259
6:11	6
6:11–13	4–6
6:12	6
6:13	6
6:14	8
6:14–7:1	1–9, 10–16
6:14b–16a	8

6:15	13		271-72
6:16	5-6, 8, 9-10	2:12	35, 271
6:16-17	10	2:13	271
6:16-18	8-9	2:14	20-21, 23, 48, 261,
6:17	9-10		267, 271
6:18	9, 185	2:15	272
7:1	5, 8-10, 259	2:15-16	24, 262, 272
7:2a	6	2:15-21	101
7:2-3	6	2:16	17, 19, 21, 25,
7:2-4	4		28-32, 37, 52, 55,
7:3b	6		72, 76-77, 101,
7:8	9		106, 143, 262-
9:1	83		263, 272-274
9:8	168	2:19	169
11:4	243	2:21	100-103, 144, 275
11:22	52	3:1-5	101
12:1	244	3:1-14	145
12:4	244	3:2	35, 52, 72, 76, 77,
13:11b	84		143, 243, 262
		3:2-5	245
Galatians		3:5	35, 52, 72, 76-77,
1:1-10	100		143, 244
1:3	102-103	3:6	36-37, 61, 72, 144,
1:4	315, 317		274
1:6	100, 103	3:6-9	17, 37, 44
1:6-7	103	3:8	304
1:6-10	100	3:8-14	36
1:11-12	267	3:9-10	77
1:11-24	101	3:10	35, 52, 72, 76, 143,
1:11-2:21	267		262
1:11-2:21	100	3:10-11	144
1:13	305	3:10-14	51, 52, 67, 72
1:13-14	268	3:11	17, 24, 32, 60, 62,
1:13-16	267		65, 77
1:14	261	3:12	144, 145
1:15	100-101, 103	3:13	17, 56, 275
1:15-17	267	3:14	243, 245
1:17	267	3:16-29	144
1:18	261, 267-68	3:17	41
1:23-24	268	3:22	77
2:1	267, 271	3:26	184
2:1-2	268	3:26-27	188
2:1-10	101, 268, 271	3:26-4:6	184
2:2	267	3:27	195, 196, 213
2:2-4	55	3:28	19, 298, 304
2:4-5	270	4:1-20	101
2:6	267	4:3	274
2:9	100-101, 103, 261,	4:4	184, 188, 247
	267-68, 271	4:4-5	188
2:10	269-70	4:6	247, 261, 268
2:11	261, 267	4:21-31	101
2:11-14	55, 101, 267, 270,		

5:1	247	3:19	109
5:1-12	102	3:20	109, 118
5:4	100, 102-103	3:20-21	117, 118
5:6	102, 304	3:20-4:1	110, 115
5:12	19	3:21	109, 117-118, 212
5:13b-14	102	3:21-4:1	109, 118
5:13-6:18	102	4:1	110, 114-15, 116
5:14	105, 275	4:19-20	84
5:16	102	Colossians	
5:16-26	17, 32-34	1:10	168
5:17-21	102	1:15	213
5:19-24	104	2:12	183
5:21	32	3:5-14	200
5:22-25	102	3:10	200
5:24	174	3:11	298, 304
6:2	102	4:16	85
6:11	81	1 Thessalonians	
6:11-18	80	1:4	123-24, 138
6:13	103	1:5	123, 125, 139, 245
6:15	102, 200-201, 304	1:5-6	244
6:16	82, 278	1:6	139
6:18	103	2:1-7	140
Ephesians		2:1-12	126, 140
2:14	306	2:7-8.11	139
5:8	194	2:11	127
5:8-11	33	2:15	140
5:31	165	2:16	127, 128
6:10-12	195	2:17-3:5	139
Philippians		2:18	84, 129
2:6	118, 213, 214, 215	2:19	110, 112, 114-15,
2:6-8	214		118
2:6-11	117-118, 214	2:19-20	138
2:7	118, 201	3:5	84, 129-30
2:8	118	3:13	123, 131, 138
2:10	118	3:16	138
2:11	118	4:3-8	132, 259
3:1b-4:1	109, 116	4:4	131-33, 138, 259
3:2-3	109	4:6	133
3:2-4:1	138	4:7	176
3:4-6	109	4:8	178, 243, 245, 247
3:5	261, 278	4:9	83
3:5-6	52	4:13-17	133, 139
3:7-8	109	4:13-18	140
3:9	77, 109	4:13	83, 134
3:10-11	109	4:14	134
3:10-16	109	4:15	134
3:12-14	109	5:1	83
3:15	109	5:1-11	139
3:17	109	5:2	140
3:18	109	5:5	135-36, 262



5:5-6	183	2:24	60
5:8	194	3:9	209
5:9	127, 135, 138	5:20	82
5:10	135, 136		
5:15	123, 137-39	1 Peter	
5:19	244-45, 256	1:8	111
5:23-28	80	3:7	133
5:26	84	5:10-11	84
5:27	84	5:12	81
		5:13	81
2 Thessalonians		2 Peter	
2:19	114-16	3:15-16	86
3:16a	84	3:16	51
Philemon		1 John	
1-3	84	2:27	243
21	81	4:9	188
Hebrews		5:13	81
11:17-19	43	2 John	
12:13	20	12	81
13:20-21	84	3 John	
13:22	81	13	81
James		Revelation	
2:21	43	2:7	323
2:21-24	38	2:10	112
2:23	37		

## APOCRYPHA AND SEPTUAGINT

Baruch		15:1188	32
Susanna		16:24-18:14	221
34	249	17:1-4	231
Judith		17:2	221
8:26	44	17:3	231
1 Maccabees		17:3-4	221
1:15	295	17:30	231
2:46	295	18:9	231
2:52	43, 150	23:2	197
5:1-3	305	25:13-26	232
8:2-32	83	25:13-26:18	152
12:20-23	83	25:24	232
2 Maccabees		25:26	152
1:1-10a	82	26:1-27	232
1:10b-2:18	82	33:7-15	32
Sirach		33:8	288
5	289	33:11	288
7:26	152	42:17	131
		44:4	46
		44:19-21	39, 45
		44:20	40-41, 43-44

48:11	133, 139	12:15	131
49:16	220–21		
50:1	220–21	Wisdom of Solomon	
51:20	26	1:5	249
Tobit		7:22	249
7:13	150	7:26	235
8:6	165–66	7–9	246
8:7	160	9:17	249

PSEUDEPIGRAPHA

Ahiqar		83–84	322
3:28	138	84	323
Apocalypse of Abraham		84:2–6	323
9:6	39	85	323
10:5	39	85–90	322
Apocalypse of Moses		90	323
20:1	224	91	323
Apocalypse of Sedrach		91:1–10	322
6:5	224	91:5–10	323
2 Baruch		91:11–17	322
15:8	114	91:18–19	322
49–50	176	93:1–10	322
49:2	177	106–107	322–23
57:1–2	42	106:13–107:1	323
78–86	82	2 Enoch	
3 Baruch		30:10	217
4:16	224	Joseph and Aseneth	
4 Baruch		8:9	182
6–7	82	15:5	182
1 Enoch		20:7	182
1–36	322	Jubilees	
9	323	1:15	186
10	323	1:15–25	185
10:9	324	1:17	187
12:1	131	1:19–20	325
14:24	131	1:21–23	249
15–16	323	1:23	186
22	133	1:24	185, 187
37–71	323	1:24–25	186, 188
39:3	131	1:25	187
49:4	131	5–10	323
60:4	131	10:1–6	325
61:10	131	10:10–13	325
71:1	131	12:19–20	325
81:5	131	12:23	45
		12:25–27	42
		15:26	299

17:15–18	43	Sibylline Oracles	
19:9	38	2:78	269
20:3–4	167, 150	Testament of Benjamin	
21	42	4:1	114
21:10	42	Testament of Dan	
21:15	21	5:1–6:8	137
22:20–22	150	6:10	14
30	299–300	Testament of Joseph	
Liber antiquitatum biblicarum		20:2	14, 136
18:11	249	Testament of Judah	
28:6	249	23:5	186
32:14	249	24:1–2a	187
33:3	191	24:1–4	187
60:1	249	24:2	186
62:2	249	24:3	186–87
Life of Adam and Eve		Testament of Levi	
10:3	223, 233	3:3	131
12:1–2	223, 233	3:6	249
14:2	224, 232	8:15	47
20:1	226	9:9–10	150
20:2	223	18:8	187
21:2	223	19:1	14, 136
21:6	223	Testament of Abraham	
29:9	233	1:6	39
33:5	223, 233	2:3	39
35:2	223, 233	20:15	249
3 Maccabees		11:8–9	223
6:3	47	Testament of Job	
4 Maccabees		11:9	269
10:20–21	140	12:1	270
Pseudo-Phocylides		25:4	269
105	230	30:5	269
106	230	44:2	269
Psalms of Solomon		45:2	269
18:3	47	51:2	249
17:37	249, 258		

## DEAD SEA SCROLLS

CD (Damascus Document)		II 12–13	249
I 3	282	III 2	27, 41
I 4–5	282, 292	III 2–4	283
I 7–8	282, 283	III 4–7	283
I 14	282	III 13	283
I 18–II 1	284	III 14	283
I 20	282	III 18	226
II 9	282	III 18–18	283

III 19	283	XX 1	285
III 19–20	222		
III 20	222, 287	1QpHab (Peshar Habakkuk)	
IV	155, 165	II 6–10	66
IV 1	283	VII 17–VIII 1–3	144
IV 2	283	VIII 1–3	17, 65, 147
IV 3–4	283	XI 13	301
IV 11	284	1QapGen <sup>ar</sup> (Genesis Apocryphon)	
IV 13	284	XIX 25	42
IV 16	284		
IV 17	167	1Q27 (Mysteries)	
IV 19–V 11	154	1 i 4	159
IV 21	155, 158, 160, 166	1QS (Community Rule)	
IV 21–V 1	159	I 1	279
V 7–8	155	I 1–15	93
V 11	249	I 1–III 12	250
VI 1	284	I 3	91, 94
VI 2–3	284	I 8	91, 93–94, 111
VI 5	284	I 9	262
VI 19	284	I 16–III 11	325
VII 1–2	167	I 16–III 12	95, 97
VII 4	249	I 19	91
VII 6–9	154	I 21–22	279
VII 11–13	284	I 22	91, 95
VII 18	284	I 22–24	279
VII 19–20	284	I 26	99
VIII 5–7	167	II 1	91, 95
VIII 21	284	II 2b–4a	95–96
X 5	285	II 4	91, 95
XI 21	146	II 11	91
XII 1–2	154	II 11–15	123, 138
XII 8	285	II 16	262
XII 11	301	II 19	92
XII 19	285	II 20	91
XII 22	285	II 24	91, 97, 105
XII 23–XIII 1	285	III 1	23
XIII	155, 157	III 6	256
XIII 12–22	156	III 6–8	258
XIII 14	262	III 6–9	256
XIII 16–18	161	III 7	249, 256
XIV 3–6	299	III 8	117, 256
XIV 19	285	III 8–9	256
XV 5	285	III 9	189
XV 9	285	III 13	136, 262
XVI 1	285	III 17	222
XVI 2–3	285	III 18	251
XVI 4–6	190, 302	III 21	136, 252
XVI 10–12	154	III 24	136
XIX 2	27	III 25	117, 136, 280
XIX 10–11	285	III 13–IV 26	92, 95–96, 104, 116, 135, 136, 139,
XIX 22–34	284		

	250	VII 12-21	158
III 18-19	251-52	VIII 1-4	280
III 20	251	VIII 1-IX 26a	97
III 24-25	262	VIII 2	91, 97, 105
IV 2	117	VIII 4	280
IV 2-14	104	VIII 4-10	121
IV 2-18	31	VIII 5-6	92, 258, 280
IV 3	117	VIII 6	91
IV 4	91, 95-96	VIII 8-9	280
IV 5	91, 95-96	VIII 9	91
IV 6	31, 33, 117	VIII 11-12	281
IV 6-8	17, 31-32, 109, 115, 116, 138	VIII 14	91
		VIII 16	249
IV 7	31, 111, 114, 136	IX 3	249
IV 11-12	32	IX 3-4	281
IV 11-14	17, 31-32	IX 3-6	258
IV 12	31, 34, 135	IX 4-5	146
IV 12-13	123	IX 6	91, 281
IV 17-18	32	IX 7	91
IV 19-23	116	IX 11	91-92, 281
IV 20	120	IX 19-20	91
IV 20-21	198	IX 26b-XI 22	95-97
IV 20-23	175, 251, 258	X 4	91, 95-96
IV 21	249, 251	X 12	95
IV 21-23	226, 255	X 13	95
IV 22	123, 250, 252	X 16	91, 95-96
IV 22-23	222, 228	X 25	91
IV 23	252, 287	X 26	91, 97, 98, 105
IV 25	92	X 17-18	139
V 1	262, 280	XI 1-15	148
V 2	91-92, 280	XI 2-3	63
V 4	91, 97, 105	XI 2-9	30
V 5	301	XI 6-7	63
V 6	280	XI 6-8	325
V 9	91-92	XI 7	120, 123-124
V 20	93	XI 8	120, 131
V 21	106, 145	XI 9	31
V 25	97, 105	XI 9-11	30
V 26	301	XI 9-15	63
V 1-20	92	XI 11-15	30-31
V 1-VI 23	97	XI 12	91, 96
V 5-6	258	XI 13	91, 96
V 5-7	280		
V 20-22	262	1QSa	
V 21	72	I 1-3	281
VI 11	128	I 6	281
VI 13-14	280	II 2	282
VI 13-23	92	II 20	282
VI 14	263		
VI 17	263	1QSB	
VI 18	72, 75, 106, 263	II 24	91, 249

1QM, 1Q33 (War Scroll)		XV 9	254
		XV 9–10	139
1Q34 (Festival Prayers)		XV 10	249
3 i 7	222	XV 16–17	21
1QH (Hodayot)		XV 23	124
IV 27	222, 226, 253, 287	XV 23–25	139
IV 38	249, 254	XV 26	253
V 14	253	XV 30	253
V 25	253	XV 31	26
V 31–35	64	XV 31–34	64
V 32	253	XV 32	253
V 35–36	178	XV 40–XVI 3	202
V 36	254	XVI 13	249, 253
VI 14	253	XVI 21	223
VI 22	253	XVII 14–17	26
VI 24	249, 255	XVII 23–26	138
VI 36	255	XVII 24	114, 119
VI 41	253	XVII 32	249, 255
VII 6–7	125	XVIII 24	253
VII 17	222	XVIII 34	253
VII 20–22	125	XIX 6	180
VII 26	253	XIX 13–17	180
VII 35	253	XIX 16	253
VII 36	124	XX 13–17	255
VIII 16	253	XX 14–15	178
VIII 18	254	XX 15	249
VIII 19	254	XX 34	21
VIII 20	249, 254	XXI 5–6	202
VIII 20–21	178	XXI 26	253
VIII 21	249	XXI 34	254
VIII 24	253	XXIII 16	253
VIII 25	249	XXIII 29: 33	249
VIII 28	253	XXV 6	253
VIII 29	27–28, 254	XXV 8	253
VIII 29–30	255	XXV 23	253
VIII 30	249	1QH <sup>b</sup>	
IX 13	253	1 2	26
IX 17	253	1 12	27
IX 23–25	179	1Q39 (Hymnic Composition)	
IX 23–26	138	1 6	249
IX 24	180, 253	1QM (War Scroll)	
IX 34	253	I 1	135, 262
IX 30–31	253	I 2	286
XI 22	253	I 3	135, 262
XI 23	131	I 9	135, 262
XII 30–38	148	I 9–10	285
XII 36–38	64	I 11	135
XIV 26	253	I 13	135, 262
XIV 37	181	II 7	285
XV 2–3	203		
XV 5–6	202		

II 8–9	286	3	150
III 13	286		
XI 6	286	4Q219 (4QJubilees <sup>d</sup> )	
XIII 1–2	285	II 11–12	21
XIII 9	222	4Q225 (Pseudo-Jubilees <sup>a</sup> )	
XIII 12	193	2 i 5–12	43
XIV 4	285	2 i 7–8	17, 37, 38
XIV 9–10	325	2 i 8	39
XV 1–2	286	2 i-ii	43
XV 16	285	2 ii 7–8	43
XVIII 6	285	4Q243–245	264
4Q88 (4QPsalm <sup>d</sup> )		4Q252 (4QCommentary on Genesis A)	
VII 14–VIII 15	264	II 5–8	45
VIII 2–3	264	II 8	39
VIII 8	264	II 8–10	45
VIII 13	264	4Q255 (4QRule of the Community <sup>a</sup> , 4QpapS <sup>b</sup> )	
4Q119 (LXXLev <sup>a</sup> )	10–12	2 2	117
4Q169 (Nahum Pesher)		4Q256 (4QRule of the Community <sup>b</sup> , 4QS <sup>b</sup> )	
3–4 I 6–8	59	IX 4	91
4Q171 (Psalm Pesher <sup>a</sup> )		XIX 3	91
III 1–2	222	4Q257 (4QRule of the Community <sup>c</sup> , 4QpapS <sup>c</sup> )	
4Q174 (Florilegium)	11–12, 15, 53	IX 1	91
1–2 i 7	53, 73, 145	1a iii 2	23
1–2 i 8–9	262	4Q258 (4QRule of the Community <sup>d</sup> , 4QS <sup>d</sup> )	
4Q176 (4QTanḥûmîm)		I 2	262
V 5	27	II 1	262
4Q177 (4QCatena A)		II 1–2	262
II 7	262	II 4	91
III 8	325	4Q260 (4QRule of the Community <sup>e</sup> , 4QS <sup>e</sup> )	
IV 12.16	262	IV 2	91
4Q184 (Wiles of the Wicked Woman)		4Q266 (Damascus Document <sup>e</sup> )	
1 9	232	2 ii 22	27
1 15	22	9 iii 4–15	156
2 4–6	199	9 iii 6–7	157
4Q185 (Sapiential Work)		4Q267 (Damascus Document <sup>b</sup> )	
1–2 ii 14–15	292	9 vi 4	167
4Q196 (papTobit <sup>a</sup> ar)		9 vi 4–5	158
3–4 i 6–8	17	4Q269 (Damascus Document <sup>d</sup> )	
4Q196–199	264	9 4–8	158
4Q202 (En <sup>b</sup> ar)		4Q270 (Damascus Document <sup>e</sup> )	
III 14	262	2 ii 11	249
4Q213a (Levi <sup>b</sup> ar)		5 14–21	158
1 13	249	7 13	167
		7 i	158

7 i 12-13	158	C 25-32 (C ii 16-iii 7)	36, 80
4Q271 (Damascus Document <sup>f</sup> )		C 26 (C iii [1])	79, 80, 81
3 7-15	158	C 26-27 (C iii [1])	74
4Q280 (4QCurses)		C 27 (C iii [1])	17, 72, 78
2 1	262	C 27-28 (C iii [2-3])	80
4Q285 (SM)		C 28-29 (C iii [3]-5)	80
8 1-11	286	C 30 [C iii 6]	74, 76-77, 80-81
4Q286 (Blessings <sup>a</sup> )		C 31 (C iii 6)	72, 74, 76
7 ii 3: 7	325	C 31-32 (C iii 7)	82
4Q287 (Blessings <sup>b</sup> )		4Q394 (MMT <sup>a</sup> )	
2	201	1-2	86
10 13	249	3-7 i 1-2	147
4Q298 (4QCryptA Word of the Maskil to All the Sons of Dawn)		3-7 i 1-3 (= A 19-21)	86
I 1	262	4Q396 (MMT <sup>c</sup> )	
4Q377 (Apocryphon Pentateuch B)		1-2 iv 4-11	159
2 ii 12	222	4Q397 (MMT <sup>d</sup> )	
4Q386 (Pseudo Ezechiel <sup>b</sup> )		14-21 7	35, 54
1 ii 3	14	14-21 10	54
4Q390 (Pseudo Moses <sup>c</sup> )		14-21 ii 5-6	149, 167
2 i 4	14	14-21 ii 12-15	37
4Q392 (Works of God)		14-21 ii 16-17	36
1 4	222	23(?) 2 (?)	76
4Q393 (Communal Confession)		23 2-7	36
3 2	27	4Q398 (MMT <sup>e</sup> )	
4QMMT		2 ii 2-8	54
A 19-21	86	11-13 7	147
B 1	74	14-17 i 9-ii 2	148
B 2	75	14-17 ii	36
B 8	83	14-17 ii 3	36, 53, 146
B 55	83	14-17 ii 7	17
B 64	83	14-17 ii 7-8	149
B 72	83	4Q399 (MMT <sup>f</sup> )	
B 75-82	159, 167	1 i 2.3.14.19	123, 131, 138
B 76	83	1 i 2.3	131
B 77	83	1 i 11	36
C 5	167	1 ii 2	36
C 7 (C ii 7)	72	1 ii 2-5	36
C 10 (C ii 10)	79-80	1 ii 3	36
C 13-17 (C ii 12-15)	72	4Q400 (Song of the Sabbath Sacrifice <sup>a</sup> )	
C 14 (C ii 13)	76	1 ii 6	123, 131
C 16 (C ii 14-15)	76	4Q403 (Song of the Sabbath Sacrifice <sup>d</sup> )	
C 21 (C i 14)	76	1 i 17	22
C 23 (C i [16])	75	1 i 24.31	123, 131
		4Q408 (Morning and Evening Prayer)	
		3+3a 3	222
		3+3a 9-10	222



4Q415 (Instruction <sup>a</sup> )		4Q444 (Incantation)	
11	160, 166	1-4 i 4	194
11 12-15	163	1-4 1+5 1	249
11 12-15	168	1-4 3	193
2 ii 4	163	4Q466	
2 ii 6	249	10 ii 10	201
2 ii 7	163		
2 ii 7-9	159	4Q487 (Sapiential Work B)	
		1 ii 2	222
4Q416 (Instruction <sup>b</sup> )		4Q491 (4QM <sup>a</sup> )	
2 iii 19-iv 7	159	1-3 5	111
2 iii 20-iv 10	166	8-10 i 6-7	325
2 ii 21	123, 131, 133, 259		
2 iv 5	132	4Q495 (4QM <sup>c</sup> )	
		2 1	222
4Q417 (Instruction <sup>c</sup> )		4Q504 (Words of the Luminaries <sup>a</sup> )	
1 i 12	111	1-2 III 4	221
2 i 15-17	29	1-2 III 4-5	228
2 i 16	275	1+2 v recto 11-18	249
		4 5	249
4Q418 (Instruction <sup>d</sup> )		4 11	301
8 6	249	6 6-10	273
10 5-8	159	8 4	221
76 1-3	249	8 6	221
4Q418a (Instruction <sup>e</sup> )		4Q506 (Words of the Luminaries <sup>c</sup> )	
18	166	131-132 11	249
18 1-4	159		
4Q422 (4QParaphrase of Genesis and Exodus)		4Q510 (Song of the Sage <sup>a</sup> )	
1 7	249	1 4-8	324
i 8	221	1 6b-7	324
		1 7	262
4Q423 (Instruction <sup>g</sup> )		4Q511 (Song of the Sage <sup>b</sup> )	
1-2 i 2	221	8-49	193
4Q427 (Hodayot <sup>a</sup> )		10 1-6	324
7 i 17	111	10 4-5	324
7 ii 4-7.11-13	116	28-29	193
		28-29 4	193
4Q428 (Hodayot <sup>b</sup> )		48-49 4	194
9	26		
14 6	111	4Q521 (Messianic Apocalypse)	
		2 ii 12	270
4Q430 (Hodayot <sup>f</sup> )		2 ii+4 10	148
12	26	7 1-8 + 5 ii 7-16	139
		7 4-6	148
4Q434 (Barki Napshi <sup>a</sup> )		7 7	134
1 1.4	301	4Q524 (Temple Scroll)	
1 i 11	249	14	58
1 i 3-4	202	15-22 1-2	157
4Q438 (Barki Napshi <sup>e</sup> )		15-22	155
4 ii + 5 3	275		

4Q525 (Beatitudes)		XIV 1–2	154
10 5	29, 274	LIV 4–5	156, 157
4Q530 (EnGiants <sup>b</sup> ar)		LVII 15–19	155, 159
2 ii + 6–7 + 8–12 4–20	323	LXIV 6–13	17
		LXIV 9–13	58
4Q548 (Visions of Amram <sup>f</sup> ar)		LXV 11–17	155
1 9.10.12.16	262	LXV-LXVI	154
		LXVI 8–11	156
4Q560 (Exorcism ar)	325	LXVI 10–11	157
4Q569 (Aramaic L)		Murabba'at	
1–2 8	159, 270	19:8	150
11Q5 (Psalms <sup>a</sup> )		19:21	150
XIX	325	20	163
XIX 1	181	20:3	150
		42:7	82
11Q11 (apocrPs)	325	115	163
11Q13 (Melchizedek) II 8	262	5/6Hev 44–46	265
11QSM (Sefer haMilhamah)		P. Yadin 7	261
1 ii 2–15	286	P. Yadin 7	265
11Q17 (ShirShabb)	249		
11Q19 (11QTemple Scroll <sup>a</sup> , 11QT <sup>a</sup> )			
XXIX 7–8	11		

RABBINIC LITERATURE

'Abot de Rabbi Nathan		Ned. 3:10	41–42
2:51	227	Qidd. 4:12	42
39:10–12	228	Qidd. 4:14	41
		Sanh. II 4	161
Babylonian Talmud		Palestinian (Jerusalem) Talmud	
B. Qam. 130b	79	Kil. 9:4	192
Ber. 17a	177, 203	Genesis Rabbah	
Ber. 5a	191	8:11	233
Meg. 12b	133	12:6	223
Šabb. 30a	192	61:1	41
Sanh. 22b	133	63	191
Tamid 32a	183	64:4	41
Yebam. 72a	295	Exodus Rabbah 15:6	189
Yoma 28b	41	Deuteronomy Rabbah 11:3	225
Fragmentary Targum		Ruth Rabbah 3:1	191
Gen 2:15	229	Sifre Deuteronomy	
Leqah Tov Genesis 36:24	201	41	229
Mishnah		45	189
'Abot 3:14	201–229	306	176, 233
'Abot 3:11	301		
'Ed. 4:1:	75		

Targum Pseudo-Jonathan		Sanh. 2:6	82
2:25	224	Šabb. 1:16	75
Tosefta		Šabb. 15:9	295
Parah 7:4	79	Tanḥuma Bereshit 18	233

## PAPYRI AND INSCRIPTIONS

BGU		48	151, 163
IV 1097:11	83		
IV 1097:5	83	P.Amh. II 130: 9.12–13	83
IV 1141:31	83	P.Eleph. 13:4–5	83
IV 1141:40	83		
Cowley, Aramaic Papyri		P.Hib. I 40:2–6	83
9.8	152	P.Mich. Inv. 337	20
15	163		
15:23	152	P.Mil. 24:2	20
15:27	152	P.Oxy. III 520:2–4	83
Kraeling, Brookling Museum Aramaic Papyri		P.Oxy. VIII 1159:10.14	83
2	163	P.Oxy. XXXIV 2725:2.9.17	83
2:7–10	151		
7	163	P.Tebt. II 423:2–4	83
7.21–28	151	P.Tebt. III,1 768:21.25	83
7:30–40	151		
Grelot, Documents araméens d'Égypte		P.Yale I 42:22–23.32	83
9	152		
38	152, 163	PCZ III 59412:10.22	83
43	151, 163	PSI III 236:15.34.35	83

## APOSTOLIC AND CLASSICAL AUTHORS

1 Clement		Josephus	
33:1–7	226	A. J. 1.122–153	47
Clement of Alexandria		Ag. Ap. 2.152	263
Strom. 5.77.2	249	Ag. Ap. 2.121	140
Didache		Ag. Ap. 2.171	263
1:1–6:3	137	Ant. 16.1–5	301
8:2	268	Ant. 20	295
Diodorus Siculus		Ant. 20.41	296
Library of History 34:1	140	Ant. 20.51	269
Eupolemus		Ant. 20.101	269
Frg. 2	83	Ant. 4.287	291
Irenaeus		Ant. 5.209	291
Haer. 4.4.3	217	Ant. 6.83	291
		Ant. 7.366	291
		C. Ap. 2.218	176
		C. Ap. 1.37–41	94
		J.W. 2.163	176

J.W. 3:375	176	QE 2:39	217
J.W. 7:45	271	QG 3:11a	217, 231
Philo		Sacr. 5	217, 231
Agr. 100	217	Somn. 1:181	217, 230
Alleg. Interp. 1:108	183	Somn. 1:218	217
Alleg. Interp. 3:236	263	Spec. 1:81	216, 230
Det. 83–84	216	Spec. Laws 2.82	263
Ebr. 140	217	Spec. Laws 1:279	13
Fug. 56	217	Spec. Laws 2:204	13
Fug. 59	217, 231	Virt. 205	231
Her. 35	217	Seneca	
Her. 93	13	Epist. 41.2	249
Her. 230–231	216	Tacitus	
Leg. 1:43	235	Ann. 15:44	140
Leg. 1:31–32	216	Theophilus	
Migr. 1:118.122	45	Autol.	217
Migr. 89–93	295		
Mos. 2:165	13		
Mos. 2:61	217, 230		
Opif. 134	216, 230		
Opif. 135	217, 230		
Plant. 45	230		



## INDEX OF MODERN AUTHORS

- Abegg, M. G. 53, 70, 72-73, 93, 116  
 Adams, S. L. 154  
 Adewuya, J. A. 10  
 Aitken, J. A. 220  
 Aland, K. 85, 217  
 Aletti, J.-N. 24  
 Alexander, P. S. 91  
 Allegro, J. M. 28, 53, 59, 73, 145, 199  
 Allison, D. C. 321  
 Alonso-Schökel, I. 21  
 Amadi-Azuogu, C. A. 55  
 Amador, D. H. 5  
 Amitai, J. 69  
 Anderson, G. 42  
 Assmann, J. 189  
 Avemarie, F. 171, 180, 209, 226, 228-229,  
     232-233, 287  
 Avery-Peck, A. J. 277-278, 282  
 Baarda, T. 4  
 Bachmann, M. 53, 69-70, 73, 75-79  
 Baillet, M. 34, 188, 193  
 Bakhtine, M. 18, 48  
 Balz, H. 113  
 Bar-Asher Siegal, E. A. 72  
 Bar-Asher, M. 191  
 Barclay, J. M. G. 18, 38, 70  
 Barthes, R. 74  
 Baumgarten, J. A. 192  
 Baumgarten, J. M. 57, 83, 86, 222, 239,  
     262, 299  
 Baus, K. 111  
 Beale, G. K. 278  
 Beck, C. H. 172  
 Becker, B. 265  
 Becker, J. 60, 187, 227-228, 239, 316  
 Becker, M. 323  
 Beentjes, P. C. 220  
 Beker, J. C. 309, 313, 315-317, 321, 326  
 Ben-Dov, J. 86  
 Benoit, P. 131, 148, 150  
 Bergmeier, R. 77  
 Bernstein, M. 53, 57, 70, 74, 152, 154, 239  
 Berrin, S. L. 59  
 Bertone, J. A. 176, 187-188  
 Best, E. 183, 194  
 Betz, H. D. 2-3, 8, 60, 172  
 Beyer, K. 266  
 Bhatia, T. K. 267  
 Bieringer, R. 2, 4-5, 174, 217  
 Billerbeck, P. 172, 191  
 Bird, M. F. 77  
 Black, M. 238, 313  
 Blackwell, B. C. 211-212, 215, 225, 267  
 Blaschke, A. 301-302  
 Blass, F. 213  
 Blinzer, J. 2  
 Blum, E. 231  
 Boer, M. de 317, 322  
 Bonnafous, S. 19  
 Borg, M. 321  
 Botterweck, G. J. 90  
 Bovon, F. 229  
 Bowley, J. E. 93  
 Boyarin, D. 52  
 Brändel, M. 114  
 Brandenburger, E. 215  
 Brandon, G. F. 309  
 Braun, H. 126, 237-239, 311  
 Brawley, R. L. 77  
 Breytenbach, C. 55  
 Brin, G. 152, 157, 168  
 Bromiley, G. W. 99, 313, 321  
 Brooke, G. J. 1, 10-11, 17, 28, 45, 53, 70-71, 73,  
     82, 180, 195, 239, 301  
 Broshi, M. 157, 305  
 Brown, R. E. 25, 238  
 Brownlee, W. H. 65, 203  
 Bruce, F. F. 113, 257  
 Bultmann, R. 177, 184  
 Burchard, C. 82, 182, 239  
 Burrows, M. 65  
 Busch, A. 227  
 Byrne, B. 188  
 Campbell, D. 320  
 Cancik, H. 70, 146  
 Caneday, A. 56

- Caquot, A. 42-43, 98  
 Carmignac, J. 23, 31, 145  
 Carson, D. A. 60  
 Casey, T. G. 17, 240  
 Caudill, E. M. 312  
 Chapman, G. 2, 25, 65, 148, 195  
 Charaudeau, P. 18  
 Charles, R. H. 89, 183, 185, 187, 312  
 Charlesworth, J. H. 28, 89, 91, 120, 147, 180,  
 222, 238-239, 251, 311  
 Chazon, E. 11, 83, 153, 193, 195, 221, 273, 307  
 Chesnutt, R. D. 182  
 Chester, A. 181  
 Chilton, B. D. 277-278, 282  
 Christiansen, E. J. 297, 300  
 Christophersen, A. 239  
 Ciampa, R. E. 21, 25  
 Clark, G. R. 3, 7, 53, 55, 69-70, 90-91, 112,  
 172, 177, 195, 210, 240, 251, 274, 310,  
 313, 322  
 Clements, R. A. 86, 153, 182, 307  
 Cohen, S. J. D. 296, 300  
 Collange, J.-F. 110, 117  
 Collins, J. J. 76, 128, 156, 179-180, 258, 277,  
 279-280, 282-283, 286-287, 312, 317,  
 322  
 Colpe, C. 215  
 Cook, E. M. 93  
 Coppens, J. 257  
 Corsani, B. 7, 25  
 Cotton, H. M. 262, 264-265  
 Coulot, C. 123, 135, 137, 140  
 Cowley, A. 152, 163  
 Cranfield, C. E. B. 172, 177  
 Cross, F. M. 57, 91, 214, 217, 246, 314, 316  
 Crossan, J. D. 321  
 Cullmann, O. 314  
 Curtis, A. H. W. 11  
 Dahmen, U. 90, 232  
 Dautzenberg, G. 211  
 Davies, P. R. 33, 156, 171-172, 189, 238, 279,  
 284, 286-287, 313  
 Davis, S. K. 309  
 Debrunner, A. 213  
 Deines, R. 217  
 Deissmann, A. 112  
 Dempsey, D. 81  
 Dibelius, M. 242  
 Dietz, W. R. 234  
 Dietzfelbinger, C. 211  
 Díez Macho, A. 226  
 Diezinger, W. 192  
 Dimant, D. 2, 17, 61, 153, 156, 238-239, 252,  
 273  
 Dochhorn, J. 220, 223, 226, 233  
 Dodd, C. H. 321  
 Doering, L. 35, 69, 71, 83-84, 86, 166  
 Doeve, J. W. 36  
 Doigne, C. 57  
 Donfried, K. P. 126  
 Doob Sakenfeld, K. 90  
 Doudna, G. L. 59  
 Dreytza, M. 248  
 Duff, B. 212  
 Dunderberg, I. 53, 69  
 Dunn, D. G. 21, 30, 37-38, 46, 51, 53, 69-70,  
 72-73, 78, 147, 172, 176-177, 183, 191,  
 196, 268-269, 313, 318-319, 321, 326  
 Dupont-Sommer, A. 96, 98, 120, 130, 145  
 Eberhardt, G. 231  
 Eckstein, H.-J. 211  
 Edwards, J. 266-267  
 Egger, W. 74  
 Ego, B. 73  
 Eisenman, R. H. 238  
 Elgvin, T. 131-132, 259, 282  
 Elledge, C. 155  
 Elliger, K. 65  
 Ellis, E. E. 53, 69  
 Eltester, F.-W. 215  
 Elwolde, J. F. 181, 220, 265  
 Engberg-Pedersen, T. 172  
 Eshel, H. 249, 265, 305  
 Evans, C. A. 179  
 Fabry, H.-J. 90, 232, 248-249  
 Falk, D. K. 34, 195, 221, 301  
 Farmer, W. R. 313  
 Fee, G. D. 244  
 Filson, F. V. 314  
 Fischer, I. 220  
 Fitzmyer, J. A. 2, 13, 25, 30-31, 37, 42, 51,  
 57, 73, 89, 156, 162, 172, 174, 179, 191,  
 238, 269  
 Flanagan, N. 117  
 Fletcher-Louis, C. H. T. 220-223  
 Flint, P. W. 25, 30, 51, 53, 89, 264  
 Flusser, D. 30, 33-34, 70, 146, 171, 174, 179,  
 191  
 Fraade, S. D. 71, 74, 79  
 Freedman, D. N. 312  
 Frey, J. 34, 89, 174, 179, 237-238, 240-245,  
 247, 250, 258, 297, 323

- Friedrich, J. 60, 99, 110, 171, 209  
 Frishman, J. 221  
 Fuller, R. 69, 152, 313  
 Funk, R. W. 321  
 Gamble, H. Y. 85  
 García-Martínez, F. 120  
 Garlington, D. B. 310  
 Garnet, P. 31  
 Gärtner, B. 2  
 Gathercole, S. J. 70, 73, 76  
 Geoffrion, T. C. 113  
 Gielen, M. 209, 211-212, 224, 234  
 Ginsburger, D. 53  
 Glessmer, U. 86  
 Glueck, N. 90  
 Gnilka, J. 2-3, 14, 110, 117-118  
 Goldblatt, D. 277  
 Goldin, J. 227  
 Goodman, M. 45-46, 301  
 Gottschalk, A. 90  
 Gow, A. S. F. 266  
 Grappe, C. 109, 138  
 Graystone, G. 257  
 Green, G. L. 113  
 Greenberg, M. 179  
 Greenfield, J. C. 150, 249  
 Gregory, B. 39-40, 43, 217  
 Grelot, P. 70, 146-147, 151-152, 163  
 Gripentrog, S. 240, 297  
 Groß, W. 210  
 Grossman, M. L. 71, 284, 294  
 Grundmann, W. 65, 110-112  
 Guilbert, P. 31  
 Gundry, R. H. 174  
 Gunkel, H. 242  
 Gunneweg, A. H. J. 248  
 Güttgemanns, E. 117-118  
 Haacker, K. 224  
 Habermann, A. M. 66, 214  
 Hacham, N. 306  
 Hafemann, S. J. 318  
 Hahn, F. 243  
 Hahne, H. A. 310  
 Halperin, D. J. 57  
 Halpern-Amaru, B. 307  
 Hanson, P. 312  
 Hardin, J. K. 55  
 Harl, M. 57  
 Harlow, D. C. 76  
 Harrington, D. J. 131-132  
 Harrison, J. R. 212, 220, 223-224, 234  
 Hartman, L. 85  
 Harvey, G. 7, 278, 283, 285  
 Havrelock, R. 46  
 Hawthorne, G. F. 111-113, 117, 196  
 Hay, D. M. 217, 230  
 Healey, J. F. 266  
 Heckel, U. 100  
 Heger, P. 159  
 Heil, C. 2, 60, 180, 223  
 Heininger, B. 244  
 Hempel, C. 34, 72, 82-83, 146, 158, 174, 250, 283  
 Hengel, M. 57, 70, 86, 146, 232, 241, 245, 296  
 Hennecke, E. 312  
 Hezser, C. 84  
 Hietanen, M. 55  
 Hilhorst, A. 13-14, 222, 291  
 Höffken, P. 248  
 Høgenhaven, J. 28  
 Hogeterp, A. L. A. 9-10, 23, 29, 232, 243, 261, 283, 285, 291-292  
 Hollander, H. W. 185, 187  
 Holmén, T. 156  
 Holtz, G. 282-283, 286  
 Holtz, T. 114, 126  
 Hooker, M. D. 118, 126  
 Hoover, R. W. 321  
 Hopkins, J.-D. 299, 309  
 Horgan, M. 65  
 Houtman, A. 198  
 Howard, G. 214  
 Howard, W. F. 274  
 Hubbard, M. V. 200  
 Hübner, H. 25, 244  
 Hultgren, S. J. 5, 13, 217-218  
 Jackson, B. S. 158  
 Jaffé, D. 47, 307  
 Jaffee, M. S. 78-79  
 Janowski, B. 210  
 Janssen, C. 213  
 Jepsen, A. 90  
 Jeremias, G. 126  
 Jervell, J. 215  
 Jewett, R. 25, 172, 177, 187, 212, 224  
 Johnson, S. E. 223, 261  
 Jonge, M. de 185, 187  
 Joüon, P. 40  
 Kaiser, O. 61, 85, 210, 221  
 Kamlah, E. 33  
 Kampen, J. 53, 70, 74, 152, 158, 239



- Kapera, Z. J. 71  
 Käsemann, E. 60, 177, 192, 194, 313-317, 321  
 Kertelge, K. 60  
 Kim, C. H. 195  
 Kister, M. 71, 132, 153, 155, 157, 159, 166, 171,  
 174, 176, 181-183, 189-190, 198, 204, 217,  
 222, 233  
 Klauck, H.-J. 80, 82, 85  
 Klein, A. 252  
 Kleine, W. 5  
 Klijn, A. F. J. 4  
 Klinzing, G. 2  
 Koch, R. 248  
 Kollmann, B. 244  
 Konradt, M. 239  
 Kottsieper, I. 238  
 Kraeling, E. G. 151, 163  
 Kraft, R. G. 113  
 Kratz, R. G. 80, 252  
 Kraus, H.-J. 179  
 Krauter, S. 227  
 Kreitzer, J. 310, 312  
 Krentz, E. 113  
 Krupp, M. 41  
 Kugel, J. L. 40-42, 182, 188  
 Kugler, R. A. 190  
 Kuhn, H.-W. 2, 17, 34, 51, 53, 60-61, 70,  
 73, 89, 123, 125-127, 129, 135-137, 180,  
 239, 311  
 Kuhn, K. G. 33, 171, 179, 191, 194  
 Kümmel, W. 321  
 Lambrecht, J. 4-5, 8-9, 13-14, 211-212  
 Lange, A. 34, 73, 86, 174, 223, 250, 256  
 Lapide, P. 237  
 Larue, G. A. 90  
 Lee, S. 41, 211  
 Legasse, S. 126, 128, 138, 140  
 Lella, A. A. Di 40, 220  
 Levenson, J. D. 40-41  
 Levinson, J. 191  
 Levison, J. R. 176, 178, 216, 218, 220-221,  
 223, 226, 230-233, 237, 242, 244-245,  
 249, 259-260  
 Lewis, S. M. 312  
 Licht, J. 112, 176, 178, 199, 209  
 Lichtenberger, H. 28, 34, 70, 146, 174, 180,  
 222, 227, 229, 232, 250, 310  
 Liess, K. 231  
 Lifshitz, B. 191  
 Lim, T. 8, 17, 25, 29, 258  
 Lindars, B. 11  
 Loader, W. 132  
 Lohmeyer, E. 110, 112  
 Lohse, E. 66, 120, 224, 234  
 Longenecker, B. W. 269, 310  
 Lorenzen, S. 212  
 Lüdemann, H. 235  
 Machiela, D. A. 42  
 Mack, B. 321  
 MacRae, G. W. 85  
 Maher, M. 224  
 Maier, J. 120  
 Maingueneau, D. 18  
 Makiello, P. 45  
 Malherbe, A. J. 110-111, 114  
 Mandel, P. 191  
 Mann, J. 204  
 Marböck, J. 220  
 Marcus, J. 317  
 Marguerat, D. 11, 126, 128, 140  
 Marrxen, W. 133  
 Martin, R. P. 60, 70, 111-114, 117, 146, 196,  
 241, 296, 309  
 Martyn, J. L. 25, 38, 313, 316-317  
 Mason, E. F. 36, 72, 147  
 Mason, S. 177  
 Matlock, B. R. 77, 312-313, 320, 322  
 McEleney, N. J. 296  
 Meier, J. P. 163-164, 168, 244  
 Mell, U. 239  
 Merklein, H. 218  
 Metso, S. 91, 93, 250  
 Milik, J. T. 150  
 Millar, F. 313  
 Mittmann-Richert, U. 86  
 Monnickendam, Y. 177  
 Montgomery, J. A. 100, 321  
 Montgomery, W. 309, 321  
 Moo, D. 172, 174, 177  
 Morag, S. 265  
 Moreau, J.-C. 261  
 Morgenstern, M. 217, 265  
 Morris, L. 133  
 Mosis, R. 37, 61  
 Moule, C. F. D. 313  
 Moulton, J. H. 274  
 Müller, U. B. 239  
 Muraoka, T. 40, 99-100, 156, 181, 220, 265  
 Murphy-O'Connor, J. 2-4, 9, 13, 89, 171,  
 194, 237, 267-268  
 Mussner, F. 21, 195  
 Myers, S. E. 215

- Najman, H. 40  
 Nathan, E. 4, 183, 189, 227-228  
 Nebe, G. W. 265  
 Nelson, R. D. 57, 111  
 Neusner, J. 277-278, 282  
 Neve, L. 179  
 Newsom, C. A. 18, 22, 32, 131, 254  
 Nickelsburg, G. W. E. 85, 180-181, 232, 312  
 Niclas, T. 181  
 Niebuhr, K.-W. 217, 313  
 Nielsen, E. 57  
 Nitzan, B. 65  
 Nolland, J. 296  
 Noort, E. 38, 62  
 Notley, R. S. 265  
 Nötscher, F. 257  
 Novenson, M. 310  
 O'Brien, P. T. 111, 118, 200  
 Öhler, M. 323  
 Onwuka, P. C. 55  
 Oppenheimer, A. 295  
 Page, D. L. 266  
 Paige, T. 196  
 Pardee, D. N. 81  
 Parry, D. W. 283  
 Pate, C. M. 290  
 Paul, A. 2  
 Paul, S. M. 38, 188  
 Pearson, B. A. 128  
 Pécheux, M. 18  
 Perrin, N. 321  
 Pesch, O. H. 60  
 Pfitzner, V. C. 112, 114  
 Philip, F. 245  
 Philonenko, M. 98, 130, 281  
 Pilhofer, P. 73  
 Piñero, A. 14  
 Pinnick, A. 83  
 Pokorný, P. 100  
 Porter, E. 164, 310  
 Puech, É. 13-14, 35-36, 45, 53, 58, 72-73, 76,  
     80, 87, 113, 116, 133-134, 143, 147, 155,  
     159, 161, 169, 180, 232, 270, 281, 293  
 Pustet, F. 2  
 Qimron, E. 53, 58, 69-70, 75, 79, 82, 86, 91,  
     147, 156-157, 195-196, 199, 202, 251  
 Rabin, C. 30  
 Räisänen, H. 53, 69, 278, 282, 288, 293-294  
 Rapa, R. K. 55  
 Rappaport, U. 2, 17, 61, 156, 239, 273  
 Raurell, F. 120  
 Rausch, T. P. 321  
 Rehkopf, F. 213  
 Reicke, B. 261  
 Reinhardt, A. 86  
 Reiterer, F. V. 181  
 Reitzenstein, R. 113  
 Renaud, B. 21  
 Rendsburg, G. A. 264  
 Rennes, J. 19-20, 48-49  
 Reumann, J. 110, 113, 117  
 Reventlow, H. G. 61  
 Rey, J.-S. 17, 32, 76, 132-133, 153, 159, 237  
 Rigaux, B. 133, 136, 140  
 Ringgren, H. 21, 90  
 Ritchie, W. C. 267  
 Roberts, C. H. 20  
 Roo, J. C. H. de 70, 73, 75, 146  
 Rothschild, C. K. 242  
 Rowland, R. 322  
 Rowley, H. H. 312  
 Rüger, H. P. 189  
 Russell, D. S. 312  
 Rütterswörden, U. 57  
 Ruzer, S. 183, 189  
 Safrai, S. 191  
 Sanders, E. P. 1, 30, 51, 89, 181, 189, 223, 295  
 Sanderson, J. E. 11  
 Sandmel, S. 238  
 Sänger, D. 239  
 Schäfer, P. 70, 146, 232, 234, 295-296  
 Schaller, B. 217  
 Schiffman, L. H. 116, 156, 200, 232, 239,  
     265, 282-283, 286  
 Schlegel, J. 243  
 Schlenke, B. 90  
 Schliesser, B. 38-39, 44  
 Schlueter, C. J. 128  
 Schmeller, T. 7, 210-212  
 Schmidt, J. M. 288, 312  
 Schneemelcher, W. 312  
 Schneider, G. 113  
 Schnelle, U. 78, 244-245  
 Schnider, W. 80  
 Schofield, A. 147, 232  
 Schrage, W. 213, 220  
 Schreiner, T. R. 248, 321  
 Schüle, A. 209-210  
 Schuller, E. 34, 63, 190, 195, 202, 223, 253,  
     301  
 Schulz, S. 60  
 Schunck, K.-D. 248

- Schürer, E. 295, 313  
 Schürmann, H. 136  
 Schwanz, P. 215, 217, 224  
 Schwartz, D. R. 14, 47, 81, 86, 112, 182, 222,  
 240, 295, 297, 300, 306  
 Schweitzer, A. 309, 321  
 Schweizer, E. 174, 176, 183, 188-189  
 Schwemer, A. M. 245  
 Schwindt, R. 216  
 Scott, J. M. 185, 187-188, 279, 282, 289,  
 291-292  
 Scroggs, R. 192, 225, 234  
 Seely, D. R. 195, 200, 301  
 Seemann, H. 129  
 Segal, A. 52  
 Segal, M. Z. 220  
 Seifrid, M. A. 61  
 Sekki, A. E. 248, 251-252  
 Sellin, G. 216-218  
 Shatzman, I. 300  
 Shemesh, A. 155  
 Silva, M. 117  
 Sjöberg, E. 182, 200  
 Skehan, P. W. 11, 40, 220, 264  
 Smith, B. D. 179  
 Smith, J. E. 132  
 Smith, M. 306  
 Soards, M. L. 317  
 Söding, T. 244  
 Son, S.-W. A. 53, 69  
 Southwell, P. J. M. 65  
 Spicq, C. 20  
 Sprinkle, P. M. 77  
 Stadel, C. 265  
 Standaert, B. 165  
 Standhartinger, A. 224, 226  
 Stanley, C. D. 28, 310  
 Stegemann, E. W. 128  
 Stegemann, H. 63, 87, 156, 223, 253  
 Stendahl, K. 33, 85, 171, 261  
 Stenger, W. 80  
 Sterling, G. E. 215  
 Steudel, A. 47, 58, 73, 76, 80, 87, 180, 281  
 Stoebe, H. J. 90  
 Stone, M. E. 11, 249  
 Strecker, G. 312  
 Strolz, W. 232  
 Stroumsa, G. 183, 189, 201  
 Strugnell, J. 28, 53, 69, 71, 73, 75, 79, 82, 86,  
 131-132, 147  
 Stuckenbruck, L. 120, 309, 313  
 Stuhlmacher, P. 60, 318  
 Sturm, R. 317  
 Sukenik, E. L. 63, 253  
 Sussmann, Y. 70  
 Talmon, S. 86  
 Tannehill, R. C. 177, 205  
 Taylor, J. 17, 240  
 Teicher, J. L. 238  
 Teubner, B. G. 113  
 Thiessen, M. 295-296, 298-299  
 Thomas, S. I. 60, 111, 147  
 Thompson, T. W. 242  
 Thornton, C.-J. 241  
 Thraede, K. 84-85  
 Thrall, M. E. 2-3, 210-211  
 Tietz, C. 217  
 Tigchelaar, E. J. C. 13-14, 22, 28, 38, 54, 58,  
 62, 80, 87, 120, 175, 180, 198, 249, 263,  
 272-273, 281, 291  
 Todorov, T. 18  
 Toit, A. du 55  
 Töpelmann, A. 33, 177, 215  
 Tov, E. 38, 86, 200-201, 239, 265  
 Trapp, M. 81  
 Trobisch, D. 85  
 Tso, M. K. M. 262  
 Turnage, M. 265  
 Tzoref, S. 265  
 Ulrich, E. 11, 71, 147, 264, 283  
 Urbach, E. E. 192  
 VanderKam, J. C. 25, 30, 36, 44, 51, 71, 86-  
 87, 89, 116, 147, 185-186, 200, 232, 239  
 Verheyden, J. 181  
 Vermes, G. 91, 120, 313  
 Vielhauer, P. 312  
 Vincent, M. R. 112  
 Vögtle, A. 33  
 Vollenweider, S. 209, 212, 218, 224  
 Volz, P. 242  
 Vouga, F. 78  
 Waddell, J. A. 310  
 Walker, W. O. 6  
 Wanamaker, C. A. 110  
 Watson, E. W. 188  
 Watson, F. 70, 74, 77  
 Watt, J. G. van der 247  
 Watt, J. M. 266  
 Webb, W. J. 6  
 Wedderburn, A. J. M. 172, 176, 178, 180,  
 182, 201, 239  
 Weinle, H. 242

- Weinfeld, M. 195  
Weissenberg, H. Von 53, 71, 79-80, 82  
Weissenrieder, A. 211  
Wernberg-Møller, P. 222-223, 251  
Werner, W. 5, 80, 309  
Wibbing, S. 33  
Wick, P. 74  
Wieder, N. 198  
Willitts, J. 277, 285-286  
Wilson, T. A. 55, 217  
Winter, J. G. 20, 265  
Wischmeyer, O. 240  
Wise, M. O. 238  
Witt Burton, E. de 242  
Witte, M. 210  
Wold, B. G. 132  
Wolter, M. 244-245, 249  
Worthington, J. D. 215  
Woyke, J. 77  
Wright, N. T. 53, 69, 74, 310, 322  
Xeravits, G. 250  
Yadin, Y. 1, 30, 57-58, 150, 156, 261, 265  
Yardeni, A. 150, 262, 264-265  
Youtie, H. C. 20  
Zalkinsan, Y. 53  
Zeitlin, S. 301-302  
Zenger, E. 248  
Zetterholm, M. 310  
Zimmerli, W. 98-100  
Zobel, H.-J. 90, 94-95, 98-99  
Zurli, E. 31, 60

