SIMON J. JOSEPH

Jesus, Q, and the Dead Sea Scrolls

Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2. Reihe
333

Mohr Siebeck

Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament · 2. Reihe

Herausgeber / Editor
Jörg Frey (Zürich)

Mitherausgeber / Associate Editors
Friedrich Avemarie (Marburg)
Markus Bockmuehl (Oxford)
James A. Kelhoffer (Uppsala)
Hans-Josef Klauck (Chicago, IL)

333

Simon J. Joseph

Jesus, Q, and the Dead Sea Scrolls

A Judaic Approach to Q

Mohr Siebeck

Simon J. Joseph, born 1966; 2000 BA; 2003 MA Religious Studies, New York University; 2010 PhD, New Testament, Claremont Graduate University; currently Adjunct Professor, Dept. of Religion, California Lutheran University.

e-ISBN 978-3-16-152288-8
ISBN 978-3-16-152120-1
ISSN 0340-9570 (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament, 2. Reihe)

Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliographie; detailed bibliographic data are available on the Internet at *http://dnb.dnb.de*.

© 2012 by Mohr Siebeck, Tübingen, Germany. www.mohr.de

This book may not be reproduced, in whole or in part, in any form (beyond that permitted by copyright law) without the publisher's written permission. This applies particularly to reproductions, translations, microfilms and storage and processing in electronic systems.

The book was printed by Laupp & Göbel in Nehren on non-aging paper and bound by Buchbinderei Nädele in Nehren.

Printed in Germany.

For Jennifer

Preface

This monograph is a thorough revision of my Ph. D. dissertation, "Q, the Essenes, and the Dead Sea Scrolls: A Study in Christian Origins," submitted to the School of Religion at Claremont Graduate University in April, 2010. Special thanks are due to James M. Robinson, who directed my Q studies at Claremont. Dr. Robinson kindly supported and encouraged my work for the International Q Project and the Institute for Antiquity and Christianity on the Q 12:22b–31 database for the *Documenta Q* series and graciously described my dissertation project as reaching "a new stage in the academic study of first-century Judaism and Christianity." Special thanks are also due to Vincent L. Wimbush, whose support and encouragement were instrumental in my pursuit of doctoral research while I was completing a Master's degree in Religious Studies at New York University. Dr. Wimbush served as the second reader for my Master's thesis on Asceticism and the Jesus Tradition in Q, and encouraged my engagement with the political and ideological implications of contemporary biblical scholarship. I am also grateful to Kristin de Troyer, whose ability to navigate Q Studies, Second Temple Judaism, and postmodern critical theory with wit and grace was inspiring. Her careful readings and comments were invaluable. Thanks also go to Karen L. Torjesen for her assistance throughout my coursework and qualifying exams and for serving as the third member of my committee.

Special thanks also go to John S. Kloppenborg, who discussed this project with me in its earliest stages and provided extensive notes and constructive criticism on an early draft of my dissertation. I would also like to thank Dr. Jörg Frey for recommending this manuscript for publication in Mohr Siebeck's *Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament* 2 series. Dr. Frey's comparative work on the Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament is a model of methodological clarity and precision. Thanks also go to Dr. Henning Ziebritzki, for his assistance in swiftly bringing this project to publication, and to Tanja Idler, for her careful and professional attention to detail. I would be remiss here not to thank Frank E. Peters for first directing my studies in Q and the New Testament at New York University, and Lawrence H. Schiffman, for assisting my research on Second Temple Judaism and the Dead Sea Scrolls. I would like to thank Bruce D. Chilton for reading

the manuscript and for his encouraging comments; Dale C. Allison, Jr., for a memorable conversation in Boston during the annual Society of Biblical Literature meeting in November, 2008; and Dennis R. MacDonald, for having the New Testament Graeca Seminar translate Josephus' account of the Essenes. James Robinson, Dennis MacDonald, Bradley Root, Arthur Droge, and Steve Mason were kind enough to provide access to their forthcoming publications. Claremont Graduate University awarded this project a CGU Dissertation Grant for the 2008–2009 academic year. This book is dedicated to my wife, Jennifer, whose love and support made it possible.

July, 2012 Simon J. Joseph

Table of Contents

Preface VII

Chapter 1. Introduction and Methodology 1

1.1 Introduction 1
1.2 On the Comparative Method 5
1.3 Q, the Essenes, and the Dead Sea Scrolls 22
1.4 Conclusion 32

Chapter 2. Reconstructing Q 33

2.1 Introduction 33
2.2 The Existence of Q 34
2.3 A History of Research on Q 38
2.4 The Ethnicity of Q 45
2.5 The Aramaic Substratum of Q 51
2.6 The Composition of Q 64
2.7 The Community of Q 70
2.8 The Provenance of Q 74
2.9 The Social Structure(s) of Q 87
2.10 Conclusion 93

Chapter 3. Qumran, the Essenes, and the Dead Sea Scrolls 94

3.1 Introduction 94
3.2 The Identity of the Qumran Community 95
3.3 The Qumran Essene Hypothesis 102
3.4 Qumran, the Essenes, and the Enoch Tradition 118
3.5 Qumran Messianism 123
3.6 Conclusion 129

Chapter 4. Q, John the Baptist, and Jesus 130

4.1 Introduction 130
4.2 The Role of John the Baptist in Q 131
4.3 John and the Essenes 135
4.4 “More Than A Prophet?” 142
4.5 Conclusion 147

Chapter 5. The Eschatological Wisdom of the Beatitudes 149

5.1 Introduction 149
5.2 The Eschatological Wisdom of 4QInstruction 151
5.3 The Beatitudes (Q 6:20–23) 153
5.4 The Wisdom of 4QBeatitudes 159
5.5 Conclusion 161

Chapter 6. “The One Who Is To Come” 163

6.1 Introduction 163
6.2 The Reconstruction of Q 7:22 165
6.3 4Q521: Date, Genre, and Provenance 168

6.4 The Messiah of 4Q521 ... 172

6.5 Q 7:22 and 4Q521:
The Case for Literary Dependence ... 175

6.6 Conclusion ... 185

Chapter 7. Conclusion ... 187

Bibliography ... 191

Index of Ancient Sources ... 239

Index of Authors ... 252

Index of Subjects ... 259

Chapter 1

Introduction and Methodology

1.1 Introduction

"Judaism" and "Christianity" are commonly regarded as two distinct, separate categories and religions in biblical scholarship.[1] Yet the Jesus movement originated as a *Jewish* movement.[2] The relationship between Judaism and Christianity, therefore, is both complex and paradoxical and the (re)description of Christian origins has become a central site of debate in biblical studies.[3] The study of the relationship between Judaism and Christianity is a particularly pertinent example of how social and religious difference is constructed. Jonathan Z. Smith has shown that a "dichotomous agenda of division" has frequently been employed in the classification of religions, which tends to render such classifications "useless."[4] Smith has also drawn attention to the comparative process in relation to the construction of the "other."[5] For

---

[1] Some recent scholarship has begun to challenge this assumption. See Adam H. Becker and Annette Yoshiko Reed, eds., *The Ways that Never Parted: Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007); Daniel Boyarin, *Dying for God: Martyrdom and the Making of Christianity and Judaism* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1999); *Border Lines: The Partition of Judaeo-Christianity* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004); Stephen G. Wilson, *Related Strangers: Jews and Christians 70–170 C.E.* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995); Jacob Neusner, *Jews and Christians: The Myth of a Common Tradition* (Philadelphia: Trinity Press International, 1991).

[2] Jacob Neusner, *Judaism in the Beginning of Christianity* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984); Bruce Chilton and Jacob Neusner, *Judaism in the New Testament* (London: Routledge, 1995).

[3] See, for example, Ron Cameron and Merrill P. Miller, eds., *Redescribing Christian Origins* (SBLSymS 28; Atlanta: SBL, 2004); Elizabeth A. Castelli and Hal Taussig, eds., *Reimagining Christian Origins: A Colloquium Honoring Burton L. Mack* (Valley Forge: Trinity Press International, 1996); James G. Crossley, *Why Christianity Happened: A Sociohistorical Account of Christian Origins (26–50 CE)* (Louisville: Wesminster John Knox, 2006); Ward Blanton, *Displacing Christian Origins: Philosophy, Secularity, and the New Testament* (RP; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007).

[4] Jonathan Z. Smith, "Fences and Neighbors: Some Contours of Early Judaism," in *Imagining Religion: From Babylon to Jonestown* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982), 1–18, esp. 6.

[5] Jonathan Z. Smith, "What a Difference a Difference Makes," in *"To See Ourselves As Others See us": Christians, Jews, "Others" in Late Antiquity* (SH; eds. J. Neusner and E. S. Frerichs; Chico: Scholars, 1985), 3–48.

Smith, "Difference is not a matter of comparison between entities judged to be equivalent; rather, difference most frequently entails a hierarchy of prestige and ranking."[6] Distinctions are drawn between "near neighbors" and the "proximate other." Otherness is "a relativistic category," a "term of interaction," "a political and linguistic project, a matter of rhetoric and judgement."[7] Since the "other" is a socio-cultural construct, the greatest tension is located in cases where the other is perceived as being "*too-much-like-us*, or when he claims to *be-us*."[8] The problem is not so much with how to locate or place the "other," but rather how "to situate ourselves." The problem is not "otherness," but similarity. This is pressed home when we consider that Jews are thought of as being "near-Christians."[9] Ancient Jews, like many other groups, saw the world in bipolar terms, i.e., as Israel and the nations, Jews and Gentiles.[10] Daniel Boyarin argues that Paul constructed a set of binary oppositions in which "Christianity" became the symbolic religious marker of the universal, transcendent, and trans-local while Judaism assumed the role of the other, embodying the particular, the ethnic, the local.[11] Judaism was the "promise," Christianity the "fulfillment." Judaism had the "law," Christianity the "gospel." Judaism was "particularistic," Christianity "universal." The construction of the "hermeneutical Jew" also facilitated a contrast between Jews and Christians and shaped the history of Christian apologetics, sermons, heresiological works, commentaries, histories, historical fictions, martyr stories, and impe-

---

[6] Smith, "What a Difference a Difference Makes," 15, 16, with the result that constructed difference has often "supplied a justificatory element for a variety of ideological postures, ranging from xenophobia to exoticism, from travel, trade and exploration to military conquest, slavery and colonialism."

[7] Smith, "What a Difference a Difference Makes," 46.

[8] Smith, "What a Difference a Difference Makes," 47. See also William Scott Green, "Otherness Within: Towards a Theory of Difference in Rabbinic Judaism," in *"To See Ourselves As Others See us": Christians, Jews, "Others" in Late Antiquity* (eds. J. Neusner and E. S. Frerichs; Chico: Scholars, 1985), 50; Brian Stock, *The Implications of Literacy: Written Language and Models of Interpretation in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1983), 90; Jacob Neusner, ed., *Take Judaism, For Example: Studies Toward the Comparison of Religions* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983).

[9] Smith, "What a Difference a Difference Makes," 48.

[10] Shaye J. D. Cohen, *The Beginnings of Jewishness: Boundaries, Varieties, Uncertainties* (HCS 31; Berkeley, Calif: University of California Press, 1999), 1. See also Erich S. Gruen, "Jewish Perspectives on Greek Culture and Ethnicity" in *Ancient Perceptions of Greek Ethnicity* (ed. I. Malkin; Cambridge, Mass.: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 347–73; Tim Whitmarsh, *Greek Literature and the Roman Empire: The Politics of Imitation* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001). See also Edith Hall, *Inventing the Barbarian: Greek Self-Definition through Tragedy* (Oxford: Clarendon), 1989, 56–69.

[11] Daniel Boyarin, "Semantic Differences; or, "Judaism"/"Christianity," in *The Ways That Never Parted: Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages* (eds. A. H. Becker and A. Y. Reed; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007) , 65–85, esp. 73; *A Radical Jew: Paul and the Politics of Identity* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994), 14.

rial decrees.[12] Christianity was perceived as "superseding" Judaism.[13] The construction of Judaism in New Testament scholarship came to be rooted in a conception of Judaism as *antithetical* to Christianity.[14] Facilitated by the construction of a "parting of the ways" model that mirrored "the configuration of disciplinary boundaries," Judaism and Christianity came to be seen not as two mutually interrelated religious traditions, but as separate, oppositional paradigms.[15] The ancient invention of the "Jew" and "Judaism" emerged in the service of identity politics, social conflict, and "Christian" theology. The gentile constituency of the early Jesus movement came to regard itself as a new ἔθνος,[16] claiming that there was now "neither Judean nor Greek" ἐν χριστῷ.[17]

The separation between Judaism and Christianity was facilitated by the idea that Jews were a different ἔθνος from (gentile) Christians. Those "*Jewish* Christians" who maintained Judean practices *and* revered Jesus undermined the dichotomous theological construction of Jew/Christian and functioned as a constant reminder of the constructed opposites, blurred boundaries, and inherent hybridity of the new "Christian" ἔθνος. This is why both groups sought to expel such "heretics" from their midst: the "Christians" fighting the Gnostics and "Jewish Christians," the "Jews" rejecting their own as *minim*.

---

[12] Paula Fredriksen, "What 'Parting of the Ways'?: Jews, Gentiles, and the Ancient Mediterranean City," in *The Ways That Never Parted: Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages* (eds. A. H. Becker and A. Y. Reed; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007) , 35–63. On the hermeneutical Jew in patristic theology, see Ora Limor and Guy G. Stroumsa, eds., *Contra Iudaeos: Ancient and Medieval Polemics between Christians and Jews* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996); Graham N. Stanton and Guy G. Stroumsa, eds., *Tolerance and Intolerance in Early Judaism and Christianity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998); Judith Lieu, *Image and Reality: The Jews in the World of the Christians in the Second Century* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1996). Gregory Baum, introduction to *Faith and Fratricide: The Theological Roots of Anti-Semitism*, by Rosemary Radford Ruether (New York: Seabury, 1974), 1–22, esp. 12–13.

[13] Adolf von Harnack, *Die Mission und Ausbreitung des Christentums in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten* (2 vols.; 3d ed.; Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1915), 1:70–71; ET: *The Mission of Early Christianity* (trans. J. Moffatt; 2 vols; New York: G. P. Putnam, 1904-05), 1:81–82. For a critique of Harnack, see L. Michael White, "Adolf Harnack and the 'Expansion' of Early Christianity: A Reappraisal of Society History," *Second Century* 5 (1985–86): 97–127.

[14] E. P. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns in Religion* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977), 2.

[15] Becker & Reed, *The Ways that Never Parted*, 20; John J. Collins, "Cult and Culture: The Limits of Hellenization in Judea," in *Hellenism in the Land of Israel* (eds. J. J. Collins and G. E. Sterling; Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 2001), 38–61, esp. 38.

[16] Aristides, *Apol.* 2; Tertullian, *Ad Nat.* 8; *Scorp.* 10. See also Marcel Simon, *Verus Israel* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986), 107–11.

[17] David G. Horrell, "'No Longer Jew or Greek': Paul's Corporate Christology and the Construction of Christian Community," in *Christology, Controversy and Community: New Testament Essays in Honour of David R. Catchpole* (eds. D. G. Horrell and C. M. Tuckett; NovTSup 99; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 321–44, esp. 343.

Early Christians defined their boundaries in numerous ways. One way was the founding of a canon, a rule, or "standard." The creation of a canon excluded noncanonical texts and the communities that produced those texts. Jewish Christian texts did not survive because they did not contribute to a "Christian" identity defined in opposition to Judaism. The texts that did survive tended to support a sense of Christian difference.[18] Early Christianity is characterized by the creativity of its literary production.[19] Since the production of texts involves acts of power, exclusion, and inclusion, it is within the production of texts that identity is most prominently displayed. Texts not only construct identity, they also shape and are shaped by a community's self-understanding.[20] Texts construct worlds, and new textual worlds become part of the reality within and out of which new constructions are made.[21]

The New Testament documents the emergence of a new "Christian" identity. By the time the synoptics were written, a systematic "othering" of Jews had become a regular literary feature, if not a social event, of early Christianity. By the time of Justin, "Christian" self-definition was normative: Christians were not "Jews" and did not follow "Jewish" practices or observances. For early Christians, the role of the "other" was thus played, often unwittingly, by Jews.[22] The construction of Christian identity is therefore to be understood in relation to the separation between Judaism and Christianity.[23]

There is no need to document an age-old Christian dislike for things Jewish.[24] Christianity defined itself as different from Judaism,[25] and Judaism was made into the signifier of (that which was not) Christianity.[26] Jews, Jewish Christians and gentile Christians all claimed identity as "true Israel." It was inevitable that conflict would be the result of such contestation. It was also inevitable that those conflicts would become embedded in Christian discourse and biblical scholarship.[27] The study of the relationship between Judaism and

---

[18] Lieu, *Christian Identity*, 299.

[19] Lieu, *Christian Identity*, 48.

[20] Lieu, *Christian Identity*, 25–27.

[21] Lieu, *Christian Identity*, 61.

[22] Lieu, *Christian Identity*, 307.

[23] Lieu, *Christian Identity*, 3.

[24] Peter Richardson, David Granskou, eds., *Anti-Judaism in Early Christianity* (2 vols.; Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier: University Press, 1986); Rosemary Redford Ruether, *Faith and Fratricide: The Theological Roots of Anti-Semitism* (New York: Seabury, 1974), 64–116; Samuel Sandmel, *Anti-Semitism in the New Testament?* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1978); Charlotte Kleio, *Anti-Judaism in Christian Theology* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1978).

[25] John F. A. Sawyer, *Sacred Languages and Sacred Texts* (London: Routledge, 1999), 85.

[26] Susanna Heschel, *Abraham Geiger and the Jewish Jesus* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998), 21.

[27] Shawn Kelley, *Racializing Jesus: Race, Ideology, and the Formation of Modern Bibli-*

Christianity thus requires considerable sensitivity to the social, political, and theological implications involved in the comparative process.

1.2 On the Comparative Method

The comparative process is a fundamental characteristic of human intelligence, the basic method underlying classification, cognition and information processing.[28] It is the "omnipresent substructure of human thought" without which we could not speak, learn, perceive or reason.[29] Comparison has the capacity to help us see the world in new ways and make connections which often lead to scientific breakthroughs when new perspectives on familiar materials are reached.[30] In the field of religion, it also has the capacity to examine and explore many common elements of the human experience.[31] Unfortunately, comparative studies often appear deceptively simple.[32] Comparison

---

cal Scholarship (London: Routledge, 2002), 24, explores how Hegel's narrative of world history constructed a binary opposition between Jews and Christians in order to assuage Europe's anxiety about its own origins.

[28] Jonathan Z. Smith, "Adde Parvum Parvo Magnus Acervus Erit," *HR* 11 (1971): 67–90, esp. 67. See also *Map is Not Territory: Studies in the Histories of Religions* (SJLA 23; Leiden: Brill, 1978); *Imagining Religion: From Babylon to Jonestown* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982).

[29] Smith, "Adde Parvum," 67.

[30] Jonathan Z. Smith, *Drudgery Divine: On the Comparison of Early Christianities and the Religions of Late Antiquity* (JLCR 14/CSHJ; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990), viii. For Smith, progress is made in this "not so much by the uncovering of new facts or documents as by looking again with new perspectives on familiar materials." Alternative approaches often provide new insights that challenge our assumptions even when existing theories appear to account for much of the data before us. After all, it is frequently readings "against the grain" of accepted or common interpretations that expose the "gaps, breaks, inconsistencies and problems" which underlie ideologically or theologically driven readings of texts, and it is these gaps which are more interesting than the systematic structures. Consequently, we should not be afraid of scientific inquiry that breaks old rules. Throughout history, scientific advances have been made because certain scientists "decided not to be bound by certain 'obvious' methodological rules, or because they unwittingly broke them." See also Mieke Bal, *Death and Dissymmetry: The Politics of Coherence in the Book of Judges* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988), 34; Paul Feyerabend, *Against Method: Outline of an Anarchistic Theory of Knowledge* (New Jersey: Atlantic Highlands, 1988), 23. See also Thomas Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962).

[31] Charles H. Long, *Significations: Signs, Symbols, and Images in the Interpretation of Religion* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986), 141: "it is in the religious life of humankind that we are best able to discern the human mode of being."

[32] Jeffrey Carter, "Comparison in the History of Religions: Reflections and Critiques." *MTSR*, 16/ 1 (2004): 3–11, esp. 5, defines comparison as "the consideration of how two apparently distinct entities are similar and different for the purpose of determining the degree to

has often been used for apologetic purposes, to emphasize or suppress difference, affirm and/or deny relationship.[33] Comparative approaches have also been accused of misrepresentation and essentialism as well as suppression of cultural difference, neglect of historical context, superficiality, and impressionism.[34] As a result, comparative studies are often rejected in favor of culturally specific "area studies," where the object of study is limited to specific traditions in their historical context(s).[35]

Jonathan Z. Smith has called for a renewed focus not only on the history of the use of comparison in scholarship but on how to address the "deeper questions of method and the underlying implications of comparison" that many disciplines have ignored.[36] Since comparison is a fundamental expression of human intelligence, it does not seem that human beings, let alone scholars, can avoid comparison. The challenge is establishing sound criteria to facilitate methodologically legitimate comparisons.[37] Sound comparative study must balance and accommodate both the general and the particular,[38] recognizing

---

which they can be intellectually grouped or separated." Smith, "Adde," 67, also defines comparison as "the bringing together of two or more objects for the purpose of noting either similarity or dissimilarity."

[33] Some comparative approaches have been characterized by rationalist or universalist agendas. For example, James G. Frazer's *The Golden Bough*, an encyclopedic opus of world ritual and myth, attempts to document the universal (hence, pre-Christian) motif of the symbolic death and resurrection of the divine king. Similarly, Mircea Eliade proposed that religion is characterized by the use of universal patterns, symbols or motifs that correspond to a higher, transcendent reality known as "the sacred."

[34] Carter, "Comparison in the History of Religions," 3. For critiques, see Samuel Sandmel, "Parallelomania," *JBL* 81 (1962): 1–13 ; L. Michael White and John T. Fitzgerald, "Quod est comparandum: The Problem of Parallels," in *Early Christianity and Classical Culture: Comparative Studies in Honor of A. J. Malherbe* (eds. J. T. Fitzgerald, T. H. Olbricht and L. M. White; NovTSup 110; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 13–39; Shemaryahu Talmon, "The 'Comparative Method' in Biblical Interpretation–Principles and Problems," in *Congress Volume: Göttingen 1977*, VTSup 29; Leiden: Brill, 1978), 320–56; Jacob Neusner, "Contexts of Comparison: Reciprocally Reading Gospels' and Rabbis' Parables," in *The Missing Jesus*, 45–68.

[35] Smith, *Drudgery Divine*, vii. Smith notes how comparison has come to be "the sign of unscientific procedure, abjured in the name of responsibility towards the concrete specificity of their objects of study."

[36] Smith, "Adde," 90.

[37] Carter, "Comparison in the History of Religions," 6–7, argues that comparison requires theoretical justification because a parallel, "divorced from a conscious stipulation of theory is little more than happy coincidence, random relationship, insignificant noodling, and hence is easily criticized." As Carter notes, "*both* similarity *and* difference are at work in the cognitive process of categorization. Neither concept, neither 'similarity' nor 'difference,' can exclude the presence of the other because each requires a selection between possible entities, cognitive contents, or features of entities. It is in this selection process that we negotiate the complex possibilities of similarity and difference, consider alternatives, and ultimately stipulate which features constitute similarity and which do not."

[38] Jeffrey Carter, "Description is not Explanation: A Methodology of Comparison," *MTSR*

both precise points of reference while simultaneously affirming difference.[39] Accordingly, Smith calls for replacing the category of the "unique" with the recognition of distinctiveness and the affirmation of difference, an approach that "invites negotiation, classification and comparison, and avoids too easy a discourse of the 'same.'"[40] The comparative enterprise always involves "the stipulation of similarity and difference."[41]

For Smith, comparison does not seek the equation or identity of two things, but rather a "disciplined exaggeration" of two phenomena in order to shed light on unrecognized aspects of one or both items.[42] *Comparison requires the recognition of difference.* The scholar brings certain features of differences together and asks "*with respect to what*" is identity and difference being noted?[43] The essence of comparison "consists of a mixture of identity and difference."[44] While Smith recognizes that comparing texts, rituals and commu-

---

10/2 (1998): 133–148, esp. 133. Carter acknowledges "a problematic contrast between the concern for particularity . . . and a desire for generality . . . a sound comparative study somehow negotiates this contest and accommodates both the particular and the general.

[39] William E. Paden, "Elements of a New Comparativism," *MTSR* 8 (1996): 5–14. See also Shemaryahu Talmon, "The 'Comparative Method,'" in *Congress Volume*, *Göttingen 1977* (VT Sup 29; Leiden: Brill, 1978); *Scripture in Context: Essays on the Comparative Method* (eds. C. D. Evans, W. W. Hallo and J. B. White; PT 34; Pittsburgh: Pickwick, 1980).

[40] Smith, *Drudgery Divine*, 42.

[41] Carter, "Comparison in the History of Religions," 6.

[42] Smith, *Drudgery Divine*.

[43] Smith, *Drudgery Divine*, 51–52. Smith argues that comparison "brings differences together within the space of the scholar's mind . . . It is the scholar who makes their cohabitation – their 'sameness' – possible . . . (Comparison) "lifts out and strongly marks certain features within difference as being of possible intellectual significance."

[44] Smith identifies four "classes" of comparison: (1) cultural; (2) historical; (3) assimilation (diffusion, or borrowing); and (4) comparison as a hermeneutic device. According to Smith, these four classes of comparison correspond to four modes or styles of comparison: ethnographic, encyclopedic, morphological and evolutionary. The first class, cultural comparison, tends to simply describe cultural features, and is often "idiosyncratic, depending on intuition, a chance association" or limited knowledge. The second, historical (corresponding to encyclopedic) comparison, is often characterized by "contextless lists" held together by surface associations rather than careful, specific and meaningful comparisons. The third approach is characterized by "the noting of similarity . . . and the accounting for this similarity in terms of a process of borrowing." Often utilizing "diffusionist" theories, this approach tends to introduce historical frameworks into the comparative enterprise, usually by trying to get back to the earliest expression of a particular motif, idea or symbol. Hence high value is placed on pedigree. Naturally, this approach can be seen as threatening to those whose traditions proceed from earlier ones with "a clear sense of higher value and authenticity attached to the source and a sense of second handedness, of imitation, and even of fraud attached to the alleged borrower." Furthermore, "there is frequently a strong sense of in- and out-groups, of peoples from whom it is alright to have borrowed and peoples from whom one ought not (70)." The fourth class, comparison as a hermeneutical device, holds that a motif, symbol or custom found in one culture can be used as a key to interpret a similar one in another culture.

nities is as old as our earliest literary documents,[45] too much prior discussion on method neglects "methodological rigor in answering the fundamental question: 'when is a parallel a true parallel?'"[46] The majority of cases in the history of comparison involve a "subjective experience . . . projected as an objective connection through some theory of influence, diffusion, borrowing, or the like."[47] For Smith, this is "a process of working from a psychological association to an historical one; it is to assert that similarity and contiguity have causal effect." This is not science, but "magic."[48] Too much comparative study is "impressionistic" and lacks the methodological rigor attained in such fields as comparative law, literature, and philology.[49]

Smith's critical study of comparative method is especially helpful in the study of Christian origins for he has shown that genealogical comparisons are often dismissed or ignored in order to preserve a privileged position for early Christianity, i.e., to make Christianity *incomparable*.[50] The "unique" does not allow for comparison.[51] Smith suggests that instead of attempting to establish Christianity's "uniqueness," comparative studies should develop "a discourse of 'difference,'" which would also avoid discourses of the "'same.'"[52] Smith highlights one of the most difficult problems facing New Testament scholars:

Such comparisons are used to argue for either a common archetype or to justify comparing similar stages of human development.

[45] Jonathan Z. Smith, *Map Is Not Territory: Studies in the History of Religions* (SJLA 23; Leiden: Brill, 1978), 240.

[46] Smith, *Map Is Not Territory,* 241, n. 3. On parallels, see Herbert J. Rose, *Concerning Parallels* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1934); Henri Frankfort, *The Problem of Similarity in Ancient Near Eastern Religions* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1951); Bruce M. Metzger, "Considerations of Method in the Study of Mystery Religions," *HTR* 48 (1955): 1–20; Morton Smith, *Tannaitic Parallels to the Gospels* (SBLMS 6; Philadelphia: Society of Biblical Literature, 1951).

[47] Jonathan Z. Smith, "In Comparison a Magic Dwells," in *Imagining Religion: From Babylon to Jonestown* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982), 22.

[48] Smith, "In Comparison a Magic Dwells," 22.

[49] In historical and comparative linguistics, the comparative method is used for studying the development of languages, to reconstruct prehistoric phases of languages and to explore hypothetical relationships between languages. Developed over the course of the nineteenth century, the comparative method was (and is) used as a means of establishing genetic and genealogical relationships between language systems. There are a series of methodological steps required for demonstrating genetic relationship, which include the identification of cognates, determining their sound correspondences, reconstructing proto-phonemes and examining the systems typologically.

[50] Smith, *Drudgery Divine*, 48: "from a standpoint of protecting the privileged position of early Christianity, it is only genealogical comparisons that are worthy of note, typically, insistently to be denied." See also John Hick and Paul F. Knitter, *The Myth of Christian Uniqueness: Toward a Pluralistic Theology of Religions* (Maryknoll: Orbis, 1987).

[51] Smith, *Drudgery Divine*, 116.

[52] Smith, *Drudgery Divine*, 42.

the challenge of (re)describing early Christianity's emergence as *a distinct entity (entities) within the genetic matrix of Judaism.*

Smith criticizes both the indiscriminate pursuit of identifying instances of "borrowing," with its implications of "prestigious origins (pedigree),"[53] as well as the construction of a static picture of Judaism as a cultural "background" against which to contrast the "uniqueness" of Christianity. For Smith, such portraits depict early Christian materials as dynamic, while Jewish, Gnostic, or pagan texts are regarded as somehow "frozen" in time.[54] James M. Robinson has also criticized studying the New Testament in terms of its Jewish "background" since (re)constructions dependent on such "background" studies tend to relegate Judaism to "a static backdrop or stage setting."[55] He suggests categorizing the concept of "background" as *trajectories* since this method can be used to apply "both to the most embracing movement in which a whole culture is caught up . . . or the trajectory of one specific religious tradition within the wider streams of movement."[56] The term itself signifies the sense of *movement* inherent to developing traditions far more than the *static* term "background." Such a re-orientation might allow for more nuanced reconstructions and models of historical development.[57]

Comparative study is never disinterested; it is always a "technique of persuasion," a rhetorical device or discursive strategy intended to move an audience in a particular direction. Comparison is a political act informed by ideological interests.[58] Alleged "influences" between texts or literary traditions

---

[53] Smith, *Drudgery Divine*, 47.

[54] James M. Robinson and Helmut Koester, *Trajectories through Early Christianity* (eds. J. M. Robinson and H. Koester; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1971), 108.

[55] James M. Robinson, "Introduction: The Dismantling and Reassembling of the Categories of New Testament Scholarship," in *Trajectories*, 12. This was especially the case in older "history of religions" research which tended to view the ancient world as a monolithic unity: "the religious world through which early Christianity moved has been conceptualized as strangely immobile … Research had not advanced to the point where layers of tradition could be distinguished. The fragmentary state of the documentation did not permit tracing step by step a series of developments but required the amalgamation of references scattered over half a millennium into one coherent and harmonized picture."

[56] Robinson, "Introduction: The Dismantling," 13–14.

[57] Robinson, "Introduction: The Dismantling," 16: "Not only are specific trajectories to be understood and evaluated with reference to their interplay with overarching trajectories; also specific events, individuals, documents, and positions become intelligible only in terms of the trajectories in which they are caught up. At one stage of a movement a document may function in a specific way, have a certain meaning or influence on the movement; at a subsequent stage on the trajectory that document, unaltered, may function or cut in a different way, may mean in effect something different, may influence the movement differently."

[58] See Bruce Lincoln, *Death, War and Sacrifice: Studies in Ideology and Practice* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991), 244. Terry Eagleton, *Ideology: An Introduction* (London: Verso, 1991), 3, points out that ideology can refer to how signs and meaning are produced; to a body of ideas held by a social group or class; ideas which legitimate dominant

can betray nationalistic motivations.[59] Comparative constructions can be "and often are 'fabrications.'"[60] Fortunately, scholars are increasingly cognizant of the fact that ideology, location, interest and politics inform every interpretation (and/or comparison) of text and/or history.[61] But if it is true that we (re)construct, i.e., (re)*invent* the past for contemporary interests, one might well ask: how can we (re)construct an ancient past that we have no non-mediated access to? How can we responsibly conduct research into Christian origins when we know that all readings are "ideological" readings? These are important questions, especially when we consider that we always run the risk of exchanging one ideologically mythic narrative for another.[62]

---

political power; distorted communication; ideas motivated by social interests; the medium in and through which people live in relation to social structure(s); or most commonly, preconceived ideas which distort understanding. Eagleton defines ideologies as "belief systems characteristic of certain social groups or classes, comprised of both discursive and non-discursive elements." In a more negative sense, ideologies can be understood as flawed, false belief systems that legitimize social oppression. Vernon Robbins, *The Tapestry of Early Christian Discourse: Rhetoric, Society, and Ideology* (London: Routledge, 1996), 96, follows David Davis' definition of ideology as "an integrated system of beliefs, assumptions and values, not necessarily true of false, that reflect the needs and interests of a group or class at a particular time in history." See David Brion Davis, *The Problem of Slavery in the Age of Revolution, 1770-1823* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1975), 14. According to Robbins, ideologies are present in the production and framing of texts and in the history of interpretation of texts. Ideological criticism is a relatively new approach in New Testament studies. See John S. Kloppenborg, "Ideological Texture in the Parable of the Tenants," in *Fabrics of Discourse: Essays in Honor of Vernon K. Robbins* (Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 2003), 64–88.

[59] Arthuro Farinelli, "Literary Influences and the Pride of Nations," *YCGL* 36 (1987): 69–74.

[60] Morten H. Jensen, "On How Making Differences Makes a Difference," in *Introducing Religion; Essays in Honour of Jonathan Z. Smith* (eds. W. Braun and R. T. McCutcheon; London: Equinox, 2008), 147.

[61] Hayden White, "Afterword" in Victoria E. Bonnell and Lynn Hunt, eds., *Beyond the Cultural Turn: New Directions in the Study of Society and Culture* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999), 315–324, 324, criticizes "a certain ideology of social science that pretends to be free of ideology and capable of perceiving social reality in a 'disinterested' manner." Western academic social science itself is "shot through with ideological preconceptions about the nature of social reality and the proper way to study it." See also Hans-Georg Gadamer, "On the Scope and Function of Hermeneutical Reflection," in *Philosophical Hermeneutics* (ed. D. E. Linge; Berkeley: University of California Press, 1976), 28, argued that historical understanding always develops within particular traditions of knowledge that involve presuppositions on the part of the interpreter. Melanie Johnson-Debaufre, *Jesus among Her Children: Q, Eschatology, and the Construction of Christian Origins* (HTS 55; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2005), 9–10, reminds us that that there is no such thing as "objective" scholarship, as all scholars are to some extent "interested" and socially located.

[62] Bruce Lincoln, *Theorizing Myth: Narrative, Ideology, and Scholarship* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999), 209, recognizes this dilemma and characterizes scholarship as "myth with footnotes."

The problem is that if biblical scholars do *not* provide the models for contemporary reflection on Christian origins, others most certainly will.[63] We cannot, therefore, *not* do readings in Christian origins, as assumptions and presuppositions always inform our scholarship, but we can aspire to perform "thicker" readings that reflect informed research and training in the field.[64] So while ideological investments can be identified in virtually all critical scholarship, this does not mean that critical scholarship is illegitimate. On the contrary, it is precisely the ideological interests inherent in critical scholarship that makes (and keeps!) things interesting.[65] The study of Christian origins need not be a naive, pre-critical, apologetic, pseudo-scientific re-inscription of (canonical) scripture, but can (and should) be an incisive, critical, investigative, and self-reflexive willingness to challenge paradigms, question assumptions and come to new conclusions by holding problematic categories and issues in creative tension for further study and reflection.

The study of early Christian social formation should evoke a sense of movement, not stasis.[66] Human behavior is ever evolving, constantly shifting and changing as new practices emerge.[67] Early Christianity arose at a time when different groups were undergoing rapid social change. It might be preferable to think in terms of *polygenesis*,[68] practice,[69] and "*continuity in difference*," perspectives that assume that there is no such thing as "pure beginnings."[70] It is hybridity, "not purity, [that] characterizes historical proc-

[63] Jacques Berlinerbrau, *The Secular Bible: Why Nonbelievers Must Take Religion Seriously* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005), referring to less critical interpreters of the tradition.

[64] Clifford Geertz, *The Interpretation of Cultures* (New York: Basic, 1973), 3–30.

[65] Kloppenborg Verbin, *Excavating Q*, 443: "many of the historiographic endeavors in the field of Christian origins will show, I think, that ideological (theological as well as antitheological) subtexts lurk beneath the often pretended objectivity of criticism. That is not a defect of criticism. It is what makes historical criticism of interest in the first place."

[66] A number of social theorists use theories of practice, which posit that individual action exists only within a context, site or background of practices that assume human agency and constitute social formations. See, for example, Theodore R. Schatzki, *The Site of the Social: A Philosophical Account of the Constitution of Social Life and Change* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2002).

[67] *Smith, Drudgery Divine*, 106, insists on "the recognition and role of historical development and change."

[68] William E. Arnal and Willi Braun, "Social Formation and Mythmaking: Theses on Key Terms," in *Redescribing Christian Origins* (eds. R. Cameron and M. P. Miller; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2004), 459–67, esp. 463, n. 6.

[69] Karen L. King, *What is Gnosticism?* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2003), 228–33.

[70] King, *What is Gnosticism?*, 229. Since religious traditions are constantly in the process of formation, deformation and reformation, they are "constructions that require assiduous, ongoing labor to maintain in the face of both contested power relations within, and porous, overlapping boundaries with traditions without (230)." The task of history, therefore, is to

esses."[71] Religious traditions are subject to processes of "amalgamation, of blending heterogeneous beliefs and practices."[72] Traditions borrow from each other; community borders are often undefined. The communities comprising ancient Judaism and early Christianity represent a *spectrum* within which there were "many gradations which provided social and cultural progression across this spectrum."[73] There were "much more fluid and not strictly defined borders," with "contact zones" and spaces of "transculturation" between communities. This model provides us with a more realistic description of the shared forms of worship, ethics, and textual interpretation between Jews and Christians,[74] as well as an opportunity to reconsider how difference is constructed within and between religious communities.[75]

---

analyze the processes and practices "by which people make sense of their lives in contexts of ancient pluralism, the governing regimes and institutions that further and constrain such practices, and the power relations that are at stake," not simply identify the "true" provenance of particular ideas, stories, and practices (230–31)."

[71] Homi K. Bhabha, *The Location of Culture* (London: Routledge, 1994), 19, argues that creative forms of identity are produced on the boundaries in *between* forms of difference, in the intersections and overlaps across the spheres of class, gender, race, nation and location.

[72] See Peter Van der Veer, "Syncretism, Multiculturalism and the Discourse of Tolerance," in *Syncretism/Anti-Syncretism: The Politics of Religious Synthesis* (eds. C. Stewart and R. Shaw; London: Routledge, 1994), 196–211, 208. Rather than implying genetic impurity, "syncretism" can be understood as "an aspect of religious interaction over time" that allows us to understand how religious beliefs and practices change over time and across "geographical and cultural space (King, *What is Gnosticism?*, 223)." The term itself illustrates the "politics of difference and identity" that have characterized the study of early Christianity, since it has often been used as "a rhetorical tool" in inter-sectarian Christian conflict. King, *What is Gnosticism?*, 223, notes that the term came "into parlance during the Reformation, almost solely in the context of intra-Christian controversy. It was deployed largely by Protestants as a rhetorical tool to discredit Catholicism." See also Robert Young, *Colonial Desire: Hybridity in Theory, Culture, and Race* (London: Routledge, 1995), 6–26.

[73] Boyarin, *Border Lines: The Partition of Judaeo-Christianity*, 18, suggests that second/third century Christianity and Judaism existed as "points on a continuum" between Marcionites and Jews." He envisions early Christianity as "the entire multiform cultural system . . . the original cauldron of contentious, dissonant, sometimes friendly, more frequently hostile, fecund religious productivity out of which ultimately precipitated two institutions at the end of late antiquity: orthodox Christianity and rabbinic Judaism (44)."

[74] Judith Lieu, *Neither Jew Nor Greek?: Constructing Early Christianity* (London: T & T Clark, 2002), 206; Boyarin, *Dying for God*, 10.

[75] Boyarin, *Border Lines*, 18. Boyarin's "wave-theory account" seeks "to replace the older *Stammbaum* (family tree) model. Wave theory posits that linguistic similarity is not necessarily the product of a common origin but may be the product of convergence of different dialects spoken in contiguous areas, dialects that are, moreover, not strictly bounded and differentiated from each other but instead shade one into the other. Innovations at any one point spread like the waves created when a stone is thrown into a pond, intersecting with other such waves produced in other places and leading to the currently observed patterns of differentiation and similarity. The older theory, the *Stammbaum* model, presumed that all similarity between languages and dialects is the product of a shared origin, while differentiation is pro-

It is one thing to compare texts; it is quite another to compare *texts* and *communities*.[76] And yet texts are written by individuals and individuals tend to be members of communities. Traces of such allegiances, identities, and social memberships may be embedded in texts, allowing the critic to excavate texts and retrieve this data.[77] Individual cases of historical influence may be difficult to prove, but we may proceed with the following general methodological principles: (1) if the case for socio-historical influence is stronger than the case for isolation, then socio-historical contact between the individual author of a text and the comparative text, individual, or community can be posited; (2) although any two texts, ideas, or rituals can be compared, the closer that such texts, ideas, or rituals become in historical time and space, the more likely the possibility (and probability) of socio-historical contact becomes; and (3) if close socio-historical, geographical and chronological proximities, social structures, sectarian orientations, approaches to religious institutions, and literary forms cumulatively point towards a spectrum or continuum of socio-historical and ideological affinities, then comparative analysis may require a working model of historical contact and influence.

The challenges involved in comparative research can be illustrated by a brief history of comparative work on Qumran and the New Testament. Since the discovery of the Scrolls, scholars have been finding "parallels" between the New Testament and Qumran,[78] between the Gospel of John,[79] Paul's let-

---

duced after the languages no longer have contact with each other." The older model corresponds to a distinct "parting of the ways" and assumes "that all that is shared between the two is a product of their common origins, while the wave theory model leads us to think of much more fluid and not strictly defined borders on the ground."

[76] Stanley Stowers, "Towards a Social Explanation for the Formation of Christian Anti-Judaism," (unpublished paper), 5, criticizes the "community of the text" fallacy, a notion that reinscribes a Christian myth of origins: "I agree that every writing has a context that is some form of sociality, but not every form of sociality is a community."

[77] Jeff S. Anderson, "From 'Communities of Texts' to Religious Communities: Problems and Pitfalls," in *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection* (ed. G. Boccaccini; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 351–55, 353: "the search for evidence of communities behind texts is a legitimate enterprise." George W. E. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch, Chapters 1–36; 81–108* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001), 2: "texts are historical artifacts, created in time and space, by real human beings." Consequently, "the book as text calls for literary analysis, and its genesis in time and place invites historical investigation (1)." See also *Ancient Judaism and Christian Origins: Diversity, Continuity, and Transformation* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2003), 147: "Both the development of archaeological science and the use of new historical and social scientific methods have emphasized the need to read the ancient religious texts historically and not simply to treat them as pieces of literature or theological compendia. They are artifacts that were created in time and place . . . these texts arose in response to concrete historical circumstances and functioned in particular geographic and social locations. To be fair to the texts and their authors, we must try to identify these times, circumstances, and locations."

[78] Pierre Benoit, "Qumran and the New Testament," in *Paul and Qumran: Studies in New*

ters,[80] John the Baptist, Jesus, and the Qumran texts.[81] The early phases of research were marked by excitement about the discovery of ancient Jewish

---

Testament Exegesis (ed. J. Murphy-O'Connor; Chicago: Priory, 1968), 1–30; Matthew Black, *The Scrolls and Christian Origins: Studies in the Jewish Background of the New Testament* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1961); "The Dead Sea Scrolls and Christian Origins," in *The Scrolls and Christianity: Historical and Theological Significance* (ed. M. Black; London: SPCK, 1969), 97–106; Raymond E. Brown, "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament," in *John and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. J. H. Charlesworth; New York: Crossroad, 1990), 1–8; Oscar Cullmann, "The Significance of the Qumran Texts for Research into the Beginnings of Christianity," *JBL* (1955): 213–26; Jean Daniélou, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Primitive Christianity* (trans. Salvator Attanasio: Baltimore: Helicon, 1958); Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Christian Origins* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000); David Flusser, *Judaism and the Origins of Christianity* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1988); David N. Freedman, "Early Christianity and the Scrolls: An Inquiry," in *Jesus in History and Myth* (ed. R. J. Hoffman and G. A. Larue; Buffalo: Prometheus, 1986), 97–102; William S. Lasor, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1972); Lucetta Mowry, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Early Church* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962); Krister Stendahl, ed., *The Scrolls and the New Testament* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1957).

[79] Karl Georg Kuhn, "Die in Palästina gefundenen hebraïschen Texte und das neue Testament," *ZTK* 47 (1950): 192–211; Howard M. Teeple, "Qumran and the Origin of the Fourth Gospel," *NovT* 4 (1960): 6–25; Raymond E. Brown, "The Qumran Scrolls and the Johannine Gospel and Epistles," *CBQ* 17 (1955): 403–19, 559–74; James H. Charlesworth, ed., *John and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York: Crossroad, 1990); Richard Bauckham, "Qumran and the Fourth Gospel: Is there a Connection?" in *The Scrolls and the Scriptures: Qumran Fifty Years After* (eds. S. E. Porter and C. A. Evans; JSPSup 26; Sheffield University Press, 1997), 267–79; Harold W. Attridge, "The Gospel of John and the Dead Sea Scrolls," 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, 11–12 January, 2004* (eds. R. A. Clements and D. R. Schwartz; STDJ 84; Leiden: Brill, 2009), 109–26.

[80] Jerome Murphy-O'Connor, ed., *Paul and Qumran: Studies in New Testament Exegesis* (Chicago: Priory, 1968). Fitzmyer, *The Semitic Background of the New Testament*, 213–17. See also Henry J. Cadbury, "A Qumran Parallel to Paul," *HTR* 51 (1958): 1–2.

[81] Herbert Braun, "The Significance of Qumran for the Problem of the Historical Jesus," in *The Historical Jesus and the Kerygmatic Christ: Essays on the New Quest of the Historical Jesus* (eds. C. E. Braaten and R. A. Harrisville, Nashville: Abingdon, 1964), 69–78; William H. Brownlee, "Jesus and Qumran," in *Jesus and the Historian* (ed. F. T. Trotter; E. C. Colwell Festschrift; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1968), 52–81; Howard C. Kee, "The Bearing of the Dead Sea Scrolls on Understanding Jesus," in *Jesus in History and Myth* (eds. R. J. Hoffman and G. A. Larue; Buffalo: Prometheus, 1986), 54–75; Otto Betz, *What Do We Know About Jesus: The Bedrock of Fact Illuminated by the Dead Sea Scrolls* (trans. M. Kohl; London: Philadelphia, 1968); James H. Charlesworth, "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Historical Jesus," in *Jesus and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. J. H. Charlesworth; New York: Doubleday, 1992), 1–74; Craig A. Evans, "Jesus and the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment* (eds. P. W. Flint and J. C. VanderKam; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 573–98; B. Herjel-Hansen, "Did Christ Know the Qumran Sect?: Jesus and the Messiah of the Desert, An Observation based on Matthew 24, 26-28," *RevQ* 1 (1959): 495–

manuscripts contemporary with early Christianity. In this initial enthuasiam, various claims were made regarding the nature, degree, and extent of relationship. After all, it appeared that the Jesus movement and the Qumran community seemed to have shared a number of technical terms, such as "the Poor,"[82] the "Sons of Light,"[83] "the Way,"[84] and "the Holy Spirit."[85]

Similarities were also noticed between the organizational structures at Qumran and those described in the Book of Acts. For example, both groups had a full assembly of "the Many."[86] The Qumran community was composed of priests, Levites, laymen and proselytes, and represented all of Israel.[87] This was a full assembly ("the Many") of Aaron and Israel. In Acts, the "assembly" or "congregation" was also the full body of Jewish Christian followers and disciples.[88] Both groups also had respected "elders" in their communities.[89] Both communities seem to have had a "council of twelve" that probably represented the eschatological twelve tribes of Israel.[90] Both had "overse-

---

508; Kurt Schubert, "The Sermon on the Mount and the Qumran Texts," in *The Scrolls and the New Testament* (ed. K. Stendahl; New York: Harper, 1957), 118–28.

[82] Q 6:20; Mt 10:21,19:21; Lk 18:22; Gal 2:10; 1QpHab 12.3, 12.6, 12.10; 1QH 2.32-34, 5.13, 18, 20-22.

[83] Lk 16:8; Jn 12:35-36; 1 Thess 5:5. In John 12:35-36.

[84] In Acts 24:5 "the Way" is the technical term referring to "the sect of the Nazoreans" that Paul is accused of belonging to (Acts 24:5, 22:4, 9:2, 19:9, 24:14, 22). The Qumran community used this term to describe their own way of life. See Fitzmyer, *The Semitic Background of the New Testament*, 282–83; S. Vernon McCasland, "The Way," *JBL* 77 (1958): 222–30. The community "have chosen the Way" (1QS 9.17-18) while those who leave the community are "they who turn aside from the Way" (CD 1.13). The term "the Way" may allude to "the Way of the Lord" of Isaiah 40:3, which is to be prepared by his messengers in the wilderness. Although "the Way" refers to the study and observance of the law at Qumran, this study was believed to be divinely-inspired (see 1QS 4.22, 8.10, 18, 21, 9.5, 9, 11.11, 1QM 14.7, 1QSa 1.28). According to 1QS, the Qumran community was "the perfect Way" and taught the "perfection of Way (1QS 8.18, 21, 9.5, 6, 8, 9)."

[85] Magen Broshi, "What Jesus Learned From the Essenes," *BAR* 30 (2004): 32–37, 64. Charlesworth, "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Historical Jesus," 22. See also Frederick F. Bruce, "Holy Spirit in the Qumran Texts," *The Annual of Leeds University Oriental Society* 6 (1969): 49–55. John's Gospel frequently uses the phrase "Spirit of Truth" (14:17, 15:26, 16:13), a phrase found in the scrolls (1QS 3.19, 4.21, 23, 4Q177 4.10). James H. Charlesworth, "Qumran, John and the Odes of Solomon," in *John and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. J. H. Charlesworth; New York: Crossroad, 1990), 126, suggests that the author of "John probably borrowed some of his dualistic terminology and mythology from 1QS 3:13–4:26."

[86] Acts 4:32, 6:2, 6:5; 1QS 6.1, 7.16, 8.19.

[87] 1QS 2.1, 2.19-21, 1.18, 21, CD 14.3; 1QS 6.1, 7.16, 7–9, 8.19, 11-18, 21, 25, 26.

[88] Acts 4:32, 6:2, 6:5.

[89] 1QS 6.18; CD 5.4; Acts 11:30, 15:2, 4, 6, 16:4, 21:18.

[90] 1QS 8.1; Acts 6:2, 1:15, 2:14. The correspondence is not exact, as there may have been fifteen men in the Qumran inner circle; however, both groups employed the number twelve, which clearly has eschatological significance.

ers" who acted as "shepherds" to the communities.[91] In Acts 20:28, Paul likens the overseer to a shepherd over the flock he "oversees." In CD 13.7–9, the camp overseer is described as bringing back those who have strayed "as a shepherd his flock." Acts 1:17–25 even uses the word ἐπισκοπὴν in connection with Matthias' office. The title of ἐπίσκοπον is also used in 1 Tim. 3:2 to refer to "guardians" or "overseers." Both cast "the lot," in conjunction with prayer, to decide the ranking of members within the community.[92] In Acts, Matthias replaces Judas through a casting of "the lot" by revelation.[93] In 1QS, "the lot" is used to determine a candidates' admission into the community and his rank.

Both shared a communal meal which had eschatological and messianic significance.[94] The Qumran community envisioned a kind of "messianic banquet" to be overseen by the messiah of Israel in celebration of the "new covenant." In 1QSa, the messiah of Israel presides over the bread and wine. According to Acts, the early Jerusalem community practiced communal meals (2:46). For the early Jesus community, Jesus' last evening was undoubtedly seen as initiating a renewal of the covenant in and through his person. Both practiced communality of goods.[95] The Qumran community was the יחד, those of "the Unity."[96] In 1QS, private property becomes the communal property of the whole assembly or "the Many."[97] Both punished those who failed to transfer their property to the community.[98] Both seem to have conceived of their communities as eschatological temples.[99] Richard Bauckham notes that "the

---

[91] Acts 1:17–25, 20:28, Phil. 1:1; 1QS 6.11, 6.14; CD 13.7–9.

[92] Acts 1:17, 1:25, 2:24; 1QS 1.10, 6.16, 6.22, 2.23, 9.7; CD 13.22, 20.4; 1QS 6.16, 6.22, 2.23, 1.10, 9.7, CD 13.22, 20.4. 1QS also describes the process of prayer when casting the lot (1QS 2.23).

[93] Acts 1:25; 2:24.

[94] See Acts 2:46; 1QS 6.4–5, 1QSa 2.11-22. For discussions, see Black, *The Scrolls and Christian Origins,* 102–15; Karl Georg Kuhn, "The Lord's Supper and the Communal Meal at Qumran," in *The Scrolls and the New Testament* (ed. K. Stendahl; New York: Harper, 1957), 65–93; Johannes van der Ploeg, "The Meals of the Essenes," *JSS* 2 (1957): 163–75; Edmund F. Sutcliffe, "Sacred Meals at Qumran?," *HeythJ* 1 (1960): 48–65.

[95] Acts 4:32-35, 6:1; 1QS 1.11–13, 6.19; CD 13.11; Philo, *Quod Omnis Probus Liber Sit* (*Every Good Person is Free*), 75-91; *Hypothetica (Apologia pro Iudaeis)* 1–18; Pliny, *Natural History*, 5.17.4 (73); Josephus *B. J.* (*Jewish War*) 2.119–161; *A. J.* (*Antiquities*) 18.18–22; Brian J. Capper, "The Palestinian Cultural Context of Earliest Christian Community of Goods," in *The Book of Acts in Its Palestinian Setting*, The Book of Acts in Its First Century Setting (ed. R. J. Bauckham; vol. 4; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 327; "Community of Goods in the Early Jerusalem Church," in *ANRW* 2.26.2 (eds. H. Temporini and W. Haase; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1995), 1730–74.

[96] 1QS 1.1, 2, 5.1, 6.21, 7.20, 16, 1QSa 1.26.

[97] 1QS 1.11–13; 6.17, 19; CD 13.1.

[98] 1QS 6.24–25, 7.6.

[99] Richard Bauckham, "For What Offence Offence Was Jesus Put to Death?," in *James the Just and Christian Origins* (ed. B. D. Chilton and C. A. Evans; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 207; Geza Vermes, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Qumran in Perspective* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977),

first Christians could describe themselves and their leaders as various parts of the structure of the Temple building." General members were "stones" (1 Pet 2:5); the apostles and prophets the "foundation" (Eph 2:20); Peter the "rock" (Mt 16:18); James, Peter and John the "pillars" (Gal 2:9); and Jesus the "cornerstone" (1 Pet 2:4; Eph 2:20). The council of the *yahad* considered itself a Temple (בית קודש לישראל) as did the Pauline communities (ναὸς θεοῦ).[100]

Both communities also celebrated "Pentecost." For the Qumran community, the Festival of Weeks was the ceremonial Feast of the Renewal of the Covenant,[101] held on the fifteenth day of the third month when the entire community gathered in Jerusalem and expelled unfaithful members. In Acts 2:1–13, the disciples gather in Jerusalem in preparation for this festival and cast lots to decide who would replace Judas, a particularly "unfaithful" member of the community. While many of these parallels are interesting, the Book of Acts is not a particularly reliable historical source. Acts was intended to be the first "official" version of the birth of early Christianity written from a gentile Christian perspective. Consequently, it is preoccupied with Paul's missionary efforts and tends to ignore whatever Jewish Christian activities were occurring at the very same time. The writing of Luke-Acts may even have been intended to offer a counter-version of the Jewish trajectory and constituency of the "church" and thus erase the latter from history.[102]

Many of these parallels now seem more like "parallelomania."[103] Nonetheless, "It is widely admitted that some influence was exerted by the Qumran Essenes on the early church . . . the Qumran texts provide at least an intelligible Palestinian matrix for many of the practices and tenets of the early

---

218: "the parallelism between Paul's theology and that of Qumran is too pronounced to be no more than a coincidence. It is very probable that he was acquainted with Qumran Temple symbolism and adapted it in shaping his own teaching."

[100] 1QS 8.5–10; 4Q174 1 2 I.6; and 1 Cor 3:16–17; 2 Cor 6:16, respectively.

[101] 4Q266 fr. 11.

[102] See Ernst Haenchen, *The Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary* (trans. B. Noble and G. Shinn; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1971), 98–110; Hans Conzelmann, *Die Apostelgeschichte* (HNT; Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1963), 7, 9–11; Erwin R. Goodenough, "The Perspective of Acts," in *Studies in Luke-Acts: Essays in Honour of Paul Schubert* (eds. L. E. Keck and J. L. Martyn; Nashville: Abingdon, 1966), 51.

[103] Samuel Sandmel, "Parallelomania," *JBL* 81 (1962): 1–13, characterizes this phenomenon as an "extravagance among scholars which first overdoes the supposed similarity in passages and then proceeds to describe source and derivation as if implying literary connection flowing in an inevitable or predetermined direction." It is difficult to determine the nature of relationship between texts and social movements when the evidence is so fragmentary, the potential results so consequential, and the comparative approach itself so fraught with subjective, extra-disciplinary presuppositions. For a sociological analysis of how knowledge is constructed, see G. Nigel Gilbert and Michael Mulkay, *Opening Pandora's Box: A Sociological Analysis of Scientist' Discourse* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984).

church."[104] The problem is determining the *nature* of that relationship. Four models have been adopted: (1) the Essenes and/or the Qumran community had *no influence* on the Jesus movement; (2) Qumran texts represent the writings of early Christians, so the Qumran community and/or the Essenes are *identical to* or to be equated with early Christians; (3) the Essenes and/or Qumran texts *directly*; or (4) *indirectly* influenced the Jesus movement.

The idea that the Jesus movement had no contact with the Qumran community is understandable, given that neither the Qumran community nor the Essenes are ever mentioned in the New Testament.[105] Yet it seems difficult to concede that Jesus' followers moved among, debated, challenged and instructed large numbers of Palestinian Jews without ever encountering, interacting with (let alone relating to or learning from) the four thousand Essenes living in Palestine.[106] This does not mean that the Essenes or Qumran community can be equated or identified with the Jesus movement or vice versa.[107] Yet a number of scholars have argued that some degree of *direct* influence existed between the Essenes, Qumran, and the Jesus movement, either as "passive reception," "a transforming reaction,"[108] "borrowing,"[109] a "conver-

[104] Fitzmyer, *The Semitic Background of the New Testament*, 273.

[105] Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *Responses to 101 Questions on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York: Paulist, 1992), 39, correctly points out that "The Christian message itself, however, has found no parallel in these Scrolls. There is nothing about Jesus of Nazareth or his story or the interpretation of him, nothing about the Christian Church, nothing about the vicarious and salvific character of what Jesus accomplished for humanity in his passion, death, and resurrection." These observations are valid, although somewhat misleading. The majority of the scrolls, after all, have been paleographically dated to long before 30 C. E. and if a portion of the scrolls do date to the first-century, it is likely that their original dates of composition are earlier. Charlesworth, *Jesus and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, xxxv, argues that although the Essenes existed during the time of Jesus "none of the Dead Sea Scrolls refer to him, and they do not mention any follower of Jesus described in the New Testament."

[106] Charlesworth, "Have the Dead Sea Scrolls Revolutionized Our Understanding of the New Testament?," 123, regards this perspective as "myopic."

[107] Contra Robert H. Eisenman, *Maccabees, Zadokites, Christians and Qumran: A New Hypothesis of Qumran Origins* (Leiden: Brill, 1983); *James the Just in the Habakkuk Pesher* (Leiden: Brill, 1986); *James the Just: The Key to Unlocking the Secrets of Early Christianity and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York: Viking, 1996); *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the First Christians: Essays and Translations* (Rockport: Element, 1996); Barbara Thiering, *The Qumran Origins of the Christian Church* (Sydney: Theological Explorations, 1983); *Jesus & The Riddle of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Unlocking the Secrets of His Story* (New York: HarperSanFrancisco, 1992); John Allegro, *The Dead Sea Scrolls* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1956); *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A Reappraisal* (Baltimore: Penguin, 1964); *The Sacred Mushroom and the Cross: A Study of the Nature and Origins of Christianity within the Fertility Cults of the Ancient Near East* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1970); *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Christian Myth* (Newton Abbot: Westbridge Books, 1979).

[108] Benoit, "Qumran and the New Testament," 6, admits that the Essenes "had some direct influence on Christianity" but is unable to determine when this took place and whether this influence was transmitted through "passive reception or a transforming reaction."

sion" of Qumran members or Essenes into the (post-Easter) Jesus movement,[110] or even through John the Baptist, or Jesus himself.[111]

Despite the attention devoted to the subject, there is still no consensus regarding the similarities and differences between the New Testament and the Dead Sea Scrolls.[112] The comparative study of Qumran and the New Testa-

---

[109] Andre Dupont-Sommer, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A Preliminary Survey* (trans. E. M. Rowley; Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1952); *The Jewish Sect of Qumran and the Essenes: New Studies on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (trans. R. D. Barnett; New York: Macmillan, 1955), 164; Cross, *The Ancient Library at Qumran*, 145; W. D. Davies, *Christian Origins and Judaism* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1962), 110; Frederick F. Bruce, *Second Thoughts on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1956), 89, 101; Marcel Simon, *Jewish Sects at the Time of Jesus* (trans. J. H. Farley; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1967), 147–48; Taylor, *Where Did Christianity Come From?*, 123; Flusser, *Judaism and the Origins of Christianity*, 72; Theodore H. Gaster, *The Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York: Doubleday, Anchor, 1964), 13.

[110] Hakan Ulfgard, "The Branch in the Last Days: Observations on the New Covenant Before and After the Messiah," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls in their Historical Context* (eds. T. H. Lim, L. W. Hurtado, A. G. Auld and A. Jack; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 2001), 246.

[111] Black, *The Scrolls and Christian Origins*, 168; "The Dead Sea Scrolls and Christian Origins," in *The Scrolls and Christianity: Historical and Theological Significance* (ed. M. Black; London: SPCK, 1969), 99; Jonathan Campbell, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: The Complete Story* (Berkeley: Ulysses, 1998), 140; Kurt Schubert, "The Sermon on the Mount and the Qumran Texts," in *The Scrolls and the New Testament*, 123, 131; Charlesworth, "Have the Dead Sea Scrolls Revolutionized Our Understanding of the New Testament?," 123–24; "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Historical Jesus," 18; Brian J. Capper, "The New Covenant in Southern Palestine At the Arrest of Jesus," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls as Background to Post-biblical Judaism and Early Christianity* (ed. J. R. Davila; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 90–116; "The Church as the New Covenant of Effective Economics: The Social Origins of Mutually Supportive Christian Community," in *IJSCC* 2 (2002): 83–102; "With the Oldest Monks…" Light from Essene History on the Career of the Beloved Disciple?," *JTS* 49 (1998): 1–55; "Community of Goods in the Early Jerusalem Church," 1730–74; "The Palestinian Cultural Context of Earliest Christian Community of Goods," in *The Book of Acts in Its Palestinian Setting, The Book of Acts in Its First Century Setting* (vol. 4; ed. R. J. Bauckham; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 323–56; Edmund Wilson, *The Scrolls from the Dead Sea* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1955); Hugh J. Schonfield, *Secrets of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Studies Towards their Solution* (London: Vallentine Mitchell, 1956); Duncan Howlett, *The Essenes and Christianity: An Interpretation of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1957), 134–44; A. Powell Davies, *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York: Mentor, 1956).

[112] Florentino García Martínez, *Echoes from the Caves: Qumran and the New Testament* (ed. F. García Martínez; STDJ 85; Leiden: Brill, 2009), 1–2, recognizes that both corpora represent groups that "shared the same general chronological time frame and certainly co-existed until the year 68," were "geographically close," and "developed in the same Palestinian society in a crisis situation" and were "two similar Jewish reform movements, both guided by a strong charismatic leader, both interpreting the Scripture in an actualizing way, applying its prophecies to their present situation, both with very strong eschatological expectations, whose members shared the conviction that they were the chosen remnant of the true Israel, the New Covenant at the end of days." García Martínez admits that the results have been "disappointing." Edna Ullmann-Margalit, *Out of the Cave: A Philosophical Inquiry into the*

ment has come to something of an impasse. As a result, "The quest has been practically abandoned, and the relationship between the two corpora is only sporadically treated."[113] This absence of consensus encourages alternative comparative approaches to the problem.[114]

García Martínez has proposed a new working hypothesis to explain the similarities and differences between the two corpora: both the New Testament and the Qumran Scrolls emerged from the "common ground" of the Hebrew Bible. García Martínez is right to point out that many Qumran texts are either nonsectarian or presectarian,[115] and that we will never have "a full picture" of the relationship between the two corpora since we only have a fraction of the Qumran corpus. He maintains, therefore, that since "there is no proof of any direct relationship between the two corpora . . . a genetic relationship or a direct influence of one corpus on the other does not most logically explain the similarities or the differences we find between them."[116] The relationship between the two corpora can be understood in terms of "different evolutionary phases starting from a common ground . . . different expressions of the multiform reality that was Palestinian Judaism."[117]

It is true that both traditions developed in relationship to the Judaism(s) from which they emerged.[118] First-century Judaism was diverse, and while there may have been "unifying" themes (belief in one God, the covenant, etc.) and practices (circumcision, Sabbath, kosher and purity laws, etc.), it is far more difficult to posit that such generalities are responsible for the specific sapiential, eschatological, apocalyptic, and messianic similarities discovered

---

Dead Sea Scrolls Research (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2006), 137, 17–18, has studied the *study of the* scrolls and identifies two "eras" of research: the first characterized by Christian agendas, the second by Jewish. During the first era, the question that "overshadowed" all others was "whether or not the scrolls would prove to be the missing link between Second Temple Judaism on the one hand, and the New Testament on the other." The second "era," with the addition of *Jewish* researchers trained in *halakhic* studies and Mishnaic and Talmudic literature brought new expertise (and new *interests*) to the field. The publication of the Temple Scroll and 4QMMT, with their emphasis on temple law and cultic purity, also led to a tendency to the Qumran community as "an internal priestly-Jewish" group "dissociated from anything Christian" (142).

[113] García Martínez, *Echoes from the Caves*, 2.

[114] García Martínez, *Echoes from the Caves*, 1: since "research had still not been able to find an acceptable explanation for the common points as for the differences . . . a new way to look at the relationship between the two corpora was needed."

[115] García Martínez, *Echoes from the Caves*, 3.

[116] García Martínez, *Echoes from the Caves*, 5.

[117] García Martínez, *Echoes from the Caves*, 5.

[118] On "common Judaism," see E. P. Sanders, *Judaism: Practice and Belief 63 B.C.E. –66 C.E.* (London: SCM, 1992); *Common Judaism: Explorations in Second-Temple Judaism* (eds. W. O. McCready and A. Reinhartz; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2008). For criticism, see Martin Hengel and R. Deines, "E. P. Sanders' 'Common Judaism,' Jesus and the Pharisees," *JTS* 46 (1995): 1–70.

between the two corpora. García Martínez's hypothesis precludes the possibility of direct relationship between these traditions, yet cannot adequately account for such similarities. The methodologically valid affirmation of the New Testament and Qumran corpus as *different* and *distinct* literary products of Second Temple Judaism has been confused and/or conflated with the idea that they are necessarily *unrelated* and *isolated* phenomena. Our inability to establish clear relationships between the Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament is complicated by the paucity of evidence, the ambiguity of the material, and its remoteness in time, but the primary problem is not that we cannot affirm *some* degree of relationship; the problem is that we cannot determine the precise degree of relationship. Part of the problem lies in the very nature of the data: one set of texts is in Hebrew; the other in Greek. For those seeking "difference," one need look no further.

The most reliable approach to the comparative study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament requires the identification of the earliest Palestinian Jewish texts and traditions associated with the early Jesus movement. Despite some claims to the contrary,[119] the general consensus is that Q fits this profile. Many Q specialists have recognized that Q 3–7 is an integrated unit.[120] Q 3–7 is a complex composition intended to describe John and Jesus in light of their mutual relationship. John is both prophetic and yet "*more* than a prophet." John calls Israel to repentance yet challenges traditional ethnic conceptions of election. Jesus preaches about the kingdom of God yet rejects "all the kingdoms of this world." His identity is questioned and confirmed.

[119] See especially Austin Farrar, "On Dispensing with Q," in *Studies in the Gospels: Essays in Memory of R.H. Lightfoot* (ed. D. E. Nineham; Oxford: Blackwell, 1955), 55–88; Michael Goulder, "On Putting Q to the Test," *NTS* 24 (1978): 218–34; "Is Q a Juggernaut?," *JBL* 115 (1996): 667–81; *Luke: A New Paradigm* (2 vols; JSNT Sup 20; Sheffield: JSOT, 1989); Mark S. Goodacre, *Goulder and the Gospels: An Examination of a New Paradigm* (JSNTSupp 133; Sheffield: Sheffield University Press, 1996); Allan J. McNicol, et al., *Beyond the Q Impasse – Luke's Use of Matthew: A Demonstration by the Research Team of the Internacional Institute for Gospel Studies* (Valley Forge: Trinity Press International, 1996); Mark S. Goodacre, *The Case Against Q: Studies in Markan Priority and the Synoptic Problem* (Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 2002).

[120] Dale C. Allison, Jr., *The Jesus Tradition in Q* (Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 1994). Kloppenborg regards this as Deuteronomostic material, whereas the Inaugural Sermon is form-critically sapiential. While Q 7:22 comes after 6:20–38, there may be some justification for examining this passage with the Inaugural Sermon, since Luke sets the sermon in Nazareth immediately after Q 4:16 and even has Jesus read from Isaiah 61, a text that plays a major role in 4Q521 and Q 7:22. Michael Labahn, "The Significance of Signs in Luke 7:22-23 in the Light of Isaiah 61 and the Messianic Apocalypse," in *From Prophecy to Testament: The Function of the Old Testament in the New* (ed. C. A. Evans; Peabody: Hendrickson, 2004), 146–68, esp. 157, sees Q 7:18–23 as "a rhetorical and pragmatic unit in its literary context," citing Ron Cameron, "'What Have You Come Out to See? Characterizations of John and Jesus in the Gospels," *Semeia* 49 (1990): 35–70, who argues that 7:18–35 is an entire unit like an ancient chreia.

John and Jesus are the "children of Wisdom" rejected by "this generation." While the term Χριστός is not found in Q, the author of Q clearly regarded Jesus as an eschatological figure.[121] A comparative study of Q and the Qumran texts may shed new light on the composition, community, and Christology of Q in its original Palestinian Jewish context.

1.3 Q, the Essenes, and the Dead Sea Scrolls

The idea that the Essenes had some degree of influence on early Christianity has a long and colorful history in New Testament scholarship.[122] In 1717 Humphrey Prideaux was already challenging the "wrong use" of the classical sources made by "infidel Deists" who claimed "to find in them an agreement between the Christian religion" and the Essenes.[123] Between 1784 and 1792, Karl Bahrdt published *Ausführung des Plans und Zwecks Jesu. In Briefen an Wahrheit suchende Leser*, an expose of Christian origins involving an Essene plot to transform Jewish society by delivering it from its futile hopes for a political messiah.[124] According to Bahrdt, the Essenes staged Jesus' crucifixion and resurrection by drugging him and having him reappear to his disciples days later. Jesus' miracles were staged productions intended to attract followers. Between 1800 and 1802, Karl Venturini followed Bahrdt with *Natürliche*

[121] Simon J. Joseph, "'Blessed is Whoever is Not Offended By Me': The Subversive Appropriation of (Royal) Messianic Ideology in Q 3–7," *NTS* 57.3 (2011): 307–24.

[122] Siegfried Wagner, *Die Essener in der wissenschaftlichen Diskussion: Vom Ausgang des 18. bis zum Beginn des 20. Jahrhunderts: Eine wissenschaftsgeschichtliche Studie* (Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1960).

[123] Humphrey Prideaux, *The Old and New Testaments Connected in the History of Jews & Neighboring Nations, from the Declensions of the Kingdoms of Israel and Judah to the Time of Christ* (London: W. Baynes, 4 vols., 16th ed., 1808 [1717]), 3: 429–30. Prideaux argued that the Essenes were not mentioned in the New Testament because Jesus "took no notice of them" (3:407). Unlike the Pharissees and Sadducees, they did not merit the criticism "which the others very justly deserved." Prideaux thus rejected the idea that "Christ and his followers were no other than a sect branched out from that of the Essenes . . . And let these infidels make the most of it they can. Though they search all these accounts of this sect through to the utmost, can any of the proper doctrines of Christianity be found in any part of them? Is there any thing in them of the two Christian sacraments? Is there any thing of the redemption of the world by the Messiah, or of the erecting of the spiritual kingdom here on earth? Or were any of the peculiar documents or usages of that sect ever ingrafted into Christianity? (429–30)." For Prideaux, Christians were so *different* from Essenes that "almost all that is peculiar in that sect, is condemned by Christ and his disciples (430)." Consequently, the Essenes had nothing to do with "Christ and his apostles," none of Christianity's "proper doctrines" or sacraments can be found among the Essenes, and and none of their "peculiar documents" were ever absorbed into the Christian canon.

[124] Karl Friedrich Bahrdt, *Ausführung des Plans und Zwecks Jesu. In Briefen an Wahrheit suchende Leser* (11 vols.; Berlin: August Mylius, 1784–1792).

Geschichte des großen Propheten von Nazareth, claiming that Jesus was secretly trained by the Essenes.[125] Coinciding with the rise of historical criticism, these early "biographies" are characterized by two motifs that reflect their emergence in the Enlightenment: political intrigue and rationalism.[126] Jesus is portrayed "as the model of rationalism and morality." He is surrounded by a mysterious secret society and implicated in various political intrigues.[127] These lives promote Enlightenment values, providing rational explanations of the miracles while affirming their historicity, preserving a sense of religious mystery "in the face of the threat posed by rationalism."[128] This "odd mixture of the rational and the occult" served several purposes for Christian scholars: the Essenes could be used as a foil for rationalist agendas. More importantly, identifying Jesus as an Essene preserved the historical record of Jesus' Jewishness and located him on the *margins* of Judaism rather than within its normative, Pharisaic/rabbinical center.[129]

Looking back on two hundred years of "historical Jesus" research, Albert Schweitzer readily concluded that "die Annahme der geheimen Gesellschaft, so sern sie das äußerlich Unerklärliche in der Auseinanderfolge der Gleichnisse und im Handeln Jesu anerkennt und respektiert, war in manchem historischer" than the research being conducted in his own time.[130] Schweitzer recognized that "Manches ist sehr fein beobachtet."[131] For Schweitzer, it was Bahrdt and Venturini's biographies which "die zuerst eine konsequent natürliche Darstellung der evangelischen Wundergeschichten versuchten."[132]

Essene studies appeared throughout the nineteenth century.[133] F. C. Baur and members of the Tübingen School argued that the Essenes influenced early

---

[125] Karl Heinrich Venturini, *Natürliche Geschichte des großen Propheten von Nazareth* (4 vols.; Copenhagen, 1800–1802).

[126] Susannah Heschel, "The Image of Judaism in Nineteenth-Century Christian New Testament Scholarship in Germany," in *Jewish-Christian Encounters over the Centuries: Symbiosis, Prejudice, Holocaust, Dialogue* (AUSS 9.136; eds. M. Perry and F. M. Schweitzer; New York: Peter Lang, 1994), 215–240, esp. 217–220.

[127] Heschel, "The Image of Judaism," 219.

[128] Heschel, "The Image of Judaism," 220.

[129] Heschel, "The Image of Judaism," 134, 141–42, 169.

[130] Albert Schweitzer, *Von Reimarus zu Wrede: Eine Geschichte der Leben-Jesu-Forschung* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1906), 296–297.

[131] Schweitzer, *Von Reimarus*, 47.

[132] Schweitzer, *Von Reimarus*, 38.

[133] August Friedrich Gfrörer, *Kritische Geschichte des Urchristentums* (vol. 1, 1831 [2nd ed. 1835]; vol. 2, 1838); Joseph Salvador, *Jésus-Christ et sa doctrine. Histoire de la naissance de l'église, de son organisation et de son progrès pendant le premier siècle* (2 vols., Paris, 1838), 1: 119; Friedrich Wilhelm Ghillany (Richard von der Alm), *Theologische Briefe an die Gebildeten der deutschen Nation* (1863); *Die Urteile heidnischer und jüdischer Schriftsteller der vier ersten christlichen Jahrhunderte über Jesus* (1863).

"Jewish Christianity" and the Ebionites.[134] By 1875, the popularity of such ideas prompted J. B. Lightfoot's refutation of any relationship between the Essenes and Christian origins.[135] Lightfoot called the Essenes "the great enigma of Hebrew history" yet criticized those who "call Essenism to their aid in accounting for any distinctive features of Christianity."[136] Dismissing the New Testament's failure to refer to the Essenes as "a negative argument," Lightfoot claimed that this silence is best "explained by the comparative insignificance of the sect; their small numbers and their retired habits."[137] The Essenes "entirely denied" Jewish beliefs in messianism because "the Essenes had no interest in the Jewish polity (and) separated themselves almost entirely from public affairs." Consequently, the idea that the Essenes anticipated a messiah should be dismissed "as a mere hypothesis, unsupported by evidence and improbable in itself.[138] Yet Lightfoot admitted that "the fact seems certain, that after the destruction of Jerusalem the Christian body was largely reinforced from their ranks. The Judaizing tendencies among the Hebrew Christians . . . are henceforth largely Essene."[139] Lightfoot's efforts did not deter other scholars from formulating variations on the theme.[140] By the end of the century, the theme still enjoyed great popularity. As Ernest Renan put it: "Le christianisme est un essénisme qui a largement réussi."[141]

The idea was also as popular among Jewish scholars as among Christian. In 1870, Heinrich Graetz, argued that Jesus had adopted "Essene principles" ("essäische Grundsätze") and was "a member of the Jewish sect of the Essenes" whose purpose was not to create a new religion, but rather to reform Judaism.[142] Christianity "was really an offshoot of the sect of the Essenes, and

---

[134] Ferdinand Christian Baur, *Kirchengeschichte der drei ersten Jahrhunderte* (Tübingen: L. F. Fues, 1863); ET: *The Church History of the First Three Centuries* (trans. A. Menzies; 2 vols; London & Edinburgh: Williams and Norgate, 1878); *Das Christentum und die christliche Kirche der drei ersten Jahrhunderte* (2d ed.; Tübingen: L. F. Fues, 1860). See also Albert Schwegler, *Das nachapostolische Zeitalter in den Hauptmomenten seiner Entwicklung* (2 vols.; Tübingen: L. F. Fues, 1846); Albrecht Ritschl, *Die Entstehung der altkatholischen Kirche* (Bonn: A. Marcus, 1857).

[135] J. B. Lightfoot, *Saint Paul's Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon* (London: Macmillan, 1912).

[136] Lightfoot, *Saint Paul's Epistles to the Colossians*, 395.

[137] Lightfoot, *Saint Paul's Epistles to the Colossians*, 396.

[138] Lightfoot, *Saint Paul's Epistles to the Colossians*, 417.

[139] Lightfoot, *Saint Paul's Epistles to the Colossians*, 407.

[140] Arthur Lillie, *Buddhism in Christendom: or, Jesus, the Essene* (London: Kegan Paul, Trench and Co., 1887); *India in Primitive Christianity* (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner, Co., Ltd., 1909), 200. See also Ernest de Bunsen, *The Angel – Messiah of Buddhists, Essenes, and Christians* (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1880).

[141] Ernest Renan, *Histoire du Peuple d'Israël* (Paris: Calman-Lévy, 1891), 5: 70.

[142] Donald A. Hagner, *The Jewish Reclamation of Jesus: An Analysis and Critique of Modern Jewish Study of Jesus* (Grand Rapids: Academie Books, 1984), 62; Heinrich Hirsch Graetz, *History of the Jews* (vol. 2: *From the Reign of Hyrcanus (135 B.C.E.) to the Comple-*

inherited the aversion of that sect for the Pharisaic laws."[143] Jesus adopted the "fundamental principles" of the Essenes.[144] He was "an earnest, gentle, moral figure who emerged within the Essene community."[145] He was drawn to the Essenes and the people of Galilee were drawn to his "Essene teachings."[146] Christianity was dependent on Judaism for its existence and its ideas.[147]

Kaufman Kohler, an early proponent of Reform Judaism, asserted that John and Jesus were "members of the Essene party"[148] and that the Essenes "joined the new Church which was ready to acknowledge the crucified Jesus as the expected Messiah and helped in its formation."[149] The Essenes not only joined the early church, but the fact "that the Essenes are nowhere mentioned in the New Testament is perhaps the best proof of their having been merged in the early Church."[150] The Essene hypothesis served several purposes for Jewish scholars: (1) it boosted "Jewish self-esteem in the face of Christianity's success;"[151] (2) it de-stabilized normative self-definitions of Judaism and Christianity;[152] (3) it supported subversive, revisionist readings of early Christianity in which Jesus was firmly embedded in a Jewish context;[153] and (4) emphasizing the Jewish origins of Christianity highlighted a Christian "anxiety of influence."[154] The relationship between Jesus and the Essenes has also been a prominent feature in western esotericism.[155] Reender Kranenborg

---

tion of the Babylonian Talmud (500 C.E.), Pennsylvania: The Jewish Publication Society of America,1893); *Geschichte der Juden* (11 vols.; Leipzig, 1870), III: 285.

[143] Hagner, *The Jewish Reclamation of Jesus*, 171.

[144] Hagner, *The Jewish Reclamation of Jesus*, 150.

[145] Jonathan M. Elukin, "A New Essenism: Heinrich Graetz and Mysticism," *JHI* 59/1 (1998): 135–48, esp. 136. See also Simon Dubnow, *History of the Jews* (trans. M. Spiegel; South Brunswick: T. Yoseloff, 1967–73).

[146] Elukin, "A New Essenism: Heinrich Graetz and Mysticism," 137.

[147] Elukin, "A New Essenism: Heinrich Graetz and Mysticism," 140.

[148] Kaufmann Kohler, *The Origins of the Synagogue and the Church* (New York: Macmillan, 1929), 205.

[149] Kohler, *The Origins of the Synagogue and the Church*, 237.

[150] Kohler, *The Origins of the Synagogue and the Church*, 239–40, 133.

[151] Heschel, *Abraham Geiger and the Jewish Jesus*, 134.

[152] Heschel, *Abraham Geiger and the Jewish Jesus*, 239.

[153] Heschel, *Abraham Geiger and the Jewish Jesus*, 128, 14.

[154] Harold Bloom, *The Anxiety of Influence* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1973); Heschel, *Abraham Geiger and the Jewish Jesus*, 233: "Nineteenth-century Christianity can be understood as harboring the fear that it is not its own creator, but that Judaism and its Old Testament have a historical and moral claim to theological superiority by virtue of having been developed first." Christianity could be seen as "subordinate" to Judaism. Consequently, "The anxiety of not being original, but rather secondary and derivative, is part of the motivating power behind Christian denial of Judaism's religious legitimacy."

[155] Reender Kranenborg, "The Presentation of the Essenes in Western Esotericism," *JCR* 13/2 (1998): 245–56; Per Beskow, *Strange Tales about Jesus: A Survey of Unfamiliar Gospels* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983).

points out that this tradition can be derived from Enlightenment rationalists who provided "the foundation of the modern myth of the Essenes."[156]

Today, most scholars admit that there were points of "indirect" contact between the movements.[157] Generally, this is attributed to similar organizational forms and a "common tradition,"[158] with similarities mostly in matters of community organization and shared worldview,[159] although some have suggested that a number of Essenes "converted" to the Jesus movement.[160] Supporting this view is the possibility that the early Jerusalem community may have been located adjacent to an Essene community in Jerusalem near the "gate of the Essenes" (ἡ Ἐσσηνῶν πύλη).[161] Pope Benedict XVI has also af-

[156] Kranenborg, "The Presentation of the Essenes in Western Esotericism," 252.

[157] Raymond E. Brown, "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament," in *John and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. J. H. Charlesworth; New York: Crossroad, 1990), 2; Pierre Benoit, "Qumran and the New Testament," in *Paul and Qumran: Studies in New Testament Exegesis* (ed. J. Murphy-O'Connor; Chicago: Priory, 1968), 1, 14, admits that "a certain influence . . . seems undeniable . . . It is not only possible, but very likely, that some zealous and sincere Essenes gradually accepted and joined the infant Church."

[158] Vermes, "The Qumran Community, the Essenes, and Nascent Christianity," 585–586, proposes that any influence between the Qumran texts and the New Testament is limited to "the adoption and adaptation by both communities of ideas and ideals which inspired first-century Palestinian Jews." Similarly, James C. VanderKam, "The Dead Sea Scrolls and Christianity," in *Understanding the Dead Sea Scrolls: A Reader from the Biblical Archaeological Review* (ed. H. Shanks; New York: Random House, 1992), 185.

[159] Frederick F. Bruce, "Qumran and Early Christianity," *NTS* 2 (1955-56): 176–90; Raymond E. Brown, "The Qumran Scrolls and the Johannine Gospels and Epistles," *CBQ* 17 (1955): 403–19, 559–74; Jean Danielou, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Primitive Christianity* (New York: New American Library, 1958); Herbert Braun, *Qumran und das Neue Testamen*t I-II (Tübingen: Mohr, 1966); Joseph A. Fitzmyer, "The Use of Explicit Old Testament Quotations in Qumran Literature and in the New Testament," *NTS* 7 (1961): 297–333.

[160] Otto Betz and Rainer Riesner, *Jesus, Qumran and the Vatican: Clarifications* (London: SCM, 1994), 155, argue that "a whole group of Essenes were converted to Jesus as the Messiah. These converted Essenes formed a body of theologians who were highly qualified for their time. They were capable of working out at a deep intellectual level who Jesus was and how he had brought salvation." Fitzmyer, *The Semitic Background of the New Testament*, 296, asserts that "there were undoubtedly some Essenes among the priests converted to Christianity (Acts 6:7), and that they were most likely the bridge of contact between the two communities." See also Sherman E. Johnson, "The Dead Sea Manual of Discipline and the Jerusalem Church of Acts," in *The Scrolls and the New Testament* (ed. K. Stendahl; New York: Harper & Brothers, 1958), 129–42. Brooke, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament*, 4: "it is . . . possible that some Essenes became members of some early Christian communities."

[161] Josephus, *B.J.* 5.145. See Bargil Pixner, "An Essene Quarter on Mount Zion?," in *Studia Hierosolymitana in onore dei P. Bellarmino Bagatti* (vol. 1, SA; ed. G. C. Bittini; SBFCM 22; Jerusalem: Franciscan Printing Press, 1976), 245–86; Bargil Pixner, Doron Chen and Shlomo Margalit, "Mount Zion: The Gate of the Essenes Reexcavated," in *ZPV* 105 (1989): 85–95; "Das Essener-Quarter in Jerusalem," in *Wege des Messias und Stätten der Urkirche* (ed. R. Riesner; Giessen/Basel: Brunnen, 1991), 180–207; "Das letzte Abendmahl Jesu," in *Wege des Messias und Stätten der Urkirche* (ed. R. Riesner; Giessen/Basel: Brun-

firmed, although without the Magisterium, that "not only John the Baptist, but possibly Jesus and his family as well, were close to the Qumran community . . . It is a reasonable hypothesis that John the Baptist lived for some time in this community and received part of his religious formation from it."[162]

This colorful history of research suggests that a comparative study of Q and the Essenes would be both helpful and potentially fruitful; yet no such study has been made. This study seeks to explore a new perspective on Q and new models for the complex historical, literary, and theological relationships within which the historical Jesus and the Jesus tradition can be located in first-century Judaism.[163] A preliminary survey of similarities between Q, the

---

nen, 1991), 219–28; "Essener-Viertel und Urgemeinde," *Wege des Messias und Stätten der Urkirche* (ed. R. Riesner; Giessen/Basel: Brunnen, 1991), 327–34; "Archäologische Beobachtungen zum Jerusalemer Essener-Viertel und zur Urgemeinde," in *Christen und Christliches in Qumran?* (ed. B. Mayer; ES 32; Regensburg: F. Pustet, 1992), 89–113; "Jerusalem's Essene Gateway: Where the Community Lived in Jesus' Time," *BAR* 23 (1997): 23–31; Rainer Riesner, "Josephus' Gate of the Essenes in Modern Discussion," in *ZPV* 105 (1989): 105–09; "Das Jerusalemer Essenerviertel: Antwort auf einige Einwände," in *Intertestamental Essays in Honour of Jozef Tadeusz Milik* (ed. Z. J. Kapera; QM6; Krakow: Enigma, 1992), 179–86; "Essener und Urkirche in Jerusalem," in *Christen und Christliches in Qumran?* (ed. B. Mayer; ESNF 32; Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet, 1992), 139–55; "Jesus, the Primitive Community, and the Essene Quarter of Jerusalem," in *Jesus and the Dead Sea Scroll*s (ed. J. H. Charlesworth; New York: Doubleday, 1991), 198–234; "Essene Gate," *ABD* (eds. D. N. Freedman, et al.; 3 vols.; New York: Doubleday, 1992), 2: 618–19; "Das Jerusalemer Essener-Viertel und die Urgemeinde: Josephus, Bellum Judaicum V 145; 11QMiqdasch 46, 13–16; Apostelgeschichte 1–6 und die Archäologie," *ANRW* 2.26.2 (ed. W. Haase; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1995), 1775–1922.

[162] Joseph Ratzinger, Pope Benedict XVI, *Jesus of Nazareth: From the Baptism in the Jordan to the Transfiguration* (New York: Doubleday, 2007), 14.

[163] There are also numerous parallels between the sayings of Jesus and rabbinic traditions. See Bruce Chilton, Craig A. Evans, and Jacob Neusner, *The Missing Jesus: Rabbinic Judaism and the New Testament* (Boston: Brill, 2002); Craig A. Evans, *Jesus and His Contemporaries* (AGJU 25; Leiden: Brill, 1995), 251–97; Paul Fiebig, *Die Gleichnisreden Jesu im Lichte der rabbinischen Gleichnisse des neutestamentlichen Zeitalters* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1912); Gustaf Dalman, *Jesus-Jeshua: Studies in the Gospels* (London: SPCK, 1929); W. O. E. Oesterley, *The Gospel Parables in the Light of Their Jewish Background* (London: Macmillan, 1936); David Flusser, *Die rabbinischen Gleichnisse und der Gleichniserzähler Jesus* (Bern: Peter Lang, 1981); Brad H. Young, *Jesus and His Jewish Parables* (New York: Paulist, 1989); Philip S. Alexander, "Rabbinic Judaism and the New Testament," *ZNW* 74 (1983): 237–46; Gary G. Porton, "The Parable in the Hebrew Bible and Rabbinic Literature," in *The Historical Jesus in Context* (eds. A–J. Levine, D. C. Allison, Jr., and J. D. Crossan; Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2006), 206–221; Samuel Tobias Lachs, *A Rabbinical Commentary on the New Testament: The Gospels of Matthew, Mark and Luke* (Hoboken: KTAV, 1987); Harald Riesenfeld, *The Gospel Tradition and its Beginnings: A Study in the Limits of 'Formgeschichte'* (London: A. R. Mowbray & Co, 1957); Birger Gerhardsson, *Memory and Manuscript: Oral Tradition and Written Transmission in Rabbinic Judaism and Early Christianity* (Uppsala and Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1964); *The Origins of the Gospel Tradition* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979). But see Jacob Neusner, *Why No Gospels in Talmudic Judaism*

Essenes, and the Dead Sea Scrolls immediately yields provocative results: Q and the Dead Sea Scrolls are ancient Palestinian Jewish texts lost for almost two thousand years.[164] Q, the Q community, the Dead Sea Scrolls, the Qumran community, and the Essenes all disappeared at the same time, circa 70 C. E. Q, Qumran, and the Essenes represent marginalized Jewish communities noticeably absent from the New Testament.[165] Q and the Dead Sea Scrolls are literary-theological products of Second Temple Judaism long before the existence of a New Testament or Jewish canon.

Q and the Dead Sea Scrolls reflect the eschatological expectations of communities in various Palestinian villages and towns.[166] Both communities seem to have regarded their eschatological expectations as requiring new social practices that assured the forgiveness of sins.[167] Eschatological expectations frame the beginning and end of Q. In Q 3:7–9, John's preaching is explicitly eschatological. The beatitudes (Q 6:20–23) anticipate eschatological

---

(BJS 135; Atlanta: Scholars, 1988); *Are There Really Tannaitic Parallels to the Gospels?: A Refutation of Morton Smith* (Atlanta: Scholars, 1993); *Rabbinic Literature and the New Testament: What We Cannot Show We Do Not Know* (Valley Forge: Trinity, 1994).

[164] The *Damascus Document* (CD) was found in the Cairo Geniza in the nineteenth century, but was not linked to either the Essenes or the Qumran site until the scrolls were found, so the true significance of the document was not felt until the mid-twentieth century. Norman Perrin and Dennis Duling, *The New Testament: An Introduction* (New York: Harvest, 1982), 100, argue that there is an "almost unanimous belief that it (Q) ultimately emanates from a type of early Jewish apocalyptic Christianity found in Palestine or southern Syria." See also Siegfried Schulz, *Q: Die Spruchquelle der Evangelisten* (Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1972), 168. Schulz proposes that the community responsible for Q was an eschatologically-oriented Palestinian Jewish Christian movement. Q portrays Jesus as part of a larger group of "sons of God," Wisdom's prophets, messengers and sages as "children of Sophia." Jesus is thus seen as part of and in continuity with a Palestinian Jewish community.

[165] But see Hartmut Stegemann, "The Qumran Essenes: Local Members of the Main Jewish Union in Late Second Temple Times" in *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid 18–21 March, 1991* (eds. J. Trebolle Barrera and L. Vegas Montaner; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 83–166. For Q, James M. Robinson, "The Critical Edition of Q and the Study of Jesus," in *The Sayings Source Q and the Historical Jesus* (ed. A. Lindemann; BETL 158; Leuven: Peeters, 2001), 34, proposes that since Gentile Christianity rejected Jewish Christianity as heretical, "the exclusion of its oldest Gospel from the canon was inevitable." But see Mahlon Smith, "The Canonical Status of Q," Jesus Seminar Forum, http://virtualreligion.net/forum/q_canon.html [accessed 2 June, 2009].

[166] Many scholars link 1QS, 1Qsa, and CD to formulate connections between Qumran and various "camps." Similarly, Q's "itinerants" were dependent on local Jewish villages for their economic support.

[167] John S. Kloppenborg Verbin, "Discursive Practices in the Sayings Gospel Q and the Quest of the Historical Jesus" in *The Sayings Gospel Q and the Historical Jesus* (BETL 158; ed. A. Lindemann; Leuven: Peeters, 2001), 149–190, esp. 177, sees Q 11: 2–4 and 1QDM iii 5-7 and 11Q13 ii 1-6 (11QMelch) as signifying that "both Qumran and Q presuppose a sense of eschatological expectation, the point of both is to promote a social practice in the present, which is buttressed by the assurance of sin forgiveness."

reversal. The end of the Sermon (Q 6:46–49) warns the listeners of the consequences resulting from their attitudes to the teachings of Jesus. The entire Sermon is eschatologically oriented.[168] In Q 10:9, the kingdom of God has drawn near. In Q 10:4–12, the mission to Israel seems to have an eschatological time-table. In Q 11:49–51, "*this* generation" is threatened with divine judgment. Q 12:8 promises that those who confess or deny Jesus now will be rewarded or punished before the angels. Q 13:18–21, the parable of the mustard seed, refers to an eschatological future. According to Q 13:24, a few will be able to enter through the "narrow" door, i.e., the end-time is coming soon. Q 12:54–56, a saying about the "signs" of the times, alludes to being able to predict the "weather" from the clouds. Q 12:57–59 describes the importance of reconciliation before it is too late. Q 12:39–46 (the parable of the thief) is evidence for a belief in the delay of the *parousia*. The coming of the son of man will be sudden, unexpected, and imminent. In Q 12:42–46 (the parable of the faithful and unfaithful servants), the "coming" time will be potentially disastrous for the unprepared. According to Q 17:22–37, the son of man will come without warning at any time. Q 22:30 promises that Jesus' disciples will judge the twelve tribes of Israel at the end-time. Based on this brief survey, "an eschatological outlook pervades large parts of the Q material."[169]

The Q group, like the Qumran community, seems to have been hostile to both the Pharisees and the Jerusalem Temple establishment.[170] Yet the Q group, like the Essenes and the Qumran community, maintained allegiances towards Jewish law.[171] Q, like various Qumran texts, is characterized by a

---

[168] On the eschatology of Q, see Tuckett, *Q,* 141: "A great deal of Q seems to be oriented to the eschatological future"; Schulz, *Q*, 168; John S. Kloppenborg, "Symbolic Eschatology and the Apocalypticism of Q," *HTR* 80/3 (1987): 292: "Q is thoroughly permeated by eschatology." Dieter Lührmann, *Die Redaktion der Logienquelle* (WUNT 33; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1969), 69–71, argues that Q is dominated by a delay of the Parousia (*Parusieverzögerung*), not an imminent eschatology (*Naherwartung*).

[169] Tuckett, *Q*, 161.

[170] The Qumran community's association with "Sadducean" origins has been effectively refuted by VanderKam, Davies, and others. Both groups use "Zadok" as an identity-marker, but any "Sadducean" influence in 4QMMT is undermined by the serious disagreements between other Qumran texts and the Sadducees as we know them from Josephus and the New Testament. Qumran texts also refer to Pharisees as "seekers of smooth things" (CD 1.18; 4Q163 [4QpIs^{c}] frag. 23.10–11; 1QH 10.23).

[171] Catchpole, *The Quest for Q*, 256, 279: "the Q Christians were a conservative grouping. An antithesis between the gospel of Jesus and the law of Moses held no attraction for them. At the same time, they clearly found themselves very much at odds with the Pharisaic movement . . . (they were) a community whose outlook was essentially Jerusalem-centered, whose theology was Torah-centered, whose worship was temple-centered and which saw . . . no incompatibility between all of that and commitment to Jesus."

Deuteronomistic perspective of Jewish history,[172] a feature it does *not* generally share with the synoptics or the New Testament.[173] Q and the Qumran texts represent a remarkable creativity in scriptural exegesis, their authors drawing on common biblical patterns and templates, seeking "both to share in the cultural authority of scripture but also in some measure to co-opt it,"[174] assuming "the independence and freedom not only to rewrite Scripture but also to turn it upside down and even contradict it."[175] The practice of recording a revered teacher's sayings was also common and oral traditions circulated well into the second century.[176] The similar use of scriptural references in the Q and Qumran communities as well as their high regard for their founding "teachers," suggests a shared cultural tradition.[177]

The author(s) of Q and the Qumran texts both recognized the authority of the Torah, held the prophetic literature in high esteem, and favored the same biblical texts. Q is partial towards the Psalms, Isaiah, and the Pentateuch. These books are also particularly well represented at Qumran.[178] The authors

[172] Robert A. Derrenbacker Jr. and John S. Kloppenborg Verbin, "Self-Contradiction in the IQP? A Reply to Michael Goulder," *JBL* 120 (2001): 75.

[173] In CD 1.3–2.1, Israel's disobedience and punishment underlies the charter document of the mainstream Essene movement, a community that regarded itself as an elect "remnant" and "the new covenant." The book of Deuteronomy is well represented in the Qumran library; the total number of Hebrew manuscripts is twenty-nine, with one Greek manuscript from cave 7. This witnesses to the importance of Deuteronomy for the Qumran community. Bruce D. Chilton, *Jesus' Use of the Interpreted Scripture of His Time* (GN 8; Wilmington: M. Glazier, 1984), 133–34, notes that "One of the characteristic themes of the Tannaitic framework of the Isaiah Targum is that of the persistent refusal of God's people to attend to the announcement of the prophets and repent. It is a remarkable instance of the thematic coherence between the Targum and Jesus' preaching that he voiced the same complaint. For Jesus, the refusal to hear the prophets is both consistent and systematic (Matthew 5:12; Luke 6:23) . . . The theme of the rejection of the prophets by their own people, and that of the prophetic opposition to contemporary worship is therefore a common element between Jesus and the [Isaiah] Targum."

[174] Carol Newsom, *The Self as Symbolic Space: Identity and Community at Qumran* (STDJ 52; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 6. See also Sidnie White Crawford, *Rewriting Scripture in Second Temple Times: Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008).

[175] Dale C. Allison Jr., *The Intertextual Jesus: Scripture in Q* (Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 2000), 194; Michael Fishbane, "Torah and Tradition," in *Tradition and Theology in the Old Testament* (ed. D. A. Knight; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977), 275–300.

[176] Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* 3.39.4.

[177] George J. Brooke, "Shared Intertextual Interpretations in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament," in *Biblical Perspectives: Early Use and Interpretation of the Bible in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (eds. M. E. Stone and E. G. Chazon; STDJ 28; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 35–57.

[178] James C. VanderKam, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today* (Minneapolis: Eerdmans, 1994), 30–32, notes that the Qumran library contains thirty six manuscripts of Psalms, twenty-nine of Deuteronomy, twenty one of Isaiah, eighteen of Genesis, seventeen of Exodus, and thirteen of Leviticus.

of both collections used similar exegetical techniques: sometimes a scriptural text is altered to fit a particular interpretation; sometimes catchword association is used. There are also similar combinations of sacred texts. Sometimes the same scriptural passages are used in both communities.[179] These author(s) expected their readers to resonate and identify with scriptural allusions.

Q and the Qumran texts represent traditions and communities with similar social, literary, and theological profiles, with respect to particular motifs, traditions, legal rulings, social patterns, and theological ideas. Q contains a high number of biblical references, indicating an intimate knowledge of biblical tradition; its author(s) intended their audience to discover this borrowing.[180]

The author(s) *and audience* of Q knew the scriptures well enough to recognize the connections being drawn, as, for example, in the application of an "exodus pattern" to the sayings material. This observation is all the more interesting in that such an "exodus pattern" is reminiscent of Qumran, where "the sect's history, its current experience, and its expectations are all eschatological, and everything falls under the exodus pattern."[181] Q shares with the Qumran community a tendency to "re-write" scripture.[182] Q "often creates a

---

[179] George J. Brooke, *The New Testament and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005), 65, 67–68.

[180] Allison, *The Intertextual Jesus*, 182–84. Allison notes that Q's intertextuality and its significance have "often been underestimated (5)," and that allusions are to be distinguished from "unconscious borrowing, coincidences, and stock expressions (19–20)." An allusion signals a "metamorphosis" in that it "dismantles a subtext, retains and/or reconfigures a few of its pieces, and then gives them a new home (x)." An allusion may be present if two texts share common vocabulary, word order, themes, imagery, structure, and circumstances. Deliberate literary borrowing may also be detected if there is an instance of an uncommon application of tradition or if an "intertext" is prominent in its new home and "cited or alluded to in other related texts (12)." The probability of an allusion can also be increased if an "intertext" "belongs to a source that the author otherwise shows interest in" or if the proposed discovery of an allusion "enhances meaning in a manner congruent with a book's arguments or themes (13)." Allison has compiled a list of over fifty scriptural references in Q. Q "recalls subtexts" by "explicit citations," "embedded quotations," explicit references to scriptural events and characters and "oblique" references or allusions to key words, phrases, themes, or images (187). Q appealed to those with "oral literacy (16)" suggesting that Q emerged "in a social setting where Scripture was well enough known that phrases pulled from it frequently carried specific associations – associations often related to the site of extraction (22)."

[181] Allison, *The Intertextual Jesus*, 71. For this, see Allison, *The New Moses: A Matthean Typology* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993).

[182] Patricia Tull Willey, *Remember the Former Things: The Recollection of Previous Texts in Second Isaiah* (SBLDS 161; Atlanta: Scholars, 1997), 70: "Not just anything can be said: new interpretations tend to be circumscribed by what the tradition, interpreted according to the community's exegetical norms, will yield. The indwelling of the authoritative text in the audience necessitates the indwelling of the authoritative text in the new interpretation."

contrast with subtexts or even inverts them"[183] in order to "express something provocatively" and create a sense of "distance" between it and the biblical subtext. Q, like 11QTemple, alters Mosaic law and creates *new* Torah.[184] In Q 6:27–45, Q modifies and adds to "Mosaic demands."[185] In Q 14:26, Q inverts the commandment to "honor your father and mother."[186] Is Q reversing scriptural referents because it is experiencing tension with its parent-tradition? Two points are in order here. The first is that Q may be in tension with its scriptural forebears, but this is a creative tension. Q relates to scripture by subverting it and its intertextuality is "an illustration of the interpretive freedom of Jewish rhetoric."[187] Second, Q's "tension" with tradition may construct difference, but this difference need not signify non-relationship: [188] Considering that both Q and the Qumran community "re-write" scripture in similar ways, is there a "common tradition" between the two?

1.4 Conclusion

Q and the Qumran library represent contemporary authors that both made exclusive claims to apocalyptic knowledge. Both perceived themselves as "prophets" and interpreted the Prophets as referring to contemporary events. Both developed an "exodus pattern" in their compositions, developed sapiential instructions, and pronounced judgement on Israel alongside hope for its repentance. Both deployed rhetorical hatred against their opponents. Both conceived of the Holy Spirit as active within their communities and both appear to have practiced exorcism. These similarities, which have never been systematically examined, warrant investigation and critical comparison.

---

[183] Allison, *The Intertextual Jesus*, 192. Allison's list of "intertexts" includes Q 3:8; 6:27–45; 9:57–58; 9:57–62; 10:4; 10:21–22; 11:31; 12:22–31; 13:19; 14:26; 16:18; 17:3–4.

[184] Allison, *The Intertextual Jesus*, 212: "the Sayings Source writes a new Bible as it reconfigures the Tanak into a collection of oracles that foreshadow, prophesy, and illustrate the words and deeds of the Son of man."

[185] Allison, *The Intertextual Jesus*, 33.

[186] Allison, *The Intertextual Jesus*, 62–64.

[187] Allison, *The Intertextual Jesus*, 197.

[188] Allison, *The Intertextual Jesus*, 9, n. 26: "dissimilitude also always exists between two things, so in and of itself it does not disprove a meaningful relationship." Of course, the converse is also true, in that "near meaningless parallels between two texts can always be uncovered if one puts in the effort."

Chapter 2

Reconstructing Q

2.1 Introduction

The "Sayings Gospel Q" is an important source for reconstructing Christian origins, a central site of conflict and debate in the field of New Testament studies.[1] Named after the German *Quelle* for "source," Q is a hypothetical collection of approximately two hundred and thirty five verses found in both Matthew and Luke, but not in Mark. A Palestinian Jewish document dating between 40 and 70 C. E.,[2] Q reflects the eschatological expectations of a community composed of itinerant missionaries as well as "local sympathizers" in numerous villages and towns.[3] This movement seems to have been hostile to both the Pharisees as well as the Jerusalem Temple establishment.[4] At the same time, they maintained allegiance towards the covenant and the

[1] This does not mean that the Synoptic Problem has been resolved. The Farrer-Goulder hypothesis (FGH) posits that Luke re-worked Matthean material to suit his own literary, rhetorical, and theological purposes. See Mark A. Matson, "Luke's Rewriting of the Sermon on the Mount," *Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers 2000* (SBL Seminar Paper Series 39; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2000), 623–50; Farrar, "On Dispensing with Q," 55–88; Goulder, "On Putting Q to the Test," 218–34; "Is Q a Juggernaut?," 667–81; *Luke: A New Paradigm*; Goodacre, *Goulder and the Gospels*; *The Case Against Q*; "A Monopoly on Marcan Priority? Fallacies at the Heart of Q," *Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers 2000* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2000), 538–622; Edward C. Hobbs, "A Quarter Century Without Q," *Perkins School of Theology Journal*, 33/4 (1980): 10–19; E. P. Sanders and Margaret Davies, *Studying the Synoptic Gospels* (London: SCM, 1989), 117.

[2] Q has been dated to ca. 50 C. E. by T. W. Manson, *The Mission and Message of Jesus: An Exposition of the Gospels in the Light of Modern Research* (New York: E. P. Dutton, 1938), 312, and Martin Dibelius, *The Sermon on the Mount* (New York: Scribner's, 1940), 28–29. Gerd Theissen, *The Gospels in Context: Social and Political History in the Synoptic Tradition* (trans. L. M. Maloney; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991), dates Q to the 40s or 50s. Allison, *The Jesus Tradition in Q*, 49–54, dates the earliest strata of Q to the 30s. Dieter Lührmann, "Q in the History of Early Christianity," in *The Shape of Q: Signal Essays on the Sayings Gospel* (ed. J. S. Kloppenborg; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1994), 60–63, dates Q between the 50s and 60s.

[3] Gerd Theissen, *Sociology of Early Palestinian Christianity* (trans. J. Bowden; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1978).

[4] Q 11:42, 39b, 43–44; Q 11:46b, 52, 47–48; Q 13:34–35.

law.[5] Some scholars see Q as a collection of sayings collated as a primitive "missionary" document[6] transmitted by wandering "missionaries" of the early Jesus movement.[7] Others see Q as evidence of a "Q community" of non-messianic "Christians."[8] Some even see Q as evidence with which to construct Jesus as a Cynic sage. Q is a text that holds in tension a number of categorical uncertainties: it is both modern *and* ancient, canonical *and* pre-canonical, Jewish *and* Christian, wisdom *and* apocalyptically oriented.[9]

2.2 The Existence of Q

The existence of Q has sometimes been questioned in recent years.[10] It might be helpful, therefore, to briefly review a number of cases which illustrate the

---

[5] David R. Catchpole, *The Quest for Q* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1993), 256, 279: "the Q Christians were a conservative grouping. An antithesis between the gospel of Jesus and the law of Moses held no attraction for them. At the same time, they clearly found themselves very much at odds with the Pharisaic movement . . . (Q represents) a community whose outlook was essentially Jerusalem-centered."

[6] Allison, *The Jesus Tradition in Q*; Ernst Käsemann, *New Testament Questions of Today* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1969), 119–120; Heinrich Kasting, *Die Anfänge der urchristlichen Mission* (BevT 55; Munich: Kaiser, 1969), 97; Luise Schottroff and Wolfgang Stegemann, *Jesus and the Hope of the Poor* (Maryknoll: Orbis, 1986), 38; Joachim Gnilka, *Theologie des Neuen Testaments* (Freiburg: Herder, 1994), 134.

[7] Dieter Zeller, "Redactional Processes and Changing Settings in the Q-Material," in *The Shape of Q: Signal Essays on the Sayings Gospel* (ed. J. S. Kloppenborg; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1994), 129; Gerd Theissen, *Sociology of Early Palestinian Christianity* (trans. J. Bowden; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1978); Philip Jenkins, *Hidden Gospels: How the Search for Jesus Lost Its Way* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001), 78; Allison, *The Jesus Tradition in Q*, 41.

[8] Burton L. Mack, *The Lost Gospel: The Book of Q & Christian Origins* (New York: Harper San Francisco, 1993).

[9] Q is a modern text because it is (re)constructed by scholars; it is an ancient text because it is an early source for Matthew and Luke. Q is a canonical text because it is found in both Matthew and Luke; it is pre-canonical in that it represents an individual or community not otherwise found in the New Testament. Q may have been created by law-observant Palestinian "Judeans," but it also represents the early Jesus movement. The use of terms such as "Jewish" (as opposed to Ἰουδαιος/"Judean") and "Christian" for the early first century C. E. is problematic but unavoidable. Q contains wisdom sayings; but it is also an apocalyptic text because its structure is dominated by a Deuteronomistic view of Jewish history, an announcement of judgment, and the future appearance of Jesus as the "son of man." On Q as a site of contested readings, see John S. Kloppenborg Verbin, *Excavating Q: The History and Setting of the Sayings Gospel* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 2000), 446: "Q scholarship has become an important 'site' at which to understand the role of hypotheses and ideologically invested intellectual constructs within New Testament scholarship."

[10] For general introductions to the Synoptic Problem, its strengths and weaknesses, problems and pitfalls, see David Laird Dungan, *A History of the Synoptic Problem: The Canon,*

relative implausibility of Luke's use of Matthew, and support the "existence" of Q.[11] In John's announcement of judgment (Matt 3:7–12/Luke 3:7–9, 16b–17), Matthew mentions the Pharisees and Sadducees whereas Luke does not. Assuming that Luke used Matthew, there is no evident reason why he would omit Matthew's reference to the Pharisees (considering that he polemicizes against them elsewhere),[12] and omit the reference to repentance, considering that he was fond of the theme. In the temptation narrative (Matt 4:1–11/Luke 4:1–13), Matthew's reference to human beings living not by bread alone, "but by every word that proceeds from the mouth of God" (Matt 4:4b), is not taken up by Luke. Assuming Luke knew Matthew, there does not seem to be any particular reason why he would drop this line, especially considering that receptivity to the word of God is a major theme in his own work.[13] In the Lord's Prayer (Matt 6:9–13/Luke 11:2–4), Matthew's version contains "extra" phrases which address the heavenly Father, petition for God's will to be done and plea for deliverance from evil. Luke's version contains none of these phrases. Assuming Luke used Matthew, why would he omit Matthew's reference to the heavenly Father, considering that he retains it elsewhere,[14] drop Matthew's reference to God's will, considering he uses it elsewhere,[15] and omit the theme of deliverance from evil, a theme he is elsewhere concerned

the Text, the Composition, and the Interpretation of the Gospels (New York: Doubleday, 1999); Stein, *The Synoptic Problem*. For the existence of Q, see Joseph A. Fitzmyer, "The Priority of Mark and the 'Q' Source in Luke," in *Jesus and Man's Hope* (Pittsburgh: Pittsburgh Theological Seminary, 1970), 131–170; Charles E. Carlston and D. Norlan, "Once More – Statistics and Q," *HTR* 64 (1971): 59–78; Petros Vassiliadis, ΛΟΓΟΙ ΙΗΣΟΥ*: Studies in Q* (Atlanta: Scholars, 1999), 1–38; Tuckett, "The Existence of Q," in *Q*, 1–39; Catchpole, *The Quest for Q*, 1–59; Harry T. Fleddermann, *Q: A Reconstruction and Commentary* (BTS 1; Leuven: Peeters, 2005), 41–68. For a rabbinic comparative approach to the Synoptic Problem, see Bruce Chilton, *Profiles of a Rabbi: Synoptic Opportunities in Reading About Jesus* (BJS 177; Atlanta: Scholars, 1989). Chilton acknowledges "the existence of the material of 'Q,'" and admits that "Markan priority is widely and yet cautiously recommended by most scholars of the Gospels today (25)," but finds it "problematic to assume 'Q' was an actual document" (17). He calls for a "paradigm shift" in synoptic studies, a "new orientation" away from the "fixation with literary dependence" (26) and towards social, oral, *halakhic*, and "communal" factors in the composition and relationship of the synoptics. According to this view, the Gospels were created as "hermeneutical acts, which related the communities for which they were intended to the covenant with Abraham, which is taken for granted" (176).

[11] For the illustrative examples which follow, see Catchpole, *Quest for Q*, 1–59.

[12] Luke also uses Mark's single reference to Sadducees (Mark 12:18/Luke 20:27) and presents them negatively in Acts 4:1, 5:17, 23:6–8.

[13] Luke also emphasizes the "word" as divine disclosure (1:38, 2:29, 3:2) and the "words" of life (5:20).

[14] In Luke 11:13, Luke retains a reference to the "heavenly Father" and in Luke 10:21, Luke retains a reference to "Father, Lord of heaven and earth."

[15] In Luke 12:47, Jesus's parable refers to "doing the will of the Lord" and elsewhere Luke adopts a reference to God's will being done (Mark 14:36).

with?[16] In Jesus' response to John (Matt 11:2–6/Luke 7:18–23), a number of miracles are listed that Matthew's gospel has already narrated.[17] By this point in the narrative, Jesus has already been identified as the Son of God (8:29), the son of man (9:6), and the son of David (9:27). For Matthew, these activities are explicitly identified as τὰ ἔργα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, yet this phrase is missing in Luke. Assuming that Luke used Matthew, why would he have omitted an explicit reference to Jesus' messianic identity, especially considering that Luke also regarded these acts as *messianic* signs?[18]

Positing Luke's use of Matthew is essentially tantamount to saying that Luke changed every single detail of Matthew's infancy and resurrection narratives as well as his Sermon on the Mount. Since there are also several clear examples in which Luke fails to reproduce Matthew's use of Mark, including the Baptist narrative, the Beelzebul controversy, the Sending of the Twelve, and the Synoptic Apocalypse,[19] it is not difficult to see why the Two-Documentary Hypothesis (2DH) has carried the day.[20] The textual surgery that Luke would have had to perform in order to have known and used Matthew would have been formidable. The claim that Luke contains Matthean vocabulary is undermined by the argument that Matthew seems to contain *Lu-*

[16] For the theme of deliverance from supernatural evil in Luke, see 4:18, 13:16, 7:21, 8:2, 11:26, Acts 19:11–12.

[17] The blind: Matt 9:27-31; the lame: Matt 9:1-8; a leper: Matt 8:1–4; the deaf: Matt 9:32–34; the dead: Matt 9:18–26.

[18] In Luke, only three of the miracles have been narrated: (the lame: 5:17–26; a leper: 5:12–16; and the dead: 7:11–17), although Luke 7:21 refers to the eyes of the blind (allusion to Mark 3:10–11). Interestingly, Luke also adopts Mark 1:32–34, where Jesus is the "son of God," which Luke explicitly identifies as a messianic title. Elsewhere, Luke uses Isaiah 61 (with its similar list of miracles) as a programmatic statement for Jesus' ministry. Luke clearly regarded "signs," miracle-working and messianism as related (9:18–20, 23:8, 19:37).

[19] Matt 3:1–4:11/Mark 1:1–13/Luke 3:1–22, 4:1–13; Matt 12:22–45/Mark 3:20–29/Luke 11:14–26, 12:10, 6:43–45; Matt 9:35–10:16/Mark 6:13–19, 6:6-11, 34/Luke 9:1–5, 6:13–16, 10:1–12; Matt 24:4–26/Mark 13:5–37/Luke 21:8–36, respectively.

[20] Robert H. Stein, *The Synoptic Problem: An Introduction* (Grand Rapids: Baker Books House, 1987), 62, 95. See also Heinrich J. Holtzmann, *Die synoptischen Evangelien: Ihr Ursprung und geschichtlicher Charakter* (Leipzig: Engelmann, 1863), 130; B. H. Streeter, *The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins* (London: Macmillan, 1924), 183; Werner G. Kümmel, *Introduction to the New Testament* (London, SCM, 1966; rev. ed., 1975), 50; Reginald H. Fuller, *The New Testament in Current Study* (London: SCM, 1963), 87; Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke I–IX: Introduction, Translation, and Notes* (AB 28; New York: Doubleday, 1981), 73–74; Arland D. Jacobson, *The First Gospel: An Introduction to Q* (FF; Sonoma: Polebridge, 1992), 5; W. D. Davies and Dale C. Allison, Jr., *An Exegetical and Critical Commentary on the Gospel according to St. Matthew* (3 vols.; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1988–1997), 1: 98; Tuckett, *Q and the History of Early Christianity*, 8; G. M. Styler, "Synoptic Problem," in *The Oxford Companion to the Bible* (eds. B. M. Metzger and M. D. Coogan; Oxford, 1993), 724–27, esp. 726; Bart Ehrman, *The New Testament: A Historical Introduction to the Early Christian Writings* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 79.

kan vocabulary.[21] There are also instances in which Luke seems to retain a more primitive form of a saying contained in Matthew (Matt 12:28/Luke 11:20). Luke also seems to follow the original order of the double tradition more faithfully than Matthew. None of the arguments raised against the 2DH have proved decisive.[22] The FGH suggests that Luke contains Matthean vocabulary and that an argument from order supports Luke's redistribution of Matthean material. Proponents of this theory also argue that Q is never mentioned anywhere in ancient literature nor has any manuscript copy of Q ever been found. It is true, of course, that Q is never mentioned in ancient literature and no manuscript copy has been found. On the other hand, the absence of a physical manuscript is neither an unparalleled phenomenon nor a conclusive argument against Q's existence, considering the paucity of texts from antiquity. Luke had sources, true; but even if we grant that Luke *did* know Matthew, we would still be left with asking where Matthew got *his* traditions from. The minor agreements are a problem for the Two Documentary Hypothesis, and there are a number of difficult cases, but there are also a number of ways to explain them. For example, it is possible that Mark underwent several recensions (i.e. Ur-Markus or Deutero-Markus); it is also possible that interference from oral tradition(s) led to Luke conforming to Matthew or vice versa; alternatively, post-Markan textual corruption could have led to certain agreements. Finally, a number of intermediate gospels could have existed, and some agreements may be derived from a shared source. Each of these solutions provide plausible explanations for minor agreements.

The high degree of verbal agreements between Matthew and Luke, the presence of numerous peculiar phrases in Q, and the identification of Matthean and Lukan redactional habits in syntax, vocabulary and theology,

---

[21] See John S. Kloppenborg, "Goulder and the New Paradigm: A Critical Appreciation of Michael Goulder on the Synoptic Problem," in *The Gospels according to Michael Goulder: A North American Response*, (ed. C. A. Rollston; Harrisburg: Trinity, 2002), 58: "the evidence that Goulder adduces of Mattheanisms in Luke (or Q) is both weak and admits of counter-evidence: Lucanisms in Matthew."

[22] The most significant agreement can be found in the passion narratives. In Matt 26:67/Luke 22:63, both Gospels use an identical phrase – προφήτευσον ἡμῖν, χριστέ, τίς ἐστιν ὁ παίσας σε; – with no parallel in Mark. While some scholars regard this as evidence of Luke's direct literary dependence on Matthew, others argue that this agreement can be explained by conjectural emendation, shared oral tradition, or a more "chaotic" view of Q. See Frans Neirynck, "ΤΙΣ ΕΣΤΙΝ Ο ΠΑΙΣΑΣ ΣΕ, Matt 26:68/Luke 22:64 (diff. Mark 14:65)," *ETL* 63 (1987): 5–47; Marion L. Soards, *The Passion According to Luke: The Special Material of Luke 22* (JSNTSup 14; Sheffield: JSOT, 1987). Other significant agreements include: Matt 13:11/Luke 8:10 (against Mark 4:11); Matt 9:20/Luke 8:44 (against Mark 5:27); Matt 9:26/Luke 4:14 (nothing in Mark); Matt 22:34–40/Luke 10:25–28 (against Mark 12:12–34); Matt 26:75/Luke 22:62 (against Mark 14:72); Matt 28:1/Luke 23:54 (against Mark 16:1); Matt 22:27/Luke 20:32 against Mark 12:22; Matt 26:66/Luke 22:62 against Mark 14:64. See also Frans Neirynck, "Goulder and the Minor Agreements," *ETL* 73 (1997): 84–93.

have all led to the conclusion that Matthean and Lukan "fingerprints" can be identified and a critical Greek text of Q (re)constructed. Today the Two Documentary Hypothesis remains the dominant solution to the Synoptic Problem and the publication of *The Critical Edition of Q* (CEQ) by the International Q Project (IQP) marked a significant stage in Q studies.[23]

2.3 A History of Research on Q

The discovery of Q can be dated to 1838, when Christian Hermann Weisse first argued that Matthew and Luke used Mark as well as a second source, a sayings collection,[24] and, more definitively, to 1863, when Heinrich J. Holtzmann's study of the sayings in Matthew and Luke made Q a persuasive solution to the Synoptic Problem.[25] The 2DH proved to be a useful theory for it not only posited that the Gospel of Mark was the first to be written; it also argued that a second source, perhaps earlier than Mark, was used by the authors of Matthew and Luke. By the beginning of the twentieth century, Q was being (re)constructed as a *documentary source* according to the principles of text criticism.[26] Yet it was not until the 1950s that the emergence of a truly *distinctive* Q began to appear. As Heinz E. Tödt argued, Q did not originate from the *kerygma*, "sondern einen anderen Inhalt und andere Grundlagen hat."[27] Tödt's 1956 dissertation on Q launched a new phase in assessing the theology

[23] James M. Robinson, Paul Hoffmann and John S. Kloppenborg, eds., *The Critical Edition of Q: A Synopsis including the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, Mark and Thomas with English, German, and French Translations of Q and Thomas* (Leuven: Peeters/Minneapolis: Fortress, 2000). There is ongoing discussion regarding whether Mark knew Q. See Harry T. Fleddermann, *Mark and Q: A Study of the Overlap Texts* (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1995); Catchpole, *The Quest for Q*, 1993, 70–78; Burton Mack, "Q and the Gospel of Mark: Revisiting Christian Origins," *Semeia* 55 (1992): 15–39; Bernhard Weiss, *A Manual of Introduction to the New Testament* (trans. A. J. K. Davidson; 2 vols, New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1889), 2: 246–248; Jan Lambrecht, "Q-Influence on Mark 8, 34–9,1," in *Logia: Les Paroles de Jésus: The Sayings of Jesus: Mémorial* Joseph Coppens (BETL 59; ed. J. Delobel, et al.; Leuven: Peeters, 1982), 277–304; "John the Baptist and Jesus in Mark 1.1-15: Markan Redaction of Q?," *NTS* 38 (1992): 357–84.

[24] Christian Hermann Weisse, *Die evangelische Geschichte kritisch und philosophisch bearbeitet* (2 vols., Leipzig: Breitkopf und Härtel, 1838), I: 55–56, 83. For a detailed history of research on Q, see Robinson, Hoffmann and Kloppenborg, *The Critical Edition of Q*, xix–lxxi. "Q" was coined by Johannes Weiss, "Die Verteidigung Jesu gegen den Vorwurf des Bündnisses mit Beelzebul," *TSK* 63 (1890): 555–69, 557. The term "Sayings Gospel Q" originated in the SBL Q Seminar, 1987, the suggestion of John Dominic Crossan. See Kloppenborg Verbin, *Excavating Q*, 398, n. 63.

[25] Holtzmann, *Die synoptischen Evangelien.*

[26] Kloppenborg Verbin, *Excavating Q*, 329, 332–33, 336.

[27] Heinz Eduard Tödt, *Der Menschensohn in der synoptischen Überlieferung* (Gütersloh: G. Mohn, 1959), 267.

of Q and coincided with the rise of redaction criticism, which demonstrated the *diversity* and variety of early Christianity.[28] Each gospel was increasingly being seen as representing a distinct group or "community" and Q was no exception: Tödt's research led to the view that Q represented both an independent theology and community.[29] Between 1956 and 1969, the "Heidelberg branch of the Bultmannian movement" developed redactional theories of Q that further established Q's distinctive profile.[30] Odil Hannes Steck isolated the motif of the Deuteronomistic view of history (Q 6:22–23; Q 11:47–51; Q 13:34–35) as the conceptual framework of Q.[31] Dieter Lührmann supported Steck's proposal that the pronouncement of judgment on Israel had become "a decisive interpretive tool" in the redaction of Q.[32] Lührmann also emphasized the Sophia material (Q 11:49–51, 13:34–35, 7:35, 10:21–22, 11:31–32) as the dominant redactional elements in the latest layer of Q, which he argued arose as Q moved out of its Palestinian milieu into the wider Hellenistic Jewish Christian environment.[33]

The most significant realization in recent Q studies was that Q contained extensive *sapiential* traditions.[34] In 1964, James M. Robinson argued that the *Gattung* of Q (*λόγοι σοφῶν*) belonged to wisdom literature's "sayings" collections.[35] Q could now be seen as "a discrete and autonomous sphere of theologizing, independent of the passion kerygma."[36] Building on Philip Vielhauer's proposal that the son of man sayings were redactional,[37] Helmut Koester ar-

---

[28] Kloppenborg Verbin, *Excavating Q*, 346.

[29] Ulrich Luz, "Das Jesusbild der vormarkinischen Tradition," in *Jesus Christus in Historie und Theologie: Neutestamentliche Festschrift für Hans Conzelmann zum 60. Geburtstag* (ed. G. Strecker; Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1975), 349–50.

[30] James M. Robinson, *The Sayings Gospel Q: Collected Essays* (BETL 189; eds. C. Heil and J. Veryheyden; Leuven: Peeters, 2005), 297.

[31] Odil Hannes Steck, *Israel und das gewaltsame Geschick der Propheten: Untersuchungen zur Überlieferung des deuteronomistischen Geschichtsbildes im Alten Testament, Spätjudentum und Urchristentum* (WMANT 23; Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1967), 58, n. 39: "daß die Vorstellung vom gewaltsamen Geschick der Propheten in Lk 11,49ff und Lk 13,34f bereits in spätjüdischen Traditionsstücken überliefert ist, und zwar näherhin in Logien, die aus der Gattungstradition prophetischer Gerichtsworte ihre Formung empfangen haben."

[32] Lührmann, *Die Redaktion der Logienquelle*, 94.

[33] Lührmann, *Die Redaktion der Logienquelle*, 97–98, 100.

[34] Ulrich Wilckens, *Weisheit und Torheit: Eine exegetisch-religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zu 1 Kor. 1 und 2* (BHT 26; Tübingen: Mohr, 1959), 163–164.

[35] James M. Robinson, "ΛΟΓΟΙ ΣΟΦΩΝ: Zur Gattung der Spruchquelle Q", in *Zeit und Geschichte: Dankesgabe an Rudolf Bultmann* (ed. E. Dinkler; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1964), 77–96; "LOGOI SOPHON: On the Gattung of Q," in *Trajectories through Early Christianity* (eds. J. M. Robinson and H. Koester; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1971), 71–113.

[36] Kloppenborg Verbin, *Excavating Q*, 347.

[37] Philip Vielhauer, "Gottesreich und Menschensohn in der Verkündigung Jesu," in *Festschrift für Günther Dehn: zum 75. Geburtstag am 18. April 1957* (ed. W. Schneemelcher;

gued that the earliest version(s) of Q and *Thomas* were similar "sayings" collections, neither of which contained any salvific references to Jesus' death.[38] Q quickly became a significant site of early Christian *difference* within and alongside multiple "trajectories" in early Christianity. A distinctive Q facilitated the construction of alternative early Christianities and effectively challenged theological orthodoxy.[39]

The "discovery" of Q, therefore, has long been related to ideological and theological interests.[40] A dominant interest in Q studies continues to be the reconstruction of a *distinctive* social, compositional, and theological profile in early Christianity.[41] This emphasis on Q's distinctiveness may be at least in

---

Neukirchen: Kreis Moers, Verlag der Buchhandlung Erziehungsvereins, 1957), 51–79; "Jesus und der Menschensohn," *ZThK* 60 (1963): 133–77.

[38] Helmut Koester, "GNOMAI DIAPHOROI," in *Trajectories*, 203–47, argued that neither Q nor *Thomas* contained a passion narrative or a messianic *kerygma* and that both texts did not (originally) identify Jesus as son of man.

[39] Kloppenborg Verbin, *Excavating Q*, 419, 395, notes that "resistance to the discussion of Q's social location and social posture seems to be a function of much deeper theological worries" and that debates on Q have struck "deep theological nerves."

[40] Kloppenborg Verbin, *Excavating Q*, 4; 268, notes that discussions of the Synoptic Problem and Q have "taken place and still occur for the most part in the context of general theological scholarship where issues of doctrine, faith, church polity, pastoral practice, and Christian self-understanding are keenly debated." Kloppenborg Verbin, *Excavating Q*, 294: The success of the 2DH has "sometimes had more to do with ideological considerations than with . . . the way it solved literary problems." Kloppenborg criticizes the idea that the 2DH "depends" on ideological or theological factors or apologetics as "naïve" because it "would trivialize the serious and substantial literary-critical observations" made by scholars (328). John S. Kloppenborg Verbin, "Is There a New Paradigm?," in *Christology, Controversy and Community: New Testament Essays in Honour of David R. Catchpole* (eds. D. G. Horrell and C. M. Tuckett; NovTSup 99; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 23–47, esp. 46–47, notes that "solutions to the Synoptic puzzles" "have functioned within broader theological paradigms" and were "adopted not so much because they solved literary problems but because literary models "cohered with broader ideological interests." Kloppenborg's *Formation of Q* was published in 1987 (ca. the founding of the Jesus Seminar) and appeared to provide literary support for the idea that a non-apocalyptic Jesus preceded the apocalyptic material in Q, yet Kloppenborg himself has remained "agnostic" about the authenticity of the Q sayings. For a postcolonial critique of *Excavating Q*, see Ronald Charles, "Q as a Question from a Postcolonial Point of View," *BT* 7.2 (2009): 182–99, esp. 194. Charles points out that although Kloppenborg Verbin (*Excavating Q*, 443) admits that neutral historiography is impossible, "he does not provide or take any clear position where he himself stands theologically and ideologically." John J. Collins, "Wisdom, Apocalypticism, and Generic Compatibility," in *In Search of Wisdom: Essays in Memory of John G. Gammie* (eds. L. G. Perdue, B. B. Scott and W. Johnston Wiseman; Lousiville: Westminster John Knox, 1993), 183, referring to Mack, regards the stratification hypothesis as an attempt to "turn the tables" on the apocalyptic Jesus model. Richard A. Horsley, "Wisdom Justified," 744, argues that "Concepts or issues appear to be imposed upon (read into) this discourse from Christian theology and/or the conceptual apparatus of theologically oriented New Testament studies."

[41] Robinson's proposal that Q belonged to the *Gattung* of *logoi sophon* was an attempt to

part an attempt to construct a form of Christianity "different" from the traditional Gospels and Acts-centered paradigm of Christian origins.[42] The reconstruction of Q has also been used to posit literary and social developments and/or "trajectories," whether in Christology, social history, or ethnic allegiance. For example, a number of scholars hold that Q reflects a group that became progressively more interested in Torah Judaism and divine revelation. The emphasis on wisdom literature as the "formative" element in Q also appeals to the cross-cultural nature of the sapiential genre of instruction as opposed to the more ethnic Jewish expressions of law, prophecy, and revelation.[43] The problem is that it is misleading to characterize the Q group as more or less "Jewish" depending on whether or not they emphasized sapiential, prophetic, or apocalyptic literary features.

Q does proclaim judgment on "this generation." Some scholars regard this phrase as Q's rejection of Israel.[44] Yet this proposal is also misleading in that it implies that the Q group had somehow *withdrawn* from Israel and reads "Israel" as rejecting Jesus. Jesus' core followers were *Jews*. How could "the Jews" or "Israel" (*en masse*) have come to reject Jesus by the mid-first cen-

---

work out Bultmann's treatment of sayings as *Logia*. Although too broad to identify Q in its "final form," this generic identification was subsequently adopted by Helmut Koester who argued that an early "edition" of Q resembled the *Gospel of Thomas* as another example of an ancient "sayings gospel." Koester suggested that the contrast between Q's wisdom orientation and the "very different theological orientation" regarding the son of man (as a "foreign element") was "due to a secondary redaction" of a wisdom book ("Apocryphal and Canonical Gospels," *HTR* 73 (1980):105–30). The absence of "apocalyptic" expectation in *Thomas* was taken as evidence of a primitive form of Q. Stephen J. Patterson, "Wisdom in Q and Thomas," in *In Search of Wisdom*, 192, sees Q as an instruction moving towards apocalypticism, whereas *Thomas* is an instruction moving towards Gnosticism (193). He finds a common wisdom tradition underlying both Q and *Thomas* before their respective transformations into apocalyptic and Gnostic expressions (194).

[42] Kloppenborg's model of an originally sapiential Q proves useful for contemporary theological constructions of the Q people, the historical Jesus, and the early Jesus movement.

[43] Patterson, "Wisdom in Q and Thomas," 187–221, 199, confirms that part of the attraction for a sapiential Jesus is his universality ("Wisdom in antiquity was an international phenomenon"). As a *wisdom* text, Q can be regarded as less "Jewish" because the genre of wisdom is not exclusively Jewish. The same, perhaps, cannot be said for "apocalyptic" literature, or Jewish messianism. One result of this is that wisdom traditions can resemble "outside" influences (like Cynicism). At the same time, modern "fundamentalist" thought is subverted by the allegedly secondary nature of the "apocalyptic" elements in the tradition.

[44] Kloppenborg, "*Formation of Q* Revisited," 207, regards "this generation" as "coextensive with Israel" because it invokes and accompanies criticism of Jerusalem, woes against Pharisees and Galilean towns and threats of exclusion. This, however, doesn't make the Q people non-Jewish or any less Jewish than the Qumran community. The severe criticism of Israel is not to be seen as a "rejection" of Israel. Lührmann, *Redaktion*, 24–48, 30, 93; Schulz, *Q*, 340; Schürmann, "Redekomposition," 73; Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 148, 167; all see "this generation" as a term for all Israel and the Q people as giving up on Israel and maybe embracing a Gentile mission.

tury C. E.? The message of Q was welcomed by some Jews and rejected by others. The expression "this generation" is more accurately understood as directed against *non-responsive* Israel, i.e., a *part* of Israel.[45]

Some scholars interpret proposed redactions of Q as reflecting significant developments in the social history of the Jesus movement.[46] But positing *radical* discontinuity between various stages of Q or different groups for any proposed strata is unjustified.[47] While rejection certainly played a role in the rhetorical orientation of the final redaction of Q, the reconstruction of the social history of Q must reckon with the possibility of an historically "apocalyptic" social context marking the ministries of John, Paul, James, Jesus, and the larger Jewish context in which they lived. Q is not easily deployed as evidence of a non-apocalyptic and non-messianic early Jesus movement.[48]

---

[45] Tuckett, *Q*, 199. Contra Lührmann, Steck, *Geschick*, 286–88, who sees these sayings as aimed at the "Erweckung" of Israel. Richard A. Horsley, "Social Conflict in the Synoptic Sayings Source Q," in *Conflict and Invention: Literary, Rhetorical, and Social Studies on the Sayings Gospel Q* (ed. J. S. Kloppenborg; Valley Forge: Trinity, 1995), 37–52, points out that Q 22:28–30, Q 13:28–29, and Q 13:34–35 do not support a reading of Q vs. "all Israel." This reading of Israel's "unfaithfulness" appears to be "a residue of a Christian theological agenda." Horsley has argued that a Christian theological reading (of the Q group vs. all of Israel) has been supported by redactional strata in Q because the "apocalyptic" layer is seen as addressing "all Israel (39)." Horsley, "Wisdom Jusified," 741, claims this is "typical of scholarship on Q, but not in the text."

[46] Mack, *The Lost Gospel*, 4; *The Christian Myth: Origins, Logic, and Legacy* (New York: Continuum, 2001); John Dominic Crossan, *The Historical Jesus: The Life of a Mediterranean Jewish Peasant* (New York: Harper Collins, 1991); Leif E. Vaage and John S. Kloppenborg, "Early Christianity, Q, and Jesus: The Sayings Gospel and Method in the Study of Christian Origins," *Semeia* 55 (1992): 6.

[47] Kloppenborg Verbin, *Excavating Q*, 201, 213: "With the main redaction of . . . .there is a noticeable shift in the formal characteristics of the collection as well as the types of rhetorical appeals. Despite these shifts, there is no strong reason to suppose a radically different social setting, much less to suppose that a different set of persons is being addressed. The changes are more likely due to a new rhetorical situation." He adds: "the shift from the earlier stages . . . is not a matter of discontinuity but, since it is a matter of a somewhat different scribal practice, only a shift in level."

[48] Richard A. Horsley, "Q and Jesus: Assumptions, Approaches, and Analyses," *Semeia* 55 (1991): 208. Amy-Jill Levine, "The Earth Moved: Jesus, Sex, and Eschatology," in *Apocalypticism, Anti-Semitism and the Historical Jesus: Subtexts in Criticism* (London: T & T Clark International, 2005), 83–97, 88, criticizes constructions of a non-apocalyptic Jesus for neglecting the place of law, purity, Temple, ethnicity and dichotomizing wisdom and apocalypticism. She points out that "A speaker of wisdom may well be eschatologically oriented. The book of Daniel offers both wisdom and apocalyptic, as does Zechariah, the Apocalypse of Abraham, 1 Enoch, 2 Baruch, and so on. It would be odd to find in a Jewish context a text or a group in which wisdom and apocalyptic do not appear side by side."

Q is the most important source for reconstructing the "historical Jesus" and the Palestinian Jesus movement.[49] Q is a significant historical, literary, and theological link between Jesus, his Jewish context, and early Christianity. The study of the "historical Jesus" cannot be conflated with the study of Q.[50] But Q has long been associated with the liberal Protestant quest for the "historical Jesus," and certainy since Harnack's regard for Q as a pure "source" for both the Jesus tradition and Jesus.[51] As Harnack would have it, Q is a "Sammlung von Reden und Sprüchen Jesu mit so gut wie ausschließlich galiläischem Horizont."[52] Some also continue to view Q as a "grab-bag" of assorted sayings with no discernible organizing structure, *Tendenz* or framework.[53]

The dominant focus since the late 1960s has been Q's redactional profile, not the "historical Jesus,"[54] yet these domains eventually crossed as a result of increased interest in the Synoptic Problem, the recognition of Q as a Palestinian Jewish literary document, and its availability as a reconstructed text.[55] James Robinson traces the development of Q being viewed as "the document of a distinct branch of primitive Christianity" to the quest for Jesus that had been "a driving force behind Liberalism in German theology."[56] In doing so, Robinson discloses his own social and theological locations, admitting that

---

[49] For studies of Q and the historical Jesus, see James M. Robinson, "The Jesus of the Sayings Gospel Q" (OPIAC 28; Claremont: Claremont Graduate School, 1993); "The Critical Edition of Q and the Study of Jesus," in *The Sayings Source Q and the Historical Jesus* (ed. A. Lindemann; Leuven: Peeters, 2001), 27–52; Daniel Kosch, "Q und Jesus," *BZ NF* 36 (1992): 30–58; Dieter Lührmann, "Die Logienquelle und die Frage nach dem historischen Jesu," paper presented at the fall meeting at Westar Institute, Edmonton, Alberta, Oct 24–27, 1991; Jens Schröter, "Markus, Q und der historische Jesus: Methodologische und exegetische Erwägungen zu den Anfängen der Rezeption der Verkündigung Jesu," *ZNW* 89 (1998): 173–200. Theissen and Merz, *The Historical Jesus*, n. 7, 29; John S. Kloppenborg, "The Sayings Gospel Q and the Quest of the Historical Jesus," *HTR* 89 (1996): 307–44; "Discursive Practices in the Sayings Gospel Q and the Quest of the Historical Jesus," in *The Sayings Source Q and the Historical Jesus*, 149–90; Richard A. Horsley, "Q and Jesus: Assumptions, Approaches, and Analyses," in *Semeia* 55, 175–209; Allison, *The Jesus Tradition in Q*, 60–61; Brian Gregg, *The Historical Jesus and the Final Judgment Sayings in Q* (WUNT 2 207; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006).

[50] Dennis Ingolfsland, "Kloppenborg's Stratification of Q and its Significance for Historical Jesus Studies," *JETS* 46/2 (2003): 217–32.

[51] Adolf Harnack, *The Sayings of Jesus: The Second Source of St. Matthew and St. Luke* (trans. J. R. Wilkinson; NTS 2; London: Williams & Norgate, 1908). See also Paul Wernle, *Die synoptische Frage* (Leipzig, Freiburg im Breisgau/Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1899), 229–30, who regarded Q as the "free, almost revolutionary Gospel of Jesus himself."

[52] Harnack, *Sprüche und Reden Jesu*, 121; *The Sayings of Jesus*, 171.

[53] For example, John P. Meier, *A Marginal Jew: Rethinking the Historical Jesus* (vol. 2; New York: Doubleday, 1991), 181.

[54] Kloppenborg Verbin, "Discursive Practices," 150.

[55] Kloppenborg Verbin, "Discursive Practices," 151.

[56] Robinson, "Theological Autobiography," in *The Sayings Gospel Q*, 3–34, 24–25.

his "objective scholarship has not been disinterested,"[57] but rather driven and informed by his interest in the message and person of Jesus.[58]

In 1983, Robinson launched the International Q Project under the auspices of the Institute for Antiquity and Christianity and the Society of Biblical Literature in an effort to reconstruct the "original" text of Q.[59] Robinson argued that Q is "surely the most important Christian text that we have," its significance lying in the fact that "Q is not a canonical book, and yet in a way stands prior to and above the canonical books of the New Testament."[60] In Q "we are nearer to Jesus than anywhere else on the pages of history."[61] John Kloppenborg has argued that it is "erroneous" to suggest that Q studies "are somehow really about the historical Jesus" since the Jesus of Q is "a literary character, constructed from a network of sayings, stories, and editorial comments, and he belongs to the social world of the Galilean Jesus movement."[62] Yet Robinson was motivated by a conviction that Q had greater authority than canonical texts and could lead us closer than any other text could back to the "historical Jesus." Q's distinctiveness has significant implications for the study of the "historical Jesus."[63] If "Q gives no evidence of knowing items that otherwise

[57] Robinson, "Theological Autobiography," 31.

[58] Robinson, "Theological Autobiography," 26, 31, 34. For Robinson, Q is more a "call for action" than a "theological statement" . . . "the real challenge to Christianity today is to catch sight again of Jesus' ideal and to implement it effectively in our world (387)."

[59] Robinson, *The Sayings Gospel Q*, 191, carefully noted that "such a text as Q with its critical apparatus should never be considered as completed or final, but must always remain open for improvement."

[60] Robinson, *The Sayings Gospel Q*, 180 (originally published as "The Sayings of Jesus: Q [The Vosburgh Lectures, October 26–27 1983])." Kloppenborg Verbin, "Discursive Practices," 152: Q is "if not *the* most important, then at least one of the two or three most important" sources for the historical Jesus.

[61] Robinson is well aware that "one should not oversimplify by identifying Q with the historical Jesus" and points out that Q is indeed a pseudonymous text. See Robinson, *The Sayings Gospel Q*, 180, 183: "the Q people . . . proclaim their message anonymously as sayings of Jesus. Pseudonymity did not begin first with the Deutero-Pauline Epistles . . . but began already in Galilee among Jesus' followers, who continued for a generation after his death to preach in his name."

[62] Kloppenborg Verbin, "Discursive Practices," 161–62.

[63] Kloppenborg, "The Sayings Gospel Q and the Quest for the Historical Jesus," 315–19, points out the significance of Q's distinctive kerygma and the idea that the son of man sayings may be redactional, thus locating Q "within broader theological and literary streams or trajectories" (319) which underscore theological diversity: Q may be evidence of another *kerygma* alongside the passion kerygma. This discovery of Q's "distinctiveness" has the attendant discovery of Q as consciously crafted "invention." See also Ron Cameron, "The Sayings Gospel Q and the Quest for the Historical Jesus: A Response to John S. Kloppenborg," *HTR* 89:4 (1996): 351–54. Cameron praises Kloppenborg's work on Q, supporting the need to identify redactional activity and the discovery of Q's formative wisdom clusters as an advocate for the excavation of Q's literary layers. He argues that opponents of the stratification hypothesis (and proponents of Q as a unitary text) (1) do not take seriously the order of the

it might have been expected to have employed . . . [then] it is very doubtful that these should be ascribed to Jesus."[64]

2.4 The Ethnicity of Q

In some circles, Q and the Q community have been portrayed as analagous to the Greco–Roman Cynic tradition.[65] Resemblances between the Cynics and Q's "missionaries" as "wandering charismatics" have been emphasized and Cynic "parallels" developed by a number of scholars.[66] Proponents of this "Cynic hypothesis," however, have sometimes been accused of attempting to "de-Judaize" the Jesus movement.[67] Proponents deny, however, that their in-

---

sayings; (2) fail to discern the sayings' compositional effects; (3) do not grasp what the framers of Q did; and (4) fail to understand how Q functioned programmatically. Cameron argues that Q is a composite, consciously crafted literary document that does not provide evidence that Jesus was a reformer of Judaism or even engaged in religious controversies with his contemporaries. Helmut Koester, "The Sayings Gospel Q and the Quest for the Historical Jesus: A Response to John S. Kloppenborg," *HTR* 89:4 (1996): 322, praises Kloppenborg's emphasis on the literary nature of Q as opposed to it being a "facile" record of Jesus' early followers and argues that the proposed stratification work must be reckoned with in Jesus study.

[64] Kloppenborg, "The Sayings Gospel Q and the Quest for the Historical Jesus," 334.

[65] Gerd Thiessen, "Itinerant Radicalism: The Tradition of Jesus Sayings from the Perspective of the Sociology of Literature," in *RR* 2 (1975): 84–93; *The First Followers of Jesus: A Sociological Analysis of the Earliest Christianity* (London: SCM, 1978); *Social Reality and the Early Christians* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1993).

[66] F. Gerald Downing, "Cynics and Christians," *NTS* 30 (1984): 584–593; "The Social Contexts of Jesus the Teacher: Construction or Reconstruction," *NTS* 33 (1987): 439–51; *Jesus and the Threat of Freedom* (London: SCM, 1987); "Quite like Q: A Genre for 'Q': The 'Lives' of Cynic Philosophers," *Bib* 69 (1988): 196–224; *Christ and the Cynics: Jesus and Other Radical Preachers in First-Century Tradition* (JSOTM 4; Sheffield: Sheffield University Press, 1988); *Cynics and Christian Origins* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1992); Leif E. Vaage, "The Ethos and Ethics of an Itinerant Intelligence," Ph.D. diss, Claremont Graduate School, 1987; "Q and Cynicism: On Comparison and Social Identity," in *The Gospel Behind the Gospels: Current Studies on Q* (ed. R. A. Piper; NovT Sup 75; Leiden: Brill, 1994), 199–229; *Galilean Upstarts: Jesus' First Followers according to Q* (Valley Forge: Trinity, 1994); Ron Cameron, "'What Have You Come Out To See?': Characterizations of John and Jesus in the Gospels," *Semeia* 49 (1990): 35–69; Mack, *The Lost Gospel.*

[67] Richard B. Hays, "The Corrected Jesus," *First Things* (5/1994), 47; Hans Dieter Betz, "Jesus and the Cynics: Survey and Analysis of a Hypothesis," *JR* 74 (1994): 453–75; Paul Rhodes Eddy, "Jesus as Diogenes?: Reflections on the Cynic Jesus Thesis," *JBL* 115 (1996): 449–69; Richard Horsley, "Jesus, Itinerant Cynic or Israelite Prophet?" in *Images of Jesus Today* (eds. J. H. Charlesworth and W. P. Weaver; Valley Forge: Trinity, 1994), 68–97; *Sociology and the Jesus Movement* (New York: Crossroad, 1989), 117; Christopher M. Tuckett, "A Cynic Q?," *Bib* 70 (1989): 349–76; *Q and the History of Early Christianity*, 388; Ben Witherington III, *Jesus the Sage: The Pilgrimage of Wisdom* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1994); Martin Hengel, *The Charismatic Leader and His Followers* (trans. J. Greig; New York:

terests are in "origins or genealogical derivation." They maintain that the Q people *resembled* Cynics but are not to be identified *as* Cynics.[68] While an historical relationship between Jesus, Q, and the Greco–Roman Cynic tradition is probably untenable, the debate surrounding the Cynic hypothesis illustrates how deeply ideological concerns and theological interests are implicated in the field.[69] The Cynic hypothesis highlights the fact that suggesting "a different explanatory framework – one based on social relationships and the ways in which beliefs and ideas are socially situated" can illicit "deep concerns" and "theological worries."[70]

Q and the Q "community" have also been characterized as Gentile Christian, with Q as a kind of instructional booklet for new "Christian" converts from paganism.[71] Harry Fleddermann suggests that Q was originally used by Gentile Christian communities.[72] Fleddermann claims that Q attacks Israel's particularism, promotes a universal approach to salvation, a "flexible" approach to the law, singles out Gentiles as paradigmatic examples of faith, condemns Israel as being under judgment, and replaces the Temple as the site of true worship with the concept of the "kingdom of God." Is this representation correct? Q 3:8 does indeed undermine assumptions that descent from Abraham alone would serve as a guarantor of salvation, but the pronouncement of judgment made by John is still a *Jewish* critique of other Jews. While certain passages in Q do promote a "universal" approach to salvation, this can

---

Crossroad, 1981), 49; Allison, *The Jesus Tradition in Q*; N. T. Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God* (London: SPCK/Philadelphia: Fortress, 1996); E. P. Sanders, "Jesus in Historical Context," *TT* 50 (1993): 430–48; James M. Robinson, "The History-of-Religions Taxonomy of Q: The Cynic Hypothesis," in *Gnosisforschung und Religionsgeschichte. Festschrift für Kurt Rudolph* 65. *Geburtstag* (eds. H. Preißler and H. Seiwert; Marburg: Diagonal, 1994), 247–65; "Building Blocks in the Social History of Q," in *The Sayings Gospel Q*, 493–517; "*Galilean Upstarts*: A Sot's Cynical Disciples," in *The Sayings Gospel Q*, 535-57; Martin Ebner, "Kynische Jesusinterpretation – "disciplined exaggeration? Eine Anfrage," *BZ* 40 (1996): 93–100; William E. Arnal, "The Rhetoric of Deracination in Q: A Reappraisal," Ph.D. diss., Centre for the Study of Religion, University of Toronto, 1997; *Jesus and the Village Scribes: Galilean Conflicts and the Setting of Q* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001), 52–59; David E. Aune, "Jesus and Cynics in First-Century Palestine: Some Critical Considerations," in *Hillel and Jesus: Comparative Studies of Two Major Religious Leaders* (eds. J. H. Charlesworth and L. L. Johns; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1997), 177–192; Gregory A. Boyd, *Cynic Sage or Son of God?: Recovering the Real Jesus in an Age of Revisionist Replies* (Wheaton: Bridgepoint, 1995).

[68] Vaage, *Galilean Upstarts*, 10, claims that his interests are rather in typology. Mack, *The Lost Gospel*, 47, claims that "Jesus was first remembered as a Cynic sage and only later imagined as a prophet who uttered apocalyptic writings."

[69] Kloppenborg Verbin, *Excavating Q*, 421–44.

[70] Kloppenborg Verbin, *Excavating Q*, 419–20.

[71] B. H. Streeter, *The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins* (London: Macmillan, 1924), 233; Manson, *The Sayings of Jesus*, 20.

[72] Fleddermann, *Q: A Reconstruction and Commentary*, 163–66.

also be identified as *Jewish* universalism. Q does single out Gentiles as ideal models, but does so to shame Israel into repentance.[73] Q's condemnation of "this generation" is also a *Jewish* critique of other Jews. Q 13:34–35 laments that the Temple is "forsaken," but this "anti-Temple" rhetoric is not unlike the anti-Temple polemic of other contemporary Jewish groups.

The hypothesis of a *Jewish* Q is firmly supported by recent scholarship. Paul Foster identifies James Robinson's "landmark study" as opening "the way for viewing Q as being in much closer proximity to a 'Jewish' milieu."[74] The idea that Q originated in a Jewish milieu also built on H. E. Tödt's earlier work on Q's Christology, O. H. Steck's identification of Q's Deuteronomistic theology, and D. Lührmann's redactional analysis.[75] Siegfried Schulz, noting Q's "prophetic" forms of speech, saw early Q as originating with Greek-speaking Jewish Christians in Palestine.[76] Paul Hoffmann also regarded Q's mission as having originally been focused on Israel.[77] For Robinson, Q represents "a branch of primitive 'Christianity' that is historically intelligible as part of 'Judaism.'"[78] John Kloppenborg argues that the Q people "took for granted the principal distinguishing marks of Israelite identity – circumcision, some form of Sabbath observance, and probably certain dietary observances."[79] For William Arnal, the final redaction of Q (Q^3) displays an *increasingly* Jewish legalistic orientation.[80]

The history of scholarship on Q reflects a steady progression from Q being seen as a nebulous "(Gentile) Christian source" to a distinctive "Jewish (Christian) gospel." Paul Foster argues that Q contains "no explicit statements that affirm observance of typical Jewish boundary marking practices such as the practice of circumcision, Sabbath observance, and maintenance of food laws."[81] Yet there is also no polemic *against* circumcision, Sabbath, or food laws, which one would expect if Q were written by Gentiles for Gentiles. The

---

[73] Tuckett, *Q*; Robinson, *The Sayings Gospel Q*, 633, 647.

[74] Paul Foster, "Is Q a Jewish-Christian Document?" paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature, Boston, Mass., November 25, 2008, 5.

[75] Tödt, *Der Menschensohn;* ET: *The Son of Man in the Synoptic Tradition* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1965); Steck, *Israel und das gewaltsame Geschick der Propheten;* Lührmann, *Die Redaktion der Logienquelle*.

[76] Schulz, *Q: Spruchquelle der Evangelisten*, 57.

[77] Paul Hoffmann, *Studien zur Theologie der Logienquelle* (3rd ed.; NTAb, NF 8; Münster: Aschendorff, 1972), 332–33. See also "QR und der Menschensohn," in *The Four Gospels 1992* (ed. F. Neirynck; BEThL 100; Leuven: Peeters, 1992), 1: 455.

[78] Robinson, *The Sayings Gospel Q*, 195.

[79] Kloppenborg Verbin, *Excavating Q*, 256. See also Tuckett, *Q*, 435, n. 37.

[80] Arnal, *Jesus and the Village Scribes*, 202; "The Q Document," in *Jewish Christianity Reconsidered: Rethinking Ancient Groups and Texts* (ed. M. Jackson-McCabe; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007), 129.

[81] Foster, "Is Q a Jewish-Christian Document?," 15.

Jesus of Q does not "declare all foods clean."[82] Q 16:16 affirms that it would be easier "for heaven and earth to pass away" than for the law to fall. At the same time, Q 16:17 does suggest that "the law and the prophets" (ὁ νόμος καὶ οἱ προφῆται) were only "until John" (ἕως Ἰωάννου) and since that time the kingdom of God is "being violated." Q 16:16 and 16:17 suggest that the law is eternal and yet being transformed. Like the Qumran community, the Jesus of Q regards the law as eternal and changing. Gentiles are criticized in Q 6:34 and 12:30, and the *explicit* of Q (22:30) describes Jesus' followers as judging the "twelve tribes" of *Israel*. The author criticized Jewish institutions and practices, quoted from scripture and recognized the positive characteristics of some Gentiles while still affirming the law, even as it was being radicalized and intensified.[83] This is consistent with first-century Jewish discourse.

Identifying the primary features of ethnicity – *name*, *myths of common ancestry*, *shared historical memories*, *land*, *language*, *kinship*, *customs*, *religion* and *phenotypical features* – enables us to confirm the "Judean ethnicity of the Q people."[84] There are numerous indicators that Q emerged within an ethnically Judean milieu. Q provides us with "a picture of a community whose outlook was essentially Jerusalem-centred . . . whose worship was temple-centered" and did not see any "incompatibility between all of that and commitment to Jesus."[85] The Q people identify with Israel; the Gentiles/nations (τά ἔθνη) are outsiders.[86] Q contains Aramaic loan-words, refers to synaoguges, purity issues, tithing, and takes a pronounced interest in Jerusalem and the Temple.[87] Q *"presupposes a community whose Judean ethnicity was in (re)construction"* and *"discontinuity with traditional Judean identity."*[88]

The Q people were *ethnically Judean*.[89] They are monotheists who worship the Jewish God.[90] They are in a successive line of Jewish prophets.[91] Q uses ethical and theological boundaries to distinguish itself from other groups, e.g. "this generation," Pharisees and *Gentiles*.[92] Q material addresses *group* con-

---

[82] Mark 7:19.

[83] Robinson, *The Sayings Gospel Q*, 185.

[84] Markus Cromhout, *Jesus and Identity: Reconstructing Judean Ethnicity in Q* (Matrix: The Bible in Mediterranean Context; Eugene: Cascade, 2007), 260, citing Dennis C. Duling, "Ethnicity, Ethnocentrism, and the Matthean *ethnos*," *BTB* 35 (2005): 125–43, 127; Peter L. Berger and Thomas Luckmann, *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge* (Garden City: Doubleday, 1966).

[85] Catchpole, *Quest for Q*, 279. Allison, *The Jesus Tradition*.

[86] Q 6:34; Q 12:30.

[87] Q 11:39–41; Q 11:42; Q 11:49–51; Q 13: 34–35.

[88] Cromhout, *Jesus and Identity*, 6.

[89] Arnal, "The Q Document," 119–54.

[90] Q 6:36, 11:2, 13, 12:30.

[91] Tuckett, *Q*, 236.

[92] Q 7:31; Q 11:29; Q 11:31–32; Q 11:51; Q 11:39–52; Q 6:32–33; Q 12:30.

cerns and needs. Judging other members is condemned.[93] Q warns about blind guides and teachers.[94] Hypocritical brothers are criticized.[95] Communal prayer is assumed.[96] Scandalous behavior is prohibited.[97] The forgiveness of brothers is expected.[98] Q is *a Palestinian Judean text*.

What does it mean to identify Q as an "ethnically Judean" text and community? Identifying the provenance of Q requires a sensitivity towards the complexity of first-century Judaism(s) and Christianities. There is no monolithic "first-century Galilee," but rather a number of different "Galilees." Galilee was part of (larger) Judea, and contained ethnically Judean cultures; there were transplanted Galileans in Judea and transplanted Judeans in Galilee. But there were also pagan influences throughout the region. Ethnicity in ancient Galilee was a complex issue, so it will be helpful at the outset to briefly review the state of the field on the question of Jewish identity in antiquity.

There has been some discussion in recent years regarding whether Ἰουδαιος, the Greek term we translate as "Jew," should be translated as either "Jew" or "Judean."[99] Some scholars use "Judean" as an ethno-geographic determination, since this is the term many Greco-Roman authors used for what we would call "Jews." In the Greco–Roman world, Ἰουδαιος generallly signified a "person of/from Judea," presumably following the ancient social and ritual practices of others from Judea. Judeans were an ἔθνος, a people or nation. In antiquity, ἔθνος was a broad term used to designate any kind of group, tribe, people or nation, "a group of people with cultural, linguistic, geographical, or political unity."[100] τά ἔθνη in the plural could be used in a positive or negative sense. In Judean literature, τά ἔθνη were *goyim*, "Gentiles" or "pagans," signifying their outsider status. The "Judeans" were those from the tribe of Judah who had returned from Babylon. The country or region took its name from the tribe that first settled there and was called *Yehudah* (יהודה), translated as Ἰουδαῖος (LXX).[101]

---

[93] Q 6:36–38.

[94] Q 6:39–40.

[95] Q 6:41–42.

[96] Q 11:2–4.

[97] Q 17:1–2.

[98] Q 17:3–4. Jonathan Reed, *Archaeology and the Galilean Jesus: A Re-examination of the Evidence* (Harrisburg: Trinity, 2000).

[99] Lawrence H. Schiffman, *Who Was a Jew? Rabbinic and Halakhic Perspectives on the Jewish-Christian Schism* (Hoboken: Ktav, 1985); Sacha Stern, *Jewish Identity in Early Rabbinic Writing* (Leiden: Brill, 1994); Graham Harvey, *The True Israel: Uses of the Name Jew, Hebrew and Israel in Ancient Jewish and Early Christian Literature* (Leiden: Brill, 1996); David Goodblatt, "From Judeans to Israel: Names of Jewish States in Antiquity," *JSJ* 29 (1998): 1–36.

[100] Anthony J. Saldarini, *Matthew's Christian-Jewish Community* (CSHJ; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994), 59.

[101] *A.J.* 11.173.

"Judean" was an ethnic, religious and geographical reference. The term "Judean" came to signify an outsider term (although it was also sometimes used by Judeans) whereas the term "Israel" was generally used as an insider term.[102] The term "Judean" thus refers to "an 'Israelite' inhabitant of Judea (and Palestine generally), a person who was a Judean by religion and culture and therefore had ethnic connection to Judea and allegiance to its state religion."[103] The modern terms and categories of "Jew," "Jewish," and "Judaism" may be somewhat problematic and anachronistic for the first century.[104]

There may be good arguments in favor of using "Judean" at times, especially when the context makes it clear that geographical origins are intended.[105] But there are problems with the exclusive use of "Judean" for Ἰουδαῖος. After all, it is one thing to show that Greek and Roman authors saw "Jews" as "Judeans" in a ethnic-geographical sense, but diasporic "Jews (Judeans?)" lived throughout the empire. Were non-residents of Judea who practiced Judean rites "Judeans" in a *geographical* sense? Daniel Schwartz identifies a number of reasons why translating Ἰουδαῖος as "Jew" may often be preferable.[106] The term "refers mostly to people who had been born as Jews whether in Judaea/Palestine or elsewhere and in a few cases those who had converted outright to Judaism." Yet in modern English usage, Jewish birth falls under the semantic domain of "Jew," not "Judean."[107] Modern English combines the ethnic and religious meanings under "Jew" and "Jewish," whereas "Judean" refers to a geographical meaning.[108]

Translating Ἰουδαῖος as "Judean" amounts "to a preference for something relatively simple and clear rather than something complex and ambiguous,"[109] and this translation has the advantage of avoiding politically incorrect confusions of ancient and contemporary Jews (and Judaisms), but translating

---

[102] Cromhout, *Jesus and Identity*, 122.

[103] Cromhout, *Jesus and Identity*, 4–5.

[104] John H. Elliott, "Jesus the Israelite was neither a 'Jew' nor a 'Christian': On Correcting Misleading Nomenclature," *JSHJ* 5/2 (2007): 119–54; John J. Pilch, "Are There Jews and Christians in the Bible?" *HTS* 53/1-2 (1997): 119–25. John S. Kloppenborg, "Judaeans or Judaean Christians in James," in *Identity and Interaction in the Ancient Mediterranean: Jesus, Christians and Others: Essays in Honour of Stephen G. Wilson* (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2007), 113, n. 2; John M. G. Barclay, "Constructing Judean Identity after 70 CE: A Study of Josephus' *Against Apion*," in *Identity and Interaction*, 99–112.

[105] See, for example, *C. Ap.* 1.777; *A. J.* 18.196.

[106] Daniel R. Schwartz, "'Judean' or 'Jew'? How Should We Translate *Ioudaios* in Josephus?", in *Jewish Identity in the Greco-Roman World: Jüdische Identität in der griechisch-römischen Welt* (eds. J. Frey, D. R. Schwartz and S. Gripentrog; AJEC 71; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 3–27.

[107] Citing Margaret H. Williams, "The Meaning and Function of Ioudaios in Graeco-Roman Inscriptions," *ZPE* 116 (1997): 249–62, 253.

[108] Schwartz, "'Judean' or 'Jew'?", 12–13, n. 18.

[109] Schwartz, "'Judean' or 'Jew'?", 9.

Ἰουδαῖος as "Judean" is too limiting to be useful. The term "Judean" was never able to convey the full semantic range of meaning that identities "on the ground" required, for some "Judeans" did not live in Judea or practice "Judean–ism," and some peoples that did live in "Judea" were not regarded as "Judeans." Sometimes it could refer to religious identity; sometimes to a person's ethnic background; and sometimes to a person's geographical location or origin. There were many different ways of being a "Judean."

The question of "who is (or was) a Jew?" can be answered based on birth, religion, culture, and geographical location or origin, reflecting the complexity of Jewish identity. The Greco-Roman shorthand use of Ἰουδαῖος was a convenient, but imprecise and ultimately problematic expression that failed to do justice to this complexity. Identifying Q as an "(ethnically) Judean text" and the authors of Q as "Jews/Judeans," therefore, does not necessarily mean that they *lived* in Judea. What we are talking about here is allegiance to an ethnically distinctive culture that we can identify as Judaism/Judeanism, which includes interest in the Temple, Torah, and Judean identity-markers like circumcision and the Sabbath. Contemporary biblical scholars are increasingly familiar with diversity in early Christianity. Q is evidence of diversity *within* Judaism and the early Jewish Jesus movement. Affirming Q's Judean ethnicity provides us with a control that can facilitate our ability to critically evaluate various proposals for its provenance.

2.5 The Aramaic Substratum of Q

Recent Q studies generally hold that Q is a first-century C. E. Palestinian Jewish text composed in Greek with a distinctive theological perspective and complex compositional history. There have always been attempts, however, at identifying what has long been suspected must be "behind" Q: an Aramaic substratum.[110] We can be confident that Jesus (ישו/ישוע) spoke Aramaic, that

[110] See especially Maurice Casey, *An Aramaic Approach to Q: Sources for the Gospels of Matthew and Luke* (SNTS 122; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002); Matthew Black, *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts* (third ed.; Oxford: Clarendon, 1967); "Unsolved New Testament Problems: The Problem of the Aramaic Element in the Gospels," *ET* 59 (1948): 171–75; Frederick Bussby, "Is Q an Aramaic Document?," *ET* 65 (1954): 272–75; Joseph A. Fitzmyer, "A Study of the Aramaic Background of the New Testament," in *A Wandering Aramaean* (Missoula: Scholars, 1979), 1–27; Max Wilcox, "The Aramaic Background of the New Testament," in *The Aramaic Bible: Targums in Their Historical Context* (eds. D. R. G. Beattie and M. J. McNamara; JSOTSup 166; Sheffield: JSOT, 1995), 362–78; Roger Le Déaut, *The Message of the New Testament and the Aramaic Bible (Targum)* (trans. S. Miletic; Sb 5; Rome: Biblical Institute, 1982), 37–43. For earlier research, see Johann Gottfried Eichhorn, *Einleitung in das Neue Testament* (Leipzig: Weidmann, 1804–1827); Christian Hermann Weise, *Die evangelische Geschichte kritisch und philosophisch bearbeitet*

his sayings were originally delivered in Aramaic, and that the earliest Jewish Christians probably spoke Aramaic and used Greek as a second language, yet the quest for an Aramaic substratum of Q is complicated by the fact that while Jesus spoke Aramaic, the Gospels were all written in Greek.[111] Moreover, purported Aramaic reconstructions entail considerable linguistic and philological conjecture. Third, there is still some debate concerning the type of Aramaic Jesus spoke, although Qumran Aramaic, or Middle Aramaic, is now acknowledged as the best starting point in any search for Aramaic parallels.[112]

(Leipzig: Breitkopf und Hartel, 1838). See also Christopher Tuckett, "Q, Jesus and Aramaic: Some Methodological Considerations," *Proceedings of the Irish Biblical Association* 26 (2003): 29–45.

[111] According to Luke 4:16–19 (not Q), Jesus read Isaiah 61 in the synagogue at Nazareth. Aside from Luke's problematic reference to a "synagogue" in rural Nazareth, this reading would have been accompanied by a translation (תרגום) into Aramaic for the sake of his hearers. See Chilton, *A Galilean Rabbi and His Bible*, 39; *Targumic Approaches to the Gospels: Essays in the Mutual Definition of Judaism and Christianity* (Lanham: University Press of America, 1986); "The Targumim and Judaism of the First Century," in *Handbook of Oriental Studies II: Judaism in Late Antiquity* (eds. J. Neusner and A. J. Avery-Peck; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 115–50, 147; *The Glory of Israel: The Theology and Provenience of the Isaiah Targum* (JSOTSup 23; Sheffield: JSOT, 1982). Chilton compared the interpretation of *Isaiah* with the LXX, the Dead Sea Scrolls, the New Testament, and rabbinic literature and concluded that the targumic traditions could be dated between 70 and 135 C. E., although there were also interpretations which could be dated to the time of Jesus (*A Galilean Rabbi*, 57). See also *The Isaiah Targum* (AB 11; Wilmington: Michael Glazier, 1987); *The Aramaic Bible: The Isaiah Targum: Introduction, Translation, Apparatus and Notes* (AB; Collegeville: Liturgical, 1999). Chilton, "Jesus and Israel's Scriptures," in *Studying the Historical Jesus: Evaluations of the State of Current Research* (NTTS 19; eds. B. Chilton and C. A. Evans; Leiden: Brill, 1994), 300–304, and Craig A. Evans, "The Scriptures of Jesus and His Earliest Followers," in *The Canon Debate* (eds. L. M. McDonald and J. A. Sanders; Peabody: Hendrickson, 2002), 191–94, point out that Mark 4:12's paraphrase of Isa 6:9-10 (". . . and it be forgiven them") (καὶ ἀφεθῇ αὐτοῖς) agrees with the Isaiah Targum (וישתביק להון) against the MT (ורפא לו) and LXX (καὶ ἰάσομαι αὐτούς/"heal"). See also Stephen A. Kaufman, "Dating the Palestinian Targums and Their Use in the Study of First Century CE Texts," in *The Aramaic Bible: Targums in their Historical Context* (JSOTSS 166; Sheffield: JSOT, 1994); Martin McNamara, *The New Testament and the Palestinian Targum to the Pentateuch* (AB 27; Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1966).

[112] Black, *An Aramaic Approach*, 44, notes that Qumran Aramaic, in its "literary form and character, no less than in language . . . (provides) a much closer prototype of the Aramaic portions and especially the original Aramaic poetry of the Gospels." Scholars disagree whether there was a significant difference between the spoken and literary forms of Aramaic. Michael O. Wise, "Languages of Palestine," in *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels* (eds. J. B. Green, S. McKnight and I. H. Marshall; Downer's Grove: InterVarsity, 1992), 437, 439, argues that a form of what he calls "standard literary Aramaic" was current at the time of Jesus, but that its currency must be carefully qualified, for literary Aramaic may not have been common. Aramaic speech was widely intelligible but reading and writing were confined to the upper echelons of society and required advanced education. The use of Aramaic in Judea "was confined largely to speech and to ephemeral written materials such as letters, contracts

The books of the New Testament contain numerous Aramaic terms,[113] yet the place where Aramaic expressions are most frequently found is in Q. There is a long-standing tradition of associating the Gospel of Matthew with a Hebrew or Aramaic "sayings" source identified by Papias:

> Matthew collected the oracles (τὰ λόγια) in the Hebrew language (Ἑβραΐδι διαλέκτῳ) and each one intepreted (ἡρμήνευσεν) them as best he could.[114]

Papias seems to be suggesting that Matthew was written in Hebrew or Aramaic.[115] Many early church fathers affirmed Papias' account. Irenaeus, for example, wrote that "Matthew wrote a Gospel (εὐαγγελίον) for the Hebrews (Ἑβραίοις) in their own dialect (τῇ ἰδίᾳ αὐτῶν διαλέκτῳ) while Peter and Paul were preaching at Rome."[116] The problem, of course, is that Irenaeus had read (and was relying on) Papias. Unlike Irenaeus, who uses εὐαγγελίον, Papias uses τὰ λόγια to refer to the "oracles" or "sayings" of the Lord that Matthew compiled. This suggests that Papias is not referring to the *Gospel* of Matthew at all.[117] Typically, τὰ λόγια refers to the words of God (Heb 5:12; 1 Pt 4:11; *1 Clem* 13:4; 19:1; 53:1; *2 Clem* 13:3) or to prophetic oracles (Acts 7:38; Rom 3:2). It is doubtful that Papias used τὰ λόγια as a synonym for εὐαγγελίον.

This tradition that Matthew was first written in Aramaic or Hebrew is problematic, for our canonical Matthew is not "translation Greek." The Gospel of Matthew was not translated from a Semitic original. On the contrary, the author used the (Greek) Gospel of Mark and a (Greek) copy of Q. Matthew's use of the LXX also argues against Papias' λόγια being a collection of Hebrew or Aramaic scriptural "proof-texts." Some scholars have argued that Matthew arranged his Gospel using Semitic themes and devices, so λόγια "in

---

and receipts . . . Aramaic was usually the language of the marketplace." Furthermore, if any of Jesus' sayings were written in Aramaic, they may have been recorded in a form of standard *literary* Aramaic, not spoken Aramaic. Fitzmyer, *The Semitic Background of the New Testament*, 9, is "very skeptical about the alleged differences between the literary and spoken forms of Aramaic at this period" and claims that although there were distinctions, too much has been made of this without sufficient evidence to validate the claim.

[113] For example, Paul has preserved two Aramaic terms indisputably linked to the Jerusalem community: Jesus' term for God (ἀββα/אבא) (Gal 4:6), and an early prayer of the church's eschatology (1 Cor 16:22) (מרנא תא or מרן אתא).

[114] *Eccl. Hist.* 3.39.16. Kirsopp Lake, *Eusebius: Ecclesiastical History* (LCL; vol 1; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1926).

[115] Papias' comment (Ἑβραΐδι διαλέκτῳ) can be interpreted as a common construction in Greek that may refer to a subset of a language distinguishable from the Greek word for language or tongue (γλῶσσα). Papias' statement could refer to a style of language or dialect being used by "Hebrews/Jews," i.e., Aramaic.

[116] *Adv. Haer.* 3.1.1.

[117] David C. Sim, "The Gospel of Matthew, John the elder and the Papias tradition: A response to R. H. Gundry," *HTS* 63.1 (2007): 283–99, 287.

the Aramaic dialect" refers to a Semitic *style*.[118] This would require that ἡρμήνευσεν be rendered not as "translate" but as "interpret." This is unconvincing.[119] It has also been suggested that the church fathers confused the Gospel of Matthew with other "Semitic" gospels (i.e., the *Gospel of the Hebrews*) that were associated with Matthew.[120]

An alternative theory is that Papias' λόγια correlates to a collection of Aramaic sayings (and deeds) of Jesus in Q (that was later translated into Greek).[121] This theory is consistent with Papias' wording, which refers to an original Semitic sayings source and to different translations of it. In 1832, Friedrich Schleiermacher posited a lost Aramaic "source" (written by the apostle Matthew!) behind canonical (Greek) Matthew.[122] This position was very popular through the nineteenth century and served to support the hypothetical existence of Q as the λόγια that Matthew was thought to have composed in "Hebrew" (i.e., Aramaic). This assumption was challenged after the Oxyrhynchus fragments of the *Gospel of Thomas* were found.[123] The use of λόγοι for the "sayings" of Jesus in *Thomas* undermined identifying Q as λόγια.[124] Indeed, the use of λόγοι for the "sayings" of Jesus is well attested in early Jewish/Christian literature.[125]

---

[118] Carson, *Matthew*, 1984; Josef Kürzinger, "Das Papiaszeugnis und die Erstgestalt des Matthäusevangeliums," *BZ* 4 (1960): 19–38; "Irenäus und sein Zeugnis zur Sprache des Matthäusevangeliums," *NTS* 10 (1964): 108–115; Robert H. Gundry, "The Apostolically Johannine pre-Papian tradition concerning the Gospels of Mark and Matthew," in *The Old is Better: New Testament Essays in Support of Traditional Interpretations* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005), 49–73, esp. 67–68.

[119] Sim, "The Gospel of Matthew," 290.

[120] R. T. France, *Matthew: Evangelist and Teacher* (Exeter: Paternoster, 1989), 64–66.

[121] Manson, *The Sayings of Jesus*, 18–20; Charles E. Hill, *The Gospel of Matthew* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1972), 24–27; Davies and Allison, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary*, 1:17; Donald A. Hagner, *Matthew 1–13* (WBC 33A; Dallas: Word, 1993), xlv–xlvi; John Nolland, *The Gospel of Matthew: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 3. Ulrich H. J. Körtner, *Papias von Hierapolis: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des frühen Christentums* (FRLANT 133; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1983), 203–206, argued that τὰ λόγια refers not specifically to sayings, but to deeds as well.

[122] Friedrich Schleiermacher, "Über die Zeugnisse des Papias von unsern beiden ersten Evangelien," *TSK* 5 (1832): 735–68.

[123] Bernard P. Grenfell and Arthur S. Hunt, ΛΟΓΙΑ ΙΗΣΟΥ: *Sayings of our Lord* (London: Henry Frowde for the Egypt Exploration Fund, 1897); "I. ΛΟΓΙΑ ΙΗΣΟΥ," in *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, Part I (London: Egyptian Exploration Fund, 1898), 1–3. *P. Oxy.* 654 explicitly uses λόγοι in the incipit opening of the "sayings" collection known to us as *Thomas*. See Bernard P. Grenfell and Arthur S. Hunt, *New Sayings of Jesus and Fragment of a Lost Gospel from Oxyrhynchus* (London: Henry Frowde, 1904).

[124] John A. Robinson, *The Study of the Gospels* (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1902), criticizes the use of λόγια for Q as a way of positing its Matthean apostolic authority. In 1907, Adolf Harnack proposed λόγοι for the title of Q. See his *Sprüche und Reden Jesu:*

James Robinson's essay on λόγοι σοφῶν as the *Gattung* of Q marked a turning point in contemporary understanding of the Papias tradition.[126] It is indeed more accurate to use λόγοι to identify Q's "sayings," thereby distancing Q from Papias' alleged description of an Aramaic collection of λόγια, but the problem is that Q is *not* simply a collection of "sayings"; Q also includes deeds, discourses, and narrative, which more closely match Papias' use of λόγια.[127] In other words, we still don't really know what Papias is referring to and the early church fathers repeatedly describe Jewish Christians using a "Hebrew" version of Matthew. Obviously, there is a *prima facie* case for Aramaic-speaking Jews (or "Hebrews") prefering an Aramaic gospel, and Q certainly does contain a number of Aramaic loan-words. The case for an Aramaic source "behind" Q, therefore, does not need Papias' testimony of Matthean apostolic authority.[128]

Kloppenborg dismisses Papias' statement as "legendary at best,"[129] and argues against "mistranslation" theories (as opposed to redactional models) as a way of explaining divergences between Matthew and Luke.[130] He finds the whole idea of "an Aramaic original of Q" to be "extraordinarily weak" and concludes that "while parts of Q betray a Semitizing Greek style, and possibly an origin in an Aramaic-speaking milieu, there is no convincing proof of a literary formulation in Aramaic." Kloppenborg conceives of Q as a Greek document "formulated in an environment in which Aramaic speech patterns

---

Die zweite Quelle des Matthäus und Lukas (BENT 2; Leipzig: Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1907), 132.

[125] Q 6:47–49; Q 7:1; 1 Thess 4:15; Acts 20:35 (λόγων τοῦ κυρίου); *1 Clem.* 13:1, 46:7 (λόγοι); Rev 22:6; *Did* 1, 2–3a; *P. Oxy.* 654 (λόγοι).

[126] See also Roger Gryson, "A propos du Témoignage de Papias sur Matthieu: Le sens du mot λόγιον chez les Pères du second siècle," *ETL* 41 (1965): 530–47; Werner G. Kümmel, *Introduction to the New Testament* (rev. ed.; London: SCM, 1975), 120; Eduard Schweizer, *The Good News According to Matthew* (London: SPCK, 1978), 15.

[127] Q 7:1–10; Q 11:14.

[128] Helmut Koester, *Introduction to the New Testament*, Vol. 2: *History and Literature of Early Christianity* (2d ed.; Philadelphia: Fortress, 2000), 177, proposes that Papias may be referring to Aramaic traditions behind Q. Similarly, Matthew Black, "The Aramaic Dimension in Q with Notes on Luke 17.22 Matthew 24.26 (Luke 17.23)," *JSNT* 40 (1990): 33–41: 33–34, 36, argues that "Papias may well be referring to a 'Hebrew', i.e. Aramaic Chreiae (Sayings, etc.) collection of which Q is the Greek equivalent." Rudolf Bultmann, *The History of the Synoptic Tradition* (trans. J. Marsh; New York: Harper and Row, 1968), 328: "We have to conclude that Q, which originally appeared in an Aramaic version, was variously translated into Greek, because it obviously was known to Matthew and Luke in different versions." Allison, *Jesus Tradition*, 47–49, also discusses the possibility of an early Aramaic Q (Q^1). On the other hand, Q's use of the LXX does suggest that it was composed in Greek. The high degree of verbal agreements between Matthew and Luke in Q also point to a written text.

[129] Kloppenborg Verbin, *Excavating Q*, 80.

[130] Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 59.

could influence its language."[131] Heinz O. Guenther concurs, dismissing the idea that Jesus' sayings were transmitted in Aramaic as an "assumption," and the "Quest" for Aramaic sources as "based on ideology," presumably of a conservative Christian type.[132]

There are indeed ideological factors at play in New Testament scholarship, and although an Aramaic-speaking Jesus and an Aramaic "source" of his sayings is theologically appealing, there is an equally problematic although age-old theological bias against Semitic traditions and a disciplinary resistance towards training seminary students and academic scholars in Semitic languages. Moreover, the New Testament scholar's desire to reconstruct the "original" sayings of Jesus is undermined by the hypothesis of a lost Aramaic source whereas a putative Greek text can indeed be reconstructed by analyzing Mark, Matthew, and Luke's compositional and redactional habits.

It is reasonable to presuppose that Jesus' sayings were spoken and remembered in Aramaic.[133] Maurice Casey criticizes "an amorphous group of scholars" for their "large-scale omission of Aramaic" and argued against the idea that Q was a "Greek document" and that an identifiable "Q community" can be inferred from it.[134] For Casey, "Q" is simply "a convenient label for the sources of passages which are found in both the Gospel of Matthew and the Gospel of Luke, and which have not been taken from Mark's Gospel."[135] Ca-

[131] Kloppenborg, *Excavating Q*, 80, 77.

[132] Heinz O. Guenther, "Sayings Gospel Q and the Quest for Aramaic Sources: Rethinking Christian Origins," *Semeia* 55 (1991): 41–76, 73.

[133] Black, *An Aramaic Approach*, 271, concludes that "an Aramaic sayings-source or tradition lies behind the Synoptic Gospels" and that "Q is a single source that most probably represents a translation of an Aramaic document (186)." Black was not able to determine "whether that source was written or oral" since "it is not possible from the evidence to decide" (271). Black argues that some of the gospel authors were Aramaic speakers who used Greek as a second language. This means they were "for the most part writing Greek gospels, even where they are dependent upon sources" (274). The sayings of Jesus in Q need not have been "literal translations of Aramaic, but translations which have passed through the minds of the Greek Evangelists and emerged as, for the most part, literary productions" (275).

[134] Casey, *An Aramaic Approach to Q*, 1. Casey claims that "Robinson set the stage for scholarship to go down a blind alley" (17) by arguing that Jesus was a σοφός, a term never used to describe Jesus in Matthew, Luke, or the New Testament, and for suggesting that Q is a wisdom collection (since the narratives in Q and the John the Baptist material are not really comparable to wisdom collections). Casey criticizes the "bureaucratic" assumption that Q was a single text with a single community behind it, finding this hypothesis "fatally flawed, not least by Kloppenborg's handling and/or omission of Aramaic evidence (22)." Casey claims that Kloppenborg "ignores the fact that Jesus spoke Aramaic," "ignores the Son of man problem," and "has not conducted an *independent* investigation of a possible Aramaic substratum of part(s) of Q" (24). Consequently, "the most important recent monograph on Q [*The Formation of Q*] is seriously defective from beginning to end" (31) and "completely fails" to show that Q was a Greek document.

[135] Casey, *An Aramaic Approach to Q*, 2.

sey admits that "our evidence for Q is found in Greek," but argues that some parts of Q reached both evangelists in the same Greek translation, while other parts "are due to two different translations being made." This would explain the "wide variety of agreement and disagreement between Matthew and Luke in Q passages."[136]

Casey's goal in reconstructing Aramaic sources constitutes "one essential tool in the quest to recover the Jesus of history . . . the original meaning of Jesus' sayings in their original contexts."[137] There are problems, however, with Casey's reconstructions.[138] Parts of his reconstructions are "no more than decent guesses."[139] The retroversion of entire Greek passages (as opposed to individual words or phrases) into putative Aramaic originals is not sufficiently reliable, nor are his claims to have discovered "mistranslations," considering the far-reaching conclusions he wishes to make.

The quest for an Aramaic "sayings source" is complicated by the fact that Q contains a significant amount of Greek and it is the Greek literary nature of the Gospels which has predominantly shaped how the message of Jesus was interpreted and understood. If there was once an Aramaic source, it is now, like Q itself, submerged in the Gospels.

Casey is well known for his many contributions to the son of man problem.[140] The son of man sayings are a distinctive feature of Q.[141] The phrase

---

[136] Casey, *An Aramaic Approach to Q*, 17. Casey focuses on reconstructing Q 11:39–51 (as a single Aramaic source underlying two different Greek translations), Q 7:18–35 (as a single Aramaic source translated into a single Greek text used by Matthew and Luke), and Q 11:14–23 and Q 12:10 (as a Q-Mark overlap), finding in one saying-case no fewer than three Greek translations going back to a single Aramaic original. This is indeed "a chaotic model of Q" (48, 187). Casey also argues that the minor agreement of Matt 26:68/Luke 22:64 against Mark 14:65 (τίς ἐστιν ὁ παίσας σε;) may have been in Q.

[137] Casey, *An Aramaic Approach to Q*, 188–89.

[138] Peter M. Head and P. J. Williams, "Q Review," *Tyndale Bulletin* 54.1 (2003): 119–44.

[139] Casey, *An Aramaic Approach to Q*, 115.

[140] P. Maurice Casey, "The Corporate Interpretation of 'One Like a Son of Man' (Dan VII 13) at the Time of Jesus," *NovT* 18 (1976): 167–80; "The Son of Man Problem," *ZNW* 67 (1976): 147–54; "The Use of the Term 'Son of Man' in the Similitudes of Enoch," *JSJ* 7 (1976): 11–29; *Son of Man: The Interpretation and Influence of Daniel 7* (London: SPCK, 1979); "Aramaic Idiom and Son of Man Sayings," *ExpT* 96 (1985): 233–36; "The Jackals and the Son of Man (Matt. 8.20/Luke 9.58)," *JSNT* 23 (1985): 3–22; "General, Generic, and Indefinite: The Use of the Term 'Son of Man' in Aramaic Sources and in the Teaching of Jesus," *JSNT* 29 (1987): 21–56; "Method in Our Madness and Madness in Their Methods: Some Approaches to the Son of Man Problem in Recent Scholarship," *JSNT* 42 (1991): 17–43; "The Use of the Term בר אנשא in the Aramaic Translations of the Hebrew Bible," *JSNT* 54 (1994): 87–118; "Idiom and Translation: Some Aspects of the Son of Man Problem," *NTS* 41 (1995): 164–82; *The Solution to the 'Son of Man' Problem* (London: T & T Clark, 2007).

[141] Tuckett, *Q*, 253, identifies them as the *most* distinctive feature of Q.

appears nine times,[142] and many scholars regard the sayings as belonging to Q's *earliest* traditions.[143] The phrase "son of man" (τοῦ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου), derived from the Hebrew בן אדם and/or the Aramaic בר (א)נש, appears over eighty times in the Gospels,[144] but is first found in the Jesus tradition in Q, so it seems to have been used as a title for Jesus in Palestinian Jewish Christian circles.[145] Many scholars think that Jesus used the expression.[146] Some have concluded that Jesus referred to the "son of man" as a figure other than himself.[147] Others have argued that *none* of the sayings go back to Jesus because the tradition derived from post-Easter reflection on his death and vindication.[148] Since the late 1960s, the assumption that "son of man" referred to an

[142] Q 6:23; Q 7:34; Q 9:58; Q 11:30; Q 12:8; Q 12:10; Q 12:40; Q 17:23–24; Q 17:26–30. For the study of the son of man in Q, see Paul Hoffmann, "The Redaction of Q and the Son of Man: A Preliminary Sketch," in *The Gospel Behind the Gospels* (ed. R. A. Piper; NovTSup 75; Leiden: Brill, 1995), 159–98.

[143] See Frans Neirynck, "Recent Developments in the Study of Q," in *Logia: Les paroles de Jésus – The Sayings of Jesus* (ed. J. Delobel; BETL 59; Leuven: Peeters, 1982), 29–75; H. Schürmann, "Beobachtungen zum Menschensohn – Titel in der Redequelle," in *Jesus und der Menschensohn* (FSA. Vögtle, Freiburg: Herder, 1975), 124–147.

[144] Mark uses it fourteen times; Matthew thirty times; Luke twenty-five times; John twelve times. It is also attested in all strata of the early Jesus tradition, including Q, Mark, Matthew, Luke, John and *Thomas*.

[145] Delbert Burkett, *The Son of Man Debate: A History and Evaluation* (SNTSMS 107; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 123. Ivan Havener, *Q: The Sayings of Jesus (with a Reconstruction of Q by Athanasius Polag)* (GNS 19; Wilmington: Michael Glazier, 1987), 72–77, points out that the phrase is almost always used by Jesus, is never found in Paul's letters and is found in only four places outside the Gospels (Acts 7:56; Heb 2:6; Rev. 11:13, 14:14).

[146] Jürgen Becker, *Jesus von Nazaret* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1996), 249–67; David R. Catchpole, "The Angelic Son of Man in Luke 12:8," *NovT* 24 (1982): 255–65; John J. Collins, "The Second Coming," *CS* 34 (1995): 262–74; Adela Yarbro Collins, "Apocalyptic Son of Man Sayings," in *The Future of Early Christianity* (ed. B. A. Pearson; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991), 220–28; Volker Hampel, *Menschensohn und historischer Jesu* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1990); Marius Reisner, *Jesus and Judgment* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1997); E. P. Sanders, *The Historical Figure of Jesus* (London: Penguin, 1993), 247–48; Dale C. Allison, Jr., *Jesus of Nazareth: Millenarian Prophet* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1998), 115–20; Gerd Theissen and Annette Merz, *The Historical Jesus* (London: SCM, 1998), 548; Christopher M. Tuckett, "The Son of Man and Daniel 7: Q and Jesus," in *The Sayings Source Q and the Historical Jesus*, 390; Edward P. Meadors, *Jesus the Messianic Herald of Salvation* (WUNT 72; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1995), 145; Chrys C. Caragounis, *The Son of Man: Vision and Interpretation* (WUNT 38; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1986), 165.

[147] See Bultmann, *The History of the Synoptic Tradition*, 112,122, 128, 151–52; Adela Yarbro Collins, in Adela Yarbro Collins and John J. Collins, *King and Messiah as Son of God: Divine, Human, and Angelic Messianic Figures in Biblical and Related Literature* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008), 150–51.

[148] Vielhauer, "Gottesreich und Menschensohn in der Verkündigung Jesu," 51–79, 90–91; "Jesus und der Menschensohn," 133–77; Norman Perrin, "Mark XIV.62: The End Product of a Christian Pesher Tradition?," *NTS* 12 (1966): 150–55; "The Son of Man in Ancient Judaism

apocalyptic title has been challenged by a model in which Jesus used the expression idiomatically and his followers retroactively apocalypticized the expression.[149] Geza Vermes argued that the expression "son of man" was a translation of בר נש/בר נשא, the Hebrew equivalent of בן אדם, which could refer to (1) human beings in the generic sense; (2) some human being; or (3) "I," as a periphrasis.[150]

---

and Primitive Christianity: A Suggestion," *BR* 11 (1966): 17–28; "The Son of Man in the Synoptic Tradition," *BR* 13 (1968): 3–25; *Rediscovering the Teachings of Jesus* (New York: Harper & Row, 1967), 154–206, 197–98; Helmut Koester, "One Jesus and Four Primitive Gospels," *HTR* 61 (1968): 203–47; *Ancient Christian Gospels: Their History and Development* (Philadelphia: Trinity, 1990), 149–62; Hans Conzelmann, "Present and Future in the Synoptic Tradition," *JTC* 5 (1968), 26–44; Ernst Käsemann, "The Problem of the Historical Jesus," *Essays on New Testament Themes* (SBT 41; London: SCM, 1964), 43; James M. Robinson, *A New Quest of the Historical Jesus* (London: SCM, 1961), 100–104; John S. Kloppenborg, *The Formation of Q: Trajectories in Ancient Wisdom Collections* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987), 322.

[149] Prior to Vermes, a number of scholars proposed that the "son of man" sayings derived from a Semitic idiom meaning "a man" or "man" in general. Arnold Meyer, *Jesu Muttersprache: Das galiläische Aramäisch in seiner Bedeutung für die Erklärung der Reden Jesu und der Evangelien überhaupt* (Freiburg im Breisgau/Leipzig: Mohr Siebeck, 1896), argued that some Gospel sayings use the phrase to refer to "man" in general (Mk 2:10, 28; Mt 12:32) and that other sayings use it to mean "I" (e.g., Q 9:58; 7:34). Hans Lietzmann, *Der Menschensohn: Ein Beitrag zur neutestamentlichen Theologie* (Freiburg im Breisgau/Leipzig: Mohr Siebeck, 1896), 38, argued that בר נש is an indefinite pronoun meaning "someone." Paul Fiebig, *Der Menschensohn: Jesu Selbstbezeichnung mit besonderer Berücksichtigung des aramäischen Sprachgebrauches für 'Mensch'* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1901), argued that בר נש could mean "a man" or "man" in general, and that these expressions cannot signify the first-person singular pronoun "I." Sometimes this theory also proposed that the phrase could mean "I." Fiebig, *Der Menschensohn*, 61–66, for example, saw some of the "son of man" sayings ("Lord of the Sabbath'; "forgive sins") as self-references. Matthew Black, "Unsolved New Testament Problems: The 'Son of Man' in the Teachings of Jesus," *ET* 60 (1949): 32–36, rejected the idea that בר נש referred to the speaker. When it means "one" or "a man," however, it can refer to the speaker. Black also thought that Jesus used the phrase as a "veiled allusion" to his identity (35). See also Nathaniel Schmidt, "Was בר נשא a Messianic Title," *JBL* 15 (1896): 36–53. Schmidt argued that Jesus used בר נשא of "man" in a generic sense (Mark 2:10, 28: Matt. 8:20, 12:32, Mark 14:21, 9:31), i.e., "man" may forgive sins and break the Sabbath. Julius Wellhausen, "Des Menschen Sohn," in *Skizze und Vorarbeiten* (Berlin: Reimer, 1899), 6:187–215, found a generic sense of בר נשא in Mark 2:10, 28, Luke 12:10 and indefinite in Matthew 11:19. Georges Dupont, *Le Fils de l'Homme: essai historique et critique* (Paris: Fischbacher, 1924), argued that five (generic and indefinite) earthly son of man sayings reflect an authentic Aramaic idiom (Mark 2:10, 2:28, Matt. 12:32, 8:20, 11:19). Charles Alfred Honoré Guignebert, *Jesus* (New York: Knopf, 1935), 270–79, likewise argued for the generic sense (Matt 12:32, 8:20, Mark 2:28) or indefinite (Matt 11:19, Mark 2:10).

[150] Geza Vermes, "Appendix E: The Use of בר נש/בר נשא in Jewish Aramaic," in Matthew Black, *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts* (3d ed.; Oxford: Clarendon, 1967), 310–30. In the Gospels, there are several references to the son of man which seem to be surrogate uses of the term (Mark 10:45/Matt 20:28/Luke 22:27, Mark 8:27/Matt 16:13/Luke

Vermes claimed that he found ten examples of direct speech in Palestinian Aramaic in which the speaker refers to himself, not as "I," but as the "son of man" in the third person and in each case "son of man" is not a title.[151] Vermes' study suggested that the phrase was used in a generic and/or indefinite sense *and* as a "circumlocution" for "I," as a way to avoid immodesty. Vermes concluded that the "apocalyptic" sayings in the Jesus tradition were created by Jesus' followers by connecting Jesus' idiomatic speech to Daniel 7:13. Vermes' proposal has subsequently been adopted, with some modifications, by a number of scholars, including Barnabas Lindars and Casey.[152]

Casey argued that *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου* is not "natural Greek" and must be explained as a translation of בר (א)נש(א). For Casey, the expression "son of man" originated as an Aramaic phrase referring to humanity as a whole, which was sometimes used idiomatically, to apply to the speaker himself, in a "modest" way.[153] If Jesus used the expression, he used it to refer to himself while including its generic meaning. Lindars explained the use of the two articles by "the idiomatic use of the definite article in indefinite statements" in which the definite article denotes "a particular but unspecified member of group of members of the class."[154] Richard Bauckham suggested that Jesus used בר (א)נש as "a deliberately ambiguous self-reference."[155] Reginald Fuller proposed a similar theory, arguing that בר נשא was used by Jesus in the sense

9:18, Matt 5:11/Luke 6:22, Matt 10:32/Luke 12:8). Barnabas Lindars, *Jesus Son of Man: A Fresh Examination of the Son of Man Sayings in the Gospels in the Light of Recent Research* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1984), sees it as referring to "I" or "a man like me."

[151] Geza Vermes, *Jesus and the World of Judaism* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984), 90.

[152] Athanasius Polag, *Die Christologie der Logienquelle* (WMANT 45; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1977); Barnabas Lindars, "Jesus as Advocate: A Contribution to the Christology Debate," *BJRL* 62 (1980): 476–97; "The New Look on the Son of Man," *BJRL* 63 (1981): 437–62; *Jesus Son of Man*; "Response to Richard Bauckham: The Idiomatic Use of *Bar Enasha*," *JSNT* 23 (1985): 35–41; Richard Bauckham, "The Son of Man: 'A Man in My Position' or 'Someone'?" *JSNT* 23 (1985): 23–33; Reginald Fuller, "The Son of Man: A Reconsideration," in *The Living Text: Essays in Honor of Ernest W. Saunders* (eds. D. E. Groh and R. Jewett; Lanham: University Press of America, 1985), 207–17; Christopher L. Mearns, "The Son of Man Trajectory and Eschatological Development," *ExpT* 97 (1985/86): 8–12; Donald J. Goergen, *The Mission and Ministry of Jesus* (Wilmington: Glazier, 1986), 180–202; Rollin Kearns, *Die Entchristologisierung des Menschensohnes* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1988); John Dominic Crossan, *The Historical Jesus: The Life of a Mediterranean Jewish Peasant* (New York: Harper Collins, 1991), 238–59; *Jesus: A Revolutionary Biography*, 49–53; Bruce Chilton, "The Son of Man: Human and Heavenly," in *The Four Gospels 1992: Festschrift Frans Neirynck* (3 vols., eds. F. Van Segbroeck, et al., Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1992), 1:203–18; "The Son of Man: Who Was He?" *BR* 12 (1996): 35–39, 45–47.

[153] Casey, *The Solution to the "Son of Man" Problem*, sees Mark 2:27-28, 9:11–13, 10:45, 14:21 and Q 7:34 and Q 12:10 as examples of idiomatic expression.

[154] Lindars, "Jesus as Advocate: A Contribution to the Christology Debate," 35.

[155] Bauckham, "The Son of Man: 'A Man in My Position' or 'Someone'?"

of "a man" or "a fellow."[156] Others emphasize Jesus' use of the phrase in a generic sense.[157] The tendency to reject the authenticity of the apocalyptic sayings, therefore, is based on two factors: (1) "son of man" was not a recognizable Jewish messianic title at the time of Jesus; and (2) some of the "son of man" sayings seem to use the expression as a translation of the Aramaic phrase בר (א)נש(א), an ordinary term for "(hu)man."

Does an idiomatic use of the phrase lie behind the earliest compositional stages of Q? Two Q sayings have been identified as candidates: Q 7:34 and Q 9:58.[158] In Q 7:34 ("the son of man has come eating and drinking"), Jesus is contrasted with John. This is clearly a reference to *Jesus*. Casey posits an original Aramaic use of בר (א)נש(א) as "due to Jesus being in the humiliating situation of being falsely accused of a serious offense,"[159] a reference to Jesus but also to the "reality of the general level of meaning." Lindars sees this not as an *exclusive* self-reference, but a response to Jesus' preaching that "this generation" is rejecting him, the generic raised "to the level of principle."[160]

Q 9:58 ("the son of man does not have anywhere to lay his head"), a saying widely regarded as authentic,[161] seems to be a self-reference to Jesus' homeless, wandering lifestyle.[162] People, in general, *do* have homes and beds. Casey sees this saying as having "a general level of meaning . . . as well as a specific reference to Jesus."[163] Here Jesus "means anyone who shares in the

---

[156] Fuller, "The Son of Man: A Reconsideration."

[157] Kearns, *Die Entchristologisierung des Menschensohnes*. Crossan, *The Historical Jesus*, 238–59; *Jesus: A Revolutionary Biography* (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1994), 49–53, finds only *one* authentic son of man saying (*Thom* 86; Q 9:57–58) and this saying uses the expression generically. For Crossan, the early Christian communities took the expression from its indefinite/generic sense and turned it into a title. Chilton, "The Son of Man: Human and Heavenly," argues that Jesus used the expression in a generic sense and in an angelic sense to refer to an angel distinct from himself who would vindicate his teaching.

[158] Robinson, "The Son of Man in the Sayings Gospel Q," in *The Sayings Gospel Q*; Leif E. Vaage, "The Son of Man Sayings in Q: Stratigraphical Location and Significance," *Semeia* 55, 103–129, esp. 123, 126.

[159] Casey, *The Solution*, 137.

[160] Lindars, *Jesus Son of Man*, 33.

[161] Eduard Schweizer, "Der Menschensohn (Zur eschatologischen Erwartung Jesu)," *ZNW* 50 (1959): 185–209, esp. 199; "The Son of Man," *JBL* 79 (1960): 119–29, esp. 121; "The Son of Man Again," *NTS* 9 (1963): 256–61, 258; Frederick H. Borsch, *The Son of Man in Myth and History* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1967), 325; Leonhard Goppelt, "Zum Problem des Menschensohns: das Verhältnis von Leidens- und Parusieankündigung," *Mensch und Menschensohn* (ed. H. Sierig; Hamburg, 1963), 20–32, esp. 20; Carsten Colpe, *TDNT*, VIII, 432; Casey, *Son of Man*, 229; Marshall, "The Synoptic Son of Man Sayings in Recent Discussion," *NTS* 12 (1966): 327–51, esp. 340; Lindars, *Jesus Son of Man*, 29; Black, "Aramaic Barnāshā and the Son of Man," *ET* 95 (1984): 200–06, esp. 205; Mahlon H. Smith, "No Place for a Son of Man," *Forum* 4 (1988): 83–107.

[162] Lindars, *Jesus Son of Man*, 30.

[163] Casey, *The Solution*, 177.

conditions of his own missionary vocation."[164] This is not an exclusively generic use, but an inclusive use, the contrast being not between humans and animals, but between Jesus/his group and *other men*.[165]

In these sayings, τοῦ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου could *theoretically* refer both to Jesus and retain its general level of meaning as an ordinary term for man, along with an implicit reference to other people.[166] There are problems, however, with this proposal. First, the argument that בר אנש/בר נש was an Aramaic expression that simply meant "me" or "I" is contradicted by gospel passages where this expression is explicitly used as a *title* for *Jesus*.[167] Second, none of the texts cited support the claim that the Aramaic idiom is used to refer to the speaker *exclusively*.[168] The examples used refer to an *indefinite* sense, i.e., to "a man/any man" or to the generic ("man" in general), but do not show that the phrase could be used to refer *exclusively* to the speaker.[169] Third, a generic and indefinite use of the phrase may be plausible in some cases, but it does not explain *all* of the "son of man" sayings.[170] The indefinite/generic interpretation yields less than plausible results when applied to particular sayings.[171]

The main problem with the idiomatic interpretation is that it can only explain *some* of the sayings. Many sayings cannot be explained by the use of the proposed idiom and must either be later inventions or independent traditions. Idiomatic interpretations of many sayings – even given the semantic range of the proposed idiom – seem strained. The majority of the sayings reflect upon the betrayal, suffering, atonement, vindication, and return of the "son of man" are not only titular but have their inspiration, their *Sitz im Leben*, in the pas-

---

[164] Lindars, *Jesus Son of Man*, 30.

[165] Casey's solution posits that translators simply used the Greek τοῦ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου whenever בר (א)נש(א) referred to *Jesus*.

[166] Casey, *The Solution*, 253–54. Casey admits that a number of sayings are clearly secondary, redactional, and "inauthentic" (e.g., Matt. 24; Q 21:27, 17:23–24:37, 17:26–27; Q 12:39–40, 42–46), sayings reflecting Matthew's use of Daniel 7:13 and the "coming son of man" (ἡ παρουσία τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου).

[167] Theissen and Merz, *The Historical Jesus*, 550.

[168] See Adela Yarbro Collins, "The Origins of the Designation of Jesus as 'Son of Man,'" *HTR* 80 (1987): 397–98; Fitzmyer, *The Semitic Background of the New Testament*, 153.

[169] Burkett, *The Son of Man Debate*, 86–87.

[170] While some of the "present" son of man sayings *can* be explained by a generic use of the term (such as Matt. 8:20), others give the son of man considerable authority (Mark 2:28). Furthermore, some sayings indicate that the present son of man is also the suffering or rejected son of man (Matt 12:32). In addition, many of the "future" sayings have apocalyptic features and seem to belong to an apocalyptic tradition in which the son of man is envisioned as a heavenly, angelic being who will come with "angels" on the clouds of heaven (Mark 14:62, 13:26).

[171] Paul Owen and David Shepherd, "Speaking up for Qumran, Dalman and the Son of Man: Was *Bar Enasha* a Common Term for 'Man' in the Time of Jesus?" *JSNT* 81 (2001): 81–122.

sion, death and resurrection of Jesus.[172] The proposition that בר (א)נש(א) should be understood as an idiomatic expression (mis)interpreted to refer to the "one like a son of man" of Daniel 7:13 has been rejected by many scholars.[173] The idiomatic use of בר (א)נש(א) alone cannot explain the Q tradition because the identification of Jesus as "son of man" was probably not based on the idiom, but rather on post-Easter reflection on the exaltation of Jesus.

The most likely explanation of the "earthly" son of man sayings is that they were created during the "*post*-Easter" period. They have been placed on the lips of Jesus, as have all of the son of man sayings. It is unnecessary to argue that the expression is a holdover from Jesus' Aramaic speech patterns subsequently apocalypticized when it is used as an apocalyptic title throughout Q. The identification of Jesus as the "son of man" created a distinctive new identity for Jesus as a heavenly judge representative of a rejected group. Given the *Parables*' temporal proximity to Q in first-century Judaism, it is most likely that the expression was transferred to Jesus in Q via the Parabolic tradition.[174] Q projects the fulfillment of these expectations onto Jesus' *future* role as the "son of man," but it remains a matter of no small contention whether the "son of man" traditions in Q represent the earliest transmission of

---

[172] Robinson, *A New Quest for the Historical Jesus*, 101–103. See also Koester, *Introduction to the New Testament*, 2:79–89; Vielhauer, "Gottesreich und Menschensohn in der Verkündigung Jesu," 55–91; Heinz Schürmann, "Beobachtungen zum Menschensohn-Titel in der Redequelle," in *Jesus und der Menschensohn: Für Anton Vögtle* (Freiburg: Herder, 1975), 124–47.

[173] I. Howard Marshall, "The Synoptic Son of Man Sayings in Recent Discussion," *NTS* 12 (1966): 327–51; "The Son of Man in Contemporary Debate," *EvQ* 42 (1970): 67–87; George W. E. Nickelsburg, "Son of Man," *ABD* 6, 137–150; Collins, "The Heavenly Representative: The 'Son of Man' in the Similitudes of Enoch," 111–33; "The Son of Man in First-Century Judaism," 448–466; Thomas B. Slater, "One Like a Son of Man in First-Century CE Judaism," *NTS* 41 (1995): 183–98; Higgins, *Jesus and the Son of Man*; "The Son of Man Concept and the Historical Jesus," *SE* 5 (1968): 14–20; *The Son of Man in the Teaching of Jesus* (SNTSMS 39; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980); G. H. P. Thompson, "The Son of Man: The Evidence of the Dead Sea Scrolls," *ExpT* 72 (1960/61): 125; "The Son of Man – Some Further Considerations," *JTS* 12 (1961): 203–09; Robert Maddox, "The Function of the Son of Man According to the Synoptic Gospels," *NTS* 15 (1968): 45–74; "The Quest for Valid Methods in 'Son of Man' Research," *AusBr* (1971): 36–51; Caragounis, *The Son of Man*; Margaret Barker, *The Lost Prophet: The Book of Enoch and its Influence on Christianity* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1988); James H. Charlesworth, "The Portrayal of the Righteous as an Angel," in *Ideal Figures in Ancient Judaism: Profiles and Paradigms* (eds. G. W. E. Nickelsburg and J. J. Collins; SBLSCS 12; Chico: Scholars, 1980), 135–151.

[174] George W. E. Nickelsburg and James C. VanderKam, *1 Enoch: A New Translation* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2004), 6; G. W. E. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001), 83. See also Simon J. Joseph, "'His Wisdom Will Reach All Peoples': 4Q534–36, Q 17:26–27, 30, and *1 En.* 65.1–67.3, 90," *DSD* 19.1 (2012): 71–105. For the influence of the *Parables*' messianic figure on Paul, see James A. Waddell, *The Messiah: A Comparative Study of the Enochic Son of Man and the Pauline Kyrios* (JCT 10; London: T & T Clark, 2011).

tradition or whether they are later, "apocalypticized" traditions projected onto earlier Jesus tradition. The son of man traditions are distinctive of Q, but this title was already being used in the Enochic *Book of Parables*, which arguably predates the composition of Q, and may have also been used by Matthew.[175]

2.6 The Composition of Q

The so-called "Sayings Gospel" Q defies simplistic categorization. Q contains material that can be identified as sapiential, prophetic, eschatological, and apocalyptic. Q seems to cross the boundaries of a single genre or category. At the same time, attempts have been made to isolate the dominant (or "formative") element in the composition of Q. While various proposals regarding the compositional history of Q have been put forward, with different stages, times, locations and groups,[176] the dominant model, particularly in North America, is that proposed by John Kloppenborg. Building on prior findings

---

[175] See Johannes Theisohn, *Der auserwählte Richter: Untersuchungen zum traditionsgeschichtlichen Ort der Menschensohngestalt der Bilderreden des Äthiopischen Henoch* (SUNT 12; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1975), 153, 182; David R. Catchpole, "The Poor on Earth and the Son of Man in Heaven: A Re-appraisal of Matthew XXV. 31-46," *BJRL* 61 (1979): 355–97; Collins, "The Son of Man in First-Century Judaism," 448–66; Leslie W. Walck, "The Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch and the Gospels," in *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man*, 299–337; *The Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch and in Matthew* (JCT 9; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 2011). For opposition to Matthean dependence, see Casey, *Son of Man: The Interpretation and Influence of Daniel 7*; Hare, *The Son of Man Tradition*.

[176] Kloppenborg, *The Formation of Q*; Schulz, *Q: Spruchquelle*; Gerd Theissen, *The First Followers of Jesus: A Sociological Analysis of the Earliest Christianity* (trans. J. Bowden; London: SCM, 1978). According to Schulz, the first stage of Q was composed in a Transjordanian Jewish Christian community. His early "strata" contained 6:20–21, 27–30, 31, 32–36, 37–38, 41–42, 11:1–4, 9–13, 39, 42–44, 46-48, 52, 12:4–7, 8–9, 22–31, 33–34, 16:17, 18. For criticism of Schulz's proposal, see Paul Hoffmann, *BZ* 19 (1975): 104–115; John S. Kloppenborg, "Tradition and Redaction in the Synoptic Sayings Source," *CBQ* 46 (1984): 36–45. For other stratification theories, see Paul Hoffmann, *Studien zur Theologie der Logienquelle*; Polag, *Die Christologie der Logienquelle*; Risto Uro, *Sheep Among the Wolves* (Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1987); Migaku Sato, *Q und Prophetie: Studien zur Gattungs- und Traditionsgeschichte der Quelle Q* (WUNT 2/29; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1988); Allison, *The Jesus Tradition in Q*. Sato argues that Q contains prophetic minor forms (*Mikrogattungen*), announcement sayings (*Ankündigung*), "doom sayings" (*Unheilswort*) and "salvation sayings" (*Heilswort*). The genre of Q (*Makrogattung*) is a "prophetic" book (76–83, 125–75). For Fleddermann, *Q*, 101–02, the gospel genre (which poses the questions "who is Jesus?" and "what does it mean to be Jesus' disciple?") has "the ability to absorb both wisdom and prophecy." Q does not contain the term "gospel" (εὐαγγέλιον), but it does use the verb εὐαγγελίζομαι ("to preach the good news") in Q 7:22. Fleddermann sees the gospel genre, "a narrative account of Jesus' ministry to answer two questions" (105), as the key. He sees Q as a literary unity that "could not have emerged by a process of slow growth from a more primitive state to a more developed state (127)."

that Q contained sapiential material, was written in stages,[177] and that a number of sapiential speeches constituted the formative clusters around which Q grew,[178] Kloppenborg argued that Q contained a redactional layer of prophetic sayings (Q^2) and earlier instructional material (Q^1). Q was the product of skilled scribal activity, originally created as a book of wisdom instruction and then transformed through redaction.[179] Kloppenborg identified four clusters of material dominated by polemic against "this generation."[180] He also identified other clusters of sayings that were not informed by the Deuteronomistic view of history.[181] According to Kloppenborg, these "prophetic-judgment" sayings were interpolated at a later date into the wisdom blocks.[182]

By the late 1980s, this had become a working hypothesis for many,[183] and a foundation for further work on the social history of Q, the Cynic hypothesis, the "re-description" of the *kerygmatic* picture of Christian origins, and the question of whether the historical Jesus was a sapiential or apocalyptic figure.[184] This has resulted in considerable discussion and debate in the field and

---

[177] Ivan Havener, *Q: The Sayings of Jesus* (GNS 19, Wilmington: Michael Glazier, 1987), 104, notes that the composition of Q in stages is an assured result of scholarship. Q was "not a static repository . . . it was a body of material that grew and developed."

[178] James M. Robinson, "The Q Trajectory: Between John and Matthew via Jesus," in *The Future of Early Christianity: Essays in Honor of Helmut Koester* (ed. B. A. Pearson; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991), 173–94, esp. 185–89. Kloppenborg, *Formation of Q*, identifies six sapiential clusters as (1) 6:20b–23b, 27–35, 36–45, 46–49; (2) 9:57–60, 10:2–11, 16; (3) 11:2–4, 9-13; (4) 12:2–7, 11–12; (5) 12:22b–31, 33–34; (6) 13:24, 14:26–27, 17:33, 14:34–35). Lührmann, *Die Redaktion*, 84, accepts (1) 6:20b–23b, 27–35, 36–45, 46–49; (2) 12:27; (3) 12:22b–31, 33–34). Schulz, *Q: Die Spruchquelle*, 57–175, accepts five of these clusters as going back to the oldest layers: (1) 6:20b–23b, 27–35, 36–45; (3) 11:2–4, 9–13; (4) 12:4–9; (5) 12:22b–31, 33–34; (6) 16:17–18. Dieter Zeller, *Die Weisheitlichen Mahnsprüche bei den Synoptikern* (FzB 17; Würzburg: Echter, 1977), 191, accepts (1) 6:20b–23b, 27–34, 36–37a, 41–45, 46–49; (2) 10:2–8a, 10:9–10:12; (3) 11:2–4; (4) 12:2–7, 9–10; (5) 12:22b–31, 33–34. Ronald A. Piper, *Wisdom in the Q-Tradition: The Aphoristic Sayings of Jesus* (SNTSMS 61; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1989), accepts (1) 6:27–35, 36–45; (3) 11:9–13; (4) 12:2–7, 8–9, 11–12; (5) 12:22b–31.

[179] These additions, which signal shifts in projected audience, tone, and content appear to be inconsistent with the instructional genre and indicate the activity of literarily skillful scribes producing an increasingly complicated literary structure. Piper, *Wisdom in the Q-Tradition*, has also identified scribal activity in the composition of the speeches.

[180] These clusters have the same audience and use the same forms, prophetic judgment and apocalyptic sayings. (1) Q 3:7–9, 16–17; (2) Q 7:1–10, 18–23, 24–28, 31–35; (3) Q 11:14–15, 17–26, 16–29, 32–33, 39–52; (4) Q 17:22–37.

[181] These clusters have the same audience and use the same forms. (1) Q 6:20–49; (2) Q 9:57–60; (3) Q 10:2–16, 21–24; (4) Q 11:2–4, 9–13; (5) Q 12:2–12, 22b–31, 33–34.

[182] Kloppenborg, *Formation of Q*, 243.

[183] The Jesus Seminar, Mack, Crossan, Vaage, and Robinson (among others) all see Q as a stratified document with wisdom being its formative influence.

[184] For the social history of Q, see Burton L. Mack, "The Kingdom that Didn't Come: The Social History of the Q Tradents," in *Society of Biblical Literature Papers 1988* (ed. D. J.

Kloppenborg's hypothesis is not without its critics.[185] John Collins, for example, focuses on generic issues, arguing that many apocalyptic writers absorbed wisdom and integrated it into their worldviews and work.[186] Consequently, there is "no necessary antithesis" between "apocalyptic" and "sapiential."[187] Richard Horsley argues against a dichotomization of wisdom and apocalyptic in Q scholarship, claiming that these modern, scholarly categories were being deployed for theological purposes.[188] He emphasizes the need to focus on "the

---

Lull; Atlanta: Scholars, 1988), 608–35; John S. Kloppenborg, "Redactional Strata and Social History in the Sayings Gospel Q," paper presented at the annual meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature, Chicago, November, 1988.

[185] Allison, *Jesus Tradition*, 4–7; Tuckett, *Q*, 69–75; Dieter Zeller, "Eine weisheitliche Grundschrift in der Logienquelle?," in *The Four Gospels* (ed. F. Van Segbroeck; BETL 100; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1992), I: 389–401. Meadors, *Jesus the Messianic Herald of Salvation*; Richard A. Horsley, "Questions About Redactional Strata and the Social Relations Reflected in Q," in *Society of Biblical Literature 1989 Seminar Papers* (ed. D. J. Lull; Atlanta: Scholars, 1989), 175–209; Harold W. Attridge, "Reflections on Research into Q," *Semeia* 55 (1992): 223–34; Christopher M. Tuckett, "On the Stratification of Q: A Response," *Semeia* 55 (1992): 213–222; Migaku Sato, "Wisdom Statements in the Sphere of Prophecy," in *The Gospel Behind the Gospels: Current Studies in Q* (ed. R. A. Piper; NovTSup 75; Leiden: Brill, 1995), 157; Jens Schröter, *Erinnerung an Jesu Worte. Studien zur Rezeption der Logienüberlieferung in Markus, Q und Thomas* (WMANT 76; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1997); Richard Horsley with Jonathan A. Draper, *Whoever Hears You Hears Me: Prophets, Performance, and Tradition in Q* (Harrisburg: Trinity, 1999), 23–24, 61–62, 83–93, 148; Graham Stanton, *Gospel Truth?: New Light on Jesus and the Gospels* (Valley Forge: Trinity, 1995), 74.

[186] Collins, "Wisdom, Apocalypticism, and Generic Compatibility," *In Search of Wisdom: Essays in Memory of John G. Gammie* (eds. L. G. Perdue, B. B. Scott and W. J. Wiseman; Lousiville: Westminster John Knox, 1993), 165–85, divides two categories of wisdom: "declarative sayings" in the indicative and commands and prohibitions in the imperative, the latter of which dominate in Q. Collins points out that "we find various combinations and permutations of sapiential and apocalyptic material in the so-called intertestamental literature . . . sapiential sayings can also find a place in an apocalyptic context" and "ancient writers could sometimes juxtapose materials that seem ideologically incompatible to us (173, 175)." Collins concludes that "the forms of wisdom speech are adaptable and may be used in the service of more than one worldview (181)."

[187] Collins, "Wisdom, Apocalypticism," 182. For Collins, stratigraphic analyses "impose such a narrow hermeneutic on the text that they amount to a form of reductionism, for they try to resolve Q's complex synthesis into one of its strands," and in doing so, they "emasculate Q's Christology (177–78)." Collins' criticism can be summarized as follows: (1) there are wisdom speeches in Q; (2) there is no generic incompatibility between wisdom and apocalyptic; (3) the stratification "should be viewed with some suspicion"; (4) Q is a "creative adaptation" of sapiential and apocalyptic traditions (185). Q is an apocalyptic text, and sapiential admonitions are compatible with apocalyptic texts.

[188] Horsley, "Questions about Redactional Strata and the Social Relations Reflected in Q," 186–203, 188. Horsley challenges the "assumptions" and "approaches" of Q scholarship, particularly the use of stratigraphic models for understanding Q. Horsley's criticism, however, is "not with Kloppenborg, who is simply continuing the standard scholarly categories utilized in

concrete historical social relations" in which texts are rooted,[189] and considers Q a "unitary" composition.[190] Christopher Tuckett has also problematized how we identify and categorize "sapiential" material, and reminds us that "wisdom" is a *modern* scholarly category.[191] Tuckett questions Q's identification as "sapiential" since it does not conform to traditional wisdom orientations.[192] He notes that the figure of Wisdom is present in Q, but only appears in the *redactional* stratum of Q, where prophetic themes predominate.[193] He also questions the claim that there was any unified collection of sayings prior

---

recent treatments of Q, but with the conceptual apparatus of our field," the "approach by categorization (192)." Horsley, "Wisdom and Apocalypticism in Mark," 223–44, esp. 226, argues that the categories of wisdom and apocalypticism "have become dichotomized" based on "different orientations or theologies (Horsley, "Wisdom Justified," 733)." For Horsley, "concepts or issues appear to be imposed upon (read into) this discourse from Christian theology and/or the conceptual apparatus of theologically oriented New Testament studies (744)." Criticizing the preoccupation with categorizing sayings as either "sapiential" or "apocalyptic," he finds Kloppenborg's compositional analysis "unconvincing," "problematic," and "superfluous (744–45)."

[189] Horsley, "Q and Jesus," 177, warns that the use of categories is not only problematic but potentially dangerous in that "Much of what is transmitted and debated in our field may turn out to be false knowledge not only because it is unsupported by historical evidence, but also because it ignores and even veils the concrete historical social relations in which textual and other expressions were rooted."

[190] Horsley, "Social Conflict," 40. Here Horsley argues that "the material assigned to the formative stratum is not 'sapiential' with respect to traditional forms of conventional wisdom (740)." The supposed five "judgment" discourses are not consistently directed at the "out-group" of opponents or "this generation" but much of it is addressed to the "in-group" of the Q people ("Social Conflict," 40). Attridge, "Reflections on Research into Q," 224, has also questioned the validity of stratigraphical analyses. Attridge points out that despite the rigor of modern redactional analyses, "there remain sayings the strata of which everyone has difficulties in locating (226)." Moreover, Q's silence regarding Jesus' death and resurrection is "highly ambiguous" and "Various reconstructions of Jesus and his immediate followers are compatible with the data of Q^1." Since there are other bodies of data from early Christianity that must be consulted, the focus on Q^1 as "the surest path to the origins of Christianity is methodologically flawed (233)."

[191] Tuckett, *Q*, 329, questions whether such a *Gattung* as "logoi sophon" ever existed. Tuckett concedes that Q is "generically similar" to other sayings collections, but all such sayings collections are not inherently "sapiential." Q is not simply a "sayings collection." For Tuckett, "'wisdom' is a *modern* category, seeking to *abstract* from within the whole range of Jewish thinking and writing a more limited set of ideas and texts (332)."

[192] Gerhard von Rad, *Old Testament Theology* (Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1962), 418, 428, defines "wisdom" as "a practical knowledge of the laws of life and of the world based upon experience."

[193] Tuckett, *Q*, 351, notes that "Wisdom" is present as a figure, but argues that this does not mean that Q is "sapiential." In Q, the figure of Wisdom is linked not with sapiential speech or forms, but with the *prophetic* theme of the rejected prophets. Furthermore, the passages in which Wisdom appears are in Kloppenborg's Q^2, not Q^1.

to this redaction as well as the late dating to the legal elements in Q.[194] Tuckett prefers to give "methodological priority" to Q in its "final" form.[195]

Kloppenborg's critics have not always engaged the *literary-critical* aspects of his argument, which does not depend on any presumed incompatibility between wisdom and apocalyptic, but rather "from an analysis of the *actual literary deployment* of Q sayings."[196] Kloppenborg maintains that "Tradition-history is not convertible with literary history."[197] A fair evaluation of this hy-

---

[194] Tuckett, *Q*, 72. Kloppenborg's "sapiential" layer is multi-faceted: "there is no evidence that the five alleged collections ever belonged together as a literary whole prior to the use of the materials they contain by 'Q^2.'" The distinction between Q^1 as addressed to the community and a Q^2 addressed to outsiders is not certain or secure. Some of the Q^2 material is addressed to "insiders (72)." Tuckett also points out that a Q^3 with an increased sense of Jewishness and nomism is unnecessary because "a strongly nomistic outlook is more widespread in Q than Kloppenborg perhaps allows (73)."

[195] Tuckett, *Q*, 77–81. Tuckett concedes that Kloppenborg's stratification proposal is possible in principle, but closer examination provokes questions and it may be simpler to suggest "a Q-editor taking up and using (possibly a variety of) earlier materials (74)." Tuckett praises Kloppenborg for drawing our attention to the wider body of comparable material, and for utilizing the "instruction" for its generic affinities, but maintains that there are substantial differences "between the actual contents of Q" and traditional 'wisdom.'" Consequently, it may be "misleading" to think of Q (or even Q^1) as "sapiential" (348). It is only "at a high level of abstraction that Q can be called 'sapiential.'" See also Elisabeth Sevenirch-Bax, *Israels Konfrontation mit den letzten Boten der Weisheit: Form, Funktion and Interdependenz der Weisheitselemente in der Logienquelle* (MThA 21; Altenberge: Oros, 1993); Kosch, *Eschatologische Tora*.

[196] Kloppenborg Verbin, *Excavating Q*, 145, n. 61: "The question is not whether wisdom and apocalyptic, or wisdom and prophecy, can subsist in the same document . . . The question is, when diverse elements subsist in a document, how does one understand the *literary* and *generic* relationship among the various elements?" Kloppenborg, "*The Formation of Q* Revisited," 208, notes that Horsley admits that Q was written in stages, and that his principle complaint may be more "with the conceptual apparatus of the guild which has tried to drive a wedge between prophecy and apocalyptic by characterizing apocalypticists" as waiting for a literal end of the world (208). Kloppenborg counters that he did not conclude that "sapiential portions of Q are antecedent to the prophetic-polemical sections because of some *a priori* considerations about the relative ages and provenances of wisdom or prophecy (209)," but rather did so based on "compositional observations." Q^1 material is "*framed* in the form of wisdom teachings, and the structuring of the material conforms rather impressively to the conventions in organizing wisdom materials (210)." There is a need for caution in moving from genre to social context: "separate and successive layers of tradition" should not be collapsed into a single set of data to reconstruct a social world (213). Instead, "the particular literary deployments of sayings in Q must be taken quite seriously in reconstructing the social world of the Q people (214)."

[197] Kloppenborg, *Formation of Q*, 245; *Excavating Q*, 388: "to characterize Q as 'sapiential' is not, therefore, to imply a depiction of Jesus as teacher of this-worldly, prudential wisdom, still less to imply an intellectual world that was hermetically sealed against eschatology, prophetic traditions, and the epic traditions of Israel." The "assessment of the genre of Q is not dependent upon whether its hero, Jesus, was (historically speaking) a prophet or a sage or

pothesis, therefore, requires careful literary analysis of the alleged "stratigraphic markers" that identify the seams and strata of Q. This has been done elsewhere,[198] and there are reasonably persuasive alternative arguments to positing complex redaction-histories that stratify traditions and social histories. Q draws on sapiential, prophetic, eschatological, and apocalyptic perspectives because these were interrelated components of the tradition from which it emerged. There is nothing incompatible about wisdom and apocalyptic traditions in a single text.[199] First-century Judaism was influenced by eschatological and apocalyptic orientations.[200]

George Nickelsburg warns that "our categories have become hermetically sealed compartments."[201] We "fail to see that in the world from which they have come to us, they were related parts of an organic whole." The terms "wisdom" and "apocalyptic" may be unavoidable, but they remain "flawed categories." The problem is not "in the texts, but in the categories and methods that we have used to describe and interpret them."[202] We cannot easily separate traditions and genres that belong together without creating an ahistorical abstraction, i.e., an ideological construction. Q reflects a movement comprised of *both* sapiential and eschatological/apocalyptic beliefs,[203] and while there is nothing especially controversial about positing Q as an early collection of Jesus' sayings redacted from the perspective of a perceived rejection of the movement, this may have little bearing on when the text was composed, where it came from and how it relates to Jesus. The stratification

an apocalypticist, or some combination of the three, or none of the three; it is a function of the literary decisions taken by the framers of Q" (381). Kloppenborg Verbin, *Excavating Q*, 190, is well aware that his model carries "important consequences" in that "later stages must be understood in their historical and rhetorical relationships to prior stages – as developments, rationalizations, or, in Mack's terms, mythmaking."

[198] Kirk, *The Composition of the Sayings Source*, 26, criticizes the *Kleinliteratur* model, a slow-growth accretion model reflecting the social history of the community.

[199] See, for example, *1 En.*, 1QS, 4QInstruction, *Didache*, Q, etc.

[200] Amy-Jill Levine, "The Earth Moved: Jesus, Sex, and Eschatology," in *Apocalypticism, Anti-Semitism and the Historical Jesus: Subtexts in Criticism* (JSNT 275; ed. J. S. Kloppenborg with J. W. Marshall; London: T & T Clark, 2005), 83–97, argues that constructing a non-eschatological, non-apocalyptic Jesus risks misrepresenting first-century Judaism, the Jesus movement, and the historical Jesus.

[201] George Nickelsburg, "Wisdom and Apocalypticism in Early Judaism: Some Points for Discussion," in *Conflicted Boundaries*, 17–37, esp. 36.

[202] Nickelsburg, "Wisdom and Apocalypticism," 37.

[203] See Sato, "Wisdom Statements in the Sphere of Prophecy," 139–58; Charles E. Carlston, "Wisdom and Eschatology in Q," in *Logia: Les paroles de Jèsus: Memorial Joseph Coppens* (ed. J. Delobel; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1982), 101–19, esp. 116; Edwards, *A Theology of Q*, 78, 148; John S. Kloppenborg, "Symbolic Eschatology and the Apocalypticism of Q," *HTR* 80 (1987): 287–306, esp. 291.

of Q simply cannot support the weight of radical re-descriptions of the social history of Q, the historical Jesus or Christian origins.

Q may preserve the earliest *Erinnerung* of Jesus,[204] but it also depends on earlier oral tradition. The sayings in Q were preserved as part of a larger collection of speeches and acts.[205] Q presented Jesus' message about the kingdom in continuity with the law and the prophets,[206] yet the precise extent and wording of Q cannot be definitively reconstructed.[207] We cannot move from literary stages to an assumed original, oral context.[208] Consequently, we should be wary when any reconstruction of Q is offered as the "original" text.[209] Literary analyses are not immune to ideological interests.[210]

2.7 The Community of Q

Modern sociological analysis of the early Jesus movement recognizes that numerous village communities played a significant role in the socio-economic

---

[204] Schröter, *Erinnerung an Jesu Worte*; "The Historical Jesus and the Sayings Tradition: Comments on Current Research," *Neot* 30 (1996): 151–68; "Markus, Q und der historische Jesus: Methodische und exegetische Erwägungen zu den Anfängen der Rezeption der Verkündigung Jesu," *ZNW* 89 (1998): 173–200.

[205] Jens Schröter, "Anfänge der Jesusüberlieferung: Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Beobachtungen zu einem Bereich urchristlicher Theologiegeschichte," *NTS* 50 (2004): 53–76; "Jesus Tradition in Matthew, James, and the Didache: Searching for Characteristic Emphases," in *Matthew, James, and Didache: Three Related Documents in Their Jewish and Christian Settings* (eds. H. van de Sandt and J. Zangenberg; SBLSS 45; Leiden: Brill, 2008), 244–45.

[206] Q 16:16–17.

[207] Jens Schröter, *Jesus und die Anfänge*, 90–117; "Die Bedeutung der Q-Überlieferung für die Interpretation der frühen Jesustradition," *ZNW* 94 (2003): 38–67.

[208] Werner H. Kelber, *The Oral and the Written Gospel: The Hermeneutics of Speaking and Writing in the Synoptic Tradition, Mark, Paul, and Q* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983). The relationship between memory, eye-witness accounts, the early oral Jesus traditions, and written gospel records has also come under scrutiny in Jesus research. See especially Richard Bauckham, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses: The Gospels as Eyewitness Testimony* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006); James D. G. Dunn, *Jesus Remembered* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003); Dale C. Allison, Jr., *Constructing Jesus: Memory, Imagination, and History* (Grand Rapids: BakerAcademic, 2010).

[209] Johnson-Debaufre, *Jesus among Her Children*, 32.

[210] Johnson-Debaufre, *Jesus among Her Children*, 40, argues against the "assumption that it is possible to isolate a scholarly practice such as literary analysis from the rhetorical strategies and ideological interests of biblical studies in general." She also points out that "literary analyses often participate in larger and ongoing debates about the historical Jesus" and are "part of the contemporary discourse on Christian identity and how that identity might be constituted by interpretations of Jesus' identity (88)."

support of the movement.[211] The movement may have been more organized and widespread than commonly assumed.[212] Social movements grow much faster when spread through pre-existing social networks.[213] Social network analysis provides us with one way to understand the growth and development of the early Jesus movement and *die Q-Gemeinde* or *Q-Gruppe*. Many scholars are understandably skeptical about the possibility of deducing a community solely from a text,[214] but it is not uncommon for biblical scholars to posit discrete social contexts for particular texts. The problem is that communities must be *inferred* from the internal textual evidence. Hypothetical communities are then often reified into real communities, and these communities are then thought to have existed in isolation from other communities.[215]

The most influential sociological model for the early Jesus movement and the Q group is Gerd Theissen's proposition of a relationship between "wandering charismatics" and "local sympathizers" in settled communities. This model provides a plausible explanation of how itinerant preachers may have

---

[211] Richard A. Horsley, *Jesus and the Spiral of Violence: Popular Jewish Resistance in Roman Palestine* (New York: Harper & Row, 1987), 209–21; Kloppenborg Verbin, *Excavating Q*, 171, 211, 215, considers "the audience of Q to be a network of villages sympathetic to Jesus' kingdom message or a subculture or counterculture within the larger towns and cities of the Lower Galilee (171)." He sees the Q community as "a network of local groups and local leaders, perhaps household heads (with) mobile workers…dependent upon the households both materially and for the legitimation of their roles (211)." These "Q people" created "a social network that extended over several towns or between cities and towns (215)." See also Tuckett, *Q*, 82: "it does not seem unreasonable to assume . . . that it (Q) was thought to have relevance for a Christian group who needed to be addressed by it . . . We should therefore always be alive to the possibility that the Q editor is speaking at the community to which he/she belonged, quite as much as speaking for it." See also Paul D. Meyer, "The Community of Q," Ph.D. dissertation; University of Iowa, 1967; Lester Grabbe, "The Social Setting of Jewish Apocalypticism," *JSP* 4 (1989): 29.

[212] Horsley, *Jesus and the Spiral of Violence*, 209–21, notes that "The 'Jesus movement' must have had some economic base in Palestine other than a few dozen propertyless missionaries and converts in the 'Jerusalem community,' and that base must have put down roots prior to the crucifixion and resurrection-exaltation of Jesus. That is, there must already have been a more concrete 'community' than a vaguely conceived group of 'followers' during the ministry of Jesus."

[213] Rodney Stark, *The Rise of Christianity: A Sociologist Reconsiders History* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996), 55, suggests that in Paul's urban communities, friends and family networks provided effective channels of conversion and drew widely from the Jewish population (16). See Harold Remus, "Voluntary Association and Networks: Aelius Aristides at the Asclepieion in Pergamum," in *Voluntary Associations in the Graeco-Roman World* (eds. J. S. Kloppenborg and S. G. Wilson; London: Routledge, 1996), 146–75.

[214] Denise Buell, *Why this New Race?: Ethnic Reasoning in Early Christianity* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2005), 136.

[215] Seth Schwartz, *Imperialism and Jewish Society, 200 B.C.E. to 640 C.E.* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001), 9.

been socio-economically supported by local communities.[216] For Theissen, local sympathizers had a more *conservative* attitude towards the law, the Temple, sacrifice, the Temple tax, cultic worship, marriage and family than itinerant preachers.[217] The local "settled groups of sympathizers . . . remained wholly within the framework of Judaism and had no intention of founding a new 'church.' Unfortunately we know very little about them."[218]

Theissen's model, while influential, has been modified and challenged by a number of scholars. Christopher Tuckett points out that the mission instruction of Q 10:2 seems "to be directed at those with*in* a community who are sending *others* out from their midst."[219] Q's instructions about receiving hospitality "clearly presuppose the existence of groups with*in* the population" supporting the preachers. Richard Horsley has also challenged the existence of "wandering charismatics" and argues that Q's people were engaged in the "revitalization of local community life" and the renewal of village life.[220] Horsley shifts the emphasis towards the villages themselves as autonomous participants in a network of sympathetic communities.[221] Kloppenborg has also considered the possibility that the Q community was comprised of "a network of villages sympathetic to Jesus' kingdom message."[222] The Jesus movement (and Q people) seems to have been socially and economically supported by a network of villages. Both communities were also undoubtedly

---

[216] Theissen, *Sociology of Earliest Palestinian Christianity*, 7; Stephen J. Patterson, *The Gospel of Thomas and Jesus* (Sonoma: Polebridge, 1993), 159, notes that "such local sympathizers would have existed in a kind of mutually supportive relationship with the wandering charismatics, supporting their basic needs of food and shelter in exchange for their gifts of preaching and care for the sick." Arnal, *Jesus and the Village Scribes*, 94, also notes that Q provides indications that "it takes for granted the continuation of a sedentary village-based life, with family connections and ordinary life proceeding as usual."

[217] Theissen, *Sociology of Earliest Palestinian Christianity*, 18–19.

[218] Theissen, *Sociology of Earliest Palestinian Christianity*, 17.

[219] Tuckett, *Q*, 360. See also Seán Freyne, *Galilee from Alexander the Great to Hadrian, 332 B.C.E. to 135 C.E.: A Study of Second Temple Judaism* (UNDCSJCA 5; Wilmington: Michael Glazier/Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1980).

[220] Horsley, *Sociology and the Jesus Movement*, 117–23. See also Wolfgang Stegemann, "Nachfolge Jesu als solidarische Gemeinschaft der reichen und angesehenen Christen mit den bedürftigen und verachteten Christen. Das Lukasevangelium," in *Jesus von Nazareth – Hoffnung der Armen* (eds. L. Schottroff and W. Stegemann; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1978), 89–153. Stegemann has also criticized the idea that "wandering charismatics" were the "leaders" of the Jesus movement as a Lukan idealization of the early days of the church.

[221] Arnal, *Jesus and the Village Scribes*, 2001, 157, challenges the "itinerant charismatic" model because it fails to explain "how such traveling might be funded, where the surplus for travelers' support would come from, or how people might react to them."

[222] Kloppenborg Verbin, *Excavating Q*, 171. Kloppenborg tends to agree with Horsley on Q's basic orientation: Q "engaged in a struggle on two fronts: in support of town and village culture against the encroachments of the cities, and in support of local forms of Israelite religion in the face of pressures from the hierocratic worldview of Judaea" (261).

comprised of a wide variety of disciples, friends and followers with various degrees of commitment and participation.[223]

Q was the product of skilled scribal activity. Kloppenborg holds that Q is the work of "village scribes" from the lower ranks of the scribal profession whose main duties were carrying out various administrative tasks in rural villages and towns.[224] Yet he also recognizes that the "visible and overt social radicalism of Q seems atypical of peasant societies" and has proposed, as the most likely alternative, an *urban* setting for Q.[225] Willi Braun regards Q as the product of relatively high level scribal activity.[226] Q's literary profile suggests that scribes of "middling respectability," in terms of their social location, status and mobility, were responsible for Q.[227] These scribes are "remarkably *mobile figures*, both geographically and in terms of the versatility of professional or scribal activities derived from their mastery of literate instrumentalities" and could have composed Q in a kind of "school 'space.'"[228] Alan Kirk has suggested that the social level of the scribes should "be estimated a few notches higher than that of the village functionaries postulated by Kloppenborg."[229] Richard Horsley and Jonathan Draper argue that there is "little or no

---

[223] Sanders, *The Historical Figure of Jesus*, 122, argues that some followers were "close," some "slightly more remote followers," and others "still more remote sympathizers or supporters."

[224] See John S. Kloppenborg, *Conflict and Invention: Literary, Rhetorical and Social Studies on the Sayings Gospel Q* (ed. J. S. Kloppenborg; Valley Forge, Pa: Trinity, 2004), 5–6; and "Jesus and the Parables of Jesus in Q," in *The Gospel Behind the Gospels: Current Studies in Q* (ed. R. A. Piper; SNTS 75; Leiden: Brill, 1995), 275–319, esp. 318. Kloppenborg, "Redactional Strata," 11–12, suggests a social location for the formation of Q among "the petite bourgeois who formed the lower administrative classes of the cities."

[225] Kloppenborg, "Redactional Strata and Social History in the Sayings Gospel Q," 11, argues that Q's setting is to be found among "the petite bourgeoisie who formed the lower administrative classes of the cities." Kloppenborg Verbin, *Excavating Q*, 200, however, warns against putting them "too high on the professional ladder," however, and argues that Q's "general lack of compositional affectations," its relatively "mundane topics" and the "unpretentious nature of its rhetorical appeals" provide evidence that its audience, like its author(s), lived "at or near a subsistence level."

[226] Willi Braun, "The Schooling of a Galilean Jesus Association (The Sayings Gospel Q)," in *Redescribing Christian Origins*, 43–65, esp. 48: "the history of recent Q scholarship is the history of the discovery of Q as a literary document and the Q community as an increasingly self-conscious and fairly sophisticated research collective."

[227] The phrase is from Robert A. Kaster, *Guardians of Language: The Grammarian and Society in Late Antiquity* (TCH 11; Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988).

[228] Braun, "The Schooling of a Galilean Jesus Association," 59.

[229] Kirk, *The Composition of the Sayings Source*, 399. For Kirk, the *Kleinliterator* model of Q, where new material is continually added to a body of tradition as it moves through history, is untenable. Jonathan L. Reed, "Places in Early Christianity: Galilee, Archaeology, Urbanization, and Q" (Ph.D. diss., The Claremont Graduate School, 1994), argues that the author(s) of Q had contact with urban life and so were not quite "village scribes."

evidence that there were 'scribes' or 'administrative infrastructures' in either Galilee or surrounding areas or that the village officers were literate."[230] There is no evidence that such scribes ever cultivated instructional wisdom. The composition of "a relatively learned and characteristically scribal genre" such as the instruction "does not accord well with a peasant setting."[231]

Q is the work of skilled scribes located in or adjacent to an urban setting. The authors are self-identified as "prophets," familiar with wisdom literature, prophecy, apocalypticism, eschatology and Deuteronomistic theology, and capable of combining these diverse traditions in a single document.[232]

2.8 The Provenance of Q

The provenance of Q is one of the more intractable problems in Q studies. Where does Q come from? What is the *source* of the *Quelle*? A great deal of attention has been paid to Q's redactional profile and Christology, but the underlying issue remains one of *origin*. Since the provenance of Q has the potential of altering our understanding of a prominent trajectory in early Jewish Christianity, the stakes are high enough to warrant careful reconsideration.

Q has been located in Jerusalem, Syria, Palestine, the Transjordan, the Decapolis, Antioch, Tiberias, Sepphoris, and among the villages on the northern shore of the Sea of Galilee.[233] Paul Hoffmann, arguing that the Q group lo-

[230] Horsley with Draper, *Whoever Hears You*, 294, suggest that Q is an "oral-derived" text, i.e., Q's speeches were oral performances of an enacted covenant renewal. See also Kelber, *The Oral and Written Gospel*. Kloppenborg's "village scribes" are "little more than an imaginative historical conjecture (294)."

[231] John S. Kloppenborg, "Literary Convention, Self-Evidence, and the Social History of the Q People," *Semeia* 55 (1991): 77–102, esp. 85.

[232] In describing Q as a "single" document I am not denying that it underwent multiple redactions or may even have originated in a "chaotic" manner as Casey has suggested.

[233] For Jerusalem, see Julius Wellhausen, *Einleitung in die drei ersten Evangelien* (Berlin: Reimer, 1905), 88; *Einleitung in die drei ersten Evangelien* (2d ed.; Berlin: Reimer, 1911), 78; John Macleod Campbell Crum, *The Original Jerusalem Gospel: Being Essays on the Document Q* (New York: Macmillan), 1927, 84; Wilhelm Bussmann, *Synoptische Studien*, vol. 2, *Zur Redenquelle* (Halle: Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses, 1929), 117–19. For "Palestine" in general, see Gerd Theissen, *The Gospels in Context: Social and Political History in the Synoptic Tradition* (trans. L. M. Maloney; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991). For the Transjordan, see Schulz, *Q*, 481. For the Decapolis, see Kloppenborg, "Literary Convention," 77–102. For Antioch, see Bradley Root, "Is Q a Source for the Galilee?," paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature annual meeting, Philadelphia, November 21, 2005. For Tiberias, see Wolfgang Schenk, "Die Verwünschung der Küstenorte Q 10, 13–15; Zur Funktion der konkreten Ortsangaben und zur Lokalisierung von Q," in *The Synoptic Gospels: Source Criticism and the New Literary Criticism* (ed. C. Focant; BETL 110, Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1993), 477–490. For the northern shore of the Sea of Galilee,

cated itself between the collaborators with Rome and the freedom movements before the revolt, "showed a particular concern to locate Q and its tradents within the social and political situation of first-century Galilee."[234] Hoffmann's interest in a Galilean Q "became the preoccupation of the study of the Sayings Gospel Q in the two decades that followed."[235] Theissen argued that "wandering radicals" produced Q and also tried to locate Q in Galilee in a context of economic insecurity and social conflict.[236]

The most common method in determining Q's provenance has been identifying it with Q 10:13–15's "woes" against the Galilean towns of Chorazin, Bethsaida and Capernaum, although Kloppenborg admits that this is "an extraordinarily weak argument."[237] Nonetheless, the general consensus among Q scholars has been that Q is a Galilean document.[238] This is understandable, given that the *literary setting* of Q seems to be located in Galilee. Based on such considerations, Jonathan Reed has even proposed a "social map" of Q, with Capernaum as the center of the movement.[239]

---

see Havener, *Q: The Sayings of Jesus*, 42–45; Allison, *The Jesus Tradition in Q*, 53; Reed, *Archaeology*, 177. Cromhout, *Jesus and Identity*, 231.

[234] Hoffmann, *Studien zur Theologie der Logienquelle*; Kloppenborg, "Conflict and Invention: Recent Studies in Q," in *Conflict and Invention: Literary, Rhetorical and Social Studies on the Sayings Gospel Q* (ed. J. S. Kloppenborg; Valley Forge: Trinity, 2004), 1–14, esp. 2.

[235] Kloppenborg, "Conflict and Invention," 2.

[236] Gerd Theissen, "Wanderradikalismus: Literatur-soziologische Aspekte der Überlieferung von Worten Jesu im Urchristentum," *ZTK* 70 (1973): 245–71.

[237] Kloppenborg, "Conflict and Invention," 3–4.

[238] Adolf von Harnack, *The Sayings of Jesus: The Second Source of St. Matthew and St. Luke* (trans. J. R. Wilkinson; NTS 2; London: Williams & Norgate, 1908), 168; B. H. Streeter, "The Literary Evolution of the Gospels ," in *Studies in the Synoptic Problem* (ed. W. Sanday; Oxford: Clarendon, 1911), 213–16; Schenk, "Die Verwünschung der Küstenorte Q 10, 13–15," 477–90, esp. 490; Havener, *Q: The Sayings of Jesus*, 42–45; Sato, *Q und Prophetie*, 387; Tuckett, *Q*, 102; Seán Freyne, "Galilean Questions to Crossan's Mediterranean Jesus," in *Whose Historical Jesus?* (eds. W. E. Arnal and M. Desjardins; ESCJ 7; Waterloo, Ontario: Canadian Corporation for Studies in Religion/Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1997), 63–91, esp. 87; Kloppenborg, "Literary Convention," 77–102, esp. 85–86; "The Sayings Gospel Q: Recent Opinion on the People behind the Document," *CRBS* (1993): 1: 9–34, esp. 22–23, and *Excavating Q*, 167–71; Richard A. Horsley, *Galilee: History, Politics, People* (Valley Forge: Trinity, 1995), 71; "Social Conflict in the Synoptic Sayings Source Q," in *Conflict and Invention: Literary, Rhetorical and Social Studies on the Sayings Gospel Q* (ed. J. S. Kloppenborg; Valley Forge: Trinity, 1995), 42; Mack, *The Lost Gospel*, 48–49; Jonathan Reed, "The Social Map of Q," in *Conflict and Invention: Literary, Rhetorical, and Social Studies on the Sayings Gospel Q* (ed. J. S. Kloppenborg; Valley Forge: Trinity, 1995), 18; "The Sign of Jonah (Q 11:29–32) and Other Epic Traditions in Q," in *Reimagining Christian Origins: A Colloquium honoring Burton L. Mack* (eds. E. Castelli and H. Taussig; Valley Forge: Trinity, 1996), 13–31, 34–39; Vaage, *Galilean Upstarts*, 1, 3.

[239] Reed, "The Social Map of Q," 17–36; Reed, *Archaeology and the Galilean Jesus*.

There are a number of problems, however, with this proposal.[240] Reed himself recognizes "the tentative and problematic nature of the enterprise" and that locating Q in Galilee based on internal evidence in Q is "somewhat provisional."[241] He also admits that the place-names in Q are "hardly a sufficiently representative sample for a description of Jesus' public ministry's itinerary."[242] Yet Reed's Ph.D. dissertation seems to *assume* Q's Galilean provenance and then sets out "to confirm that the community behind Q remained in Galilee." Kloppenborg points out that the idea of Q having a "social map" is "rather speculative . . . especially when Q does not draw specific attention to its map."[243] The argument is "admittedly not very convincing."[244] Arnal admits that "any conclusive verification is almost certain to remain elusive."[245] Yet Arnal has based his entire study on Q by assuming a Galilean provenance of "village scribes" in deracinated rural Galilee.

The Galilean towns of Chorazin, Bethsaida, and Capernaum only occur in two pericopae (Q 7:1–10, 10:13–15). Yet Nazareth, Jerusalem and the "all the region of the Jordan" are also mentioned in Q. Q's geographical horizon is not limited to Galilee. Peter Richardson has noted that Q contains no references to lakes, fishing or boats, which would seem to place the Sea of Galilee outside its field of vision.[246] We cannot conclude that Q is Galilean solely on the basis of place-names, particularly because Q only mentions Chorazin and Bethsaida once (Q 10:13), and Capernaum twice (Q 7:1, 10:15). These place-names, moreover, are only found in Q's alleged secondary layer,[247] as "clearly secondary interpolations" into an earlier instructional collection of sayings.[248] Furthermore, they are villages that have *rejected* Q's message. On the other hand, Q begins in a setting "around the Jordan" (Q 3:3) and mentions Jerusalem *twice* (Q 4:9, Q 13:34). By sheer frequency, Jerusalem is equally as prominent as Capernaum. Yet even if these place-names *do* reflect the Galilean provenance of Q 10:13-15, this does not indicate that Q itself as a whole was composed in Galilee, since individual traditions could have originated in diverse locations.[249] The use of Q 10:13–15 as evidence of Q's Galilean provenance

---

[240] Larry W. Hurtado, *Lord Jesus Christ: Devotion to Jesus in Earliest Christianity* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), 222, n. 18; Mark A. Chancey, *The Myth of a Gentile Galilee* (SNTS 118; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 3; Root, "Is Q a Source for the Galilee?"

[241] Reed, *Archaeology*, 171.

[242] Reed, "Places in Early Christianity," 97–98.

[243] Kloppenborg Verbin, *Excavating Q*, 174. Kloppenborg, "Conflict and Invention," 4.

[244] Kloppenborg Verbin, *Excavating Q*, 171. Arnal, *Jesus and the Village Scribes*, 162.

[245] Arnal, *Jesus and the Village Scribes*, 162.

[246] Peter Richardson, *Building Jewish in the Roman East* (Waco: Baylor, 2004), 86.

[247] Arnal, *Jesus and the Village Scribes*, 162.

[248] Kloppenborg, *The Formation of Q*, 195.

[249] Tuckett, *Q and the History of Early Christianity*, 102.

"misconstrues the evidence" since "one obscure reference does not mean that Q had to have been written in Galilee."[250]

There does not seem to be much evidence of many prophetic movements in Galilee, as opposed to Judea, where such activity was relatively common.[251] There also does not seem to be much evidence for a literate scribal tradition nor much evidence for the use of Greek in *first*-century Galilee.[252] Q presupposes an urban setting,[253] but the main Galilean contenders are Tiberias and Sepphoris, two places never mentioned in Q and apparently never visited by Jesus. Q is likely of Palestinian provenance,[254] but there is no firm evidence that it originated in Galilee.[255] Kloppenborg argues that Q is "best situated" in Galilee, but he admits that "We do not possess . . . the data that would allow an exact specification of its provenance."

Q and Galilee, however, continue to function as literary-geographical *symbols* for "Jesus."[256] Over a century ago, Ernst Renan charmed his readers with his vision of an idyllic Jesus roaming the Galilean countryside in the springtime before Easter.[257] Yet he also *detached* Galilee from Judea, arguing that it was mostly inhabited by non-Jews and that Jesus "definitively left the Jewish fold."[258] Arthur Droge describes Q as part of a liberal Protestant attempt to establish the earliest gospel and recover the pure origins of Christianity.[259] Constructing Jesus as a Galilean folk-hero served this purpose and facilitated a reading of Jesus as a religious genius distinct from the Judaism of his day.[260] In 1907, Harnack's *Sayings of Jesus*, "the last hurrah for the nineteenth-

---

[250] Root, "Is Q a Source for the Galilee?," 6.

[251] "Judas the Galilean" was active in *Judea* (*War* 2.118) ca. 6 C. E.

[252] Chancey, *The Myth of a Gentile Galilee.*

[253] Kloppenborg, "Redactional Strata and Social History in the Sayings Gospel Q," 11.

[254] Hoffmann, *Studien zur Theologie der Logienquelle*, 331–34; Lührmann, *Die Redaktion*, 88; Uro, *Sheep Among the Wolves*, 21–22. Schulz, *Q*, posits a Palestinian community. Zeller, *Kommentar*, 95, posits a Palestinian provenance.

[255] Kloppenborg Verbin, *Excavating Q*, 214.

[256] Seán Freyne, "The Geography, Politics, and Economics in Galilee and the Quest for the Historical Jesus," in *Studying the Historical Jesus: Evaluations of the State of Current Research* (eds. B. Chilton and C. Evans; NTTS 19; Leiden: Brill, 1994), 75–121, 76.

[257] Ernst Renan, *Vie de Jésus* (Paris: Michael Levy, 1871).

[258] Tessa Rajak, "Jews and Greeks: The Invention and Exploitation of Polarities in the Nineteenth Century," in *The Jewish Dialogue with Greece and Rome: Studies in Cultural and Social Interaction* (Leiden: Brill, 2002), 535–57, esp. 547.

[259] Arthur Droge, "Cynics or Luddites: Excavating Q Studies" *SR* 37/2 (2008): 249–69. See also John S. Kloppenborg, "Goulder and the New Paradigm: A Critical Appreciation of Michael Goulder on the Synoptic Problem," in *The Gospels according to Michael Goulder: A North American Response* (ed. C. A. Rollston; Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 2002), 58–59.

[260] Bruce D. Chilton, "Jesus within Judaism," in *Judaism in Late Antiquity: II. Historical Syntheses* (ed. J. Neusner; HO 70; Leiden: Brill, 1995), 262–84.

century Jesus,"[261] asserted that Q's "unbiased" collection of sayings had a geographical horizon that was "absolutely bounded by Galilee." Since the 1950s, Q studies have demonstrated a distinctive redactional history and compositional profile, yet the *unproven* hypothesis of a Galilean Q remains the dominant paradigm in Q studies.

An emphasis on the *Galilean* context of Jesus' activity was promoted by anti-Semites in pre-war Germany.[262] "Galilee" was used as a symbolic way of distancing Jesus from Judaism.[263] The Galilean Jesus was deployed to support Aryan race theory and gave the impression that Judaism was "quite distinct" and "dissimilar" from the Galilean Jesus.[264] Anti-Semitic portrayals of Jews and Judaism became structurally embedded in scholarship, regardless of individual scholars' personal inclinations.[265] Ernst Lohmeyer, for example, argued that Galilee was the first home of Christianity and *rivaled* other early Christian communities.[266] Galilee has also been (mis)interpreted by the phrase "Galilee of the Gentiles" (גליל הגוים).[267] This expression may have originally referred (in Isa 8:23) to Israel being "encircled" by foreign nations, but Matthew 4:15–16 uses it as the fulfillment of biblical prophecy, and it is from this latter usage that the phrase has been taken up as an ideological tool in the de-Judaization of Christianity.

The problem with locating Q in Galilee is not only that anti-Semitic ideologies have deployed "Galilee" in biblical scholarship. A more fundamental difficulty is that there is very little evidence of any "Galilean" Christianity.[268] Seán Freyne suggests that this lack of evidence, combined with Q's condemnation of Galilean villages and James' influence in Jerusalem, suggests "that the movement was largely a failure in Galilee."[269]

---

[261] Mack, *The Lost Gospel*, 30.

[262] Arnal, *The Symbolic Jesus*, 21.

[263] Reed, *Archaeology and the Galilean Jesus*, 6; Walter Bauer, "Jesus der Galiläer," in *Aufsätze und Kleine Schriften* (ed. G. Strecker; Tübingen: Mohr, 1967), 91–108; Walter Grundmann, *Jesus der Galiläer und das Judentum* (Leipzig: Wigand, 1940); Hans Dieter Betz, "Wellhausen's Dictum 'Jesus was not a Christian, but a Jew' in Light of Present Scholarship," *ST* 45 (1991): 83–100; Mack, *The Lost Gospel*, 21.

[264] Amy-Jill Levine, *The Misunderstood Jew: The Church and the Scandal of the Jewish Jesus* (New York: Harper San Francisco, 2006), 9.

[265] Maurice Casey, "Some Anti-Semitic Assumptions in the TDNT," *NovT* 41 (1999): 280–91; Susanna Heschel, "Nazifying Christian Theology: Walter Grundmann and the Institute for the Study and Eradication of Jewish Influence on German Church Life," *CH* 63 (1994): 587–605; Peter Head, "The Nazi Quest for an Aryan Jesus," *JSHJ* 2 (2004): 55–89.

[266] Ernst Lohmeyer, *Galiläa und Jerusalem* (FRLANT 34; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1936).

[267] Chancey, *The Myth of a Gentile Galilee*, 170–74.

[268] Seán Freyne, *Galilee from Alexander the Great to Hadrian 323 B.C.E. to 135 C.E.: A Study of Second Temple Judaism* (Wilmington: Michael Glazier, 1980).

[269] Freyne, *Galilee from Alexander the Great to Hadrian*, 375.

This may well be the case. "Galilee," after all, also functions as a symbol in the Gospels. For Mark, Galilee is closely associated with the teaching of Jesus and the disciples are directed there to re-encounter Jesus as the risen Christ.[270] Yet Mark neither confines Jesus to Galilee during the ministry nor identifies any particular "Galilean community" in his own time. For Mark, Galilee is not important because it was the place of the expected *parousia* or because of any rival Jesus movement there, but because it was the place of Jesus' ministry. For Matthew, the disciples are instructed to proceed "to Galilee to the mountain" to greet the risen Jesus.[271] Here the "mountain" functions as a stand-in for Mount Zion. Matthew's Jesus is a Judean transplant in Galilee, and only ministers in Galilee after John's arrest. For Luke, Galilee has no special importance except as a theological point of origin. Unlike Matthew, Luke identifies Galilee as Jesus' homeland; yet there are no post-resurrection appearances in Galilee. More importantly, Luke is not particularly interested in any "Galilean Christianity" in his own time.

The *symbolic* resonances of Palestinian geography in the Gospels have long been recognized.[272] It would be helpful, therefore, to review recent scholarship on the ethnic and religious identity of Galilee before re-assessing Q's provenance.[273] There were multiple and complex social, cultural, and religious identities in ancient Galilee. Identity is always relative, relational and linked to questions of hybridity.[274] Similarity and difference are often "relative, rhetorical constructs that express the interests and concerns of particular ancient authors (and those modern followers who quote them) rather than the complexity of life."[275]

The ethnic and religious identity of first-century Galilee is a site of debate and its population has been seen as Jewish, "Israelite," syncretistic, and Gentile, its culture both Jewish and/or Hellenistic.[276] The archaeological record shows that Galilee was abandoned during the seventh and sixth centuries B. C. E.,[277] with no continuous "Israelite" culture in the region.[278] Nor were

---

[270] Mark 16:7.

[271] Matt 28:16.

[272] Hans Conzelmann, *The Theology of Saint Luke* (London: Faber, 1960).

[273] See Jürgen Zangenberg, Harold W. Attridge and Dale B. Martin, eds., *Religion, Ethnicity, and Identity in Ancient Galilee: A Region in Transition* (WUNT 201; Tübingen: Mohr, 2007); Morten H. Jensen, *Herod Antipas in Galilee: The Literary and Archaeological Sources on the Reign of Herod Antipas and Its Socio-Economic Impact on Galilee* (WUNT 2 215; Tübingen: Mohr, 2006).

[274] Michael Peppard, "Personal Names and Ethnic Hybridity in Late Ancient Galilee: The Data from Beth She'arim," in *Religion, Ethnicity, and Identity in Ancient Galilee: A Region in Transition* (eds. J. Zangenberg, H. W. Attridge and D. B. Martin; WUNT 210; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007), 99–113.

[275] Zangenberg, Introduction to *Religion, Ethnicity, and Identity in Ancient Galilee*, 2.

[276] Reed, *Archaeology and the Galilean Jesus*, 8.

[277] Zvi Gal, *The Lower Galilee during the Iron Age* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1992).

Galileans "Gentiles" converted to Judaism by the Hasmoneans.[279] Galilee was predominantly Jewish.[280] Galilee may have had a different social, economic and political matrix than Judea, but "Early Roman Period Galilee and Judea share indicators of Jewish religious identity in their material cultures."[281]

For Reed, both the "settlement history" and the "numismatic profile" suggest that Galileans were descendants of Judeans.[282] Galilee had been annexed to Judea by the Hasmoneans a hundred years before Jesus was born, and had become more integrated with Judean economic, legal and political affairs.[283] The Hasmoneans regarded the Galilee as a "satellite of Jerusalem." Pilgrimages to Jerusalem would have been made and probably involved kinship ties; Galileans can be envisioned as staying with kin in Jerusalem.[284] Mark Chancey has also shown that first-century Galilee, based on the archaeological data and literary sources, was predominantly Jewish.[285] Josephus and the Gospels portray it as a place "where circumcision, Sabbath observance, loyalty to the Jerusalem Temple, and purity were major concerns." It is unlikely that rural Galilee had a cosmopolitan, "multiethnic, multicultural mix."[286] Galileans were "ethnic Judeans" and there was "a fundamental continuity between the people of Judea and Galilee."[287] They shared the same "symbolic universe." The interpreter who posits ideological conflict or discontinuity between the two populations "superimposes it upon the evidence."[288]

If first-century Galilee's Jewish character effectively puts to rest the myth of a Gentile Galilee, the "Galilean Jesus" remains a construct remarkably resistant to critical analysis and continues to inform subconscious presupposi-

---

[278] Contra Albrecht Alt, "Zur Geschichte der Grenze zwischen Judäa und Samaria," in *Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte des Volkes Israel II* (München: C. H. Beck'sche, 1959), 346–62, 363–435; Richard A. Horsley, *Galilee: History, Politics, People* (Valley Forge: Trinity, 1995), 40.

[279] Contra Emil Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People* (eds. G. Vermes, et al.; Edinburgh: Clark, 1973–1987), 1:142, 216–18, 561–73; Bauer, "Jesus der Galiläer," 91–108.

[280] Freyne, *Galilee from Alexander*, 43-44; *Galilee, Jesus and the Gospels: Literary Approaches and Historical Investigation* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988), 178–90, 224–39; "Galilee-Jerusalem Relations according to Josephus' Life," *NTS* 33 (1987): 600–09; Reed, *Archaeology*, 24. Shaye J. D. Cohen, *The Beginnings of Jewishness: Boundaries, Varieties, Uncertainties* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999), 73.

[281] Reed, *Archaeology*, 27.

[282] Reed, *Archaeology*, 43.

[283] Marianne Sawicki, *Crossing Galilee: Architectures of Contact in the Occupied Land of Jesus* (Harrisburg: Trinity, 2000), 117.

[284] Reed, *Archaeology*, 58.

[285] Chancey, *The Myth of a Gentile Galilee*, 5.

[286] Contra Mack, *The Lost Gospel*, 214.

[287] Cromhout, *Jesus and Identity*, 6.

[288] Cromhout, *Jesus and Identity*, 243.

tions about the early Jesus movement.[289] It is true, of course, that Q and the Gospels set much of Jesus' ministry in Galilee, but this does not tell us anything about where *Q* was written.[290] It is a serious mistake to confuse the literary *setting* of Q in Galilee for its place of composition. Q may *narrate* Jesus' activity in Galilean villages, but this does not comprise evidence of Q's Galilean *provenance*.[291] This is problematic, for Q explicitly associates Jesus with Judea, the "area beyond the Jordan" and Jerusalem. Moreover, the Gospels link Jesus with Bethany, Jericho, Samaria, the Decapolis, Caesarea Philippi and the region of Tyre and Sidon. Jesus constantly *crosses boundaries* and is always on the move.

According to Matthew, Jesus' mother Mary was a "transplanted Judean," not a native "Galilean."[292] Jesus' family moved to Nazareth *after* he was born.[293] Luke describes John as having priestly Jerusalem connections (1:5–25, 57–63), growing up "in the wilderness" and being born in "a Judean town in the hill country (Lk 1:39)." The Gospels do not *limit* the Jesus movement to Galilee: Jesus was baptized in Judea and executed in Jerusalem. Jesus is a itinerant teacher who purposefully attempts to integrate multiple regions into his ministry. Similarly, the (post-Easter) Jesus movement does not seem to have been a particularly Galilean phenomenon.[294] According to Paul, the movement had its authoritative center in Jerusalem. Paul never even mentions a Galilean Jesus movement.

The identification of Q as a Galilean text seems to assume that Q's oral transmission, compositional history, and community profile were all Galilean. This construction envisions *no contact* between Q, Judea, and Jerusalem. Q is represented as a distinctly Galilean form of early Christianity. The problem with this model is that there is no convincing evidence that Q originated in Galilee nor is there any evidence of a distinctively Galilean form of early Christianity. We should approach such constructions with due caution.[295]

---

[289] Jens Schröter, "Jesus of Galilee: The Role of Location in Understanding Jesus," in *Jesus Research: An International Perspective: The First Princeton-Prague Symposium on Jesus Research, Prague 2005* (ed. J. H. Charlesworth with P. Pokorný; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009), 36–55, esp. 40.

[290] Casey, *An Aramaic Approach to Q*, 49, 42.

[291] Kloppenborg Verbin, *Excavating Q*, 171, admits that most suggestions are "guesses" and "it is impossible to build a very compelling case for any conjectured location or to exclude other candidates."

[292] Sawicki, *Crossing Galilee*, 139–40.

[293] Matt 2:22.

[294] Theissen, *Sociology*, 47, citing Mark 14:70, Acts 1:11 and Acts 2:7.

[295] Freyne, *Galilee*, 375: it is "not possible to confine this movement of Palestinian Jewish Christianity to Galilee, or even to Palestine itself."

Q's geographical horizon includes Judea and Jerusalem.[296] A number of scholars have argued that Q actually *originated* in Jerusalem.[297] J. M. C. Crum proposed that Q is "a Jerusalem tradition," a collection composed in Aramaic "for the Aramaic-speaking Christians in Jerusalem, the original Christians."[298] Birger Pearson also argues that "the Galilean followers of Jesus brought their Jesus traditions with them to Jerusalem."[299] Richard Bauckham notes that "It is intrinsically likely that the first written collections of Gospel traditions were produced in Jerusalem."[300] This suggestion is not popular among Q scholars. Reed rejects Jerusalem because it appears to be "remote on its social map" as a "spiritually barren," "forsaken and deserted" place.[301] Q "only" mentions Jerusalem twice, and takes a "relative disinterest in Jerusalem." Q does not seem to be "interested" in the Temple and the "inner workings of the Temple cult." Q's references to Pharisees do not require a Judean provenance.[302] Nor is Jerusalem "singled out" as the community's "primary antagonist." This role is reserved for "this generation," a term applicable to any region in Palestine.[303] Q also fails to mention James, Peter, the twelve or the apostles.[304] On the other hand, Q 22:28, 30 does refer to Jesus' followers judging the twelve tribes of Israel. Q's interests may have been more community-oriented than "apostolic." The author of James may also have known Q or a collection of similar sayings.[305]

Q originated in a Greek-literate environment. Indeed, one of the main problems with a Galilean provenance for Q is the high degree of scriptural *intertextuality* present in Q. This seems to fit neither the peasant "village

[296] Schulz, *Q*, 481; Henry Thatcher Fowler, "Paul, Q, and the Jerusalem Church," *JBL* 43 (1924): 9–14; Crum, *The Original Jerusalem Gospel*; Luke Timothy Johnson, *The Letter of James: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 37A; Garden City: Doubleday, 1995); Julius Wellhausen, *Einleitung in die drei ersten Evangelien* (2d ed.; Berlin: Georg Reimer, 1911), 163; Marco Frenschkowski, "Galiläa oder Jerusalem? Die topographischen und politischen Hintergründe der Logienquelle," in *The Sayings Source Q and the Historical Jesus* (ed. A. Lindemann; Leuven: Peeters, 2001), 535–59; Meadors, *Jesus the Messianic Herald*, 324.

[297] Wellhausen, *Einleitung in die drei ersten Evangelien*, 88; *Einleitung*, 78.

[298] Crum, *The Original Jerusalem Gospel*, v–vi. Bussmann, *Synoptische Studien*, 117–119.

[299] Birger A. Pearson, "A Q Community in Galilee?," *NTS* 50 (2004): 476–94, esp. 492.

[300] Richard Bauckham, "James and the Jerusalem Community," in *Jewish Believers in Jesus: The Early Centuries* (eds. O. Skarsaune and R. Hvalvik; Peabody: Hendrickson, 2007), 55–95, esp. 65.

[301] Reed, *Archaeology and the Galilean Jesus*, 187.

[302] Anthony Saldarini, *Pharisees, Scribes and Sadducees: A Sociological Approach* (Wilmington: Michael Glazier, 1988), 277–97.

[303] Reed, *Archaeology and the Galilean Jesus*, 188.

[304] Robinson, "The Critical Edition of Q and the Study of Jesus," 27–28.

[305] Patrick J. Hartin, *James and the "Q" Sayings of Jesus* (JSNTSup 47; Sheffield: JSOT, 1991).

scribe" model nor the peasant-"village scribe"-*relocated*-in-"urban"-Tiberias or Sepphoris model. As a Greek text laden with scriptural references and allusions, Q must be located in a relatively learned setting. Greek-speaking and Greek-literate Jews, including some of Jesus' *Galilean* disciples, lived in Jerusalem between the 40s and 60s, a city where Greek was commonly used. Martin Hengel has shown that the use of Greek in pre-70 C. E. Jerusalem would have been extensive.[306] Jewish pilgrims from the Diaspora, "returning emigrants and students of the law," "members of the Herodian court, Herod's family and their clientele," as well as "merchants, physicians, architects and other technical specialists, teachers of Greek language and rhetoric, skilled artisans and slaves from abroad" would all have used Greek in Jerusalem. The epigraphic evidence is also clear: more than one-third of the inscriptions found in and around the city are in Greek, indicating that as much as forty percent of the population preferred Greek.[307]

Greek was an important language for Jews and there is considerable evidence that many ancient Palestinian Jews were bilingual.[308] The Essene-like Therapeutae near Alexandria knew Greek. At Qumran, twenty-four Greek manuscript fragments, dated between 100 B. C. E. and 68 C. E., were found in Caves 4 and 7.[309] In Cave 4, two of the six fragments found were Greek papyri. In Cave 7, *all* of the manuscripts were in Greek, and all of them were papyri.[310] The Qumran community knew and perhaps used Greek.[311]

Q may not contain traits commonly associated with the Jerusalem community.[312] Yet Q passed through other locations before being incorporated into

---

[306] Martin Hengel, "Judaism and Hellenism Revisited," in *Hellenism in the Land of Israel* (eds. J. J. Collins and G. E. Sterling; CJA 13; Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2001), 28.

[307] Lee I. Levine, *Judaism and Hellenism in Antiquity: Conflict or Confluence* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1998), 76; Levi Y. Rahmani, *A Catalogue of Jewish Ossuaries: In the Collection of the State of Israel* (Jerusalem: Israel Antiquities Authority, 1994), 12–13, 73; Pieter W. Van der Horst, "Greek in Jewish Palestine in Light of Jewish Epigraphy," in *Hellenism in the Land of Israel* (eds. J. J. Collins and G. E. Sterling; CJA 13; Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2001), 154–74.

[308] John Sawyer, *Sacred Languages and Sacred Texts* (London: Routledge, 1999), 18–19.

[309] 4Q119 (4QLXXLev); 4Q120 (pap4QLXXLev); 4Q121 (4QLXXNum); 4Q122 (4QLXXDeut); 4Q127(4QpapPara Ex gr); 4Q126 (4QUnid gr); 7Q1; 7Q2; 7Q3-7Q19; 7Q1 (7QSeptuagint Exodus); 7Q7 (7QEpistle of Jeremiah); 7Q3-19 (7Q).

[310] Carsten Peter Thiede, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Jewish Origins of Christianity* (New York: Palgrave/St. Martin's, 2001), 124–81, esp. 125.

[311] James C. VanderKam, "Greek at Qumran," in *Hellenism in the Land of Israel* (eds. J. J. Collins and G. E. Sterling; CJA 13; Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2001), 175–81, esp. 178.

[312] James M. Robinson, "Judaism, Hellenism, Christianity: Jesus' Followers in Galilee until 70 C.E.," in *Ebraismo Ellenismo Christianesimo* (ed. V. Mathieu; Archivio di Filosofia, 53, 1, Padova, Cedam, 1985), 241–50, esp. 244, admits "it should not be overlooked that this demographic information includes the point that these locations rejected the message."

Matthew and Luke. The pre-70 C. E. Jerusalem community conducted an elaborate outreach network of missionary activity as far away as Antioch and Damascus. Q, by definition, *travels*. Q also seems well aware of non-Galilean Judaism: Q refers to the Jordan valley (Q 3:2), the Judean wilderness (Q 4:1–13) and Jerusalem (Q 4; 13:34). John's preaching and Jesus' baptism and temptation are all set in the Judean wilderness. Both the Pharisees and the exegetes of the law come in for severe criticism.[313] This polemic against Judean religious leaders culminates in Q's condemnation of Jerusalem.

This passage, a saying characteristic of Q's Deuteronomistic view of history,[314] warns Jerusalem of the coming judgment while it maintains hope[315] that it will one day welcome Jesus as ὁ ἐρχόμενος. Q 13:34–35 resembles an attitude characteristic of the Dead Sea Scrolls in that there is both judgment on Israel as well as hope that Israel will join the community in the future.[316] Q's polemic against Israel's religious leaders and the Temple not only indicates some level of contact with Jerusalem but suggests that the Q community perceived itself in competition with Temple-based Judaism. Jerusalem's significance is replaced by the community itself, within which Wisdom dwells. The idea of a first century Jewish community taking a "distant" attitude towards the Temple is remarkably similar to the position taken at Qumran, where the community regarded itself as having already replaced the Temple. For them, the Temple and its priestly leadership represented, as for the author(s) of Q, an illegitimate, impure place and authority. Q, therefore, cannot be said to be "disinterested" in Jerusalem. On the contrary, Jerusalem is "the focus of unbelief and nonacceptance."[317]

Jerusalem does have a *symbolic* function in the Lukan account of Christian origins.[318] And while some scholars question both the Lukan model and the very existence of a "Jerusalem community,"[319] Paul explicitly identifies Jeru-

---

[313] Q 11:42, 39b, 41, 43–44; Q 11:46b, 52, 47–48.

[314] Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 228, notes Q 13: 34–35. For Q's Deuteronomistic history, see Robert A. Derrenbacker Jr. and John S. Kloppenborg Verbin, "Self-Contradiction in the IQP? A Reply to Michael Goulder," *JBL* 120/1 (2001): 74; Arland D. Jacobson, "The Literary Unity of Q," *JBL* 101 (1982): 365–89.

[315] Allison, *The Jesus Tradition in Q*, 192–204.

[316] Allison, *The Jesus Tradition in Q*, 203; Werner G. Kümmel, *Promise and Fulfillment* (2d ed.; SBT 23; London: SCM, 1961), 81; Joachim Jeremias, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus* (London: SCM, 1966), 259–60; Uro, *Sheep among the Wolves*, 235–40; David R. Catchpole, "Temple Traditions in Q," in *Templum Amicitiae* (ed. W. Horbury; JSNTSS 48; Sheffield: JSOT, 1991), 319–20, 323; Tuckett, *Q*, 204–07.

[317] John S. Kloppenborg, "City and Wasteland: Narrative World and the Beginning of the Sayings Gospel (Q)," *Semeia* 52 (1991): 145–60, esp. 154. Reed, *Archaeology and the Galilean Jesus*, 187, n. 56, rejects Kloppenborg's proposal.

[318] Milton Moreland, "Jerusalem Imagined," Ph.D. diss., The Claremont Graduate School, 1999.

[319] Merrill P. Miller, "Beginning from Jerusalem…': Re-examining Canon and Consen-

salem as the Palestinian center of the Jesus movement during the early compositional stages of Q, ca. 40–60 C. E. Ronald A. Piper suggests that Q may have been composed and/or collected by Jewish Christian "Hellenists."[320] Acts 6–7 describes socio-economic difficulties within the Jerusalem community, opposition from Jewish authorities and a distinct use of the Deuteronomistic tradition of the fate of the prophets in Stephen's speech, a motif that only occurs in Acts 7:52 and 1 Thessalonians 2:15–16 outside the synoptic tradition.[321] Acts 6–7 also uses the term σοφίᾳ four times (6:3, 10; 7:10, 22), but nowhere else in all of Acts.[322] Acts 6–7 describe a situation in which Greek-speaking members of the early Jerusalem community had direct access to the early Jesus tradition, direct contact with Jesus' Galilean disciples, and shared Q's Deuteronomistic and wisdom orientation.

Judea and Jerusalem are better candidates for the provenance of Q.[323] Q's Galilean place-names cannot establish its provenance, especially since they are places where Jesus' message was *not* accepted. Some Q passages do rhetorically *represent* Jesus' ministry in Galilee, but there is too much uncertainty to endorse a Galilean *provenance* for Q. The provenance of Q is bettter described as "Judean" and/or "Palestinian," especially given Q's knowledge of Palestinian imagery, customs, and culture, its familiarity with Wisdom, prophetic, and Deuteronomistic traditions, its temporal and geographical proximity to the Jerusalem community described by Paul, and its evident mobility.

Q emerged from an ethnically Jewish/Judean milieu, as evidenced by its (unexplained) references to Solomon (Q 11:31; 12:27), its (unexplained) use of Aramaic words like γεέννῃ (Q 12:5) and μαμωνᾷ (Q 16:13), and its explicit references to Gentiles as outsiders or "others" (Q 6:33; 12:30). The spatial imagery of the beginning of Q focuses on the "region of the Jordan" and sets the tone of a "*story* world" which refers back to the story of Lot and Sodom near the Dead Sea.[324] Q takes a pronounced interest in the epic traditions of Israel and refers to "Israel" (Q 7:9: 22:30), "Abel" (Q 11:51), Abraham (Q 3: 8, 13:28), Noah (17:26–27), Lot (Q 17:28–29), Isaac (Q 13:28), Jacob (Q 13:28), Jonah (Q 11:32), Zechariah (Q 11:51) and the prophets (Q 6:22–23;

---

sus," *JHC* 2/1 (1995): 3–30; Dennis E. Smith, "What do we really know about the Jerusalem Church?: Christian Origins in Jerusalem according to Acts and Paul," in *Redescribing Christian Origins*, 237–52, esp. 241–42.

[320] Piper, *Wisdom in the Q-Tradition*, 184–92; Martin Hengel, *Acts and the History of Earliest Christianity* (trans. J. Bowden; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979); *Studies in Early Christology* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1995), 76; Hurtado, *Lord Jesus Christ*, 229, 256.

[321] Piper, *Wisdom in the Q-Tradition*, 188.

[322] Piper, *Wisdom in the Q-Tradition*, 192.

[323] Dieter Lührmann, "Q in the History of Early Christianity," in *The Shape of Q: Signal Essays on the Sayings Gospel* (ed. J. S. Kloppenborg; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1994), 59–73, esp. 62; Fleddermann, *Q: A Reconstruction and Commentary*, 159, 160–61.

[324] Kloppenborg, "City and Wasteland," 145–160 (italics added).

11:49–51; 13:34–35). Q 11:51 describes the deaths from the time of Abel to Zechariah (2 Chron 24:20–22), and "assumes knowledge of the literary arrangement of the books of the Tanak."[325]

There are explicit references to *urban* imagery in Q, e.g., to the *polis* (Q 10:8, 10), palaces (Q 7:25), *agorai* (Q 7:31, 11:43), plazas (Q 10:10, 13:26, 14:21), rooftops (Q 12:3), judges and prisons (Q 12:58–59), a city gate (Q 13:24), banquets (Q 14:16–24) and banks (Q 19:23).[326] Q's criticism of Pharisees (Q 11:39–41, 11:42) and its hostility towards Jerusalem and the Temple (Q 11:49–51; 13:34–35) are comparable to Qumran orientations, especially since the Pharisees are widely regarded as aligned with the Jerusalem Temple, and the "woes" directed at them occur in relation to urban settings such as "marketplaces" (ἀγοραῖς) and assemblies (συναγωγάς). While these urban images *could be* compatible with cities like Tiberias and Sepphoris (which are never mentioned in Q), they are *certainly* compatible with Jerusalem.

The provenance of Q is an intractable problem in contemporary biblical scholarship. Nonetheless, some advances have been made. Q is an ethnically Judean text representative of an ethnically Jewish community. The Jewish ethnicity of Q problematizes constructions of early Christianity and highlights the fact that Jewish Christianity survived for several centuries through late antiquity. The hypothesis of a Galilean provenance, while commonly assumed, is problematic. There is no compelling evidence for the identification. Furthermore, there are disturbing tendencies in the history of scholarship where Galilee is used for anti-Semitic ideology, Aryan race theory, and false constructions of a non-Jewish Jesus. Some scholars have even linked these ideologies with modern proponents of a Cynic hypothesis. It seems difficult not to conclude that the hypothesis of a Galilean provenance is related to deeper theological and ideological concerns involving the historical Jesus.

Our enthusiasm for Q has sometimes been used to construct an alternative Jesus movement to rival traditional orthodoxy. Yet locating the provenance of Q in Judea/Jerusalem is not a regression to the canonical narratives of Acts and Eusebius, but a model that makes the best sense of the evidence, even while it recognizes diversity within early Christianity. The early Jesus movement was centered in Jerusalem, which included a number of Jesus' transplanted Galilean disciples. Jerusalem was a center of scribal production, and was intimately familiar with Greek as a literary and everyday language. Jerusalem also provided an ideal socio-economic infrastructure, as well as contemporary models of social networking, for the early Jesus movement.

---

[325] Kloppenborg Verbin, *Excavating Q*, 209; Gerd Theissen, *The Gospels in Context: Social and Political History in the Synoptic Tradition* (trans. L. M. Maloney; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991), 228.

[326] Reed, "The Social Map of Q," 26–27.

The community of Q was ethnically Jewish or "Judean."[327] The geographical provenance of Q is unknown. Q is often situated in Galilee and Galilee does appear to be *a* literary setting for (part of) Q, but there are counter indications that make positing a Galilean provenance of Q problematic, including the presence of Judean place-names and ethno-cultural allegiances. Q must be located, with its own distinctive characteristics, within Second Temple Judaism. These characteristics include Judean ethnicity; eschatology; son of man traditions; wisdom traditions; apocalyptic revelation; demonological exorcism; prophetic self-identification; a Deuteronomistic view of history; and hostility to Pharisees, "this generation," and the Jerusalem Temple establishment. These conclusions support re-opening the question(s) of how we view Q and warrant closer analysis and comparison between Q and the Essenes.

2.9 The Social Structure(s) of Q

According to Josephus, traveling Essenes did not take anything with them except arms to guard themselves against thieves, since they were welcomed in every city by Essenes living there, and given everything needed.[328] Philo also reports that Essenes lived communally, since "no one's house is his own in the sense that it is not shared by all, for beside the fact that they dwell together in communities, the door is open to visitors from elsewhere who share their convictions."[329] Essenes carried no money, provisions or extra clothing on journeys, for they anticipated finding lodging and food in others' homes.[330]

Q provides us with a similar description of its social structure in Q 9:57–11:13, a collection of sayings collated as a kind of primitive "missionary" document.[331] The core of this tradition appears to be an "equipment instruc-

---

[327] For Q's Jewish ethnicity, see Schulz, *Q*, 57; Hoffmann, *Studien zur Theologie*, 1972, 332–33; "QR und der Menschensohn," in *The Four Gospels 1992* (ed. F. Neirynck; BEThL 100; Leuven: Peeters, 1992), 1: 455; Robinson, *The Sayings Gospel Q*, 195; Kloppenborg Verbin, *Excavating Q*, 256; Tuckett, *Q*, 236, 435, n. 37; Arnal, *Jesus and the Village Scribes*, 202; "The Q Document," in *Jewish Christianity Reconsidered*, 129; Cromhout, *Jesus and Identity*; Catchpole, *Quest for Q*, 279.

[328] Josephus, *B.J.* 2.124–125.

[329] Philo, *Quod Omnis Probus Liber Sit*, 9.85.

[330] Jirair S. Tashjian, "The Social Setting of the Mission Charge in Q," Ph.D. diss., The Claremont Graduate School, 1987, 147.

[331] For the mission instructions as some of the older sayings in Q, see Allison, *The Jesus Tradition in Q*, 30–46. See also Ernst Käsemann, *New Testament Questions of Today* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1969), 119–20; Kasting, *Die Anfänge der urchristlichen Mission*, 97; Luise Schottroff and Wolfgang Stegemann, *Jesus and the Hope of the Poor* (Maryknoll: Orbis, 1986), 38; Joachim Gnilka, *Theologie des Neuen Testaments* (Freiburg: Herder, 1994), 134; Dieter Zeller, "Redactional Processes and Changing Settings in the Q-Material," in *The Shape of Q: Signal Essays on the Sayings Gospel* (ed. *Gospel* (ed. J. S. Kloppenborg; Minneapolis:

tion" (Q 10:4) with various instructions regarding acceptance and rejection of Q's itinerant "workers."[332] These instructions include a greeting of peace, eating what is placed before you and greeting no one on the road. Q's traveling "workers" are sent out in response to the prayers of those not designated as "workers" and admitted into the home of one identified as a "son of peace" (Q 10:6). By requiring the "workers" to depend solely on what is provided for them, these instructions involve the reversal of worldly expectations of self-preservation and self-sustenance. Q's version, which forbids carrying a staff, seems to be the earlier one, as opposed to Mark's, which allows a staff. In fact, Luke later explicitly reforms Q's prohibition (Luke 22:35–38) in having Jesus tell his disciples to obtain swords.[333]

Both Q's "workers" and traveling Essenes were economically supported by networks of "sympathetic" local villagers. In both cases, hospitality was anticipated. Yet the Essenes were "a much more developed network of communities" than Q's "sympathizers."[334] Q's "workers" also seem to have been involved in a mission oriented to all of Israel, which could explain the rejection anticipated in some villages (Q 10:10). Q also prohibits disciples from carrying a staff. This is consistent with Q's concern for loving one's enemies. It is also consistent with trusting in God's providence. Q and the Essenes agree in that there was no need of a purse, extra clothing or sandals, but Q goes one step further in denying self-defense. There is a remarkable congruence in everything except the non-violence with which Jesus insisted his mission be carried out, a characteristic that Mark and Luke changed by including the "staff," which then make their accounts conform precisely with Josephus' Essenes.

The mission instructions depict the sectarian orientation of the community: Q 10:21 claims that God has hidden his wisdom from the wise but revealed it

---

Fortress, 1994), 129: "the kernel of many of the sayings groups was composed and transmitted by wandering and wonder-working *missionaries*." The tradition of the wandering missionaries were later used by the communities founded by the missionaries for "paraenetic purposes." Steck, *Israel*, 288, as instruction for preachers to Israel ("Israelprediger"). Hoffmann, *Studien*, 333-34; Theissen, *Sociology*. See also Werner G. Kümmel, *Introduction to the New Testament* (rev. ed., Nashville: Abingdon, 1975), 73. Kasting, *Die Anfänge der urchristlichen Mission*, 97, thought of Q as a memory aid for the missionaries of the early community. Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 25, argues that *parts* of Q are "directed at a much broader group than simply missionaries."

[332] Kloppenborg, *Formation of Q*, 192–93. The workers are told to μὴ βαστάζετε βαλλάντιον, μὴ πήραν, μὴ ὑποδήματα, μηδὲ ῥάβδον. καὶ μηδένα κατὰ τὴν ὁδὸν ἀσπάσησθε. A similar set of instructions is found in Mark 6:8–9. A general consensus is that Q's version is more original. See Hahn, *Mission*, 42; Rudolf Pesch, *Markusevangelium*, 1: 328–30; Vincent Taylor, *The Gospel According to Mark* (London: Macmillan & Co., 1966), 302; Hoffmann, *Studien*, 240; Schulz, *Spruchquelle*, 408. Kloppenborg, *Formation*,195, describes it as "very ancient."

[333] This may reflect Luke's "two eras" schema.

[334] Tashjian, "The Social Setting of the Mission Charge in Q," 148.

to children, reflecting the community's self-understanding as the "elect."[335] Q 10:21 also appears to make use of a "*Hodayot* formula" similar to those used in the Thanksgiving Scroll (1QH) from Qumran.[336] In 1QH, most of the hymns begin with the phrase "I thank you, God" (אודך אדוני) and then give a reason for the thanksgiving (כי).[337] Q 10:21 follows this "formulaic" pattern.[338] Both the Q and Qumran communities erected social, cultural, and religious boundaries in their identity constructions. Both envisioned themselves as privileged recipients of divine revelation unavailable to those outside the group; and both promoted an "intensified law against the horizon of a final salvation and judgment imminently awaited."[339]

Q provides us with a classic example of nascent sectarian identity formation.[340] It redefines who belongs to "Israel" (Q 3:8, 13:29, 28, 13:30, 14:11, 14:16–23); polarizes its self-definition (Q 11:23); criticizes other Jews (Q 11:42, 39b, 43–44, 46b, 52, 47–48); rejects those villages that have rejected Jesus' message (Q 10:10–12, 13-15); is self-aware as a marginalized group (Q 10:2-3, 12:11-12); condemns "this generation," (Q 7:31, 11:16, 29–30, 11:49–51); pronounces judgment on Israel (Q 13:34–35); intensifies its practice of Mosaic law (Q 16:18); cautiously admires Gentiles (Q 7:9); proclaims the eschatological reversal of the "blessed" (Q 6:20–23); and promotes Jesus as the "Coming One" through appeals to scripture (Q 7:22–23).

The social boundaries of Q have been drawn, indicating that the people of Q regarded themselves as a special group, or cluster of groups, centered around John and Jesus. One joins the Q community by doing what Jesus says (Q 6:46); by not being offended by Jesus (Q 7:23); by observing the law as interpreted by Jesus (Q 16:18); by renouncing family ties in order to join the new family of Jesus people (Q 12:53), by seeking God first (Q 12:22b–31), by rejecting the alleged religious hypocrisy among other sectarian Jewish groups (Q 11:42, 39b, 43–44, 46b, 52, 47–48), and by exalting Jesus to the status of the son of God (Q 10:22). Can a sociological explanation be (re)constructed

---

[335] Kloppenborg, *Formation of Q*, 202–203: "In a similar way, 10: 21–22, 23–24 articulates the community's self-understanding as the privileged recipients of the revelation of the kingdom. But this in no way affected their ability to hurl invective and condemn outsiders for non-acceptance of their preaching."

[336] James M. Robinson, "The Hodayot Formula in Prayers and Hymns of Early Christianity," in *The Sayings Gospel Q*, 75–118.

[337] E. L. Sukenik, *The Dead Sea Scrolls of the Hebrew University* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1955), 39.

[338] Robinson, *The Sayings Gospel Q*, 109, points out that this saying reflects "the esotericism that has been derived from . . . Qumran."

[339] Herbert Braun, "The Significance of Qumran for the Problem of the Historical Jesus," in *The Historical Jesus and the Kerygmatic Christ: Essays on the New Quest of the Historical Jesus* (ed. C. E. Braaten and R. A. Harrisville; Nashville: Abingdon, 1964), 74.

[340] Cohen, *From the Maccabees to the Mishnah*, 126–27; Baumgarten, *Flourishing*, 7.

for Q's sectarian emergence and development? Based on Q's eschatological framework, it would seem that the failure of Q's mission to Israel is the causal agent of this development. Q explains its failure by appealing to the Deuteronomistic view of Jewish history,[341] which is also characteristic of CD, i.e., the "mainstream" Essene view. Indeed, the dominant compositional theme of Q is the "pronouncement of judgment" on "this generation."

Q begins with John's warning of an impending judgment (3:7–9). John calls the crowd(s) of Jew(s) "snakes' litter" and warns them of "the impending rage (or wrath)." He warns Jews not to rely solely on their ancestral lineage as Jews (Q 3:8) because God can easily replace them. Q 3:16b–17 reiterates this theme as John predicts the arrival of the "Coming One" who will separate the "wheat" from the "chaff" and burn the chaff in an everlasting fire. In Q 10:3, the disciples are sent out like "sheep among wolves" (Q 10:3), anticipating rejection and persecution (Q 10:10–12). Yet here rejection is not met with forgiveness, but with the warning that "for Sodom it will be more bearable on that day than for that town" (Q 10:12). In Q 10:13–15, Q's Jesus pronounces "woes" on the Galilean towns that rejected his message. Here the reference to the coming "judgment" (κρίσει) is explicit (Q 10:14) for those towns which reject Jesus' message. Capernaum itself is condemned as being thrown into Hades (ᾅδου) (Q 10:15).

Q 13:34–35 describes Jerusalem, the Temple, and the elite as "desolate" or "forsaken" and laments how Jerusalem has killed the prophets sent to her. In Q 11:16, 29–30, Jesus criticizes "this generation" as "evil" (πονηρά). In Q 7:31–35, "this generation" is criticized for not recognizing John and Jesus. In Q 11:31–32, Jesus says that the Queen of Sheba will be raised at the "judgment" with "this generation" only to condemn it. Similarly, "Ninevite men" will arise at the "judgment" and condemn it. In a series of "woes," the Pharisees (Q 11:42, 39b, 43–44) are criticized for their religious hypocrisy while the "exegetes of the law" (Q 11:46b, 52, 47–48) are attacked for their oppression of the people and their persecution of the prophets. In Q 11:49–51, "this generation" is again condemned as those who have killed and persecuted the prophets. A "settling of accounts" will be required of them. Q 12:39–40 describes how the judgment will come without warning. Q 12:42–46 predicts that a judgment will be brought on the unfaithful. Q 13:29, 28 warns "this generation" that they will be shut out of the kingdom, "thrown out into the outer darkness" where there will be "wailing and grinding of teeth." Finally, Q 22:28,30 has Jesus tell his followers that they will "sit . . . on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel" at the time of judgment.

Based on the sheer number of such sayings, as well as the fact that the theme of judgment is found in sayings framing the entire document and complements the theme of the rejected prophets, it is not unreasonable to suppose

[341] Kloppenborg, "Symbolic Eschatology," 304, following Lührmann, *Redaktion*, 87–88.

that the author(s) and/or Q group perceived that they were met with hostility, non-belief, opposition, rejection and even persecution. Again, this does not mean that the author(s) or community actually engaged in *physical* violence with their fellow Jews; on the contrary, the rhetorical pronouncement and anticipation of apocalyptic violence and judgment effectively allowed the Jesus people of Q to criticize, condemn and attack their opponents without ever having to recourse to *physical* violence. Yet it is this rhetorical violence that allows us to reconstruct the social history and conflict(s) of the Q group.

Q contains traces and echoes of all the social conflict dynamics delineated in social identity theory.[342] It employs stereotypes, such as "this generation," to criticize its opponents. It combats stereotypes directed at its leaders, John and Jesus. Q labels Pharisees as "empty tombs" and the "wicked" Jews of "this generation" who fail to respond to the call of Jesus, the Son of God. Q draws "symbolic boundaries" between its in-group as a new "Israel" and those who have rejected its message and are thus consigned to judgment. It emphasizes faithfulness to Jesus and his teachings and mission. It draws "social closure" around the Jesus people by claiming that the "last will be first and the first last." Some will "enter" the kingdom and others will be "excluded." The faithful servant will be given charge and authority over his master's estate.

The author of Q sharply differentiates Jesus and the Jesus people of Q from Pharisees, the Temple establishment and scribes; it challenges traditional Jewish norms and assumptions of familial piety and ethnic identity. The Jesus people of Q seem to have differentiated themselves from their fellow Jews as a result of social conflict, ideological differences and contestations over law, Jesus' identity, worship, prayer, ethics, and the Temple. We catch sight of this in part in Q 12:11–12's reference to the Jesus people being involved in "hearings before synagogues." In short, the Q worldview was polarized: there was the Q community and then there was everybody else or "this generation."

Burton L. Mack has argued that "the history of the Q community can be traced by noting the shifts in its discourse."[343] The difference in tone between the sapiential orientation of Q^1 and the critical judgment in Q^2 reflects changes in the movement's social orientation and reception. Mack recognized that changes in social circumstances must be behind this shift.[344] He argued that the Q people went from social critique[345] and countercultural experimentation to "a period of frustration with failed expectations" which occasioned

[342] Simon J. Joseph, "A Social Identity Approach to the Apocalyptic Rhetoric of Violence in the Sayings Gospel Q," *HR* (2013): forthcoming.

[343] Mack, *The Lost Gospel*, 203, asks: "if the shift from wisdom to apocalyptic could be explained, it would have tremendous consequences for the quest of the historical Jesus and a revision of Christian origins" (37).

[344] Mack, *The Lost Gospel*, 134.

[345] Mack, *The Lost Gospel*, 44.

the language and rhetoric of judgment directed at those who opposed the group.[346] Mack posits "rejection" as a major factor leading to this shift in tone. The people of "this generation" were like children that refused to play in the marketplace, i.e., they rejected the message of John and Jesus (and by extension, the Q community).[347] Mack noted that "the language of divisive conflict" in Q is very closely related to "the theme of inclusion versus exclusion, a theme that presupposes the notion of boundaries and borders."[348]

Q's conflict with "this generation" is *a Jewish conflict within Judaism*. "This generation" is "the non-responsive part of the Jewish people."[349] It is the scribes, Pharisees, and Temple elite who are being criticized, not "Israel" as a whole.[350] At some point, loyalty to the Jesus movement seems to have been in tension with some traditional norms of Jewish cultural identity and community belonging. We find hints of this in Q 3:8, where John warns the crowds that Jewish ethnic identity in and of itself was not deemed sufficient to avoid the coming judgment. The author(s) of Q seem to have *distanced* themselves from those norms, to *differentiate* themselves from Pharisaic customs, normative family values and ethnic identity, and this differentiation led to social conflict and "hearings before synagogues."

The Q group experienced social conflict and rejection at some point in its history and this intergroup conflict led to the construction of Q's distinctive Jewish (Christian) identity. The social dynamics responsible for producing the distinctive social identity of the Q community were *mutual*: the author(s) of Q criticized and condemned their fellow Jews who had themselves rejected and opposed the teachings of John and Jesus.[351] After Q was incorporated into the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, Q's apocalyptic rhetoric, which was originally directed at other Jews, became an effective tool in the polemical repertoire of early Christian apologists, and what was once a Jewish conflict *within* Judaism became a conflict *between* Jews and Christians. The Jew was constructed as the "other," and Q's condemnation of "this generation" was re-directed to-

---

[346] Mack, *The Lost Gospel*, 45.

[347] Mack also argues that the Q people adopted this shift in tone because the movement lost and/or could not secure the loyalty of its members. This caused "social stress" (136).

[348] Mack, *The Lost Gospel*, 136.

[349] Tuckett, *Q*, 201.

[350] Horsley with Draper, *Whoever Hears You*, 299.

[351] George W. E. Nickelsburg, "Revealed Wisdom as a Criterion for Inclusion and Exclusion: From Jewish Sectarianism to Early Christianity," in *"To See Ourselves As Others See us": Christians, Jews, "Others" in Late Antiquity* (eds. J. Neusner and E. S. Frerichs; SH; Chico: Scholars, 1985), 73–91, 90: "this attitude of superiority and exclusivism was derived, in part, from ideas and attitudes already present in the parent body." John W. Marshall, "Apocalypticism and Anti-Semitism: Inner-group Resources for Intergroup Conflicts," in *Identity and Interaction*, 77, asks what happens "when the materials of a conversation within a group fall into the hands of those outside the group?"

wards the Jewish people as a whole, which ultimately resulted in a dark history of prejudice, discrimination, and violence, although even in this Q was following a sociological pattern first witnessed at Qumran.[352]

2.10 Conclusion

Q is a mid-first-century Palestinian Jewish Greek text of the early Jesus movement. As a collection of sayings and discourses, its compositional history is complex, as it contains sapiential forms and motifs set within an eschatological context. Its precise provenance is unknown, but it is reasonable to suppose that it emerged within a Palestinian Judean/Jewish network of village communities dedicated to the message and teachings of Jesus.

[352] Boccaccini, *Beyond the Essene*, 155: Qumran is "the first example of supersessionism" where "concepts such as dualism, individual predestination and self-segregation strengthened the identity and unity of the group, provided a way of explaining the suffering of the chosen and the opposition of outsiders, and targeted the adversaries as the devil's party according to a pattern that would be repeated often with tragic results in the history of religion."

Chapter 3

Qumran, the Essenes, and the Dead Sea Scrolls

3.1 Introduction

Since the discovery of the scrolls, the general consensus has been that the Qumran library, a collection of biblical and non-biblical (sectarian) texts copied and/or composed between 200 B. C. E. and 70 C. E., belonged to a community of Essenes living at the Khirbet Qumran site in the Judean desert.[1] The Qumran-Essene hypothesis continues to be the dominant model in Qumran studies, but like the Two-Document hypothesis, it is also a contested site of

[1] E. L. Sukenik, *Megillot Genuzot* I (Jerusalem: Mosad Bialik, 1948), 16–17; Józef Tadeusz Milik, *Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea* (trans. J. Strugnell; London: SCM, 1963), 80–98; Andre Dupont-Sommer, *The Essene Writings from Qumran* (trans. G. Vermes; Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1961); Millar Burrows, *The Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York: Viking, 1955); Theodore H. Gaster, *The Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York: Doubleday, 1964); Geza Vermes, *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York: Penguin, 1997); Florentino García Martínez, "Qumran Origins and Early History: A 'Groningen Hypothesis,'" *FO* 25 (1989); Hartmut Stegemann, "The Qumran Essenes: Local Members of the Main Jewish Union in Late Second Temple Times," in *The Madrid Qumran Congress* (eds. J. Trebolle Barrera and L. Vegas Montaner; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 83–166; Daniel J. Harrington, *Wisdom Texts from Qumran* (London: Routledge, 1996), 2; Gabriele Boccaccini, *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis: The Parting of the Ways between Qumran and Enochic Judaism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 191. Frank Moore Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic: Essays on the History of the Religion of Israel* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1973), 331–32; Todd S. Beall, *Josephus' Description of the Essenes Illustrated by the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988); E. P. Sanders, "The Dead Sea Sect and Other Jews: Commonalities, Overlaps and Differences," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls in their Historical Context* (eds. T. H. Lim, et al.; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 2001), 34; Shaye J. D. Cohen, *From the Maccabees to the Mishnah* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1987), 152; Joseph A. Fitzmyer, "The Dead Sea Scrolls and Christian Origins: General Methodological Considerations," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Christian Faith: In Celebration of the Jubilee Year of the Discovery of Qumran Cave 1* (eds. J. H. Charlesworth and W. P. Weaver; Harrisburg: Trinity, 1998), 16. James C. VanderKam, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today* (Minneapolis: Eerdmans, 1994); Raymond E. Brown, "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament," in *John and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. J. H. Charlesworth; New York: Crossroad, 1990), 1; Devorah Dimant, "The Library of Qumran: Its Contents and Chracter," 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, Israel Museum, 2000), 171.

critical debate. It would be helpful to briefly review the strengths and weaknesses of the hypothesis in order to evaluate its current explanatory power.

3.2 The Identity of the Qumran Community

Josephus introduces the Essenes during the reign of Jonathan, but he does not claim that the Essenes originated during the Maccabean period.[2] He tells us that this "philosophy" has "existed since ancient times." Philo associates the Essenes with Moses and claims that they lived according to his original instructions:[3] "for thousands of centuries a race has existed which is eternal yet into which no one is born."[4] These claims are obviously exaggerated, but they do describe the Essenes as an ancient movement, not a recently formed group.[5] This may be how the Essenes saw *themselves*: as a brotherhood with an ancient heritage, their beliefs and practices not derived from Mosaic ordinances, let alone recent innovations or contemporary religious or political polemic, but from a wisdom tradition that predated the Flood.[6]

Josephus and Philo describe the Essenes as being located in numerous places, including Jerusalem. Both Josephus and Philo tell us that the Essenes numbered over four thousand men and women located in numerous villages and towns.[7] Josephus describes the Essenes as living "in every town" in Palestine.[8] Philo simply locates them in Παλαιστίνῃ Συρία ("Palestinian Syria").[9]

---

[2] *A.J.* 13; 18.11.

[3] *Hypothetica* 1. Vermes and Goodman, *The Essenes According to the Classical Sources,* 27. Philo states that "Our lawgiver encouraged the multitude of his disciples to live in community: these are called Essaeans."

[4] *Natural History* 5. 17,4 (73). Vermes and Goodman, *The Essenes*, 33.

[5] Dimant, "The Library of Qumran: Its Contents and Character," 173–176: "The community seems to have appeared on the historical scene earlier and undoubtedly inherited an even older literary and religious tradition . . . whatever school the Qumran community and library may have belonged to it was an ancient one, rich in traditions and creative in literature. Such a school must have flourished in Israel for many centuries, as attested by its diverse and fully-fledged literature."

[6] For the Qumran community as an apocalyptic group, see John J. Collins, "Was the Dead Sea Sect an Apocalyptic Movement?," in *Archaeology and History in the Dead Sea* Scrolls (ed. L. H. Schiffman; Sheffield: JSOT, 1990), 25–46; *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (London: Routledge, 1997). See also George Nickelsburg, "Apocalyptic Texts," in *The Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (eds. L. H. Schiffman and J. C. VanderKam; New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 32.

[7] *A.J.* 18.1.5, 20–21; *Quod Omnis Probus Liber Sit* 75. Josephus devotes two passages to the Essenes, one in *B.J.* 2.119–61, the other in *A.J.*18.18–22. The earlier one does not mention the number four thousand, refusal to own slaves, agricultural pursuits, or exclusion from the Temple's common court and peculiar sacrifices. The later passage introduces these elements which weren't in *B.J.* 2, but which are found in Philo's *Quod Omnis Probus Liber Sit*.

[8] Josephus, *B.J.* 2.124.

Both Josephus and Philo describe the Essenes as living in Palestine.[10] Josephus indicates that "Judea" is the name for the entire land of Israel, including the district Galilee, and the specific district, Judea.[11] It follows that Essenes may have lived anywhere in larger Judea, including Galilee. The name "Judea" seems to have been interchangeable with "Palestine" in antiquity. Cassius Dio refers to "Palestine" but also claims that "the land is [also] called Judea."[12] "Judea" was a geographical location intended to include Galilee.[13] Pliny reports that "the part of Judaea adjoining Syria is called Galilee."[14] Philo does not limit the Essenes to Judea.[15] He reports that

> οἰκοῦσι δὲ πολλὰς μὲν πόλεις τῆς Ἰουδαίας, πολλὰς δὲ κώμας καὶ μεγάλους καὶ πολυανθρώπους ὁμίλους.
>
> On one hand they live in many towns in Judea; on the other hand, they *also* live in many villages and large groups.[16]

Why then are the Essenes regarded as an exclusively *Judean* movement? A partial answer to this question may be because scholars are confident of only *two* locations where Essenes could be found: Qumran and Jerusalem. Yet Josephus and Philo tell us that the Essenes lived throughout Palestine in many villages, their principle occupation being agriculture.[17] Stephen Goranson has suggested that at least one Essene community resided in northern Galilee.[18] A few scholars have also proposed that Essenes may have lived in Galilee.[19] If

---

[9] Philo, *Quod Omnis Probus Liber Sit*, 75–76.

[10] Galilee was incorporated into the province of Judea in 44 C. E., when all of Palestine came under direct Roman administration. Consequently, one cannot be sure that ancient authors did not include Galilee in their descriptions of Judea.

[11] Shaye J. D. Cohen, *The Beginnings of Jewishness: Boundaries, Varieties, Uncertainties* (HCS 31; Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999), 72. See Josephus, *A.J.* 11.173.

[12] Cassius Dio, *Hist. Rom.* 37.16–17.

[13] According to Josephus, Gabinius, governor of Syria (57-55 B. C. E.), created five synhedria and installed an overseer (epimeletes) in each one. Yet Josephus refers to the epimeletes of Sepphoris, Galilee as a *Judaean* epimeletes (*A.J.* 14.127.139). See Stephen Goranson, http://orion.mscc.huji.ac.il/orion/archives/1997b/msg00045.html, [accessed 2 June, 2009].

[14] Pliny, *Natural History*, 5.70.

[15] Philo, *Hypothetica* 1G. Philo's use of a μὲν/δὲ clause suggests that the Essenes could *not only* be found in Judean towns but also in many villages and communities *elsewhere*.

[16] In *Hypothetica* 1, quoted by Eusebius in *Praep. Evang.* 8.6–7.

[17] Josephus *A.J.* 18.19; Philo, *Hypothetica* 11.8.

[18] Stephen Goranson, "On the Hypothesis that Essenes lived on Mt. Carmel," *RevQ* 9/35 (1978): 563–67, esp. 567, suggests that "Essenes might have lived on Mt. Carmel" since some members of the Carmelite Order traced their monastery to Elijah, the sons of the prophets and the Essenes, who "converted" to Christianity. For a summary, see *Etudes Carmélitaines, Elie le Prophète* (2 vols.; Paris, 1956). For criticism, see Clemens Kopp, *Elias und Christentum auf dem Karmel* (CHier 3; Paderborn: Schöningh), 1929.

[19] Charlesworth, *Jesus and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 6, argues that "Jesus did not have to venture into the desert to discover how the Essenes lived and what they taught. As an itinerant

Galilean Jews were transplanted Judeans, there could well have been Essenes in Galilee. The Essenes lived throughout Palestine. CD uses language suggesting that there were a large number of places where its members lived. [20]

The first historical references to the Essenes occur in Josephus' account of the Hasmonean era. As a result, many scholars have surmised that the Essene movement originated as a direct outgrowth of Jewish opposition to Hellenization. The Maccabean Revolt initially had the support of many traditional groups, one of which was the *Hasidim*. In 1 Maccabees, the Hasidim are "mighty men of Israel who willingly offered themselves for the Law (1 Macc. 2:42)."[21] Very little is known about this "Assembly of the Hasidim" (2 Macc. 7:13). The term may refer more to a type or class of people rather than to any specific or single organization. Alternatively, the term may refer to a variety of groups.[22] The Hasidim seem to have joined Mattathias in the revolt, and fought in Judah's army, but then withdrew (1 Macc. 7:13), suggesting that their participation in the revolt was based on religious, not political reasons. 2 Maccabees calls them "warmongers and revolutionaries" (2 Macc. 14:6).[23] The Hasidim then seem to have joined Alcimus in Jerusalem, believing that they would receive religious freedom and support. Instead, Alcimus slaughtered sixty of them in 162 B. C. E., according to 1 Maccabees. They then seem to have disappeared from the political arena.

The Maccabean leaders began asserting their political and military authority, usurping both the Davidic throne as well as the Zadokite priesthood, and becoming, in the eyes of many, illegitimate priest-kings in Judea. These events may have led to the formation of the Qumran community. The Hasidim did not support the usurpation of the priesthood, even if they initially celebrated the Maccabean victory over the Seleucids. The Hasidim may have withdrawn from the political arena and attracted to themselves various remaining Zadokite priests, now ousted by Jonathan's usurpation of the priesthood. According to the "Hasidean model," a confluence of Zadokite priests

---

preacher, he certainly could have encountered Essenes in Galilee, throughout Palestine, and within the environs of Jerusalem." See also Thiede, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Jewish Origins of Christianity*, 33: "Jesus, his disciples, and someone like Paul . . . could have met Essenes anywhere, in Galilee, Samaria and Judea, in and around Jerusalem."

[20] The word for "camp" occurs 15 times in CD 7.6–7, 19.2, 12.23, 13.20, 14.3, 14.9. The *Damascus Document* also contains the term (עיר) ("town" or "city") six times (CD 12.1–2, 20.22, 10.21, 11.5–6, 12.19). These terms point to groups of Essenes living outside of Qumran and Jerusalem.

[21] Henry A. Fischel, *The First Book of Maccabees* (New York: Schocken Books, 1948), 30. 1 Macc. 7:13 describes them as a "company of scribes" and "first among the Israelites."

[22] John J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to the Jewish Matrix of Christianity* (New York: Crossroad, 1984), 63.

[23] Sidney Tedesche, *The Second Book of Maccabees* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1954), 229.

with the Hasidean "Assembly" forged the Essenic union around 150 B. C. E., largely under the guidance of the Teacher of Righteousness.

There are problems with this model.[24] First, there is no direct link between the Maccabean revolt and the origins of the *Essene* movement. Second, the literary evidence does not support a direct connection between the Hasidim and the refugees in the desert seeking righteousness and justice (1 Macc 2:29-38). Neither Josephus nor Philo refer to the Essenes *as* (formerly) Hasidim, which is odd if the Hasidim were such a well-known group and the historical forebears of the Essenes. Third, the classical authors do not describe the Essenes as militant. On the contrary, Philo and Josephus explicitly describe the Essenes as *pacifists*. So unless the Hasidim (who refused to fight on the Sabbath) renounced their militancy (as described in 1 Macc.) and transformed themselves into a peaceful sect of "holy ones" as a result of their political misfortunes (and thus no longer actually being Hasidim), identifying the Essenes with the Hasidim remains problematic.

Nonetheless, the priestly constituency of the Qumran community is a distinguishing mark of their identity. The assumption of the high priesthood by Jason, followed by Menelaus, Alcimus, Jonathan, and Simon, represented a breach of protocol in the hereditary succession of this office.[25] The conflict was not only about hereditary legitimacy and religious authority, but moral purity.[26] If the priesthood was illegitimate and corrupt, then the sacrificial system was illegitimate and corrupt, and there could be no atonement in Israel. If the Temple was defiled, then the sacrifices taking place there were impure.

It is in this conflict that the "Teacher of Righteousness" may be located.[27] According to one model, a group of Zadokite priests were led by the Teacher of Righteousness to form a community that saw itself as the true Temple of Israel, a Temple that could offer pure atonement for the people (1QS 8.5–6, 8–9). The Teacher may have been a Zadokite "priest" (1QpHab 2.8),[28] an inspired interpreter of the law as well as a prophet who came into conflict with a

---

[24] Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism*, 1:175–80, argued that the Hasidim represent the "parent-movement" of the Essenes/Qumran community. But see Philip R. Davies, "Hasidim in the Maccabean Period," *JJS* 28 (1977): 127–40; John J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Vision of the Book of Daniel* (HSM 16; Atlanta: Scholars, 1977), 201; Lester L. Grabbe, "Digging among the Roots of the Groningen Hypothesis," in *Enoch and Qumran Origins*, 280–85, esp. 281.

[25] Elias J. Bickerman, *The Jews in the Greek Age,* (Cambridge: Harvard, 1988), 143.

[26] Robert A. Kugler, "Priesthood at Qumran," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment* (eds. P. W. Flint and J. C. VanderKam; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 113.

[27] Identifying the "Teacher of Righteousness" (or the "Righteous Teacher") is problematic. There are no conclusive parallels that can be drawn between historical figures of this period and the biographical data contained in the scrolls, although a number of candidates have been proposed. See Stephen Goranson, "Jannaeus, His Brother Absalom and Judah the Essene," (accessed October 1, 2010; http://www.duke.edu/~goranson/jannaeus.pdf).

[28] Vermes, *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls*, 63.

figure identified as the "Wicked Priest."[29] It is not clear that there ever really was an exodus of Zadokite priests from the Jerusalem Temple.[30] An earlier community may have *incorporated* in-coming Zadokite priests, as opposed to the Sons of Zadok *themselves* founding the movement.[31] The Zadokites may have already been part of the community, not the cause of separation from the Hasmoneans.[32] The Qumran community did not call itself the "Sons of Zadok." They used this term to refer to a group of priests *within* the community.[33] Zadokites represent a priestly constituency of the community, not its main body. The "Sons of Zadok" were a sub-group within the movement.[34]

The Sons of Zadok cannot be *equated* with the Essenes as described by Josephus and Philo. The Sons of Zadok were a group of Zadokite priests

---

[29] Hayes and Mandell, *The Jewish People in Classical Antiquity*, 92.

[30] Sarianna Metso, *The Textual Development of the Community Rule* (Leiden: Brill, 1997), points out that although the "sons of Zadok" (בני צדוק), the Zadokite priests, are held to have been the founding members of the community (1QS 5.2, 9, 1QSa 1.2, 24, 2.3), this term used in 1QS 5.2 and 9, is absent from the older Community Rule documents from Cave 4 and "the Many," (הרבים), a term suggesting an earlier and more democratic body, appears in its place. Nonetheless, the date of 4QS(e) is unclear. It has been dated to the second half of the second century B. C. E. (Milik) and by F. M. Cross to the third quarter of the first century. VanderKam has also suggested the possibility of scribal error to explain the omission.

[31] Kugler, "Priesthood at Qumran," 114, calls for a reassessment of the priestly nature of the Qumran community and argues that "the oft-stated view of the community being essentially a 'priestly group' originating from a withdrawal of Zadokite priests from the temple over Hasmonean seizure of the high priests' office is undermined by the evidence. A reassessment of this view is required by the equivocal nature of texts describing community origins (CD 1; 1QS 8–9), the absence of any reference to Zadokites in the earliest recension of the Community Rule, the inconsistent use of priestly titles, and the indications that only over time the central texts offered an elevated role to named priests of any sort."

[32] Jacob Liver, "The Sons of Zadok the Priests' in the Dead Sea Sect," *RevQ* 6/21 (1967): 3–32. For the view that the designation Zadokite does not pertain to priestly lineage, but reflects the Qumran community's *ideology* of priestly righteousness, see Joseph Baumgarten, "The Heavenly Tribunal and the Personification of *Sedeq* in Jewish Apocalyptic," in *ANRW* 2.19 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1979), 233–236; William H. Brownlee, *The Midrash Pesher of Habakkuk* (Missoula: Scholars, 1979).

[33] Schiffman, *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 72–73, points out that "the term *bene sadoq* is not a general term for the sect . . . Obviously, *bene sadoq* refers to a segment of the sect entrusted with the duty of teaching and interpreting the law to the others." Philip R. Davies, *Sects and Scrolls: Essays on Qumran and Related Topics* (Atlanta: Scholars, 1996), 132, notes that "it is perfectly clear that the *yahad* did not call itself "sons of Zadok," because it refers to "sons of Zadok" as a group within it" and that "Sons of Zadok" refers to "*priests within the community/communities and never to the entire community*" (132).

[34] The Qumran "Sons of Zadok" diverged in belief and practice from the Sadducees referred to by Josephus and the New Testament. Josephus' Sadducees were Zadokites *in name only*. He first mentions them during Jonathan's reign in 152 B. C. E. (*A.J.* 13.171) as an aristocratic political party that controlled the priesthood and adopted the name "Sadducees" as an honorific title. There was simply no better way to claim priestly authority than by associating the priesthood with David's high priest Zadok.

(whether in name only or by lineal descent) *within* the Qumran community. Furthermore, the Qumran site itself does not represent the origins of Essenism as much as the origins of *Qumran* Essenism. The Qumran community was related to, and supported by, a larger Essene community-network. This recognition that the Essenes were a multi-regional movement is key to (re)-constructing their significance in ancient Judaism and possible relationship(s) to the early Jesus movement.

The Essene movement seems to have been more widespread than is commonly recognized.[35] Some scholars even identify the Therapeutae as an Egyptian branch or "wing" of the Palestinian Essene movement.[36] The Therapeutae lived above Lake Mareotis near Alexandria and Philo describes them as a "contemplative" community. Like the Essenes, they held meals in common, studied the art of healing, practiced celibacy, possessed sectarian writings, engaged in regular Torah study, lived in strict discipline, and wore white garments during ritual meals. They also composed hymns and songs not unlike those composed and/or collected at Qumran.[37] The most compelling reason to posit a multi-regional Essene movement, however, comes from the Qumran corpus itself. The community laws referred to in the *Damascus Document* (CD) represent a tradition *predating* the Qumran community.[38] Here the ori-

---

[35] Josephus' description of the Essenes as "a group which employs the same daily regime revealed to the Greeks by Pythagoras" (*A.J.* 15.371) does not require an historical relationship with Pythagorean thought. Vermes and Goodman, *The Essenes*, 51. Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism*, 245, notes that both groups wore white linen, lived communally, devoted themselves to prayer and purification, held regular study sessions and shared common meals. They both required an oath of initiation, but otherwise restricted the use of oaths. Strict rules were laid down to establish the process of initiation and the testing of initiates with binding oaths as well as establishing the precedence of the community's officials.

[36] García Martínez, *The People of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 93; Bilde, "The Essenes in Philo and Josephus," 65; Vermes and Goodman, *The Essenes,* 17. While Bilde concludes that the Therapeutae were Essenes, Vermes notes that "the available evidence does not justify a complete identification of the Therapeutae and the Essenes/Qumran sectarians. The most likely conclusion is that the former represented a Egyptian off-shoot of the Palestinian ascetic movement of the Essenes." See also Jean Riaud, "Les Thérapeutes d'Alexandrie dans la tradition et dans la recherche critique jusqu'aux découvertes de Qumran," in *ANRW* 2.20.2 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1987): 1189–1295; Otto Betz, "Essener und Therapeuten," *TRE* 10 (1982): 386–91; Geza Vermes, "Essenes and Therapeutae," *RevQ* 3 (1962): 495–504; "Essenes-Therapeutae-Qumran," *DUJ* 21 (1960): 97–115.

[37] For example, the *Hodayot* and the *Angelic Liturgy*.

[38] Philip R. Davies, "The Birthplace of the Essenes: Where is 'Damascus?,'" *RevQ* 14/56 (1990): 505, points out that CD contains a claim "that its content and its legal tradition and its organization originated in Babylon in the wake of the exile . . . CD claims some antiquity for its community" (512). See also *Damascus Covenant: An Interpretation of the 'Damascus Document'* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1983), 39. Michael A. Knibb, "The Place of the Damascus Document in Recent Scholarship," in *The Provo International Conference on Methods of Investigation of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Khirbet Qumran Site: Present Realities and Future Prospects* (eds. M. O. Wise, N. Golb, J. J. Collins and D. G. Pardee; New

gins of the Essene movement are traced back to the Exile "in the land of Damascus."[39] There is no consensus as to what "Damascus" signifies. One explanation is that the phrase should be understood literally: the early Essenes had been exiled in Damascus and returned to Judea following the Maccabean war. This was the most common explanation in the early days of Qumran scholarship and continues to be held by some scholars.[40]

Some scholars have identified the "Damascus" of CD as a code-name for Qumran.[41] The *Damascus Document* contains numerous symbolic, and allegorical terms and phrases. "Damascus" may be a cryptic symbol standing for the Qumran community, perhaps as a splinter group that identified itself exclusively as "exiled" there.[42] Yet this hypothesis has neither archaeological nor textual support. Qumran was in "the land of *Judah*," not "the land of Damascus." The hypothesis that "the land of Damascus" is a cryptic symbol for Qumran also does not provide a correlative symbol for "the land of Judah."

A third proposal suggests that "Damascus" refers to the place of exile in which the movement originated, i.e., the city of Babylon.[43] This hypothesis proposes that a group returned from Babylon, were joined by the Teacher of Righteousness and went into exile at Qumran while the majority lived in the

---

York: The New York Academy of Sciences, 1994), 153: "there seem to be good grounds for the view that the law code is somewhat older than the Admonition and stems from a pre-Qumranic and pre-teacher community." See also Charlotte Hempel, "Community Origins in the *Damascus Document* in the Light *the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues* (eds. D. W. Parry and E. Ulrich; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 328.

[39] In CD, the Exile is followed by the "plant root" that sprang from Israel and Aaron (CD 1.5–8) and "the new covenant" that was enacted "in the land of Damascus" (CD A 6.19, 8.21) Referring to "the converts (or returnees) of Israel, who left the land of Judah and lived in the land of Damascus" (CD A 6.5), CD also mentions "an interpreter of the law who came to Damascus" (8.17).

[40] Stegemann, "The Qumran Essenes: Local Members of the Main Jewish Union in Late Second Temple Times"; Flusser, *The Spiritual History of the Dead Sea Sect*, 11; Hayes and Mandell, *The Jewish People in Classical Antiquity*, 92; Philip R. Callaway, "Qumran Origins: From the *Doresh* to the *Moreh*," *RevQ* 14/56 (1990): 644.

[41] Gaster, *The Dead Sea Scriptures*, 4, 24. Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran*. Schiffman, "Origin and Early History," 45.

[42] This idea has also been defended by suggestions that since the Nabateans controlled southern Syria and the northern end of the Dead Sea in the second century B. C. E., this region may have been named after their principle city, and known as "the land of Damascus."

[43] Jerome Murphy-O-Connor, "The Essenes and their History," *RB* 81 (1974): 219–23; Murphy-O'Connor, *The Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 1: 166; Davies, "The Birthplace of the Essenes," 503–19; Isaac Rabinowitz, "A Reconsideration of Damascus," *JBL* 73 (1954): 11–35; Annie Jaubert, "Le pays de Damas," *RB* 65 (1958): 214–48; E. Wiesenberg, "Chronological Data in the Zadokite Fragments," *Vetus Testamentum* 5 (1955): 284–308. Fitzmyer, *Responses to 101 Questions on the Dead Sea Scrolls,* 30, notes that "'Damascus' . . . may be a covert or cryptic name for Babylon, whence the community may have come. If so then the regulations of CD may represent the rule that governed their life there, in camps in the land of exile."

villages and cities of Judea: the *Damascus Document* originated within a circle composed of Babylonian Jews returning to Judea.[44] A textual precedent for this interpretation may be found in Acts 7:43 where a verse from Amos is cited, with Babylon in place of Damascus.[45] The Admonition of CD does indeed refers to an exilic origin for the community.[46] They were the true "remnant of Israel" who returned to Judea to inherit the land. Of course, many aspects of Jewish law, as well as much of the Hebrew Bible, were formulated under Babylonian influence.[47] There are also marked Babylonian influences on the *Book of Enoch* and the apocalyptic tradition.[48] Throughout the Second Temple period, Babylon remained a vibrant center of Jewish culture and two-way traffic between Judea and Babylon is highly probable. According to this model, the Essenes originated during the Babylonian exile and formed a "new covenant" consisting of sectarian law, returning to Israel after the Maccabean revolt. Upon arrival, they were joined by a group of Zadokite priests, including the Teacher of Righteousness, who founded the *Qumran* community.

3.3 The Qumran Essene Hypothesis

The Qumran-Essene hypothesis is based primarily on two interrelated arguments: (1) the existence of numerous similarities between the Essenes as de-

---

[44] Davies, "The Birthplace of the Essenes,'" 513, concedes that while 'Damascus' may have originally referred to Babylon, it may also have come to refer to the Qumran community itself during later redactional activity on CD.

[45] Davies, "The Birthplace of the Essenes,'" 510–11.

[46] William F. Albright and C. S. Mann, "Qumran and the Essenes: Geography, Chronology, and Identification of the Sect," in *The Scrolls and Christianity: Historical and Theological Significance* (ed. M. Black; London: SPCK, 1969), 16; Jaubert, "Le pays de Damas," 214–48; Hempel, "Community Origins in the *Damascus Document* in the Light of Recent Scholarship," 329. Jonathan Campbell, "Essene-Qumran Origins in the Exile: A Scriptural Basis?," *JJS* 46 (1995): 143–56, notes that *both* an exilic origin as well a second-century B. C. E. context seem to be referred to in CD, suggesting that the original formation of the Essene movement may have taken place during the exilic period. Various Essene rule-books such as CD may have been in existence before they were copied and stored at Qumran. Similarly, the solar calendar used by the predecessors of the Essenes may have been in use long before the Hasmonean appropriation of the high priesthood in 152 B. C. E. The fact that a sectarian system of law was in existence *before* the arrival of the Teacher of Righteousness and the settlement of Qumran suggests that the Essene movement was already in existence, only to be transformed by the Teacher's arrival, which led to a new phase of development, one aspect of which we now identify as *Qumran* Essenism.

[47] The traces of this Babylonian-influenced priestly code can be found in Ezra, Nehemiah, Jeremiah 32, in Ezekiel's pro-Zadokite tone and the holiness code of Lev. 17–26.

[48] John J. Collins, "Apocalypse: The Morphology of a Genre," *Semeia* 14 (1979): 26; Mathew Black, *The Book of Enoch or 1 Enoch* (Leiden: Brill, 1985). VanderKam, *Enoch and the Growth of an Apocalyptic Tradition*.

scribed in the classical sources and the community described in the scrolls; and (2) Pliny's description of the Essenes living west of the Dead Sea. Regarding the former, many scholars have found a high degree of correlation between the details mentioned by Josephus and the contents of the scrolls.[49] The number of parallels may not only be sufficient to warrant a Qumran-Essene identification, but has generally required the burden of proof to be assumed by those who argue otherwise.[50]

Both communities practiced ascetic self-control,[51] despised riches,[52] and performed purificatory washings.[53] Both held common meals,[54] ate in silence,[55] and had priests perform prayers before the meal.[56] Both communities required an extensive probationary period for new members,[57] demanded obedience to overseers,[58] and expelled members for certain offenses.[59] Both communities required extensive entrance oaths,[60] both against stealing,[61] and disclosing community-secrets to outsiders while concealing nothing from fellow members.[62] Both studied ancient writings,[63] as well as their own sectarian books,[64] and professed to know the future.[65] Both communities avoided spitting in the middle of their gatherings,[66] and dug pits for defecation.[67] Both appear to have held to a belief in predestination.[68] Both appear to have been comprised of a network of various "camps."[69] Some of these parallels are of a general kind, and might be found among other Jewish sects, yet their cumulative weight here is impressive.

---

[49] Beall, *Josephus' Description of the Essenes*.
[50] Beall, *Josephus' Description of the Essenes*, 125.
[51] *B.J.* 2.120; 1QS 4.9–11.
[52] *B.J.* 2.122; 1QS 9.21–24, 10.18–19, 11.1–2.
[53] *B.J.* 2.129; 1QS 3.4–5, 5.13–14.
[54] *B.J.* 2.129; 1QS 6.2–5.
[55] *B.J.* 2.132–33; 1QS 6.10–13.
[56] *B.J.* 2.131; 1QS 6.4–5; 1QSa 2.17–21.
[57] *B.J.* 2.137–8; 1QS 6.13–23.
[58] *B.J.* 2.134; 1QS 5.2–3, 6.11–13, 7.17.
[59] *B.J.* 2.143–44; 1QS 7.1–2, 16–17.
[60] *B.J.* 2.139; 1QS 5.8–9.
[61] *B.J.* 2.141; 1QS 4.10, 10.19.
[62] *B.J.* 2.141; 1QS 8.11–12, 4.5–6, 7.22–24.
[63] *B.J.* 2.136, 2.159; 1QS 6.6–8; CD 16.1–5.
[64] *B.J.* 2.142; 1QS; 1QSa; CD; 1QM; 11QTemple; 11QMelchizedek.
[65] *B.J.* 2.159; *pesharim*.
[66] *B.J.* 2.147; 1QS 7.13.
[67] *B.J.* 148–9; 1QM 7.6–7; 11QTemple 46.13–16.
[68] *A.J.* 18.18; 1QS 3.15–16, 9.23–24.
[69] *B.J.* 2.124; CD 7.6–7.

Pliny the Elder's account of the Essenes further supports the identification of the Khirbet Qumran site as an Essene community center.[70] In his *Natural History*, Pliny describes how

> infra hos Engada oppidum fuit, secundum ab Hierosolymis fertilitate palmetorumque nemoribus, nunc alterum bustum. inde Masada castellum in rupe, et ipsum haut procul Asphaltite.

> Below the Essenes was the town of Ein-gedi, second only to Jerusalem [Jericho?] in its fertility and palm-groves but now another ash-heap. From there, one comes to the fortress of Masada, located on a rock, and itself near the sea of Asphalt.

The Greek orator and philosopher Dio Chrysostom (40–115 C. E.), a contemporary of Pliny, is reported to have referred to the Essenes

> πόλιν ὅλην εὐδαίμονα τὴν παρὰ τὸ νεχρὸν ἐν τῇ μεσογειᾳ τῆς Παλαιστίνης κειμένην παρ᾽αὐτά που τὰ Σόδομα.

> who form a whole and prosperous *city* near the Dead Sea, in the middle of Palestine, in the vicinity of Sodom.[71]

While Dio's testimony supports identifying the inhabitants of Qumran with the Essenes, there is still some debate regarding Pliny's use of the phrase "infra hos," the question of Pliny's sources, and his geographical knowledge of Judea. It is generally recognized that Pliny used a great number of sources in composing his *Natural History*.[72] This would explain a number of problems, namely the description of Ein-gedi lying "downstream," "south of," or "below" the Essenes, and being able to proceed from there, further south, to Masada. Second, it would account for the fact that although Pliny's account was written after 70 C.E., and apparently refers to the destruction of Jerusalem, he does not mention the Roman destruction of Qumran or Masada. This omission is best explained not only by positing an earlier source, but by proposing that at some point in its transmission, "Jerusalem" was substituted for "Jericho," a far more likely candidate for Pliny's description of a fertile location of palm-

---

[70] Pliny the Elder, *Natural History* 5.17, 4 (73).

[71] Dio Chrysostom, preserved in Synesius of Cyrene, *Dion* or *Of Life After His Example*, 3, 2 (ca 400 C. E.). See Vermes & Goodman, *The Essenes*, 58–59.

[72] Stephen Goranson, "Rereading Pliny on the Essenes," Orion Center for the Dead Sea Scrolls, 1998, http://orion.mscc.huji.ac.il/orion/programs/Goranson98.shtml. Goranson argues that Pliny's account is based on a source written more than 80 years before the Jewish War (Marcus Agrippa, governor of Syria, thus would have been describing Qumran ca 15 B. C. E.). Interestingly, archaeological work by Jodi Magness confirms that Qumran was occupied at the time of Marcus Agrippa and that the destruction of Qumran was near the end of Herod's life or after his death (4/3 B. C. E.). According to Goranson, Pliny used a source by Marcus Vipsanius Agrippa, governor of Syria and friend of Herod, maker of a map and commentary who referred to the destruction of Ein Gedi around 40 B. C. E. during the Parthian invasion and Jewish civil war. Agrippa thus describes the state of Qumran/Ein Feshkha and Ein Gedi around 15 B. C. E.

groves, especially since both place-names begin with Hier.[73] Moreover, Pliny's description of Jerusalem's destruction (nunc alterum bustum) does not require a second destroyed place. Consequently, there is no reason to assume that Pliny is actually referring to the destruction of Jerusalem after 70 C.E. Pliny's account, therefore, remains a reliable early first-century C. E. description of the Essenes, and although it has recently been suggested that Essenes actually lived in the Ein-gedi area, despite intensive archaeological investigation, no site other than Qumran/Ein-Feshka qualifies.[74]

Pliny refers to Ein-gedi lying "below" the Essenes and then "from there," one comes to Masada, thus suggesting a north-south movement. This (rightly) leads scholars to conclude that Pliny's Essenes were located at the northernmost part of this description, especially if Pliny used sources and consulted a map of the Dead Sea area. At any rate, Pliny explicitly refers to a group of Essenes living near the western shore of the Dead Sea north of Masada. Yet no suitable Essene settlements have been found in the hills "above" Ein-gedi. Nonetheless, Pliny's Essenes must still be accounted for, and identifying the Qumran site as an Essene community is still the most satisfying explanation.[75]

Naturally, the site of Khirbet Qumran itself has come under scrutiny.[76] Some scholars have suggested that the site better resembles a Roman manor

---

[73] Théodore Reinach, *Textes d'auteurs grecs et romains relatifs au Judäisme* (Paris: Ernest Laroux, 1895), 273, n. 2.

[74] See Yizhar Hirschfeld, *Qumran in Context: Reassessing the Archaeological Evidence* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2004). The problem with this proposal is that there are not enough houses or dwelling places in Ein-gedi to make a community, let alone a city. There are also no traces of *mikvaoth*, which 1QS requires, and which are to be found in both Qumran and Jerusalem, near the "Gate of the Essenes."

[75] Steve Mason, *Josephus, Judea, and Christian Origins: Methods and Categories* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2009), 241–49, argues that it is inappropriate to use Pliny's description for a Qumran/Essene identification because (1) it is not clear what *infra hos* means in Pliny; (2) whether Pliny's geographical knowledge was accurate; and (3) the use of Pliny's description is a circular argument. He asserts that since scholars only identified the Qumran site as Essene after the discovery of the scrolls, Pliny's account should not be used. Mason is right to question the non-critical use of Pliny, but the Qumran site is very close to the caves, with footpaths leading from the settlement to the caves and identical pottery found in both the site and the caves. To dismiss the possibility of relationship between the two is unwarranted. Pliny's description of the Ein-Gedi lying "below" or "south" of the Essene community, with Masada further "below," seems to be relatively accurate geographical knowledge.

[76] Jodi Magness, "A Villa at Khirbet Qumran?," *RevQ* 16 (1994): 397–419; "Qumran: Not a Country Villa," *BAR* 22 (6 1996): 38, 40–47, 72–3; Magness, *The Archaeology of Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002), 65, argued that the Qumran site was settled between 100 and 50 B. C. E., i. e., after the copying of the *yahad* texts like 1QS (ca. 125 B. C. E.). See also Mark A. Elliott, "Sealing Some Cracks in the Groningen Foundation," in *Enoch and Qumran Origins* (ed. Gabriele Boccaccini; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 263–72, esp. 271–72: "part of the enigma of the surprisingly lengthy residence represented by the Qumran ruins can be explained, perhaps can *only* be explained, by appealing to a parent movement which continued to thrive in Palestine and Jerusalem . . . evidence for a

house or a military fortress than a sectarian community center.[77] There are a number of reasons why such proposals are unlikely. First, Pliny explicitly mentions a community of Essenes living on the west shore of the Dead Sea. The area has been surveyed and Qumran is the only suitable location for such a community. Eleven caves containing manuscripts were found in the immediate vicinity of the site, some of which can only be accessed by first entering the settlement. There are well-worn paths from the site to the caves, many of which contained pottery identical to that found at the site.

The internal evidence provided by the Scrolls themselves attest to a sectarian establishment and no pro-Hasmonean or Sadducean texts were found in the caves. The Qumran/Essene hypothesis is also supported by the presence of several ritual baths, or *mikvaoth*, in the archaeological site which are also referred to in the sectarian texts. The paleographical evidence culled from the Scrolls dates the handwriting to between 150 B. C. E. and 70 C. E., which corresponds to the historical existence of the Essene movement. This confluence of archaeological, paleographical, geographical and internal evidence is sufficient to warrant and defend the Qumran/Essene hypothesis.[78]

---

serious cleft in the parent movement out of which the Qumran settlement evolved is considerably depreciated by the manifest dependency of the desert settlement (272).”

[77] Yizhar Hirschfeld, “Early Roman Manor Houses in Judea and the Site of Khirbet Qumran,” *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 57 (1998): 161–89; *Qumran in Context*; Golb, *Who Wrote the Dead Sea Scrolls?* The idea that Qumran was a manor house or villa is hard to reconcile with the presence of sectarian texts, pottery found in the caves, a path to the caves, a large cemetery, numerous ink-wells, Pliny’s description of the Essene community and Dio’s secondary reference to the Essenes’ “city” by the Dead Sea. Such theories tend to disregard the presence of carefully buried animal bones, the religious *miqva’ot,* and the lack of any equipment for commerce. Furthermore, Qumran does not lie on a major trade route. See Magen Broshi, “Was Qumran a Crossroads?,” *RevQ* 19 (1999): 273–76. See also Robert Donceel and Pauline Donceel-Voûte, “The Archaeology of Khirbet Qumran,” in *Methods of Investigation of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Khirbet Qumran Site: Present Realities and Future Prospects* (ANYAS 722; eds. M. O. Wise, N. Golb, J. J. Collins and D. G. Pardee; New York: New York Academy of Sciences, 1994), 1–38, argued that Qumran was a wealthy manor house. Yet relatively few fine wares have been found at the site. Rachel Bar-Nathan, “Qumran and the Hasmonean and Herodian Winter Palaces of Jericho: The Implication of the Pottery Finds on the Interpretation of the Settlement at Qumran,” in *Qumran: The Site of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Archaeological Interpretations and Debates: Proceedings of a Conference held at Brown University, November 17–19, 2002* (eds. K. Galor, J-B. Humbert and J. K. Zangenberg; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 263–77, holds that the dishware found at Qumran resemble that found at Masada and Jericho. David Stacey, “Some Archaeological Observations on the Aqueducts of Qumran,” *DSD* 14/2 (2007): 222–43, associates the Qumran site with the estate at Jericho as a seasonal tannery and pottery production facility. Yizhak Magen and Yuval Peleg, *The Qumran Excavations 1993–2004: Preliminary Report* (Judea & Samaria Publications 6; Jerusalem: Israel Antiquities Authority, 2007), propose that Qumran was a pottery production plant.

[78] For the Qumran site as a sectarian Jewish community center and/or Essene site, see Jean-Baptiste Humbert, “L’espace sacré á Qumrân: Propositions pour l’archéologie (Planches

There is a general consensus today that not all of the scrolls found at Qumran were written there nor are they all sectarian compositions. Different documents written at different times may also reflect different phases of the community's development. Yet a number of scholars maintain that differences between the scrolls and Josephus, Philo and Pliny are strong enough to undermine the Qumran-Essene hypothesis altogether.[79] Other scholars have forwarded alternative hypotheses, for example, that the Qumran texts actually belonged to the Jerusalem Temple library and were brought there shortly before the revolt of 66–73 C. E.[80] or that the Qumran community represents a Sadduccean priestly group.[81] Neither proposal has found much support.[82]

I–III)," *Revue Biblique* 101 (1994): 161–214, argues that Qumran was an Essene site. See also Minna Lönnqvist and Kenneth Lönnqvist, *Archaeology of the Hidden Qumran: The New Paradigm* (Helsinki: Helsinki University Press, 2002), see Qumran as the site of an Essene or Therapeutae-like group. Robert Cargill, *Qumran through (Real) Time: A Virtual Reconstruction of Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (BT 1; Piscataway: Gorgias, 2009), sees Qumran as both a Hasmonean fortress and a sectarian Jewish settlement. Ada Yardeni, "A Note on a Qumran Scribe," in *New Seals and Inscriptions: Hebrew, Idumean, and Cuneiform* (HBM 8; ed. M. Lubetski; Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2007), 287–98, argues that dozens of manuscripts from numerous caves (1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 8, 11) can be assigned to a single "Qumran scribe." Ira Rabin, Oliver Hahn, Timo Wolff and Admir Masic, "On the Origin of the Ink of the Thanksgiving Scroll (1QHodayota)," *DSD* 16/1 (2009): 97–106, argue that the ink used in the Thanksgiving Scroll uses water from the Dead Sea.

[79] John C. Reeves, "Complicating the Notion of an 'Enochic Judaism,' in *Enoch and Qumran Origins*, 373–83, esp. 380, questions the very existence of an "Essene" movement. First, "There is not a single extant Palestinian or Syro-Mesopotamian Jewish writing authored in either Hebrew or Aramaic during the Achaemenid, Hellenistic, Roman, Byzantine, or Sassanian periods which mentions an Essene sect, categorizes a tradition or practice as Essene, or employs the label Essene in a recognizable way." Second, the classical sources "can leave an unwary reader with the mistaken impression that the primary sources for a scholastic reconstruction of Essene ideology are manifold and grounded on an extensive series of empirical observations and experiences." Third, "modern scholars have been unduly credulous about the actual existence of a Jewish Essene sect." Reeves does not apply such skepticism to Josephus' description and the historical existence of Pharisees and Sadducees. The insinuation that scholars are "unduly credulous," the dismissal of the classical sources, and Reeves' argument from silence are simply not compelling reasons to dismantle the Qumran Essene hypothesis, let alone the historical existence of an Essene movement.

[80] Norman Golb, *Who Wrote the Dead Sea Scrolls?: The Search for the Secret of Qumran* (New York: Scribner, 1995).

[81] Schiffman, *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls*; Louis Ginzberg, *An Unknown Jewish Sect* (New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1976); Cecil Roth, *The Historical Background of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1958).

[82] Schiffman, *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls*, holds that a group of Sadducees founded the community at Qumran, where they "underwent a gradual process of development and radicalization," ultimately becoming the group now known as the "Dead Sea sect." Schiffman does not claim "that the Dead Sea sect as we know it is Sadducean, only that its origins and the roots of its halakhic tradition lie in the Sadducean Zadokite priesthood" (89). He proposes two possibilities: one in which "the term 'Essene' came to designate the originally Sadducean

There are, of course, significant differences between the Essenes described by Josephus, Philo, and Pliny, and the Qumran community.[83] The names and geographical locations of the movements appear to be different.[84] According to Josephus, the Essenes were "sun-worshippers," while according to 11Q-Temple, sun-worship was prohibited and a capital offense.[85] According to Philo, the Essenes did not sacrifice, and although Josephus's testimony is ambiguous, several Qumran texts *seem* to presuppose sacrifice.[86] Josephus reports that new members only swore oaths at the end of their 3-year probation period, yet 1QS's new members swear an oath to God and are then instructed by priests and Levites.[87] Josephus claims that prospective members only had to show willingness to obey the rules of the order whereas 1QS indicates that

---

sectarians who had gone through a process of radicalization until they became a distinct sect," the other recognizing that the term Essene may "include a wide variety of similar groups, of which the Dead Sea sect might be one." The latter option is not an altogether radical one. It was already known long before the discovery of the scrolls that Essenism was not a monolithic or uniform movement. Yet while Schiffman admits that "the term 'Essene' may have been an inclusive term encompassing a number of groups (129)," he does not explain the extreme similarities of this hypothetically Sadducean group with the Essene movement or its pronounced differences with the Hellenized Sadducees referred to in Josephus and the New Testament. For criticism, see Vermes, *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls*, 42; Philip R. Davies, *Sects and Scrolls: Essays on Qumran and Related Topics* (Atlanta: Scholars, 1996), 131–38; John J. Collins, *DSD* 2/2 (1995): 245; Fitzmyer, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Christian Origins*, 16; James C. VanderKam, "The People of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Essenes or Sadducees?," in *Understanding the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. H. Shanks; New York: Vintage, 1993), 51–61.

[83] Alan David Crown and Lena Cansdale, "Focus on Qumran: Was it an Essene Settlement?," *BAR* 20 (1994): 24–35, 73; Lena Cansdale, *Qumran and the Essenes: A Re-evaluation of the Evidence* (TSAJ 60; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997). Eyal Regev, *Sectarianism in Qumran: A Cross-Cultural Perspective* (RS 45; New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2007), 8, finds "no justification to automatically identify the descriptions of the Essenes by Philo and Josephus with the internal evidence of the scrolls." Regev focuses on the *differences* between the Essenes and the Qumran sects (248-261), such as social structure, oaths, slaves, acceptance of new members, private property, and celibacy, but admits that "it is less probable that the Essenes and the Qumranites developed independently in such proximity, in the same period. It is more reasonable that these two groups had some historical ties (262)." He concludes that "the Essenes were a later development of the Qumran movement (264)." But if Regev's model is correct, how do we explain that Josephus (*A.J.* 13, 171–2) wrote that the *Essenes* existed in the mid-second century B. C. E. or that "Judah the Essene" lived around 104 B. C. E. in Jerusalem?

[84] The term "Essene" is never mentioned in the Qumran texts, and although Pliny and Dio specifically mention the Dead Sea, the Qumran texts do not. Instead, CD describes "camps" (13.7) and cities (11.5–6), including Jerusalem (1/4QM 7.4).

[85] *B.J.* 2.128, 148; 11QTemple 55.15–21.

[86] Philo, *Quod Omnis Probus Liber Sit* 75; Josephus, *A.J.* 18.19; 11QTemple and 1/4QM describe burnt offerings; CD 4.2 presupposes sacrifice. 1QS does not mention sacrifice, and may even regard the ascetic life of the community as an "acceptable" offering in lieu of animal sacrifice.

[87] *B.J.* 2.139–142; 1QS 1.16–17, 5.1–11.

prospective members were tested by the elders and the priests.[88] Josephus reports that new members were admitted to the common meal after their final vows and admittance to the community whereas 1QS has new members being admitted after two years of probation.[89] Philo claims that only older men could join the order yet 1QSa indicates that women and children were part of the community.[90] Josephus and Philo claim that all property was handed over to the community for safekeeping, yet CD appears to allow for private property.[91] Both Josephus and Philo claim that the Essenes did not use oaths except for admittance oaths, yet several Qumran texts presuppose oath-taking.[92] Both Josephus and Philo claim that the Essenes did not possess slaves, yet CD presupposes the existence of slaves.[93]

Josephus refers to Essene determinism (*A.J.* 13.171–73§ 5.9), immortality of the soul (*B.J.* 2.154–58§ 8.11), their strong sense of community, communal practice, ritual and discipline, yet the "essential elements of Qumran theology are totally lacking in the accounts of Philo, Josephus, and Hippolytus. We hear not a word about their exclusivistic dualistic worldview, their thoroughgoing eschatological outlook, their strong sense of revelation, or the desert existence of the Qumran community."[94] It would seem, then, that "the accounts of Philo, Josephus, and Hippolytus omit any reference to the rationale and worldview that provide the basis for Qumran theology and practice."

Nonetheless, the differences between the Essenes and the Qumran community as represented in the sectarian texts can be explained in a number of ways:[95] 1QS and CD may refer to different groups and different stages within the community's history;[96] the classical authors, being "outsiders," may not

---

[88] *B.J.*; 1QS 6.14–15.

[89] *B.J.* 2.139; 1QS 6.16–17.

[90] *Hypothetica* 3; 1QSa 1.4–20.

[91] *Hypothetica* 4; *Quod Omnis Probus Liber Sit* 86; *B.J.* 2.122; CD 9.10–16, 14.12–13 may allow for private property, but 1QS 6.19, 22 does seem to agree with Josephus and Philo's testimony, although 7.6–8, paradoxically, also seems to allow for private property.

[92] *Quod Omnis Probus Liber Sit* 84; *B.J.* 2.135; (admittance oath: *B.J.* 2.139–140; 1QS 5.8 presupposes an oath entering the community, and both CD 15.5–11 and 11QTemple 53.9–54.5 presuppose oaths.

[93] *A.J.* 18.21; *Quod Omnis Probus Liber Sit* 79; CD 11.12, 12.10.

[94] Nickelsburg, *Ancient Judaism and Christian Origins*, 167–75, esp. 171, notes that the "consensus is still largely intact," although "in recent years the ranks of the skeptics have increased" (168). Yet it still "seems best to give full weight to the considerable array of detailed procedural parallels and to identify the Qumran community as Essene (172)."

[95] Martin Goodman, "A Note on the Qumran Sectarians, the Essenes and Josephus," *JJS* 46 (1995): 161–66, esp.161.

[96] Beall, *Josephus' Description of the Essenes*, 11, points out that 1QS and CD are inconsistent and may reflect the two divisions of the movement mentioned by Josephus. Josephus clearly describes the Essenes as including a secondary, "lay" or marrying group (*B.J.* 2.160–1), which suggests that "the entire Essene movement was more fluid than Josephus presents." Similarly, there is evidence in CD that the Essenes lived in a number of locations.

have had access to specific rules and practices;[97] Josephus provides us with an incomplete account of first-century Jewish life.[98] Even scholars who regard the Qumran/Essene hypothesis as "much less probable than is usually proposed" concede that the archaeological evidence makes it "overwhelmingly likely that the site at Qumran was used by ascetic Jews" and that the Essenes match the description of the sectarians in 1QS better than any other group.[99]

Models that identify the Qumran community as affiliated with the "Essenes" are capable of reconciling most problems. For example, at least three differences between Qumran and the Essenes involve discrepancies between 1QS and CD which describe different positions on private property, oaths, and slavery. Yet the classical sources do not mention in any significant detail the different practices of the lay and married Essene communities.[100] The significance of Khirbet Qumran has also often been exaggerated relative to the number of its possible occupants. The Qumran site could only have supported about one hundred and fifty people.[101] Yet the Qumran texts refer to its members living in many "camps," clearly indicating that the community existed in relationship to a movement with groups in multiple locations.

Josephus, Philo, and Pliny report that the Essenes were celibate and shunned women, yet several Qumran texts presuppose the existence of women and children.[102] Considering that celibacy is a distinctive element in classical de-

---

[97] Since neither Josephus nor Philo were *fully* initiated members, we should not expect them to have fully accurate information on the initiation rules and probation periods of the Essenes. Furthermore, a major literary-rhetorical qualification of the two bodies of literature is that of projected audience. The classical authors were writing to and for Greco-Roman pagans whereas the audience of the Dead Sea Scrolls were written by and for sectarian Jews. The projected audiences are completely different and *determinative* of the purpose, style, content and intent of discourse. Josephus, Philo and Pliny's accounts should be understood in the context of Greco-Roman apologetics. Hence the focus on the exotic, peculiar, and elements amenable to Greco-Roman cultural comprehension. It is to be expected, therefore, that various aspects of the Essenes were altered, shaped, modified and, perhaps, omitted.

[98] Goodman, "A Note on the Qumran Sectarians," 162.

[99] Goodman, "A Note on the Qumran Sectarians," 164: it is "undoubtedly true that the information about the lives of the sectarians in 1QS is closer to the description of the Essenes in the classical sources than to that of any other group described by those writers." Shemaryahu Talmon, "Qumran Studies: Past, Present and Future," *JQR* 85 (1994): 11: the Qumran/Essene hypothesis is "without doubt particularly persuasive, and is endorsed by most scholars."

[100] Josephus, *B.J.* 2. 160–61, mentions the marrying Essenes almost as an afterthought.

[101] Roland de Vaux, *Archaeology and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (London: Oxford University Press, 1973), 86; Magen Broshi and Hanan Eshel, "How and Where did the Qumranites live?," in the *Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues* (eds. D. W. Parry and E. Ulrich; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 272.

[102] *B.J.* 2.120*; Hypothetica* 14–17; *Natural History* 5.73; 1QS 1.4 presupposes women and children; CD 4.19, 5.2, 5.7 contain rules on marriage, 5.6 discusses rules about sex with menstruating women; 7.6–7 contains rules about marriage and children. For the Essene position

scriptions of the Essenes,[103] this would seem to be a real problem. Philo claims that the Essenes observe "celibacy" (ἐγκράτειαν), "eschew marriage," and that "no Essene takes a wife."[104] Pliny tells us that the Essenes "have no women and have renounced all sexual desire.[105] Josephus tells us that they "disdain" marriage, although there is another "order" (τάγμα) of Essenes who do marry (albeit only to propagate the race).[106] Josephus' report of two kinds of Essenes is supported by references to two kinds of groups in 1QS and CD, but these texts do not support the emphasis Josephus places on why Essenes renounced marriage.

While there are problems with these accounts, they do provide "sufficient evidence for us to conclude that some Essenes did not marry."[107] Nonetheless, we need not accept their misogynistic views or opinions on sexual desire, as none of this in the Qumran materials. Boccaccini argues that Essene "celibacy" should not be confused with modern notions of life-long celibacy, but that the Essene movement was "made up of adult males, who . . . decided to join a group with special laws," citing Philo's report that the Essene communities were composed of "men of ripe years, already inclining to old age."[108] Essene members could have been married and had children *before* joining the group and then renounced marriage. Josephus confirms this conclusion.[109]

The problem is that there is no unambiguous evidence that the Qumran community or *yahad* was celibate.[110] The general identification of the Qumran

---

on marriage, see Joseph M. Baumgarten, "The Qumran-Essene Restraints on Marriage," in *Archaeology and History in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. L. H. Schiffman; Sheffield: JSOT, 1990), 13–24; Joseph Coppens, "Le célibat essénien," in *Qumrân: Sa piété, sa théologie et son milieu* (ed. M. Delcor; BETL 46; Paris: Duculot, 1978), 295–304; Yigael Yadin, "L'attitude essénienne envers la polygamie et le divorce," *RB* 79 (1972): 98–99; Antoine Guillaumont, "A propos du célibat des Esséniens," in *Hommages à A. Dupont-Sommer* (eds. A. Caquot and M. Philonenko; Paris: Adrien-Maisonneuve, 1971), 395–404; Alfred Marx, "Les racines du célibat essénien," *RevQ* 7 (1971): 323-42; Hans Hübner, "Zölibat in Qumran?" *NTS* 17 (1971): 153–67; Horst R. Moehring, "Josephus on the Marriage Customs of the Essenes," in *Early Christian Origins* (ed. A. P. Wikgren; Chicago: Quadrangle, 1961), 120–127.

[103] Eyal Regev, "Cherchez les femmes: Were the *yahad* Celibates?" *DSD* 15 (2008): 253–284, 253, describes this as "the Essenes' most distinctive characteristic."

[104] *Hypothetica* 11.14.

[105] *Natural History* 5.73.

[106] *B.J.* 2.120; 2.160–61.

[107] William Loader, *The Dead Sea Scrolls on Sexuality: Attitudes Towards Sexuality in Sectarian and Related Literature at Qumran* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009), 372. Loader argues that "The misogynist explanation for their celibacy is entirely Philo's and probably has no basis in Essene reality. Nothing in the documents we have considered suggests such an approach to women (370-71)." Josephus provides "an equally tendentious account."

[108] Boccaccini, *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis*, 39, citing *Hypothetica* 2–3.

[109] *B.J.* 2.120.

[110] Schiffman, *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 143, rejects the view that the Qumran

community as Essenes assumes that the *yahad* was celibate.[111] Yet there is considerable debate regarding whether the Qumran community or *yahad* was comprised exclusively of celibate male members or included women and children. The fact that women and children are not mentioned in 1QS, although an argument from silence, has been interpreted to mean that celibacy is implied. On the other hand, it does not mention celibacy either.

Some scholars see CD 7.3–10 as a reference to a celibate community,[112] concluding that CD represents the rule for all the Essenes whereas 1QS legislates only for the *yahad* or Qumran community.[113] Nonetheless, the archaeological evidence is ambiguous: a large cemetery near Qumran contains the graves of eleven hundred individuals, among which were women, although the women were not found in the central cemetery area.[114] The question whether women were present in the Qumran community is still open.[115] Moreover, there are no family burials at the Qumran site, which appears to be unprecedented in ancient Jewish burial practice.[116] The absence of anything indicating family housing or family life at Qumran is consistent with a predominantly male community who did not live in camps and marry. Yet a number of Qumran texts assume both marriage and divorce, and while sexuality was seen as a source of ritual impurity, it was not a source of moral impurity, but, like marriage, assumed to be "a natural part of human life."[117] The Qumran evidence, therefore, is ambiguous, although it is certain that the Essene movement included men, women, and children.

---

community was celibate, citing the presence of women, marriage and family life in Qumran texts and the absence of any negative views of women.

[111] As noted by Elisha Qimron, "Celibacy in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Two Kinds of Sectarians," in *The Madrid Qumran Congress* (eds. J. Trebolle Barrera and L. Vegas Montaner; 2 vols.; STDJ 11; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 1: 289.

[112] Joseph Baumgarten, "The Qumran-Essene Restraints on Marriage," in *Archaeology and History in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. L. H. Schiffman; Sheffield: JSOT; 1990), 18–19, 23; E. Qimron, "Celibacy in the Dead Sea Scrolls"; Philip R. Davies, "Reflections on DJD XVIII," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls at Fifty* (eds. R. A. Kugler and E. M. Schuller; Atlanta: Scholars, 1999), 161; John J. Collins, "Family Life," in *EDSS*, 1:287; Sidnie White Crawford, "Not according to Rule: Women, the Dead Sea Scrolls and Qumran," in *Emanuel*, 149; Charlotte Hempel, "Earthly Essene Nucleus," 91.

[113] White Crawford, "Not according to Rule," 149.

[114] Rachel Hachlili, "Burial Practices at Qumran," *RevQ* 62 (1994): 247–64; Nicu Haas and N. Nathan, "Anthropological Survey on the Human Skeletal Remains from Qumran," *RevQ* 6 (1968): 345–52; S. H. Steckoll, "Preliminary Excavation Report on the Qumran Cemetery," *RevQ* 6 (1968): 323–36.

[115] Linda Bennett Elder, "The Women Question and Female Ascetics among Essenes," *BA* 57/4 (1994): 220–34.

[116] Hachlili, "Burial Practices at Qumran."

[117] Loader, *The Dead Sea Scrolls on Sexuality*, 389, notes that the Temple Scroll, 4QInstruction, CD, and 4QMMT all assume divorce.

Similar doubts exist regarding whether the Qumran community, and/or the Essenes, should be identified as "militant." Josephus describes the Essenes as "upright managers of anger and peacemakers."[118] They swear "to observe justice towards men and to do no wrong to any man," to remain loyal "to those in power, for authority never falls to a man without the will of God."[119] While Josephus praises the Essenes for their pacifism and submission to political authorities, Philo praises them for their "love for God," "unceasing purity," and "love of men."[120] While Josephus reports that the Essenes take an oath never to commit violence and to obey the rulers who have their power conferred on them by God,[121] Philo denies that they were violent at all.[122] It seems unlikely that the Essenes were ever known for militant activity.[123]

Josephus *does* name "John the Essene" as a leader in the revolt.[124] Yet this hardly justifies characterizing the Essenes as having "participated" in the revolt.[125] Steve Mason points out that this reference to "John the Essene" (Ἐσσαῖος) may be an *ethnikon* designating John as someone from Essa.[126] Josephus mentions a placed called Essa in the Transjordan (*A.J.* 13.393); a person from Essa would be called an Ἐσσαῖος.[127] Yet even if this "John" *was* an Essene, he may have left the movement to join the revolt.[128] The singular reference is anomalous, as if the mention of *one* Essene were an exception.[129]

Josephus tells us that the Essenes were tortured; he does not tell us that the Essenes fought back.[130] On the contrary, the Essenes are described as passively resisting the Romans, while Roman soldiers are described as torturing them in order to make them "blaspheme against the Lawgiver" or "eat forbid-

---

[118] *B.J.* 2. 135.

[119] Josephus, *B.J.* 2.139–140. David Flusser, *The Spiritual History of the Dead Sea Sect* (trans. C. Glucker; Tel Aviv: MOD Books, 1989), 78, proposes that Josephus' depiction of the Essenes is an example of how "hatred can turn into real non-violence, and an unconditional non-resistance to evil into all-embracing love."

[120] *Quod Omnis Probus Liber Sit* 84.

[121] *B.J.* 2.139–140.

[122] *Quod Omnis Probus Liber Sit* 78.

[123] See Gordon Mark Zerbe, *Non-Retaliation in Early Jewish and New Testament Texts: Ethical Themes in Social Contexts* (JSPSup13; Sheffield: JSOT, 1993), 106–135.

[124] *B.J.* 2.567.

[125] Golb, *Who Wrote the Dead Sea Scrolls?*, 136.

[126] Mason, "The Essenes of Josephus' Judean War," 428.

[127] Mason, "The Essenes of Josephus' Judean War," 428. Mason points out that both references (*B.J.* 2.567; 311) and their immediate contexts, "along with the fact that John is never credited with any of the traits otherwise mentioned for Essenes, provide prima facie support for Schalit's proposal that in John's case Ἐσσαῖος means 'of Essa." See Abraham Schalit, *Namenwörterbuch zu Flavius Josephus* (Leiden: Brill, 1968), 46.

[128] Golb, *Who Wrote the Dead Sea Scrolls?*, 141.

[129] Cecil Roth, "Why the Qumran Sect cannot have been Essenes," *RevQ* 3 (1959): 417–22, argues that the idea that the Essenes joined the Revolt "has no foundation" in Josephus.

[130] *B.J.* 2.152–153.

den food." There is no unambiguous evidence that the Essenes participated in the revolt.[131] On the contrary, there are contemporary reports of their pacifism, their passive resistance to violence, their submission to foreign rule as willed by God, and their belief that God alone would settle their affairs. The Qumran community has repeatedly been described as "militant."[132] Some scholars appeal to the *War Scroll* (1QM) as evidence of militancy.[133] 1QM narrates a final conflict between the forces of good and evil, and describes military equipment, army formations, battle-plans and rules about trumpets, standards, shields, cavalry, and soldiers. 1QM also depicts an angelic host leading the battle. 1QM is an idealized depiction of an eschatological war.[134] The phases of the battle are predetermined *in advance,* as is the outcome.

---

[131] Hippolytus, who describes the Essenes as "Zealots" and militant, confused the Essenes with the Zealots whom Josephus describes following his description of the Essenes in *B.J.* 2.161. Alternatively, Hippolytus may have derived his information on the Essenes from the same source used by Josephus. For the latter possibility, see Morton Smith, "The Description of the Essenes in Josephus and the Philosophumena," *HUCA* 29 (1958): 273–313; Black, *The Scrolls and Chrisitan Origins*, 187–191.

[132] Christopher Rowland, *The Open Heaven: A Study in Apocalyptic in Judaism and Early Christianity* (New York: Crossroad, 1992), 38, claims that while "externally they appeared very pleasant in the way they received their guests, we now know from the scrolls their hidden attitude, which they certainly did not disclose in public. It was a doctrine of hatred toward the world outside and toward the rest of the Jews." Rowland sees 1QM as a military manual where "elaborate preparations which were required for the proper conduct of war . . . are set out in minute detail (31)." Similarly, John J. Collins, *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York: Routledge, 1997), 108–09, admits that "the war anticipated in the War Rule has many fantastic tactics, it also shows some knowledge of realistic military tactics. The preparation of such an elaborate War Rule strongly suggests that the community was prepared to implement it, if the members believed that the appointed time had arrived. That time may very well have arrived in the war against Rome." Collins concludes that "they were wiped out by the Roman army (109)." See also Loren L. Johns, "Identity and Resistance: The Varieties of Competing Models in Early Judaism," in *Qumran Studies: New Approaches, New Questions* (eds. M. T. Davis and B. A. Strawn; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007), 254–77; Raija Sollamo, "War and Violence in the Ideology of the Qumran Community," in *Verbum et Calamus: Semitic and Related Studies in Honour of the Sixtieth Birthday of Professor Tapani Harviainen* (eds. H. Juusola, et al.; SO 99; Helsinki: Finnish Oriental Society, 2004), 341–52.

[133] Jean Duhaime, "War Scroll," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations*, Vol. 2: *Damascus Document, War Scroll, and Related Documents* (ed. J. H. Charlesworth; PTSDSSP 2; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1995), 84, calls 1QM a "tactical treatise." Vermes, *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls*, 163, argues that "it should not be mistaken for a manual of military warfare." Lester Grabbe, "Warfare," in *EDSS* 2: 965, claims that it contains data of a military manual with a theological message. Hans Bardtke, "Die Kriegsrolle v. Qumran übersetzt," *TLZ* 80 (1955): 401–20; Leonard Rost, "Zum Buch der Kriege der Söhne des Lichtes gegen die Söhne der Finsternis," *TLZ* 80 (1955): 205–08.

[134] Collins, *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 127.

1QM is not a training manual for a "holy war."[135] There is no evidence that the Qumran community ever engaged in actual warfare.

The extent to which scholars accept Josephus' description of the Essenes varies. Todd S. Beall finds a high degree of correlation between Josephus' description and the information in the scrolls.[136] Roland Bergmeier argues that the similarities and the discrepancies between Josephus and the scrolls can be explained by positing Josephus' use of sources:[137] the similarities between Philo's account and Josephus' are best explained by the use of a common Hellenistic Jewish source on the Essenes and the longest account of the Essenes is a composite text; Josephus uses this text.[138] Bergmeier claims that most of the "parallels" between a Jewish-Hellenistic "Essäer-Quelle" and the Qumran texts belong to the tendency of the source to present an ideal image of the 'Εσσαῖοι.[139] Bergmeier collects characteristics especially of Josephus' Pythagorizing "Essener-Quelle," the longest of four reconstructed sources,

---

[135] Helmer Ringgren, *The Faith of Qumran: Theology of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (trans. E. T. Sander; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1963), 18–19, points out that "an actual war is completely out of the question. The list is, further, so stereotyped and obviously based on the list of peoples in Genesis 10 (and other similar lists in the Old Testament), that it must be viewed as the result of purely theoretical speculations. Second, the mottoes to be written on banners and weapons are throughout of a symbolic and religious nature. While this is not a decisive argument for an allegorical interpretation, it must, nevertheless, be said to point in this direction. Third, the very designation of the fighting parties, 'children of light' and 'children of darkness' is an intimation that the war belongs on the religious plane." Willis S. Barnstone, *The Other Bible* (New York: HarperSanFrancisco, 1984), 235–36, points out that "it would be a mistake to treat the battle as an external conflict between Israel and the entire Gentile world. Clearly the 'holy war' is a metaphor for an ethical and theological conflict between the forces of light and the forces of darkness." Beall, *Josephus' Description of the Essenes*, 68.

[136] Beall, *Josephus' Description of the Essenes*.

[137] Roland Bergmeier, *Die Essener-Berichte des Flavius Josephus: Quellenstudien zu den Essenertexten im Werk des Jüdischen Historiographen* (Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1993), 51–52. Bergmeier posits four sources: one from Nicolaus of Damascus, one from a Stoic-like school; one from a Hellenistic-Jewish source representing Alexandrian Jewry, from which Philo and Josephus drew; and a source that understood the Essenes as Jewish Pythagoreans which influenced Pliny and Philo. See also "Zum historischen Wert der Essenerberichte von Philo und Josephus," in *Qumran kontrovers: Beiträge zu den Textfunden vom Toten Meer* (eds. J. Frey and H. Stegemann; Bonifatius: Paderborn, 2003), 11–22.

[138] Roland Bergmeier, "Die drei jüdischen Schulrichtungen nach Josephus und Hippolyt von Rom: Zu den Paralleltexten Josephus, B.J.2, 119–6 und Hippolyt, Haer. IX 18, 2–29,4," *JSJ* 34/4 (2003): 443–470.

[139] Bergmeier, *Die Essener-Berichte des Flavius Josephus*, 79: "Ausgeprägte Liebe untereinander und Gemeinschaft, Güter- und Mahlgemeinschaft, besondere Verpflichtung zu Frömmigkeit und Gerechtigkeit, all dies weist zwar erkennbare Beziehungen zu den Qumrantexten auf, allerdings nicht, ohne sich zugleich der Idealisierung der Essäer zuordnen zu lassen."

and refers to a number of parallels with 1QS.[140] Bergmeier's model accounts for both similarities and differences on the basis of reconstructed sources.[141]

Steve Mason points out that Josephus' description has been shaped with his own rhetorical aims and themes, namely to characterize them as idealized representatives of Judean character.[142] Josephus uses language reminiscent of Spartan virtues and shapes his account of the Essenes to conform to Hellenistic expectations of manly virtue, areté, courage, and asceticism. His description of the Essenes' reverence for the sun as a deity, their avoidance of oil, and their belief in an "Isles of the Blessed" are Hellenistic embellishments. Josephus, a Jewish apologist who surrendered to the Romans during the Revolt, is often guilty not only of exaggeration but of outright deception.[143] Nonetheless, there is no good reason to dismiss Josephus out of hand.[144] Josephus shaped his account to suit his own purposes, but that does not mean that

---

[140] Bergmeier, *Die Essener-Berichte des Flavius Josephus*, 94–107, esp. 105, n. 300: "Je abstrakter der Vergleich geführt wird, desto 'vergleichbarer' wird auch historisch Unvergleichbares." Bergmeier, *Die Essener*, 79–107, provides a complete inventory of comparisons between the Essenes and the Pythagoreans, and concludes that the Essenes were influenced by Pythagoreanism.

[141] Jörg Frey, "Zur historischen Auswertung der antiken Essenerberichte: Ein Beitrag zum Gespräch mit Roland Bergmeier," in *Qumran kontrovers: Beiträge zu den Textfunden vom Toten Meer* (eds. J. Frey and H. Stegemann; Bonifatius: Paderborn, 2003), 23–56, criticizes Bergmeier's optimism regarding the possibility of producing a detailed reconstruction of sources on the basis of the extant material.

[142] Steve Mason, "Essenes and Lurking Spartans in Josephus' Judean War: From Story to History," in *Making History: Josephus and Historical Method* (ed. Z. Rodgers; JSJ 110; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 219–61, objects to identifying Josephus' Essenes with the Qumran community and the Dead Sea Scrolls; "What Josephus Says about the Essenes in his *Judean War*," in *Text and Artifact in the Religions of Mediterranean Antiquity: Essays in Honour of Peter Richardson* (eds. S. G. Wilson and M. Desjardins; Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 2000), 434–67. See also Mason, *Josephus, Judea, and Christian Origins*, 239–79. But see Kenneth Atkinson, Hanan Eshel and Jodi Magness, "Another View: Do Josephus' Writings Support the 'Essene Hypothesis?'" *BAR* 35/2 (2009): 56–59, who argue that Josephus remains "our best evidence" for the Qumran Essene hypothesis and contend that Mason "fails" to interpret the Qumran text (1QS) "correctly." Hershel Shanks, "The Editor's Verdict," 59, concludes that Mason "erred in analyzing the issue," and that "the burden of coming forward is now on those who would deny the Essene hypothesis."

[143] For exaggeration, see *B.J.* 2.135, 2.143, 2.145, 2.147; for "Hellenization," see *B.J.* 2.119, 2.154–8, 2.128, *A.J.* 15.10, 4.371; for deception, see Josephus' claim that he joined the Essenes (*Vita* 1.2, 10–12). Josephus, Philo, and Pliny's accounts should be understood in the context of Greco-Roman apologetics. Hence the focus on the exotic, peculiar, and elements amenable to Greco-Roman cultural comprehension. Various aspects of the Essenes were altered, shaped, modified and, perhaps, omitted.

[144] Bilde, "The Essenes in Philo and Josephus," 67, calls for the rejection of "the idea that the accounts in Philo and Josephus are 'Hellenized distortions' of the historical reality which we find in the Dead Sea Scrolls . . . In fact, the accouts of Philo and, especially, of Josephus correspond with the Dead Sea Scrolls to a very large extent."

he invented the Essenes out of whole cloth nor that he did not omit material he found unsuitable. Attempts to discredit Josephus' account of the Essenes (notwithstanding its idealized, utopian, and Hellenized bias) often overlook the fact that Philo and Pliny also describe the Essenes in remarkably similar ways. As one among several first-century witnesses and contemporaries to the Essenes, Josephus' testimony still bears considerable weight.

The parallels between the Qumran texts, site, and the classical sources require the burden of proof to be assumed by those who would argue against the Qumran Essene hypothesis.[145] Despite its limitations, this hypothesis is still the best solution to the data.[146] The Dead Sea Scrolls were collected by a sectarian group loosely identifiable as *Essenic*. The Qumran community was *part* of an Essene movement.[147] There has been a tendency to *equate* the Essenes with the Qumran community,[148] but the term "Essene" is best understood as a reference to a network of diverse, multi-regional groups.[149]

---

[145] Beall, *Josephus' Description of the Essenes*, 125.

[146] Daniel Schwartz, *Studies in the Jewish Background of Christianity* (WUNT 60; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1992), 35, n. 19, argues that "the similarity is so great, and the lack of any other candidates for identification with the Qumran sect is so clear, that the Essene identification should be accepted until something stronger than hitherto be adduced against it or in favor of another identification." Beall, *Josephus' Description of the Essenes*, 11, points out that 1QS and CD may reflect the two divisions of the Essene movement mentioned by Josephus. Josephus describes the Essenes as including a "lay" or marrying group (*B.J.* 2.160–1), which suggests that "the entire Essene movement was more fluid than Josephus presents." Goodman, "A Note on the Qumran Sectarians," 164, states that it is "undoubtedly true that the information about the lives of the sectarians in 1QS is closer to the description of the Essenes in the classical sources than to that of any other group described by those writers." But Shemaryahu Talmon, "Qumran Studies: Past, Present and Future," *JQR* 85 (1994): 1–31, 11, recognizes that the Qumran/Essene hypothesis is "without doubt particularly persuasive, and is endorsed by most scholars."

[147] Talmon, "Qumran Studies: Past, Present and Future," 6, points out that the "Qumran community" was "but the spearhead of a much wider movement, the Community of the Renewed Covenant, which could boast a much larger membership. The foundation documents recurrently mention 'camps,' viz. communal centers, which this movement maintained in various localities on a countrywide scale." John J. Collins, "Forms of Community in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov* (eds. S. M. Paul, et al; VTSup 94; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 97–111, argues that the term *yahad* does not refer to a single settlement but to an "umbrella union" or network of communities of which Qumran was part. Catherine M. Murphy, *Wealth in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Qumran Community* (STDJ 40; Leiden: Brill, 2001), 3, notes how the occassional contradictions of beliefs and practices, the small size and portability of the manuscripts, the lack of residential space in the "compound," the incongruity of the number of graves and *miqva'ot* with the residential capacity of the site, the presence of affiliated sites in the vicinity and numerous references to those residing in "camps" all point to "a more dispersed social entity, that is, to communities rather than a single community."

[148] Charlotte Hempel, "The Essenes," in *Religious Diversity in the Graeco-Roman World: A Survey of Recent Scholarship* (eds. D. Cohn-Sherbok and J. M. Court; Sheffield: Sheffield

3.4 Qumran, the Essenes, and the Enoch Tradition

The Qumran group was indebted to and the intellectual inheritors of the early apocalyptic tradition.[150] This tradition was not the "common heritage" of all Second Temple Jews,[151] but a stream within Judaism which the Qumran community saw as its spiritual ancestor and regarded as authoritative.[152] It has

---

Academic Press, 2001), 75. Boccaccini, *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis*, 192, points out that "the terms 'Essene' and 'Qumran' have too often been taken as if they were identical and interchangeable, with the result of confusing two overlapping yet distinct historical phenomena." Richard Bauckham, "The Early Jerusalem Church, Qumran, and the Essenes," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls as Background to Postbiblical Judaism and Early Christianity: Papers From an International Conference at St. Andrews in 2001* (ed. J. Davila; STDJ 46; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 65–66, points out "the difference between the generally Essene and the specifically Qumran . . . We have to recognize that we are engaged with a triangular issue, i.e., with the question of relationships between not just two, but three entities: Qumran, mainstream Essenism, and the early church." See also Stegemann, "The Qumran Essenes," 90–92; Capper, "Two Types of Discipleship," 110; Murphy-O'Connor, "Qumran and the New Testament," 63.

[149] Hempel, "The Essenes," 67; Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic*, 332.

[150] Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran*, 199. John H. Hayes and Sara R. Mandell, *The Jewish People in Classical Antiquity: From Alexander to Bar Kochba* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1998), 88, see the Essenes as having produced *1 Enoch* and *Jubilees* and that the Qumran community should be seen as a sect *within* the larger Essene movement. Similarly, James C. VanderKam, "Authoritative Literature in the Dead Sea Scrolls," *DSD* 5 (1998): 401, notes that "It is widely agreed that *1 Enoch*, *Jubilees*, and the Qumran scrolls represent a single stream of tradition in second-temple Judaism." See also Devorah Dimant, "Qumran Sectarian Literature," in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period* (ed. M. E. Stone; Assen: Van Gorcum, 1984), 483–550; "The Qumran Manuscripts," 23–58. Florentino García Martínez and J. T. Barrera, *The People of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (trans. W. G. E. Watson; Leiden: Brill, 1995), 88, argue that the earliest formation of the Essenes cannot be related to the Maccabean crisis because the Aramaic fragments of the *Book of Enoch* found at Qumran lead to the conclusion that these works date back at least to the third century B. C. E. See also Florentino García Martínez and Adam S. van der Woude, "A 'Groningen' Hypothesis of Qumran Origins and Early History," *RevQ* 14 (1990): 521–41; "Qumran Origins and Early History: A Groningen Hypothesis," *FO* 25 (1989): 113–36. García Martínez argues that non-Qumran Essenism was "a much wider and more important phenomenon than the one represented by the Qumran sect." Essenism was "rooted in apocalyptic tradition" (86) and emerged "independent of and earlier than the antiochene crisis" (88). He places the origins of the Essene movement before the Maccabean revolt in a Palestinian environment with its roots in the apocalyptic tradition. He attempts to distinguish between Qumran Essenism and the larger Essene movement by positing that an internal schism occurred in which the Teacher of Righteousness separated from the main body over *halakhic* disputes with an Essene Man of Lies, thereby creating the Qumran community.

[151] Contra Schiffman, *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 400–04.

[152] George W. E. Nickelsburg, "The Books of Enoch at Qumran: What We Know and What We Need to Think About," in *Antikes Judentum und Frühes Christentum: Festschrift*

long been recognized that besides the more explicitly "sectarian" works like 1QS, CD, 1QM, 1QpHab, and 1QH found at Qumran, there are also texts like the *Book of the Watchers*, *Jubilees*, and the *Genesis Apocryphon* which were not composed by the community but which were held in high regard by the community.[153] These texts belonged to an earlier parent-tradition, which the Qumran sectarians knew and borrowed from.[154] Composed at different times, these books are related through "a consistent internal system of literary connections, metaphors, allusions, and quotations."[155]

The *Book of Enoch* (*1 En.*) forms "the core of an ancient and distinct variety of second temple Judaism."[156] The Enoch tradition and Qumran share cosmic dualism, angelology, demonology, a 364-day solar calendar, an anti-Temple orientation, and a distinctive focus on revelation. The Enoch tradition proposed that the origin of evil was to be found in a group of fallen angels,[157] "the function of a primordial heavenly revolt whose results continue to vic-

---

für Hartmut Stegemann zum 65. Geburtstag (eds. B. Kollmann, W. Reinbold and A. Steudel; BZNW 97; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1999), 99–113.

[153] John J. Collins, "'Enochic Judaism' and the Sect of the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *The Early Enoch Literature* (ed. G. Boccaccini; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans), 283–99, esp. 298. On the relationship between the Scrolls and the Enochic tradition, see Pierre Grelot, "L'eschatologie des Esséniens et le livre d'Hénoch," *RQ* 1 (1958): 113–31; Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism*, 1.175–210: García Martínez, "Qumran Origins and Early History: A Groningen Hypothesis," 119; Philip R. Davies, "Three Essene Texts," in *Behind the Essenes: History and Ideology in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (BJS 94; Atlanta: Scholars, 1987), 107–34; "The Prehistory of the Qumran Community," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research* (eds. D. Dimant and U. Rappaport; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 116–25, esp. 123. See especially Józef Tadeusz Milik, *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumrân Cave 4* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1976). David R. Jackson, *Enochic Judaism: Three Defining Paradigm Exemplars* (London: T & T Clark, 2004), 221, argues that "In terms of priority . . . it is not to much that 1 Enoch or Jubilees are works of the Qumran sect, but rather than the Qumran sectarian works are works of 'Enochic Judaism' . . . a thorough investigation of possible interaction between the Christian community . . . and Enochic Judaism and its literature, is therefore suggested as a promising perspective for further research."

[154] On the antiquity of the Enoch tradition and its Babylonian roots, see James C. VanderKam, *Enoch: A Man for All Generations* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1995); *Enoch and the Growth of an Apocalyptic Tradition* (CBQMS 16; Washington, D. C.: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1984); H. S. Kranvig, *Roots of Apocalyptic: The Mesopotamian Background of the Enoch Figure and of the Son of Man* (WMANT 61; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1988); Pierre Grelot, "La géographie mytique d'Hénoch et ses sources orientales," *RB* 65 (1958): 33–69; "La légende d'Hénoch dans les apocryphes et dans la Bible: Origine et signification," *RSR* 46 (1958): 5-26, 181–220.

[155] Boccaccini, *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis*, 12.

[156] Boccaccini, *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis*, 12, supported by Paolo Sacchi, *Jewish Apocalyptic and Its History* (trans. W. J. Short; JSPSup 20; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997).

[157] See John J. Collins, *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (London: Routledge, 1997), 30–51; Sacchi, *Jewish Apocalyptic*.

timize the human race."[158] A major theme of this tradition is the coming judgment in which God will restore the original creation and reverse the misfortunes of the current age. The Enochic tradition posited an alternative view of the origins of evil.[159] This tradition, characterized by its eschatology and emphasis on revealed Wisdom, may have presented itself as "an alternative or rival to the Mosaic Torah."[160] The Enochic tradition may have been perceived as a rival to the Temple through its claim of antediluvian ancestry whereas the Zadokite tradition originated in an age that "was already corrupted after the angelic sin and the flood."[161] The Zadokite priesthood, to the extent that it presumed to be able to mediate atonement for sin, was not only mistaken and impure, but a potential instrument of evil.

The Enochic texts served a number of functions at Qumran.[162] The texts were compatible with the religious thought of the Qumran community. The calendrical material informed their community life and observances. The texts "informed and undergirded the community's high eschatological consciousness," supported its "dualistic cosmology," and its "claims to possess special revelation." The Enochic tradition also provided a scathing critique of the Jerusalem Temple and a theological system of sin and the demonic realm.[163]

There are significant similarities between the Essenes as described in the classical sources and the Enochic tradition(s). Gabriele Boccaccini has identified a number of highly distinctive traits shared in common. For example, the Enoch tradition claimed to have had its origins in a pre-Mosaic priesthood, an ancestral lineage of great antiquity. This idea of an alternative priestly tradi-

---

[158] Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch*, 46. *1 En.* 15.3–7 states that angels took human sexual partners, perverting the divine order, a doctrine of "original sin" remarkably different from the Genesis account. In this tradition, sin originates from the rebellious, fallen angels and Watchers who transgressed the divine order before the Flood and whose offspring continue to cause disease among humankind. Another mythic tradition in *1 En.* (8.1; 9.6; 10.4–8) describes the Watchers wrongly revealing heavenly secrets to humanity (metallurgy, cosmetics, jewelry, magic), the results of which are violence, bloodshed and sexual misconduct. God intended the Flood to correct this, but the original order of creation was not restored, for although the evil angels were defeated by Michael and the offspring of the union of angels and women were killed, their souls continued to roam as evil spirits (*1 En* 15.8–10), causing sickness and disease.

[159] Boccaccini, *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis*, 71, characterizes this as a "nonconformist priestly tradition."

[160] George W. E. Nickelsburg, "Enochic Wisdom: An Alternative to the Mosaic Torah?" in *Hesed ve-Emet: Studies in Honor of Ernest D. Frerichs* (eds. J. Magness and S. Gitin; BJS 320: Atlanta: Scholars, 1998), 123–32, esp. 124. See also "Enochic Wisdom and Its Relationship to the Mosaic Torah," in *The Early Enoch Literature* (JSJSup 121; eds. G. Boccaccini and J. J. Collins; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 81–94.

[161] Boccaccini, *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis*, 74.

[162] Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch*, 109–112.

[163] The Qumran community developed its own distinctive worldview, and placed greater emphasis on the prophets, the covenant, and the Mosaic law than the Enochic tradition, but their intellectual, ideological and theological debts to the earlier tradition are clear.

tion prior to the time of Moses is similar to Pliny's fanciful description of the Essenes existing for thousands of years.[164] Josephus reports that the Essenes studied the "works of the ancients" and that "in them they study the healing of diseases, the roots offering protection and the properties of stones."[165] This list of esoteric subjects correlates to matters revealed by the fallen angels in the *Book of the Watchers* (7.1). Neither Josephus nor Philo mention Enochic traditions, but Essene traditions were indeed based on "books" and the Essenes are described as "zealous in the writings of the ancients," "educated in holy books," the "books of their sect."[166] The Essenes had their own secret books that contained teachings on prophecy, healing and the names of angels: an Essene will "swear that he will transmit their teachings to no one in a way other than as he received them . . . and that he will preserve in like manner both the books of their sect and the names of the angels."[167]

There are also striking similarities between Essene and Enochic pacifism. Philo notes that one will not find "arrows, or javelins, or swords, or helmets, or breastplates, or shields" among the Essenes.[168] In the *Book of the Watchers*, the fallen angel Azaz'el teaches the people how to make "swords and knives, and shields, and breastplates."[169] There are also intriguing parallels with the Essenes' attitude towards oaths and the *Book of the Watchers*.[170] There is also a link between the Enochic writings and the scrolls in their mutual adherence to a 364 day solar calendar as well as a critical attitude towards the Temple.[171] These correspondences suggest that Josephus and Philo describe a group implementing a way of life designed to reverse the evil effects of the fallen angels. The Qumran community inherited and maintained this expectation, but adapted it to their own distinctive ideals of divinely inspired exegesis of Mosaic law and the prophets.

The relationships between Enochic Judaism, mainstream Essenism, and the Qumran community are complex and obscure, and more work needs to be done in this area. Boccaccini proposes that there were two branches of Essenes, both of which he claims originated from an ancient Enochic tradition

[164] *Natural History* 5. 17, 4 (73).

[165] *B.J.* 2.137. The Essenes "search out medicinal roots and the properties of stones for the healing of diseases" (*B.J.* 2.136; *1 En.* 7.1).

[166] *B.J.* 2.136; 2.159; 2.142.

[167] *B.J.* 2.142.

[168] *Quod Omnis Probus Liber Sit* 78.

[169] *Book of the Watchers* 8.1.

[170] *Quod Omnis Probus Liber Sit* 84; *Book of the Watchers*. 6.4–5; 69.16–26. It is also possible to trace Essene reservations about marriage and wealth (*B.J.* 2.120-21; *Quod Omnis Probus Liber Sit* 79, respectively) to Enochic traditions (*1 En*. 8.1; 94.7).

[171] VanderKam notes that the cultic calendar was disturbed during the persecution by Antiochus, indicating that adherence to a traditional solar calendar may not be a mark of sectarian identity. See "The Origin, Character, and Early History of the 364–Day Calendar: A Reassessment of Jaubert's Hypotheses," *CBQ* 41 (1979): 390–411.

with (ideologically) Babylonian roots: "Enochic Judaism" was "the mainstream body of the Essene party" from which the Qumran community, "a radical, dissident, and marginal offspring" emerged.[172] John Collins counters that there is very little evidence of any schism between the Enoch tradition, the Essenes, and the Qumran community. [173] It is not clear whether the Enoch traditions derive from the same circles as the Essenes described by Josephus and Philo, but what is clear is that the Enoch literature is related to the Essene movement, the Essene movement is related to Qumran, and this nexus intersects with the early Jesus movement.[174] Qumran and the Enochic traditions

---

[172] Boccaccini, "Enochians, Urban Essenes, Qumranites," 315–16, concedes that "the gulf between Enochians and Qumranites is too wide to infer a direct sociological link," and argues that the "*intellectual* origins" of the Qumran community are in the Enochic movement. Boccaccini proposes that the relationship between the Enoch group and the Qumran group was somehow mediated by a third group, a "transitional," "[urban] Essene" literature of *Jubilees* that "laid the foundations on which the sectarian literature of Qumran was built. See "Enochians, Urban Essenes, Qumranites: Three Social Groups, One Intellectual Movement," in *The Early Enoch Literature* (JSJSup 121; eds. G. Boccaccini and J. J. Collins; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 316–17. Both the Enochic tradition and the "[urban] Essene tradition parted ways with the more radical wing of Qumran Essenes." The "Enochians," urban Essenes, and Qumranites all belonged to the same (intellectual) movement; sociologically, the Enochians were closer to the urban Essenes; whereas the Qumranites seem to have separated themselves from Enochic theology and the urban Essenes (325). This transitional, "pre-sectarian" (i.e., pre-Qumranic) literature "seems to have many of the characteristics of the Essenes" as described by Philo and Josephus. Boccaccini contends that the Enochic movement lost touch with Qumran but "maintained a closer relationship with the larger Essene movement," and was thus able to influence early Christianity (Boccaccini, "Enochians, Urban Essenes, Qumranites," 320). The early Jesus movement "shows awareness of *both* Enochism and non-Qumran Essenism," but no direct knowledge of Qumran (320).

[173] Collins, "'Enochic Judaism,'" 284, 294. See also John J. Collins, "Enoch, the Dead Sea Scrolls, and the Essenes: Groups and Movements in Judaism in the Early Second Century B. C. E.," in *Enoch and Qumran Origins*, 345–50: "Josephus gives no hint that the existence of the two orders of Essenes was due to a schism. Quite the contrary. He suggests that they differed only with respect to marriage (347)." For Collins, "the two orders of Essenes represented different options within the sect, not dissenting factions." Collins notes that the key points of similarity between the scrolls and the classical sources are found in 1QS. Yet according to Boccaccini's thesis, 1QS was composed *after* Qumran's "break" with mainstream Essenism. 1QS 6.2 refers explicitly to "*all* their places of residence," suggesting that 1QS was meant not only for the Qumran community, but for all "Essenes" throughout Judea/Palestine: the *yahad* is "not a single community, but an association of people who live in many communities (293)." Collins sees the Qumran settlement as a special place designated for more stringent ascetic practice, since both 1QS and CD "envision a network of communities."

[174] Boccaccini, *Beyond*, 188–89, notes that "mainstream Essenism provides a much more intriguing context for Christian origins than that offered by the sectarian literature of Qumran" and that "the clear distinction between mainstream Essenism and Qumran calls for an urgent reassessment of the Essene contribution to Christian origins." On the use of the Enochic tradition in early Christianity, see Hugh Jackson Lawlor, "Early Citations from the Book of Enoch," *JPh* 25 (1897): 164–225; James C. VanderKam, "1 Enoch, Enochic Motifs, and

"provide a Jewish prototype for the early church," a church "conceived in an apocalyptic environment that was also inhabited by John the Baptist, the Qumran community, and the circles that produced the Enochic literature."[175]

3.5 Qumran Messianism

The Qumran community was a "messianic" movement. Messianism plays a central role in the community's central documents of self-definition (1QS, 1QSa, CD) and is inseparable from its apocalyptic and eschatological world-view.[176] Some scholars claim that the small number of messianic texts discov-

---

Enoch in Early Christian Literature," in *The Jewish Apocalyptic Heritage in Early Christianity* (eds. J. C. VanderKam and W. Adler; CRINT 3/4; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1996), 32–101. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch*, 86–87, points out that both the early Christian community and the Enochic authors "believed that they were members of the eschatological community of the chosen constituted by revelation" and that this revelation was to be proclaimed to "all nations," but urges that "The parallels with the Enochic tradition should be noted with caution. The Enochic authors posited some sort of *revealed law* as the touchstone for salvation in the judgment. Nonetheless, the NT notion parallels 1 Enoch more closely than it does the Qumran community, where eschatological awareness did not involve a mission to the Gentiles. The structural similarities between the Enochic and NT notions of eschatology and proclamation deserve closer study." Consequently, we should not necessarily be looking for conclusive evidence of relationship between the early Jesus movement and *Qumran* but rather expanding the horizons of this cultural relationship to extend between the early Jesus movement and the Essenes of Jerusalem, rural and urban Judea, and Palestine.

[175] Nickelsburg, *Ancient Judaism and Christian Origins*, 193, 175: "The matrix of the early church was an apocalyptic wing, or wings, of Judaism, exemplified by the communities attested by the Enochic writings and the Qumran Scrolls." In the Qumran community and scrolls, we find "a first-century Jewish religious community whose worldview and many of whose institutions, theological ideas, and rhetoric anticipate the early church, its institutions, and its theology (174)." For Nickelsburg, the church's "uniqueness" lay in its claim that *Jesus* was "God's transforming eschatological agent, its pursuit of a Gentile mission, and, increasingly, as a corollary of this, its dismissal of most of the Mosaic Torah." Gabriele Boccaccini, "Qumran: The Headquarters of the Essenes or a Marginal Splinter Group?," in *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection* (ed. G. Boccaccini; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 303–09, esp. 309, argues that new approaches differentiate between the mainstream Essene movement and the Qumran community and "now allow us to recognize a close relationship between the Essenes and the Christian movement, while continuing to see many major differences between the New Testament and the sectarian literature of Qumran."

[176] The *Qumran* community was a *priestly* branch of the (Essene) movement that collected, copied, and stored various sacred writings of the community. These sacred books were hidden and kept secret from non-members and so it is no surprise that Josephus, Philo, and Pliny could not tell us much about the eschatological and messianic doctrines of the Essenes. The classical sources do not even mention Essenic messianism or eschatology, but this is to be expected, considering the esoteric nature of these beliefs and, in particular, Josephus' reluctance to endorse apocalyptic or eschatological movements.

ered at Qumran indicates that messianism was relatively unimportant to them. This argument is undermined by the sheer diversity of messianic texts discovered at Qumran and the fact that messianism played a significant role in the earliest formation of the Qumran community and remained a major feature of its religious ideology. The Qumran community believed that they were living shortly before or during the "End of Days" (אחרית הימים).[177] The "End of Days" (1QpHab 2.5) is a central theme of the Qumran worldview: God created the world by divine design, fixed the courses of the heavenly bodies, set the stars in motion and allowed the Two Spirits to remain in conflict until the predetermined *end* of this conflict. The "End of Days" was this last period in a series of divinely determined periods of time.[178] All of world-history was leading up to this period of time.[179] History was seen as a series of "ages" (קצים) beginning with the time before the creation of humanity and ending with "the decreed epoch of new things" (קץ נחרצה ועשות חדשה) (1QS 4.25). This comprehensive periodization of history from creation to the "End of Days" includes all "the ages made by God … Before ever He created them, He determined the works of … age by age. And it was engraved on tablets … the ages of their domination."[180]

---

[177] This term occurs over thirty times in Qumran texts and always in reference to prophetic scriptural interpretation. 4QMMT announces that "this is the End of Days" (4Q394-399) while 4Q174 and 4Q177 4.1 associate the "End of Days" with a time period known as "the time of refining that has come," indicating a period of preparation that has already begun. On the other hand, 1QS describes the community's laws as remaining in effect "until the time of his visitation" (1QS 3.18) and "until the appointed time and the new creation" (1QS 4.25). Yet its addendum (1QSa) is described as a community-rule "for the End of Days," signifying an imminent shift in the community's organization. Furthermore, both 11QMelch and 4Q174 predict the arrival of messianic figures "at the End of Days," which is also known as "the age of visitation" (CD 19.10). See Annette Steudel, "The Development of Essenic Eschatology," in *Eschatology in the Bible and in Jewish and Christian Tradition* (ed. H. G. Reventlow; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 241; Schiffman, *The Eschatological Community of the Dead Sea Scrolls*; Bilhah Nitzan, "Eschatological Motives in Qumran Literature: The Messianic Concept," in *Eschatology in the Bible and in Jewish and Christian Tradition* (ed. H. G. Reventlow; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 133.

[178] Steudel, "The Development of Essenic Eschatology," 231. See also Annette Steudel, *Der Midrasch zur Eschatologie aus der Qumrangemeinde (4QmidrEschat^{a-b})* (STDJ 13; Leiden: Brill, 1994); "4QMidr Esch: 'A Midrash on Eschatology' (4Q174 + 4Q177)," in *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid 18–21 March, 1991* (vol. 2; eds. J. Trebolle Barrera and L. Vegas Montaner; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 531–41; Jean Carmignac, "La Notion d'Eschatologie dans la Bible et à Qumran," *RevQ* 7 (1969): 17–31; Jacob Licht, "Time and Eschatology in Apocalyptic Literature and in Qumran," *JJS* 16 (1965): 177.

[179] Shemaryahu Talmon, "Waiting for the Messiah: The Spiritual Universe of the Qumran Covenanters," in *Judaisms and their Messiahs at the Turn of the Christian Era* (eds. J. Neusner, W. Scott-Green and E. S. Frerichs; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 126.

[180] Vermes, *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls*, 520.

Time was part of God's divine design: "All things are graven . . . on a written Reminder for everlasting ages, and for the numbered cycles of the eternal years in all their seasons."[181] God's creation included "the sacred seasons . . . the cycles of the years and of time everlasting."[182] The natural world, with its rhythms and cycles, the "turning-points" of sunrise, sunset, and the changing seasons were designed "according to a statute engraved forever: at the heads of years and at the turning points of the seasons."[183]

The Qumran community understood that time moved in cycles or ages and this is why they understood their community to be the "new covenant," not because the "old" covenant was being annulled (let alone "abrogated"), but because it was being *renewed.* God's revelations were ongoing and they were (partly) already living in the "new age."[184] The End of Days was not the end of time, but a turning point *in* time, a turning point of cosmological proportions: the renewal of the original design of creation. The community expected a universally new beginning[185] and the conversion of "all the congregation of

---

[181] Hodayot IX, formerly I; Vermes, *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls*, 254.

[182] 1QM 10.15. Vermes, *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls*, 174.

[183] 1QS 10.1–6 quoted from J. H. Charlesworth, et al., *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations*, vol. I: *The Rule of the Community and Related Documents* (Tübingen: Mohr/Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1994), 43.

[184] William S. Lasor, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1972), 93, points out that "the expression, 'the end of the world,' is probably misleading. More accurate would be 'the end of the age,' which is based on the view that there is a succession of ages in the course of redemption-history." Alfred C. Leaney, *The Rule of Qumran and Its Meaning* (London: SCM, 1966), 152, argues that "Jewish eschatological hopes were not centered upon another sphere but on this world, transformed in a new age but still this world." Collins, *The Scepter and the Star*, 105, notes that the term End of Days is "somewhat misleading, since an end of history or of the world is not envisaged. In all the prophetic texts, the reference is rather to the end of one era and the beginning of another." Gaster, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 8: the Essenes were clearly influenced by "a widespread and well-established contemporary belief that the great cycle of ages was about to complete its revolution." Davies, *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 43: they saw themselves as "destined to play a leading part in events that would change history profoundly, that the existing world order would be brought to an end and a new and very different one inaugurated." See also Henning Graf Reventlow, "The Eschatologization of the Prophetic Books: A Comparative Study," in *Eschatology in the Bible and in Jewish and Christian Tradition* (ed. H. G. Reventlow; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 170–71, notes that the End of Days was "a change between two historical periods, not with the contrast between two worlds, a natural and a supernatural one." Schiffman, *The Eschatological Community of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 7: "The old order would soon come to an end . . . The sect lived on the verge of the *eschaton,* with one foot, as it were, in the present age and one foot in the future age. The messianic era would happen in their lifetime." Talmon, "Waiting for the Messiah," 126, points out that they were "standing on the threshold of a new epoch in history, infinitely sublime, but basically not different from preceding stages in actually experienced history."

[185] E. P. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977).

Israel" during the messianic age (1QSa 1.1–6). The *Community Rule*, after all, was only in effect "(עד) *until* the coming of the messiahs" (1QS 9.10).[186]

The origins of Jewish messianism can be traced to the Near Eastern royal ideal of divine kingship,[187] yet it was expressed in multiple ways in the religious and political landscape of Second Temple Judaism.[188] First-century Jew-

---

[186] Nils Alstrup Dahl, "Eschatology and History in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *The Future of Our Religious Past: Essays in Honour of Rudolf Bultmann* (ed. J. M. Robinson; trans. C. E. Carlston and R. P. Scharlemann; London; SCM, 1971), 14, notes that 1QS implies that the community's rules were "understood as interim laws which were not to be changed during the pre-eschatological period." Dahl further argues that "eschatological concepts underwent a change . . . The transformation of the eschatology may be connected with a change in the sociological structure . . . Persons and events are understood in the light of eschatological prophecies, and texts and concepts handed down in the tradition have been reordered on the basis of events. In this process interpretation and re-interpretation are not only things added subsequently to the events in the events themselves eschatological meanings and revisions of meanings must have been added as constitutive factors (19–21)." The idea that the Teacher of Righteousness had fulfilled the role of "prophet" has been supported by Vermes, *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English*, 87; Naphtali Wieder, "The 'Law Interpreter' of the Sect of the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Second Moses," *JJS* 4 (1953): 158–175; Adam S. van der Woude, *Die messianischen Vorstellungen der Gemeinde von Qumran* (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1957), 186; Howard M. Teeple, *The Mosaic Eschatological Prophet* (Philadelphia: SBL, 1957), 54; Frederick M. Strickert, "Damascus Document VII, 10-20 and Qumran Messianic Expectation," *RevQ* 47 (1986): 344; Kurt Schubert, *The Dead Sea Community: Its Origins and Teachings* (trans. J. W. Doberstein; Westport: Greenwood, 1959), 114; David Petersen, *Late Israelite Prophecy* (*SBLMS* 23; Missoula: Scholars, 1977), 101–02; William H. Brownlee, "John the Baptist in the New Light of Ancient Scrolls," 44; Ringgren, *The Faith of Qumran*, 198; Émile Puech, "Messianism, Resurrection, and Eschatology at Qumran and in the New Testament," in *The Community of the Renewed Covenant: The Notre Dame Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (eds. E. Ulrich and J. C. VanderKam; Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1994), 240–241; John J. Collins, "Apocalypticism and Literary Genre in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment* (vol. 2; eds. P. W. Flint and J. C. VanderKam; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 424.

[187] Sigmund Mowinckel, *He That Cometh* (trans. G. W. Anderson; New York: Abingdon, 1954); Dahl, "Messianic Ideas and the Crucifixion of Jesus," 384.

[188] Jacob Neusner, eds., et al, *Judaisms and their Messiahs at the Turn of the Christian Era* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1987); Ithamar Gruenwald, Shaul Shaked and Guy G. Stroumsa, eds., *Messiah and Christos: Studies in the Jewish Origins of Christianity, Presented to David Flusser on the Occasion of his Seventy-Fifth Birthday* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1992); Charlesworth, ed., *The Messiah*; Ekkehard Stegemann, ed., *Messias-Vorstellungen bei Juden und Christen* (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1993). Collins, *The Scepter and the Star*, 189, notes that instead of a single model, "we should think of a spectrum of messianic expectation" ranging from earthly Davidic to transcendent and heavenly pre-existent 'messianic' figures." Fitzmyer, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Christian Origins*, 78; Oegema, *The Anointed King and his People*, 303; Kenneth E. Pomykala, *The Davidic Dynasty Tradition in Early Judaism: Its History and Significance for Messianism* (SBLEJL 7; Atlanta: Scholars, 1995), 271; Martin Karrer, *Der Gesalbte. Die Grundlagen des Christustitels* (FRLANT 151; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990), 243; Marinus de Jonge, "The Use of the Word 'Anointed' in the Time of Jesus," *NovT* 8 (1966): 132–48.

ish messianism was diverse.[189] The messianic texts from Qumran reflect that diversity. A number of studies have identified the dual nature of Qumran messianism and a variety of motifs and figures. Attempts have also been made to delineate historical development.[190] The evidence has not supported such efforts. There are, however, various motifs that reoccur.[191]

1QS and CD refer to a time when the "messiah(s) of Aaron and Israel" will appear.[192] 1QSa is a rule for all "the congregation of Israel" in the last days, when the messiah of Israel (משיח ישראל) will be born (יו[ל]יד).[193] The royal messiah is the "son of God." 1QSa 11–12 refers to the time "when God begets the messiah."[194] This idea seems to be derived from Psalm 2:7, where God declares "You are my son; today I have begotten you." 1QSa reproduces this phrase and serves as a first-century B. C. E. Judean attestation of what was previously assumed to be a pagan/Hellenistic title attributed to Jesus as messiah. Similarly, 4Q174 interprets 2 Samuel 7:11 ("*the Lord declares…I will be his father and he shall be my son"*) as "the Branch of David who shall arise with the Interpreter of the Law [to sit on the throne] in Zion [at the end] of days."[195] 4Q246 ii 1, the Aramaic "Son of God" text, also refers to one who will be named "Son of God" (ברה די אל) and "son of the Most High" (עליון

[189] For a fuller discussion, see Joseph, "'Blessed is Whoever is Not Offended By Me.'"

[190] Jean Starcky, "Les quatres étapes du messianisme à Qumran," *RB* 70 (1963): 481–505.

[191] Collins, *The Scepter and the Star*, 12, proposes four basic messianic paradigms: an anointed/messianic king, priest, prophet, and heavenly messiah.

[192] Both 1QSa and 1QSb were originally attached to the scroll containing 1QS. The second document (1QSa) seems to have been an "annex," "attachment," appendix, or addendum to the earlier rule-book. See John F. Priest, "The Messiah and the Meal in 1QSa," *JBL* 82 (1963): 95–100; Schiffman, *The Eschatological Community of the Dead Sea Scrolls*; H. Neil Richardson, "Some Notes on 1QSa," *JBL* 76 (1957): 108–22; Robert Gordis, "The 'Begotten' Messiah in the Qumran Scrolls," *VT* 7 (1957): 191–94; Philip Sigal, "Further Reflections on the 'Begotten' Messiah," *HAR* 7 (1983): 221–33.

[193] Vermes, *Complete*, 157, dates the text to the mid-first century B. C. E.

[194] Although the left-hand part of the text is damaged, many scholars have reconstructed the last word on line 11 as יו[ל]יד, to "beget" or "engender." See Talmon, "The Concepts of *Mashiah*," 110, n. 73; Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran*, 87; Schiffman, *The Eschatological Community*, 53–54. On the other hand, a strong case has been made for the original reading proposed by D. Barthélemy. See Richardson, "Some Notes on 1QSa," 108–122; Fitzmyer, *Essays on the Semitic Background*, 153, n. 27; John J. Collins, "The *Son of God* Text," in *From Jesus to John: Essays on Jesus and New Testament Christology* (ed. M. C. De Boer; Sheffield: JSOT, 1993), 78-79; Martin Hengel, *The Son of God* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1976), 44; Gordis, "The 'Begotten' Messiah in the Qumran Scrolls," 191–194; Morton Smith, "'God's Begetting the Messiah' in 1QSa," *NTS* 5 (1958-1959): 218–224; Sigal, "Further Reflections on the 'Begotten' Messiah," 221–33. This reading is consistent with the notions of God's begetting of the king in Psalm 2:2, 7 and 2 Sam 7:11–16. Vermes, *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls*, 159, n. 1, notes that the original reading "seems to be confirmed by computer image enhancement."

[195] Vermes, *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls*, 494.

בר). Much of the attention given to this text has been generated from its correspondences to similar titles in Luke 1:32–35:

> He will be great and will be called the *Son of the Most High* (υἱὸς ὑφίστου) therefore the child to be born will be holy; *he will be called Son of God* (υἱὸς θεοῦ).[196]

Luke mentions the Holy Spirit as visiting Mary and Elizabeth and echoes 4Q246, where the Aramaic titles "*Son of God*" and "*Son of the Most High*" refer to a messianic figure. In both 4Q246 and Luke the figures are predicted to inherit an "eternal kingdom." In 4Q246, "His kingdom will be an eternal kingdom" (מלכותה מלכות עלם); in Luke 1:33, "of his kingdom there will be no end." Some scholars think that Luke knew 4Q246 or the tradition from which it emerged.[197] Opinion is divided on the identity of the Son of God,[198] although the consensus seems to be that the figure is "messianic."[199] 4Q246 provides evidence that the royal messiah was understood as the 'Son of God' in some Palestinian Jewish circles.[200]

In 4Q252 (4QPatrBles 5.1–7), a *pesher* on the star prophecy of Genesis 49:10 dated to the first half of the first century B.C.E., the "messiah of right-

---

[196] Fitzmyer, *The Semitic Background of the New Testament*, 105–06, points out that 4Q246 represents "the first attestation of such titles in a clearly Aramaic-speaking context . . . possibly an heir to the Davidic throne."

[197] Brooke, "Qumran: The Cradle of the Christ?," 26: "it seems preferable to consider seriously that Luke 1 was dependent on some such tradition as is found in 4Q246." Collins, *The Scepter and the Star*, 155; J. A. Fitzmyer, "The Dead Sea Scrolls and Christian Origins: General Methodological Considerations," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Christian Faith: In Celebration of the Jubilee Year of the Discovery of Qumran Cave 1* (eds. J. H. Charlesworth and W. P. Weaver; Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 1998), xiii.

[198] Milik, *The Books of Enoch*, 60, 213, 261, associates the figure with Alexander Balas, the Hasmonean king. Fitzmyer, "The Contribution of Qumran Aramaic," 382–407, believes he is a Jewish king, but allows for a messianic reference in the title. David Flusser, "The Hubris of the Antichrist in a Fragment from Qumran," *Imm* 10 (1980): 31–37, claims it refers to an anti-Christ. Florentino García Martínez, "The Eschatological Figure of 4Q246," in *Qumran and Apocalyptic: Studies on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran* (STDJ 9; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 162–79, asserts that this is Michael or Melchizedek. Puech now favors the messianic interpretation. See "246. 4QApocryphe de Daniel ar," in *Qumran Cave 4 XVII. Parabiblical Texts, Part 3* (eds. G. Brooke, et al.; Oxford; Clarendon, 1996), 165–184; Collins, "The *Son of God* Text from Qumran," 65–82.

[199] See James D. G. Dunn, "'Son of God' as 'Son of Man' in the Dead Sea Scrolls? A Response to John Collins on 4Q246," in *The Scrolls and the Scriptures: Qumran Fifty Years After* (eds. S. E. Porter and C. A. Evans; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 209; Craig A. Evans, "Jesus and the Messianic Texts from Qumran: A Preliminary Assessment of the Recently Published Materials," in *Jesus and His Contemporaries: Comparative Studies* (Leiden: Brill, 1995), 107–10; Otto Betz and Rainer Riesner, *Jesus, Qumran and the Vatican: Clarifications* (New York: Crossroad, 1994), 93–97; Kim, *The 'Son of Man' as the Son of God*, 22–25, argues that 4Q246 represents a conflation of the "one like a son of man" from Daniel 7:13 with a messianic interpretation. Similarly, Collins, *The Scepter and the Star*, 167.

[200] Schiffman, *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 344, 342.

eousness” (משיח הצדק) will appear at the End of Days. He will observe “the law with the men of the community.”[201] 4Q161, a *pesher* on Isaiah dated to the first century B. C. E., interprets Isaiah 11:1–4 as signifying that the royal messiah would be born, raised and instructed within the community.

The messianic texts from Qumran attest to the expectation that the messiah(s) would be born within their community and be instructed by its teachers. The royal messiah would be trained by the leaders of the community.[202] 4Q161 interprets Isaiah 11:1 to mean that the royal messiah would be born, raised, and instructed within the Qumran community: “As they teach him, so will he judge.” 4Q252 further informs us that the royal messiah was expected to observe and “keep . . . the law with the men of the Community.”

The Qumran community anticipated the arrival of *two* messiahs and the offices of the priestly and royal messiah were conceived as two distinct roles.[203] These figures were expected to appear at the same time.[204] According to 1QS 9.11, the community was to live by the original laws in which it was first instructed “until the coming of the prophet and the messiahs of Aaron and Israel” (עד בוא נביא ומשיחו אהרון וישראל). Qumran law was thus a *temporary* legal code expected to change when the messiah(s) arrived, allowing for a transformation of the movement during the messianic age. The laws described in CD give “guidance to the sect *only* about how to observe the Sabbath in the current ‘period of wickedness.’”[205] The messianic age was to be an age of transformation that would alter how the community lived and interpreted the law, presumably now instructed by the messiah(s) of Aaron and Israel.

3.6 Conclusion

The Qumran-Essene hypothesis remains the dominant solution to the identity of the Qumran community and those who collected, copied, and composed the (sectarian) Dead Sea Scrolls. The Qumran community was a part of a larger Essene movement that was related to and influenced by the early Enoch traditions. These interrelated movements and traditions were characterized by a heightened sense of eschatology, apocalypticism, and messianism.

---

[201] Gerbern S. Oegema, “Messianic Expectations in the Qumran Writings: Theses on their Development,” in *Qumran Messianism: Studies on the Messianic Expectations in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (eds. J. H. Charlesworth, et al.; Tübingen: Mohr, 1998), 73; Vermes, *Complete Dead Sea Scrolls*, 462–63; Fitzmyer, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Christian Origins*, 87-88.

[202] See Vermes, *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls*, 462–463.

[203] Evans, “Qumran’s Messiah: How Important Is He?,” 147; Talmon, “The Concepts of the *Mashiah*,” 112.

[204] Flusser, *The Spiritual History of the Dead Sea Sect*, 85.

[205] Lawrence H. Schiffman, *The Halakhah at Qumran* (SJLA 16; Leiden: Brill, 1975), 78.

Chapter 4

Q, John the Baptist, and Jesus

4.1 Introduction

The social history of the early Jesus movement, like the narrative structure of Q, begins with John the Baptist.[1] Unfortunately, we know very little about the "historical John."[2] The earliest historical reference to John is Q. Naturally,

---

[1] On the historicity of Jesus' baptism by John, see Meier, *A Marginal Jew*, 2:7; Bultmann, *History*, 47; Sanders, *Jesus and Judaism*, 11; *The Historical Figure of Jesus*, 92–94; Koester, I*ntroduction*, 2.73; Paul W. Hollenbach, "The Conversion of Jesus: From Jesus the Baptizer to Jesus the Healer," *ANRW* 2.25.1 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1982), 198–99; Crossan, *The Historical Jesus*, 11; John P. Meier, *Mentor, Message, and Miracles* (ABRL; New York: Doubleday, 1991), 103; Robert W. Funk and the Jesus Seminar, *The Acts of Jesus: The Search for the Authentic Deeds of Jesus* (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1998), 54. As non-historical, see Morton S. Enslin, "John and Jesus," *ZNW* 66 (1975): 1–18; Ernst Haenchen, *Der Weg Jesu: Eine Erklärung des Markus-Evangeliums und der kanonischen Parallelen* (2d ed.; Berlin: De Gruyter, 1968), 58–63; F. Gerald Downing, *Jesus and the Threat of Freedom* (London: SCM, 1987), 154. Clare K. Rothschild, *Baptist Traditions and Q* (WUNT 190; Tübingen: Mohr, 2005), 6, notes that Q has "a pronounced Baptist *Tendenz*."

[2] Ernst Bammel, "The Baptist in Early Christian Tradition," *NTS* 18 (1972): 95–128; Jürgen Becker, *Johannes der Täufer und Jesus von Nazareth* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1972); Jean Daniélou, *The Work of John the Baptist* (Baltimore: Helicon, 1966); Martin Dibelius, *Die urchristliche Überlieferung von Johannes dem Täufer* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1911); A. S. Geyser, "The Youth of John the Baptist: A Deduction from the Break in the Parallel Account of the Lucan Infancy Story," *NovT* 1 (1956): 70–75; Paul W. Hollenbach, "Social Aspects of John the Baptist's Preaching Mission in the Contexts of Palestinian Judaism," *ANRW* II.19.1 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1972), 850–75; Carl H. Kraeling, *John the Baptist* (New York: Scribner, 1951); Hermann Lichtenberger, "Reflections on the History of John the Baptist's Communities," *FolOr* 25 (1988): 45–49; Ernst Lohmeyer, *Das Urchristentum I: Johannes der Täufer* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1932); Jerome Murphy O'Connor, "John the Baptist and Jesus: History and Hypothesis," *NTS* 36 (1990): 359–74; John Reumann, "The Quest for the Historical Baptist," in *Understanding the Sacred Text: Essays in Honor of Morton S. Enslin on the Hebrew Bible and Christian Beginnings* (ed. J. Reumann; Valley Forge: Judson, 1972), 181–99; J. Schütz, *Johannes der Täufer* (Zürich: Zwingli, 1967); Charles H. H. Scobie, *John the Baptist* (London: SCM, 1964); Jean Steinmann, *Saint John the Baptist and the Desert Tradition* (New York: Harper, 1958); W. Barnes Tatum, *John the Baptist and Jesus: A Report of the Jesus Seminar* (Sonoma: Polebridge, 1994); Wolfgang Trilling, "Die Täufertradition bei Matthäus," *BZ* (1959): 271–89; Robert L. Webb, *John the Baptizer and Prophet: A Socio-Historical Study* (Sheffield: JSOT, 1991); "John the Baptist and his Relationship to Jesus," in *Studying the Histori-*

this makes Q's portrait of John pivotal in any reconstruction of the Baptist's role in the early Jesus movement. Yet John's relationship to Jesus is complex and paradoxical: Jesus presumably came to John for baptism, and thus seems to have been a member of John's movement at one time, yet John and Jesus also seem to be on equal footing; other times John is subordinate to Jesus.

4.2 The Role of John the Baptist in Q

A major section of Q (3–7) addresses John and Jesus' relationship and the nature and significance of their respective identities. Q 3:2b–3a, 3:7–9 and 3:16b begin with a description of the ministry, preaching, and eschatological expectations of John. Here the threat of an imminent judgment echoes the Deuteronomistic view of history characteristic of the secondary redaction of Q.[3] This inner-Jewish polemic against national pride and covenantal privilege resembles the attitude "of the Qumran covenanters who regarded themselves as part of the reconstituted 'remnant of Israel'" while other Jews were seen as the "men of the lot of Belial" or the "wicked of Israel."[4] Q 3:7–8 also uses the theme of eschatological reversal as a rhetorical warning to "Israel."

In Q 3:16b–17, John predicts the imminent arrival of "the Coming One" (ὁ ἐρχόμενος) who will baptize with (Holy) Spirit and fire. Q thus casts John in the role of a prophet who announces judgment, calls Israel to repent, and proclaims the arrival of a powerful figure who will dispense both judgement and eschatological renewal.[5] But did John expect a human being or God as "the one who is to come?" It would seem, at first, due to the figure bestowing a "(Holy) Spirit" and the threshing floor imagery,[6] that "John's expected figure

---

cal Jesus: Evaluations of the State of Current Research (eds. B. D. Chilton and C. A. Evans; Leiden: Brill, 1994), 179–229; "Jesus' Baptism by John: Its Historicity and Significance," in *Key Events in the Life of the Historical Jesus: A Collaborative Exploration of Context and Coherence* (WUNT 247; eds. D. L. Bock and R. L. Webb; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009), 95–150; Walter Wink, *John the Baptist in the Gospel Tradition* (Cambridge, 1968); "Jesus' Reply to John: Matt. 11:2–6/Luke 7:18–23," *Forum* 5 (1989): 121–28. William Arnal, "Redactional Fabrication and Group Legitimation: The Baptist's Preaching in Q 3:7–9, 16–17," in *Conflict and Invention: Literary, Rhetorical, and Social Studies on the Sayings Gospel Q* (ed. J. S. Kloppenborg; Valley Forge: Trinity Press International, 1995), 165–80, argues that we cannot even be sure that John prophesied judgment, since this is part of Q's Deuteronomistic redaction.

[3] Judgment is a major, if not dominant theme in Q (3:7–9, 3:16–17, 10:12–15, 13:34–35, 11:31–32, 49–51, 12:39–40, 17:23–34, 12:42–46, 19:12–27).

[4] Kloppenborg, *Formation of Q*, 106, quoting 1QS 2.4–5 and 1QpPs 37.3.12. Although neither Q or Qumran precluded the possibility of the repentance of fellow Jews, neither can be said to have been "particularly optimistic over the fate of its countrymen."

[5] Webb, "Jesus' Baptism by John: Its Historicity and Significance," 121.

[6] Isa 27:12–13; Jer. 13:24, 15:7; Mal. 4:1; Wis. 5:23.

was most likely understood to be God himself."[7] John, however, compares the expected figure to himself (as one "mightier than I"). Furthermore, John states that the figure wears sandals (Mark 1:7; Q 3:16). Finally, in Q 7:22, John considers Jesus a potential candidate for the role. It would seem that "John indicated that his expected figure was other than God,"[8] whether that role be attributed to Jesus, the "son of man," or a Davidic messiah.[9] There is no real tension between the arrival of God's judgment and the particular agent authorized to implement that judgement.[10]

John's expectation of an imminent judgment recalls Malachi's "Day of the Lord" (Mal 3:19) which foresees a time when Elijah will appear and God will purify Israel with fire (3:19). In a composite citation (Ex 23:20/Mal 3:1), Q 7:27 implicitly identifies John as the *fulfillment* of Malachi 3:1:

> This is the one about whom it has been written: 'Look, I am sending my messenger ahead of you, who will prepare your way in front of you.'

Q casts John in the role of messenger while Jesus is identified as the "Coming One." John is the prophetic "forerunner" and guarantor of Jesus' identity.[11]

The author(s) of Q obviously held John in high regard: he is, like Jesus, a "child of Wisdom" (Q 7:35), "more than a prophet" (Q 7:26) and the greatest of all human beings (Q 7:28). Yet from the very beginning of the early Jesus movement, Jesus' baptism by John was a problem.[12] Why, after all, does Jesus submit to baptism by John, especially a baptism for the forgiveness of sins? In Matthew, John already knows who Jesus is. This is not explained and is "somewhat problematic."[13] Matthew also subordinates John to Jesus and mitigates the embarrassment as an appeal "to fulfill all righteousness." Luke downplays the issues by narrating John's arrest (Luke 3:19–20) before Jesus' baptism, thus distancing John and Jesus. The Gospel of John does not mention Jesus' baptism at all. There is a trajectory, therefore, of downplaying the event, which indicates "the early church's increasing discomfort with Jesus'

---

[7] See Paul G. Bretscher, "Whose Sandals? (Matt 3:11)," *JBL* 86 (1967): 81–87; Hartwig Thyen, "ΒΑΠΤΙΣΜΑ ΜΕΤΑΝΟΙΑΣ ΕΙΣ ΑΦΕΣΙΝ ΑΜΑΡΤΙΩΝ" in *The Future of Our Religious Past: Essays in Honour of Rudolf Bultmann* (ed. J. M. Robinson; trans. C. E. Carlston and R. P. Scharlemann; London: SCM, 1971), 131–68, esp. 136; Ernst, *Johannes*, 50, 305.

[8] Webb, "Jesus' Baptism by John: Its Historicity and Significance," 123.

[9] For the Davidic messiah, see Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 1:313–14; James D. G. Dunn, "Spirit-and-Fire Baptism," *NovT* 14 (1972): 81–92, esp. 89–92; Scobie, *John*, 72–73. For the "son of man," see Becker, *Johannes*, 34–37; Ernst Lohmeyer, *Johannes der Täufer* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1932), 157–60; Kraeling, *John the Baptist.*

[10] Webb, "Jesus' Baptism by John: Its Historicity and Significance," 124, cites *Pss. Sol.* 17:1–3 to illustrate how God as the causal agent performs deeds through an intermediary.

[11] According to the Gospels, John's role was "to prepare the way of the Lord" in the wilderness, a role which is generally interpreted as preparing the way of the "messiah."

[12] Taylor, *The Immerser*, 262.

[13] Webb, "Jesus' Baptism by John: Its Historicity and Significance," 105, n. 21.

baptism by John."[14] It was not invented by the author of Q, let alone the early "church,"[15] yet John figures so prominently in the Gospels about *Jesus*. Why is John given so much importance in the Jesus tradition?

Q 7:26–27 describes John as "*more* than a prophet?" (περισσότερον προφήτην). But if *John* is more than a prophet, what does that make Jesus? Some scholars think that Q is here referring to *the* eschatological prophet, the prophet of the end-time. Yet this would still make John *a* prophet, even if the final prophet.[16] Q seems to suggest something "more" of John than prophecy, something that may have once put him on more equal footing with Jesus, as their parallel and interrelated ministries suggest.[17] Neither John or Jesus can be limited to the role of "prophet" in Q.[18]

The question that must be asked is exactly what role *did* John play in the early Jesus movement? The Gospels agree that John proclaimed the coming messianic age in the wilderness of Judea.[19] John anticipated the arrival of the "Coming One."[20] At the same time, Q qualifies John's authority by subordinating him to Jesus. John is carefully demoted to a position *below* Jesus even though it would seem that Jesus came to John for baptism. At an early stage in the tradition, John seems to be Jesus' (near-) *equal*; later, he is subordinated, yet retained, as if he was too important a figure in the earliest tradition to dispense with altogether. Nonetheless, there is no evidence of competition between the two nor is there any evidence for a sustained or radical break between Jesus and John.[21] On the contrary, it is Jesus' own estimation of John, as preserved in Q 7:26–28, that best explains John's eminent position.[22]

---

[14] Webb, "Jesus' Baptism by John: Its Historicity and Significance," 106.

[15] Joachim Jeremias, *New Testament Theology: The Proclamations of Jesus* (trans. J. Bowden; London: SCM, 1971), 45. Jeremias points out how Jesus' baptism was such a "scandalizing piece of information" that it could not have been invented by the Church.

[16] Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God*, 161: "From a strictly historical point of view . . . we are bound to see John as more than simply an oracular prophet."

[17] Tuckett, *Q*, 129–30.

[18] Bruce Chilton, "John the Purifier," in *Judaic Approaches to the Gospels* (ISFCJ 2l; Atlanta: Scholars, 1994), 1–37, 16, cogently argues that we should "remove the prophetic mantle from John" as apologetic and tendentious.

[19] Brownlee, "John the Baptist in the New Light of Ancient Scrolls," 52.

[20] Although some scholars argue that John expected *God* as the "Coming One," John refers to this imminent figure as wearing *sandals*.

[21] Ben Witherington III, "John the Baptist," in *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels* (eds. J. B. Green and S. McKnight; Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1992), 389: "it has sometimes been thought that the New Testament reflects an anti-Baptist polemic, based on the assumption that the Christian movement saw the Baptist movement as a competitor."

[22] Wink, *John the Baptist in the Gospel Tradition*. In Matthew, Jesus appears before John for baptism although John admits that it is *he* who should be receiving the baptism. Jesus insists and tells John to perform the baptism "to fulfill all righteousness."

John's role in Q is to predict and inaugurate Jesus' arrival. Similarly, Jesus seems to have viewed John's ministry as an eschatological "turning point" between the era governed by the "law and the prophets" and the presence of the kingdom (Q 16:16).[23] Both John and Jesus are interrelated in the eschatological timetable of Q. John is consistently portrayed as Jesus' predecessor and John's Gospel even describes Jesus (or his disciples) performing baptisms at the same time as John, which suggests that their ministries were understood to be compatible and complementary,[24] John's baptismal ministry *paralleling* the baptism to be performed by the "Coming One."[25] It would follow then that the two ministries are to be understood as related.[26] Q's John and Jesus are "colleagues, rather than rivals."[27] In Q 7:33–34, John and Jesus' ministries are described by Q's use of a "ἦλθεν formula," emphasizing their equality:[28]

> ἦλθεν γὰρ Ἰωάννης μὴ...ἐσθίων μήτε πίνων, καὶ λέγετε δαιμόνιον ἔχει.
> ἦλθεν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐσθίων καὶ πίνων καὶ λέγετε ἰδοὺ
> ἄνθρωπος γάγος καὶ οἰνοπότης τελωνῶν φίλος καὶ ἁμαρτωλῶν.

> For John *came*, neither eating or drinking, *and you say* he has a demon.
> The son of man *came*, eating and drinking, *and you say*, look!
> A glutton and a drunkard, a friend of tax collectors and sinners!

Q 7:35 portrays Jesus and John as parallel figures; they are *both* "children of Wisdom":

---

[23] Horsley, *Jesus and the Spiral of Violence*, 196.

[24] Webb, "John the Baptist and His Relationship to Jesus," 193.

[25] John 3:22–24 describes Jesus as baptizing. Several explanatory models have been proposed: (1) Jesus had a baptizing ministry with his own disciples distinct from John or possibly as a rival to John (see Sanders, *Jesus and Judaism*, 92; as a rival as portrayed in John's Gospel, see Wink, *John*, 94); (2) Jesus' baptizing is aligned with John's (see Meyer, *The Aims of Jesus*, 122; Jerome Murphy-O' Connor, "John the Baptist and Jesus: History and Hypotheses," *NTS* 36 (1990): 359–74; Hollenbach, "The Conversion of Jesus," 1.204–06); and (3) Jesus began baptizing with John but they separated over (theological?) differences (see Scobie, *John*, 153–56; Goguel, *Jean-Baptiste*, 235–74). Webb, "Jesus' Baptism by John: Its Historicity and Significance," 137–39, finds the second model the most probable, concluding that "the two men viewed themselves as working together."

[26] Webb, "John the Baptist and His Relationship to Jesus," 194: "As the term 'baptize' is used to refer to John's physical activity of baptizing, so it is also used metaphorically to refer to the expected figure's activity. This invites a comparison between the functions of their two baptisms. For example, they both cleanse. John's baptism is used to express conversionary repentance and the expected figures' baptism with holy spirit might be understood to complete the conversion." See also Witherington III, "John the Baptist," 384. See especially Matt 11:16–19/Luke 7:31–35 and Mark 11:27–33. As Witherington notes, "Jesus expresses his own purpose and authority by comparing and contrasting himself with John and suggesting they are part of a single effort by God to reach his people."

[27] Kloppenborg Verbin, *Excavating Q*, 122. Jacobson, "Wisdom Christology," 94–98, argues that anti-Baptist "polemic" is later than the view of John and Jesus as colleagues.

[28] Holmén, "Knowing about Q and Knowing about Jesus," 507.

καὶ ἐδικαιώθη ἡ σοφία ἀπὸ τῶν τέκνων αὐτῆς.
But Wisdom was vindicated by her children.

As "children (τέκνων) of Wisdom," John and Jesus are also "sons of God," which in Jesus' case is subsequently heightened whereas in John's case it is subordinated to Jesus and those in the kingdom. This tendency towards parallelism is continued in the synoptics.[29] Q presupposes that both John and Jesus have been rejected by "this generation" (Q 7:31–35). Luke identifies John and Jesus as *cousins*.[30] John and Jesus seem to have worked together for the redemption of Israel. Based on John's presence in Q, John's relationship to Jesus is an early part of the tradition and stories relating the two developed together from the very beginning of that tradition.[31] Both were popular figures leading popular reform movements and both were perceived as subversive and threatening to the priesthood and the Herodian/Roman authorities.[32]

4.3 John and the Essenes

The relationship between John, the Essenes, and/or Qumran has long intrigued New Testament scholars. First, the geographical site of John's baptism in the Judean desert seems to have been remarkably close to the Qumran community. Second, according to Luke, John belonged to a priestly family, but was raised "in the desert" until his appearance or manifestation in Israel.[33] Similarly, the Qumran Essenes were a priestly wing of the Essene movement

[29] In Q 7:31–35, Mark 6:17–29 and 14–15, both John and Jesus are arrested, bound, executed and laid in a tomb. In Luke 1:5–25, 57–80 and Luke 1:26–38 and 2:1–52, the infancy narratives of John and Jesus mirror each other. In Matthew 3:2 and 4:17, Jesus and John both proclaim the same message.

[30] According to Luke 1:36, John's mother Elizabeth was related to Jesus' mother, and so John was Jesus' cousin. Based on the criteria of dissimilarity and embarrassment, this identification *may* be historical as Luke would have preferred not to emphasize Jesus' family relationships and blood-kinship to John.

[31] Wink, *John the Baptist in the Gospel Tradition*, 71–72.

[32] Horsley and Hanson, *Bandits*, 172–73, see John as a solitary "oracular prophet." Webb, "Jesus' Baptism by John: Its Historicity and Significance," 128, however, points out that "several streams of evidence point to the alternate conclusion that John was a leadership popular prophet" and "the leader of a movement" since his baptism was an initiatory rite and Josephus suggests group formation (*A.J.* 18.118). As a popular prophetic figure critical of the authorities, John was probably executed for reasons not unlike those offered by Josephus: namely, that he was a potentially threatening and subversive political figure attracting a great deal of attention and popular loyalty. Chilton, "John the Purifier," has rightly pointed out that the category of a "solitary"/"public" prophet is a contradiction in terms.

[33] According to Luke 1:80, John "grew up in the desert till the day of his manifestation to Israel." Some scholars think that John may have been reared among the Essenes.

known to adopt orphans and young children into their community.[34] Third, each of the Gospels use Isaiah 40:3 to explain why John was in the desert, i.e., to "prepare the way of the Lord."[35] Similarly, the Qumran community used Isaiah 40:3 to refer to their activity in the desert (1QS 8.12–16). Fourth, like the Essenes, John was not married and seems to have been a priest. Fifth, John is reported to have eaten locusts and wild honey. CD 12.13–14 describes how to prepare locusts for consumption. Sixth, like Jesus, John criticizes the Pharisees and the Sadducees,[36] but not the Essenes, which is strange, considering his geographical proximity to one of their community centers. Seventh, John's preaching about an imminent eschatological judgment and the arrival of a "Coming One" is reminiscent of Qumran eschatology. Eighth, both John and the Qumran Essenes used immersion as an act of purification accompanied by moral repentance, and both baptisms exceeded ritual purification by initiating the repentant into a community of the "true Israel."

These parallels have led many to conclude that John was a member of the Qumran Essene community.[37] Others have accepted the hypothesis that John may *at one time* have lived among the Essenes.[38] Others agree that there must

---

[34] Josephus, *B.J.* 2.120.

[35] Mark1:3, Matt 3:3, Luke 3:3–6, John 1:23.

[36] Matt 3:4–10; Luke 3:7–14.

[37] Daniel R. Schwartz, *Studies in the Jewish Background of Christianity* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1992), 3. William H. Brownlee, "John the Baptist in the New Light of Ancient Scrolls," in *The Scrolls and the New Testament*, 33–53: "the ideas of John's later preaching have so much kinship with Essene thought as to suggest that he lived among the Essenes as a boy" and that it was "intrinsically possible that John had been reared by the Essenes." Fitzmyer, *Responses to 101 Questions on the Dead Sea Scrolls*; "The Dead Sea Scrolls and Christian Origins: General Methodological Considerations," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Christian Faith: In Celebration of the Jubilee Year of the Discovery of Qumran Cave 1* (eds. J. H. Charlesworth and W. P. Weaver; Harrisburg, Trinity Press International, 1998), 19; Flusser, *Judaism and the Origins of Christianity*, xix: "John the Baptist was surely a non-orthodox Essene . . . the Essene elements in Jesus' message may well have originated from his personal contact with John the Baptist."

[38] J. M. Oesterreicher, "The Community of Qumran," in *The Bridge* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1956), 91–134; Duncan Howlett, *The Essenes and Christianity* (New York: Harper, 1957); Davies, *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls*; A. S. Geyser, "The Youth of John the Baptist," *NovT* 1 (1956): 70; James D. G. Dunn, *Baptism in the Holy Spirit* (London: SCM, 1970). Otto Betz, "Was John the Baptist an Essene?" *BR* 18 (1990), 18, argues that "the Baptist was raised in this community . . . but that he later left it to preach directly to a wider community of Jews." Kurt Schubert, *The Dead Sea Community: Its Origins and Teachings* (trans. J. W. Doberstein; Westport: Greenwood, 1959), 126–28, notes that "John the Baptist was undoubtedly in close contact with the teachings of the Qumran Essenes . . . it is inconceivable that there was no contact between the two . . . he may have lived with the Qumran Essenes." See also Lasor, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament,* 152. James H. Charlesworth, "John the Baptizer and Qumran Barriers in Light of the Rule of the Community," in *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Refomulated Issues* (eds. D. W. Parry and E. Ulrich; Leiden: Brill, 1999),

have been some form of direct contact between John and the Essenes.[39] This is not to imply that the idea that John was an Essene is by any means a scholarly consensus. On the contrary, a number of scholars see substantial differences between John and the Essenes and conclude that there was no contact between the two.[40] For example, it has been suggested that even if John was

---

356, argues that "the similarities between John the Baptizer and the Qumranites are too impressive to be dismissed as merely an example of a shared milieu." Joachim Jeremias, *New Testament Theology: The Proclamations of Jesus* (trans. J. Bowden; London: SCM, 1971), 43; Raymond E. Brown, "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament," in *John and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. James H. Charlesworth; New York: Crossroad, 1990), 5.

[39] Charles Fritsch, *The Qumran Community* (New York: Macmillan Co., 1956), 113–14; Ethelbert Stauffer, *Jesus and the Wilderness Community at Qumran* (trans. H. Spalteholz, Philadelphia: Fortress, 1964), 7; Jean Danielou, *The Work of John the Baptist* (trans. J. Horn; Baltimore: Helicon, 1966), 38; Jean Steinman, *Saint John the Baptist and the Desert Tradition* (trans. M. Boyes; London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1958), 59; Jack Finnegan, *Light from the Ancient Past* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1959), 293; Raymond E. Brown, "Second Thoughts, the Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament," *ExpT* 10 (1966): 19–23; Leonard F. Badia, *The Qumran Baptism and John the Baptist's Baptism* (Lanham: University Press of America, 1980), 38. Pierre Benoit, "Qumran and the New Testament," in *Paul and Qumran* (ed. J. Murphy-O'Connor; Chicago: Priory, 1968), 6: "the content of his preaching and the proximity of his sphere of activity to the Dead Sea all suggest that some form of connection existed between the Precursor and the community at Qumran." Yigael Yadin, *The Temple Scroll: The Hidden Law of the Dead Sea Sect* (New York: Random House, 1985), 240: John "not only knew the Essenes but may also have been a member of the community for a period."

[40] See R. Kenneth Hanson, *The Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York: Harper & Row, 1961), 108–09; Scobie, "John the Baptist," 58, 66; John A. Robinson, "The Baptism of John and the Qumran Community," *HTS* 50 (1957): 176–77; Oscar Cullmann, "The Significance of the Qumran Texts for Research into the beginnings of Christianity," *JBL* 74 (1955): 219. Rothschild, *Baptist Traditions and Q*, 77–78, regards John's relationship to the community of the Scrolls as "fallacious," although she admits that John "probably shared certain practices in common with this group(s); naming only a few: dietary concerns, ablutions, priestly lineage, the sharing of property, and an exegetical interest in Isa 40:3a." Rothschild argues that these "associations" must "neither be overstated, nor overlooked. Making too much or too little of purported links between John and the Qumran documents has won commentators on both sides due criticism." Similarly, Adela Yarbro Collins, "The Origin of Christian Baptism," *StudLit* 19 (1989): 28–46, esp. 52, argues that these features "were not unique to John and the community at Qumran. The differences are at least equally striking: a priestly, exclusive community versus the activity of a prophetic, charismatic leader in a public situation; a ritual practiced at least once daily versus an apparently once and for all ritual; and a self-enacted ritual versus a ritual administered by John." See also Walter Wink, "John the Baptist and the Gospel," Th.D. diss. (New York: Union Theological Seminary, 1963), 75–103; Webb, *John the Baptizer*, 351, n. 4; "John the Baptist," *EDSS*, 1:418–21; Webb, "Jesus' Baptism by John: Its Historicity and Significance," 130: "concrete evidence of John's membership in the Qumran community is lacking. And even if John had been a member at one time . . . one would be forced to conclude that John had broken away from them. Thus while an intriguing hypothesis, it remains speculation." Chilton, "John the Purifier," 21, 26, argues that "The practice of regular ablutions at Qumran shows that Bannus, John the Baptist, and the Pharisees were in

once a member of the Qumran community, the public nature of his ministry can be contrasted to that of the Essenes' withdrawal from the corruption of society.[41] Other scholars have rightly pointed out that physical proximity alone does not require direct influence, contact, or relationship.[42] Similarities could also be regarded as evidence of "a common milieu."[43] It is true, of course, that John's baptisms, unlike those of the Qumran group, appear to have been public ritual performances.[44] Both John and Jesus seem to have commenced public ministries to the people of Israel and it was because their ministries were popular that they were perceived as political threats.

Objections to relating John to the Essenes may underestimate the fact that Qumran Essenism was only one form of the Essene movement. Moreover, this was a movement poised in anticipation of an eschatological transformation.[45] Therefore, if by "Essene" one means a reclusive, anti-social community of celibate hermits living in isolation at Qumran, then no, John should not be identified as an Essene. On the other hand, if John's mission was to prepare the people of Israel for the arrival of a "Coming One," then the question of John's relationship to the Essene movement may need to be re-examined.

Josephus may shed some additional light on John's ministry. Josephus tells us he delivered persuasive "sermons" (*A.J.* 18.118). In both Josephus and the synoptics, John is ὁ Βαπτιστής (the Baptist or the Baptizer).[46] He is "a good

---

no sense unique, or even unusual, in their insistence upon such practices. But the entire direction of Essene practice, the interest in the actual control of worship in the Temple, appears unlike John's." The idea that John was raised by the Essenes is "an exercise in hagiography."

[41] Witherington, "John the Baptist," 384.

[42] Joan E. Taylor, *The Immerser: John the Baptist within Second Temple Judaism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 15–48, esp. 48.

[43] Taylor, *The Immerser*, 25. According to Taylor, John was a "loner," had no disciples (what about Jesus?), and "nothing suggests that John wished to found a sect." Consequently, the scriptural use of Isaiah 40:3 means nothing because "Only if the interpretation is precisely the same can we suppose that the two may have been linked." J. Ian H. McDonald, "What Did You Go Out to See? John the Baptist, the Scrolls and Late Second Temple Judaism," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Their Historical Context* (ed. T. H. Lim; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 2000), 53–64, notes that John's wilderness setting, appeal to Isaiah 40:3, ascetic diet, ritual immersion and priestly background are similar to Qumran orientations, but dismisses attempts to portray John as a member of the community as "facile comparisons," (61) "special pleading" (59) and "Speculative Identifications" (54). Arguing that "similarities do not prove identity and must be balanced by dissimilarities," (61) McDonald's John is simply "a significant figure in the religious and political life of late Second Temple Judaism (64)."

[44] Badia, *The Qumran Baptism and John the Baptist's Baptism*, 38.

[45] Charlesworth, "John the Baptizer," 375, argues that the similarities between John and Qumran suggest *direct* relationship, yet John "refused full initiation because of the institutionalized hatred" of the order and thus "*seems to be* one of the Sons of Dawn who was expelled from, or better left, the Qumran Community. . . John the Baptizer was not an Essene, but he had been almost fully initiated into the *yahad*."

[46] Matt 3:1, 11:1, 14:2, 8, 16:14, 17:13; Mark 6:25, 8:28; Luke 7:20, 33, 9:19.

man" (ἀγαθὸς ἀνήρ) who preaches virtue and calls to baptism and righteousness, but whose popularity among the masses led Herod to put him to death. For John, virtue, righteousness and piety (ἀρετή, δικαιοσύνη and εὐσέβει) are prerequisites for baptism's efficacy before God (*A.J.* 18.117). Josephus describes John as having such great powers of speech that the crowds "were aroused to the highest degree by his sayings (καὶ γὰρ ἤρθησαν ἐπὶ πλεῖστον τῇ ἀκροάσει τῶν λόγων)," for he had an "eloquence that had so great an effect on men (τὸ ἐπὶ τοσόνδε πιθανὸν αὐτοῦ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις)."[47]

There are striking terminological parallels between Josephus' account of John the Baptist and his account of the Essenes.[48] Josephus tells us that John

> exhorted the Jews to lead virtuous lives, *to practice justice towards their fellow men* and *piety towards God*, and so doing to join in baptism.
>
> τοῖς Ἰουδαίος κελεύοντα ἀρετὴν ἐπασκοῦσιν καὶ τὰ πρὸς ἀλλήλους δικαιοσύνῃ καὶ πρὸς τὸν θεὸν εὐσεβείᾳ κρωμένοις βαπτισμῷ συνιέναι

In Josephus, John exhorts Jews to practice justice towards their fellow men and piety towards God. Josephus tells us that a new Essene initiate swore[49]

> First that he will practice *piety towards God*
> πρῶτον μὲν εὐσεβήσειν τὸ θεῖον
>
> and next that he will observe *justice towards their fellow men*[50]
> ἔπειτα τὰ πρὸς ἀνθρώπους δίκαια φυλάξειν

Josephus uses *the same phrase* to describe both John's ministry and Essene practice.[51] There is another parallel between John's ministry and the Essenes as described in the classical sources. In Q 3:7–9, John warns the crowds to "bear fruit worthy of repentance." Pliny describes the Essenes as long-lived because "so *fruitful* for them is the *repentance* which others feel for their past lives" (*tam fecunda illis aliorum vitae paenitentia est*).[52] Here the "fruits" of repentance represent a key feature of both movements.

The Essenes were well known, not as anti-social outcasts, but as prophets who used their oracular powers in the socio-political arena throughout the

[47] *A.J.* 18.118. See Josephus, *Jewish Antiquities*, Books XVIII–XIV (trans. L. H. Feldman; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, repr. 1996).

[48] Hermann Lichtenberger, "The Dead Sea Scrolls and John the Baptist: Reflections on Josephus' Account of John the Baptist," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research* (eds. D. Dimant and U. Rappaport; STDJ 10; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 340–46.

[49] Among the Essenes, purification baths were allowed after a year; after an additional two years, the initiate swore oaths: the same moral values that John exhorted Israel to follow.

[50] *B.J.* 2, 137–142.

[51] On the other hand, Josephus does seem to have used this pair of attributes as a formula to describe many of Israel's leaders, for example of David (*A.J.* 7. 338, 341, 356, 374, 384), Abijah to Jeroboam (8.280), Josaphat (9.16), Jotham (9.236) and Simon the Just (12:43).

[52] *Natural History* 5.73.

Second Temple period.[53] Josephus portrays John as a political figure whose arrest and execution seem to have been calculated political decisions made by Herod Antipas out of fear of John's growing authority over the people:[54]

> Many others came in crowds about him; for they were greatly moved or pleased by hearing his words; Herod, who feared lest the great influence John had over the people might put it into his power and inclination to raise rebellions (for they seemed to do anything he should advise), thought it best, by putting him to death, to prevent any mischief he might cause.[55]

John's arrest and execution suggest that he was far more than a harmless and reclusive prophet in the wilderness. His popularity and authority seems to have been considered a direct threat by Herod Antipas, and considering that John was widely regarded as a prophet, prophesied the arrival of an eschatological "Coming One," as well as the fact that he had a large following and was critical of Israel, and possibly the Jerusalem establishment, it seems appropriate to characterize John's arrest and execution as political acts. But why did John have such "great influence" over the people?

The location and symbolic impact of John's baptism are significant. John's baptismal activity "in the wilderness" was located alongside a major thoroughfare situated at an old trade route that crossed the Jordan.[56] John's baptism took place on the *east* side of the Jordan and echoed the biblical tale of Joshua's entry into the Promised Land. This may have been intended to be a prophetic announcement signifying not only the arrival of a "new covenant" and the need for immediate purification through ritual baptism, but the imminent arrival of a new Joshua (Jesus) to lead Israel into the "Promised Land."

According to Josephus, John's baptism was intended for the purification of the body (*ἀλλ ἐφ 'ἁγνείᾳ τοῦ σώματος*) *after* the soul had been purified by righteous living. Josephus also describes the Essene baptismal rites as "purification" (*ἁγνεία*) (*B.J.* 2, 129; *A.J.* 18,19). John's baptism closely resembles the Essene rite.[57] John, like the Essenes, did not necessarily offer baptism as a way of *gaining* forgiveness of sins; rather, he offered water purification *after*

---

[53] In three different examples, Josephus tells us of Essenes who used their prophetic powers in a political context: Judas the Essene in the time of the Hasmonean Antigonus (*B.J.* 1, 78–80; *A.J.* 13.311–313); Menachem the Essene during the time of Herod the Great (*A.J.* 15.372–379); and Simon the Essene during Archelaus' reign (*B.J.* 2.111; *A.J.* 17.345–348).

[54] Josephus adds to our knowledge of John's socio-political influence, although Josephus' agenda is anti-eschatological and anti-messianic. See Richard Horsley, "Popular Messianic Movements Around the Time of Jesus," *CBQ* 46 (1984): 471–95; Richard Horsley and John S. Hanson, *Bandits, Prophets, and Messiahs: Popular Movements in the Time of Jesus* (NVBS; Minneapolis: Winston, 1985), 88–134; Webb, *John*, 310–12, 333–48.

[55] *A.J.* 18.5.2.

[56] Stegemann, *The Library of Qumran*, 213.

[57] There is no evidence that John's baptism was a one-time only rite, and thus no evidentiary basis on which to *contrast* John's baptism(s) and the multiple immersions of the Essenes. Baptism, of course, did become a one-time only rite for later gentile Christians.

repentance had been made.[58] John was also insisting that his baptism was not only for proselytes, but necessary for *all of Israel*, implying that the entire nation needed repentance and purification, a position characteristic of the Qumran community.[59] By encouraging Jews to "come together" for baptism, John was not only calling his audience to gather together and form a kind of cohesive group but using baptism as the means by which the group could identify itself.[60] John's baptism seems to have functioned as a kind of eschatological initiation into the "true Israel."[61] John's baptism seems to have been a creative adaptation of ritual purification for the people of Israel and, like the Qumran (Essene) rites, it is likely that such immersions could be taken frequently.[62] According to the Gospels, John's baptism was limited to water whereas that of the "Coming One" would be a baptism with (Holy) Spirit and fire.

According to 1QS 4.20–21, the Holy Spirit *itself* cleansed and purified ("like a sprinkling of water") which was then physically sealed and realized by the immersion and purification ritual. Once instructed in the Two Spirits, initiates pledged to remove themselves from impurity and wickedness and were cleansed "by the Holy Spirit of the Community (וברוח קדושה ליחד) . . . cleansed of all his sins. And by the spirit of uprightness and humility, his sin is atoned" (1QS 3.7–8). The Holy Spirit served as a purifying agent, mediating atonement between God and the community. According to 1QS, it is "by the Holy Spirit (וברוח קדושה) that he can be cleansed from his iniquities" (1QS 3.7). The "Holy Spirit" itself could cleanse, a purification then completed by immersion. In 1QS 4.20–21 God is said "to purify him by the Holy Spirit (ברוח קדושה) from all works of wickedness, and sprinkle upon him the Spirit of Truth (רוח אמת) like purifying water." The "Holy Spirit" and the "Spirit of

[58] Burrows, *More Light on the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 59, noted that "John may have been closer to the 'Essenes' of Qumran than the Gospels indicate."

[59] Badia, *The Qumran Baptism and John the Baptist's Baptism*, 37, argues that "the originality of John would be in his insistence that this rite be applied, not only to proselytes, but to persons who were born Jews. If so, this would imply that the whole nation was apostate and sinful" and yet "this severe indictment of Jewish society as utterly corrupt and as outside the pale of God's people is precisely characteristic of the Essenes."

[60] Robert L. Webb, "John the Baptist and His Relationship to Jesus," in *Studying the Historical Jesus: Evaluations of the State of Current Research* (eds. B. D. Chilton and C. A. Evans; Leiden: Brill, 1994), 196.

[61] Webb, "John the Baptist and His Relationship to Jesus," 194.

[62] Bruce D. Chilton, *Judaic Approaches to the Gospels* (Atlanta: Scholars, 1994), 26–27, notes that "ablutions in Judaism were characteristically repeatable, and Hebrews must argue against the proposition that one may be baptized afresh. Only the attribution to John of later, catholic theology of baptism can justify the characterization of his baptism as symbolic of a definite 'conversion.'" Joseph M. Baumgarten, "The Purification Liturgies," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment* (eds. P. W. Flint and J. C. VanderKam; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 206–07: "'ritual' participation was held to be a prerequisite of prophecy by the Essenes."

Truth" work together to purify the repentant, i.e., it is not the *water* that cleanses, but rather God's Holy Spirit present within the community.[63] CD describes how God "made known to them his Holy Spirit through his Anointed" (CD 2.12), which seems to associate a messianic figure as the "bearer of the Spirit."[64] Purification by the Holy Spirit is a *Qumranic* conception, but here we have John predicting the arrival of one who will come *with* the Holy Spirit to *complete* the purification John commenced. John's public ministry of baptism was preparatory for the baptism by the Holy Spirit for the people of Israel to be conducted by the "Coming One."

4.4 "More Than A Prophet"?

John and Jesus appear to have been complementary, parallel figures mutually dedicated to the redemption of Israel. Like the function of the ritual immersion at Qumran (1QS 2.25–3.9, 5.7–15), John's baptism seems to have been a (symbolic) initiatory rite into "true Israel."[65] John preached and conducted baptisms in the Judean wilderness by the Jordan river, a location highly symbolic of the Exodus and Conquest narrative.[66] Yet whereas traditional ritual bathing tended to be self-administered, in the Jesus tradition it is *John* who baptizes, which makes John's ministry mediatorial.[67] John's role is analagous

---

[63] Joseph M. Baumgarten, "The Purification Liturgies," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment* (eds. P. W. Flint and J. C. VanderKam; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 211. Daily life at Qumran involved common meals, the study of the law, and community-prayer services (1QS 6.3–8). Purification baths preceded the meals which were, if not sacral in character, at least imbued with the sanctity of a purified atmosphere.

[64] Fitzmyer, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Christian Origins*, 21.

[65] Webb, "Jesus' Baptism by John: Its Historicity and Significance," 118, notes that this "initiatory rite" into "true Israel" has "corporate" implications: "John was calling his audience to gather together into some form of group, and baptism was the means (120)." In support of "initiatory," see Scobie, *John the Baptist*, 114–16; Oscar Cullmann, "The Significance of the Qumran Texts for Research Into the Beginnings of Christianity," in *The Scrolls and the New Testament*, 215; Goguel, *Jean Baptiste*, 291, Bo Ivar Reike, "The Historical Setting of John's Baptism," in *Jesus, the Gospels, and the Church: Essays in Honor of William R. Farmer* (ed. E. P. Sanders; Macon: Mercer University Press, 1987), 209–24, esp. 214–19; Webb, *John*, 133–62. Contra "initiatory," see Becker, *Johannes der Täufer und Jesus von Nazareth*, 38–40; Kraeling, *John*, 119–20; Ernst, *Johannes*, 340, Goppelt, *Theology*, 1:35. Webb, "Jesus' Baptism by John," 115, further points out that John's baptism was "an expression of conversionary repentance" in light of a coming judgment, a demand to live more ethically (*Ant.* 18.117; Q/Lk 3:10–14).

[66] Webb, *John*, 181–83, 360–66.

[67] Webb, "Jesus' Baptism by John: Its Historicity and Significance," 114. Baptism "mediated forgiveness" (Mark 1:4); it was necessary along with the repentance for true atonement. So John is "a mediator of the forgiveness (116)." See also Leonhard Goppelt, *Theology of the New Testament* (2 vols.; trans. J. E. Alsup; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1981–82), 1:36; Jürgen

to the "mediatorial role of a priest in performing a sacrifice to mediate forgiveness in the sacrificial system." John's baptism can also be seen "as a protest against the Temple establishment."[68] Q 3:7–9 addresses the "Pharisees and Sadducees" and that the Qumran community also used immersions for forgiveness in conjunction with their criticism of the Temple.[69]

John's role has been demoted in the Jesus tradition. John may have been considered, by Jesus and his own followers, as "more than a prophet." John's followers may have seen him as a "messianic" figure.[70] Some Jews believed that John may have been the messiah.[71] Some Jewish Christian groups continued believing in John's messianic identity even after Jesus' ministry.[72]

John	*Jesus*
"More than a Prophet"	"The One Who Is To Come"
"Child of Wisdom"	"Child of Wisdom"
Disciples	Disciples
Eschatological Inauguration	Eschatological Fulfillment
Baptizes with Water	Baptizes with Fire/Holy Spirit
Zadokite/Priest (?)	"Anointed" by the Spirit
Moral Reform	Moral Reform
Polemic aginst Pharisees, etc.	Polemic against Pharisees, etc.
Political Execution	Political Execution

The most distinctive feature of Qumran messianism is the expectation of *two* messiahs: a royal and a priestly figure. Considering that John is widely regarded as a candidate for affiliation with the Essenes, the idea that John may have been regarded as a "priestly messiah" deserves careful consideration.[73]

Becker, *Johannes der Täufer und Jesus von Nazareth* (BibS[N] 63; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1972), 38–40.

[68] Webb, "Jesus' Baptism by John: Its Historicity and Significance," 120.

[69] Webb, *John*, 175–78, argues for Matthew's reading being original to Q.

[70] Witherington III, "John the Baptist," 385: "Given that all messianic movements in early Judaism had some social and political repercussions . . . it is easy to see how John the Baptist . . . could have been viewed as some sort of messianic figure." Oscar Cullmann, "The Significance of the Qumran Texts for Research into the Beginnings of Christianity," *JBL* (1955): 213, suggested that "during Jesus' lifetime, John's disciples seem to have become a sort of rival sect" since they believed that John was the messiah. Brownlee, "John the Baptist," 46, suggests that considering the close connections between Essene thought in 1QS and John's Gospel, "one may *almost* say that in John's portrayal of Jesus we have the Essene Christ. That being so, the same would be expected with regard to the Baptist."

[71] John 1:9-22, 25; Luke 3:15, Acts 13:25.

[72] In the Pseudo-Clementine *Recognitions*, a late second or early third century Jewish Christian text, John's disciples are said to have believed that John was the messiah (*Rec.* 1.60). See William R. Farmer, "John the Baptist," *IDB* (1962): 1.955–62. The Mandeans also trace the origins of their community to John.

[73] Lucetta Mowry, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Early Church* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962), 164, points out that since John was a priest, he "could be regarded as fulfilling the hopes of those looking for a Messiah from the tribe of Levi." This clearly pre-

According to Luke, John came from a priestly family.[74] His role as ὁ Βαπτιστής parallels the mediating role of "a priest in performing a sacrifice to mediate forgiveness in the sacrificial system."[75] He exhorts the people of Is-

---

sents the "possibility that John, by his mission and message . . . must have attracted certain sectarians to his circle of followers. To give their allegiance to John would have required a minimal alteration of their hopes for the appearance of a priestly Messiah." See also Hugh J. Schonfield, *The Essene Odyssey: The Mystery of the True Teacher and the Essene Impact on the Shaping of Human Destiny* (Shaftesbury, Dorset: Element, 1984), 5. Regarding dual messianism at Qumran, Klaus Berger, J*esus and the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Truth under Lock and Key?* (trans. J. S. Currie; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1995), 82–83, points out that "it is possible to ask whether the relationship between John the Baptist and Jesus might not be better understood in light of such expectations. For it is striking that Jesus and the evangelists assume no competition between the Baptist and the Messiah/Son of man, but rather allow both to stand with high position next to each other. John the Baptist is portrayed as the son of a priest (son of Zechariah) and is thus of Aaronic extraction. And he almost has something of a parallel appearance with Jesus . . . in the infancy stories in Luke's Gospel the 'priestly' John is again and again sketched in parallel form to Jesus . . . It could thus be argued that by means of his consistent parallel portrayal Luke wanted to 'uncover' at least the expectation that took into account a priestly and a Davidic Messiah . . . However, among Christians the appraisal is the reverse of that in Qumran. In Luke the Davidic Messiah takes absolute precedence over the priestly one. But it becomes clear to what a great extent Christians themselves retain here the same expectations as are present in Qumran." Taylor, *The Immerser*, 24, asserts that "John's putative priestly descent means nothing" in terms of his relationship to the Essenes.

[74] Webb, "John the Baptist and His Relationship to Jesus," 207. According to Luke, John was the son of a priest named Zechariah who served in the Temple. According to Luke, an angel tells John's mother Elizabeth that John is to be "great in the sight of the Lord, and shall drink neither wine nor strong drink. He will also be filled with the Holy Spirit." This would have made John a Nazirite from birth. Chilton, "John the Purifier," 22, dismisses the "motif" of John's priesthood and notes that "John well may not have been a priest: the claim that he was is weakly attested (Luke 1:5), and made within the same complex of material which asserts that Jesus was related to him" (25). Chilton is correct, of course, that the John traditions in Luke are not very reliable, but John's eschatological program of public purification does suggest a "crossing over" into a new way of being. It is not difficult to see this as providing a means of "atonement." Chilton criticizes "The notion that John somehow opposed the cult in the Temple" as "weakly based. The argument is sometimes mounted that, because John preached a baptism of repentance for the forgiveness of sins, he challenged the efficacy of sacrificial forgiveness" (21). Chilton rightly criticizes the view of a widespread "baptist movement" and notes that "Such assertions invoke a supposed dualism between moral and cultic atonement which simply has no place in the critical discussion of early Judaism" (21). In any case, this alleged "repentance" motif "may in any case represent the anachronistic assignment to John of an element of the language of catechesis within early Christianity" (22). Josephus doesn't mention "for sins" but for purification of the body (*A.J.* 18.117). Consequently, Webb's proposal that John sought to found a sect like the Essenes is undermined by the fact that "There is no evidence whatever that baptism for John constituted an initiation, comparable to the ceremony for novices at Qumran."

[75] Webb, "John the Baptist," 191–92: "Since a person was baptized 'by John' rather than performing the rite for themselves, John could be considered a mediator of the forgiveness. The mediatorial role of 'the baptizer' in performing baptism to mediate forgiveness is parallel

rael to repent for their sins and be purified.[76] He has the authority to call to baptism. Anyone offering baptism for the "forgiveness of sins" was essentially saying that such a baptism was a substitute for the Temple cult.

Jesus' baptism by John may explain the early church's embarrassment that Jesus needed to be baptized by John, since the scrolls confirm that such a subordinate relationship between the two messiahs was appropriate.[77] John's relationship to Jesus may be compared to the Qumran belief that the Davidic messiah would be subordinated to the priestly.[78] Nowhere else in the New Testament is *anyone* identified on an equal footing with Jesus. This is distinctive of Q.[79] Q both preserves and subverts John's place in the Jesus tradition.

Luke's infancy-narrative also contains an exalted portrayal of John as a kind of "wonder-child" (1:16–17) destined to "prepare the Way." The people of Israel rejoice at John's birth because it signifies the day of redemption (Luke 1:46–55). These pre-Lukan traditions underlying Luke's infancy narrative may describe John as the messiah of Aaron.[80] These traditions, perhaps originating from John's disciples, may have considered John and Jesus to be the two messiahs from Aaron and Israel.[81] They were "co-redeemers, co-deliverers, the dual instruments of God's salvation."[82]

---

to the mediatorial role of a priest in performing a sacrifice to mediate forgiveness in the sacrificial system . . . This parallel is striking in light of the New Testament tradition that John came from a rural priestly family."

[76] Webb, *John the Baptizer and Prophet*, 203–05, notes that John's "activity of offering a baptism for forgiveness out in the desert presented a clear alternative to the Temple."

[77] The scrolls confirm these roles by actually stating that the messiah of Israel would defer to the priestly messiah. In 4Q161, the messiah of Israel recognizes the priestly authority of the Essene priests, which is not at all unlike Jesus' submitting to John's baptism in order "to fulfill all righteousness." The Gospels themselves mirror the dual messianism of the scrolls in their unanimous acceptance of John's significance in heralding Jesus' mission. Howlett, *The Essenes and Christianity*, 165, notes that "The fatal flaw in every theory that seeks to make Jesus an Essene is that he was baptized by John the Baptist . . . If Jesus had been an Essene, he would have been baptized upon confession, unto the remission of sins, and within the order. As a baptized Essene he would not have felt the need of being baptized by John."

[78] Kurt Schubert, *The Dead Sea Community: Its Origin and Teachings* (trans. J. W. Doberstein; Westport: Greenwood, 1959), 130: "when the Davidic Jesus comes to the priest John at the Jordan and subjects himself to his baptism for the forgiveness of sins, this must necessarily create the impression that he subordinated himself to the latter."

[79] Jacobson, "Wisdom Christology," 227.

[80] Wink, *John the Baptist in the Gospel Tradition*. James Tabor, *The Jesus Dynasty: A Hidden History of Jesus, his Royal Family, and the Birth of Christianity* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2006), has also suggested that John was the priestly messiah.

[81] Wink, *John the Baptist*, 78.

[82] Wink, *John the Baptist*, 74: "the strongest indication that a 'two-messiahs' view may lie behind Luke 1–2 is the manner in which the annunciation, conception, birth, rejoicing, circumcision, naming, greeting and growth of John are placed parallel to those of Jesus." Similarly, Brown, *The Birth of the Messiah*, 283, has pointed out that although "there were two

According to Walter Wink, this "two-messiahs" theology was "suppressed" in the traditions underlying Luke 1-2 because it was viewed as "heretical" once Jesus became the one and *only* messiah.[83] As a result, John's ministry became that of a "forerunner," a precursor to Jesus.[84] Few scholars consider this peculiar parallelism between John and Jesus, a parallelism that begins in Q but continues through Luke, to be anything more than literary ornamentation.[85] Yet John *was* a Zadokite priest.[86] Consequently, it is certainly possible that (at least some) Essenes regarded John as a priestly messiah.

It is true that Q portrays John as Elijah (Q 7:27).[87] Mark and Matthew also portray John as a figure like Elijah,[88] showing that they accepted that Elijah's return would precede that of the "messiah." Interestingly, Elijah himself has been associated with an eschatological *priestly messiah* in rabbinical Jewish traditions. In the Targumim and the Talmud, Elijah is referred to as a "high priest" descended from the house of Aaron.[89] Rabbinical speculation on Elijah

---

salvific figures, each proclaiming the imminence of God's eschatological action and each dying a martyr's death, after having had contact with each other during their ministries and having shared a certain harmony of thought . . . there was a tendency among Christians to reinterpret these almost parallel careers by subordinating" John to Jesus.

[83] Wink, *John the Baptist*, 76.

[84] Wink, *John the Baptist*, 72: "few writers have asked whether the parallelism between John and Jesus in the infancy narrative may have originated out of just such a belief."

[85] Brown, *The Birth of the Messiah*, 267, (erroneously) argues that John could not have been a priestly messiah because "there is no evidence of his having had a Zadokite lineage."

[86] According to Luke 1:5, John's father *was* "of the course of Abijah, the eighth course of the sons of Zadok" (1 Chron. 24:10). See Wink, *John the Baptist in the Gospel Tradition*, 74. Of all the sons of Levi, only the sons of Zadok had preserved the sanctuary when Israel went astray (Ezek. 44:15; 48:11). Therefore they alone are allowed to minister before the Lord at his altar (Ezek. 40:46). In Luke's gospel, it is one of these 'sons of Zadok' who received the revelation that his own son will inaugurate the messianic age (Luke 1:6). By transmitting this peculiar information about John's father being of the priestly course of Abijah, Luke has shown that John could quite plausibly be understood as one of the "sons of Zadok."

[87] As did the early church (Mark 9:11–13, Matt 11:14, 17:10–12, Luke 1:17). Yet the idea that Elijah would come as the forerunner of the messiah is not necessarily a Christian idea, as in Mark 9:12, where John the priestly (Elijah) is described as "coming first to restore all things." A fragment from Qumran Cave 4 (4Q558) has the words "therefore I will send Elijah be[fore]" and 4Q521 may associate Elijah with the commencement of the messianic age.

[88] Bultmann, *History*, 124–25; Koester, *Introduction*, 2:71; Robert Macina, "Jean le Baptist était-il Élie?: Examen de la tradition néotestamentaire," *POC* 34 (1984): 209–32; Georg Richter, "'Bist du Elias?' (Joh. 1, 21)," *BZ* n.s.6 (1962): 79–92, 238–56.

[89] Taylor, *The Immerser*, 286, argues that Elijah appears as a priestly figure in the Targum where the messenger figure from Malachi appears as the priest Phineas, the grandson of Aaron. Elijah is referred to as "a 'high priest,' a view that may derive from 1 Kgs. 18:30–39, where Elijah builds an altar and offers sacrifice. In Christian tradition John is identified with Elijah and is also a priest (Luke 1:5). There is evidence from Qumran that a priestly teacher was expected who would 'atone for all the sons of his generation' (4Q541 9). The messiahs of Aaron and Israel both atone for sin in CD 14.19. In 4Q541 it is said of the atoning figure that

held that he belonged "to the tribe of Levi. He is the High Priest of the Messianic age. He is thus a colleague of the Messiah rather than his forerunner."[90] Justin Martyr also refers to a second (if not first-) century Jewish belief that the "messiah" must be anointed and proclaimed as such by Elijah.[91]

The high priest's role and function was to mediate the covenant between God and Israel, to announce "the word of God to the people, who bow down in obeisance."[92] The Essenes, however, considered the high priesthood in Jerusalem as corrupt and illegitimate. Furthermore, John's polemic against the priestly establishment at the Jerusalem Temple suggests that John's baptism functioned as "a protest against the Temple establishment."[93]

The Essenes sought to fulfill the priestly function of atonement through *alternative* forms (the community itself was a Temple); John's baptism was a new form of atonement offered to the people of Israel: a priestly rite of purification and atonement for sin intended as an alternative to the sacrificial system in Jerusalem.[94] This located both him and Jesus in the midst of a politically charged conflict with the Temple administration. It is not surprising that John appears in sayings where John and Jesus are paralleled with the prophets sent to Israel with a message of repentance and judgment (Q 7:31–35; 11:49–51; 13:34–35), nor that they shared the same fate in their public lives.

4.5 Conclusion

The Gospels portray John as a prophetic forerunner to Jesus, but this is a *demotion* of John's historical role, which was, at the very least, a ministry preceding, complementary, and parallel to Jesus' ministry. In Q, John the Baptist is the forerunner, the guarantor, the one who authorizes and legitimates Jesus' identity. Yet he is also "more than a prophet" and the greatest of all human beings. In Luke, John is a Zadokite priest. In Q, he predicts the imminent arrival of the end time to be inaugurated by the "Coming One," and baptizes Jesus. His ministry parallels and complements Jesus' ministry. In the Gospels, his disciples become Jesus' disciples. These factors support the identification of John as a "priestly messianic" figure.

---

he will suffer at the hands of people who spread lies about him." Schonfield, *The Essene Odyssey*, 39, refers to *Bab. Mets.* 114b and *Midr. Tehill* xliii.1 to argue that Elijah appears in the Talmud as a priest ("Elijah the Just") descended from the house of Aaron.

[90] Manson, *The Sayings of Jesus*, 69.

[91] *Dialogue with Trypho* 8, 49, 110.

[92] Baumgarten, *The Flourishing of Jewish Sects*, 117.

[93] Webb, "John the Baptist and His Relationship to Jesus," 197.

[94] John denied that he was *the* messiah, but this denial may have been intentional, considering the public confusion it might have caused among those expecting a *single* messiah.

Q's account of John is widely regarded as historical bedrock. Despite the embarrassment that John's significance to Jesus caused, John is firmly embedded in the early Jesus tradition. This early, authentic attestation points to the following conclusion: John and Jesus were parallel, complementary figures in the earliest tradition, with John perhaps having once held a (quasi-) superior role. Different strands of tradition – some attesting to John's superiority to Jesus, others attesting to Jesus' superiority to John, still others placing Jesus' disciples above John – were never removed, but remain in tension with each other. The fact that Jesus describes John as "*more than* a prophet" in Q supports the hypothesis that John was seen as a "messianic" figure. John's messianic authority was quickly undermined and subverted, although the engimatic attribution *remained*: John is "*more than* a prophet." Luke describes John and Jesus as cousins, and John as a Zadokite priest. Considering that the Qumran community was composed of Zadokite priests in conflict with the Temple and that the relationship between the Qumran community, the Essenes, and John continues to be debated, it seems likely that John proposed baptism as an alternative to the illegitimate atonement offered in the Temple. Like the Qumran community, John seems to have believed that the Temple and priesthood had been defiled and an alternative was needed. Consequently, John may have been identified as a "priestly messiah" by (some of) the Essenes and/or the Qumran community. John's baptism *functioned* as a priestly alternative to the atonement available in the Temple and his political engagement, in keeping with his role, ultimately led to his political execution.

Chapter 5

The Eschatological Wisdom of the Beatitudes

5.1 Introduction

Jesus and John are "Wisdom's children" (Q 7:35).[1] Wisdom sends out prophets who are rejected.[2] Wisdom weeps for her people who refuse to listen to Jesus as an agent of wisdom. Jesus is a revealer of wisdom. The Inaugural Sermon, which includes the beatitudes, teachings on loving your enemies, non-violence, the golden rule, unconditional love, compassion, non-judgment and discipleship, is a major component of Q 3–7. Q identifies Jesus as something *more* than Solomon, with all his wisdom.[3] Like the authors of Q, the Qumran members were familiar with the wisdom traditions of Israel.[4] Qumran was a kind of "Wisdom community."[5] The community was founded by a "*Teacher* of Righteousness" whose wisdom was esoteric insight into divine mysteries applied to his community and times.[6] A prominent figure in the community was the *maskil* (משכיל), "he who imparts wisdom," and his function was to provide instruction to members of the community. He was authorized to give words of blessings[7] and expected to live by as well as promote

---

[1] Graham Stanton, "On the Christology of Q," in *Christ and Spirit in the New Testament* (eds. B. Lindars and S. S. Smalley; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973), 38, cites Q 7:35, Q 10:21, Q 11:49–51, and Q 13:34–35 as representative of Q's preoccupation with the figure of Wisdom. The group may have actually claimed that Wisdom was now dwelling in their community.

[2] Q 11:49–51; 13:34–35.

[3] Q 11:31–32.

[4] John J. Collins, Gregory E. Sterling and Ruth A. Clements, eds., *Sapiential Perspectives: Wisdom Literature in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the Sixth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 20–22 May, 2001* (STDJ 51; Leiden: Brill, 2004); Daniel J. Harrington, *Wisdom Texts from Qumran* (New York: Routledge, 1996); "Ten Reasons Why the Qumran Wisdom Texts are Important," *DSD* 4 (1997): 245–54. The Dead Sea Scrolls include all the canonical Wisdom texts from the Hebrew Bible, including Sirach, portions of the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, unknown psalms and a number of sectarian or non-canonical texts, such as 4Q525, 4QInstruction, 4Q184, 4Q185, 4Q302a, 4Q424, 4Q434–7, and 4Q510–11.

[5] John E. Worrell, "Concepts of Wisdom in the Dead Sea Scrolls," Ph.D. dissertation, The Claremont Graduate School, 1968, 121.

[6] Worrell, "Concepts of Wisdom in the Dead Sea Scrolls," 383.

[7] 1QSb 1.1, 3.22, 5.20.

the community's rules.[8] The Teacher was more than a common sage: he was "a divine revealer."[9] The most common wisdom genre at Qumran was the instruction.[10] The Qumran community possessed a number of instructional books and wisdom teaching is pervasive within its sectarian texts.[11] Both 1QS and CD are "manuals" intended for instruction in the community and both contain sapiential sections using vocabulary taken from wisdom literature.[12]

Q and 1QS share numerous features.[13] Both set out "the two ways."[14] Both texts are "rule-books" for their communities and preserve the teachings of their founders as well as "the present ordering, experience and hope of the community."[15] 1QS is a composite document, with 1QS 3.13–4.26 being a sapiential insertion,[16] a "sort of overall amorphous constitution which is reminiscent of student notes in random review of a master."[17] Similarly, in CD, the first section begins with an exhortative address, references to personified Wisdom[18] and typical sapiential expressions.[19] The Qumran community was clearly familiar with the feminine personification of divine Wisdom.[20] In addition, a number of wisdom figures appear in the scrolls.[21]

---

[8] 1QS 9.12, CD 12.20.

[9] Worrell, "Concepts of Wisdom in the Dead Sea Scrolls," 173.

[10] Harrington, *Wisdom Texts from Qumran*, 81-82: "the most prominent literary genre among the Qumran wisdom texts is the instruction or admonition in which the sage instructs either an individual or a group – and sometimes both."

[11] Harrington, *Wisdom Texts from Qumran*, 119.

[12] In 1QS, there is frequent mention of wisdom, understanding, truth, right-teaching and knowledge. Moreover, sapiential literary devices and forms, such as parenesis, apodictic exhortation and catchword or-idea composition can be found in this composite document.

[13] N. T. Wright, *The New Testament and the People of God*, vol. 1: *Christian Origins and the Question of God* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992), 439–40.

[14] 1QS 3.13–4.26.

[15] Wright, *The New Testament and the People of God*, 440, notes that 1QS offers "excellent evidence that the divisions made in the Q material by Kloppenborg and others have no real basis in the actual history of first-century religion." Q, "if it existed, must have been this sort of book."

[16] 1QS's "Two Spirits" is a composite insertion that differs in vocabulary, style and content from the rest of 1QS. Interestingly, the Spirit of Truth functions like Wisdom does in other wisdom traditions and the life lived in following the Spirit of Truth is similar to that achieved in following Wisdom.

[17] Wright, *The New Testament and the People of God*, 161.

[18] CD 1.1, 2.2, 14.

[19] CD 2.3.

[20] See 4Q525; Sirach, Proverbs. In the Psalms Scroll from Cave 11, Wisdom is the Teacher (3.13, 9.13), as in Sir 51. See James A. Sanders, *The Psalms Scroll of Qumran Cave 11* (DJD 4; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1965).

[21] Worrell, "Concepts," 358, regards such figures as characters "to whom an uncommon wisdom is imputed or whose characteristics include accentuated sapiential attributes."

5.2 The Eschatological Wisdom of 4QInstruction

The most remarkable Wisdom text at Qumran is 4QInstruction,[22] "a wisdom instruction expressed in small units and put together without much apparent concern for logical or thematic progression."[23] In form and content it is similar to Sirach, Proverbs, Egyptian wisdom writings and Q. 4QInstruction frequently refers to the concept of reward and punishment at the judgment and contains numerous "symbolic uses of scripture." It also begins, like Q, with "a cosmic and eschatological theological framework"[24] and contains several sections which make use of agricultural imagery,[25] referring to plowmen, baskets, barns, fruits, trees, gardens, and the harvest.[26] Throughout the text, a teacher gives instructions for every stage of life. The "elect" are given insight into mysteries and knowledge hidden from others.[27] Like Q, one of 4Q-Instruction's central themes is concern for "the Poor" (אביון), and while a direct literary relationship between Q and 4QInstruction cannot be affirmed, the main theme of 4QInstruction is the expectation of an imminent "mystery that is to come" (רז נהיה) while the author of Q is at some pains to prove that Jesus fulfils the role of "the one who is to come" (ὁ ἐρχόμενος).[28]

Based on the high number of manuscript copies found at Qumran, 4Q-Instruction was evidently important to the Qumran community.[29] The esoteric

[22] Daniel J. Harrington and John Strugnell, "Qumran Cave 4 Texts: A New Publication," *JBL* 112 (1993): 490–99, esp. 492–94; Daniel J. Harrington, "Wisdom at Qumran," in *The Community of the Renewed Covenant: The Notre Dame Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (eds. E. Ulrich and J. VanderKam; Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1994), 137–52; Torleif Elgvin, "Admonition Texts from Qumran Cave 4," in *Methods of Investigation of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Khirbet Qumran Site: Present Realities and Future Prospects* (eds. M. O. Wise, et al; New York: Academy of Arts and Sciences, 1993), 137–52; "Wisdom, Revelation, and Eschatology in an Early Essene Writing," in *Society of Biblical Literature 1995 Seminar Papers* (ed. E. H. Lovering; Atlanta: Scholars, 1995), 440–63; "The Reconstruction of Sapiential Work A," *RQ* 16 (1995): 559–80.

[23] Harrington, *Wisdom Texts from Qumran*, 40.

[24] Harrington, *Wisdom Texts from Qumran*, 41.

[25] Harrington, *Wisdom Texts from Qumran*, 58. See 4Q418 103; 4Q423 2, 5.

[26] 4Q418 103 2–5.

[27] Alexander Rofè, "Revealed Wisdom: From the Bible to Qumran," in *Sapiential Perspectives: Wisdom Literature in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the Sixth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 20–22 May, 2001* (eds. J. J. Collins, G. E. Sterling and R. A. Clements; STDJ 51; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 1–11, esp. 1: "a central tenet of Qumran theology is the notion of "revealed wisdom," i. e. the idea that humanity receives wisdom by revelation."

[28] On the "mysteries" at Qumran, see Samuel I. Thomas, *The "Mysteries" of Qumran: Mystery, Secrecy, and Esotericism in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (EJL 25; Leiden: Brill, 2009).

[29] Strugnell, *DJD* 35, 2, designated the fragments of seven manuscripts (4Q415, 4Q415, 4Q417, 4Q418, 4Q418a, 4Q423 and 1Q26) under the official siglum of 4Q415 ff. The number of copies of this work found at Qumran strongly suggests that it was considered important

wisdom provided by 4QInstruction may also have been well-known among those living in the "camps," (i.e., the villages and towns referred to in the *Damascus Document*) where its agricultural, legal, and marital wisdom instruction would have been practical.[30] 4QInstruction comes from scribal circles outside the Temple and court, presupposes family life, addresses those engaged in regular society and traditional occupations such as farmers, herders, and craftsmen while disclosing eschatological mysteries, transcendent wisdom, and (sectarian) knowledge. Although 4QInstruction has been designated a Wisdom text, it is doubtful that the community themselves distinguished between their "wisdom" and "eschatological" works. The repeated references to imminent eschatological mysteries are inseparable from the practical advice offered to the student. Classifying this work as a Wisdom text should not prevent us from seeing that it contains pronounced eschatological ideas. 4QInstruction was undoubtedly used as a kind of guide-book, providing practical advice, guidance, and pragmatic wisdom to the community. Its eschatological framework testifies to how seamlessly apocalyptic ideas were integrated into the community. Its popularity would certainly have continued well into the first century C. E.[31] Matthew Goff has argued that both Q and

---

and authoritative by the Qumran community. Strugnell and Harrington claim that "The abundance of copies of this work at Qumran suggests that the work, whatever its origins, was treated as important, authoritative, perhaps even 'canonical,' among the Qumran community." Elgvin, "The Mystery to Come," 116, states that this work "should be seen as representative of the wider Essene movement, not of the *yahad*." Vermes, *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls*, 402, asserts that "the work is unquestionably sectarian and displays a terminology akin to the Community Rule, the Damascus Document and the Thanksgiving Hymns." The author of the Hodayot was clearly familiar with it and this work is also related terminologically to other sectarian works, such as 1QS and the Book of Mysteries (Elgvin, "The Mystery to Come," 116; *DJD* 25, 34).

[30] As its title suggests, 4QInstruction refers to the "instruction for a maven" or student (מוסר למבין) mentioned throughout the work. A possible alternative title, "The Great Instruction" (*DJD* 35, 3) has also been suggested.

[31] Torleif Elgvin, "Wisdom and Apocalypticism in the Early Second Century BCE – The Evidence of 4QInstruction," 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/Shrine of the Book, Israel Museum, 2000), 226–47. Elgvin has proposed that this text was composed in two stages: an older wisdom text and newer texts which stress eschatology and revelation. For Elgvin, the sapiential and apocalyptic materials appear to function at different redactional phases, with an older layer of admonitions encouraging a sapiential perspective and a younger, apocalyptic layer consisting of longer discourses (226)." 4QInstruction thus includes several genres. Wisdom admonitions and sayings give "concrete advice to specific fields of life: family, the responsibility of the farmer, work ethics, financial matters, lifestyle and table manners (227–28)." In contrast, theological interests are presented through "discourses" dealing with the eschatological revelation of God's mysteries, and employ genres like rhetorical dialogue, announcement of judgment, salvation and biblical paraphrase. According to Elgvin, the shorter wisdom

4QInstruction belong to a "wisdom trajectory" in the late Second Temple period.[32] 4QInstruction, like Q, is "a sapiential text with an apocalyptic worldview."[33] Sapiential and apocalyptic material co-exist in the same text.[34] Josephus and Philo both extolled the Essenes for their (secret) *wisdom*.[35] Q and Qumran both utilized wisdom forms in their literary compositions.

5.3 The Beatitudes (Q 6:20–23)

The beginning of Q is widely regarded as the Inaugural Sermon, which begins with a series of beatitudes (Q 6:20–23), a common form of sapiential literature.[36] Q's beatitudes share the structural and formal features of wisdom

---

sentences in 4QInstruction (4Q420/21 and 4Q424) "do not reflect the structure or theology of the yahad and seem to derive from pre-sectarian sapiential milieus (230)." Consequently, they seem to have "undergone sectarian editing (231)." John J. Collins, "The Eschatologizing of Wisdom in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *Sapiential Perspectives: Wisdom Literature in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the Sixth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 20–22 May, 2001* (STDJ 51; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 60–61, remains skeptical about literary layers and questions "whether an editor added the eschatological discourses to an older wisdom document or . . . an author composed a wisdom text that embodied a new perspective."

[32] Matthew J. Goff, "Discerning Trajectories: 4QInstruction and the Sapiential Background of the Sayings Source Q," *JBL* 124/4 (2005): 657–673.

[33] Goff, "Discerning," 658: 4QInstruction does "not represent the redaction of distinct sapiential and apocalyptic layers" but rather contains ideas alien to traditional wisdom such as heavenly revelation, election, theophanic judgment and interest in the angelic world.

[34] Goff, "Discerning Trajectories," 669, 659. See also Robinson, "LOGOI SOPHON," 129: "apocalypticism and wisdom, rather than being at almost mutually exclusive extremes within the spectrum of Jewish alternatives, share certain affinities and congruencies that encourage a transition from one to the other." See also Seth Schwartz, *Imperialism and Jewish Society, 200 B.C.E. to 640 C.E.* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001), 76: Apocalyptic is "In its literary expression, at least, it is in fact an elite or subelite phenomenon, for the most part socially coextensive with wisdom literature." See also Philip R. Davies, "The Social World of Apocalyptic Writings," in *The World of Ancient Israel: Social, Anthropological, and Political Perspectives* (ed. R. E. Clements; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 251–71, esp. 263. For texts that mix the two genres, see *1 En.*, *4 Ezra*, the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, *Didache*, the Wisdom of Solomon, *2 Baruch* and James. According to Matthew J. Goff, *The Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom of 4QInstruction* (STDJ 50; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 216, 218, 4QInstruction is "a sapiential text that attests a transformation of wisdom," a "stream of the sapiential tradition . . . characterized by the combination of traditional wisdom with an apocalyptic worldview."

[35] Philo, *Quod Omnis Probus Liber Sit* 11–13; Josephus *B.J.*, 2, 158.

[36] For beatitudes in rabbinical literature, see Martin Hengel, "Makarismen in frühjüdischen und rabbinischen Texten," in *Judaica, Hellenistica et Christiana: Kleine Schriften II* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1999), 224-33. Thomas Hieke, *Documenta Q: Reconstructions of Q Through Two Centuries of Gospel Research Excerpted, Sorted and Evaluated. Q 6:20–21: The Beatitudes*

blessings.[37] Scholars have long debated which of the two is more original, Matthew's longer list (Matt 5:1–12) or Luke's (6:20–23). Matthew's list is considerably longer than Luke's, which is also simpler, and seemingly more primitive. It is reasonable to conclude that Matthew has expanded the "list," adding characteristically "spiritualizing" Matthean traits (τῷ πνεύματι, τῶν οὐρανῶν) whereas Luke seems to have better preserved the original structure. This general consensus is further supported by the observation that Matthew and Luke essentially agree with regards to their *first* and *last* beatitudes:

Matt 5:3, 11–12	*Luke 6:20, 22–23*
Μακάριοι οἱ πτωχοὶ τῷ πνεύματι	Μακάριοι οἱ πτωχοί
ὅτι αὐτῶν ἐστιν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν.	ὅτι ὑμετέρα ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ
μακάριοί ἐστε ὅταν ὀνειδίσωσιν ὑμᾶς	μακάριοι ἐστε ὅταν μισήσωσιν ὑμᾶς οἱ
καὶ διώξωσιν καὶ εἴπωσιν πᾶν πονηρὸν	ἄνθρωποι καὶ ὅταν ἀφορίσωσιν ὑμᾶς καὶ
καθ' ὑμῶν ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ.	ὀνειδίσωσιν καὶ ἐκβάλωσιν τὸ ὄνομα ὑμῶν
χαίρετε καὶ ἀγαλλιᾶσθε,	ὡς πονηρὸν ἕνεκα τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου
ὅτι ὁ μισθὸς ὑμῶν πολὺς ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς	χάρητε ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ καὶ σκιρτήσατε,
οὕτως γὰρ ἐδίωξαν	ἰδοὺ γὰρ ὁ μισθὸς ὑμῶν πολὺς ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ
τοὺς προφήταις τοὺς πρὸ ὑμῶν.	κατὰ τὰ αὐτὰ γὰρ ἐποίουν
	τοῖς προφήταις οἱ πατέρας αὐτῶν.

Matthew and Luke's first beatitudes both refer to the "poor," although Matthew appears to have added τῷ πνεύματι and τῶν οὐρανῶν. In Matthew's ninth and Luke's fourth beatitude, those who are persecuted and hated are pronounced blessed, and their similar structures strongly suggest that this beatitude appeared in Q. It is uncertain whether the beatitudes were composed in the second (Luke) or third (Matthew) person.[38] Q's first three beatitudes follow a similar structural pattern whereas the fourth is markedly different:

for the Poor, Hungry, and Mourning (DQ; ed. T. Hieke; Leuven: Peeters, 2001). For the earliest layer of Q beginning with Q 6:20, see Robinson, *The Sayings Gospel Q*, 406, n. 9; Paul Wernle, *Die synoptische Frage* (Freiburg: Mohr, 1899), 226; Kloppenborg, *Formation of Q*, 243–62, 325–27; Jacobson, *First Gospel*, 255. For its introductory function in Q, see Shawn Carruth, "Strategies of Authority: A Rhetorical Study of the Character of the Speaker in Q 6:20–49," in *Conflict and Invention: Literary, Rhetorical, and Social Studies on the Sayings Gospel Q* (Valley Forge: Trinity, 1995), 108–09; Catchpole, *Quest for Q*, 80; R. Conrad Douglas, "Love Your Enemies: Rhetoric, Tradents, and Ethos," in *Conflict and Invention*, 125; Tuckett, *Q*, 226.

[37] Kloppenborg, *Formation of Q*, 188. Q's beatitudes "share many of the structural and formal features of the sapiential beatitude, in particular, serialization and placement at the beginning of an instruction." For beatitudes occurring in series, see Tob 13:14; Pss 32:1–2, 119:1–2, 128: 1–2, 137: 8–9; Sir 14:1–2; 25: 8–9; *2 Enoch* 52:1–5, 42:6–14; Pss 1:1, 32: 1–2; 41:1, 112:1; *1 Enoch* 10:6–7.

[38] For a survey of opinions, see Heinz Schürmann, *Lukasevangelium* (Freiburg: Herder, 1969), 1: 329, n. 25; Schulz, *Spruchquelle*, 77, n. 128). The third person form is more common in sapiential beatitudes; however, Luke's version corresponds more satisfyingly with the intended audience of the Inaugural Sermon as a whole, which suggests his is the more faithful

Μακάριοι οἱ πτωχο
ὅτι [ ] ἐστιν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ.
μακάριοι οἱ πεινῶντες,
ὅτι χορτασθήσεσθε
μακάριοι οἱ πενθοῦντες,
ὅτι παρακληθήσεσθε
μακάριοι ἐστε ὅταν ὀνειδίσωσιν ὑμᾶς
καὶ διώξωσιν καὶ εἴπωσιν
πᾶν πονηρὸν καθ' ὑμῶν
ἕνεκεν τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.
χαίρετε καὶ ἀγαλλιᾶσθε,
ὅτι ὁ μισθὸς ὑμῶν πολὺς ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ
οὕτως γὰρ ἐδίωξαν τοὺς προφήτας
τοὺς πρὸ ὑμῶν.

The first three beatitudes contain the formulaic μακάριοι οἱ plus a substantive; they are bipartite, consisting of a beatitude and an ὅτι clause; they pronounce blessings by using the ὅτι clause in giving the reason for the reversal of conditions; they have no expressed verb; they refer to the reversal of values on earth; they depend upon the logic of eschatological reversal; and they refer to general conditions of poverty.

In Q 6:22–23, this structure changes. The fourth beatitude does not use the formulaic μακάριοι οἱ plus substantive, but rather μακάριοι ἐστε ὀταν. The fourth beatitude is not bipartite, but contains a beatitude and an imperative with a motive clause.[39] The fourth beatitude diverges from the first three in length, form, vocabulary, and content.[40] Yet the fourth beatitude also seems to have been present early on in the composition of the Sermon because it provides the catchwords διώκειν and μισθός. These literary-critical observations have led to the conclusion that Q 6:23c is a "secondary addition."[41] Q 6:23c

---

to Q. Catchpole, *Quest for Q*, 79, refers to "the broad trend in contemporary Q discussion . . . to accept that Luke has more or less faithfully preserved the Q sequence" and notes that the beatitudes for the meek, the merciful, the pure in heart, the peacemakers express "favourite Matthaean ideas" (81). Consequently, "all the evidence supports the conclusion that we take no risk in attributing all the single tradition Matthaean beatitudes to the evangelist" (83) since they are all "explicable without recourse to pre-Matthaean tradition." The three "short" beatitudes (6:20–21) represent the earliest stratum of Q; 6:22–23 is a later addition; and Matt 5:5, 7–9 is Matthean redaction.

[39] The fourth beatitude uses the postpositive γὰρ, not ὅτι, to give the reason for the blessing. It also uses the verb ἐστε; refers not to the reversal of values on earth, but to a reward "in heaven" and refers not to general conditions but to the specific situation of the Q community.

[40] Robinson, *The Sayings Gospel Q*, 443–44: "it is generally agreed that it is a later composition than the first three, in diverging clearly from them in length (three, rather than one, designations of the blessed), form (clauses rather than adjectives/participles), vocabulary (even different words for 'for') and content (the blessing is no longer on victims of fate, but rather on persecuted Q people)."

[41] See Steck, *Israel*, 258–59; Schulz, *Q*, 456, n. 404; Jacobson, "Wisdom Christology," 53;

"falls outside the scope of the sapiential idiom"[42] and fits poorly with the rest of the beatitudes, as it reflects the Deuteronomistic view of history and appears to be "an interpolation made from the perspective of that redaction." The themes of the "son of man" and the persecution of the prophets in 6:23 appear to be redactional. In the first three beatitudes, each concludes with an ὅτι clause, yet in the fourth, there is not only a change in wording (γὰρ), but an additional "for" clause which diverges from the theme of reversal towards an analogy with the prophets: "for this is how they persecuted the prophets who were before you."[43] Consequently, this is "as close an instance of a secondary redaction as one could wish," as the second "for" clause seems to have been added after the initial composition of Q^1, and thus represents an example of Deuteronomistic history.[44] This is Lührmann's "main instance of the redactor at work secondarily imposing that redactional view on the earlier Q materials."[45] Kloppenborg identifies it as a "stratigraphic marker" because of its "intrusive" and "interruptive character."[46] Not only is the second clause redundant after 6:23b, it is also missing in the persecution beatitudes found in *Thomas* and 1 Peter.[47] Yet since it is thematically associated with Q 11:49–51 and Q 13:34–35, it appears to belong to the redactional layer in which those two pericopae occur. Q 6:23c may be evidence of a secondary redaction.[48]

Although many scholars regard the first beatitude (Q 6:20) as authentic Jesus tradition,[49] the beatitudes as a whole do not seem to have been originally

Bultmann, *History*, 109–10. For Bultmann, Q 6:22 "is a new element of the tradition which is clearly distinguished from the older element Lk 6:20f . . . in form . . . and content." See also Catchpole, *Quest for Q*, 91; Mack, *The Lost Gospel*, 73, 83; Manson, *Sayings*, 49; Kloppenborg, *Formation of Q*, 172–73; Sato, *Q und Prophetie*, 258; Jacobson, *First Gospel*, 100; Tuckett, *Q*, 180. Kloppenborg sees this a "intrusive on literary grounds" (149) because it is "redundant" after 6:23b. and expresses the Deuteronomistic view of killing the prophets. This phrase is absent from the parallel versions in *Thomas* (68, 69a; 1 Pet 3:14; 4:13–14). 6:23c is linked thematically to 11:49–51 and 13:34–35 and "this phrase is most plausibly associated with the redactional stratum in which those pericopae appear (149)."

[42] Kloppenborg, *Formation of Q*, 190.

[43] Robinson, *The Sayings Gospel Q*, 443: "Each Beatitude concludes with a 'for' clause, giving a reversal of circumstances as the reason why paradoxically one is blessed, in the case of the fourth: 'for your pay is great in heaven.' But to this is added a second 'for' clause, not indicating a reversal of circumstances but rather a biblical precedent: 'for this is how they persecuted the prophets who were before you.'"

[44] Steck, *Israel*, 259.

[45] Robinson, *The Sayings Gospel Q*, 444. Betz, *The Sermon on the Mount*, 151–53, considers this in Matt 5:12 as a separate beatitude with a different form.

[46] Kloppenborg Verbin, *Excavating Q*, 149–50. See also Sato, *Q und Prophetie*, 259; Jacobson, *The First Gospel*, 100; Tuckett, *Q*, 180.

[47] *Thom.* 68, 69a; 1 Pet 3:14, 4:13–14.

[48] 6:23 is Kloppenborg's "best instance" of Q's stratification.

[49] George R. Beasley-Murray, *Jesus and the Kingdom of God* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986), 157; Jacques Dupont, *Les Béatitudes* I (Brugge: Leuven: Leuven University Press,

performed and/or composed as a unit, but were rather collected as individual makarisms.[50] Parallels to three of the four beatitudes can be found in the *Gospel of Thomas*. The first beatitude (Q 6:20) is paralleled by L. 54, the second by L. 69b, and a close paralel with the fourth beatitude (Q 6:22) in L. 68.1:

ⲡⲉϫⲉ ⲓ̅ⲥ̅ ϫⲉ ϩⲛ̅ⲙⲁϫⲁⲣⲓⲟⲥ ⲛⲉ ⲛϩⲏⲕⲉ ϫⲉⲧ ⲱⲧⲛ̅ ⲧⲉ ⲧⲙⲛ̅ⲧⲉⲣⲟ ⲛ̅ⲙ̅ⲡⲏⲩⲉ
"Jesus said, 'Blessed are the poor, for yours is the kingdom of heaven.'"

ϩⲙⲁⲕⲁⲣⲓⲟⲥ ⲛⲉⲧϩⲕⲁⲉⲓⲧ ϣⲓⲛⲁ ⲉⲩⲛⲁⲧⲥⲓⲟ ⲛ̅ⲑϩⲏ ⲙ̅ⲡⲉⲧⲟⲩⲱϣ
"Blessed are they who are hungry, that the stomach of the one in want may be filled."

ⲡⲉϫⲉ ⲓ̅ⲥ̅ ϫⲉ ⲛ̅ⲧⲱⲧⲛ̅ ϩⲙ̅ⲙⲁⲕⲁⲣⲓⲟⲥ ϩⲟⲧⲁⲛ ⲉⲩϣⲁⲛⲙⲉⲥⲧⲉ ⲧⲏⲩⲧⲛ̅ ⲛ̅ⲥⲉⲣ̅ⲇⲓⲱⲕⲉ ⲙ̅ⲙⲱⲧⲛ̅
"Jesus said, 'Blessed are you when they hate you and persecute you.'"

Since L. 68 contains neither Q's reference to the "son of man" nor 6:23c's γὰρ clause, *Thomas* has been seen as evidence of the compositional history of the beatitudes from a single makarism to Q's early collation.

Another distinguishing feature of Q's beatitudes is that they are not "typically" sapiential (i.e. mundane, this-worldly); rather, they are "proclamations of eschatological salvation,"[51] pronouncements of blessing upon a community characterized by persecution and poverty.[52] They represent reversals of what is generally regarded as dire circumstances: the poor, hungry and mourning are *blessed*, rather than destitute and forlorn.[53]

Q 6:20–23 introduces a theme characteristic of Q: eschatological reversal, a counter-cultural stance that subverts traditional expectations, assumptions and

---

1958), 210–12; Eduard Schweizer, *The Good News According to Matthew* (Atlanta: John Knox, 1975), 86; I. Howard Marshall, *Luke* (NIGTC, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978), 247; Schulz, *Q*, 78; Davies and Allison, *The Gospel According to Saint Matthew*, 1: 438; Polag, *Die Christologie der Logienquelle*, 129; Jan Lambrecht; *The Sermon on the Mount: Proclamation and Exhortation* (GNS 14; Wilmington: Glazier, 1985), 57; Joachim Jeremias, *Die Sprache des Lukasevangeliums* (RTNME KEK; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1980), 128.

[50] See Arnal, "Why Q Failed: From Ideological Project to Group Formation," 67–87, esp. 77. The independent parallel in L. 68 suggests that 6:22c (ἕνεκεν τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου) and the imperative clause (23c: χαίρετε καὶ ἀγαλλιᾶσθε) were secondary redactions and that originally, the saying was bipartite: a blessing of the "persecuted followed by a motive clause describing the rewards of results of the persecution." Thus 6:23b (ὅτι ὁ μισθὸς ὑμῶν ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ) is "probably original to the makarism" (as in L. 68, 69).

[51] Kloppenborg, *Formation of Q*, 188. See also Augustin George, "La 'Forme' des Béatitudes jusqu'à Jésus," *Mélanges bibliques rédigés en l'honneur de André Robert* (TIC 4; Paris: Bloud et Bay, 1957), 398–403; James M. Robinson, "The Formal Structure of Jesus' Message," in *Current Issues in New Testament Interpretation: Essays in Honor of Otto A. Piper* (New York: Harper & Row, 1962), 91–110, 273–84, esp. 98, 278, n. 25.

[52] Kloppenborg, *Formation of Q*, 188.

[53] Tuckett, *Q*, 141.

preconceptions.[54] The beatitudes *reverse* expectations; they oppose the conventional wisdom that the affluent and comfortable are blessed.[55] This reversal of expectations is characteristic of Q's "language of reversal," its "invesionary ethical injunctions and encomia on detachment from cultural norms."[56] Q envisions a world where "conventional values are inverted and turned on their heads."[57] Numerous "reversal sayings" are found in Q.[58] The four beatitudes also draw on Isaiah 61, a text with eschatological overtones.[59]

Q's first beatitude announces "Blessed are the poor (πτωκοί)." Isaiah 61:1 proclaims: "the Lord has anointed me to preach good news (εὐαγγελίσασθαι/לבשר) to the poor (πτωχοῖς/ענוים)." Q's third beatitude claims that "those who mourn" (πενθοῦντες) "will be comforted (παρακληθήσονται)." Isaiah's mission is "to comfort all who mourn (παρακαλέσαι πάντας τοὺς πενθοῦντας/לנחם כל אבלים)." Q's fourth beatitude assures hearers that they are blessed "when people revile you . . . rejoice and be glad (ἀγαλλιᾶσθε)." Isaiah 61:3, 10 contains thematic parallels of joyfulness and the LXX uses the same Greek term (ἀγαλλιάσθω). Whereas Isaiah's prophetic figure announces a new "year of the Lord," Q's beatitudes take this announcement one step further by proclaiming that this time has arrived.

Q 6:20 "Blessed are the poor (πτωκοί)
Isa 61:1 "to preach good news to the poor (πτωχοῖς/ענוים)."

---

[54] Gary T. Meadors, "The 'Poor' in the Beatitudes of Matthew [5:3] and Luke," *GTJ* 6/2 (1985): 305–14.

[55] Betz, *Essays on the Sermon on the Mount*, 17–36; John O. York, *The Last Shall Be First: The Rhetoric of Reversal in Luke* (JSNTSup 46; Sheffield: JSOT, 1991).

[56] Arnal, *Jesus and the Village Scribes*, 160.

[57] Arnal, *Jesus and the Village Scribes*, 2.

[58] Q 3:8; Q 4:5–8; Q 6:20–23; Q 6:27–28; Q 6:32–34; Q 7:9; Q 7:22; Q 12:2–3; Q 13:30; Q 13:18–19; Q 13:20–21; Q 14:11; Q 14:16–18; Q 14:26; Q 16:18; Q 17:33.

[59] For the eschatological interpretation of Isaiah 61, see James A. Sanders, "From Isaiah 61 to Luke 4," in *Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults: Studies for Morton Smith at Sixty*, Part 1: *New Testament* (ed. J. Neusner; SJLA 12; Leiden: Brill, 1975), 75–106; Allison, *The Intertextual Jesus*, 104-05; Theodor Zahn, *Das Evangelium des Matthäus* (Wuppertal: R. Brockhaus, 1984), 183; Robert Guelich, "The Matthean Beatitudes: 'Entrance Requirements' or 'Eschatological Beatitudes,' *JBL* 95 (1976): 415–34; Betz, *The Sermon on the Mount*, 121, 123-24. A possible contact with Isaiah occurs in Matthew 5:4, although the corresponding beatitude in Luke is quite different. If Luke were regarded as the more original, this could cast doubt on whether the author of Q 6:20–23 intended to allude to Isaiah as opposed to the Isaianic motifs being due to Matthean redaction. But see Hubert Frankemölle, "Jesus als deuterojesajanischer Freudenbote? Zur Rezeption von Jes 52,7 und 61,1 im Neuen Testament, durch Jesus und in den Targumim," in *Jüdische Wurzeln christlicher Theologie* (BBB 116; Bodenheim: Philo, 1998), 131–60, esp. 143–44; Frans Neirynck, "Q 6,20b–21; 7:22 and Isaiah 61," in *Scriptures in the Gospels* (ed. C. M. Tuckett; BETL 131; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1997), 27–64. Matthew's other five beatitudes show no assimilation to Isaiah and apart from Matthew 11:5 nowhere else does Matthew use Isaiah 61.

Q 6:21--"those who mourn" (πενθοῦντες) . . . "will be comforted (παρακληθήσονται)."
Isaiah 61:2 "to comfort all who mourn"
LXX/MT: (παρακαλέσαι πάντας τοὺς πενθοῦντας/לנחם כל אבלים).

Q 6:23-- "when people revile you . . . rejoice and be glad (ἀγαλλιᾶσθε)."
Isaiah 61:3, 10 LXX: (ἀγαλλιάσθω) . . . a new "year of the Lord"

Since those who wrote the Dead Sea Scrolls composed texts with numerous allusions to Isaiah 61,[60] do Q's beatitudes "stand in some sort of exegetical tradition" with the Qumran compositions?[61] Interestingly, an earlier parallel to Q 6:20–23 can be found in 4Q525 ("4QBeatitudes").[62]

5.4 The Wisdom of 4QBeatitudes

4Q525 is widely recognized as a Wisdom composition.[63] The provenance of 4Q525, however, continues to be debated.[64] The discovery of 4Q525 was first publicized by Jean Starcky in 1954.[65] Its official publication, however, did not occur until 1992.[66] Puech dated 4Q525 to the Herodian period, i.e., between 50 B. C. E. and 50 C. E., noting that 4Q525 has a similar structure to Matthew's beatitudes.[67] Charlesworth dates the composition to the pre-Herodian

[60] For example, 11QMelch or 11Q13 2.4,6,9,13,17,18, 20.

[61] Allison, *The Intertextual Jesus*, 106.

[62] Brooke, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament*, 217.

[63] Robert Eisenman and Michael O. Wise, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Uncovered* (Shaftesbury: Element, 1992), 168; Florentino García Martínez, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated: The Qumran Texts in English*, (trans. W. G. E. Watson; Leiden: Brill, 1994), 395; Brooke, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament*, 224, argues that 4Q525 "clearly contains some eschatological language, even though its macarisms are principally an exhortation to live according to Wisdom." It is fitting to identify 4Q525, as well as Q and Matthew 5, as "Wisdom material that has been adapted so as to give it an eschatological perspective (227)."

[64] For a sectarian identification, see Jacqueline C. de Roo, "Is 4Q525 a Qumran Sectarian Document?," in *The Scrolls and the Scriptures: Qumran Fifty Years After* (eds. S. E. Porter and C. A. Evans; RILP 3; JSPSup 26; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 338–67. For a non-sectarian view, see Émile Puech, *DJD* 25, 119; "The Collection of Beatitudes in Hebrew and in Greek (4Q525 and Mt 5,3–12)," in *Early Christianity in Context: Monuments and Documents* (eds. F. Manns & E. Alliata; SBFCM 38; Jerusalem: Franciscan, 1993), 353–68.

[65] Jean Starcky, *Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres. Comptes rendus des séances de l'année 1954* (Paris, 1954), 408; "Le travail d'édition des fragments manuscrits de Qumran," *RB* 63 (1956): 67.

[66] Puech, *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert XXV*.

[67] Émile Puech, "4Q525 et les péricopes des beatitudes en Ben Sira et Matthieu," *RB* 98 (1991): 80–106. Puech claimed that 4Q525 originally contained nine beatitudes (8 short and 1 long), raising the question of whether Matthew's longer list may reflect an earlier or more original structural form of the Q beatitudes since it appears to correspond to the pre-existing

period, the original having been composed between 200 and 100 B. C. E.[68] Charlesworth claims that 4Q525 does not contain any "Qumran specific vocabulary" and was not composed at Qumran.[69] Charlesworth admits that 4Q525 looks remarkably like Matthew in form, content, and "possibly even purpose,"[70] since both texts bless the persecuted and the "pure in heart."[71]

4Q525 2-3 II, 1–6[72]

בלב טהור ולוא רגל על לשונו אשרי תומכי חוקיה ולוא יתמוכו
בדרכי עולה אשרי הגלים בה ולוא יביעו בדרכי אולת אשרי דורשיה
בבור כפים ולוא ישחרנה בלב מרמה אשרי אדם השיג חוכמה וידהלך
בדורת עליון ליכן לדרכיה לבו וידאפק ביסוריה ובנגיעיה ירצה ת[מי]ד
ולוא יטושנה בעוני מצר[יו] ובעת צוקה לוא יעוזבנה ולוא ישכחנה [בימי פ]חד

1. with a pure heart and does not slander with his tongue. *vacat* Blessed are those who hold to her statutes and do not hold to
2. ways of folly. *vacat* Blessed are those who rejoice in her and do not burst forth in ways of folly. *vacat* Blessed are those who search for her
3. with pure hands and do not pursue her with a deceitful heart. Blessed is the man who attains Wisdom *vacat* and walks
4. in the law of the Most High, and directs his heart to her ways *vacat* and restrains himself by her corrections and always accepts her chastisements,
5. and does not forsake her in the hardship of his distress, nor forsake her in the time of trouble, and does nor forget her [in the days of] fear.

Charlesworth explains the similarities between 4Q525 and Matthew as due to the simple fact that "two gifted authors" used a similar genre and were "the heirs of a common exegetical tradition." George Brooke has also found a number of similarities between 4Q525 and Matthew's beatitudes.[73] The personified figure of Wisdom in 4Q525 brings to mind Q's Wisdom references

---

literary form and compositional style featured in 4Q525. Luke's list could then be regarded as an abbreviated version of Matthew's list.

[68] James H. Charlesworth, "The Qumran Beatitudes (4Q525) and the New Testament (Mt. 5:3–11, Lk 6:20–26)," *RHPR* 80 (2000): 13–35.

[69] Charlesworth, "The Qumran Beatitudes," 21, 24, notes the absence of "technical terms," the reference to the *yahad* in col. 2, line 8 (which displays a different meaning from other Qumran texts), and the absence of any explicit identification that the sect will be the recipients of blessing. He also does not find anything particularly eschatological in the text, citing Joseph A. Fitzmyer, "A Palestinian Collection of Beatitudes," in *The Four Gospels 1992: Festschrift Frans Neirynck* (ed. F. Van Segbroek; BETL 100; Leuven: Peeters, 1992), 509–515, esp. 513, and Puech, "The Collection of Beatitudes," 363.

[70] Charlesworth, "The Qumran Beatitudes," 14.

[71] Charlesworth, "The Qumran Beatitudes," 29, 33, notes that 4Q525 is directed to an individual whereas Q addresses a group, using plural verbs and pronouns.

[72] Several manuscript pieces have been put together to make a fragment with the remains of three columns. The beatitudes belong to the first six lines of column 2. The beatitudes are technically identified as 4Q525 2–3 II, 1–6 (or frags 2–3, col. II, lines 1–6).

[73] Brooke, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament*, 220–21.

and Matthew's identification of Jesus as Wisdom.[74] The Matthean beatitudes "may be interacting with Essene understanding, but not necessarily on the level of overt polemic against it. Rather, Jesus or, more likely, Matthew (or the Q group), uses a common fund of Palestinian Wisdom texts to put over his eschatological exhortation."[75] David Flusser also contended that beatitudes were utilized by Jesus in order to show "what his message has in common with Essenism."[76] Like Kurt Schubert, who found evidence of polemic directed at Qumran in Matthew 5:43 ("you have heard . . . hate your enemies"),[77] Brooke finds evidence of such polemic in Matthew 5:3 where the "poor *in spirit*" appears to contrast with Qumran's identification as "the poor."[78] Brooke speculates that "some of the Jewish Christians in Matthew's community may have been Essenes at some time."[79]

4Q525 contains three short beatitudes followed by a longer, and markedly different, fourth beatitude. Since 4Q525's four beatitudes appear to be a unified composition, Q's four beatitudes may have also originally been unified. The final clause in Q 6:23c contains the only occurrence in the beatitudes of the main catchword "to do" (ποιέω) that dominates the Sermon. Furthermore, even though the fourth beatitude diverges in length, form, vocabulary, and content from the first three, Q 6:22–23 may well have been present in the *original* composition of the Sermon, since it provides the catchwords διώκειν and μισθός.[80] The beatitudes of 4Q525 provide us with evidence that a contemporary Jewish sectarian group could compose a series of beatitudes with a longer, extended beatitude appended to a series of shorter, bipartite beatitudes, establishing the possibility that "Essenic" influences on Q were formative.

5.5 Conclusion

The Inaugural Sermon begins with Q 6:20-23, a series of beatitudes describing an eschatological reversal of fortune. Like 1QS, 4QInstruction, and

---

[74] Brooke, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament*, 228. For Brooke, Matthew is simply "taking further" the adaptation and expansion of Wisdom elements by combining them with explicitly eschatological ideas (224).

[75] Brooke, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament*, 232.

[76] David Flusser, "Some Notes on the Beatitudes," in *Judaism and the Origins of Christianity* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1988), 115–25.

[77] Kurt Schubert, "The Sermon on the Mount and the Qumran Texts" in *The Scrolls and the New Testament*, 118–28.

[78] 1QpHab 12.3, 6,10; 7.3–5; *War* 2.159; *Ant.* 15.373–9.

[79] Brooke, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament*, 232

[80] Allison, *The Jesus Tradition in Q*, 102. Fleddermann, *Q*, 176–77; Robinson, "The History-of-Religions Taxonomy of Q," in *The Sayings Gospel Q*, 443.

4Q525, Q represents an individual intimately familiar with the wisdom traditions of Israel but adapting them to an eschatological context. 4Q525, in particular, provides us with a Jewish Palestinian Jewish textual precedent for a series of beatitudes with a longer, extended beatitude as the concluding beatitude, illustrating that the distinctive literary and theological creativity found in Q, a creativity which conflated traditional sapiential forms and motifs with an eschatological worldview, was also amenable to the Qumran community.

Chapter 6

"The One Who Is To Come"

6.1 Introduction

The John of Q predicts a powerful figure whose arrival is imminent and who will vindicate the righteous and condemn the wicked in judgment.[1] When John is arrested, he expresses doubts that *Jesus* is the "one" he expected.[2] John is portrayed as "a disillusioned skeptic," a "hesitant inquirer."[3] But Q 7:22–23 affirms that Jesus, despite all appearances, is the fulfillment of John's expectation.[4] Q does not explicitly identify Jesus as a "messiah," let alone a

---

[1] Hughes, "John the Baptist: Forerunner of God." Webb, *John the Baptizer and Prophet*, 221–27, 259, 283. This is similar to the description of the coming "son of man" in Q (see Q 12:8,10, 12:40, 17: 24, 26, 30).

[2] This questioning would certainly have been embarrassing to the church and so this saying is likely to have been an authentic part of the early Jesus tradition. But see Rothschild, *Baptist Traditions and Q*, 192–95, who argues that Jesus *denied* that he was the "Coming One," imagining Jesus as saying "No, I am not the one to come. Any eyewitness to my ministry could attest that I merely work wonders." John's question is thus a test for Jesus, a test which Jesus passes by rejecting the identification of the "Coming One."

[3] Webb, "Jesus' Baptism by John," 108, proposing that "the identification of Jesus as John's announced figure is more likely due to early Christian theological reflection."

[4] On 7:18–23 as authentic, see Meier, *Marginal Jew*, 2:131–37; Webb, *John the Baptizer*, 278–82; Walter Wink, "Jesus' Reply to John: Matt 11:2–6 // Luke 7:18–23," *Forum* 5 (1989): 121–28; Meadors, *Jesus the Messianic Herald*, 163-68. On Isaiah 61:1, see Martin Hengel, *Studies in Early Christology* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1995), 38: "I know of no other Old Testament text that better describes the ministry of Jesus in Galilee as portrayed by the Synoptics." See also Werner G. Kümmel, *Promise and Fulfillment: The Eschatological Message of Jesus* (trans. D. M. Barton; London: SCM, 1958), 110-11; Martin Dibelius, *Die urchristliche Überlieferung von Johannes dem Täufer* (FRLANT 15: Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1911), 313–19; James 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* (NTL; London: SCM, 1975), 55–60; Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke I-IX* (AB 28; Garden City: Doubleday, 1981), 662–64. As non-historical, see Polag, *Die Christologie der Logienquelle*, 35, 38, 145; Zeller, *Kommentar zur Logienquelle*, 39; Schürmann, *Lukas*, 414; Schulz, *Q*, 195; Hoffmann, *Studien*, 200-14; Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 107; Maurice Goguel, *Au seuil de l'Évangile: Jean-Baptiste* (Bh; Paris: Payot, 1928), 60–63; Kraeling, *John the Baptist*, 130–31. Anthony Ernest Harvey, *Jesus and the Constraints of History* (London: Duckworth, 1982), 131–42, argues that it was from this passage (Q 7:22) that Jesus' followers concluded he was a "messianic" figure.

military warrior in the Davidic tradition.[5] The Qumran messianic texts tend to typify what many first-century Jews would probably have expected from a political king or "royal messiah."[6] In 1QSa 2.11–22, he presides over the community's eschatological banquet. In CD 19.10–11, 1QSb 5.20–29; 1QM 11.6–13, he executes judgment on those who oppress God's people. He subdues the Kittim and the nations. In 1QM 11.9–12, he leads a new exodus. In 4Q161, 4Q174, 4Q252, 4Q285, he is the "Branch of David." In 4Q252 5.1-5, he reigns over Israel, establishing the covenant. In 4Q252 5.5, he keeps the law with the congregation. In 4Q381 15.1–10, he is endowed with special insight. In 1QSb, he is the "prince of the congregation" (נשיא העדה).[7] The Qumran community portrayed the royal messiah in militaristic terms.[8]

In contrast, Jesus *opposes* violence in Q's Inaugural Sermon.[9] There is no evidence that the historical Jesus advocated violence or planned any kind of

---

[5] Joseph, "'Blessed is Whoever is Not Offended By Me,'" 307–24.

[6] The messianic idea was rooted in the royal ideology of divine kingship and the royal messiah was referred to variously as the "messiah of Israel" (משיח ישראל), the "Prince of the Congregation" (נשיא העדה), the "Branch of David" (צמח דויד), the "Scepter" (שבט), and the "son of God." These titles seem to have been used somewhat interchangeably in Qumran texts. Consequently, each of these titles should be understood as "messianic," even though they may not necessarily mention a "messiah" *per se*.

[7] The prince will have "the spirit of knowledge and of the fear of God" "for he (God) has established you as a scepter over the rulers" and "he shall strengthen you by his holy name." The royal messiah is the "Branch of David." This title derives from Isaiah 11:1 ("a branch shall grow from his roots") (ונצר משרשין יפרה) which was further developed in Jeremiah 23:5 and 33:15. Qumran texts referring to the Branch of David become more common in the late first century B. C. E. The royal messiah is identified as the Branch of David in 4Q174, 4Q161, 4Q252 and 4Q285, which were all composed in Herodian script and can be paleographically dated to the second half of the first century B. C. E. See George J. Brooke, "Kingship and Messianism in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *King and Messiah in Israel and the Ancient Near East: Proceedings of the Oxford Old Testament Seminar* (ed. J. Day; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 447–54. This emphasis on the royal messiah can be attributed to the political turbulence following the Roman invasion of Judea. The usurpation of the priesthood and the kingship contributed to the formation of *dual* messianism at Qumran, but the overthrow of the Hasmonean dynasty following the invasion of 63 B. C. E. probably led to greater emphasis on the political role of the royal messiah.

[8] Evans, "Qumran's Messiah: How Important Is He?," 146. The use of military imagery can be understood as reflecting the state of post-exilic Judea in constant occupation and the hope that foreign occupying forces would be defeated in battle and national independence restored. Collins, *The Scepter and the Star,* 67, argues that the scrolls present a *consistent* portrait of the royal messiah as "the scepter who will smite the nations, slay the wicked with the breath of his lips, and restore the Davidic dynasty."

[9] When Jesus instructs not to "resist evil" (Matt 5:39), he uses the word (ἀντιστηναι), a technical term for revolutionary resistance of a military variety. See Walter Wink, "Neither Passivity Nor Violence: Jesus' Third Way (Matt. 5:38–42 parr.)," in *The Love of Enemy and Nonretaliation in the New Testament* (ed. W. M. Swartley; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1992), 102–05. While scholars seeking to portray Jesus as a revolutionary figure ap-

armed insurrection against Rome. Jesus did not encourage militant revolt.[10] He was not a violent militant bent on political revolution. Similarly, Q's Jesus is not intent on overthrowing the Romans.[11] Yet the Jesus of Q 7:22 seems to qualify his affirmation of the fulfillment of a "messianic" role by illustrating how his ministry bears the mark of a genuine messianic authority.[12]

6.2 The Reconstruction of Q 7:22

Matt 11:5/Luke 7:22 provides a near perfect example of Q material. The two versions are virtually identical:[13]

Matt 11:5	*Luke 7:22*
τυφλοὶ ἀναβλέπουσιν καὶ χωλοὶ περιπατουσιν, λεπροὶ καθαρίζονταικαὶ κωφοὶ ἀκούουσιν, καὶ νεκροὶ ἐγείρονται καὶ πτωχοὶ εὐαγγελίζονται.	τυφλοὶ ἀναβλέπουσιν χωλοὶ περιπατουσιν, λεπροὶ καθαρίζονται καὶ κωφοὶ ἀκούουσιν, νεκροὶ ἐγείρονται πτωχοὶ εὐαγγελίζονται.

Q 7:22 is "the first documentation for the usage that ultimately led to the secondary designation of the Gospels as 'Gospel.'"[14] In Q, the "good news" preached (εὐαγγελίζονται) to "the poor" (πτωχοὶ) is based on Isaiah 61, signifying that the great reversal has begun. Kloppenborg classifies Q 7: 22 as a Q^2 saying, reflecting an interest in defending Jesus' identity. Jesus' answer verifies his identity through an exegetically coded message:[15]

peal to such sayings as Q 12:51 ("I have come not to bring peace but a sword"), the social context of the saying confirms that it regards division in families, not militant revolution.

[10] This conclusion is supported by the accounts of Jesus' arrest. According to all four Gospels, Jesus' disciples were armed and fought with the Temple guards. Yet Jesus' response to this violence illustrates that he neither endorsed, encouraged, or even tolerated such behavior (Mark 14:47; Matt 26:52; Luke 22:50; John 18:10–11).

[11] Collins, *The Scepter and the Star*, 67, has proposed, based largely on evidence from the scrolls, a typological identification of the royal messiah as a "warrior-king" and concludes that Jesus did not fit this "type" of messianic pattern.

[12] In Jesus' ministry, "enemies" are loved, outcasts are brought back into the social fold, and God's love and mercy is universal and available to all, both the just and the unjust.

[13] Casey, *An Aramaic Approach*, 105, argues that Matthew preserved Q better than Luke and that both inherited a single Greek translation of an Aramaic source. The verbal agreements between Matthew and Luke show that "this portion of Q reached both in the same Greek translation (111)." Casey reconstructs Q 7:22 in its proposed original Aramaic: עוירין חזין וחגירין מהלכין מצרעין מתדכין וחרשין שמעין ומיתין מתקימין ועניו מתבשרין.

[14] Robinson, *The Sayings Gospel Q*, 329.

[15] James D. Tabor and Michael O. Wise, "4Q521 'On Resurrection' and the Synoptic Gospel Tradition: A Preliminary Study," in *Qumran Questions* (ed. J. H. Charlesworth; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 163, describe this as "a pre-Synoptic formula for identifying the Messiah" and suggest that "all three movements – that of John, of Jesus, and

τυφλοὶ ἀναβλέπουσιν καὶ χωλοὶ περιπατουσιν, λεπροὶ καθαρίζονται καὶ κωφοὶ ἀκούουσιν, καὶ νεκροὶ ἐγείρονται καὶ πτωχοὶ εὐαγγελίζονται

the blind receive their sight, and the lame walk, lepers are cleansed and the deaf hear, and the dead are raised, and the poor have good news brought to them.

Q 7:22 borrows and develops a number of scriptural passages from Isaiah:[16]

Q 7:22: τυφλοὶ ἀναβλέπουσιν
Isa 61:1: τυφλοῖς ἀνάβλεψιν
Isa 35:5: ἀνοιχθήσονται ὀφθαλμοὶ τυφλῶν[17]

Q 7:22: αἱ κωφοὶ ἀκούουσιν
Isa 35:5-6: ὦτα κωφῶν ἀκούσονται

Q 7:22: αἱ χωλοὶ περιπατουσιν
Isa 35:5: ἁλεῖται ὡς ἔλαφος ὁ χωλός

Q 7:22: καὶ νεκροὶ ἐγείρονται
Isa 26:19: ἀναστήσονται οἱ νεκροί καὶ ἐγερθήσονται οἱ ἐν τοῖς μνμείοις

Q 7:22: καὶ πτωχοὶ εὐαγγελίζονται
Isa 61:1: εὐαγγελίσασθαι πτωχοῖς

Q 7:22 contains a series of clauses reflecting passages from Isaiah 29:18, 35:5–6, and 61:1.[18] Q 7:22 is a pastiche of scriptural citations, but the dominant influence is Isaiah. James Robinson has noted the "pervasive dependence of the Q trajectory on Isaiah 61:1."[19] In Q 6:20 and Q 7:22, Isaiah 61 "is used to inform and delineate the teaching of Jesus . . . and his own interpretation of his work."[20] Q 7:22 plays an important role in Q, for it provides a summarizing and organizing principle for the first major section of Q 3–7.[21] Throughout this section, Q supports Jesus' claim that he was in fact the "Coming One" in conformity with Isaiah 61: in Q 3:21b–22, Jesus is "anointed" by the Spirit at his baptism; in Q 6:20, Jesus preaches "good news" to the poor; in Q 7:3, Jesus is asked to *heal* the centurion's son in Capernaum.

Jesus' confirmation of John's inquiry in Q 7:22, then, is a covert self-disclosure of his identity. According to Q 7:22, Jesus is the fulfillment of John's prediction in Q 3:16b. Michael Labahn sees Q 7:18–23 as part of the

---

of the Qumran materials – seem to use the same sets of texts to describe the messianic age and its tell tale signs."

[16] Allison, *The Intertextual Jesus*, 110.

[17] Isaiah 61:1 (LXX): Πνεῦμα κυρίου ἐπ' ἐμὲ, οὗ εἵνεκεν ἔχρισέ με, εὐαγγελίσασθαι πτωχοῖς ἀπέσταλκέμε, ἰάσασθαι τοὺς συντετριμμένους τὴν καρδίαν, κηρύξαι αἰχμαλώτοις ἄφεσιν, καὶ τυφλοῖς ἀνάβλεψιν.

[18] Christopher Tuckett, "Scripture and Q," in *The Scriptures in the Gospels* (ed. C. M. Tuckett; BETL 131; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1997), 21.

[19] Robinson, "Building Blocks in the Social History of Q," 500.

[20] Tuckett, "Scripture and Q," 21.

[21] Robinson, "Building Blocks," 500.

earliest tradition in Q.[22] What is most striking here about Q 7:22 is that it appears to bring together two scriptural traditions: Psalm 117:26 ("Blessed is the one who comes in the name of the Lord") and a string of Isaianic prophecies from Isaiah 26, 29/35, and 61. Both scriptural references revolve around Jesus' identity. The "Coming One," a participial title used three times in Q, is related to Psalm 117:26 and identifies the one predicted by John;[23] the citations in turn identify Jesus as "the Coming One."

A number of scholars see Jesus' reply to John as an indirect claim to be a messiah.[24] Both Matthew and Luke interpret Q 7:22 as Jesus' messianic qualifications or credentials. Yet Jesus' affirmation of his identity does not quite tally with John's expectations.[25] John does not seem to have predicted a miracle-worker. Jesus was *not* what John expected.[26] This dissonance between-

---

[22] Labahn, "The Significance of Signs," 153, n. 33. On Q 7:18–23 as a later collection of separate traditions, see Martin Dibelius, *Die urchristliche Überlieferung von Johannes dem Täufer* (FRLANT 15; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1911), 6–8; Josef Ernst, *Johannes der Täufer: Interpretation – Geschichte – Wirkungsgeschichte* (BZNW 53; New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1989), 55; Kloppenborg, *Formation of Q*, 115; Tuckett, *Q*, 126. On Q 7:18–23 being a later addition, see Kloppenborg, *Formation of Q*, 166–70; Cotter, "'Yes, I Tell You, and More Than a Prophet,': The Function of John in Q," 135.

[23] The phrase τυφλοὶ ἀναβλέπουσιν confirms dependence on LXX Isaiah 61:1–2, as well as Isaiah 42: 6–7, 35:5, 29:18–19.

[24] Stanton, "On the Christology of Q," 32; Charles K. Barrett, *The Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition* (London: SPCK, 1947), 118; Werner G. Kümmel, *Heilsgeschehen und Geschichte: gesammelte Aufsätze, 1933-1964* (eds. E. Grässer, O. Merk and A. Fritz; MTS 3; Marburg: N. G. Elwert, 1965), 434; Lührmann, *Logienquelle*, 26. Labahn, "The Significance of Signs," 158, argues that "Jesus' remark does not contain any explicit messianic claim." For Labahn, Jesus' reply "provides an indefinite answer. This seems to be a rhetorical signal, as whether Jesus is the coming one cannot be answered by a clear yes or not (153)." See also Cotter, "Yes, I Tell You," 140–42; J. I. H. McDonald, "Questioning and Discernment in Gospel Discourse: Communicative Strategy in Matthew 11:2–19," in *Authenticating the Words of Jesus* (eds. B. D. Chilton and C. A. Evans; NTTS 28/1; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 344.

[25] On the dissonance, see Tuckett, *Q*, 126. As tradition, see Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 2: 244–46; James 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, 1975), 56–60; Werner G. Kümmel, "Jesu Antwort an Johannes den Täufer: Ein Beispiel zum Methodenproblem in der Jesusforschung," in *Heilsgeschehen und Geschichte: gesammelte Aufsätze, 1965–1977* (2 vols., eds. E. Grässer and O. Merk; MTS 16; Marburg: N. G. Elwert, 1965–1978), 2: 177–200, esp. 195–200. Chilton and Evans, "Jesus and Israel's Scriptures," 325, argue that Jesus' interpretation of Isa 61:1–2 in Luke 4 "provides the needed clarification" for why John doubted him: "when Jesus says *nothing* about the awaited judgment upon Israel's enemies . . . but implies through his appeal to the examples of Elijah and Elisha (Luke 4:25–27) that Israel's traditional enemies will enjoy the messianic blessings, the congregants' joyful anticipation turns to rage. The element of judgment that plays such an important role in the exegesis of the Qumran materials and, indeed, appears in Isa 61:2 itself . . . is omitted in Jesus' quotation and finds no place in his homily."

[26] Nonetheless, there is no "polemic" against John's followers in Q. See Bultmann, *Die*

John's expectations and Jesus' affirmation comes to expression in Q 7:23 (μακάριός ἐστιν ὅς ἐὰν μὴ σκανδαλισθῇ).[27] For our purposes, it is not important to determine whether Q 7:22–23 is an "authentic" saying of the historical Jesus or whether it is a post-Easter creation, "arising in the effort to attract Baptist disciples into the Christian fold."[28] Its rhetorical function in Q serves to legitimize Jesus' identity as the one expected by John. Here the assertion that Jesus is the "Coming One" requires a modification of expectations. Q 7:22 does not reflect "traditional Jewish expectations about the messiah."[29] Q 7:22–23 serves as an example of "traditional" messianic expectations being subverted and transformed in Q.

6.3 4Q521: Date, Genre, and Provenance

The official publication of 4Q521 in 1992 has provided a remarkably similar description of what God would perform when "his messiah" arrived.[30] 4Q521

Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1931), 22; Catchpole, *Quest for Q*, 240.

[27] Labahn, "The Significance of Signs," 157, sees Q 7:23 as a polemic against "this generation" in that it "functions as a literary-sociological link. On the negative side, 7:23 is directed against 'this generation' . . . On the positive side, the beatitude strengthens the group, which acknowledges itself to be safe and secure in the light of the promise of salvation; such a view is comparable to that of the pious, to whom the promises of salvation in the *Messianic Apocalypse* (4Q521) are addressed."

[28] Kloppenborg, *Formation of Q*, 107. Bultmann, *History of the Synoptic Tradition*, 110, 126, regarded it as an authentic saying of Jesus. Casey, *An Aramaic Approach to Q*, 114, argues that here "we have an authentic report of John's uncertain question to Jesus, and of Jesus' reply. The amount of verbal agreement means that this passage reached both evangelists in Greek." Yet the "source is likely to have been in Aramaic." For Casey, Q 7:22 has "an excellent Sitz im Leben in the life of Jesus (144)." Here Jesus "seems to have claimed indirectly to be fulfilling the hopeful parts of the prophecy" (of Isa 20:18–19, 35:5–6, 61:1) and this is "sufficiently extensive for us to infer that it was deliberate, and that John the Baptist could reasonably be expected to pick it up . . . The summary itself refers to Jesus' successful healing ministry, and then to his preaching activity. This corresponds to the synoptic accounts of the ministry and does not contain any Christological statement such as we might expect from the early church. We must therefore accept its substantial authenticity (111)."

[29] Kloppenborg, *Formation of Q*, 107. Kloppenborg's work was, of course, published five years before the official publication of 4Q521.

[30] Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Christian Origins* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 37. For the original publication, see Émile Puech, "Une Apocalypse Messianique (4Q521)," *RevQ*15 (1992): 475–519; *Discoveries of the Judaean Desert XXV: Qumran Grotte 4 XVIII: Textes Hebreux (4Q521–4Q528, 4Q576–4Q579)* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1998), 1–38; Robert Eisenman, "A Messianic Vision," *BAR* 17.6 (1991): 65; Robert Eisenman and Michael O. Wise, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Uncovered* (Shaftesbury: Element, 1992), 19–23; James D. Tabor and Michael O. Wise, "4Q521 'On Resurrection' and the Synoptic Gospel Tradition: A Preliminary Study," in *Qumran Questions* (ed. J. H. Charlesworth; Shef-

contains an explicit reference to a messianic figure, a series of eschatological blessings described in Isaiah, and an explicit reference to the resurrection of the dead.[31] Paleographically dated to the first quarter of the first-century B.C.E.,[32] 4Q521 is a copy, not an autograph, and its original composition has been dated to the second half of the second century B. C. E. (ca. 150–100 B. C. E.) by members of the Qumran community.[33] The genre of the text has been identified as an eschatological psalm.[34] Fragment 2 ii describes how:

4Q521 2 ii 1–2, 5–8, 11–12

כי השמים והארץ ישמעו למשיחו
וכל אשר בם לוא יסוג ממצות קדושים
כי אדני חסידים יבקר וצדיקים בשם יקרא
ועל ענוים רוחו תרחף ואמונים יחליף בכחו
כי יכבד את חסידים על כסא מלכות עד
מתיר אסורים פוקח עורים זוקף כפופים
ונכבדות שלוח היו יעשה אדני כאשר דבר
כי ירפא חללים ומתים יחיה ענוים יבשר

1. The heavens and the earth will listen to his anointed
2. and all that is in them will not turn away from the commandments of the holy ones . . .
5. For the Lord will visit the pious and call the righteous by name
6. And upon the poor his spirit will hover and the faithful he will renew with his force
7. He will honor the pious on a throne of an eternal kingdom,
8. liberating the captives, giving sight to the blind, straightening the bent . . .
11. And glorious deeds that never were the Lord will perform as he said
12. For he will heal the wounded, revive the dead, and proclaim good news to the poor

---

field: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995); Geza Vermes, "Qumran Forum Miscellanea I," *JJS* 43 (1992): 299–305; Schiffman, *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 347–50; John J. Collins, "The Works of the Messiah," *DSD* 1 (1994): 98–112.

[31] Chilton and Evans, "Jesus and Israel's Scriptures," 322, note the exegetical use of Isaiah at Qumran: "In the Dead Sea Scrolls the passage is extant with only minor variations in 1QIsa[a] 49:26–29 (= 61:1–2) and 1QIsa[b] 11:33–35 (= 61:1–2)." See John C. Trever, *Scrolls from Qumran Cave 1* (Jerusalem: Shrine of the Book, 1974). The textual witnesses of Isa 61 are remarkably varied. See E. L. Sukenik, *The Dead Sea Scrolls of the Hebrew University* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1955), pl. 13. In the opening words 1QIsa[b] reads רוח יהוה אלהים instead of רוח אדני יהוה, as in 1QIsa[a] and the MT. In 1QIsa[b] v.2 concludes with פקחקח, which is probably nothing more than a spelling variant of the difficult פקח קוח which is the way it is read in 1QIsa[a] (minus the *maqeph*) and the MT. In the LXX it is rendered τυφλοῖς ἀνάβλεψιν ("sight to the blind"), while in the Targum it is rendered אחנלו לניהור (322, n. 98).

[32] See Puech, *Discoveries of the Judaean Desert XXV*, 5.

[33] Émile Puech, "Some Remarks on 4Q246 and 4Q521 and Qumran Messianism," in *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues* (eds. D. W. Parry and E. Ulrich; STDJ 30; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 552.

[34] Karl Wilhelm Niebuhr, "4Q521, 2 II – Ein eschatologischer Psalm," in *Mogilany 1995: Papers on the Dead Sea Scrolls Offered in Memory of Aleksy Klawek* (ed. Z. J. Kapera; Krakow: Enigma, 1996), 151–68.

Due to the fragmentary nature of the text, it is difficult to determine its provenance. The original editor, Émile Puech, argued that 4Q521 is a sectarian text. Some have agreed.[35] Others have disagreed.[36] Some remain undecided.[37] There are a number of indications that 4Q521 may have originated within the Qumran community. First, the use of terms צדיקים, חסידים and ענוים is noteworthy in their implicit relationship to the theory that the Qumran/Essenes had Hasidean and Zadokite origins and referred to themselves as "the Poor."[38] References to the חסידים are also striking, considering that the word "Essene" can be etymologically derived from the Aramaic חסא ("holy").[39]

Second, the word לוא on line 2, with its additional *waw*, is a distinctive feature characteristic of Qumran orthography and language.[40] Its presence here, as well as on line 10, confirms that 4Q521 is at least a Qumran *copy* of a text. In addition, the presence of a scribal correction on line 11 also indicates that this text is a copy produced at Qumran. Third, 4Q521 was discovered in Cave 4 and is otherwise unknown in ancient Jewish literature, which also suggests a Qumranic/Essenic provenance. Fourth, 4Q521 envisions the messi-

---

[35] Craig A. Evans, "Qumran's Messiah: How Important Is He?," in *Religion in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (eds. J. J. Collins and R. A. Kugler; SDSSRL; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 135–49, esp. 137, n. 17, argues for an Essenic provenance. Eisenman and Wise, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Uncovered,* 19, argue for a sectarian provenance. Similarly, Tabor and Wise, "4Q521 'On Resurrection' and the Synoptic Gospel Tradition," 162, argue for a sectarian provenance. Charlesworth, "Have the Dead Sea Scrolls Revolutionized Our Understanding of the New Testament?," 129, suggests that 4Q521 "may well be a late Qumran sectarian composition." George J. Brooke, "The Pre-Sectarian Jesus," in *Echoes from the Caves*, 46, identifies it as a "pre-sectarian" or "quasi-sectarian" text.

[36] Geza Vermes, "Qumran Forum Miscellanea I," *JJS* 43 (1992): 303–04, argues for a non-sectarian provenance. Schiffman, *Reclaiming,* 347, claims it is "lacking any sectarian character." Bergmeier, "Beobachtungen zu 4Q521 f2, II, 1–13," *ZDMG* 145 (1995): 44–45, argues that 4Q521 does not contain characteristic features of Qumran theology.

[37] Collins, "The Works of the Messiah," 106: "it is not clear whether 4Q521 should be regarded as a product of the Dead Sea sect" and notes the absence of sectarian terminology.

[38] For example, 4Q171 2.11, 3.10; 1QHab 12.3, 12.6, 12.10.

[39] A popular explanation is that "Essene" can be derived from חסי or חסיא or חסין, the Aramaic word for "pious" or "holy." According to Josephus and Philo, the Essenes were known above all for their holiness. See Emil Schürer, *A History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ* (Second Division, vol. 2; Edinburgh, 1893), 191. Józef Tadeusz Milik, *Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea* (trans. J. Strugnell; London: SCM, 2nd ed., 1963), 80–81; Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran*. Philo calls them "Essenes or holy ones" (Ἐσσαίων ἤ ὁσίων) (*Quod Omnis Probus Liber Sit* 91). Philo suggests that they "are called Essenes (Ἐσσαιοι), having merited this title, I think, because of their holiness" (ὁσιότητά) (*Hypothetica* 1). Josephus also notes that the Essenes "have a reputation for cultivating a particularly holy (σεμνότητα) life" (*B.J.* 2.119). The derivation of "Essene" from חסיא, signifying the Essenes as "holy ones," may be preferable. An Aramaic fragment (4QLevi[b] ar) published in 1996 mentions a "holy one" (חסיא) in Palestinian Aramaic.

[40] Emanuel Tov, "The Orthography and Language of the Hebrew Scrolls Found at Qumran and the Origins of these Scrolls," *Textus* 13 (1986): 31.

anic age as involving the *healing* of the wounded, the sick, the bent, the lame, and the blind. 1QS 4.6 describes the “visitation” as being an age of *healing*. These factors – the references to the “poor,” “righteous” and the “pious,” the orthographic features, the text’s presence in the Qumran library, and its focus on eschatological healing – are consistent with Qumran compositions.

Some scholars have argued that 4Q521is not a “sectarian” text, citing the absence of any explicit “sectarian” terminology. This position is consistent with the prevailing methodological orientation in Qumran studies: that previously unknown texts are not necessarily sectarian documents. “Sectarian” texts are characterized by cosmic dualism, predestination, and the equation of evil and impurity (1QS 3.13–4.26), with 1QS, 1QSa, 1QSb, 1QH, 1QM, 4Q400–407, 1QpHab, and 4QpNah being regarded as representative of quintessentially sectarian texts.[41] 4Q521 does not explicitly refer to the *yahad* nor does it refer to “sectarian” rules. Yet this is also to be expected of a work in this literary *genre*. Moreover, the text is clearly a copy of an unknown work, which limits its known circulation to *Qumran*.

4Q521 is heavily indebted to Isaiah 61:1 and Psalm 146. Psalm 146 has been “taken up” Isaiah 61 in an eschatological context.[42] This indicates relatively sophisticated scriptural literary and scribal competence:

Psalm 146:6: “heaven and earth . . . and all that is in them” (שמים וארץ ואת כל אשר בם)
4Q521 2 ii 1: “heaven and earth … and all that is in them” (השמים והארץ וכל אשר בם)

Psalm 146:8: “the Lord loves the righteous (צדיקים)”
4Q521 2 ii 5: “the Lord will call the righteous (צדיקים) by name.”

Psalm 146:10: “the Lord will reign forever (ימלך לעולם);
4Q521 2 ii 7: “on the throne of an eternal kingdom (מלכות עד).”

Psalm 146:7-8: “sets the prisoners free” (מתיר אסורים), “opens the eyes of the blind” (פקח עורים), “lifts up those who are bowed down” (זקיף כפופים).
4Q521 2 ii 8: “releasing the prisoners” (מתיר אסורים), “sight to the blind” (פוקח עורים), “lifting up those who are bowed down” (זוקף כפופים).

Isaiah 26:19: “your dead will live” (מתיך יחיו)
4Q521 2 ii 12: “life to the dead” (ומתים יחיה)

Isaiah 61:1: (לבשר ענוים)
4Q521 2 ii 12: (ענוים יבשר)

4Q521 is best identified as “pre-sectarian,” an example of “a group of texts that have only some sectarian features, and yet are compatible with the com-

---

[41] Boccaccini, *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis*, 59.

[42] Tuckett, “Scripture and Q,” 23. For the Isaiah scroll, see Eduard Y. Kutscher, *The Language and Linguistic Background of the Isaiah Scroll (1QIs^{a})* (STDJ 6; Leiden: Brill, 1974).

plex of ideas characteristic of the sectarian works."[43] 4Q521was found at Qumran. The community was familiar with its contents and found it authoritative enough to copy and preserve. 4Q521 is eschatological. There is a definite end-time: God will intervene on behalf of the poor, the righteous, and the pious. These features are compatible with a pre-sectarian *Essenic* provenance.

6.4 The Messiah of 4Q521

Since its discovery, interest in 4Q521 has focused primarily on the *identity* of the messianic figure described in the text. Yet there is no consensus as to the *number* or *type* of "messianic" figure(s). Michael Becker has argued that 4Q521 does not provide evidence of a messianic figure since the reference to "*his* anointed" (למשיחו) can be read as a defective plural and taken as a parallel to the "holy ones" (קדושים) in the next line.[44] The text should thus be understood as closely related to other Qumran references to prophets as "anointed ones." Becker cites as evidence an instance of the plural form with a feminine suffix in 4Q521 8.9 (וכל משיחיה).[45] Novakovic, however, argues that the plural משיחיה in frg. 8 line 9 is "no help here, because that form is plural with a feminine pronominal suffix, whereas למשיחו has the masculine suffix."[46] Puech also notes that the plural משיחיה in frg. 8, line 9 is far from column 2, II and in a different context. Consequently, Puech concludes that the singular reference is to be preferred. The plural קדושים in the next line does not require a plural reading of משיחו. Bergmeier has also argued for the singular referent,[47] as have Novakovic[48] and John Collins.[49]

If the "messianic" figure in 4Q521 is arguably singular, there is still considerable debate on precisely what *kind* of "messiah" is being described. Novakovic has identified three dominant hypotheses: that of a royal, priestly, or prophetic messiah.[50] The first hypothesis (that of a royal, Davidic messiah)

---

[43] Boccaccini, *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis*, 58, notes that such documents "may belong either to the formative period of the 'community of the Dead Sea Scrolls' or to a parent or sister group directly related to it, chronologically and ideologically."

[44] Michael Becker, "4Q521 und die Gesalbten," *RevQ* 18 (1997): 73–96, esp. 74–78; Stegemann, *The Library of Qumran*, 206; *Die Essener, Qumran, Johannes der Täufer*, 49–51. See also Niebuhr, "4Q521, 2 II," 153; "Die Werke des Eschatologischen," 638.

[45] Becker, "4Q521," 89, n.76.

[46] Linda Novakovic, "4Q521: The Works of the Messiah or the Signs of the Messianic Time?," in *Qumran Studies: New Approaches, New Questions* (eds. M. T. Davis and B. A. Strawn; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007), 211, n.11.

[47] Bergmeier, "Beobachtungen," 44–45.

[48] Novakovic, "4Q521: The Works of the Messiah," 208–31, esp. 212.

[49] Collins, "The Works of the Messiah," 98–112.

[50] Novakovic, "4Q521," 208–31.

was first announced by Eisenman and Wise, who mistakenly attributed the eschatological blessings of 4Q521 to the messianic figure from line 1.[51] Puech and Garcia Martinez also see the title as a reference to the "Prince of the Congregation," or royal messiah.[52] The fact that the figure seems to be invested with a high degree of authority, in that both "heaven and earth" are said to listen to him or obey him, is reminiscent of royalty.[53] Some scholars have also considered the possibility of the figure being a priestly messiah, but this has not been well received.[54]

John Collins suggests that the messianic figure of 4Q521 is a "prophetic messiah of the Elijah type rather than of the royal messiah."[55] Noting that there is no "clear reference here to a royal figure,"[56] the Qumran community regarded prophets as "anointed"[57] and that the principle role of this figure is to preach "good news" to the poor,[58] Collins draws attention to the similarities between the proclamation of "good news" to the poor (ענוים יבשר) mentioned in 4Q521 1 ii 12 and the "herald" or "messenger . . . anointed of the spir[it]" (המבשר הואה משיח הרוח) referred to in 11QMelchezedek ii 18.[59]

11Q13 refers to Melchizedek, a heavenly judge who will "carry out the vengeance of Go[d]'s judgment" (l.13). This day of judgment will be an eschatological jubilee. Melchizedek, the "King of Righteousness" (מלכי צדק), is expected to rule, judge, and provide atonement during the tenth week or Jubilee period. The day of judgment is said to be the day of which the prophet Isaiah spoke, proclaiming the arrival of the "messenger" (מבשר) who an-

---

[51] Eisenman and Wise, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Uncovered*, 19.

[52] Florentino García Martínez, "Messianic Hopes in the Qumran Writings," in *The People of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (eds. F. García Martínez and J. Trebolle Barrera; Leiden: Brill, 1995), 169, argues that the word "scepter" appears in frg. 2 3.6. See also Puech, "Une apocalypse messianique," 498–99; *DJD* 25:18–19. This reference to "scepter" in 4Q521, however, while arguably "messianic" in Numbers 24:15–17 (and CD MS A 7.19–20), is uncertain.

[53] Puech, *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert XXV*, 37.

[54] Niebuhr, "4Q521, 2 II," 151–68; "Die Werke des Eschatologischen," 636–646. See also Puech, "Some Remarks on 4Q246 and 4Q521," 551–558.

[55] Collins, "The Works of the Messiah," 98–99; "Jesus, Messianism and the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *Qumran Messianism: Studies in the Messianic Expectations in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (eds. J. H. Charlesworth, H. Lichtenberger and G. S. Oegema; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998), 100–120; *The Scepter and the Star*, 117–122.

[56] Collins, "The Works of the Messiah," 103.

[57] For example, CD MS A 2.12, 6.1, 1QM 11.7.

[58] Collins, "Jesus, Messianism and the Dead Sea Scrolls, 118–19.

[59] Chilton and Evans, "Jesus and Israel's Scriptures," 325, note that "We are told that the 'Anointed of the Spirit' of Isa 61:1 is the herald of glad tidings of Isa 52:7 (11QMelch 2.18). He will proclaim liberty for them [וקרא להמה דרור]," the "children of light," and "make atonement for their sins (2:6–8). It will be the "acceptable year" (שנת הרצון) (2: 9). The "tenor" of 4Q521 "coheres with that of 11QMelchizedek: A messianic figure, in fulfillment of Isa 61:1–2 and other related prophetic texts, is anticipated who will appear in the 'acceptable' time, vindicate the righteous of Israel, and vanquish Israel's enemies."

nounces peace and salvation, the "herald" here identified as "anointed of the spirit" (משיח הרוח). 11QMelch 2.15–20 interprets Isaiah 52:7 and 61:1–3, identifying the "mountains" as the "prophets" and the "messenger" as the "anointed of the spirit." Since the "mountains" are the "prophets" and "the feet of the messenger" are "on the mountains" in Isaiah, "this suggests that the proclamation of salvation by 'messenger' is based on the Prophets or, put another way, that the 'messenger of good news' bases his announcement of salvation on the interpretation of the biblical books of the Prophets."[60]

Despite the similarity of both texts referring to an "anointed" figure, יבשר in 4Q521 does not refer to a "herald," as מבשר does in 11QMelchizedek. In 4Q521, the figure is not explicitly identified as announcing the "good news"; rather, it is the *Lord* who does so. It can be surmised, of course, that the Lord will need an agent to announce the "good news," but this hypothetical "anointed" agent is not explicitly identified as doing so in 4Q521. Second, the "anointed of the spir[it]," in 11Q13 2.18 is not necessarily a *prophetic* figure.[61] 11Q13 prefaces its description by identifying the figure as the one "about whom Dan[iel] said," which, if 11Q13 is quoting from Daniel 9:25, refers to an "anointed prince." Third, while it is true that the Qumran community regarded the prophets as "anointed ones," such references are always in the plural, not the singular. To single out a specific prophetic figure as "anointed" would be exceptional. The figure in 4Q521 is paralleled or accompanied by "holy ones," and in the majority of cases, "holy ones" are angels.[62] Collins has suggested that this parallelism suggests that the "anointed" figure "enjoys a status comparable to the holy ones, or angels."[63] Finally, while Collins likens the figure in 4Q521 to Elijah in that Elijah was a prophet re-

[60] Annette Steudel, "אחרית הימים in the Texts from Qumran," *RevQ* 16/62 (1993): 225–246, notes that in lines 20–21, the messenger/anointed of the spirit announces salvation and instructs "them in all the ages of the w[orld] in truth" (להשכילמה בכול קצי העולם באמת) which can be understood as a reference to the 'Teacher of Righteousness' who apparently fulfilled these attributes. William Horbury, *Jewish Messianism and the Cult of Christ* (London: SCM, 1998), 86, sees 11QMelchizedek's "messiah of the spirit" (משיח הרוח) as an example of an "embodiment of an angel-like spirit," a type of messianism that seems to have existed throughout Second Temple Judaism. Horbury points out that a number of ancient Jewish figures gained angelic status (Moses; Melchizedek; Enoch), in and argues for a "widespread attestation of a 'spiritual messiah' with superhuman characteristics (151)." This messianic figure may have contributed to the early worship of Jesus as the "great link" between Judaism and Christianity: "from the Greek period of Jewish history to the later Roman empire, the messianic king was continuously taken to have what may be called a spiritual aspect. He was a star-like being of light, an angelic spirit hidden with God from of old in celestial beauty until the day when he should come forth (152, 102)."

[61] Collins, "The Works of the Messiah," 101; Bergmeier, "Beobachtungen," 44.

[62] Collins, "Jesus, Messianism and the Dead Sea Scrolls," 115.

[63] Collins, "Jesus, Messianism and the Dead Sea Scrolls," 115. This would seem to argue against identifying the figure as a "prophetic messiah."

ported to have raised the dead, in 4Q521 it is the Lord who raises the dead. These considerations warrant retaining the original identification: the "anointed" one of 4Q521 should be regarded as a royal "messianic" figure.

In 4Q521, it is the Lord, not the "anointed" one, who is responsible for the eschatological signs: "Es steht jedoch fest, dass es immer Gott ist, der dies Heil wirkt, und keinesfalls der Messias oder eine ähnliche Gestalt."[64] It can be surmised that the Lord must have an agent, because nowhere else is it said that the Lord will preach "good news" to the poor, yet it is difficult to reach any firm conclusion about the role of the figure because the events described as taking place are attributed not to the figure, but to the Lord.[65]

6.5 Q 7:22 and 4Q521: The Case for Literary Dependence

Since these two texts have been the subject of considerable discussion, and the question of literary dependence/relationship has been at the forefront of that discussion, it is apparent that a close comparative study and textual analysis is needed. Under certain circumstances, texts can and should be compared to other texts in terms of direct literary dependence.[66] In such cases, the possibility of historical transmission must be shown. Accordingly, some scholars have delineated categories of registering similarity and difference.[67] Karlheinz

---

[64] Becker, "4Q521," 92.

[65] Novakovic, "4Q521: The Works of the Messiah," 210–11, argues that "any conclusion regarding the function and the character of the Messiah in the end-time events described in 4Q521 is destined to be inconclusive because the text of this fragment neither ascribes the execution of these miracles directly to the messiah nor, more fundamentally, clarifies the Messiah's identity in the first place."

[66] Lutz Doering, "Parallels without 'Parallelomania': Methodological Reflections on Comparative Analysis of Halakhah in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *Rabbinic Perspectives: Rabbinic Literature and the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the Eighth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 7–9 January, 2003* (eds. S. D. Fraade, A. Shemesh and R. A. Clements; STDJ 62; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 13–42, esp. 20–21: "even directly dependent phenomena should be considered analogous in one sense, since they belong to different times and contexts while having common features." See also Smith, *Drudgery Divine*, 51, quoting John Stuart Mill, *A System of Logic* (10th ed.; London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1879), 2: 371: "if we have the slightest reason to suppose any relationship between . . . A and B, the argument is no longer one of analogy."

[67] Klaus Berger and Carsten Colpe, *Religionsgeschichtliches Textbuch zum Neuen Testament* (TNT 1; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1987); ET: *Hellenistic Commentary to the New Testament* (eds. M. E. Boring, K. Berger and C. Colpe; Nashville: Abingdon, 1995), propose extensive lists describing the categories of "contrast" and "similarity." For criticism, see Seelig, *Religionsgeschichtliche Methode*, 305–11. Although designed specifically to work with parallels between Hellenistic/Greco-Roman traditions and the New Testament (as opposed to Jewish parallels), their *Kategorien, die Kontrast und Andersheit erfassen* are still

Müller offers four general categories delineating direct relationship: (1) adoption without modification; (2) adaptation; (3) reorganization; and (4) rejection.[68] Lutz Doering has also differentiated between "common tradition" and direct dependence of a literary nature.[69] In either case, we must be able to (re)construct or "discern" the processes of transmission. In such cases of alleged influence or dependence, there should be evidence of some form of "*exclusive* similarity," i.e., similarities found exclusively in the presumed source text and recipient text,"[70] as opposed to "inclusive similarity," where similarities found in numerous works may simply be the result of a shared culture or "semiotic community."[71]

Cases of alleged genealogical dependence face a formidable burden of proof.[72] The burden lies with the one claiming dependence. Fortunately, the problem of literary dependence is one New Testament scholars have long been familiar with. Q, after all, was "discovered" by recognizing the *differ-*

---

helpful and include *Metamorphose*, *Rezeption mit entgegengesetzter Tendenz* ("adoption with the contrary tendency"), *Beabsichtigter Kontrast* ("intentional contrast"), *Implizite Antithese* ("implicit antithesis"), *Umkehrung der Relationen* ("Reversal of relations") and Transposition. On the other hand, their *Kategorien, die Ähnlichkeit betonen* include *Voraussetzung* ("presupposition"), which argues that similar phenomena can be found when one religion "shares the same history and participates in the same culture in which these characteristic features are widespread (27)." Another useful category is *Bezugnahme* ("reference"), where ideas already developed in a surrounding culure are "commandeered" for theological purposes. Categories such as *Parallele* and *Entfernte Ähnlichkeit* also recognize similarities, albeit without positing direct dependence. The category of *Zeugnisse für gemeinsame Basis* ("witnesses for a common basis") holds that "an original historically conditioned common element is perceived on the basis of later texts that have undergone development along different paths (29)" whereas *Entlehnung* ("borrowing"), *Nachahmung* ("imitation") and *Angleichung* ("adpatation") all provide alternative explanations for similar phenomena. Another helpful category is *Katalysatorische Gegenwart* ("catalytic presence") which proposes that "The mere existence of a certain material or literary product . . . provides the stimulus and occasion for the production of competitive or alternative texts (31)."

[68] Karlheinz Müller, "Die religionsgeschichtliche Methode: Erwägungen zu ihrem Verständnis und zur Praxis ihrer Vollzüge an neutestamentlichen Texten," *BZ* 29 (1985): 161–92.

[69] See Lutz Doering, *Schabbat: Sabbathalacha und -praxis im antiken Judentum und Urchristentum* (TSAJ 78; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999). See also Seelig, *Religionsgeschichtliche Methode*, 316–19.

[70] Bert Cozijnsen, "A Critical Contribution to the Corpus Hellenisticum Novi Testament: Jude and Hesiod," in *The Use of Sacred Books in the Ancient World* (eds. L. V. Rutgers, P. W. van der Horst, H. W. Havelaar and L. Teugels; CBET 22; Leuven: Peeters, 1998), 79–109, esp. 88, citing See J. T. Shaw, "Literary Indebtedness and Comparative Literary Studies," in *Comparative Literature: Method and Perspective*, (eds. N. P. Stallknecht and H. Franz; Carbondale, 1961), 58–71. But see also G. Hermerén, *Influence in Art and Literature* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1975), 207–09, 218–19.

[71] Cozijnsen, "A Critical Contribution to the Corpus Hellenisticum Novi Testament," 88.

[72] Hans-Josef Klauck, *Herrenmahl und hellenistischer Kult: Eine religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zum ersten Korintherbrief* (NTAbh15; Münster: Aschendorff, 1982).

ences (as well as the similarities) between Matthew and Luke and trying to establish genealogical relationships between them.[73] On the other hand, there is no reliable guidebook for diagnosing cases of literary dependence.[74] Thomas L. Brodie, however, has proposed a number of helpful criteria: (1) external plausibility; (2) internal similarities; and (3) intelligibility of the differences. External plausibility requires that cases of alleged dependence must be *plausible*, i.e., those making such claims must substantiate those claims with evidence that the author of the alleged dependent text could have had access to the independent text. Internal similarities between allegedly related texts can include shared themes, plot devices, motifs, the extent and order of the alleged similarities, and distinctive linguistic details. Finally, intelligibility of differences posits that differences between texts can sometimes be misleading, giving the (false) impression that two texts are not genealogically related when they are. Differences can be creative (re)interpretations.

Brodie criticizes the assumption that literary dependence is only worth considering in cases where differences are limited, e.g., in Matthew's use of Mark, as opposed to "dealing with the complexity of diverse kinds of literary relationship."[75] He notes that "differences between two texts do not decide the issue of their relationship. One must allow for the whole range of relationships found in ancient mimetic rivalry (*imitatio*/*aemulatio*). The issue is not whether the differences are small or great but whether they are intelligible, whether, for instance . . . they form a coherent pattern, whether one can account for them in view of the writer's larger purposes."

Dennis R. MacDonald has also developed criteria for establishing literary dependence in terms of literary μίμησις in ancient texts.[76] These six criteria are accessibility, analogy, density, order, distinctiveness, and interpretability.[77] The first criterion, *accessibility*, requires that an author could have had

---

[73] Kloppenborg Verbin, *Excavating Q*, 272.

[74] Thomas L. Brodie, *The Birthing of the New Testament: The Intertextual Development of the New Testament Writings* (Sheffied, 2004), 43–49. Crossan, *The Birth of Christianity*, 118–19, proposes that *genetic relationship* between texts can be established "by the presence of individually specific order or content from independent to dependent text."

[75] Thomas L. Brodie, "Towards Tracing the Gospels' Literary Indebtedness to the Epistles," in *Mimesis and Intertextuality in Antiquity and Christianity* (ed. D. R. MacDonald; SAC; Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 2001), 104–16, esp. 110.

[76] MacDonald, ed., *Mimesis and Intertextuality in Antiquity and Christianity*, 2.

[77] Dennis R. MacDonald pioneers an approach, i.e., "mimesis criticism," that seeks out literary influences from Homer and the Greco-Roman epic and philosophical traditions on the New Testament. A "mimesis critic" assesses a text for literary influences as imitations instead of citations, allusions, paraphrases, echoes or redactions. Dennis R. MacDonald, *Christianizing Homer: "The Odyssey," Plato, and "The Acts of Andrew"* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994); *The Homeric Epics and the Gospel of Mark* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000). For criticism, see Margaret M. Mitchell, "Homer in the New Testament?," *JR* 83 (2003): 244–58; Karl Olav Sandnes, "Imitatio Homeri? An Appraisal of Dennis R. Mac-

access to an "antetext."[78] The second criterion, *analogy*, "asks if the ancient authors imitated the same proposed model."[79] Criteria three, four, and five "examine similarities between two texts that might indicate mimesis." Criterion three, *density*, investigates the number and volume of parallels between any two texts.[80] Criterion four, *order*, looks for common or similar sequences in the parallels, since if parallels appear in the same order, the case for dependence is strengthened. The fifth criterion, *distinctiveness*, attempts to determine the rarity and particularity of the influences, looking for examples of a telling word, phrase, context or motif.[81] MacDonald cautions against what he calls "philological fundamentalism," the view that cases of proposed literary dependence require distinctive traits to words or phrases that are nearly unique to both texts. The reality is that "few ancient imitations can clear so high a bar, and they should not have to."[82] The argument for distinctive traits is "cumulative" and texts that display several distinctive traits in common make a *prima facie* case for literary dependence. MacDonald's sixth criterion, *interpretability*, asks how literary dependence may be meaningful in a particular context, and involves an assessment of strategic differences and "an assessment of why the author may have targeted the model for imitation."[83] These criteria can help us identify cases of literary relationship.

Interest in the relationship between 4Q521 and the New Testament was initially brought about through the premature publication of 4Q521 by Eisenman and Wise who implied that the grammatical subject of line 12 ("raising the dead," "preaching good news to the poor") was the "messiah" mentioned in

---

Donald's 'Mimesis Criticism,'" *JBL* 124 (2005): 715–32. MacDonald, *Does the New Testament Imitate Homer?: Four Cases from the Acts of the Apostles* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003), 2, argues that although he "crafted the criteria to reflect descriptions of mimetic practices in Greek and Roman authors," these criteria also "apply to all types of direct literary influence."

[78] MacDonald, *Mimesis*, 2, and thus "pertain to the popularity of the proposed material."

[79] MacDonald, *Does the New Testament Imitate Homer?*, 4. Analogy thus examines the possibility that other (ancient) authors also utilized an "antetext" and "seeks for examples of imitations of the same story by other authors" since the case for dependence is strengthened by examples of other analogies.

[80] MacDonald, *Does the New Testament Imitate Homer?*, 5. MacDonald notes that "it is by no means transparent what constitutes a parallel. Ancient imitators borrowed whatever they needed from their literary antecedents, including vocabulary, grammar, names, settings, characterizations, and especially motifs. In some cases the similarities are obvious, while others are subtle and elusive." Ironically, "even opposites occasionally function as parallels."

[81] MacDonald, *Does the New Testament Imitate Homer?*, 5.

[82] MacDonald, *Does the New Testament Imitate Homer?*, 6.

[83] MacDonald, *Mimesis*, 7, argues that ancient authors also "transvalue" other texts, i.e., radically modify, subvert and/or transform their "antetexts." Such imitations are often found in narrative devices of plot, motifs and characterizations, but not necessarily in precise verbal agreements. Imitations can thus be disguised by an author's utilizing a variety of sources and borrowing from several models ("mimetic eclecticism")."

line 1.[84] While this identification was mistaken, it *is* significant that 4Q521 mentions the raising of the dead, an event which is not found in either Isaiah 61 or Psalm 146. Considering the fact that 4Q521 12 contains an allusion to Isaiah 61, and that Q 7:22 does so as well, the similarity is striking: "both texts juxtapose an allusion to Isa 61,1 with a reference to giving life to the dead."[85] In "the whole of Jewish literature between the Bible and the Mishnah, it is only in 4Q521 and the Jesus saying" in Q that Isaiah 61 is expanded with a statement about the raising of the dead.[86] Kloppenborg notes that "neither the cleanings of lepers . . . nor raising of the dead . . . is mentioned in Psalm 146 or any of the Isaianic texts which seem otherwise to have informed both 4Q521 and Q 7:22."[87] He refers to the similarity between the two texts as "an uncanny resemblance."[88] The eschatological blessings described in 4Q521 bear a striking resemblance to those described in Q 7:22.

4Q521 2 ii	*Q 7:22*
Blind see	Blind see
Lame walk	Lame walk
	Lepers cleansed
Deaf hear	Deaf hear
Dead raised	Dead raised
Poor/Good News	Poor/Good News

Q 7:22 shares material with *both* Isaiah and 4Q521; with Isaiah, but not with 4Q521, and contains material found in *neither* Isaiah nor 4Q521. Q 7:22 is quite distinctive in that it adds the clause about the "lepers." On the other hand, the author(s) of Q would have had to *independently* allude to three dif-

[84] See Wise and Tabor, "The Messiah at Qumran," 60–65; Tabor & Wise, "4Q521 'On Resurrection." For critique, see Otto Betz and Rainer Riesner, *Jesus, Qumran und der Vatikan: Klarstellungen* (Giessen: Brunnen Verlag, 1993), 111–15; Paul Stuhlmacher, *Wie treibt man Biblische Theologie* (BThSt 24; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1995), 32; Karl Wilhelm Niebuhr, "Die Werke des eschatologischen Freudenboten (4Q521 und die Jesusüberlieferung)," in *The Scriptures in the Gospels* (ed. C. M. Tuckett; BETL 131; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1997), 637–46; Hans Kvalbein,"The Wonders of the End-Time: Metaphoric Language in 4Q521 and the Interpretation of Matt 11.5 par.," *JSP* 18 (1998): 87–110.

[85] Tuckett, "Scripture and Q," 22, referring to Puech, and Collins, "The Works," 106–07.

[86] Brooke, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament*, 262.

[87] Kloppenborg Verbin, *Excavating Q*, 123, n.17.

[88] Kloppenborg, "The Sayings Gospel Q and the Historical Jesus," 330, n. 101, referring to the "The deeds of the Messiah listed in 4Q521." See also Kloppenborg Verbin, *Excavating Q*, 405, n. 72: "It would appear that a synthesis of Isaian texts was *already* in circulation by the time of the composition of Q (and certainly, Matthew) and that Q 7:22 reflects this exegetical development (original emphasis)." Kloppenborg, "Discursive Practices," 166, further notes that Jesus' reply is "surely implying that some sort of fulfillment is imminent." Yet the logic of Jesus' reply "bears scrutiny" for while Jesus' "rather elliptical response is evidently designed to be affirmative . . . (it) also amounts to a dramatic recasting of triumphalistic and nationalistic expectations association with the kingdom."

ferent Isaiah texts in order to accomplish something similar to what the author of 4Q521 has done, especially since neither Isaiah nor any other contemporary Jewish text ever combined eschatological miracles in this way.

It is theoretically possible that the author(s) of Q independently combed through Isaiah looking for suitable miraculous deeds to ascribe to Jesus; but since nearly all of Q 7:22's themes can be found in Isaiah, the author would have had to combine at least *three* different passages to do so: Isaiah 26, 35, and 61.[89] In contrast, 4Q521 represents a scribal tradition that had *already* combined four of Q's six Isaianic miracles in a *single* text. It seems more likely that the author of Q inherited or had access to traditions in which such deeds were already ascribed to a coming messianic age and/or figure.[90] James Robinson has noted that the reference to resurrection "does invite speculation as to a shared source."[91] 4Q521's reference to "the pious" being glorified "on the throne of an eternal kingdom" is also reminiscent of Q 22:30 and Q's "kingdom of God." Robinson considers the possibility that Q 7:22 "could be a mosaic put together in some other context and just taken over (and perhaps adapted) by Q to its redactional purposes . . . one might find here in the redactional layer of Q already dependence on an erudition shared with Qumran."[92] John Collins notes that it is "quite possible that the author of the Sayings source knew 4Q521; at least he drew on a common tradition."[93] Tabor and Wise argue for "common eschatological traditions."[94] Émile Puech has identified eight points of verbal and conceptual contact between 4Q521 and Q.[95] Klaus Koch simply notes that 4Q521 lies "dem Messiasbild der Evangelien

[89] Isa 26:19 ("your dead will live, their corpses will rise"); Isa 29:18–19 ("the deaf will hear . . . the eyes of the blind will see"); Isa 35:5–6 ("the eyes of the blind will be opened, and the ears of the deaf unstopped and the lame will leap like a deer"); Isa 61:1 ("good news to the oppressed").

[90] Robinson, "The Sayings Gospel Q," 5, the reference to resurrection "does invite speculation as to a shared source." Q 7:22 "could be a mosaic put together in some other context and just taken over (and perhaps adapted) by Q to its redactional purposes . . . one might find here in the redactional layer of Q already dependence on an erudition shared with Qumran." Q 7:22 "may not be the *ad hoc* creation of the redactor of Q, but rather a *florilegium* or *testimonium* produced by primitive Christian erudition and available to the Q redactor" ("Q 7B," 3). Chilton, *Galilean Rabbi*, 70, proposes that "some interpretive traditions, later incorporated in the [Isaiah] Targum, had a formative influence on the wording of some of the sayings of Jesus."

[91] Robinson, "The Sayings Gospel Q," 5.

[92] Robinson, "The Sayings Gospel Q," 5. Robinson, "Q 7B, 3."

[93] Collins, "The Works of the Messiah," 107.

[94] Tabor and Wise, "4Q521 'On Resurrection,'" 161.

[95] Puech, "Une Apocalypse Messianique (4Q521)," 488–93, finds in lines 6–8 and 10–13 eight points of verbal and conceptual contact with verses in Q: 6:20 (line 6); 6:21 (line 13); 7:22 (lines 8, 11, 12,); 10:9 (line 12); 11:33–36 (line 10); 22:30 (line 7).

näher als jeder andere Qumrantext."[96] Labahn simply concludes that "there is no significant difference … in the way they use Scripture."[97]

An additional argument in favor of Q's dependence on the tradition represented by 4Q521 is that while Q 7:22 describes Jesus as having already healed the blind, the lame, the diseased, and the deaf, as well as raised the dead and preached good news to the poor, these events are not narrated in Q: Jesus only *announces* eschatological blessings. Q mentions the healing of the centurion's servant, and whereas Luke has the servant being "ill and close to death" (Luke 7:2), in Matthew he is "paralyzed" (Matt 8:6), which means that Q's reference to the lame walking *may* be illustrated. Yet Q also contains an elaborate series of Isaianic blessings that it fails to narrate. Matthew apparently saw this discrepancy and sought to correct it by narrating several miraculous healings *prior* to his placement of Q 7:22.[98] The author of Q seems to have inherited 4Q521's list of Isaianic miracles and attributed them directly to Jesus.

Such enthusiasm has not gone unchecked. There are, after all, significant differences between the texts. 4Q521 looks to the future, for example, while Q narrates the *past* deeds of Jesus; and while Q does contain "the closest known parallel" to 4Q521 in that both texts add references to resurrection to the preaching of "good news,"[99] Novakovic argues that direct dependence between the two texts "cannot be established" since it is more probable that "both texts go back to a common tradition."[100] Allison has also argued that the list of events in 4Q521 "is far from identical with the recitation of Jesus' deeds in Q, and the parallels should not be exaggerated."[101] Brooke notes that although the parallels are significant, close textual comparison can easily compound differences. For example, Q draws from both LXX Isaiah 35:5 (blind, deaf and lame) and LXX Isaiah 61:1 (poor, blind). But in Q's use of the LXX, the "blind" seeing is not a direct quote from Isaiah 35; the "lame" walking uses the same noun as in Isaiah 35:5, but there is no parallel in the LXX for "lepers" being cleansed. The "deaf" hearing in Q uses the same verb and noun as in Isaiah 35:5. Similarly, in the reference to "good news" in

---

[96] Klaus Koch, "Heilandserwartungen im Judäa der Zeitenwende," in *Die Schriftrollen von Qumran: Zur aufregenden Geschichte ihrer Erforschung und Deutung* (ed. S. Talmon; Regensburg: Pustet, 1998), 107–135, esp. 116.

[97] Labahn, "4Q521," 166. See Johannes Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte aus Qumran: Königliche, priesterliche, und prophetische Messiasvorstellungen in den Schriftfunden von Qumran* (WUNT 2 104; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998), 343–89, esp. 343, n. 84; Niebuhr, "Die Werke des eschatologischen Freudenboten. 4Q521 und die Jesusüberlieferung," 637–46; Puech, "Some Remarks," 545–65, 551–63.

[98] Matthew inserts Q 7:22 at 11:2–6, *after* Jesus heals the blind (9:27–30), lame (8:5–13; 9:2–3), diseased (8:1–4), raises the dead (9:18–25), and preaches good news (4:23–24).

[99] Novakovic, "The Relationship between 4Q521 and Matt," 225–30.

[100] Novakovic, "The Relationship between 4Q521 and Matt," 225.

[101] Allison, *The Intertextual Jesus*, 112.

Isaiah 61:1, the verb precedes the noun, but in Q, the noun precedes the verb. Brooke concedes that the reference to resurrection is "unique" to the two lists, and that even the "order of the two elements is the same in both," but concludes that "Beyond that the parallels end."[102] For Brooke, the shared reference to "good news" is remarkable, but otherwise 4Q521 is "a combination of *different* elements of Isaiah 61:1 w/motifs from other passages."[103] So while the pair of "raising the dead" and "preaching good news" is "a striking similarity," the two citations and allusions are "re-presented in a rich variety of ways, suggesting anything but literary dependence."[104] Brooke concludes that it is "unwarranted" to suggest that Q "was deliberately meant to fit John's expectations with a precise literary allusion to a text found at Qumran."[105]

While a direct literary influence between Q 7:22 and 4Q521 is impossible to *prove*, 4Q521 is a "missing link" in explaining the compositional history of Q's beatitudes, since 4Q521 links language from Isaiah 61 with language from Psalm 146 set in an eschatological context.[106] A "similar exegetical tradition . . . lies behind the Q tradition."[107] For Tuckett, Isaiah 61:1-2 provides "an even closer link" to Q 7:22 than Q 6:20.[108] Tuckett highlights the third beatitude for the hungry as being related to Psalm 146:7 far better than Isaiah 61 since 4Q521 refers not only to the Lord "releasing prisoners" but also giving food to the hungry.[109] Tuckett sees a similarity between 4Q521's linking Psalm 146 with Isaiah 61 reflected in Q's beatitudes and proposes that "the language and form of the Q beatitudes may thus be significantly influenced . . . by an exegetical tradition in which Isa 61 and Ps 146 had already been allowed to influence and interpret each other."

The relationship between Q 7:22 and 4Q521 is quite complex. Accordingly, there are several possible models: (1) *direct literary dependence*; (2) *common tradition*; and (3) *non-literary/exegetical influence*. The first model, that of direct literary dependence, cannot be sustained, for the differences between the two texts do not allow for such a model. 4Q521 is composed in Hebrew; Q 7:22 in Septuagintal Greek. Moreover, the use of Isaiah is sufficiently different in these two distinctive contexts to preclude outright dependence. The second model, which posits that both Q 7:22 and 4Q521 drew from a "common tradition" is also problematic, not only because it is vague and

[102] Brooke, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament*, 82.

[103] Brooke, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament*, 146. Brooke considers Isa 49:9, Ps 107: 9 and Ps 146:7 as possible influences.

[104] Brooke, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament*, 82.

[105] Brooke, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament*, 82, n. 37.

[106] Tuckett, "Scripture and Q," 3–26, esp. 24.

[107] Christopher M. Tuckett, "Introduction," *The Scriptures in the Gospels* (ed. C. M. Tuckett; BETL 131; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1997), xiii–xiv.

[108] Tuckett, "Scripture and Q," 20.

[109] Tuckett, "Scripture and Q," 24.

nebulous, but because it amounts to requiring an additional undocumented Jewish community and textual tradition (separate and distinct from Qumran) to provide the "common tradition" from which both the Q and Qumran textual traditions drew. Although positing a "shared source" is possible and "cannot be directly disproved," it also cannot be proved. But since it bears the burden of proof (in that it claims documents "no one has ever seen or traditions for which there is no reliable evidence"), it is in "the weaker position." Appeals to a third entity avoid the possibility of direct dependence and thereby avoiding dealing directly with the problem. This may make "the problem easier," and the similarities and differences disappear "under the cover of a third, unproven element" which "can create the illusion that the difficulty has been solved . . . it has not." The simplest hypothesis in such cases may be simply positing direct or indirect dependence.[110]A more economical model in this case, therefore, is that of non-literary, exegetical influence. This model posits that non-literary exegetical traditions (and methods) were inherited by or transmitted to the author(s) of Q and that the direction of influence led from the chronologically earlier tradition (Qumran) to the later one (Q) through an unidentified transitional agency. Let us briefly review the evidence.

There is *exclusive* similarity between Q 7:22 and 4Q521. In both texts, Isaiah 61 and the eschatological raising of the dead are combined. Nowhere else in extant Jewish literature is this creative combination to be found. It is theoretically *possible*, as a number of scholars have suggested, that the author(s) of Q knew 4Q521, since 4Q521, which is dated to approximately 75 B. C. E., is the chronologically earlier text. The exegetical choices made in 4Q521 have been transmitted in an oral form. The two texts share a remarkable density of themes: the blind receiving their sight, the lame being healed, the dead being raised, and the poor having good news preached to them. Both texts also display a concern for eschatology and messianism. Puech has argued that there are eight points of verbal contact betwen the two texts. What is perhaps most remarkable about the relationship between the two texts is that where Q and 4Q521 *share* Isaianic motifs, the order is identical. This argument from order, in addition to the high density of parallels, and the unusually complex exegetical decisions involved with combining several passages from different texts, strongly suggests dependence.

This comparative analysis suggests that the Essene movement and/or the Qumran community envisioned events described in Isaiah as complementary to the arrival of a messianic figure. 4Q521 affirms that it is the Lord who performs the deeds (as causal agent), but there is an implicit relationship between the deeds performed and the appearance of an "anointed" figure. Jesus does not explicitly claim to be messiah or "anointed" nor is he explicitly identified as such in the text. Rather, he indirectly indicates that certain Isaianic deeds

[110] Brodie, *The Birthing of the New Testament*, 47.

have been performed in response to a question regarding his identity. Jesus does *not* claim to have performed the deeds, as Q 7:22 is composed in the passive ("the blind see, the lame walk, and the poor have good news. . ."). But those familiar with 4Q521's Isaianic list of eschatological blessings (with its explicit reference to an arrival of a messianic figure) would have concluded that the messianic age had arrived upon hearing that these very deeds had come about in and through Jesus' ministry.

According to Q, Jesus' healing activities were eschatological signs that Jesus was the "Coming One." It is widely recognized that Jesus performed healings and exorcisms.[111] Josephus describes the Essenes as treating diseases with medical cures (*B.J.* 2.136), and relates that they applied themselves "with extraordinarily zeal to the study of the works of the ancients, choosing, above all, those which tend to be useful to body and soul. In them they study the healing of diseases, the roots offering protection and the properties of stones."[112] Qumran texts also indicate that the community was interested in medical issues (4Q266, 4Q268, 4Q272).[113] According to Philo, the Therapeutae were named after their reputation as healers of the soul. A major correspondence between Jesus' method of healing and Qumran can also be found in 1QapGen, where the "laying on of hands" to exorcise an unclean spirit or demon is described (1QapGen 10:21–29). This act of healing by laying on of hands has frequent parallels in the Gospels.[114]

The *Community Rule* states that "healing" was a major element of the time of the eschatological "visitation" (1QS 4.6). The Jesus of Q 7:22 not only challenges popular and/or Davidic messianic expectations, but the very heart

[111] Sanders, *Jesus and Judaism*, 157–73; Vermes, *Jesus the Jew*, 58–82; Evans, *Jesus and his Contemporaries*, 2–8, 213–43; Reginald H. Fuller, *Interpreting the Miracles* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1963), 39; Gerd Theissen, *The Miracle Stories of the Early Christian Tradition* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983), 277; Paul J. Achtemeier, "Miracles and the Historical Jesus: A Study of Mark 9:14-29," *CBQ* 37 (1975): 471–91; Herman Hendrickx, *The Miracle Stories of the Synoptic Gospels* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1987), 22; Dieter Zeller, "Wunder und Bekenntnis: zum Sitz im Leben urchristlicher Wundergeschichten," *BZ* 25 (1981): 204–22; Barry L. Blackburn, "The Miracles of Jesus," in *Studying the Historical Jesus*, 353–94; G. H. Twelftree, *Jesus the Miracle Worker* (Downer's Grove: InterVarsity, 1999).

[112] *B.J.* 2.136. Vermes and Goodman, *The Essenes*, 43. For the Essenes as "healers," see Geza Vermes "The Etymology of 'Essenes,'" *RevQ* 7 (1960): 427–43; Joan E. Taylor, "'Roots, Remedies and Properties of Stones': The Essenes, Qumran and Dead Sea Pharmacology," *JJS* 60/2 (2009): 226–44.

[113] Joseph M. Baumgarten, "The 4Q Zadokite Fragments on Skin Disease," *JJS* 41 (1980): 205–42.

[114] Mark 5:23, 6:5, 7: 32, 8:32–35, 16:18, Luke 13:13, Acts 9:12, 17–18, 28:8. See David Flusser, "Healing Through the Laying on of Hands in a Dead Sea Scroll," *IEJ* 7 (1957): 107–108; Andre Dupont-Sommer, "Exorcismes et guérisons, dans des écrits de Qoumran," *Congress Volume, Oxford 1959* (VTSup 7; Leiden: Brill, 1960), 246–261.

of the sectarian orientation of the Qumran community: the rejection of the socially outcast: the lepers, the blind, the sick, the lame.[115] Jesus' acts of healing restore socially outcast individuals to wholeness, and challenges the social boundaries of Jewish sectarianism. It would be ill-advised to confuse Qumran sectarianism, with its rigid social boundaries, with the eschatological transformation that Jesus' ministry initiated. After all, the Essenes and the Qumran community were poised at the threshold of a perceived eschatological turning point and would have been receptive to what they may have regarded as a fulfillment of their expectations, even if it did not necessarily appear *as expected*. 1QS clearly states that community member were to abide by the laws as laid down "*until* the coming of the messiahs of Aaron and Israel."

Q 7:22–23 records this moment of interaction. The question is not whether a perfect alignment can be established between popular Jewish or, more specifically, the Qumran community's "messianic expectations" and Jesus' fulfillment of such expectations. This model is too simplistic in its approach to historical contingency and excludes the possibility of interaction, transforming reactions, mutual influence, and trajectories of development. But Q 7:22–23 provides a telling witness to Jesus' affirmation that eschatological signs of the messianic age had arrived in his ministry: John and the Essenes' expected blessings of the messianic age have been *fulfilled* in and through Jesus.[116]

6.6 Conclusion

Q 7:22, a near perfect example of Q material (as both the Matthean and the Lukan versions of this saying are virtually identical), plays a pivotal role in the larger compositional structure of Q 3–7. Q 7:22 not only confirms Jesus' identity as "The One Who Is To Come" anticipated and heralded by John the Baptist, it also carefully qualifies this confirmation. The author of Q is well aware that Jesus "scandalizes" or "offends" the religious sensibilities of some of his contemporaries, and mitigates this with a concluding beatitude. Matthew and Luke both regard this saying complex as evidence of Jesus' messianic credentials, primarily because Q 7:22 contains a number of fulfilled Isaianic prophecies which are interpreted as eschatological signs. This pastiche of scriptural citations reveals the relatively sophisticated literary skill and scriptural engagement deployed by the author of Q.

Since its publication in 1992, 4Q521 has received a considerable amount of attention, primarily because it contains a strikingly similar list of eschatologi-

[115] 1QSa 2.4–10; 11QTemple 45–47; CD 15.15.

[116] Chilton and Evans, "Jesus and Israel's Scriptures," 322, 325: "Jesus' allusion to Isa 61:1–2, especially as it is preserved in Q, parallels 4Q521 in an amazing way," as the fulfillment of "What the members of Qumran longed for."

cal signs set within a messianic context. 4Q521 was found in Cave 4 at Qumran, was *copied* by its scribes, and is only attested in the Qumran library. It is reasonable to conclude that 4Q521 represents an Essenic or pre-sectarian text. 4Q521 contains a list of Isaianic blessings that will occur when "his messiah" arrives and illustrates a remarkably similar literary creativity and scriptural engagement to that displayed in Q 7:22. A careful literary analysis and comparison of the two texts reveals that it is far more likely that the author of Q 7:22 knew and borrowed from the earlier tradition represented by 4Q521 than positing that both authors independently developed this literary exercise or that both authors drew from a third, unknown common source.

Q 7:22 suggests that Jesus' reply to John not only confirmed that the messianic age had arrived in his ministry, but that both John and the Essenes' eschatological expectations were being fulfilled in and through Jesus.

Chapter 7

Conclusion

This study has taken a Judaic approach to Q. This has required a fundamental reevaluation of the dominant consensus in Q studies, namely that Q originated as a Galilean text with no discernable relationship to Judea, Jerusalem, or the Jerusalem community referred to by Paul. On the contrary, this study has argued that there is very little evidence for Greek-literate scribes in first-century Galilee and no compelling evidence that Q originated in Galilee. Q contains polemic *against* Galilean villages and displays relatively sophisticated literary techniques reminiscent of a number of Qumran and Essene texts. Q should no longer be used to support the project of a Galilean Jesus movement constructed in opposition to a Judean/Jerusalem community. The physical, geographical locations of Galilee and Jerusalem should also not be ideologically reified to represent two radically different alternatives to the social history, constituency, or Christology of Q. Q contains extensive urban imagery and explicit criticism of Judean religious figures and institutions such as the Pharisees, scribes, the Temple, and Jerusalem itself, but the narrative world of Q begins and ends in Judea. Q is better understood as an ethnically and perhaps geographically Judean text.

The reconstruction of the social history of Q remains uncertain, but we may proceed with several tentative conclusions. First, it seems rather odd that Q, a text purportedly about *Jesus*, begins with *John*. John's narrative function in Q establishes an expectation of an apocalyptic figure, "the one who is to come," but Jesus' reply to John makes it evident that Jesus did not fulfill John's expectations. The oddity of John being so prominently featured in the beginning of Q indicates that John's authority was so highly regarded that it could not be dropped without the movement losing something that anchored it to its earliest cultural origin and matrix. The Q group did not, at least at first, see any problem with holding John and Jesus in high regard at the same time, even when the tradition was willing to admit that Jesus' activities did not quite fit John's expectations. John is "more than a prophet" and the greatest of all those born to women. Jesus and John are "Children of Wisdom," and their ministries complement and parallel each other's. The best known parallel to this is the Qumranic expectation of two "anointed" figures. Q 7:22–23, in particular, correlates Jesus, John, and messianic expectations found in 4Q521.

The provenance of 4Q525 and 4Q521 continue to be debated, and we must be methodologically cautious in assessing their sectarian, non-sectarian, or pre-sectarian status. To be sure, neither 4Q525 nor 4Q521 should necessarily be identified as *Qumran* sectarian texts. Yet it may not be necessary for 4Q525 or 4Q521 to be Qumran compositions in order for them to be classified as pre-sectarian or even "Essenic" texts. Let us recall the following: (1) these texts were found at Qumran, in a "sectarian" library; (2) they were presumably regarded as theologically amenable to the Qumran "community"; (3) the texts are otherwise unattested in Jewish literature; and (4) the Qumran community was part of a broader "Essene" network of textual traditions which was also related to the Enoch tradition. It is methodologically prudent to locate 4Q525 and 4Q521 within this broader Jewish Essene movement.

There is a need for further research on the relationship(s) between this broader Essene movement and the early Jesus tradition. Such research could not only provide a new lens for looking at the Christology of Q, it could also provide the cultural context within which to locate the "historical Jesus," his spiritual development, the early socio-political formation of the early Jesus movement, and the origins and background of early Jewish Christianity.

Could "Essene" ideas, texts, and practices have influenced Q? Yes. Jesus' teachings and identity were shaped to fit into pre-existing literary forms and ideas, thereby introducing the Jesus movement to Essenic scriptural and exegetical expertise.[1] The Jesus movement had contact with the lay Essene movement, and it is among such lay Essenes that an early messianic identification of Jesus may have been made.[2] Both the Essenes and the early Jesus

[1] Otto Betz and Rainer Riesner, *Jesus, Qumran and the Vatican: Clarifications* (London: SCM, 1994), 155: "a whole group of Essenes were converted to Jesus as the Messiah. These converted Essenes formed a body of theologians who were highly qualified for their time. They were capable of working out at a deep intellectual level who Jesus was and how he had brought salvation." See also Fitzmyer, *The Semitic Background of the New Testament*, 296: "there were undoubtedly some Essenes among the priests converted to Christianity (Acts 6:7), and that they were most likely the bridge of contact between the two communities." Johnson, "The Dead Sea Manual of Discipline and the Jerusalem Church of Acts," 129–142; Brooke, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament,* 4: "it is… possible that some Essenes became members of some early Christian communities." Pierre Benoit, "Qumran and the New Testament," in *Paul and Qumran: Studies in New Testament Exegesis* (ed. J. Murphy-O'Connor; Chicago: Priory, 1968), 1, 14: "a certain influence . . . seems undeniable . . . It is not only possible, but very likely, that some zealous and sincere Essenes gradually accepted and joined the infant Church." Martin S. Jaffee, *Torah in the Mouth: Writing and Oral Tradition in Palestinian Judaism, 200 BCE – 400 CE* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001), notes that "dissident scribes" were involved in the oral transmission of various texts in diverse contexts.

[2] On the Jesus movement being directly influenced by Essenes, see Renan, *History of the People of Israel*; Lightfoot, *Saint Paul's Epistles to the Colossians*; Benoit, "Qumran and the New Testament"; Dupont-Sommer, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*; *The Jewish Sect of Qumran*; Cross, *The Ancient Library at Qumran*, 145; Davies, *Christian Origins and Judaism*, 110;

movement changed over time, with new social, ethnic, and theological boundaries being drawn until the early Jewish Jesus movement – now including rural and educated Galileans, Judeans, Essenes, Pharisees, God-fearers, and Diasporic Jews – transformed into the complex and conflicted sectarian formations of early Jewish Christianity, with the Q group, like Q itself, disappearing in the canonical Gospels of Matthew and Luke.

Bruce, *Second Thoughts on the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 89, 101; Simon, *Jewish Sects at the Time of Jesus*, 147–48; Taylor, *Where Did Christianity Come From?*, 123; Flusser, *Judaism and the Origins of Christianity*, 72; Gaster, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 13; Ulfgard, "The Branch in the Last Days," 246; Brown, "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament," 2; VanderKam, "The Dead Sea Scrolls and Christianity," 185; Black, *The Scrolls and Christian Origins*, 168; "The Dead Sea Scrolls and Christian Origins," 99; Campbell, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 140; Schubert, "The Sermon on the Mount and the Qumran Texts," 123, 131; Charlesworth, "Have the Dead Sea Scrolls Revolutionized Our Understanding of the New Testament?," 123–24; "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Historical Jesus," 18; Capper, "The New Covenant in Southern Palestine At the Arrest of Jesus," 90–116; "The Church as the New Covenant of Effective Economics," 83–102; "With the Oldest Monks . . . ," 1–55; "Community of Goods in the Early Jerusalem Church," 1730–74; "The Palestinian Cultural Context of Earliest Christian Community of Goods," 323–56; Wilson, *The Scrolls from the Dead Sea*; Potter, *The Lost Years of Jesus*; Schonfield, *Secrets of the Dead Sea Scrolls*; Howlett, *The Essenes and Christianity*, 134–44; Davies, *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Paolo Sacchi, "Recovering Jesus' Formative Background," in *Jesus and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 135: "Jesus' formative years was of an Essene type. His uniqueness must be sought within this kind of thought." Brooke, "Qumran: Cradle of the Christ?," 33: "the manuscripts from Qumran provide us with several of the planks that make up the cradle of the Christ."

Bibliography

Achtemeier, Paul J. “Miracles and the Historical Jesus: A Study of Mark 9:14–29.” *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 37 (1975): 471–491.

Albright, William Foxwell. and C. S. Mann. “Qumran and the Essenes: Geography, Chronology, and Iden- tification of the Sect.” Pages 11–25 in *The Scrolls and Christianity: Historical and Theological Significance*. Theological Collections 11. Edited by M. Black. London, SPCK, 1969.

Alexander, Philip S. “Rabbinic Judaism and the New Testament.” *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* 74 (1983): 237–246.

Allegro, John. *The Dead Sea Scrolls*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1956.

–. *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A Reappraisal*. Baltimore: Penguin, 1964.

–. *The Sacred Mushroom and the Cross: A Study of the Nature and Origins of Christianity within the Fertility Cults of the Ancient Near East.* London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1970.

–. *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Christian Myth*. Newton Abbot: Westbridge Books, 1979.

Allison, Dale C., Jr. *The New Moses: A Matthean Typology*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993.

–. *The Jesus Tradition in Q*. Valley Forge, Pa.: Trinity Press International, 1997.

–. *Jesus of Nazareth: Millenarian Prophet*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1999.

–. *The Intertextual Jesus: Scripture in Q*. Harrisburg, Pa.: Trinity Press International, 2000.

–. *Constructing Jesus: Memory, Imagination, and History*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2010.

Alt, Albrecht. “Zur Geschichte der Grenze zwischen Judäa und Samaria.” Pages 346–435 in *Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte des Volkes Israel II.* München: C. H. Beck’sche, 1959.

Anderson, Jeff S. “From ‘Communities of Texts’ to Religious Communities: Problems and Pitfalls.” Pages 351–355 in *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection.* Edited by G. Boccaccini. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005.

Arnal, William E. “Redactional Fabrication and Group Legitimation: The Baptist’s Preaching in Q 3:7–9, 16–17.” Pages 165–180 in *Conflict and Invention: Literary, Rhetorical, and Social Studies on the Sayings Gospel Q*. Edited by J. S. Kloppenborg. Valley Forge: Trinity Press International, 1995.

–. “The Rhetoric of Deracination in Q: A Reappraisal.” Ph. D. diss., Centre for the Study of Religion, University of Toronto, 1997.

–. *Jesus and the Village Scribes: Galilean Conflicts and the Setting of Q*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001.

–. “Why Q Failed: From Ideological Project to Group Formation.” Pages 67–87 in *Redescribing Christian Origins*. Edited by R. Cameron and M. P. Miller. Symposium Series 28. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2004.

–. “The Q Document.” Pages 119–154 in *Jewish Christianity Reconsidered: Rethinking Ancient Groups and Texts*. Edited by M. Jackson-McCabe. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007.

–. and Willi Braun, “Social Formation and Mythmaking: Theses on Key Terms.” Pages 459–467 in *Redescribing Christian Origins*. Edited by R. Cameron and M. P. Miller. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2004.

Atkinson, Kenneth, Hanan Eshel and Jodi Magness, "Another View: Do Josephus' Writings Support the 'Essene Hypothesis?'" *Biblical Archaeology Review* 35/2 (2009): 56–59.
Attridge, Harold W. "Reflections on Research into Q." *Semeia* 55 (1991): 223–234.
–. "The Gospel of John and the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 109–126 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, 11–12 January, 2004*. Edited by R. A. Clements and D. R. Schwartz. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 84. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
Aune, David E. "Jesus and Cynics in First-Century Palestine: Some Critical Considerations." Pages 177–192 in *Hillel and Jesus: Comparative Studies of Two Major Religious Leaders*. Edited by J. H. Charlesworth and L. L. Johns, Minneapolis: Fortress, 1997.
Badia, Leonard F. *The Qumran Baptism and John the Baptist's Baptism*. Lanham: University Press of America, 1980.
Bahrdt, Karl Friedrich. *Ausführung des Plans und Zwecks Jesu. In Briefen an Wahrheit suchende Leser*. 11 vols. Berlin: August Mylius, 1784–1792.
Bal, Mieke. *Death and Dissymmetry: The Politics of Coherence in the Book of Judges*. Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1988.
Bammel, Ernst. "The Baptist in Early Christian Tradition." *New Testament Studies* 18 (1972): 95–128.
Bar-Nathan, Rachel. "Qumran and the Hasmonean and Herodian Winter Palaces of Jericho: The Implication of the Pottery Finds on the Interpretation of the Settlement at Qumran." Pages 263–277 in *Qumran: The Site of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Archaeological Interpretations and Debates: Proceedings of a Conference held at Brown University, November 17–19, 2002*. Edited by K. Galor, J-B. Humbert and J. K. Zangenberg. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
Barclay, John M. G. "Constructing Judean Identity after 70 CE: A Study of Josephus' *Against Apion*." Pages 99–112 in *Identity and Interaction in the Ancient Mediterranean*. Edited by Z. E. Crook and P. A. Harland. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2007.
Bardtke, Hans. "Die Kriegsrolle von Qumran übersetzt," *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 80 (1955): 401–20.
Barker, Margaret. *The Lost Prophet: The Book of Enoch and its Influence on Christianity*. Nashville: Abingdon, 1988.
Barnstone, Willis S., ed. *The Other Bible*. New York: HarperSanFrancisco, 1984.
Barrett, Charles K. *The Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition*. London: SPCK, 1947.
Bauckham, Richard. "The Son of Man: 'A Man in My Position' or 'Someone'?" *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 23 (1985): 23–33.
–. "Qumran and the Fourth Gospel: Is there a Connection?" Pages 267–279 in *The Scrolls and the Scriptures: Qumran Fifty Years After*. Edited by S. E. Porter and C. A. Evans. Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha: Supplement Series 26. Roehampton Institute London Papers 3. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.
–. "For What Offence Was Jesus Put to Death?" Pages 199–232 in *James the Just and Christian Origins*. Edited by B. Chilton and C. A. Evans. Novum Testamentum Supplements 98. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
–. "The Early Jerusalem Church, Qumran, and the Essenes." Pages 63–89 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls as Background to Postbiblical Judaism and Early Christianity: Papers From an International Conference at St. Andrews in 2001*. Edited by J. Davila. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 46. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
–. "James and the Jerusalem Community." Pages 55–95 in *Jewish Believers in Jesus: The Early Centuries*. Edited by Oskar Skarsaune and Reidar Hvalvik. Peabody: Hendrickson, 2007.

–. *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses: The Gospels as Eyewitness Testimony*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006.

Bauer, Walter. "Jesus der Galiläer." Pages 91–108 in *Aufsätze und Kleine Schriften*. Edited by G. Strecker. Tübingen: Mohr, 1967.

Baum, Gregory. Introduction. Pages 1–22 in to *Faith and Fratricide: The Theological Roots of Anti-Semitism*, by Rosemary Radford Ruether. New York: Seabury, 1974.

Baumgarten, Albert I. *The Flourishing of Jewish Sects in the Maccabean Era: An Interpretation*. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 55. Leiden: Brill, 1997.

Baumgarten, Joseph M. "The Heavenly Tribunal and the Personification of *Sedeq* in Jewish Apocalyptic." Pages 233–236 in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt.* 2.19. Edited by H. Temporini and W. Haase. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1979.

–. "The 4Q Zadokite Fragments on Skin Disease." *Journal of Jewish Studies* 41 (1980): 205–242.

–. "The Qumran Essene Restraints on Marriage." Pages 13–24 in *Archaeology and History in the Dead Sea Scrolls: The New York University Conference in Memory of Yigael Yadin*. Edited by L. H. Schiffman. Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplements 8. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1990.

–. "Messianic Forgiveness of Sin in CD 14:19, (4Q266 10 I 12–13)." Pages 541–544 in *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues.* Edited by D. W. Parry and E. Ulrich. Leiden: Brill, 1999.

–. "The Purification Liturgies." Pages 202–212 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment.* Edited by P. W. Flint and J. C. VanderKam. Leiden: Brill, 1999.

Baur, Ferdinand Christian. *Kirchengeschichte der drei ersten Jahrhunderte*. Tübingen: L. F. Fues, 1863. ET: *The Church History of the First Three Centuries*. Translated by Allan Menzies. 2 vols. London & Edinburgh: Williams and Norgate, 1878.

–. *Das Christentum und die christliche Kirche der drei ersten Jahrhunderte.* 2d ed. Tübingen: L. F. Fues, 1860.

Beall, Todd S. *Josephus' Description of the Essenes Illustrated by the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.

Beasley-Murray, George Raymond. *Jesus and the Kingdom of God*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986.

Becker, Adam H. and Annette Yoshiko Reed, eds. *The Ways that Never Parted: Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages*. Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism 95. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003

Becker, Jürgen. *Jesus von Nazaret.* Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1996.

–. *Johannes der Täufer und Jesus von Nazareth*. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1972.

Becker, Michael. "4Q521 und die Gesalbten." *Revue de Qumran* 18 (1997): 73–96.

Berger, Klaus and Carsten Colpe, eds. *Religionsgeschichtliches Textbuch zum Neuen Testament.* Texte zum Neuen Testament 1. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1987. ET: *Hellenistic Commentary to the New Testament.* Edited by M. E. Boring, K. Berger and C. Colpe. Nashville: Abingdon, 1995.

Bergmeier, Roland. *Die Essener-Berichte des Flavius Josephus: Quellenstudien zu den Essenertexten im Werk des Jüdischen Historiographen*. Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1993.

–. "Beobachtungen zu 4Q521 f2, II, 1–13." *Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 145 (1995): 39–48.

–. "Zum historischen Wert der Essenerberichte von Philo und Josephus." Pages 11–22 in-*Qumran kontrovers: Beiträge zu den Textfunden vom Toten Meer*. Edited by J. Frey and H. Stegemann. Bonifatius: Verlag Paderborn, 2003.

–. “Die drei jüdischen Schulrichtungen nach Josephus und Hippolyt von Rom: Zu den Paralleltexten Josephus, B.J. 2.119–166 und Hippolyt, Haer. IX 18, 2–29,4.” *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 34/4 (2003): 443–470.
Berlinerbrau, Jacques. *The Secular Bible: Why Nonbelievers Must Take Religion Seriously*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
Benoit, Pierre. “Qumran and the New Testament.” Pages 1–30 in *Paul and Qumran: Studies in New Testament Exegesis*. Edited by J. Murphy-O’Connor. Chicago: Priory, 1968.
Berger, Klaus. J*esus and the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Truth under Lock and Key?* Translated by J. S. Currie. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1995.
Berger, Peter & Thomas Luckmann. *The Social Construction of Reality*. Garden City: Doubleday, 1966.
Beskow, Per. *Strange Tales about Jesus: A Survey of Unfamiliar Gospels*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983.
Betz, Hans Dieter. *Essays on the Sermon on the Mount*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985.
–. “Wellhausen’s Dictum ‘Jesus was not a Christian, but a Jew’ in Light of Present Scholarship.” *Studia theologica* 45 (1991): 83–100.
–. “Jesus and the Cynics: Survey and Analysis of a Hypothesis.” *Journal of Religion* 74 (1994): 453–75.
–. *The Sermon on the Mount: A Commentary on the Sermon on the Mount, Including the Sermon on the Plain (Matthew 5:3–7:27 and Luke 6:20–49)*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995.
Betz, Otto. *What Do We Know About Jesus: The Bedrock of Fact Illuminated by the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Translated by M. Kohl. London: Philadelphia, 1968.
–. “Essener und Therapeuten.” Pages 386–391 in *Theologische Realenzyklopädie*. Volume 10. Edited by G. Krause and G. Müller. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1982.
–. Otto Betz, “Was John the Baptist an Essene?” *Bible Review* 18 (1990): 18–25.
–. and Rainer Riesner. *Jesus, Qumran und der Vatikan: Klarstellungen*. Giessen: Brunnen Verlag, 1993. ET: *Jesus, Qumran and the Vatican: Clarifications*. Translated by J. Bowden. London: SCM, 1994.
Bhabha, Homi. *The Location of Culture*. London: Routledge, 1994.
Bilde, Per. “The Essenes in Philo and Josephus.” Pages 32–68 in *Qumran Between the Old and New Testaments*. Edited by F. Cryer and T. L. Thompson. Sheffield: Sheffield University Press, 1998.
Bickerman, Elias J. *The Jews in the Greek Age*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1988.
Black, Matthew. “Unsolved New Testament Problems: The Problem of the Aramaic Element in the Gospels.” *Expository Times* 59 (1948): 171–175.
–. “Unsolved New Testament Problems: The ‘Son of Man’ in the Teachings of Jesus.” *Expository Times* 60 (1948–49): 32–36.
–. *The Scrolls and Christian Origins: Studies in the Jewish Background of the New Testament*. New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1961.
–. *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts. With an Appendix on the Son of Man by Geza Vermes*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1967.
–. “The Dead Sea Scrolls and Christian Origins.” Pages 97–106 in *The Scrolls and Christianity: Historical and Theological Significance*. Edited by M. Black. London: SPCK, 1969.
–. “Aramaic Barnāshā and the Son of Man.” *Expository Times* 95 (1984): 200–206.
–. “The Aramaic Dimension in Q with Notes on Luke 17.22 Matthew 24.26 (Luke 17.23).” *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 40 (1990): 33–41.
Blackburn, Barry L. “The Miracles of Jesus.” Pages 353–394 in *Studying the Historical Jesus: Evaluations of the State of Current Research*. Edited by B. A. Chilton and C. A. Evans. New Testament Tools and Studies 19. Leiden: Brill, 1994.

Blanton, Ward. *Displacing Christian Origins: Philosophy, Secularity, and the New Testament*. Religion and Postmodernism. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007.

Bloom, Harold. *The Anxiety of Influence*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1973.

Boccaccini, Gabriele. *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis: The Parting of the Ways between Qumran and Enochic Judaism*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.

–. “Qumran: The Headquarters of the Essenes or a Marginal Splinter Group?” Pages 303–309 in *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection*. Edited by G. Boccaccini. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005.

–. “Enochians, Urban Essenes, Qumranites: Three Social Groups, One Intellectual Movement.” Pages 301–326 in *The Early Enoch Literature*. Edited by G. Boccaccini and J. J. Collins. Journal for the Study of Judaism Supplements 121. Leiden: Brill, 2007.

Borg, Marcus J. *Jesus: A New Vision: Spirit, Culture and the Life of Discipleship*. New York: HarperSanFrancisco, 1987.

Borsch, Frederick H. *The Son of Man in Myth and History*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1967.

Boyarin, Daniel. *A Radical Jew: Paul and the Politics of Identity*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994.

–. *Dying for God: Martyrdom and the Making of Christianity and Judaism*. Stanford University Press, 1999.

–. *Border Lines: The Partition of Judaeo-Christianity*. Divinations. Philadelphia, Pa.: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004.

–. “Semantic Differences; or, “Judaism”/”Christianity.” Pages 65–85 in *The Ways That Never Parted: Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages*. Edited by A. H. Becker and A. Y. Reed. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007.

Boyd, Gregory A. *Cynic Sage or Son of God?: Recovering the Real Jesus in an Age of Revisionist Replies*. Wheaton, Ill.: Bridgepoint, 1995.

Braun, Herbert. “The Significance of Qumran for the Problem of the Historical Jesus.” Pages 69–78 in *The Historical Jesus and the Kerygmatic Christ: Essays on the New Quest of the Historical Jesus*. Edited by C. E. Braaten and R. A. Harrisville. Nashville: Abingdon, 1964.

–. *Qumran und das Neue Testamen*t I–II. Tübingen: Mohr, 1966.

Braun, Willi. “The Schooling of a Galilean Jesus Association (The Sayings Gospel Q).” Pages 43–65 in *Redescribing Christian Origins*. Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series 28. Edited by R. Cameron and M. P. Miller. Atlanta: Society Biblical Literature, 2004.

Bretscher, Paul G. “Whose Sandals? (Matt 3:11).” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 86 (1967): 81–87.

Brodie, Thomas L. “Towards Tracing the Gospels’ Literary Indebtedness to the Epistles.” Pages 104–116 in *Mimesis and Intertextuality in Antiquity and Christianity*. Edited by D. R. MacDonald. Studies in Antiquity and Christianity. Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 2001.

–. *The Birthing of the New Testament: The Intertextual Development of the New Testament Writings*. Sheffied: Sheffield University Press, 2004.

Brooke, George J. “Shared Intertextual Interpretations in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament.” Pages 35–57 in *Biblical Perspectives: Early Use and Interpretation of the Bible in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by M. E. Stone and E. G. Chazon. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 28. Leiden: Brill, 1998.

–. “Kingship and Messianism in the Dead Sea Scrolls.” Pages 447–454 in *King and Messiah in Israel and the Ancient Near East: Proceedings of the Oxford Old Testament Seminar*. Edited by J. Day. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.

–. “Qumran: The Cradle of the Christ?” Pages 23–34 in *The Birth of Jesus: Biblical and Theological Reflections*. Edited by G. J. Brooke. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 2000.

–. *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament.* Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005.

–. “The Pre-Sectarian Jesus.” Pages 33–48 in *Echoes from the Caves: Qumran and the New Testament.* Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 85. Edited by F. García Martínez. Leiden: Brill, 2009.

Broshi, Magen. “Was Qumran a Crossroads?” *Revue de Qumran* 19 (1999): 273–276.

–. *Bread, Wine, Walls and Scrolls*. Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplemental Series 36. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001.

–. “What Jesus Learned From the Essenes.” *Biblical Archaeology Review* 30 (2004): 32–37, 64.

–., ed., *The Damascus Document Reconsidered*. Jerusalem: The Israel Exploration Society/Shrine of the Book: Israel Museum, 1992.

–. and Hanan Eshel. “How and Where did the Qumranites live?” Pages 267–73 in *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 30. Edited by D. W. Parry and E. Ulrich. Leiden: Brill, 1999.

Brown, Raymond E. “The Qumran Scrolls and the Johannine Gospels and Epistles.” *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 17 (1955): 403–419, 559–574.

–. “Second Thoughts, the Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament.” *Expository Times* (10/1966): 19–23.

–. “The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament.” Pages 1–8 in *John and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by J. H. Charlesworth. New York: Crossroad, 1990.

–. *The Birth of the Messiah: A Commentary on the Infancy Narratives in the Gospels of Matthew and Luke*. Anchor Bible Reference Library. New York: Doubleday, 1993.

Brownlee, William H. “John the Baptist in the New Light of Ancient Scrolls.” Pages 33–53 in *The Scrolls and the New Testament*. Edited by Krister Stendahl. New York: Harper, 1957.

–. “Jesus and Qumran.” Pages 52–81 in *Jesus and the Historian*. Edited by F. T. Trotter. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1968.

–. *The Midrash Pesher of Habakkuk*. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1979.

Bruce, Frederick Fyvie. *Second Thoughts on the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1956.

–. “Qumran and Early Christianity.” *New Testament Studies* 2 (1955–56): 176–190.

–. “Holy Spirit in the Qumran Texts.” *The Annual of Leeds University Oriental Society* 6 (1969): 49–55.

Bultmann, Rudolf. *Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition*. Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments 29. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1931, 1958. ET: *The History of the Synoptic Tradition*. Translated by J. Marsh. Oxford: Blackwell, 1963.

Buell, Denise Kimber. *Why This New Race?: Ethnic Reasoning in Early Christianity*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2005.

Burkett, Delbert. *The Son of Man Debate: A History and Evaluation.* Society of New Testament Studies Monograph Series 107. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Burrows, Millar. *The Dead Sea Scrolls*. New York: Viking, 1955.

–. *More Light on the Dead Sea Scrolls: New Scrolls and New Interpretations, with Translations of Important Recent Discoveries*. New York: Viking, 1958.

Bussby, Frederick. “Is Q an Aramaic Document?” *Expository Times* 65 (1954): 272–275.

Bussmann, Wilhelm. *Synoptische Studien*. 3 vols. *Zur Redenquelle*. Halle: Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses, 1925–31.

Cadbury, Henry J. “A Qumran Parallel to Paul.” *Harvard Theological Review* 51 (1958): 1–2.

Callaway, Philip R. "Qumran Origins: From the *Doresh* to the *Moreh*." *Revue de Qumran* 14/56 (1990): 637–650.

Cameron, Ron. "'What Have You Come Out to See? Characterizations of John and Jesus in the Gospels." *Semeia* 49 (1990): 35–70.

–. "The Sayings Gospel Q and the Quest for the Historical Jesus: A Response to John S. Kloppenborg." *Harvard Theological Review* 89:4 (1996): 351–354.

–. and Merrill P. Miller, eds. *Redescribing Christian Origins*. Society of Biblical Literature Symposium 28. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2004.

Campbell, Jonathan. "Essene-Qumran Origins in the Exile: A Scriptural Basis?" *Journal of Jewish Studies* 46 (1995): 143–156.

–. *The Dead Sea Scrolls: The Complete Story*. Berkeley, Calif.: Ulysses, 1998.

Cansdale, Lena. *Qumran and the Essenes: A Re-Evaluation of the Evidence*. Texte und Studien zum Antiken Judentum 60. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997.

Capper, Brian J. "Community of Goods in the Early Jerusalem Church." Pages 1730–1774 in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*. 2.26.2. Edited by H. Temporini and W. Haase. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1995.

–. "The Palestinian Cultural Context of Earliest Christian Community of Goods." Pages 323–356 in *The Book of Acts in Its Palestinian Setting, The Book of Acts in Its First Century Setting*. Vol. 4. Edited by R. J. Bauckham. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995.

–. "With the Oldest Monks…" Light from Essene History on the Career of the Beloved Disciple?," *Journal of Theological Studies* 49 (1998): 1–55.

–. "Two Types of Discipleship in Early Christianity." *Journal of Theological Studies* 52 (2001): 105–123.

–. "The Church as the New Covenant of Effective Economics: The Social Origins of Mutually Supportive Christian Community." *International Journal for the Study of the Christian Church* 2 (2002): 83–102.

–. "The New Covenant in Southern Palestine At the Arrest of Jesus." Pages 90–116 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls as Background to Postbiblical Judaism and Early Christianity*. Edited by J. R. Davila. Leiden: Brill, 2003.

Caragounis, Chrys C. *The Son of Man: Vision and Interpretation*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 38. Tübingen: Mohr: Siebeck, 1986.

Cargill, Robert. *Qumran through (Real) Time: A Virtual Reconstruction of Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Bible in Technology 1. Piscataway: Gorgias Press, 2009.

Carlston, Charles E. "Wisdom and Eschatology in Q." Pages 101–119 in *Logia: Les paroles de Jésus: Memorial Joseph Coppens*. Edited by J. Delobel. Leuven: Peeters, 1982.

–. and Dennis Norlan. "Once More – Statistics and Q." *Harvard Theological Review* 64 (1971): 59–78.

Carmignac, Jean. "La Notion d'Eschatologie dans la Bible et à Qumran." *Revue de Qumran* 7 (1969): 17–31.

Carruth, Shawn. "Strategies of Authority: A Rhetorical Study of the Character of the Speaker in Q 6:20–49." Pages 98–115 in *Conflict and Invention: Literary, Rhetorical, and Social Studies on the Sayings Gospel Q*. Valley Forge, Pa.: Trinity, 1995.

Carter, Jeffrey. "Description is not Explanation: A Methodology of Comparison." *Method and Theory in the Study of Religion* 10/2 (1998): 133–148.

–. "Comparison in the History of Religions: Reflections and Critiques." *Method and Theory in the Study of Religion* 16/1 (2004): 3–11.

Casey, P. Maurice. "The Corporate Interpretation of 'One Like a Son of Man' (Dan VII 13) at the Time of Jesus." *Novum Testamentum* 18 (1976): 167–80.

–. "The Son of Man Problem." *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* 67 (1976): 147–54.

–. "The Use of the Term 'Son of Man' in the Similitudes of Enoch." *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 7 (1976): 11–29.
–. *Son of Man: The Interpretation and Influence of Daniel 7*. London: SPCK, 1979.
–. "Aramaic Idiom and Son of Man Sayings." *Expository Times* 96 (1985): 233–236.
–. "The Jackals and the Son of Man (Matt. 8.20/Luke 9.58)." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 23 (1985): 3–22.
–. "General, Generic, and Indefinite: The Use of the Term 'Son of Man' in Aramaic Sources and in the Teaching of Jesus." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 29 (1987): 21–56.
–. "Method in Our Madness and Madness in Their Methods: Some Approaches to the Son of Man Problem in Recent Scholarship," *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 42 (1991): 17–43.
–. "The Use of the Term בר אנשא in the Aramaic Translations of the Hebrew Bible." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 54 (1994): 87–118.
–. "Idiom and Translation: Some Aspects of the Son of Man Problem." *New Testament Studies* 41 (1995): 164–182.
–. "Some Anti-Semitic Assumptions in the TDNT." *Novum Testamentum* 41 (1999): 280–291.
–. *An Aramaic Approach to Q: Sources for the Gospels of Matthew and Luke*. Society of New Testament Studies 122. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
–. *The Solution to the 'Son of Man' Problem*. London: T & T Clark, 2007.
Castelli, Elizabeth A. and Hal Taussig, eds. *Reimagining Christian Origins: A Colloquium-Honoring Burton L. Mack*. Valley Forge: Trinity Press International, 1996.
Catchpole, David R. "The Poor on Earth and the Son of Man in Heaven: A Re-appraisal of Matthew XXV. 31–46." *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester* 61 (1979): 355–397.
–. "The Angelic Son of Man in Luke 12:8." *Novum Testamentum* 24 (1982): 255–265.
–. "Temple Traditions in Q." Pages 305–329 in *Templum Amicitiae*. Edited by W. Horbury. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplements 48. Sheffield: JSOT, 1991.
–. *The Quest for Q*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1993.
Chancey, Mark A. *The Myth of a Gentile Galilee*. Society for New Testament Studies 118. Cambridge: Cambridge University, 2002.
Charles, Ronald. "Q as a Question from a Postcolonial Point of View." *Black Theology* 7.2 (2009): 182–199.
Charlesworth, James H. "The Portrayal of the Righteous as an Angel." Pages 135–151 in *Ideal Figures in Ancient Judaism: Profiles and Paradigms*. Edited by G. W. E. Nickelsburg and J. J. Collins. Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies 12. Chico: Scholars, 1980.
–. "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Historical Jesus." Pages 1–74 in *Jesus and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by J. H. Charlesworth. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
–. "John the Baptizer and Qumran Barriers in Light of the Rule of the Community." Pages 353–375 in *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Refomulated Issues.* Edited by D. W. Parry and E. Ulrich. Lieden: Brill, 1999.
–. "Have the Dead Sea Scrolls Revolutionized Our Understanding of the New Testament?" Pages 116–132 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years After Their Discovery: Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20-25, 1997*. Edited by L. H. Schiffman, E. Tov and J. C. VanderKam. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society/The Shrine of the Book, Israel Museum, 2000.

–. "The Qumran Beatitudes (4Q525) and the New Testament (Mt. 5:3–11, Lk 6:20–26)." *Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuses* 80 (2000): 13–35.
–, ed. *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha and the New* Testament. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.
–, ed. *John and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Christian Origins Library. New York: Crossroad, 1990.
–. ed., et al. *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations*. Vol. I: *The Rule of the Community and Related Documents*. Tübingen: Mohr/Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1994.
Chilton, Bruce D. *The Glory of Israel: The Theology and Provenience of the Isaiah Targum*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplements 23. Sheffield: JSOT, 1982.
–. *Jesus' Use of the Interpreted Scripture of His Time.* Good News Studies 8. Wilmington: Michael Glazier, 1984.
–. *A Galilean Rabbi and his Bible: Jesus' own interpretation of Isaiah*. London: SPCK, 1984.
–. *Targumic Approaches to the Gospels: Essays in the Mutual Definition of Judaism and Christianity*. Lanham: University Press of America, 1986.
–. *The Isaiah Targum.* Anchor Bible 11. Wilmington: Michael Glazier, 1987.
–. *Profiles of a Rabbi: Synoptic Opportunities in Reading About Jesus*. Brown Judaic Studies 177. Atlanta: Scholars, 1989.
–. "The Son of Man: Human and Heavenly." Pages 1:203–218 in *The Four Gospels 1992: Festschrift Frans Neirynck.* 3 vols. Edited by F. Van Segbroeck, et al. Leuven, 1992.
–. "Jesus and Israel's Scriptures." Pages 281–335 in *Studying the Historical Jesus: Evaluations of the State of Current Research.* New Testament Tools and Studies 19. Edited by B. Chilton and C. A. Evans. Leiden: Brill, 1994.
–. "John the Purifier." Pages 1-37 in *Judaic Approaches to the Gospels*. University of South Florida International Studies in Formative Christianity and Judaism 2l. Atlanta: Scholars, 1994.
–. "Jesus within Judaism." Pages 262–284 in *Judaism in Late Antiquity: II. Historical Syntheses.* Edited by Jacob Neusner. Handbuch der Orientalistik 70. Leiden: Brill, 1995.
–. "The Son of Man: Who Was He?" *Biblical Research* 12 (1996): 35–39, 45–47.
–. "The Targumim and Judaism of the First Century." Pages 115–150 in *Handbook of Oriental Studies II: Judaism in Late Antiquity*. Edited by J. Neusner and A. J. Avery-Peck. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
–. *The Aramaic Bible: The Isaiah Targum: Introduction, Translation, Apparatus and Notes*. Anchor Bible. Collegeville: Liturgical, 1999.
–. and Jacob Neusner. *Judaism in the New Testament*. London: Routledge, 1995.
Cohen, Shaye J. D. *From the Maccabees to the Mishnah*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1987.
–. *The Beginnings of Jewishness: Boundaries, Varieties, Uncertainties*. Hellenistic Culture and Society 31. Berkeley, Calif: University of California Press, 1999.
Collins, Adela Yarbro. "The Origins of the Designation of Jesus as 'Son of Man.'" *Harvard Theological Review* 80 (1987): 391–408.
–. "The Origin of Christian Baptism." *Studia Liturgica* 19 (1989): 28–46.
–. "Apocalyptic Son of Man Sayings." Pages 220–228 in *The Future of Early Christianity*. Edited by B. A. Pearson. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991.
–. and John J. Collins. *King and Messiah as Son of God: Divine, Human, and Angelic Messianic Figures in Biblical and Related Literature*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008.
Collins, John J. *The Apocalyptic Vision of the Book of Daniel.* Harvard Semitic Monographs 16. Atlanta: Scholars, 1977.
–. "Apocalypse: The Morphology of a Genre." *Semeia* 14 (1979): 1–20.
–. *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to the Jewish Matrix of Christianity.* New York: Crossroad, 1984.

–. "Was the Dead Sea Sect an Apocalyptic Movement?" Pages 25–46 in *Archaeology and History in the Dead Sea* Scrolls. Edited by L. H. Schiffman. Sheffield: JSOT, 1990.
–. "The Son of Man in First-Century Judaism." *New Testament Studies* 38 (1992): 448–466.
–. "Wisdom, Apocalypticism, and Generic Compatibility." Pages 165–185 in *In Search of Wisdom: Essays in Memory of John G. Gammie.* Edited by L. G. Perdue, B. B. Scott andW. J. Wiseman. Lousiville: Westminster John Knox, 1993.
–. "The *Son of God* Text from Qumran." Pages 65–82 in *From Jesus to John: Essays on Jesus and New Testament Christology.* Edited by M. C. De Boer. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplements 84. Sheffield: JSOT, 1993.
–. "The Works of the Messiah." *Dead Sea Discoveries* 1 (1994): 98–112.
–. *The Scepter and the Star: The Messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Ancient Literature*. New York: Doubleday, 1995.
–. "The Second Coming." *Chicago Studies* 34 (1995): 262–274.
–. *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. London: Routledge, 1997.
–. "Jesus, Messianism and the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 100–119 in *Qumran Messianism: Studies in the Messianic Expectations in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by J. H. Charlesworth, H. Lichtenberger and G. S. Oegema. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998.
–. "Apocalypticism and Literary Genre in the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 403–430 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment.* 2 Volumes. Edited by P. W. Flint and J. C. VanderKam. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
–. "Family Life." Pages 1: 287–290 in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls.* Edited by L. H. Schiffman and J. C. VanderKam. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.
–. "Cult and Culture: The Limits of Hellenization in Judea." Pages 38–61 in *Hellenism in the Land of Israel*. Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity 13. Edited by J. J. Collins and G. E. Sterling. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2001.
–. "Forms of Community in the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 97–111 in *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov*. Edited by S. M. Paul, et al. Vetus Testamentum Supplements 94. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
–. "The Eschatologizing of Wisdom in the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 49–65 in *Sapiential Perspectives: Wisdom Literature in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the Sixth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 20–22 May, 2001*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 51.Edited by J. J. Collins, G. E. Sterling and R. A. Clements. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
–. "Enoch, the Dead Sea Scrolls, and the Essenes: Groups and Movements in Judaism in the Early Second Century B. C. E." Pages 345–350 in *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection*. Edited by G. Boccaccini. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005.
–. "'Enochic Judaism' and the Sect of the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 283-299 in *The Early Enoch Literature*. Edited by G. Boccaccini and J. J. Collins. Journal for the Study of Judaism Supplements 121. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
Conzelmann, Hans. *The Theology of Saint Luke*. London: Faber, 1960.
–. *Die Apostelgeschichte*. Handbuch zum Neuen Testament. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1963.
–. "Present and Future in the Synoptic Tradition." *Journal for Theology and the Church* 5 (1968): 26–44.
Coppens, Joseph. "Le célibat essénien." Pages 295–304 in *Qumrân: sa piété, sa théologie et son milieu.* Edited by M. Delcor. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium 146. Paris: Duculot, 1978.
Cotter, Wendy. "'Yes, I Tell You, and More Than a Prophet,': The Function of John in Q." Pages 135–150 in *Conflict and Invention: Literary, Rhetorical, and Social Studies on the Sayings Gospel Q*. Edited by J. S. Kloppenborg. Valley Forge, Pa.: Trinity, 1995.

Cozijnsen, Bert.“A Critical Contribution to the Corpus Hellenisticum Novi Testament: Jude and Hesiod.” Pages 79–109 in *The Use of Sacred Books in the Ancient World*. Edited by L. V. Rutgers, P. W. van der Horst, H. W. Havelaar and L. Teugels. Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology 22. Leuven: Peeters, 1998.

Crawford, Sidnie White. “Not according to Rule: Women, the Dead Sea Scrolls and Qumran.” Pages 127–150 in *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov*. Edited by S. M. Paul, R. A. Kraft, L. H. Schiffman and W. W. Fields. Leiden: Brill, 2003.

–. *Rewriting Scripture in Second Temple Times: Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008.

Cromhout, Markus. *Jesus and Identity: Reconstructing Judean Ethnicity in Q*. Matrix: The Bible in Mediterranean Context. Eugene: Cascade, 2007.

Cross, Frank Moore. *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic: Essays on the History of the Religion of Israel*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1973.

–. *The Ancient Library at Qumran*. 3rd ed. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995.

Crossan, John Dominic. *The Historical Jesus: The Life of a Mediterranean Jewish Peasant*. New York: Harper Collins, 1991.

–. *Jesus: A Revolutionary Biography*. San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1994.

–. *The Birth of Christianity: Discovering what happened in the years immediately after the execution of Jesus*. San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1998.

Crossley, James G. *Why Christianity Happened: A Sociohistorical Account of Christian Origins (26–50 CE)*. Louisville: Wesminster John Knox, 2006.

Crown, Alan David and Lena Cansdale. “Focus on Qumran: Was it an Essene Settlement?” *Biblical Archaeology Review* 20 (1994): 24–35, 73.

Crum, John Macleod Campbell. *The Original Jerusalem Gospel: Being Essays on the Document Q*. London: Constable & Constable, 1927.

Cullmann, Oscar. “The Significance of the Qumran Texts for Research into the beginnings of Christianity.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* (1955): 213–226.

Dahl, Nils Alstrup. “Eschatology and History in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls.” Pages 3–18 in *The Future of Our Religious Past: Essays in Honour of Rudolf Bultmann*. Edited by J. M. Robinson. Translated by C. E. Carlston and R. P. Scharlemann. London, SCM, 1971.

–. “Messianic Ideas and the Crucifixion of Jesus.” Pages 382–403 in *The Messiah*, *Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity. The First Princeton Symposium on Judaism and Christian Origins*. Edited by J. H. Charlesworth. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992.

Dalman, Gustaf. *Jesus-Jeshua: Studies in the Gospels*. London: SPCK, 1929.

Daniélou, Jean. *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Primitive Christianity*. Translated by S. Attanasio. Baltimore, Md.: Helicon Press, 1958.

–. *The Work of John the Baptist*. Translated by Joseph Horn. Baltimore: Helicon, 1966.

Davies, A. Powell. *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. New York: Mentor, 1956.

Davies, Philip R. “Hasidim in the Maccabean Period,” *Journal of Jewish Studies* 28 (1977): 127–140.

–. *Damascus Covenant: An Interpretation of the ‘Damascus Document.’* Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplements 25. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1983.

–. *Behind the Essenes: History and Ideology in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Atlanta: Scholars, 1987.

–. “The Social World of Apocalyptic Writings.” Pages 251–271 in *The World of Ancient Israel: Social, Anthropological, and Political Perspectives*. Edited by R. E. Clements. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.

–. “The Birthplace of the Essenes: Where is ‘Damascus?,’” *Revue de Qumran* 14/56 (1990): 503–519.

–. “The Prehistory of the Qumran Community.” Pages 116–125 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research*. Edited by D. Dimant and U. Rappaport. Leiden: Brill, 1992.
–. *Sects and Scrolls: Essays on Qumran and Related Topics*. Atlanta: Scholars, 1996.
–. *Scribes and Schools: The Canonization of the Hebrew Scriptures*. London: SPCK, 1998.
–. “Reflections on DJD XVIII.” Pages 151–165 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls at Fifty: Proceedings of the 1997 Society of Biblical Literature Qumran Section Meetings*. Edited by R. A. Kugler and E. M. Schuller. Atlanta: Scholars, 1999.
Davies, W. D. *Christian Origins and Judaism*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1962.
–. and Dale C. Allison, Jr. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to Saint Matthew*. 3 Volumes. International Critical Commentary on the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1988–1997.
Davis, David Brion. *The Problem of Slavery in the Age of Revolution, 1770–1823*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1975.
Deasley, Alex R. G. *The Shape of Qumran Theology*. Carlisle, Cumbria: Paternoster, 2000.
De Bunsen, Ernest, *The Angel-Messiah of Buddhists, Essenes, and Christians*. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1880.
De Jonge, Marinus. “The Use of the Word ‘Anointed’ in the Time of Jesus.” *Novum Testamentum* 8 (1966): 132–148.
De Roo, Jacqueline C. “Is 4Q525 a Qumran Sectarian Document?” Pages 338–367 in *The Scrolls and the Scriptures : Qumran Fifty Years After*. Edited by S. E. Porter and C. A. Evans. Roehampton Institute London Papers 3. Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplements 26. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.
De Vaux, Roland. *Archaeology and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. London: Oxford University Press, 1973.
Derrenbacker Jr., Robert. and John S. Kloppenborg Verbin. “Self-Contradiction in the IQP? A Reply to Michael Goulder.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 120/1 (2001): 57–76.
Dibelius, Martin. *Die urchristliche Überlieferung von Johannes dem Täufer*. Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments 15. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1911.
–. *The Sermon on the Mount*. New York: Scribner’s Sons, 1940.
Dimant, Devorah. “Qumran Sectarian Literature.” Pages 483–550 in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period*. Edited by M. E. Stone. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1984.
–. “The Qumran Manuscripts: Contents and Significance.” Pages 23–58 in *Time to Prepare the Way in the Wilderness*. Edited by D. Dimant and L. H. Schiffman. Leiden: Brill, 1995.
–. “The Library of Qumran: Its Contents and Character.” Pages 170–176 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years After Their Discovery: Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20–25, 1997*. Edited by L. H. Schiffman, E. Tov and J. C. VanderKam. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society/ The Shrine of the Book, Israel Museum, 2000.
Doering, Lutz. *Schabbat: Sabbathalacha und -praxis im antiken Judentum und Urchristentum.* Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism 78. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999.
–. “Parallels without ‘Parallelomania’: Methodological Reflections on Comparative Analysis of Halakhah in the Dead Sea Scrolls.” Pages 13–42 in *Rabbinic Perspectives: Rabbinic Literature and the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the Eighth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 7–9 January, 2003*. Edited by S. D. Fraade, A. Shemesh and R. A. Clements. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 62. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
Donceel, Robert and Pauline Donceel-Voûte. “The Archaeology of Khirbet Qumran.” Pages 1–38 in *Methods of Investigation of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Khirbet Qumran Site: Present Realities and Future Prospects.* Annals of New York Academy of Sciences 722.

Edited by M. O. Wise, N. Golb, J. J. Collins and D. G. Pardee. New York: New York Academy of Sciences, 1994.

Douglas, R. Conrad. "Love Your Enemies: Rhetoric, Tradents, and Ethos." Pages 116–131 in *Conflict and Invention: Literary, Rhetorical, and Social Studies on the Sayings Gospel Q*. Valley Forge, Pa.: Trinity Press, 1995.

Downing, F. Gerald "Cynics and Christians." *New Testament Studies* 30 (1984): 584–593.

–. "The Social Contexts of Jesus the Teacher: Construction or Reconstruction." *New Testament Studies* 33 (1987): 439–451.

–. *Jesus and the Threat of Freedom*. London: SCM, 1987.

–. *Christ and the Cynics: Jesus and Other Radical Preachers in First-Century Tradition*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1988.

–. "Quite like Q: A Genre for 'Q': The 'Lives' of Cynic Philosophers," *Biblica* 69 (1988): 196–224.

–. *Cynics and Christian Origins*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1992.

Droge, Arthur. "Cynics or Luddites: Excavating Q Studies." *Studies in Religion* 37/2 (2008): 249–269.

Dubnow, Simon. *History of the Jews*. Translated by M. Spiegel. South Brunswick: T. Yoseloff, 1967–1973.

Duhaime, Jean. "War Scroll (1QM; 1Q33; 4Q491–496 = 4QM1–6; 4Q497)." Pages 80-203 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations*, Vol. 2: *Damascus Document, War Scroll, and Related Documents*. Edited by J. H. Charlesworth. Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project 2. Tübingen: Mohr, 1995.

Duling, Dennis C. "Ethnicity, Ethnocentrism, and the Matthean *ethnos*." *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 35 (2005): 125–143.

Dungan, David Laird. *A History of the Synoptic Problem: The Canon, the Text, the Composition, and the Interpretation of the Gospels*. New York: Doubleday, 1999.

Dunn, James D. G. *Baptism in the Holy Spirit*. London: SCM, 1970.

–. "Spirit-and-Fire Baptism." *Novum Testamentum* 14 (1972): 81–92.

–. *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, 1975.

–. "'Son of God' as 'Son of Man' in the Dead Sea Scrolls? A Response to John Collins on 4Q246." Pages 198–210 in *The Scrolls and the Scriptures: Qumran Fifty Years After*. Edited by S. E. Porter and C.A. Evans. Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplements 26. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.

–. *Jesus Remembered*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003.

Dupont, Jacques. *Les Béatitudes* I. Brugge: Leuven, 1958.

Dupont-Sommer, Andre. *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A Preliminary Survey*. Translated by E. M. Rowley. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1952.

–. *The Jewish Sect of Qumran and the Essenes: New Studies on the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Translated by R. D. Barnett. New York: Macmillan, 1955.

–. "Exorcismes et guérisons, dans des écrits de Qoumran." Pages 246–261 in *Congress Volume, Oxford 1959*. Vetus Testamentum Supplements 7. Leiden: Brill, 1960.

–. *The Essene Writings from Qumran*. Translated by G. Vermes. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1961.

Dupont, Georges. *Le Fils de l'Homme: essai historique et critique*. Paris: Fischbacher, 1924.

Eagleton, Terry. *Ideology: An Introduction*. London: Verso, 1991.

Ebner, Martin. "Kynische Jesusinterpretation – "disciplined exaggeration? Eine Anfrage." *Biblische Zeitschrift* 40 (1996): 93–100.

Eddy, Paul Rhodes. "Jesus as Diogenes?: Reflections on the Cynic Jesus Thesis." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 115 (1996): 449–469.
Edwards, Richard A. *A Theology of Q: Eschatology, Prophecy, and Wisdom*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1976.
Ehrman, Bart. *The New Testament: A Historical Introduction to the Early Christian Writings*. 2d ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.
Eichhorn, Johann Gottfried. *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*. Leipzig: Weidmann, 1804–1827.
Eisenman, Robert H. *Maccabees, Zadokites, Christians and Qumran: A New Hypothesis of Qumran Origins*. Leiden: Brill, 1983.
–. *James the Just in the Habakkuk Pesher*. Leiden: Brill, 1986.
–. "A Messianic Vision." *Biblical Archaeology Review* 17.6 (1991): 65.
–. *James the Just: The Key to Unlocking the Secrets of Early Christianity and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. New York: Viking, 1996.
–. *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the First Christians: Essays and Translations*. Rockport: Element, 1996.
–. and Michael O. Wise, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Uncovered*. Shaftesbury: Element, 1992.
Elder, Linda Bennett. "The Women Question and Female Ascetics among Essenes." *Biblical Archaeologist* 57/4 (1994): 220–234.
Elgvin, Torleif. "Admonition Texts from Qumran Cave 4." Pages 137–152 in *Methods of Investigation of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Khirbet Qumran Site: Present Realities and Future Prospects*. Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences 722. Edited by M. O. Wise. New York: Academy of Arts and Sciences. 1993.
–. "Wisdom, Revelation, and Eschatology in an Early Essene Writing." Pages 440–463 in *Society of Biblical Literature 1995 Seminar Papers*. Edited by E. H. Lovering. Atlanta: Scholars, 1995.
–. "The Reconstruction of Sapiential Work A." *Revue de Qumran* 16 (1995): 559–580.
–. "The Mystery to Come: Early Essene Theology of Revelation." Pages 113–150 in *Qumran between the Old and New Testaments*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 290. Edited by F. H. Cryer and T. L. Thompson. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.
–. "An Analysis of *4QInstruction*." Ph. D. diss. The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1998.
–. "Wisdom and Apocalypticism in the Early Second Century BCE—The Evidence of 4QInstruction." Pages 226–247 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years After Their Discovery: Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20–25, 1997*. Edited by L. H. Schiffman, E. Tov and J. C. VanderKam. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society/The Shrine of the Book, Israel Museum, 2000.
Elliott, John H. "Jesus the Israelite was neither a 'Jew' nor a 'Christian': On CorrectingMisleading Nomenclature." *Journal for the Study of the Historical Jesus* 5/2 (2007): 119–154.
Elliott, Mark A. "Sealing Some Cracks in the Groningen Foundation." Pages 263–272 in *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection*. Edited by G. Boccaccini. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005.
Elukin, Jonathan M. "A New Essenism: Heinrich Graetz and Mysticism." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 59/1 (1998): 135–148.
Enslin, Morton S. "John and Jesus." *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* 66 (1975): 1–18.
Ernst, Josef. *Johannes der Täufer: Interpretation – Geschichte – Wirkungsgeschichte*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 53. New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1989.

Evans, Carl D. William W. Hallo and John B. White, eds. *Scripture in Context: Essays on the Comparative Method*. Pittsburgh Theological Monograph Series 34. Pittsburgh: Pickwick, 1980.

Evans, Craig A. *Jesus and his Contemporaries: Comparative Studies*. Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums 25. Leiden: Brill, 1995.

–. "Jesus and the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 573–598 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*. Edited by P. W. Flint and J. C. VanderKam. Leiden: Brill, 1999.

–. "Messianic Apocalypse (4Q521)." Pages 695–698 in *Dictionary of New Testament Background*. Edited by C. A. Evans and S. E. Porter. Downer's Grove: InterVarsity, 2000.

–. "Qumran's Messiah: How Important Is He?" Pages 135–149 in *Religion in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by J. J. Collins and R. A. Kugler. Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.

–. "The Scriptures of Jesus and His Earliest Followers." Pages 191–194 in *The Canon Debate*. Edited by L. M. McDonald and J. A. Sanders. Peabody: Hendrickson, 2002.

Farinelli, Arthuro. "Literary Influences and the Pride of Nations." *Yearbook of Comparative and General Literature* 36 (1987): 69–74.

Farmer, William R. "John the Baptist." Pages 1:955–962 in *Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*. New York: Abingdon, 1962.

Farrar, Austin. "On Dispensing with Q." Pages 55–88 in *Studies in the Gospels: Essays in Memory of R. H. Lightfoot*. Edited by D. E. Nineham. Oxford: Blackwell, 1955.

Feyerabend, Paul. *Against Method: Outline of an Anarchistic Theory of Knowledge*. New Jersey: Atlantic Highlands, 1988.

Fiebig, Paul. *Der Menschensohn: Jesu Selbstbezeichnung mit besonderer Berücksichtigung des aramäischen Sprachgebrauches für 'Mensch.'* Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1901.

–. *Die Gleichnisreden Jesu im Lichte der rabbinischen Gleichnisse des neutestamentlichen Zeitalters*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1912.

Finnegan, Jack. *Light from the Ancient Past*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1959.

Fischel, Henry A. *The First Book of Maccabees*. New York: Schocken Books, 1948.

Fishbane, Michael. "Torah and Tradition." Pages 275–300 in *Tradition and Theology in the Old Testament*. Edited by D. A. Knight. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977.

Fitzmyer, Joseph A. "The Use of Explicit Old Testament Quotations in Qumran Literature and in the New Testament." *New Testament Studies* 7 (1960-1): 297–333.

–. "The Priority of Mark and the 'Q' Source in Luke." Pages 131–170 in *Jesus and Man's Hope*. Pittsburgh: Pittsburgh Theological Seminary, 1970.

–. "The Contribution of Qumran Aramaic to the Study of the New Testament." *New Testament Studies* 20 (1974): 382–407.

–. "A Study of the Aramaic Background of the New Testament." Pages 1–27 in *A Wandering Aramaean*. Missoula: Scholars, 1979.

–. *The Gospel According to Luke I–IX: Introduction, Translation, and Notes*. Anchor Bible 28. New York: Doubleday, 1981.

–. *Responses to 101 Questions on the Dead Sea Scrolls*. New York: Paulist, 1992.

–. "A Palestinian Collection of Beatitudes." Pages 509–515 in *The Four Gospels 1992: Festschrift Frans Neirynck*. Edited by F. Van Segbroek. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium 100. Vol. 1. 1992.

–. "4Q246: The 'Son of God' Document from Qumran." *Biblica* 74 (1993): 153–174.

–. *The Semitic Background of the New Testament (combined edition of Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament and A Wandering Aramean: Collected Aramaic Essays)*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997.

–. “The Dead Sea Scrolls and Christian Origins: General Methodological Considerations.” Pages 1–19 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Christian Faith: In Celebration of the Jubilee Year of the Discovery of Qumran Cave 1*. Faith and Scholarship Colloquies. Edited by J. H. Charlesworth and W. P. Weaver, Harrisburg, Pa.: Trinity, 1998.

–. *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Christian Origins*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.

Fleddermann, Harry T. *Mark and Q: A Study of the Overlap Texts*. Leuven: Peeters, 1995.

–. *Q: A Reconstruction and Commentary*. Biblical Tools and Studies 1. Leuven: Peeters, 2005.

Flusser, David. “Healing Through the Laying on of Hands in a Dead Sea Scroll.” *Israel Exploration Journal* 7 (1957): 107–108.

–. “Blessed are the poor in Spirit,” *Israel Exploration Journal* 10 (1960): 1–13.

–. “The Hubris of the Antichrist in a Fragment from Qumran.” *Immanuel* 10 (1980): 31–37.

–. *Die rabbinischen Gleichnisse und der Gleichniserzähler Jesus*. Bern: Peter Lang, 1981.

–. *Judaism and the Origins of Christianity*. Jerusalem: Magnes, 1988.

–. “Some Notes on the Beatitudes.” Pages 115–125 in *Judaism and the Origins of Christianity*. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1988.

–. *The Spiritual History of the Dead Sea Sect*. Translated by C. Glucker. Tel Aviv: MOD Books, 1989.

Foster, Paul. “Is Q a Jewish-Christian Document?” Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature, Boston, Mass., November 25, 2008.

Fowler, Henry Thatcher. “Paul, Q, and the Jerusalem Church.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 43 (1924): 9–14.

France, R. T. *Matthew: Evangelist and Teacher*. Exeter: Paternoster, 1989.

Fuller, Reginald H. *Interpreting the Miracles*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1963.

Frankemölle, Hubert. “Jesus als deuterojesajanischer Freudenbote? Zur Rezeption von Jes 52,7 und 61,1 im Neuen Testament, durch Jesus und in den Targumim.” Pages 131–160 in *Jüdische Wurzeln christlicher Theologie*. Bonner biblische Beiträge 116. Bodenheim: Philo, 1998.

Frankfort, Henri. *The Problem of Similarity in Ancient Near Eastern Religions*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1951.

Fredriksen, Paula. “What ‘Parting of the Ways’?: Jews, Gentiles, and the Ancient Mediterranean City.” Pages 35–63 in *Ways That Never Parted: Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages*. Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism 95. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003.

Freedman, David N. “Early Christianity and the Scrolls: An Inquiry.” Pages 97–102 in *Jesus in History and Myth*. Edited by R. J. Hoffman and G. A. Larue. Buffalo: Prometheus, 1986.

Frenschkowski, Marco. “Galiläa oder Jerusalem? Die topographischen und politischen Hintergründe der Logienquelle.” Pages 535–559 in *The Sayings Source Q and the Historical Jesus*. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium 158. Edited by A. Lindemann. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2001.

Frey, Jörg. “Zur historischen Auswertung der antiken Essenerberichte: Ein Beitrag zum Gespräch mit Roland Bergmeier.” Pages 23–56 in *Qumran kontrovers: Beiträge zu den Textfunden vom Toten Meer*. Edited by J. Frey and H. Stegemann. Bonifatius: Paderborn, 2003.

–. “The Impact of the Dead Sea Scrolls on New Testament Interpretation: Proposals, Problems, and Further Perspectives.” Pages 407–461 in *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls:* Vol. 3: *The Scrolls and Christians Origins*. The Second Princeton Symposium on Judaism and Christian Origins. Edited by J. H. Charlesworth. Waco: Baylor, 2006.

–. “Critical Issues in the Investigation of the Scrolls and the New Testament.” Pages 519–540 in *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by J. J. Collins and T. H. Lim. OH. New York: Oxford University Press.

Freyne, Seán. *Galilee from Alexander the Great to Hadrian, 332 B.C.E. to 135 C.E.: A Study of Second Temple Judaism. Temple Judaism*. University of Notre Dame Center for the Study of Judaism and Christianity in Antiquity 5. Wilmington, Del: Michael Glazier/Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1980.

–. “Galilee-Jerusalem Relations according to Josephus’ Life.” *New Testament Studies* 33 (1987): 600–609.

–. *Galilee, Jesus and the Gospels: Literary Approaches and Historical Investigations*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988.

–. “The Geography, Politics, and Economics in Galilee and the Quest for the Historical Jesus.” Pages 75–121 in *Studying the Historical Jesus: Evaluations of the State of Current Research*. New Testament Tools and Studies 19. Edited by B. Chilton and C. A. Evans. Leiden: Brill, 1994.

–. “Galilean Questions to Crossan’s Mediterranean Jesus.” Pages 63–91 in *Whose Historical Jesus?* Edited by W. E. Arnal and M. Desjardins. Studies in Christianity and Judaism 7. Waterloo, Ontario: Canadian Corporation for Studies in Religion/Wilfrid Laurier, 1997.

Fritsch, Charles. *The Qumran Community*. New York: Macmillan Co., 1956.

Fuller, Reginald H. *The New Testament in Current Study*. London: SCM, 1963.

–. “The Son of Man: A Reconsideration.” Pages 207–217 in *The Living Text: Essays in Honor of Ernest W. Saunders*. Edited by D. E. Groh and R. Jewett. Lanham: University Press of America, 1985.

Funk, Robert W. and the Jesus Seminar. *The Acts of Jesus: The Search for the Authentic Deeds of Jesus*. San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1998.

Gadamer, Hans-Georg. “On the Scope and Function of Hermeneutical Reflection.” Pages 18–58 in *Philosophical Hermeneutics*. Translated and edited by D. E. Linge. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1976.

Gal, Zvi. *The Lower Galilee during the Iron Age*. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1992.

García Martínez, Florentino. “Qumran Origins and Early History: A ‘Groningen Hypothesis.’” *Folia Orientalia* 25 (1989): 113–36.

–. “The Eschatological Figure of 4Q246.” Pages 162–179 in *Qumran and Apocalyptic: Studies on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 9. Leiden: Brill, 1992.

–. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated: The Qumran Texts in English*. Translated by W. G. E. Watson. Leiden: Brill, 1994.

–. “Messianic Hopes in the Qumran Writings.” Pages 159–189 in *The People of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by F. García Martínez and J. Trebolle Barrera. Leiden: Brill, 1995.

–, ed. *Echoes from the Caves: Qumran and the New Testament*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 85. Leiden: Brill, 2009.

–. and Adam S. van der Woude. “A ‘Groningen’ Hypothesis of Qumran Origins and Early History.” *Revue de Qumran* 14 (1990): 521–541.

–. and J. T. Barrera. *The People of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Translated by W. G. E. Watson. Leiden: Brill, 1995.

Gaster, Theodore H. *The Dead Sea Scrolls*. New York: Doubleday/Anchor Books, 1964.

Geertz, Clifford. *The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays*. New York: Basic, 1973.

Gerhardsson, Birger. *Memory and Manuscript: Oral Tradition and Written Transmission in Rabbinic Judaism and Early Christianity*. Uppsala and Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1964.

–. *The Origins of the Gospel Tradition*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979.

George, Augustin. "La 'Forme' des Béatitudes jusqu'à Jésus." Pages 398–403 in *Mélanges bibliques rédigés en l'honneur de André Robert*. Travaux de l'Institute Catholique 4. Paris: Bloud et Bay, 1957.

Geyser, A. S. "The Youth of John the Baptist: A Deduction from the Break in the Parallel Account of the Lucan Infancy Story." *Novum Testamentum* 1 (1956): 70–75.

Gfrörer, August Friedrich. *Kritische Geschichte des Urchristentums*. 2 vols. 1831–1838.

Ghillany, Friedrich Wilhelm (Richard von der Alm). *Theologische Briefe an die Gebildeten der deutschen Nation*. Leipzig: Wigand, 1863.

–. *Die Urteile heidnischer und jüdischer Schriftsteller der vier ersten christlichen Jahrhunderte über Jesus und die ersten Christen: Eine Zuschrift an die gebildeten Deutschen zur weiteren Orienterung in der Frage über die Gottheit und Jesu*. Leipzig: Wigand, 1864.

Gilbert, G. Nigel and Michael Mulkay. *Opening Pandora's Box: A Sociological Analysis of Scientists' Discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984.

Ginzberg, Louis. *An Unknown Jewish Sect*. New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1976.

Gnilka, Joachim. *Theologie des Neuen Testaments*. Freiburg: Herder, 1994.

Goergen, Donald J. *The Mission and Ministry of Jesus*. Wilmington: Glazier, 1986.

Goff, Matthew J. *The Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom of 4QInstruction*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 50. Leiden: Brill, 2003.

–. "Discerning Trajectories: 4QInstruction and the Sapiential Background of the Sayings Source Q." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 124/4 (2005): 657–673.

Goguel, Maurice. *Au seuil de l'Évangile: Jean-Baptiste.* Bh. Paris: Payot, 1928.

Golb, Norman. *Who Wrote the Dead Sea Scrolls?: The Search for the Secret of Qumran*. New York: Scribner, 1995.

Goodacre, Mark S. *Goulder and the Gospels: An Examination of a New Paradigm*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplemental Series 133. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996.

–. "A Monopoly on Marcan Priority? Fallacies at the Heart of Q." Pages 538–622 in *Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers 2000*. Atlanta: SBL, 2000.

–. *The Case Against Q: Studies in Markan Priority and the Synoptic Problem*. Harrisburg, Pa.: Trinity Press, 2002.

Goodblatt, David. "From Judeans to Israel: Names of Jewish States in Antiquity." *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 29 (1998): 1–36.

Goodenough, Erwin R. "The Perspective of Acts." Pages 51–59 in *Studies in Luke-Acts: Essays in Honour of Paul Schubert*. Edited by L. E. Keck and J. L. Martyn. Nashville: Abingdon, 1966.

Goodman, Martin. "A Note on the Qumran Sectarians, the Essenes and Josephus." *Journal of Jewish Studies* 46 (1995): 161–166.

Goppelt, Leonhard. "Zum Problem des Menschensohns: das Verhältnis von Leidens- und Parusiean- kündigung." Pages 20–32 in *Mensch und Menschensohn. Festschrift für Bischof Prof. D. Karl Witte.* Edited by H. Sierig. Hamburg: Wittig, 1963.

–. *Theology of the New Testament.* 2 volumes. Translated by J. E. Alsup. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1981–82.

Goranson, Stephen. "On the Hypothesis that Essenes lived on Mt. Carmel." *Revue de Qumran* 9/35 (1978): 563–567.

–. "Rereading Pliny on the Essenes: Some Bibliographic Notes." The Orion Center for the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 1998.

–. "Jannaeus, His Brother Absalom and Judah the Essene." [accessed October 1, 2010; http://www.duke.edu/~goranson/jannaeus.pdf].

Gordis, Robert. "The 'Begotten' Messiah in the Qumran Scrolls." *Vetus Testamentum* 7 (1957): 191–194.

Goulder, Michael. "On Putting Q to the Test." *New Testament Studies* 24 (1978): 218–234.

–. *Luke: A New Paradigm*. 2 vols. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplements 20. Sheffield: JSOT, 1989.

–. "Is Q a Juggernaut?" *Journal of Biblical Literature* 115 (1996): 667–681.

Guelich, Robert A. "The Matthean Beatitudes: 'Entrance Requirements' or Eschatological Beatitudes." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 95 (1976): 415–434.

Grabbe, Lester L. "The Social Setting of Jewish Apocalypticism." *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 4 (1989): 27–47.

–. "Warfare," Pages 2: 963–965 in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. 2 Volumes. Edited by L. H. Schiffman and J. C. VanderKam. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.

–. "Digging among the Roots of the Groningen Hypothesis." Pages 280–285 in *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection*. Edited by G. Boccaccini. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005.

Graetz, Heinrich Hirsch. *History of the Jews*. Vol. 2: *From the Reign of Hyrcanus (135 B.C.E. to the Completion of the Babylonian Talmud (500 C.E.)*. Pennsylvania: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1893.

Green, William Scott. "Otherness Within: Towards a Theory of Difference in Rabbinic Judaism." Pages 49–69 in *"To See Ourselves As Others See us": Christians, Jews, "Others" in Late Antiquity*. Edited by J. Neusner and E. S. Frerichs. Studies in the Humanities. Chico: Scholars, 1985.

Gregg, Brian Han. *The Historical Jesus and the Final Judgment Sayings in Q*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2 207. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006.

Grelot, Pierre. "L'eschatologie des Esséniens et le livre d'Hénoch." *Revue de Qumran* 1 (1958): 113–131.

–. "La géographie mytique d'Hénoch et ses sources orientales." *Revue Biblique* 65 (1958): 33–69.

–. "La légende d'Hénoch dans les apocryphes et dans la Bible: Origine et signification." *Recherches de science religieuse* 46 (1958): 5–26, 181–220.

Grenfell, Bernard P. and Arthur S. Hunt. ΛΟΓΙΑ ΙΗΣΟΥ: *Sayings of our Lord*. London: Henry Frowde for the Egypt Exploration Fund, 1897.

–. "I. ΛΟΓΙΑ ΙΗΣΟΥ." Pages 1–3 in *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*. Part I. London: Egyptian Exploration Fund, 1898.

–. *New Sayings of Jesus and Fragment of a Lost Gospel from Oxyrhynchus*. London: Henry Frowde, 1904.

Gruen, Erich S. "Jewish Perspectives on Greek Culture and Ethnicity." Pages 62–93 in *Hellenism in the Land of Israel*. Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity 13. Edited by J. J. Collins and G. E. Sterling. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2001.

Gruenwald, Ithamar, Shaul Shaked and Guy G. Stroumsa, eds. *Messiah and Christos: Studies in the Jewish Origins of Christianity, Presented to David Flusser on the Occasion of his Seventy-Fifth Birthday*. Tübingen: Mohr, 1992.

Grundmann, Walter. *Jesus der Galiläer und das Judentum*. Leipzig: Wigand, 1940.

Gryson, Roger. "A propos du Témoignage de Papias sur Matthieu: Le sens du mot λόγιον chez les Pères du second siècle." *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 41 (1965): 530–547.

Guenther, Heinz O. "Sayings Gospel Q and the Quest for Aramaic Sources: Rethinking Christian Origins." *Semeia* 55 (1991): 41–76.

Guignebert, Charles Alfred Honoré. *Jesus*. New York: Knopf, 1935.

Guillaumont, Antoine. “A propos du célibat des Esséniens.” Pages 395–404 in *Hommages à A. Dupont-Sommer*. Edited by A. Caquot and M. Philonenko. Paris: Adrien-Maisonneuve, 1971.

Gundry, Robert H. *Matthew: A Commentary on His Literary and Theological Art*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982.

–. “The Apostolically Johannine pre-Papian tradition concerning the Gospels of Mark and Matthew.” Pages 49–73 in *The Old is Better: New Testament Essays in Support of Traditional Interpretations*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005.

Hachlili, Rachel. “Burial Practices at Qumran.” *Revue de Qumran* 62 (1994): 247–264.

Haas, Nicu and N. Nathan. “Anthropological Survey on the Human Skeletal Remains from-Qumran.” *Revue de Qumran* 6 (1968): 345–352.

Haenchen, Ernst. *Der Weg Jesu: Eine Erklärung des Markus-Evangeliums und der kanonischen Parallelen*. 2d ed. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1968.

–. *The Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary*. Translated by B. Noble and G. Shinn. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1971.

Hagner, Donald A. *The Jewish Reclamation of Jesus: An Analysis and Critique of Modern Jewish Study of Jesus*. Grand Rapids: Academie Books, 1984.

–. *Matthew 1–13*. Word Biblical Commentary 33A. Dallas: Word, 1993.

Hahn, Ferdinand. *Mission in the New Testament*. Translated by F. Clarke. London: SCM, 1965.

Hall, Edith. *Inventing the Barbarian: Greek Self-Definition through Tragedy*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1989.

Hampel, Volker. *Menschensohn und historischer Jesus: ein Rätselwort als Schlüssel zum messianischen selbstverständnis Jesu*. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1990.

Hanson, R. Kenneth. *The Dead Sea Scrolls*. New York: Harper & Row, 1961.

Harnack, Adolf. *Sprüche und Reden Jesu: Die zweite Quelle des Matthäus und Lukas*. Beiträge zur Einleitung in das Neue Testament 2. Leipzig: Hinrichs’sche Buchhandlung, 1907. ET: *The Sayings of Jesus: The Second Source of St. Matthew and St. Luke*. Translated by J. R. Wilkinson. New Testament Studies 2. London: Williams & Norgate, 1908.

–. *Die Mission und Ausbreitung des Christentums in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten*. 2 vols. 3rd ed. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1915. ET: *The Mission of Early Christianity*. Translated by J. Moffatt. 2 vols. New York: G.P. Putnam, 1904-05.

Hare, Douglas R. A. *The Son of Man Tradition*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990.

Harrington, Daniel J. “Social Concepts in the Early Church: A Decade of Research.” *Theological Studies* 41 (1980): 181–190.

–. “Wisdom at Qumran.” Pages 137–152 in *The Community of the Renewed Covenant: The Notre Dame Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by E. Ulrich & J. C. VanderKam. Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1994.

–. *Wisdom Texts from Qumran*. New York: Routledge, 1996.

–. “Ten Reasons Why the Qumran Wisdom Texts are Important.” *Dead Sea Discoveries* 4 (1997): 245–254.

–. and John Strugnell. “Qumran Cave 4 Texts: A New Publication.” J*ournal of Biblical Literature* 112 (1993): 490–499.

Hartin, Patrick J. *James and the “Q” Sayings of Jesus*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 47. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991.

Harvey, Anthony Ernest. *Jesus and the Constraints of History*. London: Duckworth, 1982.

Harvey, Graham. *The True Israel: Uses of the Name Jew, Hebrew and Israel in Ancient Jewish and Early Christian Literature*. Leiden: Brill, 1996.

Havener, Ivan. *Q: The Sayings of Jesus (with a Reconstruction of Q by Athanasius Polag)*. Good News Studies 19. Wilmington, Del.: Michael Glazier, 1987.

Hayes, John H. and Sara R. Mandell. *The Jewish People in Classical Antiquity: From Alexander to Bar Kochba*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1998.

Hays, Richard. "The Corrected Jesus." *First Things* 43 (5/1994): 43–48.

Head, Peter. "The Nazi Quest for an Aryan Jesus." *Journal for the Study of the Historical Jesus* 2 (2004): 55–89.

Head, Peter M. and P. J. Williams. "Q Review." *Tyndale Bulletin* 54.1 (2003): 119–144.

Hempel, Charlotte. "The Earthly Essene Nucleus of 1QSa." *Dead Sea Discoveries* 3.3 (1996): 253–269.

–. "Community Origins in the *Damascus Document* in the Light of Recent Scholarship." Pages 316–329 in *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues*. Edited by D. W. Parry and E. Ulrich. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 30. Leiden: Brill, 1999.

–. "The Essenes." Pages 65–80 in *Religious Diversity in the Graeco-Roman World: A Survey of Recent Scholarship*. Edited by D. Cohn-Sherbok and J. M. Court. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001.

Hendrickx, Herman. *The Miracle Stories of the Synoptic Gospels*. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1987.

Hengel, Martin. *Judaism and Hellenism*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1974.

–. *The Son of God*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1976.

–. *Acts and the History of Earliest Christianity*. Translated by J. Bowden. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979.

–. *The Charismatic Leader and His Followers*. Translated by J. Greig. New York: Crossroad, 1981.

–. *Studies in Early Christology*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1995.

–. "Makarismen in frühjüdischen und rabbinischen Texten." Pages 224–233 in *Judaica, Hellenistica et Christiana: Kleine Schriften II*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999.

–. "Judaism and Hellenism Revisited." Pages 6–37 in *Hellenism in the Land of Israel*. Edited by J. J. Collins and G. E. Sterling. Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity 13. Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 2001.

–. and R. Deines. "E. P. Sanders' 'Common Judaism,' Jesus and the Pharisees." *Journal of Theological Studies* 46 (1995): 1–70.

Herjel-Hansen, B. "Did Christ Know the Qumran Sect?: Jesus and the Messiah of the Desert, An Observation based on Matthew 24, 26–28." *Revue de Qumran* 1 (1958–59): 495–508.

Hermerén, Göran. *Influence in Art and Literature*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1975.

Heschel, Susanna. *Abraham Geiger and the Jewish Jesus*. Chicago Studies in the History of Judaism. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998.

–. "The Image of Judaism in Nineteenth-Century Christian New Testament Scholarship in Germany." Pages 215–240 in *Jewish-Christian Encounters over the Centuries: Symbiosis, Prejudice, Holocaust, Dialogue*. American University Studies Series 9, vol. 136. Edited by M. Perry and F. M. Schweitzer. New York: Peter Lang, 1994.

–. "Nazifying Christian Theology: Walter Grundmann and the Institute for the Study and Eradication of Jewish Influence on German Church Life." *Church History* 63 (1994): 587–605.

Hick, John and Paul F. Knitter. *The Myth of Christian Uniqueness: Toward a Pluralistic Theology of Religions*. Maryknoll: Orbis, 1987.

Hieke, Thomas. *Documenta Q: Reconstructions of Q Through Two Centuries of Gospel Research Excerpted, Sorted and Evaluated. Q 6:20–21: The Beatitudes for the Poor, Hungry, and Mourning*. Documenta Q. Edited by T. Hieke. Leuven: Peeters, 2001.

Higgins, Angus John Brockhurst. *Jesus and the Son of Man*; "The Son of Man Concept and the Historical Jesus." *Studia Evangelica* 5 (1968): 14–20.

–. *The Son of Man in the Teaching of Jesus*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 39. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980.

Hill, Charles E. *The Gospel of Matthew*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1972.

Hirschfeld, Yizhar. "Early Roman Manor Houses in Judea and the Site of Khirbet Qumran." *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 57 (1998): 161–189.

–. *Qumran in Context: Reassessing the Archaeological Evidence*. Peabody: Hendrickson, 2004.

Hobbs, Edward C. "A Quarter Century Without Q." *Perkins School of Theology Journal* 33/4 (1980): 10–19.

Hoffmann, Paul. *Studien zur Theologie der Logienquelle*. 3rd ed. Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen 8. Münster: Aschendorff, 1982 (1972).

–. "QR und der Menschensohn." Pages 421–56 in *The Four Gospels 1992 Festschrift*. 3 vols. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium 100. Edited by F. Neirynck. Leuven: Peeters, 1992.

–. "The Redaction of Q and the Son of Man: A Preliminary Sketch." Pages 159–198 in *The Gospel Behind the Gospels*. Edited by R. A. Piper. Novum Testamentum Supplements 75. Leiden: Brill, 1995.

Hollenbach, Paul W. "The Conversion of Jesus: From Jesus the Baptizer to Jesus the Healer." Pages 204–206 in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt.* 2. 25.1. Edited by H. Temporini and W. Haase. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1982.

–. "Social Aspects of John the Baptist's Preaching Mission in the Contexts of Palestinian Judaism." Pages 850–875 in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt.* 2.19. 1. Edited by H. Temporini and W. Haase. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1972.

Holmén, Tom. "Knowing about Q and Knowing about Jesus: Mutually Exclusive Undertakings?" Pages 498–514 in *The Sayings Source Q and the Historical Jesus*. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium 158. Edited by A. Lindemann. Leuven: Peeters, 2001.

Holtzmann, Heinrich Julius. *Die synoptischen Evangelien: Ihr Ursprung und geschichtlicher Charakter*. Leipzig: Engelmann, 1863.

Horbury, William. *Jewish Messianism and the Cult of Christ*. London: SCM, 1998.

Horrell, David G. "'No Longer Jew or Greek': Paul's Corporate Christology and the Construction of Christian Community." Pages 321–344 in *Christology, Controversy and Community: New Testament Essays in Honour of David R. Catchpole.* Edited by D. G. Horrell and C. M. Tuckett. Novum Testamentum Supplements 99. Leiden: Brill, 2000.

Horsley, Richard A. "Popular Messianic Movements Around the Time of Jesus." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 46 (1984): 471–495.

–. *Jesus and the Spiral of Violence: Popular Jewish Resistance in Roman Palestine*. New York: Harper & Row, 1987.

–. *Sociology and the Jesus Movement.* New York: Crossroad, 1989.

–. "Questions About Redactional Strata and the Social Relations Reflected in Q." Pages 175–209 in *Society of Biblical Literature 1989 Seminar Papers*. Edited by D. J. Lull. Atlanta: Scholars, 1989.

–. "Q and Jesus: Assumptions, Approaches, and Analyses." *Semeia* 55 (1991): 175–209.

–. "Jesus, Itinerant Cynic or Israelite Prophet?" Pages 68–97 in *Images of Jesus Today*. Edited by J. H. Charlesworth and W. P. Weaver. Valley Forge, Pa.: Trinity, 1994.

–. "Wisdom Justified by All Her Children: Examining Allegedly Disparate Traditions in Q." Pages 733–751 in *Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers 33*. Missoula: Scholars, 1994.

–. “Social Conflict in the Synoptic Sayings Source Q.” Pages 37–52 in *Conflict and Invention: Literary, Rhetorical, and Social Studies on the Sayings Gospel Q*. Edited by J. S. Kloppenborg. Valley Forge, Pa.: Trinity Press, 1995.

–. *Galilee: History, Politics, People*. Valley Forge, Pa.: Trinity Press International, 1995.

–. with John S. Hanson, *Bandits, Prophets, and Messiahs: Popular Movements in the Time of Jesus*. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1988.

–. with Jonathan A. Draper. *Whoever Hears You Hears Me: Prophets, Performance, and Tradition in Q*. Harrisburg, Pa.: Trinity Press International, 1999.

Howlett, Duncan. *The Essenes and Christianity: An Interpretation of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1957.

Hübner, Hans. “Zölibat in Qumran? Plädoyer für eine ‘zeitlich eingegrentze kultische Kontinenz,’” *New Testament Studies* 17 (1971): 153–167.

Hughes, John H. “John the Baptist: Forerunner of God.” *Novum Testamentum* 14 (1972): 190–218.

Humbert, Jean-Baptiste. “L’espace sacré á Qumrân: Propositions pour l’archéologie (Planches I–III).” *Revue Biblique* 101 (1994): 161–214.

Hurtado, Larry W. *Lord Jesus Christ: Devotion to Jesus in Earliest Christianity*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003.

Ingolfsland, Dennis. “Kloppenborg’s Stratification of Q and its Significance for Historical Jesus Studies.” *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 46/2 (2003): 217–232.

Jackson, David R. *Enochic Judaism: Three Defining Paradigm Exemplars*. London: T & T Clark, 2004.

Jacobson, Arland D. “Wisdom Christology in Q.” Ph.D. diss. Claremont Graduate School, 1978.

–. “The Literary Unity of Q.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 101 (1982): 365–389.

–. *The First Gospel: An Introduction to Q*. Sonoma, Calif.: Polebridge, 1992.

Jaffee, Martin S. *Torah in the Mouth: Writing and Oral Tradition in Palestinian Judaism, 200 BCE – 400 CE*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2001.

Jaubert, Annie. “Le pays de Damas.” *Revue Biblique* 65 (1958): 214–248.

Jenkins, Philip. *Hidden Gospels: How the Search for Jesus Lost Its Way*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2001.

Jensen, Morten H. *Herod Antipas in Galilee: The Literary and Archaeological Sources on the Reign of Herod Antipas and Its Socio-Economic Impact on Galilee*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2 215. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006.

–. “On How Making Differences Makes a Difference.” Pages 140–162 in *Introducing Religion: Essays in Honor of Jonathan Z. Smith*. Edited by W. Braun and R. T. McCutcheon. London: Equinox, 2008.

Jeremias, Joachim. *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*. London: SCM, 1966.

–. *New Testament Theology: The Proclamations of Jesus*. Translated by J. Bowden. London: SCM, 1971.

–. *Die Sprache des Lukasevangeliums: Redaktion und Tradition im Nicht-Markusstoff des dritten Evangeliums*. Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1980.

Johns, Loren L. “Identity and Resistance: The Varieties of Competing Models in Early Judaism.” Pages 254–277 in *Qumran Studies: New Approaches, New Questions*. Edited by M. T. Davis and B. A. Strawn. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.

Johnson, Luke Timothy. *The Letter of James: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Anchor Bible 37A. Garden City: Doubleday, 1995.

Johnson, Sherman E. "The Dead Sea Manual of Discipline and the Jerusalem Church of Acts." Pages 129–142 in *The Scrolls and the New Testament*. Edited by K. Stendahl. New York: Harper, 1957.

Johnson-Debaufre, Melanie. *Jesus among Her Children: Q, Eschatology, and the Construction of Christian Origins*. Harvard Theological Studies 55. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2005.

Joseph, Simon J. "Wisdom, Apocalypticism, and the Sayings Gospel Q." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature, New Orleans, Louisiana, November 23, 2009,

–. "'Blessed is Whoever is Not Offended By Me': The Subversive Appropriation of (Royal) Messianic Ideology in Q 3–7." *New Testament Studies* 57.3 (2011): 307–324.

–. "'His Wisdom Will Reach All Peoples': 4Q534–36, Q 17:26–27, 30, and *1 En.* 65.1–67.3, 90." *Dead Sea Discoveries* 19.1 (2012): 71–105.

–. "A Social Identity Approach to the Apocalyptic Rhetoric of Violence in the Sayings Gospel Q." *History of Religions* (2013): forthcoming.

Karrer, Martin. *Der Gesalbte. Die Grundlagen des Christustitels*. Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments 151. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990.

Käsemann, Ernst. "The Problem of the Historical Jesus." Pages 15–47 in *Essays on New Testament Themes.* Studies in Biblical Theology 41. London: SCM, 1964.

–. *New Testament Questions of Today*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1969.

Kaster, Robert A. *Guardians of Language: The Grammarian and Society in Late Antiquity*. The Transformation of the Classical Heritage 11. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988.

Kasting, Heinrich. *Die Anfänge der urchristlichen Mission*. Beiträge zur evangelischen Theologie 55. Munich: Kaiser, 1969.

Kaufman, Stephen A. "Dating the Palestinian Targums and Their Use in the Study of First Century CE Texts." Pages 118–141 in *The Aramaic Bible: Targums in their Historical Context*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplements 166. Sheffield: JSOT, 1994.

Kearns, Rollin. *Die Entchristologisierung des Menschensohnes*: *die Übertragung des Traditionsgefüges um den Menschensohn auf Jesus*. Tübingen: Mohr, 1988.

Kee, Howard Clark. "The Bearing of the Dead Sea Scrolls on Understanding Jesus." Pages 54–75 in *Jesus in History and Myth*. Edited by R. J. Hoffman and G. A. Larue. Buffalo: Prometheus, 1986.

Kelber, Werner H. *The Oral and Written Gospel: The Hermeneutics of Speaking and Writing in the Synoptic Tradition, Mark, Paul, and Q*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983.

Kelley, Shawn. *Racializing Jesus: Race, Ideology, and the Formation of Modern Biblical Scholarship*. Biblical Limits. London: Routledge, 2002.

Kim, Seyoon. *The 'Son of Man' as the Son of God*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 30. Tübingen: Mohr, 1983.

King, Karen L. *What is Gnosticism?* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2003.

Klauck, Hans-Josef. *Herrenmahl und hellenisticher Kult: Eine religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zum ersten Korintherbrief.* Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen 15. Münster: Aschendorff, 1982.

Kleio, Charlotte. *Anti-Judaism in Christian Theology*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1978.

Kloppenborg, John S. "Wisdom Christology in Q." *Laval théologique et philosophque* 34.2 (1978): 129–147.

–. "Tradition and Redaction in the Synoptic Sayings Source." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 46 (1984): 36–45.

–. *The Formation of Q: Trajectories in Ancient Christian Wisdom Collections*. Studies in Antiquity and Christianity. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987.
–. "Symbolic Eschatology and the Apocalypticism of Q." *Harvard Theological Review* 80 (1987): 287–306.
–. *Q Parallels: Synopsis, Critical Notes, and Concordance*. Sonoma: Polebridge, 1988.
–. "Redactional Strata and Social History in the Sayings Gospel Q." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the SBL. Chicago, Ill, November, 1988.
–. "City and Wasteland: Narrative World and the Beginning of the Sayings Gospel (Q)." *Semeia* 52 (1991): 145–160.
–. "Literary Convention, Self-Evidence, and the Social History of the Q People." *Semeia* 55 (1991): 77–102.
–. "The Sayings Gospel Q: Recent Opinion on the People behind the Document." *Currents in Research: Biblical Studies* (1993): 9–34.
–. "Jesus and the Parables of Jesus in Q." Pages 275–319 in *The Gospel Behind the Gospels: Current Studies in Q*. Edited by R. A. Piper. Supplements to Novum Testamentum 75. Leiden: Brill, 1995.
–. "The Sayings Gospel Q and the Quest of the Historical Jesus." *Harvard Theological Review* 89 (1996): 307–344.
–. "Ideological Texture in the Parable of the Tenants." Pages 64–88 in *Fabrics of Discourse: Essays in Honor of Vernon K. Robbins*. Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 2003.
–. "Judaeans or Judaean Christians in James." Pages 113–123 in *Identity and Interaction in the Ancient Mediterranean: Jesus, Christians and Others: Essays in Honour of Stephen G. Wilson*. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2007.
–, ed. *Conflict and Invention: Literary, Rhetorical and Social Studies on the Sayings Gospel Q*. Valley Forge, Pa.: Trinity, 2004.
– Verbin. *Excavating Q: The History and Setting of the Sayings Gospel*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 2000.
– Verbin. "Is There a New Paradigm?" Pages 23–47 in *Christology, Controversy and Community: New Testament Essays in Honour of David R. Catchpole*. Edited by D. G. Horrell and C. M. Tuckett. Novum Testamentum Supplements 99. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
– Verbin. "Discursive Practices in the Sayings Gospel Q and the Quest of the Historical Jesus." Pages 149–160 in *The Sayings Gospel Q and the Historical Jesus*. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium 158. Edited by A. Lindemann. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2001.
– Verbin. "Goulder and the New Paradigm: A Critical Appreciation of Michael Goulder on the Synoptic Problem." Pages 29–60 in *The Gospels according to Michael Goulder: A North American Response*. Edited by C. A. Rollston. Harrisburg, Pa.: Trinity Press International, 2002.
Knibb, Michael A. "The Place of the Damascus Document in Recent Scholarship." Pages 149–162 in *The Provo International Conference on Methods of Investigation of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Khirbet Qumran Site: Present Realities and Future Prospects*. Edited by M. O. Wise, N. Golb, J. J. Collins and D. G. Pardee. New York: The New York Academy of Sciences, 1994.
Koch, Klaus. "Heilandserwartungen im Judäa der Zeitenwende." Pages 107–135 in *Die Schriftrollen von Qumran: Zur aufregenden Geschichte ihrer Erforschung und Deutung*. Edited by S. Talmon. Regensburg: Pustet, 1998.
Koester, Helmut. "One Jesus and Four Primitive Gospels." *Harvard Theological Review* 61 (1968): 203–247.

–. *Introduction to the New Testament*. 2 vols. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1982. Volume 1: *History, Culture, and Religion of the Hellenistic Age*. Volume 2: *History and Literature of Early Christianity*. 2d ed. Foundations and Facets. Philadelphia: Fortress, 2000.
–. *Ancient Christian Gospels: Their History and Development*. Philadelphia: Trinity, 1990.
–. "The Sayings Gospel Q and the Quest for the Historical Jesus: A Response to John S. Kloppenborg." *Harvard Theological Review* 89:4 (1996): 345–349.
Kohler, Kaufmann. *The Origins of the Synagogue and the Church*. New York: Macmillan, 1929.
Kopp, Clemens. *Elias und Christentum auf dem Karmel*. Collectanea Hierosolymitana 3. Paderborn: Schöningh, 1929.
Körtner, Ulrich H. J. *Papias von Hierapolis: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des frühen Christentums*. Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments 133. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1983.
Kosch, Daniel. *Die eschatologische Tora des Menschensohnes. Untersuchungen zur Rezeption der Stellung Jesu zur Tora in Q*. Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus 12. Freiburg & Göttingen: Universitätsverlag & Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989.
–. "Q und Jesus." *Biblische Zeitschrift* 36 (1992): 30–58.
Kraeling, Carl H. *John the Baptist*. New York: Scribner, 1951.
Kranenborg, Reender. "The Presentation of the Essenes in Western Esotericism." *Journal of Contemporary Religion* 13/2 (1998): 245–256.
Kranvig, H. S. *Roots of Apocalyptic: The Mesopotamian Background of the Enoch Figure and of the Son of Man*. Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament 61. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1988.
Kugler, Robert A. "Priesthood at Qumran." Pages 2: 93–116 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*. 2 Volumes. Edited by P. W. Flint and J. C. VanderKam. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
Kuhn, Karl Georg. "The Lord's Supper and the Communal Meal at Qumran." Pages 65–93 in *The Scrolls and the New Testament*. Edited by K. Stendahl. New York: Harper, 1957.
–. "Die in Palästina gefundenen hebraïschen Texte und das neue Testament." *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 47 (1990): 192–211.
Kuhn, Thomas. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Chicago, 1962.
Kümmel, Werner G. *Promise and Fulfillment: The Eschatological Message of Jesus*. Translated by Dorothea M. Barton. 2d ed. Studies in Biblical Theology 23. London: SCM, 1958.
–. *Heilsgeschehen und Geschichte: Gesammelte Aufsätze 1933-1964*. Edited by E. Grässer, O. Merk and A. Fritz. Marburg theologische Studien 3. Marburg: N. G. Elwert, 1965.
–. *Introduction to the New Testament*. London: SCM, 1966 (rev. ed., 1975).
–. "Jesu Antwort an Johannes den Täufer: Ein Beispiel zum Methodenproblem in der Jesusforschung." Pages 177–200 in *Heilsgeschehen und Geschichte: Gesammelte Aufsätze 1965–1977*. Edited by E. Grässer and O. Merk. Marburger theologische Studien 16. Marburg: Elwert, 1965–1978.
Kürzinger, Josef. "Das Papiaszeugnis und die Erstgestalt des Matthäusevangeliums." *Biblische Zeitschrift* 4 (1960): 19–38.
–. "Irenäus und sein Zeugnis zur Sprache des Matthäusevangeliums." *New Testament Studies* 10 (1964): 108–115.
Kutscher, Eduard Y. *The Language and Linguistic Background of the Isaiah Scroll* (1QIs[a]). Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 6. Leiden: Brill, 1974.
Kvalbein, Hans. "The Wonders of the End-Time: Metaphoric Language in 4Q521 and the Interpretation of Matt 11.5 par." *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 18 (1998): 87–110.

Labahn, Michael. "The Significance of Signs in Luke 7:22–23 in the Light of Isaiah 61 and the Messianic Apocalypse." Pages 146–168 in *From Prophecy to Testament: The Function of the Old Testament in the New*. Edited by C. A. Evans. Peabody: Hendrickson, 2004.

Lachs, Samuel Tobias. *A Rabbinical Commentary on the New Testament: The Gospels of Matthew, Mark and Luke*. Hoboken: KTAV, 1987.

Lambrecht, Jan. "Q-Influence on Mark 8, 34–9,1." Pages 277–304 in *Logia: Les paroles de Jésus: The Sayings of Jesus: Mémorial* Joseph Coppens. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium 59. Edited by J. Delobel, et al. Leuven: Peeters, 1982.

–. *The Sermon on the Mount: Proclamation and Exhortation*. Good New Studies 14. Wilmington: Glazier, 1985.

–. "John the Baptist and Jesus in Mark 1.1–15: Markan Redaction of Q?" *New Testament Studies* 38 (1992): 357–384.

Lasor, William Sanford. *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1972.

Lawlor, Hugh Jackson. "Early Citations from the Book of Enoch." *Journal of Philology* 25 (1897): 164–225.

Le Déaut, Roger. *The Message of the New Testament and the Aramaic Bible (Targum)*. Translated by S. F. Miletic. Subsidia Biblica 5. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1982.

Leaney, Alfred R. C. *The Rule of Qumran and Its Meaning*. London: SCM, 1966.

Levine, Amy-Jill. "The Earth Moved: Jesus, Sex, and Eschatology." Pages 83–97 in *Apocalypticism, Anti-Semitism and the Historical Jesus: Subtexts in Criticism*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament 275. Edited by J. S. Kloppenborg with J. W. Marshall. London: T & T Clark International, 2005.

–. *The Misunderstood Jew: The Church and the Scandal of the Jewish Jesus*. New York: Harper San Francisco, 2006.

Levine, Lee I. *Judaism and Hellenism in Antiquity: Conflict or Confluence*. Samuel and Althea Stroum lectures in Jewish Studies. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1998.

Licht, Jacob. "Time and Eschatology in Apocalyptic Literature and in Qumran." *Journal of Jewish Studies* 16 (1965): 177–182.

Lichtenberger, Hermann. "Reflections on the History of John the Baptist's Communities." *Folia Orientalia* 25 (1988): 45–49.

–. "The Dead Sea Scrolls and John the Baptist: Reflections on Josephus' Account of John the Baptist." Pages 340–346 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research*. Edited by D. Dimant and U. Rappaport. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 10. Leiden: Brill, 1992.

Lietzmann, Hans. *Der Menschensohn: Ein Beitrag zur neutestamentlichen Theologie*. Freiburg im Breisgau/Leipzig: Mohr Siebeck, 1896.

Lieu, Judith. *Image and Reality: The Jews in the World of the Christians in the Second Century*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1996.

–. *Neither Jew nor Greek?: Constructing Early Christianity*. Studies of the New Testament and its World. London: T & T Clark, 2002.

Lightfoot, J. B. *Saint Paul's Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon*. London: Macmillan, 1912.

Lillie, Arthur. *Buddhism in Christendom: or, Jesus, the Essene*. London: Kegan Paul, Trench and Co., 1887.

–. *India in Primitive Christianity*. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner, 1909.

Limor, Ora and Guy G. Stroumsa, eds. *Contra Iudaeos: Ancient and Medieval Polemics between Christians and Jews*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996.

Lincoln, Bruce. *Death, War and Sacrifice: Studies in Ideology and Practice*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991.

–. *Theorizing Myth: Narrative, Ideology, and Scholarship*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999.
Lindars, Barnabas. "Jesus as Advocate: A Contribution to the Christology Debate." *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester* 62 (1980): 476–497.
–. "The New Look on the Son of Man." *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester* 63 (1981): 437–462.
–. *Jesus Son of Man: A Fresh Examination of the Son of Man Sayings in the Gospels in the Light of Recent Research*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1984.
–. "Response to Richard Bauckham: The Idiomatic Use of *Bar Enasha*." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 23 (1985): 35–41.
Liver, Jacob. "The Sons of Zadok the Priests' in the Dead Sea Sect." *Revue de Qumran* 6/21 (1967): 3–32.
Loader, William. *The Dead Sea Scrolls on Sexuality: Attitudes Towards Sexuality in Sectarian and Related Literature at Qumran*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009.
Lohmeyer, Ernst. *Das Urchristentum I: Johannes der Täufer*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1932.
–. *Galiläa und Jerusalem*. Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments 34. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1936.
Long, Charles H. *Significations: Signs, Symbols, and Images in the Interpretation of Religion*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986.
Lönnqvist, Minna and Kenneth Lönnqvist. *Archaeology of the Hidden Qumran: The New Paradigm*. Helsinki: Helsinki University Press, 2002.
Lührmann, Dieter. *Die Redaktion der Logienquelle*. Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament 33. Neukirchener-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1969.
–. "Die Logienquelle und die Frage nach dem historischen Jesus." Paper presented at the fall meeting at Westar Institute, Edmonton, Alberta, Oct 24–27, 1991.
–. "Q in the History of Early Christianity." Pages 59–73 in *The Shape of Q: Signal Essays on the Sayings Gospel*. Edited by J. S. Kloppenborg. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1994.
Luz, Ulrich. "Das Jesusbild der vormarkinischen Tradition." Pages 349–350 in *Jesus Christus in Historie und Theologie: Neutestamentliche Festschrift für Hans Conzelmann zum 60. Geburtstag*. Edited by G. Strecker. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1975.
MacDonald, Dennis R. *Christianizing Homer: "The Odyssey," Plato, and "The Acts of Andrew."* New York: Oxford University Press, 1994.
–. *The Homeric Epics and the Gospel of Mark*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000.
–. *Does the New Testament Imitate Homer? Four Cases from the Acts of the Apostles*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003.
–. ed. *Mimesis and Intertextuality in Antiquity and Christianity*. Studies in Antiquity and Christianity. Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 2001.
Macina, Robert. "Jean le Baptist étail-il Élie?: Examen de la tradition néotestamentaire." *Proche-Orient Chrétien* 34 (1984): 209–232.
Mack, Burton L. "The Kingdom that Didn't Come: The Social History of the Q Tradents." Pages 608–635 in *Society of Biblical Literature Papers 1988*. Edited by D. J. Lull. Atlanta: Scholars, 1988.
–. "Q and the Gospel of Mark: Revising Christian Origins," *Semeia* 55 (1991): 15–39.
–. *The Lost Gospel: The Book of Q and Christian Origins*. New York: HarperSanFrancisco, 1993.
–. *The Christian Myth: Origins, Logic, and Legacy*. New York: Continuum, 2001.
Maddox, Robert. "The Function of the Son of Man According to the Synoptic Gospels." *New Testament Studies* 15 (1968): 45–74.

–. “The Quest for Valid Methods in ‘Son of Man’ Research.” *Australian Biblical Review* (1971): 36–51.
Magen, Yizhak and Yuval Peleg. *The Qumran Excavations 1993-2004: Preliminary Report*. Judea & Samaria Publications 6. Jerusalem: Israel Antiquities Authority, 2007.
Magness, Jodi. “A Villa at Khirbet Qumran?” *Revue de Qumran* 16 (1994): 397–419.
–. “Qumran: Not a Country Villa.” *Biblical Archaeological Review* 22 (6 1996): 38, 40–47, 72–3.
–. *The Archaeology of Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002.
Manson, Thomas Walter. *The Teaching of Jesus: Studies of its Form and Content*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1935.
–. *The Mission and Message of Jesus*: *An Exposition of the Gospels in the Light of Modern Research*. New York: E. P. Dutton, 1938.
Marshall, I. Howard. “The Synoptic Son of Man Sayings in Recent Discussion.” *New Testament Studies* 12 (1965–66): 327–351.
–. “The Son of Man in Contemporary Debate.” *Evangelical Quarterly* 42 (1970): 67–87.
–. *The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek New Testament*. New International Greek Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Paternoster, 1978.
Marshall, John W. “Apocalypticism and Anti-Semitism: Inner-Group Resources for Inter-group Conflicts.” Pages 68–82 in *Apocalypticism, Anti-Semitism and the Historical Jesus: Subtexts in Criticism*. Edited by J. S. Kloppenborg and J. W. Marshall. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplements 275. London: T & T Clark, 2005.
Marx, Alfred. “Les racines du célibat essénien.” *Revue de Qumran* 7 (1971): 323–342.
Mason, Steve. “What Josephus Says about the Essenes in his *Judean War*.” Pages 434–467 in *Text and Artifact in the Religions of Mediterranean Antiquity: Essays in Honour of Peter Richardson*. Edited by S. G. Wilson and M. Desjardins. Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 2000.
–. “Essenes and Lurking Spartans in Josephus’ Judean War: From Story to History.” Pages 219–261 in *Making History: Josephus and Historical Method*. Edited by Z. Rodgers. Journal for the Study of Judaism Supplements 110. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
–. “Did the Essenes write the Dead Sea Scrolls?: Don’t Rely on Josephus.” *Biblical Archaeology Review* 34/6 (Nov/Dec 2008): 61–65, 81.
–. *Josephus, Judea and Christian Origins: Methods and Categories*. Peabody: Hendrickson, 2009.
Matson, Mark A. “Luke’s Rewriting of the Sermon on the Mount.” Pages 623–650 in *Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers 2000*. Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Paper Series 39. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2000.
McCasland, S. Vernon. “The Way.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 77 (1958): 222–230.
McCready, Wayne O. and Adele Reinhartz, eds. *Common Judaism: Explorations in Second-Temple Judaism*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2008.
McDonald, J. Ian H. “Questioning and Discernment in Gospel Discourse: Communicative Strategy in Matthew 11:2–19.” Pages 333–361 in *Authenticating the Words of Jesus*. Edited by B. D. Chilton and C. A. Evans. New Testament Tools and Studies 28/1. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
–. “What Did You Go Out to See? John the Baptist, the Scrolls and Late Second Temple Judaism.” Pages 53–64 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Their Historical Context*. Edited by T. H. Lim. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 2000.
McNamara, Martin. *The New Testament and the Palestinian Targum to the Pentateuch*. Analecta Biblica 27. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1966.

McNicol, Allan J., David L. Dungan and David B. Peabody, eds. *Beyond the Q Impasse – Luke's Use of Matthew: A Demonstration by the Research Team of the International Institute for Gospel Studies*. Valley Forge: Trinity Press International, 1996.

Meadors, Edward P. *Jesus the Messianic Herald of Salvation*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 72. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1995.

–. "The 'Messianic' Implications of the Q Material." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 118/2 (1999): 253–277.

Meadors, Gary T. "The 'Poor' in the Beatitudes of Matthew [5:3] and Luke." *Grace Theological Journal* 6/2 (1985): 305–314.

Mearns, Christopher L. "The Son of Man Trajectory and Eschatological Development." *Expository Times* 97 (1985/86): 8–12.

Meier, John P. *A Marginal Jew: Rethinking the Historical Jesus*. Volume 1. New York: Doubleday, 1991.

–. *Mentor, Message, and Miracles*. Volume 2 of *A Marginal Jew: Rethinking the Historical Jesus*. Anchor Bible Reference Library. New York: Doubleday, 1991.

Metzger, Bruce M. "Considerations of Method in the Study of Mystery Religions." *Harvard Theological Review* 48 (1955): 1–20.

Metso, Sarianna. *The Textual Development of the Qumran Community Rule*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 21. Leiden: Brill, 1997.

Meyer, Ben F. *The Aims of Jesus*. London: SCM, 1979.

Meyer, Arnold. *Jesu Muttersprache: Das galiläische Aramäisch in seiner Bedeutung für die Erklärung der Reden Jesu und der Evangelien überhaupt*. Freiburg im Breisgau/Leipzig: Mohr Siebeck, 1896.

Meyer, Paul D. "The Community of Q." Ph.D. dissertation. University of Iowa, 1967.

Milik, Józef Tadeusz. *Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea*. Translated by J. Strugnell. 2d ed. London: SCM, 1963.

–. "Les modèeles araméens du livre d'Esther dans la grotte 4 de Qumran." *Revue de Qumran* 15 (1992): 321–399.

–. with Matthew Black. *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumrân Cave 4*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1976.

Mill, John Stuart. *A System of Logic*. 10th ed. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1879.

Miller, Merrill P. "'Beginning from Jerusalem…': Re-examining Canon and Consensus." *Journal of Higher Criticism* 2/1 (1995): 3–30.

Mitchell, Margaret M. "Homer in the New Testament?" *Journal of Religion* 83 (2003): 244–258.

Moehring, Horst R. "Josephus on the Marriage Customs of the Essenes." Pages 120–127 in *Early Christian Origins*. Edited by A. P. Wikgren. Chicago: Quadrangle, 1961.

Moreland, Milton. "Jerusalem Imagined." Ph.D. dissertation. The Claremont Graduate School, 1999.

Morgenthaler, Robert. *Statistische Synopse*. Zürich: Gotthelf Verlag, 1971.

Mowinckel, Sigmund. *He That Cometh*. Translated by G. W. Anderson. New York: Abingdon, 1954.

Mowry, Lucetta. *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Early Church*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962.

Müller, Karlheinz. "Die religionsgeschichtliche Methode: Erwägungen zu ihrem Verständnis und zur Praxis ihrer Vollzüge an neutestamentlichen Texten." *Biblische Zeitschrift* 29 (1985): 161–192.

Murphy, Catherine M. *Wealth in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Qumran Community*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 40. Leiden: Brill, 2001.

Murphy-O'Connor, Jerome. "The Essenes and their History." *Revue biblique* 81 (1974): 219–223.

–. "Qumran and the New Testament." Pages 55–71 in *The New Testament and Its Modern Interpreters*. Edited by J. Epp and G. W. MacRae. Atlanta: Scholars, 1989.

–. "John the Baptist and Jesus: History and Hypothesis." *New Testament Studies* 36 (1990): 359–374.

–, ed. *Paul and Qumran: Studies in New Testament Exegesis*. Chicago: Priory, 1968.

Neirynck, Frans. "Recent Developments in the Study of Q." Pages 29–75 in *Logia: Les paroles de Jésus—The Sayings of Jesus*. Edited by J. Delobel. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium 59. Leuven: Peeters, 1982.

–. "ΤΙΣ ΕΣΤΙΝ Ο ΠΑΙΣΑΣ ΣΕ. Matt 26,68/ Luke 22, 64 (diff. Mark 14:65)." *Ephemerides theologicae lovanienses* 63 (1987): 5–47.

–. "Goulder and the Minor Agreements." *Ephemerides theologicae lovanienses* 73 (1997): 84–93.

–. "Q 6, 20b–21; 7, 22 and Isaiah 61." Pages 27–64 in *Scriptures in the Gospels*. Edited by C. M. Tuckett. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium 131. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1997.

Neusner, Jacob. *Judaism in the Beginning of Christianity*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984.

–. *Why No Gospels in Talmudic Judaism*. Brown Judaic Studies 135. Atlanta: Scholars, 1988.

–. *Jews and Christians: The Myth of a Common Tradition*. Philadelphia: Trinity Press International, 1991.

–. *Are There Really Tannaitic Parallels to the Gospels?: A Refutation of Morton Smith*. Atlanta: Scholars, 1993.

–. *Rabbinic Literature and the New Testament: What We Cannot Show We Do Not Know*. Valley Forge: Trinity, 1994.

–. "Contexts of Comparison: Reciprocally Reading Gospels' and Rabbis' Parables." Pages 45–68 in *The Missing Jesus: Rabbinic Judaism and the New Testament*. Edited by B. A. Chilton, C. Evans and J. Neusner. Boston: Brill, 2002.

–, ed. *Take Judaism, For Example: Studies Toward the Comparison of Religions*. Chicago Studies in the History of Judaism. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983.

–. ed, et al. *Judaisms and their Messiahs at the Turn of the Christian Era*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1987.

Newsom, Carol A. *The Self as Symbolic Space: Constructing Identity and Community at Qumran*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 52. Leiden: Brill, 2004.

Nickelsburg, George W. E. "Son of Man." Pages 137–150 in *Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Edited by D. N. Freedman. 6 Vols. New York, 1992.

–. "Revealed Wisdom as a Criterion for Inclusion and Exclusion: From Jewish Sectarianism to Early Christianity." Pages 73–91 in *"To See Ourselves As Others See us": Christians, Jews, "Others" in Late Antiquity*. Edited by J. Neusner and E. S. Frerichs. Studies in the Humanities. Chico: Scholars, 1985.

–. "Enochic Wisdom: An Alternative to the Mosaic Torah?" Pages 123–132 in *Hesed ve-Emet: Studies in Honor of Ernest D. Frerichs*. Edited by J. Magness and S. Gitin. Brown Judaic Studies 320. Atlanta: Scholars, 1998.

–. "The Books of Enoch at Qumran: What We Know and What We Need to Think About." Pages 99–113 in *Antikes Judentum und Frühes Christentum: Festschrift für Hartmut Stegemann zum 65. Geburtstag*. Edited by B. Kollmann, W. Reinbold and A. Steudel. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 97. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1999.

–. "Apocalyptic Texts." Pages 29–35 in *The Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by L. H. Schiffman and J. C. VanderKam. NewYork: Oxford University Press, 2000.

–. *1 Enoch: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch, Chapters 1–36; 81–108*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001.
–. "Wisdom and Apocalypticism in Early Judaism: Some Points for Discussion." Pages 17–37 in *Conflicted Boundaries in Wisdom and Apocalypticism.* Edited by B. G. Wright, III and L. M. Wills. Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series 35. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2005.
–. *Ancient Judaism and Christian Origins: Diversity, Continuity, and Transformation.* Minneapolis: Fortress, 2003.
–. "Enochic Wisdom and Its Relationship to the Mosaic Torah." Pages 81–94 in *The Early Enoch Literature.* Journal for the Study of Judaism Supplements 121. Edited by G. Boccaccini and J. J. Collins. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
–. and James C. VanderKam. *1 Enoch: A New Translation*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2004.
Niebuhr, Karl Wilhelm "4Q521, 2 II – Ein eschatologischer Psalm." Pages 151–68 in *Mogilany 1995: Papers on the Dead Sea Scrolls Offered in Memory of Aleksy Klawek*. Edited by Z. J. Kapera. Krakow: The Enigma Press, 1996.
–. "Die Werke des Eschatologischen Freudenboten (4Q521 und die Jesusüberlieferung)." Pages 637–46 in *The Scriptures in the Gospels*. Edited by C. M. Tuckett. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium 131. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1997.
Nitzan, Bilhah. "Eschatological Motives in Qumran Literature: The Messianic Concept." Pages 132–151 in *Eschatology in the Bible and in Jewish and Christian Tradition.* Edited by H. G. Reventlow. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.
Nolland, John *The Gospel of Matthew: A Commentary on the Greek Text.* New International Greek Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005.
Novakovic, Lidija. "4Q521: The Works of the Messiah or the Signs of the Messianic Time?" Pages 208–231 in *Qumran Studies: New Approaches, New Questions*. Edited by M. T. Davis and B. A. Strawn. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.
Oegema, Gerbern S. *The Anointed and his People: Messianic Expectations from Maccabees to Bar Kochba.* Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplements 27. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.
–. "Messianic Expectations in the Qumran Writings: Theses on their Development." Pages 53–82 in *Qumran Messianism: Studies on the Messianic Expectations in the Dead Sea Scrolls.* Edited by J. H. Charlesworth, H. Lichtenberger and G. S. Oegema. Tübingen: Mohr, 1998.
Oesterley, William O. E. *The Gospel Parables in the Light of Their Jewish Background*. London: Macmillan, 1936.
Oesterreicher, John M. "The Community of Qumran." Pages 91–134 in *The Bridge: A Yearbook of Judaeo-Christian Studies*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1956.
Owen, Paul and David Shepherd. "Speaking up for Qumran, Dalman and the Son of Man: Was *Bar Enasha* a Common Term for 'Man' in the Time of Jesus?" *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 81 (2001): 81–122.
Paden, William E. "Elements of a New Comparativism." *Method and Theory in the Study of Religion* 8 (1996): 5–14.
Patterson, Stephen J. "Wisdom in Q and Thomas." Pages 187–222 in *In Search of Wisdom: Essays in Memory of John G. Gammie.* Edited by L. G. Perdue, B. B. Scott and W. J. Wiseman. Lousiville: Westminster John Knox, 1993.
–. *The Gospel of Thomas and Jesus*. Sonoma, Calif.: Polebridge, 1993.
Pearson, Birger A. "A Q Community in Galilee?" *New Testament Studies* 50 (2004): 476–494.
Peppard, Michael. "Personal Names and Ethnic Hybridity in Late Ancient Galilee: The Data from Beth She'arim." Pages 99–113 in *Religion, Ethnicity, and Identity in Ancient Galilee:*

A Region in Transition. Edited by J. Zangenberg, H. W. Attridge and D. B. Martin. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 210. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007.

Perrin, Norman. "Mark XIV.62: The End Product of a Christian Pesher Tradition?" *New Testament Studies* 12 (1965–66): 150–155.

–. "The Son of Man in Ancient Judaism and Primitive Christianity: A Suggestion." *Biblical Research* 11 (1966): 17–28.

–. *Rediscovering the Teachings of Jesus*. New York: Harper & Row, 1967.

–. "The Son of Man in the Synoptic Tradition." *Biblical Research* 13 (1968): 3–25.

–. and Dennis Duling. *The New Testament: An Introduction*. New York: Harvest, 1982.

Pesch, Rudolf. *Das Markusevangelium*. 2 Vols. Herders theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament 2. Freiburg: Herder, 1976–1977.

Petersen, David. *Late Israelite Prophecy*. Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series 23. Missoula: Scholars, 1977.

Pilch, John J. "Are There Jews and Christians in the Bible?" *Harvard Theological Studies* 53/1-2 (1997): 119–25.

Piper, Ronald A. *Wisdom in the Q-Tradition: The Aphoristic Sayings of Jesus*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 61. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1989.

Pixner, Bargil. "An Essene Quarter on Mount Zion?" Pages 245–286 in *Studia Hierosolymitana in onore dei P. Bellarmino Bagatti*. Vol.1. Studi Archeologici. Edited by G. C. Bittini. Studium Biblicum Franciscanum: Collectio Maior 22. Jerusalem: Franciscan Printing Press, 1976.

–. "Das Essener-Quarter in Jerusalem." Pages 180–207 in *Wege des Messias und Stätten der Urkirche. Jesus und das Judenchristentum im Licht neuer archäologischer Erkenntnisse*. Edited by R. Riesner. Giessen/Basel: Brunnen, 1991.

–. "Das letzte Abendmahl Jesu." Pages 219–228 in *Wege des Messias und Stätten der Urkirche. Jesus und das Judenchristentum im Licht neuer archäologischer Erkenntnisse*. Edited by R. Riesner. Giessen/Basel: Brunnen, 1991.

–. "Essener-Viertel und Urgemeinde." Pages 327–234 in *Wege des Messias und Stätten der Urkirche. Jesus und das Judenchristentum im Licht neuer archäologischer Erkenntnisse*. Edited by R. Riesner. Giessen/Basel: Brunnen, 1991.

–. "Archäologische Beobachtungen zum Jerusalemer Essener-Viertel und zur Urgemeinde." Pages 89–113 in *Christen und Christliches in Qumran?* Eichstätter Studien 32. Edited by B. Mayer. Regensburg: F. Pustet, 1992.

–. "The Jerusalem Essenes, Barnabas and the Letter to the Hebrews." Pages 167–178 in *Intertestamental Essays in Honour of Jozef Tadeusz Milik*. Qumranica Mogilanensia 6. Edited by Z. J. Kapera. Krakow: Enigma, 1992.

–. "Jerusalem's Essene Gateway: Where the Community Lived in Jesus' Time." *Biblical Archaeology Review* 23 (1997): 23–31.

–, Doron Chen and Shlomo Margalit. "Mount Zion: The Gate of the Essenes Reexcavated." *Zeitschrift des deutschen Palästina-Vereins* 105 (1989): 85–95.

Polag, Athanasius. *Die Christologie der Logienquelle*. Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament 45. Neukirchen-Vluyn, Neukirchener, 1977.

Pomykala, Kenneth E. *The Davidic Dynasty Tradition in Early Judaism: Its History and Significance for Messianism.* Early Judaism and its Literature 7. Atlanta: Scholars, 1995.

Porton, Gary G. "The Parable in the Hebrew Bible and Rabbinic Literature." Pages 206–221 in *The Historical Jesus in Context*. Edited by A-J. Levine, D. C. Allison, Jr. and J. D. Crossan. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2006.

Potter, Charles Francis. *The Lost Years of Jesus*. New Hyde Park: University Books, 1963.

Prideaux, Humphrey. *The Old and New Testaments Connected in the History of Jews & Neighboring Nations, from the Declensions of the Kingdoms of Israel and Judah to the Time of Christ*. London: W. Baynes. 4 vols. Sixteenth ed. 1808 (1717).

Priest, John F. "The Messiah and the Meal in 1QSa." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 82 (1963): 95–100.

Puech, Émile. "Un Hymne essénien en partie retrouvé et les Béatitudes. 1QH V 12–VI 18 (= col. XIII–XIV 7) et 4Qbéat." *Revue de Qumran* 13 (1988): 59–88.

–. "4Q525 et les péricopes des béatitudes en Ben Sira et Matthieu," *Revue Bibliqu*e 98 (1991): 80–106.

–. "Une Apocalypse Messianique (4Q521)." *Revue de Qumran* 15 (1992): 475–519.

–. "Fragment d'une apocalypse en araméen (4Q246 = pseudo Dan[d]) et le 'royaume de Dieu." *Revue Biblique* 99 (1992): 98–131.

–. "The Collection of Beatitudes in Hebrew and in Greek (4Q525 and Mt 5, 3–12)." Pages 353–368 in *Early Christianity in Context: Monuments and Documents*. Edited F. Manns and E. Alliata. Studium Biblicum Franciscanum Collectio Maior 38. Jerusalem: Franciscan Printing Press, 1993.

–. "Notes sur le fragment d'apocalypse 4Q246 – 'Le Fils de Dieu." *Revue Biblique* 101 (1994): 533–558.

–. "Messianism, Resurrection, and Eschatology at Qumran and in the New Testament." Pages 235–256 in *The Community of the Renewed Covenant: The Notre Dame Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by E. Ulrich and J. VanderKam. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1994.

–. "246. 4QApocryphe de Daniel ar." Pages 165–184 in *Qumran Cave 4 XVII. Parabiblical Texts, Part 3*. Edited by G. Brooke, et al. Oxford: Clarendon, 1996.

–. "Some Remarks on 4Q246 and 4Q521 and Qumran Messianism." Pages 545–565 in *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts and Reformulated Issues*. Edited by D. W. Parry and E. C. Ulrich. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 30. Leiden: Brill, 1999.

–, ed. *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert XXV. Qumran Grotte 4 XVIII: Textes Hebreux (4Q521–4Q528, 4Q576–4Q579)*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998.

Qimron, Elisha. "Celibacy in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Two Kinds of Sectarians." Pages 1: 287–294 in *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by J. Trebolle Barrera and L. Vegas Montaner. 2 volumes. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 11. Leiden: Brill, 1992.

Rabin, Ira, Oliver Hahn, Timo Wolff and Admir Masic. "On the Origin of the Ink of the Thanksgiving Scroll (1QHodayota)." *Dead Sea Discoveries* 16/1 (2009): 97–106.

Rabinowitz, Isaac. "A Reconsideration of Damascus." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 73 (1954): 11–35.

Rahmani, Levi Y. A *Catalogue of Jewish Ossuaries: In the Collections of the State of Israel*. Jerusalem: Israel Antiquities Authority, 1994.

Rajak, Tessa. "Jews and Greeks: The Invention and Exploitation of Polarities in the Nineteenth Century." Pages 535–557 in *The Jewish Dialogue with Greece and Rome: Studies in Cultural and Social Interaction*. Boston/Leiden: Brill, 2002.

Ratzinger, Joseph. Pope Benedict XVI. *Jesus of Nazareth: From the Baptism in the Jordan to the Transfiguration*. New York: Doubleday, 2007.

Reed, Annette Yoshiko. *Fallen Angels and the History of Judaism and Christianity: The Reception of Enochic Literature*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Reed, Jonathan L. "Places in Early Christianity: Galilee, Archaeology, Urbanization, and Q." Ph. D. diss. The Claremont Graduate School, 1994.

–. "The Social Map of Q." Pages 17–36 in *Conflict and Invention: Literary, Rhetorical and Social Studies on the Sayings Gospel Q*. Edited by J. S. Kloppenborg. Valley Forge, Pa.: Trinity Press International, 1995.

–. "The Sign of Jonah (Q 11:29–32) and Other Epic Traditions in Q." Pages 130–143 in *Re-imagining Christian Origins: A Colloquium honoring Burton L. Mack*. Edited by E. Castelli and H. Taussig. Valley Forge, Pa.: Trinity, 1996.

–. *Archaeology and the Galilean Jesus: A Re-examination of the Evidence*. Harrisburg, Pa.: Trinity, 2000.

Reeves, John C. "Complicating the Notion of an 'Enochic Judaism.'" Pages 373–383 in *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection*. Edited by G. Boccaccini. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005.

Regev, Eyal. "From Enoch to John the Essene: An Analysis of Sects Development in 1 Enoch, Jubilees, and the Essenes." Pages 67–93 in *New Perspectives on Old 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*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 88. Edited by E. Chazon and B. Halpern-Amaru. Leiden: Brill, 2006.

–. *Sectarianism in Qumran: A Cross-Cultural Perspective*. Religion and Society 45. New York/Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2007.

–. "Cherchez les femmes: Were the *yahad* Celibates?" *Dead Sea Discoveries* 15 (2008): 253–284.

Reike, Bo Ivar. "The Historical Setting of John's Baptism." Pages 209–224 in *Jesus, the Gospels, and the Church: Essays in Honor of William R. Farmer*. Edited by E. P. Sanders. Macon: Mercer University Press, 1987.

Reinach, Théodore. *Textes d'auteurs grecs et romains relatifs au Judäisme*. Paris: Ernest Laroux, 1895.

Reisner, Marius. *Jesus and Judgment*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1997.

Remus, Harold. "Voluntary Association and Networks: Aelius Aristides at the Asclepieion in Pergamum." Pages 146–175 in *Voluntary Associations in the Graeco-Roman World*. Edited by J. S. Kloppenborg and S. G. Wilson. London: Routledge, 1996.

Renan, Ernst. *Vie de Jesu*. Paris: Michael Levy, 1871.

–. *Histoire du Peuple d'Israël*, 5 vols. Paris: Calman-Lévy, 1891. ET: *History of the People of Israel*. 5 vols. Boston: Roberts Brothers,1888–1896.

Reumann, John. "The Quest for the Historical Baptist." Pages 181–199 in *Understanding the Sacred Text: Essays in Honor of Morton S. Enslin on the Hebrew Bible and Christian Beginnings*. Edited by J. Reumann. Valley Forge: Judson, 1972.

Reventlow, Henning Graf. "The Eschatologization of the Prophetic Books: A Comparative Study." Pages 169–188 in *Eschatology in the Bible and in Jewish and Christian Tradition.* Edited by H. G. Reventlow. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.

Riaud, Jean. "Les Thérapeutes d'Alexandrie dans la tradition et dans la recherche critique jusqu'aux découvertes de Qumran." Pages 1189–1295 in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt.* 2.20. Edited by H. Temporini and W. Haase. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1987.

Riesenfeld, Harald. *The Gospel Tradition and its Beginnings: A Study in the Limits of Formgeschichte.'* London: A. R. Mowbray & Co, 1957.

Riesner, Rainer. "Josephus' Gate of the Essenes in Modern Discussion." *Zeitschrift des deutschen Palästina Vereins* 105 (1989): 105–109.

–. "Jesus, the Primitive Community, and the Essene Quarter of Jerusalem." Pages 198–234 in *Jesus and the Dead Sea Scroll*s. Edited by J. H. Charlesworth. New York: Doubleday, 1991.

–. "Das Jerusalemer Essenerviertel: Antwort auf einige Einwände." Pages 179–186 in *Inter-estamental Essays in Honour of Jozef Tadeusz Milik*. Qumranica Mogilanensia 6. Edited by Z. J. Kapera. Krakow: Enigma, 1992.
–. "Essener und Urkirche in Jerusalem." Pages 139–155 in *Christen und Christliches in Qumran?* Edited by B. Mayer. Eichstätter Studien NF 32. Regensburg: Verlag Friedrich Pustet, 1992.
–. "Essene Gate." Pages 618–619 in *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Vol. 2. Edited by D. N. Freedman, G. A. Herion, D. F. Graf and J. D. Pleins. 3 Vols. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
–. "Das Jerusalemer Essenerviertel und die Urgemeinde. Josephus, Bellum Judaicum V 145; 11QMiqdasch 46, 13–16; Apostelgeschichte 1–6 und die Archäologie." Pages 1775–1922 in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*. 2.26.2. Edited by W. Haase. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1995.
Richardson, H. Neil. "Some Notes on 1QSa." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 76 (1957): 108–122.
Richardson, Peter. *Building Jewish in the Roman East*. Waco: Baylor University Press, 2004.
–. and David Granskou, eds. *Anti-Judaism in Early Christianity*. 2 vols. Waterloo: Wilfrid-Laurier: University Press, 1986.
Richter, Georg. "'Bist du Elias?' (Joh. 1,21)." *Biblische Zeitschrift* 6 (1962): 79–92, 238–256.
Ringgren, Helmer. *The Faith of Qumran: Theology of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Translated by E. T. Sander. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1963.
Ritschl, Albrecht. *Die Entstehung der altkatholischen Kirche*. Bonn: A. Marcus, 1857.
Robbins, Vernon. *The Tapestry of Early Christian Discourse: Rhetoric, Society, and Ideology*. London: Routledge, 1996.
Robinson, James M. *A New Quest of the Historical Jesus*. London: SCM, 1961.
–. "The Formal Structure of Jesus' Message." Pages 91–110, 273–284 in *Current Issues in New Testament Interpretation: Essays in Honor of Otto A. Piper*. New York: Harper & Row, 1962.
–. "ΛΟΓΟΙ ΣΟΦΩΝ: Zur Gattung der Spruchquelle Q". Pages 77–96 in *Zeit und Geschichte: Dankesgabe an Rudolf Bultmann zum 80.* Edited by E. Dinkler. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1964.
–. "LOGION SOPHON: On the *Gattung* of Q." Pages 71–113 in *Trajectories through Early Christianity*. Edited by J. M. Robinson and H. Koester. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1971.
–. "Judaism, Hellenism, Christianity: Jesus' Followers in Galilee until 70 C.E." Pages 241–250 in *Ebraismo Ellenismo Christianesimo*. Edited by V. Mathieu. Archivio di Filosofia, 53, 1, Padova, Cedam, 1985.
–. "The Q Trajectory: Between John and Matthew via Jesus." Pages 173–194 in *The Future of Early Christianity: Essays in Honor of Helmut Koester*. Edited by B. A. Pearson. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991.
–. "The Sayings Gospel Q." Pages 361–388 in *The Four Gospels 1992: Festschrift Frans Neirynck*. 3 Volumes. Edited by F. Van Segbroeck, C. M. Tuckett, G. Van Belle and J. Verheyden. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium 100. Leuven, 1992.
–. "The Sayings Gospel Q." Rel. 484. Unpublished class notes. Claremont Graduate School, Fall 1992.
–. "The Jesus of the Sayings Gospel Q." Institute for Antiquity and Christianity Occasional Papers 28. Claremont: Claremont Graduate School, 1993.
–. "The History-of-Religions Taxonomy of Q: The Cynic Hypothesis." Pages 247–265 in *Gnosisforschung und Religionsgeschichte; Festschrift für Kurt Rudolph zum 65. Geburtstag*. Edited by H. Preißler and H. Seiwert. Marburg: Diagonal, 1994.

–. “The Critical Edition of Q and the Study of Jesus.” Pages 27–52 in *The Sayings Source Q and the Historical Jesus*. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium 158. Edited by A. Lindemann. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2001.
–. *The Sayings Gospel Q: Collected Essays by James M. Robinson*. Edited by C. Heil and J. Verheyden. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium 189. Leuven: Peeters, 2005.
–. “Theological Autobiography.” Pages 3–34 in *The Sayings Gospel Q: Collected Essays by James M. Robinson*. Edited by C. Heil and J. Verheyden. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium 189. Leuven: Peeters, 2005.
–, Paul Hoffmann and John S. Kloppenborg, eds. *The Critical Edition of Q: A Synopsis including the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, Mark and Thomas with English, German, and French Translations of Q and Thomas*. Leuven: Peeters/Minneapolis: Fortress, 2000.
Robinson, John A. T. “The Baptism of John and the Qumran Community.” *Harvard Theological Review* 50 (1957): 175–191.
Robinson, Joseph A. *The Study of the Gospels*. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1902.
Rofé, Alexander. “Revealed Wisdom: From the Bible to Qumran.” Pages 1–11 in *Sapiential Perspectives: Wisdom Literature in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the Sixth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 20–22 May, 2001*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 51. Edited by J. J. Collins, G. E. Sterling and R. A. Clements. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
Root, Bradley. “Is Q a Source for the Galilee?.” Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature. Philadelphia, Pa., November, 21, 2005.
Rose, Herbert J. *Concerning Parallels*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1934.
Rost, Leonhard. “Zum Buch der Kriege der Söhne des Lichtes gegen die Söhne der Finsternis.” *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 80 (1955): 205–08.
Roth, Cecil. *The Historical Background of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1958.
–. “Why the Qumran Sect cannot have been Essenes.” *Revue de Qumran* 3 (1959): 417–422.
Rothschild, Clare K. *Baptist Traditions and Q*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 190. Tübingen: Mohr, 2005.
Rowland, Christopher. *The Open Heaven: A Study in Apocalyptic in Judaism and Early Christianity*. New York: Crossroad, 1992.
Ruether, Rosemary Redford. *Faith and Fratricide: The Theological Roots of Anti-Semitism*. New York: Seabury, 1974.
Sacchi, Paolo. “Recovering Jesus’ Formative Background.” Pages 123–139 in *Jesus and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by J. H. Charlesworth. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
–. *Jewish Apocalyptic and Its History*. Translated by W. J. Short. Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplements 20. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.
Saldarini, Anthony J. *Pharisees, Scribes and Sadducees: A Sociological Approach*. Wilmington, Del.: Michael Glazier, 1988.
–. *Matthew’s Christian-Jewish Community*. Chicago Studies in the History of Judaism. Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1994.
Salvador, Joseph. *Jésus-Christ et sa doctrine. Histoire de la naissance de l’église, de son organisation et de son progrès pendant le premier siècle*. 2 vols. Paris, 1838.
Sanders, E. P. *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns in Religion*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977.
–. *Judaism: Practice and Belief 63 B.C.E.–66 C.E.* London: SCM, 1992.
–. *The Historical Figure of Jesus*. London: Allen Lane, 1993.
–. “Jesus in Historical Context.” *Theology Today* 50 (1993): 430–448.

–. "The Dead Sea Sect and Other Jews: Commonalities, Overlaps and Differences." Pages 7–43 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls in their Historical Context*. Edited by T. H. Lim, L. W. Hurtado, A. G. Auld and A. Jack. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 2001.

–. and M. Davies. *Studying the Synoptic Gospels*. London: SCM Press, 1989.

Sanders, James A. *The Psalms Scroll of Qumran Cave 11*. Discoveries in the Judaean Desert 4. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1965.

–. "From Isaiah 61 to Luke 4." Pages 75–106 in *Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults: Studies for Morton Smith at Sixty, Part One: New Testament*. Edited J. Neusner. Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity 12. Leiden: Brill, 1975.

Sandmel, Samuel. "Parallelomania." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 81 (1962): 1–13.

–. *Anti-Semitism in the New Testament?* Philadelphia: Fortress, 1978.

Sandnes, Karl Olav. "Imitatio Homeri? An Appraisal of Dennis R. MacDonald's 'Mimesis Criticism,'" *Journal of Biblical Literature* 124 (2005): 715–732.

Sato, Migaku. *Q und Prophetie: Studien zur Gattungs- und Traditionsgeschichte der Quelle Q*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2/29. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1988.

–. "Wisdom Statements in the Sphere of Prophecy." Pages 139–158 in *The Gospel Behind the Gospels: Current Studies in Q*. Edited by R. A. Piper. Novum Testamentum Supplements 75. Leiden: Brill, 1995.

Sawicki, Marianne. *Crossing Galilee: Architectures of Contact in the Occupied Land of Jesus*. Harrisburg, Pa.: Trinity Press International, 2000.

Sawyer, John F. A. *Sacred Languages and Sacred Texts*. London: Routledge, 1999.

Schalit, Abraham. *Namenwörterbuch zu Flavius Josephus*. Leiden: Brill, 1968.

Schatzki, Theodore R. *The Site of the Social: A Philosophical Account of the Constitution of Social Life and Change*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2002.

Schenk, Wolfgang. "Die Verwünschung der Küstenorte Q 10,13–15: Zur Funktion der konkreten Ortsangaben und zur Lokalisierung von Q." Pages 477–490 in *The Synoptic Gospels: Source Criticism and the New Literary Criticism*. Edited by C. Focant. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium 110. Leuven: Leuven University/Peeters, 1993.

Schiffman, Lawrence H. *The Halakhah at Qumran*. Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity 16. Leiden: Brill, 1975.

–. *Who Was a Jew? Rabbinic and Halakhic Perspectives on the Jewish-Christian Schism*. Hoboken: Ktav, 1985.

–. *The Eschatological Community of the Dead Sea Scrolls: A Study of the Rule of the Congregation*. Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series 38. Atlanta: Scholars, 1989.

–. *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls: The History of Judaism, the Background of Christianity, the Lost Library at Qumran*. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1994.

Schleiermacher, Friedrich. "Über die Zeugnisse des Papias von unsern beiden ersten Evangelien." *Theologische Studien und Kritiken* 5 (1832): 735–768.

Schmidt, Nathaniel. "Was בר נשא a Messianic Title." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 15 (1896): 36–53.

Schonfield, Hugh J. *Secrets of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Studies Towards their Solution*. London: Vallentine Mitchell, 1956.

–. *The Essene Odyssey: The Mystery of the True Teacher and the Essene Impact on the Shaping of Human Destiny*. Shaftesbury, Dorset: Element, 1984.

Schottroff, Luise and Wolfgang Stegemann, *Jesus and the Hope of the Poor*. Maryknoll, New York: Orbis, 1986.

Schröter, Jens. "The Historical Jesus and the Sayings Tradition: Comments on Current Research." *Neotestamentica* 30 (1996): 151–168.

–. *Erinnerung an Jesu Worte. Studien zur Rezeption der Logienüberlieferung in Markus, Q und Thomas*. Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament 76. Neukirchener-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1997.

–. "Markus, Q und der historische Jesus: Methodologische und exegetische Erwägungen zu den Anfängen der Rezeption der Verkündigung Jesu." *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* 89 (1998): 173–200.

–. "Die Bedeutung der Q-Überlieferung für die Interpretation der frühen Jesustradition." *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* 94 (2003): 38–67.

–. "Anfänge der Jesusüberlieferung: Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Beobachtungen zu einem Bereich urchristlicher Theologiegeschichte." *New Testament Studies* 50 (2004): 53–76.

–. "Jesus Tradition in Matthew, James, and the Didache: Searching for Characteristic Emphases." Pages 244–245 in *Matthew, James, and Didache: Three Related Documents in Their Jewish and Christian Settings.* Edited by H. van de Sandt and J. Zangenberg. Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series 45. Leiden: Brill, 2008.

–. "Jesus of Galilee: The Role of Location in Understanding Jesus." Pages 36–55 in *Jesus Research: An International Perspective: The First Princeton-Prague Symposium on Jesus Research, Prague 2005*. Edited by J. H. Charlesworth with P. Pokorny. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009.

Schubert, Kurt. "The Sermon on the Mount and the Qumran Texts." Pages 118–128 in *The Scrolls and the New Testament*. Edited by K. Stendahl. New York: Harper, 1957.

–. *The Dead Sea Community: Its Origins and Teachings*. Translated by J. W. Doberstein. Westport: Greenwood, 1959.

Schulz, Siegfried. *Q: Spruchquelle der Evangelisten*. Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1972.

Schürer, Emil. *A History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C.–A.D. 135)*. Translated by T. A. Burkill. Revised and edited by G. Vermes and F. Millar. 3 vols. Edinburgh: Clark, 1973-1987.

Schürmann, Heinz. *Das Lukasevangelium*. Vol. 1. Freiburg: Herder, 1969.

–. "Beobachtungen zum Menschensohn – Titel in der Redequelle." Pages 124–147 in *Jesus und der Menschensohn: Für Anton Vögtle*. Freiburg: Herder, 1975.

Schütz, J. *Johannes der Täufer*. Zürich: Zwingli, 1967.

Schwartz, Daniel R. *Studies in the Jewish Background of Christianity*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 60. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1992.

–. "'Judean' or 'Jew'? How Should We Translate *Ioudaios* in Josephus?" Pages 3–27 in *Jewish Identity in the Greco-Roman World: Jüdische Identität in der griechisch-römischen Welt*. Edited by J. Frey, D. R. Schwartz and S. Gripentrog. Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity 71. Leiden: Brill, 2007.

Schwartz, Seth. *Imperialism and Jewish Society, 200 B. C. E. to 640 C. E.* Jews, Christians, and Muslims from the Ancient to the Modern World. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001.

Schwegler, Albert. *Das nachapostolische Zeitalter in den Hauptmomenten seiner Entwicklung*. 2 vols. Tübingen: L. F. Fues, 1846.

Schweitzer, Albert. *Von Reimarus zu Wrede: Eine Geschichte der Leben-Jesu-Forschung*. Tübingen: Mohr, 1906. ET: *The Quest of the Historical Jesus: A Critical Study of its Progress from Reimarus to Wrede*. Translated by W. Montgomery. New York: Macmillan, 1910.

Schweizer, Eduard. "Der Menschensohn (Zur eschatologischen Erwartung Jesu)." *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* 50 (1959): 185–209.

–. "The Son of Man." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 79 (1960): 119–129.

–. "The Son of Man Again." *New Testament Studies* 9 (1962–63): 256–261.
–. *The Good News According to Matthew*. London: SPCK, 1978.
Scobie, Charles H. H. *John the Baptist*. London: SCM, 1964.
–. "John the Baptist." Pages 58–69 in *The Scrolls and Christianity*. Edited by M. Black. London: Talbot, 1969.
Seelig, August Wilhelm. *Die Religionsgeschichtliche Methode*. Lichterfelde: E. Runge, 1908.
Sevenirch-Bax, Elisabeth. *Israels Konfrontation mit den letzten Boten der Weisheit: Form, Funktion und Interdependenz der Weisheitselemente in der Logienquelle*. Münsteraner Theologische Abhandlungen 21. Altenberge: Oros, 1993.
Shanks, Hershel. "The Editor's Verdict." *Biblical Archaeological Review* 35/2 (2009): 59.
Shaw, J. T. "Literary Indebtedness and Comparative Literary Studies." Pages 58-71 in *Comparative Literature: Method and Perspective*. Edited by N. P. Stallknecht and H. Franz. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1961.
Sigal, Philip. "Further Reflections on the 'Begotten' Messiah." *Hebrew Annual Review* 7 (1983): 221–233.
Sim, David C. "The Gospel of Matthew, John the elder and the Papias tradition: A response to R. H. Gundry." *Harvard Theological Studies* 63.1 (2007): 283–299.
Simon, Marcel. *Verus Israel: A Study of the Relations between Christians and Jews in the Roman Empire, 135–425*. Translated by H. McKeating. New York: Oxford University Press, 1966.
–. *Jewish Sects at the Time of Jesus*. Translated by J. H. Farley. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1967.
Simons, Eduard. *Hat der dritte Evangelist den kanonischen Matthäus benutzt?* Bonn: Universitäts- Buchdruckerei von Carl Georgi, 1880.
Slater, Thomas B. "One Like a Son of Man in First-Century CE Judaism." *New Testament Studies* 41 (1995): 183–198.
Smith, Dennis E. "What do we really know about the Jerusalem Church?: Christian Origins in Jerusalem according to Acts and Paul." Pages 237–252 in *Redescribing Christian Origins*. Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series 28. Edited by R. Cameron and M. P. Miller. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2004.
Smith, Jonathan Z. "Adde Parvum Parvo Magnus Acervus Erit." *History of Religions* 11 (1971): 67–90.
–. "The Social Description of Early Christianity." *Religious Studies Review* 1 (1975): 19–25.
–. *Map is Not Territory: Studies in the Histories of Religions*. Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity 23. Leiden: Brill, 1978.
–. *Imagining Religion: From Babylon to Jonestown*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982.
–. "What a Difference a Difference Makes." Pages 3-48 in *"To See Ourselves As Others See us": Christians, Jews, "Others" in Late Antiquity*. Studies in the Humanities. Edited by J. Neusner and E. S. Frerichs. Chico: Scholars, 1985.
–. *Drudgery Divine: On the Comparison of Early Christianities and the Religions of Late Antiquity*. Jordan Lectures in Comparative Religion 14/Chicago Studies in the History of Judaism, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990.
Smith, Mahlon. "No Place for a Son of Man." *Forum* 4 (1988): 83–107.
–. "The Canonical Status of Q." http://virtualreligion.net/forum/q_canon.html [accessed 2 June, 2009]. Jesus Seminar Forum,
Smith, Morton. "The Description of the Essenes in Josephus and the Philosophumena." *Hebrew Union College Annual* 29 (1958): 273–313.
–. *Tannaitic Parallels to the Gospels*. Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series 6. Philadelphia, 1951.
–. "'God's Begetting the Messiah' in 1QSa." *New Testament Studies* 5 (1959): 218–224.

Soards, Marion L. *The Passion According to Luke: The Special Material of Luke 22*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplements 14. Sheffield: JSOT, 1987.

Sollamo, Raija. “War and Violence in the Ideology of the Qumran Community.” Pages 341–352 in *Verbum et Calamus: Semitic and Related Studies in Honour of the Sixtieth Birthday of Professor Tapani Harviainen*. Edited by H. Juusola, J. Laulainen and H. Palva. Studia Orientalia 99. Helsinki: Finnish Oriental Society, 2004.

Stacey, David. “Some Archaeological Observations on the Aqueducts of Qumran.” *Dead Sea Discoveries* 14/2 (2007): 222–243.

Stanton, Graham. “On the Christology of Q.” Pages 27–42 in *Christ and Spirit in the New Testament*. Edited by B. Lindars and S. S. Smalley, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973.

–. *Gospel Truth?: New Light on Jesus and the Gospels*. Valley Forge, Pa.: Trinity, 1995.

Stanton, Graham N. and Guy G. Stroumsa, eds. *Tolerance and Intolerance in Early Judaism and Christianity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Starcky, Jean. *Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres. Comptes rendus des séances de l’année*. 1954.

–. “Le travail d’édition des fragments manuscrits de Qumran,” *Revue Biblique* 63 (1956): 67.

–. “Les quatres étapes du messianisme à Qumran.” *Revue Biblique* 70 (1963): 481–505.

Stark, Rodney. *The Rise of Christianity: A Sociologist Reconsiders History*. Princeton, 1996.

Stauffer, Ethelbert. *Jesus and the Wilderness Community at Qumran*. Translated by H. Spalteholz. Biblical Series 10. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1964.

Steck, Odil Hannes. *Israel und das gewaltsame Geschick der Propheten: Untersuchungen zur Überliererung des deuteronomistischen Geschichtsbildes im Alten Testament, Spätjudentum und Urchristentum*. Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament 23. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1967.

Steckoll, S. H. “Preliminary Excavation Report on the Qumran Cemetery.” *Revue de Qumran* 6 (1968): 323–336.

Stegemann, Ekkehard. ed., *Messias-Vorstellungen bei Juden und Christen*. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1993.

Stegemann, Hartmut. “Der lehrende Jesus: Der sogenannte biblische Christus und die geschichtliche Botschaft Jesu von der Gottesherrschaft.” *Neue Zeitschrift für Systematische Theologie und Religionsphilosophie Berlin* 24 (1982): 3–20.

–. “The Qumran Essenes: Local Members of the Main Jewish Union in Late Second Temple Times.” Pages 83–166 in *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid 18–21 March, 1991*. Edited by J. Trebolle Barrera and L. Vegas Montaner. Leiden: Brill, 1992.

–. *Die Essener, Qumran, Johannes der Täufer und Jesus: Ein Sachbuch*. Spektrum Band 4249; Freiburg: Herder, 1993.

–. *The Library of Qumran: On the Essenes, Qumran, John the Baptist, and Jesus*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans/Leiden: Brill, 1998.

Stegemann, Wolfgang. “Nachfolge Jesu als solidarische Gemeinschaft der reichen und Angesehenen Christen mit den bedürftigen und verachteten Christen. Das Lukasevangelium.” Pages 89–153 in *Jesus von Nazareth – Hoffnung der Armen*. Edited by L. Schottroff and W. Stegemann. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1978.

Stein, Robert H. *The Synoptic Problem: An Introduction*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1987.

Steinmann, Jean. *Saint John the Baptist and the Desert Tradition*. Translated by M. Boyes. New York: Harper, 1958.

Stendahl, Krister, ed. *The Scrolls and the New Testament*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1957.

Steudel, Annette. “4QMidr Esch: ‘A Midrash on Eschatology’ (4Q174 + 4Q177).” Pages 531–541 in *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid 18–21 March, 1991*. 2 Volumes. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 11. Edited by J. Trebolle Barrera and L. Vegas Montaner. Leiden: Brill, 1992.

–. “אחרית הימים in the Texts from Qumran.” *Revue de Qumran* 16/62 (1993): 225–246.

–. *Der Midrasch: Zur Eschatologie aus der Qumrangemeinde (4QMidrEschat $^{a-b}$)*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 13. Leiden: Brill, 1994.

–. “The Development of Essenic Eschatology.” Pages 79–86 in *Apocalyptic Time*. Edited by A. I. Baumgarten. Numen Book Series. Studies in the History of Religions 86. Leiden: Brill, 2000.

Stern, Sacha. *Jewish Identity in Early Rabbinic Writing*. Leiden: Brill, 1994.

Stock, Brian. *The Implications of Literacy: Written Language and Models of Interpretation in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1983.

Stowers, Stanley. “Towards a Social Explanation for the Formation of Christian Anti-Judaism.” Unpublished paper.

Streeter, B. H. “The Literary Evolution of the Gospels.” Pages 213–216 in *Studies in the Synoptic Problem*. Edited by William Sanday. Oxford: Clarendon, 1911.

–. *The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins*. London: Macmillan, 1924.

Strickert, Frederick M. “Damascus Document VII, 10–20 and Qumran Messianic Expectation.” *Revue de Qumran* 47 (1986): 327–349.

Stuhlmacher, Peter. *Wie treibt man Biblische Theologie*. Biblisch-theologische Studien 24. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1995.

Styler, G. M. “Synoptic Problem.” Pages 724–727 in *The Oxford Companion to the Bible*. Edited by B. M. Metzger and M. D. Coogan. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.

Sukenik, E. L. *Megillot Genuzot* I. Jerusalem: Mosad Bialik, 1948.

–. *The Dead Sea Scrolls of the Hebrew University*. Jerusalem: Magnes, 1955.

Sutcliffe, Edmund F. “Sacred Meals at Qumran?” *Heythrop Journal* 1 (1960): 48–65.

Tabor, James D. *The Jesus Dynasty: A Hidden History of Jesus, his Royal Family, and the Birth of Christianity*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 2006.

–. and Michael O. Wise. “4Q521 ‘On Resurrection’ and the Synoptic Gospel Tradition: A Preliminary Study.” Pages 151–163 in *Qumran Questions*. Edited by J. H. Charlesworth. The Biblical Seminar 36. Sheffield: Sheffield, 1995.

Talmon, Shemaryahu. “The ‘Comparative Method.’” Pages 320–356 in *Congress Volume, Göttingen 1977*. Vetus Testamentum Supplements 29. Leiden: Brill, 1978.

–. “Waiting for the Messiah: The Spiritual Universe of the Qumran Covenanters.” Pages 111–138 in *Judaisms and their Messiahs at the Turn of the Christian Era*. Edited by J. Neusner, W. Scott-Green and E. S. Frerichs. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1987.

–. “The Concepts of *Mashiah* and Messianism in Early Judaism.” Pages 79–115 in *The Messiah, Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity. The First Princeton Symposium on Judaism and Christian Origins*. Edited by J. H. Charlesworth. Minneapolis; Fortress, 1992.

–. “Qumran Studies: Past, Present and Future.” *Jewish Quarterly Review* 85 (1994): 1–31.

Tashjian, Jirair S. “The Social Setting of the Mission Charge in Q.” Ph. D. diss., The Claremont Graduate School, 1987.

Tatum, W. Barnes. *John the Baptist and Jesus: A Report of the Jesus Seminar*. Sonoma: Polebridge, 1994.

Taylor, Joan E. *The Immerser: John the Baptist within Second Temple Judaism*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997.

–. "'Roots, Remedies and Properties of Stones': The Essenes, Qumran and Dead Sea Pharmacology." *Journal of Jewish Studies* 60/2 (2009): 226–244.
Taylor, Justin. *Where Did Christianity Come From?* Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical, 2001.
Taylor, Vincent. *The Gospel According to Mark*. London: Macmillan & Co., 1966.
Tedesche, Sidney. *The Second Book of Maccabees*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1954.
Teeple, Howard M. *The Mosaic Eschatological Prophet*. Philadelphia: Society of Biblical Literature, 1957.
–. "Qumran and the Origin of the Fourth Gospel." *Novum Testamentum* 4 (1960): 6–25.
Theisohn, Johannes. *Der auserwählte Richter: Untersuchungen zum traditiongeschichtlichen Ort der Menschensohngestalt der Bilderreden des Äthiopischen Henoch*. Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments 12. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1975.
Theissen, Gerd. "Wanderradikalismus: Literatur-soziologische Aspekte der Überlieferung von Worten Jesu im Urchristentum." *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 70 (1973): 245–271.
–. "Itinerant Radicalism: The Tradition of Jesus Sayings from the Perspective of the Sociology of Literature." *Radical Religion* 2 (1975): 84–93.
–. *Sociology of Earliest Palestinian Christianity*. Translated by J. Bowden. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1978.
–. *The First Followers of Jesus: A Sociological Analysis of the Earliest Christians*. Translated by J. Bowden. London: SCM, 1978.
–. *The Miracle Stories of the Early Christian Tradition*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983.
–. *The Gospels in Context: Social and Political History in the Synoptic Tradition*. Translated by L. M. Maloney. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991.
–. *Social Reality and the Early Christians: Theology, Ethics, and the World of the New Testament*. Translated by M. Kohl. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992.
–. and Annette Merz. *The Historical Jesus*. London: SCM, 1998.
Thiede, Carsten Peter. *The Earliest Gospel Manuscript?: The Qumran Papyrus 7Q5 and its significance for New Testament Studies*. London: Paternoster Press, 1992.
–. *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Jewish Origins of Christianity*. New York: Palgrave/St. Martin's, 2001.
Thiering, Barbara. *The Qumran Origins of the Christian Church*. Sydney: Theological Explorations, 1983.
–. *Jesus & The Riddle of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Unlocking the Secrets of His Story*. New York: Harper San Francisco, 1992.
Thomas, Samuel I. *The "Mysteries" of Qumran: Mystery, Secrecy, and Esotericism in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Early Judaism and its Literature 25. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
Thompson, G. H. P. "The Son of Man: The Evidence of the Dead Sea Scrolls." *Expository Times* 72 (1960/61): 125.
–. "The Son of Man—Some Further Considerations." *Journal of Theological Studies* 12 (1961): 203–209.
Thyen, Hartwig. "ΒΑΠΤΙΣΜΑ ΜΕΤΑΝΟΙΑΣ ΕΙΣ ΑΦΕΣΙΝ ΑΜΑΡΤΙΩΝ." Pages 131–168 in *The Future of Our Religious Past: Essays in Honour of Rudolf Bultmann*. Edited by J. M. Robinson. Translated by C. E. Carlston and R. P. Scharlemann. London: SCM, 1971.
Tödt, Heinz Eduard. *Der Menschensohn in der synoptischen Überlieferung*. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlaghaus Mohn, 1959. ET: *The Son of Man in the Synoptic Tradition*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1965.
Tov, Emanuel. "The Orthography and Language of the Hebrew Scrolls Found at Qumran and the Origins of these Scrolls." *Textus* 13 (1986): 31–57.
Trever, John C. *Scrolls from Qumran Cave 1*. Jerusalem: Shrine of the Book, 1974.

Trilling, Wolfgang. “Die Täufertradition bei Matthäus.” *Biblische Zeitschrift* (1959): 271–289.

Tuckett, Christopher M. “A Cynic Q?” *Biblica* 70 (1989): 349–376.

–. “On the Stratification of Q: A Response,” *Semeia* 55 (1991): 213–222.

–. *Q and the History of Early Christianity: Studies on Q*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1996.

–. “Scripture and Q.” Pages 3–26 in *The Scriptures in the Gospels*. Edited by C. M. Tuckett. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium 131. Leuven: Peeters, 1997.

–. “The Son of Man and Daniel 7: Q and Jesus.” Pages 371–394 in *The Sayings Source Q and the Historical Jesus*. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium 158. Edited by A. Lindemann. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2001.

–. “Q, Jesus and Aramaic: Some Methodological Considerations.” *Proceedings of the Irish Biblical Association* 26 (2003): 29–45.

Twelftree, Graham H. *Jesus the Miracle Worker*. Downer’s Grove, Ill.: Inter-Varsity, 1999.

Ulfgard, Hakan. “The Branch in the Last Days: Observations on the New Covenant Before and After the Messiah.” Pages 233–247 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls in their Historical Context*. Edited by T. H. Lim, L. W. Hurtado, A. Graeme Auld and A. Jack. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 2001.

Ullmann-Margalit, Edna. *Out of the Cave: A Philosophical Inquiry into the Dead Sea Scrolls Research*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2006.

Uro, Risto. *Sheep Among the Wolves: A Study on the Mission Instructions of Q*. Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae 47. Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1987.

Vaage, Leif E. “The Ethos and Ethics of an Itinerant Intelligence.” Ph. D. diss. The Claremont Graduate School, 1987.

–. “The Son of Man Sayings in Q: Stratigraphical Location and Significance.” *Semeia* 55 (1991): 103–129.

–. *Galilean Upstarts: Jesus’ First Followers according to Q*. Valley Forge, Pa.: Trinity, 1994.

–. “Q and Cynicism: On Comparison and Social Identity.” Pages 199–229 in *The Gospel Behind the Gospels: Current Studies on Q*. Edited by R. A. Piper. Novum Testamentum Supplements 75. Leiden: Brill, 1994.

–. and John S. Kloppenborg. “Early Christianity, Q, and Jesus: The Sayings Gospel and Method in the Study of Christian Origins.” *Semeia* 55 (1991): 1–14.

Van der Horst, Pieter W. “Greek in Jewish Palestine in Light of Jewish Epigraphy.” Pages 154–174 in *Hellenism in the Land of Israel*. Edited by J. J. Collins and G. E. Sterling. Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity 13. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2001.

Van der Ploeg, Johannes. “The Meals of the Essenes.” *Journal of Semitic Studies* 2 (1957): 163–175.

Van der Veer, Peter. “Syncretism, Multiculturalism and the Discourse of Tolerance.” Pages 196–211 in *Syncretism/Anti-Syncretism: The Politics of Religious Synthesis*. Edited by C. Stewart and R. Shaw. London: Routledge, 1994.

Van Der Woude, Adam S. *Die messianischen Vorstellungen der Gemeinde von Qumran*. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1957.

–. “Fifty years of Qumran Research.” Pages 1–45 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years After Their Discovery*: *Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20–25, 1997*. Edited by L. H. Schiffman, E. Tov and J. C. VanderKam. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society/Shrine of the Book, 2000.

VanderKam, James C. “The Origin, Character, and Early History of the 364-Day Calendar: A Reassessment of Jaubert’s Hypotheses.” *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 41 (1979): 390–411.

–. *Enoch and the Growth of an Apocalyptic Tradition.* Catholic Biblical Quartely Monograph Series 16. Washington, D.C.: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1984.

–. "The Dead Sea Scrolls and Christianity." Pages 181–202 in *Understanding the Dead Sea Scrolls: A Reader from the Biblical Archaeological Review*. Edited by H. Shanks. New York: Random House, 1992.
–. "The People of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Essenes or Sadducees?" Pages 51–61 in *Understanding the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by H. Shanks. New York: Vintage, 1993.
–. *Enoch: A Man for All Generations.* Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1995.
–. "1 Enoch, Enochic Motifs, and Enoch in Early Christian Literature." Pages 32–101 in *The Jewish Apocalyptic Heritage in Early Christianity*. Edited by J. C. VanderKam and W. Adler. Compendium rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum 3: Jewish Traditions in Early Christian Literature 4. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1996.
–. "Authoritative Literature in the Dead Sea Scrolls." *Dead Sea Discoveries* 5 (1998): 382–402.
–. "Greek at Qumran." Pages 175–181 in *Hellenism in the Land of Israel*. Edited by J. J. Collins and G. E. Sterling. Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity 13. Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 2001.
–. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today*. Minneapolis: Eerdmans, 1994.
Vassiliadis, Petros. ΛΟΓΟΙ ΙΕΣΟΥ*: Studies in Q*. Atlanta: Scholars, 1999.
Venturini, Karl Heinrich. *Natürliche Geschichte des Großen Propheten von Nazareth*. 4 vols. Copenhagen, 1800–1802.
Vermes, Geza. "The Etymology of 'Essenes.'" *Revue de Qumran* 7 (1960): 427–443.
–. "Essenes-Therapeutae-Qumran." *Durham University Journal* 21 (1960): 97–115.
–. "Essenes and Therapeutae." *Revue de Qumran* 3 (1962): 495–504.
–. "Appendix E: The Use of בר נשא/בר נש in Jewish Aramaic." Pages 310–330 in Matthew Black, *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts.* 3d ed. Oxford: Clarendon, 1967.
–. *Jesus the Jew: A Historian's Reading of the Gospels*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1973.
–. *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Qumran in Perspective*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977.
–. *Jesus and the World of Judaism*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984.
–. "Qumran Forum Miscellanea I." *Journal of Jewish Studies* 43 (1992): 299–305.
–. *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls*. New York: Penguin Books, 1997.
–. "The Qumran Community, the Essenes, and Nascent Christianity." Pages 581–586 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years After Their Discovery: Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20–25, 1997*. Edited by L. H. Schiffman, E. Tov and J. C. VanderKam. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society/The Shrine of the Book, Israel Museum, 2000.
–. and Martin Goodman, eds. *The Essenes according to the classical sources*. OCT 1. Sheffield: JSOT, 1989.
Vielhauer, Philip. "Gottesreich und Menschensohn in der Verkündigung Jesu." Pages 51–79 in *Festschrift für Günther Dehn, zum 75. Geburtstag am 18. April 1957*. Neukirchen: Kreis Moers, Verlag der Buchhandlung Erziehungsvereins, 1957.
–. "Jesus und der Menschensohn." *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 60 (1963): 133–177.
Von Rad, Gerhard. *Old Testament Theology.* Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1962.
Waddell, James A. *The Messiah: A Comparative Study of the Enochic Son of Man and the Pauline Kyrios*. Jewish and Christian Texts 10. London: T & T Clark, 2011.
Wagner, Siegfried. *Die Essener in der wissenschaftlichen Diskussion: Vom Ausgang des 18. bis zum Beginn des 20. Jahrhunderts: Eine wissenschaftsgeschichtliche Studie*. Berlin: Verlag Alfred Töpelmann, 1960.
Walck, Leslie W. "The Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch and the Gospels." Pages 299–337 in *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man*. Edited by G. Boccaccini. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.
–. *The Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch and in Matthew.* Jewish and Christian Texts in Contexts and Related Studies 9. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 2011.

Webb, Robert L. *John the Baptizer and Prophet: A Socio-Historical Study*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplements 62. Sheffield: JSOT, 1991.

–. "John the Baptist and his Relationship to Jesus." Pages 179–229 in *Studying the Historical Jesus: Evaluations of the State of Current Research*. New Testament Tools and Studies 19. Edited by B. D. Chilton and C. A. Evans. Leiden: Brill, 1994.

–. "Jesus' Baptism by John: Its Historicity and Significance." Pages 95–150 in *Key Events in the Life of the Historical Jesus: A Collaborative Exploration of Context and Coherence*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 247. Edited by D. L. Bock and R. L. Webb. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009.

Weiss, Bernhard. *A Manual of Introduction to the New Testament*. Translated by A. J. K. Davidson. 2 volumes. New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1889.

Weisse, Christian Hermann. *Die evangelische Geschichte kritisch und philosophisch bearbeitet*. 2 vols. Leipzig: Breitkopf und Härtel, 1838.

Weiss, Johannes. "Die Verteidigung Jesu gegen den Vorwurf des Bündnisses mit Beelzebul." *Theologische Studien und Kirchen* 63 (1890): 555–569.

Wellhausen, Julius. "Des Menschen Sohn." Pages 6: 187–215 in *Skizze und Vorarbeiten*. Berlin: Reimer, 1899.

–. *Einleitung in die drei ersten Evangelien*. Berlin: Reimer, 1905.

–. *Einleitung in die drei ersten Evangelien*. 2d ed. Berlin: Reimer, 1911.

Wernle, Paul. *Die synoptische Frage*. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1899.

White, Hayden. "Afterword." Pages 315–324 in *Beyond the Cultural Turn: New Directions in the Study of Society and Culture*. Edited by V. E. Bonnell and L. Hunt. Berkeley/Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1999.

White, L. Michael. "Adolf Harnack and the 'Expansion' of Early Christianity: A Reappraisal of Society History." *Second Century* 5 (1985–86): 97–127.

–. and John T. Fitzgerald, "Quod est comparandum: The Problem of Parallels." Pages 13–39 in *Early Christianity and Classical Culture: Comparative Studies in Honor of A. J. Malherbe*. Edited by J. T. Fitzgerald, T. H. Olbricht and L. M. White. Novum Testamentum Supplements 110. Leiden: Brill, 2003.

Whitmarsh, Tim. *Greek Literature and the Roman Empire: The Politics of Imitation*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2001.

Wieder, Naphtali. "The 'Law Interpreter' of the Sect of the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Second Moses." *Journal of Jewish Studies* 4 (1953): 158–175.

Wiesenberg, E. "Chronological Data in the Zadokite Fragments." *Vetus Testamentum* 5 (1955): 284–308.

Wilckens, Ulrich. *Weisheit und Torheit: Eine exegetisch-religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zu 1 Kor. 1 und 2*. Beiträge zur historischen Theologie 26. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1959.

Wilcox, Max. "The Aramaic Background of the New Testament." Pages 362–378 in *The Aramaic Bible: Targums in Their Historical Context*. Edited by D. R. G. Beattie and M. J. McNamara. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplements 166. Sheffield: JSOT,1995.

Willey, Patricia Tull. *Remember the Former Things: The Recollection of Previous Texts in Second Isaiah*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 161. Atlanta: Scholars, 1997.

Williams, Margaret H. "The Meaning and Function of Ioudaios in Graeco-Roman Inscriptions." *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 116 (1997): 249–262.

Wilson, Edmund. *The Scrolls from the Dead Sea*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1955.

Wilson, Stephen G. *Related Strangers: Jews and Christians 70–170 C.E.* Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995.

–. *Leaving the Fold: Apostates and Defectors in Antiquity*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2004.

Wink, Walter. "John the Baptist and the Gospel." Th. D. diss. New York: Union Theological Seminary, 1963.

–. *John the Baptist in the Gospel Tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968.

–. "Jesus' Reply to John: Matt. 11:2–6/Luke 7:18–23." *Forum* 5 (1989): 121–128.

–. "Neither Passivity Nor Violence: Jesus' Third Way (Matt. 5:38–42 parr.)." Pages 102–105 in *The Love of Enemy and Nonretaliation in the New Testament*. Edited by W. M. Swartley. Studies in Peace and Scripture. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1992.

Wise, Michael O. "Languages of Palestine." Pages 434–444 in *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels*. Edited by J. B. Green, S. McKnight and I. H. Marshall. Downer's Grove: Inter-Varsity Press, 1992.

–. and James D. Tabor. "The Messiah at Qumran." *Biblical Archaeology Review* 18.6 (1992): 60–65.

Witherington III, Ben. *The Christology of Jesus*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990.

–. "John the Baptist." Pages 383–391 in *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels*. Edited by J. B. Green and S. McKnight. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1992.

–. *Jesus the Sage: The Pilgrimage of Wisdom*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1994.

Worrell, John E. "Concepts of Wisdom in the Dead Sea Scrolls." Ph. D. diss. The Claremont Graduate School, 1968.

Wright, N. T. *The New Testament and the People of God*. Volume 1: *Christian Origins and the Question of God*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992.

–. *Jesus and the Victory of God*. Volume 2: *Christian Origins and the Question of God*. London: SPCK, 1996.

Yadin, Yigael. "L'attitude essénienne envers la polygamie et le divorce." *Revue biblique* 79 (1972): 98–99.

–. *The Temple Scroll: The Hidden Law of the Dead Sea Sect*. New York: Random House, 1985.

Yardeni, Ada. "A Note on a Qumran Scribe." Pages 287–298 in *New Seals and Inscriptions: Hebrew, Idumean, and Cuneiform*. Hebrew Bible Manuscripts 8. Edited by M. Lubetski. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2007.

York, John O. *The Last Shall Be First: The Rhetoric of Reversal in Luke*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplements 46. Sheffield: JSOT, 1991.

Young, Brad H. *Jesus and His Jewish Parables*. New York: Paulist, 1989.

Young, Robert J. C. *Colonial Desire: Hybridity in Theory, Culture, and Race*. London: Routledge, 1995.

Zahn, Theodor. *Das Evangelium des Matthäus*. Wuppertal: R. Brockhaus, 1984.

Zangenberg, Jürgen, Harold W. Attridge and Dale B. Martin, eds. *Religion, Ethnicity, and Identity in Ancient Galilee: A Region in Transition*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 201. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007.

Zeller, Dieter. *Die Weisheitlichen Mahnsprüche bei den Synoptikern*. Forschungen zur Bibel 17. Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1977.

–. "Wunder und Bekenntnis: zum Sitz im Leben urchristlicher Wundergeschichten." *Biblische Zeitschrift* 25 (1981): 204–222.

–. "Eine weisheitliche Grundschrift in der Logienquelle?." Pages 389–401 in *The Four Gospels*. Edited by F. Van Segbroeck. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium 100. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1992.

–. "Redactional Processes and Changing Settings in the Q-Material." Pages 116–130 in *The Shape of Q: Signal Essays on the Sayings Gospel*. Edited by J. S. Kloppenborg. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1994.

Zerbe, Gordon Mark. *Non-Retaliation in Early Jewish and New Testament Texts: Ethical Themes in Social Contexts*. Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplements 13. Sheffield: JSOT, 1993.

Zimmermann, Johannes. *Messianische Texte aus Qumran: Königliche, priesterliche und prophetische Messiasvorstellungen in den Schriftfunden von Qumran*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament II 104. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998.

Index of Ancient Sources

Hebrew Bible

Genesis
10 115
49:10 128

Exodus
23:20 132

Leviticus
17–26 102

Numbers
24:15–17 173

1 Kings
18:30–39 146

2 Sam
7:11 127

1 Chronicles
24:10 146

2 Chronicles
24:20–22 86

Psalms
1:1 154
2:7 127
32:1–2 154
41:1 154
112:1 154
119:1–2 154
128: 1–2 154
117:26 167
146 171, 179, 182
146:6 171
146:7 181–182
146:7-8 171
146:8 171
146:10 171

Isaiah
6:9-10 52
8:23 78
11:1 129, 164
11:1–4 129
20:18–19 168
26:19 166–167, 171, 180
27:12–13 131
29:18 166–167
29:18–19 167, 180
35:5 166–167, 181
35:5–6 166, 168, 180
40:3 15, 136, 137
42:6–7 167
52:7 173, 174
61 21, 52, 165, 167, 169, 179
61:1 158, 163, 166, 168, 171, 179, 180–182
61:1–2 167, 168, 173, 181, 185
61:1–3 174
61:2 158–159
61:3 158–159
61:10 158–159

Jeremiah
13:24 131
15:7 131
23:5 164
32 102
33:15 164

Ezekiel
40:46 146
44:15 146
48:11 146

Daniel
7:13 57, 63, 128
9:25 174

Malachi
3:1 132
3:19 132
4:1 131

New Testament

Q
3:2 84
3:2b–3a 131
3:3 76
3–7 21, 131, 149, 166, 185
3:7-8 131
3:7-9 28, 65, 90, 131, 139, 143
3:8 32, 46, 85, 89, 90–91, 158
3:10–14 142
3:16 132
3:16b 131, 166
3:16–17 65, 131
3:16b–17 90, 131
3:21b–22 166
4:1–13 84
4:5–8 158
4:9 76
4:16 21
6:20 15, 154, 156–157, 166, 181
6:20–21 64
6:20–23 28, 89, 153–154, 157–159
6:20b–21 158
6:20b–23b 65
6:20–38 21
6:20–49 65
6:21 159
6:22 156–157
6:22c 157
6:22–23 39, 85, 155, 161
6:23 58, 155, 157, 159
6:23b 156
6:23c 155–157, 161
6:27–28 158
6:27–34 65
6:27–35 65
6:27-45 32
6:32–33 48
6:32–34 158
6:33 85
6:34 48
6:36 48
6:36–38 49
6:36–45 65
6:36–37a 65
6:37–38 64
6:39–40 49
6:41–42 49, 64
6:41–45 65
6:46 89
6:46–49 29, 65
6:47–49 55
7:1 55, 76
7:1–10 55, 65, 76
7:3 166
7:9 85, 89, 158
7:18–23 21, 65, 163, 166–167
7:18–35 21, 57
7:22 21, 64–65, 132, 158, 165–167, 175, 179, 180–184, 186
7:22–23 89, 163, 168, 185, 187
7:23 89, 168
7:24–28 65
7:25 86
7:26 132
7:26–27 133
7:26–28 133
7:27 132, 146
7:28 132
7:31 48, 86, 89

7:31–35 65, 90, 135, 147
7:33–34 134
7:34 58–59, 60–61
7:35 39, 132, 134, 149
9:57–58 32, 61
9:57–60 65
9:57–62 32
9:57-11:13 87
9:58 58, 59, 61
10:2 72
10:2–8a 65
10:2–11 65
10:2–16 65
10:2–3 89
10:3 90
10:4 32, 88
10:4–12 29
10:6 88
10:8 86
10:9 29
10:9–10:12 65
10:10 86, 88
10:10–12 89, 90
10:12 90
10:12–15 131
10:13 76
10:13–15 75, 76, 89, 90
10:14 90
10:15 76, 90
10:16 65
10:21 88, 89, 149
10:21–22 32, 39, 89
10:21–24 65
10:22 89
10:23–24 89
11:1–4 64
11:2 48
11:2–4 28, 49, 65
11:9–13 64–65
11:13 48
11:14 55
11:14–15 65
11:14–23 57
11:16 89–90
11:16–29 65
11:17–26 65
11:23 89
11:29 48
11:29–30 89, 90
11:30 58
11:31 32, 85
11:31–32 39, 48, 90, 131, 149
11:32 85
11:32–33 65
11:39 64
11:39b 33, 84, 89–90
11:39–41 48, 86
11:39–51 57
11:39–52 48, 65
11:41 84
11:42 33, 48, 84, 86, 89–90
11:42–44 64
11:43 86
11:43–44 33, 84, 89–90
11:46-48 64
11:46b 33, 84, 89–90
11:47–48 33, 84, 89–90
11:47–51 39
11:49–51 29, 39, 48, 86, 89–90, 131, 147, 149, 156
11:51 48, 85, 86
11:52 33, 64, 84, 89–90
12:2–3 158
12:2–7 65
12:2–12 65
12:3 86
12:4–7 64
12:4–9 65
12:5 85
12:8 29, 58, 163
12: 8–9 64, 65
12:9–10 65
12:10 57, 58, 60, 163
12:11–12 65, 89, 91
12:22–31 32, 64
12:22b–31 65, 89
12:27 65, 85
12:30 48, 85
12:33–34 64, 65
12:39–40 62, 90, 131
12:39–46 29
12:40 58, 163
12:42–46 29, 62, 90, 131
12:51 165
12:53 89
12:54–56 29
12:57–59 29
12:58–59 86
13:18–19 158
13:18–21 29

13:19 32
13:20–21 158
13:24 29, 65, 86
13:26 86
13:28 85, 89–90
13:28–29 42
13:29 89–90
13:30 89, 158
13:34 76
13:34–35 33, 39, 42, 47–48, 84, 86, 89–90, 131, 147, 149, 156
14:11 89, 158
14:16–18 158
14:16–23 89
14:16–24 86
14:21 86
14:26 32, 158
14:26–27 65
14:34–35 65
16:13 85
16:16 48, 134
16:16-17 70
16:17 48, 64
16:17–18 65
16:18 32, 64, 89, 158
17:3–4 32, 49
17:22–37 29, 65
17:23–24 58, 62
17:23–34 131
17:24 163
17:26 163
17:26–27 62, 63, 85
17:26–30 58
17:28–29 85
17:30 63, 163
17:33 65, 158
19:12–27 131
19:23 86
21:27 62
22:28 82, 90
22:28–30 42
22:30 29, 48, 82, 85, 90, 180

Matthew
2:22 81
3:1 138
3:1–4:11 36
3:2 135
3:3 136
3:4–10 136
3:7–12 35
3:11 132
4:1–11 35
4:4b 35
4:15–16 78
4:17 135
4:23–24 181
5:1–12 154
5:3 154, 158, 161
5:3–11 160
5:3–12 158–159
5:4 158
5:5 155
5:11 60
5:11–12 154
5:12 30, 156
5:38–42 164
5:39 164
5:43 161
6:9–13 35
8:1–4 36, 181
8:5-13 181
8:6 181
8:20 59, 62
8:29 36
9:1–8 36
9:2–3 181
9:6 36
9:18-25 181
9:18–26 36
9:20 37
9:26 37
9:27 36
9:27–30 181
9:27–31 36
9:32–34 36
9:35–10:16 36
10:21 15
10:32 60
11:1 138
11:2–6 36, 163, 181
11:2–19 167
11:5 158, 165
11:14 146
11:16–19 134
11:19 59
12:22–45 36
12:28 37
12:32 59, 62

13:11	37
14:2	138
14:8	138
16:13	59
16:14	138
16:18	17
17:10–12	146
17:13	138
19:21	15
20:28	59
22:27	37
22:34–40	37
24	62
24:4–26	36
24:26	55
25:31–46	64
26:52	165
26:66	37
26:67	37
26:68	37, 57
26:75	37
28:1	37
28:16	79

Mark

1:1–13	36
1:1–15	38
1:3	136
1:4	142
1:7	132
1:32–34	36
2:10	59
2:27–28	60
2:28	59, 62
3:10–11	36
3:20–29	36
4:11	37
4:12	52
5:23	184
5:27	37
6:5	184
6:6–11	36
6:8–9	88
6:13–19	36
6:17–29	135
6:25	138
6:34	36
7:19	48
7:32	184
8:27	59
8:28	138
8:32–35	184
8:34–9:1	38
9:11–13	60, 146
9:12	146
9:35–10:16	36
10:45	59–60
11:27–33	134
12:12–34	37
12:18	35
12:22	37
13:5–37	36
13:26	62
14:21	60
14:36	35
14:47	165
14:62	62
14:64	37
14:65	37, 57
14:70	81
14:72	37
16:1	37
16:7	79

Luke

1	129
1-2	145–146
1:5	144, 146
1:5–25	81, 135
1:6	146
1:16–17	145
1:17	146
1:26–38	135
1:32–35	128
1:33	128
1:36	135
1:38	35
1:39	81
1:46–55	145
1:57–63	81
1:57–80	135
1:80	135
2:1–52	135
2:29	35
3:1–22	36
3:2	35
3:3–6	136
3:7–9	35
3:7–14	136
3:15	143

3:16b–17 35
3:19–20 132
4 158, 168
4:1–13 35–36
4:16–19 52
4:25–27 168
5:14 37
4:18 36
5:12–16 36
5:17–26 36
5:20 35
6:13–16 36
6:20 154
6:20–23 154
6:20–26 160
6:22 60
6:22–23 154
6:23 30
6:43–45 36
7:2 181
7:11–17 36
7:18–23 36, 163
7:20 138
7:21 36
7:22 165
7:22–23 22
7:31–35 134
7:33 138
8:2 36
8:10 37
8:44 37
9:1–5 36
9:18 60
9:18–20 36
9:19 138
10:1–12 36
10:21 35
10:25–28 37
11:2–4 35
11:13 35
11:14–26 36
11:20 37
11:26 36
11:49 39
12:8 58, 60
12:10 36, 59
12:47 35
13:13 184
13:16 36
13:34 39
16:8 15
17:22 55
17:23 55
18:22 15
19:37 36
20:27 35
20:32 37
21:8–36 36
22:27 59
22:35–38 88
22:50 165
22:62 37
22:63 37
22:64 37, 57
23:8 36
23:54 37

John
1:9–22 143
1:23 136
1:25 143
3:22–24 134
12:35–36 15
14:17 15
15:26 15
16:13 15
18:10–11 165

Acts
1:11 81
1:15 15
1:17 16
1:17–25 16
1:25 16
2:1-13 17
2:7 81
2:14 15
2:24 16
2:46 16
4:1 35
4:32 15
4:32–35 16
5:17 35
6:1 16
6:2 15
6:3 85
6:5 15
6:7 26, 188
6-7 85
6:10 85

7:10 85
7:22 85
7:38 53
7:43 102
7:52 85
7:56 58
9:2 15
9:12 184
11:30 15
13:25 143
15:2 15
15:4 15
15:6 15
16:4 15
19:9 15
19:11–12 36
20:28 15–16
20:35 55
21:18 15
22:4 15
23:6–8 35
24:5 15
24:14 15
24:22 15
28:8 184

Romans
3:2 53

1 Corinthians
3:16–17 17
16:22 53

2 Corinthians
6:16 17

Galatians
2:9 17
2:10 15
4:6 53

Ephesians
2:20 17

Philippians
1:1 16

1 Thessalonians
2:15–16 85
4:15 55
5:5 15

Hebrews
2:6 58
5:12 53

1 Peter
2:4 17
2:5 17
3:14 156
4:11 53
4:13–14 156

1 Tim
3:2 16

Revelation
11:13 58
14:14 58
22:6 55

Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha

1 Enoch
6.4–5 121
7.1 121
8.1 120–121
9.6 120
10.4–8 120
10.6–7 154
15.3–7 120
15.8–10 120
65.1–67.3 63
69.16–26 121
90 63
94.7 121

2 Enoch
42:6–14 154
52:1–5 154

1 Maccabees
2:29–38 98
2:42 97
7:13 97

2 Maccabees
7:13 97
14:6 97

Psalms of Solomon
17:1–3 132

Sirach
14:1–2 154
25: 8–9 154
51 150

Tobit
13:14 154

Wisdom of Solomon
5.23 131

Philo

Quod Omnis Probus Liber Sit
75 95, 108
75–76 96
75–91 16
78 113, 121
79 109, 121
84 109, 113, 121
85 87
86 109
91 170

Hypothetica
1 95–96, 170
2–3 111
3 109
4 109
8.11.1–18 16
11–13 153
11.8 97
11.14 111
14–17 110

Josephus

B.J.
1.78–80 140
2.111 140
2.118 77
2.119 116, 170
2.119–161 16, 95
2.120 103, 110–111, 136
2.120–21 121
2.122 103, 109
2.124 95, 105
2.124–125 87
2.128 108, 116
2.129 103, 140
2.131 103
2.132–33 103
2.134 103, 113
2.135 109, 116
2.136 105, 121, 184
2.137 121
2.137–8 103
2.137–142 139
2.139 103, 109
2.139–140 109, 113
2.139–142 108
2.141 103, 105
2.142 105, 121
2.143 116
2.143–44 103
2.145 116
2.147 105, 116
2.148 108
2.152–153 113

2.154–58 109, 116
2.158 153
2.159 105, 121, 161
2.160–61 109, 111, 117
2.161 114
2.311 113
2.567 113
5.145 26

A.J.
4.371 116
7.338 139
7.341 139
7.356 139
7.374 139
7.384 139
8.280 139
9.16 139
9.236 139
11.173 49, 96
12.43 139
13 95
13.171 99
13.171–2 108
13.171–73 109
13.311–313 140
14.127–139 96
15.10 116
15.371 100
15.372–379 140
15.373–9 161
17.345–348 140
18.1.5 95
18.5.2 140
18.11 95
18.18 105
18.18–22 16, 95
18.19 97, 108, 140
18.20–21 95
18.21 109
18.117 139, 142, 144
18.118 135, 138–139
18.196 50

Life
1.2 116
10–12 116

Ag. Ap.
1.777 50

Dead Sea Scrolls

CD
1 99, 108
1.1 150
1.3–2.1 30
1.5–8 101
1.13 15
1.18 29
1.32 30
2.2 150
2.3 150
2.12 142, 173
4.2 108
4.19 110
5.2 110
5.4 15
5.6 110
5.7 110
6.1 173
6.5 101
6.19 101
7.3-10 112
7.6–7 97, 105, 110
7.19–20 173
8.17 101
8.21 101
9.10–16 109
10.21 97
11.12 109
11.5–6 97, 108
12.1–2 97
12.10 109
12.13–14 136
12.19 97
12.20 150
12.23 97
13.1 16
13.7 108
13.7–9 16
13.11 16
13.20 97

13.22 16
14 150
14.3 15, 97
14.9 97
14.12–13 109
14.19 146
15.5–11 109
15.15 185
16.1–5 105
19.2 97
19.10 124
19.10–11 164
20.4 16
20.22 97

1QapGen
10.21–29 184

1QIsa[a]
49:26–29 169

1QIsa[b]
11:33–35 169

1QpHab
2.5 124
2.8 98
7.3–5 161
12.3 15, 161, 170
12.6 15, 161, 170
12.10 15, 161, 170

1QH
2.32–34 15
5.13 15
5.18 15
5.20–22 15
10.23 29

1QM
7.6–7 105
10.15 125
11.6–13 164
11.7 173
11.9–12 164
14.7 15

1QpPs
37.3.12 131

1QS
1.1 16
1.2 16
1.4 110
1.10 16
1.11–13 16
1.16–17 108
1.18 15
1.21 15
2.1 15
2.4–5 131
2.19–21 15
2.23 16
2.25–3.9 142
3.4–5 103
3.7 141
3.7-8 141
3.13–4.26 15, 150, 171
3.15–16 105
3.18 124
3.19 15
4.5–6 105
4.6 171, 184
4.9–11 103
4.10 103
4.20–21 141
4.21 15
4.22 15
4.25 124
5.1 16
5.1–11 108
5.2 99
5.2–3 103
5.7–15 142
5.8 109
5.8–9 103
5.9 99
5.13–14 103
6.1 15
6.2 122
6.2–5 103
6.3–8 142
6.4–5 16, 103
6.6–8 105
6.9 16
6.10–13 103
6.11 16
6.11–13 103
6.13–23 103
6.14 16

6.14–15 109
6.16 16
6.16–17 109
6.17 16
6.18 15
6.19 16, 109
6.21 16
6.22 16, 109
6.24–25 16
7.1–2 103
7.6 16
7.6–8 109
7.13 105
7.16 15–16
7.16–17 103
7.17 103
7.20 16
7.22–24 105
8–9 99
8.1 15
8.5–6 98
8:8–9 98
8.5–10 17
8.10 15
8.11 15
8.11–12 105
8.11–18 15
8.12–16 136
8.18 15
8.19 15
8.21 15
8.25 15
8.26 15
9.5 15
9.6 15
9.7 16
9.8 15
9.9 15
9.10 126
9.11 129
9.12 150
9.17–18 15
9.21–24 103
9.23–24 105
10.1–6 125
10.18–19 103
10.19 103
11.1–2 103
11.11 15

1QSa
1.1–6 126
1.2 99
1.4–20 109
1.24 99
1.26 16
1.28 15
2.3 99
2.4–10 185
2.11–22 16, 164
2.17 103
11–12 127

1QSb
1.1 149
3.22 149
5.20 149
5.20–29 164

4QM
7.4 108

4Q119 83

4Q120 83

4Q121 83

4Q122 83

4Q127 83

4Q126 83

4Q163 [4QpIs^c]
f. 23.10–11 29

4Q171
2.11 170
3.10 170

4Q174
1 2 I.6 17

4Q177
4.1 124
4.10 15

4Q246 127–128

4Q252
5.1–5 164
5.1–7 128
5.5 164

4Q266
fr. 11 17, 127

4Q381
15.1–10 164

4Q418
103 151

4Q423
2 151

4Q521
1 ii 12 173
2 ii 1 171
2 ii 1–2 169
2 ii 5 171
2 ii 5–8 169
2 ii 7 171
2 ii 8 171
2 ii 8.9 172
2 ii 11–12 169
2 ii 12 171, 178

4Q525
2-3 II, 1–6 160

4Q534–36 63

4Q541
9 146

7Q1 83

7Q2 83

7Q3–7Q19 83

7Q7 83

11Q5
3.13 150
9.13 150

1QDM
3.5–7 28

11Q13 (11QMelch)
2.1–6 28
2.4 159
2.6 159
2:6–8 173
2.9 159, 173
2.13 159
2.15–20 174
2.17 159
2.18 159, 173–174
2.20 159

11QT
45–47 185
46.13–16 105
53.9–54.5 109
55.15–21 108

11QMiqdash
46, 13–16 27

Greek and Latin Literary Sources

Pliny the Elder
Natural History
5.17.4 16, 95, 104, 121
5.70 96
5.73 110, 111, 139

Early Christian Literature

Didache
1 55
2–3a 55

Eusebius
Hist. Eccl.
3.39.4 31
3.39.16 53

Gospel of Thomas
54 157
68 156
68.1 157
69a 156
69b 157
86 61

P. Oxy.
654 54, 55

Irenaeus
Adv. Haer.
3.1.1 53

Justin Martyr
Dial.
8 147
49 147
110 147

1 Clem
13:1 55
13:4 53
19:1 53
46:7 55
53:1 53

2 Clem
13:3 53

Rabbinic Literature

Bab. Mets.
114b 147

Midr. Tehill
xliii.1 147

Index of Authors

Achtemeier, P. J. 184
Albright, W. F. 102
Alexander, P. S. 27
Allegro, J. 18
Allison, D. C. 21, 30–34, 36, 46, 48, 54–55, 58, 64, 66, 70, 75, 84, 87, 132, 157–159, 161, 166–167, 181
Alt, A. 80
Anderson, J. S. 13
Arnal, W. E. 11, 46–48, 72, 76–78, 87, 131, 157–158
Atkinson, K. 116
Attridge, H. W. 14, 66–67
Aune, D. E. 46

Badia, L. F. 137, 138, 141
Bahrdt, K. 22, 23
Bal, M. 5
Bammel, E. 130
Bar-Nathan, R. 106
Barclay, J. M. G. 50
Bardtke, H. 114
Barker, M. 63
Barnstone, W. S. 115
Barrera, J. T. 118
Barrett, C. K. 167
Bauckham, R. 14, 16, 60, 62, 70, 82, 118
Baum, G. 3
Bauer, W. 80
Baumgarten, A. I. 89, 147
Baumgarten, J. 99, 111–112, 141–142, 184
Baur, F. C. 23, 24
Beall, T. S. 94, 103, 109–110, 115, 117
Beasley-Murray, G. R. 156
Becker, A. H. 1, 3
Becker, J. 58, 130, 132, 142–143
Becker, M. 172, 175
Benoit, P. 13, 18, 26, 137, 188
Berger, K. 144, 175
Berger, P. L. 48
Bergmeier, R. 115, 116-117, 170, 172, 174
Berlinerbrau, J. 11
Beskow, P. 25
Betz, H. D. 45, 78, 158
Betz, O. 14, 26, 100, 128, 136, 179, 188
Bhabha, H. K. 12
Bickerman, E. J. 98
Bilde, P. 100, 116
Black, M. 14, 16, 19, 51–52, 55–56, 59, 102, 114, 189
Blackburn, B. L. 184
Blanton, W. 1
Bloom, H. 25
Boccaccini, G. 93, 94, 111, 113, 118–120, 122–123, 171–172
Borsch, F. H. 61
Boyarin, D. 1, 2, 12
Boyd, G. A. 46
Braun, H. 14, 89
Braun, W. 11, 73
Bretscher, P. G. 132
Brodie, T. L. 177, 183
Broshi, M. 15, 106, 110
Brooke, G. J. 26, 30–31, 128, 159–161, 164, 170, 179, 181–182, 188–189
Brown, R. E. 14, 26, 94, 137, 145–146, 189
Brownlee, W. H. 14, 99, 126, 133, 136, 143
Bruce, F. F. 15, 26, 189
Buell, D. 71
Bultmann, R. 55, 58, 130, 146, 156, 167–168
Burkett, D. 58, 62
Burrows, M. 94, 141
Bussby, F. 51
Bussmann, W. 74, 82

Cadbury, H. J. 14
Callaway, P. R. 101
Cameron, R. 1, 21, 44–45
Campbell, J. 19, 102, 189
Cansdale, L. 108
Capper, B. J. 16, 19, 118, 189
Caragounis, C. C. 58
Cargill, R. 107
Carlston, C. E. 35, 69
Carmignac, J. 124
Carruth, S. 154
Carter, J. 5, 6
Casey, M. P. 51, 56–58, 60, 61–63, 64, 78, 81, 165, 168
Castelli, E. A. 1
Catchpole, D. R. 29, 34–35, 38, 48, 58, 64, 84, 87, 154–156, 168
Chancey, M. A. 76– 78, 80, 82
Charles, R. 40
Charlesworth, J. H. 14–15, 18–19, 63–64, 96, 125–126, 136, 138, 160, 170, 189
Chilton, B. D. 1, 27, 30, 35, 52, 60, 61, 77, 133, 135, 137, 141, 144, 164, 167, 169, 173, 180, 185
Cohen, S. J. D. 2, 80, 89, 94
Collins, A. Y. 58, 62, 137
Collins, J. J. 3, 40, 58, 64, 66, 95– 98, 102, 108, 112, 114, 117, 119, 122, 123, 125–128, 149, 153, 165, 169, 170, 172–174, 177–178, 179–180, 184
Colpe, C. 61, 175
Conzelmann, H. 17, 59, 79
Coppens, J. 111
Cotter, W. 167
Cozijnsen, B. 176
Crawford, S. W. 30, 112
Cromhout, M. 48, 50, 80, 87
Cross, F. M. 19, 94, 101, 118, 127, 170, 188
Crossan, J. D. 42, 60–61, 130, 177
Crossley, J. G. 1
Crown, A. D. 108
Crum, J. M. C. 74, 82
Cullmann, O. 14, 137, 142–143

Dahl, N. A. 126
Daniélou, J. 14, 26, 130, 137
Davies, A. P. 19
Davies, M. 33
Davies, P. R. 98–102, 108, 112, 119, 125, 136, 153, 189
Davies, W. D. 19, 36, 54, 132, 157, 167, 188
Davis, D. B. 10
De Bunsen, E. 24
De Jonge, M. 126
De Roo, J. C. 159
De Vaux, R. 110
Deines, R. 20
Derrenbacker, R. A. 30, 84
Dibelius, M. 33, 130, 163, 167
Dimant, D. 94–95, 118
Doering, L. 175–176, 180
Donceel, R. 106
Donceel-Voûte, P. 106
Douglas, R. C. 154
Downing, F. G. 45, 130
Draper, J. A. 66, 74, 92
Droge, A. 77, 79
Dubnow, S. 25
Duhaime, J. 114
Duling, D. 28, 48
Dungan, D. L. 34
Dunn, J. D. G. 70, 128, 132, 136, 163, 167
Dupont, G. 59
Dupont, J. 156
Dupont-Sommer, A. 19, 94, 184, 188

Eagleton, T. 9
Ebner, M. 46
Eddy, P. R. 45
Edwards, R. A. 69
Ehrman, B. 36
Eichnorn, J. G. 51
Eisenman, R. H. 18, 159, 168, 170, 173, 178
Elder, L. B. 112
Elgvin, T. 151–152
Eliade, M. 6
Elliott, J. H. 50
Elliott, M. A. 105
Elukin, J. M. 25
Enslin, M. S. 130
Ernst, J. 132, 142, 167
Eshel, H. 110, 116
Evans, C. A. 14, 27, 52, 128–129, 164, 167, 169–170, 173, 184–185

Farinelli, A. 10
Farmer, W. R. 143
Farrar, A. 21, 33
Feyerabend, P. 5
Fiebig, P. 27, 59
Finnegan, J. 137
Fischel, H. A. 97
Fishbane, M. 30
Fitzgerald, J. T. 6
Fitzmyer, J. A. 14–15, 18, 26, 35–36, 51–52, 62, 94, 101, 108, 126, 128–129, 136, 142, 160, 163, 168, 188
Fleddermann, H. T. 35, 38, 46–47, 64, 85 161
Flusser, D. 14, 19, 27, 113, 128, 129, 136, 161, 164, 184
Foster, P. 47
Fowler, H. T. 82
France, R. T. 54
Frankemölle, H. 158
Frankfurt, H. 8
Frazer, J. G. 6
Fredriksen, P. 3
Freedman, D. N. 14
Frenschkowski, M. 82
Frey, J. 116
Freyne, S. 72, 75, 77–78, 80–81
Fritsch, C. 137
Fuller, R. H. 36, 60–61, 184
Funk, R. W. 130

Gadamer, H-G. 10
Gal, Z. 79
García Martínez, F. 19, 20–21, 94, 100, 118–119, 128, 159, 173
Gaster, T. H. 94, 101, 125, 189
Geertz, C. 11
George, A. 157
Gerhardsson, B. 27
Geyser, A. S. 130, 136
Gfrörer, A. F. 23
Ghillany, F. W. 23
Gilbert, G. N. 17
Gnilka, J. 34, 87
Goergen, D. J. 60
Goff, M. 153
Goguel, M. 134, 142, 163
Golb, N. 106, 107, 113
Goodacre, M. S. 21, 33
Goodenough, E. R. 17
Goodblatt, D. 49
Goodman, M. 95, 100, 109, 117, 184
Goppelt, L. 61, 142
Goranson, S. 96, 98, 104
Gordis, R. 127
Goulder, M. 21, 33
Grabbe, L. L. 71, 98, 114
Graetz, H. H. 24–25
Green, W. S. 2
Gregg, B. 43
Grelot, P. 118–119
Grenfell, B. P. 54
Gruenwald, I. 126
Grundmann, W. 78
Gryson, R.
Guelich, R. 158
Guenther, H. O. 56
Guignebert, C. A. H. 59
Guillaumont, A. 111
Gundry, R. H. 54

Haas, N. 112
Hachlili, R. 112
Haenchen, E. 17, 130
Hagner, D. A. 24–25, 54
Hahn, F. 42
Hahn, O. 107
Hall, E. 2
Hampel, V. 58
Hanson, J. S. 135, 140
Hanson, R. K. 137
Harnack, A. 3, 43–44, 54, 75, 79
Harrington, D. J. 94, 149–152
Hartin, P. J. 82
Harvey, A. E. 163
Harvey, G. 49
Havener, I. 58, 65, 75
Hayes, J. H. 99, 101, 118
Hays, R. B. 45
Head, P. M. 57, 78
Hempel, C. 101, 102, 112, 117–118
Hendrickx, H. 184
Hengel, M. 20, 45, 83, 85, 98, 100, 119, 127, 153, 163
Herjel-Hansen, B. 14
Hermerén, G. 176
Heschel, S. 4, 23, 25, 78
Hick, J. 8
Hieke, T. 153
Higgins, A. J. B. 63

Hill, C. E. 54
Hirschfeld, Y. 105–106
Hobbs, E. C. 33
Hoffmann, P. 38, 47, 58, 64, 75–77, 87–88, 163
Hollenbach, P. W. 130, 134
Holmén, T. 134
Holtzmann, H. J. 36, 38–39
Horbury, W. 174
Horrell, D. G. 3
Horsley, R. A. 40, 42–43, 45, 66–68, 71–75, 80, 92, 134–135, 140
Howlett, D. 19, 136, 145, 189
Hübner, H. 111
Hughes, J. H. 163
Humbert, J-B. 106
Hunt, A. S. 54
Hurtado, L. W. 76, 85

Ingolfsland, D. 43

Jackson, D. R. 119
Jacobson, A. D. 36, 84, 134, 145, 154–155
Jaffee, M. S. 188
Jaubert, A. 101–102
Jenkins, P. 34
Jensen, M. H. 10, 79
Jeremias, J. 84, 133, 137, 157
Johns, L. L. 114
Johnson, L. T. 82
Johnson, S. E. 26, 188
Johnson-Debaufre, M. 10, 70
Joseph, S. J. 22, 63, 91, 127, 164

Karrer, M. 126
Käsemann, E. 34, 59, 87
Kaster, R. A. 73
Kasting, H. 34, 87–88
Kaufman, S. A. 52
Kearns, R. 60–61
Kee, H. C. 14
Kelber, W. H. 70, 74
Kelley, S. 4
Kim, S. 128
King, K. L. 11–12
Kirk, A. 69, 73, 75
Klauck, H-J. 176
Kleio, C. 4
Kloppenborg, J. S. 10–11, 28–30, 34, 37–47, 50, 55–57, 59, 64–69, 71–78, 81, 84– 90, 131, 134, 154, 156–157, 159, 163, 167–169, 177, 179, 183
Knibb, M. A. 100
Knitter, P. F. 8
Koch, K. 181
Koester, H. 9, 40–41, 45, 55, 59, 130, 146
Kohler, K. 25
Kopp, C. 96
Körtner, U. H. J. 54
Kosch, D. 43, 68
Kraeling, C. H. 130, 132, 142, 163
Kranenborg, R. 25–26
Kranvig, H. S. 119
Kugler, R. A. 98–99
Kuhn, K. G. 14, 16
Kuhn, T. 5
Kümmel, W. G. 36, 55, 84, 88, 163, 167
Kürzinger, J. 54
Kutscher, E. Y. 171
Kvalbein, H. 179

Labahn, M. 21, 167–168, 170, 181
Lachs, S. T. 27
Lake, K. 53
Lambrecht, J. 38, 157
Lasor, W. S. 14, 125, 136
Lawlor, H. J. 122
Le Déaut, R. 51
Leaney, A. C. 125
Levine, A-J. 42, 69, 78
Levine, L. I. 83
Licht, J. 124
Lichtenberger, H. 130, 139
Lietzmann, H. 59
Lieu, J. 3, 4, 12
Lightfoot, J. B. 24, 188
Lillie, A. 24
Limor, O. 3
Lincoln, B. 9, 10
Lindars, B. 60–62
Liver, J. 99
Loader, W. 111–112
Lohmeyer, E. 78, 130, 132
Long, C. H. 5
Lönnqvist, K. 107
Lönnqvist, M. 107
Luckmann, T. 48

Lührmann, D. 29, 33, 39–41, 43, 47, 65, 77, 85, 90, 159, 167
Luz, U. 39

MacDonald, D. R. 177–178
Macina, R. 146
Mack, B. L. 34, 38, 42, 45–46, 65, 75, 78, 80, 91–93, 156
Maddox, R. 63
Magen, Y. 106
Magness, J. 105, 116
Mandell, S. R. 99, 101, 118
Mann, C. S. 102
Manson, T. W. 33, 46, 54, 147, 156
Marshall, I. H. 61, 63, 157
Marshall, J. W. 92
Marx, A. 111
Masic, A. 107
Mason, S. 105, 113, 115–118
Matson, M. A. 33
McCasland, S. V. 15
McDonald, J. I. H. 138, 167
McNamara, M. 52
McNicol, A. J. 21
Meadors, E. P. 58, 66, 82, 163
Meadors, G. T. 158
Mearns, C. L. 60
Meier, J. P. 43, 130, 163
Merz, A. 58, 62
Metso, S. 99
Metzger, B. M. 8
Meyer, A. 59
Meyer, B. F. 134
Meyer, P. D. 71
Milik, J. T. 94, 119, 128, 170
Mill, J. S. 175
Miller, M. P. 1, 84
Mitchell, M. M. 177
Moehring, H. R. 111
Moreland, M. 84
Mowinckel, S. 126
Mowry, L. 14, 143
Mulkay, M. 17
Müller, K. 176, 179–180
Murphy, C. M. 117
Murphy-O'Connor, J. 14, 101, 118, 130, 134

Nathan, N. 112
Neirynck, F. 37, 58, 158
Neusner, J. 1, 2, 6, 27, 126
Newsom, C. 30
Nickelsburg, G. W. E. 13, 63, 69, 92, 95, 109, 118, 120, 123
Niebuhr, K. W. 169, 172–173, 179, 181
Nitzan, B. 124
Nolland, J. 54
Norlan, D. 35
Novakovic, L. 172, 175, 181

Oegema, G. S. 129
Oesterley, W. O. E. 27
Oesterreicher, J. M. 136
Owen, P. 62

Paden, W. E. 7
Patterson, S. J. 41, 72
Pearson, B. 82
Peleg, Y. 106
Peppard, M.
Perrin, N. 28, 58
Pesch, R. 88
Petersen, D. 126
Pilch, J. J. 50
Piper, R. A. 65, 85
Pixner, B. 26
Polag, A. 60, 163
Pomykala, K. E. 126
Porton, G. G. 27
Potter, C. F. 189
Prideaux, H. 22–23
Priest, J. F. 127
Puech, É. 126, 128, 159–160, 168–169, 173, 179–181, 183

Qimron, E. 112

Rabin, I. 107
Rabinowitz, I. 101
Rahmani, L. Y. 83
Rajak, T. 77
Ratzinger, J. 27
Reed, A. Y. 1, 3
Reed, J. L. 49, 73, 75–76, 78, 80–82, 84, 86
Reeves, J. C. 107
Regev, E. 108, 111
Reike, B. I. 142
Reinach, T. 105
Reisner, M. 58

Remus, H. 71
Renan, E. 24, 25, 77, 188
Reumann, J. 130
Reventlow, H. G. 125
Riaud, J. 100
Richardson, N. 127
Richardson, P. 4, 78
Richter, G. 146
Riesenfeld, H. 27
Riesner, R. 26–27, 128, 179, 188
Ringgren, H. 115–116
Ritschl, A. 24
Robbins, V. 10
Robinson, J. A. 54, 137
Robinson, J. M. 9, 28, 38–40, 43–48, 56, 59, 61, 63, 65, 82–83, 87, 89, 154–157, 161, 165–166, 170, 180, 184
Rofè, A. 151
Root, B. 74, 76–77
Rose, H. J. 8
Rost, L. 114
Roth, C. 107, 113
Rothschild, C. K. 130, 137, 163
Rowland, C. 114
Ruether, R. R. 4

Sacchi, P. 119, 189
Saldarini, A. J. 49
Salvador, J. 23
Sanders, E. P. 3, 20, 33, 46, 58, 73, 94, 125, 130, 134, 184
Sanders, J. A. 150, 158
Sandmel, S. 17
Sandnes, K. O. 177
Sato, M. 64, 66, 69, 75, 156
Sawicki, M. 80–81
Sawyer, J. F. A. 4, 83
Schalit, A. 113
Schatzki, T. R. 11
Schenk, W. 74, 75
Schiffman, L. H. 49, 99, 107, 111, 118, 124–125, 127–129, 169–170
Schleiermacher, F. 54
Schmidt, N. 59
Scobie, C. H. H. 130, 132, 134, 142
Schonfield, H. J. 19, 144, 147, 189
Schottroff, L. 34, 87
Schröter, J. 43, 66, 70, 81
Schubert, K. 15, 19, 126, 136, 145, 161, 164, 189
Schulz, S. 28–29, 41, 47, 64–65, 74, 77, 82, 87–88, 154–155, 163
Schürer, E. 80, 170
Schürmann, H. 41, 58, 63, 154, 163
Schütz, J. 130
Schwartz, D. R. 50, 117, 136
Schwartz, S. 153
Schwartz, S. 71
Schwegler, A. 24
Schweitzer, A. 23
Schweizer, E. 55, 61, 157
Seelig, A. W. 175–176
Sevenirch-Bax, E. 68
Shaked, S. 126
Shank, H. 116
Shaw, J. T. 176
Shepherd, D. 62
Sigal, P. 127
Sim, D. C. 53, 54
Simon, M. 3, 19, 189
Slater, T. B. 63
Smith, D. E. 85
Smith, J. Z. 1, 2, 5–9, 11, 175
Smith, M. 114, 127
Smith, M. H. 8, 28, 61
Soards, M. L. 37
Sollamo, R. 114
Stacey, D. 106
Stanton, G. 66, 149, 167
Starcky, J. 127, 159
Stark, R. 71
Stauffer, E. 137
Steck, O. H. 39–40, 42, 47, 88, 155–156
Steckoll, S. H. 112
Stegemann, E. 126
Stegemann, H. 28, 94, 101, 118, 140, 172
Stegemann, W. 34, 72, 87
Stein, R. H. 35–36
Steinman, J. 130, 137
Stendahl, K. 14
Stern, S. 49
Steudel, A. 124, 174
Stock, B. 2
Streeter, B. H. 36, 46, 75
Strickert, F. M. 126
Stroumsa, G. G. 3, 126
Strugnell, J. 151–152
Stowers, S. 13
Stuhlmacher, P. 179
Styler, G. M. 36

Sukenik, E. L. 89, 94, 169
Sutcliffe, E. F. 16

Tabor, J. 145, 165, 168, 170, 179, 180, 185
Talmon, S. 6, 7, 110, 117, 124–125, 129
Tashjian, J. S. 87–88
Tatum, W. B. 130
Taussing, H. 1
Taylor, J. 19, 189
Taylor, J. E. 132, 138, 144, 146, 184
Taylor, V. 88
Tedesche, S. 97
Teeple, H. M. 14, 126
Theisohn, J. 64
Theissen, G. 33, 34, 45, 58, 62, 64, 72, 74, 75, 76, 81, 86, 88, 184
Thiede, C. P. 83, 97
Thiering, B. 18
Thomas, S. I. 151
Thompson, G. H. P. 63
Thyen, H. 132
Tödt, H. E. 38–40, 47
Tov, E. 170
Trever, J. C. 169
Trilling, W. 130
Tuckett, C. M. 29, 35, 36, 42, 45, 47–48, 52, 57–58, 66–69, 71, 73, 75–76, 84, 87, 92, 133, 154, 156–157, 166–167, 171, 179, 182
Twelftree, G. H. 184

Ulfgard, H. 19, 189
Ullmann-Margalit, E. 19
Uro, R. 64, 77, 84

Vaage, L. E. 42, 45–46, 61, 75
Van der Horst, P. W. 83
Van der Ploeg, J. 16
Van der Woude, A. S. 118, 126
VanderKam, J. C. 26, 30, 83, 94, 102, 108, 118, 119, 121–122, 189
Vassiliadis, P. 35
Veer, P. V. 11
Venturini, K. 23
Vermes, G. 16, 26, 59–61, 94, 95, 98, 100, 108, 114, 124–127, 129, 152, 169–170, 184
Vielhauer, P. 39, 40, 58, 63
Von Rad, G. 67

Waddell, J. A. 63
Wagner, S. 22
Walck, L. W. 64
Webb, R. L. 130–135, 137, 140–145, 147, 163
Weise, C. H. 38, 51
Weiss, B. 38
Weiss, J. 38
Wellhausen, J. 59, 74, 82
Wernle, P. 43, 154
White, H. 10
White, L. M. 3, 6
Whitmarsh, T. 2
Wieder, N. 126
Wiesenberg, E. 101
Wilckens, U. 39
Wilcox, M. 51
Willey, P. T. 31
Williams, M. H. 50
Williams, P. J. 57
Wilson, E. 19, 189
Wilson, S. G. 1
Wink, W. 131, 133–135, 137, 145–146, 149, 163–164
Wise, M. O. 52, 159, 165, 168, 170, 173, 178–180, 185
Witherington, B. 45, 133–134, 138, 143
Wolff, T. 107
Worrell, J. E. 149–150
Wright, N. T. 46, 133, 150

Yadin, Y. 111, 137
Yardeni, A. 107
York, J. O. 158
Young, B. H. 27
Young, R. 12

Zahn, T. 158
Zangenberg, J. 79
Zeller, D. 34, 65–66, 77, 87, 163, 184
Zerbe, G. M. 113
Zimmermann, J. 181

Index of Subjects

Aaron 146
Abel 85–86
Abijah 139, 146
Abraham 46, 85
Acts 15, 17, 41
– as historical source 17
agorai 86
Alcimus 97-98
Alexandria 100
– Jews 115
ancient Greeks 2
angelic host 114
angel 29, 62, 119, 153
– angelic sin 120
– fallen 120–121
– “holy ones” 174
Angleichung 176
anointed 169, 172, 174–175
antediluvian 120
antetext 178
Antioch 74, 84
Antiochus 121
Antigonus 140
anti-Semite 78, 86
apocalypticism 20, 34, 40–41, 64, 68, 74, 91–92, 102, 118, 129, 153
apologetics 2, 92, 110, 116
apostles 17, 82
Aramaic 51, 56–58, 63, 82, 85, 127
– literary 59–60
– loan-words 48, 55
– Middle 52
– Palestinian 60, 170
– Qumran 52
Archelaus 140
Aryan race-theory 78, 86
asceticism 103
atonement 98, 141–142, 144, 147–148
Azaz’el 121

Babylon 49, 100–102, 119
Bannus 137
baptism 135–136, 139–142, 147
– as initiatory rite 135–136, 141–142
– as substitute for Temple cult 145, 147–148
barbarians 2
Beabsichtigter Kontrast 176
beatitudes 28, 149–162, 182
– as sapiential literature 153
Belial 131
Bethany 81
Bethsaida 75, 76
Bezugnahme 176
biblical scholarship 1, 4, 11, 70, 78, 86
– as “interested” 11
– scholars 71
binary oppositions 2, 3, 5
Book of Enoch 102, 119
Book of the Watchers 119, 121
boundaries 3, 4, 47, 89, 92, 185, 189
– symbolic 91
“Branch of David” 127, 164

Caesarea Philippi 81
Cairo 28
canon 4, 28
Capernaum 75–76, 90, 166
Carmelite 96
Cassius Dio 96
categorization 64, 66–67, 69
Catholicism 12
celibacy 100, 108, 110–112
centurion 166, 181
“children of Darkness” 115
“children of Light” 115
“children of Wisdom” 22, 132, 134, 149, 187
Chorazin 75, 76
Christian origins 1, 8, 10, 11, 22, 24, 33, 41, 65, 67, 70, 77, 84, 122
– as site of debate

Christianity 1, 11, 12, 15, 17, 24–25, 39–41, 43, 47, 51, 67, 78, 86, 96, 122, 144, 188
– as different from Judaism 4, 40
– as diverse 12, 86
– as offshoot of Essenes 24–25
– as superseding Judaism 3
– as symbolic marker of the universal 2
– as unique 8, 9
– de-Judaization of 78
– emerging within Judaism 9
– incomparable 8
– literary production 4
– self-definition 4
– social formation 11
Christians (early) 17–18, 140
circumcision 20, 47, 51, 80
classification 1, 5
"Coming One' 89–90, 131, 133–134, 136, 138, 140–142, 147, 163, 166–168, 184–185, 187
common tradition 176, 180, 182
comparison 1–2, 5, 7
– as apologetics 6
– as borrowing 9
– as deceptively simple 5
– as "disciplined exaggeration" 7
– as fabrications 10
– as interested 9
– as "magic" 8
– as mixture of identity and difference 7
– as political act 9
– classes 7
– definitions 5–6
– history of the use of 6
– method 5
– parallels 8
– texts and communities 13
communal meal 16, 100, 103, 109, 142
communality of goods 16, 100, 109–110
conjectural emendation 37
conquest (narrative) 142
covenant 20, 33, 120, 147, 164
Cynic 34, 45–46, 65, 86
Cynicism 41

Damascus 84, 101–102
Daniel (book of) 60, 63, 174
David 139
Davidic throne 97
– dynasty 164
– messiah 132, 144–145, 172, 184
– tradition 164
Dead Sea 85, 101, 103–107
Dead Sea Scrolls 13, 19, 21, 28, 84, 94, 106, 110, 115, 117, 129, 159
– and the New Testament 19
– research 20
death and resurrection
– of the divine king 6
Decapolis 74, 81
Deists 22
demonology 119–120, 184
determinism 109
Diaspora 50, 83, 189
difference 2, 6–8, 11–12, 78–79
– Christian 4, 40
Dio Chrysostom 104, 106
disciples 29
dissimilarity (criterion) 135
Deutero-Markus 37
Deuteronomy (book) 30
Deuteronomistic (history) 21, 30, 34, 39, 47, 65, 74, 84–85, 87, 90, 131, 156
dualism 93, 109, 119–120, 171

Ebionites 24
Ein-Feshkha 104–105
Ein-Gedi 104–105
elders 15
election 21, 89, 151, 153
Elijah 96, 132, 146–147, 167, 173–174
Elisha 167
Elizabeth 128, 135, 144
embarrassment (criterion) 135
End of Days 124, 129
Enlightenment 23, 26
Enoch 118, 174
– tradition 118–120, 122, 129, 188
– Judaism 119, 121–122
– literature 123
Entferntere Ähnlichkeit 176
Entlehnung 176
Epimeletes 96
Erinnerung 70
eschatology 16, 20, 28–29, 33, 64, 68–69, 74, 87, 89–90, 109, 120, 123, 126, 129, 136, 158, 160, 169, 171–173, 179, 183, 185
– blessings 181
– healing 171, 184
– Jubilee 173
– miracles 180

– reversal 131, 151–152, 155, 157–158, 161, 164-165
– salvation 157
– signs 175, 185
– war 114
esotericism 25
Essa 113
Essenes 17–19, 22–23, 26–29, 87–90, 95–100, 104–105, 111–112, 117–118, 121, 135–137, 139, 147, 161, 170, 172, 184, 188–189
– and the Enoch tradition 119–120
– as equated with early Christians 18
– as influencing Jesus movement 18
– as Pythagorean Jews 115
– as rationalist foil 23
– as reform movement 24
– as “Sons of Zadok” 99
– avoidance of oil 116
– community in Jerusalem 26
– converting to Jesus movement 26, 188
– eschatology 123
– etymology 170
– in Galilee 97
– influencing early Christianity 22
– initiation 108–109
– lay/marrying 109–111, 117, 188
– messianism 123
– movement 98, 100–101, 106–107, 117, 122, 129, 135, 183, 188
– origins 102
– relationship to Qumran community 100
– sectarian books 121
– sun-worship 108, 116
– treating diseases 184
essentialism 6
ethics 12
ethnicity 45, 48–51, 79, 91
ethnikon 113
Eusebius 86
evil (supernatural) 36, 119–120, 164
– as impurity 171
exegesis (scriptural) 30
exile 101
exodus (narrative) 142
“exodus pattern” 31–32
exorcism 32, 87, 184
Ezekiel 102
Ezra 102

Farrer-Goulder hypothesis 33, 37
Feast of the Renewal of the Covenant 17
Festival of Weeks 17
Flood 95, 120
Florilegium 180

Gabinius 96
Galilee 41, 49, 74–80, 83, 90, 96, 187
– as part of Judea 49, 96
– ethnicity 79–80
– first-century 79, 80
“Galilee of the Gentiles” 78
“gate of the Essenes” 26
Gattung 39, 40, 55, 67
Gemeinde (Q) 71
geneaological dependence 176–177
Geniza 28
Gentiles 2, 4, 46–48, 80, 85, 89, 123, 140
– as outsiders 85
Gnostics 3
Gnosticism 41
God 20, 48, 88, 113–114, 120, 124–125, 131–132, 139, 145, 147, 164, 172, 175
God-fearer 189
gospel (genre) 64
Gospel of John 13, 132, 134
Gospel of the Hebrews 54
Gospels 35, 41, 51, 57, 59, 79–80, 133, 136, 141, 147, 165, 184
goyim 49
Greco-Roman 45–46, 49, 51, 110, 116
Greek 21, 51–52, 55, 57, 60, 77, 82–83, 182
– in Jerusalem 83, 86
– Septuagintal 182
Gruppe (Q) 71

Hades 90
halakhah 20, 118
Hasidim 97, 98, 170
Hasmonean 80, 97, 99, 102, 106, 140, 164
healing 100, 121, 171, 184
Hebrew 21, 58
Hebrew Bible 20, 102
Heilswort 64
Hellenist(ic) 85, 115–116, 127
Hellenization 97
heresiology 2, 3
“hermeneutical Jew” 2
Herod Antipas 140
Herod(ian) 83, 104, 135, 159
– script 164
Hippolytus 109
history of religions 9, 93

historical criticism 11, 23
historical influence 13
Historical Jesus 23, 27, 41, 43, 44, 57, 65, 69–70, 86, 164, 168, 188
historiography 40
Hodayot 89
"holy ones" 174
Holy Spirit 15, 32, 128, 131, 141–142, 144
– purification 142
"holy war" 115
hybridity 3, 11, 79

identity 3, 4, 7, 12, 51, 79, 89, 91
– Christian 4, 70
– Jewish 80, 92
ideology 9–11, 40, 46, 56, 69–70, 78, 91, 164
idiom 59, 61, 63
immortality of the soul 109
Implizite Antithese 176
impressionism 6
information processing 5
initiation 100, 103, 110, 141
Institute for Antiquity and Christianity 44
Instruction (sapiential genre) 32, 41, 65, 74, 76, 150
International Q Project (IQP) 38, 44
interpolation 76
intertextuality 31–32, 82
Irenaeus 53
Isaac 85
Isaiah 166–167, 171, 174, 179–183, 186
"Isles of the Blessed" 116
Israel 2, 15, 21, 32, 39, 41–42, 46–48, 50, 78, 84–85, 88–89, 91–92, 98, 102, 126–127, 131, 135, 138, 140–142, 145, 147, 164, 167

Jacob 85
James (the Just) 42, 78, 82
Jason 98
Jeremiah 102
Jericho 81, 104, 106
Jeroboam 139
Jerusalem 17, 41, 48, 74, 76, 78, 80–86, 90, 95, 97, 104, 108, 123, 140, 147, 187
– destruction 24, 104–105
Jerusalem community 16, 26, 53, 71, 82–86, 187
Jesus 14, 19, 21, 25, 27, 36, 41, 43–45, 58, 61, 69, 77, 91–92, 132, 147, 163–164
– announces eschatological blessings 181
– as "cornerstone" 17
– as Cynic sage 46
– as dissimilar to Judaism 78
– as eschatological figure 22
– as literary character in Q 44
– as non-apocalyptic 42, 65, 69
– as son of God 89, 91
– as son of man 63
– as the Coming One 89, 184–185
– as Wisdom 161
– baptism 84, 131-133, 145, 166
– death and resurrection 22, 40, 58, 63, 67, 71, 79
– family 81
– healing 185
– identity 21, 63, 70, 91, 132, 166–168, 188
– Jewish followers 41, 48
– Jewishness 23, 25, 86
– meeting Essenes 96-97
– messianic identity 36, 163, 166–167, 183, 188
– ministry 76, 81, 85, 89, 143, 185
– miracles 22, 36
– relationship to John the Baptist 131
– speaking Aramaic 51, 56
– teaching 29, 68, 79, 91–92, 188
– trained by Essenes 23, 25
Jesus movement 1, 15–16, 18–19, 21, 34, 41, 43–45, 51, 69–72, 81, 85–86, 92, 100, 121, 123, 130–132, 187–189
– as a new *ethnos* 3
– as Cynic-like 45–46
– as Jewish 1
– as Galilean 44, 80, 187
– as non-messianic 42
– social history 42, 130
Jesus Seminar 40, 65
Jesus tradition 27, 58, 60, 64, 85, 133, 142–143, 148, 156, 163, 188
Jewish Christians 3, 17, 24, 47, 51, 55, 58, 64, 85, 161
– texts 4
Jewish Christianity 74, 81, 86, 188–189
Jewish Revolt 116
Jewish sectarianism 185
Jews 12, 89, 93
– as invention 3

– as Judeans 49–51, 189
– as “near-Christians” 2
– as other 4, 92
– Palestinian 18, 83
John the Baptist 14, 19, 21, 25, 27–28, 35–36, 42, 46, 48, 61, 89–92, 123, 130–148, 163, 168, 185, 187
– as Essene 135–136, 143
– as historical figure 130, 135, 140, 148
– as messianic figure 143, 148, 187
– as “more than a prophet” 21, 132–133, 142–143, 147–148, 187
– as priestly figure 144, 146–148
– as “priestly messiah” 145–147
– hostility to Temple 147
John the Essene 113
Jonah 85
Jonathan 95, 97-99
Jordan 76, 81, 85, 140
– river 142
– valley 84
Josaphat 139
Josephus 80, 87–88, 95–100, 103, 107, 109–111, 113, 115–117, 121–123, 138–140, 153, 170, 184
Joshua 140
Jotham 139
Jubilee 173
Judah (*Yehudah*) (tribe) 49, 101
Judah (Maccabean) 97
Judah the Essene 108, 140
Judaism 1, 4, 12, 24, 45, 47, 50–51, 72, 80, 123
– anti-Semitic portrayals 78
– as antithetical to Christianity 3–4
– in New Testament scholarship 3
– as diverse 12
– as static “background” 9
– as the other 2, 92
– first-century 20, 27, 49, 63, 69, 110, 164
– Palestinian 20
– rabbinical 146
– relationship with Christianity 1–4, 92
– Second-Temple 21, 28, 84, 87, 102, 118–119, 126, 138, 140, 153, 174
Judas 16–17
Judea 49–51, 77, 80–82, 85, 94, 96, 101–102, 104, 133, 164, 187
– as name for Israel 96
– as narrative world 187
– character 116
– Roman invasion 164
– use of Aramaic 52
– wilderness 84, 135, 142
Judgment 29, 32, 35, 39, 41, 46, 84, 90–92, 120, 131–132, 136, 147, 153, 163–164, 174
Justin Martyr 147

Katalysatorische Gegenwart 176
kerygma 38–40, 44, 65
Khirbet Qumran 94, 104–105, 110
– as Hasmonean military fortress 105, 107
– as manor house 105–106
– as pottery production facility
– as sectarian community center 106–107, 110
– as tannery 106
– as villa 106
kingdom of God 21, 29, 46, 48, 70, 72, 91, 134–135, 179–180
Kittim 164
Kleinliteratur 69, 73
kosher 20

Lake Mareotis 100
Law (Jewish/Mosaic) 29, 32, 34, 41, 48, 70–71, 89, 91, 102, 120–121, 142, 164
– “of Moses” 29, 34
Levi (tribe) 147
Leviticus 102
Levites 15, 108
Liberalism (German) 43
linguistics 8
literary dependence 175, 177–178, 182
– accessibility 177–178
– adaptation 176
– adoption 176
– allusion 177
– analogy 177–178
– citation 177
– density 177–178
– distinctiveness 177–178
– echoes 177
– exclusive similarity 176, 183
– external plausibility 177
– intelligibility of differences 177
– internal similarity 177
– interpretability 177–178
– mimetic rivalry 177
– order 177–178
– paraphrase 177
– redaction 177
– rejection 176

– reorganization 176
literary forms 13
literary history 68
"local sympathizers" 71–72, 88
logia 41, 53, 54
logoi (*sophon*) 39, 54–55, 67
"lot" 16
Lot 85
Luke, Gospel of 33, 35–38, 56, 79, 81, 84, 92, 189
Luke-Acts 17

Maccabee 95
Maccabean revolt 97–98, 101–102, 118
magic 120
Magisterium 27
Makrogattung 64
Malachi 132, 146
Mandeans 143
"Man of Lies" 118
"Many" 15, 16
Marcionites 12
Marcus Agrippa 104
Mark, Gospel of 33, 37–38, 53, 56, 79, 88
– Baptist narrative 36
– Beelzebul controversy 36
– sending of the Twelve 36
– Synoptic Apocalypse 36
martyr stories 2
Mary (mother of Jesus) 81, 128
Masada 104–105
Maskil 149
Mattathias 97
Matthew, Gospel of 33, 35–38, 53–56, 64, 79, 81, 84, 92, 189
– Infancy narrative 36, 81
– resurrection narrative 36
– Sermon on the Mount 36
Matthias 16
maven 152
Melchizedek 173–174
Menachem the Essene 140
Menelaus 98
messiah 147, 172, 175, 178
– age 171, 180, 185–186
– expectations 168, 187
– priestly 172–173
– prophetic 172–173
– royal 128–129, 164, 172
"messiah of Israel" 16, 127, 145, 164
messianism (Jewish) 20, 24, 41, 123, 126–127, 129, 183
metallurgy 120
Metamorphose 176
Michael 120
mikvaoth 106, 117
mimesis 177–178
– criticism 177
– mimetic eclecticism 178
minim 3
Mishnah 20, 179
mission instructions 72, 88
Moses 95, 121, 174
Mount Zion 79
"Mystery that is to come" 151

Nabateans 101
Nachahmung 176
Nazareth 21, 76, 81
Nazirite 144
Nazoreans 15
Nehemiah 102
"new covenant" 16, 101–102, 125, 140
New Testament 4, 9, 13, 18–22, 24–25, 28, 30, 34, 40, 44, 53, 99, 108, 123, 133, 135, 145, 175, 178
– and Dead Sea Scrolls 19
– and Qumran 13
– background 9
– failure to mention Essenes 24–25, 28
– scholars 8, 56, 135, 176
– studies 33, 40, 56, 67
Nicolaus of Damascus 115
Ninevah 90
Noah 85
noncanonical texts 4

oaths 100, 103, 108, 110, 121, 139
Old Testament 25
Oracles 53
Oral tradition 37, 70
"other" 1–2, 4
"overseers" 15–16
Oxyrhynchus 54

pacifism 113–114, 121
pagan 49
paleography 106
Palestine 82, 95–96
Papias 53–55
Papyri 83
Parables (*of Enoch*) 63–64
parable of the mustard seed 29
Parallele 176

parallels 13
parallelomania 17
parousia 29, 79
Parthia 104
particularism 46
"parting of the ways" 3
passion narratives 37, 40
past 10
Paul 2, 16, 42, 53, 71, 81, 84, 85, 187
– letters 13
– mission 17, 71
Pentateuch 30
Pentecost 17
pesher 103, 128–129
Peter 53, 82
Pharisees 25, 29, 33–35, 41, 48, 82, 84, 86–87, 90–92, 107, 136–137, 143, 187, 189
– as "seekers of smooth things" 29
Philo 87, 95–96, 98–100, 107–111, 113, 115, 117, 121–123, 153, 170, 184
Phineas 146
"pillars" 17
Pliny 96, 103–108, 110, 115, 117, 121, 123, 139
polis 86
Politics 10
"Poor" 15, 151, 154, 158, 165–166, 170–171, 173, 178
polygenesis 11
practice 11
preachers 71
predestination 93, 103, 171
"Prince of the Congregation" 164, 173
priests 15, 98, 102, 108–109, 120, 143
prophetic traditions 68
prophet 17, 30, 32, 48, 67, 70, 74, 85, 90, 98, 120, 126, 133, 135, 139–140, 147, 156, 172–174
– as "anointed" 172–174
proselytes 15
Protestants 12, 77
Proverbs (book) 151
Psalms 30
pseudonymity 44
purity 11, 80, 113
– issues 48
– laws 20
– moral 98
Pythagoras 100
Pythagoreans 115–116
Q 21, 22, 27–28, 31–33, 189
– as apocalyptic text 66
– as community of prophets 74, 87
– as Jewish Christian 28, 39, 47–48, 86
– as Gentile Christian 46
– as missionary document 34, 45, 87–88, 90
– as Palestinian Jewish text 21–22, 33, 51
– as rejecting Israel 41
– as sapiential text 39
– audience 31
– author 31, 91, 162, 180, 185
– Aramaic substratum 51–64
– Christology 22, 41, 47, 66, 74, 187–188
– community 22, 28, 34, 39, 41, 45–46, 48, 56, 70–74, 81, 87, 89, 91–92, 155, 187, 189
– composition 22, 42, 44, 47, 51, 64–70, 74, 81, 85
– critical text 38
– date 33
– eschatology 29, 33, 69
– ethnicity 41, 45–51, 86–87, 187
– existence 34–38
– Greek 55–57
– history of research 38–45, 47, 73, 78
– Inaugural Sermon 21, 29, 149, 153–154, 161, 164
– literary setting 75, 81, 87
– provenance 49, 74–87, 187
– reconstruction 43, 44
– role of Jesus 165, 183–184
– sectarian 90
– social boundaries 89
– social history 41, 42, 65, 70, 187
– social map 75, 76, 82
– social structure, 87–93
– theology 38–39
Queen of Sheba 90
Quelle 33, 74
Qumran 83, 89, 93, 96, 120, 161, 180, 182-183
– and the New Testament 13
– as eschatological temple 16
– as messianic movement 123, 143, 185
– community 15–16, 18, 27–29, 31–32, 48, 89, 97–100, 102, 104, 107–108, 110, 112–114, 117–125, 129, 131, 135–137, 141, 148–149, 151, 162, 164, 169–170, 173, 183, 185
– corpus 21
– "council of twelve" 15

– Essene hypothesis 17, 94, 102–117, 129
– "exodus pattern" 31–32
– family life 112
– hostility towards Temple 86, 119, 121
– identity 95
– interest in medical issues 184
– law 129
– library 32, 94, 100, 171, 186, 188
– "messianic banquet" 16
– messianic texts 123–129, 164
– militancy 113–115
– organizational structures 15
– priests 15
– sectarianism 93, 119, 122, 185
– scholarship 101
– texts 14, 17–18, 20, 29–30, 117, 122–123, 159, 187–188
– theology 109, 151
– vocabulary 160, 170

radicalism 73
rationalism 23, 26
redaction 37, 39, 158
Reform Judaism 25
religion 5, 12
religious difference 1
remnant 102, 131
repentance 47, 136, 139, 141–142
resurrection 169, 179–183
revelation 41, 89, 109, 119–120, 125, 153
revolution 165
Rezeption mit entgegengesetzter Tendenz 176
rhetoric 2
– Jewish 32
Romans 2, 113-114, 116
Rome 53, 75, 165

Sabbath 20, 47, 51, 80, 98, 129
sacrifice 98, 108, 143–144
Sadducee 29, 35, 99, 106–108, 136, 143
salvation 46, 89, 145, 157
Samaria 81
sapiential (literature) 20, 39, 64–65, 67, 69, 150, 153, 156–157, 162
"scepter" 164
scribes 65, 73, 74, 76, 82–83, 92, 97, 107, 152, 186–187
Scripture 11, 30–32, 151, 166, 185
Second Temple Judaism 21
sectarian 13, 88–89, 100, 185
– books 103, 119, 121
– law 102
– texts 20, 106–107, 170–171, 186
Seleucid 97
Semiotic community 176
Semitic 53–54, 56, 59
Sepphoris 74, 77, 83, 86
Septuagint (LXX) 53
shepherds 16
shields 114
Sidon 81
Simon (priest) 98
Simon the Essene 140
Simon the Just 139
sin 28, 120
– atonement 141
– forgiveness 140, 145
– original 120
– repentance 145
Sitz im Leben 62, 168
Sirach 151
slavery 108-110
social boundaries 185, 189
social closure 91
social conflict 75, 91–92
social critique 91
social dynamics 92
social identity theory 91–92
social location 73
social network analysis 71, 86
social movements 71
social rejection 92
social structures 13, 87, 108
Society of Biblical Literature 44
sociology 70
Sodom 85, 90, 104
solar calendar 102, 119, 121
soldiers 114
Solomon 85, 149
"son of David" 36
"son of God" 36, 127–128, 164
"son of man" (sayings) 29, 32, 34, 36, 39–40, 44, 57–64, 87, 132, 134, 144, 156–157
– as circumlocution 60
– as distinctive feature of Q 57
– as idiom 60–62
– as messianic title 60–62
– as redactional 39, 44
– coming 29
"Son of the Most High" 128
"Sons of Dawn" 138
"Sons of Light" 15

“Sons of Zadok” 99
Sophia 39
Spartan 116
“Spirit of Truth” 15, 141, 150
Stammbaum 12
standard 114
star prophecy 128
stratigraphical analysis 64–70
stratigraphic marker 156
Stephen 85
stereotypes 91
Stoic 115
supersessionism 93
synagogue 48, 92
syncretism 12, 79
synhedria 96
Synoptic (Gospels) 30, 85, 135, 138
Synoptic Problem 33–34, 38, 40, 43
Syria 74, 95–96, 101

Talmud 20 146
Targum (Isaiah) 30, 52
Targumim 146
Teacher of Righteousness 98, 101-102, 118, 126, 149, 174
Temple 17, 29, 33, 46–48, 51, 72, 80, 82, 84, 86–87, 90–92, 95, 98–99, 107, 119–121, 138, 143–145, 147–148, 152, 187
– guards 165
Temple Scroll 20
temptation (narrative) 35
Testimonium 180
textual corruption 37
textual interpretation 12
theology 3, 46, 66, 151, 163
Therapeutae 100, 184
“this generation” 22, 29, 41– 42, 47–48, 61, 65, 67, 82, 87, 89–92, 135, 168
– as part of Israel 42, 92
Thomas, *Gospel of* 40–41, 54, 156–157
Tiberias 74, 77, 83, 86
time 125
tithing 48
Torah 30, 32, 41, 51, 100, 120, 123
tradition history 68
trajectories 9, 40–41
transculturation 12
Transjordan 64, 74, 113
transmission 176
transposition 176
transvaluation 178
trumpets 114
Tübingen 23
twelve tribes of Israel 15, 29, 48, 82, 90
Two-Documentary Hypothesis (2DH) 36–38, 40, 94
Two Spirits 124, 141
Two Ways 150
Tyre 81

Umkehrung der Relationen 176
Unheilswort 64
universalism 47
Ur-Markus 37

Voraussetzung 176

“wandering charismatics” 71–72, 75
Watchers 120
wave-theory 12
“Way (of the Lord)” 15, 136, 145
“Wicked Priest” 99
Wisdom 34, 65–69, 74, 84–85, 87, 120, 132, 133–134, 149, 152, 154, 159
– definition 67
– eschatological 151
– figure 67, 134, 149–150, 160
– literature 41, 150, 152
– traditions 149, 161–162
worship 12

xenophobia 2

yahad 17, 99, 111–112, 117, 122, 138, 152, 160, 171

Zadokite 97–99, 102, 107, 120, 146–147, 170
Zealots 114
Zechariah 85–86, 144
Zeugnisse für gemeinsame Basis 17