

Expectations of the End

*A Comparative Traditio-Historical
Study of Eschatological,
Apocalyptic and Messianic Ideas
in the Dead Sea Scrolls and
the New Testament*

ALBERT L.A. HOGETERP

BRILL

Expectations of the End

Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah

Edited by

Florentino García Martínez

Associate editors

Peter W. Flint

Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar

VOLUME 83

Expectations of the End

A Comparative Traditio-Historical Study of
Eschatological, Apocalyptic and Messianic Ideas
in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament

By

Albert L.A. Hogeterp



BRILL

LEIDEN • BOSTON
2009

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Hogeterp, Albert L.A.

Expectations of the end : a comparative traditio-historical study of eschatological, apocalyptic, and messianic ideas in the Dead Sea scrolls and the New Testament / by Albert L.A. Hogeterp.

p. cm. — (Studies on the texts of the desert of Judah ; v. 83)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-90-04-17177-0 (hardback : alk. paper) 1. Dead Sea scrolls. 2. Eschatology. 3. Apocalyptic literature. 4. Messiah. 5. Judaism—History—Post-exilic period, 586 B.C.–210 A.D. 6. Rabbinical literature—History and criticism. 7. Judaism—Relations—Christianity. 8. Christianity and other religions—Judaism. 9. Bible. N.T.—Criticism, interpretation, etc. I. Title. II Series.

BM487.H58 2009

296.1'55—dc22

2008055470

ISBN 978 90 04 17177 0

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

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

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

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	xi
Abbreviations	xiii
Chapter One. Toward Comparative Study of Eschatological Ideas in Qumran and in Emerging Christianity	1
1. Definition of Eschatology and Problems of Comparative Study	2
2. Jesus, Emerging Christianity and Eschatology	7
2.1. The Debate about Jesus and Eschatology	7
2.2. Interpretive Problems	10
3. Concluding Observations and Prospect	15
Chapter Two. Integrating Qumran Eschatology into Late Second Temple Judaism	19
1. Eschatology and Scripture	19
1.1. The Transmission of the Biblical Text and Eschatology	20
1.2. The Reception of the Biblical Text and Eschatology	24
2. Eschatology in Non-Sectarian Qumran Texts	31
2.1. Pre-Qumran Texts	31
2.2. Non-Sectarian Qumran Texts	36
2.3. Non-Sectarian Writings: Summary	42
3. Eschatology in Sectarian Qumran Texts	43
3.1. 4QMMT	43
3.2. The Damascus Document	47
3.3. The Serekh ha-Yahad	52
3.4. The Rule of the Congregation	54
3.5. 1Q/4QHodayot	55
3.6. Early Pesharim	59
3.7. The Midrash on Eschatology ^{a-b}	65
3.8. The War Scroll	68
3.9. Late Pesharim	69

3.10. Sapiential and Poetical Texts	74
3.11. Sectarian Writings: Summary	75
4. The Umwelt to Qumran Eschatology: Comparative Texts and Traditions	76
4.1. Epigraphical and Papyrological Evidence	76
4.2. The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha	78
4.3. Philo of Alexandria	99
4.4. Flavius Josephus	101
4.5. New Testament	103
4.6. Hippolytus of Rome	103
4.7. Early Rabbinic Literature	104
5. Evaluation and Conclusions	106
5.1. Common Features of Jewish Eschatology in the Second Temple Period	106
5.2. Distinctions between pre-70 CE Jewish Eschatologies	109
5.3. Qumran Eschatology in Its Exegetical and Historical Context	112
 Chapter Three. Emerging Christianity and Eschatology	 115
1. The Sources and Their Order of Discussion	115
2. First-Century Christian Eschatological Ideas and Scripture	117
2.1. Isaiah	117
2.2. Psalms	119
2.3. Minor Prophets	121
2.4. Daniel	124
2.5. Genesis	126
3. The Gospel of Mark	127
3.1. The Social and Historical Setting of Mark	127
3.2. Marcan Eschatology	131
4. The Sayings Source Q	154
4.1. The Identification of Q and Its Social Settings	154
4.2. Eschatology in Q	156
4.3. Evaluation: Tradition and Redaction in the Apocalyptic-Eschatological Materials	161
5. The Gospel of Matthew	163
5.1. The Social and Historical Setting of Matthew	163
5.2. Matthean Eschatology	169
5.3. Evaluation	173

6. The Gospel of Luke	174
6.1. The Social and Historical Setting of Luke	174
6.2. Lucan Eschatology	177
6.3. Evaluation	186
7. Eschatological Jesus-Traditions in the Gospel of Thomas	186
7.1. The Text of the Gospel of Thomas	187
7.2. Socio-Religious and Historical Settings of the Gospel of Thomas	188
7.3. Eschatology in the Gospel of Thomas	189
7.4. Evaluation	193
8. The Gospel of John	194
8.1. Social and Historical Setting of John	195
8.2. Eschatology in John	197
9. Eschatology in the Pauline Letters	206
9.1. First Thessalonians	207
9.2. First Corinthians	213
9.3. Romans	217
10. Eschatology in the Acts of the Apostles	230
10.1. The Text of Acts and Its Missionary Perspective ...	230
10.2. Eschatology in Acts	231
11. Evaluation	242
11.1. First-Century Christian Communities and Eschatology	242
11.2. Intra-Jewish Dimensions to First-Century Christian Eschatological Ideas	244
11.3. Outlook on Subsequent Chapters	246
 Chapter Four. Resurrection of the Dead in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament	 247
1. Introduction	247
1.1. Reasons for Renewed Study	248
1.2. Problems of Delimitating the Subject of Resurrection	250
1.3. The Debate about Resurrection in Qumran Literature	252
2. Scriptural Foundations for the Belief in Life after Death	255
2.1. Hebrew Biblical Passages with Resurrection Language	255

2.2. Resurrection Language and Eschatologization in the Septuagint	257
2.3. Evaluation	264
3. Resurrection in Non-Sectarian Qumran Texts	265
3.1. Parabiblical Qumran Texts	266
3.2. 4Q521 (4QMessianic Apocalypse)	277
3.3. Poetical and Liturgical Texts	281
3.4. Evaluation	284
4. Resurrection in Sectarian Qumran Texts	285
4.1. The <i>Damascus Document</i>	285
4.2. The <i>Serekh ha-Yahad</i>	286
4.3. 1QRule of Benedictions	288
4.4. The <i>Hodayot</i>	288
4.5. <i>4QAgnes of Creation B</i> (4Q181)	291
4.6. Evaluation	291
5. Resurrection Beliefs in the Pre-70 CE Jesus-Movement	293
5.1. Resurrection Beliefs in the Milieu of the Historical Jesus	294
5.2. Jesus' Resurrection in the Kerygma of the Early Jesus-Movement	308
5.3. Resurrection of the Dead in Pauline Theology: 1 Corinthians 15	316
6. Post-70 CE New Testament Texts and Pre-70 CE Traditions on Resurrection	323
6.1. Matthew 27:51b–53	323
6.2. John 5:19–30	325
7. Summary and Evaluation	326
7.1. Qumran Evidence of Resurrection and Biblical Tradition	326
7.2. Qumran Evidence and Palestinian Jewish Tradition History	328
7.3. Longer Known Sectarian Qumran Literature and Qumran Cave 4 Evidence	330
7.4. Comparative Study of Qumran and New Testament	331
 Chapter Five. Apocalypticism in Qumran and the New Testament	 335
1. Introduction	335
1.1. Wisdom and Apocalypticism	339
1.2. Apocalypticism and Eschatology	340

1.3. Apocalypticism in the Early Jesus-Movement and Contemporary Palestinian Judaism	341
2. Early Jewish Apocalyptic Tradition and Scripture	342
2.1. 1 Enoch	342
2.2. Jubilees	350
2.3. Daniel and the Qumran Daniel Cycle	353
2.4. The Enochic Book of Parables (<i>1 Enoch</i> 37–71)	356
3. Qumran Apocalyptic Texts and Early Jewish Apocalypticism	357
3.1. Predestination and Periodization of History	357
3.2. Cosmic Dualism	362
3.3. Apocalypticism and Ideas of War	370
3.4. Visions of Final Judgement	374
3.5. Wisdom and Apocalypticism	380
4. The Beginnings of the Jesus-Movement and Apocalypticism	382
4.1. John's Baptism and the Beginnings of the Jesus-Movement	382
4.2. The Relation between John and Jesus	383
4.3. John's Baptism and the Apocalyptic Focus on Judgement	386
5. Jesus and Apocalypticism	391
5.1. Prophetic Inspiration and Apocalypticism	391
5.2. Signs and Their Interpretation	392
5.3. Apocalyptic Features in Jesus-Traditions about the Kingdom	393
5.4. Final Judgement	397
6. The Synoptic Gospels and Apocalypticism	400
6.1. The Marcan 'Eschatological Discourse'	400
6.2. Q 11:29–32 and Apocalypticism	404
7. Paul and Apocalypticism	410
8. Post-Pauline Letters	413
9. The Apocalypse of John	414
10. Evaluation	417
 Chapter Six. Messianism in Qumran and the New Testament	 423
1. Introduction	423
1.1. Problematic Presuppositions about Early Jewish Messianism	424

1.2. Early Jewish Messianism and Its Terminology	428
1.3. On the Selection of Texts for Discussion and Reasons for Renewed Study	431
2. Early Jewish Messianism and Biblical Tradition	434
3. Messianic Texts in Second Temple Jewish Literature	442
3.1. Second Temple Jewish Texts (non-Qumran)	442
3.2. Qumran Literature	445
4. Messianic Beliefs and Christology in Early Christianity ...	458
4.1. Paul's Christology and Messianic Backgrounds	459
4.2. Messianism and Mark	460
4.3. Messianism and Q	463
4.4. Messianism and Matthew	464
4.5. Messianism and Luke	465
4.6. Messianic Proclamation of Jesus' Gospel in Acts	468
4.7. Messianism and John	469
4.8. The Apocalypse	469
5. Evaluation	470
Bibliography	473
Index	511

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The composition of this work was made possible by participation in the FWO-project 'Qumran between the Old and New Testaments' coordinated by Prof. Dr Florentino García Martínez at the Faculty of Theology, Catholic University Leuven. My acknowledgements are due to him for consultations with his longstanding expertise on Qumran literature as well as for his organization of the fifth IOQS Meeting in Groningen (2004) and the Experts meeting on 'Qumran and the New Testament' at Leuven (2007) that have provided me important platforms for scholarly discussion on Qumran literature.

ABBREVIATIONS

AB	Anchor Bible
ABRL	Anchor Bible Reference Library
AGJU	Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums
AJEC	Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity
ALGHJ	Arbeiten zur Literatur und Geschichte des hellenistischen Judentums
AnBib	Analecta biblica
BAR	<i>Biblical Archaeology Review</i>
BASOR	<i>Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research</i>
BASP	<i>Bulletin of the American Society of Papyrologists</i>
BBB	Bonner biblische Beiträge
BBR	Bulletin for Biblical Research
BCNH	Bibliothèque copte de Nag Hammadi
BETL	Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium
BGBE	Beiträge zur Geschichte der biblischen Exegese
BHT	Beiträge zur historischen Theologie
<i>Bib</i>	<i>Biblica</i>
BibInt Series	Biblical Interpretation Series
BibOr	Biblica et orientalia
BiTS	Biblical Tools and Studies
BZNW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft
CBET	Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology
CBQ	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i>
CEJL	Commentaries on Early Jewish Literature
ConBNT	Coniectanea biblica neotestamentica
CQS	Companion to the Qumran Scrolls
CSHJ	Chicago Studies in the History of Judaism
DJD	Discoveries in the Judaean Desert
<i>DSD</i>	<i>Dead Sea Discoveries</i>
EBib	Etudes bibliques
EKKNT	Evangelisch-katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament
<i>ETL</i>	<i>Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses</i>
FB	Forschung zur Bibel
FOTL	Forms of the Old Testament Literature
FRLANT	Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments
GCS	Die griechische christliche Schriftsteller der ersten [drei] Jahrhunderte
HO	Handbuch der Orientalistik
HSM	Harvard Semitic Monographs
HTKNT	Herders theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament
<i>HTR</i>	<i>Harvard Theological Review</i>
HTS	Harvard Theological Studies
<i>HUCA</i>	<i>Hebrew Union College Annual</i>
IAA Reports	Reports of the Israel Antiquities Authority
ICC	International Critical Commentary
<i>IEJ</i>	<i>Israel Exploration Journal</i>
<i>Int</i>	<i>Interpretation</i>

<i>JBL</i>	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
<i>JJS</i>	<i>Journal of Jewish Studies</i>
<i>JQR</i>	<i>Jewish Quarterly Review</i>
<i>JSHJ</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the Historical Jesus</i>
<i>JSJ</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of Judaism</i>
<i>JSJSup</i>	Journal for the Study of Judaism: Supplement Series
<i>JSNT</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the New Testament</i>
<i>JSNTSup</i>	Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series
<i>JSOTSup</i>	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series
<i>JSP</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha</i>
<i>JSPSup</i>	Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha: Supplement Series
<i>JSS</i>	<i>Journal of Semitic Studies</i>
<i>JTS</i>	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>
KBANT	Kommentare und Beiträge zum Alten und Neuen Testament
LCL	Loeb Classical Library
MTSt	Marburger Theologische Studien
NHC	Nag Hammadi Codices
NHMS	Nag Hammadi and Manichean Studies
NHS	Nag Hammadi Studies
NICNT	New International Commentary on the New Testament
NIGTC	New International Greek Testament Commentary
<i>NovT</i>	<i>Novum Testamentum</i>
<i>NovTSup</i>	Supplements to Novum Testamentum
NTAbh	Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen
NTOA	Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus
NTTS	New Testament Tools and Studies
<i>NTS</i>	<i>New Testament Studies</i>
OBO	Orbis biblicus et orientalis
PFES	Publications of the Finnish Exegetical Society
PKNT	Papyrologische Kommentare zum Neuen Testament
PTSDSSP	Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project
<i>RB</i>	<i>Revue biblique</i>
<i>RevQ</i>	<i>Revue de Qumrân</i>
<i>RGG</i>	<i>Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart</i> . Edited by K. Galling. 7 vols. 3d ed., Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck, 1957–1965.
RSV	Revised Standard Version
SBLEJL	Society of Biblical Literature Early Judaism and Its Literature
SBLMS	Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series
<i>SBLSP</i>	<i>Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers</i>
SBLSymS	Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series
SBS	Stuttgarter Bibelstudien
SBT	Studies in Biblical Theology
SC	Sources chrétiennes
<i>ScrHier</i>	<i>Scripta hierosolymitana</i>
SHR	Studies in the History of Religions
SJLA	Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity
<i>SJOT</i>	<i>Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament</i>
SNTG	Studies in New Testament Greek
SNTSMS	Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series
<i>SPhilo</i>	<i>Studia philonica</i>
<i>ST</i>	<i>Studia theologica</i>
STAC	Studien und Texte zu Antike und Christentum / Studies and Texts in Antiquity and Christianity
STDJ	Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah

StPB	Studia post-biblica
SVTP	Studia in Veteris Testamenti pseudepigraphica
SUNT	Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments
TBN	Themes in Biblical Narrative
TS	<i>Theological Studies</i>
TSAJ	Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum
<i>TynBul</i>	<i>Tyndale Bulletin</i>
UTB	Uni-Taschenbücher
VC	<i>Vigiliae christianae</i>
VT	<i>Vetus Testamentum</i>
VTSup	Supplements to Vetus Testamentum
WBC	Word Biblical Commentary
WMANT	Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
ZAW	<i>Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>
ZNW	<i>Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche</i>

CHAPTER ONE

TOWARD COMPARATIVE STUDY OF ESCHATOLOGICAL IDEAS IN QUMRAN AND IN EMERGING CHRISTIANITY

This introductory chapter is devoted to a number of problematic issues concerning the comparative study of eschatological ideas in Qumran, late Second Temple period Palestinian Judaism and emerging Christianity. These issues need to be addressed, before a traditio-historical study of eschatological, apocalyptic, and messianic in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament can be undertaken. First, this introductory chapter discusses the definition of eschatology and problems of comparing Qumran eschatology with other sources about eschatology in Second Temple Judaism (section 1). Second, on the part of New Testament scholarship, discussion of previous debate about Jesus and eschatology will introduce the other side of the traditio-historical comparison (section 2). The subsequent chapters two and three will specifically turn to eschatology in Qumran sectarian and non-sectarian texts in comparison with other corpora of early Jewish texts and to eschatology in the literature of emerging Christianity respectively, thereby integrating eschatological ideas in Qumran and the New Testament into our picture of Palestinian Judaism and the Palestinian Jesus-movement of the late Second Temple period.

The present survey of introductory issues aims to provide groundwork for subsequent chapters on eschatology in the Qumran evidence as compared to other early Jewish literature (chapter 2) and in the New Testament (chapter 3), eschatological resurrection (chapter 4), apocalypticism (chapter 5), and messianism (chapter 6). Chapters two and three first survey eschatology in the Qumran and New Testament corpora of texts *per se*. The subsequent chapters four, five and six engage in traditio-historical comparison, turning from broader strands of tradition (expectations of the end, belief in resurrection) to currents of thought (apocalypticism, messianism) whose comparison is bound up with questions about the relation between genre (apocalypse, Synoptic 'apocalyptic/eschatological discourse') and tradition (apocalyptic ideas, motifs), and with a focus on individual eschatological protagonists (messianic expectations).

1. DEFINITION OF ESCHATOLOGY AND PROBLEMS OF COMPARATIVE STUDY

The literature of Qumran exhibits a multifaceted eschatology that raises questions about its interpretive relation to the biblical text as well as about its historical relation to the Umwelt of late Second Temple Judaism. Before we can turn to these questions which seek to situate Qumran eschatology in its historical and literary context, we should determine what we understand by the term ‘eschatology’. Writing in a quite different domain, that of ancient Greek eschatology, L. Albinus keenly observed that eschatology is an “observer’s category from the perspective of phenomenology of religion”.¹ Coined in nineteenth-century systematic theology,² the term eschatology derives etymologically from the Greek τὸ ἔσχατον, ‘the end’. The expression ἐπ’ ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν, ‘at the end of days’ is one of several Greek designations for the endtime in Septuagintal, Jewish post-biblical and New Testament Greek and presupposes a linear concept of time. The contrast between linear and cyclical concepts of time is much referred to in order to emphasise the disjunction between the Judaeo-Christian traditions and Graeco-Roman cosmology respectively.³

Apart from eschatology as beliefs about the endtime, the afterlife is also considered a part of eschatology. In this respect, a distinction is made between individual, national, and cosmic eschatology.⁴ This terminological distinction may be useful as long as the individual and the collective dimensions are not artificially contrasted.⁵ There are strong indications in early Jewish and Christian traditions that the ultimate point of belief in the individual afterlife, bodily resurrection, is set in the

¹ Albinus, *The House of Hades*, 9.

² Aune, “Eschatology (Early Christian),” 594–609 at 594.

³ E.g. Aune, “Eschatology (Early Christian),” 598–599, mentioning Platonic, Aristotelian and Stoic cosmology in terms of “a periodic conflagration (*ekpyrosis*) and reconstitution (*palingenesis*) of the cosmos”; Reale, *A History of Ancient Philosophy. III*, 256–257; Collins, “The Expectation of the End in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 74–90 at 74: “The spread of this concept of history in the West [i.e. ‘that history is linear and proceeds towards a foreseeable end, or eschaton’] was undoubtedly due to Jewish and Christian tradition”.

⁴ See e.g. Fischer, *Eschatologie und Jenseitserwartung im hellenistischen Diasporajudentum*, 3; Grabbe, “Eschatology in Philo and Josephus,” 163–185.

⁵ *Contra* Petersen, “Eschatology (OT),” 575–579 at 576, who writes that “this discussion [i.e. about the individual’s afterlife] *sensu stricto* is not coterminous with eschatology, which is often innately communal and cosmic in reference”.

endtime and related to God's judgment of humankind at large (cf. e.g. Dan 12:1–3; 1 Enoch 22:9–13, 90:9–10; Luke 14:14, 20:35; John 11:24; Acts 24:15; *m.Sot.* 9.15, *m.Sanh.* 10.1). Eschatology may thus be defined as beliefs about the fate of humanity beyond death in the final age.

Scholarship of the early twentieth century saw the publication of great syntheses about ancient Jewish eschatology.⁶ Since the Dead Sea discoveries and because of the expanded knowledge about other early Jewish texts and traditions⁷ as well as the growing awareness of the diversity in Second Temple Judaism, if not a plurality of 'Judaisms',⁸ scholarship has increasingly focused on separate fields. Separate studies have been published on the eschatology of Hellenistic Diaspora Judaism by Ulrich Fischer (1978),⁹ and on aspects of Palestinian Jewish eschatology by Günter Stemmerger (1972) and by Christoph Münchow (1981).¹⁰ Case-studies of separate texts were also published, about *Jubilees* by Gene L. Davenport (1971),¹¹ about the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* by Anders Hultgård (1977–1982), and about *4 Ezra* by Michael E. Stone (1989).¹² Hultgård considered this composition to be of Palestinian Jewish provenance from the first half of the first century BCE,¹³ but its character and provenance have been subject of continuous debate.¹⁴ Qumran eschatology has also received much separate attention.¹⁵ The newly published texts from Qumran cave 4, such as 4QMMT, 4QTime

⁶ See Charles, *Eschatology*; Volz, *Die Eschatologie der jüdischen Gemeinde im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter*.

⁷ E.g. Horbury, "Preface," *CHJ III*, xii refers to the fact that "the constantly increasing body of newly-found inscribed and written documents and archaeological material requires constant re-assessment, especially as regards its relation to existing literary sources for ancient Judaism".

⁸ See Neusner, Green and Frerichs (eds.), *Judaisms and Their Messiahs at the Turn of the Christian Era*.

⁹ Fischer, *Eschatologie und Jenseitserwartung*.

¹⁰ E.g. Stemmerger, *Der Leib der Auferstehung*; Münchow, *Ethik und Eschatologie*.

¹¹ Davenport, *The Eschatology of the Book of Jubilees*.

¹² Stone, *Features of Eschatology of IV Ezra*; cf. Willett, *Eschatology in the theodicies of 2 Baruch and 4 Ezra*.

¹³ Hultgård, *L'eschatologie des Testaments des Douze Patriarches*. 1, 12.

¹⁴ See e.g. Kee, "Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs," *OTP I*, 775–828 at 778, who refers to proponents of an 'Aramaic origin' and of a 'Christian origin' respectively. Most recently, M. de Jonge, *Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament as Part of Christian Literature*, 71–177 has argued the 'present Testaments' should be read as a Christian writing rather than as a Jewish text with some Christian interpolations.

¹⁵ See e.g. Kuhn, *Enderwartung und gegenwärtiges Heil*; Steudel, "אחרית הימים in the Texts from Qumran," 225–246; Davies, "Eschatology at Qumran. An 'Apocalyptic' Community?," 61–78; Evans and Flint (eds.), *Eschatology, Messianism, and the Dead Sea Scrolls*; Knibb, "Eschatology and Messianism in the Dead Sea Scrolls," 379–402.

of *Righteousness*, and *4QSecond Ezekiel*, have further supplemented our knowledge of eschatological traditions in the Dead Sea Scrolls.¹⁶

Notable exceptions to the specialism in the field of early Jewish eschatology are the comprehensive studies by G.W.E. Nickelsburg (1972)¹⁷ and by É. Puech (1993).¹⁸ These two comparative studies focus on immortality, resurrection and eternal life in both Hellenistic Diaspora Jewish and Palestinian Jewish texts. With regard to the evidence of the Qumran texts available by the early 1970s, the study by Nickelsburg focused on the *Hodayot* and the *Rule of the Community*. Puech's study argued that there is a connection between Hippolytus' account of the Essene belief in the resurrection and a cross-section of sectarian Qumran texts, with particular attention to 4Q521 2 ii and 7.¹⁹ This argument has been contested by John J. Collins,²⁰ Michael A. Knibb,²¹ and Philip R. Davies.²²

The comparison of eschatologies in different texts and apparently disparate traditions is not without problems. There is a problem at the level of presuppositions in the comparative study of eschatological texts and traditions. Stemberger suggested that, even though a hermetic distinction between Judaism and Hellenism was no longer tenable, it is necessary to distinguish between biblical/Jewish anthropology on the one hand and Hellenistic ideas and modern modes of thought on the other.²³ Philip R. Davies has even noted the possibility of a "varying

¹⁶ See e.g. Kister and Qimron, "Observations on 4QSecond Ezekiel," 595–602; the articles by T. Elgvin, É. Puech, J.J. Collins, and D.J. Harrington in García Martínez (ed.), *Wisdom and Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Biblical Tradition*, 89–102, 133–170, 287–305, and 343–355, who discuss eschatology in *4QTime of Righteousness*, *1–4QInstruction*, and *4QSecond Ezekiel*.

¹⁷ Nickelsburg, *Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism*.

¹⁸ Puech, *La croyance des Esséniens en la vie future*.

¹⁹ Puech, *La croyance des Esséniens en la vie future*. 2, 780 considers this text to be "l'un des plus anciens témoins irréfutables de la foi en la résurrection dans un texte probablement essénien".

²⁰ Collins, "Review: É. Puech, *La croyance des Esséniens en la vie future*," 246–252. Cf. Idem, "The Expectation of the End in the Dead Sea Scrolls," 88, having questioned the sectarian provenance of *Messianic Apocalypse* (4Q521) and *Pseudo-Ezekiel* (4Q385), concludes that "the evidence suggests that resurrection was only a minority belief at Qumran and was not typical of the eschatology of the sect".

²¹ Knibb, "Eschatology and Messianism in the Dead Sea Scrolls," 379–402 at 384.

²² Davies, "Death, Resurrection, and Life after Death in the Qumran Scrolls," 189–211 at 208 observes that "the [Qumran] texts themselves are suggestive [of a belief in resurrection], but less conclusive than Puech pretends", concluding that the "question must be left open" (209).

²³ Stemberger, *Der Leib der Auferstehung*, 1–2.

anthropology” within the Scrolls.²⁴ Recently, Nickelsburg has argued that the presence of ‘compatible or conflicting eschatologies’ is a far less adequate, if not inadequate, criterion for the identification of the provenance of newly published Qumran texts from cave 4 than for instance the “presence of common or diverse halakot”.²⁵

At the level of the nature of eschatology, various distinctions have been proposed by scholars, such as that between prophetic and apocalyptic eschatology²⁶ or between realised (or ‘inaugurated’) eschatology and future eschatology. It has been pointed out that the heterogeneous Qumran evidence for eschatological traditions resists a synthesis or generalization.²⁷

In spite of problems with the comparative study of eschatology, advances have been made in previous scholarship which has situated the eschatological traditions of the Qumran community in a broader Palestinian Jewish milieu, with reference to the apocalyptic heritage of the Enochic literature, *Jubilees* and Daniel.²⁸ Yet the notion of the Qumran community as a “tightly knit and isolated ‘apocalyptic community’” has been criticised by P.R. Davies, who argued that the use of this label carries the danger of pre-empting critical study of the evolution of eschatological ideas among the Qumran community.²⁹ Apart from apocalyptic literature, other texts, such as *Aramaic Levi*,

²⁴ Davies, “Death, Resurrection, and Life after Death,” 207.

²⁵ Nickelsburg, “Religious Exclusivism. A World View Governing Some Texts Found at Qumran,” 45–67 at 65 n. 41 substantiates his view as follows: “Attempts to distinguish texts and parts of texts on the basis of ‘conflicting’ eschatologies have often been governed by anachronistic western rationalistic presuppositions”.

²⁶ Davenport, *The Eschatology of the Book of Jubilees*, 6 and n. 2 with bibliography.

²⁷ Collins, “The Expectation of the End in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 86; Knibb, “Eschatology and Messianism,” 382.

²⁸ See Xeravits, *King, Priest, Prophet*, 5 and nn. 14–15, referring to VanderKam, “Enoch Traditions in Jubilees and Other Second-Century Sources,” 229–252; Nickelsburg, “1 Enoch and Qumran Origins,” 341–360; Collins, “Was the Dead Sea Sect an Apocalyptic Movement?,” 25–51; Idem, “Apocalypticism and Literary Genre in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 403–430; Boccaccini, *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis*. Cf. VanderKam, “Authoritative Literature in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 382–402 at 401: “It is widely agreed that 1 Enoch, Jubilees, and the Qumran scrolls represent a single stream of tradition in second-temple Judaism, with 1 Enoch and Jubilees preceding the specifically Qumran texts in date”.

²⁹ Davies, “Eschatology at Qumran. An ‘Apocalyptic’ Community?,” 61–78 at 62 and 78, mainly in reaction to an article by Collins, “Patterns of Eschatology at Qumran,” 351–375.

have also been drawn into the search for the milieu of the origin of the Qumran community.³⁰

Opportunities for further critical work on Qumran eschatology in its historical context may be sought in the following directions. Recent work on the development of sectarian Qumran texts, like the *Community Rule*, the *Damascus Document* and the *War Scroll* may provide a vantage point for also tracing developments in sectarian beliefs about the end of days (see chapter two).

Further, in the case of Qumran texts, Annette Steudel has noted that the expression אַחֲרֵי־הַיָּמִים “always appears in the context of Scripture interpretation”.³¹ Even though there are also other components to eschatological consciousness, such as contemporary experience and revelation,³² the Qumran community apparently took Scripture as the point of departure for its perceptions about the end of days.³³ In view of the question how Qumran eschatology may be integrated in late Second Temple Judaism, it is important to compare the interpretation of Scripture in different eschatological texts and traditions. Comparative study may be based on the detection of possible common strands, like shared scriptural passages or shared eschatological interpretations of Scripture which recur in different texts, and the explanation of the significance of differences between eschatologically oriented texts.

Introductory issues in comparative study of eschatological ideas in the Dead Sea Scrolls and other Second Temple Jewish literature concern one side of the traditio-historical comparison of eschatological ideas in Qumran and emerging Christianity. The other side of the traditio-historical comparison, the evidence of emerging Christianity also calls for introductory consideration in view of previous scholarly debate about Jesus and eschatology. It is to this subject that my survey of introductory issues now turns.

³⁰ Stone, “Enoch, Aramaic Levi and Sectarian Origins,” 247–258.

³¹ Steudel, “אַחֲרֵי־הַיָּמִים in the Texts from Qumran,” 225–246 at 227 n. 16, calling 1QSa I, 1 the only exception to this rule.

³² Cf. Nickelsburg, *Ancient Judaism and Christian Origins. Diversity, Continuity*, 119–146 (“Eschatology”) at 132–133 on the distinction between eschatology and apocalypticism.

³³ On the interrelation between the interpretation of Scripture and revelatory experience, see Lange, “Interpretation als Offenbarung,” 17–33.

2. JESUS, EMERGING CHRISTIANITY AND ESCHATOLOGY

2.1. *The Debate about Jesus and Eschatology*

The historical question of whether and in which way the message of the earthly Jesus was eschatologically oriented has thoroughly divided New Testament scholarship.³⁴ In the course of scholarship on the ‘historical Jesus’, different roles have been assigned to eschatology in Jesus’ message and in the subsequent development of Jesus-traditions.

In scholarship of the beginning of the twentieth century, the influential notion established itself that Jesus’ proclamation of the kingdom of God was fundamentally eschatological.³⁵ Because of the scholarly idea that the historical Jesus had in mind that the final age would come in his own time and generation, the hermeneutical problem of interpreting Jesus’ message arose with a view to subsequent early Christian generations (delay of the Parousia)³⁶ and to the modern age (existential level).³⁷ Subsequent scholarship discussed the ‘eschatological tension’ in the New Testament, distinguishing ‘realized’³⁸ or ‘inaugurated eschatology’ from ‘futurist eschatology’, while exploring the question whether and how the two types of eschatology were related. W.G. Kümmel, for instance, observed that the coexistence of the Kingdom as a present reality and as an imminent future in the sayings of Jesus is not an ‘historical accident’, but it voices the idea that Jesus’ earthly presence inaugurated the final age. Kümmel dissociated Jesus’ prophetic message from ancient Jewish apocalypticism, the latter supposedly being determined by an interest

³⁴ Aune, “Eschatology (Early Christian),” 594–609 at 599–600 distinguishes four scholarly models dealing with the eschatological evidence: the ‘consistent eschatology model’ (J. Weiß, A. Schweitzer, F.C. Burkitt, B.F. Easton, M. Dibelius, R. Bultmann, R.H. Hiers), the ‘realised eschatology model’ (C.H. Dodd), the ‘proleptic eschatology model’ (J. Jeremias, O. Cullmann, W.G. Kümmel, N. Perrin, G. Lundström, G.E. Ladd), and ‘models de-emphasizing eschatology’ (T.F. Glasson, M.J. Borg, B. Mack).

³⁵ Its foundation was laid by Weiss, *Die Predigt Jesu vom Reiche Gottes*, and Schweitzer, *Geschichte der Leben-Jesu-Forschung*.

³⁶ The Parousia concerns the expectation of the second coming of Christ which brings on the final age. See e.g. A. Strobel, *Untersuchungen zum eschatologischen Verzögerungsproblem*; Grässer, *Das Problem der Parusieverzögerung in den Synoptischen Evangelien und in der Apostelgeschichte*; Smalley, “The Delay of the Parousia,” 41–54.

³⁷ See e.g. R. Bultmann’s view of Jesus’ eschatology as a “valid interpretation of the ‘understanding of life’”, as discussed in Perrin, “Eschatology and Hermeneutics,” 3–14.

³⁸ The term was coined by Dodd, *The Parables of the Kingdom*.

in date and premonitory signs about the final age.³⁹ O.D. Vena recently observed that “the early Christians resorted to apocalyptic language to express the two eschatological perspectives that existed in the early communities: realized and futuristic”.⁴⁰

The questions and exegetical problems left by earlier scholarship led to criticism of previous scholarly paradigms of eschatology since the 1970s. J. Carmignac pointed to the danger of uncritically imposing the scholarly category ‘eschatology’ on the New Testament writings,⁴¹ and objected against previous scholarly equations between the Kingdom of God in the New Testament and eschatology.⁴² Notwithstanding his criticism of previous scholarly ‘eschatologism’, Carmignac did not deny eschatology a place in his theology about Jesus.⁴³

The paradigm of an ‘eschatological Jesus’ became the object of fundamental reconsideration in the 1980s and 1990s. In an article of 1986, M.J. Borg made a ‘temperate case for a non-eschatological Jesus’ on the basis of critical signs that the consensus about an eschatological Jesus “is weakening or dying the death of a thousand qualifications”.⁴⁴ Since the 1990s, other scholars, such as J.D. Crossan,⁴⁵ B. Mack,⁴⁶ and J.M. Robinson,⁴⁷ have advocated a radical paradigm shift, turning from an ‘eschatological Jesus’ to the plea for a non-eschatological, aphoristic Jesus. This scholarly position appears to presuppose an idea of eschatology as a world view unconcerned with a continuing social and historical order, so that scholarship about the eschatological Jesus of necessity obscures the question about Jesus’ relationship to culture.⁴⁸

³⁹ Kümmel, *Promise and Fulfilment*, 141–55.

⁴⁰ Vena, *The Parousia and Its Rereadings*, 266.

⁴¹ Carmignac, “Les dangers de l’Eschatologie,” 365–90.

⁴² Carmignac, *Le Mirage de l’Eschatologie*, 133–201 critiques traditional eschatological interpretations of the Kingdom, characterised as ‘Eschatologie Conséquente’ and ‘Eschatologie Réalisée’.

⁴³ Carmignac, *Le Mirage de l’Eschatologie*, 201, after having noted that Jesus with the members of his Church embodies the Kingdom of God, observes: “Le refus de l’eschatologisme ne perturbe nullement la théologie (...) il [le Royaume de Dieu] grandit depuis lors et renferme non seulement des ‘justes’, mais aussi des ‘pêcheurs’; il englobera la Parousie, la Résurrection Générale, le Jugement Dernier, l’Offrande au Père; il s’épanouira dans la Vie Eternelle”.

⁴⁴ Borg, “A Temperate Case for a Non-Eschatological Jesus,” 47–68 at 59.

⁴⁵ Crossan, *The Historical Jesus*.

⁴⁶ Mack, *The Lost Gospel*.

⁴⁷ Robinson, “The Critical Edition of Q and the Study of Jesus,” 27–52.

⁴⁸ See Borg, “A Temperate Case for a Non-Eschatological Jesus,” 61: “we have tended to assume that, because Jesus proclaimed the end of the world, he was therefore not

Yet it remains to be seen whether the disjunction between eschatology and cultural concerns can be justified as a foregone conclusion.

Less far-reaching scholarly reconsideration has rejected the relation between Jesus and apocalyptic eschatology, rather than denying eschatology at large a place in the debate about the historical Jesus. In his article ‘The End of Apocalypse: Rethinking the Eschatological Jesus’ of 1995, S.J. Patterson rejected the picture of Jesus as an apocalyptic preacher,⁴⁹ as it was proposed by J. Weiss and A. Schweizer. Patterson replaced the scholarly notions of future eschatology and present, realized eschatology with the idea of the Kingdom of God, and indirectly of eschatology, as a ‘potential’ dimension, depending on “one’s decision to live out of its reality (that of the Kingdom of God) in an act of faithfulness”.⁵⁰

The ‘old consensus’ has also received recent defence. D.C. Allison, Jr., has argued in favour of the historical picture which envisages an apocalyptic Jesus with a thoroughgoing eschatology.⁵¹ Taking Jesus’ resurrection from the dead as a starting point, Allison states that “to proclaim a man’s vindication by τὴν ἀνάστασιν τὴν ἐκ νεκρῶν (Acts 4:2) was to proclaim the occurrence of an eschatological event, to claim that in one individual God had already accomplished the resurrection process expected at the end of time”.⁵² To this Allison adds other arguments dealing with Jesus-traditions in the Synoptic Gospels and *Thomas*. J.S. Kloppenborg has argued against Allison’s interpretation that none of the sayings which articulate apocalyptic eschatology “is likely to be authentic”.⁵³ In an encyclopedia article of 1998, Allison has reasserted the view that apocalyptic eschatology was part of Jesus’ message.⁵⁴

The matter has not been settled, as the recent methodical and exegetical reflections by J. Schröter may attest. While Schröter points out that it is a matter of scholarly discussion whether Jesus’ message was

interested in questions pertaining to a continuing social and historical order. But if we see Jesus non-eschatologically, then those questions return as significant questions”.

⁴⁹ Patterson, “The End of Apocalypse,” 29–48 at 47 presupposes that apocalypticism has the following connotation: “(a view of the future), in which God would intervene with violence to overthrow our enemies”.

⁵⁰ Patterson, “The End of Apocalypse,” 47–8 at 48.

⁵¹ Allison, Jr., “A Plea for Thoroughgoing Eschatology,” 651–68.

⁵² Allison, “A Plea for Thoroughgoing Eschatology,” 653.

⁵³ Kloppenborg, “The Sayings Gospel Q and the Quest of the Historical Jesus,” 307–44 at 340 n. 131 on Mark 9:1, 13:30 and Matt 10:23 as “the most obvious instances of an articulate *Naherwartung*”.

⁵⁴ Allison, “The Eschatology of Jesus,” 267–302.

eschatologically oriented, in view of the secondary character of some or all Son of Man traditions, he concludes that a radical excision of eschatological and apocalyptic perspectives does not do justice to the evidence of Mark and Q about Jesus.⁵⁵

It will be instructive to turn from the scholarly positions in the debate about Jesus and eschatology to interpretive problems underlying this debate. The interpretive problems may be subdivided into three categories: problems of identification, of understanding the temporal dimension(s), and of historical interpretation.

2.2. *Interpretive Problems*

2.2.1. *The Identification of Eschatological Passages*

The identification of eschatological evidence in the New Testament is not in every case self-evident. We already came across the example of the Jesus-traditions about the Kingdom, whose eschatological interpretation was criticised by Carmignac. Another example of divergent interpretations concerns Mark 13:3–31. Traditionally, Mark 13 has been understood as an ‘eschatological discourse’ and Mark 13:24–27 has been read as a passage about the second coming of Jesus Christ in the final age.⁵⁶ The eschatological understanding of Mark 13, while constituting the most influential scholarly position, is not shared by all scholars. R.T. France challenged the eschatological reading of Mark 13:3–31 as *eisegesis*, while N.T. Wright denied eschatology a place in Mark 13:3–37.⁵⁷ In his recent commentary, R.T. France emphasised that Mark 13 “is concerned more to damp down premature eschatological excitement than to encourage it”. France rather reads Mark 13:3–31 as a theological perspective on “imminent and far-reaching political change” in light of the destruction of the Temple, even though he concedes that Mark 13:32–37 does speak about the subject of the Parousia.⁵⁸ Other commentaries and studies by, among others, J. Marcus, C.A. Evans,

⁵⁵ J. Schröter, “Markus, Q und der historische Jesus,” 173–200 at 175–6 and 199.

⁵⁶ See e.g. Beasley-Murray, *Jesus and the Last Days*, 358–76, 422–34; Wenham, *The Rediscovery of Jesus’ Eschatological Discourse*, 14, 304–26.

⁵⁷ France, *Jesus and the Old Testament*, 139–48; Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God*, 339–66. Cf. Evans, *Mark 8:27–16:20*, 327–8 who refers to the argument of Hatina, “The Focus of Mark 13:24–27,” 43–66 that the cosmic language in Mark 13:24–27 parallels prophetic visions of the destruction of doomed cities.

⁵⁸ France, *The Gospel of Mark*, 497–503, quotations from 498–9 and 500.

E. Adams, and M.E. Boring continue to uphold the traditional eschatological interpretation.⁵⁹ At any rate, it remains an issue of further discussion how Mark sought to accommodate eschatological perspectives to the theological purpose of his Gospel.⁶⁰

Apart from the canonical New Testament writings, extra-canonical texts also contain evidence whose supposed eschatological content is the subject of debate. This is the case with the *Gospel of Thomas*, part of the Coptic Gnostic library of Nag Hammadi discovered in Egypt in 1945, which plays a serious role in historical Jesus research.⁶¹ Against previous scholarship which identified a perspective of 'realised eschatology' in *Thomas*, T. Zöckler recently argued that the sayings of Jesus in *Thomas* reflect a timeless dimension.⁶² Yet, as I have argued elsewhere, several logia in *Thomas* speak against a timeless dimension and give indications about events associated with the final age.⁶³ The question is rather how expectations of the end on the part of the disciples (e.g. *G.Th.* 3, 18, 37, 51, 113) interact with words of Jesus in *Thomas* and which theological message underlies these logia.

2.2.2. *Eschatology and the Relation between the Tempora*

The nature of eschatology in the New Testament has been recognised as a problematic issue in previous scholarship. An 'eschatological tension' is observed between the present and future fulfilment of conditions

⁵⁹ Marcus, *Mark 1-8*, 71-2 designates Mark's outlook as 'apocalyptic eschatology' (including Mark 13:24-27); Evans, *Mark 8:27-16:20*, 324-30 at 329 cites Beasley-Murray's work in support of an eschatological interpretation of Mark 13:24-27; Adams, "The Coming of the Son of Man in Mark's Gospel," 39-61 brings the 'traditional parousia reading' into discussion against R.T. France and N.T. Wright, defending the Parousia reading on the basis of a reinterpretation of Mark 8:38, 13:24-27, and 14:62; Boring, *Mark*, 355 n. 43 considers the historical, non-eschatological interpretation of (parts of) Mark 13 by N.T. Wright and R.T. France to be a 'minority' position.

⁶⁰ See Telford, *The Theology of the Gospel of Mark*, 28 who discerns three theories about Mark's theological purpose (parenetic, kerygmatic, christological) and observes that, as compared to Q, "the Markan tendency is to de-eschatologize the life and message of Jesus" (172), thereby in n. 34 referring to a study by Luz, "Das Jesusbild der vormarkinischen Tradition," 347-74.

⁶¹ See e.g. F.T. Fallon and R. Cameron, "The Gospel of Thomas," 4196-4251 at 4237; Aune, "Assessing the Historical Value of the Apocryphal Jesus Traditions," 243-72; Klauck, *Apocryphal Gospels*, 107-22 at 121.

⁶² Zöckler, *Jesu Lehren im Thomasevangelium*, 178-80.

⁶³ Hogeterp, "The Gospel of Thomas and the Historical Jesus," 381-96.

concerning the final age, with regard to the Synoptic Gospels,⁶⁴ John,⁶⁵ and the Pauline and Deutero-Pauline Letters.⁶⁶ It is erroneous to define eschatology as a study of the final age without taking the relation to other tempora into account. The literature of Qumran provides parallel evidence for the idea that the concept of the final age is embedded in a developing communal perspective of time. 1QpHab VII 7 and 10–14, for instance, relates revelations about the fact that the final age (הקץ) (האחרון) is extended and goes beyond what the prophets say. The relation between the different tempora therefore is an important issue of interpretation for a better understanding of eschatology.

Previous presuppositions that the delay of the Parousia underlies theological perspectives in the New Testament, Luke-Acts in particular, have become less self-evident. More recent scholarship has turned away from a one-sided focus on this theme. The observation by J. Schröter may be illustrative: “Nicht die ausbleibende Parusie, sondern die fraglich gewordene Zugehörigkeit der christlichen Kirche zum Gottesvolk sei es, die Lukas mit dem zweiten Teil seines Werkes bearbeiten wolle und für die er eine Lösung entwickle”.⁶⁷

2.2.3. *Historical Interpretation*

It is a primary historical question of how eschatological expectations in the New Testament are informative about the historical Jesus, his earliest followers and subsequent transformations of Jesus-tradition. This historical question has been explored with the aid of tradition-historical,⁶⁸ form-critical,⁶⁹ and redaction-critical⁷⁰ approaches.

⁶⁴ See e.g. Kümmel, *Promise and Fulfilment*, 141–55 (“The Meaning of Jesus’ Eschatological Message”). With regard to Luke in particular, see e.g. Ellis, “Eschatology in Luke,” 105–19, “Eschatology in Luke Revisited,” 120–8, and “Present and Future Eschatology in Luke,” 129–46 (cf. “Preface,” in Idem, *Christ and the Future*, xi–xii n. 2 for bibliographical references about the earlier publication of these collected articles).

⁶⁵ See Frey, *Die johanneische Eschatologie*. 2, 2–22 at 2, who refers to John 4:23 and 5:25 as examples of the parallel mention of future expectation and present fulfillment (‘Zukunftserwartung und Gegenwartsgewißheit’).

⁶⁶ See e.g. Dunn, *The Theology of Paul the Apostle*, 461–98 (“The Eschatological Tension”). On 1–2 Thess, see e.g. Koester, “From Paul’s Eschatology to the Apocalyptic schemata of 2 Thessalonians,” 441–58. On Colossians, see e.g. Still, “Eschatology in Colossians,” 125–38.

⁶⁷ Schröter, “Heil für die Heiden und Israel,” 285–308 at 286.

⁶⁸ See recently e.g. Holleman, *Resurrection and Parousia*; Lietaert-Peerbolte, *The Antecedents of Antichrist*; Vena, *The Parousia and Its Rereadings*.

⁶⁹ See e.g. Bartsch, “Early Christian Eschatology in the Synoptic Gospels,” 387–97.

⁷⁰ See Lambrecht, *Die Redaktion der Markus-Apokalypse*; Pesch, *Naherwartungen*; Zmijewski, *Die Eschatologiereden des Lukas-Evangeliums*; Burnett, *The Testament of*

The redaction-critical reconstruction of stages in the composition of the Sayings Source Q, shared by Luke and Matthew, has particularly influenced scholarly pictures of the historical Jesus in the past decades. The position of a non-eschatological, aphoristic Jesus is largely dependent on the distinction between a prophetic layer as the earliest stage of composition of Q and an apocalyptic layer as the product of secondary additions (J.D. Crossan, B. Mack, J.M. Robinson). Antecedents to this distinction may further play a part.⁷¹

It is recently recognised that criteria for the reconstruction of stages of Jesus-tradition in Q are problematic.⁷² This also becomes clear from the fact that different reconstructions have been proposed (D. Lührmann, J.S. Kloppenborg, M. Sato, D.C. Allison, Jr., H.T. Fleddermann).⁷³ D.C. Allison has rejected Kloppenborg's influential idea of an early sapiential recension of Q. Allison distinguishes three phases in the literary expansion of Q, rather according to developing needs for communal regulations and growing interests in Christology than from the *a priori* assumption of a dichotomy between wisdom and apocalypticism.⁷⁴ Further, M. Goff recently demonstrated through his comparison with *4QInstruction* that the boundaries between sapiential and apocalyptic strands of thought are not as clear-cut as was previously assumed.⁷⁵

Even if unanimity about the composition history of Q could be achieved,⁷⁶ the resulting picture of 'archaic collections of Q' does not

Jesus-Sophia; Agbanou, *Le discours eschatologique de Matthieu 24–25*; Brandenburger, *Markus 13 und die Apokalyptik*; I. Broer, "Redaktionsgeschichtliche Aspekte von Mt. 24:1–28," 209–33.

⁷¹ See Kümmel's position, as noted above. Robinson, "The Critical Edition of Q and the Study of Jesus," 39 n. 23 cites H. Conzelmann, "Jesus Christ," in *RGG* 3 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1959), 634, 637 to juxtapose ethics in "archaic collections" to a redactional perspective of eschatological judgement.

⁷² Theissen and Merz, *Der historische Jesus*, 44–5 are sceptical about the hypothetical reconstruction of any compositional stage beyond the 'final redaction' of Q; Conzelmann and Lindemann, *Arbeitsbuch*, 80–82 are cautious about the reconstruction of stages of Q based on Luke.

⁷³ Lührmann, *Die Redaktion der Logienquelle*; Kloppenborg, "Tradition and Redaction in the Synoptic Sayings Source," 34–62; Idem, *The Formation of Q*; Sato, *Q und Prophetie*; Allison, *The Jesus Tradition in Q*. See recently, Fleddermann, *Q: A Reconstruction and Commentary*.

⁷⁴ Allison, *The Jesus Tradition in Q*, 3–8 and 30–42.

⁷⁵ Goff, "Discerning Trajectories," 657–73 at 667–8, who concludes that "Q is in continuity with a stream of the wisdom tradition characterized by influence from the apocalyptic tradition" (673). See also Wright and Wills (eds.), *Conflicted Boundaries in Wisdom and Apocalypticism*.

⁷⁶ So Cameron, "The Sayings Gospel Q and the Quest of the Historical Jesus," 351–54, who speaks of a 'remarkable consensus' in Q scholarship about a two-stage composition

necessarily provide a compelling ground for the idea that Jesus' message should be detached from (apocalyptic) eschatology. C.M. Tuckett has emphasised that the literary-historical study of Q does not preclude the possibility that material added to Q in a later stage of secondary literary expansion could be related to the historical Jesus just as well as material in the earliest stratum of Q.⁷⁷

The discussion of how the composition history of Q could inform our understanding of Jesus-traditions should depend on rather than predetermine the broader debate about the historical Jesus. G. Theissen and D. Winter proposed that a historical picture of Jesus should stand the test of plausibility in relation to the contemporary Jewish context and to effects on early Christian thought.⁷⁸ Yet these are not completely objective criteria either, since C.M. Tuckett observed that arguments on the basis of dissimilarity, coherence, multiple attestation, Jesus in his Jewish context, and historical plausibility, partly depend on *a priori* assumptions about first-century Judaism and Christianity.⁷⁹

At any rate, a number of weak points may be detected in the scholarly argument which searches to detach the eschatological passages in the New Testament from the picture of the historical Jesus. First, the use of redaction criticism as a 'tool of excision' for apocalyptic-eschatological material is arbitrary, since it presupposes a radical disjunction between the message of Jesus and that of the carriers of Jesus-traditions. The validity of this presupposition should be demonstrated apart from the redaction-critical enterprise. A second problematic point concerns the dichotomy between sapiential and apocalyptic traditions. A third unproven assumption occurs in M.J. Borg's plea for a non-eschatological Jesus. Borg winds up favouring the idea that, in comparison to Mark and Matthew, Luke "actually represents an *earlier* non-eschatological understanding of Jesus", without proving this point. Only Borg's idea that eschatology was not the centre of belief for the early Jesus-movement, but rather "it was one of the things they believed",⁸⁰ merits

history: Q¹ as the formative stratum of instructional units; Q² as literary expansion with prophetic and polemical sayings directed against "this generation" (352).

⁷⁷ Tuckett, "Q and the Historical Jesus," 213–241, concludes that the study of Q and of the historical Jesus are two 'separate enterprises'.

⁷⁸ Theissen and Winter, *The Quest for the Plausible Jesus*.

⁷⁹ Tuckett, "Sources and methods," 121–37 at 132–37.

⁸⁰ Borg, "Jesus and Eschatology," 69–96, citations on pages 90 and 89; cf. 89: "My intention is not to argue this case, but simply to suggest what it would look like".

further discussion, as it concerns the question of the relative importance of eschatological expectations for the Jesus-movement.

In view of these shortcomings of the 'non-eschatological position', it may be justified to take as starting point a working hypothesis which takes seriously the relevance of eschatology for both the historical Jesus and the early Jesus-movement.

3. CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS AND PROSPECT

The study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Qumran Judaism has been revolutionised by the publication of texts from Qumran cave 4 since the 1990s. Subsequent scholarly reflections have made it clear that old hypotheses about an isolated Qumran community behind the scrolls are no longer tenable.⁸¹ The Essene hypothesis that identifies the Qumran community with (a branch of) the Essene movement has also become more problematic, although it may still be used as a working hypothesis. Archaeological as well as textual studies have argued in favour of the idea that Qumran was part of an intricate web of sectarian settlements.⁸² At the same time, the unique place of the Qumran settlement as a sectarian study centre where scribal activity took place is still recognised in recent scholarship.⁸³ It has been noted that the collection of Qumran

⁸¹ Cf. Campbell, "The Qumran Sectarian Writings," 798–821 at 801.

⁸² With regard to archaeology, see e.g. Bar-Adon, "Another Settlement of the Judaean Desert Sect," 1–25, Puech, "The Necropolises of Khirbet Qumrân and 'Ain el-Ghuweir," 21–36, and Broshi, "The Archaeology of Palestine 63 BCE–CE 70," 1–37 at 35 who advocated the idea that there was a sectarian Qumran-like settlement in Ein el-Ghuweir; Magness, *The Archaeology of Qumran*, 223 argues that "the archaeological remains do not provide evidence that Ein Feshka and Ein el-Ghuweir were sectarian settlements, although it is possible that they were". On the recent hypothesis that literary attestations of $\Gamma\Pi$ constitute an umbrella term for an organization with several settlements, see Collins, "Forms of Community in the Dead Sea Scrolls," 97–111.

⁸³ Tov, "The Scribes of the Texts found in the Judean Desert," 150–151 sums up five cases of "Qumran scribal practice": (1) the same scribe for 1QS, 1QSa, 1QSB, 4QSam^c, and several corrections in 1QIsa^a according to E. Ulrich (1979), as well as for 4Q175 according to J.M. Allegro (1968); (2) the same scribe for the final hand of 1QS and hand B of 1QpHab according to M. Martin (1958); (3) the same scribe for 11QT^b and 1QpHab according to J.P.M. van der Ploeg (1978, 1985–87); (4) the same scribe for 4QGen^f and 4QGen^s according to J. Davila (1994); and (5) the same scribe for 4QTQahat ar (4Q542) and 4QSam^c according to J. Strugnell (1991). See further Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judean Desert*, 272–3 for a recent survey of biblical and non-biblical, sectarian and non-sectarian Qumran texts identified with Qumran scribal practice, dated between the mid-second century BCE and 70 CE.

texts exhibits a lesser degree of Hellenisation, as the smaller percentage of Greek texts may indicate, than other Palestinian Jewish corpora of texts, such as those of Masada, Muraba'at, and Nahal Hever.⁸⁴ This corresponds with the perspective in sectarian Qumran texts that eschew contacts with Gentiles for purity reasons. Nevertheless, the evidence of Greek biblical manuscripts from Qumran caves 4 (4Q119–122) and 7 (7Q1–2), historical references in Qumran texts, and the occurrence of the term מאכריוס in 4Q553 1 4, a transliteration of the Greek word μακάριος possibly reflecting interest in the biblical literary form of beatitudes,⁸⁵ defy complete and overly strict compartmentalization.

The differentiation between sectarian and non-sectarian Qumran evidence is of great significance for the study of eschatological ideas. This differentiation provides a challenge for further traditio-historical classification of these ideas and their development within the Qumran community and outside of it. Qumran texts without clearly identifiable sectarian characteristics can be probed with regard to the question to which extent these texts at large represent broader strands of Palestinian Judaism and to which extent their present form reflects their incorporation into the Qumran library as 'adopted texts'. The overlap between the Pseudepigrapha and the Dead Sea Scrolls on the one hand, and between sectarian and non-sectarian texts within the Qumran collection on the other provides incentives for and directions to the project of integrating Qumran Judaism in the broader historical context of pre-70 CE Palestinian Judaism.

Palaeography provides an important means for dating Qumran texts.⁸⁶ The dates of Qumran texts and recensions of texts (as in the case of the *Community Rule*, the *Damascus Document*, and the *War Scroll*) may constitute a starting point for the order of the historical-critical discussion of texts in the next chapter. However, the reconstruction of the textual development of important sectarian texts is at times fraught with difficulties, depending on suppositions about the devel-

⁸⁴ Tov, "The Nature of the Greek Texts from the Judean Desert," 1–11 at 2.

⁸⁵ García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*. 2, 1104. For the singular μακάριος, cf. e.g. LXX Ps 1:1, 31:2, 32:12, 33:9, 39:5, 40:2, 64:5, 83:6.13, 88:16, 93:12, 11:1, 126:5, 127:2, 136:8–9, 143:15, 145:5; LXX Prov 3:13, 8:34, 28:14; LXX Job 5:17; LXX Isa 31:9, 56:2; Sir 14:1–2.20, 25:8–9, 28:19, 31:8, 50:28; LXX Dan 12:12.

⁸⁶ Cross, "The Development of the Jewish Scriptures," 133–202 introduced a model for palaeographical dating of the Scrolls that is widely adopted in scholarship; cf. B. Webster, "Chronological Index of the Texts from the Judaean Desert," *DJD* 39, 351–446 at 354.

opment of communal ideas and the chosen methodology. The case of the *Community Rule* is illustrative in this respect.⁸⁷ In cases of doubt, comparison with other sectarian texts could provide a way out of this hermeneutical circle.

Previous study of eschatology in the New Testament has produced divergent views ranging between the argument for a 'non-eschatological' picture of Jesus and the defense of thoroughgoing eschatology in the picture of the historical Jesus. While the relative importance of eschatology in early-Jesus tradition and subsequent developments in emerging Christianity merits re-evaluation, the basis for a non-eschatological picture in composition-historical analysis of the Sayings source Q is disputable. The challenge of reconsideration may consist in analysis of recent trends in the literary and historical study of Q as well as in re-interpretation of apocalyptic and eschatological materials in Q in comparison with a matrix of contemporary Jewish tradition, including the evidence of the Dead Sea Scrolls.

From the viewpoint of traditio-historical comparison, starting points in Scripture for later exegetical tradition are of particular interest. Therefore chapters two, three, four, five, and six begin with sections on scriptural starting points for eschatological, apocalyptic, and messianic ideas. The complete Qumran biblical evidence now available can be integrated into the discussion of literary history and transmission history of Scripture and be applied to the question of whether and how eschatological views and their exegetical elaboration can be traced back to Scripture.

Subsequent discussion in the following chapters will begin with eschatology in Qumran texts, putting these texts on a literary time-scale ranging from pre-Qumran texts, like *1 Enoch* and *Jubilees*, texts contemporary to the Qumran settlement, and later post-70 CE Jewish literature, such as *4 Ezra*, *2 Baruch*, and early rabbinic literature. Discussion in chapter three will turn to the New Testament evidence of eschatology and its respective communal settings, mainly the first century CE. Apart from the pre-70 CE evidence of the Pauline Letters, the starting point for analysis concerns later texts, in particular the

⁸⁷ Metso, *The Textual Development of the Qumran Community Rule*, takes 4QS^{b,d} and 4QS^e to be earlier versions than 1QS, whereas Alexander, "The Redaction History of Serekh ha-Yahad: A Proposal," 437–56 P.S. Alexander is not convinced that these manuscripts from cave 4, which are palaeographically dated later than 1QS, should contain the earlier recension.

Gospels and Acts, which are mostly dated between the last third and the turn of the first century CE. Subsequent chapters on resurrection, apocalypticism, and messianism also aim to trace back eschatological, apocalyptic, and messianic ideas to the milieu of the historical Jesus (chapters 4, 5, 6).

CHAPTER TWO

INTEGRATING QUMRAN ESCHATOLOGY INTO LATE SECOND TEMPLE JUDAISM

In order to integrate the understanding of Qumran eschatology into our picture of late Second Temple Judaism, this chapter subsequently discusses literary-historical and reception-historical connections of eschatology with Scripture (section 1), eschatology in non-sectarian and pre-sectarian Qumran texts (section 2), eschatology in sectarian Qumran texts (section 3), and comparative texts and traditions (section 4), before turning to evaluation and conclusions.

1. ESCHATOLOGY AND SCRIPTURE

The existence of eschatology *per se* in the Hebrew Scriptures is a disputed issue.¹ The Hebrew expression באחרית הימים, usually translated as ἐπ' ἐσχάτ(ου/ων) τῶν ἡμερῶν in the Septuagint, occurs in various biblical books.² D.L. Petersen discerned three main sources for 'Old Testament eschatology': patriarchal promise traditions, David-Zion tradition, and Sinai covenant traditions.³ Annette Steudel has observed that "a de-eschatologized understanding of אחרית הימים" in the Old Testament is "still predominant today".⁴ Nevertheless, אחרית הימים has eschatological connotations in many Qumran texts.

The evidence of biblical Qumran scrolls, dated between the mid-third century BCE and the early first century CE, has led to a crucial insight that the late Second Temple period was "characterised by textual plurality".⁵ The dividing lines between textual variety and exegetical

¹ Lindblom, "Gibt es eine Eschatologie bei den alttestamentlichen Propheten?," 79–114; Reventlow, "The Eschatologization of the Prophetic Books," 169–188; Becking, "Expectations about the End of Time in the Hebrew Bible," 44–59.

² MT Gen 49:1; Num 24:14; Deut 4:30, 31:29; Isa 2:2; Jer 23:20, 30:24, 48:47, 49:39; Ezek 38:16; Dan 2:28 (באחרית יומיא), 10:14; Hos 3:5; Mi 4:1.

³ Petersen, "Eschatology (OT)," 576–577.

⁴ Steudel, "אחרית הימים in the Texts from Qumran," 225–6.

⁵ Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 187–197 at 191. Cf. Ulrich, "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Biblical Text," 79–100 at 98, who proposes a "successive literary

creativity have become less self-evident,⁶ so that the following questions emerge. Do the biblical scrolls reflect strands of developing eschatological thought? What is the significance of common strands as well as differences between eschatological readings of Scripture in sectarian and non-sectarian Qumran texts? In what follows, I discuss aspects of transmission and reception of the biblical text that may be relevant for the subject of eschatology.

1.1. *The Transmission of the Biblical Text and Eschatology*

It has been pointed out by Eugene Ulrich that the Qumran biblical manuscripts do not contain evidence of the alteration of Scripture in the interest of sectarian ideology.⁷ He observes that theological variants which do occur in the Qumran biblical texts were “not sectarian but in line with general Jewish views or impulses”.⁸ Ulrich shows that there is a complicated burden of proof for establishing a variant reading as a ‘sectarian’ variant.⁹

In addition to the major evidence of Hebrew,¹⁰ Aramaic,¹¹ and Greek¹² biblical texts from Qumran, other sites of the Judaeen desert have further yielded witnesses to the text of biblical books and biblical apocrypha. Biblical texts and fragments of texts have been found at Wadi Murabba‘at (Genesis, Exodus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Isaiah, and the Minor Prophets; dated between 42–43 and 132–135 CE);¹³ at

editions” theory, which “does not judge ancient evidence from the Second Temple period by the standard of the later MT”.

⁶ Cf. Lim, *Holy Scripture in the Qumran Commentaries and Pauline Letters*, 19–27.

⁷ Ulrich, “The Absence of ‘Sectarian Variants,’” 179–95.

⁸ Ulrich, “The Absence of ‘Sectarian Variants,’” 191.

⁹ *Ibidem*, 192 lists four criteria: secondariness, intentionality, group- or sect-specificity, and repetition. Cf. Josephus, *Ag.Ap.* 42 and Matt 5:18 on the authoritative, unalterable status of Scripture, the Law in particular.

¹⁰ Tov, *The Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 103–5 at 103 refers to “fragments of more than 200 biblical scrolls” found in the 11 Qumran caves between 1947 and 1956.

¹¹ 4QPr-Esther^{a-c} ar (4Q550, 550^{a-c}); the Aramaic sections in 4QEzra (4Q117); the apocryphal Tobit in Aramaic (4Q196–199 = 4QpapTob^a ar, 4QTobit^{b-d} ar). Cf. e.g. the Aramaic ‘para-biblical’ texts, like 4Q243–245 (4QpsDan^{a-c} ar), and the targums from Qumran 4Q156 (4QtgLev), 4Q157 (4QtgJob), and 11Q10 (11QtgJob).

¹² 4Q119 (4QLXXLev^a), 4Q120 (4QpapLXXLev^b), 4Q121 (4QLXXNum), 4Q122 (4QLXXDeut), 7Q1 (7QLXXExod); cf. 7Q2 (7QLXXEpher).

¹³ Mur 1 frags. 1–7, Mur 2, Mur 3, and Mur 88, published by Benoit, Milik, and De Vaux, *DJD* 2 (1961), plates XIX–XXII, LVI–LXXII. Cf. the fragment of Genesis 33:18–34:3 from Murabba‘at published by É. Puech in *RevQ* 10 (1979–81) 163–166.

Masada (Genesis, Leviticus, Deuteronomy, Ezekiel, Psalms, and Sirach (Mas1, 1a–f, h); dated before 73 CE);¹⁴ at Nahal Hever (Numbers, Deuteronomy, the Psalter, dated before 135 CE,¹⁵ and the Greek Minor Prophets scroll (8HevXII gr), dated to the late Ptolemaic or early Roman period).¹⁶ Finally, apart from Murabba'at, Masada, and Nahal Hever, some fragments of biblical text have come to light from Wadi Sdeir (Sdeir 1, Gen) and Nahal Se'elim (34Se 2, Num).¹⁷

The Qumran biblical evidence is most significant because of the great number of manuscripts and of its challenge to textual criticism due to variant readings and passages unknown before the Dead Sea discoveries.¹⁸ The most prominent example of passages previously unknown concerns Qumran Psalter texts, about which scholarly opinion diverges between 'regular biblical texts', liturgical texts or alternate Second Temple Jewish editions.¹⁹

1.1.1. *Eschatology in Hebrew Biblical Texts from Qumran*

There are a number of cases in which the Hebrew biblical texts from Qumran have preserved possible traces of eschatology that were unknown before the Dead Sea discoveries.

The Hebrew text of Isaiah 41:22 in 1QIsa^a differs slightly from the Masoretic Text of Isaiah 41:22, thereby bringing out their potential eschatological significance in a more pronounced way. While MT Isaiah 41:22 already deals with prophecy, referring to that which shall happen, the outcome of former things and the revelation about things to come (אוּתְּבִיאֵם אִתְּךָ אֲנִי הַבְּאוֹת), 1QIsa^a relates the prophecy to 'either the

On dating of the fragments, see De Vaux *et al.*, *DJD* 2, 47; cf. Tov, "Hebrew Biblical Manuscripts from the Judaean Desert," 107–137 at 111.

¹⁴ For Mas 1, 1a–f, see Talmon, "Hebrew Fragments from Masada," 1–149, illustrations 2–10; for Sirach (Mas1h), see Yadin, *The Ben Sira Scroll from Masada*.

¹⁵ 5/6Hev 1a & 1b, XHev/Se 1–4 published by J. Charlesworth *et al.*, *DJD* 38 (2000).

¹⁶ Tov, *DJD* 8 (1990; reprinted with corrections, 1995), 22–6; cf. Cotton, "Greek," 324–6 at 325 who observes that 8HevXIIgr "can be dated to the later first century BCE".

¹⁷ Both published in *DJD* 38.

¹⁸ Tov, *The Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 100–17 at 111–4 on variant readings; at 117 Tov notes the importance of Qumran texts for reconstructing the Hebrew 'Vorlage' of the Septuagint, since "the reconstruction of many such details is now supported by the discovery of identical Hebrew readings in Qumran scrolls".

¹⁹ Sanders, *DJD* 4; Flint, *The Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls and the Book of Psalms*, 202–27; Tov, *The Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 346; Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Biblical Text*, 92–4.

last things or the things to come', או אחרונות או הבאות. This passage has been interpreted by Arie van der Kooij as a 'sectarian' reading;²⁰ an identification which was rejected by Eugene Ulrich. Yet Ulrich also recognises eschatological connotations to the use of the term אחרון in Isaiah 41:4, 44:6 and 48:12.²¹ If Isaiah 41:4 already has eschatological connotations, it may not be out of place to suppose an eschatological sense of Isaiah 41:22 in the early history of its Palestinian Jewish transmission.

As I have already briefly noted above, the Psalms scrolls from Qumran include much material previously unknown to scholars. Some of this material is of great significance for the subject of eschatology. 4QPsalm^f (4Q88) column IX, lines 1–15 contains a passage that has been called the 'Eschatological Hymn'.²² Although this passage does not explicitly mention 'the end of days', it does refer to God's eventual judgment (ll. 6–7) and his removal of the wicked, the 'children of iniquity', בני עולה, from the earth (ll. 6–8). It further appears to describe a new heaven and a new earth as envisioned at the end of days (ll. 8–14). This Psalms scroll comprises psalms that have been categorised as 'biblical' and 'apocryphal' psalms respectively, taking the Masoretic Text as the frame of reference.²³ The fact that these materials are found side by side in one scroll, which has been dated to around 50 BCE,²⁴ could point to the fluidity of textual transmission in cases other than the Torah. It seems unjustified to preconceive of the 'Eschatological Hymn' as 'non-biblical' evidence.²⁵

Other additional passages in the Qumran Psalms scrolls, in particular the 'Apostrophe to Zion' (attested in 11QPs^a col. XXII, 11QPs^b frg. 6, and 4QPs^f cols. VII–VIII) and the 'Apostrophe to Judah' (4QPs^f col. X, ll. 4–15), comprise implicit traces of eschatology. The expectation of future salvation, תוחלת ישועתך, in the 'Apostrophe to Zion', and the

²⁰ Van der Kooij, *Die alten Textzeugen des Jesajabuches*, 95–96.

²¹ Ulrich, "The Absence of 'Sectarian Variants'," 184–5.

²² Starcky, "Psaumes apocryphes de la grotte 4 de Qumrân (4QPs^f VII–X)," 350–71; preliminary edition by Skehan, Ulrich and Flint, "A Scroll Containing 'Biblical' and 'Apocryphal' Psalms," 267–82; ed. pr. idem (eds.), *DJD 16* pls. XIII–XIV. Cf. Abegg, Jr., Flint, and Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible*, 588–9.

²³ Fragments 1–2 contain Ps 22:15–17; columns I–IV contain parts of Ps 107; columns VI–VII contain parts of Ps 109 as well as the beginning of the 'Apostrophe to Zion', which is continued on column VIII; column IX contains the 'Eschatological Hymn'; column X contains the 'Apostrophe to Judah'.

²⁴ See Skehan, Ulrich and Flint (eds.), *DJD 16*.

²⁵ Cf. C. Martone, "Biblical or not Biblical? Some Doubts and Questions," 387–394.

absence of Belial from among Judah in the ‘Apostrophe to Judah’ constitute general, not necessarily specifically sectarian, themes of (prophetic) eschatology.

1.1.2. *Eschatology in the Septuagint and Its Hebrew Vorlage*

The Septuagint has long been studied as an ancient translation that does not just convey the literal sense of the original Hebrew biblical text but may also comprise paraphrastic and interpretative elements.²⁶ With regard to the subject of eschatology, the Septuagint contains a number of variants from the Masoretic Text whose possible significance has been the subject of debate. LXX Numbers 24:7.17 and Psalm 109 provide cases in which the variant readings of the Septuagint play a part in the debate about messianism.²⁷ LXX Psalm 1:5 is a well-known example of a Septuagint passage that speaks in a more pronounced manner about resurrection (ἀναστήσονται), namely that ‘the wicked will not rise (from the dead) in the judgment’, than the Masoretic Text.²⁸ There are also cases in which the Septuagint refers to ‘the latter days’, where the Masoretic Text does not. LXX Joshua 24:27 mentions a stone as a witness ‘in the latter days’, εἰς μαρτύριον ἐπ’ ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν, to God’s covenant with the people at Shechem. The exhortation not to transgress this covenant is thereby given a more explicitly future, if not eschatological, direction. LXX Daniel 11:20, which is part of the eschatologically oriented vision in Daniel 11:1–12:13, situates an event ‘in latter days’, ἐν ἡμέραις ἐσχάταις, whereas MT Daniel 11:20 refers to a timespan ‘within a few days’, בְּיָמִים אֶחָדִים, and Dan Th reads ‘in those days’, ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκεῖναις.

The Dead Sea discoveries have shed new light on the Septuagint and the reconstruction of its Hebrew *Vorlage*. There are many cases in which Hebrew biblical manuscripts from Qumran agree with the Septuagint against the Masoretic Text, so that it is now considered a serious possibility that the Hebrew text underlying the Septuagint

²⁶ See e.g. Swete, *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*, 315–341 (“The Septuagint as a Version”); Jellicoe, *The Septuagint and Modern Study*, 314–37 (“Language and Style”).

²⁷ Variant readings which may concern the subject of messianism will be treated in chapter six. The recent Colloquium Biblicum Lovaniense (27–29 July 2004), of which the proceedings have been published by Knibb (ed.), *The Septuagint and Messianism*, attests to the fact that this is a subject of continuous debate.

²⁸ Van der Horst, “De Septuaginta als joods document,” 100–107 at 104 on eschatology.

differed in certain ways from the Masoretic Text.²⁹ Isaiah 46:10 may be a relevant case for the subject of eschatology. This verse stands in the context of God's revelation of future events to Israel by the mouth of the prophet Isaiah. Whereas MT Isaiah 46:10 refers to God's declaration of 'the end from the beginning', מראשית אחרית, 4QIsa^c reads 'the latter things (אחרונות) from the beginning', thereby rather corresponding with the Septuagint version of Isaiah 46:10 which has τὰ ἔσχατα. While אחרית can in certain cases stand for the (prophetic) future (as, for instance, in MT Jer 29:31, Prov 23:18),³⁰ the term אחרונות could be more eschatologically oriented.

1.2. *The Reception of the Biblical Text and Eschatology*

Various passages from Scripture, including those with the expression באחרית הימים / ἐπ' ἔσχατ(ου/ων/ων) τῶν ἡμερῶν, have served as a point of departure for early Jewish texts with eschatological traditions. Scripture could serve as a point of departure for eschatological traditions that continued on the 'developing eschatological tendency' in Scripture.³¹ The below survey discusses a cross-section of illustrative examples.

1.2.1. *Pentateuch*

Early Jewish literature comprises eschatological interpretations of several passages from the Pentateuch with the expression באחרית הימים. Genesis 49:1, which stands at the beginning of Jacob's blessing on his twelve sons (Gen 49:1–28), may be an example of a patriarchal promise tradition. Genesis 49:1 appears to be paraphrased in *Jubilees* 45:14 which notes that Jacob "told them everything which was going to happen to them in the land of Egypt and in the latter days; he made

²⁹ See Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 115–6 ("Texts Close to the Presumed Hebrew Source of the Septuagint"); cf. e.g. Greenspoon, "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Greek Bible," 101–127. Van der Kooij, "The Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible before and after the Qumran Discoveries," 167–77 at 171 further notes that "one has to consider the possibility that agreements between biblical texts from Qumran and the LXX could have arisen from a common or similar interpretation of a given passage".

³⁰ Cf. the translation of אחרית in MT Isa 46:10 as *the future* by Abegg, Flint, and Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible*, 347 n. 978.

³¹ Nickelsburg, *Ancient Judaism and Christian Origins*, 120–122 refers to a developing eschatological tendency in Jeremiah and Ezekiel, Second and Third Isaiah, and other prophetic books.

them know how it would come upon them”.³² In light of the distinction between foretold events “in the land of Egypt” and “in the latter days”, it could well be that a distant future up to the end of days was in view with “the latter days”. Genesis 49:1 further counted as evidence of Jacob’s prophetic gift (Philo, *Her.* 261),³³ and of the messianic final age (*Targum Pseudo-Jonathan* on Gen 49:1).³⁴ The Qumran perspective relates Jacob’s blessing, especially that addressing Judah (Gen 49:8–12), to messianic expectations, as the sectarian *Commentary on Genesis A* (4Q252) V 1–5 indicates.

The expression באחרית הימים occurs twice in Deuteronomy, in the context of the blessings and curses related to the covenant (Deut 4:30, 31:29). Deuteronomy plays a prominent part in the eschatological perspective of 4QMMT C (12–23). Pseudo-Philo’s *Biblical Antiquities*, a first-century CE composition possibly antedating 70 CE,³⁵ contains a passage about Moses’ farewell, prayer and death (*L.A.B.* 19) that puts the admonition of the people not to transgress the covenant in an eschatological context. *L.A.B.* 19.4 alludes to words from Deut 4:26, which call heaven and earth to witness “that God has revealed the end of the world so that he might establish his statutes with you and kindle among you an eternal light”.³⁶

Finally, *m. Sanh.* 10.1 relates the early rabbinic conviction that the resurrection of the dead is prescribed in the Law (תחיית המתים מן התורה). Evidence from the New Testament (Acts 23:8) and Josephus (*J.W.* 2.163; *Ant.* 18.14) attribute this belief to the Pharisees. Jesus’ reference to the ‘book of Moses’ in his dispute with the Sadducees on the afterlife (Mark 12:26; Luke 20:37) suggests that this was a broader shared belief in pre-70 CE Palestinian Judaism.

³² Translation from O.S. Wintermute, “Jubilees,” in *OTP* 2, 137.

³³ ἐνθουσιῶντος ἦν· ἢ γὰρ τῶν μελλόντων κατὰληψις ἀνοίκειος ἀνθρώπων (*Her* 261 (LCL 261)).

³⁴ Maher, *The Aramaic Bible 1B*, 157 on the revelation of “concealed secrets, the hidden times, the giving of the reward of the righteousness, the punishment of the wicked, and what the happiness of Eden will be” on the one hand, and the fact that “as soon as the Glory of the Shekhinah of the Lord was revealed, the time in which the King Messiah was destined to come was hidden from him [Jacob]” on the other in *Tg. Ps.-J.* on Gen 49:1.

³⁵ See D.J. Harrington, “Pseudo-Philo,” in *OTP* 2, 299.

³⁶ Translation from Harrington, “Pseudo-Philo,” 327.

1.2.2. *Psalms*

The Psalms Pesharim from Qumran (1Q16, 4Q171, 4Q173, 4Q173a) cite Psalter verses as point of departure for eschatological interpretations. Psalm 37, which concerns retribution against the wicked, receives an actualised interpretation in 4Q171 (*4QPsalms Peshera*^a I–IV 21). Psalm 37 is applied to the Qumran community's history on the one hand, while it carries eschatological overtones on the other. 4Q173 (*4QPsalms Peshera*^b) 1 5 mentions a priest in the 'final era', לְאַחֲרֵי־הַקָּץ. Psalms 2:1 and 89:23 receive an eschatological interpretation in the *Eschatological Midrash*^a (4Q174 1 I, 21, 2, ll. 1–2 and 18–19). Psalms 13:2–3 and 17:1 are eschatologically interpreted in the *Eschatological Midrash*^b (4Q177 II 8–11, III 4–5).

The biblical Psalms, which frequently comprise a literary attribution to David, probably served as a model for the pseudepigraphical *Psalms of Solomon*, a composition dated to the first century BCE.³⁷ The *Psalms of Solomon* comprise eschatological themes like the final judgement (*Pss. Sol.* 2:31–35, 15:12) and resurrection (*Pss. Sol.* 2:31, 3:12) as well as messianic psalms (*Pss. Sol.* 17–18).³⁸

The Psalter contains eschatological themes like final judgment (Ps 1:5) and resurrection (LXX Ps 1:5), as we have already seen. Psalm 1:5 is also quoted in the context of early rabbinic discussion about those who have no share in the world to come (*m. Sanh.* 10.3).

1.2.3. *Isaiah and Jeremiah*

Isaiah has an important place in both Jewish and Christian traditions. It comprises various passages of eschatological (e.g. Isa 2, 24–27, 34) and messianic interest (e.g. Isa 9:2–7, 11:1–16). The *Apocryphon of Ezekiel*, a fragmentarily preserved pseudepigraphon dated between 50 BCE and 50 CE,³⁹ cites words from Isaiah 26:19 about the resurrection of the dead. Isaiah was important for both the eschatologically oriented Qumran community and the early Jesus-movement, although the applications

³⁷ R.B. Wright, "Psalms of Solomon," *OTP* 2, 640–1.

³⁸ On the Jewish, in particular Jerusalemite provenance of *Pss. Sol.*, see Schüpphaus, *Die Psalmen Salomos*; on eschatology in *Pss. Sol.*, cf. De Jonge, "The Expectation of the Future in the Psalms of Solomon," 3–27.

³⁹ J.R. Mueller and S.E. Robinson, "Apocryphon of Ezekiel," *OTP* 1, 488 and 492–3 n. 1 b, concerning the fragment preserved in Epiphanius' *Against Heresies* 64.70, 5–17, note that the reference to Ezekiel's 'own apocryphon' "substantiates the witness of Josephus (*Ant.* 10.6) to a second book of Ezekiel".

of Isaiah 40:3 in the *Rule of the Community* (1QS VIII 13–14) and the canonical Gospels (Matt 3:3, Mark 1:3, Luke 3:4, John 1:23) are very different.⁴⁰ The Qumran Isaiah Peshers, 3Q4 (3QpIsa) and 4Q161–165 (4QpIsa^{a-c}), comprise various eschatological themes, like the day of judgment (3Q4 6), events in the ‘latter days’ (4QpIsa^a 2–6 22f.; 4QpIsa^b II 1), and messianic expectations (in the context of the interpretation of Isaiah 11:1–5 in 4QpIsa^a 8–10 11–25). Isaiah 10:34–11:1 is quoted in the *Sefer ha-Milhamah* (4Q285 5 1–2 // 11Q14 1 I 9–11). Isaiah 60:21 is quoted in *m.Sanh.* 10.1 as a proof-text for the idea that “all Israelites have a share in the world to come.”⁴¹

Jeremiah comprises passages of messianic interest (MT Jer 23:1–8, 30:9). Jeremiah 18:18, which introduces Jeremiah’s lament about the plotting of his enemies against him (MT Jer 18:18–23), receives an eschatological interpretation in the *Eschatological Midrash*^b (4Q177) IV 6–7, as applied to the eschatological enmity between the ‘sons of light’ and Belial and ‘all the men of his lot’.

Jeremiah is the only biblical book that refers to a ‘new covenant’ (ברית חדשה, MT Jer 31:31 / διὰθήκη καινή, LXX Jer 38:31); a biblical concept applied in different ways by the Qumran community (cf. CD-A VI 19, VIII 21; CD-B XIX 33–34, XX 12; 1QpHab II 3–4) and the early Jesus-movement respectively (cf. Matt 26:28, Mark 14:24, Luke 22:20, 1 Cor 11:25, 2 Cor 3:6; quotation of Jer 31:31–34 in Heb 8:8–12). The notion of covenant renewal occurs in the sectarian *Rule of Benedictions* (1QSb III 26, V 21), in the non-sectarian Qumran text *Festival Prayers* (ותחדש בריתך להם, 1Q34 +1Q34bis 3 II 6; cf. 4Q509 97–98 I 8),⁴² and in Pseudo-Philo’s *Biblical Antiquities* 23.14. Since both the Qumran community and the early Jesus-movement were eschatologically oriented, the notion of a ‘new covenant’ could also have eschatological connotations.⁴³ It should further be noted that

⁴⁰ Cf. Abegg, Flint and Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible*, 270–1.

⁴¹ Translation from Danby, *The Mishnah*, 397.

⁴² On the non-sectarian character of the *Festival Prayers*, see Newsom, “‘Sectually Explicit’ Literature from Qumran,” 167–87 at 177 who notes that 4Q507–509 (4Q*Festival Prayers*^{a-c}) reflect “different [non-sectarian] calendrical assumptions”.

⁴³ Freedman and Miano, “People of the New Covenant,” 7–26 at 23 observe that “the new covenant was a symbol and a hope which he [Jeremiah] did not expect to experience in his own time]. Cf. Nitzan, “The Concept of Covenant in Qumran Literature,” 85–104 at 89: “in post-biblical literature, such as *Jub.* 1:15–29 and the Qumran literature, the concept of covenant renewal was applied to the new eschatological covenant, one based on the revealed interpretations of the Law of Moses”.

1 *Enoch* 60:6 characterises the final judgment as a “day of covenant for the elect and inquisition for the sinners.”⁴⁴

1.2.4. *Ezekiel*

Ezekiel deals with two traumatic issues: the fall of the kingdom of Israel and the destruction of the First Temple at Jerusalem. The misery of oppression associated with the first issue is transferred to an eschatological level in the *Eschatological Midrash*^b (4Q177) II 14–16. This passage interprets Ezekiel 25:8 as applying to the animosity of the congregation of ‘those looking for easy interpretations’ against the sectarian community at the end of days. Ezekiel’s vision of a physical resurrection for the whole house of Israel in Ezekiel 37:1–14 figures in the Qumran pseudepigraphon *4QPseudo Ezekiel* (4Q385 2, 4Q386 1 I, 4Q388 8). In addition to the Ezekielic theme of Israel’s restoration, the *Apocryphon of Ezekiel* further goes into the subject of resurrection for the sake of final judgment of body and soul (fragment 1 preserved in Epiphanius’ *Against Heresies* 64.70, 5–17).

Ezekiel 40–48, which gives a visionary perspective on the restored Temple and the new Jerusalem, deals with the second issue mentioned above. Ezekiel 44:10 figures in different contexts: in Philo’s treatise on the *Special Laws* 1.156, in the eschatologically oriented context of the *Eschatological Midrash*^a (4Q174) 1 I, 21, 2, lines 16–17, and in an apparently past perspective in the mishnaic treatises *m. Tamid* 3.7 and *m. Middoth* 4.2. Ezek 44:15 is quoted in CD-A III 21–IV 4 and interpreted as the priestly service of the ‘sons of Zadok’, a possible term of self-definition of the Qumran community (cf. 1QS V 2).

1.2.5. *Minor Prophets*

The Minor Prophets comprise passages of eschatological (e.g. Joel 3:30–31; Amos 5:18–20, 8:9–14; Obad 1:15; Mic 4:1–5:15; Zeph 1:14–18; Zech 14:1–21) and messianic interest (e.g. Amos 9:11; Mic 5:2; Zech 4:14). The biblical text of the Minor Prophets is well attested among manuscripts from Qumran (4Q76–82 (4QXII^{a-s}), 5Q4 (5QAmos)), Nahal Hever (8HevXII gr), and Wadi Muraba‘at (MurXII). Many of the Qumran Pesharim are Pesharim on the Minor Prophets: the *Pesher to Micah* (1Q14, 4Q168), *1QPesher to Habakkuk*, the *Pesher to Zephaniah*

⁴⁴ Translation from E. Isaac, “1(Ethiopic Apocalypse of) Enoch,” in *OTP* I, 40.

(1Q15, 4Q170), 4QHosea Peshera^{a-b} (4Q166–167), 4QNahum Peshera (4Q169), and 5QMalachi Peshera (5Q10).⁴⁵ The most substantially preserved Pesharim, 1QpMic, 1QpHab, 4QpHos^{a-b}, and 4QpNah, contain numerous eschatological elements.

Apart from the Qumran Pesharim, passages from the Minor Prophets are further quoted in the interest of eschatological and messianic concerns in the *Damascus Document* and the *Eschatological Midrash*. Amos 9:11 receives a messianic interpretation in both the *Eschatological Midrash*^a (4Q174) 1 I 21, 2, ll. 12–13⁴⁶ and the ‘Midrash Amos-Numbers’ in CD-A VII 14–21.⁴⁷ The *Damascus Document* also contains other eschatological interpretations of the Minor Prophets. Malachi 1:10 is interpreted in relation to the ‘age of wickedness’ that precedes the final age (CD-A VI 12–14). Zechariah 11:11 and 13:7 are applied to a future age of visitation, preceding the final age, in CD-B XIX 5–11a. CD-B XIX 15–16 applies Hosea 5:10 to the day of God’s visitation.

Among the Jewish Pseudepigrapha, the *Apocalypse of Zephaniah*, dated between the first century BCE and the first century CE, mentions final judgement (*Apoc. Zeph.* 12.5–8), thereby possibly alluding to Zephaniah 1:14–15.

The Minor Prophets are also cited in the context of eschatological and messianic expectations in the New Testament.⁴⁸ Some of these expectations could be understood as part of the broader contemporary Jewish context. Certain passages are applied to expectations of tribulation and division before the end of days (Micah 7:6 in Luke 12:53 (cf. Matt 10:35); Hosea 10:8 in Luke 23:30 and Rev 6:16). Micah 7:6 is further quoted in *m. Sotah* 9:15 that relates the messianic age. Mark 9:11 and

⁴⁵ Cf. 4QCommentary on Malachi (4Q253a) preliminary edited in 1995 by Brooke, “4Q253: A Preliminary Edition,” 233–239 and published in 1996 by idem *et al.* (eds.), *DJD* 22, 213–215, plate XIV.

⁴⁶ Cf. e.g. Oegema, “Messianic Expectations in the Qumran Writings: Theses on Their Development,” 53–82 at 77–78.

⁴⁷ Cf. the ‘parallel’ passage in CD-B XIX 9–12 that mentions the ‘messiah of Aaron and Israel’. Xeravits, “Précisions sur le texte original et le concept messianique de CD 7:13–8:1 et 19:5–14,” 47–59 has argued that the ‘Midrash Amos-Numbers’ is a ‘messianic teaching’, thereby referring to the “eschatological setting of Am 9:11 in Florilegium [4Q174] and of Num 24:17 in 4QTestimonia, the War Scroll and T. Levi 18:1–3” (58). Oegema, “Messianic Expectations in the Qumran Writings,” 60–2 notes a ‘messianic element’ in CD-A VII 14–21.

⁴⁸ Cf. Mal 3:1 in Mark 1:2, Matt 11:10, Luke 7:27 (John the Baptist as eschatological messenger who prepares the way for Jesus); Micah 5:1.3 in Matt 2:6 (fulfilment quotation); Hosea 13:14 in 1 Cor 15:55 (resurrection); Joel 3:1–5 in Acts 2:17–21 (eschatological missionary consciousness).

Matt 17:10 allude to Malachi 4:5 (LXX Mal 3:22) in the context of the disciples' question to Jesus why the Jewish scribes said that 'first Elijah must come'. Elijah was probably important in Jewish eschatological expectations (*m. Shek.* 2.5, *m. Sotah* 9.15; 1QS IX 11; 4Q558 1 II).

1.2.6. *Daniel*

The book of Daniel, with its visions about future events and the final age (MT Dan 2:1–45, 7:1–28, 10:1–21, 11:1–12:13), constitutes an important exponent of eschatology in the later biblical books.⁴⁹ The composition of the final text of Daniel is usually dated to about 165 BCE, the time of persecution by Antiochus Epiphanes. The Qumran evidence of eight biblical manuscripts, dated between 125 BCE (4QDan^a) and 50 CE (4QDan^c),⁵⁰ shows a relatively short time span between the date of composition and the witnesses to its transmission.

The Qumran evidence comprises various texts related to Daniel. Martin Abegg, Peter Flint, and Eugene Ulrich observed that "many traditions and writings associated with him were circulating in Palestine from the second century BCE well into the first century CE".⁵¹ Flint has recently outlined the 'Daniel tradition' at Qumran, discerning eschatological material in the First Pseudo-Daniel Document (4QpsDan ar^a (4Q243) frags. 16, 25, 33, 24, 26) and the Second Pseudo-Daniel Document (4QpsDan ar^c (4Q245) frg. 2).⁵² There are still two other Qumran texts of prophetic and eschatological interest that have been related to Daniel:⁵³ 4Q246⁵⁴ and 4Q*Four Kingdoms*^{a-b} ar (4Q552–553).

⁴⁹ For a critique of the categorization of Daniel as 'apocalyptic', see Davies, "Eschatology in the Book of Daniel," 23–44, who interprets the Danielic eschatology as a "product of the tales read in the Maccabean crisis". Cf. Hartman *et al.*, "Eschatology. In the Bible," 872 who observes that "Daniel contains the first unequivocal affirmation of a belief in the eschatological resurrection of the dead", that is, in Dan 12:1–2.

⁵⁰ 1QDan^a and 1QDan^b, ed. pr. Barthélemy and Milik, *DJD* 1, 150–2; pap6QDan, ed. pr. Baillet, Milik, and De Vaux, *DJD* 3, 114–6, plate XXIII; 4QDan^{a-c}, ed. pr. Ulrich *et al.*, *DJD* 16, plates XXX–XXXVIII. Cf. Abegg, Flint and Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible*, 482–5.

⁵¹ Abegg, Flint, and Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible*, 485.

⁵² Flint, "The Daniel Tradition at Qumran," 41–60 further refers to the *Prayer of Nabonidus* (4Q242), but this text does not contain eschatological traditions.

⁵³ Cf. VanderKam, "Apocalyptic Tradition in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Religion of Qumran," 113–34 at 118–9 on 'Related Texts' to Daniel.

⁵⁴ 4Q246 has been variously designated as "4Qpseudo-Dan¹¹" (Puech, *RB* 99 (1992) 98–131), the "Extra-canonical Daniel Apocalypse" (F.M. Cross in Parry and Ricks (eds.), *Current Research and Technological Developments*, 1–13), an "Aramaic Danielic Apocryphon" (Xeravits, *King, Priest, Prophet*, 82), the "'Son of God' Document from

The pseudepigraphic character of these texts and Josephus' reference to Daniel's prophecy (*Ant.* 10.275, 12.322) attest to the importance of Danielic tradition in pre-70 CE Palestinian Judaism.

The classification of Daniel as a biblical book did not yet have a fixed status in Second Temple Judaism, as we may infer from the fact that it was considered a prophetic writing (4Q174 frgs. 1 col. II, 3, 24, 5; Matt 24:15; cf. *Ag. Ap.* 1.40); the Masoretic Tradition instead classifies Daniel among the 'Writings'.⁵⁵ The fact that Daniel was considered a prophet may be an additional indication of Daniel's eschatological significance in Second Temple Judaism.

2. ESCHATOLOGY IN NON-SECTARIAN QUMRAN TEXTS

This section will focus on the non-biblical evidence from Qumran which is pertinent to the subject of eschatology, thereby distinguishing between non-sectarian texts (this section) and sectarian texts (section 3 below). In the previous chapter we have already discussed criteria for determining whether a text is sectarian or non-sectarian. Some non-sectarian texts which overlap with previously known Jewish pseudepigrapha, like *Jubilees* and *1 Enoch*, are discussed here as 'pre-Qumran texts'. The eschatological traditions in the pseudepigrapha that are attested independently from the Qumran evidence will be discussed in section four below.

2.1. Pre-Qumran Texts

Pre-Qumran texts are texts from the Qumran caves of which the date of composition antedates any chronology of the settlement of the Qumran community.⁵⁶ Compositions dated before the middle of the second century therefore qualify as 'pre-Qumran texts' in any case.

Qumran" (J.A. Fitzmyer in *Bib* 74 (1993) 153–174; cf. "'Son of God' text" in Collins, *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 17), and as "4QAramaic Apocalypse" (García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*. 1, 492–3).

⁵⁵ On the fixed status of Daniel as holy Scripture in the post-70 CE tannaitic period, see e.g. *m. Yadaim* 4.5.

⁵⁶ The conventional chronology established by Roland de Vaux distinguishes between phases Ia, Ib, II, and III in the sectarian occupation of Qumran, dating the beginning of phase Ia to about 140 BCE; see e.g. VanderKam, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today*, 13–14. Recently, Magness, *The Archaeology of Qumran*, 47–72 ("The Buildings and Occupation

2.1.1. *1 Enoch*

1 Enoch is a composite work of which the earliest dated parts go back to the pre-Maccabean period.⁵⁷ The Qumran evidence comprises so many Aramaic fragments of *1 Enoch*, 19 manuscripts in total ranging from the pre-Qumran period to the first century BCE,⁵⁸ that it is highly probable that this text enjoyed a privileged if not authoritative status at least during the early stages of the Qumran community's history.⁵⁹ The so-called 'Book of the Watchers' (*1 Enoch* 1–36), of which fragments have been preserved in *4QEnoch^{a-e}* ar, introduces the theme of eschatological punishment for the wicked and salvation for the righteous (*1 Enoch* 1–5). The idea of a day of final judgement recurs in *1 Enoch* 10:7.12–14, of which parts have been preserved in *4QEn^b* ar (*4Q202*) IV and *4QEn^c* ar (*4Q204*) V 1–2. The 'day of the end', יום קצא, is mentioned in *1 Enoch* 22:4 in conjunction with the 'great judgment', רבא רבא, of all people (*4QEn^e* ar 2 II 2–3; cf. *1 Enoch* 22:8–13 not preserved in the Qumran fragments).

There are no witnesses among the Qumran Aramaic fragments to the so-called 'Book of the Similitudes' (*1 Enoch* 37–71),⁶⁰ but the Qumran

Phases of Qumran") instead dated the first sectarian settlement at Qumran to around 100 BCE; cf. Wise, "Dating the Teacher of Righteousness," 53–87. However, Tigchelaar, "De Dode-Zeerollen: wat we weten na ruim vijftig jaar," 9–19 at 17–8 observed that the theory of a later settlement (and an earlier decline) conflicts with the palaeographical dating by F.M. Cross of most Qumran texts between 125 BCE and 70 CE, among which *4QS^a*, which is dated between 125 and 100 BCE.

⁵⁷ See Isaac, "1 (Ethiopic Apocalypse of) Enoch," *OTP* 1, 5–89 at 7; Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch*.

⁵⁸ *4QEn^{a-g}* ar (*4Q201*, 202, 204–207, 212), *4QEnastr^{a-d}* ar (*4Q208–211*), *1QEnGiants^{a-b}* ar (*1Q23–24*), *2QEnGiants* ar (*2Q26*), *4QEnGiants^{a-c}* ar (*4Q203*, 530–532, 556); ed. pr. for *1Q23–24* in Milik, *DJD* 1, 97–9, plate XIX–XX; ed.pr. for *2Q26* by Baillet, *DJD* 3, 90, plate XVII; ed.pr. for most of the fragments from cave 4 by Milik, *The Books of Enoch*; cf. L.T. Stuckenbruck, "201 2–8. *4QEnoch^a* ar," *DJD* 36, 3–7, plate I; Tigchelaar and García Martínez, "4QAstronomical Enoch^{a-b} ar," *DJD* 36, 95–171, plates III–VII. On the uncertainties surrounding the identification of Greek fragments of Enoch from Qumran cave 4 (*7Q4*, 8, 11–14) with further bibliography, see e.g. Knibb, "The Case of *1 Enoch*," 396–415 at 401 nn. 17–18.

⁵⁹ The idea that the sectarian Qumran community would consider *1 Enoch* authoritative as 'Scripture', as supposed in an 'admittedly speculative' manner by Abegg, Flint, and Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible*, 480–1, appears far-fetched. Milik, *The Books of Enoch*, 7 deduced from the reuse of the back of the first leaf of *4QEn^a* for a 'schoolboy's exercise' that the Qumran community eventually lost its interest in the Enochic traditions.

⁶⁰ It is a debated question what place the 'Book of Similitudes' has in the textual development of *1 Enoch*. See e.g. Isaac, "1 (Ethiopic Apocalypse of) Enoch," *OTP* 1, 7 who noted that the idea of J.T. Milik that the 'Similitudes' would be a late Christian

evidence comprises a 'Book of Giants'.⁶¹ *1QEnoch Giants^b ar* (1Q24) 7 1–2 indicates an eschatological setting to the 'Book of Giants', since it mentions the 'day of the end', [..] יום קץ (l. 1), and the 'consummation', [..] גמירת (l.2).

The 'Book of Astronomical Writings' (*1 Enoch* 72–82) comprises calendrical visions that have been counted among the traditions that distinguished apocalyptic and Essene strands of Palestinian Judaism with their emphasis on solar elements from the pharisaic Temple-based tradition of a lunar calendar.⁶² Several fragments of 'Astronomical Enoch' have been preserved at Qumran (4QEnastr^{a-d} (4Q209–211)). *1 Enoch* 72–82 does not comprise an elaborate eschatological outlook.⁶³ Nevertheless, *Jubilees* 4.17–19 puts Enoch's astronomical and calendrical knowledge in an eschatological perspective by observing that his vision concerned the order of events 'until the day of judgement' (*Jub.* 4.19).

The 'Book of Dream Visions', also known as the 'Animal Apocalypse' (*1 Enoch* 83–90), is further attested in several Qumran Aramaic fragments (4QEn^c ar (4Q204) 4; 4QEn^d ar (4Q205) 2 I–III; 4QEn^e ar (4Q206) 5 I–III; 4QEn^f ar (4Q207) 1). The Qumran Aramaic fragments do not provide connections with eschatology. Only *1 Enoch* 84:4, not preserved at Qumran, explicitly refers to the 'great day of judgment' in the final age.

Finally, Aramaic fragments of the 'Book of the Epistle of Enoch' (*1 Enoch* 91–107) have also been preserved at Qumran (4QEn^c ar (4Q204) 5 I–II; 4QEn^g ar (4Q212) II–V). The 'Apocalypse of Weeks' (*1 Enoch* 91, 93) alludes to judgment and return to goodness and

work has been widely rejected; Knibb, "The Case of 1 Enoch," 410–1, while attributing a Jewish character to the 'archetype' of the 'Similitudes', still points to the "possible inclusion of Christian elements" at the final stage of its formation.

⁶¹ See recently Stuckenbruck, *The Book of Giants from Qumran*; cf. Idem, *DJD* 36, 8–94, plates I–II for the text of *4QEnGiants^a ar* (4Q203), and re-editions of *1QEnGiants^{a-b} ar* (1Q23–24), *2QEnGiants ar* (2Q26), and *6QpapEnGiants ar* (6Q8); Puech, *DJD* 31, 9–115, plates I–VI, for the texts of 4Q530–533 and 4Q203 1.

⁶² Cf. Glessmer, "The Otot-Texts (4Q319) and the Problem of Interpretations in the Context of the 364-Day Calendar," 125–64 at 142–3 who notes a differentiation between calendars (different solar calendars, or synchronistic calendars with both solar and lunar elements): "Since more texts are available now, the picture is changing and the different texts with a 364-day calendar are seen as witnesses of their own".

⁶³ 4QEnastr^b ar (4Q209) frg. 23, l. 9, however, does refer to the '[Paradi]se of Righteousness', פּרַדִּיזָה קוֹשְׁטָא, just as the Qumran Aramaic version of *1 Enoch* 32:3 does (4QEn^e ar (4Q206) frg. 3, l. 21; the Ethiopic version of *1 Enoch* 32:3 is translated as the 'garden of righteousness'; Isaac, *OTP* I, 28).

righteousness in the final age (*1 Enoch* 91:14–17, 93:9–10; 4QEn^s ar IV). Other passages, not preserved in the Qumran manuscripts, contain eschatological elements (*1 Enoch* 94:9, 97:1–5, 98:8, 99:15, 100, 102, 104:5), but 4QEn^c ar 5 I–II comprises parts near the end of the ‘Epistle of Enoch’. 4QEn^c ar 5 II 27–29a deals with the eschatological theme of the eventual rise of generations of justice, דרִי קוֹשָׁטָא (l. 28), which bring an end to all wickedness (cf. *1 Enoch* 107:1).

2.1.2. *Jubilees*

The *Book of Jubilees* counted as authoritative literature in the Qumran community, since it is both abundantly attested among the Dead Sea scrolls (sixteen clear-cut cases,⁶⁴ two uncertain identifications,⁶⁵ and three ‘pseudo-Jubilees’ manuscripts)⁶⁶ and it is more than once cited in Qumran texts (CD-A XVI, 2–4; *Work with citation of Jubilees* (4Q228) 1 I 9–10).⁶⁷ Yet it would be another thing to say that *Jubilees* had biblical authority for the sectarian Qumran community, since the *Damascus Document* counts *Jubilees* as ‘exact interpretation’, פְּרוֹשׁ (CD-A XVI 2) rather than referring to it explicitly as part of the Law.⁶⁸ The composition of *Jubilees* has been dated between 161–140 BCE on the basis of manuscript evidence from Qumran, its use in other ancient documents, and allusions to events in the Maccabean era.⁶⁹

The *Book of Jubilees* contains several passages that are relevant for the subject of eschatology. In the above discussion of *1 Enoch*, we have

⁶⁴ 1QJub^{a-b} (1Q17–18) in *DJD* 1, 82–4, plate XVI; 2QJub^{a-b} (2Q19–20) in *DJD* 3, 77–9, plate XV; 3QJub (3Q5) in *DJD* 3, 96–8, plate XVIII; 4QJub^a (4Q216), 4QJub^{c-s} (4Q218–222), 4QpapJub^h (4Q223–224) in VanderKam, Milik, *DJD* 13, 1–22, 35–140, plates I–II, IV–IX.

⁶⁵ 4QpapJub^{b?} (4Q217) in *DJD* 13, 23–33, plate III; 4QpapJub[?] (4Q482) in *DJD* 7, 1–2, plate I.

⁶⁶ 4QpsJub^{a-b} (4Q225–226), 4QpsJub^{c?} (4Q227) in *DJD* 13, 141–75, plates X–XII.

⁶⁷ CD-A XVI 3–4 refers to the ‘book of the divisions of the periods according to their Jubilees and their weeks’, סֵפֶר מַחְלָקוֹת הָעֵתִים לְיֻבֵּלֵיהֶם וּבִשְׁבוּעוֹתֵיהֶם (cf. 4QD^f 4 II 5–6); 4Q228 1 I 9–10 has [... בְּכֵן כְּתוּב בְּמַחְלָקֵי הָעֵתִים] (l. 2) and בְּמַחְלָקַת עֵתָהּ (l. 7). Cf. Lange, “The Status of the Biblical Texts,” 21–30 at 23 who notes an allusion to *Jub.* 23:1 in CD-A X 9–10.

⁶⁸ *Contra* Abegg, Flint and Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible*, 196–8 who have included a brief discussion of *Jubilees*, considering it to be somehow part of the ‘Torah’ in the Dead Sea Scrolls Bible.

⁶⁹ Wintermute, “Jubilees,” *OTP* 2, 43–4 at 44 n. 31 refers to the decisive argument from ‘allusions to Maccabean history’ for dating *Jubilees*, as elaborated by VanderKam, *Textual and Historical Studies in the Book of Jubilees*, 283.

already come across one passage that attributes eschatological revelation to Enoch (*Jub.* 4.17–19). Gene L. Davenport distinguished structurally eschatological passages (*Jub.* 1.4b–26; 1.27–28, 29c; 23.14–31), passages with significant eschatological elements (*Jub.* 5.1–19; 8.10–9.15; 15.1–34; 16.1–9; 22.11b–23; 24.8–33; 31.1–32; 36.1–18; 50.1–5), and incidental cases (*Jub.* 4.17–26; 10.1–17; 10.18–26) in *Jubilees*.⁷⁰ 4QJubilees^a (4Q216) contains considerable parts of the beginning of *Jubilees*, including *Jub.* 1.26 on the revelation to Moses what will happen from the first to the last ([ה]אחרני[ם]) in 4QJub^a IV 3). The first chapter of *Jubilees* puts the Sinaitic revelation of God's covenant with his people in a future-eschatological perspective.

Jubilees occupied an intermediate place between the Law of Moses and the sectarian dualistic perspective on the (non-)observance of this Law throughout Israel's history, as demonstrated in the *Damascus Document*. *Jubilees* and 4QpsJub^a 2 I–II both apply the activity of the angel Mastema or Prince of Animosity to biblical history, while CD-A XVI 4–5 observes that Mastema turns aside from the one who returns to the Law of Moses.

2.1.3. Pre-Qumran Roots of the War Scroll

The *War Scroll* is an important sectarian document with an eschatological orientation. It is a debated question whether the composition of the *War Scroll* should be dated to the Seleucid period⁷¹ or rather to the early Roman period.⁷² Apart from the *War Scroll* as a finished product,⁷³ it has been argued from a redaction-critical perspective that it is possible to identify pre-Qumran strata of the *War Scroll*; a text which was adopted by the Qumran community and reworked in light of its sectarian perspective on contemporary circumstances.⁷⁴

⁷⁰ Davenport, *The Eschatology of the Book of Jubilees*, 19–46, 47–71, and 81–7.

⁷¹ Gmirkin, "Historical Allusions in the War Scroll," 172–214 at 172 argued that the *War Scroll* "should be understood against the highly charged historical background of the Maccabean crisis", focusing on 1QM I–II.

⁷² Wenthe, "The Use of the Hebrew Scriptures in 1QM," 290–319 at 291 nn. 2–6 with further bibliography on the 'two major options'.

⁷³ For early scholarship on 1QM, see Davies, *1QM, the War Scroll from Qumran*, 11–20 who discusses contributions by Y. Yadin, J. Carmignac, J. van der Ploeg, B. Jongeling, J. Becker and P. von der Osten-Sacken.

⁷⁴ Hunzinger, "Fragmente einer älteren Fassung des Buches Milhama aus Höhle 4 von Qumran," 131–51; Davies, *1QM, the War Scroll from Qumran*, 13–5 critiques the idea of J. van der Ploeg that a 'primitive scroll' written under the influence of Daniel 11:40–12:3 and Ezekiel 37–39 underlies 1QM. He concludes his own analysis of the

Column XIV of 1QM has served as a main piece of evidence for redaction-critical studies which situate the earliest strata in the context of the Maccabean warfare and its aftermath. C.-H. Hunzinger observed that 4QM^a frgs. 8–10 col. 1, which runs parallel to 1QM XIV 4–18, should be considered an earlier recension than column XIV of 1QM.⁷⁵ In spite of his doubts about 4QM^a as an earlier recension, P.R. Davies concedes that there are “differences between 1QM XIV’s text and 4QM^a, in which there is evidence that the hymn [XIV 4b–8a] has been amended so as to apply not to Israel but to a chosen sect”.⁷⁶ The earliest historical nucleus of the *War Scroll* may thus reflect broader Palestinian Jewish concerns about eschatological deliverance from Israel’s enemies that stemmed from the Maccabean period.

2.2. Non-Sectarian Qumran Texts

With the accumulation of newly published Qumran texts since the 1990s, the number of discussions of texts with a possibly non-sectarian character and setting has also increased. Examples are liturgical and poetical texts, like *4QDivrei ha-Me’orot* (4QDibHam^{a+c}), *4QBeatitudes* (4Q525), the *Festival Prayers* (1Q34 +1Q34bis, 4Q507–509).⁷⁷

Apart from liturgical and poetical texts, we also have abundant evidence of Qumran texts with eschatological traditions of which the origin in the Qumran community is strongly doubted. This doubt is for instance occasioned by the genre of a particular text or the absence of distinctive terminology that characterises the Qumran community. The fact that these Qumran texts do not overlap with other texts and traditions known apart from the Dead Sea scrolls, makes it more problematic to assign a date to their historical origins.

literary structure and historical origins of 1QM with the observation that “the material in 1QM (..) extends from the Maccabean period to the first century A.D.” Alexander, “The Evil Empire,” 17–31 at 28 maintains that “there is still much force in J. van der Ploeg’s proposal that 1QM grew from a primitive work based on Daniel 11–12, which has been preserved at the beginning and end of the surviving War Scroll”.

⁷⁵ Hunzinger, “Fragmente einer älteren Fassung des Buches Milhama,” 131–51.

⁷⁶ Davies, *1QM, the War Scroll from Qumran*, 84–7, who further supplies parallels between 1QM XIV 4b–8a and 1 Macc 3:50; 1QM XIV 4b and 1 Macc 1:63, 2:20, 27, 4:10; 1QM XIV 2 and 1 Macc 4:24.

⁷⁷ See Chazon, “Is Divrei ha-me’orot a Sectarian Prayer?,” 3–17; De Roo, “Is 4Q525 a Qumran Sectarian Document?,” 338–67; on the *Festival Prayers*, see Newsom, “‘Actually Explicit’ Literature from Qumran,” 167–87 at 177.

Let us first consider parabiblical texts and pseudepigrapha unknown prior to the Dead Sea discoveries.⁷⁸ *4QPseudo-Moses^c* (4Q390) frg. 1 relates Israel's captivity and the devastation of the land, while frg. 2 col. I mentions presumably post-exilic circumstances in terms of the 'dominion of Belial' (l. 4). The fact that this passage mentions a period of seventy years of struggle (l. 6)⁷⁹ in conjunction with oppression and the abuses of the priesthood (ll. 9–10) could be an indication that it is concerned with the eschatological period. It has already been noted that Palestinian Jewish cycles existed of writings on Daniel and Ezekiel (sections 1.2.4 and 1.2.6 above). The *Pseudo-Daniel* (4Q243–244 and 4Q245)⁸⁰ and *Pseudo-Ezekiel* texts (4Q385c, 4Q386, 4Q388) elaborate on passages in these prophetic writings and comprise eschatological traditions. These are salvation and the establishment of the holy kingdom (4Q243 16), the destruction of wickedness (4Q243 25, 33, 24; 4Q245 2 2), the gathering of the elect, [קריאי] (4Q243 24 2), and physical resurrection (4Q385 2 // 4Q386 1 I // 4Q388 7). 4Q246 col. II further relates the establishment of God's kingdom on earth in the final age, characterised by judgment, truth and peace.⁸¹

There are also non-sectarian texts with eschatological features that do not explicitly claim a connection with biblical figures and/or texts. *4QRenewed Earth* (4Q475) envisions a time when there will be no more guilty deeds on the earth, ולוא יהיה עוד אשמות בארץ (l. 4), but instead of this rest or peace forever, [ו]שקטה הארץ לעולמים (l. 6).⁸²

⁷⁸ There are many Qumran apocryphal and pseudepigraphical texts, including: *1QGenesis Apocryphon*, *4QApocryphon Pentateuch A–B* (4Q368, 4Q377), *4QApocryphon of Joseph^{a–c}* (4Q371–373; cf. 4Q539), *1–4QArabic Levi* (1Q21, 4Q213, 4Q213a–b, 4Q214, 4Q214a–b), *4QApocryphon of Levi^{a–b}* (4Q540–541), *4QTestament of Naphtali* (4Q215), *4QTestament of Qahat* (4Q542), *4QVisions of Amram^{a–c}* (4Q543–547; cf. 4Q548), *1QWords of Moses* (1Q22), *2–4QApocryphon of Moses* (2Q21, 4Q375–376), *4QPseudo-Moses^{a–c}* (4Q385a, 4Q387a, 4Q388a, 4Q389, 4Q390), *4QApocryphon of Joshua^{a–b}* (4Q378–379; cf. 4Q522, 5Q9), *4QApocryphon of Elisha* (4Q481a), *4QApocryphon on Samuel-Kings* (6Q9), *4QApocryphon of Jeremiah^{a–c}* (4Q383–384, 4Q385b, 4Q387b, 4Q389a), *4QApocryphal Lamentations A–B* (4Q179, 4Q501). However, apart from the *Visions of Amram* and the *Apocryphon of Levi^{a–b}*, many of these Qumran apocrypha and pseudepigrapha do not comprise eschatological traditions.

⁷⁹ On seventy years, cf. 4Q243 16 60 in Flint, "The Daniel Tradition at Qumran," 50.

⁸⁰ Ed. pr. Collins, Flint, *DJD* 22, 97–131, 153–64, plates VII–X.

⁸¹ Ed. pr. Puech, *DJD* 22, 165–184, plate XI. 4Q246 II 1–2 also refers to a possibly messianic eschatological figure; this text will therefore be discussed separately in chapter six.

⁸² First edition in Elgvin, "Renewed Earth and Renewed People: 4Q475," 576–91. Ed. pr. idem, *DJD* 36, plate XXXI. Text and translation after García Martínez and

With regard to the character of this fragmentarily preserved work of nine lines, Torleif Elgvin has observed that there are “no indications of origin within the *yahad*” and tentatively suggested that it should be dated to the second century BCE.⁸³

4QTime of Righteousness (4Q215a) envisions the completion of the period of wickedness (1 II 4) and the dawn of the final age as a ‘time of righteousness’, עת הצדק (1 II 5), and an era of peace (1 II 6). 4Q215a 1 II was preliminarily published by Esther G. Chazon and Michael E. Stone in 1999.⁸⁴ The text contains no specific community terminology.⁸⁵ Chazon argued that “the Qumranic origin of *4QTime of Righteousness* cannot be definitely proven.”⁸⁶ Recently, Elgvin advocated a non-sectarian origin of this text, considering several possible dates ranging from the pre-Maccabean period to the time of Jannaeus.⁸⁷ Both Chazon and Elgvin have pointed to the influence of Enochic traditions about eschatological judgment and righteousness in *4QTime of Righteousness*.⁸⁸ Fragment 2 focuses on preordained ‘appointed times’ (ll. 4–5), while fragment 3 mentions both the eschatological destruction of the earth and renewal by God. In view of the connections with

Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*. 2, 956–7. Cf. the different reconstructions in line 5 by Elgvin, “Renewed Earth and Renewed People,” 577–8 (והיתה כול תבל כעש) ‘and all the earth will be like a moth’) and García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*. 2, 956–7 (כעדן) (והיתה כול תבל כעדן) ‘and all the world will be like Eden’) respectively.

⁸³ Elgvin, “Renewed Earth and Renewed People,” 576 and 590: “The hope for a national restoration of Israel without reference to the community as the nucleus of the renewal makes an origin within the *yahad* unlikely”.

⁸⁴ Chazon and Stone, “4QTime of Righteousness (4Q215a, olim 4QTNaphtali),” 124–5. 4Q215a also consists of the much briefer fragments 2 and 3; cf. Chazon, Stone, *DJD* 36, plate IX.

⁸⁵ The terms בחירי צדק (1 II 3) and חס[ד]י (1 II 4) are not necessarily typical of the Qumran community.

⁸⁶ Chazon, “Testament of Naphtali (4Q215) and Time of Righteousness (4Q215a),” 110–23 at 117. Cf. 121 where Chazon limits the options to the question “whether it was produced within the Qumran community or in circles closely related to Qumran, such as a parent movement or a like-minded contemporary group”, in view of the parallels between 4Q215a, 1 Enoch 1–11, the Apocalypse of Weeks, *Sapiential Work A*, 1QS, 1QH and CD-A/CD-B (121–2).

⁸⁷ Elgvin, “The Eschatological Hope of 4QTime of Righteousness,” 89–102 at 100–1.

⁸⁸ Chazon, “Testament of Naphtali (4Q215) and Time of Righteousness (4Q215a),” 117–8 mentions parallels to the terms ‘elect righteous’ (4Q215a 1 II 3; 1 Enoch 1:1, 39:6, 93:10) and ‘time of righteousness’ (4Q215a 1 II 5; 1 Enoch 91:12–13); Elgvin, “The Eschatological Hope of 4QTime of Righteousness,” 101 supposes an equation of Zion with the renewed earth (4Q215a 1 II 3, 5, 9–10; 1 Enoch 10:16–11:2, 25:3–27:5); 95: “While Zion or pilgrimage are not specifically mentioned in the text, a Zion theology seems to permeate this passage”.

Enochic traditions, it seems probable that *4QTime of Righteousness* has a second-century BCE origin under the influence of the parent Essene movement.⁸⁹ In view of its predestinarian features of eschatology ('his holy design', 4Q215a 1 II 11 and 2 1; 'appointed times', 4Q215a 2 4–5), it is understandable that *4QTime of Righteousness* was important for the Qumran community as 'adopted text'.

Finally, we should consider sapiential Qumran texts with elements of apocalyptic eschatology. *1Q/4QMysteries* (1Q27, 4Q299–301)⁹⁰ and *1Q/4QInstruction* (1Q26; 4Q415–418, 4Q418a,c, 4Q423)⁹¹ do not exhibit connections with Qumran community terminology.

Before turning to the concept רַז נְהִיָּה, previous scholarly discussion of the origins of *1Q/4QMysteries* and *1Q/4QInstruction* should be noted. To start with common features in these two texts, both *Instruction* (אמת בחירי in 4Q418 69 II 10) and *Mysteries* (ב[חירי צדק] in 4Q299 72 2) use a concept of the 'elect' comparable to that in *1 Enoch* and *4QTime of Righteousness*.⁹² Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar has observed that the "address of sinners in the second person plural, as well as third person plural statements about these same addressees" constitute features that are present in *Mysteries* and *Instruction* on the one hand and in *1 Enoch* 2–5 on the other.⁹³ Apart from parallels with Enochic traditions, there are also clear differences. Tigchelaar has noted that *Mysteries* and *Instruction* mention astrology;⁹⁴ an occupation that is condemned in *1 Enoch* 8:3 and *Jubilees* 8:3, 12:16–20. He situates *Mysteries* in priestly circles in view of the fragments dealing with priestly affairs.⁹⁵ However,

⁸⁹ Contra Elgvin, "The Eschatological Hope of 4QTime of Righteousness," 98 who argues that "a priestly milieu in Jerusalem could be behind" *4QTime of Righteousness* (as well as *1Q/4QMysteries*). Echoes of Zion motifs are not sufficient evidence for situating *4QTime of Righteousness* in a priestly milieu; the text does not deal with priestly affairs. The predestinarian features may be better situated in an Essene milieu (*Ant.* 13.172).

⁹⁰ 1Q27 ed.pr. Milik, *DJD* 1, 102–7, plates XXI–XXII; 4Q299–301, ed.pr. Schiffman, *DJD* 20, 33–123, plates III–IX.

⁹¹ 1Q26 ed.pr. Milik, *DJD* 1, 101–2, plate XX; 4Q415–418, 4Q418a,c, 4Q423 ed.pr. Strugnell, Harrington, Elgvin, *DJD* 34, *passim*, plates I–XXXI.

⁹² See Tigchelaar, "Your Wisdom and Your Folly: The Case of 1–4QMysteries," 80 and n. 50; cf. 78–9 and nn. 41–2 where he lists a number of specific terms attested in both *Instruction* and *Mysteries*.

⁹³ Tigchelaar, "Your Wisdom and Your Folly," 80.

⁹⁴ *Ibidem*, 79, 87–8 translates מוֹלְדִים (בית), present in both *Mysteries* and *Instruction*, as 'horoscope'.

⁹⁵ *Ibidem*, 77–8; at 82 he identifies the "we" group of *Mysteries* as 'priestly sages' (cf. חכמים in 4Q301 2 1).

the interest in astrology may not necessarily be a non-Essenic feature,⁹⁶ but it could constitute a later development when astrological interests were incorporated in a monotheistic setting.⁹⁷

Although *Instruction* has a different setting than the *Rule of the Community*,⁹⁸ it appears to be closer to the sectarian community than *Mysteries*.⁹⁹ The references to poverty in *Instruction*¹⁰⁰ could parallel the ideological designation of the ‘poor’ in sectarian texts (in particular עֲדַת הָאֲבִיּוֹנִים in 4Q171 II 10, III 10), while *Instruction* follows the sapiential model of instruction by a teacher to his ‘son’.¹⁰¹ While the editors advocated a pre-Qumran origin,¹⁰² D.J. Harrington has argued that *Instruction* dates “in or before the first century B.C.”¹⁰³

The expression רַז נְהִיָּה does not occur in biblical literature, but רַז/רַז־רַז figures in Daniel 2 and 4 in the context of the divinely inspired interpretation of dreams. The Danielic usage includes a future-eschatological orientation, in particular in Dan 2:27–28.¹⁰⁴ The various contexts in which the concept רַז נְהִיָּה occurs have been extensively studied,¹⁰⁵ and it has been recognised that the term may comprise an eschatological component.¹⁰⁶ In the *Rule of the Community* (1QS XI

⁹⁶ Ibidem, 85–8 at 86: “the only forms of divination that would have been permitted in later times by the Essenes would have been the oracle of the lot and the inspired exegesis of scripture”.

⁹⁷ See Albani, “Horoscopes in the Qumran Scrolls,” 279–330 who discusses 4Q186 (*4QHoroscope/4QCrypt*) and 4Q318 (*Zodiacology and Brontology*).

⁹⁸ Tigchelaar, “The Addressees of 4QInstruction,” 62–75 at 74–5.

⁹⁹ Puech, “Apports des textes apocalyptiques et sapientiels de Qumrân à l’eschatologie du judaïsme ancien,” 133–70 at 135 attributes the composition of *Instruction* to the same circle as that which presumably was behind the ‘treatise of the two spirits’ in 1QS and the Hymns of 1QH^a.

¹⁰⁰ See Tigchelaar, “The Addressees of 4QInstruction,” 69–71 (“The Addressee as a Poor Man?”), who, however, emphasises that “the text does not (...) insist on the poverty of the addressee” (71).

¹⁰¹ Cf. Koch, “Das Geheimnis der Zeit,” 35–68 at 52–3.

¹⁰² Milik, *DJD 1*, 101–2; Strugnell, Harrington, Elgvin, *DJD 34*, 1–36.

¹⁰³ Harrington, “Wisdom and Apocalyptic in 4QInstruction and 4 Ezra,” 343–55 at 354, where he also observes “that the precise life-setting of 4QInstruction remains elusive”.

¹⁰⁴ In LXX Dan 2:18–19.27.30.47, רַז/רַז־רַז is consistently translated as τὸ μυστήριον.

¹⁰⁵ See Harrington, “The Raz Nihyeh in a Qumran Wisdom Text (1Q26, 4Q415–418, 423),” 449–53; Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning for the Understanding Ones*, 204–5. Cf. the recent discussions with further bibliography by García Martínez, “Wisdom at Qumran: Worldly or Heavenly?,” 1–15 at 9 n. 34, 12–3 nn. 42–8; Koch, “Das Geheimnis der Zeit,” 35–68 at 52–61; and Collins, “The Mysteries of God,” 287–305 at 288–91.

¹⁰⁶ Cf. the translation ‘the mystery that is to come’ by the editors Strugnell, Harrington, Elgvin of *DJD 34*, adopted by García Martínez, “Wisdom at Qumran: Worldly or Heavenly?,” 9 and 12. Milik, *DJD 1*, 103–4 (‘Livre des Mystères’) interpreted רַז נְהִיָּה

3–4), רז נהיה runs parallel to מקור דעתו and denotes the revelation of divine knowledge. Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar has emphasised the difference between the usages of רז נהיה in *Mysteries* and in *Instruction* with its ‘terminological systematization’.¹⁰⁷

Let us then start with רז נהיה in *Mysteries*. John J. Collins has observed that רז נהיה may well denote a future mystery which complements “the ancient matters”, קדמוניות, in *1QMysteries* (1Q27) 1 I 3 (= *4QMysteries*^b (4Q300) 3 3), but he does not rule out the alternate possibility of ‘synonymous parallelism’.¹⁰⁸ Nevertheless, the context of lines 4–5, which deal with that “which will happen” (אשר יבוא, l. 4; כי יהיה, l. 5) and again mention the רז נהיה (l. 4), makes the latter option only a theoretical possibility. רז נהיה thereby has a future-eschatological orientation in *Mysteries*, in a setting that focuses on justice that prevails against evil in the end (1Q27 1 I 3–7). The mystery concerns this transformation, when “knowledge will pervade the world, and there will ne[ver] be folly there” (1Q27 1 I 7).¹⁰⁹

Due to the fragmentary nature of the manuscripts of *1Q–4QInstruction*, the direct context in which רז נהיה occurs is often difficult to determine. In his survey of the occurrences of רז נהיה, Florentino García Martínez deduced from the different usages of רז נהיה in *4QInstruction*, that the author “considered all the knowledge he communicated, be it of an apocalyptic nature or similar to traditional biblical wisdom, as the same kind of knowledge”.¹¹⁰ The eschatological component of רז נהיה in *Instruction* may in particular be illustrated by its connection with the apprehension of ‘the birth-times of salvation’, מולדי ישע (4Q416 2 I 5–6 // 4Q417 1 I 10–11). רז נהיה here implies inaugurated eschatology.

in *1QMysteries* as “le mystère future”. Collins, “The Mysteries of God,” 289 further deduces from Sir 42,19 and 48,25 (נהיות being translated as τὰ ἐσόμενα), 1QS III 15 and CD-A II 9–10 that the translation of נהיה as a future tense is a good possibility, although he also leaves other options open, depending on the “contexts in which it is used in *4QInstruction*” (290).

¹⁰⁷ Tigchelaar, “Your Wisdom and Your Folly,” 79.

¹⁰⁸ Collins, “The Mysteries of God,” 289.

¹⁰⁹ Translation from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*. 1, 67.

¹¹⁰ García Martínez, “Wisdom at Qumran: Worldly or Heavenly?,” 13–4.

2.3. *Non-Sectarian Writings: Summary*

The non-sectarian Qumran texts and traditions concerning eschatology are concerned with the ultimate destiny of Israel and the world at large (cf. *4QRenewed Earth*). This destiny is determined by the eventual victory of justice over evil. The non-sectarian texts and traditions are different from the sectarian Qumran texts, in that they do not convey the perspective of a chosen sect within Israel. Nevertheless, *1 Enoch*, *4QTime of Righteousness*, *1Q/4QMysteries*, and *1Q/4QInstruction* do contain ‘election’ language, like the ‘elect of righteousness’ and the ‘pious ones’; a feature that made them interesting as ‘adopted texts’ for the Qumran community. The divergent calendar in *1 Enoch* and *Jubilees* further served the community to define itself in opposition to the Temple establishment. On the other hand, *1Q/4QMysteries* has been situated in a priestly milieu from Jerusalem. Considering the interests of the Qumran community in priestly matters and in Jerusalem as well as the Essene presence in Jerusalem, it is not a ‘*contradictio in terminis*’ to suppose the presence of documents of Jerusalemite origin together with polemical texts against the Temple establishment in Qumran literature.

The appeal to biblical figures and texts in the non-sectarian writings may provide a vantage point from which to ‘extrapolate’ to a broader context of Palestinian Jewish eschatological expectations. *1 Enoch* attributes eschatological knowledge to Enoch, while *Jubilees* and *4Qps-Moses^e* attribute this to Moses. The other Qumran pseudepigrapha attest to eschatological traditions being attributed to the Prophets (e.g. Daniel and Ezekiel). The fact that Daniel was considered a prophetic writing in the Second Temple period and even Moses appears to be regarded a prophet (*Ag.Ap.* 1.37–40) indicates that there was a broader context to future-eschatological interpretations of Scripture. The extent to which we can advance our understanding of this historical context will depend on further comparative study (section 4).

3. ESCHATOLOGY IN SECTARIAN QUMRAN TEXTS

3.1. 4QMMT

This survey of eschatology in sectarian Qumran texts begins with *Miqsat Ma'ase ha-Torah* (4QMMT),¹¹¹ because this text has an important place at the earliest stages of the history of the Qumran community. Although recent debate has emphasised MMT's place in the ideological traditions within the Qumran community,¹¹² to the extent of supplanting the editors' hypothesis about MMT as an epistle by the alternate idea of MMT as a 'foundation document' addressing neophytes *within* the community,¹¹³ it seems to me that there is still much force in the 'epistle' hypothesis. A clear correspondence between the sections in the *Damascus Document* and the *Rule of the Community* that address neophytes and 4QMMT cannot be demonstrated. On the other hand, the editors have juxtaposed "the primitiveness of MMT's theology" to the "standard sectarian theology of Qumran".¹¹⁴

The palaeographical dates assigned to the manuscripts 4Q394–399 by the editors range from ca. 30 BCE to 30 CE.¹¹⁵ With regard to 4Q395, however, the editors observed a 'mixture of forms' of script, alternating between late Hasmonean (75–50 BCE) and early Herodian (30–1 BCE), which "renders precise dating difficult". Their explanation was to postulate "an Herodian scribe who attempts to write in an archaising Hasmonean style".¹¹⁶ The palaeographical date assigned to a manuscript may provide a *terminus ante quem* for the date of composition, but it does not preclude the possibility that the document has earlier historical origins. The Qumran manuscripts of *Jubilees* are an example of this possibility, since none of them are palaeographically dated before the

¹¹¹ Ed.pr. Qimron and Strugnell, *DJD* 10, 3–63 who reconstruct 4QMMT units A, B and C from 4Q394–399.

¹¹² See e.g. Grossman, "Reading 4QMMT: Genre and History," 3–22, and eadem, *Reading for History in the Damascus Document*, 57–87; Høgenhaven, "Rhetorical Devices in 4QMMT," 187–204.

¹¹³ Fraade, "4QMMT and Its Addressees," 507–26.

¹¹⁴ Qimron and Strugnell, *DJD* 10, 120.

¹¹⁵ The palaeographical dates range from the 'early Herodian period' (4Q394, pages 3–6; 4Q395, page 14; 4Q397, page 25; 4Q398, page 34) through 'early or mid-Herodian' (4Q396, page 18) to 'mid-Herodian' (4Q399, page 39).

¹¹⁶ Qimron and Strugnell, *DJD* 10, 14.

first century BCE,¹¹⁷ whereas the composition of *Jubilees* is conventionally dated to the early second century BCE.¹¹⁸ The ‘epistle’ hypothesis does not necessarily stand or fall with the (non-)preservation of the ‘autograph’.¹¹⁹

There are several reasons why we may consider an early, second-century BCE date of composition of MMT a good possibility. The relative ‘primitiveness’ of MMT’s theology has already been noted. Jerusalem is considered the “capital of the camps of Israel” (MMT B 61–62); an apparent contrast with the negative associations with (influential parties in) Jerusalem in the Pesharim. References to camps, *מחנות*, in MMT also parallel camp terminology in the *Damascus Document*. Charlotte Hempel identified common strata of halakhot related to priestly matters in 4QMMT and the *Damascus Document*.¹²⁰ No other sectarian Qumran text makes a more direct statement about the historical event of a sectarian separation than MMT does ([ש]פרשנו מרוב הע[ן]);¹²¹ no other sectarian text appears to be as apologetic¹²² to an apparent outside party (cf. MMT C 8c–9, 30b), while at the same time stipulating halakhic regulations about priestly matters (MMT B). The Temple-related issues in MMT B give the impression of a community behind the epistle that was relatively near to the Temple.

Turning to traces of eschatology in 4QMMT, it should be noted that the hortatory part C of MMT has a strong eschatological orientation, as four clearly recognizable references to the ‘end of days’, *אחרית הימים*,

¹¹⁷ See the survey of palaeographically dated manuscripts of *Jubilees* from caves 1, 2, 3, 4, and 11 by Flint, “‘Apocrypha’, Other Previously-Known Writings, and ‘Pseudepigrapha’ in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 24–66 at 46.

¹¹⁸ See e.g. Wintermute, “*Jubilees*,” *OTP* 2, 44 who dates *Jubilees* between 161–140 BCE.

¹¹⁹ Parallel to this, there are no ‘autographs’ of the Pauline Letters; a fact which by itself does not play a significant part in the debate about authenticity and date of the respective epistles.

¹²⁰ Hempel, “The Laws of the Damascus Document and 4QMMT,” 69–84.

¹²¹ The editors’ reconstruction, *DJD* 10, 58, is [ש]פרשנו מרוב הע[ם]. The idea of separation from the majority of the *people* would concur with passages in other sectarian texts which emphasise separateness from the people or mention the ‘way(s) of the people’ in a pejorative way (CD-A VIII 8, 16; CD-B XIX 20.29, XX 24; 1QSa I 1–3. A published alternative, [ש]פרשנו מרוב הע[דה], could imply a separation from the congregation in Jerusalem which controlled the priestly and public affairs; perhaps the congregation eventually despised as the *בירושלים אשר בירושלים* in 4QpIsa^b II 10?

¹²² The editors of *DJD* 10 refer to the friendly and respectful nature of the address (117–121); Høgenhaven, “Rhetorical Devices in 4QMMT,” 202 refers to the “eirenic tone of the C section”.

may indicate (MMT C 14, 16, 21, 30). There is an apparent idea of inaugurated eschatology in MMT C 20–22: “And we know that some of the blessings and the curses have (already) been fulfilled as it is written in the bo[ok of Mo]ses. And this is at the end of days (זוה הוא אחרית) (הימים) when they will return to Isra[el forever]”.¹²³

The eschatological references in MMT C appear to rely most of all on the ‘book of Moses’, ספר מושה, as biblical proof-text. The expressions באחרית[ת] (C 14) and [באחרית] (C 16) are interspersed between parts of the quoted text of Deut 30:1–3; MMT C 21 mentions the book of Moses of which the fulfilment of some of the blessings and the curses is applied to the ‘end of days’. MMT C 30 mentions the expected enjoyment ‘at the end of time’, באחרית העת, when ‘some of our practices’ are found to be correct, that is, practices rooted in precepts of the Torah (C 27), whose rationale the addressee is expected to approve, having “wisdom and knowledge of the Torah” (C 28).

On the other hand, MMT C also comprises references to biblical books outside the Pentateuch, supposedly ‘the books of the Prophets and (the writings of) David’ according to the maximal reconstruction of C 10 by the editors of *DJD 10*,¹²⁴ but these appear to be of secondary importance as compared to the frequent mentioning of the book of Moses. G.J. Brooke and H. von Weissenberg have noted the importance of Deuteronomy for the structure of MMT C.¹²⁵ The author(s) of 4QMMT may also have based their eschatological vision on the Deuteronomic notion of the covenant, applying curses to those who turn away from the covenant and blessings to those who remain steadfast in or return to the covenant.

The eschatology in section C may not be isolated from the literary structure of MMT at large, but in fact permeate the message of the entire document. The last part of 4QMMT, C 27, comprises the phrase

¹²³ Translation from *DJD 10*, 61.

¹²⁴ *DJD 10*, 58: בספר מושה [ו]בספר[י] ה[נ]ביאים ובדו[י]ד. The figure of David is further mentioned in 4QMMT C 25–26 as the prototypical example of a ‘man of righteous deeds’ who was forgiven his transgressions. Against this maximal reconstruction, see recently Ulrich, “The Non-attestation of a Tripartite Canon in 4QMMT,” 202–14, who proposes a more limited ‘simple transcription’ from 4QMMT^d 17 10: [[]]... בספר מ[] . יאים ובד[] . (209).

¹²⁵ Brooke, “The Explicit Presentation of Scripture in 4QMMT,” 67–88 observed that “section C is dominated almost exclusively by Deuteronomy”; Von Weissenberg, “4QMMT—Towards an Understanding of the Epilogue,” 29–45 at 45 concluded that “the use of Deuteronomic language and terminology seems to be intentional and offer a key for a more profound understanding of the epilogue”.

מקצת מעשי התורה from which the editors have derived the title of the document (translated as ‘Some of the precepts of the Torah’); a phrase that is partially represented also in MMT B 1–2.¹²⁶ What appears to be at stake according to the halakhic section B concerns the moral and ritual (ir)responsibility of the priestly leadership on the one hand (cf. MMT B 11–13, 26–27, 80–82) and transgressions of the people of Israel on the other (cf. MMT B 39–49, 75–76). The consequences of irresponsibility and transgression, expressed by the term עוון in MMT B 13 and 27,¹²⁷ appear to prefigure the eschatologically oriented exhortation in section C, which refers to the blessings and the curses as applied to the seekers of the Torah (MMT C 24) and the wicked (MMT C 22) respectively.

If we take the sectarian separation mentioned in MMT C 7–8 to stand for a separation from the ‘multitude of the people’ in the first place, following the editors’ reconstruction and translation (*DJD 10*, pp. 58–59),¹²⁸ it seems that the situation of the Essenes described by Josephus is strikingly parallel to this. Josephus writes that the Essenes performed different purification rites and perhaps offered sacrifices in a domain of the Temple apart from the common precincts of the Temple (*Ant.* 18.19).¹²⁹ It appears to follow from Josephus’ *Jewish Antiquities* 18.22 that the Essenes had their own priests. It may be inferred from 4QMMT that the breakaway from the ‘way(s) of the people’ and the criticism of the priestly leadership probably stood at the beginning of the sectarian eschatological consciousness.

¹²⁶ Cf. Baumgarten, “The Perception of the Past in the Damascus Document,” 1–15 at 4: “Ancient authors regularly situated comments intended to guide the reader at the beginning or at the end of works, indicating what sort of work they had produced and how they wanted it to be read. Ideological statements therefore were concentrated in passages at the beginning or end of works”.

¹²⁷ עוון (= השיא) is translated as ‘cause to bear punishment’ by the editors of *DJD 10*, 49.

¹²⁸ The editors’ reconstruction could perhaps find additional support in the fact that MMT C 27 refers to ‘your welfare and the welfare of your people’, לטוב לך ולעמך, rather than to ‘your welfare and the welfare of your congregation’; an addressee who is admonished to remove from him/herself the plans of evil and the advice of Belial, which thereby also applies to the situation of the people associated with the addressee.

¹²⁹ Cf. the translation of Feldman, *Josephus. Jewish Antiquities. Books XVIII–XIX*, 17: “For this reason they are barred from those precincts of the temple that are frequented by all the people and perform their rites by themselves”.

3.2. *The Damascus Document*

The text of the *Damascus Document* as we now know it still relies to an important extent on the two manuscripts from the Cairo Genizah (CD-A and CD-B),¹³⁰ but the discoveries from Qumran cave 4 have supplemented this text with a significant amount of legal material.¹³¹ The *Damascus Document* is usually divided in two subsections: the *Admonition* (CD-A I–VIII, CD-B XIX–XX) and the *Laws* (CD-A XV–XVI, IX–XIV). Extensive eschatological material figures in the *Admonition*, but the *Laws* are not devoid of references to an eschatological setting with messianic figures either (CD-A XII 23–XIII 1, XIV 19 (= 4QD^a 10 I 12)).¹³² It has been noted that CD-A I 1 cannot be the beginning of the *Damascus Document*.¹³³ 4QD^a frg. 1a–b appears to have preserved the prologue or introduction.¹³⁴ This fragment provides important information about the sectarian eschatological setting of the work. I therefore quote lines 1–5a as translated by Joseph M. Baumgarten:¹³⁵

1. [The elaboration of the laws by the Sage for the s]ons of light to keep apart from the way[s of wickedness]
2. [] until the completion of the fixed time for visitation upon [the spirit of iniquity]
3. [] God [will destroy] all her works, bringing rui[n]
4. upon [the errant in spirit] those who move the boundaries, and he will wreak ruin [upon those who work]
- 5a. wickedness.

¹³⁰ The *Damascus Document* was originally published by Schechter, *Documents of Jewish Sectaries*, V–LXIX, 1–20. For a new edition with photographs of the text of CD mss. A and B, see Qimron, “The Text of CDC,” 9–49. On the Cairo Genizah collection, see Reif, *A Jewish Archive from Old Cairo*. For a survey of scholarship up to the 1970s, see Davies, *The Damascus Covenant*.

¹³¹ 4QD^{a-g}, 4QpapD^h (4Q266–273), ed.pr. J.M. Baumgarten, *DJD 18*, on the basis of transcriptions of Józef T. Milik and with contributions by Stephen Pfann and Ada Yardeni. On page 6, Baumgarten observes that “the 4Q manuscripts tend to enhance the general reliability of the text extant in the Genizah versions of CD”. Apart from CD-A, CD-B, and 4Q266–273, small fragments from caves 5 (5QD = 5Q12) and 6 (6QD = 6Q15) mostly witness CD-A; only 6QD frg. 5 preserves text that overlaps with 4QD^c 2 II and is not attested in CD-A/CD-B.

¹³² Cf. CD-B XIX 10–11, XX 1.

¹³³ See the observation that Schechter made about CD-A as preserved “in a very fragmentary state, leaving the impression that we are dealing with extracts from a larger work, put together, however, in a haphazard way with little regard to completeness or order” (page X; quotation from Davies, *The Damascus Covenant*, 5 and 48).

¹³⁴ Cf. Baumgarten, *DJD 18*, 3 referring to 4QD^b 1 i–2 i, as well as 4QD^b frg. 1 and 4QD^c frg. 1, as textual witnesses to the ‘Introduction’ of the *Admonition*.

¹³⁵ Baumgarten, *DJD 18*, 32.

The self-designation of the ‘sons of light’, בני אור, is common to, though not exclusively characteristic of, other sectarian texts.¹³⁶ The “completion of the fixed time for visitation,” תום המועד פקודה, sets the stage for the eschatological setting of antagonism between the sons of light and ‘those who move boundaries’ (4QD^a 1a–b 2–5). 4QD^a 1a–b 16–17 mention slander against the statutes and commandments of God (l. 17) mediated to Israel by the ‘voice of Moses’ (l. 16). It may be deduced from 4QD^a 1a–b and from CD-A I 16–17, which mentions curses of the covenant applied to those who removed the ancestral boundary, that the ‘boundary’, גבול, relates to the observance of the Mosaic covenant, the Torah. Fundamental differences between the sectarian perspective on the Torah and that of other groups therefore are an important factor behind the eschatological dualism in the *Damascus Document*.

The *Damascus Document* as incorporated among the Qumran scrolls may reflect a hindsight perspective on the (pre)history and origins of the sectarian Qumran community, but it probably also preserves strata of a primitive document as has been argued in a redaction-critical study by Charlotte Hempel.¹³⁷ The *Damascus Document* may therefore relate to the early stages of the history of the Qumran community, and consequently also be informative about the early stages of sectarian eschatological thought.

In contrast to 4QMMT, the *Damascus Document* is much more specific about the sectarian community itself and about its opponents. The first column mentions the enigmatic figure of the ‘Teacher of Righteousness’, מורה צדק, who is associated with the foundation of the sectarian community elsewhere (הכוהן מורה ה[צדק אשר ב]חר) [הכינו לבנות לו עדת] [בחירו באמת] [בו אל לעמוד] [...].¹³⁸ and is here said to direct the community ‘on the path of his

¹³⁶ Cf. 1QS I 9, II 16, III 13, 24, 25; 1QM I 1, 3, 9, 11, 13, 14 (cf. 4QM^f (4Q496) I, frgs. 2 + 1, ll. 6–7); 4QMidrEschat^b (4Q177) II 7, IV 12, 16; 4Q280 (4QCurses) frg. 1, l. 1; 4QSongs of the Sage^{a–b} (4Q510 frg. 1, l. 7 // 4Q511 frg. 10, l. 4); 11QMelchizedek II 8. The designation ‘sons of light’, in Greek υιοὶ φωτός, also occurs in Paul’s First Letter to the Thessalonians (1 Thess 5:5).

¹³⁷ Hempel, “Community Origins in the Damascus Document,” 316–29. Cf. eadem, *The Damascus Texts, 54–70* (“The Damascus Document and the Quest of the Origins and Early History of the ‘Qumran Community’”).

¹³⁸ The ‘Teacher of Righteousness’ also figures in 1QpMic 8–10 6; 1QpHab I 13, II 2, V 10, VII 4, VIII 3, IX 9, XI 5; 4Qpap pIsa^c (4Q163) 21 6; 4QpPs^a (4Q171) 1, 3–4 III, 15, 19 and 3–10 IV 27; 4Q172 (4QpUnid) 7 1; 4QpPs^b (4Q173) 1 4 and 2 2. The late palaeographical dates assigned to some Pesharim, like 1QpHab, may attest to the enduring importance of the Teacher of Righteousness for the Qumran community.

heart' (CD-A I 11). Directly following this is the statement about the divine revelation to the 'last generations', *לדורות אחרונים*,¹³⁹ presumably the sectarian community, what he did to the 'last generation, the congregation of traitors', *בדור אחרון בעדת בוגדים*, presumably the opponents of the community. The mediation of eschatological knowledge is attributed to the Teacher of Righteousness in 1QpHab VII 1–8, and this may also be implied in CD-A I 11–12. The 'introduction' to the *Admonition* mentions predetermined 'appointed times' (4QD^a 2 I 2): a 'period of wrath', *קץ הרון*, for the 'people that know him not' (4QD^a 2 I 3) and 'times of favour (*מועדי רצון*) for those who seek his commandments' (4QD^a 2 I 4).¹⁴⁰ The eschatological pertinence of the teachings of the Teacher of Righteousness is further emphasised in CD-B XX 27b–34. This passage claims salvation, *ישועה*, for those who remain steadfast in the just regulations and who listen to the voice of the Teacher of Righteousness.

The lines subsequent to CD-A I 11–12 (CD-A I 13–II 1 // 4QD^a 2 I 16b–II 2a)¹⁴¹ make it clear that the 'congregation of traitors' is further characterised by, among other things, the search of 'slippery matters', *חלקות* (CD-A I 18). It was already noted in early Qumran scholarship that this term may be a polemical 'play of words' on *הלכות*, thereby implying that the Pharisees could be the congregation against which the Qumran community turned its polemic.¹⁴² Josephus refers to an antagonism between Pharisees and Sadducees already at the time of John Hyrcanus (135–104 BCE; *Ant.* 13.288–298), but the possibility of an even earlier dispute between Sadducean and Essene legal perspectives on the one hand¹⁴³ and Pharisaic legal perspectives on the other cannot be excluded. The distinction between Pharisees, Sadducees and Essenes as separate schools figures in the chronology of Josephus' account as early as Jonathan's leadership (160–142 BCE; *Ant.* 13.171–173). The

¹³⁹ The identification of the Qumran community with the 'last generations' corresponds with the eschatological consciousness and expectations which emanate from CD-B XX 13b–15a (cf. 1QpHab VII 1–8).

¹⁴⁰ Translation after Baumgarten, *DJD* 18, 35.

¹⁴¹ CD-A I 21b–II 1 ends with the observation about God's wrath being kindled against 'their congregation', *עדתם*, thereby referring back to the 'congregation of traitors' mentioned in CD-A I 12.

¹⁴² For an up-to-date discussion, see VanderKam, "Those Who Look for Smooth Things," 465–77.

¹⁴³ Cf. Qimron, "The Halakha," 123–77 who has observed a number of cases in which halakhic views ascribed by rabbinic sources to the Sadducees and to sectarians occur in 4QMMT.

setting of intra-Jewish conflict also determines the sectarian eschatological perspective.

The *Damascus Document* contains lines of thought suggesting that the Qumran community built its eschatological consciousness on the parent movement, while at the same time defining itself in contradistinction to the predecessors. There are two passages from which we may deduce this: CD-A III 19–IV 4a and CD-A VI 8b–11a.¹⁴⁴

First, CD-A III 19–IV 4a refers to God's building of a 'sure house', **בית נאמן**, "such as there has not been from ancient times till now," in Israel (III 19), followed by an eschatological interpretation of Ezekiel 44:15 that mentions the Temple service (III 20–IV 4a). It has been argued that this passage concerns the eschatological Temple,¹⁴⁵ but I think that **בית נאמן** is a self-designation of the Qumran community. The activity of God's building expressed by **ויבן** in CD-A III 19 probably denotes an activity in the past tense,¹⁴⁶ so that it may be interpreted as a statement about the foundation of the sectarian community¹⁴⁷ in retrospect as a momentous event without parallel 'even up till now'. The Qumran community probably saw itself as a 'sure house' in Israel, in that it defined itself as the 'house of the Torah' (CD-B XX 10) as opposed to the 'house of division' (CD-B XX 22). In this respect, the Qumran community elaborated on the basis provided by the parent movement. If CD-A III 12b–IV 12a and V 20–VI 11a constitute accounts of community origins,¹⁴⁸ the 'diggers of the well', the well being the Torah (CD-A III 16–17, VI 2–7) may in all probability be identified with the parent movement. Further, the parent movement is associated with a 'shoot of the planting', **שורש מטעת** (CD-A I 7), while the Qumran community associates itself with an 'everlasting planting place', **מטעת עולם** (1QS VIII 5).

The link between the 'sure house' and the eschatological Temple implied in CD-A III 19–IV 4a may be interpreted as follows. The Qumran community defined itself as a 'holy house for Israel and the foundation of the holy of holies for Aaron' (1QS VIII 5–6 // 4QS^e II

¹⁴⁴ These two passages in CD-A are not paralleled by Qumran fragments (4Q266 3 II 14–16, lines which could have comprised parallel material to CD-A VI, 11, are missing).

¹⁴⁵ See Kampen, "The significance of the Temple in the Manuscripts of the Damascus Document," 185–97 at 193–5.

¹⁴⁶ Thus I take the *waw* in **ויבן** as a *waw consecutive*.

¹⁴⁷ Cf. the 'foundation' language in 1QS VIII 5–10 and IX 6.

¹⁴⁸ See Hempel, "Community Origins in the Damascus Document," 324–7.

14). It may further be deduced from 4Q174 frgs. 1, col. I, 21, 2, lines 1–7a that the Qumran community distinguished between the Temple of Israel in the past, a ‘Temple of man’, **מקדש אדם**, at an intermediate stage,¹⁴⁹ and the Temple of the Lord in the last days. It could well be that the Qumran community applied temple imagery to itself in anticipation on the expected eschatological Temple. Since the ‘sons of Zadok’ have a prominent place in 1QS V 2 and 4Q174 frgs. 1, col. I, 21, 2, line 17, it could be that the Qumran community attributed to itself a privileged place in the Temple service ‘at the end of days’, **באחרית הימים**, as the sons of Zadok, who are “the chosen of Israel, the men of renown” (CD-A IV 3–4a). The image of the ‘sure house’ thus comprises legal and temple-theological aspects of self-definition.

The second passage that may indicate elaborations on the heritage of the parent movement is CD-A VI 8b–11a. We have already mentioned the pivotal role of the Teacher of Righteousness in the history of the parent movement and of the Qumran community. CD-A VI 10 refers to observance of the Torah “throughout the whole age of wickedness,” presumably the contemporary age. This age is contrasted to the expectation that “there arises one who will teach justice at the end of days,” **עד עמד יורה הצדק באחרית הימים** (CD-A VI 10–11). This passage has led to discussion whether the Qumran community saw an eschatological role for the Teacher of Righteousness, **מורה צדק**.¹⁵⁰ At any rate, it seems probable that the Qumran community’s expectations of “one who will teach justice at the end of days” were determined by the heritage and pivotal significance of the Teacher of Righteousness.¹⁵¹

Finally, a 4QD fragment expresses a notion of progressive revelation about the final age. 4QD^e (4Q270) 7 II 15 mentions “the final interpretation of the Torah,” **מדרש התורה האחרון**; a designation that is not paralleled in CD-A and CD-B. The context, lines 12b–15, indicates that this “final interpretation of the Torah” probably has an eschatological orientation:

¹⁴⁹ Cf. Brooke, “Miqdash Adam, Eden and the Qumran Community,” 285–301.

¹⁵⁰ Davies, “The Teacher of Righteousness and the ‘End of Days,’” 313–7; Hempel, *The Damascus Texts*, 75–7.

¹⁵¹ The fact that the *Rule of the Community* does not mention the Teacher of Righteousness, does not diminish his significance for the Qumran community. The *Community Rule* is a foundation text that stipulates regulations for the *yahad* as it probably developed after the time of the Teacher’s activity rather than a historical text. Further, the Teacher of Righteousness is deemed the founder of the **עדה**, not of the **יחד**, in 4QpPs^a III 15–16.

- 12b This is the elaboration of the laws
 13 [to be followed during the entire] period of [visitation] that will be
 [vis]ited upon them during all the periods of wrath
 14 and [their journeys,] for all who dwell in their [c]amps and all who
 [dwell in their] towns. Behold it is all w[ritten(?)]
 15 in accordance with the final interpretation of the Law. *vacat* ¹⁵²

3.3. *The Serekh ha-Yahad*

The *Serekh ha-Yahad* (from **ס**ר**ך** ה**י**ח**ד** in 1QS I 1) or *Rule of the Community* makes part of a ‘rules scroll’ from Qumran cave 1 which also contains the *Rule of the Congregation* (1QSa, see next section 3.4) and the *Rule of the Benedictions* (1QSB).¹⁵³ Small fragments of the *Rule of the Community* were also discovered and published from caves 5 (5Q11)¹⁵⁴ and 11 (11Q29).¹⁵⁵ Manuscripts from cave 4 subsequently became identified as recensions of the *Community Rule* and were published as 4QpapS^a, 4QSB^b, 4QpapS^c, 4QS^{d-j} (4Q255–264).¹⁵⁶ 1QS is palaeographically dated between 100–75 BCE,¹⁵⁷ while the palaeographical dates assigned to the 4QS manuscripts range from 125–100 BCE (4QpapS^a) to 1–50 CE (4QS^b).¹⁵⁸

At an earlier stage of Qumran scholarship, the study of 1QS yielded the impression that its literary structure has a composite character which may be traced back to literary development.¹⁵⁹ The evidence of

¹⁵² Translation from Baumgarten, *DJD* 18, 166–7; cf. page 78: “the Qumran community believed in the progressive unfolding of the Law as interpreted by the **ר**א**ש**ו**נ**י**ם** and the **א**ח**ר**ו**נ**י**ם** (CD IV 8; XX 8–9, 31)”.

¹⁵³ Ed. pr. Burrows, Trever, Brownlee, *The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark’s Monastery. II. Fascicle 2*; the ‘Manual of Discipline’ being the older, outdated designation for the *Rule of the Community*.

¹⁵⁴ Ed. pr. by Milik, *DJD* 3, 180–181, plate XXXVIII.

¹⁵⁵ Ed. pr. García Martínez, Tigchelaar, Van der Woude, *DJD* 23, 433–4, plate L; incorporating earlier editions by J.P.M. van der Ploeg, O.P., with a contribution by E. Herbert. Cf. Tigchelaar, “A Newly Identified 11QSerekh ha-Yahad Fragment (11Q29)?,” 285–92.

¹⁵⁶ Ed. pr. Alexander and Vermes, *DJD* 26.

¹⁵⁷ F.M. Cross, “Introduction,” in Idem *et al.* (eds.), *Scrolls from Qumrân Cave I*, 1–5. Cf. e.g. Tigchelaar, “In Search of the Scribe of 1QS,” 439–52.

¹⁵⁸ See Alexander and Vermes, *DJD* 26, 20–1 table 5, who assign the following palaeographical dates to the 4QS manuscripts: 125–100 BCE for 4QpapS^a; 30–1 BCE for 4QS^b; 100–75 BCE for 4QpapS^c; 30–1 BCE for 4QS^d; 50–25 BCE for 4QS^e; 30–1 BCE for 4QS^f; 50–1 BCE for 4QS^g; 1–50 CE for 4QS^h; 30–1 BCE for 4QSⁱ; 50–25 BCE for 4QS^j.

¹⁵⁹ See e.g. Murphy-O’Connor, “La genèse littéraire de la Règle de la Communauté,” 528–49; Pouilly, *La Règle de la Communauté de Qumrân*.

the 4QS manuscripts has provided a new challenge for the study of the textual development of the *Rule of the Community*. Basically two directions in the text-critical study of 1Q/4QS have been proposed. Philip S. Alexander has expressed a slight preference for a chronological order of recensions, in which text-criticism and palaeography are mutually supportive: first 1QS + 4QS^c, then 4QS^e, and finally 4QS^{b+d}.¹⁶⁰ Sarianne S. Metso, on the other hand, has argued on the basis of the basis of literary- and redaction-critical analysis that both 4QS^{b,d} and 4QS^e contain lines of tradition which are older than 1QS.¹⁶¹

The question of the literary development and historical setting of the *Community Rule* is far from solved.¹⁶² The perspective on textual development mainly impacts the perspective on communal development as regards 1QS V–VII,¹⁶³ VIII–IX,¹⁶⁴ and X–XI¹⁶⁵ as compared to the 4QS manuscripts. Both older and more recent analyses have identified columns I–IV as a separate entity that was added to the composition of 1QS.¹⁶⁶ Since the palaeographical *terminus ad quem* for 1QS is 100–75 BCE, 1QS I–IV may still contain relatively old traditions from before the first century BCE.

One literary unit of the *Rule of the Community*, the so-called ‘treatise of the two spirits’ (1QS III 13–IV 26), is particularly relevant for the

¹⁶⁰ Alexander, “The Redaction-History of Serekh ha-Yahad: A Proposal,” 437–56 at 450.

¹⁶¹ Metso, *The Textual Development of the Qumran Community Rule*. Cf. eadem, “In Search of the Sitz im Leben of the Community Rule,” 306–15.

¹⁶² Cf. Alexander, “The Redaction-History of Serekh ha-Yahad,” 453: “Analysis of the problem [the redaction-history of S] has only begun”; Metso, “In Search of the Sitz im Leben of the Community Rule,” 309: “The community possessed several different versions of the *Community Rule*, and it is not at all clear which practice was observed at any particular time.”

¹⁶³ In particular, the difference between 1QS V 2 (בני צדוק) and 4QS^b IX 3 + 4QS^d I 2 (הרבים), when put in a redaction-critical perspective, also affects one’s perspective on communal development.

¹⁶⁴ 1QS IX 11 mentions the eschatological expectation “until the prophet comes, and the Messiahs of Aaron and Israel”, עד בוא נביא ומשיחי אהרון וישראל, significantly, the parallel passage in 4QS^c column III omits this messianic reference, comprising a text which corresponds to 1QS VIII 11–15, immediately followed by 1QS IX 12–20, thereby leaving out the sections of 1QS VIII 15b–19, 20–27, and IX 1–11.

¹⁶⁵ Cf. Metso, *The Textual Development of the Qumran Community Rule*, 119: “1QS IX, 26b–XI, 22: The final psalm containing a calendaric section at the beginning had an independent existence before its insertion in the composition. This can be demonstrated with the aid of the material reconstruction of the manuscript 4QS^c, where the psalm was replaced by the calendrical text 4QOtot”.

¹⁶⁶ Murphy-O’Connor, “La genèse littéraire de la Règle de la Communauté,” 538–44; Metso, “In Search of the Sitz im Leben of the Community Rule,” 311 and 315.

subject of eschatology. Jacob Licht observed about this treatise that there are three “main points which the author seeks to establish”: predestination, dualism, and eschatology.¹⁶⁷ Of the 4QS fragments, only 4QpapS^c column V, which runs parallel to 1QS IV 4–10.13–14 without a noteworthy divergence from 1QS, contains a part of this treatise. However, this literary unit may not be isolated from other strands of both sectarian and non-sectarian tradition, since Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar has pointed out that there is a relationship between 1QH^a, *Instruction* and 1QS III–IV on the basis of the large number of correspondences in vocabulary.¹⁶⁸

1QS IV 16–17 comprises an eschatological perspective of predestined human division ‘until the last time’, *עד קץ אחרון*, when God will bring an “end to the existence of injustice and on the appointed time of the visitation he will obliterate it for ever”.¹⁶⁹ 1QS IV 19–20 defines this expected final age as a time of truth and an appointed time of judgment, *מועד משפט* (1QS IV 20). 1QS IV 23 repeats the point that in the final age “there will be no more injustice” and internalises the temporary dualism between truth and injustice: “until now the spirits of truth and injustice feud in the heart of man”.¹⁷⁰ 1QS IV 25 refers to the final age as the ‘appointed end and the new creation’, *עד קץ נחרצה ועשות*, *חדשה*.¹⁷¹ Since the dualism of this passage is oriented to the final age, the reference to the ‘mysteries of his [God’s] knowledge’, *ברזי שכלו*, in 1QS IV 18 may also have a strong eschatological component.

3.4. *The Rule of the Congregation*

The *Rule of the Congregation* (1QSa)¹⁷² is part of the same scroll which contains 1QS, being palaeographically dated to 100–75 BCE. It consists of two columns. The title is derived from column I line 1, which also sets the stage for the eschatological setting of this text: *וזוה הסרדך לכול עדת ישראל באחרית הימים*, “And this is the rule for the entire congregation

¹⁶⁷ Licht, “An analysis of the treatise on the two spirits in DSD,” 88–100 at 88–9.

¹⁶⁸ Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning for the Understanding Ones*, 194–207 (“Instruction, 1QS III–IV, and 1QH^a V (Sukenik XIII & Frags.)”).

¹⁶⁹ Translation from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*. 1, 79.

¹⁷⁰ Translation from *Ibidem*.

¹⁷¹ Translation from *Ibidem*.

¹⁷² Ed.pr. Barthélemy, *DJD* 1, 107–18, plates XXIII–XXIV; cf. Licht, *The Rule Scroll*.

of Israel *in the latter days*.” The text continues, “when they gather [in community to wa]lk in accordance with the regulation of the sons of Zadok, the priests, and the men of their covenant who have turn[ed away from the] path of the nation.”¹⁷³ The authority attributed to the ‘sons of Zadok, the priests,¹⁷⁴ and the men of their covenant’, בְּנֵי צְדוֹק, הכוהנים ואנשי בריתם reminds us of a self-designation of the Qumran community with priestly leadership circles (1QS V 2; 4Q174 frgs. 1 col. I, 21, 2, l. 17; CD-A IV 3–4).

The entire congregation of Israel as envisaged by the Qumran community should adopt its sectarian regulations. Lawrence H. Schiffman formulated the intent of the *Rule of the Congregation* as follows: “All those destined to join the Sons of Light would do so as the *eschaton* dawned. All others would be destroyed. The sect, in its newly expanded form, would now constitute the entirety of the Congregation of Israel.”¹⁷⁵ This idea may accord with the eschatological self-designations of the Qumran community as a ‘holy house for Israel’ in 1QS VIII 4 and a ‘house of the Community for Israel’ in 1QS IX 6. 1QSa, though comprising references to armies (I 6) and future warfare (I 21, 26), appears to convey a less sharply defined idea of an eschatological war than the *War Scroll*. 1QSa mentions warfare to ‘subdue the gentiles’ (1QSa I 21), to be sure, but there is not a single reference to ‘sons of light’, ‘sons of darkness’ or ‘Belial’ in it. The eschatological setting of the *Rule of the Congregation* appears to focus rather on the internal structures and social cohesion of the entire congregation of Israel as envisaged from the sectarian perspective than on the antagonism with the sectarian community’s enemies.

3.5. 1Q/4QHodayot

The Qumran text *1QHodayot*^a already received attention in earlier scholarship on Qumran eschatology, in particular for its perspective on the afterlife and the time of judgment.¹⁷⁶ *1QHodayot* (1QH^a) was first

¹⁷³ Translation from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*. 1, 101.

¹⁷⁴ The authoritative position of the ‘sons of Zadok, the priests’ is further mentioned in 1QSa I 24, II 3.

¹⁷⁵ Schiffman, *The Eschatological Community of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 12.

¹⁷⁶ See Nickelsburg, *Resurrection, Immortality and Eternal Life*, 146–56 (“The Hymns Scroll”); cf. Puech, *La croyance des Esséniens en la vie future*. 2, 335–419 (“Les Hymnes (1QH)”).

published by E.L. Sukenik in 1954/1955.¹⁷⁷ J.T. Milik published some smaller fragments known as *1QHodayot^b*.¹⁷⁸ New evidence from cave 4, *4QHodayot^{a-f}* (4Q427–432), was published by E.M. Schuller in 1999.¹⁷⁹ Reconsideration of 1QH led Hartmut Stegemann and Émile Puech to make a new reconstruction of the *Hodayot* text, different from that of E.L. Sukenik. This new reconstruction is followed by many scholars today, even though the order of text reconstructed by Sukenik is usually added in brackets.¹⁸⁰ The title *Hodayot* (הודיות) or *Thanksgiving Hymns* is derived from the frequently recurring expression אֲדוּנִי אֲדוּכָה (‘I give you thanks, Lord’). *1QHodayot^a* was palaeographically dated to the second half of the first century BCE.¹⁸¹ Of the 4QH manuscripts, *4QHodayot^b* has been palaeographically dated to the Mid- to Late Hasmonean period ((125–)100–50 BCE), while *4QHodayot^c* is dated between 50–25 BCE.¹⁸² Due to the fact that part of the evidence is palaeographically dated to the early first century BCE, it is possible to trace the date of composition of the *Hodayot* back to the late second century BCE.¹⁸³

The possible interrelationship between the origin of the *Hodayot* and the origins of the Qumran community has interested scholars since the earliest stages of Qumran scholarship. E.L. Sukenik identified the author of the *Hodayot* as the Teacher of Righteousness, in view of the perceived individual character of the hymns and references to individual persecution paralleled by other descriptions of the Teacher’s fate (cf. 1QH^a IV 9; 1QpHab XI 6).¹⁸⁴ Sukenik’s hypothesis was met by a divided scholarly reception.¹⁸⁵ Since the studies by S. Holm-Nielsen and

¹⁷⁷ Sukenik, *אוצר המגילות הגנוזות*; idem, *The Dead Sea Scrolls of the Hebrew University*, columns I–XVIII, fragments 1–66, plates 35–58.

¹⁷⁸ Milik, *DJD 1*, 136–8, plate XXXI.

¹⁷⁹ Schuller, *DJD 29*, 69–232, plates IV–XIV, XXVIII. Cf. *4QHodayot-like text A–B* (4Q433–433a) published in the same edition by E.M. Schuller, and *4QSelf-Glorification Hymn^{a-b}* (4Q471b, 4Q491c), of which 4Q471b was published in the same edition by E. Eshel and 4Q491c was published already by Baillet, *DJD 7*, 26–30, plate VI, as part of *4QWar Scroll^a* (4Q491 fragments 11 and 12).

¹⁸⁰ Stegemann, *Rekonstruktion der Hodajot*; Puech, “Quelques aspects de la restauration du rouleau des hymnes [1QH],” 38–55.

¹⁸¹ Cross, “The Development of the Jewish Scripts,” 133–202 at 173 f. and nn. 132 and 136.

¹⁸² Cf. B. Webster, “Chronological Index of the Texts from the Judaean Desert: Introduction,” *DJD 39* (eds. Tov *et al.*), 351–446 at 372–3.

¹⁸³ Cf. Puech, *La croyance des Esséniens en la vie future*, 2, 336.

¹⁸⁴ See Sukenik, *סקירה שנייה: מגילות גנוזות*, 33.

¹⁸⁵ For a survey of sceptical, non-committal, and approving reactions to Sukenik’s thesis, see Douglas, “The Teacher Hymn Hypothesis Revisited,” 239–66 at 240–3.

G. Morawe,¹⁸⁶ scholars have sought to identify ‘Community Hymns’ and ‘Teacher Hymns’ in the *Hodayot* rather than assuming it to be a literary unity.¹⁸⁷ It is also understandable from apparently institutionalised references to forms of community in the *Hodayot* (e.g. 1QH^a III 10, VI 18, VII 4) that the *Hodayot* in its entirety cannot be attributed to the Teacher of Righteousness. Yet, passages which indicate a specific teacher-disciples relation (1QH^a XIV 19, XV 20) may speak for their authorship by a sectarian leader.

Michael C. Douglas has recently revived the ‘Teacher Hymn hypothesis’ by identifying **בִּי הַגְּבִירָה** in 1QH^a columns 10–13 as a ‘signature phrase’, deducing from this and other criteria that “1QH cols 10–17 are substantially the work of a single author”.¹⁸⁸ Furthermore, Douglas concludes on the basis of the provenance of 1QH 10 and 12, which he dates earlier than the provenance of the ‘rules for the *Maskil*’ in 1QS, that “1QH 10–17 could not have been the product of a “later leader of the sect”, but should in all probability be attributed to the Teacher of Righteousness.¹⁸⁹

Douglas’s idea that 1QH^a X–XVII constitute the earliest historical core of the *Hodayot* may indeed be acceptable, since this part does not contain the terminology of an institutionalised community, whereas it does mention features also associated with the Teacher of Righteousness in other sectarian texts. 1QH^a X 13 contains the self-designations “a banner for the elect of justice (**בַּחֲרֵי צְדָק**)” and “a knowledgeable mediator of secret wonders,” **מְלִיץ דַּעַת בְּרִזִּי פְּלֵא** (cf. 1QH^a XV 27).¹⁹⁰ We already came across the term **בַּחֲרֵי צְדָק** in *1 Enoch*, *4QTime of Righteousness* and *1Q/4QMysteries*, while the mediation of divine revelation about hidden, secret things is also attributed to the Teacher of

¹⁸⁶ Holm-Nielsen, *Hodayot: Psalms from Qumran*; Morawe, *Studien zur gattungsgeschichtlichen Einordnung der Hodajoth*.

¹⁸⁷ Douglas, “The Teacher Hymn Hypothesis Revisited,” 242–5, n. 12 and Table 1 on page 245 discusses the works of G. Jeremias, *Der Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit* (1963), J. Becker, *Heils- und Sündenbegriffe in den Qumrantexten und im Neuen Testament* (1964), and H.-W. Kuhn, *Enderwartung und gegenwärtiges Heil* (1966), in the Göttingen SUNT-series, nos. 2, 3 and 4.

¹⁸⁸ Douglas, “The Teacher Hymn Hypothesis Revisited,” 256.

¹⁸⁹ Douglas, “The Teacher Hymn Hypothesis Revisited,” 266 thus refutes the argument of Licht, *יהודה מדבר ממגילות ההודיות*, 24–6 that 1QH’s author could be a **משכיל** or **מבקר**, rather agreeing with G. Jeremias and others that the Teacher of Righteousness was the author of the ‘Teacher Hymns’.

¹⁹⁰ Text and translation from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition. 1*, 162–3.

Righteousness in 1QpHab VII 4–5 and 4QpIsa^e 1–2 3. Another example may be the reference to the “tongue of my instruction,” [לש]ון למודי, which cannot be silenced (1QH^a XVI 35–36; cf. XV 10b–12a). This is paralleled by the peshet in 4QpPs^a IV 26–27 which identifies the tongue, the pen of a skilled scribe, in Psalm 45:2 with the reply of the tongue by the Teacher of Righteousness. 1QH^a also contains certain foundation language, like מטעת עולם (1QH^a XIV 15) and building imagery typified as ‘tested’, בחן, and ‘unshakable’, לוא תתזעזע, (1QH^a XIV 26–27, XV 9), which further occurs in the *Community Rule* (1QS VIII–IX).¹⁹¹ Assuming that 1QH^a X–XVII may indeed be related to the earliest stages in the history of the Qumran community, it is probable that the later sectarian community adopted foundation language from the Teacher of Righteousness. Consequently, the sectarian perspective on the conflict with the ‘congregation of the seekers of easy interpretations’ (1QH^a X 32), who change God’s Law (1QH^a XII 10) goes back to the time of the Teacher of Righteousness.

1QH^a X–XVII contains early sectarian eschatological traditions about final judgement and salvation for the righteous. 1QH^a X 24 mentions future “judgement of the wicked,” משפט רשעים. 1QH^a XII 20 substantiates the consequences of divine judgement: “At the judgment you will annihilate all the men of deception, seers of delusion (אנשי מרמה) (וחוזי תעות) will no longer be found.”¹⁹² 1QH^a XIII 11–12 and XIV 24–25 stipulate individual salvation in which the Teacher has put his hope. 1QH^a XIV 28–30 recapitulates the eschatological vision of the “era of judgment,” קץ משפט, in terms of an end to “wicked battles,” when “all the sons of his t[ru]th will awaken, to destroy [the sons of] wickedness, and all the sons of guilt will no longer exist”.¹⁹³ 1QH^a XV 12 claims God’s final judgement against the Teacher’s opponents: כי בול גרי למשפט תרשיע להבדיל בי בין צדיק לרשע, “at the judgement you pronounce guilty all those who harass me, separating the just from the wicked through me”.¹⁹⁴

Other columns in the *Hodayot* also contain eschatological material that probably elaborates on the earlier traditions in columns X–XVII.

¹⁹¹ Cf. the parallel between לבוא ביחד עם עדת בני שמים (1QH^a XI 22) and ועם סודם בני שמים חבר סודם (1QS XI 8).

¹⁹² Text and translation from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*. 1, 168–9.

¹⁹³ Translation from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *ibidem*, 177.

¹⁹⁴ Text and translation from *ibidem*, 178–9.

1QH^a VII 17b–20a mentions eternal salvation and endless peace for the just man, צדיק, while 1QH^a VII 20b refers to the predestined time of God’s wrath against the wicked as the ‘day of slaughter’, יום הרגה. In the sectarian communal perspective (cf. אֲנַחְנוּ בְיַחַד in 1QH^a VII 7), salvation is applied not to the individual ‘I’, as in columns X–XVII, but to the ‘just man’ in general (cf. 1QH^a VIII 18).

3.6. Early Pesharim

The Qumran Pesharim constitute a specific genre of exegetical works which applies sectarian interpretation of Scripture to past, contemporary and eschatological contexts.¹⁹⁵ Sectarian historiography can be discerned in the margins of commentary on Scripture. References to historical figures and events can even make it possible to assign an approximate date to some of these writings. Since the sectarian community held Scripture in high regard, we may suppose that original meaning as well as later applications of prophecies mattered for this community.¹⁹⁶ The order of the interpreted biblical text will be followed when discussing the Qumran Pesharim, to the extent that reconstruction of the text is assured.

My discussion distinguishes early Pesharim, antedating growing Roman hegemony by 63 BCE, from late Pesharim that reflect changed circumstances under Roman hegemony. To a limited extent, the distinction between early and late Pesharim can be based on palaeographical considerations, but the main argument can be drawn from text-internal evidence. The presence or absence of references to the ‘Kittim’, הכתים, a term that is usually equated with the Romans,¹⁹⁷ may be among the arguments which make a difference.

¹⁹⁵ Cf. the definition of Qumran peshar by Berrin, *The Peshar Nahum Scroll from Qumran*, 9–10: “a form of biblical interpretation peculiar to Qumran, in which biblical poetic/prophetic texts are applied to post-biblical historical/eschatological settings through various literary techniques in order to substantiate a theological conviction regarding divine reward and punishment”.

¹⁹⁶ See the argument of Berrin, *The Peshar Nahum Scroll from Qumran*, 12–8 about the ‘significance of the base-text’ and her supposition of ‘textual multivalence at Qumran’, which Berrin establishes as an alternate model against a previous scholarly understanding, which took “the peshar application as the only valid interpretation of the text for the author of the peshar” (13).

¹⁹⁷ The term הכתים comes from the ‘table of the nations’ in Genesis 10:1–32 at vv. 2–4. Cf. Josephus, *Ant.* 1.127–128; Schürer, *History*. 1, 241 n. 30: “Today there is

3.6.1. *3QIsaiah Pesher and 4QIsaiah Pesher^{b-d}*

The Qumran *Isaiah Pesher* is among the texts that were published at a relatively early stage.¹⁹⁸ The palaeographical date assigned to 4Q164 (*4QIsaiah Pesher^d*), the early Hasmonean period (150–125 BCE),¹⁹⁹ provides an early *terminus a quo* for the early historical origin of this sectarian text. 4QpIsa^a (4Q161) attests to subsequent elaboration in view of its reference to the Kittim (see section 3.9.1 below).

Apart from 4QpIsa^d, which counts as an early pesher text on palaeographical grounds, *3QIsaiah Pesher* and *4QIsaiah Pesher^{b-c}* may also preserve early strata of the Qumran *Isaiah Pesher*, since they are not concerned with the Kittim, but in some cases rather with the ‘(congregation of) the arrogant men who are in Jerusalem’ (4QpIsa^b II 6–7, 10).²⁰⁰

The very beginning of Isaiah, Isaiah 1:1–2, is the object of eschatologically oriented pesher in *3QIsaiah Pesher* (3Q4).²⁰¹ Lines 1–4 fragmentarily preserve the biblical text of Isaiah 1:1–2, followed by a blank line 5, while line 6 refers to [י]וֹם מִשְׁפָּט [ט], the ‘[d]ay of judgment’. This sets the stage for the sectarian re-application of Isaiah’s prophecy to an eschatological setting.

The reproaches in Isaiah 5:8–23, which probably concern Judah and Jerusalem (cf. Isa 5:3), provide the part of the biblical context to column II of *4QIsaiah Pesher^b* (4Q162). Column II, line 1 at once starts with the ‘interpretation of the word’, פֶּשֶׁר הַדָּבָר, while it is followed by the quotation of Isaiah 5:11–14 in lines 2–6a. It may be assumed that the immediately preceding last part of column I, which has not been preserved, originally contained the quotation of (parts of) Isaiah 5:8–10,²⁰² since the pesher alludes to desolation mentioned in Isaiah 5:9–10. 4QpIsa^b II 1–2 applies this desolation to the “last days (לְאַחֲרֵיתָהּ) הַיָּמִים), laying wast the land through drought and hunger. This will happen at the time of the visitation”.²⁰³ The subsequent negative descriptions in the biblical text of Isa 5:11–14 and 5:24–25 are identified in

quasi-unanimity in identifying the victorious Kittim of Qumran literature with the Romans”.

¹⁹⁸ 4Q161–165; ed.pr. Allegro, *DJD* 5, 11–30, plates IV–VI, IX.

¹⁹⁹ See Webster, “Chronological Index of the Texts from the Judaean Desert,” 372.

²⁰⁰ I exclude *4QIsaiah Pesher^c* (4Q165) here, since this text does not contain relevant eschatological material.

²⁰¹ Ed.pr. Baillet, *DJD* 3, 95–6, plate XVIII.

²⁰² 4QpIsa^b I 1–2 quotes Isaiah 5:5 and 5:6.

²⁰³ Translation from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*. 1, 319.

the Qumran pesher with ‘the (congregation of) the boastful men who are in Jerusalem’, אַנְשֵׁי הַלְצוֹן אֲשֶׁר בִּירוּשָׁלַיִם, in lines 6–7 and 10 respectively. We here see a structural analogy between the biblical base-text and the Qumran pesher, in that Isaiah 5:11–25 also implies a contrast between haughty attitudes of Jerusalem and Judah and God’s anger against his people for their rejection of his Law. The sectarian rebuke of opponents for their transgression and rejection of the Law corresponds to what we have discussed in previous texts (*Damascus Document*, 4QMMT). However, in the present text the polemic against the opponents labelled as the arrogant men in Jerusalem appears more eschatologically focused.

The prophecy in Isaiah 10:20–23 about the destruction, captivity and return of a remnant of Israel is the object of eschatological re-application in *4QIsaiah Pesher^c* (4Q163) 4–6 II 12–13. The fragmentary state in which column II of fragments 4–6 has been preserved permits only to note that these verses of Isaiah are indeed applied to the “latter days”, אַחֲרֵית הַיָּמִים. In view of the ideological importance of exile and return in sectarian theology, it may be that the Qumran community identified itself with the eschatological remnant (cf. CD-A I 4–5).

The next passage from Isaiah which receives an eschatological re-interpretation in the fragments of *4QIsaiah Pesher^c* is Isaiah 30:15–18. The larger context, Isaiah 30:1–18, relates Judah’s perverseness in attempting, contrary to God’s plan, “to take refuge in the protection of Pharaoh, and to seek shelter in the shadow of Egypt” (Isa 30:2).²⁰⁴ Isaiah 30:15–18 outlines the consequences of this ill-favoured plan of Judah, while stressing that the Lord is a God of justice. In *4QIsaiah Pesher^c* 23 II, 10–11, “the interpretation of the word, for the last days, concerns the congregation of those l[ooking] for easy interpretations who are in Jerusalem”, פֶּשֶׁר הַדָּבָר לְאַחֲרֵית הַיָּמִים עַל דּוֹרְשֵׁי הַחֲלָקוֹת, אֲשֶׁר בִּירוּשָׁלַיִם.²⁰⁵ Lines 12 and 14 express the sectarian idea that the opponents rejected the Law. The re-application of Isaiah 30:15–18 probably addresses the Pharisees who had an influential position in the Judean body politic.

Finally, *4QIsaiah Pesher^d* re-interprets a passage from Second Isaiah (Isa 40–66), Isaiah 54:11–12, in an eschatological setting. Isaiah 54:1–17

²⁰⁴ Translation from RSV.

²⁰⁵ Text and translation from from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*, I, 325.

has been designated as a ‘song of assurance to Israel’.²⁰⁶ This assurance concerns a promise of restoration for the exilic Israel. Here again, we come across the sectarian re-application of the theme of exile and return. God’s activity of laying foundations, ויסדתיך, in MT Isaiah 54:11 is associated with the foundation of the ‘Community council, the priests, and the people’, [ה]כוהנים והע[ם], in 4QpIsa^d I 1–2, while line 3 adds to this ‘the congregation of his chosen ones’, עדת בחירו. The fact that Community council, priests and people are mentioned side by side implies that the Qumran community envisioned a time of restoration, since the sectarian community had dissociated itself from the priestly establishment and the (way of) the people in the contemporary age. 4QIsaiah Pesh^d (4Q164) I 7 makes the eschatological vision explicit, in that it relates the gates mentioned in MT Isaiah 54:12 to the “chiefs of the tribes of Israel in the [ast days]”, ראשי שבטי ישראל, לא[חרית הימים].²⁰⁷

3.6.2. 4QHosea Pesh^{a-b}

The Qumran *Hosea Pesh*, which consists of two manuscripts (4QpHos^a (4Q166) and 4QpHos^b (4Q167)),²⁰⁸ may be counted among the early Pesharim, since it does not comprise any reference to the ‘Kittim’. The comparison by M.J. Bernstein between 4QpHosea^a 2:15–17 and *Jubilees* 6:34–38 as evidence of a calendar controversy may perhaps provide an additional argument to situate the *Hosea Pesh* among the early Pesharim.²⁰⁹ The reference to the activity of the sectarian community’s opponents, who “fix [all cele]brations in agreement with the celebrations of the gentiles (מועדי הגואים)”, but whose “joy will be changed into mourning for them”,²¹⁰ probably reflects polemic against the Judaeo-politico-religious establishment. This Judaeo establishment observed a different (lunar) calendar and ultimately defended the gentile part in the Temple worship (cf. Josephus, *J.W.* 2.411–417).

²⁰⁶ See H.G. May and B.M. Metzger, *The New Oxford Annotated Bible with the Apocrypha. Expanded Edition. Revised Standard Version* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1977), 890.

²⁰⁷ Text and translation from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*, 1, 326–7.

²⁰⁸ Ed.pr. Allegro, *DJD* 5, 31–6, plates X–XI.

²⁰⁹ Bernstein, “4QpHosea^a 2:15–17 and *Jubilees* 6:34–38,” 21–31. On 4QpHosea^a II 15–17, see main text below.

²¹⁰ Translation after García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*, 1, 331.

The Qumran *Hosea Pesher* contains two passages that may be relevant for the subject of eschatology. In 4QpHos^a column I voices a sectarian eschatologically oriented perspective that characterises the contemporary age, dominated by the Judaeian establishment, as the ‘era of their unfaithfulness’, קץ מועלם (l. 9), and as the ‘generation of the visitation’, דור הפקודה (l. 10). Line 12 further refers to the ‘ages of wrath’, קצי חרון. These sectarian observations occur in the context of the interpretation of Hosea 2:8, which is part of a unit of biblical text (Hosea 2:2–13) which deals with God’s wrath against Israel’s idolatry. The other passage, from 4QHosea Pesher^b, refers to the opponents as “Ephraim” in an eschatological re-application of Hosea 5:14 which expresses the Lord’s wrath against Ephraim. Lines 2–3 of 4QpHos^b fragment 2 refer to “the last priest (בוהן האחרון) who will stretch out his hand to strike Ephraim”.²¹¹ Since lines 5–6 of this fragment identify the ‘I’ of Hosea 5:15 with God, it would seem plausible that the ‘last priest’ also acted on behalf of God. The ‘last priest’ could then stand for the sectarian community’s vision of its own restoration to the priesthood.

3.6.3 1QPesher to Micah

The Qumran *Pesher to Micah* (1Q14)²¹² may probably be counted among the early Pesharim, since it refers to the Teacher of Righteousness in a way that seems to reflect a perspective on him not far removed in the past (1QpMic 8–10).²¹³ The fragments that have been preserved of 1QpMic further do not refer to the ‘Kittim’. The prophetic writing of Micah associated the fate of Samaria under the Assyrian yoke with the fate of Jerusalem; 1QpMic exploits this fact in its polemic against the contemporary priestly establishment of Jerusalem.

Fragments 1–11 of the *Pesher to Micah* contain eschatological re-applications of Micah 1:1–9. The text which has been preserved in fragments 1–5 quotes Micah 1:2–5. Fragment 6 may well originally have contained the pesher of Micah 1:2–5. In this respect, the expression [ב]אחרית [הימים] in 1QpMic 6 2, in conjunction with line 4 which refers to those ‘[wh]o have trespassed’, [אש]ר עברו,²¹⁴ could

²¹¹ Translation from *ibidem*, 333.

²¹² Ed.pr. in Milik, *DJD 1*, 77–80, plate XV.

²¹³ Note the contrast with references to the Teacher of Righteousness in the *past tense* in 1QpHab V 9–12, IX 9–12, XI 4–8; CD-A I 10–11.

²¹⁴ Text and translation from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition. 1*, 8–9.

be the eschatological re-interpretation of Micah 1:5a which deals with 'Jacob's transgression' and the 'sins of the house of Israel'. Micah 1:5b, "What are the high places of Judah? Is it not Jerusalem?"²¹⁵ is interpreted in 1QpMic 8–10 6–9: "Its interpretation con]cerns the Teacher of Righteousness who [teaches the law to] his [council] and to a[1] those volunteering to join the chosen of [God, observing the law] in the council of the Community (עצת היחד), those who will be saved from the day of [judgement ...]".²¹⁶ The sectarian interpretation juxtaposes Samaria, associated with the 'Spreader of the Lie' (1QpMic 8–10 3–5a), to Jerusalem that is here associated with the Teacher of Righteousness and his council. 1QpMic 8–10 10–11 and 11 1–2 transpose the negative references to Samaria in Micah 1:6–8 to the contemporary Jerusalem and its priests. 1QpMic 11 1 mentions "[the priests of Jeru]sa[le]m, who misdirect," [כוהני ירו]ש[ל]ם אשר יתעו].²¹⁷

Finally, Micah 6:14–15, part of a passage which denounces Jerusalem along with Samaria (Micah 6:9–16), receives an eschatological re-interpretation in 1QpMic 17–18 5 that applies Micah's prophecy about Jerusalem to the '[1]ast generation', דור ה[א]חרון[ן].

3.6.4. *The Psalms Peshet*

The Qumran *Psalms Peshet*, attested by three manuscripts (1QpPs (1Q16), 4QpPs^a (4Q171), 4QpPs^b (4Q173)),²¹⁸ may finally be counted among the early Pesharim, since 4QpPs^a appears to reflect early expectations of realised eschatology, uncompromised by an idea of the delay of the final age (cf. 4QpPs^a IV 11–12, יראו במשפט רשעה). Explicitly eschatological material is only present in 4QpPs^b 1 5, which refers to a '[pri]est in the final era', [כו]הן לאחרית הק[ץ], but the context is too fragmentary to draw conclusions about identification.

²¹⁵ Translation from RSV.

²¹⁶ Translation from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*. 1, 9.

²¹⁷ Text and translation from ibidem, 8–9.

²¹⁸ 1QpPs ed.pr. Milik, *DJD* 1, 81–2, plate XV; 4QpPs^{a-b} ed.pr. Allegro, *DJD* 5, 42–53, plates XIV–XVIII.

3.7. *The Midrash on Eschatology*^{a-b}

The title ‘Midrash on Eschatology’ derives from the recent study by Annette Steudel²¹⁹ who has reconsidered the manuscript evidence of 4Q174 and 4Q177, originally published as 4QFlorilegium and 4QCatena respectively.²²⁰ Both 4Q174 and 4Q177 have been palaeographically dated to the early Herodian period, but the script of 4Q174 is considered ‘formal’ and that of 4Q177 ‘rustic semiformal’.²²¹ Steudel’s material reconstruction has pointed out that 4Q177, of which the beginning is lost, could well be the continuation of 4Q174; Steudel further observed that quotations from the Davidic Psalter determine the structure of both 4Q174 and 4Q177.²²² Even though Steudel’s study has not received undivided scholarly approval,²²³ the structural similarities outlined by Steudel may suggest that her study provides a good working hypothesis.

According to Steudel the *Midrash on Eschatology* should be dated to ca. 71–63 BCE, antedating the period of Roman hegemony, since the enemies are ‘inner-Jewish’ and the ‘Kittim’ (= Romans) do not appear on the stage.²²⁴ Instead of the Kittim, the *Midrash on Eschatology* speaks of foreigners (זרים in 4QMidrEschat^a frgs. 1, col. I, 21, 2, l. 5) and of gentiles (הגויים in 4QMidrEschat^a frgs. 1, col. I, 21, 2, l. 19) in general. The dualistic antagonism between the ‘sons of Belial’ and the ‘sons of

²¹⁹ Steudel, *Der Midrasch zur Eschatologie aus der Qumrangemeinde (4QMidrEschat^{a-b})*.

²²⁰ Ed.pr. Allegro, *DJD* 5, 53–7 and 67–74, plates XIX–XX and XXIV–XXV. Note, however, the same designation ‘Eschatological Midrash’ already used in 1958 by idem, “Fragments of a Qumran Scroll of Eschatological Midrashim,” 350–354.

²²¹ Strugnell, “Notes en Marge du Volume V des ‘Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan,’” 163–276 at 177 and 236.

²²² Steudel, *Der Midrasch zur Eschatologie*, 127–34; cf. 161–9 for a discussion of ‘central terms and themes in 4QMidrEschat^{a,b}’, among which אחרית הימים (161–3).

²²³ See J. Milgrom and L. Novakovic, “Catena A (4Q177 = 4QCat^a),” *PTSDSSP* 6B, 286–303 at 286 n. 19: “Responses to Steudel’s thesis range from various degrees of scepticism (J.C. VanderKam, *CBQ* 57 (1995) 576–77; Brooke, *JSJ* 26 (1995) 380–84; Bockmuehl, *VT* 45 (1995) 429–30) to various degrees of acceptance (Collins, *JBL* 114 (1995) 314–16; Davies, *JTS* 46 (1995) 236–39”. In addition to J.J. Collins and P.R. Davies, Puech, *La croyance des Esséniens en la vie future*, 2, 572–91 (“4QMidEsch = 4Q174 (Florilegie) + 4Q177 (Catena)”) has accepted Steudel’s hypothesis, citing the Dissertation of 1991 which underlies the publication in the STDJ series in 1994. Cf. the designations *4QMidrash on Eschatology (olim 4QFlorilegium)* by L.H. Schiffman and *Florilegium or Eschatological Midrash* by G.J. Brooke in their respective articles in Ego *et al.* (eds.), *Gemeinde ohne Tempel*, 267–284 at 279 and 285–301 at 286.

²²⁴ Steudel, *Der Midrasch zur Eschatologie*, pp. 202–210 at 208.

light' predominates in the *Midrash Eschatology*, while 4Q*MidrEschat*^b II 12 singles out the 'congregation of those who look for easy interpretations' as the Qumran community's enemies.

The eschatological orientation of the literary work 4Q174/4Q177 may already be approved by the fact that the expression 'the latter days', אחרית הימים, occurs 4 times in 4Q174 (4Q*MidrEschat*^a frgs. 1, col. I, 21, 2, ll. 2, 12, 15, 19) and 4 times in 4Q177 (4Q*MidrEschat*^b II 10, 14; III 7; V 6).²²⁵ 4Q177 II 16 further mentions 'the last generation', דור ה[אחרון].

4Q*MidrEschat*^a frgs. 1 col. I, 21, 2 combines the priestly and royal aspects of the sectarian eschatological expectations. Lines 1–7a, which quote Ps 89:23, 2 Sam 7:10, and Exod 15:17–18, concern the priestly dimension of the contrast between the contemporary Qumran community as a 'temple of man', מקדש אדם (l. 6),²²⁶ and the eschatological 'temple of the Lord', מקדש יהוה (l. 3), on the one hand, and the 'temple of Israel', מקדש ישראל (l. 6), which was laid waste in the past on account of Israel's sins, on the other. Note that the groups who shall never enter the eschatological temple, "an Ammonite, or a Moabite, or a bastard, or a foreigner, or a proselyte,"²²⁷ show a significant overlap with the groups who are forbidden to enter the temple according to 4QMMT B 39–49.²²⁸

The intermediate part between the priestly and royal aspects, lines 7b–9 which quote 2 Sam 7:11, focuses on the rest from all enemies, the sons of Belial, which the sons of light will eventually obtain. Parallel to the fate of the past 'temple of Israel', which was desolated 'because of their sins', בחטאתמה (l. 6), the trap of Belial is yet effective in the contemporary age because of the 'guilty error', במשגת א[ש]מה, of the sons of light (l. 9).

From the priestly 'house' lines 10–13 turn to the royal 'house', the house of David that will be raised up in the sectarian eschatological

²²⁵ Cf. the early observation by Carmignac, "La notion d'eschatologie dans la Bible et à Qumrân," 17–31 at 22 that the specification of אחרית הימים as a 'time of trial', עת המצרף, occurs in both 'Florilegium' (1–2 I 19 and II 1) and 'Catena A' (frgs. 5–6, l. 3).

²²⁶ Cf. Dimant, "4QFlorilegium and the Idea of the Community as Temple," 165–89. Wise, "4QFlorilegium and the Temple of Adam," 103–32 and Brooke, "Miqdash Adam," 285–301 have pointed to relations between traditions about Adam and Eden.

²²⁷ לוא יבוא שמה 4 [על עולם ועמוני ומואבי וממזר ובן נכר וגר עד עולם]. Text and translation from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*. 1, 352–3.

²²⁸ [העמוני והמואבי והממזר ופצוע הדכה וכו' ת השפרת] in 4QMMT B 39. Text from *DJD* 10, 50.

expectation to save Israel (l. 13). This line of thought is expressed in the context of interpretation of 2 Samuel 7:12–14 and Amos 9:11. The reference to the ‘branch of David’, צמח דוד, “who will arise with the Interpreter of the Law (דורש התורה) who [will rise up] in Zi[on] in the [l]ast days” in lines 11–12²²⁹ could reflect the dual royal and priestly aspects of Qumran messianism.²³⁰ Lines 14–19 further mention the eschatological role of the ‘sons of Zadok and the men of their council’ (ll. 14–17) and the plot of the kings of the nations against the ‘chosen ones of Israel in the latter days’ (ll. 18–19).

Frgs. 1 col. II, 3, 24, 5, line 1 of 4Q174 specifies the ‘latter days’ as a time of trial, the trial by Belial against the ‘chosen ones of Israel’ who observe the whole Law (l. 2). This passage underpins the sectarian dualism as applied to the final age by a quotation from the ‘book of Daniel the prophet’ (Dan 12:10, 11:32 in lines 3–4a). 4Q174 4 3–4 further mentions trial by Belial with reference to animosity against the ‘house of Judah’, presumably an ideological self-designation of the sectarian community.

Column I of 4Q177 (*4QMidrEschat^b*) continues to describe the ‘time of trial’ (I 3f.) which heralds the final era, interspersing this description between quotations from Isa 37:30, Isa 32:7, Ps 11:1, Mic 2:10–11, Ps 12:1, and Isa 22:13. Column II, line 5 again mentions the ‘Interpreter of the Law’. Apart from the ‘men of Belial’, column II, which quotes Ps 12:7, Zech 3:9, Ps 13:2–3 and Ezek 25:8, singles out “the congregation of those who look for easy interpretations” as particular enemies of the Qumran community (4Q177 II 12–13). Lines 14–16 stipulate the antagonism between the just who serve God and who have circumcised the foreskin of their heart²³¹ and the wicked in the latter days.

4Q177 III envisions the eschatological victory against the reign of Belial, referring to advice that will be sought of the Community in the latter days (l. 5) and to rebellion against the spirits of Belial (l. 10f.). Column III quotes Deut 7:15, Ps 16:3, Nah 2:11, Ps 17:1, and Hos 5:8. Column IV further envisions that the sons of light, the just, will be saved from the power of Belial and be reunited in the latter days, whereas Belial’s domain will perish. The focus on Zion and Jerusalem

²²⁹ Translation from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*. 1, 353.

²³⁰ Cf. the reference to the ‘branch of David’ in apposition to ‘the messiah of righteousness’ in 4Q252 V 3–4.

²³¹ Cf. II 9–10 where the ‘purification of the heart’ probably applies to the ‘men [of the community]’.

(IV 15) and the reunion of the sons of light (IV 16) reflects the sectarian perspective of exile from and restoration of the Jerusalem Temple and its priesthood. This eschatological condition of the sons of light being reunited (וּנְאֻסְפוּ, 4Q*MidrEschat*^b IV 16) is the reverse of the activity of Belial who “will seek with all his might to scatter them” (וּבְקֵשׁ בְּכֹל כּוּחֹו) לְבַזְרֵמָה, 4Q174 4 5).²³² The very fragmentary column V of *MidrEschat*^b mentions Belial (ll. 5 and 10) and the ‘latter [days]’ (l. 6).

3.8. *The War Scroll*

Certain segments of the *War Scroll* have already been the object of discussion with regard to the pre-Qumran roots of this composition (section 2.1.3 above). The *War Scroll* was first known from Qumran cave 1 (1QM (1Q33)),²³³ but additional manuscripts (4QM^{a-f} (4Q491–496))²³⁴ and possibly related texts from caves 4 (4Q*Sefer ha-Milhamah* (4Q285));²³⁵ 4Q*War Scroll-like Text A–B* (4Q497,²³⁶ 4Q471²³⁷) and 11 (11Q*Sefer ha-Milhamah* (11Q14²³⁸)) have subsequently come to light. 1QM has been dated palaeographically the first half of the first century CE,²³⁹ while the palaeographical dates assigned to 4QM^{a-f} range from the first half of the first century BCE (4QM^c) to the Herodian period (the rest of the 4QM manuscripts).²⁴⁰ With regard to the genre of the Qumran war cycle, P.S. Alexander has made a distinction between ‘eschatological scenarios’ (e.g. 4QSM) and ‘eschatological *serakhim*’ (1QM/ 4QM).²⁴¹ However, characteristic designations of eschatological time in other Qumran texts, such as אַחֲרֵית הַיָּמִים, are absent from the *War Scroll*.

²³² Text and translation from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*. 1, 354–5.

²³³ Ed.pr. Sukenik, *אוצר המגילות הגנוזות*; idem, *The Dead Sea Scrolls of the Hebrew University*, 1–19, plates 16–34, 47; Milik, *DJD* 1, 135–6, plate XXXI.

²³⁴ Ed.pr. Baillet, *DJD* 7, 12–68, plates V–VIII, X, XII, XIV, XVI, XVIII, XXIV.

²³⁵ Ed.pr. of 4QSM (4Q285) by Alexander and Vermes, *DJD* 36, 228–46, plates XIII–XIV.

²³⁶ Ed.pr. of 4Q497 in Baillet, *DJD* 7, 69–72, plate XXVI.

²³⁷ Ed.pr. of 4Q471 by E. Eshel and H. Eshel, *DJD* 36, 439–45, plate XXX.

²³⁸ Ed.pr. of 11Q14 in García Martínez, Tigchelaar, and Van der Woude, *DJD* 23, 243–51, plate XXVIII.

²³⁹ See Cross, “The Development of the Jewish Scripts,” 174f.; Avigad, “The Palaeography of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Documents,” 56–87 at 71f.

²⁴⁰ Cf. Alexander, “The Evil Empire,” 19.

²⁴¹ Alexander, “The Evil Empire,” 20–3.

The composition of the *War Scroll* from cave 1, which preserves the most extensive body of text (19 columns), applies the idea of apocalyptic war to the 'Kittim', that is, the Romans. While the prologue to 1QM, which introduces the apocalyptic battle between the sons of light and the sons of darkness (1QM I 1), still associates the army of Belial with Edom, Moab, Ammon, and the 'Kittim of Ashur' (1QM I 20, the 'Kittim' further occur in 1QM I 6.9.12, XI 11, XV 2, XVI 3.6.8–9, XVII 12.14–15, XVIII 2.4, and XIX 9.13).

It has been noted that columns XV–XIX of 1QM constitute the end-product of the long history of redaction of the *War Scroll*.²⁴² These columns indeed comprise a very prominent part of the references to the Kittim. 1QM envisions the destruction of the Kittim (1QM I 9–10) in the 'seventh lot' (1QM I 14–15), which is to herald a glorious era for Jerusalem, Judah and Israel at large (cf. e.g. 1QM XII 7–18, XVIII 5–XIX 8). The centrality of Jerusalem (1QM III 11, VII 4, XII 13, XIX 5), the priestly involvement in the envisioned war (e.g. 1QM VII 9–IX 9a, XVI 3–XVIII 5), and the appeal to God's aid (e.g. 1QM III–IV, VI 2–6, IX 5–6, XV 3, 12–18) are constitutive elements in the apocalyptic perspective of the *War Scroll*.

3.9. *Late Pesharim*

3.9.1. *4QIsaiah Pesher^a*

4QIsaiah Pesher^a (4Q161)²⁴³ is a late Pesher, which envisions Israel's victory in the 'war against the Kittim', מלחמת כתיאים, that is, Jewish war against Rome (4QpIsa^a 8–10 III 3–9 at l. 7). 4Q161 I and II 1–9a partly overlap with 4Q163 4–6 II. The eschatological perspective unfolded in the course of the sectarian interpretation of Isaiah 10:24–27.33–34 and 11:1–5 is only attested in 4Q161.

In contrast to what we have seen to be the case with the *War Scroll* (section 3.8 above), *4QIsaiah Pesher^a* apparently does attribute a more

²⁴² Davies, *1QM, the War Scroll from Qumran*, 88–90, 123. Cf. the disagreement on the redaction-historical place of columns XV–XIX in 1QM between J.J. Collins and P.R. Davies as attested by their articles: Collins, "The Mythology of Holy War in Daniel and the Qumran War Scroll," 596–612; Davies, "Dualism and Eschatology in the Qumran War Scroll," 28–36; Collins, "Dualism and Eschatology in 1QM. A Reply to P.R. Davies," 212–5; and Davies, "Dualism and Eschatology in 1QM. A Rejoinder," 93–6.

²⁴³ Ed.pr. Allegro, *DJD* 5, 11–5, plates IV–V; cf. Strugnell, "Notes en marge du Volume V," 183–6, plate I.

significant place to messianic expectations in its eschatological perspective of war against the Kittim. 4QpIsa^a 2–6 II 17–25 already refer to eschatological warfare in which Jerusalem is involved in the context of the interpretation of Isaiah 10:28–32 (cf. *לאחרית הימים* in 2–6 II 22). 4QpIsa^a 8–10 III 1–9 re-interpret Isaiah 10:33–34 as applying to the fall of the Kittim, whose leaders will be given over to the power of Israel. The victory and rule of Israel over all peoples is explicitly related to a messianic ruler-figure in the course of sectarian interpretation of Isaiah 11:1–5 in 4QpIsa^a 8–10 III 11–25. Line 18 interprets the words about a ‘shoot from the stump of Jesse’ in Isa 11:1 as the “shoot] of David which will sprout in the fi[nal days]”, *[פשר הדבר על צמח] דויד העומד*, *באחרית הימים*.²⁴⁴ The reference to divine support (4QpIsa^a 8–10 III 19)²⁴⁵ indicates that the ‘shoot of David’ stands for a messianic figure whose rule and judgement of all the peoples is envisioned.

The fact that *4QIsaiah Pesher^a* is a late text could indicate that the Qumran community had heightened messianic expectations in later stages of its development.

3.9.2. *4QNahum Pesher*

4QNahum Pesher (4Q169)²⁴⁶ is a late Qumran pesher with a diachronic perspective “from Antiochus up to the appearance of the chiefs of the Kittim” (4QpNah 3 + 4 I 3),²⁴⁷ which makes it clear where the text chronologically stands: in the Roman period. The text has been palaeographically dated to around 50–1 BCE.²⁴⁸ Gregory J. Doudna recently made a new critical edition of the Qumran *Nahum Pesher*, based on maximal reconstruction of the text.²⁴⁹ The historical and exegetical analyses by Shani L. Berrin rely on minimal reconstruction.²⁵⁰

Like the Qumran *Isaiah Pesher^a* and the *War Scroll*, *4QpNahum* envisions that the rule of the Kittim will come to an end, in the context of its re-interpretation of Nahum 1:4 (4QpNah 1 + 2 3–5). A comparison between these Qumran texts shows some consistent sectarian identifi-

²⁴⁴ Text and translation from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*. 1, 316–7.

²⁴⁵ Translation from *ibidem*, 317.

²⁴⁶ Ed.pr. Allegro, *DJD* 5, 37–42, plates XII–XIV.

²⁴⁷ *מאנת יכוס עד עמוד מושלי כתיים*. Text and translation from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*. 1, 336–7.

²⁴⁸ Strugnell, “Notes en marge du Volume V,” 205.

²⁴⁹ Doudna, *4QPesher Nahum. A Critical Edition*.

²⁵⁰ Berrin, *The Pesher Nahum Scroll from Qumran*, 3, 20–23, 33–71.

cations. As Ashur and the Kittim are interrelated in the *War Scroll*, so the biblical context of Nahum also concerns God's vengeance against the evil of the Assyrian empire (cf. Nah 2:8, 3:18). Just as the fall of 'Lebanon with its grandeur' (Isa 10:34) is associated with the defeat of the commanders of the Kittim in 4QpIsa^a 8–10 III 7–8, so 'Lebanon' (Nah 1:4) is also identified with 'his commanders', לְמוֹשְׁלָיו, that is, the commanders of the Kittim (4QpNah 1 + 2 5b–7). The envisaged destruction of the Kittim "in front of [the assembly of] the chosen [of...]"²⁵¹ is implied in line 8 of 4QpNah fragments 1 + 2. If fragments 1 + 2 constitute a prologue,²⁵² the eschatological orientation of 4QpNah is brought out very clearly.

4QpNah fragments 3 + 4, column I mainly highlights historical events from the sectarian perspective in the context of the re-interpretation of Nah 2:12–14. We have already mentioned the diachronic perspective "from Antiochus up to the appearance of the chiefs of the Kittim" in line 3, which concerns the fact that God had not given Jerusalem over to the power of foreign rulers during this period. The sectarian community accuses 'those who seek for slippery matters' of opening Jerusalem up to one such ruler, 'Demetrius the king of Yavan' (4QpNah 3 + 4 I 2). In 4QpNah 3 + 4 I 4–8, the biblical text of Nah 2:13 is associated with the 'Angry Lion' who turned against Ephraim, against "those who seek for slippery matters," hanging living men on the tree. The 'Angry Lion' has been identified as Alexander Jannaeus who crucified eight hundred of the Jews who opposed him (cf. *Ant.* 13.379–380); the ambiguous interrelationship between Ephraim and 'those who seek for slippery matters' has been interpreted by Berrin as "contemporary non-Qumranic Jewry", "currently under the sway of the Pharisees".²⁵³ Nahum 2:14 in 4QpNah 3 + 4 I 8b–12, in particular the part on the eradication of the spoils from the earth, receives an eschatologically oriented re-interpretation applied to the "wealth which the [pries]ts of Jerusalem assem[bled]" (cf. 1QpHab IX 3–7a).

The polemical label 'Ephraim, those who seek for slippery matters' again figures in 4QpNah 3–4 II 1–6. This passage re-interprets the condemnation of Nineveh as a "bloody city, all of it [treachery,] stuffed

²⁵¹ Translation from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*, 1, 337.

²⁵² 4QpNah 1 + 2 line 1 begins with Nahum 1:3, thereby not far removed from the first verses of Nahum.

²⁵³ Berrin, *The Peshet Nahum Scroll from Qumran*, 104–18 at 118.

with [loo]t” in Nahum 3:1,²⁵⁴ envisioning a fate of the Qumran community’s opponents ‘in the latter days’, לְאַחֲרֵי הַיָּמִים (l. 2) analogous to that of Nineveh.

4QpNah 3–4 III 2–8a distinguishes “those who seek for slippery matters” from the “simple people of Ephraim”. The latter will no longer let themselves be misdirected, but join the ‘majority of Israel’, רֹב יִשְׂרָאֵל (l. 5), since the evil deeds of the Qumran community’s opponents will have been “exposed to all Israel in the final era (בְּאַחֲרֵי הַקֵּץ)” (l. 2).²⁵⁵ The devastation of Nineveh, the subject of Nah 3:7, is applied to the opponents, “whose council will die and whose society will be disbanded” (4QpNah 3–4 III 5–7).²⁵⁶

3.9.3. *The Peshet to Habakkuk*

The *Peshet to Habakkuk* from Qumran cave 1 is among the earliest published texts from the Dead Sea region.²⁵⁷ It has been palaeographically dated to the second half of the first century BCE²⁵⁸ and comprises various references to the Kittim (1QpHab II 12.14, III 4.9,²⁵⁹ IV 5.10, VI 1.10, IX 7). Although most references to the Kittim and their power figure in the context of polemic against the sectarian community’s Jewish opponents, certain references are also explicitly negative about the Kittim. 1QpHab III 4–6a describes them as premeditated to do evil, acting cunningly and with betrayal towards the nations (הָעַמִּים). 1QpHab II 14–15 already observed about the Kittim that they will not believe in God’s laws;²⁶⁰ characteristics which implicitly put the Kittim on a par with ‘all the worshippers of idols and the wicked’ whom God will exterminate from the earth on the ‘day of judgment’ according to

²⁵⁴ Translation from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*. 1, 339.

²⁵⁵ Text and translation from *ibidem*, 338–9.

²⁵⁶ פֶּשֶׁט [על דְּרוּשֵׁי הַחֲלָקוֹת אֲשֶׁר תּוֹבֵד עֲצַתָּם וְנִפְרְדָּה כְּנַסְתָּם]. Text and translation from *ibidem*.

²⁵⁷ Ed. pr. Burrows, *The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Marks’s Monastery*. 1; cf. Nitzan, *מגילת פֶּשֶׁט חֲבַקּוּק*.

²⁵⁸ See e.g. Brownlee, *The Midrash Peshet of Habakkuk*, 22–3.

²⁵⁹ Cf. the analogy between the description of the Kittim “who come from the islands of the sea” in 1QpHab III 9–11 and Josephus’ description of the Kittim in *Ant.* 1.127–128 as inhabiting “all the islands and the greater part of the coastlands.”

²⁶⁰ Note the contrast with positive descriptions of Romans in 1 Macc 8, 12:1–4, 14:16–19.24, 15:15–24.

1QpHab XIII 2–4. 1QpHab may therefore be counted among the late Pesharim.²⁶¹

The antagonism between the sectarian community and its enemies is predetermined by the conflict between the ‘Wicked Priest’ and the Teacher of Righteousness (1QpHab I 13), a conflict that recurs throughout the *Pesher to Habakkuk* (1QpHab V 9–12, VIII 8–16, IX 9–12a, XI 4–15, XII 2–10a). This conflict is the starting point for the eschatology in 1QpHab.

1QpHab II 1–2 introduces another figure, the ‘Man of the Lie’, אִישׁ הַכֹּזֵב, but it could be that this figure played a role in the same circles as the ‘Wicked Priest’, in circles of Jerusalemite leadership (1QpHab V 9–12a). The doomed heritage that both figures left according to the *Pesher Habakkuk* appears to be transposed to the Jerusalemite establishment and all those under their sway in the final age. This may be illustrated by two examples.

First, in column II, the sectarian perspective turns from the traitors with the ‘Man of the Column’ (1QpHab II 1–2) to the traitors of the new covenant in the latter days, לְאַחֲרֵי הַיָּמִים (1QpHab II 3–6a at 5–6). “The Priest whom God has placed wi[thin the Commun]ity, to foretell the fulfilment of all the words of his servants, the prophets” (l. 8), namely what is going to happen to the ‘final generation’, הַדּוֹר הָאַחֲרוֹן (l. 7),²⁶² is in all probability the Teacher of Righteousness (cf. 1QpHab VII 1–4).

Second, the *Pesher to Habakkuk* turns from the evil of the Wicked Priest who betrayed God’s laws for the sake of riches and accumulated wealth illegitimately in column VIII, lines 8–12, to the ‘last priests of Jerusalem’, כּוֹהֲנֵי יְרוּשָׁלַם הָאַחֲרוֹנִים, who will accumulate wealth and gain from plundering the nations in column IX, lines 3–5. Analogously with the fate of the Wicked Priest who was given over the power of his enemies by God (1QpHab VIII 16–IX 2.8–12a), the sectarian perspective

²⁶¹ I disagree with the argument in Brownlee, *The Midrash Pesher of Habakkuk*, 23 that “some scholars have interpreted them [the references to the Kittim] as predictions of the Roman conquest of Palestine. The references to the Romans are sufficiently general to allow for this possibility, there being no allusions to Pompey’s capture of particular places, not even of Jerusalem”. Berrin, *The Pesher Nahum Scroll from Qumran*, 129 has rather observed: “4QpNah and 1QpHab may each be interpreted as describing both the loss of Pharisaic wealth to a priestly faction, and the subsequent seizure of that wealth by the Kittim”.

²⁶² Text and translation from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition. 1*, 12–3.

on the ‘last priests of Jerusalem’ is determined by the idea that “in the last days (לאחרית הימים) their riches and their loot will be given into the hands of the army of the Kittim” (1QpHab IX 6–7).²⁶³

The theme of eschatological judgment is prominent in the Qumran *Pesher to Habakkuk*. The ‘chosen ones’ of God, probably a self-designation of the sectarian community, have a privileged place in the judgement over all the peoples (1QpHab V 4) and in the condemnation and rebuke of ‘all the evildoers of his people’, that is, Israel (1QpHab V 4–5). 1QpHab VIII 1–3 mentions “all observing the Law in the House of Judah, whom God will free from the house of judgment on account of their toil and of their loyalty to the Teacher of Righteousness”.²⁶⁴ Those who reviled and reproached God’s chosen ones, בחירי אל, will go to the judgement of fire according to 1QpHab X 12–13. 1QpHab XII 12–14 states that idols will not save the peoples who served them on the ‘day of judgement’, יום המשפט (l. 14). 1QpHab XIII 2–4 envisions divine destruction of all idol worshippers and the wicked on the ‘day of judgement’.

Finally, it should be noted that there is a paradox in the eschatological perspective of the *Pesher to Habakkuk*. Whereas, 1QpHab II 5–10 envisions the revelation about the final age as a fulfilment of all the words of the prophets, 1QpHab VII 4–5 also relates the mysteries of the words of the prophets, but adds in the subsequent lines 7–8 that “the final age (הקץ האחרון) will be extended and go beyond all that the prophets say, because the mysteries of God are wonderful”.²⁶⁵ 1QpHab VII 10–14a further states that the final age is extended beyond the “men of truth, those who observe the Torah”. The sectarian community apparently had to come to terms with the theological problem of the delay of the expected final age.

3.10. *Sapiential and Poetical Texts*

Two Qumran sectarian works pertinent to eschatology may be mentioned here: *4QcryptA Words of the Maskil to All Sons of Dawn* (4Q298) and *4QSongs of the Sage*^{a-b} (4Q510–511).

²⁶³ Translation from *ibidem*, 19.

²⁶⁴ Translation from *ibidem*, 17.

²⁶⁵ Translation from *ibidem*, 17.

4QcryptA *Words of the Maskil to All Sons of Dawn* (4Q298) is a text of three columns reconstructed from various fragments.²⁶⁶ 4Q298 I 1 has preserved the phrase שחר בני לכול דבר אשר דבר לכול בני שחר from which the title is derived. משכיל is a recurrent designation in other Qumran texts, while שחר בני also occurs in the *Damascus Document* (CD-A XIII 14–15). Since the ‘Sons of Dawn’ are instructed by the משכיל, who is appointed to teach new members “the mysteries of wonder and truth in the midst of the men of the Community”²⁶⁷ (1QS IX 12–19), the ‘Sons of Dawn’ could perhaps be neophytes who were taught how to proceed to the lot of light. The words of the משכיל address the ‘Sons of Dawn’ as ‘pursuers of righteousness’ and ‘seekers of truth’ (4Q298 I 2; III 6–7). The instruction by the משכיל includes eschatological knowledge, as may be deduced from 4Q298 III 9–10: “in order that you understand the end of ages”, בעבור תבינו בקץ עולמות.²⁶⁸ Knowledge of the past is somehow related to knowledge of the final age in the sectarian perspective, as the subsequent phrase, “and that you examine the for[m]er things”, ובקדמוניות תביטו, implies.²⁶⁹

The title of 4QSongs of the Sage^{a-b} (4Q510–511) is derived from references in the text to למשכיל שיר (4Q511 2 I 1; 4Q511 8 4).²⁷⁰ 4Q510 1 6–8 may be indirectly relevant for the subject of eschatology: “And you have been placed in the era of the rul[e of] wickedness and in the periods of humiliation of the sons of lig[ht], in the guilty periods of [those] defiled by iniquities; not for an everlasting destruction [but ra]ther for the era of the humiliation of sin”.²⁷¹ The humiliation of the sons of light on account of their iniquities may correspond with the eschatological ‘time of trial’ in the *Midrash on Eschatology* (see section 3.7 above).

3.11. Sectarian Writings: Summary

With its ideological notions of exile and return as a result of the sectarian process of segregation, Qumran sectarian eschatology is

²⁶⁶ Ed.pr. Pfann, Kister, *DJD* 20, 1–30, plates I–II.

²⁶⁷ Translation from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*. 1, 93.

²⁶⁸ Text and translation from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*. 2, 656–7.

²⁶⁹ Text and translation from *ibidem*.

²⁷⁰ Ed.pr. Baillet, *DJD* 7, 215–62, plates LV–LXII.

²⁷¹ Translation from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*. 2, 1029.

clearly distinct from non-sectarian Jewish strands of eschatology. The eschatologically oriented polemic against the Wicked Priest and the 'last priests of Jerusalem' on the one hand and the congregation of 'those who look for easy interpretations' on the other in the *Pesher to Habakkuk* is an outspoken example. The perspective of return from exile, that is, restoration of the banished sectarian community to the Jerusalemite priesthood, emanates from the *War Scroll*, the *Rule of the Congregation*, and the *Eschatological Midrash*. In anticipation on the final age, the sectarian community claimed priestly functions for itself, as the *Community Rule* and the *Eschatological Midrash* indicate.

Nevertheless, the eschatology in sectarian texts draws on common resources, the biblical text of the Pentateuch in earlier stages of its development (4QMMT) and of the Prophets most of all in the Pesharim. Some sectarian texts, namely the *War Scroll* and the *Hodayot* have roots in the pre-Qumran period. The analogies between non-sectarian and sectarian Qumran texts, with regard to 'election language' for example, could provide one entry to the search for common strands of Second Temple Jewish eschatological expectations. The other entry, comparison with other texts and traditions, will be the subject of the next section.

4. THE UMWELT TO QUMRAN ESCHATOLOGY: COMPARATIVE TEXTS AND TRADITIONS

The below discussion includes Jewish and Christian texts and traditions to the extent that they may be informative about Jewish eschatology in the Second Temple period. The survey also considers post-70 CE texts that may comprise earlier, pre-70 CE traditions.

4.1. *Epigraphical and Papyrological Evidence*

Perhaps the most direct evidence for comparison with Qumran eschatology is that of inscriptions and papyri from Roman Palestine in the pre-70 CE period. Inscriptions²⁷² and papyri²⁷³ may contribute to our understanding of Palestinian Jewish ideas about the afterlife.

²⁷² Frey, *CII*, 2 volumes; cf. e.g. L. Roth-Gerson, *The Greek Inscriptions from the Synagogues in Eretz Israel*; Van Henten and Van der Horst (eds.), *Studies in Early Jewish Epigraphy*; Hachlili, "The Inscriptions," 142–58.

²⁷³ Tcherikover with Fuks (eds.), *CPJ*, 3 volumes.

The Palestinian Jewish matrix for afterlife beliefs is richly documented from inscriptions. Margaret Williams has noted that, compared to the disappointing evidence of the Diaspora, Palestinian “inscriptions from Jerusalem and Beth Shearim combine to illuminate the range of eschatological beliefs prevalent among Jews in the first three centuries”.²⁷⁴ Evidence up to the first century CE is particularly relevant for comparison with Qumran eschatology.²⁷⁵

Archaeological comparison between pre-70 CE Palestinian Jewish burial places may provide circumstantial evidence for situating Qumran views about death and afterlife.²⁷⁶ Apart from the literary evidence, the sectarian community’s separation from other strands of Palestinian Judaism also expressed itself in burial practices. Since both Khirbet Qumran and ‘Ain el-Ghuweir are often held to be the location for a sectarian settlement, it is noticeable that these two settlements stand out with regard to their burial practices according to Rachel Hachlili and Ann E. Killebrew: “The importance of the individual, rather than that of the family, is indicated by the individual burials found in the graves of Qumran and ‘Ein el-Ghuweir”.²⁷⁷ Émile Puech argued that epigraphic evidence from Khirbet Qumran and ‘Ain el-Ghuweir accords with literary evidence about Essene afterlife beliefs.²⁷⁸ However, this correlation between archaeological and literary data was criticized by Philip R. Davies.²⁷⁹

Two ostraca (KhQ1 and KhQ2) were found in 1997 at the edge of the cemetery at Qumran. These ostraca were originally, though

²⁷⁴ Williams, “The Contribution of Jewish Inscriptions to the Study of Judaism,” CHJ III 75–93 at 90.

²⁷⁵ Cf. Hachlili and Killebrew, “Burial Customs and Conclusions,” 166–75 at 173: “The differences in burial customs [of third-fourth century CE Bet She‘arim] from those of the first century CE are widely evident”, observing a development from primary burials to burial as a public enterprise.

²⁷⁶ See the bibliographical note in Magness, *The Archaeology of Qumran*, 186–7 referring to Puech, “The Necropolises of Khirbet Qumrân and ‘Ain el-Ghuweir,” 21–36; Zissu, “Qumran Type’ Graves in Jerusalem,” 158–71; idem, “Odd Tomb Out,” 50–55, 62; Eshel and Greenhut, “Hiam el-Sagha,” 252–9; Shanks, “Who Lies Here?,” 49–53, 76; Politis, “The Nabataean Cemetery at Khirbet Qazone,” 128.

²⁷⁷ Hachlili and Killebrew, “Burial Customs and Conclusions,” 173; cf. Hachlili, “Burial Practices at Qumran,” 247–64 at 261–4.

²⁷⁸ Puech, *La croyance des Esséniens en la vie future*. 2, 693–702 at 702; cf. idem, “Immortality and Life After Death,” 512–20 at 519 on the south-north orientation of various graves and the supposed interpretive link with the northern location of Paradise in Ps 48:3, Isa 14:13, Mal 3:20, and *1 Enoch* 22.

²⁷⁹ Davies, “Death, Resurrection, and Life after Death,” 208: “Nothing certain can be deduced from the burials”.

unsuccessfully, drawn into the debate about a definite link between the Dead Sea scrolls and the archaeology of Qumran as evidence for the term יחד apart from the scrolls.²⁸⁰ Greg Doudna has argued that the connection between the ostraca and the Qumran community rather consists in corresponding evidence about inner-communal deeds or gifts.²⁸¹ Doudna dates KhQ1/KhQ2 earlier (late first century BCE) than Cross and Eshel have done (30–68 CE).²⁸² The reference to Jericho, ירחו, in KhQ1 line 2 may indicate intra-Jewish contacts between the Qumran settlement and people from different places.

The documentary sources briefly surveyed above provide valuable information about the sectarian context of the Qumran settlement, but they do not constitute conclusive evidence for situating Qumran eschatology in its ancient Palestinian Jewish setting. For further advances in historical understanding, we will have to turn to comparison with other corpora of texts.

4.2. *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha*

The apocrypha attest to Jewish eschatological beliefs in resurrection (e.g. 2 Macc 7:14.19, 12:43), the final judgment (e.g. Jdt 16:17; Sir 39:28–31; Wis 1:6–11, 4:20–5:14), and eternal life for the righteous (e.g. Wis 5:15).²⁸³ The Old Testament pseudepigrapha include apocalyptic writings, such as *1 Enoch*, *Jubilees*, and the *Sibylline Oracles*, as well as other genres, like the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (*T. 12 Patr.*) and Pseudo-Philo's *Biblical Antiquities* (*Liber antiquitatum biblicarum*, *L.A.B.*), which contain eschatological traditions.

Apocrypha and pseudepigrapha often constitute problematic comparative evidence, since they have been transmitted as part of Chris-

²⁸⁰ Cross and Eshel, "Ostraca from Khirbet Qumrân," 17–28; their reconstruction יחד in line 8 of ostracon no. 1 (18) has been challenged. See e.g. Doudna, "Ostraca KhQ1 and KhQ2 from the Cemetery of Qumran: A New Edition," 37 pages, at pp. 1–2 referring to the rejection of the reconstruction יחד by F. Cryer (*SJOT* 11 (1997) 232–40) and the different reconstruction] וכול אילנ אח[by A. Yardeni (*IEJ* 47 (1997) 233–37). Doudna's reconstruction of line 8 of KhQ1 reads: [וכול אילנ אד[מה], 'and all the trees of the ea[rth]' (18).

²⁸¹ Doudna, "Ostraca KhQ1 and KhQ2 from the Cemetery of Qumran," 20–23 ("A 1QS connection?"), referring in particular to 1QS V 17–20 and 21–23.

²⁸² *Ibidem*, 23–25 ("13. Palaeography and dating of KhQ1/KhQ2"); Cross and Eshel, "Ostraca from Khirbet Qumrân," 17–8.

²⁸³ Cf. Nickelsburg, "Judgement, Life-after-death, and Resurrection," 141–62.

tian literature and their hypothetical Jewish ‘Vorlage’ is frequently unknown. Any historical-critical and chronological discussion of these texts must take this problem into account. Apart from apocrypha and pseudepigrapha whose presumably pre-70 CE Jewish origin is subject of discussion, there are also post-70 CE Jewish texts that may still be relevant, as they could comprise earlier pre-70 CE traditions. Prominent examples with regard to the apocalyptic genre and the subject of eschatology are *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch*. The provenance of (some of) the traditions underlying these texts is usually related to historical context of Second Temple Judaism.²⁸⁴

My discussion of texts follows a chronological subdivision between early, pre-Hasmonean texts; texts dated between the mid-second century BCE and 70 CE; and late, post-70 CE texts with early, pre-70 CE traditions.

4.2.1. *Texts Antedating the Hasmonean Period*

4.2.1.1. 1 Enoch

Eschatology makes part of the earliest Enochic writing, the so-called ‘Book of Watchers’ (*1 Enoch* 1–36). Final judgment and salvation for the righteous, otherwise attested in Qumran textual witnesses to *1 Enoch* 1–5, 10:2–6, and 22, further occur in *1 Enoch* 25:4–7 and 27:2–4. The accursed valley about which *1 Enoch* 27:2–4 speaks as the place of final judgement for the accursed could well correspond with the proverbial ‘judgment of Gehenna’ in the New Testament (Matt 23:33).²⁸⁵ *1 Enoch* 32:3 finally mentions the ‘garden of righteousness’. It may be deduced from the context (*1 Enoch* 32:6) that this is the garden of Eden, so that the ‘garden of righteousness’ could stand for the garden of Eden in the final age to which the righteous will return. There is no direct parallel for this expression in the literature of Qumran, even though 4Q265 7 II 14 stipulates that the garden of Eden is holy, קדוש גן עדן.

The ‘Similitudes’ or ‘Parables of Enoch’ (*1 Enoch* 37–71) are entirely absent from the Qumran manuscripts, but its archetype is widely held

²⁸⁴ B.M. Metzger, “The Fourth Book of Ezra,” *OTP* 1, 516–59 at 522 observed that “several striking parallels can be found between 4 Ezra and 1 Enoch”. A.F.J. Klijn, “2 (Syriac Apocalypse of) Baruch,” *OTP* 1, 615–52 at 620 suggests that the most likely explanation for the great number of parallels between *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch* is their dependence on a “common source”.

²⁸⁵ According to BDAG, ³2000, 191, Gehenna was “a ravine south of Jerusalem”, where “according to later Jewish popular belief, God’s final judgment was to take place”.

to be Jewish.²⁸⁶ This still leaves the question how to distinguish Jewish original from Christian elaboration. The general idea of final judgement against the wicked and the salvation of the righteous, occurring in *1 Enoch* 38:1–6, is what may be expected in line with the other parts of *1 Enoch*. Likewise, the resurrection of the righteous in *1 Enoch* 51:1–3 is paralleled by *1 Enoch* 91:10. However, the singular eschatological role of the ‘Elect One of righteousness’ and the ‘Righteous One’ (*1 Enoch* 38:2–3, 39:6, 40:6) appears to stand in contrast to the plural concept ‘elect ones of righteousness’ (*1 Enoch* 93:10; cf. *1 Enoch* 1:1; 4Q215a 1 II 3, 4Q299 72 2). It could be that this is a Christian redactional element, with a view to a kind of prefiguration of Christ in Enoch’s vision,²⁸⁷ since *1 Enoch* 46:2–5, 48:1–10 and 71:10.12–17 also speaks of the ‘Antecedent of Time’, a prefiguration of eschatological and messianic events. In *1 Enoch* 48:2–4, ‘that Son of Man’ is given a name, while his significance is described as, among other things, ‘the light of the gentiles’.²⁸⁸ It should further be noted that the epithet ‘Lord of the Spirits’, which recurs in the ‘Similitudes’²⁸⁹ but does not occur in the other books of *1 Enoch*, contrasts with the epithet ‘Lord of Glory’ quite common in the preceding ‘Book of the Watchers’ (*1 Enoch* 22:14, 25:3, 27:5, 36:4). The reference to eschatological judgment of those who “have denied the Lord of the Spirits and his Messiah” in *1 Enoch* 48:10 appears to be a Christian polemical formulation against unbelievers. The theme of judgement applies to the wicked in their capacity as oppressors of the righteous in other parts of *1 Enoch*, not to deniers of ‘the Lord of the Spirits and his Messiah’. Thus, much of the eschatology in the ‘Similitudes’, apart from the general elements of judgement and

²⁸⁶ See e.g. E. Isaac, “1 (Ethiopic Apocalypse of Enoch),” *OTP* 1, 7; Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination*, 177–93; Nickelsburg and VanderKam, *1 Enoch: A New Translation*, 3–6.

²⁸⁷ See in particular the formulation in *1 Enoch* 39:6, as translated by Isaac, “1 (Ethiopic Apocalypse of Enoch),” *OTP* 1, 31: “my eyes saw the Elect One of righteousness and of faith, and righteousness shall prevail in his days”. Enoch figures prominently in several early Christian apocalyptic texts, like *Apoc.Pet.* 2, *Asc.Isa.* 9.9, *Vis. Paul* 20, and *Apocr. Ep. Tit.*

²⁸⁸ Translation from Isaac, “1 Enoch,” *OTP* 1, 35. The description ‘light of the Gentiles’ could perhaps be related to a Christian setting in which mission to the Gentiles was on the foreground; Luke 2:32 and Acts 13:47.

²⁸⁹ See *1 Enoch* 37:2.4, 38:2.4.6, 39:2.7–9.12.14, 40:1–2.5–7.10, 41:2.6–8, 43:4, 45:1–2, 46:6–8, 47:1–2.4, 48:2–3.5.7.10, 49:2.4, 50:2–3.5, 52:5.9, 53:2.6, 54:7, 55:3–4, 57:3, 58:4.6, 59:1–2, 60:6.8.25, 61:3.5.7.9.11.13, 62:2.10.12.14.16, 63:1–2.7.12, 65:9.11, 66:2, 67:8–9, 68:4, 69:25.29, 71:2.17.

resurrection outlined above, may be the arguable product of Christian adoption and redaction.

The ‘Book of Astronomical Writings’ (*1 Enoch* 72–82) has already been discussed in connection with Qumran fragments of ‘Astronomical Enoch’; there are no further passages in it of particular relevance for the subject of eschatology. The ‘Book of Dream Visions’ (*1 Enoch* 83–90) contains a vision about eschatological judgement and salvation for the righteous and the upright in *1 Enoch* 84.

The ‘Book of the Epistle of Enoch’ (*1 Enoch* 91–107) contains various eschatological traditions. It focuses on the final judgement of the wicked on the one hand, who are associated with oppression and injustice (*1 Enoch* 91:7–9.11, 94:6–9, 96:4–8, 97:1, 98:9–10, 99:11–15, 100:4, 102:1–3.9–11, 103:5–8, 108:2–3). On the other hand, the ultimate salvation for the righteous is emphasised (e.g. *1 Enoch* 103:3–4, 104:5–6). The eschatological judgement of sinners is characterised as ‘judgement of fire’ (*1 Enoch* 91:9), ‘eternal judgement’ (*1 Enoch* 91:9.15), and ‘great judgement’ (*1 Enoch* 91:15, 94:9, 98:10, 99:15, 100:4, 103:8). These descriptions intersect with Qumran textual witness to *1 Enoch* 22:4.

4.2.1.2. Jubilees

In addition to the passages which intersect with extant Qumran fragments, *Jubilees* contains several other eschatological passages, as surveyed by Gene L. Davenport (cf. section 2.1.2 above). *Jubilees* 45:14, which elaborates on Jacob’s blessing of his sons in Genesis 49:1–28, is further eschatologically oriented (cf. section 1.2.1 above). The eschatologically loaded section on wickedness of a later generation and its punishment (*Jub.* 23:14–31) appears to serve a hortative purpose in the course of *Jubilees*’ retelling of the biblical narrative from the creation to the time of Moses. The underlying exhortation probably concerns faithfulness to the Law and ‘return to the way of righteousness’ (*Jub.* 23:26).

4.2.1.3. Sirach

Since the discovery of Hebrew fragments of Sirach among the Cairo Genizah, at Qumran and at Masada,²⁹⁰ some parts of the complete Greek

²⁹⁰ Cf. Schechter, “The Quotations from Ecclesiasticus in Rabbinic Literature,” 682–706, and idem and Taylor, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira; 2QBen Sira* (2Q18) comprises fragments of Sir 6:14–15 or 1:19–20 (fig. 1) and of Sir 6:20–31 (fig. 2); 11Q5 columns

text of Sirach, preserved as part of the Septuagint, can be checked against the original Hebrew text. The Hebrew original has been dated around 180 BCE, while the Greek translation presumably dates soon after 132 BCE.²⁹¹ According to the prologue, Sirach aims at providing sapiential instruction for those who love learning in order that they “should make even greater progress in living according to the law”.²⁹² This sapiential text also contains an eschatologically oriented section: *Sir* 39:28–31. Parts of the Hebrew text of *Sir* 39–40 have also been preserved in the 10th century fragment from the Cairo Genizah of *Sirach* (Or. 1102). *Sir* 39:28–31 speaks of a ‘time of consummation’ and of ‘vengeance’ against the ungodly as they have kindled the God’s anger.

4.2.2. *Texts from the Late Second Temple Period (mid-second century BCE–70 CE)*

4.2.2.1. Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs

The *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* is perhaps one of the most extensively discussed Old Testament Pseudepigrapha with regard to the question of distinguishing Christian from Jewish elements in this work.²⁹³ The main scholarly difference consists in the question whether it is possible to identify Christian interpolations in an otherwise Jewish text or that the very existence of a Jewish ‘Vorlage’ should be doubted from the point of view of a Christian origin of the composition. A. Hultgård was one of the champions of the view that *T. 12 Patr.* is the ‘literary product of ancient Judaism’,²⁹⁴ writing specifically about its eschatology, while M. de Jonge has consistently defended the view of its Christian origin.²⁹⁵ De Jonge has also expressed this view with regard to

XXI–XXII contain Sirach 51; Yadin, *The Ben Sira Scroll from Masada*. See recently, Beentjes, *The Book of Ben Sira in Hebrew*.

²⁹¹ See e.g. May and Metzger, *The New Oxford Annotated Bible with the Apocrypha*, 128.

²⁹² Translation from RSV.

²⁹³ See e.g. the “Introduction” in Hollander and De Jonge, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. A Commentary*, 1–85. Cf. De Jonge, *Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament as Part of Christian Literature*, 71–83 (“Defining the Major Issues in the Study of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs”).

²⁹⁴ Hultgård, *L’eschatologie des Testaments des Douze Patriarches* 1, 12 states that *T. 12 Patr.* “émanent, selon nous, de milieux juifs de la Palestine à la première moitié du 1^{er} siècle av. J.-C.”.

²⁹⁵ De Jonge, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*; idem, “The Main Issues in the Study of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs,” 147–63; idem, *Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament as Part of Christian Literature*, 71–177.

the eschatology in *T. 12 Patr.*, observing that its perspective on Israel's final salvation is christologically oriented.²⁹⁶

In spite of the important insight that the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* is partly determined by its Christian framework of transmission, the idea of a Christian origin²⁹⁷ appears problematic. The Second Temple Jewish concern with the Patriarchs has become abundantly clear in light of the Qumran apocrypha and pseudepigrapha.²⁹⁸ Scholarly discussion about possible intersections between the Greek *Testament of Levi* and the Aramaic Levi documents from the Cairo Genizah and Qumran makes a disjunction between *T. 12 Patr.* and a Jewish 'Vorlage' premature.²⁹⁹

The methodological starting point of the Christian framework of the composition³⁰⁰ does not necessarily preclude the existence of an earlier Jewish context. Parallels and overlaps between Greek and Aramaic materials, as in the case of the Aramaic Levi Document and the Greek *Testament of Levi*, make the study of the history of *T. 12 Patr.* less hypothetical. It has been observed at an early stage that the additional material to *T. Levi* 2:3, 18:2 in the Greek manuscript Athos (MS *e*) of *T. 12 Patr.* overlaps with Aramaic Levi documents from the Cairo Genizah³⁰¹ and from Qumran.³⁰² Michael E. Stone has further argued that "the first five lines of the Qumran document [4Q215] resemble the Greek Testament of Naphtali 1:6–8 of the Testament of the Twelve

²⁹⁶ See e.g. De Jonge, *Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament as Part of Christian Literature*, 81–3 ("Some Additional Remarks on the Eschatological Passages").

²⁹⁷ Cf. H.C. Kee, "Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs," *OTP* 1, 775–828 at 778 refers to proponents of Aramaic provenance and of Christian provenance of *T. 12 Patr.* respectively.

²⁹⁸ Cf. *1QGenesis Apocryphon*, *4QCommentary on Genesis A II–VI*, *4QCommentary on Genesis C* frgs. 5–7, *4QTestament of Jacob (?) ar*, *4QTestament of Naphtali*, *1Q/4QTestament of Levi ar*.

²⁹⁹ See Stone and Greenfield, "Remarks on the Aramaic Testament of Levi from the Genizah," 228–46; De Jonge, "The Testament of Levi and 'Aramaic Levi'," 244–62; idem and Hollander, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. A Commentary*, 17–20, 23–25; Kugler, *The Levi-Priestly Tradition from Aramaic Levi to Testament of Levi*; De Jonge, *Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament as Part of Christian Literature*, 107–23 ("The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs and Related Qumran Fragments"), 124–40 ("Levi in the Aramaic Levi Document and in the Testament of Levi").

³⁰⁰ Cf. De Jonge, *Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament as Part of Christian Literature*, 82.

³⁰¹ Pass and Arendzen, "Fragment of an Aramaic Text of the Testament of Levi," 651–61; Cowley and Charles, "An Early Source of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs," 566–80. See now the new critical edition by Puech, "Le Testament de Lévi en araméen de la Genizah du Caire," 511–56.

³⁰² Milik, "Le Testament de Lévi en araméen," 398–406.

Patriarchs”.³⁰³ An explanation of these overlaps as source material perhaps used by (a) Christian writer(s)/editor(s) leaves both possibilities, a Jewish ‘Vorlage’ and a Christian document with elaboration on Jewish sources, open for discussion.

An interpretation which leaves more room for the possibility of literary growth from Aramaic origins to (different stages of) Greek recensions, an interpretation which I would be inclined to follow, makes it possible to consider (parts of) the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* as a Jewish text of the late Second Temple period. The emphasis on the observance of the Law (*T. Reu.* 6.8; *T. Levi* 13.1–4, 19.1–2; *T. Jud.* 26.1; *T. Iss.* 5.1; *T. Dan* 5.1, 6.10; *T. Jos.* 18.1; *T. Benj.* 10.3) could be in line with this idea. It may further be important to note that the works of Enoch occur in the *T. 12 Patr.* (cf. *T. Sim.* 5.4; *T. Levi* 10.5, 14.1; *T. Jud.* 18.1; *T. Dan* 5.6; *T. Naph.* 3.5–4.1; *T. Benj.* 9.1) in the context of exhortations, which in *T. Naph.* 3.5–4.1 associate wickedness with the Gentiles. *1 Enoch* was also highly relevant for Palestinian Jewish circles that turned away from the Jerusalemite establishment. The recurring moral exhortation against sexual immorality does not provide an argument for the supposition that *T. Levi* or any other *Testament* is ‘structurally Christian’,³⁰⁴ since this exhortation also occurs in the Aramaic *Levi* documents from the Cairo Genizah and Qumran.³⁰⁵

In what follows, I aim to survey aspects of eschatology in the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* whose orientation is not messianic/christological. Let me start with the Testaments of the two most prominent tribes, Levi and Judah, to whom there are cross-references in the other Testaments. The *Testament of Levi* 3.1–10 comprises an eschatologically oriented exhortation against human injustice and insensitivity to heavenly matters. *T. Levi* 3.2 refers to the “day determined by God’s righteous judgement” and 3.3 mentions the “day of judgement to work vengeance on the spirits of error and of Beliar”.³⁰⁶ The *Testament of*

³⁰³ Stone, “The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Pseudepigrapha,” 270–95 at 281–2; cf. 282 n. 38 referring to his publication of the full text, preliminarily published in *JJS* 47 (1996) 311–332 and *JJS* 49 (1998) 346–347, and available in *DJD* 22, 1996, 73–82.

³⁰⁴ Thus De Jonge, *Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament as Part of Christian Literature*, 135–40 argues that the “present *T. Levi* is “structurally” Christian” (135), while substantiating his point by discussing, among other things, the exhortation against πορνεία (137–8).

³⁰⁵ See CTLevi ar *Bodleian Col.* b ll. 8–23; 4Q213a (4QLevi^b ar) 1 I 12–13. Cf. CD-A IV 15–19a on the ‘three nets of Belial’, fornication, wealth, and the defilement of the Temple, about which *Levi* the son of Jacob spoke.

³⁰⁶ Translations from Kee, “Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs,” 789.

Judah 18.1 observes that “in the books of Enoch the Righteous I have read the evil things you will do in the last days (ἐν ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις),”³⁰⁷ while the following line comprises an exhortation against sexual immorality (πορνεία) and love of money (φιλαργυρία).³⁰⁸ Even though this may sound like a polemical exhortation, *T. Jud.* 22:1–3 relates Israel’s salvation to the rule of the Judaic kingdom, implying that this rule also extends to all the nations, in line with the promise in Gen 49:10. *T. Judah* 24 could well be implicitly christological in its orientation,³⁰⁹ so that we will not deal with it here. *T. Jud.* 25:1–2 envisions the resurrection of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob³¹⁰ and the eschatological rule over Israel by the twelve sons of Jacob. *T. Jud.* 25:3–5 starts with the expectation to become “one people of the Lord, with one language” and it further mentions the judgment of Beliar by eternal fire, the resurrection of “those who died on account of the Lord”,³¹¹ and the glorification of the Lord by all peoples.

The *Testament of Issachar* emphasises a way of life in integrity of heart, and includes the eschatologically oriented exhortation not to abandon the statutes of the Lord for a pact with Beliar (*T. Iss.* 6.1), but to return to the Lord (*T. Iss.* 6.3–4). The *Testament of Zebulun* voices mercy and compassion to one’s neighbour, and gives the following eschatological setting to it: “in the last days God will send his compassion on the earth, and whenever he finds compassionate mercy, in that person he will dwell” (*T. Zeb.* 8.2).³¹² *T. Dan* 5.4 mentions rebellion by the tribe of Dan against Levi and Judah, while *T. Dan* 5.10 underlines that the ‘Lord’s salvation’ for Dan will come from the tribes of Levi and Judah; 5.10–13 refer to Eden and the New Jerusalem³¹³ as the dwelling places of the holy ones and the righteous after the eschatological victory

³⁰⁷ Translation from Kee, *ibidem*, 800.

³⁰⁸ Note the comparable pair הַזְנוּתָהּ and הַהֲרוֹן as part of the ‘three nets of Belial’ in CD-A IV 15–19a.

³⁰⁹ Note the parallels between the messianic figure who receives a heavenly blessing from the Holy Father in *T. Jud.* 24.2 and Jesus’ heavenly blessing (Mark 1:10–11 par.), between the description ‘fountain for the life of all humanity’ in *T. Jud.* 24.5 and Jesus’ words in John 4:14 and 7:37–39. It appears not unlikely that both explicit and implicit christological concerns are reflected in the text as the result of Christian redaction.

³¹⁰ Cf. Mark 12:18–27 at 24–27 par.; cf. chapter four.

³¹¹ Translations from Kee, “Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs,” 802.

³¹² Translation from Kee, *ibidem*, 807.

³¹³ Note that the Qumran composition *New Jerusalem*, e.g. 4Q554 1 I–II, refers to gates named after the Twelve Patriarchs; the gates presumably being gates of the New Jerusalem with its envisioned Temple.

over Beliar. The *Testament of Naphtali* 8.1–8 teaches unity with Levi and Judah and foretells that “through Judah will salvation arise for Israel”.³¹⁴ The resurrection of the Patriarchs and judgement of Israel by the ‘chosen Gentiles’, as described in *T. Benj.* 10.5–10, constitute examples of Christian redaction, and the description of salvific activity of ‘God’s Chosen One’ for the Gentiles in *T. Benj.* 11 may have a christological orientation.

4.2.2.2. Judith

The composition of the apocryphal text *Judith* has been dated to the late second century BCE.³¹⁵ Judith’s ‘thanksgiving psalm’ (*Judith* 16:1–17), which is near the end of the text and closes the preceding story, contains the eschatological element of God’s vengeance against the nations which rise up against Israel on the ‘day of judgement’ (*Judith* 16:17). This element of vengeance is completely in line with the upshot of the preceding narrative and the last part of the text (*Judith* 16:18–25).

4.2.2.3. Psalms of Solomon

The provenance of the *Psalms of Solomon* has been situated in first-century BCE Jerusalem.³¹⁶ Certain psalms (e.g. *Pss. Sol.* 1 and 2) are fiercely polemical in their condemnation of the priestly establishment. Apart from the messianic psalms (*Pss. Sol.* 17–18), with which we are not concerned here (see chapter six), the *Psalms of Solomon* contain the eschatological themes of the ‘day of the Lord’s judgement’ (*Ps. Sol.* 15:12), the eternal destruction of the arrogant and the sinner (*Pss. Sol.* 2:31, 3:11, 13:11b, 14:6–9, 15:10–13), and eternal life for the righteous, the devout, those who fear the Lord (*Pss. Sol.* 3:11–12, 13:11a, 14:10). The reference to eternal life in *Ps. Sol.* 3:12 (ἀναστήσονται εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον) implies resurrection of the dead, while *Ps. Sol.* 3:10 excludes the sinner from the resurrection.

³¹⁴ Translation from Kee, “Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs,” 813.

³¹⁵ See e.g. May and Metzger, *The New Oxford Annotated Bible with the Apocrypha*, 76. No copy of *Judith* is extant among the Dead Sea Scrolls which do contain copies of apocryphal works like Tobit and Sirach.

³¹⁶ See R.B. Wright, “Psalms of Solomon,” *OTP* 2, 639–70 at 640–1. Cf. De Jonge, “The Expectation of the Future in the Psalms of Solomon,” 3–27 at 5: “[The Psalms of Solomon] probably originated between circa 70 and 40 BC amongst the people who called themselves ‘the pious and holy’. These are usually taken to be Pharisaic groups, but it is not at all certain that this identification is the correct one”.

4.2.2.4. 2 Maccabees

2 Maccabees has been dated to the (mid-)first century BCE. With regard to its provenance, scholars disagree whether the theological outlook of 2 Maccabees corresponds more closely with Palestinian Judaism³¹⁷ or with Hellenistic Diaspora Judaism.³¹⁸ G.W.E. Nickelsburg referred to 2 Maccabees as a paradoxical example of the fact that “an author can be at the same time Jewish, anti-Hellenistic [against Hellenistic reforms and religious persecution] and Hellenistic [following the model of Hellenistic historiography]”.³¹⁹

At any rate, the narrative framework of 2 Maccabees in which eschatological elements may be discerned applies to a setting in Israel. 2 Macc 6–7 narrates the religious persecution and Jewish martyrdom under Antiochus IV Epiphanes.³²⁰ This is the context for the martyrs’ expression of their belief that the resurrection to eternal life is granted to those who die for God’s laws, while being denied to their enemies (2 Macc 7:9.14.23). 4 Maccabees, a text dated to the first half of the first century CE,³²¹ further elaborates on the story in 2 Macc 7:1–42 about seven brothers and their mother martyred for their steadfastness in the Law.³²² The expectation of eschatological punishment of those who “tried to fight against God” is expressed in 2 Maccabees 7:19. Finally, the observance of the Law in terms of cultic obligations has eschatological consequences according to 2 Maccabees, as we may infer from the description of Judas Maccabeus’ provision for a sin offering

³¹⁷ So Stemmerger, *Der Leib der Auferstehung*, 5–8, further referring to G.F. Moore and M. Hengel who likewise associated the theology of 2 Maccabees with Palestinian Judaism.

³¹⁸ So May and Metzger, *The New Oxford Annotated Bible with the Apocrypha*, 263: “Jason [the author of a five-volume work of which 2 Maccabees purports to be an abridgment] seems not to have been a Pharisee; he may reflect the ideas of Jews at Antioch or possibly Alexandria”; cf. Cohen, “Greek Words for Jewish Concepts in Philo,” 31–61 at 34–5 on Hellenistic contexts to νομοθεσία in 2 Macc 6:23 and 4 Macc 5:35, 17:16.

³¹⁹ Nickelsburg, *Ancient Judaism and Christian Origins*, 152.

³²⁰ Cf. the discussion in Stemmerger, *Der Leib der Auferstehung*, 13–22 and Nickelsburg, *Resurrection, Immortality and Eternal Life*, 93–111.

³²¹ May and Metzger, *The New Oxford Annotated Bible*, 309; H. Anderson, “4 Maccabees,” *OTP* 2, 533–4.

³²² See Nickelsburg, *Resurrection, Immortality and Eternal Life*, 109–11 at 110 about the difference between 2 Macc 6–7 and 4 Macc: “Different from 2 Maccabees 7, which anticipates a future resurrection, here the heroes pass from death immediately into eternal life and immortality”.

to Jerusalem: “In doing this he acted very well and honorably, taking account of the resurrection (ἀνάστασις)” (RSV).

4.2.2.5. Wisdom of Solomon

The apocryphal Wisdom of Solomon has been dated between the middle or late first century BCE and its provenance is usually attributed to Hellenistic Diaspora Judaism, with Alexandria as a particular location.³²³

While apocalyptic elements in the Wisdom of Solomon have long been noted, scholarly attention for eschatological perspectives in this apocryphal work has recently intensified. In their respective studies, J.J. Collins,³²⁴ É. Puech,³²⁵ and M. Gilbert³²⁶ have analysed the eschatological orientation of Wis 5, which refers to the eventual reward of the righteous and the punishment of the ungodly. Apart from Wis 5, Wis 3 plays a part in the scholarly discussion about the eschatological perspective of the Wisdom of Solomon.³²⁷

Wis 3 and 5 both bring out the contrast between the contemporary state of affliction of the righteous as perceived by the ungodly (Wis 3:2–4a, 5:4) and the eschatological perspective of salvation for the righteous (Wis 3:1.4b–9, 5:1–2.15–16). Wis 3:10–19, however, appears to stress the eschatological punishment of the ungodly, whereas Wis 5:6–14 rather voices the perspective of anguish of the ungodly about the vanity of their hope. This amounts to a reversal of the perspective attributed to the ungodly. The Wisdom of Solomon not only assigns eschatological punishment to the ungodly according to their works (Wis 3:11c, 5:7), but also according to their reasoning (καθὰ ἐλόγισαντο, Wis 3:10); reasoning which is characterised by an arrogant self-justification (Wis 5:6.8). Wis 5:17–23 expresses the cosmological setting of God’s

³²³ May and Metzger, *The New Oxford Annotated Bible*, 102; Collins, “Apocalyptic Eschatology in Philosophical Dress in the Wisdom of Solomon,” 93–107 at 94 and n. 3.

³²⁴ Collins, “Apocalyptic Eschatology in Philosophical Dress,” 93–107 at 100 refers to “the apocalyptic judgment scene” in Wis 5, and 101–106, discussing Wis 5:17–23 as a passage about God as “Divine Warrior”.

³²⁵ Puech, “La conception de la vie future,” 209–32 at 223, 226–9 discusses Wis 5:17–23 in comparison with 1QH^a XI, 20–37, XIV 32–39; 1QM XII 1f., XIII 2f., XIV 4f.; 4Q521 5 II + 7, 2 II 12–14; 4Q418 69 II 4–15.

³²⁶ Gilbert, “Sagesse 3,7–9; 5:15–23 et l’apocalyptique,” 307–22.

³²⁷ See Gilbert, “Sagesse 3,7–9; 5:15–23 et l’apocalyptique,” 307–13; Willett, *Eschatology in the Theodicies of 2 Baruch and 4 Ezra*, 31–2 subsumes discussion of Wis 3:1–7.18–19 under the rubric of ‘future retribution’.

punishment of the enemies of his creation by the language of war, representing God as “Divine Warrior”.³²⁸

4.2.2.6. Sibylline Oracles

A brief discussion of the *Sibylline Oracles* may be included into our survey, since many Sibylline writings postdate the first century CE and Christian redaction determines the framework of transmission of the Sibylline writings. Large parts of this collection must be excluded from discussion, since the dates assigned to the *Sibylline Oracles* 5–14 range from the early second century CE to centuries later.³²⁹

Book 1 of the *Sibylline Oracles* does not comprise eschatological traditions. The identification of Jewish eschatological traditions in *Sib. Or.* 2 is problematic in view of the fact that, as John J. Collins has observed, “the Christian redactor was interested primarily in the eschatology of the book”.³³⁰ Collins has identified several passages from *Sib.Or.* 2.154–176, 214–37, 285–310, 317–29) as possible parts of the Jewish ‘Vorlage’.

The provenance of the Jewish substratum of *Sib.Or.* 1–2 has been situated in Phrygia around the turn of the era.³³¹ The eschatological parts of *Sib. Or.* 2 considered possibly Jewish by Collins concern catastrophic signs of the end (154–173), among which signs by false prophets and by Beliar (165–168), the subsequent rule of the ‘chosen Hebrews’ (174–176), final judgement of humanity gathered by the four archangels before God (214–220), resurrection of the dead (221–237) ‘on a single day’ (226), the punishment of the evildoers (285–310) in Gehenna (292), and the renewal of the earth as a reward for the righteous (317–29). The fusion of elements from Hellenistic eschatology, like the Elysian plain, Ἠλύσιον πεδῖον, and the Acherusian lake, Ἀχερούσια λίμνη (*Sib. Or.* 2. 337–338),³³² and from Scripture speaks for a setting of *Sib. Or.* 1–2 in the Hellenistic Jewish Diaspora.

³²⁸ Cf. Collins, “Apocalyptic Eschatology in Philosophical Dress,” 101–6 on comparable imagery in Deut 33 and Judges 5.

³²⁹ J.J. Collins, “Sibylline Oracles (Second Century B.C. – Seventh Century A.D.),” *OTP* 1, 317–472.

³³⁰ Collins, “Sibylline Oracles,” 333.

³³¹ Collins, *ibidem*, 331–2.

³³² Apart from a general Greek term for the (place of the) afterlife, ᾗδης or Ἄϊδης (Hades), which already occurs in the Septuagint (e.g. LXX Ps 15:10, Eccl 9:10) and in 8HevXII gr XVII 32, the Elysian plain and the Acherusian lake are more specifically Hellenistic *topoi*. For the place of the Elysian plain and the Acherusian lake in the Homeric and Orphic traditions, see Albinus, *The House of Hades*, 86–9 and 131–40.

Book 3 of the *Sibylline Oracles* also comprises eschatological traditions (601–623, 635–731, 741–761, 767–808) and its Jewish substratum could even be older than that of *Sib. Or.* 1–2. The date and provenance assigned to *Sib. Or.* 3 has been variously determined as 160–150 BCE Alexandrian Judaism in Egypt by Collins³³³ and as 80–40 BCE Judaism in Asia Minor by Rieuwerd Buitenwerf.³³⁴ The eschatologically oriented sections at the end of book 3 envision the demise of Greek power (638–640, 732–740) and the protection of the Jerusalem Temple from assaults by the nations (657–668, 702–731), God’s sending of a saviour king (652–656), his establishment of a ‘kingdom for all ages among men’ (767–795), and God’s final judgment of humanity (741–761).

Apart from the above-mentioned eschatological features, the political orientation of the eschatology in *Sib. Or.* 3 may further be deduced from the fact that the signs of the end concern eschatological war (796–808). There may be formal analogies between this idea of an eschatological war accomplished by God (*Sib. Or.* 3.807) and the Divine Warrior imagery in the Wisdom of Solomon as well as the eschatological vision of the Qumran *War Scroll*. However, in contrast to the *War Scroll*, the scenario of eschatological war in *Sib. Or.* 3 does not refer to a particular, privileged role of the sons of Levi, Judah, and Benjamin or of priests. The general references to the Temple attest to Temple piety of Hellenistic Diaspora Judaism.

Book 4 of the *Sibylline Oracles* also comprises eschatological traditions about tribulations in the last times (152–161), conflagration (171–178), and resurrection and judgement (179–192). In contrast to *Sib. Or.* 3, which emphasised the divine protection of the ‘Temple of the great God’, the eschatological picture in *Sib. Or.* 4 is grim, being determined by the destruction of the Jerusalem Temple (115–129) and the hidden state of justice in the world (153). *Sib. Or.* 4 has been dated about 80 CE,³³⁵ but certain beliefs in the resurrection and final

³³³ Collins, “Sibylline Oracles,” 354–6, bases his argument on favourable references to Ptolemaic rulers, on a double reference to Egypt in *Sib. Or.* 3.155–61, and on “repeated references to the seventh king of Egypt”, noting that “the strongest clue to the provenance of Sibylline Oracles 3 is the enthusiastic endorsement of a Ptolemaic king as a savior figure who will put an end to war and usher in a reign of peace” (355).

³³⁴ Buitenwerf, *Book III of the Sibylline Oracles and Its Social Settings*, 124–34, bases his argument on topographical references and the popularity of the Erythraean Sibyl (*Sib. Or.* 3. 813–814) in first-century BCE Asia Minor.

³³⁵ Collins, “Sibylline Oracles,” 381–2 notes the reference to “the eruption of Vesuvius in A.D. 79” in *Sib. Or.* 4.130–135, characterised as “the wrath of the heavenly God” in *Sib.Or.* 4.135 (387).

judgement appear to represent a continuum between pre-70 CE and post-70 CE eschatologies.

4.2.2.7. *Pseudo-Philo's* Biblical Antiquities

The inclusion of Pseudo-Philo's *Biblical Antiquities*, also known as *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum* (hence *L.A.B.*), among Jewish apocrypha and pseudepigrapha from the late Second Temple period depends on the supposed perspective of this text on the Temple. In his recent commentary, Howard Jacobson has noted a scholarly consensus for dating *L.A.B.* between 50 and 150 CE and assigning its provenance to a Semitic 'Vorlage' composed in Israel, but also stated that "the central question to come under discussion is whether the work is before or after Jerusalem's fall and the destruction of the Temple". Jacobson has further pointed to a 'weight of scholarly opinion' in recent years in favour of an early, pre-70 CE date of *L.A.B.*³³⁶ Accordingly, Daniel J. Harrington has in particular defended a pre-70 CE date, in view of the fact that attitudes to the Temple appear to reflect a situation when the destruction of the Jerusalem Temple had not yet taken place.³³⁷ Jacobson rather concluded that "there are no cogent arguments in support of a pre-70 date, while the arguments for a post-70 date seem to me overwhelming".³³⁸ Harrington recently reasserted the possibility of a pre-70 CE date, referring to *L.A.B.* 22.8–9.³³⁹

A pre-70 CE date may in my view be justified, since the divine prediction to Moses of the destruction of the place where Israel serves God (*L.A.B.* 19.7) may well apply to the destruction of the First Temple. The idea that it would apply to the destruction of the Second Temple seems less likely, since the reference to the "measurements sanctuary and the number of sacrifices and the signs by which they are to interpret the

³³⁶ Jacobson, *A Commentary on Pseudo-Philo's Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*, 1, 199.

³³⁷ See D.J. Harrington, "Pseudo-Philo," *OTP* 2, 297–377 at 299 for considerations about *L.A.B.*'s attitude to the Temple (22:8, 32:3), its polemic against "Jewish rulers not chosen by God", and its "free attitude toward the biblical text" which "lead us to suspect that Pseudo-Philo was composed before A.D. 70".

³³⁸ Jacobson, *A Commentary on Pseudo-Philo*, 1, 199–210 at 209. Cf. Vogel, "Tempel und Tempelkult in Pseudo-Philos Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum," 251–63 who also tends to favour a post-70 CE date. An earlier example of the post-70 CE position is Stemmerger, *Der Leib der Auferstehung*, 97–114 at 97–8.

³³⁹ Harrington, "The 'Holy Land' in Pseudo-Philo, 4 Ezra, and 2 Baruch," 661–72 at 661–4.

heaven”³⁴⁰ in *L.A.B.* 19.10.13 (cf. 11.15, 22.8–9) appears to stipulate a continuous cultic interest. It is not immediately clear whether the subsequent sentence, “And he said, “These are what are prohibited for the human race because they have sinned against me””,³⁴¹ applies in particular to Israel. Israel appears to have an ambiguous place as a chosen race (19.8) and as part of the human race which sins (19.6–7.9). The ambiguous perspective of *L.A.B.*, which leaves room to suppose a continued existence of the Temple cult at the time of *L.A.B.*’s composition, contrasts with post-70 CE apocalyptic texts. *4 Ezra* rather focuses on the abiding glory of the Law (*4 Ezra* 9.26–37) than on a future Temple.³⁴² The vision of a sanctuary with its number of sacrifices is far more eschatologically oriented in *2 Baruch* 4 and 59:4–11³⁴³ than is the case in *L.A.B.* 19.10.

Pseudo-Philo’s *Biblical Antiquities* contain several eschatological traditions within the narrative framework which retells the biblical story from the creation up to the death of Saul. *L.A.B.* 3.9–10 puts God’s words after the Flood (Gen 8:21–22) in an eschatological perspective,³⁴⁴ referring to different conditions after the fulfilment of the appointed times (*donec compleantur tempora*, 3.9). These conditions are substantiated in *L.A.B.* 3.10 as an era without light and darkness, when God “will bring the dead to life and raise up those who are sleeping from the earth”;³⁴⁵ a resurrection which is followed by God’s final judgment which will “render to each according to his works and according to the fruits of his own devices, until I judge between soul and flesh”.³⁴⁶ The

³⁴⁰ Translation from Harrington, “Pseudo-Philo,” *OTP* 2, 328. The ‘signs by which they are to interpret the heaven’ presumably are the Urim and the Thummim, which according to *L.A.B.* 22.8–9 were invested with revelatory qualities.

³⁴¹ Translation from Harrington, *ibidem*, 328.

³⁴² *4 Ezra* 10.25–59 does envision the heavenly Jerusalem, but without substantial concern for cultic matters.

³⁴³ These passages in *2 Baruch*, which comprise parallels with the evidence of *L.A.B.* 11.15 and 19.10, could be elaborations on earlier, pre-70 CE traditions about the Mosaic vision of the future Temple, such as possibly contained in *L.A.B.* On pre-70 CE traditions in *2 Baruch*, see sub-section 4.2.3.2.

³⁴⁴ 4Q254a (4QcommGen D) frg. 3 also appears to put the Flood story in an eschatological perspective.

³⁴⁵ *Vivificabo mortuos et erigam dormientes de terra*. Translation from Harrington, “Pseudo-Philo,” *OTP* 2, 307; text from Jacobson, *A Commentary on Pseudo-Philo*. 1, 1–88, 323 noting an analogy between *vivificabo mortuos* and the “postbiblical phrase להחיות המתים which however is for all intents and purposes implicit in I Sam 2:6”. Cf. the rabbinic concept תחיית המתים (e.g. in *m. Sanh.* 10:1).

³⁴⁶ Translation from Harrington, “Pseudo-Philo,” *OTP* 2, 307.

final judgement as described here applies to both external works and internal considerations or intentions. The end of the world, of death and of the opened gate of hell is marked by the transition to “another earth and another heaven, an everlasting dwelling place” (*L.A.B.* 3.10).³⁴⁷

The immortal dwelling place ‘which is not subject to time’³⁴⁸ recurs in *L.A.B.* 19.12–13 as the place of resurrection of the Patriarchs. This is another digression on the final age, characterised as a visitation of the world, a shortening of times,³⁴⁹ and resurrection for ‘all who can live’.³⁵⁰ This passage does not describe God’s final judgement, but it rather appears to focus on the eschatological destiny of the righteous.

Apart from *L.A.B.* 3.9–10 and 19.12–13, *L.A.B.* 25.7–8 mentions the resurrection of the dead and the question of God’s mercy for sinners. Jacobson has collected still other passages with references to the after-life and ultimate fate of the righteous and the wicked that presumably contrast with the above-mentioned eschatological digressions.³⁵¹

4.2.3. *Later Texts with Earlier Traditions*

4.2.3.1. 4 Ezra

The date and provenance of 4 *Ezra* is usually assigned to a Palestinian origin around 100 CE on the basis of its reference to the ‘thirtieth year after the destruction of our city’ (4 *Ezra* 3.1), the interpretation of the ‘eagle vision’ (4 *Ezra* 11–12) and the presence of Semitisms in 4 *Ezra*.³⁵² It contains eschatological sections of which various elements may show a continuity with and further elaboration on earlier traditions.

As has been noted by Tom W. Willett, eschatological perspectives in 4 *Ezra* serve to come to terms with the catastrophic dilemma of the

³⁴⁷ Translation from Harrington, *ibidem*, 307.

³⁴⁸ Translation from Harrington, *ibidem*, 328.

³⁴⁹ With regard to the times which will be shortened (*breviabuntur*), Harrington, “Pseudo-Philo,” *OTP* 2, 328 n. *r* has noted parallels with 2 *Baruch* 20.1, 54.1, 83.1 and Mark 13:20, Matt 24:22; Jacobson, *A Commentary on Pseudo-Philo* 2, p. 645 further refers to 1 Cor 7:29, *Ep. Barn.* 4.3, and 4 *Ezra* 2.13. God’s shortening of time is also mentioned in 4QSecond Ezekiel (4Q385) 3 3–5.

³⁵⁰ Translation from Harrington, “Pseudo-Philo,” *OTP* 2, 328.

³⁵¹ Jacobson, *A Commentary on Pseudo-Philo*. 1, 247–50 on *L.A.B.* 15.5, 23.6, 26.13, 36.4, 38.4, 44.10 as examples of punishment of sin immediately after death, and to *L.A.B.* 51.5 as an example of resurrection for the righteous only rather than resurrection for all to receive God’s judgment.

³⁵² See e.g. Metzger, “The Fourth Book of Ezra,” *OTP* 1, 516–59 at 520; Willett, *Eschatology in the Theodicies of 2 Baruch and 4 Ezra*, 53.

destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple.³⁵³ The eschatological sections in *4 Ezra*, which focus on future hope for the people of Israel and amounts to Ezra's reassured confidence in the mercy of God, hardly deal with the idea of a future Temple. Nevertheless, the seven visions contained in *4 Ezra* (chs. 3–14) unfold eschatological ideas that may in various cases be paralleled by pre-70 CE texts and traditions.

The first vision (chs. 3–5.20) refers to a time, preceding the final age, when evil has been sown without yet being harvested (3.28–29); the harvest probably standing for the consummation of the contemporary age during which righteousness is hidden from the earth (5.11–13). The second vision (chs. 5.21–6.34) goes on to make clear that the end of the age, 'when the humiliation of Zion is complete' (6.19),³⁵⁴ has been predetermined by God (6.1–6) who saves a remnant, while blotting out evil (6.25–28).

The third vision (6.35–9.25) comprises the most elaborate eschatological section, apparently triggered by Ezra's question why Israel, for whom the world was created, does not possess the world as an inheritance (6.55–59).³⁵⁵ Israel's portion is conditioned by a phase of passing through 'difficult and vain experiences' (7.14), caused by Adam's sin from the start (7.10–11) and subsequent disobedience to God's laws (7.20–25). The rule of the Messiah during four hundred years (7.26–28) heralds the final age that is determined by God's judgement of the awakened righteous and unrighteous (7.29–35). The 'day of judgement', as subsequently described, is beyond the order of natural phenomena and juxtaposes the furnace of Hell to the Paradise of delight (7.[36–44]). Interspersed with further descriptions of the judgment of the many and the salvation of the few (7.[45–61].[70–74].[76–99].[101.104–105].[112–115]) are Ezra's questions and lamentations about the eschatological fate of humanity (7.[62–69].[75].[100.102–103].[106–111].[116–126]). God eventually answers Ezra's prayer to show mercy to his creation (8.4–19) with the observation that the multitude also received freedom and responsibility, but nevertheless chose to do evil (8.53–62). The third vision ends with references to signs that precede the end and to the fate of the wicked (9.1–25).

³⁵³ Willett, *Eschatology in the Theodicies of 2 Baruch and 4 Ezra*, 75.

³⁵⁴ Metzger, "The Fourth Book of Ezra," *OTP* 1, 535.

³⁵⁵ Translation after Metzger, *ibidem*, 536.

The fourth vision (9.26–10.59) includes a vision of a woman bereft of her son, standing for Zion, the heavenly Jerusalem mourning about the destruction of the earthly Jerusalem. The fifth vision, also known as the ‘eagle vision’ (11.1–12.51), envisions apocalyptic judgement of the ‘fourth kingdom’, Rome, which inflicted the destruction upon Jerusalem; judgement of the eagle brought about by the lion who stands for the Messiah (12.31–32) whose activity is related to the last days. The destruction of the eagle’s power corresponds with the victorious end envisioned with regard to the ‘war against the Kittim’ in Qumran texts (4QpIsa^a, 1QM).

The sixth vision (13.1–58) further describes the dangers and distress of the last days by way of exhortation. The seventh vision (14.1–48) finally relates the eschatological fate of humanity to the observance of the Law: “the things which were written in your Law, that men may be able to find the path, and that those who wish to live in the last days may live” (14.22).³⁵⁶ The eschatological consequences of the (non-) observance of the Law is also known from pre-70 CE Jewish texts and traditions (4QMMT, 2 Macc). *4 Ezra*’s seventh vision also stipulates the revelatory nature of the final age when “the names of the righteous will become manifest, and the deeds of the ungodly will be disclosed” (14.35).³⁵⁷

A few observations can be made here about connections between *4 Ezra*’s eschatology and pre-70 CE Jewish eschatological traditions. The resurrection of the dead followed by the day of judgment, the predetermined character of the final age, and the references to Hell (Gehenna) and Paradise are all general elements of eschatology which *4 Ezra* has in common with earlier pre-70 CE Jewish traditions of eschatology. Previous scholarship found connections between *4 Ezra* and *1 Enoch*, in particular striking parallels with eschatological sections in the ‘Similitudes’ (*1 Enoch* 37–71).³⁵⁸ Scholarly argument that *4 Ezra* and *L.A.B.* belong to the same school yields arguable evidence of pre-70 CE traditions in *4 Ezra*.³⁵⁹

³⁵⁶ Translation from Metzger, *ibidem*, 554.

³⁵⁷ Translation from Metzger, *ibidem*, 554.

³⁵⁸ Metzger, *ibidem*, 522 refers to striking parallels between *4 Ezra* 6.49–52 and *1 Enoch* 60.7–9, *4 Ezra* 7.32f. and *1 Enoch* 51.1.3, *4 Ezra* 7:[37] and *1 Enoch* 62.1.

³⁵⁹ See Stemberger, *Der Leib der Auferstehung*, 73–84 (‘Das vierte Buch Esra’) at 73 n. 6 referring to M.R. James, *The Biblical Antiquities of Philo* (London 1917), 46–58 on parallels with *L.A.B.*; Harrington, ‘The ‘Holy Land’ in Pseudo-Philo, *4 Ezra*, and 2 Baruch,’ 672: “Despite its different literary genre (“biblical paraphrase” or “rewritten

4.2.3.2. 2 Baruch

The last post-70 CE apocalyptic text that merits attention here is *2 Baruch*. Its composition is usually situated in a Palestinian milieu around the turn of the first century CE. The literary connections between *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch* are often explained by the hypothesis of a common source.³⁶⁰ Like *4 Ezra*, *2 Baruch* deals with the dilemma of the destruction of Jerusalem by providing visions which point forward to the end of days.

2 Baruch 4 mentions the new Jerusalem and, together with the references to the eschatological Paradise in *2 Baruch* 59.8–9, is partly paralleled by Pseudo-Philo's *Biblical Antiquities*. *2 Baruch* 7–8 shares with Flavius Josephus (*J.W.* 6.299) and Tacitus (*Histories* 5.13) the tradition of divine abandonment of the Temple, although *2 Baruch* 6.9 stipulates the temporary, not definitive character of this abandonment.³⁶¹ *2 Baruch* 13 focuses on the eschatological punishment of the nations as retribution for the evil that they perpetrated. *2 Baruch* 14–20 relates the eschatological reward of the righteous for whom the created world as well as the world to come was appointed (15.7). *2 Baruch* 15.8 juxtaposes the contemporary world and the world to come as experienced by the righteous: "For this world is to them a struggle and an effort with much trouble. And that accordingly which will come, a crown with great glory".³⁶² The theme of the shortening of the times preceding the end occurs in *2 Baruch* 20.1–2 and again in 83.1.

2 Baruch 23 first alludes to the resurrection in terms of God's salvation after the completion of an appointed number of generations, while *2 Baruch* 24 mentions the identification of the sinners and the righteous at the end of days. *2 Baruch* 25 observes that tribulations and the loss of hope are the sign for the awakening of the end of times; circumstances which are further described in *2 Baruch* 27. The reference in *2 Baruch* 28.2 to an eschatologically oriented calculation of times in

Bible") and perhaps earlier (pre-70 C.E.) setting, LAB deserves to be studied alongside the two apocalypses as reflecting the same "school" or "circle" (as M.R. James suggested long ago).

³⁶⁰ Klijn, "2 Baruch," *OTP* 1, 615–52 at 616–7; Stemberger, *Der Leib der Auferstehung*, 85–96 ("2 Baruch") at 85; cf. Willett, *Eschatology in the Theodicies of 2 Baruch and 4 Ezra*, 77–120 ("2 Baruch") at 79: "A broad consensus places the date of composition of 2 Baruch somewhere between 70 and 132 CE. The exact date, however, is elusive".

³⁶¹ Klijn, "2 Baruch," *OTP* 1, 623: "For the time has arrived when Jerusalem will also be delivered up for a time, until the moment that it will be said that it will be restored forever".

³⁶² Translation from Klijn, *ibidem*, 626.

terms of ‘weeks of seven weeks’ could be based on earlier traditions, such as the ‘Apocalypse of Weeks’ in *1 Enoch* and the calculation in terms of ‘weeks according to jubilees’ in *Jubilees* (cf. *Jub.* 4.18–19). *2 Baruch* 29–30 relates the end of times to the whole earth, but at the same time assigns a special, protected place to Israel (‘this land’ in *2 Baruch* 29.2) to which the activity of the ‘Anointed One’ appears to be related also. *2 Baruch* 30.1–5 situates the resurrection after the fulfilment of the time of messianic activity, attributing joy to the righteous and perdition of the wicked. With this passage on the resurrection, the first long eschatological section of *2 Baruch* (1–30) ends and is followed by Baruch’s address to the people (31–34); a pattern which recurs after other eschatologically oriented apocalypses (public addresses in 44–47 and 77.1–10 after apocalyptic visions in 35–43 and 53–76).

The interpretation of another apocalypse in *2 Baruch* 35–40 elaborates on the Danielic tradition of four successive kingdoms (*2 Baruch* 39:1–5 / Daniel 7). The rebuke of a cedar in a forest of wickedness, standing for remaining wickedness (36.5–11) is interpreted as the rebuke and destruction of the last ruler by the ‘Anointed One’ at the end of times in *2 Baruch* 39–40. About the fourth kingdom, usually identified with Rome, it is said in *2 Baruch* 39.5 that it will “rule the times and exalt itself more than the cedars of Lebanon”. There is a striking parallel in this respect with the previously discussed Qumran text *4QpIsa^a* 8–10 III 1–8 (section 4.9.1 above), which deals with the interpretation of Isa 10:33–34 about the cutting of the thickest of the wood and the fall of Lebanon. Since the immediately following passage in Isaiah 11:1–5 is also interpreted in *4QpIsa^a* 8–10 III 11–25 with a view to messianic expectations, the parallel between *2 Baruch* and this Qumran text may attest to a shared exegetical tradition of eschatological and messianic expectations already circulating before 70 CE.

2 Baruch 40.1–3 situates the messianic judgment of the last ruler on Mount Zion and the protection of the rest of the people of Israel “in the place that I have chosen”. *2 Baruch* 41–42 explains that the eschatological fate of each depends on the extent and period of time to which one observes or separates from God’s Law. *2 Baruch* 42.7–8 assigns corruption to “those who belong to it” and life, that is, resurrection, also to “those who belong to it”,³⁶³ thereby corresponding with other texts that attribute resurrection to the righteous.

³⁶³ Translation from Klijn, *ibidem*, 634.

2 *Baruch* 48.26–41 characterises the time when God’s final judgement is near as a time from which intelligence and wisdom are hidden due to the negligence of the Law.³⁶⁴ Baruch’s questions about the nature of the resurrection, having turned to an inquiry about the fate of the righteous (2 *Baruch* 49), are answered in 2 *Baruch* 50–51: the earth which receives the dead will give them back in the final age, and the righteous are transformed in glory and exaltation, whereas the wicked suffer torment. The comment in 2 *Baruch* 51.12 that “the excellence of the righteous will then be greater than that of the angels”³⁶⁵ could be paralleled in Paul’s rhetorical question ‘do you not know that we are to judge angels?’ (1 Cor 6:3).³⁶⁶

The ‘apocalypse of the clouds’ in 2 *Baruch* 53 is in 2 *Baruch* 55–74 applied to the progressive generations since the creation, turning from biblical history to the contemporary age and the future world. At various points of this interpretation, eschatologically oriented information about rewards and punishments is interspersed. The time of Abraham is according to 2 *Baruch* 57:2 characterised by the fact that “the belief in the coming judgement was brought about, and the hope of the world which will be renewed was built at that time, and the promise of the life that will come later was planted”.³⁶⁷ The time of Moses is characterised by the promise of reward for ‘those who believe’³⁶⁸ and the punishment of fire for those who deny the Law (59.2), along with other announcements about the end of time (59.4–11). Eschatology and the Law are here clearly interrelated. Chapters 60–66 deal with the record of wicked and righteous acts in biblical history, aligning them with the eschatological perspective of rewards and punishments. The

³⁶⁴ Cf. 1 Cor 1:19–20, where Paul juxtaposes worldly wisdom to God’s hidden wisdom. Since Paul refers to the wisdom and rulers of ‘this age’ (1 Cor 2:6), an eschatological perspective could play in the background.

³⁶⁵ Translation from Klijn, “2 Baruch,” *OTP* 1, 638.

³⁶⁶ Translation from RSV. This rhetorical question comes after Paul’s juxtaposition of the unrighteous and the holy ones in 1 Cor 6:1–2; the latter being ascribed the future (eschatological) judgment of the world.

³⁶⁷ Translation from Klijn, “2 Baruch,” *OTP* 1, 641. Another characteristic feature, the idea that “at that time the *unwritten law* was in force among them”, could indicate an affiliation of 2 *Baruch* with the Pharisaic-rabbinic tradition (*Ant.* 13.297.408; cf. the rabbinic term תורה שבעל פה).

³⁶⁸ Translation from Klijn, *ibidem*, 641. Cf. 633 n. 42a: “To believe in God is to live according to the Law. Cf. 54:5 and 21; 59:2; 4Ezra 6:27, 28; 9:7–8; and 1En 47:8” (633).

examples of Israelite kings could be comparable with the eschatologically motivated references to Israel's kings in 4QMMT C 18–26.

2 Baruch 67 deals with the contemporary predicament of the destruction of Jerusalem, while *2 Baruch* 68–74 turn to the future age characterised by tribulations and the final age. The eschatological theme of the judgment of the nations recurs in *2 Baruch* 72 (cf. *2 Baruch* 13), but here it is emphasised that the 'Anointed One' will spare some of them and kill others (72.2). *2 Baruch* 72.3 provides the following explanation: "Every nation which has not known Israel and which has not trodden down the seed of Jacob will live".³⁶⁹ According to *2 Baruch* 73–74, the renewed earth is characterised in the final age by eternal peace, joy and rest, based on a transformation from the corruptible to the incorruptible (74.2).

The last parts of *2 Baruch* contain the exhortation to Baruch to instruct the people (76), Baruch's address to the people (77.1–10), and his composition of a 'letter of doctrine and a roll of hope' (77.12) for the brothers in Babylon (77.11–87.1).

4.3. *Philo of Alexandria*

The evaluation of whether and how Philonic eschatology may be connected in any way with pre-70 CE Palestinian Jewish eschatologies depends on how we understand the place of Philo between the Diaspora and Israel.

It has been a debated question how representative this Alexandrian-Jewish author is even for Greek-speaking Judaism. In a recent article, G.E. Sterling argued that Philo's treatises do not stand isolated and present ideas in the areas of cosmology, anthropology and ethics that are shared in other Hellenistic Jewish literature.³⁷⁰ In view of these connections, the position of Philo's writings as an 'island' should therefore be abandoned.

With regard to his relation to Israel, Philo's information, except for the one personal reference to his pilgrimage to Jerusalem (*Prov.* 2.64), was probably indirect, based on sources. Furthermore, if Philo had any

³⁶⁹ Translation from Klijn, *ibidem*, 645.

³⁷⁰ Sterling, "Recherché or Representative?," 1–30 at 2 n. 5 discusses previous scholarship.

proficiency in Hebrew or Aramaic, it must have been very limited.³⁷¹ These circumstances by themselves do not necessarily diminish the historical value of Philo's information about the Essenes and the Palestinian Jewish situation at large.³⁷² Josephus refers to the Alexandrian-Jewish embassy to the emperor Caligula headed by Philo (*Ant.* 18.259–260), and it seems probable that there were contacts between Alexandrian-Jewish and Palestinian-Jewish delegations (cf. *Ant.* 13.74–79). R. Riesner pointed out that Philo's use of the term συναγωγή (*Prob.* 81) rather than προσευχή to designate Essene synagogues could speak for some acquaintance with the Palestinian Jewish situation.³⁷³

Philonic eschatology may mainly be found in his treatise *On Rewards and Punishments* (*De praemiis et poenis*).³⁷⁴ Apart from this, Philo cites Genesis 49:1 in his treatise *Who Is the Heir* as proof-text for the idea that Isaac and Jacob were prophets. He further describes the idea of the Therapeutae about the afterlife as an 'immortal and blessed life' as opposed to the 'mortal life' (*Contempl. Life* 13). Philo's notion of rewards and punishments, though generally analogous with the reward for the righteous and punishment of the wicked in other pre-70 CE Jewish eschatologies, appears to focus rather on ethics than on the eschatological dimension.³⁷⁵ T.H. Tobin made the following observation about *Praem.* 85–97 and 127–62: "the pattern that emerges is one which maximizes the importance of the practice of virtue and the observance of God's commandments and minimizes the role played by violence".³⁷⁶

Nevertheless, Philo could have scriptural connections for future-eschatological ideas in common with other Jewish texts and traditions,

³⁷¹ Kahn, "Did Philo know Hebrew?," 337–45.

³⁷² In his treatise *On the Embassy to Gaius*, Philo writes not only about the Alexandrian-Jewish cause, ἐν μέρος τοῦ Ἰουδαϊκοῦ, but about that of 'the entire nation', when confronted with Caligula's plan to have his statue erected in the Temple (184). Philo tells about Jews in Jamnia (197–202), the inhabitants of Judaea vs. Petronius (215–225), and about Agrippa's communication with Caligula (276–329).

³⁷³ Riesner, "Synagogues in Jerusalem," 179–211 at 182.

³⁷⁴ Cf. Fischer, *Eschatologie und Jenseitserwartung*, 187–210; Grabbe, "Eschatology in Philo and Josephus," 163–85 at 164–73.

³⁷⁵ It seems hard to prove or disprove the scholarly suggestion by Tobin, "Philo and the Sibyl," 84–103 and Grabbe, "Eschatology in Philo and Josephus," 164–73, that the absence of a 'national eschatology' in Philo's works would betray an implicit reaction against the Egyptian-Jewish eschatology in *Sib. Or.* 3 and 5. Note that Buitenwerf, *Book III of the Sibylline Oracles*, has contested the Egyptian provenance of *Sib. Or.* 3.

³⁷⁶ Tobin, "Philo and the Sibyl," 101.

as is the case with Gen 49:1.³⁷⁷ His reference to words from Scripture as ‘oracle’, ὁ χρησμός, in *Praem.* 95 could imply a future-eschatological dimension. The discussion in *Praem.* 93–96 of a future war which will lead the ‘holy ones’, ὅσιοι, to victory with divine aid against its enemies, great and populous nations, may generally be paralleled by scenarios of eschatological war. However, Philo’s discussion is less pointedly dualistic and does not bring an anti-Roman perspective to the surface.³⁷⁸

The Hellenistic context of Philo’s notions of the afterlife has been substantiated by documentary evidence. For instance, one inscription of Leontopolis in Egypt from the Graeco-Roman period (mid-second century BCE – early second century CE), *CIJ* 2.1511 mentions a ‘deep place of ages’, μυχὸς αἰώνων; a term which W. Horbury and J. Noy have compared to Septuagintal as well as Philonic terminology.³⁷⁹

4.4. *Flavius Josephus*

Josephus writes as a historian, which could be why we do not find extensive discourses on eschatology in his works.³⁸⁰ It is a debated matter whether Josephus originally shared messianic views that attracted Jewish revolutionaries in the war against Rome (66–70 CE).³⁸¹ Josephus’ explicit motivation to take part on the Jewish side of the war is rooted in public outrage about the excessive injustice under the Roman procuratorship of Gessius Florus (64–66 CE): “It was Florus who constrained *us*

³⁷⁷ Tobin, *ibidem*, 102 noted that Philonic eschatology is “rooted in interpretations of Leviticus 26 and Deuteronomy 28 and 30”. Deut 30 also plays an important part in the eschatology of 4QMMT C.

³⁷⁸ Cf. Tobin, *ibidem*, 95, who contrasts the eschatological interpretation of LXX Num 24:7 in *Praem.* 95 to the non-eschatological interpretation of Balaam’s oracles in *Mos.* 1.263–99.

³⁷⁹ See Horbury and Noy, *JIGRE*, 77: “μυχός, a nook, recess or hidden place, here of Hades; the implied connection was familiar, see *Wisd.* Xvii 13 (14) ἐξ ... ἄδου μυχῶν, Philo *Heres* 45 ἐν μυχοῖς Ἄιδου, *Somn.* I 151, τοὺς ἐν Ἄιδου μυχοῦς, *Leg.* 49 πρὸς ... Ταρτάρου μυχοῦς”.

³⁸⁰ Cf. Grabbe, “Eschatology in Philo and Josephus,” 174–85 at 180 noting that Josephus refers the reader to the Book of Daniel for things that lie beyond history, ‘the hidden things that are to come’ (*Ant.* 10.210).

³⁸¹ Fischer, *Eschatologie und Jenseitserwartung*, 182 holds that Josephus, coming from priestly circles, must have been sceptical and reserved about eschatologically oriented tendencies from the outset; Grabbe, “Eschatology in Philo and Josephus,” 179 has the “strong impression that Josephus himself *once* believed in various oracles thought to predict a coming messianic deliverer”.

(ὁ καταναγκάσας ἡμᾶς) to take up war with the Romans, for we preferred to perish together rather than by degrees” (*Ant.* 20.257).³⁸²

Josephus’ works provide information about Second Temple Jewish views of the afterlife (cf. *J.W.* 2.154–159.163.165; 3.362–382; *Ant.* 18.14,16; *Ag.Ap.* 2.218) and pre-70 CE Jewish eschatological expectations, albeit in a way adapted to the frame of reference of his Roman audience. Josephus couches expectations of a Judaeian ruler in Graeco-Roman terms as concerning an ‘ambiguous *oracle* in the holy books’, χρησμός ἀμφίβολος ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς γράμμασιν. Josephus applies the oracle to Vespasian’s proclamation as Roman emperor in Judaea (*J.W.* 6.312–313); an application shared by the Roman historians Tacitus and Suetonius.³⁸³ Josephus’ account in his *Jewish War* 6.285–315 is determined by a post-70 CE perspective of contrast between signs of impending disaster and expectations of deliverance.

In spite of his post-70 CE perspective possibly interested in downplaying political elements of Jewish eschatology, Josephus’ information yet implies that eschatological expectations circulated in various circles of pre-70 CE Palestinian Judaism. Josephus not only attributes prophetic interests and gifts to individual Essenes (*J.W.* 1.78; *Ant.* 13.311, 15.373, 17.346) and to the Essenes as a movement (*J.W.* 2.159; *Ant.* 15.379), but also relates the interpretation of divine ‘oracles’ to other groups. Josephus refers to his own interpretation of the Prophets with regard to contemporary and future events, emphasising his being an exponent of the priestly class (*J.W.* 3.352). The interpretation of signs by Jewish scribes is mentioned in the *Jewish War* 6.291.295. *J.W.* 6.313 refers to ‘many of the wise men’, πολλοὶ τῶν σοφῶν, in Judaea who erred in their interpretation of ‘the oracle’ about a Judaeian ruler.

Josephus could have an agenda in explaining the catastrophic fate of Jewish defeat and the destruction of the Jerusalem Temple *after the fact* by surveying signs of impending disaster. However, the fact that Josephus refers to the interpretation of signs *per se* may be indicative of eschatological and apocalyptic beliefs in pre-70 CE Israel.

³⁸² Translation and Greek text from Feldman, *Josephus. Jewish Antiquities. Book XX. General Index*, 136–7.

³⁸³ Cf. Tacitus, *Histories* 5.13.2 who attributes the prophecy to *antiquis sacerdotum litteris*, ‘the ancient scriptures of their priests’, and Suetonius, *Vespasian* 4.5, who attributes the Judaic messianic expectation to a continuous, ancient tradition and 5.6, where he explicitly refers to Josephus’ prediction. Tacitus and Suetonius suppose a broader setting of the *Orient* for the oracle, perhaps in the interest of a Roman political agenda.

4.5. *New Testament*

The comparative value of the New Testament writings for the subject of Qumran eschatology is limited, since they only comprise traditions about Pharisaic beliefs and Sadducean non-beliefs about afterlife (Mark 12:18–27, Matt 22:23–33; Luke 20:27–40; Acts 23:8), not about Essene beliefs. None of the canonical or extra-canonical New Testament writings contain information about the Essenes.³⁸⁴ Apart from Paul's Letters, the traditions about the Pharisees and Sadducees have their setting in post-70 CE circumstances, when the separation of the ways between Judaism and Christianity progressively became reality. To the extent that pre-70 CE traditions can be reconstructed, we can also conceive of Christian Judaism(s)³⁸⁵ which made part of the Palestinian Jewish matrix of eschatological beliefs. This subject will be discussed extensively in chapter three.

4.6. *Hippolytus of Rome*

The treatise *Refutation of All Heresies* of the churchfather Hippolytus of Rome (c. 170–236 CE) traditionally plays an important part in the discussion whether the Essenes believed in bodily resurrection (*Haer.* IX 27,1). It is a matter of debate whether Hippolytus' account is directly dependent on Josephus's digression³⁸⁶ or rather that both accounts share a common source, whether Semitic³⁸⁷ or Hellenistic Jewish.³⁸⁸ Comparison with Qumran texts might add to the discussion

³⁸⁴ See recently Frey, "Die Bedeutung der Qumranfunde für das Verständnis des Neuen Testaments," 129–208 at 133–52 for discussion of four 'problematic models' concerning supposed connections between earliest Christianity, the Essenes, and Qumran.

³⁸⁵ See e.g. Malina, "Jewish Christianity or Christian Judaism," 46–57; Luttikhuisen, "Vroegchristelijk jodendom," 163–89.

³⁸⁶ The majority view according to Burchard, "Die Essener bei Hippolyt. Hippolyt, Ref. IX 18, 2–28, 2 und Josephus, Bell. 2, 119–161," 1–41 at 3–4.

³⁸⁷ Smith, "The Description of the Essenes in Josephus and the *Philosophumena*," 273–313 at 292 envisaged the reconstruction of a supposed common Hebrew or Aramaic source as a future task of scholarship: "Any such attempt would have to be based on a detailed study of the vocabulary and grammar of the Dead Sea documents, and should not, therefore, be attempted until the official publication of those has been completed".

³⁸⁸ Cf. Bergmeier, *Die Essener-Berichte des Flavius Josephus*, 120 on Josephus' Essenes as a Hellenistic literary phenomenon.

whether or not the hypothesis of a common source, as proposed by Émile Puech,³⁸⁹ is tenable. The issue of resurrection will be specifically discussed in chapter four.

4.7. *Early Rabbinic Literature*

Early rabbinic literature starts with the Mishnah of which the final redaction under Rabbi Yehudah ha-Nasi in the early third century CE dates far beyond the end of the Second Temple period. The same is even more true for the Tosefta, and the Palestinian and Babylonian Talmuds. It is a debated question whether individual traditions in early rabbinic literature may provide historically reliable information about pre-70 CE Judaism.³⁹⁰ That does not alter the fact that early rabbinic literature provides information about Jewish figures (e.g. Hillel, Shammai, Gamaliel the Elder), movements (Pharisees and Sadducees), institutions (the Temple), and historical events of the period before 70 CE. Albert I. Baumgarten observed that the rabbis adapted the ‘collective memory’ of the past to the narrative and didactic interests of their own discourses. He acknowledges possible connections between rabbinic, Josephan, and Qumran materials which “went back to the same pool of collective memory”.³⁹¹

The importance of early rabbinic literature may consist in the fact that it provides a frame of reference for the historical development of certain religious and legal traditions³⁹² in Judaism. Religious traditions

³⁸⁹ Puech, *La croyance des Esséniens en la vie future*. 2, 703–87 proposed the idea of a common source on the basis of thematic comparison with 1 Enoch and ‘internal data’ from the Dead Sea Scrolls. Davies, *Death, Resurrection, and Life after Death*, 189–211 at 208–9 is sceptical about Puech’s consideration of Hippolytus and 4Q521 as ‘internal data’ for the idea of resurrection, concluding that “the question must be left open” (209).

³⁹⁰ See e.g. Neusner, *The Rabbinic Traditions about the Pharisees before 70*; Safrai, “Talmudic Literature as an Historical Source for the Second Temple Period,” 121–37; Baumgarten, “Rabbinic Literature as a Source for the History of Jewish Sectarianism in the Second Temple Period,” 14–57.

³⁹¹ Baumgarten, “Rabbinic Literature as a Source,” 55–7 at 56; cf. 32 on “considerable telescoping of events”.

³⁹² The comparison between legal traditions in Qumran and rabbinic literature has received much attention. See e.g. Schiffman, “Qumran and Rabbinic Halakhah,” 138–46; idem, “Pharisaic and Sadducean Halakhah in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 285–99; Qimron, “The Halakha,” 123–77; Baumgarten, “Sadducean Elements in Qumran Law,”

about the afterlife and the expected endtime were probably not a *creatio ex nihilo*, but must have had a pre-history. Early rabbinic literature attests to several eschatological beliefs³⁹³ that also figure in pre-70 CE Jewish texts. The resurrection of the dead, תחיית המתים, is related to the Law (*m.San.* 10:1).³⁹⁴ The gemara on this passage in Mishnah-treatise further refers to punishments and rewards after death: רובו זכיות יורש גיהנם, ‘if the larger portion of one’s works are merits, then he will inherit the garden of Eden; if the larger portion are transgressions, than he will inherit Gehenna’ (*y.San.* 27c, 19–38).³⁹⁵ Messianic expectations are minimally present in the Mishnah (cf. *m.Sot.* 9:15), but they figure more extensively in the Babylonian Talmud (cf. *b. San.* 96a–99a).

Rabbinic traditions of eschatology take certain parts of Scripture as a point of departure, like Gen 49:1 and the Law of Moses at large with regard to the resurrection, which are also important in other, pre-70 Jewish eschatological traditions, as we have seen (section 2.2, ‘Pentateuch’, above). The description of circumstances which herald the final (messianic) age in *m. Sotah* 9.15 contains elements, like growing negligence and the waning wisdom of the scribes, which are paralleled in biblical and post-biblical traditions (cf. Isa 29:14, 2 *Baruch* 48.26–41). With regard to divisions, *m. Sotah* 9.15 cites Micah 7:6 as a proof-text; a biblical passage which is also cited in Matthew 10:35–36 and Luke 12:53, and of which some words may be preserved in the *IQPeshet to Micah* frgs. 20–21. The early rabbinic notion of the messianic final age therefore probably built on pre-70 CE Jewish eschatological traditions.

27–36; Bernstein, García Martínez, and Kampen (eds.), *Legal Texts and Legal Issues*; Schiffman, “The Qumran Scrolls and Rabbinic Judaism,” 552–71; Baumgarten, “Tanaitic Halakha and Qumran: A Re-Evaluation,” 1–11.

³⁹³ For recent surveys, see Avery-Peck, “Death and Afterlife in the Early Rabbinic Sources,” 243–66 and Neusner, “Death and Afterlife in the Later Rabbinic Sources,” 267–91.

³⁹⁴ On resurrection of the dead in the Targumim on the Pentateuch, cf. Sysling, *Techiyat ha-Metim*.

³⁹⁵ Text and translation after Schäfer and Becker, *Synopse zum Talmud Yerushalmi*. IV, 199 and 251–2.

5. EVALUATION AND CONCLUSIONS

5.1. *Common Features of Jewish Eschatology in the Second Temple Period*5.1.1. *Eschatology and Scripture*

Most of the texts and traditions we have surveyed presuppose a scriptural basis, whether explicitly cited or implicitly elaborated. The Qumran Pesharim take the Minor Prophets, Isaiah and the Psalter as their explicit point of departure, while the *Midrash on Eschatology* and CD-A VII (the Amos-Numbers Midrash) use midrashic devices to elaborate eschatological perspectives. Philo and Josephus also refer to Scripture as points of departure for eschatological expectations (*Praem.* 93–96; *J.W.* 3.352, 6.312–313).

Another group of texts, among which are *Jubilees* and Pseudo-Philo's *Biblical Antiquities*, comprises eschatological traditions in the context of narrating biblical history. The Flood story (*L.A.B.* 3.9–10), the death of Abraham (*Jub.* 23.11–31), Jacobs' blessing of his sons (*Jub.* 45.14), the Sinaitic revelation to Moses (*Jub.* 1.26), and Moses' farewell (*L.A.B.* 19.12–13) are prominent examples of points in biblical history that receive an eschatological interpretation. Of *Sib.Or.* 1–2, the first book of the *Sibylline Oracles* further sets the stage by recounting events of biblical history from the creation to the Flood. Israel's kings serve as examples of eschatologically oriented sections in 4QMMT C 18–26 and 2 *Baruch* 60–66.

Apocalyptic texts are less explicitly concerned with Scripture in terms of commentary, prooftext or narrative framework, but in their visionary perspectives they nevertheless elaborate on biblical traditions. For instance, the Danielic tradition of the four kingdoms is echoed in 2 *Baruch* 35–40. Other writings attribute eschatological revelations to biblical figures, like Adam (2 *Baruch* 4.3), Enoch (1 *Enoch*; cf. *Jubilees* 4.17–19), Abraham (2 *Baruch* 4.4) and Moses (2 *Baruch* 4.5–6; cf. *L.A.B.* 19.12–13, *Jubilees*).³⁹⁶ The biblical Patriarchs have a particularly important place in certain eschatological texts and traditions (4 *Ezra* 3.12–19),

³⁹⁶ The attribution of visions of apocalyptic eschatology to the biblical figures of Ezra and Baruch in 4 *Ezra* and 2 *Baruch* respectively may well be a post-70 CE concern of reacting to the catastrophe of the fall of Jerusalem by relating it to Jerusalem's destruction in 587 BCE, the captivity and restoration.

in particular with regard to the resurrection (*L.A.B.* 19.12–13, *T. Jud.* 25.1–2). In connection with eschatology, the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* in turn refer to the books of Enoch as authoritative writings (e.g. *T. Jud.* 18.1). Visionary perspectives and biblical interpretation are not necessarily opposed to each other as revelatory experience and literary study, as the recent scholarly emphasis on the revelatory aspect of scriptural interpretation attests.

5.1.2. *Salvation and the Law*

Many early Jewish texts and traditions put the observance of the Law in an eschatological perspective. 4QMMT C applies the curses and blessings of the Deuteronomic notion of the covenant of the Law to the progressive revelation about the end of days. Martyrdom for the Law and resurrection are interrelated in *2 Maccabees*. Early rabbinic literature relates the belief in resurrection to the Torah (*m. San.* 10.1). *Jubilees* 23:26, 4QMMT C and the *Damascus Document* provide examples of eschatologically motivated traditions about search of the Law as return to the way of righteousness. The *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* comprise various exhortations to observe the Law (*T. Reu.* 6.8; *T. Levi* 13.1–4, 19.1–2; *T. Jud.* 26.1; *T. Iss.* 5.1; *T. Dan* 5.1, 6.10; *T. Jos.* 18.1; *T. Benj.* 10.3). Philo's treatise *On Rewards and Punishments* presupposes faithfulness to the Law as a condition for future-eschatological victory against the enemies of the 'holy ones' (*Praem.* 79–96). The apocalyptic texts *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch* also voice connections between eschatology and the Law (*4 Ezra* 14.22; *2 Baruch* 41–42, 59.2.4–11). These connections attest to the inadequacy of a scholarly trend that sought to distinguish between legalistic and apocalyptic currents of Jewish tradition.³⁹⁷

5.1.3. *Rewards and Punishments*

The ethical notion of rewards and punishments assigned to the righteous and the wicked in the final age is a further example of a recurrent tradition. 4QMMT C applies the curses and blessings of the covenant to the end of days, while the 'treatise of the two spirits' (*1QS* III 13–IV 26)

³⁹⁷ See Willett, *Eschatology in the Theodicies of 2 Baruch and 4 Ezra*, 35–49 at 36–7, about R.H. Charles, H.H. Rowley, D.S. Russell, B. Duhm and J. Wellhausen as exponents of this scholarly trend.

further substantiates the ‘reward’ of all those who walk in the spirit of truth and the ‘visitation’ by God’s wrath of all those who walk in the spirit of deceit.³⁹⁸ Josephus attributes the belief about eschatological rewards and punishments to the Pharisees and the Essenes (*J.W.* 2.155–157.163), while describing the Sadducees as deniers of this belief (*J.W.* 2.165). Philo’s treatise *On Rewards and Punishments* is devoted to this subject. *2 Baruch* 59.2 mentions rewards and punishments in relation to the (non-)observance of the Law. The rationale for the rewards and punishments may differ in the respective texts.³⁹⁹

5.1.4. *Apocalyptic War*

The notion of apocalyptic war against lawlessness from the perspective of Israel as God’s people makes part of several early Jewish texts (*Wis* 5:17–23; *War Scroll*; 4QpIsa^a frgs. 8–10; *Praem.* 93–96; *J.W.* 6.312; *Sib. Or.* 3.807; *2 Baruch* 35–40), but these texts do not uniformly voice the idea of eschatological war. The extent to which apocalyptic war is determined by God’s direct commitment or by (a) messianic figure(s) also differs in the respective texts.

5.1.5. *Final Judgement*

Final judgement is described as God’s judgement of all people (e.g. *1 Enoch* 22:4), but also often characterised as vengeance and retribution against the enemies of God’s people (e.g. *Sirach* 39:28–31, *Judith* 16:17, *Ps. Sol.* 15:12, *Wis* 3 and 5, 1QpHab, 1QH^a XIV 12, *Praem.* 93–96). Apart from the perspective of salvation for Israel and destruction for the wicked, there are different perspectives on the eschatological fate of the nations. The apocalyptic rhetoric of the Qumran *War Scroll* envisions a ‘destruction with no remnant’ for Gentile armies (1QM XIV 5; cf. 1QM VI 3–6) and subjection of kings of the nations and oppressors to Zion (1QM XIX 6–7). *2 Baruch* 72.2–3 observes that not all nations receive the judgement to destruction.

³⁹⁸ Cf. 1QS III 14–15 on the ‘visitation of their punishments and the times of their reward’, לפקודה נגועיהם עם קצי שלומם. Text and translation from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*. 1, 74–5.

³⁹⁹ See e.g. *Wis* 3:10 on punishment according to the reasoning of the wicked, along with punishment according to their works (*Wis* 3:11c, 5:7); retribution according to one’s works and the fruits of one’s devices in *L.A.B.* 3.10; judgment according to one’s belief in or denial of the Law (*2 Baruch* 59.2).

5.1.6. *Paradise/Eden and Hell/Gehenna*

The juxtaposition of Paradise or Eden to Hell or Gehenna as the places appointed for the righteous and the wicked in the final age occurs in many texts (*1 Enoch* 27:2–4, 32:2–6; *T. Dan* 5.10–13; 4 *Ezra* 7.[36–44]; *y. San.* 27c, 19–38). The references to Sheol/Abaddon and Eden/eternal plantation in the sectarian ‘Teacher Hymns’ (1QH^a XI 19–36, XIV 14–17) may further be mentioned in this connection.

5.1.7. *New Heaven and New Earth*

Finally, the apocalyptic notion that heaven and earth will be renewed in the final age is common to Hellenistic Diaspora Judaism and Palestinian Judaism alike, among which newly published texts from Qumran (the ‘Eschatological Hymn’ in 4QPsalms^f (4Q88), 4Q*Renewed Earth* (4Q475), *Sib. Or.* 2.317–29, *L.A.B.* 3.10, 2 *Baruch* 57.2, 73–74).

5.2. *Distinctions between pre-70 CE Jewish Eschatologies*

In the above survey, we have already hinted at certain differences when turning from general commonalities to more specific features of eschatology, such as the rationale of retribution and the eschatological fate of the nations. Notwithstanding the scholarly recognition of differing degrees of Hellenization in both Israel and the Diaspora during the late Second Temple period,⁴⁰⁰ a dividing line may be drawn with regard to eschatological traditions in the respective contexts of the Hellenistic Diaspora and Israel.

5.2.1. *Hellenistic Diaspora Judaism*

First, the context of Hellenistic Diaspora Judaism is particularly apparent in the case of Philo’s treatises, Josephus’ historical works, and the *Sibylline Oracles*. Both Philo and Josephus, when dealing with eschatological perspectives rooted in Scripture, refer to Scripture as ‘oracle’ (ὁ χρησμός; *Praem.* 95, *J.W.* 6.312–313), thereby using language of Graeco-Roman culture about the foretelling of events through oracles.

⁴⁰⁰ The term ‘Hades’, for instance, figures in texts of both Hellenistic Jewish and Palestinian Jewish provenance, as we have seen (section 4.2.2.6, ‘Sibylline Oracles’, n. 332 above).

The *Sibylline Oracles* even attribute the mediation of eschatological knowledge to Sibyls, whose oracular gifts stand in a Graeco-Roman tradition.⁴⁰¹ The designation of Scripture as ‘oracle’ does not occur in pre-70 CE Palestinian Jewish texts.

The explicit comparison of the Essenes and their eschatology in particular with philosophical schools and tribes in the Graeco-Roman world at large is what set Philo and Josephus apart from Palestinian Jewish texts and traditions. Philo describes the Essenes in a comparative framework of examples of the practice of virtue among various nations in his treatise *That Every Good Man Is Free* (73–91). Josephus compares Essene beliefs about the afterlife to Greek ideas (*J.W.* 2.155–156). The *Sibylline Oracles* incorporate elements of Hellenistic eschatology, such as the Elysian plain and the Acherusian lake, into their picture of the final age (*Sib.Or.* 2.337–338).

5.2.2. *Palestinian Judaism*

A number of elements set Palestinian Jewish traditions of eschatology apart from Jewish traditions in the Graeco-Roman world at large. The Palestinian Jewish setting is the more relevant for situating Qumran eschatology in its historical context.

The eschatologically oriented calculation of appointed times in terms of weeks of jubilees plays a part in *1 Enoch*, *Jubilees*, *Damascus Document* (CD-A XVI 2–4), *2 Baruch* 28.2, 4Q390 (4QpsMoses^e) 2 I 4–5. The issue of calendar separated Palestinian Judaism from the surrounding Graeco-Roman world,⁴⁰² but also determined the division between the Temple-establishment and sectarian strands of Palestinian Judaism.

The notion of a shortening of times further occurs in texts of Palestinian Jewish provenance (*4QSecond Ezekiel* (4Q385) frgs. 3 and 4; *L.A.B.* 19.12–13; *2 Baruch* 20.1–2, 83.1). The Marcan and Matthean ‘eschatological discourses’, which also contain this notion (Mark 13:20, Matt 24:22), stood at the receiving end of this Palestinian Jewish tradition.

While general notions of war that puts an end to injustice of evil-doers figure in texts from the Hellenistic Diaspora (*Praem.* 93–96, Wis

⁴⁰¹ Cf. e.g. Collins, “Sibylline Oracles,” *OTP* 1, 332, who compares the schematization of history in terms of generations in *Sib.Or.* 1 to the Cumean Sibyl of Virgil’s Fourth Eclogue.

⁴⁰² Josephus, for instance, mentions Graeco-Roman items of calendar as a frame of reference for his history.

5:17–23, *Sib. Or.* 3.807), several Palestinian Jewish texts specifically envision apocalyptic war against the Kittim or Rome (*War Scroll*, 4QpIsa^a frgs. 8–10, *2 Baruch*). The Qumran Pesharim and *2 Baruch* share the identifications of biblical Ashur and (the cedars of) Lebanon with (the chiefs of) Rome.

Finally, it should be noted that Palestinian Jewish texts, among which the Qumran *War Scroll* and the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, put a specific emphasis on the eschatological role of the tribes of Judah and Levi. The inner- and intra-Jewish election language, like בחירי צדק in Qumran texts and *1 Enoch*, may be further contrasted with election language which implies self-identification in a foreign (Graeco-Roman) context, such as ‘chosen Hebrews’ (*Sib. Or.* 2.174–176).

5.2.3. *Essene Eschatology in the ‘Interpretatio Graeca’*

Putting the issue of immortality (Josephus) or resurrection (Hippolytus) apart, what can we make of Josephus’ Hellenistic-minded description of Essene eschatology as compared to the Dead Sea Scrolls? Flavius Josephus compares Essene views about the afterlife with Greek eschatology (*J.W.* 2.154–158) and the Essene way of life at one place with that of Pythagoreans (*Ant.* 15.371) and at another with that of the ‘Ctistae’ among the Dacians (*Ant.* 18.22). The comparison with the Pythagoreans may be important, since it also occurs in Hippolytus’ account (*Haer.* IX, 18, 27,2). R. Bergmeier discerns a ‘pythagoraicising’ source with connections with Qumran texts, which supposedly underlies Josephus’ discourses in his *Jewish War* 2.119–161 and his *Jewish Antiquities* 18.18–22.⁴⁰³

If we are to take Josephus’ account seriously, rather than explaining his comparison entirely away as a rhetorical way of “accommodating his material to appeal to his Gentile readers”⁴⁰⁴ and literary fiction, we may wonder whether Josephus had an intrinsic reason to present certain Hellenistic-minded comparisons in his account of the Essenes.

⁴⁰³ Bergmeier, *Die Essenerberichte*, 104.

⁴⁰⁴ Cf. Glasson, *Greek Influence in Jewish Eschatology*, 48–56 at 50 who argued that Josephus’ *interpretatio graeca* cannot be mere rhetoric. However, his suggestion that Essene eschatology was influenced by Greek philosophy appears to be the polar opposite of Josephus’ apologetic suggestion that the first Greek philosophers, in particular Pythagoras, were disciples of the Egyptians and the Chaldeans (*Ag. Ap.* 1.14, 162–165).

With regard to the comparison of the Essenes to Pythagoreans, Josephus' rationale for the comparison could consist in his perception of formal similarities with the Pythagorean way of life in terms of asceticism and eschatology. According to L. Albinus, Orphic as well as Pythagorean eschatological traditions moved beyond the cyclical concept of time, encountered in other currents of Greek philosophy and religion, in that they "thought it possible to escape the condition of perpetual rebirth". The Pythagoreans further distinguished themselves from 'Orphics' by viewing an ascetic way of life as a means to achieve this sense of immortality beyond the cycle of regeneration.⁴⁰⁵ Josephus' pythagoraicising description of the Essenes undoubtedly appealed to his Roman audience's acquaintance with this religious milieu.⁴⁰⁶ The analogy probably served to give a recognisable frame of reference to the eschatological consciousness of the Qumran community that permeated its segregated practices of purification (cf. 1QS IV, 16–25; VIII–IX).

5.3. *Qumran Eschatology in Its Exegetical and Historical Context*

Qumran texts share exegetical traditions, which take Genesis 49:1–28, Numbers 24:7 and Isaiah 10:33–11:5 as a point of departure for eschatological and messianic interpretations, with other early Jewish literature. The application of the Deuteronomic notion of blessings and curses of the covenant of the Law to rewards and punishments at the end of days, as attested in 4QMMT C, also plays a part in Philo's treatise *On Rewards and Punishments*.

The Palestinian Jewish setting of eschatology in both non-sectarian and sectarian Qumran texts distinguishes itself from the Hellenistic elements mentioned in the above section 5.2.1. The concepts of God's 'wonderful mysteries', רזי פלא, and the 'mystery that is to come', רז נהיה, which figure in both non-sectarian and sectarian Qumran texts, may stem from Palestinian Jewish apocalyptic traditions.

That which singles the eschatology in the sectarian Qumran texts out as 'sectarian' in its developed form concerns the intense renouncement of the 'way of the people', the ideological self-identifications and the

⁴⁰⁵ Albinus, *The House of Hades*, 112–30 at 126.

⁴⁰⁶ Albinus, *ibidem*, 126 refers to Pindar as a source on the religious milieus of Sicily and Italy, including Orphic and Pythagorean cult practice.

eschatologically motivated polemic against the community's enemies, in particular the priestly establishment and the 'seekers of easy interpretations'. The ideological self-identifications which we find in more than one Qumran text are for instance the (congregation of) the poor and the notion of the community as Temple in the contemporary age, in anticipation on the restoration of the sectarian community to the priesthood. The conflict between the 'Wicked Priest' and the 'Teacher of Righteousness', also a priest, known from the Qumran Pesharim marked the beginning of the eschatologically oriented perspective of the sectarian community in its antagonism with the Jerusalemite and Judaeen authorities.

Several factors should be taken into account, when we attempt a historical reconstruction of the developing eschatological consciousness of the Qumran community. The chronological discussion of sectarian Qumran texts depends on palaeographical dates on the one hand and historical considerations about the date of composition on the other. The sectarian historiography in the margins of the Qumran Pesharim as well as historical references in other texts, like the *Damascus Document*, may help to underpin a critical understanding of developing sectarian notions of the community's history, contemporary situation and future in relation to the surrounding world. The redactional study of Qumran texts of which we have different recensions, main examples being the *Community Rule* and the *War Scroll*, may provide another point of entry for studying developing ideas about the community and its future-eschatological destiny.

It may be deduced from 4QMMT, the *Damascus Document* and the Pesharim that the (proto-)sectarian community at the earliest stages of its history was involved in an inner-Jewish conflict within the Judaeen religious establishment about ritual and moral obligations of the Law related to the Temple service. The emphasis on the eschatological consequences of (non-)observance of the Law turned from conflict into the marginalization of the sectarian community into seclusion and persecution (cf. 1QpHab). The sharply polemical perspective of the Qumran community envisioned the downfall and disgrace of the 'last priests of Jerusalem' on the one hand, but maintained its belief in the centrality of Jerusalem as the holy place on the other (cf. 1QM).

The Qumran community probably elaborated its eschatologically oriented self-definition as a tested foundation and an 'eternal plantation' (1QS) on the basis of traditions transmitted from the Teacher

of Righteousness, whose ideas could well be found reflected in the 'Teacher Hymns' (1QH^a X–XVII). The foundational importance of the Teacher of Righteousness for the eschatological consciousness of the early community is also apparent from the *Damascus Document* and the *Pesher to Habakkuk*. The fact that the Teacher of Righteousness does not figure in the *Rule of the Community* may be related to the fact that he is associated with the $\eta\delta\delta$ in 4QpPs^a III 15–16, perhaps the sectarian community in its embryonic form, not with the foundation of the more developed organization of the $\eta\eta$.

The *Damascus Document*, as an adopted and reworked text taken over from its parent movement, provides symbolical clues about how the Qumran community perceived its relation to its predecessors. These predecessors are described as the shoot of the planting and the diggers of a well of plentiful water, that is, the Law, on which the Qumran community based its self-designations as an 'eternal plantation' and a 'sure house', a house of the Law, in anticipation on the final age when their priestly role in the Temple service would be restored.

The negative references to the kings of Greece and their commanders in the *Damascus Document* and the *Nahum Pesher* reflect the circumstances of antagonism between Hellenistic rulers and Judaeans from the Maccabean era. However, the late Pesharim and the latest redactional layers of the *Qumran War Scroll* from cave 1 make it clear that a new enemy of Israel, apart from the biblical designations of nations neighbouring Israel, has entered the stage: Rome. It is against this enemy, designated with the biblical term 'Kittim', that several Qumran texts direct their notions of apocalyptic war with eschatological expectations of judgement and justice (1QM, 4QpIsa^a frgs. 8–10, 4QpNah frgs. 1 + 2). In this respect, as in other respects, the sectarian community, though secluded, was not isolated from the Palestinian Jewish context. The Essenes were in fact ascribed a part in the Jewish war against Rome by Josephus (cf. *J.W.* 2.152–153).

The dualism between truth and deceit, light and darkness which the Qumran sectarian community saw reflected in the contemporary age and even inside the 'heart of man' (1QS IV 23) was not what it ultimately envisioned for the final age. The 'treatise of the two spirits' characterises this final age without injustice as a 'new creation'.

CHAPTER THREE

EMERGING CHRISTIANITY AND ESCHATOLOGY

1. THE SOURCES AND THEIR ORDER OF DISCUSSION

The sources for eschatology in emerging Christianity and their order of discussion are the subject of this subsection. Section two will give a general outline of recurring biblical texts and themes which provided the exegetical basis for earliest Christian expectations about the final age. Sections three through ten will analyse eschatological material in separate (groups of) texts with attention for their historical and social settings. The concluding section will evaluate the picture of pre-70 CE and post-70 CE texts and traditions with their respective elaborations on biblical tradition; a survey which is at the basis of further traditio-historical comparison with Qumran literature in the subsequent chapters.

The order of my discussion of individual texts is related to the extent to which information about the Palestinian Jewish milieu of emerging Christianity can be derived from these respective texts. While this chapter focuses on the canonical Gospels, the *Gospel of Thomas*, Pauline Letters, and the Acts of the Apostles with a view to pre-70 CE and post-70 CE social and historical settings, it also aims to lay a foundation for further exploration in subsequent chapters of New Testament features of eschatology, apocalypticism and messianism which can be traced back to the milieu of the historical Jesus.

The discussion of eschatology starts with the post-70 CE evidence of canonical as well as extra-canonical Gospels rather than the chronologically earlier Pauline Letters for two main reasons. First, as compared to the canonical and some extra-canonical Gospels, Paul's letters are generally considered of secondary importance for historical Jesus research.¹ Second, as compared to the Palestinian Jewish settings of

¹ See the categorisation of Jesus-sayings in Paul's Letters among 'freie Jesusüberlieferung', a final rubric in the survey of sources by Theissen and Merz, *Der historische Jesus*, 65–8. This is not to negate traditio-historical points of connection between Paul and Jesus-tradition; cf. Dungan, *The Sayings of Jesus in the Churches of Paul*; Wenham, *Paul. Follower of Jesus or Founder of Christianity?*.

the canonical and some extra-canonical² Gospel evidence, Paul's letters reflect a virtually complete shift to missionary activity in the Diaspora. The discussion of eschatology will therefore start with the oldest of the Synoptic Gospels, Mark, then turn to the Sayings Source Q shared by Matthew and Luke,³ and subsequently go into the evidence of Matthew and Luke with their respective special materials.⁴ Since the Jesus-traditions in the *Gospel of Thomas* stand in an arguable relation of literary (in)dependence vis-à-vis the Synoptic tradition⁵ and comprise sayings of potential importance for historical Jesus research,⁶ their evidence will be discussed before we turn to eschatology in the Gospel of John. The discussion of the Acts of the Apostles follows that of the Pauline Letters, since the latter have a 'relative' priority to the information of Acts, with regard to both Paul's life and thought and post-Easter missionary activity at large.⁷

The mostly post-70 CE evidence of other New Testament Letters also comprises eschatological passages, but they hardly contribute to the understanding of eschatological ideas in pre-70 CE emerging Christianity. These post-Pauline Letters are therefore left out of consideration in this chapter. The Apocalypse of John attests to a late first-century CE perspective of Christology and comprises eschatological concepts such as 'the first resurrection' (Rev 20:5) and 'the second death' (Rev 20:14) that are unparalleled in the rest of the New Testament and pre-70

² Some logia of the 'Sayings' *Gospel of Thomas* presuppose Palestinian Jewish settings (*GTh* 52, 60).

³ It has sometimes been argued that Matthew and Luke may have relied on different versions of Q, but this view is not beyond dispute. See e.g. Allison, *The Jesus Tradition in Q*, 3 and n. 14, who mentions a scholarly debate about "two different versions of the source (Q^{mt} and Q^{lk}), as supposed by Sato, *Q und Prophetie*, and critiqued by J.M. Robinson and A.D. Jacobson. Scholars usually explain the variations between Matthew and Luke as the products of different redactional adaptations and arrangements of Q material.

⁴ Conzelmann and Lindemann, *Arbeitsbuch*, provide an implicit pragmatic reason to treat the Matthean evidence first as "erweiterte Nacherzählung" of Mark (326), before turning to the Lucan evidence as "geschichtliche 'Erzählung'" with a more sophisticated literary style (338). For a survey of M and L, see e.g. Schnelle, *Einleitung*, 206–9, who notes at page 206 that this 'Sondergut' cannot be categorised among 'sources', but among "Traditionsbereichen".

⁵ See the extensive list of Synoptic parallels to the sayings in *Thomas* provided by H. Koester, "Introduction," *Nag Hammadi Codex II*, 2–7 (ed. Layton), 38–49 at 46–8. On Matthean parallels to sayings in the *Dialogue of the Saviour* and its literary kinship to *Thomas*, see e.g. Klauck, *Apocryphal Gospels*, 185–91.

⁶ See Theissen and Merz, *Der historische Jesus*, 55–6; cf. Franzmann, *Jesus in the Nag Hammadi Writings*, 1–23 ("Nag Hammadi and Jesus Research").

⁷ See Knox, *Chapters in a Life of Paul*, 34.

CE Jewish writings, but have points of analogy in Targumic literature (*Tg.Isa.* 65:6.15). Even though Rev 21 elaborates on pre-70 CE Jewish traditions about an envisioned new Jerusalem (*Isa* 65:17–18, 66:22–23; *Ezek* 40–48; cf. the Qumran composition *New Jerusalem*), its focus is on a heavenly city without a temple (*Rev* 21:22).⁸ These factors provide reasons not to include extensive discussion of the Apocalypse into the present chapter that focuses on texts with information on pre-70 CE Christianity. Evidence of the Apocalypse will be surveyed in subsequent chapters on apocalypticism and messianism.

2. FIRST-CENTURY CHRISTIAN ESCHATOLOGICAL IDEAS AND SCRIPTURE

Emerging Christianity started as a Jewish movement whose proclamation of the gospel of Jesus Christ included many references to Scripture and was prophetically inspired. This can be inferred from the canonical Gospels, Acts and Paul's Letters, while the extra-canonical *Gospel of Thomas* further includes allusions to biblical figures (logia 31, 46, 52, 85, 88). It therefore stands to reason to explore along which main lines we can discern a biblical frame of reference for eschatological ideas in emerging Christianity. The main scriptural texts will be treated in order of importance, according to both the volume of references and their relative significance in eschatological passages.

2.1. *Isaiah*

Among the Scriptures, Isaiah is the most extensively used biblical writing throughout the New Testament⁹ and quotations from Isaiah serve as an important leitmotif in both the Synoptic and the Pauline tradition. The beginning of the gospel is introduced by words from 'Isaiah the prophet' in Mark 1:2–3. These words, a citation from Isaiah 40:3, recur

⁸ See Hirschberg, *Das eschatologische Israel*, 260–78 on Old Testament and early Jewish backgrounds to the Apocalypse's vision of the heavenly city with regard to its construction and measures, twelve gates and reference to twelve tribes. 'New Jerusalem' is a scholarly designation for the Qumran composition preserved in fragments from caves 1, 2, 4, 5 and 11 (1Q32, 2Q24, 4Q554a, 4Q555, 5Q15, 11Q18) that envisions the city of the temple in its structure, measures and priestly service, but the extant fragments do not provide an exact parallel for the term 'new Jerusalem' in the Apocalypse.

⁹ Cf. Evans, "The Function of Isaiah in the New Testament," 651–91 at 651.

in other Gospels (Matt 3:3; Luke 3:4, John 1:23) and in various ways denote John's precursory role in preparing the way for the one who comes after him (Mark 1:7 par.), the expected Messiah. When John has his disciples ask Jesus whether he is the one "who is to come" or "are we to look for another?," Jesus' reaction that the answer may be found in his miraculous deeds (Q 7:18–23)¹⁰ probably echoes an Isaian horizon of expectations about divine manifestation.¹¹ Luke 4:16–21 presents Jesus as reader from the book of Isaiah in the synagogue at Nazareth who states that Isaiah's prophecy about the expected 'acceptable year of the Lord' (Isa 61:1–2 and 58:6) is fulfilled in the ears of Jesus' audience. With these words, the Lucan Jesus implies the inauguration¹² of the messianic age.¹³ Mark 13:24–25 cites Isaiah 13:10, 34:4 in a setting of heightened eschatological expectation after great tribulation.

The Pauline evidence also indicates that Isaiah constitutes an important frame of reference for eschatology. Isaiah is most prominently named as prophet in Romans 9–11 (Rom 9:27.29, 10:16.20–21), Paul's theological discourse on Israel, and Isaiah is cited as proof-text on Israel's ultimate salvation (Isa 59:20–21a, 27:9 in Rom 11:26–27). Romans 15:12 further quotes Isaiah 11:10, part of a scriptural passage on the messianic king and the messianic age, to underline the theological relevance of Israel's messianic hope for the Gentiles. In Paul's digression on resurrection, a quotation from Isaiah 25:8, together with Hosea 13:14, underlines the point of victory over death (1 Cor 15:54). In 2 Corinthians 6:2, Paul observes that words from Isaiah about the 'acceptable season' and the 'day of salvation' (Isa 49:8) are applicable to the present, thereby implying that the eschatological expectations of acceptance and salvation by God are to be experienced as present conditions (cf. 2 Cor 5:11–6:1).

¹⁰ References to Q are numbered in the order of Luke. See Neiryneck, Verheyden, and Corstjens, *The Gospel of Matthew and the Sayings Source Q: A Cumulative Bibliography, 1950–1995*, 366. Cf. Allison, *The Jesus Tradition in Q*. Tuckett, *Q and the History of Early Christianity*, 9 ("Luke generally preserves Mark's order closely") and 36 ("Matthew conflated the two (Q material and Mark) whereas Luke kept the two separate") provides arguments in favour of the idea that Luke by and large preserved the order of Q.

¹¹ Compare the sequence of miraculous deeds in Q 7:22 with Isa 29:18, 35:5, 35:6, 53:4, 42:18, 26:19, 61:1.

¹² Luke 4:21 focuses on the *present*, not the future: "And he began to say to them: 'Today (σήμερον) this scripture has been fulfilled in your ears'. It thereby presents a case of 'inaugurated eschatology'.

¹³ Cf. BDAG ³2000, 337 on ἐνισυτὸς κυρίου δεκτός as the "age of salvation brought by the Messiah."

2.2. *Psalms*

According to Luke 24:44 the Psalter had an important place next to the Law of Moses and the Prophets in early Christian views of the fulfillment of Scripture in Jesus' ministry, death and resurrection. This impression may be confirmed by quotations from Ps 118:26 in Mark 11:9 par., from Ps 118:22–23 in Mark 12:10–11 par. (cf. Acts 4:11), and from Ps 110:1 in Mark 12:36 par.¹⁴ The narrative sequence of references to these Psalms brings out the contrast between messianic expectations and Christology. In the setting of Mark 11:1–11 par., Psalm 118:26 has a part in popular exclamations about the messianic expectation surrounding Jesus' entry into Jerusalem (Mk 11:1–11 par.). Mark 12:11 par. concludes the parable of the vineyard by underlining the crucial importance of the rejected Son and heir with words from Psalm 118:22–23 about the rejected stone which becomes the cornerstone.¹⁵ Psalm 110:1 is the key verse in Jesus' confrontation with scribal expectations of a Davidic Messiah, countering them with the interpretive question how the Messiah can be David's son, i.e. descendant, if David himself calls him Lord (Mk 12:35–37a / Lk 20:39–44).

Words from Psalm 110:1 further play a role in Paul's theological argument that the end will come when Christ delivers the Kingdom to God (1 Cor 15:24) after God has 'put' all his 'enemies under' his 'feet' (1 Cor 15:25),¹⁶ including death as the last enemy (1 Cor 15:26). Paul complements this eschatological idea about the defeat of death by quoting words from Psalm 8:7b as proof-text that God 'has put all things in subjection under his feet' (RSV).

Psalm 110:1 finally occurs in the eschatologically loaded setting of Pentecost as narrated in Acts 2:1–47. This psalm serves as proof-text for Jesus' messianic identity as both Lord and Christ at the end of Peter's speech (Acts 2:14–36 at vv. 34–36). In the setting of another missionary speech (Acts 13:16–41), Acts 13:32–37 further interweaves quotations from Psalm 2:7 (in Acts 13:33), LXX Isaiah 55:3

¹⁴ See Rowe, *God's Kingdom and God's Son*, who traces the background of Mark's Christology back to four royal Psalms (2, 118, 110, 22). Cf. Watts, "The Psalms in Mark's Gospel," 25–45 at 25 deems "Mark's interest in the Psalms... second only to Isaiah".

¹⁵ In the Coptic *Gospel of Thomas* the parable of the vineyard (logion 65) is directly followed by the saying about the rejected stone which becomes the cornerstone (logion 66); yet the orientation of these logia is far less demonstrably christocentric, although they probably do reflect criticism against a religious establishment.

¹⁶ On the subject change from Jesus to God between 1 Cor 15:25a and 15:25b, see Holleman, *Resurrection and Parousia*, 59.

(in Acts 13:34), and LXX Psalm 15:10 (in Acts 13:35) as prooftexts to proclaim Jesus' resurrection as fulfillment of God's promise to the fathers, in particular as fulfillment in line with 'the holy and sure blessings of David' (Acts 13:34).

Eschatological and messianic exegesis of Psalms was not peculiar to the early Jesus-movement, since the Greek Psalter and Hebrew biblical manuscripts among the Dead Sea Scrolls also provide points of connection. In his discussion of eschatology and messianism in the Greek Psalter, J. Schaper includes LXX Psalm 15 among eschatological evidence, while he categorises LXX Psalms 2 and 109 (MT Ps 110:1) among messianic evidence.¹⁷ Recent study of the Hebrew Psalms scrolls from Qumran cave 4, in particular 4QPs^e, by P.W. Flint tends to confirm earlier scholarly arguments from study of 11QPs^a that at least two different collections of psalms circulated in Israel in the late Second Temple period.¹⁸ 1QPs^a, 11QPs^b, and 4QPs^c have been characterized by G.J. Brooke as Davidic Psalms scrolls for their stress on the figure of David and thereby important for Davidic messianism.¹⁹ Other cave 4 Psalms manuscripts also attribute psalms to David in addition to those already occurring in the Masoretic text, and sometimes corresponding with the Septuagint.²⁰

¹⁷ On eschatology and messianism in the Greek Psalter, see Schaper, *Eschatology in the Greek Psalter*, 46–72 (on eschatology in Ps 1, 15 (16), 21 (22), 45 (46), 47 (48), 48 (49), 55 (56), 58 (59), 72 (73)) and 72–107 (on messianism in Ps 2, 8, 44 (45), 59 (60), 67 (68), 71 (72), 79 (80), 86 (87), 109 (110)). Cf. Schaper, "Der Septuaginta-Psalter als Dokument jüdischer Eschatologie," 38–61.

¹⁸ Flint, *The Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls and the Book of Psalms*; Sanders, *DJD 4*; Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 346 incorporates this evidence into his survey of literary developments of biblical texts.

¹⁹ See Brooke, "The Psalms in Early Jewish Literature in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls," 5–24 at 9–10.

²⁰ E.g. the incipit 'Of David' to Ps 33 in 4QPs^g, which is not in MT Ps 33:1 but comparable to Τῷ Δαυὶδ in LXX Ps 33:1; the incipit 'Of Davi[d. A Psalm]' to Ps 99 in 4QPs^k, which is not in MT Ps 99:1 but comparable to Ψαλμὸς τῷ Δαυὶδ in LXX Ps 98:1. Both sectarian Qumran texts and New Testament texts include quotations from the Psalms that are introduced as words from David (in 4Q177 IV 7, the phrase אֱמַר דָּוִד introduces a quotation from Ps 6:2–3; Mark 12:36–7 par.; in Rom 4:6 and 11:9–11, the phrase Δαυὶδ λέγει introduces quotations from LXX Ps 31:1–2a and LXX Ps 68:23–24; cf. Acts 2:25–28.34–35, 4:25–26).

2.3. *Minor Prophets*

The twelve Minor Prophets constitute a collection of prophetic tradition²¹ of which various passages serve as biblical prooftext or background to both Synoptic and Pauline passages about eschatological and messianic ideas and expectations. Several Minor Prophets, Hosea (Rom 9:25), Joel (Acts 2:16), Jonah (Q 11:29–32), and Zechariah (Q 11:51), are explicitly named in New Testament passages which deal with biblical tradition. Some major examples of the eschatological use of the Minor Prophets will be discussed below.

LXX Joel 3:1–5 is quoted in the first speech of Peter in Acts which marks the day of Pentecost in the Lucan narrative (Acts 2:14–36 at vv. 17–21). This quotation comprises additional elements in comparison with the biblical text. Acts 2:17 puts the whole quotation, which turns to the subject of the ‘day of the Lord’ (Acts 2:20), in eschatological perspective by adding the words ‘in the last days’, and Acts 2:18 refers to the activity of ‘prophesying’ after God has poured out the Spirit (Acts 2:18). This Lucan eschatological use of Joel 3:1–5 probably stands for a broader early Christian horizon of prophetic inspiration and post-Easter eschatological expectation.²² The salvation for *whoever* calls on the name of the Lord in Joel 3:5 serves as Paul’s biblical prooftext in Rom 10:13 for his point that there is no distinction between Jew and Greek in Christian belief concerning God’s salvation (Rom 10:12). The expectations of the ‘day of the Lord’ in terms of judgement and salvation from it are prominent in prophetic scriptures²³ and influential in apocalyptic tradition.²⁴ The Lucan and Pauline eschatological and

²¹ On biblical Minor Prophets scrolls from the Judaean desert (4QXII^{a-g}, 5QXII (5Q4), Murabba‘at 88, 8HevXIIgr) and the use of the Minor Prophets in non-biblical Qumran texts, see Brooke, “The Twelve Minor Prophets and the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 19–43. The introduction to the quotation of Amos 5:25–27 in Acts 7:42 as ‘written in the *book of the prophets*’ (plural!) and of Hab 1:5 (Acts 13:41) in Acts 13:40 as ‘what is said in the *prophets*’ (plural!) may indicate that the Minor Prophets were conceived of as a collection of prophetic tradition.

²² On the importance of the ‘day of the Lord’ in early Christian thought, cf. 1 Thess 5:2; 1 Cor 1:8, 3:13, 5:5; 2 Cor 1:14; 2 Pet 3:10. 1 Cor 14:1–25 goes into prophecy as special gift among spiritual gifts to believers.

²³ See Joel 1:15; Amos 5:18–20; Zephaniah 1:7.14–18, 2:2–3; Zechariah 14:1; LXX Malachi 4:5 (MT Mal 3:23). Cf. Isaiah 13:6.9, 34:8; LXX Jeremiah 26:10 (MT Jer 46:10), 32:33; LXX Ezekiel 7:10, 13:5, 30:3.

²⁴ Cf. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination*, 7, 17–19 on the omnipresence of the theme of eschatological judgement in apocalyptic texts and their rich ‘allusiveness’ to biblical prophecy.

soteriological references to prophecy from Joel are without clear parallel in pre-Christian Jewish texts.

Micah 7:1–7 constitutes a prophetic denouncement of the world's ungodliness and evil; a description which reaches its climax in the opposition within the same house in Micah 7:6. In Q 12:49–53 and *Thomas* (G.Th. 16), Jesus alludes to this verse from Micah in order to make the point to his disciples that his ministry would bring about division. An analogous statement in the setting of the 'eschatological discourses' of Mark 13:3–37 and Luke 21:8–36 (Mark 13:12 / Luke 21:16) indicates that this saying about inner-family division was part of apocalyptic expectations of tribulation and ultimate theophany (cf. Mark 13:19–20, 24–27f.).²⁵ The Synoptic Jesus's confrontation with a sinful and faithless generation (Mark 8:38, 9:19) probably puts the statement that it is division rather than peace on earth which he has come to bring about in perspective; a confrontational perspective which may have parallels in contemporary Jewish apocalyptic texts.²⁶

Habakkuk 2:4 is quoted in Rom 1:17 and Gal 3:11 as proof-text for Paul's theological point that salvation for the righteous concerns righteousness of faith, not righteousness of works of the Law.

Zechariah 9:9 figures as fulfillment quotation in Matthew 21:5 and John 12:15 as part of Matthean and Johannine passages that describe Jesus' messianic entry into Jerusalem. This written word probably serves as one of several scriptural backgrounds to the descriptions of Jesus' messianic entry by Mark 11:1–11²⁷ and the parallel passage in Luke 19:28–38 as well. Messianic exegesis of Zechariah 9:9 can be traced to Jewish tradition as represented by rabbinic literature,²⁸ but there is no clear parallel to this in the Dead Sea Scrolls.

²⁵ Edwards, *A Theology of Q*, 127–8 interprets Jesus' words in relation to the Q community's persecution; yet it is questionable to limit the picture to the 'Q community'. In this connection, Myllykoski, "The Social History of Q and the Jewish War," 143–99 at 176 notes a parallel between Q 12:53 and Mark 13:12.

²⁶ As part of a theophany (1 *Enoch* 1:4–9), 1 *Enoch* 1:8 underlines that God will make peace with the righteous and only they will be God's; CD-A I 1–2 // 4QD^a 2 I 6–8, 4QD^c 1 9–10 foregrounds the idea that God holds a dispute with all flesh judging all who revile him, thereby addressing those 'who know justice'. CD-A VI 14 stipulates a contemporary sectarian perspective in terms of 'the age of wickedness', קץ הרשע.

²⁷ Pesch, *Das Markusevangelium II. Teil*, 181; France, *The Gospel of Mark*, 429; Boring, *Mark*, 314.

²⁸ Stendahl, *The School of St. Matthew, and Its Use of the Old Testament*, 119; Hagner, *Matthew 14–28*, 593–5 mentions *Gen. Rab.* 98.9, *b. Sanh.* 98a–99a, *Koh. Rab.* 1.9. Werline, "The Psalms of Solomon and the Ideology of Rule," 69–87 at 80 reads Zech

Malachi 3:1, a verse about the messenger who prepares the way for the day of judgement by the Lord (Mal 3:1–5), is applied to John the Baptist in Mark 1:2 and in Q 7:27. In Mark 9:11 and Matthew 17:10, Jesus' disciples attribute to the scribes the idea that 'first Elijah must come' before the resurrection of the dead would take place. The notion of an expected future return of Elijah stems from Malachi 3:23, which mentions the sending of Elijah prior to the coming of the 'great and terrible day of the Lord'. Recent discussion of Malachi 3 and its pre-Christian reception history has rightly casted doubt on its classification as a 'predictive messianic text', but the reference to the Day of the Lord in Mal 3:23 and the allusion to this verse in Sirach 48:10 constitute points of connection for an eschatological interpretation of Malachi 3.²⁹ Sirach 48:10 addresses Elijah as the one "ready at the appointed time, it is written, to calm the wrath of God before it breaks out in fury, to turn the heart of the father to the son, and to restore the tribes of Jacob" (RSV). The disciples' reference to a scribal notion that 'first Elijah must come' and Jesus' taking up of the idea that Elijah comes to 'restore all things' (Mark 9:11–12 // Matt 17:10–11), possibly finds a background in the scribal setting to Sirach identified by several scholars.³⁰ It should further be noted that early Pharisaic-Rabbinic tradition also includes references to the eschatological coming of Elijah.³¹ As regards the literature of Qumran, the notion of Elijah as a precursory figure does not occur in the immediate context of messianic passages,³² but Elijah may not be excluded from Qumranite horizons of eschatological

9:9–10 as background to the negative description of what the expected Messiah is not in *Pss. Sol.* 17:33, but this seems a rather uncertain parallel.

²⁹ On different identifications of the messenger-figure(s) ('my messenger', 'messenger of the covenant') in Malachi 3:1 as a prophetic messenger or the Lord, see Malone, "Is the Messiah Announced in Malachi 3:1?," 215–28; Miller, "The Messenger, the Lord, and the Coming Judgement in the Reception History of Malachi 3," 1–16 notes Luke's portrayal of both John and Jesus as 'Elijah-like figures', while discussing the reception of Malachi in Sirach 48, 4Q521 and the Septuagint.

³⁰ See Wright, "Some Suggestions concerning the Social Location of the Wisdom of Ben Sira," 89–112 at 107 n. 64 building on an argument made by G. Lenski, R.A. Horsley and P.A. Tiller that Ben Sira was a scribe-sage representing a 'retainer class' of officials, diplomats and educators.

³¹ *m. Šeqal.* 2.5; *m. Sotah* 9.15, "And the resurrection of the dead shall come through Elijah of blessed memory" (translation Danby, *The Mishnah*, 307); *m. B. Mes.* 1.8, 2.8, 3.4–5; *m. 'Ed.* 8.7 mentions discussion about the expected role of Elijah including a citation of Malachi 3:23.

³² See, however, the general reference to the expected coming of 'the prophet', $\text{עַד אֲבִיבֵי אִיִּרְיָא}$, just before the mentioning of the 'Messiahs of Aaron and Israel', in 1QS IX 11 (not paralleled in 4QS fragments).

expectation either. Émile Puech has identified an allusion to Malachi 3:23 in 4Q558 (4QVision^b ar),³³ of which one fragment mentions the future sending of Elijah, לכן אשלח לאליה.³⁴ The sending of Elijah is surrounded by references to an ‘elected one’, בחיר, and to “po[w]er, lightning and met[eo]rs,” תו[ק]ף {ו} ברקא וזי[קיא],³⁵ imagery which is indicative of divine providence and theophany. Puech compared the surrounding imagery with Malachi 3:2.19.21,³⁶ but the lack of verbatim agreement makes a general parallel with imagery surrounding the Day of the Lord in prophetic tradition³⁷ more likely.

2.4. Daniel

The Synoptic eschatological discourses allude to Daniel 7:13 which refers to the coming ‘Son of Man’ (Mark 13:26 / Matt 24:31 / Luke 21:27). While it is a debated issue whether Mark 13:24–27 deals with the second coming of Christ (the parousia)³⁸ or with the post-Easter declaration of Jesus’ supreme authority,³⁹ the Matthean version in

³³ Puech, *La croyance des Esséniens en la vie future*. 2, 676–8.

³⁴ 4Q558 1 II 4 according to García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*. 2, 1114–5 who reconstruct, לכן אשלח לאליה קדם, and translate ‘to you I will send Eliyah, befo[re]’; 4Q558 54 II 4 according to Parry and Tov, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader*. 6, 148–9 whose reconstruction, לכן אשלח לאליה קש[יטא], and translation, “to you I will send Elijah [the] righ[teous],” follows that of E. Cook.

³⁵ The reconstruction תו[ק]ף, ‘power’, by García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*. 2, 1114–5 seems more logical in the context of the passage than the reconstruction תו[ס]ף, ‘you/she/it will add’, by Parry and Tov, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader*. 6, 148–9, since the preceding line 4 is in the first person singular of divine agency, while the א at the end of line 3 probably also indicates the beginning of a first person singular imperfect, thereby making a transition to a third person singular in line 5 implausible.

³⁶ Puech, *La croyance des Esséniens en la vie future*. 2, 677.

³⁷ There is no clear correspondence to ‘lightning and meteors’ in prophetic passages about the Day of the Lord, but imagery of fire and power does occur in prophetic texts (Isa 26:11, Joel 2:1–3.5.11, Mal 3:2.19–20).

³⁸ E.g. Beasley-Murray, *Jesus and the Last Days*, 424–34; Wenham, *The Rediscovery of Jesus’ Eschatological Discourse*, 304–26 presupposes its eschatological interpretation; Van Iersel, *Mark: A Reader-Response Commentary*, 406 on Mark 13:26–27: “At this point in Mark the Son of Man’s coming is for the first time connected with the end of the world”.

³⁹ E.g. Geddert, *Watchwords: Mark 13 in Markan Eschatology*, 226–9 interprets Mark 13:24–27 in terms of divine judgement, but not of “preliminary events signaling the nearness of the parousia” (227), while he attributes a deliberate ambiguity to Mark with regard to eschatological time-tables (255–8); France, *The Gospel of Mark*, 500–1 interprets Mark 13:24–27 in terms of “vindication and enthronement of the Son of Man at the right hand of God”, while he excludes an eschatological interpretation on the basis of Mark 13:30 which implies historical events.

particular presupposes a setting in which the parousia and the end of days are expected (Matt 24:3). Daniel 7:13 is further echoed in two other Synoptic passages, one prior to the Passion narrative (Mark 8:38 / Matt 16:27 / Luke 9:26) and the other constituting Jesus' testimony before the high priest (Mark 14:62 / Matt 26: 64 / Luke 22:69).⁴⁰ It is a matter of discussion how the tradition about the 'coming Son of Man' should be related to other Son of Man sayings.⁴¹ Words from Daniel 7:13 are further quoted in Revelation 1:7 which envisions Christ's second coming.

Paul's Letters do not comprise any 'Son of Man' references; perhaps due to the fact that Pauline Christology addresses a Greek audience which had already received the gospel, while not focusing on Christ 'from a human point of view' (2 Cor 5:16),⁴² and perhaps due to Paul's restraint about an 'abundance of revelations' (2 Cor 12:7–10). Nevertheless, Paul does seem to imply Christ's second coming as a presence on the clouds, since 1 Thessalonians 4:17 speaks of the faithful being caught up in the clouds (ἐν νεφέλαις) to meet the Lord there.

Matthew 13:36–43 refers to the fate of destruction for the sons of the evil one (Matt 13:42, but also Matt 13:50) in language of Daniel 3:6 and to the fate of the righteous (Matt 13:43) in that of Daniel 12:3. A parallel to the allusion to Daniel 12:3 in Philippians 2:15 may indicate that this is not an isolated apocalyptic interest of Matthew among emerging Christianity, even though this evangelist stands out among the Synoptic Gospels in accentuating these traditions.

⁴⁰ Tuckett, "The Son of Man and Daniel 7: Q and Jesus," 371–94 favours the idea that "in both Mark and Q, influence of Dan 7 may be seen, albeit in different ways", by direct allusion and by echoing the exegetical tradition which Dan 7 generated respectively (392).

⁴¹ On Mark 13:26 par. as 'post-Easter' tradition, see Schröter, "Markus, Q und der historische Jesus," 173–200 at 175 nn. 11–12. Tuckett, "The Son of Man and Daniel 7," 392 has argued that a *Danielic* Son of Man "would seem to be something we can indeed ascribe to the historical Jesus".

⁴² Cf. Burkett, *The Son of Man Debate: A History and Evaluation*, whose survey of possible meanings of the term 'Son of Man' as reconstructed backgrounds to the Gospel tradition includes the notions of 'human Son of Man' (13–21), 'apocalyptic/messianic Son of Man' (22–31), and 'idiomatic/nontitular son of man' (82–96), that is, Semitic idiom.

2.5. *Genesis*

In both the New Testament and contemporary Jewish tradition, stories about primeval history in Genesis can serve as an analogy for tribulation and judgement that herald the envisioned final age and new era. This is specifically the case with the biblical flood story and the fate of Sodom and Gomorrah. The eschatological discourses of Matthew 24–25 and Luke 17:22–37 both include references to the ‘days of Noah’ as analogy for the days of (Luke 17:26) or coming (Matt 24:37) of the Son of Man (Luke 17:26–27 / Matt 24:37–39), while Luke 17:28–29 adds the ‘days of Lot’ and Sodom as analogy. Two late epistles, Jude 6–7 and 2 Peter 2:4–10, also explicitly present these two stories from Genesis as examples of theodicy and final judgement against evildoers.

Contemporary Jewish eschatological readings of the biblical flood story mainly occur in Palestinian Jewish texts with apocalyptic affiliations,⁴³ as will be seen. *1 Enoch* 6–11, a passage about the rebellion and fall of the angels (patterned on Genesis 6:1–4), puts the final judgement of the fallen angels in a broader perspective of destruction of the wicked and eternal planting of righteousness (*1 Enoch* 10:11–22). Another example is the Qumran text 4Q254a (*4QCommentary on Genesis D*), possibly sectarian,⁴⁴ which also envisions an eschatological signal function for the Flood story by stipulating the relevance of Noah’s sending of the raven from the ark for the ‘[a]st generations’, לדורות האחרונים.

Other ancient Jewish literature comprises intertwined references to the biblical flood story and the men of Sodom. These references serve a paraenetic purpose of designating the wrongdoing which is liable to judgement in *Jubilees* 20.5 or make part of a description of those who will not have a share in the ‘world to come’ in *m. Sanhedrin* 10.3. The Hellenistic-Jewish writings of Philo and Josephus do not contain eschatological readings of these Genesis stories in that they respec-

⁴³ Note that the eschatological concern with ‘judgment/destruction of the wicked’ is central to apocalypticism, as outlined by Collins (ed.), *Semeia* 14 and idem, *The Apocalyptic Imagination*, 7.

⁴⁴ Other texts with commentary on Genesis, 4Q252–254 (*4QCommentary on Genesis A-C*), comprise sectarian community terminology, such as אנשי היחוד (4Q252 V 5; 4Q254 4 5), or terms standing for dualism, such as בליעל in 4Q253 3 2. 4Q254 and 4Q254a may stand for an interrelated set of commentaries on Genesis, as the numbering of manuscripts, C and D, also indicates. Apart from 4Q254a, Qumran literature includes 4Q176 8–11 (l. 10 mentioning נוח בימי נוח), 4Q370 (*4QExhortation Based on the Flood*) and 4Q577 (*4QText Mentioning the Flood*), but these texts do not comprise an eschatological perspective.

tively comprise accounts of, for instance, the Flood story, in terms of philosophy (*Giants*) and of comparative biblical historiography (*Ant.* 1.73–95). The analogy or signal function for events leading up to the final age therefore finds its clearest parallel in strands of contemporary apocalyptic Jewish thought.

Finally, Genesis 49:1–28, a passage about Jacob’s blessing of his twelve sons including future promises, is important in contemporary Jewish tradition (chapter 2, section 1.2.1). This biblical passage appears relatively insignificant for eschatological ideas in the Gospel tradition. Nevertheless, Revelation 5:5 echoes Genesis 49:9 together with Isaiah 11:1 in speaking of the “Lion of the tribe of Judah, the Root of David”.

3. THE GOSPEL OF MARK

3.1. *The Social and Historical Setting of Mark*

Previous redaction-critical work on Mark turned the attention away from the historical Jesus to the Marcan community.⁴⁵ The criticism by R. Pesch of ‘vor-redaktionsgeschichtliche Studien’ consisted exactly in the fact that they uncritically related the evidence in Mark 13 back to the question of the historical Jesus.⁴⁶ Yet the divergent reconstructions of Gospel communities and their shortcomings have led some scholars to refute the redaction-critical objective of such reconstruction altogether; a case which was recently argued with regard to reconstructions of a ‘Marcan community’.⁴⁷ Such reconstructions may indeed be problematic, as far as the location⁴⁸ and the (supposed mainly Gentile) background of the community⁴⁹ are concerned. However, valid historical-critical

⁴⁵ On Mark 13, cf. Pesch, *Naherwartungen*, 27–47, who surveyed ‘redaktionsgeschichtliche Studien’ by, among others, Riesenfeld, “Tradition und Redaktion im Markusevangelium,” 157–64, and Marxsen, *Der Evangelist Markus*.

⁴⁶ Pesch, *Naherwartungen*, 21.

⁴⁷ The hypothesis that a distinctive Marcan ‘Gospel community’ can be reconstructed was refuted by Peterson, *The Origins of Mark*, who discussed previous scholarly work by W. Kelber, H.C. Kee, and C. Myers.

⁴⁸ Rome, Antioch, Syria, Galilee, the Dekapolis and Asia Minor have been considered as places of composition of Mark (Schnelle, *Einleitung*, 238). Marcus, *Mark 1–8*, 30–7 at 36 defends a Syrian provenance, albeit with the reservation that “most of the exegesis would work just as well if the setting were Rome or some other place where Christians were under pressure”. Van Iersel, *Mark*, 31–41 supports a Roman provenance.

⁴⁹ See e.g. Schnelle, *Einleitung*, 238 (predominantly Gentile converts); Marcus, *Mark 1–8*, 36 (a predominantly Gentile community). Yet Telford, *The Theology of the Gospel of Mark*, 1–29 at 15–7 observes that certain Marcan features “could apply to urban

and literary-critical arguments support the communal situatedness and reader-oriented character of the Gospel of Mark.⁵⁰

Mark provides some clear historical points of connection for its communal situatedness. We have indications of the distance from Palestinian Judaism (*their* synagogues', Mark 1:39), from a predominantly Semitic milieu, as the translations of Semitic words indicate (Mark 3:17; 5:41; 7:11, 34; 14:36; 15:22, 34), and from circles of Jewish, mainly Pharisaic leadership with their perspective on the Law and ancestral customs (e.g. Mark 2:23–3:6; 7:3–4 on purification customs of “the Pharisees, and all the Jews”;⁵¹ 8:15; 10:2–9; 12:13–27, 38–40), which the evangelist presupposes on the part of his audience. The passages about Gentile converts, ranging from the prominent examples of Gentile faith in Jesus (cf. Mark 7:24–30, 15: 39) to the expressed commission to preach the gospel to all nations (Mark 13:10), may further attest to the communal self-definition of emerging Christianity, being increasingly Gentile-oriented in its gospel mission. Yet several factors speak against a disjunction between the Marcan community and the Jewish origins of the early Jesus-movement. Examples of Jewish acclaim of Jesus, apart from that by his disciples, are also singled out in the Marcan narrative (e.g. Mark 1:27–8; 2:12b), which, as little as is the case with the disciples' role in the narrative, cannot have been recorded for the mere purpose of ‘historical reminiscence’. On the other hand, the Marcan Jesus deems the Jewish scribes' exegetical authority important enough to take issue with it as regards messianic expectations (Mark 9:11–13, 12:35–37a), while occasionally praising the wisdom of a scribe (Mark 12:28–34). Finally, the evangelist refers to Joseph of Arimathea as “a respected member of the council who was also himself looking

Gentile Christians in Rome suffering persecution (see V. Taylor, S.G.F. Brandon), Jewish Christians in Galilee awaiting the parousia (W. Marxsen) or to a rural and ethnically inclusive community in southern Syria with an apocalyptic orientation (H.C. Kee)”, while at 17 n. 30 further referring to Donahue, “The Quest for the Community of Mark’s Gospel,” 817–38.

⁵⁰ For historical-critical arguments, see e.g. Telford, *The Theology of the Gospel of Mark*, 16–7 (forms of tradition, content of issues, and atmosphere created), and Marcus, *Mark 1–8*, 25–39 at 25 (communal setting behind Mark 13, 13:14, 15:21). For literary-critical arguments, see e.g. France, *The Gospel of Mark*, 28 on the prominence of the disciples in the Marcan narrative, which appeals not just to their “historical reminiscence”, but also to a communal setting of “the successors to that early group of followers of Jesus”.

⁵¹ See, however, Marcus, *Mark 1–8*, 441 on Mark 7:3: “while (Mark’s) need to inform his readers about Jewish customs suggests that at least some of them are non-Jewish, it does not necessarily mean that all of them are, or that he himself is, as is shown again by the parallel to *Ep. Arist.* 305”.

for the kingdom of God" (Mark 15:43, RSV), thereby possibly implying a broader Jewish as well as Christian horizon of expectations about God's reign in heaven and on earth.⁵²

The reference to the 'desolating sacrilege' and appeal to flight from Judaea in Mark 13:14–15, the prominence of Syrian regions (e.g. Mark 4:25, 5:20, 7:31), and the parallels between Mark 13:5–8, 14, 21–23 and Josephus' account of the Jewish war (*J.W.* 2.258–88; 6.285–88, 316) make a northern Syro-Palestinian setting of the Marcan community⁵³ in the aftermath of the Jewish war (66–70 CE), thereby after 70 CE, probable.⁵⁴

The exploration of the communal situatedness of Mark may further be refined with the aid of reader-oriented approaches. From the angle of reader-response criticism, R.M. Fowler discerns three levels of communication by which the evangelist addresses his readers: explicit commentary, implicit commentary and the intentional use of indirection.⁵⁵ The most famous example of explicit commentary is the statement in Mark 13:14, 'let the reader understand', which speaks beyond the intranarrative audience to the audience addressed by the narrator.⁵⁶ Fowler discerns two forms of implicit commentary: statements by

⁵² See France, *The Gospel of Mark*, 666: "The term (ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ) by itself need not imply any connection with Jesus. Every pious Jew would pray regularly in the synagogue for the coming of God's kingdom in the Kaddish prayer"; cf. 666 n. 94.

⁵³ For a comprehensive discussion of the Syrian provenance, cf. Marcus, *Mark 1–8*, 33–7. Boring, *Mark*, 15–20 leaves Syrian and Galilean provenance open as two options. Against the arguments for a Roman provenance (Latinisms, Neronian persecutions) as background to Mark 13, proposed by, e.g., Van Iersel, *Mark*, 31–41, 49–54, see Marcus, *Mark 1–8*, 30–3 and Schnelle, *Einleitung*, 237–8. Schnelle, *Einleitung*, 238 relates his idea of provenance from Asia Minor to the assumption of a predominant Gentile setting for the Marcan community. Yet Gentile settings and Gentile-Jewish relations also played a part in Syria (cf. Josephus, *J.W.* 7.43–45 on Antioch). Galilean provenance for Mark has recently been advocated by Roskam, *The Purpose of the Gospel of Mark in its Historical and Social Context*, 75–142 on the basis of "the role of the three Galilean women in Mk 15 and 16, Mark's special interest in Galilee in Mk 14:28 and 16:7, and his correct and detailed geographical references to places in Galilee" (113–4). However, this evidence may well be traced back to early Jesus-tradition as recorded by Mark as the oldest of the canonical Gospels; even Acts 10:37 relates the beginnings of Jesus' ministry in Galilee. Roskam's idea that the general reference to trial before 'governors and kings' in Mark 13:9 fits a specifically Galilean setting (pp. 112–3) seems implausible, in view of other references, such as 2 Cor 11:32 (Damascus); Acts 23:24.26, 24:1.10, 25:13, 26:2.30 (Caesarea); cf. 1 Pet 2:13–14 (εἴτε βασιλεῖ εἴτε ἡγεμόσιν).

⁵⁴ Cf. Roskam, *The Purpose of the Gospel of Mark*, 81–94 who strongly argues in favour of a post-70 CE date of Mark, on the basis of, among other passages, Mark 12:9, 13:2.14–23, and 15:38.

⁵⁵ Fowler, *Let the Reader Understand*, 81–126, 127–54, 155–227.

⁵⁶ On Mark 13:14 and Mark 13 at large, see Fowler, *ibidem*, 82–7.

the characters of the narrative and the 'emplotment' of the narrative. Fowler's introductory example for 'indirection' is the Messianic Secret in Mark.⁵⁷

The interpretation of the Marcan Messianic Secret (Mark 8:27–30, 9:9) may be properly undertaken in connection with the narrative role of the disciples and discipleship.⁵⁸ Several interpretations of Mark 9:9–10, such as the disciples' astonishment about Jesus' individual 'rising from the dead' apart from the final resurrection (B.M.F. van Iersel) and the disciples' 'misdirected messianic hopes' prior to the perception of Jesus' rejection, death and resurrection (R.T. France),⁵⁹ may affirm this connection. Reading Mark over the shoulder of Jesus' first followers and their initial failure to understand and follow Jesus, the Marcan audience is instructed about true discipleship (cf. Mark 10:35–45), modelled after the mission of the Marcan Jesus as the Son of man (Mark 10:45). Jesus' instructions of silence about his identity could serve a reader-oriented purpose to withhold one's conclusions about Jesus and discipleship of his gospel before his mission as the Son of man (Mark 8:31–33, 9:30–32, 10:32–34) has progressively become unravelled.⁶⁰ The context in which Jesus affirms his messianic identity, Mark 14:61–62, a context of trial, appears to be paralleled by trial for Jesus' "name's sake" that would befall Jesus' followers (Mark 13:9–13). This context has been related to tribulation, persecution and war experienced by the Marcan community (Mark 4:17; 10:29–30; 13:7–8, 9–13, 14–23).⁶¹ The Marcan narrative addresses the predicament of its original audience: the Marcan Jesus sets the promise of eternal life against contemporary persecutions (Mark 10:30), and salvation of the elect against tribulation (Mark 13:9–23).⁶²

⁵⁷ Fowler, *ibidem*, 127 and 155.

⁵⁸ Fowler, *ibidem*, 86 on Mark 9:9 as a "statement by the narrator to the reader" that the reading is "at a time after the resurrection", arguing against its one-sided reading as a "retrospective, dogmatic rationalization of the disciples' befuddlement before their eventual post-Easter enlightenment, as W. Wrede took it".

⁵⁹ Van Iersel, *Mark*, 298; France, *The Gospel of Mark*, 356.

⁶⁰ Cf. the reader-oriented interest of Jesus' questions: 'have you no faith yet?' (Mark 4:40); 'do you not yet perceive and understand?' (Mark 8:17); 'do you not yet understand?' (Mark 8:21).

⁶¹ Cf. Verheyden, *Persecution and Eschatology. Mk 13,9–13*, 1141–59; Schnelle, *Einleitung*, 241; Van Iersel, *Mark*, 54 and n. 67 further mentions Mark 8:34–38 and 9:43–49 as evidence of oppression and persecution; Marcus, *Mark 1–8*, 28–9 ("A Persecuted Community"); France, *The Gospel of Mark*, 513–9 relates the 'prospect of persecution' in Mark 13:9–13 to 'early Christian self-consciousness' (518).

⁶² Cf. France, *The Gospel of Mark*, 518, who mentions both Roman (Neronian) persecution and Jewish persecution, referring to Acts 12:1–3, *Ant.* 20.200 and "persecution

The Marcan narrative comprises still other evidence that attests to the evangelist's retrospective viewpoint on the early Jesus-movement and later communal circumstances. Mark 6:30 is the only generally attested instance⁶³ that the twelve disciples are called 'apostles'. In Mark 6:30, the term ἀπόστολοι appears to receive its meaning from the passage about the commission of the twelve by Jesus (Mark 6:7–13), preceding that about the death of John (Mark 6:14–29). The later missionary interest of the term ἀπόστολοι may be paralleled by evidence of commission in the secondary ending of Mark (Mark 16:17.20), and by the post-Easter references to apostleship in the Pauline Letters and Acts.

Finally, we may detect one other indication of the late retrospective viewpoint of the narrator in Mark 9:38–41. This is a pericope in which Jesus confronts John the son of Zebedee with the legitimacy of an unknown exorcist's 'mighty work' in Jesus' name, even though, according to John, he "was not following us" (Mark 9:38), that is, the disciples. The Marcan Jesus's answer, that "whoever gives you a cup of water to drink because you *bear the name of Christ*, will by no means lose his reward" (Mark 9:41, RSV), may reflect later communal self-definition through Christ-confession under circumstances of oppression.⁶⁴

3.2. Marcan Eschatology

Marcan eschatology is represented by diverse traditions.⁶⁵ The question is which kind of eschatology the Gospel of Mark envisages and whether

headed by Saul". McLaren, "Ananus, James and Earliest Christianity," 1–25 argued that Josephus' account of James's death should not be understood as a programmed persecution but rather of victimization by rival priestly factions. On victimization of other Jews by the 'Fourth Philosophy', which justified bloodshed for the sake of independence from Rome, cf. *Ant.* 18.4–5, 8.

⁶³ The only other reference to ἀπόστολοι, Mark 3:14, is merely attested in part of the manuscript evidence. Several commentators deem this reference a harmonization with the parallel verse in Luke 6:13; see Pesch, *Das Markusevangelium*. 1, 203 n. a and 204 n. 4; Van Iersel, *Mark*, 164 n. 78; France, *The Gospel of Mark*, 157.

⁶⁴ See also 1 Pet 4:14 (ἐν ὀνόματι Χριστοῦ), 16; cf. Acts 11:26, 26:28. Evans, *Mark* 8:27–16:20, 66 considers the concluding statement in Mark 9:41 with the 'difficult clause' ἐν ὀνόματι ὅτι Χριστοῦ ἔστε as "probably a later Christian saying, perhaps originally cast in the form of a prophecy". Note that this clause does not occur in the parallel passages of Matt 10:42 (a conflation of Mark 9:37, 41a?) and Luke 9:49–50.

⁶⁵ The insistence by Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God*, 339–67 at 341 on a "seriously historical reading" of Mark 13:5–37 does not invalidate the question of Marcan eschatology as an issue *per se*. The other passages with a possible eschatological import, Mark 1:14–15; 8:38–9:1; 9:41, 42–48; 12:18–27 at 23, 40b; 14:25, 62; 15:43, are more briefly discussed than Mark 13; certain passages, like Mark 8:38–9:1 and 9:42–48,

and to which extent the Marcan Jesus opposes other eschatological expectations, in particular in Mark 13:3–37.⁶⁶ Previous scholarship diverged about the issue whether earliest Christian eschatology, of which certain strata of Mark could be representative, should be understood in relation to or rather in distinction from apocalypticism;⁶⁷ an interpretive issue which remains a challenge for scholarship⁶⁸ and partly depends on one's definition of apocalypticism and eschatology in a broader ancient Jewish context. N.T. Wright stresses with some justification that, first-century Judaism held concrete historical expectations about restoration and return from exile rather than “an other-worldly expectation of the end of the space-time universe”, which he deems the “classic false reading of ‘apocalyptic’”.⁶⁹ However, first-century Jewish literature, in particular Qumran literature, does also attest to expectations of an end to all periods of wickedness, which cannot be reduced to a climactic sense of historical transition.⁷⁰ The evaluation of connections or disjunctions between eschatological and apocalyptic traditions and Mark will depend on the discussion of distinctive features of Marcan eschatology.

do not receive separate attention apart from their putative Synoptic force as ‘oracles of judgment’ (ibidem, 182–3); and Mark 9:41, 14:62, and 15:43 are not discussed by Wright. Wright's non-eschatological hypothesis about the New Testament further leaves ostensive non-Markan evidence for Parousia expectations, such as 1 Thess 4:13–18 (only in a footnote: *Ibid.*, p. 50 n. 105) or John 21:22–23 (absent from Wright's discussion), unexplained.

⁶⁶ Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God*, 339 and Fletcher-Louis, “Jesus, the Temple and the Dissolution of Heaven and Earth,” 117–41 at 117, consider Mark 13 to be the *locus classicus* for discussion of eschatology, be it related to Jesus, to his early followers or to the later Gospel community(/ies). Yet in the survey by Allison, “The Eschatology of Jesus,” 267–302, Mark 13 is only one among various Marcan passages included for discussion.

⁶⁷ For approaches that relate Mark to apocalypticism, see e.g. Beasley-Murray, *Jesus and the Last Days*; Kee, *Studies in Mark's Gospel*, 144 who notes about Mark's eschatology that “the basic pattern is that of any apocalyptic community, Jewish or otherwise”; Brandenburger, *Markus 13 und die Apokalyptik*; Marcus, *Mark 1–8*, 71–3. Kümmel, *Promise and Fulfilment*, 141–55 detaches Jesus' eschatology from Jewish apocalypticism.

⁶⁸ Note that recently Nielsen, *Lukan Eschatology According to Luke 22 and Acts 20*, 10 reiterated the question about “the relationship between a Jewish apocalyptic and a Christian eschatology” as a ‘basic problem’.

⁶⁹ Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God*, 198–243 at 210; cf. 244 on Mark 1:15, 4, 12:1–12 in connection with restoration and return. On ‘restoration eschatology’ as an important context for the New Testament, cf. Pitre, *Jesus, the Tribulation, and the End of the Exile*, whose analysis includes Mark 10:35–45 and 13.

⁷⁰ Cf. Adams, “The Coming Son of Man,” 39–61, whose discussion includes Daniel, Zechariah, 1 Enoch, 4 Ezra, T. Moses, and the *Sibylline Oracles* as examples of ‘Jewish eschatological currents’. As for Qumran texts, see 1QS IV 18–25; 4Q215a (4QTime of Righteousness) 1 II; 4Q246 II; 4Q475 (4QRenewed Earth).

Several passages in Mark may disclose a particular theological perspective relevant to the question of apocalypticism and eschatology. Before turning to the traditional *loci* of attention for eschatology, such as Mark 8:38–9:1 and 13, a quick survey of other parts of Mark could illuminate whether and in which way cosmology, the question of good and evil, dualism and determinism have a place in the Gospel of Mark; issues which may provide or preclude a basis for identifying strands of apocalypticism and eschatology in Mark. The narrative of Mark clearly presupposes a cosmological setting in which supernatural forces are at work:⁷¹ Satan (Mark 1:13; 3:22–26; 4:15; 8:33) as ruler of the demons (Mark 3:22) and separate demons (Mark 1:34.39; 3:15; 6:13; 7:26, 29–30; 9:38; 16:9, 17) on the evil side, and God (e.g. Mark 10:18), the Holy Spirit (Mark 1:8b.10–12; 3:29; 12:36; 13:11), and Jesus as the exalted Son of man together with the angels (Mark 8:38; cf. Mark 13:26–27, 32; 14:62) on the good side. In fact, through his earthly ministry the Marcan Jesus preaches the nearness of God’s kingdom (Mark 1:14–15) and combats Satan’s reign (cf. Mark 3:23–26), invading it by casting demons out of human beings (Mark 1:23–26.34.39; 3:22; 7:25–30; 16:9). Ethical dualism therefore is an undeniable part of the Marcan narrative. It is difficult to identify and discern determinism in Mark, although a notion of predestination permeates the sayings about the Son of man’s deliverance, death, and resurrection (Mark 8:31, 9:30–32, 10:33–34). Predestination may be further be reflected by Marcan notions of the fulfilment of Scripture in contemporary events (Mark 14:27.49).⁷² The passages with distinctly eschatological language will now merit our attention in order to substantiate the subject of Marcan eschatology.

3.2.1. *The Kingdom of God and Its Nearness (Mark 1:14–15)*

The Kingdom of God figures prominently at the beginning of the narrative, where Mark introduces Jesus’ gospel message: “the time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand; repent and believe in the

⁷¹ Marcus, *Mark 1–8*, 72–3, Schnelle, *Einleitung*, 249, and Evans, *Mark 8:27–16:20*, lxxi mention the demons’ recognition of Jesus’ identity (Mark 1:23–27, 3:11, 5:7–13) and the Marcan secrecy motif.

⁷² Mark 9:12–13 could be another example, if one accepts the link between Elijah and John the Baptist, already presumed earlier in the Marcan narrative (Mark 6:14–15, 8:28). France, *Jesus and the Old Testament*, 83–163 includes Marcan evidence in his survey of ‘the use of Old Testament prediction’; Marcus, *Mark 1–8*, 71 observes that “Mark’s mode of OT interpretation is particularly close to that found in Jewish apocalyptic writings”, thereby also referring to idem, *The Way of the Lord*.

gospel” (Mark 1:15, RSV). The nearness of the Kingdom, expressed by the Greek perfect tense ἤγγικεν, should not be taken to stand for a fully realised eschatology.⁷³ Mark 1:14–15 implies that the realization of God’s kingdom on earth is progressively worked out through Jesus’s ministry and through the communication of his message. If we read the Marcan passage about the Beelzebul controversy (Mark 3:19b–30)⁷⁴ in light of Mark 1:14–15, it may be inferred that the drawing near of God’s kingdom, ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ, sets aside the reign (βασιλεία, Mark 3:24) of Satan who “is coming to an end” (Mark 3:26; RSV).⁷⁵ This definitive Marcan language may indicate that the kingdom of God as the Marcan Jesus envisages it in Mark 1:14–15 inaugurates the final age.

The ‘kingdom of God’ as introduced by the Marcan Jesus in Mark 1:14–15 was undoubtedly central to the kerygma of the Marcan community and the early Jesus-movement.⁷⁶ It stands to reason that God’s reign also had an eschatological dimension for the historical Jesus. Sayings of Jesus in Mark 9:47 and 14:25 attest to notions of the kingdom of God that denote the eternal life (cf. Mark 9:43, 45)⁷⁷ and an eschatological banquet⁷⁸ respectively. It may be deduced from the analogy between the

⁷³ See Kümmel, *Promise and Fulfilment*, 19–24 on the terms ἐγγός and ἐγγίξειν, denoting the imminent future, and Dunn, *Jesus Remembered*, 407–8 at 408: “The sense, then, is of imminence rather than of presence”. The arguments by France, *The Gospel of Mark*, 92 for ‘realised eschatology’, with reference to Mark 14:42–43, Luke 4:21, 21:8 are not compelling. Mark 1:15 marks the ‘beginning’ not the full realization of Jesus’ ministry.

⁷⁴ On Mark 3:23–26 and its parallels in Q 11:17–18, cf. Marcus, “The Beelzebul Controversy and the Eschatologies of Jesus,” 247–77.

⁷⁵ On τέλος ἔχει in Mark 3:26, see BDAG, ³2000, p. 998.

⁷⁶ The term was interpreted ecclesiologically by Carmignac, *Le Mirage de l’Eschatologie*; cf. the criticism against the equation of βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ with the Church by Gnilka, *Das Evangelium nach Markus. I*, 67–9.

⁷⁷ Evans, *Mark 8:27–16:20*, 69–71 relates Mark 9:43–48 to the historical Jesus, while discussing the opposite position of the North American Jesus Seminar in terms of a “misguided preference for a noneschatological Jesus” (70), with reference to further bibliography with trenchant criticism of the ‘noneschatological position’ (W. Zager, N.T. Wright), and pointing out parallels to contemporary Jewish literature.

⁷⁸ France, *The Gospel of Mark*, 571–2 relates Mark 14:25 to Jewish evidence of the expectation of the ‘messianic banquet’, including 1QSa in his discussion; Dunn, *Jesus Remembered*, 425–8 at 427 more cautiously focuses on Mark 14:25 among other Synoptic passages as evidence of a heavenly ‘eschatological banquet’. The comparison between the messianic banquet in 1QSa and the Christian Eucharist has been rejected by Schiffman, *The Eschatological Community of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 59–64 who emphasises that the sectarian communal meal, conducted as “preenactments of the final messianic banquet” (p. 67), was of a non-sacral nature. Hengel, “Das Mahl in der Nacht, ‘in der Jesus ausgeliefert wurde’ (1 Kor 11,23),” 115–60 at 141 rightly considers the Christian eucharist to be a development *sui generis*.

Messianic secret and ‘secret (μυστήριον) of the kingdom of God’ (Mark 4:11) that the Marcan Jesus’s preaching of the kingdom of God intersects with his messianic identity.⁷⁹ Yet it is a matter of debate whether and to which extent messianic expectations determined contemporary Jewish, in particular Palestinian Jewish ideas about God’s reign.⁸⁰ It is at least clear that Palestinian Jewish ideas about God’s kingdom included eschatological expectations.⁸¹ When Mark 1:14–15 is considered as an editorial summary of the gospel as preached by the historical Jesus, final elements, like resurrection (Mark 12:18–27) and eschatological fate (Mark 9:41, 9:42–48, 12:40b; see below), cannot be denied a place in Jesus’s message about the ‘kingdom of God’.

3.2.2. *The Coming of the Kingdom of God (Mark 8:38–9:1)*

Mark 8:38–9:1 has often been considered to be the product of redaction, not of Jesus-tradition.⁸² Yet the arguably redactional nature of this passage is not beyond dispute.⁸³

Mark 8:38–9:1 announces a future perspective of vindication of Jesus as the Son of man who will come “in the glory of his Father with the holy angels” to the shame of those who were ashamed of him (8:38), while promising some of those around that they “will not taste death before they see that the kingdom of God has come with power” (9:1; RSV). The evaluation of tradition and redaction in Mark 8:38–9:1 may

⁷⁹ Cf. the contrast between Mark 10:47–48, 11:9–10 (the Messiah as the son/descendant of David) and Mark 12:35–37 (Jesus’s questioning of the idea that the Christ is the son of David). On God’s kingship in the Psalter as a background to Mark, see recently Rowe, *God’s Kingdom and God’s Son*.

⁸⁰ See Stuedel, “The Eternal Reign of the People of God,” 507–25 who counters a previous hypothesis of ‘collective messianism’ presented by H. Stegemann at the IOQS Paris Meeting in 1992.

⁸¹ Stuedel, “The Eternal Reign of the People of God,” 524 affirms the eschatological dimension to “the kingdom of the people of God (which) clearly corresponds to and manifests the kingdom of God”; Dunn, *Jesus Remembered*, 390–401 includes eschatological elements in his survey of Second Temple Jewish notions of God’s kingdom, considering this to be a “context of expectation” to the New Testament (396).

⁸² See the comments by Kloppenborg, “The Sayings Gospel Q and the Quest of the Historical Jesus,” 340 n. 132; Künzi, *Das Naherwartungslogion Markus 9,1 par.*, concludes from a survey of scholarship that “die Echtheit des Wortes umstritten ist” (184–5).

⁸³ Zager, *Gottesherrschaft und Endgericht in der Verkündigung Jesu*, 250–3 deems Mark 8:38 secondary to Q 12:8–9, but includes Mark 9:1 among evidence that the historical Jesus considered God’s reign and judgement to be inseparable (311–6), with bibliography on page 311 n. 4; Evans, *Mark 8:27–16:20*, 25 and 27–30 at 29 further argues that Mark 9:1 contains “authentic material”.

be aided by comparison with other Marcan sayings. When this evaluation is established, we can then probe the question of which significance this Marcan passage could have for the first-century readers of Mark.

The Marcan sayings to which Mark 8:38–9:1 or, individually, Mark 9:1 has most usually been related in terms of language and ideas are Mark 13:26, 30 and 14:62.⁸⁴ R.T. France provides a clear rationale for the supposed connection: the sayings share similar climactic expressions, a similar time span of the “lifetime of some of those present”, and a common scriptural background in Daniel 7:13–14.⁸⁵ Depending on the literal or metaphorical interpretation of these supposedly interconnected sayings, Mark 9:1 has been interpreted in eschatological terms of ‘Naherwartung’⁸⁶ or rather in terms of historical vindication.⁸⁷ Other interpretations of Mark 9:1 take the saying to have a more or less metaphorical force, relating it symbolically to the transfiguration narrative (Mark 9:2–8),⁸⁸ attributing a Semitic “touch of hyperbole for emphasis” to it,⁸⁹ or reading it as the embodiment and enactment of Jewish expectations about the kingdom “in and through (Jesus) himself”.⁹⁰

I propose an alternative interpretation of the saying in Mark 9:1, exploring the possibility that it may be a veiled reference to Jesus’

⁸⁴ Lambrecht, *Die Redaktion der Markus-Apokalypse*, 181–4, 189–93; France, *Jesus and the Old Testament*, 139–40; idem, *The Gospel of Mark*, 342–4; Beasley-Murray, *Jesus and the Last Days*, 428–9; Zager, *Gottesherrschaft und Endgericht*, 171 discusses Mark 9:1 together with Mark 4:11–12, 13:26, and 14:62, while noting on page 191 that Mark 9:1 and 13:30 attest to the expectation that final judgement and God’s reign will take place within the lifetime of some contemporaries of Jesus, i.e. the elect (170–1, 307); cf. 288 and n. 265.

⁸⁵ France, *The Gospel of Mark*, 342–4 at 344, who considers Mark 13:26 together with Mark 13:30.

⁸⁶ See e.g. Künzi, *Das Naherwartungslogion Markus 9,1 par.*

⁸⁷ France, *Jesus and the Old Testament*, 140 relates the nature of the manifestation in Mark 9:1 to that in Mark 13:26, which he considers “as the climax of Jesus’ prediction of the destruction of Jerusalem” (227–39 at 239); idem, *The Gospel of Mark*, 345 remains more general, observing about Mark 9:1 that “God has powerfully taken control of events and was working out his purpose in history”; Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God*, 365 relates the “timing of the kingdom”, as suggested by Mark 9:1, Mark 13, and Matt 10:23, to ‘vindication’ through destruction within a generation, i.e. the Jewish War. On Mark 13, see below.

⁸⁸ B.D. Chilton’s view as cited by Evans, *Mark 8:27–16:20*, 28, reading Mark 9:1 as “an assurance that the coming of the kingdom of God is as certain as is the immortality of the immortals”, Enoch, Elijah, and Moses.

⁸⁹ Evans, *Mark 8:27–16:20*, 28, who further observes that “Jesus’ words (in Mark 9:1) may very well have been in reference to his exorcisms”, but then refers to a Lucan passage, Luke 11:20, in support of this idea; at page 29 he alternatively relates Mark 9:1 to Mark 13:28–32 and 14:25.

⁹⁰ Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God*, 651–3.

resurrection.⁹¹ The resurrection of the Son of man from the dead is mentioned immediately after the transfiguration narrative (Mark 9:9), so that the notion of Jesus' resurrection may play in the background or, at least, it may not be far removed from our passage. The idea that the kingdom of God will have come *with power* may be identified with Jesus' resurrection, since the 'kingdom of God' can symbolically stand for the afterlife (Mark 9:45, 47) and resurrection is associated with the power of God (Mark 12:24; 1 Cor 6:14, 15:43). To read Jesus' resurrection into Mark 9:1 may here appropriately imply that the kingdom of God is centered around Jesus, since the preceding verse, Mark 8:38, mentioned the coming of the Son of man.⁹² The difference between the two verses is that Mark 8:38 addresses Jesus' disciples and, beyond them, Mark's readers in an undetermined future tense, whereas the future tense in Mark 9:1 is determined by the life time of "some standing here" and the perfect tense of the participle ἐληλυθῆσαν. When interpreted in light of Jesus' resurrection, Mark 9:1 appears to serve as a premiss for the idea that the Son of man will come "in the glory of his Father with the holy angels" (Mark 8:38). In a Palestinian Jewish context, resurrection of the dead could be understood as one of several manifestations of God's kingdom. 4Q521 2 II 7 and 11–12, with its references to an 'eternal kingdom', מלכות עד, and God's revivification of the dead, ומתים יחיה, affirms this.⁹³ Since the belief in Jesus' resurrection was central to earliest Christian kerygma (Mark 8:31, 9:9, 31, 10:34, 16:6–7; 1 Cor 15:1–28; Acts 1:22, 2:31–32, 4:2), it may not be surprising that this would be regarded as a powerful sign that the kingdom of God had come. The veiled reference to Jesus' resurrection fits into the Marcan

⁹¹ This idea is not entirely new, since Beasley-Murray, *Jesus and the Last Days*, 428 already observed that seeing the Son of man, being the same "as seeing the kingdom of God come with power (9:1)", "is not unrelated to seeing Jesus in the resurrection (16:7)". Yet the focus of this view aims to depart from both traditional views of 'Naherwartung' and the historical interpretation in view of prophecies about Jerusalem.

⁹² The identification of the Son of man in Mark 8:38 with Jesus is justified by Evans, *Mark 8:27–16:20*, p. 27 because "in the wider context Jesus speaks of his own suffering and shameful treatment (vv 31 and 34)". Cf. the juxtapositions between first and third person singular in Mark 10:33 and Mark 10:35–45 at 39–40 and 45.

⁹³ In spite of a caveat by Davies, "Death, Resurrection, and Life after Death", 208–9 that 'resurrection' is a possible, but not compelling reading of ומתים יחיה in 4Q521 2 II 12, many Qumran scholars, like É. Puech, J.J. Collins, H. Lichtenberger, M.A. Knibb, J.D. Tabor, and M.O. Wise, agree that this passage provides one of the few instances of 'unambiguous evidence' about resurrection in the literature of Qumran; cf. chapter four.

secrecy motif, while it is only after the transfiguration narrative that the message of resurrection becomes more explicit (Mark 9:9).

The sequence of Mark 8:38–9:1 should be understood in terms of an eschatological tension, rather than a prophecy about historical vindication, since the broader context of Mark 8:34–9:1 does not focus on historical events but on theological themes of discipleship (8:34) and salvation (8:35–37).⁹⁴

In a survey of scholarship about Mark 9:1 up to the early 1970s, it has been pointed out that Jesus' resurrection cannot be equated with the heavenly kingdom or the coming of Christ in his kingdom.⁹⁵ Yet this argument against the interpretation of Mark 9:1 in light of Jesus' resurrection ignores the distinction between Mark 8:38 and 9:1. The phrase καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς at the beginning of Mark 9:1 may attest to Mark's editorial activity, purposely interweaving sayings material about theological conviction (Jesus' resurrection) and eschatological expectation (the heavenly kingdom and the Parousia). The theological purpose of the evangelist probably consists in presenting the gospel of Jesus Christ (Mark 1:1) as an earthly manifestation of the heavenly kingdom, which not only anticipates on the final age (Mark 1:15), but assures that God's kingdom already challenged the power of death through the vision of the risen Jesus (Mark 8:31; 9:1.9).

3.2.3. *The Son of Man and Elijah (Mark 9:9–13)*

The resurrection of the Son of man is further spelled out at the beginning of the pericope of Mark 9:9–13;⁹⁶ an enigmatic saying for the disciples (Mark 9:10) which ultimately elicits their question of 'why do the scribes say that first Elijah must come?' (Mark 9:11; RSV). The

⁹⁴ In this respect, France, *The Gospel of Mark*, 344 and Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God*, 365 interpret Mark 9:1 too much in conjunction with and in light of Mark 13, and therefore out of its proper context.

⁹⁵ Künzi, *Das Naherwartungslogion Markus 9,1 par.*, 200–1 nn. 45–6, referring to a commentary on Matthew by P.A. Gratz (Tübingen 1823, 149) and to A. Loisy's *Les Évangiles synoptiques* (vol. 2, page 28).

⁹⁶ Mark 9:9–13 may be considered as a pericope, since the Marcan Jesus's response to the disciples' question (v. 11) draws an analogy between Elijah and the Son of man (v. 12); the latter's resurrection from the dead being the subject in Mark 9:9–10. France, *The Gospel of Mark*, 357–9 relates Mark 8:11 to the transfiguration narrative with its mention of Elijah and Mark 8:12–13 to Mark 6:14–15, 16–29; 8:28, 31, but does not pay attention to a possible connection with the immediately preceding verses in Mark 9:9–10. Matthew's reading (Matt 17:9–13) makes the connection between the saying about the resurrection of the Son of man, as in Mark 9:9, with the disciples' question about Elijah, as in Mark 9:11, more explicit.

disciples' question presupposes a connection between resurrection in general (cf. Mark 9:10) and the coming of Elijah, while attributing this idea to the scribes of that time. Several biblical as well as post-biblical Jewish texts refer to Elijah's coming as a sign of the 'Day of the Lord' or the final age (Mal 4:5; Sir 48:10; *Sib.Or.* 2.187–9), while *m. Sot.* 9.15 explicitly links Elijah's coming to the resurrection of the dead, תחיית המתים. The Qumran text *4QVision^b ar* (4Q558) 1 II 4 further mentions the future-oriented sending of Elijah: לכן אשלח לאליה, "to you I will send Elijah".⁹⁷ Jesus' answer in Mark 9:12–13 draws an analogy between Elijah and the Son of man (Mark 9:12–13). This answer presupposes that Elijah's role "to restore all things" (Mark 9:12) serves as an eschatological precursor to the Son of man. The idea of restoration that the Marcan Jesus utters probably echoes the idea of reconciliation in Malachi (MT Mal 3:24 / LXX Mal 3:23).⁹⁸ On the other hand, the analogy between the Son of man and Elijah does not have a clear point of connection with biblical and early Jewish literature that mentions a 'Son of man' (e.g. Daniel 7, *1 Enoch* 37–71). Yet the idea of a prophetic precursor to a messianic final age may not be without a contemporary Jewish parallel (cf. IQS IX 11). Apart from the issue of Jesus' place among Jewish and earliest Christian messianic expectations, it stands to reason that the historical Jesus conceived of his own mission in terms of vindication and resurrection in response to his treatment as a rejected prophet (Mark 6:4 par.; *G.Th.* 31 / *P.Oxy.* 1 ll. 30–35) and his violent fate. Prophetic inspiration and eschatological orientation in sayings of Jesus may have general points of analogy in biblical and early Jewish tradition.⁹⁹ This may further apply to the saying about the powerful manifestation of God's kingdom in Mark 9:1.¹⁰⁰

⁹⁷ Text and translation from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition.* 2, 1114–5.

⁹⁸ The Septuagint uses the same verb, ἀποκαθιστάσθαι, as Mark 9:12 does; cf. *m. 'Ed.* 8.7 which also quotes Mal 3:24 as evidence of the eschatological belief that Elijah will come 'to make peace in the world'. Note that the reconciliation is the opposite of the family division envisaged in Mark 13:12.

⁹⁹ Vindication occurs in, e.g., Isaiah's third and fourth 'Servant Songs' in a context of prophetic affliction (Isa 50:4–11 at vv. 8–9, and Isa 53:7–12), while Isa 52:13 attributes to the prophet as God's suffering servant that he will be exalted and lifted up (MT וְנִשְׂאָ וְנִשְׂאָ, LXX ὑψωθήσεται καὶ δοξασθήσεται). See also Kellermann, *Auferstanden in den Himmel*, 134–42 who observes that 2 Maccabees 7 provides religion-historical evidence for the argument that the historical Jesus did expect and announce his own (heavenly) resurrection.

¹⁰⁰ I thereby agree with the conclusion of Evans, *Mark 8:27–16:20*, 29 that Mark 9:1 does "makes sense in the life setting of Jesus (*Sitz im Leben Jesu*)" and contains "authentic material"; note that Künzi, *Das Naherwartungslogion Markus 9,1 par.*, 186–212 also

3.2.4. *Eschatological Rewards and Punishments (Mark 9:41, 9:42–50, 10:29–30, 12:40b)*

A number of Marcan passages with a possible eschatological dimension, Mark 9:41, 9:42–50, 10:29–30 and 12:40b, may be considered together, since, as it will be argued, these passages are all about eschatological rewards and punishments.

Mark 9:41 closes a pericope on the justification of ‘mighty works’ in Jesus’ name with the saying that “whoever gives you a cup of water to drink because you bear the name of Christ, will by no means lose his reward” (RSV). This saying comprises late elements, as we have seen (see the end of the section on ‘The Marcan Community’ above). Yet, a variant reading, which has ἐν ὀνόματι μου instead of ἐν ὀνόματι ὅτι Χριστοῦ ἐστε, may suggest that a core of this saying could go back to Jesus-tradition.¹⁰¹ It is probable that the ‘reward’, ὁ μισθός, is a shorthand for the eschatological reward of eternal life. While Mark 9:41 concludes with the affirmation that those outside the circle of disciples who ‘are not against us’ but in fact supportive will be rewarded, Mark 9:42–50 turns to a warning against everyone who leads believers to sin (cf. Mark 9:42, 49) about consequences in the afterlife. Since the transition between the two pericopes, Mark 9:38–41 and 9:42–48, is not marked by editorial comments, like, for instance, καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς in Mark 9:1, it may be supposed that there are some points of connection in the course of the transition. Probably, then, the reward in Mark 9:41 denotes the afterlife, thereby anticipating on what is more elaborately treated in the subsequent pericope. The sequence of the text is further oriented toward the afterlife, as the below discussion of Mark 9:42–48, 49–50 indicates.

Mark 9:42–50 is a pericope which warns against temptations to induce followers of Jesus to sin¹⁰² or to be induced to sin (Mark 9:42–48), while turning to the special charge of discipleship in verses 49–50. The most explicit identification of the ‘kingdom of God’ with eternal life

argued that Mark 9:1 par. “ist in seiner Substanz als echtes Jesuswort zu betrachten”, even though he interpreted it in conjunction with the expected Parousia.

¹⁰¹ Cf. Evans, *Mark 8:27–16:20*, p. 66 who considers the clause ἐν ὀνόματι ὅτι Χριστοῦ ἐστε to constitute “the principal objection to the statement’s authenticity”; France, *The Gospel of Mark*, p. 378 observes that the title Χριστός “will be the basis of people’s treatment of Jesus’ disciples after his death”.

¹⁰² Perhaps the terminology in Mark 9:42, οἱ μικροὶ οὗτοι οἱ πιστεύοντες εἰς ἐμέ, may be analogous with Paul’s exhortation that those who make the weak (in conscience) stumble ‘sin against Christ’ (1 Cor 8:7–13).

occurs in this pericope (Mark 9:43, 47), being juxtaposed to Gehenna (Mark 9:43, 45, 47), the apocalyptic Jewish designation for hell.¹⁰³ This identification shows that the 'kingdom of God' could take on these eschatological overtones in Jesus' teachings.

Mark 10:29–30 is part of a pericope which stipulates the detachment from worldly riches for the sake of the kingdom of God (Mark 10:17–31), after Jesus' response to the rich man's question what he should do to inherit eternal life, ζῶν ἰώνιον κληρονομεῖν (Mark 10:17–22). Mark 10:29–30 concludes that the reward for the detachment, even from one's family, for the sake of Jesus and the gospel (v. 29) already manifests itself "in this time" through the hundredfold acceptance in the 'family' of Jesus' followers, "with persecutions, and in the age to come eternal life" (v. 30, RSV). It is possible that Jesus warned about tribulation, in particular persecutions. Yet the flow of the text in verses 29–30 and the singular juxtaposition between νῦν ἐν τῷ καιρῷ τούτῳ and ὁ αἰὼν ὁ ἐρχόμενος in Mark 10:30 suggests that verse 30 reflects late editorial interests. The reference to persecutions, διωγμοί, may well address the Marcan audience from a discourse perspective. The juxtaposition of two ages could parallel the eschatological tension between Jesus' inauguration of the final age and his second coming at the end of time; a theological perspective which had probably crystallized by the time the evangelist composed the Gospel of Mark.¹⁰⁴ The eschatological dimension in Mark 10:29–30 may therefore be assigned to a redactional level of the text.

The third passage which reflects the issue of eschatological rewards and punishments is the conclusion to the pericope in which the practices and pretension of scribes is denounced (Mark 12:38–40).¹⁰⁵ The

¹⁰³ The term Gehenna as the place of eschatological punishment is unparalleled in the Hebrew Bible, but it does occur in early Jewish, mainly apocalyptic, literature (*1 Enoch* 26–27; *Sib. Or.* 1.103, 2.292; *Mart. Isa.* 1.3; cf. *m. 'Ed.* 2.10 and *m. 'Abot* 1.5, 5.19–20); cf. BDAG, ³2000, pp. 190–1. Sectarian Qumran texts, like 1QS IV 12–14 and 1QH^a XI 16–19, rather employ biblical language, such as Sheol, Abaddon (cf. Prov 15:11, 27:20), the pit (cf. Ps 55:24), fire (Isa 66:24), destruction, and dark regions (Ps 143:3).

¹⁰⁴ A two-ages doctrine is absent from Paul's Letters; the rabbinic-sounding distinction between ὁ αἰὼν οὗτος and ὁ αἰὼν μέλλων figures in the Deutero-Pauline Letter to the Ephesians 1:21. Paul distinguishes between ὁ αἰὼν οὗτος (1 Cor 1:20, 2:6.8; 2 Cor 4:4; Rom 12:2) or 'the present evil age', ὁ αἰὼν ὁ ἐνεστώς πονηρός, in Gal 1:4, and 'the end', τὸ τέλος (1 Cor 1:8, 15:24), implying multiple periodization.

¹⁰⁵ I disagree with the generalizing reading of Mark 12:38–40 in terms of parting of the ways by Zager, *Gottesherrschaft und Endgericht*, 287 who takes the scribes to stand for "Funktionsträger der eigenen religiösen Gemeinschaft", in view of divergent views of scribes in Mark (cf. the praise of a scribe in Mark 12:28–34).

Marcan Jesus observes that “they will receive the greater condemnation”, περισσότερον κρίμα (Mark 12:40b, RSV). The future tense in this announcement of judgement against the scribes with their reproachable behaviour denotes final judgement.¹⁰⁶

The eschatological perspective of rewards and punishments in the afterlife in the three above passages corresponds to literary strands of Jewish thought contemporary to Jesus.¹⁰⁷ Josephus attributes a belief in punishments and rewards in the afterlife to the Pharisees and Essenes (*J.W.* 2.157, 163, 165; cf. *Ant.* 18.14), while Philo devoted a treatise to the subject *On Rewards and Punishments*. 2 Maccabees 7 provides information about such beliefs in a context of martyrdom (2 Macc 7:9, 14, 17–19, 35–36). Palestinian Jewish texts abundantly attest to eschatological perspectives of reward and judgement (see e.g. *1 Enoch* 1, 22, 103; *Jub.* 23:27–31; *4 Ezra* 7:32–44; *2 Baruch* 50–51). The literature of Qumran attests to sectarian ideas of eschatological judgement, משפט, and ‘all the glory of Adam’, כול כבוד אדם,¹⁰⁸ for the righteous (1QS IV 6–8, 9–14, 18–26; 1QH^a IV 14–15; CD-A I 1–2, III 20), while including possibly non-sectarian perspectives on the final age as a dominion of justice which terminates all wickedness (e.g. 4Q215a (*4QTime of Righteousness*); 4Q475 (*4QRenewed Earth*); 4Q521 2 II and 7 + 5 II).¹⁰⁹ This contemporary Jewish context may indicate that the notions of reward and judgement can probably be attributed to the historical Jesus as a Jewish teacher.

¹⁰⁶ See Zager, *ibidem*, 282–8 at 286 (“das eschatologische Gericht”); Evans, *Mark* 8:27–16:20, 279 on κρίμα in Mark 12:40b as “primarily eschatological”; France, *The Gospel of Mark*, 492 claims that the reference “must be to God’s eschatological judgement”; Van Iersel, *Mark*, 384 interprets Mark 12:40b as Jesus’ “sentence that they (the scribes) will receive the greater condemnation on judgment day”.

¹⁰⁷ Cf. e.g. Isa 62:11, Ps 9:16, Ezek 5:8, Dan 12, Isa 24–27. Non-literary, epigraphic evidence about Jewish beliefs in (post-mortem) judgement and eternal life is relatively scarce, as Park, *Conceptions of Afterlife in Jewish Inscriptions*, 188 has noted, while citing a few late examples from Beth She’arim (*BS* ii 162, 183 and 194), Asia Minor, and Leontopolis (*JIGRE* 36) on pages 143–8.

¹⁰⁸ The ‘glory of Adam’, כבוד אדם, occurs in conjunction with ‘eternal life’, חיי נצח, in CD-A III 20. 1QH^a IV 15 mentions כבוד אדם together with an ‘abundance of days’, רוב ימים.

¹⁰⁹ On 4Q215a and 4Q475, see chapter 2, section 2.2. On 4Q521 as a non-sectarian text belonging to a broader strands of Palestinian Judaism, see Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination*, 173, and *idem*, *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 124–8, noting the lack of community terminology in 4Q521.

3.2.5. *The Question about Eschatological Resurrection* (Mark 12:18–27)

Mark 12:18–27, the next pericope in which an eschatological theme is at issue, describes a dispute between Jesus and the Sadducees “who say that there is no resurrection (ἀνάστασις)” (Mark 12:18, RSV).¹¹⁰ The subject of resurrection clearly has a setting in the final age, as the expression of time ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει (Mark 12:23), the described nature of those risen from the dead “like angels in the heavens” (Mark 12:25) and contextual information about contemporary Jewish and Christian belief in the resurrection¹¹¹ indicate. The organization of the material, as part of other confrontations of Jesus with Jewish schools of the time (cf. Mark 12:13–17, 28, 35–40) reflects Marcan editorial activity, but this is not to deny the probability that individual sayings about the resurrection can be related to Jesus.¹¹²

3.2.6. *The Eschatological Discourse* (Mark 13:3–37)

Much previous scholarship on Mark 13 has been engaged in redaction-critical concerns to reconstruct the sources of the Marcan eschatological discourse and its social setting. The sources discussed in previous scholarship are a written *Vorlage*, often identified in verses 7f.14–20.24–27,¹¹³ and oral traditions going back to sayings of Jesus.¹¹⁴ Certain scholars

¹¹⁰ The parallel pericope in Matt 22:23–33 hardly differs from Mark 12:18–27, whereas Luke 20:27–40 at vv. 35–37, 38b–40 adds several points, while dropping the direct form of rebuke altogether, which Kilgallen, “The Sadducees and Resurrection from the Dead: Luke 20,27–40,” 478–95 at 481 has called “*ad hominem*-type statements”. Cf. Acts 4:1–2, 23:8; *J.W.* 2.165; *Ant.* 18.16; a variant reading of *m. Ber.* 9.5 attributes the conviction that “there is but one world” to the Sadducees (Danby, *The Mishnah*, 10 and n. 7).

¹¹¹ E.g. Dan 12:1–4; *1 Enoch* 51; *2 Maccabees* 7; *T. Judah* 25:1–5; *Sib. Or.* 2.214–237; *2 Baruch* 51; *1 Cor* 15; *John* 5:29, 11:24.

¹¹² Cf. Evans, *Mark 8:27–16:20*, 252 on Mark 12:18–27 as “a piece of genuine, but reworked and recontextualized, exegesis from Jesus in support of the resurrection”.

¹¹³ This identification of a written *Vorlage* was supported by Hahn, “Die Rede von der Parusie des Menschensohnes Markus 13,” 240–66; Brandenburger, *Markus 13 und die Apokalyptik*, 23–30, 32–41; and Schnelle, *Einleitung*, 246. Cf. Pesch, *Naherwartungen* (Mark 13:6a.c.22.7b.8.12.13b.14–17.18?.19–20a.24–27); idem, *Das Markusevangelium*. 2, 264–318 (Mark 13:3–5.7–9.11–22.24–31); and Gnllka, *Das Evangelium nach Markus*. 2, 179–216 (Mark 13:6.22.7.8.12.13b.14.17.18.19.20.24.25–27).

¹¹⁴ For instance, Pesch, “Markus 13,” 355–68 at 358–9 assigns Mark 13:3–4.9b.11.12.13a.28–31 to oral Jesus-tradition; Brandenburger, *Markus 13 und die Apokalyptik*, 75, 87–147, 166–7 identifies this in Mark 13:1b–2.9b.11–13.21–23.30–34.35b–36 (‘Schul- oder Lehrgesprächen’ and ‘eschatologische Jesuslogien’).

have argued for the possibility that parts of Mark 13 may go back to Q tradition,¹¹⁵ but the supposition of Mark's use of Q has been refuted in several recent studies.¹¹⁶ The identification of (parts of) the Marcan eschatological discourse with a Christian-Jewish apocalypse has a long-standing history.¹¹⁷ Yet the idea of a written source underlying Mark 13 has been problematised in more recent scholarly contributions.¹¹⁸ Some scholars have rejected the characterisation of Mark 13 as an apocalypse and emphasised the anti-apocalyptic features of Mark 13.¹¹⁹

Notwithstanding these problematic issues, the redaction-critical enterprise remains pertinent to the study of Mark 13. For instance, the fact that Mark addresses the reader(s) in an exceptionally direct way (Mark 13:14) elicits the critical question about how the historical context of Mark's editorial aside¹²⁰ may be understood and how this relates to the earlier context of traditions about Jesus. Opposing interpretations

¹¹⁵ See Lambrecht, *Die Redaktion der Markus-Apokalypse*, 100–5 (“Die Q-Herkunft der VV. 5b–6 und 21–22”), 115–41 (“Mk 13,9–13 und Q”); Neiryneck, “Marc 13. Examen critique de l'interprétation de R. Pesch,” 369–401 at 400 and n. 97 refers to an argument by R. Pesch, in his monograph *Naherwartungen*, that the resemblance between Mark 13:21.24–26 and Matt 24:26.27 / Luke 17:23.24 can be explained in terms of Mark's dependence on the ‘Q apocalypse’.

¹¹⁶ See e.g. Marcus, *Mark 1–8*, 51–3 referring to studies by C.M. Tuckett, T.A. Friedrichsen, and F. Neiryneck.

¹¹⁷ See Beasley-Murray, *Jesus and the Last Days*, 1–79 (on the ‘Little Apocalypse Theory’); Brandenburger, *Markus 13 und die Apokalyptik*, 22–40 (“Kritische Analyse von Rekonstruktionstypen”).

¹¹⁸ Collins, “The Eschatological Discourse of Mark 13,” 1125–40 and Verheyden, “Persecution and Eschatology. Mk 13,9–13,” 1141–59.

¹¹⁹ The ‘anti-apocalyptic’ view about Mark 13 was already advocated by Pesch, *Naherwartungen*, 24, 46, 119, 122. Yet see the criticism by Brandenburger, *Markus 13 und die Apokalyptik*, 10–11 and *passim*. For recent views which de-emphasise apocalypticism in Mark 13, see e.g. Geddert, *Watchwords: Mark 13 in Marcan Eschatology*, 18 who dismisses Brandenburger's study, arguing that it “fails to read the chapter in its Gospel context”; France, *The Gospel of Mark*, 497–546.

¹²⁰ Scholarship has tended to regard the tradition about the ‘desolating sacrilege’ as secondary. On Mark 13:14 par. as secondary tradition, see Pesch, *Markus 13*, 358 (Mark 13:14–20 as “der aktuellste Teil der vormk Apkalypse”, a pamphlet addressing Judaean congregations); Neiryneck, “Marc 13. Examen critique,” 369 (on the *Vorlage* to Mark 13 as “un tract (judéo-)chrétien du début de la guerre juive (67)”); Collins, “The Eschatological Discourse of Mark 13,” 1136 (on Mark 13:14 as “an element of high importance at the final stage of the composition of the gospel”); Burnett, *The Testament of Jesus-Sophia*, 300–38 at 323 (Matt “24:15–22 seems to be derived from a Jewish apocalypse with little or no ‘Christian’ content”); Agbanou, *Le discours eschatologique*, 85–8 at 87 (Mark 13:14 and Matt 24:15 as two specimens of a “vue rétrospective”); Zmijevski, *Die Eschatologiereden*, 192 (on the “Umdeutung” of Mark 13:14–23 in Luke 21:20–24). Recently, Becker, “Markus 13 Re-Visited,” 95–124 at 106–12 has interpreted Mark 13:14 as reference to the destruction of the Temple, deeming Mark 13:14–23 to constitute a transition from ‘historical to eschatological time’ (112).

have been proposed for the second-person plural instructions, addressing primarily Jesus' disciples¹²¹ or rather Mark's readers.¹²²

Mark 13:3–37, traditionally designated as the 'eschatological discourse', is intensively debated in studies on eschatology in Mark and on Jesus and eschatology.¹²³ More recent scholarship has rightly moved away from assumptions that a detailed reconstruction of a (written or oral) *Vorlage* to Mark 13 can be undertaken¹²⁴ and that the Marcan text should be understood as an apocalypse.¹²⁵ Nevertheless, the identification of an eschatological orientation in (parts of) Mark 13:3–37 is the subject of ongoing debate. The debate is most of all focused on the question whether Mark 13:24–27.30 is about the expected Parousia (G.R. Beasley-Murray, D. Wenham, and others) or historical events and vindication (R.T. France, N.T. Wright), and to a lesser extent on the material in Mark 13:32–37. An important factor in the evaluation of the divergent interpretations is the decision whether and in which way the Marcan evidence should be taken literally or metaphorically. Pending further discussion of Mark 13:3–31 and 13:32–37, it is beyond dispute that the Marcan text addresses eschatological expectations of disciples of Jesus and, beyond them, of the Marcan audience.

The intranarrative audience addressed by the Marcan Jesus's discourse in Mark 13:3–37, consists of Peter, James, John and Andrew (Mark 13:3). These four disciples were the first mentioned followers of Jesus (Mark 1:16–20). This information could serve to assure the Marcan audience that the earliest followers of Jesus had already been instructed

¹²¹ France, *The Gospel of Mark*, 499 interprets these instructions as "addressed to the disciples".

¹²² See e.g. Fowler, *Let the Reader Understand*, 85, "Jesus' words in the story function primarily at the discourse level, and the second-person plural pronouns point primarily at Mark's, not Jesus', audience".

¹²³ For extensive bibliography, see e.g. Evans, *Mark 8:27–16:20*, 293–4, 300–2f.

¹²⁴ Pesch, *Naherwartungen*; idem, "Markus 13," 355–68; and Neiryndck, "Marc 13. Examen critique," 369–401 presupposed a *Vorlage* to Mark 13. Collins, "Mark 13," 1125–40 at 1129–32, notes that "the arguments in favor of the use of a written, coherent source in Mark 13 are not compelling" (1131), while Verheyden, "Persecution and Eschatology," 1141–59, questions the "need for a *Vorlage*" (1159).

¹²⁵ For a survey of scholarship on and discussion of the 'little apocalypse theory', see Beasley-Murray, *Jesus and the Last Days*, 1–79. Against this theory, see e.g. Neiryndck, "Le discours anti-apocalyptique de Mc 13," 598–608; Schenk, "The Testamental Disciple-Instruction," 213 n. 12: "the theory of a 'little apocalypse' underlying Mk 13 can no longer be regarded, without qualification, as a *sententia recepta* of synoptic criticism"; France, *The Gospel of Mark*, 498: "it has been increasingly recognised in recent study that to describe Mark 13 as 'apocalyptic' is misleading".

about future tribulation in Jesus' name and about misguided as well as legitimate expectations.

Since Mark 13 comprises sections which bear some relation to historical events in the first century CE up to the Jewish War (e.g. Mark 13:9–13, 14–23),¹²⁶ it seems appropriate to begin with evaluating the historical, especially non-eschatological, interpretations and then to return to the question whether and how Mark 13 comprises an eschatologically oriented message.

The question posed by the four disciples, “when will this be, and what will be the sign when these things are all to be accomplished?” (Mark 13:4, RSV), has been interpreted as an inquiry about which events would lead up to the destruction of the Temple, as prophesied in verse 2.¹²⁷ Yet, if we read Mark 13:5–31 as a response to this question, the answer is couched in at times enigmatic apocalyptic terms (e.g. vv. 19–20, 24–27). R.T. France and N.T. Wright have taken such apocalyptic terms to symbolize the climactic historical events of the Jewish War and its aftermath.¹²⁸ A metaphorical reading may be justified in certain cases,¹²⁹ including perhaps Mark 13:19–20. However, it seems hard to understand for which ‘great power and glory’ the coming of the Son of man (Mark 13:26) stands, if we read the discourse up to verses 24–27 exclusively in relation to the historical events of the end of the Jewish War.

¹²⁶ Adams, “The Coming of the Son of Man,” 54–5 who interprets Mark 13:5–27 in eschatological terms, leaves room for the idea that Mark 13:5–23 incorporates “current or soon expected events” (55); Evans, *Mark 8:27–16:20*, 318–9 argues that no scholarly suggestion about first-century events fits Jesus’ prophecy. Yet it is unclear why the evidence of desolation (*J.W.* 6.288) and Roman sacrifice to their standards in the Temple court (*J.W.* 6.316) may not correspond to the ‘abomination of desolation’ in Mark 13:14.

¹²⁷ Evans, *Mark 8:27–16:20*, 304 notes about “ταῦτα, ‘these things’” that “the temple’s destruction cannot be an isolated event”; France, *The Gospel of Mark*, 506 relates the twofold question to the time of destruction and to the preparatory sign. Verheyden, “Persecution and Eschatology,” 1159 discerned a “combined experience of dramatic events”, not only the “acute experience of war” as background to Mark’s discourse.

¹²⁸ France, *Jesus and the Old Testament*, 235–6 on Mark 13:26 and the use of Daniel 7:13: “Jesus is speaking of the fall of Jerusalem”; idem, *The Gospel of Mark*, 534 interprets vv. 26–27 as a prediction about “the new order which is to take its place” after 70 CE; Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God*, 339–65 at 360–5.

¹²⁹ The metaphorical reading of Mark 13:31 by Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God*, 364–5 may be more plausible than the literal reading by Fletcher-Louis, “Jesus, the Temple and the Dissolution,” 140 in view of the subject change between Mark 13:30 and 13:31 and of similar wordings in Matt 5:18 and Luke 16:17.

There is a scholarly line of thought which reads 'historical judgement' into Mark 13:24–27 at v. 26.¹³⁰ Yet explicit language of judgement does not occur anywhere in Mark 13, not even in verses 24–27. In fact, when we take the 'desolating sacrilege' in Mark 13:14 to stand for the desecration and destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple,¹³¹ the idea that "Jesus and his followers are vindicated in and through the destruction of Jerusalem"¹³² contradicts the flow of the Marcan text. Later Christian literature did interpret the destruction of Jerusalem in anti-Jewish terms as divine historical judgement (e.g. *Barn.* 16.1–5; Justin, *Dial.* 40.1), but it appears to be an ill-founded assumption to read this interpretation into Mark 13.

An important reason why R.T. France and N.T. Wright insist on a historical, i.e. non-eschatological interpretation of Mark 13:24–27 is the idea that the saying about 'this generation', ἡ γενεὰ αὐτῆς, in Mark 13:30 applies to the preceding sequence of the Marcan text.¹³³ Mark 13:30, which foretells that "this generation will not pass away before all these things take place" (RSV), does indeed pose a problem for eschatological interpretations,¹³⁴ since it is unclear how this saying could stand for anything else than an expected fulfillment of events during the lifetime of 'this generation', i.e. contemporaries of Jesus and his followers.¹³⁵

¹³⁰ France, *Jesus and the Old Testament*, 145; Brandenburger, *Markus 13 und die Apokalyptik*, 164; Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God*, 365.

¹³¹ See Schnelle, *Einleitung*, 238–9; Marcus, *Mark 1–8*, 37; France, *The Gospel of Mark*, 522–6.

¹³² Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God*, 365.

¹³³ France, *Jesus and the Old Testament*, 228 notes "the embarrassment which verse 30 creates for those who wish to see the whole chapter from verse 24 on as referring to the Parousia"; idem, *The Gospel of Mark*, 501 describes Mark 13:30 as a "quite unequivocal and very emphatic statement... that the events just described will take place before this generation has passed"; Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God*, 224 n. 96 and 470 n. 88 takes Mark 13:30 to be the literal language of a historical, non-eschatological prediction.

¹³⁴ See e.g. Künzi, *Das Naherwartungslogion Markus 9,1 par.*, 212–24 at 224 whose conclusion that Mark 13:30 speaks about both contemporaries of Jesus and the Parousia seems contradictory; Beasley-Murray, *Jesus and the Last Days*, 443–9 at 449 relates v. 30 "primarily to the prophecy of v. 2 and the signs in the discourse related to it", while upholding the eschatological interpretation of vv. 24–27 as a Parousia description (422–34); Evans, *Mark 8:27–16:20*, 335 applies τὰ πάντα to "the events leading up to and including the coming of the 'son of man'", events which "will take place within the span of a single generation"; yet this contradicts Evans' statement that it is "uncertain" when the "sudden and decisive appearance" of the son of man "will take place" (330), referring to Mark 13:32. Adams, "The Coming of the Son of Man," 39–61 does not discuss Mark 13:30.

¹³⁵ However, Lövestam, "The ἡ γενεὰ αὐτῆς. Eschatology in Mk 13,30 parr.," 403–13 explained Mark 13:30 in an eschatological sense, contrasting 'this generation' which

In view of the evidence of Mark 13:30 together with Jesus' prophecy (vv. 1–2) and the disciples' question (vv. 3–4), France has argued that the prophecy of the destruction of the Temple “must set the agenda for our interpretation of the discourse which follows”.¹³⁶

The exclusive claim of the non-eschatological interpretation of Mark 13:3–31 (or even 13:3–37) is not without problems either. Studies about Marcan compositional techniques do not necessarily support the idea that the evangelist composed a discourse having in mind a linear interpretation of events that led to the destruction of the Temple. The Marcan narrative is full of ‘intercalation’, “the dovetailing or interlacing of one pericope with another in an A-B-A pattern”; a literary technique that serves both literary and theological purposes.¹³⁷

In the case of Mark 13, the exploration of a possible intercalation pattern could throw new light on the problem of history and eschatology in the Marcan discourse. It is a conspicuous fact that Mark 13:24–27 stands out among the surrounding pericopes, verses 14–23 and 28–31, in that there is neither a first person singular speaker (as in vv. 23, 30–31) nor an addressed second person plural (as in vv. 14, 18, 21, 23, 28–30). On the contrary, Mark 13:24–27 describes cataclysmic events and the activity of the Son of man witnessed by a third person plural (ὄψονται). Perhaps Mark 13:14–23, 24–27, 28–31 may therefore be examined as an instance of intercalation, which could illuminate for what purpose Mark interwove eschatological expectation and historical experience.

In both Mark 13:14–23 and 13:28–31, the addressees of the discourse are urged to recognise that what they see (ἴδητε in vv. 14 and 29) taking place should warn them about imminent tribulation (vv. 17,¹³⁸ 19–20, 28–29). Both pericopes, Mark 13:14–23 and 13:28–31, emphasise that the words of Jesus can be relied upon for recognition of events which usher in great tribulation (vv. 23 and 31) and both pericopes address a

‘will not pass away’ with the generations of the flood and of the wilderness which “were removed from the face of the earth after which life continued” (412).

¹³⁶ France, *The Gospel of Mark*, p. 498.

¹³⁷ Citation from Telford, *The Theology of the Gospel of Mark*, 15–26 at 25, whose examples of ‘intercalation’ include material in Mark 3–6, 11, 14–15. See also Edwards, “Markan Sandwiches,” 193–216; Shepherd, “The Narrative Function of Marcan Intercalation,” 522–40.

¹³⁸ Verse 17 may be related to the tribulation mentioned in verse 19, in view of the parallelism between ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις (v. 17) and ἔσονται γὰρ αἱ ἡμέραι ἐκεῖναι (v. 19) and of the unity of at least vv. 14–20 (cf. Lambrecht, *Die Redaktion der Markus-Apokalypse*, 144–67; Beasley-Murray, *Jesus and the Last Days*, 407–8, 418) but also vv. 14–23 at large as a pericope (cf. Evans, *Mark 8:27–16:20*, 316–7).

foreseeable future (vv. 14–16 and 30). The two pericopes mention the seasons of winter (v. 18) and of summer (v. 28) respectively; seasons which play a prominent role in contemporary Jewish visions of theophany or judgement.¹³⁹

Between Mark 13:14–23 and 28–31, the pericope of Mark 13:24–27 stands out as the only passage in the Marcan discourse which mentions the Son of man, relating his ‘coming in clouds with great power and glory’ (RSV). There is no clear indication that the intranarrative audience of disciples or even the extranarrative audience takes part in this revelation of the Son of man, in view of the third person plural ὄψονται (v. 26), which we already noted. The events described in verses 24–27 relate to a period ‘after that tribulation’ (v. 24a). The introductory marker of time in verse 24a does not necessitate a period immediately after the tribulation mentioned in verses 19–20.¹⁴⁰ The context of the Marcan discourse (see vv. 7–8, 32–37) as well as the intertextuality with Daniel 12 (Dan 12:7 in Mark 13:4; Dan 12:1 in Mark 13:19)¹⁴¹ appear to provide a negative answer against suppositions of a clear eschatological timeframe. Perhaps the significance of the introductory phrase in verse 24a consists in drawing an analogy between the promise of salvation for those who withstand tribulation within the timespan of a generation and the gathering of the elect in the indefinite future.

An eschatological interpretation of Mark 13:24–27, which upholds the idea that verses 26–27 represent an idea of the Parousia, may stand on the basis of the following arguments. The coming of the Son of man (v. 26) is inextricably linked with the gathering of the elect ‘from the

¹³⁹ See e.g. *1 Enoch* 2:3, 3:1, 4:1 (cf. 4Q201 (4QEn^a ar) II 1–9 // 4Q204 (4QEn^c ar) I 20–27) which singles out the ‘signs of summer and winter’ within the larger context of an ‘oracle of judgement (1:2–5:9)’ (Nickelsburg and VanderKam, *1 Enoch: A New Translation*, 19 and 21). 4Q179 (4QapocrLam A) 1 II 8 mentions winter, הָרִיב, as an additional disadvantageous circumstance in a context of Jerusalem’s desolation (I II 7, 15; 2 4–9) and God’s wrath, לֵאָרֶץ (I II 3). 4Q423 (4QInstruction^s) 5 5 mentions the observation of the ‘fixed times of the summer’, קִיָּהּ הַקִּיָּהּ, in a context of instruction about reward and judgement (ll. 3–4), good and evil (l. 6); France, *The Gospel of Mark*, 537 has observed that “θέρος may have a particular connotation of harvest-time (ὁ θερισμός)”, which could also have figurative overtones.

¹⁴⁰ Adams, “The Coming of the Son of Man,” 53–5 attests to scholarly division about this question, ranging between ‘close chronological succession’ and ‘an interval’ of time. If preposition μετά were to be translated as ‘immediately after’, it could as well have been specified by, e.g., μετ’ οὐ πολύ, μετὰ μικρόν, μετὰ βραχύ, μετ’ ὀλίγον (see BDAG, ³2000, p. 638).

¹⁴¹ Dan 12:7 is elusive in its reference to the timespan, “a time, two times, and half a time”, before “all these things would be accomplished” (RSV).

ends of the earth to the ends of heaven' (v. 27).¹⁴² The gathering of the elect (v. 27) has eschatological overtones in Jewish traditions about Israel's restoration¹⁴³ and in the Marcan context which presupposes a future perspective of apostolic commission (cf. Mark 6:7–13, 30; 13:10; 16:15, 20). The intertextuality of verses 24b–25, which quote Isa 13:10 and 34:4, points to a notion of theophany connected with the 'day of the Lord', while the introductory phrase ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις (24a) also occurs in contexts of the announcement of the 'day of the Lord' (Joel 4:1) and of a messianic oracle (Jer 23:5–6). Yet judgement is not the focus of Mark 13:24–27, but rather salvation and vindication of the elect (v. 27).¹⁴⁴

If the interpretation of Mark 13:14–23, 24–27, 28–31 in terms of intercalation is accepted, its theological purpose and the reason for the repeated mention of tribulation (vv. 19–20, 24a) can be explained as follows. The idea that those who, being warned to take heed, endure tribulation and withstand attempts to be led astray are *mutatis mutandis* the 'elect' destined for salvation runs through the text of Mark 13:5–27 (vv. 5–6, 9–13, 20–22, 27, 33–37).¹⁴⁵ This recurring concern of the Marcan discourse may reflect the perspective of a 'refugee community' faced by the destruction of Jerusalem and the depths of human catastrophe in the aftermath of war (Mark 13:14–18). Since the Marcan discourse presupposes eschatological expectations on the part of the audience (e.g. vv. 7–8), it also warns against misguided signs of salvation (vv. 5–6, 21–23)¹⁴⁶

¹⁴² Cf. 1QM, which, apart from a reference to 'the chosen ones of his holy people', בְּחִירֵי עַם קוֹדֶשׁ (XII 1), also mentions 'the chosen ones of heaven', בְּחִירֵי שָׁמַיִם (XII 5), angels and holy ones (XII 1, 4).

¹⁴³ See Deut 30:1–3; Ps 106:47, 147:2; Isa 34:16–17, 35:10; 1QM 2–5; Acts 1:6. Cf. Dunn, *Jesus Remembered*, 393–4; Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God*, 202–9, 615–31.

¹⁴⁴ I disagree with France, *The Gospel of Mark*, 533 and Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God*, 339–67 who equate the sense of vindication in vv. 24–27 with the tribulation caused by Jerusalem's destruction. The Marcan text indicates that the tribulation will come upon all human beings (vv. 19–20), including the elect, while the divine intervention in verse 20 focuses on salvation through the shortening of days, not on judgement.

¹⁴⁵ The idea that an elect group, whom God chose (Mark 13:20), will not be led astray is paralleled by biblical and early Jewish notions of a remnant for Israel (e.g. Jer 50:20; CD-A I 1–5, שְׂאִירֵיט לְיִשְׂרָאֵל).

¹⁴⁶ *Contra* Beasley-Murray, *Jesus and the Last Days*, 392–8, who discusses verses 21–22 as though they follow verses 5–6 and precede verses 7–8. The fact that the Marcan discourse warns at different points against 'those who lead astray' should not be understood as repetition or 'doublets' (Pesch, *Naherwartungen*, 112), but as warnings in transcending order at different points of time leading up to the time of tribulation.

in the midst of tribulation, whose description in verses 19¹⁴⁷ and 20¹⁴⁸ does have overtones of theophany. From the contemporary communal perspective, in the shadow of the cataclysmic events of the Jewish War, a repeated reference to tribulation in verse 24a probably served to emphasise that, even in face of tribulation, salvation and vindication of the elect was assured (vv. 20, 22) and would be assured in the end (vv. 13b, 26–27).

The overall theological purpose of the Marcan discourse in verses 3–37 therefore is not to set a clearly calculable timeframe leading to the ‘day of the Lord’, which would be impossible as verse 32 may indicate, but to warn about the trials which will be ahead for those who follow Jesus’ teachings and to assure them of salvation of the elect at the same time. Mark 13:26–27 implies that the vindication of the Son of man consists in the gathering of the elect. The discourse also incorporates references to historical events like persecution, martyrdom, and the catastrophe of Jerusalem’s destruction, as verses 9–13 and 14 indicate.

It stands to reason that the eschatological discourse of Mark 13:3–37 in its present form is determined by later circumstances, those of a persecuted community living in the shadow of the Jewish War, and compositional perspectives, such as directions to the reader¹⁴⁹ and literary devices as intercalation and anticipation. This leaves the question open whether and how different parts of the discourse could relate to the historical Jesus. While it seems no longer possible to defend a clear-cut reconstruction of a *Vorlage* or sources underlying Mark 13, this does not necessarily preclude cases in which the evangelist may have incorporated Jesus-traditions, whose precise original form cannot be recovered.

¹⁴⁷ The phrase ‘such tribulation as has not been from the beginning of the creation which God created until now, and never will be’ in Mark 13:19 (RSV) clearly echoes Daniel 12:1; cf. Joel 2:2, Exod 9:18, Deut 4:32. CD-A II 17 (מלפנים ועד הנה) and III 19–20 (אשר לא עמד כמהו למלפנים ועד הנה) may further provide parallels.

¹⁴⁸ The shortening of the days of tribulation for the sake of the elect in Mark 13:20 may further have a Jewish traditio-historical background, as the comparison with 4Q385 (4QpsEzek^a) 3 3–5 by Kister and Qimron, “Observations on 4QSecond Ezekiel (4Q385 2–3),” 595–602 at 600 may indicate.

¹⁴⁹ Schenk, “The Testamental Disciple-Instruction,” 207 argues that the evangelist’s communication to his audience goes much beyond the statement ‘let the reader understand’ in Mark 13: 14b, and also includes “many more aspects within the narrated speeches of Jesus: Mk 13:7c, 8c, 10, 14b, 17, 19–20, 24–27, 32, 35c”; cf. Fowler, *Let the Reader Understand*, 82–6 at 86 who notes about Mark 13 as a ‘discourse about the future’ that “the future referred to in Mark 13 concerns primarily the time of the Gospel’s implied audience”.

Possible connections with Jesus-tradition can arguably be discerned in Mark 13. The warning against those who lead astray (Mark 13:5–6) could parallel eschatologically oriented warnings not to cause believers to sin (Mark 9:42–48). Yet the rather dualistic perspective between false Christs and false prophets on the one hand and the elect on the other in verses 21–22 probably addresses the later circumstances of the Marcan community.¹⁵⁰ The pericope about the unexpected Parousia (Mark 13:32–27) may be paralleled by Q traditions about the unexpected coming of the Son of man (Q 17:23–24, 26–30). It has been argued by C.M. Tuckett that the Q tradition in Luke 17:23–24 appears “pre-redactional”, while he ascribes the tradition of a ‘*Danielic* Son of Man’ to the historical Jesus.¹⁵¹

3.2.7. *A Saying about the Future Kingdom (Mark 14:25)*

Mark 14:25 comprises a saying of Jesus about the kingdom of God, ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ, in the context of the Last Supper (Mark 14:12–25). Like other sayings,¹⁵² it is introduced by the words ‘truly, I say to you’, and concludes the narrative about the Last Supper with the statement that “I shall not drink again of the fruit of the vine until that day when I drink it new in the kingdom of God” (RSV).¹⁵³ This saying has an undeniably future orientation. In view of the Marcan passages in which the kingdom of God has an eschatological dimension (Mark 1:15, 9:42–48), it is a strong possibility that the saying points forward to an eschatological banquet. Since the vineyard is a biblical symbol for the house of Israel (Isa 5:1–7), it could be that the Marcan Jesus has Israel in the final age in mind, when speaking of new fruit of the vine in the kingdom of God. There is no clear indication to suppose that this saying does not reflect early Jesus-tradition.

¹⁵⁰ France, *The Gospel of Mark*, 528–9 mentions examples in Josephus’ *Jewish War* of Jewish figures, like Menahem son of Judas of Galilee and Simon Bar-Giora, who operated during the Jewish war and had royal (read: messianic) pretensions.

¹⁵¹ Tuckett, “The Son of Man and Daniel 7,” 371–94 at 385 and 392.

¹⁵² See Mark 3:28; 8:12; 9:1, 41; 10:15, 29; 11:23; 13:30; 14:9, 30.

¹⁵³ The Matthean redaction in Matt 26:29 adds “with you”, μεθ’ ὑμῶν, and changes “the kingdom of God” into “my Father’s kingdom”, ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ πατρὸς μου; the Lucan redaction in Luke 22:18 reads “until the kingdom of God comes”, ἕως οὗ ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ ἔλθῃ.

3.2.8. *The Vindication of the Son of Man (Mark 14:62)*

The next passage with an arguably eschatological orientation in the context of the Passion narrative is Mark 14:62. Mark 14:62 comprises a Christological vision of the future, which may be the Parousia in the final age, although this is not beyond scholarly dispute.¹⁵⁴ This verse comprises the Marcan Jesus's answer to the high priest's interrogation whether he is "the Christ, the Son of the Blessed", ὁ χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ εὐλογητοῦ¹⁵⁵ (Mark 14:61). Jesus' answer in Mark 14:62, "I am, and you will see the Son of man seated at the right hand of Power, and coming with the clouds of heaven" (RSV), addresses the Marcan audience at the discourse level, just as the high priest's question already did. The dramatic tension between the narrative level of trial and denouncement and the discourse level of Christ-confession may indicate the editorial interest in the arrangement of the material in this pericope.¹⁵⁶ The vindication which the saying in Mark 14:62 entails could be an expression of martyrological vindication against those who tried and delivered Jesus in the hands of Roman authorities.¹⁵⁷ The eschatological component in this vindication is the inauguration of the final age through Jesus' heavenly exaltation (cf. Mark 16:19) that anticipates the Parousia; yet this should be distinguished from sayings about the Parousia proper (Mark 13:24–27).

3.2.9. *The Kingdom of God on the Horizon of Expectation (Mark 15:43)*

Finally, Mark 15:43 informs us that Joseph of Arimathea "was also himself awaiting the kingdom of God", καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν προσδεχόμενος τὴν

¹⁵⁴ Van Iersel, *Mark*, 450 interprets Mark 14:62 as a "vision of the future" which alludes to Dan 7:13–14, 27; Evans, *Mark 8:27–16:20*, 459 observes that this verse expresses Jesus' "divine status and the threat of judgment on those who judge him". Yet France, *The Gospel of Mark*, who concedes that Mark 14:62 is the "christological climax of the gospel" (610), disidentifies this verse from the expectation of the Parousia (611).

¹⁵⁵ ὁ εὐλογητός as an appellation for God neither occurs in the parallel Matthean and Lucan passages nor in John 18:19–24; yet it does occur in Luke 1:68, Rom 9:5, 2 Cor 1:3 and 11:31, Eph 1:2, and 1 Pet 1:3.

¹⁵⁶ Cf. Evans, *Mark 8:27–16:20*, 440 on Mark 14:53–65: "That the material has been edited and that it took shape in stages seem to be unavoidable conclusions".

¹⁵⁷ The plea for its pre-Markan authenticity, as defended by Evans, *Mark 8:27–16:20*, 450–2, may have a point; on the other hand, the veiled reference to the 'Son of man' fits into the Marcan Messianic secrecy motif.

βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ (RSV).¹⁵⁸ This is an instance of the contemporary Jewish horizon of expectations about God's kingdom, which included an eschatological dimension.

4. THE SAYINGS SOURCE Q

4.1. *The Identification of Q and Its Social Settings*

The Synoptic Sayings source Q shared by Matthew and Luke¹⁵⁹ contains many eschatological traditions. This study will only take those passages into account which both explicitly attest to eschatology and are a demonstrable part of the main substance of Q.¹⁶⁰ The arguable Q *Vorlage* to material shared by all three Synoptic Gospels, the so-called 'Triple Tradition', is therefore excluded from our discussion.¹⁶¹ If the

¹⁵⁸ Matt 27:57 instead notes about Joseph of Arimathea that he "also was a disciple of Jesus", while Luke 23:51 has προσεδέχετο instead of ἦν προσδεχόμενος. See BDR, ¹⁷1990, § 353 on the usage of εἶναι with present participle, mentioning Mark 15:43 as an example of the 'depiction of a situation'. France, *The Gospel of Mark*, 666 compares the Marcan wording with "Luke's description of Simeon, προσδεχόμενος παράκλησιν τοῦ Ἰσραήλ (Lk. 2:25)".

¹⁵⁹ On the extent of Q, see e.g. Robinson, Hoffmann, and Kloppenborg Verbin, *The Critical Edition of Q*; Neiryck, "The Reconstruction of Q," 53–147. Cf. Tuckett, *Q and the Historical Jesus*, 219 n. 24, arguing that the 'results' of any reconstruction of Q "can be at best provisional"; the main substance of Q is "relatively uncontroversial" (218), but the precise limits remain subject of scholarly debate.

¹⁶⁰ For a survey of the main substance of Q, see e.g. Kloppenborg, *The Formation of Q*, 92 (Q 3:7–9, 16–17; Q 4:1–13; Q 6:20b–49; Q 7:1–10, 18–28; (16:16); 7:31–35; Q 9:57–62; 10:2–24; Q 11:2–4, 9–13; Q 11:14–52; Q 12:2–12; Q 12:(13–14, 16–21), 22–31, 33–34; Q 12:39–59; Q 13:18–19, 20–21; Q 13:24–30, 34–35; 14:16–24, 26–27; 17:33; 14:33–34; Q 15:3–7; 16:13, 17–18; 17:1–6; Q 17:23–37; 19:12–27; 22:28–30), further referring to earlier scholarship by T.W. Manson, A.D. Jacobson, J.D. Crossan, A. Polag, and W. Schenk (90–1); Allison, *The Jesus Tradition in Q*, 8–27 (Q 3:7–9, 16–17; Q 4:1–13; Q 6:20–49; Q 7:1–10; Q 7:18–35; Q 9:57–62; Q 10:1–16; Q 10:21–24; Q 11:2–4; Q 11:9–13; Q 11:14–23; Q 11:24–26; Q 11:29–32; Q 11:33–36; Q 11:39–44; Q 11:45–51 + 13:34–35 + 11:52; Q 12:2–12; Q 12:22–32; Q 12:33–34; Q 12:35–40; Q 12:42–46[+ 47–48?]; Q 12:49–53; Q 12:54–56; Q 12:58–59; Q 13:18–19; Q 13:20–21; Q 13:23–24; Q 13:25–27; Q 13:28–30 + 14:11; Q 14:16–24; Q 14:26; Q 14:27; Q 14:34–35; Q 15:4–7; Q 16:13; Q 16:16–17; Q 16:18; Q 17:1–4; Q 17:6; Q 17:22–37; Q 19:12–26; Q 22:28–30) with reference to scholarly discussion in the footnotes. Fleddermann, *Q: A Reconstruction and Commentary*, 69–77 ("The Extent of Q") lists 38 sections based on 'double tradition passages' (69–71). Fleddermann discerns three problematic cases (disputed double tradition passages, Matthean and Lucan *Sondergut*, 'triple tradition' in cases of Mark-Q overlap) and argues that none of them belong to Q (72, 74, 77).

¹⁶¹ Thus Broadhead, "The Extent of the Sayings Tradition (Q)," 719–28 argues for a 'maximal extent' of Q, incorporating not only the 'Double Tradition', but also "the triple tradition, singular Marcan traditions, the special sources of Matthew and Luke,

two-source hypothesis is to be taken seriously, we cannot deny analysis of the hypothetical Sayings Source Q¹⁶² a place to our historical-critical investigation.¹⁶³ The majority of the material shared by Matthew and Luke, in the absence of Marcan parallels,¹⁶⁴ justifies the term ‘Sayings source’, but there are a few cases in which the Q material has a narrative framework (Q 7:1–10; cf. John 4:46b–53).

Can one legitimately hypothesise about a ‘Q community’, apart from Marcan, Matthean and Lucan communities? The idea of a Q community has been presupposed in several scholarly studies.¹⁶⁵ We may at least conceive of a communal setting of the carriers of tradition who handed down the evidence shared by Matthew and Luke. Jesus-traditions in Q could reflect a breakaway from Palestinian settings of the early missionary Jesus-movement, like Chorazin, Bethsaida, and Capernaum (Q 10:13–15); the memory of antagonism and confrontation of which could perhaps go back to the milieu of the early Jesus-movement.¹⁶⁶ Yet scholars have increasingly recognized that it is problematic if not impossible to reach precision about the location of the ‘Q community’.¹⁶⁷

the doublets, other canonical material, non-canonical material, and formal elements” (726); a rather controversial point of view about the extent of the Sayings Source in Q scholarship.

¹⁶² I prefer the term *Sayings Source* to *Sayings Gospel*, as propounded for instance in Uro (ed.), *Symbols and Strata*, for ‘Sayings Gospel’ suggests a clearly defined text, whereas the extent of Q is subject to ongoing debate.

¹⁶³ Cf. Kloppenborg, “The Sayings Gospel Q: Literary and Stratigraphic Problems,” 1–66 at 3, on the statement that Q scholarship is built on a hypothesis: “all Synoptic scholarship, to the extent that it relies on *any* solution to the Synoptic problem, is likewise hypothetical”.

¹⁶⁴ Kloppenborg, “Literary and Stratigraphic Problems,” 1 calls this the ‘double tradition’ material. His addition of “triple tradition materials where Matthew and Luke have versions of stories or sayings that depart substantially from those preserved in Mark” may be more problematic, since this evidence could also be interpreted in certain cases as Matthean and Lucan redactional activity, elaborating on Mark.

¹⁶⁵ See e.g. Han, *The Q Community’s Attitude Toward the Temple*; Michaud, “Quelle(s) communauté(s) derrière la Source Q?,” 577–606.

¹⁶⁶ Capernaum, for instance, is also the place about which Mark 2:1–12 and 3:1–6 relates vehement opposition to Jesus’ ministry on the part of some scribes (Mark 2:6–7), Pharisees, and Herodians (Mark 3:6); on the localization of Capernaum in Mark 3:1–6, cf. France, *The Gospel of Mark*, 149. Bethsaida is briefly mentioned in Mark 6:45 and 8:22. It seems difficult to conceive how Q, which includes both polemical passages like Q 10:11–15 and the statement that not one dot of the Law will become void (Q 16:17), speaks for and addresses a(n exclusively) Gentile Christian communal setting, as Fleddermann, *Q: A Commentary and Reconstruction*, 161–6 at 166 supposes: “From start to finish Q reads like a gentile Christian gospel”.

¹⁶⁷ Cf. Frenschkowski, “Galiläa oder Jerusalem?,” 535–60; Reed, *Archaeology and the Galilean Jesus*, 170–96 (“The Sayings Source Q in Galilee”). Pearson, “A Q Community

The history of the Q community has consequently been related to the pre-70 Palestinian history of the early Jesus-movement. However, scholars disagree about the date of composition of Q as a (lost) *Vorlage* to Matthew and Luke. G. Theissen has dated Q to the 40s or 50s CE in the context of Caligula's attempt to set up his statue in the Jerusalem Temple. Other scholars have dated Q to the years of the Jewish war (66–70 CE), or even to its aftermath.¹⁶⁸ Assigning a date of composition to Q partly depends on one's perspective to which strata of the development of Q the apocalyptic-eschatological material belongs.

The Syro-Palestinian setting at any rate makes the Sayings Source particularly important for an investigation of both early tradition from the milieu of the historical Jesus and later redaction.¹⁶⁹ The final redaction of Q may coincide with the composition of the Gospels of Matthew and Luke. It may therefore stand to reason to think in tentative terms about Q as consisting of early pre-war traditions and later traditions which attest to the experience of war.

4.2. *Eschatology in Q*

The following eschatological traditions may be discerned in Q: John's warning of God's wrath and judgement by fire (Q 3:7–9); the communication between John and Jesus on their respective eschatological roles (Q 7:18–35); Jesus' woes against Chorazin, Bethsaida, and Caper-

in Galilee?," 476–94 at 492: "the Galilean followers of Jesus brought their Jesus traditions with them to Jerusalem". Fleddermann, *Q: A Reconstruction and Commentary*, 159–61 deems the question of place where the document was written insoluble.

¹⁶⁸ See Theissen, *Lokalkolorit und Zeitgeschichte*, 215–32; Allison, *The Jesus Tradition in Q*, 54 also tends to favour a date of composition of Q "in the 40s or 50s"; Myllykoski, "The Social History of Q and the Jewish War," 143–99 dates Q to the aftermath of the Jewish war, "presumably around 75 CE" (199).

¹⁶⁹ Q 13:34–35 is interpreted in squarely opposed ways. Schnelle, *Einleitung*, 221 observes: "Die Logienquelle wurde vor der Zerstörung des Tempels abgefaßt, das Wort gegen Jerusalem und den Tempel in Lk 13,34fQ setzt noch keine kriegerischen Ereignisse voraus". Yet Myllykoski, "The Social History of Q and the Jewish War," 179 states: "Rather than dating a vision like this [Q 13:34–35] in the 50's or early 60's (or earlier), it seems more plausible to connect it with the advanced or final stage of the Jewish War: the Roman troops are advancing toward Jerusalem or have already destroyed it". Fleddermann, *Q: A Reconstruction and Commentary*, 157–9 also argues for a late date of composition of Q "around 75 CE", but on different grounds, namely of "the confidence and sophistication of Q's theology of the delay (of the Parousia)", as compared to "anxious questioning and doubt" in other strands of Gospel tradition (159). However, evidence such as Q 12:39–40, 17:22–23 seems difficult to correlate with this hypothesis.

naum (Q 10:13–15); the sign of Jonah (Q 11:29–32); eschatological fear (Q 12:5); the exhortation to be watchful for the coming of the Son of Man (Q 12:39–40); Jesus' polemic against the neglect of signs of eschatological crisis (Q 12:51–56);¹⁷⁰ Jesus' teaching about salvation (Q 13:23–29); the eschatological validity of the Law (Q 16:16–17); the day of the Son of Man (Q 17:22–37); the eschatological setting of the parable of the pounds/talents (Q 19:12–27); and the disciples' judgement of the twelve tribes of Israel (Q 22:28–30).

The eschatological Q material has been previously discussed with attention for its coherence,¹⁷¹ the relation between eschatological, apocalyptic and sapiential elements in Q,¹⁷² as well as for eschatological subthemes and separate passages in Q.¹⁷³ The eschatological material is well represented throughout the literary evidence for Q.

The identification and evaluation of apocalyptic and eschatological materials in Q has given rise to scholarly debate about the place of this evidence in the compositional history of Q. The question raised by scholars is whether the apocalyptic and eschatological materials or rather different traditions are the 'organizing paradigm for interpreting Q'.¹⁷⁴

Those scholars who advocate a distinction between sapiential and apocalyptic layers have tended to relate the eschatological material in Q to redactional activity rather than to early tradition.¹⁷⁵ The distinction between sapiential and apocalyptic layers has also received critical

¹⁷⁰ The matter of interpretation of 'signs of the times' in Matt 16:3 is followed in Matt 16:4 by Jesus' reaction to an 'evil and adulterous generation' to whom only the *sign of Jonah* should be given; cf. Q 11:29–32.

¹⁷¹ Lührmann, *Die Redaktion der Logienquelle*, 69–83; Hoffmann, *Studien zur Theologie der Logienquelle*, 34–50; Zeller, "Der Zusammenhang der Eschatologie in der Logienquelle," 67–77; Edwards, *A Theology of Q*; Kloppenborg, *The Formation of Q*, 102–70; Tuckett, *Q and the History of Early Christianity*, 139–63.

¹⁷² Carlston, "Wisdom and Eschatology in Q," 101–19; Kloppenborg, "Symbolic Eschatology and the Apocalypticism of Q," 287–306; Jacobson, "Apocalyptic and the Synoptic Sayings Source Q," 403–19.

¹⁷³ Kosch, *Die eschatologische Tora des Menschensohnes*; Zeller, "Jesus, Q und die Zukunft Israels," 351–70 and Verheyden, "The Conclusion of Q: Eschatology in Q 22,28–30," 695–718.

¹⁷⁴ See Jacobson, "Apocalyptic and the Synoptic Sayings Source Q," 403–19 at 418 who argues against connections between "the apocalyptic and deuteronomistic strands within Q".

¹⁷⁵ See e.g. Kloppenborg, "Symbolic Eschatology and the Apocalypticism of Q," 306: "The framers of Q no doubt apprehended the transformative powers resident in traditional apocalyptic motifs. Their innovation was to deploy these motifs in nontraditional, nonapocalyptic ways".

scholarly responses.¹⁷⁶ The combination of sapiential and apocalyptic elements in other ancient Jewish and Christian texts may provide important contextual evidence for connections between the two.¹⁷⁷ The presence of eschatological material throughout the relatively undisputed contents of Q renders the hypothesis of ‘archaic’ sapiential collections and apocalyptic-eschatological additions problematical. My below discussion of eschatology in Q will distinguish between exemplary cases in which early tradition is retained or adapted and redactional changes or additions are made, without aiming at a comprehensive survey.¹⁷⁸

4.2.1. *Retained Eschatological Traditions*

First, we may consider cases in which early tradition from Q was probably retained in Matthew and Luke. One example may be John’s message of eschatological judgement in Q 3:7–9, 16–17. Q 3:2b–4.7–9 applies the quotation of Isaiah 40:3 to John who warns against the imminent judgment by God, the ‘wrath to come’ (Q 3:7).¹⁷⁹ It has been extensively demonstrated in previous scholarship that final judgement was an essential component of first-century Jewish eschatological beliefs.¹⁸⁰ The eschatological orientation of John’s baptism with its prophetically

¹⁷⁶ Zeller, “Der Zusammenhang der Eschatologie in der Logienquelle,” 77 argued against a tendency “Q aus seiner eschatologischen Verankerung zu lösen” and deemed the expectation of the Kingdom of God in Q to be rooted in the preaching of Jesus (p. 76). Carlston, *Wisdom and Eschatology in Q*, p. 118 conceives of Christology as “the bridge uniting wisdom and apocalyptic” in Q; cf. Allison, *The Jesus Tradition in Q*, 3–8.

¹⁷⁷ Carlston, “Wisdom and Eschatology in Q,” 114 refers to Wis, *T. 12 Patr.*, 4 *Ezra*, Matthew, the Didache, and Hermas as parallels to Q in this regard; Allison, *The Jesus Tradition in Q*, 4–5 and n. 21 mentions *T. 12 Patr.* and 4 *Ezra* as ‘obvious examples’, while adding Tobit, Wis, Matthew, and the *Didache*. For the comparative evidence of the Dead Sea Scrolls, see García Martínez (ed.), *Wisdom and Apocalypticism*.

¹⁷⁸ Discussion of Q 7:18–35, having a setting of messianic expectation, together with ‘Son of man’ traditions in Q with an arguably messianic outlook will be subsumed in the chapter on Messianism. Cf. Piper, “In Quest of Q: The Direction of Q Studies,” 1–18 at 13: “Q’s treatment of the Son of man is crucial to any discussion of the development of early Christology”.

¹⁷⁹ Parallel to ἡ μέλλουσα ὄργη in Q 3:7, 1 Thess 1:10 has ἡ ὄργη ἡ ἐρχομένη. On eschatological wrath of God, ὄργη θεοῦ, cf. 1 Thess 2:16, 5:9; Rom 1:18–32, 2:8, 3:5, 4:15, 5:9, 9:22, 12:19, 13:5; Eph 5:6; Col 3:6; Rev 11:18, 19:15. On the day of judgment as a ‘day of wrath’ for the wicked, cf. e.g. Rom 2:5, Rev 6:17.

¹⁸⁰ See e.g. Reiser, *Die Gerichtspredigt Jesu*; Gregg, *The Historical Jesus and the Final Judgment Sayings in Q*, 35–78 (“The Final Judgment in Late Second Temple Judaism”), who discusses apocalyptic texts (*1 Enoch*, Daniel, *T. Moses*), poetic texts (*Pss. Sol.*, the *Hodayot*), community rules (1QS, CD, 1QM), ‘Rewritten Scripture’ (*1 Enoch* 1–36, *Jubilees*, 1QpHab), wisdom literature (*1 Enoch* 92–105, Wis), and histories (2 Macc 7).

inspired message of repentance may be understandable in this contemporary Jewish context.

The fate of the biblical Sodom and Gomorra (Gen 18:16–19:29) is a final example of a narrative theme from Genesis whose interpretation has eschatological significance in the New Testament. The Jesus-tradition in Q attributes a worse eschatological fate to a town that will not receive the disciples than the fate of Sodom (Q 10:10–12). According to the saying in Q 10:15, Capernaum is foretold that it will be brought down to Hades.

Another example concerns Jesus' eschatologically oriented polemic against Chorazin, Bethsaida and Capernaum in Q 10:13–15. The idea that Jesus' pronouncement of judgement against these places could go back to early tradition may be supported by the fact that it may have been part of the events which led Jesus to heavy controversies (the plausibility criterion). This tradition was probably retained, since at the same time it also mirrors the later context in which Christian Jews experienced rejection of their Palestinian mission.¹⁸¹ A final example of the retention of tradition may be the passage about trial and vindication in Q 22:28–30, which has been discussed in detail by J. Verheyden. Verheyden observes that there is no reason "to refuse to admit that it may go back to Jesus", while explaining its editorial retention in light of a later context of disillusion with the Jewish mission.¹⁸²

4.2.2. *Adapted Eschatological Traditions*

Early tradition may also be adapted to a later context in the course of the composition history of Q. Jonah figures in a Jesus-tradition in Q 11:16.29–32, in which Jesus rebukes the 'evil generation', addressing those among his hearers who tested him,¹⁸³ for searching a sign. Jesus' rebuke of those who search for a sign from heaven is common to the Synoptic Gospels (Mark 8:11–13; Q 11:29a–d, Matt 16:1.4a–b), but the part on the 'sign of Jonah' (Q 11:29e, Matt 16:4c) does not occur in Mark. Q 11:32 attests to an eschatological orientation: "the men of Nineveh will arise at the judgement with this generation and condemn

¹⁸¹ Note that Matthew 11:24 attributes an eschatological fate to Capernaum less tolerable than that of Sodom, in addition to the assertion that it will be brought down to Hades (Q 10:15).

¹⁸² Verheyden, "The Conclusion of Q: Eschatology in Q 22,28–30," 718.

¹⁸³ Like Mark 8:11, Matt 12:38, 16:1 is more specific in naming Jesus' opponents than Luke 11:16.29–32 is.

it; for they repented at the preaching of Jonah, and behold, something greater than Jonah is here” (RSV). R.A. Edwards argued that the Q tradition about the ‘sign of Jonah’ is a secondary addition. Edwards’ argument is based on the comparison between Mark 8:11–13 at v. 12, in which Jesus says, “Truly, I say to you, no sign shall be given to this generation”, and Q 11:29 / Matt 16:4, in which Jesus says, “no sign shall be given to it *except the sign of Jonah*”.¹⁸⁴ Yet signs about things to come were not a non-issue in Mark’s picture of Jesus. The ‘eschatological discourse’ following the disciples’ question about a sign (Mark 13:4) may affirm this.

Another example may be the passage in Q 12:2–12. As part of his instructions of encouragement for the disciples, Jesus contrasts unnecessary human fear for those who ‘kill the body’ (Q 12:4) to eschatological fear for the one who, ‘after he has killed, has power to cast into hell’ (Luke 10:5, RSV) or who, in other words, ‘can destroy both soul and body in hell’ (Matt 10:28b, RSV). At the end of the Lucan passage (Luke 12:11–12) and in the direct context of the Matthean passage (Matt 10:17–19), details are given about circumstances of (future) persecution. Apart from the parallel materials in the Synoptic eschatological discourses, these details may have been appended in order to adapt the early tradition to a later context of persecution. A further example of the adaptation of tradition may be drawn from the discussion by R. Uro. According to Uro, who does not favour a distinction between apocalyptic and non-apocalyptic sayings in Q, the change from optimistic (Kingdom sayings) to pessimistic (Son of man sayings) “modes of language is so drastic that it can hardly be explained as different aspects of the same group identity”. Uro singles out ‘rejection’ and ‘vindication’ as central elements to the Son of man sayings in Q. He advocates “a shift in the group’s symbolic universe” in the course of time, as an “outcome of some hard experiences and setbacks in the movement”.¹⁸⁵

4.2.3. *Redactional Elaborations*

We finally turn to redactional additions or changes made by the evangelists who incorporated Q into their respective Gospels. One example

¹⁸⁴ Translations from RSV. See Edwards, *The Sign of Jonah in the Theology of the Evangelists and Q*; idem, *A Theology of Q*, 113–5.

¹⁸⁵ Uro, “Apocalyptic Symbolism and Social Identity in Q,” 67–118 at 117–8.

are the different characterizations of the audience to John's message of judgement in Q 3:7–9.16–17 in the respective Matthean and Lucan contexts: 'many of the Pharisees and Sadducees' in Matt 3:7, but the 'multitudes' in Luke 3:7.10. These divergent settings may imply different editorial interests, all the more since Luke 7:30 does imply an antagonism between John's baptism and the Pharisees and the lawyers. Another case in which differences may attest to redactional activity is the passage about the sign of Jonah (Q 11:29–32). Matt 12:40 applies this sign to Jesus' death and resurrection after three days, quoting Jonah 2:1 as proof-text for the analogy. Luke 11:30 rather draws an analogy between Jonah as 'a sign to the men of Nineveh' and the Son of man (as a sign) to 'this generation'. While Matthew and Luke differ in this respect, both evangelists agree in their use of Q on the subject of final judgement. Final judgement is related to two things in this Q passage. With regard to lack of attentiveness to wisdom coming from God, the queen of the South is said to pronounce a sentence on 'this generation' (Q 11:31). With regard to the lack of repentance, the men of Nineveh are said to pronounce a sentence on 'this generation' (Q 11:32). The aspects of receptiveness of God's word and repentance recur in other gospel traditions, but the negative side of final judgement related to rejection of the gospel may also mirror later missionary concerns (cf. 1 Thess 2:14–16).

4.3. *Evaluation: Tradition and Redaction in the Apocalyptic-Eschatological Materials*

Since the apocalyptic-eschatological evidence is an important part of the Sayings Source, the relation between the social setting of Q and its eschatology becomes a legitimate question. In view of parallels between Q and Mark (e.g. Q 12:11–12 // Mark 13:11 / Luke 21:14–15), the situation of persecution underlying certain passages in Q may partly correspond with that in Mark. Both Mark and Q drew on a Palestinian context, while not sharing a uniform tradition. The division even within the early Jerusalem church makes this the more understandable (Gal 2:11–13; Acts 6:1, 15:4–5). Pre-war and war-time stages should be distinguished in the composition and final redaction of Q.

Let us first consider war-time stages in the final redaction of Q as it has become integrated in Matthew and Luke. It could well be that the final redaction of Q expresses an intensified apocalyptic-eschatological perspective in the context of experiences of war. The Q tradition in

which Jesus warns against false messages about the Kingdom that should not be obeyed or followed could presuppose these expectations from a redactional point of view (Q 17:22–37).¹⁸⁶ In his *Jewish War*, Josephus likewise gives a picture of Jewish people in Israel who, influenced by war-time circumstances, were susceptible to apocalyptic prophecies and messages of eschatological salvation (*J.W.* 6.286–315). Yet apocalyptic-eschatological visions and experiences of persecution may not have been limited to a war-time context.

The biblical Flood story (Gen 6:1–8:22) functions as an analogy to the day of the ‘coming of the Son of man’ in the Synoptic Sayings source Q (Q 17:22.26–27). In certain strands of Second Temple Jewish literature, the biblical Flood story was also emblematic for eschatological visions of judgement of injustice and salvation for the righteous martyred (*1 Enoch* 6–10; *4 Macc* 15:3.29–31; *4Q254a* (*4QCommentary on Genesis D*) 3 4).¹⁸⁷

The pre-war stages in the composition history of Q may be reflected in the examples of retention and adaptation of tradition that I have discussed above. The communal setting of Q ultimately goes back to carriers of tradition from the Palestinian missionary movement. The pre-70 setting of eschatology in Q was probably determined by the antagonism between Christian Jews and the Palestinian Jewish leadership due to the latter’s rejection of the gospel message. The ubiquity of the designation ‘this generation’ in Q could be transparent of later polemic against the Palestinian Jewish leadership. Analogously with this, the sectarian literature of Qumran comprises a polemical use of *הדור האחרון* (CD-A I 12 // 4QD^a 2 I 16; 1QpMic frags. 17–18, l. 5; 1QpHab II 7);¹⁸⁸ a polemic which was probably aimed against the politico-religious leadership in Jerusalem. The language of eschatological polemic in the pre-70 CE strata of Q may therefore be understood in a broader Palestinian Jewish context.

¹⁸⁶ Both Allison, *The Jesus Tradition in Q*, 27 and Schnelle, *Einleitung*, 219 consider the materials in parallel passages of Matthew 24:26–41 and Luke 17:22–37 to be part of Q.

¹⁸⁷ Cf. the exhortation not to oppose the words of the Lord (col. II, l. 9) after the paraphrase of the Flood story (col. I) in 4Q370 (*4QExhortation Based on the Flood*); García Martínez, “Interpretations of the Flood in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 86–108 at 96 considers 4Q370 “a good example of the re-use of the Flood narrative for parenetic or didactic purposes”. Cf. Dimant, “Noah in Early Jewish Literature,” 123–50 at 132, 135–6, 140–4.

¹⁸⁸ Cf. 1QSb III 7, which mentions a ‘generation of wickedness’, *דור עול[ה]*.

5. THE GOSPEL OF MATTHEW

5.1. *The Social and Historical Setting of Matthew*5.1.1. *Scholarly Debate about Matthew's Community and Judaism*

The composition of Matthew is usually situated in Syria and dated to 80–90 CE.¹⁸⁹ A most conspicuous and characteristic element in Matthew is Jesus' diatribe against the 'scribes and Pharisees' (see esp. Matt 23). Yet there are more levels at which tradition may be discerned from redaction, on the basis of which we may also get an impression of the milieu in which Matthew was composed. Much previous scholarship has focused the attention on the history of the Matthean community underlying the history of composition of Matthew.¹⁹⁰

Previous debate has developed from the supposition that Matthew reflects a conflict between Judaism and Christianity to increasing support for the idea that the conflict was inner Jewish, between Matthew's Christian Judaism and post-war 'formative Judaism'.¹⁹¹ In view of 'law-free' Pauline Christianity and the 'anti-judaizing' tendency in the letters of Ignatius of Antioch, it was previously assumed that a law-observant Matthean community¹⁹² could not be located in Antioch. In his recent reconsideration of the history of the Christian movement in Antioch, D.C. Sim has argued that the initial Hellenist and Pauline mission in Antioch lost the clash with the law-observant circles of the Jerusalem

¹⁸⁹ See e.g. Davies and Allison, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to Saint Matthew*. 1, 127–38; Schnelle, *Einleitung*, 261.

¹⁹⁰ Stendahl, *The School of St. Matthew*; Overman, *Matthew's Gospel and Formative Judaism*; Balch (ed.), *Social History of the Matthean Community*; Stanton, *Studies in Matthew*; Wong, *Interkulturelle Theologie und multikulturelle Gemeinde im Matthäusevangelium*; Saldarini, *Matthew's Christian-Jewish Community*; Sim, *The Gospel of Matthew and Christian Judaism*.

¹⁹¹ Overman, *Matthew's Gospel and Formative Judaism*; Saldarini, *Matthew's Christian-Jewish Community*, 107–16; Sim, *The Gospel of Matthew and Christian Judaism*, 109–63 ("The Matthean Community and Formative Judaism"); Repschinski, *The Controversy Stories in the Gospel of Matthew*, 343–9 ("The Matthean Controversy Stories as Reflections of a Struggle *Intra Muros* of Judaism"). Foster, *Community, Law and Mission in Matthew's Gospel*, 1 and 79 recently countered this 'new consensus', evaluating Matthew instead as the 'supersessionary document' (1), but a supersessionist interpretation of a community over against and outside the bounds of Judaism runs up against the line of thought in e.g. Matt 5:17–20, 24:20.

¹⁹² See e.g. Matt 5:17–20, 24:20. Cf., however, Schnelle, *Einleitung*, 259–60, who surveys evidence in Matthew for both a Christian-Jewish (e.g. Matt 5:17–20) and a Gentile-Christian setting (e.g. Matt 28:18–20).

church and had to leave the ground to a law-observant Antiochene church 'under the local leadership of Peter'.¹⁹³ Since only Matthew makes Peter's authority in the church explicit (Matt 16:13–19), Sim deduces that the Matthean law-observant community should probably be located in Antioch.¹⁹⁴

While Sim's analysis of the setting and location of the Matthean community appears perspicacious, his presentation of the dichotomy between a 'law-free' and a 'law-observant' party in the primitive Christian movement may stand in need of reconsideration.¹⁹⁵ The Pauline evidence rather shows that Paul does not deny Jewish privilege (τὸ περισσόον, in Rom 3:1–2; cf. Rom 9:1–5), the election of Israel (Rom 11:1.26–29), the value of circumcision (Rom 3:1–2, 1 Cor 7:18¹⁹⁶) or the value of the Jewish Law (Rom 3:31, 7:12) a place in his theological thought.¹⁹⁷ Nor does Paul's emphasis on the moral aspects of the Law claim an exclusive place at the expense of ritual aspects in his Letters (e.g. 1 Cor 7:14, 8:1.7–13, 9:13; Rom 14:21). The difference which Paul's gospel made consists in the apostle's message that the Law is not an end or goal in itself but that Christ is the τέλος of the Law (Rom 10:4). For Paul's opponents, the Law was of absolute value and their gospel of Jesus Christ was probably determined by its correspondence with and fulfilment of the Law. The distinction between 'law-observant' and 'law-free' parties may therefore amount to an oversimplification of the conflict, even though it could correspond to polemic on both sides.

¹⁹³ Sim, *The Gospel of Matthew and Christian Judaism*, 10–12, 63–107 at 107.

¹⁹⁴ Sim, *ibidem*, 257–87 explains the 'anti-judaizing' tendency in the letters of Ignatius of Antioch in terms of the independent, rival existence of the Ignatian church, which "probably originated with the renewed Pauline mission in Antioch in the years following the Jewish war" (p. 287), and the Matthean church.

¹⁹⁵ Sim, *ibidem*, 19–26, 165–213. Note for instance that the view of Pauline Christianity being 'law-free' is not shared by all scholars; cf. e.g. Tomson, *If This Be from heaven...*, 194: "Paul did not break with the law but viewed it no longer as the universal way of salvation".

¹⁹⁶ 1 Cor 7:18, which admonishes the Jewish convert to the faith in Christ not to 'seek to remove the marks of circumcision', μη ἐπιπάσθω, indicates that, just as he was against the imposition of the Law on Gentile converts, Paul would not advocate that Jewish converts should not have to join Gentile custom (cf. 1 Macc 1:15).

¹⁹⁷ *Contra* Sim, *The Gospel of Matthew and Christian Judaism*, who states the following as a matter of fact at 23: "Paul effectively denied the very fundamentals of Judaism, the (eternal) election of Israel (and the privileged position of the Jews) and the validity of the law in the context of the covenant".

5.1.2. *Scholarly Debate about Matthean Eschatology and Its Socio-Historical Setting*

When we turn to the text of Matthew in search of particular features of Matthean eschatology, it is important first to survey the place which eschatology has in the Gospel at large. The eschatology in Matthew which will be discussed in this section consists of traditions peculiar to Matthew and Matthean redactional activity, whether elaborating on Mark and Q or conceptualising a Matthean understanding of the tradition. Previous scholarship has discerned five main discourses in Matthew: the Sermon on the Mount (Matt 5–7), the Mission Discourse (Matt 10), the Parables Discourse (Matt 13), the Community Discourse (Matt 18), and the Eschatological Discourse (Matt 24–25).¹⁹⁸ It was already argued by G. Bornkamm that the Matthean discourses are transparent of both the Matthean church's history and eschatological interests.¹⁹⁹ K. Stendahl even contended that the Gospel of Matthew is the product of a school rather than of an individual evangelist.²⁰⁰

Subsequent redaction-critical scholarship has focused much attention on the Matthean eschatological discourse, in relation to Mark 13 and to other parts of Matthew.²⁰¹ F.W. Burnett interpreted Matt 24 in light of wisdom Christology, associating Jesus with wisdom and God's presence on the basis of Matt 11:2–19 and 23:32–39. Burnett interprets the transition from Matt 23:32–39 to Matt 24 as transparent of Matthean polemic which draws a line from Israel's rejection of wisdom embodied by Jesus to Jesus's withdrawal from Israel.²⁰² The interpretation of Matt 24–25 by V.K. Agbanou highlighted the eschatological context of exhortations about 'discernment, vigilance, and faithfulness', in preparation for judgement.²⁰³

¹⁹⁸ See recently Brown, "Direct Engagement of the Reader in Matthew's Discourses," 19–35.

¹⁹⁹ Bornkamm, "End-Expectation and Church in Matthew," 15–51 at 15–24.

²⁰⁰ Stendahl, *The School of St. Matthew*, 142.

²⁰¹ Burnett, *The Testament of Jesus-Sophia*; Agbanou, *Le discours eschatologique*; Hahn, "Die eschatologische Rede Matthäus 24 und 25," 107–26; Broer, "Redaktionsgeschichtliche Aspekte," 209–33.

²⁰² Burnett, *The Testament of Jesus-Sophia*, 111–32 at this point advocates the thematic unity of Matt 23:37–39 and Matt 24:1–2 as the product of Matthean redaction which omits the story of the "Widow's Mite", otherwise present in the narrative sequence of Mark 12:41–44 and Luke 21:1–4. Burnett contends that, from the perspective of Matthew, "when Jesus goes from the temple in 24:1, the very presence of God itself leaves the people" (p. 131). Yet Matthew does not make this point explicitly.

²⁰³ See Agbanou, *Le discours eschatologique*, 171–207 at 205.

The above works of scholarship still argued from the premiss that Matthew reflects a conflict between Judaism and Christianity. Agbanou, for instance, accounted for the combination of Jewish adherence to the Law and the pro-Gentile universalism in Matthew in terms of the evangelist's redactional interest in a unified community, the Matthean church apart from Judaism.²⁰⁴ Yet Sim has made a convincing point that the Matthean evidence points to an internal dispute between Christian Judaism and formative Judaism and it should not be stretched to a picture of conflict between the Matthean community and the people of Israel at large.²⁰⁵ With regard to Burnett's 'interpretive key' of wisdom Christology, the focus in more recent redaction-critical work is not only on composition history (comparison of sources),²⁰⁶ but also on the composition itself (text-internal indications).²⁰⁷

The recent monograph by D.C. Sim envisages *apocalyptic eschatology*, understood by him as a religious perspective about the final age in terms of dualism and determinism, as an important component of Matthean theology. Sim has attempted to reconstruct "Matthew's particular apocalyptic-eschatological scheme", drawing on a redaction-critical analysis of evidence throughout Matthew. The organising principle of Sim's survey consists of the following five themes of apocalyptic eschatology: 'dualism and determinism'; 'eschatological woes and the coming of the Son of Man'; 'the judgement'; 'the fate of the wicked and the fate of the righteous'; and 'the imminence of the end'.²⁰⁸ Prominent examples of identification are not only confined to what Sim calls the 'apocalyptic discourse' (Matt 24–25). He also treats evidence in other Matthean

²⁰⁴ Agbanou, *ibidem*, 202 thus attributes frictions and a lack of internal homogeneity to Matthew.

²⁰⁵ See Sim, *The Gospel of Matthew and Christian Judaism*, 109–63 at 148–9 about the prominent example of the parable of the vineyard (Matt 21:33–42), which has been misinterpreted as the "evangelist's rejection of Judaism". Sim emphasises that "the people of Israel are represented by the vineyard" and the tenants are explicitly identified by Matthew "with the Jewish leaders (21:45)" (149).

²⁰⁶ Luke 11:49 has the ἡ σοφία τοῦ θεοῦ introduce the theme of persecution of the prophets, whereas in the parallel verse in Matthew, Matt 23:34, it is the Ἴ, ἐγώ, of Jesus who introduces this theme.

²⁰⁷ Broer, "Redaktionsgeschichtliche Aspekte," 209 insists that only on the basis of an integrated redaction-critical approach, something may be said about the *intended* message of the evangelist.

²⁰⁸ Sim, *Apocalyptic Eschatology in the Gospel of Matthew*, 15–18, 73–177 treats these five themes in his chapters 3 (75–92), 4 (93–109), 5 (110–28), 6 (129–47), and 7 (148–74).

discourses²⁰⁹ and other passages in Matthew (e.g. Matt 8:12, 12:31–37, 16:18.27–28, 19:28, 22:11–14, 23:15.33, 26:64).²¹⁰ Sim considers Matt 13:36–43.49–50 to be a prominent example of Matthean “creation of important apocalyptic-eschatological pericopae”. Sim thus concludes from his discussion of the Matthean presentation of eschatology that the “two themes of developed cosmic dualism and historical determinism provide the framework for Matthew’s eschatological expectations”.²¹¹

Notwithstanding Sim’s consistent and thorough treatment of the Matthean evidence, there are also certain weak points in his argument that Matthew employed a developed apocalyptic-eschatological scheme. Sim has a well-founded point as regards (cosmic) dualism in Matthew. However, his argument about historical determinism in Matthew, inasmuch as it stands apart from Mark and Q, is mainly based on a logion about election (Matt 22:14) and the Matthean quotations of the fulfilment of prophecy.²¹² Yet it appears difficult to verify whether the belief in fulfilment of prophecies *per se* presupposes a perspective of historical determinism. On the other hand, the sectarian Qumran texts apply a more consistent and elaborate idea of determinism to their picture of history (e.g. 1QS III 13–IV 26; CD-A I–VIII); a picture which expresses rather than arguably presupposes the perspective of historical determinism.²¹³

Another debatable point concerns the supposed ‘imminent end expectation’ in Matthew. Sim’s argument in favour of an ‘imminent end expectation’ depends on his discussion of the Matthean ‘apocalyptic discourse’ (Matt 24–25) and ‘mission discourse’ (Matt 9:37–10:42). This discussion further serves to (re-)establish the idea that the three traditionally discussed passages in Matthew (Matt 10:23, 16:28 and 24:34) should also be understood in light of imminent end

²⁰⁹ Sim, *ibidem*, 136–7 (on eschatology in the *Sermon on the Mount* (Matt 5:22.29–30, 7:19)); 115, 137, 169–73 (on the eschatological framework to the *Mission Discourse*, Matt 9:37–10:42); 137–9 (on eschatological punishment of the wicked in the *Community Discourse*, Matt 18:9.23–35); 78–87, 122, 135 (on Matt 13:36–43.49–50 as ‘apocalyptic-eschatological pericopae’ in the *Parables Discourse*).

²¹⁰ Sim, *ibidem*, 9, 87, 97–9, 117–9, 126–8, 139–40, 143, 155, 228.

²¹¹ Sim, *ibidem*, quotations at 175.

²¹² Sim, *ibidem*, 87–92 at 91 distinguishes between determinism and individual free will in Matthew; “an apparent inconsistency (which) is found in many of the apocalyptic-eschatological schemes of his day”.

²¹³ On *determinism* in the sectarian literature of Qumran as a distinctive feature for identification with Josephus’s presentation of Essene beliefs, see e.g. VanderKam, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today*, 76–8.

expectation.²¹⁴ Matt 16:28 and 24:34 both depend on Marcan tradition (Mark 9:1 and 13:30 respectively). In the individual case of Matt 10:23, it has usually been assumed that this passage is the product of secondary expansion and thereby of no value for the study of the historical Jesus.²¹⁵ Yet the possible relation of Matt 10:23 to the Jesus tradition has become the subject of renewed discussion in a recent article by A.J.M. Wedderburn,²¹⁶ so that it cannot be taken for granted that Matt 10:23 expresses a typically *Matthean* (imminent) end expectation.²¹⁷ The idea that an intensified expectation about the final ‘new age’ lying ahead in the ‘imminent future’ pervades the Gospel of Matthew²¹⁸ has further become the subject of recent debate. As an alternative to the idea of an intensified ‘Naherwartung’ in Matthew, J. Roloff has posited the idea of an intensified ‘Individualeschatologie’.²¹⁹

If the presence of a consistent and developed ‘apocalyptic-eschatological scheme’ in Matthew, as Sim envisages it, may be debatable at certain points, it can hardly be denied that there are apocalyptic elements in Matthean eschatology. In what follows, I will survey exemplary cases of Matthean eschatology on different levels of the text. This survey by no means aims to be comprehensive, but searches to discern Matthean compositional activity in terms of conceptualisation and retention, adaptation and alteration of tradition.

²¹⁴ Sim, *Apocalyptic Eschatology in the Gospel of Matthew*, 155–73.

²¹⁵ E.g. Kloppenborg, “The Sayings Gospel Q and the Quest of the Historical Jesus,” 307–44; Dunn, *Jesus Remembered*, 432 classifies Matt 10:23 together with Mark 9:1 and 13:30 as “much-disputed texts”, whose relation to other eschatological Jesus traditions is “unclear” (436).

²¹⁶ Wedderburn, “Matthew 10,23B and the Eschatology of Jesus,” 165–81.

²¹⁷ The argument by Sim, *Apocalyptic Eschatology in the Gospel of Matthew*, 169–73 at 173 focuses on the analogy between Matt 10:22–3 and 24:13–14, observing that “consolation [about persecution before the Parousia] without an imminent end expectation is no consolation at all!”. Yet it may be hard to test this type of argument against the evidence of the text. Matt 24:22, which mentions the shortening of days, rather appears to convey a sense of consolation that the period of tribulation will be shortened (Matt 24:21), without this bringing even the elect closer to certainty about the hour or time of the Parousia (Matt 24:36–37).

²¹⁸ Sim, *Apocalyptic Eschatology in the Gospel of Matthew*, 176.

²¹⁹ Roloff, “Das Reich des Menschensohnes,” 275–92 at 291–92 and n. 48, arguing against Grässer, *Das Problem der Parusieverzögerung*, 217, concludes that Matthew accords a heavier weight to the *presence* of the risen Jesus in the proclaimed Gospel and to future judgement of individuals by the Son of Man than to an intensified ‘Naherwartung’.

5.2. *Matthean Eschatology*

5.2.1. *Eschatology in Matthean Special Materials*

Matthean special materials include several parables, community and missionary instructions as well as narrative sections. An example of an eschatologically oriented missionary instruction is Matt 10:23. This verse expresses the imminent expectation that the Son of Man comes before the mission in Israel is completed. Matt 13:24–30, the Matthean parable of the weeds of the field, is further eschatologically oriented, as the explanation in verses 36–43 indicates. Certain eschatological features should probably be attributed to Matthean redaction, such as the consistent eschatological focus (Matt 5:19–20.29–30.46)²²⁰ in the section on the true understanding of the Law (Matt 5:17–48) and the eschatological concept of the ‘new world’, *παλιγγενεσία*, in Matt 19:28.²²¹

The Matthean Passion narrative could reflect a post-Easter consciousness about the reversal of eschatological expectations. The rhetorical question of the Matthean Jesus, “do you think that I cannot appeal to my Father, and he will at once send me more than twelve legions of angels?” (Matt 26:53, RSV) counters political expectations. Peter’s expectation “to see the end” (Matt 26:58), when he follows Jesus, is reversed by Jesus’ resurrection and his presence with the missionary disciples “always, to the close of the age” (Matt 28:19–20).

5.2.2. *Matthean Adoption of Eschatological Traditions from Mark and Q*

We have already seen above that Matt 16:28 and 24:34 are examples of Matthean adoption of Marcan tradition. While the Matthean reading substitutes Mark’s phrase ‘the kingdom of God (which) has come with power’ (Mark 9:1) for ‘the Son of man coming in his kingdom’ (Matt 16:28), both could be related to the post-Easter kerygma of Jesus’ ascension and vindication in heaven. This kerygma may include

²²⁰ Some of the eschatological material in this Matthean section in fact corresponds with other Synoptic passages, for instance Matt 5:29–30 as compared with Matt 18:8–9 / Mark 9:43–47; this possibly being evidence of Matthew’s redactional hand in the arrangement of the material in Matt 5:17–48.

²²¹ On the different connotations of the term in Matthew’s time, see e.g. BDAG, ³2000, p. 752. Cf. Sim, *Apocalyptic Eschatology in the Gospel of Matthew*, 112–4 who considers its meaning to be “in general agreement with the wider apocalyptic-eschatological tradition” (113), in light of Matt 5:18, 24:29.35.

a sense of inaugurated eschatology.²²² Matthew 24:34 by itself depends on Mark 13:30, but the larger context of the Matthean Eschatological Discourse (Matt 24–25) focuses more explicitly on the Parousia (Matt 24:3.27; 25:31) than Mark or even Luke does. This evidence will therefore be treated further below as an example of redactional additions or changes by Matthew, as compared to pre-existing tradition. Matthew's adoption of Q tradition comprises a case, the 'sign of Jonah', in which the evangelist adapts the material partly to his redactional interest in the fulfilment of prophecy (Matt 12:40), that is, prophecy as applied to Jesus' death and resurrection after three days.

Matthew 10:15, being part of the Mission Discourse, mentions the 'day of judgement' for those who do not receive the missionaries of Christ's Gospel. The parallel passages in Mark 6:7–13 and Luke 9:1–6 only mention a 'testimony against them'. The eschatological point in Matt 10:15 is reiterated in a different context in Matt 11:22.24. Matthew therefore draws out the eschatological perspective of judgement, which could be implied in the other Synoptic Gospels, more consistently, possibly in the evangelist's theological interest.

5.2.3. *Matthean Conceptualisations of Eschatology*

Matthew has a distinctive way of conceptualising the final age.²²³ The Matthean eschatological application of the term *παλιγγενεσία*, 'new age' (Matt 19:28), is not attested elsewhere in the canonical New Testament.²²⁴ The Greek usage of this term has been extensively discussed.²²⁵ With

²²² Matt 16:27 affirms eschatological retribution by the Son of Man, while Matt 16:28 stipulates that some of Jesus' followers would already be witness to the 'the Son of Man coming in his kingdom'.

²²³ The expression βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν is left out of consideration here, for, even though Schnelle, *Einleitung*, 267 lists it among 'Spracheigentümlichkeiten des Matthäus', the Coptic equivalent to this Greek term, τῆντερο ἡβηγε, occurs in the *Gospel of Thomas* (*G.Th.* 20, 114). Cf. the expression שמי מלכות כב[וד]כה, 'the heaven(s) of the kingdom of your glory', in the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* (4Q401 14 I 6), which also locates God's kingdom in heaven.

²²⁴ The only other place where *παλιγγενεσία* occurs, Titus 3:5, highlights the ritual of baptism ('the washing of *regeneration* and renewal in the Holy Spirit', RSV) rather than specifically denoting the final age. The Coptic term *πικροσμος ββρπε* for 'new world' in *G.Th.* 51 could provide an interesting extra-canonical parallel.

²²⁵ See the survey by Sim, *Apocalyptic Eschatology in the Gospel of Matthew*, 112–4 with further bibliography and discussion of its usage in Stoic philosophy and by Philo and Josephus.

reference to other Matthean passages about eschatological destruction and regeneration of the cosmos (Matt 24:29; Matt 5:18 / Luke 16:17; Matt 24:35 / Mark 13:31), D.C. Sim has interpreted the term as an example of Matthew's apocalyptic-eschatological perspective.²²⁶ While Sim may be right about this, the broader context of contemporary expectations about the 'new age' on which Matthew drew still merits further attention. The term *παλιγγενεσία* is applied to the regeneration of the world after the Flood in *1 Clem.* 9:4. Although this is a late apostolic text, the analogy between the primeval 'days of Noah' and the eschatological 'day(s) of (the coming of) the Son of Man' already occurs in the Q tradition (Matt 24:37–39 // Luke 17:26–27). The sense of eschatological renewal of the world is also covered by the Hebrew of some Qumran texts,²²⁷ most specifically by the term *קדושה חדשה*, 'the new creation' in IQS IV 25, in the eschatological setting to the 'Treatise of the two spirits' (IQS III 13–IV 26).²²⁸ The notion of return or restoration that permeates some eschatological gospel traditions (Mark 9:12 // Matt 17:11; Acts 1:6) could perhaps be another aspect covered by the Matthean *παλιγγενεσία*.²²⁹

Another Matthean concept that denotes the final age is *συντελεία* (τοῦ) αἰῶνος, which means 'the end of the age' (Matt 13:39–40.49, 24:3, 28:20). Apart from Matthew, Hebrews 9:26 is the only other New Testament text that refers to the 'end of the age' with a similar term *συντελεία τῶν αἰώνων*. *συντέλεια καιρῶν* in LXX Dan 9:27 and *συντέλεια ἡμερῶν* in LXX Dan 12:13 provide the closest scriptural parallel to the Matthean usage.

²²⁶ Sim, *ibidem*, 114 attributes the following notion of eschatology to *παλιγγενεσία* in Matt 19:28: "The eschaton witnesses the passing of the impermanent and imperfect creation and its replacement by an eternal and perfect order in the new age. It is only after this has been accomplished that the judgement can take place".

²²⁷ Cf. the eschatological notion of the arrival of the 'dominion of goodness' in *4QTime of Righteousness* with connotations of 'renewal' (4Q215a frg. 2, l. 2; frg. 3, l. 1: *שׁ לְהַחֲרִים אֶרֶץ בְּחַרְוֹנוֹ וּלְחַדֵּשׁ*; text and translation from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition. 1*, 456–7). *4QRenewed Earth* (4Q475) envisions an end of all guilty deeds and a return to peace.

²²⁸ Paul's term *καινή κτίσις* in Gal 5:17, 6:15 appears to be focused more on anthropology than on the temporal dimension of the final age as the 'new creation'.

²²⁹ See BDAG, ³2000, sub *πάλι*. Cf. the cyclical sense of return to a previous state in Stoic cosmology, as noted by Reale, *A History of Ancient Philosophy III*, 256–57 with reference to *palingenesis* and *apokatastasis*.

A final point of Matthean conceptualisation concerns the eschatologically oriented language of dualism in Matt 13:36–43.49–50, which Sim has deemed Matthew’s “outright creation of important apocalyptic-eschatological pericopae”.²³⁰ Matt 13:38 juxtaposes the ‘sons of the kingdom’, οἱ υἱοὶ τῆς βασιλείας, to the ‘sons of the evil one’, οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ πονηροῦ. Just as with the Semitic ‘noun of relation’,²³¹ the evangelist undoubtedly had a sense of participation in mind rather than literal sonship. Another important element may be all ‘temptations to sin’, τὰ σκάνδαλα, which, together with all evildoers, are to be gathered out of the kingdom by the angels at the close of the age (Matt 13:41). The term σκάνδαλον, which does not occur in Mark and only once in Luke (Luke 17:1), consistently denotes temptation to sin in Matthew (Matt 13:41, 16:23, 18:7).²³² Matt 13:41–43.49–50 juxtaposes final judgement of the ‘evil(doers)’ to the fate of the ‘righteous’. The focus on a work-related notion of good and evil²³³ and of final judgement²³⁴ may further be a distinctive feature of Matthew, while yet having possible points of connection with pre-existing Jesus-traditions.²³⁵

5.2.4. *The Matthean Eschatological Discourse (Matthew 24–25)*

The Matthean eschatological discourse (Matt 24–25) is a prominent example of the evangelist’s consistent theological tendency to draw out the eschatological perspective of judgement. The Matthean reading of Mark highlights the Parousia and the eschatological judgement. Yet the Matthean additional material concerning the coming of the Son of Man and his judgement of all the nations (Matt 25:31–46) has no

²³⁰ Sim, *Apocalyptic Eschatology in the Gospel of Matthew*, p. 175.

²³¹ Cf. juxtaposition between ‘sons of light’, בני אור, and ‘sons of darkness’, בני תוֹשָׁה, in e.g. 1QM I 1, 1QS I 9–10, III 13–IV 26, 4QD^a 1a–b 1.

²³² The Pauline usage of σκάνδαλον sometimes denotes temptation to sin (e.g. Rom 14:13, 16:17), but in other cases it rather stands for the challenge posed by Paul’s gospel mission (e.g. 1 Cor 1:23; Gal 5:11).

²³³ οἱ ποιοῦντες τὴν ἀνομίαν in Matt 13:41, οἱ ἐργαζόμενοι τὴν ἀνομίαν in Matt 7:23. Matt 7:21–23 contrasts evildoers with those who do ‘the will of my Father who is in heaven’. Matt 5:17–20 presents a notion of righteousness that is informed by the doing and teaching of the commandments of the Law. In sectarian Qumran texts, ‘doing’ is related to the Torah (הַתּוֹרָה (ה/ו) עוֹשֵׂי in 4QpPs^a II 15, 23; 1QpHab VIII 1, XII 4–5).

²³⁴ Eschatological judgement ‘according to one’s works’, ἀποδώσει ἐκάστω κατὰ τὴν πράξιν αὐτοῦ, in Matt 16:27b; a phrase unparalleled by Mark and Luke. Cf. Rom 2:6, ἀποδώσει ἐκάστω κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ.

²³⁵ Cf. e.g. Mark 10:17–22 / Matt 19:16–22 / Luke 18:18–23; Luke 12:28. See also Rom 2:6.

clear parallel in the Marcan eschatological discourse. The latter rather focuses on salvation (Mark 13:13.20), the gathering of the elect by the Son of Man (Mark 13:26–27), and the need to be watchful (Mark 13:32–37). There are also other prominent differences with Mark. Matt 24:12 substantiates the picture of tribulation in a way not attested by Mark or Luke: “And because wickedness is multiplied, most men’s love will grow cold” (RSV). Matt 24:14 explicitly correlates the gospel mission as a ‘testimony to all nations’ with the coming of the end (Matt 24:14); a point which is not directly made in the parallel Marcan verse (Mark 13:10).

5.3. Evaluation

My conclusions about community and eschatology in Matthew can only be tentative. The Matthean emphasis on final judgement of good and evil (Matt 13:36–43.49–50, 25:31–46) is undoubtedly related to the time and circumstances as perceived by the evangelist. Yet the missionary commitment to which the Matthean evidence attests (e.g. Matt 28:19–20) does not seem to support the idea of radical detachment²³⁶ and sectarian isolation of the Matthean community. If there is a sense of alienation discernible in Matthew, it was probably a phenomenon more broadly experienced by Jewish and Christian(-Jewish) communities in the aftermath of the Jewish war, in particular also in Antioch.²³⁷ The Matthean statement that “because wickedness (ἡ ἀνομία) is multiplied, most men’s love will grow cold” (Matt 24:12, RSV) may be an expression of this phenomenon. Since Matt 24:12 implies wickedness and men’s love as a pair of opposites, in this context ἀνομία may denote a more

²³⁶ *Contra* Schnelle, *Einleitung*, 260 who conceives of a “heidenchristliche Standort” for the definitive text of Matthew as completely detached from Judaism, in view of the abolition of ritual commandments (Matt 15:11.20b; 23:25) and the loss of significance accorded to the ritual prescriptions for the Sabbath (Matt 12:1–8). Nevertheless, Matt 5:17 stipulates the importance of the Law; cf. Luz, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus. I*, 51: “Matthäus schreibt jüdisch, gelegentlich rabbinisch bestimmtes Griechisch”.

²³⁷ Antioch was one of the scenes of repercussions of the Jewish war, as we read in Josephus’ *Jewish War* 7.41–62, 100–111. Josephus mentions the previous coexistence of Jews and Greeks (*J.W.* 7.43–44), the appeal of Judaism for many Greeks in Antioch (*J.W.* 7.45), the general hatred against the Jews (*J.W.* 7.46–47), the intra-Jewish betrayal in Antioch (*J.W.* 7.47–48.55–56), and the persecution of its Jewish community (*J.W.* 7.48–62).

broadly conceived phenomenon,²³⁸ not necessarily being restricted to the antagonism between the ‘law-observant’ and ‘law-free’ wings in the early Christian movement.²³⁹

The Matthean focus on hatred by ‘all the nations for my name’s sake’ (Matt 24:9), the gospel mission as a testimony to ‘all nations’ (Matt 24:14), and rejection of Jesus by ‘all the people’ (Matt 27:25) may be transparent of the bitter antagonism experienced in the upbuilding of the church in Matthew’s days. Yet an intra-Jewish sense behind the expression ‘house of Israel’ (Matt 10:6) and the universalist orientation of the gospel mission to ‘make disciples of all nations’ (Matt 28:19–20) contradict the idea of complete sectarian isolation.²⁴⁰ The references to (unconverted) Gentiles as outsiders to the ‘ingroup’ of the faithful in Matt 5:47, 6:7 and 18:17 may belong to a missionary rhetoric and outlook based on Jesus traditions; basic aspects of which Paul also appears to share (1 Cor 6:6, 7:14b, 12:2; Gal 2:15). The Matthean parable of the weeds (Matt 13:24–30) and its apocalyptic-eschatological explanation (Matt 13:36–43.49–50) may be illustrative of the antagonism and active opposition against the gospel mission as perceived by Matthew and the Matthean community.

6. THE GOSPEL OF LUKE

6.1. *The Social and Historical Setting of Luke*

Our starting point for the exploration of the Gospel of Luke about the subject of community and eschatology is quite different from that of Mark, Q and Matthew. Luke is often dated around 90 CE on the basis of the graphic, non-apocalyptic description of Jerusalem’s destruction

²³⁸ Perhaps there may be a biblical echo in the Matthean reference to the multiplication of wickedness, that is, in the Flood story of Genesis (Gen 6:1.5.11–13). The analogy between the ‘days of Noah’ and the ‘coming of the Son of man’, mentioned in Matt 24:37–39, may affirm this impression.

²³⁹ Note that Paul also uses the term ἀνομία in the sense of wickedness or iniquity (Rom 4:6–7, 6:19), without thereby sharing a perspective of complete Law-observance for all converts to the Christian faith.

²⁴⁰ Cf. Sim, *Apocalyptic Eschatology in the Gospel of Matthew*, 181–221. The following statement on page 217 may be typical: “Not only was (Matthew’s community) alienated from the Jewish and gentile worlds, but this law-observant church which had recently lost its power base in Jerusalem was completely alienated from the wider Christian world which preached a law-free gospel and was composed mainly of gentiles”.

(Luke 21:24).²⁴¹ Different locations have been defended with regard to the composition of the third Gospel, among them Rome²⁴² and Antioch²⁴³ being prominent options, but other scholars have considered this question to be unsolvable.²⁴⁴ Luke gives the appearance of a more individual presentation than the other Synoptic Gospels, as attested by the authorial 'I' in Luke 1:1–4 who dedicates the work to Theophilus (Luke 1:3; cf. Acts 1:1). Previous scholarship has noted parallels between Luke-Acts and ancient historiography.²⁴⁵

Yet the distinctive style and presentation of the third evangelist do not alter the fact that the Gospel of Luke was composed to address a community of believers in the gospel.²⁴⁶ The narrator's retrospective statement that "many have undertaken to compile a narrative of things which have been accomplished *among us*" (Luke 1:1, RSV) may already attest to a collective dimension. The theological activity of Luke was not that of an 'armchair theorist', as P.F. Esler rightly criticised a previous scholarly trend.²⁴⁷ The theological interests that permeate his narrative may rather voice a communal setting.

According to John Knox, an important theological concern of Luke consisted in portraying Christianity "as the continuation and fulfilment of authentic Judaism"; hence his interest in "the city of Jerusalem as

²⁴¹ See e.g. Schnelle, *Einleitung*, 285; Esler, *Community and Gospel in Luke-Acts*, 27–9 at 28 mentions 95 CE as *terminus ante quem*, in view of indications that some of the Pauline Letters were "available in a collected form by c. 95 CE"; a date after which Lucan non-acquaintance with Paul's Letters would be less conceivable. Esler further adds the Lucan picture of Roman trial (Acts 25:16) as a general argument that Luke presupposed a political atmosphere prior to the trials of Christians under Trajan (28–9).

²⁴² Schnelle, *Einleitung*, 285 and n. 314 with reference to F. Bovon, J. Roloff, G. Theißen, and M. Korn.

²⁴³ Schnelle, *Einleitung*, 285 n. 311 refers to commentaries on Luke and Acts by G. Schneider; Esler, *Community and Gospel in Luke-Acts*, 231 n. 36.

²⁴⁴ Schnelle, *Einleitung*, 285 n. 314 refers in this respect to Ph. Vielhauer and J.A. Fitzmyer.

²⁴⁵ See e.g. Schnelle, *Einleitung*, 291–2; cf. Breytenbach and Schröter (eds.), *Die Apostelgeschichte und die hellenistische Geschichtsschreibung*.

²⁴⁶ Note that Luke 1:4 presupposes prior knowledge about the gospel on the part of the dedicatee, Theophilus, thereby presupposing a broader, probably communal setting of gospel instruction. Analogously, Josephus also dedicated his works to one person, Epaphroditus (*Life* 430; *Ag.Ap.* 1.1, 2.296), but undoubtedly had a broader audience in mind for circulation of his works, though not specifically an 'ingroup' religious audience.

²⁴⁷ Esler, *Community and Gospel in Luke-Acts*, 1 thus criticises previous scholarship, of which he takes Conzelmann's *Die Mitte der Zeit* to be an exemplary case, of envisaging Luke's theological activity as "a glorified armchair theorist", supposedly devoid of communal interests in the social and political environment.

the place where the transition took place”.²⁴⁸ This theological concern has been interpreted in different ways, depending on previous scholarly viewpoints about the relation between Judaism and Christianity and their separation of the ways, as supposedly reflected by Luke and the Lucan community.

S.G. Wilson related Luke’s theological interest to a socio-political context in which Christian antiquity had to be demonstrated to the Graeco-Roman world and the Lucan community needed to establish its identity in view of the dominant direction to Gentile Christianity.²⁴⁹ Wilson recently contended that the effect of the Lucan portrayal of Jews and Judaism was that it contributed to a parting of the ways: “the dispute ceases to be *intra muros*. Christian enmity toward Jews becomes a public affair”.²⁵⁰ P.F. Esler rather maintained that the Lucan community consisted of a “mixture of Jew and Gentile, in which each group is significant”.²⁵¹ Concomitantly, Esler explains the Lucan focus on Jewish religious culture and Jerusalem in terms of intramural ‘legitimation’ of the gospel to members with both Jewish and Roman backgrounds rather than as extramural apology.²⁵² Wilson finds difficulty with Esler’s hypothesis of a mixed community with ‘more than one group of recipients’; a communal setting in which Luke would have to tread so delicate a middle course that his strategy could only be flawed.²⁵³ Wilson and Esler disagree about the question whether or not converts with a Jewish background could be a significant group in the Lucan community.²⁵⁴

²⁴⁸ Knox, *Chapters in a Life of Paul*, 35 makes this observation in the course of his argument that the Pauline Letters rather than the Acts of the Apostles should have priority in the scholarly analysis of Paul’s life and thought. It should be noted that, apart from the evidence of Acts, the focus on Jerusalem is also distinctively recognisable in Luke 1:5–25, 2:41–52, 24:13–53.

²⁴⁹ Wilson, *The Gentiles and the Gentile Mission in Luke-Acts*; see more recently idem, *Related Strangers: Jews and Christians, 70–170 CE*, 56–71.

²⁵⁰ Wilson, *Related Strangers*, 71.

²⁵¹ Esler, *Community and Gospel in Luke-Acts*, 24–45 (“The Community”) at 31 takes this option to be “nearest to the truth, with the qualification that most of the Gentiles in Luke’s community had not converted to Christianity from idolatry, but had previously been associated with Jewish synagogues”.

²⁵² Esler, *Community and Gospel in Luke-Acts*, 205–19 (“Apologetic or legitimation?”).

²⁵³ Wilson, *Related Strangers*, 60.

²⁵⁴ Cf. Esler, *Community and Gospel in Luke-Acts*, 44–5 at 44: “When one remembers that Luke-Acts was probably written between 85 and 95 CE, it is difficult to imagine how New Testament scholars could ever have come to discount the possibility of a significant Jewish presence among Luke’s audience”, referring to Jewish converts and children of the first converts, as well as to Acts 2:39; Wilson, *Related Strangers*, 66: “The setting [of Acts 28] in Rome and the ringing declaration that the Gentiles will

I tend to favour Esler's hypothesis for the following reasons. Wilson's objections can only be partly justified, for the 'mixed community' was a reality in Paul's time (cf. e.g. 1 Cor 1:22–24, 7:12–16; Rom 11:13–14) and Ignatius' polemic against a Jewish way of life (Ign. *Magn.* 10.3) could still be a response to the situation of rival churches or rival interests within the church. Luke-Acts appears to be directed to (salvation for) the Gentiles as a new stage in the early history of the gospel mission. Yet, in the Lucan perspective, the 'people' remains the Jewish people of Israel (Luke 2:32; Acts 26:23, 28:26). The contrasts between accusation and testimony that Luke presents (e.g. Acts 6:11–14 and 7:35–53; Acts 21:21.28 and 28:17) could serve as powerful examples for the identity of Lucan Christianity in face of possible opposition and persecution. It could well be that the narrative of Acts, inasmuch as it addressed converts with Jewish affiliations, served a purpose of double legitimation: a denouncement of Jewish opposition to the gospel on the one hand, and a demonstration of Christian integrity, which did not seek to give offense to Jews with respect to the observance of the Law or of Jewish customs (cf. Acts 28:17), on the other. In fact, the Lucan portrayal of Paul's circumcision of Timothy in Acts 16:1–3 could be an example of the latter aspect of legitimation.²⁵⁵

6.2. *Lucan Eschatology*

6.2.1. *Eschatology in Luke's Special Materials*

Certain parables in Luke voice the idea of eschatological reversal. The parable about the great banquet (Luke 14:16–24 / Matt 22:1–10), for which Luke provides a distinctively eschatological framework (Luke 14:12–15 at v. 14), comprises a reversal in the pattern of inviting guests, turning from those close to the host through kinship or friendship to the outcast (Luke 14:21).²⁵⁶ The eschatological point of this reversal

hear seem to point beyond the limits of the narrative to a time when the mission of the church will be addressed predominantly and successfully to Gentiles. Nothing encourages a hope for the Jews as Jews, and the time of mass conversions lies, according to Acts itself, in the past".

²⁵⁵ Cf. Levinskaya, *The Book of Acts in Its First Century Setting*. 5, 12–17 ("Jewish Identity and the Circumcision of Timothy: the Ethnic Boundary"), who discusses the Lucan story as an example of the "principle of defining ethnic Jewish identity along matrilineal lines" (17).

²⁵⁶ Luke 14:13.21 consistently refers to the 'poor and maimed and blind and lame', whereas the Matt 22:9–10 refers to "as many as you find" and "all whom they [the

is made in Luke 14:12–14, in which the Lucan Jesus insists on acts of loving charity which cannot be repaid during lifetime but which “will be repaid at the resurrection of the just”, ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει τῶν δικαίων (Luke 14:14, RSV). The parable about the dishonest steward (Luke 16:1–13) includes eschatological reversal in verses 8–9. These verses stress that a use of ‘unrighteous mammon’, ὁ μαμωνᾶς τῆς ἀδικίας,²⁵⁷ for the benefit of others rather than for personal gain may have the reverse eschatological effect of being received “into the eternal habitations” (Luke 16:9, RSV). The last example that may be noted here is the Lucan parable about the rich man and Lazarus (Luke 16:19–31).²⁵⁸ This parable voices the idea that their respective fates in the afterlife are the reverse of their respective fates during their lifetimes.

Lucan special materials include sayings about the Kingdom. Luke 17:20–21 contains a Kingdom-tradition unparalleled in Mark and Matthew²⁵⁹ according to which Jesus reacts to the question of the Pharisees when the kingdom of God would come by asserting that the “kingdom of God is in the midst of you” (Luke 17:21, RSV).²⁶⁰

Luke focuses on God’s *speedy* vindication of his elect (Luke 18:8, contrary to the practices of an unrighteous judge “who neither feared God nor regarded man” (Luke 18:1–8 at v. 2, RSV). At the end of this pericope, Luke likewise urges his audience to be faithful, posing the rhetorical question: “when the Son of man comes, will he find faith on earth?” (Luke 18:8).

According to recent scholarship, the Last Supper as portrayed in Luke 22:7–38 may be connected with the theme of the eschatological banquet, symbolised as ‘my table in my kingdom’ (Luke 22:30).²⁶¹ Jesus’

servants] found, both good and bad”.

²⁵⁷ Apart from the Aramaism of μαμωνᾶς (a transliteration of ממונא), this Lucan passage is replete with Semitic expressions, such as the contrast between ‘sons of this world (/age)’ and ‘sons of light’ in Luke 16:8.

²⁵⁸ See now Lehtipuu, *The Afterlife Imagery in Luke’s Story of the Rich Man and Lazarus*.

²⁵⁹ Logia 3 and 113 of the *Gospel of Thomas* may parallel Luke 17:20–21, but there are also differences, so that a single underlying Jesus-tradition cannot be assumed without argument.

²⁶⁰ Cf. Kümmel, *Promise and Fulfilment*, 32–34 at 34, who observes that the translation ‘in you’ denotes a matter of place, while the preferable translation ‘amongst you’ voices the contrast as actually implied in this passage, being a matter of time: the future Kingdom (Pharisees) vs. the present Kingdom (Jesus).

²⁶¹ See Nielsen, *Lukan Eschatology According to Luke 22 and Acts*; cf. Kieffer, “Les repas eschatologiques chez Luc,” 161–75 with particular attention for Luke 22. Dunn, *Jesus Remembered*, 425–8 includes Luke 22:30 in his survey on ‘Reward and Heavenly

words at the cross addressing a robber (Luke 23:43) imply that the 'kingdom' (Luke 23:42) and 'Paradise' (Luke 23:43) are two symbols for the afterlife for which Jesus provides the keys of entrance.²⁶² If this saying anticipates on Jesus' resurrection, it constitutes an example of inaugurated eschatology.²⁶³

6.2.2. *Lucan Adoption of Eschatological Traditions from Mark and Q*

Luke has retained certain eschatological traditions from Mark and Q and adapted them to the context of his own narrative. The Markan 'eschatological discourse' (Mark 13:3–37) has been taken by the third evangelist as a point of departure for his own eschatological discourse in Luke 21:7–36. The other Lucan 'eschatological discourse', in Luke 17:20–37, integrates material from Mark²⁶⁴ and from Q,²⁶⁵ but it also comprises material particular to Luke (Luke 17:20–22.28–29.32). Before turning to these two Lucan eschatological discourses and other eschatological traditions, some observations need to be made about Lucan eschatology and its relation to pre-Lucan eschatological traditions as perceived in previous scholarship.

Luke 12:35–48 shares parables with Matt 24:43–51 that conclude with exhortation about readiness concerning the unexpected hour when the Son of man comes (Luke 12:40 / Matt 24:44) and a concomitant disposition of faithfulness (Luke 12:41–48 / Matt 24:45–51).²⁶⁶ The parable about the wicked servant who denies the coming of the master (Luke 12:45 / Matt 24:48) only serves to stress this point of God's righteousness in judgement from Luke's point of view, rather than voicing a Lucan conviction of the 'delay of the parousia'.

Previous scholarship supposed a theological development of response to the delay of the imminently expected Parousia that would underly the

Banquet', further referring to Matt 8:11 / Luke 13:28–29: "the many coming from east and west will recline in the kingdom of heaven/God with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob" (427).

²⁶² Cf. Ellis, "Present and Future Eschatology in Luke," 139–45.

²⁶³ Ellis, *Christ and the Future*, 139–45 interprets Luke 23:43 as "a proleptic saying or, better, a *pesher* to the post-resurrection situation".

²⁶⁴ Luke 17:23 / Mark 13:21; Luke 17:25 / Mark 8:31; Luke 17:31a / Mark 13:15.

²⁶⁵ Luke 17:24.26–27.30.31b.33–37 / Matt 24:27.37–39, 24:18, 16:25, 24:40–41, 24:28.

²⁶⁶ The underlying message about faithfulness may be deduced from the fact that the wicked servant is grouped with the *unfaithful* (μετὰ τῶν ἀπίστων, Luke 12:46). Note that, in accordance with the Matthean paraenesis against hypocrisy (cf. Matt 23), the parallel Matthean verse, Matt 24:51, has μετὰ τῶν ὑποκριτῶν.

Synoptic Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles.²⁶⁷ Luke-Acts supposedly represented a more advanced stage, turning from apocalyptic expectations of an imminent end to a historicising tendency of salvation history.²⁶⁸ Strobel, while affirming this perspective for the Greek audiences of the Synoptic Gospels, discerned the possibility of reading a passage of key importance to the ‘delay of the Parousia’-hypothesis (Matt 24:45–51 / Luke 12:42–46) differently at the level of underlying Jesus-tradition. On the basis of a connection with the piel קָרָא in Habakkuk 2:3, Strobel argued that an Aramaic ‘Vorlage’ to χρονίζειν could denote *failure to come* (*Ausbleiben*) rather than *delay*. For the original audience, this Jesus tradition in Q would have been part of uncompromising eschatological paraenesis that warned about the unknown hour of the Parousia. Far from reflecting the audience’s experienced delay of the Parousia, according to Strobel the Jesus-tradition underlying the passage shared by Matthew and Luke was directed to the hearer’s disposition to the Kingdom of God, whether expected to come or not.²⁶⁹

The problematic point with regard to Luke 12:42–46 as evidence of a theology of ‘delay of the Parousia’ is that it considers as theological tendency that which Luke ascribes to reasoning of an unfaithful servant (Luke 12:45–46). Luke 12:46 rather confirms the idea that “the master of that servant *will* come”, but at an unexpected time (RSV; cf. Mark 13:32–37).²⁷⁰

²⁶⁷ See chapter one, section 2.1 note 36. Cf. the recent supposition of a confident and sophisticated ‘theology of delay’ in Q by Fleddermann, *Q: A Reconstruction and Commentary*, 159.

²⁶⁸ Grässer, *Das Problem der Parusieverzögerung*, 113–27 provides a survey of direct attestations of a perspective of ‘delay of the Parousia’, thereby taking Matt 24:45–51 / Luke 12:42–46 to be a *dictum probans* (χρονίζει μου ὁ κύριος in Matt 24:48 / χρονίζει ὁ κύριός μου ἔρχεσθαι in Luke 12:45). Cf. Conzelmann, *Die Mitte der Zeit*, 88: “Die Eschatologie des Lukas ist gegenüber der ursprünglichen Konzeption von der Nähe des Reiches eine sekundäre Konstruktion auf Grund bestimmter, ‘mit der Zeit’ gar nicht mehr zu umgehender Reflexionen. Deren Ursache läßt sich erkennen: das Ausbleiben der Parusie”. The recent monograph by Vena, *The Parousia and Its Rereadings*, shares the viewpoint of a de-apocalypticising development as the result of the delay of the Parousia. Vena elaborates an evaluation of three periods of eschatological expectation, exemplified by Paul’s authentic Letters; the Synoptic Gospels, the Deutero-Pauline Letters, the Acts of the Apostles, and Hebrews; the Pastoral Epistles, Johannine literature, 1–2 Peter, James and Jude, respectively (107–111, 257–68).

²⁶⁹ Strobel, *Untersuchungen zum eschatologischen Verzögerungsproblem*, 216–22. Cf. BDAG, ³2000, 1092 about two possible meanings of χρονίζειν in Matt 24:48 par.

²⁷⁰ Cf. Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, 506: “the overall emphasis falls on the unpredictability and certainty of the return and, thus, on the importance of faithful behavior for the duration of one’s stewardship”.

Recent scholarship has also questioned the centrality of the delay of the Parousia in Lucan theology as reflected in Acts. With regard to Luke, the following comment in a recent monograph by S.L. Bridge may be illustrative: “emphasis should be placed not on the *timing* of the parousia relative to Luke’s history but on the *nature* of the Eschaton relative to Luke’s theology—especially in matters of faith, salvation, Christology, and morality”.²⁷¹

While present and future dimensions to eschatology are part of Lucan theology (cf. Luke 17:20–21 and 17:21–37), the evidence for a supposed ‘eschatological tension’ needs to be reconsidered. There is growing scholarly recognition of the fact that the perceived contradiction between prophecy about the future and the final age on the one hand and experienced reality on the other may not necessarily have been a historical category of religious experience in earliest Christianity.²⁷² The contradiction deduced from a supposed ‘eschatological tension’ could rather belong to the perspective of modern observers.²⁷³ In what follows, I will treat exemplary cases of Lucan conceptualisation of eschatology, as well as adaptation of and additions to other Synoptic, pre-Lucan traditions of eschatology.

6.2.3. *Lucan Conceptualisations of Eschatology*

There are two particularly Lucan conceptualisations of matters related to eschatological expectation. The first is Luke’s emphasis on God’s visitation, which could be in line with the Lucan theological interest in salvation history. The theme of God’s visitation may have eschatological connotations in the context of prophecy of good news related to John the Baptist (Luke 1:68.78) and to Jesus (Luke 7:16). In the Gospel of Luke, God’s visitation applies to the Jewish people of Israel (Luke 1:68.78, 7:16, 19:44), but in Acts 15:14 it applies to the Gentiles. For the third evangelist, God’s visitation is mostly related to salvation. Yet the reference to the ‘time of visitation’, ὁ καιρὸς τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς,

²⁷¹ Bridge, *The Deliverance of the Elect in Lukan Eschatology*, xvi.

²⁷² See Dunn, *Jesus Remembered*, 478–84 (“What Kind of ‘Eschatology?’”) at 483 against the modern focus on chronology: “both Jesus’ contemporaries and the first Christians could live with the disappointment of failed prophecy without that failure disturbing the core faith which found expression in the prophecy”.

²⁷³ Cf. Esler, *Community and Gospel in Luke-Acts*, 60 contra Conzelmann’s idea, “it is impossible to maintain a belief in an imminent *parousia* in the face of continued delay in its arrival, is demonstrably false”.

unknown by the personified Jerusalem in Luke 19:44, which presents a prophecy about Jerusalem's destruction,²⁷⁴ is more ambiguous. Luke could have in mind a salutary visitation through Jesus' gospel mission which was 'unknown' to the Jerusalem leadership in the sense of not being recognised as such and rejected.²⁷⁵ This point is subsequently made in certain speeches in Acts (e.g. Acts 2:22, 3:13–17; κατὰ ἄγνοιαν in Acts 3:17). On the other hand, the immediate context of Luke 19:44 may imply that ignorance of the 'time of visitation' is ignorance about "things that make for peace" which are "hid from your eyes" (Luke 19:42; RSV). In the biblical tradition, God's visitation (LXX ἐπισκοπή / MT (ה)ד(ו)קפ) may relate to destruction and punishment²⁷⁶ on the one hand and to promise and salvation on the other.²⁷⁷ The Dead Sea scrolls also comprise a twofold notion of God's visitation (הקודה).²⁷⁸

The Qumran evidence could illuminate a Jewish context of eschatological expectation to the Lucan concept of God's visitation as an event that inaugurates the final age (Luke 7:16). In the *Damascus Document*, God's visitation of a remnant of Israel (CD-A I 7 // 4QD^a 2 I 11 // 4QD^c 1 14) is surrounded by communal consciousness about iniquity and revelation of eschatological matters (CD-A I 11–12 // 4QD^a 2 I 15–16). In both Luke 7:16 and the *Damascus Document*, the eschatological dimension to God's visitation is informed by a salutary event and revelation.

The second conceptualisation pertaining to Luke's eschatological perspective is the phrase "until the times of the Gentiles (καιροὶ ἔθνῶν) are fulfilled" in Luke 21:24 (RSV). This phrase occurs in the context of a vision about 'this people' falling by the edge of the sword, being led into captivity among all the nations, and Jerusalem being trampled by the nations.²⁷⁹ J. Nolland argued that this Lucan phrase would denote

²⁷⁴ Only in Luke's version of Jesus 'messianic entry' into Jerusalem do we find the anticipation on words (καὶ οὐκ ἀφήσουσιν λίθον ἐπὶ λίθον) which recur in the Synoptic prophecy about the destruction of the Temple (Mark 13:2 / Matt 24:2 / Luke 21:6).

²⁷⁵ Nolland, *Luke 18:35–24:53*, 932: "The time of visitation by God is not the entry to Jerusalem as such, but the whole of the ministry of Jesus, now coming to its end".

²⁷⁶ See e.g. Isa 10:3, 23:17, 24:22; Jer 6:15, 10:15, 11:23; LXX Wis 14:11.

²⁷⁷ See e.g. Gen 50:24; Exod 3:16; Job 10:12, 29:4; Isa 29:6.

²⁷⁸ On 'visitation' in the sense of retribution and destruction of evil, see e.g. 1QS IV 19; 4QpHos^a I 10; 4QD^a 1 a–b 2. On 'visitation' in the sense of salvation of the elect, see e.g. CD-A I 7 // 4QD^a 2 I 11.

²⁷⁹ For possible echoes of biblical prophecy in Luke 21:24, not paralleled by Mark or Matthew, see e.g. Isa 63:18, Dan 8:13; cf. CD-A I 3–4.17, III 10–11; 4Q174 frgs. 1 col. I, 21, 2, ll. 5–6. Cf. Nolland, *Luke 18:35–24:53*, 1002–1004 at 1004: "V 24 is a pastiche

a turn from God's wrath against 'this people' through the sword of the Gentiles (Luke 21:22–23) to God's ultimate judgement of the Gentiles.²⁸⁰ Yet wrath, distress, and vengeance in Luke 21:22–24 could be categories voicing human outrage and violence in view of war (Luke 21:10–11.20–21.25–26), persecution and alienation (Luke 21:12–17); part of which is historical retrospect (Luke 21:20). The parts of this Lucan discourse (Luke 21:5–36) which do come to speak directly of revelation from Jesus and of God's kingdom focus on the following issues: vigilance against many who lead astray (Luke 21:8), deliverance from adversaries (Luke 21:15), endurance (Luke 21:19), redemption through the expected coming of the Son of man (Luke 21:27–33), and vigilance for "strength to escape all these things that will take place, and to stand before the Son of man" (Luke 21:36, RSV). The Lucan reference to the fulfilment of the 'times of the Gentiles' probably denotes an end to distress and days of vengeance. The concept of *καίροι ἐθνῶν* has no specific parallel in the biblical tradition. However, in view of the negative connotation to Gentiles as instruments of wrath, there may be a general parallel with references to 'periods of wrath', קצי (ה)חרון (4QpHos^a I 12; 4QD^a 11 19 // 4QD^c 7 II 13; 4QD^c 1 5), and 'periods of darkness', מועדי חושך (1QM I 8) in the literature of Qumran.²⁸¹ Luke 21:24 may imply that an intra-Jewish perspective was important for Luke as well as for his (mixed) audience.

6.2.4. *The Lucan Eschatological Discourses (Luke 17:20–37 and 21:5–36)*

The two 'eschatological discourses' in Luke have quite different settings. The eschatological discourse in Luke 17:20–37 is immediately preceded by the Pharisees' question when the kingdom of God would come (Luke 17:20). The framework of this discourse is provided by Jesus' answer (Luke 17:21), and Jesus' teaching to and discussion with the disciples (Luke 17:22.37). The other eschatological discourse, in Luke 21:5–36, starts with Jesus' prophecy about the destruction of the Temple (Luke

of allusions to OT descriptions of judgment upon Jerusalem (see esp. Jer 20:4–6; 28:64; and the Greek text of Zech 12:3)".

²⁸⁰ According to Nolland, *Luke 18:35–24:53*, 1004 "pervasive OT pattern of judgment upon Jerusalem / Israel / Judah followed by judgment in turn upon the instruments of their judgment (e.g., Isa 10; Jer 50–52" underlies Luke 21:24.25–26.

²⁸¹ מועדי הגואים in 4Q166 (4QpHos^a) II 16 corresponds verbally with *καίροι ἐθνῶν*, but stands for the 'feasts of the Gentiles' in its own proper context.

21:5–6) and the disciples' question "when will this be, and what will be the sign when this is about to take place?" (Luke 21:7). The latter discourse responds to eschatological expectations ("the end will not be at once," Luke 21:9) in the context of prophecy²⁸² rather than working out a vision of the end itself. Against previous redaction-critical views,²⁸³ S.L. Bridge has contended that the 'Eschatological Discourse' (Luke 17:22–37), not the 'Synoptic Apocalypse' (Luke 21:5–36) "may be said to comprise the core of Lukan eschatology."²⁸⁴ Bridge's approach presupposes a priority of the issue of the nature of the eschaton over the question of its timing. However, the questions of the nature of the end and timing play a part in both Luke 17:22–37 and Luke 21:5–36, and caution is due against a dichotomy between these two issues.

Luke 17:20–37, while yielding an impression about the nature of the end in terms of imminence, destruction and judgement on the 'day when the Son of man is revealed' (Luke 17:30), does also express a concern with timing. The Jesus tradition in Luke 17:20–21 focuses on the present reality of the kingdom of God,²⁸⁵ whereas the subsequent verses deal with the day(s) of the Son of man in the future tense. According to E.E. Ellis, present and future dimensions to eschatology repeatedly occur side by side in Luke. Ellis also upheld the view that this feature may well go back to pre-Lucan Jesus tradition.²⁸⁶ The evidence from Q to which Ellis refers could provide at least partial support for this scholarly view.²⁸⁷ In fact, even the *Gospel of Thomas*, with its predomi-

²⁸² Cf. the plural 'days of vengeance', ἡμέραι ἐκδικήσεως, in Luke 21:22 instead of the singular, eschatological '(day of) judgement', ἡμέρα κρίσεως / ἐν τῇ κρίσει (e.g. in Luke 10:14 par.).

²⁸³ See Zmijevski, *Die Eschatologiereden*, 39: "In Lk 21 kommen die Grundtendenzen der lukanischen Eschatologie besser in den Blick als in Lk 17"; Geiger, *Die Lukanischen Endzeitreden*, 265f. about the special significance of Luke 21:5–36 for Lukan eschatology.

²⁸⁴ Bridge, *Where the Eagles are Gathered*, xvii. Cf. xviii: "the nature of Luke's Eschaton (17.22–37) can take priority over its timing (21.5–36)".

²⁸⁵ Cf. Kümmel, *Promise and Fulfilment*, 32–4 about the translation of ἐν τῶν ὑμῶν as 'among you' being preferable to 'in you', in view of the fact that "to calculate the Kingdom of God in advance or to search for it in the future can hardly be contrasted with 'in you' as a matter of a place, but only as one of time".

²⁸⁶ Ellis, "Present and Future Eschatology in Luke," 129–46 at 146: "The relationship of present and future eschatology forms the framework for Luke's 'history of salvation' theology. Luke accentuates and elaborates the framework, but he did not originate it".

²⁸⁷ Ellis, "Present and Future Eschatology in Luke," 146 refers to the "future kingdom" and the "present giving of the kingdom's bread" (Luke 11:2. 13 / Matt 6:10–11), to "future resurrection" and "the 'greater thing' that is present in Jesus' mission" (Luke 11:31–32 / Matt 12:41–42), to "future reward and judgment" and "immediate judgment" (Luke 12:41–48.49–53 / Matt 24:43–51 and 10:34–36).

nant focus on the kingdom of God as a present reality (*G.Th.* 3, 113; cf. logion 51), may still reveal traces of this double dimension to eschatology in early Jesus-tradition. *G.Th.* 37 refers to revelation of Jesus to the disciples in a future tense, while the garments in this logion may well symbolise the body and the resurrection (cf. 2 Cor 5:1–5, Luke 12:28). The Parousia expectation on the part of the disciples appears to play in the background here. In his treatment of the future dimension, Luke turns from the vain expectation of (the return of) the ‘days of the Son of man’ (Luke 17:22) to the destruction “on the day when the Son of man is revealed” (Luke 17:30), evoking judgement and destruction. Yet the pericope ends with a saying about the salvation of the elect gathered around the body of resurrection of the Lord, as S.L. Bridge has recently convincingly argued.²⁸⁸

Luke 17:28–30 draws an analogy between the ‘days of Lot’, when Sodom was destroyed, and the “day when the Son of man is revealed” (Luke 17:30; RSV). This analogy directly follows that of the ‘days of Noah’ (Q 17:26–27).

The eschatological discourse in Luke 21:5–36 cautions against undue expectations about an imminent end on the one hand (Luke 21:8–9) and urges the addressees to be watchful on the other (Luke 21:34–36). Yet the issue in Luke 21:5–36 is not so much the timing of the end, but a description of conditions which inaugurate the final age envisaged as ‘redemption’ for the faithful, ἡ ἀπολύτρωσις ὑμῶν (Luke 21:28), and as the (future) kingdom of God (Luke 21:31).²⁸⁹ It was observed in previous scholarship that Luke, as compared to Mark, presupposes a longer duration of time before the end.²⁹⁰ The repeated mention of imminence (Luke 21:28.31.34) may yet speak against this interpretation of chronology and the concomitant idea of the ‘delay of the parousia’. The paraenesis against concerns that lead astray from faithfulness is part of Luke’s second eschatological discourse (Luke 21:34).

²⁸⁸ Bridge, *Where the Eagles are Gathered*, 20: “Luke employs this logion [Luke 17:37b] neither as an inscrutable retort nor as a macabre image of judgment or suffering. Rather, Luke presents Jesus’ saying as a word of comfort to the elect, assuring them of their deliverance from the inevitable destruction of the final days”; the ἀγροί and the σῶμα to stand metaphorically for the righteous and the Lord respectively (21).

²⁸⁹ Cf. the attention for components of *ethical paraenesis* in Luke 21:5–36 by Zmijevski, *Die Eschatologiereden*, 323–25; Geiger, *Die Lukanischen Endzeitreden*, 253–54 on “die Gestaltung der Paränese und Paraklese durch Lukas” in Luke 21.

²⁹⁰ E.g. Geiger, *Die Lukanischen Endzeitreden*, 250–53, 255–58; Zmijevski, *Die Eschatologiereden*, 321–2 notes a stronger tendency of Luke in this direction, while observing that “beide Evangelisten durchaus das gleiche eschatologische Grundverständnis besitzen” (321).

6.3. *Evaluation*

The Lucan focus on faithfulness in eschatological sections (Luke 12:41–48, 18:8, 21:34) may bring us closer to the communal setting of Luke. This Lucan focus may be an elaboration on pre-Lucan Jesus tradition (Mark 4:19.40),²⁹¹ but its repetition in Lucan passages and pericopes makes it clear that there was a clear communicative intention toward the Lucan audience behind this recurring theme. Faithfulness was probably complicated not only by tribulation and persecution, against which the Synoptic Jesus tradition posited endurance and watchfulness for the day of the Son of Man. The audience for which Luke wrote his work probably required a new perspective of hope and faith in the narrative setting of the earliest history of the Jesus-movement and its subsequent mission to the Diaspora. In this respect, there may be an important link between the eschatological paraenesis on faithfulness in Luke on the one hand and the growth of faith among the audience of the gospel mission (e.g. Acts 2:47, 4:4, 6:7, 18:8, 21:20) together with the ‘continuation in the faith’ (e.g. Acts 14:22) among the disciples in face of persecution in the Acts of the Apostles on the other. The Lucan perspective of salvation history and the eschatological paraenesis about faithfulness probably served to respond to the Lucan community’s experience of division and questioning of previous convictions in the missionary Jesus-movement. The daunted hope that Jesus “was the one to redeem Israel” (Luke 24:21, RSV) and the questioning in the hearts of the disciples who went to Emmaus (Luke 24:38) could be transparent of the Lucan community’s doubts and needs for reassurance of the faith through the gospel.

7. ESCHATOLOGICAL JESUS-TRADITIONS IN THE GOSPEL OF THOMAS

The canonical New Testament writings contain abundant evidence of eschatology, in narrative form, in sayings, in letters, and in a full-blown apocalypse. The potential evidence of writings preserved outside the

²⁹¹ Cf. the parallel between Luke’s eschatological admonition against ‘cares of this life’, μέριμνα βιωτικά, in Luke 21:34 and Paul’s eschatologically motivated exhortation to the Corinthians ‘to be free from anxieties’, ἀμέριμνοι εἶναι (1 Cor 7:32; cf. 1 Cor 7:29–31 on eschatological expectation).

canon, the extra-canonical New Testament writings,²⁹² is usually left out of consideration. The recent synthesis of eschatology in the New Testament by O.D. Vena (2001)²⁹³ attests to this tendency. However, the *a priori* assumption that extra-canonical writings are of secondary historical importance as sources about Jesus and his earliest followers has become questionable since Walter Bauer's study on 'orthodoxy and heresy in the earliest church'.²⁹⁴ If extra-canonical sources are increasingly considered serious evidence for historical Jesus-research,²⁹⁵ this should also be the case with eschatology.

The *Gospel of Thomas* merits particular consideration with regard to the subject of eschatology in emerging Christianity. The timespan for dating the Greek original preceding the Coptic *Gospel of Thomas* has generally been set between the mid-first century CE and the mid-second century CE, even though an early second century CE date is mostly argued.²⁹⁶ Nevertheless, Jesus-traditions in the *Gospel of Thomas* can be pertinent to first-century CE Christianity, as will be surveyed below, and play a part in historical Jesus-research.

7.1. *The Text of the Gospel of Thomas*

The Coptic *Gospel of Thomas*, classified in the Nag Hammadi library as Codex II, tractate two (NHC II, 2), dated to the mid-fourth century CE, constitutes the main textual evidence, in that it preserves a complete text of this extra-canonical Gospel. This text is usually subdivided into 114 logia, according to introductory phrases such as 'Jesus said' or 'his disciples said'. Greek fragments from *P.Oxy.* 1, 654, 655, which are dated between 200 and 250 CE, run parallel to the Coptic prologue and logia 1–7, 24, 26–33, 36–39, 77. In view of perceived differences

²⁹² The term *extra-canonical* may be conceptually more sound than *apocryphal*; cf. Luttikhuisen, *De veelvormigheid van het vroegste christendom*, 34–39 on the (late-) antique and contemporary meanings of the term 'apocryphal'.

²⁹³ Vena, *The Parousia and Its Rereadings*.

²⁹⁴ Bauer, *Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei im ältesten Christentum*.

²⁹⁵ See the surveys by Theissen and Merz, *Der historische Jesus*, 51–65 and Charlesworth and Evans, "Jesus in the Agrapha and Apocryphal Gospels," 479–533.

²⁹⁶ On the date of composition of the originally Greek *Gospel of Thomas*, see e.g. Valantasis, *The Gospel of Thomas*, 12–21 (100–110 CE date of Greek version); cf. Fallon and Cameron, "The Gospel of Thomas: A Forschungsbericht and Analysis," 4196–251 at 4224–7 (survey of proposed dates between 50 and 140 CE); Klauck, *Apocryphal Gospels*, 108 (120–140 CE date of an early version).

between the Coptic manuscript and the Greek fragments, the textual evidence could reflect different redactional stages of *Thomas*.²⁹⁷

7.2. Socio-Religious and Historical Settings of the Gospel of Thomas

In its Coptic form, the audience of the *Gospel of Thomas* was the Coptic church in late antique Egypt, but the Greek fragments (*P.Oxy.* 1, 654, 655) attest to an earlier recension. The audience of a ‘Gospel of Thomas’, κατὰ θωμᾶν εὐαγγέλιον, included Manicheans and Naasenes according to patristic testimonia of the third and fourth centuries CE.²⁹⁸ The origin of the Greek *Gospel of Thomas* has been related to Syria, whose sources of Jesus-tradition have at times been traced back to a community of Christian Jews in Syrian Antioch.²⁹⁹

While the *Gospel of Thomas* does not comprise citations or paraphrases of Scripture, biblical tradition is not absent from this text as intertextual background. Allusions to biblical tradition in the *Gospel of Thomas* include references to Paradise (*G.Th.* 19), Adam (*G.Th.* 46, 85), the biblical prophets (‘twenty-four prophets of Israel’, *G.Th.* 52; 88), and the designation the ‘word of the Father’, which could be related to biblical tradition (*G.Th.* 79).

The *Gospel of Thomas* is a Sayings Gospel with both parallels to and material distinct from the Synoptic Gospels; the overall sequence of sayings in *Thomas* not fitting into a uniform redactional theory of literary dependence on the Synoptic Gospels.³⁰⁰ It may be among the potentially most significant extra-canonical sources about early Jesus-tradition.³⁰¹

In view of the absence of an explicit Gnostic worldview in terms of Gnostic dualism on the one hand and overlaps with Synoptic tradition

²⁹⁷ H. Koester, “Introduction,” and H.W. Attridge, “Appendix. The Greek Fragments,” *Nag Hammadi Codex II*, 2–7 (ed. Layton), 38–49 and 96–109 respectively.

²⁹⁸ Attridge, “Appendix. The Greek Fragments,” 103–9.

²⁹⁹ Koester, “Introduction,” 40; Valantasis, *The Gospel of Thomas*, 3–4; Klauck, *Apocryphal Gospels*, 108. The recent study by DeConick, *Recovering the Original Gospel of Thomas*, 153–5 has defended a radically early dating between 30–50 CE of a ‘kernel’ of apocalyptic and Christological ideas in *Thomas*, whose origin would be situated in the itinerant Jerusalem mission.

³⁰⁰ For a survey of Synoptic parallels, see Koester, “Introduction,” 38–49 at 46–9; cf. Klauck, *Apocryphal Gospels*, 121: “a nuanced position on the relationship between *EvThom* and the canonical gospels is advisable, since individual logia point in different directions”.

³⁰¹ Cf. e.g. Aune, “Assessing the Historical Value of the Apocryphal Jesus Traditions,” 243–72; Patterson, “The Gospel of Thomas and Christian Beginnings,” 1–17.

and to a far lesser extent with Johannine tradition on the other, the *Gospel of Thomas* can be situated in the early second century CE as proto-Gnostic Gospel.³⁰² Extensive parallels between *Thomas*, Q, and Mark as well as divergent materials speak for first-century CE Jesus-tradition in this extra-canonical Gospel.³⁰³ The aforesaid lack of any uniform pattern of literary arrangement in *Thomas* as compared to the Synoptic tradition appears to make the idea that *Thomas* would constitute a clearly specifiable form of redactional reworking of Q problematic.³⁰⁴ References to 'James the righteous' as leader (*G.Th.* 12; cf. 1 Cor 15:7; Gal 1:19, 2:9; Acts 15:13–21) and to Pharisees and scribes (*G.Th.* 39, 102) may indicate that *Thomas* comprises elaboration on traditions from first-century CE emerging Christianity.³⁰⁵

7.3. *Eschatology in the Gospel of Thomas*

Thomas includes references to eschatological expectations to which the Thomasine Jesus responds. Contrary to previous scholarly opinion about the Thomasine sayings of Jesus being non-eschatological or even anti-eschatological,³⁰⁶ certain sayings (*G.Th.* 18, 51, 111, 113) could be eschatological in content with regard to the following themes:³⁰⁷ apocalyptic transformation of heaven and earth (*G.Th.* 51, 111), the

³⁰² Hurtado, *Lord Jesus Christ*, 452–79 has discussed *Thomas* in terms of 'revisionism' and 'spiritual elitism', with a rather one-sided emphasis on the evidence of *G.Th.* 3 and 13. However, Hurtado's analysis appears persuasive in that the post-70 CE ecclesiastical with leadership (*G.Th.* 3) is deemed part of *Thomas*.

³⁰³ On literary parallels between *Thomas* and Q in particular, see e.g. Tuckett, "Q and Thomas: Evidence of a Primitive "Wisdom Gospel"? A Response to H. Koester," 346–60; McLean, "On the Gospel of Thomas and Q," 321–45. Hurtado, *Lord Jesus Christ*, 452–79 at 455 questions previous suppositions of connections between Q and *Thomas* that would point to early Christian 'trajectories'.

³⁰⁴ See e.g. Dunn, *Jesus Remembered*, 355, who argues that comparison between Q 7:28, Q 7:24–25, and *G.Th.* 46 and 78 "suggests in turn a conscious elimination by the *Thomas* tradents of the strong note of imminent judgment, which characterizes the Q account of John's preaching (Q 3.7–9, 16–17), as part of a broader redactional diminution of the larger judgment motif in the Q/Synoptic tradition".

³⁰⁵ Cf. Valantasis, *The Gospel of Thomas*, 73–4 who approvingly refers to an argument by H. Koester who takes *G.Th.* 12 as "indicator of a 'politico-ecclesiastical situation in Palestine' in the first century CE"; DeConick, *Recovering the Original Gospel of Thomas*, 94–5 traces *G.Th.* 12 back to historical memorization of Jesus-tradition in the Thomasine community's history, preceding the death of James in 62 CE.

³⁰⁶ See e.g. Zöckler, *Jesu Lehren im Thomasevangelium*, 178–80 ("Realisierte Eschatologie?").

³⁰⁷ See also my recent article, Hogeterp, "The Gospel of Thomas and the Historical Jesus," 381–96.

end (*G. Th.* 18), and the expectation of the kingdom (*G. Th.* 113). In addition to the Coptic logia, the Greek evidence parallel to the Coptic *G. Th.* 5 (*P. Oxy.* 654 27–31) could include a reference to resurrection: “Jesus said, “Recognize what is in] your sight, and [that which is hidden] from you will become plain [to you. For there is nothing] hidden which [will] not [become] manifest, nor buried that [will not be raised] ([οὐ γὰρ ἔσ]τιν κρυπτόν ὃ οὐ φανε[ρὸν γενήσεται], καὶ θεθαμμένον ὃ οὐκ ἐγερθήσεται).”³⁰⁸ Several of these sayings have a brief setting in conversation between Jesus and his disciples through question and answer (*G. Th.* 18, 51, 113). The question is how these themes are elaborated in the course of this conversation.

Eschatologically loaded questions of Jesus’ disciples are: “Tell us how our end will be” (*G. Th.* 18); “When will you become revealed to us and when shall we see you?” (*G. Th.* 37); “When will the repose of the dead come about, and when will the new world come?” (*G. Th.* 51); and “When will the kingdom come?” (*G. Th.* 113).³⁰⁹ In what follows, I will explain what makes these questions eschatologically loaded and how the answer of the Thomasine Jesus takes up these respective questions.

The question in logion 18 of *Thomas* could be taken to interrogate about a collective setting of the end of days rather than being limited to a personal question of anxiety about death. ‘Our end’ probably intersects with expectations of death and eternal life as well as collective eschatological expectations, in view of Jesus’ response in this logion which takes up the question by referring to the end in general and the notion of ‘not experiencing death’.³¹⁰ According to the answer of the Thomasine Jesus, the precondition for ‘not experiencing death’ lies in the discovery of the beginning,³¹¹ perhaps the beginning if not source of life, and in taking one’s place in this beginning. The sequence of logia, among which *G. Th.* 18 has its place, may imply interpretive

³⁰⁸ Attridge, “The Greek Fragments,” 115 (Greek text) and 126 (translation).

³⁰⁹ Translations from T.O. Lambdin in Layton (ed.), *Nag Hammadi Codex II, 2–7*, 61, 69, 73, and 93. Of these four sayings in the Coptic *Gospel of Thomas*, only *G. Th.* 37 is paralleled by the Greek fragments, *P. Oxy.* 655 col. i 17–col. ii 1; see main text.

³¹⁰ Cf. Valantasis, *The Gospel of Thomas*, 86 argues that “the ‘end’ about which the disciples ask presumably relates to their deaths”, but then relates Jesus’ answer to “knowledge of the end and immortality”.

³¹¹ Valantasis, *The Gospel of Thomas*, 86 reads this saying as “a mythologized understanding of human origins and destiny common in ancient religion as a future return to a continually existent point of origin”. However, the difference with ancient religion and its cyclical thought consists in *Thomas*’ elaborations on biblical thought, referring to Paradise (*G. Th.* 19) and to a timeframe from Adam to John the Baptist (*G. Th.* 46).

connections between pre-existence (*G.Th.* 17) and predestination of the end (*G.Th.* 17,³¹² 19), discipleship of Jesus and the hope for eternal life (*G.Th.* 19). ‘Not experiencing death’ is related to taking one’s place in the beginning and thereby knowing the end in logion 18. Perhaps analogously with the ‘beginning’ in logion 18, acquaintance with ‘five trees in Paradise’ is related to ‘not experiencing death’ in logion 19. The ‘five trees in Paradise’ could be related to a mystical character of Jesus’ words in *G.Th.* 19 (cf. *incipit* of *Thomas*). Within the sequence of logia, the definition of the end in logion 18 may have overtones of predestination and biblical association with Paradise.

The question in logion 37 in *Thomas*, posed in the future tense, has the following counterpart in the Greek fragments: *πότε ἡμεῖν ἐμφανῆς ἔσει, καὶ πότε σε ὀνόμεθα;* (*P.Oxy.* 655 col. i 19–21).³¹³ This question may have points of analogy in language of epiphany of the risen Jesus and of expectations of his second coming (cf. Acts 10:40 (ἔδωκεν αὐτὸν ἐμφανῆ γενέσθαι); Mark 13:26 par. (ὄψονται); Mark 16:7 (ὄψεσθε); John 20:25 (ἐωράκαμεν τὸν κύριον). The analogy with post-mortem or transcendent revelation may be grounded in the disciples’ knowledge that “we know that you (Jesus) will depart from us. Who is to be our leader?” (*G.Th.* 12),³¹⁴ thereby reflecting consciousness of Jesus’ death.

The answer of the Thomasine Jesus in *G.Th.* 37 gives metaphorical expression to the idea of transcendence of death if not of resurrection, in terms of ‘disrobing’³¹⁵ (of the perishable body) and frankness compared to the state of children.³¹⁶ Under conditions of openness and

³¹² *G.Th.* 17 “Jesus says, ‘I shall give you what no eye has seen and what no ear has heard and what no hand has touched and what has never occurred to the human mind.’” (translation after Lambdin in Layton (ed.), *Nag Hammadi Codex II*, 2–7, 61). Klauck, *Apocryphal Gospels*, 115 interprets this logion as ‘a quotation from Paul’, i.e. 1 Cor 2:9, but the postulation of such an exclusive literary point of dependence seems unwarranted, in view of other evidence, such as Q 10.23–24 noted by Valantasis, *The Gospel of Thomas*, 84. On 1 Cor 2:9, which introduces words as scriptural words with the introductory formula ‘as it is written’, cf. Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 252: “Probably we have ‘a pastiche of biblical allusions,’ including Isa 64:3”, with further reference to the occurrence of this quotation in *1 Clem.* 34:8, the attribution of the quotation to the *Apocalypse of Elijah* by Origen in his *Commentary on Matthew* on Matt 5:29 (250–1).

³¹³ Attridge, “The Greek Fragments,” 122.

³¹⁴ Translation from Lambdin in Layton (ed.), *Nag Hammadi Codex II*, 2–7, 59.

³¹⁵ Paul uses comparable imagery in 2 Cor 5:3–4, when speaking about death and resurrection (2 Cor 5:1–10). Cf. Klauck, *Apocryphal Gospels*, 117.

³¹⁶ Perhaps the frankness implied in this logion is one of harmlessness associated with children. Cf. Paul’s exhortation to ‘be as children in evil’ (1 Cor 14:20).

transcendence of death, Jesus' answer confirms the disciples' expectation to see "the son of the living one, and you will not be afraid" (*G.Th.* 37).

The question in logion 51 of *Thomas* about the time of repose (Greek loanword ἀνάπαυσις) of the dead and the new world (Greek loanword κόσμος) could be read as two-stage expectation, in view of the repeated interrogative adverb 'when' in the Coptic text. This twofold question seems to react to the saying in the previous logion that 'the sign of the father in you is movement and repose'.³¹⁷ The question of the disciples is not about religious self-assurance as 'children coming from the light' and 'the elect of the living father' (*G.Th.* 50), but about concerns of time and place beyond themselves. These concerns are eschatologically loaded, in that they appear to be paralleled by an eschatological perspective of rest of the dead preceding the final age (cf. *Jub.* 23:31).³¹⁸ The answer of the Thomasine Jesus focuses on the new world as present reality: "What you look forward to has already come, but you do not recognize it".³¹⁹ This present reality is probably informed by the images of religious identification mentioned in the previous logion 50. The fact that the Coptic wording of Jesus' answer has a perfect tense signifies that the religious world of thought of *Thomas* is not timeless.³²⁰ Traces of eschatological expectation can be discerned behind the disciples' questions, but the answer of the Thomasine Jesus focuses on belief and religious identification as living dimension in the present.

The question in logion 113 of *Thomas*, also temporal but here related to the coming of the kingdom, is again a disciples' question in terms of a dimension beyond themselves. The answer of the Thomasine Jesus emphasizes that it is a dimension not to be waited for, but to be recognized all around them: "It will not come by waiting for it. It will not be a matter of saying 'Here it is' or 'There it is.' Rather, the kingdom of the father is spread out upon the earth, and men do not see

³¹⁷ Valantasis, *The Gospel of Thomas*, 129: "Again the questioning of the disciples indicates that they do not understand".

³¹⁸ "And their bones will rest in the earth, and their spirits will increase joy" (*Jub.* 23:31; translation O.S. Wintermute, *OTP* 2, 102). Cf. Dan 12:13: "But go your way till the end; and you shall rest, and shall stand (ἀναπαύση καὶ ἀναστήση in LXX Dan 12:13) in your allotted place at the end of the days" (RSV).

³¹⁹ Translation from Lambdin in Layton (ed.), *Nag Hammadi Codex II*, 2-7, p. 73.

³²⁰ Cf. *G.Th.* 85 which mentions the death of Adam in spite of his coming from great power and great wealth and contrasts this with discipleship of Jesus, by implication represented as participation in immortality. This contrast implies a religious perspective of linear time.

it”.³²¹ *G.Th.* 113 implies the idea that the kingdom of the father is not a dimension working apart from human beings, but with and through them on the earth if they recognize it as such. This idea of the kingdom stands in continuity with what has already been said in logion 3 of *Thomas*: “the kingdom is inside of you, and it is outside of you. When you come to know yourselves, then you will become known, and you will realize that it is you who are the sons of the living father”.³²² The answer of the Thomasine Jesus in logion 113 reacts against passivity and misleading perceptions accompanying eschatological expectation, while reacting to the question of time per se in a proleptic manner in terms of the present.

7.4. Evaluation

The *Gospel of Thomas* preserves traces of eschatological expectation on the part of Jesus’ disciples (*G.Th.* 18, 37, 51, 113), but also comprises theological reaction to impasse accompanying passive expectations and misleading perception on the part of the Thomasine Jesus. This reaction emphasizes religious renewal and identification with the kingdom as a present, living dimension. This theological emphasis takes up proleptic language of the kingdom that is also part of Synoptic Jesus-tradition (cf. Luke 11:20, 17:20–21). The earliest (Greek) version of the *Gospel of Thomas* is probably a representative of a late first and early second century CE movement of spiritual renewal, whose communal roots could go back to the pre-70 CE decades of missionary activity of the early Jesus-movement.³²³ The *Gospel of Thomas*, at least in its complete Coptic form, also received some overtones of Gnostic theology,³²⁴ but this later configuration did not erase features of earlier Jesus-tradition. Some beatitudes included in the *Gospel of Thomas* seem to imply a perspective on afterlife for whoever has suffered (*G.Th.* 58)³²⁵ and on the exclusion of haters and persecutors from the place where the hated

³²¹ Translation from Lambdin in Layton (ed.), *Nag Hammadi Codex II*, 2–7, 93.

³²² Translation from ibidem, 53.

³²³ Cf. Valantasis, *The Gospel of Thomas*, 16 who adopts Crossan’s stratification of literary and traditio-historical development of Jesus-tradition in the *Gospel of Thomas*, dating the ‘First Stratum’ between 30–60 CE; DeConick, *Recovering the Original Gospel of Thomas*, 153–5.

³²⁴ Valantasis, *The Gospel of Thomas*, 103; Klauck, *Apocryphal Gospels*, 117.

³²⁵ “Jesus said, ‘Blessed is the man who has suffered and found life’”. (*G.Th.* 58; translation from Lambdin in Layton (ed.), *Nag Hammadi Codex II*, 2–7, 75).

and persecuted are to be (*G.Th.* 68).³²⁶ The features of eschatological tension in the *Gospel of Thomas* include expectation of eternal life in contrast to the mortality associated with Adam (*G.Th.* 85), apocalyptic transformation of the heavens and the earth (*G.Th.* 111), and reactions of the Thomasine Jesus to his disciples' eschatological expectations in proleptic or inaugurated terms of the kingdom as present reality for them to engage in.

8. THE GOSPEL OF JOHN

The composition of the Gospel of John is often dated to the last decade of the first century CE.³²⁷ The Fourth Gospel comprises a developed Christology, expressed through imagery about Jesus as, for instance, the 'lamb of God' (John 1:29.36), the 'light of the world' (John 8:12), and the 'true vine' (John 15:1) as well as through extensive speech-sections of Jesus in the first person singular (e.g. John 14–17). As compared to the Synoptic Gospels, the Gospel of John makes later memorization by disciples (cf. John 2:22),³²⁸ retrospective viewpoints on the earliest followers of Jesus (John 21:23–24), gospel mission in the Greek-speaking Diaspora (John 7:35), and alienation from Jewish milieus by references to exclusion from the synagogue (John 9:22,

³²⁶ "Jesus said, 'Blessed are you when you are hated and persecuted. And they will not find a place in the place where they have persecuted you'" (translation after Lambdin in Layton (ed.), *Nag Hammadi Codex II*, 2–7, 79). The subsequent logion 69 associates inner persecution/torment with a process of arriving at true knowledge of the father. The 'place' in *G.Th.* 68 probably also implies distinction between persecutor and persecuted in respective terms of distance from and nearness to the father.

³²⁷ See e.g. Schnelle, *Einleitung*, 541 n. 120: "In der neueren Exegese wird das Johannevangelium zumeist in das letzte Jahrzehnt des 1. Jhs. bzw. um 100 n.Chr. datiert"; Conzelmann and Lindemann, *Arbeitsbuch*, 373 ('90/100'); Beasley-Murray, *John*, lxxvii notes that a date of composition between 90–100 CE "is, indeed, the date favored by most Johannine scholars", but at the same time expresses caution against precise determination on this issue (lxxvii–lxxviii). Recent analysis of papyrus 52, sometimes used as external evidence in the argument for the early dating of John, by Nongbri, "The Use and Abuse of P⁵²", 23–48 at 46 concludes about possible palaeographical dates for this papyrus text, ranging from the late second to early third centuries CE, that P⁵² "cannot be used as evidence to silence other debates about the existence (or non-existence) of the Gospel of John in the first half of the second century".

³²⁸ Schnelle, *Einleitung*, 547 refers to John's origin in post-Easter "Anamnese des Christusgeschehens (vgl. Joh 2,17.22; 12,16; 13,7) unter der Führung des Parakleten (vgl. Joh 14,26)".

12:42, 16:2)³²⁹ more explicit. If the Fourth Gospel is taken as theology about Jesus Christ from a late first-century CE perspective, it yet also incorporates many early Jesus-traditions related to, for instance, the Passion narrative (John 18–19).³³⁰

8.1. *Social and Historical Setting of John*

The Gospel of John exhibits a layered structure which probably reflects stages in its composition history,³³¹ characteristics particularly visible in John 20 and 21, of which both John 20:30–31 and 21:25 make the impression of presenting a concluding statement. The Fourth Gospel differs markedly from the Synoptic Gospels, in that only indirectly parallels the Synoptic Christ-confession of Peter (Mark 8:29; Matt 16:16–19; Luke 9:20; cf. John 6:68–69 (first person plural confession!)), but from the outset attributes the identification of Jesus as Messiah to Andrew, Simon Peter's brother (John 1:40–41). Throughout the Fourth Gospel, a significant role is accorded to 'the disciple, whom Jesus loved' (John 13:23–26; 20:1–10, 21:7.20–23), to whom the witness of this Gospel is also attributed in John 21:24. The communal setting of John is thereby also associated with circles for whom the 'beloved disciple' as follower of Jesus had special significance.³³² This differentiates John from, for instance, the Gospel of Matthew that accords a foundational role to Peter in the church (Matt 16:17–19).

It is generally supposed that the Gospel of John, together with the Johannine Letters, has its socio-historical setting in a shared Johannine school tradition.³³³ J. Frey recently argued that the Johannine

³²⁹ Cf. Wilson, *Related Strangers*, 72–3, 175–6 and 180, who takes this Johannine evidence to reflect a parting of the ways from the synagogue in an independent communal setting, while cautioning against earlier problematic arguments for highly specified connections between the Johannine passages and the liturgical malediction against heretics ('minim') in the early rabbinic *Birkat ha-mimim*. See recently, Hakola, *Identity Matters: John, the Jews and Jewishness*, 41–86 who further criticizes previous scholarly argument about Johannine passages and the *Birkat ha-mimim*, concluding that analysis of the Johannine evidence "speaks for a growing alienation from the community's Jewish roots" (86).

³³⁰ See e.g. Schnelle, *Einleitung*, 558–60 and 567–9.

³³¹ Cf. Schnelle, *Einleitung*, 550–58 on identification of redactional work and secondary additions.

³³² Cf. Brown, *The Community of the Beloved Disciple*.

³³³ Schnelle, *Einleitung*, 495–500 at 495–7 lists six criteria for the existence of a Johannine school behind 1–3 John and the Gospel of John: commonalities in theology,

Letters have a primary place of importance in the study of the horizon of reception of the gospel in Johannine circles. Frey emphasises the apocalyptic perspective of time and the expectation of the Parousia in the Johannine Letters, over against the finished imminent expectation ('terminierte Naherwartung') retained in literary form in John 21:22–24.³³⁴ Frey's analysis of traditio-historical connections between the Johannine Letters and John indicates the importance of a common apocalyptic background to the Johannine school tradition. However, Frey's argument that the Johannine Letters with their polemics against docetic false teachers (2 John 7) chronologically precede the Gospel of John³³⁵ and are presupposed by this Gospel is not beyond discussion.³³⁶ It seems that imminent expectation of the end is not the main issue in a Johannine Letter such as 1 John either, but rather faithfulness in face of the coming of 'antichrist', the denier of Christian faith (1 John 1:18.22, 4:3; 1 John 2:28 and 4:17), and the overcoming of the evil one (1 John 2:13–14).³³⁷

The Johannine school tradition and communal setting are usually localized in Asia Minor, in particular in Ephesus (Irenaeus, *Haer.* 3.1.2).³³⁸ John further comprises many traditions related to the Palestinian Jewish milieu of Jesus, independent of the Synoptic tradition. These Johannine traditions include passages on Nathanael (John 1:45–49, 21:2), John the Baptist (3:23–30), Nicodemus (John 3:1–21), a Samaritan woman (John 4:4–42), Lazarus (John 11:1–44, 12:1), Caiaphas (John 11:49–52), and Thomas (John 20:24–29). Part of the background of John may thereby be connected to the Palestinian milieu of the historical Jesus.³³⁹

common language ('Soziolekt'), the communal plural voice in John 21:24b, ecclesiological terms, ethical admonitions, and the representation of Jesus as 'teacher'; Frey, *Die johanneische Eschatologie.* 3, 2–5. Cf. Byrskog, *Story as History—History as Story*, 235–42 on John 19:35, John 21:24 and 1 John 1:1–4 as reaction against docetism.

³³⁴ Frey, *Die johanneische Eschatologie.* 3, 14–101.

³³⁵ Frey, *ibidem*, 46–60; Schnelle, *Einleitung*, 500 (successive order of 2 John, 3 John, 1 John, and John).

³³⁶ Conzelmann and Lindemann, *Arbeitsbuch*, 382–4 argue for the priority of John, reading 1 John 1:1–4, 1:5–10, and 2:7 as 'commentary' on John 1:1–18, 8, and 13:34. Cf. the divergent usage of παράκλητος designating the Holy Spirit in John 14:16–17.26, 15:26, and 16:7, and 'Jesus Christ the righteous' in 1 John 2:1.

³³⁷ Lietaert Peerbolte, *The Antecedents of Antichrist*, 101 observes about 1 John 2:28 that the accent lies "on the decisive character of the present, not on the nearness of the end".

³³⁸ Schnelle, *Einleitung*, 499, 509, 522, 538–40; Conzelmann and Lindemann, *Arbeitsbuch*, 373.

³³⁹ Cf. Beasley-Murray, *John*, lxx favours the idea of "growth of the Fourth Gospel as a process indebted to more than one area" (Syro-Palestinian regions, Jerusalem, Antioch, Ephesus).

8.2. *Eschatology in John*

Johannine eschatology can be considered part of the Johannine school tradition, in that an eschatological tension between future-eschatological and present-eschatological statements has been discerned in both the Gospel of John and the Johannine Letters.³⁴⁰ Yet the evidence of the Gospel of John merits separate attention, in view of its narrative framework about the life, death and resurrection of Jesus and Palestinian Jewish setting of traditions.

8.2.1. *John 3:1–21, Belief in God’s Son and Eternal Life*

John 3:1–21, a discourse of the Johannine Jesus about belief in him as the way to eternal life in a narrative setting of discussion with Nicodemus, relates eschatological destiny of salvation or condemnation to belief or unbelief in the only Son of God (John 3:17–18), Jesus Christ (John 1:17b–18.34). The sequence of the text implies that the Johannine perspective of judgement applies to belief or unbelief as accompanied by deeds performed in God and by deeds of evil that cannot stand the light (John 1:19–21). The discourse proceeds from predestinarian formulations of rebirth as birth as precondition for ‘seeing the kingdom of God’, ἰδεῖν τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ (John 3:3), and ‘entering the kingdom of God’, εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ (John 3:5), to belief in God’s Son as the way to ‘eternal life’, ζωὴ αἰώνιος (John 3:15–16).³⁴¹ The analogy between kingdom of God and eternal life is paralleled in the Synoptic Gospels (Mark 9:45.47, 10:17.23; cf. 1 Cor 15:50).

³⁴⁰ Niederwimmer, “Zur Eschatologie im Corpus Johanneum,” 105–16 at 106 refers to John 5:28–29, 6:39c.40c.44c.54c, 12:48b, 21:22, and 1 John 2:28, 3:2–3, 4:17 as future-eschatological statements and to John 3:18–19, 4:23, 5:24–25, 8:26.51, 9:39, 11:25, 12:31, 16:11 and 1 John 3:14 as present-eschatological statements. Cf. the criticisms by Frey, *Die johanneische Eschatologie*, 3, 9 nn. 37–38 of Kammler, *Joh 5,17–30 als Schlüsseltext johanneischer Theologie*, for imposing a “präsentisch-eschatologisch” interpretation on John 5:17–30 and for letting exegesis be governed by dogmatic rather than historical questions.

³⁴¹ Frey, *Die johanneische Eschatologie*, 3, 254–61 reads the sequence of terms (kingdom of God, eternal life) as transformation from eschatological horizon (John 3:3.5) to Christological salvation (John 3:13–16).

8.2.2. *John 3:22–36, John the Baptist and Belief in Jesus as God’s Son*

John 3:22–36 presents further testimony of John the Baptist on Jesus, following John’s witness in John 1:19–34; testimony which concludes with an eschatologically loaded admonition that “he who believes in the Son has eternal life (ζωὴ αἰώνιος); he who does not obey the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God (ἡ ὀργὴ τοῦ θεοῦ) rests upon him” (John 3:36, RSV). In view of preceding verses (John 3:33–35), unbelief or disobedience of the Son is equated with denial that God is true (v. 33), denial of the words of God (v. 34), and denial of God’s love as Father of the Son (v. 35). This second testimony of John the Baptist turns from witness to Jesus (John 1:19–34) to Christological admonition.³⁴²

8.2.3. *John 4:1–42, Jesus and the Samaritans*

John 4:1–42, a passage on Jesus and the Samaritans in the Samaritan city Sychar (John 4:5), includes references to eternal life and Messianic identification of Jesus.³⁴³ The passage begins with a conversation between the Jewish Jesus (John 4:9) and a Samaritan woman beside a well, turning to the subject of Jesus who gives ‘living water’ (John 4:10–11) which will become “a spring of water welling up to eternal life”, πηγὴ ὕδατος ἀλλομένου εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον (John 4:14, RSV) in the one to whom it is given.

The imagery about eternal life has a Christological orientation in the Johannine passage at large, but the imagery of a well of living and life-giving water standing for soteriological revelation may also have a point of analogy in contemporary Jewish tradition.³⁴⁴ The *Damascus Document* relates divine revelation of “hidden matters in which all Israel had gone astray”, and observes about those subject to this revelation that “they dug a well of plentiful water (באר למים רבים); and whoever spurns them shall not live (ומואסיהם לא יחיה)” (CD-A

³⁴² Frey, *ibidem*, 305 interprets the usage of ὀργὴ (τοῦ) θεοῦ as “johanneische Umformung der Tradition”, that is, of John’s admonition about ‘the wrath to come’, ἡ μέλλουσα ὀργή, in Q 3:7.

³⁴³ The pericope on Jesus and the Samaritan woman (John 4:4–42) is not the object of extensive discussion independent from other Johannine passages by Frey, *Die johanneische Eschatologie*. 3.

³⁴⁴ Brown, “The Qumran Scrolls and the Johannine Gospel and Epistles,” 183–207 at 199 pointed to metaphorical use of the term ‘fountain of living waters’ in biblical tradition (Jer 2:13, Ps 36:9, and Prov 13:14).

III 16–17).³⁴⁵ While the well is associated with the Torah in CD-A VI 4 (// 4QD^a 3 II 11, 4QD^b 2 11),³⁴⁶ the Johannine perspective presupposes a continuum from belief in the writings of Moses to belief in Jesus (John 5:45–46). The imagery of a ‘spring of living water’ is further part of sapiential discourse with apocalyptic features in Qumran literature, as *4QInstruction*^d (4Q418) indicates. This text comprises a fragment, 4Q418 103 II 6, which includes the phrase ‘like a spring of living water’, כמקור מים חיים, thereby probably designating revealed knowledge, whose search and instruction is the subject of the composition at large. At any rate, the analogy could affirm Palestinian Jewish settings to Johannine tradition about the Jewish Jesus who speaks in terms of a spring of living water.

The discussion of the Johannine Jesus with the Samaritan woman turns from soteriological revelation, visualized as a spring of living water, to the identity of the revealer in the subsequent section, John 4:16–26. The Samaritan woman initially addresses the Johannine Jesus as a prophet (θεωρῶ ὅτι προφήτης εἶ σύ, John 4:19), but also voices the expectation that the Messiah will come to reveal all things about true worship of God (John 4:25).

In the course of conversation about worship of God and places of worship, the Johannine Jesus states that “you worship what you do not know; we worship what we know, for salvation is from the Jews” (ὅτι ἡ σωτηρία ἐκ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἐστίν) (John 4:22, RSV). True worship of God the Father is defined as worship ‘in spirit and truth’ in John 4:23–24.³⁴⁷ The collective plural in John 4:22, ‘we (ἡμεῖς) worship what we know, for salvation is from the Jews’, could be related to the Palestinian Jewish milieu of early Jesus-tradition. Within this Johannine passage, the notion of salvation is ultimately related to expectation of

³⁴⁵ Translation from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*. 1, 555.

³⁴⁶ Analogous metaphorical imagery in the *Damascus Document* and John 4:14, 7:38 and Rev 7:17, 21:6 was noted by Brown, “The Qumran Scrolls and the Johannine Gospel and Epistles,” 183–207 at 199–200, but his discussion of CD-A III 16–17, VI 4–5, and CD-B XIX 33–34 focused on community discipline. A setting of soteriological revelation makes part of CD-A III 13–17. See recently Charlesworth, “The Qumran Community and the Johannine Community,” 97–152 at 138 who adds 1QH^a XVI 7–8 and 16, 4Q504 (i.e. 4Q504 1–2 V 2), and 11QT 45.16 as attestations of the “technical term ‘living water’”, denoting “eschatological salvation”.

³⁴⁷ The issue of true worship underlies Synoptic as well as Johannine polemics against the priestly establishment (Mark 11:15–18 par.; John 2:13–25); cf. Hogeterp, *Paul and God’s Temple*, 169–74 and 181–2.

a Jewish Messiah as saviour (cf. John 4:42, ὁ σωτὴρ τοῦ κόσμου).³⁴⁸ In John 4:22, salvation is yet related to worship of ‘what we know’. John 4:25 provides the following reaction of the Samaritan woman that knowledge of salvation is associated with Messianic revelation of true worship: “I know that Messiah is coming (he who is called Christ);³⁴⁹ when he comes, he will show us all things (ἀναγγελεῖ ἡμῖν ἅπαντα)” (RSV). Jesus’ answer provides Messianic self-identification: “I who speak to you am he”, ἐγὼ εἰμι, ὁ λαλῶν σοι (John 4:26, RSV).³⁵⁰

Subsequent passages interrelate Samaritan reactions, wondering whether Jesus could be the Christ (John 4:29) and belief in him as the ‘Saviour of the world’ (John 4:42), with Jesus’ teaching to his disciples about eternal life, ζωὴ αἰώνιος (John 4:36), through terms of sowing, reaping, and harvesting (John 4:31–38). The conceptualization of the gospel mission in figurative terms of sowing, reaping and harvesting is ingrained in early gospel tradition about John (Q 3:12) and Jesus (Mark 4:1–29 par.; Q 10:2; cf. Matt 13:24–30, 36–43).

8.2.4. *John 5:19–30, The Authority of God’s Son over Eternal Life and Judgement*

John 5:19–30 has been much debated for its evidence of both present-eschatological (John 5:24) and future-eschatological statements (John 5:28–29). It has been argued that Christology is the focus of this passage, expressing itself in eschatological terms.³⁵¹

³⁴⁸ Cf. Beasley-Murray, *John*, 62 on John 4:22 as statement which implies that the Jews “were elected as the people from whom the salvation of the world would come, i.e., through the Messiah”.

³⁴⁹ The clause ὁ λεγόμενος χριστός in John 4:25, standing in apposition to the phrase Μεσσίας ἔρχεται, could be formally compared to the designation of James as ‘brother of Jesus who was called the Christ’, ὁ ἀδελφὸς Ἰησοῦ τοῦ λεγομένου Χριστοῦ, in Josephus, *Ant.* 20.200.

³⁵⁰ Cf. Frey, *Die johanneische Eschatologie*. 3, 379: “In der Gegenwart der Person Jesu ist auch die Stunde gegenwärtig, in der sein eschatologisches Werk geschieht (vgl. Joh 4,23.26)”.

³⁵¹ See Frey, *Die johanneische Eschatologie*. 3, 322–402 (“Die eschatologische Vollmacht des Sohnes nach Johannes 5,19–30”). Frey analyses the literary structure of John 5:19–30 in terms of parallelism (pp. 326–35 at 334–5): A (John 5:19aβb–2–), B (John 5:21–23), C (John 5:24f.), B’ (John 5:26f.), C’ (John 5:28f.), and A’ (John 5:30). According to Frey, the interpretive consequence of this literary structure consists in the theological accent on Christology, from which the eschatological authority of the Son is a derivative theme (335). This literary inference corresponds with a previous exegetical observation about John 5:19–30 by J. Blank (*Untersuchungen zur johanneischen Christologie und Eschatologie*), cited by De Jonge, “The Radical Eschatology of the Fourth Gospel and the Eschatology of the Synoptics,” 481–7 at 483–4: “Die Christologie ist

The Christology of this Johannine passage emphasizes the relation between Jesus and God as a relation between Father and Son in inter-related terms of deeds, words, and authority. The divine perspective of bringing the dead back to life³⁵² is associated with Jesus as God's Son in John 5:21: "For as the Father raises the dead (ἐγείρει τοὺς νεκρούς) and gives them life (ζωοποιεῖ), so also the Son gives life to whom he will" (RSV). The theme of resurrection receives elaboration in two directions.

First of all, the language of resurrection figures in the present³⁵³ as statement of the soteriological certainty of faith in John 5:24: "Truly, truly, I say to you, he who hears my word and believes him who sent me, has eternal life; he does not come into judgement, but has passed from death to life" (RSV). This present language of resurrection is paralleled in Pauline evidence (Rom 6:13, 8:11) and could thereby go back to early kerygma in emerging Christianity. The subsequent Johannine verse, which also focuses on the present ('the hour is coming, and now is', ἔρχεται ὥρα καὶ νῦν ἐστίν),³⁵⁴ emphasizes that the dead who hear the voice of the Son of God will live. Understood in a present perspective, 'the dead' have been associated with a "condition of spiritual death" in previous scholarship.³⁵⁵ The present perspective in John 5:25 may be interrelated with Johannine Christology, addressing mortality without hope and transforming it into life of faith.³⁵⁶ The recurrent formulation of 'having life' as a present reality for the believer (John 3:15, 6:47, 10:28; 1 John 3:14) may voice Johannine theology.

keine Funktion der Eschatologie, sondern umgekehrt, die johanneische Eschatologie ist eine Funktion der Christologie".

³⁵² Frey, *Die johanneische Eschatologie*. 3, 357 and n. 136 refers to Deut 32:39, LXX 1 Kgdms 2:6, LXX 3 Kgdms 5:7, 2 Macc 7:22f., 4 Macc 18:19, Wis 16:13, and Tob 13:2 as evidence for biblical and early Jewish tradition which attributes the raising of the dead and judgement to God.

³⁵³ Cf. Beasley-Murray, *John*, 76: "This is the strongest affirmation of realized eschatology applied to the believer in the NT".

³⁵⁴ Cf. Frey, *Die johanneische Eschatologie*. 2, 144–6 on the temporal tension in this expression in John 4:23 and 5:25; Frey, *Die johanneische Eschatologie*. 3, 377 comments on the Johannine phrase 'and now is' (John 5:25) that the hour of final resurrection is applied to a perspective on the present, on the time of the community.

³⁵⁵ Beasley-Murray, *John*, 76–7; cf. Frey, *Die johanneische Eschatologie*. 3, 381 infers from John 5:25 the soteriological point of view that people who are physically alive but without eternal life through faith in Christ "nach johanneischem Verständnis als 'Tote' gelten".

³⁵⁶ Cf. the present perspective in 2 Cor 5:17: "Therefore, if any one is in Christ, he is a new creation; the old has passed away, behold, the new has come" (RSV).

The second direction of elaboration on resurrection is interrelated with eschatological categories of life and judgement. John 5:22 and 5:27 state that the Father has given the commission of judgement to the Son. The Johannine perspective on salvation is interrelated with hearing the voice of Jesus as the Son of God in both John 5:25 and 5:28 on the respective levels of time in the present and the envisioned final age. The interrelation between listening to the voice of a mediator of revealed divine knowledge and salvation is not without analogy in contemporary Jewish tradition. The *Damascus Document* stipulates the listening to 'the Teacher's voice' (וישמעו לקול מורה, CD-B XX 28), that is, the voice of the Teacher of Righteousness (לקול מורה צדק, CD-B XX 32), with regard to the revealed interpretation of God's regulations as the way to see God's salvation, וראו בישועתו (CD-B XX 27–34). A cosmic setting of heaven and earth listening to 'his anointed one', a prophetic-messianic figure, occurs in another Qumran text, 4Q521 2 II 1.³⁵⁷ Repeated reference to the Son's authority to execute judgement could have a setting in confrontation with persecution against Jesus and his early followers (John 5:16.18; John 15:18–27; cf. Mark 8:38, 13:9–13 at v. 13).

The subject of judgement concerns evil deeds according to John 5:29. Judgement or salvation according to deeds is the concluding point in John 5:28–29: "Do not marvel at this; for the hour is coming when all who are in the tombs will hear his voice, and come forth, those who have done good, to the resurrection of life (εις ἀνάστασιν ζωῆς), and those who have done evil, to the resurrection of judgement (εις ἀνάστασιν κρίσεως)" (RSV).

8.2.5. *John 6:22–59, Jesus the Bread of Life*

John 6:22–59 comprises discourse about Jesus as the bread of life (John 6:35.48). This discourse comes after the miracle story about the feeding of the five thousand (John 6:1–15). John 6:27 mentions 'food that endures to eternal life', ἡ βρωσις ἡ μένουσα εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον. John 6:31–33 associate this food with manna, bread from heaven, which gives life to the world. In John 6:35, Jesus presents himself as the bread of life, ὁ ἄρτος τῆς ζωῆς, for everyone who believes in him. Subsequent

³⁵⁷ Ed.pr. Puech, *DJD* 25, 1–38.

verses stipulate that Jesus, having come down from heaven (John 6:38), is sent by the Father to do his will.

The will of the Father is eschatologically specified in John 6:41: “For this is the will of my Father, that every one who sees the Son and believes in him should have eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day (καὶ ἀναστήσω αὐτὸν ἐγὼ ἐν τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ)” (RSV). In John 6:44, Jesus mentions eschatological resurrection again, but at this point emphasizes the role of the Father in drawing one to Jesus; this role being teaching by God through hearing and learning of Scripture according to John 6:45.³⁵⁸ John 6:47–48 repeats the identification of Jesus as the bread of life and eternal life for everyone who believes in him.

The identification receives overtones of the Eucharist by the end of the discourse (John 6:51–58), in that the Johannine Jesus takes the bread for life of the world (John 6:51) to stand for his ‘flesh’ (John 6:51) and for ‘the flesh and blood of the Son of man’ (John 6:53). The eschatological orientation on eternal life (cf. John 6:58) is also strongly implied in this setting with overtones of the liturgical performance of the Eucharist: “he who eats my flesh and drinks my blood has eternal life, and I will raise him up at the last day” (John 6:54, RSV).³⁵⁹ The interrelation between participation in remembrance of Jesus’ death and the prospect of the final age is also presupposed in pre-Pauline tradition (1 Cor 11:23–26 at v. 26, ἄχρι οὗ ἔλθῃ)³⁶⁰ and in Pauline theology (Rom 6:5).

8.2.6. *John 11:1–44, The Raising of Lazarus and Jesus as Giver of Eternal Life*

John 11:1–44 narrates Jesus’ raising of Lazarus, the brother of Mary from Bethany (John 11:2), from the dead.³⁶¹ According to John 12:9.11.17–18, this revivification was taken to be a sign or miracle and thereby a reason

³⁵⁸ John 6:45 cites from ‘the prophets’, i.e. Isaiah 54:13, as proof-text. Cf. 1 Thess 4:9 for comparable language of ‘teaching by God’. The conviction that Scripture, in particular the prophets, promised beforehand the good news of God through Jesus Christ, occurs in Rom 1:1–6.

³⁵⁹ Cf. Beasley-Murray, *John*, 94–5.

³⁶⁰ Cf. Philonenko, “La préhistoire d’une formule cultuelle,” 177–86 who also surveys John 6:51–56.

³⁶¹ Cf. Frey, *Die johanneische Eschatologie*. 3, 403–62, who conceptualizes John 11:1–44 as ‘Eschatologie in narrativer Gestalt’; Frey situates the Lazarus-narrative (John 11:1–44) in the following literary structure of concentric parallelism (410): A (John 10:40, Jesus’ departure from his opponents), B (John 10:41, no sign from John), C (John 10:42, belief in Jesus), John 11:1–44, C’ (John 11:45, belief in Jesus), B’ (John 11:47, many signs from Jesus), and A’ (John 11:54, Jesus’ departure from his opponents).

for belief in and following of Jesus in popular perception. The narrative of Jesus' raising of Lazarus four days after his death (John 11:17.39) includes indications of belief in final resurrection on the part of Martha, in reaction to Jesus' assertion that her brother would rise again: "Martha said to him, 'I know that he will rise again in the resurrection at the last day (ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει ἐν τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ)'" (John 11:24, RSV). Jesus' reaction to Martha's eschatological belief emphatically puts forward the raising of the dead as present reality concentrated on Jesus: "I am the resurrection and the life (ἐγὼ εἰμι ἡ ἀνάστασις καὶ ἡ ζωή); he who believes in me, though he die, yet shall he live, and whoever lives and believes in me shall never die" (John 11:25–26a, RSV). It has been rightly argued by J. Frey that this self-proclamation by Jesus does not deny the future-eschatological dimension to resurrection, but gives expression to Johannine Christology as present reality.³⁶² The subsequent narrative further puts forward resurrection as occurring already through Jesus' presence and belief in him (cf. John 11:26b–27.40.42).

Johannine Christology is further taken up in Martha's answer to the question of faith in the last part of Jesus' self-proclamation, "Do you believe this?" (John 11:26b, RSV). This answer comprises Martha's Christ-confession: "Yes, Lord; I believe that you are the Christ, the Son of God, he who is coming into the world", σὺ εἶ ὁ χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ὁ εἰς τὸν κόσμον ἐρχόμενος (John 11:27, RSV). This confession in John 11:27 consists of three successive Christological identity markers: 'the Christ', 'the Son of God', and 'the one who is coming into the world'. The third identity marker, ὁ εἰς τὸν κόσμον ἐρχόμενος, can be traced back to previous Johannine passages which also articulate expectation of the coming of either the Messiah (Μεσσίας ἔρχεται and ὅταν ἔλθῃ ἐκεῖνος in John 4:25) or an eschatological prophetic figure (ὁ προφήτης ὁ ἐρχόμενος εἰς τὸν κόσμον in John 6:14). This pluriform horizon of expectations may well go back to the Palestinian milieu of the historical Jesus. The clause 'the one who is coming into the world' (John 11:27) may further intersect with the designation of an expected messianic figure in Q 7:20 (ὁ ἐρχόμενος).

³⁶² Frey, *Die johanneische Eschatologie*. 3, 403 considers this self-revelation of Jesus in John 11:25–26a to be the core expression of Johannine eschatology, discussing the statement further in its context on pp. 445–57.

8.2.7. *John 12:37–50, Judgement and Eternal Life in Relation to Jesus*

John 12:37–50 includes a Christological perspective on eternal life and judgement (John 12:44–50) which has a narrative setting in persistence of unbelief in spite of many signs (John 12:37–43). The words of the Johannine Jesus in John 12:44–50 start with the point that believing in and seeing Jesus is believing in and seeing the one ‘who sent me’ (John 12:44–45). The passage also ends with emphasis on the relation between Jesus and the Father ‘who sent me’ with regard to Jesus’ words, reflecting knowledge that “his commandment is eternal life” (John 12:49–50 at v. 50). The intermediate verses, John 12:46–48, focus on salvation of the world from remaining in darkness and judgement of the one who rejects Jesus and does not receive his sayings by Jesus’ word as judge (John 12:48).

Judgement is not the dominant concern in this passage,³⁶³ as the conclusion about the divine commandment to eternal life (John 12:50) indicates. A soteriological interest rather emerges from John 12:47–48: “If any one hears my sayings and does not keep them, I do not judge him; for I did not come to judge the world, but to save the world (οὐ γὰρ ἦλθον ἵνα κρίνω τὸν κόσμον, ἀλλ’ ἵνα σώσω τὸν κόσμον). He who rejects me and does not receive my sayings has a judge; the word that I have spoken will be his judge on the last day (ὁ λόγος ὃν ἐλάλησα ἐκεῖνος κρινεῖ αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ)” (RSV). Even the word spoken by Jesus as eschatological judge relates to a present concern in the text of what the Johannine Jesus has said in the context of his ministry.³⁶⁴ The Johannine concern related to Jesus’ word (λόγος), is, put positively, ‘belief in him who sent me’ (John 5:24) and, put negatively, “you do not have his word abiding in you, for you do not believe him whom he has sent” (John 5:38).

8.2.8. *John 21:22–23, The Beloved Disciple and Jesus’ Second Coming*

Finally, John 21:22–23 reacts to an imminent eschatological understanding of a Jesus-tradition about the ‘beloved disciple’. The saying of

³⁶³ It seems problematic to conceive of John 12:44–50 as a parallel to John 3:31–36, as Frey, *Die johanneische Eschatologie*. 3, 309–18, does. The concluding reference to the ‘wrath of God’ in John 3:36 is not clearly paralleled in John 12:44–50. John 3:18 and 5:24 provide indirect points of analogy for the statement in John 3:36.

³⁶⁴ Cf. Frey, *Die johanneische Eschatologie*. 3, 313 on John 12:48: “das Verurteiltwerden im Endgericht durch das von Jesus bereits *jetzt* gesprochene, dann richterlich wirksame Wort”.

Jesus who addresses Peter, “if it is my will that he remain until I come (μένειν ἕως ἔρχομαι), what is that to you? Follow me!” (John 21:22, RSV), receives the following editorial comment in John 21:23: “The saying spread abroad among the brethren that this disciple was not to die; yet Jesus did not say to him that he was not to die, but, “If it is my will that he remain until I come, what is that to you?” (RSV). The repetition of the saying implies a different understanding of ‘remaining’, μένειν, while maintaining belief in the Parousia, as pointed out in previous scholarship.³⁶⁵

It should be noted here that the expectation of the Parousia of the ‘first generation Church’ is not as unanimously associated with the lifetime of all witnesses to Christ’s resurrection and post-resurrection appearances, as is sometimes assumed (cf. 1 Cor 15:6). For instance, Paul conceptualizes the coincidence of final resurrection and Jesus’ second coming through imagery of ‘the first fruits of those who have fallen asleep’ (1 Cor 15:20–23 at v. 20, RSV). The apostle further implies the consideration that a lapse of time could occur between his own death and resurrection to life in 2 Corinthians 5:3–4.³⁶⁶

The different understanding of ‘remaining’, μένειν, in John could perhaps be related to eschatologically loaded abiding in Jesus’ love (cf. John 15:9) as beloved disciple, in view of the fact that the saying answers Peter’s question with regard to torment about love and forsaking of love for the Lord (John 21:15–21).

9. ESCHATOLOGY IN THE PAULINE LETTERS

Eschatology in the Pauline Letters addresses congregations ‘in Christ’ in the Greek-speaking Diaspora, voicing relatively little explicit attention for traditions about eschatological sayings of Jesus as compared to the canonical and extra-canonical Gospels. Pauline eschatology focuses on proclamation of the risen Christ rather than on the earthly Jesus

³⁶⁵ Frey, *Die johanneische Eschatologie*. 3, 22. Cf. Beasley-Murray, *John*, 412: “That is, he announced a possibility of the future, in harmony with the eschatological hope of the entire NT, gospels and epistles, in order to etch indelibly on Peter’s mind that the future of the Beloved Disciple was not his concern but that of the risen Lord, and of him alone”.

³⁶⁶ Cf. Holleman, *Resurrection and Parousia*, 73: “Paul is absolutely convinced that if there will be an interval between his natural death and the coming of the new aeon, that is, an interval during which he is dead, or, in his own words, ‘unclothed, he will turn out to be clothed when the new aeon breaks through as a result of the resurrection”.

(cf. 2 Cor 5:16), and turns to the Parousia, final judgement, salvation, and resurrection.

The most important traditional ‘loci’ of scholarly attention for Pauline eschatology are three Letters: 1 Thessalonians (1 Thess 2:19, 3:13, 4:13–5:11.23),³⁶⁷ 1 Corinthians (1 Cor 3:12–15, 15)³⁶⁸ and Romans (Rom 1:18–2:16, 5–6, 8:18–25, 9–11, 13:11–14).³⁶⁹ God’s wrath and impartial judgement of all human beings, salvation and resurrection in Christ, and the expectation of the Parousia are important themes in the eschatological Pauline passages.

It is a matter of contention whether eschatology can claim a central place in Paul’s theology.³⁷⁰ Yet, a presupposed contrast between an evil contemporary age and a glorious final age occurs not only in the aforementioned Letters (1 Thess 4:13, 5:3–5; 1 Cor 2:6–8; Rom 8:18), but it also permeates most other Letters of Paul (e.g. Gal 1:4, Phil 2:15–16; cf. 2 Cor 5:1–5). Evaluation of the role of eschatology in Paul’s theology depends on the significance which eschatological passages have their respective rhetorical contexts.

The focus of analysis will be on the three above-mentioned Pauline Letters, which comprise extensive eschatological evidence. These Letters merit consideration as ‘window’ on Pauline eschatology and on the respective congregations that the apostle addresses.

9.1. *First Thessalonians*

9.1.1. *The Rhetorical Situation of 1 Thessalonians*

First Thessalonians, the earliest Pauline Letter according to scholarly consensus,³⁷¹ dated around 50 CE,³⁷² has left an impressive mark of

³⁶⁷ Cf. De Boer, “Paul and Apocalyptic Eschatology,” 345–83 at 345: “1 Thess. 4:13–18 and 1 Cor 15:20–28, 50–56 are the classic examples in the undisputed letters”.

³⁶⁸ See recently Holleman, *Resurrection and Parousia*.

³⁶⁹ See e.g. De Boer, *The Defeat of Death*. Cf. the attention for Romans by Dunn, *The Theology of Paul the Apostle*, 461–532 (“The Process of Salvation”).

³⁷⁰ See Aune, “Eschatology (Early Christian),” 602.

³⁷¹ Partition hypotheses about 1 Thessalonians and the attribution of 2 Thessalonians to Paul as Pauline rather than Deutero-Pauline Letter, such as recently argued by, e.g., Murphy-O’Connor, *Paul. A Critical Life*, 106–14, are disputed and rejected in detail in many surveys and discussions, such as by Schnelle, *Einleitung*, 66–8 and 365–8, 371–7, and by Conzelmann and Lindemann, *Arbeitsbuch*, 228–9 and 233–8; cf. Donfried, “2 Thessalonians and the Church of Thessalonica,” 49–67 who refers to ‘path-breaking studies’ on the pseudonymity of 2 Thessalonians by W. Trilling.

³⁷² Schnelle, *Einleitung*, 62–3.

eschatological expectation of the Parousia (1 Thess 4:13–5:11)³⁷³ in early gospel mission in the Greek-speaking Diaspora. Apart from epistolary opening and closing of the Letter (1 Thess 1:1 and 5:26–28), literary analysis of First Thessalonians has discerned two main sections; one section with intimations of the apostle about previous missionary contacts and expressed wish for renewed contact (1 Thess 1–3),³⁷⁴ and the other section with exhortations about Christian way of life and eschatological prospect (1 Thess 4–5). While attention for the subjects of final resurrection and Parousia is concentrated in the paraenetic section, in particular 1 Thess 4:13–5:11, eschatological ideas also find expression throughout other parts of the Letter (1 Thess 1:9–10, 2:19, 3:13, 5:23).³⁷⁵

The rhetorical situation³⁷⁶ of First Thessalonians may be characterised as follows. The exigence or direct occasion for the writing of this Letter could be the apostle's concern to enter into renewed contact with the Thessalonian congregation after an intermediate period of affliction and hindrance as the lot of the apostle as well as of the congregation (1 Thess 2:2.14.17, 3:3–5), so as to “establish you in your faith and to exhort you, that no one be moved by these afflictions” (1 Thess 3:2–3, RSV).³⁷⁷

The audience in First Thessalonians, the Thessalonian congregation, is characterised by Paul as an “example of faith to all the believers in Macedonia and in Achaia” (1 Thess 1:7); faith in God and his Son,

³⁷³ Bruce, *1 & 2 Thessalonians*, xxxviii: “The Thessalonian letters present the first literary evidence for the use of *παρουσία* (Parousia) in the sense of the future Advent of Christ”; Schnelle, *Einleitung*, 70: “Den 1 Thess durchzieht eine *apokalyptisch-eschatologische* Grundstimmung”; Malherbe, *The Letters to the Thessalonians*, 80 on the distinctive ‘eschatological tone’ of 1 Thessalonians; Conzelmann and Lindemann, *Arbeitsbuch*, 232: “Richtig ist, daß die Parusieerwartung im 1 Thess eine große Rolle spielt (vgl. 2,19; 3,13; 4,15; 5,23)”.

³⁷⁴ Malherbe, “The Letters to the Thessalonians,” 78 designates 1 Thess 1:2–3:13 as ‘Autobiography’, but this may be misleading, since Paul’s letter is not comparable to a *Vita* such as written by Flavius Josephus.

³⁷⁵ 1 Thess 2:13–16 includes a reference to ‘God’s wrath at last/until the end’ (εἰς τέλος, 2:16b). As the different possible translations of this phrase and the accompanying aorist tense ἔφθασεν suggest, it is not beyond doubt whether this verse is eschatological or rather reflects contemporary polemical concern of the apostle against specific cases of obstruction and repression of gospel mission. Donfried, “Paul and Judaism: 1 Thessalonians 2.13–16 as a Test Case,” 195–208 at 208 compares 1 Thess 2:13–16 and Rom 9:22–24, 10:3.21.

³⁷⁶ Bitzer, “The Rhetorical Situation,” 1–14.

³⁷⁷ Malherbe, *The Letters to the Thessalonians*, 90 refers to 1 Thess 2:17–3:10 as key to the ‘epistolary situation’ with the characteristics of “the so-called friendly letter”.

Jesus Christ, that the apostle contrasts with their largely Gentile past of idol worship (1 Thess 1:8–10). Apart from this largely Gentile environment, a Diaspora Jewish milieu of influence in Thessalonica cannot be excluded in view of the mention of a synagogue in Thessalonica in Acts 17:1.³⁷⁸ The theocentric references to holiness as the will of God (1 Thess 4:3–8)³⁷⁹ and to love of one's neighbour as 'taught by God' (1 Thess 4:9),³⁸⁰ could echo dominical tradition (1 Thess 4:2) which also expresses itself in relation to Scripture, in particular Leviticus 19 (at vv. 17–18) as part of the Levitical holiness code. The apostle prescribes congregational boundaries with the outside world in terms of moral exhortations about God's calling to a holy way of life (1 Thess 4:7) apart from "heathen who do not know God" (1 Thess 4:5, RSV) as internal perspective and of respectable behaviour toward 'those outside', οἱ ἔξω (1 Thess 4:12), as external perspective.

Constraints that Paul addresses in First Thessalonians are concerns that affliction and temptation (1 Thess 3:5) will not unsettle the congregation in its steadfastness and faith (1 Thess 3:6–10). Therefore the apostle writes to them with language of 'a friendly letter'.³⁸¹

9.1.2. *Eschatology in 1 Thessalonians*

At the beginning of the Letter, the rhetorical unit on thanksgiving for the Thessalonians' faith (1 Thess 1:2–10)³⁸² turns to the eschatologically oriented point of salvation through Jesus (1 Thess 1:10), preceded by the reference to the Thessalonians' conversion from Gentile idolatry to service of "a living and true God", θεὸς ζῶν καὶ ἀληθινός (1 Thess 1:9). While several terms in 1 Thess 1:9b–10 have been compared to Hellenistic Jewish expressions,³⁸³ they are not necessarily exclusively related to Hellenistic Diaspora Judaism. The designation of God in

³⁷⁸ See Levinskaya, *The Book of Acts in Its Diaspora Setting*, 154–7 who discusses literary evidence of Philo, *Embassy* 281 and epigraphic evidence from the late second century CE to late antiquity on a Diaspora Jewish as well as a Samaritan community in Thessalonica.

³⁷⁹ Cf. Klein, "Gottes Wille im Corpus Paulinum als Ansatzpunkt paulinischer Ethik," 133–48 at 136–42.

³⁸⁰ Cf. Josephus, *Ag.Ap.* 1.42 on Scriptures, τὰ ἴδια γράμματα, as 'doctrines of God', θεοῦ δόγματα.

³⁸¹ Malherbe, *The Letters to the Thessalonians*, 90.

³⁸² Malherbe, *ibidem*, 78; Schnelle, *Einleitung*, 64; Holtz, *Der erste Brief an die Thessalonicher*, 41–64.

³⁸³ Holtz, *Der erste Brief an die Thessalonicher*, 57: "Die Analyse der Wendungen führt in den Sprachbereich, der entscheidend vom hellenistischen Judentum bestimmt ist".

1 Thess 1:9 also has points of analogy in contemporary Semitic Jewish evidence as attested in the Dead Sea Scrolls (יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ, in the liturgical text 4Q504 (*4QWords of the Luminaries*^a) 1–2 V 9 and 8 12; כִּי אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱמַתָּה in the sapiential text *4QInstruction* (4Q416 1 14 // 4Q418 2 6). 1 Thess 1:10 explicates the eschatological horizon of expectation in this Letter from the outset, by observing that the congregation waits “for his Son from heaven, whom he raised from the dead (ὃν ἤγειρεν ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν), Jesus who delivers us from the wrath to come (Ἰησοῦν τὸν ῥυόμενον ἡμᾶς ἐκ τῆς ὀργῆς τῆς ἐρχομένης, RSV).”

Deliverance from the ‘wrath to come’, ἡ ὀργὴ ἢ ἐρχόμενη, in 1 Thess 1:10 has been related to deliverance from final judgement against wickedness.³⁸⁴ The contrast between a way of life which provokes wrath and hope for salvation through Jesus Christ is further made explicit toward the end of the Letter, in 1 Thess 5:8–10 at v. 9: “For God has not destined us for wrath, but to obtain salvation through our Lord Jesus Christ” (RSV). Perceptions of divine wrath against wickedness as well as hope for deliverance through divine mercy are part of sapiential, apocalyptic, and liturgical Palestinian Jewish discourse contemporary to Paul.³⁸⁵ Paul’s comparison of the Thessalonian congregation with the churches in Judaea (1 Thess 2:14) presupposes some prior knowledge of Palestinian Christian milieus on the part of his Greek audience. The way of life that is not destined for wrath is defined by Paul in terms of God’s good news, τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ θεοῦ, through encouragement “to lead a life worthy of God, who calls you into his own kingdom and glory” (1 Thess 2:9–12 at v. 12, RSV).

The expectation of Christ’s second coming, the Parousia, is a recurring issue throughout First Thessalonians: in 1 Thess 1:9, as the expectation of God’s risen Son from heaven; in 1 Thess 2:19–20, as praise of the congregation in glory and joy before the Lord Christ ‘at his coming’, ἐν τῇ αὐτοῦ παρουσίᾳ (v. 19); in 1 Thess 3:11–13, as hope for increase of human love and sanctification of the heart “before our god and Father,

³⁸⁴ E.g. Bruce, *1&2 Thessalonians*, 20 who compares 1 Thess 1:10 to the preaching of John in Q 3:7 and to Rom 1:18f.; Holtz, *Der erste Brief an die Thessalonicher*, 59 (‘alttestamentlich-jüdisch’) and 61 (“Rettung aus dem zukommenden Gericht”); Malherbe, *The Letters to the Thessalonians*, 122: “the OT and later Jewish literature with few exceptions accepted the notion as integral to the nature of God, and it is to them that Paul is indebted”, with reference to the *Sibylline Oracles* and other Pauline passages, mainly in Romans.

³⁸⁵ E.g. 4Q416 (*4QInstruction*^b) 3 2–4; 4QD^a 2 I 3–4 // 4QD^c 1 5–7 and CD-A III 17–18 (*Damascus Document*); 4Q504 (*4QWords of the Luminaries*^a) 1–2 II 7–16).

at the coming of our Lord Jesus with all his holy ones”, ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ μετὰ πάντων τῶν ἁγίων αὐτοῦ (v. 13);³⁸⁶ and near the end of the Letter, in 1 Thess 5:23, as eschatological prospect for the sanctification of spirit, soul, and body. 1 Thess 4:13–5:11 extensively engages in eschatological expectations surrounding the Parousia; a passage to which we now turn.

1 Thessalonians 4:13–5:11 can be subdivided into two sections: 1 Thess 4:13–18 on hope of resurrection connected with the coming of the Lord, and 1 Thess 5:1–11 on encouragement for mutual strengthening in view of the unexpected Day of the Lord.³⁸⁷ Paul introduces the first section as instruction in order not to have his audience being ignorant (1 Thess 4:13), while he observes about the times and seasons of the Day of the Lord that his audience has no need for instruction (1 Thess 5:1) but for affirmation in hope for salvation. The religious instruction in 1 Thess 4:13–18 appears to be occasioned by mourning about ‘those who are asleep’ (v. 13) and responds to this with words of encouragement about future hope, different from ‘others who have no hope’ (v. 13, RSV), and consolation (v. 18).³⁸⁸

1 Thess 4:13–18³⁸⁹ has been read in terms of imminent Parousia expectation and ‘radically realized eschatology’ in earlier scholarship.³⁹⁰ Scholarly reactions to this interpretation have rightly emphasised

³⁸⁶ Since the Parousia is expected from the heavens, ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν, according to 1 Thess 1:10, it would stand to reason that the ‘holy ones’ accompanying the Lord Jesus are also heavenly beings. On οἱ ἅγιοι αὐτοῦ, ‘his holy ones’, as angels in 1 Thess 3:13, cf. BDAG, ³2000, 11 and the translation of Parousia-expectation in 1 Thess 3:13 as “the coming (*parousia*) of our Lord Jesus with all his angels” by Dunn, *The Theology of Paul the Apostle*, 299. See also Mark 8:38 on the Parousia with angelic accompaniment: “when he comes in the glory of his Father with the holy angels”, μετὰ τῶν ἀγγέλων τῶν ἁγίων (RSV); cf. Mark 13:26–27.

³⁸⁷ Cf. Holtz, *Der erste Brief an die Thessalonicher*, 182–238; Malherbe, *The Letters to the Thessalonians*, 260–307; Schnelle, *Einleitung*, 64; Conzelmann and Lindemann, *Arbeitsbuch*, 229.

³⁸⁸ Cf. Conzelmann and Lindemann, *Arbeitsbuch*, 232: “Offenbar geht es gar nicht um dogmatische Belehrung, sondern um Trost angesichts akuter Trauer”; Holtz, “Zu 1 Thessalonicher 4,13–18,” 120–32 on 1 Thess 4:13 as comfort from ‘hoffnungsloser Trauer’.

³⁸⁹ Schmithals, “Apokalyptik, Eschatologie und Literarkritik,” 174–98 at 187–91 interpreted 1 Thess 4:15–18 as Deutero-Pauline interpolation. However, observed thematic parallels between 1 Thess 4:15–17 and 1 Cor 15:51–52, noted by Delobel, “The Fate of the Dead According to 1 Thessalonians 4 and 1 Corinthians 15,” 340–7, as well as formal parallels between λόγος κυρίου in 1 Thess 4:15 and παραγγέλλω, οὐκ ἐγὼ ἀλλὰ ὁ κύριος in 1 Cor 7:10 yield evidence against this interpolation-hypothesis.

³⁹⁰ E.g. Mearns, “Early Eschatological Development in Paul: The Evidence of 1 and II Thessalonians,” 137–57. Koester, “From Paul’s Eschatology to the Apocalyptic Schemata

that the focus of this passage is not on timeframe but on the nature of eschatological events that ultimately unite the dead in Christ, οἱ νεκροὶ ἐν Χριστῷ (v. 16), with the living.³⁹¹ It may be added that the first person plural of verses 14–15 and 17 voice statements of faith that could be correlated with other parts of Pauline theology. The recurrent phrase ‘we who are alive, surviving relatives’, ἡμεῖς οἱ ζῶντες οἱ περιλειπόμενοι,³⁹² in vv. 15 and 17 may reflect the conviction that the fellowship with the Lord transcends boundaries of life and death and ultimately reunites the faith community with the coming of the Lord. The unity of the faith community, including those who died and those who are alive, is also the point made by the apostle in 1 Thess 5:9b–10: “to obtain salvation through our Lord Jesus Christ, who died for us so that whether we wake or sleep we might live with him (ἄμα σὺν αὐτῷ ζήσωμεν)” (RSV). Paul’s words of comfort in 1 Thess 4:13–18 emphasise that “the dead in Christ will rise first” (1 Thess 4:16, RSV). The first person plural voice in verses 14–15 and 17 does not necessarily stipulate a setting of imminent expectation, but faith about ultimate union of humanity as recipient of salvation from the Lord.³⁹³ Analogously, 1 Cor 13:12a also speaks in the first person plural about eschatological fulfillment of understanding: “For now we see in a mirror dimly, but then face to face” (RSV). 1 Cor 15:51–52 speak in the first person plural to illustrate the belief in eschatological transformation to immortality: “Lo! I tell you a mystery. We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trumpet.

of 2 Thessalonians,” 441–58 at n. 32 refers to commentaries by W. Marxsen and T. Holtz. Cf. recently Vena, *The Parousia and Its Rereadings*, 257–8.

³⁹¹ E.g. Kaye, “Eschatology and Ethics in 1 and 2 Thessalonians,” 47–57 at 48–9; Koester, “From Paul’s Eschatology to the Apocalyptic Schemata of 2 Thessalonians,” 447 on 1 Thess 4:13–18 as concerned with the “communal question: ‘will the dead be united with us in order to meet the Lord when he arrives?’”; Conzelmann and Lindemann, *Arbeitsbuch*, 64 read 1 Thess 4:13–18 as statement of faith (πιστεύομεν, v. 14) about the believers’ relation to Jesus rather than as visionary, apocalyptic speculation about the time of the Parousia; Holtz, “Zu 1 Thessalonicher 4,13–18,” 121–32 at 122 and n. 2 argues that Paul speaks about the fate of the dead in Christ in reaction to pagan euphemistic conceptualizations of the dead as ‘those who are asleep’, thereby referring to Hoffmann, *Die Toten in Christus*.

³⁹² On περιλείπωμα in a context of martyrdom, see 4 Macc 12:6 and 13:18; on περιλείπωμα in the context of surviving relatives from the event of war, see Josephus, *Ag.Ap.* 1.35 (οἱ περιλειπόμενοι τῶν ἱερέων).

³⁹³ Cf. the notion of the unity of creation in Rom 8:38–39, “For I am sure that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor things present, nor things to come, nor powers, nor height, nor depth, nor anything else in all creation, will be able to separate us from the love of God in Christ Jesus our Lord” (RSV).

For the trumpet will sound, and the dead will be raised imperishable, and we shall all be changed” (RSV).

The language of participation in Christ constitutes a recurring feature of Pauline theology (Rom 6:5–11).³⁹⁴ Paul’s reference to ‘the word of the Lord’, λόγος κυρίου (1 Thess 4:15), implies a continuum with pre-Pauline Jesus-tradition about the Parousia, even though Paul’s conceptualization does not have a clear parallel in other New Testament writings.³⁹⁵

1 Thessalonians 5:1–11 encourages the Thessalonian audience to continue on their way of strengthening one another, being sons of light and belonging to the day, so that the Day of the Lord will not surprise them like a thief in the night, as it would to those who are of the night and of darkness. The insistence with regard to the times and seasons, οἱ χρόνοι καὶ οἱ καιροί, that the Thessalonians themselves know well “that the day of the Lord will come like a thief in the night”, ἡμέρα κυρίου ὡς κλέπτῃς ἐν νυκτὶ οὕτως ἔρχεται (1 Thess 5:2, RSV), alludes to Jesus-tradition which is also part of gospel tradition (Q 12:39; *G.Th.* 21) as well as of other New Testament writings (cf. 2 Pet 3:10, Rev 3:3).³⁹⁶

9.2. *First Corinthians*

9.2.1. *The Rhetorical Situation of First Corinthians*

It may be inferred from 1 Cor 16:8 that Paul wrote First Corinthians, usually dated to 55 CE, from Ephesus.³⁹⁷ The occasion which led Paul to write First Corinthians can be associated with concern about reported dissensions (1 Cor 1:10–12, 11:18–22) and the wish to provide guidelines for the community in reaction to questions (1 Cor 7:1f., 8:1f., 12:1) and doubts (e.g. 1 Cor 15:12) among the Corinthians. The Corinthian audience addressed by the apostle consisted of various households, οἴκοι,

³⁹⁴ Cf. Dunn, *The Theology of Paul the Apostle*, 390–412 (“Participation in Christ”) at 396 on the forms ‘in Christ’ and ‘in Christ Jesus’ as a “distinctively Pauline feature”.

³⁹⁵ Dunn, *The Theology of Paul the Apostle*, 303 takes the λόγος κυρίου in 1 Thess 4:15 to be “an inspired utterance or prophecy given to Paul...perhaps drawing on earlier Jesus tradition”; Conzelmann and Lindemann, *Arbeitsbuch*, 64 deem ‘prophetische Redeweise’ possible; Holtz, “Zu 1 Thessalonicher 4,13–18,” 125–31 notes that λόγος κυρίου could go back to Jesus as well as to Jesus-traditions in early post-Easter Christianity.

³⁹⁶ Böttrich, “Das Gleichnis vom Dieb in der Nacht,” 31–57 on the Parousia as a challenge for the present.

³⁹⁷ Cf. e.g. Schnelle, *Einleitung*, 76–7; Conzelmann and Lindemann, *Arbeitsbuch*, 267.

of which the household of Stephanas (1 Cor 1:16) were reckoned as the ‘first converts in Achaia’ (1 Cor 16:15). The Corinthian audience probably consisted mainly of Gentile converts (1 Cor 12:2), among whom may also have been Gentile godfearers and proselytes (Acts 18:7–8). The reference to a synagogue in Corinth in Acts 18:4³⁹⁸ and the missionary visits of itinerant fellow workers and apostles of Jewish descent³⁹⁹ implies a Jewish sphere of influence. Paul further appeals to the Corinthians to “give no offense to Jews or to Greeks or to the church of God” (1 Cor 10:32, RSV). The constraints against getting the gospel across to the Corinthian audience would be attachment to the type of philosophical argument that allowed no place to faith and spirituality (1 Cor 2:10–16) in its dialectic definition of wisdom (1 Cor 1:20.27–28, 2:6–8, 4:18–20, 15:12.35–36).

9.2.2. *Eschatology in First Corinthians*

Eschatology figures in the opening section at the point of the apostle’s concern with his audience’s disposition to spiritual truths (1 Cor 1:8) after his initial proclamation of the gospel among them. The apostle addresses the perceived lack of communal identity through dissensions, jealousy and strife, and diversion from ways in Christ taught by Paul (1 Cor 1:10–17, 3:1–5, 4:14–20). In the course of these exhortations, the apostle urges his audience to be taught by the Spirit and discern spiritual truths (1 Cor 2:13.15). At the outset, Paul has correlated his goal of religious instruction “that you are not lacking in any spiritual gift (χάρισμα)” (1 Cor 1:7, RSV) to blamelessness at the awaited revelation of Christ “on the day of our Lord Jesus Christ”, ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (1 Cor 1:8).⁴⁰⁰

With the goal of building up the congregation on the one hand and the situation of strife and dissensions on the other in mind, Paul warns the Corinthians that each work will be tested and become mani-

³⁹⁸ Philo, *Embassy* 281; Acts 18:4. Two synagogue inscriptions from Corinth, *CII I* 718 and *SEG XXIX* (1979) 300 (cf. *Bulletin Épigraphique* 93 (1980) 230; *SEG XXXVII* (1987) 264), have been variously dated.

³⁹⁹ Apollos (1 Cor 1:12, 3:4–6, 16:12; cf. Acts 18:24–19:1); Cephas (1 Cor 1:12); Barnabas (1 Cor 9:6; Acts 4:36); Aquila and Prisca (1 Cor 16:19; Acts 18:2), Timothy (1 Cor 4:17, 16:10; 2 Cor 1:1.19; Acts 16:1–3) and Silvanus (2 Cor 1:19; Acts 15:22.32, 16:25; cf. BDAG, ³2000, 923).

⁴⁰⁰ The ‘day of our Lord Jesus Christ’ in 1 Cor 1:8 is usually associated with the final judgement; cf. e.g. Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 102. Dunn, *The Theology of Paul the Apostle*, 306 further correlates 1 Cor 1:8 with the expected Parousia.

fest on the Day (of the Lord), either in terms of reward or of a suffering of loss together with salvation only as through fire (1 Cor 3:12–15). This passage entails a revelatory perspective of eschatological judgement of works, which is also consistent with other Pauline passages (e.g. Rom 2:6; 2 Cor 5:10, 11:15).

Judgement in the sense of justification or questioning of trustworthiness (1 Cor 4:3–4)⁴⁰¹ is not to be precipitated according to Paul, who points forward to the Parousia as the occasion of judgement: “Therefore do not pronounce judgement before time, before the Lord comes (ἕως ἄν ἔλθῃ ὁ κύριος), who will bring to light the things now hidden in darkness and will disclose the purposes of the heart. Then every man will receive his commendation from God” (1 Cor 4:5, RSV). In 1 Cor 4:1–7, Paul asks his audience to give him and his fellow-workers some credit of trustworthiness rather than being “puffed up in favour of one against another” (1 Cor 4:6, RSV). The appeal not to pronounce premature judgement against integrity and trustworthiness, but to leave this to the Parousia, does not preclude present judgement of misdeeds in Paul’s perspective, as, for instance, present judgement in 1 Cor 5:1–5⁴⁰² indicates.

1 Cor 10:1–13 comprises ‘warnings and models from Scripture’⁴⁰³ to withstand temptations to evil and to be neither overconfident (v. 12) nor daunted by fear for temptation beyond one’s strength, in view of God’s faithfulness and provision of a way out (v. 13). Within this passage, 1 Cor 10:11 voices an eschatological orientation to the reading of Scripture as contemporary model: “Now these things happened to them as a warning, but they were written down for our instruction, upon whom the end of the ages has come (εἰς οὓς τὰ τέλη τῶν αἰώνων κατήντηκεν)” (1 Cor 10:11, RSV). The plural reference to τὰ τέλη τῶν αἰώνων could imply an inaugurated sense of eschatology, analogously

⁴⁰¹ 1 Cor 4:3–4 employs terms, ἀνακρίνω and δικαιούσθαι, which at most possibly intersect with judicial language, but in their context (1 Cor 4:1–7) signify testing and judging of trustworthiness in the relationship between missionaries and congregation. Cf. BDAG, ³2000, 66 and 249.

⁴⁰² According to Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 396, ‘delivering to Satan’ in 1 Cor 5:5 “means excluding him from the community” (cf. 1 Cor 5:2.12–13); cf. 397–400 for a survey of scholarly interpretations, emphasizing that 1 Cor 5:5 stands for physical expulsion of the offender with his fleshly inclinations from the community in the hope that the offender’s repentance from the misdeed may lead to ultimate salvation of the offender’s spirit.

⁴⁰³ Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 719.

with the Pauline view that 'being in Christ' entails new creation (2 Cor 5:17, Gal 6:15).

The Pauline passage with directions for the Lord's supper, 1 Cor 11:17–34, comprises Jesus-tradition (1 Cor 11:23–26)⁴⁰⁴ which concludes on an eschatological perspective in 1 Cor 11:26, "For as often as you eat this bread and drink the cup, you proclaim the Lord's death *until he comes* (ἄχρι οὗ ἔλθῃ)" (RSV). The final phrase voices the expectation of the second coming, the Parousia, of the Lord. The new covenant, ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη, which Paul mentions in 1 Cor 11:25 entails both remembrance, ἀνάμνησις (1 Cor 11:24; cf. Luke 22:19), and eschatological orientation (cf. Luke 22:16.18; Mark 14:24–25, Matt 26:28–29).⁴⁰⁵

Paul's passage about love as the greatest of gifts (1 Cor 13:1–13) includes an eschatological orientation on faith, hope, and love, but most of all love, as abiding (μένει) to the end (v. 13), contrary to speaking in tongues and prophetic gifts (vv. 1–2). The eschatological orientation of unending and fulfilling love, described in 1 Cor 13:8–13,⁴⁰⁶ finds expression in 1 Cor 13:12 "For now we see in a mirror dimly, but then face to face. Now I know in part; then I shall understand fully, even as I have been fully understood" (RSV). In view of imperfect knowledge,⁴⁰⁷ whose perfection is up to the final age, love fulfils and abides.

The most extensively discussed eschatological passage in First Corinthians is near the end of the Letter, the Pauline discourse on resurrection par excellence: 1 Corinthians 15.⁴⁰⁸ This passage can be subdivided in smaller units on the witness underlying the proclamation of Jesus' resurrection from the dead (1 Cor 15:1–11); on Paul's initial reaction to some among his audience 'who say there is no resurrection of the dead' (1 Cor 15:12–18 at v. 12); on eschatological prospect which correlates the Parousia with final resurrection (1 Cor 15:20–28); on moral implications of affirmation or denial of resurrection for one's (way of) life in the present (1 Cor 15:29–34); on general illustrations of bodily

⁴⁰⁴ Cf. Hengel, "Das Mahl in der Nacht, »in der Jesus ausgeliefert wurde« (1 Kor 11,23)," 115–60 who argues that 1 Cor 11:23 presupposes prior knowledge about the Passion history on the part of Paul's audience.

⁴⁰⁵ Cf. Philonenko, "La préhistoire d'une formule cultuelle," 177–86.

⁴⁰⁶ Cf. Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 1060–74.

⁴⁰⁷ Cf. Wis 7:26 on divine wisdom as "a spotless mirror of the working of God" (RSV).

⁴⁰⁸ See e.g. De Boer, *The Defeat of Death*; more recently Holleman, *Resurrection and Parousia*, with further bibliography on pages 1–31 at 4–31 ("History of research"). On resurrection, cf. chapter four.

resurrection from earthly and cosmic corporealities (1 Cor 15:35–41);⁴⁰⁹ on application of imagery to the subject of resurrection, with the addition of an Adam-Christ typology standing for mortality and lifegiving spirit respectively (1 Cor 15:42–50);⁴¹⁰ and on the divine mystery of eschatological transformation to immortality as concluding section to assure one another of the permanence of the work of the Lord among human beings (1 Cor 15:51–58). The eschatological perspective of the ‘end’, τὸ τέλος, is conceptualized in ultimately theocentric terms by Paul in 1 Cor 15:24 as Christ’s deliverance of the kingdom to God after the subjection of all things.

9.3. Romans

9.3.1. *The Rhetorical Situation of Romans*

The apostle’s composition of the Letter to the Romans, usually dated to 55/56 CE, has been located in Corinth in view of the opening of the section with greetings (Rom 16:1–23 at v. 1).⁴¹¹ The occasion of exigence which led Paul to write this Letter is his wish of an advance introduction of his own gospel mission to share some spiritual gift and provide mutual encouragement (Rom 1:11–12) in view of news about external threats and challenges in the recent past (cf. Rom 12:12.14; Acts 18:2)⁴¹² and internal dissensions (Rom 16:17).⁴¹³ At the same time,

⁴⁰⁹ Cf. Martin, *The Corinthian Body*, 104–36 on Greco-Roman settings of beliefs about death and afterlife, astral souls and celestial bodies.

⁴¹⁰ For examples of a typological way of thinking in contemporary Jewish literature, see e.g. 4 Macc 6:19 and Philo, *Worse* 75–8. Cf. Dunn, *The Theology of Paul the Apostle*, 82–90 on the relevance of ‘Adam in Jewish Scripture’ and of ‘Adam in post-biblical Jewish tradition’ for understanding Adam in Paul’s theology.

⁴¹¹ Dunn, *Romans 1–8*, xliii–xliv; Schnelle, *Einleitung*, 135.

⁴¹² Acts 18:2 refers to the expulsion of Jews, including Christian Jews, from Rome during the reign of emperor Claudius; an event which has recently been dated to 41 CE rather than 49 CE (on the basis of Orosius) in view of analysis of the combined evidence of Acts 18:2, Suetonius, and Dio Cassius by Murphy-O’Connor, *Paul. A Critical Life*, 9–14; cf. Botermann, *Das Judenedikt des Kaisers Claudius*, on this subject.

⁴¹³ Previous scholarly hypotheses which read Rom 14:1–15:13 as heuristic key to reconstruct dissensions between Gentile and Jewish parties within Roman Christianity have become debatable in view of discussions by e.g. Klein, “Paul’s Purpose in Writing the Epistle to the Romans,” 29–43 at 35–7 and Karris, “Romans 14:1–15:13 and the Occasion of Romans,” 65–84 at 84 (“general Pauline paraenesis”). However, Watson, “The Two Roman Congregations: Romans 14:1–15:13,” 203–15 continues to uphold the supposition that Rom 14:1–15:13 reflects as Paul’s attempt to bridge a distance between Gentile and Jewish Christians in Rome. A further problem with this interpretation

the apostle appeals to his Roman audience to pray for him with regard to his service for Jerusalem so that his ultimate coming to Rome may be joyful (Rom 15:30–33).

The original audience of Paul's Letter to the Romans included various persons known personally by the apostle from previous communications (e.g. 1 Cor 16:19), missionary itineraries elsewhere (e.g. Acts 18:1–2) or otherwise, as the greetings in Romans 16:3–16 indicate. Among the named persons are fellow workers and kinsmen of Jewish descent, *συνεργοί* and *συγγενεῖς* (Rom 16:3.7; cf. Rom 9:3) as well as Christian believers of Gentile backgrounds.⁴¹⁴ While the larger part of Roman Christianity may have been Gentile, as Paul's forms of addressing his readers as Gentiles suggests (Rom 1:13, 11:13.17–24), the apostle also speaks from a first person plural perspective of himself among Jews (Rom 3:9–20). Paul uses confrontational language against preaching of the Jewish Law without integrity of way of life vis-à-vis relations to non-Jewish believers (Rom 2:17–29),⁴¹⁵ but he also seems to presuppose Christian Jewish hearers in his insistence on upholding the Law (Rom 2:12–16, 3:31).

Restraints against the sharing of some spiritual gift and mutual encouragement probably include slander against the apostle's theological reasoning (e.g. Rom 3:8), challenges through external circumstances (Rom 12:14–21), and disputes over opinions (Rom 14:1).

9.3.2. *Eschatology in Romans*

Eschatology in terms of final judgement and salvation makes part of the theological (Rom 1:16–11:36) as well as the more paraenetic (Rom 12:1–15:13) sections of this Letter. The Letter to the Romans is the

of Rom 14:1–15:13 as reaction to dissensions between Gentile and Jewish Christians, let alone two congregations, seems to me the fact that, contrary to all previous passages where the apostle mentions Jew and Gentile by name (e.g. Rom 2:7–29, 3, 9–11, 15:16.18.27, 16:3.7), Rom 14:1–15:13 does not specify different groups. Paul sketches situations that call for mutual brotherly upbuilding in faith (Rom 14:13.19, 15:2) rather than 'disputes over opinions', *διακρίσεις διαλογισμῶν* (Rom 14:1).

⁴¹⁴ For a comparative survey with epigraphic evidence, see Lampe, *Die stadtrömischen Christen in den ersten beiden Jahrhunderten*; idem, "The Roman Christians of Romans 16," 216–30.

⁴¹⁵ The imagined Jewish interlocutor in Rom 2:17–24 could be related to different possible backgrounds: the radical elements of the 'fourth philosophy' as breeding ground for persecution of (the) church(es) in Jerusalem and Judaea (Rom 15:31, 1 Thess 2:13–16; Josephus, *Ant.* 18.4–10.23–25; cf. my *Paul and God's Temple*, 225–9); confrontations within the missionary Jesus-movement on a Jewish way of life for Gentiles (e.g. Gal 2:1–14).

only Pauline Letter that includes an extensive theological discourse on promises and salvation for Israel as well as the Gentiles and on theological problems confronted in this respect from the perspective of gospel mission (Rom 9–11).

9.3.2.1. *Romans 1:18–2:16, God's Wrath and Impartial Judgement*

After the opening statement of the gospel as power of God for salvation, σωτηρία, and as revelation of God's righteousness, Paul's theological discourse turns to the theme of God's wrath, ὀργή θεοῦ, against all impiety and injustice of human beings who stifle the truth with wickedness (Rom 1:18). Paul's elaboration on this subject in Romans 1:18–2:16 also has eschatological implications.⁴¹⁶ Rom 2:1–11, in particular, emphasises wrath and fury for evildoers “on the day of wrath when God's righteous judgement will be revealed”, ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ὀργῆς καὶ ἀποκαλύψεως δικαιοκρισίας τοῦ θεοῦ (Rom 2:5, RSV, and vv. 8–9), on the one hand, and eternal life, ζωὴ αἰώνιος, for those who do good (Rom 2:7) on the other. Paul stipulates that divine judgement is ‘according to his works’, κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ, thereby alluding to Scripture (Rom 2:6),⁴¹⁷ and impartial to Jews and Greeks (Rom 2:9–11).

9.3.2.2. *Romans 3:9–20, God's Judgement and Human Plight*

The point of impartial judgement including each and everyone as accountable to God is further underscored in Rom 3:9–20. Apart from the biblical tradition echoed by Paul through allusions and scriptural testimonia (Rom 3:10–18), the revelatory perspective of divine judgement (Rom 2:5) has points of analogy in contemporary Jewish apocalyptic tradition (cf. e.g. *1 Enoch* 98:9–10, 106:13–15). Paul's concluding statement that “no human being (οὐ πᾶσα σάρξ)⁴¹⁸ will be justified in his sight by works of the law, since through the law comes knowledge of sin” (Rom 3:20, RSV), may partly intersect with contemporary Jewish apocalyptic and eschatologised sapientiel discourse known from Qumran. The *Damascus Document* confronts addressees, ‘all those who learn to know justice and notice the workings of God’, that God “has a dispute with all flesh (ריב לו עם כל בשר) and will carry out judgement

⁴¹⁶ On possible thematic connections between Rom 1:18–32 and Acts 17:22–31, see Barrett, *On Paul*, 139–54 (“Paul at Athens and Paul to Rome”). Cf. Rom 3:25b and Acts 17:30 on divine forbearance.

⁴¹⁷ LXX Prov 24:12, ὅς ἀποδίδωσιν ἑκάστῳ κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ; cf. LXX Ps 61:13, σὺ ἀποδώσεις ἑκάστῳ κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ.

⁴¹⁸ On οὐ...πᾶσα σάρξ as Semitism in Paul, cf. BDR § 302.2 n. 2.

(ומשפט יעשה) on all those who spurn him” (CD-A I 2 // 4QD^a 2 I 7–8, 4QD^c 1 9–10).⁴¹⁹ 4Q525 (4Q*Beatitudes*) 10 5 includes the phrase that “G[od] will not justify any flesh”, [ל]א צדק א[ל] כול בשר א[ל].⁴²⁰

9.3.2.3. *Romans 5:12–21, Mortality and Eternal Life in Paul’s Christology*

After passages on justification by faith (Rom 3:21–26, 4) and on consequences of salvation from God’s wrath and reconciliation to God (Rom 5:1–11 at vv. 9–10), Paul introduces an Adam-Christ typology in Romans 5:12–21 on the reign of death since Adam’s sin (vv. 12–14) and the reign in life through Jesus Christ (v. 17).⁴²¹ The eschatological connotation to ‘reign in life’ is brought out in Rom 5:21, in which Paul juxtaposes the reign of sin in death to the reign of grace “through righteousness to eternal life (εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον) through Jesus Christ our Lord” (Rom 5:21, RSV).

9.3.2.4. *Romans 6:5–11, Resurrection through Participation in Christ*

Romans 6:5–11 describes death and life on two levels of participation in Christ: death to sin and live with Christ to God, and defeat of the dominion of death by the assurance that “we shall certainly be united in a resurrection like his”, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως ἐσόμεθα (Rom 6:5). The future-eschatological prospect of resurrection could have a proleptic counterpart in the present of Paul’s appeal to his readers to “yield yourselves to God as human beings who have been brought *from death to life* (ὡσεὶ ἐκ νεκρῶν ζῶντας), and your members to God as instruments of righteousness” (Rom 6:13, after RSV).⁴²²

9.3.2.5. *Romans 9:1–5, Introduction of Paul’s Salvation Theology regarding Israel*

In Romans 9–11, Paul turns to his theology of salvation for Israel, beginning with a statement of belonging to the Israelites, his kinsmen,

⁴¹⁹ Translation from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition. 1*, 551.

⁴²⁰ Ed.pr. Puech, *DJD 25*, 115–78; text and translation from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition. 2*, 1054–5.

⁴²¹ Cf. Dunn, *The Theology of Paul the Apostle*, 94–7 at 94 who reads the typology in Rom 5:18 as Paul’s “own version of the epochal choice between death and life laid before Israel in the climax to the Deuteronomistic covenant (Deut. 30.15–20)”, while comparing Rom 7:7–11 to 2 *Baruch* 54.19 and Rom 5:12–14 to Wis 2:23–24.

⁴²² Cf. Dunn, *Romans 1–8*, 331 on Rom 6:5: “Here then is the end or goal of the state or process of assimilation to Christ’s death—the future resurrection, the redemption of the body (cf. 8:11, 23; Phil 3:10–11)”.

together with confirmation of Israel's blessings (Rom 9:3–5) and ending with his belief in all Israel's salvation (Rom 11:25–36). The discourse also begins with the apostle's anguish and sorrow with regard to a distance between the Christ of Jewish descent and his Jewish kinsmen (Rom 9:1–3a.5). Paul ultimately critiques self-centred notions of election (Rom 10:1–3) and unfaithfulness (ἀπιστία, Rom 11:20.23)⁴²³ among part of Israel, while insisting on his self-understanding as an Israelite (Rom 11:1).⁴²⁴

9.3.2.6. *Romans 9:19–29, Vessels of Wrath and of Mercy*

Self-centred notions of election are polemically confronted by Paul in predestinarian apocalyptic terms of God's patience with “the vessels of wrath made for destruction (σκεύη ὀργῆς κατηρτισμένα εἰς ἀπώλειαν) in order to make known the riches of his glory for the vessels of mercy, which he has prepared beforehand for glory (σκεύη ἐλέους ἃ προητοίμασεν), even us whom he has called, not from the Jews only but also from the Gentiles?” (Rom 9:23–24, RSV). Paul's polemical charge against self-centred notions of election probably served the rhetorical purpose of driving back distinctions between Jewish and Gentile converts made by rival missionaries (e.g. Gal 2:11–14; cf. 2 Cor 11:3–5.12–23).

9.3.2.7. *Romans 9:30–10:1, Temporary Plight and Hope for Salvation*

Paul's critique which finds fault with the pursuit of righteousness among Israel “as if it were based on works” (Rom 9:32, RSV) observes that “they have stumbled over the stumbling stone, as it is written, ‘Behold I am laying in Zion a stone that will make men stumble, a rock that will make them fall; and he who believes in him will not be put to shame’” (Rom 9:32b–33, RSV).⁴²⁵ This temporary plight observed by the apostle

⁴²³ BDAG, ³2000, 103; see also Rom 3:3–4 for a contrast of unfaithfulness, ἀπιστία, and God's faithfulness, ἡ πίστις τοῦ θεοῦ. Wis 14:25 lists ἀπιστία, ‘faithlessness’, among misdeeds and iniquities (Wis 14:23–26). The range of meanings to ἀπιστία in Josephus includes “disbelief, doubt, distrust, suspicion, disloyalty, unreliability, perfidy, incredibility” (Rengstorf, *A Complete Concordance to Flavius Josephus. Study Edition. 1. A-K*, 173).

⁴²⁴ *Contra* Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 543 who interprets Rom 9:2 as reaction to “charges of apostasy or infidelity (2 Cor 2:17; 12:19)” that “he is not an apostate without sympathy for his brothers and kinsmen”.

⁴²⁵ Citation from Isa 28:16/Isa 8:14; Dunn, *Romans 9–16*, 583–5 deems ἐπ’ αὐτῷ (Rom 9:33) Christological.

with reference to Isaian language is contrary to his wish and prayer for salvation for all Israel (Rom 10:1).

Paul's language of plight and salvation is not without parallels in contemporary Jewish discourse addressing God on collective and individual levels as attested among Qumran texts. The possibly non-sectarian⁴²⁶ liturgical prayer text *4QWords of the Luminaries*^a (4Q504) includes the following language of plight in a communal prayer of 'your people Israel', עמכה ישראל, (4Q504 1–2 V 11), to God: "We have come into anguish, [we were str]uck and tested by the anger of the oppressor; for we too have [we]aried God by our iniquities, we have tried the Rock with [our] si[n]" כִּי אִם גַּם [הוּ]גַעְנוּ אֶל בְּעוֹנוֹנוֹ הָעִבְדָנוּ צוּר, "כִּי אִם גַּם [הוּ]גַעְנוּ אֶל בְּעוֹנוֹנוֹ הָעִבְדָנוּ צוּר" (4Q504 1–2 V 17–19).⁴²⁷ The subsequent column VI of 4Q504 1–2 entreats atonement from God for unfaithfulness and opposition (יְשׁוּב נָא אַפְכָּה וְחַמְתָּכָה מִמֶּנּוּ, 4Q504 1–2 VI 6)⁴²⁸ as well as removal of God's wrath and rage from his people (יְשׁוּב נָא אַפְכָּה וְחַמְתָּכָה מִמֶּנּוּ, 4Q504 1–2 VI 11). A fragment of the sapiential text *4QBeatitudes* includes the concern with righteousness as well as the imagery of a stumbling stone in connection with the perceived plight in the relation between the individual protagonist and God: "justice, and like a rock for stu[m]bling... For] God is indignant with me", [זֶדֶק וְכִצּוֹר מִכְשׁוֹל] (כִּי) 10 (4Q525 23 9–10).⁴²⁹

Paul's language of plight with reference to a stumbling stone in Zion (Rom 9:33) has its eschatological counterpart in Romans 11:26, which again cites Isaian language about the expected coming of the Deliverer from Zion as confirmation of all Israel's salvation. The language of temporary plight could be related to the apostle's perspective on radical elements in Judaea (1 Thess 2:13–16) and deadly peril for believers in Judaea from unbelievers (Rom 15:31). Flavius Josephus writes that since the early 50s, during the Roman governorship of Felix (52–60 CE) and at the time of Paul's composition of his Letters, various

⁴²⁶ See Chazon, "Is Divrei ha-me'orot a Sectarian Prayer?," 3–17 at 8 who mentions palaeographical dating of 4Q504 to the mid-second century BCE.

⁴²⁷ Ed.pr. Baillet, *DJD* 7, 137–68; text and translation from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*. 2, 1016–7.

⁴²⁸ These Hebrew terms of 4Q504 1–2 VI 6, מַעַל, 'unfaithfulness', and קָרִי, 'opposition', parallel the critical terms through which Paul charges the hardening of part of Israel with unfaithfulness (ἀπιστία, Rom 11:20.23) and disobedience (ἀπειθεία, Rom 11:30).

⁴²⁹ Text and translation from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*. 2, 1058–9.

revolutionary groups in Judaea, among whom the ‘sicarii’ with their murderous manifestations, gained ground and challenged other parts of Jewish society (*J.W.* 2.252–263). The apostle’s theological discourse about temporary plight may not have been unrelated to impressions of this historical situation in Judaea at Paul’s time.

9.3.2.8. *Romans 11:1–16, Hope of Salvation in Spite of Partial Hardening among Israel*

In Romans 11:1–10, Paul emphasizes God’s abiding relationship to and call of his people through an elect remnant chosen by grace (λεῖμμα κατ’ ἐκλογὴν χάριτος), while perceiving partial hardening on the other hand.⁴³⁰ Paul derives the notion of a remnant from exegesis of prophetic tradition (cf. the citations from Isaiah in Rom 9:27–29).⁴³¹ The apostle substantiates the contrast between elect remnant and hardening through scriptural argument about divine hope in face of human peril on the one hand (Rom 11:1–6) and through scriptural argument about closing and darkening of the mind on the other (Rom 11:7–10). This contrast is not what the apostle had hoped for, since he speaks of his expressed wish of salvation, reconciliation of the world, and divine acceptance of Jews and Gentiles alike in the subsequent section, to which we will now turn (Rom 11:11–16).

In Romans 11:11–16, Paul employs *a minori ad maius* types of formulation to express his hope to get fellow Jews on his side with regard to his belief in salvation and reconciliation of the world (Rom 11:15). The apostle attempts to give a favourable turn to wrongdoing, παράπτωμα (Rom 11:11–12), among Israel by perceiving in it and by magnifying his own ministry (Rom 11:13) an occasion of mission to the Gentiles. This mission entailed the proclamation of salvation to the Gentiles, ἡ σωτηρία τοῖς ἔθνεσιν (Rom 11:11), and the imparting of riches for the Gentiles, πλοῦτος ἐθνῶν (Rom 11:12).⁴³² When Paul repeatedly

⁴³⁰ Cf. Dunn, *Romans 9–16*, 632–50; Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 602–8.

⁴³¹ Notions of a remnant for Israel are part of a review of the biblical past through the time of exile up to the perceived present in the *Damascus Document* (שׂאִירֵית לְיִשְׂרָאֵל, CD-A I 4–5 // 4QD^a 2 I 9, 4QD^c 1 12; לְמַעַן הַתִּיר פְּלִיטָה לְאַרְץ, CD-A II 11–13 at 11 // 4QD^a 2 II 10–13 at 11; CD-A III 12–20); notions which give a place to faithfulness to God’s precepts, openness to divine revelation, divine atonement of iniquities of those who seek God wholeheartedly (CD-A I 9–11) or of iniquities in God’s ‘wonderful mysteries’ (CD-A III 17–18).

⁴³² On ‘riches for the Gentiles’, cf. Rom 9:23 which mentions riches of God’s glory, ὁ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ; perhaps the sharing of the Gentiles in ‘spiritual blessings’ (Rom 15:27) may further be related to πλοῦτος ἐθνῶν (Rom 11:12).

refers to his mission to the Gentiles so as to make fellow Jews jealous (παραζηλοῦν, Rom 11:11.14), this could have a parallel in his biblical exegesis in Rom 10:19. The other end of the current curve in Paul's *a minori ad maius* formulation is the fulfillment, τὸ πλήρωμα αὐτῶν (Rom 11:12), and acceptance, ἡ πρόσληψις (Rom 11:15), of Israel. The apostle puts Israel's acceptance on a par with life from the dead, ζωὴ ἐκ νεκρῶν (Rom 11:15). With this conclusion, Paul provides imagery that has eschatological overtones of resurrection to life.⁴³³

9.3.2.9. Romans 11:25–32, The Mystery of All Israel's Salvation

After an illustration of severity and kindness of God through the metaphor of the olive tree (Rom 11:17–24), Paul ends his theological discourse on Israel with the mystery of all Israel's salvation (Rom 11:25–32) and a concluding hymn (Rom 11:33–36). Paul juxtaposes wisdom in the readers' own estimation to the mystery that Israel's partial hardening is a temporary phenomenon (Rom 11:25). Paul perceives a timespan of temporary and partial hardening of Israel "until the full number of the Gentiles has come in" (to the reach of God's salvation, cf. Rom 11:11) "and all Israel will be saved as follows, as it is written:⁴³⁴ The Deliverer will come from Zion, he will banish ungodliness from Jacob; and this will be my covenant with them when I take away their sins" (Rom 11:26–27, after RSV).

The mystery of all Israel's salvation, πᾶς Ἰσραὴλ σωθήσεται (Rom 11:26a), is underscored by biblical prooftexts from Isaiah: Isaiah 59:20–21a and Isaiah 27:9 in Romans 11:26b–27, which Paul probably combines because both prooftexts mention the removal of iniquity from Jacob. The Greek text of Romans 12:26b–27, ἥξει ἐκ Σιών ὁ ῥύόμενος, ἀποστρέψει ἀπὸ Ἰακώβ. καὶ αὕτη αὐτοῖς ἡ παρ' ἐμοῦ διαθήκη, ὅταν

⁴³³ Dunn, *The Theology of Paul the Apostle*, 312: "Their resulting acceptance would mean nothing less than 'life from the dead', that is, the final resurrection (11.15)". Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 613 observes that the meaning of ζωὴ ἐκ νεκρῶν is disputed, arguing that a figurative sense of transition from death to life in Christ seems preferable, but also intersects with the prospect of resurrection (Rom 6:5–11 at v. 5).

⁴³⁴ I interpret οὕτως in Rom 11:26 as prolepsis in conjunction with καθώς (οὕτως... καθώς) rather than as reflecting back on what is said in Rom 11:25. The entrance of the full number of the Gentiles is a corollary of the temporary and partial hardening of Israel in Paul's thought (Rom 11:11–12.25), whereas the hopeful perspective of all Israel's salvation is underpinned by Scripture (Rom 11:26–27) and by God's irrevocable call (Rom 11:29).

ἀφέλωμαι τὰς ἀμαρτίας αὐτῶν, comes close to that of the Septuagint.⁴³⁵ LXX Isaiah 59:20–21a reads καὶ ἤξει ἕνεκεν Σιών ὁ ῥυόμενος καὶ ἀποστρέψει ἀσεβείας ἀπὸ Ἰακώβ. καὶ αὕτη αὐτοῖς ἡ παρ' ἐμοῦ διαθήκη, while LXX Isaiah 27:9 reads ὅταν ἀφέλωμαι αὐτοῦ τὴν ἀμαρτίαν. Apart from minor alterations for a stylistic purpose of combining scriptural words,⁴³⁶ the difference between ἐκ Σιών (Rom 11:26) and ἕνεκεν Σιών (LXX Isa 59:20)⁴³⁷ is one of the most prominent apparently exegetical modifications. This difference has been explained from the possible influence of Psalm 14:7 (LXX Ps 13:7),⁴³⁸ thereby implying the idea that salvation for Israel radiates from Zion, providing restored fortunes for God's people, rejoicing for Jacob and gladness for Israel. In Paul's time, the horizon of expected salvation for Zion included the idea of peace (11Q5 (11QPs^a) XXII 2–3) and Zion's expected remoteness from falsehood and iniquity (שקר ועול, 11QPs^a XXII 6–7), as the 'Apostrophe to Zion' (11QPs^a XXII 1–15 // 4Q88 (4QPs^f) VII–VIII, 11Q6 (11QPs^b) frg. 6) indicates.⁴³⁹ In Paul's theology, ἐκ Σιών probably additionally denotes a general perspective of salvation and reconciliation of the world, including salvation for Gentiles who are faithful to God and continue in God's generosity (Rom 11:11–12.20–22; cf. Rom 2:14–16).

⁴³⁵ Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 624–5 deems the quotation in Rom 11:24–25 according to LXX; Wilk, *Die Bedeutung des Jesajabuches für Paulus*, 36 and 38 relates quotations in Rom 10:26–27 to a revised LXX Vorlage.

⁴³⁶ The latter part of Paul's quotations in Rom 11:27 differs from LXX Isa 27:9, by aligning the object, αὐτῶν, to that of αὐτοῖς in LXX Isa 59:21a and thereby reading Jacob in a collective sense. On composite quotations, 'testimonia' and the Qumran text *4QTestimonia* (4Q175), cf. Fitzmyer, "'4QTestimonia' and the New Testament," 59–89.

⁴³⁷ ἕνεκεν Σιών (LXX Isa 59:20) parallels MT Isa 59:20 לְצִיּוֹן, which may denote 'to Zion' or 'for Zion'.

⁴³⁸ Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 624. Cf. the verbal repetition of Psalm 14:7 in Psalms 53:6 (LXX Ps 52:7). Scriptural verses from Isaiah and the Psalter are successively quoted by the apostle in Romans 15:11–12.

⁴³⁹ Ed.pr. of 11QPs^a by Sanders, *DJD* 4; ed.pr. of 4QPs^f by Skehan, Ulrich, Flint, *DJD* 16, 85–106; ed.pr. of 11QPs^b by García Martínez, Tigchelaar, and Van der Woude, *DJD* 23, 37–47. 11QPs^a XXII, 2–3 (// 4Q88 (4QPs^f) VII 16–17) גדולה תקותך ציון ושלום ותוחלת ישועתך לבוא, 'Great is your hope, O Zion; peace will come and the expectation of your salvation'; text and translation from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*, 2, 1176–7. The following palaeographical dates have been assigned to 11QPs^a: first half of first century CE; to 4QPs^f: mid-first century BCE; and to 11QPs^b: first half of the first century BCE. Commentators, for instance Dunn, *Romans* 9–16, pp. 681–4 and Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 621–5, hitherto mainly compared evidence of Jewish expectation in the Old Testament, Pseudepigrapha, and occasional references to Qumran texts to Rom 11:26–27.

Romans 11:25–27 provides a perspective of future atonement of Israel from ungodliness with eschatological overtones of salvation.⁴⁴⁰ The relation between salvation of all Israel and Christology in Paul's Letter to the Romans has been much debated.

These prooftexts refer to the 'Deliverer', ὁ ῥυόμενος, from Zion and to God's covenant with his people. It has been argued by several scholars that only a Christological identification of the Deliverer who heralds Israel's salvation fits the context of theology in Romans.⁴⁴¹

While Paul's gospel of God (cf. Rom 1:1, 15:16.19) comes through the preaching of Christ, διὰ ῥήματος Χριστοῦ (Rom 10:17), the apostle writes in terms of converging lines of thought between God's righteousness and faith in Christ (Rom 3:21–26, 10:3–4).⁴⁴² In Palestinian Judaism at the time of the early Jesus-movement, the voicing and teaching of the Law could be strongly identified with an eschatologically expected prophetic, if not messianic figure.⁴⁴³ Paul's notion of deliverance is related to Jesus as well as to God, as other Pauline passages attest. 1 Thess 1:10

⁴⁴⁰ Cf. Dunn, *Romans 9–16*, 682; Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 623 who stipulates the "eschatological sense of the future *sōthēsetai*"; Dunn, *The Theology of Paul the Apostle*, 528 ("hope for the final salvation of Israel").

⁴⁴¹ E.g. Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 619–20: "it is difficult to see how Paul would envisage two different kinds of salvation, one brought about by God apart from Christ for Jews, and one by Christ for Gentiles and believing Jews"; Wilk, *Die Bedeutung des Jesajabuches für Paulus*, 69–70 and 73 observes about Rom 11:25–27 and the larger context that the quotations serve to confirm a belief in the salvation of all Israel, following the *parousia* of Christ and the eschatological pilgrimage of all nations to Zion; cf. Kuula, *The Law, the Covenant and God's Plan*, 2, 337 on Rom 11:26–27: "Israel will finally turn to Christ". On 337 n. 77, Kuula refers to 'conclusive arguments' against the idea that "Paul had in mind a "Sonderweg" for Israel's salvation that does not include faith in Christ" by Hvalvik, "'A Sonderweg' for Israel," 87–107.

⁴⁴² On τέλος γὰρ νόμου Χριστός εἰς δικαιοσύνην παντὶ τῷ πιστεύοντι in Rom 10:4, I think that the translation should be teleological, "For Christ is the goal/upshot of the Law up to righteousness for everyone who believes", thereby addressing Jewish and Gentile converts about the relevance of the Law as conceived through the ministry, life and resurrection from the dead of Jesus Christ. This teleological translation could be sustained in view of the anticipation in Rom 10:4 on the next passage, Rom 10:5–13, which provides a Christological interpretation of the word of Scripture, including that of the Law, being near to human beings.

⁴⁴³ The notion of Christ as goal of the Law could in this regard be related to Christological interpretations of 'a prophet raised up after Moses' (Deut 18:15–20) in e.g. Acts 3:22, 7:37; cf. John 5:46. See also John 4:25 on the expectation of the Messiah that "when he comes, he will show us all things" (RSV). On the side of Qumran literature, several texts include intersections between messianic and prophetic figures and newly revealed teaching of precepts of the Law (1QS IX 9–11; CD-A XII 23–XIII 1, CD-A XIV 18–19 // 4QD^a 10 I 11–12, CD-A VI 10–11; 4Q174 1–2 i 11–12 (in Zion!); 4Q521 2 II 1–2. For discussion of Messianism, see chapter six.

designates Jesus as deliverer, ὁ ῥυόμενος, from the wrath to come, while 2 Cor 1:10 expresses the apostle's conviction that God who raises the dead, ὁ θεὸς ὁ ἐγείρων τοὺς νεκρούς (2 Cor 1:9), "delivered us from so deadly a peril, and he will deliver us; on him we have set our hope that he will deliver us again", ἐρρύσατο ἡμᾶς καὶ ῥύσεται, εἰς ὃν ἠλπίζομεν ὅτι καὶ ἔτι ῥύσεται (2 Cor 1:10, RSV). In Paul's perspective theocentric and Christological ideas of eschatological deliverance are converging lines of thought (cf. 1 Cor 15:20–28). Therefore, in Paul's theology, the reference to the Deliverer, ὁ ῥυόμενος, in Rom 11:26 could denote both the redeeming agency through the divine Sonship of Jesus and God's redeeming promise through his covenant of old with Israel.⁴⁴⁴

In Romans 11:28 Paul goes on to observe that "with respect to the proclaimed good news they are hostile because of you, but with respect to election they are amiable because of the forefathers". It appears that the reference to hostility in this observation reflects back on the temporary 'hardening of part of Israel' in Rom 11:25. The reader-oriented setting of δι' ὑμῶς, 'because of you' (Rom 11:25a), could perhaps be historically related to growing hostility of parts of Judaism in Palestine toward Gentile people, in particular Rome, possibly in the wake of ethnic tensions and oppression by Roman authorities on the one hand (J.W. 2.266–270) and the rise of Judaeo radical elements on the other (J.W. 2.252–265).

Romans 11:29 underscores the promise to the forefathers for future generations as follows: "for the gifts and the call of God are irrevocable" (RSV). Election, ἐκλογή, and divine call, κλήσις, are intertwined. In this respect, P.J. Tomson speaks of two intertwined elections, of Israel and of the church of Christ.⁴⁴⁵ In Rom 11:30–32, Paul does not make Israel's salvation conditional on faith or lack of faith, but emphasises God's mercy, ἔλεος, upon disobedience, ἀπειθεία, and presupposes the divine power of reconciliation of those hardened "if they do not persist in their unfaithfulness" (Rom 11:23). Romans 2:8 and 15:31 inform Paul's sense of disobedience in terms of strife, disobedience to the truth, being won over to unrighteousness and causing peril to

⁴⁴⁴ Cf. Hogeterp, "A Re-Reading of Romans 11:25–32 in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls," 653–66 at 662–5.

⁴⁴⁵ Tomson, *If this be from Heaven...*, 213: "two elections are intertwined in this passage—that of *Israel* and that of *the church of Christ*. Again the question is, How is this contra-distinction to be resolved? Modern theologians would possibly register this as a contradiction, but Paul takes it as an enigma of history".

others. Factions and slaughter of fellow citizens and friends ascribed to the radical movement intrusively called the ‘fourth philosophy’⁴⁴⁶ by Josephus (*Ant.* 18.7–8. 23) could historically inform Paul’s notion of unfaithfulness and disobedience with Judaea and hardening of part of Israel in mind.⁴⁴⁷ Analogously with his statement of God’s impartiality in judgement (Rom 2:1–16), Paul stresses that God’s mercy is for Jews and Gentiles alike.

9.3.2.10. *Romans 12:9–21, The Principle of Love and Divine Retribution*

In the paraenetic part of Paul’s Letter (Rom 12:1–15:13), eschatological perspectives of judgement and salvation make part of several passages. In the context of admonition to live in genuine love with one another and as much as possible in peace with all (Rom 12:9–21), Paul cites Deuteronomy 32:35 to stipulate that eschatological retribution belongs to the wrath of God (Rom 12:19)⁴⁴⁸ and Proverbs 25:21–22a to make the point that one should not be overcome by evil but overcome evil with good.

9.3.2.11. *Romans 13:8–12, The Nearness of Salvation*

After a reminder to his readers that the commandments of the Law are summed up and fulfilled in love of one’s neighbour (Rom 13:8–10),⁴⁴⁹ Paul writes about the nearness of salvation in the following way: “Besides this you know what hour it is, how it is full time now for you

⁴⁴⁶ The designation τετάρτη φιλοσοφία ἐπίσακτος (*Ant.* 18.9) underlines the novel and strange character of this movement in Josephus’ view as compared to the schools of the Pharisees, Sadducees and Essenes.

⁴⁴⁷ Note that an intra-Jewish polemical perspective against warfare in God’s name is attested in 4Q471a (*4QPolemical fragment*), fragment 2 of manuscript 4Q471 (*4QWar Scroll-like Text B*) that is palaeographically dated to the end of the first century BCE. See e.g. 4Q471a 1 2–3: **בִּיא גְּאֻלְנוּ** **וּתְשַׁקְרוּ בְּבְרִיתוֹ** 3 [ת...] **אִמְרוּ נִלְחָמָה מִלְחָמוֹתָיו**, **כִּי אַתְּ בִּיָּא גְּאֻלְנוּ**, “and you have betrayed his covenant 3 [... and you] said: ‘Let us fight his battles, for he has redeemed us’”; text and translation from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*. 2, 952–3.

⁴⁴⁸ The introduction of the quotation as illustration that vengeance should be left to God’s wrath, ὀργή, touches on an eschatologically loaded theme in Paul’s Letter to the Romans (Rom 1:18–2:16 at 2:5).

⁴⁴⁹ Citations from Deut 5:17–21 / Exod 20:13–17 and Lev 19:18. Cf. Gal 5:14; Mark 12:31 par. Cf. e.g. Dunn, *Romans 9–16*, p. 780 on the roots of this thought about the fulfilment of the Law in love of one’s neighbour in the Old Testament, intertestamental literature, and a saying attributed to Hillel in rabbinic tradition. On brotherly and neighbourly love and charity in the Dead Sea Scrolls, see e.g. CD-A VI 20–VII 1 // 4QD^d 4 II 2–4, 6QD 4 1–3; cf. 1QS II 24–25, V 24–25 // 4QS^d II 4, VIII 2 // 4QS^e II 10–11.

to wake from sleep. For salvation is nearer to us now than when we first believed; the night is far gone, the day is at hand. Let us then cast off the works of darkness and put on the armor of light” (Rom 13:11–12, RSV). This passage has been interpreted as imminent expectation of the Parousia,⁴⁵⁰ but contrary to other Pauline passages (e.g. 1 Thess 5:1–2, 1 Cor 15:23) the Letter to the Romans, in particular this passage, does not spell out the Parousia.⁴⁵¹ Perhaps the perceived approach of salvation could also have its setting in Paul’s missionary perspective of the spreading of faith and the sharing of spiritual blessings between the Gentiles and the holy ones at Jerusalem (Rom 15:18–29). While Paul’s statement of the nearness of salvation may have eschatological overtones, the present perspective of the apostle in Romans 13:11–12 could rather be related to his prospect that “when I come to you I shall come in the fullness of the blessing of Christ (ἐν πληρώματι εὐλογίας Χριστοῦ)” (Rom 15:29, RSV).⁴⁵²

9.3.2.12. *Romans 14:10–12, Accountability and Judgement*

In Romans 14:10–12, Paul admonishes his readers not to judge or despise each other in view of each one’s standing before the judgement seat of God, τὸ βῆμα τοῦ θεοῦ⁴⁵³ (Rom 14:10), for which he quotes words from Scripture as proof-text in Rom 14:11: “As I live, says the Lord, every knee shall bow to me, and every tongue shall give praise to God” (RSV).⁴⁵⁴ The apostle’s conclusion that “each of us shall give account of himself to God” (Rom 14:12) has a positively formulated counterpart in 1 Cor 4:5.

⁴⁵⁰ E.g. Dunn, *The Theology of Paul the Apostle*, 311 categorises Rom 13:11–12 among Pauline passages about the expected coming of the Lord, the Parousia, observing that “there is a striking consistency in imminence of expectation throughout the undisputed letters of Paul”; Vena, *The Parousia and Its Rereadings*, 110.

⁴⁵¹ Cf. Conzelmann and Lindemann, *Arbeitsbuch*, 285: “Die Eschatologie tritt im Röm auffallend zurück, verschwindet aber keineswegs (vgl. 8,31 ff. und insbesondere 13,11–14). Allerdings ist sie kaum noch apokalyptisch expliziert”. According to Schnelle, *Einleitung*, 142 Rom 13:11–14 corresponds to Rom 12:1.2.

⁴⁵² On Paul’s perspective of fulfillment, *πλήρωμα*, through reconciliation of Jews and Gentiles in faith, see Rom 11:11–16.25–32, and of fulfillment of the Law through love, see Rom 13:8–10.

⁴⁵³ A variant reading of Rom 14:10 has τὸ βῆμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, but the theocentric concept τὸ βῆμα τοῦ θεοῦ fits better with the theocentric orientation of the scriptural quotation in Rom 14:11. Cf. 2 Cor 5:10 that includes the concept of τὸ βῆμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ.

⁴⁵⁴ This composite quotation or testimonia has been related to words from Isa 49:18, Jer 22:24, Ezek 5:11, but most of all Isaiah 45:23; see e.g. Dunn, *Romans 9–16*, 809–10.

9.3.2.13. *Romans 15:1–13, Eschatological Hope for Believers*

In connection with his appeal to bear with the failures of those weak in faith, not to please oneself and to look after each other's well-being and strengthening (Rom 15:1–2), Paul underlines the normative significance of Christ and of Scripture for the present and for future hope (Rom 15:3–4). In Romans 15:4, the apostle writes: “For whatever was written in former days was written for our instruction (εἰς τὴν ἡμετέραν διδασκαλίαν), that by steadfastness and by the encouragement of the scriptures we might have hope” (RSV). This contemporising reference to Scripture as source of instruction⁴⁵⁵ and inspiration includes eschatological overtones in Paul's theology, in view of the prospect of hope (ἐλπίς).⁴⁵⁶

10. ESCHATOLOGY IN THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES

10.1. *The Text of Acts and Its Missionary Perspective*

The second volume of the double work Luke-Acts, frequently attributed a late first-century CE date to ca. 80–90 CE,⁴⁵⁷ reflects back on the earliest stages of missionary activity of the Jesus-movement in Palestine and in the Greek-speaking Diaspora after appearances of the risen Jesus during forty days and witness to his heavenly ascension (Acts 1:1–11).

The textual history of Acts is by and large divided between the shorter ‘Alexandrian’ text tradition, mostly deemed more original, and the longer ‘Western’ text tradition, often deemed redactional elaboration.⁴⁵⁸

⁴⁵⁵ Cf. 1 Cor 10:11, where Paul refers to the instructive purpose of Scripture, πρὸς νοουθεσίαν ἡμῶν, εἰς οὓς τὰ τέλη τῶν αἰώνων κατήντηκεν, in terms of eschatologically loaded admonition against temptations.

⁴⁵⁶ Rom 5:2, 8:24–25, 15:13; cf. 1 Thess 4:13. Cf. Dunn, *Romans 9–16*, 840.

⁴⁵⁷ Fitzmyer, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 51–5 at 54 calls this the ‘intermediate dating’ of Acts; Schnelle, *Einleitung*, 303 dates Acts later between 90–100 CE, depending on his later dating of Luke around 90 CE (p. 285); Conzelmann and Lindemann, *Arbeitsbuch*, 360 argue for a date before 100 CE.

⁴⁵⁸ The Alexandrian text tradition is mainly represented by Codices Sinaiticus, Vaticanus, and Alexandrinus, while the Western text tradition is mainly represented by Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis and the Coptic Codex Glazier; cf. e.g. Schnelle, *Einleitung*, 307 who estimated that the Western text is ca. 8,5% longer, and Barrett, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles. 1*, 20–9 at 28: “the Western text often has a secondary, paraphrastic appearance”. Note that Epp, “The Significance of the Papyri for Determining the Nature of the New Testament Text in the Second Century,” 274–97 argued for the early existence of three text-types around 200 CE on the basis of the New Testament papyri: a text-type represented by Codex Vaticanus,

However, recent studies have given renewed reconsideration to textual witnesses of the Western text of Acts and its significance for exegesis of Acts.⁴⁵⁹ Critical attention for the Western text of Acts may also have consequences for the reading of eschatological passages, as will be illustrated in the next section.

The perspective in Acts on the missionary Jesus-movement has been characterised in terms of a shift of attention from Palestine to the Graeco-Roman Diaspora, and from Jerusalem to Rome.⁴⁶⁰ This schematic enclosing of the text is problematic in view of the elaborate attention for Jerusalem and Caesarea as settings in Acts 20:15–26:32 and for the interest in relations to Palestine in communications between Paul and Roman Jews in Acts 28:17–22. While the narrative of missionary journeys interchanges between different regions, from beginning to end Acts presupposes a geographical perspective of one world,⁴⁶¹ interchanging between Palestine and the Diaspora.

10.2. *Eschatology in Acts*

The Book of Acts begins and ends with speaking of the kingdom of God, ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ, through revelations of Jesus (Acts 1:3 and 28:23.31). At the beginning of Acts, a question of the followers of Jesus, designated as ‘apostles whom he had chosen’ (Acts 1:2),⁴⁶² shows that the idea of the Kingdom intersected with expectations about Israel for Christian Jews (Acts 1:6); a passage to which we turn in a moment. Toward the end of the Book of Acts, intersections between dialogue about the kingdom of God and the hope of Israel are also part of the narrative. The Lucan Paul consistently makes the point that he does not

a text-type represented by Codex Bezae, and an ‘in-between’ text-type with elements of the two former text-types.

⁴⁵⁹ Boismard, *Le Texte occidental des Actes des Apôtres*; Strange, *The Problem of the Text of Acts*; Rius-Camps and Read-Heimerdinger, *The Message of Acts in Codex Bezae. A Comparison with the Alexandrian Tradition. 1*.

⁴⁶⁰ E.g. Schnelle, *Einleitung*, 304–5; Conzelmann and Lindemann, *Arbeitsbuch*, 349 propose a tripartite division of the text: Acts 1–7 on the church in Jerusalem; Acts 8–12 on mission in Judaea and Samaria; and Acts 13–28 on ‘worldwide mission’.

⁴⁶¹ Note that the survey of pilgrims to Jerusalem in Acts 2:9–11 includes ‘visitors from Rome, both Jews and proselytes’, οἱ ἐπιδημοῦντες Ῥωμαῖοι, Ἰουδαῖοί τε καὶ προσήλυτοι (Acts 2:10–11, RSV).

⁴⁶² On apostolic commission and designation of Jesus’ earliest followers as ἀπόστολοι, cf. Luke 6:13, 9:10, 17:5, 22:14, 24:10. In Acts, the commissioned apostles are described as missionary leaders with disciples.

understand why he stands on trial⁴⁶³ for the hope of Israel (Acts 23:6–8, 26:6–8, 28:20, ἡ ἐλπίς τοῦ Ἰσραήλ). The hope of Israel is probably part of the theology of the Book of Acts.

10.2.1. Acts 1:6–8, Question and Answer about Restoration of the Kingdom Preached by Jesus

According to the Alexandrian text tradition, Acts 1:6 introduces the following question of the commissioned and gathered followers of Jesus to the risen Lord: “Lord, will you at this time restore the kingdom to Israel?” (RSV), κύριε, εἰ ἐν τῷ χρόνῳ τούτῳ ἀποκαθιστάνεις τὴν βασιλείαν τῷ Ἰσραήλ; This question could suggest a political expectation of restored kingship,⁴⁶⁴ but the Western text tradition in Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis frames the question differently: “Lord, is this the time when you will restore to the kingdom of Israel...?”, κύριε, εἰ ἐν τῷ χρόνῳ τούτῳ ἀποκαταστάνεις εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Ἰσραήλ.⁴⁶⁵ This textual version leaves the question open what would be restored to the kingdom of Israel. The Coptic witness of Codex Glazier to the Western text implies a twofold question of the time when Jesus would be restored and when the kingdom of Israel would be restored.⁴⁶⁶ If these witnesses of the Western text should be given credit in the reading of this introductory part of Acts, the significance of βασιλεία in Acts 1:6 should not be exclusively sought in political expectations, even though it may reflect a broader horizon of expectations of deliverance for Israel (cf. Luke 24:19–21 at v. 21).

In light of the Western text, the temporal expectation of βασιλεία in Acts 1:6 could also be related to the power and glory associated with the kingdom of God as preached by Jesus during his earthly ministry

⁴⁶³ On the Lucan Paul’s appeal to Caesar (Acts 25:11) and trial in Rome for Roman citizens, cf. e.g. Pliny, *Letter X* 96 4 (*quia cives Romani erant, adnotavi in urbem remittendos*, ‘urbs’ implying the city of Rome).

⁴⁶⁴ Cf. Barrett, *Acts 1–14*, 76 interprets the question in Acts 1:6 and Jesus’ answer in Acts 1:7–8 as a contrast between nationalist expectation and universal (com)mission; Fitzmyer, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 205: “The question formulates a hope for the restoration of an autonomously kingly rule for the Jews of Judea”.

⁴⁶⁵ Text and translation from Rius-Camps and Read-Heimerdinger, *The Message of Acts in Codex Bezae*. 1, 48 and 52.

⁴⁶⁶ Boismard, *Le Texte occidental des Actes des Apôtres*, 52–3 retroverts the textual witness to Acts 1:6 in the Coptic Codex Glazier (G⁶⁷), with the aid of a Latin reading of Augustine (*domine, si hoc in tempore repraesentaberis, et quando regnum Israel*), into the following Greek question: κύριε, εἰ ἐν τῷ χρόνῳ τούτῳ ἀποκατασταθῆσῃ καὶ πότε ἡ βασιλεία τοῦτῳ Ἰσραήλ.

(cf. Acts 1:3). If the question in Acts 1:6 is thus understood with eschatological overtones of expectations of the abiding presence of the risen Lord,⁴⁶⁷ the answer in Acts 1:7–8 does partly interact with the preceding question.⁴⁶⁸ That is, the question of time is answered in a twofold way about the unknowability of the times or seasons of the day of the Lord on the one hand (Acts 1:7) and about a time in the short future that the witnesses to Jesus' resurrection "will receive power when the Holy Spirit has come upon you" (Acts 1:8, RSV) on the other. The commission to be "witnesses in Jerusalem and in all Judaea and Samaria and to the end of the earth (ἕως ἑσχάτου τῆς γῆς)" (Acts 1:8, RSV) with the latter accent on proclamation of the gospel across all boundaries has been compared to prophetic inspiration, as attested in Isaiah 49:6 which is also quoted in Acts 13:47.⁴⁶⁹ Glorification of God as God of all the earth, inspired by prophetic tradition, in particular in Isaiah, is also part of contemporary Jewish tradition attested in the Dead Sea Scrolls.⁴⁷⁰

In the perspective of the Lucan author, the commission to be witnesses, ἔσεσθέ μου μάρτυρες, in Acts 1:8 probably related to gospel mission as well as oppression of the Jerusalem church. This oppression is described in the Book of Acts with regard to the spheres of influence of the Sadducean high-priestly faction (Acts 4:1.5–7, 5:17–18), of activism and persecution by some radical Jewish circles in Jerusalem (Acts 6:9–15, 7:54–8:4, 11:19), and of Herod Agrippa until the death of this ruler (Acts 12:1–24).⁴⁷¹

⁴⁶⁷ This expectation could perhaps also be inferred from the observation by 'two men in white robes' in Acts 1:11: "Men of Galilee, why do you stand looking into heaven? This Jesus, who was taken up from you into heaven, will come in the same way as you saw him go into heaven" (RSV).

⁴⁶⁸ Cf. Barrett, *Acts 1–14*, 77: "The question of v. 6 receives no direct answer"; Fitzmyer, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 205: "The risen Christ refuses to answer the political question posed by his followers".

⁴⁶⁹ Fitzmyer, *Acts of the Apostles*, 206.

⁴⁷⁰ See 4Q176 8–11 7 יקרא ה' ארץ יקרא [א]ל[והי כול ה]ארץ קדוש יש[רא]ל [א]ל[והי כול ה]ארץ, citing Isa 54:5, "and the Holy One of Israel is our Redeemer, God of the whole earth he is called", with the possible difference of וּגְאֹלוֹנוֹ (my reading of the fragment on PAM 43.427), perhaps a scribal error of וּגְאֹלְנוֹ, 'our redeemer', as adaptation of scriptural words in a setting of words of comfort and great glory (4Q176 8–11 13). 4Q434a (= 4Q434 frg. 2) frgs. 1+2 2–3 envisages the renewal of the works of heaven and earth, rejoicing and divine glory that fills all the earth, כָּל מְעֵשֵׂי שָׁמַיִם וָאָרֶץ וַיִּגְלוּ וּכְבוֹדוֹ מְלֵא [כָּל הָאָרֶץ]. Hebrew texts after García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*. 1, 359 and from idem, *Study Edition*. 2, 912. On 4Q434a, see chapter four, section 4.3.1.

⁴⁷¹ On the hailing of Herod Agrippa I as god in Caesarea and his subsequent death, narrated in Acts 12:19–23, cf. Josephus, *Ant.* 19.343–359 who also relates that the people of Caesarea celebrated the king's death.

Apart from gospel mission, the connection between oppression⁴⁷² and going to the ends of the earth appears to have a general point of analogy in the Aramaic Qumran text 4Q568 (*4QAramaic K*):⁴⁷³

1 [...] לון דינין בעדניהן ויהך ויתעשק ויאמר אהך לי עד סיאפי ארעא ועל.
[...] ל [...] 2 [...] ל [...]]

1 judgements in their times. And he will go, and will be oppressed, and he will say: ‘Let me go to the ends of the earth and...’

10.2.2. Acts 2:14–36, *The Gift of the Spirit as Certainty about Eschatological Salvation*

In the narrative about the gift of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost, the speech of Peter (Acts 2:14–36) includes an interpretive rendering of scriptural words from Joel 2:28–32 as applied to a perspective of inaugurated eschatology.⁴⁷⁴

And in the last days (ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις) it shall be, God declares, that I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh, and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, and your young men shall see vision, and your old men shall dream dreams; yea, and on my menservants and my maidservants in those days I will pour out my Spirit; and they shall prophesy (Acts 2:17–18, RSV).⁴⁷⁵

⁴⁷² Apart from 4Q568 cited in the text above which connects oppression and going to the ends of the earth, oppression is mentioned in 1QpHab I 6, בעשק ומעל, ‘with oppression and deceit’, and X 1; in 1Q27 (1QMyst) 1 I 10–11 in a larger setting of contrast between actual realities of oppression among peoples and hope for revelation of justice (1QMyst 1 I–II); in 4Q525 16 4–6, which refer to “men of bloodshed (who) have kil[l]ed...] 6 with unfaithfulness and oppression”, ואתעשקו ובעל ועשק, [אנשי] 5 דמים המי[תו] 6 [במעל ועשק], (text from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*. 2, 1058); in 4Q488 1 I which contains the verb ואתעשקו, “and they were oppressed” (text and translation from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*. 2, 968–9).

⁴⁷³ Text and translation from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*. 2, 1120–1. The editio princeps of this fragment among other Aramaic texts, 4Q550–575, 580–582, is yet to be awaited, being in preparation as volume 37 of Discoveries in the Judaean Desert by É. Puech.

⁴⁷⁴ Cf. Barrett, *Acts 1–14*, 136: “ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις points to the last act of history and claims that they are part of God’s final act of redemption”, arguing that the “stress is on fulfillment”; Fitzmyer, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 252 reads Acts 2:17 as “a new eschatological orientation” and “a new period in God’s salvation history”.

⁴⁷⁵ The textual version of Acts 2:17 in Codex Vaticanus, καὶ ἔσται μετὰ ταῦτα, has rightly been interpreted by Fitzmyer, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 252 with reference to others as “a scribal variant that harmonizes the Lucan text with the LXX”, since most early textual witnesses include the phrase ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις.

The pouring out of the Spirit with regard to prophecy and visions about the day of the Lord, is described in Joel 2:28–32 as an event in the future (אָרוֹרֵי־כֶן in MT Joel 3:1; μετὰ ταῦτα in LXX Joel 3:1 / MurXII). In the setting of Acts, the outpouring of the Spirit is conceived as an event of eschatological significance in which the audience can already have part through revelations about salvation (Acts 2:21). The gift of the Spirit as advance certainty about salvation has a point of analogy in Paul's thought in 2 Cor 5:5. The apostle here emphasizes that the Spirit given by God can be understood as guarantee (ὁ ἀρραβὼν τοῦ πνεύματος) about life beyond mortality (2 Cor 5:1–5). This idea intersects with the speech in Acts 2:14–36, in that this speech turns to the witness to God's raising and heavenly elevation of Jesus from the death of crucifixion, "having loosed the pangs of death (αἱ ὠδῖνες τοῦ θανάτου)" (Acts 2:24, RSV) and having "made known the ways of life (ὁδοὶ ζωῆς)" (Acts 2:28, RSV).

At the same time, the speech in Acts 2:14–36 includes a charge against the 'men of Judaea and all who dwell in Jerusalem' (Acts 2:14) that they "crucified and killed (this Jesus) by the hands of lawless men (διὰ χειρὸς ἀνόμων)" (Acts 2:23, RSV). In the context of the narrative of Luke-Acts, the designation διὰ χειρὸς ἀνόμων could stand for extradition to those without the Law who implemented punishments unjustly, to Gentile,⁴⁷⁶ i.e. Roman authorities (cf. Luke 18:32). In the narrative of Luke-Acts, the responsibility of the extradition seems to be placed in the hands of the Sadducean high-priestly faction in office (Luke 22:47.50.52), with which the Book of Acts also describes a confrontation about authority questions (Acts 4:1.5–7).⁴⁷⁷ It is also to Sadducean high-priestly office that Josephus ascribes the most heartless procedures in judgement (Josephus, *Ant.* 20.197–203 at § 199).⁴⁷⁸

⁴⁷⁶ Note that the climax of Synoptic Passion predictions (in Luke 9:22, 9:43b–45, 18:31–33), explicitly mentions extradition to the Gentiles, τοῖς ἔθνεσιν (Luke 18:32) for torture and execution (Luke 18:32–33).

⁴⁷⁷ Acts 4:5–6 should in my view be read in terms of the faction of rulers, elders and scribes that sided with the Sadducean high-priestly family, not "the components of the Sanhedrin"; *contra* Fitzmyer, *The Acts of the Apostle*, 299. The possessive pronoun αὐτῶν in Acts 4:5, "their rulers and elders and scribes", relates to the Sadducean high-priestly faction in Acts 4:1.6, not to a perspective of distance to Jerusalemite Judaism at large.

⁴⁷⁸ αἴρεσιν δὲ μετῆει τὴν Σαδδουκαίων, οἵπερ εἰσὶ περὶ τὰς κρίσεις ὡμοὶ παρὰ πάντας τοὺς Ἰουδαίους καθὼς ἤδη δεδηλώκαμεν, "He followed the school of the Sadducees, who are indeed more heartless than any of the other Jews, as I have already explained, when they sit in judgement"; a passage on the younger Ananus and his appointment to the

10.2.3. *Acts 3:12–26, A Lucan Speech with an Outlook on Restoration and Parousia*

In another speech by which the Lucan author renders Peter's preaching (Acts 3:12–26), the proclaimed Christ is related to fulfillment of prophecy from Moses to Samuel and those after him (Acts 3:22–24) for the blessing of Israelites as sons of the prophets and turning from all wickedness (Acts 3:25–26). This Christological interpretation of fulfillment of prophecy includes an eschatological prospect about Jesus Christ, "whom heaven must receive until the time for establishing all that God spoke by the mouth of his holy prophets from of old", ἄχρι χρόνων ἀποκαταστάσεως πάντων ὧν ἐλάλησεν ὁ θεὸς διὰ στόματος τῶν ἁγίων ἀπ' αἰῶνος αὐτοῦ προφητῶν (Acts 3:21, RSV). The times of restoring all things (χρόνοι ἀποκαταστάσεως πάντων) prophesied have been interpreted as "time of universal restoration".⁴⁷⁹ The possible relation between of Acts 3:21 to Acts 1:6 could be the eschatological expectation of the kingdom of God among the missionary Jesus-movement as preached and embodied by Jesus. In Acts 3:21, the expectation of the Parousia, Jesus' second coming, is further implied in view of the reference to a point in time until which 'heaven must receive Jesus' (cf. Acts 1:11) and after which all things prophesied will be restored.

10.2.4. *Eschatology in Syro-Palestinian Missionary Contexts (Acts 4–12)*

The preaching of Jesus as Messiah is narrated in various Syro-Palestinian contexts like Philip's preaching in Samaria (Acts 8:5.12; cf. Acts 6:5); Paul's preaching in Damascus that Jesus is the Christ (Acts 9:20.22); and Peter's words about Jesus' anointment with the Holy Spirit addressing Cornelius' household in Joppa (Acts 10:34–43). The closing part of the latter speech includes the belief that God ordained Jesus "to be judge of the living and the dead", κριτῆς ζώντων καὶ νεκρῶν, and that "to

high-priesthood. Text and translation from Feldman, *Josephus. Jewish Antiquities. Book XX. General Index*, 106–7; cf. 108 n. a, noting that "Unlike the passage on Jesus (*Ant.* xviii.63–64), few have doubted the genuineness of this passage on James (on which see Schürer, i. 546)". Cf. McLaren, "Ananus, James and Earliest Christianity," 1–25.

⁴⁷⁹ Fitzmyer, *The Acts of Apostles*, 288–9, who further relates the 'restoration' back to 'the kingship to Israel' (Acts 1:6), but on Acts 1:6 see my discussion above. Barrett, *Acts 1–14*, 206 relates 'restoration', ἀποκατάστασις, to a putting right of creation corrupted from its intended state, comparing Acts 3:21 with 1QS IV 23 and with the expectation about Elijah's role of reconciliation in Mal 3:23–24 cited in Mark 9:12 par.

him all the prophets bear witness that every one who believes in him receives forgiveness of sins through his name" (Acts 10:42–43, RSV). This Christological idea of judgement has a general point of analogy in Johannine tradition (John 5:25–29) as well as in post-Pauline Letters (1 Pet 4:5 and 2 Tim 4:1).⁴⁸⁰ The description of Jesus as judge in a speech addressing the household of a Roman godfearer (Acts 10:1–2) could be related to the belief in divine elevation of the risen Jesus and of that which his earthly ministry stood for, in that he "went about doing good and healing all that were oppressed by the devil, for God was with him" (Acts 10:38, RSV). The narrative of Acts recounts that the Jerusalemite congregation, hearing the news of Peter's gospel mission to the Gentiles, ultimately "glorified God, saying, 'Then to the Gentiles also God has granted repentance unto life (ἡ μετάνοια εἰς ζωὴν)'" (Acts 11:18, RSV).⁴⁸¹ 'Repentance unto life' may imply a prospect of human choice for God's call to ways of life and eternal life.⁴⁸²

Acts 11:26 reflects back on the fact that the disciples of the missionary Jesus-movement with their Christological message of salvation were for the first time called 'Christians', Χριστιανοί, in Syrian Antioch. Preaching in the name of Jesus Christ (cf. Mark 9:41; 1 Pet 4:16) apparently gave rise to a growing perception of 'those who belong to Christ' as Christians, but the designation by itself may originally have had overtones of Messianic, eschatologically oriented mission.

10.2.5. *Eschatology in Subsequent Stages of Mission in the Diaspora (Acts 13–20:16)*

At some points in the missionary narrative of Acts 13–20:16, eschatological prospects make part of recounted words and speeches. The subsequent narrative following persecution under Herod Agrippa I up to his death (Acts 12:1–24), can be subdivided into the following main sections: the phase in which Paul and Barnabas acted as fellow workers up to their sharp contention (Acts 13:1–15:41) and the phase

⁴⁸⁰ Fitzmyer, *The Acts of Apostles*, 466 further compares Romans 14:9 to this Lucan passage, but Paul does not specify Christ's role as judge in Romans 14:9.

⁴⁸¹ Paul, in his Letter to the Galatians, also refers back to an initially positive reception of his gospel to the Gentiles among the 'churches of Christ in Judaea', in that "they glorified God because of me" (Gal 1:24, RSV).

⁴⁸² Cf. Acts 5:31; Barrett, *Acts 1–14*, 543; Fitzmyer, *The Acts of Apostles*, 472 ('live-giving repentance').

of missionary journeys to Asia Minor and Greece (Acts 16:1–20:16) up to Paul’s resolution to go to Jerusalem (Acts 19:21, 20:17–35).

Toward the end of Acts 13:13–50, about gospel mission in Pisidian Antioch, Acts 13:46–48 presents the gospel as message of eternal life, ἡ αἰώνιος ζωῆ, which Paul and Barnabas spoke first to Jews and then turned to the Gentiles, thereby referring to Isaiah 49:6 as proof-text (Acts 13:47).⁴⁸³ The narrative also includes eschatologically oriented words of strengthening and encouragement in faith spoken by Paul and Barnabas addressing followers, “saying that through many tribulations we must enter the kingdom of God”, εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ (Acts 14:22, RSV). Acts 15:1–5 relates dissensions internal to the Syro-Palestinian Jesus-movement about the role that the Mosaic Law should have in the message of salvation for Gentiles. Acts 15:6–35 retrospectively formulates how the Jerusalemite church attempted to resolve the dissension through Petrine emphasis on grace (Acts 15: 11) and James’ proposition of a decree for Gentile converts (Acts 15:13–21 at vv. 20–21; cf. Gal 2:1–14). Yet Acts 15 ends with separation between Paul and Barnabas (Acts 15:36–41).

Subsequent narrative about missionary journeys through Asia Minor to Greece (Acts 16–17) includes eschatology on the part of the Lucan Paul in the Areopagus speech at Athens (Acts 17:22–31). This speech takes up Greek religiosity to proclaim the unknown God (Acts 17:22–23) as Lord and Creator of heaven and earth and concludes with the following perspective of inaugurated eschatology:⁴⁸⁴ “The times of ignorance God overlooked, but *now* (νῦν) he commands all men everywhere to repent, because he has fixed a day on which he will judge the world in righteousness by a man whom he has appointed (ὄρισεν), and of this he has given assurance to all men by raising him from the dead” (Acts 17:30–31, RSV). Divine judgement in righteousness (Acts 17:31) has a point of analogy in Paul’s own terms, δικαιοκρισία τοῦ θεοῦ (Rom 2:5). The divided reception of the belief in resurrection of the dead in

⁴⁸³ Qumran Pesharim to Isaiah do not preserve commentary on Isaiah 49, but a small fragment with a few words, 4Q228 (*4QWork with citation of Jubilees*) 2 2 does preserve the expression [אור בגוים], ‘light on peo[ples]’; ed.pr. VanderKam and Milik, *DJD* 13, 178–85. The fragments of 4Q228 also include attention for ‘the family of the nations’, [משפחת הגוים] (4Q228 1 II 2).

⁴⁸⁴ Cf. Fitzmyer, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 611–2 interprets Acts 17:30–31 as Paul’s preaching of ‘eschatological repentance’ without specification of the day of judgement “just as it is generally kept hidden in Jewish and Christian apocalyptic writings (see Mark 13:32)” (612).

a Greek scholastic setting (Acts 17:18–19.32) corresponds to Paul's confrontation with Greek unbelief in resurrection among some of the Corinthian converts (1 Cor 15:12).

10.2.6. *The Lucan Paul and His Cause of Israel's Hope between Jerusalem and Rome (Acts 20:17–28:31)*

The latter part of the Book of Acts comprises the narrative about Paul's resolution to go to Jerusalem, his trial in Caesarea, and subsequent voyage to and ultimate arrival in Rome because of his appeal to Caesar (Acts 25:1–12). Paul's farewell address in Miletus (Acts 20:18–35) appears to comprise a prospect on later circumstances of challenge and communal setting of ecclesiastical organization (Acts 20:28–30).⁴⁸⁵ The speeches of Paul consistently contrast his trial to his defense of integrity and of solidarity with the hope of Israel that finds expression in several ways (Acts 23:6–8, 24:15.21, 26:6–7.23, 28:20).

Acts 23:6–10 narrates a defense of the Lucan Paul against Jewish accusers in the Sanhedrin, starting with his avowed identification with the Pharisees and turning to a cause of Israelite hope that he perceived to be unjustly criminalized; a cause which allegedly became subject of violent dissension between Pharisees and Sadducees in the Sanhedrin.⁴⁸⁶ In Acts 23:6, Paul states: "it is concerning hope and resurrection of the dead that I am handed over for judicial punishment", *περὶ ἐλπίδος καὶ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν ἐγὼ κρίνομαι*. Lucan terms of Israelite hope are determined by a message of salvation, light for those in darkness and guidance for the way of peace (Luke 1:46–55.68–79), hope of deliverance in Luke 24:21, and by expectations of the kingdom of God in Acts 1:3.6–8.

Contemporary Palestinian Jewish literature of the Dead Sea Scrolls may exhibit points of analogy to eschatological expectation and hope expressed in Luke-Acts. The first-century BCE Qumran text *4QBarki Nafshi* (4Q434–438),⁴⁸⁷ which emphasises God's salvation and grace for

⁴⁸⁵ Fitzmyer, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 680–1 compares the imagery of 'wolves' (Acts 20:29) to, among other passages, Matt 7:15 and 1 Pet 5:8, and draws attention to polemic against false teachers in Deutero-Pauline, Pastoral, and Johannine Letters as comparative frame of reference to Acts 20:30.

⁴⁸⁶ Josephus relates dissensions between Pharisees and Sadducees in the Sanhedrin, during the reign of John Hyrcanus I (134–104 BCE; *Ant.* 13.288–298) and in the passage on James' death ca. 62 CE (*Ant.* 20.197–203).

⁴⁸⁷ Ed.pr. Weinfeld and Seely, *DJD* 29, 255–334.

the poor, the afflicted, the downcast, and orphans (4Q434 1 I 1–3 // 4Q437 1 1–2), includes imagery that also finds expression in Luke. 4Q434 1 I 4 mentions God’s teaching which sets “their feet firm on the path”, ויכן לדרך רגלם.⁴⁸⁸ 4Q434 1 I 9 observes that God “turns darkness into light for them, and twisting paths into a plain. He reveals to them [t]ra[ck]s of peace and truth (נ[ג]ת[י]ב[ו]ת שלום ואמת)” (4Q434 1 I 9).⁴⁸⁹ Analogously, the last part of Zechariah’s prophecy in Luke 1:67–79 envisions the dawn of the day of God’s mercy “to give light to those who sit in darkness and in the shadow of death, to guide our feet into the way of peace” (Luke 1:79, RSV).⁴⁹⁰ 4QBarkī Nafshī envisions hope in a collective setting of covenant theology, turning “from the wilderness to a door of hope”, ממדב[ר] ל[פ]תח תקוה (4Q434 3 II 2). 4Q437 (4QBarkī Napshī^d) 2 I 14–15 adds individual joy: “my heart rejoices; I [l]ong for you, Lord, I think of you, and my heart relies on you, I hope [for] your [deliverance]”, גיל לבי [י] אבתי אתך אדוני זכרתי ונסמך לבי, [ל]פניך שברתי [לישועת]ך.⁴⁹¹

The defense of hope and resurrection of the dead that the Lucan Paul briefly expresses in Acts 23:6 thereby probably stands in relation to a broader horizon of Palestinian Jewish hope and belief in divine salvation.

A subsequent speech of Paul before the Roman governor Felix in Acts 24:10–21 includes a designation of the worship of God “according to the Way, which they call a sect” (Acts 24:14, RSV), “having a hope in God which these themselves accept (ἐλπίδα ἔχων εἰς τὸν θεὸν ἦν καὶ αὐτοὶ οὗτοι προσδέχοντα), that there will be a resurrection of both the just and the unjust” (Acts 24:15, RSV). The conclusion to this

⁴⁸⁸ Text and translation from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*. 2, 910–1. The usage of דרך as part of a revealed perspective of divine justice, in a text without Qumran community terminology, may have a general parallel to the usage of ὁδός in Acts 9:2, 22:4, 24:14.22.

⁴⁸⁹ Text and translation after García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *ibidem*, 910–1 except for the translation of the imperfect tenses וינתן and ויגל in the present time; cf. GKC, § 107 f–h on the use of the imperfect “in the sphere of the *present time*”.

⁴⁹⁰ Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, 117–20 compares Luke 1:76–79 to Isaiah with regard to light-darkness imagery. 4Q434 adds Palestinian Jewish evidence to the prophetic mode of expression in Luke 1:67–79 at v. 79.

⁴⁹¹ Text and translation from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*. 2, 916–9. The spelling of the name of the Lord, אדוני, could indicate Essene affiliations of the text 4QBarkī Nafshī, in view of Essene reverence for the divine name (Josephus, *J.W.* 2.135.145; cf. CD-A XV 1–2).

speech repeats the contrast between trial and belief in resurrection of the dead (Acts 24:18–21 at v. 21).

Acts 26:2–23 comprises Paul’s defense before king Herod Agrippa II in terms that once more include a perspective of eschatological hope. After a reference to his way of life as a Pharisee (Acts 26:4–5), the Lucan Paul emphasizes his “hope in the promise made by God to our fathers, to which our twelve tribes hope to attain, as they earnestly worship night and day” (Acts 23:6–8 at vv. 6–7, RSV). The question, “why is it thought incredible by any of you that God raises the dead?” (Acts 23:8, RSV), appears to voice the excruciating incomprehension on the part of Paul about persecution against him for having hope. Acts 23:22–23 concludes the speech with a statement about help from God in witness to Christ’s suffering and resurrection from the dead and proclamation of light to the people and the Gentiles.

Following the narrative of voyage, shipwreck, and ultimate arrival in Rome (Acts 27:1–28:16), the semi-final part of Acts presents a discussion between Paul and Jews in Rome (Acts 28:17–28). In Acts 28:17–20, Paul introduces his desire to speak with leading persons among the Roman Jews, indicating his appeal to Caesar and defense that “it is because of the hope of Israel (ἡ ἐλπὶς τοῦ Ἰσραήλ) that I am bound with this chain” (Acts 28:20, RSV). Acts 28:25–28 presents Paul’s polemical words in prophetic language against his Jewish kinsmen for their lack of understanding and his insistence on the additional importance of a Gentile hearing of the means of divine deliverance presented by the gospel mission.⁴⁹² The discussion ends with division (Acts 28:24).⁴⁹³ Acts 28:30–31 concludes with Paul’s preaching of the kingdom of God and teachings about Jesus Christ in Rome with unhindered freedom of speech, μετὰ πάσης παρρησίας ἀκωλύτως,⁴⁹⁴ for a period of two years.

⁴⁹² The statement in Acts 28:28, “Let it therefore be known to you (γνωστὸν ἔστω) that this means of deliverance by God has been sent to the Gentiles; they will also give careful attention”, makes part of language of gospel mission that is paralleled by Acts 4:10–12 at v. 10 and 13:38–39 at v. 38. The usage γνωστὸν οὖν ἔστω ὑμῖν in Acts 28:28 appears to constitute a polemical counterpart to the phrase “with regard to this sect we know (γνωστὸν ἡμῖν ἐστίν) that everywhere it is spoken against” in Acts 28:22 (RSV). The demonstrative pronoun and the neuter substantive σωτήριον in the phrase τοῦτο τὸ σωτήριον τοῦ θεοῦ (Acts 28:28) makes a translation such as ‘this salvation of God’ (RSV) less than probable; on σωτήριον, cf. BDAG, ³2000, 986.

⁴⁹³ Acts 28:29 in some text-traditions further mentions division; cf. Fitzmyer, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 796.

⁴⁹⁴ Note that Josephus, *J.W.* 2.276 recounts the total elimination of the freedom of speech, καθόλου δὲ ἡ μὲν παρρησία πάντων περικέκοπτο, and the omnipresence of

11. EVALUATION

11.1. *First-Century Christian Communities and Eschatology*

This chapter has explored the role and significance of eschatology in canonical as well as extra-canonical sources about emerging Christianity, countering a number of previous scholarly suppositions in the course of this renewed exploration.

The extra-canonical *Gospel of Thomas* includes eschatological expectations on the part of the disciples and reactions of the Thomasine Jesus in proleptic terms of the kingdom as present dimension. My analysis of this evidence counters previous tendencies to downplay or deny eschatological ideas a place in this extra-canonical sayings gospel. The analysis of identifiable traces of eschatology indicates that the *Gospel of Thomas* does not provide an analogous case for the hypothetical reconstruction of a non-eschatological kernel of Q.⁴⁹⁵ My analysis of the Sayings Source Q has argued that eschatology makes part of the retention of tradition, adaptation of tradition, and redactional elaborations in the composition history of Q.

Much previous study of eschatology focused attention on the 'eschatological discourses' in the Synoptic Gospels (Mark 13:3–37; Matthew 24–25; Luke 17:20–37, 21:5–36). The eschatological interpretation of these discourses was challenged in part or as a whole by some scholars in favour of an historicizing interpretation. The historicizing interpretation rightly contextualizes the Synoptic discourses in the destructive aftermath of the Jewish War (e.g. Mark 13:14–16 par.) and points to concerns against misguided eschatological anxieties in the text. Historical contextualization of Mark 13:3–31 or 13:3–37 at large either provokes the idea of delay of the Parousia or has led scholars to interpret Mark 13:24–27 as symbolic language of divine vindication of the Son of man through historical events. However, salvation from tribulation rather than vindication or judgement is a consistent concern of the Marcan

tyranny in Judaea under the Roman procuratorship of Albinus (62–64 CE). Greek text from Thackeray, *Josephus. The Jewish War. Books I–II*, 430.

⁴⁹⁵ E.g. the studies by B. Mack and J.M. Robinson about Q and a non-eschatological picture of Jesus, surveyed in chapter one, section 2.1. This standpoint is also reflected in individual cases. For instance, Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels*, 86–99 at 96–7 interpreted John's preaching of imminent judgement in Q 3:7–9, 16–17 as the product of secondary, redactional development; on Q 3:7–9, 16–17 and apocalypticism, see chapter five.

and other Synoptic eschatological discourses. My literary analysis of Mark 13:14–23.24–27.28–31 in terms of intercalation has argued that the evangelist anticipates on salvation and gathering of the elect at the time of the Parousia (Mark 13:24–27) as encouragement of belief and eschatological assurance in face of contemporary contexts of great tribulation. The difference between the second person plural form of address in Mark 13:14–23.28–31 and the third person plural subject in Mark 13:26 further precludes a simple equation between contemporary hope of salvation in face of tribulation and future expectation of the Parousia.

The Synoptic Gospels further comprise a large diversity of eschatological ideas, such as traditions about restoration (Mark 9:9–13 par.), rewards and punishments (Mark 9:41, 9:42–50, 10:29–30, 12:40b), and resurrection (Mark 12:18–27 par.). Scholarly discussion that reduces the debate about Jesus and eschatology to a matter of inauthentic sayings (chapter one, section 2.1, note 53) thereby appears insufficient and misguided. It may further be inferred from the expectation about Jesus as the one who “delivers us from the wrath to come” in 1 Thess 1:10, that eschatology is presupposed as part of pre-Pauline Jesus-tradition.

Several studies up to recent scholarship have supposed a development in first-century CE Christian eschatology from imminent expectation of the Parousia to theologies of delay of the Parousia.⁴⁹⁶ However, there are several problems with the argument that this would be a main tendency in the development of first-century Christian eschatological consciousness. First, my discussion of Pauline evidence has proposed a different interpretation of certain passages, like 1 Thess 4:13–18 and Rom 13:11–12, which previous scholarship has tended to associate with imminent Parousia expectation. In a setting of mourning about the dead and words of comfort, 1 Thess 4:13–18 gives expression to the general eschatological belief in unity with the Lord dimension for humanity as recipient of salvation; a belief about the faith community that transcends boundaries of life and death. In Romans 13:11–12, Paul appears to reflect on the spreading of faith and sharing in spiritual blessings, not necessarily on the imminent expectation of the Parousia, when writing that “salvation is nearer to us now than when we first believed” (Rom 13:11, RSV). Second, some passages that could be associated with delay or denial of the Parousia, like Luke 12:42–46 and 2 John 7, emphasise

⁴⁹⁶ Section 6.2 nn. 267 and 268 above, and chapter one, section 2.1, note 36.

that this belongs to the respective attitudes of the unfaithful servant (Luke 12:46) and of deceivers (2 John 7).

11.2. *Intra-Jewish Dimensions to First-Century Christian Eschatological Ideas*

The Palestinian Jewish origins of the early Jesus-movement are important for traditio-historical explorations of emerging Christianity's self-expression in relation to Scripture and early Jewish traditions and worldviews. From the Synoptic picture of Jesus as teacher who recites the great commandment addressing Israel (Mark 12:28–34 / Matt 22:35–40), to Paul's identification with fellow Jews as Israelite (Rom 9:1–5, 11:1.29), and to the biblical example of the tribes of Israel next to that of the apostles in the Apocalypse (Rev 7:1–8, 21:12–14), New Testament writings attest to this traditio-historical dimension in general. Since the early Jesus-movement included missionaries and believers in the Graeco-Roman Diaspora as Ἰουδαῖοι, Jews, in a relation of kinship, συγγενεῖς, together with godfearers and proselytes (Gal 2:15–16; Rom 16:7.11.21; Acts 18:1.7.24; John 9:31), the earliest stages of emerging Christianity have been rightly characterised as Christian Judaism by several scholars.⁴⁹⁷

This chapter has discussed Gospel evidence of both first-century CE Jesus-traditions and eschatology that may go back to pre-70 CE emerging Christianity, with more attention for connections with contemporary Jewish tradition as reflected in the Dead Sea Scrolls than previously supposed. The eschatological expectation of the prophetic role of Elijah 'to restore all things' in Mark 9:9–13 par. has a further Palestinian Jewish parallel in 4Q558. The eschatological anxiety about salvation in the midst of tribulation that Q 17:26–27 compares with the 'days of Noah' has a point of analogy in 4Q254a, while 4Q176, 4Q370, and 4Q577 include paraenetic references to the 'days of Noah'. Eschatologically loaded polemic against unfaithfulness of 'this generation' in Jesus-traditions in Q could have a parallel in polemic against injustice on the part of האחרון הדור in sectarian Qumran texts (CD-A I 12 //

⁴⁹⁷ E.g. Malina, "Jewish Christianity or Christian Judaism," 46–57; Wild, "The Encounter between Pharisaic and Christian Judaism," 105–24; Luttikhuisen, "Vroegchristelijk jodendom," 163–89, reprinted in idem, *De veelvormigheid van het vroegste christendom*, 75–100; Bardet, *Le Testimonium Flavianum*, 179, 187–8.

4QD^a 2 I 16; 1QpMic 17–18 5; 1QpHab II 7).⁴⁹⁸ The Matthean concept of ‘new age’ (Matt 19:28) has been compared with Greek evidence, but its sense of eschatological renewal is also present in Qumran texts such as 1QS IV 25 and 4Q215a 2 2 and 3 1. John 4:10–11.14, that visualize soteriological revelation as a spring of living water for eternal life, can now be put in comparative relief by CD-A III 16–17 and 4Q418 103 II 6. The eschatological significance attached to hearing the voice of the Son of man (John 5:25–29) runs parallel to listening to the voice of revealed knowledge from the Teacher of Righteousness in CD-B XX 27–34 and from a messianic figure in 4Q521 2 II 1.

The present analysis of Pauline evidence has argued that the image of God in 1 Thess 1:9 does not exclusively reflect Hellenistic expressions, but is also paralleled in the Dead Sea Scrolls. My analysis of Romans 9–11 has compared the language of faith and unfaithfulness, plight and salvation with historical situations described by Josephus and theological vocabulary in non-sectarian Qumran texts. Paul’s confrontation with unfaithfulness and opposition of his time in Romans 9–11 should be situated in deadly peril for believers in Judaea (1 Thess 2:13–16, Rom 15:31) from radical elements, such as described by Josephus, and is paralleled by language of entreaty for divine atonement in 4Q504.

The Acts of the Apostles begin with expectations about the kingdom as preached by Jesus on the one hand and the commission of the apostles to be Jesus’ witnesses to the end of the earth on the other (Acts 1:1–8 at vv. 6–8). The subsequent narration in Acts indicates that the witness concerns the eschatologically loaded proclamation of the gospel about Jesus as well as persecution and oppression against the church in Jerusalem. With regard to a connection between oppression and going to the ends of the earth, 4Q568 (*4QAramaic K*) provides a general point of analogy. The universal orientation of salvation as ‘light for the Gentiles’ in Isaiah 49:6, that is quoted in a missionary setting in Acts 13:47, is not paralleled in extant Qumran Pesharim to Isaiah, but 4Q228 (*4QWork with citation of Jubilees*) does refer to ‘light on nati[ons]’, [אור בגו[ים] (2 2), and to ‘the family of the nations’, משפחת הגוים (1 II 2). Speeches of the Lucan Paul toward the end of Acts consistently stress a contrast between the apostle’s trial and his cause of hope and belief in resurrection (Acts 23:6–8, 24:15.21, 26:6–7.23,

⁴⁹⁸ On periodization and generation language in apocalyptic discourse, see chapter five. Josephus refers to the destructive impact of ‘a generation’, γενεά, of revolutionary zeal on the Jewish people at large (*J.W.* 5.566).

28:20). References to eschatological expectation and hope of Israel in Luke-Acts (cf. Luke 1:67–79) comprise ideas that are further paralleled in *4QBarkī Napfshī* (4Q434–438).

The points of analogy between the eschatologically loaded perspective of salvation history in Luke-Acts and Palestinian Jewish traditions reflected in the Dead Sea Scrolls could be situated in the following Lucan communal setting. The author of Luke-Acts speaks for a Christian community of both Jewish and Gentile backgrounds, defending ancestral Jewish traditions from an intramural perspective on the one hand and testifying to opposition, persecution and Gentile mission on the other. References to the ‘people’, such as in Luke 2:32 and Acts 26:23, are references to the Jewish people of Israel and could thereby reflect an intra-Jewish dimension of thought. In this respect, the author of Luke-Acts also expressed eschatological ideas in terms partly reflective of Palestinian Jewish strands of thought about righteousness and the predicament of evil, hope and salvation.

11.3. *Outlook on Subsequent Chapters*

Three chapters have introduced comparative study of eschatological ideas, integrated Qumran eschatology into the picture of Second Temple Judaism, and explored the evidence of first-century Christian communities and eschatology with special attention for intra-Jewish dimensions. Within this broader setting of eschatological ideas in Qumran, Palestinian Judaism and emerging Christianity, the subsequent three chapters focus on beliefs that associate their fulfillment with the final age (resurrection, chapter four; messianism, chapter six) or that include eschatological features (apocalypticism, chapter five). Because of the comparative focus on study and reconstruction of pre-70 CE traditions, the extra-canonical New Testament writings, post-Pauline Letters and the Apocalypse will come less into view in the chapters on resurrection, apocalypticism, and messianism. Extensive attention will be rather be focused on early Jesus-tradition in the canonical Gospels, Pauline Letters and Acts of the Apostles, with an outlook on post-70 CE texts and traditions where appropriate.

CHAPTER FOUR

RESURRECTION OF THE DEAD IN THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS AND THE NEW TESTAMENT

1. INTRODUCTION

The tradition history of the eschatological belief of resurrection in Second Temple Jewish literature has received much attention,¹ while resurrection in the New Testament has been the subject of many exegetical and historical-critical studies.² Nevertheless, Qumran literature was given limited attention until the 1990s, if treated at all in tradition-historical surveys on this subject.³ The evidence of the Dead Sea Scrolls about resurrection has only recently been given more extended attention and new impetus through the publication of Émile Puech's two-volume study *La croyance des Esséniens en la vie future*. The ensuing debate has witnessed varying degrees of critical appraisal and skepticism about Puech's findings.⁴ Yet there is a relative consensus that at least two newly

¹ E.g. Stemberger, *Der Leib der Auferstehung*; Nickelsburg, *Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life*; Cavallin, *Life after Death*; Fischer, *Eschatologie und Jenseitserwartung im hellenistischen Diasporajudentum*; Kellermann, *Auferstanden in den Himmel*. The recent study by Setzer, *Resurrection of the Body in Early Judaism and Early Christianity*, mainly focuses on first- and second-century Christian resurrection beliefs.

² Principal general studies with discussion of older scholarship include: Perkins, *Resurrection*; Lüdemann, *Die Auferstehung Jesu*; Bieringer, Koperski and Lataire (eds.), *Resurrection in the New Testament*.

³ Stemberger, *Der Leib der Auferstehung*, omits discussion of Qumran literature, supposing its silence on the nature of the resurrection body (3); Cavallin, *Life after Death*, 60–8 concludes that “only one text, or possibly two, proved to represent a sure, supporting testimony” (65), having identified 1QH^a XIV 29b–30a, 34–35a and XIX 10–14; Nickelsburg, *Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life*, 144–59 and 165–7 relates 1QH^a and 1QS III 13–IV 26 to “a theology of immortality (Wisdom Sol.) or immediate assumption (Test. Asher)” (167).

⁴ See e.g. Collins, “Review: Émile Puech, *La Croyance des Esséniens en la vie future*,” 246–52; Davies, “Death, Resurrection, and Life after Death in the Qumran Scrolls,” 189–211. Setzer, *Resurrection of the Body*, only mentions Qumran texts in her introduction (1–20 at 13–15, 18) and takes Davies' skepticism as a lead (13–15), while omitting references in her chapter on ‘Resurrection in Early Judaism’ (21–52).

published texts, 4Q521 and 4QPseudo-Ezekiel^{a,b,d}, can be added to longer discussed Qumran evidence (1QS, 1QSb, CD, 1QH).⁵

1.1. *Reasons for Renewed Study*

The comparative study of resurrection traditions in Qumran literature and New Testament texts merits renewed attention for a number of reasons. First, the Dead Sea Scrolls provide firsthand evidence about pre-70 CE Palestinian Judaism which is important in order to put to the test and develop theories about the development of the belief of resurrection from biblical tradition. Qumran literature brings in evidence of particular importance for the literary history of the biblical text, that is, biblical scrolls, as well as evidence potentially important for the interpretation history of biblical resurrection language, that is, parabiblical Qumran texts, such as 4QPseudo-Daniel and 4QPseudo-Ezekiel. This Qumran evidence needs to be integrated in the discussion about resurrection language, which previously engaged relevant passages in Scripture, including the Septuagint and its supposed Hebrew Vorlage, and in apocryphal and pseudepigraphical texts hitherto known from Christian transmission.

Second, the newly published evidence of the Dead Sea Scrolls since the 1990s has been given specialised attention as regards its place in sectarian Essene and non-sectarian thought, but its possible broader implications for Palestinian Jewish tradition history have yet to be evaluated. The analysis of Qumran evidence should supplement if not correct pictures which have previously been drawn about historical circumstances in which the belief in resurrection developed; for instance, arguments about its development in (proto-)Pharisaic circles.⁶ One could further explore the question whether the debate about ‘conflicted boundary lines between wisdom and apocalypticism,’ for which newly published

⁵ See e.g. Collins, *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 110–29 (“Resurrection and Eternal Life”); Knibb, “Eschatology and Messianism in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 379–402 at 384.

⁶ See e.g. Schaper, *Eschatology in the Greek Psalter*, 47–8 who mainly relates the promotion of the belief in resurrection as a response to Maccabean martyrdom and forceful Hellenization to (proto-)Pharisaic circles, referring to Josephus, *Ant.* 18:14, 2 Macc 7:9.14.36, 12:44f. and *m. Sanh.* 10, while arguing for the “Palestinian, proto-Pharisaic origin of the Greek Psalter” in his discussion of LXX Ps 1:5; about which see section 2.2 below.

Qumran texts provide an important incentive,⁷ is also relevant for the tradition history of the belief in resurrection.

Third, the question of literary history of longer known sectarian Qumran texts, the *Serekh ha-Yahad* (1QS), the *Damascus Document* (CD) and the *Hodayot* (1QH), has not been drawn into the discussion, neither by Puech nor by his critics.⁸ Nevertheless, newly published recensions from Qumran cave 4 (4QS^{a-j}; 4QD^{a-h}; 4QH^{a-f}) may yield new insights into the literary place of sections on resurrection and eternal life in texts and recensions.

Fourth, comparative discussion with the New Testament, hitherto characterised by piecemeal attention for case-studies on 4Q521 and 4Q385,⁹ has yet to integrate the complete Qumran evidence now available about resurrection.¹⁰ Biblical tradition and its interpretation

⁷ García Martínez (ed.), *Wisdom and Apocalypticism*; Wright and Wills, *Conflicted Boundaries*. Important Qumran texts in this discussion purportedly include hymnic parts of 1QS, Hodayot, 4QInstruction, 1–4QMysteries, and 4QTime of Righteousness (4Q215a).

⁸ Puech, *La croyance des Esséniens en la vie future*. 2, 335–419 (“Les Hymnes (1QH)”; 421–442 (“La Règle de la Communauté (1QS et 1QSb)”) briefly mentions 4QS^{a-j} without further discussing these cave 4 recensions; 499–514 (“Le Document de Damas (CD)”) at 501 briefly surveys the manuscript witnesses (CD-A, CD-B, 4QD, 5QD (5Q12), 6QD (6Q15)) without further going into the additional cave 4 evidence. Collins, *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 110–29 consistently refers to 1QS, CD, 1QH, and also 1QM, without referring to cave 4 recensions of these texts. Davies, “Death, Resurrection, and Life after Death,” 201 refers to cave 4 fragments of the *Serekh ha-Yahad*, holding that “an originally strictly dualistic statement(, in 1QS III 13–IV 18a, 23b–26) itself was not part of an earlier version of the document.” See, however, Tigchelaar, “These are the names of the spirits of . . .” 529–47, whose discussion does not suggest the absence of a dualistic statement, but “at some places a shorter and variant form of *The Two Spirits Treatise*” in fragments of 4Q257 (4QpapS^c).

⁹ See Tabor and Wise, “4Q521 ‘On Resurrection’ and the Synoptic Gospel Tradition,” 149–62; Kvalbein, “Metaphoric Language in 4Q521 and the Interpretation of Matthew 11.5 par.,” 87–110; Kister and Qimron, “Observations on 4QSecond Ezekiel (4Q385 2–3),” 595–602 on 4Q385 3 3 with Mark 13:20 / Matt 24:22.

¹⁰ Perkins, *Resurrection*, includes longer known Qumran texts, such as 1QH, 1QS, and CD, in his discussion of resurrection and immortality in early Judaism (38, 47, 178, 262, 305); Alsop, *The Post-Resurrection Appearance Stories*, 214–74 includes discussion of Hellenistic ‘history-of-religion backgrounds’ (215–38) and the ‘Old Testament/Jewish World’ (239–74), but omits Qumran evidence about afterlife; Lüdemann, *Die Auferstehung Jesu*, includes a few references to the Old Testament, apocrypha, pseudepigrapha, and rabbinic texts as traditio-historical backgrounds (70–1, 101); Perkins, “The Resurrection of Jesus of Nazareth,” 423–42, refers to the Old Testament and pseudepigrapha, but omits Qumran evidence about resurrection; the volume by Bieringer, Koperski and Lataire (eds.), *Resurrection in the New Testament*, includes articles on post-mortem appearances in Graeco-Roman literature (1–19) and about afterlife expectations in Pseudo-Philo, *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch* (21–34), but has no entries on Qumran evidence about afterlife. Cf. Wright, *The Resurrection of the Son of God*,

history, variations in resurrection language, and contextual meanings of resurrection in eschatological thought are all important issues for a traditio-historical understanding of resurrection in the New Testament on which Qumran literature may shed new light.

1.2. *Problems of Delimitating the Subject of Resurrection*

The analysis in this chapter concerns the development of an eschatological belief in resurrection, which could take on diverse forms but was fixed on expectations about the final age. In view of the diversity of beliefs about afterlife, a proper way of proceeding should be grounded in careful delimitation of resurrection with the aid of the following observations.

Accounts of heavenly assumptions,¹¹ visions of post-mortem appearances¹² or miracle stories of revivification¹³ will not be the focus of our attention, except for cases where intersections with eschatological expectation can be demonstrated. The Jesus-tradition in Q which recounts divine miracles, including the raising of the dead, as confirmation of Jesus' messianic identity in comparison with the Qumran evidence of 4Q521 constitute such a case.

A question more difficult to determine is how one should conceptualize resurrection of the dead in anthropological terms. Older scholarly tendencies to juxtapose a Greek belief in immortality of the soul to Semitic belief in bodily resurrection have rightly been criticized for being too schematic and for carrying undue systematic presuppositions with

whose discussion of resurrection (109–15, 146–99) has been criticized by D.J. Bryan in *JSHJ* 3 (2005) 155–69 for, among other things, not leaving room for the diversity of Qumran evidence (181–90).

¹¹ For biblical examples, see Gen 5:24 (Enoch), 2 Kgs 2:11 (Elijah); cf. the *Ascension of Isaiah*.

¹² On Graeco-Roman literary evidence of post-mortem apparitions, see Zeller, "Erscheinungen Verstorbener im griechisch-römischen Bereich," 1–19 who concludes that these accounts are silent about the question of permanent afterlife. On Greek views of afterlife, see Albinus, *The House of Hades*, who distinguishes between 'negative' eschatology as post-mortem memory and a shadowy realm of the dead in Homeric discourse and 'positive' eschatology as immortality of the soul and 'metempsychosis' in Orphic discourse. Lüdemann, *Die Auferstehung Jesu*, 52 contrasts 'hellenistic epiphany thought' to apocalyptic Jewish tradition.

¹³ See e.g. 1 Kgs 17:21–23, on Elijah's reviving of a child, also referred to as the raising of a corpse from death in Sirach 48:5; yet these passages do not explicate a notion of eschatological resurrection.

them.¹⁴ A few examples may illustrate this point. Resurrection could be conceived in terms of an angelic state, as New Testament evidence (Mark 12:25 par.)¹⁵ indicates. A first-century CE Hellenistic-Jewish work like the *Sentences of Pseudo-Phocylides* appears to leave room for notions of both immortality of the soul and bodily resurrection (Ps.-Phoc. 103–8). Further, the possibility of a Palestinian Jewish notion of ‘resurrection of the spirit’ has been argued with regard to *1 Enoch* 104, *Jubilees* 23.¹⁶ Even the notion of bodily resurrection can be couched in terms pertinent to the spirit. This becomes clear from Paul’s conceptualization of resurrection of the dead in 1 Corinthians 15:44: “It is sown a physical body, it is raised a spiritual body” (RSV), analogously with terrestrial and heavenly bodies in 1 Cor 15:40.

Nevertheless, a differentiation between eschatological notions of afterlife remains pertinent in order to put belief in resurrection of the dead in proper relief. Bodily resurrection implies a holistic view of human afterlife, while even ‘resurrection of the spirit’ envisaged in terms of ‘transformation of the *nepeš* or spirit to an angelic state’ may not be as expressly dualistic as Greek ideas about immortality of the soul and its transmigration or reincarnation.¹⁷ *1 Enoch* 103:4, for instance, mentions both the resurrection of the souls of the pious and the imperishability of their spirits, implying more than a disembodied spirit.¹⁸ Flavius Josephus conceptualizes Pharisaic and Essene afterlife beliefs in terms of immortality of the soul, thereby admittedly accommodating his picture to the Hellenistic mindset of his historical audience (*J.W.* 2.154–8, 163;

¹⁴ See e.g. Nickelsburg, *Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life*, 177–80 (“Some Presuppositions of Cullmann’s Essay on *Immortality of the Soul or Resurrection of the Dead*”); Cavallin, *Life after Death. Part 1*, 17 criticizes Stemmerger’s systematic presuppositions about holistic ‘Biblical/Jewish anthropology’ in Palestinian Jewish literature for not allowing room to variations and ambiguity in imagery; Barr, “Immortality and Resurrection: Conflict and Complementarity?,” 94–116, 138–40. See also the critique of a ‘sharp distinction between Palestinian and Hellenistic Judaism’ by Park, *Conceptions of Afterlife in Jewish Inscriptions*, 1–15 at 5.

¹⁵ Acts 23:8, which mentions Sadducean denial of resurrection, angel and spirit, could be another example of angelic/spiritual conceptualization of resurrection, depending on how this phrase is read.

¹⁶ Collins, *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 113.

¹⁷ Collins, *ibidem*, 113. Collins envisages the ‘resurrection of the *nepeš* or spirit’ in *1 Enoch* 104:2.4.6; Stemmerger, *Das Leib der Auferstehung*, 44–5 and 116 insists that the souls of the dead are not conceived of as disembodied spirits in *1 Enoch* 108.

¹⁸ Note that the Hebrew term **נפש** encompasses connotations of breath, life, soul, and living being/individual, while Septuagintal Greek usage of *ψυχή* can stand for a variety of meanings, such as life, soul, conscious self, personality, person, individual, as well.

cf. *Ant.* 18.14). Influences of Hellenistic culture are a well-known part of the historical spectrum of Jewish afterlife beliefs,¹⁹ but the eschatological perspective and roots in biblical tradition are at the same time points which separate Jewish resurrection beliefs from non-Jewish Greek thought about afterlife.²⁰

1.3. *The Debate about Resurrection in Qumran Literature*

Puech's study has invigorated the discussion about afterlife beliefs, in particular resurrection, in the Dead Sea Scrolls, but at the same time carried debatable presuppositions with it. Puech's survey of afterlife belief in Qumran eschatology includes many texts, not only earlier discussed Qumran texts, such as the *Hodayot*, the *Serekh ha-Yahad*, and the *Damascus Document*,²¹ but also the *Rule of Benediction* (1QSb), the *War Scroll*, 11QMelchizedek, 4QAgnes of Creation A–B, 4QVisions of Amram^{a-f} ar, 4QTestament of Qahat ar, 4Q280, 4QBlessings^{a-b}, 4QWords of the Luminaries^a, 4QPseudo-Daniel^{k-d}, 4QMidrEschat^{a,b}, 4QNew Jerusalem^a ar, Qumran Pesharim, 4QPseudo-Ezekiel, 11QPs^a, and 4Q521.²²

One debated question is whether all these texts are relevant for this subject and whether an Essene belief in resurrection can actually be discerned in a representative cross-section of sectarian Qumran texts.²³ Many scholars, like J.J. Collins, M.A. Knibb, and P.R. Davies, would disagree (see notes 4 and 5 above). The texts assembled by Puech may

¹⁹ Collins, *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 112–3 notes 1 Enoch 22 as a “peculiar mix of Babylonian and Greek (Orphic) traditions”, thereby referring to Wacker, *Weltordnung und Gericht. Studien zu 1 Henoch 22*.

²⁰ One should be cautious with the term ‘Greek eschatology’, which Albinus, *The House of Hades*, 9 defines as “human afterlife within a perspective of what is generally beyond space and time in the world of mortals”; a definition which equates ‘eschatology’ and ‘afterlife’ and does not say anything about a final age.

²¹ These three sectarian ‘foundation texts’ recur in discussions by Cavallin, *Life after Death. Part 1*, 60–8, and Collins, *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 110–29. Nickelsburg, *Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life*, 144–69 focuses on 1QS and 1QH, while H.-W. Kuhn, *Enderwartung und gegenwärtiges Heil*, 12–4, 84–8 and Lichtenberger, *Studien zum Menschenbild in Texten der Qumrangemeinde*, 219–24 focus on 1QH.

²² Puech, *La croyance des Esséniens en la vie future*. 2, 335–692.

²³ This was already a debated question with regard to longer known sectarian foundation texts. See e.g. Nickelsburg, *Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life*, 144–5 at 145 who considers these texts to contain “ambiguous and elusive data”; Lichtenberger, *Studien zum Menschenbild*, 219. It should be noted that some of the additional texts, namely 4QVisions of Amram, 4QPseudo-Daniel, and 4QAgnes of Creation B, already received short notice by Cavallin, *Life after Death. Part 1*, 64–5.

be important for the broader subject of 'Qumran eschatology', but in some cases his line of reasoning that associates motifs in a text with a tradition background of belief in judgement and resurrection attests to systematizing tendencies, while lacking reference to explicit resurrection language. Final judgement and resurrection are not necessarily explicitly and inextricably linked in every text. For instance, the *War Scroll* does attest to a vision of final judgement and eschatological war, but the phrase addressing God, 'you raised the fallen with your strength', ואתה הקימותה נופלים (1QM XIV 10–11),²⁴ could echo biblical language of Psalms 145:14 and 146:8, without necessarily reflecting the concept of resurrection from Daniel 9–12 as Puech claims.²⁵ Puech's treatment of diverse texts gathered around the figure Melchizedek and his antitype Melchiresha' (11Q13, 4Q180–181, 4Q*Visions of Amram*, 4Q542, 4Q280, 4Q286–287) concludes that one tradition, that of Daniel 12, underlies the eschatology of these texts. However, only with regard to 4Q*Vision of Amram*^f Puech's argument goes beyond passages about final judgement to argue in detail for connections with resurrection language in Daniel 12:1–3.²⁶ Puech also includes other sectarian Qumran texts, like the Qumran Pesharim and the *Eschatological Midrash* (4Q174, 4Q177), a fragment of the Aramaic *New Jerusalem Jerusalem* (4Q554 2 III), and 4Q*Words of the Luminaries*^a in the Danielic tradition. However, specific connections with resurrection language, apart from eschatological tribulation and judgement, are not demonstrated in the latter case.²⁷ Eschatological orientation and supposed partial parallels with Danielic tradition are not sufficient arguments in themselves for identification of resurrection belief in a text. The relevance of texts for the subject of

²⁴ Text and translation from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition. 1*, 136–7.

²⁵ Cf. the criticism by Collins, *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 119 that the point in 1QM XIV 11 is not eschatological resurrection, but that God "has revived those who were defeated in battle", while he further differentiates the eschatology in 1QM from that of Daniel and 1 *Enoch*.

²⁶ Puech, *La croyance des Esséniens en la vie future* 2, 515–62 at 559–60.

²⁷ Puech, *ibidem*, 563–604; his treatment further includes fragments of 4Q*Pseudo-Daniel* (568–72). When suggesting a connection between 'being written in the book' in Daniel 12:1 and 4Q504 1–2 VI 14 (כול הכתוב בספר החיים), Puech supports his analysis (565 n. 7) on earlier scholarship by Nickelsburg, *Resurrection, Immortality, Eternal Life*, 15–6, who, whoever also mentions Isa 4:2–6, Mal 3:16–18, Ps 69:28 as evidence from biblical tradition about a 'book of life' in which the names of the righteous are written.

resurrection further depends on the identification and analysis of after-life language.

Another issue that needs further evaluation concerns the dividing line between sectarian and non-sectarian evidence about resurrection belief and its significance for Palestinian Jewish tradition history. Puech's study deems all discussed evidence important for Qumran Essene thought. In this respect, Puech's survey still stands in line with older scholarship that considered the Qumran literature to represent the sectarian library of the Qumran community. Yet the amount of fragments from Qumran cave 4 published since the 1990s includes many texts which lack any clear affiliation with hitherto known sectarian community terminology or thought.²⁸ Qumran literature, including the many texts from cave 4, has been described as the "library of a specific circle or school, a school *close to but not identical with the community*".²⁹ The scholarly division has been described in terms of Puech's position of a belief in resurrection identifiable in Qumran sectarian works standing over against that Collins' position that this belief is only identifiable in non-sectarian compositions.³⁰ Yet this apparently simple contrast leaves questions to be answered about the traditio-historical relief and differentiation of eschatological beliefs about afterlife to be reconstructed within the corpus of sectarian Qumran texts³¹ as well as in the Qumran library at large. Even if Collins' position would be affirmed after re-evaluation of sectarian texts, the question remains whether and in which way the non-sectarian texts about resurrection can be characterized as 'adopted texts',³² as texts appropriated by the parent movement and/or the Qumran community.

The order of discussion in this chapter will first integrate findings from biblical, apocryphal, and pseudepigraphical Qumran literature with biblical tradition (section 2). Non-Qumranic early Jewish evidence about resurrection will be mentioned in the interest of integrating Qumran

²⁸ Puech, *La croyance des Esséniens en la vie future*. 2, 327–33 distinguishes pre-Qumran from Qumran texts, but considers texts not clearly sectarian to have contributed to or influenced Qumran Essene thought.

²⁹ Dimant, "The Qumran Manuscripts: Contents and Significance," 23–58 at 36, my italics.

³⁰ Xeravits, *King, Priest, Prophet*, 100 n. 83.

³¹ The point of diversity in eschatological beliefs, including afterlife beliefs, within sectarian Qumran literature has rightly been made by Mattila, "Two Contrasting Eschatologies at Qumran (4Q246 vs 1QM)," 518–38 and Davies, "Death, Resurrection, and Life after Death in the Qumran Scrolls," 207.

³² Newsom, "'Sectually Explicit' Literature from Qumran," 167–87 at 173.

evidence into a broader picture of Second Temple Jewish beliefs about resurrection.³³ Qumran evidence will be evaluated with respective attention for non- and pre-sectarian Qumran texts (section 3) and for sectarian Qumran texts (section 4). The discussion of Qumran evidence will include texts not previously given consideration, such as some poetical and liturgical texts (section 3.3 below) and cave 4 recensions of longer known sectarian Qumran texts. The New Testament will be explored along traditio-historical lines of information about pre-70 resurrection tradition (section 5) and with attention for late first-century CE texts (section 6). The concluding section will draw out lines of convergence and difference between the Scrolls and the New Testament and explore their significance.

2. SCRIPTURAL FOUNDATIONS FOR THE BELIEF IN LIFE AFTER DEATH

2.1. *Hebrew Biblical Passages with Resurrection Language*

Classical examples from Hebrew Scriptures often referred to as exegetical starting points for later traditions about life after death are Isaiah 25:8 and 26:19, Ezekiel 37:1–14, and Daniel 12:1–3 and 12:13. The following evocative imagery in prophetic literature³⁴ speaks the language of resurrection and eternal life: ‘swallowing up of death forever’, בלע המות לנצח (Isa 25:8); ‘your dead will live’, יחיו מתים (Isa 26:19a); ‘rising of a dead body’, נבלתי יקומו (Isa 26:19a); ‘awakening’, קיץ (Dan 12:2, Isa 26:19b), ‘raising and living before God’, יקמנו ונחיה לפניו (Hos 6:2), ‘resting and standing up for your lot at the end of days’, ותנוח ותעמד לגרלך לקץ הימין (Dan 12:13). Resurrection imagery can also be surrounded by its negative formulation in Isa 26:14, מתים בליחי רפאים, בלייקמו, within a setting of denouncement of wicked people who do not learn righteousness (Isa 26:7–15). Ezekiel 37:1–14 comprises a prophetic vision that bones come together, are covered and come to life out of the graves.

³³ Full-scale treatment of non-Qumranic early Jewish evidence of resurrection beliefs is beyond the scope of this chapter that focuses on comparison between Qumran and New Testament evidence about resurrection. On non-Qumran early Jewish evidence of resurrection, see e.g. Cavallin, *Life after Death. Part 1*, and Puech, *La croyance des Esséniens en la vie future. 1–2*.

³⁴ On Daniel as a prophetic book, see Matthew 24:15 and 4Q174 1 II, 3, 24, 5, 1. 3.

Among these biblical passages only Daniel 12 stands out as undisputed biblical evidence for the literal idea of resurrection.³⁵ It has been argued that the apocalyptic imagery in the so-called ‘Isaiah Apocalypse’ (Isa 24–27), of which Isaiah 25:8 and Isaiah 26:14, 19 make part, should be understood metaphorically.³⁶ Ezekiel 37:1–14 uses resurrection imagery in a figurative sense to give powerful expression to the idea that the ‘whole house of Israel’ (Ezek 37:11) will rise again and return from exile to the land of Israel (Ezek 37:12–14). The first person plural in which Hosea 6:2 is versed stands in a context of Israel’s covenantal relationship with God. Nonetheless, this resurrection language stands in contrast with biblical passages that negate even the theoretical possibility to conceive of resurrection by describing that what comes after death as a realm of shades and forgetfulness (Psalm 88:10–12).³⁷

The admittedly figurative sense of resurrection language in the Hebrew biblical passages apart from Daniel further does not preclude the interpretive role which biblical imagery could come to play in subsequent Jewish and Christian resurrection traditions. This subject will be reviewed in subsequent sections. Yet it may be noted from the start that scriptural roots of the belief in eschatological resurrection were taken for granted in emerging Christianity (cf. 1 Cor 15:54–5 which cites Isaiah 25:8 and Hosea 13:14) and rabbinic Judaism. At the core of early Christian expressions of faith about the inauguration of the final age by Jesus Christ, Jesus’ resurrection is described as an event having come to pass ‘in accordance with the Scriptures,’ *κατὰ τὰς γραφάς* (1 Cor 15:4; Luke 24:46, Acts 17:2–3; cf. Matt 12:40).³⁸ On the part of early rabbinic literature, *m.Sanhedrin* 10:1 recounts the conviction that eschatological

³⁵ Cf. Cavallin, *Life after Death. Part 1*, 23–31; Nickelsburg, *Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life*, 11–27; Collins, *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 111.

³⁶ Doyle, *The Apocalypse of Isaiah Metaphorically Speaking*, 306–7 discusses Isa 26:11–15 as “relational metaphorical speech”, contrasting the covenantal relationship of God with his people to the relationship of this people to “other lords”. He describes the resurrection language in Isaiah 26:19 as “figurative language” expressing the reversal of infertility and fruitlessness, in view of preceding figurative statements in Isaiah 26:17–18 (309–10, 314–8). Doyle considers arguments that Isaiah 26:19, in its Isaianic context (Isa 24–27), stands for national restoration from exile to be most convincing (319–20).

³⁷ Collins, *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 110 further mentions Pss. 6:5, 30:9, 115:16–17, Qoh 3:20, Sir 41:4.

³⁸ Notwithstanding the widespread early Christian conviction that Jesus’ resurrection is in accordance with and in fulfillment of the Scriptures, the scriptural background of individual passages is not always immediately clear and sometimes de-emphasised by commentators. See the comment by Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, 857: “One would be hard-pressed to locate specific texts that make these prognostications explicit. Even to

resurrection of the dead, תחיית המתים, as an Israelite tradition is rooted in the Torah.

Apart from the resurrection language in biblical passages according to the Masoretic Text tradition and its reception history in later interpretive traditions, other evidence about the subject of resurrection may also be derived from the ‘textual multiplicity’ of the biblical manuscript tradition. The discovery, publication, and discussion of biblical Dead Sea Scrolls has given new fuel to textual theory about the history of the biblical text in early Judaism up to and including the time of emerging Christianity.³⁹ Qumran biblical scrolls at times bring to light the importance of the Septuagint and its supposed Hebrew Vorlage for the understanding of the history of the biblical text.⁴⁰ It is to the evidence of the Septuagint and comparison with Qumran biblical scrolls that we will now turn.

2.2. Resurrection Language and Eschatologization in the Septuagint

It has been a known fact that the Septuagint comprises passages that are more pointedly eschatological than the Hebrew Masoretic text.⁴¹ The question is whether this results from eschatological interpretation (eschatologization) by the translator(s) or from a presumed different Hebrew ‘Vorlage’. The answer partly depends on issues like the type of translation (from very literal to extremely free) and cultural and theological contexts.⁴² The incorporation of Qumran biblical scrolls into text-critical and literary discussion makes it possible to evaluate this

attempt to do so would be wrongheaded, however”; yet Green also suggests the “pivotal importance of Isa 49:6”.

³⁹ Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 160–3 observes that, in view of the Qumran finds since 1947, “the theory of the division of the biblical witnesses into three recensions (Masoretic Text, Samaritan Pentateuch, Septuagint) cannot be maintained”, proposing a new classification of Qumran evidence along five groups: Qumran practice, Proto-Masoretic, Pre-Samaritan, close to Hebrew Vorlage of LXX, non-aligned (114–6).

⁴⁰ Tov, *ibidem*, 313–50 (“Textual Criticism and Literary Criticism”) includes discussion of cases in which Qumran biblical texts agree with the Septuagint and its supposed Hebrew Vorlage, such as 4QJer^{bd}, or with the extra-biblical witness of Josephus’ *Antiquities* 6.68–71, namely 4QSam^a.

⁴¹ See Cavallin, *Life After Death. Part 1*, 103–11 at 107–8.

⁴² Cf. Dines, *The Septuagint*, 117–28 on translation technique. Cavallin, *Life After Death. Part 1*, 107 generally implies ‘contextual translation’ when he observes that “the LXX translation tends to interpret the Hebrew Scriptures in light of the hopes about future life, which were developed in Judaism in the last centuries BC”. On examples

question in individual cases. The below survey will discuss resurrection language in the Septuagint and, where possible, include comparison with Qumran evidence.

The Septuagint version of Isaiah 26:19 is more pointedly oriented to future hope of resurrection than the Masoretic Text. This becomes clear from the future tenses ἐγερθήσονται and εὐφρανθήσονται which consistently appear in the Septuagint version of Isaiah 26:19a and which differ from the imperatives in the Masoretic Text (הקיצו ורננו). The Septuagint text of Isaiah 26:19a with its translation reads: ἀναστήσονται οἱ νεκροί, καὶ ἐγερθήσονται οἱ ἐν τοῖς μνημείοις, καὶ εὐφρανθήσονται οἱ ἐν τῇ γῆ, “the dead will rise, those who are in the graves will be awakened and those who are in the dust will rejoice”. Biblical evidence of Qumran, namely that of 1QIsa^a, corresponds with the Greek future tenses of LXX Isaiah 26:19a, since its Hebrew text has imperfect tenses יקיצו וירננו, following the imperfect יקומו, thereby differing from the imperatives of MT Isaiah 26:19a.

This evidence, which was not discussed by Cavallin’s survey of Septuagint passages,⁴³ constitutes an important argument for Puech to favour the future tenses in the Septuagint version and its presumed Hebrew Vorlage as being more original and to evaluate the imperatives of the Masoretic text as later revision.⁴⁴ Yet other scholars have expressed more caution about the text-critical value of 1QIsa^a in general,⁴⁵ and the

of ‘contextual translation’ and the contribution of Qumran texts, see the main text below.

⁴³ The survey by Cavallin, *Life After Death. Part 1*, 103–11 includes LXX Deut 32:39; Ps 1:5, 21(22):30, 48(49):16, 65(66):1,9; Prov 9:6, 10:25b, 12:28, 15:24; Job 14:14, 19:25–27, 42:17; Isa 26:19; Ezek 37:1–14 consistently compares the Septuagint texts with the Masoretic Text and at most refers to counterparts in Targumic tradition. Many of Cavallin’s examples will not be discussed in my survey, since his interpretation of these passages either lacks clear identification of resurrection language or depends more on comparison with other apocryphal and pseudepigraphical passages than on the intrinsic information provided by the LXX passage.

⁴⁴ Puech, *La croyance des Esséniens en la vie future. 1*, 66–73 at 69. Puech further adds the witnesses of Targum Pseudo-Jonathan and the Syriac Peshitta as evidence in support of the Septuagint version, even though he also refers to the Vulgate in support of the Masoretic Text and cites a commentary by H. Wildberger on Isaiah with a different view on the Peshitta (p. 69 n. 99).

⁴⁵ Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 116 considers 1QIsa^a among ‘non-aligned texts’ which “follow an inconsistent pattern of agreements and disagreements with MT, SP, and LXX”, while also noting the great number and therefore ‘authoritative status’ of proto-Masoretic texts among Qumran biblical texts (117); Van der Kooij, “The Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible before and after the Qumran Discoveries,” 167–77 observes that in relatively few cases agreements between 1QIsa^a and the LXX can be noted (p. 171) and emphasizes the linguistically secondary character of 1QIsa^a

other Qumran biblical witnesses to the Hebrew text of Isaiah (1QIsa^b; 4QIsa^{a-r}, of which 4QIsa^b 16 II 17–20 also comprises fragments of Isaiah 26:1–5.7–19; 5QIsa) include much proto-Masoretic evidence.⁴⁶ Further, the witness of 1QIsa^a to Isaiah 26:19b comes closer to the Masoretic Text than to the Septuagint.⁴⁷ The witness of 1QIsa^a to Isaiah 26:19 in its entirety thereby confirms the status of 1QIsa^a as a ‘non-aligned text’. In light of this evidence and textual criticism, Puech’s analysis can in my view only partially be agreed. 1QIsa^a does indeed give further weight to the future tenses of the Septuagint as more pointedly indicative expressions of future hope, phrased in resurrection language. However, rather than speaking in terms of original text and later revision, it appears from the textual plurality of the biblical text to which the Qumran biblical evidence attests that the literary transmission process in the Second Temple Jewish period left room for a more pointed eschatological reading of Isaiah 26:19.

The biblical text of Ezekiel 37:1–14 admittedly comprises metaphorical language that applies to restoration of Israel, not to literal resurrection. Cavallin observed that the Septuagint translation does not significantly change or add to the Masoretic Text.⁴⁸ Nonetheless, the literary history of this passage in the Septuagint has been given special attention since the article by J. Lust, who argued that the different ordering of chapters 36–40 of Ezechiel in papyrus 967 (Ezek 38–39, 37, 40) reflects a different, in fact earlier Hebrew Vorlage as compared to the Masoretic Text.⁴⁹ The theological consequence of this different ordering is that the resurrection language of Ezekiel 37:1–14 follows the Gog and Magog oracles in Ezekiel 38–39 with their apocalyptic language of

in comparison to the MT with reference to a study by E.Y. Kutscher; Paul, *La Bible avant la Bible*, 97–108 at 107, having treated various Isaian passages in comparison between MT, LXX and 1QIsa^a, concludes that that 1QIsa^a comprises an independent text with both strengths and weaknesses and represents a plurality of literary ‘editions’ of the book of Isaiah.

⁴⁶ See Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 29–32 about the close relation between 1QIsa^b and the Codex Leningradensis of the Masoretic Text; idem, *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judaean Desert*, 254 categorises 4QIsa^{a,b,d,e,f} among the “proto-Masoretic texts” of the Qumran biblical scrolls.

⁴⁷ See also Puech, *La croyance des Esséniens en la vie future*. 1, 70.

⁴⁸ Cavallin, *Life After Death. Part 1*, 107.

⁴⁹ Lust, “Ezekiel 36–40 in the Oldest Greek Manuscript,” 517–33 further observes that the MT plus in Ezek 36:23c–38 is omitted in Papyrus 967. Lust bases the analysis of Papyrus 967 on the published manuscript sections preserved in the ‘John H. Scheide Biblical Papyri’ (ed.pr. 1938), in Cologne (ed.pr. 1972) and in Madrid (ed.pr. 1971), which together comprise the Greek text of Ezekiel 11:25–48:35.

battle, victory, divine judgement and vindication (Ezek 39:21–29). In this textual arrangement, Ezekiel 37 corresponds to the place resurrection could have in eschatological scenarios of apocalyptic tradition.⁵⁰

Lust's claim that Papyrus 967 comprises the more original version as compared to the Masoretic Text appears difficult to maintain, also in view of Qumran and Masada biblical evidence.⁵¹ For instance, unlike the omission of Ezekiel 36:23c–38 in Papyrus 967, the fragments of Ezekiel from Masada (MasEzek), which comprise parts of Ezekiel 35–38, do witness text corresponding to Ezek 36:23–35. Nevertheless, the available witnesses to the biblical text leave room for a shorter and a longer literary edition of Ezekiel.⁵² The eschatological contextual reading of Ezekiel 37 in Papyrus 967 is not completely isolated from Qumran evidence about Ezekiel. The parabiblical Qumran text *4QPseudo-Ezekiel*, analysed for its evidence about resurrection by Puech,⁵³ also attests to an apocalyptic reading of Ezekiel 37,⁵⁴ but at the same time merits further exploration for its intriguing relation to the biblical text (section 3.1.2 below). It may be noted in advance that Papyrus 967 together with *4QPseudo-Ezekiel* and the interpretive reading of Ezekiel 37:2–3 in 4 Maccabees 18:17 make it possible that a literary and interpretive

⁵⁰ Lust, *ibidem*, 529–32 refers to *1 Enoch* as analogy for 'later corruption of the text or change for theological reasons' and to the apocalyptic scenario of Daniel. Cf. Scatolini Apóstolo, "Ezek 36, 37, 38 and 39 in Papyrus 967 as Pre-Text for Re-Reading Ezekiel," 331–57 at 351 confirms that a synchronic reading of Ezek 37 in the ordering of Papyrus 967 situates the resurrection language "in eschatological times".

⁵¹ Scatolini Apóstolo, *ibidem*, 353 observes that most scholars accept the MT arrangement as the 'more original' "perhaps because of its being the *lectio difficilior*"; according to Abegg, Flint, and Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible*, 407 the fragments of six Qumran manuscripts and one Masada manuscript of Ezekiel together with the MT "fairly uniformly attest the same textual tradition".

⁵² Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 333–4 distinguishes between "a shorter and earlier edition as represented by the LXX" and the "edition of the MT" with an added literary layer. According to Abegg, Flint, and Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible*, 407, 409 the textual witnesses of 11QEzek and 4QEzek^a further possibly attest to a shorter text of Ezekiel as compared to the MT.

⁵³ First brought to the attention by Dimant and Strugnell, "4QSecond Ezekiel," 45–58; analysis by Puech, *La croyance des Esséniens en la vie future*. 2, 605–16; Puech *La croyance des Esséniens en la vie future*. 1, 40–2 curiously omits Lust's hypothesis about Ezekiel 37 in Papyrus 967 from his survey of biblical texts.

⁵⁴ Cf. García Martínez, "The Apocalyptic Interpretation of Ezekiel in the Dead Sea Scrolls," 163–76 who presents *4QPseudo-Ezekiel* as witness "to a more widespread tendency in the Judaism of the second century BCE to interpret Ezekiel 'apocalyptically'" (176).

tradition which reads Ezekiel 37 eschatologically went back to the late Second Temple period.⁵⁵

The Greek Psalter has recently been studied by J. Schaper with attention for the arguable eschatological and messianic exegesis which this Septuagint text contains. Part of eschatological exegesis is evidence about eschatological resurrection, of which LXX Psalm 1:5 constitutes an important, longer known example.⁵⁶ The motif of resurrection is expressed by the Greek verb ἀναστήσονται in LXX Ps 1:5 vis-à-vis the more general Hebrew verb קָמַו in MT Psalm 1:5. The question how the more pronounced eschatological reading in LXX Psalm 1:5 should be explained has been answered by Schaper in the following way. Schaper attributes the origin of the Greek Psalter to doctrinal developments of the second century BCE in Palestinian proto-Pharisaic circles. Confronted by the forceful Hellenization and martyrdom at the time of the Maccabean revolt, the idea of resurrection for the righteous martyred established itself in these circles. Schaper accounts for this explanation by referring to Pharisaic belief in resurrection, thereby mentioning Josephus' *Antiquities* 18.14, 2 Macc 7:9.14.36, 12:44f., and *m.Sanhedrin* 10 as contextual literary evidence for this hypothesis.⁵⁷

While this religious thought may certainly have helped to shape this Septuagintal eschatological reading, the exclusive relation to proto-Pharisaism that Schaper supposes appears problematic. Schaper's exegesis of the Greek Psalter has been characterized by A. Pietersma as a 'maximalist approach', as opposed to the 'minimalist view' that takes the possible influence of a translator's religious and cultural environment far less into account.⁵⁸ It should be noted that a second century BCE Palestinian Jewish belief in resurrection was not limited to 'proto-Pharisaic circles', but also belonged to apocalyptic currents of thought.⁵⁹ Schaper's argument for a proto-Pharisaic setting may thus be at risk of painting

⁵⁵ Puech, *La croyance des Esséniens en la vie future*. 1, 41 refers to Matt 27:51–53, Rev 11:11, Palestinian Targum and 4 Macc 18:17, but the New Testament texts mentioned by him are examples of possible allusion, not of citation and interpretive reading, as is the case in 4 Macc 4:10–19 at v. 17.

⁵⁶ Cf. Cavallin, *Life after Death. Part 1*, and Schaper, *Eschatology in the Greek Psalter*, 47–8.

⁵⁷ Schaper, *Eschatology in the Greek Psalter*, 47–8.

⁵⁸ Pietersma, "Septuagintal Exegesis and the Superscriptions of the Greek Psalter," 443–75 at 443–4.

⁵⁹ One of the texts which Schaper mentions, 2 Macc 7, has in fact been explained by Kellermann, *Auferstanden in den Himmel*, 81 in more general traditio-historical terms as standing in dialogue with apocalyptic expectations of resurrection for the righteous

a monolithic picture of doctrinal developments in the second century BCE.⁶⁰ Parabiblical and other non-sectarian Qumran texts (discussed in section 3 below) further indicate that the belief in resurrection sprang from more diversified settings. Further, the contrast between the fate of the righteous and the wicked in Psalm 1, of which Ps 1:5 makes part, was also an issue in the sectarian Qumran community, as the citation of Psalm 1:1 in 4Q174 1 I, 21, 2, l. 14 indicates. In 4Q174 this citation makes part of a passage with an eschatological orientation (ll. 15, 19).

The book of Job comprises a number of passages whose Septuagint translation attest to the idea of resurrection: LXX Job 14:14, 19:25–27, and 42:17. These passages have previously been discussed by Cavallin, Puech, and recently by J. Schnocks.⁶¹ LXX Job 14:14 turns into an affirmative statement what was a question in MT Job 14:14. Instead of asking ‘if a man dies, shall he live again?’, אִם-יָמוּת גַּבַר הִיחִיָּה (MT Job 14:14a),⁶² LXX Job 14:14 has ‘if a man dies, he shall live, after having completed his days of life; I will wait patiently, until I will come into being again’, ἐὰν γὰρ ἀποθάνῃ ἄνθρωπος, ζήσεται συντελέσας ἡμέρας τοῦ βίου αὐτοῦ· ὑπομενῶ, ἕως ἂν πάλιν γένωμαι. This Septuagintal passage envisages life after death in physical terms of rebirth (πάλιν γένωμαι).

LXX Job 19:25–27 is the second passage with resurrection language, which clearly differs from the Masoretic Text and reads as follows: ‘for I know that he who is about to unloose me on earth is eternal. May my skin which endured these things rise (ἀναστήσαι τὸ δέρμα μου); for from the Lord these things happened to me, which I myself know very well, which my eye has seen and not another; all things have been accomplished for me in the bosom.’⁶³ Death and resurrection are attributed to the Lord and the end of this passage, which mentions accom-

as attested in Dan 12 and of resurrection for the martyred as allegorically indicated in *1 Enoch* 90:33.

⁶⁰ For a more diverse historical reconstruction of the pre-history of the Jewish schools, cf. Beckwith, “The Pre-History and Relationships of the Pharisees, Sadducees and Essenes,” 3–46.

⁶¹ Cavallin, *Life After Death. Part 1*, 105–6; Puech, *La croyance des Esséniens en la vie future. 1*, 44–6; Schnocks, “The Hope for Resurrection in the Book of Job,” 291–99 at 291 deeming Job 42:17a LXX “unequivocal evidence for an individual resurrection from the dead”.

⁶² Note the ‘he-interrogative’ in הִיחִיָּה.

⁶³ Note the contrast with MT Job 19:25–26 which has the Redeemer (גֹּאֲלִי) as subject of the verb יִקּוּם in v. 25 and describes a (post-mortem) vision of God ‘out of my flesh; מִבְּשָׂרִי, in v. 26.

plishment of things in the bosom, even seems to reflect a notion of predestination.

The third passage, LXX Job 42:17a, comprises an addition as compared to the end of the book of Job according to the Masoretic Text, which records Job's death in old age (MT Job 42:17). LXX Job 42:17 reads: 'it is written that he will rise again with those whom the Lord raises up', γέγραπται δὲ αὐτὸν πάλιν ἀναστήσεσθαι μεθ' ὧν ὁ κύριος ἀνίστησιν. This addition clearly attests to a belief in collective eschatological resurrection. In this regard, J. Schnocks has noted a parallel with a reference to Job's being raised 'in the resurrection' in the Greek *Testament of Job* 4.9, which he understands as elaboration on the Septuagint.⁶⁴

How can this Greek evidence of LXX Job be situated in relation to the question of the history of the biblical text? In addition to MT Job and LXX Job, Qumran biblical witnesses to the text of Job, 2QJob (2Q15) and 4QJob^{a-c} (4Q99–101), comprise scattered fragments, of which only one, 4QpaleoJob^c fragment 3, partly overlaps with one of the above-mentioned passages, in that it preserves parts of Job 14:13–18. The reconstructed Hebrew text of Job 14:14 according to this Qumran fragment has been translated by M.G. Abegg, Jr., P.W. Flint, and E. Ulrich as follows: "[If] mort[als d]ie, [will they live again? All the days of my warfare would I wai]t, until [my release] would co[me]".⁶⁵ This reading corresponds with the Masoretic Text of Job 14:14a rather than the Septuagint. Qumran literature further includes an extensive targum on Job, which comprises no clear reference to resurrection and rather voices a decidedly this-worldly perspective on theodicy (cf. 11QtgJob XXIII 4–9, XXVII 4–7).

These considerations give reason to think that the Septuagint readings of Job 14:14, 19:25–27 and 42:17a could be explained in terms of free rendering⁶⁶ and interpretation rather than of literal rendering of a different Hebrew Vorlage. Cavallin noted that the addition in LXX 42:17a

⁶⁴ The *Testament of Job* has been dated between the first century BCE and the first century CE by R.P. Spittler, in *OTP* 1, 829–68, who observes about this text that "although Christian editing is possible, the work is essentially Jewish in character" (833). Spittler also deems a Christian interpolation possible in the case of *T. Job* 4.9 in view of syntax, doctrine and manuscript evidence (841).

⁶⁵ Abegg, Flint, and Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible*, 591. Ed.pr. of 4QpaleoJob^c by Skehan, Ulrich, and Sanderson (eds.), *DJD* 9, 155–7.

⁶⁶ See also Dines, *The Septuagint*, 21 who observes about the LXX translation of Job that it "renders the difficult Hebrew in a free and sometimes elegant Greek style".

has no counterpart in targumic texts.⁶⁷ Puech mentions a targumic reference to resurrection, but this is in connection with Job 10:10–12, not with one of the three passages in which the Septuagint has evidence about resurrection.⁶⁸ Schnocks has proposed to read LXX Job against the mental background of mid-second century BCE Hellenistic Judaism “where the resurrection of the dead is considered possible.”⁶⁹ Nonetheless, a compartmentalization between Hellenistic (Alexandrian) Judaism and Palestinian Jewish biblical tradition is probably not to be envisaged in the case of LXX Job.⁷⁰

2.3. Evaluation

The above survey of resurrection language in Septuagint passages of the books of Isaiah, Ezekiel, Psalms, and Job has reviewed evidence whose analysis points to new directions in the literary history of the biblical text as compared to previous scholarship. Cavallin still worked with the assumption that Septuagint and Masoretic Text should be exclusively compared and juxtaposed, concluding that “the LXX translation tends to interpret the Hebrew Scriptures in light of the hopes about future life, which were developed in Judaism in the last centuries BC.”⁷¹ In light of more recent findings in Septuagintal scholarship (Lust’s hypothesis and subsequent discussion), textual theory about the Hebrew Bible (Tov’s paradigm of textual multiplicity), and the biblical and parabiblical evidence of the Dead Sea Scrolls (1QIsa^{a-b}, 4QIsa^b, 4QpaleoJob^c, 4QPseudo-Ezekiel) this conclusion needs to be modified. In some cases one can speak of interpretation (LXX Job 14:14, 19:25–27, 42:17), but in other cases of a different, not necessarily earlier, Hebrew Vorlage (cf. 1QIsa^a; 4QIsa^b) may explain differences between the Septuagint and the Masoretic Text (LXX Isa 26:19). In the case of LXX Ezekiel 37, as witnessed

⁶⁷ Cavallin, *Life After Death. Part 1*, 106.

⁶⁸ Puech, *La croyance des Esséniens en la vie future*. 1, 46 further mentions 1 Clement 19:2–3 whose citation of Job 19:26 follows the Septuagint version with the idea of resurrection.

⁶⁹ Schnocks, “The Hope for Resurrection in the Book of Job,” 296 and 299.

⁷⁰ Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 67 compares the supposed ‘uncorrected, original text’ of MT Job 7:21 (וְאֵהִיָּה עֲלֶיךָ לְמִשָּׂא) and LXX Job 7:20 (εἰμὶ δὲ ἐπὶ σοὶ φορτίον), observing that the “practice of correcting a text out of respect for a god or gods,” as in the case of וְאֵהִיָּה עֲלֶיךָ לְמִשָּׂא in MT Job 7:21, “is also known in the Hellenistic world”.

⁷¹ Cavallin, *Life After Death. Part 1*, 107.

by Papyrus 967, it depends on further evaluation of *4QPseudo-Ezekiel* in which way one can think of a literary and interpretive tradition which took the language of Ezekiel 37 to stand for eschatological resurrection.

3. RESURRECTION IN NON-SECTARIAN QUMRAN TEXTS

Non-sectarian Qumran texts are among the most recently published among Qumran cave 4 publications since the 1990s. The order of discussion, proceeding from non-sectarian to sectarian Qumran texts, is based on the fact that non-sectarian Qumran texts could be considered 'adopted texts' preceding and probably originating outside the Qumran community, while sectarian Qumran texts may in certain cases build on or presuppose knowledge of non-sectarian texts.⁷² Contrary to the hypothesis by É. Puech,⁷³ the evidence of *4QVisions of Amram*, *4QPseudo-Ezekiel*, and 4Q521 is not considered to be sectarian or Qumran Essene in several discussions of these texts.⁷⁴ Since none of these texts comprises sectarian community terminology,⁷⁵ I incorporate them in this section of non-sectarian Qumran texts, while further discussing their characteristics and setting individually. This section will provide re-evaluation and reinterpretation of the longer known evidence together with the inclusion of some new evidence into the discussion (4Q434a, 4Q442).

⁷² CD-A XVI 2–4 // 4QD^f 4 II 4–5 refers to *Jubilees*; CD-A II 17–21 // 4QD^a 2 II 17–21 could be reminiscent of the Enochic 'Book of Watchers' (1 *Enoch* 1:5–6 // 4QEn^a ar I 6–8; 1 *Enoch* 10:9–10).

⁷³ Puech, *La croyance des Esséniens en la vie future*. 2, 616 prefers a hypothesis that *4QPseudo-Ezekiel* should be considered as 'Essene composition'; pp. 664–9 at 669 argues for the attribution of 4Q521 to the Essene movement; 532 tends to favour an association of *4QVisions of Amram* with characteristic teachings of the Qumran Essene community; while alternating between Qumranite and Essene, pre-Essene and pre-Qumran designations of Qumran texts (703).

⁷⁴ Collins, *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 124–8 includes discussion of *4QVisions of Amram*? ar, 4Q521 and *4QPseudo-Ezekiel* under the rubric "Resurrection in Scrolls That Are Not Clearly Sectarian"; Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte aus Qumran*, 388 takes into account that 4Q521 "wahrscheinlich nicht von der Qumrangemeinde verfaßt wurde"; Dimant, *DJD* 30, 13: "While *Pseudo-Ezekiel* shows no overt connection to the sectarian literature of Qumran, its literary profile displays important links to non-Qumran works"; Xeravits, *King, Priest, Prophet*, 100 and n. 83.

⁷⁵ Cf. Dimant, "The Qumran Manuscripts: Contents and Significance," 23–58 at 48 and 53 for the categorization of 4Q521, *4QPseudo-Ezekiel*, and *4QVisions of Amram* among "Literary Works Without Terminology Connected to the Community."

3.1. *Parabiblical Qumran Texts*

Several Qumran compositions whose evidence makes part of scholarly debate about resurrection, *4QVisions of Amram*, *4QPseudo-Ezekiel*, and *4QPseudo-Daniel^{a-c} ar*, have been labeled ‘parabiblical’. This term is descriptive of these texts to the extent that they elaborate on biblical texts and themes without presenting a clear distinction between quotation and interpretation, as is the case with exegetical texts. All of these three Qumran compositions have also been categorized as examples of ‘Rewritten Bible’,⁷⁶ thereby reflecting an attitude to Scriptures whose text was not considered fixed and closed as part of a canon, but susceptible of textual dialogue and elaboration. At the same time, the evidence of Qumran biblical scrolls has impacted textual theory about the Hebrew Bible in that a new paradigm of ‘textual multiplicity’ is considered applicable for the Second Temple period.

3.1.1. *4QVisions of Amram*

The Qumran composition *4QVisions of Amram* is attested in the fragments of six Aramaic manuscripts (4Q543–548).⁷⁷ This composition has been dated to the second century BCE on the basis of palaeographical analysis.⁷⁸ One manuscript, *4QVisions of Amram^f* (4Q548), comprises much-discussed afterlife imagery. The extant text of the fragments of *4QVisions of Amram^f* does not comprise biblical names and its relation to the other manuscripts of *4QVisions of Amram* has been doubted.⁷⁹

⁷⁶ See e.g. Brooke, “Rewritten Bible,” 777–81.

⁷⁷ Puech, *DJD 31*, 283–405 at 399–405 additionally argues for the identification of 4Q549 as seventh manuscript (*4QVisions de ‘Amram^s(?) ar*), but the scanty fragments extant of 4Q549 appear to attest to a different conception of afterlife in terms of ‘his eternal sleep’, שנת עלמה (4Q549 2 2), as compared to the afterlife imagery in terms of light and darkness in *4QVisions of Amram^f* (4Q548) frg. 1 to be discussed in the text below. Puech, *DJD 31*, 402–4 aims to relate the departure for ‘his eternal dwelling’, לבית עלמה, in 4Q549 2 6 to teaching at Amram’s ‘day of death’ in 4Q543 1 2 // 4Q545 1 1 2, but this depends on conjectural emendation of a whole phrase about ‘words of the vision of Amram’ in 4Q549 2 6. Cf. the designation ‘Work Mentioning Hur and Miriam ar’ for 4Q549 in García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*. 2, 1096–7.

⁷⁸ Puech, *La croyance des Esséniens en la vie future*. 2, 532 who refers to previous study of the fragments by Milik, “4QVisions de ‘Amram et une citation d’Origène,” *RB* 79 (1972) 77–99; Puech, *DJD 31*, 283–398.

⁷⁹ Note the reservations and uncertainty expressed by Puech, *DJD 31*, 392: “On peut l’abandonner et revenir à un exemplaire des *Visions de ‘Amram*, mais sans certitude en l’absence de recoupement avec les autres exemplaires, tout en relevant l’importance

Nevertheless, the light and darkness imagery in 4Q548 generally corresponds with imagery in 4Q543 6 3–5; 4Q544 1 13–14, 2 5–6, and 3 1 (כול בני נהורא), while the vision of teaching to sons (4Q543 1 1–2 // 4Q545 1 I 1–2; 4Q548 1 5 and 7–9) to ‘eternal generations’ of Israel (4Q543 3 4; 4Q548 1 6) provides further points of correspondence.⁸⁰

Fragment 1 column 2 of 4Q*Visions of Amram*^f together with fragment 2 has been taken to be evidence of the ‘two ways theology’ since the preliminary study by J.T. Milik and was included in Cavallin’s survey about resurrection of the dead and/or eternal life after death in Qumran literature.⁸¹ This fragment stipulates the ways of the sons of light and the sons of darkness respectively, as part of a teaching of the ‘desired [way]’, א[רחה] א [י]צבתא (4Q548 1 ii–2 9; cf. 4Q548 1 ii–2 2, [ארחת] by a first person singular protagonist, presumably Amram, who addresses ‘sons of the blessing’, בני ברכתא (4Q548 1 ii–2 5).⁸² This desired way appears to be further associated with righteousness and truth (4Q548 1 ii–2 7–9). This ‘two ways theology’ with its imagery of light and darkness was of interest to the Qumran community (1QS III 13–IV 26),⁸³ but not limited to it (*T. Levi* 19:1; 4Q213 3 + 4 8–11; *T. Ash.* 1:3–5:4).

The part relevant for discussion of resurrection is that directly following the sentence about the teaching of the desired way, namely lines 9b–14. In the interest of discussion, I cite text and translation of 4Q548 1 ii–2 9b–14 below:⁸⁴

	[ארו כל בני נהורא]	9b
	נהירין להוון [וכל בני חשוכא השיכין להוון א]רו בני נהורא ישתכלון[?]	10
[ובכל מנדעהון [צדיקין ל]הוון בני חשוכא יתעדון [ו	11
	ארו כל סכל ורשיע חשי[ך] וכל [חכ[ים] קשיט נהירין ארו כל בני נהורא]	12

qu’occupe le dualisme lumière et ténèbres dans cette composition. Serait-il recommandé de donner le sigle 4Q*Visions of Amram*^f (?)?”

⁸⁰ Apart from conceptual points of correspondence, cf. corresponding vocabulary such as תתק[רה] in 4Q543 3 1 and תתק[רון] in 4Q548 1 ii–2 8; לעמד in 4Q543 7 1, 8 2 and לעמא in 4Q548 1 ii–2 14.

⁸¹ Milik, “4Q*Visions of Amram*,” 77–99; Cavallin, *Life After Death. Part 1*, 64.

⁸² Text from Puech, *DJD* 31, 394.

⁸³ On the pre-Qumran origin of and development of eschatology in the “Two Spirits Treatise” (1QS III 13–IV 26), see now Hogeterp, “The Eschatology of the Two Spirits Treatise Revisited,” 247–59.

⁸⁴ Text from Puech, *DJD* 31, 394–6, unless otherwise indicated.

- לנהורא לשמחא [ת עלמא ולח] דותא [א יהכו] וכל בני חשוכא לחשוכא למותא⁸⁵ 13
 ולאבדנא יהכון [ביומא דנה תנה]ר לעמא נהירותא ואחוי ל[הון די 14

9b Behold all the sons of light 10 will be bright [and all the sons of]darkness will be dark. Because the sons of light will consider (?) 11 and in all their understanding they [will] be [righteous]. But the sons of darkness will vanish [and] 12 For every fool and wicked one (will be) dark and each wise and truthful person (will be) bright. [Behold all the sons of light [will g]o 13 to the light, to [eternal] glad[ness and j]oy and all the sons of darkness will go to the (place of) dark[ness, to death 14 and to destruction. [On that day] light will shine for the people and I will show to [them that]].

The evidence in this passage was evaluated as uncertain and at most implicit evidence of resurrection of the dead by H.C.C. Cavallin and J.J. Collins on the one hand, and adduced as witness to a horizon of hope for eschatological resurrection of the righteous or sons of light by É. Puech.⁸⁶ This passage does not comprise explicit resurrection terminology, but, as observed in advance, the destination of the sons of light in the afterlife in terms of light has its parallels in *1 Enoch* 104:2.4.6, *Daniel* 12:2–3, *Ps.Sol.* 3:12, and *2 Baruch* 51.1–5.10. The above passage in *4QVisions of Amram*? *ar* in fact implies that there will not be an afterlife for the sons of darkness, who will vanish (l. 11) and go to death and destruction (ll. 13–14). This focus on afterlife for the ‘sons of righ-

⁸⁵ This Hebrew line tentatively follows the reconstruction of text as presented by Milik, “4QVisions de ‘Amram,” 90; García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*. 2, 394 and followed in the English translation by Collins, *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 125–6. Puech, *La croyance des Esséniens en la vie future*. 2, 537 presented the following Hebrew text (in transliteration) for 4Q548 1 ii 13: ולשלמא] ושלמחא [לנהורא לשמחא] ושלמא [ב. דינא רבא יהכו] וכל בני חשוכא לחשוכא למותא [לנהורא ל}תמימותא{ >נעימתא [ולשלמא ב] דינא [א, 13, 1 ii–2 4Q548 Hebrew text for Puech, *DJD* 31, 394 is argued on the basis of ‘oppositions in parallel structure’, visible traces, counted spaces, and conceptual parallels with other texts, in particular *1 Enoch* 22:4 and 91:15 with regard to דינא רבא (p. 397). Puech’s argument against the reconstruction by J.T. Milik, K. Beyer, and F. García Martínez and E.J.C. Tigchelaar that their readings include an incomprehensible doublet is not persuasive. A complementary quality rather than redundancy of parallelism through verbal equivalents also occurs in, for instance, 1QS IV 7 and 12–14. Literary parallelism could also support the reading לשמחא in 4Q548 1 ii–2 13, as the term ש[מחא] is further reconstructed for l. 5 of the same fragment by Puech, *DJD* 31, 394. The proposed reconstruction by Puech for 4Q548 1 ii–2 13 makes a very long Hebrew line as compared to other extant text.

⁸⁶ Cavallin, *Life After Death. Part 1*, 64; Collins, *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 125–6; Puech, *La croyance des Esséniens en la vie future*. 2, 559 and 773.

teousness,' [בני צדקתא] (4Q548 1 ii-2 7), interrelated with the 'sons of light' (4Q548 1 ii-2 9-13), corresponds to Enochic and Danielic strands of eschatological thought in terms of vindication for the righteous and wise beyond death.

Our passage may further echo Isaianic strands of thought, which in figurative language of death and destruction on the one hand and resuscitation from the dust on the other contrasts the respective fates of the wicked and the righteous (Isa 26:7-19 at 14 and 19). Furthermore, the phrase *לעמא נהירותא* [ביומא דנה תנה]ר, "[On that day] light will shine for the people" in 4Q548 1 ii-2 14 may have an analogy in Isaianic language.⁸⁷ MT Isa 9:1, *העם ההלכים בחשך ראו אור גדול ישבי בארץ צלמות לעמא*, "The people who walked in darkness have seen a great light; those who dwelt in a land of deep darkness, on them has light shined." (RSV).

Indirectly, the collective setting of the people, *עם*, also plays a role in the resurrection passage of Daniel 12:1-3 at v. 1, but the phrase about light which will shine for the people in 4Q548 1 ii-2 14 has a more precise analogy in MT Isaiah 9:1. The fragment of *4QVisions of Amram? ar* thereby presents a collective setting which differentiates it from the 'two-ways theology' as it occurs in the 'Two Spirits Treatise' (1QS III 13-IV 26). The broader collective eschatological setting and the intersection with afterlife imagery in Enochic and Danielic strands of tradition provide a basis for the idea that resurrection in terms of heavenly transformation is implied in *4QVisions of Amram? ar* 1 ii-2.

3.1.2. 4QPseudo-Ezekiel

The composition *Pseudo-Ezekiel* from Qumran cave 4 has received much attention from its preliminary publication by J. Strugnell and D. Dimant in the late 1980s onwards,⁸⁸ because it is one of the pieces of relatively undisputed evidence about resurrection of the dead among the Dead Sea Scrolls. However, scholarly attention has most extensively focused on one manuscript, *4QPseudo-Ezekiel^a* (4Q385) fragments 2, 3 and 4 for their most completely extant evidence of resurrection, the apocalyptic

⁸⁷ *Contra* Puech, *DJD* 31, 397 who relates the term *לעמא* in 4Q548 1 ii-2 14 to *עמך* in Daniel 12:1. This tendency to relate all terms to Danielic tradition leaves unexplained the fact that Daniel 12:1 only describes deliverance of 'your people' from tribulation, but lacks the imagery of light in direct connection with *עמך*.

⁸⁸ Strugnell and Dimant, "4Q Second Ezekiel," 45-58. Cf. the idea in Josephus, *Ant.* 10.79 that Ezekiel wrote two books.

shortening of days, and the Ezekielian chariot vision respectively.⁸⁹ Overlaps with the resurrection passage in 4Q385 in other manuscripts, 4Q386 1 I and 4Q388 frg. 7 have been noted, but the evidence of the *Pseudo-Ezekiel* manuscripts from Qumran cave 4 is more extensive. The official publication of *4QPseudo-Ezekiel* by D. Dimant in 2001 distinguishes four numbered manuscripts, 4Q385 (*4QPseudo-Ezekiel^a*), 4Q386 (*4QPseudo-Ezekiel^b*), 4Q385b (*4QPseudo-Ezekiel^c*), 4Q388 (*4QPseudo-Ezekiel^d*), and unidentified Pseudo-Ezekiel fragments of 4Q385c.⁹⁰ A fifth manuscript, *4QpapPseudo-Ezekiel^e* (4Q391), was published by M. Smith in 1995.⁹¹

Palaeographical analysis has dated 4Q391 (4QpsEzek^e) to the second half of the second century BCE, and the other manuscripts (4Q385, 4Q386, 4Q385b, 4Q388, 4Q385c) a century later, to the second half of the first century BCE. The palaeographical date of 4QpsEzek^e has been taken as *terminus ad quem*, “the latest possible date for the composition” of *4QPseudo-Ezekiel* by D. Dimant.⁹² While the writing of the tetragrammaton with dots in 4Q391 is different from the other *Pseudo-Ezekiel* manuscripts, formal similarities may also be noted. For instance, fragment 36 of 4Q391 presents a dialogue between the prophetic protagonist and the Lord, analogously with a dialogue form in 4Q385 2, 4Q386 1 I–II and 4Q388 7.⁹³ I thereby take the date of composition argued by Dimant as point of departure.

The relevant evidence for discussion about resurrection, 4QpsEzek^a (4Q385) 2 // 4QpsEzek^b (4Q386) 1 I // 4Q388 7 should be reconsidered in view of the sequence of three columns which fragment 1 of *4QPseudo-Ezekiel^b* comprises. Columns 1 and 2 of 4Q386 (4QpsEzek^b) fragment 1 present a sequence in dialogue between Ezekiel as prophetic protagonist addressed as ‘son of man’ and the Lord, thereby unfolding a vision about

⁸⁹ Kister and Qimron, “Observations on 4QSecond Ezekiel (4Q385 2–3),” 595–602; Puech, *La croyance des Esséniens en la vie future*, 2, 605–16; Alison, “An Arboreal Sign of the End-Time (4Q385 2),” 337–44; Collins, *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 126–8; Puech, “Apports des textes apocalyptiques et sapientiels de Qumrân à l’eschatologie du judaïsme ancien,” 133–70 at 144–7 (“Le Pseudo-Ezéchiél (4Q385 2–4 et //)”); García Martínez, “The Apocalyptic Interpretation of Ezekiel in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 163–76.

⁹⁰ Dimant, *DJD* 30, 7–88. Dimant renumber the overlapping evidence of 4Q388 (4QpsEzek^d) with that of 4Q385 2 as ‘Frg. 7 (*olim* frg. 8)’ (83).

⁹¹ Smith, *DJD* 19, 153–93.

⁹² Smith, *DJD* 19, 154; Dimant, *DJD* 30, 7–9 and 16 (quotation at page 16).

⁹³ Dimant, *DJD* 30, further mentions the setting of the *Merkabah* (throne) vision in both 4Q385 6 (*olim* frg. 4) and 4Q391 65 6–8 (11) and observes the lack of allusion to any first-century BCE event in 4Q386 (16).

God's people and the land of Israel. Column 3 of the same fragment appears to comprise an oracle about Babylon. Column 1 follows several biblical terms in its elaboration on Ezekiel 37:1–10, whereas column 2 has been described as having “no close connection to any biblical passage” in a recent study by M. Brady.⁹⁴ Nevertheless, the biblical text of Ezekiel 37–43 has been taken by D. Dimant as frame of reference in search of a coherent text order in the *Pseudo-Ezekiel* fragments.⁹⁵

My reinterpretation will pay further attention to the textual dialogue with the book of Ezekiel in which 4QPseudo-Ezekiel^b 1 I–II as a parabiblical text engages, next to the apocalyptic interpretation of resurrection as eschatological reward for piety which has been rightly discerned in 4QPsEzek^a (4Q385) 2 // 4QPsEzek^b (4Q386) 1 I // 4Q388 7.⁹⁶

4Q385 2 1 comprises one sentence preceding the text with which 4Q386 overlaps: *להם הברית עמי לתת להם הגואל עמי* [יהוה] [כי אני], “[for I am the Lord] who redeems my people, giving unto them the covenant.”⁹⁷ This sentence provides an introductory setting of God's redeeming covenantal relationship to his people, which is of importance for the whole sequence in dialogue in 4Q386 1 I–II.

In the interest of further discussion, I cite the Hebrew text of 4Q386 1 I–II with translation below.⁹⁸

4Q386 1 i (// 4Q385 2 2–10, 4Q388 7 4–7)
top margin

[אמרה יהוה ראיתי רבים מישראל אשר אהב] ו את שמך	1
[וילכו בדרכי לבך ואלה מתי יהיו ו] הכה ישתלמו חסדם	2
[vacat] ויאמר יהוה אלי אני אראה א[ת בני ישראל וידעו	3
[vacat] כי אני יהוה ויאמר בן אדם הנ[בא על העצמות	4
[ואמרת ויקרבו עצם אל עצמו ו] פרק אל פרקו ויהי	5

⁹⁴ Brady, “Biblical Interpretation in the ‘Pseudo-Ezekiel’ Fragments (4Q383–391) from Cave Four,” 88–109 at 107. Cf. Dimant, “Resurrection, Restoration, and Time-Curtailling in Qumran, Early Judaism, and Christianity,” 527–48 at 534: “the vision recorded in 4Q386 1 ii–iii is non-biblical”.

⁹⁵ Dimant, *DJD* 30, 10: “the outline of Ezekiel 37–43 strings the surviving passages (of *Pseudo-Ezekiel*) into a coherent sequence, and assigns all these scenes to the sphere of the final, redemptive era”.

⁹⁶ On apocalypticization of Ezekiel in *Pseudo-Ezekiel* at large see Dimant, “The Apocalyptic Interpretation of Ezekiel at Qumran,” 31–51 at 49–50; Collins, *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 10, 126–8 and 138; and most recently García Martínez, “The Apocalyptic Interpretation of Ezekiel in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 163–76.

⁹⁷ Text and translation from Dimant, *DJD* 30, 23–4.

⁹⁸ Text from Dimant, *DJD* 30, 60–62. Translation of 4Q386 1 I from Dimant, *DJD* 30, 61; the translation of 4Q386 1 II is my own.

6 [בן ויאמר שנית הנבא ויעלו עליהם גדי]ם ויקרמו עור
 7 [עליהם מלמעלה ויקרמו עור ויעל]ל[ו] עליהם גדים
 8 [ורוח אין בם ויאמר אלי שוב הנבא] על ארבע רחות
 9 [השמים ויפחו בם ויעמדו על רג]ל[יהם ע]ם רב אנשי[ם]
 10 [ויברכו את יהוה צבאות אשר חים] *vacat* []

4Q386 1 ii

top margin

1 [אר]ן וידעו כי אני יהוה *vacat* ויאמר אלי התבונן
 2 בן אדם באדמת ישראל ואמר ראיתי יהוה והנה חרבה
 3 ומתי תקבצם ויאמר יהוה בן בליעל יחשב לענות את עמי
 4 ולא אניח לו ומשרו לא יהיה והמן הטמא זרע לא ישאר
 5 ומנצפה לא יהיה תירוש ותזיו לא יעשה דבש [] ואת
 6 הרשע אהרג במף ואת בני אוציא ממף ועל ש[א]רם אהפך
 7 כאשר יאמרו היה השל[ו]ם והשדך ואמרו תה[י]ה הארץ
 8 כאשר היתה בימי [] קדם בכך אעיר עליהם חמ[ה]
 9 מ[אר]בע רחות השמי[ם] [] ל[] את []
 10 [כא]ש בערת כֹּׁ []
 11 [] ׁׁ []

4Q386 1 I

1 [And I said: 'O Lord! I have seen many (men) from Israel who have love]d
 your Name 2 [and have walked in the ways of your heart. And these
 things when will they come to be and] how will they be recompensed for
 their piety?' 3 [*vacat* And the Lord said to me: 'I will make (it) manifest to
 th]e children of Israel and they shall know [that I am the Lord'. *vacat* And
 He said: 'son of man, prop]hesy over the bones 5 [and speak and let them
 be joined bone to its bone and] joint to its joint'. And it was 6 [so. And
 He said a second time: 'Prophecy and let arterie]s[come upon them]
 and let skin cover 7 [them from above'. And they were co]ve[red with
 skin and] arteries came upon them, 8 [but there was no breath in them.
 And He said to me: 'Prophecy once again]over the four winds 9 [of heaven
 and let them blow into them'. And] a large [cro]wd of peop[le stood on
 their f]e[et] 10 [and blessed the Lord Sebaot who had given them life]
vacat []

4Q386 1 II

1 [la]nd and they will know that I am the Lord *vacat* and he said to me:
 consider, 2 son of man, the land of Israel. and I said, I have seen, Lord,
 but look, it is a desolated place 3 and when will you assemble them? And
 the Lord said: a son of Belial will mean to oppress my people, 4 but I
 will not allow him and of his leader(ship)⁹⁹ there will not be (anyone),

⁹⁹ In my view, משרו should be read as preposition (מ) + noun () + pronominal suffix (ו). The supposition of a defective orthography of משארו by Dimant, *DJD* 30, 64 is complicated by the fact that the same line has the plene spelling ישאר; cf. ש[א]רם.

nor will any offspring remain of the impure one. 5 And of the caper-bush there will not be any wine, nor will a bee make honey. 6 But I will slay the wicked one in Memphis and I will bring my children out of Memphis and turn the reverse way concerning their remnant. 7 As they will say, 'peace and quiet have come', they will (also) say, 'the land will be 8 as it was in days [] of old. After this I will arouse wrath against them 9 from the four quarters of the heavens[]° [] [] 10 [like] a burning [fi]re, like ° [] 11 [] °° []'.

Various terms of the Ezekelian vision of the valley of dry bones (Ezek 37:3, 4, 7, 10) recur in column 1 of this fragment, but the physical imagery of resuscitation clearly has a setting of expectation of reward for the righteous in Israel. This expectation is voiced in the question by the prophetic protagonist in lines 1–2 and in the divine answer that 'these things', אלה, probably the redeeming acts of God, including the giving of the (renewed?) covenant (4Q385 2 1), as well as the divine retribution for piety will be made manifest. While the subsequent prophetic vision of the resuscitation of the dry bones is narrated in the past tense, the narration is a response to eschatological expectation of theodicy and vindication of those 'who have loved the Lord's name and have walked in the paths of his heart'.

This horizon of eschatological expectation is further elaborated in column II of 4Q386 1 through juxtapositions between contemporary experience of desolation and future assembly of the people (ll. 1–3), between threats of representative figures of evil and the deliverance of a remnant (ll. 3–6), between the state of the land (of Israel) in peace, quiet and like days of old and divine wrath against those involved in evil against God's people (ll. 7–10;¹⁰⁰ cf. ll. 3–4). The term ארבע רחות השמים, occurring in both 4Q386 1 I 8–9 (// 4Q385 2 7) and 4Q386 1 II 9, could reflect two respective sides of theodicy, divine vindication of the righteous through resurrection and divine wrath against evildoers. This may be an additional apocalyptic feature of the text, as it appears from the two columns of 4QPseudo-Ezekiel^b (4Q386) fragment 1. Analogous contrasts in terms of vindication through resurrection and divine wrath occur in Enochic and Danielic tradition (1 Enoch 22–27, 91:9–10; Daniel 12:2).

¹⁰⁰ It seems most likely to associate a collectivity of evil ones, of whom ll. 3, 4, and 6 name individual leader figures, with the third person plural object of divine wrath 'like burning fire' in 4Q386 1 II 8–10. This association follows from the contrast between the respective fates of God's people (cf. l. 3), God's children and their remnant (l. 6) on the one hand and of the individual representatives of evil forces (ll. 3–4, 6) on the other.

Contrary to previous scholarship which emphasised the loose connection or disconnection between 4Q386 1 II and the biblical text of Ezekiel (note 94 above), I think that several points of correspondence between 4Q386 1 II and the biblical text of Ezekiel may be discerned. First of all, the consideration of the 'land of Israel', אֶרֶץ יִשְׂרָאֵל, whose state of desolation is contrast to an expected time of assembling in 4Q386 1 II 2–3 has a clear analogy in Ezekiel 37:12, in which the same term, אֶרֶץ יִשְׂרָאֵל, occurs in the context of resurrection imagery being applied to return to the land of Israel. The prophetic protagonist's anticipating question, 'when will you gather them together?', מִתִּי תִקְבְּצֵם (4Q386 1 II 3), is paralleled by MT Ezekiel 36:24 (וּקְבַצְתִּי אֹתְכֶם) and 37:21 (וּקְבַצְתִּי אֹתָם), which both envision a gathering in terms of divinely aided return from exile. The individual leader figures representing wickedness in 4Q386 1 II 3–4 and 6 may constitute a contemporizing element of parabolic elaboration, but the 'slaying of the wicked one in Memphis' (4Q386 1 II 6) could still have a general parallel in an Ezekielian passage (Ezek 30:13). These examples of textual dialogue indicate that elaboration on Ezekiel 37:1–14 together with surrounding passages in the book of Ezekiel¹⁰¹ was in view in the composition of *Pseudo-Ezekiel*.

The importance of the first two columns of fragment 1 of 4Q386 (*4QPseudo-Ezekiel^b*) consists in the room which this sequence of text leaves to explore the relation between resurrection and elaboration on the biblical text of Ezekiel, in particular Ezekiel 37:1–14, in further detail. My analysis of both columns argues that *Pseudo-Ezekiel's* apocalypticization of Ezekiel 37 in terms of eschatological resurrection does not substitute the supposed original sense of the biblical text in terms of restoration of Israel and return from exile (Ezek 37:11–14), but works along with it. That is, the apocalyptic vision of eschatological resurrection for the righteous and divine wrath against evildoers inscribes itself in the prophetic setting of restoration theology.

3.1.3. 4QPseudo-Daniel^{a-c} ar

The so-called 'Daniel cycle' from Qumran (4Q242–246; cf. 4Q552–553 (*4QFour Kingdoms^{a-b} ar*)) attests to the extent Danielic tradition perme-

¹⁰¹ See the general comment by Dimant, "Resurrection, Restoration, and Time-Curtailing," 534 who proposes to read 4Q386 1 II–III against the background of Ezekiel 37:15–38:24.

ated subsequent Palestinian Jewish strands of thought.¹⁰² Three manuscripts, designated as *4QPseudo-Daniel^{a-c} ar* (4Q243–245), elaborate on prophecies of Daniel, of which one manuscript, *4QPseudo-Daniel^c ar* (4Q245) comprises evidence which has been drawn into the debate about resurrection.¹⁰³

4QPseudo-Daniel^c ar (4Q245) has been palaeographically dated to the early first century CE, but the list of priests, historical review and Hasmonean names in the fragments of *4QpsDan^c ar* have led J.J. Collins and P.W. Flint to date the composition of this text between 135–104 BCE, the timespan of John Hyrcanus' reign.¹⁰⁴ Collins and Flint observed about the provenance of the text that it "is uncertain; it could have been composed at Qumran, but this cannot be proved".¹⁰⁵ In view of the lack of connections with Qumran community thought and noted analogies between language of blindness and straying in *4QpsDan^c ar* 2 3 and the *Damascus Document* (CD-A I 9 and 13–14),¹⁰⁶ it could be that *4QPseudo-Daniel^c ar* as parabiblical writing constituted an 'adopted text' in the Qumran library.

The fragment relevant for discussion, *4QpsDan^c ar* frg. 2, has generally been considered as eschatological conclusion to the preceding fragment 1 with its references to Daniel, priests and kings.¹⁰⁷ The Aramaic text and translation of the fragment are quoted below.¹⁰⁸

]o{o[1
למסר רשעא	2
א לן בעור וטעו	3
א לן אדין יקומון	4
ק דיש[ת]א ויתובון	5
רשעא o[6

¹⁰² Cf. Dimant, "The Qumran Manuscripts: Contents and Significance," 53–4.

¹⁰³ Cavallin, *Life After Death. Part 1*, 64–5; García Martínez, *Qumran and Apocalyptic*, 137–61; Puech, *La croyance des Esséniens en la vie future. 2*, 568–70.

¹⁰⁴ Collins and Flint, *DJD 22*, 95–164 ("Pseudo-Daniel") at 153–8.

¹⁰⁵ Collins and Flint, *DJD 22*, 158.

¹⁰⁶ Collins, *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 16 on the reminiscence of CD-A I 9 in 4Q245 2 3.

¹⁰⁷ García Martínez, *Qumran and Apocalyptic*, 137–61; Puech, *La Croyance des Esséniens en la vie future. 2*, 568–70; Collins and Flint, *DJD 22*, 154; Flint, "The Daniel Tradition at Qumran," 41–60 at 52–5; Collins, *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 16–7.

¹⁰⁸ Text and translation from Collins and Flint, *DJD 22*, 162–3.

1].[2]to exterminate wickedness 3]these in blindness, and they have gone astray 4 [th]ese then will arise 5]the [h]oly [], and they will return 6]. wickedness

Scholarly discussion is divided about the interpretation of the verb יקומוֹן (line 4) in the context of this fragment, considering it either as evidence of resurrection¹⁰⁹ or as the eschatological activity of one group of rising and returning in view of the juxtaposition to another group who goes astray in blindness (line 3).¹¹⁰ With regard to the juxtaposition between lines 3 and 4, it should be noted that the group designated in line 3 appears to be described in terms of deeds in the past, in view of the perfect tense וטעו. The fragment could then be read as an eschatological conclusion which envisages the extermination of wickedness (line 2) represented by those who went astray in their blindness (line 3) and persisted in their wickedness on the one hand, and the eschatological rising of ‘these’ (line 4), namely those associated with the holy who will return (line 5) on the other. Return could denote a theological perspective of eschatological restoration.

The question whether the verb יקומוֹן denotes resurrection has been approached with reference to the arguable relation of 4QpsDan^c ar 2 to Daniel 12.¹¹¹ In view of the composition 4QPseudo-Daniel^c ar at large, the precise relation to the book of Daniel, apart from the reference to Daniel, דניאל, in 4QpsDan^c ar 1 I 3, is not clear. The (dis)identification of resurrection terminology should not exclusively depend on comparison with Daniel 12:2. It should be noted that the revivification imagery in Isaiah 26:19 includes both יקומוֹן (MT Isa 26:19 and הקיצו (MT Isa 26:19) or יקיצו (Isa 26:19 in 1QIsa^a). If the verb יקומוֹן in 4QpsDan^c ar 2 4 denotes resurrection, this has its setting in destruction of wickedness on the one hand and return/restoration on the other. The evidence of 4QPseudo-Daniel^c ar includes a possible but unproven reference to eschatological resurrection.

¹⁰⁹ Cavallin, *Life After Death. Part 1*, 64–5, who also argues about 4QpsDan^c ar frg. 2 that “the ‘two-way theology’ is again exhibited”, but this argument does not find substantial support in the extant evidence of 4QpsDan^c ar, as compared to 4QVisions of Amramⁱ which includes terminology of ‘ways’; García Martínez, *Qumran and Apocalyptic*, 137–61; Puech, *La Croyance des Esséniens en la vie future*, 2, 568–70.

¹¹⁰ Collins and Flint, *DJD* 22, 163; Flint, “The Daniel Tradition at Qumran,” 52–3; Collins, *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 16–7.

¹¹¹ García Martínez, *Qumran and Apocalyptic*, 137–61 and Puech, *La Croyance des Esséniens en la vie future*, 2, 568–70 noted a relation to Daniel 12; Flint, “The Daniel Tradition at Qumran,” 53 countered the alleged relation of 4QpsDan^c ar 2 4 to Daniel 12 by noting that Dan 12:2 has a different verb, יקיצו.

3.2. 4Q521 (4QMessianic Apocalypse)

The composition 4Q521, generally designated as ‘Messianic Apocalypse’,¹¹² comprises two larger fragments (frgs. 2 ii + 4 and frgs. 7 1–8 + 5 ii 7–16)¹¹³ with evidence relevant for the discussion of resurrection. É. Puech has palaeographically dated the fragments of 4Q521 between 100–80 BCE, and attributed to this text a date of composition in the second half of the second century BCE.¹¹⁴ Puech considered the ‘Messianic Apocalypse’ to be a Qumran Essene composition, in view of thematic points of correspondence with Qumran sectarian writings, in particular the *Hodayot* (1QH) and the consistent suppression of the tetragrammaton through the substitutive rendering אֲדָנִי.¹¹⁵ Nevertheless, 4Q521 neither comprises sectarian community terminology nor includes elaborations on imagery that could be demonstrated beyond dispute to be specifically Qumran sectarian group designations.¹¹⁶ Other scholars have contested Puech’s identification of 4Q521 as a Qumran Essene composition, classifying it instead as a text ‘not clearly sectarian’ (J.J. Collins),¹¹⁷ a ‘non-sectarian writing’ (G. Xeravits),¹¹⁸ or a text from a proto-Essene milieu of חֲסִידִים (J. Zimmermann).¹¹⁹

¹¹² Puech, “Une apocalypse messianique (4Q521),” 475–522; idem, *DJD* 25, 1–38 (“521. 4QApocalypse messianique”); Collins, *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 126; García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*, 2, 1044–5 (“4Q521. 4QMessianic Apocalypse”); Xeravits, *King, Priest, Prophet*, 98–110 (“Messianic Apocalypse (4Q521)”); Parry and Tov, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader*, 6, 158–65 (“4Q521 (4QMessianic Apocalypse)”).

¹¹³ My designation of fragments follows Puech, *DJD* 25, 2–3, 10, 23.

¹¹⁴ Puech, *La Croyance des Esséniens en la vie future*, 2, 627–92 at 629 and 668; Puech, *DJD* 25, 3–5 and 37.

¹¹⁵ Puech, *La Croyance des Esséniens en la vie future*, 2, 664–9; Puech, *DJD* 25, 36–8.

¹¹⁶ 4Q521 does not include references to sons of light/darkness, sons of righteousness/injustice. References to the ‘pious’, חֲסִידִים; the ‘righteous’, צַדִּיקִים; the ‘poor’, עֲנִוִּים; and the ‘faithful’, אֲמוּנִים, in 4Q521 2 ii + 4 lines 5–7 and 12 are partly allusions to biblical texts, e.g. Isa 61:1, and partly explainable as eschatological elaboration on biblical tradition without further specifications of a sectarian type of dualism between insiders and outsiders.

¹¹⁷ Collins, “Review: É. Puech, *La Croyance des Esséniens en la vie future*,” 246–52 at 251; idem, *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 124–8 on 4Q521 in the rubric “Resurrection in Scrolls That Are Not Clearly Sectarian”.

¹¹⁸ Xeravits, *King, Priest, Prophet*, 99–100 justifies this classification, noting the absence of sectarian terminology and affinities of 4Q521 with other non-sectarian works, such as 4Q385 and 4Q558, while de-emphasizing parallels with the sectarian *Hodayot* as being “too vague to indicate direct influence” (100).

¹¹⁹ Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte aus Qumran*, 379 and 388 argues for this provenance of 4Q521 on the basis of noted connections with 11QPs^a.

My discussion of the 'Messianic Apocalypse' categorises the text among non-sectarian Qumran texts in view of the fact that its theological perspective lacks the sense of dualism and separation from the 'ways of the people' that occur in Qumran sectarian texts. The attention for the righteous and the pious, the poor and the faithful in 4Q521 may be among the features which made this composition of interest as an 'adopted text' for the Qumran community. The consistent rendering of the tetragrammaton as אַדְנִי in 4Q521 could perhaps be explained as influence of the broader Essene parent movement, in view of parallels for this usage in pseudepigraphical, parabiblical, liturgical, and apocalyptic texts rather than in the well-known sectarian Qumran texts.¹²⁰ Text and translation of the two passages relevant for discussion about resurrection are quoted below.¹²¹

4Q521 2 ii + 4

top margin

- 1 כי הש[מים והארץ ישמעו למשיחו
- 2 [וכל אש]ר במ לוא יסוג ממצות קדושים
- 3 התאמצו מבקשי אדני בעבדתו *vacat*
- 4 הלוא בזאת תמצאו את אדני כל המיחלים בלבם
- 5 כי אדני חסידים יבקר וצדיקים בשם יקרא
- 6 ועל ענוים רוחו תרחף ואמונים יחליף בכחו
- 7 כי יכבד את חסידים על כסא מלכות עד
- 8 מתיר אסורים פוקח עורים זוקף כפופים
- 9 ול[ע]לם אדבק [במ]יחלים ובחסדו י[]
- 10 ופר[י מעש]ה טוב לאיש לוא יתאחר
- 11 ונכבות שלוא היו יעשה אדני כאשר ד[בר]
- 12 כי ירפא חללים ומתים יחיה ענוים יבשר
- 13 ו[דלי]ם ישב[יע] נתושים ינהל ורעבים יעשר
- 14 ונב[וני]ם (?) [] וכלם כקד[ושים?]
- 15 וא]

¹²⁰ אַדְנִי in 4Q225 (4QpsJub^a) 2 I 5; אַדְנִי in 4Q378 (4QapocrJosh^a) 6 II 7; אַדְנִי in 4Q410 (4QNon-Canonical Psalms B) 76–77 14; אַדְנִי in 4Q459 (4QNarrative Work Mentioning Lebanon) 1 2; אַדְנִי in 4Q504 (4QDibHam^a) 1–2 II 7; אַדְנִי in 4Q509 (4QpapPrFêtes^c) 285 1; אַדְנִי in 4Q526 (4QTestament?) 1. The extant evidence of well-known sectarian Qumran texts, such as the *Serekh ha-Yahad*, the *Damascus Document*, and the *Pesharim*, does not include this usage; CD-A XV 1 // 4QD^a 8 I even prohibits swearing by Aleph and Daleth, the first two letters of the word אַדְנִי.

¹²¹ Texts from Puech, *DJD* 25, 10 and 23; translations after García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*, 1045 and 1047 except for reverse parts which constitute my own translation of Puech's additional readings and reconstructions of Hebrew text as compared to those in the *Study Edition*.

1 [for the heav]ens and the earth will listen to his anointed one, 2 [and all th]at is in them will not turn away from the precepts of the holy ones. 3 Strengthen yourselves, you who are seeking the Lord, in his service! *Blank* 4 Will you not in this encounter the Lord, all those who hope in their heart? 5 For the Lord will consider the pious, and call the righteous by name, 6 and his spirit will hover upon the poor, and he will renew the faithful with his strength. 7 For he will honour the pious upon the throne of an eternal kingdom, 8 freeing prisoners, giving sight to the blind, straightening out the twis[ted.] 9 And for[e]ver shall I cling [to those who h]ope, and in his mercy *he will*[] 10 and the fru[it of] a good [dee]d for humankind will not be delayed. 11 And the Lord will perform marvellous acts such as have not existed, just as he sa[id,] 12 [for] he will heal the badly wounded and will make the dead live, he will proclaim good news to the poor 13 and *he will make the* [poo]r who[le], lead those who are uprooted and enrich the hungry. 14 *And those who have under*[standing (?)] ◦ and all of them like the ho[ly ones?] 15 *And I will*

4Q521 7 1-8 + 5 ii 7-16

	ראו [א]ת כל א[שר עשה]	1
	אדני האר[ץ] וכל אשר בה ימים] וכל	2
	אשר בם] וכל מקוה מים ונחלים (vacat)	3
	[כ]ל[כם] העושים את הטוב לפני אדנ[י]	4
	מברכים ולו]א כאלה מקלל[ים] ולמות יהי]ו כאשר	5
	יקי]ם המחיה את מתי עמו (vacat)	6
	ונ[ו]דה ונגידה לכם צדקות אדני אשר]	7
	בנ[י] תמ[ותה] ופתח] קברות-	8
	ופ[תח]ת(?)	9
	ו]	10
	וגי מות ב]	11
	וגשר תה]ו-ומ- (ות)	12
	קפאו ארור]ים	13
	וקדמו שמים]	14
	וכ]ל מלאכים]	15
	ל]	16

1 see all th[at the Lord has made:] 2 [the ear]th and all that is in it, *Blank* the seas [and all] 3 [they contain,] and all the reservoirs of waters and torrents. 4 *Blank* [just as (is the case)] for[you] who do the good before the Lor[d] 5 [you praise God and no]t like these, the accursed. And [they] shall b[e] for death [As] 6 he who gives life [rais]es the dead of his people. *Blank* 7 And we shall [gi]ve thanks and announce to you the *acts of justice of the Lord* who [] 8 tho[se who are appointed to dea]th and opens [the tombs of] 9 and o[pen]s] 10 and [] 11 the valley of death in [] 12 and the bridge of the abys[ses] 13 the accur[sed] have coagulated [] 14 and the heavens have met [] 15 [and a]ll the angels[] 16] [

The references to the raising of the dead (4Q521 2 ii + 4 12 and 7 6) have different settings in the respective passages, which I will discuss separately below, before turning to a joint discussion about resurrection.

4Q521 2 ii + 4 starts with a setting of messianic expectation (ll. 1–2), then turns to the Lord’s visit of those who hope in their heart (ll. 3–4 and l. 9) confirming the eternity and non-delay of theodicy (ll. 9–10), and ultimately mentions the Lord’s performance of glorious things, נַכְבּוֹת, among which the raising of the dead, מְתִיִם יַחִיָּה (l. 12). The horizon of messianic expectation, the characterization of the glorious acts with the phrase “such as have not existed”, and the imperfect tense of יַחִיָּה all point forward to an eschatological timeframe. The phrase ‘just as he sa[id]’, כַּאֲשֶׁר דָּבַר,¹²² introduces deeds which can be partly traced back to a scriptural background in Isaiah; the raising of the dead possibly relating to Isa 26:19 and the proclaiming of good news to the poor relating to Isa 61:1.¹²³ The intertextuality of this passage at large has been extensively studied with comparative attention for Q 7:18–23.¹²⁴

In view of the intertextuality with scriptural passages from, among other biblical books, Isaiah in 4Q521 2 ii + 4,¹²⁵ the eschatologically oriented setting of this passage may be called prophetically inspired. In fact, the introductory phrase ‘the heavens and the earth will listen’ has been compared with passages in Isaiah, such as the introduction of the prophet’s vision in Isaiah 1:2 and Isaiah 48:13.¹²⁶ Analogously with a prophetic vision, 4Q521 2 ii + 4 concentrates on glory, hope, and divine visit through marvellous deeds which God’s reign (cf. מַלְכוּת עֵד in l. 7) signifies for those faithful to the Lord. Differently from a prophetic

¹²² Note parallels to this expression in e.g. CD-A VI 13 and 4QD^a 3 III 25. Cf. 2 Cor 6:16 in which the phrase καθὼς εἶπεν θεὸς ὅτι introduces a set of scriptural words from different parts of Scripture.

¹²³ Cf. the set of scriptural and extra-scriptural parallels noted by Puech, *La Croyance des Esséniens en la vie future*, 2, 641 and idem, *DJD* 25, 16.

¹²⁴ See e.g. Tabor and Wise, “4Q521 ‘On Resurrection’ and the Synoptic Gospel Tradition,” 149–62; Kvalbein, “Metaphoric Language in 4Q521 and the Interpretation of Matthew 11.5 par.,” 87–110; Brooke, “Shared Intertextual Interpretations in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament,” 70–94 at 79–82 describes the passage in 4Q521 as “a collection of scriptural passages to be associated with the activity of God (and his anointed agent) in the last days”.

¹²⁵ MT Psalm 146:7–8 is quoted by and large in 4Q521 2 ii + 4 8, except for the tetragrammaton יהוה which occurs three times as subject to the participles in the Masoretic text.

¹²⁶ Puech, *La Croyance des Esséniens en la vie future*, 2, 634 and idem, *DJD* 25, 12; Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte aus Qumran*, 348.

vision, 4Q521 2 ii + 4 also combines with the notion of divine glorification a horizon of messianic expectation and hymnic appraisal of God's help from different parts of Scripture, in particular Psalm 146.

4Q521 7 1-8 + 5 ii 7-16 is the second passage which mentions the raising of the dead. This passage, like 4Q521 2 ii + 4, provides a cosmological introductory setting, referring to "all th[at the Lord has made: the ear]th and all that is in it" (ll. 1-2), but the extant text lacks a messianic reference. Differently from 4Q521 2 ii + 4, this passage focuses on theodicy of those 'who do the good before the Lor[d]' on the one hand and the 'accursed' who shall be for death on the other. 4Q521 7 1-8 + 5 ii 7-16 line 6 observes that "he who gives life [rais]es the dead of his people, עמו את המחיה [יקי]ם. The collective setting of God's people is clearly that which the 'Messianic Apocalypse' identifies with, since the sequel in line 7 speaks in the first person plural: "And we shall [gi]ve thanks and announce to you the acts of justice of the Lord", ונ[ו]דה ונגידה לכם צדקות אדני. The perspective of 4Q521 7 1-8 + 5 ii 7-16 differs from that of 4Q521 2 ii + 4, in that it focuses on divine theodicy and retribution rather than on prophetic hope and glorification. Both dimensions are yet part of the conceptualization of the raising of the dead in the 'Messianic Apocalypse'.

Considering the relevant terminology of the two passages together, it should be noted that the divine activity of raising the dead in the 'Messianic Apocalypse' is given more pronounced emphasis as compared to imagery in Isaiah. While Isaiah 26:19 includes the phrase that 'your dead shall live', יחיו מתיד, both passages in 4Q521 include a piel of the verb חיה (יחיה and המחיה respectively; cf. the hifil [יקי]ם in 4Q521 7 6). The latter usage denotes intensified causation as well as emphasis on direct divine involvement. Both setting and usage of terminology thereby distinguish the concrete evidence of belief in eschatological resurrection in the 'Messianic Apocalypse' from the metaphorical imagery in prophetic tradition such as reflected in Isaiah 26:7-19.

3.3. *Poetical and Liturgical Texts*

3.3.1. *4Q434a (4QGrace after Meals)*

Fragment two of 4Q434 (4QBarkī Napshī^a) has been identified as a separate text about a 'blessing after the meal at the mourner's house' by M. Weinfeld, in comparison with liturgical evidence in rabbinic literature

(mainly *b.Ber.* 44a, 46b, 48b, 49a; *y.Ber.* 1:9, 3d).¹²⁷ The text is included here in order to explore whether its perspective of consolation yields glimpses of eschatologically oriented afterlife belief.

4Q434 has been palaeographically dated to the mid-first century BCE.¹²⁸ Fragment 2 of 4Q434, also designated as 4Q434a,¹²⁹ does not comprise clearly identifiable sectarian terminology and thought, so that it can be included here among non-sectarian Qumran texts. Text and translation of this fragment are quoted below.¹³⁰

	1	[] כה [] כה להנחם על אבלה עניה ה[]
גיים ל[ש]חת ולאומים יכרות ורשעים []	2	חדש[]
מעשי שמים וארץ ויגילו וכבודו מלוא[] כל הארץ בעד אשמתם	3	
יכפר ורב <טו> טוב ינחמם טוב הש[]	4	◦ לאכל
פריה וטובה	5	<i>vacat</i> [] <i>vacat</i>
כאיש אשר אמו תנחמנו כן ינחמם בירושל[ים] כחתן[] על כלה עליה	6	
לעו[לם] ישכון [כי] א כסאו לעולם ועד וכבודו []	7	◦ וכל גוים
לו והיה בו צב[א] השמ[ים] ו[א]רצם חמדה	8	
עד תפער[ת] ש[]	9	[ד] אברכה את
ברוך שם עליו[]	10	<i>vacat</i> []
חסדך עלי	11	[] ברכי[]
לתורה הכינותה	12	[]
ך ספר חוקיך	13	[]

1 [] so that (the) poor woman may be comforted for her mourning [2 to [de]stroy peoples and cut down nations and wicked [] renew 3 the works of heaven and earth, and let them rejoice, and his glory to fill [all the earth] to atone [for] their [guil]t. 4 And the one abounding in goodness will comfort them. Goodness [] to eat 5 its fruit and goodness. *vacat* [] *vacat* 6 As a person whom his mother comforts, so he will comfort them in Jerusal[em] as a bridegroom] on a bride, on her 7 he will dwell[forev]er [fo]r his throne is forever and ever and his glory [] and all peoples 8 [] to him and the hos[t of heav]en will be in it, and their desirable [I]and 9 [] glor[y] [] I will bless 10 [] Blessed be the name of the high[est]] *vacat* 11 [] Bless[] your grace upon me 12 [] for the Torah you established 13 [] the book of your laws.

Consolation of mourning of the dead, אבל, runs through this text (להנחם in l. 1; ינחמם in l. 4; ינחמנו and תנחמם in l. 6). The perspec-

¹²⁷ Preliminary edition by Weinfeld, "Grace after Meals in Qumran," 427–40; ed.pr. Seely, Weinfeld, *DJD* 29, 279–81.

¹²⁸ Seely, Weinfeld, *DJD* 29, 255–86.

¹²⁹ Dimant, "The Qumran Manuscripts: Contents and Significance," 47; García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*, 2, 912–3.

¹³⁰ Text and translation from Seely, Weinfeld, *DJD* 29, 279–80.

tive of consolation continuously interchanges from that of individual persons (the poor woman, a mother's son)¹³¹ to that of a collective setting of the third person plural. The collective setting which appears to be presupposed is probably that of the Torah-abiding people of Israel in a covenant relationship with God (cf. ll. 10–13). The circumstances of destruction of nations associated with wickedness, the renewal of the works of heaven and earth, and the joy accompanying divine glory and redemption which fill the earth (ll. 2–3) envisage a future-oriented timeframe. The 'renewal of the works of heaven and earth', **חדש מעשי וארץ שמים**, has been compared with Isaiah 65:17–18,¹³² but the focus of this fragment on 'works', **מעשים**, of heaven and earth could denote new creation rather than transformation expressed in metaphorical terms.

The covenant theology in lines 6–7, which stipulate God's eternal dwelling with his people in glory and focuses on comfort in Jerusalem, is partly couched in a simile of marriage which has been traced back to Isaiah 62:5.¹³³

While lines 6–7 could have aspects in common with prophetic restoration theology, such as reflected in Isaiah 62:5 and Jeremiah 33:10–11.16,¹³⁴ the occasion of reference to divine consolation in Jerusalem through eternal dwelling and glory is not a prophecy on punishment, exile and restoration, but mourning of the dead. The setting of future-oriented hope for divine glory and renewal of creation in this fragment could well include eschatological expectation¹³⁵ of afterlife in the final age, even though its nature cannot be ascertained.

3.3.2. 4Q442 (4QIndividual Thanksgiving B)

A small fragment of four lines, labelled as *4QIndividual Thanksgiving B* (4Q442),¹³⁶ comprises a first line which mentions eternal life: **שבע וחיה**

¹³¹ Weinfeld, "Grace after Meals in Qumran," 433 compared the latter simile with that in Isaiah 66:13, "as a mother comforts her son so I will comfort Jerusalem".

¹³² Weinfeld, *ibidem*, 433; Seely, Weinfeld, *DJD* 29, 280.

¹³³ Weinfeld, "Grace after Meals in Qumran," 433; Seely, Weinfeld, *DJD* 29, 280.

¹³⁴ I am indebted here to critical comments on parallels to 4Q434a in prophetic restoration theology made by Prof. Dr Torleif Elgvin during the Expert Meeting on 'Qumran and the New Testament' in Leuven, 3–6 December 2007.

¹³⁵ Weinfeld, "Grace after Meals in Qumran," 436 observes that "the messianic element is indispensable in the grace after meals", while discussing the reference to the eternal throne and glory, **כסאו לעולם ועד וכבודו**, in line 7 in comparison with rabbinic passages.

¹³⁶ Ed.pr. Chazon, *DJD* 29, 345–6.

לעולם אודה, “abundance, and life for ever. I give thanks”.¹³⁷ The terminology of eternal life in this fragment does not have a clear analogy in sectarian Qumran texts, in which the conceptualizations חיי נצח, ‘endless life’ (1QS IV 7 // 4QpapS^c V 5; CD-A III 20; cf. 1QH^a XV 15) and כל כבוד אדם, ‘all the glory of Adam’ (1QS IV 23; CD-A III 20; 1QH^a IV 15), are more prominent. The evidence in 4Q442 of eternal life could therefore be categorized among texts not clearly sectarian.

3.4. Evaluation

The survey of non-sectarian Qumran evidence yields a more diversified impression of religious settings to the belief in resurrection, as compared to previous studies up to the 1990s.¹³⁸ The two non-sectarian Qumran texts whose conceptualization most clearly reflects eschatological resurrection, *4QPseudo-Ezekiel* and 4Q521, do not only attest to resurrection in a setting of vindication of the righteous and final judgement, but also voice horizons of prophetic restoration theology, prophetically inspired hope and messianic expectation.

4QPseudo-Daniel^c ar and *4QVisions of Amram^f ar*, texts in which identification of their concepts of afterlife with resurrection is less demonstrable but possible in light of analogies with other texts, attest to an eschatological setting and to the influence of Isaianic imagery along with Danielic tradition.

4QGrace after Meals and *4QIndividual Thanksgiving B* respectively yield eschatologically oriented ideas of the renewal of creation and eternal life, of which the former (*4QGrace after Meals*) might imply resurrection.

¹³⁷ Text and translation from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*. 2, 922–3.

¹³⁸ Nickelsburg, *Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life*, analysed settings of religious persecution, oppression, and vindication, while evaluating evidence of the *Hodayot* and the *Serekh ha-Yahad* in connection with persecution and two-ways theology (144–59). In his more recent survey, Puech, *La Croyance des Esséniens en la vie future*, connects much evidence of both non-Qumran early Jewish texts, such as 2 Maccabees (vol. 1, 91–2), *T. Jud.* 25 (vol. 1, 123), Ps. Sol. 3 (vol. 1, 126) and Qumran texts, such as 4Q245 (vol. 2, 568–70) and 4Q548 (vol. 2, 559, 773), with Daniel 12 as representation of apocalyptic tradition. Schaper, *Eschatology in the Greek Psalter*, 47–8 explains resurrection terminology in LXX Ps 1:5 against a background of second-century BCE proto-Pharisaic circles, with reference to *Ant.* 18.14, 2 Macc 7:9.14.36, 12:44f. and *m.Sanh.* 10.

4. RESURRECTION IN SECTARIAN QUMRAN TEXTS

4.1. *The Damascus Document*

The *Damascus Document* includes a passage which envisages “eternal life and all the glory of Adam”, לחיי נצח וכל כבוד אדם להם, for those who remain steadfast in God’s covenant with Israel (cf. CD-A III 12–13).¹³⁹ If, as previous redaction-critical analysis has argued, CD-A III 12b–17a provides a window on the predecessors of the Qumran community,¹⁴⁰ the statement in CD-A III 20 suggests that the Qumran community claimed a sense of continuity with the revelation of covenantal requirements as mentioned in CD-A III 13–16. The combined reference could suggest eternal life in earthly terms, in view of the mention of Adam’s or human glory. However, further specification about the eschatological state of afterlife is not possible with regard to this passage.¹⁴¹

The 4QD fragments provide some additional evidence for eschatological afterlife beliefs. 4QD^e 2 II 20 contrasts the following eschatological destinies: “to you paths of life, but the ways to the pit I shall open for”, לכם דרכי חיים ונתיבות שחת אפתחה ל, אל. The setting of this statement about eschatological destinies is a concern for justice and fulfillment of the law of God (4QD^e 2 II 19 // 6QD 5 5). The form(s) of eschatological afterlife for ‘those who know justice and [fulfil the] law [of God] is/are not further specified than דרכי חיים, ‘paths of life.’

¹³⁹ Note the different translations “Those who remained steadfast in it” by García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*, 1, 555 and “The people who cling to Him” by Wacholder, *The New Damascus Document*, 33 and 180. In view of literary parallelism of the phrase במחזיקים in CD-A III 20 with that in CD-A III 12, ובמחזיקים במצות, אל, the steadfastness can be related to the covenant relationship with God as further described in the intermediate lines of CD-A III 12–19.

¹⁴⁰ Hempel, “Community Origins in the Damascus Document,” 316–29. Cf. Hogeterp, “Eschatological Identities in the Damascus Document,” 111–130.

¹⁴¹ Cf. Cavallin, *Life after Death. Part 1*, 62: “nothing is said about death and resurrection”; Collins, *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 118 takes this and other passages as implication that the described destinies are non-eschatological and instead are “implemented immediately after the death of the individual”. However, the terms in CD-A III 20 denote infinity, in my view thereby including the final age.

¹⁴² Ed.pr. Baumgarten, *DJD* 18, 137–68. Text and translation from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*, 1, 610–1.

4.2. *The Serekh ha-Yahad*

The Qumran sectarian foundation text *Serekh ha-Yahad* comprises a number of passages about afterlife and eschatological judgement, 1QS IV 2–14, 23, 25; V 12–13; and XI 7b–9a. Of these passages in 1QS, only the section on the two ways and their eschatological visitation (1QS IV 2–14) in the ‘Two Spirits Treatise’ (1QS III 13–IV 26) has overlaps with 4QS fragments (1QS IV 4–10, 13–14 // 4QpapS^c V). Recently, parallel materials to the ‘Two Spirits Treatise’ have further been identified in 1Q29a and 4Q525 11–12 by E.J.C. Tigchelaar.¹⁴³

The ‘Two Spirits Treatise’ (1QS III 13–IV 26) includes a passage about the visitation, פקודה, of the two ways, those of the spirit of truth and of the spirit of wickedness (1QS IV 2–14),¹⁴⁴ which presents a sliding scale from this-worldly retribution to eschatological concepts (1QS IV 6–7, 11–14). The eschatological destiny for those whose way of life follows the spirit of truth is described in terms of “eternal enjoyment with endless life (שמחת עולמים בחיי נצח), and a crown of glory with majestic raiment in eternal light (באור עולמים)” (1QS IV 7–8 // 4QpapS^c V 5–6). The eschatological destiny for those who follow the spirit of wickedness is described in terms of “humiliation of destruction by the fire of the dark regions” and “in bitter weeping and harsh evils in the abysses of darkness until their destruction, without there being a remnant or a survivor for them” (1QS IV 13–14 // 4QpapS^c V 12–13).¹⁴⁵

The identification of parallel evidence to the ‘two-ways section’ in 1Q29a 13 and 4Q525 11–12 by Tigchelaar has yielded shorter versions of the visitation of way of life according to the spirit of truth (1QS IV 7–8). Both fragments record the words כול ברכות עד, ‘all eternal blessings’ (1Q29a 13 2; 4Q525 11–12 1), which also occur in 1QS IV 7, but the space for reconstruction in these fragments indicates that in all probability they did not include the eschatologically oriented concepts of afterlife.¹⁴⁶ The variability of the text may give reason to think that the ‘Two Spirits Treatise’, which is often thought to have a pre-Qumran

¹⁴³ Tigchelaar, “These are the names of the spirits of...,” 529–47.

¹⁴⁴ On the coherent structure of and literary parallelism in the ‘Two Spirits Treatise’ and the two-ways section in particular, see recently Duhaime, “Cohérence structurelle et tensions internes dans l’instruction sur les deux esprits (1QS III 13–IV 26),” 103–31.

¹⁴⁵ Translations from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*, 1, 77.

¹⁴⁶ Tigchelaar, “These are the names of the spirits of...,” 529–47.

origin,¹⁴⁷ with its eschatologically oriented conceptualization of rewards and punishments only received its 1QS form when it was incorporated in the *Serekh ha-Yahad* from cave 1.¹⁴⁸

The terms of eschatological visitation in 1QS IV 7–8 and 13–14 were analysed as eternal life and post-mortem punishment of the wicked respectively by G.W.E. Nickelsburg.¹⁴⁹ J.J. Collins distinguishes between the accounts of visitation in 1QS IV 7–8 and 13–14, which he deems post-mortem conditions, from eschatological judgement, which he discerns in 1QS IV 18–19.¹⁵⁰ In my opinion, the descriptions in 1QS IV 7–8 and 13–14 foreshadow eschatological fate and the sliding scale from this-worldly retribution to eschatological visitation and judgement appears to be confirmed by overlapping terminology of visitation, פקודה (1QS IV 6, 11, 19, 26). Nevertheless, the state of endless life is not given further specification.

The concluding section of the ‘Two Spirits Treatise’, 1QS IV 15–26, includes various references to the eschaton in terms of an end to the existence of wickedness (1QS IV 18–19), the eternal rise of truth in the world (1QS IV 19), and determined judgement (1QS IV 20). The passage attributes ‘all the glory of Adam’, כול כבוד אדם, to the upright ones and those of a ‘blameless way (of life)’ (1QS IV 22–23) and associates the end with ‘new creation’, עשות חדשה (1QS IV 25). New creation could be related to the description of divine purification of the structure of man (1QS IV 20–22), but it may also denote eschatological transformation.

The concept of ‘new creation’ in 1QS IV 25 is presented in a general way and its eschatological orientation may denote life as envisaged in the final age, if not afterlife. The concept עשות חדשה may be somehow similar to that of [החדשה] הבריאה, ‘the day of the [new] creation’ in 4Q225 (4QPseudo-Jubilees^a) 1 7.¹⁵¹

1QS V 12–13 partially repeats terms of the eschatological visitation of the way of life according to the spirit of wickedness (לכלת עולם לאיזן)

¹⁴⁷ See e.g. Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination*, 127–8; Metso, *The Textual Development of the Community Rule*, 137–8; Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination*, 154–5; Tigchelaar, “These are the names of the spirits of...,” 537 and 546 n. 56.

¹⁴⁸ For extensive argument about the implications of the shorter versions of the ‘two ways section’, see Hogeterp, “The Eschatology of the Two Spirits Treatise Revisited,” 247–59.

¹⁴⁹ Nickelsburg, *Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life*, 156–7.

¹⁵⁰ Collins, *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 116–7.

¹⁵¹ Cf. Paul’s anthropological concept of ‘new creation’, καινή κτίσις, in Gal 6:15 and 2 Cor 5:17.

שרית in 1QS V 13 / כלותם לאין שרית in 1QS IV 14). Yet 1QS V 10–13 contextualizes the terms of judgement by rendering them as curses of the covenant against the ‘men of injustice,’ אנשי העול, who stand outside the covenant (1QS V 10–12).

1QS XI 7b–9a envisages the association of the assembly of the chosen by God with the ‘sons of heaven,’ בני שמים, giving them an inheritance in the lot of the holy ones. In the Qumran sectarian perspective, this association is brought into being for “the council of the Community and a foundation of the building of holiness to be an everlasting plantation throughout all future ages” (1QS XI 8–9a).¹⁵² É. Puech interpreted this passage as eschatological expectation of eternal life in an angelic state.¹⁵³ However, the terms in this passage appear reminiscent of previous passages about the envisioned foundation of the sectarian community for future ages (1QS VIII 5–6, IX 6). Since eschatological conceptualization is not explicated in 1QS XI 7b–9a, this excludes the probability that this passage would reflect a specified idea about afterlife in the final age.

4.3. *1QRule of Benedictions*

The *Rule of Benedictions* from cave 1 (1QSb) includes passages which voice an association with angels if not an angelic state (1QSb III 6, IV 24–26), which have been included in previous surveys of afterlife and resurrection.¹⁵⁴ However, the imagery has its setting in the exaltation of priesthood and priestly service (1QSb III 1, 22, 26; IV 25–26), without a clear reference to eschatological expectation.

4.4. *The Hodayot*

The most intensively engaged Qumran sectarian text with regard to the subject of resurrection is *1QHodayot* (1QH^a). H.-W. Kuhn included discussion of afterlife belief in his survey of eschatology in the *Hodayot*, which he deemed realized eschatology, associating new creation or re-creation (1QH^a XI 21; XIX 13–14) with resurrection of the dead

¹⁵² Translation from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*. 1, 97.

¹⁵³ Puech, *La Croyance des Esséniens en la vie future*. 2, 423–5.

¹⁵⁴ Cavallin, *Life After Death. Part 1*, 63; Puech, *La Croyance des Esséniens en la vie future*. 2, 440–1; idem, “Immortality and Life After Death,” 512–20 at 517.

(1QH^a XIX 12).¹⁵⁵ Nickelsburg's discussion of realized eschatology in the *Hodayot* interpreted the evidence of 1QH^a XI 19–23 and XIX 3–14 as a theological viewpoint of 'present participation in eschatological life' for the sectarian community and its individual protagonist, who would thereby have "not need to speak of a future death and of resurrection from that death".¹⁵⁶

É. Puech discussed notions of eschatological war, final judgement, and heavenly vindication of the righteous in the *Hodayot* (1QH^a XIV 32–34, XI 20–37, and XIX 6–17), arguing that heavenly exaltation above Sheol (1QH^a XI 20–24) and Semitic anthropology (1QH^a XVI 29f., XIII 36f.) voice an idea of eschatological re-creation.¹⁵⁷ J.J. Collins deemed the evidence of the *Hodayot* inconclusive and ambiguous, observing that "the focus was on sharing the angelic life within the community and thereby transcending death and continuing that life in heaven".¹⁵⁸ Collins explained the imagery of a call to war 'for those who lie in the dust' in the context of eschatological war in the envisioned era of judgement in 1QH^a XIV 29–34, considering a reference to resurrection 'possible, but not certain'.¹⁵⁹ According to the recent literary and exegetical study of 1QH^a XII 5–XIII 4 by G.J. Brooke, the language of standing and rising in the *Hodayot*, in particular 1QH^a XII 22–37 would resonate belief in and anticipate bodily resurrection. Brooke compares angelic imagery with angelophanies surrounding other resurrection traditions.¹⁶⁰ Recent scholarship thereby diverges between the idea that resurrection resonates in the *Hodayot* and eternal life as heavenly transcendence.

Communion with angelic beings, *להתיצב עם צבא קודשים*, (1QH^a XI 21–22) and *להתיצב במעמד* (1QH^a XIX 13), is not the only feature which characterises eschatological afterlife belief in the *Hodayot*. The *Hodayot*

¹⁵⁵ Kuhn, *Enderwartung und gegenwärtiges Heil*, 83–8 and 185. My references to 1QH^a follow the arrangement by H. Stegemann and É. Puech, differing from Kuhn's, who referred to the edition by É.L. Sukenik.

¹⁵⁶ Nickelsburg, *Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life*, 152–6 at 156. Nickelsburg's conclusion was followed by Lichtenberger, *Studien zum Menschenbild*, 219–24 who discussed 1QH^a XIV 32–34 and XIX 12.

¹⁵⁷ Puech, *La Croyance des Esséniens en la vie future*, 2, 417–9.

¹⁵⁸ Collins, *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 119–23 at 123.

¹⁵⁹ Collins, *ibidem*, 122.

¹⁶⁰ Brooke, "The Structure of 1QH^a XII 5–XIII 4 and the Meaning of Resurrection," 15–33, underpinning his argument with intertextual analysis of the literary structure of 1QH^a XII 5–XIII 4, and surveying 1QH^a XI 19–23 and XIX 10–14 as reflections on afterlife, if not physical resurrection.

include the following passage, 1QH^a XIV 12b–19a, which mentions both communion with angels and an earthbound concept of paradise:

12b For you have brought [your truth and] your [glo]ry 13 to all the men of your council and in the lot, together with the angels of the face (עם מלאכי פנים), without there being a mediator between [your holy ones...]... 14 Its fruit, because [...] The will respond to your glorious commands, and they will be your princes in the lo[t of your holy ones. Their root] 15 will sprout like a flo[wer of the field f]or ever, to make a shoot grow in branches of the everlasting plantation so that it covers all the wo[rld] (על כול תבל) with its shade, [and] its [crown] 16 (reaches) up to the skie[s, and] its roots down to the abyss. All the streams of Eden (כול נהרות עדן) [will water] its [bra]n[ch]es and they will be [seas with-out] 17 limits; and its forest will be over the whole world, endless, and as deep as to Sheol [its roots.] ([שורשיה] ועד שאול) The source of light [will] be an eternal spring, 18 inexhaustible, in its shining flames all the son[s of injustice] will burn [and it will be turned] into a fire that sings all the men of 19 guilt into destruction.¹⁶¹

This passage appears to constitute a prelude to the vision of final judgement and destruction of wickedness in eschatological war in 1QH^a XIV 29–34. The setting of 1QH^a XIV 29–34 could imply that the envisaged destruction of all sons of wickedness with their ‘heroes of war’ is also the issue in 1QH^a XIV 34: “Those lying in the dust lifted up the flag, and the worm of the dead raised the standard to”; war activities probably being associated with ‘the battles of the insolent’, מלחמות זדים, in 1QH^a XIV 35.¹⁶² The eschatological war scenario evoked in 1QH^a XIV 29–34 envisages a physical end to the existence of the wicked without hope for salvation, while the eschatological destiny of the sons of truth (1QH^a XIV 29) is described in terms of both earthly and heavenly dimensions (1QH^a XIV 12b–19a).

The passage in 1QH^a XIV 12b–19a includes language of transformation and growth (פרח and לגדל in 1QH^a XIV 15) in connection with the envisioned Eden. Perhaps the implied part of ‘all the men of God’s council’ (1QH^a XIV 13) in Eden with its source of light is therefore presupposed in terms of eschatological transformation and afterlife.

The idea of afterlife in imagery of physical resuscitation occurs in 1QH^a XIX 10–14 at line 12, a passage which also mentions communion with

¹⁶¹ Translation and Hebrew phrases from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*, 1, 174–5.

¹⁶² I interpret the verbs נשא and הרינו as perfect tenses presenting imminent events as accomplished fact.

angels: “to raise the worms of the dead from the dust, to an ever[lasting] community”, [ולם] ע[ולם] ל[סוד] מ[תים] ל[ע] (1QH^a XIX 12).¹⁶³ This resuscitation is contextualized as an event taking place for the sake of God’s glory (ולמען כבודכה) and in a setting of the purification of man from iniquity (1QH^a XIX 10). The imagery of resuscitation and renewal of the creation (1QH^a XIX 13–14) could, in the words of G.J. Brooke, anticipate on the idea of resurrection. The *Hodayot* do not comprise more explicit evidence of eschatological resurrection.¹⁶⁴

4.5. 4QAg^{es} of Creation B (4Q181)

The sectarian text *4QAg^{es} of Creation B* envisions a “holy congregation on the standing-ground of eternal life and in the lot with his holy ones”, עדת קודש במעמד לחיי עולם ובגורל עם קדושו (4Q181 1 II 4), while line 6 of the same fragment again mentions ‘et[er]n[al] life’, [לחי ע] [ו]. H.C.C. Cavallin translated מעמד לחיי עולם as ‘resurrection to eternal life’, pointing to possible influence from Daniel 12:2 and 13, but the communal setting of 4Q181 does not seem to be equatable with the sense of the verb תעמד in Daniel 12:13. The text rather coheres with the idea of angelic communion in other sectarian texts, in that it mentions consideration of “some from among the sons of the world” in the “community of divine beings”, י[חד א] לים (4Q181 1 II 3–4).

4.6. Evaluation

Previous scholarship diverged on the question whether or not sectarian Qumran texts would include a belief in eschatological resurrection. In a way, Lichtenberger’s presentation of the state of scholarship, divided between identification, disidentification, and evaluation of the

¹⁶³ In my view, there is a clear disjunction between terms in 1QH^a XIX 12 and XIV 34 within their respective contexts. The perfect tenses in 1QH^a XIV 34 appear to relate the envisioned destruction of the sons of wickedness who lifted up the flag and raised the standard as past fact, describing them as lying in the dust and as worm of the dead. The ל with the infinitive הרים in 1QH^a XIX 12 envisages a raising of the mortal state itself, represented by the image ‘worm of the dead’, from the dust for an everlasting community.

¹⁶⁴ The extant text of *Hodayot* manuscripts from Qumran cave 4 (4Q427–432 (4QH^{a-f})) does not preserve overlaps with the passages in 1QH^a discussed above, nor does it add further evidence relevant for discussion of resurrection.

ambiguous evidence as inconclusive,¹⁶⁵ still holds with regard to recent scholarly discussion of sectarian Qumran texts. Even though the cave 4 recensions of the *Serekh ha-Yahad* and the *Damascus Document* have yielded some additional eschatological passages about afterlife, their evidence does not conclusively point to afterlife belief in the form of bodily resurrection. On the other hand, the imagery of resuscitation and Eden in the *Hodayot* implies that the Qumran sectarian community did not negate such afterlife beliefs. If, from the viewpoint of Qumran sectarian texts, the central concern of a proper covenantal way of life coincided with a present part in divine revelation and heavenly communion, this might explain that the conceptualization of bodily resurrection receded to the background.

The Qumran sectarian texts have been taken to support the ‘interpretatio graeca’ by Josephus, who ascribed belief in the immortality of the soul to the Essenes.¹⁶⁶ However, the anthropological concepts of resuscitation and renewal of humankind in the *Hodayot* (1QH^a XIX 10–14) and new creation in the *Serekh ha-Yahad* (1QS IV 20–25 at line 25) do not seem to be equatable with the strict dichotomy of mortal body and immortal soul in the Greek mythological analogies which Josephus mentions in his description of Essene afterlife beliefs (*J.W.* 2.154–158). Josephus’ personal acquaintance with Jewish schools of thought, as a Jew of priestly lineage (*Life* 1–6), does not provide a basis for the argument that he would have had first-hand knowledge of the secluded Qumran community per se.¹⁶⁷ Josephus’ ‘interpretatio graeca’ of Essene afterlife beliefs may generally be related to Qumran texts with references to eternal life (e.g. 1QS IV 7; CD-A III 20; 4Q181 1 II 4, 6; 4Q442 1), but this interpretation may be derived from information and instruction within the larger Essene parent movement.

¹⁶⁵ Lichtenberger, *Studien zum Menschenbild*, 219; cf. idem, “Auferstehung in den Qumranfunden,” 79–91 at 79.

¹⁶⁶ Collins, *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 122–3 thereby refers to the *Hodayot*.

¹⁶⁷ Qumran sectarian texts comprise many indications of antagonism against the Jerusalem priesthood (e.g. 4QMMT, 1QpHab). Josephus’ description of Essene prayers to the sun (*J.W.* 2.128; cf. 2.148), perhaps referring to their observance of the solar calendar, and their separate performance of communal rites and customs with their own priests (*Ant.* 18.19 and 22) also attests to the distance of this movement to the priestly establishment.

5. RESURRECTION BELIEFS IN THE PRE-70 CE JESUS-MOVEMENT

The comparison between resurrection beliefs in emerging Christianity and in the Palestinian Jewish evidence of the Dead Sea Scrolls starts from two premisses. First, the early Jesus-movement started out as part of Judaism in Israel in the late Second Temple period. Second, the most versatile representations of Second Temple Jewish belief in eschatological resurrection occur in either (originally) Palestinian Jewish compositions (*1 Enoch*; Daniel 12; *T. Levi* 18.10–14; *T. Jud.* 25; *T. Zeb.* 10.1–3; *Ps. Sol.* 3:11–12; *L.A.B.* 3.10, 19.12, 25.7, 51.5; *4QPseudo-Ezekiel*; 4Q521) or texts related to events and perceptions in Israel (2 Maccabees; 4 Maccabees).¹⁶⁸ This is not to deny possible points of interaction between Palestinian Jewish conceptualizations and Hellenistic culture,¹⁶⁹ but resurrection of the dead was probably a belief which would have had a marginal place in Graeco-Roman thought, determined as it probably was by dualism between body and soul, earthly and heavenly dimensions.¹⁷⁰ The fact that the Acts of the Apostles record a Greek misunderstanding of ἀνάστασις as the name of a divinity (Acts 17:18)¹⁷¹ rather than an eschatological event proclaimed about Jesus (Acts 17:31) may provide an indication of the distance between the mindset of a pagan Graeco-Roman audience and beliefs in eschatological resurrection.

The cult of the dead, necromantic practices, and visionary accounts of otherworldly appearances were part of Graeco-Roman culture and literature,¹⁷² but ἀνάστασις could denote various ideas in classical and Hellenistic Greek, such as a raising up and restoration, but also removal

¹⁶⁸ Cf. Bockmuehl, “Resurrection,” 102–18 at 112–3 observes about the New Testament evidence of resurrection that “insofar as this is history, it is history with a heavy Jewish Palestinian accent”, while mentioning a historical context of ‘first-century Pharisaic and apocalyptic Judaism.’

¹⁶⁹ E.g. intersections between *1 Enoch* 22.8–13 and Greek thought of afterlife argued in previous scholarship; see n. 19 above.

¹⁷⁰ Albinus, *The House of Hades*, 112–30 discusses belief in immortality beyond cyclical regeneration only in Pythagorean and Orphic thought. Cf. Martin, *The Corinthian Body*, 115: “Belief in body/soul dualism was... quite widespread in the early Roman Empire, especially in philosophical circles, though also among ordinary folk”.

¹⁷¹ Fitzmyer, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 605: “a pagan Athenian... would have understood the fem. Greek noun *anastasis* as the name of a consort for the foreign deity, Jesus, ‘Jesus and Anastasis’”, with reference to patristic comments.

¹⁷² See e.g. Cancik, “The End of the World, of History, and of the Individual in Greek and Roman Antiquity,” 84–125; Zeller, “Erscheinungen Verstorbener im griechisch-römischen Bereich,” 1–19.

and destruction.¹⁷³ Influential Greek mythological tradition rather emphasised an absolute distinction between the realms of life and death, excluding return to life.¹⁷⁴ The Areopagus speech (Acts 17:22–31), which concludes with the resurrection of the dead (Acts 17:31), indicates that the initial stage of gospel mission to a polytheistic Greek audience would have been characterised by a discourse bridging the gap from pagan religiosity to a re-conceptualization of the divinity and human relationships to the divinity.

In what follows, I will survey how New Testament accounts and conceptualizations of resurrection of the dead interact with Jewish tradition, and reconsider the contribution that the Dead Sea Scrolls make to this area of study. This survey starts with arguably pre-70 CE levels of Jesus-tradition in the Gospels and Acts together with the evidence of Paul the apostle, and then proceeds to post-70 CE stages of composition in New Testament texts.

5.1. *Resurrection Beliefs in the Milieu of the Historical Jesus*

Resurrection beliefs can be traced back to the earliest stages of Jesus-tradition in the canonical Gospels. Paul's Letters constitute the only evidence among the New Testament writings which have been unanimously dated before 70 CE, between ca. 49/50 and 60 CE, but the apostle only provides glimpses on the earthly Jesus (cf. 2 Cor 5:16) and the eschatological beliefs of the Palestinian movement of his earliest followers. Paul's discourses of resurrection (1 Thessalonians 4:13–18; 1 Corinthians 15)¹⁷⁵ include a part on earlier tradition (1 Cor 15:1–11) but also reflect Pauline theology adapted to the audience of his Letters (cf. 1 Thess 4:13.18; 1 Cor 15:12.35). While the canonical Gospels further

¹⁷³ LSJ, lemma ἀνάστασις.

¹⁷⁴ Aeschylus, *Eumenides* 647–8, ἀνδρός δ' ἐπειδὴν αἶμ' ἀνασπάσει κόνις ἄπαξ θανόντος οὔτις ἐστ' ἀνάστασις, clearly voices a classical viewpoint of distinction between earthly life and the realm of the dead, excluding a return or restoration to a state of life. Cf. Burkert, *Greek Religion*, 194–9 on Homeric traditions of afterlife mythology with reference to the ψυχή, Hades, a realm of the dead beyond the Okeanos, and Tartaros; imagery which Josephus also takes up in the analogies which he draws between Essene afterlife beliefs and Greek beliefs (*J.W.* 2.155–6).

¹⁷⁵ These two passages are the most concrete and extensive about belief in resurrection of the dead. Other passages on the subject of resurrection are shorter, such as 1 Thess 1:10; 2 Cor 1:9–10; Rom 1:4, 4:24–25, 7:4, 8:11.34, 10:9, 11:15; Phil 3:10, or focus on figurative language, such as 2 Cor 5:1–10 and Rom 6:1–11.

address later Greek-speaking audiences, they address eschatological expectations and resurrection beliefs among Jewish schools, popular beliefs, and the earliest followers of Jesus in Israel. My survey therefore begins with the Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles, before turning to the Pauline Letters.

5.1.1. *Mark 12:18–27 par., Jesus and Sadducean Denial of Resurrection*

The Synoptic Gospels narrate situations of dispute between Jesus and representatives of the Jewish schools, among which one with the Sadducees, ‘who say that there is no resurrection’, οἵτινες λέγουσιν ἀνάστασιν μὴ εἶναι (Mark 12:18 par.). The passage in question, Mark 12:18–27 / Matt 22:23–33 / Luke 20:27–38, has been categorized as didactic material in the setting of ‘scholastic dialogue’ and ‘controversy story’.¹⁷⁶ The Sadducees are associated with priestly aristocracy in various sources (Acts 4:1, 5:17; Josephus, *Ant.* 13.298 and 18.17) and the chief priests and scribes are singled out as those who sought to kill Jesus (Mark 14:1–2).¹⁷⁷ The didactic point of resurrection in this passage therefore seems to be to underpin the power of belief in resurrection and the risen Jesus against his opponents. According to the Marcan and Matthean versions of the passage, Jesus rebukes Sadducees for their ignorance of the Scriptures and the power of God (Mark 12:24 / Matt 22:29). According to all three Synoptic Gospels, Jesus opposes the Sadducean rejection of resurrection by insisting that the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob is the God of the living (Mark 12:27 / Matt 22:32 / Luke 20:38). The Sadducean rejection of resurrection is formulated through a test case about the successive death of seven brothers and the question of marriage and remarriage of a wife in the resurrection (Mark 12:19–22).

The casuistry in Mark 12:19–23 par. could perhaps also echo Sadducean sarcastic rejection of and indifference to Jewish resurrection belief as represented in 2 Maccabees 7, in view of parallels with the reference to seven brothers in the martyrdom story of 2 Maccabees 7 and its resurrection language (2 Macc 7:11.14.23.29). The Sadducean rejection of

¹⁷⁶ Boring, *Mark*, 337–8. Bultmann, *Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition*, 8–73 included this passage in his survey of ‘Apothegmata’ among ‘Streitgespräche’.

¹⁷⁷ Josephus, *Ant.* 20.197–200, relates the execution of James at the instigation of the priestly faction of the Sadducees, noting about the Sadducees that they “are indeed more heartless than any of the other Jews when they sit in judgement” (*Ant.* 20.199; translation from Feldman, *Josephus. Jewish Antiquities. Book XX. General Index*, 107). Cf. McLaren, “Ananus, James and Earliest Christianity,” 1–25.

resurrection belief would then serve the Sadducean political purpose to maintain the status quo against any claim of hope for afterlife springing from defense of Law-observance up to martyrdom. Josephus describes an uprising led by two Jerusalemite scribes near end of the reign of Herod I (37–4 BCE); an uprising against the power symbol of a golden eagle in the Temple precincts which signified transgression of the biblical prohibition of setting up graven images in a religious worship context to these scribes (*J.W.* 1.648–653; cf. Exod 20:4–5, Deut 5:8–9). The motivating factor for this uprising was the defense of the ‘laws of the fathers’, οἱ πατέριοι νόμοι (*J.W.* 1.649; cf. ὁ πατριος νόμος in *J.W.* 1.650 and 653),¹⁷⁸ for the sake of which the two scribes taught their followers readiness to martyrdom and belief in eternal life (*J.W.* 1.649–50). Antagonism about religio-political authority between the priestly establishment and the early Jesus-movement is also an important theme in Mark 11:27–33 par. and Acts 4:1–7.¹⁷⁹ In Jesus’ lifetime, the dispute with the Sadducees about resurrection would have carried overtones of political-religious as well as theological ideas and expectations.¹⁸⁰

The Synoptic Jesus’ reply to the Sadducees, who mentioned legal regulations of remarriage (Deut 25:5 and Gen 38:8 in Mark 12:19 par.), refers them back to the Mosaic Law, which they claimed to be the sole source of legally binding authority (Josephus, *Ant.* 13.297). The reference to ‘the book of Moses, in the passage about the thorn-bush’ (Mark 12:26 par.; citation of Exod 3:6) may be framed by the setting of this dispute, but a fundamental conviction in the milieu of the historical Jesus that God raises the dead underlied this argument.

¹⁷⁸ This reference to ‘the laws of the fathers’ could imply a Pharisaic affiliation of these two Jerusalemite scribes, since the Pharisees handed down traditions of religious law from a succession of ancestors, νόμμά τινα ἐκ πατέρων διαδοχῆς (*Ant.* 13.297).

¹⁷⁹ The authority question from the priestly establishment occurs in Mark 11:28 par. (ἐν ποίᾳ ἐξουσίᾳ ταῦτα ποιεῖς; ἢ τίς σοι ἔδωκεν τὴν ἐξουσίαν ταύτην ἵνα ταῦτα ποιῆς;), addressing Jesus, and in Acts 4:7 (ἐν ποίᾳ δυνάμει ἢ ἐν ποίᾳ ὀνόματι ἐποιήσατε τοῦτο ὑμεῖς;), addressing Peter and John. Cf. Acts 5:17–18.21.24.27.33.

¹⁸⁰ I therefore disagree with the view by France, *The Gospel of Mark*, 470 that, contrary to the Synoptic tradition about a political question of the Pharisees and Herodians for Jesus, “The Sadducees now pose a purely theological question, earthed in a specific test case”.

5.1.2. *Acts 23:6–8, Eschatological Hope, Resurrection and the Jewish Schools in Jerusalem*

Beyond the Synoptic Gospels, Acts 23:6–8 recounts the divergent views of the Pharisees and the Sadducees, whose later narrative and historical setting will not concern us here. However, historical awareness of divergent views of Palestinian Jewish schools would probably go back to the pre-70 CE period. The specification of that which the Sadducees denied merits further attention at this point. Acts 23:8 adds to Synoptic tradition represented by Mark 12:18 par. that the Sadducees ‘say that there is neither resurrection *nor (as) angel nor (as) spirit*,¹⁸¹ λέγουσιν μὴ εἶναι ἀνάστασιν μήτε ἄγγελον μήτε πνεῦμα. The interpretation of the phrase μήτε ἄγγελον μήτε πνεῦμα as an apposition to ἀνάστασις, denoting further qualification, could find support in the subsequent phrase that ‘the Pharisees admit both of them’, Φαρισαῖοι δὲ ὁμολογοῦσιν τὰ ἀμφοτέρω. ¹⁸² The conceptualization of resurrection as an angelic state is put forward in Mark 12:25 (ὡς ἄγγελοι ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς), Matthew 22:30 (ὡς ἄγγελοι ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ) and Luke 20:36 (ἰσάγγελοι καὶ υἱοὶ θεοῦ τῆς ἀναστάσεως υἱοὶ ὄντες).¹⁸³ The conceptualization of resurrection as a spiritual state could be associated with what Paul writes about spiritual body, σῶμα πνευματικόν, and life-giving spirit, πνεῦμα ζωοποιούν, in 1 Corinthians 15:44–45. Resurrection to an angelic, heavenly state has points of connection with *1 Enoch* 104:2.4.6, 108:11–12; Daniel 12:3; *Ps.Sol.* 3:12; and *4QVisions of Amram?* ar 1 II-2 12–13. Resurrection to a spiritual state could have a point of connection in *1 Enoch* 22:13

¹⁸¹ I thereby translate μήτε ἄγγελον μήτε πνεῦμα as accusatives of respect, providing further information about qualities or attributes of the noun ἀνάστασις in apposition to which they stand. Cf. Smyth, *Greek Grammar*, 360 § 1601. My translation thereby agrees with Fitzmyer, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 719, who interprets the double μήτε as “appositive to the noun *anastasin*, specifying a mode of it”, rather than with Barrett, *Introduction and Commentary on Acts XV–XXVIII*, 1065–6, who takes Acts 23:8 to express Sadducean denial of views about both final resurrection and interim state (angel, spirit). Acts 23:9 cannot be adduced as argument for an interim state, for the question ‘what if a spirit or an angel spoke to him?’ (RSV) serves as polemical retort to Sadducean denial of every form of eschatological afterlife by introducing the otherworldly dimension in present imagination.

¹⁸² BDAG, ³2000, lemma ἀμφοτέροι, distinguishes two translations, ‘both’ and ‘all’, categorizing Acts 23:8 among the latter translation, but a translation ‘all of the(m)/se (things)’ would more naturally follow from different Greek usage, such as τὰ πάντα (cf. Mark 13:4). Cf. BDR § 274.3 on τὰ ἀμφοτέρω in Acts 23:8 among other examples (Eph 2:16.18) of ἀμφοτέροι with article denoting ‘both together’.

¹⁸³ Nolland, *Luke 18:35–24:53*, 966 reckons the construction ‘son of’ in the terms ‘sons of God’ and ‘sons of the resurrection’ among “Lukan Septuagintalism”.

(in a negative context) and 103:4.¹⁸⁴ Since Acts 22:30–23:11 provides a narrative setting of deliberations in the Sanhedrin, perceptions of other Jewish groups, who did not take part in this council,¹⁸⁵ are not in view in this passage. Nevertheless, even sectarian Qumran texts include views of participation in the heavenly realm, with reference to a union with the ‘sons of the heavens,’ בני שמים, in settings of proleptic expression of afterlife belief (1QH^a XI 21–22; cf. 1QH^a XIX 12–13).

The introductory reference in Acts 23:6 to ‘hope and resurrection of the dead’ voices eschatological expectation, whose twofold expression has been considered as two ways of saying one and the same thing.¹⁸⁶ Nevertheless, the articulation of two differentiated aspects of an eschatological horizon of expectation calls for further explanation.

The interpretation of the dual references to ‘hope and resurrection of the dead,’ ἐλπίς καὶ ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν (Acts 23:6), requires further exploration of the background to the eschatologically loaded term ‘hope’ in Luke-Acts. Luke 24:21 describes the messianic hope of two men going to Emmaus that Jesus would be the one to redeem Israel. Yet we have to turn to the evidence of the book of Acts for further intertwined references to hope and resurrection. Subsequent speeches in Acts attributed to Paul in custody at Jerusalem provide indications of how hope and resurrection are intertwined as well as differentiated. Acts 24:14–15 makes the following statement which appears to claim continuity and common ground with contemporary Jewish religion:¹⁸⁷ “But this I admit to you, that according to the Way, which they call a sect, I worship the God of our fathers, believing everything laid down by the Law or written in the prophets, having a hope in God (ἐλπίδα ἔχων εἰς τὸν θεὸν) which these themselves accept, that there will be a resurrection of both the just and the unjust (ἀνάστασιν μέλλειν ἔσσεσθαι δικαίων τε καὶ ἀδίκων)” (Acts 24:14–15, RSV). Analogously with Acts 23:6, Acts 24:21 adduces the resurrection of the dead as curious reason for trial. Another

¹⁸⁴ Cf. Collins, *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 113 who distinguishes an eschatological conceptualization of ‘resurrection of the spirit’.

¹⁸⁵ Note the polemical references to Jerusalemite assemblies in the Qumran Pesharim: ‘assembly of the boastful men who are in Jerusalem,’ עדת אנשי הלצון אשר בירושלים, in 4Q162 (4QpIsa^b) II 10; and ‘the assembly of those s[seeking] slippery matters who are in Jerusalem,’ עדת ד[ורשי] החלקות אשר בירושלים, in 4Q163 (4Qpap pIsa^c) 23 II 10–11. Cf. the polemic against the Jerusalemite priesthood in the *Pesher to Habakkuk* (1QpHab).

¹⁸⁶ Barrett, *Acts XV–XXVIII*, 1063 interprets this as ‘hendiadys,’ “two propositions which were in fact one.”

¹⁸⁷ Cf. Fitzmyer, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 735.

speech includes reference to “hope in the promise made by God to our fathers (ἐλπίς τῆς εἰς τοὺς πατέρας ἡμῶν ἐπαγγελίας γενομένης ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ), to which our twelve tribes hope to attain, as they earnestly worship night and day” (Acts 26:6–7, RSV), while Acts 26:8 apologetically adds the question: “Why is it thought incredible by any of you that God raises the dead (ὁ θεὸς νεκροὺς ἐγείρει)?” (RSV). The context of narrated events in these passages is decades later (possibly 57–61 CE)¹⁸⁸ and the context of composition of the book of Acts, ca. 80–85 CE,¹⁸⁹ is many decades later than the time of Jesus’ ministry. Nevertheless, apart from the application of hope to Jesus’ resurrection in gospel proclamation, the eschatological expectations voiced in the above quoted statements probably can be traced back to earlier times, including the time of Jesus’ ministry. Contextual evidence of Second Temple Jewish literature corroborates this idea.

Contextual evidence of 2 Maccabees and 4Q521 also attests to the combination of hope in God, with the expectation of the raising of the dead. 2 Maccabees relates the prospect of hope provided by God to be raised again by him, τὰς ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ προσδοκᾶν ἐλπίδας πάλιν ἀναστήσεσθαι ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ (2 Macc 7:14). 4Q521 2 ii + 4 repeatedly stresses the encountering by ‘those who hope’, הַמְיֹחֵלִים (ll. 4, 9), of God who is further characterized through marvelous deeds as the one who ‘will make the dead live’, יַחַי מֵתִים (l. 12). The specification of a resurrection for the righteous as well as the unrighteous in Acts 24:15 has points of analogy in Daniel 12:2–3, 1 Enoch 51:1–22, L.A.B. 3.10, and possibly 4Q521 7 5–8 + 5 ii 7–13.¹⁹⁰ In view of the reference to hope for the ‘twelve tribes’, τὸ δωδεκάφυλον ἡμῶν, through divine promises in Acts 26:6–7, the dimension of hope could reflect a hope of resurrection in a setting of restoration theology in missionary Christian Judaism. The promise to be attained by the twelve tribes seems to coincide with forgiveness of sins, sanctification and light, envisaged in Acts 26:18.23, as broader setting to resurrection belief.¹⁹¹ While the Christian missionary setting turning to the Gentiles is related to later decades, the perspective of light for the people (Acts 26:23) represents a continuum with early

¹⁸⁸ Cf. Murphy-O’Connor, *Paul. A Critical Life*, 31.

¹⁸⁹ See e.g. Fitzmyer, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 51–55 at 54.

¹⁹⁰ Cf. Fitzmyer, *ibidem*, 736 with reference to Daniel 12:2–3 as a belief “developed further in Judaism in the intervening centuries”.

¹⁹¹ The promises which the twelve tribes of Israel are said to hope to attain, ἐλπίζει κατατηῆσαι, in Acts 26:7 point forward to a future dimension.

Jesus-tradition (cf. Matt 4:16, Luke 1:79). With regard to resurrection and restoration theology, the evidence of 4QPseudo-Ezekiel^b provides a general and indirect point of analogy.

5.1.3. *Mark 9:9–13, Resurrection and the Scribal View of the Coming of Elijah*

Apart from viewpoints of Jewish schools with regard to afterlife, in particular resurrection of the dead, the Synoptic tradition in Mark 9:9–13 and Matthew 17:9–13 relates a Jewish viewpoint attributed to the scribes that ‘Elijah must first come’ (Mark 9:11 / Matt 17:10) in connection with the subject of resurrection. In this passage, Jesus’ disciples come up with this scribal viewpoint in order to ascertain what Jesus’ reference to individual ‘resurrection from the dead,’ τὸ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστῆναι, would mean (Mark 9:10), as compared to traditional Jewish eschatological expectations about resurrection.¹⁹² The narrative setting serves a later reader-oriented purpose of presupposing the resurrection of Jesus (Mark 9:9 / Matt 17:9).¹⁹³ However, the horizon of eschatological expectation connected with the figure of Elijah can be traced back to Jewish tradition current at the time of Jesus’ ministry.

Since we already surveyed the evidence of eschatological expectation connected with the prophet Elijah in Malachi 3:23–24, Sirach 48:10, *Sib.Or.* 2.187–189, 4Q558 1 II 4, and *m.Sot.* 9.15 (cf. chapter three, sections 2.3 and 3.2.3), suffice it here to stipulate the dimension of restoration. The saying of Jesus in Mark 9:12 / Matthew 17:11 that ‘Elijah does come first to restore all things’ (ἀποκαθιστάνει πάντα, Mark 9:12; ἀποκαταστήσει πάντα, Matt 17:11) presupposes a notion of restoration which could echo its signification as reconciliation in Malachi 3:23 (ἀποκαταστήσει).¹⁹⁴ Sirach 48:10 adds to Elijah’s role ‘to turn the heart of the father to the son,’ echoing Mal 3:23, the objective ‘to restore the tribes of Jacob,’ καταστήσαι φυλὰς Ἰακώβ (RSV).¹⁹⁵ However, neither

¹⁹² Cf. France, *The Gospel of Mark*, 357; Boring, *Mark*, 262.

¹⁹³ Fowler, *Let the Reader Understand*, 86: “readers must realize, consciously or unconsciously, that they are reading at a time after the resurrection”.

¹⁹⁴ LXX Mal 3:23 ὅς ἀποκαταστήσει καρδίαν πατρὸς πρὸς υἱὸν καὶ καρδίαν ἀνθρώπου πρὸς τὸν πλησίον αὐτοῦ.

¹⁹⁵ Sir 48:10a, “you who are ready at the appointed time, it is written, to calm the wrath of God before it breaks out in fury” (RSV), could be an interpretation of the last part of Mal 3:23, “lest I come and smite the land with a curse” (RSV).

passage mentions resurrection, and it is at this point that comparison with Qumran evidence merits further attention.

The Qumran 'Messianic Apocalypse' (4Q521) includes a fragment 2, of which the third column, following the second column with its reference to God's 'anointed one' and God's raising of the dead (4Q521 2 ii + 4; section 3.2 above), includes a phrase whose echo of Malachi 3:24 was first analysed by É. Puech and followed by several other scholars.¹⁹⁶ This phrase, נכוֹן באים אבות על בנים, 'it is su[re:] The fathers will return towards the sons' (4Q521 2 III 2),¹⁹⁷ could thereby put the expectation of resurrection in 4Q521 2 II 12 in a perspective of prophetic restoration theology. This impression may be further corroborated by the prophetically inspired perspective in 4Q521 2 ii + 4 with its echoes of passages from Isaiah. While the figure of Elijah is not explicitly mentioned in 4Q521, the relation between restoration theology and final resurrection on the one hand and Elijah's eschatological role remains diffuse. If the interrelation between restoration, Elijah's coming, and final resurrection had been self-evident, perhaps the Markan and Matthean passages would not have presented it as scribal exegetical argument. Nevertheless, 4Q521 provides important contextual information to this Synoptic Jesus-tradition in that it presupposes a horizon of eschatological expectation in terms of prophetic-type restoration and final resurrection.¹⁹⁸

As compared to contemporary Jewish eschatological expectation, the typology of Elijah and the Son of man in Mark 9:12b-13 and Matthew 17:12-13 gives these passages its different christological direction. In Mark 9:12b-13, Jesus compares the coming of Elijah in the perfect tense, to whom 'they did whatever they pleased' (RSV), with the suffering and treatment with contempt of the Son of man. The Marcan typological comparison seems to follow from diffuse expectations about Jesus, including identification with Elijah, related in Mark 6:15 and 8:28 (cf. section 5.1.4 below). The Matthean typology compares and differentiates the fates of

¹⁹⁶ Puech, *La croyance des Esséniens en la vie future*. 2, 644-5. Cf. Collins, *The Scepter and the Star*, 120; Xeravits, *King, Priest, Prophet*, 105; Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte aus Qumran*, 367.

¹⁹⁷ Text from Puech, *DJD* 25, 18; translation from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*. 2, 1045.

¹⁹⁸ Belief in resurrection inscribed on prophetic restoration theology also occurs in 4QPseudo-Ezekiel^b, as we have seen (section 3.1.2 above), but the type of restoration in this composition focuses on gathering together, return to the land, and salvation for a remnant rather than on reconciliation, as in Mal 3:23. This evidence is thereby of less direct relevance for traditio-historical comparison with Mark 9:9-13 and Matt 17:9-13.

the eschatological Elijah-figure and the Son of man, explicitly identifying the Elijah-figure with John the Baptist: “Then the disciples understood that he was speaking to them of John the Baptist”, τότε συνῆκαν οἱ μαθηταὶ ὅτι περὶ Ἰωάννου τοῦ βαπτιστοῦ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς (Matt 17:13, RSV).¹⁹⁹ The Matthean formulation probably denotes later memorization and interpretation of sayings of Jesus,²⁰⁰ in view of the conviction in emerging Christianity that John was the prophetic precursor to Jesus, thereby informed by sayings of Jesus in Q 7:24–26 designating John as a ‘prophet, and more than a prophet’. Resurrection and the coming of Elijah have received an inaugurated eschatological significance in early Jesus-tradition.

5.1.4. *Mark 6:14–16 par. and 8:27–28 par., Popular Beliefs according to Synoptic Tradition*

The Synoptic Gospels and Acts not only relate viewpoints of Palestinian Jewish schools and scribes vis-à-vis eschatological resurrection, but also mention popular beliefs surrounding John the Baptist and Jesus during Jesus’ lifetime. The Synoptic perspective on popular beliefs includes the notion of resurrection. Mark 6:14–16 (/ Matt 14:1–2, Luke 9:7–9) relates such popular beliefs at a point when Jesus’ name as leader of an influential movement of religious renewal through preaching of repentance, exorcism of unclean spirits and healing miracles (cf. Mark 6:12–13) had become known to Herod Antipas:

6:14 King Herod heard of it; for Jesus’ name had become known. Some said, “John the baptizer has been raised from the dead (ἐγήγερται ἐκ νεκρῶν); that is why these powers are at work in him.” 15 But others said, “It is Elijah.” And others said, “It is a prophet, like one of the prophets of old.” 16 But when Herod heard of it he said, “John, whom I beheaded, has been raised (ἠγέρθη).” (Mark 6:14–16, RSV)

¹⁹⁹ Hagner, *Matthew 14–28*, 499. Cf. France, *The Gospel of Mark*, 358 who also emphasizes the difference between the Marcan and Matthean versions, but yet deems this identification implicit in Mark, in view of passages like Mark 1:14, 6:14–15.16–29, 8:28.

²⁰⁰ It is also only in Matthew that the identification of John with Elijah who is to come is attributed to Jesus: “and if you are willing to accept it, he is Elijah who is to come” (Matt 11:14); perhaps having overtones of reader-oriented commentary. Matt 11:14, like Matt 17:13, has no parallel in the other Synoptic Gospels. Cf. Fleddermann, *Q: A Reconstruction and Commentary*, 782 on Matthean redactional activity in Matt 11:14.

The beliefs voiced in Mark 6:14–15 intersect with eschatological expectations, if only in view of Jesus as *Elijah redivivus* (Mark 6:15). The belief of powers at work in Jesus (ἐνεργοῦσιν αἱ δυνάμεις ἐν αὐτῷ, Mark 6:14) caused by John's resurrection from the dead could be interpreted as resurrection to a spiritual state and spiritual power coming to the aid of Jesus' ministry, in view of the conceptualization of 'powers at work in him'.²⁰¹ This notion of resurrection as post-mortem powers at work appears to imply a popular belief in proleptic divine torment of the executor of John,²⁰² anticipating on retribution at the final judgement. An outspoken notion of retribution occurs in Josephus, who relates that "to some of the Jews the destruction of Herod's army seemed to be divine vengeance, and certainly a just vengeance, for his treatment of John, surnamed the Baptist" (*Ant.* 18.116).²⁰³

The present passage in Mark 6:14–15 further focuses on beliefs as applied to Jesus and the powers at work in him. According to the Synoptic tradition in Mark 6:14,²⁰⁴ these powers were not an isolated cause of belief,²⁰⁵ but connected with the belief in resurrection, John's resurrection from the dead. Perhaps the correlation between resurrection and miraculous powers has a general point of analogy in the Qumran 'Messianic Apocalypse', which mentions the raising of the dead among God's marvellous acts, נִבְדוּת (4Q521 2 ii + 4 11–12), and refers to the renewing of the faithful with his strength, בַּכְחוֹ (4Q521 2 ii + 4 6).

²⁰¹ Cf. France, *The Gospel of Mark*, 253 who mentions analogous imagery "of the transfer of the 'spirit of Elijah' to his companion Elisha (2 Ki 2:15)"; Boring, *Mark*, 177 and 192–6 at 195, who includes the word δύναιμις as a term for miracle in his excursus on miracle stories in Mark, arguing that the miracles serve a proleptic purpose to anticipate on the resurrection as "inbreaking of the eschaton".

²⁰² Cf. France, *The Gospel of Mark*, 254: "John's 'reappearance' is a threat to him personally, coming back to haunt his guilty conscience".

²⁰³ Translation from Feldman, *Josephus. Jewish Antiquities. Books XVIII–XIX*, 81, observes that "in general, this famous passage, §§ 116–199, on the murder of John the Baptist has been accepted as authentic" (81 n. b). Cf. analogous evidence for a correlation between martyrological death and retribution/theodicy in 2 Macc 7:33–38 at vv. 37–38 (appeal for divine mercy and end to wrath) and 8:1–5 at v. 5 (turn from divine wrath to divine mercy).

²⁰⁴ Matthew 14:2, αὐτὸς ἠγέρθη ἀπὸ τῶν νεκρῶν καὶ διὰ τοῦτο αἱ δυνάμεις ἐνεργοῦσιν ἐν αὐτῷ, has a similar text as compared to Mark 6:14, but attributes it not to popular belief, but to Herod Antipas himself speaking to his children. Luke 9:7–8 only records rumours of the three beliefs (John's resurrection, Elijah's appearance, rise of one of the old prophets), without relating the part on powers at work in Jesus.

²⁰⁵ Note the unbelief in 'mighty works', αἱ δυνάμεις τοιαῦται (Mark 6:2), in Mark 6:1–6.

Reference to popular beliefs recurs in the narrative sequence of Mark at the point when Jesus asks his disciples, ‘who do people say that I am?’ (Mark 8:27). The varying answers, ranging between John the Baptist, Elijah, and one of the prophets, are reminiscent of the previous passage, Mark 6:14–16, even though the conclusion to this pericope (Mark 8:27–30) is Jesus’ messianic identification by Peter and the charge to silence. One other passage, Acts 3:17–26, could provide indications of how popular beliefs in a risen eschatological prophetic figure intersected with Scripture, in particular Deuteronomy 18:15.18–19 (Acts 3:22–23). This passage is further part of *4QTestimonia* (4Q175) whose arrangement (Deut 5:28–29, Deut 18:18–19, Num 24:15–17, Deut 33:8–11, Josh 6:26) also has ‘eschatological overtones.’²⁰⁶

5.1.5. *Q 7:18–23, Expectation of the One Who is to Come and the Raising of the Dead*

In the narrative about Jesus’ ministry, the Sayings Source Q relates the raising of the dead among other manifestations as Jesus’ answer to a question of John the Baptist whether Jesus is “the one who is to come, or shall we look for another?” σὸ εἶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἢ ἄλλον προσδοκῶμεν; (Q 7:19). The question of John has been interpreted as the Baptizer’s inquiry whether Jesus is indeed the one to whom John’s preaching aimed to point forward, according to Q/Luke 3:16: “he who is mightier than I is coming, the thong of whose sandals I am not worthy to untie, he will baptize you with the Holy Spirit and with fire” (RSV).²⁰⁷ The question of John is therefore an eschatologically loaded question, and it may be expected that the answer also takes up eschatological expectations.²⁰⁸ The raising of the dead, mentioned in Q 7:22, would indeed be part of such expectations.

²⁰⁶ Xeravits, *King, Priest, Prophet*, 58; cf. Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte aus Qumran*, 428–36; Fitzmyer, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 289; Barrett, *Acts I–XIV*, 208.

²⁰⁷ Fleddermann, *Q: A Reconstruction and Commentary*, 375. Cf. e.g. Hagner, *Matthew 1–13*, 300; Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, 295.

²⁰⁸ Fleddermann, *Q: A Reconstruction and Commentary*, 377 has argued about Q 7:22 that “all six clauses that summarize Jesus’ ministry refer to eschatological signs. Jesus as the Coming One fulfils the OT hopes of end-time salvation”. In my opinion, the setting of John’s question and the inclusion of the raising of the dead in Q 7:22 point to an eschatological orientation, while the individual activities mentioned in Q 7:22 intersect with a sliding scale from prophetically inspired perspectives to eschatological expectations.

For the sake of further discussion, the passage in its Lucan as well as Matthean settings will be quoted below. Starting with the Lucan version, Luke 7:18–23 follows after a passage which narrates Jesus' raising of a widow's dead son at Nain (Luke 7:11–17). Reported popular reactions to this miracle are couched in terms of awe, glorification of God, and the spread of Jesus' name throughout Judaea and beyond, accompanied by sayings that 'A great prophet has arisen among us!', προφήτης μέγας ἠγέρθη ἐν ἡμῖν, and 'God has visited his people!', ἐπεσκέψατο ὁ θεὸς τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ (Luke 7:16–17, RSV). These sayings imply a sense of eschatological fulfillment of expectations of prophecy. In Luke 1:67–79, Zechariah's prophecy about John as 'prophet of the Most High' and precursor preparing the Lord's ways (Luke 1:76) includes references to divine visitation and redemption of Israel (ἐπεσκέψατο, Luke 1:68; ἐπισκέψεται, Luke 1:78). Jesus' acclaim as a great prophet through whom God visits his people probably responded to a horizon of expectation about eschatological fulfillment of prophecy already voiced in Luke 1:67–79.

At this point, Luke 7:18–23 recounts John's question and Jesus' response:

7:18 The disciples of John told him of all these things. 19 And John, calling to him two of his disciples, sent them to the Lord, saying, 'Are you he who is to come, or shall we look for another?' 20 And when the men had come to him, they said, 'John the Baptist has sent us to you, saying, 'Are you he who is to come, or shall we look for another?'" 21 In that hour he cured many of diseases and plagues and evil spirits, and on many that were blind he bestowed sight. 22 And he answered them, 'Go and tell John what you have seen and heard: the blind receive sight, the lame walk, lepers are cleansed, and the deaf hear, the dead are raised up, the poor have good news preached to them. 23 And blessed is he who takes no offense at me.' (Luke 7:18–23, RSV)

In the Lucan version, the question of John thereby appears to follow up prior expectations about John's precursor activity (Luke 1:68.17) on the one hand and John's prospect of an eschatological protagonist who 'will baptize you with the Holy Spirit and with fire' (Luke 3:16, RSV) on the other. In John's question, these expectations and anxieties or concerns about a turning point of rejection ('or shall we look for another?', cf. Luke 7:29–34) directly address Jesus, in view of the name which had spread about him.

The Matthean version is much more terse, but the wording of the question of John as well as of Jesus' answer is similar to that in Luke:

11:2 Now when John heard in prison about the deeds of the Christ (τὰ ἔργα τοῦ Χριστοῦ), he sent word by his disciples 3 and said to him, ‘Are you he who is to come, or shall we look for another?’ 4 And Jesus answered them, ‘Go and tell John what you hear and see: 5 the blind receive their sight and the lame walk, lepers are cleansed and the deaf hear, and the dead are raised up, and the poor have good news preached to them. 6 And blessed is he who takes no offense at me.’ (Matthew 11:2–6, RSV)

The Matthean version makes the messianic setting of expectation more explicit through the mention of τὰ ἔργα τοῦ Χριστοῦ (Matt 11:2), sometimes translated as ‘the works of the Messiah.’²⁰⁹ The Matthean version is preceded by an extensive account of Jesus’ commissioning and instruction of the twelve (Matt 10:1–11:1), including instruction of the following activities accompanying the message that ‘the kingdom of heaven is near’ (Matt 10:7): “Heal the sick, raise the dead, cleanse lepers, cast out demons”, ἀσθενοῦντας θεραπεύετε, νεκροὺς ἐγείρετε, λεπροὺς καθαρῖζετε, δαιμόνια ἐκβάλλετε (Matt 10:8). According to the Matthean version, therefore, the ‘deeds of the Christ’ appear to be carried out not only by Jesus himself but also, in part at least, by the twelve commissioned by Jesus. This impression is confirmed by intersections between Matthew 10:8 (νεκροὺς ἐγείρετε, λεπροὺς καθαρῖζετε) and Matthew 11:5 (λεπροὶ καθαρῖζονται... νεκροὶ ἐγείρονται).

The six clauses τυφλοὶ ἀναβλέπουσιν, χωλοὶ περιπατοῦσιν, λεπροὶ καθαρῖζονται καὶ κωφοὶ ἀκούουσιν, νεκροὶ ἐγείρονται, πτωχοὶ εὐαγγελίζονται, in Q 7:22 have been intertextually related to LXX Isaiah 61:1 (/ LXX Isa 29:18), Isaiah 35:6, 4 Kingdoms (MT 2 Kgs) 5:10.12–14, Isaiah 35:5b, Isaiah 26:19, and Isaiah 61:1 respectively in previous scholarship.²¹⁰ The fact that beginning and end of this sequence of acts can be related to Isaiah 61:1 may signify that the list constitutes a sort of *inclusio*, a concentric structuring of clauses between two parts from the same scriptural verse. Perhaps this feature was important in oral memorization and literary transmission of early Jesus-tradition, in addition to the

²⁰⁹ Hagner, *Matthew 1–13*, 300. The translation of ὁ Χριστός as ‘the Messiah’, rather than as personal name, could find support in its usage with the article, perhaps comparable to usage in Matthew 16:16.20; yet the capital letter X in Matthew 11:2 also implies christological overtones to the term in emerging Christianity.

²¹⁰ Fleddermann, *Q: A Reconstruction and Commentary*, 376–7 at 377 argues that “all of the six clauses except the third derive from the Septuagintal text of Isaiah”; cf. Hagner, *Matthew 1–13*, 301. Brooke, “Shared Intertextual Interpretations,” 80–2 and n. 33 discerns a main influence from Isaiah 35:5 and 61:1 in Luke 7:22 // Matthew 11:5, and ‘secondary Isaianic influences’ from Isaiah 26:19, 29:18–19, 42:7.18.

oral and aural dimensions stipulated in Q 7:22 (“Go and tell John what you have seen and heard,” RSV).²¹¹

The above sequence of six clauses in Q 7:22 intersects in significant respects with 4Q521 2 ii + 4 8 and 12, as noted in several previous scholarly discussions (cf. note 124 above). The similar sequence of the clauses **יבשר ענוים יחיה ומתים יחיה** in 4Q521 2 ii + 4, as compared to Q 7:22, point to a broader horizon of prophetically inspired messianic expectation. It could be that an overlap in terms and verbal equivalents is that which interconnects MT Psalm 146:7–8 (**יהוה מתיר אסורים יהוה פקח עורים**) and MT Isa 61:1 (**לקרא לשבויים דרוור ולאסורים פקח-קוח**) in 4Q521 2 ii 4 8 and 12. The ‘opening of the eyes’ is one translation that may render **פקח-קוח**,²¹² while release of people from a state of imprisonment, **אסורים**, occurs in both MT Ps 146:7–8 and MT Isa 61:1.

Ps 146 in 11QPs^a II refers to the Lord’s ‘mighty works’²¹³ as part of additional material between verses 9 and 10 of Psalm 146 that is not attested in MT Ps 146 nor in LXX Ps 145. The plus material in 11QPs^a yields ‘mighty works’ as notion of divine engagement with humanity and may thereby constitute an additional point of connection between Psalm 146 and Isaiah 61:1 whose catchword association is already presupposed in 4Q521. This notion of God’s ‘mighty works’ is also relevant for the Q passage about expectation with regard to ‘the one who is to come’, in particular in its Lucan context. Luke 7:11–17 has related popular reactions of great prophecy and divine visitation to Jesus’ raising of a widow’s dead son at Nain. In Q 7:18–23 Jesus answers messianic expectation in terms of mighty works of which some are also associated with praise of God for his help in Psalm 146 and with prophetically anointed proclamation of good tidings in Isaiah 61:1.

Contrary to the imperfect tenses in 4Q521 2 ii + 4 12 (**ומתים יחיה יבשר ענוים**), the formulation in Q 7:22 (**νεκροὶ ἐγείρονται, πτωχοὶ εὐαγγελίζονται**) is proleptic, presented as a present reality. This proleptic

²¹¹ Cf. Byrskog, *Story as History—History as Story*, 103 on the communication between John and Jesus in Q 7:18–23: “to convey the message of their identity required... visual as well as aural means”; cf. 160–5 on memory and memorization, including visual memory.

²¹² See lemma **פקח-קוח** in KBL. Qumran witnesses to the biblical text of Isa 61:1 (1QIsa^a XLIX 26–27; 1QIsa^b XIII; 4QIsa^b frg. 40; 4QIsa^m frgs. 1–3) do not preserve significant variants to this part of MT Isa 61:1.

²¹³ Abegg, Flint, and Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible*, 556 translate this additional material between vss. 9 and 10 of Ps 146 in 11QPs^a as follows: “[Let] all the earth [fear] the Lord, [let all the inhabitants of the earth revere] hi[m]!... in his being known through all his works (which) he created [...] his mighty works”.

formulation corresponds to the gospel message that the Kingdom of God is near (Mark 1:15; Matt 3:2, 10:7; Luke 10:9.11; cf. Luke 17:20–21).

5.2. *Jesus' Resurrection in the Kerygma of the Early Jesus-Movement*

5.2.1. *Witnesses to Jesus' Resurrection*

Central to the Gospel tradition and to the Pauline Letters is the proclamation of Jesus' resurrection from the dead.²¹⁴ Witnesses to Jesus' resurrection are voiced not only in canonical New Testament writings (Mark 16; Matt 28; Luke 24; John 20–21; 1 Cor 15:3–8), but also in extra-canonical texts (e.g. *Gospel of Peter*; *Apocryphon of James* (NHC I,2)).²¹⁵ The *Gospel of Thomas* implies Jesus' crucifixion (*G.Th.*55) and its *incipit*, which introduces 'hidden words spoken by the *living* Jesus', may presuppose a belief in a continuum between the earthly Jesus and the risen Jesus.²¹⁶ The canonical texts are usually dated earliest and their accounts of Jesus' suffering, death and resurrection have a more elaborate narrative setting in first-century CE Palestinian Judaism,²¹⁷ as compared to the extra-canonical New Testament writings. Therefore, my survey focuses on the canonical New Testament writings.

²¹⁴ Most New Testament scholarship on resurrection concentrates on Jesus' resurrection. See e.g. Alsup, *The Post-Resurrection Appearance Stories*; Perkins, *Resurrection*; Lüdemann, *Die Auferstehung Jesu*; Wright, *The Resurrection of the Son of God*; Bieringer, Koperski and Lataire (eds.), *Resurrection in the New Testament*.

²¹⁵ Perkins, *Resurrection*, 331–90 at 338–48 and 356–62 who includes 'apocryphal Gospels' and 'Gnostic Revelation Dialogues' among his survey of second-century CE Christian debates and beliefs about Jesus' resurrection. Cf. the recent survey of 'Gospels about Jesus' Death and Resurrection' (*Gos.Pet.*, *Gos.Nic.*, *Gos.Bart.*), of 'Dialogues with the Risen Jesus' (*Soph. Jes. Chr.* (NHC III, 4), *Ep.Apos.*, *Gos. Mary*, *Ap. John*), and of 'Non-Localized Dialogues with Jesus' (*Thom.Cont.* (NHC II, 7), *Dial.Sav.* (NHC III, 5)), by Klauck, *Apocryphal Gospels*, 82–104 and 145–91.

²¹⁶ *G.Th.* logion 55 includes a reference to Jesus' taking up of the cross and to an expected 'imitatio Christi'; cf. Mark 8:34 / Matt 16:24 / Luke 9:23. The reference to the 'living Jesus' (Ἰη(σοῦ)ς ὁ ζῶν in *P.Oxy.* 654.1–3a) could have an analogy with Luke 24:5 (τί ζητεῖτε τὸν ζῶντα μετὰ τῶν νεκρῶν;), Acts 1:3 (παρέστησεν ἑαυτὸν ζῶντα); note that in the *incipit* to *Thomas* ὁ ζῶν stands in apposition to Jesus, not to the hidden words.

²¹⁷ See e.g. the canonical Gospel accounts of rites of burial (Mark 16:1, Luke 24:1, John 19:39–40) and references to appearances of the risen Jesus in Galilee (Mark 16:7, Matt 28:10.16–20, John 21:1), the region also associated with the beginnings of Jesus' ministry (Luke 24:6–7, Acts 10:37).

It is often argued that the Gospel narratives about Jesus' resurrection go back to secondary post-Easter re-telling of the story of eyewitnesses of Jesus' resurrection.²¹⁸ While the point of re-telling in later post-Easter situations is important for traditio-historical study, it would be erroneous to draw a contrast between narrative accounts of the Gospels in terms of re-invention of Jesus-tradition and prior oral tradition with historical reflection and memorization.²¹⁹ Recent studies also stress points of continuity rather than dichotomy between pre- and post-Easter gospel tradition. For instance, H.J. de Jonge characterised post-Easter gospel proclamation as "continuation of the positive response which the historical Jesus had inspired among his followers before his death."²²⁰ Recent emphasis on points of continuity between early tradition and written forms of re-telling could also be related to new perspectives on orality and oral tradition. W. Kelber perceived the written Gospel as a 'counterform' to oral speech and as transit from "oral fluidity to textual stability", but a recent study by S. Byrskog criticized this presupposition of a "sharp dichotomy between orality and literacy."²²¹ Byrskog advocates a view of oral history that accentuates living dimensions of interaction between oral accounts and written texts, including gospel narratives about Jesus' resurrection.²²² The point of interaction and interrelationship between

²¹⁸ Conzelmann and Lindemann, *Arbeitsbuch*, 522–5 ("Oster' als Urdatum der Kirche") at 522 consider resurrection and Easter accounts in the Gospels and Acts as "spätere erzählende Darstellungen des Glaubens, daß Jesus lebt und daß er als der Auferstandene die Kirche stiftete", contrary to early tradition in 1 Cor 15:3–5 and Luke 24:34; Lüdemann, *Die Auferstehung Jesu*, 153, 169, 208. With regard to the Synoptic Gospel texts at large, 'displaced' appearance stories were identified in Luke 5:1–11; Mark 4:35–41, 6:45–52, and 9:2–8 by Alsup, *The Post-Resurrection Appearance Stories*, 139–44 and in Mark 6:45–52, 9:2–8; Matt 14:28–31, 16:17–19; Luke 5:1–11 by Lüdemann, *Die Auferstehung Jesu*, 45.

²¹⁹ See e.g. Kelber, *The Oral and the Written Gospel*; new introduction, 1997, 210: "early and radical reconceptualizations via the written medium are likely to occur in response to external circumstances".

²²⁰ De Jonge, "Visionary Experience and the Historical Origins of Christianity," 35–53 at 53, after having argued that Gospel passages about Jesus' disciples presuppose their continuing "faith in the value of Jesus' preaching" (52).

²²¹ Kelber, *The Oral and the Written Gospel*, 207–11; Byrskog, *Story as History—History as Story*, 128–9.

²²² Byrskog, *Story as History—History as Story*, 129–31 ("Narrative as Oral Communication in Textualized Form") at 130 conceives of Gospels as "stories reflective of an oral mind-set", and 133–5 ("A True Sense of Pastness' and the Resurrection Belief") emphasizes the possibility of reading gospel narratives as interpreted and actualized versions of Jesus-tradition rather than post-Easter faith "opposed to a sensitivity to the past" (134).

oral and written tradition has also been made by T.C. Mournet with regard to the Synoptic tradition and Q.²²³

New Testament writings comprise individual and collective visions of witness accounts that range from angelophany at Jesus' empty tomb, to Christophany at the tomb, to visions of the risen Jesus in a missionary setting of apostolic commission led by Peter. The account of angelophany to Mary Magdalene and other women at their discovery of Jesus' empty tomb makes part of canonical as well as extra-canonical Gospels (Mark 16:1–8; Matt 28:1–8; Luke 24:1–11; John 20:1–2.11–12; *Gos. Pet.* (PCair 10759) 50–57). The omission of any reference to the empty tomb tradition in 1 Cor 15:3–5 could perhaps be explained from the fact that Paul's delivering "as of first importance what I also received" has its setting in the emphasis on apostolic commission that may go back to Paul's contacts with Peter in the first place about gospel mission (Gal 1:18, 2:7). It is also Peter's vision that Paul mentions in the first place in 1 Cor 15:5.²²⁴ John 20:11–18 relates the appearance of the risen Jesus to Mary Magdalene at the tomb (cf. Mark 16:9). Pre-Pauline kerygma and Lucan evidence attest to visions of the risen Jesus in a missionary setting of apostolic commission of the twelve, starting with the appearance to Peter (1 Cor 15:5; Luke 24:33–34; cf. Mark 16:7 and John 20:24–25a). Previous scholarship has intensively engaged in the study of tradition and redaction in Gospel accounts of witnesses to Jesus' resurrection, usually distinguishing between early kerygmatic formulations in 1 Cor 15:3–5 and Luke 24:34,²²⁵ empty tomb traditions, and post-

²²³ Mournet, *Oral Tradition and Literary Dependency*, 100–49 ("Oral Communication and Written Texts") at 111: "we must be careful to avoid oversimplifying the problem by juxtaposing orality against literacy in an antithetical manner, or as has been done in the past, by using one in contradistinction to the other", thereby referring to the study of W. Kelber (111 n. 27).

²²⁴ It could be asked whether the former persecutor of the church would have had first-hand acquaintance of the accounts of all post-resurrection witnesses, in view of the relative distance to the 'churches of Christ in Judaea' related by Paul in Gal 1:22–24. Other explanations for the absence of empty tomb tradition in 1 Cor 15:3–5 have emphasised accommodation of a 'placeless' kerygmatic formula to churches in the Diaspora (Perkins, *Resurrection*, 93–4) and implicit correlation between Paul's message of physical resurrection and the tradition of the empty tomb (Lüdemann, *Die Auferstehung Jesu*, 67–9).

²²⁵ Alsup, *The Post-Resurrection Appearance Stories*, 55–63 and 267 identifies a relationship between appearance story and kerygma in Luke 24:34 "at the redactional level"; Perkins, *Resurrection*, 84, 88; Lüdemann, *Die Auferstehung Jesu*, 41–2. Recently, De Jonge, "Visionary Experience and the Historical Origins of Christianity," 41 n. 19 has argued that one has to reckon with the possibility that Luke 24:34 could be dependent on 1 Cor 15:5. Lüdemann, *Die Auferstehung Jesu*, 42–4 further includes Mark 16:9–20, the

resurrection appearance traditions in different redactional frameworks of the evangelists.

Comparative traditio-historical study could put the conceptualization of visionary experiences in historical relief. Contexts of Jewish tradition about theophany and eschatological beliefs about resurrection as part of theodicy through restoration, vindication, and judgement have been drawn into comparative discussion in previous scholarship.²²⁶ Comparison with the Dead Sea Scrolls may illuminate an additional issue common to canonical and extra-canonical Gospel traditions about the empty tomb: angelophany.

Angelophany is part and parcel of the empty tomb traditions. Luke 24:23 summarily mentions the witness of women among the early Jesus-movement who found an empty tomb and attested to 'a vision of angels,' ὄπτασία ἀγγέλων, "who said that Jesus was alive" (RSV).²²⁷ The angelic visions in the Gospel accounts of Jesus' resurrection vary between references to one angelic messenger (Mark 16:5, Matt 28:2–3) and to two angelic figures (Luke 24:4, 23, John 20:12; cf. Acts 1:10).²²⁸ The Greek Akhmim fragment of the *Gospel of Peter* includes references to two angelic figures who accompanied Jesus out of the tomb and reaching to heaven (*Gos.Pet.* 39–40) and to one angelic figure who communicated

secondary ending of Mark, among 'early kerygmatic formulations' about appearances, but this is disputable in view of its brief treatment of post-resurrection appearances and apostolic commission that are partly paralleled by more extensive passages mainly in Luke and John; cf. e.g. France, *The Gospel of Mark*, 686.

²²⁶ See e.g. Alsup, *The Post-Resurrection Appearance Stories*, 239–63; Perkins, *Resurrection*, 47–56; Wright, *The Resurrection of the Son of God*, 129–206. Setzer, *Resurrection of the Body*, 21–52 ("Resurrection in Early Judaism") recently argued that resurrection belief also served a purpose of "self-definition and social control within the community" (52), thereby mainly referring to Pharisees and rabbis. Yet this historical interpretation of resurrection belief as a function of communal identity construction does not sufficiently take into account evidence of resurrection belief across boundaries of community, not being restricted to Pharisaic-rabbinic tradition, but also occurring in several corpora of other early Jewish literature, including Qumran texts. An exclusive focus on community construction could further run the risk of reducing the study of a belief to the study of a social function.

²²⁷ Note that Paul also refers to 'visions and revelations of the Lord,' ὄπτασῆαι καὶ ἀποκαλύψεις κυρίου (2 Cor 12:1), but in a setting of much separation in time with regard to the related Easter experiences.

²²⁸ Nicklas, "Angels in Early Christian Narratives on the Resurrection of Jesus," 293–311 at 301–3 discusses an explanation by J. Rius-Camps and J. Read-Heimerdinger for references to two angelic figures in Luke 24:4 and Acts 1:10 as supposedly connected with the transfiguration, but observes striking differences between transfiguration and ascension scenes and lack of explicit connection.

the message of Jesus' resurrection to the women (*Gos.Pet.* 55–56).²²⁹ The angelic presence is visualized in terms of a figure or figures with a shining garment, στολή λευκή (Mark 16:5),²³⁰ a garment white as snow, τὸ ἔνδυμα αὐτοῦ λευκὸν ὡς χιῶν (Matt 28:2–3), with clothing gleaming like lightning, ἐν ἐσθῆτι ἀστραπτύσει (Luke 24:4), in white, (John 20:12), and with a brightly shining garment, στολή λαμπροτάτη (*Gos.Pet.* 55).²³¹ The common feature in these varying accounts of angelophany consists in the fact that they identify angelic presence with an apparel of shining brilliance that implies light.²³²

The angelophany surrounding the witness to Jesus' resurrection may be further contextualized in view of eschatological beliefs about angels and the destiny of life after death that may be deduced from the Dead Sea Scrolls. Relatively little attention has been paid to Qumran evidence in this comparative discussion about angels and resurrection.²³³ The apparel of shining brilliance, associated with light, recurring throughout all above-mentioned accounts of angelophany could give expression to visionary experience that the messenger symbolized the message, the belief that Jesus did not remain in the shadows of death but had risen to life in a heavenly exalted state associated with the realm of light (cf. Acts 2:32–33, 26:18).

4Q*Visions of Amram* provides contextual evidence of contemporary belief that the eschatological destiny of a righteous, wise, and truthful

²²⁹ Textual witnesses to the *Gos.Pet.* are PCair 10759, POxy 2949, POxy 4009, PViindob G 2325. Current and recent editions of *Gos.Pet.* are by Mara, *Évangile de Pierre*; Lührmann, *Fragmente apokryph gewordener Evangelien*, 84–93; Kraus and Nicklas (eds.), *Das Petrus-evangelium und die Petrusapokalypse*, 32–53. For discussion of the empty tomb tradition in the *Gospel of Peter*, cf. Verheyden, “Silent Witnesses,” 457–82.

²³⁰ The anthropomorphic picture in Mark 16:5 does not exclude transcendent/angelic identification, in view of the symbolism of a ‘white garment’ in the Marcan transfiguration story (Mark 9:2–8 at 3, “and his clothes became very shining white, such as no cloth refiner on earth could make them white”). Cf. Beasley-Murray, *John*, 374 who cites a statement by J. Blank that “shining white garments are the symbol of the heavenly world”. On the twofold meaning of λευκός, denoting ‘bright, shining, gleaming’ on the one hand and ‘white’ on the other, see BDAG, ³2000, 593.

²³¹ Lührmann, *Fragmente apokryph gewordener Evangelien*, 91.

²³² Cf. the association of white garments with light, φῶς, in Matt 17:2.

²³³ Flusser, “Resurrection and Angels in Rabbinic Judaism, Early Christianity, and Qumran,” 568–72 refers to 1QS XI and the ‘Self-Glorification Hymn’ (4Q471b 1–3 // 4Q427 7 I + 9 // 1QH^a XXVI top) as contextual evidence for Synoptic passages on Jesus’ reply to the Sadducees that resurrection should be conceived not in earthly terms but as an angelic state; Nicklas, “Angels in Early Christian Narratives on the Resurrection of Jesus,” 293–311 includes comparative discussion of Old Testament, apocrypha, pseudepigrapha, and Josephus into his essay, but does not refer to the Dead Sea Scrolls.

way of life will be light, thereby making those who lead this life ‘sons of light’, whereas foolish, deceitful and evil life is considered to lead to darkness, death, and destruction, making those who lead a wicked life ‘sons of darkness’ (4Q548 1; cf. section 3.1.1 above). 4Q548 1 12–13 attributes to each wise and truthful person brightness, נְהִיר, that belongs to the realm of light. The same composition envisions the spheres of influence of two otherworldly beings with respective clothing, מַלְבוּשׁ, of darkness and brightness that surround the life of human beings, בְּנֵי אָדָם (4Q543 6 // 4Q544 1 10–14 and 2).²³⁴ The apparel of angelic beings in terms of darkness and brightness runs parallel to the realms of light and darkness associated with eschatological destiny.

In light of contemporary beliefs about eschatological destiny and angelic beings, the common feature of shining brilliance in gospel accounts of angelophany may give expression to the fundamental conviction among witnesses of a heavenly message that Jesus had not been abandoned to death (cf. Acts 2:31), but belongs to the realm of light. The accounts of visionary experiences of an angelic message about Jesus’ resurrection emphasise the identification of Jesus with the heavenly realm of light.

5.2.2. *Heavenly and Earthly Dimensions to Jesus’ Resurrection*

Visionary accounts of Jesus’ post-resurrection appearances in the New Testament include transcendent features.²³⁵ In the Lucan passage about two who were on the road to Emmaus (Luke 24:13–35), the two do not immediately recognize Jesus who converses with them (Luke 24:15–16). Once Jesus has broken the bread with them, they recognize him, but then he vanishes out of their sight (Luke 24:31). Luke 24:36–37 attributes to followers of Jesus gathered in Jerusalem a state of being frightened and the supposition that they saw a spirit (πνεῦμα) as first reaction to the appearance of the risen Jesus among them. According to John 20:14, Mary Magdalene does not immediately recognize the risen Jesus,

²³⁴ The extant fragments of 4Q544 1 10–14 and 2 only preserve reference to dark clothing, but it may be inferred from the contrast between rule over darkness and rule over all that is bright in fragment 2 (ll. 5–6) that clothing of darkness also implies a contrast with clothing of light.

²³⁵ Cf. Bockmuehl, “Resurrection,” 109 on New Testament resurrection narratives as a “deliberate constellation of blatantly ‘material’ with ‘spiritual’ and transcendental aspects”.

while John 20:19 and 20:26 imply that the risen Jesus appeared to the disciples in a room with locked doors.²³⁶

Three of the four canonical Gospels express the idea that the realization of Jesus' resurrection did not immediately occur as belief to all of the earliest disciples.²³⁷ Mark and Luke include references to initial unbelief among disciples who hear from heavenly messages about the resurrection of Jesus at an empty tomb (Mark 16:11.13–14; Luke 24:11.24) until the risen Jesus appears to the disciples themselves (Mark 16:14; Luke 24:36–53). John 20 narrates that the realization of Jesus' resurrection dawns on Jesus' earliest followers once they have seen him,²³⁸ while John 21:4.14 implies a sense of revelation of the risen Jesus who is not immediately recognized by his disciples.

The evidence of visionary accounts suggests both earthly and heavenly dimensions to Jesus' resurrection and several New Testament passages presuppose the heavenly elevation of Jesus through his resurrection and ascension (1 Thess 1:10; Acts 1:6–11; John 20:17).

The New Testament accounts of Jesus' suffering of a violent death and his heavenly exaltation after resurrection have been connected with a traditio-historical background in Jewish martyrological tradition in previous scholarship. U. Kellermann identified a martyrological tradition of 'individual transcendental-heavenly resurrection' in 2 Macc 7:9.11.30–38 that influenced subsequent strands of thought about resurrection, including the early Christian kerygma about Jesus' resurrection.²³⁹

²³⁶ Cf. e.g. Beasley-Murray, *John*, 378 who comments on John 20:19 that the revelation of the risen Jesus as Lord is described in a way that surpasses comprehension; Perkins, *Resurrection*, 177 observes that John 20:19 expresses the miraculous character of the risen Jesus's appearance to the disciples.

²³⁷ Only Matthew is different in this respect, in that it focuses on the immediate connection between the earliest message of Jesus' resurrection, his appearance, and worship, προσεκύνησαν (Matt 28:9. 17), while only mentioning doubt among some (Matt 28:17), not unbelief. Hagner, *Matthew 14–28*, 885 interprets this doubt as uncertainty about the significance of Jesus' appearance, to which Matt 28:18–20 then provides an answer.

²³⁸ Cf. the statements 'I have seen the Lord', *ἑώρακα τὸν κύριον*, by Mary Magdalene in John 20:18 and 'we have seen the Lord', *ἑώρακαμεν τὸν κύριον*, by eleven disciples in John 20:24–25.

²³⁹ Kellermann, *Auferstanden in den Himmel*, 94–142 at 109–42 on the 'Nachgeschichte' of 2 Macc 7 in early Judaism and emerging Christianity.

Subsequent New Testament studies by H.J. de Jonge²⁴⁰ and J. Holleman²⁴¹ have accepted Kellermann's thesis of a traditio-historical connection of New Testament accounts of Jesus' resurrection and heavenly ascension with Jewish martyrological tradition. This traditio-historical analysis puts New Testament accounts of Jesus' individual resurrection and vindication in light of martyr-theology and thereby rightly distinguishes it from the contemporary belief in collective eschatological resurrection.

This traditio-historical argument highlights an important point of intersection, but it may also be derived from early gospel mission that the expression of belief in Jesus' resurrection had a messianic orientation. Jesus was more than a martyr, rather their teacher and Messiah for his earliest followers (Mark 8:27–29 par.). The belief in the vindication of Jesus' violent death through his resurrection and ascension to heaven probably intersected with language of martyr-theology. Yet resurrection belief about Jesus also goes beyond martyr-theology, in that it includes the idea that the risen Jesus is 'exalted at the right hand of God', τῆ δεξιᾷ τοῦ θεοῦ ὑψωθεὶς (Acts 2:33).²⁴² It may be derived from messianic exegesis of Psalm 110:1 in Mark 12:35–37a par. and the answer of Jesus to the question whether he is the Messiah (Mark 14:61–62 par.) that the idea of Jesus' seat "at the right hand of God" has a messianic orientation. The idea of Jesus' post-resurrection exaltation 'at the right hand of God' also has a messianic orientation and is part of early Christian kerygma about Jesus' resurrection.

Martyr-theology and Messianic orientation are not paralleled in Qumran texts on afterlife and resurrection, but Qumran evidence does include a belief in heavenly exaltation as eschatological destiny for the 'sons of light'. That is, *4QVisions of Amram?* ar 1 12–13 envisages that the sons of light "will go to the light (לְנֵהוֹרָא)".

Early Christian visions of the risen Jesus identified his heavenly exaltation as surrounded by light. The repeated narration of Paul's calling

²⁴⁰ De Jonge, "De opstanding van Jezus. De joodse traditie achter een christelijke belijdenis," 47–61 further mentions a pattern of contrast in Acts between Jesus' violent death and his divine vindication through resurrection, and makes a comparison with in early Christian martyrdom texts.

²⁴¹ Holleman, *Resurrection and Parousia*, 14–5 applies the ideas of U. Kellermann and H.J. de Jonge about the origin of belief in Jesus' resurrection in martyr-theology to the interpretation in 1 Cor 15:20–23 that connects Jesus' heavenly resurrection with the belief that Jesus' messianic ministry inaugurated the eschaton.

²⁴² This part of 'individual transcendental-heavenly resurrection' belief about Jesus, his seat "at the right hand of God", is not paralleled in 2 Macc 7.

by the risen Jesus on the road to Damascus in the book of Acts consistently phrases this calling as surrounded by visual terms of bright light from heaven (Acts 9:3–6, 22:6–11, 26:13–15). Paul associates the face of Christ with “the light of the knowledge of God’s glory” (2 Cor 4:6). In his First Letter to the Thessalonians, the apostle further addresses his original readers as ‘sons of light’ and ‘sons of the day’, not of the night or of darkness, in the expectation of the second coming of the risen Jesus (1 Thess 5:5). *4QVisions of Amram*?²⁴³ provides a point of analogy with regard to the correlation between eschatological destiny and sonship of light in 1 Thess 5:5, albeit eschatological destiny determined by salvation through Jesus Christ in the Pauline passage.

5.3. Resurrection of the Dead in Pauline Theology: 1 Corinthians 15

The belief in Jesus’ resurrection is at the basis of Paul’s theology, as his statements about gospel mission throughout his Letters (1 Thess 1:9–10; 1 Cor 6:14, 15:1–11; Gal 1:1; 2 Cor 4:13–14; Rom 1:4; Phil 3:10) attest. This section does not aim to provide a comprehensive discussion of this intensively researched subject, in particular with regard to 1 Corinthians 15,²⁴³ nor to cover all resurrection terminology in Paul’s Letters.²⁴⁴ 1 Corinthians 15 is Paul’s most elaborate exposition on resurrection of the dead that reacts to those deny resurrection in face of the preaching of Christ as raised from the dead (1 Cor 15:12). This section will thereby explore where comparative study with a view to the Qumran evidence may contribute to the study of 1 Corinthians 15 as a representative core

²⁴³ See e.g. De Boer, *The Defeat of Death*, 39–91 and 93–140 on apocalyptic Jewish backgrounds to Pauline notions in 1 Cor 15 of a messianic interregnum, apocalyptic dualism of cosmological forces underlying life and death; Lüdemann, *Die Auferstehung Jesu*, engages intensively into redaction-critical and traditio-historical discussion of 1 Corinthians 15:1–11 (50–141) at the outset of his ‘Einzelanalysen’ (50–208); Holleman, *Resurrection and Parousia*, 1–31 and 35–48 with a survey of history of research about 1 Cor 15, further bibliography, and focus on 1 Cor 15:20–23.

²⁴⁴ For a survey of resurrection in Paul’s Letters, see e.g. Koperski, “Resurrection Terminology in Paul,” 265–81 who identifies ‘christological soteriology’ as key concept in Paul’s theology as reflected by Pauline resurrection terminology. Note, however, that theocentric accents are also part of Paul’s resurrection terminology, in e.g. 2 Cor 1:9–10 in which Paul relates hope of deliverance to “God who raises the dead”, ὁ θεὸς ὁ ἐγείρων τοὺς νεκρούς. For the phrase ζῶν ἐκ νεκρῶν in Rom 11:15 as allusion to resurrection, cf. Hogeterp, “A Re-Reading of Romans 11:25–32 in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 653–66 at 661–2.

example of Pauline thought about Jesus' resurrection in an eschatological perspective.

Paul's exposition on resurrection of the dead addressing a Hellenistic audience whose reception of Paul's gospel included sincere doubts about the conceivability of physical resurrection (1 Cor 15:12-35).²⁴⁵ It has been argued in previous scholarship that Paul, in order to come to terms with doubts about bodily resurrection in a Greek mindset, also adapted his exposition to Greek terms.²⁴⁶ Nevertheless, as it will be argued below, Paul's terms about bodily resurrection should not exclusively be read in comparison with Greek and Hellenistic Jewish usage, as though they were compartmentalized from Hebraic anthropology.²⁴⁷ Since the anthropological and cosmological terms with regard to resurrection occur mainly in 1 Cor 15:35-50, my comparative exploration with a view to Qumran literature will turn to this part of Paul's exposition.

In sections leading up to the anthropological conceptualization of resurrection (1 Cor 15:35-50), Paul has gone into presuppositions of faith in the risen Christ (1 Cor 15:12-19), Christ's resurrection in eschatological perspective (1 Cor 15:20-28), and moral-theological considerations (1 Cor 15:29-34) as grounds for accepting resurrection as fundamental part of the gospel of Christ. Having defended the conceivability of resurrection of the dead as essential to faith in Christ, the apostle sets out to explain how bodily resurrection may be conceived in 1 Cor 15:35-50.

In 1 Cor 15:35-41, Paul turns to imagery of earthly and celestial bodies to illustrate bodily resurrection. This imagery serves as analogy for the resurrection of the dead that is conceptualized as transition from a perishable physical body to an imperishable spiritual body (1 Cor 15:42-44). Paul not only explains bodily resurrection with reference to cosmological imagery, but also with reference to an Adam-Christ

²⁴⁵ See recently Arzt-Grabner *et al.*, *1. Korinter*, 472-4 on the Greek dualism between body and soul, individual rather than collective eschatological interests in Greek beliefs about immortality, and Greek beliefs about appearances of spirits of the dead in light of Greek magical papyri, with reference to Betz, "Zum Problem der Auferstehung Jesu im Lichte der griechischen magischen Papyri," 230-61. Cf. Zeller, "Erscheinungen Verstorbener im griechisch-römischen Bereich," 1-19.

²⁴⁶ See Martin, *The Corinthian Body*, 104-36 at 129 on "The Resurrected Body" in 1 Cor 15 in relation to Graeco-Roman physiological and cosmological views: "Far from rejecting the physiological and cosmological hierarchy of his disputants, Paul assumes it".

²⁴⁷ Cf. Dunn, *The Theology of Paul the Apostle*, 76-8 on backgrounds of Pauline terms ψυχή and πνεῦμα in Hebraic anthropological usage of נפש and רוח.

typology, which he evokes in 1 Cor 15:22 and elaborates in 1 Cor 15:45–49.²⁴⁸ As part of the Adam-Christ typology, Paul juxtaposes the first human being as a living being, ψυχὴ ζῶσα (1 Cor 15:45),²⁴⁹ and a human from earth, ἄνθρωπος ἐκ γῆς χοϊκός (1 Cor 15:47), to the last human being as a life-giving spirit, πνεῦμα ζωοποιούν (1 Cor 15:45), and a human from heaven, ἄνθρωπος ἐξ οὐρανοῦ (1 Cor 15:47).

The anthropological terms of body and spirit and the cosmological terms of heaven and earth in 1 Cor 15:35–50 have been interpreted against divergent backgrounds. M.C. de Boer analysed the anthropological terminology of bodily resurrection in 1 Cor 15:35–58 against the background of Jewish apocalyptic eschatology.²⁵⁰ G. Lüdemann interpreted 1 Cor 15:35–49 as Pauline answer to questions and doubts about bodily resurrection in Jewish apocalyptic terms that are remote from Hellenistic epiphany thought.²⁵¹ According to the analysis of J. Barr, Pauline anthropological terms in 1 Cor 15, in particular the term σῶμα, reflect the apostle's distance from the Hebrew Bible and instead relate to Hellenistic Jewish usage in view of parallels with Wisdom, Sirach, and Maccabees.²⁵² D.B. Martin has interpreted the apostle's terms of bodily resurrection in light of Graeco-Roman views of astral souls and celestial bodies, thereby analyzing 1 Cor 15 as Pauline accommodation between "Jewish scripture and Greek rhetorical commonplaces, between Jewish apocalyptic and Greco-Roman popular philosophical topoi".²⁵³ Points of correspondence with Graeco-Roman commonplaces may constitute a relevant background to Paul's general analogies in 1 Cor 15:35–41, but subsequent imagery in 1 Cor 15:42–50 returns to the application of ideas of embodiment to resurrection of the dead. In view of divergent analyses of 1 Cor 15 against backgrounds of Hebraic anthropology and bibli-

²⁴⁸ Cf. the Adam-Christ typology in Rom 5:12–21 that includes reference to the end of the reign of the death the beginning of the reign to eternal life through Jesus Christ, but omits resurrection terminology.

²⁴⁹ The Greek in 1 Cor 15:45, ἐγένετο ὁ πρῶτος ἄνθρωπος Ἀδὰμ εἰς ψυχὴν ζῶσαν, corresponds closely with LXX Gen 2:7.

²⁵⁰ De Boer, *The Defeat of Death*, 39–91 surveys the evidence of Isa 24–27, Dan 12, 2 Maccabees, 1 *Enoch*, Wisdom of Solomon, *Psalms of Solomon*, *Jubilees*, *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, 1QS, 1QH, CD, 4 *Ezra*, L.A.B., and 2 *Baruch*, while interpreting 1 Cor 15:23–28.35–58 in terms of "Paul's considerable indebtedness to Jewish cosmological apocalyptic eschatology" (93–140 at 132).

²⁵¹ Lüdemann, *Die Auferstehung Jesu*, 52 conceives of the controversy in Corinth about resurrection as a clash of Jewish and Hellenistic modes of thought.

²⁵² Barr, "Immortality and Resurrection: Conflict or Complementarity?," 94–116 at 112–3.

²⁵³ Martin, *The Corinthian Body*, 133.

cal tradition, apocalyptic eschatology and Graeco-Roman philosophy, it amounts to oversimplification to relate Pauline distinctions between physical and spiritual, earthly and heavenly exclusively to a background of Hellenistic Greek thought.

The evidence of the Dead Sea Scrolls may further illuminate the anthropological and cosmological dimensions to resurrection of the dead in 1 Cor 15:42–50, on the basis of two comparative texts: the *Damascus Document* and *4QInstruction*. The fragments of the *Damascus Document* from Qumran cave 4 include a notion of corporeality that distinguishes a ‘spirit of life’, רוּחַ הַחַיִּים, and flesh, הַבָּשָׂר (4QD^d 7 8 // 4QD^s 1 I 7–8 // 4QpapD^h 4 II 3–4).²⁵⁴ These fragments further include designations like ‘living flesh’, הַבָּשָׂר הַחַי, and ‘living skin’, עוֹר הַחַי (4QD^d 7 11–12 // 4QD^s 1 I 10–11 // 4QpapD^h 4 II 7), but the substantive reference to life, הַחַיִּים, only occurs in direct connection with spirit. The close anthropological connection between spirit and life in these fragments thereby provides a Hebraic background to Pauline thought that differentiates earthly, physical terms of perishable flesh from the life-giving realm of the spirit.

The second Qumran text, *4QInstruction*, includes future-oriented imagery of reward and inheritance that may be relevant for comparison with Pauline language of ‘those who are of heaven’ (1 Cor 15:48), the ‘image of the human being of heaven’ (1 Cor 15:49) and resurrection in terms of ‘inheritance’ (1 Cor 15: 50). The Hebrew passage of *4QInstruction*^c (4Q417) 2 I 13–18 // *4QInstruction*^d (4Q418) 43,44,45 I 10–14 and its translation are quoted below.²⁵⁵

4Q417 2 I 13–18

13b ואז תדע בכבוד ע[ולם ע]ם רזי פלאו וגבורות מעשיו ואתה
 14 מבין רוש פעלתכה בזכרון ה[...כ]י בא חרות חוק[כה] וחוקק כול הפקודה
 15 כי חרות מחוקק לאל על כול ע[...]. בני שית וספר זכרון כתוב לפניו
 16 לשמרי דברו והואה חזון ההגי וספר זכרון וינחילה לאנוש עם^ע רוח כיא
 17 כתבנית קדושים יצרו ועיד לוא נתן הגוי לרוח בשר כי לא ידע בין
 18a [טו]ב לרע כמשפט [ר]וחו

13b And then you will know et[ernal] glory [wi]th his wonderful mysteries and his mighty deeds. And you, 14 understanding one, inherit your

²⁵⁴ Only 4QD^a 6 I 12–13 lacks reference to הַבָּשָׂר.

²⁵⁵ Ed.pr. Strugnell and Harrington, *DJD* 34. Text and translation of 4Q417 2 I 13–18, of which the extant text that is more extensive than that of 4Q418 43,44,45 I 10–14, are from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*. 2, 858–9, except where otherwise indicated.

reward in the remembrance of the [...] for it comes. Engraved is /the/ {your} portion, and ordained is all the punishment, 15 for engraved is that which is ordained by God against all the... [...] of] the sons of Seth, and a book of remembrance is written in his presence 16 for those who keep his word. And this is the vision of meditation and a book of remembrance. And he will give it as an inheritance to *humankind*²⁵⁶ together with a spiritual /people/, f[o]r 17 according to the *image*²⁵⁷ of the holy ones is his fashioning, but he did not give meditation (as) a witness to the spirit of flesh, for it does not know the difference between 18a [goo]d and evil according to the judgement of its [sp]irit.

The passage relates knowledge of eternal glory conditionally to a blameless way of life in deeds together with proper understanding of and continuous attention for divine wisdom (4Q417 2 I 8–13 // 4Q418 43,44,45 I 5–9). Knowledge of eternal glory, כבוד עולם, includes an eschatological dimension.

The passage elaborates an eschatologically oriented perspective on reward, פעלה, and punishment, פקודה. 4QInstruction first exhorts the addressee(s) as understanding one to inherit one's reward in remembrance, רוש פעלתכה בזכרון (4Q417 2 I 14 // 4Q418 43,44,45 I 10–11), probably a reward in remembrance of the way of life according to revealed divine wisdom in understanding and deeds, as the context of the passage suggests. The passage envisions each one's portion, חוק, as ordained. 4QInstruction warns about predestined divine punishment, הפקודה, of all the sons of Seth²⁵⁸ (4Q417 2 I 14–15), possibly on account

²⁵⁶ The cursive word is my translation of אנוש, which differs from the translation 'Enosh' that is adopted by Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination*, 87; García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*, 2, 859; Strugnell and Harrington, *DJD* 34, 165. Goff, *Discerning Wisdom*, 34–5 considers both translations of אנוש, as referring to the biblical patriarch Enosh and as humankind or Adam, possible, but favours the translation 'Adam' in view of a possible allusion to Gen 1:27 in 4Q417 2 I 17–18, already noted by Collins, "In the Likeness of the Holy Ones," 609–19 at 613, 615. For my translation of אנוש as humankind, see my arguments in the main text.

²⁵⁷ תבנית can be translated as 'pattern', 'image', or 'model' according to KBL. García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*, 2, 859 translate 'pattern'. My translation 'image' follows the visual language in this passage of vision and divine predestination, while אדם תבנית in 1QM X 14 further provides a parallel for the translation of תבנית as 'image' (cf. García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*, 1, 131).

²⁵⁸ The reference to the 'sons of Seth', בני שית, in 4Q417 2 I 15 // 4Q418 43,44,45 12 could be a proverbial negative designation of human beings as each other's enemies and as hostile to God's word, as in Num 24:17 quoted in 1QM XI 6 and 4Q175 13 and as in a hostile sense in CD-A VII 20–21 // 4QD^a 3 III 21–22.

of all their evil deeds, עולות,²⁵⁹ on the one hand. On the other hand, those who keep God's word are given a place in the heavenly book of remembrance, ספר זכרון (4Q417 2 I 15–16 // 4Q418 43,44,45 I 12).²⁶⁰ Since the passage has framed the eschatological inheritance of reward in terms of exhortation (4Q417 2 I 14 // 4Q418 43,44,45 I 10–11), the notion of inheritance remains conditional and general in the following lines (4Q417 2 I 16–18).

According to 4Q417 2 I 16 // 4Q418 43,44,45 I 13, God gives the inheritance of a reward in heavenly remembrance to humankind, אנוש, which is 'as a spiritual people', עם עם רוח, or 'with spirit' (that is spirited), עם רוח.²⁶¹ According to 4Q417 2 I 17–18 // 4Q418 43,44,45 I 13–14, the vision of meditation, let alone heavenly remembrance, is not given as witness to the 'spirit of flesh', רוח בשר, that knows no distinction between good and evil. In my view, this general juxtaposition between spirit and spirit of flesh justifies the translation of אנוש as humankind, while a translation presupposing the biblical figure Enosh (Gen 5:6–7) does not find support in a further described role of this patriarch in the composition *4QInstruction*. Comparison with the usage of אנוש in other Qumran texts demonstrates that אנוש may represent a verbal equivalent to אדם. 1QS III 17 uses the term אנוש to designate humankind as created by God (1QS III 17),²⁶² while 4Q413 (*4QComposition concerning Divine Providence*) 1–2 1–2 intertwines references to "ways of man", דרכי אנוש, in apposition to "works of the sons of m[an]", פועלות בני אד[ם].

4QInstruction surrounds the idea that those with spirit receive the inheritance of eschatological reward with a predestinarian sense that their fashioning, יצרו, is 'according to the image of the holy ones',

²⁵⁹ A conjectural reading עולות could perhaps fill in the lacuna in the extant fragment 4Q417 2 I 15, transcribed as [...]ע by García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*, 2, 858. For the plural עולות, cf. e.g. MT Ps 58:3, 64:7.

²⁶⁰ The notion of heavenly record-keeping of those who keep God's word in a 'book of remembrance' before God is probably derived from prophetic tradition, as attested in Mal 3:16–18 (also in 4Q253a (4QcommMal) 1 I 1–5), but the general notion of heavenly record-keeping also makes part of apocalyptic tradition (cf. e.g. Dan 12:1; 1 *Enoch* 103:1–4, 104:1).

²⁶¹ The reading depends on whether עם עם is correct or a dittography, erroneous doubling of the word עם.

²⁶² Note that 4Q417 2 I 8–11 also presupposes a general context of divine knowledge addressing 'every creature', כול מעשה, to walk in the purpose of the understanding of the foundation of truth that is communicated by the God of knowledge through the 'mystery of existence', רז נהיה.

כתבנית קדושים. The term קדושים appears to denote one among several designations in *4QInstruction* for angelic, celestial beings (cf. קדושים in 4Q418 81 11–12; מלאכי קודש בשמים in 4Q418 55 8; בני שמים in 4Q418 69 II 12–13).

The term ‘holy ones,’ קדושים, in 4Q417 2 I 17 // 4Q418 43,44,45 I 13 is also interpreted in a celestial, angelic sense in several recent studies.²⁶³ Analogously, angelic or heavenly beings are described as ‘spiritual creatures,’ מעשי רוח, and ‘holy ones,’ קדושים, in the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* (4Q400 1 I 5 and 17).

The passage in *4QInstruction* which we have discussed above has comparative relevance for a number of features in Pauline language of anthropological and cosmological exposition on bodily resurrection. First, *4QInstruction* juxtaposes a pre-ordained inheritance of reward for humankind with spirit to the denial of heavenly witness to the ‘spirit of the flesh’ which knows no distinction between good and evil. Analogously, Paul attributes resurrection to the realm of the spiritual (1 Cor 15:46) and conceives of bodily resurrection as a ‘spiritual body,’ while emphasizing that “flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God” (1 Cor 15:50). In Pauline thought, spiritual (πνευματικός) discernment that comes from God further stands in contrast to worldly spirit and fleshly (σαρκικός) behaviour (1 Cor 2:9–3:3). Both the above-mentioned passage in *4QInstruction* and Pauline thought in 1 Cor 15 presuppose a spiritual condition for eschatologically oriented inheritance.

Second, *4QInstruction* presupposes that those who will receive the eschatological inheritance from God are fashioned according to the celestial ‘image of the holy ones,’ כתבנית קדושים. Paul’s imagery in 1 Cor 15:45–49 in terms of an Adam-Christ typology is first of all Christologically oriented. Nevertheless, Paul’s language draws on celestial imagery that may have a point of analogy with our passage in *4QInstruction*. Paul associates participation in bodily resurrection as a state of ‘those who are of heaven,’ οἱ ἐπουράνιοι (1 Cor 15:48), and of future bearing of ‘the image of the heavenly one,’ ἡ εἰκὼν τοῦ ἐπουρανίου (1 Cor 15:49). The future orientation of this Pauline language serves to conceptualize the eschatological belief of the bodily resurrection. *4QInstruction* gives a predestinarian sense of fashioning of those with the spirit ‘according

²⁶³ See e.g. Wold, *Women, Men, and Angels*, 149–56; Goff, *Discerning Wisdom*, 34–5 thereby referring to a possible allusion to Gen 1:27 and taking אלהים in an angelic sense.

to the image of the holy ones,' but the passage at large also presupposes a pre-ordained eschatological perspective of reward and punishment. *4QInstruction* and 1 Cor 15 share a tradition of thought that identifies the eschatological fate of those who are of the spirit with the image of the heavenly realm.

6. POST-70 CE NEW TESTAMENT TEXTS AND PRE-70 CE TRADITIONS ON RESURRECTION

This section discusses select passages whose evidence is more peculiar to distinct post-70 CE New Testament texts than to broadly shared strata of Jesus-tradition. A broader survey of eschatology in New Testament writings has been provided in the preceding chapter three. This section focuses on passages with particular relevance for comparative discussion with the Dead Sea Scrolls and with possible connections to pre-70 CE tradition.

6.1. *Matthew 27:51b–53*

Matthew 27:51b–53 relates events that bystanders of Jesus' death reportedly believed to have witnessed and that led a centurion and his men to attribute divine sonship to Jesus (Matt 27:54 / Mark 15:39; cf. Luke 19:47).²⁶⁴ The reportedly witnessed events surrounding Jesus' death are described in Matthew 27:51b–53 as follows:

27:51b and the earth shook, and the rocks were split; 52 the tombs also were opened, and many bodies of the saints who had fallen asleep were raised (ἠγέρθησαν), 53 and coming out of the tombs after his resurrection (μετὰ τὴν ἔγερσιν αὐτοῦ) they went into the holy city and appeared (ἐνεφανίσθησαν) to many (Matt 27:51b–53, RSV).

This Matthean description points forward to Jesus' resurrection from the dead in several respects, by anticipating on his resurrection (ἔγερσις, Matt 27:53) in terms related to the angelic message that Jesus had been raised (ἠγέρθη, Matt 28:6–7) and by envisioning Jesus' death and resurrection as an earth-shaking event (Matt 27:51b, 28:2). According to

²⁶⁴ Cf. Acts 10 that narrates the conversion of a named centurion, Cornelius, and his household by Peter.

Matthew 27:53, it is Jesus' resurrection that signals the appearance of many risen holy ones in Jerusalem.

The collective setting of the opening of graves and the appearance of a multitude of saints to many in Matthew 27:52–53 has been related to a traditio-historical background in Ezekiel 37:12 in previous scholarship.²⁶⁵ However, Ezekiel 37:12 speaks in metaphorical language about prophecy of return to the land of Israel. The Qumran text *4QPseudo-Ezekiel* includes the idea of reward for the piety of “many (men) from Israel who have loved your Name and have walked in the ways of your heart” (4Q385 2 2–3 // 4Q386 1 I 1–2; cf. section 3.1.2 above) and envisions Ezekielian prophecy of Israel's restoration in an apocalyptic setting of resurrection. 4Q385 2 8–9 // 4Q386 1 I 9–10 reads as follows: “Prophecy over the four winds of the sky and the winds of the sky will blow upon them and they will live (וַיְחַיֶּינָם) and a large crowd of people will rise (וַיַּעֲמֵד) and bless YHWH Sebaoth who caused them to live (חַיֵּים)”.²⁶⁶

Matthew 27:51b–53 describes a collective setting of bodily resurrection of many holy persons that appeared to many in Jerusalem after Jesus' resurrection. This collective setting echoes an apocalyptic belief of collective resurrection for the pious as conceptualized in *4QPseudo-Ezekiel*. In the Matthean narrative, the centrality of Jerusalem in this appearance tradition, rather than Galilee for instance (cf. Mark 14:28, 16:7), relates to the hour of Jesus' death at the cross near Jerusalem. The Matthean tradition of the appearance of risen holy ones to many in Jerusalem could further have a theological background in contemporary Jewish traditions that presuppose the centrality of Jerusalem in consolation from mourning (4Q176 (*4QTanhûmîm*), 4Q434a (*4QGrace after Meals*); cf. section 3.3.1 above).

The interrelation between Jesus' resurrection and the appearance of many risen holy persons that Matthew 27:51b–53 presupposes a belief that Jesus' life, death, and resurrection inaugurated a new age. The belief in Jesus' resurrection is couched in language of eschatological events, including a collective setting of resurrection.²⁶⁷ This passage belongs to Matthean special tradition, but it proleptically designates that which was

²⁶⁵ See e.g. Perkins, *Resurrection*, 125; cf. Hagner, *Matthew 14–28*, 851 on Matt 27:51b–53 as “a piece of realized and historicized apocalyptic depending on OT motifs found in such passages as Isa 26:19; Dan 12:2; and especially Ezek 37:12–14”.

²⁶⁶ Translation from Garcia Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*. 2, 769 and 775.

²⁶⁷ Cf. Perkins, *Resurrection*, 125 on Matt 27:51b–53 as “proleptic resurrection of the righteous at the hour of the crucifixion”; Denaux, “Matthew's Story of Jesus' Burial

also believed to accompany Jesus' second coming in pre-70 CE Christianity. Paul writes in 1 Thessalonians 4:14: "For since we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so, through Jesus, God will bring with him those who have fallen asleep" (RSV). Since the subsequent verse, 1 Thess 4:15, speaks of the coming of the Lord, it stands to reason that 'with him', σὺν αὐτῷ, in 1 Thess 4:14 presupposes the resurrection of the dead with the second coming of Jesus. This idea also finds expression in 1 Cor 15:23.

6.2. *John 5:19–30*

The previous chapter three, section 8.2.4, highlighted comparative aspects of soteriology in John 5:19–30 and the *Damascus Document*. John 5:19–30 further comprises resurrection terminology that has a theocentric orientation as starting point (John 5:21) and is specified as 'resurrection to life' or 'resurrection of judgement' according to good or evil deeds (John 5:29). Apart from scriptural backgrounds,²⁶⁸ the Dead Sea Scrolls provide important comparative evidence with regard to the Johannine resurrection terminology in this passage.

The statement in John 5:21 that God the Father "raises the dead and brings them to life", ὁ πατήρ ἐγείρει τοὺς νεκροὺς καὶ ζῳοποιεῖ, renders resurrection as divine attribute in the present tense. Analogously, 4Q521 7 + 5 II 6 renders the idea of resurrection to life in the present tense as 'he who gives life [rais]es the dead of his people', יקי[ם] המחייה את מתי עמו, albeit with specific reference to God's people.

Resurrection to life for those who have done good (John 5:29a) has a point of analogy in the lines preceding 4Q521 7 + 5 II 6 that contrast the fate of all "who do the good before the Lor[d]", העושים את הטוב [י] לפני אדני (4Q521 7 + 5 II 4), to that of the accursed who "shall b[e] for death" (4Q521 7 + 5 II 5). Resurrection of judgement for those who have done evil (John 5:29b) has a point of analogy in the judgemental sense of 'acts of justice of the Lord', צדקות אדני, mentioned in 4Q521 7 +

and Resurrection (Mt 27,57–28,20)," 123–45 at 133–4 on Matt 27:51b–53 as Matthean understanding of Jesus' resurrection as a soteriological and eschatological event.

²⁶⁸ Frey, *Die johanneische Eschatologie*. 3, 356, 357 and n. 136, 358–60 refers to Deut 32:39 and LXX 1 Kgdms 2:6; LXX 3 Kgdms 5:7, 2 Macc 7:22 ff., 4 Macc 18:19, Wis 16:13, Tobit 13:2; Isa 26:19, Dan 12:2.4.9.13, while further mentioning rabbinic evidence of תחיית המתים. Frey briefly mentions 4Q521 2 II 1 and 12 on p. 359 in footnotes 150 and 152 without further elaborating on the comparison with Johannine terms.

5 II 7. The twofold sense of resurrection to life and to judgement in John 5:29 thereby not only echoes scriptural tradition, but also has a pre-70 CE Palestinian Jewish background, as attested in 4Q521.

7. SUMMARY AND EVALUATION

This chapter has integrated discussion of biblical, parabiblical, and non-biblical Qumran evidence into the traditio-historical picture of development of resurrection belief and into comparative study with regard to emerging Christianity. An evaluation can now be made of the significance that Qumran evidence has in the four domains for renewed study mentioned at the outset (section 1.1 above): the development of belief in resurrection from the starting-point of biblical tradition, Palestinian-Jewish tradition history, Qumran cave 4 recensions of longer known texts, and comparative study with regard to the New Testament.

7.1. *Qumran Evidence of Resurrection and Biblical Tradition*

Daniel 12:1–4 has traditionally been adduced as primary biblical evidence for the eschatological belief in collective resurrection. The language of Daniel stands at the receiving end of both prior prophetic tradition, as represented by Isaiah, in particular Isa 66:24²⁶⁹ and 26:19, and apocalyptic tradition, as represented by *1 Enoch* 104:2.4.6. However, the sense of mystery and revelation in Daniel, that constitutes a larger context to Daniel 12, is clearly rooted in apocalyptic tradition, as is illustrated by, for instance, *1 Enoch* 106:19 (4Q204 (4QEn^c ar 5 II 26–27)), rather than being explained from a cryptic reference to רזי in Isa 24:16.

The future-eschatological orientation of resurrection language in Daniel 12:2, יקיצו, is paralleled by the imperfect tense יקיצו in the witness of 1QIsa^a to Isa 26:19, as has previously been observed by É. Puech. Contrary to previous argument by É. Puech, that the witness of 1QIsa^a to Isa 26:19 would constitute the original text as compared to later revision in MT Isa 26:19 (הקיצו), the Qumran biblical manuscripts of Isaiah (1QIsa^a, 1QIsa^b, 4QIsa^{a-r}) attest to textual multiplicity ranging from pro-

²⁶⁹ Blenkinsopp, *Opening the Sealed Book*, 14–23 speaks in this respect of an ‘Isaianic-Danielic Interpretative Trajectory’. This is an important addition to the focus on Daniel as part of a ‘Enochic-Danielic’ trajectory of apocalyptic tradition, that has been proposed by e.g. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination*, 85–115.

to-Masoretic to non-aligned evidence. Nevertheless, 1QIsa^a confirms the importance of the future-eschatological reading of resurrection of the dead as early literary tradition, already known from LXX Isa 26:19. The point of correspondence between resurrection language in Daniel 12:2 and Isa 26:19, that indicates the influence of prophetic tradition, may further be contextualized by the perception of Daniel as prophetic book in 4Q174 1 II 3 and Matthew 24:15.²⁷⁰ Belief in resurrection in the Second Temple period was part of prophecy as well as of Jewish apocalypticism.

In view of both Isaianic-Danielic and Enochic-Danielic interpretive trajectories, a tendency to move from 'eschatological-earthly' resurrection (Isa 26:19;²⁷¹ *1 Enoch* 24–25) to an accent on 'transcendental-heavenly' resurrection (*1 Enoch* 104:2.4.6; Dan 12:3) seems discernible in the book of Daniel (Dan 12:1–3).

The imagery of revivification in Ezekiel 37, that is usually taken to stand metaphorically for return from exile and restoration for the house of Israel, was hitherto by and large excluded as biblical evidence of eschatological resurrection belief.²⁷² An exception to this idea has been the witness of papyrus manuscript 967 to the Septuagint text of Ezekiel 36–40, as argued by J. Lust and reviewed in recent scholarship. The early reception history of Ezekiel 37 through intertextual citations and allusions in texts such as 4 Macc 18:14–19 at v. 17, *Sib.Or.* 2.221–226 and *Sib.Or.* 4.179–82 further indicates an eschatological reading of Ezekielian imagery.²⁷³ Qumran literature adds important evidence to the idea that the literary tradition of reading Ezekiel 37 in an eschatological setting is far from isolated. The close literary relation of the parabiblical Qumran text *4QPseudo-Ezekiel* to Ezekiel, in particular also in the case

²⁷⁰ The terms *בספר דניאל הנביא* in 4Q174 1 II 3 and *Δανιὴλ ὁ προφήτης* in Matt 24:15 are not directly paralleled by language in the book of Daniel per se, which includes three references to prophets and prophecy in general (Dan 9:6.10.24), so that these designations reflect perception of Daniel as prophetic book. Cf. the general perception of Josephus, *Ag.Ap.* 1.40 of 'thirteen books' written by "the prophets subsequent to Moses", οἱ μετὰ Μωϋσῆν προφήται, in all probability including Daniel.

²⁷¹ Cf. e.g. Holleman, *Resurrection and Parousia*, 13 on Isa 26:19 as evidence for a biblical tradition of 'eschatological-earthly' resurrection.

²⁷² See e.g. Cavallin, *Life After Death. Part I*, 107; Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination*, 25.

²⁷³ The *Apocryphon of Ezekiel*, which could perhaps further be mentioned in this respect, has only been fragmentarily preserved in quotations by later church fathers, so that extensive literary comparison in search of reception and interpretation of Ezekiel 37 appears impossible in this case.

of 4QpsEzek^b (4Q386) as we have argued,²⁷⁴ indicates that a reading of Ezekiel 37 as restoration theology with eschatological overtones of resurrection belief was more widespread around the turn of the common era than previously supposed.

The common feature of eschatological reading of Ezekiel 37 occurs in divergent contexts of literary transmission (Papyrus 967), parabiblical writing (*4QPseudo-Ezekiel*), apocalyptic visions of final judgement (*Sibylline Oracles*), and martyr theology (4 Macc). It seems likely to explain this common feature in terms of divergent elaborations on a Second Temple Jewish literary tradition of Ezekiel. Apart from individual accents of separate texts, the evidence speaks in favour of a literary tradition in which Ezekiel 37:1–10 as well as elements of Ezekiel 37:11–14 receive an eschatological sense alongside prophetic restoration theology.

7.2. Qumran Evidence and Palestinian Jewish Tradition History

Until the publication of many new Qumran texts in the 1990s, Qumran evidence did not play a major role in discussions about resurrection belief in Palestinian Jewish tradition history. The semi-complete corpus of Qumran texts recently available contributes to the understanding of Palestinian Jewish tradition history concerning ideas of afterlife and resurrection on several levels. Qumran literature adds Semitic manuscript evidence of longer known texts (*1 Enoch*, *Jubilees*, *Tobit*, *Sirach*), literary check-points for the testaments genre (*Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*), and thematic points of reference for comparison with afterlife beliefs and language in apocrypha and pseudepigrapha.

Early Jewish evidence, whose original composition antedates the mid-second century BCE, includes pronounced apocalyptic belief in resurrection (*1 Enoch*, *Daniel*), a parabiblical vision of future hope for the spirits of the righteous dead (*Jubilees* 23:30–31), eulogy of God who “brings down to the deepest Sheol and brings up from the abyss [immense and great]” (*Tobit* 13:2 in 4QTob^c 6 6–7), and sapiential expressions of future hope that could include overtones of resurrection (*Sirach* 46:11–12, 49:10, and perhaps *Sir* 48:11).

²⁷⁴ Cf. Hogeterp, “Resurrection and Biblical Tradition,” 59–69.

Resurrection beliefs in early Jewish texts dated between the mid-second century BCE and 70 CE occur in contexts of martyr theology (2 Macc, 4 Macc), patriarchal testaments (*T.Levi* 18.10–14, *T.Judah* 25, *T.Zebulon* 10.1–3), apocalyptic visions (*1 Enoch* 37–71; *Sib.Or.* 2 and 4), parabiblical writing (*Pss.Sol.*; *Apocr. Ezek.*; *L.A.B.*), and sapiential instruction (*Ps.-Phoc.*). Qumran literature brings in additional evidence for points of correspondence in resurrection language. Examples are descriptions of the transcendent-heavenly destiny of light for the righteous (*1 Enoch* 104:2; *Dan* 12:3; *Ps.Sol.* 3.12; *L.A.B.* 51.5; 4Q548 1 II–2 12–13), eschatological joy of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob (*T.Levi* 18.14; 4QTQahat ar 1 I 10–11), and terms of revivification of the dead (*vivificabo mortuos et erigam dormientes de terra* in *L.A.B.* 3.10; יקיים המחיה ומתים יחיה and את מתי עמו in 4Q521 2 II 12 and 7 + 5 II 6).

Qumran literature further brings in new evidence of resurrection belief, apart from and hitherto unknown in other corpora of texts. In my view, non-sectarian Qumran evidence of resurrection is not limited to *4QMessianic Apocalypse* (4Q521) and *4QPseudo-Ezekiel* (4Q385, 4Q386, 4Q388), as has been argued by J.J. Collins.²⁷⁵ I have argued that eschatological afterlife imagery in *4QVisions of Amram*^f (4Q548), *4QPsDan*^c ar (4Q245) frg. 2, 4Q434a (*4QGrace after Meals*), and 4Q442 (*4QIndividual Thanksgiving B*) may further denote belief in resurrection. This selection of texts not clearly sectarian is more restricted than the broad survey of É. Puech, who extrapolated a context of Danielic tradition in various Qumran texts with an implication of resurrection belief. It may be deduced from my selection of non-sectarian evidence that belief in resurrection of the dead occurs in the divergent settings of apocalyptic vision (4Q521), parabiblical writing (*4QPseudo-Ezekiel*, *4QPseudo-Daniel*), testament genre (4Q548), and consolation from mourning (4Q434a). *4QIndividual Thanksgiving B* further expresses afterlife belief as abundance and eternal life.

Belief in resurrection is far from homogeneously or consistently represented as a doctrine in the Qumran texts not-clearly sectarian. Some Qumran fragments voice rather different ideas of afterlife, such as 'eternal sleep', שנת עלמה (4Q549 2 2) and 'eternal rest', מנוחות עד (4Q525 14 II 14). Non-sectarian Qumran texts that mention or imply resurrection exhibit strong intertextual links with Scripture, such as Isaiah and the Psalter in 4Q521, Ezekiel 37 in *4QPseudo-Ezekiel*, and Isaiah

²⁷⁵ Collins, *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 126.

and Jeremiah in 4Q434a. This evidence of ‘adopted texts’ may imply the relative importance that the Qumran community attached to this eschatological belief.

The parabiblical, apocalyptic, testamentary, and liturgical evidence of non-sectarian Qumran texts for eschatological hope of resurrection defies monocausal explanations of the development of resurrection belief. For instance, a previous interpretive tendency sought to situate the development of resurrection belief in (proto-)Pharisaic circles; a Palestinian-Jewish school of thought described as most influential by Josephus (*Ant.* 18.15.17).²⁷⁶ Even though Pharisaic-rabbinic tradition clearly attests to belief in the resurrection, the evidence of Second Temple Jewish literature, including Qumran texts, indicates that this eschatological belief was part of more diversified strands of thought among apocalyptic, (proto-)Pharisaic, and (proto-) Essene circles, and possibly in some liturgical contexts (4Q434a).

7.3. *Longer Known Sectarian Qumran Literature and Qumran Cave 4 Evidence*

The *Damascus Document* (CD-A, CD-B), the *Serekh ha-Yahad* (1QS), and the *Hodayot* (1QH^a) have been part of long-standing debate about the question whether or not belief in resurrection is presupposed or implied in sectarian Qumran literature. Recensions from other Qumran caves, mainly Qumran cave 4 (4QD^{a-h}, 5QD, 6QD; 4QS^{a-j}, 5QS, 11Q29?; 4QH^{a-f}), add some additional evidence to the discussion of eschatological afterlife belief in these longer known sectarian texts.

4QD^e 2 II 20 // 6QD 5 5 address those who know justice and obey the law of God for whom there are ‘paths of life’, as opposed to ‘ways to the pit’ for those who presumably are unjust and godless. These terms imply afterlife belief, but they are no more specific for the search of resurrection belief than ‘eternal life and all the glory of Adam’ in CD-A III 12–13.

Shorter forms of the ‘Two Spirits Treatise’ (1QS III 13 – IV 26), attested by 4QpapS^c V on the one hand and by 1Q29a 13 and 4Q525 11–12 on the other, seem to imply that the eschatological terms of rewards and

²⁷⁶ Schaper, *Eschatology in the Greek Psalter*, 47–8. Cf. Setzer, *Resurrection of the Body*, 1–20, who minimizes the importance of Qumran evidence, while mainly turning to Pharisaic-rabbinic tradition in her chapter on ‘Resurrection in Early Judaism’ (21–52).

punishments for the two ways developed over time to their expression in 1QS. Apart from conceiving of 'all the glory of Adam' and 'new creation' (1QS IV 23, 25), specific expression of resurrection was apparently beyond the bounds of this Qumran rule text that does not put eschatological visions on the foreground.

A review of two passages in the *Hodayot*, 1QH^a XIV 12b-19a that combines Eden imagery with communion with angels and 1QH^a XIX 10-14 that combines physical imagery of revivification and communion with angels, with a view to their eschatological context indicates that the imagery of the *Hodayot* alludes to resurrection belief.

7.4. Comparative Study of Qumran and New Testament

Qumran evidence on resurrection of the dead has particular comparative relevance for New Testament traditions on resurrection belief in the Jewish milieu of Jesus' ministry and the pre-70 CE Palestinian Jesus-movement, some features in the expression of belief in Jesus' resurrection, resurrection in Pauline theology, and special materials of the Gospels.

The Synoptic Gospels and Acts refer to the positions of the Jerusalemite schools of Pharisees and Sadducees with regard to (non-)belief in resurrection. In view of historical information from Josephus and comparison with the motif of martyrdom of seven brothers in 2 Macc 7, Sadducean denial of the resurrection through a casuistic question about seven brothers (Mark 12:19-23 par.) may have carried political-religious overtones in Jesus' time. These Sadducean overtones were probably in the interest of maintaining a Judaeo-Roman status quo against uprisings in defense of ancestral laws with belief in eternal life. This interpretation counters previous readings of the Synoptic passage as limited to a 'scholastic dialogue' on a theological issue.

Resurrection belief that the Lucan author designates as common ground between Paul, the Jesus-movement, and Jews in Palestine, in particular the Pharisees (Acts 23:6-8, 24:15, 26:6-7) presupposes a broader socio-religious horizon of religious hope of divine promise and justice. With regard to this collective socio-religious horizon to resurrection belief, Qumran literature adds comparative evidence. 4Q521 mentions divine miracles, among which resurrection of the dead (4Q521 2 II + 4 12) together with issues of social justice, as divine visitation for 'all those who hope in their heart' (4Q521 2 II + 4 4).

Mark 9:11 / Matthew 17:10 relate a scribal viewpoint that ‘Elijah must first come’ before the eschatologically expected resurrection and restoration can take place. This idea of a scribal viewpoint could hitherto be put in literary-historical relief with reference to Malachi 3:23–24, Sirach 48:10, *Sib.Or.* 2.187–189, and *m. Sot.* 9.15. Among these passages, only the later rabbinic passage explicitly relates the role of Elijah to the expected time of resurrection. Qumran texts add contemporary Palestinian Jewish evidence to this discussion. 4Q521, that envisions resurrection of the dead, further alludes to a motif of prophetic reconciliation known from Mal 3:23–24 (4Q521 2 III 2), while 4Q558 1 II 4–5 refers to the future-oriented sending of Elijah surrounded by ‘power, lightning, and meteors.’ 4Q521 presupposes that prophetic restoration and resurrection of the dead could make part of one and the same horizon of eschatological expectation in contemporary Judaism. It may thereby be inferred from this Qumran evidence that the discussion between Jesus and his disciples as represented in Mark 9:9–13 / Matthew 17:9–13 engaged with eschatological expectations of prophetic restoration and resurrection current at the time of Jesus’ ministry.

Belief in resurrection as powers at work in Jesus underlies Synoptic passages on popular beliefs about Jesus as *Elijah redivivus* (Mark 6:14–16 par. and 8:27–28 par.). The question of John to Jesus in Q 7:19, ‘Are you he who is to come, or shall we look for another?’, is further couched in terms of popular concern, to which Jesus’ reaction in Q 7:22–23 answers in terms of manifest workings of his ministry, among which the raising of the dead.

Several scholars have compared the latter passage, Q 7:18–23, to 4Q521 2 II + 4 with regard to their shared intertextuality with Isaiah 61:1. Yet 4Q521 intertwines allusions to Isaiah 61:1 and to Psalm 146:7–8. The additional relevance of Psalm 146 as intertextual background to a text that refers to the raising of the dead may further be explained from plus material to Psalm 146 in 11QPs^a. 11QPs^a adds reference to the Lord’s ‘mighty works’ as plus material between verses 9 and 10 of Psalm 146. From the perspective of Q 7:18–23, the raising of the dead was also among ‘mighty works’ of divine engagement with humanity, as manifested through Jesus’ messianic ministry.

A common feature in canonical and extra-canonical Gospel accounts of Jesus’ resurrection is angelophany. References to (an) angelic figure(s) in white garments who emerge(s) at an empty tomb to communicate the message of Jesus’ resurrection may be contextualized with a view

to contemporary Jewish afterlife belief. The Qumran text *4QVisions of Amram* envisions the eschatological destiny of a righteous, wise, and truthful way of life in terms of sonship of light and of going to the light, while further proleptically describing otherworldly spheres of influence surrounding humanity in terms of light and darkness. In the context of the Gospel tradition, white garments analogously stand for the realm of light and angels as messengers in white apparel symbolize the message of Jesus' eschatological destiny to the realm of light rather than having been abandoned to the shadows of death. Paul further describes salvation through Jesus Christ as sonship of light (1 Thess 5:5). *4QVisions of Amram* provides a contemporary Palestinian Jewish point of analogy for the correlation between eschatological destiny for those who serve a living and true God (1 Thess 1:9) and sonship of light.

1 Corinthians 15 constitutes a representative core example of resurrection in Pauline theology, which has been extensively analyzed in previous scholarship for its indebtedness to contemporary Jewish apocalyptic tradition on the one hand and for its accommodation to Hellenistic Greek categories of thought on the other. With regard to the latter point of accommodation to Greek thought, my comparative discussion has argued against compartmentalization of Paul's thought from Palestinian Jewish traditions. Qumran literature includes an anthropological notion that distinguishes perishable flesh and life-giving realm of the spirit (רוח החיים in 4QD^d 7 8 // 4QD^s 1 I 7–8 // 4QpapD^h 4 II 3–4) as well as an eschatological perspective of the inheritance of reward for humanity with spirit whose fashioning is 'according to the image of the holy ones' (4Q417 2 I 13b–18a). Paul's conceptualization of bodily resurrection as spiritual body and as a state of 'those who are of heaven', bearing 'the image of the heavenly one' may have points of intersection with Greek cosmology and anthropology. Comparison with the above-mentioned Qumran evidence indicates that these Pauline categories of thought also resonate with apocalyptic strands of thought and apocalypticized wisdom in contemporary Palestinian Jewish tradition.

Comparative analysis of two Gospel passages with special materials pertinent to the subject of resurrection, Matthew 27:51b–53 and John 5:19–30, highlights further connections with pre-70 CE traditions. Matthew 27:51b–53 envisions a collective setting of bodily resurrection and appearance of many holy ones to many in the holy city surrounding Jesus' death and resurrection. This collective setting has been compared with Ezekiel 37, but comparison with *4QPseudo-Ezekiel* is more to the

point with regard to eschatological setting and the presupposition of resurrection as divine visitation of human holiness and piety. In view of this traditio-historical context, Matthew 27:51b–53 stands out as (inaugurated) eschatological language that expresses belief that Jesus' life, death, and resurrection inaugurated a new age.

John 5:19–30 mentions the raising of the dead as divine attribute (John 5:21) and emphasizes judgement according to deeds in the collective final resurrection (John 5:29). These features of resurrection in the Johannine passage have close parallels not only with biblical tradition, but also with pre-70 CE Palestinian Jewish tradition as reflected by 4Q521.

CHAPTER FIVE

APOCALYPTICISM IN QUMRAN AND THE NEW TESTAMENT

1. INTRODUCTION

Comparative study of apocalypticism in Qumran literature and the New Testament has to take as starting point an idea of features that are common to early Jewish apocalypticism. The basis for common apocalyptic features is usually drawn from the literary genre apocalypse, that has been defined as follows in *Semeia* 14 (1979):¹

‘Apocalypse’ is a genre of revelatory literature with a narrative framework, in which a revelation is mediated by an otherworldly being to a human recipient, disclosing a transcendent reality which is both temporal, insofar as it envisages eschatological salvation, and spatial insofar as it involves another, supernatural world.

Many studies on early Jewish apocalypticism have come to use this definition of the literary genre apocalypse as paradigm for recognizing apocalyptic texts.² The study of early Jewish apocalypticism yet goes beyond literary study of apocalypses and presupposes a historical phenomenon of developing tradition. Composite early Jewish apocalyptic texts can be taken as a lead for traditio-historical study of development. In this regard, *1 Enoch* has been taken as primary example for stages of development in apocalyptic tradition.³

¹ Collins, “Apocalypse: The Morphology of a Genre,” 9.

² E.g. Collins, “The Genre Apocalypse in Hellenistic Judaism,” 531–48 at 532; idem, *The Apocalyptic Imagination*, 5; García Martínez, “Wisdom at Qumran: Worldly or Heavenly?,” 1–15 at 14; Grabbe, “Introduction and Overview,” 2–43 at 5 and 16. Cf. Wolter, “Apokalyptik als Redeform im Neuen Testament,” 171–91 at 179–80 refers to the definition of ‘apocalypse’ by J.J. Collins, further elaborated by A.Y. Collins, “die zur Zeit die größte Akzeptanz gefunden hat” (179).

³ See García Martínez, “Is Jewish Apocalyptic the Mother of Christian Theology?,” 129–51 at 146–7, who refers to the ‘Book of Watchers’, the ‘Book of Dreams’, and the ‘Epistle of Enoch’ as evidence for apocalypticism as a current of thought, while mentioning previous scholarship by P. Sacchi, L. Hartman, and D. Hellholm who contributed to a conception of apocalypticism with developmental phases.

The combination of vertical (supernatural) and horizontal (temporal) dimensions to revelation in the apocalypse as literary genre should also keep study of apocalypticism from one-sided emphasis on either one of these dimensions. The study by C. Rowland criticized previous studies that focused on the eschatological (temporal) component of apocalypticism and instead proposed a study of apocalypticism from the angle of revelation of divine mysteries.⁴

A balanced treatment of early Jewish apocalypticism should take both temporal and spatial dimensions of apocalyptic worldviews into account. An alternative perspective that overemphasizes spatial, non-eschatological angles to revelation is thereby as problematic⁵ as an approach that overemphasizes the eschatological component in apocalypticism at the expense of attention for the otherworldly realm.

Previous scholarship, following the discussion in *Semeia* 14, has noted that the two dimensions of time and the otherworldly realm at times occur separately in ‘historical apocalypses’, with visions of time expressed in reviews of history, and in apocalyptic visions of ascent to ‘otherworldly journeys’, but they can also be intertwined, as in the case of *1 Enoch*.⁶ Both historical apocalypses, such as the ‘Apocalypse of Weeks’ (*1 Enoch* 93:1–10; 91:11–17), Daniel, and *4 Ezra*, and otherworldly journeys, such as the ‘Book of Watchers’ (*1 Enoch* 1–36), presuppose to differing extents cosmic dualism between good and evil and a visionary perspective that named events and periods are determined and predestined.

The semi-complete corpus of Qumran literature now available adds a significant number of texts designated as apocalyptic to the study of early Jewish apocalypticism. In addition to longer known apocalyptic sectarian Qumran texts, namely 1QS III 13–IV 26, 1QpHab, 1QM, 1QH^a, the *Damascus Document*, and 11QMelchizedek,⁷ many apocalyptic Qumran texts that are not clearly sectarian have been published and

⁴ Rowland, *The Open Heaven*.

⁵ Fletcher-Louis, *Luke-Acts: Angels, Christology and Soteriology*, 11 mentions an ‘alternative perspective’, represented Michael E. Stone and Christopher Rowland, as one that “ties apocalyptic closely to streams of mystical experience and speculation which later emerge as *merkabah mysticism* in the rabbinic period”.

⁶ Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination*, 6–7; García Martínez, “Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 195–226 at 196.

⁷ Cf. Philonenko, “L’apocalyphe qoumrânienne,” 211–8.

surveyed since the 1990s.⁸ These texts are in part parabiblical, such as Pseudo-Danielic writings (4QPseudo-Daniel^{a-c} ar (4Q243–245), 4QFour Kingdoms^{a-b} ar (4Q552–553)),⁹ 4QPseudo-Ezekiel^{a-e} (4Q385, 4Q386, 4Q385c, 4Q388, 4Q391), and 4QApocryphon of Jeremiah (4Q383, 4Q385a, 4Q387, 4Q388a, 4Q389, 4Q390, 4Q387a).¹⁰ 4Q246 could be more loosely associated to Daniel as ‘Apocryphon of Daniel’,¹¹ but it has also been designated as ‘Aramaic Apocalypse’.¹²

The composition 4QVisions of Amram (4Q543–548),¹³ which ranks among texts of the testamentary genre, includes revelatory presentation of otherworldly and eschatological dimensions and thereby qualifies as apocalyptic Qumran text not clearly sectarian. 4QBirth of Noah^{a-c} ar (4Q534–536)¹⁴ can be considered a Qumran text with apocalyptic features, in that it includes references to the revelation of heavenly mysteries, to the Watchers also known from Enochic tradition, and to an envisioned end to the time of the wicked.¹⁵ 4Q521, the ‘Messianic Apocalypse’ already discussed with regard to its evidence of resurrection (chap. 4, section 3.2), includes features of cosmic dualism, determinism, and an eschatological focus on final judgement.¹⁶ The Qumran composition *New Jerusalem* (1Q32 (1QNJ ar); 2Q24 (2QNJ ar); 4Q554,

⁸ See e.g. the surveys by Dimant, “Apocalyptic Texts at Qumran,” 175–91, and Collins, “Apocalypticism and Literary Genre in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 403–30.

⁹ Ed.pr. Collins and Flint, *DJD* 22, 95–164 (“Pseudo-Daniel”). The fragments and translations of 4Q552–4Q553 have been preliminarily published by García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*. 2, 1102–7, and by Parry and Tov, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader*. 6, 76–9; publication of these fragments by É. Puech in volume 37 of the *DJD* series is awaited.

¹⁰ Ed.pr. Dimant, *DJD* 30.

¹¹ Ed.pr. Puech, *DJD* 22, 165–84 (“Apocryphe de Daniel”).

¹² García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*. 1, 492–5. Flint, “The Daniel Tradition at Qumran,” 41–60 omits 4Q246 from his survey, whereas Stuckenbruck, “The Formation and Re-Formation of Daniel in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 101–30 at 117–8 notes “wide agreement that 4Q246 is dependent on Daniel 7”.

¹³ Ed.pr. Puech, *DJD* 31, 283–398. Puech also hesitatingly designates 4Q549 as ‘4QVisions de ‘Amram^s (?) ar’ (399–405), but the extant fragments do not seem to overlap with or parallel other manuscripts and include ideas of afterlife (frg. 2, ll. 2 and 6) that diverge from those in 4Q548.

¹⁴ Ed.pr. Puech, *DJD* 31, 117–70 (“Naissance de Noé”). Cf. Parry and Tov, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader*. 3, 372–7.

¹⁵ 4Q534 was already included among Qumran apocalyptic literature as ‘Book of Noah’ by García Martínez, *Qumran and Apocalyptic*, 1–44; Collins, *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 24; idem, “Apocalypticism and Literary Genre,” 409–10. Cf. Dimant, “Noah in Early Jewish Literature,” 123–50 on the prominent role of Noah in apocalyptic texts like 1 *Enoch*, *Jubilees*, and 2 *Enoch* (in particular chaps. 69–70).

¹⁶ Collins, “Apocalypticism and Literary Genre,” 419 contests the designation ‘apocalypse’ for 4Q521, observing that “the literary genre has rightly been shown to be

554a, 555 (4QNJ^{a-c} ar); 5Q15 (5QNJ ar); 11Q18 (11QNJ ar)) has been considered among the apocalyptic subtype of ‘otherworldly journeys’.¹⁷ *New Jerusalem* includes references to time (4Q554 2 III 16, 20; 11Q18 19 4) that indicate an eschatological perspective, while further comprising a predestinarian view of successive kingdoms (4Q554 2 III).¹⁸ 4Q541 (4QapocrLevi^{b?} ar) may be added as Qumran text with apocalyptic features, in that includes reference to heavenly revelation, cosmic dualism, and determinism.¹⁹

The above-mentioned texts are major examples of substantial apocalyptic compositions from Qumran, to which smaller fragments categorized among ‘apocalyptic texts’ could be added.²⁰ Other Qumran compositions that arguably exhibit features of an apocalyptic worldview will be discussed in the course of this chapter.

The *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* should in my view be excluded from a survey of apocalyptic texts, since this ‘angelic liturgy’ with its imagery of the heavenly world does not exhibit sufficiently recognizable apocalyptic features of both spatial and temporal dimensions to revelation, as well as cosmic dualism and determinism.²¹ Further, this composition has come to be categorized as evidence of Qumran mysticism.²² To be sure, the themes of communion with angels and heavenly visions in the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* intersect with Qumran texts with apocalyptic features.²³ On the other hand, *1 Enoch* 14:8–16:4 and

psalmic or hymnic”; yet 1QH^a is also hymnic, but this does not preclude the respective discussions of 1QH^a and of 4Q521 as apocalyptic texts.

¹⁷ Parry and Tov (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader*. 6, 38–73. Cf. Dimant, “Apocalyptic Texts at Qumran,” 182–4; Collins, “Apocalypticism and Literary Genre,” 417–8: “The New Jerusalem text may plausibly be taken as an apocalypse”.

¹⁸ García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*. 2, 1110–1 and 1224–5. 11Q18 19 5–6 further mentions revelation about a ‘writing’, כְּתָב, to a first person singular protagonist and 11Q18 24 2 includes the motif of judgement, יוֹד.

¹⁹ Cf. Dimant, “Apocalyptic Texts at Qumran,” 185–6, 191.

²⁰ Parry and Tov (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader*. 6, 38–153 further include 4Q248, 4QWords of Michael (4Q529), and several texts designated as ‘Revelatory Texts Too Fragmentary for Further Classification’ (4Q410, 4Q458, 4Q489, 4Q556, 4Q557, 4Q558) that still make part of their larger rubric ‘Apocalyptic Texts’.

²¹ Cf. Collins, “Apocalypticism and Literary Genre,” 419–20 who lists the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* as text “sometimes said to be apocalyptic and (...) among the few texts that Stegemann allowed as possible apocalypses”.

²² See recently Alexander, *The Mystical Texts*.

²³ In his chapter two, Alexander, *The Mystical Texts*, compares 4QBlessings, 4QWords of the Luminaries, 4QDaily Prayers, 4QPseudo-Ezekiel, 4QMysteries (?) (4Q301), 4QSongs of the Sage, 11QMelchizedek, 1QH^a, 1QS, 1QSa, 1QSB, and 1QM as ‘parallel texts from Qumran’ to the theme of the ‘celestial temple and its angelic liturgy’ in the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*.

4QPseudo-Ezekiel^a (4Q385) frg. 6 include ‘*Merkabah* visions’ that constitute a theme that was also important for the development of early Jewish mysticism.²⁴ Nevertheless, the larger picture of revelation in temporal and spatial dimensions presented in these apocalyptic texts differs from the mystical character of the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*.

1.1. *Wisdom and Apocalypticism*

Since the 1990s, scholarship on early Jewish apocalypticism has entered a new stage, by paying attention to the relation between wisdom and apocalypticism from the point of view of trajectories of cross-fertilization rather than boundary lines of strict dichotomy.²⁵ Earlier scholarship already observed that apocalypticism elaborated on a blend of prophetic and sapiencial categories of thought.²⁶ The importance of the discussion about wisdom and apocalypticism consists in the fact that provides a corrective for overly compartmentalized discussion and for the understanding of apocalyptic theology as a closed matrix of sectarian thought. Previous New Testament scholarship on Q that sought to dissect two strata of tradition, so-called archaic collections of sayings of Jesus with features of sapiencial instruction and literary expansion with apocalyptic materials,²⁷ constitutes an example of such compartmentalized discussion. (Reactions to) pictures of apocalypticism as marginalized current of thought constitute an example of the tendency to characterize apocalyptic thought in terms of a closed matrix of sectarian thought.²⁸

²⁴ Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination*, 53–4; Dimant, *DJD* 30, 8 and 42–51.

²⁵ See recently Wright and Wills (eds.), *Conflicted Boundaries*.

²⁶ VanderKam, “The Prophetic-Sapiencial Origins of Apocalyptic Thought,” 163–76; Michel, “Weisheit und Apokalyptik,” 413–34 at 434: “die Apokalyptiker, die etwas ganz Neues ausdrücken wollten, benutzten dazu die ihnen überlieferten theologische Denkmuster, auch die der Weisheit”.

²⁷ Kloppenborg, *The Formation of Q*; idem, “Symbolic Eschatology and the Apocalypticism of Q,” 287–306; Cameron, “The Sayings Gospel Q and the Quest of the Historical Jesus: A Response to John S. Kloppenborg,” 351–54; Robinson, “The Critical Edition of Q and the Study of Jesus,” 27–52 at 44–7. Cf. chapter one, section 2.

²⁸ Collins, “Apocalyptic Theology and the Dead Sea Scrolls: A Response to Jonathan Wilson,” 129–33 at 133 argued that “a theology that relies exclusively on apocalyptic assertion”, i.e. apocalyptic theology, “runs the risk of self-marginalization and irrelevance”, as opposed to enculturation; cf. Sängler, “Destruktive Apokalyptik? Eine Erinnerung in eschatologischer und ethischer Perspektive,” 285–307 who counters presuppositions on apocalypticism as primarily motivated by anxiety about catastrophic events by conceptualizing it in terms of hope for justice in face of disillusionment with a contemporary state of things.

Qumran literature brings in concrete new evidence of a text which combines sapiential genre and apocalyptic categories of thought, namely *1-4QInstruction* (1Q26, 4Q415–418, 4Q423),²⁹ as well as of a text that combines sapiential and eschatological features, namely *1-4QMysteries* (1Q27, 4Q299–301).³⁰ This Qumran evidence changes the picture of developments in early Jewish apocalyptic and sapiential tradition, indicating the existence of an intertwined trajectory of apocalypticized wisdom.³¹

1.2. *Apocalypticism and Eschatology*

As it may be inferred from the *Semeia* definition of ‘apocalypse’, quoted above, apocalypticism partly overlaps with the theme of eschatology, in that apocalyptic texts are concerned with divine revelation in both temporal and spatial dimensions. It has been pointed out by J.J. Collins that all major apocalyptic texts known apart from Qumran literature share the concern with final judgement and destruction of the wicked as common motif.³² While eschatology stands for the beliefs and expectations about the final age in general, ‘apocalyptic eschatology’ could be taken to stand for a revealed, predestinarian perspective on the final age that entails a judgemental solution to cosmic dualism between good and evil.³³ ‘Apocalyptic eschatology’ has been distinguished from ‘prophetic eschatology’, in that the former stresses the otherworldly feature of judgement of the dead and the latter presupposes this-worldly fulfilment of oracles within the bounds of human history.³⁴

²⁹ Ed.pr. of 1Q26 by Milik, *DJD 1*, 101–2; ed.pr. of 4Q415–418, 4Q423 by Strugnell, Harrington, and Elgvin, *DJD 34*, 1–540.

³⁰ Ed.pr. of 1Q27 by Milik, *DJD 1*, 102–7; ed.pr. of 4Q299–301 (4QMyst^{a-c}(?)) by Schiffman, *DJD 20*, 33–123.

³¹ See e.g. Harrington, “Wisdom and Apocalyptic in 4QInstruction and 4 Ezra,” 343–55 who refers to ‘wisdom in an apocalyptic context’ in *4QInstruction* and to ‘apocalyptic wisdom’ in *4 Ezra*; Goff, *Discerning Wisdom*, 9–68 designates *4QInstruction* as ‘A Wisdom Text with an Apocalyptic Worldview’ and *1-4QMysteries* as ‘Eschatological Wisdom’.

³² Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination*, 7.

³³ Cf. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination*, 11: “All the apocalypses (..) involve a transcendent eschatology that looks for retribution beyond the bounds of history”.

³⁴ Collins, “Prophecy, Apocalypse and Eschatology: Reflections on the Proposals of Lester Grabbe,” 44–52 at 49–50: “The distinctive feature of apocalyptic eschatology over against that of the prophets is the expectation of the post-mortem judgement of individuals”.

With regard to the New Testament, the term ‘apocalyptic eschatology’ is frequently used with regard to theological perspectives of Paul and the Gospel of Matthew, and the Revelation to John.³⁵ The question is whether and in which way apocalypticism and apocalyptic eschatology made part of the beginnings of the early Jesus-movement.

1.3. *Apocalypticism in the Early Jesus-Movement and Contemporary Palestinian Judaism*

Comparative study of apocalypticism in emerging Christianity and contemporary Palestinian Judaism can benefit from the expanded textual basis of Qumran evidence and methodological reconsideration of apocalypticism in relation to wisdom and to eschatology. The comparative focus on a Palestinian Jewish matrix for apocalypticism may be justified by the fact that the early Jesus-movement started out in a Palestinian social and historical context.³⁶

With regard to comparative study, caution is needed against overly systemic presuppositions on apocalypticism on the one hand and against motif search isolated from contexts on the other. Systemic presuppositions in terms of primary concern with time calculation about the final age and ‘Naherwartung’ are unwarranted in view of previous scholarship on developments in early Jewish apocalypticism.³⁷ Motif search with regard to, for instance, Qumranite and Johannine dualism lacks

³⁵ See e.g. De Boer, “Paul and Jewish Apocalyptic Eschatology,” 169–90; Sim, *Apocalyptic Eschatology in the Gospel of Matthew*; Macaskill, *Revealed Wisdom and Inaugurated Eschatology in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*, 241–58 surveys ‘Previous Research on Wisdom and Apocalyptic in the Gospel of Matthew’; Wolter, “Apokalyptik als Redeform im Neuen Testament,” 182–90 lists Pauline passages (Rom 11:25–26a, 1 Cor 15:51–52, 1 Thess 4:13–18) and the Apocalypse as primary examples of ‘Apokalyptische Texte im NT’.

³⁶ Cf. Sanders, “The Genre of Palestinian Jewish Apocalypses,” 447–59 at 458 referred to the distinct “historical and social realities in the history of Israel” on which ‘Palestinian Jewish Apocalypses’ reflect, even though they “do not constitute one tightly defined literary genre”.

³⁷ Cf. the criticism against ‘anti-apocalyptic apologetics in previous New Testament scholarship’ by Frey, “Die Apokalyptik als Herausforderung der neutestamentlichen Wissenschaft. Zum Problem: Jesus und die Apokalyptik,” 23–94 at 27–38. Reductionistic presuppositions about what apocalyptic concerns would essentially stand for may depend on erroneous, schematic reading of New Testament passages, such as e.g. Mark 13:7 par., Luke 17:20–21, and *G.Th.* 51, that turn against eschatological anxiety.

sufficient thematic correspondence and contextual relief.³⁸ Comparative study needs to take both thematic points of correspondence and socio-historical settings of apocalyptic themes into account. Comparative study of apocalypticism in Qumran and the New Testament frequently considers inaugurated eschatology, which conceives of the final age as present or proleptic reality, as a common concern in two otherwise different movements.³⁹ ‘Naherwartung’ or eschatological anxiety about the imminence of the final age may be a corollary to this perspective. Nevertheless, the core theme of comparison that recent scholarship has recognized in this respect is the notion of the final age as present or proleptic reality. This notion may in turn have overtones of both fulfillment of divine promise and anxiety about eschatological tribulation.

2. EARLY JEWISH APOCALYPTIC TRADITION AND SCRIPTURE

2.1. 1 Enoch

1 Enoch comprises various features, such as heavenly revelation, focus on final judgement, historical survey of generations, and otherworldly journey, which contributed to the growth of early Jewish apocalyptic tradition.⁴⁰

2.1.1. *The Book of the Luminaries* (1 Enoch 72–82)

The oldest part of *1 Enoch*, the so-called Book of the Luminaries (*1 Enoch* 72–82), contains ideas about the motion of heavenly luminaries in the interest of calendrical concerns of a 364-day solar calendar (*1 Enoch* 72:32, 74:10.12, 82:6). These ideas are presented as revelation from the angel Uriel (*1 Enoch* 72:1) and include observations on earthly regions,

³⁸ Earlier scholarship, as that by Brown, “The Qumran Scrolls and the Johannine Gospel and Epistles,” 183–207 at 184–95, focused on comparison between ‘modified dualism’ in sectarian Qumran literature and Johannine literature. Collins, “Qumran, Apocalypticism, and the New Testament,” 133–8 at 138 observed that “the dualism of John is not nearly as developed as that of the Instruction on the Two Spirits.” Cf. the argument by Frey, “Different Patterns of Dualistic Thought in the Qumran Library. Reflections on Their Background and History,” 275–335 who distinguished ten types of dualistic thought in Qumran literature, among which cosmic dualism.

³⁹ Collins, “Qumran, Apocalypticism, and the New Testament,” 137–8; García Martínez, “Is Jewish Apocalyptic the Mother of Christian Theology?,” 129–51 at 150–1; cf. Frey, “Jesus und die Apokalyptik,” 75–9.

⁴⁰ Cf. VanderKam, *Enoch and the Growth of an Apocalyptic Tradition*.

among which a mythical reference to ‘the Paradise of righteousness’ (1 *Enoch* 77:3; ס קושטא [פרד] in 4Q209 (4QEnastr^b ar) 23 9). The closing chapters of the Book of the Luminaries (1 *Enoch* 80–82) unfold a perspective of predestination for generations of the world with good and wicked deeds, right and wrong calendrical practice, correlating a celestial law of the stars and ‘signs of the days on earth’ (1 *Enoch* 82:16.19; cf. דגליהון in 4Q209 (4QEnastr^b ar) 28 1). The Enochic concern with the solar calendar could stand in relation to the terse passage in Genesis 5:21–24 on Enoch, in that the symbolic 365-years age of Enoch in Gen 5:23 has been compared with the number of days in a solar calendar.⁴¹

The impact of the solar calendar is clearly discernible in the *Book of Jubilees* (*Jub.* 6:32, 364-days solar year), which is in turn cited in the *Damascus Document* as authoritative source for the periodization of ages (CD-A XVI 2–4 // 4QD^f 4 II 4–5). The 364-day solar calendar further finds expression in the sectarian Qumran text 4QMMT A 20–21,⁴² a text of foundational importance with regard to the separation of the (pre-)Qumran movement. The sectarian commentary on Genesis 4Q252 (4QcommGen A) II 2–3 identifies the timespan of Noah’s stay in the ark until departure for dry land with “a complete year of three-hundred and sixty-four days”, שנה תמימה לימים שלוש מאות ששים וארבעה.⁴³ Josephus’ reference to Essene reverence for the sun (*J.W.* 2.128.148) further implies that the solar calendar was characteristic of the Essene movement with its divergent rites (*Ant.* 18.19).⁴⁴

2.1.2. *The Book of the Watchers* (1 *Enoch* 1–36), *Its Influence, and the Qumran Book of Giants*

The Book of the Watchers (1 *Enoch* 1–36) contrasts the contemplation of the unalterable order of works of heaven and earth, including the luminaries (1 *Enoch* 2:1–5:3), to wickedness among humanity that does not stand firm but turns aside (1 *Enoch* 5:4). The Book of Watchers attributes godlessness to a rebellion among the Watchers (1 *Enoch*

⁴¹ VanderKam, *Enoch and the Growth of an Apocalyptic Tradition*, 43–4.

⁴² “ושלמה השנה שלוש מאות וששים וארבעה] יום”, “And the year is complete—three hundred and [sixty-four] days”. Text and translation of 4QMMT A 20–21 from Strugnell and Qimron, *DJD* 10, 44–5.

⁴³ Ed.pr. Brooke, *DJD* 22, 185–207. Text and translation from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*. 1, 502–3.

⁴⁴ Cf. VanderKam, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today*, 61–2 on 4Q317–30 that, parallel to *Jubilees*, apply the 364-day solar calendar to religious festivals.

6–11), and narrates Enoch's mission (*1 Enoch* 12–13:7), heavenly ascent and vision (*1 Enoch* 13:8–16:4),⁴⁵ and otherworldly journeys with post-mortem and eschatological visions (*1 Enoch* 17–36). This section will concentrate on the Enochic tradition about the Watchers as progenitors of earthly evil that preceded the flood, its influence in other Qumran texts, and additional materials in the Qumran Book of Giants.

The terms in the Book of Watchers about the Watchers and their offspring as well as the evil that they engendered stand in partial relation to the biblical flood story. While *1 Enoch* 6–7 speaks of 'the Watchers, the sons of heaven' (*1 Enoch* 6:2 // 4Q202 (4QEn^b ar) II 3) who begot giants that in turn begot Nephilim (*1 Enoch* 7:2), Genesis 6:1–4 mentions 'divine sons', בני־האלהים, and their earthly offspring, designated as both Nephilim, הנפילים,⁴⁶ and mighty men, הגברים. Whereas the narrative of Genesis is relatively terse about divine judgement of humankind as wicked (Gen 6:5) and of the earth as filled with violence and decay (Gen 6:11–13), the Book of Watchers more extensively narrates the evil brought into the world by the Watchers. According to *1 Enoch* 6:4–6 (// 4Q201 (4QEn^a ar) III 1–5, 4Q202 (4QEn^b ar) II 6–8) the Watchers bound one another with a curse to realize their earthly desire collectively. *1 Enoch* 7:2–5 (// 4QEn^a ar III 16–21, 4QEn^b ar II 20–25) describes the earthly offspring of the Watchers as giants by birth whose rate of growth consumed more than the sons of men could supply with their labour, after which the giants started to kill human beings and shed blood among all other flesh on earth.

The Book of Watchers presents the realization that the earth had become filled with wickedness as an interplay of earthly accusation and human outcry going up to heaven (*1 Enoch* 7:6, 8:4), the pleading of four archangels before God of the outcry of iniquity made by the souls of human beings who died (*1 Enoch* 9), and divine words of judgement against earthly iniquity announcing the flood (*1 Enoch* 10 at 10:2). The Enochic presentation of divine judgement envisions that the Watchers will have no peace or mercy (*1 Enoch* 12:5–6) and are confronted with

⁴⁵ Alexander, "The Enochic Literature and the Bible: Intertextuality and Its Implications," 57–69 at 60–1 has identified Enoch's role as intermediary between the Watchers and God before his ascent in *1 Enoch* 12:1–2 as Enochic interpretation of האלהים as angels, i.e. Watchers, in Genesis 5:18–25 at v. 22.

⁴⁶ KBL, lemma נפילים, relates this term etymologically to the root נפל, interpreting it as "giants, superhuman beings emerging from miscarriages". Note that LXX Gen 6:4 renders both הנפילים and הגברים as οἱ γίγαντες.

the slaughter of their sons in a war of destruction (*1 Enoch* 10:9 // קרב אבדן in 4QEn^b ar IV 6).⁴⁷

The Enochic discourse interchanges divine commission about angelic instruction for Noah to escape from the imminent end of the earth by the flood (*1 Enoch* 10:1–3) and a broader perspective of deliverance for all the righteous (*1 Enoch* 10:17), starting with Noah as the righteous one (*1 Enoch* 10:3 // 4QEn^a ar V 3). The divine commission of the archangel Michael, as narrated in *1 Enoch* 10:11–11:2 (// 4QEn^a ar VI, 4QEn^b ar IV 8–11, 4QEn^c ar V 1–10), includes both destruction of evil from the earth and renewed cultivation of the earth in righteousness. *1 Enoch* 10:16–11:2 supposes an ultimately restored relation between heaven and earth in terms of blessing and joy, truth and peace, stressing that “all the sons of men will become righteous, and all the peoples will worship (me), and all will bless me and prostrate themselves” (*1 Enoch* 10:21 // 4QEn^a ar VI 3–4).⁴⁸ The terms of judgement and ultimate righteousness on the earth in this passage prefigure Enoch’s vision of judgement of all the cursed and afterlife for the righteous in *1 Enoch* 24–27. The above-quoted vision of universal worship of God by humanity that has turned righteous could have a point of analogy in the Isaianic oracle of a house of prayer for all peoples (Isa 56:6–8). A further point of analogy is provided by the eschatological Qumran text *4QTime of Righteousness* 1 II 5–8 that envisions the time of righteousness in terms of peace and truth and universal praise of God: “Every t[ongue] will bless him, and every man will bow down before him, [and they will be] of on[e mi]nd” (4Q215a 1 II 7–8).⁴⁹

The Enochic tradition about the fall of the Watchers resonates in several non-Enochic Qumran texts. The archetypal example of admonition about evil set by the Watchers is mentioned in the *Damascus Document* as a case in point with regard to ungodly deviation. CD-A II 16–17 // 4QD^a 2 II 17 conceptualizes ungodly deviation as a matter of giving in to thoughts of a guilty inclination and eyes of unfaithfulness ‘from ancient times until now’. CD-A II 17–18 attributes the fall of the ‘Watchers of the heavens’, עירי השמים, to a way of life in the stubbornness of their heart coupled with transgression of God’s precepts. CD-A II 19–21 //

⁴⁷ This sentence of war of destruction seems to parallel the desolating effect of crafts taught by the Watchers to men leading to perdition of the latter, as described in *1 Enoch* 8.

⁴⁸ Translation from Nickelsburg and VanderKam, *1 Enoch. A New Translation*, 30.

⁴⁹ Translation from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*. 1, 457.

4QD^a 2 II 18–21 further describes the ominous result begotten by the transgression of the Watchers in terms of utter annihilation without leaving a trace. 4Q227 (4QPseudo-Jubilees^{c?}) 2 1–4 mentions Enoch as witness against all the sons of men and also against the Watchers, while having premonition in view that the righteous should not err (4Q227 2 6). 4Q370 (4QExhortation Based on the Flood) I 2–6 mentions utter destruction which the flood brought for everything on earth because of evil deeds that opposed God in everything. This includes destruction without escape for the giants, והג[בור]ים לוא נמלטו (4Q370 I 6). 4Q534 (4QNoah ar) refers to a guilty deed analogous to that of the Watchers, עירין (4Q534 II 16–20).⁵⁰

Qumran literature comprises additional Enochic materials, previously unattested in literary transmission history, designated as the Qumran Enochic ‘Book of Giants’. This composition is represented in Qumran caves 1, 2, 4, and 6 (1Q23–24 (1QEnGiants^{a-b} ar), 2Q26 (2QEnGiants ar) 4QEnGiants^{a-e} ar (4Q203, 4Q530–532, 4Q556); 6Q8 (6QpapEnGiants ar)).⁵¹ The most extensive fragments are from Qumran cave 4 (4Q530–532 (4QBook of Giants^{b-d} ar)), which have become part of broader scholarly discussion since further textual study of these fragments from the 1990s onwards. The broad distribution of fragments among Qumran caves appears to attest to the importance of this Enochic composition as ‘adopted text’ for the Qumran community.⁵²

The extant fragments of the Book of Giants do not seem to preserve an eschatological framework,⁵³ but they do include a focus on divine

⁵⁰ Ed.pr. of 4Q534 as ‘4QNaissance de Noe a ar’ by Puech, *DJD* 31, 129–52.

⁵¹ Text edition with commentary by Stuckenbruck, *The Book of Giants from Qumran. Texts, Translation and Commentary*, 43–191. Ed.pr. of 1Q23–24 by Milik, *DJD* 1, 97–9; ed.pr. of 2Q26 by Baillet, *DJD* 3, 90–1; preliminary edition of 4Q203 by Milik, *The Books of Enoch. Aramaic Fragments of Qumrân Cave 4*, 310–7 and ed.pr. by Stuckenbruck, *DJD* 36, 8–41; ed.pr. of 4Q530–532 by Puech, *DJD* 31, 19–104, who additionally designates 4Q533 as ‘4QLivre des Géants e ar’, previously labelled ‘4QGiants or Pseudo-Enoch ar’ in García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*. 2, 1068–9; preliminary edition of 4Q556 as ‘4QBook of Giants^c ar’ by García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*. 2, 1112–3; ed.pr. of 6Q8 by Baillet, *DJD* 3, 1148–9. Re-editions of 1Q23–24, 2Q26, and 6Q8 were published by Stuckenbruck, *DJD* 36, 49–94.

⁵² VanderKam, “Apocalyptic Tradition in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Religion of Qumran,” 113–34 at 124 hesitates whether all these fragments “are actually copies of the *Book of Giants*”, but refers to it as “a well-attested work” copied between the first century BCE and the first century CE.

⁵³ Collins, “Apocalypticism and Literary Genre,” p. 406: “there is no evident eschatological interest in the preserved fragments (of the *Book of Giants*)”. Note, however, that 1Q24 (1QEnGiants^b) frg. 7 ll. 1–2 include the concept ‘day of the end’, יום קץ, that could perhaps include eschatological overtones.

judgement, דין (4Q530 II 16–18 at 18) as well as presentation of this judgement in revelatory terms of dream visions and their interpretation by Enoch (4Q530 II 20 and 23, III 6–10). The Qumran Book of Giants intersects with the Book of Watchers by including, among other things, references to rebelling Watchers by name, Azazel and Shemihazah (4Q203 7 I 6 and 8 5; cf. *1 Enoch* 6:3.7, 8:1.3), to news of corruption that reached the archangel Raphael (4Q203 8 11–12; cf. *1 Enoch* 9:1, 10:4–8), and the statement “you will not have peace” (1Q24 8 2; 4Q203 13 3), which addresses the Watchers in *1 Enoch* 12:6. The Book of Giants makes reference to the ‘Nephilin,’ נפילין and נפיליא (4Q530 II 6 and 20, III 8; 4Q531 5 2; 4Q532 2 3), also mentioned in Genesis 6:4, and to the Giants, גבריא and גברינ (1Q23 9+14+15 5; 4Q530 II 13, 15, 20–21, and III 3, and 6 I 8; 4Q531 4 4, and 5 2, 5) as sons of Watchers, בני עירין (4Q203 7 I 6–7).

As compared to the Book of Watchers, the Book of Giants comprises further narrative of the role of the Giants in bringing about evil on earth.⁵⁴ The Giants appear to be held responsible for inflicting “great [in]justice on [the] ea[rth],” [ח]בל רב חנבלו בא[רעא] (4Q532 (4QEnGiants^d ar) 2 9).⁵⁵ 4Q556 (4QEnGiants^e ar) 6 2–3 refers to bloodshed and the speaking of lies preceding the flood on earth, מבול על ארעא. 4Q203 (4QEnGiants^a ar) mentions ‘violence done to me[n],’ [חמס אנו]שא (4Q203 5 2),⁵⁶ fornication and corruption (4Q203 8 9–11). 4Q530 (4QEnGiants^b ar) 6 I 4 describes the violence done to men in the following terms, apparently in the context of a dream vision (4Q530 6 I 7): “[the souls of those killed are complaining against their murderers and crying out unceasingly].”⁵⁷

The Book of Giants describes Enoch’s intermediary position between heaven and the Giants in terms of interpretation and explanation of dreams on the part of the Giants (4Q530 II 13–15, 21–23). Two dream visions are successively related by two brothers among the Giants in column 2 of 4Q530, one about a watered garden from which tongues of fire emerge and burn everything (4Q530 II 6–12), and the other about

⁵⁴ The Book of Giants is briefly noted by Collins, *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, pp. 23–4.

⁵⁵ Text and translation from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*. 2, pp. 1068–9.

⁵⁶ Text and translation from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*. 1, pp. 408–9.

⁵⁷ Translation from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*. 2, p. 1065.

the descent of the Ruler of the heavens to earth to proclaim a sentence against all living flesh (4Q530 II 16–20). The two dreams both appear to highlight judgement to destruction of the Giants' corruption of the earth.⁵⁸ The interpretation of these dreams by Enoch is not preserved in the extant fragments, but 4Q203 8 3–15 does include admonition of Enoch against the Watchers led by Shemihazah in terms of accusation on the one hand and of appeal to let loose the fetters that bound them and pray. This appeal of Enoch could perhaps imply an unfastening of that with which the Watchers bound each other, their curse (*1 Enoch* 6:4–6).

The fragments of the Book of Giants provide a glimpse of Palestinian Jewish Enochic currents of thought about the wickedness and injustice associated with the prequel to the flood. In this general sense, Enochic traditions could be relevant for comparative study of Palestinian Jewish types of admonition based on the flood story.

2.1.3. *The Book of Dream Visions* (1 Enoch 83–90)

The Book of Dream Visions (*1 Enoch* 83–90) comprises two dream visions, one of the flood as revealed to Enoch who prays for a remnant of righteousness to be preserved and raised up (*1 Enoch* 83–84), and the other known as the so-called 'Animal Apocalypse' (*1 Enoch* 85–90). It is to the latter dream vision that several extant Qumran manuscripts bears textual witness (4Q204 (4QEn^c ar) frg. 4; 4Q205 (4QEn^d ar) 2 I–III; 4Q206 (4QEn^c ar) 5 I–III; 4Q207 frg. 1). The 'Animal Apocalypse' presents a symbolic retelling of the biblical past through the second century BCE up to an envisioned consummation of time. The animal imagery turns to sheep from reference to the twelve patriarchs, whose names came to stand for the twelve tribes, onwards (*1 Enoch* 89:12 // 4Q205 2 I 27, 4Q206 5 II 13–14).⁵⁹ The Animal Apocalypse narrates the successive commission of seventy shepherds from the Babylonian period up to the envisioned final age (*1 Enoch* 89:59–90:17) with recurring denunciatory terms of their excessively destructive effect on the sheep.⁶⁰ *1 Enoch*

⁵⁸ At the beginning of column 2 of 4Q530, mention is made of 'the death of our souls,' מוֹת נַפְשָׁא (4Q530 II 1), a sentence against an individual's life, אֵין עַל נַפְשָׁה (4Q530 II 2), and God's curse of the high officials, וְרַבָּא לֹט לְרוּזְנָא (4Q530 II 2).

⁵⁹ Cf. Lange, "Dream Visions and Apocalyptic Milieus," 27–34 at 28: "From Jacob onward Israel and the Israelites are depicted as sheep".

⁶⁰ Cf. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination*, 69 on parallels of the Enochic number of seventy shepherds with Deut 32, Daniel 10, and Jeremiah 25.

90:18–42 describes the final age as judgement by the Lord of the sheep of the seventy shepherds as sinners as well as of sinful sheep, while further envisioning a new home for the sheep.

References to sheep and shepherd as analogies, including the relation between God and Israel, also make part of biblical tradition that is represented in prophetic writings,⁶¹ the Psalter,⁶² and sapiential literature (Sir 13:17, Wis 19:9). The Animal Apocalypse provides a most elaborate example of the symbolic imagery of sheep and shepherds, leading up to a vision that extends to post-mortem judgement and the final age.⁶³

2.1.4. *The Epistle of Enoch* (1 Enoch 91.92–105) and *Added Writings* (1 Enoch 106–107, 108)

1 Enoch 91 introduces Enoch's vision of righteousness and eventual consummation of all iniquity on earth to his son Methuselah and other relatives; a vision that is presented as writing in the so-called 'Epistle of Enoch' (*1 Enoch* 92–105). *1 Enoch* 106–107 presents itself as narrative about the birth of Noah as righteous and blameless from among generations of wickedness. Part of *1 Enoch* 106–107, *1 Enoch* 106:13–107:2, is witnessed in 4QEn^c ar (4Q204) 5 II. The recent edition of 4Q534–536 by É. Puech further identified these Qumran manuscripts as '4QBirth of Noah^{a-c} ar'.⁶⁴ *1 Enoch* 108 presents itself as "Another book that Enoch wrote for his son Methuselah and for those who would come after him and keep the Law in the last days" (*1 Enoch* 108:1).⁶⁵

The Epistle of Enoch (*1 Enoch* 91.92–105) includes after an opening section the so-called 'Apocalypse of Weeks' (*1 Enoch* 93:1–10; 91:11–17), whose textual order is established with the aid of 4QEn^g ar column IV, Enochic instruction of two ways theology (*1 Enoch* 94:1–5), and several discourses of admonition comprising woes against the wicked and

⁶¹ E.g. Isa 13:14, 53:6–7; Jer 23:1–2; Hos 5:16; Mic 2:12, 7:14; Zech 9:16, 10:2, 11:4.7.11.17, 13:7.

⁶² Ps 44:11.22, 49:14, 74:1, 77:20, 78:52.70–71, 79:13, 80:1, 95:7, 100:3, 107:41, 119:176.

⁶³ The periodization of several epochs up to the final age in the Animal Apocalypse represents a sequential linear concept of time that opposes a dual notion of 'temporal dualism' between present time and new age; a dichotomy that appears to belong rather to later writings, such as early rabbinic literature. *Contra* Nickelsburg, "The Apocalyptic Construction of Reality in 1 Enoch," 51–64 at 58.

⁶⁴ Puech, *DJD* 31, 117–70. 4Q534 II refers to receding waters (l. 14) and to the Watchers (l. 18).

⁶⁵ Translation from Nickelsburg and VanderKam, *1 Enoch. A New Translation*, 168.

encouragement of the righteous (*1 Enoch* 94:6–104:8).⁶⁶ The interchange between exhortation and woes is also known from prophetic and sapiential literature (Isa 3:9–12; Sir 2:7–11.12–14.15–18), while prophetic literature comprises several examples of direct forms of address in terms of woes against sinful rich, oppressive evildoers, and idolaters (Isa 5:8–23, 10:1–4; Hab 2:6.12.19). As compared to prophetic and sapiential literature, the admonitions in the Epistle of Enoch consistently refer to post-mortem and final judgement and retribution according to deeds as they are revealed in heaven. The emphasis on post-mortem retribution counters imagined discourse of sinners who equate the character of the pious, “who consider themselves righteous” (*1 Enoch* 102:10),⁶⁷ with their earthly fate of suffering, oppression, and violent death, and justify their own sumptuous lifestyle added by plunder and sin (*1 Enoch* 102:6–11).

2.2. Jubilees

The *Book of Jubilees*, dated prior to around the mid-second century BCE,⁶⁸ narrates biblical history from the creation to the exodus from Egypt from the perspective of Moses as pseudepigraphical author. *Jubilees* relates the creation of ‘all spirits which minister before’ God, that is the creation of the angels, to the first day of creation of heavens and earth (*Jub.* 2:2). *Jubilees* attributes calendar calculation to Enoch (*Jub.* 4:17) and prescribes the observance of religious festivals according to the 364-days solar calendar as part of a Noachic covenant (*Jub.* 6:32–38).⁶⁹ Like *1 Enoch*, *Jubilees* describes Enoch as witness against the Watchers and as scribe of judgement against all injustice committed by the offspring of the Watchers (*Jub.* 4:21–23, cf. 4Q227 (4QpsJub^{c?} frg. 2);⁷⁰ *Jub.* 5:1–11). Unlike *1 Enoch* 8, *Jubilees* does not extensively go into specific crafts of fallen angels that led human beings to perdition (yet

⁶⁶ Cf. Nickelsburg and VanderKam, *1 Enoch. A New Translation*, 144–62 who subdivide the text into six discourses (*1 Enoch* 94:6–96:3, 96:4–98:8, 98:9–99:10, 99:11–100:6, 100:7–102:3, 102:4–104:8) followed by a conclusion (*1 Enoch* 104:9–105:2).

⁶⁷ Nickelsburg and VanderKam, *1 Enoch. A New Translation*, 158.

⁶⁸ O.S. Wintermute, *Jubilees*, in *OTP* 2, 35–142 at 43–4.

⁶⁹ *Jub.* 6:36–37 includes polemics against lunar calendar observance as corruption of holy and profane days.

⁷⁰ 4QpsJub^{c?} 2 1–4: “1 [...] E]noch, after we had taught him 2 [...] six jubilees of years 3 [...] of the ea]rth, among the sons of men and he gave witness against them all 4 [...] and also against the Watchers and he wrote everything.” The extant text (translation from

cf. *Jub.* 8:3). *Jub.* 4:15 implies that the Watchers originally descended to teach the sons of man in combination with performance of judgement and uprightness on earth.

Beyond the traditions surrounding the Flood, *Jubilees* includes several passages with reference to angels and demons that presuppose cosmic dualism. *Jub.* 10:1–6.7–9 successively relates Noah's prayer against demons and God's binding of nine tenths of the demons, ruled by Mastema, to the place of judgement. According to *Jub.* 11:4–5, sin, pollution and idolatry in Ur of the Chaldees were incited by evil spirits sent by Mastema. *Jubilees* 11:10–13 relates the poor fruit of agriculture in the days of Terah, the father of Abraham, to crows and birds sent by Prince Mastema to eat away seeds sown in the earth. *Jub.* 15:27 draws an analogy between the covenant of the Lord with Abraham and the nature of the holy angels, whereas *Jub.* 15:33 attributes the transgression against this covenant to sonship of Beliar. *Jub.* 15:31–32 attributes the rule of spirits to many nations and God's rule over Israel.

Jub. 17:16 mentions the role of Prince Mastema in proposing to test Abraham's faithfulness in affliction through the binding of Isaac (cf. *Jub.* 18:9.12).⁷¹ Analogously, *4QPseudo-Jubilees*^a (4Q225 2 I–II)⁷² also attributes an antagonizing role of the Prince of Animosity, שר המשטמה, and his angels rejoicing over an imminent end for Isaac (4Q225 2 I 9 and 2 II 6–7, 13–14) in tension with angels of holiness standing weeping above (4Q225 2 II 5). According to *Jub.* 19:28–29, among Abraham's blessings for Jacob and his offspring is the expressed wish that the spirit of Mastema may not rule over them to the effect of distancing them from following God. Perhaps analogously, after a quotation of *Jubilees* (CD-A XVI 2–4 // 4QD^f 4 II 4–5), CD-A XVI 4–5 // 4QD^f 4 II 6–7 correlates faithful return to the Law of Moses with the angel Mastema's turning aside from following the faithful.

As part of Isaac's blessing of Levi, *Jub.* 31:14 likens the priestly service of Levi and his sons to the service of the angels of the presence and the holy ones. *Jub.* 32:20–26 mentions a vision of Jacob who receives seven heavenly tablets from an angel to foreshow future events.

García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*. 1, 483) includes details that correspond closely to *Jub.* 4:21–22. Ed.pr. VanderKam, Milik, *DJD* 13, 171–5.

⁷¹ Cf. Job 1:6–12 that attributes a role of Satan/the adversary in proposing affliction for a human protagonist, Job, as a test of faithfulness to God.

⁷² Ed.pr. VanderKam, *DJD* 13, 141–55.

Jubilees 48:2–3.9–15 successively narrates the desire of Prince Mastema to kill Moses upon his return from Midian to Egypt and Mastema's siding with Pharaoh and the Egyptians against Moses and the people of Israel until Mastema's binding. *Jub.* 49:2 attributes the slaughter of all firstborn in Egypt to the powers of Mastema (cf. Exod 12:29–30).

At several points in the narrative of *Jubilees*, precepts and laws are presented as engraved on heavenly tablets and final judgement further plays a recurring part.⁷³ *Jubilees* is extensively represented as adopted, perhaps reworked (4QpsJub^{a-c}), and quoted text (CD-A XVI 2–4 // 4QD^f 4 II 4–5) among the Dead Sea Scrolls.⁷⁴ At the same time, *Jubilees* has been categorized as 'protosectarian' text, in that its worldview does not appear to coincide with the polemical view against other Jewish groups of leadership in Qumran sectarian texts.⁷⁵ Apocalyptic categories of thought in *Jubilees*, such as the examples of cosmic dualism, and the heavenly reckoning of a thousand years as one day (*Jub.* 4:30; cf. 2 Pet 3:8), could be of further comparative interest for broader strands of Palestinian Jewish apocalyptic thought. The demonic figure of Mastema, which recurs in *Jubilees*, further occurs in apocryphal and non-sectarian Qumran texts, such as 4Q*Beatitudes* (4Q525 19 4) and 11Q*Apocryphal Psalms* (11Q11 II 4), as well as in the Qumran sectarian *War Scroll* that refers to the angel of enmity, מלאך משטמה, in apposition to Belial (1QM XIII 11 // 4QM^e 2 3).

The vision of an evil generation in *Jub.* 23:14–20, usually situated in the period of the Chasidim and the Maccabean revolt,⁷⁶ may further have contributed to broader strands of an apocalyptic tradition of polemic against sinful deeds and the urge of repentance and return to the way of righteousness (cf. *Jub.* 23:26). This vision includes language of a struggle between children and parents (*Jub.* 23:16) and the impression that return to 'the way', to righteousness, is not realized until much bloodshed has occurred (*Jub.* 23:20). The extant Qumran copies of *Jubilees* preserve fragments of the text of *Jubilees* 23:14–31, that is *Jub.* 23:21–23.30–31 in 4Q176a,b frgs. 19–21, including the notion in *Jub.* 23:22 that "there

⁷³ Cf. e.g. Collins, *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 25–6.

⁷⁴ See the survey by VanderKam, "Apocalyptic Tradition in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Religion of Qumran," 125–32 on 14/15 copies, quotations in CD-A XVI 2–4 and CD-A X 8, and use and influence, with reference to, among other texts, 4Q225–227, 4Q228, 4Q265, and 4Q252.

⁷⁵ Cf. VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees*, 142–3.

⁷⁶ Davenport, *The Eschatology of the Book of Jubilees*, 41–2; cf. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination*, 82.

will be great wrath against the deeds of [that] generation”, ויהי קצף גדול [ההואה] על מעשי הדור (4Q176a,b 19–20 2).⁷⁷ The end of the vision in *Jub.* 23:24–31 ultimately envisions return to righteousness, long life, and peace without destructive adversaries.

2.3. *Daniel and the Qumran Daniel Cycle*

The Book of Daniel, whose final stage of composition is usually dated around 165 BCE,⁷⁸ is represented among the biblical Qumran scrolls by a relatively significant number of eight manuscripts (1QDan^{a-b}, 4QDan^{a-e}, 6QpapDan).⁷⁹ Apart from narrative sections about the setting of the book in Babylonian exile, Daniel includes many sections about revelations of apocalyptic visions about future events, otherworldly dimensions, and periodization of unfolding history up to the envisioned time of the end (Daniel 11–12). In what follows, I will highlight apocalyptic features of Daniel and their elaboration in the Qumran Daniel cycle.

Daniel 2 presents Nebuchadnezzar’s dream and Daniel’s interpretation of the dream as revelation from God in heaven who reveals mysteries about ‘what will come to pass hereafter’, *מה די להוא אחרי דנה* (Dan 2:29), namely a succession of kingdoms inferior to each other concluded with eschatologically loaded overtones by God’s setting up of an eternal kingdom (Dan 2:36–45 at 44–45).⁸⁰ The Danielic interpretation singles out four kingdoms forged by mankind. Daniel 7 elaborates on the theme of four successive kingdoms, from the starting point of Daniel’s night visions of four beasts and revelation about their pertinence to human history unfolding up to final judgement (Dan 7:9–11.22).⁸¹ Previous scholarship has pointed out that the theme of four kingdoms has

⁷⁷ Text from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*. 1, 360.

⁷⁸ Cf. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination*, 89 on the Hebrew (Dan 1:1–2:4a, 8–12) and Aramaic (Dan 2:4b–7:28) sections of Daniel: “an author of the Maccabean period wished to incorporate the collection of Aramaic tales, but himself preferred to write in Hebrew”.

⁷⁹ Cf. Flint, “The Daniel Tradition at Qumran,” 41–2.

⁸⁰ Cf. *מה די להוא באחרית יומיא* in Dan 2:28.

⁸¹ Discussion of the envisioned everlasting kingdom in Daniel 7, with its individual (Dan 7:13–14) and collective (Dan 7:18.27) dimensions, will be taken up in the subsequent chapter six, since these aspects of Daniel 7 and its ‘Wirkungsgeschichte’, along with a possible connection between Daniel 7 and 4Q246, play an important part in the study of messianism; cf. chapter six.

a broader cultural background as well as a reception history in subsequent early Jewish literature.⁸²

The Qumran Daniel cycle adds further evidence to the Danielic theme of four kingdoms. *4QFour Kingdoms*^{a-b} ar (4Q552–553)⁸³ comprises symbolic imagery of four trees, (4Q552 1 II 1 // 4Q553 6 II 2), which carry different names. One of them is called by name as Babel, בבל, that rules over Persia, שליט בפרס, in the extant fragments (4Q552 1 II 5–6 // 4Q553 6 II 4–5), while a second tree, possibly located to the West (4Q552 1 II 7), is attributed the rule over the powers of the sea and the shipyards (4Q552 1 II 9–10).⁸⁴ This implies that the four trees symbolically stand for four kingdoms (cf. the term במלכות in 4Q553 6 I 5). The (presumably Danielic) vision interpreter, who addresses a king, מלכא, in 4Q552 1 I 8, speaks in the third person singular in 4Q552 1 I and 4Q553 6 I. 4Q552 1 I 10 includes the phrases “[what] he spoke, will be. And their end is in plain sight”, אמר להון ומפקא להון בפרוש, ⁸⁵ possibly implying the envisioned end of the rule of four kingdoms.

Daniel 9 comprises a prophecy of seventy weeks of years, i.e. 490 years (Dan 9:2.24) that refers to Jeremiah (Dan 9:2) and elaborates on Jeremiah 25:11–12 and 29:10, thereby expanding the envisioned timespan of the threat of desolation and abomination against Jerusalem to the Hellenistic period. The calculation of seventy weeks of years has been compared with other apocalyptic time schemes in early Enochic literature.⁸⁶ Perhaps analogously with the Danielic vision of seventy (weeks of) years

⁸² Burkert, “Apokalyptik im frühen Griechentum: Impulse und Transformationen,” 235–54 at 244–51 argued that the broader theme of ‘four kingdoms’ also played a role in ancient Greek literature, albeit without subversive apocalyptic features and as part of a divine utopia. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination*, 92–6 surveys parallel evidence for a four-kingdom schema in Hesiod’s *Works and Days* 106–201, the Roman chronicler Aemilius Sura, Babylonian and Persian prophecy, and the attestation of the theme in *Sib.Or.* 4:49–101.

⁸³ Flint, “The Daniel Tradition at Qumran,” 41–60 and Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination*, did not include 4Q552–553 into their surveys; Collins, *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 136 makes a terse reference to 4Q552–3 as ‘the Four Kingdoms Text’ among diverse apocalyptic texts from cave 4 ‘that contain visionary material’. Abegg, Flint, and Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible*, 484 refer to *4QFour Kingdoms* among Aramaic manuscripts that “also mention Daniel or events associated with his book”.

⁸⁴ Text and translation are preliminarily edited by García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition. 2*, 1102–7.

⁸⁵ Text and translation from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition. 2*, 1102–3.

⁸⁶ Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination*, 109 compares this Danielic time scheme to the Apocalypse of Weeks (*1 Enoch* 93:1–10, 91:11–17), *1 Enoch* 10, and the Animal Apocalypse (*1 Enoch* 85–90).

(Dan 9:2.24), a period marked by the effect of transgression that must be atoned for in order to bring in everlasting righteousness according to Daniel 9:24, *4QPseudo-Daniel^a* (4Q243) 16 1–2 mentions divine deliverance after oppression for a period of [se]venty years, [ש]בעין שנין.⁸⁷ In his collation of the fragments of *4QPseudo-Daniel^a*, P.W. Flint tentatively assigned fragment 16 to the vision of the ‘eschatological period’ in this Pseudo-Danielic composition.⁸⁸ Perhaps analogously with the Danielic vision of a decreed end that is eventually poured out on the desolator (Dan 9:27), the Pseudo-Danielic passage on the ‘eschatological period’, as collated from the fragments of *4QPseudo-Daniel^a* by Flint, appears to envision the defeat to death of the sons of wickedness and the eventual gathering of the elect after this (4Q243 frgs. 25, 33, 24).

The cataclysmic proportions of the troubles envisioned before the ‘decreed end’ are described in Daniel 9:26 as an end coming with “a flood (בשטף), and to the end there shall be war; desolations are decreed” (RSV).⁸⁹ The figurative reference to the flood attests to the general influence of earlier biblical and apocalyptic traditions of the flood.

Daniel 10–12 further develops a vision of future days up to and including the final age, with a prominent role for the angelic figure of Michael, one of the chief princes (Dan 10:13.21), as helper for God’s people in times of trouble up to the eschatological time of deliverance (Dan 12:1). The importance of the archangel Michael is already attested in Enochic tradition, according to which Michael is commissioned to bind the Watchers and their sons for judgement and to cleanse the earth from all wickedness (*1 Enoch* 10:11–22). Qumran literature includes an Aramaic text designated as *4QWords of Michael ar* (4Q529), that could perhaps be situated on the apocalyptic trajectory of Enochic-Danielic thought.⁹⁰ The motif of Michael as contender with the devil as fallen

⁸⁷ Text from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*. 1, 490; Flint, “The Daniel Tradition at Qumran,” 50 further translates “[seven]ty years”; Collins and Flint, *DJD* 22, 108–9 read שנין בעין and translate “for [seven]ty(?) years”.

⁸⁸ Flint, “The Daniel Tradition at Qumran,” 50–1 at the same time indicates uncertainty about the placement of fragment 16, but is inclined to eschatological reading of the fragment in view of references to God’s salvific agency and to ‘the kingdoms of the peoples’.

⁸⁹ Old Greek translations of Dan 9:26 provide divergent renderings; Dan Th 9:26 literally renders בשטף, whereas LXX Dan 9:26 renders μετ’ ὀργῆς.

⁹⁰ Preliminary edition by García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*. 2, 1060–3. 4Q529 4 mentions the first person singular vision of Gabriel, which could parallel *1 Enoch* 32:6; 4Q529 6, 7, 9, 10, and 12 repeatedly refers to God as ‘my Great One, the Lord Eternal’, רבי מרא עלמא, a title that partly corresponds to רבא in e.g. 4QEn^s

angel, that occurs in Jude 9 and Rev 12:7–9, may further have its general background in apocalyptic tradition.⁹¹

2.4. *The Enochic Book of Parables* (1 Enoch 37–71)

The latest dated Enochic writing, the Book of Parables, comprises three parables that envision vindication of the righteous and final judgement of the wicked (1 Enoch 38–44), the eschatological dwelling of the holy ones and the lot of those who deny them (1 Enoch 45–57), and salvation of the righteous and chosen from judgement (1 Enoch 58–69).⁹² The parables are preceded by an introduction (1 Enoch 37) and concluded by a section on Enoch's heavenly ascent (1 Enoch 70–71). In part, these parables resume issues of earlier Enochic writings, including, among other things, the punishment of fallen angels (1 Enoch 54:1–6, 55:3–4; cf. 1 Enoch 13:1–3, 21:7–10), astronomical visions (1 Enoch 41:3–44:1; cf. 1 Enoch 72–82), and lists of fallen angels (1 Enoch 69:2–12; cf. 1 Enoch 6:7, 8:1–3). The Book of Parables has no parallels in extant Qumran fragments. As I have noted in the survey of comparative texts and traditions of chapter two, section 4.2.1.1, it is a complicated matter to distinguish accretions in the process of Christian adoption and transmission from the broadly recognized Semitic Jewish original. Therefore, apart from considering 1 Enoch 37–71 among cumulative evidence of eschatological ideas and notions of resurrection, the Book of Parables appears more problematic evidence for the study of early Jewish apocalypticism (as well as messianism) per se.⁹³

ar IV (// 1 Enoch 91:13). The language of a 'distant province', מדינתא רחיקתא, on the other hand could be terminologically more close to Daniel and Pseudo-Danielic writings (Dan 11:24; מדינתא in 4Q246 I 5, II 7).

⁹¹ Cf. the eschatologically loaded reference to 'the archangel's call' in 1 Thess 4:16 that could perhaps further echo apocalyptic, in particular Danielic tradition about Michael's archangelic role at the time of deliverance and collective resurrection.

⁹² Nickelsburg and VanderKam, *1 Enoch: A New Translation*, 50–95.

⁹³ Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination*, 177–193 argues that "the Similitudes fully belong in the discussion of ancient Jewish apocalypticism" (178), but at the same time notes the "primary emphasis on faith in (the) heavenly Son of Man" (193) in the Book of Parables as example of relation of influence on the New Testament and early Christianity; an issue unparalleled in all other Enochic writings.

3. QUMRAN APOCALYPTIC TEXTS AND EARLY JEWISH APOCALYPTICISM

3.1. *Predestination and Periodization of History*

Longer known apocalyptic texts of sectarian Qumran literature, such as the ‘Two Spirits Treatise’ (1QS III 13–IV 26), the *Damascus Document* (e.g. CD-A II 7–12 // 4QD^a 2 II 6–12), and *4QAgnes of Creation A–B* (4Q180–181), attest to an apocalyptic perspective of predestination and periodization of history.⁹⁴ With regard to periodization of ages and generations, the sectarian Qumran literature stood at the receiving end of older strands of apocalyptic tradition represented by *1 Enoch*, *Jubilees* as also attested by its quotation in CD-A XVI 2–4 // 4QD^f 4 II 4–5, and the Book of Daniel. The periodization in jubilees in *11QMelchizedek* has been compared to the apocalyptic tradition of *Jubilees*.⁹⁵ Enochic traditions about the Watchers are echoed in *4QAgnes of Creation A* 1 7–9, that refers to Azazel and other fallen angels in a context of interpretive teaching about predestination of the ages made by God. *4QAgnes of Creation A* 1 4–9 and *4QAgnes of Creation B* 2 1–4 provide partly parallel terms on ten generations from the sons of Noah to Abraham and the giants. The parallel terms appear to indicate that “those who love injustice and inherit evil” (4Q181 2 4) are likened to words about Azazel “[to love] injustice and to let him inherit evil for all [his] ag[e]” (4Q180 1 9).⁹⁶

The introduction of periodization in terms of time calculation up to an expected final turning point in history has been identified in the Book of Daniel.⁹⁷ Daniel further includes the notion of calculation of periods of trouble and tribulation (Dan 9:24–27). A general example of calculation against times of oppression by foreign rule may be discerned in the context of the Daniel passage about the writing on the wall (Daniel 5:24–28). According to Daniel 5, the days of the Babylonian kingdom, that brought oppression to other nations (Dan 5:19) and further confronted Israel with idolatry (Dan 5:23), were numbered and brought to

⁹⁴ Cf. e.g. Collins, *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 52–70; García Martínez, “Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 195–226 at 206–13.

⁹⁵ Collins, *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 55.

⁹⁶ Translations from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*. 1, 373 and 375. The reading of the plural *אשמה ומנחילי אשמה* in 4Q181 2 4 in admonitory respect rather than in a descriptive sense of the giants is supported by the previous line that mentions not giants but “Israel in the seventieth week” (4Q181 2 3).

⁹⁷ Cf. Collins, *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 63–4.

an end by God (Dan 5:26). As we have already noted, pseudo-Danielic Qumran literature attests to the influence of Danielic tradition of seventy (weeks of) years as calculated time of oppression (4Q243 16 1–2).

In what follows, I will highlight what non-sectarian Qumran texts published since the 1990s and cave 4 recensions of longer known sectarian Qumran texts contribute to this subject.

3.1.1. *Qumran Texts Not-Clearly Sectarian*

4Q228 presents ‘divisions of times,’ *מחלקות העתים* (1 I 2, 9–10) as predestined through the introductory phrase “for thus it is written,” (4Q228 1 I 9). This introductory formula has further been taken to stand for a citation of Jubilees,⁹⁸ but the fragmentary preservation of the phrase does not allow for full comparison with the citation of the extensive title in the *Damascus Document* (CD-A XVI 2–4 // 4QD^f 4 II 4–5).

4Q228 1 I 5 envisions judgement of ‘times of wickedness,’ *משפט עתי*, *עולה*, and visualizes this as ‘fire that scorches and eats of the foundation of wickedness’ in the next line (4Q228 1 I 6). The fragmentarily preserved lines at the beginning of this column appear to address a second person plural group with the predestinarian idea that the division of time for each human being is known before God (4Q228 1 I 4). The mentioning of times of wickedness and their judgement are part of this predestinarian vision on the one hand, while references to the ‘angel of one’s peace’ (4Q228 1 I 8) and the ‘strengthening’ of the addressed group (4Q228 1 I 11) appear to make part of it on the other hand.

4Q390, a parabiblical text published as ‘4QApocryphon of JeremiahC^e’ by D. Dimant,⁹⁹ comprises an apocalyptic vision of Israelite history that includes periodization with reference to a period of seventy years (4Q390 1 2 and 2 I 6), a week of years (4Q390 2 I 4), and jubilees (4Q390 1 7 and 2 I 4).¹⁰⁰ The judgemental perspective of 4Q390 refers to the effect of evil in terms of abandonment to angels of animosity, *מלאכי המשטמות* (4Q390 1 11 and 2 I 6–7), and the reign of Belial, *ממשלת בליעל* (4Q390 2 I 4). 4Q390 2 I 4–10 at 8–10 comprises a vision of a

⁹⁸ 4Q228 is designated as ‘4QText with a Citation of Jubilees’ in the editio princeps by VanderKam and Milik, *DJD* 13, 177–86.

⁹⁹ Dimant, *DJD* 30, 235–54.

¹⁰⁰ 4Q387a (4QapocrfJer C^f) 3 II 3–4 (*עשרה יבלי שנים*) further refers to a period in terms of jubilees. Eshel, “4Q390, the 490-Year Prophecy, and the Calendrical History of the Second Temple Period,” 102–10 at 103 argued that “just as Daniel 9 updated Jeremiah’s prophecy, 4Q390 is an update of the 490-year prophecy in Daniel 9.”

seventy-years period when an influential group that includes priestly lineage among its ranks perpetrates the following deeds designated as evil and disloyal to God.¹⁰¹

2 I 8 (...) להתגבר להון ולבצע 9 [ולחמס ואיש] אשר לר[ע] הו יגולו ויעשוקו
 איש את רעהו ואת מקדשי יטמאו 10 [ואת שבתותי יחללו ו]את[מו]עדי
 יש[כח]ו ובבני[ח]ללו[א]ת זר[ע]ם כוהניהם יחמסו

8 domineering for money, for advantage 9 [and for violence. And each] will steal what belongs to one's neigh[bour] and they will oppress one another; they will defile my temple, 10 [they will defile my Sabbaths, and] they will f[orget] my [fest]ivals and with the sons of [foreigners they will de]base their off[spring;] their priests will act violently.

This periodized vision in 4Q390 includes language that resembles Qumran sectarian viewpoints, in particular terms in the *Damascus Document* that identify fornication (הזנות),¹⁰² wealth (ההון), and defilement of the temple (טמא המקדש) as three nets of Belial (CD-A IV 12–19). In this respect, the *Apocryphon of Jeremiah* could be of great interest as pre-Qumran Essene ‘adopted text’ for the Qumran community, even though the extant fragments of the composition lack Qumran sectarian community terminology.

4Q413 (*4QComposition concerning Divine Providence*)¹⁰³ fragments 1–2 comprise a perspective of wisdom instruction that encompasses God’s revelation about the years of ea[ch] generation (4Q413 1–2 4), after having juxtaposed divinely foreknown inheritance in the knowledge of God’s truth to God’s loathing of every evil person. The predestinarian sense of divine revelation that undergirds the contrast between good and evil in this text brings in possibly apocalyptic features to a text with wisdom instruction.¹⁰⁴

¹⁰¹ Text and translation from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*. 2, 784–5.

¹⁰² Cf. 4QMMT B 75–82 that designates mingling between part of the priests and laity as זונות (B 75, 82) and as the act of ‘polluting the [holy] seed’, מטמאי[ם] [את זרע] הקודש (B 81).

¹⁰³ Ed.pr. by Qimron, *DJD* 20, 169–72.

¹⁰⁴ Cf. Goff, *Discerning Wisdom*, 272–7 who deems the deterministic view in 4Q413 compatible with the apocalyptic worldview of the Qumran community, without attributing 4Q413 to Qumran sectarian authorship.

3.1.2. *Sectarian Qumran Texts*

The *Damascus Document* emphasizes the momentous importance of the communal establishment of a remnant group and its eventual leadership by the Teacher of Righteousness by presenting this as God's visitation of them in the midst of a "period of wrath, three hundred and ninety years after having delivered them up into the hand of Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon" (CD-A I 5–6 // 4QD^a 2 I 10–11, 4QD^c 1 12–14).¹⁰⁵ This periodization, which has been considered in literal terms as referring to the early second century BCE and in symbolic terms with reference to Ezekiel 4:5.¹⁰⁶ The larger composite text that precedes CD-A column I, as we now know it from the 4QD fragments, indicates that this periodization has its setting in a predestinarian perspective:

He determined the moments of wrath for a nation that does not know him, and he has established times of favour for those who examine his precepts and walk on the perfect path. He uncovered their eyes for hidden things and opened their ears and they heard profound things and understood everything that happens before it comes upon them (4QD^c 1 5–8 // 4QD^a 2 I 3–6).¹⁰⁷

The latter sentence in 4QD^c 1 7–8 // 4QD^a 2 I 5–6 is further paralleled in 4Q463 (4QNarrative D) 1 4, which preserves the following phrase: [תַּחְסֵּר וְיִפְתָּח עֲלֵיהֶם מִקְּדוֹת] "hidden things, and he opened their ears, and they heard profound things".¹⁰⁸ This phrase in 4Q463 is preceded by the assurance of God's remembrance of his word, illustrated by a citation of Leviticus 26:44 (4Q463 1 1–3). Somehow analogously, the *Damascus Document* further mentions God's remembrance of his covenant with the ancestors to the effect of saving a remnant for Israel that is not abandoned to destruction (CD-A I 4–5 // 4QD^a 2 I 9–10, 4QD^c 1 11–12). 4Q463 1 1–4 thereby constitutes an important textual parallel.¹⁰⁹

¹⁰⁵ Translation from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*. 1, 551.

¹⁰⁶ Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination*, 149.

¹⁰⁷ Translation from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*. 1, 605. 4QD^a 2 I 3–6, that runs parallel to 4QD^c 1 5–8, differs in a few major respects from 4QD^c 1 5–8, referring instead to 'a period of wrath is determined', חֲסֵר קִץ חֲרוֹן (4QD^a 2 I 3), and 'they opened their [e]ars', וַיִּפְתְּחוּ [וְאֵ] (4QD^a 2 I 5). The version of 4QD^a 2 I 3, that refers to a period of wrath in the singular could correspond with the singular reference to a 'period of wrath' in CD-A I 5.

¹⁰⁸ Ed.pr. Smith, *DJD* 19, 211–4 and plate XXVII. Text and translation from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*. 2, 940–1.

¹⁰⁹ To my knowledge the textual parallel between 4QD^c 1 7–8 // 4QD^a 2 I 5–6 and 4Q463 1 4 has not been noted in previous scholarship; Steudel, *Der Midrasch zur*

The periodization in CD-A I 5–6 // 4QD^a 2 I 10–11, 4QD^c 1 12–14 attributes crucial importance to the community of the Teacher of Righteousness since the time of Babylonian exile. The *Damascus Document* attributes to the Teacher of Righteousness the role of directing those who sought God with an undivided heart and of spreading knowledge to “future generations that he (God) acts¹¹⁰ on the last generation, the generation of traitors” (CD-A I 12 // 4QD^a 2 I 15–16).

The *Damascus Document* conceives of the contemporary age as an extended period of wickedness that is transformed by the rise of one who teaches righteousness at the end of days (CD-A VI 10–11). It thereby appears plausible that CD-A I 12 // 4QD^a 2 I 15–16 speaks of the ‘last generation, the congregation of traitors,’ דור אחרון עדת בוגדים, in terms that encompass past and present experiences as well as a general perspective with eschatological overtones.¹¹¹

CD-A II 7–13 // 4QD^a 2 II 6–13 subsequently unfolds a perspective of God’s predestination of generations and their deeds, abominating those who stray on account of bloodshed on the one hand and raising people called by name, teachers anointed with the holy spirit, and seers of truth for the sake of leaving a remnant on the other.¹¹²

CD-A IV 4–10 evokes an overview of generations and their deeds, who may enter into the covenant of the Law as established between God and the forefathers and receive atonement for iniquities. CD-A IV 10–13 stipulates the completion of this process as a period after which separation and Israel’s trial by Belial prevent any further ‘affiliation with the house of Judah’ (CD-A IV 11).

Finally, CD-A XVI 2–4 // 4QD^f 4 II 4–5, already noted before as text that cites *Jubilees*, stipulates that it follows the perspective of periodization

Eschatologie aus der Qumrangemeinde (4QMidrEschata.b), 53–6 reacting to an earlier analysis by J. Strugnell (1970), briefly argued in terms of a ‘Negativ-Befund’ that 4Q463 does not comprise further ‘Florilegium-fragments’ in addition to 4Q174, while noting unique parallels to the citation-formula לַאֲמֹר [לֵא] of 4Q463 1 2–3 in 1QM X 6, XI 5.11 and CD-A III 20f., IV 13f. (55 and n. 2).

¹¹⁰ For the translation of the perfect עָשָׂה as present tense in a prophetic or gnomic sense, cf. GKC § 106 k–n.

¹¹¹ Davies, *The Damascus Covenant*, 68–9 is inclined to interpret CD-A I 12 as relating to events in the past, translating this line as “He made known to later generations what He had done to the congregation of traitors” (p. 69). Wacholder, *The New Damascus Document*, 147–8 argues for an eschatological sense, translating “and he (the Teacher) will make known to the eschatological generations what He will have done to the last generation.”

¹¹² Cf. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination*, 155 observes that CD-A II 2–13 is a “passage that has many parallels with the Instruction on the Two Spirits” (1QS III 13–IV 26).

in *Jubilees* about “the accurate interpretation of their periods, namely of Israel’s loss of sight from all these matters” (CD-A XVI 2–3 // 4QD^f 4 II 4–5), related in the previous columns of admonition.

The Treatise of the Two Spirits in the *Rule of the Community* (1QS III 13–IV 26) provides a further prominent example of a sectarian Qumran text in which predestination throughout all generations with their times of visitation up to the envisioned final age plays an important part. However, the Two Spirits Treatise does not elaborate a periodization of history, but emphasizes general principles of dualism between spirits of truth and deceit up to the appointed end and new creation.

3.2. Cosmic Dualism

A further feature of early Jewish apocalypticism, which merits to be explored anew with attention to newly available Qumran texts not clearly sectarian and cave 4 recensions of longer known sectarian Qumran texts, is cosmic dualism. Cosmic dualism denotes a perspective on good and evil in the world that conceives this contrast as opposing forces that are operative beyond the individual and collective human levels on cosmological plans, proverbially designated as the realms of light and darkness, of angels and demons. My below discussion will treat examples of more extensive texts and fragments with completely preserved phrases and sentences on the subject of cosmic dualism.¹¹³

3.2.1. Qumran Texts Not Clearly Sectarian

The parabiblical Qumran composition *Pseudo-Ezekiel* includes an eschatologically oriented vision of resurrection of many children of Israel gathered in the land of Israel (cf. chapter four, section 4.1.2). This Pseudo-Ezekielian vision, as represented in 4Q386 (4QpsEzek^b) fragment 1 columns I–II, further includes envisioned deliverance of the Israelite people from oppression by ‘a son of Belial’, בן בליעל (4Q386 1 II 3) through divine intervention. Along with the ‘son of Belial’, 4Q386

¹¹³ Texts and fragments with reference to otherworldly beings, such as 4Q557 (4QVision^f ar) 2 which mentions the angel Gabriel; 4Q529 (4QWords of Michael ar) which narrates ‘words of the book that Michael spoke to the angels’; 4Q458 (4QNarrative A) which includes the phrase ‘and the first angel will cast down’ (frg. 1, l. 8); and 4Q463 (4QNarrative D) 2 3 which mentions a rebuke of Belial, either constitute small scraps of text or do not include elaborate evidence of cosmic dualism.

1 II 4 mentions a defiled multitude, **הַמֶּן הַטְּמֵא**, that appears to be part of the dominion of the ‘son of Belial’ in his attempted oppression of the people of Israel. It is against this collectively perpetrated evil and its wicked leadership that the end of the second column seems to formulate divine wrath that is likened to consuming fire (4Q386 1 II 8–10). 4Q386 1 III 4 further seems to compare the rule of Babylon with ‘a dwelling-place of demons,’ **מְדוּר שְׂדִים**.¹¹⁴ *Pseudo-Ezekiel* thereby includes apocalyptic terms of cosmic dualism in its parabiblical elaboration on visions of Ezekiel.

The *Visions of Amram* include the idea that human life is surrounded by two spheres of influence of two otherworldly beings who rule over light and darkness respectively (4Q543 6; 4Q544 1–3). According to 4Q544 (4Q*Visions of Amram*^b ar), Amram has a dream vision about two otherworldly beings who claim rule over ‘all the sons of man,’ **כּוֹל בְּנֵי אָדָם** (4Q544 1 12), while disputing against each other about rule over him (4Q544 1 10–11). Another fragment seems to imply that the dispute of the two otherworldly beings is over the soul of each human being, **עַל [תַּרְתִּיהֶן] בֵּין נַפְשֵׁה תַכְמוֹן** (4Q545 4 3).¹¹⁵ One of the otherworldly beings is named ‘Melchiresha,’ **מַלְכִי רִשְׁע** (4Q544 2 3), that is, ‘wicked king,’ presumably the opponent of a ‘just king,’ ‘Melchizedek.’¹¹⁶ This cosmic dualism in the extant fragments of the *Visions of Amram* is not without an earthly counterpart of human responsibility to choose between these two spheres of influence. The envisioned dialogue between Amram and the other-worldly beings includes the question on the part of the other-worldly beings addressing Amram: “Which of us do you [choose to be ruled?]” (4Q544 1 12).¹¹⁷

Finally, apocryphal psalms of Qumran include features of cosmic dualism that intersect with apocalypticism. 11QPs^a XIX // 11Ps^b 4–5 comprises an apocryphal psalm that presupposes cosmic dualism.¹¹⁸ 11QPs^a XIX 13–16 // 11QPs^b 4–5 14–16 draws a contrast between a

¹¹⁴ Text and translation from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*. 2, 776–7. Cf. the connotation of “a dwelling that has been occupied by gentiles” to **מְדוּר** in Jastrow, 733.

¹¹⁵ Text from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*. 2, 1090.

¹¹⁶ Cf. Collins, *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 45–6 on ‘Melkiresha’ in the *Visions of Amram*, 4Q280 1 2, that formulates a curse against Melkiresha, and the counterpart ‘Melchizedek’ in the Qumran sectarian composition 11Q*Melchizedek*. Note that 11Q*Melchizedek* does not refer to Melkiresha, but to Belial (11Q13 II 13, 25; III 7).

¹¹⁷ Translation from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*. 2, 1089.

¹¹⁸ Ed.pr. Sanders, *DJD* 4; García Martínez, Tigchelaar, Van der Woude, *DJD* 23, 29–47. Cf. Kottsieper, “11Q5 (11QPsa) XIX—A Plea of Deliverance?,” 125–50 on the

spirit of faith in God, for which the protagonist prays, and an unclean spirit, רוח טמאה, possessed by Satan, שטן, from whose rule the protagonist asks to be delivered. 11Q11 (11QapocrPs)¹¹⁹ includes references to spirits and demons, to the Pri[nce of Animosity], ש[ר המשט]מה (11Q11 II 4) and to [all the] sons of Bel[ial], [כול] [בני בל]יעל (11Q11 VI 3), in settings of incantation (11Q11 II 2, 8; V 4) and exorcism of that which threatens to kill the soul (11Q11 I 7, III 9 (להרוג נפש), V 2–13).¹²⁰ Over against any demon who damages, הרע, humankind (11Q11 V 12), 11Q11 also mentions angels of the Lord (11Q11 III 4), among whom Raphael, to whom 11Q11 V 2–3 presumably attributes that he restores the ‘possessed one[s]’, הפגוע[ים], to peace.¹²¹ This evidence touches on a worldview that was probably compatible with cosmic dualism in early Jewish apocalypticism, as represented in Qumran literature.

3.2.2. *Sectarian Qumran Texts*

3.2.2.1. *The Damascus Document*

The *Damascus Document* comprises some passages that presuppose cosmic dualism, even though the composition is mainly concerned with admonition and legal issues with reference to the forefathers up to future generations from the standpoint of the rise of the Teacher of Righteousness.¹²² Interwoven with the admonitory and legal sections of the *Damascus Document* are the following notions of cosmic dualism. The admonitory part mentions ‘angels of destruction’, מלאכי חבל, who strike those who turn aside from the way to follow the ways of the wicked (CD-A II 2–7 at 5–6 // 4QD^a 2 II 2–6),¹²³ while at the same time emphasizing that the angel Mastema turns aside from following

poetic structure and interpretation of this apocryphal psalm as text that appeals to those who doubt and stumble to join the protagonist in praise of God.

¹¹⁹ Ed.pr. García Martínez, Tigchelaar, Van der Woude, *DJD* 23, 181–205.

¹²⁰ In view of further inclusion of Ps 91 in 11Q11 VI 3–14, following the apocryphal passages in 11Q11 I–VI 3, Abegg, Flint, Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible*, 539–42 refer to four ‘exorcism psalms’ (11Q11 I; 11Q11 II–V 3; 11Q11 V 4–14; Psalm 91 in 11Q11 VI 3–14).

¹²¹ García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*, 2, 1200–5. Cf. Jastrow, 1135 on פגועין standing for “stricken, afflicted (with insanity)”.

¹²² Cf. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination*, 154–5 who supposes that few explicit dualistic statements can be discerned in the *Damascus Document*.

¹²³ 4QD^a 2 II 2–3 adds מכול שבילי חט[אים], “and from all the tracks of the s[inners]”, to the phrase דרכי רשעים in CD-A II 2–3; text and translation from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*, 1, 582–3.

the one who returns to the Law of Moses and keeps his word (CD-A XVI 4–5 // 4QD^f 4 II 6–7). CD-A VIII 1–2 // CD-B XIX 13–14 presupposes that those who do not remain firm in the covenant will be visited for destruction through the power of Belial.

The admonitory survey of past examples of those who went astray by allowing themselves to be caught in guilty inclinations includes reference to the fallen Watchers of the heavens (CD-A II 17–21 // 4QD^a 2 II 17–21). CD-A IV 12–19 refers to Belial being set loose against Israel with the aid of Belial's three nets that are given the appearance of three kinds of righteousness: fornication, wealth, and the defilement of the Temple. CD-A V 17–19 // 4QD^a 3 II 5–7, 4QD^b 2 1–3, 6Q15 (6QD) 3 1–2 most explicitly turns to language of cosmic dualism that elaborates on the biblical theme of the time of the Exodus: “For in ancient times there arose Moses and Aaron, by the hand of the prince of lights and Belial, with his cunning, raised up Jannes and his brother during the first deliverance of Israel” (CD-A V 17–19).¹²⁴ The antagonism between Moses and Aaron on the one hand and Jannes and his brother on the other appears to represent a tradition that had wider circulation beyond the (pre-Qumran) Essene movement.¹²⁵

Finally, the legal section of the *Damascus Document* includes one reference to Belial in the following context: “Every man over whom the spirits of Belial dominate, and who preaches apostasy, will be judged according to the regulation of the necromancer or the diviner.” Within the larger framework of the text, the association of the rule of spirits of Belial with the preaching of rebellion, סרה, signifies rebellion against God's commandments through the Law of Moses and the ‘holy anointed

¹²⁴ Translation from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*. 1, 559. 4QD^a 3 II 5–7 differs from CD-A V 17–19, in that it concludes with an accent on Belial's first wicked manifestation against Israel, בהר[שעה] {בִּרְשָׁעָה} שֶׁעַ יִשְׂרָאֵל אֶת הַרִישׁוֹנָה (4QD^a 3 II 6–7), rather than on Israel's first deliverance, בהושע ישראל את הראשונה (CD-A V 19). On the other hand, 4QD^b 2 1–3 at lines 2–3, that present the phrase בהושע ישראל את הריאשונה, and 6QD 3 2, that presents the phrase בהושע ישראל את הריאשונה, correspond to CD-A V 19; García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*. 1, 558, 584, and *Study Edition*. 2, 1154.

¹²⁵ The pseudepigraphical ‘Fragments from the Book of Jannes and Jambres,’ dated between the first and third centuries CE by A. Pietersma and R.T. Lutz, “Jannes and Jambres,” in *OTP* 2, 427–42 at 432–3, refer to Jannes and Jambres as magicians at the Egyptian court and in Memphis, who opposed Moses and his brother Aaron. 2 Timothy 3:8 further mentions the opposition of Jannes and Jambres to Moses; cf. section 8 below.

ones,' subsequent prophets (CD-A V 21–VI 1 // 4QD^a 3 II 8–9, 4QD^b 2 5–6, 6QD 3 3–4; cf. CD-A II 12–13).¹²⁶

3.2.2.2. *The Rule of the Community*

The *Rule of the Community* comprises several sections with language that presupposes or explicates cosmic dualism. Near the beginning of the *Rule of the Community* from cave 1 (1QS), a section on entrance into the covenant of the sectarian Qumran community (1QS I 11b–II 18 // 4QS^b II–III, 4QpapS^c II, 5Q11 (5QS) 1 I) includes language of a liturgical ceremony led by priests and levites. The language of blessings of the covenant and curses against all men of the lot of Belial (1QS II 1–10 // 4QS^b II 12–13, III 1–4, 4QpapS^c II 1–7, 5QS 1 I 2–6), of contrast between Belial's lot of darkness and the sons of light (1QS II 7, 16 // 4QS^b III 1, 4QpapS^c II 4), presupposes cosmic dualism. This dualistic language of blessings of the covenant and curses against the lot of Belial followed by a double amen is paralleled by a passage in another sectarian composition, *4QBerakhot*, that is in 4Q286 (*4QBerakhot^a*) 7 II // 4Q287 (*4QBerakhot^b*) 6.¹²⁷ The passage in 4QBer^a 7 II // 4QBer^b 6 also comprises sectarian community terminology and curses against Belial and his lot of darkness.

The Treatise of the Two Spirits (1QS III 13–IV 26) contrasts spirits of truth and deceit with paths of light and of darkness from a predestinarian starting point with a view to visitation of these two ways and eschatological resolution of this conflict. This Treatise explicitly attributes these two opposite spirits to the respective dominions of the Prince of Lights, שר אורים, and the Angel of Darkness, מלאך חושך (1QS III 20–21).¹²⁸ This dualistic language of contrast corresponds to that in the *Damascus Document* (שר האורים vs. בליעל in CD-A V 18 // 4QD^a 3 II 5–6, 4QD^b 2 1–2, 6QD 3 1) and the *War Scroll* (שר מאור vs. מלאך לשחת מלאך in 1QM XIII 10–11 // 4Q495 (4QM^c) 2 2–3).

¹²⁶ Cf. סרה in CD-A V 21 and ודבר סרה in CD-A XII 3. Wacholder, *The New Damascus Document*, 341 identifies the apostasy with “idoltrous practices”.

¹²⁷ Ed.pr. by Nitzan, *DJD* 11, 7–60.

¹²⁸ On points of correspondence between the Treatise's use of רוח and the Hebrew Bible on the one hand and apocalyptic language of cosmic dualism as development beyond the Hebrew Bible on the other, cf. Sekki, *The Meaning of Ruah at Qumran*, 193–223.

3.2.2.3. *The Hodayot*

The language of cosmic dualism in the *Hodayot* is concentrated in the so-called ‘Teacher Hymns’ section (1QH^a X–XVII), as distinct from Community Hymns (cf. chapter two, section 3.5). The Teacher Hymns evoke a picture of violent opponents to the individual protagonist, opponents to whom 1QH^a X 16 attributes ‘devilish schemes’, מזמות בליעל, and whom 1QH^a X 22 identifies with an ‘assembly of Belial’, עדת בליעל, opposed to God’s covenant. 1QH^a XI 27–36 // 4QH^f 4 II 2–6 subsequently envisions judgement and wrath against hypocrites and every wicked one, כול בליעל (1QH^a XI 28 // 4QH^f 4 II 3), with reference to imagery that includes consuming fire, torrents of wickedness or ‘Belial’ into destruction (1QH^a XI 29, 32 // 4QH^f 4 II 4), and a war of heavenly mighty ones, מלחמת גבורי שמים (1QH^a XI 35–36).

The imagery in 1QH^a XI 35–36 appears to convey the protagonist’s sense of finding himself on the brink of wickedness, the soul of a poor person dwelling with great tumults (1QH^a XI 24–25), tumults of rejection, expulsion, isolation, and life-threatening plotting against the protagonist (1QH^a XII 8–10; cf. 1QH^a X 21–22).¹²⁹ The imagery in 1QH^a XI 35–36 carries the overtones of antedeluvian calamity brought to the earth through the offspring of the Watchers, the Giants, הגבורים, thereby echoing Enochic tradition.

1QH^a XII 12–14 // 4Q430 (4QH^d) 1 1–2 contrasts the enduring counsel of God who abhors every device of wickedness, כל מחשבת בליעל, to the deliberation for scandalous deeds of wickedness by a group of hypocrites, נעלמים, who “search you with a double heart (וידרשוכה בלב) (ולב), and are not firmly based in your truth.”¹³⁰ This characterization of opponents is the opposite of that of the group around the Teacher of Righteousness in the *Damascus Document* (בלב שלם דרשוהו) in CD-A I 10 // 4QD^a 2 I 14, 4QD^c 1 17), while the charge against opponents that they denied the ‘vision of knowledge’ and the ‘path of your heart’ (לא

¹²⁹ 1QH^a XII 8–10, “For I have been rejected by them, and they do not esteem me when you made yourself great through me; for they drive me from my land like a bird from its nest; all my friends and my acquaintances have been driven away from me, and rank me like a broken jug. But they are mediators of fraud and seers of deceit, they have plotted a devilish thing against me.” Cf. 1QH^a X 21–22, “vicious men have sought my soul (בקשו נפשי) when I relied on your covenant” and 1QH^a XIII 39, “[The streams of Be]ll[al] surround my soul”; translations from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*. 1, 163, 169, 175.

¹³⁰ Translation from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*. 1, 169.

נכון and לא הואה in 1QH^a XII 17–18 // 4QH^d 1 6–7) resembles that in CD-A V 12 (לא נכוננו).

Finally, 1QH^a XIV 12–22 begins to associate people of God's counsel with the lot of 'angels of the presence', (1QH^a XIV 13), indicating nearness to God, while eventually turning to those who "have staggered off the path of your heart", who have instead Belial as "counsellor of their heart" (1QH^a XIV 21–22 // 4QH^c 2 I 10–11).¹³¹ In the middle of this passage, the protagonist envisions a world as an 'everlasting plantation' from which all injustice is destroyed, with overtones of otherworldly cosmic proportions:

All the streams of Eden [will water] its [bra]n[ch]es and they will be [seas without] limits; and its forest will be over the whole world, endless, and as deep as to Sheol [its roots.] The source of light [will] be an eternal spring, inexhaustible, in its shining flames all the son[s of injustice] will burn [and it will be turned] into a fire that singes all the men of guilt until destruction. (1QH^a XIV 16–19).¹³²

This survey of passages in the *Hodayot* attests to an alternation between references to בליעל as verbal equivalent for a wicked one, a hypocrite (1QH^a XI 28),¹³³ and language that presupposes dualism of cosmic proportions (e.g. 1QH^a XI 35–36, XIV 12–22).

3.2.2.4. *The Eschatological Midrash*

The 'Eschatological Midrash' (4Q174, 4Q177) comprises an eschatological vision¹³⁴ of definitive rest for the people of Israel from all the sons of Belial and of the salvation of Israel through the raised branch of David together with the Interpreter of the Law. 4Q174 (4QMidrEschat^a) 1 I 8–9 attributes to the sons of Belial the plan of Belial to make the sons of light fall, to entrap them in their sins and make evil plots against them. 4Q174 1 I 14–17 gives an explicit sectarian focus to the vision by asso-

¹³¹ Translation from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *ibidem*, 175.

¹³² Translation from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *ibidem*, 175.

¹³³ The apposition of 'and a spreading out of wrath against hypocrites,' ומתך חמה, and 'and a period of wrath for every wicked one,' וקץ תרון לכול בליעל, in 1QH^a XI 28 suggests this sense of verbal equivalents. For the meaning of בליעל (איש) as a 'wicked person,' cf. e.g. 2 Sam 20:1, Prov 16:27, Nah 2:1.

¹³⁴ Cf. Steudel, *Der Midrasch zur Eschatologie aus der Qumrangemeinde* (4QMidrEschat^{a-b}), 161–3 at 163 who defines the recurring references to אחרית הימים in 4QMidrEschat as 'the last age of periodized history predetermined by God,' thereby denoting 'the end of days.'

ciating those who turn aside from the way of the wicked with ‘the sons of Zadok and the men of their counsel who pursue justice’ who come to the community council, *לעצת היחד*. 4Q174 1 II 1–2 and 4 3–4 associate times of testing (*עת המצרף*) and of hardships concerning animosity cherished against Judah with the workings of Belial. 4Q177 (4QMidr-Eschat^b) I 1–3 specifically relates the time of testing, *עת המצרף*, to the sectarian community, *אנשי היחד*. Analogously with 4Q174 1 I 8–9, 4Q177 II 4–7 identifies ‘all the men of Belial (*כל אנשי בליעל*) and all the mob’ as ‘those who make the sons of light stagger’, *בני המכשילים את בני האור*. Cosmic dualism is further explicated in 4Q177 III 8, which distinguishes the rule over the lot of light and that over the lot of darkness by Belial. 4Q177 IV 12 attributes deliverance of all the sons of light from the power of Belial to ‘the angel of his truth’, *מלאך אמתו*, while 4Q177 IV 14 further mentions God’s great hand in deliverance from ‘all the spirits of [Belial]’, *כול רוחי בליעל*. 4Q177 IV 16 ultimately envisions that “[Be][lia] and all the men of his lot will be fin[ished] for ever, and all the sons of li[ght] will be reunited”,¹³⁵ probably in ‘Zion with joy’, as the preceding line 15 reads.¹³⁶

3.2.2.5. *The War Scroll*

The *War Scroll* (1QM // 4Q491–496 (4QM^{a–f})) comprises much dualistic language in its description of an envisioned battle between the sons of light and the sons of darkness, with explicit reference to wrath of God against Belial (e.g. 1QM IV 1–2 // 4QM^f V 16 5). The dualistic language of war, which the *War Scroll* conceives as “a time of salvation for the nation of God and a period of rule for all the men of his lot, and of everlasting destruction for all the lot of Belial” (1QM I 5 // 4QM^f I 3 4–5),¹³⁷ includes an explicit sense of cosmic dualism. 1QM I 14–15 // 4QM^f I 2+1 7 refers to the ultimate subjection of “[Belial, and al]l the angels of his dominion and all the men of [his lot]”¹³⁸ by the great power of God. 1QM XIII 10–12 // 4QM^e 2 1–4 contrasts the dominion of the Prince of light, *שר מאור*, with angels of righteousness and spirits of truth to the dominion of Belial as angel of animosity, *מלאך משטמה*, in darkness with angels of destruction, *מלאכי חבל*. 1QM XIV 8–10 // 4QM^a 8–10

¹³⁵ Translation from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*. 1, 367.

¹³⁶ 4Q177 IV 15, *ויראי אל יקדישו שמו ובאו ציון בסמחה וירושלים*, (text from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *ibidem*, 366). Cf. 1QM III 10–11, XII 13 and XIX 5.

¹³⁷ Translation from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *ibidem*, 113.

¹³⁸ Translation from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *ibidem*, 115.

I 6–7 attributes the guarding of the ancestral covenant and mercy for a remnant from spirits of destruction during the reign of Belial, בממשלת בליעל, to the God of mercy, אל החסדים.

In the course of its description of the rule of war of the sons of light against the sons of darkness, the *War Scroll* refers to the appointed time for the downfall of the dominion of evil through God's power as a matter of the present in a high-priestly speech (1QM XVI 13–XVII 9): "Today is his appointed time to humiliate and abase the prince of the dominion of evil", היום מועדו להכניע ולהשפיל שר ממשלת רשעה (1QM XVII 5–6).¹³⁹ Subsequent lines express cosmic dualism between the 'prince of the dominion of evil' and the envisioned divine aid to "the lot of his [co]venant by the power of the majestic angel for the sway of Michael in everlasting light, to illuminate with joy the covenant of Israel, peace and blessing to God's lot, to exalt the sway of Michael above all the gods, and the dominion of Israel over all flesh" (1QM XVII 6–8).¹⁴⁰ 1QM XVIII 1–3 mentions a definitive blow brought to Belial and the army of his dominion by the mighty hand and power of the God of Israel.

The apocalyptic notion of war in the *War Scroll* and related texts merits separate attention with regard to the historical and traditio-historical question which part it made of the worldview of the sectarian Qumran community. Reconsideration of this question in comparison with other recently available fragments related to the subject of war and reflection on warfare may serve to put this issue in further relief.

3.3. *Apocalypticism and Ideas of War*

The *War Scroll* presents an apocalyptic notion of war, which incorporates cosmic dualism, predestination¹⁴¹ and a perspective of divine judgement (e.g. 1QM VI 3), in reaction to the perception of the rule of the Kittim, (1QM I 6), as an evil empire that oppresses the people of Israel in its own land (cf. 1QM X 6–8 with citation of Num 10:9) and as Ashur that stands for "the [ene]mies of all the countries", [אן]יבי כול הארצות, (1QM XI 13). The much discussed question has been to which historical situation the sectarian Qumran community applied this perspective of war

¹³⁹ Text and translation from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *ibidem*, 140–1.

¹⁴⁰ Translation from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *ibidem*, 141.

¹⁴¹ The *War Scroll* envisions the war against the Kittim as foretold since ancient times (1QM I 10, XI 11).

between the sons of light and the sons of darkness and whether and how the *War Scroll* elaborated on prior dualistic notions of war. While 1QM and 4QM^{a-f} have been longer-known texts,¹⁴² the publication of some new texts, 4QSefer ha-Milkhamah (4Q285) and 11QSefer ha-Milkhamah (11Q14), since the 1990s,¹⁴³ indicates the existence of a more elaborate cycle of Qumran writings about apocalyptic war.

Historical points of reference in the mentioning of the ‘war against the Kittim,’ מלחמתם בכתיים (1QM I 12), have been divergently interpreted. The war perspective is usually interpreted as originally related to the era of the Maccabean revolt against Seleucid rule, in view of the mentioning of the ‘Kittim of Ashur’ (1QM I 2) and ‘the kings of the North’ (1QM I 4).¹⁴⁴ Since manuscripts of the *War Scroll* were copied throughout the first century BCE, the text has also been drawn into historical discussion about Jewish opposition to Roman rule.¹⁴⁵

A recurring issue with regard to the apocalyptic perspective of war in the *War Scroll* is further the supposition that this text envisaged eschatological war and thereby projected previous prophecies of war, such as in Daniel 11–12, on contemporary, post-Hellenistic times of domination by Roman rule. Many scholarly surveys presuppose that the *War Scroll* is a vision of eschatological war.¹⁴⁶ The belief in a time of salvation for Israel and a definitive end to all wickedness predestined since ancient times carries eschatological overtones. Josephus further mentions the Essene part in the Jewish war against Rome (66–70 CE) in martyrological terms

¹⁴² Respectively published by E.L. Sukenik in 1954–1955 and by Baillet, *DJD* 7, 12–68 in 1982.

¹⁴³ Ed.pr. of 4Q285 by Alexander and Vermes, *DJD* 36, 228–46; ed.pr. of 11Q14 by García Martínez, Tigchelaar, and Van der Woude, *DJD* 23, 243–51.

¹⁴⁴ Davies, *1QM, the War Scroll from Qumran*, 19 and 59; Duhaime, *The War Texts: 1QM and Related Manuscripts*, 72–6 (“Historical References in 1QM 1–2”).

¹⁴⁵ Alexander, “The Evil Empire,” 17–31. Cf. Duhaime, *The War Texts*, 80–1 who observes about the question of the identity of the Kittim that “a mixed picture also emerges in the Qumran compositions”, thereby leaving the possibility open that an updated interpretation of Kittim as Greeks and Romans could apply to the literary transmission of copies of the *War Scroll*.

¹⁴⁶ Davies, *1QM, the War Scroll from Qumran*, 124. Davies yet also cites a view by Y. Yadin that 1QM “was not essentially written for the purpose of consolation and description of the splendid future at the End of Days. Its purpose was to supply an urgent and immediate need, a guide for the problems of the long-predicted war, which according to the sect would take place in the near future”. Collins, *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 91–109 devotes a separate chapter to ‘the eschatological war’; García Martínez, “Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 195–226 at 220–6 labels ‘the eschatological war’ as one among four clusters of ideas in the description of apocalyptic tradition in the Dead Sea Scrolls.

(*J.W.* 2.152–153; cf. chapter two, section 5.3). However, some cautions are in place against a possible implication of the above-mentioned idea of eschatological war that the Qumran sectarian community would conceive of the first-century CE war against Rome as an inevitably eschatological event predestined since ancient times.¹⁴⁷ Josephus observes ambiguity in the expectation of a war that would bring an end to foreign rule and institute Israelite hegemony, thereby referring to the interpretation of ‘an ambiguous oracle’, *χρησµὸς ἀµφίβολου*, from the holy scriptures (*J.W.* 6.312–313).

First, it has been observed by P.S. Alexander that the most ‘active phase of the tradition’ embodied by the *War Scroll* had its heyday between 63 and 30 BCE, in the aftermath of Pompey’s conquest.¹⁴⁸ Historical names of a Roman commander and Hasmonean rulers that occur in Qumran fragments, such as *אמליוס*, Aemilius Scaurus (4Q324a 2 8; cf. *J.W.* 1.127–129), *שלמציון*,¹⁴⁹ Salome Alexandra (4Q322 2 4; 4Q324b 1 II 7; 76–67 BCE), and *הרקנוס*, Hyrcanus II (4Q322 2 6; 67 BCE), also relate to transition from the last Hasmonean rulers to Roman domination at the time of Pompey’s capture of Jerusalem (63 BCE). The occurrence of these names in calendrical documents implies a preoccupation with this period.

Second, the *War Scroll* is less explicit in its designations of the envisioned, predestined war against evil as eschatological war than previously assumed. Characteristic designations for the final age, such as *אחרית הימים* and *קץ אחרון* known from other Qumran texts,¹⁵⁰ do not occur in the *War Scroll* (cf. chapter two, section 3.8).

Third, Qumran texts and fragments, in particular those published since the 1990s, yield the idea that the Qumran library does not comprise a homogeneous conception of apocalyptic war, but evinces more diversity in ideas of war. A longer known sectarian text such as the *Hodayot* emphasizes a defensive sense of fortification against “the wars of wickedness”, *מלחמות רשעה*, with the aid of God’s holy spirit (1QH^a XV 6–7). Three texts, two of them published since the 1990s and one still

¹⁴⁷ Cf. the open question posed by Duhaime, *The War Texts*, 115: “was it (military rhetoric in 1QM) sufficient to turn them into activists who would join to fight a desperate struggle such as the Great Revolt (66–73)? It is not impossible, but probably undemonstrable”.

¹⁴⁸ Alexander, “The Evil Empire,” 31.

¹⁴⁹ Cf. Jastrow, 1587: “*שלמצו*, *שלמצה* pr. n. f. (abbrev. of *שלם ציון*) Sh’lamtsa, Sh’lamtsu (Salome Alexandra), wife and successor of king Alexander Jannai”.

¹⁵⁰ Abegg, Bowley, and Cook, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Concordance*. 1, 27–8.

awaiting official publication, may be added to this discussion. 4Q471a (4QPolemical Text)¹⁵¹ seems to voice polemic against a group of war-mongers. I have quoted text and translation below.¹⁵²

4Q471a 1
 1 [...]עת צויתם לבלתי 1
 2 [...]ם ותשקרו בבריתו 2
 3 [...]ות]אמרו נלחמה מלחמותיו כיא גאלנו 3
 4 [...]גבור]יכם ישפלו ולוא ידעו כיא מאס 4
 5 [...]תתגברו למלחמה ואתם נחשבתם 5
 6 [...]בקיאו vacat משפט צדק תשאלו ועבודת 6
 7 [...]תתנשאו vacat ויבחר ב[...] לזעקה 7
 8 [...]ותשיתו] מר למתוק [ומתוק 8

1 [...]...you were commanded not to 2 [...] and you have betrayed his covenant 3 [...] and you] said: 'Let us fight his battles, for he has redeemed us' 4 [...] your [champion]s will be subdued and will not know that he rejected 5 [...] you will show yourselves to be mighty for war but you shall be regarded 6 [...] in one's vomit (?). *Blank* You will ask for a just judgement and the work of 7 [...] you shall extol. *Blank* And he will choose [...] at the cry 8 [...] you shall turn [bitter to sweet] and sweet (4Q471a 1)

The polemic in this fragment appears to be intra-Jewish, in view of reference to betrayal of God's covenant and polemic against the claim to fight God's battles together with redemption by him. It is difficult to enter into further precision, but arguments about the possible association of involved parties should at any rate take as starting-point the fact that the fragments of 4Q471, published as 4Q471, 4Q471a, 4Q471b, and 4Q471c, have been dated to the end of the first century BCE. The party that could be in view in this intra-Jewish polemic might be a group or groups that would favour a type of war perspective that is associated with a nascent movement at the turn of the common era designated with the umbrella term the 'fourth philosophy' by Josephus. It is particularly with regard to them that the first-century CE Jewish historian describes a militant zeal for theocracy (*Ant.* 18.1–10.23). The small extant fragment does not include sectarian community terminology. Yet the fact that it has been considered part of 4Q471, that also includes a 'War Scroll-like text' (4Q471) and 'self-glorification hymn' (4Q471b),

¹⁵¹ Ed.pr. of 4Q471a by E. Eshel and M. Kister, *DJD* 36, 446–49.

¹⁵² Text and translation from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*. 2, 952–3.

could speak for the possible significance of this fragment for the Qumran sectarian community.

A second recently officially published text, 4Q246 (*4QAramaic Apocalypse*), refers to oppression on the earth (4Q246 I 4), the trampling of one people by another people, and the trampling of one province by another province (4Q246 II 3). Yet according to 4Q246 II 4, the key role of the people of God is to make “everyone rest from the sword”, **ובלא ונייה מן הרב**. 4Q246 II 5–6 envisions a kingdom on earth with judgement in truth and peace that makes the sword cease from the earth.

Finally, 4Q562 (*4QAramaic D*) 1 1–2, of which I have quoted text and translation below,¹⁵³ appears to exclude from the priesthood those who have been involved in evil through warfare or other cases of taking up the sword.

[...] שיעין די בחרב ובקרב [...] 1
 [...] לא ימלון ידיהן לכהנה [...] 2

[e]vil ones, who by the sword, or in a war [...] 2 [...] shall not taken upon themselves the priesthood.

The above survey indicates that the notion of apocalyptic war in dualistic terms was part of the received traditions from the Maccabean era that may well have taken on contemporary significance in the first century BCE, as the literary evidence of the Qumran war cycle attests. Beyond this point, however, there is no unanimous textual evidence for application to war against Rome in the first century CE. On the contrary, the extant evidence even includes intra-Jewish polemic against certain notions of holy war (4Q471a), the idea that God’s people brings about rest from war in an apocalyptic text (4Q246), and the supposition that the priesthood was incompatible with bloodshed (4Q562).

3.4. *Visions of Final Judgement*

In addition to the above discussed features of predestination and periodization, cosmic dualism, and ideas of war in apocalyptic texts among the semi-complete corpus of sectarian and non-sectarian Qumran literature, evidence for a focus on final judgement as expression of the concern for righteousness and against injustice in the world needs to

¹⁵³ Text and translation from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *ibidem*, 1118–9.

be surveyed as characteristic feature of apocalypticism. The synoptic table of early Jewish apocalypses by J.J. Collins indicates that envisioned judgement as destruction of wickedness is the one recurrent element in both otherworldly journeys and 'historical' apocalypses.¹⁵⁴

3.4.1. *Qumran Texts Not Clearly Sectarian*

Among Qumran texts not clearly sectarian that mention or explicitly presuppose final judgement may be surveyed a number of texts that combine several features of apocalypticism. The following texts can be considered under this rubric: 4Q521 (*4QMessianic Apocalypse*) and 4Q215a (*4QTime of Righteousness*).

4Q521 (*4QMessianic Apocalypse*) has been discussed previously with regard to its evidence of resurrection (chapter four, section 3.2), so that this theme, which also recurs in several early Jewish apocalyptic texts (*1 Enoch*, *Daniel*, *Sib.Or.* 2.221–26 and 4.179–82, *4 Ezra*, *2 Baruch*), will not concern us here. The 'Messianic Apocalypse', whose composition has been dated to the second half of the second century BCE,¹⁵⁵ includes a focus on divinely mediated good news for those who hope in their heart (4Q521 2 II + 4) as well as thanksgiving for 'the Lord's acts of justice', צדקות אדני (4Q521 7 1–8 + 5 II 7–16 at 7 7), including judgement according to deeds, either good or accursed (4Q521 7 4–5). Cosmic ramifications for ethical dualism seem to be implied by references to 'the valley of death' (4Q521 5 II 11), the accursed (4Q521 5 II 13), and angels (4Q521 5 II 15). The contrast between the raising of the dead (4Q521 7 6) and a state of being for death (4Q521 7 5 and 5 II 8) appears to be at stake where the contrast between righteous and wicked becomes absolute.¹⁵⁶ The extant fragments of the 'Messianic Apocalypse' emphasise a conviction that divine righteousness is according to "the law of your lovingkindness", חק חסד {יד}ך (4Q521 2 III 1).¹⁵⁷

4Q215a (*4QTime of Righteousness*), whose composition may be dated to the second century BCE (cf. chapter two, section 2.2), envisions destruction of all iniquity (כּוּל פּשַׁע [כוּל] in 4Q215a 1 II 3), while also

¹⁵⁴ Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination*, 7.

¹⁵⁵ Puech, *La Croyance des Esséniens en la vie future*. 2, 627–92 at 629 and 668; Puech, *DJD* 25, 3–5 and 37.

¹⁵⁶ Cf. the phrase '[between the righteo]us and the wicked', [בין צדי]ק לרש[ע], in 4Q521 14 2; text and translation from Parry and Tov, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader*. 6, 164–5.

¹⁵⁷ Text and translation after Parry and Tov, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader*. 6, 160–1.

including features of predestination and ethical dualism possibly with cosmic ramifications.¹⁵⁸ Several parallels between 4Q215a and Enochic writings, 4QInstruction, 1QS, 1QH, and the *Damascus Document* have been noted by E.G. Chazon.¹⁵⁹ This evidence points to the text's affiliations with apocalyptic themes and at the same time indicates that these affiliations are not exclusively Qumran sectarian.¹⁶⁰ The vision of final judgement and the concomitant end to all iniquity in *4QTime of Righteousness* is characterized by proleptic formulation. That is, the text formulates hope for the end of the age of wickedness and the dawn of a new era of justice in a proleptic sense¹⁶¹ as already having materialized: 'the time of justice has arrived', באה עת הצדק (4Q215a 1 II 5); 'the age of peace has arrived', בא קץ השלום (4Q215a 1 II 6); 'the dominion {of justice} of goodness has arrived', בא ממשל {הצדק} הטוב (4Q215a 1 II 10).¹⁶²

3.4.2. Sectarian Qumran Texts

Final judgement as envisioned end to all wickedness constitutes a prominent theme in sectarian Qumran literature. The *Damascus Document* presupposes a perspective of God's dispute with all flesh (CD-A I 2 // 4QD^a 2 I 7–8, 4QD^c 1 9–10) in a contemporary age conceived of as an 'age of wickedness' (CD-A VI 10). Final judgement is phrased as punishment of the wicked on earth in CD-A VII 9 / CD-B XIX 6. Analogously with the *Damascus Document*, the Qumran sectarian 'Songs of the Sage' also suppose divine wrath "against all flesh, and a judgement of vengeance to terminate wickedness", בכול בשר ומשפט נקמות לכלית, רשעה (4Q511 (4QShir^b) 35 1).¹⁶³

¹⁵⁸ Cf. references to darkness, חושך (4Q215a 2 3–4) and to destruction and renewal of the earth (4Q215a 3 1).

¹⁵⁹ Chazon, "A Case of Mistaken Identity: Testament of Naphtali (4Q215) and Time of Righteousness (4Q215^a)," 110–23 at 121–2.

¹⁶⁰ Chazon, "A Case of Mistaken Identity," 121 leaves open the possibility that 4Q215a originated in the Qumran community, its parent movement or 'a like-minded contemporary group'. Cf. chapter two, section 2.2.

¹⁶¹ An interpretation in a proleptic sense seems to be justified by the fact that two imperfect tenses (וימח and ת[עבו]ר; 4Q215a 1 II 3–4) precede the lines on the arrival of the time of righteousness and the era of peace and express the envisioned prospect that all iniquity will be terminated and all evil will pass away.

¹⁶² Text and translation from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*. 1, 456–7.

¹⁶³ Text and translation after García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*. 2, 1032–3.

The *Hodayot* phrase a beatitude of truthful people chosen by justice to search for wisdom and love compassion (1QH^a VI 2–4)¹⁶⁴ who control themselves throughout severe trial “until the time of your judgements”, **עד קץ משפטיכה**, and who are “watchful for your salvation”, **וצופים לישועתך** (1QH^a VI 4–5). In the *Hodayot*, final judgement is presented as encompassing the whole creation (**לעשות משפט תבל** in 1QH^a VI 5–6; **משפט ב[כ]ול מעשיכה** in 1QH^a XVIII 36), while at the same time presupposing vindication of the individual protagonist, who was persecuted for his life, through ‘judgement of the wicked’, **במשפט רשעים** (1QH^a X 24).¹⁶⁵ The *Hodayot* include a brief reference to the expectation of final judgement: **במשפט** (1QH^a XII 20, 26; 1QH^a XXII bottom 11) and **למשפט** (1QH^a XV 12), probably meaning ‘at the judgement’.

Column XIV of the *Hodayot* comprises much eschatologically loaded imagery, of which I already cited the otherworldly vision of streams of Eden with a source of light that destroys all persons committed to evil (1QH^a XIV 16–19; section 3.2.2.3 above). The same column goes on to envision final judgement that comes after an end to all wicked battles and phrases this as follows:

Then the sword of God (**חרב אל**)¹⁶⁶ will pounce in the era of judgement (**בקץ משפט**), and all the sons of his t[ru]th will awaken, to destroy [the sons of] wickedness, and all the sons of guilt will no longer exist (1QH^a XIV 29–30).

The *Hodayot* takes up the language of battle in describing final judgement against a world viewed as filled with wicked battles, **מלחמות רשעה** (1QH^a XIV 29; cf. 1QH^a XV 7). This vision of final judgement leaves no escape to any inclination to guilt and no refuge for all heroes of war (1QH^a XIV 32–33), repeating a verdict against wicked battles as ‘wars of the insolent’, **מלחמות זדים** (1QH^a XIV 35).

The *Rule of the Community* includes references to final judgement in the ‘Treatise of the Two Spirits’ (1QS III 13–IV 26), in the rules section (1QS V 1–VI 23), and in the hymnic part (1QS X–XI). 1QS IV 19–20 observes that ‘the appointed time for judgement decided’, **מועד משפט נחרצה** (1QS IV 20), brings an end to the stumbling of truth on ways of

¹⁶⁴ García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*. 1, 152 reconstruct the word **אשרי** at the beginning of the Hebrew sentence that starts in 1QH^a VI 2.

¹⁶⁵ Texts from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*. 1, 152, 162, 188.

¹⁶⁶ Cf. the expression **ליהוה חרב** (Judg 7:20; Isa 34:6; Jer 12:12) in prophetic writings of Scripture.

wickedness, so that a true world comes forth for ever. The deterministic language of final judgement in 1QS IV 20 has its parallel in the possibly sectarian text 4Q369 (*4QPrayer of Enosh* (?) 1 I 6 (קץ משפט נחרצה)).¹⁶⁷ Within the rules section (1QS V 1–VI 23), 1QS V 11–13 makes the following statement of final judgement against all men of injustice from whom community members should swear by the covenant to keep away (1QS V 7–11a):

For they are not included in his covenant since they have neither sought nor examined his decrees in order to know the hidden matters in which they err by their own fault and because they treated revealed matters with disrespect; this is why wrath will rise up for judgement (לעלות אף למשפט) in order to effect revenge by the curses of the covenant, in order to administer fierce punishments for everlasting annihilation without there being any remnant (1QS V 11–13).¹⁶⁸

Parallel 4QS fragments also mention distantiation from ‘all people of injustice’, כול אנשי העול (4QS^b IX (frag. 4) 8; 4QS^d I (frags. 1a I, 1b) 7), but appear to omit the statement of final judgement.¹⁶⁹ Finally, the hymnic part of the *Community Rule*, 1QS X–XI, makes repeated mention of God’s judgement of every living being, משפט כול חי (1QS X 16–17, 18 // 4QS^b XX (frags. 7a–c) 5 and 7, 4QS^d X (frag. 5 II) 5 and 7, 4QS^f IV 3 and 5–6). 1QS X 19–20 further envisions final judgement as ‘the day of vengeance’, יום נקם, against ‘the men of the grave’, אנשי שחת¹⁷⁰ (1QS X 19 // 4QS^f IV 7–8), and as God’s establishment of judgement, עד הכון משפט, against people of injustice, אנשי עולה (1QS X 20).

Two texts refer to judgement with a retrospect to periods of injustice. 4Q228 has already been mentioned (section 3.1.1 above). 4Q265 (*4QMiscellaneous Rules*) 7 II 10 mentions a situation that “shall end in the judgement of the times of injustice”, וספה במשפט קצי עולה.¹⁷¹

¹⁶⁷ Ed.pr. by Attridge, Strugnell, *DJD* 13, 353–62. Text from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*. 2, 730. Dimant, “The Qumran Manuscripts: Contents and Significance,” 23–58 at 39 includes 4Q369 among ‘literary works with terminology related to the community’.

¹⁶⁸ Translation from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*. 1, 81.

¹⁶⁹ Cf. Metsu, *The Textual Development of the Qumran Community Rule*, 80–1 who identifies the omission of material in 1QS V 11–13 from 4QS^{b,d} as ‘free quotation and combination of biblical citations’ from Zeph 1:6, Deut 29:28, Num 15:30, Ezek 24:8 and Deut 29:1.

¹⁷⁰ I.e. scribal error of אנשי שחת.

¹⁷¹ Text and translation from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*. 1, 548–9.

The Pesharim and other Qumran sectarian exegetical texts include various ideas of judgement in the final age. Early pre-63 BCE Pesharim (1QpMic, 4QpPs^a) as well as late first-century BCE Pesharim (4QpNah, 1QpHab) mention judgement as part of their eschatological perspectives (cf. chapter two, sections 3.6 and 3.9). 1QpMic 8–10 7–9 refers to salvation from the day of judgement, [המשפט] מיום, for each who out of free will add up to God's chosen by observing the Law in the community council. 4QpPs^a voices the expectation that “[the community of the poor] (...) will see the judgement of wickedness (יראו במשפט רשעה)” (4QpPs^a IV 11).¹⁷² 4QpNah 1+2 4 envisions divine judgement against the Kittim that makes their rule vanish from the face of the earth. 1QpHab XII 14, XIII 2–3 supposes destruction of idol worship and wickedness on the day of judgement, ביום המשפט. The *Pesher to Habakkuk* envisions eschatological vindication of those who kept God's commandments while suffering from violators of the covenant (1QpHab V 5–6, 8–12; cf. 1QpHab II 5–10). 1QpHab V 4–5 attributes judgement over all the peoples, including reproof and conviction of ‘all the evildoers of his people’, כל רשעי עמו (1QpHab V 5), to God's ‘chosen ones’, בחירו.¹⁷³ At other places, 1QpHab makes general reference to a ‘house of judgement’, בית המשפט, from which all law-abiding people in the house of Judah are deemed acquitted by God (1QpHab VIII 2), but through which the one who cuts off many nations and sins against his soul (Hab 2:10) is deemed as standing condemned by God to destructive punishment (1QpHab X 3–5). 11QMelchizedek applies quotations from Psalms 82:1, 7:8–9 and 82:2 about theodicy to judgement of Belial and the spirits of his lot (11QMelch II 10–12).

The *War Scroll* mingles notions of divine judgement with the language of war (1QM IV 6; VI 3, 5; XI 13–14), envisaging the apocalyptic idea of a ‘time of war’, מועד מלחמה, predestined since ancient times as divine ‘[judge]ment against all flesh’, על כול בשר (1QM XV 12–13). 1QM XV 14, 17 subsequently refer to ‘all the wicked spirits’ and to the removal of Belial.¹⁷⁴ These references to divine judgement carry eschatological overtones.

¹⁷² Text and translation from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *ibidem*, 346–7.

¹⁷³ García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *ibidem*, pp. 14–15. Cf. Brownlee, *The Midrash Pesher of Habakkuk*, 86 on the singular בחירו as “a collective, ‘His chosen [people]’”.

¹⁷⁴ García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition. I*, 138–9.

3.5. *Wisdom and Apocalypticism*

A brief overview of Qumran evidence that effects traditio-historical thought about wisdom and apocalypticism and their trajectories completes this section on Qumran apocalyptic texts and its place in early Jewish apocalypticism. Several Qumran texts that are prominently (*1-4QMysteries*, *1-4QInstruction*) if not exclusively (4Q525 (*4QBeatitudes*)) attested among recently published Qumran cave 4 finds,¹⁷⁵ are categorized among sapiential works.¹⁷⁶ At the same time, these texts include eschatological and, arguably, apocalyptic features.

1-4QMysteries (1Q27, 4Q299–4Q300) has already been discussed with regard to the future-eschatological usage of רז נהיה in 1QMyst 1 I 3 // [4QMyst^b 3 3] and some common features as well as divergent parameters as compared to *1-4QInstruction* (chapter two, section 2.2). It has recently been argued that the identification of *1-4QMysteries* as a sapiential text is not clear cut as compared to the standard of biblical wisdom literature.¹⁷⁷ However, a concentration of sapiential terms, like [נחלת חכמ]ים, ‘the inheritance of the wise’ (4Q301 2 1; cf. Prov 3:35), [מ]של וחידה, ‘parable and riddle’ (4Q301 1 2, 4Q300 1 II 1; Prov 1:6, cf. Sir 8:8), מוסר (4Q299 30 4; cf. e.g. Prov 1:1.2.7.8), רודפי דעת, ‘pursuers of knowledge’ (4Q299 8 7; cf. בקש דעת in Prov 15:14, 18:15), indicates that the language of *1-4QMysteries* intersects with biblical wisdom literature.¹⁷⁸ *1-4QMysteries* also includes apocalyptic features¹⁷⁹ such as determinism (4Q299 3 II 10–11, 16), cosmic dualism between realms of light and darkness (4Q299 5 2; cf. 1Q27 1 I 5–7 // 4Q300 3 5–6), and final judgement for the termination of the time of wickedness, [קץ רשעה] בכלו[ת] (4Q301 3 8), and the disappearance of evil (1Q27 1 I 3–8 // 4Q300 3 3–6). Fragments 59 and 62 of 4Q299 further indicate

¹⁷⁵ Ed. pr. of 4Q299–301 (4QMyst^{a-c}) by Schiffman, *DJD* 20, 33–123; ed. pr. of 4Q415–418, 4Q423 (*4QInstruction^{a-8}*) by Strugnell, Harrington, Elgvin, *DJD* 34, 1–540; ed.pr. of 4Q525 by Puech, *DJD* 25, 115–78.

¹⁷⁶ Cf. the inclusion of 4Q415–4Q418, 4Q299–4Q301, and 4Q525 (‘Wisdom Text with Beatitudes’) among the rubric ‘Sapiential Works’ by Dimant, “The Qumran Manuscripts: Contents and Significance,” 43–4.

¹⁷⁷ Goff, *Discerning Wisdom*, 70.

¹⁷⁸ Goff, *Discerning Wisdom*, 72 further mentions a parallel for שורש בינה (4Q301 1 2) in Wis 3:15 (ἡ ρίζα τῆς φρονήσεως).

¹⁷⁹ Goff, *ibidem*, 74–89 discerns four issues, eschatology and creation, determinism, revelation and judgement, as of central concern in the passage in 1Q27 1 I 5–8 // 4Q300 3 4–6.

that 'at the judgement,' במשפט (4Q299 59 2) there will be great dispute ([ת]א[ת]א, 4Q299 59 2; ריב רב, 4Q299 62 2).

1-4QInstruction has figured most prominently in recent debates about mixed trajectories of sapiential and apocalyptic traditions.¹⁸⁰ This wisdom text comprises several apocalyptic features, such as final judgement (4Q416 1 10-14 // 4Q418 2 2-6 and 212,213, 2-5; 4Q418 69 II 6-9 // 4Q417 5 3-5; 4Q418 122 II + 126 II 9-10) and predestination (4Q417 2 I // 4Q418 43,44,45 I).¹⁸¹ Cosmic dualism could be implied in the reference to 'dark places,' מחשכים, that cry out against the pleadings of the fool-hearted (4Q418 69 II 7 // [4Q417 5 3-4]).¹⁸²

4QBeatitudes (4Q525) constitutes a final elaborate example from Qumran literature that complicates a dichotomous conceptualization of wisdom and apocalypticism. 4QBeatitudes provides a sapiential perspective on divine commandments, the 'Torah of the Most High,' תורת עליון (4Q525 2 II + 3 4), with beatitudes as appreciative forms of admonition. At the same time, 4QBeatitudes comprises several apocalyptic features. 4Q525 includes judgemental language through references to 'judgement of destruction,' משפט משחית (4Q525 8 3), and a 'fixed day,' ביום נחרצת, in conjunction with 'the bottom of the pit' and the 'furnace of wrath' (4Q525 23 2-4).¹⁸³ 4Q525 10 5 appears to indicate impartiality in divine judgement by referring to '[judgeme]nt of friend and foe, and God will not justify any flesh,' ט אויב ואוהב וכול בשר אל [משפ]ט א[ל].¹⁸⁴ The latter part of the sentence has a close parallel in Paul's Greek phrase οὐ δικαιοθῆσεται πᾶσα σὰρξ ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ in Romans 3:20.¹⁸⁵ The phrase in 4Q525 10 5 has further been taken to mean by

¹⁸⁰ See several articles in the congress volumes by García Martínez (ed.), *Wisdom and Apocalypticism*, 133-70 at 134-44, 171-81, 287-305, 343-55, and by Wright and Wills (eds.), *Conflicted Boundaries*, 39-49 at 46, 57-67; cf. Collins, "The Eschatologizing of Wisdom in the Dead Sea Scrolls," 49-65 at 63 observes that 4QInstruction "presupposes an apocalyptic tradition that was already well developed".

¹⁸¹ Cf. Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination*, 45-92; Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning for the Understanding Ones*, 194-207 at 200, who points to shared words and phrases on the issue of 'pre-determination' in 4QInstruction and the Two Spirits Treatise; Goff, *Discerning Wisdom*, 9-68 ("A Wisdom Text with an Apocalyptic Worldview: 4QInstruction (1Q26; 4Q415-18; 423)") at 16-17 ("Revelation and Determinism").

¹⁸² Macaskill, *Revealed Wisdom and Inaugurated Eschatology*, 72-114 at 75 infers dualism between the righteous and the wicked from references to 'every spirit of flesh' and 'the sons of the heavens' in 4Q416 1 12.

¹⁸³ Cf. Goff, *Discerning Wisdom*, 198-229 at 217-23.

¹⁸⁴ Hebrew text from Puech, *DJD* 25, 115-78.

¹⁸⁵ According to BDR, § 4 n. 5 and § 302 n. 2, the construction οὐ...πᾶς is a Septuagintalism.

M. Goff that no one is above judgement.¹⁸⁶ 4Q*Beatitudes* finally includes the following terms that may imply cosmic dualism: *המשטמה*, ‘Mas-tema’ (4Q525 19 4) and *[ב]ני בל[יעל]*, ‘sons of Belial’ (4Q525 25 2).

Comparative exploration of apocalypticism in Qumran and the New Testament can be undertaken on the basis of Qumran contributions to early Jewish apocalyptic tradition and the contribution of Qumran apocalyptic evidence by itself. Subsequent comparative analysis on the New Testament part will proceed by the successive treatment of evidence about John and Jesus common to Gospel tradition (section 4), Gospel traditions about the historical Jesus (section 5), Synoptic evidence that is usually attributed to later redactional development (section 6), Paul (section 7), post-Pauline Letters (section 8), and the Apocalypse (section 9).

4. THE BEGINNINGS OF THE JESUS-MOVEMENT AND APOCALYPTICISM

4.1. *John’s Baptism and the Beginnings of the Jesus-Movement*

The four canonical Gospels and Acts voice the idea that the baptism of John stands at the beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ (Mark 1:1–11; Matt 3:1–17; Luke 3:1–22; John 1:19–34; Acts 10:37). Extra-canonical New Testament writings also mention John’s baptism in relation to Jesus (*Gos. Eb.* in Epiphanius, *Pan.* 30.13.6–7;¹⁸⁷ *Gos. Naz.* in Jerome, *Pelag.* 2). Yet the fragment of the *Gospel of the Nazaraeans* has a different version, according to which Jesus counters the exhortation of his mother and his brothers to be baptised by John, saying: “Wherein have I sinned that I should go and be baptised by him? Unless what I have said is ignorance (a sin of ignorance).”¹⁸⁸ The evidence in the *Jewish Antiquities* about John ‘surnamed the Baptist’ (*Ant.* 18.116–19) and Jesus (*Ant.* 18.63–4)

¹⁸⁶ Goff, *Discerning Wisdom*, 218: “4Q525 10 5 is fragmentary but appears to state that all of humankind will be judged”.

¹⁸⁷ The *Gospel of the Ebionites* has been characterised by P. Vielhauer and G. Strecker, in *NTA 1*, 167–68 as a “Gospel of the synoptic type” with a “harmonising tendency”.

¹⁸⁸ English translation from Vielhauer and Strecker in *NTA 1*, 160. This reaction is comparable to the first part of Jesus’ answer to the exhortation to pray and fast in *G. Th.* 104: “What is the sin that I have committed, or wherein have I been defeated?” (English translation from T.O. Lambdin, in Layton (ed.), *Nag Hammadi Codex II*, 2–7, 91).

leaves the two unconnected.¹⁸⁹ Josephus' philosophical account of John's message, focused on virtues like justice and piety toward God,¹⁹⁰ further differs from the eschatological flavour of the Gospels' picture of John.

If John's baptism stood at the beginning of the Jesus-movement, various gospel traditions also claim that John the Baptist stood at the end of a period determined by the Law and the Prophets. A Jesus-tradition in Q (Q 16:16a–b) contrasts the proclamation of the Law and the Prophets until John to the proclamation of the Kingdom. Both Q 7:28 and *Thomas* (*G.Th.* 46) contain a saying of Jesus which states that of those born of women no one is greater than John, whereas from the perspective of the kingdom of heaven anyone who is least in the kingdom is greater than he. The *Apocryphon of James* relates the following saying of Jesus: "Do you not know that the head of prophecy was cut off with John?"¹⁹¹

In what follows, I will explore the apocalyptic-eschatological dimension to the baptism of John and its relation to Jesus' ministry as it is represented in the Gospels.¹⁹²

4.2. *The Relation between John and Jesus*

The relation between John and Jesus first merits closer examination, since in most Gospel traditions the information about John is almost inextricably linked with the subject of his relation to Jesus. John is described in light of his role as a messenger who prepares the way for Jesus Christ. More incidentally, the evidence of the Gospels lets John

¹⁸⁹ Bardet, *Le Testimonium Flavianum*, 170–80 at 173–174 interprets this 'unconnectedness' of Jesus and John in the *Antiquities* as a discrete form of polemic by Josephus who sought to dissociate the Christian movement from baptist movements and associate it exclusively with messianism.

¹⁹⁰ *Ant.* 18.117 refers to ἀρετή, 'virtue'. Stoic philosophy considered justice a primary virtue and piety as subordinate to this (cf. Stobaeus in H. von Arnim, *SVF* 3, fragments 262 and 264).

¹⁹¹ *NHC* I, 2, 6. Translation from D. Kirchner, "The Apocryphon of James," in *NTA* 1, 293.

¹⁹² Much scholarly attention focused on the relation of John's baptism and prophetic role to Second Temple Judaism; see Webb, *John the Baptizer and Prophet: A Socio-Historical Study*, 93–216 and Taylor, *The Immerser. John the Baptist within Second Temple Judaism*. Yet the evaluation of Q's information about John, either in terms of redaction (H. Koester) or of tradition (J.D.G. Dunn), the interpretation of John's announcement of judgement, either in apocalyptic-eschatological terms (J. Gnilka) or in theological and socio-historical terms which de-emphasise apocalyptic (Webb, *John the Baptizer*, 300–4 and 381), and the relation between John and Jesus (cf. R.L. Webb, J.E. Taylor) are the objects of continuous debate. See discussion in the text below.

speak for himself, addressed by others as teacher (Luke 3:12) and rabbi (John 3:26), who in popular belief was held to be a prophet according to the Synoptic tradition (Mark 11:32 / Matt 21:26 / Luke 20:6). The earliest witness to the Christian movement, Paul's Letters, is even entirely silent about John the Baptist.¹⁹³ Yet it should be noted that Paul neither digresses on the earthly life of Jesus, since his gospel focuses on the death and resurrection of Christ (cf. 2 Cor 5:15–17).

Various sayings of Jesus assign a fundamental importance to John as Jesus' precursor in the proclamation of the Kingdom. In the Synoptic tradition, Jesus confronts the Jerusalemite authorities with the question whether John's baptism was from men or from heaven, when asked about the authority by which Jesus acted (Mark 11:27–33 / Matt 21:23–27 / Luke 20:1–8). Matthean Jesus-traditions even associate John with Elijah 'who is to come', ὁ μέλλων ἔρχεσθαι (Matt 11:14)¹⁹⁴ and with the 'way of righteousness', ὁδὸς δικαιοσύνης,¹⁹⁵ leading to the Kingdom of God, which the Jerusalemite authorities rejected (Matt 21:32; cf. Luke 7:29–30).

Several Palestinian Jewish texts indicate a religious context to ὁδός as a way of life rather than as a philosophical doctrine. *Jubilees* 23:20 envisions return to 'the way', to righteousness from an eschatological perspective. The *Damascus Document* refers to דרך as the way directed by the Teacher of Righteousness (CD-A I 11, 13). The singular reference to 'the way of righteousness' in Matthean tradition about John (Matt 21:32) thereby has several points of analogy in Palestinian Jewish strands of apocalypticism.

A Jesus-tradition in Q also stipulates the contrast between John and Jesus in terms of their (non-)observance of fasts (Q 7:33–34), from a perspective of rebuke against 'this generation' for its negative perception of both Jesus and John (Q 7:31–35).

There are several indications of a tension between the theological idea of John as precursor to Jesus and the historical reconstruction of

¹⁹³ This point has also been noted by Stegemann, "Erwägungen zur Bedeutung des Täufers Johannes im Markusevangelium," 101–16 at 101, 105–7, who discusses Pauline evidence for a pre-Markan tradition of Christian baptism as "ein Prozeß der sekundären Christologisierung ursprünglich spezifisch theologischer Aussagen" (105).

¹⁹⁴ Cf. Mark 6:14–15 and Mark 8:28 which mention expectations about the role of Jesus as John the Baptist, Elijah, and a prophet. Stegemann, "Zur Bedeutung des Täufers Johannes," 103 relates the 'Elijah-typology' in Mark 9:2–13 and 15:35.39 to the Baptist, but this view imposes a Matthean reading (Matt 17:12–13) on Mark.

¹⁹⁵ Cf. BDAG ³2000, 691–92 (lemma ὁδός, 2 b–c).

John's 'preparatory' message. First, in the Synoptic tradition, John does not specifically name the 'one coming after me who is stronger than me' (Mark 1:7–8 / Matt 4:11–12 / Luke 3:16).¹⁹⁶ The repeated insistence in John 1:15.26–27.29–34 that John the Baptist applies his testimony explicitly to Jesus appears to be part of later theological reflection. Second, the ambiguity in John's relation to Jesus becomes clear from a Q 7:18–20, according to which John, upon hearing about Jesus' ministry, had his disciples ask Jesus, "Are you he who is to come (ὁ ἐρχόμενος), or shall we look for another?" (RSV). Third, the Acts of the Apostles indicate that new followers of the missionary Christian movement in the Diaspora could know only John's baptism, while being unaware of Jesus' baptism with the Holy Spirit (Acts 19:1–7; cf. Acts 18:25).

All four canonical Gospels claim that John's prophetic teaching (Mark 11:32 par.; Luke 1:76; John 1:23) anticipated on popular expectations about redemption and salvation by God (Mark 1:1–8; Q 3:7–9, 16–17; Luke 1:68–79; John 1:19–28). The Gospels further concur on John's expectation that someone 'stronger than me' would come, thereby probably alluding to the agency of a messianic figure¹⁹⁷ through whom the 'way of the Lord'¹⁹⁸ should be made manifest. John's question to Jesus in Q 7:18–20 may indicate that John's expectation of 'the coming one' was not without question fixed on Jesus.¹⁹⁹ John's statement not to have known the one coming after him in John 1:31a adds to this ambiguity.

¹⁹⁶ Stegemann, "Zur Bedeutung des Täufers Johannes," 105 argued that, from a *religionsgeschichtlich* perspective, the words of John the Baptist about 'one who is stronger than me' could only be related to God, while excluding the possibility of a prophetic precursor, in particular Elijah, to the Messiah in a pre-Christian Jewish context, with reference to Öhler, *Elia im Neuen Testament*, 28 and 29 n. 149. However, the evidence of 1QS IX 11, **עד בוא נביא ומשיחי אהרון וישראל**, appears to speak against this categorical statement.

¹⁹⁷ The *antropomorphic* focus of the description of the 'coming one' Mark 1:7 / Matt 3:11 / Luke 3:16 / John 1:26–27; Acts 13:25 speaks for a messianic figure rather than God. Cf. Luke 3:15 and John 1:19–25 on expectations about John as the 'Anointed One', ὁ χριστός. Cf. Dunn, *Jesus Remembered*, 369 and n. 152 with bibliography; on 370, Dunn contests the plausibility of two other identifications, the 'Son of Man' and Elijah.

¹⁹⁸ On the soteriological connotations to the 'way of the Lord', cf. Isa 35:8, 40:3–5, 42:16, 43:14–19, 48:17. Flint, "The Book of Isaiah in the Dead Sea Scrolls," 229–51 at 242 lists the use of Isa 40:3 in 1QS VIII 13–14 among examples of "an eschatological emphasis".

¹⁹⁹ Fleddermann, *Q: A Reconstruction and Commentary*, 378–9 insists against modern 'historicizing concerns' that the ancient text presents the discussion as "a literary device to dramatize the central question of Christianity" (379). However, part of Jesus' response to John's question in the Q tradition has a parallel in the *Gospel of Thomas* (logion 46 // Q 7:28). This speaks for a broader tradition than only a 'literary device in Q'.

Josephus' silence about a connection between John and Jesus could attest to the difference between John's and Jesus' Judaism as perceived by non-Christian Judaism. The picture of John as precursor to Jesus probably stemmed from theological reflections in inner-Christian circles.²⁰⁰

4.3. *John's Baptism and the Apocalyptic Focus on Judgement*

The Q tradition focuses on final judgement as an important dimension to John's message, addressing 'many of the Pharisees and Sadducees' in Matt 3:7a and 'the multitudes' in Luke 3:7a:²⁰¹

You brood of vipers! Who warned you to flee from the wrath to come? Bear fruits that befit repentance, and do not begin to say to yourselves, 'We have Abraham as our father'; for I tell you, God is able from these stones to raise up children to Abraham. Even now the axe is laid to the root of the trees; every tree therefore that does not bear good fruit is cut down and thrown into the fire" (Q 3:7b-9, RSV).

In Q 3:16-17, John says that the one mightier than he, who will come to baptise with the Holy Spirit and with fire, will 'burn the chaff with inextinguishable fire'.

H. Koester argued that Q 3:7-9, 16-17 is the product of secondary, redactional development.²⁰² Against Koester's argument, J.D.G. Dunn has interpreted the evidence of Q in comparison with *Thomas* 46 and

²⁰⁰ Only in John 1:23, it is John the Baptist who cites Isa 40:3, whereas in Mark 1:3 par., it is the narrator who quotes Isa 40:3. Differently from Mark 1:2-3, Q 7:27 has Jesus quote Mal 3:1 and apply it to John.

²⁰¹ Lucan polemic against Jewish leadership occurs elsewhere, in Luke 7:30: "the Pharisees and the lawyers rejected the purpose of God for themselves, not having been baptized by him [John]" (RSV).

²⁰² Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels*, 86-99 at 96-97. Fleddermann, *Q: A Reconstruction and Commentary*, 210-33 at 232-3 has argued against the supposition that the pericope Q 3:7-9.16-17 "goes back to earlier traditions about John" (contra R. Uro) that the literary structure and use of rhetorical techniques suggest its origin in composition by the author of Q. Less far-reaching conclusions are reached in the analyses by Hoffmann, *Studien zur Theologie der Logienquelle*, 15-33, who associates Q 3:7-9, 16-17 with Q's incorporation of tradition; and Kloppenborg, *The Formation of Q*, 102, who considers Q 3:7-9, 16-17 to be "the result of the juxtaposition and editing of smaller units of tradition" (my emphasis); cf. idem, "Q and the Historical Jesus," 328 and 342 on the rhetorical significance of Q 3:7-9, 16-17 in Q's composition. Allison, *The Jesus Tradition in Q*, 32-3, 37 assigned Q 3:7-9, 16-17 a place in the "third stage of Q's formation (Q³)". Tuckett, *Q and the History of Early Christianity*, 107-37 and 139-63 argued that an 'eschatological outlook', including the eschatological preaching of John in Q, "pervades large parts of the Q material and one cannot easily ascribe such an outlook to just one stratum within Q" (161).

78, observing “a conscious elimination by the *Thomas* tradents of the strong note of imminent judgment, which characterizes the Q account of John’s preaching (Q 3.7–9, 16–17), as part of a broader redactional diminution of the larger judgement motif in the Q/Synoptic tradition”.²⁰³ Dunn’s argument depends on the presupposition that ‘*Thomas* tradents’ knew and adapted a tradition represented by Q to their own theological interests.²⁰⁴ Other sources need to be drawn into the discussion whether or not the distinction between an early non-apocalyptic stratum and a later apocalyptic stratum of Q is verifiable.

In the Synoptic Gospels (Mark 1:4 par.; cf. Acts 13:24, 19:4) and in Josephus (*Ant.* 18. 117), the notion of repentance or a return to a righteous way of life determines the essence of John’s baptism. Without a return to a way of life approved by God, John’s baptism by itself could not provide the means to receive forgiveness from sin.²⁰⁵ The term *μετάνοια*, prevalent in the Synoptic Gospels, merits closer examination, since it may provide a point of entry for interpreting the message of the historical John that the sources allow us to reconstruct.

There are a number of arguments which support the idea that *μετάνοια* has an implicit eschatological sense. First, in John’s baptism, *μετάνοια*, denoting not just repentance but a radical return or conversion, was directed to God.²⁰⁶ The goal of forgiveness of sins, conditional on a return to a godly way of life, denotes salvation, which is an implicitly eschatological category.²⁰⁷ Second, John operated within a Jewish context, in which conversion or return to a righteous way of life probably denoted return to the covenant of the Law.²⁰⁸ The Deuteronomic notion of blessings and curses of the covenant could have an eschatological

²⁰³ Dunn, *Jesus Remembered*, 355 and n. 77.

²⁰⁴ On *Thomas*’s relation to the Synoptic Gospels, see e.g. Fallon and Cameron, “The Gospel of Thomas: A Forschungsbericht and Analysis,” 4196–4251 at 4213–24; Theissen and Merz, *Der historische Jesus*, 52–55.

²⁰⁵ This is probably what *βάπτισμα μετανοίας εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν* in Mark 1:4 / Luke 3:3 denotes. Matt 3:11 (*βαπτίζω εἰς μετάνοιαν*) has a terser version; cf. Acts 13:24, 19:4. Josephus, *Ant.* 18.117 (translation from Feldman, *Josephus. Jewish Antiquities. Books XVIII–XIX*, 83) observes: “In his view this [a righteous way of life] was a necessary preliminary if baptism was to be acceptable to God. They must not employ it to gain pardon for whatever sins they committed, but as a consecration of the body implying that the soul was already thoroughly cleansed by right behaviour”.

²⁰⁶ Josephus, *Ant.* 18.117 explicitly affirms this; Q 3:8 presupposes it, and Mark 1:1–11 probably implies it.

²⁰⁷ Cf. Condra, *Salvation for the Righteous Revealed*, 4–6.

²⁰⁸ Cf. the terminology derived from the verb *שוב*, related to the theme of repentance/conversion/return, in the Damascus Document: *שבי פשע* (CD-A II 5); *לכל*

dimension in Palestinian Judaism.²⁰⁹ Concomitantly, in this Palestinian Jewish context, John's message of repentance was probably not detached from eschatological consequences. Third, the Markan narrative indicates that the call for repentance, albeit preached by Jesus after John was arrested, could be part of an eschatological perspective in which the time is fulfilled and God's kingdom has come near (Mark 1:15).²¹⁰

The absence of eschatology from Josephus' picture of John (*Ant.* 18.116–119) may be understood in relation to his philosophical presentation of Jewish movements to a Hellenistic audience. While it would have been pointless to negate the messianic character of the Jesus-movement and apocalyptic expectations at some point during the Jewish War, it was probably in the interest of Josephus' agenda vis-à-vis Flavian Rome to downplay messianic and eschatological expectations within Judaism²¹¹ (including the message of John as a Jewish preacher). Yet we may still discern traces of popular Jewish belief about divine providence and retribution in Josephus' passage; a belief which attributed the destruction of Herod's army to divine vengeance against his execution of John (*Ant.* 18.116).

Returning to Q 3:7–9.16–17, it should be noted that various elements of John's polemical exhortations are paralleled in biblical and Second Temple Palestinian Jewish literature.²¹² Only the challenge to a religious self-definition as 'children of Abraham' in Q 3:8 appears without clear analogy, even though the prophetic denouncement of Israel's sinfulness in Isaiah 63:16–19 may come close to such a challenge. The apocalyptically loaded admonition to bear fruit befitting repentance, since every

השב מדרכו הנשחחתה (CD-A XV 7); לשוב אל תורת משה (CD-A XVI 1–2, 4–5); ברית תשובה (CD-B XIX 16).

²⁰⁹ This dimension is stipulated in the sectarian text 4QMMT, but eschatological implications of the Deuteronomistic sense of the covenant were probably not absent from other parts of Palestinian Judaism. On Law-observant circles of the Palestinian Jesus-movement, cf. Gal 2; Acts 11:2.18b (μετάνοια εἰς ζωὴν); 15:1.5.

²¹⁰ Note that Matt 3:2 attributes the statement "Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand" (RSV) to John.

²¹¹ See Feldman, "Josephus (CE 37–c. 100)," *CHJ III*, 901–21 at 904.

²¹² With regard to γεννήματα ἐχιδνῶν in Q 3:7, cf. Isa 59:5, CD-A V 14. As for the apocalyptic expectation of 'the wrath to come' in Q 3:7, Hagner, *Matthew 1–13*, 50 mentions biblical parallels in Dan 7:9–11, Isa 13:9, Zeph 1:15, 2:2–3, Mal 4:1. According to Hagner, *Matthew 1–13*, 51–2, the reference to a baptism with the Holy Spirit and with fire by the coming One in Q 3:16 follows from the two-sided perspective on judgement and salvation represented by John's baptism. As for the apocalyptic imagery in Q 3:17, see Hagner, *ibidem*, 52 for parallels in the Old Testament, rabbinic literature, Matt 13:30, and Mark 9:43.

tree which does not bear good fruit will be cut down and thrown into the fire (Q 3:8–9, RSV) can now be compared with recently published fragments of Qumran texts in terms of the admonitory use of tree imagery.

4QAdmonitory Parable (4Q302), a composition officially published in 1997,²¹³ comprises the following text of comparative relevance (4Q302 2 II 2–6):²¹⁴

2 הבינו נא בזאת החכמים אם יהיה
 3 לאיש עץ טוב ויגבה עד לשמים
 4 לא... ארצות ועשה פרי שמן...
 5 יורה ומלקוש י... בחרוב ובצמה
 6 הלוא אתו יא[הב]...[...] ואתו ישמר

2 Understand this, wise ones: If 3 a man has a good tree that towers up to the heavens... [...] 4 for the... of the lands, and it produces juicy fruit... 5 early and late rains, ... in heat and in thirst; 6 does not he l[ove] it [...] ... and he watches it

This fragment exhorts ‘wise ones’ to understand that “if a man has a good tree (עץ טוב) that towers up to heaven” (4Q302 2 II 2–3), which “produces rich fruit” (ועשה פרי שמן, 4Q302 2 II 4), “does not he l[ove] it” ([הב] אתו יא, 4Q302 2 II 6). The subject of the rhetorical question in line 6 is probably God, in view of the sequence of thought from fragment 1 column 1, which speaks of God’s righteousness, goodness and providence (4Q302 1 I 4, 5, 13) to 4Q302 2 II. 4Q302 2 III 7 subsequently refers to something, presumably a tree, that “will be cut down without”, ויכרת בלוא.²¹⁵ The sequence of fragments of 4Q302 indicates that the ‘admonitory parable’ emphasizes God’s righteousness (4Q302 1 I 4) on the one hand and visitation of human deeds on the other, including divine retribution against disloyalty and wickedness (4Q302 3 II 6–7). The parable of a tree in 4Q302 2 II–III serves as an illustration.

²¹³ Ed. pr. B. Nitzan in *DJD* 20, 125–49, plates X–XII.

²¹⁴ Text and translation from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*. 2, 666–7.

²¹⁵ Text and translation from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *ibidem*, 666–7.

Another recently published Qumran text, which has been categorized among apocalyptic texts, 4QNarrative A (4Q458)²¹⁶ includes the following portion of text that has comparative relevance (4Q458 1 7–9):²¹⁷

[...] 7
 [א]מר לרישון לאמור [...] 7
 [...] לחיים ושלך המלאך הריש[ון] [...] 8
 [...] ב מחרבת ויד את עץ הרשע [...] 9

7 [... and he sa]id to the first, saying [...] 8 [...] for life. And the fir[st] angel will throw down [...] 9 [...] laid waste, and he will cut down the tree of evil [...]

4Q458 1 9 speaks of the ‘cutting down of the tree of evil,’ עץ את הרשע, following a reference to angelic activity of throwing down in the preceding line 8. This fragments brings out most explicitly the connection between ethical concern and tree imagery.

In light of this imagery in Qumran texts, as well as tree motifs in both prophetic (Isa 37:31, Hos 9:16, Amos 2:9) and apocalyptic texts (*1 Enoch* 25–32 and 91:8), it stands to reason that John spoke the language of the time using well-known imagery as illustration to exhort his audience to lead a way of life befitting repentance.

The implicit eschatological sense of *μετάνοια* and the connections of John’s message in Q 3:7–9.16–17 with Jewish prophetic and apocalyptic imagery could indicate that the picture of John as a prophetic figure with an apocalyptic-eschatological message belongs to pre-Q tradition. It appears implausible to conceive of Q 3:7–9.16–17 as a redactional creation exclusively motivated by Christological interests.²¹⁸ The apocalyptic-eschatological dimension in Q 3:7–9.16–17, with its focus on judgement and deliverance, was probably an inherent part of John’s message which insisted on a righteous and holy way of life (cf. Mark 6:20; Luke 3:10–14; *Ant.* 18.117).²¹⁹

²¹⁶ Ed. pr. by E. Larson in *DJD* 36, 353–65. Parry and Tov, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader*, 6, 132–7 include 4Q458 among the rubric “Apocalyptic texts”.

²¹⁷ Text and translation from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*, 2, 934–5.

²¹⁸ I can thus agree with Webb, *John the Baptizer*, 51, who observes that “Q has described John primarily in his own terms (esp. Q 3.7–9, 16–17); that is, John has not been Christianized”.

²¹⁹ *Contra* Webb, *John the Baptizer*, 381–2, whose evaluation of socio-political aspects of John’s message appears to reduce the apocalyptic-eschatological elements in Q 3:7–9.16–17 to a socio-historical function. Further, if Q 3:7–9.16–17 were to be taken “in a thoroughly historical sense”, as Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God*, 326 and n. 22, defends, this view passes over indications that (part of) the imagery applies

5. JESUS AND APOCALYPTICISM

5.1. *Prophetic Inspiration and Apocalypticism*

All four canonical Gospels as well as the *Gospel of Thomas* relate the saying of Jesus that no prophet is honoured in his home town (Mark 6:4 / Matt 13:57; Luke 4:24 / John 4:44; *G. Th.* 31). Since there is no obvious reason to doubt its provenance from the milieu of the historical Jesus, this proverb implies that prophetic inspiration permeated Jesus' missionary consciousness.²²⁰ Logion 52 of *Thomas* makes this prophetic association even more explicit: "His disciples said to him, 'Twenty-four prophets spoke in Israel, and all of them spoke in you'. He said to them, 'you have omitted the one living in your presence and have spoken (only) of the dead'".²²¹ Other Jesus-traditions indicate that Jesus' mission as perceived by himself and others went beyond that of a prophet (Mark 8:27–30; Matt 16:13–20; Luke 9:18–21; *G. Th.* 13).

In view of the prophetic dimension, the question arises which place the future,²²² in particular the final age, has in the message of the historical Jesus. Earlier scholarship detached Jesus' eschatological prophecy from Jewish apocalypticism, while recent 'non-eschatological' scholarship has denied both apocalypticism and eschatology a place in its picture of Jesus.

Against a bias about apocalypticism which reduces it to judgemental material, D.C. Sim recently insisted that apocalypticism should be more broadly defined as an "all-embracing religious perspective which considers the past, present and future within a dualistic and deterministic framework".²²³ Sim's view generally corresponds with parameters of Qumran apocalyptic texts and early Jewish apocalypticism surveyed above (section 3), and may thereby be useful for the traditio-historical

to other-worldly phenomena, like 'inextinguishable fire' in Q 3:17 (cf. fire imagery in Q 3:9 and 3:16), and presupposes a tenuous reference to "a great national disaster", demonstrable in the Old Testament, but not in John's case.

²²⁰ Cf. Tomson, *If This Be from Heaven...*, 132–38 on the fact that all evangelists concur about the basic idea concerning Jesus' mission that "Jesus knew that he had been sent by God" (132).

²²¹ Translation from Lambdin, in Layton (ed.), *Nag Hammadi Codex II*, 2–7, 73.

²²² On the link between *prophecy* and *future*, see e.g. *J.W.* 2.159 (Essene prophecy); *J.W.* 4.387–388 (predictions about good and evil); *J.W.* 7.432 (Isaiah's prophecy, Isa 19:19–23, foretelling the foundation of a Jewish Temple in Egypt); Acts 11:27–28, 21:10 (the prophet Agabus and his prediction of a great famine).

²²³ Sim, *Apocalyptic Eschatology in the Gospel of Matthew*, 1.

exploration whether and in which way Jesus' ministry in his Jewish context could have been apocalyptically oriented.

5.2. *Signs and Their Interpretation*

An inherent part of early Jewish apocalypticism is a perspective of revelation about the final age. The revelatory perspective on the end of days was anchored in religious experience through the recognition of premonitory signs. Josephus describes heightened apocalyptic expectations during the Jewish War and reinterprets signs from a hindsight post-70 CE perspective of the destruction of Jerusalem (*J. W.* 6.288–315). *1Q–4QMysteries* attests to the apocalyptic concern with signs and their eschatological interpretation well before the outbreak of the Jewish war. In connection with the partly eschatologically oriented concept רז נהיה, 'the mystery that is to come', *Mysteries* makes the following observation: יהיה לכם האות כן יהיה (1QMyst (1Q27) 1 I 5 // 4QMyst^b (4Q300) 3 4). The text then describes the victory of justice over evil, marked by the locking up of 'those born of sin', מולדי עולה (1QMyst 1 I 5–7 // 4QMyst^b 3 4–6).

The Synoptic Gospels present a picture of Jesus' opponents who ask a sign, σημεῖον, from Jesus in order to test him (Mark 8:11–12 / Matt 12:38–39, 16:1.4 / Luke 11:16.29).²²⁴ Jesus' response to his opponents reads as follows in Mark 8:12b: "Why does this generation seek a sign? Truly, I say to you, no sign shall be given to this generation" (RSV). When one would consider the Markan Jesus' refusal to give a sign to be an argument for the idea that the historical Jesus was unconcerned with apocalyptic eschatology, the polemical context of this passage may not be given due attention. Perhaps we could read Jesus' answer as a rebuke of his opponents for not taking his message of the Kingdom of God to heart rather than as a negation of any apocalyptic dimension of signs from heaven.²²⁵ The polemical force of Jesus' answer turns the

²²⁴ Contrary to the Synoptic Gospels, John almost exclusively mentions σημεῖα, 'signs', in the sense of miracles or deeds that Jesus performed (John 2:11.23, 3:2, 4:54, 6:2.14.26.30, 9:16, 10:41, 11:47, 12:18.37, 20:30). Two possible exceptions to this rule could be John 2:18 (a sign as legitimation for Jesus' clearing of the Temple precincts), 7:31 (signs expected of the Christ, hence eschatologically oriented).

²²⁵ In the Marcan narrative strategy, the 'voice from heaven' at John's baptism of Jesus (Mark 1:11) probably serves as a very concrete 'sign from heaven', σημεῖον ἀπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ (Mark 8:11); cf. Matt 3:17, Luke 3:22.

question for a sign against those who ask for it as an indication of their unbelief in face of Jesus' ministry as a major sign about the arrival of the Kingdom.

Furthermore, it follows from the supposition of a non-apocalyptic Jesus that the Synoptic evangelists heavily distorted the message of the historical Jesus in their respective 'eschatological discourses' (section 6.1 below), attributing to him apocalyptic language in response to his disciples' request for a sign about the fulfilment of foretold events (Mark 13:4f. par.). It appears hardly plausible that the Synoptic evangelists would have left such a square contradiction in their texts. Even though the present framework of the eschatological discourses reflects the editorial concerns of the evangelists, it seems probable to suppose elaboration on apocalyptic sayings of Jesus rather than to conceive of *creatio ex nihilo*.

The parallel evidence of Matthew 16:1–4, Luke 12:54–56 and *Thomas* 91 may indicate that Jesus uttered prophetic polemic against hypocrisy in preoccupations with the final age. According to all three versions, Jesus contrasts the human ability to foretell events of nature from signs in nature²²⁶ to the human inability of interpreting signs in the contemporary age (τὰ σημεῖα τῶν καιρῶν, Matt 16:3; ὁ καιρὸς οὗτος, Luke 12:56; ΠΕΡΙΚΛΙΡΟΣ, *G.Th.* 91).

5.3. *Apocalyptic Features in Jesus-Traditions about the Kingdom*

In Palestinian Jewish traditions that go back to the Old Testament kingship is theocratic. Some texts and traditions insist on continuity with the Davidic dynasty. 4Q252 (4QCommGen A) V 2–4 attributes the 'covenant of the kingdom', ברית (ה) מלכות, to the 'branch of David', צמח דויד. 1 Macc 2:57 observes that "David, because he was merciful, inherited the throne of the kingdom for ever" (RSV). The *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* praise God's heavenly kingship in a timeless liturgical or poetical framework. The *War Scroll* (1QM XII 7–15, XIX 7–8) praises God's kingship in the context of its perspective of apocalyptic war.

²²⁶ Luke 12:55: "And when you see the south wind blowing, you say, 'There will be scorching heat'; and it happens" (RSV). Cf. *1 Enoch* 76:7 / 4Q210 (4QEnastr^c ar) 1 II 7: "a wind from the South, which is in the South and veers to the East: a hot wind" (translation from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*. 1, 439).

The proclamation of the Kingdom (God's kingdom, the kingdom of heaven) is a central part of Gospel tradition about Jesus' ministry.²²⁷ The debate begins with the question what this Kingdom stood for in Jesus' message and whether or not it was apocalyptic-eschatological in orientation.²²⁸ J. Carmignac proposed an 'ecclesial' interpretation of the Kingdom, identifying it with Jesus and the members of his Church and criticising previous scholarly 'eschatologism.'²²⁹ Hermeneutical objections have been raised against the apocalyptic-eschatological interpretation of Kingdom-traditions in the Gospels, for pinning them down to a temporal phenomenon that is exhausted and proven wrong by historical reality.²³⁰ Yet R.A. Horsley has observed that this critique depends on a misleading literal understanding of ancient Jewish apocalypticism as applied to the Gospels.²³¹ According to Horsley the interpretive use of Jewish apocalyptic texts may illuminate the Gospels, provided that it takes the respective socio-historical settings of these texts into account and proceeds from traditio-historical method rather than from the ahistorical supposition of a synthetic concept.²³² An indirect argument for the apocalyptic reading of Kingdom traditions in the Synoptic Gospels could be drawn from Paul's Letters. For K.P. Donfried noted that apocalyptic traditions about the Kingdom, in 1 Cor 15:50, 1 Cor 6:9, and Gal 5:21, are dependent on the teaching of Jesus in the Synoptic Gospels.²³³

The Marcan Jesus begins his preaching of the gospel of God with a saying in which the Kingdom is of central importance:

²²⁷ All four canonical Gospels and *Thomas*, starting with Mark 1:14–15, attest to Jesus' proclamation of the Kingdom; cf. 1 Cor 15:23–24. See Dunn, *Jesus Remembered*, 383: "The centrality of the kingdom of God (*basileia tou theou*) in Jesus' preaching is one of the least disputable, or disputed, facts about Jesus".

²²⁸ For a recent survey, see e.g. Dunn, *Jesus Remembered*, 383–487.

²²⁹ Carmignac, "Les dangers de l'Eschatologie," 365–90 and idem, *Le Mirage de l'Eschatologie*, 133–201.

²³⁰ Perrin, "Eschatology and Hermeneutics," 3–14 at 12 understands "the symbol 'kingdom of God'" as "a 'tensive symbol,' that its meaning is by no means exhausted by any 'literal intentionality'". Chilton, "The Kingdom of God in Recent Discussion," 255–80 identifies with scholarship which is "not satisfied with an apocalyptic construction of Jesus' preaching" (259).

²³¹ Horsley, "The Kingdom of God and the Renewal of Israel: Synoptic Gospels, Jesus Movements, and Apocalypticism," 303–44 disapproves of "debates about Jesus and the Gospels carried on in terms of the standard old synthetic concept of apocalypticism" (304).

²³² Horsley, "The Kingdom of God and the Renewal of Israel," 304.

²³³ Donfried, "The Kingdom of God in Paul," 233–52 at 248 and 251.

πεπλήρωται ὁ καιρὸς καὶ ἤγγικεν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ· μετανοεῖτε καὶ πιστεύετε ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ.

The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand, repent, and believe in the gospel (Mark 1:15, RSV).

The perspective of inaugurated eschatology that underlies the saying “the kingdom of God is at hand” may have a point of analogy in the proleptic formulations ‘the time of righteousness has arrived’, ‘the age of peace has arrived’, and ‘the dominion {of justice} of goodness has arrived’ of *4QTime of Righteousness* (4Q215a 1 II 5, 6, 10; section 3.4.1 above); a text that stipulates the expectation that all injustice should pass away at the same time. The horizon of expectation evoked by the words in Mark 1:15 thereby intersects with Palestinian Jewish strands of imminent apocalyptic hope for a world of righteousness, peace, and goodness as well as the admonitory concern for return from error and iniquity to the way of righteousness (cf. e.g. *Jub.* 23:26; CD-A I 8–10 // 4QD^a 2 I 12–14, 4QD^c 1 15–17).

For our analysis of Kingdom traditions, it may be instructive to start with Mark 4:11–12, the first time that Mark returns to the subject of the Kingdom, after his summarily stated introduction of Jesus’ gospel message in Mark 1:14–15. Mark 4:11 relates that the ‘mystery of the kingdom of God’, τὸ μυστήριον τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ, has been given to Jesus’ disciples, while “for those outside everything is in parables” (RSV; cf. Matt 13:10–13 / Luke 8:9–10). While the type of clause and its meaning in Mark 4:12 have been differently interpreted,²³⁴ the dualistic juxtaposition between those to whom the mystery of God’s kingdom has been given and ‘those outside’ is phrased in seemingly deterministic terms,²³⁵ which could serve to stress the absolute, unconditional character of the gospel mission. There may be a connection between ‘mystery’ in its ancient sense of a hidden matter and revelation, since the understanding of that which is hidden involves the act of revealing it.²³⁶ The

²³⁴ See the different translations of Mark 4:12 by Guelich, *Mark 1–8:26*, 199 (ἴνα as “that is” and μήποτε starting a conditional clause), and Marcus, *Mark 1–8*, 298 (purpose clause). Fowler, *Let the Reader Understand*, 102 attributes an ironical sense to Mark 4:11b–12.

²³⁵ Cf. Marcus, *Mark 1–8*, 298 who notes that δέδοται in Mark 4:11 “is probably a divine passive”.

²³⁶ Ὁ μυστήριον, see BDAG ³2000, 661–62. 1QpHab VII 1–8 relates the *mysteries* of the words of God’s servants, the prophets, on the one hand, and eschatological revelations that base themselves on an authoritative interpretation of these mysteries on the

revelatory dimension to the Kingdom in this Synoptic Jesus-tradition provides a basic precondition for discerning apocalyptic elements in Jesus' proclamation of the Kingdom.²³⁷

When we turn to parables about the Kingdom in Mark 4, the parables of the sower (Mark 4:3–9.13–20.26–29) express a sense of good (fruitful acceptance of the word, Mark 4:20) and evil (Satan who takes away the sown word, Mark 4:15). Yet this is not evidence of dualism or determinism, but it may rather reflect different receptions of Jesus' gospel, ranging from rejection, failure through temptation(s), and faithfulness. J.D.G. Dunn made the following observation about parables of the Kingdom: "The inherent polyvalency of the parables of the kingdom subverts any attempt to draw a single uniform picture of the kingdom."²³⁸

Notwithstanding the 'polyvalency' of the Synoptic Kingdom traditions, apocalyptic elements may be discerned in some of them. Mark 9:47 comprises the following saying of Jesus: "And if your eye causes you to sin, pluck it out; it is better for you to enter the *kingdom of God* with one eye than with two eyes to be thrown into hell (γέεννα)"²³⁹ (RSV). Mark 9:42–48 is not among the sayings that are usually considered secondary articulations of *Naherwartung*. Mark 9:47 presupposes an apocalyptic element of dualism (kingdom of God vs. Gehenna), which is thus not confined to Q or to editorial interests of Matthew and Luke.

The tension between notions of the Kingdom as a present reality (Luke 17:20–21; *G.Th.* 3, 113) and as an imminent future (Mark 1:14–15, Matt 4:17, Luke 10:9.11) may have a point of analogy in *4QTime of Righteousness* that also interchanges perfect and imperfect tenses to voice its perspective of inaugurated eschatology in terms of righteousness, peace and goodness, as we have seen above. It may be noted here that to let one of these notions dominate and ignore the other does not provide a proper basis for the debate about Jesus and apocalyptic eschatology. Tensions between temporal notions of the Kingdom can even occur within one Gospel (cf. Luke 17:20–21 (present) and Luke 21:29–31 (future)).

other. Marcus, *Mark 1–8*, 298 further notes that "the most significant background (to μυστήριον in Mark 4:11) is in OT and apocalyptic Jewish passages".

²³⁷ See Rowland, *The Open Heaven*, 9–72. Cf. Koch, "Das Geheimnis der Zeit in Weisheit und Apokalyptik um die Zeitenwende," 35–68.

²³⁸ Dunn, *Jesus Remembered*, 486–7.

²³⁹ On the usage of γέεννα as eschatological place of punishment in this passage and the Synoptics in general, see e.g. BDAG ³2000, 191; France, *The Gospel of Mark*, 381–2; Hagner, *Matthew 1–13*, 117.

The Synoptic Kingdom traditions may not attest to a consistent picture of an 'apocalyptic Jesus', but apocalyptic language does figure in several of them. This is the case with both traditions whose authenticity has been questioned (Mark 9:1, Matt 10:23) and those whose connection with the historical Jesus is less debated (Mark 4:11 par., Mark 9:47 par.).

5.4. *Final Judgement*

Final judgement is an important component of apocalyptic eschatology. Final judgement is implied in Mark 9:42–50 according to which Jesus exhorts his followers not to be tempted or to tempt to sin "one of these little ones who believe in me".²⁴⁰ The warnings of hell and its unquenchable fire are prominent in this Marcan passage and its Matthean parallel (Matt 18:6–9). A survey of eschatological traditions in Q (cf. chapter three, section 4.2) makes it clear that judgemental sayings are here even more broadly represented. In his study about the judgemental material in the Synoptic Gospels, M. Reiser has identified words and parables about final judgement with at least a 'kernel of authenticity' in all four strata of Synoptic Jesus-tradition (Mark, Q, M and L).²⁴¹ Therefore the judgemental material cannot be exclusively considered the product of secondary literary expansion;²⁴² a point which is further corroborated by the likelihood that it was not just the later milieu of transmission and redaction of Q traditions but already Jesus who engaged in controversy with and apocalyptic counter-discourse against Jewish circles of leadership in Israel.

The idea that gospel traditions about final judgement have a basis in traditions that go back to the milieu of the historical Jesus is confirmed by several recent literary-historical and methodological studies. C. Rinker argued that final judgement underlies repentance and salvation in Jesus' ministry, having analysed announcements of judgement, counter-

²⁴⁰ Analogously, Paul exhorts the knowledgeable not to cause those whose conscience is 'weak' to fall and thereby sin 'against Christ' (1 Cor 8:12). Like Mark 9:49 ('everyone will be salted with fire', RSV), Paul mentions the test of fire for each person regarding his work on the Day (of the Lord) (1 Cor 3:13–15; 1 Cor 1:8).

²⁴¹ Reiser, *Die Gerichtspredigt Jesu*.

²⁴² Reiser, *Die Gerichtspredigt Jesu*, 294–5 at 295 n. 6, further rejects the hypothesis by Lührmann, *Die Redaktion der Logienquelle*, 94, who envisaged "Re-apokalyptisierung der Verkündigung Jesu" in Q.

discourse of judgement against human conduct, parables of the Parousia, and counter-discourse of judgement vis-à-vis attitudes to Jesus in the Synoptic Gospels.²⁴³ The recent study by B.H. Gregg further argued for authenticity of the majority of final judgement sayings in Q on the basis of literary-historical analysis together with the criteria of multiple attestation, dissimilarity, embarrassment, and coherence.²⁴⁴ Gregg's analysis also exposed the flaws of several hypotheses that deemed judgemental sayings secondary and inauthentic.²⁴⁵

Comparative discussion of Jesus' proclamation of final judgement with a view to its roots in ancient apocalyptic eschatology, such as the studies by M. Reiser and B.H. Gregg, have taken into account the long published evidence of sectarian Qumran texts.²⁴⁶ The recently available Qumran evidence of sapiential works with apocalyptic features, *1-4QMysteries*, *1-4QInstruction*, and *4QBeatitudes* includes motifs of final judgement (section 3.5 above). This evidence constitutes a further argument of Palestinian Jewish context for an understanding of Jesus-tradition that combines sapiential and apocalyptic features. This non-sectarian Qumran evidence removes the traditio-historical ground for

²⁴³ Riniker, *Die Gerichtsverkündigung Jesu*, 457–60.

²⁴⁴ B.H. Gregg, *The Historical Jesus and the Final Judgment Sayings in Q* (WUNT, II/207), Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck, 2005, who supports the authenticity of most of the 'final judgement sayings in Q'.

²⁴⁵ Gregg, *Jesus and the Final Judgment Sayings in Q*, 4–7 describes the problematic general picture of a non-apocalyptic Jesus that derives from literary work on the composition history and communal setting of Q; on pp. 107–10 he critiques unsubstantiated presuppositions behind the argument that Q 10:10–12 would go back to an early Christian prophet; on pages 123–7 Gregg argues against the idea that the woes in Q 10:13–15 would be incongruous with other sayings of Jesus; on pages 141–3 at 141 argues against a reading by E.P. Sanders of Q 11:31–32 as "early Christian 'anti-Jewish polemic' which reflects an early failure of the Christian mission among Jews", interpreting Q 11:31–32 in terms of Gentile examples as "a way of shaming the Israelites" and considering the unlikelihood of massive retrojection of polemical language; on pages 157–60 he argues against an anachronistic idea of persecution in Q 12:4–5, referring to multiple attestation of sayings about Jesus' own suffering and death, and the violent death of John the Baptist; on pages 181–9, with a view to Q 12:8–9, Gregg evaluates the unlikelihood "that every reference to the Son of Man which alludes to Daniel 7 was a creation of the early church" (186) and argues against Käsemann's view of Q 12:8–9 as an early Christian prophetic creation of a 'sentence of holy law', pointing to Second Temple Jewish evidence of this form.

²⁴⁶ Reiser, *Die Gerichtspredigt Jesu*, 236–42, 303, 312–313 refers to 1QH, CD, 1QS, 1QM, 1QpHab, 4QPs, 4QFlor, 11QMelch, 4QPs⁶; Gregg, *Jesus and the Final Judgment Sayings in Q*, 53–7, 63–4, 71–8, 275–6, 277 n. 12 refers to 1QS, CD, 1QM, 1QpHab, 1QH. To my knowledge, Riniker, *Die Gerichtsverkündigung Jesu*, does not include comparative discussion of Qumran literature, but refers to evidence from the Old Testament, together with some passages from the Pseudepigrapha, Josephus, and rabbinic literature.

presupposing a strict dichotomy between wisdom and apocalypticism in contemporary Jewish tradition.

The Gospel of John also accords final judgement a place in its picture of Jesus' message. John 12:47–48 may be the clearest illustration of reminiscences of an apocalyptic-eschatological feature in Jesus' message;²⁴⁷ a message which was adapted to the context of Johannine kerygma:²⁴⁸ "If any one hears my sayings and does not keep them, I do not judge him; for I did not come to judge the world but to save the world. He who rejects me and does not receive my sayings has a judge; the word that I have spoken will be his judge on the last day (κρινεῖ αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ ἑσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ)" (RSV). John 12:49–50 indicates that Jesus speaks on the authority of the Father who sent him; a theological rationale that also occurs in the Synoptic Gospels (cf. Mark 9:37; Matt 10:40; Luke 10:16). The apocalyptic element of final judgement which we already came across in Synoptic Jesus-traditions has a setting of Johannine Christology in John 12:44–50.²⁴⁹

Extra-canonical New Testament writings comprise traditions that range from ambiguous to clear indications that final judgement could be part of the message of Jesus. Sayings in the *Gospel of Thomas* include references to fire with possible apocalyptic connotations (*G.Th.* 10;²⁵⁰ Luke 12:49) and to salvation and its opposite pole as 'interior realities' (*G.Th.* 70).²⁵¹ The *Dialogue of the Saviour* 51–52 mentions the afterlife in a metaphorical way ('garments of life') and relates this to travel "through that place [which] is [the] retribution".²⁵² In this context, the mentioning

²⁴⁷ Cf. Frey, *Die johanneische Eschatologie*. 3, 310 and nn. 338–344, who observes that the redaction-critical excision of the future-eschatological part in John 12:44–50, as proposed in previous scholarship (R. Bultmann, R. Schnackenburg, J. Wagner, M.-É. Boismard, R.E. Brown), cannot be justified in view of the 'literary homogeneity of the Johannine text'.

²⁴⁸ Frey, *Die johanneische Eschatologie*. 3, 309–18 correlates John 12:44–50 to John 3:31–36. Beasley-Murray, *John*, lxxxvi notes that the expressions of future eschatology "are in harmony with the fundamental theology of the Evangelist".

²⁴⁹ Cf. Beasley-Murray, *John*, lxxxvii: "the Johannine eschatology is explicable through the Evangelist's grasp of the insight that *eschatology is Christology*". Yet it should be noted that various elements in John 5:25–29 are not peculiar to Johannine Christology, since they are paralleled in the Synoptic Gospels, such as the divine authority granted to Jesus as the Son of Man (cf. Mark 13:26 par., 14:62; Matt 28:18, 20), resurrection of judgement (cf. Q 11:31–32) and resurrection to eternal life for the righteous (cf. Luke 14:14).

²⁵⁰ Cf. Valantasis, *The Gospel of Thomas*, 69 on the 'double significance' of fire in *G.Th.* 10, one role of it being described as follows: "the fire that Jesus casts seems to relate to a judgemental use of fire, the metaphor of fire as an apocalyptic or eschatological tool".

²⁵¹ Valantasis, *The Gospel of Thomas*, 149–50.

²⁵² Translation from Blatz, "The Dialogue of the Saviour," *NTA* 1, 308.

of a 'place that is the retribution' can hardly be taken to mean something else than the place of final judgement.

6. THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS AND APOCALYPTICISM

At the compositional level of the Synoptic Gospels and of the Sayings Source Q, two sections will be highlighted here with regard to the comparative study of apocalypticism in the New Testament and the Dead Sea scrolls: the Marcan 'eschatological discourse' and Q 11:29–32. These sections have already been treated with regard to the subject of eschatology in a previous chapter.²⁵³ The aim of the present survey is not to provide a comprehensive survey on these sections, but to illustrate how Qumran literature contributes to a traditio-historical relief for Gospel passages with arguably apocalyptic features whose relation to early Jesus-tradition has often been characterized as secondary in previous scholarship.

6.1. *The Marcan 'Eschatological Discourse'*

The Marcan 'eschatological discourse' (Mark 13:3–37) interweaves eschatological expectation of salvation and Parousia (vv. 24–27, 32–37) and historical experience of tribulation and destruction in the aftermath of the Jewish War (vv. 9–13, 14–23), as we have argued in chapter three. Apart from this, the Marcan 'eschatological discourse' envisions anxieties, upheavals and tribulation that could partly give voice to experienced situations in decades leading up to the Jewish War. It could further be that the envisioned events described by Mark partly take up vocabulary of apocalyptic tradition known by the early Jesus-movement and Mark's original audience in order to cope religiously with traumas left by catastrophic events. I will demonstrate this with examples, in particular with regard to apocalyptic tradition, below.

A passage near the beginning of the Marcan 'eschatological discourse', Mark 13:5b–8, provides evidence that exemplifies both historical and

²⁵³ For discussion of eschatology in Mark 13:3–37, see chapter three, section 3.2.6. For discussion of Q 11:29–32 as 'adapted eschatological tradition', see chapter three, section 4.2.2.

apocalyptic dimensions to this Marcan passage. Mark 13:5b–8 envisions calamitous upheavals as follows:

5 b ‘Take heed that no one leads you astray. 6 Many will come in my name, saying, ‘I am he!’ and they will lead many astray. 7 And when you hear of wars and rumors of wars, do not be alarmed; this must take place, but the end is not yet. 8 For nation will rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom; there will be earthquakes in various places, there will be famines; this is but the beginning of the birth-pangs. (RSV)

A historical context that corresponds to the reference to famine in Mark 13:8 is the famine in Judaea during the late 40s of the first century CE. Josephus mentions a ‘great famine’, ὁ μέγας λιμός, which occurred in Judaea during the procuratorship of Tiberius Alexander (*Ant.* 20.100–101), while Acts 11:28 (RSV) relates ‘a great famine over all the world’, λιμός μεγάλη μέλλειν ἔσεσθαι ἐφ’ ὅλην τὴν οἰκουμένην, foretold by prophet Agabus and having taken place during Claudius’ reign. Josephus further relates famine, λιμός, as part of a chain of ominous events preceding the Jewish War against Rome, and “reserved to exhibit the last degree of shamelessness, followed by the storming and razing of cities until at last the very temple of God was ravaged by the enemy’s fire through this revolt” (*Ant.* 18.8).²⁵⁴

Mark 13:7–8 has been the object of much previous scholarly attention for apocalyptic features. The phrase ‘this must take place’, δεῖ γενέσθαι (Mark 13:7), has been taken by E. Brandenburger to reflect apocalyptic determinism,²⁵⁵ while the reference to earthquakes in Mark 13:8 has been put in traditio-historical relief with a view to early Jewish apocalyptic texts by L. Hartman.²⁵⁶ The Marcan ‘eschatological discourse’ is intertextually conversant with the book of Daniel in various ways. Mark 13:14 cites words from Daniel 12:11 / 11:31, while Mark 13:26 cites words from Daniel 7:13. The question in Mark 13:4 about the time of prophesied events and a sign of them has been identified as an allusion to LXX Daniel 12:7 by L. Hartman,²⁵⁷ while E.-M. Becker recently surveyed other Danielic motifs in Mark 13.²⁵⁸

²⁵⁴ Translation from Feldman, *Josephus. Jewish Antiquities. Books XVIII–XIX*, 9.

²⁵⁵ Brandenburger, *Markus 13 und die Apokalypik*, 47–8.

²⁵⁶ Hartman, *Prophecy Interpreted*, 71–7 surveys the occurrence of the ‘earthquake motif’ in *1 Enoch* 1.3–9, *Sib.Or.* 3.64ff., *1 Enoch* 102.1f., *T. Levi* 4.1, *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch*.

²⁵⁷ Hartman, *Prophecy Interpreted*, 145.

²⁵⁸ Becker, “Markus 13 Re-Visited,” 95–124 at 107–8.

A text generally associated with the Qumran Daniel cycle, 4Q246 (cf. section 1, nn. 11–12 above), may further be drawn into traditio-historical discussion of the Marcan ‘eschatological discourse’ at the point where warfare between nations and kingdoms is mentioned (Mark 13:8). The Marcan reference to warfare between nations and kingdoms, ἐγερθήσεται γὰρ ἔθνος ἐπ’ ἔθνος καὶ βασιλεία ἐπὶ βασιλείαν, is part of a survey of events that carry overtones of eschatological expectation.²⁵⁹ Column II of 4Q246 envisions war between peoples (עמ) and countries (מד׳ינר) at the expense of one another in a setting of eschatological expectation with both collective and individual dimensions, including reference to the ‘people of God,’ עמ אל (l. 4), and a ruler figure guided by divine strength (ll. 7–8). Below I have quoted in translation 4Q246 II 1b-3 that mentions warfare between nations and countries.²⁶⁰

1b Like the sparks 2 that you saw, so will their kingdom be; they will rule several year[s] over 3 the earth and crush everything; a people will crush another people, and a province another province.

Both the Marcan passage and 4Q246 mention warfare between nations and dominions in a setting of eschatological expectation and both passages are at the receiving end of Danielic tradition. Column II of 4Q246 contrasts the reference to a kingdom of others, מלכותהן (4Q246 II 2), to an eternal kingdom, מלכות עלם, identified with God and his people (4Q246 II 4–5), thereby being indebted to the Danielic vision of an everlasting kingdom (Dan 7:27). Mark 13:26–27 ultimately envisions the Parousia with great power and glory in Danielic terms (Dan 7:13 in Mark 13:26), accompanied by the gathering of the elect (Mark 13:27). Both Mark 13 and 4Q246 presuppose that the warfare between nations and dominions will eventually be eclipsed by otherworldly power coming from God (cf. Mark 13:26–27.32; 4Q246 II 4–9).

Apart from points of analogy, a clear difference should also be noted between Mark 13 and 4Q246. 4Q246 II 4–9 envisions the rise of the people of God, judgement of all the earth in truth and peace and everlasting rulership guided by divine strength, whereas Mark 13 envisions great tribulation that well-nigh crushed hope of salvation (cf. Mark 13:19–20).

²⁵⁹ Becker, “Markus 13 Re-Visited,” 121–2 compares the phrase ‘this is but the beginning of the birth-pangs,’ ἀρχὴ ὀδίνων ταῦτα (Mark 13:8), with prophetic announcements of divine judgement as well as apocalyptic visions of final judgement and renewal at the resurrection in *1 Enoch* 62:4 and *4 Ezra* 4:42.

²⁶⁰ Translation from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*. 1, 495.

4Q246 and Mark 13 incorporate different transformations of Danielic tradition with emphases on earthly rule in truth and peace associated with an eternal kingdom (4Q246) and on the expected Parousia associated with great power and glory (Mark 13:26) respectively.

The Marcan 'eschatological discourse' further shares with Qumran apocalyptic texts several motifs that make part of soteriological perspectives on Israel. One motif, the shortening of days (Mark 13:19), has been compared with the hastening of days for the sake of Israel's inheritance in 4QPseudo-Ezekiel^a 3 2–5 by previous scholarship.²⁶¹

Another motif, for which comparison with Qumran literature has not yet received full attention, is the eschatological gathering of the elect in Mark 13:27.²⁶² Following a quotation of words from Daniel 7:13 in Mark 13:26, Mark 13:27 could further be conversant with Danielic tradition, in view of the repeated temporal designation καὶ τότε in verses 26 and 27. The motif of gathering of the elect also makes part of the eschatological perspective of one fragment of the Qumran Daniel cycle, 4Q243 (4QpsDan^a ar) 24 2: [דנה יתכנשון קריאי] [בתר], "after [this] the elect shall be assembled".²⁶³ In their reconstruction of sequence of fragments, J.J. Collins and P.W. Flint assign fragment 24 a place in *Pseudo-Daniel's* vision of 'the eschatological period' after its apocalyptic review of Israel's history.²⁶⁴ This vision of the eschatological period includes reference to oppression (4Q243 16 1) and wickedness (4Q243 24 1), which are followed by the gathering of the elect. Analogously, Mark 13:27 envisions the gathering of the elect after great tribulation (Mark 13:24).

²⁶¹ Kister and Qimron, "Observations on 4QSecond Ezekiel," 595–602.

²⁶² Hartman, *Prophecy Interpreted*, 174 argued that "the traditional motif of the gathering together is connected with the Danielic consummation (the eternal Kingdom)", while further referring to Deut 30:3f., Zech 2:10 and Isa 43:6 as possible intertextual backgrounds. Recently Becker, "Markus 13 Re-Visited," 105 n. 34 took up words from Brandenburger, *Markus 13 und die Apokalyptik*, 13 to describe Mark 13:24–27 as "jüdisch-apokalyptische Aussagen bzw. eine 'schemahaft gegliederte Beschreibung der Eschata'", drawing on evidence from Daniel, 1 *Enoch* 62, 4 *Ezra* 13, and Josephus (cf. page 118), but neglecting Qumran evidence.

²⁶³ Text and translation from Collins and Flint, *DJD* 22, 114.

²⁶⁴ Collins and Flint, *DJD* 22, 144. At page 136, Collins and Flint generally related Pseudo-Daniel's eschatological prophecy to 'its biblical counterpart', the book of Daniel.

6.2. Q 11:29–32 and Apocalypticism

A passage in the sayings source Q, whose framework has frequently been perceived as the secondary product of combination of separate sayings of Jesus and of redaction in the respective Gospels of Matthew and Luke,²⁶⁵ may further be illuminated through comparative discussion of apocalypticism. This passage, Q 11:29–32, has been discussed as an example of ‘adapted eschatological tradition’ with the secondary addition of the ‘sign of Jonah’ (chapter three, section 4.2.2). The Q passage, which comprises language of final judgement, is quoted in translation below, following the reconstruction of Q 11:29–32 by H.T. Fleddermann.²⁶⁶

11:29 But he answered and said to them: ‘An evil generation seeks a sign, and no sign will be given it except the sign of Jonah. 30 For as Jonah was a sign to the Ninevites, so will the Son of Man be to this generation. 31 The queen of the south will be raised in the judgement with this generation and she will condemn it, for she came from the ends of the earth to hear the wisdom of Solomon, and see, there is more than Solomon here. 32 The men of Nineveh will rise in the judgement with this generation and they will condemn it, for they repented at the preaching of Jonah, and see, there is more than Jonah here.’ (Q 11:29–32; reconstruction by H.T. Fleddermann).

The theme of final judgement makes integral part of ancient Jewish apocalypticism, as we have seen in sections 1 and 3.4 above (cf. note 154 above). The repeated Greek phrase ἐν τῇ κρίσει in Q 11:31–32 is usually taken to represent a temporal designation of judgement at the end of days.²⁶⁷ The Greek terms of being raised, ἐγερθήσεται (Q 11:31), and rising, ἀναστήσονται (Q 11:32), are less unanimously associated with eschatological resurrection. These terms have at times been taken to

²⁶⁵ The redaction-critical study of Q 11:29–32 by Edwards, *The Sign of Jonah*, 105–10 characterised this pericope as the product of the Q community which rewrote and redacted earlier Jesus tradition which underlies Mark 8:11–13, thereby relegating it to a secondary place in the study of the historical Jesus. Cf. Kloppenborg, *The Formation of Q*, 128 and n. 117, who claims that the double saying in Q 11:31–32 “is widely held to be authentic”, while on the other hand noting the opinion of Schulz, *Q: Die Spruchquelle der Evangelisten*, 253 that “the saying is a secondary composition”.

²⁶⁶ Fleddermann, *Q: A Reconstruction and Commentary*, 501–2.

²⁶⁷ E.g. Hagner, *Matthew 1–13*, 354; Nolland, *Luke 9:21–18:34*, 654; Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, 465; Fleddermann, *Q: A Reconstruction and Commentary*, 510; Uro, “Apocalyptic Symbolism and Social Identity in Q,” 92 (“judgement at the end of the days”).

render a juridical sense of 'rising up against'.²⁶⁸ Yet the consistently distinct use of two verbs, ἐγείρομαι and ἀνίσταμαι, in both Luke 11:31–32 and Matthew 12:41–42, that frequently denote rising/being raised from death in New Testament Greek,²⁶⁹ make eschatological overtones more likely than two verbal equivalents exclusively rendering the same juridical sense.²⁷⁰

The combination of polemic against 'this generation' (Q 11:29) and sayings about final judgement (Q 11:31–32) within one redactional framework has at times been taken to represent partly sayings of Jesus and partly a later communal setting with a juxtaposition between Gentiles and Israel.²⁷¹ An alleged later communal setting of missionary polemic against Israel thereby serves as argument against tracing the general tendency of polemic and final judgement back to the milieu of the historical Jesus. This idea has recently been critiqued by B.G. Gregg, who argued that "the Gentiles are used as a way of shaming the Israelites" in Q 11:31–32 through a rhetorical 'qal wahomer' argument.²⁷²

The question thereby is whether the Q passage should have to imply a theological equation of 'this generation' with Israel and its subsequent juxtaposition to Gentile protagonists from biblical literature. E. Lövestam compared ἡ γενεὰ αὕτη in the Synoptic Gospels with salvation-historical situations of 'special generations' in biblical and rabbinic tradition, such as the generation of the flood and of the wilderness.²⁷³ In the Lucan representation of the sequence of Q, the specific context of Q 11:29–32 with its polemic against 'an evil generation' is determined

²⁶⁸ Riniker, *Die Gerichtsverkündigung Jesu*, 291–2 thereby referring to earlier studies by G.H. Dalman and M. Black on Aramaic backgrounds to ἀνίσταμαι μετά τὸν ἴσθραήλ as "semitisierender terminus technicus für das Verhalten von Zeugen und Richter bei einer Gerichtsverhaltung" and mentioning biblical as well as rabbinic evidence (Isa 54:17, Ps 1:5, 109:6f.; *t.San.* 6.2, *ARN* 6).

²⁶⁹ BDAG, ³2000, 83 (lemma ἀνίστημι, rubric 7) and 271–2 (lemma ἐγείρω, rubrics 6 and 7).

²⁷⁰ Cf. Riniker, *Die Gerichtsverkündigung Jesu*, 292 who accounts for two different Greek renderings "um den Bezug des Textes auf die Totenerstehung deutlicher herauszuheben".

²⁷¹ Lührmann, *Die Redaktion der Logienquelle*, 93.

²⁷² Gregg, *The Historical Jesus and the Final Judgment Sayings in Q*, 141–2, thereby arguing against an earlier hypothesis put forward by E.P. Sanders in his study on *Jesus and Judaism* (1985) that Q 11:31–32 would be inauthentic "on the grounds that they represent early Christian 'anti-Jewish polemic' which reflects an early failure of the Christian mission among Jews" (141).

²⁷³ Lövestam, "The ἡ γενεὰ αὕτη. Eschatology in Mk 13,30 parr.," 403–13 at 409–10 with reference to Luke 11:30–32 par.

by demonization of Jesus' activity of casting out demons, the so-called Beelzebul controversy (Q 11:14–26), and by the request for a sign to put his integrity to the test (Q 11:16).²⁷⁴ These confrontations specifically determine the picture of the 'generation' that the Synoptic Jesus addresses according to Q 11:29–32.

Evidence from Josephus, longer known apocalyptic literature, and Qumran literature may further illuminate how 'generation' language could have been used in polemical intra-Jewish contexts without thereby necessarily implying distance from the people of Israel. This evidence could provide historical and traditio-historical information in order to evaluate Q 11:29–32 in relation to the early Jesus-movement and its Palestinian Jewish context.

Flavius Josephus polemicises about 'a generation', γενεά, whose fanaticism dragged the people along into the catastrophic outcome of the Jewish War (*J.W.* 5.566), while attributing the destruction of Jerusalem to 'such a generation (γενεά τοιαύτη) as brought forth by her' (*J.W.* 6.408). This polemical language applies to radical groups designated with the umbrella term of the 'fourth philosophy' by Josephus, since the context implies that Josephus has followers of John of Gischala (*J.W.* 5.562–565) as well as terrorist leaders in mind (*J.W.* 6.399) and he elsewhere attributes 'the ruin of our cause' to the fourth philosophy (*Ant.* 18.9–10). Josephus attributes the origins of the 'fourth philosophy' to the time of Quirinius' Roman census by the beginning of the first century CE (*Ant.* 18.1–10) and observes that this movement agreed in various respects with views of the Pharisees except for their militant zeal for theocracy (*Ant.* 18.23). According to Josephus, it was by the time of Felix' procuratorship of Judaea (52–60 CE) that revolutionary as well as terrorist zeal became more organized (*J.W.* 2.254–265). While Josephus writes from hindsight about events and movements preceding and leading up to the Jewish War against Rome, the term 'fourth philosophy' probably is a hindsight term of Josephus for a succession of radical groups first inspired by the zeal of Judas a Gaulanite and Saddok a Pharisee (*Ant.* 18.4.9).²⁷⁵ Such a movement of revolutionary zeal drew various follow-

²⁷⁴ Luke 11:16 includes the participle *πειράζοντες*; Matt 12:38 omits this. The Marcan passage on the request for a sign, Mark 8:11–13, further includes this participle *πειράζοντες*.

²⁷⁵ As compared to other, well-established Jewish schools, Josephus refers to the 'fourth philosophy' as a "novel/heterogeneous school of philosophy", *φιλοσοφία ἐπίσκοτος* (*Ant.* 18.9).

ers, as Josephus observes (*Ant.* 18.9). If at the time of Jesus' ministry revolutionary as well as terrorist zeal was less organized than in later decades, polemical language against an 'evil generation' such as that in Q 11:29–32 could address tendencies toward such zeal that put bold emphasis on heavenly signs (Q 11:16) and relentlessly associated with evil the very effort to drive out evil and to cure diseases (Q 11:14–26).

This identification of the polemical language in Q 11:29–32 would further correspond with larger pictures of tendencies attributed to certain opponents of the early Jesus-movement toward radicalism and religious persecution in the Synoptic Gospels (e.g. Matt 5:9–12, 10:23; Mark 4:17 par., 13:9–13; Q 11:47–51) and Acts (Acts 6:8–8:3) and Josephus' description of the 'fourth philosophy'. Josephus' describes the challenge of the 'fourth philosophy' to the rest of Palestinian Jewish society as a movement that "filled the body politic (ἡ πολιτεία) immediately with tumult, also planting the seeds of those troubles which subsequently overtook it" (*Ant.* 18.9).²⁷⁶ The upsurge of radical elements in Judaea represented by the 'Sicarii', σικάριοι, as described by Josephus with regard to the 50s of the first century CE (*J.W.* 2.254–257), is further echoed in suspicions of a Roman tribune in Jerusalem about the activity of 'Assassins', σικάριοι, according to Acts 21:38.

Apart from historical dimensions to the judgemental language in Q 11:29–32, apocalyptic texts known outside Qumran and from Qumran literature may put the polemical language of judgement against 'this generation' into traditio-historical relief.

The *Book of Jubilees* includes a vision of an "evil generation which sins in the land" (*Jub.* 23:14–20 at 14), bringing about circumstances that "there is not any peace in the days of this evil generation" (*Jub.* 23:15; cf. section 2.2 above).²⁷⁷ The Qumran witness to parts of *Jubilees* 23, 4Q176a, includes a judgemental perspective on the deeds of this 'evil generation': "And there will be great anger against the deeds of [that] generation ([ההואה] מעשי הדור) on the part of the Lord" (*Jub.* 23:22 in 4Q176a 19–20 2–3).²⁷⁸ *Jubilees* 23:22–23, as preserved in 4Q176a 19–20 2–4, includes language of judgement, למשפט, and reference to the arousal of 'the sinners of the nations' against the evil generation, albeit from an apparently historicizing perspective rather than from a point of view

²⁷⁶ Translation from Feldman, *Jewish Antiquities. Books XVIII–XIX*, 9.

²⁷⁷ Translation from Wintermute, "Jubilees," 100.

²⁷⁸ Translation from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition. 1*, 361.

of eschatological judgement. Nevertheless, the judgemental ‘generation’ language provides a general point of analogy with that of Q 11:29–32. It could well be that the judgemental perspective of Q 11:29–32 took up vocabulary of denouncement from earlier apocalyptic tradition.

Finally, a fragment from the Qumran text 4Q541 (*4QApocryphon of Levi^b (?) ar*) may bring in new evidence in order to put into tradition-historical relief the pattern of contrast in Q 11:29–32 between a collective entity ‘evil generation’ and an individual Jewish teacher with charisma who denounced ‘this generation’, Jesus. 4Q541 has been palaeographically dated to the end of the second century BCE.²⁷⁹ 4Q541 9 column I describes a confrontation between an individual teacher figure and his generation that “will be evil and changed”, דרה באיש ואפיד (4Q541 9 I 6).²⁸⁰ Text and translation are cited below.²⁸¹

1 Frag. 9 I [...] [...] 2 [...] כל [...]]בני דרה [...] מיה [...]] [...]] וכפר על כול בני דרה וישתלח לכול בני 3 [עמ]ה מאמרה כמאמר שמין ואלפונה כרעות אל שמש עלמה תגיר 4 ויתזה נורהא בכול קצוי ארעא ועל חשוכא { } תגיר אדין יעדה חשוכא 5 [מ]ן ארעא וערפלא מן יבישתא שגיאן מלין עלוהי יאמרון ושגה 6 [כדב]ין ובדיאן עלוהי יבדון וכול גנואין עלוהי ימללון דרה באיש ואפיד 7 [...]] להוה ודי שקר וחמס מקמה [ו] יטעה עמא ביומוהי וישתבשון

1 [...] ... [...] the sons of his generation [...] ... [...] 2 [...] his [wi]sdom. And he will atone for all children of his generation, and he will atone for all the children of his generation, and he will be sent to all the children of 3 his [people]. His word is like the word of the heavens, and his teaching, according to the will of God. His eternal sun will shine 4 and its fire will burn in all the ends of the earth; above the darkness it will shine. Then, darkness will vanish 5 [fr]om the earth, and gloom from the dry land. They will utter many words against him, and an abundance of 6 [lie]s; they will fabricate fables against him, and utter every kind of disparagement against him. His generation will be evil and changed 7 [and ...] will be, and its position of deceit and of violence. [And] the people will go astray in his days and they will be bewildered.

²⁷⁹ Starcky, “Les quatre étapes du messianisme à Qumrân,” 481–505 at 492 made initial comments on 4Q540/4Q541 and assigned the preliminary title ‘Aharonide Araméen’ (4QAHA) to the composition; preliminary publication by Puech, “Fragments d’un apocryphe de Lévi,” 449–501; ed.pr. by Puech, *DJD* 31, 225–56.

²⁸⁰ Text and translation from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*. 2, 1080–1.

²⁸¹ Text and translation from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *ibidem*, 1080–1.

The reference to atonement (4Q541 9 I 2) could imply priestly if not high-priestly affiliations of the individual protagonist, who is further characterized as a teacher of divinely inspired teachings (4Q541 9 I 3). The reference to 'his eternal sun' (4Q541 9 I 3-4) could imply a point of view of religious calendar that presupposes the solar calendar. If this allusion is intentional, the affiliations of the text may be traced back to apocalyptic or Essene circles that upheld the solar calendar. J.J. Collins convincingly argued that the 'referential background' to the individual protagonist in 4Q541 9 I was modeled on the Teacher of Righteousness. The Teacher of Righteousness, whose priestly affiliations are mentioned in 1QpHab II 6-10, VII 4-5, and 4QpPs^a 1,3-4 III 15, was also confronted with lies and rebuke against his teachings by a whole council according to 1QpHab V 9-12.²⁸²

The above Aramaic fragment of 4Q541 indicates that polemic of a divinely inspired Jewish teacher against an 'evil generation' made part of Palestinian Jewish counter-discourse against dominant circles that are characterized as evil and changed to a position of falsehood and violence. It should be noted that 4Q541 9 I distinctly refers to 'his generation', דרר, that perpetrates evil and violence, and the people, עמא, that strays and becomes perplexed (4Q541 9 I 6-7). The polemic of this fragment against an 'evil and changed generation' thereby probably addresses dominant circles with influence to misguide people and lead them to sin. In view of possible traditio-historical connections between 4Q541 9 I and *T.Levi* 18,²⁸³ the counter-discourse of 4Q541 9 I may have become part of some strands of Palestinian Jewish cultural memory. In this respect, 4Q541 9 I puts into further traditio-historical relief the intra-Jewish dimension to judgemental language of Q 11:29-32 against 'this generation'.

The above comparative survey has aimed to demonstrate that there is more to Q 11:29-32 than a redactional framework for sayings of Jesus that reflects later developments in early Christian theology disillusioned with mission in Israel. The polemical tone of Q 11:29-32 against 'this

²⁸² Collins, "The Referential Background of 4QAaron A," 579-90; idem, *The Scepter and the Star*, 124-5.

²⁸³ Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte aus Qumran*, 260-1 puts *T.Levi* 18:3-4 and 4Q541 9 I 3-5 in a comparative synoptic table, mentions other passages (*T.Levi* 10,2; 14,1; 16,2-3 (18,9) and further draws Isa 60, into the traditio-historical discussion. Xeravits, *King, Priest, Prophet*, 110 and 112 compares 4Q541 9 with *T.Levi* 17-18 in particular *T.Levi* 18:3-4, while noting a parallel to 4Q541 24 5b-6 in Isaiah 52:13-53:12.

generation' as an evil generation may be contextualised by a historical situation of growing tendencies toward radicalization that have been identified with the 'fourth philosophy' from hindsight by Josephus. The context to Q 11:29–32 relates a struggle between Jesus and certain opponents in Roman Palestine who demonized Jesus' very efforts to help people getting their body and soul restored to peace from demonic possession (Q 11:14–26)²⁸⁴ and challenged him to come up with a heavenly sign (Q 11:16). The traditio-historical relief provided by *Jubilees* and 4Q541 9 I yields the impression that such a confrontation of Jesus with certain opponents who characterized themselves by these pervasive tendencies may well have been expressed in intra-Jewish terms denouncement against an 'evil generation.'

7. PAUL AND APOCALYPTICISM

Pauline scholarship has recurrently drawn attention to apocalyptic features in Paul's theology.²⁸⁵ A focus on final judgement and salvation makes integral part of major Pauline Letters (cf. chapter three, section 9). Several Pauline passages imply dualism between dominions of light and darkness and a struggle of powers serving God against Satan's sphere of influence in the world (1 Thess 5:5; 1 Cor 7:5; 2 Cor 2:11, 4:4, 11:13–15; Rom 16:20); a perspective that touches the apostle's perspective of the present as "the present evil age", ὁ αἰὼν ὁ ἐνεστώς πονηρός, that stands in need of deliverance from human sins (Gal 1:4). Analogously, the *Damascus Document* recurrently describes the contemporary age as 'an age of wickedness' (קץ הרשיע in CD-A VI 10; קץ הרשע in CD-A VI 14 // 4QD^a 3 II 20; קץ הרשע in CD-A XV 7; קץ הרשעה in CD-A XII 23); a perspective of time limited by eschatological expectations of the rise of

²⁸⁴ Cf. section 3.2.1 above on Jewish terms of incantation and exorcism in apocryphal psalms of Qumran.

²⁸⁵ Cf. e.g. De Boer, "Paul and Jewish Apocalyptic Eschatology," 169–90; idem, "Paul and Apocalyptic Eschatology," 345–83; Dunn, *The Theology of Paul the Apostle*, 40–1, 297 (with reference to A. Schweitzer, Ernst Käsemann, J.L. Martyn, and J.C. Beker as proponents of apocalypticism as hermeneutical key for interpreting Paul); cf. the conclusion by Tronier, "The Corinthian Correspondence between Philosophical Idealism and Apocalypticism," 165–96 at 196 who maintains that "Paul may float smoothly between apocalyptic and philosophical ideas, even though his basic interpretive framework is a distinctly apocalyptic one". See recently Wolter, "Apokalyphtik als Redeform im Neuen Testament," 171–91 at 183–5 who discusses Rom 11:25–26a and 1 Cor 15:51–2 as examples of apocalyptic forms of speech with corresponding 'Rezeptionsanweisung'.

one 'who teaches justice at the end of days' (CD-A VI 10–11) and of the rise of the messiah of Aaron and Israel (CD-A XII 23–XIII 1).

Determinism further makes part of Paul's Letters, in that the apostle mentions 'vessels of wrath made for destruction' and 'vessels of mercy which he has prepared beforehand for glory' (Rom 9:22–23, RSV) and observes that "what no eye has seen, nor ear heard, nor the heart of man conceived, what God has prepared for those who love him, God has revealed to us through the Spirit" (1 Cor 2:9–10, RSV).

In 1 Corinthians 2:6–10a, Paul's concept of divine wisdom comprises a revelatory sense that may further reflect an orientation similar to apocalyptic discourse. Paul's reference to divine wisdom that is "not a wisdom of this age (σοφία δὲ οὐ τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου) or of the rulers of this age (οὐδὲ τῶν ἀρχόντων τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου), who are doomed to pass away (τῶν καταργουμένων)" (1 Cor 2:6, RSV) reflects a sense of revelation of 'secret and hidden wisdom' (1 Cor 2:7) which the apostle juxtaposes to the misunderstanding of 'the rulers of this age' who crucified "the Lord of glory" (1 Cor 2:8). Paul further identifies the wisdom of God as predestined, wisdom which God "decreed before the ages for our glorification" (1 Cor 2:7, RSV). The apostle describes revelation of divine wisdom in otherworldly terms in 1 Cor 2:9–10a:²⁸⁶

2:9 But, as it is written, 'What no eye has seen, nor ear heard, nor the heart of man conceived, what God has prepared for those who love him,' 10a God has revealed to us through the Spirit (1 Cor 2:9–10a, RSV)

Analogously with Paul's contrast between divine wisdom and a wisdom of 'the rulers of this age', who are held responsible for Jesus' crucifixion and are 'doomed to pass away' (1 Cor 2:6.8), Enochic apocalyptic discourse juxtaposes tribulation and oppression of the righteous by earthly rulers (1 *Enoch* 103:14, 104:3) to the assurance of heavenly elevation of the righteous (1 *Enoch* 104:1–6). 1 *Enoch* 104:12–13²⁸⁷ identifies the heavenly assurance with a mystery that is given to the righteous "for the joy of righteousness and much wisdom" (1 *Enoch* 104:12).²⁸⁸ Differently from the Enochic apocalyptic discourse, Paul attributes this knowledge to those who are receptive to the Spirit, being 'spiritual

²⁸⁶ Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 252 characterizes the 'citation' in 1 Cor 2:9 as "a pastiche of biblical allusions", including Isa 64:3. Yet most of the Greek clauses of Paul's citation have a parallel in MT Isa 64:3.

²⁸⁷ 4Q204 (4QEn^c ar) 5 I 20–21 preserve a few words of 1 *Enoch* 104:13.

²⁸⁸ Translation from Nickelsburg and VanderKam, 1 *Enoch. A New Translation*, 163.

people' (πνευματικός, 1 Cor 2:13.15) rather than to 'the righteous'. Pauline theology connects righteousness with Jesus Christ (1 Cor 1:30; cf. Rom 3:21–26). Yet in its contrast between the unrighteousness of earthly rulers and divine wisdom revealed from heaven, Enochic discourse reflects an apocalyptic concern that appears to be echoed in this Pauline passage.

Paul's letters further include eschatological and soteriological strands of thought that are paralleled by both sapiential and apocalyptic evidence from Qumran. We have argued for connections with both Jewish apocalypticism and *4QInstruction* as regards the anthropological and cosmological dimensions to Paul's discourse on the resurrection in 1 Cor 15:42–50 (chapter four, section 5.3). We have further put in relief a Pauline phrase about justification in Rom 3:20 through comparison with *4QBeatitudes* (section 3.5 above). A further example may be adduced from First Corinthians. In 1 Cor 10:11, Paul expresses the belief that admonitions through Scripture "were written down for our instruction, upon whom the end of the ages (τὰ τέλη τῶν αἰώνων) has come" (1 Cor 10:11, RSV). This perspective of time has been considered among Pauline evidence of apocalyptic eschatology that contrasts the past ages up to the present as evil to the fulfillment of conditions for salvation.²⁸⁹ Paul's concept of 'the end of the ages' is paralleled by a sectarian Qumran text, 4Q298 (*4Qcrypt A Words of the Maskil to All the Sons of Dawn*) III 9–10, which preserves the following phrase:²⁹⁰

9 בעבור תבינו בקץ 10 עולמות ובקד[מ]וניות תביטו לדעת

9 in order that you understand the end of 10 ages, and that you examine the for[m]er things, to know

The Hebrew terms קץ עולמות in 4Q298 III 9–10 closely correspond with Paul's concept τὰ τέλη τῶν αἰώνων in 1 Cor 10:11. M.J. Goff has characterized 4Q298 as a sectarian wisdom text that includes revelation of eschatological knowledge.²⁹¹ Paul's eschatological perspective in

²⁸⁹ Cf. De Boer, "Paul and Apocalyptic Eschatology," 349, who takes 1 Cor 10:11 as evidence of 'eschatological dualism,' "the end of the old age and the beginning of the new"; Dunn, *The Theology of Paul the Apostle*, 41 on Paul's sharing of a Jewish apocalyptic view that saw time "as a progression of ages, and looked for the age to come to release them from the evils of the present."

²⁹⁰ Text and translation from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*. 2, 656–7.

²⁹¹ Goff, *Discerning Wisdom*, 146–59.

1 Cor 10:11, that has been associated with a background of apocalyptic tradition,²⁹² may thereby also have a point of analogy with eschatologized wisdom.

8. POST-PAULINE LETTERS

Among the post-Pauline Letters, two letters may be mentioned here that are particularly intertextually conversant with early Jewish apocalyptic tradition: 2 Timothy and Jude.

2 Timothy comprises a passage that is concerned with premonition that ‘in the last days,’ ἐν ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις, there will be hard times (2 Tim 3:1–9 at v. 1) due to treacherous people who are to be avoided. The author of 2 Timothy further characterizes such treacherous people by comparing them with opponents of Moses:

As Jannes and Jambres (Ἰάννης καὶ Ἰαμβρής) opposed Moses, so these men also oppose the truth, men of corrupt mind and counterfeit faith (2 Tim 3:8, RSV)

The enumeration of characteristics in the preceding verses 2–7 of 2 Tim 3 evokes a dualistic contrast between truth and deceit. The figures Jannes and Jambres do not occur in canonical biblical tradition, while several texts that concern or mention Jannes and Jambres date from centuries later than the first century CE.²⁹³ The *Damascus Document* illustrates an apocalyptic background to the opposition of Jannes and Jambres against Moses. CD-A V 17–19 // 4QD^a 3 II 5–7 comprises the following passage that expresses cosmic dualism:

For in ancient times there arose Moses and Aaron, by the hand of the prince of lights, and Belial, with his cunning, raised up Jannes and his brother (יְחִנֵּה וְאֵת אִחֵיהּ) during the first deliverance of Israel.²⁹⁴

This passage makes part of an apocalyptic review of the past that also turns to a horizon of eschatological expectation (CD-A VI 10–11). The

²⁹² Cf. Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 743 who refers to comparison of 1 Cor 10:11 with 4 Ezra 6:7–10.

²⁹³ Cf. A. Pietersma and R.T. Lutz, “Jannes and Jambres,” *OTP* 2, 427–42 at 427–30 who refer to, among other evidence, later pseudepigraphical literature (*Jannes and Jambres* (first to third centuries CE); *Testament of Solomon* 25:4 (first to third century CE)); rabbinic literature (*b.Men.* 85a; *tg. Ps.-J.* to Exod 1:15, 7:11 and Num 22:22); Eusebius, *Praeparatio evangelica* 9.8; *Contra Celsum* 4.51.

²⁹⁴ Translation from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*. 1, 559.

eschatological orientation in 2 Tim 3:1 and the analogy from the biblical past in 2 Tim 3:8 may thereby stand at the receiving end of apocalyptic tradition.

The Letter of Jude comprises extensive polemic against false teachers; polemic that includes analogies from apocalyptic tradition through allusion and citation. Jude 9 mentions contention between the archangel Michael and the devil, observing that the opponents go beyond such contention in their revilements (Jude 10). The analogy in Jude 9 evokes an intertextual allusion to parabiblical tradition that added apocalyptic traits of cosmic dualism to biblical narrative. Second, Jude 14–15 comprises the following citation of Enochic prophecy of judgement that the author of Jude applies to people whom he designates as opponents of the addressed community:

14 Behold, the Lord came with his holy myriads, 15 to execute judgement on all, and to convict all the ungodly of all their deeds of ungodliness which they have committed in such an ungodly way, and of all the harsh things which ungodly sinners have spoken against him (Jude 14–15, RSV).

These words of Enochic prophecy stem from *1 Enoch* 1:9; a passage that is also fragmentarily attested among the Aramaic Qumran manuscripts of *1 Enoch*, in 4Q204 (4QEn^c ar) I 15–17. As compared to the text of *1 Enoch* 1:9, the citation in Jude 14–15 omits the phrase ‘and to destroy all the wicked’²⁹⁵ between the references to judgement and to conviction, thereby focusing on judgement without turning to destruction.

9. THE APOCALYPSE OF JOHN

The eschatological vision of judgement and afterlife in the book of Revelation includes later concepts, like ‘first resurrection’ (Rev 20:5) and ‘second death’ (Rev 20:6, 14; cf. Rev 2:11) as compared to pre-70 CE New Testament traditions (cf. chapter three, section 1). At the same time, the book of Revelation elaborates on earlier apocalyptic traditions of Second Temple Judaism and the early Jesus-movement. I will illustrate this point with some examples.

At the beginning of the Apocalypse, John describes a preparatory vision (Rev 1:9–20), which includes the appearance of ‘one like a son of

²⁹⁵ See Nickelsburg and VanderKam, *1 Enoch. A New Translation*, 20; cf. García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*. 1, 413.

man, ὅμοιος υἱὸν ἀνθρώπου, to him (Rev 1:12–16 at v. 13). Rev 1:13–16 describes this appearance in otherworldly terms that, among other characteristics,

his head and his hair were white as white wool, white as snow; his eyes were like a flame of fire (Rev 1:14, RSV).

The imagery in this passage has been traced back to a fusion of two figures in Daniel 7, the ‘white-headed Ancient of Days’ (Dan 7:9–10) and ‘the one like a Son of man’ (Dan 7:13–14), in previous scholarship.²⁹⁶ Yet the imagery of Rev 1:12–16 may further be related to a description of Noah in otherworldly terms in *1 Enoch* 106:10:

And his form and appearance are not like the form of human beings. And his color is whiter than snow and redder than a rose, and the hair of his head is whiter than white wool. And his eyes are like the rays of the sun.²⁹⁷

Apocalyptic tradition about Noah may further play a part in the background of the visionary imagery in Rev 1:12–16, in view of Noah’s typological significance standing for salvation in the midst of cataclysm. In early Gospel tradition, the ‘days of Noah’ are compared to the ‘days of the Son of man’ (Matt 24:37, Luke 17:26). The analogy between characteristics attributed to Noah and the vision of ‘one like a son of man’ in Rev 1:12–16 could implicitly serve to illustrate an analogy between times of tribulation and between key roles in overcoming the tribulation and deliverance from it.²⁹⁸ The apocalyptic significance of the figure of Noah is further underlined by a Qumran text, designated as 4Q534 (*4QBirth of Noah*^a),²⁹⁹ which indicates that the protagonist, Noah, “will know the secrets of all living things”, וידע רזי כול חייא (4Q534 I 8) and is ‘the elect of God’, בחיר אלהא (4Q534 I 10).³⁰⁰

The Apocalypse comprises a vision of war in heaven resulting in the downfall of Satan from heaven to the earth (Rev 12:7–17 at v. 9). This

²⁹⁶ Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination*, 273.

²⁹⁷ Translation from Nickelsburg and VanderKam, *1 Enoch. A New Translation*, 165. *1 Enoch* 106:10 makes part of a section, *1 Enoch* 106–107, designated by Nickelsburg and VanderKam as ‘The Birth of Noah’. Cf. *1 Enoch* 106:2 with a comparable description, of which one word, שמוק, has been preserved in the Aramaic fragment of 4Q204 (4QEn^c ar) 5 I 28.

²⁹⁸ Cf. Rev 2–3 in which John addresses seven churches with their hardship and tribulation in the name of the ‘one like a Son of man’.

²⁹⁹ Ed.pr. by Puech, *DJD* 31, 129–52 (“4QNaissance de Noe a ar”).

³⁰⁰ Text and translation from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*. 2, 1070–1.

apocalyptic event is accompanied by a loud voice in heaven which states that “the salvation and the power and the kingdom of our God and the authority of his Christ have come” (Rev 12:10, RSV), while forewarning earth and sea that “the devil has come down to you in great wrath, because he knows that his time is short!” (Rev 12:12, RSV). The eschatological tension implied in this heavenly voice (Rev 12:10–12) appears to be analogous with Gospel tradition. Moreover, the envisioned downfall of Satan from heaven has a point of analogy in earlier Gospel tradition. Luke 10:17–20 comprises the following interaction between Jesus and the commissioned ‘seventy’ on the struggle against demonic spheres of influence:

10:17 The seventy returned with joy, saying, ‘Lord, even the demons are subject to us in your name!’¹⁸ And he said to them, ‘*I saw Satan fall like lightning from heaven.*’ 19 Behold I have given you authority to tread upon serpents and scorpions, and over all the power of the enemy; and nothing shall hurt you. 20 Nevertheless do not rejoice in this, that the spirits are subject to you; but rejoice that your names are written in heaven’ (Luke 10:17–20, RSV).

The words of Jesus in this passage have largely been counted among Luke’s special materials,³⁰¹ thereby going back to earlier gospel tradition. The vision by the Lucan Jesus of the downfall of Satan from heaven has been interpreted as a realization that his ministry drew the ‘coming triumph of the kingdom of God over the rule of Satan’ nearer.³⁰² As compared to earlier Gospel tradition, Rev 12:7–10 claims that the downfall of Satan from heaven is determined by “the blood of the Lamb and by the word of their testimony, for they loved not their lives even unto death” (Rev 12:11, RSV). The reference to the devil’s knowledge that “his time is short”, ὀλίγον καιρὸν ἔχει (Rev 12:12, RSV), could be compared to the shortening of days of tribulation by the Lord for the sake of the elect in the Marcan ‘eschatological discourse’ (Mark 13:20). The Apocalypse thereby elaborates on several strands of earlier gospel tradition. Rev 12:13–17 subsequently draws out earthly tribulation in apocalyptic

³⁰¹ Schnelle, *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, 207 lists Luke 10:18–20 as ‘Lukas-Sondergut’; cf. e.g. Nolland, *Luke 9:21–18:34*, 561 who refers to Luke 10:18–19 as “materials that had been transmitted in the tradition as isolated sayings”, while considering vv. 17 and 20 as derived from Q.

³⁰² Nolland, *Luke 9:21–18:34*, 564. At page 563, Nolland surveys evidence of Jewish tradition about the eschatological defeat of Satan, including reference to 1QM XV 12–XVI 1; XVII 5–8 and to 11QMelch II 13–14.

terms for “those who keep the commandments of God and bear testimony to Jesus” (Rev 12:17, RSV); tribulation and flight from it whose duration ‘for a time, and times and half a time’ (Rev 12:14) incorporates Danielic language (Dan 7:25, 12:7).

A final example of the Apocalypse’s dependence and elaboration on earlier Jewish tradition concerns the vision of cosmic transformation in Rev 21:1:

Then I saw a new heaven and a new earth; for the first heaven and the first earth had passed away, and the sea was no more (Rev 21:1, RSV).

This vision could allude to Isaianic language about God’s creation of new heavens and a new earth (Isa 65:17, 66:22), and its subsequent focus on the new Jerusalem appears to elaborate on the Isaianic connection between a vision of cosmic transformation and God’s creation of renewed joy for Jerusalem (Isa 65:18–19). On the other hand, the eschatological orientation of the Apocalypse and the first-person singular standpoint of the apocalyptic seer may be rather comparable to the vision of a new heaven in the Enochic ‘Apocalypse of Weeks’:

And the first heaven will pass away in it, and a new heaven will appear, and all the powers of heaven will shine forever with sevenfold (brightness) (*1 Enoch* 91:16).³⁰³

4Q212 (4QEn^s ar) IV 23–25 fragmentarily preserves the Aramaic text of *1 Enoch* 91:16:³⁰⁴

23 ושמין 24 קדמין בה יעברון ושמ[ין] [...] שמיא 25 צ[הר]ין ודנחין לכול
עלמי[ן] ... ש[ב]עין

Analogously with Enochic tradition, that envisions great judgement prior to cosmic transformation (*1 Enoch* 91:15–16 (4QEn^s ar IV 22–25)), the Apocalypse envisions final judgement (Rev 20:11–15) prior to the appearance of a new heaven and a new earth.

10. EVALUATION

Comparative study between the New Testament and ancient Jewish apocalyptic literature has been recurrently recognized as of key importance

³⁰³ Translation from Nickelsburg and VanderKam, *1 Enoch. A New Translation*, 142.

³⁰⁴ Text from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*. 1, 444.

for the study of the origins of Christianity (J. Weiss, A. Schweizer, E. Käsemann, D.C. Allison, Jr.) and at the same time been criticized as an unsustainable project with regard to the study of the historical Jesus. A scholarly trend since the 1980s and 1990s instead proposed a ‘non-eschatological’ picture of Jesus as wisdom teacher rather than as apocalyptic preacher (J.D. Crossan, B. Mack, J.M. Robinson, S.J. Patterson, M.J. Borg), partly supporting their argument on literary-historical analysis of Q by J.S. Kloppenborg who dissected archaic collections of sapiential sayings in Q from the secondary addition of prophetic and apocalyptic materials (cf. chapter one). The presupposition of a dichotomy between wisdom and apocalypticism has been undermined by methodological discussion about ‘conflicted boundaries’ since the 1990s and by new textual evidence from Qumran of wisdom literature with apocalyptic features (*1–4Instruction*, *1–4Mysteries*) and of eschatologized wisdom (*4QBeatitudes*; cf. sections 1.1 and 3.5 above).

Renewed attention to the study of early Jewish apocalypticism and its arguable role at the origins of Christianity should take into account the full corpus of Qumran texts available since the 1990s. Comparative discussion is no longer limited to a set of sectarian Qumran texts, but has broadened up to the comparative study of a collection of sectarian as well as non-sectarian writings, parabiblical, apocryphal and pseudepigraphical texts that needs to be incorporated into our picture of Jewish apocalypticism prior and contemporary to emerging Christianity. Comparative study in this chapter has produced the following new insights.

Early Jewish apocalypticism was not a matrix of sectarian thought that tended to ‘self-marginalization’ through lack of enculturation in the surrounding Hellenistic world.³⁰⁵ On the contrary, the full corpus of available Qumran evidence indicates that apocalyptic thought was interwoven with sapiential literature (*1–4Instruction*, *1–4QMysteries*, *4QBeatitudes*), parabiblical literature (*4QPseudo-Ezekiel*, *4QPseudo-Daniel^{a-c}*), and apocryphal literature (apocryphal Psalms (11QPs^a XIX // 11QPs^b 4–5; 11Q11 (11QapocrPs)). Characteristic features of many apocalyptic texts, such as revelation about an otherworldly dimension, determinism, cosmic dualism, and a focus on final judgement, probably served to redefine a worldview about what is good in view of the problem of evil in the world and of major breaches in confidence, be it in relation

³⁰⁵ Cf. the terms used by Collins, “Apocalyptic Theology and the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 133.

to an archetypal distant past, to cultural memory or to the perceived contemporary age. The earliest Jewish apocalyptic writings attest to this by relating the great injustice inflicted on the earth by the offspring of the Watchers (*1 Enoch* and the Qumran cycle of Enochic writings) and by including reference to tribulation at the time of the Maccabees (*Jubilees* 23; Daniel 9, 10–12). Qumran literature further attests to more diversity in ideas of apocalyptic war than previously assumed on the basis of discussion of the *War Scroll*. Apart from 1QH^a XV 6–7, which defies certain ‘wars of wickedness’, 4Q471a polemicalises against a party that claims to fight God’s battles, while 4Q246 II 4 attributes a key role to the ‘people of God’ in making everyone rest from the sword.

This more extended and diversified as well as different picture of early Jewish apocalyptic currents of thought in Palestine prior and contemporary to emerging Christianity further impacts comparative study in a number of ways.

The apocalyptic focus on judgement attributed to John’s preaching of baptism in Q 3:7–9.16–17 is not an isolated phenomenon of secondary redaction in the sayings source Q, but corresponds with Josephus’ information about the ethical focus of John’s baptism and popular beliefs surrounding him (*Ant.* 18.116–119). Furthermore, the imagery of admonition that every tree that does not bring forth good fruit is cut down and thrown into the fire (Q 3:9) can be understood as symbolic language of the time in view of analogous evidence of admonition in the Qumran texts 4Q302 (*4QAdmonitory Parable*) and 4Q458 (*4QNarrative A*).

The eschatological tension between the announcement that ‘the kingdom of God is at hand’ (Mark 1:15) and the future-eschatological expectations of fulfillment conveyed in the Synoptic gospel tradition merits renewed comparative attention with regard to apocalypticism. It has been observed in previous scholarship that the idea of the present as the inauguration of the final age with its struggle against evil stems from early Jewish apocalypticism.³⁰⁶ Furthermore, present terms of the arrival of the time of righteousness, peace and goodness alternate with future terms of expectation that all injustice will pass away in the Qumran text *4QTime of Righteousness*.

³⁰⁶ Cf. García Martínez, “Is Jewish Apocalyptic the Mother of Christian Theology?” 150.

The Marcan 'eschatological discourse' (Mark 13:3–37) reflects on events that may partly be compared with historical work by Flavius Josephus, while putting its perspective in terms that traditio-historically derive from apocalyptic tradition, with an eschatological outlook on the expected Parousia (cf. chapter 3, section 3.2.6). The framework of Mark 13:3–37 indicates reference to the destruction of the Jerusalem Temple (Mark 13:1–4.14) and suggests events in the decades preceding the Jewish War (66–70 CE). The Marcan reference to 'famines' (Mark 13:8) appears to be closely paralleled by indications by Josephus of great famine in Judaea (*Ant.* 20.100–101) and of famine as part of a chain of ominous events preceding the destruction of the Jerusalem Temple (*Ant.* 18.8) as well as by information in Acts 11:28.

The apocalyptic language of the Marcan 'eschatological discourse' may further be put in traditio-historical relief by apocalyptic texts from Qumran available since the 1990s. The questions, 'when will this be, and what will be the sign when these things are all to be accomplished' (Mark 13:4, RSV), and expectations of the eschatological gathering of the elect (Mark 13:27) reflect concerns that are paralleled in apocalyptic discourse. Parallels between Danielic language (Daniel 12:6–7) and Mark 13:4 were noted in previous scholarship.³⁰⁷ Comparative study with a view to Qumran literature indicates that the Marcan 'eschatological discourse' is more extensively receptive of and intertextually conversant with prior apocalyptic tradition.

Questions of timeframe in overcoming oppression by the wicked and eschatological vindication are further part of the apocalyptic discourse of *4QPseudo-Ezekiel*. The prophetic protagonist poses the questions 'when will these things happen?' (4Q385 (4QpsEzek^a) 2 3 // 4Q386 (4QpsEzek^b) 1 I) and 'when will you assemble them?' (4Q386 (4QpsEzek^b) 1 II 3).³⁰⁸ The reference to the shortening of days of tribulation for the sake of the elect in Mark 13:20 has further been compared with 4QpsEzek^a 3 3–5 in previous scholarship.³⁰⁹

Intertextual dialogue with Danielic tradition may further be discerned in other parts of the Marcan eschatological discourse on the basis of comparative attention for the Qumran Daniel cycle. The Marcan refer-

³⁰⁷ Hartman, *Prophecy Interpreted*, 145.

³⁰⁸ Translations from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*. 2, 769 and 775.

³⁰⁹ Kister and Qimron, "Observations on 4QSecond Ezekiel," 595–602.

ence to the rise of nation against nation and kingdom against kingdom (Mark 13:8) is paralleled by the Qumran 'Aramaic Apocalypse' (4Q246) that is generally associated with the Qumran Daniel cycle. 4Q246 II 3 mentions the crushing of one people by another and of one province by another, while envisaging an eternal kingdom (4Q246 II 4–5) in terms indebted to Daniel 7:27. Mark 13:8 mentions warfare between nations and kingdoms, ultimately envisaging the Parousia in terms derived from Daniel 7:13 (Mark 13:26). The eschatological gathering of the elect accompanying the Parousia according to Mark 13:27 has a point of analogy in 4Q243 (4QpsDan^a) 24 2 that also envisages the gathering of the elect.

Historical analysis and comparative traditio-historical analysis of apocalypticism in Qumran and the New Testament provide further evidence for the idea that certain forms polemic of Jesus in the Synoptic Gospels may be differently understood in an intra-Jewish context than previously assumed in redaction-critical analysis. A case study of Q 11:29–32, which includes polemical language of judgement against 'this generation' as an evil generation, has illustrated this point. Our analysis has pointed out a historical context of radical elements, designated as the 'fourth philosophy' by Josephus and polemically referred to in 'generation' language (*J. W.* 5.566, 6.408) in view of their part in the catastrophic outcome of the Jewish War. The immediate context to Q 11:29–32, the Beelzebul controversy (Q 11:14–26), and the larger context of Synoptic references to radicalism and religious persecution (Matt 5:9–12, 10:23, Mark 4:17 par., 13:9–13; Q 11:47–51; Acts 6:8–8:3, 21:38) suggest a situation that seems to correspond with Josephus' hindsight description of the 'fourth philosophy' that challenged and eventually overtook the Judaeans body-politic. Polemic against an 'evil generation' in Q 11:29–32 need not imply an anti-Jewish juxtaposition between Israel and the Gentiles, as recent analysis by B.H. Gregg has rightly objected to previous scholarship. *Jubilees* 23:14–20 and 4Q541 (*4QApocryphon of Levi^b (?) ar*) 9 I provide further evidence that polemical language of judgement against 'this generation' is paralleled by earlier modes of intra-Jewish apocalyptic discourse that sharply denounced a generation as evil and as having a misleading influence on the people.

Pauline letters, post-Pauline letters (2 Tim, Jude), and the Apocalypse of John further attest to the impact of early Jewish apocalypticism, as new connections with Enochic writings and other Qumran literature attest.

CHAPTER SIX

MESSIANISM IN QUMRAN AND THE NEW TESTAMENT

1. INTRODUCTION

The comparative study of messianism in Qumran and the New Testament is a subject that merits separate attention, even though it intersects with eschatological perspectives (cf. chapters two and three) and the study of apocalyptic texts (e.g. 4Q246, 4Q521). The reason for this is twofold. First, Qumran literature published since the 1990s provides much new evidence that has recently become the subject of intensive study and methodological debate.¹ Second, the canonical Gospels yield pictures of Jewish messianic expectations at the time of Jesus that recurrently evoke the question of whether and how contemporary Jewish literature provides contextual evidence and how Christology in the New Testament developed from the Jewish origins of the Jesus-movement.² This chapter focuses on comparative study of messianism in Qumran and at the origins of emerging Christianity, thereby having in view pre-70 CE traditions that the New Testament writings allow us to reconstruct. Apart from the Pauline letters and the Gospels, other New Testament writings will thereby only receive attention to the extent that a connection with pre-70 CE traditions can be made plausible.

¹ See e.g. the following recent books with particular attention to Qumran evidence of messianism: García Martínez, "Messianische Erwartungen in den Qumranschriften," 171–208; Collins, *The Scepter and the Star*; Evans and Flint (eds.), *Eschatology, Messianism, and the Dead Sea Scrolls*; Charlesworth, Lichtenberger, and Oegema (eds.), *Qumran-Messianism*; Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte aus Qumran*; Fitzmyer, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Christian Origins*, 73–110 ("Qumran Messianism"); Xeravits, *King, Priest, Prophet*; Porter (ed.), *The Messiah in the Old and New Testaments*, with the article by A. Wolters, "The Messiah in the Qumran Documents," 75–89; Fitzmyer, *The One Who Is to Come*, 82–133 ("Extra-biblical Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period") at 88–115.

² Cf. Miller, "The Problem of the Origins of a Messianic Conception of Jesus," 301–35 at 301 who notes the following crucial question on which the first Princeton Symposium on Judaism and Christian origins agreed: "*Christos* is the title or term most frequently applied to Jesus in the New Testament. Scholars agreed that the crucial question is the following: How did this happen, since 'the Messiah' is rarely found, and the functions or attributes of 'the Messiah' are even less explained, in extant pre-70 Jewish documents?"

1.1. *Problematic Presuppositions about Early Jewish Messianism*

In the study of late Second Temple Judaism, ‘messianism’ frequently serves as umbrella term for ideas about a divinely commissioned redeemer figure who plays a crucial role in acting on behalf of Israel’s eschatological deliverance. The heterogeneous and pluriform character of the evidence resists a comprehensive definition of the term messianism. The ancient body of literature does not attest to a uniform expectation of ‘the Messiah’ but to several eschatological protagonists whose messianic role and identity is a matter of debate. Some examples will illustrate this point.

Earlier twentieth-century scholarship, as illustrated by an influential study by Sigmund Mowinckel,³ associated two sides with early Jewish messianism, this-worldly and otherworldly, but predominantly identified the this-worldly side with a horizon of political expectation. The alleged horizon of political expectation would focus on a future-eschatological ruler figure from the house of David whose role consists in delivering the people of Israel from enemies and in playing a leading role in the restored kingdom of David sanctioned by a divine covenant of royalty.⁴ Mowinckel’s study was critical of assumptions that messianism would be “the substance of a general hope throughout Judaism”, arguing that the milieu of messianic faith evoked in the Gospels only “coincides with that represented by the apocalyptic literature and by certain more limited circles”.⁵ Several presuppositions on early Jewish messianism as represented by Mowinckel have become susceptible to criticism.

The predominantly political conceptualisation of the term ‘Messiah’ in early Judaism appears problematic in view of the diverse literary evidence. The longer-known Qumran sectarian literature already yielded a more differentiated picture of messianic expectation, as, for instance, the plural reference to ‘the messiahs of Aaron and Israel,’ משיחי אהרן

³ Mowinckel, *He That Cometh* (2005 reprint with forward by J.J. Collins), 155–86 (“The Place of the King in the Future Hope: the Messiah”) and 280–345 (“The National Messiah”). The English translation of this monograph was first published in 1956 at Abingdon Press. Note that both Porter, “Introduction: The Messiah in the Old and New Testaments,” 1–9 at 1, and Fitzmyer, *The One Who Is to Come*, vii–viii and passim take issue with the study by Mowinckel.

⁴ Mowinckel, *He That Cometh*, 155–86 (“The Place of the King in the Future Hope: the Messiah”) and 280–345 (“The National Messiah”).

⁵ Mowinckel, *ibidem*, 337–8; cf. Collins, *The Scepter and the Star*, 3–4 on the presupposition of “a uniform system of messianic expectation in ancient Judaism” (3) in studies by Emil Schürer and George Foot Moore.

וִישְׂרָאֵל in 1QS IX 11 indicates. It has further been argued by several scholars that no leadership role in the *War Scroll* (1QM) is explicitly described in terms of Davidic messianism.⁶ The *Damascus Document* recurrently envisions a ‘messiah of Aaron and Israel,’ מְשִׁיחַ אֶהְרֹן וְיִשְׂרָאֵל (CD-A XII 23–XIII 1, XIV 18–19 // 4QD^a 10 I 10–12; CD-B XIX 10–11, XX 1). The dual identification of the sceptre and the star with the prince of the whole congregation, נְשִׂיא כָּל הָעֵדָה, and the Interpreter of the Torah, דּוֹרֵשׁ הַתּוֹרָה, in CD-A VII 18–20 // 4QD^a 3 III 19–22 further indicates that Qumran evidence of messianism cannot be reduced to a political concept of a future-eschatological ruler figure.

Mowinckel’s discussion of ‘The Messiah a Historical Person,’ claiming that Josephus listed a series of ‘false messiahs,’⁷ may further give the impression that political fervour producing ‘false messiahs’ mainly characterized messianic expectation. Josephus wrote from a retrospective point of view about the Jewish war against Rome (66–70 CE). He most strongly implies messianic pretensions at a point where the political side to messianism became most twisted by the tyranny of several revolutionary Jewish leaders during the height of the war. Josephus mentions successive Jewish revolutionary leaders who made their entry as king in Jerusalem and were tyrants (*J.W.* 2.433–434.442.444 (Menahem son of Judas the Galilean), *J.W.* 4.510.573–576 (Simon son of Giora)). These descriptions of tyrants along with references to false prophets (*J.W.* 6.285–288) give impressions of revolutionary manipulation of popular hope for deliverance at the height of war. However, the term ‘false messiahs’ seems to be derived from gospel tradition (ψευδόχριστοι in Mark 13:22, Matt 24:24) and it appears methodically flawed to construe a list of ‘false messiahs’ from Josephus’ descriptions of pre-70 CE movements of revolutionary zeal or resistance against the status quo.⁸

⁶ Stegemann, “Some Remarks to 1QSa, to 1QSB, and to Qumran Messianism,” 479–505 at 502; Steudel, “Collective Expectations in Qumran Texts (4Q246 and 1QM),” 507–25 at 521–4 with the observation “no individual messianic hope is found in 1QM” on page 524; Knibb, “Eschatology and Messianism in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 379–402 at 393. Cf. Xeravits, *King, Priest, Prophet*, 75–9 who observes that the ‘general theological view’ of 1QM focuses on collective dimensions of the eschatological community.

⁷ Mowinckel, *He That Cometh*, 284–5 considers historical references to persons at some time regarded as Messiah but afterward described as ‘false messiahs’ as “the best proof of the diffusion of the Messianic expectation and of the political, this-worldly character of the conception” (284).

⁸ Cf. Oegema, *Der Gesalbte und sein Volk*, 123–5 at 124 on divergent scholarly designations of Josephus’ descriptions of Judas the Galilean, Simon, Anthronges, Menahem and Simon bar Giora as ‘Messias-Prätendenten’ by M. Hengel, as charismatic royal

Apart from these points of criticism against a predominantly political concept of early Jewish messianism, it should be noted that the greatest political upheaval in first-century CE Jewish history, the Jewish war against Rome (66–70 CE), is described by Josephus as occasioned by divergent motivations. On the one hand, Josephus writes about an influential belief that an ‘ambiguous oracle’, χρησιμὸς ἀμφίβολος, in the holy scriptures would apply to the rise of someone from Judaea who ‘would rule the world’ (*J.W.* 6.312). He writes that this politically loaded belief incited ‘them’, αὐτούς, most of all to war (*J.W.* 6.312), possibly having in mind the Jewish followers of revolutionary leadership who also razed Antonia (*J.W.* 6.311; cf. *J.W.* 6.165–167). He further states that “many of their wise men were mistaken concerning their interpretation (of the oracle), πολλοὶ τῶν σοφῶν ἐπλανήθησαν περὶ τὴν κρίσιν (*J.W.* 6.313). Josephus also notes the correct recognition of ominous signs by scribes at an earlier occasion (*J.W.* 6.291), and presupposes God’s relation to his people (*J.W.* 6.288.310). Contrary to the third person plural reference to a group of revolutionaries in Jerusalem and their popular following in *J.W.* 6.312–313, Josephus writes about desperate rebellion against Rome provoked by the lawlessness under the Roman procuratorship of Gessius Florus (64–66 CE) from the perspective of the nation, τὸ ἔθνος (*Ant.* 18.25). Josephus further implicates himself in describing the motivation for Jewish war against Rome under Florus’ procuratorship (*Ant.* 20.252–258), by writing from a first person plural perspective: “It was Florus who constrained us (ἡμᾶς) to take up war with the Romans, for we preferred to perish together rather than by degrees” (*Ant.* 20.257).⁹ These passages in Josephus’ *Jewish Antiquities* describe general outrage on Florus’ lawlessness, his partnership with brigands and devastation, without thereby referring to messianic ideas.

Kenneth E. Pomykala has recently challenged the very idea that Davidic messianism was the exclusive focal point of Jewish expectations of kingship. In this connection, Pomykala pointed out literary evidence for various other non-Davidic biblical models of royalty in the Second Temple period. With reference to varying concepts of a Davidic messiah in *Ps. Sol.* 17, sectarian Qumran texts (4Q252, 4Q174, 4QpIsa^a, 4Q285),

leaders of peasant troops by R.A. Horsley and J.S. Hanson, and as ‘Freiheitskämpfer mit königlichen/messianischen Ansprüchen’ by G.S. Oegema. Horsley, “‘Messianic’ Figures and Movements in First-Century Palestine,” 276–95 distinguishes prophetic movements and ‘movements led by figures popularly recognized as “kings”’.

⁹ Translation from Feldman, *Josephus. Jewish Antiquities Book XX*, 137.

4 Ezra, Pomykala has observed that “there never existed a continuous, widespread, dominant, or uniform expectation for a Davidic messiah in early Judaism”.¹⁰ Pomykala’s argumentation has been critiqued by G.G. Xeravits with regard to his exclusion of 1QS^b column V from the survey of Qumran evidence for Davidic messianism, even though Xeravits’ criticism partly depends on the reconstructed reading ד[ו]יך ברית in 1QS^b V 21 rather than ברית ה[י]חד.¹¹

Finally, problematic suppositions that Qumran literature would yield pre-Christian evidence for Jewish beliefs in a suffering and exalted Messiah, should be briefly mentioned here. These suppositions have been brought forward in the recent monographs *The First Messiah* by M.O. Wise (1999) and *The Messiah before Jesus* by I. Knohl (2000).¹² The Qumran texts adduced as main evidence for these suppositions, 4Q471b, 4Q491c, and 1QH^a X–XVI, do not make undisputed part of evidence for Qumran messianism and are not representative for Qumran messianic texts.¹³ Since these two studies have been duly and extensively criticised by J.J. Collins and J.A. Fitzmyer,¹⁴ discussion of the disputed hypotheses of Wise and Knohl need not be recapitulated here.

¹⁰ Pomykala, *The Davidic Dynasty Tradition*, 271.

¹¹ Xeravits, *King, Priest, Prophet*, 149–50 with reference to Pomykala, *The Davidic Dynasty Tradition*, 242–3. Xeravits supposes the reconstruction ד[ו]יך ברית in 1QS^b V 21 (p. 150), thereby supported by Stegemann, “Some Remarks to 1QSa, to 1QSB, and to Qumran Messianism,” 499, and Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte aus Qumran*, 53–4 who yet also notes on page 54 note *b* that the most current unsubstantiated reading is ברית ה[י]חד, as proposed by J.T. Milik. Cf. García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition. 1*, 106 who read ברית ה[י]חד in 1QS^b V 21.

¹² Wise, *The First Messiah*; Knohl, *The Messiah before Jesus*.

¹³ Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte aus Qumran*, 285–310 discusses “4Q491 11 I und verwandte Texte,” among his categorization of priestly anointed figures, but concludes that the identification of the speaker in this fragment is inconclusive (310), and 420–6 surveys 1QH^a XI (= 3) 6–18 among “Sonstige Texte,” concluding that a specific identification of a messianic figure or function remains unsubstantiated (426); i.e., such an identification would amount to ‘eisegesis’. Xeravits, *King, Priest, Prophet*, does not include either 4Q491c with 4Q471b or 1QH^a X–XVI into his discussion of evidence for ‘positive eschatological protagonists’. Van der Woude, *Die messianischen Vorstellungen der Gemeinde von Qumrân*, 144–56 already discussed and extensively refuted early hypotheses by A. Dupont-Sommer and W.H. Brownlee that 1QH^a XI (=III) 5–18 would constitute evidence of Qumran messianism.

¹⁴ Collins, “A Messiah before Jesus?,” 15–35; Collins, “An Essene Messiah?,” 37–44; Fitzmyer, *The One Who is to Come*, 111–5.

1.2. *Early Jewish Messianism and Its Terminology*

A continuum in the study of early Jewish messianism is the eschatological role attributed to the messianic figure expected to play an important role in deliverance of the Jewish people, as is attested by a cross-section of definitions of the term ‘messiah.’¹⁵ The starting-point for a comparative survey of messianism is thereby the eschatological orientation of texts with reference to (a) messiah(s) or messianic figures.

The study of messianism does not entirely coincide with the Hebrew term משיח, since משיח may generically denote ‘anointed’ as adjective (cf. Dan 9:25), apply to the anointment of priesthood, as in Leviticus 4:3.5.16, or concern a prophetic function in a survey of the biblical past (CD-A II 12–13).¹⁶ It has been argued in previous scholarship that the study of early Jewish messianism should not be limited to the term משיח, but it should take into account other biblical terms like ‘shoot from the stump of Jesse’ (Isa 11:1), and ‘righteous branch of David’ (Jer 23:5–6).¹⁷ Qumran evidence for Davidic messianism attests to the eschatological reception of biblical passages like Isa 11:1–5 (4QpIsa^a 8–10 11–25; 4Q285 5 2–4) and Gen 49:10 (4QcommGenA V 1–5). A broader conceptualisation of messianism that includes verbal equivalents from eschatologically interpreted biblical passages is thereby acceptable over

¹⁵ Van der Woude, *Die messianischen Vorstellungen der Gemeinde von Qumrân*, 5: “eine eschatologische Erlösergestalt”; Charlesworth, “From Messianology to Christology: Problems and Prospects,” 3–35 at 4: “God’s eschatological Anointed One, the Messiah”; García Martínez, “Messianische Erwartungen in den Qumranschriften,” 172: “die Gestalt des ‘Messias’ unter diesem Namen oder .. verschiedene andere ‘messianische’ Gestalten, Agenten endzeitlicher Errettung”; Collins, *The Scepter and the Star*, 11: “The word ‘messiah’ refers at the minimum to a figure who will play an authoritative role in the end time, usually the eschatological king”; Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte aus Qumran*, 17 refers to a definition of ‘messiah’ by J.J. Collins in *DSD* 2 (1995) 145–164 at 146 as most appropriate for the study of Qumran messianism: “an agent of God in the end-time, who is said somewhere in the literature to be anointed, but who is not necessarily ‘messiah’ in every passage”; Fitzmyer, *The One Who Is to Come*, 1: “an eschatological, an *anointed* human agent of God, who was to be sent by Him as a deliverer and was awaited in the end time”.

¹⁶ Cf. Van der Woude, *Die messianischen Vorstellungen der Gemeinde von Qumrân*, 16–7; Davies, *The Damascus Covenant*, 74–5.

¹⁷ E.g. Collins, *The Scepter and the Star*, 11–12 with reference to Jer 23:5–6; VanderKam, “Messianism and Apocalypticism,” 193–228 at 195: “If we go by the usage of ancient texts, there can be little doubt that the broader understanding is an acceptable one”, with reference to Isa 11:1.2–16 and Jer 23:5–6, and other passages; Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte aus Qumran*, 16–18.

against an approach restricted to the term משיח.¹⁸ With regard to Qumran evidence, three terms, משיח, צמח דויד, and נשיא העדה, have been deemed main designations for a royal messianic figure from the house of David.¹⁹ At the same time, Qumran evidence is more diversified. Recent scholarly surveys of Qumran messianic texts recurrently discern three types of earthly eschatological, presumably messianic, protagonists: royal, priestly, and prophetic,²⁰ thereby going beyond earlier twofold, royal and priestly, categorizations.²¹

Apart from this classification of three earthly types of messianic figures, the notion of a heavenly messiah has sometimes been categorized as separate paradigm.²² This appears problematic, since different earthly types (royal, priestly, prophetic) of messianic figures may incorporate various qualifications of status in relation to earthly and heavenly dimensions. For instance, among the Qumran literature under discussion in this chapter, 4Q246 relates both a royal function and divine epithets of 'son of God' and 'son of the Most High' (4Q246 II), while 4Q521 relates both prophetic, Isaianic themes and the divine status of God's anointed to whom heaven and earth listen, analogously with the statutes of the holy ones (4Q521 2 II). 11QMelchidezek is sometimes discussed

¹⁸ An approach of messianism with a restrictive focus on the term משיח has been presupposed by Charlesworth, "From Messianology to Christology: Problems and Prospects," 3–35 at 25, who deduces from the 3 percent occurrence of the 'terminus technicus' משיח in Qumran literature that "messianology was not a major concern of this community"; and by Fitzmyer, *The One Who Is to Come*, 1–7, 82–133 at 88–111.

¹⁹ VanderKam, "Messianism in the Scrolls," 211–34 at 212–9 on these terms as titles of 'the Davidic Messiah'; Collins, *The Scepter and the Star*, 60–1; Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte aus Qumran*, 49–51; Xeravits, *King, Priest, Prophet*, 130–59, while further mentioning the 'Wirkungsgeschichte' of the terms scepter and star from Num 24:17 in eschatological passages of Qumran literature (159–64).

²⁰ García Martínez, "Messianische Erwartungen in den Qumranschriften," 173 and 203–7 ("Drei »Messiasse«: der endzeitliche Prophet"); Collins, *The Scepter and the Star*, 12 on king, priest, and prophet as basic paradigms of earthly messianic figures; Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte aus Qumran*, 467; Xeravits, *King, Priest, Prophet*, passim and 205–19 and 224.

²¹ See e.g. Van der Woude, *Die messianischen Vorstellungen der Gemeinde von Qumrân*, 245–6, who made this categorization of dual royal and priestly messianism, having discussed Qumran sectarian evidence then available (CD-A, CD-B, 1QS, 1QS^a, 1QS^b, 1QM, 1QH^a, 1QpHab, 1QIsa^a, 4Q252, 4Q174, 4QpIsa^a, 4Q175); cf. VanderKam, "Messianism in the Scrolls," 211–34 who discussed the evidence under two rubrics, 'The Davidic Messiah' and 'The Eschatological Priest', categorizing 4Q521 under the rubric 'Davidic Messiah' (215).

²² Collins, *The Scepter and the Star*, 12 on "four basic messianic paradigms (king, priest, prophet, and heavenly messiah)".

as evidence of a heavenly or angelic eschatological protagonist.²³ However, the figure of Melchizedek in *11QMelchizedek* has also been associated with a priestly function,²⁴ and the identification of the messenger, מְבִשֵּׁר, from Isaiah 52:7 with the ‘anointed of the spirit’ in *11QMelch II* 18 has been taken to imply that a prophetic messianic figure is possibly in view.²⁵

The use of the very terms ‘messiah’ and ‘messianic’ have recently been challenged by J. Maier who argued that they entail more confusion through theological presuppositions and Christian projections into Jewish sources than analytical precision. According to Maier, the broadened use of the terms ‘messiah’ and ‘messianic’ makes the study of early Jewish messianism hardly distinguishable from the study of eschatology.²⁶ G.G. Xeravits further argued that ‘messianism’ “reflects a particular concept of Christian theology” and is thereby anachronistic.²⁷ Of course, cautions are due against unreflective broadening of terms, but the long known evidence of sectarian Qumran texts about ‘messiahs of Aaron and Israel’ precludes that the labels ‘messiah’ or ‘messianic’, rendering מְשִׁיחַ and related epithets, by definition entail ‘eisegesis’ of Christian theology. It further appears unlikely that post-70 CE Jewish evidence of messianism, as that in *4 Ezra* 7:26–35, *2 Baruch* 29–30, and early rabbinic literature,²⁸ would constitute a phenomenon that arose from a vacuum without Second Temple Jewish precedents. J.J. Collins further noted that ‘messianic’ is “by no means coterminous with ‘eschatological,’” since a messianic figure does not occur in all eschatological texts.²⁹

²³ Xeravits, *King, Priest, Prophet*, 191–204; cf. page 224. Schiffman, “Messianic Figures and Ideas,” 126 compares the role of Melchizedek to that of archangel Michael in *1QM*.

²⁴ Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte aus Qumran*, 389–412 at 404–5 and 412 on Melchizedek in *11QMelch* as priest in the heavenly sanctuary.

²⁵ Collins, *The Scepter and the Star*, 11; cf. Xeravits, *King, Priest, Prophet*, 182–3.

²⁶ Maier, “Messias oder Gesalbter?” 585–612.

²⁷ Xeravits, *King, Priest, Prophet*, 8–9.

²⁸ Cf. Schiffman, “Messianism and Apocalypticism in Rabbinic Texts,” 1053–72 at 1053 on “the resurfacing of a set of apocalyptic messianic ideas that had typified various trends of Second Temple Judaism.”

²⁹ Collins, “What Was Distinctive about Messianic Expectation at Qumran?” 71–92, viz. 73–6 at 76.

1.3. *On the Selection of Texts for Discussion and Reasons for Renewed Study*

Having observed the need for caution about broadening the use of 'messiah' and 'messianic' as umbrella terms, it should be noted that recent surveys of Qumran messianic texts cover divergent corpora of texts. Several Qumran texts discussed in the recent monograph by J. Zimmermann, appear problematic as evidence for messianism,³⁰ since the the protagonist in a given text has led to non-messianic identification in other scholarly editions of the text or indications for any eschatological orientation are absent. Clear examples of non-messianic identification and non-eschatological framework are 4Q534³¹ and 4Q377³² respectively. Of these two texts, 4Q534 is excluded from and 4Q377 is included into the discussion of Qumran evidence by G.G. Xeravits.³³

The extant columns of 4Q534 include reference to the Watchers (4Q534 II 16 and 18) and discussion of 4Q534 previously led several scholars to identify the protagonist with the biblical figure of Noah.³⁴ The recent DJD edition of 4Q534 by É. Puech further confirms this identification, since 4Q534 is designated as '4QNaissance de Noe a ar' together with 4Q535 and 4Q536 as '4QNaissance de Noe c ar'.³⁵ Zimmermann returns to a messianic identification of 4Q534 by J. Starcky that was refuted by J.A. Fitzmyer and briefly suggests thematic connections between 4Q534 and 4Q246 at the end of his discussion of 4Q534.³⁶ These 'connections' are very generic or even unclear and thereby unconvincing: non-sectarian provenance of the two Aramaic texts; references

³⁰ I have already referred to Zimmermann's own evaluation that the claims for 4Q491 11 I and 1QH^a XI 6–18 as 'messianic texts' remain inconclusive and unsubstantiated, in note 13 above. 4Q491 11 I and 1QH^a XI 6–18 are not part of the discussion by Xeravits, *King, Priest, Prophet*.

³¹ Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte aus Qumran*, 170–204 refers to 4Q534 as "Der 'Erwählte Gottes'", with reference to the Aramaic term אלהא בחיר in 4Q534 I 10.

³² Zimmermann, *ibidem*, 332–42.

³³ Xeravits, *King, Priest, Prophet*, 10–11 excludes 4Q534 from discussion in view of its identification "with a biblical figure (most probably with Noah)", referring to García Martínez, "4QMess Ar," 1–24 (11 n. 31).

³⁴ Fitzmyer, "The Aramaic 'Elect of God' Text", 348–72; García Martínez, "4QMess Ar," 1–44.

³⁵ Puech, *DJD 31*, 117–70. In their bilingual edition, Parry and Tov, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader*, 3, 372–7 also designate 4Q534–536 as '4QBirth of Noah^{ac} ar'. Cf. designation of 1 Enoch 106–107 as 'The Birth of Noah' by Nickelsburg and VanderKam, *1 Enoch. A New Translation*, 164–7.

³⁶ Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte aus Qumran*, 204.

to very important figures without direct parallel; exegetical roots of Davidic messianic thought of 4Q246 in Daniel 7 and Enochic tradition and of 'sapiential-messianic' thought of 4Q534 in Isaiah 7, 11 and Enochic tradition; and royal characteristics of the protagonists in 4Q246 and 4Q534.³⁷

The other example of a Qumran text whose discussion as evidence of messianism or of 'eschatological protagonists' appears problematic is 4Q377. 4Q377 makes part of the studies by Zimmermann and Xeravits as well as into preliminary surveys by other scholars.³⁸ 4Q377 1 *recto* II 4–5 refers to Moses as 'his anointed one', משיחו, as part of the formulation of a curse against any one who does not observe all the commandments of the Lord "by the mouth of Moses his anointed one", בפי מושה, משיחו (4Q377 1 *recto* II 5).³⁹

According to both Zimmermann and Xeravits, the exalted designation of Moses as 'his anointed one', משיחו, in 4Q377 1 *recto* II 5 paved the way for an eschatologizing interpretation.⁴⁰ Xeravits further emphasises that the reference to Moses as 'messenger', מבשר, in 4Q377 1 *recto* II 11 corresponds with the identification of the eschatological prophet as מבשר in 11QMelch, even though he has also noted occurrences of מבשר in the *Hodayot* that cannot conclusively be deemed eschatologi-

³⁷ Zimmermann, *ibidem*, 204. Zimmermann deduces royal characteristics of the protagonist in 4Q534 from a questionable translation of כול חייה as "die Herrschaft(?) über alle Lebenden" in 4Q534 I 9 (171 and 204). García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*, 2, 1071 translate "the opposition of all living things".

³⁸ Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte aus Qumran*, 332–42; Xeravits, *King, Priest, Prophet*, 124–7, who yet concedes on page 10 that 4Q377, together with 4Q374, 4Q246 and 4Q369, is among texts "in which the eschatological or positive character of the protagonist is contested"; Abegg and Evans, "Messianic Passages in the Dead Sea Scrolls," 191–203 at 193; Fitzmyer, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Christian Origins*, 98 refers to 4Q377, together with 4Q287 and 4Q458, as a pending case for eventual discussion concerning Qumran messianism. Ed.pr. of 4Q377 by J.C. VanderKam and M. Brady in *DJD* 28, 205–217.

³⁹ Text and translation from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*, 2, 744–5.

⁴⁰ Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte aus Qumran*, 332–342 at 342: "Wenn Mose משיח genannt worden kann, dann auch der eschatologische 'Prophet wie Mose' (Dtn 18,5–18)"; Xeravits, *King, Priest, Prophet*, 121–7 at 127 deduces from the descriptions of Moses as משיח and מבשר that "this proves to be an important contribution to the interpretation of the figure of the eschatological prophet in 11QMelch". Xeravits discusses 4Q374 and 4Q377 together 'Writings connected to Moses' with some common traits; yet the editio princeps of 4Q377 by VanderKam and Brady, *DJD* 28, 205–217 rather categorizes this text as '4QApocryphal Pentateuch B' together with 4Q368 as '4QApocryphal Pentateuch A' (131–49).

cal.⁴¹ The evidence for a traditio-historical connection with an eschatological prophet thereby appears inconclusive.

Non-eschatological references to prophets as ‘anointed ones’ are also part of Qumran literature (CD-A II 12–13) up to the point of mentioning Moses and the ‘holy anointed ones’, the prophets of the biblical past, in apposition to one another (CD-A V 21–VI 1). Josephus mentions the lawgiver Moses in terms of prophecy (*Ag.Ap.* 2.218, ὁ νομοθέτης προφητεύσας) and refers to prophets subsequent to Moses (*Ag.Ap.* 1.40). 4Q377 lacks any eschatological orientation and supposed connections with the figure of an eschatological prophet remain inconclusive. The description of Moses in 4Q377 rather fits into a pattern of giving an exalted picture of the lawgiver as an unparalleled ‘man of the pious ones’, **אִישׁ הַחַשִּׁידִים** (4Q377 1 *recto* I 8 and 1 *recto* II 12), together with the attribution of high esteem to the prophets of the biblical past.⁴² In my view, 4Q377 thereby does not count as significant evidence for messianic figures or eschatological protagonists.

Qumran texts that at least incorporate an eschatological orientation as well as characteristics of an eschatological protagonist that presuppose divine commission merit renewed consideration as comparative messianic evidence. These are long known sectarian Qumran texts (1QS IX 11; 1QSa II; 1Qsb V; 1QM V 1; CD-A VII 9–VIII 2 // 4QD^a 3 III 18–25, CD-A XII 22–XIII 1, CD-A XIV 18–19 // 4QD^a 10 I 11–12; CD-B XIX 33–XX 2, 4QpIsa^a 8–10 11–25, 4Q174 1 I 10–13, 4Q252 V 1–5, 11QMelch) as well as other more recently published sectarian texts (4Q285 5 // 11Q14 1 I)⁴³ and texts not clearly sectarian (4Q246, 4Q521, 4Q541).⁴⁴ Renewed comparative consideration of messianism in Qumran and the New Testament should further explore in which ways the Qumran evidence for royal, priestly and prophetic messianic figures discerned in previous scholarship represent divergent or overlapping

⁴¹ Xeravits, *King, Priest, Prophet*, 126 mentions an ‘atemporal’ use of **מְבַשֵּׂר** in 1QH^a XXIII 14 and a non-eschatological use of **מְבַשֵּׂר** in 4Q432 3 4, which leaves about one half of Xeravits’ examples inconclusive. Xeravits does not further substantiate a supposed specific connection of **מְבַשֵּׂר** in 4Q377 with the eschatological use of **מְבַשֵּׂר** which he discerns in 4Q440 3 I 16 and 11QMelch by further traditio-historical arguments.

⁴² Note that analogously with Deut 33:1, 4Q377 1 *recto* II 10 calls Moses **אִישׁ הָאֱלֹהִים**, “the man of God”, while “a man of the pious ones”, **אִישׁ הַחַשִּׁידִים**, seems to have a parallel in Deut 33:8, where **חַסִּידךָ** is Moses’ designation of Levi.

⁴³ 4Q285 was categorized as “Serekh ha-milhamah related to the War Rule” by Dimant, “The Qumran Manuscripts: Contents and Significance,” 38.

⁴⁴ These texts lack clearly identifiable Qumran community terminology; cf. Dimant, *ibidem*, 48 and 53.

social, political, and theological interests. In order to put comparative traditio-historical study into proper relief, the following sections will first go into early Jewish Messianism and biblical tradition (section 2) and then put the Qumran evidence into context by surveying non-Qumran Second Temple Jewish texts (section 3.1).

2. EARLY JEWISH MESSIANISM AND BIBLICAL TRADITION

The study of early Jewish messianism has biblical tradition as its exegetical starting point. Several Qumran texts that mention messianic figures are intertextually conversant with Scripture through explicit citation of passages, such as 4Q174, 4Q252, CD-A VII 14–21, 11QMelch, or through allusion to words from Scripture, such as Isaianic passages in 4Q521 and Daniel 7:27 in 4Q246. The *Psalms of Solomon*, presumably originating from decades around the mid-first century BCE,⁴⁵ comprise royal and messianic psalms (*Pss.Sol.* 17–18) that include several allusions to Scripture, such as Psalm 2:9 in *Pss.Sol.* 17:23–24 and Isaiah 11:2 in *Pss.Sol.* 17:37.⁴⁶ Among the disputed evidence of the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* for the study of early Jewish messianism, based on scholarly observations that the present form of the text reflects Christian reworking,⁴⁷ the *Testament of Levi* 18 yet comprises evidence of a priestly messianic figure that has been compared with 4Q540–541

⁴⁵ R.B. Wright, “Psalms of Solomon (First Century BC),” *OTP* 2, 639–70 at 641: “Narrow limits would be about 70 to 45 BC, with the caveat that the undatable psalms may have been earlier or later and the collection as a whole was certainly later”; cf. Kaiser, *The Old Testament Apocrypha*, 82–83.

⁴⁶ Cf. Knibb, “Messianism in the Pseudepigrapha,” 165–84 at 166–70 with survey of intertextual connections between *Pss.Sol.* 17–18 and Scripture, noting Psalm 89 as model for the structure of *Pss.Sol.* 17, an allusion to 2 Sam 7:12–16 in *Pss.Sol.* 17:4, and allusions to Isa 11:1–5 in *Pss.Sol.* 17:21–46 and 18:5–8.

⁴⁷ H.C. Kee, “Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs (Second Century BC),” *OTP* 1, 775–828 at 777: “A large number of passages in the Testaments are messianic, but ten or more of them also sound specifically Christian”; Hollander and De Jonge, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. A Commentary*, 55–61 and 63–4 on the Christian orientation of ‘saviour’ passages; see recently Stuckenbruck, “Messianic Ideas in the Apocalyptic and Related Literature of Early Judaism,” 90–113 at 92 on references to ‘the Messiah’ in *TXIIP* “though heavily indebted to Jewish tradition, are Christian in their present form and convey views that cannot be straightforwardly assigned to non-Christian Jewish tradition”. For a different, minority view on *TXIIP* as evidence of early Jewish messianism along with *Pss.Sol.*, see Hultgård, *Léschatologie des Testaments des Douze Patriarches*. 1, 203–230 at 229–30.

(4Qapocr Levi^{a-b} ar).⁴⁸ *T. Levi* 18:7 alludes to Isaiah 11:2. The Enochic ‘Book of Parables’ (*1 Enoch* 37–71), dated around the turn of the era,⁴⁹ comprises three parables (*1 Enoch* 38–44, 45–57, 58–69), of which the second parable, *1 Enoch* 45–57, includes references to a messiah of the ‘Lord of Spirits’ (*1 Enoch* 48:10, 52:4). These messianic references make part of an eschatological perspective that further mention the Danielic designations ‘Head of Days’ and ‘Son of man’ (*1 Enoch* 46:1–2, 48:2; Daniel 7:13–14) that presumably are analogous to the Lord and his messiah in the Enochic perspective.⁵⁰ Josephus’ reference to an ‘ambiguous oracle’ from Scripture that many wise men mistakenly applied to an expected ruler from Judaea (*J.W.* 6.312–313) further indicate that messianic expectations sought their basis in biblical tradition and its interpretation. To the extent that biblical tradition was characterized by textual multiplicity,⁵¹ Qumran biblical, parabiblical, apocryphal, and pseudepigraphical texts further contribute to the study of early Jewish messianism and biblical tradition.

As compared to the larger body of eschatologically oriented sections in pre-70 CE Jewish literature (chapter two, section 4), a smaller quantity of Second Temple Jewish texts attest to messianic ideas;⁵² a fact that is also true for Qumran literature as a distinct corpus of texts. A broader cross-section of pre-70 CE Jewish literature, including the Dead Sea Scrolls, is concerned with eschatologized biblical interpretation than with messianic ideas. Nevertheless, it does not follow from this that messianic ideas would be marginal and clearly delimited to restricted circles or currents

⁴⁸ Cf. Knibb, ‘Messianism in the Pseudepigrapha,’ 181–4 with whose critical discussion of *T. Levi* 18 in comparison with 4Q541 leaves the question of whether and how Christian reworking and Jewish original may be distinguished in *T. Levi* 18.

⁴⁹ Nickelsburg and VanderKam, *1 Enoch: A New Translation*, 6.

⁵⁰ Stuckenbruck, ‘Messianic Ideas in the Apocalyptic and Related Literature of Early Judaism,’ 99.

⁵¹ Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 160–3 and 194 observes a transformation from centuries of ‘textual plurality’ to ‘a period of uniformity and stability at the end of the first century CE’ with regard to the development of the biblical text.

⁵² Collins, *The Scepter and the Star*, 38–40 and Schiffman, ‘Messianism and Apocalypticism in Rabbinic Texts,’ 1057–8 further survey *Sib.Or.* 3.652–795 as evidence of an expected ‘saviour king’, but the prophetic oracle of a Gentile, presumably Egyptian, king in *Sib.Or.* 3.652–6 is rather analogous to the Isaianic description of Cyrus’ role in salvation history (*Isa* 45:1). The sections that envision final judgement, God’s establishment of an eternal kingdom, and signs of the end (*Sib.Or.* 3.741–808) do not include messianism as major concern.

of thought, such as apocalyptic circles.⁵³ If Josephus' reference to 'many of the wise men,' πολλοὶ τῶν σοφῶν, who were mistaken in their understanding of an 'ambiguous oracle' (*J.W.* 6.312–313) indicates anything, it makes clear at least that revolutionary expectations of a ruler figure from Judaea were not marginal or restricted to marginalizable circles. The post-70 CE Jewish evidence of messianic ideas, as represented by the Jewish pseudepigrapha *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch*,⁵⁴ early rabbinic literature (e.g. *m. Ber.* 1:5, *m. Sot.* 9:15), further indicates that messianism was a recurrent factor in post-70 CE Jewish currents of thought and horizons of expectation.⁵⁵ A brief survey of early Jewish messianism and biblical tradition may illuminate from which contours of biblical thought messianic texts took their starting point and which underlying interests could be at stake.

The term משיח in the Hebrew Bible with its translational counterpart χριστός in the Septuagint covers references to royal dynastic, priestly, and prophetic settings.⁵⁶ The usage of משיח in Qumran texts for royal (e.g. 4Q252 V 3–4), priestly (e.g. 'messiahs of Aaron and Israel' in 1QS IX 11), and prophetic (e.g. 11QMelch II 15–20) messianic figures generally corresponds to biblical contours of anointment that distinguished various named representatives of core institutions in ancient Israel.

Several passages in the Hebrew Bible and the Septuagint served as exegetical frame of reference in messianic texts of late Second Temple Judaism. This is not to say that in their original context, most biblical passages cited in messianic texts were messianic in orientation. The following statement in the influential study *He That Cometh* by S. Mowinckel illustrates this point:

⁵³ *Contra* Mowinckel, *He That Cometh*, 337–8. Cf. my previous chapter five, section 10, where I concluded that apocalypticism should not be understood as a closed matrix of sectarian thought, but to some extents interwoven with sapiential, parabiblical, and apocryphal literature.

⁵⁴ Cf. Stuckenbruck, "Messianic Ideas in the Apocalyptic and Related Literature of Early Judaism", 101–12 who surveys *4 Ezra* 7:26–44, 11:1–12:36, 13:1–56; *2 Baruch* 29:3, 30:1, 39:7, 40:1, 70:9, 72:2 as evidence of messianic ideas, noting connections with biblical tradition as well as later New Testament writings, such as Rev 5:5 (104).

⁵⁵ Cf. Schiffman, "Messianism and Apocalypticism in Rabbinic Texts," 1063 who designates the Bar Kokhba revolt (132–135 CE) as "explicitly messianic in tone".

⁵⁶ Anointed rulers (MT 1 Sam 2:10.35, 10:1, 12:3.5, 16:6.13, 24:6.10, 26:9.11.16.23; 2 Sam 1:14.16, 19:22, 22:51, 23:1; 1 Kgs 19:16a; 1 Chron 16:22/Ps 105:15; 2 Chron 6:42, 22:7; MT Ps 18:50, 20:7, 89:38.52, 132:10.17; Hab 3:13; Isa 45:1, Lam 4:20; Dan 9:26; Sir 46:13.19); anointed priests (MT Exod 29:7; Lev 4:5.16, 6:15 (הכהן המשיח); 2 Macc 1:10 (ἀπὸ τοῦ τῶν χριστῶν ἱερῶν γένους)); anointed prophets (1 Kgs 19:16b; Isa 61:1; Ps 105:15).

The Messiah is not the central and dominating figure in the future hope of later Judaism, and even less so in that of the Old Testament... The title 'Messiah', 'the Anointed One', as a title or technical term for the king of the final age, does not even occur in the Old Testament.⁵⁷

Nevertheless, the literary and transmission history of biblical literature, of which biblical and apocryphal manuscripts from Qumran provide our earliest extensive witnesses and to which the Septuagint as early translation and indirect witness to a Hebrew 'Vorlage', arguably contribute evidence to the study of messianism in individual cases. The latter theme of Septuagint and messianism has been intensively engaged in various studies by J. Lust⁵⁸ and constitutes the subject of a recent congress volume of the 'Colloquium Biblicum Lovaniense' 2004.⁵⁹ Since the identification of messianic references introduced in the Septuagint as compared to the Masoretic Text is a whole field of study by itself, this section limits discussion to examples of Septuagint evidence that also plays a role in Qumran and New Testament texts.

Two passages in the Pentateuch merit particular attention: Genesis 49:10 and Numbers 24:15–17. As part of the Hebrew Bible, Genesis 49:10 does not claim anything beyond future continuity of Judah's dominion 'until the coming of Shiloh':

לא־יסור שבט מיהודה ומחקק מבין רגליו עד כִּי־יבא שילה ולו יקהת עמים

The staff shall not depart from Yehuda, nor the sceptre from between his feet, until Shilo come, and the obedience of the people be his.⁶⁰

However, LXX Genesis 49:10 renders a different horizon of expectation in the second part of this verse: ἕως ἃν ἔλθῃ τὰ ἀποκείμενα αὐτῷ καὶ αὐτὸς προσδοκία ἐθνῶν, "until he comes for whom these things are reserved and he is the expectation of the peoples". It has been noted in previous scholarship that the Septuagint translation may go back to

⁵⁷ Mowinckel, *He That Cometh*, 4. Cf. Roberts, "The Old Testament's Contribution to Messianic Expectations," 39–51 who emphasises a reception-historical horizon of messianic expectations with his survey of "Passages which acquired a later messianic interpretation"; see recently Longman, "The Messiah: Explorations in the Law and Writings," 13–34 at 30 and 34 who relates the theme of the Messiah to "later fuller revelation", and Boda, "Figuring the Future: The Prophets and Messiah," 35–74 at 73–4 who associates messianic expectation with "the final phase of prophetic tradition in the Old Testament" (73).

⁵⁸ Lust, *Messianism and the Septuagint*.

⁵⁹ Knibb (ed.), *The Septuagint and Messianism*.

⁶⁰ Translation from the Jerusalem Bible.

a virtually similar consonantal Hebrew text, possibly rendering ש לו rather than שילה, among other options of retroversion.⁶¹ The Qumran sectarian *Commentary on Genesis A* further includes words from Genesis 49:10 and commentary that makes messianic expectation explicit with the phrase “until the messiah of righteousness, the branch of David, comes”, עד בוא משיח הצדק צמח דויד (4Q252 V 3–4). Instead of שבט מיהודה (MT Gen 49:10), 4Q252 V 1 reads שליט משבט יהודה, “the sceptre from the tribe of Judah”. It has recently been supposed that the second part of the subsequent sentence, “While Israel has the dominion, there [will not] be cut off someone who sits on the throne of David” (4Q252 V 1–2),⁶² echoes Jeremiah 33:17.⁶³ The *Commentary on Genesis A* thereby does not appear to provide a direct quotation,⁶⁴ but a combination of words from different parts of Scripture. Nevertheless, the recurring reference to words from Gen 49:10 throughout 4Q252 V 1–4, such as המחקק (4Q252 V 2) and עד בוא (4Q252 V 3), implies that Genesis 49:10 is the leading scriptural verse for sectarian exegesis. The parallelism between the phrases המחקק היא ברית המלכות and [ואל] פי in 4Q252 V 2–3 may imply that דגלים, ‘standards’, could be an exegetical modification of רגלים, that is, רגליו in the phrase “the sceptre from between *his feet*”, ומחקק מבין רגליו, in MT Gen 49:10.⁶⁵ This exegetical elaboration establishes an interrelation between individual (covenant of royalty) and collective (the thousands of Israel) dimensions, which further finds its expression in “the covenant of the kingship of his people”, ברית מלכות עמו, in 4Q252 V 4.⁶⁶ The messianic interpretation in 4Q252 V presupposes a Hebrew text of Gen 49:10 analogously with LXX Gen 49:10 and its supposed Hebrew ‘Vorlage’.

⁶¹ Lust *et al.*, *Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint*, 68 (lemma ἀπόκειμαι); Rösel, “Jacob, Bileam und der Messias,” 151–75 at 159; Collins, “Messianism and Exegetical Tradition,” 129–49 at 135–6 surveys several scholarly options (ש לו; ש י לו; or a ‘defective form’ of משלו).

⁶² Translation from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition. 1*, 505.

⁶³ Paul, *La Bible avant la Bible*, 59.

⁶⁴ On the reference to Gen 49:10 in 4Q252 V 1, cf. Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte aus Qumran*, 115 “ein fast wörtliches Zitat von Gen 49,10aα”, supposing a play of words with regard to שבט; Collins, “Messianism and Exegetical Tradition,” 136, who characterizes 4Q252 as “part paraphrase, part commentary on Genesis”.

⁶⁵ Another explanation of הדגלים in 4Q252 V 3 would be its correspondence with a Hebrew ‘Vorlage’ of Gen 49:10 as indirectly attested by the Samaritan Pentateuch, to which Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte aus Qumran*, 114 n. k, and Xeravits, *King, Priest, Prophet*, 62 refer.

⁶⁶ Text and translation from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition. 1*, 504–5.

Numbers 24:15–17 is a much discussed passage of which the Masoretic text envisions a star, כּוֹכַב, coming out of Jacob and a sceptre, שֵׁבֶט, rising from Israel (MT Num 24:17), while the Septuagint refers to a star and a human being rising from Israel, ἀναστήσεται ἄνθρωπος ἐξ Ἰσραήλ (LXX Num 24:17).⁶⁷ This Septuagintal reading has no direct parallel in Qumran texts that cite (parts of) Numbers 24:15–17. Both 4Q175 (*4QTestimonia*) 9–13 at 12, of which the combination of scriptural verses (Deut 5:28–29, 18:18–19; Num 24:15–17; Deut 33:8–11; Josh 6:26) arguably has an eschatological orientation,⁶⁸ and the *Damascus Document* (CD-A VII 19–20 // 4QD^a 3 III 20–21) refer to a star, כּוֹכַב, and a sceptre, שֵׁבֶט, thereby presupposing a proto-masoretic text. The term ‘sceptre’ could receive different exegetical elaborations. It is identified with the messianic ‘prince of the whole congregation,’ נְשִׂיא כָּל הָעֵדָה, in CD-A VII 20 // 4QD^a 3 III 21), who at the time of his rise, בְּעֵמְדוֹ, following Num 24:17b, “will destroy all the sons of Seth”, וְקִרְקַר אֶת כָּל בְּנֵי שֵׁט (CD-A VII 20–21 // 4QD^a 3 III 22).⁶⁹ The identification of שֵׁבֶט with an individual messianic figure in the *Damascus Document* and the quotation of Num 24:15–17 as part of scriptural passages about individual protagonists could provide indirect parallels for the focus on an individual in the Septuagintal reading. Yet the royal attribute of the sceptre is apparently crucial in proto-masoretic Qumran readings of Num 24:15–17. J.J. Collins pointed out that the scriptural motif of a star arising from Jacob could be identified with Judah on the one hand and with Levi on the other in *T. Judah* 24 and *T. Levi* 18:3 respectively.⁷⁰ *T. Judah* 25 further refers to the wielding of the sceptre in Israel by Judah and his brothers in the final age. Analogously with the exegetical elaboration on שֵׁבֶט, denoting both ‘sceptre’ and ‘tribe’ in 4Q252 V, interpretation of Num 24:17 as envisioned rule of the twelve tribes, headed by Judah, could underly *T. Jud.* 25 and its Semitic ‘Vorlage’.

⁶⁷ On LXX Num 24:15–17, see Lust, “The ἄνθρωπος in Num 24,7 and 17. Messianism and Lexicography,” 69–86 at 81 who noted parallels with Philo’s references to Balaam’s third oracle including mention of ἄνθρωπος in *Mos.* 1.290 and *Praem.* 95. Cf. Collins, “Messianism and Exegetical Tradition,” 129–49 at 144–7, and Rösel, “Messianische Erwartungen in Gen 49 und Num 22–24,” 151–75 at 169–74.

⁶⁸ Both Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte aus Qumran*, 428–36, and Xeravits, *King, Priest, Prophet*, 57–9 relate the contours of eschatological expectation evoked by 4Q175 to 1QS IX 11. Cf. Collins, *The Scepter and the Star*, 64 who attributes ‘eschatological significance’ to 4Q175.

⁶⁹ Text and translation from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition. 1*, 560–1 and 586–7.

⁷⁰ Collins, *The Scepter and the Star*, 66.

Isaiah 11:1–5, a prophetic passage on the ‘shoot from the stump of Jesse’, recurrently figures in early Jewish evidence of messianic ideas, namely in *Ps.Sol.* 17:37, *T. Levi* 18:7, 4QpIsa^a 8–10 11–17, and 4Q285 5 2 // 11Q14 1 I 10–11. It should be noted that the Isaian passage not only presupposes Davidic dynasty tradition (Isa 11:1), but also endowment with the Spirit (Isa 11:2), righteous judgement (Isa 11:3–4), and the ruler figure’s righteousness and faithfulness (Isa 11:5). 4QpIsa^a 8–10 11–25, which quotes Isa 11:1–5 in lines 11–17, also includes interpretation of Isa 11:3 in lines 22–25.

Isaiah 52:7 receives a messianic interpretation in 11QMelchizedek II 15–18, which identifies the ‘mountains’ with the prophets and the messenger, **הַמְבַשֵּׂר**, upon the mountains who announces salvation with “the anointed of the spirit”, **מְשִׁיחַ הַרוּחַ**. 11QMelch II 18 further cites Daniel 9:25 as additional proof-text for the expectation of an anointed one, and 11QMelch II 18–20 takes up words from Isa 61:2–3 to underline the prophetic role of the anointed in comforting those who mourn. 11QMelch II 23–24 returns to words from Isa 52:7. The interposed citation from Daniel, together with quotation from Daniel as ‘prophet’ in 4Q174 1 II, 3, 24, 5, l. 3, implies a perception of Daniel as prophetic writing.

2 Samuel 7:11b–16 stipulates a vision of Nathan for David’s offspring, assuring the establishment of a house and a throne for ever. This biblical passage by itself, or together with 1 Chron 17:11–15, only indicates the establishment of a royal house starting with David.⁷¹ Yet the *Eschatological Midrash* takes 2 Sam 7:12–14 as exegetical starting-point for referring to the envisioned rise of the branch of David in the latter days, together with the Interpreter of the Torah (4Q174 1 I 21, 2, ll. 10–12). The reference to the eternal throne of the kingdom in 2 Sam 7:16 is transposed to messianic expectation at the receiving end of biblical tradition.

Among the Minor Prophets, Amos 9:11, which envisions the raising of the fallen booth of David, plays an important role in Qumran sectarian interpretation. In 4Q174 1 I, 21, 2, ll. 12–13, Amos 9:11 serves as further proof-text, next to 2 Sam 7:12–14, in order to voice messianic expectation for the salvation of Israel, **לְהוֹשִׁיעַ אֶת יִשְׂרָאֵל**. In the *Damascus Document*, Amos 9:11 is cited as part of the Amos-Numbers midrash (CD-A VII 14–21 // 4QD^a 3 III 18–22). Yet the interpretation of Amos 9:11 in CD-A VII 15–17 // 4QD^a 3 III 18 rather associates the fallen

⁷¹ Cf. Schenker, “Die Verheissung in 2 Sam 7 in der Septuaginta,” 177–92 at 190.

booth of David, 'the booth of the king', with the books of the Torah and the 'king' with the 'assembly', *הקהל*, in view of Israel's perceived contempt for them. The interpretation of Amos 9:11 in the *Damascus Document* points forward to the expected rise of the Interpreter of the Torah, *דורש התורה* (CD-A VII 18 // 4QD^a 3 III 19–20), implying his rise from the midst of the 'assembly' as authoritative teaching figure. CD-A VI 10–11 already voiced the expectation of "one who teaches righteousness at the end of days." It has been noted in previous scholarship that CD-A VII 14–21 and 4Q174 1 I, 21, 2, ll. 10–13 share the messianic expectation that the branch of David will rise together with the Interpreter of the Torah.⁷² A difference between these two Qumran sectarian passages consists in the directly messianic interpretation of Amos 9:11 in 4Q174 as compared to the collective dimension that the *Damascus Document* associates with Amos 9:11. The *Damascus Document* mainly associates the 'booth of David' with the books of the Torah, of which the safe keeping appears to be identified with an 'assembly', while interpretive authority is expected to manifest itself when the Interpreter of the Torah rises. This comparison indicates that the interpretation of Amos 9:11 could be invested with divergent individual and collective dimensions within the sectarian Qumran community.

The Psalter comprises many psalms ascribed to David, to which Qumran Psalter manuscripts add further examples.⁷³ Among the Greek Psalter, LXX Pss 2, 8, 44 (45), 59 (60), 67 (68), 71 (72), 79 (80), 86 (87), and 109 (110) have been designated as evidence of messianism by J. Schaper.⁷⁴ It is a debated issue whether the Greek Psalter reflects theological development toward further emphasis on messianism.⁷⁵ Qumran non-canonical Psalms yield further evidence of messianic expectation. In 4Q381 (*4QNon-Canonical Psalms B*)⁷⁶ 15 7–9 refers to a first person

⁷² Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte aus Qumran*, 97.

⁷³ See chapter three, section 2.2, note 20.

⁷⁴ Schaper, *Eschatology in the Greek Psalter*, 72–107.

⁷⁵ Jobes and Silva, *Invitation to the Septuagint*, 299–300 do not deem messianism in the Septuagint especially prominent as compared to "the messianic themes in the Semitic Palestinian texts of the same period" (300), while relating eschatological views in LXX to its Hebrew 'Vorlage' rather to a window of theological development in the Hellenistic period (302). Contrary to Schaper, Cordes, "Spricht Ps 109 LXX von einem Messias oder nicht?" 253–260 associates messianic identification in LXX Ps 109 with the reception history of this Psalm rather than with a supposed greater accent on a messianic figure in LXX Ps 109 as compared to MT Ps 110.

⁷⁶ Ed.pr. E.M. Schuller, *DJD 11*, 87–172, plates IX–XV. The evidence of 4Q381 has been extensively surveyed by Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte aus Qumran*, 222–8,

singular protagonist as ‘your anointed one,’ משיחך (4Q381 15 7), who addresses God as the one who taught him and who makes part of a collective setting of calling “upon your name, my God, and on your salvation”, בשמך אלהי נקרא ואל ישועתך (4Q381 15 9).⁷⁷ This passage mainly elaborates on themes in Psalm 89 that comprises an entreaty for deliverance from enemies and reference to the Davidic covenant of kingship.⁷⁸ Apart from this non-canonical Psalm, the Psalter does not appear to play a major exegetical part in articulating Qumran sectarian messianic expectations. 4Q174 1 I 21, 2, lines 1, 14, and 18–19 rather associate psalms verses with ideas about an eschatological temple, separation from the way of the wicked, and plots of Gentile kings against ‘the chosen ones of Israel in the last days.’ *Ps.Sol.* 17:23–24 alludes to Psalm 2:9 in its picture of a messianic king.

3. MESSIANIC TEXTS IN SECOND TEMPLE JEWISH LITERATURE

3.1. *Second Temple Jewish Texts (non-Qumran)*

Apart from the above-mentioned scriptural passages that constituted the frame of reference and shoot for developing messianic ideas, Second Temple Jewish evidence merits attention per se. Non-Qumran early Jewish evidence of messianic ideas includes various texts, such as the *Psalms of Solomon*, 1 *Enoch* 37–71, 4 *Ezra*, 2 *Baruch*, Josephus’ historical works and references in early rabbinic literature. However, our focus is on the pre-70 CE period, which is of primary importance for comparative study of Qumran and emerging Christianity. With regard to the Second Temple period, the non-Qumran literary evidence is limited to

and briefly noted by Xeravits, *King, Priest, Prophet*, 132, 133, who excludes further discussion of 4Q381–382 for its perceived lack of ‘eschatological context’ (135). However, 4Q381 15 comprises material that has points of connection with MT Ps 89, a royal Psalm, and includes an outlook on divine salvation (4Q381 15 9). It should further be noted that 4Q381 31 7–8 comprise the eschatologically loaded concepts of ‘day of wrath’ and ‘book of life’.

⁷⁷ Text from and translation after García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*. 2, 756–7.

⁷⁸ Cf. Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte aus Qumran*, 229, and Xeravits, *King, Priest, Prophet*, 132 who list 4Q381 as evidence for a royal figure. Cf. Koch, “Erwägungen zu Ps 89,20–38 und Ps 20 und ihren Vorstufen,” 9–52 at 19–32 on 4Q236/Ps^s with a synoptic table that presents connections with Ps 89, 2 Sam 7, and 1 Chron 17.

a few apocryphal and pseudepigraphical writings,⁷⁹ of which part (*T. 12 Patr.*, *1 Enoch* 37–71) has a disputed value for the study of Jewish tradition in view of Christian redaction (cf. chapter two, sections 4.2.1.1 and 4.2.2.1).⁸⁰ None of them precede the Maccabean era.

The *Psalms of Solomon* include an eschatological and messianic outlook toward the end of the composition. *Ps.Sol.* 17 addresses God as king and God's covenant with the Davidic dynasty (*Ps.Sol.* 17.4; cf. 2 Sam 7), and appeals to God for help against despoilment of the throne of David on account of sin and the power of lawless people (*Ps.Sol.* 17.5–20). The help envisioned consists in raising “up for them their king, the son of David, to rule over your servant Israel in the time known to you, O God” (*Ps.Sol.* 17.21).⁸¹ *Ps.Sol.* 17.22–46 describes the role of this king as bringing defeat to unrighteous rule and Gentile domination in Jerusalem, gathering and guidance of a holy people in righteousness, judgement in wisdom and righteousness, and compassion. *Ps.Sol.* 17.24 echoes Ps 2:9 as well as Isa 11:4 in its vision that the messianic king destroys the arrogance of sinners and lawless nations by word and deed. *Ps.Sol.* 17.32 designates him as ‘anointed one of the Lord’, *χριστὸς κυρίου*.⁸²

Ps.Sol. 18 again refers to the Lord's Messiah (*Ps.Sol.* 18.5 and 18.7), envisioning the messianic age as a time of blessing with good things of the Lord and guidance of the people in righteousness and fear of God.

The ‘Parables of Enoch’ (*1 Enoch* 37–71), whose messianic features were briefly surveyed as part of an overview of eschatology in *1 Enoch* in chapter two (section 4.2.1.1), may be the arguable product of Christian adoption and redaction. Contrary to other eschatological and apocalyptic themes like resurrection and final judgement, the messianic features of the Parables are without any parallel in other Enochic writings. This survey thereby excludes further consideration of the Book of

⁷⁹ Cf. Knibb, “Messianism in the Pseudepigrapha in the Light of the Scrolls,” 165–84; Horbury, “Messianism in the Old Testament Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha,” 35–64.

⁸⁰ Fitzmyer, *The One Who Is to Come*, 117–9 further discusses passages in *Sib.Or.* 3.652–72 and 5.414–33; on the former passage, see note 52 above; on the latter passage, cf. J.J. Collins, “Sibylline Oracles,” *OTP I*, 317–472 at 390, who dates *Sib.Or.* 5 later than 80 CE, that is later than the Second Temple period, while discussing *Sib.Or.* 5.414 among passages about a saviour figure, of which he identifies part as ‘clearly Christian’.

⁸¹ Translation from R.B. Wright, “Psalms of Solomon (First Century B.C.),” 639–70 at 667.

⁸² The alternative reading *χριστὸς κυρίος* is broadly held to be a Christian interpolation. See Rahlfs, *Septuaginta. Volumen II: Libri poetici et prophetici*, 488; Oegema, *Der Gesalbte und sein Volk*, 105; Sollamo, “Messianism and the ‘Branch of David,’” 365; cf. Fitzmyer, *The One Who Is to Come*, 116.

Parables from discussion of non-Qumran pre-70 CE Jewish evidence of messianism.

The *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* comprise several passages, whose messianic outlook is the object of discussion, such as *T. Reu.* 6.7–8, *T. Sim.* 7.1–2, *T. Levi* 8.11–15, *T. Jud.* 21:2–3, *T. Jud.* 24.1, *T. Dan* 5.10–11, and *T. Naph.* 8.2–3, albeit it with attention for christianisation of these passages.⁸³ Two passages among messianic evidence in *T. 12 Patr.* merit some further attention in view of comparison with Qumran literature, *T. Levi* 18 and *T. Jud.* 24. It has already been noted by J.J. Collins that the vision in *T. Levi* 18 of an eschatological priestly protagonist who receives divine revelation and whose star “shall rise in heaven like a king” (*T. Levi* 18.3),⁸⁴ has parallels in the Qumran ‘Apocryphon of Levi’ 4Q541, in particular fragment 9 column 1.⁸⁵ It should be noted that 4Q541 not only brings to light previously unknown parallel evidence to Levi tradition in the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, but also illuminates messianic features in *T. Judah* 24. *T. Judah* 24.1 refers to a star coming forth out of Jacob and the rise of a man “from my offspring like the sun of righteousness.”⁸⁶ Fitzmyer recently contended that “there is no evidence that ‘sun of righteousness’ was anointed or interpreted messianically in pre-Christian Judaism and even in Christianity before the patristic period.”⁸⁷ However, 4Q541 9 I 3–4 mentions an eschatological protagonist whose “word is like the word of the heavens and (whose) teaching, according to the will of God” and whose “eternal sun (שמש עלמה) will shine and its fire will burn in all the ends of the earth.”⁸⁸ It may further be added that the reference to ‘sun of righteousness’ in *T. Judah* 24.1 may also have a general point of analogy in Daniel 12:3 that imagines shining brilliance and stars as metamorphosis of those who “turn many to righteousness” (RSV).

⁸³ See e.g. recently Fitzmyer, *The One Who Is to Come*, 123–9 at 125 on christianisation in *T. Reu.* 6.7–8 and *T. Sim.* 7.1–2. Cf. the categorical statements concerning messianic expectations in *T. 12 Patr.* by Hollander and De Jonge, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. A Commentary*, 61: “Whenever a saviour figure occurs in L.J. passages, there is only one, and clearly Jesus Christ is referred to”; and the caution expressed by Collins, *The Scepter and the Star*, 90 that “many of the Levi-Judah passages in the *Testaments* actually speak of only one figure, who must be identified as Christ.”

⁸⁴ Translation from H.C. Kee, “Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs,” *OTP* 1, 794.

⁸⁵ Collins, *The Scepter and the Star*, 93.

⁸⁶ Translation from Kee, “Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs,” 801.

⁸⁷ Fitzmyer, *The One Who Is to Come*, 127–8.

⁸⁸ Translation from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition* 2, 1081.

3.2. *Qumran Literature*

3.2.1. *Texts Not Clearly Sectarian*

3.2.1.1. 4Q246

The Aramaic composition 4Q246, which has been generally related to the Qumran Daniel cycle in view of connections with the Danielic vision of God's eternal kingdom (Dan 7:27; cf. chapter five, section 6.1), comprises an eschatological vision of a ruler figure, of which the potential significance for the study of early Jewish messianism is increasingly recognised.⁸⁹ 4Q246 I–II was recently analysed by K.A. Kuhn as messianic interpretation of Daniel 7, reflecting a transformation of the Danielic redeemer figure designated as 'one like a son of man' to the 'Son of God' and 'Son of the Most High' in 4Q246 II 1.⁹⁰ The traditio-historical connections between Daniel 7 and 4Q246 that have been explored by Kuhn affirm the impression of a messianic interpretation of Daniel 7, even though the transcendent features of one coming with the clouds of heaven in Dan 7:13–14 do not have an exact parallel in 4Q246.⁹¹ The titular usage of the terms 'Son of God,' ברה די אל, and 'Son of the Most High,' בר עליון, in 4Q246 II 1 could denote divine commission and unique authority endowed with divine power, in view of 4Q246 II 7.

Analogously with Daniel 7, the vision of 4Q246 does not make isolated mention of an individual figure with divine dominion, but inter-relates this dominion with eschatological expectations about the rise of

⁸⁹ For a survey of earlier hypotheses about the identification of the ruler figure in 4Q246 II by J.T. Milik (historical description), by J.A. Fitzmyer (Davidic heir), and by D. Flusser (pre-Christian equivalent of Antichrist), see García Martínez, *Qumran and Apocalyptic*, 162–79 ("The Eschatological Figure of 4Q246"), who instead proposed an identification of the figure in 4Q246 II 1, who is described by the titular designations 'Son of God' and 'son of the Most High,' as "an eschatological saviour". Cf. Collins, *The Scepter and the Star*, 154–72 ("The Messiah as the Son of God"); Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte aus Qumran*, 128–70 ("4Q246—Der 'Sohn Gottes'"); Xeravits, *King, Priest, Prophet*, 82–9. However, Fitzmyer, *The One Who Is to Come*, 104–7 considers the evidence for identifying 4Q246 as a messianic text problematic, without substantial ground.

⁹⁰ Kuhn, "The 'One like a Son of Man' Becomes the 'Son of God,'" 22–42 at 27, who presents a synoptic table of comparison between Dan 7:4–8 and 4Q246 I 4–6; Dan 7:13–14 and 4Q246 I 7–II 1; Dan 7:14 and 4Q246 II 9; Dan 7:21.23–24 and 4Q246 II 3; Dan 7:22.26–27 and 4Q246 II 4–6; Dan 7:27 and 4Q246 II 5; Dan 7:27 and 4Q246 II 7.

⁹¹ The conclusion drawn by Kuhn, "The 'One like a Son of Man' Becomes the 'Son of God,'" 42 that 4Q246 may be categorized among Jewish apocalyptic traditions "foretelling the coming of a transcendent redeemer figure", as parallel pre-gospel tradition to Luke 1:31b-35, thereby appears problematic.

the people of God (4Q246 II 4). According to 4Q246 II 4 and 6, God's people ultimately causes everyone to rest from the sword and makes the sword cease from the earth according to 4Q246 II 4 and 6. On the other hand, 4Q246 II 1 and 7b-9 envision an eschatological ruler figure who plays a decisive role of leadership in warfare that presumably ends oppression (4Q246 I 4), great slaughter (4Q246 I 5) and destruction (4Q246 II 2-3) and brings peoples into God's dominion of truth and peace (4Q246 II 5-9).⁹²

3.2.1.2. 4Q521

The 'Messianic Apocalypse' 4Q521, whose evidence for the belief in resurrection was already discussed in chapter four (section 3.2), mentions a messianic figure at the beginning of 4Q521 2 II + 4:⁹³

4Q521 2 ii + 4

top margin

1 כי הש[מים והארץ ישמעו למשיחו
2 [וכל אש]ר במ לוא יסוג ממצות קדושים

1 [for the heav]ens and the earth will listen to his anointed one, 2 [and all th]at is in them will not turn away from the precepts of the holy ones (4Q521 2 II + 4, 1-2)

This messianic figure in 4Q521 2 II + 4 line 1 has been identified with an eschatological prophet after the model of Elijah by J.J. Collins. Collins supports this identification of the messianic figure as 'Elijah redivivus' through comparison with 4Q521 2 III 1-2 that mentions return of the fathers to the sons and echoes Mal 3:24. He further makes intertextual comparison with Ps 146:1-8, Sir 48, Mal 3:22-24, Isa 61, Q 7:22, as well as later texts, such as 2 *Baruch* 30:2, 4 *Ezra* 7 and rabbinic literature in order to establish the connection between resurrection of the dead and

⁹² Differently from the translations of 4Q246 II 8-9 by García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*. 1, 495 ("and cast them all away before him") and Kuhn, "The 'One like a Son of Man' Becomes the 'Son of God,'" 26 ("And all of them he shall cast before him"), I would rather translate קדמוהי ירמה ובלהן as "and he will place/present them all before him"; cf. KBL, 1124 on רמה in Dan 7:9.

⁹³ Text from Puech, *DJD* 25, 10; translation from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*. 2, 1045.

the role of Elijah.⁹⁴ This interpretation received divided reactions by J. Zimmermann and G.G. Xeravits.⁹⁵

If 4Q521 2 II + 4 1–2 serves as introduction of subsequent words associated with ‘his anointed one’, words intertextually conversant with Scripture, then 4Q521 2 II + 4 12 may indeed provide a further qualification of the messianic figure as one who “will proclaim good news (יְבוֹשֶׁר) to the poor”.⁹⁶ However, a further identification of the messianic figure with the role of liberation and restoration in 4Q521 2 III 1–2 is complicated by the difference between the third person singular in 4Q521 2 II + 4 12 and the first person singular in 4Q521 2 III 1. This first person singular could be paralleled by that in 4Q521 2 II + 4 9, which expresses everlasting commitment with the hopeful and pious as a verbal equivalent to what has already been attributed to the Lord in 4Q521 2 II + 4 3–5. MT Psalms 33:18 and 147:11 could further play in the background of 4Q521 2 II + 4 9, so that the first person singular in this passage as well as in 4Q521 2 III 1 refers to the workings of the Lord.⁹⁷ According to this interpretation, the messianic figure is the one who will proclaim good news to the poor, but a connection with 4Q521 2 III 1–2 and the role of the messianic figure does not appear established. 4Q521 2 III 1–4 envisions eschatological circumstances of restoration, blessing of the Lord, and joy everywhere on earth, perhaps concomitant with or subsequent to the good tidings heralded by the messianic figure in 4Q521 2 II + 4.

A number of factors complicate the identification of the messianic figure with ‘Elijah redivivus’. Elijah is not named as such in any of the fragments of 4Q521, whereas the extant fragment that does name Elijah, 4Q558 1 II 4, does not use the epithet ‘anointed’, nor does 1QS IX 11 which envisions the coming of ‘the prophet and the Messiahs of Aaron and Israel’. The imagery surrounding the sending of Elijah, אֵלִיָּה, that

⁹⁴ Collins, *The Scepter and the Star*, 117–23.

⁹⁵ Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte aus Qumran*, 381–6 at 382 critiques Collins’ approach for connecting scattered phrases in 4Q521 in the interest of building his hypothesis, while at 386 leaving various options of identification as eschatological prophets and biblical prophets open. Xeravits, *King, Priest, Prophet*, 98–110 at 110 deems “the identification of the prophet with Elijah .. indisputable, based especially on the allusions to the Book of Malachi”.

⁹⁶ Text and translation from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*. 2, 1044–5.

⁹⁷ The first person singular in 4Q521 2 III 1 as words of the Lord would not be out of place, since 4Q521 2 III 2 introduces words from Scripture with the term נִבְּרָה, “It is su[re]:” (text and translation from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*. 2, 1044–5).

of “po[w]er, lightning and met[eors]”, [תו[ק]ף {ס} ברקא זוי[קיא], in 4Q558 1 II 5,⁹⁸ does not have a clear parallel in 4Q521 2 II + 4 or 2 III. On the other hand, it does not seem plausible to leave an identification with biblical prophets open as option with regard to למשיחו in 4Q521 2 II + 4 1.⁹⁹ In fact, 4Q521 8 9–10 which appears to envision a group of ‘all his anointed ones’, בל משיחה, who “will speak the word of the Lord”, provides a more plausible option for identification along the tradition of biblical prophets than 4Q521 2 II + 4 1. 4Q521 2 II + 4 1–2 envisions a singular role of God’s anointed one, apart from that evoked in 4Q521 8 9. The entire column of 4Q521 2 II + 4 establishes the eschatologically oriented setting. 4Q521 2 II + 4 1–2 probably envisions a prophetically inspired messianic figure who will bring forward divine revelation, analogously with the “statutes of the holy ones” (4Q521 2 II + 4 2).

3.2.2. 4Q541: An Eschatological Protagonist in a Proto-Qumran Community Text?

The fragment of the ‘Apocryphon of Levi’ 4Q541, fragment 9 column I, potentially relevant for the study of messianism, has already been cited in chapter five (section 6.2), in the course of comparative discussion of apocalyptic generation language. 4Q541 was palaeographically dated by Puech to the end of the second century BCE or ca. 100 BCE, in view of its Hasmonean script.¹⁰⁰ The evidence of 4Q541 9 I is usually categorized among examples of a ‘priestly messianic figure’ or ‘eschatological priestly figure’, in view of the reference to atonement (4Q541 9 I 2).¹⁰¹ The eschatological setting of 4Q541 9 I was convincingly argued by F. García

⁹⁸ Text and translation from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*. 2, 1114–5.

⁹⁹ Contra Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte aus Qumran*, 386.

¹⁰⁰ Puech, “Fragments d’un apocryphe de Lévi,” 449–501 at 452, and Idem, *DJD* 31, 216 and 227: “Cette écriture est du type de 1QS, 1QIs^a, 4Q175, . . . , mais postérieure à 4Q504”.

¹⁰¹ García Martínez, “Messianische Erwartungen in den Qumranschriften,” 171–208 at 186–8; Collins, *The Scepter and the Star*, 88–9, 92–4, 115, 123–6 and idem “Messianic Authority in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 145–64 at 159–60; Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte aus Qumran*, 247–77; Duhaime, “Recent Studies on Messianism in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 789–99 at 791, 793; Beall, “History and Eschatology at Qumran: Messiah,” 125–46 at 140–2; Lichtenberger, “Qumran-Messianism,” *Emanuel* (eds. S.M. Paul et al.), 323–33 at 331; Xeravits, *King, Priest, Prophet*, 110–5; Collins, “What Was Distinctive about Messianic Expectation at Qumran?,” *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. 2 (ed. Charlesworth), 71–92 at 87; Knibb, “The Septuagint and Messianism: Problems and Issues,” *The Septuagint and Messianism* (ed. Knibb), 3–19 at 12–13.

Martínez who associated the references to the eternal sun and vanishing darkness from the earth (4Q541 9 I 3–5) with envisioned circumstances of the final age.¹⁰² Several commentators have observed connections with passages in the *Testament of Levi*,¹⁰³ while J.J. Collins made a thorough case for characterizing the protagonist in 4Q541 9 I after the model of the ‘Teacher of Righteousness’.¹⁰⁴ The impression of a priestly teacher figure is affirmed by references to wisdom, words of heavenly revelation and conformity with the will of God (4Q541 9 I 2–3). If we follow Collins’ argument of a horizon of expectations about an eschatological protagonist after the model of the Teacher of Righteousness, CD-A VI 11 that envisions the rise of ‘one who teaches justice at the end of days’ could provide a point of analogy. The comparison with the role of the Teacher of Righteousness provokes the question whether the composition at large could be somehow related to perspectives of communal history and eschatological outlook in Qumran sectarian literature.

Fragment 24 II of 4Q541 provides indications that a relation of the ‘Apocryphon of Levi’ to Qumran sectarian literature as ‘proto-Qumran community text’ could be affirmed. 4Q541 24 II 5–6 addresses a second person singular with the following words:¹⁰⁵

5 ותקים לאבוכה שם חדוא ולכול אחיכה יסוד [מבחן]
6 ת[צ]וֹיָא ותחזה ותחדה בנהיר עלמא ולא תהוה מן שנאא *vacat*

And you will establish for your father a name of joy, and for all your brothers you will make a [tested] foundation 6 rise. You will see and rejoice in eternal light. And you will not be of the enemy. *Blank*

4Q541 24 II 5 envisions the rise of “a [tested] foundation”, [יסוד מבחן],¹⁰⁶ of which parallels with the Qumran community term בחן חומת in 1QS

¹⁰² García Martínez, “Messianische Erwartungen in den Qumranschriften,” 186.

¹⁰³ Collins, *The Scepter and the Star*, 93; Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte aus Qumran*, 260–1 makes a synoptic comparison between *T. Levi* 18:3–4 and 4Q541 9 I 3–5, and further refers to *T. Levi* 10:2; 14:1; 16:2–3 (18,9); Xeravits, *King, Priest, Prophet*, 110 and 112 compares 4Q541 9 with *T. Levi* 17–18 in particular *T. Levi* 18:3–4, while noting a parallel to 4Q541 24 5b–6 in Isaiah 52:13–53:12.

¹⁰⁴ Collins, “The Referential Background of 4QAaron A,” 579–90.

¹⁰⁵ Text and translation from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*. 2, 1080–1.

¹⁰⁶ The preliminary edition by Puech, “Fragments d’un apocryphe de Lévi,” 449–501 at 475 read מבחן יסוד; García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*. 2, 1080 read [מבחן] יסוד; the official editio princeps by Puech, *DJD* 31, 252 reads מבחן יסוד with text-critical signs indicating uncertainty about the reading of מב in the word מבחן.

VIII 7 as well as 1QH^a XIV 29 and XV 9 have been noted by É. Puech.¹⁰⁷ The notion of a ‘foundation,’ יסוד, further makes part of the expression ‘foundation of the community,’ יסוד היחוד, in 1QS VII 17–18, 1QS VIII 10 // 4QS^d VI (3a–d) 4, and in 4QS^s 6 4. The perspective on a ‘tested foundation’ takes into account individual contribution and a collective dimension. The sequence of sentences, which presuppose a contrast with ‘the enemy,’ שנאא, makes it possible that ‘your brothers,’ אחיכה, is not restricted to a familial sense, but beyond this also has a figurative sense. The figurative sense of ‘your brothers,’ אחיכה, in 4Q541 24 II 5 makes part of a collective, institutional setting of bringing about the rise of a ‘tested foundation.’ The reference to the establishment of ‘a name of joy for your father’ (4Q541 24 II 5) could be a mode of wisdom instruction.

The above considerations lead me to suggest a communal perspective underlying 4Q541 that focuses on an eschatological priestly figure with revealed wisdom that will bring light to the ends of the earth and make darkness vanish. The eschatological perspective of light that makes darkness vanish from the earth in 4Q541 9 I is transposed to a communal perspective in 4Q541 24 II 6 that addresses the reader of the text with a vision of joy in ‘eternal light,’ נהיר עלמא, in a collective setting, together with “your brothers,” אחיכה (4Q541 24 II 5).

The interpretation of 4Q541 as a proto-Qumran text that envisions an eschatological priestly figure further corresponds with the argument made by G.G. Xeravits, based on analysis of the *Damascus Document* and the *Rule of the Community*, that Qumran messianism had priestly origins.¹⁰⁸

3.2.3. *Qumran Community Texts*

3.2.3.1. *Foundation Texts with Community Regulations*

Major rule texts of the Qumran community, the *Damascus Document*, the *Serekh ha-Yahad*, and the *Rule of the Congregation*, all include messianic references and thereby indicate the importance of messianic ideas for the sectarian community.

The textual order of the *Damascus Document* as represented by CD-A, CD-B, and 4QD fragments an eschatologically oriented introduction and a review of history from the perspective of the Qumran community

¹⁰⁷ Puech, *DJD* 31, 256.

¹⁰⁸ Xeravits, “The Early History of Qumran’s Messianic Expectations,” 113–21.

and retrospect on its parent movement. Embedded in this setting are explicit messianic references that occur in both the Admonition (CD-A VII 12–21 // 4QD^a 3 III 18–22; CD-B XIX 10, XIX 33–XX 1) and the Law Code (CD-A XII 22–XIII 2, XIV 18–19 // 4QD^a 10 I 11–12).¹⁰⁹

The first reference to an eschatological protagonist in the sequence of the text is to “one who teaches righteousness at the end of days,” יורה בצדק באחרית הימים, in CD-A VI 11. This reference is not necessarily messianic in itself, but it has been generally related to a pivotal model set by the Teacher of Righteousness.¹¹⁰ In the eschatological perspective of time of CD-B XIX 35–XX 1, the time when the ‘unique teacher’, מורה היחיד, was taken away and the time when the messiah arises from Aaron and Israel mark to, perhaps not entirely unrelated, ends of a communal spectrum. The expectation of “one who teaches righteousness at the end of days” could mark off conditions that put an end to the perceived ‘age of wickedness’ (CD-A VI 10), while unalterable standards of judgement up to and including the messianic age appear to be underlined in CD-B XIX 33–XX 1. Since the ‘interpreter of the law’, דורש התורה (CD-A VI 7), further occurs in the context of CD-A VI 10–11, the expected ‘one who teaches righteousness at the end of days’ could play a role analogously with that of the Interpreter of the Law next to a royal messianic figure, as is the case in CD-A VII 18–21 // 4QD^a 3 III 19–22; cf. 4Q174 1 I, 21, 2, ll. 11–12). The general formulation “one who teaches righteousness at the end of days” does not allow further identification.

Manuscript A of the Cairo Genizah comprises the messianically oriented ‘Amos-Numbers midrash’ (CD-A VII 14–21 // 4QD^a 3 III 18–22), which is absent from the overlapping column XIX of CD-B that yet also refers to the coming of “the messiah of Aaron and Israel”, משיח אהרן וישראל (CD-B XIX 10–11), albeit as part of envisioned visitation to destruction of the wicked (CD-B XIX 5–11). Messianic references thereby occur in different settings in two partly overlapping manuscripts, CD-A VII and CD-B XIX. The majority opinion in previous scholarly analysis favoured the reading of manuscript B as the more original,¹¹¹ even

¹⁰⁹ Cf. Hempel, *The Damascus Texts*, 44–53 on different scholarly analyses of the composite character of the *Damascus Document*.

¹¹⁰ Davies, “The Teacher of Righteousness and the End of Days,” 313–7; Collins, “The One Who Will Teach Righteousness at the End of Days,” 193–210.

¹¹¹ Davies, *The Damascus Covenant*, 143–72 regarded CD-A VII 10–VIII 2 as supplementary to the “original Admonition”, while at 146–7 argued for the secondary character of the ‘Amos-Numbers midrash’, with reference to arguments by J. Murphy-O’Connor and G.J. Brooke for identifying it as an interpolation within CD-A; G.J. Brooke, “The

though arguments for the antiquity of the ‘Amos-Numbers midrash’ in manuscript A have also been advanced.¹¹² It has further been argued that the passages of both manuscripts CD-A and CD-B could contain parts of an original text, while differences are to be ascribed to scribal error.¹¹³ The evidence of 4QD^a 3 III 18–22 that corresponds to part of the ‘Amos-Numbers midrash’ has not played a major part in this textual comparison.¹¹⁴ The fact that 4QD fragments extensively attest to a prologue about community origins (4QD^a 1a–b // 4QD^b 1; and 4QD^a 2 I // 4QD^c 1) that partly precedes and partly overlaps with CD-A I indicates that 4QD material is of critical importance for understanding early stages of the communal setting of the *Damascus Document*. It is beyond the scope of this survey to interact with every detail of argument that favours the reading of manuscript B as more original. Even if Qumran messianism originated in Levitical circles, for which references to a ‘messiah of Aaron and Israel’ in other parts of the *Damascus Document* may provide evidence, this does not necessarily preclude an occasional

Messiah of Aaron in the Damascus Document,” 215–30 at 224–30 characterized the ‘Amos-Numbers midrash’ as an interpolation, considering the reference to a messiah of Aaron and Israel in CD-B XIX 10–11 to be more in line with pre-Qumranic origins of the *Damascus Document* and its supposedly Levitical setting; Knibb, “CD VII, 9b–VIII,2a and XIX, 5b–14,” 243–51 deemed CD-A VII 13b–VIII 1a to be an interpolation while characterizing CD-A VII 9b–13a plus CD-B XIX 7b–14 as original text; Xeravits, “Précisions sur le texte original et le concept messianique de CD 7:13–8:1 et 19:5–14,” 47–59; Kister, “The Development of the Early Recensions,” 61–76 at 70 refers to consistency in verbal tenses in CD-B XIX 1–14 as compared to inconsistency in CD-A VII 4–VIII 2 among his arguments for the secondary character of the ‘Amos-Numbers midrash’.

¹¹² Carmignac, “Manuscrits ‘A’ et ‘B’ du Document de Damas,” 53–67 at 66 who argued that CD-A VII 10–21 fits best with the contents of the *Damascus Document* at large and corresponds with other sectarian Qumran texts such as 4Q174 and 1QM; Murphy-O’Connor, “The Damascus Document Revisited,” 223–46 at 243 deduces the originality of the Amos-Numbers Midrash from a comparison of CD-A VIII 3–19 with CD-B XIX 15–33; Strickert, “Damascus Document VII 10–20 and Qumran Messianic Expectation,” 327–49 related the reading of CD-A VII 10–20 to an early communal setting ‘in the land of Damascus’.

¹¹³ White, “The ‘A’ and ‘B’ Manuscripts of the Damascus Document,” 537–53. Cf. the reconstruction with commentary by Wacholder, *The New Damascus Document*, 40–3 who reconstructs CD-A VII 10a, CD-B XIX 7–9, CD-A VII 10b–21, CD-B XIX 10b–13, CD-A VIII 1b–2 as sequence of text, while at 234–6 observing that this sequence “generally follows that of the more highly represented A-manuscript” (236) on the one hand and includes readings of the B-text which are deemed more reliable.

¹¹⁴ See e.g. Xeravits, “Précisions sur le texte original de CD 7:13–8:1 et 19:5–14,” 52 that the 4QD evidence is not very important for this question because of the damaged state of critical passages; cf. the reiteration of this point of view in idem, *King, Priest, Prophet*, 35. This observation downplays the portion of text which is identifiable in 4QD^a 3 III 18–25. Kister, “The Development of the Early Recensions,” 61–76 does not draw 4QD^a 3 III into his comparative discussion.

outlook on a royal form of messianism. For instance, the *War Scroll* frequently refers to priestly service in a setting of envisioned apocalyptic war, but also mentions the ‘prince of the whole congregation’ (1QM V 1). 4QMMT with its emphasis on priestly and cultic issues also refers to the kings of Israel (4QMMT C 23–25), in particular David (4QMMT C 25–26) as prominent example for the deliverance of those who search the Torah as way of life. These features of sectarian Qumran texts speak against a strict disjunction between priestly forms of messianic expectation at the origins of the Qumran community and interests in royal dimensions and figures. The evidence of 4QD^a 3 III 18–25, and to a lesser extent that of 4QD^d 5 1–4 that preserves the word הכוכב as part of material probably parallel to CD-A VII 17–21, supports the antiquity of the ‘Amos-Numbers midrash.’ Perhaps variety of messianic views was an early part of the Qumran community’s history, as reflected by CD-A VII 14–21 and CD-B XIX 5–13.

The Law Code of the *Damascus Document* further comprises messianic references. CD-A XII 23–XIII 1 underlines the continuity of described regulations for the ‘assembly of the camps’ (CD-A XII 22–23) throughout the period of wickedness up to the time when “there arises the messiah of Aaron and Israel,” אהרן וישראל (משיח) עד עמוד משוח (CD-A XII 23–XIII 1).¹¹⁵ CD-A XIV 18–19 // 4QD^a 10 I 11–12 again stipulates the continuous validity of regulations and their interpretation with regard to those who live in the camps up to the time when “there arises the messiah of Aaron and Israel,” עד (מ)עמוד משיח אהרן וישראל.¹¹⁶ The apposition of Aaron and Israel in these messianic references further corresponds with the foundation of a community council as envisioned in the *Rule of the Community* that mentions imagery of ‘a holy house for Israel’ and a ‘foundation of holy of holies for Aaron’ (1QS VIII 5–6 // 4QS^e II 14). The designation ‘messiah of Aaron and Israel’ thereby underlines priestly orientation and broader scope of justice and atonement for sin in the land.

The *Rule of the Community* comprises only one messianic reference, in 1QS IX 11 that has no parallels in the extant fragments of most 4QS manuscripts and is omitted in 4QS^e III that comprises a sequence of text parallel to 1QS VIII 11–15 and IX 12–20. 1QS IX 10–11 emphasises

¹¹⁵ Text and translation from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition. 1*, 570–1.

¹¹⁶ Text and translation from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *ibidem*, 574–5.

the importance of “the first directives which the men of the Community began to be taught until the prophet comes, and the messiahs of Aaron and Israel,” *עד בוא נביא ומשיחי אהרון וישראל*. This legal emphasis with an outlook on the messianic age corresponds with that in the above-mentioned passages of the Law Code in the *Damascus Document*. The omission of a messianic reference in 4QS^e III has been taken to imply that as compared to an earlier version, represented by 4QS^e III, 1QS incorporated later messianic interests.¹¹⁷ However, this argument depends on the debated chronological order of textual development of the *Rule of the Community* (cf. chapter two, section 3.3). The textual evidence of 4QS^e III at least indicates that a concern with study of the Torah and application of its regulations could have a setting in prophetic inspiration (1QS VIII 13–15 // 4QS^e III 4–6) with or without further outlook on messianic expectations.

The *Rule of the Congregation* is an eschatologically oriented composition (1QSa I 1) with references to the ‘messiah,’ *המשיח* (1QSa II 12), and to the ‘messiah of Israel,’ *משיח ירשאל* (1QSa II 14, 20). L.H. Schiffman described 1QSa II 11–22 as an envisioned ‘messianic banquet’ at the end of days, headed by two messianic figures, the chief priest (1QSa II 12) and the ‘messiah of Israel,’ a military ruler figure.¹¹⁸ This evidence for two messianic figures in 1QSa II 12, 14, 20 concurs with the plural reference to the ‘messiahs of Aaron and Israel,’ *משיחי אהרון וישראל*, in 1QS IX 11.

The *Rule of Benedictions* (1QSb) does not comprise a direct reference to a messiah or to messiahs, but it includes words of blessing for the ‘prince of the congregation,’ *נשיא העדה* (1QSb V 20). According to 1QSb V 21–23, the role of the ‘prince of the congregation’ consists in renewing and establishing the kingdom of God’s people in its covenantal bounds for ever, in rendering just judgement and providing an example of blamelessness. Part of this description, namely judgement of the poor with righteousness and fairness to the humble of the earth (1QSb V 22–23), echoes Isaiah 11:4. 1QSb V 23–27 then turns to a series of wishes of strength and wisdom for the ‘prince of the congregation’ that partly echo scriptural verses, such as Isa 11:4 in 1QSb V 24–25a, Isa 11:2 in 1QSb V 25, Isa 11:5 in 1QSb V 26a. 1QSb V 27–29 envisions

¹¹⁷ Cf. Charlesworth, “Challenging the *Consensus Communis* Regarding Qumran Messianism (1QS, 4QS MSS),” 120–34.

¹¹⁸ Schiffman, *The Eschatological Community of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 53–67 at 55–6.

the power of the ‘prince of the congregation’ as a “sceptre for the rulers”, לשבט למושלים (1QSb V 27–28), endowed with divine power (1QSb V 27, 28). The reference to service of the nations, [כול לא]ומים יעובדוכה,¹¹⁹ in 1QSb V 28 has a general point of analogy in 4Q246 II 8.

3.2.3.2. *Pesharim, Commentaries and Other Exegetical Works*

A number of Qumran sectarian exegetical texts include messianic references, namely 4Q161 (4QIsaiah Peshera), 4Q174 (4QEschatological Midrash), 4Q252 (4QCommentary on Genesis A), and 11Q13 (11QMelchizedek).

4Q161 (4QIsaiah Peshera) 8–10 1–10 interpret Isaiah 10:33–34 as applying to an envisioned ‘war against the Kittim’ who are placed in the power of Israel. 4QpIsa^a 8–10 11–25 then turns to exegesis of Isaiah 11:1–5 which is fully quoted in lines 11–17 and interpreted with a view to messianic expectation in lines 18–25. The shoot from the stump of Jesse becomes the “[shoot] of David which will sprout in the fi[nal days],” צמח דויד העומד באחרית הימים (4QpIsa^a 8–10 18).¹²⁰ 4QpIsa^a 8–10 20 mentions the royal attributes of a “throne of glory, holy crown, and multi-colour[ed] vestments”¹²¹ and lines 21–22 envision rule over and judgement of all the peoples, analogously with 1QSb V 28 and 4Q246 II 8. 4QpIsa^a 8–10 22–25 emphasises that the ‘shoot of David’ will not act of his own accord, but is accompanied by teaching, authority and “one of the priests of renown”, אחד מכוהני השם (4QpIsa^a 8–10 25).

4Q174 1 I 11–12 envisages the combined activity of “the sprout of David who will arise with the inquirer of the Torah who establishes himself in Zion at the end of days” in the course of interpreting 2 Samuel 7:12–14. Interpretation of Torah is integral to the vision of the *Eschatological Midrash* about the time when a messianic figure, the sprout of David (צמח דויד), arises.

4Q252 V 1–4 comprises messianic exegesis of Genesis 49:10, concerning which I mentioned an example of exegetical modification in section 2 above. 4Q252 V 3–4 emphasises justice through the phrase “until the messiah of righteousness comes, the branch of David,” משיח, הצדק צמח דויד.¹²² The covenant of royalty, ברית המלכות, which 4Q252 V 2 employs as interpreting term for ‘the staff’, מחקק, in Gen 49:10,

¹¹⁹ Text from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*. 1, 108.

¹²⁰ Text and translation from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *ibidem*, 316–7.

¹²¹ Translation from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *ibidem*, 317.

¹²² Text and translation from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *ibidem*, 504–5.

further has a collective dimension, as 4Q252 V 4–5 indicates. It is further described as “covenant of the kingdom of his people for eternal generations” (4Q252 V 4), whose covenantal bounds appear to be related to the “Torah with the men of the Community” (4Q252 V 5).

11Q13 II 1–14 envisions a year of jubilee, when Melchizedek will have carried out divine retribution and brought liberty from the power of Belial (at ll. 13–14), after which a ‘day of [peace]’ is envisaged in a context of messianic interpretation of Isaiah 52:7 (11QMelch II 15–24). Melchizedek’s role of setting free from the power of Belial is reiterated in 11QMelch II 25. The divine role of Melchizedek as a salvific figure, who is described as ‘priest of the most high God’ and priest forever in biblical tradition (Gen 14:18, Ps 110:4), appears to mediate God’s righteous kingship in *11QMelchizedek* (11QMelch II 24–25). The intermediate passage, 11QMelch II 15–24, elaborates a messianic interpretation of Isaiah 52:7, identifying the messenger who announces the day of peace and salvation with “the anointed of the spir[it]”, משיח הרוח [ח], (11QMelch II 18).¹²³ Line 18 of 11QMelch II further relates this messianic identification to a verse from the book of Daniel, presumably Daniel 9:25 that mentions “[an anointed, a prince],” משיח נגיד.¹²⁴ This exegetical procedure implies that the messianic figure not only has a prophetically inspired role of announcing peace and salvation, but also one of leadership, of a משיח נגיד. The designation ‘anointed of the spirit’ could further echo Isaiah 61:1, an intertextual background that further puts the prophetic contours of the messianic figure in 11QMelch II 18 into relief. The echo of Isaiah 61:1 in 11QMelch II 18 appears to be followed up by an echo of the phrase כל־האבלים לנחם from Isa 61:1 behind the phrase “to comfo[rt] the [afflicted],” [האבלים] לנחם [ם],¹²⁵ in 11QMelch

¹²³ Text and translation from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*. 2, 1208–9.

¹²⁴ Text and translation from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *ibidem*, 1208–9. Cf. Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte aus Qumran*, 394 who observes that the reconstruction of a citation from Dan 9:25 is supported by J.T. Milik, É. Puech, and others, but at 400 argues that this reading is uncertain, since Dan 12:4 would also be an option; Xeravits, *King, Priest, Prophet*, 74 notes that “both verses 9:25 and 26 (of Daniel) seem to be appropriate here, for both contain the word משיח, yet, in completely different contexts.” The combination of reference to the catchword משיח and the chronological concern with a period of seven weeks, analogous with the figure 49 after which a jubilee begins (cf. 11QMelch II 2), make Daniel 9:25 a very likely candidate as reconstructed reading in 11QMelch II 18.

¹²⁵ Text and translation from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*. 2, 1208–9.

II 20. The latter phrase is interpreted as instruction “in all the ages of the world,” [בכול קצי העולם],¹²⁶ in 11QMelch II 20. The messianic exegesis of 11QMelchizedek does not comprise an isolated focus on a prophetic messianic messenger-figure, but includes a setting of divine workings of justice through Melchizedek as well as a communal setting that is interpretively related to the word ‘Zion’ of Isaiah 52:7. 11QMelch II 24 interprets ‘Zion’ as “[the congregation of all the sons of justice, those] who establish the covenant, those who avoid walking [on the pa]th of the people.”¹²⁷

3.2.3.3. *The War Scroll and Related Texts*

The *War Scroll* from Qumran cave 1 does not extensively attest to messianic expectations. 1QM XI 6–7 quotes Numbers 24:17–19, but without messianic interpretation. This scriptural passage serves among proof-texts to make the point that apocalyptic war for the salvation and victory of Israel was foretold since ancient times (1QM XI 5–6), with the aid of anointed prophets (1QM XI 7–8). 1QM V 1–2 is the only passage with explicit reference to a ruler figure, namely the “Prince of the whole congregation,” גשיא כול העדה, who is associated with the names of Israel, Levi, and Aaron as well as the names of the twelve tribes of Israel and their commanders. Even this passage is far less explicitly messianic in orientation than, for instance, relevant passages in 1QSa and 4QpIsa^a are that likewise presuppose a military leader figure. As it has been noted by A. Steudel, collective expectations focusing on the role of God’s people predominate in 1QM.¹²⁸ 4QM fragments do not comprise evidence that counteracts this conclusion.

An exception to the idea that the apocalyptic war cycle of Qumran literature comprises relatively unsubstantial evidence of messianic expectation is 4Q285 (4QSefer ha-Milhamah) fragment 5 with which 11Q14 (11QSefer ha-Milhamah) 1 I overlaps. These two overlapping fragments of manuscripts do not comprise overlapping material with the *War Scroll* from cave 1. In his comparative textual study of 4Q285 5 and 11Q14 1 I, E.J.C. Tigchelaar concluded that the evidence, as compared

¹²⁶ Text and translation from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *ibidem*, 1208–9.

¹²⁷ Translation from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *ibidem*, 1209. Cf. Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte aus Qumran*, 394 who notes that the reconstructed part [עדת כול בני הצדק] is supported by J.T. Milik and É. Puech and deems it a possible addition; Xeravits, *King, Priest, Prophet*, 70 also presents this reconstructed reading.

¹²⁸ Steudel, “The Eternal Reign of the People of God,” 507–25 at 521–4.

to 1QM and 4QM, indicates “there were different compositions or editions dealing with eschatological war, which were related to one another”.¹²⁹ Apparently, a messianic outlook was not equally important for the respective editions or compositions represented by 1QM/4QM and 4Q285/11Q14.

4Q285 5 3–4 and 11Q14 1 I 11–13 refer to the ‘Prince of the Congregation,’ גשיא העדה, as ‘the shoot of David,’ צמח דויד, in the context of interpretation of Isaiah 10:34–11:1. The activity of the ‘Prince of the Congregation, the shoot of David’ consists in leadership in battle, killing a third person singular (המיתו) in 4Q285 5 4 // [11Q14 1 I 13]), possibly the rulership of Israel’s enemies, the Kittim (4Q285 5 6), with their armies, analogously with 4QpIsa^a 8–10 1–9.¹³⁰ The messianic outlook of the *Sefer ha-Milhamah* does not provide an isolated focus on a messianic military ruler figure, but 4Q285 5 5 (// [11Q14 1 I 14]) also presupposes the authoritative role of the High Priest.

4. MESSIANIC BELIEFS AND CHRISTOLOGY IN EARLY CHRISTIANITY

Comparative study of messianism in Qumran literature and the New Testament should take into account that references to Jesus as Messiah, as the Christ, in the literature of emerging Christianity have taken on radically different meanings as compared to early Jewish messianism from the beginnings of gospel proclamation.¹³¹ Paul writes, “we preach Christ crucified, a stumbling block to Jews and folly to Gentiles, but to those who are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God and the wisdom of God” (1 Cor 1:23–24, RSV). Nevertheless, the Gospels at the same time describe Jesus’ ministry in terms of fulfilment of Scripture (cf. Luke 24:26–27.44) and of expectations of a messiah that turn to Jesus (Q 7:19, John 1:41) or that are challenged by Jesus (Mark 12:35–37 par.). Pre-Pauline tradition represented by Rom 1:2–4 further

¹²⁹ Tigchelaar, “The Relation between 4Q285 and 11Q14,” 49–56 at 56.

¹³⁰ Intersecting ideas between 4Q285 and 4QpIsa^a could be substantiated by the fact that 4QpIsa^a 8–10 9 further refers to a third person singular in the phrase “in his flight befo[re Is]rael,” בברחו מלפ[ני] יש[ר]אל; text and translation from Text and translation from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition. I*, 316–7. Analogously, 4Q285 6 + 4 6–7 mentions the military leadership of the Prince of the Congregation and flight of a third person plural from Israel at a given moment, while 4Q285 6+4 10 refers to a third person singular personage who is brought before the Prince of the Congregation.

¹³¹ Cf. Miller, “The Problems of the Origins of a Messianic Conception of Jesus,” 301–35 at 311 with reference to studies by N.A. Dahl.

designates the gospel about Jesus Christ as gospel concerning the Son of God and descendant of David, “which he promised beforehand through his prophets in the holy scriptures” (Rom 1:2, RSV). These indications of theological elaboration on Scripture and on messianic expectations at the time of Jesus in the Gospels and, more indirectly, in Paul’s Letters evoke the question of traditio-historical relief.

In what follows, I briefly survey evidence in Paul, Mark, Q, Matthew, Luke, Acts, John, and the Apocalypse that touches the question of messianism at the origins of Christology and compare it with Qumran literature. This comparative traditio-historical survey aims to highlight contemporary Palestinian Jewish contexts to messianic belief at the time of Jesus that arguably bear on early gospel tradition.

4.1. *Paul’s Christology and Messianic Backgrounds*

Paul’s Letters presuppose divine salvation and justification through Jesus (1 Thess 1:10, Rom 3:21–26) and provide extensive evidence of belief in Jesus as Jesus Christ, Christ Jesus, as well as Christ.¹³² It is a matter of discussion whether and to which extent Pauline references to Χριστός presuppose titular usage analogously with messianic titles in early Jewish messianism.¹³³

The apostle employs terms such as promise through the prophets, ‘Son of God’, descendant of David (Rom 1:2–4) that partly reflect back on biblical and early Jewish contexts of tradition. 1QS IX 10–11, 4Q521 2 II + 4, 11QMelch II 15–24 all presuppose a role of prophecy or a prophetic figure in their respective horizons of messianic expectation. The designation ‘Son of God’ also occurs in 4Q246 II 1, while Davidic lineage combined with prophecy is further attested in sectarian texts such as 4QpIsa^a 8–10, 4Q285 5 // 11Q14 1 I. Paul’s application of divine sonship to belief in Jesus Christ is a development *sui generis*, related to

¹³² Cf. Miller, “The Problem of the Origins of a Messianic Conception of Jesus,” 309–10 who notes that “more than half of the instances of *christos* in the New Testament” occur in the undisputed Pauline Letters.

¹³³ Miller, “The Problem of the Origins of a Messianic Conception of Jesus,” 310–3 argues against messianic titular interpretation of Pauline usage for reading it too much in light of the Gospels and Acts. However, Hengel, “Jesus der Messias Israels,” *Der messianische Anspruch Jesu* (Hengel and Schwemer), 1–80 at 4–5 rightly refers to passages in Paul’s Letter to the Romans (Rom 1:3f., 9:5, 15:12) as points of connection with Jewish messianic expectation from the apostle’s point of view.

the kerygma of Jesus' resurrection from the dead (Rom 1:4; cf. 1 Cor 15:3–4).

Romans 9:4–5 mentions divine prerogatives that belong to the Israelites, ending with the phrase “and of their race, according to the flesh, is the Christ (ὁ Χριστός)” (Rom 9:5, RSV). The determined state of the designation ὁ Χριστός through the definite article may in this context well denote Christ as titular designation, parallel to the Semitic term ‘Messiah.’¹³⁴ The Israelite descent of the ‘Messiah’ is further presupposed in all early Jewish evidence of messianism and articulated by references to a ‘messiah of Aaron and Israel’ (CD-A, CD-B, 4QD), ‘messiahs of Aaron and Israel’ (1QS IX 11), and ‘messiah of Israel’ (1QSa I 1).

Romans 15:12 comprises a Christologically oriented citation of LXX Isaiah 11:10, “The root of Jesse shall come, he who rises to rule the Gentiles; in him shall the Gentiles hope” (RSV). The ‘root of Jesse’, also mentioned in Isaiah 11:1, which is the object of Davidic messianic exegesis in several early Jewish texts, namely 4QpIsa^a 8–10, 4Q285 5 // 11Q14 1 I, and is echoed in *Ps.Sol.* 17:21–37 and *T. Levi* 18:7, is interpreted in an entirely different setting by Paul. Having developed his theology of Israel in Rom 9–11, Paul applies his citation of Isaiah 11:10 in a setting of gospel mission that extends to the Gentiles. Nevertheless, Paul presupposes Christ’s descent from David, as stated in Rom 1:3.

4.2. *Messianism and Mark*

The earliest written Gospel, Mark, presents Jesus’ messianic identity in a narrative setting of the ‘messianic secret’ (Mark 1:34, 3:12, 8:30). This ‘messianic secret’ appears to serve a reader-oriented purpose of admonition to withhold one’s conclusions about beliefs about the Christ and discipleship of Christ before the whole gospel narrative has unfolded up to and including Jesus’ resurrection from the dead (cf. Mark 9:9). At the intra-narrative level, the Marcan ‘messianic secret’ could further be related to a silencing and casting out of demons (Mark 1:25) and demonic influences (cf. Mark 8:30.33). Mark 1:24.34, 3:11, 5:7 narrates instances of demonic fear and confession of Jesus’ messianic identity,

¹³⁴ Cf. Dunn, *Romans 9–16*, 535: “Paul does not forget that ‘the Christ’ is first and foremost the Messiah of Israel”; Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 547 translates this phrase in Rom 9:5 as “and from them by natural descent comes the Messiah” and recognizes Rom 9:5 as a “rare instance in Paul’s writings in which *Christos* has the titular sense of ‘Messiah’”.

while Jesus' exorcism is demonized by Jerusalemite scribes in the Marcan 'Beelzebul controversy' (Mark 3:19b–30).

The Marcan 'messianic secret' and its narrative setting are unparalleled, but the eventual open opposition to Jesus' messianic ministry with works of healing that were traditionally associated with priestly functions of examination (Mark 1:44; cf. Lev 13:49) could have a point of analogy in the confrontation between the priestly eschatological protagonist and 'his generation' in 4Q541 9 I.

Mark 4:35–41 narrates Jesus' calming of wind and sea; a passage that ends with the disciples' question, "Who then is this, that even wind and sea obey him?" (Mark 4:41, RSV). The signal function of this narrative passage appears to consist in conveying Jesus' great authority (cf. Mark 1:27) going beyond everything to supernatural dimensions. Cosmic dimensions of attentiveness or obedience are also ascribed to the prophetic messianic figure in 4Q521 2 II 1–2: "[for the heav]ens and the earth will listen to his anointed one, [and all th]at is in them will not turn away from the precepts of the holy ones".¹³⁵

The Marcan passage about Peter's Christ-confession (Mark 8:27–33) makes a point of diffuse perceptions of Jesus, ranging from John the Baptist, Elijah, one of the prophets, to Christ, as well as of Peter's initial misunderstanding of Jesus' messianic identity, since his reaction to Jesus' prediction of the Passion is one of rebuke (Mark 8:31–32). These diffuse perceptions and misunderstanding stand in sharp contrast with the plain introduction of the Gospel as about 'Jesus Christ, the Son of God' (Mark 1:1). This presentation of different ideas about Jesus reported by the disciples could imply a variety of Palestinian Jewish popular beliefs about transcendent (cf. Mark 6:14–16), prophetic, and messianic workings and visitations at the time of Jesus' ministry. Somewhat analogously, the literary evidence of the Dead Sea Scrolls attests to a variety of beliefs about prophecy and prophetic messianic figures (1QS IX 11; 4Q521; 11QMelch; 4Q558).¹³⁶

Jesus' "messianic entry" into Jerusalem, described in Mark 11:1–11 is made explicit through acclamation of Jesus by a movement of followers in terms of eulogy of 'he who comes in the name of the Lord' and of

¹³⁵ Translation from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*. 2, 1045.

¹³⁶ Cf. France, *The Gospel of Mark*, 329: "there is good reason to doubt whether the cessation of prophecy during the Second Temple period was as widespread a dogma as has been traditionally supposed," with reference to a study of prophecy in early Judaism by D.E. Aune.

the 'kingdom of our father David that is coming' (Mark 11:9–10, RSV). This eulogy alludes to words from the Psalter, namely Psalm 118:26 and 148:1.¹³⁷ In the immediate context to Psalm 118:26, Ps 118:27 further mentions branches of a festival procession up to the horns of the altar, which could further play in the background to the description of Jesus' messianic entry in Mark 11:1–11 as a procession leading up to the temple (Mark 11:11a). The combination of verses from different Psalms (Pss 118:26, 148:1), as known from their sequence in the Masoretic Text, in Mark 11:9–10 could perhaps be explained from their closer proximity and thematic coherence in a different, ancient order of Psalms reflected in Qumran Psalters. That is, Psalms 118 and 148 make part of a sequence of 'hymns of praise' (Pss 118, 104, 147, 106, 105, 146, 148) witnessed by 11QPs^a and 4QPs^e in particular.¹³⁸

Mark 12:35–37a presents messianic exegesis as bone of contention between the Marcan Jesus and the scribes. The scribal opinion that "the Christ is the son of David" (Mark 12:35, RSV) is challenged in Mark 12:36–37a by reference to a Psalm of David, Psalm 110:1, that is interpreted as a saying about the Messiah as Lord, going beyond descent from David. This divine epithet for the Christ through messianic exegesis of Psalm 110:1 is without clear parallel outside the New Testament, but references to a messianic figure in 4Q246 II 1 as 'Son of God' and 'Son of the Most High' indicate that divine dimensions of commission were conceivable in early Jewish messianism.

The messianic (ac)claim of Jesus is at issue in Mark 14:61–64, a passage in which the high priest reacts with a charge of blasphemy in the trial of Jesus. The designation of a messianic figure as "the Christ, the Son of the Blessed" would not necessarily be perceived as blasphemy *per se* in contemporary Judaism, as divine epithets in 4Q246 II 1 and cosmic dimensions in 4Q521 2 II+4 1–2 indicate. However, Jesus challenge against the religious authority and influence of the priestly establishment (Mark 11:27–33) through his messianic claim probably informs the charge of blasphemy in the Marcan narrative. Analogously, Mark 1:22 narrates the astonishment about Jesus' teaching with authority,

¹³⁷ On the importance of four royal Psalms, Ps 2, 118, 110, and 22, as tradition-historical background to the Marcan picture of Jesus as the Messiah, see Rowe, *God's Kingdom and God's Son*.

¹³⁸ See Abegg, Flint, and Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible*, 550–6, who observe at 556 that, following Ps 148, a different group of so-called 'Psalms of Ascent', Pss 120–132, is represented in the 11QPs^a-Psalter.

“and not as the scribes” (RSV), and at a subsequent point in the narrative refers to the deliberation among some of the scribes about Jesus’ claim of forgiveness of sins as blasphemy (Mark 2:6–7).

Throughout the Gospel of Mark, Jesus’ messianic identity is addressed by various personages with the following titular designations:¹³⁹ ‘the Holy One of God’, ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ (Mark 1:24); ‘the Son of God’, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ (Mark 3:11; cf. Mark 15:39); ‘Son of the Most High God’, υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ὑψίστου (Mark 5:7); ‘the Christ’, ὁ χριστός (Mark 8:29); ‘Son of David’, υἱὸς Δαυίδ (Mark 10:47–48); and ‘the Christ, the Son of the Blessed’, ὁ χριστός ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ εὐλογητοῦ (Mark 14:61). Several of them are paralleled in Qumran literature, such as ‘Son of God’, ברה די אל, and ‘Son of the Most High’, בר עליון, in 4Q246 II 1, while ‘Son of David’ has a clear parallel in *Ps.Sol.* 17.21.

The self-designation of the Marcan Jesus as ‘Son of man’ in, among other passages, the predictions of the Passion (Mark 8:31, 9:30–32, 10:33–34) is part of Marcan Christology. This self-designation is inter-related with Daniel 7:13–14 in Mark 8:38, 13:26, and 14:62. The recent survey of the ‘Son of Man debate’ by D. Burkett demonstrated that “we cannot speak of a unified ‘Son of man’ tradition in ancient Judaism”, having observed that, apart from *1 Enoch* 37–71, messianic interpretations of Dan 7:13 are mainly attested in later post-70 CE apocalyptic and rabbinic texts.¹⁴⁰ Qumran literature does not add substantial evidence to this debate.¹⁴¹ It thereby appears likely that this part of Marcan and, beyond that, Synoptic Christology reflects theological concerns and developments *sui generis* within emerging Christianity.

4.3. *Messianism and Q*

It has been argued that the titular designation χριστός as a messianic title is absent from the Sayings source Q,¹⁴² and we have critically surveyed the influential hypothesis about an archaic collection of sapiential

¹³⁹ Boring, *Mark*, 248–57 surveys ‘Christ’, ‘Son of God’, ‘Son of Man’, ‘Lord’, ‘Suffering Servant’, ‘Teacher’, ‘Prophet’, ‘Shepherd’, ‘Holy One of God’, ‘Bridegroom’, ‘King of the Jews/Israel’, ‘Son of David’, ‘the Coming One’, and ‘the Mightier One’ as titles, designations and images of Marcan Christology, but only a smaller part of these designations can be meaningfully drawn into comparative traditio-historical discussion of messianism.

¹⁴⁰ Burkett, *The Son of Man Debate*, 22–120 at 120.

¹⁴¹ See my argument against the hypothesis about 4Q246 by Kuhn, “The ‘One like a Son of Man’ Becomes the ‘Son of God,’” 22–42 in section 3.2.1.1 above.

¹⁴² Miller, “The Problems of the Origins of a Messianic Conception of Jesus,” 310.

sayings in Q (chapter 1, section 2; chapter three, section 4). However, one of the key passages of recent comparative attention between New Testament and Dead Sea Scrolls (4Q521 2 II + 4) with regard to intertextual horizons of messianic expectation makes part of Q: Q 7:18–23. Q 7:19 comprises the question of John the Baptist whether Jesus is ‘the one who is to come,’ ὁ ἐρχόμενος, “or shall we look for another?” (RSV); a messianically loaded question, as the context of the passage indicates. This passage with its Lucan and Matthean adaptations has been extensively discussed in connection with the subject of resurrection (chapter four, section 5.1.5). It should be noted here that Matthew 11:2–6 incorporates this Q material with the introductory words that “John heard in prison about the deeds of the Christ,” τὰ ἔργα τοῦ Χριστοῦ (Matt 11:2, RSV). The Greek terms have also been translated as “the works of the Messiah”.¹⁴³ Even though the titular designation χριστός is absent from Q, the designation ὁ ἐρχόμενος in Q 7:19 has clear messianic overtones (cf. Mark 11:9) and is eschatological in orientation, as reference to works of the Messiah further indicates, among which the raising of the dead (Q 7:22) that is paralleled in 4Q521 2 II+4. This messianic passage in Q has its place among various other eschatological passages in Q (cf. chapter three, section 4.2).

4.4. *Messianism and Matthew*

The first two chapters of the Gospel of Matthew contrast the humble circumstances of Jesus’ descent from David to political weariness and oppressive rage against messianic pretenders on the part of king Herod with the aid of the Jerusalemite establishment. The ‘book of the genealogy of Jesus Christ’ in Matthew 1:1–17 refers to Jesus as “the son of David” from the outset (Matt 1:1). According to Matthew 1:20, an angel of the Lord addresses Joseph in a dream vision as ‘son of David’. In Matt 2:4–6, the assembled chief priests and scribes point to Micah 5:2 as proof-text for the idea that ‘the Christ’ was to be born in Bethlehem, analogously with David’s own descent (1 Sam 17:12).

Works of healing and prophetic inspiration for proclamation of justice, underlined by a quotation from Isa 42:1–4, are the features that made people wonder whether Jesus could be “the Son of David” (Matt

¹⁴³ Hagner, *Matthew 1–13*, 300; cf. Collins, “The Works of the Messiah,” 98–112.

12:15–23). These features partly parallel the ‘works of the Messiah’ enumerated in the Q passage incorporated in Matthew 11:2–6.

These Matthean features provide further elements of Christological reorientation of the designation ‘Son of David’, as compared to the Gospel of Mark. Matt 11:2–6 and 12:15–23 focus on a prophetically inspired understanding of works of the Messiah, partly paralleled by 4Q521 2 II+4. The Matthean narrative subverts the presupposition on the part of Herod *cum suis* of suppressing any idea of the Christ as ‘Son of David’ through political control and oppression (Matt 2), while challenging the view that the Christ can only be of Davidic descent attributed to the Pharisees (Matt 22:41–46). The issue of Davidic descent of the Messiah is also underlined by *Ps.Sol.* 17:21 and a number of Qumran texts, 4QpIsa^a, 4Q285 5 // 11Q14 1 I, even though this is not the exclusive focus of Qumran messianic texts. The politically charged atmosphere in Jerusalem with its concerns against upheavals (cf. e.g. Acts 5:34–37; Josephus, *J.W.* 1.648–655 and *Ant.* 18.1–10, 20.97–98) perhaps brought this issue of messianic identity to the fore to the well-nigh exclusion of other features of messianic beliefs.

4.5. *Messianism and Luke*

Lucan special materials and narrative incorporation of Jesus-traditions add several features of messianism. The Lucan Nativity narrative (Luke 1:5–2:40) comprises angelic as well as revelatory announcements about Jesus’ envisioned messianic role. The announcement of Jesus’ birth by the angel Gabriel to Mary (Luke 1:26–38) describes Jesus in the following messianic terms:

He will be great, and will be called the Son of the Most High; and the Lord God will give to him the throne of his father David, and he will reign over the house of Jacob for ever; and of his kingdom there will be no end (Luke 1:32–33, RSV)

The Holy Spirit will come upon you, and the power of the Most High will overshadow you; therefore the child to be born will be called holy, the Son of God (Luke 1:35, RSV)

The titular designations ‘Son of the Most High’ and ‘Son of God’, paralleled in the earliest written Gospel, Mark 5:7 and 3:11, also have a traditio-historical background in messianic expectation as expressed by the non-sectarian text 4Q246 II 1. The emphasis on an eternal kingdom

related to God and the Son of God may stand at the receiving end of Danielic tradition (Dan 7:14.27) to which 4Q246 attests in an analogous way, envisioning that “His kingdom will be an eternal kingdom (מלכות עלם)” (4Q246 II 5).

Another, revelatory announcement about Jesus’ messianic identity is situated at the time for “purification according to the law of Moses” in Jerusalem (Luke 2:22, RSV) and attributed to a Jerusalemite man “whose name was Simeon, and this man was righteous and devout, looking for the consolation of Israel, and the Holy Spirit was upon him” (Luke 2:25, RSV). According to Luke 2:26, Simeon had received revelation from the Holy Spirit that he would see “the Lord’s Christ,” ὁ χριστὸς κυρίου, before his death. This messianic designation is closely paralleled by *Ps.Sol.* 17:32 (cf. section 3.1 above). The mentioning of משיחו, ‘his anointed one’, in line 1 of 4Q521 2 II+4 in a setting of several references to the Lord, אדני (4Q521 2 II+4 3–5, 11), implies the same titular designation. Qumran sectarian texts omit such references, probably because the tetragrammaton was an object of unspeakable reverence within the Qumran community and its parent movement (CD-A XV 1–3; cf. Josephus, *J.W.* 2.135.145).

Luke 2:28–35 narrates Simeon’s eulogy, associating Jesus as the Lord’s Christ with God’s

salvation (τὸ σωτήριόν σου) which thou hast prepared in the presence of all peoples, a light for revelation to the Gentiles and for glory to thy people Israel (Luke 2:30–32, RSV)

Echoes from the book of Isaiah, Isa 49:6, 49:9, 46:13, 60:1.19, have been discerned in this vision of Jesus’ salvific messianic role.¹⁴⁴ This vision is without a clear parallel in Qumran literature, even though 4Q246 presupposes the messianic role of causing every province to pay homage to God (4Q246 II 7). 4Q228 (*4QWork with Citation of Jubilees*) 2 2 refers to ‘light among the nati[ons]’, אור בגו[ים], albeit in a very fragmentary context of which further details appear beyond the bounds of reconstruction. 4Q521 2 II + 4 1–2, 7 + 5 II 1–3 provide general cosmic settings for the articulation of beliefs about the Lord’s anointed one and resurrection.

The more pronounced attention for Gentiles on the one hand and Israel on the other in the Lucan salvation-historical perspective (Luke

¹⁴⁴ Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, 148.

2:30–32) appears to reflect the orientation of emerging Christianity with its gospel mission to Jews and Gentiles. Luke 2:34–35, the darker side of Simeon's revelation, further reflects developments *sui generis* of Christology about Jesus as a sign that is opposed, σημεῖον ἀντιλεγόμενον, in light of his rejection and Passion as well as divided reactions to the gospel:

Behold, this child is set for the fall and rising of many in Israel, and for a sign that is spoken against (and a sword will pierce through your own soul also), that thoughts out of many hearts may be revealed. (Luke 2:34–35)

Luke 4:16–30 narrates Jesus' messianic proclamation of good news in the synagogue of Nazareth and his rejection there. According to Luke 4:16–21, after having read from the book of Isaiah, of which LXX Isa 61:1, 58:6, and 61:2 are quoted, Jesus holds this Isaian anointment by the Spirit as fulfilled in his audience's hearing (Luke 4:21, RSV). 4Q521 2 II + 4 further applies words of Isaiah 61:1 to the description of a prophetically inspired messianic figure and affirms the idea that those who hope may encounter the Lord in the divine workings mediated through the messianic figure. The messianic self-designation of Jesus in Luke 4:16–21 thereby stands in a contemporary Palestinian Jewish context of messianic ideas that further plays in the background to Q 7:18–23.

Luke 24:13–35 comprises the Lucan tradition about two men on the road to Emmaus who reflect back on convictions and expectations about Jesus as “a prophet mighty in deed and word before God and all the people” (Luke 24:19, RSV) and as object of hope that “he was the one to redeem Israel (ὁ μέλλων λυτροῦσθαι τὸν Ἰσραήλ)” (Luke 24:21, RSV). The latter designation has a close parallel in 4Q174 1 I 21 2 line 13 that envisions the raising of the fallen ‘booth of David’ in the latter days “in order to save Israel,” לְהוֹשִׁיעַ אֶת יִשְׂרָאֵל.¹⁴⁵

Christology that relates Christ's suffering and Passion to the scriptures in Luke 24:26.44–46 has no clear parallel in early Jewish messianism and represents Jesus-tradition, beliefs and theological elaborations within emerging Christianity.

¹⁴⁵ Text and translation from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*. 1, 352–3. Cf. BDAG, ³2000, 606 on the meaning of λυτρόω as “to liberate from an oppressive situation” in Luke 24:21.

4.6. *Messianic Proclamation of Jesus' Gospel in Acts*

The Book of Acts recurrently voices the idea that early gospel mission was an undertaking of messianic proclamation of Jesus as 'the Christ' in Judaea (Acts 5:42), in Samaria (Acts 8:5), in Damascus (Acts 9:22), and in the Greek-speaking Diaspora, for instance in Macedonia (Acts 18:5). This titular usage of the term ὁ χριστός presupposes pre-Christian Jewish ideas or expectations of an anointed one, a messiah. A Palestinian-Jewish setting of messianic ideas is expressed in Acts 1:6 through the disciples' question about restoration of the kingdom as preached by Jesus in Israel (cf. chapter three, section 10.2.1, on Acts 1:6–8). Ideas about the kingdom of God (Acts 1:3) centre around Israel from the point of view of the early Palestinian Jesus-movement, as the question in Acts 1:6 presupposes.

The narrative of Acts turns to messianic proclamation in a setting that addresses Gentile God-fearers and proselytes. The narrative setting of the conversion of the centurion Cornelius (Acts 10:1–48) marks a major shift in this direction. Peter's speech Acts 10:34–43 refers to Jesus' messianic authority as follows in Acts 10:38, addressing Cornelius' recognition "how God anointed (ἔχρισεν) Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Spirit and with power; how he went about doing good and healing all that were oppressed by the devil, for God was with him". In a setting of messianic proclamation to Gentiles, Jesus' anointment with the Spirit and with power was further underlined, reflecting prophetic tradition (Isaiah 61:1) and messianic ideas as represented by 11QMelchizedek II 18.

Another instance of gospel mission in a Gentile setting that still reflects a point of analogy with Palestinian Jewish strands of messianic thought could be the reference to 'judgement of the world in righteousness' by a person appointed by God at the end of the Areopagus speech (Acts 17:22–31 at v. 31). Judgement 'of the world in righteousness' by a messianic figure is paralleled by Isaiah 11:3–5, 1QSb V 21–22, and 4QpIsa^a 8–10 13–16. The messianic text 4Q246 II 5–6 further mentions judgement of the earth and peace.

Apart from points of analogy with early Jewish messianism, the book of Acts presents many biblical passages as prooftexts for Christology *sui generis* in terms of belief in Jesus as exalted Lord and Christ (e.g. Acts 2:34–36, with citation of Ps 110:1). Psalm 2:1–2, that is cited in Acts 4:25–27 and interpreted with reference to plotting against Jesus on the

part of Jewish and Roman rulers in Acts 4:27–28, receives an entirely different interpretation in 4Q174 1 I 21, 2, lines 18–19 with reference to plotting against “the elect ones of Israel in the last days.”¹⁴⁶

4.7. *Messianism and John*

The Fourth Gospel explicitly relates the Semitic background of the Greek term *χριστός* as translation of *ὁ Μεσσίας* (משיח, John 1:41). John 1:43–51 subsequently describes perceptions about the Messiah on the part of the disciples concerning Jesus as the one “of whom Moses in the law and also the prophets wrote” (John 1:45, RSV), as “the Son of God,” and “the King of Israel” (John 1:49). These Johannine references partly parallel Synoptic tradition. The designation ‘king of Israel’ is paralleled by Qumran evidence of royal messianic figures, in particular by 4Q252 V that mentions Israel’s dominion through rulership on the throne of David (4Q252 V 1–2). 4Q252 V 3–4 explicitly states that to the ‘messiah of righteousness, the branch of David’ with his descendants “has been given the covenant of the kingship of his people for everlasting generations.”¹⁴⁷

Apart from Johannine passages on beliefs of Jesus’ Palestinian followers about his messianic identity that have general points of analogy with Qumran literature,¹⁴⁸ many Johannine designations of Jesus, such as ‘the Lamb of God,’ ‘the good shepherd,’ ‘the bread of life,’ ‘the true vine,’ represent strands of distinctly Johannine Christology.

4.8. *The Apocalypse*

The Apocalypse comprises a few designations of Jesus Christ that may reflect elaboration on earlier messianic tradition. For instance, Rev 5:1–5 attributes revelatory authority of opening a scroll in heaven with seven seals to “the Lion of the tribe of Judah, the Root of David” (Rev 5:5, RSV). These designations echo biblical imagery from Genesis 49:9–10

¹⁴⁶ Translation from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*. 1, 355.

¹⁴⁷ Translation from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *ibidem*, 505.

¹⁴⁸ Cf. Neufeld, “Aspects of Johannine Messianism,” 120–40 who surveys messianic evidence in John 1:19–34, 1:35–52, 3:22–36, 4:1–42, 6:22–65, 7:1–13.14–52, 9:1–41, 11:1–44, 11:55–12:11, with a comparative view to Qumran literature.

and Isaiah 11:1 and their early Jewish interpretation history, as reflected in, for instance, 4QpIsa^a 8–10 and 4Q285 5 // 11Q14 1 I with regard to Isaiah 11:1 and 4Q252 V with regard to Genesis 49:10. In Rev 11:15, the seventh trumpet blown by an angel in heaven heralds the everlasting kingdom as follows: “The kingdom of the world has become the kingdom of our Lord and of his Christ (τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν καὶ τοῦ χριστοῦ αὐτοῦ), and he shall reign for ever and ever.” (RSV) This passage comprises titular usage of the term χριστός. The reference to the Lord and his anointed is paralleled by Ps 2:2 and *Ps.Sol.* 17:32, and has a point of analogy in 4Q521 2 II + 4 1. Rev 12:10 presents a comparable case of reference to ‘our God’ and ‘his Christ’, where χριστός likewise reflects titular messianic usage.

5. EVALUATION

The semi-complete evidence of the Dead Sea Scrolls yields several biblical, non-canonical, non-sectarian and sectarian points of reference for the study of pre-70 CE Palestinian Jewish messianic ideas. As compared to a recent tendency to include many titular designations and occurrences of the term משיח among evidence of ‘Qumran messianism’, caution is due to take into account the eschatological orientation of a text as *sine qua non* for its identification as a messianic text.

Older scholarship on early Jewish messianism, such as that by S. Mowinckel (section 1.1 above), as well as recurrent presuppositions in New Testament scholarship about a contrast between early Jewish political expectations of a messiah and Jesus’ messianic identity,¹⁴⁹ have maintained a predominantly political, nationalistic characterization of early Jewish messianism.¹⁵⁰ The variegated evidence of Qumran messianic texts, both sectarian and non-sectarian, does not exclusively focus on messianic roles of royal and military leadership (e.g. 1QSa, 4QpIsa^a, 4Q246, 4Q285 5 // 11Q14). Priestly origins of Qumran mes-

¹⁴⁹ See e.g. Smith, “The Function of the Son of David Tradition in Mark’s Gospel,” 523–39 at 539 argues for the “distinction between the political view of messiahship expressed by the Jerusalem scribes, and the ethical view represented by the Markan Jesus,” presupposing “the political perspective held in such esteem in early and rabbinic Judaism”.

¹⁵⁰ Cf. Barrett, *Acts 1–14*, 76 who observes a ‘Jewish interest’ in the question of Acts 1:6, while arguing that “Luke uses the question to underline the non-nationalist character of the Christian movement”.

sianic expectation are reflected in 4Q541, the *Damascus Document* and the *Community Rule*. Apart from this, prophetic roles of working divine miracles and announcing good tidings of salvation are attributed to messianic figures in the sectarian text 11Q*Melchizedek* and in the non-sectarian text 4Q521. The traditio-historical points of connection between 'works of the Messiah' in 4Q521 2 II + 4 and Q 7:18–23 indicate that Palestinian Jewish messianic beliefs before and at the time of Jesus were far more complex and interrelated with theological elaboration on prophetic tradition, social concern with justice, and eschatologically loaded hope than a political-nationalistic characterization of early Jewish messianism would suggest.

Apart from the New Testament pictures of Jewish schools and movements, early Jewish sources yield the impression that messianic beliefs were held in Pharisaic circles (*Pss.Sol.*; Pharisaic-Rabbinic tradition), among 'many wise men' in Judaea (Josephus, *J.W.* 6.313), by the Qumran community and its parent movement (CD-A, CD-B, 4QD; 1QS; 1QSa; 1QSB; 4QpIsa^a; 4Q252; 4Q174; 4Q285 5 // 11Q14 1 I; 11QMelch; possibly 4Q541 as proto-sectarian text), and non-sectarian strands of Palestinian Jewish thought reflected by Qumran texts not clearly sectarian (4Q246, 4Q521) as well as by Qumran evidence of the Psalter and non-canonical Psalms.

Both the Pauline Letters and the canonical Gospels presuppose Palestinian Jewish roots of messianic expectation as frame of reference for the early Jesus-movement. The Messianic identity of Jesus Christ by descent and by scriptural and divine promise is a recurrent theme in several New Testament writings (Romans, Matthew, Luke, John) surveyed. Hitherto relatively neglected aspects in the discussion of messianism and Christian origins that have been discussed in light of Qumran literature include the comparison of Qumran evidence for Psalters with the Marcan description of Jesus' messianic entry, analysis of the designation 'the Lord's Christ' in Luke 2:26 against the background of non-sectarian strands of thought (*Pss.Sol.*; 4Q521), and interpretation of messianic judgement (Acts 17:31) in the light of biblical tradition and early Jewish evidence of messianism from Qumran.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. SOURCES

1.1. *Hebrew and Greek Bible*

- BHS *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (eds. K. Elliger, W. Rudolph, H.P. Rüger, G.E. Weil; Stuttgart: Deutsche Buchgesellschaft, 1990).
- LXX *Septuaginta. Id est Vetus Testamentum graece iuxta LXX interpretes Duo volumina in uno* (ed. A. Rahlfs; Stuttgart: Deutsche Buchgesellschaft, 1979).
- The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible. The Oldest Known Bible Translated for the First Time into English* (eds. M. Abegg, Jr., P.W. Flint, and E. Ulrich; San Francisco: Harper, 1999).
- The Jerusalem Bible, English text revised and edited by H. Fisch (Jerusalem: Koren Publishers, 1998).

1.2. *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha*

- Beentjes, P.C., *The Book of Ben Sira in Hebrew. A Text Edition of All Extant Hebrew Manuscripts and a Synopsis of all parallel Hebrew Ben Sira Texts* (VTSup 68, Leiden: Brill, 1997).
- Cowley, A. and R.H. Charles, "An Early Source of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs," *JQR* 19 (1907) 566–580.
- James, M.R., *The Biblical Antiquities of Philo* (London: SPCK, 1917).
- Knibb, M.A., *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch: A New Edition in the Light of the Aramaic Dead Sea Fragments*, 2 volumes (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978).
- Milik, J.T., "Le Testament de Lévi en araméen. Fragments de la grotte 4 de Qumrân," *RB* 62 (1955) 398–406.
- *The Books of Enoch. Aramaic Fragments from Qumrân Cave 4* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976).
- Nickelsburg, G.W.E. and J.C. VanderKam, *1 Enoch: A New Translation* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2004).
- OTP *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* 2 volumes (ed. J.H. Charlesworth, New York: Doubleday, 1983 and 1985).
- Pass, H.L. and J. Arendzen, "Fragment of an Aramaic Text of the Testament of Levi," *JQR* 12 (1900) 651–661.
- Puech, É., "Le Testament de Lévi en araméen de la Genizah du Caire," *RevQ* 20 (2002) 511–556.
- Schechter, S., "The Quotations from Ecclesiasticus in Rabbinic Literature," *JQR* 3 (1891) 682–706.
- Schechter, S., and C. Taylor, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira, Portions of the Book Ecclesiasticus from Hebrew Manuscripts in the Cairo Genizah Collection Presented to the University of Cambridge* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1899).
- Yadin, Y., *The Ben Sira Scroll from Masada* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society—the Shrine of the Book, 1965).

1.3. *Dead Sea Scrolls*

- Allegro, J.M., "Fragments of a Qumran Scroll of Eschatological Midrashim," *JBL* 77 (1958) 350–354.
- Brooke, G.J., "4Q253: A Preliminary Edition," *JSS* 40 (1995) 233–239.

- Burrows, M., *The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Marks's Monastery. 1. The Isaiah Manuscript and the Habakkuk Commentary* (New Haven: The American Schools of Oriental Research, 1950).
- Burrows, M., J.C. Trever, W.H. Brownlee, *The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery. II. Fascicle 2: Plates and Transcription of the Manual of Discipline* (New Haven: The American Schools of Oriental Research, 1951).
- Chazon, E.G. and M.E. Stone, "4QTime of Righteousness (4Q215^a, olim 4QTNaphtali): A Preliminary Publication of Fragment 1 II," *The Provo International Conference* (eds. Parry and Ulrich), 124–125.
- Cross, F.M. et al. (eds.), *Scrolls from Qumrân Cave I. The Great Isaiah Scroll, The Order of the Community, The Peshet to Habakkuk from Photographs by John C. Trever* (Jerusalem: Albright Institute of Archaeological Research and The Shrine of the Book, 1972).
- DJD 1 *Qumran Cave 1*, eds. D. Barthélemy and J.T. Milik (DJD 1, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955).
- DJD 2 *Les grottes de Murabba'at*, eds. M. Benoit, J.T. Milik, and R. de Vaux (DJD 2, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1961).
- DJD 3 *Les "Petites Grottes" de Qumrân. Exploration de la falaise. Les grottes 2Q, 3Q, 5Q, 6Q, 7Q à 10Q. Le rouleau de cuivre. 1 Texte. 2. Planches*, eds. M. Baillet, J.T. Milik, and R. de Vaux (DJD 3, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962).
- DJD 4 *The Psalms Scroll of Qumran Cave 11 (11QPs^a)*, ed. J.A. Sanders (DJD 4, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965).
- DJD 5 *Qumran Cave 4. I (4Q158–4Q186)*, ed. J.M. Allegro (DJD 5, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969).
- DJD 7 *Qumrân grotte 4. III (4Q482–4Q520)*, ed. M. Baillet (DJD 7, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982).
- DJD 8 *The Greek Minor Prophets Scroll from Nahal Hever (8HevXIIgr) (The Seiyâl Collection I)*, ed. E. Tov (DJD 8, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990; reprinted with corrections, 1995).
- DJD 9 *Qumran Cave 4. IV Palaeo-Hebrew and Greek Biblical Manuscripts*, eds. P.W. Skehan, E. Ulrich, J.E. Sanderson (DJD 9, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992).
- DJD 10 *Qumran Cave 4. V: Miqsat Ma'ase ha-Torah*, eds. E. Qimron and J. Strugnell (DJD 10, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994).
- DJD 11 *Qumran Cave 4. VI: Poetical and Liturgical Texts. Part 1*, eds. E. Eshel et al. (DJD 11, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998).
- DJD 13 *Qumran Cave 4. VIII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 1*, eds. J.C. VanderKam, J.T. Milik et al. (DJD 13, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994).
- DJD 16 *Qumran Cave 4. XI: Psalms to Chronicles*, eds. P.W. Skehan, E. Ulrich, and P. Flint (DJD 16, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000).
- DJD 18 *Qumran Cave 4. XIII: The Damascus Document (4Q266–273)*, ed. J.M. Baumgarten (DJD 18, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996).
- DJD 19 *Qumran Cave 4. XIV: Parabiblical Texts, Part 2*, eds. M. Broshi et al. (DJD 19, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995).
- DJD 20 *Qumran Cave 4. XV: Sapiential Texts, Part 1*, ed. L.H. Schiffman (DJD 20, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997).
- DJD 22 *Qumran Cave 4. XVII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 3*, eds. G.J. Brooke et al. (DJD 22, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996).
- DJD 23 *Qumran Cave 11. II: 11Q2–18, 11Q20–31*, eds. F. García Martínez, E.J.C. Tigchelaar, A.S. van der Woude (DJD 23, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998).
- DJD 25 *Qumrân grotte 4. XVIII: Textes hébreux (4Q521–4Q528, 4Q576–579)*, ed. É. Puech (DJD 25, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998).
- DJD 26 *Qumran Cave 4. XIX: 4QSerekh Ha-Yahad and Two Related Texts*, eds. P.S. Alexander and G. Vermes (DJD 26, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998).

- DJD 28 *Wadi Daliyeh II: The Samaria Papyri from Wadi Daliyeh and Qumran Cave 4. XXVIII: Miscellanea, Part 2*, eds. D.M. Gropp and M.J. Bernstein (DJD 28, Oxford Clarendon Press, 2001).
- DJD 29 *Qumran Cave 4. XX: Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part 2*, eds. E. Chazon et al. (DJD 29, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999).
- DJD 30 *Qumran Cave 4. XXI: Parabiblical Texts, Part 4: Pseudo-Prophetic Texts*, ed. D. Dimant (DJD 30, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2001).
- DJD 31 *Qumrân Grotte 4. XXII: Textes Araméens, Première partie*, ed. É. Puech (DJD 31, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2001).
- DJD 34 *Qumran Cave 4. XXIV: 4QInstruction (Mûsar lʾMevin): 4Q415 ff.*, eds. J. Strugnell, D.J. Harrington, and T. Elgvin (DJD 34, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999).
- DJD 36 *Qumran Cave 4. XXVI: Cryptic Texts and Miscellanea, part 1*, eds. S.J. Pfann et al. (DJD 36, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000).
- DJD 38 *Miscellaneous Texts from the Judaean Desert*, eds. J.H. Charlesworth et al. (DJD 38, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000).
- DJD 39 *The Texts from the Judaean Desert. Indices and Introduction to the Discoveries in the Judaean Desert Series*, eds. E. Tov et al. (DJD 39, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2002).
- Licht, J., *The Rule Scroll: A Scroll from the Wilderness of Judaea—1QS, 1QSa, 1QSb: Text, Introduction and Commentary* (Jerusalem: Bialik, 1957 [Hebrew]).
- Milgrom, J. and L. Novakovic, "Catena A (4Q177 = 4QCat*)," PTSDSSP 6B, 286–303.
- Nitzan, B., *מגילת פשר חבקוק (1QpHab)* (Jerusalem: Mosad Bialik, 1986).
- Parry, D.W. and E. Tov, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader 6 parts Part 1: Texts Concerned with Religious Law, Part 2: Exegetical Texts, Part 3: Parabiblical Texts, Part 4: Calendrical and Sapiential Texts, Part 5: Poetic and Liturgical Texts, Part 6: Additional Genres and Unclassified Texts* (Leiden: Brill, 2004–2005).
- PTSDSSP 6B: *The Dead Sea Scrolls. Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek Texts with English Translations. 6B. Pesharim, Other Commentaries, and Related Documents*, ed. J.H. Charlesworth (PTSDSSP 6B, Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck, and Louisville, Westminster John Knox, 2002).
- Qimron, E., "The Text of CDC," *The Damascus Document Reconsidered*, ed. M. Broshi (Jerusalem: the Israel Exploration Society—the Shrine of the Book, Israel Museum, 1992), 9–49.
- Schechter, S., *Documents of Jewish Sectaries. 1. Fragments of a Zadokite Work* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1910), V–LXIX, 1–20 (ed. pr. of the Damascus Document from the Cairo Genizah).
- Skehan, P.W., E. Ulrich and P. Flint, "A Scroll Containing "Biblical" and "Apocryphal" Psalms: A Preliminary Edition of 4QPs^a (4Q88)," *CBQ* 60 (1998) 267–282.
- Study Edition*: García Martínez, F., and E.J.C. Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition: Volume 1 (1Q1–4Q273)* and *Volume 2 (4Q274–11Q31)*, paperback edition (Leiden: Brill, and Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000).
- Sukenik, E.L., *אוצר המגילות הגנוזות* (Jerusalem: Mosad Bialik—the Hebrew University, 1954) = Idem, *The Dead Sea Scrolls of the Hebrew University*, Jerusalem, the Magnes Press—the Hebrew University, 1955).

1.4. Documentary and Archaeological Evidence

- Cross, F.M. and E. Eshel, "Ostraca from Khirbet Qumrân," *RevQ* 47 (1997) 17–28.
- Doudna, G., "Ostraca KhQ1 and KhQ2 from the Cemetery of Qumran: A New Edition," 37 pages, Cited 29 March 2004. Online: http://www.arts.ualberta.ca/JHS/Articles/article_35.htm.

- BE *Bulletin Épigraphique*. volumes 1 (1938/1939)–10 (1983), included in the *Revue des Études Grecques* 1 (1888).
- CII *Corpus inscriptionum iudaicarum. Recueil des inscriptions juives qui vont du III siècle avant Jésus-Christ au VII siècle de notre ère. Volume 1: Europe, Volume 2: Asie-Afrique*, ed. J.B. Frey (Rome, Pont. Inst. di Archeologia Christiana, 1936–1952).
- CPJ *Corpus Papyrorum Judaicarum*, ed. V. Tcherikover, with A. Fuks, 3 volumes (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1957–64).
- JIGRE *Jewish Inscriptions of Graeco-Roman Egypt. With an Index of Jewish Inscriptions of Egypt and Cyrenaica*, eds. W. Horbury and D. Noy (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992).
- Roth-Gerson, L., *The Greek Inscriptions from the Synagogues in Eretz Israel* (Jerusalem, 1987).
- SEG *Supplementum epigraphicum graecum*, vol. 1, 1923–..., Leiden, Sijthoff.

1.5. Josephus and Philo

- Colson, F.H. and G.H. Whitaker, *Philo. Works. 4: De confusione linguarum; De migratione Abrahami; Quis rerum divinarum heres; De congressu quaerendae eruditionis gratia* (LCL 261, London: Heinemann, 1958).
- Feldman, L.H., *Josephus XII Jewish Antiquities. Books XVIII–XIX* (LCL 433, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1965; nine-volume edition, 1998).
- *Josephus. Jewish Antiquities. Book XX. General Index* (LCL 456, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1965).
- Thackeray, H.St.J., *Josephus. 1. The Life, Against Apion* (LCL 186, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1926).
- *Josephus. The Jewish War. Books I–II* (LCL 203, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1927).

1.6. Mishnah, Talmud, and Targumim

- Danby, H., *The Mishnah* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1933).
- Maher, M., *The Aramaic Bible. 1B. Targum Pseudo-Jonathan: Genesis. Translated, with Introduction and Notes* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1992).
- Schäfer, P. and H.-J. Becker, *Synopse zum Talmud Yerushalmi. IV. Ordnung Neziqin. Ordnung Toharot: Nidda* (TSAJ 47, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1995).

1.7. Greek and Latin Literature

- Den Boer, W., *Scriptorum paganorum I–IV saec. de Christianis testimonia* (Textus Minores 2, Leiden: Brill, 1965).
- SVF *Stoicorum veterum fragmenta*, ed. H. von Arnim, 4 volumes (Leipzig and Stuttgart: Teubner, 1903–1924).

1.8. New Testament

- Boismard, M.-É., *Le Texte occidental des Actes des Apôtres Édition nouvelle entièrement refondue* (ÉBib 40, Paris, Gabalda, 2000).
- NA²⁷ *Novum Testamentum Graece*, eds. E. and E. Nestle, B. and K. Aland, J. Karavidopoulos, C.M. Martini, and B.M. Metzger (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 271993).

1.9. *New Testament Apocrypha*

- Kraus, T.J. and T. Nicklas (eds.), *Das Petrus-evangelium und die Petrusapokalypse: Die griechischen Fragmente mit deutscher und englischer Übersetzung* (GCS NF 11; Neutestamentliche Apokryphen 1, Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2004).
- Layton, B. (ed.), *Nag Hammadi Codex II, 2–7. Together with XIII, 2*, Brit. Lib. Or. 4926(1), and P. Oxy. 1, 654, 655 volume 1 Gospel According to Thomas, Gospel According to Philip, Hypostasis of the Archons, and Indexes* (NHS 20, Leiden: Brill, 1989).
- NTA *New Testament Apocrypha*, ed. W. Schneemelcher, 2 volumes (English translation edited by R. McL. Wilson, Cambridge: Clarke, and Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1991 and 1992).
- Lührmann, D., *Fragmente apokryph gewordener Evangelien in griechischer und lateinischer Sprache* (MTSt 59, Marburg: Elwert, 2000), 84–93 (Gospel of Peter).
- Mara, M.G., *Évangile de Pierre. Introduction, texte critique, traduction, commentaire et index* (SC 201, Paris: Cerf, 1973).

2. TOOLS AND REFERENCE WORKS

- ABD *Anchor Bible Dictionary*, ed. D.N. Freedman *et al.*, 6 volumes (New York: Doubleday, 1992).
- Abegg, M.G., Jr., J.E. Bowley, and E.M. Cook, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Concordance. 1. The Non-Biblical Texts from Qumran* (Leiden: Brill, 2003).
- ANRW *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt: Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung*, ed. H. Temporini and W. Haase (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1972–).
- BDAG, ³2000: Bauer, W., F.W. Danker, W.F. Arndt, and F.W. Gingrich, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (Chicago: University Press, ³2000).
- BDR Blass, F., A. Debrunner, F. Rehkopf, *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, ¹⁷1990).
- CHJ III *The Cambridge History of Judaism III The Early Roman Period*, eds. W. Horbury, W.D. Davies, and J. Sturdy (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999).
- CHJ IV *The Cambridge History of Judaism IV The Late Roman-Rabbinic Period*, ed. S.T. Katz (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 2006).
- DSSAFY: *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*, eds. P.W. Flint and J.C. VanderKam, 2 volumes (Leiden: Brill, 1998–1999).
- DSSFYR: *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research*, eds. D. Dimant and U. Rappaport (STDJ 10, Leiden: Brill, 1992).
- EDSS *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, eds. L.H. Schiffman and J.C. VanderKam, 2 volumes (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000).
- EncJud *Encyclopedia Judaica*. 16 volumes (Jerusalem: Keter Publishing House, 1972).
- GKC *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, ed. E. Kautsch, translation by A.E. Cowley, second edition (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1910).
- HRCS, ²1998: Hatch, E. and H.A. Redpath, *A Concordance to the Septuagint. And the Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament (Including the Apocryphal Books)*, first edition Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1897–1906; second edition, with “Introductory Essay” by R.A. Kraft and E. Tov and “Hebrew/Aramaic Index to the Septuagint” by T. Muraoka (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, ²1998).
- Jastrow: Jastrow, M., *A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli, and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature* (New York: The Judaica Press, ²1903).

- KBL Koehler, L. and W. Baumgartner, *Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti libros* (Leiden: Brill, 1958).
- Lust, J., E. Eynikel, K. Hauspie, *Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint Revised Edition* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2003).
- QONT *Qumran between the Old and New Testaments*, eds. F.H. Cryer and T.L. Thompson (JSOTSup 290; Copenhagen International Seminar 6, Sheffield: Academic Press, 1998).
- Rengstorff, K.H., *A Complete Concordance to Flavius Josephus. Study Edition*, first published 1972–1975, 2 volumes (Leiden: Brill, 2002).
- Schürer, *History*: Schürer, E., *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 BC–AD 135)*, A New English Version based on the German edition *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*, 1885–1924, revised edition by G. Vermes, F. Millar, M. Black, M. Goodman, volumes I–III.2 (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1973–1987).
- Smyth, H.W., *Greek Grammar* (1920 edition revised by G.M. Messing in 1956, Harvard University Press, 1984).

3. MONOGRAPHS AND ARTICLES

- Abegg, M.G. and C.A. Evans, “Messianic Passages in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” *Qumran-Messianism* (eds. Charlesworth, Lichtenberger and Oegema), 191–203.
- Adams, E., “The Coming Son of Man in Mark’s Gospel,” *TynBul* 56 (2005) 39–61.
- Agbanou, V.K., *Le discours eschatologique de Matthieu 24–25: Tradition et rédaction* (EBib n.s. 2, Paris: Gabalda, 1983).
- Albani, M., “Horoscopes in the Qumran Scrolls,” *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years. 2* (eds. Flint and VanderKam), 279–330.
- Albinus, L., *The House of Hades. Studies in Ancient Greek Eschatology* (Studies in Religion 2, Aarhus: Aarhus University Press, 2000).
- Alexander, P.S., “The Redaction-History of Serekh ha-Yahad: A Proposal,” *RevQ* 17 (1996) 437–456.
- “The Enochic Literature and the Bible: Intertextuality and Its Implications,” *The Bible as Book* (eds. Herbert and Tov), 57–69.
- “The Evil Empire: The Qumran Eschatological War Cycle and the Origins of Jewish Opposition to Rome,” *Emanuel* (eds. Paul et al.), 17–31.
- *The Mystical Texts: Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice and Related Manuscripts* (CQS 7, Library of Second Temple Studies 61, London: T&T Clark, 2006).
- Alison, J., “An Arboreal Sign of the End-Time (4Q385 2),” *JJS* 47 (1996) 337–44.
- Allison, Jr., D.C., *The End of the Ages Has Come: An Early Interpretation of the Passion and Resurrection of Jesus* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1985).
- “A Plea for Thoroughgoing Eschatology,” *JBL* 113 (1994) 651–68.
- *The Jesus Tradition in Q* (Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 1997).
- “The Eschatology of Jesus,” *The Encyclopedia of Apocalypticism. I* (ed. Collins), 267–302.
- Alsop, J.E., *The Post-Resurrection Appearance Stories of the Gospel Tradition. A History-of-tradition Analysis With Text-Synopsis* (Calwer Theologische Monographien 5, Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1975).
- Arzt-Grabner, P., R.E. Kritzer, A. Papatomas, F. Winter, *1. Korinter* (PKNT 2, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2006).
- Asgeirsson, J.Ma., A.D. DeConick, and R. Uro (eds.), *Thomasine Traditions in Antiquity. The Social and Cultural World of the Gospel of Thomas* (NHMS 59, Leiden: Brill, 2006).
- Aune, D.E., “Eschatology (Early Christian),” in *ABD 2 D–G*, 594–609.
- “Assessing the Historical Value of the Apocryphal Jesus Traditions. A Critique of Conflicting Methodologies,” *Der historische Jesus* (eds. Schröter and Brucker), 243–72.

- Avemarie, F. and H. Lichtenberger (eds.), *Auferstehung—Resurrection* (WUNT 135, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001).
- Avery-Peck, A.J. and J. Neusner (eds.), *Judaism in Late Antiquity. 4. Death, Life-after-death, Resurrection and the World-to-come in the Judaism of Antiquity* (HO I/49, Leiden: Brill, 2000).
- “Death and Afterlife in the Early Rabbinic Sources: The Mishnah, Tosefta, and Early Midrash Compilations,” *Judaism in Late Antiquity. 4* (eds. Idem and Neusner), 243–266.
- Avery-Peck, A.J., J. Neusner, and B.D. Chilton (eds.), *Judaism in Late Antiquity. V. The Judaism of Qumran: A Systemic Reading of the Dead Sea Scrolls. 2. World View, Comparing Judaism* (HO I/56, Leiden: Brill, 2001).
- Avigad, N., “The Palaeography of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Documents,” *ScrHier IV* (1965) 56–87.
- Baarda, T., H.J. de Jonge, and M.J.J. Menken (eds.), *Jodendom en vroeg christendom: continuïteit en discontinuïteit* (Kampen: Kok, 1991).
- Bachmann, M. (ed.), *Lutherische und Neue Paulusperspektive. Beiträge zu einem Schlüsselproblem der gegenwärtigen exegetischen Diskussion* (WUNT 182, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005).
- Balch, D.L. (ed.), *Social History of the Matthean Community: Cross-Disciplinary Approaches* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991).
- Bar-Adon, P., “Another Settlement of the Judaeen Desert Sect at En el-Ghuweir on the Shores of the Dead Sea,” *BASOR* 237 (1977) 1–25.
- Bardet, S., *Le Testimonium Flavianum. Examen historique, considerations historiographiques* (Collection «Joseph et son temps» 5, Paris: Cerf, 2002).
- Barr, J., *The Garden of Eden and the Hope of Immortality. The Read-Tuckwell Lectures for 1990* (London: SCM, 1992).
- “Immortality and Resurrection: Conflict and Complementarity?,” in Idem, *The Garden of Eden and the Hope of Immortality*, 94–116, 138–40.
- Barrett, C.K., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles. 1. Preliminary Introduction and Commentary on Acts I–XIV* (ICC, London: T&T Clark—Continuum, 1994).
- *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles. 2. Introduction and Commentary on Acts XV–XXVIII* (ICC, Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998).
- Barton, J. and C. Rowland (eds.), *Apocalyptic in History and Tradition* (JSPSup 43, Sheffield: Academic Press, 2002).
- Bartsch, H.-W., “Early Christian Eschatology in the Synoptic Gospels (A Contribution to Form-Critical Research,” *NTS* 11 (1965) 387–97.
- Bauckham, R.J. (ed.), *The Book of Acts in Its First Century Setting. 4. The Book of Acts in Its Palestinian Setting* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, and Carlisle: Paternoster, 1995).
- Bauer, W., *Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei im ältesten Christentum* (BHT 10, Tübingen: Mohr, 1934).
- Baumgarten, A.I., “Rabbinic Literature as a Source for the History of Jewish Sectarianism in the Second Temple Period,” *DSD* 2 (1995) 14–57.
- “The Perception of the Past in the Damascus Document,” *The Damascus Document. A Centennial of Discovery* (eds. J.M. Baumgarten et al.), 1–15.
- Baumgarten, J.M., “Sadducean Elements in Qumran Law,” *The Community of the Renewed Covenant* (eds. Ulrich and VanderKam), 27–36.
- “Messianic Forgiveness of Sin in CD 14:9 (4Q266 10 I 12–13),” *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (eds. Parry and Ulrich), 537–44.
- “Tannaitic Halakha and Qumran: A Re-Evaluation,” *Rabbinic Perspectives* (eds. Fraade, Shemesh, and Clements), 1–11.
- Baumgarten, J.M., E.G. Chazon, A. Pinnick (eds.), *The Damascus Document. A Centennial of Discovery* (STDJ 34, Leiden: Brill, 2000).

- Beall, T.S., "History and Eschatology at Qumran: Messiah," *Judaism in Late Antiquity*. V. 2. (ed. A.J. Avery-Peck, J. Neusner, and B.D. Chilton), 125–46.
- Beasley-Murray, G.R., *Jesus and the Last Days: The Interpretation of the Olivet Discourse* Combined updated and revised edition of *Jesus and the Future*, 1954, and *A Commentary on Mark Thirteen*, 1962 (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1993).
- *John* (WBC 36, Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 2000).
- Becker, E.-M., "Markus 13 Re-Visited," *Apokalyptik als Herausforderung neutestamentlicher Theologie* (eds. Becker and Öhler), 95–124.
- Becker, J., *Das Heil Gottes: Heils- und Sündenbegriffe in den Qumrantexten und im Neuen Testament* (SUNT 3, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1964).
- Becker, M. and W. Fenske (eds.), *Das Ende der Tage und die Gegenwart des Heils. Begegnungen mit dem Neuen Testament und seiner Umwelt* (FS H.-W. Kuhn, AGJU 44, Leiden: Brill, 1999).
- Becker, M. and M. Öhler (eds.), *Apokalyptik als Herausforderung neutestamentlicher Theologie* (WUNT II/214, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006).
- Beckwith, R.T., "The Pre-History and Relationships of the Pharisees, Sadducees and Essenes: A Tentative Reconstruction," *RevQ* 11 (1982) 3–46.
- Becking, B., "Expectations about the End of Time in the Hebrew Bible: Do They Exist?," *Apocalyptic in History and Tradition* (eds. Barton and Rowland), 44–59.
- *Between Fear and Freedom. Essays on the Interpretation of Jeremiah 30–31* (OTS 51, Leiden: Brill, 2004).
- Bergmeier, R., *Die Essener-Berichte des Flavius Josephus. Quellenstudien zu den Essener-texten im Werk des jüdischen Historiographen* (Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1993).
- "Die drei jüdischen Schulrichtungen nach Josephus und Hippolyt von Rom. Zu den Paralleltextrn Josephus, B.J. 2,119–166 und Hippolyt, Haer. IX 18,2–29,4," *JSJ* 34 (2003) 443–70.
- Bernstein, M., "Walking in the Festivals of the Gentiles: 4QpHosea^a 2:15–17 and Jubilees 6:34–38," *JSP* 9 (1991) 21–31.
- Bernstein, M., F. García Martínez, and J. Kampen (eds.), *Legal Texts and Legal Issues* (STDJ 23, Leiden: Brill, 1997).
- Berrin, S.L., *The Peshar Nahum Scroll from Qumran. An Exegetical Study of 4Q169* (STDJ 53, Leiden: Brill, 2004).
- Betz, H.D., *Hellenismus und Urchristentum. Gesammelte Aufsätze I* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1990).
- "Zum Problem der Auferstehung Jesu im Lichte der griechischen magischen Papyri," in Idem, *Hellenismus und Urchristentum*, 230–61.
- Betz, O. et al. (eds.), *Josephus-Studien. Untersuchungen zu Josephus, dem antiken Judentum und dem Neuen Testament* (FS O. Michel, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1974).
- Bieringer, R., V. Koperski, and B. Lataire (eds.), *Resurrection in the New Testament* (FS J. Lambrecht; BETL 165, Leuven: Leuven University Press—Peeters, 2002).
- Bitzer, L.F., "The Rhetorical Situation," *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 1 (1968) 1–14.
- Blank, J., *Krisis. Untersuchungen zur johanneischen Christologie und Eschatologie* (Freiburg: Herder, 1964).
- Blenkinsopp, J., *Opening the Sealed Book: Interpretations of the Book of Isaiah in Late Antiquity* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006).
- Boccaccini, G., *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis. The Parting of the Ways between Qumran and Enochic Judaism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998).
- (ed.), *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005).
- Bockmuehl, M. (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Jesus* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001).
- "Resurrection," in Idem (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Jesus*, 102–18.

- Boda, M.J., "Figuring the Future: The Prophets and Messiah," *The Messiah in the Old and New Testaments* (ed. Porter), 35–74.
- Boer, M.C. de, *The Defeat of Death: Apocalyptic Eschatology in 1 Corinthians 15 and Romans 5* (JSNTSup 22, Sheffield, JSOT, 1988).
- "Paul and Jewish Apocalyptic Eschatology," *Apocalyptic and the New Testament* (eds. Marcus and Soards), 169–90.
- "Paul and Apocalyptic Eschatology," *The Encyclopedia of Apocalypticism. 1* (ed. Collins), 345–83.
- Böttrich, C. (ed.), *Eschatologie und Ethik im frühen Christentum* (FS G. Haufe, Greifswalder theologische Forschungen 11, Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2006).
- "Das Gleichnis vom Dieb in der Nacht. Parusieerwartung und Paränese," in Idem (ed.), *Eschatologie und Ethik im frühen Christentum*, 31–57.
- Borg, M., "A Temperate Case for a Non-Eschatological Jesus," *Forum* 2 (1986) 81–102; reprinted in Idem, *Jesus in Contemporary Scholarship*, 47–68.
- *Jesus in Contemporary Scholarship* (Valley Forge: Trinity Press International, 1994).
- "Jesus and Eschatology: Current Reflections," in Idem, *Jesus in Contemporary Scholarship*, 69–96.
- Boring, M.E., *Mark: A Commentary* (The New Testament Library, Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2006).
- Bornkamm, G., G. Barth and H.J. Held (eds.), *Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew* (London: SCM, 1963).
- "End-Expectation and Church in Matthew," *Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew* (eds. Bornkamm, Barth and Held), 15–51.
- Botermann, H., *Das Judenedikt des Kaisers Claudius: römischer Staat und Christiani in 1. Jahrhundert* (Hermeneus: Zeitschrift für klassische Philologie. Einzelschriften 71, Stuttgart: Steiner, 1996).
- Brady, M., "Biblical Interpretation in the 'Pseudo-Ezekiel' Fragments (4Q383–391) from Cave Four," *Biblical Interpretation at Qumran* (ed. Henze), 88–109.
- Brandenburger, E., *Markus 13 und die Apokalypitik* (FRLANT 134, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984).
- Breytenbach, C. (ed.), *Paulus, die Evangelien und das Urchristentum* (FS W. Schmithals, AGJU 54, Leiden: Brill, 2004).
- Breytenbach, C. and J. Schröter (eds.), *Die Apostelgeschichte und die hellenistische Geschichtsschreibung* (FS E. Plümacher; AJEC/AGJU 57, Leiden: Brill, 2004).
- Bridge, S.L., *Where the Eagles are Gathered: The Deliverance of the Elect in Lukan Eschatology* (JSNTSup 240, Sheffield: Academic Press, 2003).
- Broadhead, E., "The Extent of the Sayings Tradition (Q)," *The Sayings Source Q and the Historical Jesus* (ed. Lindemann), 719–728.
- Broer, I., "Redaktionsgeschichtliche Aspekte von Mt. 24:1–28," *NovT* 35 (1993) 209–33.
- Brooke, G.J., "The Explicit Presentation of Scripture in 4QMMT," *Legal Texts and Legal Issues* (eds. Bernstein, Garcia Martínez, and Kampen), 67–88.
- "Shared Intertextual Interpretations in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament," *Biblical Perspectives* (eds. Stone and Chazon), 35–57. Reprinted in Brooke, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament*, 70–94.
- "Miqdash Adam, Eden and the Qumran Community," *Gemeinde ohne Tempel* (eds. Ego, Lange, and Pilhofer), 285–301.
- "Rewritten Bible," in *EDSS* 2, 777–81.
- "The Psalms in Early Jewish Literature in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls," *The Psalms in the New Testament* (eds. Moyise and Menken), 5–24.
- *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2005).
- "The Twelve Minor Prophets and the Dead Sea Scrolls," *Congress Volume Leiden 2004* (ed. Lemaire), 19–43.

- “The Structure of 1QH^a XII 5–XIII 4 and the Meaning of Resurrection,” *From 4QMMT to Resurrection* (eds. García Martínez, Steudel, and Tigchelaar), 15–33.
- Broshi, M., “The Archaeology of Palestine 63 BCE–CE 70,” *CHJ* III (eds. Horbury, Davies, and Sturdy), 1–37.
- Brown, J.K., *The Disciples in Narrative Perspective: The Portrayal and Function of the Matthean Disciples* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2002).
- “Direct Engagement of the Reader in Matthew’s Discourses: Rhetorical Techniques and Scholarly Consensus,” *NTS* 51 (2005) 19–35.
- Brown, R.E., “The Qumran Scrolls and the Johannine Gospel and Epistles,” *The Scrolls and the New Testament* (ed. Stendahl), 183–207.
- *The Community of the Beloved Disciple* (New York: Paulist Press, 1979).
- Brownlee, W.H., *The Midrash Peshet of Habakkuk* (SBLMS 24, Missoula: Scholars Press, 1979).
- Broyles, C.C. and C.A. Evans (eds.), *Writing and Reading the Scroll of Isaiah: Studies of an Interpretive Tradition* (VTSup 70/2; FOTL I/2, Leiden: Brill, 1997).
- Bruce, F.F., *1 & 2 Thessalonians* (WBC 45, Waco: Word Books, 1982).
- Bryan, D.J., “The Jewish Background to *The Resurrection of the Son of God* by N.T. Wright,” *JSHJ* 3 (2005) 155–69.
- Buitenwerf, R., *Book III of the Sibylline Oracles and Its Social Settings. With an Introduction, Translation, and Commentary* (SVTP 17, Leiden: Brill, 2003).
- Bultmann, R., *Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition* (FRLANT n.f. 12, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, ¹1921, ¹⁰1995).
- Burchard, C., “Zum Nebenüberlieferung von Josephus’ Bericht über die Essener Bell 2, 119–161 bei Hippolyt, Porphyrius, Josippus, Niketas Choniates und anderen,” *Josephus-Studien* (eds. BETZ et al.), 77–96.
- “Die Essener bei Hippolyt. Hippolyt, Ref. IX 18, 2–28, 2 und Josephus, Bell. 2, 119–161,” *JSJ* 7–9 (1976–78) 1–41.
- Burkert, W., “Apokalyptik im frühen Griechentum: Impulse und Transformationen,” *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East* (ed. Hellholm), 235–54.
- *Greek Religion* (English translation by J. Raffan, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1985).
- Burkett, D., *The Son of Man Debate: A History and Evaluation* (SNTSMS 107, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999).
- Burnett, F.W., *The Testament of Jesus-Sophia: A Redaction-Critical Study of the Eschatological Discourse in Matthew* (Lanham: University Press of America, 1981).
- Byrskog, S., *Story as History—History as Story. The Gospel Tradition in the Context of Ancient Oral History* (WUNT 123, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000).
- Cameron, R., “The Sayings Gospel Q and the Quest of the Historical Jesus: A Response to John S. Kloppenborg,” *HTR* 89 (1996) 351–54.
- Cameron, R. and M.P. Miller (eds.), *Redescribing Christian Origins* (SBLSymS 28, Leiden: Brill, 2004).
- Campbell, J.G., “The Qumran Sectarian Writings,” *CHJ* III (eds. Horbury, Davies, and Sturdy), 798–821.
- Cancik, H., “The End of the World, of History, and of the Individual in Greek and Roman Antiquity,” *The Encyclopedia of Apocalypticism. 1* (ed. Collins), 84–125.
- Caquot, A., M. Hadas-Lebel, and J. Riaud (eds.), *Hellenica et Judaica. Hommage à V. Nikiprowetzky* (Leuven: Peeters, 1986).
- Carlston, C.E., “Wisdom and Eschatology in Q” *Logia: Les Paroles de Jésus* (ed. Delobel), 101–19.
- Carmignac, J., “Comparaison entre les manuscrits ‘A’ et ‘B’ du Document de Damas,” *RevQ* 2 (1959) 53–67.
- “La notion d’eschatologie dans la Bible et à Qumrân,” *RevQ* 7 (1969) 17–31.
- “Les dangers de l’Eschatologie,” *NTS* 17 (1971) 365–90.

- *Le Mirage de l'Eschatologie. Royauté, Règne et Royaume de Dieu... sans Eschatologie* (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1979).
- Carson, D.A., P.T. O'Brien and M.A. Seifrid (eds.), *Justification and Variegated Nomism* Volume 1, *The Complexities of Second Temple Judaism* (WUNT II/140, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001).
- Volume 2, *The Paradoxes of Paul* (WUNT II/181, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck and Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2004).
- Cavallin, H.C.C., *Life after Death. Paul's Argument for the Resurrection of the Dead in 1 Cor 15. Part 1. An Enquiry into the Jewish Background* (ConBNT 7/1, Lund: Gleerup, 1974).
- Charles, R.H., *Eschatology: The Doctrine of a Future Life in Israel, Judaism, and Christianity—A Critical History* (New York: Schocken Books, 1963; reprint of the second edition, London: A&C Black, 21913).
- Charlesworth, J.H. (ed.), *The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Christianity* The First Princeton Symposium on Judaism and Christian Origins (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992).
- "From Messianology to Christology: Problems and Prospects," in Idem (ed.), *The Messiah*, 3–35.
- (ed.), *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 3 volumes, *Volume 1: Scripture and the Scrolls*, *Volume 2: The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Qumran Community*, *Volume 3: The Scrolls and Christian Origins* The Second Princeton Symposium on Judaism and Christian Origins (Waco: Baylor University Press, 2006).
- "A Study in Shared Symbolism and Language: The Qumran Community and the Johannine Community," in Idem (ed.), *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. 3, 97–152.
- Charlesworth, J.H. and C.A. Evans, "Jesus in the Agrapha and Apocryphal Gospels," *Studying the Historical Jesus* (eds. Chilton and Evans), 479–533.
- Charlesworth, J.H., H. Lichtenberger and G.S. Oegema (eds.), *Qumran-Messianism. Studies on the Messianic Expectations in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998).
- "Challenging the *Consensus Communis* Regarding Qumran Messianism (1QS, 4QS MSS)," *Qumran-Messianism* (eds. Charlesworth, Lichtenberger, Oegema), 120–34.
- Chazon, E.G., "Is *Divre'i ha-me'orot* a Sectarian Prayer?," *The Dead Sea Scrolls. Forty Years of Research* (eds. Dimant and Rappaport), 3–17.
- "A Case of Mistaken Identity: *Testament of Naphtali* (4Q215) and *Time of Righteousness* (4Q215^a)," *The Provo International Conference* (eds. Parry and Ulrich), 110–23.
- Chilton, B.D. and C.A. Evans (eds.), *Studying the Historical Jesus: Evaluations of the State of Current Research* (NTTS 19, Leiden: Brill, 1994).
- "The Kingdom of God in Recent Discussion," in Chilton and Evans (eds.), *Studying the Historical Jesus*, 255–80.
- (eds.), *Authenticating the Activities of Jesus* (NTTS 28/2, Leiden: Brill, 1999).
- Cohen, N.G., "Context and Connotation. Greek Words for Jewish Concepts in Philo," *Shem in the Tents of Japhet* (ed. Kugel), 31–61.
- Collins, A.Y., "Early Christian Apocalypses," *Semeia* 14 *Apocalypse: The Morphology of a Genre* (1979) 61–121.
- "The Eschatological Discourse of Mark 13," *The Four Gospels 1992 II* (eds. Van Segbroeck et al.), 1125–40.
- Collins, J.J., "The Mythology of Holy War in Daniel and the Qumran War Scroll: a Point of Transition in Jewish Apocalyptic," *VT* 25 (1975) 596–612.
- "Dualism and Eschatology in 1QM. A reply to P.R. Davies," *VT* 29 (1979) 212–215.

- (ed.), *Apocalypse: The Morphology of a Genre* (Semeia 14, Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1979).
- “Patterns of Eschatology at Qumran,” *Traditions in Transformation* (eds. Halpern and Levenson), 351–75.
- “The Genre Apocalypse in Hellenistic Judaism,” *Apocalypticism* (ed. Hellholm), 531–48.
- “Was the Dead Sea Sect an Apocalyptic Movement?,” *Archaeology and History in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. Schiffman), 25–51.
- Review: “É. Puech, *La croyance des Esséniens en la vie future: immortalité, résurrection, vie éternelle?*,” *DSD* 1 (1994) 246–252.
- “Teacher and Messiah? The One Who Will Teach Righteousness at the End of Days,” *The Community of the Renewed Covenant* (ed. Ulrich and VanderKam), 193–210.
- “The Works of the Messiah,” *DSD* 1 (1994) 98–112.
- *The Scepter and the Star: The Messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Ancient Literature* (ABRL, New York: Doubleday, 1995).
- “‘He Shall Not Judge by What His Eyes See’: Messianic Authority in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” *DSD* 2 (1995) 145–64.
- “Asking for the Meaning of a Fragmentary Qumran Text: The Referential Background of 4QAaron A,” *Texts and Contexts* (eds. Fornberg and Hellholm), 579–90.
- *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (The Literature of the Dead Sea Scrolls, London and New York: Routledge, 1997).
- “The Expectation of the End in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” *Eschatology, Messianism, and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (eds. Evans and Flint), 74–90.
- *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature* (The Biblical Resource Series, Grands Rapids: Eerdmans, 2nd 1998).
- (ed.), *The Encyclopedia of Apocalypticism. 1. The Origins of Apocalypticism in Judaism and Christianity* (New York: Continuum, 1998).
- “Apocalypticism and Literary Genre in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years. 2* (eds. Flint and VanderKam), 403–430.
- “In the Likeness of the Holy Ones: The Creation of Humankind in a Wisdom Text from Qumran,” *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (eds. Parry and Ulrich), 609–19.
- “Qumran, Apocalypticism, and the New Testament,” *The Dead Sea Scrolls. Fifty Years after Their Discovery* (eds. Schiffman, Tov, and VanderKam), 133–8.
- “Apocalyptic Eschatology in Philosophical Dress in the Wisdom of Solomon,” *Shem in the Tents of Japhet* (ed. Kugel), 93–107.
- “Prophecy, Apocalypse and Eschatology: Reflections on the Proposals of Lester Grabbe,” *Knowing the End from the Beginning* (eds. Grabbe and Haak), 44–52.
- “The Mysteries of God. Creation and Eschatology in 4QInstruction and the Wisdom of Solomon,” *Wisdom and Apocalypticism* (ed. García Martínez), 287–305.
- “Forms of Community in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” *Emanuel* (ed. Paul et al.), 97–111.
- “The Eschatologizing of Wisdom in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” *Sapiential Perspectives* (eds. Collins, Sterling, and Clements), 49–65.
- “A Messiah before Jesus?,” *Christian Beginnings and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (eds. Collins and Evans), 15–35.
- “An Essene Messiah? Comments on Israel Knohl, *The Messiah before Jesus?*,” *Christian Beginnings and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (eds. Collins and Evans), 37–44.
- “Apocalyptic Theology and the Dead Sea Scrolls: A Response to Jonathan Wilson,” *Christian Beginnings and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (eds. Collins and Evans), 129–33.
- “What Was Distinctive about Messianic Expectation at Qumran?,” *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls. 2* (ed. Charlesworth), 71–92.

- “Messianism and Exegetical Tradition: The Evidence of the LXX Pentateuch,” *The Septuagint and Messianism* (ed. Collins), 129–49.
- Collins, J.J. and J.H. Charlesworth (eds.), *Mysteries and Revelations: Apocalyptic Studies since the Uppsala Colloquium* (JSPSup 9, Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991).
- Collins, J.J. and C.A. Evans (eds.), *Christian Beginnings and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Acacia Studies in Bible and Theology, Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2006).
- Collins, J.J. and R.A. Kugler (eds.), *Religion in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000).
- Collins, J.J., G.E. Sterling and R.A. Clements (eds.), *Sapiential Perspectives: Wisdom Literature in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (STDJ 51, Leiden: Brill, 2004).
- Collins, R.F. (ed.), *The Thessalonian Correspondence* (BETL 87, Leuven: Leuven University Press—Peeters, 1990).
- Condra, E., *Salvation for the Righteous Revealed. Jesus amid Covenantal and Messianic Expectations in Second Temple Judaism* (AGJU 51, Leiden: Brill, 2002).
- Conzelmann, H., *Die Mitte der Zeit. Studien zur Theologie des Lukas* (BHT 17, Tübingen: Mohr, 1954, ⁵1964).
- Conzelmann, H. and A. Lindemann, *Arbeitsbuch zum Neuen Testament* (UTB 52, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, ¹³2000).
- Cordes, A., “Spricht Ps 109 LXX von einem Messias oder nicht?,” *The Septuagint and Messianism* (ed. Knibb), 253–60.
- Cotton, H.M., “Greek,” *EDSS 1* (eds. Schiffman and VanderKam), 324–6.
- Cross, F.M., “The Development of the Jewish Scriptures,” *The Bible and the Ancient Near East* (ed. Wright), 133–202.
- “Notes on the Doctrine of the Two Messiahs at Qumran and the Extracanonical Daniel Apocalypse (4Q246),” *Current Research and Technological Developments* (eds. Parry and Ricks), 1–13.
- Crossan, J.D., *The Historical Jesus. The Life of a Mediterranean Jewish Peasant* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1991).
- Davenport, G.L., *The Eschatology of the Book of Jubilees* (StPB 20, Leiden: Brill, 1971).
- Davies, P.R., *1QM, the War Scroll from Qumran. Its Structure and History* (BibOr 32, Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1977).
- “Dualism and Eschatology in the Qumran War Scroll,” *VT* 28 (1978) 28–36.
- “Dualism and Eschatology in 1QM. A Rejoinder,” *VT* 30 (1980) 93–96.
- *The Damascus Covenant. An Interpretation of the “Damascus Document”* (JSOT-Sup 25, Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1983).
- “Eschatology at Qumran. An ‘Apocalyptic’ Community?,” *JBL* 104 (1985) 39–55, reprinted in *Idem, Sects and Scrolls*, 61–78.
- “The Teacher of Righteousness and the ‘End of Days,’” *RevQ* 13 (1988) 313–317.
- *Sects and Scrolls. Essays on Qumran and Related Topics* (South Florida Studies in the History of Judaism 134, Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996).
- “Eschatology in the Book of Daniel,” in *Idem, Sects and Scrolls*, 23–44.
- “Death, Resurrection, and Life after Death in the Qumran Scrolls,” *Judaism in Late Antiquity. 4* (eds. Avery-Peck and Neusner), 189–211.
- Davies, W.D. and D.C. Allison, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to Saint Matthew. 1. Introduction and Commentary on Matthew I–VII* (ICC, Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988).
- Day, J. (ed.), *King and Messiah in Israel and the Ancient Near East* Proceedings of the Oxford Old Testament Seminar (JSOTSup 270, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998).
- DeConick, A.D., *Recovering the Original Gospel of Thomas. A History of the Gospel and Its Growth* (London and New York: T&T Clark—Continuum, 2006).
- Delcor, M. (ed.), *Qumrân. Sa piété, sa théologie et son milieu* (BETL 46, Leuven: Peeters, 1978).

- Delobel, J. (ed.), *Logia: Les Paroles de Jésus—The Sayings of Jesus* (BETL 59, Leuven: University Press—Peeters, 1982).
- “The Fate of the Dead According to 1 Thessalonians 4 and 1 Corinthians 15,” *The Thessalonian Correspondence* (ed. Collins), 340–7.
- Denaux, A. (ed.), *John and the Synoptics* (BETL 101, Leuven: University Press—Peeters, 1992).
- “Matthew’s Story of Jesus’ Burial and Resurrection (Mt 27,57–28,20),” *Resurrection in the New Testament* (eds. Bieringer, Koperski, and Lataire), 123–45.
- Dimant, D., “4QFlorilegium and the Idea of the Community as Temple,” *Hellenica et Judaica* (eds. Caquot *et al.*), 165–189.
- “The Apocalyptic Interpretation of Ezekiel at Qumran,” *Messiah and Christos* (eds. Gruenwald, Shaked, and Stroumsa), 31–51.
- “Apocalyptic Texts at Qumran,” *The Community of the Renewed Covenant* (eds. Ulrich and VanderKam), 175–91.
- “The Qumran Manuscripts: Contents and Significance,” *Time to Prepare the Way in the Wilderness* (eds. Dimant and Schiffman), 23–58.
- “Noah in Early Jewish Literature,” *Biblical Figures Outside the Bible* (eds. Stone and Bergren), 123–50.
- “Resurrection, Restoration, and Time-Curtailing in Qumran, Early Judaism, and Christianity,” *RevQ* 19 (2000) 527–48.
- Dimant, D. and U. Rappaport (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls. Forty Years of Research* (STDJ 10, Leiden: Brill and Jerusalem, Magness Press, 1992).
- Dimant, D. and L.H. Schiffman (eds.), *Time to Prepare the Way in the Wilderness* (STDJ 16, Leiden: Brill, 1995).
- Dimant, D. and J. Strugnell, “4QSecond Ezekiel,” *RevQ* 13 (1988) 45–58.
- Dines, J.M., *The Septuagint* (Understanding the Bible and its World, London and New York: T&T Clark—Continuum, 2004).
- Dodd, C.H., *The Parables of the Kingdom* (London: Nisbet & Co., 1935).
- Donahue, J.R., “The Quest for the Community of Mark’s Gospel,” *The Four Gospels 1992. II* (ed. Van Segbroeck *et al.*), 817–38.
- Donfried, K.P., “Paul and Judaism: 1 Thessalonians 2:13–16 as a Test Case,” *Int* 38 (1984) 242–53, reprinted in Idem, *Paul, Thessalonica, and Early Christianity*, 195–208.
- “The Kingdom of God in Paul,” *The Kingdom of God in 20th Century Interpretation* (ed. Willis), 175–90, reprinted in Donfried, *Paul, Thessalonica, and Early Christianity*, 233–52.
- (ed.), *The Romans Debate* (Revised and Expanded Edition of the original edition in 1977, Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1991).
- *Paul, Thessalonica, and Early Christianity* (London: Continuum, 2002).
- “2 Thessalonians and the Church of Thessalonica,” in Idem, *Paul, Thessalonica, and Early Christianity*, 49–67.
- Doudna, G.L., *4QPesher Nahum. A Critical Edition* (JSPSup 35; Copenhagen International Series 8, Sheffield: Academic Press—Continuum, 2001).
- Douglas, M.C., “The Teacher Hymn Hypothesis Revisited: New Data for an Old Crux,” *DSD* 6 (1999) 239–266.
- Doyle, B., *The Apocalypse of Isaiah Metaphorically Speaking. A Study of the Use, Function and Significance of Metaphors in Isaiah 24–27* (BETL 151, Leuven: Leuven University Press—Peeters, 2000).
- Duhaime, J., “Recent Studies on Messianism in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years After Their Discovery* (eds. Schiffman, Tov, and VanderKam), 789–99.
- “Cohérence structurelle et tensions internes dans l’instruction sur les deux esprits (1QS III 13–IV 26),” *Wisdom and Apocalypticism* (ed. García Martínez), 103–31.
- *The War Texts: 1QM and Related Manuscripts* (CQS 6, London and New York: T&T Clark International—Continuum, 2004).

- Dungan, D.L., *The Sayings of Jesus in the Churches of Paul. The Use of the Synoptic Tradition in the Regulation of Early Church Life* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1971).
- Dunn, J.D.G., *Romans 1–8* (WBC 38A, Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1988).
- *Romans 9–16* (WBC 38B, Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1988).
- *The Theology of Paul the Apostle* (London: T&T Clark—Continuum, 1998).
- *Jesus Remembered* (Christianity in the Making 1, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003).
- Edwards, J.R., “Markan Sandwiches: The Significance of Interpolations in Markan Narratives,” *NovT* 31 (1989) 193–216.
- Edwards, R.A., *The Sign of Jonah in the Theology of the Evangelists and Q* (SBT 2/18, London: SCM, 1971).
- *A Theology of Q: Eschatology, Prophecy and Wisdom* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1976).
- Ego, B., A. Lange, P. Pilhofer (eds.), *Gemeinde ohne Tempel. Community without Temple. Zur Substituierung und Transformation des Jerusalemer Tempels und seines Kults im Alten Testament, antiken Judentum und frühen Christentum* (WUNT 118, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999).
- Ehrman, B.D., *The New Testament. A Historical Introduction to the Early Christian Writings* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000).
- Elgvin, T., “Renewed Earth and Renewed People: 4Q475,” *The Provo International Conference* (eds. Parry and Ulrich), 576–591.
- “The Eschatological Hope of 4QTime of Righteousness,” *Wisdom and Apocalypticism* (ed. García Martínez), 89–102.
- Ellis, E.E., “Present and Future Eschatology in Luke,” *NTS* 12 (1965–66) 27–41, reprinted in Idem, *Christ and the Future*, 129–46.
- *Christ and the Future in New Testament History* (Leiden: Brill, 2001).
- “Eschatology in Luke,” in Idem, *Christ and the Future*, 105–19.
- “Eschatology in Luke Revisited,” in Idem, *Christ and the Future*, 120–8.
- Engberg-Pedersen, T. (ed.), *Paul beyond the Judaism/Hellenism Divide* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001).
- Epp, E.J. and G.D. Fee (eds.), *Studies in the Theory and Method of New Testament Textual Criticism* (Studies and Documents 45, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993).
- “The Significance of the Papyri for Determining the Nature of the New Testament in the Second Century: A Dynamic View of Textual Transmission,” *Studies in the Theory and Method of New Testament Textual Criticism* (eds. Epp and Fee), 274–97.
- Eshel, H., “4Q390, the 490-Year Prophecy, and the Calendrical History of the Second Temple Period,” *Enoch and Qumran Origins* (ed. Boccaccini), 102–10.
- Eshel, H. and Z. Greenhut, “Hiam el-Sagha, A Cemetery of the Qumran Type, Judaean Desert,” *RB* 100 (1993) 252–59.
- Esler, P.F., *Community and Gospel in Luke-Acts: The Social and Political Motivations of Lucan Theology* (SNTSMS 57, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987).
- Evang, M., H. Merklein, and M. Wolter (eds.), *Eschatologie und Schöpfung* (FS E. Gräßer, BZNW 89, Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1997).
- Evans, C.A., “From Gospel to Gospel. The Function of Isaiah in the New Testament,” *Writing and Reading the Scroll of Isaiah* (eds. Broyles and Evans), 651–91.
- *Mark 8:27–16:20* (WBC 34B, Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 2001).
- Evans, C.A. and P.W. Flint (eds.), *Eschatology, Messianism, and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature 1, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997).
- Evans, C.A. and S. Talmon (eds.), *The Quest for Context and Meaning. Studies in Biblical Intertextuality in Honor of James A. Sanders* (BibInt Series, 28, Leiden: Brill, 1997).
- Fabry, H.-J., A. Lange, and H. Lichtenberger (eds.), *Qumranstudien* (Schriften des Institutum Judaicum Delitzschianum 4, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996).

- Falk, D.K., F. García Martínez, E.M. Schuller (eds.), *Sapiential, Liturgical and Poetical Texts from Qumran* (STDJ 35, Leiden: Brill, 2000).
- Fallon, F.T. and R. Cameron, "The Gospel of Thomas: A Forschungsbericht and Analysis," *ANRW II* 25.6 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1988), 4196–4251.
- Feldman, L.H., "Josephus (CE 37–c. 100)," *CHJ III*, 901–21.
- Fiedler, P. and D. Zeller (eds.), *Gegenwart und kommendes Reich* (Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1975).
- Fieger, M., K. Schmid, and P. Schwagmeier (eds.), *Qumran—Die Schriftrollen vom Toten Meer* (NTOA 47, Freiburg, Schweiz: Universitätsverlag, and Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2001).
- Fischer, U., *Eschatologie und Jenseitserwartung im hellenistischen Diasporajudentum* (BZNW 44, Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 1978).
- Fitzmyer, J. A., "'4QTestimonia' and the New Testament," *TS* 18 (1957) 513–37.
- "The Aramaic 'Elect of God' Text from Qumran Cave 4," *CBQ* 27 (1965) 348–72, reprinted in Idem, *Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament*, 127–60.
- *Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament* (London: Chapman, 1971).
- *A Wandering Aramean: Collected Aramaic Essays* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1979).
- *Romans. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 33, New York: Doubleday, 1993).
- "The 'Son of God' Document from Qumran," *Bib* 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* (The Biblical Resource Series, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997).
- *The Acts of the Apostles. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 31, New York: Doubleday, 1998).
- *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Christian Origins* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000).
- *The One Who Is to Come* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007).
- Fleddermann, H.T., *Q: A Reconstruction and Commentary* (BiTS 1, Leuven: Peeters, 2005).
- Fletcher-Louis, C.H.T., *Luke-Acts: Angels, Christology and Soteriology* (WUNT II/94, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997).
- "Jesus, the Temple and the Dissolution of Heaven and Earth," *Apocalyptic in History and Tradition* (eds. Rowland and Barton), 117–41.
- Flint, P.W., *The Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls and the Book of Psalms* (STDJ 17, Leiden: Brill, 1997).
- "The Daniel Tradition at Qumran," *Eschatology, Messianism, and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (eds. Evans and Flint), 41–60.
- "The Book of Isaiah in the Dead Sea Scrolls," *The Bible as Book* (eds. Herbert and Tov), 229–51.
- Flint, P.W. and P.D. Miller (eds.), *The Book of Psalms: Composition and Reception* (VTSup 99 / Formation and Interpretation of Old Testament Literature 4, Leiden: Brill, 2005).
- Flint, P.W., E. Tov, and J.C. VanderKam (eds.), *Studies in the Hebrew Bible, Qumran, and the Septuagint Presented to Eugene Ulrich* (VTSup 101, Leiden: Brill, 2006).
- Flint, P.W. and J.C. VanderKam (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years. A Comprehensive Assessment*, 2 volumes (Leiden: Brill, 1998–1999).
- Flusser, D., "Resurrection and Angels in Rabbinic Judaism, Early Christianity, and Qumran," *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years after Their Discovery* (eds. Schiffman, Tov, and VanderKam), 568–72.
- Fornberg, T. and D. Hellholm (eds.), *Texts and Contexts. Biblical Texts in Their Textual and Situational Contexts* (FS L. Hartman, Oslo and Boston: Scandinavian University Press, 1995).

- Foster, P., *Community, Law and Mission in Matthew's Gospel* (WUNT II/177, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004).
- Fowler, R., *Let the Reader Understand. Reader-Response Criticism and the Gospel of Mark* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991).
- Fraade, S.D., "To Whom It May Concern: 4QMMT and Its Addressees," *RevQ* 19 (2000) 507–526.
- Fraade, S.D., A. Shemesh, and R.A. Clements (eds.), *Rabbinic Perspectives: Rabbinic Literature and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, Proceedings of the Eight International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 7–9 January, 2003 (STDJ 62, Leiden: Brill, 2006).
- France, R.T., *Jesus and the Old Testament: His Application of Old Testament Passages to Himself and His Mission* (London: Tyndale, 1971).
- *The Gospel of Mark. A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002).
- Franzmann, M., *Jesus in the Nag Hammadi Writings* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1996).
- Freedman, D.N. and D. Miano, "People of the New Covenant," *The Concept of the Covenant* (eds. Porter and De Roo), 7–26.
- Frenschkowski, M., "Galiläa oder Jerusalem? Die topographischen und politischen Hintergründe der Logienquelle," *The Sayings Source Q and the Historical Jesus* (ed. Lindemann), 535–560.
- Frey, J., *Die johanneische Eschatologie* volume 1, *Ihre Probleme im Spiegel der Forschung seit Reimarus* (WUNT 96, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997).
- volume 2, *Das johanneische Zeitverständnis* (WUNT 110, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998).
- volume 3, *Die eschatologische Verkündigung in den johanneischen Texten* (WUNT 117, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000).
- "Different Patterns of Dualistic Thought in the Qumran Library. Reflections on Their Background and History," *Legal Texts and Legal Issues* (eds. Bernstein, García Martínez, and Kampen), 275–335.
- "Die Bedeutung der Qumranfunde für das Verständnis des Neuen Testaments," *Qumran—Die Schriftrollen vom Toten Meer* (eds. Fieger, Schmid, and Schwagmeier), 129–208.
- "Der historische Jesus und der Christus der Evangelien," *Der historische Jesus* (eds. Schröter and Brucker), 273–336.
- "Die Apokalyptik als Herausforderung der neutestamentlichen Wissenschaft. Zum Problem: Jesus und die Apokalyptik," *Apokalyptik als Herausforderung neutestamentlicher Theologie* (eds. Becker and Öhler), 23–94.
- García Martínez, F., "La apocalíptica judía como matriz de la teología cristiana," *Orígenes del cristianismo. Antecedentes y primeros pasos* (ed. A. Piñero, Madrid: El Almendro—Universidad Complutense, 1991), 177–99; reprinted in English translation as "Is Jewish Apocalyptic the Mother of Christian Theology?," in Idem (ed. E.J.C. Tigchelaar), *Qumranica Minora I*, 129–51.
- *Qumran and Apocalyptic: Studies on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran* (STDJ 9, Leiden: Brill, 1992).
- "4QMess Ar and the Book of Noah," in Idem, *Qumran and Apocalyptic*, 1–44.
- "Messianische Erwartungen in den Qumranschriften," *Jahrbuch für Biblische Theologie* 8 (1993) 171–208.
- "Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls," *The Encyclopedia of Apocalypticism. I* (ed. Collins), 162–92 (reprinted in F. García Martínez (ed. E.J.C. Tigchelaar), *Qumranica Minora I*, 195–226).
- "Interpretations of the Flood in the Dead Sea Scrolls," *Interpretations of the Flood* (eds. García Martínez and Luttikhuisen), 86–108.
- "Apocalypticism and Literary Genre in the Dead Sea Scrolls," *DSSAFY 2* (eds. Flint and VanderKam), 403–30.

- (ed.), *Wisdom and Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Biblical Tradition* (BETL 168, Leuven, University Press—Peeters, 2003).
- “Wisdom at Qumran: Worldly or Heavenly?,” in Idem (ed.), *Wisdom and Apocalypticism*, 1–15.
- “The Apocalyptic Interpretation of Ezekiel in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” *Interpreting Translation* (eds. García Martínez and Vervenne), 163–76.
- *Qumranica Minora I. Qumran Origins and Apocalypticism* (edited by E.J.C. Tigchelaar, STDJ 63, Leiden: Brill, 2007).
- García Martínez, F. and G.P. Luttikhuisen (eds.), *Interpretations of the Flood* (TBN 1, Leiden: Brill, 1999).
- García Martínez, F. and M. Popovic (eds.), *Defining Identities: Who is the Other? We, You, and the Others in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (STDJ 70, Leiden: Brill, 2007).
- García Martínez, F., A. Steudel, and E.J.C. Tigchelaar (eds.), *From 4QMMT to Resurrection: Mélanges qumraniens en hommage à Émile Puech* (STDJ 61, Leiden: Brill, 2006).
- García Martínez, F. and M. Vervenne (eds.), *Interpreting Translation. Studies on the LXX and Ezekiel in Honour of Johan Lust* (BETL 192, Leuven: Leuven University Press—Peeters, 2005).
- Geddert, T.J., *Watchwords: Mark 13 in Markan Eschatology* (JSNTSup 26, Sheffield: Academic Press, 1989).
- Geiger, R., *Die Lukanischen Endzeitreden. Studien zur Eschatologie des Lukas-Evangeliums* (Europäische Hochschulschriften XXIII 16, Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang and Bern: Herbert Lang, 1973).
- Gilbert, M., “Sagesse 3,7–9; 5:15–23 et l’apocalyptique,” *Wisdom and Apocalypticism* (ed. García Martínez), 307–322.
- Glasson, T.F., *Greek Influence in Jewish Eschatology. With Special Reference to the Apocalypses and Pseudepigraphs* (SPCK Biblical Monographs 1, London: SPCK, 1961).
- Glessmer, U., “The Otot-Texts (4Q319) and the Problem of Interpretations in the Context of the 364-Day Calendar,” *Qumranstudien* (eds. Fabry, Lange, and Lichtenberger), 125–164.
- Gmirkin, R., “Historical Allusions in the War Scroll,” *DSD* 5 (1998) 172–214.
- Gnilka, J., *Das Evangelium nach Markus. 1. Mk 1–8,26* (EKKNT II/1, Zürich: Benziger Verlag, and Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1978).
- *Das Evangelium nach Markus. 2. Mk 8,27–16,20* (EKKNT II/2, Zürich: Benziger Verlag, and Neukirchen-Vluyn, Neukirchener Verlag, 1979).
- Goff, M.J., “Discerning Trajectories: 4QInstruction and the Sapiential Background of the Sayings Source of Q,” *JBL* 124 (2005) 657–73.
- *Discerning Wisdom: The Sapiential Literature of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (VTSup 116, Leiden: Brill, 2007).
- Goodblatt, D., A. Pinnick, and D.R. Schwartz (eds.), *Historical Perspectives. From the Hasmoneans to Bar Kokhba in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (STDJ 37, Leiden: Brill, 2001).
- Grabbe, L.L., “Eschatology in Philo and Josephus,” *Judaism in Late Antiquity*. 4 (eds. Avery-Peck and Neusner), 163–185.
- “Introduction and Overview,” *Knowing the End from the Beginning* (eds. Grabbe and Haak), 2–43.
- Grabbe, L.L. and R.D. Haak (eds.), *Knowing the End from the Beginning. The Prophetic, the Apocalyptic and their Relationships* (JSPSup 46, London and New York: T&T Clark International—Continuum, 2003).
- Grässer, E., *Das Problem der Parusieverzögerung in den Synoptischen Evangelien und in der Apostelgeschichte* (BZNW 22, Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1957).
- Grappe, C. (ed.), *Le Repas de Dieu. Das Mahl Gottes 4*. Symposium Strasbourg, Tübingen, Upsal. Strasbourg 11–15 septembre 2002 (WUNT 169, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004).

- Green, J.B., *The Gospel of Luke* (NICNT, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997).
- Greenspoon, L., "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Greek Bible," *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years. 1* (eds. Flint and VanderKam), 101–127.
- Greenspoon, L., and O. Munnich (eds.), *VIII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies. Paris 1992* (SBLSCS 41, Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995).
- Gregg, B.H., *The Historical Jesus and the Final Judgment Sayings in Q* (WUNT II/207, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005).
- Grossman, M.L., "Reading 4QMMT: Genre and History," *RevQ* 20 (2001) 3–22.
- *Reading for History in the Damascus Document. A Methodological Study* (STDJ 45, Leiden: Brill, 2002).
- Gruenewald, I., S. Shaked, and G.G. Stroumsa (eds.), *Messiah and Christos. Studies in the Jewish Origins of Christianity* (FS D. Flusser, TSAJ 32, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1992).
- Guelich, R., *Mark 1–8:26* (WBC 34A, Dallas: Word Books, 1989).
- Hachlili, R., "Burial Practices at Qumran," *RevQ* 16 (1993) 247–64.
- "The Inscriptions," *Jericho* (eds. Hachlili and Killebrew), 142–58.
- Hachlili, R. and A.E. Killebrew (eds.), *Jericho. The Jewish Cemetery of the Second Temple Period* (IAA Reports 7, Jerusalem: Israel Antiquities Authority, 1999).
- "Chronology," *Jericho* (eds. Hachlili and Killebrew), 164–5.
- "Burials Customs and Conclusions," *Jericho* (eds. Hachlili and Killebrew), 166–75.
- Hagner, D., *Matthew 1–13* (WBC 33A, Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1993).
- *Matthew 14–28* (WBC 33B, Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1995).
- Hahn, F., "Die Rede von der Parusie des Menschensohnes Markus 13," *Jesus und der Menschensohn* (eds. Pesch, Schnackenburg, and Kaiser), 240–66.
- "Die eschatologische Rede Matthäus 24 und 25," *Studien zum Matthäusevangelium* (ed. Schenke), 107–26.
- Hakola, R., *Identity Matters: John, the Jews and Jewishness* (NovTSup 118, Leiden: Brill, 2005).
- Halpern, B. and J. Levenson (eds.), *Traditions in Transformation* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1981).
- Han, K.S., *Jerusalem and the Early Jesus Movement. The Q Community's Attitude Toward the Temple* (JSNTSup 207, London: Sheffield Academic Press—Continuum, 2002).
- Harrington, D.J., "The Raz Nihyeh in a Qumran Wisdom Text (1Q26, 4Q415–418, 423)," *RevQ* 17 (1996) 449–53.
- "Wisdom and Apocalyptic in 4QInstruction and 4 Ezra," *Wisdom and Apocalypticism* (ed. García Martínez), 343–55.
- "The 'Holy Land' in Pseudo-Philo, 4 Ezra, and 2 Baruch," *Emanuel* (eds. Paul et al.), 661–72.
- Hartman, L., *Prophecy Interpreted: The Formation of Some Jewish Apocalyptic Texts and of the Eschatological Discourse Mark 13 par.* (ConBNT 1, Lund: Gleerup, 1966).
- Hartman, L.F., J.G. Klausner, G. Scholem, and H.Z. Hirschberg, "Eschatology," *Encyclopedia Judaica* (ed. C. Roth) 6. *Di-Fo* (Jerusalem: Keter Publishing House, 1971), 860–72.
- Hatina, T.R., "The Focus of Mark 13:24–27—The Parousia, or the Destruction of the Temple?," *BBR* 6 (1996) 43–66.
- Hellholm, D. (ed.), *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East* (Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Apocalypticism, Uppsala, August 12–17, 1979, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1983).
- Hempel, C., *The Laws of the Damascus Document. Sources, Tradition and Redaction* (STDJ 29, Leiden: Brill, 1998).
- "Community Origins in the Damascus Document in the Light of Recent Scholarship," *The Provo International Conference* (eds. Parry and Ulrich), 316–29.

- “The Laws of the Damascus Document and 4QMMT,” *The Damascus Document. A Centennial of Discovery* (eds. Baumgarten, Chazon, and Pinnick), 69–84.
- *The Damascus Texts* (CQS 1, Sheffield: Academic Press, 2000).
- Hengel, M., *Judentum und Hellenismus: Studien zu ihrer Begegnung unter besonderer Berücksichtigung Palästinas bis zur Mitte des 2. Jh.s v.Chr.* (WUNT 10, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1969).
- “Jesus der Messias Israels,” *Der messianische Anspruch Jesu* (Hengel and Schwemer), 1–80.
- “Das Mahl in der Nacht, »in der Jesus ausgeliefert wurde« (1 Kor 11,23),” *Le Repas de Dieu* (ed. Grappe), 115–60.
- Hengel, M. and A.M. Schwemer (eds.), *Die Septuaginta zwischen Judentum und Christentum* (WUNT 72, Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck, 1994).
- *Der messianische Anspruch Jesu und die Anfänge der Christologie. Vier Studien* (WUNT 138, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001).
- Henten, J.W. van and P.W. van der Horst (eds.), *Studies in Early Jewish Epigraphy* (Leiden: Brill, 1994).
- (ed.), *Biblical Interpretation at Qumran* (Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005).
- Herbert, E.D., and E. Tov (eds.), *The Bible as Book. The Hebrew Bible and the Judaean Desert Discoveries* (London: the British Library, and New Castle: Oak Knoll Press, 2002).
- Hilhorst, A. and G.H. van Kooten (eds.), *The Wisdom of Egypt: Jewish, Early Christian, and Gnostic Essays in Honour of Gerard P. Luttikhuisen* (AGJU/AJEC 59, Leiden: Brill, 2005).
- Hilhorst, A., É. Puech, and E.J.C. Tigchelaar (eds.), *Flores Florentino: Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Studies in Honour of Florentino García Martínez* (JSJSup 122, Leiden: Brill, 2007).
- Hirschberg, P., *Das eschatologische Israel. Untersuchungen zum Gottesvolkverständnis der Johannesoffenbarung* (WMANT 84, Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1999).
- Hoffmann, P., *Die Toten in Christus: eine religionsgeschichtliche und exegetische Untersuchung zur paulinischen Eschatologie* (NTAbh N.F. 2, Münster: Aschendorff, 1969).
- *Studien zur Theologie der Logienquelle* (NTAbh N.F. 8, Münster: Aschendorff, 1972).
- Hofius, O., *Katapausis. Die Vorstellung vom endzeitlichen Ruheort im Hebräerbrief* (WUNT 11, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1970).
- Høgenhaven, J., “Rhetorical Devices in 4QMMT,” *DSD* 10 (2003) 187–204.
- Hogeterp, A.L.A., “The Gospel of Thomas and the Historical Jesus. The Case of Eschatology,” *The Wisdom of Egypt* (eds. Hilhorst and Van Kooten), 381–96.
- *Paul and God’s Temple: A Historical Interpretation of Cultic Imagery in the Corinthian Correspondence* (BiTS 2, Leuven: Peeters, 2006).
- “The Mystery of Israel’s Salvation: A Re-Reading of Romans 11:25–32 in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls,” *Flores Florentino* (eds. Hilhorst, Puech, and Tigchelaar), 653–66.
- “Eschatological Identities in the Damascus Document,” *Defining Identities* (eds. García Martínez and Popovic), 111–30.
- “The Eschatology of the Two Spirits Treatise Revisited,” *RevQ* 23 (2007) 247–59.
- “Resurrection and Biblical Tradition: Pseudo-Ezekiel Reconsidered,” *Biblica* 89 (2008) 59–69.
- Hollander, H.W. and M. de Jonge, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. A Commentary* (SVTP 8, Leiden: Brill, 1985).
- Holleman, J., *Resurrection and Parousia: A Traditio-Historical Study of Paul’s Eschatology in 1 Corinthians 15* (NovTSup 84, Leiden: Brill, 1996).
- Holm-Nielsen, S., *Hodayot: Psalms from Qumran* (Aarhus: Universitetsforlaget, 1960).

- Holtz, T., *Der erste Brief an die Thessalonicher* (EKKNT 13, Braunschweig: Benziger, and Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, ²1990).
- “Tröstliche Gewissheit im Dreiklang von Bekenntnis, Herrenwort und überliefertem Wissen. Zu 1 Thessalonicher 4,13–18,” *Eschatologie und Ethik im frühen Christentum* (ed. Böttrich), 120–32.
- “The Judgment on the Jews and the Salvation of All Israel. 1 Thess 2,15–16 and Rom 11,25–26,” *The Thessalonian Correspondence* (ed. R.F. Collins), 284–94.
- Horbury, W., “Messianism in the Old Testament Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha,” *King and Messiah* (ed. J. Day), 402–33, reprinted in Horbury, *Messianism among Jews and Christians*, 35–64.
- *Messianism among Jews and Christians. Twelve Biblical and Historical Studies* (London and New York: T&T Clark—Continuum, 2003).
- Horbury, W., W.D. Davies, and J. Sturdy (eds.), *CHJ III. The Early Roman Period* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999).
- Horsley, R.A., “‘Messianic’ Figures and Movements in First-Century Palestine,” *The Messiah* (ed. Charlesworth), 276–95.
- “The Kingdom of God and the Renewal of Israel: Synoptic Gospels, Jesus Movements, and Apocalypticism,” *The Encyclopedia of Apocalypticism. 1* (ed. Collins), 303–44.
- Horst, P.W. van der, “De Septuaginta als joods document,” *Hermeneus* 70 (1998) 266–71, reprinted in idem, *Joden in de Grieks-Romeinse wereld. Vijftien miniaturen* (Utrechtse Studies 5, Zoetermeer: Meinema, 2003), 100–107.
- Hultgård, A., *Léschatologie des Testaments des Douze Patriarches* 2 volumes (Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis, Historia Religionum 6–7, Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1977 and 1982).
- Hunzinger, C.-H., “Fragmente einer älteren Fassung des Buches Milhama aus Höhle 4 von Qumran,” *ZAW* 69 (1957) 131–151.
- Hurtado, L., *Lord Jesus Christ. Devotion to Jesus in Earliest Christianity* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003).
- Hvalvik, R., “‘A Sonderweg’ for Israel: A Critical Examination of a Current Interpretation of Romans 11:25–27,” *JSNT* 38 (1990) 87–107.
- Iersel, B.M.F. van, *Mark. A Reader-Response Commentary* (ET by W.H. Bisscheroux; JSNTSup 164, Sheffield: Academic Press, 1998).
- Jacobson, A.D., “Apocalyptic and the Synoptic Sayings Source Q,” *The Four Gospels 1992. I* (eds. Van Segbroeck *et al.*), 403–19.
- Jacobson, H., *A Commentary on Pseudo-Philo’s Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum. With Latin text and English Translation* 2 volumes (AGJU 31, Leiden: Brill, 1996).
- Jellicoe, S., *The Septuagint and Modern Study* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1968).
- Jeremias, G., *Der Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit* (SUNT 2, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1963).
- Jobes, K.H. and M. Silva, *Invitation to the Septuagint* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2000).
- Jonge, H.J. de, “De opstanding van Jezus. De joodse traditie achter een christelijke belijdenis,” *Jodendom en vroeg christendom* (eds. Baarda, De Jonge, and Menken), 47–61.
- “Visionary Experience and the Historical Origins of Christianity,” *Resurrection in the New Testament* (eds. Bieringer, Koperski, and Lataire), 35–53.
- Jonge, M. de, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. A Study of Their Text, Composition and Origin* (Doctoral Dissertation, Assen: Van Gorcum, 1953, ²1975).
- “The Main Issues in the Study of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs,” *NTS* 26 (1980) 508–524, reprinted in idem, *Collected Essays*, 147–163.
- “The Testament of Levi and ‘Aramaic Levi,’” *RevQ* 13 (1988) 367–385, reprinted in idem, *Collected Essays*, 244–262.

- “The Expectation of the Future in the Psalms of Solomon,” *Neotestamentica* 23 (1989) 93–117, reprinted in Idem, *Collected Essays*, 3–27.
- *Jewish Eschatology, Early Christian Christology and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. Collected Essays of Marinus de Jonge* (NovTSup 63, Leiden: Brill, 1991).
- “The Radical Eschatology of the Fourth Gospel and the Eschatology of the Synoptics. Some Suggestions,” *John and the Synoptics* (ed. Denaux), 481–7.
- *Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament as Part of Christian Literature. The Case of the Twelve Patriarchs and the Greek Life of Adam and Eve* (SVTP 18, Leiden: Brill, 2003).
- Kahn, J.-G., “Did Philo know Hebrew? The Testimony of the ‘Etymologies,’” *Tarbiz* 34 (1964) 337–345.
- Kaiser, O., *The Old Testament Apocrypha: An Introduction* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2004).
- Kammler, H.-C., *Christologie und Eschatologie. Joh 5,17–30 als Schlüsseltext johanneischer Theologie* (WUNT 126, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000).
- Kampen, J., “The Significance of the Temple in the Manuscripts of the Damascus Document,” *The Dead Sea Scrolls at Fifty* (eds. Kugler and Schuller), 185–197.
- Karris, R.J., “Romans 14:1–15:13 and the Occasion of Romans,” *The Romans Debate* (ed. Donfried), 65–84.
- Kaye, B.N., “Eschatology and Ethics in 1 and 2 Thessalonians,” *NovT* 17 (1975) 47–57.
- Kazen, T., “Sectarian Gospels for Some Christians? Intention and Mirror Reading in the Light of Extra-Canonical Texts,” *NTS* 51 (2005) 561–78.
- Kee, H.C., *Community of the New Age: Studies in Mark’s Gospel* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1977).
- Kelber, W.J., *The Oral and the Written Gospel: The Hermeneutics of Speaking and Writing in the Synoptic Tradition, Mark, Paul, and Q* (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1983).
- Kellermann, U., *Auferstanden in den Himmel. 2 Makkabäer 7 und die Auferstehung der Märtyrer* (SBS 95, Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1979).
- Kieffer, R., “Les repas eschatologiques chez Luc,” *Le Repas de Dieu* (ed. Grappe), 161–175.
- Kilgallen, J.J., “The Sadducees and Resurrection from the Dead: Luke 20,27–40,” *Bib* 67 (1986) 478–95.
- Kister, M., “The Development of the Early Recensions of the Damascus Document,” *DSD* 14 (2007) 61–76.
- Kister, M. and E. Qimron, “Observations on 4QSecond Ezekiel (4Q385 2–3),” *RevQ* 15 (1992) 595–602.
- Klauck, H.-J., *Apocryphal Gospels. An Introduction* (English translation by B. McNeil, London and New York: T&T Clark—Continuum, 2003).
- Klein, G., “Paul’s Purpose in Writing the Epistle to the Romans,” *The Romans Debate* (ed. Donfried), 29–43.
- Klein, H., “Gottes Wille im Corpus Paulinum als Ansatzpunkt paulinischer Ethik,” *Eschatologie und Ethik im frühen Christentum* (ed. Böttrich), 133–48.
- Kloppenborg, J.S., “Tradition and Redaction in the Synoptic Sayings Source,” *CBQ* 46 (1984) 34–62.
- *The Formation of Q: Trajectories in Ancient Christian Wisdom Collections* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987).
- “Symbolic Eschatology and the Apocalypticism of Q,” *HTR* 80 (1987) 287–306.
- “The Sayings Gospel Q and the Quest of the Historical Jesus,” *HTR* 89 (1996) 307–44.
- “The Sayings Gospel Q: Literary and Stratigraphic Problems,” *Symbols and Strata* (ed. Uro), 1–66.
- Knibb, M.A., “The Interpretation of Damascus Document VII, 9b–VIII, 2a and XIX, 5b–14,” *RevQ* 15 (1991) 243–51.

- “Messianism in the Pseudepigrapha in the Light of the Scrolls,” *DSD* 2 (1995) 165–84.
- “Eschatology and Messianism in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years*. 2 (eds. Flint and VanderKam), 379–402.
- “Christian Adoption and Transmission of Jewish Pseudepigrapha: The Case of 1 Enoch,” *JSJ* 32 (2001) 396–415.
- (ed.), *The Septuagint and Messianism* (BETL 195, Leuven: Leuven University Press—Peeters, 2006).
- “The Septuagint and Messianism: Problems and Issues,” *The Septuagint and Messianism* (ed. M.A. Knibb), 3–19.
- Knohl, I., *The Messiah before Jesus: The Suffering Servant of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000).
- Knox, J., *Chapters in a Life of Paul* (New York & Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1950).
- Koch, K., “Das Geheimnis der Zeit in Weisheit und Apokalyptik um die Zeitenwende,” *Wisdom and Apocalypticism* (ed. García Martínez), 35–68.
- “Königspsalmen und ihr ritueller Hintergrund; Erwägungen zu Ps 89,20–38 und Ps 20 und ihren Vorstufen,” *The Book of Psalms* (eds. Flint and Miller), 9–52.
- Koester, H., “From Paul’s Eschatology to the Apocalyptic Schemata of 2 Thessalonians,” *The Thessalonian Correspondence* (ed. Collins), 441–58.
- *Ancient Christian Gospels: Their History and Development* (London: SCM, 1990).
- Kooij, A. van der, *Die alten Textzeugen des Jesajabuches: Ein Beitrag zur Textgeschichte des Alten Testaments* (OBO 35, Freiburg, Schweiz: Universitätsverlag, and Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981).
- “The Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible before and after the Qumran Discoveries,” *The Bible as Book* (eds. in Herbert and Tov), 167–177.
- Koperski, V., “Resurrection Terminology in Paul,” *Resurrection in the New Testament* (eds. Bieringer, Koperski, and Lataire), 265–81.
- Kosch, D., *Die eschatologische Tora des Menschensohnes: Untersuchungen zur Rezeption der Stellung Jesu zur Tora in Q* (NTOA 12, Freiburg (Schweiz): Universitätsverlag, and Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989).
- Kottsieper, I., “11Q5 (11QPsa) XIX—A Plea of Deliverance?,” *From 4QMMT to Resurrection* (eds. García Martínez, Steudel, and Tigchelaar), 125–50.
- Kümmel, W.G., *Promise and Fulfilment. The Eschatological Message of Jesus* (English translation by D.M. Barton from *Verheissung und Erfüllung*, Zürich 1953; SBT 23, London: SCM, 1961).
- Künzi, M., *Das Naherwartungslogion Markus 9,1 par.: Geschichte seiner Auslegung* (BGBE 21, Tübingen: Mohr, 1977).
- Kugel, J.L. (ed.), *Shem in the Tents of Japhet. Essays on the Encounter of Judaism and Hellenism* (JSJSup 74, Leiden: Brill, 2002).
- Kugler, R.A., *From Patriarch to Priest. The Levi-Priestly Tradition from Aramaic Levi to Testament of Levi* (SBLEJL 9, Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996).
- Kugler, R.A. and E.M. Schuller (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls at Fifty. Proceedings of the 1997 Society of Biblical Literature Qumran Section Meetings* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1999).
- Kuhn, H.-W., *Enderwartung und gegenwärtiges Heil. Untersuchungen zu den Gemeindegliedern von Qumran* (SUNT 4, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966).
- Kuhn, K.A., “The ‘One like a Son of Man’ Becomes the ‘Son of God’,” *CBQ* 69 (2007) 22–42.
- Kuula, K., *The Law, the Covenant and God’s Plan. 2. Paul’s Treatment of the Law and Israel in Romans* (PFES 85, Helsinki: The Finnish Exegetical Society, and Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2003).

- Kvalbein, H., "The Wonders of the End-Time: Metaphoric Language in 4Q521 and the Interpretation of Matthew 11.5 par.," *JSP* 18 (1998) 87–110.
- Lambrecht, J., *Die Redaktion der Markus-Apokalypse. Literarische Analyse und Strukturuntersuchung* (AnBib 28), Rome, Pontificio Instituto Biblico, 1967).
- (ed.), *L'Apocalypse johannique et l'Apocalyptique dans le Nouveau Testament* (BETL 53, Leuven: Leuven University Press, and Gembloux: Duculot, 1980).
- Lampe, P., *Die stadtrömischen Christen in den ersten beiden Jahrhunderten: Untersuchungen zur Sozialgeschichte* (WUNT II/18, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1987).
- "The Roman Christians of Romans 16," *The Romans Debate* (ed. Donfried), 216–30.
- Lange, A., *Weisheit und Prädestination: Weisheitliche Urordnung und Prädestination in den Textfunden von Qumran* (STDJ 18, Leiden: Brill, 1995).
- "The Status of the Biblical Texts in the Qumran Corpus and the Canonical Process," *The Bible as Book* (eds. Herbert and Tov), 21–30.
- "Interpretation als Offenbarung. Zum Verhältnis von Schriftauslegung und Offenbarung in apokalyptischer und nichtapokalyptischer Literatur," *Wisdom and Apocalypticism* (ed. García Martínez), 17–33.
- "Dream Visions and Apocalyptic Milieus," *Enoch and Qumran Origins* (ed. Boccaccini), 27–34.
- Lehtipuu, O., *The Afterlife Imagery in Luke's Story of the Rich Man and Lazarus* (NovT-Sup 123, Leiden: Brill, 2007).
- Lemaire, A. (ed.), *Congress Volume Leiden 2004* (VTSup 109, Leiden: Brill, 2006).
- Levinskaya, I., *The Book of Acts in Its First Century Setting. 5. The Book of Acts in Its Diaspora Setting* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, and Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 1996).
- Licht, J., *מגילת ההודיות ממגילות מדבר יהודה* (Jerusalem: the Bialik Institute, 1957).
- "An Analysis of the Treatise on the Two Spirits in DSD," *Scripta Hierosolymitana* 4 (1958) 88–100.
- Lichtenberger, H., *Studien zum Menschenbild in Texten der Qumrangemeinde* (SUNT 15, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1980).
- "Auferstehung in den Qumranfunden," *Auferstehung—Resurrection* (eds. Avemarie and Lichtenberger), 79–91.
- "Qumran-Messianism," *Emanuel* (eds. S.M. Paul et al.), 323–33.
- Lietaert Peerbolte, L.J. *The Antecedents of Antichrist: A Traditio-Historical Study of the Earliest Christian Views on Eschatological Opponents* (JSJSup, 49), Leiden, Brill, 1996).
- Lim, T.H., *Holy Scripture in the Qumran Commentaries and Pauline Letters* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997).
- Lindblom, J., "Gibt es eine Eschatologie bei den alttestamentlichen Propheten?," *ST* 6 (1952) 79–114.
- Lindemann, A. (ed.), *The Sayings Source Q and the Historical Jesus* (BETL 158, Leuven: Leuven University Press—Peeters, 2001).
- Lövestam, E., "The ἡ γενεὰ αὐτή. Eschatology in Mk 13,30 par.," *L'Apocalypse johannique et l'Apocalyptique* (ed. Lambrecht), 403–13.
- Longman, T. III, "The Messiah: Explorations in the Law and Writings," *The Messiah in the Old and New Testaments* (ed. Porter), 13–34.
- Lüdemann, G., *Die Auferstehung Jesu: Historie, Erfahrung, Theologie* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1994).
- Lührmann, D., *Die Redaktion der Logienquelle* (WMANT 33, Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1969).
- Lust, J., "Ezekiel 36–40 in the Oldest Greek Manuscript," *CBQ* 43 (1981) 517–33.
- "The Greek Version of Balaam's Third and Fourth Oracles: The ἀνθρώπος in Num 24:7 and 17. Messianism and Lexicography," *VIII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* (eds. Greenspoon and Munnich), 233–52, reprinted in Lust (ed.), *Messianism and the Septuagint*, 69–86.

- *Messianism and the Septuagint: Collected Essays* (BETL 178, Leuven: Leuven University Press—Peeters, 2004).
- Luttikhuisen, G.P., “Vroegchristelijk jodendom,” *Jodendom en vroeg christendom* (eds. Baarda, De Jonge, and Menken), 163–89.
- *De veelvormigheid van het vroegste christendom* (Delft: Eburon, 2002).
- Luz, U., “Das Jesusbild der vormarkinischen Tradition,” *Jesus Christus in Historie und Theologie* (ed. Strecker), 347–74.
- *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus. I. Mt 1–7* (EKK I/1, Düsseldorf and Zürich: Benziger Verlag, and Neukirchen-Vluyn, Neukirchener Verlag, ⁵2002).
- Macaskill, G., *Revealed Wisdom and Inaugurated Eschatology in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity* (JSJSup 115, Leiden: Brill, 2007).
- Mack, B., *The Lost Gospel. The Book of Q and Christian Origins* (San Francisco: Harper Collins, 1993).
- Magness, J., *The Archaeology of Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002).
- Maier, J., “Messias oder Gesalbter? Zu einem Übersetzungs- und Deutungsproblem in den Qumrantexten,” *RevQ* 17 (1996) 585–612.
- Malherbe, A.J., *The Letters to the Thessalonians. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 32B, New York: Doubleday, 2000).
- Malina, B.J., “Jewish Christianity or Christian Judaism: Toward a Hypothetical Definition,” *JSJ* 7 (1976) 46–57.
- Malone, A.S., “Is the Messiah Announced in Malachi 3:1?,” *TynBul* 57 (2006) 215–28.
- Marcus, J., *The Way of the Lord: Christological Exegesis of the Old Testament in the Gospel of Mark* (Studies of the New Testament and Its World, Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1993).
- “The Beelzebul Controversy and the Eschatologies of Jesus,” *Authenticating the Activities of Jesus* (eds. Chilton and Evans), 247–77.
- *Mark 1–8* (AB 27, New York: Doubleday, 2000).
- Marcus, J. and M.L. Soards (eds.), *Apocalyptic and the New Testament* (JSNTSup 24, Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989).
- Martin, D.B., *The Corinthian Body* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1995).
- Martin, J.D. and P.R. Davies (eds.), *A Word in Season* (FS W. McKane, JSOTSup 42, Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1986).
- Martone, C., “Biblical or Not Biblical? Some Doubts and Questions,” *RevQ* 21 (2004) 387–94.
- Marxsen, W., *Der Evangelist Markus. Studien zur Redaktionsgeschichte des Evangeliums* (FRLANT 67, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1956).
- Mattila, S.L., “Two Contrasting Eschatologies at Qumran (4Q246 vs. 1QM),” *Bib* 75 (1994) 518–38.
- McLaren, J.S., “Ananus, James and Earliest Christianity. Josephus’ Account of the Death of James,” *JTS* 52 (2001) 1–25.
- McLean, B.H., “On the Gospel of Thomas and Q,” *The Gospel behind the Gospels* (ed. Piper), 321–45.
- Mearns, C.L., “Early Eschatological Development in Paul: The Evidence of I and II Thessalonians,” *NTS* 27 (1981) 137–57.
- Metso, S.S., *The Textual Development of the Qumran Community Rule* (STDJ 21, Leiden: Brill, 1997).
- “In Search of the Sitz im Leben of the Community Rule,” *The Provo International Conference* (eds. Parry and Ulrich), 306–15.
- Michaud, J.-P., “Quelle(s) communauté(s) derrière la Source Q?,” *The Sayings Source Q and the Historical Jesus* (ed. Lindemann), 577–606.
- Michel, D., “Weisheit und Apokalyptik,” *The Book of Daniel* (ed. Van der Woude), 413–34.

- Milik, J.T., "4QVisions de 'Amram et une citation d'Origène," *RB* 79 (1972) 77–99.
- Miller, D.M., "The Messenger, the Lord, and the Coming Judgement in the Reception History of Malachi 3," *NTS* 53 (2007) 1–16.
- Miller, M.P., "The Problem of the Origins of a Messianic Conception of Jesus," *Redescribing Christian Origins* (eds. Cameron and Miller), 301–35.
- Morawe, G., *Aufbau und Abgrenzung der Loblieder von Qumran: Studien zur gattungsgeschichtlichen Einordnung der Hodajoth* (Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1961).
- Mournet, T.C., *Oral Tradition and Literary Dependency. Variability and Stability in the Synoptic Tradition and Q* (WUNT II/195, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005).
- Mowinckel, S., *He That Cometh. The Messiah Concept in the Old Testament and Later Judaism* (translated by G.W. Anderson, Abingdon Press 1956, reprinted in *The Biblical Resource Series*, foreword by J.J. Collins; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005).
- Moyise, S. and M.J.J. Menken (eds.), *The Psalms in the New Testament* (The New Testament and the Scriptures of Israel, London and New York: T&T Clark International—Continuum, 2004).
- Münchow, C., *Ethik und Eschatologie. Ein Beitrag zum Verständnis der frühjüdischen Apokalyptik mit einem Ausblick auf das Neue Testament* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981).
- Murphy-O'Connor, J., "La genèse littéraire de la Règle de la Communauté," *RB* 76 (1969) 528–49.
- "The Damascus Document Revisited," *RB* 92 (1985) 223–46.
- *Paul. A Critical Life* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996).
- Myllykoski, M., "The Social History of Q and the Jewish War," *Symbols and Strata* (ed. Uro), 143–99.
- Neiryneck, F., "Le discours anti-apocalyptique de Mc 13," *ETL* 45 (1968) 154–64, reprinted in *L'Apocalypse johannique et l'Apocalyptique* (ed. Lambrecht), 598–608.
- "Marc 13. Examen critique de l'interprétation de R. Pesch," *L'Apocalypse johannique et l'Apocalyptique* (ed. Lambrecht), 369–401.
- "The Reconstruction of Q," *The Sayings Source Q and the Historical Jesus* (ed. Lindemann), 53–147.
- Neiryneck, F., J. Verheyden, and R. Corstjens, *The Gospel of Matthew and the Sayings Source Q: A Cumulative Bibliography, 1950–1995* (BETL 140B, Leuven: Leuven University Press—Peeters, 1998).
- Neufeld, D., "‘And When That One Comes’: Aspects of Johannine Messianism," *Eschatology, Messianism, and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (eds. Evans and Flint), 120–40.
- Neusner, J., *The Rabbinic Traditions about the Pharisees before 70*, 3 volumes (Leiden: Brill, 1971).
- "Death and Afterlife in the Later Rabbinic Sources: The Two Talmuds and Associated Midrash-Compilations," *Judaism in Late Antiquity* 4 (eds. Avery-Peck and Neusner), 267–91.
- Neusner, J., W.S. Green, and E.S. Frerichs (eds.), *Judaisms and Their Messiahs at the Turn of the Christian Era* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987).
- Newsom, C.A., "‘Sectually Explicit’ Literature from Qumran," *The Hebrew Bible and Its Interpreters* (eds. Propp, Halpern, and Freedman), 167–87.
- Nickelsburg, G.W.E., *Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism* (HTS 26, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, and London: Oxford University Press, 1972).
- "1 Enoch and Qumran Origins: The State of Question and Some Prospects for Answers," *SBLSP* 25 (1986) 341–360.
- "The Apocalyptic Construction of Reality in 1 Enoch," *Mysteries and Revelations* (eds. Collins and Charlesworth), 51–64.
- "Religious Exclusivism. A World View Governing Some Texts Found at Qumran," *Das Ende der Tage und die Gegenwart des Heils* (eds. Becker and Fenske), 45–67.

- “Judgement, Life-after-death, and Resurrection in the Apocrypha and the Non-Apocalyptic Pseudepigrapha,” *Judaism in Late Antiquity*. 4 (eds. Avery-Peck and Neusner), 141–62.
- *1 Enoch. 1. A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch, Chapters 1–36*, 81–108 (Hermeneia, Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001).
- *Ancient Judaism and Christian Origins. Diversity, Continuity* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2003).
- Nicklas, T., “Angels in Early Christian Narratives on the Resurrection of Jesus: Canonical and Apocryphal Texts,” *Angels* (eds. Reiterer, Nicklas, and Schöpflin), 293–311.
- Niederwimmer, K., “Zur Eschatologie im Corpus Johanneum,” *NovT* 39 (1997) 105–16.
- Nielsen, A.E., *Until It is Fulfilled. Lukan Eschatology According to Luke 22 and Acts* (WUNT II/126, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000).
- Nitzan, B., “The Concept of Covenant in Qumran Literature,” *Historical Perspectives* (eds. Goodblatt, Pinnick and Schwartz), 85–104.
- Nolland, J., *Luke 9:21–18:34* (WBC 35B, Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1993).
- *Luke 18:35–24:53* (WBC 35C, Dallas: Word Books, 1993).
- Nongbri, B., “The Use and Abuse of P⁵²: Papyrological Pitfalls in the Dating of the Fourth Gospel,” *HTR* 98 (2005) 23–48.
- Oegema, G.S., *Der Gesalbte und sein Volk: Untersuchungen zum Konzeptualisierungsprozeß der messianischen Erwartungen von den Makkabäern bis Bar Koziba* (Schriften des Institutum Judaicum Delitzschianum 2, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1994).
- “Messianic Expectations in the Qumran Writings: Theses on Their Development,” *Qumran-Messianism* (eds. Charlesworth, Lichtenberger and Oegema), 53–82.
- Öhler, M., *Elia im Neuen Testament* (BZNT 88, Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1997).
- Overman, J.A., *Matthew’s Gospel and Formative Judaism: The Social World of the Matthean Community* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991).
- Park, J.S., *Conceptions of Afterlife in Jewish Inscriptions. With Special Reference to Pauline Literature* (WUNT 121, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000).
- Parry, D.W., and S.D. Ricks (eds.), *Current Research and Technological Developments on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (STDJ 20, Leiden: Brill, 1996).
- Parry, D.W. and E. Ulrich (eds.), *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls. Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues* (STDJ 30, Leiden: Brill, 1999).
- Patterson, S.J., “The End of Apocalypse: Rethinking the Eschatological Jesus,” *Theology Today* 52 (1995) 29–48.
- “The Gospel of Thomas and Christian Beginnings,” *Thomasine Traditions in Antiquity* (eds. Asgeirsson, DeConick, and Uro), 1–17.
- Paul, A., *La Bible avant la Bible. La grande révélation des manuscrits de la mer Morte* (Paris: Cerf, 2005).
- Paul, S.M. et al. (eds.), *Emanuel. Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov* (VTSup 94, Leiden: Brill, 2003).
- Pearson, B.A., “A Q Community in Galilee?” *NTS* 50 (2004) 476–94.
- Perkins, P., *Resurrection: New Testament Witness and Contemporary Reflection* (Garden City: Doubleday, 1984).
- “The Resurrection of Jesus of Nazareth,” *Studying the Historical Jesus* (eds. Chilton and Evans), 423–42.
- Perrin, N., “Eschatology and Hermeneutics: Reflections on Method in the Interpretation of the New Testament,” *JBL* 93 (1974) 3–14.
- Pesch, R., *Naherwartungen. Tradition und Redaktion in Mk 13* (KBANT, Düsseldorf, Patmos, 1968).
- *Das Markusevangelium. 1. Kommentar zu Kap. 1,1–8,26* (HTKNT II/1, Freiburg: Herder 1976).

- *Das Markusevangelium. 2. Kommentar zu Kap. 8,27–16,20* (HTKNT II/2, Freiburg: Herder, 1977).
- “Markus 13,” *L’Apocalypse johannique et l’Apocalyptique* (ed. Lambrecht), 355–68.
- Pesch, R., R. Schnackenburg, and O. Kaiser (eds.), *Jesus und der Menschensohn* (FS A. Vögtle, Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1975).
- Petersen, D.L., “Eschatology (OT),” *ABD 2 D-G*, 575–579.
- Peterson, D.N., *The Origins of Mark: The Markan Community in Current Debate* (BibInt Series 48, Leiden: Brill, 2000).
- Philonenko, M., “L’Apocalyptique qoumrânienne,” *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East* (ed. Hellholm), 211–8.
- “»Ceci est mon corps«, »ceci est mon sang«. La préhistoire d’une formule culturelle,” *Le Repas de Dieu* (ed. Grappe), 177–86.
- Pietersma, A., “Septuagintal Exegesis and the Superscriptions of the Greek Psalter,” *The Book of Psalms* (eds. Flint and Miller), 443–75.
- Piper, R.A. (ed.), *The Gospel behind the Gospels: Current Studies on Q* (NovTSup 75, Leiden: Brill, 1995).
- “In Quest of Q: The Direction of Q Studies,” *The Gospel behind the Gospels* (ed. Piper), 1–18.
- Pitre, B., *Jesus, the Tribulation, and the End of the Exile. Restoration Eschatology and the Origin of the Atonement* (WUNT II/204, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005).
- Politis, K.D., “The Nabataean Cemetery at Khirbet Qazone,” *Near Eastern Archaeology* 62 (1999) 128.
- Pomykala, K.E., *The Davidic Dynasty Tradition in Early Judaism. Its History and Significance for Messianism* (SBLEJL 7, Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995).
- Porter, S.E. (ed.), *The Messiah in the Old and New Testaments* (McMaster New Testament Studies; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007).
- “Introduction: The Messiah in the Old and New Testaments,” *The Messiah in the Old and New Testaments* (ed. Porter), 1–9.
- Porter, S.E. and C.A. Evans (eds.), *The Scrolls and the Scriptures* (Sheffield: Academic Press, 1997).
- Porter, S.E. and J.T. Reed (eds.), *Discourse Analysis and the New Testament. Approaches and Results* (JSNTSup 170 / SNTG 4, Sheffield: Academic Press, 1999).
- Porter, S.E. and J.C.R. de Roo (eds.), *The Concept of the Covenant in the Second Temple Period* (JSJSup 71, Leiden: Brill, 2003).
- Pouilly, J., *La Règle de la Communauté de Qumrân. Son évolution littéraire* (Cahiers de la Revue Biblique 17, Paris: Gabalda, 1975).
- Propp, W.H., B. Halpern, and D.N. Freedman (eds.), *The Hebrew Bible and Its Interpreters* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1990).
- Puech, É., “Quelques aspects de la restauration du rouleau des hymnes [1QH],” *JJS* 39 (1988) 38–55.
- “Fragment d’une apocalypse en araméen (4Q246 = pseudo-Dan^d) et le ‘royaume de Dieu,’” *RB* 99 (1992) 98–131.
- “Une apocalypse messianique (4Q521),” *RevQ* 15 (1992) 475–522.
- *La croyance des Esséniens en la vie future: immortalité, résurrection, vie éternelle? Histoire d’une croyance dans le judaïsme ancien. 2 volumes 1. La résurrection des morts et le contexte scripturaire, and 2. Les données qumraniennes et classiques* (EBib n.s. 21–22, Paris: Lecoffre—Gabalda, 1993).
- “Fragments d’un apocryphe de Lévi et le personnage eschatologique, 4QTest-Lévi^{c-d}(?) et 4QAJa,” *The Madrid Qumran Congress* (eds. Treballe Barrera and Vegas Montaner), 449–501.
- “The Necropolises of Khirbet Qumrân and ‘Ain el-Ghuweir and the Essene Belief in Afterlife,” *BASOR* 312 (1998) 21–36.

- “Immortality and Life After Death,” *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years After Their Discovery* (eds. Schiffman, Tov, and VanderKam), 512–20.
- “Apports des textes apocalyptiques et sapientiels de Qumrân à l’eschatologie du judaïsme ancien,” *Wisdom and Apocalypticism* (ed. García Martínez), 133–70.
- “La conception de la vie future dans le livre de la Sagesse et les manuscrits de la mer morte: un aperçu,” *RevQ* 21 (2003) 209–32.
- Qimron, E., “The Halakha,” *DJD* 10 (eds. Qimron and Strugnell), 123–77.
- Reale, G., *A History of Ancient Philosophy. III. The Systems of the Hellenistic Age* (English translation by J.R. Catan, Albany: State University of New York Press, 1985).
- Reed, J.L., *Archaeology and the Galilean Jesus. A Re-examination of the Evidence* (Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 2000).
- Reif, S.C., *A Jewish Archive from Old Cairo. The History of Cambridge University’s Genizah Collection* (Richmond: Curzon Press, 2000).
- Reiser, M., *Die Gerichtspredigt Jesu. Eine Untersuchung zur eschatologischen Verkündigung Jesu und ihrem Frühjüdischen Hintergrund* (Münster: Aschendorf, 1990 (English translation as *Jesus and Judgment. The Eschatological Proclamation in its Jewish Context* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1997))).
- Reiterer, F.V., T. Nicklas, and K. Schöpflin (eds.), *Angels. The Concept of Celestial Beings—Origins, Development and Reception* (Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature Yearbook 2007, Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2007).
- Repschinski, B., *The Controversy Stories in the Gospel of Matthew. Their Redaction, Form and Relevance for the Relationship Between the Matthean Community and Formative Judaism* (FRLANT 189, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000).
- Reventlow, H.G. (ed.), *Eschatology in the Bible and in Jewish and Christian Tradition* (JSOTSup 243, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997).
- “The Eschatologization of the Prophetic Books: A Comparative Study,” in Idem (ed.), *Eschatology*, 169–88.
- Riesenfeld, H., “Tradition und Redaktion im Markusevangelium,” in *Neutestamentliche Studien für Rudolf Bultmann* (BZNW 21, Berlin: Töpelmann, 1957), 157–64.
- Riesner, R., “Synagogues in Jerusalem,” *The Book of Acts in Its First Century Setting. 4* (ed. Bauckham), 179–211.
- Riniker, C., *Die Gerichtsverkündigung Jesu* (Europäische Hochschulschriften, Reihe XXIII Theologie, Band 653, Bern: Peter Lang, 1999).
- Rius-Camps, J. and J. Read-Heimerdinger, *The Message of Acts in Codex Bezae. A Comparison with the Alexandrian Tradition. 1. Acts 1.1–5.42: Jerusalem* (London: T&T Clark - Continuum, 2004).
- Roberts, J.J.M., “The Old Testament’s Contribution to Messianic Expectations,” *The Messiah* (ed. Charlesworth), 39–51.
- Robinson, J.M., “The Critical Edition of Q and the Study of Jesus,” *The Sayings Source Q and the Historical Jesus* (ed. Lindemann), 27–52.
- Robinson, J.M., P. Hoffmann, and J.S. Kloppenborg Verbin, *The Critical Edition of Q* (Leuven: Peeters, and Minneapolis: Fortress, 2000).
- Rösel, M., “Jakob, Bileam und der Messias: Messianische Erwartungen in Gen 49 und Num 22–24,” *The Septuagint and Messianism* (ed. Knibb), 151–75.
- Roloff, J., “Das Reich des Menschensohnes. Ein Beitrag zur Eschatologie des Matthäus,” *Eschatologie und Schöpfung* (eds. Evang, Merklein, and Wolter), 275–92.
- Roo, J.C.R. de, “Is 4Q525 a Qumran Sectarian Document?,” *The Scrolls and the Scriptures* (eds. Porter and Evans), 338–67.
- Roskam, H.N., *The Purpose of the Gospel of Mark in its Historical and Social Context* (NovTSup 114, Leiden: Brill, 2004).
- Rowe, R.D., *God’s Kingdom and God’s Son. The Background to Mark’s Christology from Concepts of Kingship in the Psalms* (AGJU 50, Leiden: Brill, 2002).
- Rowland, C., *The Open Heaven. A Study of Apocalyptic in Judaism and Early Christianity* (New York: Crossroad, 1982).

- Rowland, C. and J. Barton (eds.), *Apocalyptic in History and Tradition* (JSPSup 43, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press—Continuum, 2002).
- Rutgers, L.V., "Death and Afterlife: The Inscriptural Evidence," *Judaism in Late Antiquity* 4 (eds. Avery-Peck and Neusner), 293–310.
- Sänger, D., "Destruktive Apokalyptik? Eine Erinnerung in eschatologischer und ethischer Perspektive," *Eschatologie und Ethik im frühen Christentum* (ed. Böttrich), 285–307.
- Safrai, S., "Talmudic Literature as an Historical Source for the Second Temple Period," *Mishkan* 17/18 (1992/93) 121–37.
- Saldarini, A.J., *Matthew's Christian-Jewish Community* (CSHJ, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994).
- Sanders, E.P., *Paul and Palestinian Judaism. A Comparison of Patterns of Religion* (London: SCM, 1977).
- "The Genre of Palestinian Jewish Apocalypses," *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East* (ed. Hellholm), 447–59.
- Sato, M., *Q und Prophetie: Studien zur Gattungs- und Traditions-geschichte der Quelle Q* (WUNT 2/29, Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck, 1988).
- Scatolini Apóstolo, S.S., "Ezek 36, 37, 38 and 39 in Papyrus 967 as Pre-Text for Re-Reading Ezekiel," *Interpreting Translation* (eds. García Martínez and Vervenne), 331–57.
- Schaper, J., "Der Septuaginta-Psalter als Dokument jüdischer Eschatologie," *Die Septuaginta zwischen Judentum und Christentum* (eds. Hengel and Schwemer), 38–61.
- *Eschatology in the Greek Psalter* (WUNT II/76, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1995).
- Schenk, W., "The Testamental Disciple-Instruction of the Markan Jesus (Mark 13): Its Levels of Communication and Its Rhetorical Structures," *Discourse Analysis and the New Testament* (eds. Porter and Reed), 197–222.
- Schenke, L. (ed.), *Studien zum Matthäusevangelium* (FS W. Pesch, Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1988).
- Schenker, A., "Die Verheissung Natans in 2 Sam 7 in der Septuaginta: Wie erklären sich die Differenzen zwischen Massoretischen Text und LXX, und was bedeuten sie für die messianische Würde des davidischen Hauses in der LXX," *The Septuagint and Messianism* (ed. Knibb), 177–92.
- Schiffman, L.H., *The Eschatological Community of the Dead Sea Scrolls. A Study of the Rule of the Congregation* (SBLMS 38, Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989).
- (ed.), *Archaeology and History in the Dead Sea Scrolls. The New York University Conference in Memory of Yigael Yadin* (JSPSup 8, Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990).
- "Qumran and Rabbinic Halakhah," *Jewish Civilization in the Hellenistic-Roman Period* (ed. Talmon), 138–46.
- "Messianic Figures and Ideas in the Qumran Scrolls," *The Messiah* (ed. Charlesworth), 116–29.
- "Pharisaic and Sadducean Halakhah in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls," *DSD* 1 (1994) 285–99.
- "The Qumran Scrolls and Rabbinic Judaism," *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years* 2 (eds. Flint and VanderKam), 552–71.
- "Community Without Temple: The Qumran Community's Withdrawal from the Jerusalem Temple," *Gemeinde ohne Tempel* (eds. Ego, Lange, and Pilhofer), 267–84.
- "Messianism and Apocalypticism in Rabbinic Texts," *CHJ* IV, 1053–72.
- Schiffman, L.H., E. Tov, J.C. VanderKam (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls. Fifty Years after Their Discovery. Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20–25, 1997* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2000).
- Schiffman, L.H. and J.C. VanderKam (eds.), *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls* 2 volumes (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000).

- Schmithals, W., "Apokalyptik, Eschatologie und Literarkritik," *Paulus, die Evangelien und das Urchristentum* (ed. Breytenbach), 174–98.
- Schnelle, U., *Einleitung in das Neue Testament* (UTB 1830, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 21996).
- Schnocks, J., "The Hope for Resurrection in the Book of Job," *The Septuagint and Messianism* (ed. Knibb), 291–9.
- Schröter, J., "Markus, Q und der historische Jesus. Methodische und exegetische Erwägungen zu den Anfängen der Verkündigung Jesu," *ZNW* 89 (1998) 173–200.
- "Heil für die Heiden und Israel. Zum Zusammenhang von Christologie und Volk Gottes bei Lukas," *Die Apostelgeschichte und die hellenistische Geschichtsschreibung* (eds. Breytenbach and Schröter), 285–308.
- Schröter, J. and R. Brucker (eds.), *Der historische Jesus. Tendenzen und Perspektiven der gegenwärtigen Forschung* (BZNW 114, Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2002).
- Schüpphaus, J., *Die Psalmen Salomos. Ein Zeugnis jerusalemener Theologie und Frömmigkeit in der Mitte des vorchristlichen Jahrhunderts* (ALGHJ 7, Leiden: Brill, 1977).
- Schulz, S., Q: *Die Spruchquelle der Evangelisten* (Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1972).
- Schweitzer, A., *Geschichte der Leben-Jesu-Forschung* (Tübingen: Mohr, 21913).
- Sekki, A.E., *The Meaning of Ruah at Qumran* (SBLDS 110, Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989).
- Setzer, C., *Resurrection of the Body in Early Judaism and Early Christianity. Doctrine, Community, and Self-Definition* (Leiden: Brill Academic Publishers, 2004).
- Shanks, H., "Who Lies Here? Jordan Tombs Match Those at Qumran," *BAR* 25 (1999) 49–53, 76.
- Shepherd, T., "The Narrative Function of Markan Intercalation," *NTS* 41 (1995) 522–40.
- Sim, D.C., *Apocalyptic Eschatology in the Gospel of Matthew* (SNTSMS 88, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996).
- *The Gospel of Matthew and Christian Judaism: The History and Social Setting of the Matthean Community* (Studies of the New Testament and its world, Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998).
- Smalley, S.S., "The Delay of the Parousia," *JBL* 83 (1964) 41–54.
- Smith, M., "The Description of the Essenes in Josephus and the *Philosophumena*," *HUCA* 29 (1958) 273–313.
- Smith, S.H., "The Function of the Son of David Tradition in Mark's Gospel," *NTS* 42 (1996) 523–39.
- Sollamo, R., "Messianism and the 'Branch of David': Isaiah 11,1–5 and Genesis 49,8–12," *The Septuagint and Messianism* (ed. Knibb), 357–70.
- Stanton, G.N., *A Gospel for a New People: Studies in Matthew* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1992).
- Starcky, J., "Les quatre étapes du messianisme à Qumrân," *RB* 70 (1963) 481–505.
- "Psaumes apocryphes de la grotte 4 de Qumrân (4QPs^f VII–X)," *RB* 73 (1966) 350–71.
- Stegemann, H., *Rekonstruktion der Hodajot: Ursprüngliche Gestalt und kritisch bearbeiteter Text der Hymnenrolle aus Höhle 1 von Qumran* (Ph.D. Dissertation, Heidelberg: University of Heidelberg, 1963).
- "Some Remarks to 1QSa, to 1Qsb, and to Qumran Messianism," *RevQ* 17 (1996) 479–505.
- "Erwägungen zur Bedeutung des Täufers Johannes im Markusevangelium," *Das Ende der Tage und die Gegenwart des Heils* (eds. Becker and Fenske), 101–16.
- Stemberger, G., *Der Leib der Auferstehung. Studien zur Anthropologie und Eschatologie des palästinischen Judentums im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter (ca. 170 v. Chr.–100 n. Chr.)* (AnBib 56, Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1972).
- Stendahl, K. (ed.), *The Scrolls and the New Testament* (London: SCM, 1958).

- *The School of St. Matthew and Its Use of the Old Testament* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1968).
- Sterling, G.E., "Recherché or Representative? What is the Relationship between Philo's Treatises and Greek-Speaking Judaism?," *SPhilo* 11 (1999) 1–30.
- Stuedel, A., "אחרית הימים in the Texts from Qumran," *RevQ* 16 (1993) 225–46.
- *Der Midrasch zur Eschatologie aus der Qumrangemeinde (4QMidrEschat^{a,b})*. *Materielle Rekonstruktion*, Textbestand, Gattung und traditionsgeschichtliche Einordnung des durch 4Q174 („Florilegium“) und 4Q177 („Catena A“) repräsentierten Werkes aus den Qumranfunden (STDJ 13, Leiden: Brill, 1994).
- "The Eternal Reign of the People of God—Collective Expectations in Qumran Texts (4Q246 and 1QM)," *RevQ* 17 (1996) 507–25.
- Still, T.D., "Eschatology in Colossians: How Realized is It?," *NTS* 50 (2004) 125–38.
- Stone, M.E., "Enoch, Aramaic Levi and Sectarian Origins," *JSJ* 19 (1988) 159–70, reprinted in Idem, *Selected Studies*, 247–58.
- *Features of Eschatology of IV Ezra* (HSM 35, Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989).
- *Selected Studies in Pseudepigrapha and Apocrypha. With Special Reference to the Armenian Tradition* (SVTP 9, Leiden: Brill, 1991).
- "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Pseudepigrapha," *DSD* 3 (1996) 270–95.
- Stone, M.E. and T.A. Bergren (eds.), *Biblical Figures Outside the Bible* (Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 1998).
- Stone, M.E. and E.G. Chazon (eds.), *Biblical Perspectives: Early Use and Interpretation of the Bible in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (STDJ 28, Leiden: Brill, 1998).
- Stone, M.E. and J.C. Greenfield, "Remarks on the Aramaic Testament of Levi from the Genizah," *RB* 86 (1979) 214–230, reprinted in Idem, *Selected Studies*, 228–46.
- Strange, W.A., *The Problem of the Text of Acts* (SNTSMS 71, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992).
- Strecker, G. (ed.), *Jesus Christus in Historie und Theologie* (FS H. Conzelmann, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1975).
- Strickert, F.M., "Damascus Document VII, 10–20 and Qumran Messianic Expectation," *RevQ* 12 (1986) 327–49.
- Strobel, A., *Untersuchungen zum eschatologischen Verzögerungsproblem. Auf grund der spätjüdisch-urchristlichen Geschichte von Habakuk 2,2 ff.* (NovTSup 2, Leiden: Brill, 1961).
- Strugnell, J., "Notes en Marge du Volume V des 'Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan,'" *RevQ* 7 (1970) 163–276.
- Stuckenbruck, L.T., *The Book of Giants from Qumran: Texts, Translation, and Commentary* (TSAJ 63, Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck, 1997).
- "The Formation and Re-Formation of Daniel in the Dead Sea Scrolls," *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls. 1. Scripture and the Scrolls* (ed. Charlesworth), 101–30.
- "Messianic Ideas in the Apocalyptic and Related Literature of Early Judaism," *The Messiah in the Old and New Testaments* (ed. Porter), 90–113.
- Sukenik, E.L., *סקירה שנייה; מגילות גנוזות* (Jerusalem: the Bialik Institute, 1950).
- Swete, H.B., *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek* (revised by R.R. Ottley, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1914).
- Sysling, H., *Techiyat ha-Metim. The Resurrection of the Dead in the Palestinian Targums of the Pentateuch and Parallel Traditions in Classical Rabbinic Literature* (TSAJ 57, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996).
- Tabor, J.D. and M.O. Wise, "4Q521 'On Resurrection' and the Synoptic Gospel Tradition: A Preliminary Study," *JSP* 10 (1992) 149–62.
- Talmon, S. (ed.), *Jewish Civilization in the Hellenistic-Roman Period* (JSPSup 10, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991).
- "Hebrew Fragments from Masada," in *Masada VI* (eds. Talmon and Yadin), 1–149.

- Talmon, S. and Y. Yadin (eds.), *Masada VI, The Yigael Yadin Excavations 1963–1965, Final Reports* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1999).
- Taylor, Joan E., *The Immerser: John the Baptist within Second Temple Judaism* (Studying the Historical Jesus, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997).
- Telford, W.R., *The Theology of the Gospel of Mark* (New Testament Theology, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999).
- Theissen, G., *Lokalkolorit und Zeitgeschichte. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition* (NTOA 8, Freiburg: Universitätsverlag—Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989).
- Theissen, G. and A. Merz, *Der historische Jesus. Ein Lehrbuch* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996).
- Theissen, G. and D. Winter, *Die Kriterienfrage in der Jesusforschung. Vom Differenzkriterium zum Plausibilitätskriterium* (NTOA 34, Freiburg (Schweiz): Universitätsverlag—Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1997), English translation by M.E. Boring as *The Quest for the Plausible Jesus. The Question of Criteria* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2002).
- Thiselton, A.C., *The First Epistle to the Corinthians: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, and Carlisle: Paternoster, 2000).
- Thurén, L., *Derhetorizing Paul: A Dynamic Perspective on Pauline Theology and the Law* (WUNT 124, Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck, 2000).
- Tigchelaar, E.J.C., “The Addressees of 4QInstruction,” *Sapiential, Liturgical and Poetical Texts from Qumran* (eds. Falk, García Martínez, and Schuller), 62–75.
- “A Newly Identified 11Q^{Serekh} ha-Yahad Fragment (11Q29)?,” *The Dead Sea Scrolls. Fifty Years after Their Discovery* (eds. Schiffman, Tov, and VanderKam), 285–92.
- “Working with Few Data: The Relation between 4Q285 and 11Q14,” *DSD* 7 (2000) 49–56.
- *To Increase Learning for the Understanding Ones. Reading and Reconstructing the Fragmentary Early Jewish Sapiential Text 4QInstruction* (STDJ 44, Leiden: Brill, 2001).
- “Your Wisdom and Your Folly: The Case of 1–4QMysteries,” *Wisdom and Apocalypticism* (ed. García Martínez), 69–88.
- “In Search of the Scribe of 1Q^S,” *Emanuel* (eds. Paul *et al.*), 439–52.
- “De Dode-Zeerollen: wat we weten na ruim vijftig jaar,” *Fragmenten uit de woestijn* (eds. Tigchelaar and García Martínez), 9–19.
- “‘These are the names of the spirits of...’ A Preliminary Edition of 4QCatalogue of Spirits (4Q230) and New Manuscript Evidence for the Two Spirits Treatise (4Q257 and 1Q29a),” *RevQ* 21 (2004) 529–47.
- Tigchelaar, E.J.C. and F. García Martínez (eds.), *Fragmenten uit de woestijn. De Dode-Zeerollen opnieuw bekeken* (Zoetermeer: Meinema, 2003).
- Tobin, T.H., “Philo and the Sibyl: Interpreting Philo’s Eschatology,” *The Studia Philonica Annual* 9 (1997) 84–103.
- Tomson, P.J., *‘If This Be from Heaven...’ Jesus and the New Testament Authors in Their Relationship to Judaism* (The Biblical Seminar 76, Sheffield: Academic Press, 2001).
- “‘Die Täter des Gesetzes werden gerechtfertigt werden’ (Röm 2,13). Zu einer adäquaten Perspektive für den Römerbrief, *Lutherische und Neue Paulusperspektive* (ed. Bachmann), 183–221.
- Tov, E., “Hebrew Biblical Manuscripts from the Judaean Desert: Their Contribution to Textual Criticism,” *Jewish Civilization in the Hellenistic-Roman Period* (ed. Talmon), 107–37.
- “The Scribes of the Texts found in the Judean Desert,” *The Quest for Context and Meaning* (eds. Evans and Talmon), 131–52.

- *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (Minneapolis: Fortress, and Assen: Royal Van Gorcum, 2001).
- “The Nature of the Greek Texts from the Judean Desert,” *NovT* 43 (2001) 1–11.
- *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judean Desert* (STDJ 54, Leiden: Brill, 2004).
- Trebolle Barrera, J. and L. Vegas Montaner (eds.), *The Madrid Qumran Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls 18–21 March 1991* (STDJ 11, Leiden: Brill, 1993).
- Tronier, H., “The Corinthian Correspondence between Philosophical Idealism and Apocalypticism,” *Paul beyond the Judaism/Hellenism Divide* (ed. Engberg-Pedersen), 165–96.
- Tuckett, C.M., “Q and Thomas: Evidence of a Primitive ‘Wisdom Gospel’? A Response to H. Koester,” *ETL* 67 (1991) 346–60.
- *Q and the History of Early Christianity. Studies on Q* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1996).
- “The Son of Man and Daniel 7: Q and Jesus,” *The Sayings Source Q and the Historical Jesus* (ed. Lindemann), 371–94.
- “Sources and methods,” *The Cambridge Companion to Jesus* (ed. Bockmuehl), 121–37.
- “Q and the Historical Jesus,” *Der historische Jesus* (eds. Schröter and Brucker), 213–41.
- Ulrich, E., “The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Biblical Text,” *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years. 1* (eds. Flint and VanderKam), 79–100.
- “The Absence of ‘Sectarian Variants’ in the Jewish Scriptural Scrolls Found at Qumran,” *The Bible as Book* (eds. Herbert and Tov), 179–95.
- “The Non-Attestation of a Tripartite Canon in 4QMMT,” *CBQ* 65 (2003) 202–14.
- Ulrich, E. and J.C. VanderKam (eds.), *The Community of the Renewed Covenant. The Notre Dame Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity Series 10, Notre Dame: Notre Dame University Press, 1994).
- Uro, R. (ed.), *Symbols and Strata. Essays on the Sayings Gospel Q* (PFES 65, Helsinki: The Finnish Exegetical Society, and Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996).
- “Apocalyptic Symbolism and Social Identity in Q” in Idem, *Symbols and Strata*, 67–118.
- Valantasis, R., *The Gospel of Thomas* (New Testament Readings, London: Routledge, 1997).
- VanderKam, J.C., “Enoch Traditions in Jubilees and Other Second-Century Sources,” *SBLSP* (1976) 229–52.
- *Textual and Historical Studies in the Book of Jubilees* (HSM 14, Missoula: Scholars Press, 1977).
- *Enoch and the Growth of an Apocalyptic Tradition* (CBQMS 16, Washington, DC: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1984).
- “The Prophetic-Sapiential Origins of Apocalyptic Thought,” *A Word in Season* (eds. Martin and Davies), 163–76.
- *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, and London: SPCK, 1994).
- “Messianism in the Scrolls,” *The Community of the Renewed Covenant* (eds. Ulrich and VanderKam), 211–34.
- “Authoritative Literature in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” *DSD* 5 (1998) 382–402.
- “Messianism and Apocalypticism,” *The Encyclopedia of Apocalypticism. 1* (ed. Collins), 193–228.
- “Apocalyptic Tradition in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Religion of Qumran,” *Religion in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (eds. Collins and Kugler), 113–34.
- *The Book of Jubilees* (Guides to Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001).

- “Those Who Look for Smooth Things, Pharisees, and Oral Law,” *Emanuel* (eds. Paul et al.), 465–77.
- Van Segbroeck, F. et al. (eds.), *The Four Gospels 1992*. 3 volumes (FS F. Neiryneck, BETL 100, Leuven: Leuven University Press—Peeters, 1992).
- Vena, O.D., *The Parousia and Its Rereadings. The Development of the Eschatological Consciousness in the Writings of the New Testament* (Studies in Biblical Literature 27, New York: Peter Lang, 2001).
- Verheyden, J., “Persecution and Eschatology. Mk 13,9–13,” *The Four Gospels 1992. II* (eds. Van Segbroeck et al.), 1141–59.
- “The Conclusion of Q: Eschatology in Q 22,28–30,” *The Sayings Source Q and the Historical Jesus* (ed. Lindemann), 695–718.
- “Silent Witnesses: Mary Magdalene and the Women at the Tomb in the Gospel of Peter,” *Resurrection in the New Testament* (ed. Bieringer, Koperski, and Lataire), 457–82.
- Vogel, M., “Tempel und Tempelkult in Pseudo-Philos *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*,” *Gemeinde ohne Tempel* (eds. Ego et al.), 251–63.
- Volz, P., *Die Eschatologie der jüdischen Gemeinde im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter. Nach den Quellen der rabbinischen, apokalyptischen und apokryphen Literatur* (Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1966, reprint of the original edition, Tübingen: Mohr, 1934).
- Wacholder, B.Z., *The New Damascus Document: The Midrash on the Eschatological Torah of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Reconstruction, Translation and Commentary* (STDJ 56, Leiden: Brill, 2007).
- Wacker, M.T., *Weltordnung und Gericht. Studien zu 1 Henoch 22* (Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1982).
- Watson, F., “The Two Roman Congregations: Romans 14:1–15:13,” *The Romans Debate* (ed. Donfried), 203–15.
- Watts, R., “The Psalms in Mark’s Gospel,” *The Psalms in the New Testament* (eds. Moyise and Menken), 25–45.
- Webb, R.L., *John the Baptizer and Prophet: A Socio-Historical Study* (JSNTSup 62, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991).
- Wedderburn, A.J.M., “Matthew 10,23B and the Eschatology of Jesus,” *Das Ende der Tage und die Gegenwart des Heils* (eds. Becker and Fenske), 165–81.
- Weinfeld, M., “Grace after Meals in Qumran,” *JBL* 111 (1992) 427–40.
- Weiss, J., *Die Predigt Jesu vom Reiche Gottes* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1900).
- Weissenberg, H. von, “4QMMT—Towards an Understanding of the Epilogue,” *RevQ* 21 (2003) 29–45.
- Wenham, D., *The Rediscovery of Jesus’ Eschatological Discourse* (Gospel Perspectives: Studies of History and Tradition in the Four Gospels 4, Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1984).
- *Paul. Follower of Jesus or Founder of Christianity?* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995).
- Wenthe, D.O., “The Use of the Hebrew Scriptures in 1QM,” *DSD* 5 (1998) 290–319.
- Werline, R.A., “The Psalms of Solomon and the Ideology of Rule,” *Conflicted Boundaries in Wisdom and Apocalypticism* (ed. Wright and Wills), 69–87.
- White, S.A., “A Comparison of the ‘A’ and ‘B’ Manuscripts of the Damascus Document,” *RevQ* 12 (1987) 537–53.
- Wild, R.A. “The Encounter between Pharisaic and Christian Judaism: Some Early Gospel Evidence,” *NovT* 27 (1985) 105–24.
- Wilk, F., *Die Bedeutung des Jesajabuches für Paulus* (FRLANT 179, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998).
- Willett, T.W., *Eschatology in the Theodicies of 2 Baruch and 4 Ezra* (JSPSup 4, Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989).

- Willis, W. (ed.), *The Kingdom of God in 20th Century Interpretation* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1987).
- Wilson, S.G., *The Gentiles and the Gentile Mission in Luke-Acts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973).
- *Related Strangers: Jews and Christians, 70–170 C.E.* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1995).
- Wise, M.O., “4QFlorilegium and the Temple of Adam,” *RevQ* 15 (1991) 103–132.
- *The First Messiah: Investigating the Savior before Jesus* (San Francisco: Harper, 1999).
- “Dating the Teacher of Righteousness and the Floruit of his Movement,” *JBL* 122 (2003) 53–87.
- Wold, B.G., *Women, Men, and Angels: The Qumran Wisdom Document Musar leMevin and Its Allusions to Genesis Creation Traditions* (WUNT II/201, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005).
- Wolter, M., “Apokalyptik als Redeform im Neuen Testament,” *NTS* 51 (2005) 171–91.
- Wolters, A., “The Messiah in the Qumran Documents,” *The Messiah in the Old and New Testaments* (ed. Porter), 75–89.
- Wong, K.C., *Interkulturelle Theologie und multikulturelle Gemeinde im Matthäusevangelium* (NTOA 22, Freiburg: Universitätsverlag, and Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1992).
- van der Woude, A.S., *Die messianischen Vorstellungen der Gemeinde von Qumrân* (Doctoral dissertation; Assen: Van Gorcum, 1957).
- (ed.), *The Book of Daniel in the Light of New Findings* (BETL 106, Leuven: Leuven University Press—Peeters, 1993).
- Wright III, B.G., “Putting the Puzzle Together: Some Suggestions concerning the Social Location of the Wisdom of Ben Sira,” *Conflicted Boundaries in Wisdom and Apocalypticism* (eds. Wright and Wills), 89–112.
- Wright III, B.G. and L.M. Wills (eds.), *Conflicted Boundaries in Wisdom and Apocalypticism* (SBLSymS 35, Leiden: Brill, 2006).
- Wright, G.E. (ed.), *The Bible and the Ancient Near East* (FS W.F. Albright, Garden City: Doubleday, 1961).
- Wright, N.T., *Jesus and the Victory of God* (Christian Origins and the Question of God 2, London: SPCK, 1996).
- *The Resurrection of the Son of God* (Christian Origins and the Question of God 3, London: SPCK, 2003).
- Xeravits, G.G., “Précisions sur le texte original et le concept messianique de CD 7:13–8:1 et 19:5–14,” *RevQ* 19 (1999) 47–59.
- “The Early History of Qumran’s Messianic Expectations,” *ETL* 76 (2000) 113–21.
- *King, Priest, Prophet. Positive Eschatological Protagonists of the Qumran Library* (STDJ 47, Leiden: Brill, 2003).
- Zager, W., *Gottesherrschaft und Endgericht in der Verkündigung Jesu: eine Untersuchung zur markinischen Jesusüberlieferung einschließlich der Q-Parallelen* (BZNW 82, Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1996).
- Zeller, D., “Der Zusammenhang der Eschatologie in der Logienquelle,” *Gegenwart und kommendes Reich* (eds. Fiedler and Zeller), 67–77.
- “Jesus, Q und die Zukunft Israels,” *The Sayings Source Q and the Historical Jesus* (ed. Lindemann), 351–70.
- “Erscheinungen Verstorbener im griechisch-römischen Bereich,” *Resurrection in the New Testament* (eds. Bieringer, Koperski, and Lataire), 1–19.
- Zimmermann, J., *Messianische Texte aus Qumran. Königliche, priesterliche und prophetische Messiasvorstellungen in den Schriftfunden von Qumran* (WUNT II/104, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998).

- Zissu, B., "‘Qumran Type’ Graves in Jerusalem: Archaeological Evidence of an Essene Community?," *DSD* 5 (1998) 158–71.
- "Odd Tomb Out: Has Jerusalem’s Essene Cemetery Been Found?," *BAR* 25 (1999) 50–55, 62.
- Zmijevski, Y., *Die Eschatologiereden des Lukas-Evangeliums: Eine traditions- und redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zu Lk 21,5–36 und Lk 17,20–37* (BBB 40, Bonn: Hanstein, 1972).
- Zöckler, T., *Jesu Lehren im Thomasevangelium* (NHMS 47, Leiden: Brill, 1999).

INDEX OF MODERN AUTHORS

- Abegg, M.G., Jr. 22, 24, 27, 30, 32, 34,
 260, 263, 307, 354, 364, 372, 432, 462
 Adams, E. 11, 132, 146-7, 149
 Agbanou, V.K. 144, 165-6
 Albani, M. 40
 Albinus, L. 2, 89, 112, 250, 252, 293
 Alexander, P.S. 17, 36, 52-3, 68, 338,
 344, 371-2
 Alison, J. 270
 Allegro, J.M. 15, 60, 62, 64-5, 69-70
 Allison, D.C., Jr. 9, 13, 116, 118, 132,
 154, 156, 158, 162-3, 386, 418
 Alsop, J.E. 249, 308-11
 Arendzen, J. 83
 Arnim, H. von 383
 Arzt-Grabner, P. 317
 Attridge, H.W. 188, 190-1, 378
 Aune, D.E. 2, 7, 11, 188, 207, 461
 Avery-Peck, A.J. 105
 Avigad, N. 68
- Baillet, M. 30, 32, 56, 60, 68, 75, 222,
 346, 371
 Balch, D.L. 163
 Bar-Adon, P. 15
 Bardet, S. 244, 383
 Barr, J. 251, 318
 Barrett, C.K. 219, 230, 232-4, 236-7,
 297-8, 304, 470
 Barthélemy, D. 30, 54
 Bartsch, H.-W. 12
 Bauer, W. 187
 Baumgarten, A.I. 46, 104
 Baumgarten, J.M. 47, 49, 52, 104-5,
 285
 Beall, T.S. 448
 Beasley-Murray, G.R. 10-1, 124, 132,
 136-7, 144-5, 147-8, 150, 194, 196,
 200-1, 203, 206, 312, 314, 399
 Becker, E.-M. 144, 401-3
 Becker, H.-J. 105
 Becker, J. 35, 57
 Becking, B. 19
 Beckwith, R.T. 262
 Beentjes, P.C. 82
 Beker, J.C. 410
 Benoit, M. 20
 Bergmeier, R. 103, 111
- Berrin, S.L. 59, 70-1, 73
 Bernstein, M. 62, 105
 Beyer, K. 268
 Bieringer, R. 247, 249, 308
 Bitzer, L.F. 208
 Black, M. 405
 Blank, J. 200, 312
 Blatz, B. 399
 Blenkinsopp, J. 326
 Boccaccini, G. 5
 Bockmuehl, M. 65, 293, 313
 Boda, M.J. 437
 Boer, M.C. de 207, 216, 316, 318, 341,
 410, 412
 Böttrich, C. 213
 Boismard, M.-É. 231-2, 399
 Borg, M.J. 7-8, 14, 418
 Boring, M.E. 11, 122, 129, 295, 303,
 463
 Bornkamm, G. 165
 Botermann, H. 217
 Bovon, F. 175
 Bowley, J.E. 372
 Brady, M. 271, 432
 Brandenburger, E. 132, 143-4, 147,
 401, 403
 Brandon, S.G.F. 128
 Breytenbach, C. 175
 Bridge, S.L. 181, 184-5
 Broadhead, E. 154
 Broer, I. 165-6
 Brooke, G.J. 45, 51, 65-6, 120-1, 266,
 280, 289, 306, 343, 451
 Broshi, M. 15
 Brown, J.K. 165
 Brown, R.E. 195, 198-9, 342, 399
 Brownlee, W.H. 52, 72-3, 379, 427
 Bruce, F.F. 208, 210
 Bryan, D.J. 250
 Buitenwerf, R. 90, 100
 Bultmann, R. 7, 295, 399
 Burchard, C. 103
 Burkert, W. 294, 354
 Burkett, D. 125, 463
 Burkitt, F.C. 7
 Burnett, F.W. 12, 144, 165
 Burrows, M. 52, 72
 Byrskog, S. 196, 307, 309

- Cameron, R. 11, 13, 187, 339, 387
 Campbell, J.G. 15
 Cancik, H. 293
 Carlston, C.E. 157-8
 Carmignac, J. 8, 10, 35, 66, 134, 394, 452
 Cavallin, H.C.C. 247, 251-2, 255-9, 261-2, 264, 267-8, 275-6, 285, 288, 291, 327
 Charles, R.H. 3, 83, 107
 Charlesworth, J.H. 21, 187, 199, 423, 428-9, 454
 Chazon, E.G. 36, 38, 222, 283, 376
 Chilton, B.D. 136, 394
 Cohen, N.G. 87
 Collins, A.Y. 144-5, 335
 Collins, J.J. 2, 4-5, 15, 31, 37, 40-1, 65, 69, 80, 88-90, 110, 121, 126, 137, 142, 247-9, 251-4, 256, 265, 268, 270-1, 275-7, 285, 287, 289, 292, 298, 301, 326-7, 329, 335-40, 342, 346-8, 352-7, 360-1, 363-4, 371, 375, 381, 403, 409, 415, 418, 423-4, 427-30, 435, 438-9, 443-5, 447-9, 451, 464
 Condra, E. 387
 Conzelmann, H. 13, 116, 175, 180-1, 194, 196, 207-8, 211-3, 229-31, 309
 Cook, E.M. 372
 Cordes, A. 441
 Corstjens, R. 118
 Cotton, H.M. 21
 Cowley, A. 83
 Cross, F.M. 16, 30, 52, 56, 68, 78
 Crossan, J.D. 8, 13, 154, 418
 Cryer, F. 78
 Cullmann, O. 7, 251

 Dahl, N.A. 458
 Dalman, G.H. 405
 Danby, H. 27, 123, 143
 Davenport, G.L. 3, 5, 35, 81, 352
 Davies, P.R. 3-5, 30, 35-6, 47, 51, 65, 69, 77, 104, 137, 247, 249, 252, 254, 361, 371, 428, 451
 Davies, W.D. 163
 Davila, J. 15
 DeConick, A.D. 188-9, 193
 Delobel, J. 211
 Denaux, A.J. 324
 Dibelius, M. 7
 Dimant, D. 66, 162, 254, 260, 265, 269-72, 274-5, 282, 337-9, 358, 378, 380, 433
 Dines, J.M. 257, 263

 Dodd, C.H. 7
 Donahue, J.R. 128
 Donfried, K.P. 207-8, 394
 Doudna, G.L. 70, 78
 Douglas, M.C. 56-7
 Doyle, B. 256
 Duhaime, J. 286, 371-2, 448
 Duhm, B. 107
 Dungan, D.L. 115
 Dunn, J.D.G. 12, 134-5, 150, 168, 178, 181, 189, 207, 211, 213-4, 217, 220-1, 223-6, 228-30, 317, 383, 385-7, 394, 396, 410, 412, 460
 Dupont-Sommer, A. 427

 Easton, B.F. 7
 Edwards, J.R. 148
 Edwards, R.A. 122, 157, 160, 404
 Ego, B. 65
 Elgvin, T. 4, 37-40, 283, 340, 380
 Ellis, E.E. 12, 179, 184
 Epp, E.J. 230
 Eshel, E. 68, 78, 373
 Eshel, H. 68, 77
 Esler, P.F. 175-7, 181
 Evans, C.A. 3, 10-1, 117, 131, 133-7, 139-40, 142-3, 145-8, 153, 187, 423, 432
 Eynikel, E. 438

 Fallon, F.T. 11, 187, 387
 Feldman, L.H. 46, 102, 236, 295, 303, 387-8, 401, 407, 426
 Fischer, U. 2-3, 100-1, 247
 Fitzmyer, J.A. 31, 175, 221, 223-6, 230, 232-9, 241, 293, 297-9, 304, 423-4, 427-9, 431-2, 443-5, 460
 Fleddermann, H.T. 13, 154-6, 180, 302, 304, 306, 385-6, 404
 Fletcher-Louis, C.H.T. 132, 146, 336
 Flint, P.W. 3, 21-22, 24, 27, 30, 32, 34, 37, 44, 120, 225, 260, 263, 275-6, 307, 337, 353-5, 364, 385, 403, 423, 462
 Flusser, D. 312, 445
 Foster, P. 163
 Fowler, R.M. 129-30, 145, 151, 300, 395
 Fraade, S.D. 43
 France, R.T. 10-1, 122, 124, 128-31, 133-4, 136, 138, 140, 142, 144-50, 152-5, 296, 300, 302-3, 311, 396, 461
 Franzmann, M. 116
 Freedman, D.N. 27
 Frenschkowski, M. 155

- Frerichs, E.S. 3
 Frey, J. 12, 103, 195-8, 200-1, 203-6,
 325, 341-2, 399
 Frey, J.B. 76
 Friedrichsen, T.A. 144
 Fuks, A. 76
- García Martínez, F. xi, 4, 31-2, 37-8,
 40-1, 52, 54-5, 57-8, 60-4, 66-8,
 70-5, 105, 108, 124, 139, 158, 162, 171,
 199, 220, 222, 225, 228, 233-4, 240,
 249, 253, 260, 266, 268, 270-1, 275-8,
 282, 284-6, 288, 290, 301, 319-21, 324,
 335-8, 342-3, 345-7, 351, 353-5, 357,
 359-60, 363-5, 367-71, 373-4, 376-9,
 381, 389-90, 393, 402, 407-8, 412-5,
 417, 419-20, 423, 427-9, 431-2, 438-9,
 442, 444-9, 453, 455-8, 461, 467, 469
- Geddert, T.J. 124, 144
 Geiger, R. 184-5
 Gilbert, M. 88
 Glasson, T.F. 7, 111
 Glessmer, U. 33
 Gmirkin, R. 35
 Gnilka, J. 134, 143, 383
 Goff, M.J. 13, 320, 322, 340, 359, 380-2,
 412
 Grabbe, L.L. 2, 100-1, 335, 340
 Grässer, E. 7, 168, 180
 Gratz, P.A. 138
 Green, J.B. 180, 240, 256, 304, 404, 466
 Green, W.S. 3
 Greenfield, J.C. 83
 Greenhut, Z. 77
 Greenspoon, L. 24
 Gregg, B.H. 158, 398, 405, 421
 Grossman, M.L. 43
 Guelich, R. 395
- Hachlili, R. 76-7
 Hagner, D. 122, 302, 304, 306, 314, 324,
 388, 396, 404, 464
 Hahn, F. 143, 165
 Hakola, R. 195
 Han, K.S. 155
 Hanson, J.S. 426
 Harrington, D.J. 4, 25, 39-40, 91-3, 95,
 319-20, 340, 380
 Hartman, L.F. 30, 335, 401, 403, 420
 Hatina, T.R. 10
 Hauspie, K. 438
 Hellholm, D. 335
 Hempel, C. 44, 48, 50-1, 285, 451
 Hengel, M. 87, 134, 216, 425, 459
- Henten, J.W. van 76
 Herbert, E. 52
 Hiers, R.H. 7
 Hirschberg, H.Z. 30
 Hirschberg, P. 117
 Hoffmann, P. 154, 157, 212, 386
 Høgenhaven, J. 43-4
 Hogeterp, A.L.A. 11, 189, 199, 218, 227,
 267, 285, 287, 316, 328
 Hollander, H.W. 82-3, 434, 444
 Holleman, J. 12, 119, 206-7, 216,
 315-6, 327
 Holm-Nielsen, S. 56-7
 Holtz, T. 209-13
 Horbury, W. 3, 101, 443
 Horsley, R.A. 123, 394, 426
 Horst, P.W. van der 23, 76
 Hultgård, A. 3, 82, 434
 Hunzinger, C.-H. 35-6
 Hurtado, L. 189
 Hvalvik, R. 226
- Iersel, B.M.F. van 124, 127, 129-31,
 142, 153
 Isaac, E. 28, 32-3, 80
- Jacobson, A.D. 116, 154, 157
 Jacobson, H. 91-3
 James, M.R. 95-6
 Jastrow, M. 364, 372
 Jellicoe, S. 23
 Jeremias, G. 57
 Jeremias, J. 7
 Jobes, K.H. 441
 Jonge, H.J. 309-10, 315
 Jonge, M. de 3, 26, 82-4, 86, 200, 434,
 444
 Jongeling, B. 35
- Käsemann, E. 398, 410, 418
 Kahn, J.-G. 100
 Kaiser, O. 434
 Kammler, H.-C. 197
 Kampen, J. 50, 105
 Karris, R.J. 217
 Kaye, B.N. 212
 Kee, H.C. 3, 83-6, 127-8, 132, 434,
 444
 Kelber, W. 127, 309-10
 Kellermann, U. 139, 247, 261, 314-5
 Kieffer, R. 178
 Kilgallen, J.J. 143
 Killebrew, A.E. 77
 Kirchner, D. 383

- Kister, M. 4, 75, 151, 249, 270, 373, 403, 420, 452
 Klauck, H.-J. 11, 116, 187–8, 191, 193, 308
 Klausner, J.G. 30
 Klein, G. 217
 Klein, H. 209
 Klijn, A.F.J. 79, 96–9
 Kloppenborg, J.S. 9, 13, 135, 154–5, 157, 168, 339, 386, 404, 418
 Knibb, M.A. 3–5, 23, 32–3, 137, 248, 252, 425, 434–5, 437, 443, 448, 452
 Knohl, I. 427
 Knox, J. 116, 175–6
 Koch, K. 40, 396, 442
 Koester, H. 12, 116, 188–9, 211–2, 242, 383, 386
 Kooij, A. van der 22, 24, 258
 Koperski, V. 247, 249, 308, 316
 Korn, M. 175
 Kosch, D. 157
 Kottsieper, I. 363
 Kraus, T.J. 312
 Kritzer, R.E. 317
 Kümmel, W.G. 7–8, 12–3, 132, 134, 178, 184
 Künzi, M. 135–6, 138–9, 147
 Kugler, R.A. 83
 Kuhn, H.-W. 3, 57, 252, 288–9
 Kuhn, K.A. 445–6, 463
 Kutscher, E.Y. 259
 Kuula, K. 226
 Kvalbein, H. 249, 280

 Ladd, G.E. 7
 Lambrecht, J. 12, 136, 144, 148
 Lambdin, T.O. 190–4, 382, 391
 Lampe, P. 218
 Lange, A. 6, 34, 65, 287, 320, 348, 381
 Larson, E. 390
 Lataire, B. 247, 249, 308
 Layton, B. 116, 188, 190–4, 382, 391
 Lehtipuu, O. 178
 Lenski, G. 123
 Levinskaya, I. 177, 209
 Licht, J. 54, 57
 Lichtenberger, H. 137, 252, 289, 291–2, 423, 448
 Lietaert Peerbolte, L.J. 12, 196
 Lim, T.H. 20
 Lindblom, J. 19

 Lindemann, A. 13, 116, 194, 196, 207–8, 211–3, 229–31, 309
 Lövestam, E. 147, 405
 Loisy, A. 138
 Longman, T. III 437
 Lüdemann, G. 247, 249–50, 308–10, 316, 318
 Lührmann, D. 13, 157, 312, 397, 405
 Lundström 7
 Lust, J. 259–60, 264, 327, 437–9
 Luttikhuizen, G.P. 103, 187, 244
 Lutz, R.T. 365, 413
 Luz, U. 11, 173

 Macaskill, G. 341, 381
 Mack, B. 7–8, 13, 242, 418
 Magness, J. 15, 31, 77
 Maher, M. 25
 Maier, J. 430
 Malherbe, A.J. 208–11
 Malina, B.J. 103, 244
 Malone, A.S. 123
 Manson, T.W. 154
 Mara, M.G. 312
 Marcus, J. 10–1, 127–30, 132–4, 144, 147, 395–6
 Martin, D.B. 217, 293, 317–8
 Martin, M. 15
 Martone, C. 22
 Martyn, J.L. 410
 Marxsen, W. 127–8, 212
 Mattila, S.L. 254
 May, H.G. 62, 82, 86–8
 McLaren, J.S. 131, 236, 295
 McLean, B.H. 189
 Mearns, C.L. 211
 Merz, A. 13, 115–6, 187, 387
 Metzso, S.S. 17, 53, 287, 378
 Metzger, B.M. 62, 79, 82, 86–8, 93–5
 Miano, D. 27
 Michaud, J.-P. 155
 Michel, D. 339
 Milgrom, J. 65
 Milik, J.T. 20, 30, 32, 34, 39–40, 52, 56, 63–4, 68, 83, 238, 266–8, 340, 346, 351, 358, 427, 445, 456–7
 Miller, D.M. 123
 Miller, M.P. 423, 458–9, 463
 Moore, G.F. 87, 424
 Morawe, G. 57
 Mournet, T.C. 310
 Mowinkel, S. 424–5, 436–7, 470
 Mueller, J.R. 26

- Münchow, C. 3
 Murphy-O'Connor, J. 52-3, 207, 217, 299, 451-2
 Myers, C. 127
 Myllykoski, M. 122, 156
- Neiryneck, F. 118, 144-5, 154
 Neufeld, D. 469
 Neusner, J. 3, 104-5
 Newsom, C.A. 27, 36, 254
 Nickelsburg, G.W.E. 4-6, 24, 55, 78, 80, 87, 149, 247, 251-3, 256, 284, 287, 289, 345, 349-50, 356, 411, 414-5, 417, 431, 435
 Nicklas, T. 311-2
 Niederwimmer, K. 197
 Nielsen, A.E. 132, 178
 Nitzan, B. 27, 72, 366, 389
 Nolland, J. 182-3, 297, 404, 416
 Nongbri, B. 194
 Novakovic, L. 65
 Noy, D. 101
- Oegema, G.S. 29, 423, 425-6, 443
 Öhler, M. 385
 Osten-Sacken, P. von der 35
 Overman, J.A. 163
- Papathomas, A. 317
 Park, J.S. 142, 251
 Parry, D.W. 30, 124, 277, 337-8, 375, 390, 431
 Pass, H.L. 83
 Patterson, S.J. 9, 188, 418
 Paul, A. 438
 Pearson, B.A. 155
 Perkins, P. 247, 249, 308, 310-11, 314, 324
 Perrin, N. 7, 394
 Pesch, R. 12, 122, 127, 131, 143-5, 150
 Petersen, D.L. 2, 19
 Peterson, D.N. 127
 Pfann, S. 47, 75
 Philonenko, M. 203, 216, 336
 Pietersma, A. 261, 365, 413
 Pilhofer, P. 65
 Piper, R.A. 158
 Pitre, B. 132
 Ploeg, J.P.M. van der 15, 35, 52
 Polag, A. 154
 Politis, K.D. 77
 Pomykala, K.E. 426-7
 Porter, S.E. 423
- Pouilly, J. 52
 Puech, É. 4, 15, 20, 30, 33, 37, 40, 55-6, 65, 77, 83, 88, 104, 124, 137, 202, 220, 234, 247, 249, 252-5, 258-62, 264-70, 275-8, 280, 284, 288-9, 301, 326, 329, 337, 346, 349, 375, 380-1, 408, 415, 431, 446, 448-50, 456-7
- Qimron, E. 4, 43-7, 49, 66, 104, 151, 249, 270, 343, 359, 403, 420
- Rahlfs, A. 443
 Read-Heimerdinger, J. 231-2, 311
 Reale, G. 2, 171
 Reed, J.L. 155
 Reif, S.C. 47
 Reiser, M. 158, 397-8
 Rengstorf, K.H. 221
 Repschinski, B. 163
 Reventlow, H.G. 19
 Ricks, S.D. 30
 Riesenfeld, H. 127
 Riesner, R. 100
 Riniker, C. 397-8, 405
 Rius-Camps, J. 231-2, 311
 Roberts, J.J.M. 437
 Robinson, J.M. 8, 13, 116, 154, 242, 339, 418
 Robinson, S.E. 26
 Rösel, M. 438-9
 Roloff, J. 168, 175
 Roo, J.C.R. de 36
 Roskam, H.N. 129
 Roth-Gerson, L. 76
 Rowe, R.D. 119, 135, 462
 Rowland, C. 336
 Rowley, H.H. 107
 Russell, D.S. 107
- Sacchi, P. 335
 Sängler, D. 339
 Safrai, S. 104
 Saldarini, A.J. 163
 Sanders, J.A. 21, 120, 225, 363
 Sanders, E.P. 341, 398, 405
 Sanderson, J.E. 263
 Sato, M. 13, 116
 Scatolini Apóstolo, S.S. 260
 Schäfer, P. 105
 Schaper, J. 120, 248, 261, 284, 330, 441
 Schechter, S. 47, 81
 Schenk, W. 145, 151, 154
 Schenker, A. 440

- Schiffman, L.H. 39, 55, 65, 104–5, 134,
380, 430, 435–6, 454
Schmithals, W. 211
Schackenburg, R. 399
Schneider, G. 175
Schnelle, U. 116, 127, 129–30, 133, 143,
147, 156, 162–3, 170, 173, 175, 194–6,
207–9, 211, 213, 217, 229–31, 416
Schnocks, J. 262, 264
Scholem, G. 30
Schröter, J. 9–10, 12, 125, 175
Schüpphaus, J. 26
Schürer, E. 59, 424
Schuller, E.M. 56, 441
Schulz, S. 404
Schweitzer, A. 7, 9, 410, 418
Seely, D.R. 239, 282–3
Sekki, A.E. 366
Setzer, C. 247, 311, 330
Shepherd, T. 148
Silva, M. 441
Sim, D.C. 163–4, 166–72, 174, 341,
391
Skehan, P.W. 22, 30, 225, 263
Smalley, S.S. 7
Smith, M. 103, 270, 360
Smith, S.H. 470
Smyth, H.W. 297
Sollamo, R. 443
Spittler, R.P. 263
Stanton, G.N. 163
Starcky, J. 22, 408, 431
Stegemann, H. 56, 135, 289, 384–5,
425, 427
Stemberger, G. 3–4, 87, 91, 95–6, 247,
251
Stendahl, K. 122, 163, 165
Sterling, G.E. 99
Steudel, A. 6, 19, 65, 135, 360, 368, 425,
457
Still, T.D. 12
Stone, M.E. 3, 6, 38, 83–4, 336
Strange, W.A. 231
Strecker, G. 382
Strickert, F.M. 452
Strobel, A. 7, 180
Strugnell, J. 15, 39–40, 43–6, 65–6,
69–70, 260, 269, 319–20, 340, 343, 361,
378, 380
Stuckenbruck, L.T. 32–3, 337, 346,
434–6
Sukenik, E.L. 54, 56, 68, 289, 371
Swete, H.B. 23
Sysling, H. 105
Tabor, J.D. 137, 249, 280
Talmon, S. 21
Taylor, C. 81
Taylor, J.E. 383
Taylor, V. 128
Tcherikover, V. 76
Telford, W.R. 11, 127–8, 148
Thackeray, H.St.J. 242
Theissen, G. 13–4, 115–6, 156, 175, 187,
387
Thiselton, A.C. 191, 214–6, 411, 413
Tigchelaar, E.J.C. 31–2, 38–41, 52,
54–5, 57–8, 60–4, 66–8, 70–5, 108,
124, 139, 171, 199, 220, 222, 225, 228,
233–4, 240, 249, 253, 266, 268, 277–8,
282, 284–8, 290, 301, 319–21, 324,
337–8, 343, 345–7, 351, 353–5, 357,
359–60, 363–5, 367–71, 373–4, 376–9,
381, 389–90, 393, 402, 407–8, 412–5,
417, 420, 427, 432, 438–9, 442, 444,
446–9, 453, 455–8, 461, 467, 469
Tiller, P.A. 123
Tobin, T.H. 100–1
Tomson, P.J. 164, 227, 391
Tov, E. 15–16, 19–21, 24, 56, 120, 124,
257, 259–60, 264, 277, 337–8, 375, 390,
431, 435
Trever, J.C. 52
Trilling, W. 207
Tronier, H. 410
Tuckett, C.M. 14, 118, 125, 144, 152,
154, 157, 189, 386
Ulrich, E. 15, 19–22, 24, 27, 30, 32, 34,
45, 225, 260, 263, 307, 354, 364, 462
Uro, R. 155, 160, 386, 404
Valantasis, R. 187–93, 399
VanderKam, J.C. 5, 30–1, 34, 49, 65,
80, 149, 167, 238, 339, 342–3, 345–6,
349–52, 356, 358, 411, 414–5, 417,
428–9, 431–2, 435
Vaux, R. de 20–1, 30
Vena, O.D. 8, 12, 180, 187, 212, 229
Verheyden, J. 118, 130, 144–6, 157,
159, 312
Vermes, G. 52, 68, 371
Vielhauer, P. 175, 382
Vogel, M. 91
Volz, P. 3
Wacholder, B.Z. 285, 361, 366, 452
Wacker, M.T. 252
Wagner, J. 399

- Watson, F. 217
 Watts, R. 119
 Webb, R.L. 383, 390
 Webster, B. 16, 56, 60
 Wedderburn, A.J.M. 168
 Weinfeld, M. 239, 281-3
 Weiss, J. 7, 9, 418
 Weissenberg, H. von 45
 Wellhausen, J. 107
 Wenham, D. 10, 115, 124, 145
 Wenthe, D.O. 35
 Werline, R.A. 122
 White, S.A. 452
 Wild, R.A. 244
 Wilk, F. 225-6
 Willett, T.W. 3, 88, 93-4, 96, 107
 Williams, M. 77
 Wills, L.M. 13, 249, 339, 381
 Wilson, J. 339
 Wilson, S.G. 176-7, 195
 Winter, D. 14
 Winter, F. 317
 Wintermute, O.S. 25, 34, 44, 192, 350, 407
 Wise, M.O. 32, 66, 137, 249, 280, 427
 Wold, B.G. 322
 Wolter, M. 335, 341, 410
 Wolters, A. 423
 Wong, K.C. 163
 Woude, A.S. van der 52, 68, 225, 363-4, 371, 427-9
 Wrede, W. 130
 Wright III, B.G. 13, 123, 249, 339, 381
 Wright, N.T. 10-1, 131-2, 134, 136, 138, 145-7, 150, 249, 308, 311, 390
 Wright, R.B. 26, 86, 434, 443
 Xeravits, G.G. 5, 29-30, 254, 265, 277, 301, 304, 409, 423, 425, 427, 429-33, 438-9, 442, 445, 447-50, 452, 456-7
 Yadin, Y. 21, 35, 82, 371
 Yardeni, A. 47, 78
 Zager, W. 134-6, 141-2
 Zeller, D. 157-8, 250, 293
 Zimmermann, J. 265, 277, 280, 301, 304, 409, 423, 427-32, 438-9, 441-2, 445, 447-9, 456-7
 Zissu, B. 77
 Zmijevski, Y. 12, 144, 184-5
 Zöckler, T. 11, 189

INDEX OF ANCIENT SOURCES

1. HEBREW BIBLE

<i>Genesis</i>	20–1, 126–7	<i>Numbers</i>	20, 29
1:27	320, 322	10:9	370
2:7	318	15:30	378
5:6–7	321	24:7	23, 101, 112
5:18–25	344	24:14	19
5:21–24	343	24:15–17	304, 437, 439
5:22	344	24:17–19	457
5:23	343	24:17	23, 29, 439
5:24	250		
6:1–8:22	162	<i>Deuteronomy</i>	20–1, 112
6:1–4	126, 344	4:26	25
6:1	174	4:30	19, 25
6:4	344, 347	4:32	151
6:5	174, 344	5:8–9	296
6:11–13	174, 344	5:17–21	228
8:21–22	92	5:28–29	304, 439
10:1–32	59	7:15	67
14:18	456	18:15–20	226
18:16–19:29	159	18:15	304
38:8	296	18:18–19	304, 439
49:1–28	24, 81, 112, 127	25:5	296
49:1	19, 24, 100–1, 105	28	101
49:8–12	25	29:1	378
49:9–10	469	29:28	378
49:9	127	30	101
49:10	85, 428, 437–8, 455,	30:1–3	45, 150
	470	30:3	403
50:24	182	30:15–20	220
		31:29	19, 25
<i>Exodus</i>	20	32	348
3:6	296	32:35	228
3:16	182	32:39	201, 258, 325
9:18	151	33:1	433
12:29–30	352	33:8–11	304, 439
15:17–18	66	33:8	433
20:4–5	296		
20:13–17	228	<i>Joshua</i>	
		6:26	304, 439
<i>Leviticus</i>	21	24:27	23
4:3–5	428		
4:16	428	<i>Judges</i>	
13:49	461	7:20	377
19:17–18	209		
19:18	228	<i>1 Samuel</i>	
26	101	2:6	92, 201, 325
26:44	360	17:12	464

<i>2 Samuel</i>		11:1	67
7	442-3	12:1	67
7:10	66	12:7	67
7:11	66	13:2-3	26, 67
7:11-16	440	14(13):7	225
7:12-16	434	15(14)	120
7:12-14	67, 440, 455	15:10	89, 120
7:16	440	16(15)	120
20:1	368	16:3	67
		17:1	26, 67
<i>1 Kings</i>		22(21)	120, 462
5:7	201, 325	22(21):30	258
17:21-23	250	30:9	256
		32(31):1-2a	120
<i>2 Kings</i>		33	120
2:11	250	33:18	447
2:15	303	34(33):1	120
5:10	306	36:9	198
5:12-14	306	45(44)	120, 441
		45:2	58
<i>1 Chronicles</i>		46(45)	120
17	442	48(47)	120
17:11-15	440	48:3	77
		49(48)	120
<i>Job</i>	263-4	49(48):16	258
1:6-12	351	53(52):6(7)	225
7:20-21	264	55:24	141
10:10-12	264	56(55)	120
10:12	182	58:3	321
14:13-18	263	59(58)	120
14:14	258, 262-4	60(59)	120, 441
19:25-27	258, 262-4	62(61):13	219
19:25-26	262	64:7	321
19:26	264	66(65):1	258
29:4	182	66(65):9	258
42:17	258, 262-4	68(67)	120, 441
		69(68):23-24	120
<i>Psalms</i>	21, 26, 106, 119-20,	69:28	253
	225, 264	72(71)-107(106)	120
1	120, 262	72(71)	441
1:1	262	80(79)	441
1:5	23, 26, 248, 258,	82:1-2	379
	261-2, 284, 405	87(86)	441
2	120, 441, 462	88:10-12	256
2:1-2	468	89	434, 442
2:1	26	89:23	26, 66
2:2	470	91	364
2:7	119	98:1	120
2:9	434, 442-3	99	120
6:2-3	120	99:1	120
6:5	256	104-106	462
7:8-9	379	106:47	150
8	441	109:6	405
8:7b	119	110(109)	23, 120, 441, 462

110(109):1	119–20, 315, 462, 468	5:3	60
110:4	456	5:8–23	60, 350
115:16–17	256	5:8–10	60
118	462	5:9–10	60
118:22–23	119	5:11–25	61
118:26	119, 462	5:11–14	60
118:27	462	5:24–25	60
120–132	462	7	432
143:3	141	8:14	221
145:14	253	9:1	269
146(145)	307, 332	9:2–7	26
146–148	462	10	183
146:1–8	446	10:1–4	350
146:7–8	280, 307, 332	10:3	182
146:8	253	10:20–23	61
146:9–10	307, 332	10:24–27	69
147	462	10:28–32	70
147:2	150	10:33–34	69–70, 97
147:11	447	10:33–11:5	112
148	462	10:34–11:1	27
148:1	462	10:34	71
		11	432
<i>Proverbs</i>		11:1–16	26, 428
1:1–2	380	11:1–5	27, 69–70, 97, 428, 434, 440, 455
1:6–8	380		
3:35	380	11:1	70, 127, 428, 440, 460, 470
9:6	258		
10:25	258	11:2	434–5, 440, 454
12:28	258	11:3–5	468
13:14	198	11:3–4	440
15:11	141	11:3	440
15:14	380	11:4	443, 454
15:24	258	11:5	440, 454
16:27	368	11:10	118, 460
18:15	380	13:9	388
23:18	24	13:10	118, 150
24:12	219	14:13	77
25:21–22	228	19:19–23	391
27:20	141	22:13	67
		23:17	182
<i>Qohelet</i>		24:16	326
3:20	256	24:22	182
9:10	89	24–27	26, 256, 318
		25:8	118, 255–6
<i>Isaiah</i>	20, 26–7, 60, 106, 117–8, 225, 240, 264, 280, 329, 466	26:1–5	259
		26:7–19	259, 269, 281
1:1–2	60	26:7–15	255
1:2	280	26:11–15	256
2	26	26:11	124
2:2	19	26:14	255–6, 269
3:9–12	350	26:17–18	256
4:2–6	253	26:19	26, 118, 255–6, 258–9, 264, 269, 276, 280–1, 306, 324–7
5:1–7	152		

27:9	118, 224-5	54:12	62
28:16	221	54:13	203
29:6	182	54:17	405
29:14	105	55:3	119
29:18-19	306	56:6-8	345
29:18	118, 306	58:6	118, 467
30:1-18	61	59:5	388
30:2	61	59:20-21	118, 224-5
30:15-18	61	59:20	225
32:7	67	59:21	225
34	26	60	409
34:4	118, 150	60:1	466
34:6	377	60:19	466
34:16-17	150	60:21	27
35:5-6	118	61	446
35:5	306	61:1-2	118, 440
35:6	306	61:1	118, 277, 280, 306-7, 332, 456, 467-8
35:8	385	61:2	467
35:10	150	62:5	283
37:30	67	63:16-19	388
37:31	390	63:18	182
40-66	61	64:3	191, 411
40:3-5	385	65:17-18	117, 283
40:3	27, 117, 385-6	65:17	417
41:4	22	65:18-19	417
41:22	21	66:22-23	117
42:1-4	464	66:22	417
42:7	306	66:24	141, 326
42:16	385		
42:18	118, 306	<i>Jeremiah</i>	24, 27, 330
43:6	403	2:13	198
43:14-19	385	6:15	182
44:6	22	10:15	182
45:1	435	11:23	182
45:23	229	12:12	377
46:10	24	18:18-23	27
46:13	466	18:18	27
48:12	22	20:4-6	183
48:13	280	22:24	229
48:17	385	23:1-8	27
49	238	23:5-6	150, 428
49:6	233, 238, 245, 466	23:20	19
49:8	118	25	348
49:9	466	25:11-12	354
49:18	229	28:64	183
50:4-11	139	29:10	354
52:7	430, 440, 456-7	29:31	24
52:13-53:12	409, 449	30:9	27
52:13	139	30:24	19
53:4	118	31:31-34	27
53:7-12	139	31:31(38:31)	27
54:1-17	61	33:10-11	283
54:11-12	61	33:16	283
54:11	62		

33:17	438	2:44-45	353
48:47	19	3:6	125
49:39	19	4	40
50-52	183	5	357
50:20	150	5:19	357
		5:23	357
<i>Ezekiel</i>	21, 24, 28, 37, 42, 260,	5:24-28	357
	264	5:26	358
4:5	360	7	97, 139, 353, 398, 415,
5:11	229		432, 445
11:25-48:35	259	7:1-28	30
24:8	378	7:4-8	445
25:8	28, 67	7:9-11	353, 388
30:13	274	7:9-10	415
35-38	260	7:9	446
36-40	259, 327	7:13-14	136, 353, 415, 435, 445,
36:23c-38	259-60		463
36:23-35	260	7:13	124-5, 146, 401-3, 421,
36:24	274		463
37-43	271	7:14	445, 466
37-39	35	7:18	353
37	259-61, 264-5, 274,	7:21	445
	327-9, 333	7:22	353, 445
37:1-14	28, 255-6, 258-9, 274	7:23-24	445
37:1-10	271, 328	7:25	417
37:2-3	260	7:26-27	445
37:3	273	7:27	353, 402, 421, 434, 445,
37:4	273		466
37:10	273	8:13	182, 253
37:11-14	274, 328	9	354, 358, 419
37:11	256	9:2	354-5
37:12-14	256, 324	9:6	327
37:12	274, 324	9:10	327
37:15-38:24	274	9:24-27	357
37:21	274	9:24	327, 354-5
38-39	259	9:25	428, 440, 456
38:16	19	9:26	355, 456
39:21-29	260	9:27	171, 355
40-48	28, 117	10-12	355, 419
40	259	10	348
44:10	28	10:1-21	30
44:15	28, 50	10:13	355
Papyrus 967	259-60, 265, 327-8	10:14	19
		10:21	355
<i>Daniel</i>	5, 30-1, 37, 42, 124-5,	11:1-12:13	23, 30, 353, 371
	132, 158, 326-8, 336,	11:20	23
	353-7, 375, 420, 440	11:24	356
2	40, 353	11:31	401
2:1-45	30	11:32	67
2:18-47	40	11:40-12:3	35
2:27-28	40	12	149, 253, 256, 262, 276,
2:28	19		284, 293, 318, 326
2:29	353	12:1-4	326
2:36-45	353	12:1-3	3, 253, 255, 269, 327

12:1	149, 151, 253, 269, 321, 355	2:10-11	67
12:2-3	268, 299	4:1	19
12:2	255, 273, 276, 291, 324-7	4:1-5:15	28
12:3	125, 297, 327, 329, 444	5:1-3	29
12:4	325, 456	5:2	28, 464
12:6-7	420	6:14-15	64
12:7	149, 401, 417	6:9-16	64
12:9	325	7:1-7	122
12:10	67	7:6	29, 105, 122
12:11	401		
12:13	171, 192, 255, 291, 325	<i>Nahum</i>	
<i>Hosea</i>	121	1:3	71
2:2-13	63	1:4	71
2:8	63	2:1	368
3:5	19	2:8	71
5:8	67	2:11	67
5:10	29	2:12-14	71
5:14	63	2:13	71
5:15	63	2:14	71
6:2	255-6	3:1	72
9:16	390	3:7	72
10:8	29	3:18	71
13:14	29, 118, 256		
<i>Joel</i>	121	<i>Habakkuk</i>	
2:1-5	124	2:3	180
2:2	151	2:4	122
2:11	124	2:6	350
2:28-32	234-5	2:10	379
3:1-5	29, 121	2:12	350
3:1	235	2:19	350
3:5	121		
3:30-31	28	<i>Zephaniah</i>	
4:1	150	1:6	378
<i>Amos</i>	29	1:14-18	28
2:9	390	1:14-15	29
5:18-20	28	1:15	388
8:9-14	28	2:2-3	388
9:11	28-9, 67, 440-1	<i>Zechariah</i>	121, 132
<i>Obadiah</i>		2:10	403
1:15	28	3:9	67
<i>Jonah</i>		4:14	28
2:1	161	9:9-10	123
<i>Micah</i>		9:9	122
1:1-9	63	11:11	29
1:2-5	63	12:3	183
1:5	64	13:7	29
1:6-8	64	14:1-21	28
		<i>Malachi</i>	
		1:10	29
		3	123
		3:1-5	123
		3:1	29, 123, 386

3:2	124	3:22-24	446
3:16-18	253, 321	3:23-24	236, 300, 332
3:19	124, 388	3:23(3:22)	30, 123-4,
3:20	77, 124		139, 300-1
3:21	124	3:24(3:23)	139, 301, 446

2. APOCRYPHA AND PSEUDEPIGRAPHA

<i>Apocalypse of Elijah</i>	191	44-47	97
		48:26-41	98, 105
<i>Apocalypse of Zephaniah</i>	29	49	98
12.5-8	29	50-51	98, 142
		51:1-5	268
<i>Apocryphon of Ezekiel</i>	26, 28, 329	51:10	268
frg. 1 (apud Epiphanius)		51:12	98
		53-76	97
<i>Aramaic Levi</i>	5	53	98
CTLevi ar		54:1	93
Bodleian Col. b 8-23	84	54:5	98
		54:19	220
<i>2 Baruch</i>	17, 79, 96-9,	54:21	98
	107, 111, 249,	55-74	98
	318, 375, 401,	57:2	98, 109
	436, 442	59:2	98, 107-8
1-30	97	59:4-11	92, 98, 107
4	92, 96	59:8-9	96
4:3-6	106	60-66	98, 106
6:9	96	67	99
7-8	96	68-74	99
13	96, 99	70:9	436
14-20	96	72	99
15:7-8	96	72:2-3	99, 108
20:1-2	96, 110	72:2	436
20:1	93	73-74	99, 109
23-25	96	74:2	99
27	96	76	99
28:2	96, 110	77:1-12	99
29-30	97, 430	77:1-10	97
29:2	97	77:11-87:1	99
29:3	436	83:1	93, 96, 110
30:1-5	97		
30:1	436	<i>1 Enoch</i>	5, 17, 31-4,
30:2	97, 446		39, 42, 57,
35-43	97		78-81, 84, 95,
35-40	97, 106, 108		97, 104, 106,
36:5-11	97		110-1, 132,
39-40	97		158, 293, 318,
39:1-5	97		328, 335-7,
39:5	97		342-50, 375,
39:7	436		414, 419,
40:1-3	97		443
40:1	436	<i>Book of the Watchers</i>	32, 79, 158,
41-42	97, 107		265, 336,
42:7-8	97		343-8

<i>Book of Parables</i>	32-3, 79-81, 95, 139, 329, 356, 435, 442-3, 463	10:11-22 10:12-14 10:16-11:2 10:17 10:21	126, 355 32 38, 345 345 345
<i>Astronomical Book</i>	33, 81, 342-3, 356	12-13:7 12:1-2	344 344
<i>Book of Dream Visions</i>	33, 81, 348-9	12:5-6	344
<i>Epistle of Enoch</i>	33-4, 81, 158, 349-50	12:6 12:16-20	347 39
<i>Apocalypse of Weeks</i>	33-4, 38, 97, 336, 354, 417	13:1-3 13:8-16:4 14:8-16:4	356 344 338
1-11	38	17-36	344
1-5	32, 79	21:7-10	356
1	142	22-27	273
1:1	38, 80	22	77, 79, 142,
1:2-5:9	149	22:4	252
1:3-9	401	22:8-13	32, 81, 268
1:4-9	122	22:9-13	3
1:5-6	265	22:13	297
1:8	122	22:14	80
1:9	414	24-27	345
2-5	39	24-25	327
2:1-5:3	343	25-32	390
2:3	149	25:3-27:5	38
3:1	149	25:3	80
4:1	149	25:4-7	79
5:4	343	26-27	141
6-11	126, 344	27:2-4	79, 109
6-10	162	27:5	80
6-7	344	32:2-6	109
6:2	344	32:3	33, 79
6:3	347	32:6	79, 355
6:4-6	344, 348	36:4	80
6:7	347, 356	37	356
7:2-5	344	38-44	356, 435
7:2	344	38:1-6	80
7:6	344	38:2-3	80
8	345, 350	39:6	38, 80
8:1-3	356	40:6	80
8:1	347	41:1-44:1	356
8:3	39, 347	45-57	356, 435
8:4	344	46:1-2	435
9	344	46:2-5	80
9:1	347	47:8	98
10	344, 354	48:1-10	80
10:1-3	345	48:2-4	80
10:2-6	79	48:2	435
10:2	344	48:10	80, 435
10:3	345	51:1-22	299
10:4-8	347	51:1-3	80, 95
10:7	32	52:4	435
10:9-10	265		
10:9	345		
10:11-11:2	345		

54:1-6	356	97:1-5	34
55:3-4	356	97:1	81
58-69	356, 435	98:8	34
60:6	28	98:9-10	81, 219
60:7-9	95	98:10	81
62	403	99:11-15	81
62:1	95	99:15	34, 81
62:4	402	100	34
69:2-12	356	100:4	81
70-71	356	102	34
71:10	80	102:1-3	81
71:12-17	80	102:1	401
72:1	342	102:6-11	350
72:32	342	102:9-11	81
74:10	342	102:10	350
74:12	342	103	142
76:7	393	103:1-4	321
77:3	343	103:3-4	81
80-82	343	103:4	251, 298
82:6	342	103:5-8	81
82:16	343	103:8	81
82:19	343	103:14	411
83-84	348	104	251
84	81	104:1-6	411
84:4	33	104:1	321
85-90	348, 354	104:2	251, 268, 297, 326-7, 329
89:12	348	104:3	411
89:59-90:17	348	104:4	251, 268, 297, 326-7
90:9-10	3	104:5-6	81
90:18-42	349	104:5	34
90:33	262	104:6	251, 268, 297, 326-7
91, 93	33	104:12-13	411
91	349	104:12	411
91:7-11	81	104:13	411
91:8	390	106-107	349, 415
91:9-10	273	106:2	415
91:9	81	106:10	415
91:10	80	106:13-107:2	349
91:11-17	336, 349, 354	106:13-15	219
91:12-13	38	106:19	326
91:13	356	107:1	34
91:14-17	34	108	251, 349
91:15-16	417	108:1	349
91:15	81, 268	108:2-3	81
91:16	417	108:11-12	297
92-105	349		
93:1-10	336, 349, 354	<i>2 Enoch</i>	337
93:9-10	34		
93:10	38, 80	<i>4 Ezra</i>	3, 17, 79, 93-6, 107, 132, 158, 249, 318, 336, 340, 375, 401, 427, 436, 442
94:1-5	349		
94:6-104:8	350	2:13	93
94:6-9	81	3-14	94
94:9	34, 81	3-5:20	94
96:4-8	81		

3:1	93	4:15	351
3:12-19	106	4:17-26	35
3:28-29	94	4:17-19	33, 35, 106
4:42	402	4:17	350
5:11-13	94	4:18-19	97
5:21-6:34	94	4:19	33
6:1-6	94	4:21-23	350
6:7-10	413	4:21-22	351
6:19	94	4:30	352
6:25-28	94	5:1-19	35
6:27-28	98	5:1-11	350
6:35-9:25	94	6:32-38	350
6:49-52	95	6:32	343
6:55-59	94	6:34-38	62
7	446	8:3	351
7:10-11	94	8:10-9:15	35
7:14	94	10:1-17	35
7:20-126	94	10:1-9	351
7:26-44	436	10:18-26	35
7:26-35	430	11:4-5	351
7:32-44	142	11:10-13	351
7:32	95	15:1-34	35
7:36-44	109	15:27	351
7:37	95	15:31-32	351
8:4-19	94	15:33	351
9:1-25	94	16:1-9	35
9:7-8	98	17:16	351
9:26-10:59	95	18:9	351
9:26-37	92	18:12	351
10:25-59	92	19:28-29	351
11-12	93	20:5	126
11:1-12:51	95	22:11-23	35
11:1-12:36	436	23	251, 407
12:31-32	95	23:1	34
13	403	23:11-31	106
13:1-58	95	23:14-31	35, 81, 352
13:1-56	436	23:14-20	352, 407, 421
14:1-48	95	23:14	407
14:22	95, 107	23:15	407
14:35	95	23:16	352
<i>Jannes and Jambres</i>	365, 413	23:20	352, 384
<i>Jubilees</i>	3, 5, 17, 31, 34-5, 42-4, 78, 81, 97, 106, 110, 158, 265, 318, 328, 337, 343, 350-3, 357, 407, 410, 419	23:21-23	352
		23:22-23	407
		23:22	352, 407
		23:24-31	353
		23:26	81, 107, 352, 395
		23:27-31	142
		23:30-31	328, 352
		23:31	192
		24:8-33	35
1:4b-26	35	31:1-32	35
1:15-29	27	31:14	351
1:26	35, 106	32:20-26	351
1:27-28, 29c	35	36:1-18	35
2:2	350		

45:14	24, 81, 106	14:16–24	72
48:2–3	352	15:15–24	72
48:9–15	352		
49:2	352	<i>2 Maccabees</i>	87–8, 95,
50:1–5	35		107, 158,
			284, 293,
<i>Judith</i>	86		299, 318
16:1–17	86	6–7	87
16:17	78, 86, 108	6:23	87
16:18–25	86	7	139, 142,
			261, 295,
<i>Liber Antiquitatum</i>			314–5, 331
<i>Biblicarum</i>	25, 78, 91–3,	7:1–42	87
	95–6, 106,	7:9	87, 142, 248,
	318, 329		261, 284, 314
3.9–10	92–3, 106	7:11	295, 314
3.10	93, 108–9,	7:14	78, 87, 142,
	293, 299,		248, 261,
	329		284, 295, 299
11.15	92	7:17–19	142
15.5	93	7:19	78, 87
19	25	7:22	201, 325
19.4	25	7:23	87, 295
19.6–9	92	7:29	295
19.7	91	7:30–38	314
19.8	92	7:33–38	303
19.10	92	7:35–36	142
19.12–13	93, 106–7,	7:36	248, 261, 284
	110	8:1–5	303
19.12	293	12:43	78
19.13	92	12:44	248, 261, 284
22.8–9	91–2		
23.6	93	<i>4 Maccabees</i>	87, 293, 328
23.14	27	4:10–19	261
25.7–8	93	4:17	261
25.7	293	5:35	87
26.13	93	6:19	217
32.3	91	12:6	212
36.4	93	13:18	212
38.4	93	15:3	162
44.10	93	15:29–31	162
51.5	93, 293, 329	17:16	87
		18:14–19	327
<i>1 Maccabees</i>		18:17	260–1, 327
1:15	164	18:19	201, 325
1:63	36		
2:20	36	<i>Martyrdom and Ascension</i>	250
2:27	36	<i>of Isaiah</i>	
2:57	393	1.3	141
3:50	36		
4:10	36	<i>Psalms of Solomon</i>	26, 86, 158,
4:24	36		318, 329,
8	72		426, 434,
12:1–4	72		442–3, 470–1

1-2	86	<i>Sybilline Oracles</i>	78, 89-91, 109-10,
2:31-35	26		132, 210, 328
2:31	26, 86	1-2	89-90, 106
3	284	1	89
3:10	86	1.103	141
3:11-12	86, 293	2	89, 329
3:11	86	2.154-176	89
3:12	26, 268, 297, 329	2.154-173	89
13:11	86	2.165-168	89
14:6-9	86	2.174-176	89, 111
14:10	86	2.187-189	139, 300, 332
15:10-13	86	2.214-237	89
15:12	26, 86, 108	2.214-220	89
17-18	26, 86, 434	2.221-237	89
17	434, 443	2.221-226	327, 375
17:4	434, 443	2.226	89
17:5-20	443	2.285-310	89
17:21-46	434	2.292	89, 141
17:21-37	460	2.317-329	89, 109
17:21	443, 463, 465	2.337-338	89, 110
17:22-46	443	3	90, 100
17:23-24	434, 442	3.64	401
17:24	443	3.155-161	90
17:32	443, 466, 470	3.601-623	90
17:33	123	3.635-731	90
17:37	434, 440	3.638-640	90
18	443	3.652-795	435
18:5	443	3.652-672	443
18:7	443	3.652-656	90, 435
18:5-8	434	3.657-668	90
		3.702-731	90
<i>Pseudo-Phocylides</i>	251, 329	3.732-740	90
103-108	251	3.741-808	435
		3.741-761	90
<i>Sirach</i>	21, 81-2, 328	3.767-808	90
1:19-20	81	3.767-795	90
2:7-11	350	3.796-808	90
2:12-14	350	3.807	90, 108, 111
2:15-18	350	3.813-814	90
6:14-15	81	4	90, 329
6:20-31	81	4.49-101	354
8:8	380	4.115-129	90
13:17	349	4.130-135	90
39-40 (Or. 1102)	82	4.152-161	90
39:28-31	78, 82, 108	4.153	90
41:4	256	4.179-192	90
42:19	41	4.179-182	327, 375
46:11-12	328	5-14	89
48	123, 446	5	100, 443
48:5	250	5.414-433	443
48:10	123, 139, 300, 332	5.414	443
48:11	328		
48:25	41	<i>T. Job</i>	
49:10	328	4.9	263
51	82		

<i>T. Moses</i>	132, 158	18:7	435, 440, 460
25:4	413	18:9	409, 449
		18:10–14	293, 329
<i>Testaments of the</i>	3, 78, 82–6, 107,	18:14	329
<i>Twelve Patriarchs</i>	111, 158, 318,	19:1–2	84, 107
	328, 434, 443–4	19:1	267
<i>Testament of Asher</i>	247	<i>Testament of Naphtali</i>	
1:3–5:4	267	1:6–8	83
<i>Testament of Benjamin</i>		3:5–4:1	84
9:1	84	8:1–8	86
10:3	84, 107	8:2–3	444
10:5–10	86	<i>Testament of Reuben</i>	
11	86	6:7–8	444
<i>Testament of Dan</i>		6:8	84, 107
5:1	84, 107	<i>Testament of Simeon</i>	
5:4	85	5:4	84
5:6	84	7:1–2	444
5:10–13	85, 109	<i>Testament of Zebulun</i>	85
5:10–11	444	8:2	85
5:10	85	10:1–3	293, 329
6:10	84, 107	<i>Tobit</i>	158, 328
<i>Testament of Issachar</i>	85	13:2	201, 325, 328
5:1	84, 107		
6:1	85	<i>Wisdom of Solomon</i>	88–9, 158, 247,
6:3–4	85		318
<i>Testament of Joseph</i>		1:6–11	78
18:1	84, 107	2:23–24	220
<i>Testament of Judah</i>		3	88, 108
18:1	84–5, 107	3:1–7	88
21:2–3	444	3:1	88
22:1–3	85	3:2–4	88
24	85, 439, 444	3:4–9	88
24:1	444	3:10–19	88
24:2	85	3:10	88, 108
24:5	85	3:11	88, 108
25	284, 293, 329, 439	3:15	380
25:1–2	85, 107	3:18–19	88
25:3–5	85	4:20–5:14	78
26:1	84, 107	5	88, 108
<i>Testament of Levi</i>	29, 83–4	5:1–2	88
2:3 (Athos MS e)	83	5:4	88
3:1–10	84	5:6–14	88
3:2–3	84	5:6	88
4:1	401	5:7	88, 108
8:11–15	444	5:8	88
10:2	409, 449	5:15–16	88
10:5	84	5:15	78
13:1–4	84, 107	5:17–23	88, 108, 111
14:1	84, 409, 449	14:11	182
16:2–3	409, 449	14:23–26	221
17–18	409, 449	14:25	221
18	409, 434–5, 444	16:13	201, 325
18:1–3	29	17:13	101
18:2 (Athos MS e)	83	19:9	349
18:3–4	409, 449		
18:3	439, 444		

3. DEAD SEA SCROLLS

<i>Damascus Document</i>	6, 16, 29, 34-5,	II 19-21	345
(CD)	38, 43-4, 47-52,	III 10-11	182
	61, 107, 110,	III 12b-IV 12a	50
	113-4, 158, 182,	III 12-19	285
	198, 202, 219,	III 12b-17a	285
	223, 248-9, 252,	III 12-13	285, 330
	275, 278, 285, 292,	III 12	285
	318-9, 325, 330,	III 13-17	199
	336, 345, 357,	III 13-16	285
	360, 364-7, 376,	III 16-17	50, 199, 245
	384, 398, 423,	III 17-18	210, 223
	429, 439-41, 450,	III 19-IV 4a	50
	452-4, 460, 471	III 19-20	151
<i>Admonition</i>	47	III 19	50
<i>Laws</i>	47	III 20-IV 4a	50
I-VIII	167	III 20	142, 284-5, 292,
I	360		361
I 1-5	150	III 21-IV 4	28
I 1-2	122, 142	IV 3-4	51, 55
I 1	47	IV 4-10	361
I 2	220, 376	IV 10-13	361
I 3-4	182	IV 11	361
I 4-5	61, 223, 360	IV 12-19	359, 365
I 5-6	360-1	IV 13	361
I 5	360	IV 15-19a	84-5
I 7	50, 182	V 12	368
I 8-10	395	V 14	388
I 9	275	V 17-19	365, 413
I 10-11	63	V 18	366
I 10	367	V 19	365
I 11-12	49, 182	V 20-VI 11a	50
I 11	49, 384	V 21-VI 1	366, 433
I 12	49, 162, 244, 361	V 21	366
I 13-II 1	49	VI 2-7	50
I 13-14	275	VI 4-5	199
I 13	384	VI 4	199
I 16-17	48	VI 7	451
I 17	182	VI 8b-11a	50-1
I 18	49	VI 10-11	51, 226, 361, 411,
I 21b-II 1	49		413, 451
II 2-13	361	VI 10	51, 376, 410, 451
II 2-7	364	VI 11	449, 451
II 2-3	364	VI 12-14	29
II 5-6	364	VI 13	280
II 5	387	VI 14	122, 410
II 7-13	361	VI 19	27
II 7-12	357	VI 20-VII 1	228
II 9-10	41	VII	451
II 11-13	223	VII 4-VIII 2	452
II 12-13	366, 428, 433	VII 9-VIII 2	433
II 16-17	345	VII 9-13	452
II 17-21	265, 365	VII 9	376
II 17-18	345	VII 10-VIII 2	451
II 17	151	VII 10-21	452

VII 10-20	452	XIX 13-14	365
VII 10	452	XIX 15-33	452
VII 12-21	451	XIX 15-16	29
VII 13-VIII 1	452	XIX 16	388
VII 14-21	29, 106, 434, 440-1, 451, 453	XIX 20	44
VII 15-17	440	XIX 29	44
VII 17-21	453	XIX 33-XX 2	433
VII 18-21	451	XIX 33-XX 1	451
VII 18-20	425	XIX 33-34	27, 199
VII 18	441	XIX 35-XX 1	451
VII 19-20	439	XX 1	47, 425
VII 20-21	320, 439	XX 10	50
VIII 1-2	365, 452	XX 12	27
VIII 3-19	452	XX 13b-15a	49
VIII 8	44	XX 22	50
VIII 16	44	XX 24	44
VIII 21	27	XX 27-34	49, 202, 245
X 8	352	XX 28	202
X 9-10	34	XX 32	202
XII 3	366	<i>IQIsa^a</i>	15, 21, 258-9, 264, 326-7, 429, 448
XII 22-XIII 2	451		
XII 22-XIII 1	433	XLIX 26-27	307
XII 22-23	453	<i>IQIsa^b</i>	259, 264, 326
XII 23-XIII 1	47, 226, 411, 425, 453	XIII	307
XII 23	410		
XIII 14-15	75	1Q10 (<i>Ps^a</i>)	120
XIV 18-19	226, 425, 433, 451, 453	1Q14 (<i>pMic</i>)	28-9, 63-4, 379
XIV 19	47	1-11	63
XV 1-3	466	1-5	63
XV 1-2	240	6 2-4	63
XV 1	278	8-10	63
XV 7	388, 410	8-10 3-5a	64
XVI 1-2	388	8-10 6-9	64
XVI 2-4	34, 110, 265, 343, 351-2, 357-8, 361	8-10 7-9	379
XVI 2-3	362	8-10 10-11	64
XVI 2	34	11 1-2	64
XVI 3-4	34	17-18 5	64, 162, 245
XVI 4-5	35, 351, 365, 388	20-21	105
XIX	451	<i>IQPesher to Habakkuk</i> (1QpHab)	15, 28-9, 72-4, 76, 108, 113-4, 158, 292, 336, 379, 398, 429
XIX 1-14	452		
XIX 5-13	453	I 6	234
XIX 5-11	29, 451	I 13	73
XIX 6	376	II 1-2	73
XIX 7-14	452	II 3-6	73
XIX 7-9	452	II 3-4	27
XIX 9-12	29	II 5-10	74, 379
XIX 10-13	452	II 5-6	73
XIX 10-11	47, 425, 451-2	II 6-10	409
XIX 10	451		

II 7-8	73	1Q23-24 (<i>EnGiants^{a-b} ar</i>)	32-3, 346
II 7	162, 245	1Q23 (<i>EnGiants^a ar</i>)	
II 12	72	9+14+15 5	347
II 14-15	72	1Q24 (<i>EnGiants^b ar</i>)	
II 14	72	7 1-2	33, 346
III 4-6	72	8 2	347
III 4	72		
III 9-11	72	1Q26 (<i>Instruction</i>)	39-42, 54,
III 9	72		340, 380-1,
IV 5	72		398, 418
IV 10	72		
V 4-5	74, 379	1Q27 (<i>Mysteries</i>)	39-42, 57,
V 4	74		249, 340, 380,
V 5-6	379		392, 398, 418
V 5	379	1 i 3-8	380
V 8-12	379	1 i 3-7	41
V 9-12	63, 73, 409	1 i 3	41, 380
VI 1	72	1 i 4-5	41
VI 10	72	1 i 5-8	380
VII 1-8	49, 395	1 i 5-7	380, 392
VII 1-4	73	1 i 5	392
VII 4-5	58, 74, 409	1 i 7	41
VII 7-8	74	1 i 10-11	234
VII 7	12	1 i-ii	234
VII 10-14	12, 74		
VIII 1-3	74	<i>Rule of the</i>	4, 6, 15-7, 27,
VIII 1	172	<i>Community</i> (1QS)	38, 40, 43,
VIII 2	379		52-4, 57,
VIII 8-16	73		76, 113, 158,
VIII 8-12	73		248-9, 252,
VIII 16-IX 12	73		278, 286-8,
IX 3-7	71		292, 318,
IX 3-5	73		330-1, 366,
IX 6-7	74		376-8, 398,
IX 7	72		429, 448-50,
IX 9-12	63, 73		453-4, 470
X 1	234	<i>Treatise of the Two Spirits</i>	40, 53-4, 107,
X 3-5	379		167, 171-2,
X 12-13	74		247, 267, 269,
XI 4-15	73		286, 330, 336,
XI 4-8	63		357, 361-2,
XI 6	56		366, 377
XII 2-10	73	I-IV	53
XII 4-5	172	I 1	52
XII 12-14	74	I 9-10	172
XII 14	379	I 11b-II 18	366
XIII 2-4	73	II 1-10	366
XIII 2-3	379	II 7	366
		II 16	366
1Q15 (<i>pZeph</i>)	28	II 24-25	228
		III-IV	54
1Q16 (<i>pPs</i>)	26, 64	III 13-IV 18a	249
		III 14-15	108
1Q17-18 (<i>Jub^{a-b}</i>)	34	III 15	41

III 17	321	VIII 10	450
III 20-21	366	VIII 11-15	53, 453
IV 2-14	286	VIII 13-15	454
IV 4-10	54, 286	VIII 13-14	27, 385
IV 6-8	142	VIII 15b-27	53
IV 6-7	286	IX 1-11	53
IV 6	287	IX 6	50, 55, 288
IV 7-8	286-7	IX 9-11	226
IV 7	268, 284, 286, 292	IX 10-11	453, 459
IV 9-14	142	IX 11	30, 53, 123, 139, 385, 425, 433, 436, 439, 447, 453-4, 460-1
IV 11-14	286	IX 12-20	53, 453
IV 11	287	IX 12-19	75
IV 12-14	141, 268	IX 26b-XI 22	53
IV 13-14	54, 286-7	X-XI	53, 377-8
IV 14	288	X 16-18	378
IV 15-26	287	X 19-20	378
IV 16-25	112	XI	312
IV 16-17	54	XI 3-4	41
IV 18-26	142	XI 7-9	286, 288
IV 18-25	132	XI 8-9	288
IV 18-19	287	XI 8	58
IV 18	54	1Q28a (<i>Sa</i>)	6, 15, 52, 54-5, 76, 134, 429, 450, 454, 457, 470-1
IV 19-20	54, 377	I 1-3	44
IV 19	182, 287	I 1	54, 454, 460
IV 20-25	292	I 6	55
IV 20-22	287	I 21	55
IV 20	54, 287, 377-8	I 26	55
IV 22-23	287	II	433
IV 23	54, 114, 236, 284, 286, 331	II 11-22	454
IV 23b-26	249	II 12	454
IV 25	54, 171, 245, 286-7, 292, 331	II 14	454
IV 26	287	II 20	454
V-VII	53	1Q28b (<i>Sb</i>)	15, 52, 248-9, 252, 288, 427, 429, 454-5, 471
V 1-VI 23	377-8	III 1	288
V 2	28, 51, 53, 55	III 6	288
V 7-11a	378	III 7	162
V 10-13	288	III 22	288
V 10-12	288	III 26	27, 288
V 11-13	378	IV 24-26	288
V 12-13	286-7	IV 25-26	288
V 13	288	V 20	454
V 17-20	78	V 21-23	454
V 21-23	78	V 21-22	468
V 24-25	228	V 21	27, 427, 433
VII 17-18	450	V 22-23	454
VIII-IX	53, 58, 112	V 23-27	454
VIII 2	228	V 24-25	454
VIII 4	55	V 25	454
VIII 5-10	50		
VIII 5-6	50, 288, 453		
VIII 5	50		
VIII 7	450		

V 26	454	XI 7-8	457
V 27-29	454	XI 11	69, 361, 370
V 27-28	455	XI 13-14	379
V 28	455	XI 13	370
		XII 1	88, 150
1Q29a	286	XII 4	150
13	286, 330	XII 5	150
13 2	286	XII 7-18	69
		XII 7-15	393
1Q32 (<i>NJar</i>)	117, 337	XII 13	69, 369
		XIII 2	88
1Q33 (<i>M</i>)	6, 16, 29, 35-6, 55, 68-70, 76, 90, 95, 108, 111, 113-4, 158, 249, 252-3, 336, 352, 366, 369-72, 379, 398, 419, 425, 429, 452, 457-8	XIII 10-12	369
		XIII 10-11	366
		XIII 11	352
		XIV	36
		XIV 2	36
		XIV 4-18	36
		XIV 4b-8a	36
		XIV 4	36, 88
		XIV 5	108
		XIV 8-10	369
		XIV 10-11	253
		XIV 11	253
		XV-XIX	69
		XV 2	69
		XV 3	69
		XV 12-18	69
		XV 12-XVI 1	416
		XV 12-13	379
		XV 14	379
		XV 17	379
		XVI 3-XVIII 5	69
		XVI 3	69
		XVI 6	69
		XVI 8-9	69
		XVI 13-XVII 9	370
		XVII 5-8	416
		XVII 5-6	370
		XVII 6-8	370
		XVII 12	69
		XVII 14-15	69
		XVIII 1-3	370
		XVIII 2	69
		XVIII 4	69
		XVIII 5-XIX 8	69
		XIX 5	69, 369
		XIX 6-7	108
		XIX 7-8	393
		XIX 9	69
		XIX 13	69
		1Q34+34bis	
		(<i>Festival Prayers</i>)	27, 36
		3 ii 6	27
I-II	35		
I 1	69, 172		
I 2	371		
I 4	371		
I 5	369		
I 6	69, 370		
I 8	183		
I 9-10	69		
I 9	69		
I 10	370		
I 12	69, 371		
I 14-15	69, 369		
I 20	69		
II-V	150		
III-IV	69		
III 10-11	369		
III 11	69		
IV 1-2	369		
IV 6	379		
V 1-2	457		
V 1	433, 453		
VI 2-6	69		
VI 3-6	108		
VI 3	370, 379		
VI 5	379		
VII 4	69		
VII 9-IX 9a	69		
IX 5-6	69		
X 6-8	370		
X 6	361		
X 14	320		
XI 5-6	457		
XI 5	361		
XI 6-7	457		
XI 6	320		

<i>1QHodayot^a (H^a)</i>	4, 38, 40, 54-9, 76, 158, 247-9, 252, 277, 288-92, 318, 330-1, 336, 338, 367-8, 372, 376-7, 398, 429, 432	XIII 36 XIII 39 XIV 12-22 XIV 12 XIV 12b-19a XIV 13 XIV 14-17 XIV 15 XIV 16-19 XIV 19 XIV 21-22 XIV 24-25 XIV 26-27 XIV 28-30 XIV 29-34 XIV 29-30 XIV 29 XIV 32-39 XIV 32-34 XIV 32-33 XIV 34-35 XIV 34 XIV 35 XV 6-7 XV 7 XV 9 XV 10b-12a XV 12 XV 15 XV 20 XV 27 XVI 7-8 XVI 16 XVI 29 XVI 35-36 XVIII 36 XIX 3-14 XIX 6-17 XIX 10-14 XIX 10 XIX 12-13 XIX 12 XIX 13-14 XIX 13 XXII bottom 11 XXIII 14 XXVI top	289 367 368 108 290, 331 290, 368 109 58, 290 368, 377 57 368 58 58 289-90 247, 377 290, 377, 450 88 289 377 247 290-1 290, 377 372, 419 377 58, 450 58 58, 377 284 57 57 199 199 289 58 377 289 289 247, 289-90, 292, 331 291 298 289-91 288, 291 289 377 433 312
III 10	57	1Q35 (<i>H^b</i>)	56
IV 9	56	1Q71 (<i>Dan^a</i>)	353
IV 14-15	142	1Q72 (<i>Dan^b</i>)	353
IV 15	284		
V	54		
VI 2-4	377		
VI 2	377		
VI 4-5	377		
VI 5-6	377		
VI 18	57		
VII 4	57		
VII 7	59		
VII 17b-20a	59		
VII 20b	59		
VIII 18	59		
X-XVII	57-9, 114, 367		
X-XVI	427		
X-XIII	57		
X	57		
X 13	57		
X 16	367		
X 21-22	367		
X 22	367		
X 24	58, 377		
XI 5-18	427		
XI 6-18	427, 431		
XI 16-19	141		
XI 19-36	109		
XI 19-23	289		
XI 20-37	88, 289		
XI 20-24	289		
XI 21-22	289, 298		
XI 21	288		
XI 22	58		
XI 24-25	367		
XI 27-36	367		
XI 28	367-8		
XI 29	367		
XI 32	367		
XI 35-36	367-8		
XII	57		
XII 5-XIII 4	289		
XII 8-10	367		
XII 12-14	367		
XII 17-18	368		
XII 20	58, 377		
XII 22-37	289		
XII 26	377		
XIII 11-12	58		
		2Q15 (<i>Job</i>)	263

2Q18 (<i>Sir</i>)	81	4Q114 (<i>Dan^c</i>)	30
1	81		
2	81	4Q117 (<i>Ezra</i>)	20
2Q19–20 (<i>Jub^{a-b}</i>)	34	4Q119 (<i>LXXLev^d</i>)	16, 20
2Q24 (<i>NJ ar</i>)	117, 337	4Q120 (<i>papLXXLev^d</i>)	16, 20
2Q26 (<i>EnGiants ar</i>)	32–3, 346	4Q121 (<i>LXXNum</i>)	16, 20
		4Q122 (<i>LXXDeut</i>)	16, 20
3Q4 (<i>pIsa</i>)	27, 60	4Q156 (<i>tgLev</i>)	20
1–4	60	4Q157 (<i>tgJob</i>)	20
5	60		
6	27, 60	4Q161–165 (<i>pIsa^{a-e}</i>)	27
3Q5 (<i>Jub</i>)	34	4Q162–164 (<i>pIsa^{b-d}</i>)	60
		4Q161 (<i>pIsa^a</i>)	60, 69–70, 95, 426, 429, 455, 457–8, 465, 470–1
4Q6 (<i>Gen^f</i>)	15		
4Q7 (<i>Gen^g</i>)	15	1	69
		2–6 1–9a	69
4Q51 (<i>Sam^a</i>)	257	2–6 17–25	70
4Q53 (<i>Sam^c</i>)	15	2–6 22	27, 70
		8–10	108, 111, 114, 459–60, 470
4Q55–69b (<i>Isa^{a-r}</i>)	259, 326	8–10 1–10	455
4Q56 (<i>Isa^b</i>)	264	8–10 1–9	70, 458
16 II 17–20	259	8–10 1–8	97
40	307	8–10 3–9	69
4Q66 (<i>Isa^m</i>)		8–10 7–8	71
1–3	307	8–10 9	458
4Q71 (<i>Jer^b</i>)	257	8–10 11–25	27, 70, 97, 428, 433, 440, 455
4Q72a (<i>Jer^d</i>)	257		
		8–10 11–17	440, 455
4Q73 (<i>Ezek^d</i>)	260	8–10 13–16	468
		8–10 18–25	455
4Q76–82 (<i>XII^{a-g}</i>)	28	8–10 18	70, 455
		8–10 19	70
4Q87 (<i>Ps^e</i>)	120, 462	8–10 20	455
4Q88 (<i>Ps^f</i>)	22, 109, 225, 398	8–10 21–22	455
VII–VIII	22, 225	8–10 22–25	455
VII 16–17	225	8–10 25	455
IX 1–15	22	4Q162 (<i>pIsa^b</i>)	60
IX 6–7	22	i	60
IX 8–14	22	ii 1–2	60
X 4–15	22	ii 1	27, 60
4Q92 (<i>Ps^k</i>)	120	ii 2–6a	60
4Q98 (<i>Ps^q</i>)	120	ii 6–7	60–1
		ii 10	44, 60–1, 298
4Q99–101 (<i>Job^{a-c}</i>)	263	4Q163 (<i>pIsa^c</i>)	
4Q101 (<i>paleoJob^c</i>)	264	4–6 II	69
3	263	4–6 II 12–13	61
		23 II 10–11	61, 298
4Q112–116 (<i>Dan^{a-e}</i>)	353	23 II 12	61
4Q112 (<i>Dan^a</i>)	30		

23 II 14	61	4Q173 (<i>pPs^b</i>)	26
4Q164 (<i>pIsa^d</i>)	60	1 5	26, 64
i 1-3	62	4Q173a	26
i 7	62		
4Q165 (<i>pIsa^e</i>)		4Q174 (<i>MidrEschat^a</i> olim <i>Flor</i>)	29, 65-8, 75-6, 106, 252-3, 361, 368-9, 398, 426, 429, 434, 441, 452, 455, 471
1-2 3	58		
4Q166-167 (<i>pHos^{a-b}</i>)	29, 62-3		
4Q166 (<i>pHos^a</i>)	62	1-2 i 1-7a	51, 66
i 9-12	63	1-2 i 1-2	26
i 10	182	1-2 i 1	442
i 12	183	1-2 i 2	66
ii 15-17	62	1-2 i 3	66
ii 16	183	1-2 i 5-6	182
4Q167 (<i>pHos^b</i>)	62-3	1-2 i 5	65
2 2-3	63	1-2 i 6	66
2 5-6	63	1-2 i 7b-9	66
		1-2 i 8-9	368-9
4Q168 (<i>pMic[?]</i>)	28	1-2 i 9	66
		1-2 i 10-13	66, 433, 441
4Q169 (<i>pNah</i>)	29, 70-3, 114, 379	1-2 i 10-12	440
1+2	114	1-2 i 11-12	67, 226, 451, 455
1+2 1	71	1-2 i 12-13	29, 440
1+2 3-5	70	1-2 i 12	66
1+2 4	379	1-2 i 13	67, 467
1+2 5-7	71	1-2 i 14-19	67
1+2 8	71	1-2 i 14-17	67, 368
3+4 i	71	1-2 i 14	262, 442
3+4 i 2	71	1-2 i 15	66, 262
3+4 i 3	70	1-2 i 16-17	28
3+4 i 4-8	71	1-2 i 17	51, 55
3+4 i 8-12	71	1-2 i 18-19	26, 67, 442, 469
3+4 ii 1-6	71	1-2 i 19	65-6, 262
3+4 ii 2	72	1 ii 1-2	369
3+4 iii 2-8a	72	1 ii 1	66-7
3+4 iii 2	72	1 ii 2	67
3+4 iii 5-7	72	1 ii 3-4	67
3+4 iii 5	72	1 ii 3	31, 255, 327, 440
		4 3-4	67, 369
4Q170 (<i>pZeph</i>)	29		
4Q171,173 (<i>pPs^{a-b}</i>)	64	4Q175 (<i>Testimonia</i>)	15, 29, 225, 304, 429, 439, 448
4Q171 (<i>pPs^a</i>)	26, 64, 379	9-13	439
i-iv 21	26	12	439
ii 10	40	13	320
ii 15	172		
ii 23	172	4Q176 (<i>Tanhumim</i>)	244, 324
iii 10	40	8-11 7	233
iii 15-16	48, 51, 114	8-11 10	126
iii 15	409	8-11 13	233
iv 11-12	64		
iv 11	379	4Q176a,b (<i>Jub^{if?}</i>)	407
iv 26-27	58	19-21	352

19-20 2-4	407	1 II 6	291-2
19-20 2-3	407	2 1-4	357
19-20 2	353	2 3	357
		2 4	357
4Q177 (<i>MidrEschat^b olim Catena A</i>)	29, 65-8, 75-6, 106, 252-3, 368-9	4Q196-199 (<i>Tob^{a-d} ar</i>) 4Q200 (<i>Tob^e</i>) 6 6-7	20 328
i 1-3	369		
i 3	66-7	4Q201-202, 204-207, 212 (<i>Enoch^{a-g} ar</i>)	32
ii 4-7	369	4Q201 (<i>En^a ar</i>)	
ii 5	67	I 6-8	265
ii 8-11	26	II 1-9	149
ii 9-10	67	III 1-5	344
ii 10	66	III 16-21	344
ii 12-13	67	V 3	345
ii 12	66	VI	345
ii 14-16	28, 67	VI 3-4	345
ii 14	66	4Q202 (<i>En^b ar</i>)	
ii 16	66	II 3	344
iii	67	II 6-8	344
iii 4-5	26	II 20-25	344
iii 5	67	IV	32
iii 7	66	IV 6	345
iii 8	369	IV 8-11	345
iii 10	67	4Q204 (<i>En^c ar</i>)	
iv	67	I 15-17	414
iv 6-7	27	I 20-27	149
iv 7	120	V 1-10	345
iv 12	369	V 1-2	32
iv 14	369	4	33, 348
iv 15	68, 369	5 i-ii	33-4
iv 16	68, 369	5 i 20-21	411
v 5	68	5 i 28	415
v 6	66-7	5 ii	349
v 10	68	5 ii 26-27	326
		5 ii 27-29a	34
4Q179 (<i>apocrLam A</i>)		4Q205 (<i>En^d ar</i>)	
1 ii 3	149	2 i-iii	33, 348
1 ii 7	149	2 i 27	348
1 ii 8	149	4Q206 (<i>En^e ar</i>)	
1 ii 15	149	2 ii 2-3	32
2 4-9	149	3 21	33
		5 i-iii	33, 348
4Q180-181 (<i>Ages of Creation A-B</i>)	252-3, 357	5 ii 13-14	348
4Q180 (<i>Ages of Creation A</i>)		4Q207 (<i>En^f ar</i>)	
1 4-9	357	1	33, 348
1 7-9	357	4Q212 (<i>En^g ar</i>)	
1 9	357	II-V	33
4Q181 (<i>Ages of Creation B</i>)	291	IV	34, 349, 356
1 II 3-4	291	IV 22-25	417
1 II 4	291-2	IV 23-25	417

4Q203 (<i>EnGiants^a ar</i>)	32-3, 346	4Q225 (<i>psJub^a</i>)	
5 2	347	1 7	287
7 i 6-7	347	2 I-II	35, 351
7 i 6	347	2 I 5	278
8 3-15	348	2 I 6-7	351
8 5	347	2 I 9	351
8 9-11	347	2 I 13-14	351
8 11-12	347	2 II 5	351
13 3	347	4Q227 (<i>psJub^c?</i>)	
		2	350
4Q208-211 (<i>Enastr^{a-d} ar</i>)	32-3	2 1-4	346, 350
4Q209 (<i>Enastr^b ar</i>)		2 6	346
23 9	33, 343		
28 1	343	4Q228 (<i>Work with citation of Jubilees</i>)	352, 378
4Q210 (<i>Enastr^c ar</i>)		1 i 2	34, 358
1 ii 7	393	1 i 4-6	358
		1 i 7	34
4Q213 (<i>Levi^a ar</i>)		1 i 8	358
3+4 8-11	267	1 i 9-10	34, 358
4Q213a (<i>Levi^b ar</i>)		1 i 9	358
1 i 12-13	84	1 i 11	358
		1 ii 2	238, 245
4Q215 (<i>TNaph</i>)	83	2 2	238, 245, 466
4Q215a (<i>Time of Righteousness</i>)	3-4, 38-9, 42, 57, 142, 171, 249, 375-6, 395-6, 419	4Q236 (<i>Ps89 now 4Q98g</i>)	442
1 ii	38, 132	4Q242 (<i>PrNab ar</i>)	274
1 ii 3-4	376		
1 ii 3	38, 80, 375	4Q243-245 (<i>psDan^{a-c} ar</i>)	20, 37, 248, 253, 266, 274-6, 329, 337, 418
1 ii 4	38		
1 ii 5-8	345	4Q243 (<i>psDan^a ar</i>)	30, 355
1 ii 5	38, 376, 395	16	30, 37, 355
1 ii 6	38, 376, 395	16 1-2	355, 358
1 ii 7-8	345	16 1	403
1 ii 9-10	38	16 60	37
1 ii 10	376, 395	24	30, 37, 355, 403
1 ii 11	39	24 1	403
2 1	39	24 2	37, 403, 421
2 2	171, 245	25	30, 37, 355
2 3-4	376	26	30
2 4-5	38-9	33	30, 37, 355
3	38	4Q245 (<i>psDan^c ar</i>)	30, 252, 275-6, 284
3 1	171, 245, 376	1 i 3	276
		2	30, 275-6, 329
4Q216-224 (<i>Jub^a-papJub^b</i>)	34		
4Q216 (<i>Jub^a</i>)	35	2 2	37, 276
IV 3	35	2 3	275-6
4Q225-227 (<i>psJub^{a-c}</i>)	34, 352		

2 4	276	V 4-5	456
2 5	276	V 4	438, 456
		V 5	126, 456
4Q246 (<i>apocrDan ar</i>)	30, 252, 274, 337, 353, 374, 403, 421, 423, 429, 431-4, 445-6, 463, 466, 470-1	4Q253 (<i>commGen B</i>) 3 2	126 126
		4Q253a (<i>commMal</i>) 1 i 1-5	29 321
I-II	445		
I 4-6	445	4Q254 (<i>commGen C</i>)	126
I 4	374, 402, 446	4 5	126
I 5	356, 446		
I 7-II 1	445	4Q254a (<i>commGen D</i>)	126
II	37, 132, 402, 429	3 3 4	92 162
II 1b-3	402		
II 1-2	37	4Q255-264 (<i>S^{a-j}</i>)	52-4, 249, 330
II 1	445-6, 459, 462-3, 465	4Q255 (<i>papS^a</i>) 4Q256 (<i>S^b</i>)	52 17, 53
II 2-3	446	II-III	366
II 2	402	II 12-13	366
II 3	374, 421, 445	III 1-4	366
II 4-9	402	III 1	366
II 4-6	445	IX 3	53
II 4-5	402, 421	IX 8	378
II 4	374, 419, 446	XX 5-7	378
II 5-9	446	4Q257 (<i>papS^c</i>)	53, 249
II 5-6	374, 468	II	366
II 5	445, 466	II 1-7	366
II 6	446	II 4	366
II 7-9	446	V	286, 330
II 7-8	402	V 5-6	286
II 7	356, 445, 466	V 5	284
II 8-9	446	V 12-13	286
II 8	455	4Q258 (<i>S^d</i>)	17, 53
II 9	445	I 2	53
		I 7	378
4Q252 (<i>CommGen A</i>)	126, 352, 426, 429, 434, 438, 455, 471	II 4	228
		VI 4	450
II 2-3	343	X 5-7	378
V	439, 469-70	4Q259 (<i>S^e</i>)	17, 53
V 1-5	25, 428, 433	II 10-11	228
V 1-4	438, 455	II 14	51, 453
V 1-2	438, 469	III	53, 453-4
V 1	438	III 4-6	454
V 2-4	393	4Q260 (<i>S^f</i>)	
V 2-3	438	IV 3-8	378
V 2	438, 455	4Q261 (<i>S^g</i>)	
V 3-4	67, 436, 438, 455, 469	6 4	450
		4Q262 (<i>S^h</i>)	52
V 3	438		

4Q265 (<i>Miscellaneous Rules</i>)	352	3 iii 25	280
7 ii 10	378	6 i 12-13	319
7 ii 14	79	8 i	278
		10 i 10-12	425
4Q266-273 (<i>D^a-papD^b</i>)	47, 249, 330, 450, 452, 460, 471	10 i 11-12	226, 433, 451, 453
		10 i 12	47
		11 19	183
4Q266 (<i>D^a</i>)		4Q267 (<i>D^b</i>)	
1a-b	47-8, 452	1	47, 452
1a-b 1-5a	47	2 1-3	365
1a-b 1	172	2 1-2	366
1a-b 2-5	48	2 2-3	365
1a-b 2	182	2 5-6	366
1a-b 16-17	48	2 11	199
1 i-2 i	47	4Q268 (<i>D^c</i>)	
2 i	452	1	47, 452
2 i 2-4	49	1 5-8	360
2 i 3-6	360	1 5-7	210
2 i 3-4	210	1 5	183
2 i 3	360	1 7-8	360
2 i 5-6	360	1 9-10	122, 220, 376
2 i 5	360		360
2 i 6-8	122	1 11-12	360
2 i 7-8	220, 376	1 12-14	360-1
2 i 9-10	360	1 12	223
2 i 9	223	1 14	182
2 i 10-11	360-1	1 15-17	395
2 i 11	182	1 17	367
2 i 12-14	395	4Q269 (<i>D^d</i>)	
2 i 14	367	4 ii 2-4	228
2 i 15-16	182, 361	5 1-4	453
2 i 16b-ii 2a	49	7 8	319, 333
2 i 16	162, 245	7 11-12	319
2 ii 2-6	364	4Q270 (<i>D^e</i>)	
2 ii 2-3	364	2 ii	47
2 ii 6-13	361	2 ii 19	285
2 ii 6-12	357	2 ii 20	285, 330
2 ii 10-13	223	7 ii 12b-15	51-2
2 ii 17-21	265, 365	7 ii 13	183
2 ii 17	345	7 ii 15	51
2 ii 18-21	346	4Q271 (<i>D^f</i>)	
3 ii 5-7	365, 413	4 ii 4-5	265, 343, 351-2, 357-8, 361-2
3 ii 5-6	366		34
3 ii 6-7	365	4 ii 5-6	351, 365
3 ii 8-9	366	4 ii 6-7	
3 ii 11	199	4Q272 (<i>D^g</i>)	
3 ii 20	410	1 i 7-8	319, 333
3 iii 18-25	433, 452-3	1 i 10-11	319
3 iii 18-22	440, 451-2	4Q273 (<i>papD^h</i>)	
3 iii 18	440	4 ii 3-4	319, 333
3 iii 19-22	425, 451	4 ii 7	319
3 iii 19-20	441		
3 iii 21-22	320, 439		

4Q280 (<i>Curses</i>)	252-3	4Q301 (<i>Myst^f</i>)	
1 2	363	1 2	380
		2 1	380
4Q285 (<i>SM</i>)	68, 371,	4Q302 (<i>Admonitory Parable</i>)	389, 419
	426, 433,	1 I	389
	457-8	1 I 4-5	389
5	433, 457,	1 I 13	389
	459-60,	2 II-III	389
	465,	2 II	389
	470-1	2 II 2-6	389
5 1-2	27	2 II 2-3	389
5 2-4	428	2 II 4	389
5 2	440	2 II 6	389
5 3-4	458	2 III 7	389
5 4	458	3 II 6-7	389
5 5	458	4Q317-330	343
5 6	458	4Q322 (<i>Calendrical Doc C^d</i>)	
6+4 6-7	458	2 4	372
6+4 10	458	2 6	372
		4Q324a (<i>Calendrical Doc C^d</i>)	
4Q286-287 (<i>Ber^{a-b}</i>)	252-3	2 8	372
4Q286 (<i>Ber^a</i>)		4Q324b (<i>Calendrical Doc C^e</i>)	
7 II	366	1 II 7	372
4Q287 (<i>Ber^b</i>)	432		
6	366	4Q368 (<i>apocrPent A</i>)	432
		4Q369 (<i>PEnosh?</i>)	432
4Q298 (<i>cryptA Words of the</i>	74-5, 412	1 I 6	378
<i>Maskil to All Sons of Dawn</i>)			
I 1	75	4Q370 (<i>Exhortation Based</i>	126, 244
I 2	75	<i>on the Flood</i>)	
III 6-7	75	I	162
III 9-10	75, 412	I 2-6	346
		I 6	346
4Q299-301 (<i>Myst^{a-c}</i>)	39-42, 57,	II 9	162
	249, 340,		
	380, 392,	4Q374 (<i>Discourse on the</i>	432
	398, 418	<i>Exodus/Conquest Tradition</i>)	
4Q299 (<i>Myst^a</i>)		4Q377 (<i>apocrPent B</i>)	431-3
3 II 10-11	380	1 <i>recto</i> I 8	433
3 II 16	380	1 <i>recto</i> II 4-5	432
5 2	380	1 <i>recto</i> II 5	432
8 7	380	1 <i>recto</i> II 10	433
30 4	380	1 <i>recto</i> II 11	432
59 2	381	1 <i>recto</i> II 12	433
62 2	381		
72 2	39, 80	4Q378 (<i>apocrJoshua^a</i>)	
4Q300 (<i>Myst^b</i>)		6 II 7	278
1 II 1	380		
3 3-6	380	4Q381 (<i>Non-Canonical</i>	441
3 3	41, 380	<i>Psalms B</i>)	
3 4-6	380, 392	15 7-9	441
3 4	392		
3 5-6	380		
3 8	380		

15 7	442	1 ii 2-3	274
15 9	442	1 ii 3-6	273
31 7-8	442	1 ii 3-4	273-4
76-77 14	278	1 ii 3	273-4, 362, 420
4Q383, 385a, 387, 388a, 389, 390, 387a (<i>Apocryphon of Jeremiah</i>)	337, 359	1 ii 4	363
4Q387a (<i>apocrJer C'</i>)		1 ii 6	272-4
3 II 3-4	358	1 ii 7-10	273
		1 ii 8-10	273, 363
		1 ii 9	273
		1 iii	271, 363
4Q385, 385 ^{b-c} , 386, 388, 391 (<i>Pseudo-Ezekiel</i>)	4, 248, 252, 260, 264-6, 269-74, 284, 293, 324, 327-9, 333, 337, 418, 420	1 iii 4 4Q388 (<i>psEzek^d</i>)	363 37, 248, 270, 329
		7 (olim 8)	28, 37, 270-1
		7 (olim 8) 4-7	271-2
		4Q391 (<i>psEzek^e</i>)	270
		36	270
		65 6-8	270
4Q385 (<i>psEzek^a</i>)	4, 248-9, 269-70, 277, 329	4Q390 (<i>apocrJer C^c olim psMoses^e</i>)	42, 358
2	28, 37, 269-71	1	37
2 1	271, 273	1 2	358
2 2-10	271-2	1 7	358
2 2-3	324	1 11	358
2 3	420	2 I 4-5	110
2 7	273	2 I 4-10	358
2 8-9	324	2 I 4	37, 358
3	110, 269	2 I 6-7	358
3 2-5	403	2 I 6	37, 358
3 3-5	93, 151, 420	2 I 8-10	358-9
		2 I 9-10	37
3 3	249	4Q394-399 (<i>MMT^{w-f}</i>)	3, 43-6, 48-9, 61, 76, 95, 113, 292, 388, 453
6 (olim 4)	110, 269, 339	A 20-21	343
4Q385b (<i>psEzek^c</i>)	37, 270	B	44
4Q386 (<i>psEzek^b</i>)	37, 248, 270, 301, 328-9	B 1-2	46
1	274	B 11-13	46
1 i	28, 37, 270-3, 420	B 13	46
		B 26-27	46
1 i 1-2	273, 324	B 27	46
1 i 8-9	273	B 39-49	46, 66
1 i 9-10	324	B 39	66
1 i-ii	270-1, 273, 362	B 61-62	44
1 ii-iii	271, 274	B 75-82	359
1 ii	271-4	B 75-76	46
1 ii 1-3	273	B 75	359
		B 80-82	46

B 81	359	4Q417 (<i>Instruction</i> ^c)	
B 82	359	1 i 10-11	41
C	44-6, 101, 107, 112	2 i	381
C 7-8	46	2 i 8-13	320
C 8c-9	44	2 i 8-11	321
C 10	45	2 i 13-18	319-20, 333
C 12-23	25	2 i 14-15	320
C 14	45	2 i 14	320-1
C 16	45	2 i 15-16	321
C 18-26	99, 106	2 i 15	320-1
C 20-22	45	2 i 16-18	321
C 21	45	2 i 16	321
C 22	46	2 i 17-18	320-1
C 23-25	453	2 i 17	322
C 24	46	5 3-5	381
C 25-26	45, 453	5 3-4	381
C 27	45-6	4Q418 (<i>Instruction</i> ^d)	199
C 28	45	2 2-6	381
C 30	45	2 6	210
C 30b	44	43,44,45 i	381
4Q395 (<i>MMT</i> ^b)	43	43,44,45 i 5-9	320
4Q397 (<i>MMT</i> ^d)	45	43,44,45 i 10-14	319-20
		43,44,45 i 10-11	320-1
4Q400-407 (<i>ShirShabb</i> ^{a-h})	338-9, 393	43,44,45 i 12	320-1
4Q400 (<i>ShirShabb</i> ^a)		43,44,45 i 13-14	321
1 i 5	322	43,44,45 i 13	321-2
1 i 17	322	55 8	322
4Q401 (<i>ShirShabb</i> ^b)		69 ii 4-15	88
14 i 6	170	69 ii 6-9	381
		69 ii 7	381
4Q410 (<i>Vision and Its Interpretation</i>)		69 ii 10	39
1 7	278	69 ii 12-13	322
		81 11-12	322
		103 ii 6	199, 245
4Q413 (<i>Composition concerning Divine Providence</i>)	359	122 II+126 II 9-10	381
1-2 1-2	321	212,213 2-5	381
1-2 4	359	4Q423 (<i>Instruction</i> ^g)	
		5 3-6	149
4Q415-418, 423 (<i>Instruction</i> ^{a-g})	13, 39-42, 54, 249, 319-23, 340, 376, 380-1, 398, 412, 418	4Q427-432 (<i>H</i> ^{a-f})	55-6, 249, 291, 330
		4Q427 (<i>H</i> ^a)	
		7 I + 9	312
		4Q428 (<i>H</i> ^b)	56
		4Q429 (<i>H</i> ^c)	56
		2 I 10-11	368
4Q415 (<i>Instruction</i> ^a)	38	4Q430 (<i>H</i> ^d)	
4Q416 (<i>Instruction</i> ^b)		1 1-2	367
1 10-14	381	1 6-7	368
1 12	381	4Q432 (<i>H</i> ^f)	
1 14	210	4 II 2-6	367
2 i 5-6	41	4 II 3	367
3 2-4	210	4 II 4	367

4Q434a (<i>Grace after Meals</i>)	265, 281–4, 324, 329–30	4Q475 (<i>Renewed Earth</i>)	37, 42, 109, 132, 142, 171
1+2 1	282	4	37
1+2 2–3	233, 283	6	37
1+2 4	282		
1+2 6–7	283	4Q482 (<i>papJub?</i>)	34
1+2 6	282		
1+2 7	283	4Q488	
1+2 10–13	283	1 1	234
4Q434–438 (<i>Barki Nafshi^{a-c}</i>)	239–40, 246	4Q491c (<i>Self-Glorification Hymn^b</i>)	427
4Q434 (<i>Barki Nafshi^a</i>)	240, 281		
1 i 1–3	240	4Q491–496 (<i>M^{a-f}</i>)	68, 369, 371, 457–8
1 i 9	240		
3 ii 2	240	4Q491 (<i>M^a</i>)	36
4Q437 (<i>Barki Nafshi^d</i>)		8–10 I	36
1 1–2	240	8–10 I 6–7	370
2 i 14–15	240	11 I	427, 431
4Q440 (<i>Hodayot-like text C</i>)		4Q493 (<i>M^f</i>)	68
3 i 16	433	4Q495 (<i>M^f</i>)	
		2 1–4	369
4Q442 (<i>Individual Thanksgiving B</i>)	265, 283–4, 329	2 2–3	366
1	283–4, 292	2 3	352
		4Q496 (<i>M^f</i>)	
4Q458 (<i>Narrative A</i>)	419, 432	I 2+1 7	369
1 7–9	390	I 3 4–5	369
1 8	362	V 16 5	369
1 9	390		
		4Q497 (<i>War Scroll-like Text A</i>)	68
4Q459 (<i>Narrative Work Mentioning Lebanon</i>)			
1 2	278	4Q504, 4Q506 (<i>DibHam^{a+c}</i>)	36
		4Q504 (<i>DibHam^a</i>)	245, 252–3, 448
4Q463 (<i>Narrative D</i>)	361	1–2 II 7	278
1 1–4	360	1–2 V 7–16	210
1 2–3	361	1–2 V 2	199
1 4	360	1–2 V 9	210
2 3	362	1–2 V 11	222
		1–2 V 17–19	222
4Q471 (<i>War Scroll-like Text B</i>)	68, 228, 373	1–2 VI 6	222
		1–2 VI 11	222
		1–2 VI 14	253
4Q471a (<i>Polemical fragment</i>)	228, 373–4, 419	8 12	210
1 1–8	373		
1 2–3	228	4Q507–509 (<i>Festival Prayers^{a-c}</i>)	36
4Q471b (<i>Self-Glorification Hymn^a</i>)	373, 427		
1–3		4Q509+505 (<i>Festival Prayers^c</i>)	
		97–98 i 8	27
		285 1	278

4Q510-511 (<i>Shir^{a-b}</i>)	74-5	5 ii 11	375
4Q510 (<i>Shir^a</i>)		5 ii 13	375
1 6-8	75	5 ii 15	375
4Q511 (<i>Shir^b</i>)		7 1-3	466
2 i 1	75	7 4-5	375
8 4	75	7 4	325
35 1	376	7 5-8 + 5 ii 7-13	299
		7 5	325
4Q521 (<i>Messianic Apocalypse</i>)	4, 104, 123, 248-50, 252, 265, 277-81, 284, 293, 299, 301, 307, 326, 329, 331-2, 334, 337-8, 375, 423, 429, 433-4, 446-8, 461, 464, 470-1	7 6 7 7 8 9-10 8 9 14 2	280-1, 325, 329, 375 281, 326, 375 448 448 375
		4Q525 (<i>Beatitudes</i>)	36, 352, 380, 398, 412, 418
2 ii+4	4, 142, 277-81, 299, 301, 307, 332, 375, 429, 446-8, 459, 465, 467, 470	2 ii+3 4 8 3 10 5 11-12 11-12 1 14 ii 14 16 4-6	381 381 220, 381 286, 330 286 329 234
2 ii+4 1-2	226, 280-1, 446-8, 461-2, 466	19 4 23 2-4 23 9-10	352, 382 381 222
2 ii+4 1	202, 245, 325, 446, 448, 466, 470	25 2	382
2 ii+4 2	448	4Q526 (<i>Testament?</i>)	
2 ii+4 3-5	447, 466	1	278
2 ii+4 3-4	280	4Q529 (<i>Words of Michael ar</i>)	355, 362
2 ii+4 4	299, 331	4	355
2 ii+4 5-7	277	6-7	355
2 ii+4 6	303	9-10	355
2 ii+4 7	137, 280	12	355
2 ii+4 8	280, 307		
2 ii+4 9-10	280	4Q530-532	32-3, 346
2 ii+4 9	280, 299, 447	(<i>EnGiants^{b-d} ar</i>)	
2 ii+4 11-12	137, 303	4Q530 (<i>EnGiants^b ar</i>)	
2 ii+4 11	466	II 1	348
2 ii+4 12	137, 277, 280, 299, 301, 307, 325, 329, 331, 447	II 2 II 6-12 II 6 II 13-15	348 347 347 347
2 ii+4 12-14	88	II 13	347
2 iii	448	II 15	347
2 iii 1-4	447	II 16-20	347
2 iii 1-2	446-7	II 16-18	347
2 iii 1	375, 447	II 18	347
2 iii 2	301, 332	II 20-21	347
7 1-8 + 5 ii 7-16	4, 88, 142, 279, 281, 375	II 20	347

II 21–23	347	4Q543–548 (<i>Visions of Amram^{a-f} ar</i>)	252–3, 265–9, 312, 333, 337, 363
II 23	347		
III 3	347	4Q543 (<i>Visions of Amram^a ar</i>)	
III 6–10	347	1 1–2	267
III 8	347	1 2	266
6 i 4	347	3 1	267
6 i 7	347	3 4	267
6 i 8	347	6	313, 363
4Q531 (<i>EnGiants^c ar</i>)		6 3–5	267
4 4	347	7 1	267
5 2	347	8 2	267
5 5	347	4Q544 (<i>Visions of Amram^b ar</i>)	363
4Q532 (<i>EnGiants^d ar</i>)		1–3	363
2 3	347	1 10–14	313
2 9	347	1 10–11	363
4Q534–536 (<i>Birth of Noah^{a-c}</i>)	337, 349	1 12	363
4Q534 (<i>Birth of Noah^a</i>)	337, 346, 415, 431–2	1 13–14	267
I 8	415	2	313
I 9	432	2 3	363
I 10	415, 431	2 5–6	267, 313
II 14	349	3 1	267
II 16–20	346	4Q545 (<i>Visions of Amram^c ar</i>)	
II 16	431	1 i 1–2	267
II 18	349, 431	1 i 2	266
4Q535 (<i>Birth of Noah^b</i>)	431	4 3	363
4Q536 (<i>Birth of Noah^c</i>)	431	4Q548 (<i>Visions of Amram^f ar</i>)	253, 265–9, 284, 316, 329, 337
4Q540–4Q541 (<i>apocrLevi^{a-b} ar</i>)	408, 434	1	266, 313
4Q541 (<i>apocrLevi^{b?} ar</i>)	338, 408–9, 433, 435, 444, 448–50, 470–1	1 5	267
9 i	408–10, 421, 444, 448–9, 461	1 6	267
9 i 2–3	449	1 7–9	267
9 i 2	409, 448	1 ii–2	267, 269
9 i 3–5	409, 449	1 ii–2 2	267
9 i 3–4	409, 444	1 ii–2 5	267
9 i 3	409	1 ii–2 7–9	267
9 i 1–7	408	1 ii–2 7	269
9 i 6–7	409	1 ii–2 8	267
9 i 6	408	1 ii–2 9b–14	267–8
24 ii	449	1 ii–2 9–13	269
24 ii 5–6	409, 449	1 ii–2 9	267
24 ii 5	449–50	1 ii–2 11	268
4Q542 (<i>TQahat ar</i>)	15, 252–3	1 ii–2 12–13	297, 313, 315, 329
1 i 10–11	329	1 ii–2 13–14	268
		1 ii–2 13	268
		1 ii–2 14	267, 269
		4Q549	266, 337
		2 2	266, 329, 337
		2 6	266, 337

4Q550, 550a-d (<i>PrEsther^{a-c} ar</i>)	20	5Q4 (<i>Amos</i>)	28
		5Q10 (<i>pMal?</i>)	29
4Q552-553 (<i>Four Kingdoms^{a-b} ar</i>)	30, 274, 337, 354	5Q11 (<i>S</i>)	52, 330
4Q552 (<i>Four Kingdoms^a ar</i>)	354	1 I	366
1 i	354	1 I 2-6	366
1 i 8	354		
1 i 10	354	5Q12 (<i>D</i>)	47, 249, 330
1 ii 1	354		
1 ii 5-6	354	5Q15 (<i>NJ ar</i>)	117, 338
1 ii 7	354		
1 ii 9-10	354	6Q7 (<i>papDan</i>)	353
4Q553 (<i>Four Kingdoms^b ar</i>)	16	6Q8 (<i>papEnGiants ar</i>)	33, 346
1 4	16		
6 i	354	6Q15 (<i>D</i>)	47, 249, 330
6 i 5	354	3 1-2	365
6 ii 2	354	3 1	366
6 ii 4-5	354	3 2	365
		3 3-4	366
4Q554 (<i>NJ^a ar</i>)	252, 337	4 1-3	228
1 i-ii	85	5	47
2 iii	253, 338	5 5	285, 330
2 iii 16	338		
2 iii 20	338	7Q1 (<i>LXXExod</i>)	16, 20
4Q554a (<i>NJ^b ar</i>)	117, 338	7Q2 (<i>LXXEpJer</i>)	16, 20
4Q555 (<i>NJ^c ar</i>)	117, 338		
		7Q4, 8, 11-14 (<i>papEn gr</i>)	32
4Q556 (<i>EnGiants^e ar</i>)	346		
6 2-3	347	11Q4 (<i>Ezekiel</i>)	260
4Q557 (<i>Vision^c ar</i>)		11Q5 (<i>Ps^a</i>)	81, 120, 225, 252, 277, 332, 462
2	362	XIX	363, 418
4Q558 (<i>Vision^b ar</i>)	30, 124, 244, 277, 461	XIX 13-16	363
1 ii	30	XXI-XXII	82
1 ii 4-5	332	XXII	22
1 ii 4	124, 139, 300, 447	XXII 1-15	225
1 ii 5	448	XXII 2-3	225
		XXII 6-7	225
4Q562 (<i>Aramaic D</i>)		11Q6 (<i>Ps^b</i>)	120, 225
1 1-2	374	4-5	363, 418
		4-5 14-16	363
4Q568 (<i>Aramaic K</i>)	234, 245	6	22, 225
1	234		
		11Q10 (<i>tgJob</i>)	20
4Q577 (<i>Text Mentioning the Flood</i>)	126, 244	XXIII 4-9	263
		XXVII 4-7	263
5Q3 (<i>Isaiah</i>)	259	11Q11 (<i>Apocryphal Psalms</i>)	364, 418

I-VI 3	364	1 i	433, 457,
I	364		459-60, 465,
I 7	364		470-1
II-V 3	364	1 i 9-11	27
II 2	364	1 i 10-11	440
II 4	352, 364	1 i 11-13	458
II 8	364	1 i 13	458
III 4	364	1 i 14	458
III 9	364		
V 2-13	364	11Q17 (<i>ShirShabb</i>)	338-9, 393
V 2-3	364		
V 4-14	364	11Q18 (<i>NJ ar</i>)	117, 338
V 4	364	19 4	338
V 12	364	19 5-6	338
VI 3-14	364	24 2	338
VI 3	364		
11Q13 (<i>Melchizedek</i>)	252-3, 330, 357, 363, 379, 398, 429-30, 432-4, 455-7, 461, 470-1	11Q19 (<i>T^a</i>) XLV 16 11Q20 (<i>T^b</i>) 11Q29 (<i>Fragment Related to Serekh ha-Yahad</i>)	199 15 52, 330
II 1-14	456	KhQ1-2	77-8
II 2	456		
II 10-12	379	Mas1, 1a-f, h	21
II 13-14	416, 456	Mas1d (<i>MasEzek</i>)	260
II 13	363		
II 15-24	456, 459	Mur 1 1-7	20
II 15-20	436	Mur 2 (<i>Deut</i>)	20
II 15-18	440	Mur 3 (<i>Isa</i>)	20
II 18-20	440	Mur 88 (<i>XII</i>)	20, 28, 235
II 18	430, 440, 456, 468	5/6 Hev 1a & 1b	21
II 20	457		
II 23-24	440	8HevXIIgr	21, 28
II 24-25	456	XVII 32	89
II 24	457		
II 25	363, 456	XHev/Se 1-4	21
III 7	363		
11Q14 (<i>SM</i>)	68, 371, 457-8	Sdeir 1 (<i>Gen</i>) 34Se 2 (<i>Num</i>)	21 21

4. NEW TESTAMENT

<i>Matthew</i>	13-4, 18, 116,	1:20	464
	154, 158, 161,	2	465
	163-74, 178,	2:4-6	464
	182, 195, 459,	2:6	29
	464-5, 471	3:1-17	382
1:1-17	464	3:2	308, 388
1:1	464	3:3	27, 118

3:7	161, 386	12:38	159, 406
3:11	385, 387	12:40	161, 170, 256
3:17	392	12:41-42	184, 405
4:11-12	385	13	165
4:16	300	13:10-13	395
4:17	396	13:24-30	169, 174, 200
5-7	165, 167	13:30	388
5:9-12	407, 421	13:36-43	125, 167, 169, 172-4, 200
5:17-48	169	13:38	172
5:17-20	163, 172	13:39-40	171
5:17	173	13:41-43	172
5:18	146, 169, 171	13:41	172
5:19-20	169	13:42	125
5:22	167	13:43	125
5:29-30	167, 169	13:49-50	167, 172-4
5:29	191	13:49	171
5:46	169	13:50	125
5:47	174	13:57	391
6:7	174	14:1-2	302
6:10-11	184	14:2	303
7:15	239	14:28-31	309
7:19	167	15:11	173
7:21-23	172	15:20	173
7:23	172	16:1-4	393
8:11	179	16:1	159, 392
8:12	167	16:3	393
9:37-10:42	167	16:4	159-60, 392
10	165	16:13-20	391
10:1-11:1	306	16:13-19	164
10:6	174	16:16-19	195
10:7	306, 308	16:16	306
10:8	306	16:17-19	195, 309
10:15	170	16:18	167
10:17-19	160	16:20	306
10:22-23	168	16:23	172
10:23	136, 167-9, 397, 407, 421	16:24	308
10:28	160	16:25	179
10:34-36	184	16:27-28	167
10:35-36	105	16:27	125, 170, 172
10:35	29	16:28	167-70
10:40	399	17:9-13	138, 300-1, 332
10:42	131	17:9	300
11:2-19	165	17:10-11	123
11:2-6	306, 464-5	17:10	30, 123, 300, 332
11:2	306, 464	17:11	171, 300
11:5	306	17:12-13	301, 384
11:10	29	17:13	302
11:14	302, 384	18	165
11:22	170	18:6-9	397
11:24	159, 170	18:7	172
12:1-8	173	18:8-9	169
12:15-23	465	18:9	167
12:31-37	167	18:17	174
12:38-39	392	18:23-35	167

19:16-22	172	24:45-51	179-80
19:28	167, 169-71, 245	24:48	179-80
21:5	122	24:51	179
21:23-27	384	25:31-46	172-3
21:26	384	25:31	170
21:32	384	26:28-29	216
21:33-42	166	26:28	27
21:45	166	26:29	152
22:1-10	177	26:53	169
22:9-10	177	26:64	125, 167
22:11-14	167	27:25	174
22:14	167	27:51-53	261, 323-5, 333-4
22:23-33	103, 295	27:51b	323
22:29	295	27:52-53	324
22:30	297	27:53	323-4
22:32	295	27:54	323
22:35-40	244	28	308
22:41-46	465	28:1-8	310
23	163, 179	28:2-3	311-2
23:15	167	28:2	323
23:25	173	28:6-7	323
23:32-39	165	28:9	314
23:33	79, 167	28:10	308
23:34	166	28:16-20	308
23:37-39	165	28:17	314
24-25	126, 165-7, 170, 172-3, 242	28:18-20	163, 314
24	165	28:18	399
24:1-2	165	28:19-20	169, 173-4
24:1	165	28:20	171, 399
24:2	182	<i>Mark</i>	10, 14, 18, 116, 127-54, 161, 167, 169-70, 172, 174, 178-9, 182, 189, 311, 314, 384, 397, 459-63
24:3	125, 170-1	1:1-11	382, 387
24:9	174	1:1-8	385
24:12	173	1:1	138, 461
24:13-14	168	1:2-3	117, 386
24:14	173-4	1:2	29, 123
24:15	31, 255, 327	1:3	27, 386
24:18	179	1:4	387
24:20	163	1:7-8	385
24:21	168	1:7	118, 385
24:22	93, 110, 168, 249	1:8	133
24:24	425	1:10-12	133
24:26-41	162	1:10-11	85
24:27	170, 179	1:11	392
24:28	179	1:13	133
24:29	169, 171	1:14-15	131, 133-5, 394-6
24:31	124	1:14	302
24:34	167-70	1:15	132, 134, 138, 152, 308, 388, 395, 419
24:35	169, 171	1:16-20	145
24:36-37	168	1:22	462
24:37-39	126, 171, 174, 179		
24:37	126, 415		
24:40-41	179		
24:43-51	179, 184		
24:44	179		

1:23-26	133	6:15	301, 303
1:24	460, 463	6:16-29	138, 302
1:25	460	6:20	390
1:27-28	128	6:30	131, 150
1:27	461	6:45-52	309
1:34	133, 460	6:45	155
1:39	128, 133	7:3-4	128
1:44	461	7:11	128
2:1-12	155	7:24-30	128
2:6-7	155, 463	7:25-30	133
2:12	128	7:26	133
2:23-3:6	128	7:29-30	133
3:1-6	155	7:31	129
3:11	460, 463, 465	7:34	128
3:12	460	8:11-13	159-60, 404, 406
3:14	131	8:11-12	392
3:15	133	8:11	138, 159, 392
3:17	128	8:12-13	138
3:19b-30	134, 461	8:12	160, 392
3:22-26	133	8:15	128
3:22	133	8:17	130
3:23-26	133-4	8:21	130
3:24	134	8:27-33	461
3:26	134	8:27-30	130, 304, 391
3:29	133	8:27-29	315
4	132	8:27-28	302, 332
4:1-29	200	8:27	304
4:3-9	396	8:28	138, 301-2, 384
4:11-12	136, 395	8:29	195, 463
4:11	135, 395-7	8:30	460
4:12	395	8:31-33	130
4:13-20	396	8:31-32	461
4:15	133, 396	8:31	133, 137-8, 179, 463
4:17	130, 407, 421	8:33	133, 460
4:19	186	8:34-9:1	138
4:20	396	8:34-38	130
4:25	129	8:34	137-8, 308
4:26-29	396	8:35-37	138
4:35-41	309, 461	8:38-9:1	131, 133, 135-8
4:40	130, 186	8:38	11, 122, 133, 135, 137-8, 202, 211, 463
4:41	461	9:1	135-40, 168-9, 397
5:7	460, 463, 465	9:2-13	384
5:20	129	9:2-8	136, 309, 312
5:41	128	9:3	312
6:1-6	303	9:9-13	138-9, 243-4, 300-2, 332
6:2	303	9:9-10	130, 138
6:4	139, 391	9:9	130, 137-8, 300, 460
6:7-13	131, 150	9:10	138-9, 300
6:12-13	302	9:11-13	128
6:13	133	9:11-12	123, 138
6:14-19	131	9:11	29, 123, 138, 300, 332
6:14-16	302, 304, 332, 461	9:12-13	139, 301
6:14-15	138, 302-3, 384	9:12	139, 171, 236, 300
6:14	303		

9:19	122	12:25	143, 251, 297
9:30–32	130, 133, 463	12:26	25, 296
9:31	137	12:27	295
9:37	399	12:28–34	128, 141, 244
9:38–41	131, 140	12:28	143
9:38	131, 133	12:31	228
9:41	131–2, 135, 140, 237, 243	12:35–40	143
9:42–50	140, 243, 397	12:35–37a	119, 128, 135, 315, 458, 462
9:42–48	131, 135, 140, 152, 396	12:35	462
9:42	140	12:36–37	120, 462
9:43–49	130	12:36	119, 133
9:43–48	134	12:38–40	128, 141
9:43–47	169	12:40b	131, 135, 140, 142, 243
9:43	134, 141, 388	13	10–1, 127–9, 131–3, 136, 138, 144, 146–8, 151–2, 165, 401–2
9:45	134, 137, 141, 197		
9:47	134, 137, 141, 197, 396–7	13:1–4	420
9:49–50	140	13:1–2	148
9:49	140, 397	13:2	129, 147, 182
10:2–9	128	13:3–37	10, 122, 132, 143–52, 179, 242, 400, 420
10:17–22	141, 172		
10:17	197	13:3–31	10, 145, 148, 242
10:18	133	13:3–4	148
10:23	197	13:3	145
10:29–30	130, 140–1, 243	13:4	146, 149, 160, 297, 393, 401, 420
10:30	130, 141		
10:32–34	130	13:5–37	131
10:33–34	133, 463	13:5–31	146
10:33	137	13:5–27	146, 150
10:34	137	13:5–23	146
10:35–45	130, 137	13:5–8	129, 400–1
10:39–40	137	13:5–6	150, 152
10:45	130, 137	13:7–8	130, 149–50, 401
10:47–48	135, 463	13:7	143, 341, 401
11:1–11	119, 122, 461–2	13:8	401–2, 421
11:9–10	135, 462	13:9–23	130
11:9	119, 464	13:9–13	130, 146, 150–1, 202, 400, 407, 421
11:11	462		
11:15–18	199	13:9	129
11:27–33	296, 384, 462	13:10	128, 150, 173
11:28	296	13:11	133, 161
11:32	384–5	13:12	122, 139
12:1–12	132	13:13	151, 173, 202
12:9	129	13:14–23	129–30, 144, 146, 148–50, 243, 400
12:10–11	119		
12:11	119	13:14–20	143, 148
12:13–27	128	13:14–18	150
12:13–17	143	13:14–16	149, 242
12:18–27	85, 103, 131, 135, 143, 243, 295–6	13:14–15	129
		13:14	128–9, 144, 146–8, 151, 401, 420
12:18	143, 295, 297		
12:19–23	295, 331	13:15	179
12:19	296	13:17	148
12:23	131, 143	13:18	148–9
12:24	137, 295		

13:19–20	122, 146, 148–50, 402	15:43	129, 131–2, 153–4
13:19	148–9, 151, 403	16	308
13:20–22	150	16:1–8	310
13:20	93, 110, 150–1, 173, 249, 416, 420	16:1	308
13:21–23	129, 150	16:5	311–2
13:21–22	152	16:6–7	137
13:21	148, 179	16:7	129, 137, 191, 308, 310, 324
13:22	151, 425	16:9–20	310
13:23	148	16:9	133, 310
13:24–27	10–1, 122, 124, 143, 145–50, 153, 242–3, 400, 403	16:11	314
13:24–25	118, 150	16:13–14	314
13:24	147, 149–51, 403	16:14	314
13:26–27	133, 149, 151, 173, 211, 402	16:15	150
13:26	124, 136, 146–7, 149, 191, 243, 399, 401–3, 463	16:17	131, 133
13:27	150, 402–3, 420–1	16:19	153
13:28–32	136	16:20	131, 150
13:28–31	148–50, 243	Q	10, 13–4, 17, 116, 144, 154–62, 167, 169–70, 174, 179–80, 184, 189, 242, 244, 250, 307, 310, 339, 387, 396–8, 405, 416, 418, 459, 463–4
13:28–30	148	3:2–4	158
13:28–29	148	3:7–9	156, 158, 161, 189, 242, 385–8, 390, 419
13:28	149	3:7	158, 198, 210, 388
13:29	148	3:8–9	389
13:30–31	148	3:8	387–8
13:30	124, 136, 145–9, 168, 170	3:9	391, 419
13:31	146, 148, 171	3:12	200
13:32–37	10, 145, 149, 152, 173, 180, 400	3:16–17	158, 161, 189, 242, 385–8, 390–1, 419
13:32	133, 147, 238, 402	7:1–10	155
13:33–37	150	7:18–35	156
14:1–2	295	7:18–23	118, 280, 304–8, 332, 464, 467, 470
14:12–25	152	7:18–20	385
14:24–25	216	7:19	304, 332, 458, 464
14:24	27	7:20	204
14:25	131, 134, 136, 152	7:22–23	332
14:27	133	7:22	118, 304, 306–7, 446, 464
14:28	129, 324	7:24–26	302
14:36	128	7:24–25	189
14:42–43	134	7:27	123, 386
14:49	133	7:28	189, 383, 385
14:61–64	462	7:31–35	384
14:61–62	130, 315	7:33–34	384
14:61	153, 463	10:2	200
14:62	11, 125, 131–3, 136, 153, 399, 463	10:10–12	159, 398
15–16	129	10:11–15	155
15:21	128	10:13–15	155, 157, 159, 398
15:22	128	10:15	159
15:34	128	10:23–24	191
15:35	384		
15:38	129		
15:39	128, 323, 384, 463		

11:14-26	406-7, 410, 421	1:78	181, 305
11:16	159, 406-7, 410	1:79	240, 300
11:17-18	134	2:22	466
11:29-32	121, 157, 159, 161, 400, 404-10, 421	2:25-26	466
11:29	159-60, 405	2:26	471
11:31-32	398-9, 404-5	2:28-35	466
11:31	404	2:30-32	466-7
11:32	159, 404	2:32	177, 246
11:47-51	407, 421	2:34-35	467
11:51	121	2:41-52	176
12:2-12	160	3:1-22	382
12:4-5	398	3:3	387
12:4	160	3:4	27, 118
12:5	157	3:7	161, 386
12:8-9	135, 398	3:10-14	390
12:11-12	161	3:10	161
12:39-40	156-7	3:12	384
12:39	213	3:15	385
12:49-53	122	3:16	304-5, 385
12:51-56	157	3:22	392
13:23-29	157	4:16-30	467
13:34-35	156	4:16-21	118, 467
16:16	383	4:21	118, 134, 467
16:17	155	4:24	391
17:22-37	157, 162	5:1-11	309
17:22-23	156	6:13	131, 231
17:22	162	7:11-17	305, 307
17:23-24	152	7:16-17	305
17:26-30	152	7:16	181-2
17:26-27	162, 244	7:18-23	305
19:12-27	157	7:22	306
22:28-30	157, 159	7:27	29
		7:29-34	305
		7:29-30	384
<i>Luke</i>	12-4, 18, 116, 154, 161, 170, 172, 174-86, 239, 246, 314, 459, 465-7, 471	7:30	161, 386
1:1-4	175	8:9-10	395
1:1	175	9:7-9	302
1:3	175	9:7-8	303
1:4	175	9:10	231
1:5-2:40	465	9:18-21	391
1:5-25	176	9:20	195
1:17	305	9:23	308
1:26-38	465	9:26	125
1:31b-35	445	9:49-50	131
1:32-33	465	10:5	160
1:35	465	10:9	308, 396
1:46-55	239	10:11	308, 396
1:67-79	240, 246, 305	10:14	184
1:68-79	239, 385	10:16	399
1:68	181, 305	10:17-20	416
1:76-79	240	11:2	184
1:76	305, 385	11:13	184
		11:16	159, 392
		11:20	193

11:29-32	159	17:30	179, 184-5
11:29	392	17:31	179
11:30-32	405	17:32	179
11:30	161	17:33-37	179
11:31-32	184, 405	17:37	183
11:31	161	18:1-8	178
11:32	161	18:2	178
11:49	166	18:8	178, 186
12:11-12	160	18:18-23	172
12:28	172, 185	18:32	235
12:35-48	179	19:28-38	122
12:40	179	19:42	182
12:41-48	179, 184, 186	19:44	181-2
12:42-46	180, 243	19:47	323
12:45-46	180	20:1-8	384
12:45	179-80	20:1	384
12:46	179-80, 244	20:27-40	103
12:49-53	184	20:27-38	295
12:49	399	20:35	3
12:53	29, 105	20:36	297
12:54-56	393	20:37	25
13:28-29	179	20:38	295
14:12-15	177	20:39-44	119
14:12-14	178	21	184-5
14:13	177	21:5-36	183-5, 242
14:14	3, 177-8, 399	21:5-6	184
14:16-24	177	21:6	182
14:21	177	21:7-36	179
16:1-3	178	21:7	184
16:8-9	178	21:8-36	122
16:8	178	21:8-9	185
16:9	178	21:8	134, 183
16:17	146, 171	21:9	184
16:19-31	178	21:10-11	183
17	184	21:12-17	183
17:1	172	21:14-15	161
17:5	231	21:15	183
17:20-37	179, 183-4, 242	21:16	122
17:20-22	179	21:19	183
17:20-21	178, 181, 184, 193, 308, 341, 396	21:20-21	183
17:20	183	21:20	183
17:21-37	181	21:22-24	183
17:21	178, 183	21:22-23	183
17:22-37	126, 162, 184	21:22	184
17:22	183, 185	21:24	175, 182-3
17:23-24	152	21:25-26	183
17:23	179	21:27-33	183
17:24	179	21:27	124
17:25	179	21:28	185
17:26-27	126, 171, 179, 185	21:29-31	396
17:26	126, 415	21:31	185
17:28-30	185	21:34-36	185
17:28-29	126, 179	21:34	185-6
		21:36	183

21:37	185	1:29-34	385
22:7-38	178	1:29	194
22:14	231	1:31	385
22:16	216	1:34	197
22:18	152, 216	1:35-52	469
22:19	216	1:36	194
22:20	27	1:40-41	195
22:30	178	1:41	458, 469
22:47	235	1:43-51	469
22:50	235	1:45-49	196
22:52	235	1:45	469
22:69	125	1:49	469
23:30	29	2:11	392
23:42	179	2:13-25	199
23:43	179	2:17	194
24	308	2:18	392
24:1-11	310	2:22	194
24:1	308	2:23	392
24:4	311-2	3:1-21	196-7
24:5	308	3:2	392
24:6-7	308	3:3	197
24:11	314	3:5	197
24:13-53	176	3:13-16	197
24:13-35	313, 467	3:15-16	197
24:10	231	3:15	201
24:15-16	313	3:17-18	197
24:19-21	232	3:18-19	197
24:19	467	3:18	205
24:21	186, 239, 467	3:22-36	198, 469
24:23	311	3:23-30	196
24:24	314	3:26	384
24:26-27	458	3:31-36	205, 399
24:26	467	3:33-35	198
24:31	313	3:36	198, 205
24:33-34	310	4:1-42	198-200, 469
24:34	309-10	4:4-42	196, 198
24:36-53	314	4:5	198
24:36-37	313	4:9	198
24:38	186	4:10-11	198, 245
24:44-46	467	4:14	85, 198-9, 245
24:44	119, 458	4:16-26	199
24:46	256	4:19	199
		4:22	199-200
<i>John</i>	12, 18, 194-206, 399, 459,	4:23-24	199
	469, 471	4:23	12, 197, 200-1
1:1-18	196	4:25	199-200, 204, 226
1:15	385	4:26	200
1:17-18	197	4:29	200
1:19-34	198, 382, 469	4:31-38	200
1:19-28	385	4:36	200
1:19-25	385	4:42	200
1:19-21	197	4:44	391
1:23	27, 118, 385-6	4:46-53	155
1:26-27	385	4:54	392

5:16	202	9:31	244
5:17-30	197	9:39	197
5:18	202	10:28	201
5:19-30	200-2, 325, 333-4	10:41	392
5:21	201, 325, 334	11:1-44	196, 203-4, 469
5:22	202	11:2	203
5:24-25	197	11:17	204
5:24	200-1, 205	11:24	3, 204
5:25-29	237, 245, 399	11:25-26	204
5:25	12, 201-2	11:25	197
5:27	202	11:26-27	204
5:28-29	197, 200, 202	11:26	204
5:28	202	11:27	204
5:29	202, 325, 334	11:39	204
5:38	205	11:40	204
5:45-46	199	11:42	204
5:46	226	11:47	392
6:1-15	202	11:49-52	196
6:2	392	11:55-12:11	469
6:14	204, 392	12:1	196
6:22-65	469	12:9	203
6:22-59	202-3	12:11	203
6:26	392	12:15	122
6:27	202	12:16	194
6:30	392	12:17-18	203
6:31-33	202	12:18	392
6:35	202	12:31	197
6:38	203	12:37-50	205
6:39-40	197	12:37-43	205
6:41	203	12:37	392
6:44	197, 203	12:42	195
6:45	203	12:44-50	205, 399
6:47-48	203	12:44-45	205
6:47	201	12:46-48	205
6:48	202	12:47-48	205, 399
6:51-58	203	12:48	197, 205
6:51	203	12:49-50	205, 399
6:53	203	12:50	205
6:54	197, 203	13:7	194
6:58	203	13:23-26	195
6:68-69	195	13:34	196
7:1-13	469	14-17	194
7:14-52	469	14:16-17:26	196
7:31	392	14:26	194
7:35	194	15:1	194
7:37-39	85	15:9	206
7:38	199	15:18-27	202
8	196	15:26	196
8:12	194	16:2	195
8:26	197	16:7	196
8:51	197	16:11	197
9:1-41	469	18-19	195
9:16	392	19:35	196
9:22	194	19:39-40	308

20–21	195, 308	2:17–18	234
20	314	2:17	121, 234
20:1–10	195	2:18	121
20:1–2	310	2:20	121
20:11–18	310	2:21	235
20:11–12	310	2:22	182
20:12	311–2	2:23	235
20:14	313	2:25–28	120
20:17	314	2:31–32	137
20:18	314	2:31	313
20:19	314	2:32–33	312
20:24–29	196	2:33	315
20:24–25	310, 314	2:34–36	119, 468
20:25	191	2:34–35	120
20:26	314	2:39	176
20:30–31	195	2:47	186
20:30	392	3:12–26	236
21:1	308	3:13–17	182
21:2	196	3:17–26	304
21:4	314	3:17	182
21:7	195	3:21	236
21:14	314	3:22–24	236
21:15–21	206	3:22–23	304
21:20–23	195	3:22	226
21:22–24	196	3:25–26	236
21:22–23	132, 205–6	4–12	236
21:22	197, 206	4:1–7	296
21:23–24	194	4:1	233, 235, 295
21:23	206	4:2	9, 137
21:24	195–6	4:4	186
21:25	195	4:5–7	233, 235
		4:5–6	235
<i>Acts</i>	12, 18, 115, 175–6, 180–2, 186, 230–41, 245–6, 331, 385, 459, 468–9	4:7	296
		4:10–12	241
1:1–11	230	4:10	241
1:1–8	245	4:11	119
1:1	175	4:25–27	468
1:2	231	4:25–26	120
1:3	231, 233, 239, 308, 468	4:27–28	469
1:6–11	314	5:17–18	233, 296
1:6–8	232, 239, 245, 468	5:17	295
1:6	150, 171, 231–3, 236, 468, 470	5:21	296
		5:24	296
1:7–8	233	5:27	296
1:10	311	5:33	296
1:11	233, 236	5:34–37	465
1:22	137	5:42	468
2:1–47	119	6:1	161
2:9–11	231	6:5	236
2:14–36	119, 121, 234–5	6:7	186
2:14	235	6:8–8:3	407, 421
2:16	121	6:9–15	233
2:17–21	29, 121	6:11–14	177
		7:35–53	177

7:37	226	17:1	209
7:54-8:4	233	17:2-3	256
8:5	236, 468	17:18-19:32	239
8:12	236	17:18	293
9:2	240	17:22-31	219, 238, 294, 468
9:3-6	316	17:22-23	238
9:20-22	236	17:30-31	238
9:22	468	17:30	219
10	323	17:31	238, 293-4, 468, 471
10:1-48	468	18:1-2	218
10:1-2	237	18:1	244
10:34-43	236, 468	18:2	217
10:37	129, 308, 382	18:4	214
10:38	237, 468	18:5	468
10:40	191	18:7-8	214
10:42-43	237	18:7	244
11:2	388	18:8	186
11:18	237, 388	18:24	244
11:19	233	18:25	385
11:26	131, 237	19:1-7	385
11:27-28	391	19:4	387
11:28	401, 420	19:21	238
12:1-24	233, 237	20:15-26:32	231
12:1-3	130	20:17-28:31	239
12:19-23	233	20:17-35	238
13-20:16	237	20:18-35	239
13:1-15:41	237	20:28-30	239
13:13-50	238	20:29	239
13:16-41	119	20:30	239
13:24	387	21:10	391
13:25	385	21:20	186
13:32-37	119	21:21	177
13:33	119	21:28	177
13:34	120	21:38	407, 421
13:35	120	22:4	240
13:38-39	241	22:6-11	316
13:38	241	22:30-23:11	298
13:46-48	238	23:6-10	239
13:47	233, 238, 245	23:6-8	232, 239, 241, 245, 297-300, 331
14:22	186, 238	23:6-7	241
15	238	23:6	239-40, 298
15:1-5	238	23:8	25, 103, 241, 251, 297
15:1	388	23:9	297
15:4-5	161	23:22-23	241
15:5	388	23:24-26	129
15:6-35	238	24:1	129
15:11	238	24:15	3, 239, 245
15:13-21	189, 238	24:10-21	240
15:14	181	24:10	129
15:20-21	238	24:14-15	298
15:36-41	238	24:14	240
16:1-20:16	238	24:15	240, 299, 331
16-17	238	24:18-21	241
16:1-3	177		

24:21	239, 241, 245, 298	2:8-9	219
24:22	240	2:8	158, 227
25:1-12	239	2:9-11	219
25:13	129	2:12-16	218
25:16	175	2:14-16	225
26:2	129	2:17-29	218
26:4-5	241	2:17-24	218
26:6-8	232	3	218
26:6-7	239, 245, 299, 331	3:1-2	164
26:7	299	3:3-4	221
26:8	299	3:5	158
26:13-15	316	3:8	218
26:18	299, 312	3:9-20	218-9
26:23	177, 239, 245-6, 299	3:10-18	219
26:28	131	3:20	219, 381, 412
26:30	129	3:21-26	220, 226, 412, 459
27:1-28:16	241	3:25	219
28	176	3:31	164, 218
28:17-28	241	4	220
28:17-22	231	4:6-7	174
28:17-20	241	4:6	120
28:17	177	4:15	158
28:20	232, 239, 241, 246	4:24-25	294
28:22	241	5-6	207
28:23	231	5:1-11	220
28:24	241	5:2	230
28:25-28	241	5:9-10	220
28:26	177	5:9	158
28:28	241	5:12-21	220, 318
28:29	241	5:12-14	220
28:30-31	241	5:17	220
28:31	231	5:18	220
		5:21	220
<i>Romans</i>	207, 210, 217-30, 471	6:1-11	294
1:1-6	203	6:5-11	213, 220, 224
1:1	226	6:5	203, 220, 224
1:2-4	458-9	6:13	201, 220
1:2	459	6:19	174
1:3	459-60	7:4	294
1:4	294, 316, 460	7:7-11	220
1:11-12	217	7:12	164
1:13	218	8:11	201, 220, 294
1:16-11:36	218	8:18-25	207
1:17	122	8:18	207
1:18-2:16	207, 219, 228	8:23	220
1:18-32	158, 219	8:24-25	230
1:18	210, 219	8:34	294
2:1-16	228	8:38-39	212
2:1-11	219	9-11	118, 207, 218-20, 245, 460
2:5	158, 219, 228, 238	9:1-5	164, 220-1, 244
2:6	172, 215, 219	9:1-3	221
2:7-29	218	9:2	221
2:7	219	9:3-5	221

9:3	218	11:26-29	164
9:4-5	460	11:26-27	118, 224-6
9:5	221, 459-60	11:26	222, 224-5, 227
9:19-29	221	11:27	225
9:22-24	208	11:28	227
9:22-23	411	11:29	224, 227, 244
9:22	158	11:30-32	227
9:23-24	221	11:30	222
9:23	223	11:33-36	224
9:25	121	12:1-15:13	218, 228
9:27-29	118, 223	12:2	141
9:30-10:1	221	12:9-21	228
9:32-33	221	12:12	217
9:32	221	12:14-21	218
9:33	221-2	12:14	217
10:1-3	221	12:19	158, 228
10:1	222	13:5	158
10:3-4	226	13:8-12	228
10:3	208	13:8-10	228-9
10:4	164, 226	13:11-14	207
10:5-13	226	13:11-12	229, 243
10:9	294	13:11	243
10:12	121	14:1-15:13	217-8
10:13	121	14:1	218
10:16	118	14:9	237
10:17	226	14:10-12	229
10:19	224	14:13	172, 218
10:20-21	118	14:19	218
10:21	208	14:21	164
10:26-27	225	15:1-13	230
11:1-16	223	15:1-2	230
11:1-10	223	15:2	218
11:1-6	223	15:3-4	230
11:1	164, 221, 244	15:4	230
11:7-10	223	15:11-12	225
11:9-11	120	15:12	118, 459-60
11:11-16	223, 229	15:13	230
11:11-12	223-5	15:16	218, 226
11:11	223-4	15:18-29	229
11:12	223-4	15:18	218
11:13-14	177	15:19	226
11:13	218	15:27	218, 223
11:14	224	15:29	229
11:15	223-4, 294, 316	15:30-33	218
11:17-24	218, 224	15:31	218, 222, 227, 245
11:20-22	225	16:1-23	217
11:20	221-2	16:1	217
11:23	221-2, 227	16:3	218
11:24-25	225	16:7	218, 244
11:25-36	221	16:11	244
11:25-32	224, 229	16:17	172, 217
11:25-27	226	16:20	410
11:25-26	341, 410	16:21	244
11:25	224, 227		

<i>1 Corinthians</i>	207, 213–7, 412	10:1–13	215
1:7	214	10:11	215, 230, 412–3
1:8	141, 214, 397	10:12	215
1:10–17	214	10:13	215
1:10–12	213	10:32	214
1:16	214	11:17–34	216
1:19–20	98	11:18–22	213
1:20	141, 214	11:23–26	203, 216
1:22–24	177	11:23	216
1:23–24	458	11:24	216
1:23	172	11:25	27, 216
1:27–28	214	11:26	203, 216
1:30	412	12:1	213
2:6–10	411	12:2	174, 214
2:6–8	207, 214	13:1–13	216
2:6	98, 141, 411	13:1–2	216
2:7	411	13:8–13	216
2:8	141, 411	13:12	212, 216
2:9–3:3	322	13:13	216
2:9–10	411	14:20	191
2:9	191, 411	15	207, 216, 294, 316–23, 333
2:13	214, 412	15:1–11	216, 294, 316
2:15	214, 412	15:1–28	137
3:1–5	214	15:3–8	308
3:12–15	207	15:3–5	309–10
3:12	215	15:3–4	460
3:13–15	397	15:4	256
4:1–7	215	15:5	310
4:3–4	215	15:6	206
4:5	215, 229	15:7	189
4:6	215	15:12–19	317
4:14–20	214	15:12–18	216
4:18–20	214	15:12	213–4, 216, 239, 294, 316–7
5:1–5	215	15:20–28	207, 216, 227, 317
5:2	215	15:20–23	206, 315–6
5:5	215	15:20	206
5:12–13	215	15:22	318
6:3	98	15:23–28	318
6:6	174	15:23–24	394
6:9	394	15:23	229, 325
6:14	137, 316	15:24–26	119
7:1	213	15:24	141, 217
7:5	410	15:25	119
7:10	211	15:29–34	216, 317
7:12–16	177	15:35–58	318
7:14	164, 174	15:35–50	317–8
7:18	164	15:35–49	318
7:29–31	186	15:35–41	217, 317–8
7:29	93	15:35–36	214
7:32	186	15:35	294, 317
8:1	164, 213	15:40	251
8:7–13	140, 164	15:42–50	217, 318–9, 412
8:12	397		
9:13	164		

2:19	207-8, 210	<i>Jude</i>	413, 421
3:2-3	208	6-7	126
3:3-5	208	9	356, 414
3:5	209	10	414
3:6-10	209	14-15	414
3:11-13	210		
3:13	207-8, 211	<i>1 Peter</i>	
4-5	208	2:13-14	129
4:2	209	4:5	237
4:3-8	209	4:14	131
4:5	209	4:16	131, 237
4:7	209	5:8	239
4:9	203, 209		
4:12	209	<i>2 Peter</i>	
4:13-5:11	207-8, 211	2:4-10	126
4:13-18	132, 207, 211-2, 243, 294, 341	3:8	352
		3:10	213
4:13	207, 211, 230, 294		
4:14-15	212	<i>1 John</i>	195-7
4:14	325	1:1-4	196
4:15-18	211	1:5-10	196
4:15-17	211	1:18	196
4:15	208, 211-3, 325	1:22	196
4:16	212, 356	2:1	196
4:17	125, 212	2:7	196
4:18	211, 294	2:13-14	196
5:1-11	211, 213	2:28	196-7
5:1-2	229	3:2-3	197
5:1	211	3:14	197, 201
5:2	213	4:3	196
5:3-5	207	4:17	196-7
5:5	316, 333, 410		
5:8-10	210	<i>2 John</i>	195-7
5:9-10	212	7	196, 243-4
5:9	158, 210		
5:23	207-8, 211	<i>3 John</i>	195-7
5:26-28	208		
		<i>Revelation</i>	414-7, 421, 459, 469-70
<i>2 Thessalonians</i>	12, 207	1:7	125
		1:9-20	414
<i>2 Timothy</i>	413, 421	1:12-16	415
3:1-9	413	1:13-16	415
3:1	413-4	1:13	415
3:2-7	413	1:14	415
3:8	365, 413-4	2-3	415
4:1	237	2:11	414
		3:3	213
<i>Titus</i>		5:1-5	469
3:5	170	5:5	127, 436, 469
		6:16	29
<i>Hebrews</i>		6:17	158
8:8-12	27	7:1-8	244
9:26	171		

7:17	199	12:17	417
11:11	261	19:15	158
11:15	470	20:5	116, 414
11:18	158	20:6	414
12:7-17	415	20:11-15	417
12:7-10	416	20:14	116, 414
12:7-9	356	21	117
12:9	415	21:1	417
12:10-12	416	21:6	199
12:10	470	21:12-14	244
12:13-17	416	21:22	117
12:14	417		

5. ANCIENT JEWISH WRITERS

Flavius Josephus	101-2, 106, 108-9, 111-2, 126, 170, 222, 292, 373, 403, 433, 442	3.352 3.362-382 4.387-388 4.510 4.573-576 5.562-565 5.566 6.165-167 6.285-315 6.285-288 6.286-315 6.288 6.291 6.295 6.299 6.310 6.311 6.312-313	102, 106 102 391 425 425 406 245, 406, 421 426 102 129, 425 162, 392 146, 426 102, 426 102 96 426 426 102, 106, 109, 372, 426, 435-6 108, 426 102, 426, 471 129, 146 406 406, 421 173 129 173 173 173 173 173 173 173 173 391
<i>Jewish War</i>	162		
1.78	102		
1.648-655	465		
1.648-653	296		
1.649-650	296		
1.649	296		
1.650	296		
1.653	296		
2.119-161	111		
2.128	292, 343		
2.135	240, 466		
2.145	240, 466		
2.148	292, 343		
2.152-153	114, 372		
2.154-159	102		
2.154-158	111, 251, 292	6.312	108, 426
2.155-157	108	6.313	102, 426, 471
2.155-156	110, 294	6.316	129, 146
2.157	142	6.399	406
2.159	102, 391	6.408	406, 421
2.163	25, 102, 108, 142, 251	7.41-62 7.43-45 7.43-44 7.45 7.46-47 7.47-48 7.48-62 7.55-56 7.100-111 7.432	173 129 173 173 173 173 173 173 173 391
2.165	102, 108, 142		
2.252-265	227		
2.252-263	223		
2.254-265	406		
2.254-257	407		
2.258-88	129		
2.266-270	227		
2.276	241		
2.411-417	62		
2.433-434	425	<i>Jewish Antiquities</i>	426
2.442	425	1.73-95	127
2.444	425	1.127-128	59, 72

6.68-71	257	20.252-258	426
10.6	26	20.257	102, 426
10.79	269		
10.210	101	<i>Against Apion</i>	
10.275	31	1.1	175
12.322	31	1.14	111
13.74-79	100	1.35	212
13.171-173	49	1.37-40	42
13.288-298	49, 239	1.40	31, 327, 433
13.297	98, 296	1.162-165	111
13.298	295	2.218	102, 433
13.311	102	2.296	175
13.379-380	71		
13.408	98	<i>Life</i>	208
15.371	111	1-6	292
15.373	102	430	175
15.379	102		
17.346	102	Philo of Alexandria	99-101, 106, 109, 126, 170
18.1-10	373, 406, 465		
18.4-10	218	<i>Contempl.</i>	
18.4	406	13	100
18.7-8	228	<i>Det.</i>	
18.8	401, 420	75-78	217
18.9-10	406	<i>Gig.</i>	127
18.9	228, 406-7	<i>Her.</i>	100
18.14	25, 102, 142, 248, 252, 261, 284	45	101
18.15	330	261	25
18.16	102	<i>Legat.</i>	
18.17	295, 330	281	209
18.18-22	111	<i>Mos.</i>	
18.19	46, 292, 343	1.263-99	101
18.22	46, 111, 292	1.290	439
18.23-25	218	<i>Praem.</i>	100, 107-8, 112, 142
18.23	228, 373, 406	79-96	100, 107
18.25	426	93-96	101, 106, 108, 110
18.63-64	236, 382	95	101, 109, 439
18.116-119	382, 388, 419	127-62	100
18.116	303, 388	<i>Prob.</i>	
18.117	383, 387, 390	73-91	110
18.259-260	100	81	100
19.343-359	233	<i>Prov.</i>	
20.97-98	465	2.64	99
20.100-101	401, 420	<i>Somn.</i>	
20.197-203	235, 239	1.151	101
20.197-200	295	<i>Spec.</i>	
20.199	295	1.156	28
20.200	130, 200		

6. RABBINIC LITERATURE

<i>m. 'Abot</i>		<i>m. Baba Mesī'a</i>	
1.5	141	1.8	123
5.19-20	141	2.8	123

3.4–5	123	<i>b. Menahot</i>	
<i>m. Berakot</i>		85a	413
1.5	436	<i>b. Sanhedrin</i>	
<i>m. 'Eduyyot</i>		96a–99a	105
2.10	141	98a–99a	122
8.7	123, 139		
<i>m. Middoth</i>		<i>y. Berakot</i>	
4.2	28	1:9	282
<i>m. Sanhedrin</i>		3d	282
10.1	3, 25, 27, 92, 105, 107, 248, 256, 261, 284	<i>y. Sanhedrin</i>	
		27c, 19–38	105, 109
10.3	26, 126	<i>Targum Isaiah</i>	
<i>m. Shekalim</i>		65:6	117
2.5	30, 123	65:15	117
<i>m. Sotah</i>			
9.15	3, 29–30, 105, 123, 139, 300, 332, 436	<i>Targum Pseudo-Jonathan</i>	
		Genesis	
		49:1	25
<i>m. Tamid</i>		Exodus	
3.7	28	1:15	413
		7:11	413
<i>t. Sanhedrin</i>		Numbers	
6.2	405	22:22	413
<i>b. Berakot</i>		<i>'Abot de Rabbi Nathan</i>	
44a	282	6	405
46b	282		
48b	282	<i>Genesis Rabbah</i>	
49a	282	98.9	122

7. CLASSICAL AND EARLY CHRISTIAN LITERATURE

Aeschylus		Eusebius	
<i>Eumenides</i>		<i>Praeparatio evangelica</i>	
647–648	294	9.8	413
<i>Apocryphon of James</i>	308, 383	<i>Gospel of the Ebionites</i>	382
		(apud Epiphanius)	
<i>Barnabas</i>		<i>Gospel of the Nazarenes</i>	382
4.3	93	(apud Jerome)	
16.1–5	147		
<i>1 Clement</i>		<i>Gospel of Peter</i>	308, 311
9:4	171	39–40	311
19:2–3	264	(PCair 10759) 50–57	310
34:8	191	55–56	312
		55	312
<i>Didache</i>	158		
<i>Dialogue of the Saviour</i>		<i>Gospel of Thomas</i>	11, 115–7, 119, 184, 186–94, 242, 383, 385, 387, 399
51–52	399		

Coptic logia	187-8	113	11, 178, 185,
incipit	191, 308		189-90,
1-7	187		192-3, 396
3	11, 178, 185,	114	170
	189, 193,	Greek fragments	187-8
	396	<i>P.Oxy. 1</i>	188
5	190	30-35 (logion 31)	139
10	399	<i>P.Oxy. 654</i>	187-8
12	189, 191	1-3a (incipit)	308
13	189, 391	27-31 (logion 5)	190
16	122	<i>P.Oxy. 655</i>	187-8
17	191	i 17-ii 1 (logion 37)	190
18	11, 189-91,	i 19-21	191
	193		
19	188, 190-1	<i>Hermas</i>	158
20	170		
21	213	Hesiod	
24	187	<i>Works and Days</i>	
26-33	187	106-201	354
31	117, 139,		
	391	Hippolytus of Rome	103-4
36-39	187	<i>Refutation of all Heresies</i>	
37	11, 185,	IX 27,1	103
	190-3	IX 18, 27,2	111
39	189		
46	117, 188-90,	Ignatius	
	383, 385-6	<i>To the Magnesians</i>	
50	192	10.3	177
51	11, 170, 185,		
	189-90,	Irenaeus	
	192-3, 341	<i>Haer.</i>	
52	116-7, 188,	3.1.2	196
	391		
55	308	Justin	
58	193	<i>Dialogue</i>	
60	116	40.1	147
65	119		
66	119	Origen	
68	194	<i>Commentary on Matthew</i>	191
69	194	<i>Contra Celsum</i>	
70	399	4.51	413
77	187		
78	189, 387	Suetonius	
79	188	<i>Vespasian</i>	
85	117, 188, 192,	4.5	102
	194	5.6	102
88	117, 188		
91	393	Tacitus	
102	189	<i>Histories</i>	
111	189, 194	5.13	96, 102

