

# Text, Thought, and Practice in Qumran and Early Christianity

*Edited by*

**RUTH A. CLEMENTS**

**AND DANIEL R. SCHWARTZ**

BRILL

Text, Thought, and Practice in Qumran and  
Early Christianity

# Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah

*Edited by*

Florentino García Martínez

*Associate Editors*

Peter W. Flint

Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar

VOLUME 84

# Text, Thought, and Practice in Qumran and Early Christianity

Proceedings of the Ninth International  
Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of  
the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature,  
Jointly Sponsored by the Hebrew University  
Center for the Study of Christianity,  
11–13 January, 2004

*Edited by*

Ruth A. Clements & Daniel R. Schwartz



BRILL

LEIDEN • BOSTON  
2009

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature.  
International Symposium (9th : 2004)

Text, thought, and practice in Qumran and early Christianity : proceedings of the Ninth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, jointly sponsored by the Hebrew University Center for the Study of Christianity, 11–13 January, 2004 / edited by Ruth A. Clements and Daniel R. Schwartz.

p.cm. — (Studies on the texts of the Desert of Judah ; v. 84)

Includes indexes.

ISBN 978-90-04-17524-2 (hardback : alk. paper) 1. Dead Sea scrolls—Congresses. 2. Dead Sea scrolls—Relation to the New Testament—Congresses. 3. Qumran community—Congresses. I. Clements, Ruth. II. Schwartz, Daniel R. III. Title. IV. Series.

BM487.075 2004

296.1'55—dc22

2009006369

ISSN 0169-9962

ISBN 978 90 04 17524 2

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

Preface .....	vii
Abbreviations .....	xi

### CANON, PROPHECY, AND COMMENTARY

The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of Biblical Commentary MARKUS BOCKMUEHL	3
Prophets and Prophecy in the Qumran Scrolls and the New Testament .....	31
GEORGE J. BROOKE	
Special People or Special Books? On Qumran and New Testament Notions of Canon .....	49
DANIEL R. SCHWARTZ	

### COMMUNITIES AND THEIR BOUNDARIES

Temple and Righteousness in Qumran and Early Christianity: Tracing the Social Difference between the Two Movements EYAL REGEV	63
We, You, They: Boundary Language in 4QMMT and the New Testament Epistles .....	89
ADELE REINHARTZ	

### THE SCROLLS AND JOHANNINE LITERATURE

The Gospel of John and the Dead Sea Scrolls .....	109
HAROLD W. ATTRIDGE	
Recent Perspectives on Johannine Dualism and Its Background JÖRG FREY	127

## BELIEFS AND INTERPRETATIONS

Towards a Theology of the Tabernacle and Its Furniture .....	161
GARY A. ANDERSON	
Divorce, Reproof, and Other Sayings in the Synoptic Gospels: Jesus Traditions in the Context of "Qumranic" and Other Texts .....	195
MENAHEM KISTER	
Exegetical Patterns Common to the Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament, and Their Implications .....	231
SERGE RUZER	

## DEMONS AND SAVIORS

Melchizedek: A Model for the Union of Kingship and Priesthood in the Hebrew Bible, <i>11QMelchizedek</i> , and the Epistle to the Hebrews .....	255
ISRAEL KNOHL	
Demonology in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament	267
HERMANN LICHTENBERGER	
A Messiah in Heaven? A Re-Evaluation of Jewish and Christian Apocalyptic Traditions .....	281
CANA WERMAN	
Index of Modern Authors .....	000
Index of Ancient Sources .....	000

## PREFACE

It is rare that the happenstance of preservation allows scholars to compare two corpora of ancient religious literature deriving from the same region, both of which relate to a shared religious tradition and sacred scripture, and both of which were produced by communities quite aware of their own innovative characters. It is even rarer that such comparative work transpires in the context of intensive discussion among modern scholars from around the world of whom many adhere, one way or another, alongside their shared devotion to the *religio grammatici*, to different versions of that same ancient tradition. And it is, of course, quite unique that such a discussion can take place on a hilltop that confronts participants with the challenging view of the holiest site of that ancient tradition—the site in light of which all ancient versions of that tradition had to identify themselves.

The present volume is, accordingly, the record of quite a rare colloquium. During three days in 2004, more than twenty scholars from Europe, America, and Israel gathered at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem's Mt. Scopus campus to discuss the comparison of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament. Of this group, some focused upon issues of belief, others upon laws, yet others upon methods of biblical exegesis, notions of canon, community self-definition, or the nature of supernatural figures. Whatever the particular focus, they all shared the conviction that the comparison of these two corpora is a potentially valuable project for the proper understanding of each corpus individually and also for the question of their possible interrelationships—if carried out with full awareness of the methodologies employed and assumptions they entail.

Of course, comparison of the New Testament to the Dead Sea Scrolls began as soon as the first of the Scrolls became known. Broadly put, generalizing with regard to the sixty years of Qumran scholarship that precede this volume and with regard to the studies it offers, it should be viewed as part of a third stage of development in this area of study. Namely, the first decades of Qumran scholarship saw a widespread tendency to posit a highly significant relationship between the Scrolls and the New Testament, and indeed tended to understand this relationship as a genetic one, with early Christianity growing out of the



Qumran community. These decades saw an enthusiastic pursuit of parallels between the two corpora and historical reconstructions of how Qumran influenced the early Church and its writings; witness such titles and compendia as K. Stendahl's *The Scrolls and the New Testament* (1957), M. Black's *The Scrolls and Christian Origins* (1961), H. Braun's *Qumran und das Neue Testament* (1966), and W. S. La Sor's *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament* (1972), not to mention such specialized collections as J. Murphy-O'Connor's *Paul and Qumran* (1968) and J. H. Charlesworth's *John and Qumran* (1972), along with a myriad of other works on this and that theme in *den Qumranschriften und im Neuen Testament*.

Later, however, beginning in the 1970s, scholarship backed away from the "genetic" approach. For this there were, it seems, three main reasons. First, and most generally, as is usual in scholarship there was some sobering up after a few decades of excitement about the new material; if the first discoveries had been so impressive that it might seem they could explain everything, as time went by the doubts and differences were noticed more and more. Second, and more particularly, it seems that some of the sobering up concerning "Qumran and the New Testament" derived from Christian second thoughts about the desirability of positing too meaningful a relationship between nascent Christianity and this or that particular part of the Jewish world. (Similar developments occurred in the parallel and contemporary branch of scholarship dealing with "Jesus and the Zealots"—a balloon that went up in the 1950s and flourished in the 1960s under the impact of the discoveries not far from Qumran, at Masada.) Finally, and most specifically, the 1970s saw the beginning of the publication of a good bit of nitty-gritty halakhic material from Qumran, notably the *Temple Scroll*, and these new texts made it seem that the Qumran sect was, in a very fundamental way, quite distant from the early Church; indeed, they suggested that comparison with rabbinic literature might be more apt and natural. Thus, such titles as L. H. Schiffman's *The Halakhah at Qumran* (1975) and J. M. Baumgarten's *Studies in Qumran Law* (1977) became more and more prevalent, especially as rumors about 4QMMT began to circulate; with the full publication of 4QMMT in 1994 this orientation began to take over the entire field, culminating in such volumes as *Legal Texts and Legal Issues* (the 1995 conference of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, published in 1997) and *Rabbinic Perspectives: Rabbinic Literature and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (the Orion Center's 2003 conference, published in 2006). All of these works, and many more, are easily characterized as bespeaking

the same basic point of view as that evinced by the title of Schiffman's volume that appeared the same year as 4QMMT: it was dedicated to *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls* for Judaism.

The present volume may be seen, to a large extent, as a synthesis that follows upon those decades of successive thesis and antithesis. Scholars of both NT and rabbinic literature, who are quite aware of the methodological difficulties involved in comparing these two corpora, indeed, who are by and large skeptical about the possibility of establishing any genetic connections between them, and who are also quite aware of—and at home with—Qumran legal materials, have nevertheless applied their efforts to seeking out the knowledge that might be derived from such comparative work. The results of their work, gathered in this volume, show that each corpus, when studied responsibly and on its own terms, can be made to shed light upon the other, and that this can be quite a fruitful endeavor for both disciplines. These papers are quite suggestive, and it is our hope that they will spur and inspire other scholars to continue this project.

We would like to thank Esther Chazon, Steven Fassberg, and the Orion Center staff for hosting the symposium, and for their ongoing assistance in the preparation of this volume. Nadav Sharon prepared and checked the Hebrew and Greek text and assisted tremendously both in the preparation of the final manuscript and at the proofing and indexing stages.

We are grateful to the Hebrew University's Center for the Study of Christianity, under the guidance of Guy Stroumsa and David Satran, both for its cosponsorship of the conference and its support of the volume. A special vote of thanks goes to the Alfried Krupp von Bohlen und Halbach-Stiftung, which supported the symposium with a generous grant to the CSC. As always, we extend our heartfelt appreciation to the Orion Foundation, the Sir Zelman Cowen Universities Fund, and the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, for their ongoing support of the Orion symposia and of the preparation of this volume. Finally, we owe our appreciation to Florentino García Martínez, editor of the STDJ series, and to the editorial staff of Brill Academic Press, especially Camila Werner and Renee Otto, for their assistance in bringing the book to completion.

Ruth A. Clements  
Daniel R. Schwartz  
The Hebrew University of Jerusalem  
November, 2008



## ABBREVIATIONS

AB	Anchor Bible
ABD	<i>Anchor Bible Dictionary</i> . Ed. D. N. Freedman. 6 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1992
ABRL	Anchor Bible Reference Library
AGJU	Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und Urchristentums
AGSU	Arbeiten zur Geschichte des Spätjudentums und Urchristentums
AJS	<i>Association of Jewish Studies [Review]</i>
ANRW	<i>Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt: Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung</i> . Part 2, <i>Principat</i> . Ed. H. Temporini and W. Haase. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1974–
ANTC	Abingdon New Testament Commentaries
BA	<i>Biblical Archaeologist</i>
BDB	Brown, F., S. R. Driver, and C. A. Briggs. <i>A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament</i> . Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1907
BETL	Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologiarum lovaniensium
BHT	Beiträge zur historischen Theologie
BJJ	Brown Judaic Studies
BK	<i>Bibel und Kirche</i>
BTB	<i>Biblical Theology Bulletin</i>
BWANT	Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament
BZNW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft
CAD	<i>The Assyrian Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago</i> . Chicago: The Oriental Institute, 1956–
CaESup	Supplements to Cahiers évangile
CBQ	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i>
CBQMS	Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series
ConBNT	Coniectanea neotestamentica or Coniectanea biblica: New Testament Series
CQ	<i>Classical Quarterly</i>
CRINT	Compendia rerum iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum

CSCO	Corpus scriptorum christianorum orientalium
DJD	Discoveries in the Judaean Desert
DNP	<i>Der neue Pauly: Enzyklopädie der Antike</i> . Ed. H. Cancik and H. Schneider. Stuttgart: Metzler, 1996–
DNTB	<i>Dictionary of New Testament Background</i> . Ed. C. A. Evans, S. E. Porter, with G. Evans. Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 2000
DSD	<i>Dead Sea Discoveries</i>
EBib	Études bibliques
EDSS	<i>Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls</i> . Ed. L. H. Schiffman and J. C. VanderKam. 2 vols. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2000
EvT	<i>Evangelische Theologie</i>
EWNT	<i>Exegetisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament</i> . Ed. H. Balz and G. Schneider. 3 vols. 2d ed. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1992
FC	Fathers of the Church. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1947–
FRLANT	Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments
HDR	Harvard Dissertations in Religion
HSM	Harvard Semitic Monographs
HSS	Harvard Semitic Studies
HTKNT	Herder theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament
HTR	<i>Harvard Theological Review</i>
HUCA	<i>Hebrew Union College Annual</i>
ICC	International Critical Commentary
IEJ	<i>Israel Exploration Journal</i>
JAAR	<i>Journal of the American Academy of Religion</i>
JBL	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
JJS	<i>Journal of Jewish Studies</i>
JNSL	<i>Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages</i>
JR	<i>Journal of Religion</i>
JSJ	<i>Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic and Roman Periods</i>
JSJSup	Journal for the Study of Judaism: Supplement Series
JSNTSup	Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series
JSOTSup	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series
JSP	<i>Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha</i>

JSPSup	Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha: Supplement Series
JTS	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>
KEK	Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neuen Testament
KIPauly	<i>Der kleine Pauly: Lexikon der Antike</i> . Ed. K. Ziegler, W. Sontheimer, and H. Gärtner. 5 vols. Munich: Druckenmüller, 1964–1975
LCL	Loeb Classical Library
NovT	<i>Novum Testamentum</i>
NovTSup	Supplements to Novum Testamentum
NPNF <sup>2</sup>	<i>Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, Series 2</i>
NTOA	Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus
NTS	<i>New Testament Studies</i>
NTTS	New Testament Tools and Studies
OCD	<i>Oxford Classical Dictionary</i> . Ed. S. Hornblower and A. Spawforth. 3d ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996
OTP	<i>Old Testament Pseudepigrapha</i> . Ed. J. H. Charlesworth. 2 vols. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1983–1985
RAC	<i>Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum</i> . Ed. T. Klauser et al. Stuttgart: Hiersemann, 1950–
RB	<i>Revue biblique</i>
RevQ	<i>Revue de Qumrân</i>
RHR	<i>Revue de l'histoire des religions</i>
RILP	Roehampton Institute London Papers
SBLDS	Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series
SBLEJL	Society of Biblical Literature Early Judaism and its Literature
SBLMS	Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series
SBLSCS	Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies
SBLSymS	Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series
ScrHier	Scripta hierosolymitana
SJLA	Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity
SNTSMS	Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series
SNTU	Studien zum Neuen Testament und seiner Umwelt Series A
STDJ	Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah
StPB	Studia postbiblica
SUNT	Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments
TDNT	<i>Theological Dictionary of the New Testament</i> . Ed. G. Kittel and G. Friedrich. Tr. G. W. Bromiley. 10 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964–1976

TRE	<i>Theologische Realenzyklopädie</i> . Edited by G. Krause and G. Müller. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1977–
TRu	<i>Theologische Rundschau</i>
TSAJ	Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum
TU	Texte und Untersuchungen
TZ	<i>Theologische Zeitschrift</i>
VC	<i>Vigiliae christianae</i>
VCSup	Supplements to <i>Vigiliae christianae</i>
VT	<i>Vetus Testamentum</i>
VTSup	Vetus Testamentum Supplements
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</i>
ZTK	<i>Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche</i>

CANON, PROPHECY, AND COMMENTARY





## THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS AND THE ORIGINS OF BIBLICAL COMMENTARY

MARKUS BOCKMUEHL  
*University of Oxford*

A generation ago, the distinguished patristic scholar R. P. C. Hanson made the following claim in a well-known compendium of learning: “There can be little doubt that the gnostics invented the form of scriptural exegesis which we call the Commentary.”<sup>1</sup> There may have been little doubt about that proposition when Hanson wrote these words in the 1960s, although a glance at the work of his fellow contributors to *The Cambridge History of the Bible* might have raised questions even then. Today we can show very clearly that commentaries long predate the rise of Gnosticism.

Seemingly without precedent, the world’s oldest biblical commentaries emerge among the Dead Sea Scrolls fully formed around the end of the second century BCE. The study of these works, known as *pesharim*, has long since generated a virtual subdiscipline complete with its own conferences, monographs, student textbooks and the requisite petty feuds and wrangles.<sup>2</sup> But can it really be the case that these

---

<sup>1</sup> R. P. C. Hanson, “Biblical Exegesis in the Early Church,” in *The Cambridge History of the Bible* (ed. P. R. Ackroyd and C. F. Evans; 3 vols.; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963–1970), 1:419. I owe this reference to Marianne Meye Thompson.

<sup>2</sup> For an overview of current *peshar* studies see, e.g., T. H. Lim, *Pesharim* (Companion to the Qumran Scrolls 3; London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002); G. J. Brooke, “Pesharim,” *DNTB*, 778–82; and M. P. Horgan, “Pesharim,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations, Vol. 6B: Pesharim, Other Commentaries and Related Documents* (ed. J. H. Charlesworth; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2002), 1–193. J. H. Charlesworth, *The Pesharim and Qumran History: Chaos or Consensus?* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002), is more generally concerned with Qumran history. Pioneering earlier works include: K. Elliger, *Studien zum Habakuk-Kommentar vom Toten Meer* (BHT 15; Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1953); W. H. Brownlee, *The Midrash Peshar of Habakkuk* (Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1979); M. P. Horgan, *Pesharim: Qumran Interpretations of Biblical Books* (CBQMS 8; Washington, D.C.: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1979); as well as B. Nitzan, *Peshar Habakkuk* (Jerusalem: Mosad Bialik; Tel-Aviv: Tel-Aviv University Press, 1986 [Hebrew]). See also the more recent substantive studies of *Peshar Nahum* by G. L. Doudna, *4Q Peshar Nahum: A Critical Edition* (JSJSup 35; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001); and S. L. Berrin, *The Peshar Nahum Scroll from Qumran: An Exegetical Study of 4Q169* (STDJ 53; Leiden: Brill, 2004).

commentaries were, like Melchizedek, *sui generis* and without genealogy? What similarities and connections, if any, exist between the *pesharim* and contemporary Graeco-Roman commentaries?

Strangely, the major reference works and textbooks on the Scrolls show little interest in this question. Literary analogies and points of comparison have been sought almost exclusively in later Jewish literature, including the Targums, rabbinic midrash, and occasionally the New Testament—though no genuine parallels have been agreed upon.<sup>3</sup> The wider context of ancient commentary has not featured in this discussion. Even Philo of Alexandria, whom in these pages we will identify as perhaps the most important bridge between Graeco-Roman and Jewish commentary writing, has received remarkably little attention in relation to the *pesharim*.

The findings of this short study are preliminary and relatively modest, but its subject matter seems sufficiently important to solicit the interest of Qumran scholars more expert than the present writer. We begin by establishing some definitions, and move from there to a brief sketch of ancient Graeco-Roman commentary literature. A survey of the *pesharim* commentaries then leads to concluding comments about potential contact between Qumran and Hellenistic commentary techniques and more specifically about formal analogies between them.

## I. WHAT MAKES A COMMENTARY?

Given the enormous range of ancient interpretative material on Scripture and other canonical texts, we need a definition to keep the subject from becoming unmanageable. By “commentary” I will here denote *works consisting primarily of sequential, expository annotation of identified texts that are themselves distinguished from the comments and reproduced intact*, whether partially or continuously.

This definition is not without its problems, but it has the advantage of distinguishing commentary from a number of related interpretative phenomena. These include paraphrase, scholion,<sup>4</sup> “inner-Biblical

<sup>3</sup> See the circumspect assessment of *pesharim* as a distinct genre in Lim, *Pesharim*, 44–53.

<sup>4</sup> G. M. Newlands, *Hilary of Poitiers: A Study in Theological Method* (European University Studies 23.108; Bern: Peter Lang, 1978), 16, 19, suggests that continuity distinguishes the commentary from the scholion.

exegesis,”<sup>5</sup> “rewritten Bible,”<sup>6</sup> and also intertextual allusions or citations in works not of a primarily expository nature. The boundaries in this area are undoubtedly somewhat fuzzy, especially between commentary and “rewritten Bible,”<sup>7</sup> or in rare cases where the actual *lemma* of a cited text departs from known text forms and may already reflect a degree of interpretative modification.<sup>8</sup>

Nevertheless, the difference between “reworking” and expounding a normative text is sufficiently clear in terms of both form and pre-suppositions to allow us to set commentary apart from other forms of intertextual reflection. As George J. Brooke has also suggested in a study of the diverse genres in use at Qumran, the beginning of explicit commentary is a relatively late stage of such reflection, and one of the clearest markers of the end of the process of canonization.<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> A phrase popularized by M. Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1985); idem, “Inner-Biblical Exegesis,” in *Hebrew Bible/Old Testament: The History of its Interpretation* (ed. M. Sæbø; 1 vol. in 2 parts; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996), 1.1:33–48.

<sup>6</sup> This term, although still controversial, has been widely employed for at least three decades to describe so-called “parabiblical” works that often seem to adapt or rewrite earlier Scriptural narratives. See D. J. Harrington, “Abraham Traditions in the Testament of Abraham and in the ‘Rewritten Bible’ of the Intertestamental Period,” in *International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies and the SBL Pseudepigrapha Seminar, 1972 Proceedings* (ed. R. A. Kraft; Missoula, Mont.: Society of Biblical Literature, 1972), 155–64; reprinted in *Studies in the Testament of Abraham* (ed. G. W. E. Nickelsburg; SBLSCS 6; Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1976), 165–72. For the current state of discussion see, e.g., S. W. Crawford, *Rewriting Scripture in Second Temple Times* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008); and D. K. Falk, *The Parabiblical Texts: Strategies for Extending the Scriptures in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Companion to the Qumran Scrolls 8; London: T&T Clark, 2007).

<sup>7</sup> See, e.g., M. J. Bernstein, “4Q252: From Re-Written Bible to Biblical Commentary,” *JJS* 45 (1994): 1–27; G. J. Brooke, “4Q252 as Early Jewish Commentary,” *RevQ* 17 (1996): 385–401; and Crawford, *Rewriting Scripture*, 130–43, although they operate with a somewhat looser definition of “commentary.” On 4Q252 see also below.

<sup>8</sup> This contested phenomenon is widely discussed; for useful recent introductions see, e.g., Lim, *Pesharim*, 54–63; and idem, “Biblical Quotations in the Pesharim and the Text of the Bible—Methodological Considerations,” in *The Bible as Book: The Hebrew Bible and the Judaean Desert Discoveries* (ed. E. D. Herbert and E. Tov; London: British Library; New Castle, Del.: Oak Knoll Press, 2002), 71–79.

<sup>9</sup> G. J. Brooke, “Between Authority and Canon: The Significance of Reworking the Bible for Understanding the Canonical Process,” in *Reworking the Bible: Apocryphal and Related Texts at Qumran. Proceedings of a Joint Symposium by the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature and the Hebrew University Institute for Advanced Studies Research Group on Qumran, 15–17 January, 2002* (ed. E. G. Chazon, D. Dimant, and R. A. Clements; STDJ 58; Leiden: Brill, 2005), 95, 97: “It is noticeable that in the Qumran literary collection there is a mixture of explicit and implicit commentary on authoritative scriptures. I am inclined to think that the explicit commentary such as is found in the *pesharim* is generally to be considered

The gradual move from “rewriting” via implicit exegesis to formally explicit commentary documents the emergence of a conviction that the text is now a given. It is not merely authoritative in content, but has achieved the status of a “classic” which is at least in principle substantially inviolate. This much is true for all relationships between ancient commentaries and texts, including pagan examples in Greek and Latin. Where ancient Jewish (and indeed Christian) biblical commentary differs, as we shall see, is in the additional assumption that the text is no longer merely a literary “classic” of formative philosophical and religious interest, but *definitive*, precisely inasmuch as it is divinely revealed. In this sense the literary move towards textual fixity has its corollary in the *theological* shift from the text as a sympathetic (but malleable) *reflection* of normative views to a point at which its form and content are themselves the uniquely normative disclosure of divine truth. Whether in Judaeo-Christian or Graeco-Roman contexts, however, to close and “canonize” a text or a literary collection is to open it up to a wealth of fresh exegetical exploration—and to invite the possibility of commentary.<sup>10</sup>

## II. GREEK AND ROMAN COMMENTARIES

In antiquity, the term *commentarius* (Greek ὑπόμνημα) originally denoted a bewildering variety of written records intended as *aide-mémoire* of either a private or official nature. These records ranged widely from notebooks or archival records of accounts; speeches or didactic material; jurisprudential, priestly or governmental decrees or rescripts; all the way to literary works, including scholarly texts and biographical or autobiographical material (i.e., “memoirs” rather than “memoranda”), and even to more private records like notes for a speech or outlines

---

later than those compositions which contain implicit exegesis in their reworkings of authoritative texts. . . . The discovery of explicit commentary in the Qumran library, such as is represented in the sectarian *pesharim*, shows that the process with regard to a certain selection of literary traditions is nearly complete.”

<sup>10</sup> Cf. similarly M. Halbertal, *People of the Book: Canon, Meaning, and Authority* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1997), 32–40; as cited in M. Finkelberg, “Homer as a Foundation Text,” in *Homer, the Bible, and Beyond: Literary and Religious Canons in the Ancient World* (ed. M. Finkelberg and G. G. Stroumsa; Jerusalem Studies in Religion and Culture 2; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 92.

for study, teaching or writing.<sup>11</sup> It is only in later usage that one finds treatments of earlier works of history, geography, medicine, philosophy and rhetoric identified as *hypomnēmata*.<sup>12</sup> Of particular interest for early Christianity is the fact that the term also came to be used of autobiographical and biographical writings—as it is in Justin’s famous designation of the gospels (e.g., *Dial.* 106.2–3). Under this more literary heading there also emerged a thriving and important genre of “commentary” proper.

### A. *The Greek Tradition*

According to Philo of Byblos (c. 70–160 CE), Sanchuniathon of Berytus (c. 700 BCE?) attributed the invention of *hypomnēmata* to none other than the Egyptian man-god Thoth (i.e., Hermes).<sup>13</sup> Allegorical exegesis of Homer, which enjoyed an early efflorescence under Crates (fl. 159 BCE) and his pupils at Pergamum,<sup>14</sup> can be shown to have its oral origins in the performative tradition well before the fifth century BCE,<sup>15</sup> and to have continued despite the studied resistance of Plato

<sup>11</sup> Surveys of the terminology are widely available; see, e.g., H. Thédénat, “Commentarium, Commentarius,” *Dictionnaire des Antiquités Grecques et Romaines* (ed. C. Daremburg and E. Saglio; 5 vols.; Paris: Hachette, 1873–1919), 1.2:1404–6; A. Lippold, “Commentarii,” *KIPauly* 1:1257–59; F. Bömer, “Der Commentarius,” *Hermes* 81 (1953): 210–50; C. B. R. Pelling, “Commentarii,” *OCD*, 373; R. A. Kaster, “Kommentar,” *DNP* 6:680–82.

<sup>12</sup> See F. Montanari, “Hypomnema,” *DNP* 5:813–14, with references *inter alia* to works of Polybius, Ptolemy, Galen, Diogenes Laertius, and Ps.-Longinus. In this respect, Pfeiffer’s critique of Wilamowitz-Moellendorff’s definition is perhaps a little overstated; see his comment (R. Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship from the Beginnings to the End of the Hellenistic Age* [Oxford: Clarendon, 1968], 29) on U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Einleitung in die griechische Tragödie* (Berlin: Weidmann, 1907), 121–219.

<sup>13</sup> Philo of Byblos, quoted in Eusebius, *Praep. Ev.* 1.9.24. On Sanchuniathon see, e.g., O. Eissfeldt, *Taautos und Sanchuniaton* (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1952); W. Röllig, “Sanchuniathon,” *KIPauly* 4:1539; J. F. Healey, “Sanchuniathon,” *OCD*, 1352 and the literature cited there.

<sup>14</sup> Cf. P. B. R. Forbes, R. Browning, and N. G. Wilson, “Crates of Mallus,” *OCD*, 406; cf. Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship*, 140, 235, 237–46.

<sup>15</sup> See, e.g., D. Obbink, “Allegory and Exegesis in the Derveni Papyrus: The Origin of Greek Scholarship,” in *Metaphor, Allegory, and the Classical Tradition: Ancient Thought and Modern Revisions* (ed. G. R. Boys-Stones; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), 178; A. Ford, “Performing Interpretation: Early Allegorical Exegesis of Homer,” in *Epic Traditions in the Contemporary World: The Poetics of Community* (ed. M. H. Beissinger, J. Tylus, and S. L. Wofford; Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999)—also cited by A. Laird, “Figures of Allegory from Homer to Latin Epic,” in Boys-Stones, *Metaphor, Allegory, and the Classical Tradition*, 175. Finkelberg, “Homer as a Foundation Text,”

and the earlier Platonists.<sup>16</sup> The earliest identifiable “commentaries,” however, do not in fact appear until very much later. Some recent scholarship would wish to identify the so-called *Derveni Papyrus* (fifth century BCE) as a commentary on an Orphic religious text.<sup>17</sup> However, formal commentaries in the narrower sense defined above do not really emerge until the third century in Greek and the late second or early first century in Latin.<sup>18</sup>

The influence of the Greek commentary tradition remained for a long time largely confined to the East. It is, however, no less interesting for all that, and intrinsically more likely to have influenced Jewish expositors in the Holy Land and the Diaspora—not least in Alexandria, as we shall see.

Commentaries in the narrower sense of sequential annotations of literary texts began to emerge in the Hellenistic period. Together with the definitive edition of texts (*ekdosis*), we shall see that the commentary (*hypomnēma*) became one of the characteristic forms above all of Alexandrian scholarship from about the second century BCE, although it arose out of a thriving earlier tradition of erudite poetry and its textual

---

92, cites the sixth-century Theagenes of Rhegium. Cf. previously Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship*, 212.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. the discussion of F. Siegert, “Early Jewish Interpretation in a Hellenistic Style,” in Sæbø, *Hebrew Bible/Old Testament* 1.1:130–98, pp. 131–33 and *passim*.

<sup>17</sup> So, e.g., A. Lamedica, “Il papiro di Derveni come commentario: Problemi formali,” in *Proceedings of the XIXth International Congress of Papyrology, Cairo, 2–9 September 1989* (ed. A. H. S. El-Mosalamy; 2 vols.; Cairo: Ain Shams University, Center of Papyrological Studies, 1992), 1:325–34; but cf. already Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship*, 139 n. 7, cited approvingly by Obbink, “Allegory and Exegesis in the Derveni Papyrus,” 180, who consistently refers to the author as “the Derveni commentator” (*passim*). The papyrus (also known as *P. Thessaloniki*) was discovered in that Greek city in 1962 and features a late fifth-century interpretation of an Orphic poem of theogony. For text and recent discussion see, e.g., R. Janko, “The Derveni Papyrus: An Interim Text,” *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 141 (2002): 1–62; A. Laks and G. W. Most, *Studies on the Derveni Papyrus* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997); G. Betegh, *The Derveni Papyrus: Cosmology, Theology, and Interpretation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004).

<sup>18</sup> These dates, although obviously debatable, refer respectively to the New Comedy poet Euphron’s *hypomnēmata* on Aristophanes’ *Plutus* (so Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship*, 160–61, quoting *Lexicon Messanense*), and to the interpretation of *Carmen Saliare* (a barely intelligible ancient hymn) by Lucius Aelius, the first great Roman scholar. J. Geffcken, “Zur Entstehung und zum Wesen des griechischen wissenschaftlichen Kommentars,” *Hermes* 67 (1932): 397–412, offers an earlier study of the origin of Greek scholarly commentaries, written before many of the twentieth century’s papyrus discoveries.

explication.<sup>19</sup> Alexandria's philological eminence was due in large part to its two famous publicly funded institutions of learning: the great Library and the adjacent scholarly community known as the Museum, founded ca. 280 BCE by Ptolemy I Soter.<sup>20</sup>

Not unlike their modern successors, ancient philologists carefully distinguished between treatises or monographs (*syngrammata*) and commentaries (*hypomnēmata*) on a given text.<sup>21</sup> Most of this material did not survive intact, although it exercised an extensive influence on the subsequent Byzantine scholia and philological tradition.

It is of significance to my argument here that a particularly fertile commentary tradition on the classics had thrived in Alexandria for a good century or two before the first scribes at Qumran put pen to parchment. To take just one genre, early expositors of ancient comedy, for example, included Lycophron (born ca. 320 BCE) and Callimachus (ca. 305–ca. 240) as well as Eratosthenes (ca. 275–195), who wrote at least twelve books on early comedy; a commentator in the more technical vein was Aristophanes of Byzantium (ca. 257–180), director of the Royal Library (though he did not compose *hypomnēmata* as such).<sup>22</sup>

Alexandrian *hypomnēmata* in the proper sense originated around this same time with writers like Callistratos (2nd cent BCE), who produced them on Homer and at least six comedies of Aristophanes. Aristarchus of Samothrace (ca. 216–144), another head of the Library and a champion philologist (ὁ γραμματικώτατος),<sup>23</sup> produced both critical editions of and commentaries on Homer, Hesiod, Pindar, Aeschylus, Sophocles, Aristophanes, Herodotus and others.<sup>24</sup>

---

<sup>19</sup> Prof. Horbury suggests to me that the learned nature of Alexandrian poetry may itself have encouraged a commentary tradition, and that recondite biblical texts that explicitly required interpretation (e.g., Zechariah, Daniel) would have fostered an analogous Jewish interest.

<sup>20</sup> See, e.g., L. D. Reynolds and N. G. Wilson, *Scribes and Scholars: A Guide to the Transmission of Greek and Latin Literature* (3d ed.; Oxford: Clarendon; New York: Oxford University Press, 1991), 6–17.

<sup>21</sup> For this distinction see, e.g., Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship*, 212–14; Montanari, "Hypomnema," 814.

<sup>22</sup> See S. Trojahn, *Die auf Papyri erhaltenen Kommentare zur alten Komödie: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der antiken Philologie* (Beiträge zur Altertumskunde 175; Munich: Saur, 2002), 123–27.

<sup>23</sup> Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* 15.12 (*Athenaei Navcratitae Dipnosophistarvm libri XV* [ed. G. Kaibel; Leipzig: Teubner, 1887]).

<sup>24</sup> Cf. J. F. Lazenby, R. Browning, and N. G. Wilson, "Aristarchus of Samothrace," *OCD*, 159.



Thanks to the twentieth century's extensive papyrus discoveries, especially at Oxyrhynchus, we are today in the fortunate position of having at our disposal, for the first time since late antiquity, a substantial library of Alexandrian commentaries ranging in date from the third century BCE to the sixth century CE.

Greek commentaries on papyrus achieved their heyday between the first and third centuries CE.<sup>25</sup> The best examples were produced on good, though not luxurious, mid-sized scrolls, with the text written in wide columns using a clear and functional semicursive script and a system of abbreviations and diacritical symbols. The title, with the names of the author and commentator, was placed at the end.<sup>26</sup>

From the recent discoveries we know that commentaries usually expounded literary works, above all those of Homer, the Greek "Bible" widely regarded as the fount of all knowledge.<sup>27</sup> Aside from him, favourite subjects consisted of the great Attic tragedians and comedians including Aristophanes and Eupolis,<sup>28</sup> and increasingly Aristotle and Plato (famously explicated by Proclus in the fifth century CE and

---

<sup>25</sup> This is, at any rate, the period for which the fullest documentation exists. A pioneering treatment of this material was the survey of 112 such papyri by M. del Fabbro, "Il commentario nella tradizione papiracea," *Studia Papyrologica* 18 (1979): 69–132; see her catalogue, pp. 128–30; and cf. pp. 92 n. 74, 131–32 for the dominant time frame. More recent literature is discussed in T. Dorandi, "Le commentaire dans la tradition papyrologique: quelques cas controversés," in *Le commentaire entre tradition et innovation: Actes du Colloque International de l'Institut des Traditions Textuelles, Paris et Villejuif, 22–25 septembre 1999* (ed. M.-O. Goulet-Cazé and T. Dorandi; Paris: Vrin, 1999), 15–27; W. Luppe, "Scholia, Hypomnemata und Hypotheseis zu griechischen Dramen auf Papyri," in *Der Kommentar in Antike und Mittelalter: Beiträge zu seiner Erforschung* (ed. W. Geerlings and C. Schulze; *Clavis Commentariorum Antiquitatis et Medii Aevi* 2; Leiden: Brill, 2002), 55–77; and Trojahn, *Die auf Papyri erhaltenen Kommentare*. See also n. 17 above for discussion of the Derveni papyrus.

<sup>26</sup> Cf. del Fabbro, "Il commentario nella tradizione papiracea," 92.

<sup>27</sup> On this subject see usefully Finkelberg, "Homer as a Foundation Text," 91–96 (esp. pp. 94–95 on *De Homero*); also A. Ford, "Performing Interpretation"; S. Honigman, *The Septuagint and Homeric Scholarship in Alexandria: A Study in the Narrative of the Letter of Aristeas* (London and New York: Routledge, 2003); and previously P. Lévêque, *Aurea Catena Homeri: Une Étude sur l'Allegorie Grecque* (*Annales Littéraires de l'université de Besançon*; Paris: Belles Lettres, 1959).

<sup>28</sup> For the commentary and scholia (marginal notes) tradition on Attic comedy see esp. Trojahn, *Die auf Papyri erhaltenen Kommentare*; and previously G. Zuntz, *Die Aristophanes-Scholien der Papyri* (Berlin: Seitz, 1975; first published in 1939). Trojahn, 211 and *passim*, notes that while scholia are necessarily subject to limitations of space, the nature of the comments could in principle be the same as that in *hypomnēmata*.

by Damascius in the sixth),<sup>29</sup> as well as historians like Herodotus or Thucydides and orators like Demosthenes.<sup>30</sup>

A developing scientific subgenre eventually included extensive commentaries on Euclid and Ptolemy (e.g., by Pappus of Alexandria, fl. 320 CE), but also on Hippocrates and other “applied” medical texts, of which Galen (ca. 129–199) is a towering, if somewhat rambling, representative.<sup>31</sup> In late antiquity, another important subgenre was that of commentaries on legal texts, developed especially in fifth-century Beirut and Gaza.<sup>32</sup>

<sup>29</sup> See the extensive editions of Leendert Westerink on Proclus, Damascius, and Olympiodorus (e.g., *The Greek Commentaries on Plato's Phaedo* [ed. L. G. Westerink; 2 vols.; Amsterdam: North-Holland, 1976]; *Damascius: Lectures on the Philebus* [ed. L. G. Westerink; Amsterdam: North-Holland, 1959]; *Olympiodori in Platonis Gorgiam Commentaria* [ed. L. G. Westerink; Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana; Leipzig: Teubner, 1970]); for Proclus see also *Proclus: Commentaire sur le Timée* (ed. A. J. Festugière; 5 vols.; Bibliothèque des textes philosophiques; Paris: Vrin, 1966–68); *Proclus: Commentaire sur la République* (ed. A. J. Festugière; 3 vols.; Paris: Vrin, 1970). D. N. Sedley, “Plato's *Auctoritas* and the Rebirth of the Commentary Tradition,” in *Philosophia Togata II: Plato and Aristotle at Rome* (ed. J. Barnes and M. T. Griffin; Oxford: Clarendon, 1997), 110–29, discusses Roman commentary on Plato; C. D’Ancona Costa, “Commenting on Aristotle: From Late Antiquity to the Arab Aristotelianism,” in Geerlings and Schulze, *Der Kommentar in Antike und Mittelalter*, 201–53, deals with commentary on Aristotle in the late antique and medieval period.

<sup>30</sup> E.g., del Fabbro, “Il commentario nella tradizione papiracea,” 123.

<sup>31</sup> See H. von Staden, “‘A Woman Does Not Become Ambidextrous’: Galen and the Culture of Scientific Commentary,” in *The Classical Commentary: Histories, Practices, Theory* (ed. R. K. Gibson and C. Shuttleworth Kraus; Mnemosyne Supplements 232; Leiden: Brill, 2002), 109–40, who comments (e.g., pp. 134–36) on Galen’s frequent failure to observe his own criterion of utility for the practitioner of medicine. On Galen as a commentator see further D. Manetti and A. Roselli, “Galeno commentatore di Ippocrate,” *ANRW* 37.2:1529–1635; see also on Stephanus (6th century), *Stephanus: Commentary on Hippocrates' Aphorisms* (ed. L. G. Westerink; 3 vols.; Corpus Medicorum Graecorum 11.1.3; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1985–1995); and on the medieval reception history of Galen’s commentary, see G. Strohmaier, “Galen als Hippokrateskommentator: Der griechische und der arabische Befund,” in Geerlings and Schulze, *Der Kommentar in Antike und Mittelalter*, 253–74. I. Andorlini, “Codici papiracei di medicina con scoli e commento,” in Goulet-Cazé and Dorandi, *Le commentaire entre tradition et innovation*, 37–52, notes more generally the phenomenon of medical papyri and their annotation by owners who were medical practitioners. See more generally H. von Staden, *Herophilus: The Art of Medicine in Early Alexandria. Edition, Translation, and Essays* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), concerning the pioneering influence of Herophilus (ca. 330–260) on much of ancient medical primary and secondary literature.

<sup>32</sup> See N. G. Wilson, “A Chapter in the History of Scholia,” *CQ* n.s. 17 (1967): 244–56; idem, “A Chapter in the History of Scholia: A Postscript,” *CQ* n.s. 18 (1968): 413 on Gaza; and K. McNamee, “Another Chapter in the History of Scholia,” *CQ* 48 (1998): 269–88; cf. K. McNamee, “Missing Links in the History of Scholia,” *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 36 (1995): 399–414, on Beirut.

The Greek commentaries consistently distinguish between *lemma* and exposition, and like their Latin counterparts they may include a wide variety of comments covering matters of philological, exegetical, rhetorical, antiquarian, historical and biographical, scientific, mythological and philosophical interest. Nevertheless, the majority of commentaries on papyrus served relatively popular pedagogical rather than strictly scientific purposes.<sup>33</sup> They offer sapiential, moral and aesthetic advice, often by way of allegory.

### B. *The Latin Tradition*

Most of the early Latin commentaries were on classic plays or poems like Aristophanes, the *Carmen Saliare* and above all Virgil, although some commentators cover unknown or seemingly more obscure works, like those of the mid-first-century BCE poet C. Helvius Cinna, a friend of Catullus.<sup>34</sup> On the whole, what is striking about the earliest Roman commentaries is that they tended to appear soon after the works they treated.

Much of this extensive literary output remains at best in fragments. The earliest extant complete commentary in Latin is the influential treatment of Virgil by the fourth-century grammarian Servius, apparently a fellow student of Jerome under Donatus. This commentary, whose author held the prestigious lectureship associated with the title of *grammaticus urbis Romae*, survives in several hundred medieval MSS.<sup>35</sup> Other near contemporaries include Pomponius Porphyrio on Horace (early third century) and Aelius Donatus on Terence (fourth century); but we know of many other commentaries in circulation at this time.<sup>36</sup> By the fourth century, there was a widespread and highly developed commentary tradition on Virgil, whose importance had long

---

<sup>33</sup> So, e.g., I. Hadot, "Der fortlaufende philosophische Kommentar," in Geerlings and Schulze, *Der Kommentar in Antike und Mittelalter*, 184–85, 199 and *passim*, on the primary function of philosophical commentaries. See previously H. Usener, "Ein altes Lehrgebäude der Philologie," in idem, *Kleine Schriften* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1913), 2:265–314, to which my former colleague Winrich Löhr has kindly drawn my attention.

<sup>34</sup> Kaster, "Kommentar," 681; Cinna's sophisticated miniature epic *Zmyrna* was regarded as a masterpiece of the emerging Roman poetry (cf. E. Courtney, "Helvius Cinna, Gaius," *OCD*, 681).

<sup>35</sup> Cf., e.g., J. E. G. Zetzel, *Latin Textual Criticism in Antiquity* (Monographs in Classical Studies; New York: Arno Press, 1981), 81–83; Reynolds and Wilson, *Scribes and Scholars*, 32–33.

<sup>36</sup> Jerome, *Apologia Contra Rufinum* 1.16 (CCL 79.15.26; quoted in P. K. Marshall, "Kommentar: II. Lateinische Literatur," *DNP* 14:1057–62, p. 1058), knows numerous

been assured by his ubiquitous presence in schools. The compendious *variorum* commentary of Donatus permitted commentators to draw on a wide range of learning and opinion from four centuries of Virgil scholarship. No other ancient author was so extensively commented on.

To modern readers, at least the critical philology of Servius's commentary on Virgil may seem in some respects familiar.<sup>37</sup> His method is to highlight critical questions of particular importance, discussing them with reference to a range of opinion. Sometimes readers are encouraged to make their own judgment among a variety of options. Servius's introduction deals with standard issues of *Einleitung*: the life of the poet, the title, character (*qualitas*) of the poem, its "intention" and the number and order of the books. This is followed by line-by-line or word-by-word explications of the text, aiming to communicate Virgil's intention. The majority of comments are linguistic, concerned with semantic meaning and assessing Virgil's use of language by the criteria of the grammatical rules of his time—departures are explained as "archaisms" or "figures." Finally, Servius turns to a range of matters of textual<sup>38</sup> and rhetorical criticism, intertextual links with Homer and other Greek and Latin poets, philosophical and religious issues in the text, and notes of antiquarian or historical interest.

For our purposes, a number of features of ancient commentary on literary classics are of particular interest. We shall return to these after considering the phenomenon of commentary at Qumran.

### III. QUMRAN COMMENTARIES

The Dead Sea Scrolls have brought to light the earliest explicit Jewish commentaries on Scripture, dating by common consent from the period of ca. 100 BCE–70 CE.

---

commentaries not only on Virgil, but on Sallustius, Cicero, Terence, Plautus, Lucretius, Flaccus, Persius, and Lucan.

<sup>37</sup> For this discussion I am indebted to B. Guthmüller, "Kommentar," *DNP* 14:1055–57; Marshall, "Kommentar: II. Lateinische Literatur," 1059–60; Kaster, "Kommentar," 681–82.

<sup>38</sup> For the Latin commentators' textual criticism see esp. Zetzel, *Latin Textual Criticism in Antiquity* (81–147 on Servius, and 148–70 on Donatus).

### A. Identification

Before turning to commentaries proper, it will be useful to mention in passing several other texts that are here excluded, although they are sometimes identified as “commentaries” in the scholarly literature on the Scrolls. In particular, there are several fragments formally identified by the editors as a *Commentary on Genesis* (4Q252, 4Q253, 4Q254, 4Q254a).<sup>39</sup> Of these, 4Q252 in particular has attracted a lot of scholarly attention, partly because its genre is so intriguingly difficult to classify.<sup>40</sup> It is true that in its treatment of Jacob’s blessings in Genesis this text not only employs the distinctive technical term *pishro* (“its interpretation,” 4Q252 4:5) to expound Gen 49:4, but also proceeds to offer an explicitly messianic interpretation of Gen 49:10 as referring to the “Messiah of righteousness, the branch of David” (4Q252 5:3–4). Correspondingly, other influential texts confirm that the Dead Sea sect clearly viewed the Pentateuch as of no less “prophetic” importance than other parts of Scripture (see, e.g., 4QMMT C 20–24 = 4Q398 11–13 3–7). Despite this, however, 4Q252 does not obviously belong to the “commentary” genre as defined above: it consists for the most part of a noncontinuous and extensively *rewritten* text of Gen 7:10–8:13; 9:24–27; 22:10–12; 49:3–20. Apart from the annotations in columns 4 and (especially) 5, there is no attempt to distinguish textual *lemmata* from their interpretations; and it remains difficult to distinguish what is simply an integral part of the *aggiornamento* of “rewritten” discourse from what is intended as comment upon an inviolate given text. Although a number of recent scholars have spoken here of “excerpted” or “selective commentary,”

---

<sup>39</sup> See the official publications: G. J. Brooke, “252. 4QCommentary on Genesis A,” in *Qumran Cave 4.XVII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 3* (ed. G. J. Brooke et al.; DJD 22; Oxford: Clarendon, 1996), 185–207; idem, “253. 4QCommentary on Genesis B,” in Brooke et al., DJD 22.209–12; idem, “254. 4QCommentary on Genesis C,” in Brooke et al., DJD 22.217–32; idem, “254a. 4QCommentary on Genesis D,” in Brooke et al., DJD 22.233–36. For a time this writing was even mislabelled as a Genesis “*peshet*”; contrast, e.g., *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated: The Qumran Texts in English* (ed. F. García Martínez; trans. W. G. E. Watson; Leiden: Brill; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996), 213, with *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* (ed. F. García Martínez and E. J. C. Tigchelaar; 2 vols.; Leiden: Brill; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997–98), 1:505.

<sup>40</sup> Cf. Brooke, “Pesharim”; Bernstein, “4Q252: From Re-Written Bible to Biblical Commentary”; J. L. Trafton, “Commentary on Genesis A,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations, Vol. 6B: Pesharim, Other Commentaries, and Related Documents* (ed. J. H. Charlesworth et al.; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2002), 203–19 and the literature cited there; also Crawford, *Rewriting Scripture*, 130–43.

it is also generally admitted that the document is a composite compilation of preexisting interpretations.<sup>41</sup> In this and other respects its genre is also clearly unstable, appearing to fluctuate between “rewritten Bible” and perhaps commentary—and thus not a clear instance of the latter.<sup>42</sup> In that sense, for all its undoubted intertextual reflection, the hermeneutical posture of 4Q252 in significant respects resembles that of documents like the *Temple Scroll*, *Jubilees*, *Pseudo-Ezekiel*, and a number of Qumran “apocrypha” more than that of the explicit commentary in the consecutive *pesharim*, which will claim our attention here.<sup>43</sup>

Another group of texts to be omitted here are the so-called “thematic” *peshar* texts like 11QMelchizedek or 4QFlorilegium, which collate scriptural material around a particular topical focus.<sup>44</sup> Although here too the technical term *pishro* is used to identify eschatological interpretations,<sup>45</sup> once again we are clearly not dealing with the *consecutive* exposition of an intact, objective text. A number of other fragmentary texts seem in some respects to resemble the prophetic *pesharim*, but probably also do not properly belong to this genre.<sup>46</sup> The same applies, *mutatis mutandis*, to the occasional identification of the *Damascus Document* as a kind of thematic commentary.

<sup>41</sup> So, e.g., Crawford, *Rewriting Scripture*, 141–42. Brooke, “4Q252 as Early Jewish Commentary,” 400 speaks of “a compilation of pericopae containing various kinds of commentary,” although even this designation begs the question of whether we are dealing with continuous “commentary” in the sense here in view.

<sup>42</sup> See, e.g., Brooke, “4Q252 as Early Jewish Commentary,” 395–400; Bernstein, “4Q252: From Re-Written Bible to Biblical Commentary,” 24 and *passim*; Trafton, “Commentary on Genesis A,” 204 and n. 4.

<sup>43</sup> Among the same group of fragments appears a text known as *Commentary on Malachi B* (4Q253a), which uses *pishro* ‘al once and might in theory be part of a more extensive work. Another noteworthy exception is 4Q159 5 1, which applies the term *peshar* to the explication of Lev 16:1. The highly damaged fragments of 4QpUnid (4Q172) permit few conclusions. In all these cases, we have few indications of continuous commentary. On these and other exceptions see Lim, *Pesharim*, 53; Brooke, “Pesharim,” 779; also see, e.g., the analyses of specific texts in Charlesworth, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations*, Vol. 6B, 203–365, the section on “other commentaries” and “related documents.”

<sup>44</sup> Cf. Brooke, “Pesharim,” 779; Lim, *Pesharim*, 14, citing terminology first employed by J. Carmignac, “Le Document de Qumrân sur Melkisédeq,” *RevQ* 7 (1969–71): 342–78. See also Lim’s fuller list of ten “thematic *pesharim* and other related texts,” pp. 16–18. D. Instone-Brewer, *Techniques and Assumptions in Jewish Exegesis Before 70 CE* (TSAJ 30; Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1992), 194, regards 4QFlor as a commentary on 2 Sam 7; but that identification, although not implausible at first, breaks down at the end of line 13.

<sup>45</sup> E.g. 11QMelch (11Q13) 2:12, 17; cf. 4QFlor (4Q174) 1 i 14, 19.

<sup>46</sup> See the discussion in Lim, *Pesharim*, 15.

To be sure, these exceptions serve to demonstrate that the boundary lines between *pesher* and related literature remain admittedly somewhat fluid in both genre and interpretative techniques. A fuller discussion of the origin of Qumran commentary would certainly need to take into account a wider range of literature, including the texts cited above, along with exegetical discussions in texts like the *Damascus Document*. For present purposes, however, the narrower focus on the *pesharim* nevertheless helps to delimit the material for purposes of comparison.

### B. Characteristics

For present purposes, therefore, I will adopt a fairly standard inventory of fifteen continuous *pesharim*, all of them in Hebrew: five on Isaiah, seven on the minor prophets (Hosea [2], Micah [1], Nahum [1], Habakkuk [1], Zephaniah [2]) and three on the Psalms (Pss 37, 68, 129).<sup>47</sup> Although all of these texts are fragmentary and none provides anything approaching a complete running commentary, they do share several distinctive characteristics that bear on our inquiry. We will do well to bear in mind George Brooke's admonition that at Qumran the term *pesher* serves to denote more than just commentary, and that

---

<sup>47</sup> 4QpIsa<sup>a</sup> (4Q161), 4QpIsa<sup>b</sup> (4Q162), 4QpIsa<sup>c</sup> (4Q163), 4QpIsa<sup>d</sup> (4Q164), 4QpIsa<sup>e</sup> (4Q165); 4QpHos<sup>a</sup> (4Q166), 4QpHos<sup>b</sup> (4Q167); 1QpMic (1Q14); 4QpNah (4Q169); 1QpHab; 1QpZeph (1Q15), 4QpZeph (4Q170); 1QpPs (1Q16), 4QpPs<sup>a</sup> (4Q171), 4QpPs<sup>b</sup> (4Q173, but N.B. excluding frg. 5, now reclassified as 4Q173a: see M. P. Horgan, "House of Stumbling Fragment [4Q173a = 4Q173 *olim*]," in Charlesworth, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations*, Vol. 6B, 363–65 [cf. 31 n. 5]). Reference may also be made to two other fragmentary texts including an apparent Isaiah *pesher*, 3QpIsa (3Q4), on Isa 1:1, and a possible Micah *pesher*, 4QpMic(?) (4Q168), on Mic 4:9–10; both are included as *pesharim* in Horgan, "Pesharim." The document sometimes thought to be a possible Malachi *pesher*, 5QpMal(?) (5Q10), on Mal 1:14, is now generally called *Commentary on Malachi A* (e.g., J. H. Charlesworth, "Commentary on Malachi A," in Charlesworth, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations*, Vol. 6B, 240–43), and paired with *Commentary on Malachi B* (4Q253a; see G. J. Brooke, "Commentary on Malachi B," in Charlesworth, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations*, Vol. 6B, 244–47; cf. previously Brooke, "253a. 4QCommentary on Malachi," DJD 22.213–15). Both of these remain sufficiently fragmentary to preclude confident conclusions about any sort of consecutive commentary; the same is true *a fortiori* of doubtful fragments like 4QpUnid (4Q172; J. H. Charlesworth and C. D. Elledge, "Unidentified Pesharim Fragments [4Q172 = 4QpUnid]," in Charlesworth, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations*, Vol. 6B, 195–201); and 4Q183 (J. H. Charlesworth and C. D. Elledge, "Peshar-Like Fragment [4Q183]," in Charlesworth, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations*, Vol. 6B, 358–61).

there is much biblical interpretation that is not *peshet*.<sup>48</sup> Nevertheless, it is the case that all the commentaries here in view are interested in *peshet*. Eight brief observations may suffice for the moment:

1. All the relevant commentaries assume that the biblical text is, at least formally, a fixed point of reference. Although the textual *lemmata* reflect a degree of continuing textual fluidity and may occasionally be adjusted to suit the commentator's hermeneutical stance, there is now no doubt that the text stands in some sense over against the interpreter, as the object of interpretation and understanding rather than simply as available means to a writer's literary ends. More typically, the Qumran commentaries' often radical sectarian *relecture* of Scripture is achieved *not* by altering the text of the *Vorlage*, but by techniques other than textual adaptation.<sup>49</sup>
2. None of the *pesharim* in question reproduces the biblical text in its entirety; this is a point whose significance in the context of ancient commentary writing will be further explored below. What matters here is that the Qumran commentators all nevertheless quote the relevant portion of text (the *lemma*) before expounding it.
3. Some commentaries quote only brief phrases, while others (like several of the Isaiah commentaries) may cite whole verses or paragraphs of text. Similarly, some expository comments are extensive while others are little more than parenthetical glosses. In the case of 4Q163, at least, it has been suggested that the complete *peshet* quoted extensively from chapters 8–30 of Isaiah,<sup>50</sup> while the *pesharim* on Nahum and Habakkuk repeatedly confine themselves to citing (or reiterating) individual terms. In each case, however, the pattern of citation followed by an exposition remains consistent; as does the deliberate separation of the former from the latter by a stereotypical tag (e.g., *pishro* [*'al* or *'asher*], *peshet ha-dabar* [*'al*], *hu* [*'ah*] etc.),<sup>51</sup> or in some cases even by a clear space or blank line (so some of the

<sup>48</sup> Cf. Brooke, "Pesharim," 783.

<sup>49</sup> So rightly J. R. Wagner, "Review: T. H. Lim, *Holy Scripture in the Qumran Commentaries and Pauline Letters*," *JBL* 120 (2001): 175–78, pp. 176–77.

<sup>50</sup> See, e.g., Horgan, *Pesharim: Qumran Interpretations of Biblical Books*, 86–93; cf. Lim, *Pesharim*, 29.

<sup>51</sup> Note, e.g., the index of citation formulae in Trafton, "Commentary on Genesis A"; also M. J. Bernstein, "Introductory Formulas for Citation and Re-citation of Biblical Verses in the Qumran Pesharim," *DSD* 1 (1994): 30–70, esp. pp. 67–68 on the significance of the different formulae within the continuous *pesharim*.



- pesharim* on Isaiah as well as those on Hosea, Nahum and Habakkuk: 4Q161, 4Q166, 4Q167, 4Q169; 1QpHab).
4. Although not straightforwardly continuous, the order of the texts expounded nevertheless remains in keeping with the canonical sequence.<sup>52</sup>
  5. The Dead Sea commentators only occasionally make reference to the biblical author or circumstances pertaining at the time of the biblical text's composition. Generally speaking, linguistic, philological or diachronic historical issues remain outside the Qumran commentary's purview.
  6. The commentators take for granted that the text contains definitive divine pronouncements or prophecies that concern the commentator's present, near future, or relatively recent past, often with surprising specificity. These contemporary points of reference are in turn understood as part of the eschatological (and sometimes messianic) end-time conflicts.
  7. In keeping with this confident interpretative stance, insights about the text's specific bearing on the contemporary context are themselves implicitly (and sometimes explicitly)<sup>53</sup> derived from divine revelation, although that revelation was granted exclusively to the sect's founding master interpreter, the Teacher of Righteousness, and through him to his followers.<sup>54</sup> As the Habakkuk commentary famously shows, even the prophet himself may not have understood the deeper meaning of his words,<sup>55</sup> and by taking the prophetic text as *unfulfilled* prophecy the commentator deliberately interprets *more* than the literal sense of the words. In this respect there is also an interesting correlation between the "*lemma* commentary" of Qumran and the interpretation of signs and dreams in mantic wisdom

---

<sup>52</sup> 4QpIsa<sup>c</sup> (4Q163), without diverging from the canonical order of Isaiah, quotes several other biblical prophets (Jeremiah, Zechariah, Hosea) in the course of its commentary. The only apparent exception is 4QpIsa<sup>a</sup> (4Q165), whose *editio princeps* arranges the fragments so as to produce a nonsequential commentary; see J. M. Allegro, "165. Commentary on Isaiah (E)," in *Qumrân Cave 4.I (4Q158-4Q186)* (ed. J. M. Allegro; DJD 5; Oxford: Clarendon, 1968), 28-30 and pl. ix. In view of the consistency of the other *pesharim* on Isaiah, it would seem plausible to rearrange the material in canonical order, as has been variously suggested (cf. Lim, *Pesharim*, 29, citing J. Strugnell and M. P. Horgan).

<sup>53</sup> Most famously in 1QpHab 6:15-7:6; cf. 1QpHab 2:8-10; 4QpIsa<sup>d</sup> (4Q164).

<sup>54</sup> Cf. my fuller remarks in M. Bockmuehl, *Revelation and Mystery in Ancient Judaism and Pauline Christianity* (WUNT 2.36; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1990), 79-81.

<sup>55</sup> 1QpHab 7:1-14; cf. similarly 4 Ezra 12:12; note already Isa 16:13-14.

traditions, which have often been assumed to be connected with the origin of Jewish apocalyptic literature.<sup>56</sup>

8. An interesting feature of Qumran, as of other ancient commentaries, is that the commentator's typological reading is not always univocal. An instructive example of such hermeneutical multivalency is 4QpNah 3–4 i 1–11. Within the space of a few lines the *Pesher* on Nahum first identifies the "lion" (*aryeh*) of Nah 2:12 (ET 2:11) with "Demetrius, king of Yavan" (probably Demetrius III Eucareus, 95–88 BCE), and then proceeds to find a *different* "lion" (*aryeh*) in Nah 2:13 (ET 2:12)—the contemporary Jewish ruler who "hanged living men from a tree"; that is, Alexander Jannaeus (who notoriously crucified eight hundred Pharisaic dissidents).<sup>57</sup>

#### IV. THE SCROLLS AND ANCIENT COMMENTARY: ALEXANDRIAN LITERARY CRITICISM IN THE JUDEAN DESERT?

What, then, are we to make of the similarities between the ancient Graeco-Roman commentary tradition and the genre of Scriptural commentary that appears to have emerged more or less fully formed on the shores of the Dead Sea around 100 BCE?

The easiest and safest answer is to treat them as wholly unrelated: no love is lost in the Scrolls for the Kittim and all their works, and aside from passing merchants only an encyclopaedic geographer like Pliny could show even superficial interest in an eccentric religious conventicle in one of the ancient world's least hospitable environments.

Great ideas, however, have a habit of crossing even the most impermeable cultural boundaries, and of taking root in contexts that appear in other ways radically opposed. A wholly unrelated Jewish example of this might be the postexilic development of beliefs in a dualistic cosmology or in resurrection, both of which have been thought to derive from Persian roots. More closely *à propos* the topic of literary

<sup>56</sup> Cf., e.g., J. C. VanderKam, "The Prophetic–Sapiential Origins of Apocalyptic Thought," in *A Word in Season: Essays in Honour of William McKane* (ed. J. D. Martin and P. R. Davies; JSOTSup 42; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1986), 163–76, following the influential essay of K. Müller, "Mantische Weisheit und Apokalyptik," in *Congress Volume, Uppsala 1971* (VTSup 22; Leiden: Brill, 1972), 268–93; and note, e.g., the expansion of LXX Esther 10:3 c–f.

<sup>57</sup> Cf. Josephus, *Ant.* 13.372–383; *War* 1.90–98. For the polysemy of the terms *aryeh* and *kefirim* in this passage see also Lim, *Pesharim*, 32–33.

production, it is clear that even the monastic scribes of Qumran had benefited from a degree of “globalization”: for all their idiosyncrasies, they came to adopt not only the new “square” Aramaic script and trends in Hebrew *plene* orthography, but their physical production of scrolls shows extensive dependence on contemporary scribal technology—from the manufacture of ink to the craftsmanship and preparation of leather and papyrus.

It is obviously tempting, therefore, to speculate about links between Qumran and the emerging commentary tradition of the Hellenistic world—perhaps above all as evidenced in Alexandria. After all, despite their relative isolation the two worlds were never wholly sealed off from each other. Greek philosophical and literary texts featured at the Dead Sea site of Wadi Murabba‘at, as did a fragment of Virgil at Masada.<sup>58</sup> And of course Qumran and especially Naḥal Ḥever turned up a wide variety of biblical texts in Greek. These are the same texts that were the object of Jewish study and indeed commentary in Alexandria—a point to which we shall return before long. Egyptian Jews in turn were accustomed to extensive contacts with the Holy Land, including the Jerusalem Jews who are said to have played a part in the composition of the Septuagint.<sup>59</sup> Even Josephus’s exposition of the Pentateuch in the *Antiquities* famously acknowledges that a proper understanding requires one to recognize that some things Moses “shrewdly veils in enigmas, others he sets forth in solemn allegory.”<sup>60</sup>

<sup>58</sup> *Aeneid* 4.9 (Mas pap 721). The influence of Virgil in Palestinian Judaism is documented to good effect in W. Horbury, “Der Tempel bei Vergil und im herodianischen Judentum,” in *Gemeinde ohne Tempel / Community without Temple: Zur Substituierung und Transformation des Jerusalemer Tempels und seines Kults im Alten Testament, antiken Judentum und frühen Christentum* (ed. B. Ego, A. Lange, and P. Pilhofer; WUNT 118; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999), 149–68, pp. 157–62 and *passim*; cf. also P. S. Alexander, “‘Homer the Prophet of All’ and ‘Moses our Teacher’: Late Antique Exegesis of the Homeric Epics and of the Torah of Moses,” in *The Use of Books in the Ancient World* (ed. L. V. Rutgers et al.; Leuven: Peeters, 1998), 127–42 on the perceived relationship between Homer and Moses. For the Wadi Murabba‘at literary fragments see *Les grottes de Murabba‘at* (ed. P. Benoit, J. T. Milik and R. de Vaux; 2 vols.; DJD 2; Oxford: Clarendon, 1961), 1:234–38 (nos. 108–112); and note more generally E. Tov, “The Nature of the Greek Texts from the Judean Desert,” *NovT* 43 (2001): 1–11.

<sup>59</sup> LXX Esther 10:3f; *Aristeas* 46 and *passim*; Ben Sira (Prologue 27); and for that matter the Gospel of Matthew (2:13–14), appear to take such contact for granted.

<sup>60</sup> Josephus *Ant.* 1.24, τὰ μὲν αἰνιττομένου τοῦ νομοθέτου δεξιῶς, τὰ δ’ ἀλληγοροῦντος μετὰ σεμνότητος (while also stressing that whatever needed to be clear is in fact clear!). Note too the argument of G. Veltri, *Eine Tora für den König Talmai: Untersuchungen zum Übersetzungsverständnis in der jüdisch-hellenistischen und*

If one were to give vent to such “genetic” speculation for a moment, it could be well worth pondering the connection that many scholars still suspect between the Essenes and the *Therapeutae* near Lake Mareotis in Lower Egypt, both of which were known to Philo of Alexandria as keen “allegorical” interpreters of Scripture in the context of a monastic common life. The Essenes, he writes, take a keen moral interest in their interpretation of the divinely inspired ancestral laws (τὸ ἠθικὸν εὖ μάλα διαπονοῦσιν ἀλείπταις χρώμενοι τοῖς πατρίοις νόμοις, *Prob.* 80). They study them at all times and especially on the Sabbath, when in their synagogues they will listen as one person reads aloud from the books and another, more experienced interpreter “explains what is not self-evident” (ὅσα μὴ γνώριμα παρελθὼν ἀναδιδάσκει, *Prob.* 82).

Philo’s other ascetics, the *Therapeutae*, were thought by some church fathers to have been Christians,<sup>61</sup> but are now usually regarded as representing the Egyptian branch of the Essene movement. They base their initiation into the sect (NB αἵρεσις, *Vit. Cont.* 29) on a similar commitment to the “laws, prophetic oracles, psalms” and other books; and their spiritual exercises between morning and evening prayers consist substantially of allegorical reflection on their Holy Scriptures (τοῖς ἱεροῖς γράμμασι). Imitating the exegetical method exemplified in the writings of their founders, they take words of the surface text to imply a deeper symbolic meaning (σύμβολα τὰ τῆς ῥητῆς ἐρμηνείας νομίζουσιν ἀποκεκρυμμένης φύσεως ἐν ὑπονοίαις δηλουμένης, *Vit. Cont.* 28–29). The formal exposition of Scripture in these inherited “allegorical” terms<sup>62</sup> is also of particular importance at their festive banquets, when the senior president (πρόεδρος; *Vit. Cont.* 75) takes up a particular topic in the Scripture and begins to instruct the community in extended and reiterative fashion. It is characteristic of their interpretation that the whole written revelation (νομοθεσία) resembles a living being that has the literal commandments (τὰς ῥητὰς διατάξεις) as its body and the invisible sense (ἀόρατον νοῦν) as its soul; and the task is to view the invisible through the visible (τὰ ἀφανῆ διὰ τῶν φανερῶν θεωρεῖν, *Vit. Cont.* 75–78). Once again we find the intriguing combination of respect for the literal text while seeking a hidden meaning, even if Philo

---

*rabbinischen Literatur* (TSAJ 41; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1994), 213–15 and *passim*, about the Septuagint’s continuing significance for Jews.

<sup>61</sup> E.g., Eusebius, *Eccl. Hist.* 2.16–17.

<sup>62</sup> αἱ δὲ ἐξηγήσεις τῶν ἱερῶν γραμμάτων γίνονται δι’ ὑπονοιῶν ἐν ἀλληγορίαις, *Vit. Cont.* 78.

understandably conceives of that meaning in mystical and transcendent rather than specifically eschatological terms.

While there is here no reference to written commentaries, Philo's Essenes and Therapeutae arguably took up *lemmata* requiring explanation in much the same fashion as Qumran's pesherists did.<sup>63</sup> This is quite clearly a different enterprise from that of translation or even of a meturgeman's paraphrase. Nevertheless, it is significant that Philo identifies an explicitly homiletical *Sitz im Leben* for these activities, as indeed for his similar description of the Sabbath service in synagogues (*proseuchai*) more generally, where a priest or elder reads the holy laws and "expounds them point by point," καθ' ἕκαστον ἐξηγεῖται.<sup>64</sup> Philo's fascination with the homiletical hermeneutics of Essenes and Therapeutae is arguably of a piece with his own approach to Scriptural exposition, which has been thought to have similarly homiletical origins.<sup>65</sup>

Philo was undeniably familiar with Alexandrian literary criticism and commentators on Homer and the classics, whose exegesis resembles this Jewish philosopher's allegoresis in several respects. Despite initial resistance to Pergamum's perceived excesses,<sup>66</sup> Alexandrian pagan and Jewish scholars alike had by the first pre-Christian century come to accept allegorical interpretation of Homer and other classics. Philo's contemporary Heracleitus and later neo-Platonic commentators favoured a mystical, hermeneutically sophisticated exegesis that found in Homer knowledge about the quest of the soul, and disclosures about

---

<sup>63</sup> Taking up an early suggestion of David Flusser, M. Kister, "A Common Heritage: Biblical Interpretation at Qumran and its Implications," in *Biblical Perspectives: Early Use and Interpretation of the Bible in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Proceedings of the First International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 12–14 May, 1996* (ed. M. E. Stone and E. G. Chazon; STDJ 28; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 111 n. 37, suggests that Philo's reference to Essene allegories may indeed refer to *pesher* exegesis. Kister's additional argument that the *pesherim* constitute plausible antecedents for Philo's development of Jewish allegoresis needs, however, to be balanced against the extensive influence on Philo of contemporary Alexandrian hermeneutics.

<sup>64</sup> *Hypothetica*, apud Eusebius, *Praep. Ev.* 8.7.13. For the significance of this passage cf. also J. Leonhardt, *Jewish Worship in Philo of Alexandria* (TSAJ 84; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001), 89–90; also pp. 93–95 on Philo's link between liturgy and homiletical exposition.

<sup>65</sup> So, e.g., Newlands, *Hilary of Poitiers*, 20–23.

<sup>66</sup> Cf., e.g., Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship*, 140, 167, 237; J. Carleton Paget, "Jews and Christians in Ancient Alexandria from the Ptolemies to Caracalla," in *Alexandria, Real and Imagined* (ed. A. Hirst and M. S. Silk; London: Ashgate, 2004), 152–53; and D. Dawson, *Allegorical Readers and Cultural Revision in Ancient Alexandria* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992), 74–75; Carleton Paget and Dawson comment more on the Ptolemaic than the later periods.

the secrets either of the natural world (e.g., its spherical shape) or of the mystical realms above.<sup>67</sup>

Alexandrian Jewish allegoresis of the Pentateuch had long been encouraged by secular developments in the same city, already noted above. Anticipated to some extent in the Septuagint, it arguably came into its own with second-century BCE texts like the *Letter of Aristeas* (144–69), Aristobulus, and Artapanus.<sup>68</sup> The *Letter of Aristeas* in particular repeatedly refers to the Septuagintal editors' task in terms analogous to those one might associate with work on textual editions of Homer and other ancient authors.<sup>69</sup> In accounting for the absence from the King's library of the Hebrew laws of the Jews, Demetrius the royal librarian is said to suggest that (30–31):

They have, in the opinion of the experts, been transcribed [σεσήμανται] rather carelessly and inadequately. This is because they have never benefited from royal patronage. Suitably corrected [διηκριβωμένα], they too should be in your library [παρά σοι].<sup>70</sup>

It is important for present purposes to note that both Jewish biblical translation and interpretation in Greek were at that stage already under the extensive influence of Alexandrian philology and Homeric

---

<sup>67</sup> For philosophical allegoresis of Homer cf., e.g., R. Lamberton, "The Neoplatonists and the Spiritualization of Homer," in *Homer's Ancient Readers: The Hermeneutics of Greek Epic's Earliest Exegetes* (ed. R. Lamberton and J. J. Keaney; Magie Classical Publications; Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992), 115–33 (esp. on Proclus and Porphyry); and previously Lévêque, *Aurea Catena Homeri*, 10; F. Buffière, *Les Mythes d'Homère et la Pensée Grecque* (Paris: Belles Lettres, 1956), 2–3; *Héraclite: Allégories d'Homère* (ed. F. Buffière; Collection des Universités de France; Paris: Belles Lettres, 1962) (on Heraclitus' *Homeric Allegories*); R. M. Grant, *The Letter and the Spirit* (London: SPCK, 1957); and more broadly F. Wehrli, *Zur Geschichte der allegorischen Deutung Homers im Altertum* (Leipzig: R. Noske, 1928).

<sup>68</sup> See esp. Aristobulus, *apud* Eusebius, *Praep. Ev.* 8.9.38–10.17; 13.12.9–16. Translation in *OTP* 2:837–42; text in A.-M. Denis and M. De Jonge, *Pseudepigrapha Veteris Testamenti Graece* (3 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 1964–70), 3:217–28.

<sup>69</sup> A point recently developed by Honigman, *The Septuagint and Homeric Scholarship*, 48–49, 130–36 and passim; cf. further D. Weissert, "Alexandrian Analogical Word-Analysis and Septuagint Translation Techniques," *Textus* 8 (1973): 31–44, on philology; and S. Lieberman, *Hellenism in Jewish Palestine: Studies in the Literary Transmission, Beliefs and Manners of Palestine in the I Century BCE–IV Century CE* (New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1950), 47–82, on hermeneutics.

<sup>70</sup> For the interpretative difficulties surrounding the Greek words quoted, see, e.g., R. J. H. Shutt, "Letter of Aristeas," *OTP* 2:7–34, pp. 14–15 and nn. (e)–(g); M. Hadas, *Aristeas to Philocrates* (Jewish Apocryphal Literature; New York: Ktav, 1973), 110 n.; Honigman, *The Septuagint and Homeric Scholarship*, 48 and the literature she cites on 164 n. 39.

scholarship.<sup>71</sup> Demetrius the Chronographer, too, although not obviously allegorical or directly concerned with scriptural interpretation, has been regarded as applying to the Torah such Alexandrian interpretative genres as “problems and solutions” (ἀπορίαι/ζητήματα καὶ λύσεις), by which a poet would be examined and, if appropriate, acquitted of the charge of “irrationality” (ἀλογία).<sup>72</sup> A more attenuated awareness of some Hellenistic interpretative techniques has even been identified in the *Book of Jubilees*; if this is true, despite the book’s almost “anti-philosophical” and emphatically halakhic outlook, it would immediately attach our discussion to Palestinian circles close to the seemingly xenophobic sectarians of the Dead Sea.<sup>73</sup> (Even among Alexandrian Jews, to be sure, there were always some interpreters who shared the older reservations about Homer and thus “refused to accept that Moses had spoken in allegories.”)<sup>74</sup>

Philo, writing a century and a half later, was already very much in tune with the literary-critical and mystagogical concerns of contemporary Alexandrian interpretation of Homer, whom he cites over 50 times.<sup>75</sup> Philo applied many of these Alexandrian exegetical conventions

<sup>71</sup> So, e.g., Weissert, “Alexandrian Analogical Word-Analysis,” 36 and *passim*, concerning the Alexandrian grammarians’ influence on Septuagintal translation techniques; cf. Honigman, *The Septuagint and Homeric Scholarship*, 119–43. Pace Dawson, *Allegorical Readers*, 74–78, who insists that Ptolemaic Jews had no interest in textual authenticity (75; contrast 269–70 n. 2) and were “not... significantly influenced by the interests and practices of the Alexandrian grammarians and editors” (74). While Philo’s more supernatural views of the Septuagint’s origins arguably do leave him uninterested in matters of textual criticism (Dawson, *Allegorical Readers*, 86–89; cf. Siegert, “Early Jewish Interpretation,” 173–74), *Aristeas* suggests a more nuanced and differentiated assessment.

<sup>72</sup> On Philo’s use of the technique, see, e.g., Lieberman, *Hellenism in Jewish Palestine*, 65–68; 47–82 *passim*; S.-k. Wan, “Philo’s *Quaestiones et Solutiones in Genesis*: A Synoptic Approach,” *SBL Seminar Papers*, 1993 (*SBLSP* 32; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993), 22–53; and P. Borgen and L. Skarsten, “*Quaestiones et Solutiones*: Some Observations on the Form of Philonic Exegesis,” *Studia Philonica* 4 (1976–1977): 1–15; also H. Dörrie and H. Dörries, “*Erotapokriseis*,” *RAC* 6:342–70, on the cognate genre of *Erotapokriseis*. For Demetrius, see further J. Hanson, “Demetrius the Chronographer,” *OTP* 2:843–54, p. 845.

<sup>73</sup> So C. Werman, “The *Book of Jubilees* in Hellenistic Context,” *Zion* 66 (2001): 275–96, p. 294 (Hebrew).

<sup>74</sup> Siegert, “Early Jewish Interpretation,” 190; cf. pp. 190–97 on the fragmentary Jewish “historians” preserved in Eusebius, and on Pseudo-Philonian sermons.

<sup>75</sup> Buffière, *Les Mythes d’Homère et la Pensée Grecque*, 38–39 n. 27, somewhat overstates the case in suggesting an exclusively allegorical interest: for him, Philo’s approach “correspond à la tendance des Néoplatoniciens qui, pour l’exégèse d’Homère, ne s’intéressent plus au sens physique, mais cherchent dans les aventures d’Ulysse l’histoire mystique de l’âme en marche vers la vraie patrie.” Philo in fact remained somewhat nervous about solely allegorical readings, as he famously shows in *Migr.* 89–93. Cf. further my discussion in Bockmuehl, *Revelation and Mystery*, 78–81.

to his own consecutive expositions of the Pentateuch (e.g., in *Leg., Spec., QG, QE*), whose author is the hierophant *par excellence* and prophet of divine oracles.<sup>76</sup> He shows little interest in philology or textual criticism, perhaps precisely because of this intensely mystical approach. This in turn is based on a view of the Septuagint's origins which is rather more exalted and error-proof than that represented in *Aristeas*.<sup>77</sup>

In view of this literary critical setting, it seems significant that Philo thought he recognized a kindred and commendable hermeneutical practice in the biblical interpretation of both the Essenes and the *Therapeutae*. Even the talk of exegetical "mysteries" (μυστήρια; *razim*) and of "plain" (ῥήτη, φανερός; *niglot*) and "hidden" (ὑπόνοια, ἄδηλος; *nistarot*) meanings of the text shows intriguing parallels.<sup>78</sup> And it remains inevitably suggestive that apart from Philo and the *pesharim* we know of no other consecutive biblical commentaries during the Second Temple period.<sup>79</sup>

Philo appears, indeed, to be familiar with a number of other Jewish exegetical techniques. The influence of Alexandrian grammarians on Palestinian Jewish interpretation has repeatedly been suggested,<sup>80</sup> as has Philo's reception of Palestinian aggadic traditions and modes of interpretation.<sup>81</sup> Philo himself appears to have visited Jerusalem (and Ashkelon) in person at least once.<sup>82</sup> What is more, the possibility that Alexandrian Jews exported ideas about biblical interpretation to the Dead Sea seems immediately less far-fetched when we recall the

<sup>76</sup> Cf. on this Siegert, "Early Jewish Interpretation," 171–72, and references cited there.

<sup>77</sup> Note the references to dictation, literal correspondence with the Hebrew, and the authors as prophets rather than translators in *Mos.* 2.37–40. See further Siegert, "Early Jewish Interpretation," 182–87, on the assumptions underlying Philo's literal and allegorical exegesis; he sees in Philo one of the "first witnesses of what has been called 'Hellenistic mysticism'" (185).

<sup>78</sup> For references see, e.g., Bockmuehl, *Revelation and Mystery*, 77.

<sup>79</sup> A point rightly stressed by Instone-Brewer, *Techniques and Assumptions*, 194.

<sup>80</sup> Notably by David Daube (e.g., D. Daube, "Rabbinic Methods of Interpretation and Hellenistic Rhetoric," *HUCA* 22 [1949]: 239–64; idem, "Alexandrian Methods of Interpretation and the Rabbis, 1953," in *Essays in Greco Roman and Related Talmudic Literature* [ed. H. A. Fischel; New York: Ktav, 1977], 165–82); cf. also J. Cazeaux, *Philon d'Alexandrie: De la grammaire à la mystique* (CaESup 44; Paris: Cerf, 1983), 88; and J. Cazeaux, "Philon d'Alexandrie, exégète," *ANRW* 21.1:156–226.

<sup>81</sup> See, e.g., Instone-Brewer, *Techniques and Assumptions*, 199–200, 203–4; cf. the classic treatment of H. A. Wolfson, *Philo: Foundations of Religious Philosophy in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam* (2 vols.; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1947). Also perhaps, S. Belkin, *Philo and the Oral Law: The Philonic Interpretation of Biblical Law in Relation to the Palestinian Halakah* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1940; repr. New York: Johnson, 1968).

<sup>82</sup> *Prov.* 2.64; καθ' ὅν χρόνον may well refer to one of several or even regular visits to Jerusalem, as F. H. Colson's note *ad loc.* in LCL rightly suggests.



appreciable number of discoveries in Caves 4 and 7, as well as at Naḥal Hever, of biblical and other texts in Greek—amounting to about 3% of the total.<sup>83</sup> As for the owners of these texts, Timothy Lim has argued not only that at least *some* members of the Dead Sea community must have known Greek, but that in fact certain *peshet* interpretations reflect knowledge of Septuagintal text types or variants.<sup>84</sup> In this light, it no longer seems unreasonable to consider that a confluence of Alexandrian textual and interpretative concerns with the canonizing tendencies of the early Greek translations known at or near Qumran<sup>85</sup> could in turn have encouraged moves from “rewritten Bible” towards canon and commentary.

Although none of this rules out the possibility that early sectarian biblical interpretation might have been influenced by Hellenistic philologists at Damascus,<sup>86</sup> everything we have seen makes it tantalizing to ponder the intellectual analogies specifically between the *commentary* traditions of Alexandria and Qumran. At Qumran itself, that correlation led historically to a dead end, since *peshet* found no direct continuation in subsequent Jewish or Christian interpretation. Looking forward, however, one also notes the influence of that same Alexandrian

---

<sup>83</sup> Other texts often cited in this connection are 4Q186 (e.g., by M. Hengel, “Qumran und der Hellenismus,” in *Judaica et Hellenistica: Kleine Schriften* [WUNT 90; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996], 258–94; cf. M. Hengel, “Qumran and Hellenism,” in *Religion in the Dead Sea Scrolls* [ed. J. J. Collins and R. A. Kugler; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000], 46–56); 4Q341 and 4Q468g (on which cf. W. Horbury, “The Proper Name in 4Q468g: Peitholaus?” *JJS* 50 [1999]: 310–11); and the Wadi Murabbaʿat material cited in n. 58 above.

<sup>84</sup> T. H. Lim, “The Qumran Scrolls, Multilingualism, and Biblical Interpretation,” in Collins and Kugler, *Religion in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 67–72. Tov, “Nature of the Greek Texts,” 9–11, notes the prevalence of the Old Greek text at Qumran but of the first-century BCE *kaige*-Theodotion recension (towards a more “proto-Masoretic” text) at Naḥal Hever.

<sup>85</sup> For the Minor Prophets scroll see the classic treatment of D. Barthélemy, *Les devanciers d’Aquila: Première publication intégrale du texte des fragments du Dodécaprophéton trouvés dans le désert de Juda* (Leiden: Brill, 1963); and cf. *The Greek Minor Prophets Scroll from Nahal Hever (8HevXIIgr) (The Seiyāl Collection I)* (ed. E. Tov, R. A. Kraft, and P. J. Parsons; rev. ed.; DJD 8; Oxford: Clarendon, 1995); also, e.g., A. van der Kooij, “Perspectives on the Study of the Septuagint: Who are the Translators?” *VT* 73 (1998): 214–29; and A. van der Kooij, “Textual Witnesses to the Hebrew Bible and the History of Reception: The Case of Habakkuk 1:11–12,” in *Die Textfunde vom Toten Meer und der Text der Hebräischen Bibel* (ed. U. Dahmen, A. Lange, and H. Lichtenberger; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2000), 91–108.

<sup>86</sup> So in a passing (but in his view “not merely speculative”) suggestion, M. D. Herr, “Continuum in the Chain of Torah Transmission,” *Zion* 44 (1979): 43–56, p. 54 and n. 74 (Hebrew), citing the interpretation of the “well” of Num 21:18 at CD 6:3–6 and of the “star” of Num 24:13 at CD 7:18–19.

concern for text and commentary on the great “gnostic” and orthodox Christian commentators (including Heracleon, as well as Origen, Aristarchus, Didymus, and Theon).<sup>87</sup> In this respect it may be relevant that even before the end of the Second Temple period a certain Apollos, an educated Alexandrian Jew with an Essene-like background in the movement of John the Baptist came to exercise considerable influence in primitive Christian circles at Ephesus and Corinth.<sup>88</sup>

#### V. CONCLUSION: QUMRAN AND ANCIENT COMMENTARY

In the end, the superficial analysis just provided permits of no grand deductions about literary connections or even confident conclusions about intellectual points of contact. Nevertheless, further research in this area remains a definite *desideratum* simply because Qumran scriptural commentaries emerged in a context where Jewish scholars were aware of a thriving Hellenistic commentary tradition that bore certain analogies to their own hermeneutical concerns and techniques. Certain texts came to be regarded as inviolate literary classics replete with hidden meaning: every seemingly stony phrase might to the attentive exegete yield an unexpected flood of divinely charged significance that was often directly applicable to the life of the reader.

By way of a preliminary conclusion, I wish here to single out four salient formal characteristics that would seem to invite further comparative research:

1. Leaving aside the separate genre of *florilegia*, commentaries in the developed sense here in view tended to be concerned with *sequential texts*, even if the vagaries and accidents of time have ensured that in

---

<sup>87</sup> Cf. e.g. W. Horbury, “Old Testament Interpretation in the Writings of the Church Fathers,” in *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading, and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity* (ed. M. J. Mulder and H. Sysling; CRINT 2:1; Assen: Van Gorcum; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990), 727–87, pp. 733–36 and n. 16. The abiding influence of the Alexandrian tradition for commentary on papyri as well as for medieval scholia is demonstrated in the case of comedy by Zuntz, *Die Aristophanes-Scholien der Papyri*, followed by Trojahn, *Die auf Papyri erhaltenen Kommentare*, 215.

<sup>88</sup> See Acts 18:24–19:7; cf. 1 Cor 1:12; 3:4–6, 22; 4:6; 16:12. I am indebted for this suggestion to D. R. Schwartz, “On Quirinius, John the Baptist, the Benedictus, Melchizedek, Qumran, and Ephesus,” *RevQ* 13 (1988): 635–46, p. 646.

many cases we are dealing with fragments rather than entire books. Qumran and the Alexandrian commentaries vary considerably in the style and length of comment provided; but the impression given is that the text to be covered was at least in principle treated in its entirety, from beginning to end, and that all of its particularities were of interest. Having said that, an obvious difference in the developed classical commentary is its more explicitly philological and scientific concerns, which might range from breathings and accents to vocabulary, orthography, and the precise meaning of terms. Grammatical and mythological features were equally of interest, and commentators might take a view of aesthetic strengths or weaknesses. Similarly, especially the later Graeco-Roman commentaries often showed more interest in the personality of the authors and the historical circumstances in which they worked.

2. Whether fully sequential or not, commentaries cited the text by means of consecutive *lemmata*. The most complete classical commentaries in fact provided a continuous sequence of *lemmata*, since this obviated the need for a separate edition of the text. In her study of commentaries on papyrus, Marina del Fabbro noted that the use of noncontinuous *lemmata* presupposed the availability to the readers of a separate edition of the complete text<sup>89</sup>—a point of evident relevance for the Qumran commentators, who could take for granted the presence of a written or at least a memorized scriptural text. Partly because abbreviated or incomplete *lemmata* tended to preclude the independent circulation of the commentary in the absence of a separate text, later Graeco-Roman commentators increasingly opted to include the entire text.<sup>90</sup>
3. The commentator's interpretation was deliberately separated from the text and yet presented as a valid and implicitly authoritative exposition of its significance. This separation is usually achieved by means of formulaic phrases: where at Qumran one finds terms like *pishro*, *peshet ha-dabar* or the like, in classical commentaries one might encounter ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ ᾠδῇ λέγει ὅτι to mark a paraphrase, and ὅτι or τὸ σημείον ὅτι in case of explanatory comments.<sup>91</sup> As at Qumran, *lemma* citations may sometimes be less than exact. While

<sup>89</sup> So del Fabbro, "Il commentario nella tradizione papiracea," 81.

<sup>90</sup> Ibid., 91. Note the similar but imperfect analogy in the Talmudic relationship between Mishnah and Gemara, and between the Talmud itself and the marginal Tosafot.

<sup>91</sup> Cf. *ibid.*, 97.

one cannot rule out the possibility that a variant may represent an adjustment to suit a commentator's preferred reading, especially for classical texts the original may not always have been continuously at the commentator's disposal.<sup>92</sup> Both Qumran and Graeco-Roman commentators periodically resorted to quotations from elsewhere in the same or another author's work (especially in the case of Homer); this often served either to confirm the interpretative position taken by the commentator or else to underline the authority of the work under investigation.

4. Finally, Alexandrian exposition on Homer in particular affirmed the need to read texts allegorically, to discover under the rough literal surface of the text the polished gems of an interpretation for the life of the readers, both for their knowledge of God and for their present life in the world. In Alexandrian commentary these gems were of course philosophical rather than eschatological, but Philo for one found among the biblical interpretation of Essenes and Therapeutae a kindred love for the deeper sense of the sacred text. At any rate the sudden appearance at Qumran of a surprisingly mature technique of prophetic commentary is suggestive of wider Graeco-Roman cultural influences that may have facilitated its rapid development. It also confirms the existence of a well-established Jewish commentary tradition, in both Alexandria and the Holy Land, a full two and a half centuries before the "gnostic" philologist Heracleon of Alexandria began his celebrated work on the Fourth Gospel.<sup>93</sup>

---

<sup>92</sup> Cf. *ibid.*, 102–4.

<sup>93</sup> At the same time, as B. Aland implies, in a study to which Winrich Löhr has kindly drawn my attention ("Die Rezeption des neutestamentlichen Textes in den ersten Jahrhunderten," in *The New Testament in Early Christianity = La réception des écrits néotestamentaires dans le Christianisme primitif* [ed. J.-M. Sevrin; BETL 86; Leuven: Leuven University Press and Peeters, 1989], 1–39), it may indeed be that "gnostic" teachers (including Ptolemy, Heracleon, and the Valentinians) were among the first to perceive the textual integrity of the New Testament writings and their need for *ekdosis* and commentary. N.B.: W. A. Löhr, "Valentinian Variations on Lk 12,8–9/ Mt 10,32," *VC* 57 (2003): 437–55, has recently also discussed a surviving fragment of Heracleon's exposition of Luke. I offer a fuller discussion of the origin of Christian commentary in M. Bockmuehl, "The Making of Gospel Commentaries," in *The Written Gospel* (ed. M. Bockmuehl and D. A. Hagner; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 274–95.

I am grateful for comments received from my former colleagues William Horbury and James Carleton Paget; from participants in the 2004 Orion Center Symposium at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, "Text, Thought, and Practice in Qumran and Early Christianity"; and from senior seminars at Fuller Seminary and Cambridge University in 2005.



PROPHETS AND PROPHECY  
IN THE QUMRAN SCROLLS AND THE NEW TESTAMENT

GEORGE J. BROOKE  
*University of Manchester*

I. INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this paper is to begin to reassess in a modest way some aspects of what can be stated about prophets and prophecy in the Qumran Scrolls and the New Testament, in light of the virtually complete publication of all the fragments that were found in the Qumran caves. There is a problem of definition at the outset which cannot be sidestepped.<sup>1</sup> Recent work on prophets and prophecy has resulted in a more integrated reading of the evidence and a determination to set the whole breadth of what might be labelled “prophetic” within a framework that includes both ancient Near Eastern parallels for the prophets of the Hebrew Bible,<sup>2</sup> and the classical traditions of the Graeco-Roman world for the late Second Temple and New Testament writings.<sup>3</sup> I wish to begin the process of reassessment of this issue by a comprehensive survey of the uses of נְבִיא/נְבִיָּא in the Hebrew and Aramaic sources found at Qumran and a consideration of the uses of προφήτης/προφητεύω in the writings of the New Testament.

This study thus has a very limited purview, but in my opinion it comprises a necessary first step in order to make a renewed attempt at a thoroughgoing phenomenological reading of the extant data. Such a

---

<sup>1</sup> This has been helpfully addressed by L. L. Grabbe, “Poets, Scribes, or Preachers? The Reality of Prophecy in the Second Temple Period,” in *Knowing the End from the Beginning: The Prophetic, the Apocalyptic and their Relationships* (ed. L. L. Grabbe and R. D. Haak; JSPTS 46; London: T&T Clark International, 2003), 192–215.

<sup>2</sup> See, e.g., *Prophecy in its Ancient Near Eastern Context: Mesopotamian, Biblical, and Arabian Perspectives* (ed. M. Nissinen; SBLSymS 13; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2000); M. Nissinen, “Das kritische Potential in der altorientalischen Prophetie,” in *Propheten in Mari, Assyrien und Israel* (ed. M. Köckert and M. Nissinen; FRLANT 201; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2003), 1–32.

<sup>3</sup> See, e.g., the landmark study by D. E. Aune, *Prophecy in Early Christianity and the Ancient Mediterranean World* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983); also B. Witherington, *Jesus the Seer: The Progress of Prophecy* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1999), esp. chapters 8–10.

comprehensive consideration of prophecy in early Judaism and early Christianity must engage with many diverse topics and a wide range of technical terms which might have some relationship to prophecy or prophetic activity. For example, such a term as **רָאָה**, “to see,” whose participle can refer to a seer, might make part of the poem in the *War Scroll* relevant to this discussion:

Who is like Your people Israel  
which You have chosen for Yourself  
from all the peoples of the lands;  
the people of the saints of the Covenant,  
instructed in the laws  
and learned in wisdom...  
who have heard the voice of Majesty  
and have seen (**וְרָאָה**) the Angels of Holiness,<sup>4</sup>  
whose ear has been unstopped,  
and who have heard profound things? (1QM 10:9–11)<sup>5</sup>

Or again, it is certain that any study of prophecy in late Second Temple times, and within the communities reflected in the Qumran documents in particular, should contain a detailed analysis of references to the spirit or holy spirit. However, for the immediate purposes of this study, the starting point has been the well-known observation that in the Septuagint **προφήτης** and **προφητεύω** are used almost exclusively to render **נְבִיא/נְבִיאָה**. In relation to prophecy there is thus a prima facie case that all the uses of the root **נבא** in the scrolls found at Qumran should be studied. For the New Testament all the uses of **προφήτης** and **προφητεύω** and their associated terms are the clear comparator.<sup>6</sup>

## II. **נבא** IN THE SCROLLS FROM QUMRAN

The majority of occurrences of the root **נבא** in the scrolls found at Qumran involve the use of the nominal form applied to the prophets found in the scriptural books. There are thus many uses of the term

<sup>4</sup> Translated as “seers of the holy angels” by F. García Martínez and E. J. C. Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* (Leiden: Brill, 1997–1998), 1:129.

<sup>5</sup> Trans. G. Vermes, *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English* (London: Penguin, 1998), 173, slightly altered.

<sup>6</sup> This pragmatic approach is also adopted in most respects by L. L. Grabbe, “Poets, Scribes, or Preachers?” 193, though he insists that **נְבִיא/נְבִיאָה** and **προφήτης** do not necessarily have the same connotation. The use of these terms in all Jewish sources of the Graeco-Roman period should also be considered.

נביא which have clear referents. Sometimes the designation “prophet” is juxtaposed explicitly with a named person, often in introductory formulae for quotations from their works: Isaiah<sup>7</sup> (CD 4:13; 4Q174 1–2 i 15; 4Q265 1 3; 4Q285 7 1; 11Q13 2:15; cf. 4Q177 5–6 i 2, 5);<sup>8</sup> Jeremiah (4Q385a 18 i a–b 2, 6; B 1); Ezekiel (CD 3:21; 4Q174 1–2 i 16; 4Q177 7 3);<sup>9</sup> Amos (CD 7:10); Zechariah (CD 19:7); and Daniel (4Q174 1–3 ii 3);<sup>10</sup> 11Q5 28:8 and 13 refer to Samuel, explicitly or implicitly, as prophet. Sometimes the references seem clearly to be to the literary prophets whose works carry some authority in the late Second Temple period. Thus there are several references in the movement’s literature to the “books of the prophets” (CD 7:17; 4Q266 3 iii 18; 4Q397 14–21 10,<sup>11</sup> 15<sup>12</sup>). In addition to the literary prophets, David’s activity as psalmist is famously described in 11Q5 27:10: “all these he spoke through prophecy (בנבואה) which was given to him from before the Most High.”

In some instances the precise referent of the term “prophet(s)” is not entirely clear. For example, at the opening of 1QS (1:3) there is an appeal to do what is just and good in God’s presence, “as he commanded by the hands of Moses and by the hand of all his servants the prophets”; it would seem that here is a reference to the Law and the authoritative prophetic books put in terms of those understood to be responsible for them, but the term “prophets” might possibly have a

<sup>7</sup> 3Q4 3 is suitably reconstructed as נבא א[ל] [י]שע[יה] , with Isaiah as the subject of the verb נבא; 4Q165 1–2 1 may also contain a reference to Isaiah’s prophecy (הנבואות).

<sup>8</sup> An explicit reference to Isaiah is not preserved in 4Q177, but enough survives of the introductory formula to enable a suitable reconstruction of the prophet’s name in both places.

<sup>9</sup> Ezekiel is addressed as “son of man” and the verb נבא is used in 4Q385 2 5, 6, 7; 4Q385b 1 2; and 4Q386 1 i 4. The verb also seems to occur in PAM 44.102 66 4 in a part of the fragment which mentions בגמול.

<sup>10</sup> The fact that Daniel is described as a prophet is widely noted, so that discussion of scriptural antecedents should not be limited solely to the literary prophets; see Grabbe, “Poets, Scribes, or Preachers?” 199.

<sup>11</sup> If the juxtaposition of fragments 15–17 and the restoration by the editors are accepted: [ו]בספר[י הנבואים ובודי[ד]; see E. Qimron and J. Strugnell, *Qumran Cave 4. V: Miqsat Ma’ase Ha-Torah* (DJD 10; Oxford: Clarendon, 1994), 27. On this phrase, see the critical reassessment by E. C. Ulrich, “The Non-attestation of a Tripartite Canon in 4QMMT,” *CBQ* 65 (2003): 202–14, esp. pp. 208–11; Ulrich argues that this restoration is really a maximalist reading which many readers have accepted without appreciating its tentative character.

<sup>12</sup> This is almost entirely a matter of restoration: [מושה ובספר[י הנבואים]; see Qimron and Strugnell, DJD 10.28.



wider reference than that.<sup>13</sup> This opening statement in the Cave 1 copy of the *Rule of the Community* may provide the most suitable frame of reference for understanding the subsequent interpretation of Isa 40:3 in 1QS 8:15–16: the preparation of the way of the Lord is the study of the law which God commanded by the hand of Moses, “to do according to all that has been revealed from age to age” and according to what “the prophets have revealed by his holy spirit.” The prophets of old are clearly understood as inspired interpreters of the law.

In *Peshar Habakkuk* the commentator refers to the priest whom God has set in the midst of the congregation who will interpret “all the words of his servants the prophets” (1QpHab 2:9); subsequently the commentator refers to the Teacher of Righteousness “to whom God has made known all the mysteries of the words of his servants the prophets” (1QpHab 7:5), and asserts that the final age will go beyond “all that the prophets said” (1QpHab 7:8). In the context of the explicit interpretation of the writings of Habakkuk, it is most natural again to take these references to prophets as references to the scriptural literary prophets. Or again, in 4Q265 7 7–8 J. M. Baumgarten has suitably restored, “[When] there will be in the council of the Communit[y] fift[een] men, as God foretold through his servants,]/[the p]rophets, the council of the Community will be established [in truth.]”<sup>14</sup> However, some other kind of restoration, even one which might suggest that there are prophets in the council of the Community, is indeed possible though less likely. A general reference in Tob 14:4 is also to be considered here: on his deathbed Tobit mentions all that the prophets of Israel have spoken (4Q198 1 12). All these references seem to be to the prophets of earlier times, many of whom have left literary traditions.

In 4Q292, a composition whose remains attest no explicit sectarian terminology, there is again reference to “all your servants the prophets” (4Q292 2 4). The second person suffix indicates that the context is a prayer addressed to God, possibly a prayer that prophetic sayings

<sup>13</sup> A similar formula is found in 4Q292 2 4 (ביד כול עבדיכה הנביאים); 4Q390 2 i 5 (בושה ועבדיכה הנביאים); and 4Q504 1–2 iii 12–13 (ביד עבדי הנביאים).

<sup>14</sup> J. M. Baumgarten, “265. 4QMiscellaneous Rules,” in *Qumran Cave 4.XXV: Halakhic Texts* (ed. J. M. Baumgarten et al.; DJD 35; Oxford: Clarendon, 1999), 70. Baumgarten alludes to the parallel in the interpretation of Isa 54:11–12 in 4QpIsa<sup>d</sup> to explain the presence of “prophets” here, though the plural is somewhat problematic if the reference is to Isaiah, especially since Isaiah the prophet is explicitly referred to earlier in the composition (4Q265 1 3).

containing eschatological promises to Israel might be fulfilled.<sup>15</sup> In another liturgical text, 4Q381 69 4, there is the following reading: “and he gave them to you by his spirit, prophets to instruct and teach you.”<sup>16</sup> As E. M. Schuller has noted, the task of the prophets as teachers echoes the Deuteronomistic description of the role of Moses (e.g., Deut 4:1, 5, 14). It is intriguing that in the quasi-historical recitation that the poetic fragment reflects, the mention of the prophets is followed by, rather than itself following, the allusions to Sinai. The prophets of 4Q381 seem to belong securely in the past but the context is not extensive enough for any sure conclusions.

Further liturgical references to the prophets can be found in the psalms of 11Q5. In the *Apostrophe to Zion* there are two references to prophets; in neither is it clear whether they are entirely figures of the past. In the first, God is requested to remember the merciful deeds of the prophets (11Q5 22:5), and in the second, to recognize the dreams of prophets (11Q5 22:14). In 11Q5 28:8 (Psalm 151A) “prophet” designates Samuel, and the title of another composition (Psalm 151B; 11Q5 28:13) refers to “David’s power after the prophet of God had anointed him.”<sup>17</sup> In addition to these poetical references to the prophets, there are some narrative texts in which the term occurs. In 4Qpap paraKings et al. (4Q382), several of whose fragments seem to be a reworking of the Elijah and Elisha cycles of stories in the Books of Kings, the term [הנביאים] occurs in a small fragment (4Q382 31 5) which has a minimal amount of eschatological orientation and phraseology, as its editor has observed.<sup>18</sup> The exegesis of “the mountains” of Isa 52:7 in 11Q13 2:13 as “the prophets” implies that the messenger in the prophetic text based his message upon what was declared by the prophets of old. In

<sup>15</sup> B. Nitzan suggests comparing such sentiments with 11Q5 22:5–6, 12–14; Sir 36:20–21; and Luke 1:70: “292. 4QWork Containing Prayers B,” in *Qumran Cave 4.XX: Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part 2* (ed. E. G. Chazon et al.; DJD 29; Oxford: Clarendon, 1999), 18. Something similar can be said concerning the liturgical composition 4Q504: 4Q504 1–2 iii 12–13 (מוֹשֶׁה וְעִבְדֵיכֶה הַנְּבִיאִים) seems to be part of an address to God in which there is a confessional description of how the divine message delivered to the people has been ignored.

<sup>16</sup> E. M. Schuller, “381. 4QNon-Canonical Psalms B,” in *Qumran Cave 4.VI: Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part 1* (ed. E. Eshel et al.; DJD 11; Oxford: Clarendon, 1998), 150.

<sup>17</sup> J. A. Sanders, *The Psalms Scroll of Qumrân Cave 11 (11QPs<sup>a</sup>)* (DJD 4; Oxford: Clarendon, 1965), 60.

<sup>18</sup> S. Olyan, “382. 4Qpap paraKings et al.,” in *Qumran Cave 4.VIII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 1* (ed. H. Attridge et al.; DJD 13; Oxford: Clarendon, 1994), 379. Olyan sees this orientation through noting parallels in phraseology with 4QpPs<sup>a</sup> and 1QpHab.

receiving messages from God, these prophets of old are understood to hear, see, and dream (4Q88 8:14; 11Q5 22:14); to deliver their messages they speak (דבר: CD 4:13) and write (כתב: CD 19:7).

The list of compositions so far would strongly imply that those labelled as prophets were all members of earlier generations and for the most part could be clearly identified with the figures associated with authoritative texts. There is, however, a small group of texts whose interpretation is more complex.

4Q375 contains a reworked form of the laws of Deuteronomy 13 and 18. 4Q375 1 i opens with a section on the true prophet through whom God commands his people. A subsequent section discusses the false prophet (4Q375 1 i 4, 6) who rises up and teaches apostasy (as is the case in CD 6:1–2; 1QH<sup>a</sup> 12:16; 4Q267 2 6; 4Q269 4 i 2). Such a false prophet is to be put to death, though 4Q375 contains a non-scriptural exception clause stating that if the tribe of the prophet so accused stands up in his defence, all those concerned will assemble with the anointed priest for judgement. In his interpretation of this text, J. Strugnell oscillated between seeing it, on the one hand, as a reference to future or eschatological prophetic figures, and on the other, as a set of “general prescriptions for any case of prophecy that will occur.”<sup>19</sup> A thorough investigation of the composition by G. Brin concluded that 4Q375 is “an example of the usage of legal material, the law of the prophet in Deuteronomy, in a new, nonbiblical context. . . . In practice, this reflects an attempt to explain actual events in the life of the sect and its world-view while presenting them as biblical legal material.”<sup>20</sup> It is possible that the reworked legislation of 4Q375 was presectarian but was reused and copied at Qumran for the community’s own purposes as members tried to judge between true and false prophets. The implication of the composition is that prophecy in some form or other had not ceased.

In the *Temple Scroll* the same passage of scriptural legislation about prophets is repeated with minor redactional variations, notably the change from the third person to the first person narrative voice

<sup>19</sup> J. Strugnell, “375. 4QApocryphon of Moses<sup>a</sup>,” in *Qumran Cave 4.XIV: Parabiblical Texts, Part 2* (ed. M. Broshi et al.; DJD 19; Oxford: Clarendon, 1995), 119.

<sup>20</sup> G. Brin, *Studies in Biblical Law: From the Hebrew Bible to the Dead Sea Scrolls* (JSOTSup 176; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1994), 164. Brin probably overinterprets the text by identifying the false prophet, who can in fact be proved innocent, with a spiritual leader of the Qumran sect who was accused of false prophecy by the Jerusalem hierarchy.

characteristic of the *Temple Scroll*. Deuteronomy 13:2–6 is rehearsed in 11Q19 54:8–18 and so three uses of נביא occur in 54:8, 11, and 15.<sup>21</sup> Deuteronomy 18:20–22 is represented in 11Q19 61:1–5 with three uses of נביא in 61:2, 3, and 4. The legislation of the *Temple Scroll* is difficult to locate in a life setting; it seems to be presenting itself as legislation that should have been put in place when the first Temple was built, but never was. This legislation apparently should have lasted until the day of new creation referred to in 11Q19, column 29. As such it could well be that these laws reflect something of the practices of those who put them together. If so, the legislation against false prophets can be understood as being in force in the second and first centuries BCE. Thus, as with 4Q375, there may be hints in the *Temple Scroll* of the outlook and practices of those who produced and transmitted the text.

A further text which may belong in the same category as 4Q375 and the *Temple Scroll* is the Aramaic 4Q339, the list of false prophets (נביאי [ש]קרא).<sup>22</sup> This list begins with Balaam (Numbers 22–24) and runs through the man of Bethel (1 Kgs 13:11–31), Zedekiah (1 Kgs 22:1–28), Ahab and Zedekiah son of Maaseiah (Jer 29:21–24), Shemaiah the Nehelamite (Jer 29:24–32), and Hananiah son of Azur (Jeremiah 28); but it may conclude with a reference to John Hyrcanus (יוחנן בן) [שמ]עון which would bring the list down to the end of the second century BCE.<sup>23</sup>

Of some occurrences of the term נביא little or nothing can be said. In 4Q379 36 2 the plural נביאים occurs without any surviving context; if the fragment is correctly assigned to *4QApocryphon of Joshua*<sup>b</sup>, then it may reflect some aspect of the rewriting of the Joshua traditions in light of “subsequent” prophetic traditions. Such would not be surprising, given the use of various scriptural passages, especially the Psalms, in the composition, as well as the well-known occurrence of the parallel to 4Q175 in 4Q379 22 ii, which seems to have been understood as

<sup>21</sup> No parallel to this passage survives in 11Q20, but the next pericope, which concerns being misled to worship false gods by family members, is present in 11Q20 16.

<sup>22</sup> M. Broshi and A. Yardeni, “339. 4QList of False Prophets ar,” in Broshi et al., DJD 19.77–79.

<sup>23</sup> As proposed by E. Qimron, “On the Interpretation of the List of False Prophets,” *Tarbiz* 63 (1994): 273–75 (Hebrew); and by A. Rofé in an article, “רשימת נביאי השקר, מקומראן—שתי חידות ופתרון,” *Ha'aretz* (April 13, 1994): 11B. The principal editors prefer to reconstruct the last line as a reference to Gibeon, whence Hananiah came (Broshi et al., DJD 19.78–79). J. E. Bowley, “Prophets and Prophecy at Qumran,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years* (ed. P. W. Flint and J. C. VanderKam; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 2:365, also views the list as referring only to prophets of the biblical past.

prophecy.<sup>24</sup> In a tiny fragment which has been assigned to 4Q383 6, either the noun **נְבִיאִים** or a verbal form can be reconstructed at the beginning of line 1. The likely reference to Egypt in line 2 suggests to D. Dimant, the fragment's editor, that it is likely that the prophet referred to is Jeremiah.<sup>25</sup> The reading of 4Q418 221 2 is very unclear, though J. Strugnell and D. Harrington suggest it may be read as **נְבִיאִים**, with the first three letters marked as uncertain.<sup>26</sup> If so, this is the only occurrence of the term in a sapiential text from Qumran, though the term does indeed occur in Ben Sira, which was known at Qumran.<sup>27</sup> Also to be included in this small group of references without context is the one tantalising reference to a prophetess in the whole corpus from Qumran. In PAM 43.677 fragment 6, the only preserved word is **נְבִיאָה** (possibly, "prophetess") without a definite article.<sup>28</sup> Three very fragmentary Aramaic compositions also contain the word **נְבִיאָה** (4Q556 1 7; 4Q562 7 1; 4Q570 30 4); since very little context survives in each case, it is impossible to determine to whom the noun refers.

The final category of occurrences of the term **נְבִיאִים** concern the future. There is a small group of compositions which refer explicitly to a future or eschatological prophet (1QS 9:11; 4Q158 6 6; 4Q175 5, 7). All these texts, and possibly also *11QMelchizedek*,<sup>29</sup> seem to depend, either directly or indirectly, on Deut 18:15 and 18.<sup>30</sup> At least one other text seems to

<sup>24</sup> Cf. Sir 46:1 which describes Joshua as the successor to Moses in the prophetic office.

<sup>25</sup> D. Dimant, "383. 4QApocryphon of Jeremiah A," in D. Dimant, *Qumran Cave 4.XXI: Parabiblical Texts, Part 4: Pseudo-Prophetic Texts* (DJD 30; Oxford: Clarendon, 2001), 124: "It is, however, impossible to tell whether it stood in an autobiographical 1st person discourse, as is the case in frg. 1, or as part of a 3rd person narrative, as in 4Q385a 18 i-ii."

<sup>26</sup> "418. 4QInstruction<sup>d</sup>," in *Qumran Cave 4.XXIV: Sapiential Texts, Part 2: 4QInstruction (Mûsâr lē-Mēvîn): 4Q415ff.* (ed. J. Strugnell, D. J. Harrington, and T. Elgvin; DJD 34; Oxford: Clarendon, 1999), 211-474, p. 436.

<sup>27</sup> The writings of Ben Sira should probably be factored into this discussion, though it is not always clear what the original Hebrew would have been. In 39:1-3, Ben Sira describes the ideal sage as the one who is "concerned with prophecies."

<sup>28</sup> As noted by D. M. Pike and A. C. Skinner, *Qumran Cave 4.XXIII: Unidentified Fragments* (DJD 33; Oxford: Clarendon, 2001), 104. Since it is just possible to read the *yod* as a *waw*, this could be **נְבוֹאָה** in any case.

<sup>29</sup> G. G. Xeravits has recently argued that the eschatological figure accompanying the angelic Melchizedek has many Mosaic characteristics; see his *King, Priest, Prophet: Positive Eschatological Protagonists of the Qumran Library* (STDJ 47; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 182-83, 218-19.

<sup>30</sup> The term **נְבִיאִים** is used for the eschatological prophet only in the three texts cited here; for the most recent expansive discussions of the eschatological prophet in various guises, see J. J. Collins, *The Scepter and the Star: The Messiahs of the Dead Sea*

refer to a future eschatological prophet, but the term נביא is not used: in 4Q558 1 mention is made of the return of Elijah with an allusion to Mal 3:23.<sup>31</sup> Yet other texts, such as 4Q521, which uses משיח of its eschatological figure, have been interpreted suitably as referring to a future prophet, probably Elijah *redivivus*.<sup>32</sup>

Overall we may conclude from the scrolls found at Qumran that the majority of explicit uses of the term נביא are references to the great prophetic figures of the past, especially the literary prophets: the three major prophets, the twelve minor ones, and Daniel. In addition, the creative hymnic activity of David is described as prophecy, so that the Psalms become available for the kind of fulfilment interpretation which is also to be found for all other unfulfilled blessings, curses, and oracles.

However, the overall ideology of the community in the so-called sectarian scrolls is also a reading of the present as if the community had ongoing continuity with biblical Israel. As such it is possible that both true and false prophets might arise at any time.<sup>33</sup> Adapted forms of pentateuchal legislation are available to deal with cases as they occur. As is suggested by 4Q375 and the *Temple Scroll*, the harsh scriptural rules of Deuteronomy 13 and 18 seem to have been adapted pragmatically, so that there was always a chance of survival for the one who was falsely accused of false prophecy, provided that his tribe came out in his support. It is also the hope of the community that one day a Mosaic prophet will arise as promised in Deuteronomy 18.

---

*Scrolls and Other Ancient Literature* (ABRL; New York: Doubleday, 1995), chapter 5 (“Teacher, Priest, and Prophet”); and J. Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte aus Qumran: Königliche, priesterliche und prophetische Messiasvorstellungen in den Schriftfunden von Qumran* (WUNT 2.104; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998), chapter 5 (“Prophetische Gesalbtenvorstellungen”). Zimmermann’s comprehensive discussion surprisingly fails to mention the much earlier study of H. M. Teeple, *The Mosaic Eschatological Prophet* (JBL Monograph Series 10; Philadelphia: Society of Biblical Literature, 1957).

<sup>31</sup> For the text and detailed discussion see É. Puech, *La Croyance des Esséniens en la vie future: Immortalité, résurrection, vie éternelle? Histoire d’une croyance dans le Judaïsme ancien. II. Les données qumraniennes et classiques* (EBib 22; Paris: Gabalda, 1993), 676–81.

<sup>32</sup> See, notably, J. J. Collins, “The Works of the Messiah,” *DSD* 1 (1994): 98–112.

<sup>33</sup> If the Qumran community or the wider movement of which it was a part is identified with the Essenes, then information from the classical sources can be used to support the view that prophecy was still a live issue at Qumran; see especially R. Gray, *Prophetic Figures in Late Second Temple Jewish Palestine: The Evidence from Josephus* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993). In chapter 3 (“The Essenes”), she describes in analytical detail the activity of three Essene prophets: Judas (*War* 1.78–80; *Ant.* 13.311–313), Menahem (*Ant.* 15.373–379), and Simon (*War* 2.112–113; *Ant.* 17.345–348).

In sum, it is important to indicate that the term נביא and its cognates are not used freely or frequently. Although there is some interest in divination in the nonbiblical compositions found in the Qumran caves, in no instance is such activity ever associated with a prophet (נביא). Although Abraham is described as a prophet in Genesis 20:7, his extended activity as dreamer and healer in the *Genesis Apocryphon* does not seem to depend on his role as so defined. Genesis 20 defines his prophetic activity in terms of intercessory prayer rather than any other activity.

Although I am inclined to think that the community which preserved the scrolls did not subscribe to the view that prophecy had ceased,<sup>34</sup> it was indeed reluctant to use the specific language of prophecy to describe its own activities.<sup>35</sup> Nevertheless, there are some practices at Qumran which seem to be largely continuous with how the prophets of old were viewed. Although at this point it is tempting to shift to a more comprehensive phenomenological approach to the subject, I will restrict myself to brief comments on three possibilities. It is perhaps with these that an overall description of prophetic activity at Qumran might begin.<sup>36</sup>

To begin with it would seem that the identification of David's compositions as given through prophecy might suggest that the creation of poetry could be understood as ongoing prophetic activity. The presence in the Qumran library of several scrolls containing such works might reflect such an opinion. Most especially the various copies of the *Hodayot* and the real possibility that some or all of its contents can be associated directly or indirectly with the leading Teacher is suggestive of the likelihood that such activity was deemed *consistent* with David's inspired psalter. Although it may be significant that the Teacher is nowhere identified as a נביא, the way in which the author of the *Hodayot*

<sup>34</sup> "Any conclusion that the sect's doctrine considered true prophecy to have ceased is unwarranted," Bowley, "Prophets and Prophecy at Qumran," 375.

<sup>35</sup> This is a slightly different conclusion from that of G. Brin, "תפיסת הנבואה", *המקראית בכתבי קומראן*, in *Sha'arei Talmon: Studies in the Bible, Qumran, and the Ancient Near East Presented to Shemaryahu Talmon* (ed. M. Fishbane, E. Tov, W. W. Fields; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1992), 101\*-12\*. Brin argues that the members of the Qumran community believed that prophecy did not exist in its time, but that they appointed themselves as the living substitute for the defunct prophetic office.

<sup>36</sup> Much else could be said. For example, J. C. VanderKam has argued that there is continuity with prophetic activity at Qumran in the mantic wisdom found reflected in some Qumran texts: "Mantic Wisdom in the Dead Sea Scrolls," *DSD* 4 (1997): 336-53, esp. 338-40.

sets himself over against the false prophets (1QH<sup>a</sup> 12:16) may suggest that he understood himself to be a true prophet.

Second, as has been noted, the prophets and their books are often idiomatically associated with Moses and the law as the means through which God has made demands on Israel through the ages. There were commands and Israel's failure to follow them resulted in disaster. Just as the prophets of old had attempted to expound the meaning of the law, so discerning the meaning of the divine commandments was a priority within the community.<sup>37</sup> If the group was to live out its wilderness vocation, then the study of the law and the prophets was the way to discern righteous behaviour which was *continuous* with what the prophets disclosed of the divine purposes.<sup>38</sup> Halakhah was to be found in both the law and the prophets, and the community's halakhic decisions and practices were about living within the ongoing prophetic call to obedience. The hope for a prophet like Moses was an expression of how the future would also be continuous with the present; nowhere, however, was any contemporary figure clearly identified with the prophet like Moses.

Third, part of the discernment of divine purposes in the prophetic literature and the lives of the prophets depended upon suitable scriptural interpretation. The varieties of such interpretation covered not just halakhic matters but also insights into how God might be working his purposes out through the current circumstances of the community and the wider movement of which it was a part. The *pesharim* provided a mode of interpretation of unfulfilled prophetic texts of all kinds which demonstrated that the experiences of the community were anticipated in the prophecies of previous generations. Prophetic text and inspired exegetical interpretation are *coherent* with one another, so much so that the interpretation sometimes infected the presentation of the prophetic text and the prophetic text bears frequent repetition in the interpretation.<sup>39</sup>

---

<sup>37</sup> This is developed somewhat by J. E. Bowley, "Prophets and Prophecy at Qumran," 364–65.

<sup>38</sup> D. N. Freedman has expressed it as follows: "When new contemporary prophetic utterances are unavailable or unacceptable, the alternative is to recycle old prophecies"; see his article "Prophecy in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Christian Faith: In Celebration of the Jubilee Year of the Discovery of Qumran* (ed. J. H. Charlesworth and W. P. Weaver; Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 1998), 49.

<sup>39</sup> The focus in this study has been on a limited range of terminology. More general phenomenological overviews of prophets and prophecy at Qumran include the following:



### III. προφήτης AND ASSOCIATED TERMS IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

In turning to the New Testament for further insight on prophecy and prophets, it is important to recall that some of the terminology is found exclusively in the Septuagint; thus, it is highly likely that the Septuagint played a key part in providing the language which was reused by New Testament authors. Some of the Greek terms also occur in Hellenistic sources, so the background of the understanding of prophets and prophecy in the New Testament probably does not depend upon Jewish precedents alone. What picture emerges?

To begin with, as in the Qumran scrolls, there are many uses of the terminology associated with the designation of a prophet or prophets and referring to the scriptural prophets, several of whom are named explicitly: Isaiah (Matt 1:22; 3:3 [Mark 1:2; Luke 3:4]; 4:14; 8:17; 12:17; 13:14, 35; 15:7 [Mark 7:6]; Luke 4:17; John 1:23; 12:38; Acts 7:48; 8:28–34; 28:25); Jeremiah (Matt 2:17; 27:9); Ezekiel, Hosea (Matt 2:15), Joel (Acts 2:16); Amos (Acts 7:42); Jonah (Matt 12:39); Micah (Matt 2:5–6); Habakkuk (Acts 13:40); Zechariah (Matt 21:4–5; 27:9), Daniel (Matt 24:15); Moses (Acts 3:22); Samuel (Acts 3:24; 13:20); David (Acts 2:30); Elisha (Luke 4:27); and even Enoch (Jude 14).<sup>40</sup>

There are also more general references to the scriptural prophets: “No prophecy of scripture is a matter of one’s own interpretation, because no prophecy ever came by human will, but people moved by the holy spirit spoke from God” (2 Pet 1:21). It seems as if the references to prophesying and prophecy in the vision of Revelation 11 are to scriptural prophets who testify to how the Temple and those who worship there are to be preserved. “All the prophets and the law prophesied until John came” declares Matthew’s Jesus, in marking that a new era has begun with John the Baptist (Matt 11:13). The author of 1 Peter refers to the prophets who prophesied of the grace that was to be experienced by his addressees (1 Pet 1:10).<sup>41</sup>

---

M. Burrows, “Prophets and Prophecy at Qumran,” in *Israel’s Prophetic Heritage* (ed. B. W. Anderson and W. Harrelson; New York: Harper, 1962), 593–99; Bowley, “Prophets and Prophecy at Qumran”; G. J. Brooke, “Prophecy,” *EDSS* 2:694–700. All these studies go beyond consideration of נביא/נבוא and so mix precise analysis of the data with other approaches to the material.

<sup>40</sup> Balaam is also identified as a prophet in 2 Pet 2:16.

<sup>41</sup> Other general references to the scriptural prophets include Matt 1:23; 5:12//; 13:17//; 23:29–31; 26:56; Luke 1:70; 13:28; 18:31; 24:25; John 6:45; 8:52–53; Acts 3:18,

Second, in continuity with the scriptural prophetic works, the Book of Revelation appears to speak of itself as prophecy in its opening, “blessed is the one who reads aloud the words of the prophecy, and blessed are those who hear and keep what is written in it” (Rev 1:3), and its closing chapter, “blessed is the one who keeps the words of the prophecy of this book” (Rev 22:7; cf. 22:10, 18, 19).<sup>42</sup> In addition the author of the work is commanded by the angels: “You must prophesy again about many peoples and nations and languages and kings” (Rev 10:11).

Third, as for particular prophets of the first century CE, some of the New Testament writers identify John the Baptist as a prophet (Luke 1:76) or more than a prophet (Matt 11:9//), or tell how the crowds recognised him as such (Matt 14:5//; 21:26//); the author of the Fourth Gospel has John deny that the Baptizer is “the prophet” (John 1:21, 25), presumably so that that title can be retained by Jesus (John 4:19; 6:14). It is indeed possible that Jesus aligned himself with the prophets (Matt 13:57//) or was perceived by those he encountered as a prophet (Matt 16:14//; 21:11, 46; Mark 6:15//; Luke 7:39; John 7:40; 7:52; 9:17).<sup>43</sup> According to Luke the crowd declares Jesus to be a great prophet in reaction to the raising from the dead of the widow of Nain’s son; the disciples on the road to Emmaus, notwithstanding their lack of perceptiveness, describe Jesus as a “prophet mighty in deed and word before God and all the people” (Luke 24:19). In the Acts of the Apostles Luke has Peter preach about Jesus, identifying him with the prophet like Moses whom God will raise up (Acts 3:22–23). Stephen subsequently echoes Peter’s words (Acts 7:52), also using Deut 18:15.<sup>44</sup> In the Acts of the Apostles, Luke names Agabus as one of the

---

21, 25; 10:43; 13:27; 15:15; 26:27; Rom 1:2; 11:3; 1 Thess 2:15; Heb 1:1; 11:32; Jas 5:10; 1 Pet 1:10; 2 Pet 3:2; Rev 10:7; 11:10, 18; 16:6; 18:24; 22:6.

<sup>42</sup> The author explicitly aligns his work with those of the scriptural prophets in Rev 22:6 (“These words are trustworthy and true, for the Lord, the God of the spirits of the prophets, has sent his angel to show his servants what must soon take place”) and 22:9 (“I am a fellow servant with you and your brothers the prophets”).

<sup>43</sup> Though he goes beyond a consideration of just those passages which use the term *προφήτης*, J. D. G. Dunn has provided a recent summary survey on Jesus as prophet, echoing a wide consensus and concluding that “[i]n short, there need be little doubt that Jesus was regarded as a prophet by many, that he saw himself in the tradition of the prophets, and probably also that he claimed a(n eschatological) significance for his mission (and thus himself) which transcended the older prophetic categories” (*Jesus Remembered* [Christianity in the Making 1; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003], 655–66, here p. 666).

<sup>44</sup> See, e.g., R. Schnackenburg, “Die Erwartung des ‘Propheten’ noch dem Neuen Testament und den Qumran-Texten,” in *Studia Evangelica: Papers Presented to the*

prophets who went from Jerusalem to Antioch and predicted by the spirit a great famine (Acts 11:27–28).<sup>45</sup> In Acts 13:1 he narrates that there were prophets and teachers at Antioch, naming several people, but not identifying them with one role or the other. Judas and Silas, “who were themselves prophets, said much to encourage and strengthen the believers” (Acts 15:32).

Fourth, prophecy is clearly named by Paul as one of the spiritual gifts present in the Christian communities with which he is associated. Not everybody is a prophet (1 Cor 12:29); “We have gifts that differ according to the grace given to us: prophecy, in proportion to faith” (Rom 12:6). In 1 Corinthians Paul is particularly exercised by the practice of spiritual gifts, including prophecy, which he distinguishes at one point from wisdom, knowledge, faith, healing, miracles, discernment of spirits, tongues, and the interpretation of tongues (1 Cor 12:8–10), and at another from revelation, knowledge and teaching (1 Cor 14:6); although he associates it closely with prayer (1 Cor 11:4–5).<sup>46</sup> In one place prophetic activity is given preeminence: “Pursue love and strive for the spiritual gifts, and especially that you may prophesy” (1 Cor 14:1, 5); in another place prophets are placed second after apostles (1 Cor 12:27).<sup>47</sup> In instructing his Corinthian church Paul stresses that the exercise of prophetic powers is of no value unless done with love (1 Cor 13:2)—not least because in his view one day prophecies will cease (1 Cor 13:8–9), but the love that motivates them will not. Prophets must act with decorum (1 Cor 14:29–33, 39–40). Prophecy is a practice for believers, not for those outside the community (1 Cor 14:22), though outsiders who encounter it will nevertheless be impressed (1 Cor 14:24). Prophecy is to be done for edification and encouragement (1 Cor 14:3–4);<sup>48</sup> it should not be despised (1 Thess 5:20). Whereas for Paul

---

*International Congress on “The Four Gospels in 1957”* (ed. K. Aland et al.; TU 73; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1959), 622–39.

<sup>45</sup> It is probably the same prophet Agabus who is mentioned in Acts 21:10–11, where he is described as performing a symbolic act, not unlike the prophets of old (cf. Isa 20:2–6).

<sup>46</sup> In Eph 4:11 the gifts are listed as the ability to serve as apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors, or teachers, in order to equip the saints for the work of ministry.

<sup>47</sup> Cf. Eph 2:20: the household of God is “built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, with Christ Jesus himself as the cornerstone;” this phraseology is repeated in Eph 3:5. Cf. Rev 18:20: “saints and apostles and prophets.”

<sup>48</sup> This is as close as Paul gets to declaring the content of prophecy, as J. Barclay rightly notes: “‘Prophecy’ is never defined, but seems to constitute speech which instructs, encourages, consoles or challenges its hearers (vv. 3, 24–5, 31)” (“1 Corinthians,”

there is a clear differentiation between prophecy and glossolalia, in the Acts of the Apostles (Acts 19:6) the gift of prophecy is associated closely with speaking in tongues as an outward sign (cf. what follows) of the coming of the Holy Spirit: “and they spoke with tongues and prophesied.” H. Conzelmann has commented on Acts 19:6 that “speaking in tongues and prophecy are identified; Luke no longer has any exact knowledge of the former,” though he acknowledges that some scholars read the verse as maintaining the Pauline distinction.<sup>49</sup> If glossolalia and prophecy overlap or are identified in Luke’s mind, then there is a clear distinction between the activity of prophecy in at least one Christian understanding and the conceptions of prophecy at Qumran, where there does not seem to have been any speaking in tongues, for all that God’s holy spirit is manifest there (1QS 3:7; 4:21; 9:3),<sup>50</sup> in seeming continuity with the revelatory activities of the prophets (1QS 8:16).

Apart from the possibility of glossolalia (according to Acts 19:6), what were the contents of prophecies? The term is used in a popular way when those who mock Jesus ask him to prophesy to them by identifying who struck him (Matt 26:68 [Mark 14:65; Luke 22:64]). Prophecies are indeed declarations of what is happening or predictions of what is about to happen: the author of the Fourth Gospel describes the high priest’s words about the imminent fate of Jesus to be an act of prophesying, an act somehow made possible because he was high priest and so was not speaking on his own (John 11:51). Prophecies can be made about and for individuals: “I am giving you these instructions, Timothy, my child, in accordance with the prophecies made earlier about you” (1 Tim 1:18) says the author of 1 Timothy, who later reminds the letter’s recipient not to neglect the gifts given to him through prophecy. But it seems as if in some early Christian traditions the content of prophecy was considered to be “the testimony of Jesus” (Rev 19:10), namely “the witness Jesus bore and bears” (cf. 1:2).<sup>51</sup> In a distinctive reference in

---

in *The Oxford Bible Commentary* [ed. J. Barton and J. Muddiman; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001], 1129).

<sup>49</sup> H. Conzelmann, *A Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987), 159–60.

<sup>50</sup> See the discussion of A. E. Sekki, *The Meaning of Ruah at Qumran* (SBLDS 110; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989), 71–93, for detailed arguments on the spirit as God’s spirit in these passages.

<sup>51</sup> R. Bauckham, “Revelation,” in Barton and Muddiman, *The Oxford Bible Commentary*, 1302. On Rev 1:2, Bauckham writes: “‘witness’ is a key word in Revelation, referring first to the witness to God that Jesus bore in his earthly life (cf. 1:5) and then to the witness his followers bear (1:9). The content of John’s prophecy, as intended to

the Gospels, Zechariah's song, the so-called Benedictus (Luke 1:68–79) is declaimed “prophetically” (Luke 1:67).

The practice of prophecy was seen as continuous with the activities of the scriptural prophets, as is represented in the narration of Jesus' teaching which links the prophets, sages and scribes (and/or apostles) who will follow Jesus with the scriptural prophets and others who were abused by those amongst whom they worked (Matt 23:34//). The practice was justified by the author of Acts through an appeal to Joel 2:28–32: “In the last days it will 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 visions, and your old men shall dream dreams” (Acts 2:17–18). This proof-text may go some way towards explaining why occasionally women are specifically identified with prophetic activity, such as the four unmarried daughters of Philip the evangelist (Acts 21:9).<sup>52</sup>

All this indicates that prophecy was practised in the early churches. Matthew's Jesus declares for those to whom the Gospel of Matthew was addressed: “whoever welcomes a prophet in the name of a prophet will receive a prophet's reward” (Matt 10:41). Within early church practices there seems to have been the need to discern between true and false prophecy. This is implied in the saying of Jesus preserved distinctly in Matthew that only those who do the will of God will enter the kingdom, not those who merely may have claimed to have prophesied in his name (Matt 7:22).<sup>53</sup>

#### IV. CONCLUSION: QUMRAN AND THE NEW TESTAMENT

At Qumran the explicit use of terms associated with נָבִי is largely restricted to the scriptural prophets of old. A few texts imply that prophecy could have been an ongoing activity, since legislation concerning what should be done with false prophets seems to have been updated for contemporary use. A further small group of texts suggests that there

---

serve this witness, is attested by Jesus himself (1:2; 22:20), his angel (22:16), and John (1:2)” (p. 1289).

<sup>52</sup> The only women in the NT to be explicitly designated as prophets (προφήτις) are Anna (Luke 2:36) and Jezebel (Rev 2:20).

<sup>53</sup> On true and false prophecy in the New Testament and early Christian sources, see D. E. Aune, *Prophecy in Early Christianity*, 209–10, 217–29.

was a hope in the arrival of a future prophet like Moses, perhaps in the form of Elijah *redivivus*. The weight of explicit use of the terms is in re-presenting the past, and there is enough evidence to suggest that continuities with scriptural prophets and prophecy were maintained in the community's present and for the future. Those continuities can be discerned more clearly in a phenomenological approach, through which it is possible to see that the community's interest in the exposition of the law, its interpretation of the prophets and its creative poetic activities were very much consistent, coherent, and continuous with the activities of prophets of earlier generations.

For the New Testament writers, the use of the terminology still points to a very significant place for the scriptural prophets. However, three readily identifiable factors seem to have resulted in a much wider use of the terms *προφήτης* and *προφητεύω* in the early churches. First, the way in which both John the Baptist and Jesus are variously explicitly identified as the expected eschatological prophet, in Jesus' case as the fulfilment of the prophecy to Moses, created a more direct bridge to the prophets of old than was found in the Qumran sectarian literature, in which the expected future prophet seems to have remained explicitly a future figure. In the Qumran sectarian literature there is no evidence that the Teacher of Righteousness or any of his successors in leadership, even though their interpretation may have been understood as inspired, were ever called prophets. However, the use of the label "prophet" in the New Testament is not dominated by the descriptions of Jesus; for early Christians Jesus seems to have merited from an early stage other honorific titles and so the designation prophet seems to have been released for use by early church members of some of their number.

Second, the fulfilment of the scriptural prophetic promises is intensified in the present, perhaps not least because the eschatological prophet is understood by some to have come in some form or other, as either John the Baptist or Jesus. Although the Qumran *pesharim* show how some there reckoned that unfulfilled prophecies were being fulfilled in the present and imminent future experiences of the community, the eschatological prophet apparently remains a figure of the slightly more distant future.

In addition, a third factor may have played a part in the freer use of the terms *προφήτης* and *προφητεύω* in the New Testament: the wider Graeco-Roman context for the activity of the early churches may have stimulated early church authors to define the activities of some members of the early churches with the labels of *προφήτης* and

προφητεύω. However, although it is no longer necessary to suppose that the Qumran community or the wider movement of which it was a part was entirely sealed off from the Graeco-Roman world around it, it is clear that the predominant way in which it explicitly understood itself was in continuity with scriptural antecedents, not contemporary non-Jewish religious activity.

Without considering the broader phenomenological analysis of what might be labelled “prophetic” both in the Qumran community and in the early churches, it can be acknowledged that there is considerable overlap between the two groups with regard to their use of the terms. At Qumran there is apparently a greater reluctance to use the term “prophet” of current members, for all that the functions of a prophet were being variously carried out in the community. In the early churches there is an apparent reluctance to specify the *content* of prophetic activity, though this is a problem for the modern understanding of several of the offices mentioned in the New Testament. These socio-linguistic reluctances are worth further investigation.

Phenomenologically, there are, not surprisingly, overlaps as well, though these require subtle and lengthy discussion, both from theological and sociological perspectives, before the similarities crowd out the differences. In both the texts from Qumran and in the New Testament there are, in addition to what reverberates around the explicit terminology of prophecy, aspects of prophetic activity which seem to reflect broad developments in apocalyptic, whether this might be described in terms of mantic wisdom or apocalyptic discourse.

SPECIAL PEOPLE OR SPECIAL BOOKS?  
ON QUMRAN AND NEW TESTAMENT NOTIONS OF CANON

DANIEL R. SCHWARTZ  
*The Hebrew University of Jerusalem*

This paper began as a detail in the composition of a commentary on 2 Maccabees. At 2:13, in the course of what purports to be a Jerusalemite epistle to the Jews of Egypt inviting them to celebrate the Hanukkah festival, it is reported that Nehemiah gathered the “books about kings and prophets and also those of David and letters from kings concerning dedications” (i.e., to the Temple of Jerusalem—a major theme in this book). What are “those (books) of David”? Do these words refer only to the different books of Psalms? But why collect only Psalms, and not other sacred writings? Given the fact that the Book of Psalms is the first and also the largest book of the Hagiographa, should we rather suppose that the term is used as a *pars pro toto* for the entire third division of the Bible? And should we then understand that Nehemiah collected all the books of the Bible, or at least all of its last two divisions (since the Torah is not mentioned)?

I would state, first of all, that I see no basis for the assumption that the author of 2 Maccabees expected his readers to understand that, apart from Psalms, Nehemiah ignored all of the Hagiographa. Beyond that, support for the assumption that the “books of David” are indeed to be understood as comprising more than the Psalms comes from two or three other texts. First, it is easy to document, for the second century BCE, the assumption that the corpus of books a Jew should study falls into three divisions. In the Prologue to Ben Sira, the translator writes that his grandfather, the book’s author, had devoted himself to “the reading of the law and of the prophets and of the other ancestral books” (εἰς τὸν τοῦ νόμου καὶ τῶν προφητῶν καὶ τῶν ἄλλων πατρίων βιβλίων ἀνάγνωσιν). While we don’t know exactly what books composed the second and third divisions, the notion of a tripartite corpus is certainly here, so it is easy to imagine this notion being assumed in 2 Macc 2:13 as well.

Second, at Luke 24:44, Jesus reminds his disciples of his teaching that everything written about him “in the law of Moses, and in the



prophets, and in the psalms” had to be fulfilled. In this passage, reading as we must from the perspective of the “New” Testament looking at the “Old” one, we naturally understand the reference to be to the entire Hebrew Bible, so “psalms,” it is often argued, is a way of referring to all of the Hagiographa. This understanding is especially plausible insofar as the Jerusalem scene described in Luke 24:44 is the second such scene in this chapter; and in the first one, where Jesus explains more or less the same things, Luke says he did so on the basis of “all the scriptures beginning with Moses and with all the prophets” (24:27). Since speaking about “all the scriptures” only “begins” with discussion of Moses and the prophets, it is evident that there are other scriptures too. Thus, since the scene at v. 44 is referring back to the one at v. 27, it seems that the reference in v. 44 to “the psalms” is another way to say “in all the other scriptures,” that is, it means either “in all the other scriptures apart from Moses and the prophets” or, as we might say, “in all the Hagiographa, alongside the writings of Moses and the Prophets.” As noted, given the fact that Psalms is the first and largest book of the Hagiographa, such usage would not be surprising.<sup>1</sup>

The third text to discuss in this context will bring us back to the second century BCE, and also to Qumran. Namely, in the third section of *Miqṣat Ma’ase Ha-Torah*, nearing his conclusion, the author states at C 9–11 that he has composed the letter so that the addressee may consider (that which is written) “in the book of Moses, and in the books of the prophets and in David”—[בספר מושה [ו] בספר]—[הנ] ביאים ובדוי [ד].<sup>2</sup> This certainly sounds like a reference to a tripartite Bible, and so it has been taken by many. Although we cannot be sure

<sup>1</sup> So, for example: A. Plummer, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to S. Luke* (4th ed.; ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1901), 562: “This is the only place in N.T. in which the tripartite division of the Hebrew Canon of Scripture is clearly made.... Of that [third] division of the Jewish Scriptures the Psalter was the best known and most influential book.... hence it is singled out as representative of the group.” This notion was rejected out of hand by J. A. Fitzmyer, who wrote simply, “but the psalms scarcely stand for all the *ketubim*” (*The Gospel According to Luke (X–XXIV)* [AB 28A; New York: Doubleday, 1985], 1583). But then what about the obvious parallelism between v. 27 and v. 44? Fitzmyer avoids it by turning the third item mentioned in v. 27 into an inclusive category: “in every part of Scripture” (p. 1553). But this requires turning “all” into “every,” adding “part,” and turning “writings” (lower-case and plural) into Scripture. That’s a lot of changes in four simple words (ἐν πάσαις ταῖς γραφαῖς).

<sup>2</sup> For some doubts about this text, see E. Ulrich, “The Non-Attestation of a Tripartite Canon in 4QMMT,” *CBQ* 65 (2003): 202–14, esp. 208–11. His doubts apply mainly to “David” and do not affect our major argument, for which “book of Moses” and “the prophets” are enough.

that the author's Bible included precisely the same books ours does, since this epistle does not list which books compose each division, it has been taken, quite naturally, along with the Prologue to Ben Sira and perhaps 2 Macc 2:13, as another piece of second-century BCE evidence for a tripartite canon. True, as Steven Fraade put it already in 2000, even by then "much ink had been spilled on the question of whether this sentence is evidence for a tripartite scriptural canon at Qumran."<sup>3</sup> Indeed, there is room for debate, both concerning what books were in whose canon and what that status entailed. But in all that debate it was always assumed, I believe, that the words "of David" refer to books. In 2001, however, Timothy Lim took issue with this assumption, preferring rather to put weight on the fact that while the text uses the term "books" in the first two cases (with regard to Moses and the prophets) it does not do so concerning David.<sup>4</sup> Lim's article ends with clear assertions:

Line 10 should be translated as follows: "We have written to you, so that you will consider the book of Moses, the prophetic books, and (the deeds of) David." It does not refer to the tripartite division of the Hebrew Bible.

First, for whatever it is worth, I will note that I tend both to agree and to disagree with Lim. On the one hand, I agree with him that it is unlikely that "in David" refers to the third division of the Bible as we have it. This agreement derives from the fact that in its context in MMT this passage is urging the addressee to consider the events of the past; as the next line says, he should consider (שתבין) that which happened in every generation—דור ודור (an apparent allusion to Deut 32:7—בנינו שנות דור ודור).<sup>5</sup> The text then goes on to refer specifically, following Deut 30:1, to blessings and curses, and then to point out that while the blessings were fulfilled in the days of Solomon, the curses were fulfilled "in the days of Jeroboam ben Nabat and down until the exile from Jerusalem and Zedekiah, king of Judaea." Thus, one should expect him to refer the addressee to the books that report those events.

---

<sup>3</sup> S. D. Fraade, "To Whom it May Concern: 4QMMT and Its Addressees," *RevQ* 76 (2000): 514 (with bibliography *ibid.* n. 21).

<sup>4</sup> T. Lim, "The Alleged Reference to the Tripartite Division of the Hebrew Bible," *RevQ* 77 (2001): 23–37.

<sup>5</sup> See M. J. Bernstein, "The Employment and Interpretation of Scripture in 4QMMT: Preliminary Observations," in *Reading 4QMMT: New Perspectives on Qumran Law and History* (ed. J. Kampen and M. J. Bernstein; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996), 49 n. 47.

If the reference were to Psalms, or to the Hagiographa in general, which hardly report events, it would not be to the point. The events he means are recounted in the Books of Samuel and Kings.

On the other hand, however, I disagree with Lim because reasonable interpretation of a text would seem to require that when it lists three items, all three with parallel grammatical status in the same sentence and recommending that the addressee do the same with all three, viz. consider them, then—all things being equal—we should apply the *eiusdem generis* rule of interpretation and assume the third item is of the same genus as the first two. So it seems to me likely that we should read the passage from MMT as referring not to David's deeds, as Lim suggests, but to *books* by or about David—and, apparently, his descendants as well. Which books in particular are meant, however, the author does not specify, and it is indeed unlikely that he meant the third part of the canon as we have it.

So, first of all, I would point out that while there may be a relationship between Luke's willingness to focus on the Psalms, on the one hand, and that in Qumran—as represented by MMT—to focus on David, the particular meaning that MMT ascribed to "David" was probably not the same as that of Luke's allusion to "Psalms" (24:44), which, as we saw, he equated with "the other writings" (24:27). However, consideration of another issue of *eiusdem generis* interpretation in this context will lead us to something else which the two texts seem to have in common, and which points in what seems to me to be a very meaningful direction.

To see this, we begin by noting that there is a minor inaccuracy, or rather departure from literal translation, in Lim's version of our passage in MMT. Namely, the Hebrew text refers to ספר משה alongside of ספרי הנביאים; that is, in both cases it uses the construct state to define books respectively by their relationship to certain people, Moses and the prophets, but Lim turned the second case into an adjective, rendering: "the book of Moses, the prophetic books." Now this deviation from the literal sense of the text serves Lim well, for by breaking up the parallelism between the first two items in this list of three it prepares his readers for the suggestion that the third item too, "in David," is not parallel to its predecessors—so it doesn't have to refer to a book or books just because they did. If we translate the total parallelism of the Hebrew literally, "in the book of Moses and in the books of the prophets and in David," it is a bit harder to accept the notion that the genus of the third item is different from that of the first two.

But I want to emphasize that it is clear to me not only that Lim knew how to translate *sifre haneviim* literally but also that it was not in order to serve his own purpose that he employed the translation “prophetical books.” He probably was not even conscious of the deviation. Rather, the reason he translated thus, I would submit, is that we are used to using terms for the first and third divisions of the Bible which avoid the names of people—we speak of Torah and Ketuvim, or of Pentateuch and Hagiographa, not of Moses and David or anyone else. Given human propensities to make things consistent, we are thus under some psychological pressure to make the middle division one of the same nature.<sup>6</sup> This we normally achieve by turning “the prophets” from people into an adjective qualifying “books”—and it is this usage which survived in Lim’s translation of our passage, as in many Bibles, handbooks, and other publications;<sup>7</sup> when we refer to the Pentateuch, the prophetical books, and the (other) sacred writings, we are being consistent. The other option, of course, would be to leave the prophets “prophets” and iron out the terminology in the other direction by speaking of the books of Moses, of the prophets, and of some other individual or individuals, such as David—and that is the road taken by the authors of MMT.

What I want to suggest in this paper is that this matter of terminology is not a trifle, not merely a matter of nomenclature. Nomenclature can indicate much more. Whoever is used to talking about Moses and the prophets is used to talking about individuals who lived in the past, whereas whoever is used to speaking about “the Torah” and “the prophetical books” is used to speaking of things still on our table today just as much as yesterday, and tomorrow too. Moses and the prophets lived and died, but the Torah and the prophetical books might well

---

<sup>6</sup> Note, by way of comparison, that when 2 Macc 15:36 wants to refer to Purim as the day after “Nicanor’s Day,” it terms the former “Mordechai’s Day,” thus indicating that, for the author, the calendar included two days, one after the other, named for two individuals; cf. the American juxtaposition of “Lincoln’s Birthday” and “Washington’s Birthday.” Or, for a case in modern Hebrew parlance, note the fact that The Hebrew University of Jerusalem used to be referred to simply as “The Hebrew University” but today—since the establishment of “The University of Tel-Aviv” and “The University of Haifa”—one frequently hears references to “The University of Jerusalem.”

<sup>7</sup> I note that entering the terms “prophetical books” into Google immediately turns up endless cases of such usage, including the introductions and divisions of editions of the New American Bible and the New Revised Standard Version.

remain forever, unchanged. Accordingly, whoever speaks of Moses, the prophets and David, referring to certain individuals, more readily opens the possibility of their work belonging to the past alone, and therefore—to being supplemented, or superseded, by the work of other individuals. Indeed, just as 2 Macc 2:13 adds “the kings’ letters about dedications” to the same list, someone else might add books by this or that teacher—righteous or otherwise. If we instead use terminology that refers to books and even includes definite articles referring to them—*the* Torah, *the* prophetic writings, *the* Hagiographa—our corpus sounds a lot more closed.

This Qumran preference for the people rather than the books is expressed in another way as well: a willingness to cite verses from the Torah as having been said by Moses rather than having been written in his book. Thus, for example, when the *Damascus Document* complains about marriages with nieces, arguing from the fact that Lev 18:13 forbids the analogous case of marriage with one’s aunt, that verse is introduced by “And Moses said” (CD 5:8). Here, then, we have a quote from Lev 18:13 cited as if it were a statement of Moses. The status of the statement is no different from that quoted a page earlier in the same text (CD 4:15), where Levi the son of Jacob was said to be quoted—from a book which, in fact, did *not* make it into our canon. Just as we noted above with regard to the royal letters cited alongside biblical books in 2 Macc 2:13, so too here it is the use of Moses’ name which allows other such names to be listed and cited the same way.

I would point out, however, that citing verses from the Pentateuch as if they were composed by Moses of course dictates a clear response to a question that was to exercise the rabbis: the question of דברה כלשון בני אדם. Should the Torah be read as if it were written in human parlance, or should it be read, rather, as R. Akiba and his school would have it, as if it did not follow the rules of human parlance and therefore should not be understood that way?<sup>8</sup> As the example just cited indicates, the *Damascus Document* assumes that when Moses prohibited marriage with nephews, we ought to know that he meant nieces, too.

---

<sup>8</sup> On this issue see G. F. Moore, *Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era: The Age of the Tannaim* (New York: Schocken, 1971), 1:88; and especially L. Finkelstein, *Akiba: Scholar, Saint, and Martyr* (Cleveland & New York: World; Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1962), 171–72, 308–12. As Finkelstein points out, the view held by R. Akiba’s opponent, R. Ishmael, that the Torah’s parlance is indeed like that of regular people, amounts to equating Moses with the other prophets.

If, that is, Moses specified only the usual example, presuming that men seek out their spouses and not vice versa, that does not limit the law to the usual case, just as a teacher who warns boys to be careful when they play football with one another does not thereby allow them to be reckless if they happen to play with girls.<sup>9</sup> For rabbis of the R. Akiba school, in contrast, if *God*—Who *isn't* just anyone we know—chose to refer explicitly to nephews, we have no way of assuming He meant nieces too.

Now, quoting a verse by reference to its speaker in the past, rather than by reference to where it is found, now and forever, need not be intended to undercut the verse's authority. As these cases from Qumran show, Moses was a pretty good authority, good enough to forbid marriages and create walls between sects. So was Levi. So was the Teacher of Righteousness, whoever he may have been. Nevertheless, Moses is not God, and so it is interesting to note that although the terms *Torat Moshe* ("the law of Moses") and *Sefer Moshe* ("the book of Moses") were used here and there in Hebrew literature as late as the Persian period (2 Chr 23:18; 25:4; 30:16; Mal 3:22, Ezra 6:18; 7:6; Neh 8:1; 13:1; Dan 9:11),<sup>10</sup> and such texts as 1 Chr 6:34; 2 Chr 8:13 and 24:9 even have Moses authoring commandments, by the Hellenistic period it is very hard to find such usage. Rather, "the Torah" *simpliciter* was the usual term. Although Greek-speaking Jews were frequently happy to play up Moses' role as a legislator, a *nomothetēs*, thus giving the Jews a respectable opposite number to such Greek heroes as Lycurgus and Minos, a review of most Palestinian literature, and ancient Jewish literature in general, shows that "the law" is definitely the rule.<sup>11</sup>

Apparently, Jews who used that term didn't want to compromise the absoluteness of the Torah, either laterally, by qualifying it as the Torah of any particular national legislator, or chronologically, by setting it up as one link in a succession of revelations, a link that could potentially be superseded. And the same is the case, of course, for

---

<sup>9</sup> For the natural ("realistic") logic of the Qumran reading, see my "Law and Truth: On Qumran-Sadducean and Rabbinic Views of Law," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research* (ed. D. Dimant and U. Rappaport; STDJ 10; Leiden: Brill; Jerusalem: The Hebrew University Magnes Press and Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi, 1992), 231.

<sup>10</sup> See A. Hurvitz, "On the Borderline between Biblical Criticism and Hebrew Linguistics: The Emergence of the Term ספר-משה," in *Tehillah le-Moshe: Biblical and Judaic Studies in Honor of Moshe Greenberg* (ed. M. Cogan, B. L. Eichler and J. H. Tigay; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1997), 37\*–44\* (Hebrew).

<sup>11</sup> See e.g., J. Jeremias, "nomos," in *TDNT* 4:1047–48.

rabbinic literature. Not only is scripture always cited as just that—what “is written” or “what is said,” with no human author mentioned; rather, it is also the case that attribution of the law to Moses himself is taken to be a hallmark of heresy. Thus, we find it said that anyone who holds that even the slightest element of the Torah was said by Moses himself is a heretic (*b. Sanh.* 99a); correspondingly, we find the rabbis holding their opponents up to ridicule precisely because they thought that the Torah was to be interpreted on the basis of the assumption that Moses wrote it. So, for example, when those who argue with the rabbis are said to have claimed that *mimohorat hashabbat* (“the morrow of the Sabbath”—Lev 23:11, 15) must refer to Sunday because Moses so loved the Jews that he wanted them to have a long weekend; or that a certain meal-offering is to be eaten by the priests because Moses loved his brother Aaron and wanted him to have a balanced meal—readers are supposed simply to laugh, and Joḥanan ben Zakkai, the rabbis’ spokesman, is indeed allowed to make fools of the speakers.<sup>12</sup>

This type of approach of course opens up the question: What then was the significance of Moses? If he wasn’t a legislator, what was he? Just God’s mouthpiece? Does that justify terming him such a great prophet, as the Torah itself does (Num 12:7–8; Deut 34:10)? Indeed, the rabbinic answer is in the affirmative: not just anyone can be God’s mouthpiece, speaking with Him face to face. And Moses also had wonderful personal qualities. That, together with receiving the divine revelation, made him into a great teacher—and *that* is how rabbinic tradition categorizes him: Moshe Rabbenu, or the *saḥra rabba*—“great scribe.”<sup>13</sup> Rabbinic tradition has no trouble putting Moses at the beginning of a long line of tradents—as we see at the outset of the mishnaic tractate *’Abot*—precisely because he was seen not as a *lawgiver* but, rather, as one who *received* the law and passed it on.

Now although there are various nuances, it is nevertheless the case that the standard New Testament approach to Moses, and especially that of Luke, is just the opposite. Rather than leaving the Torah to God and the teaching to Moses, which allows us to revere Moses by putting

---

<sup>12</sup> For these traditions, see the scholion to *Megillat Ta’anit* ad 8 Nisan and 27 Marḥeshvan (ed. V. Noam, *Megillat Ta’anit: Versions, Interpretation, History, with a Critical Edition* [Jerusalem: Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi, 2003], 61, 97); the former is paralleled at *b. Menah.* 65a–b.

<sup>13</sup> See my *Studies in the Jewish Background of Christianity* (WUNT 60; Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1992), 98.

him into a list of people who no one supposes were authors of revealed law, it associates the Torah with Moses very insistently and places Moses in a line with the prophets in such a way that he and his law are just as passing as the other prophets and their prophecies were. That sets him and his law up for being superseded, when and if a new prophet like himself comes. This basic approach of the New Testament has a number of expressions, of which I will mention three:

- a. The Law can be considered to be of Mosaic origin, even to the extent that it may depart from God's own will. Thus, at Mark 10:4–6, Jesus is made to establish a contrast between the way God made things at creation, i.e., the way things ideally should have been and still should be, on the one hand, and Moses' concession to human foibles, on the other. God, we are told, wanted men never to divorce their wives, but Moses, realizing that men can be hard-hearted, deemed it better to allow them to divorce their wives than to force a couple to continue living together in hatred. Such comparisons undercut Moses' law and prepare the way for replacing it with something more ideal.
- b. In chapter 15 of the Acts of the Apostles, the Church council in Jerusalem is said to have decided that since Moses was only the national legislator of the Jews, there is no need to impose *him*, that is, his laws, upon non-Jews who are turning to *God*.<sup>14</sup>
- c. In Rom 10:4–6 Paul contrasts the Christ way to salvation, which is one of faith, to the Moses way, which is one of doing; the latter he illustrates by quoting, like CD 5, a verse from Leviticus 18. Had he considered Leviticus to be God's book, not Moses', Paul could not have suggested such a contrast.

Before we go on, I should underline that, as scholars have noted,<sup>15</sup> Luke went the furthest in this regard, in three ways. First, Luke, more than any other NT writer, links the Torah to Moses—from the Infancy

---

<sup>14</sup> For my interpretation of this chapter, see my, "The Futility of Preaching Moses (Acts 15, 21)," *Biblica* 67 (1986): 276–81.

<sup>15</sup> For these points and bibliography, see Schwartz, "Futility," 280. In general, see S. G. Wilson, *Luke and the Law* (SNTSMS 50; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983); T. Saito, *Die Mosevorstellungen im Neuen Testament* (Europäische Hochschulschriften 23.100; Bern: Peter Lang, 1977); and especially J. Lierman, *The New Testament Moses: Christian Perceptions of Moses and Israel in the Setting of Jewish Religion* (WUNT 2.173; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004), 156–58.



Narrative that begins his gospel, where Jesus' parents handle the baby in accordance with the Law of Moses (Luke 2:22), down to the end of Acts, where—first in Jerusalem (26:22) and then in Rome (28:23)—Paul argues with the Jews about Jesus, on the basis of what had been predicted by Moses and the prophets. Note well: he refers here to the authors, not to their books. For “Law of Moses” see also Acts 13:39 and 15:1, 5; as we noted above, in Acts 15 it is the association of the Law with Moses rather than with God that allows James to avoid imposing the Law on Gentiles. Second, and correspondingly, Luke frequently speaks of “Moses and the prophets,” which basically means “Moses and the other prophets” (Luke 24:27; 26:29, 31; Acts 26:22; 28:23); thus he makes Moses one—no matter how special—of a number of individuals and sets him up, as we noted, to be superseded. And third, Luke—alone among all New Testament writers—puts Deut 18:15, 18 to use so as to portray Jesus as the promised second Moses (Acts 3:22–23; 7:37); indeed, the whole emphasis on Moses in Acts 7 (Stephen's speech) is meant to back up the parallelism between Moses and Jesus. What I am suggesting is that these three points work together in a very functional way: if Moses was a prophet then it is easier to understand that his book could be superseded by the teaching of another prophet, and if Jesus is the second Moses his significance vis-à-vis the Torah is all the greater the more Moses is viewed as the Torah's author.

Parenthetically, I would add that Luke seems to have been quite aware that the Jewish opponents of the early Church refused to share his terminology, and he reflects that faithfully and artistically: the hardliners who accuse Stephen accuse him of speaking against the Holy Place and the Law *simpliciter* (Acts 6:13); the hardliners who attack Paul in Corinth accuse him of teaching people to worship in ways that are against “the Law” (18:13); and those who attack Paul in Jerusalem accuse him of preaching against “the people and the Law and this place” (21:28). In each case, Luke's response is to relativize the Law, to undermine the implication of the definite article used by the Gospel's opponents: it is law but given by Moses, who predicted he would be replaced by another prophet like himself (Ch. 7); it is not law but merely customs (Ch. 15); it is only “your (= the Jews') Law” (18:15); it is only the law of the fathers (22:3).

Now if we ask where in the Jewish world the New Testament writers got the idea of dealing with Moses this way, of associating him so closely with the Torah that it becomes more his than God's, it might seem sim-

plest to suppose that they got it from the world of Hellenistic Judaism. As I noted earlier, in that world it was common to portray Moses as the Jews' legislator (*nomothētēs*), even to the extent—as Yehoshua Amir has shown concerning Philo—of deriving the phrasing of the Torah from particulars of Moses' personality and talents.<sup>16</sup> So, assuming that Judaism and Jewish education in Paul's Tarsus were somewhat similar to those in Philo's Alexandria, it would be reasonable to trace Paul's focus on Moses to a Hellenistic Jewish background. However, this will not take us all that far. For if we want to understand the background of early Christian preoccupation with the prophets (and so with "Moses and the prophets"), we must note that Alexandrian Judaism seems to have had little use for the prophets apart from Moses.<sup>17</sup> Qumran, in contrast, of course gave them much attention and looked forward to the fulfillment of their prophecies; that is what the *pesharim* are all about. So, if we try to imagine where the author of Luke 24:27 got the idea that Jesus could explain everything that pertained to him, "beginning with Moses and all the prophets and in all the scriptures," Qumran would be a much likelier background.

Let me draw this together in a broader way. The New Testament is a collection of books that centers on a figure, Jesus, whose life, death and resurrection were believed, by the New Testament writers, to have revolutionized Judaism. But Judaism was based upon sacred writings, something not lightly revolutionized. The way the New Testament handles this is, for the most part, by presenting Jesus as the fulfillment of the prophecies in the middle division of the Hebrew Bible: those prophetic texts themselves, it is argued, had already promised the coming revolution. Hence the prominence of the Prophets, especially Isaiah, in the New Testament.<sup>18</sup> But this was not enough, for apart from the Prophets there were another two parts of the Bible to deal with. To some extent they were handled the same way: for the Torah one could make much of Moses' promise in Deut 18:15, 18 that God would raise up a prophet like him, and for the Hagiographa one could

---

<sup>16</sup> Y. Amir, *Die hellenistische Gestalt des Judentums bei Philon von Alexandria* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1983), 77–106.

<sup>17</sup> W. L. Knox, "A Note on Philo's Use of the Old Testament," *JTS* 41 (1940): 30–34; F. H. Colson, "Philo's Quotations from the Old Testament," *JTS* 41 (1940): 237–51.

<sup>18</sup> Note, for example, that the index of quotations printed in the back of the United Bible Society's *The Greek New Testament* (ed. K. Aland et al.; 2d ed.; London: United Bible Societies, 1968), has ten columns of references to citations from Isaiah—as many as it has for all of Exodus, Leviticus and Numbers.

use passages like Psalm 110, where David himself seems to refer to Jesus as being up there at the right hand of God. But a more basic and thoroughgoing New Testament response to the authority of the Old Testament, insofar as that was invested in the first and third divisions of the Hebrew Bible, was to claim that Jesus was himself of the type of Moses and David, a new and better version of both—mediator of a new covenant, and also Messiah. For this to work, it was necessary to make the Hebrew Bible focus on those two figures, so that supplanting those figures would *ipso facto* supplant their respective parts of the Bible. This the New Testament writers could hardly have learned from Alexandrian Judaism, on the one hand, since it seems to have given little attention to the third part of the Bible, as also to the second. Neither could they have learned this approach from rabbinic Judaism, which by and large abstained from viewing the first division of the Torah as Moses', and instead used such a view as a *topos* of heresy. But they could well have learned it from Qumran, which likewise believed in the continuity of divine revelation and, therefore, was willing to relativize, by personalizing, all previous installments.

## COMMUNITIES AND THEIR BOUNDARIES



TEMPLE AND RIGHTEOUSNESS IN QUMRAN AND EARLY  
CHRISTIANITY: TRACING THE SOCIAL DIFFERENCE  
BETWEEN THE TWO MOVEMENTS

EYAL REGEV  
*Bar-Ilan University*

INTRODUCTION

Since the beginning of the study of the religious and so-called sectarian texts discovered in the caves near Wadi Qumran, scholars have compared them with the New Testament texts. Most often, the aim is to elucidate the Jewish background of early Christianity, especially its eschatological terminology and messianic ideas.<sup>1</sup> Indeed, there are certain similarities between the two movements in their understandings of atonement and their hopes for salvation. Moreover, both tended to transfer sacrificial conceptions into forms of ritual or ethical behavior (prayer, ways of righteousness), or, in the case of early Christianity, christological beliefs, that were detached from the Temple cult.

However, did the two movements also share similar views concerning the nature of contemporary Jewish society and its religious institutions? The purpose of the present paper is to study the social ethos of these two movements, as portrayed in their own writings. In order to examine their approaches towards the surrounding world of those who were non-Qumranic or non-Christian, I will discuss their attitudes towards the system of Temple–priest–sacrifices on the one hand, and towards people outside the group who were still nonbelievers or sinners, on the other hand. Both trajectories will eventually lead to a reevaluation of the Qumranic and early Christian codes of behavior, emphasizing the differences between their respective social outlooks.

Due to the vast number of relevant sources that might serve as a basis for comparison, and the fact that most of them require some interpretation, I will focus only on a few selected texts and refer the

---

<sup>1</sup> See for example, C. A. Evans, “Jesus and the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment* (ed. P. W. Flint and J. C. VanderKam; 2 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 1998–1999), 2:573–98 and bibliography.

reader to my previous articles where I have discussed these issues in a more detailed fashion.<sup>2</sup> Another obstacle that should be noted at the outset is that the different early Christian communities (and, to a lesser degree, also the *yahad* and the group[s] described in the *Damascus Document*) were not united in their perceptions regarding the Temple or sinners. Consequently, it is impossible to make a precise characterization of each of the various conceptions. Rather, the following discussion has to be limited to a brief overview of the main conceptions that shaped the social formation of the Qumranites and various groups of early Christians.

#### THE QUMRANIC WITHDRAWAL FROM THE TEMPLE AND ITS CULT

The Qumran sects withdrew from the rest of Jewish society and did not take part in the Temple cult in Jerusalem. Scholars usually conclude that the rift concerning the Temple cult evolved due to halakhic controversies over calendar and sacrificial rites, citing the laws detailed in MMT,<sup>3</sup> the polemic in CD,<sup>4</sup> and the rewriting of the scriptural cultic laws in the *Temple Scroll*.<sup>5</sup> However, although it is reasonable to assume that the Qumranites were fated to stay outside the Temple cult as long as they held to these halakhic restrictions, the Qumranites saw their withdrawal in a different light; they condemned the Temple and its sacrifices because, in their view, the Jewish leaders were morally corrupt and morally defiled.

---

<sup>2</sup> "Abominated Temple and a Holy Community: The Formation of the Concepts of Purity and Impurity in Qumran," *DSD* 10 (2003): 243–78; "A Kingdom of Priests or a Holy (Gentile) People: The Temple in Early Christian Life and Thought," *Cathedra* 113 (2004): 5–34 (Hebrew); "Moral Impurity and the Temple in Early Christianity in Light of Qumranic Ideology and Ancient Greek Practice," *HTR* 97 (2004): 383–411.

<sup>3</sup> E. Qimron, "The Halakha," in E. Qimron and J. Strugnell, *Qumran Cave 4.V: Miqsat Ma'ase Ha-Torah* (DJD 10; Oxford: Clarendon, 1994), 123–77.

<sup>4</sup> CD 1:11–20, 2:5–9, 4:19–5:11.

<sup>5</sup> Y. Yadin, *The Temple Scroll* (3 vols; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society and the Shrine of the Book, 1977 [Hebrew]). For a conceptualization of the Qumranic perception of holiness that lies behind all these laws, see E. Regev, "Reconstructing Qumranic and Rabbinic Worldviews: Dynamic Holiness vs. Static Holiness," in *Rabbinic Perspectives: Rabbinic Literature and the Dead Sea Scrolls. Proceedings of the Eighth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 7–9 January, 2003* (ed. S. Fraade, A. Shemesh, and R. A. Clements; STDJ 62; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 87–112.

The Qumran sectarians believed that the Temple itself was polluted.<sup>6</sup> In *Peshar Habakkuk* the authors condemned the Hasmonean high priest and leader, whom they called “the Wicked Priest,” saying that he was “arrogant, [had] abandoned God, and [had] betrayed the laws for the sake of wealth. He stole and amassed the wealth of men of violence who had rebelled against God, and he took the wealth of people to add himself guilty sin. And abominated ways he practiced with every sort of unclean impurity.”<sup>7</sup> The Wicked Priest was also accused of having “committed abominable deeds (מעשי תועבות) and [having] defiled God’s Sanctuary.... He stole the wealth of the poor ones.”<sup>8</sup>

Similar condemnations were also directed towards another group, “the sons of the pit” named in CD 6:11–17. Here the members of the community were called to “separate (themselves) from the sons of the pit and to refrain from the wicked wealth (which is) *impure due to oath(s) and dedication(s) and to (being) the wealth of the sanctuary*, (for) they (the sons of the pit) steal from the poor of his people, preying upon wid[ow]s and murdering orphans.” Here the “wicked,” stolen money was infected by impurity, and so when it was donated to the sanctuary (that is, to the Temple’s treasury) it caused the pollution of the cult.<sup>9</sup>

#### EARLY CHRISTIAN PERCEPTIONS OF THE TEMPLE: PARTICIPATION, ANALOGY, CRITICISM, AND REJECTION

Many studies have been devoted to the approaches of Jesus, Paul and different Christian texts or groups to the Temple and its cult. Some

---

<sup>6</sup> Regev, “Abominated Temple and a Holy Community,” 256–62. See also D. R. Schwartz, “The Three Temples of 4QFlorilegium,” *RevQ* 10 (1979–1981): 83–89. Admittedly, a more moderate approach can be found in CD. See P. R. Davies, “The Ideology of the Temple in the Damascus Document,” *JJS* 33 (*Essays in Honour of Yigael Yadin*) (1982): 287–301.

<sup>7</sup> 1QpHab 8:8–13 (*peshar* on Hab 2:5–6). Translation of the *pesharim* follows M. P. Horgan, *Pesharim: Qumran Interpretations of Biblical Books* (CBQMS 8; Washington, D.C.: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1979).

<sup>8</sup> 1QpHab 12:7–10 (*peshar* on Hab 2:17). On the moral dimension of impurity in this passage, see also J. Klawans, *Impurity and Sin in Ancient Judaism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 69–72.

<sup>9</sup> For the interpretation of this passage, see J. Murphy-O’Connor, “The Translation of Damascus Document VI 11–14,” *RevQ* 7 (1969–1971): 553–56. The paragraph actually begins with a citation of Mal 1:10 and a reference to the correct sacrificial rites. Another case of moral defilement of the Temple is mentioned in the *Temple Scroll* 51:11–15, in relation to the taking of bribes by judges (cf. Klawans, *Impurity and Sin*, 49–51).



seem to take for granted an early Christian understanding of Jesus' death as atonement in a single act for all human sins,<sup>10</sup> which obviated the need for animal sacrifices and priestly ritual; they have thus argued that these first believers had no need to feel committed to the Temple and the sacrificial system.<sup>11</sup> Only a few scholars, such as D. R. Schwartz and E. P. Sanders, have taken the opposite view and asserted that the synoptic gospels (especially Luke) evince a positive appreciation of the Temple.<sup>12</sup>

I think that if one examines all the first-century Christian texts which are relevant vis-à-vis the relation to their immediate context and without prejudice, most of the treatments of the Temple and the sacrificial rites will seem quite sympathetic. In another study,<sup>13</sup> I introduced a classification of the New Testament references to the Temple and sacrifices into four categories: participation, analogy, criticism, and rejection. Only the last-named category really justifies the commonly held view that the early Christians substituted new alternatives for the Temple.

Indirect *participation* in the Temple cult, namely, visiting the Temple (or the Temple Mount), is attributed to Jesus in Mark, Luke and John. In Luke, for example, Jesus visits the Temple Mount several times.<sup>14</sup> At the age of twelve, when Jesus stays in the Temple without notifying his parents, he explains that he had to be close to "his father," thus acknowledging the spatial sacredness of the Temple.<sup>15</sup> In Acts, the apostles in Jerusalem, including Paul, are depicted as taking part in

<sup>10</sup> 1 Cor 15:3. See also Rom 3:21–26; 6:1–11; 2 Cor 5:17–21; Gal 1:4; Mark 10:45// Matt 20:28.

<sup>11</sup> C. F. D. Moule, "Sanctuary and Sacrifice in the Church of the New Testament," *JTS* 1 (1950): 29–41; J. McKelvey, *The New Temple: The Church in the New Testament* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1969); G. Klinzing, *Die Umdeutung des Kultus in der Qumrangemeinde und im NT* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971); M. J. Borg, *Conflict, Holiness and Politics in the Teaching of Jesus* (New York: Edwin Mellen, 1984); G. Theissen and A. Merz, *The Historical Jesus: A Comprehensive Guide* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1996), 431–37, 528.

<sup>12</sup> D. R. Schwartz, "Priesthood, Temple, Sacrifices: Opposition and Spiritualization in the Late Second Temple Period" (Ph.D. diss., The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1979), 56–59, 117–19, 124–25; E. P. Sanders, "Jerusalem and its Temple in Early Christian Thought and Practice," in *Jerusalem: Its Sanctity and Centrality to Judaism, Christianity, and Islam* (ed. L. I. Levine; New York: Continuum, 1999), 90–103. See further below.

<sup>13</sup> Regev, "Kingdom of Priests."

<sup>14</sup> Luke 2:25–38, 41–50. Luke also emphasizes the commitment of Jesus' parents to the sacrificial rites (2:22–24, 39) and to making the yearly Passover pilgrimage to Jerusalem (2:41).

<sup>15</sup> Luke 2:49. Cf. also the revelation of the angel to John's father near the incense altar inside the sanctuary (Luke 1:9–20).

certain activities (mostly prayer and teaching), without the slightest evidence of resisting the sacrificial cult.<sup>16</sup> Although these texts may not reflect historical events in an accurate way, the fact that they emphasize such participation does not correspond to the scholarly view that Jesus' death was held to substitute for the cult. On the contrary, I think that in Luke–Acts at least, the aim of these descriptions is to demonstrate that belief in Jesus does *not* contradict a commitment to the Temple cult.<sup>17</sup> One may also understand them as historical, inasmuch as they attest to the fact that Jesus or the apostles had a special interest in the Temple cult and the human interactions surrounding it.<sup>18</sup>

*Analogies* between the Temple/sacrifices and the community/believer (or between the serving priest and the apostle) are introduced in a positive light in the letters of Paul. I maintain that these “spiritualized” analogies are not meant to “transfer” the cult to new realms but are merely metaphorical expressions of the sanctity of the community. There is no indication that the community or the believer replaces the Temple itself. There is no explicit language of substitution when Paul says to the Corinthians “You are a shrine (*naos*) to God” (1 Cor 3:16). On the contrary, the analogies draw on the supposition that the Temple is an archetype of holiness and sanctity without any attempt to invalidate its *original* image.

In order to illustrate this point I would like to examine Jesus' sayings in the Last Supper: “this is my body,” when he broke the bread and gave it to his disciples, and “this is my blood of the covenant, which is poured out for many,” when he took the cup and gave thanks and offered it to them (Mark 14:22–24; cf. Matt 26:26–28; Luke 22:10–12; 1 Cor 11:23–25; John 6:51–58). Some commentators have read Mark and Paul to imply that Jesus substituted the symbols of his own body for elements of the (Paschal) sacrifice, transforming himself into a sacrifice of atonement for sins (compare 1 Cor 15:3).<sup>19</sup> However, as Jonathan

<sup>16</sup> Acts 2:46; 3:1–11; 5:12; 21:23–25.

<sup>17</sup> Sanders, “Jerusalem and its Temple”; P. F. Esler, *Community and Gospel in Luke–Acts: The Social and Political Motivations of Lucan Theology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 131–63.

<sup>18</sup> C. K. Barrett, “Attitudes to the Temple in the Acts of the Apostles,” in *Templum Amicitiae: Essays on the Second Temple Presented to Ernst Bammel* (ed. W. Horbury; JSNTSup 48; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991), 345–67.

<sup>19</sup> R. J. Daly, *Christian Sacrifice: The Judaeo-Christian Background Before Origen* (Catholic University of America Studies in Christian Antiquity 18; Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1978), 221–25, 491–508; B. Chilton, *The Temple of Jesus: His Sacrificial Program Within a Cultural History of Sacrifice* (University Park,

Klawans recently asserted, the text itself contains only a metaphor of the bread and wine as sacrifice, without claiming that Jesus' flesh and blood will be a substitute for sacrificial rites in the future. Using such a metaphor does not necessarily mean that the signified is fully identical with the signifier. As Klawans emphasizes, the use of such a metaphor or analogy of sacrifice as a model for the relationship between Jesus and his followers actually attests to the strength of the sacrificial metaphor within the earliest Christian circles.<sup>20</sup> Furthermore, how can one ascribe to Jesus such an initial rejection of sacrifice while he is portrayed as dining at the Passover sacrificial meal with his disciples?

I would suggest that this interpretive lens may be used, although cautiously, in reading the analogies of Temple and sacrifice in the letters of Paul as well. Paul portrayed the community of believers as a temple or a shrine (1 Cor 3:16; 6:19; 2 Cor 6:14–7:1), and their faith and service as like a sacrifice (Rom 12:1; 2 Cor 2:14–15). He also portrayed himself as a priest of Jesus and God who is virtually sanctifying and offering the gentiles to God (Rom 15:16, following Isaiah 66:20); and as a libation poured on the sacrifice of the Philippians' belief (Phil 2:17). In 1 Cor 10:16–21, Paul compares the Eucharist with sacrificial meals.

Now, why did Paul use so many analogies involving the language of Temple and sacrifices to describe the relationship between Jesus or God and the believers? It seems that Temple, sacrifice, and priest are characterized in these analogies in an extremely favorable light; it would be a disgrace to draw an analogy between the most sublime Christian beliefs and an irrelevant Jewish cultic practice. Again, there is no trace of terms of substitution such as those found in Hebrews (7:11–19), since Paul does not say that the community is *the* new Temple or sacrifice, replacing that in Jerusalem; he only claims that they are *like* a temple or sacrifice.<sup>21</sup> Moreover, when Paul speaks of temple and sacrifices, one may think that since his audience is Greek gentiles, Paul has in mind pagan cults.<sup>22</sup> However, Paul's metaphorical world has strong Jewish roots; he tends to make extensive use of biblical prooftexts and exegesis,

---

Pa.: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1992), 138–54; Theissen and Merz, *Historical Jesus*, 431–36.

<sup>20</sup> J. Klawans, "Interpreting the Last Supper: Sacrifice, Spiritualization, and Anti-Sacrifice, *NTS* 48 (2002): 1–17.

<sup>21</sup> J. R. Lanci, *A New Temple for Corinth: Rhetorical and Archaeological Approaches to Pauline Imagery* (New York: Peter Lang, 1997).

<sup>22</sup> M. E. Thrall, *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians* (ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994), 476. For the view that Temple metaphor is a common rhetoric device in early Roman literature, see Lanci, *A New Temple for Corinth*, 121–28.

as well as of Jewish halakhic terms (the gentile reader-response to such rhetoric still requires further study).<sup>23</sup> More to the point, Paul uses an analogy drawn from cultic halakhah when he compares the relationship between gentile and Jewish believers to the separation of the priest's portion from the dough (Rom 11:16).

Although Paul spoke against the authority of the Torah, he never invalidated the Temple and its cult. True, Paul did introduce an alternative means of atonement, but he never explicitly asserted that the role and function of the Temple were exhausted.<sup>24</sup> In his epistles, Paul never speaks of his adherence to or withdrawal from the Temple cult. However, when Luke insists upon several occasions that Paul did visit and pray in the Temple (Acts 21:23–26; 22:17; 24:17), we should take his account more seriously and not simply dismiss it as mere apologetics.<sup>25</sup> One should also bear in mind that scholars are still debating to what extent Paul's epistles to the gentiles and the Acts account (in which Paul is portrayed as an observant Jew), are respectively indicative of his own religious behavior or Jewish identity.<sup>26</sup> I suggest that since Paul used the imagery of Temple and sacrifices as a model for sacredness and closeness to God, he had some appreciation for the Jewish cult.<sup>27</sup> Whether or not Paul was an observant participant in the Temple cult is another matter that requires a separate discussion.

*Criticism* of the Temple in the New Testament documents is quite rare. It may be found in Jesus' "cleansing" of the Temple (Mark 11:15–17 and par.) and in Mark 13:1–2 (where Jesus proclaims the destruction of the Temple).<sup>28</sup> Criticism, however, is not rejection or denial. When witnesses ascribe to Jesus the saying that he will destroy the Temple,

---

<sup>23</sup> P. J. Tomson, *Paul and the Jewish Law: Halakha in the Letters of the Apostle to the Gentiles* (CRINT 3.1; Assen: Van Gorcum; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990); E. P. Sanders, *Paul, the Law, and the Jewish People* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983).

<sup>24</sup> E. P. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977), 463–66, 499–501. For an opposing view see W. D. Davies, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism: Some Rabbinic Elements in Pauline Theology* (3d ed.; London: S.P.C.K., 1970), 237–42.

<sup>25</sup> As does, e.g., J. A. Fitzmyer, in *The Acts of the Apostles* (AB 31; New York: Doubleday, 1998), 145–47 and see bibliography there.

<sup>26</sup> For Paul's observance of Jewish Law in his own private life see, e.g., the portrayal in Acts 18:18; Davies, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism*, 69–84, 136–45, 221–23; Tomson, *Paul and Jewish Law*, esp. 11–19, 274–81.

<sup>27</sup> For similar conclusions, see now, A. L. A. Hogeterp, *Paul and God's Temple* (Biblical Tools and Studies 2; Leuven: Peeters, 2006).

<sup>28</sup> On these passages as a reaction to the Zealots during the Great Revolt, see J. Markus, "The Jewish War and the *Sitz im Leben* of Mark," *JBL* 103 (1992): 441–62.

they also claim that he said that he would build another one “not made with hands” within three days (Mark 14:57–59 and par.).<sup>29</sup> Thus, at least according to this version of the saying, Jesus (or his followers) saw a special importance in the Temple and aspired to a better one. The same approach should be followed regarding the scene of Jesus’ “cleansing” of the Temple (Mark 11:15–17 and par.). Although there are many conceptions of what Jesus meant by this remarkable act, most interpreters regard it as a “prophetic” message, that is, rebuking the Jews for their behavior in the precincts of the Temple. Rarely has this act been interpreted as a total rejection of the Temple cult. According to my own understanding, Jesus did not criticize the priests or the Temple institutions, but rather rebuked the unrighteous people who contaminated the Temple with their corrupt money (see Appendix).

*Rejection* of the Temple and its cult is found only in three texts: the Gospel of John, the Letter to the Hebrews, and Revelation. In these texts, replacement cultic systems are introduced, imitating major components of the traditional sacrificial rituals. In John 4:21–24 Jesus implicitly speaks against the Temple worship, and in 2:13–21 his resurrection is portrayed as a new Temple.<sup>30</sup> In Hebrews the traditional cult is explicitly invalidated, while Jesus is proclaimed the new High Priest serving in the heavenly Temple, as well as the ultimate sacrifice that sanctifies both flesh and spirit.<sup>31</sup> In Revelation there is no Temple in the New Jerusalem, since “its Temple is the Lord God, and the Lamb” (21:22). In place of an earthly Temple, there is a heavenly and ideal one, where the (lost) holy ark is placed (11:9). The believers themselves are the priests (1:6; cf. 5:10; 20:6).<sup>32</sup>

I think that it is unwarranted to postulate that positions similar to those of John, Hebrews, and Revelation were held by Jesus, Peter, Mark, Luke, or even Paul. I have tried to show that there are numerous

---

<sup>29</sup> On the versions of this saying and the question of its authenticity see J. D. Crossan, *The Historical Jesus: A Life of a Mediterranean Jewish Peasant* (New York: HarperCollins, 1991), 355–60. On the problem of authenticity and its implications for reconstructing Jesus’ “trial,” see E. Regev, “Temple or Messiah: On the Trial of Jesus, the Temple and the Roman Policy,” *Cathedra* 119 (2006): 13–36 (Hebrew).

<sup>30</sup> See R. E. Brown, *The Gospel According to John I–XII* (AB 29; New York: Doubleday, 1966) 122–125. For a somewhat positive view of John’s attitude towards the Temple, see J. Lieu, “Temple and Synagogue in John,” *NTS* 45 (1999): 51–64.

<sup>31</sup> See H. W. Attridge, *The Epistle to the Hebrews* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1989), 10–31.

<sup>32</sup> For a general overview, see R. Bauckham, *The Theology of the Book of Revelation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993).

nonpolemical references to the Temple and the sacrificial system, which I have classified as participation and analogy, and there is also an absence of explicit (or any) rejections and substitutions for the Temple cult outside of John, Hebrews, and Revelation. Thus, I conclude that most early Christians viewed the Temple and its cult favorably, and that the Temple played a significant role in their belief system. Some of them, presumably including Jesus and his disciples, probably felt committed to it in a practical way.

Since the authors of Hebrews and Revelation rejected the sacrificial system and introduced alternative holiness systems, it appears that they actually acknowledged the importance of its symbolism and tried to cope with the strong impact that the Temple had upon the imaginations of their fellow Christians. Their purpose was virtually to tear the traditional Jewish Temple from the heart of the Jesus-believers (notwithstanding that at least by the writing of Revelation it was already physically nonexistent). However, the fact is that in order to do so these writers had to introduce a very detailed imaginary sacrificial system that would fulfill the same functions as sacrifice and worship centered on the Temple cult.

#### THE MORAL CODE OF THE QUMRAN SECT AS A SECTARIAN WORLDVIEW

As seen in the Qumranic attitude towards the Wicked Priest and the Temple, the Qumran sectarians defined reality in dualistic terms of righteousness versus wickedness. Only those who were acknowledged as just and pious could enter the *yahad*. The people outside the sect were considered wicked and morally impure. One of the main presuppositions of the *Community Rule* is that the members of the community were to “separate from the congregation of the men of injustice (אנשי העול).”<sup>33</sup> That is, the members of the community were required to withdraw from those who might have morally defiled their holy spirits, as well as their bodies (cf. also CD 5:7–11, 7:3–4). The *Community Rule* develops the strong association of sin with impurity and thus aims to prevent any contact with the wicked in order to avoid defilement. Thus,

---

<sup>33</sup> 1QS 5:2–3. This passage is attested in the earliest versions of the *Community Rule* (4QS<sup>d</sup>, 4QS<sup>e</sup>). See S. Metso, *The Textual Development of the Qumran Community Rule* (STDJ 21; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 41, 44–45.

immorality, wickedness, and their spiritually and physically defiling consequences seem to pervade the entire world outside the realm of the Qumran sect. Similar perceptions (although somewhat less rigorous) are also found in the *Damascus Document*, both in the Admonition and in the rules.<sup>34</sup>

As for the members of the Qumran sects, according to the *Community Rule* they aspired to be purified from all sins, and practiced rituals and ablutions in order to maintain a state of moral and physical purity. Consequently, novices were accepted after a long, gradual procedure in order to make sure they were entitled to join the sect and would not contaminate the communal meal and “liquids” with their wickedness. Transgressing members who lied about financial issues, gossiped about other members, bore a grudge, answered other members stubbornly or addressed them impatiently were punished by exclusion from the community’s pure “liquids” and meals. In cases of grave sins such as transgressing the Sabbath laws, they were expelled from the sect.<sup>35</sup> In Qumran, wickedness and sin thus had a defiling, coercive and dynamic force that was overcome by prayer, study of scripture and moral behavior. The total defeat of evil and moral impurity would happen only on the eschatological Day of Judgment.

The fundamental place of moral behavior in the Qumranic religious system can be illustrated in several passages in which acts of righteousness serve as means of atonement. According to IQS 8:3 one of the purposes of the “council” of the *yahad* is “to pay for iniquity by works

<sup>34</sup> CD 4:12<sup>b</sup>–19; 7:9–8:10; J. M. Baumgarten, “‘The Sons of Dawn’ in CDC 13:14–15 and the Ban on Commerce among the Essenes,” *IEJ* 33 (1983): 81–85.

<sup>35</sup> L. H. Schiffman, *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls: The History of Judaism, the Background of Christianity, the Lost Library of Qumran* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1994), 97–104, 299; idem, *Sectarian Law in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Courts, Testimony, and Penal Code* (BJS 33; Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press, 1983) [= *Law, Custom, and Messianism in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Jerusalem: Zalman Shazar, 1993), 136–267 (Hebrew)]. For the view that these regulations were meant to protect from moral (and not ritual) impurity, see Schiffman, *Law, Custom, and Messianism*, 252, 267. Cf. Klawans, *Impurity and Sin*, 79–88. For purification rites, note IQS 3:6–12; see J. M. Baumgarten, “The Purification Liturgies,” in Flint and VanderKam, *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years*, 2:200–212. Klawans, *Impurity and Sin*, 85–91, concludes that only in Qumran was moral impurity considered ritually defiling; thus, for the Qumranites, repentance also required ritual purification. In all other ancient Jewish systems, including those represented in the New Testament (*ibid.*, 150), moral defilement violated holiness alone, and thus required atonement, but not ritual purification.

of judgment.”<sup>36</sup> Another more complex and ambiguous passage is 1QS 9:3–5, in which atonement through sacrifices is replaced by atonement through prayer, judgment, and the perfect of the way:

These (men) become in Israel a foundation of the Holy spirit in eternal truth, they shall atone for iniquitous guilt and sinful unfaithfulness, so that (God’s) favor for the land (is obtained) without flesh of burnt offerings and without the fat of sacrifices. The proper offerings of the lips for *judgment* (is as) a *righteous sweetness*, and *the perfect of the Way* (are as) a pleasing freewill offering.<sup>37</sup>

The exact translation and meaning of this passage requires a certain clarification. The phrase *ותרומת שפתים למשפט בניחוח צדק* is sometimes translated as “prayer rightly offered,”<sup>38</sup> where “judgment” serves as an adverb describing the act of prayer. This understanding follows the meaning of *כמשפט* as “done rightly,” or according to the law.<sup>39</sup> However, in 1QS 9:5 we find *למשפט* as a noun. Virtually all other occurrences of this form of *mishpat* (“judgment”) with *lamed* as a prefix also seem to mean judgment as a noun.<sup>40</sup> Hence from a grammatical point of view I doubt whether judgment should be taken as directly describing prayer. The following metaphor, *בניחוח צדק*, “as a righteous sweetness,” alludes to righteous behavior which accompanies sacrifice, *זבחי צדק*, “sacrifices of righteousness.”<sup>41</sup> Thus, I prefer interpreting *למשפט* as an independent noun. “Acts of judgment” would better accord with the metaphor of offering righteousness to the Lord. Moreover, the next phrase, *ותמים דרך כנדבת מנחת רצון*, “and the perfect of the Way (are as) a pleasing freewill offering” would more plausibly parallel moral

<sup>36</sup> Or rather, “through those who pursue judgment.” See the alternative interpretation of J. Licht, *The Rule Scroll: A Scroll from the Wilderness of Judaea*, 1QS 1QSa 1QSB. Text, Introduction and Commentary (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1965), 179 (Hebrew). Translations of 1QS follow *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations. Vol. 1: The Rule of the Community and Related Documents* (ed. J. H. Charlesworth; Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck]; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1994).

<sup>37</sup> *ליסוד רוח קודש לאמת עולם לכפר על אשמת פשע ומעל חטאת ולרצון לארץ מבשר עולות ומחלבי זבח ותרומת שפתים למשפט בניחוח צדק ותמים דרך כנדבת מנחת רצון*. See also the parallel 4QS<sup>d</sup> 2 ii 5–6. For a more subtle parallel, see 1QS 8:2–10/4QS<sup>c</sup> 2:8–15. (“to pay for iniquity by works of judgment”).

<sup>38</sup> E.g., Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*, 229.

<sup>39</sup> See, for example, CD 7:2–3, 7; *Temple Scroll* 18:5.

<sup>40</sup> CD 12:21; 1QS 5:3, 12; 9:25; 1QSa 1:25; 4Q259 2:15; 4Q418 69 ii 7; *Temple Scroll* 57:13.

<sup>41</sup> Deut 33:19; Pss 4:6; 51:21.



conduct than pious prayer. I thus maintain that “the offering of the lips for *judgment* (is as) a *righteous sweetness*, and *the perfect of the Way* (are as) a pleasing freewill offering” means that not only prayer, but *especially* moral behavior, atones for wrongdoing.<sup>42</sup>

Similarly, there is a contrast between the immorality of the sect’s opponents and the righteousness of the Qumran community. The latter’s moral conduct or moral self-identity code is posted as an alternative to the traditional cultic system that has been contaminated by wickedness. Furthermore, an analogy between the communal punishment and the sacrifices of atonement and purgation of the sin from the altar (*ḥaṭṭat* and *’asham*) is drawn in 4QD<sup>e</sup> 7 i 15–17 and 4QD<sup>a</sup> 11 1–3:

Any[one] who [...] shall enter and make it known to the priest [in cha]rge over the many, and he shall receive his judgment with goodwill, as he has said through Moses concerning the one who sins unintentionally, that they shall bring his sin-offering and his guilt-offering.<sup>43</sup>

This attitude towards sacrifices and atonement is revolutionary. Here moral behavior—in this case, the willing acceptance of one’s penalty—replaces sacrifices. Ethics and discipline substitute for Temple rituals.<sup>44</sup>

For the Qumran sectarians the Temple was infected with moral pollution in a way that made it impossible to atone for sins through Temple rites until those outside the sect collectively repented. The sectarians therefore believed that the only alternative left for them was to adhere to a standard of strict moral behavior, divorced from the Temple. They

<sup>42</sup> Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*, 302, concludes that, “Righteousness and suffering in effect take the place of sacrifices, which is also more or less suggested by 9:4f, where ‘the perfection of the way’ is considered as a substitute for sacrifices.”

<sup>43</sup> כל אי[ש] אשר [ ] יבוא וידעוהו לכהן [ המ]ופקד על הרבים וקבל את משפטו מרצונו כאשר אמר ביד מושה על הנפש אשר תחטה בשיגגה אשר יביאו את חטתו ואת אשמו. For the composite text of 4QD and the ritual discussed in this passage, see C. Hempel, *The Laws of the Damascus Document: Sources, Tradition, and Redaction* (STDJ 29; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 175–79, who also notes the close relation of this passage to the *Community Rule*. Translation follows Hempel, *Laws*, 176.

<sup>44</sup> For the fundamental Qumranic concern with atonement see H. Lichtenberger, “Atonement and Sacrifice in the Qumran Community,” in *Approaches to Ancient Judaism: Theory and Practice* (ed. W. S. Green; BJS 9; 5 vols.; Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press, 1980), 2:159–71. Previous discussions focused on the phenomenon of prayers as a substitute for sacrifices (CD 11:20–21), as well as on the assumption that the sectarian community constituted a “human Temple” (following 4Q174 *Florilegium*). The meaning and significance of moral behavior as a cultic aim of worship and atonement, however, also deserves attention. On prayer at Qumran, see B. Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer and Religious Poetry* (STDJ 12; Leiden: Brill, 1994). On the “human Temple” theory, see Klinzing, *Die Umdeutung des Kultus*, 50–106.

believed that holiness or divine presence had been eliminated from the sanctuary because of the sins and guilt of those outside the sect; the Divine Presence could still dwell among their own group, the righteous “remnant,” precisely because they did not take part in the traditional sacrificial cult.

SIN, WEALTH, AND THE ACCEPTANCE OF SINNERS IN  
EARLY CHRISTIANITY

In a manner quite similar to that of the Qumranites, the early Christians viewed sin as defiling. The most famous expression of this idea is found in Mark 7:1–23. Jesus reacts to Pharisaic criticism of his disciples for neglecting the ritual of washing hands before the meal and replies to the Pharisees’ rebuke: “There is nothing from outside of a person which, when it goes into a person, is able to defile (κοινῶσαι) him; but the things that come out of a person are the ones that defile a person” (Mark 7:15). The passage in Mark 7 then continues: “(20) And he said: ‘It is what comes out of a person that defiles. (21) For it is from within, out of the human heart, that evil intentions come: fornication, theft, murder, (22) adultery, avarice, wickedness, deceit (δόλος), licentiousness, envy, slander, pride, folly. (23) All these things come from within, and they defile.’” Although it is difficult to ascertain what part of the passage Mark found in his source and what part he himself created, this teaching is undoubtedly rooted in the synoptic tradition.<sup>45</sup> Other attestations of this idea are ascribed to Jesus in Q (Luke 11:38–41// Matt 23:25–26) and *Gospel of Thomas* 14 (“For what goes into your mouth will not defile you: rather, it is what comes out of your mouth that will defile you”).<sup>46</sup>

---

<sup>45</sup> For the authenticity of Mark 7:4, 15, see R. P. Booth, *Jesus and the Laws of Purity: Tradition History and Legal History in Mark 7* (JSNTSup 13; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1986), 49–53, 67–114. For the literary development of Mark 7:1–23 and the view that vv. 21–23 are a later Markan insertion, see J. Markus, *Mark 1–8* (AB 27; New York: Doubleday, 2000), 443, 447–48, 460–62. The passage is paralleled in Matt 15:11, 17–20. In Matt 15:11 Jesus states: “For out of the heart come evil intentions, murder, adultery, fornication, theft, false witness, slander.”

<sup>46</sup> See also *Gospel of Thomas* 89. On Luke 11:38–41 and its relationship to Matt 23:25–26, see J. S. Kloppenborg, *The Formation of Q: Trajectories in Ancient Wisdom Collections* (Studies in Antiquity and Christianity; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987), 139–40, 147, who views Luke’s version as original. Booth, Dunn and Klawans interpret Mark 7:15 (“not what goes inside, rather what goes outside defiles”) as implying that the impurity of what goes out of the mouth is *more important* than that of what goes into

The concept of moral impurity also had a special place in the theology of John the Baptist and Paul. John called for and pursued a combination of ritual baptism in the Jordan's water together with moral repentance.<sup>47</sup> Flusser and Taylor follow Josephus's depiction (*Ant.* 18.117) and argue that John demanded moral purity, namely, repentance for one's sins, as a prerequisite for the final ritual purification in the water.<sup>48</sup> However, Klawans deemphasizes the role of ritual impurity and concludes that "John's baptism worked as a moral purification, effecting atonement by purifying individuals from moral defilement."<sup>49</sup> In any event, the early Christians believed that Jesus' forerunner called for a certain connection between ritual (or rather, symbolic) purification by immersion, on the one hand, and redemption of sins, on the other hand. Indeed, it is striking that early Christian traditions portray both John and Jesus as struggling with the same problem, namely, the connection between sin and impurity.

The idea that immoral behavior produces a certain metaphorical, spiritual defilement is frequent in the letters of Paul.<sup>50</sup> For instance, according to 1 Cor 5:9–13, what is considered polluting is misbehavior, especially in sexual matters. In 1 Cor. 6:9–11 Paul claims that baptism

---

the mouth. A similar structure or rhetorical pattern is also attested in Mark 2:17 ("I come not to call the righteous, but sinners"). Furthermore, such interpretation also suits the more general view that Jesus did not reject the Levitical purity laws, since hand washing (outside of the context of the sacrificial cult) was not a traditional Levitical practice but an innovation of the late Second Temple period. See Booth, *Jesus and the Laws of Purity*, 69–71 and bibliography; J. D. G. Dunn, "Jesus and Ritual Purity: A Study of the Tradition-History of Mark 7:15," in *Jesus, Paul, and the Law: Studies in Mark and Galatians* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1990), 51 and bibliography; Klawans, *Impurity and Sin*, 147–48.

<sup>47</sup> For the baptism of John, see Matt 3:2//Luke 3:3; Matt 3:6//Mark 1:5; Matt 3:8//Luke 3:8; Matt 3:11. See also J. P. Meier, *A Marginal Jew: Rethinking the Historical Jesus. Volume Two: Mentor, Message, and Miracles* (3 vols; New York: Doubleday, 1994), 49–56, who emphasized the idea of repentance and the eschatological character of John's baptism as well as its distinctiveness from the ablutions at Qumran.

<sup>48</sup> For the relationship between the ritual and the moral/spiritual components, see: D. Flusser, "The Baptism of John and the Dead Sea Sect," in idem, *Jewish Sources in Early Christianity* (Tel Aviv: Sifriat Hapoalim, 1979), 84–89 (Hebrew); idem, "The Dead Sea Sect and Pre-Pauline Christianity," in idem, *Judaism and the Origins of Christianity* (Jerusalem: The Hebrew University Magnes Press, 1988), 50–54; J. E. Taylor, *The Immerser: John the Baptist within Second Temple Judaism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 88–100.

<sup>49</sup> Klawans, *Impurity and Sin*, 139–43 (citation from 143). Klawans views the immersion itself as a ceremonial act which did not involve any actual ritual purification.

<sup>50</sup> Rom 1:18–30; 6:19; 1 Cor 5–6; 2 Cor 12:21; Gal 5:19–21; 1 Thess 4:7; Phil 2:15. See Klawans, *Impurity and Sin*, 151–56.

purifies moral impurity: adulterers, thieves, greedy people, etc., may be washed (ἀπολούω), sanctified, and justified “in the name of [our] Lord Jesus Christ and the Spirit of God.”<sup>51</sup> Thus, Paul stresses a specific dimension of the baptism rite: purification from moral defilement.<sup>52</sup>

Among all the explicit and implicit references to immoral behavior in the Jesus traditions in the synoptic gospels, perhaps the most frequent are those to the corrupting force of wealth. Throughout almost all the traditions about Jesus, and especially in the Sermon on the Mount, Q, and the parables, two substantial problems are intertwined: immorality and money. In these traditions, Jesus preaches about moral behavior,<sup>53</sup> emphasizing that immorality produces impurity. He also speaks of the destitute as potentially more righteous than the rich and treats wealth unfavorably.<sup>54</sup> These two teachings lead to an obvious conclusion: Wealth and materialism lead one astray from the true worship of God and from moral behavior, for “No one can serve two masters. . . . You cannot serve God and Mammon” (Matt 6:24//Luke 16:13).<sup>55</sup> The

---

<sup>51</sup> M. Newton, *The Concept of Purity at Qumran and in the Letters of Paul* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), 81–84. Cf. A. F. Segal, *Paul the Convert: The Apostolate and Apostasy of Saul the Pharisee* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990), 169–70, 177.

<sup>52</sup> See W. A. Meeks, *The First Urban Christians: The Social World of the Apostle Paul* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983), 153–54. There are other passages where Paul connects immoral behavior with impurity. In Gal 5:19–21, Paul mentions impurity in relation to fornication, jealousy, anger, envy, and other kinds of misbehavior. Cf. H. D. Betz, *Galatians: A Commentary on Paul's letter to the Churches in Galatia* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979), 281–90. In 2 Cor 12:21 Paul associates impurity with fornication and lasciviousness, while in Rom 6:19 impurity is mentioned in relation to wickedness. For further non-Pauline evidence see Eph 5:3–5; Jas 3:6 (cf. 3:17); 4:8; 1 Pet 1:12; 3:21.

<sup>53</sup> Cf. Luke's parables of mercy 7:41–43; 10:30–37; 13:6–9; 15:3–7; 15:8–10 (//Matt 18:10–14); 15:11–32; 18:9–14; Borg, *Conflict, Holiness, and Politics*, 105ff. Crossan, *The Historical Jesus*, 292, 294, characterizes Jesus' message as pertaining to the “ethical Kingdom.”

<sup>54</sup> See, e.g., Matt 5:3–6//Luke 6:20–31; Matt 6:19–21//Luke 12:33–34; Matt 23:23//Luke 11:42; Mark 10:17–25//Matt 19:16–23//Luke 18:18–25; Mark 10:21; Luke 14:33; Crossan, *The Historical Jesus*, 268–282. Note that Jesus' exhortations are general, with no specific rebuking of priestly immorality. The problem of the corrupting force of wealth is also central in Qumran. See C. M. Murphy, *Wealth in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Qumran Community* (STDJ 40; Leiden: Brill, 2002).

<sup>55</sup> See Betz, *The Sermon on the Mount*, 454–59. On the moral corruption of money, see 1 Tim 6:10; R. H. Hiers, “Friends by Unrighteous Mammon,” *JAAR* 38 (1970): 30–36; P. W. Van der Horst, “Mammon,” in *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible* (ed. K. van der Toorn, B. Becking, and P. W. van der Horst; 2d ed.; Leiden: Brill; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), 542–43, and bibliography. This idea is attested in Qumranic and rabbinic teachings. See: S. Safrai and D. Flusser, “The Slave of Two Masters,” in Flusser, *Judaism and the Origins of Christianity*, 169–72.

perception that wealth corrupts was central to the development of the early Christian movements and led to an idealization of poverty and resentment against the injustice of the rich.<sup>56</sup>

The notion that sin defiles has social characteristics and implications previously unnoticed by scholars. It influenced the social interactions of the earliest Christians with outsiders. I will demonstrate that there is an interesting relationship between this notion and the acceptance of sinners in early Christianity.

The close interaction with sinners is a prominent characteristic of Jesus' activity in Q and Mark. Jesus antagonized his critics ("scribes and Pharisees") when he associated with sinners and told them that their sins would be redeemed. Those sinners were people who were not concerned about religious piety (ritual purity, and possibly also the study of Scripture or oral Torah) before they joined the Jesus movement. In many cases they were engaged in occupations that involved monetary transgressions (*viz.* tax collectors and moneylenders), which consequently produced moral defilement.<sup>57</sup> According to Sanders, Jesus' attitude was exceptional, perhaps even outrageous, since he was ready to consider the sinners righteous before they completed the traditional redemption procedure that included restitution (when required) and an atoning sacrifice (with the accompanying confessional rite). Thus, from the traditional Jewish point of view, the sinners who followed Jesus were not fully redeemed and were still, at least formally, sinners. However, the Jesus traditions imply that they recognized their sins, and that spiritual change was enough, at least in the first stage.<sup>58</sup>

---

<sup>56</sup> See Esler, *Community and Gospel in Luke-Acts*, 164–200; M. H. Crosby, *House of Discipline: Church, Economics and Justice in Matthew* (Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis, 1988). On the continuity between the moral teachings of Jesus and Paul, see P. Fredriksen, *From Jesus to Christ: The Origins of the New Testament Images of Jesus* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1988), 99–100.

<sup>57</sup> Mark 2:15–17//Matt 9:10–13//Luke 5:29–32; Luke 15:1–2; Matt 11:19//Luke 7:34 (where Jesus' adversaries call him "friend of tax collectors and sinners"). For the authenticity of the traditions concerning Jesus and sinners, see Crossan, *The Historical Jesus*, 262–64; Markus, *Mark 1–8*, 230–32. Cf. Borg, *Conflict, Holiness, and Politics*, 79, 86 ff., 106–111. For the sinners' profile as set against the Pharisees, see J. D. G. Dunn, "Pharisees, Sinners, and Jesus," in *The Social World of Formative Christianity and Judaism: Essays in Tribute to Howard Clark Kee* (ed. J. Neusner et al.; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988), 264–89.

<sup>58</sup> See Sanders, *Jesus and Judaism* (London: SCM Press, 1985), 112, 174–211, esp. 206–8. The religious background for the acceptance of the sinners is the belief that even the most wretched and socially rejected people are actually potentially righteous and glorified. This perception is attested not only in the Sermon on the Plain/Mount,

The pattern of accepting people that were excluded by other religious groups, or rather, overlooking socio-religious status and prior the immoral (even idolatrous) occupations of potential converts, is also typical of John the Baptist, the Jerusalem community, and Paul. Although John himself was an ascetic hermit, he was willing to baptize anyone who was willing to repent, including, sinners, prostitutes, and soldiers.<sup>59</sup> According to Acts, Peter did not screen those who were baptized in the name of Jesus<sup>60</sup> and even converted Cornelius, the God-fearing centurion. In addition, Philip baptized Samaritans and the Ethiopian eunuch.<sup>61</sup> Paul, for his part, appealed to every potential believer, and when he was rejected by Jews he and Barnabas turned to the Gentiles.<sup>62</sup> In his letters, Paul advanced the view that even a former idolater can be baptized in Christ and become a true believer, and that one's sins are redeemed by his belief, the death of Jesus, and God. It is interesting that in his total acceptance of sinners and Gentiles, Paul did not call for repentance as a precondition for entry into the community, in contrast to John the Baptist and Peter (cf. Acts 2:38).<sup>63</sup>

---

but also in several parables, including that of the Good Samaritan. See Crossan, *The Historical Jesus*, 270–79; idem, *In Parables: The Challenge of the Historical Jesus* (New York: Harper & Row, 1973), esp. 65–66, 75. This attitude towards sinners is also related to the general call to forgiveness and the belief in divine forgiveness. See Mark 11:25; Matt 6:14–15; 18:23–35; Luke 7:41–43; 15:11–32; 18:9–14.

<sup>59</sup> Luke 3:7–14; 7:29; Mark 2:4–6; Matt 21:31–32. Neither Josephus nor the New Testament mention restitution or a sacrificial rite in relation to John's call for repentance.

<sup>60</sup> Acts 2:38, 41. See A. Yarbro Collins, "The Origins of Christian Baptism," in idem, *Cosmology and Eschatology in Jewish and Christian Apocalypticism* (JSJSup 50; Leiden: Brill, 1996), 231–34. For the Lukan theology of repentance, conversion, and baptism, see J. A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke I–IX* (AB 28; Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1981), 237–41. Even if the material in Acts cannot witness directly to the times of Peter and the apostles, it is surely indicative of later pre-Lukan or Lukan trends.

<sup>61</sup> Acts 8:5–40; 10:1–11:18 (note the debate regarding contact with gentiles in Acts 11:2–3; Gal 2:11–14). On problems concerning the authenticity of Luke's description of the conversion of Gentiles by the Jerusalem community and hypotheses about the social motivations which led to their acceptance, see Esler, *Community and Gospel in Luke–Acts*, 95–96, 154–63; idem, "Glossolalia and the Admission of Gentiles into the Early Christian Community," *BTB* 22 (1992): 136–42.

<sup>62</sup> Acts 13:44–46. For idolatry as a source of moral impurity see Rom 1:23–25; J. Klawans, "Notions of Gentile Impurity in Ancient Judaism," *AJS Review* 20 (1995): 285–312.

<sup>63</sup> Indeed, Paul did demand moral behavior from the believers; not, however, as a condition for *entering* the Christian community, but rather as a condition for *remaining* in the community, in order to obtain salvation at the eschatological judgment. For the view that belief in Jesus atones for sins see: Rom 3:21–26; 6:1–11; 1 Cor 15:3; 2 Cor 5:17–21; Gal 1:4. See also Mark 10:45//Matt 20:28. Discussion of the interrelations between the atoning force of Jesus' death and the notions of moral pollution/

In light of the multiple attestations of the notion that sin defiles, one might have expected Christian communities to reject those who were regarded (by some other Jews) as outcasts, or indeed any other individuals that were regarded as dishonest or idolatrous. Indeed, in the Qumran community the notion of moral impurity led to the screening of new members (1QS 6:13–23), as well as decisive sanctions against morally impure persons, to effect separation from the defiling force of sin. However, the evidence for the early Christian communities is more complex. John, Jesus, and Paul tolerated the morally defiled sinners as long as they joined their movements. Luke portrays Peter and Philip as eager to convert formerly idolatrous individuals. In view of the Qumranic context, this attitude seems puzzling. If sin is defiling, how should this openness towards the impure be explained? Is it possible at all to reconcile the teachings on moral impurity in Mark 7 and similar texts with the traditions about close relationships with sinners?

My proposal is that the purpose of the mission to sinners was to reduce their moral impurity. By associating with sinners, Jesus intended to lead them back to the path of righteousness. The aim of their acceptance was to ameliorate the effect of their defiling deeds. By approaching the sinners instead of condemning them, Jesus strove to transform them into potentially honest people who would avoid sin and moral impurity.

## CONCLUSIONS

New religious and social movements usually mark boundaries and separate themselves from the outside world.<sup>64</sup> The Qumran commu-

---

purification exceeds the scope of the present discussion. On this topic, see, e.g., Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*, 463–66; E. Lohse, *Colossians and Philemon* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1971), 39–40. For the Pauline doctrine of justification by faith, see, e.g., Segal, *Paul the Convert*, 174–78. For good deeds as a condition for salvation and inheritance of the Kingdom of God, see Rom 2:12–16; 1 Cor 6:9–10; Gal 5:19–26; cf. also Eph 5:5. On the belief in the eschatological judgment, see W. A. Meeks, *The Origins of Christian Morality: The First Two Centuries* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993), 175–80. For a distinction between entering into and staying in the covenant and Paul's lack of reference to repentance in the former situation, see Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*, 498–502, 515–18. On the difference between repentance before and after baptism, see further Hebrews 6:1–6; Meeks, *ibid.*, 124–25.

<sup>64</sup> This statement is based on the sociological postulate that moral codes usually create boundaries that protect them. Cf. R. Wuthnow, *Meaning and Moral Order: Explorations in Cultural Analysis* (Berkeley: University of California, 1987), 69–70;

nity is a good example. However, John the Baptist, Jesus (according to the synoptic traditions), Paul, and probably also some early Christian communities acted differently. They recognized the boundary of moral impurity but, in a certain sense, chose to cross it over and over again. Their aim in so doing was to reduce unrighteous social behavior, sin, and moral impurity within the larger Jewish society, rather than seal their own groups away from it. The very definition of moral defilement in early Christianity was quite similar to its parallels in biblical tradition and in Qumran. The way Christianity coped with the problem of evil, however, was different. In Qumran moral pollution was a dynamic power that led the group to total withdrawal from the Temple and the rest of Jewish society. In early Christianity, however, the actual implications of moral impurity were limited, since the notion of moral impurity did not lead to exclusion, separation, or sanctions against the morally defiled.

From the perspective of the sociology of religion, this paradoxical approach to impurity and sin, and especially the acceptance of sinners, shaped the early Christian communities as a “conversionist group,” to use Bryan Wilson’s typology. Its aim was to influence the masses and change social reality through integration into the group.<sup>65</sup> Such an exceptional approach to the problem of religious and social transgression probably led to the relative flourishing of early Christian communities, combining social critique and missionary activity. People from the wide margins of Jewish society, and, later on, Jewish sympathizers and eventually also Gentiles, were able to join the community and feel that they had a challenging alternative to Jewish religious institutions: they were able more easily to cope with sin and moral impurity.

In sharp contrast to this early Christian trend, the Qumran *yahad*, and to a lesser degree, the sect reflected in the *Damascus Document*, were (again, using Wilson’s typology) an introversionist sect.<sup>66</sup> The problem

---

Meeks, *Origins of Christian Morality*, 69–71, 119. See further the article by Adele Reinhartz in this volume.

<sup>65</sup> For the definition of a conversionist sect see B. Wilson, *Magic and Millennium: A Sociological Study of Religious Movements of Protest Among Tribal and Third-World Peoples* (London: Heinemann, 1973), 18–30. My use of Wilson’s terminology of sectarian ideology is for the sake of illustration. I do not regard the early Christian communities as sects. For the conclusion the Lukan community was conversionist, see Esler, *Community and Gospel in Luke–Acts*, 59–70.

<sup>66</sup> A. I. Baumgarten, *The Flourishing of Jewish Sects in the Maccabean Era: An Interpretation* (JSJSup 55; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 13–15.



of unrighteous behavior led them to separate themselves from the entire Jewish society and to condemn anybody who did not join them.

Interestingly, the fact that most of the early (Jewish) Christians lived in a more “open” movement than the “closed” sectarian movement of the Qumranites is reflected in their different attitudes towards the Temple, with which we began. It may be surprising, but the Qumranic attitudes toward the Temple were much more radical than most of the early Christian views. In fact, I see a certain relationship between the perceptions of each of the two movements concerning the Temple and the problem of unrighteous behavior. The Qumranites, who set themselves apart from the morally corrupt greater society, ignored the Jerusalem Temple and hoped for restoration of the proper sacrificial cult at the “end of days.”<sup>67</sup> In contrast, many Jewish Christians (and probably Jesus himself) were committed to the Temple cult and did not feel that unrighteous behavior by many within the people Israel impaired the sanctity or the efficacy of the Temple rite. It seems that they simply did not regard the Temple as a point of debate, although most of them believed that the death of Jesus instituted a new mode of atonement.<sup>68</sup>

In summary, I have tried to make a case for viewing the Qumran sectarians as more radical than the early Christians in terms of their ideas concerning the Temple; whereas the early Christians were more revolutionary in terms of their attitudes towards righteousness, ready to accept sinners and baptize anybody who was ready to believe in Jesus. It is interesting to conclude this paper with the thought that this new early Christian paradigm of righteousness and elimination of sin, the openness to accepting almost anybody, contributed to the development of a new religion out of the early Jewish-Christian movements.

---

<sup>67</sup> *War Scroll* 2:1–6. This is also implicit in 1QSa 2:11–22.

<sup>68</sup> This point becomes even more significant in light of my interpretation of Jesus’ “cleansing” of the Temple as an act that was intended to warn people against polluting the Temple with their sins (see Appendix).

## APPENDIX

JESUS' "CLEANSING" OF THE TEMPLE AND THE  
DEFILING FORCE OF MONEY

According to the tradition in Mark, Jesus drove out from the Temple Mount's market those who were selling and buying, overturned the tables of the money-changers for the half-shekel tribute and the chairs of those who were selling doves for sacrifices, and would not allow anyone to carry vessels through the Temple. His zealous act was directed towards the commercial aspect of the Temple cult that was located not in the Temple court itself, but on the margins (both spatial and religious) of the Temple Mount. His protest was directed against the money that was involved in the public buying and selling of sacrifices.<sup>69</sup>

This scene, the only case in which Jesus is driven to act violently, has always puzzled scholars. Two types of interpretations have been suggested. Some follow John 2:16 and see a real religious or halakhic problem regarding the central role of money in the sacrificial cult, namely, the notion that it contaminated the sanctity of the cult.<sup>70</sup> Other

---

<sup>69</sup> Mark 11:15–17. Matt 21:12–13 and John 2:13–21 omit the carrying of the vessels, and Luke 19:45–46 mentions only the action against the merchants. For a possible distinction between the merchants themselves and the Temple cult see *Gospel of Thomas* 64. The interdiction against carrying vessels through the Temple may be seen as unrelated in this context (if one compares it with a similar prohibition in *m. Ber* 9:5), but it may also be interpreted as referring to vessels of coins (which belonged to the money changers?) or donations to the Temple. See J. Ádna, "Jesus' Symbolic Act in the Temple (Mark 11:15–17)," in *Gemeinde ohne Tempel/Community without Temple: Zur Substituierung und Transformation des Jerusalemer Tempels und seines Kults im Alten Testament, antiken Judentum und frühen Christentum* (ed. B. Ego et al.; WUNT 118; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999), 465–66. E. P. Sanders, *Jesus and Judaism*, 363–64 rejects the authenticity of the vessels prohibition since it is not attested in John. In any event, the authenticity of the act itself, as depicted in Mark, is almost unanimously upheld. See R. Bultmann, *The History of the Synoptic Tradition* (Oxford and New York: Harper & Row, 1963), 36, 120; Sanders, *Jesus and Judaism*, passim. Cf. Crossan, *The Historical Jesus*, 356–60. See also the studies cited below.

<sup>70</sup> E. P. Gould, *Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to Saint Mark* (ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1896), 213. Cf. B. Chilton, *The Temple of Jesus*, 100–159; H. D. Betz, "Jesus and the Purity of the Temple (Mark 11:15–18): A Comparative Religion Approach," *JBL* 116 (1997): 455–72. Borg, *Conflict, Holiness, and Politics*, 176; idem, *Jesus, A New Vision: Spirit, Culture, and the Life of Discipleship* (New York: Harper & Row, 1987), 175, has suggested that since the money changers exchanged profane money for sacred money, they embodied the distinction between sacred and profane that was at the base of the resistance against Rome, which Jesus opposed.

scholars understand this scene as a symbolic (“prophetic”) act, that may have borne one of the following messages: foreseeing the destruction of the Temple or the coming of the Kingdom of God;<sup>71</sup> proclaiming that the Temple cult should be open to non-Jews;<sup>72</sup> protesting against greedy priests;<sup>73</sup> or protesting against the politicization of the Temple by the Herodian dynasty.<sup>74</sup>

Both alternatives, however, raise difficulties. The first type of interpretation is problematic since there is no clue in Jewish sources as to the impropriety of using money to buy sacrifices.<sup>75</sup> One cannot imagine a functioning Temple without mechanisms in place for the purchase of appropriate sacrifices. If, according to the tradition incorporated in Mark, something caused Jesus’ fury, it was not the general combination of trade and worship, but a particular problem related to it.

The symbolic or prophetic interpretations lack direct support in the earliest Jesus traditions. Most of the general cultic or political ideologies that were read into this short description in Mark might have been characteristic of certain radical Jewish (e.g., the Zealots) or later

---

See also the bibliography in A. Yarbo Collins, “Jesus and the Jerusalem Temple,” in *International Rennert Guest Lectures Series 5* (Ramat Gan: Bar-Ilan University and the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1999), 1–4. Yarbro Collins’s own suggestion is that Jesus objected to the profanation of the Temple by the bringing in of unholy vessels and the use of Tyrian tetradrachmas on which the image of Melqart/Heracles was inscribed. See also P. Richardson, “Why Turn the Tables? Jesus’ Protest in the Temple Precincts,” *SBL Seminar Papers*, 1992 (SBLSP 31; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992): 507–23 and bibliography.

<sup>71</sup> R. H. Hiers, “Purification of the Temple: Preparation for the Kingdom of God,” *JBL* 90 (1971): 82–90 and bibliography; Sanders, *Jesus and Judaism*, 31, 69–71 and bibliography; J. D. G. Dunn, *The Partings of the Ways Between Christianity and Judaism and their Significance for the Character of Christianity* (London: SCM Press; Philadelphia: Trinity Press International, 1991), 47–49. For critical observations on Sanders’s thesis, see Yarbro Collins, “Jesus and the Jerusalem Temple,” 4–7; C. A. Evans, “Jesus’ Action in the Temple: Cleansing or Portent of Destruction,” *CBQ* 51 (1989): 237–70.

<sup>72</sup> Borg, *Conflict, Holiness, and Politics*, 174–76. In his *Jesus in Contemporary Scholarship*, 112–16, Borg suggests a less specific interpretation: protest against the purity system and the elites.

<sup>73</sup> Evans, “Jesus’ Action in the Temple”; idem, *Jesus and His Contemporaries: Comparative Studies* (AGJU 25; Leiden: Brill, 1995), 319–80. Cf. also M. Hengel, *The Zealots: Investigations into the Jewish Freedom Movement in the Period from Herod I until 70 A.D.* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1989), 216 and the bibliography in n. 366.

<sup>74</sup> J. Knight, *Luke’s Gospel* (London: Routledge, 1998), 182–83; Betz, “Jesus and the Purity of the Temple.”

<sup>75</sup> I. Abrahams, *Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels: First Series* (New York: Ktav, 1917; reprint 1967), 85–89; Sanders, *Jesus and Judaism*, 63–64. Note also that a donation to the Temple is considered an act of piety in Mark 12:41–44//Luke 21:1–4.

Christian circles. However, there are only minimal indications in other early Christian traditions (such as Q) that Jesus held such views.<sup>76</sup> Is it possible that the peak of Jesus' career was so remote from the detailed descriptions of his own preaching? Furthermore, in symbolic interpretations the symbolic relationship between money, on the one hand, and its religious or political counterpart, on the other hand, is rather indirect: money symbolizes the cult that symbolizes the acceptance of the Roman/Herodian rule or the exclusion of gentiles, etc. Such interpretations do not explain why Jesus focused on the issue of money.

I think, however, that the fact that Jesus' act was directed against the financial aspect of the Temple cult is hardly a coincidence. Such an awareness of the connection between wealth, piety and the Temple money is attested to elsewhere in the saying about the poor widow's donation for the Temple (Mark 12:41–44//Luke 21:1–4).

I would like to suggest a new interpretation that aims at avoiding all these difficulties. The Markan tradition actually reflects an act that was directed not just against trading outside the Temple, but specifically against money that was related to injustice and corruption. The corrupt wealth was morally impure, in a metaphorical sense, and had a blemishing effect on the sacrificial rite. It therefore violated the sanctity of sacrifices and rituals that were financed by this money. The problem was the money itself, before it was used for financing the sacrifices and offerings, before it was delivered to priestly officials. Jesus' actions were directed towards the lay people who were selling and buying, the money-changers, and the dove sellers, without any hint of anti-priestly polemic.

Thus, this tradition actually presents Jesus as protesting not against the Temple itself or the priests, but against the more abstract unrighteousness that was transformed into the related corrupt money. Indeed this seems to be the same abstract immorality against which Jesus preached over and over again without pointing to any specific group or class. The reason for his protest in the Temple court was that when this money was used for buying sacrifices, it threatened the moral (not

---

<sup>76</sup> According to Crossan, *The Historical Jesus*, 355–60, the saying “I will destroy the house” is later than the act, and the Markan tradition even tried to suppress this saying. Therefore, it is possible that this tradition developed in order to interpret Jesus' otherwise inexplicable act. However, Crossan considers *Gospel of Thomas* 71, “I shall [destroy this] house and no one will be able to build it,” to be authentic and thus concludes that Jesus did show some resentment towards the Temple.

ritual!) impurity of the Temple cult.<sup>77</sup> As Mark 11:15 testifies, Jesus' action pertained to both the sellers/money changers and the buyers. I presume that the reason that he attacked the sellers was that it was easier to overturn their tables and chairs than to disperse the coins of the individual buyers, and also because he was more concerned with the moral pollution of the Temple than with the unrighteousness of the buyers.

This interpretation is supported by the early traditions concerning Jesus' teachings on the corruption of wealth and moral impurity (see above). It also gains additional support from the Qumranic notion that corrupt wealth polluted the Jerusalem Temple in CD already discussed above.

I propose that in the scene of the "cleansing" of the Temple, the concept of corrupt wealth was interwoven with the other idea of the defiling force of sin. Although there is no direct attestation to the combination of the two, namely, that the money of the wicked is metaphorically defiled by their moral impurity, I maintain that such a perception is quite apparent. If wickedness is defiling, then its subject or "product," namely money, may be contaminated.

Interestingly, in this case it is possible to use the Scrolls to interpret the New Testament. The idea that wealth is not only corrupting, but can also be defiled by wicked deeds, is supported by several texts from Qumran (although in Qumran money bears substantive pollution—not just metaphorical—and is ritually defiling). In these texts, wealth (*hon*) is contaminated by the evil deeds of its possessor, as emphasized in the *Community Rule* (1QS), in two passages in the *Habakkuk pesher* (1QpHab), and in the *Thanksgiving Hymns Scroll* (1QH<sup>a</sup>).<sup>78</sup> However,

---

<sup>77</sup> I admit that it is not clear to me whose money is involved in this "cleansing," and how many people are considered corrupt. I also concede that, as with previous interpretations of this scene, it is not clear how the people in the Temple were supposed to understand the message behind the act. My interpretation stands in contrast to those who point to criticism of the priests, such as V. Eppstein, "The Historicity of the Gospel Account of the Cleansing of the Temple," *ZNW* 55 (1964): 42–58, who influenced Evans ("Jesus' Action in the Temple") and Chilton, *The Temple of Jesus*, 100–159. Chilton suggested that Jesus argued that a sacrifice should be one's own property and not be bought with money (128–30). However, Eppstein's theory was based on a very complicated exegesis of a very late rabbinic source. For the lack of evidence for criticism of the priesthood by Jesus see Sanders, *Jesus and Judaism*, 66. For evidence of the priests' piety, see idem, *Judaism: Practice and Belief* 63 BE–66 CE (London: SCM Press, 1992), 91–92, 182–99.

<sup>78</sup> 1QpHab 8:11–12 and 12:19 (both quoted above); 1QS 6:19–20, 22; Cf. 1QS 9:22/4QS<sup>d</sup> 2 iii 6; 1QH<sup>a</sup> 19:25–26 (Sukenic 10:22–23). For the more abstracted sense

the most detailed text is CD 6:13–17 cited above, which concerns Temple impurity. Here the explicit cause of the Temple's impurity is the fact that the money that was donated to the Temple was "money of wickedness."<sup>79</sup> It seems that the more one considers certain acts or people as corrupt, the more one tends to declare their money taboo.

This new suggestion may be significant for those who are interested in the historical Jesus. However, my aim is only to indicate that at least in one tradition the problem of moral impurity was actively confronted, in a way that affected the attitude towards the Temple. In any event, Jesus' symbolic, public and rather violent act was not the typical early Christian means of coping with sin and its defiling force.

---

of "evil wealth" see also CD 8:5, 8. For less concrete similarities between the Qumranic criticism of the Temple and the Jesus traditions, see C. A. Evans, "Opposition to the Temple: Jesus and the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *Jesus and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. J. H. Charlesworth; New York: Doubleday, 1992), 235–53, esp. 242–43.

<sup>79</sup> Since the next sentence in this passage deals with stealing money from the poor and widows, one may presume that this was the act of wickedness that caused defilement. A similar claim that corrupted money polluted the Temple is mentioned in *Jub.* 23:21. For the meaning and the provenance of this passage, cf. G. L. Davenport, *The Eschatology of the Book of Jubilees* (StPB 20; Leiden: Brill, 1971), 32–56.



# WE, YOU, THEY: BOUNDARY LANGUAGE IN 4QMMT AND THE NEW TESTAMENT EPISTLES

ADELE REINHARTZ  
*University of Ottawa, Ontario*

In our postmodern intellectual context, we have become accustomed, if not always reconciled, to the notion that personal identity, social location, and other nonacademic factors have an impact on the topics we address, the ways in which we approach them, and the hypotheses we propose and defend. But there is another, less personal and perhaps more subtle factor that also has an impact on our scholarship: the repertoire of texts that occupy our thoughts and that form the background against which we view any new texts that come our way. In this paper, I will explore this phenomenon by looking at 4QMMT, *Miqṣat Ma'ase Ha-Torah*, and the ways in which the disciplinary backgrounds of its interpreters—myself included—influence their efforts to discern its purpose and audience.

## I. 4QMMT

Sometimes referred to as the *Halakhic Letter*, MMT raises many halakhic and sociological issues; but perhaps the most important questions concern its historical context and purpose: To whom is this document addressed, and why was it written? Any attempt to address this problem must begin with line 7 of the third section of the document as reconstructed by Strugnell and Qimron: “And you know that we have separated ourselves from the multitude of the people and from all their impurity.”<sup>1</sup>

This line makes two clear points. First, it identifies an author or authors (“we”) and an addressee or addressees (“you”). Second, it establishes a boundary line between “us,” that is, the author(s) group,

---

<sup>1</sup> All references to and quotations from 4QMMT are taken from E. Qimron and J. Strugnell, *Qumran Cave 4.V: Miqṣat Ma'ase Ha-Torah* (DJD 10; Oxford: Clarendon, 1994).



and “the multitude of the people,” on account of impurity. But the text leaves one crucial question unanswered: What is the relationship between “we” and “you,” that is, the speaker and the addressee(s)? That is, do “you” belong to the same group as “we” do? If so, C7, and, by extension, the document as a whole, speak of two parties: the author’s community, and the “multitude” from whom this community has separated. Or are “you” outside the group whom “we” represent? If so, MMT refers to three parties, two of which are hostile towards each other (“we” and “the multitude”) and one of which is different from but in communication with the author (“you”).

Scholars who approach this issue primarily on the basis of evidence internal to MMT tend to favor the two-party option. John Kampen suggests that the addressee was part of the same movement as the writer, though he may be at a geographical and/or theological distance. This argument is supported by the fact that the addressee is recognized for his prudence and knowledge of Torah, hence implying that he is on the same page, so to speak, on halakhic issues.<sup>2</sup> George Brooke suggests that there may not be a single, specific, and definable addressee at all. It may well be that MMT is not a personal epistle but rather a confirmatory instructional treatise written in such a way that many different people could have seen themselves as being addressed by the “you” in both the singular and the plural forms.<sup>3</sup> If so, MMT was intended not only to set out the lines of opposition between the writer(s) and *rov ha-am* but also to encourage the audience to see themselves in the same camp as the author(s).

Steven Fraade reaches a similar conclusion. His main focus differs from that of Kampen and Brooke in that he is interested not so much in the original history and audience of the document, but rather in its continued use by the Qumran community, a usage implied by the fact that no fewer than six manuscripts are extant. Fraade argues that MMT may not be at all an “extramural communication, but an exhortation to a group within the community.”<sup>4</sup> This group may have consisted

---

<sup>2</sup> J. Kampen, “4QMMT and New Testament Studies,” in *Reading 4QMMT: New Perspectives on Qumran Law and History* (ed. J. Kampen and M. J. Bernstein; SBLSymS 2; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1996), 129–44, pp. 130–32.

<sup>3</sup> G. J. Brooke, “Luke-Acts and the Qumran Scrolls: The Case of MMT,” in *Luke’s Literary Achievement: Collected Essays* (ed. C. M. Tuckett; JSNTSup 116; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 72–90, pp. 80–82.

<sup>4</sup> S. D. Fraade, “To Whom It May Concern: 4QMMT and Its Addressee(s),” *RevQ* 19 (2000): 507–26, p. 518.

of neophytes or candidates for membership, who were thereby called upon to study the rules “as a way of reinforcing the process of social separation and religious return that they had begun.”<sup>5</sup>

Kampen, Brooke, and Fraade, however, are in the minority. Most scholars do not rely solely or even primarily upon evidence internal to MMT, but draw upon a broad range of sources from Second Temple and rabbinic Judaism, and most argue that the three pronouns refer to three distinct parties. According to Elisha Qimron, “we” are the Dead Sea sect, writing to “you,” a currently sympathetic Hasmonean leader. “They,” the multitude of the people, are the Pharisees, who, in accordance with Josephus, are to be seen as the majority group. Qimron hazards an even more specific identification. As noted in DJD 10, “there is a later inner-Qumranian tradition in 4QpPs<sup>a</sup> referring to a document of ‘precepts and law’ which the Teacher of Righteousness had sent to the Wicked Priest.”<sup>6</sup> If MMT is this document, it may have been sent by the Teacher of Righteousness to the Wicked Priest. Support for this point of view is found in the similarities between the halakhah of MMT and that associated with the Sadducean priesthood. The opponents, by implication, would be Pharisees or proto-Pharisees. This scenario accounts for the absence of hostility between the “we” and “you” of the document, given that both the Teacher of Righteousness and the Wicked Priest would have aligned themselves with the Sadducean perspective.<sup>7</sup>

Strugnell, while agreeing that “we”—the author’s group—are proto-Qumranites whose halakhic views are likely to have been Sadducean, argues against the identification of the addressee as a specific individual such as the Wicked Priest. Given that MMT reminds the addressee about King David’s writings, however, it is possible that “you” may well be a political leader who lived some time between the death of Alcimus and Jonathan’s accession (160/59 to 152).<sup>8</sup> In that case, the purpose of the document would have been to keep that leader faithful to Sadducean priestly laws.<sup>9</sup>

<sup>5</sup> Fraade, “To Whom It May Concern,” 525.

<sup>6</sup> Qimron and Strugnell, DJD 10.119.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, 10.175.

<sup>8</sup> Qimron and Strugnell, DJD 10.115–21.

<sup>9</sup> J. Strugnell, “MMT: Second Thoughts on a Forthcoming Edition,” in *The Community of the Renewed Covenant: The Notre Dame Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. E. Ulrich and J. VanderKam; Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity 10; Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1994), 57–73, p. 72.

A variation on this hypothesis is proposed by Larry Schiffman. Schiffman argues that “we” are the Qumran group at an early stage of its development, reflecting the perspective of early Hasmonean Sadducean priests before they were corrupted by hellenization. “You,” the addressee, is the Hasmonean High Priest.<sup>10</sup> The author’s (or authors’) opponents are the Pharisees or proto-Pharisees. The issue at stake is halakhah, particularly laws pertaining to sacrifices and ritual purity.<sup>11</sup> The purpose of the document is to persuade the Hasmonean ruler to follow the halakhic path chosen by the author(s). Only in this way will the ruler be saved from misfortune. In Schiffman’s words, the author(s) “strove to fulfill the words of the Torah as they understood them, seeking to find God in the meticulous performance of the sacrificial worship in His holy Temple in Jerusalem and in the constant maintenance of the highest standards of ritual purity.”<sup>12</sup>

Hanan Eshel concurs that “we” are associated with Qumran, but he reverses the identification of the other two parties. For Eshel, “you” are the party in power, namely, proto-Pharisees, and “they,” the opponents, are the pre-Hasmonean Temple establishment that would later become the Sadducean group. Section C aims to legitimate the authenticity and credentials of the author(s)’ group, and to persuade the addressees to see them in a favorable light. Eshel argues that both grammatically and rhetorically, the “you” group, the target of persuasion, is distinct from *rov ha’am*, the latter representing the majority of the people. Therefore at the time that MMT was written, the addressee was a political leader, but not the leader of the majority of Israel. Eshel suggests that the author of MMT and his<sup>13</sup> group separated themselves from the multitude of the people not because of the halakhot that were specified in MMT but for other reasons, such as the hellenization of Jerusalem.<sup>14</sup> Finally, Eshel

---

<sup>10</sup> This can be seen in the shift from the plural second person to the singular addressee. See L. H. Schiffman, “The Place of 4QMMT in the Corpus of Qumran Manuscripts,” in Kampen and Bernstein, *Reading 4QMMT*, 81–98, pp. 94–95.

<sup>11</sup> L. H. Schiffman, “The Judean Scrolls and the History of Judaism,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years after Their Discovery: Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20–25, 1997* (ed. L. H. Schiffman, E. Tov, and J. C. VanderKam; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society in cooperation with the Shrine of the Book, Israel Museum, 2000), 542–57, p. 551.

<sup>12</sup> Schiffman, “Place of 4QMMT,” 96.

<sup>13</sup> The use of masculine pronouns reflects my view that the author as well as the immediate addressee were likely to have been male.

<sup>14</sup> H. Eshel, “4QMMT and the History of the Hasmonean Period,” in Kampen and Bernstein, *Reading 4QMMT*, 53–65, pp. 59–62.

speculates that MMT pertains to the period either just before or just after Jonathan became High Priest in 152 BCE.<sup>15</sup> *Rov ha'am* can refer to those who followed his leadership. He concludes that “the precipitating cause of the Qumran sect’s split from the Temple cult was a quarrel not with Jonathan and the Pharisaic movement, but rather with the hellenized priesthood in charge of the Temple until 152 BCE. MMT may convey the Qumran group’s belief that it shared with Jonathan and the Pharisees some fundamental assumptions about the biblical laws and their interpretation, a belief that was soon proven to be wrong when Jonathan followed Pharisaic law rather than the calendar and stricter halakhah of the Teacher of Righteousness.”<sup>16</sup>

Daniel Schwartz develops a similar argument. He suggests that the addressee was likely to have been a ruler of the Jewish people who, along with his group, is interested in details of Jewish law. He infers this identification from the fact that the document does in fact discuss such details. Schwartz concludes that “the writer of MMT is indicating to his Pharisaic addressees that he, although of the priestly camp, is sincere in his religion: after all, he and his community separated themselves from the multitude of bad priests.”<sup>17</sup> MMT points to the centrality of law to Second Temple Judaism, as the traditional interpretation of Paul’s letters has asserted all along. MMT is therefore a Qumran text from the early Hasmonean period in which the writer attempts to justify his group’s sincerity by urging the addressee not to confuse his group with other priestly groups.<sup>18</sup>

These scholars insert MMT directly into the complex history of and ever-shifting relationship between the Hasmonean monarchy and the Pharisaic and Sadducean groups, and identify it quite precisely as a document that describes the very formation of the Qumran community. In doing so, they date MMT and thus the origins of Qumran to the mid-second century BCE. A dissenting voice in this debate is that of Israel Knohl, who disputes the dating to the early Hasmonean period and instead argues that we should look for a time much closer to the date of the extant fragments themselves, namely, in the last three

<sup>15</sup> Eshel, “4QMMT,” 62.

<sup>16</sup> Eshel, “4QMMT,” 64–65.

<sup>17</sup> D. R. Schwartz, “MMT, Josephus and the Pharisees,” in *Reading 4QMMT*, 67–80, pp. 74–79.

<sup>18</sup> Schwartz, “MMT, Josephus and the Pharisees,” 68–73.

decades of the first century BCE. His candidate for the identity of the addressee is the High Priest Simon (23–5 BCE).<sup>19</sup>

In addition to the history of the community, this approach to the pronouns of MMT also addresses the development of halakhah. In particular, this document legitimates the position that Pharisaic halakhah, and the halakhic differences between the Pharisees and Sadducees, developed in the Hasmonean period, long before the formal articulation of these positions in the Mishnah. As VanderKam notes, MMT is significant because it shows that the sorts of legal debates and positions found in rabbinic literature had a long prehistory.<sup>20</sup> Finally, all these lines of interpretation view MMT as a genuine communication from one group to another, whether this is a letter or some more general document, and argue that its purpose was to influence the addressee(s) particularly on halakhic matters, and to draw him or them into an alliance against *rov ha'am*.

What is common to the three-party solution is the assumption, or, for some, the reasoned conclusion, that the three sets of pronouns reflect three distinct groups that can be identified with greater or lesser certainty with other groups or personages known from Second Temple sources. The argument is based both on internal and external evidence. With respect to internal evidence, emphasis is placed on the variation in the use of the second person, from the singular to the plural. This variation is used to justify the position that the addressee is a leader of a group that is separate from that of the author. For example, the formula “and you know” is plural (e.g., in C 7), whereas in C 10 the writer says “we have written to you,” using the first person plural to refer to himself or themselves, and the second person singular mode of address to his or their audience. The use of the first person plural is easily enough taken as the “royal we,” to denote a singular author such as the Teacher of Righteousness, who may be speaking not only of himself but on behalf of a group. The second person plural is seen as reference to a group and its leader, an interpretation that is reinforced in C 26–27: “We have (indeed) sent you some of the precepts of the Torah according to our decision, for your welfare and the welfare of your people.”

---

<sup>19</sup> See I. Knohl, “Re-Considering the Dating and Recipient of *Miqsat Ma'ase Ha-Torah*,” *Hebrew Studies* 37 (1996): 119–25.

<sup>20</sup> J. C. VanderKam, “Review: E. Qimron and J. Strugnell, *Qumran Cave 4.V: Miqsat Ma'ase Ha-Torah*.” *JR* 75 (1995): 548–50, p. 550.

Section C suggests that the addressee (second person singular) is the leader of a group for whom he bears some corporate responsibility. This impression is reinforced in C 31–32: “This will be counted as a virtuous deed of yours, since you will be doing what is righteous and good in his eyes, for your own welfare and for the welfare of Israel.” This exhortation implies that “you” have a corporate responsibility towards Israel, just as the priests do throughout B, e.g., B 12–13: “[for the sons of] the priest[s] should take care concerning this practice [cereal and flesh sacrifices] so as not to cause the people to bear punishment.” The similarity between C 31–32 and B 12–13 suggests that the addressee may be a priest.

The arguments in favor of identifying the addressee as a leader and/or king focus on the author’s comment in C 10, namely, that he has written to “you” (singular), “so that you may study (carefully) the book of Moses and the books of the Prophets and (the writings of) David....”

With respect to external evidence, the three-party solution (Qimron, Strugnell, Schiffman, Eshel, Schwartz) focuses on three sets of texts. The first consists of other scrolls from the Dead Sea, which are seen as emerging from the same or a similar community, and are thought to be roughly contemporaneous with MMT or to come from a later stage within the same group. The second comprises the writings of Josephus, whose comments about the various groups or philosophies in the period before the Jewish revolt have long been the basis upon which many theories about Second Temple Judaism have been founded. Third is the corpus of rabbinic texts, primarily the Mishnah, which provides interesting parallels and counter-parallels to the halakhic positions outlined in MMT. The two-party advocates (Kampen, Brooke, Fraade) on the other hand, are less interested in aligning MMT’s pronouns with groups or individuals who appear in other sources, and focus primarily, though not exclusively, on the internal dynamics of the text itself.

From this brief discussion it is evident that the historical and literary context to which a scholar assigns this document dictates not only which other texts will be brought into conversation with it but also the features of the text that one will tend to emphasize in constructing one’s hypothesis concerning the identities of and the relationships among “us,” “you,” and “them.” Scholars whose primary training is in Second Temple and rabbinic Judaism tend to situate MMT within the political and legal controversies to which these sources point, though, as we have seen, a small number resist this approach and prefer to focus on the evidence internal to the text itself.

## II. NEW TESTAMENT EPISTLES

As a scholar of early Christianity, my own approach will be to reflect upon the text, and, in particular, the implied referents of the personal pronouns “we,” “you,” and “they,” against the background of the New Testament, and will take into account the norms, conventions and tensions of New Testament scholarship. There is of course an element of anachronism involved in this approach, for the New Testament books were written from the mid-to-late first century through the early second century CE, some two centuries after MMT was composed. Yet the same problem exists with respect to the works of Josephus, which date from the late first century, and, even more acutely, with rabbinic literature, the earliest texts of which stem from the early third century CE. In any case, my arguments will not posit any historical connection whatsoever between MMT and the New Testament.

MMT has been discussed in comparison with the Gospels and Acts; some have found similarities in their theologies and modes of discourse.<sup>21</sup> But perhaps the closest parallels, in terms of literary form, can be found in the New Testament epistles.<sup>22</sup> While we may debate whether MMT is the private letter of one individual to another, or a document meant for more general circulation, the fact remains that it is framed as a communication from one party (“we”) to another party (“you”) and that it addresses at least in part the relationship with a third party (“them”: the multitude of the people).<sup>23</sup>

A similar situation exists with regard to the New Testament epistles. Most scholars do not doubt that the genuine Pauline letters were sent to and read by the communities to which they were explicitly addressed; yet these letters obviously achieved a much broader circulation and

---

<sup>21</sup> Cf. Kampen, “4QMMT and New Testament Studies”; R. Bauckham, “The Qumran Community and the Gospel of John,” in Schiffman, Tov, and VanderKam, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years after Their Discovery*, 105–15; G. J. Brooke, “Luke-Acts and the Qumran Scrolls.”

<sup>22</sup> Some studies have been done of MMT in relation to the epistles, but these tend to focus on points of theology, e.g.: J. D. G. Dunn, “4QMMT and Galatians,” *NTS* 43 (1997): 147–53.

<sup>23</sup> J. Strugnell, “Second Thoughts,” 63, has argued that it may be a systematic exposition of the reasons for the separation of this group from another group, a free-standing introduction to a collection of laws, or a legal proclamation sent to an accepted leader or ruler.

eventually became canonical for the Christian churches as a whole.<sup>24</sup> Other New Testament letters are likely to have been pseudonymous; they may well have been intended from the outset for wide circulation and hence did not target specific situations in particular communities.

Of greatest interest are the epistles that address boundary issues by setting out the fundamental criteria for determining whether one is inside or outside the author's community or group. These letters, like MMT, imply an instability in the relationship between the author and the addressee. The boundary lines are clearly drawn by the author, but the position of "you" with regard to these boundaries is not static or stable. The texts that we shall examine are occasioned precisely by a real or potential instability that also constitutes their central theme. I will look briefly at examples from three New Testament letters—Galatians, 2 Peter, and 1 John—that illustrate clearly the relationship between "us," "you," and "them."

#### A. *Galatians*

The Galatian church, like all of Paul's churches, was composed of Gentiles who were moved to profess faith in Jesus through Paul's proclamation. Paul's "gospel" expressed his profound conviction that Gentiles who came to have faith that Jesus was the Messiah did not have to convert to Judaism; that is, they did not have to undergo circumcision or to observe the dietary laws, the Sabbath, or other distinctively Jewish practices. After the church in Galatia was well-established, Paul continued on his missionary journeys. In his absence, another group of leaders, possibly including the so-called "pillars" of the Jerusalem church (Peter, John and James; cf. Gal 2:9) and/or their delegates, visited Galatia with a message that posed a fundamental contradiction to Paul's gospel: that Gentile converts to the new movement did indeed have to undergo circumcision and take on Jewish practices in addition to their faith in Jesus as the Messiah.

Paul's letter chastises the Galatians for even considering the viewpoint of the "Judaizers." In doing so, he employs a variety of arguments, many of them based on scripture. His exasperation, and his fear that his own authority is being eroded, are clear from Gal 1:6–9:

---

<sup>24</sup> The genuine Pauline letters are discussed in most New Testament introductions. See, for example, R. E. Brown, *Introduction to the New Testament* (New York: Doubleday, 1997), "Part III, The Pauline Letters."



I am astonished that you are so quickly deserting the one who called you in the grace of Christ and are turning to a different gospel—not that there is another gospel, but there are some who are confusing you and want to pervert the gospel of Christ. But even if we or an angel from heaven should proclaim to you a gospel contrary to what we proclaimed to you, let that one be accursed! As we have said before, so now I repeat, if anyone proclaims to you a gospel contrary to what you received, let that one be accursed!

Here, as in MMT, the first and second person pronouns are used explicitly, and the third person is implied in the vague noun “anyone.” “I” denotes the sender, who is Paul. “You” are the Gentiles in Galatia who have been following his Gospel. “They,” the opponents, are, in general, “anyone” who proclaims a contrary gospel, but in fact are specifically the Judaizers who are confusing his Galatians with their contrary message. The argument between Paul and the Judaizers is over the question of whether Jewish boundary markers such as circumcision and the dietary laws also pertain to members of this group. For Paul, the only boundary marker needed for Gentiles is a profession of faith in Jesus; for the Judaizers, profession of faith must be accompanied by full conversion to Judaism and adherence to Jewish law.

It is clear that the first and second person pronouns (“I” and “you”) denote members of the same group. The letter is intended to bridge the geographical distance that currently exists between them. The opponents are related to the group to which the writer and addressees belong, but there are some fundamental differences between them. The writer perceives “them,” the opponents, as a threat to “you,” and he is writing in order to forestall “your” separation or defection from his church.<sup>25</sup>

### B. 2 Peter

A second example relevant to MMT can be found in 2 Peter. In contrast to the epistle to the Galatians, whose Pauline authorship is not in doubt, the Petrine attribution of this letter is almost certainly unhistorical, and there is no basis upon which to identify the individual who may have written this text. It is generally dated to the early part of the second century. Whether the letter is addressed to a specific Christian

---

<sup>25</sup> History has shown that the opponents were unsuccessful in the long run, though their immediate success or failure in Galatia is not known. For a full discussion of the situation in Galatia, see Brown, *Introduction to the New Testament*, 467–82.

subgroup is not clear. Bo Reicke, for example, has argued that the letter was intended for the church in general.<sup>26</sup>

In much of the letter, there is no hint of “them,” the opponents; the author’s intention is to confirm the faith of the addressees, as he states in 1:10–15:

Therefore, brothers and sisters, be all the more eager to confirm your call and election, for if you do this, you will never stumble. For in this way, entry into the eternal kingdom of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ will be richly provided for you. Therefore I intend to keep on reminding you of these things, though you know them already and are established in the truth that has come to you. I think it right, as long as I am in this body, to refresh your memory, since I know that my death will come soon, as indeed our Lord Jesus Christ has made clear to me. And I will make every effort so that after my departure you may be able at any time to recall these things.

To this end, the writer exhorts his reader to

make every effort to support your faith with goodness, and goodness with knowledge, and knowledge with self-control, and self-control with endurance, and endurance with godliness, and godliness with mutual affection, and mutual affection with love. For if these things are yours and are increasing among you, they keep you from being ineffective and unfruitful in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ. (1:5–8)

Here, as in Galatians, “I” and “you” are members of the same group, “I” being the leader and “you” being the followers. They are separated by geographical distance, hence the need for written communication. The writer is writing explicitly in order to strengthen them in their faith, to remind them, and to exhort them to stick with it, in anticipation of his departure and death. Staying the course, he assures them, will result in salvation at the end times.

The opponents, the “false teachers,” appear soon after these initial exhortations, in 1:20–2:3:

First of all you must understand this, that no prophecy of scripture is a matter of one’s own interpretation, because no prophecy ever came by human will, but men and women moved by the Holy Spirit spoke from God. But false prophets also arose among the people, just as there will be false teachers among you, who will secretly bring in destructive opinions. They will even deny the Master who bought them—bringing swift

---

<sup>26</sup> B. Reicke, *The Epistles of James, Peter, and Jude* (AB 37; Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1964).

destruction on themselves. Even so, many will follow their licentious ways, and because of these teachers the way of truth will be maligned. And in their greed they will exploit you with deceptive words.

These opponents originate within the group itself, and their destructive potential is clear. If allowed to prevail, “they” will drive a wedge between the writer (“me”) and the addressees (“you”). Underlying the apparent unanimity between the author and his audience is the fear of potential instability.

In both of these letters, “I” and “you” are closely aligned. They exist in a hierarchical relationship according to which the author (“I”) has some spiritual authority over “you.” “I” establishes and reinforces the boundaries within which “you” currently reside. The allegiance and good will of “you” are anticipated but nevertheless uncertain in the face of the activities and potential influence of “them.” Thus the letters serve to spell out the threat, and to exhort the addressees to adhere to the particular understanding of faith that they have been given by the writer. In doing so, the letters also underscore the spiritual authority that the addressees should ascribe to their leader.

### C. 1 John

The same points can be seen in 1 John. The question of whether the “John” to which this letter is attributed is the same as the author of the Gospel of John has never been fully resolved. Many scholars believe that even if these texts were not written by the same person, they reflect the viewpoint, theology, and experience of the same group, perhaps at different stages in their history.<sup>27</sup> Even if we surmise that the author of 1 John was involved in the composition of the Fourth Gospel, his identity is not known.

The author of 1 John, like the author of 2 Peter, exhorts his readers to faith:

My little children, I am writing these things to you so that you may not sin. But if anyone does sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous; and he is the atoning sacrifice for our sins, and not for ours only but also for the sins of the whole world. (2:1)

---

<sup>27</sup> See R. E. Brown, *The Community of the Beloved Disciple* (London: Chapman, 1979).

Soon, however, the writer warns his readers about the enemy: the antichrist.

Children, it is the last hour! As you have heard that antichrist is coming, so now many antichrists have come. From this we know that it is the last hour. They went out from us, but they did not belong to us; for if they had belonged to us, they would have remained with us. But by going out they made it plain that none of them belongs to us. (2:18–19)

Like 4QMMT, 1 John makes explicit reference to a separation within the group. Whereas in MMT the author represents the group that has separated off from “the multitude of people,” in 1 John it is “they” who have left. The identity of these “separatists” is not known. According to Rudolf Bultmann, they were heretical teachers who had belonged to the church and still constituted a danger to those who remained. These teachers still viewed themselves as legitimate members of the group, and thus may still have been among the audience of this letter.<sup>28</sup> Schnackenburg presents a slightly different point of view, arguing that the “separatist” group no longer belonged to the community.<sup>29</sup> Similarly, Brown does not see any reason to believe that this group still saw itself as part of the author’s church, though they may well have viewed themselves as the only true Johannine community. In Brown’s view, “the author is refuting the secessionist propaganda that he is an innovator who has abandoned true Johannine teaching while they are preserving the true Johannine Community. In this bitter split... each group probably said it could no longer live with the other; but the author and his adherents were not so sovereign that they could have expelled the secessionists as a small band of troublemakers.”<sup>30</sup> What separates those inside from those outside the community is faith, at least, the version of faith that the author espouses.

I write to you, not because you do not know the truth, but because you know it, and you know that no lie comes from the truth. Who is the liar but the one who denies that Jesus is the Christ? This is the antichrist, the one who denies the Father and the Son. (2:21–22)

---

<sup>28</sup> R. Bultmann, *The Johannine Epistles: A Commentary on the Johannine Epistles* (ed. R. W. Funk; trans. R. P. O’Hara et al.; Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1973), 36–37.

<sup>29</sup> R. Schnackenburg, *The Johannine Epistles: Introduction and Commentary* (trans. R. and I. Fuller; New York: Crossroad, 1992).

<sup>30</sup> R. E. Brown, *The Epistles of John* (AB 30; Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1982).

Like Galatians and 2 Peter, 1 John is addressed to those who are inside to warn them of the views of those who are now outside. All three letters reflect their authors' perceptions of the danger regarding the instability of the addressees' location with respect to the boundaries that the letters have drawn. The authors fear that "you" will follow the ways of "them" and in doing so will withdraw from "us," although "you" are currently among "us." The purpose of the letters is to confirm or strengthen "your" faith, and hence to remove the instability. In doing so, these letters also of course reflect the particular points of view of their authors, encourage the allegiance of the addressees to these points of view, and warn them away from adopting the alternatives apparently posed, directly or indirectly, by their opponents. One might well imagine that had we access to an epistle written by the "antichrists" mentioned in 1 John, we would read a different story about the split in this church.

### III. MMT REVISITED

In exhorting his audience to study the books of Moses, the prophets, and David, and to return to God with all their hearts, the author of MMT does not sound very different from the New Testament letter writers who similarly exhort their readers to faith and compliance. In explicating the laws of purity, sacrifices, forbidden and permitted marriages and other matters, the author of MMT may not necessarily be informing the audience about new issues, but reminding them of the halakhic perspective that distinguishes them from other groups, much as the author of 2 Peter writes to remind his readers and to teach them in preparation for his demise. In tying his discourse very carefully to passages from Deuteronomy towards the end of section C, the author of MMT is not very different from Paul, who builds his elaborate argument for the rejection of the Judaizers' "Gospel" on a varied and broad scriptural foundation in Galatians 2–4. In explicitly setting up an insider vs. outsider dynamic, MMT's author sounds much like the author of 1 John, who sees his opponents as the antithesis of all he holds dear.

Reading MMT against the background of the New Testament epistles therefore supports the two-party hypothesis of Kampen, Brooke and Fraade, rather than the three-party hypothesis of other scholars. This exercise suggests that the author of MMT is exhorting a person or group within his own community, who may nevertheless be geographically removed from the author, if this is a letter meant for sending to

an individual, or perhaps not so removed, if it is meant as a circular to be read within the community itself. In this light, MMT reads like a document in which “we” are confirming, teaching, reminding and exhorting “you” to remain steadfast, and not to stray from the common principles of the community. The author may be facing a real or perceived instability in the allegiance of the audience, with respect to which side of the divide he and his people are on. MMT may thus be a communication that provides information and encouragement to keep the addressees within the fold, to ensure that they continue to adhere to the author’s vision of the divine will and of the behaviors required to remain in covenantal relationship with God. According to this perspective, the phrase “and you (plural) know” is not directed to an outsider but to an insider whose allegiance the author would like to ensure. The fact that several copies were found at Qumran may suggest that, like the letters of Paul, MMT was initially directed to a specific individual or group but later came to be seen as applicable to and useful for the community as a whole.<sup>31</sup>

One objection to seeing the addressee as being within the community is the reference in C 26–27 to “you and your people.” In the two biblical parallels, Exod 9:15 and Jer 27:13, the phrase “you and your people” is uttered by God, not by one person to another. In some readings of MMT, this phrase is used to support the view that the addressee is a leader of Israel in his own right, who has authority over a group of people separate from the community represented by the author of MMT. But it is also possible that in MMT the phrase refers more generally to Israel as the covenant people, and not necessarily to a specific group of people separate from the group represented by the author. Support for this suggestion can be found in C 31–32: “This will be counted as a virtuous deed of yours, since you will be doing what is righteous and good in his eyes, for your own welfare and for the welfare of Israel.” This interpretation is also consistent with the comments in section B that the priest must act in a way that does not bring down punishment upon the people as a whole, as in B 13 and 27, where particular halakhot must be observed by the priest lest the priest causes the people (*ha’am*) to bear punishment. Thus the formulation “you and your people” does not necessarily mean a group separate from that of the author but a

---

<sup>31</sup> Fraade, “To Whom It May Concern,” 507–26.

way of calling the addressee(s) to responsibility for others. Just as the priests should behave in a way that does not bring punishment upon the people, so should the addressees behave in a similar manner. Priests, addressees, and the one(s) who is (are) enunciating the law are all part of the same community.<sup>32</sup>

At this point, it is useful to reiterate that the purpose of this comparison has been to reflect on the ways in which the scholarly preoccupations of the interpreter may affect the ways in which he or she reads MMT. As always, it is helpful to keep in mind Schiffman's comment that the historian of Judaism has evidence for what was only a small part of the canvas of Jewish history in late antiquity.<sup>33</sup> While it is important to examine our extant sources for clues to the meaning and context of MMT, we cannot rule out the possibility that MMT may allude to individuals, groups and events that are not present in the corpus of literature that has survived to our own days. Thus moving from any set of observations to a historical hypothesis is fraught with danger. Nevertheless, I will succumb to the temptation to speculate, though I would not be willing to place any money on the historical accuracy of such speculation.

Viewing MMT as addressed to an "in-group" that is geographically distant, and whose affiliation is perceived by "us" to be unstable, suggests that the author may fear that the "you" group is subject to influences from "them," who may or may not be actively engaged with or recruiting among the group. This perspective in turn implies that the document reflects a group, or perhaps a stage in the history of Qumran, when there was more than one enclave, and where at least some among the group may have been living among or near the *rov ha'am*. This scenario corresponds quite well to the comments of both Philo and Josephus concerning the Essenes, namely, that they live in various communities, in varying degrees of proximity to those not of their group.<sup>34</sup>

---

<sup>32</sup> Fraade, "To Whom It May Concern," 519–20. Fraade points out that the word that translates "and your people" is absent from one of the two extant manuscripts for section C and in the other manuscript the final consonant ("your") is difficult to discern. He suggests that "people" and "Israel" can refer both to Israel as a whole and to this particular community (the one true Israel).

<sup>33</sup> Schiffman, "The Judean Scrolls and the History of Judaism," 542.

<sup>34</sup> Cf. Josephus, *B.J.* 2.124; Philo, *Prob.*, 75. For discussion of the Josephus passage, see T. S. Beall, *Josephus' Description of the Essenes Illustrated by the Dead Sea Scrolls* (SNTSMS 58; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988).

Whether this construction will hold up at all to scrutiny by specialists in the field, I do not know. It is certainly less detailed, and so perhaps less helpful and less interesting than the hypotheses put forward by those unlike myself who do not have New Testament texts but rather Josephus, the Dead Sea Scrolls, and the entire corpus of rabbinic literature at the front of their consciousness. Nevertheless, it is important, and perhaps appropriately humbling, to keep in mind at all times the speculative nature of the exercise in which we are engaged, and the ways in which not only who we are but what we think about can influence the directions in which our speculations may lead.





THE SCROLLS AND JOHANNINE LITERATURE



## THE GOSPEL OF JOHN AND THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS

HAROLD W. ATTRIDGE  
*Yale University*

Since the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls more than 50 years ago, scholars have debated the relevance of these texts for the study of early Christianity. In the initial enthusiasm generated by the discovery, numerous parallels were found in the Gospels, the Pauline Epistles, the Epistle to the Hebrews,<sup>1</sup> the Book of Revelation. In some cases these parallels generated genetic hypotheses about the relationship of the Christian texts, and the people who wrote them, to their Jewish forebears or contemporaries. One or another Christian author was viewed as a one-time member of the sect of the Dead Sea, usually assumed to be Essene.<sup>2</sup> Before long, as one might expect in scholarly circles, the tide changed and people became more cautious. Rather than arguing for direct dependence or intimate relationship between the Dead Sea sectarians and the authors of the New Testament, scholars reconceived of the Scrolls as general background for the study of early Christian authors.

As scholars became more cautious about applying the Scrolls to the NT, the study of the Scrolls themselves became more complex. More than a simple collection of sectarian materials, the Scrolls revealed their diversity in literary form and ideology. That diversity, even more in evidence since their complete publication, has led to numerous attempts to reassess what the Scrolls reveal about religion in the Land of Israel in the late Second Temple period. It is hardly necessary to rehearse the debates about the significance and provenance of the Scrolls. Whatever hypothesis proves attractive today, it will surely be

---

<sup>1</sup> On that text, see in particular, H. W. Attridge, "The Epistle to the Hebrews and the Scrolls," in *When Judaism and Christianity Began: Essays in Memory of Anthony J. Saldarini* (ed. A. J. Avery-Peck, D. Harrington, and J. Neusner; 2 vols.; JSJSup 85; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 2:319–45.

<sup>2</sup> For a general review of the early phase of research on the Scrolls and the New Testament, see H. Braun, "Qumran und das NT: Ein Bericht über 10 Jahre Forschung (1950–59)," *TRu* 30 (1964): 1–38; idem, *Qumran und das Neue Testament* (2 vols.; Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1966).

more nuanced and complex than those in vogue when the Dead Sea discoveries first surfaced.<sup>3</sup>

While the study of the Scrolls has been progressing, the study of the New Testament has not been standing still. New methods of analysis have challenged the hegemony of traditional historical-critical research. Although concern with literary form has long been part of NT study, a concern with what Aristotle might have called the formal rather than the material accounts of the NT texts has dominated much recent scholarship. Put another way, synchronic questions of literary form and function<sup>4</sup> rather than questions of diachronic literary or community development have come to prominence.<sup>5</sup> Some criticism has been even more strident. The so called “turn to the subject” characteristic of much contemporary humanistic study has focused not on the background of the New Testament, but on its foreground, its reception history and the contemporary reactions to it of faithful and unbelieving people alike. Contemporary critics have also spent a good deal of energy worrying about how texts came to be used as instruments of social formation, how they worked to guide and control communities.

---

<sup>3</sup> Particularly useful reviews of the state of scholarship on the Scrolls are found in J. A. Fitzmyer, “The Qumran Scrolls and the New Testament after Forty Years,” *RevQ* 13 (1988): 609–20; J. C. VanderKam, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994), 159–85; *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment* (ed. P. W. Flint and J. C. VanderKam; Leiden: Brill, 1998); G. J. Brooke, “The Scrolls and the Study of the New Testament,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls at Fifty* (ed. R. A. Kugler and E. M. Schuller; SBLEJL 15; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1999), 61–78; *The Hebrew Bible and Qumran* (ed. J. H. Charlesworth; N. Richland Hills, Tex.: BIBAL, 2000); G. J. Brooke, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament* (London: SPCK; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005).

<sup>4</sup> E.g., R. A. Culpepper, *Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel: A Study in Literary Design* (New Testament Foundations and Facets; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983); J. Staley, *The Print’s First Kiss: A Rhetorical Investigation of the Implied Reader in the Fourth Gospel* (SBLDS 82; Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1988); idem, *Reading with a Passion: Rhetoric, Autobiography, and the American West in the Gospel of John* (New York: Continuum, 1995); A. Jasper, *The Shining Garment of the Text: Gendered Readings of John’s Prologue* (JSNTSup 165; Gender, Culture, Theory 6; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998); P. Chatelion Counet, *John, A Postmodern Gospel: Introduction to Deconstructive Exegesis Applied to the Fourth Gospel* (Biblical Interpretation Series 44; Leiden: Brill, 2000).

<sup>5</sup> Questions of sources and redactional history continue to be pursued. See, e.g., U. C. von Wahlde, *The Earliest Version of John’s Gospel: Recovering the Gospel of Signs* (Wilmington: Glazier, 1989). For a comprehensive review of this source-critical hypothesis, see G. van Belle, *The Sign Source in the Fourth Gospel: Historical Survey and Critical Evaluation of the Semeia Hypothesis* (BETL 116; Leuven: Leuven University Press and Peeters, 1994).

What is true of the New Testament in general is certainly true of the Fourth Gospel. Initial enthusiasm about connections with the Scrolls<sup>6</sup> met with skepticism,<sup>7</sup> and eventually a more cautious, balanced approach prevailed.<sup>8</sup> Parallels were recognized, but direct dependence of the gospel on the Scrolls has generally been doubted.<sup>9</sup> Nonetheless, the heritage of the first stage of research into the Scrolls still lives, and some scholars, particularly James Charlesworth in the US, and John Ashton in the UK, have continued to argue strongly for a direct connection, through some former Essene who had become a member of the Johannine community.<sup>10</sup> Others remain appropriately skeptical.<sup>11</sup>

<sup>6</sup> See, e.g., K. G. Kuhn, "Die in Palästina gefundenen hebräischen Texte und das neue Testament," *ZTK* 47 (1950): 192–211; cited in J. Ashton, *Understanding the Fourth Gospel* (Oxford: Clarendon; New York: Oxford University Press, 1991), 233.

<sup>7</sup> H. M. Teeple, "Qumran and the Origin of the Fourth Gospel," *NovT* 4 (1960): 6–25; repr. in *The Composition of John's Gospel: Selected Studies from Novum Testamentum* (ed. D. E. Orton; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 1–20.

<sup>8</sup> R. E. Brown, "The Qumran Scrolls and the Johannine Gospel and Epistles," *CBQ* 17 (1955): 403–19; 559–74; repr. in *The Scrolls and the New Testament* (ed. K. Stendhal; New York: Harper, 1957), 183–207; and in R. E. Brown, *New Testament Essays* (London: Chapman, 1967), 102–31.

<sup>9</sup> So R. E. Brown, *The Gospel According to John* (2 vols.; AB 29, 29a; Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1966–1970), 1:lxiii, cited with approbation in J. H. Charlesworth, "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Gospel according to John," in *Exploring the Gospel of John: In Honor of D. Moody Smith* (ed. R. A. Culpepper and C. Black; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1996), 65–97, p. 93 n. 42. Similarly R. Schnackenburg, *The Gospel according to St. John* (trans. K. Smyth; 3 vols.; London: Burns & Oates; New York: Crossroad, 1968–82), 1:129; but as Charlesworth ("Dead Sea Scrolls," 82), notes, Schnackenburg does not derive John's dualism from Qumran. Charlesworth: "To proceed by recognizing that they (*scil.* terms of dualism) shape the *mentalité*—through not the *esprit*—of John's Gospel is the correct track to follow." The distinction between *mentalité* and *esprit* is a tad elusive.

<sup>10</sup> See J. H. Charlesworth, "A Critical Comparison of the Dualism in IQS 3:13–4:26 and the 'Dualism' Contained in the Gospel of John," in *John and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. J. H. Charlesworth; New York: Crossroad, 1990; originally *John and Qumran* [London: Chapman, 1972]), 76–106; idem, *Jesus and the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Controversy Resolved* (New York: Doubleday, 1992); idem, "Dead Sea Scrolls." Charlesworth himself, responding to criticism of his earlier work, maintains that Essenes memorized IQS 3–4 and some later entered the Johannine community. Ashton, *Understanding the Fourth Gospel*, 232–37, argues along similar lines: "We have to do, I suggest, with what in modern parlance is sometimes called a mind-set. Just as Paul's underlying convictions concerning the provident dispensations of a beneficent deity remained unaltered when he became a Christian, so, I believe, the author of the Fourth Gospel retained the pattern of thinking with which he was probably familiar from an early age, maybe from childhood.... The Evangelist had dualism in his bones.... The Evangelist may well have started life as one of those Essenes who were to be found, according to Josephus, 'in large numbers in every town'... (*BJ* ii.124)" (236–37).

<sup>11</sup> R. Bauckham, "Qumran and the Fourth Gospel: Is there a Connection?" in *The Scrolls and the Scriptures: Qumran Fifty Years After* (ed. S. E. Porter and C. A. Evans;

The most important impact of the Scrolls on Johannine scholarship is their contribution to a general shift in the current estimation of the religious character of the Gospel. Johannine scholars now tend to hold that despite the Fourth Gospel's bitter polemic against "the Jews,"<sup>12</sup> it is in many ways the most Jewish of the Gospels. In the Gospel, the Messiah (John 1:41; 4:25) is endowed with much of the symbolic weight of Jewish tradition. As the locus of the divine Word he mimics the Torah, the locus of wisdom's dwelling in Israel (John 1:14; Sir 24:8, 22). His resurrected body is the New Temple, the place where God dwells (John 2:21).<sup>13</sup> His life of public proclamation replicates the sacred liturgical cycle, and his death is in various senses a New Passover.<sup>14</sup>

If the Gospel, despite its sectarian spin, is thoroughly Jewish, much of its Jewishness is at least reminiscent of the piety found in some of the Scrolls. Like the Scrolls, the Fourth Gospel delights in stark contrasts, oppositions of light and darkness, heaven and earth, all of which echo the stark contrasts of the *Rule of the Community* or the *War Scroll*. What has often been labeled the "dualism" of the Fourth Gospel comes to expression in these contrasts. Like the Scrolls, the author(s) of the Fourth Gospel has a strong sense of the divine guidance that brings members into the community that the text addresses, whether we call that sense either divine predestination or prevenient grace. Like the authors of (some of) the Scrolls, the author of the Fourth Gospel reads scripture through a special eschatological lens that focuses the

---

JSPSup 26; Roehampton Institute London Papers 3; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 267–79.

<sup>12</sup> For important recent treatments, see *Anti-Judaism and the Fourth Gospel: Papers of the Leuven Colloquium, 2000* (ed. R. Bieringer, D. Pollefeyt, and F. Vandecasteele-Vanneuille; Jewish and Christian Heritage Series 1; Assen: Van Gorcum, 2001); A. Reinhartz, "The Gospel of John: How the 'Jews' Became Part of the Plot," in *Jesus, Judaism, and Christian Anti-Judaism* (ed. P. Frederiksen and A. Reinhartz; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2002), 99–116.

<sup>13</sup> It is difficult to reconcile the implications of John 2 with attempts to date the text before the destruction of the Temple. See J. A. T. Robinson, *The Priority of John* (ed. J. F. Coakley; London: SCM, 1985; Oak Park, Ill.: Meyer-Stone, 1987); and most recently, *Johannesevangelium—Mitte oder Rand des Kanons? Neue Standortbestimmungen* (ed. K. Berger; Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 2003).

<sup>14</sup> The important liturgical elements in John are Sabbath (5:16); Passover (2:23; 6:4; 11:55); Tabernacles (7:2); Hanukkah (10:22). On the symbolism of the Gospel, see N. Petersen, *The Gospel of John and the Sociology of Light: Language and Characterization in the Fourth Gospel* (Valley Forge: Trinity Press International, 1993), and C. R. Koester, *Symbolism in the Fourth Gospel: Meaning, Mystery, Community* (2d ed.; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995, 2003).

meaning of the ancient texts on the life of the reader.<sup>15</sup> Behind all of these conceptual similarities there lurks what many scholars believe to be two similar social organizations, both at odds with a dominant “Judean” social stratum. Whether there is a genetic connection between the Scrolls and the Gospel may finally be irrelevant if such extensive parallels can be illuminating.

Before turning to those thematic elements of the Fourth Gospel with parallels in the Scrolls, one other issue merits comment. Beyond the thematic parallels between John and the Scrolls, some scholars have found correlations between the Scrolls and possible historical reminiscences in the Gospel. Students of the Fourth Gospel have long debated the question of the possibility of using the data of the text in attempts to reconstruct the life of the historical Jesus.<sup>16</sup> While it is clear that the text, like all the gospels, was created for purposes other than recording objective history, it may yet preserve valuable historical reminiscences.<sup>17</sup> Among these may be details that can at least be illuminated by the information of the Scrolls. Particular details in the Johannine account which stand in tension with the data of the Synoptic gospels, such as the dating and character of the Last Supper, have been explained on the hypothesis that Jesus and his followers followed a calendar like that attested at Qumran. He therefore could have eaten a Passover meal, as the synoptic gospels report, but at a time different from that observed by the Temple authorities.<sup>18</sup> That remains a possible solution,

---

<sup>15</sup> M. Daly-Denton, *David in the Fourth Gospel: The Johannine Reception of the Psalms* (AGJU 47; Leiden: Brill, 1999). More specifically on the parallels with the hermeneutical techniques of the Scrolls: J. Clark-Soles, *Scripture Shall not be Broken: The Social Function of the Use of Scripture in the Fourth Gospel* (Leiden: Brill, 2003).

<sup>16</sup> For a judicious summary, see R. E. Brown, *An Introduction to the Gospel of John: Edited, Updated, Introduced, and Concluded by Francis J. Moloney S.D.B.* (New York: Doubleday, 2003), 90–114, with extensive bibliography.

<sup>17</sup> Some such details have no ostensible connection with the Scrolls or things associated with them, such as the description of the pool of Bethesda (or Bethzatha) where, according to John 5, Jesus healed a paralytic; on which see J. Jeremias, *The Rediscovery of Bethesda: John 5:2* (Louisville: Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1966).

<sup>18</sup> That hypothesis was originally proposed by A. Jaubert, “Le calendrier des Jubilés et les jours liturgiques de la semaine,” *VT* 7 (1957): 35–61, esp. 52–55; idem, *The Date of the Last Supper* (trans. I. Rafferty; Staten Island: Alba House, 1965); and idem, “The Calendar of Qumran and the Passion Narrative in John,” in Charlesworth, *John and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 62–75. For discussion of this point, as well as the possibility that the Last Supper of Jesus and his disciples took place in an “Essene Quarter” of Jerusalem, see the series of articles by R. Riesner, “Essener und Urkirche in Jerusalem,” *Bibel und Kirche* 40 (1985): 64–76; idem, “Das Jerusalemer Essenerviertel und die Urgemeinde,” *ANRW* 26.2:1775–1922; idem, “Jesus, the Primitive Community, and the Essene Quarter



but not without its own difficulties. Other solutions are also possible, including tendentiousness on the part of either the Fourth Gospel or the Synoptics.

To return then to the relationship of the themes common to the Fourth Gospel and the Scrolls, I begin from the fact that these parallels exist, even if they are not exclusive and do not support a claim of direct dependence of the Gospel on the Scrolls.<sup>19</sup> Scholars have proposed various speculative schemes to explain how the similarities occurred, from literary “borrowing” (Charlesworth) through the personal heritage of a once Essene author (Ashton). An agnostic on the subject, I doubt that there was literary dependence on any known text; and if there was, it would be impossible to prove. It is possible to imagine various forms of oral transmission of the perspectives of the sectarian Scrolls, but impossible to verify them.<sup>20</sup> Further speculation about the diachronic process of transmission of conceptual models from the Scrolls to the author(s) of the Fourth Gospel is not likely to be productive. It may, however, be possible to gain some insight into the workings of the Gospel if we examine what happened to what may have been the heritage of the Scrolls, however indirect, in the Johannine mix. This paper will focus on a few cases where significant parallels have been suggested.

My analysis is based on several assumptions, which cannot be defended here. Primary among them is the working hypothesis that,

---

of Jerusalem,” in Charlesworth, *Jesus and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 198–234. For a critical perspective, see R. Bauckham, “The Early Jerusalem Church, Qumran, and the Essenes,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls as Background to Postbiblical Judaism and Early Christianity: Papers from an International Conference at St. Andrews in 2001* (ed. J. Davila; STDJ 46; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 63–89.

<sup>19</sup> Brooke, “The Scrolls and the Study of the New Testament,” 71, following the lead of Bauckham (“Qumran and the Fourth Gospel”): “Despite some protestations, preliminary results indicate that the influence is far less dominant than might have been supposed. For the Fourth Gospel, for example, there is little in its concern with light and darkness that cannot be derived from scripture itself or from standard contemporary Jewish meditations on the scriptures... even the phrase ‘sons of light’ is no more characteristic of the Gospel and its community than it is for Paul (or even Luke).”

<sup>20</sup> M. Smith, “Two Ascended to Heaven,” in Charlesworth, *Jesus and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 290–301, p. 299, acerbically suggests: “That Jesus ever read 4Q491 ii. 1 seems to me utterly unlikely. I doubt that he ever went near Qumran and I think that if he had they would have spat on him—if they hadn’t feared a fight with the tough men among his followers. But there is considerable likelihood that both this Qumran document and the mystery material in the Gospels are mushrooms of the same ring, connected not directly but by the ramified root system of popular piety and superstition from which they independently arose.”

whatever its process of composition—and it may have undergone at least one major redaction—the Gospel should be read as a unitary literary work. There are, of course, some exceptions, such as the pericope of the adulteress (John 7:53–8:11), the textual evidence for which clearly marks it as a later addition. Nevertheless, this unitary literary work is not one that operates with a simple narrative logic, telling a straightforward, linear tale, however tendentious. It is, rather, a work that shows the marks of considerable reflection on the act of communication and it shapes the available vehicles of communication to convey what it takes to be a truly unprecedented content.<sup>21</sup>

While the Gospel is a unified literary composition, it is not made out of whole cloth. One helpful image for what we find in the Fourth Gospel is the metaphor used by Lévi-Strauss in his description of the mythmakers among the native peoples of Latin America, i.e., *bricoleurs*: handymen who put together, out of the discarded scraps of various cultural sources, odd bits and pieces of tradition that they reshape into new configurations. Lévi-Strauss would argue that their bricolage is governed by an underlying structural logic of which the bricoleurs were unaware. What we find in the Fourth Gospel is another example of bricolage, but governed by a more explicit logic. The evangelist has gathered bits and pieces of lore and fitted them into what is probably a traditional framework, a narrative of the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus of Nazareth. But as he stitches his new garment together, he cuts and trims the pieces to give the whole and most of its parts a form that will somehow match the novelty of the content. Such, I believe, is the case with materials familiar from the Synoptic tradition, whatever the precise relationship of the Gospel to that tradition, and I suggest that we find the same phenomenon represented in the parallels with the Scrolls.

The focal point of comparison between the dualistic elements of John and the Scrolls remains the passage on the Two Spirits from the *Rule of the Community* (1QS 3:13–4:26).<sup>22</sup> Resonances of this passage, particularly in the motifs of light and darkness, are found in the Prologue to

---

<sup>21</sup> See H. W. Attridge, “Genre Bending in the Fourth Gospel,” *JBL* 121 (2002): 3–21.

<sup>22</sup> See Charlesworth, “Critical Comparison”; J. L. Price, “Light from Qumran upon Some Aspects of Johannine Theology,” in Charlesworth, *John and Qumran*, 9–37. For the history of scholarship on the *Serek Ha-Yahad*, see S. Metso, “Constitutional Rules at Qumran,” in Flint and VanderKam, *Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years*, 186–210.

the Fourth Gospel (John 1:1–18) and in scattered sayings throughout the text, particularly in the first half (John 3:19–21; 8:12; 12:35–36). Light and dark function for the Fourth Gospel as symbols of the worlds of belief and unbelief, of belonging to the Son of Man and rejecting him, and the boundaries between the two worlds seem clear.

But are they, after all, as clear as we might expect, or as clear as one might expect having heard that God created Two Spirits who are perpetually at war? We need to remember, of course, that even in the *Treatise on the Two Spirits/Rule of the Community* 3–4, things are not quite as black and white as they first appear, since the cosmological dualism eventually is transformed into a psychological dualism, according to which the two spirits are at war within individual human beings.<sup>23</sup> The doctrine of the two spirits then functions within the *Rule* as a cosmological framework grounding social and psychological realities.

The dualistic opposition in John is even more complex. The opposition of light and darkness is mapped onto a spatial dichotomy between above and below, which is also homologous with a dichotomy between spirit and flesh, and a moral or social dichotomy between insiders and outsiders, those who believe and those who do not. Yet the mapping of these oppositions does not form a stable or absolute grid, as it will perhaps for some of the interpreters of the gospel in the second century, people whom we used to call “gnostics.”<sup>24</sup> No, the opposition loses some of its potential metaphysical connotations because it works itself out in narrative form, with a focus on the person of Jesus.

Two passages illustrate the distinctive features of the Johannine play on the “dualistic” opposition of light and darkness. The first is the Prologue, which identifies the Divine Word and Light. Two affirmations stand in tension here. The universalizing statement, “the light enlightens

---

<sup>23</sup> Whether this modulation of the dualism is a mark of the redaction of 1QS, I leave aside. For a review of discussion of the issue, see R. A. J. Gagnon, “How Did the Rule of the Community Obtain its Final Shape? A Review of Scholarly Research,” in *Qumran Questions* (ed. J. H. Charlesworth; The Biblical Seminar 36; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995 = *JSP* 10 [1992]), 67–85.

<sup>24</sup> Although there, too, the situation is complex. The heresiological tradition has identified certain “gnostics” as deterministic deniers of free will, but that claim may be more sectarian polemic than accurate assessment. For reconsiderations of Gnosticism, see M. A. Williams, *Rethinking “Gnosticism”: An Argument for Dismantling a Dubious Category* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996), and Karen King, *What is Gnosticism?* (Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2003).

everyone who (or when it)<sup>25</sup> comes into the world” is soon followed by “and the light shines in the darkness, and the darkness grasped it not”; this, in turn, is in synonymous parallelism with “and he came into his own, and his own received him not.” The potentially universal scope of the revealing light bumps up against a resistant, hostile darkness.

The latter affirmations about the darkness and “his own” failing to “grasp” the light obviously foreshadow the dramatic encounters in the narrative between the “one sent by God” and his fellow Judeans, hostile encounters that involve bitter invective. The affirmations of the Prologue also foreshadow the prayers and prophecies at the Last Supper, which contrast the fellowship of Jesus’ followers with an unbelieving and hostile “World” (John 15:18–25). The oppositions are what we might expect of the kind of sectarian community that many scholars take the Community of the Beloved Disciple to be, one that first distinguished itself from its Jewish matrix and then stood in tension with a wider world of unbelief.

Yet the narrative is more complicated than the rhetoric would suggest. The most forceful dramatization of the power of darkness is in chapter 13. After Judas leaves the fellowship comes the darkly evocative, “and it was night” (John 13:30b). The dramatic placement of this phrase adds another dimension to the oppositions established in the Prologue. The Light has come to his own, now not the people or religious leaders of Judea, but his Galilean friends, and even there he finds rejection. Even there, the darkness fails to comprehend. The cosmological dualism that had seemed, in the course of the narrative, to map clearly into a sociological dichotomy, with a clear boundary line separating two groups, now becomes problematic. Darkness is found in the midst even of those who have, in a special and limited sense, become the teacher’s “own.” The dichotomous barb directed at the Judean outsiders in chapter 8, now points at the most intimate “friends” of the emissary from on high.

But the betrayal by Judas is just the first instance of darkness in the hearts and minds of the followers of Jesus. In the after-dinner dialogues that follow, particularly in chapter 14, the outer darkness is matched by the incomprehension of the disciples, whose lame questions and responses (John 13:36–37; 14:5; 14:8; 14:22) reveal their continuing

---

<sup>25</sup> The famous ambiguity of the syntax of this phrase, on which see Brown, *Gospel According to John*, 1:9–10, is irrelevant to my point. The fact remains that the light enlightens everyone, whether that enlightenment takes place naturally in creation, or by revelation. In either case enlightenment takes place because of the incarnation.

obtuseness, a persistent failure to comprehend that culminates in Peter's denial (John 18:25–27). This traditional episode (cf. Matt 26:69–75; Mark 14:66–72; Luke 22:56–62) has been reworked by the evangelist to give it a more vivid dramatic character than it has in other gospel accounts. Most telling perhaps is the insistence that Peter was standing by a fire, warming himself (John 18:18, 25). That fire may warm his body, but it casts no light into his soul.

The twist in chapter 13 on the boundaries set by the old sectarian dichotomy ought not to surprise us. We heard earlier in chapter 6, which relates reactions to the words concerning the “bread of life,” that some of the intimate disciples of Jesus “could not endure” his hard saying and went their own way. That narrative probably replicates the experience of the community of the Beloved Disciple, which, having weathered the storm of expulsion from the Synagogue, now confronts schism within its own ranks. Scholars have debated the relationship between the schismatic impulse recorded in John 6:64 and the explicit references in the Epistles to those who “have gone out from us” (1 John 2:19), apparently over a christological confession. Whatever their precise relationship, the two passages reflect the conviction that a simple construal of light against darkness is inadequate to the experience of internal conflict.

The crossing of the boundaries continues in the later chapters. A strong line remains fixed between the fellowship of friends formed around the memory of, and shared practice instituted by, their departed Rabbi, on the one hand, and on the other hand, various outsiders. The Last Supper discourses point to two rings of such outsiders. One is “the World,” a place that produces “hatred” for the members of the fellowship. Such terminology recalls the strong language of the Scrolls calling for hatred between the Sons of Light and the Sons of Darkness. Yet hatred, at an explicit level, only flows in one direction in the gospel, from “the World” toward the members of the community. Hatred in response is not required. Instead, what undergirds the gospel's attitude toward “the World” is the stance ascribed to God, whose self-giving love did not spare his own son. “The World” may be the place of rejection, and those who are of it may hate the disciples, but the only response the Gospel explicitly endorses towards them is love.

The dialectic of relationship toward “the World” thus replicates the dialectic embedded in the gospel toward the characters who stand as ciphers of opposition, the “Jews/Judeans.” They are, says Jesus, children of the primordial murderer, and yet, salvation is from them.

The dialectic of relationship also obtains towards closely related outsiders. This is a less well-defined group, and scholars such as Raymond Brown have detected various kinds of Christians in the environment of the gospel, including anonymous believers, schismatics, etc.<sup>26</sup> A rigid dichotomous dualism might well have condemned them all to Gehenna, but for this Gospel there is a hope, repeated twice, in chapters 10 and 17, that the sympathetic others may yet become one with the faithful remnant.

Another way of expressing the point is to maintain that “dualism” or, to be more precise, the stark opposition of light and darkness that begins the gospel and is so reminiscent of the Scrolls, is not a rigid framework for reflection on metaphysical, social, or psychological realities, but rather a more supple conceptual tool. In the hands of the craftsman (or -men) who framed this gospel, the tool is used to think about relationships within and among religious communities. The Gospel finally shows evidence of substantially modifying an inherited dichotomy, whatever its source.

What is true of the fundamental dualism of the text is also true of its language of predestination. The Gospel affirms on more than one occasion that people come to belief in Jesus if and only if the Father brings them.<sup>27</sup> This stance seems at least formally related to the position of IQS that the distribution of the “two spirits” determines where individuals find themselves;<sup>28</sup> and, if we believe Josephus, some sort of deterministic position was associated with the first-century Essenes, whatever their relationship to the Scrolls.<sup>29</sup> The “determinist” elements of the gospel stand in tension with affirmations that there is an obligation to “believe” in the Son in order to have eternal life.<sup>30</sup>

---

<sup>26</sup> See R. E. Brown, *The Community of the Beloved Disciple* (Paramus, N.J.: Paulist Press, 1979).

<sup>27</sup> John 3:21 (works of whoever does good are done “in God”); 6:39 (the will of the Father is that the Son not lose any of that which has been given to him); 6:46 (those “taught of the Father” come to the Son); 6:65 (“no one comes unless given by the Father”); 8:47 (those “of God” hear the words of God); 17:6 (the disciples are “given” to Jesus by God).

<sup>28</sup> IQS 4:16; IQH<sup>a</sup> 15:13–15. For discussion of whether 4Q215 manifests a similar position, see E. G. Chazon, “A Case of Mistaken Identity: *Testament of Naphtali* (4Q215) and *Time of Righteousness* (4Q215<sup>a</sup>),” in *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues* (ed. D. W. Parry and E. Ulrich; STDJ 30; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 110–23, esp. 119–21.

<sup>29</sup> See Josephus, *Ant.* 13.172; 18.18.

<sup>30</sup> John 3:36; 5:24; 6:40, 47.

There are, of course, other determinist systems for thinking about human action in this period, most notably among the Stoics.<sup>31</sup> And the “determinism” of the Scrolls, like their dualism, has at least one unstable element, in the designation of the membership as “volunteers.”

A determinist anthropology may be a useful tool for thinking about social phenomena, in particular why there should be insiders and outsiders, believers, unbelievers and apostates in the first place. It is dreadful to hear that one’s precious claims have not found favor among those who should accept them, and that some people outside the group may be so annoyed as to persecute the true believers. In such a setting, it may be comforting to attribute human action to the influence of a higher power. The unfortunate flip side of the predestinarian stance is the downgrading of the choices that people do make. A strict doctrine of predestination seems to absolve the self of any responsibility for one’s actions. It thereby eliminates the need for judgment and retribution, either while one is alive or in some post-mortem state.

How does the Fourth Gospel wrestle with its heritage of predestinarian thought? The answer is instructive for reconstructing the kind of cultural scene in which the bricolage of the text takes place. Recall that the Scrolls seem blithely to combine a notion of predestination with an assumption of personal responsibility. John has the same tension, holding complex affirmations about judgment, both present and future, alongside affirmations about the Father’s influence. Does the text somehow resolve the tension?

I believe it does, but by calling on a conceptual resource not evident in the Scrolls, a resource provided by the other great predestinarian system of antiquity. In their wrestling with this problem, the classical Stoics regularly held that despite the fatalistic premises of their mechanistic metaphysical monism, one tiny sphere remained within which there was freedom. In the soul of every human being there resides, if not quite a Cartesian ego, at least a hegemonic center that can give or deny assent to the forces that compel behavior.<sup>32</sup>

The anthropology of the Fourth Gospel replicates the structure of Stoic reflections on free will and determinism, but in a decidedly new

---

<sup>31</sup> In his *interpretatio graeca* of the Jewish schools of thought, Josephus compares the Pharisees to the Stoics (*Life* 12) and the Essenes to the Pythagoreans (*Ant.* 15.371).

<sup>32</sup> See A. A. Long and D. N. Sedley, *The Hellenistic Philosophers* (2 vols.; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 1:386–94.

key. Where the Stoics place “assent” as the locus of freedom and responsibility, the Fourth Gospel places “belief,” a notion which the Gospel goes a good way to explicate, with its usual indirect, narrative logic.

For the Gospel all is focused on the Cross of Christ. To see it with the eyes of the mind and heart open is to believe it, and such belief has healing power. That, in any case, is the significance of the saying by Jesus about the Son of Man being lifted up like the serpent in the desert (John 3:14). But, one might ask, is this transaction merely a bit of magic? No, to see the Cross, claims the Gospel, is to see it for what it really is, an act of self-giving love, what one does for one’s friends (John 15:13). The death of Jesus, so construed, is an exemplary act, prefigured by Jesus in his assumption of the role of a servant who washes his friends’ feet at their final meal (John 13:12–17). As a *compelling* example, it has the force of a command, made explicit by Jesus in John 13:34, when he delivers the only injunction in the Gospel, to love.

To return to the issue that may be framed in anachronistic terms as predestination, the Gospel struggles with the implications of its marginalized existence. It knows that not all have come to accept its message and offers an explanation for that situation. The explanation recalls that of the Scrolls: membership is in the hands of God. Yet the Gospel struggles with the implications of that solution, as had the sectarians, who lodged a battle in the human heart between the cosmic forces of good and evil. The Gospel’s solution is different and more complex. God wills to be beneficent to all creatures and offers to all, “Judean” and Greek alike, the possibility of relationship, or as the Prologue says, “sonship.” To have that relationship, to be “born anew,” is to assent, as would a Stoic, to the compelling truth that is love in action.

If there is any connection between the “determinism” of the Fourth Gospel and that of the Scrolls, it has been taken to an entirely new philosophical and religious level. The conceptual bricoleur of the Gospel has combined the incompatible elements of determinism and human responsibility, as did the pupils of the Teacher of Righteousness, but the key to the combination he finds in two sources not on the horizon of the sectarians. One is the place left for human freedom in one brand of ancient philosophy, but that space has been filled by a content of which the philosophers did not dream.

\* \* \*

I have so far pursued two large thematic complexes for which scholars have argued that a fairly direct relationship obtains between the Scrolls



and the Fourth Gospel. Our exploration, starting from the premise that there may have been some traces of the teachings of the Scrolls in the Gospel has shown that even on such a premise, the evangelist has gone in a very independent direction. From the viewpoint of someone who is trying to make sense of the Fourth Gospel, the Scrolls provide the possibility of a remote source for elements of the text, but more importantly, they enable us to see the world of difference between the sectarian documents and our curious Christian Gospel.

My final probe into the relationship between the Scrolls and the Fourth Gospel will be briefer. It looks not to one of the familiar sectarian texts from the earliest days of the Scrolls' publication, but to one of the later comers, a fragmentary text from Cave 4, 4Q491c (*Self-Glorification Hymn*), which may shed some light on the Christology of the Fourth Gospel. The text, originally published by Baillet in DJD 7,<sup>33</sup> has caught the attention of several scholars.<sup>34</sup>

Exactly what is going on in the text is a matter of some debate. The text refers to "a throne of strength in the congregation of the gods above which none of the kings of the East shall sit" (4Q491 11 i 12). It also contains the voice of the individual sitting on the throne:

My glory [is incomparable] and besides me no one is exalted. And he does not come to me, for I reside in [...], in the heavens and there is no [...]...I am counted among the gods and my dwelling is in the holy congregation; [...my de]sire is not according to the flesh [and] all that is precious to me is in glory [...] holy [pl]ace. (11 i 13-15).<sup>35</sup>

The speaker boasts that no one resembles him in his glory, nor, apparently, in his ability to endure suffering and opposition:

---

<sup>33</sup> M. Baillet, *Qumrân Grotte 4.III (4Q482-4Q520)* (DJD 7; Oxford: Clarendon, 1982), 26-30.

<sup>34</sup> Prominently M. Smith, "Ascent to the Heavens and Deification in 4QM," in *Archeology and History in the Dead Sea Scrolls: The New York University Conference in Memory of Yigal Yadin* (ed. L. H. Schiffman; JSPSup 8; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1990), 181-88; idem, "Two Ascended"; J. J. Collins, *The Scepter and the Star: The Messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and other Ancient Literature* (New York: Doubleday, 1995), 147-48; E. Eshel, "4Q471B: A Self-Glorification Hymn," *RevQ* 17 (1996): 175-203; M. G. Abegg, "Who Ascended to Heaven? 4Q491, 4Q427, and the Teacher of Righteousness," in *Eschatology, Messianism and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. C. A. Evans and P. W. Flint; Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature 1; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 61-73.

<sup>35</sup> Translation from F. García Martínez, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated: The Qumran Texts in English* (2d ed.; Leiden: Brill; Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1996), 118.

Who [...] sorrows like me? And who [...] anguish who resembles me? There is no one. He has (or I have) been taught but there is no comparable teaching. [...] and who will attack me when I open [my mouth]? And who can endure the flow of my lips? And who will confront me and retain comparison with my judgments? [...] For I am counted among the gods, and my glory is with the sons of the king. (11 i 16-18)

Baillet originally proposed that the text's "I" was the archangel Michael. Morton Smith argued for reading the hymn as an account of a mystical ascent to heaven. As he archly describes his reading:

Now to my amazement, the Qumran fragments have provided a little poem by some egomaniac who claimed to have done just what I conjectured Jesus claimed, that is, entered the heavenly kingdom and secured a chair with tenure, while yet commuting to earth and carrying on his teaching here.<sup>36</sup>

John Collins notes weaknesses in Smith's reading. The text does not in fact speak of enthronement, nor does it give a hint that the one enthroned has ascended to heaven. Collins has argued instead the text refers to an eschatological priest-teacher seated in heavenly glory. On either reading, the fragment would provide another interesting parallel between the messianic expectations of the Scrolls and what lurks in the background to John. Unfortunately, the identity of the "I" of the hymn remains a mystery.

Of what precise relevance is this text to the Fourth Gospel? Other fragments attest various Messianic beliefs, such as the so-called "Son of God" text, *4QAramaic Apocalypse* (4Q246); 4Q521;<sup>37</sup> or the *Visions of Amram* 4Q543-547.<sup>38</sup> Some of these beliefs may be relevant to the terminology used by some early Christians to express faith and hope in their Messiah, but the specific relationship of these texts to the Johannine version of Jesus Messianism is not at all obvious. At least some scholars have seen in 4Q491c something more directly relevant. Let me cite again Morton Smith:

<sup>36</sup> "Two Ascended," 294-95.

<sup>37</sup> J. A. Fitzmyer, *A Wandering Aramean: Collected Aramaic Essays* (SBLMS 25; Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1979), 92-93; idem, "The Aramaic 'Son of God' Text from Qumran Cave 4," in *Methods of Investigation of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Khirbet Qumran Site* (ed. M. O. Wise; New York: New York Academy of Sciences, 1994), 163-78; Charlesworth, "Dead Sea Scrolls," 72.

<sup>38</sup> See the treatments in Collins, *Scepter and Star*, 117-22 on the *Aramaic Apocalypse*, and 123-24 on 4Q521; and see P. J. Kobelski, *Melchizedek and Melchireša'* (CBQMS 10; Washington, D.C.: Catholic Biblical Association, 1981) on the *Visions of Amram*.

Whether the claims made by the author of 4Q491 ii 1 are completely false, or whether they reflect hallucinations he actually experienced, we have no way of knowing. In either event they prove that fifty or sixty years before Jesus' crucifixion, men in Palestine were actually making claims of the sort that John was to attribute to Jesus. E. R. Goodenough, who argued for years that the Fourth Gospel expressed an early Palestinian theology derived from mystical Judaism, was a voice crying in the stacks of the Yale library. Everybody—and I among them—thought he was riding his hobby too far. Now, I must wonder.<sup>39</sup>

However we understand the identity of the speaker in the text, its language and concepts certainly indicate a background for the christological affirmations of the Fourth Gospel. There Jesus similarly describes himself, the one who has revealed what the Father is about, as returning to the heavenly glory that was his before the creation of the world (John 17:5), a glory that he recovers once he embraces extreme suffering.

Yet the Fourth Gospel stands in tension with the pattern presented by the Qumran fragment and other images of eschatological glory that it evokes. The Gospel famously plays on the themes of glorification (*doxazō*) and exaltation (*hypsōō*). The latter has a primary referent in the physical lifting up of Jesus on the cross (John 3:14; 12:22), but physical lifting is also spiritual exalting, and the moment of betrayal is the moment when glorification begins (13:31). Irony is the trope most beloved of the author of the Gospel,<sup>40</sup> and like other early followers of Jesus such as Paul,<sup>41</sup> the evangelist takes particular delight in affirming the ultimate irony of exaltation at the point of ultimate degradation. This ironic stance is a far remove from 4Q491c, read as a description of eschatological exaltation of a vindicated teacher. The ironic play on the theme of eschatological glory is further developed in the final prayer of Jesus, in which, from a temporal vantage point that already seems to be beyond death and resurrection, he says to his Father that the glory long since given him he has in turn bestowed on his disciples, so that they might be one (John 17:22). If a scenario like

<sup>39</sup> Smith, "Two Ascended," 298.

<sup>40</sup> See G. W. MacRae, S.J., "Theology and Irony in the Fourth Gospel," in *The Word in the World: Essays in Honour of F. L. Moriarty* (ed. R. J. Clifford and G. W. MacRae; Cambridge, Mass.: Weston College, 1973), 83–96; repr. in *The Gospel of John as Literature: An Anthology of Twentieth-Century Perspectives* (ed. M. G. W. Stibbe; NTTs 17; Leiden: Brill, 1993), 103–13; P. D. Duke, *Irony in the Fourth Gospel* (Atlanta: John Knox, 1985); R. A. Culpepper, "Reading Johannine Irony," in Culpepper and Black, *Exploring the Gospel of John*, 193–207.

<sup>41</sup> See 1 Cor 1–4.

that of 4Q491c, read as an eschatological glorification of a teacher, was somewhere in the background of John, it has been transformed in the Johannine bricolage.

But what if we read the fragment as Smith would have us do, as an account of a heavenly ascent? That the Fourth Gospel is in some connection with ascent mysticism is a hypothesis that has made some headway in Johannine scholarship of late.<sup>42</sup> But as in so much else that has come into the Johannine orbit, this too has been reshaped by our bricoleur.

The crucial text is the encounter between Jesus and Nicodemus in chapter 3, which has much to do with coming and going from heaven. Jesus affirms that he has something heavenly to teach his nocturnal visitor (John 3:12). He also affirms that no one has ascended to heaven except the one who has come down (John 3:13). Is this an affirmation that Jesus was able to ascend because heaven was his home? Does this imply that he needed to ascend in order to be able to tell of heavenly things? No, the logic of his comment works not at the level of the story, but in the world of the evangelist. Lurking in the background are probably people like Paul's rivals, severely castigated in 2 Corinthians 11–12. Paul, who himself had mystical experiences, was not going to allow such experiences to warrant claims for authority over his flock! Similarly, the disciple of Paul who wrote the Epistle to the Colossians struggled with a piety that involved some sort of ascent mysticism.<sup>43</sup> So, too, the evangelist through the saying of Jesus in John 3:13, resists any claim that someone other than Jesus could have had an authority granted by mystical ascent.

But the ostensible aim of ascent was vision, a vision perhaps of the *Merkavah* or perhaps of the "One like a Son of Man" seated at the right hand of the Majesty on high, a vision that could enlighten and transform. John, too, urges on his readers a transformative vision, a vision

---

<sup>42</sup> A. De Conick, *Seek to See Him: Ascent and Vision Mysticism in the Gospel of Thomas* (VCSup 33; Leiden: Brill, 1996); idem, *Voices of the Mystics: Early Christian Discourse in the Gospels of John and Thomas and Other Ancient Christian Literature* (JSNTSup 157; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001); E. Pagels, *Beyond Belief: The Secret Gospel of Thomas* (New York: Random House, 2003).

<sup>43</sup> For one construal of the problem in Colossae, with references to other literature, see H. W. Attridge, "On Becoming an Angel: Rival Baptismal Theologies at Colossae," in *Religious Propaganda and Missionary Competition in the New Testament World: Essays Honoring Dieter Georgi* (ed. L. Borman, et al.; NovTSup 74; Leiden: Brill, 1994), 481–98.

of which we have already had occasion to speak, a vision referred to in the next verse of John 3, a vision of the exalted Son of Man, hanging, like the serpent in the desert, on a stake.

In conclusion, then, the major parallels between the Scrolls and the Fourth Gospel remain what they were at the start of the discussion some fifty years ago. A few new pieces have been added to the puzzle, but the results remain the same. The Scrolls *do* illuminate the Jewish background to the Gospel. They may provide generic examples of the kind of traditions with which the text worked, even if they do not provide the specific stuff of which it was constructed. What the Scrolls do not do is to show how these building blocks were shaped into a new structure, one animated by an ironic spirit very different from that which confronts us in the Scrolls.

RECENT PERSPECTIVES ON JOHANNINE DUALISM  
AND ITS BACKGROUND\*

JÖRG FREY  
*University of Munich*

Of all the links that scholars have proposed between Qumran and the New Testament, the idea of a close relation between the Scrolls and the Johannine literature is one of the earliest suggestions and certainly one of the most debated ones.<sup>1</sup> Put forward already in 1950 by Karl Georg Kuhn,<sup>2</sup> the Qumran hypothesis was then advocated with more or less caution by scholars such as Millar Burrows,<sup>3</sup> William F. Albright,<sup>4</sup> Raymond E. Brown,<sup>5</sup> and James H. Charlesworth.<sup>6</sup> It was adopted in

---

\* I am most grateful to Dr. Jutta Leonhardt-Balzer and Prof. Daniel Schwartz for their suggestions regarding the contents and language of this article, and to Nadine Kessler and Angelika Ohloff for their help during the correction process. Translations of Second Temple texts in this paper are generally taken from *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (ed. J. H. Charlesworth; 2 vols.; New York: Doubleday, 1983–1985). For a more extensive discussion of some of the topics covered here, see my article “Licht aus den Höhlen? Der johanneische Dualismus und die Texte von Qumran,” in *Kontexte des Johannesevangeliums* (ed. J. Frey and U. Schnelle, with the collaboration of J. Schlegel; WUNT 175; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004), 115–201. For an extended discussion of Johannine “dualism” see my article, “Zu Hintergrund und Funktion des johanneischen Dualismus,” in *Paulus und Johannes: Exegetische Studien zur paulinischen und johanneischen Theologie und Literatur* (ed. D. Sänger and U. Mell; WUNT 198; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006), 3–73.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. the survey of the earlier literature in H. Braun, *Qumran und das Neue Testament* (2 vols.; Tübingen: Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1966), 2:118–44.

<sup>2</sup> K. G. Kuhn, “Die in Palästina gefundenen hebräischen Texte und das Neue Testament,” *ZTK* 47 (1950): 192–211 (209–10); cf. idem, “Die Sektenschrift und die iranische Religion,” *ZTK* 49 (1952): 296–316.

<sup>3</sup> M. Burrows, *The Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York: Viking, 1955), 338.

<sup>4</sup> W. F. Albright, “Recent Discoveries in Palestine and the Gospel of St. John,” in *The Background of the New Testament and its Eschatology* (ed. W. D. Davies and D. Daube; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1956), 153–71.

<sup>5</sup> R. E. Brown, “The Qumran Scrolls and the Johannine Gospel and Epistles,” *CBQ* 17 (1955): 403–19, 559–74; German translation: “Die Schriftrollen von Qumran und das Johannesevangelium und die Johannesbriefe,” in *Johannes und sein Evangelium* (ed. K. H. Rengstorff; Wege der Forschung 82; Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1973), 486–528.

<sup>6</sup> J. H. Charlesworth, “A Critical Comparison of the Dualism in 1QS 3:13–4:26 and the ‘Dualism’ Contained in the Gospel of John,” *NTS* 15 (1968/69): 389–418; reprinted in *John and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. J. H. Charlesworth; New York: Crossroad, 1990),

commentaries on the Johannine literature; e.g., the works of Raymond E. Brown,<sup>7</sup> George Beasley-Murray, and D. Moody Smith, from whom we learn of “close contacts”<sup>8</sup> and “remarkable similarities”<sup>9</sup> between the Scrolls and the Gospel, or even between the Essene sect and the Johannine author.

While Kuhn only claimed to have found the “mother soil” of Johannine thought in Palestinian Judaism of a nonorthodox, or—as he thought—gnostic, type,<sup>10</sup> other scholars such as Frank Cross and William Albright went even further and drew consequences regarding the authenticity and historical reliability of the Fourth Gospel. Whereas the historical value of the Fourth Gospel had been heavily disputed by critical scholarship since the 19th century,<sup>11</sup> the parallels in the Scrolls now appeared as a proof of “authentic historical material which first took form in an Aramaic or Hebrew milieu.”<sup>12</sup> The Scrolls were taken as a confirmation that the Fourth Gospel contained no less than “the memories of the Apostle John” himself.<sup>13</sup>

---

76–101; idem, “Qumran, John, and the Odes of Solomon,” in *John and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 107–36; idem, “The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Gospel according to John,” in *Exploring the Gospel of John: In Honor of D. Moody Smith* (ed. R. A. Culpepper and C. C. Black; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1996), 65–97; idem, “The Priority of John? Reflections on the Essenes and the First Edition of John,” in *Für und Wider die Priorität des Johannesevangeliums* (ed. P. L. Hofrichter; Theologische Texte und Studien 9; Hildesheim: Olms, 2002), 73–114.

<sup>7</sup> R. E. Brown, *The Gospel According to John* (2 vols.; AB 29, 29A; New York: Doubleday, 1966), 1:lxiii.

<sup>8</sup> G. R. Beasley-Murray, *John* (WBC 36; Dallas: Word Publishing, 1989), lxi.

<sup>9</sup> D. M. Smith, *John* (ANTC; Nashville: Abingdon, 1999), 34.

<sup>10</sup> Cf. Kuhn, “Die in Palästina gefundenen hebräischen Texte,” 210: “Wir bekommen in diesen neuen Texten *den Mutterboden des Johannesevangeliums* zu fassen, und dieser Mutterboden ist palästinisch-jüdisch, ist aber nicht das pharisäisch-rabbinische Judentum, sondern ist eine palästinisch-jüdische Sektenfrömmigkeit gnostischer Struktur.”

<sup>11</sup> Cf., on the critical consensus from the end of the nineteenth century and its implication that John should be excluded from the quest for the historical Jesus, J. Frey, *Die johanneische Eschatologie 1: Ihre Probleme im Spiegel der Forschung seit Reimarus* (WUNT 96; Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1997), 38–39; see, e.g., E. Schürer, “Über den gegenwärtigen Stand der johanneischen Frage,” *Vorträge der theologischen Konferenz zu Giessen* (Giessen: Ricker, 1889), 5:41–73; reprinted in Rengstorf, *Johannes und sein Evangelium*, 1–27.

<sup>12</sup> F. M. Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical Studies* (London: Duckworth, 1958), 161–62: “John preserves authentic historical material which first took form in an Aramaic or Hebrew milieu where Essene currents still ran strong.”

<sup>13</sup> Cf. Albright, “Discoveries,” 170–71: “That the needs of the early Church influenced the selection of items for inclusion in the Gospel we may readily admit, but there is no reason to suppose that the needs of that Church were responsible for any inventions or innovations of theological significance... we may rest assured that it [sc. the Gospel of John] contains the memories of the Apostle John.”

Historical speculations grew even further. Scholars tried to utilize the Qumran calendar to bridge the gap between the Synoptic and Johannine chronologies of Jesus' death,<sup>14</sup> or speculated about the identity of the Beloved Disciple as an Essene priest who had hosted the Last Supper for the Jesus group in the Essene Quarter in Jerusalem.<sup>15</sup> It was often suggested that the Evangelist himself was a former member of the Essene sect, so that he had read the sectarian documents<sup>16</sup> or memorized the Essene teaching.<sup>17</sup> Others conjectured that he was a former disciple of John the Baptist,<sup>18</sup> so that the Baptist became the mediator between Qumran and Johannine teaching. Some scholars also drew conclusions vis-à-vis the intended audience of the Johannine literature and interpreted the Fourth Gospel as a Christian teaching for Essenes,<sup>19</sup> or the first Epistle as addressing former Essenes who had become Christians.<sup>20</sup>

<sup>14</sup> Cf. A. Jaubert, *La Date de la Cène* (Paris: Gabalda, 1957); eadem, "Jésus et le calendrier de Qumrân," *NTS* 7 (1960/61): 1–30; eadem, "The Calendar of Qumran and the Passion Narrative in John," in Charlesworth, *John and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 62–75; E. Ruckstuhl, "Zur Chronologie der Leidensgeschichte Jesu, I. Teil," *SNTU* 10 (1985): 27–61 (esp. 55–56), reprinted in idem, *Jesus im Horizont der Evangelien* (Stuttgarter Biblische Aufsatzbände 3; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1988), 101–40 (132–33); idem, "Zur Chronologie der Leidensgeschichte Jesu II. Teil," *SNTU* 11 (1986): 97–129, reprinted in idem, *Jesus im Horizont der Evangelien*, 141–76. Cf. the detailed criticism of Jaubert's hypotheses by J. C. VanderKam, "The Origin, Character and Early History of the 364-Day Calendar: A Reassessment of Jaubert's Hypotheses," *CBQ* 41 (1979): 390–411; reprinted in idem, *From Revelation to Canon: Studies in the Hebrew Bible and Second Temple Literature* (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 81–104; R. T. Beckwith, *Calendar and Chronology, Jewish and Christian* (Leiden: Brill, 1996), 289–92.

<sup>15</sup> E. Ruckstuhl, "Der Jünger, den Jesus liebte: Geschichtliche Umriss," in *BK* 40 (1985): 77–83 (77); idem, "Der Jünger, den Jesus liebte," *SNTU* 11 (1986): 131–67 (esp. 165–66), reprinted in idem, *Jesus im Horizont der Evangelien*, 355–394 (393–94). Cf. also B. N. Capper, "With the Oldest Monks...: Light from Essene History on the Career of the Beloved Disciple?" *JTS* 49 (1998): 1–55.

<sup>16</sup> J. Ashton, *Understanding the Fourth Gospel* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1991), 205.

<sup>17</sup> Charlesworth, "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Gospel according to John," 88.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. the unnamed disciple in John 1:35–39; see already F.-M. Braun, "L'arrière-fond judaïque du quatrième évangile et la Communauté de l'Alliance," *RB* 62 (1955): 5–44 (43–44); idem, *Jean le théologien et son évangile dans l'église ancienne 2: Les grandes traditions d'Israël et l'accord des écritures selon le quatrième évangile* (EBib; Paris: Gabalda, 1959), 310–19; also cautiously R. E. Brown, "The Qumran Scrolls and the Johannine Gospels and Epistles," but different, then, in his *The Gospel According to John*, 1:lxiii; cf. also O. Cullmann, "The Significance of the Qumran Texts for Research into the Beginnings of Christianity," in *The Scrolls and the New Testament* (ed. K. Stendahl; New York, 1957), 18–32 (24–25); Charlesworth, "A Critical Comparison," 105.

<sup>19</sup> K. Schubert, *Die Gemeinde vom Toten Meer: Ihre Entstehung und ihre Lehrer* (Munich: Reinhardt, 1958), 131.

<sup>20</sup> M.-É. Boismard, "The First Epistle of John and the Writings of Qumran," in Charlesworth, *John and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 156–66 (165–66).



The most elaborate hypothesis was put forward recently by James H. Charlesworth. Based on his earlier articles on the Qumran background of Johannine dualism, he even speculates about the exact date of a hypothetical first edition of the Gospel. According to him, this edition was composed “between June 68 and June 70,” i.e., in the period after the Essenes had fled Qumran for Jerusalem and eventually joined the Johannine community there, but before the circumvallation of Jerusalem could have prevented that community’s escape from Jerusalem.<sup>21</sup>

There is no need to discuss these hypotheses in detail here. I can only mention the fact that in recent scholarship, the idea of a Qumran background for Johannine language and thought has been subjected to severe and growing criticism. The call for revision of the widespread theories has been formulated, e.g., by Richard Bauckham,<sup>22</sup> David Aune,<sup>23</sup> and myself.<sup>24</sup> In the present paper I will 1) present a critical survey of the earlier comparisons; 2) give some reasons for a revision of the overall picture; 3) add a brief analysis of the dualistic elements in the Johannine literature together with some reflections on their possible background; and 4) end with a sober conclusion.

---

<sup>21</sup> Charlesworth, “The Priority of John?” 102.

<sup>22</sup> R. Bauckham, “Qumran and the Fourth Gospel: Is there a Connection?” in *The Scrolls and the Scriptures: Qumran Fifty Years After* (ed. S. E. Porter and C. A. Evans; JSPSup 26/RILP 3; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 267–79; idem, “The Qumran Community and the Gospel of John,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years After their Discovery: Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20–25, 1997* (ed. L. H. Schiffman, E. Tov, and J. C. VanderKam; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2000), 105–15.

<sup>23</sup> D. E. Aune, “Dualism in the Fourth Gospel and the Dead Sea Scrolls: A Reassessment of the Problem,” in *Neotestamentica et Philonica: Studies in Honour of Peder Borgen* (ed. D. E. Aune, T. Seland, and J. H. Ulrichsen; NovTSup 106; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 281–303.

<sup>24</sup> J. Frey, “Die Bedeutung der Qumranfunde für das Verständnis des Neuen Testaments,” in *Qumran—die Schriftrollen vom Toten Meer: Vorträge des St. Galler Qumran-Symposiums vom 2./3. Juli 1999* (ed. M. Fieger, K. Schmid, and P. Schwagmeier; NTOA 47; Freiburg: Universitätsverlag; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2001), 129–208 (191–206); idem, “Licht aus den Höhlen?” Cf. already the brief hints in idem, “Different Patterns of Dualistic Thought in the Qumran Library,” in *Legal Texts and Legal Issues: Proceedings of the Second Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Cambridge 1995, Published in Honour of Joseph M. Baumgarten* (ed. M. J. Bernstein, F. García Martínez, and J. Kampen; STDJ 23; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 275–335 (335).

## 1. A FRESH LOOK AT EARLIER COMPARISONS

The textual basis of the far-reaching speculations mentioned above is rather limited. It consists of a number of parallels in language and thought noted between the Johannine Gospel and Epistles and some passages from Qumran. This was quite sensational 50 years ago, when leading scholars such as Charles H. Dodd and Rudolf Bultmann interpreted the Fourth Gospel almost completely against a Hellenistic<sup>25</sup> or even gnostic<sup>26</sup> background. In that context, the scholarly and public excitement about unexpected language parallels from a Palestinian Jewish milieu is easy to comprehend. In retrospect, it is certainly true that the Qumran discoveries caused a major “shift in Johannine scholarship towards recognizing the thoroughly Jewish character of Johannine theology.”<sup>27</sup> But, as Bauckham aptly comments, “this appears to have been a case of drawing the correct conclusion from the wrong evidence,”<sup>28</sup> because the Qumran parallels are not the only evidence for the Jewish character of the Fourth Gospel, and they cannot prove a peculiar Qumranic but only a broader Palestinian Jewish background.

Since the beginning of the discussion in the early Fifties, comparisons between the Johannine literature and the Dead Sea Scrolls have garnered a wealth of more or less compelling parallels. They can be classified roughly into three groups:

- (a) General convictions shared by both corpora; e.g., parallels regarding scriptural interpretation. However, these shared ideas can only demonstrate that the Johannine literature draws on a background which is shaped by biblical and early Jewish tradition.
- (b) Parallels concerning peculiar motifs, such as the call for communal love. But even such similarities may be explained by sociological

---

<sup>25</sup> Cf. C. H. Dodd, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1953).

<sup>26</sup> Cf. R. Bultmann's foundational essay, “Die Bedeutung der neuerschlossenen manichäischen und manichäischen Quellen für das Verständnis des Johannesevangeliums,” *ZNW* 24 (1925): 100–146, reprinted in idem, *Exegetica* (ed. E. Dinkler; Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1967), 55–104; idem, “Johanneische Schriften und Gnosis,” *Orientalische Literaturzeitung* 43 (1940): 150–75, reprinted in idem, *Exegetica*, 230–54; idem, *Das Evangelium nach Johannes* (21st ed.; KEK 2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1948 [1986]).

<sup>27</sup> Bauckham, “Qumran and the Fourth Gospel,” 279.

<sup>28</sup> Bauckham, “Qumran and the Fourth Gospel,” 279.

analogies, and cannot prove a historical or tradition-historical relationship.

- (c) Precise linguistic and terminological parallels.<sup>29</sup> Evidence for a peculiar historical or tradition-historical relation between Qumran and the Johannine literature can be adduced only from such precise matches. Consequently, such parallels were focused upon by Raymond Brown and James Charlesworth, to prove Qumran influence on Johannine language and thought.

At first glance, the number of Johannine terms paralleled in Qumran is quite impressive.<sup>30</sup> It includes the particular terms denoting the Spirit-Paraclete, such as “Spirit of Truth” and “Holy Spirit”; and especially the expressions within a dualistic framework, such as “Sons of Light,” “the Light of Life,” to “walk in the darkness” or “walk in the truth,” “to witness for the truth,” “to do the truth,” “works of God” vs. “evil works,” the notion of God’s “wrath,” “full of grace” and “eternal life.” Since many of the terms and phrases mentioned occur within the so-called *Treatise on the Two Spirits* in 1QS, this passage has often been the starting point for the evaluation of Qumran dualism and its impact on the dualism of the Fourth Gospel.<sup>31</sup>

But even in view of linguistic parallels, precise distinctions are necessary: Is the parallel formed by a single word or word combination, or by a shared peculiar notion? Is the occurrence of the parallel confined to the Dead Sea Scrolls or can we find it in other sources as well? Is the assumed parallel limited to sectarian documents, or does it also occur in nonsectarian texts from the Qumran library?<sup>32</sup> Can we detect an internal development of terms or ideas within the documents from Qumran?

<sup>29</sup> Cf. Aune, “Dualism,” 283.

<sup>30</sup> Cf., fundamentally, the lists from Brown, “The Qumran Scrolls and the Johannine Gospels and Epistles,” and Charlesworth, “A Critical Comparison.” To the terms mentioned there, many others can be added by way of the concordances and electronic tools now available.

<sup>31</sup> Cf. Charlesworth, “A Critical Comparison,” whose analysis is totally focussed on the “doctrine”; but cf. also the more recent article by A. Destro and M. Pesce, “The Gospel of John and the Community Rule of Qumran: A Comparison of Systems,” in *The Judaism of Qumran: A Systemic Reading of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. A. J. Avery-Peck, J. Neusner, and B. Chilton; Judaism in Late Antiquity 5.2; Leiden: Brill, 2001), 201–29.

<sup>32</sup> On these questions, cf. also H.-W. Kuhn, “Qumran und Paulus: Unter traditions-geschichtlichem Aspekt ausgewählte Parallelen,” in *Das Urchristentum in seiner literarischen Geschichte: Festschrift für Jürgen Becker zum 65. Geburtstag* (ed. U. Mell and U. B. Müller; BZNW 100; Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 1999), 227–46 (228–29).

And if there are different patterns of an idea within the library,<sup>33</sup> which is the one that comes closest to the New Testament parallels? Only through questions like these can we decide whether or not the alleged parallels actually point to a literary or tradition-historical relation.

If we begin to ask these questions, the impressive picture drawn by the advocates of the Qumran thesis begins to lose its force. Most of the parallels mentioned above are not exclusively Qumranic. They are not confined to the Qumran library, let alone the Qumran sectarian texts.

This is totally clear for the term “eternal life,” which has its most important background in Dan 12:3 but can also be found in the *Books of Enoch*,<sup>34</sup> the *Psalms of Solomon*, *Joseph and Aseneth*, 2 and 4 Maccabees,<sup>35</sup> in early Christianity,<sup>36</sup> and in rabbinic texts,<sup>37</sup> so that the parallel in 1QS 4:7 cannot be used as an argument for a peculiar relationship with the Johannine literature. Moreover, one should not forget that the concept of “(eternal) life” is not as central in Qumran as it is in John.

Another example is the phrase “light of life” (John 8:12/1QS 3:7), which is not exclusively Qumranic, but primarily biblical.<sup>38</sup> The Johannine passage on the enduring wrath of God (John 3:36) has its closest

---

<sup>33</sup> Cf., as examples of such an inquiry, J. Frey, “Different Patterns”; idem, “Die paulinische Antithese von ‘Fleisch’ und ‘Geist’ und die palästinisch-jüdische Weisheitstradition,” *ZNW* 90 (1999): 45–77; idem, “The Notion of ‘Flesh’ in 4QInstruction and the Background of Pauline Usage,” in *Sapiential, Poetical and Liturgical Texts: Proceedings of the Third Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Oslo 1998, Published in Memory of Maurice Baillet* (ed. D. K. Falk, F. García Martínez, and E. M. Schuller; STJD 35; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 197–226; idem, “Flesh and Spirit in the Palestinian Jewish Sapiential Tradition and in the Qumran Texts: An Inquiry into the Background of Pauline Usage,” in *The Wisdom Texts from Qumran and the Development of Sapiential Thought: Studies in Wisdom at Qumran and its Relationship to Sapiential Thought in the Ancient Near East, the Hebrew Bible, Ancient Judaism, and the New Testament* (ed. C. Hempel, A. Lange, and H. Lichtenberger; BETL 159; Leuven: Peeters, 2002), 367–404.

<sup>34</sup> *1 En.* 10:10; 15:4, 6; 37:4; 40:9; 58:3.

<sup>35</sup> *Pss. Sol.* 3:12; *Jos. Asen.* 8:9; 2 Macc 7:9; 4 Macc 15:3.

<sup>36</sup> Cf. Mark 10:17, 30; Rom 2:7; 5:21; 6:22–23; Gal 6:8.

<sup>37</sup> Cf., e.g., *m. Tamid* 7:4; *Mek.* on Exod 18:27 (cf. *Mechilta d’Rabbi Ismael* [ed. H. S. Horowitz and I. A. Rabin; 2d ed.; Jerusalem: Wahrman, 1970], 201). On the background of the Johannine concept of life cf. J. Frey, *Die johanneische Eschatologie 3: Die eschatologische Verkündigung in den johanneischen Texten* (WUNT 117; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000), 264–68.

<sup>38</sup> Ps 56:14; cf. Prov 6:23; 16:15; Job 33:30.

parallel in the Wisdom of Solomon,<sup>39</sup> not in Qumran. The expression “to do the truth” (John 3:21; 1 John 1:6/1QS 1:5; 5:3; 8:2) can be found already in the LXX of Isaiah,<sup>40</sup> in Tobit,<sup>41</sup> and in the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*.<sup>42</sup> “Works of God” and the related phrase “works of the Lord” can also be found in the Bible,<sup>43</sup> so there is no reason to interpret the Johannine phrase ἔργα τοῦ θεοῦ (John 6:28; 9:3) against the background of Qumran. “To walk in truth” (2 John 4; 3 John 3/1QS 4:6; 8:3) is also paralleled in the LXX;<sup>44</sup> the expressions “to walk in the light” or “in the darkness” (John 8:12; 12:35/1QS 3:21; 4:11) similarly have LXX or MT parallels.<sup>45</sup>

Most interesting are the observations regarding the term “sons of light” (υἱοὶ φωτός) in John 12:36, which is unparalleled in the Hebrew Bible but frequent in Qumran texts as a community self-designation.<sup>46</sup> But considering that the term can also be found in Paul (1 Thess 5:5) and in the synoptic tradition (Luke 16:8),<sup>47</sup> and that in both cases it is equally opposed to the notion of darkness, the idea of an immediate Qumranic influence on John loses its cogency. In addition, we note that the term is already used in nonsectarian or “pre-Essene” texts such as the *Vision of Amram*.<sup>48</sup> Thus, we can conclude that the expression did not originate within the Essene community but rather in some kind of precursor group, so that it might have been transmitted not only by the Essene or sectarian tradition but also independently of the Qumran

<sup>39</sup> Wis 16:5; 18:20. Cf. J. Frey, “Wie Mose die Schlange in der Wüste erhöht hat...: Zur frühjüdischen Deutung der ‘ehernen Schlange’ und ihrer christologischen Rezeption in Johannes 3,14f.,” in *Schriftauslegung* (ed. M. Hengel and H. Löhrr; WUNT 73; Tübingen: Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1994), 153–205 (196–97); idem, *Die johanneische Eschatologie*, 3:305–6.

<sup>40</sup> Isa 26:10 LXX.

<sup>41</sup> Tob 4:6; 13:6.

<sup>42</sup> *T. Benj.* 10:3. Cf. also the Aramaic equivalent in the *Targum Jonathan* on Hos 4:1; see A. Sperber, *The Bible in Aramaic, Vol. 3: The Latter Prophets according to Targum Jonathan* (2d ed.; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 391; cf. already H. Braun, *Qumran und das Neue Testament*, 1:113.

<sup>43</sup> Cf. “works of God” in Exod 34:10; “works of the Lord” in Ps 107:24; Deut 11:7; Jer 51:10; and Ps 111:2 (cf. Sir 39:16).

<sup>44</sup> 4 Kings 20:3 (LXX); cf. 2 Sam 20:3 (MT).

<sup>45</sup> Cf. Isa 2:5; 9:1; 50:10; 59:9 (in both MT and LXX); Ps 56:14 (only MT; Ps 55:14 LXX differs); 82:5 (MT; cf. also Ps 81:5 LXX); Prov 2:13 (MT and LXX).

<sup>46</sup> Cf. the frequent use of this phrase in 1QS 1:9; 2:16; 3:13, 24, 25; 1QM 1:1, 3, 9, 11, 13, etc.

<sup>47</sup> Cf. also the form τέκνα φωτός in Eph 5:8; see also *1 En.* 108:11.

<sup>48</sup> 4Q548 1–2 ii 10–11, 15–16. Cf., similarly “sons of truth” and “sons of the lie” in 4Q548 1–2 ii 8–9.

group. The (single) occurrence of “sons of light” in John is by no means a proof of a Qumranic influence on John. A similar argument can be adduced regarding the phrase “spirit of truth.”<sup>49</sup> Not only is there a remarkable difference between the usage of this phrase in the *Treatise on the Two Spirits*<sup>50</sup> and in the Fourth Gospel, but the term can also be found in the *Testament of Judah* (20:1–25),<sup>51</sup> and—probably independently of John—in the Shepherd of Hermas (*Mand.* 3:4). Therefore even the peculiar designation of the Holy Spirit in John cannot be explained exclusively from Qumran usage.<sup>52</sup>

A closer look at the Qumran parallels adduced by Brown, Charlesworth and others thus leads to the conclusion that most of the parallels are not exclusively Qumranic. If the phrases occur elsewhere, in the Hebrew Bible or the Septuagint, in non-Essene Jewish texts or in other documents of early Christianity, then the linguistic argument for a Qumran influence on Johannine language and thought is undermined.

The most impressive argument for such an influence was taken, however, not from individual linguistic parallels, but rather from a more general view of *structural similarity* between the dualism in Qumran texts (especially the *Treatise on the Two Spirits*) and in John. Particularly in the fifties, when John was interpreted in gnostic terms by many interpreters, the Qumran documents provided the revolutionary evidence of a Jewish kind of dualism which was obviously much closer to the Johannine view than the Mandaeen and Manichaean texts adduced in Bultmann’s commentary. Accordingly, many scholars saw the Qumran discoveries as a decisive reason to reject the views of Bultmann and his followers. Consequently, in the history of religious interpretation of John, the foil of Gnosticism was simply replaced by that of Qumran dualism.<sup>53</sup> This was all the easier, to the extent that

<sup>49</sup> John 14:17; 15:26; 16:13; cf. 1 John 4:6.

<sup>50</sup> 1QS 3:18–19; 4:21, 23; cf. also 4Q177 12–13 i 5 and (for the same expression in Aramaic) 4Q542 1 i 10; in the plural 1QM 13:10; 4Q444 6 4.

<sup>51</sup> Here there is a dualistic opposition comparable to 1 John 4:6.

<sup>52</sup> Cf. also Aune, “John and the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 297–300.

<sup>53</sup> This is already apparent in Kuhn, “Die in Palästina gefundenen hebräischen Texte,” 209–10; cf. idem, “Johannes-Evangelium und Qumrantexte,” in *Neotestamentica et Patristica: Eine Freundesgabe, Herrn Professor Dr. Oscar Cullmann zu seinem 60. Geburtstag Überreicht* (n. ed.; NovTSup 6; Leiden: Brill, 1962), 111–22 (120–21); J. Becker, *Das Heil Gottes* (SUNT 3; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1964), 220–21; R. Bergmeier, *Glaube als Gabe nach Johannes* (BWANT 112; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1980), 28.

the common structure of Qumranic and Johannine dualism could be traced back to Iranian roots.<sup>54</sup>

In his influential article, Raymond Brown<sup>55</sup> sought to demonstrate that, despite differences in detail, Johannine and Qumran dualism have a very similar structure. Unlike gnostic dualism, they share an eschatological and ethical orientation. In his discussion of common aspects (creation; two opposed spirits; the combat motif; the role of human beings; “sons of light”), Brown is well aware of the differences: for instance that John does not use the name “Belial”; or that John distinguishes between Christ as the “light of the world” and the “spirit of truth,” whereas in the 1QS 3–4 “prince of light” and “spirit of truth” characterize one single figure. Summing up, Brown states that the basic difference between the two theologies is Christ himself. Although he rejects the theory that Christianity is a kind of Essenism, in the end he concludes that the background of Johannine thought is the language and thought of Qumran.

Charlesworth, in his key article,<sup>56</sup> provides an even more detailed analysis. The essay is totally focussed on the *Treatise on the Two Spirits* (1QS 3:13–4:26), which is seen as “representative of the dualism found elsewhere in the Scrolls.”<sup>57</sup> Here, Charlesworth finds a relative, cosmic, and eschatological dualism which is structurally paralleled in the Fourth Gospel. Like the *Treatise*, the Johannine author knows of two worlds, characterized by the notions of “above” and “below,” or “light” and “darkness.” The observation that the language parallels mentioned above are densely concentrated in the *Treatise* proves, in Charlesworth’s view, that Johannine thought is textually dependent on that passage. From the fact that another phrase, “to do the truth” (עשה אמת), does not occur within 1QS 3:13–4:26, but rather in the passages that precede and follow it in the manuscript,<sup>58</sup> he goes so far as to conjecture that the Evangelist must have read the *Treatise*—which originally was an independent composition—within its present context in 1QS (or another exact copy of that text).<sup>59</sup>

<sup>54</sup> Cf., among others, already Kuhn, “Die Sektenschrift und die iranische Religion.”

<sup>55</sup> Brown, “The Qumran Scrolls and the Johannine Gospels and Epistles.”

<sup>56</sup> Charlesworth, “A Critical Comparison.”

<sup>57</sup> *Ibid.*, 77 n. 3. The differences between the *Treatise* and other Qumran texts such as 1QM are viewed as insignificant.

<sup>58</sup> Cf. 1QS 1:5; 5:3; 8:2.

<sup>59</sup> See the explanation in Charlesworth, “A Critical Comparison,” 77 n. 3.

## 2. SIX REASONS FOR REVISION

As mentioned above, the analyses by Brown, Charlesworth and others have been criticised in recent scholarship. According to Richard Bauckham, the views sketched above “arose from a natural enthusiasm” in the first period of Qumran research, “but the parallels in this case have not been assessed with sufficient methodological rigor.”<sup>60</sup> This is correct, especially in view of the more recent developments in Qumran research. The analyses mentioned above were based on the state of publication in the fifties and sixties. They are not yet informed by the need to distinguish between sectarian and nonsectarian texts.

Moreover, the pattern of Qumran dualism was usually taken from the *Treatise on the Two Spirits*, and the differences between this text and, e.g., the *War Rule* were considered unimportant. But according to more recent research, the picture is much more complicated. Ongoing investigation of the Qumran texts, and especially the publication of the vast majority of fragments in the nineties, has led to a number of additional insights that call for a revision of the views sketched above. Without going into detail, I will briefly mention some of these new conceptions.

### a. *Sectarian and Nonsectarian Texts*

As noted above, we have to distinguish more carefully than before between the texts which originated within the *yahad* itself and other documents which were probably composed outside of it or before its constitution, and thus probably circulated independently.

There is a terminological problem here. The terms sectarian and nonsectarian are somewhat misleading, because some precursor groups of the *yahad* might also be characterized as “sects.”<sup>61</sup> The designations “Essene” and “non-Essene” are even more disputed, since not only is the identification of the *yahad* with the Essenes contested,<sup>62</sup> but the term Essene is often used in a sense that is much broader than that of

<sup>60</sup> Bauckham, “Qumran Community,” 106.

<sup>61</sup> See on the “sects,” A. I. Baumgarten, *The Flourishing of Jewish Sects in the Maccabean Era* (JSJSup 55; Leiden: Brill, 1997).

<sup>62</sup> See on the matter of identification, J. Frey, “Zur historischen Auswertung der antiken Essenerberichte,” in *Qumran kontrovers: Beiträge zu den Textfunden vom Toten Meer* (ed. J. Frey and H. Stegemann; Einblicke 6; Paderborn: Bonifatius, 2003), 23–56.



the *yaḥad*.<sup>63</sup> As for me, I use the term Essene precisely for the *yaḥad* as it is visible in the community rules from Qumran.<sup>64</sup>

In any case, though, if we do not want to speak more generally of Enochic or apocalyptic traditions, but rather, precisely of the community described by the rule texts in 1QS and the *Damascus Document*, we have to apply criteria for identifying the texts which do express the ideas of this community.<sup>65</sup> And even though the criteria are open to discussion, there is at least a growing consensus that Enochic literature, *Jubilees*, the *Temple Scroll*, most of the sapiential writings and presumably all of the Aramaic texts originated outside of the *yaḥad*. But the sectarian origin of texts such as the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*, the *War Rule*, and the *Treatise on the Two Spirits* is also heavily disputed. If the terminological criteria are used with some methodological rigor, even the *Treatise* should be seen as a traditional text from the time before the constitution of the *yaḥad*;<sup>66</sup> and even the *War Rule* might be based on older traditions from outside the community.<sup>67</sup>

#### b. *Variety Within the Sectarian Documents*

A second distinction should be made. Even if we take the “sectually explicit” literature as a body from which we may reconstruct the

<sup>63</sup> Cf. the idea of an “Essene Judaism” that encompasses not only the Qumran texts but also the Enochic literature; see principally P. Sacchi, *Jewish Apocalyptic and its History* (JSPSup 20; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1990); G. Boccaccini, *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis: The Parting of the Ways between Qumran and Enochic Judaism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998).

<sup>64</sup> Cf. Frey, “Zur historischen Auswertung.”

<sup>65</sup> For discussion of the criteria, see C. A. Newsom, “‘Sectually Explicit’ Literature from Qumran,” in *The Hebrew Bible and its Interpreters* (ed. W. H. Propp, B. Halpern, and D. N. Freedman; Biblical and Judaic Studies from the University of California, San Diego 1; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1990), 167–87; D. Dimant, “The Qumran Manuscripts: Contents and Significance,” in *Time to Prepare the Way in the Wilderness: Papers on the Qumran Scrolls* (ed. D. Dimant and L. H. Schiffman; STDJ 16; Leiden: Brill, 1995), 23–58; A. Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination* (STDJ 18; Leiden: Brill, 1995), 6–20; A. Lange and H. Lichtenberger, “Qumran,” *TRE* 28:45–79 (45–46); A. Lange, “Kriterien essenischer Texte,” in Frey and Stegemann, *Qumran kontrovers*, 59–69; C. Hempel, “Kriterien zur Bestimmung ‘essenischer Verfasserschaft’ von Qumrantexten,” in Frey and Stegemann, *Qumran kontrovers*, 71–85.

<sup>66</sup> See J. Frey, “Different Patterns,” 295–300; see also H. Stegemann, “Zu Textbestand und Grundgedanken von 1QS III, 13–IV, 16,” *RevQ* 13 (1988): 95–131; A. Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination*, 126–28.

<sup>67</sup> Cf. already C.-H. Hunzinger, “Fragmente einer älteren Fassung des Buches Mil-Hama aus Höhle 4 von Qumran,” *ZAW* 69 (1957): 131–51 (149–50); more recently Lange and Lichtenberger, “Qumran,” 45–46.

theological views of the *yaḥad*, it seems impossible to get a coherent and unified picture from all those texts. There are notable differences between the directives in *Serekh ha-Yaḥad* and those in the *Damascus Document*, and there is an open discussion as to whether these differences are due to historical developments or whether different instructions applied to different subgroups of the *yaḥad* or the Essene movement.<sup>68</sup> Since the publication of the Cave 4 fragments, things have become even more complicated. Now it seems almost impossible to reconstruct any fixed or unified position as emerging from the sectarian documents, either with regard to organizational structure or with regard to specific instructions. If the same also applies to aspects of the Qumran worldview, it is then problematic to describe an overarching type of Qumran dualism in which the differences between the individual documents are downplayed. In contrast to earlier research, which often harmonized the differences between, e.g., the *War Rule* and the *Treatise on the Two Spirits*, we should now see more precisely the peculiarities of the terminology and worldview of these two documents, which are both products of historical processes and do not represent any fixed kind of group ideology. The assumption voiced by Charlesworth and others that the *Treatise on the Two Spirits* formed some kind of “basic ideology” of the Essenes, which every member of the group had to memorize,<sup>69</sup> is, in my view, mistaken. Assumptions like this seem to be rather a result of the Qumran publication history than an insight drawn from the literary history of the documents themselves.

---

<sup>68</sup> Cf. a recent discussion in S. Metso, “Constitutional Rules at Qumran,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment* (ed. P. W. Flint and J. C. VanderKam; 2 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 1:186–210 (esp. 196–97 and 207–9); see also, for example, C. Hempel, “The Penal Code Reconsidered,” in Bernstein, García Martínez, and Kampen, *Legal Texts and Legal Issues*, 338–48.

<sup>69</sup> Thus, e.g., J. H. Charlesworth, “The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Gospel according to John,” 88; similarly in his introduction to E. Qimron and J. H. Charlesworth, “Rule of the Community,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations. Vol. 1: Rule of the Community and Related Documents* (The Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project; Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck] and Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1994), 1–53 (3): “The *Rule of the Community* is one of the most important theological works of the sect. . . . [I]t contains the theology to be taught to—and memorized by—those who during a period of a little more than two years probation desired to ‘cross over into the covenant before God’ (1QS 1.16).”

c. *1QS as a Compiled Manuscript*

More recent publications have given us additional insights into the character and development of 1QS and the *Serekh* material.<sup>70</sup> From comparison with the 4QS manuscripts, it is obvious that 1QS is a compiled manuscript which encompasses at least five different literary units.<sup>71</sup> In the 4QS manuscripts, some of them are missing. This applies also to the *Treatise on the Two Spirits*, which was not part of two of the 4QS documents (4QS<sup>d,e</sup>). One of them (4QS<sup>d</sup>) was copied even later than the comprehensive manuscript 1QS. This shows that the Qumranites copied shorter and earlier forms of the *Serekh* material even at a time when the longer version had already been composed.<sup>72</sup> The consequence is that “there never existed a single, legitimate and up-to-date version of the *Community Rule*.”<sup>73</sup> These observations lead to further consequences for the evaluation of the manuscript 1QS. Contrary to the views of earlier research, then, the text of the *Community Rule* does not function as a definitive version of the rule material, nor can its subtexts be seen as definitive expressions of the community ideology.

d. *The Treatise on the Two Spirits as an Instruction from the Time before the Yahad*

What does this mean for the interpretation of the *Treatise on the Two Spirits*? First, it should be read as a unit in and of itself, not only as a part of the *Community Rule* or against the background of the liturgy of the covenant from the first columns of 1QS (1:16–3:13), from which it differs remarkably in terminology and thought structure.

Moreover, the issue of its origin and its real relevance for the community must be raised again. When 1QS was composed, ca. 100 BCE, the passage was adopted as an appendix to the liturgy of the covenant. This means that the doctrine was probably already considered a traditional

<sup>70</sup> The most comprehensive and, in my view, most plausible analysis was done by S. Metso, *The Textual Development of the Qumran Community Rule* (STDJ 21; Leiden: Brill, 1996); eadem, “The Textual Traditions of the Qumran *Community Rule*,” in Bernstein, García Martínez, and Kampen, *Legal Texts and Legal Issues*, 141–48.

<sup>71</sup> Cf. H. Stegemann, “Zu Textbestand und Grundgedanken von 1QS III,13–IV,26,” *RevQ* 13 (1988): 95–131 (96–100); A. Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination*, 121–26; Lange and Lichtenberger, “Qumran,” 54–59.

<sup>72</sup> Cf. Metso, “Textual Traditions,” 146–47.

<sup>73</sup> Metso, *Textual Development*, 154.

text at that time.<sup>74</sup> This may hint at a rather early date of composition for the *Treatise*. If we see, then, that the passage lacks peculiar community terminology,<sup>75</sup> that it does not use the term Belial, and that, unlike the *yahad*, it puts forward a view of the covenant as being established only in the future, the conclusion seems unavoidable that the *Treatise on the Two Spirits* must have been composed before the constitution of the *yahad*. It is, therefore, a pre-Essene teaching,<sup>76</sup> deeply rooted in the tradition of the pre-Essene sapiential texts such as the *Musar leMevin* (*Instruction*) or the *Book of Mysteries*.<sup>77</sup>

Of course, this does not mean that the text was not important for the community. As a traditional teaching, it was adopted and cited in texts from the *yahad*<sup>78</sup> (and possibly even in a text from outside the community).<sup>79</sup> But the question is whether its worldview, and its peculiar type of dualism, was adopted exactly or only in some of its elements and with considerable modification.

e. *The Essene Adoption of the Treatise and the Modified Reception of its Dualism*

Looking more closely at the passages where the *Treatise on the Two Spirits* is quoted or alluded to,<sup>80</sup> we can see that the peculiarities of its dualism are *not* adopted.

The element adopted most frequently is the notion of eternal election (1QS 4:22, 26). But the idea of “Two Spirits” occurs nowhere else in the Scrolls—its only echo can be found in the *Testaments of the 12 Patriarchs* (*T. Jud.* 20:1–2). When sectarian texts convey the notion of opposed angelic leaders, they use other names than those employed in the *Treatise on the Two Spirits*. “Belial,” the usual name of the opposing angelic leader, is notably missing in the *Treatise*. And even if we can

<sup>74</sup> Cf. Lange and Lichtenberger, “Qumran,” 37–38, 57.

<sup>75</sup> Cf. the criteria as established by Dimant, “Qumran Manuscripts.”

<sup>76</sup> See the comprehensive analysis by Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination*, 126–28; cf. also Stegemann, *The Library of Qumran*, xxx, and Frey, “Different Patterns,” 295–96.

<sup>77</sup> Cf., most recently, A. Lange, “Die Weisheitstexte aus Qumran,” in Hempel, Lange, and Lichtenberger, *The Wisdom Texts from Qumran and the Development of Sapiential Thought*, 3–30 (25–26); cf. also Frey, “Different Patterns,” 296–300.

<sup>78</sup> Cf. Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination*, 132–35; Frey, “Different Patterns,” 300–301.

<sup>79</sup> 4Q502 frg. 16; cf. Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination*, 132 n. 50; Lange and Lichtenberger, “Qumran,” 57, 36.

<sup>80</sup> Cf. Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination*, 167–68; see also Frey, “Different Patterns,” 301–7.

assume that the Qumran readers of 1QS identified the “spirit of wickedness” with Belial, who is often mentioned in the preceding passage, we should not perpetuate this reading in historical-critical scholarship.

In the sectarian documents, there is also no further trace of the idea that the struggle between the two spirits takes place within the heart of every human being (1QS 4:23), or that, in the end, the hearts of the elected ones shall be purified by God’s Holy Spirit (1QS 4:21). There is a marked contrast between this *psychological* dimension, which is peculiar to the dualism in the *Treatise on the Two Spirits*, and the type of sheer cosmic dualism which is most prominent in the Essene sectarian texts. In those, the borderline between light and darkness is drawn, not within the heart of every human being, but most clearly between the community and those outside. And in every passage where the *Treatise on the Two Spirits* is adopted in other sectarian texts, its dualism is changed towards the sectarian pattern, in which the basic opposition is between the community (linked together with the angels) and those who remain outside, facing eternal destruction.<sup>81</sup>

The notion of an internal struggle within the heart of the pious ones would hardly be acceptable for the sectarian worldview, which assumes that all individuals are either fully in or fully out of the company of the Sons of Light. Therefore, the peculiar combination of cosmic, ethical, and psychological elements in dualistic opposition appears only in the *Treatise*, but nowhere else in the Scrolls. Instead, where the doctrine is adopted, its ethical opposition between the good and the wicked seems to be rigidified and firmly applied to the sociologically-defined opposition between the members of the community and those who refuse to enter.

Qumran sectarian dualism is, therefore, far from being identical with the peculiar type of dualism in the *Treatise on the Two Spirits*. It is rather a sheer cosmic dualism characterized by a strictly predestined division of humanity into those inside of and outside of the community and dominated by opposing angelic figures. Such a pattern can be found in CD 2:2–13, in the liturgy of 1QS 1:16–3:13, and in the curses of 4Q*Berakhot*,<sup>82</sup> or—with slight modifications—in the *War Rule*.

<sup>81</sup> Cf., e.g., CD 2:2–13 (especially 2:2, 5) and 4Q181 lii 5.

<sup>82</sup> 4Q280 2 2; 4Q286 7 ii 1–13. Cf. Frey, “Different Patterns,” 327–28.

f. *How Could Early Christian Authors have Adopted  
Essene Dualism?*

If we ask, then, for the possible influence of Essene sectarian dualism on early Christian thought or texts, we should rather think of such a type of sheer cosmic dualism with Belial as the leader of the evil powers. If an early Christian author had been influenced by the dualism of contemporary Essenism, he would probably have adopted the structure and distinctive language of such a mode of dualistic thought, not the language of a traditional doctrine which the Essenes themselves had adopted only partially and with considerable modification. Essene influence might be considered, e.g., where the name Belial is used extensively.<sup>83</sup> The mere use of the light vs. darkness paradigm, however, is not sufficient evidence for an Essene influence, because such a paradigm can be formed and adopted in very different contexts.

The factors noted above call for a revision of the assumption of a close relationship between the Johannine literature and Essenism. The language parallels between the Johannine texts and some Qumran documents, especially the *Treatise on the Two Spirits*, cannot prove such an exclusive tradition-historical relation. The closer analysis of the Qumran texts has demonstrated that 1QS 3–4 and the dualism expressed in that text are not representative of the views of the community, particularly not of the views shared by the Essenes in the late phase of their existence.

### 3. DUALISM IN THE JOHANNINE CORPUS

In order to deconstruct the idea of Qumranic influence on John, we should also look afresh on the peculiarities of Johannine dualism in its own right—its unity and alleged structure, its terminological peculiarities, and its function.

---

<sup>83</sup> In the NT this occurs in only one passage, 2 Cor 6:15, where the Greek form Βελιάρ (which is common in the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*) is used in a dualistic framework. Exegetes have suggested that this passage (2 Cor 6:14–7:1) is an insertion by an interpolator, who took it from an Essene context. This assumption, however, cannot be discussed here.

a. *The Problem of the Unity of Johannine Dualism*

Here, a short look at the history of interpretation is important. It is only since the interpretation of Rudolf Bultmann that dualism has been considered a distinctive element of the Johannine worldview and, consequently, a major theme for Johannine interpretation.<sup>84</sup> Earlier scholars from the history of religions school such as Heitmüller or Bousset<sup>85</sup> had identified a few dualistic elements in John, but considered them to be an effect of the hellenization of the Gospel or of some syncretistic influence, or simply as elements caused by the opposition to the synagogue. Only against the background of the idea that John was deeply influenced by the Iranian myth of the redeemer,<sup>86</sup> did dualism—as a well-known feature of Iranian religion—come to be regarded as the basic worldview within which every single term of Johannine theological language must be understood. In Bultmann's construction, Iranian or gnostic dualism provided the key even to seeing Johannine thought as a unity.<sup>87</sup> Any attempt to explain Johannine terms on the basis of the Bible or contemporary Judaism, or to understand some other aspects within a more Hellenistic framework, was fiercely rejected by Bultmann.<sup>88</sup> According to him and his followers, an interpretation could only be regarded as sufficient which could explain all terms of the Johannine language in a

---

<sup>84</sup> In his devastating review of the book by E. Percy, *Untersuchungen über den Ursprung der johanneischen Theologie* (Lund: Gleerup, 1939), Bultmann asserted: "Die johanneische Sprache ist ein Ganzes, innerhalb dessen der einzelne Terminus erst seine feste Bestimmung erhält." See Bultmann, "Johanneische Schriften und Gnosis," 233.

<sup>85</sup> Cf., e.g., W. Heitmüller, "Das Johannes-Evangelium," in *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments* (ed. J. Weiss; 2 vols.; 2d ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1907–1908), 2:685–861 (698–99); W. Bousset, *Kyrios Christos* (2d ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1921), 182–83.

<sup>86</sup> See the fundamental work of R. Reitzenstein, *Das iranische Erlösungsmysterium: Religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen* (Bonn: Marcus & Weber, 1921). Reitzenstein's ideas were adopted in 1923 by R. Bultmann, "Der religionsgeschichtliche Hintergrund des Prologs zum Johannesevangelium," in *Eucharisterion: Studien zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments. Hermann Gunkel zum 60. Geburtstag* (ed. E. Balla et al.; 2 vols.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1923), 2:3–26, republished in Bultmann, *Exegetica*, 10–35; idem, "Die Bedeutung der neuerschlossenen mandäischen und manichäischen Quellen für das Verständnis des Johannesevangeliums"; and simultaneously by H. H. Schaeder, "Der 'Mensch' im Prolog des IV. Evangeliums," in *Studien zum antiken Synkretismus aus Iran und Griechenland* (ed. R. Reitzenstein and H. H. Schaeder; 3 vols.; Studien zur Bibliothek Warburg 7; Leipzig: Teubner, 1926), 3:306–41.

<sup>87</sup> On the hermeneutical relevance of the Gnosis hypothesis for Bultmann's interpretation see Frey, *Die johanneische Eschatologie*, 1:130–41.

<sup>88</sup> Cf. Bultmann, "Johanneische Schriften und Gnosis," 233.

coherent system and against a coherent history of religions background, namely the dualistic language of Gnosticism.<sup>89</sup>

So it is conceivable why the Qumran background could so easily replace the gnostic in Johannine scholarship. The Qumran thesis provided a dualistic framework which was as coherent as the gnostic but structurally more similar to Johannine thought. So it seemed to give a better explanation of the Johannine language without questioning the structural unity of Johannine thought.

But the unity of Johannine dualism was only a fiction of Bultmann's interpretation. It was the result of Bultmann's systematic conception, according to which a dualistic worldview is the condition under which revelation takes place.<sup>90</sup> Therefore, in terms of its real religious-historical background, the unity of Johannine dualism is by no means certain. This notion of unity became problematic in the interpretation of Jürgen Becker, a former student of Karl Georg Kuhn,<sup>91</sup> who found different types of dualistic opposition in the Fourth Gospel and used them to reconstruct a history of Johannine thought through the progression of its "dualisms"—from a Qumran-like dualism in an early phase of the community (e.g., in John 3:19–21), to the gnosticizing dualism of the Evangelist, and finally, to a kind of "ecclesiastical" dualism in the later strata of the Gospel (e.g., John 15–17) and in the Epistles.<sup>92</sup> Even if such an analysis provokes a great number of methodological questions,<sup>93</sup> it has demonstrated that Johannine dualism—if we can aptly call it dualism—is not a religious-historical unity. Of course,

---

<sup>89</sup> Cf. the claim by H. Thyen, "Aus der Literatur zum Johannesevangelium I," *TRu* 39 (1974): 1–69 (49): "Wirklich ernstzunehmen sind alle diejenigen Untersuchungen, die dieser Maxime folgen, die also alle Details als Strukturmomente des Ganzen zu begreifen und ihren Funktionswert innerhalb des einheitlichen Systems zu bestimmen suchen."

<sup>90</sup> In Bultmann's interpretation, the opposition between God and the world was made the starting point of Johannine interpretation; cf. idem, "Die Eschatologie des Johannes-Evangeliums," in *Glauben und Verstehen* (4 vols.; Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1933), 1:134–52 (135); idem, *Theologie des Neuen Testaments* (rev. by O. Merk; 9th ed.; Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1984), 367–85.

<sup>91</sup> Cf. J. Becker, *Das Heil Gottes* (SUNT 3; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1964).

<sup>92</sup> Cf. J. Becker, "Beobachtungen zum Dualismus im Johannesevangelium," *ZNW* 65 (1974): 71–87; idem, *Das Evangelium nach Johannes* (2 vols.; 3d ed.; Ökumenischer Taschenbuchkommentar 4; Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Mohn; Würzburg: Echter, 1991), 1:175–79.

<sup>93</sup> See the criticism of Becker's approach in Frey, *Die johanneische Eschatologie*, 1.278–87.



the different textual elements may function together as a unity for the Johannine readers, but regarding the origin of the individual textual elements we can no longer presuppose that they all came from one coherent background.

b. *The Names of Opposing Eschatological Figures*

A significant point in a history of religions argument is the naming of the eschatological opponents. As already noted, the name Belial, which is typical for Qumran sectarian texts, is not mentioned in the Johannine literature. Instead, the chief of the evil powers is named “Satan,”<sup>94</sup> “Devil,”<sup>95</sup> “the evil one,”<sup>96</sup> or—in a peculiar Johannine idiom—the “prince of this world” (ὁ ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου τούτου).<sup>97</sup>

Σατανᾶς (as the transcription of *śātān*) represents a concept which developed in late biblical and early Jewish apocalyptic tradition<sup>98</sup> and was adopted likewise by Jesus,<sup>99</sup> Paul, and the Synoptics. Διάβολος is simply the LXX translation of *śātān*, and ὁ πονηρός can also be used to replace the term Satan.<sup>100</sup> But in New Testament usage there is some kind of development: The Hebrew loanword Σατανᾶς is predominant in Paul and Mark, whereas διάβολος is not used in these earlier documents but becomes the predominant term in later New Testament texts and in the Johannine literature.<sup>101</sup> The “evil one” (ὁ πονηρός) is used once in Paul<sup>102</sup> and then later in Matthew<sup>103</sup> and in the Johannine literature. These observations may indicate that John represents a later stage of early Christian tradition. It adopts the terms used in earlier traditions,

<sup>94</sup> Σατανᾶς John 13:27.

<sup>95</sup> διάβολος John 8:44; 13:2; 1 John 3:8, 10.

<sup>96</sup> ὁ πονηρός John 17:15; 1 John 2:13–14; 3:12; 5:18–19. According to 1 John 5:19, this “evil one” has power over the whole world.

<sup>97</sup> John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11.

<sup>98</sup> Cf. O. Böcher, “διάβολος,” in *EWNT* 1:714–16; idem, “Σατανᾶς,” *EWNT* 3:558–59. On the development of the concept of Satan, see C. Breytenbach and P. L. Day, “Satan,” in *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible* (ed. K. van der Toorn, B. Becking, and P. W. van der Horst; 2d rev. ed.; Leiden: Brill; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), 726–32; G. J. Riley, “Devil,” *Dictionary of Deities and Demons*, 244–49.

<sup>99</sup> See, for the use of “Satan,” the probably authentic sayings of Jesus in Luke 10:18 and Luke 11:20 (par. Matt 12:24–27), and possibly Mark 3:22–26 (par. Luke 11:15–19; Matt 12:24–27); for Paul cf. 1 Thess 2:18; 1 Cor 5:5; 2 Cor 2:11; 11:14; 12:7; Rom 16:20.

<sup>100</sup> Cf. Matt 13:19 with Mark 4:15.

<sup>101</sup> Cf. Böcher, “διάβολος,” 714–15.

<sup>102</sup> 1 Cor 5:13.

<sup>103</sup> Cf. Matt 13:19 (replacing “Satan” used in Mark 4:15); Matt 6:13.

but the Hebrew loanword Σατανᾶς is used only once, being normally replaced by its Greek equivalents.

With “prince of this world,”<sup>104</sup> John also shapes a term that is rooted in Jewish apocalypticism but unparalleled in earlier Christian tradition.<sup>105</sup> It represents a concept of an apocalyptic worldview in which the dominion of that ruler is temporally restricted to “this world,” in contrast to “the coming world.” In this sense, the apocalyptic tradition of the fall of Satan is adopted in John 12:31<sup>106</sup> and linked with the “hour” of Jesus’ exaltation. Thus, peculiar aspects of the Johannine view are expressed by the use of terms from Jewish or early Christian apocalyptic traditions.<sup>107</sup>

It is obvious that all the names of eschatologically opposed figures draw on traditions and concepts of Jewish and early Christian apocalypticism, but do not show any peculiar affinity with the names used in the Dead Sea Scrolls, neither in the sectarian texts nor 1QS 3–4.

On the other hand, whereas in 1QS 3–4, the phrase “spirit of truth” designates the angelic leader of the “lot of light,” its Johannine use as a

<sup>104</sup> Cf. D. E. Aune, “Archon,” in van der Toorn et al., *Dictionary of Deities and Demons*, 82–85.

<sup>105</sup> Cf., *T. Sol.* 2:9; 3:5–6; 6:1; *Ascen. Isa.* 1:3; 2:4; and 10:29 (which is certainly Christian). For early Christian tradition, cf. further Ignatius: *Eph.* 17:1; 19:1; *Magn.* 1:2; *Trall.* 4:2; *Rom.* 7:1; *Phld.* 6:2; see also *Barn.* 18:2 (always applied to the figure of “Satan” or “the Devil.” In pre-Johannine Christianity the term is missing. Paul uses a similar plural phrase (οἱ ἄρχοντες τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου), but most probably applies it to human rulers of the world. *Eph.* 2:2 speaks of “the prince of the power of the air.”

<sup>106</sup> Cf. the more colorful mythological parallel in *Rev.* 12:7–10. On the relation between these two texts, see J. U. Kalms, *Der Sturz des Gottesfeindes* (WMANT 93; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2001), 267–68; cf. also J. Frey, “Erwägungen zum Verhältnis der Johannesapokalypse zu den übrigen Schriften im Corpus Johanneum,” in *Die johanneische Frage* (ed. M. Hengel; WUNT 67; Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1993), 326–429 (386–87). The relation was already seen by Percy, *Untersuchungen über den Ursprung der johanneischen Theologie*, 141–43; O. Betz, *Der Paraklet: Fürsprecher im häretischen Spätjudentum, im Johannes-Evangelium und in neu gefundenen gnostischen Schriften* (AGSU 2; Leiden: Brill, 1963), 204–6; J. Blank, *Krisis: Untersuchungen zur johanneischen Christologie und Eschatologie* (Freiburg: Lambertus, 1964), 283.

<sup>107</sup> This is also valid for the Epistles’ use of the “antichrist” motif. The term ἀντίχριστος, which occurs first in 1 John 2:18; 4:3 and 2 John 7, might be a terminological innovation of the Johannine tradition. It refers back to the apocalyptic idea of an eschatological ruler figure. See generally G. C. Jenks, *The Origins and Early Development of the Antichrist Myth* (BZNW 59; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1991); L. J. Lietaert Peerbolte, *The Antecedents of the Antichrist* (JSJSup 49; Leiden: Brill, 1995). In the Johannine Epistles, the tradition taken from the Johannine school (cf. 1 John 4:13: “you have heard that he is to come”) is applied to a group of false teachers who are now called (in the plural) “many antichrists” (1 John 2.18). The modification of the term shows that “the antichrist” as a single figure was part of the eschatological expectation of the members of the Johannine school. See on the Johannine use of the term, J. Frey, *Die johanneische Eschatologie*, 3:23–29.

designation for the Holy Spirit does not occur in a dualistic framework.<sup>108</sup> Therefore, a direct influence of the Qumran term on the Johannine language for the Paraclete as the “spirit of truth” is quite implausible. The Johannine use might rather be explained as combination of the traditional notion of the “spirit” (πνεῦμα) with the peculiar Johannine idea of Christ himself and Christ’s revelation as “the truth.”<sup>109</sup>

c. *The Basic Structure of “Above” and “Below”*

Within Johannine dualism the opposition between “above” and “below” is so prominent that some even call it “the basic structure of Johannine dualism.”<sup>110</sup> The opponents are “from below” or “from this world,”<sup>111</sup> whereas the Son or Son of Man is “from above,”<sup>112</sup> “from Heaven,”<sup>113</sup> and those who believe in him are “born” from above (John 3:3) or from God (John 1:13). Such an opposition is paralleled in the cosmological concepts of Jewish apocalypticism but also has analogies in Hellenistic gnostic texts, whereas there is no real analogy in Qumran texts. As Richard Bauckham notes, “For the distinctively Johannine use of ‘the world’ and ‘this world’ in a pejorative sense, and the distinctively Johannine contrast of ‘from above’ and ‘from below,’ the Qumran texts provide no parallel at all.” Therefore, Bauckham correctly states, “This in itself makes implausible the view that Johannine dualism as such derives from Qumran dualism.”<sup>114</sup>

d. *The All-Encompassing Opposition of Life to Death*

When we look at the second major contrast within Johannine dualism, it is certainly the opposition between life and death, which encompasses all the other oppositions contained in the Gospel. “Life” is the most prominent term for salvation in John. It belongs to God the creator

<sup>108</sup> In 1 John 4:6 where a dualistic framework is clear, the term is not used in a “personal” sense, but merely to denote true prophetic utterances (or christological statements) in contrast to false ones.

<sup>109</sup> Cf., for Christ, John 11:25; 14:6; for the Christian revelation, John 8:32; 2 John 1; 2 John 4; 3 John 3–4, etc.

<sup>110</sup> Aune, “Dualism,” 285.

<sup>111</sup> John 8:23; cf. 3:31.

<sup>112</sup> John 3:31; 8:23; cf. 6:62.

<sup>113</sup> John 3:13; cf. John 8:42: “from the Father.”

<sup>114</sup> Both quotations can be found in the same wording in Bauckham, “Qumran and the Fourth Gospel,” 269; idem, “The Qumran Community,” 107.

and to the Logos;<sup>115</sup> the Son *has* life in himself,<sup>116</sup> he gives and even *is* life.<sup>117</sup> Eternal life is given to those who believe in him, so that they have been transferred from death to life<sup>118</sup> and will not “taste death”<sup>119</sup> but live, even if they die.<sup>120</sup> Since “life” is a motif in many Jewish and pagan texts, it is not easy to discern the background of John’s language of life.<sup>121</sup> In my view, the phrase “eternal life” (ζωὴ αἰώνιος) clearly points to a Palestinian Jewish tradition which was then adopted in earlier Christianity and developed in the Johannine school. A Qumran background is quite implausible here, since the dualistic opposition between death and life has almost no analogies in the Qumran texts. For the great Johannine scholar Rudolf Schnackenburg this was the strongest argument that the language of Johannine dualism could *not* have been adopted from Qumran.<sup>122</sup>

*e. The Opposition between “Truth” and “Lie” or “Deceit,” and its Christological Focus*

There are also important differences from Qumran usage in regard to the opposition between the notion of “truth” and that of “lie” or “deceit.” This opposition is quite frequent in 1 John,<sup>123</sup> so that one may assume that the opposition became especially important within the context of community crisis. But we should not ignore the fact that the opposition is not at all balanced. In Johannine literature, terms related to truth (ἀλήθεια) are much more frequent than terms related to “lie” or “deceit.” Since “truth” is closely related to Christ himself<sup>124</sup>—he is

<sup>115</sup> John 1:4.

<sup>116</sup> John 5:26.

<sup>117</sup> John 11:25; 14:6.

<sup>118</sup> John 5:24; 1 John 3:14.

<sup>119</sup> John 8:51–52.

<sup>120</sup> John 11:26.

<sup>121</sup> Cf., on the Johannine notion of life and its background Frey, *Die johanneische Eschatologie*, 3:262–70.

<sup>122</sup> Cf., e.g., R. Schnackenburg, *Das Johannesevangelium* (4 vols.; HTKNT 4; 6th ed.; Freiburg: Herder, 1986), 1:113: “Das dürfte das stärkste Argument dafür sein, daß der joh. ‘Dualismus’ nicht von Qumran übernommen sein kann.”

<sup>123</sup> 1 John 1:6; 2:4, 21, 27. In the Gospel, only the devil is called a “liar” (John 8:44).

<sup>124</sup> In the First Epistle, he is the “true one” (1 John 5:20); the Spirit that witnesses to him teaches or even is “the truth” (1 John 5:6; cf. 2:27). The addressees know the truth (1 John 2:21) and are from the truth (1 John 3:19). In the Gospel, Christ is the true light (John 1:9; cf. 1 John 2:8), the true vineyard (John 15:1) and even the truth

even called “the truth” incarnate—it is an open question whether the Johannine notion of truth can be considered an element of dualistic thought. Only a small part of the Johannine passages on truth occur in a dualistic opposition. When the truth is proclaimed, and people are expected to follow the witness, hear and believe, this is clearly an expression of Johannine theology which can hardly be explained from a non-Christian context. Moreover, in Qumran, the opposition is not between truth and “lie” or “deceit” but between truth and “wickedness” (פִּשְׁעַ), which is unparalleled in the Johannine literature.

f. *The Opposition between “Light” and “Darkness” and the Differences from Qumran Usage*

The only element of dualistic language that has clear parallels in Qumran is the opposition between light and darkness. But in Johannine literature, the contrast of darkness and light is less prominent than that of below and above or that of death and life. And, similar to the contrast between truth and lie, it is not balanced but focussed on the christological idea that Christ is the light,<sup>125</sup> or that the light has come and shines into the darkness<sup>126</sup> so that the people do not remain in darkness but become “children of the light” (John 12:36).

In this passage we find—for the only time in John—the term which is used as a self-designation of the Qumran sectarian group (בְּנֵי אֹרֶךְ). But as mentioned above, the term already occurs in earlier Christianity: in Paul, then in Luke, and—slightly modified—in Ephesians,<sup>127</sup> so that an immediate Qumran influence cannot be assumed. Moreover, within the Qumran library the term is not used solely as a self-designation of the members of the *yahad*. It can already be found in a pre-Essene document, the *Vision of Amram*, so we may assume that its use was more widespread among the traditions and groups of Second Temple Judaism.<sup>128</sup> A Qumran influence on John is also made implausible by

---

incarnated (cf. John 14:6). The Spirit left behind or given by him is the “Spirit of truth” that opens up the true veneration of God (John 4:23). Jesus’ word is true (John 5:32; 8:14, 45–46; 16:7; 18:35) as is God’s own word (John 17:15; cf. 3:33; 7:28; 8:26), and a person who is from the truth, listens to his voice (John 18:37).

<sup>125</sup> John 8:12; 12:46.

<sup>126</sup> John 3:19; cf. 1:5.

<sup>127</sup> Cf. 1 Thess 5:5; Luke 16:8; Eph 5:8. Therefore, it is not correct when Charlesworth (“A Critical Comparison,” 101) says that the term “is characteristic only of Qumran and John.”

<sup>128</sup> Cf. also the parallel in *1 En.* 108:11–14.

the fact that John never uses the corresponding term “sons of darkness,” which he should have employed had he been influenced by contemporary Essene language and ideas. Therefore, Richard Bauckham correctly states: “It is hardly credible that if the Qumran use of the light/darkness imagery influenced John, the highly distinctive terminology which virtually constitutes the Qumran use of the light/darkness imagery should have left such minimal traces in John.”<sup>129</sup>

On the contrary, “expressions which characterize the Johannine use of the light/darkness imagery have no parallels in the Qumran texts.”<sup>130</sup> As examples, Bauckham mentions the phrases “the true light,”<sup>131</sup> “the light of the world,”<sup>132</sup> to “come to the light”<sup>133</sup> or to “remain in the darkness,”<sup>134</sup> and also the contrast between day and night.<sup>135</sup>

The most obvious differences can be seen regarding the *function* of the light/darkness terminology. Within the Qumran worldview, the struggle of angelic leaders and their lots will persist until God finally destroys the powers of evil. But in the present, there is a strong hostility between the two realms, and people belong to the one or the other by God’s eternal predetermination. A transfer from the realm of darkness to the reign of light is hardly conceivable within this deterministic worldview. But this is just what the Fourth Gospel aims at. There, the light metaphor is used with the implication that light shines into the darkness and “enlightens” it. So, any kind of fixed dualism is broken.

#### 4. WHENCE JOHANNINE DUALISM?

If these observations are taken seriously, we should definitely dismiss the idea that Johannine dualism, or even the light/darkness motif, was formed under the influence of Qumran texts or contemporary Essene thought. But where did it come from, then? Or where did its basic elements come from, so that the Johannine school or the Evangelist could develop the Gospel’s distinctive language? In recent scholarship,

---

<sup>129</sup> Bauckham, “Qumran Community,” 109; idem, “Qumran and the Fourth Gospel,” 272–73.

<sup>130</sup> Bauckham, “Qumran Community,” 110; idem, “Qumran and the Fourth Gospel,” 273.

<sup>131</sup> John 1:9; 1 John 2:8.

<sup>132</sup> John 8:12; 9:5.

<sup>133</sup> John 3:21.

<sup>134</sup> John 8:12; 12:46; 1 Joh 2:9.

<sup>135</sup> John 9:4; 11:9.

Richard Bauckham and David Aune have made different suggestions, but, in my view, the elements mentioned by them can be combined.

a) Bauckham's first suggestion is that the light/darkness metaphor in John is inspired by the tradition of Jewish exegesis of the creation narrative.<sup>136</sup> He suggests that we see the roots of the Johannine idea of the "great light coming into the world" and "giving light to all people" (John 1:9; 3:19; 12:46)<sup>137</sup> in the exegesis of the light of the first day (Gen 1:3–5). Such a starting point is supported by the Johannine Prologue,<sup>138</sup> which obviously draws on the Genesis creation account. The passage on the primordial light was often taken as a basis for further speculation and as a metaphor for the communication of spiritual goods such as truth or life. Among a large number of other texts, Bauckham mentions Joseph's prayer in *Jos. Asen.* 8:9, where God is addressed as the one "who gave life to all (things) and called (them) from darkness to light, and from error to truth, and from death to life."<sup>139</sup> This demonstrates that the contrast between light and darkness could easily be linked with the contrasts between life and death, truth and error, or good and evil, and that such an interpretation was not necessarily influenced by Qumran.

b) Related to this, Bauckham mentions a second feature: The image of the light shining into the world, which is primary for the Johannine use of the light/darkness metaphor, has further uses in the Hebrew Bible and in postbiblical Judaism. It is applied to "the image of a prophet or teacher as a light who by his teaching of truth gives

---

<sup>136</sup> Cf. Bauckham, "Qumran Community," 112–13; idem, "Qumran and the Fourth Gospel," 275–76. See more extensively the dissertation of one of Bauckham's students, M. Endo, *Creation and Christology: A Study on the Johannine Prologue in the Light of Early Jewish Creation Accounts* (WUNT 2.149; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002). Endo discusses and classifies a great number of narrative and descriptive creation accounts and other brief references to creation according to their relevance for the understanding of the Johannine Prologue.

<sup>137</sup> Bauckham, "Qumran Community," 110; idem, "Qumran and the Fourth Gospel," 274.

<sup>138</sup> On the background of the Johannine Prologue, cf. also C. A. Evans, *Word and Glory: On the Exegetical and Theological Background of John's Prologue* (JSNTSup 89; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993).

<sup>139</sup> Quotation according to C. Burchard, "Joseph and Asenath," *OTP* 2:177–248 (213). The other texts Bauckham mentions (in "Qumran and the Fourth Gospel") are: *4 Ezra* 6:40; *Ps.-Philo, L.A.B.* 28:8–9; 60:2; 4Q3921 i 4–7; *2 En.* 24:4j; 25; Aristobulus, *ap. Eusebius, Praep. ev.* 13.12.9–11; *Philo, Opif.* 29–35, and *Gen. Rab.* 3:8.

light,”<sup>140</sup> a motif that may be applied, though in a pejorative sense, to John the Baptist as a “shining lamp” in John 5:35. Much more important and comprehensive is another motif mentioned by Bauckham: the image of the Torah or the word of God as a light for the people, so that they can walk in this light. The ethical implications of the light metaphor are quite obvious here. The motif of the Torah as light can be found in numerous passages in the Hebrew Bible—in the Psalms, the wisdom literature and the prophets;<sup>141</sup> it seems to be particularly prominent in Jewish texts which are roughly contemporary with the Fourth Gospel, e.g., the *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*,<sup>142</sup> *4 Ezra*,<sup>143</sup> and *2 Baruch*.<sup>144</sup> *2 Baruch* in particular makes extensive use of the imagery of light and darkness with reference to good and evil, truth and error, or finally, salvation and punishment.<sup>145</sup> According to *2 Bar.* 59:2 the “lamp of the eternal law... illuminated those who sat in darkness”; and *L.A.B.* 11:1 characterizes the law in its universal function as a “light to the world,” a term that refers back to the prophetic characterization of the law as “light of the nations” (*Isa* 51:4; cf. *Wis* 18:4). Bauckham correctly observes that these phrases are “remarkably close to what

<sup>140</sup> Bauckham, “Qumran Community,” 112; idem, “Qumran and the Fourth Gospel,” 276, where he mentions the description of Samuel in *Ps.-Philo, L.A.B.* 51:4, 6 (light “for this nation” and “to the peoples”; cf. *Isa* 51:4), and the image of the ideal priest according to the *Aramaic Levi Document*, 4Q541 9 i 3–5 (cf. *T. Levi* 18:2–4).

<sup>141</sup> The most explicit passages are *Ps* 119:105; *Prov* 6:23; and *Isa* 2:3, 5 and 51:4. But numerous other references could be added. From the LXX one should mention *Bar* 4:2 (conversion to the light of the Torah) and *Wis* 18:4 (the law as light for the world). The metaphor could also be developed into a dualistic opposition, cf., e.g., *T. Levi* 19:1: “Choose for yourselves light or darkness, the Law of the Lord or the works of Beliar.”

<sup>142</sup> Cf. *L.A.B.* 9:8 (the Law as an “eternal lamp”); 11:1 (“light to the world” [cf. *John* 8:12; 9:4; *Wis* 18:4]; “eternal statutes... for those in the light”); 15:6 (“to kindle a lamp for my people and to establish laws for creation”); 19:4 (“he might establish his statutes with you and kindle among you an eternal light”); 33:3 (“obey my voice; while you have the time of life and the light of the Law, make straight your ways”; cf. *John* 12:36).

<sup>143</sup> Cf. *4 Ezra* 14:20–21 (“The world lies in darkness, and its inhabitants are without light, for your Law has been burned and so no one knows the things...”).

<sup>144</sup> Cf. *2 Bar.* 17:4 (“Moses... lightened a lamp to the generation of Israel”); 18:2 (“many whom he illuminated took from the darkness of Adam and did not rejoice in the light of the lamp” [cf. *John* 3:19; 5:35]); 59:2 (“the lamp of the eternal law which exists forever and ever illuminated all those who sat in darkness”).

<sup>145</sup> Cf. the vision of the clouds in *2 Bar.* 53 where in the end, the lightning shines and illuminates “the whole earth” (53:9), taking command of it. This is then interpreted as an image of Israel’s revelation history (*2 Bar.* 56–72).



the Fourth Gospel says about Jesus Christ as the light of the world.”<sup>146</sup> The dominant feature of the Gospel’s use of the light/darkness paradigm is much better paralleled in these passages than in the Qumran texts.

c) A third observation of Bauckham’s is that the Johannine use of the light/darkness paradigm is a kind of “messianic exegesis of passages in Isaiah”;<sup>147</sup> e.g., Isa 9:1–2; 42:6–7; 49:6; or 60:1–3. The prophecies from Isaiah influenced the Fourth Gospel in many ways, and the passages mentioned could easily be linked with the idea of the Torah as light. So, the light metaphor could be adopted as a symbol of the soteriological and eschatological significance of Jesus’ coming. On the other hand, the Isaianic passages have no relevance for the use of the light/darkness motif in Qumran. So the combination of these three features—the primordial light, the law as light, and the Messiah as a “light to the nations” (Isa 42:6)—explain the Johannine use of the paradigm much better than the Qumran parallels.

d) David Aune, in his recent article, has added an additional aspect.<sup>148</sup> He refers to the language of conversion in Second Temple Judaism and in early Christianity, in which light and darkness are repeatedly used as metaphors. His observations can be combined with Bauckham’s. In some passages this is a peculiar adoption of the creation narrative (Gen 1:3–5). In Acts 26:18, the conversion of the Gentiles from the power of Satan to the true God appears as an opening of the eyes, as the transfer “from the darkness to the light.” The imagery is used in numerous Jewish passages on repentance or conversion,<sup>149</sup> most strikingly in Joseph’s prayer for Aseneth quoted above where the transfer “from darkness to light, and from error to truth, and from death to life” is mentioned explicitly within a conversion context.<sup>150</sup> A similar metaphorical use of the terms is visible, for example, when Paul describes his conversion

<sup>146</sup> Bauckham, “Qumran Community,” 113; idem, “Qumran and the Fourth Gospel,” 277.

<sup>147</sup> Bauckham, “Qumran Community,” 113; idem, “Qumran and the Fourth Gospel,” 277.

<sup>148</sup> Cf. Aune, “Dualism,” 289–91.

<sup>149</sup> Cf. Bar 4:2 (towards the light); *T. Gad* 5:7 (“repentance . . . puts darkness to flight”); *T. Jos.* 19:3 (the sheep are led “out of darkness into light”); *T. Benj.* 5:3 (the light/darkness metaphor is used in connection with doing good works). A paraenetic adoption of the metaphor can be studied in *T. Levi* 19:1, where we can also find a clear cosmic dualism (God vs. Beliar).

<sup>150</sup> Cf. also *Jos. Asen.* 15:12, where Aseneth is rescued “from the darkness.”

using the terminology of creation and of light and darkness (2 Cor 4:6). Other examples are Col 1:12–13, Eph 5:8, 1 Pet 2:9 and *1 Clement* 59:2, where converts are called “from darkness into light.”<sup>151</sup> In other passages, such as 1 Thess 5:4–8 and Rom 13:12–14, the paradigm is adopted to a paraenetic framework.<sup>152</sup>

Aune’s observations seem helpful for explaining how the light/darkness metaphor could have been adopted in the Johannine school. Without disregarding the influence of scriptural passages pertaining to creation, the law, or messianic hope, we can see that the light/darkness metaphor was already adopted by earliest Christianity, most probably on the basis of the conversion language developed in Judaism and adopted by early Christian authors.

Taken together, the observations of Bauckham and Aune may explain the different aspects of the Johannine use of the light/darkness imagery. In 1 John, the imagery is used in a paraenetic manner which can only be explained from the context of the crisis of the community and against the background of the paraenetic use of the light/darkness motif in earlier Christianity. On the other hand, the christological and soteriological focus on the use of the light/darkness metaphor in the Gospel is better explained by the references quoted by Bauckham, chiefly the use of the imagery for aspects of the eschatological salvation and, basically, for the Torah which is now represented or even replaced by Jesus himself as “the light of the world.”

So there is no need to conjecture Qumran influence to explain the Johannine use of the light/darkness terminology. The peculiarities of the Johannine use are explained better by other strands of biblical and early Jewish tradition and their adoption and development in earlier, pre-Johannine Christianity. Nor do the other dualistic elements within Johannine language and thought—the oppositions of life to death, truth to deceit, above to below—provide any further support for the idea that Johannine dualism, as a whole, could have been influenced by Qumran dualism. Similar to the use of the light metaphor, the Johannine use of the motifs of life and truth is strongly focused on the person of Christ, so that it can only be explained as a result of Johannine christological

---

<sup>151</sup> Cf. also *Odes Sol.* 11:16, and Melito of Sardis, *On Pascha* 68 (see Hall, S. G., *Melito of Sardis: On Pascha and Fragments* [Oxford: Clarendon, 1979], 36).

<sup>152</sup> Cf. also *T. Levi* 19:1.

reflection. The names used for eschatologically opposed figures point to the reception of different traditions of Jewish and early Christian apocalyptic thought, but definitely *not* to an adaptation of Qumran sectarian peculiarities.

#### 5. NO LIGHT FROM THE CAVES?

As a consequence, the view that Johannine dualism, as a whole or in part, is influenced by Qumran dualism, should be abandoned. There is conclusive support neither in the textual parallels adduced nor in the peculiar structure of the dualistic language used in each corpus. It is true that, compared with the structure of gnostic dualism, Qumran thought could appear as a relatively closer parallel to Johannine dualism. And certainly, the Qumran discoveries helped to rediscover the Jewish character of the traditions behind the Fourth Gospel. But there are a great number of Jewish parallels from other literary contexts, and some of them provide much closer analogies to the Johannine terms and phrases and, moreover, to the structure and function of Johannine dualism. Moreover, Johannine dualism is not a unity in the sense that it may be explained only from a single tradition or religious-historical background. The Johannine author and his school seem to be rather eclectic, adopting and developing motifs and phrases from different contexts into their own compositions.

A final question should be considered. If Johannine dualism cannot support the idea of a Qumran sectarian influence on the Johannine literature, and if the language parallels discussed are, in most instances, far from being exclusive, is there any other relevance of the Dead Sea Scrolls for Johannine interpretation? Is there no light from the caves on John and his tradition?

This would be drawing a premature conclusion. In fact, the caves do continue to illuminate the Johannine literature and its language. But these parallels can only be compared as part of a broader Jewish heritage which is adopted in early Christianity and also in John. More recent Qumran research has demonstrated that the library of Qumran is far more than the heritage of a single hidden sect. The documents rather represent a broad spectrum of Palestinian Jewish literary production, and even the peculiar sectarian texts are a witness to the variety of traditions and ideas from which they were themselves developed. Seen thus

in a wider context, the parallels in regard to scriptural interpretation, Messianism, the Spirit-Paraclete, and other items are in fact important—not as proofs of a direct literary or personal connection between these corpora, but as witnesses to the variegated Palestinian Jewish context in which the early Christian tradition is rooted.



## BELIEFS AND INTERPRETATIONS



## TOWARDS A THEOLOGY OF THE TABERNACLE AND ITS FURNITURE<sup>1</sup>

GARY A. ANDERSON  
*University of Notre Dame*

It has long been noted that the priestly instructions about the construction of the Tabernacle exceed the bounds of what would be expected. The sheer volume of textual detail that is lavished on this structure is not the common way of proceeding for the priestly writer. Generally he is prolix only when a theme is being introduced for the first time; should the occasion warrant a return, the priestly writer is more than capable of abbreviation.<sup>2</sup> This general pattern of composition is not followed in regard to the Tabernacle. Especially striking is the tendency to repeat the list of appurtenances that are found within the Tabernacle whenever there is occasion to do so (Exod 30:26–30; 31:7–11; 35:11–19; 39:33–41; 40:2–15; and 40:18–33). No fewer than six times are these items listed; the last three are perhaps the most striking, as they occur one right after the other. Indeed, one could say that the account of the Tabernacle ends with a concatenation of three lists of the materials for the Tabernacle, with only enough extraneous text to keep the thread of a narrative from disappearing altogether.

As Haran remarked, “The priestly writers find [this] subject so fascinating that... [they are] prompted to recapitulate the list of its appurtenances time and again. Their tendency to indulge in technicalities and stereotyped repetitions has here reached its furthest limits.”<sup>3</sup> I would suggest that the furniture of the Tabernacle possessed something of the very being of the God of Israel. As such it bears careful repetition

---

<sup>1</sup> A related but different version of this essay was published under the title, “To See Where God Dwells: The Tabernacle, the Temple, and the Origins of the Christian Mystical Tradition,” in *Letter and Spirit* 4 (2008): 15–47.

<sup>2</sup> Compare, for example, the law regarding how to offer the sin and holocaust offerings in Lev 5:8–9 and 10a; the former law is long and detailed because none of the previous chapters have dealt with this type of offering; the latter is abbreviated because a law already exists to which it can refer (Lev 1:14–17).

<sup>3</sup> M. Haran, *Temples and Temple Service in Ancient Israel: An Inquiry into Biblical Cult Phenomena and the Historical Setting of the Priestly School* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1985), 149.



whenever the occasion arises, not unlike the piling up of divine epithets in a psalm of praise or descriptions of the beloved from the pen of the lover. Mesopotamian scribes could mark temple appurtenances as divine with the DINGIR-sign;<sup>4</sup> the Bible did so by way of repetition.

This is not the occasion to consider all of the evidence from the biblical period, though some background will be necessary. My essay concerns the role the Tabernacle and its furniture assume in the Second Temple period and beyond. I hope to show (1) that the furniture of the Tabernacle was treated as quasi-divine in Second Temple Jewish sources of both a literary and iconographic nature; (2) the high valuation put on these pieces of furniture made them dangerous to look at but at the same time, and quite paradoxically, desirable or even compulsory to contemplate; and (3) the fact that it was impossible to divide with surgical precision the house of God from the being of God led to the adoption of this Jewish theologoumenon by early Christians as a means of clarifying how it was that Jesus could be both God and man. I should also mention that the starting point of my essay is the Tabernacle constructed by Moses, but because there are so many parallels and interconnections between that structure and the Temple, I will freely use imagery from the latter to illumine the former.

## I. SEEING GOD IN THE BIBLE

Anyone who has worked on the problem of the cult in the Bible knows that there is a highly realistic quality to the language used therein. The Tabernacle is God's home and so the spot where he dwells among human beings. In order to breathe life into this theologoumenon, the Bible enacts legislation that declares how to prepare the home for God's dramatic entrance, how to provision this God with food in a way that befits his dignity and finally, how to keep his home clean so that he will remain there and offer his blessings to the worshipers and pilgrims who desire to revere him.<sup>5</sup> Not unlike other ancient Near Eastern kings, the

<sup>4</sup> On the Mesopotamian practice, see below.

<sup>5</sup> The best account of the "real presence" of God in the Tabernacle is that of Haran, *Temples and Temple Service*. For a fine treatment of the theme in Mesopotamia, see the classic essay of L. Oppenheim, "The Care and Feeding of the Gods," in his *Ancient Mesopotamia: Portrait of a Dead Civilization* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964), 183–98. On the cult statue itself, E. Matsushima writes, "These statues played a central role in many important rituals and religious ceremonies in the temple area

King of Kings will, from time to time, make a personal appearance. And, like other devout subjects of an imperial realm, Israelites are urged to appear before him periodically so as to demonstrate their fealty (Exod 23:17 and parallels).<sup>6</sup>

The texts that bring this theophanic aspect most vividly to light are the laws for the pilgrimage festivals. According to Deut 16:16 (and parallels), Israelites must appear three times a year at the Temple in order “to see the face of the Lord.” As noted already by Luzzato in his commentary on Isaiah,<sup>7</sup> but seconded by Geiger,<sup>8</sup> Dillmann,<sup>9</sup> and most moderns, the masoretic vocalization of the verbal stem *ra’ah* as a *niphāl* (“to present oneself [before the face of the Lord]”) is not likely the original reading. Luzzato notes the following problems: first, nowhere in the Bible do we find the expected combination of the passive stem “to appear” with an indirect object (*liphne YHWH*); rather this passive stem somewhat anomalously is conjoined to a direct object (*’et pene YHWH* or *pene YHWH*). And, more significantly, in every text where the context is some sort of personal appearance—with the exception of those involving God—we invariably find the infinitival form of the N-stem “to appear” spelled with a *heh* after the *lamedh* (e.g., 2 Sam 17:17 or 1 Kgs 18:2). But in Isa 1:12, Exod 34:24 and Deut 31:11, texts that concern coming to the Temple, we find the infinitive spelled without the *heh*. Since the infinitive of N-stem is regularly spelled in a *plene*

---

and sometimes even outside the temple. The cult statue of the god was fully identified with the god in question and was considered by the worshippers to be actually a living being, able to do whatever a human being does, for example, sleep, wake, or eat, even though the statue was always motionless and dumb” (“Divine Statues in Ancient Mesopotamia: Their Fashioning and Clothing and their Interaction with the Society,” in *Official Cult and Popular Religion in the Ancient Near East* [ed. E. Matsushima; Heidelberg: Winter, 1993], 209).

<sup>6</sup> An appearance before a king was a sign of beatitude and favor. This point is driven home in the story of Absalom’s banishment from the court of his father, King David. Begrudgingly David accedes to Joab’s plea to normalize relations and allows Absalom to return. Nevertheless, David lets Absalom know that things are still not well by telling Joab: “Let Absalom return to his house; but *my face let him not see*. So Absalom returned to his house, but the face of the king he did not see” (2 Sam 14:24). The expression, “my face let him not see,” uses the exact same idiom as that found in Exod 23:17. In Akkadian texts as well, the idiom *amaru pani* “to see the face of PN” means to encounter either the king or the god in a face-to-face fashion (see *CAD* 1.2:21–22). In the case of an audience with the god, the idiom refers to beholding the cult statue.

<sup>7</sup> S. D. Luzzato, *Sefer Yeshayahu* (Padua: Bianchi, 1855), on Isa 1:12.

<sup>8</sup> A. Geiger, *Ha-Miqra’ ve-targumav* (Jerusalem: Mosad Bialik, 1949), 218–19.

<sup>9</sup> A. Dillmann, *Die Bücher Exodus und Leviticus* (ed. V. Ryssel; 3d ed.; Leipzig: Hirzel, 1897), 276.

fashion in biblical texts and only in rabbinic Hebrew do we find regular elision of the intervocalic *heh*, the simplest solution is to assume that the Masoretes have wrongly vocalized these texts. And if these texts have been wrongly vocalized, then there is a high probability that Exod 23:17 has been as well. The most likely reading of this verse is that the Israelites must come “to see the face of the Sovereign” three times a year. But having made the case for such a reading we have created a new problem. If the command demands that Israel “see the face of God” how was it fulfilled? The dramatic theophany that Israel was witness to at the completion of the Tabernacle (Exod 40:34–35) was certainly not standard fare at every pilgrimage festival. What exactly did the pilgrims see when they ascended the mountain of the Lord?

The most obvious answer would be the Ark. As scholars have long noted, the Ark is regularly identified with the Lord’s presence and at one time in its history was the subject of ceremonial processions. This is certainly implied by the liturgical refrain of Num 10:35–36:

When the Ark was to set out, Moses would say:  
 Advance, O Lord!  
 May your enemies be scattered,  
 And may your foes flee before you!  
 And when it halted he would say:  
 Return, O Lord,  
 Unto the ten thousands of Israel!

A similar identification of the Ark with the being of God is presumed by the entrance liturgy of Ps 24:7–10, “O gates, lift up your heads! Up high, you everlasting doors, so that the King of glory may come in...” According to Frank M. Cross this portion of Psalm 24 is “an antiphonal liturgy used in the autumn festival... [and it] had its origin in the procession of the Ark to the sanctuary at its founding, celebrated annually in the cult of Solomon and perhaps even of David. On this there can be little disagreement.”<sup>10</sup>

The close nexus between God and this piece of cultic furniture is nicely illustrated in the story of the battle with the Philistines that would eventually lead to its capture. Having been routed badly in an initial exchange of hostilities the Israelite militia regrouped to prepare a new strategy. “Let us fetch the Ark of the Covenant of the Lord from

---

<sup>10</sup> *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1973), 93.

Shiloh,” they decided, “[for] thus He will be present among us and will deliver us from the hands of our enemies” (1 Sam 4:3). The response to the Ark’s entry into the Israelite war camp reveals how close was the attachment of God’s being to this piece of furniture. “When the Ark of the Covenant of the Lord entered the camp, all Israel burst into a great shout, so that the earth resounded. The Philistines heard the noise of the shouting and they wondered, ‘Why is there such a loud shouting in the camp of the Hebrews?’ And when they learned that the Ark of the Lord had come to the camp, the Philistines were frightened; for they said, ‘*God has come to the camp.*’ And they cried, ‘Woe to us! Nothing like this has ever happened before. Woe to us! Who will save us from the power of this mighty God?’” (1 Sam 4:5–8). The highly realistic tenor of the language here must not be overlooked. Though God is not fully reducible to (i.e., coterminous with) the Ark, his presence is nevertheless so closely interwoven with it that one can point to the Ark as it approaches in military processions and say, “here comes God.”<sup>11</sup>

This entire scene—which demonstrates the rash and ill-considered efforts of the Israelites to misuse this divine image—must be contrasted with the story of David’s ignominious retreat from Jerusalem in the wake of Absalom’s revolt. As David departs, Zadok appears, along with a group of Levites bearing the Ark. Given that the odds in favor of David’s reclaiming his kingdom did not seem high, Zadok had drawn the only possible conclusion: David’s future would depend on divine assistance and the easiest way to assure this would be to bring God

---

<sup>11</sup> It may be worth pointing out that in the *Chicago Assyrian Dictionary* the entry *ilu* or “god” has as its seventh meaning: “image of the deity.” One might note the important and widespread theme in Second Temple Judaism that the most valuable Temple furniture (most notably the Ark, the other items vary across the different traditions) was hidden prior to the Babylonian destruction and will be revealed at the eschaton. There will not be time in this essay to go into any of the details but clearly implied here is the notion that just as God himself was not as fully present in the Second Temple neither was his full array of furniture. The two are inextricably related. The classic examples of this tradition are to be found in 2 Macc 2:4–8; Epistle of Jeremiah 11–19; 2 Bar. 6:5–9; 4 Bar. 3:1–9; and *L.A.B.* 26:112–115; numerous rabbinic texts give evidence of a similar understanding. Strikingly the *Temple Scroll* from Qumran includes instructions for assembling almost all the furniture. See the essay by L. Schiffman, “The Furnishings of the Temple According to the *Temple Scroll*,” in *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid, 18–21 March, 1991* (ed. J. Trebolle Barrera and L. Vegas Montaner; STDJ 11; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 621–34. Schiffman does not discuss the relationship of these instructions to parallel traditions that await the revelation of this furniture at the end of time.

along for the departure.<sup>12</sup> David, however, will have none of this. Not because he views such a stratagem as rooted in a “magical” conception of the Ark. Quite the reverse—David believes himself to be in the process of paying the price for past sins (2 Sam 12:7–15) and willingly takes upon himself this period of exile from his city and his God. His own words are most revealing: “Take the Ark of God back to the city. If I find favor with the Lord, He will bring me back and *let me see it* and its abode” (2 Sam 15:25–26). Favor with the deity will be symbolized not only by restoration to his kingdom but by being granted the privilege of *seeing* the Ark.

This high valuation placed on seeing the representation of the deity should not surprise anyone familiar with ancient Near Eastern practice. As early as 1924 [and even before], F. Nötscher, in his book *Das Angesicht Gottes schauen*, had argued that references to seeing God in pilgrimage laws and the Psalter were to be understood against the background of the act of displaying the statue of the god or goddess in non-Israelite cultures. Although Israel’s cultic life was without a direct and immediate representation of God himself, the Ark and other pieces of the Tabernacle furniture supplied an almost exact parallel. No better witness to the close nexus between Temple appurtenance and the presence of God could be seen than in the priestly rules about how to disassemble the Tabernacle prior to the Israelite camp moving to a new destination in the wilderness. The rules are carefully laid out with one goal in mind: the prevention of inappropriate levitical groups from laying eyes on the holiest parts of this structure. “Let not [the Kohathites] go inside and witness the dismantling of the sanctuary,” our writer warns, “lest they die” (Num 4:20).<sup>13</sup> In this text, seeing the furniture is analogous to seeing the very being of God.<sup>14</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup> On the theological and political importance of the cult image to the identity of a people, see P. Miller and J. Roberts, *The Hand of the Lord: A Reassessment of the “Ark Narrative” of 1 Samuel* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1977).

<sup>13</sup> In a representation of a procession from Palmyra in the first century CE, a portable sanctuary is borne by a camel that is covered with a piece of red cloth. The worshippers greet the artifact with upraised arms as though the deity himself sat astride the camel. See O. Keel, *The Symbolism of the Biblical World: Ancient Near Eastern Iconography and the Book of Psalms* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1997), 326.

<sup>14</sup> In one rabbinic tradition, this law was promulgated because the Kohathite clan was in the habit of “feasting their eyes on the Shekinah,” who dwelt among the furniture (*Num. Rab.* 5:9). This illustrates nicely the attraction that the Tabernacle appurtenances were felt to possess, as well as their attendant danger.

Finally, I might mention Psalm 48, a text that describes in considerable detail the circumambulation of the city of Jerusalem after the destruction of enemy forces that foolishly attempted to overcome it. Having exhorted the inhabitants of Zion and the surrounding province of Judah to stream forth in pilgrimage to celebrate this event, the Psalmist urges them to make a close visual inspection of the architecture of the city. “Walk about Zion, go round about her,” he urges, “number her towers, consider well her ramparts, go through her citadels; that you may tell the next generation that *this is God*, our God forever and ever” (Ps 48:13–15). It is the last line that should occasion some surprise. For here our author seems to take his paean of praise to unimaginable heights. It is these buildings, he claims, that testify to the very being of God. Amos Hacham puts his finger directly on the pulse of this text when he writes, “[Regarding the phrase] ‘this is God,’ the word ‘this’ [*zeh*] is similar in meaning to ‘look here.’ It is an expression of palpable excitement and its point is that the one who sees the Temple in its splendor and glory feels within himself as if he saw, face to face, the glory (*kavod*) of the Lord. He cries, ‘this [sc. this building] is God, our God.’”<sup>15</sup>

What I would like to suggest is that this language is not solely a result of the excess or superfluity that often characterizes the genre of praise (though obviously this is a factor). Rather, these materials give witness to a deeply held view in ancient Israel that God really dwelt in the Tabernacle and that all the pieces of that structure shared in some fashion in his tangible and visible presence. To use a modern metaphor, one might imagine the Temple as a giant electrical generating plant that powered the land of Israel. In its core was a nuclear reactor in which the radioactive rods emitted divine energy that was absorbed by the entire infrastructure of the building. Though the glow was brightest at the center, even the periphery had to be entered and handled with caution. Not even the thickest cement wall or lead surface could prevent this divine energy from overwhelming its boundaries and radiating divinity upon whatever stood in its vicinity.

Mesopotamian texts provide a very close parallel. “The aura of a god in his temple,” W. G. Lambert writes, “could so attach itself to the temple, or architectural parts of it in particular, also to the implements

---

<sup>15</sup> A. Hacham, *Sefer Tehillim* (Daat Miqra 14; Jerusalem: Mosad ha-Rav Kook, 1990), 278 (Hebrew). The translation is my own.

he used, and to the city which housed the temple, in such a way that these various things also became gods and received offerings as a mark of the fact.”<sup>16</sup> Certainly it should occasion no surprise to learn that the statue of the god was imbued with the veritable presence of the god in question, but most remarkable is the fact that even the furniture and other appurtenances that were dedicated to the temple would come to share in this divine aura.<sup>17</sup> The whole building pulsated with the veritable presence of the god. Mesopotamian texts had a decisive grammatical advantage over their biblical brethren; they could mark the overflow of the divine energies by attaching a DINGIR-sign (the cuneiform sign that marks a person or object as divine) to lists of temple furniture.<sup>18</sup> The structure of the temple itself literally shared in the presence of the divine.

## II. THE EVIDENCE OF POSTBIBLICAL JUDAISM

This deeply rooted ancient Near Eastern tendency to link the appurtenances of the building to the central cultic image had a vibrant afterlife in postbiblical Judaism. In the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* from Qumran there is regularly some confusion as to whether a particular title identifies the Holy One, the God of Israel, or one of his angelic host.<sup>19</sup> Such semantic difficulties are regular enough that one has a hard time imagining that it is the gulf of many centuries between

---

<sup>16</sup> W. G. Lambert, “Ancient Mesopotamian Gods: Superstition, Philosophy, Theology,” *RHR* 207 (1990): 129.

<sup>17</sup> Note the concluding observations of Gebhard Selz’s remarkable essay, “The Holy Drum, the Spear, and the Harp: Towards an Understanding of the Problems of Deification in Third Millennium Mesopotamia,” in *Sumerian Gods and their Representations* (ed. I. Finkel and M. Geller; Cuneiform Monographs 7; Grönigen: Styx Publications, 1997), 167–213, p. 184: “A statue of a god was an independent entity, because it stood on a holy place, and had the name of a god, the appearance of a god, and so on. It was these qualities of a statue, including its partaking in certain rituals, which left no doubt that it was the god himself. *The same holds true for the “cultic objects”; it is their function and their special attributes, including their participation in holy rites, which made them god-like.*” (Italics mine.) Compare also the essay of K. van der Toorn, “Worshipping Stones: On the Deification of Cult Symbols,” *JNSL* 23 (1997): 1–14.

<sup>18</sup> See the section of Selz’s essay (“The Holy Drum, the Spear, and the Harp”) entitled, “Cultic Objects’ and Gods in the Neo-Sumerian Period,” 176–79.

<sup>19</sup> See in particular the commentary of Carol Newsom on the seventh Sabbath Song, *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice: A Critical Edition* (HSS 27; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985), 213–25. Note also her comment on p. 24: “Many occurrences of *elohim* in the Shiroṭ are ambiguous and might refer to God or to the angels....”

composition and commentary that is creating the problem. The text itself seems to enjoy the confusion it creates, from time to time, between the two categories. The most likely explanation for this phenomenon is to be found in the Bible itself. As James Kugel has recently outlined with such clarity, the angel of the Lord will frequently, in course of a theophany, fade into the person of God Himself. “The fact that [this confusion occurs] in text after text (even if, after a time, it became conventional),” explains Kugel, “suggests that there was something essential about this confusion. It represents the biblical authors’ most realistic sense of the way things actually are. The spiritual is not something tidy and distinct, another order of being. Instead, it is perfectly capable of intruding into everyday reality, as if part of this world.”<sup>20</sup>

But it is not only the case that angels fade into God and vice versa; the same semantic difficulties attend the sanctuary as well. As Carol Newsom has argued, these thirteen songs are organized around the important seventh composition.<sup>21</sup> And, as in the sixth and eighth songs that flank this centerpiece, the number seven is itself crucial to its compositional structure. This song opens with seven highly ornate exhortations to the angelic priesthood to commence their praise. Having accomplished this, we move from voices of the angelic host to the sanctuary itself bursting into song.

/41/ [and along with the seven groups of angels who were exhorted to sing praise]<sup>22</sup> let all the [foundations of the hol]y of holies offer praise, the uplifting pillars of the supremely exalted abode, and all the corners of its structure. Sin[g praise] /42/ to Go[d who is dr]eadful in power [, all you spirits of knowledge and light ] in order to [exa]lt together the splendidly shining firmament of [His] holy sanctuary. /43/ [Give praise to Hi]m, O god-[like] spirits, in order to pr[aise for ever and e]ver the firmament of the upper[m]ost heaven, all [its] b[eams ] and its walls, a[l]l its [for]m, the work of /44/ [its] struc[ture. The spir]its of holie[st] holiness, living god-like beings[, spir]its of [eter]nal holi[ness] above /45/ all the hol[y ones...<sup>23</sup>

<sup>20</sup> J. Kugel, *The God of Old: Inside the Lost World of the Bible* (New York: Free Press, 2003), 36.

<sup>21</sup> Newsom, *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*, 13–17.

<sup>22</sup> The use of *hallelu* as an imperative call to praise marks the beginning, middle and end of the seventh song (see 4Q403 1 i 30, 41 and ii 15). First the angels are called to offer praise, then the Temple itself, and finally the chariots of the inner sanctum.

<sup>23</sup> 4Q403 1 i 41–45.



By having the building break into song in this fashion, the difference between the angelic host and the building in which they serve has been dramatically eclipsed. But even more striking is the vacillation the text demonstrates concerning precisely what *is* the object of praise. Whereas with the angels one is never in doubt that they are the ones who must offer praise, it is occasionally the case that the divinized Temple not only offers praise, but becomes itself the object of praise. “Give praise to Him, O god-like spirits” our text exhorts, “in order to praise/confess (*le-hodot*) . . . the firmament of the uppermost heaven, all its beams and walls.”

Indeed the last sentence of the text we have cited—“The spirits of holiest holiness . . .”—is difficult to parse grammatically. How exactly is it related to its immediate antecedent, that is, the list of architectural features of the Temple? Newsom’s commentary is revealing:

The expression *ruhey qodesh qodashim* may mean either “most holy spirits” . . . or “spirits of the holy of holies.” However the title is construed, these angelic spirits are in some way associated with the heavenly sanctuary which has just been described, either as attendants or as the *animate spiritual substance of the heavenly Temple itself*.<sup>24</sup>

No matter which way we go with these two options we reach essentially the same destination. Either the Temple is such an overpoweringly holy structure that angelic spirits literally ooze from its various surfaces, or those surfaces themselves slip into the realm of divine being. Hebrew constructions such as *elohim hayyim* (“the living God”), which one would normally construe as divine titles, now become attributes of the supernal Temple (“a living pulsating godlike [building]”).

Although the end of the seventh song is fragmentary, enough remains for Newsom to conclude that the praise moves from the outer parts of the heavenly sanctuary to its inner sanctum, the *debir* and its furnishings. As such, the structure of this crucial middle song anticipates “to a certain extent the structure and content of the ninth through the thirteenth songs.”<sup>25</sup> And not surprisingly, in these latter songs the structural edifice of the supernal Temple again comes to life so as to voice its praise. Strikingly, Newsom notes, the thirteenth and final song appears to conclude with a systematic list of the contents and structures of the heavenly Temple.

<sup>24</sup> Newsom, *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*, 233; emphasis added.

<sup>25</sup> Newsom, *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*, 9.

The fact that these *Sabbath Songs* seem to feel no embarrassment about ascribing divine qualities to the Temple provides a striking piece of data against which we can contextualize how the Septuagint and the Samaritan version of the Pentateuch handle several texts in Exodus that speak of seeing God. We have already mentioned the command to visit Jerusalem during the three pilgrimage festivals in order to fulfill the obligation of “seeing the face of the Sovereign, YHWH.” The Masoretes smoothed over this striking phrase by rendering “to see” in the passive “to be seen / appear.”

Though the Septuagint anticipates what the Masoretes will do with this verse by rendering the verb “to see” in the passive form, in a couple of other places the LXX replaces the difficult construction of “seeing God” with the notion of beholding the structure in which he dwells. Compare for example Exod 25:8 wherein Moses is told that the entire purpose of building the Tabernacle is so “that I may dwell among [the people Israel].” The Septuagint replaces the idiom of dwelling in favor of that of vision; build the sanctuary, Israel is exhorted, “so that I may *be visible* among you.” Similarly in Exod 24:9–11 where the MT declares that Moses and the select group that ascended to the top of Mt Sinai “saw the God of Israel,” the Septuagint introduces a rather significant qualification: “they saw *the place where* the God of Israel stood.”

The Samaritan found another way around the problem. Building on the common confusion of *daleth* and *resh* it read the line: “to see the presence of the Ark (*aron* in place of *adon*) of the Lord.” Though correctly dismissed by text critics as a secondary reading, this is an invaluable piece of information for the scholar of early biblical exegesis.<sup>26</sup> Minimally, this reading demonstrates that for at least one strand of ancient Judaism, seeing the Ark was a close substitute for seeing God himself. Maximally, it may provide us with a piece of indirect evidence that in the Second Temple period pieces of the furniture of the Temple were taken out of the building and displayed before the eyes of earnest pilgrims.<sup>27</sup>

If we skip ahead slightly to the Book of Revelation, it is perhaps significant that when the Kingdom of God is to be revealed at the end of time and the appearance of God in his full glory would seem to be

---

<sup>26</sup> The importance of this textual variant for the practices of Second Temple Judaism have already been noted by I. Knohl, “Postbiblical Sectarianism and the Priestly Schools,” *Tarbiz* 60 (1991): 139–46, pp. 140–41 (Hebrew).

<sup>27</sup> See the argument of I. Knohl below.

at hand, what is described is something not unlike what Moses must have beheld at Sinai:

Then the seventh angel blew his trumpet, and there were loud voices in heaven, saying, "The kingdom of the world has become the kingdom of our Lord and of his Messiah, and he will reign forever and ever." Then the twenty-four elders who sit on their thrones before God fell on their faces and worshiped God, singing, "We give you thanks, Lord God Almighty, who are and who were, for you have taken your great power and begun to reign. The nations raged, but your wrath has come, and the time for judging the dead, for rewarding your servants, the prophets and saints and all who fear your name, both small and great, and for destroying those who destroy the earth." *Then God's Temple in heaven was opened, and the Ark of his covenant was seen within his Temple;* and there were flashes of lightning, rumblings, peals of thunder, an earthquake, and heavy hail. (Rev 11:15–19)

The common denominator that binds all these examples together is the notion of gazing upon the architecture and furnishings of the sanctuary as a fit replacement for seeing the face of God.

A few early rabbinic texts shed additional light on the subject. In *m. Hagigah* 1:1 we have a piece of halakhah concerning who is obligated to make the pilgrimage to Jerusalem:

All are subject to the command to appear [before the Lord] excepting a deaf-mute, an imbecile, a child, one of doubtful sex, one of double sex, women, slaves that have not been freed, a man that is lame or blind or sick or aged, and one that cannot go up [to Jerusalem] on his feet.<sup>28</sup>

In the Tosefta we find a *baraita* that attempts to explain just how the various categories described herein are related to the biblical text, which states simply that every male must go up to Jerusalem to see the face of God. According to R. Yehudah "even the blind man [is exempt] because scripture states that '[every one of your males] must see [the face of God] (Exod 23:17).'" The striking detail here is the reading of *ra'ah* as a *qal*. This prompts the intervention of Rabbi, who presumes that the verb should be read in the *niphal* and cites in support 1 Sam 1:22, the only text in the Bible where the *niphal* reading is unambiguous

---

<sup>28</sup> The translation is that of H. Danby, *The Mishnah* (New York: Oxford, 1933), 211.

in regard to the pilgrimage to the Temple.<sup>29</sup> This unit of the Tosefta comes to a close with the notice that the sages inclined the scales of judgment in favor of R. Yehudah's rendering. What is remarkable here, as Shlomoh Naeh takes considerable care to point out, is that there is no discussion of a dispute between the *ketiv* and *qere*; no invocation of the technical terms that are so familiar to this sort of discourse *ha-im em la-massoret/ha-im em la-miqra*? Rather, the ambiguity of the consonantal text is the subject of dispute; and R. Yehudah believes that the simplest reading—the *qal*—has the added advantage of providing a scriptural support for a piece of mishnaic legislation. Unless Israel is obligated “to see God,” how are we to understand the Mishnah's exemption of the blind? Certainly the blind were able “to appear” before God if that is what the Torah demanded.<sup>30</sup>

In addition to considering how the biblical text is used in relationship to several other rabbinic texts, Naeh makes a very illuminating remark as to just what all of this might mean historically:

It is possible that the cause for the textual differences is not solely due to *tikkune soferim* [scribal corrections] but also rooted in historical practice. Perhaps what is seen here are two ancient customs or conceptualizations of the command to go up for pilgrimage and “see.” According to one, the pilgrims entered the Temple building and received the presence of the Shekinah; according to the other they were not authorized to enter the Temple proper but to bring a sacrifice and “appear” in the courtyard. A similar dispute regarding the participation of the gathered throng of pilgrims at the Temple liturgy during the festival existed between the Pharisee/Sages party and the various sects at the close of the Second Temple period.<sup>31</sup> It is likely that this dispute was a longstanding one inasmuch as it reflects two of the most fundamental positions regarding Temple worship and its place in the life of the community. It is possible that the talmudic terminology *re'iyat panim* and *re'iyat qorban* reflects these two variant conceptualizations.<sup>32</sup>

<sup>29</sup> T. *Ḥagigah* 1:1. I am not following the text as printed but rather the reconstruction of S. Naeh, “*Ha-im em la-massoret?*” *Tarbiz* 61 (1992): 413.

<sup>30</sup> In addition to the discussion of Naeh, see the recent article by A. Shemesh (“The Holy Angels are in their Council: The Exclusion of Deformed Persons from Holy Places in Qumranic and Rabbinic Literature,” *DSD* 4 [1997]: 179–206) on these exemptions and their relation to law at Qumran.

<sup>31</sup> Y. Sussman, “The History of the Halakhah and the Dead Sea Scrolls,” *Tarbiz* 59 (1990): 65–68 (Hebrew); and Knohl, “Postbiblical Sectarianism.”

<sup>32</sup> Naeh, “*Ha-im em la-massoret?*” 417.

In a recent article, Israel Knohl has taken this idea of “seeing God” a step further. He begins with a citation of *m. Kelim* 1:8–9:

The court of the priests is more holy (than the court of the Israelites) for the Israelites cannot enter therein except to fulfill sacrificial obligations such as the laying on of hands, slaughter, and hand-waving. The area between the porch and the altar is more holy (than the court of the priests) for no priest who is blemished or has unkempt hair can enter therein.

These boundaries are transgressed during the pilgrimage festivals. First of all, the Temple vessels, which normally belong solely to the inner sanctum, move out to the courtyard; and conversely, the people who generally are restricted to the outer court can now move into the more sacred area in order to view the vessels.

How do we know that the vessels were displayed in this fashion? Here things are a bit more ambiguous and require some development. In *m. Hagigah* 3:8, the question is asked: “How did they enter upon the cleansing of the Temple court? They immersed the vessels that were in the Temple and said to them: ‘Take care not to touch the table [or lamp] so as to render them unclean.’” This Mishnah is quite unclear about just what is meant. The two Talmuds, however, provide a plausible context. They declare that it was customary on festival days to bring the table out of the Temple into the courtyard and to display it to the pilgrims.<sup>33</sup>

As Knohl observes, this ritual is at variance with scriptural law. For according to Num 4:18–20, even the Levitical priests, who had greater privileges than the laity in terms of entering sacred space, put their lives at risk when they gazed upon the sacred furniture of the Tabernacle. Knohl’s explanation of this problem is suggestive:

It seems to me that the Sages departed from convention and permitted the display of the Temple furniture before the pilgrims so as to allow them to fulfill their obligation “to see the face.” Or to put it another way, the presentation of these holy items before the large assembly created the experience of a public theophany. The Israelites who had longed for the Temple courts and asked, “When may I come to see the face of God?” went up to the Temple at the pilgrimage feast and gazed upon the vessels of the Temple-service that were brought out of hiding. In this way their spiritual thirst was slaked and they fulfilled the commandment of

---

<sup>33</sup> *Y. Hagigah* 3:8 (79d) and *b. Hagigah* 26b.

the Torah that, "Three times a year each male must see the face of the Sovereign, the Lord, the God of Israel." (Exod 34:23)<sup>34</sup>

However we might wish to assess the historical problem of whether or not the Temple appurtenances were put on display, we can certainly conclude that one significant strand of rabbinic literature assumes as much. And in making this assumption, these rabbinic texts involve themselves in a logical contradiction. On the one hand the furniture itself, owing to the divine power that was infused within it (see Num 4:18–20), was extraordinarily dangerous. If persons without priestly status were to catch even a glimpse of it, they would be struck dead. As Daniel Schwartz has argued, one midrashic tradition employed this idea to explain how the Israelite armies in Num 31:6 were able to defeat the Midianites.<sup>35</sup> When the Midianites attacked Israel, Phinehas displayed the Ark before them and the Midianites, being unworthy of the sight of it, were instantly slain. A similar understanding is found in the MT of 1 Sam 6:19, a text that appears secondary and probably reflects a late scribal attempt to bring the traditions of Numbers 4 into alignment with the care needed when taking the Ark into a public domain.<sup>36</sup> However that might be, the lesson is clear, the Ark is not just a symbol for God; in some very real sense it is so closely linked to God that gazing indiscreetly upon it is an occasion for instant death.

Yet for all their cognizance of the dangers posed for the Israelite community by improper viewing of the Ark, the rabbis were content at times to ignore such dangers altogether within the context of the religious festivals. According to *b. Yoma* 54a:

[A] R. Judah contrasted the following passages: "And the ends of the staves were seen" and it is written "but they could not be seen without" (1 Kgs 8:8)—how is that possible?—They could be observed, but not actually seen. Thus was it also taught: "And the ends of the staves were seen." One might have assumed that they did not protrude from their place. To teach us [the fact] Scripture says: "And the staves were so long."

<sup>34</sup> Knohl, "Postbiblical Sectarianism," 140–41.

<sup>35</sup> D. R. Schwartz, "Viewing the Holy Utensils (P. Ox V, 840)," *NTS* 32 (1986): 155–56.

<sup>36</sup> According to 1 Sam 6:19, when the Philistines had tired of holding the Ark, they sent it back with the indemnity penalty of the notorious "golden hemorrhoids." But when the Ark had made its way back to Beth Shemesh the local townsmen, according to the MT, made the mistake of gazing upon it. "[The Lord] struck at the men of Beth Shemesh," the text explains, "because they looked into the Ark of the Lord; He struck down seventy men among the people [and] fifty thousand men."

One might assume that they tore the curtain and showed forth; to teach us [the fact] Scripture says: "They could not be seen without" How then? They pressed forth and protruded as the two breasts of a woman, as it is said: "My beloved is unto me as a bag of myrrh, that lieth betwixt my breasts" (Song of Songs 1:13).

[B] R. Kattina said: Whenever Israel came up to the Festival, the curtain would be removed for them and the Cherubim were shown to them, whose bodies were intertwined with one another, and they would be thus addressed: Look! You are beloved before God as the love between man and woman.<sup>37</sup>

This remarkable text engages in the most radical form of anthropomorphism. In the first unit [A] the Ark of the Covenant is imagined as the veritable body of God that beckons the Israelite forward through the power of erotic attraction. Only the veil prevents a full frontal view of a radically feminized form of the deity. Having quickened these carnal desires, the veil is thrown aside [B] so that the pilgrim might behold his God, here described not as an invisible being who sits upon the Ark ("enthroned above the Cherubim" in biblical parlance) but rather as one of the Cherubim themselves. God is, for the purposes of this text, this particular golden artifact. There is no danger in viewing the Godhead here; quite the contrary, this unveiling of the Godhead seems to be the central rite of the pilgrimage festival itself.

It is tempting to read this sugya of the Babylonian Talmud in parallel with a tradition found in the *Mekhilta of Rabbi Ishmael*.<sup>38</sup> In view of the command (Exod 20:23) not to make "gods of silver or gods of gold" to stand "beside the Lord," the *Mekhilta* moves in a surprising direction. One might expect that the normal invective against idols would be standard here. And indeed the *Mekhilta* begins its discussion of this verse with traditions precisely of this sort. But at the conclusion of its rather lengthy discussion of this verse, the *Mekhilta* abruptly turns in another, quite surprising, direction. The reference to "gods of silver and gods of gold" is no longer understood in terms of idolatrous images pure and simple. It now refers to aberrant means of producing the Cherubim. Lest you think that you can fashion them out of silver instead of gold, the Torah declares: "don't make beside me gods of silver." Moreover, should you entertain the idea of making four cherubim instead of two

<sup>37</sup> The translation is taken from: *Yoma* (London: Soncino Press, 1974).

<sup>38</sup> See H. S. Horowitz and I. A. Rabin, *Mekhilta of Rabbi Ishmael* (Frankfurt: Kauffmann, 1931), 241.

then you would commit the sin of making “gods of gold.” The turn taken by the *Mekhilta* regarding the last phrase of the verse is most striking. It reads,

“[Gods of gold] do not make for yourselves.” This is written so that you would not think that because the Torah has given permission to make them for the Temple so I will make them for the synagogues and houses of study. Accordingly, the Torah teaches: “Do not make [these gods of gold] for yourselves.”<sup>39</sup>

Now admittedly, in my translation, I have reconstructed the object of the verb “to make” in accord with the only possible antecedent provided by the biblical text—*elohe zahav*. One could, however, read the text as Rashi does and supply a different object—the Cherubim—so that there is no mistaking what is intended. I sincerely doubt whether the author of our unit in the *Mekhilta* would reprove Rashi for this explanatory gloss. For certainly “*elohe zahav*” does not mean “God conceived of as a piece of gold”; that would be idolatry pure and simple. But it is striking, just the same, that the *Mekhilta* is not as worried as Rashi seems to be about the ambiguity of the antecedent. Indeed this whole unit of the *Mekhilta* only works if we presume that the line between “a portion of God’s being represented in golden form” and a “god of gold” is a rather fine one.<sup>40</sup>

Indeed, I see no reason why one could not gloss in this way the turn taken by the *Mekhilta*: “a golden object that partakes of the divine essence do not make for yourselves [i.e., to put in your synagogues].” The usage here is a prosaic adaptation of the more poetic language of the *Sabbath Songs*, which did not shrink from describing the supernal Temple as *elohim hayyim*. The *Mekhilta*, on the other hand, comes tantalizingly close to making explicit what was implied by *b. Yoma* 54a. The Cherubim that have been placed in the Holy of Holies are, in some real sense, representations of God’s true presence in the Temple. The historian of religion will wish to ask how different this is from the Mesopotamian practice of marking the divinity of temple furniture with

<sup>39</sup> The translation is my own.

<sup>40</sup> This reading offers an intriguing parallel, perhaps, to Rabbi Judah Ha-Levi’s somewhat apologetic reading of the sin of the golden calf (*The Kuzari* 1:92). Israel, he argued, was expecting Moses to bring down some sort of visible token toward which they could “direct their gaze during their devotions.” Israel’s problem, on this view, was not so much the act of venerating a material thing; as it was attributing “divine power to a creation of their own.”



the DINGIR-sign. Or, for that matter, from the words of the Psalmist, who exclaimed when gazing upon the architecture of Jerusalem: “this is God!”

Perhaps most striking of all the examples I have found is a tradition from the Midrash on Proverbs. Here the Israelite, in terms very similar to Philo’s aphorism, is defined as the individual who gazes upon the face of God.<sup>41</sup>

The Queen of Sheba brought circumcised and uncircumcised persons before Solomon. They were of similar appearance, height, and dress. She said to him, “Distinguish for me the circumcised from the uncircumcised.” Immediately Solomon gestured to the high priest and he opened the Ark of the Covenant. Those who were circumcised bent over half-way but no more so that their faces might be filled with the radiance of the Shekinah. The uncircumcised promptly fell to the ground upon their faces. Solomon said to her, the former ones are the circumcised and the latter are the uncircumcised. She said, “How do you know this?” He said to her, “Is it not written about Balaam, ‘he who gazes upon the sight of the Almighty, [fallen (partly over) but with eyes unveiled]?’ (Num 24:4). Had he fallen completely to the ground, he would not have seen anything.”

How then are we to understand this radical disjuncture between a highly-charged Ark of the Covenant that spells immediate death for anyone who would cast their eyes upon it and the definition of an Israelite as one who can gaze directly at its center? Certainly Knohl’s suggestion is appropriate here, that during the pilgrimages, all Israel is temporarily raised to the status of priests so that they can behold the sacred furniture. Evidently, however, not all Second Temple circles were of one mind on this matter. As Knohl observes, talmudic tradition has it that the Sadducees and Boethusians opposed the display of Temple furniture before the laity. Confirmation of the historical accuracy of a charge such as this can be found in the *Temple Scroll*, which emphatically rules out the ritual act of carrying the Table of the Presence from its home within the Temple building itself.<sup>42</sup>

Additional confirmation of the practice of displaying the Temple furniture can be gathered from a puzzling piece of tradition found in P. Oxyrhynchus 840. The text reads:

---

<sup>41</sup> *Midrash Mishle* (ed. B. Visotsky; New York: Jewish Theological Seminary, 1990), 6. On Philo, see below, at n. 59.

<sup>42</sup> Within a list of the Temple appurtenances we read: “[... the altar of] incense; but the table [...] shall not depart from the Temple. And its bowls shall be of pure gold (11Q19 3:10–12).”

2.1 And having taken them he brought them into the place of purification and was walking in the Temple. 2.2 And having approached, a certain Pharisee, a chief priest, whose name was Levi, joined them and said to the Savior: Who gave you permission to enter this place of purification and to see these holy vessels, when you have not washed yourself, nor have your disciples surely bathed their feet? 2.3 But you, in a defiled state, have entered this Temple, which is a pure place that no one enters nor dares to view these holy vessels without having first washed themselves and changed their clothes.

2.4 And immediately the Savior stopped, and standing with his disciples answered: Are you then pure in your present state here in the Temple? 2.5 And he replied to him: I am pure, for I have washed myself in the pool of David, and having descended by one staircase I came up by another; 2.6 and I have put on white and pure clothes, and only then did I come and lay eyes on these holy vessels.

2.7 The Savior answered him saying: Woe unto you, O blind ones...<sup>43</sup>

As Daniel Schwartz has argued, the key point in this text is the claim that only persons of sufficient purity should be allowed to enter the Temple precincts to view the sacred vessels. Like Knohl, Schwartz is inclined to see this argument, concerning by whom and under what conditions the vessels may be viewed, as rooted in an inner-Jewish dispute over the display of the Temple vessels to the laity. "On this background," Schwartz concludes, "it is not unreasonable to assume that [the] practice associated with festive celebrations in the Temple, the exhibition of Temple utensils before the crowds of pilgrims, should be understood in [this] way: it was an attempt [by the Pharisees] to let the public share in what priests had claimed as their own prerogatives."<sup>44</sup> The fact that Jesus desires to see the Temple vessels in this text leads Schwartz to the conclusion that we have before us "another rare instance

---

<sup>43</sup> For the text and translation, see F. Bovon, "Fragment *Oxyrhynchus* 840, Fragment of a Lost Gospel, Witness of an Early Christian Controversy over Purity," *JBL* 119 (2000): 705–28. Bovon makes a very strong case that the text should *not* be read as a window onto the world of first-century Palestine and hence as another piece of information relevant to the quest for the historical Jesus. All of the pieces of this text fit better within the realm of the emerging second- or third-century church. Though I would agree, in the main, with his assessment that every detail in the text that looks Jewish is better understood in the framework of early Christianity there is one piece of data which just does not work: the presumption that gazing on the sanctuary vessels is a holy act (720). There is simply no Christian liturgical counterpart that even remotely parallels it. In private conversation, Professor Bovon confirmed that parallels he adduced are not quite satisfactory.

<sup>44</sup> D. R. Schwartz, "Viewing the Holy Utensils," 156.

of Jesus' participation in Pharisaic criticism of the same overemphasis on the part of the priests."<sup>45</sup>

But from the perspective that I have adopted in this essay, the most interesting part of Schwartz's article derives from his discussion of Josephus. For here we have a writer who claims a very good priestly pedigree. When writing about the entrance of Pompey into the Temple in 63 BCE, Schwartz observes that Josephus

lays special emphasis on the fact that he saw the Temple utensils; indeed, he states that "of all the calamities of that time none so deeply affected the nation as the exposure to alien eyes of the Holy Place, hitherto screened from view" (*B.J.* 1.7.6 § 152). Here, indeed, he is speaking of the Sanctuary or the Holy of Holies; nevertheless, the emphasis on sight rather than entry is remarkable. This point is further developed with specific reference to the holy utensils, in the parallel account in *Antiq.* 14.4.4 71–72 (although this development is counterbalanced by some new compliments for Pompey): "And not light was the sin committed against the sanctuary, which before that time had never been entered or seen. For Pompey and not a few of his men went into it and saw what it was unlawful for any but the high priests to see. But though the golden table was there and the sacred lampstand and the libation vessels..."<sup>46</sup>

Nor indeed is this the only occurrence of this remarkable point of emphasis. In some half dozen further examples in Josephus one can point to a similar interest in gazing upon the Temple and its furniture as over against an interest in physical entry or even touch.

The emphasis that Josephus puts on "seeing" can be set in best perspective through the evidence of Jewish coinage from the early second century, CE. In a recent article on the typology of the coins that hail from the revolt of Bar Kokhba, Dan Barag writes:

In a series of large and important silver coins, Bar Kokhba stamped the image of a Temple-façade along with the words, "Jerusalem" or "Shimon." On the reverse side he stamped an image of a lulav and etrog along with the words, "Year one of the redemption of Israel"... The Temple that appears on these coins... has four pillars. In the middle of the façade is an object whose identity remains a riddle. It is obvious that this object or symbol possessed tremendous significance, for in contemporary coins we frequently find images of the temple in whose center is stationed a god or goddess.<sup>47</sup>

<sup>45</sup> Schwartz, "Viewing the Holy Utensils," 157.

<sup>46</sup> "Viewing the Holy Utensils," 154.

<sup>47</sup> D. Barag, "The Table of the Bread of Presence and the Façade of the Temple upon the Coins of the Bar Kokhba War," *Qadmoniot* 20 (1987): 22 (Hebrew).

Indeed we can be even a bit more emphatic here. The god or goddess so depicted is the patron of the temple in question and as such was represented in those temples by his or her statue. As Price and Trell remark in their book on the subject, the statue of the god was normally out of view of the worshipers and so the coins do not reflect what one would have seen if one went to the respective cities and compared the image on the face of the coin to the temple façade itself. Indeed the artist often has to widen “the space between the central columns...to accommodate the image which usually identifies the shrine with no possible ambiguity.”<sup>48</sup> So, one purpose of bringing the statue forward was to signify precisely which town this coin hailed from and under which divine auspices it exercised its authority. But equally important, Price and Trell observe, is the manner by which the identification of god and temple takes place—the presentation of the god at the door of the temple “would suggest the age old custom of [an] epiphany, a god appearing in person before his worshipers.”<sup>49</sup>

Barag concludes that the symbolism of the Bar Kokhba coins is unambiguous: the Table between the two columns on the front side of the coin “symbolizes the renewal of the liturgy of regular Temple-service: ‘You shall set the bread of the presence upon the Table before me on a regular basis’ (Exod 25:30; cf. Lev 25:8) and the lulav and etrog on the reverse side of the coin represent the aspiration to renew the pilgrimage festivals, and in particular, that of Sukkot.”<sup>50</sup> In a subsequent exchange of letters Asher Grossberg mentions the talmudic interpretations of *m. Hagigah* 3:1, as well as the supporting evidence of P. Oxyr. 840.<sup>51</sup> In Grossberg’s opinion the two sides of the coins represent a single reality. The Table was paired with the lulav and ethrog because the Table was that piece of Temple furniture that was displayed before pilgrims during the festival of Sukkot. These coins denote a longing to fulfill the commandment of seeing the presence of God during Sukkot. In Barag’s opinion, however, the talmudic evidence that Grossberg cites (a set of texts that overlap with those cited by I. Knohl) is purely aggadic in character and bears no historical weight. Although Barag correctly

---

<sup>48</sup> M. Price and B. Trell, *Coins and their Cities: Architecture on the Ancient Coins of Greece, Rome, and Palestine* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1977), 19.

<sup>49</sup> Price and Trell, *Coins and their Cities*, 19.

<sup>50</sup> Barag, “The Table of the Bread of Presence,” 24.

<sup>51</sup> A. Grossberg, “Response to Dan Barag,” *Qadmoniot* 21 (1988): 56–57.

notes that the mishnah in *Hagigah* is by no means a clear reference to the practice of showing the table to pilgrims (indeed Albeck saw the text in a much more pedestrian fashion: the warnings were issued solely to priests attending to the pieces of furniture and had nothing to do with the festivals proper), it is hard to deny the fact that the coins have placed the Table exactly where statues of the god would go in nearly all of the parallel coins found in pagan contexts. This reading is suggested by the combination of evidence from P. Oxyr. 840; the *Temple Scroll*, along with more circumstantial evidence such as the Samaritan version of Exod 23:17; the importance the LXX puts on seeing the Tabernacle as a means of seeing God; and the witness of Josephus to the importance of seeing the appurtenances of the Temple.

Though Josephus does not, as Barag observes, mention the ritual of displaying the furniture on festivals, he does remark that the curtains of the Tabernacle were constructed in such a way that they could be pulled back to afford an unobstructed view.<sup>52</sup> Since the Torah gives no hint of such a thing, where would Josephus have derived such a detail if not from some sort of contemporary practice? At the very least—however we might sort out the historicity of the talmudic sources about the display of the Temple furniture—I think it would be fair to say that the image of the Table of Presence at the door of the Temple indicates for the person who struck this coin that this piece of furniture bore some

---

<sup>52</sup> As the biblical text itself offers no reason to suggest such things, many historians have cited this passage as an indication that viewing the Temple furniture was a well-known custom of the Second Temple period. The text in question (*Ant.* 3.124–125, 127–128) reads: “The Tabernacle was covered with curtains woven of fine linen, in which the hues of purple and blue and crimson were blended. Of these the first (veil—*paroket*) measured ten cubits either way and was spread over the pillars which divided the Temple and screened off the sanctuary; this it was which rendered the latter invisible to the eyes of any. . . . A second (veil—*masak*), corresponding to the first in dimensions, texture and hue, enveloped the five pillars that stood at the entrance, supported by rings at the corner of each pillar, it hung from the top to the middle of the pillar; the rest of the space was left as a passage for the priests entering beneath it. Above this was another covering of linen, of the same dimensions, which was drawn by cords to either side, the rings serving alike for curtain and cord, so that it could either be outspread or rolled together and stowed into a corner, in order *that it should not intercept the view* above all on the great days.” The translation is that of H. St. J. Thackeray, *Josephus IV: Jewish Antiquities, Books I–IV* (LCL; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1930), 375–77.

resemblance to the identity of the God who dwelled therein. If we set this coin next to the rabbinic evidence we can at least say that a goodly number of rabbinic materials imagine that the furniture shares enough of the divine presence that seeing it constitutes a fulfillment of the command, “to see the face of God.”

### III. EARLY CHRISTIANITY

Scholars have long been aware that the New Testament and early Christianity thought of the person of Jesus Christ and the community that he founded in terms of the Temple. Concerning the former, no text could be clearer than the Gospel of John. Early in his ministry when Jesus is asked for a sign to authorize his teaching and actions he declares: “Destroy this Temple and in three days I will raise it up” (John 2:19). His interlocutors puzzle over this declaration and wonder how a building that has been under construction for some forty-six years could be so quickly reestablished. At this point the narrator intervenes with an important clarification: “But Jesus was speaking of the Temple of his body. After he was raised from the dead, his disciples remembered that he had said this; and they believed the scriptures and the word that Jesus had spoken” (John 2:21–22).<sup>53</sup> For the image of the early New Testament community as an eschatological Temple that represents the perduring body of Christ after his resurrection and ascension, consider Paul’s declaration, “Do you not know that you are God’s Temple and that God’s Spirit dwells in you? If anyone destroys God’s Temple, God will destroy that person. For God’s Temple is holy, and you are that Temple” (1 Cor 3:16–17).<sup>54</sup>

---

<sup>53</sup> For a recent survey of the issue, see A. R. Kerr, *The Temple of Jesus’ Body: The Temple Theme in the Gospel of John* (JSNTSup 220; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002). Still very useful is the magisterial survey of Y. Congar, *The Mystery of the Temple* (London: Burns and Oates, 1962).

<sup>54</sup> See also 2 Cor 6:16; Eph 2:20–22; Heb 13:15–16; 1 Pet 2:5; 4:17; and Rev 3:12; 11:1–2. The literature on this matter is considerable. For a brief review see, R. Bauckham, “James and the Gentiles (Acts 15:13–21),” in *History, Literature, and Society in the Book of Acts* (ed. B. Witherington; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 165–68. An older survey of the problem can be found in B. Gärtner, *The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament: A Comparative Study in the Temple Symbolism of the Qumran Texts and the New Testament* (SNTSMS 1; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965).

But my purpose is not to survey the literature about how the Temple serves as a metaphor for Jesus' person or the community he founded. Rather, I would like to limit myself to how the metaphor of the Temple is associated with the notion of *sight*, such that looking at the physical body of Jesus becomes tantamount to beholding the very person of God. And for these purposes there is no better text than John 1:14, "And the word became flesh and dwelt among us and we saw his glory, the glory as of the Father's only Son, full of grace and truth." The key clause in establishing that this text speaks to the matter of the Temple is the phrase, "he dwelt among us." The Gk verb *skenoō* is clearly borrowed from the story of the Tabernacle in LXX Exodus and served to translate the Hebrew word *shakan/mishkan*. As Raymond Brown remarks, "we are being told that the flesh of Jesus Christ is the new localization of God's presence on earth, and that Jesus is the replacement of the ancient Tabernacle."<sup>55</sup> And as such this idea dovetails nicely with another major feature of this Gospel, that is, that Jesus is "the replacement of the Temple (2:19–22)," which Brown adds, is simply "a variation of the same theme."

Brown also notes the very important join between the "tenting" of the Word and its becoming visible to the naked eye. "In the OT," he observes, "the *glory* of God (Heb. *kabod*; Gr. *doxa*) implies a visible and powerful manifestation of God to men." Then, having reviewed several biblical texts that describe the appearance of God at the site of a temple he concludes, "it is quite appropriate that, after the description of how the Word set up a Tabernacle among men in the flesh of Jesus, the Prologue should mention that his *glory* became visible."<sup>56</sup>

Brown's observation, however, was made solely on the basis of the Exodus narrative and as such grounds the theology of the Prologue in a singular act, the moment when the glory of the Lord filled the Tabernacle on the day of its completion. What we have shown in this essay is that this momentous theophany was routinized in the daily life of the cult. It was not only the Israelites of Moses' day who saw God

---

<sup>55</sup> R. E. Brown, *The Gospel According to John, I–XII* (AB 29; Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1966), 33. Three recent works have treated this theme at great length: C. A. Evans, *Word and Glory: On the Exegetical and Theological Background of John's Prologue* (JSNTSup 89; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993), 77–113; A. R. Kerr, *The Temple of Jesus' Body*; and C. R. Koester, *The Dwelling of God: The Tabernacle in the Old Testament, Intertestamental Jewish Literature, and the New Testament* (CBQMS 22; Washington, D.C.: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1989), 100–115.

<sup>56</sup> Brown, *Gospel According to John*, 34.

as he entered his newly-dedicated Tabernacle; every Israelite could see God as they ascended to the Temple to participate in the rite of the furniture.<sup>57</sup> What the postbiblical Jewish materials we have examined provide is a more phenomenological, or even cultic, background against which we can set John's own theology of a visible and Tabernacle-like presence of the Logos.<sup>58</sup>

As is well known, the theme of God as visible to the eye was extremely important to Philo. One of his favorite definitions of the Jewish people is that of a people who have the unique gift of being able to see God.<sup>59</sup> So salient was this definition for Philo that G. Dellling writes at the conclusion of his own study, "whoever says 'Israel,' says 'seeing God.'" The etymology of the name Israel opens the possibility for Philo to express that which is specific of the Jewish religion in a siglum that points to the special relationship between the one God and the Jewish people. For him it attests the uniqueness of the revelation of God and with it the uniqueness of knowing, of seeing God, that it accords.<sup>60</sup> What is perhaps worthy of further study is how Philo relates this ability

---

<sup>57</sup> No study of the Prologue to John's Gospel and Jewish Tabernacle/Temple traditions has evidenced any knowledge of the role the Temple furniture played in Jewish sources. Compare, for example, the recent and exhaustive survey of Koester, *The Dwelling of God*, 100–115.

<sup>58</sup> I should emphasize here that the Jewish background I have proposed does not by any means exhaust the levels of meaning that are ascribed to the faculty of "sight" in John's Prologue. As Bultmann articulated, the notion of sight in John has at least three discrete meanings (*The Gospel of John* [trans. G. R. Beasley-Murray; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1971], 69 n. 2): "1. that of the perception of earthly things and happenings accessible to all men (1:38, 47; 9:8 etc.); 2. of the perception of supernatural things and events accessible only to a limited number of men (1:32, 33, 34; 20:12, 14 etc.). Whereas in both these cases what is referred to is perception with one's physical eyes, 'seeing' is used 3. of the perception of matters not visible to the organs of sight. The object of such 'seeing' is the revelation-event, or alternatively the person of Jesus the Revealer." Bultmann himself understands John 1:14 as falling under the third category; the perception of Jesus as "God" cannot originate in the physical object of sight itself but must be the subject of a specific moment of revelation. Although this understanding should not be rejected, I would argue that at the same time John compares the presence of God to that of the Temple, which was visible to the naked eye. I do not think the inner contradiction would have bothered John, just as it does not bother Athanasius in the text I will discuss below.

<sup>59</sup> See G. Dellling, "The 'One who Sees God' in Philo," in *Nourished with Peace: Studies in Hellenistic Judaism in Memory of Samuel Sandmel* (Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press, 1984), 27–41. Also see the comprehensive survey of this issue in E. Birnbaum, *The Place of Judaism in Philo's Thought* (BJS 290; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996). Especially useful are chapter two, "'Israel' and the Vision of God," and chapter three, "'Israel' and the Ones Who Can See."

<sup>60</sup> Dellling, "One who Sees God," 41.



to see God to the revelation of God within the Temple. One of Philo's prooftexts for this concept derives from Exod 24:11, a passage in which the Israelites who have ascended the heights of Mount Sinai are said to see God during their festal meal.<sup>61</sup> But more to our point is how Philo relates the Logos to the Tabernacle structure:

What is the meaning of the words, "Thou shalt set apart the veil between the Holy of Holies" (Exod 26:33b)? I have said that the simple holy (parts of the Tabernacle) are classified with the sense-perceptible heaven, whereas the inner (parts), which are called the Holy of Holies, (are classified) with the intelligible world. *The incorporeal world is set off and separated from the visible one by the mediating Logos as by a veil.* But may it not be that this Logos is the tetrad, through which the corporeal solid comes into being? For this is classified with the invisible intelligible things while the other (part of the Tabernacle) is divided into three and is connected with sense-perceptible things, so that there is between them something (at once invisible and visible of substance).<sup>62</sup>

This remarkable text notes that the Tabernacle neatly divides what is perceptible to the senses (the *three* pieces of furniture that sit in the "holy") from what is beyond all vision (i.e., the being of God himself, who resides in the holy of holies). Upon four pillars (the tetrad) rests a veil that represents the Logos and as such the Logos mediates in visible form what remains invisible to the naked eye. This veil would have been seen every day by the priests appointed to tend the menorah and the incense altar. Can we extrapolate from this text that Philo's definition of Israel as a nation that can see God includes the notion that through the cult the Logos has become a mediator in visual form of the Holy One of Israel who is beyond all human knowledge?<sup>63</sup>

---

<sup>61</sup> The text in question (*Confusion of Tongues* 56) reads: "For we are the 'race of the Chosen Ones of that Israel,' who sees God, 'and there is none amongst us of discordant voice (Exod 24:11),' that so the whole world, which is the instrument of the All, may be filled with the sweet melody of its undiscording harmonies." The translation is that of F. H. Colson, *Philo IV* (LCL; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1932), 41. Strikingly, the notion of "seeing God" only works in light of the MT; the verb in the LXX is a passive. Perhaps Philo has in mind both verses 10 and 11, for in verse 10 the LXX declares that the elders could see *the place wherein God dwells*, i.e., they could contemplate the Temple and its furniture but not God himself.

<sup>62</sup> Philo, *Questions and Answers on Exodus*, 2.94. Emphasis added. The translation is taken from *Philo, Supplement 2: Questions and Answers on Exodus* (ed. Ralph Marcus; LCL; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1953), 142–43.

<sup>63</sup> Compare the lengthy treatment of the concept in J. Z. Smith's essay, "The Prayer of Joseph," found in *Map is Not Territory* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978), 37–39.

The Johannine theme that God became visible in the flesh of Jesus had an extraordinary *Nachleben* in early Christianity. For Irenaeus, the primary reason for God becoming human is so that the world could see him (see *Against Heresies* IV.20). For to see God was to be drawn into the divine realm. Tertullian reaches the same destination but via a slightly different path.<sup>64</sup> He was bothered by the fact that God regularly makes himself visible to Israel in the Old Testament yet says at the same time that anyone who gazes upon his face will die (Exod 33:20). How can these be reconciled? For Tertullian, the Gospel of John provides the key, for while it affirms that no human being has seen the Father (John 1:18), it concedes that human beings can see the Word (1:14). When one reads, then, in the Old Testament of appearances of God to various holy individuals, these are to be understood as nothing other than appearances of the Word of God prior to his full incarnation. As for Irenaeus, the purpose of the incarnation is to make God visible to human eyes.

Perhaps even more emphatic about this theme was Gregory of Nyssa. He writes that “if everyone had the ability to come, as Moses did, inside the cloud, where Moses saw what may not be seen, or to be raised above three heavens as Paul was and to be instructed in Paradise about ineffable things that lie above reason, or to be taken up in fire to the ethereal region, as zealous Elijah was, and not be weighed down by the body’s baggage, or to see on the throne of glory, as Ezekiel and Isaiah did, the one who is raised above the Cherubim and glorified by the Seraphim—then surely if all were like this, there would be no need for the appearance of our God in flesh.”<sup>65</sup> Why then did Jesus become flesh according to John 1:14? For Gregory, the answer resides in what Jewish thought would call *yeridat ha-dorot*, the gradual decline of the world. Because of the overall weakness of the human race at this time, no one could any longer see as Moses saw. Therefore, like a physician matching his cure to the infirmity of the patient, God took drastic measures and became visible in human flesh.

There is one more twist in the story, though, that is worth attending to. If Jesus inhabits flesh the way God will inhabit the Temple, just how

---

<sup>64</sup> *Against Praxeas*, 14–16.

<sup>65</sup> *To Theophilus, Against the Apollinarians*. For the text see F. Mueller, ed., *Gregorii Nysseni Opera III.1* (Leiden: Brill, 1958), 123–24. The translation comes from an unpublished typescript of Brian Daley, SJ. My sincere thanks to him for allowing me to use it.

might we understand the relationship of the Godhead to the building in which it rests? Is the relationship an intrinsic one? By this I mean: is the entire body of Jesus, in all its carnality, divinized by this indwelling? Or to use the Jewish metaphors we have followed: Is the body of Jesus like the Temple walls in the *Sabbath Songs*, so infused with the divine energies that they come to life (and are called *elohim hayyim*) during moments of angelic praise; or the Table of Presence that is presented before the pilgrims in order to fulfill the obligation to see God; or the veil that separates the visible portions of the Temple from the invisible? All of these Jewish metaphors bespeak an intrinsic relation inasmuch as it is not possible to divide or separate fully the being of God from the objects he inhabits.

The other option is to consider the relationship of the Word to Jesus as more extrinsic in nature. The carnal flesh of Jesus, on this view, is a dispensable vehicle through which the divine medicine has been administered and as such can and indeed must be ignored by the spiritually adept in order to attend to the true source of divinity here, namely the Logos that resides within. This question, of course, is not an idle matter; the proper way of rendering John 1:14 became one of the major forks in the road for early Christianity.<sup>66</sup>

For St. Athanasius (fourth century) there was only one answer to that question: the flesh of Jesus *participates* in the divinity of the indwelling *Logos*. In order to drive home this point Christian thought would declare that what was predicated of the fleshly person of Christ could also be predicated of God, as well as the reverse (the so-called communication of properties [*communicatio idiomatum*]). The manner by which Athanasius arrives at this conclusion depends on a construal

---

<sup>66</sup> On one side of the fence was the docetic option, which claimed that the Word did not so much *become* flesh as it was made *manifest* in the flesh. For the problem of rendering the Greek, see G. Richter, "Die Fleischwerdung des Logos im Johannesevangelium," *NovT* 13 (1971): 81–126 and 14 (1972): 257–76 (who argues that 1:14 declares that the Word truly became flesh); and the response of K. Berger, "Zu 'das Wort ward Fleisch' Joh. 1:14a," *NovT* 16 (1974): 161–66. For Berger, the meaning of the Greek is the opposite of what Richter maintains: "Erscheinen in einer Gestalt, ohne damit diese zu 'werden.'" Strikingly, he compares this extrinsic connection of Logos to flesh to the way God inhabits a Temple (164): "Das Erscheinen des Christus im Fleisch und das Wohnen unter/in der Gemeinde bedeutet also nicht, dass der Kyrios mit diesen Menschen identisch wird, sondern dass er in ihnen als in einem heiligen Tempel wohnt (so wie man es sonst vom Pneuma sagt)." This precise question, whether God appeared in the flesh or became that very flesh, was the subject of enormous disagreement in the fourth- and fifth-century Christological controversies.

of the biblical Temple as a structure that *physically* participates in the life of the God who inhabits it. In his letter *Ad Adelphium* (see below), Athanasius is concerned about the readiness of the Arians “to divide” the person of Christ into two, his human side and his divine side. To do so, Athanasius claims, would be idolatrous, for when Christians prostrate themselves before Jesus they do so before the whole person, flesh and body. If human and divine are divisible, then the act of venerating the person Jesus results in the worship of a creature. “And we do not worship a creature,” Athanasius declares. “And neither do we divide the body from the Word and worship it by itself; nor when we wish to worship the Word do we set Him far apart from the flesh, but knowing, as we said above, that ‘the Word was made flesh’ (John 1:14) we recognize Him as God also, after having come in the flesh.”

And how can an argument for this point be derived from scripture? By attending to the practice of the Jewish pilgrimage feasts:

But we should like your piety to ask [the Arians] this question. When Israel was ordered to go up to Jerusalem to worship at the Temple of the Lord, where the Ark was, “and above it the Cherubim of glory overshadowing the mercy-seat” (Heb 9:5) did they do well or not? If they were in error, how is it that those who despised this law became liable for punishment? For it is written that “if a man make light of this command and not go up, he shall perish from among his people” (Num 9:13). But if they were correct in this practice and so proved themselves well-pleasing to God, then are not the Arians abominable and the most shameful of any heresy, even many times more worthy of destruction? For they approve the former people (the Jews) for the honor paid by them to the Temple, but they will not worship the Lord who is in the flesh as a God indwelling a Temple. . . . And [the Jews] did not, when they saw the Temple of stones, suppose that the Lord who spoke in the Temple was a creature; nor did they set the Temple at nought and retire far off to worship. But they came to it according to the Law, and worshipped the God who uttered His oracles from the Temple. Since this was so, how can it be other than right to worship the body of the Lord, all-holy and all-reverend as it is, announced by the Holy Spirit and made the vestment of the Word. . . . Therefore, he that dishonors the Temple dishonors the Lord in the Temple; and he that separates the Word from the Body sets at nought the grace given to us in Him.<sup>67</sup>

Athanasius’s point is crystal clear. Just as the Jews had complete justification in prostrating themselves before a building of stone and not

---

<sup>67</sup> *Ad Adelphium* 7–8. PG 26, 1080–82. The translation is from *NPNF*<sup>2</sup> 4:577.

dividing God from the house in which he dwelt—for though they knew God was not limited to the stones nor the furniture, at the same time they did not use that knowledge as license for not going up to Jerusalem—so the Christian has complete justification in prostrating himself before Jesus and not dividing the indwelling God from the flesh that contains him.

Given the importance of Athanasius in the church one might have expected that this “Temple theology” would have had a long afterlife. But in fact it ends with Athanasius himself. This is because of what happens within the school of Antiochene Christianity. There, already with the figure of Theodore of Mopsuestia, it is propounded that God abandons Jesus at his passion and lets the man suffer on his own. Though the justification is grounded in a textually problematic verse from Hebrews (see n. 69 below), the larger thematic argument comes from the metaphor of the Temple. For though God can indwell a Temple such that his presence infuses even the furniture and masonry, He can also depart from a Temple and go into exile.<sup>68</sup> Pursuing this model to its logical end, Theodore, and later most notoriously Nestorius (early fifth century), argue that the indwelling of God in Jesus’ body (likened to a Temple) is a wholly extrinsic affair. In some parts of the Gospel story we see only the weak human body that Jesus inhabits, in others the deity bursts on to the scene. At the crucifixion, God literally departs

---

<sup>68</sup> See the discussion of Theodore in his commentary on the Nicene Creed (*Homily 6*, section 6). Throughout this text he distinguishes what happened to the man Jesus—here described as the material framework of the Temple—in contrast to God who resided within him—here understood like the glory of the Lord that sits atop the Ark and is free to come and go as it pleases: “It is not Divine nature that received death, but it is clear that it was that man who was assumed as a temple to God the Word which was dissolved and then raised by the one who had assumed it. And after the Crucifixion it was not Divine nature that was raised but the temple which was assumed, which rose from the dead, ascended to heaven and sat at the right hand of God; nor is it to Divine nature—the cause of everything—that it was given that every one should worship it and every knee should bow, but worship was granted to the form of a servant which did not in its nature possess (the right to be worshipped). While all these things are clearly and obviously said of human nature he referred them successively to Divine nature so that his sentence might be strengthened and be acceptable to hearers. Indeed, since it is above human nature that it should be worshipped by all, it is with justice that all this has been said as of one, so that the belief in a close union between the natures might be strengthened, because he clearly showed that the one who was assumed did not receive all this great honor except from the Divine nature which assumed Him and dwelt in Him.” For photographs of the Syriac original see R. Tonneau, *Les homélies catéchétiques de Théodore de Mopsueste* (Vatican City: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1949), 140–43. The translation is from A. Mingana ed., *Commentary of Theodore of Mopsuestia on the Nicene Creed* (Woodbrook Studies 5; Cambridge: Heffer, 1932), 66.

from his Temple and leaves the man Jesus to die on his own.<sup>69</sup> Proper Gospel interpretation, Theodore declares, requires the ability to divide the human figure from the divine being who indwells him.

In the aftermath of the Nestorian controversy we see the rejection of the Temple metaphor as a means of understanding the incarnation (see Leo the Great, *Sermon* 23),<sup>70</sup> and the transferral of this metaphor to the person of the Virgin Mary (Leo the Great, *Sermon* 22.2),<sup>71</sup> for

---

<sup>69</sup> Theodore grounded this remarkable assertion in a textual variant of Hebrews 2:9: "And in order to teach us why He suffered and became 'a little lower [than the angels]' he said: 'Apart from God [in place of, 'by the grace of God'] He tasted death for every man.' In this he shows that Divine nature willed that He should taste death for the benefit of every man, and also that the Godhead was separated from the one who was suffering in the trial of death, because it was impossible for Him to taste the trial of death if (the Godhead) were not cautiously remote from Him."

<sup>70</sup> Leo the Great, *Sermon* 23.1 [3.1]: "For this wondrous child-bearing of the holy Virgin produced in her offspring one person which was truly human and truly Divine, because neither substance so retained their properties that there could be any division of persons in them; nor was the creature taken into partnership with its Creator in such a way that the One was the in-dweller, and the other the dwelling (*nec sic creatura in societatem sui Creatoris est assumpta, ut ille habitator, et illa esset habitaculum; sed ita ut naturae alteri altera misceretur*); but so that the one nature was blended with the other. And although the nature which is taken is one, and that which takes is another, yet these two diverse natures come together into such close union that it is one and the same Son who says both that, as true Man, 'He is less than the Father,' and that as true God 'He is equal with the Father.'" The translation is from *NPNF*<sup>2</sup> 12:132.

For Leo it is crucial that there be no division between God and man in the person of Jesus Christ. As a result, the Temple metaphor as deployed by the Antiochene school is allowed no place at the table. In Leo's mind, Nestorius had effectively divided the in-dweller (God the Son) from the dwelling (Jesus as man) and hence ruled out any direct comparison of Jesus to the Temple. For the Latin original see Léon le Grand, *Sermons* (SC 22 [2d edition]; Paris: Cerf, 1964), 94–99. The note appended by Dom René Dolle, the editor of the text, is worth quoting (97, n. 3): "C'était là, en effet, une expression employée par Nestorius pour caractériser l'union du Verbe divin avec l'homme Jésus. Dans une lettre à S. Cyrille, il écrivait: 'Il est exact et conforme à la tradition évangélique, d'affirmer que le corps du Christ est le temple de la divinité' (PG 77, 49), texte qui pouvait certes s'entendre dans un sens orthodoxe mais qui prenait un sens très particulier dans le contexte de pensée nestorienne; par ailleurs le XIe Anathématisme de saint Cyrille s'exprimait ainsi: 'Quiconque ne confesse pas que la chair du Seigneur donne la vie et qu'elle est la proper chair du Logos divin, mais prétend qu'elle appartient à un autre que lui, qui ne lui est uni que par la dignité et qui a servi de demeure à la divinité...'"

<sup>71</sup> Leo the Great, *Sermon* 22.2, "For the uncorrupt nature of Him that was born had to guard the primal virginity of the Mother, and the infused power of the Divine Spirit had to preserve in spotlessness and holiness *that sanctuary which He had chosen for Himself*: that Spirit (I say) who had determined to raise the fallen, to restore the broken, and by overcoming the allurements of the flesh to bestow on us in abundant measure the power of chastity: in order that the virginity which in others cannot be retained in child-bearing, might be attained by them at their second birth." For the Latin, see Léon le Grand, *Sermons*, 80–81.

with Mary the extrinsic element of the Temple metaphor is altogether apt and fit. She does not become God but she does “house” God in the most intimate way imaginable. Here, the extrinsic mode of relating God to Temple is put to good use. In late Byzantine hymns to Mary, the Tabernacle/Temple imagery reaches new heights.<sup>72</sup> The cult of Mary in the medieval period is greatly indebted to this development.

#### IV. CONCLUSION

It has often been stated that because of Israel’s radical aniconic stance, Israel came to prefer forms of revelation that were mediated by word rather than sight. This declaration, like all such truisms, is to some extent accurate. Nevertheless it should not be assumed that because Israel rejected the notion that God could somehow be represented in statuary form within his Temple, Israel rejected all linkages of her God to a specific physical domain. As M. Haran has pointed out with such clarity, the realistic language of the cult—that is, the provisioning of the deity with light, a pleasing aroma, and food—presume that some aspect of the deity has actually taken up residence within the confines of the Tabernacle. According to the priestly narrative he sits astride the Ark of the Covenant and is veiled from view by both the darkness of his inner cella and the outstretched wings of the Cherubim that stand in front of him.

Because his presence was thought to be localized in precisely this place, the effect of this theologoumenon on the entire Tabernacle compound was almost exactly that of what we find in other ancient Near Eastern settings. The aura of the deity’s presence was so overwhelming that all parts of the Temple compound came to share in its effulgence. There is ample biblical proof that this was the case: 1) the injunction one finds in the Psalms “to gaze” upon the Temple or the presence of God within the Temple; 2) the original form of the pilgrimage laws, which most certainly commanded the Israelites to “see the face of the Lord”; and 3) the priestly fascination with the architectural detail of

---

<sup>72</sup> The florid use of Temple imagery to fill out the figure of Mary is nicely illustrated in the collection (7th century and later) of patristic homilies on the feast of the Dormition of Mary assembled by B. Daley, *On the Dormition of Mary: Early Patristic Homilies* (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir’s Seminary Press, 1998). What had once been standard predications of Christ (see the text of Athanasius above) now become standard for the figure of the Virgin.

the Tabernacle, a fascination that leads the biblical author to repeat the list of its appurtenances whenever the narrative allows.

This evidence is greatly extended when we move into the Second Temple period. The Samaritan and Septuagint versions alter the MT at several occasions to inform the reader that seeing God means seeing either the place where he dwells (the structure of the Tabernacle itself) or the Ark itself. Josephus strikingly emphasizes in numerous places that the entrance of non-Israelites into the Temple confines was not problematic because of the danger of encroachment on sacred space but because they might view what pagan eyes should not see. Most striking is the ritual of taking the Temple vessels out of the Temple so that they can be viewed by pilgrims. This was done, no doubt, with the intention of allowing these individuals the opportunity to fulfill the mitzvah of *re'iyah*, or "seeing," while they were in Jerusalem. As Israel Knohl has suggested, the ruling of the *Temple Scroll* that these Temple vessels ought to remain within and not be subject to such movement provides strong evidence that this ritual was more than simply a product of the rabbinic imagination. Nothing more strongly suggests the close nexus between God and the house he inhabits than this practice. If God is not somehow fused with the very furniture of this building, how could viewing it fulfill the mandate for the pilgrim?

The Jewish theologian Michael Wyschogrod has argued that the Temple provides a close, though not exact, analogy to what Christianity means by the doctrine of incarnation. "The God of Israel," Wyschogrod declares, "is a God who enters the world of humanity and in so doing does not shun the parameters of human existence that include spatiality."<sup>73</sup> Indeed, when God assumes residence in the Tabernacle he so ties his personal identity to that building that praise to the building can come close to praising God himself. This close continuity between God and Temple would seem to have been radically compromised by its destruction in 587 BCE and 70 CE. Christian apologists were certainly alert to this fact and used the fact of the Temple's destruction as a basic building block in the argument that God had permanently abandoned the Jews. But, in fact, just the opposite occurs. As the Temple vessels are removed from the building just prior to this catastrophic end, God's presence and future promise of restoration becomes tied to the

---

<sup>73</sup> Michael Wyschogrod, "A Jewish Perspective on Incarnation," *Modern Theology* 12 (1996): 195–209.



place where these vessels are hidden and the time when they are to be revealed.<sup>74</sup> The attachment of God to his home continues even after that home is destroyed.

This analogy between the Temple and incarnation was not lost on early Christianity. Beginning with John 1:14, we see an attempt to describe the “tabernacling” presence of God as God’s becoming present in Jesus, so that he (God) can be “seen” among men and women. For decades after the appearance of John’s Gospel, debate raged, however on just how God was attached to the person of Jesus. Did he actually become the (now divinized) flesh of Jesus Christ (the claim of nascent orthodoxy) or did he simply make use of the (ordinary human) flesh as the occasion to manifest himself in a way that only those with the proper esoteric knowledge could ascertain (Gnosticism)? To answer this question, St. Athanasius turned to a set of logical relations that would have been most at home in Second Temple Judaism. He asked whether the pilgrims to Jerusalem, when they prostrated themselves in veneration before the Temple building, distinguished between the invisible God who dwelt therein and the very brickwork that engulfed him. At some theoretical level, of course, a distinction could and must be made, but the manner in which the deity overtook the space in which he was housed was so overwhelming that any distinction at the phenomenological level of human experience was not possible. As God became one with his furniture, so God became one with flesh.

---

<sup>74</sup> See the texts listed in n. 11. For a discussion of these documents and a survey of the motif of the hidden vessels, see Koester, *The Dwelling of God*, 48–58.

DIVORCE, REPROOF, AND OTHER SAYINGS IN THE  
SYNOPTIC GOSPELS: JESUS TRADITIONS IN THE CONTEXT  
OF "QUMRANIC" AND OTHER TEXTS

MENAHEM KISTER  
*The Hebrew University of Jerusalem*

The synoptic Gospels show few and comparatively unimportant parallels to the Sectarian writings. . . . This seems to indicate that the scrolls will not contribute much to the understanding of the personality of Jesus and of the religious world of his disciples. Talmudic literature remains our principal source for the interpretation of the synoptic Gospels.

This statement of David Flusser, in an article published in 1958,<sup>1</sup> was later updated by him in a footnote in his book of collected articles: "Meanwhile it has become clear that the Essene influence upon Jesus . . . is far from negligible. . . . Jesus . . . partially accepted Essene social and ethical views."<sup>2</sup> Although the earlier statement is by its nature an oversimplified generalization, by and large I find Flusser's scholarly intuition amazingly acute, even after the publication of much more material than was known in 1958, including many nonsectarian and other not *necessarily* sectarian texts. Although there are a few interesting affinities between sayings of Jesus and the scrolls,<sup>3</sup> the scrolls are not the key for elucidating utterances attributed to Jesus in the Synoptic Gospels, and they are relatively marginal for understanding Jesus' religious thinking, his biblical interpretation, and his prayer. On

---

<sup>1</sup> D. Flusser, "The Dead Sea Sect and Pre-Pauline Christianity," in *Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. C. Rabin and Y. Yadin; ScrHier 4; Jerusalem: The Hebrew University Magnes Press, 1958), 215–66, pp. 215–16.

<sup>2</sup> D. Flusser, *Judaism and the Origins of Christianity* (Jerusalem: The Hebrew University Magnes Press, 1998), 24 n. 3. Here the article cited in n. 1 is reprinted with slight alterations, one of them being Flusser's rewriting of n. 3.

<sup>3</sup> E.g.: "poverty" as a religious value; the institution of the "twelve"; some eschatological ideas, especially in 4Q521; see J. J. Collins, "The Works of the Messiah," *DSD* 1 (1994): 98–112. Concerning the relationship of Matt 11:4–5 = Luke 7:21–22 to 4Q521, see also M. Kister, "Qumranic Texts and Christian Texts," in *The Qumran Scrolls and Their World* (ed. M. Kister; Jerusalem: Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi, 2009), 633–37 (Hebrew). For a vast survey of the relations between the historical Jesus and Qumran, see J. H. Charlesworth, "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Historical Jesus," in *Jesus and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. J. H. Charlesworth; ABRL; New York: Doubleday, 1992), 1–74.

the other hand, the vast majority of sayings attributed to Jesus in the synoptic Gospels can be illuminated by rabbinic writings. This stands in sharp contrast to the material concerning John the Baptist on the one hand, and (to a lesser extent) to the Pauline epistles on the other hand, for which comparison with the scrolls is revealing, and often seems to suggest a genetic relationship.<sup>4</sup>

Notwithstanding the relative lack of direct contact between the Synoptic Gospels and the Dead Sea Scrolls, some sayings attributed to Jesus are closely connected with Qumranic material. For instance, Jesus' polemic against the Pharisaic legislation concerning vows and his accusation that the Pharisees "make void God's tradition through their teaching" (Mark 7:13) is very close to Qumranic sectarian accusations, in content and in style (CD 5:7–8, 20–21; 1QpHab 1:11; 1QS 1:7, 12, 3:8 and elsewhere). Jesus' exhortation to love one's neighbor as God loves all His creatures (Matt 5:43–48) gains more depth when it is perceived that according to the *Damascus Document* one has to love the members of the sect but to hate the others as God hates His enemies (CD 9:5).<sup>5</sup> Jesus' saying concerning Peter, "on this rock I will build my church (ἐκκλησία), and the gates of death shall not prevail against it" (Matt 16:18) has an illuminating parallel in the *Hodayot*. Bearing in mind the usage of the word סוד in Qumran with the meaning of "community," the words "on this rock I will build my church" may be reconstructed: אבנה סודי על סלע. This wording is similar to the passage in the *Hodayot* that reads: ונ[פשי תגיע] עד שערי מות... ואש[ענה] על סלע (4Q429 (סודי) סוד כי אתה תשים סוד (4Q429 4 ii 7)). In the *Hodayot* the word סוד means "foundation," but it could easily be interpreted as "community, ἐκκλησία." The occurrence of the "gates of death" in a similar literary context in both passages demonstrates

<sup>4</sup> Flusser has made pioneering contributions concerning both John the Baptist and Paul's epistles and their relationship with the scrolls. For the former, see D. Flusser, "John's Baptism and the Dead Sea Sect," in *Essays on the Dead Sea Scrolls in Memory of E. L. Sukenik* (ed. C. Rabin and Y. Yadin; Jerusalem: Hekhal ha-Sefer, 1961), 209–39 (Hebrew); for the latter, see "Pre-Pauline Christianity."

<sup>5</sup> See M. Kister, "The Sayings of Jesus and the Midrash," *Immanuel* 15 (1982–1983): 38–50, especially p. 46; J. L. Kugel, *In Potiphar's House: The Interpretative Life of Biblical Texts* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1990), 231–40.

that Matt 16:18 is derived from a literary unit similar to the one found in the *Hodayot*.<sup>6</sup>

These examples suffice to demonstrate that even if the Qumranic perspective (at least as far as it is known to us at this point) is not the *most* illuminating for Jesus' teachings, it is nevertheless important for understanding *some* of his sayings.

Some parallels between the Gospels and the Dead Sea Scrolls are coincidental. Thus, Jesus' saying, "Are grapes gathered from thorns, or figs from thistles?" (Matt 7:16) || "Figs are not gathered from thorns, nor are grapes picked from a bramble bush" (Luke 6:44), has a parallel in a work found at Qumran: **לֹא יִהְיֶה תִירוֹשׁ וְתִזְיָא לֹא יַעֲשֶׂה דְבַשׁ** "and from the caperbush there will be no wine, nor will *taziz* make any honey (or: [grape] syrup)" (4Q386 1 ii 5).<sup>7</sup> The context in the scroll (no [good] posterity for a wicked man) is entirely different from the contexts of the New Testament passages. The proverb is no doubt the same, however, and with this Qumran parallel it is now documented not only in Greek literature,<sup>8</sup> but also in Hebrew. Although the existence of the Hebrew parallel to the Gospels is interesting, its importance for the interpretation of either Jesus' saying or the Qumran fragment seems limited.

Moreover, there is so much wealth in the Dead Sea Scrolls for every field of Second Temple period Judaism (from language to theology to biblical interpretation) that the literature found at Qumran should by no means be ignored in interpreting Jesus' sayings. It is a part of the complex mosaic of Second Temple Judaism, of which too little is known, and in which many sayings of Jesus are rooted (or rather, of

<sup>6</sup> O. Betz, "Felsenmann und Felsengemeinde: Eine Parallele zu Mt. 16:17–19 in den Qumranpsalmen," *ZAW* 48 (1957): 49–77; M. Kister, "Some Observations on Vocabulary and Style in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *Diggers at the Well: Proceedings of a Third International Symposium on the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Ben Sira* (ed. T. Muraoka and J. F. Elwolde; *STDJ* 36; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 163–65. This saying probably represents material current in the early Christian community as applied to Peter.

<sup>7</sup> D. Dimant, *Qumran Cave 4.XXI: Parabiblical Texts, Part 4: Pseudo-Prophetic Texts* (DJD 30; Oxford: Clarendon, 2001), 62, 64. For the interpretation of **תִזְיָא** as "hornet," see also M. Bar-Asher, "Ad *Leshonenu* 61, pp. 259–263," *Leshonenu* 61 (1998): 265 (Hebrew); S. Friedman, "Response to Elisha Qimron," *Leshonenu* 64 (2002): 168–70 (Hebrew). The possibility that the word **דְבַשׁ** refers to vegetable syrup rather than to honey (both meanings occur in the Bible), and that therefore **תִזְיָא** is a plant has been suggested by Elisha Qimron (in a private communication).

<sup>8</sup> For the Greek parallels see W. D. Davies and D. C. Allison, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Matthew* (3 vols.; ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988–1997), 1:707.

which Jesus' sayings are an integral part). It should always be borne in mind that any exclusive comparison between Jesus' sayings and Qumran necessarily distorts the picture, for when approaching the interpretation of Jesus' sayings the whole range of related sources should be taken into account simultaneously.

One example will suffice. Jesus' saying, "Leave the dead to bury their own dead" (Matt 8:21–22 || Luke 9:59–60) has been interpreted by many, since antiquity, as meaning "Let those who are spiritually dead bury their own dead." The notion that the wicked are "spiritually dead" is known from Hellenistic writings, including those of Philo, and from rabbinic literature.

The resemblance between Jesus' saying and rabbinic literature on the one hand, and between Philo and the rabbis on the other, has led me to conclude elsewhere that this was indeed a widespread notion during the Second Temple period, and that Jesus' saying could be interpreted accordingly.<sup>9</sup> Now we have a Palestinian text of this period which should be interpreted as expressing the same notion. The text, a passage in the work entitled *4QInstruction* (4Q418 69 ii 4–6), reads:

.4 vacat ועתה אוילי לב מה טוב ללוא  
 .5 [נוצר ומה] השקט ללוא היה ומה משפט ללוא נוסד ומה יאנחו  
 מתים על מ[ות]ם<sup>10</sup>  
 .6 אתם [מהב]ל נוצרתם ולשחת עולם תשובתכם

4. And now, foolish of heart, what wellbeing (can there be) to those<sup>11</sup> who have not
5. [been created, and what] rest (can there be) for those who have not come into being, and what (righteous) judgment for those who have not been established and what (can) the dead groan over their own [death]?
6. You are from nothing and to eternal destruction you return...

<sup>9</sup> M. Kister, "Leave the Dead to Bury Their Own Dead," in *Studies in Ancient Midrash* (ed. J. L. Kugel; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2001), 43–56.

<sup>10</sup> This is the restoration preferred by Strugnell and Harrington, *Qumran Cave 4.XXIV: Sapiential Texts, Part 2* (ed. J. Strugnell, D. J. Harrington and T. Elgvin, in consultation with J. A. Fitzmyer; DJD 34; Oxford: Clarendon, 1999); see their translation, 283, and their commentary, 285 (in their transcription they restore על כן [יומ]ם, 281). A longer word might be מ[יתת]ם or מ[שכב]ם or מ[פשות]ם.

<sup>11</sup> Literally singular, i.e., "the one who."

The passage has hitherto not been correctly translated.<sup>12</sup> According to the rendering suggested above, its point is that the wicked are nothing, both before their births and after their deaths (line 6): they are considered as not having been created and as dead during their lives. They cannot have anything good in their lifetime, which is considered as nonexistence. We can now identify in *4QInstruction* the notion that the wicked are considered dead. This makes the interpretation of “the dead” in Jesus’ saying as “spiritually dead” even more plausible. In order to interpret this short saying of Jesus, we had to consider rabbinic, Hellenistic and Qumranic sources.

In the following sections I will deal with two sayings attributed to Jesus in the synoptic Gospels that are related, in different ways, to the Qumran scrolls. The first one is often assumed to be “authentic,” the second a “Matthean” elaboration of a saying. In each of them we shall see, in different ways, the need for a panoramic view in order to interpret the sources correctly.

## I

The exegetical grounds for Jesus’ prohibition of divorce<sup>13</sup> may be discerned by comparison to “Qumranic,” rabbinic and Samaritan parallels,

<sup>12</sup> Qimron rightly suggested (*apud* Strugnell and Harrington, DJD 34.285) that ללא קטל should be interpreted as equivalent to לא שר לא קטל “to one who has not . . .” This eliminates the translation suggested by Elgvin: “how can there be goodness if it was not [demonstrated] (?) and how can there be peacefulness if it never existed, how can there be righteousness if it were not established, and how will the dead groan because of their j[udgment]t(?)?” (T. Elgvin, “An Analysis of 4QInstruction” [Ph.D. diss., The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1997], 249, 251). Vermes’s rendering is impossible: “[What] is silence if no one is there (?), and what is judgment if it has no foundation? Why do the dead groan over their j[udgment]?” (*The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English* [New York: Penguin, 1997], 409). The translation suggested above has some affinities to that of Strugnell and Harrington, DJD 34.283, as well as that of F. García Martínez and E. J. C. Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* (2 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 1997–1998), 2:871. Somewhat similar is the translation of M. Wise, M. Abegg and E. Cook, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Translation* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 1996), 386: “[what] good is tranquility for what has not [לא] come to pass”; but ללא on line 4 is translated there “without”!

<sup>13</sup> It seems to me that this is still the best interpretation of Jesus’ argument in this passage (especially v. 4), notwithstanding the ingenious arguments of David Instone-Brewer in his recent book, *Divorce and Remarriage in the Bible: The Social and Literary Context* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002).

some of which have been noted and discussed.<sup>14</sup> The dispute between Jesus and the Pharisees runs as follows in the Gospels:

*Matthew 19:3–12*

(1) And the Pharisees came to him and tested him asking him, “Is it lawful to divorce a wife for any cause?”

(2) He answered, “Have you not read that he who made them from the beginning made them male and female, and said, ‘For this reason a man shall leave his father and mother and be joined to his wife, and the two shall become one flesh.’ So they are no longer two but one flesh. What therefore God has joined together, let not man put asunder.”

(3) They said to him, “Why then did Moses command one to give a certificate of divorce and put her away?” He said to them, “For your hardness of heart Moses allowed you to divorce your wives, but from the beginning it was not so.

(4) And I say to you:

*Mark 10:2–12*

(1) And the Pharisees came up and in order to test him asked, “Is it lawful for a man to divorce his wife?”

(3) He answered them, “What did Moses command you?” They said, “Moses allowed a man to write a certificate of divorce, and to put her away.”

(2) But Jesus said to them, “For your hardness of heart he wrote you this commandment, but from the beginning of creation, ‘God made them male and female,’ ‘For this reason a man shall leave his father and mother [and be joined to his wife], and the two shall become one flesh.’ So they are no longer two but one flesh. What therefore God has joined together, let not man put asunder.”

(4) And in the house the disciples asked him again about this matter. And he said to them, “Whoever divorces

<sup>14</sup> For a thorough survey see K. Berger, *Die Gesetzesauslegung Jesu: Ihr historischer Hintergrund im Judentum und im Alten Testament, Teil I: Markus und Parallelen* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1972), 508–75.

Whoever divorces his wife, except for unchastity, and marries another, commits adultery.”	his wife and marries another, commits adultery against her; and if she divorces her husband and marries another, she commits adultery.”
---	---

1. The prooftext from Gen 1:27 has a parallel, noticed long ago and much discussed, in the *Damascus Document*, which reads:

The “builders of the wall”<sup>15</sup> are caught by... marrying two women in their lives, while the principle of creation is “a male and a female He has created them,” and those who entered the ark, “two and two they went into the ark.” (CD 4:19–5:1)

Qirqisani (10th century CE) probably had in mind this passage of the *Damascus Document* when he compared Jesus’ teaching with that of the Zadokites.<sup>16</sup> Both CD and the Gospel tradition use Gen 1:27 (perhaps also 5:2) as a prooftext,<sup>17</sup> although the exact inference from the verse is different in both cases. In CD it is inferred that polygamy is prohibited, and that a man should have only one wife because only two human beings were created; the same is inferred there from Gen 7:9, where זכר ונקבה “male and female,” the expression occurring in Gen 1:27,<sup>18</sup> is interchanged with the unexpected idiom איש ואשתו (7:2).<sup>19</sup> Jesus seems to use Gen 1:27 (+5:2?)<sup>20</sup> as a prooftext by combining it with Gen 2:24. His saying seems to imply that Gen 1:27 describes the creation of both the first man and the first woman, and that they together were named “human being” (אדם), and therefore form one unit. This exegetical sensitivity is known from passages in the *Book of Jubilees* concerning Adam

<sup>15</sup> Probably the Pharisees.

<sup>16</sup> As already noted by the first editor of CD: S. Schechter, *Documents of Jewish Sectaries: Fragments of a Zadokite Work* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1910), xix. Many scholars assume that Qirqisani alludes to CD, a copy of which existed in the Middle Ages, and which was preserved in the Genizah.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. P. Winter, “Sadoqite Fragments IV20, 21 and the Exegesis of Genesis 1:27 in Late Judaism,” *ZAW* 68 (1956): 71–84.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. E. Lövestam, “Divorce and Remarriage in the New Testament,” *The Jewish Law Annual* 4 (1981): 50.

<sup>19</sup> This usage puzzled ancient readers of the Bible, and the words איש ואשתו were altered in the Samaritan Pentateuch (R. Weiss, *Studies in the Text and Language of the Bible* [Jerusalem: The Hebrew University Magnes Press, 1981], 118–19 [Hebrew]).

<sup>20</sup> Scholars have noted this verse as a basis for Jesus’ argument. See the recent discussion of A. Schremer, *Male and Female He Created Them: Jewish Marriage in the Late Second Temple, Mishnah and Talmud Periods* (Jerusalem: Zalman Shazar, 2002), 70–72 (Hebrew).



(2:14; cf. 3:8),<sup>21</sup> and is extended to any marriage in rabbinic literature, as has been noted.<sup>22</sup> The phenomenon of a proof-text gaining a slightly new significance by means of a different, sometimes more sophisticated interpretation is very common in rabbinic literature.

Moreover, the expected Greek rendering of *יסוד הבריאה* is ἡ ἀρχὴ τῆς κτίσεως, an expression in which the word ἀρχὴ would mean “principle.”<sup>23</sup> It seems that this expression was changed in Mark to ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς κτίσεως, “from the beginning of creation” (10:6), and in Matthew further revised to ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς (19:4, 8). If this expression indeed underlies both CD and the sayings tradition, there must be a close genetic link between them. If this is the case, we have here a striking case in which the originality of the wording in one Gospel may be established over against that of another through comparison with the Qumranic parallel.

Some scholars contend that the CD passage refers both to polygamy and to the second marriage of a divorcee, while others maintain that it refers only to polygamy.<sup>24</sup> General considerations seem to indicate the

<sup>21</sup> For the textual evidence, and for other less likely possibilities of exegesis underlying this passage, see J. C. VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees: A Critical Text* (CSCO 510–511; Scriptorum Aethiopicorum 87–88; 2 vols.; Louvain: Peeters, 1989), 2:12. There is no need to assume that Adam was created an androgyne according to the *Book of Jubilees* (A. Rönisch, *Das Buch der Jubiläen* [Leipzig: Fues, 1874], 261–62 n. 1), CD, or the Gospels (pace D. Daube, *The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism* [London: University of London, Athlone Press, 1956], 71–86; P. Winter, “Sadoqite Fragments,” 80–83). It should be admitted, however, that the same exegetical sensitivity to the wording of Gen 1:27 stimulates depictions of Adam as androgynous. See also Schremer, *Male and Female*, 70–72.

<sup>22</sup> B. Yebam. 63a (cf., e.g., Winter, “Sadoqite Fragments,” 83).

<sup>23</sup> J. de Waard, *A Comparative Study of the Old Testament Text in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the New Testament*, (STDJ 4; Leiden: Brill, 1965), 32–34. De Waard has drawn attention to the occurrence of this expression in 1 En. 15:9. The translation of the expression there may well be “the origin of their creation” (thus G. W. E. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch Chapters 1–36; 81–108* [Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001], 267). This might be an appropriate rendering of the expression in CD and in the Gospels (but not in Rev 3:14!). The expression *הַבְּרִיאָה* occurs, according to the editors’ reconstruction, in a calendrical text from Qumran (4Q320 1 i 2–3; see S. Talmon and J. Ben-Dov, “320. 4QCalendrical Document/Mishmarot A,” in *Qumran Cave 4.XVI: Calendrical Texts* [DJD 21; Oxford: Clarendon, 2001], 42–45). This meaning could perhaps apply to this text as well. It should be remembered, however, that 4Q320 is reconstructed at this point.

<sup>24</sup> L. Ginzberg, *An Unknown Jewish Sect* (New York: Jewish Theological Seminary, 1970), 19–20. See also G. Vermes, “Sectarian Matrimonial Halakhah in the Damascus Rule,” *JJS* 25 (1974): 198; G. Brin, “Divorce at Qumran,” in *Legal Texts and Legal Issues: Proceedings of the Second Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies*, Cambridge, 1995, Published in Honour of Joseph M. Baumgarten (ed. M. Bernstein, F. García Martínez, and J. Kampen; STDJ 23; Leiden, 1997), 231–44; A. Schremer, “Qumran Polemic on Marital Law: CD 4:20–5:11 and its Social Background,” in *The Damascus Document: A Centennial of Discovery. Proceedings of the Third International*

latter: After all, divorce is legitimate in the Hebrew Bible, and specifically mentioned elsewhere in the *Damascus Document* (CD 13:17 and 4Q266 9 iii 1–5) and in the *Temple Scroll* (54:4).<sup>25</sup> The context and the argumentation in this passage seem to refer to polygamy, although the word **בחייהם** (the suffix of which may be understood quite easily as plural *feminine*)<sup>26</sup> may hint that the prohibition of bigamy and polygamy could easily be extended to a prohibition of divorce.<sup>27</sup> I doubt whether the latter position can be discerned in the writings found at Qumran, although the Qumranic view of bigamy could easily be extended in other groups to a prohibition of remarriage. Therefore even if the passage in CD refers merely to polygamy and not to divorce (as I tend to think), the similarity between it and the saying of Jesus is still quite striking.

2. Another similarity, hitherto unnoticed, to a newly published Qumranic text concerning the exegesis of Gen 2:24 should also be pointed out. The parallel in *4QInstruction* reads (4Q416 2 iii 20–21 to iv 10):<sup>28</sup>

---

*Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 4–8 February, 1998* (ed. J. M. Baumgarten, E. G. Chazon, and A. Pinnick; STDJ 34; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 147–60, especially 148–49 nn. 3–6, 157–60; M. Broshi, “Matrimony and Poverty,” *RevQ* 19 (2000): 629–32; D. Instone-Brewer, *Divorce and Remarriage*, 61–72 (most of these articles contain surveys of scholarly literature concerning the interpretation of this passage). To these studies the thorough and insightful article of Vered Noam should now be added (V. Noam, “Divorce in Qumran in Light of Early Halakhah,” *JJS* 56 [2005]: 206–23), which I read just before the submission of the present article for publication (I thank Dr. Noam for letting me read the final version of her article before its publication).

<sup>25</sup> The assumption, suggested by Shemesh, that divorce would have been permitted, but not remarriage (A. Shemesh, “4Q271.3: A Key to Sectarian Matrimonial Law,” *JJS* 49 [1998]: 244–63) seems unlikely: in ancient Judaism (as in other ancient Near Eastern cultures), “divorce” was based on the premise that remarriage is legitimate, especially for the woman—and we do not have any examples of such a novel legal concept of divorce at Qumran.

<sup>26</sup> This is not an emendation, for the suffix **יה-** in the scrolls is used also for plural feminine (E. Qimron, *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls* [Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988], 62–63).

<sup>27</sup> But, as proven by Karaite commentaries, it may well not be so extended in the *Damascus Document* (Ginzberg, *Unknown Jewish Sect*, 19–20).

<sup>28</sup> According to the reading and reconstruction of E. J. C. Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning for the Understanding Ones: Reading and Reconstruction of the Fragmentary Early Jewish Sapiential Text, 4QInstruction* (STDJ 44; Leiden: Brill, 2001), 48. For previous readings of this fragment see Elgin, “An Analysis of 4QInstruction,” 232–36; Strugnell and Harrington, *DJD* 34.110, 123–26. Tigchelaar created the composite text of 4Q416 2 iii–iv, 4Q418 10b (underline) and 4Q418a 18 (bold). The translation suggested in the following lines differs in some significant details from previous renderings of this difficult passage.

20. אשה לקחתה ברישכה קח מולדיה  
 21. מרז נהיה בהתחברכה יחד התהלך עם עזר בשרכה]  
 1. את אביו [ו]את אמו ]<sup>oo</sup> [אחד  
 2. אותכה המשיל בה ותש] אביה  
 3. לא המשיל בה מאמה הפרידה ואליכה °כ"ה והיתה היא]  
 4. לך לבשר אחד בתכה לאחר יפריד ובניכה [לבנות רעיכה]  
 5. ואתה ליחד עם אשת חיקכה כי היא שאר ער[ותכה]  
 6. ואשר ימשול בה זולתכה הסיג גבול חייהי ב[רוחה]  
 7. המשילך להתהלך ברצונכה ולא להוסיף נדר ונדב[ה]  
 8. השב רוחכה לרצונכה וכל שבועת אסרה לנדר נד[בה]  
 9. חפר<sup>29</sup> על מוצא פיכה וברצונכה הניא[ה  
 10. שפתיכה סלה<sup>30</sup> לה למענכה אל תרב]

20. If you take a woman in your poverty, study her horoscope [  
 21. of the mystery of what is to come when you are joint and become a  
 union (יחד),<sup>31</sup> go about with the helpmate of your flesh [  
 1. his father and mother [ one (flesh)]  
 2. He has given you dominion over her and [ to her father]  
 3. He has not given dominion over her, from her mother He has sepa-  
 rated her and to you He has [—<sup>32</sup> and she will be]  
 4. to you as one flesh. Your daughter He will separate (in order to cling)  
 to another, and your sons (He will separate for) the daughters of others,  
 5. and you and the wife of your bosom (will become) a union (ליחד)  
 because she is the flesh (שאר) of your nakedness,<sup>33</sup>  
 6. and whoever has dominion over her except you, will draw back the  
 boundary<sup>34</sup> of his life.

<sup>29</sup> Probably to be emended to הפר (as suggested by Strugnell and Harrington, DJD 34.124).

<sup>30</sup> Probably to be emended to סלח (as suggested by Strugnell and Harrington, DJD 34.125).

<sup>31</sup> The word יחד can be interpreted here as an adverb. However, the same word in iv 5 can be interpreted only as a noun. Because of the similarity between the two sentences, it seems preferable to translate it as a noun in both occurrences. It seems to me significant that for the author the relationship between husband and wife were defined as יחד, a term used for the religious congregation.

<sup>32</sup> The traces of this word are not easily readable. According to E. Qimron, the only clear letter is *beth*. The reading חברה is impossible. The reading דבקה is not, but the *qof* is quite unusual. The readings תשוקתה (restored by Strugnell and Harrington in 4Q416) and לבבהו (suggested by Strugnell and Harrington in 4Q418a) or לבבו (Tigchelaar) are also impossible, but the reading תשובתה is not impossible.

<sup>33</sup> The words allude to Lev 18:6, 8, 12. Cf. Also *Sifra Emor Parasha 1* (on Lev 21:2): אין שארו אלא אשתו.

<sup>34</sup> For this translation see M. Kister, "Lexical and Language Issues in the Dead Sea Scrolls," *Leshonenu* 37 (2005): 36–38 (Hebrew).

7. He has given you dominion on her breath (i.e., speech)<sup>35</sup> to do as you please, so as not to make additional vows of<sup>36</sup> votive offerings<sup>37</sup>
8. You just have to blow your breath (i.e., to speak)<sup>38</sup> as pleases you, and every binding oath of hers to vow
9. (you may) annul by your speech, and as you please (you may) prevent her from performing [her vows]
10. [and by] your speech He has forgiven her because of you. Do not...

The preceding lines deal with honoring one's father and mother, while this passage deals with the relationship between husband and wife. I do not think that the two passages are closely related.<sup>39</sup> The author of *4QInstruction* tries to define the desirable relationship of a married couple. Marriage relations are based on the assumptions that the couple becomes one flesh (cf. Gen 2:24), and that the husband has dominion over his wife (cf. Gen 3:16). Both points are illustrated by the law of vows, Num 30:7–17. According to this law, first the woman's father and then her husband have the right to annul her vows (if they do it on the very day she vows them). This is an anomaly: can a human being annul the vows of another human being to God? The answer given in *4QInstruction* is that they become one flesh and one union, and that in this union the husband has dominion over his wife.

A similar view, namely that husband and wife are one body in which the wife is subject to her husband, occurs in the Epistle to the Ephesians, which likewise cites Genesis 2:24:

---

<sup>35</sup> The meaning of the expression *ברוחה המשילך* is uncertain, but the word *רוח* appears in the same context in line 8, and there the rendering "speech" seems quite fitting (see below, n. 38). It can fit the present occurrence of *רוח*.

<sup>36</sup> Literally: "and."

<sup>37</sup> Cf. Deut 23:24. The author refers to the vows of the wife that are controlled by her husband as "additional" vows, because the husband cannot annul the vows made by his wife before their marriage.

<sup>38</sup> The meaning "breath" for *רוח* is well attested (e.g., in the expression *קשה רוח*). The usage of *רוח* for "speech" is also well attested; see *וברוח שפתיו ימית רשע* (Isa 11:4); *כי תשיב אל אל רוחך והצאת מפיד מלין* (Job 15:13; possibly the word *תשיב* was interpreted as being derived from the root *נש"ב*; note the parallelism to *הצאת מפיד* in the verse, which is reminiscent of the juxtaposition of the *השב רוחכה* and *הצאת מפיד* in our text); *ישלב רוחו* || *ישלח דברו* (Ps 33:6; *ישלב רוחו* || *ישלח דברו*); *ישלב רוחו* || *ישלח דברו* (Ps 147:18; and *עד אן תמלל אלה ורוח כביר אמרי פיך* (Job 8:2).

<sup>39</sup> Contrast J. L. Kugel, "Some Instances of Biblical Interpretation in the Hymns and Wisdom Writings of Qumran," in *Studies in Ancient Midrash* (ed. J. L. Kugel; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2001), 168–69.

Wives, be subject to your husband... for the husband is the head of the wife... Husbands should love their wives as their own bodies.<sup>40</sup> He who loves his wife loves himself. For no man ever hates his own flesh, but nourishes and cherishes it... "Therefore a man shall leave his father and mother and be joined to his wife, and the two shall become one flesh"... let each one of you love his wife as himself, and let the wife (see) that she fears her husband. (Eph 5:22–33)

This passage provides a striking parallel in its argument and exegesis to the earlier passage in *4QInstruction*.<sup>41</sup>

But let us return to the significance of this passage in *4QInstruction* for the saying of Jesus. Several exegetical premises are shared by the Qumranic text and Jesus' saying:

(1) The peculiar interpretation of the sentence "and they will become one flesh" as referring to the status of marriage. Other interpretations of these words were current in antiquity. Thus the Samaritan text of the Pentateuch reads: והיה משניהם לבשר אחד. The "one flesh," according to this interpretative reading, does not refer to the couple, but rather to their offspring, in which the two become literally one flesh. An almost identical interpretation is found in Rashi's commentary on this verse: "The fetus is created by both of them, and in it their flesh becomes one" (הולד נוצר על ידי שניהם ושם נעשה בשרם אחד). Rashi's commentary follows Amoraic interpretation of these words. Thus we read in the Palestinian Talmud: בן נח שבא על אשתו שלא כדרכה נהרג. מה טעם? "ודבק באשתו והיו לבשר אחד" ממקום ששניהם עושים בשר אחד (y. *Qiddushin* 1:1 [58c]). In this rabbinic saying, the word דבק is interpreted as referring to sexual intercourse and the words "and they will become one flesh" refer to the result of this intercourse, i.e., the offspring.<sup>42</sup>

<sup>40</sup> As has already been noted, this statement should be compared to *b. Sanh.* 76b: האוהב את אשתו כגופו "he who loves his wife as his own body." Gen 2:24 is not mentioned in this context. In Ephesians "his body" is a synonym to "himself" in the next verse. This is a Semitic usage, to which a new significance was granted by the interpretation of Gen 2:24.

<sup>41</sup> Another text in which the idea of husband and wife becoming one flesh is related to the concepts that the husband takes "the authority of the master" and the woman takes "the rank of the servant" is Philo, *Questions and Answers on Genesis*, 1.29.

<sup>42</sup> The interpretation of this verse in the *Book of Jubilees* is rather uncertain. Some manuscripts read: "For this reason a man and a woman are to become one, and for this reason he leaves his father and mother. He associates with his wife, and they become one flesh"; whereas others read, "For this reason a man leaves his father and mother, etc." (3:7; translation according to VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees*, 1:16; 2:17). As VanderKam observes (2:17), the best manuscripts of *Jubilees* have the shorter reading,

(2) The biblical verse, Gen 2:24, refers to human acts: “a *man* leaves his father and mother and *clings* to his wife and they become one flesh.” *4QInstruction*, however, refers the action to God: “[to her father] *He* (= God) has not given dominion over her, from her mother *He* has separated her and to you *He* has [—and she will be] to you as one flesh. Your daughter *He* will *separate* (in order to cling) to another....” The enlistment of God as actor is common to this fragment and the saying of Jesus.

Whence was it derived in *4QInstruction*? A plausible answer is that this verse was interpreted not as an etiological explanation for a custom, but rather as God’s commandment. A similar style is found in Gen 32:33: עַל כֵּן לֹא יֹאכְלוּ בְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל אֶת גֵּיד הַנֶּשֶׁה... עַד הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה “Therefore to this day the Israelites do not eat the sinew of the hip.” This verse was understood in the literature of the Second Temple period and in rabbinic literature as meaning: “Therefore it is *forbidden* for the Israelites to eat,” i.e., as a *divine commandment* rather than an ethnic custom.<sup>43</sup> Similarly, Gen 2:24 may well be interpreted as God’s commandment concerning marriage. Such a “nomistic” mode of interpretation of this verse is also attested in rabbinic literature (see the passage cited above from *y. Qidd.* 1:1).<sup>44</sup> If this verse is understood either as a commandment of God or as a divine declaration concerning the validity of marriage, then it is God who joins any married couple.<sup>45</sup>

(3) According to both *4QInstruction* and the Gospels, the “separation” and “joining” accomplished by God have legal implications derived from the perception that the man and the woman are now “one flesh.” The implications of this interpretation of Genesis are quite different for each text, however. By the logic of *4QInstruction*, in contrast to the argument of Jesus, it seems that the woman was first joined by God to her father and mother, and then separated from them by His decree.

---

which is an almost literal citation of Gen 2:24. Two things should be noted: (1) The pronoun “he” in the latter part of the verse does not fit the nouns “man and woman” at its beginning; (2) Although VanderKam suggests that the omission of the words “for this reason a man and a woman are to become one” “could have resulted from a scribe’s eye skipping from one clause to the next one which is very similar in appearance,” this seems unlikely, since many of the manuscripts omitting this clause read *za* (“that”) instead of the words “for this reason” (*ba’entaze*).

<sup>43</sup> Thus LXX, Josephus, *4Q158*, *m. Hullin* 7:6; see M. Kister, “Two Formulae in the *Book of Jubilees*,” *Tarbiz* 70 (2001): 292–93 and n. 20 (Hebrew).

<sup>44</sup> Cf. H. L. Strack and P. Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch* (Munich: Oskar Beck, 1922–1961), 1:802–3.

<sup>45</sup> For a different suggestion see most recently Schremer, *Male and Female*, 47–50.

However, a woman can be separated also from her husband, since a divorced woman is mentioned in the law on vows (Num 30:10), and her vows cannot be annulled by others; “becoming a union” is, then, reversible, according to this text.

(4) According to the passage from Qumran, *any* intrusion into the operation of the marriage is considered a trespass against God’s decree concerning the status of the married couple, and therefore a major sin. Within the terms of Jesus’ saying, God’s joining of a couple in marriage should not be transgressed by a human being; “interference” here denotes the ending of a marriage. The conclusions of *4QInstruction* and of Jesus, then, are quite different.

To sum up: *4QInstruction* has several affinities with Jesus’ saying, although it does not deal with divorce or second marriage; the most important affinities are *exegetical*. Unlike the parallel to the passage in CD, there is no compelling reason to assume a *genetic* relationship between *4QInstruction* and Jesus’ saying, but the passage in *4QInstruction* shares some exegetical and conceptual foundations with Jesus’ teaching, and thus we are able to isolate these aspects of Jesus’ saying from the specific application to the problem of divorce.

3. Is Sir 25:26 relevant for the ancient interpretation of “one flesh” in Gen 2:24 and its relation to the law of divorce?<sup>46</sup> The answer is complicated. We have no Hebrew text for this verse. In speaking of a bad woman, the Greek translation of the verse reads: εἰ μὴ πορεύεται κατὰ χεῖράς σου, ἀπὸ τῶν σαρκῶν σου ἀπότμε αὐτήν (+ δίδου καὶ ἀπόλυσσον MS 248), “If she goes not according to your hand, cut her off from your flesh” (+ “give and send her away,” MS 248).<sup>47</sup> The Syriac version of the same verse reads: ואן לא איתיה אתיא בתרך בסרך קצץ, הב לה ושריתה מן ביתך, “if she does not follow you, cut your flesh, give (it to) her and send her away from your house.” It seems that the

<sup>46</sup> Cf., e.g., G. H. Box and W. O. Oesterly, “Sirach,” in *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament. Volume I: Apocrypha* (ed. R. H. Charles; Oxford: Clarendon, 1913), 402; A. A. Di Lella and P. W. Skehan, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira: A New Translation with Notes* (AB 39; Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday, 1987), 349; Brin, “Divorce at Qumran,” 244 n. 20.

<sup>47</sup> J. Ziegler, *Sapientia Iesu Filii Sirach* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1965), 246; J. H. A. Hart, *Ecclesiasticus: The Greek Text of Codex 248* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1909), 35, 166.

addition in MS 248 is a remnant of an alternative Greek version.<sup>48</sup> Now, according to the Syriac version the advice is to give everything to a bad wife, even a pound of flesh, in order to divorce such a woman.<sup>49</sup> A talmudic paraphrase of this passage reads: **אשה רעה צרעת לבעלה. מאי תקנתיה? יגרשנה מביתו ויתרפא מצרעתו** “A bad woman is a leprosy to her husband. How can he be mended? Let him send her away from his house<sup>50</sup> and be cured of his leprosy” (*b. Sanh.* 100b). According to the Greek version, and according to the talmudic paraphrase, divorce is a separation of the wife from her husband’s flesh. Whatever was the original intention of this verse (and it may well be closer to the Syriac), the Greek rendering represents an ancient interpretation (or reading) of the verse, shared by the late but independent talmudic paraphrase. This interpretation, according to which husband and wife become one flesh through marriage, is certainly relevant for Jesus’ saying. Does this make divorce illegitimate? Yes, according to Jesus; by no means, according to Ben Sira (Greek).

A parallel to Jesus’ saying may be found, as has been noted,<sup>51</sup> in a rabbinic saying (attributed to the Amora R. Eleazar and to the Tanna R. Yose ha-Gelili), where “your flesh” (**בשרך**) in Isa 58:7 means “your former wife” (*y. Ketub.* 11:3 [34b] par.).<sup>52</sup> This *aggada* does not hold that the couple’s status as “one flesh” prevents them from divorcing, although it does teach that the husband is in some way responsible for his ex-wife even after their divorce. Jesus’ teaching can be considered an extension of such an attitude, combined with other motives.

4. According to Jesus’ argument, Deut 24:1–4 contradicts Gen 2:24. However, we may assume an exegetical *connection* between Gen 2:24 and Deut 24:1. The expression for the bill of divorce, **ספר כריתת**, means literally “a bill of cutting.” Why cutting? It seems quite natural

<sup>48</sup> It seems that the reading of MS 248 of Ben Sira is a conflation of the reading of the other Greek MSS *ἀπότειμι αὐτήν* with an alternative translation, identical to the Syriac (which did not contain the word *αὐτήν*), namely *ἀπότειμι, δίδου καὶ ἀπόλοσον*. The word *δίδου*, “give,” is meaningless unless it refers to cutting the “pound of flesh” rather than to cutting off the wife.

<sup>49</sup> R. Smend, *Die Weisheit des Jesus Sirach* (Berlin: Georg Reimer, 1906), 233.

<sup>50</sup> Cf. the Syriac version. The expression “send her away from his house” refers to divorce in Deut 24:1.

<sup>51</sup> J. D. M. Derrett, “The Teaching of Jesus on Marriage and Divorce,” in idem, *Law and the New Testament* (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1970), 361–88, especially 373. My conclusions are different.

<sup>52</sup> This source does not mention Gen 2:24.



to understand divorce as “cutting” the “cleaving” (דבק) in Gen 2:24.<sup>53</sup> The verses were not necessarily conceived as contradictory (above, #3). This is certainly so for teachings in rabbinic literature, according to which Gen 2:24 has to do with legitimizing divorce among gentiles, or Deut 24:1–4 is conceived of as complementing the law of Gen 2:24 for Israelites.<sup>54</sup>

Samaritan marriage contracts are called מכתב הדביקה, “bill of cleaving,” and our verse is cited, but clearly this “cleaving” can be cut by divorce. A very late Samaritan formula uses both verses:

והתוספה השנאה מן האיש לאשה ומן האשה לאיש ועזב האיש מימר ה' בקדוש תורתו "על כן יעזב איש את אביו ואת אמו ודבק באשתו" בגלל כן נקתה האשה מאישה... וכתב לה ספר כריתת כאשר צוה ה' על יד עבדו משה "כי יקח איש אשה... וכתב לה ספר כריתת."

And the hatred between the husband and wife increased. And the husband forsook what was said by YHWH in his holy law: “Therefore a man should leave his father and mother and cleave to his wife.” In view of this the woman will be released from her husband... and he wrote her a bill of divorce as YHWH commanded through His servant Moses [+Deut 24:1–2].<sup>55</sup>

The Samaritan documents are very late, from the beginning of the eighteenth century. I am not arguing for any direct link between Jesus’ saying and this late Samaritan exegesis of Gen 2:24. Yet the juxtaposition of Gen 2:24 and Deut 24:1 is illuminating, for it reveals another exegetical aspect of Jesus’ teaching. To be sure, in the Samaritan document the husband is described as forsaking God’s *commandment* (cf. above, #2!) to cleave to his wife, and this *leads* to divorce, to the כריתת,

<sup>53</sup> Cf. Derrett, “Teaching of Jesus,” 372, where he noted that Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion “prefer words implying the cutting... such as would purport to put an end to the flesh” (see F. Field, *Origenis Hexaplorum que supersunt* [Oxford: Clarendon, 1875], 308). These translations are merely literal renderings of the Hebrew, but these “metaphorical niceties” are indeed relevant to the background of Jesus’ saying (see above, #3).

<sup>54</sup> Y. Qidd. 1:1 (58c); *Gen. Rab.* 18:5 (ed. J. Theodor and C. Albeck; Berlin: Poppey, 1927), 166–67.

<sup>55</sup> R. Pummer, *Samaritan Marriage Contracts and Deeds of Divorce* (2 vols.; Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1993–1997), 1:237–38, 240–43 (the translation is based on Pummer’s). The deeds of divorce, although written in the late Samaritan Aramaic and Hebrew, are clearly based on *mutual* formulae of divorce, already attested among the Samaritans in a Greek deed of divorce (Pummer, 238–39). The biblical verses of Deuteronomy 24 reflect another legal system, according to which it is the *husband* who divorces his wife. One wonders when the Deuteronomic verses were added to the deeds, and likewise when Gen 2:24 was added.

the divine commandment given through Moses in Deut 24:1–2.<sup>56</sup> The conclusion is very different from that of Jesus. We may infer, then, that the juxtaposition of the two biblical verses, a juxtaposition that could lead to different exegetical conclusions, was not necessarily related to the content of Jesus' teaching.

5. As has been observed by many scholars, the Matthean wording, "except for fornication" (μὴ ἐπὶ πορνείᾳ, παρεκτὸς λόγου πορνείας; Matt 19:9, 5:31), clearly refers to the expression ערוות דבר (Deut 24:1) as interpreted by the Shammaites (*m. Git.* 9:10): divorce is lawful only in matters related to indecent sexual behavior; i.e., matters included in the rabbinic category ערוות and (similarly, if not identically) in the Qumranic category זנות. It is difficult to determine the exact Semitic wording of Matthew or Matthew's source, but its ultimate biblical source must have been the word ערוות in Deuteronomy.<sup>57</sup> The tension between the total rejection of Deuteronomy's law of divorce and the Matthean exception clause has been noted by commentators. The usage of the word זנות in the Scrolls is far less relevant for interpreting Matthew than rabbinic usage and rabbinic halakhic midrash.<sup>58</sup> The Matthean formula grafts the rabbinic ruling onto the saying of Jesus as documented in Mark (in its Markan form, the saying is closer to the Qumranic material, as we have seen above, #1).<sup>59</sup>

To conclude: Jewish sources supply divergent parallels to different dimensions of Jesus' teaching on divorce. Although the closest parallels are found in Qumran, we lose much information if we disregard non-Qumranic material. A passage of the *Damascus Document* concerning polygamy is relevant, but so is a rabbinic midrash; both interpret Gen

<sup>56</sup> It may be noted that Gen 2:24 is referred to in the Samaritan document as "what was said by God" while Deut 24:1–2 is God's commandment through Moses; cf. the apparent contrast between "the beginning (principle) of creation" and "Moses" in the Gospels.

<sup>57</sup> Cf., e.g., Davies and Allison, *Critical and Exegetical Commentary*, 1:528; 3:9.

<sup>58</sup> Contrast Fitzmyer, "The Matthean Divorce Texts"; similarly J. Kampen, "The Matthean Divorce Texts Reexamined," in *New Qumran Texts and Studies: Proceedings of the First Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Paris 1992* (ed. G. J. Brooke and F. García Martínez; STDJ 15; Leiden: Brill, 1994), 147–67.

<sup>59</sup> Lehmann's hypothesis that the formula based on Deut 24:1 is not included in Mark because it does not apply to gentiles, according to rabbinic sources, is untenable (M. R. Lehmann, "Gen 2:24 and the Basis for Divorce in Halakhah and New Testament," *ZAW* 72 [1960]: 263–67).

1:27. A passage of *4QInstruction* in which the divinely grounded legal status of marital life is dealt with provides a significant parallel to Jesus' interpretation of Gen 2:24. The exegetical methods shared by Jesus and *4QInstruction* are made intelligible by comparison with the exegetical methods used in other literature of the Second Temple period, as well as those used in rabbinic literature. Even a late Samaritan document may add another exegetical dimension to Jesus' teaching. Statements found in rabbinic literature but not related to the biblical verse are also relevant, as is an interpretation or a reading drawn from Ben Sira. Rabbinic material is very helpful for the interpretation of Matthew. The passage that is closest in wording to Jesus' saying is perhaps the well-known parallel in the *Damascus Document*, but the other sources supply valuable information concerning the saying and its exegetical background. All the elements of Jesus' saying have parallels in Jewish writings. Yet, the compound found in Jesus' saying is distinct from other compounds made from the same elements. Was the teaching peculiar to Jesus, or would we have closer parallels if we had more material? This question must be left unanswered.

## II

Concerning rebuke and forgiveness we read:

### *Matthew 18:15–17, 21–22*

If your brother sins against you (ἀμαρτήση [εἰς σε]<sup>60</sup>), go and reprove him, between you and him alone. If he listens to you, you have gained (ἐκέρδησας) your brother. But if he does not listen, take one or two others along with you, that everything (πάν ρήμα) may be confirmed by (ἐπὶ στόματος) two or three witnesses. If he refuses to listen to them, tell (it) to the church (ἐκκλησία); and if he refuses to listen to the church, let him be to you as a gentile and a tax collector.

### *Luke 17:3–4*

If your brother sins against you (ἀμαρτήση [εἰς σε]) rebuke (ἐπιτίμησον) him,  
and if he repents  
forgive him,

<sup>60</sup> On the variant readings, see below, 225–26.

... "Lord, how often shall my brother sin against me and I forgive him? As many as seven times?" Jesus said to him: "I do not say to you seven times, but seventy-seven times." and if he sins against you seven times in the day, and turns to you seven times and says, "I repent," you must forgive him.

It is usually agreed that both Matthew and Luke are derived from Q here, and that Luke preserves a more original form of the saying. Between Matt 18:15–17 and 18:21–22, another unit was inserted in Matthew. The unit was inserted there simply because the phrase "two or three" occurred both in our saying (Matt 18:16) and in the inserted unit (Matt 18:20).<sup>61</sup> Matt 18:15–17 is an elaboration of a more primitive saying. Both in Luke and in Matthew, reproof and forgiveness are two sides of the same coin.

Before dealing with the material from Qumran, let us repeat briefly Kugel's findings concerning the passages in Ben Sira and the *Testament of Gad* that deal with reproof.<sup>62</sup> In Ben Sira we read:

- (13) Reprove a friend, lest he act; and if he acted, lest he continue.
- (14) Reprove a neighbor, lest he speak; and if he spoke, lest he repeat.
- (15) Reprove a friend for often it is false gossip, and do not believe in every word.
- (16) A person may have stumbled unintentionally, and who has not sinned with his tongue?!
- (17) Reprove a friend before getting angry, and give place to the Law of the Most High. (Sir 19:13–17)<sup>63</sup>

<sup>61</sup> Elsewhere I have argued that the inserted unit is related to *m. 'Abot* 3:6; see M. Kister, "Plucking on the Sabbath," in *The New Testament and Christian-Jewish Dialogue: Studies in Honor of David Flusser* (ed. M. Lowe; Jerusalem: Ecumenical Theological Research Fraternity in Israel, 1990 [=Immanuel 24/25]), 35–51, especially 36 n. 1.

<sup>62</sup> For a discussion of many of the sources and their covert exegesis of Lev 19:17, see J. L. Kugel, *In Potiphar's House*, 214–46 (an earlier version of this chapter appeared as "On Hidden Hatred and Open Reproach: Early Exegesis of Leviticus 19:17," *HTR* 80 [1987]: 43–61).

<sup>63</sup> The translation is based on Kugel's (*In Potiphar's House*, 219), with slight deviations. The Hebrew of this passage is lost, but the Greek and the Syriac versions agree on most details. What seems at first glance to be the Syriac translation of verse 17, אכס לבישא דסלנאא טלם ולא לכל מלא תהימניה, is in fact an *alternative* translation of verse 15: הובח רע כי לרוב עושק (הוא), ולכל דבר אל תאמן. The Syriac took רע here as "sinner" (*ra'*), rather than "neighbor" (*rēa'*); the Syriac טלם probably renders Hebrew עושק, but the meaning of the Hebrew word עושק in this context is "slander," the equivalent of Greek διαβολή (as I hope to demonstrate elsewhere). We do not have, then, a Syriac translation of verse 17.

As Kugel has pointed out, this passage in Ben Sira refers to Lev 19:17. It considers the benefit of “open reproof” (Prov 27:5) as “the ability to prevent offense from being committed” or repeated, and “to bring the facts of the case to light... since the report of the offense may be untrue, or because the offense itself may have been unintentional.”<sup>64</sup> Elsewhere in Ben Sira we read: “How good it is to reprove rather than to be angry,<sup>65</sup> and he that admits his sin will be spared \*disgrace\*” (20:2–3, reconstructed according to the Greek version).<sup>66</sup> As we shall see in other texts, the offended person must reprove and the offender must admit his sin.

Another passage referring to reproof is the *Testament of Gad*, where we read:

Love one another from your heart, and if anyone sins against you, tell him peacefully, banishing the poison of hatred, and let no treachery be in your soul, and if, after admitting (his sin) he repents, forgive him. But if he denies, do not dispute with him lest he swear and you thereby sin doubly... keep silent... for the one who denies may repent so as not to offend you again. (6:3–4; my translation)

Kugel has demonstrated the biblical background and the covert exegesis of Lev 19:17–18 in these passages. It is interesting to note that in Sir 20:2–3, as well as in the *Testament of Gad*, the reproof by the offended person and the confession and repentance of the offending one are similarly related. It is also clear that both Ben Sira and the *Testament of Gad* interpret Lev 19:17 as referring to interpersonal relationships (which is apparently also the original meaning of the biblical verse).

<sup>64</sup> Kugel, *In Potiphar's House*, 219.

<sup>65</sup> Some Greek MSS add here κρυπτῶς, “in secret”; “anger in secret” refers to the biblical commandment, “You shall not hate your brother in your heart; you shall surely reprove your neighbor” (Lev 19:17).

<sup>66</sup> \*disgrace\* = conjectural emendation. The Greek words ἀπὸ ἐλαττώσεως, render Hebrew מחסר, but this reading should be emended by conjecture to מחסד, “from disgrace,” as suggested by Segal; see M. H. Segal, *Sefer Ben Sira ha-Shalem* (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1972), 120 (Hebrew). The Syriac version is utterly different from the Greek: לית לה טיבותא למן דאכס לעולא ומשתבח מן כר דלא ולא לה למשתבח; “there is no gratitude for him that reproves the unrighteous and is glorified where it is not fitting for him to be glorified.” The first stich seems to reflect the Hebrew מה טוב מוכיח לרע. This Hebrew text is graphically similar to the text reflected by the Greek (מה טוב הוכח מלרגו). The word משתבח in the second stich probably reflects Hebrew מתודה (in a sense inappropriate here; the word הודה means “confess” and “give thanks”).

I contend that the aim of the ruling in the Matthean passage is to regulate *interpersonal relations* (see below) and to settle conflicts in the community by using a three-stage procedure: first, private reproof; then reproof before witnesses; and then, if necessary, bringing the matter to the Congregation.<sup>67</sup> As has been noted by scholars, the procedure in Matthew is closely related to a procedure of asking forgiveness of one's fellow, according to rabbinic literature:

ההן דחטא על חבריה צריך מימר ליה, סרחית עלך. ואין קבליה, הא טבאות; ואין לא, מייתי בני נש ומפייס ליה קומיהון

Whoever sins against his fellow must say to him, "I have sinned against you." If he accepts it, it is well; if not, he must bring (other) persons and appease him before them. (γ. *Yoma* 8:9 [45c])

This is an Aramaic saying of the Amora Samuel (early third century CE), and yet it reflects (so we learn, thanks to the Gospel) an ancient tradition. To be sure, according to this saying "it is the offending person who takes the initiative, not the offended,"<sup>68</sup> but, as we have seen in the Gospels and in the *Testament of Gad* (and as we will see below in the material from Qumran), reproving and forgiving are very closely linked. The reproof delivered by the offended one and the repentance and request for forgiveness made by the offending person may therefore be regarded as two elements of a single process. The procedure here is: first, private apology; then, asking forgiveness before other people. These are not considered "witnesses" as in Matthew, because the two stages are at the purely interpersonal level.

Reproof is mentioned in several Qumranic texts, some of them newly published. The similarity of the passage in Matthew to laws of reproof in CD and in 1QS has been noted and studied by many commentators.<sup>69</sup> The halakhic and exegetical background to the command of reproof

<sup>67</sup> It is not explicitly stated in Matthew that the congregation had authority to punish those who refused to accept reproof. Is banishment from the community, or a social sanction against the offender, implied by the words, "let him be to you as a gentile and a tax collector"?

<sup>68</sup> Davies and Allison, *Critical and Exegetical Commentary*, 2:784.

<sup>69</sup> E.g., J. Danielou, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Primitive Christianity* (Baltimore: Helicon, 1958), 39–40; J. Licht, *The Rule Scroll: Text, Introduction, and Commentary* (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1965), 137 (Hebrew); D. A. Hagner, *Matthew 14–28* (WBC 33B; Dallas, Tex.: Word Books, 1995), 531. See also the studies below, nn. 106–7.

has been thoroughly analyzed by Schiffman,<sup>70</sup> Kugel,<sup>71</sup> and Shemesh.<sup>72</sup> A review of the passages from Qumran concerning reproof is still in order. Following this review, I will examine how, why, and where in the scrolls a commandment pertaining to the interpersonal realm evolved into a strict judicial procedure, and what the relationship is between the Matthean passage and the Qumran material.

[1]. A passage in *Serekh ha-Yahad* (1QS 5:24–6:1) reads:<sup>73</sup>

להוכיח איש את רעהו בא[מ]ת וענוה ואהבת חסד לאיש *vacat*  
 אל ידבר אלוהיה באפ או בתלונה או בעורפ [קשה או בקנאת] רוח  
 רשע  
 ואל ישנאהו [בעור]ל[ת] לבבו כיא ביומ(יו) יוכיחנו ולוא ישא עליו עון  
 וגם אל יביא איש על רעהו דבר לפני הרבים אשר לוא בתוכחת לפני  
 עדים

- [1.A] They shall reprove one another in truth, humility and merciful love.  
 [1.B] One must not speak to his (fellow) with anger or with snarl or with a [stiff] neck or [with zealotry of] spirit of wickedness.  
 [1.C] And he must not hate him in his [uncircumcised] heart, for he shall reprove him on (the very same) day lest he bear iniquity because of him.<sup>74</sup>  
 [1.D] And also let no man bring anything against his fellow before the Many without (prior) reproof in the presence of witnesses.

The ruling that people should make peace (and one should forgive his fellow) on the very same day of the offense may well apply particularly to interpersonal matters. In the Epistle to the Ephesians it is advised, “‘be angry and do not sin; [commune with your hearts on your beds and be silent]’ (Ps 4:5);<sup>75</sup> do not let the sun go down on your anger”

<sup>70</sup> L. H. Schiffman, *Sectarian Law in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press, 1983), 89–109.

<sup>71</sup> J. L. Kugel, *In Potiphar's House*, 214–46; See also J. L. Kugel, *Traditions of the Bible: A Guide to the Bible as It Was at the Start of the Common Era* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1998), 752–57, 766–68.

<sup>72</sup> A. Shemesh, “Rebuke, Warning and Obligation to Testify—In Judaeen Desert Writings and Rabbinic Halakha,” *Tarbiz* 66 (1997): 149–68 (Hebrew).

<sup>73</sup> The translation is mine.

<sup>74</sup> [1.C] is lacking in 4Q258 1 ii 5. See P. S. Alexander and G. Vermes, *Qumran Cave 4.XIX: Serekh ha-Yahad and Two Related Texts* (DJD 26; Oxford: Clarendon, 1998), 98.

<sup>75</sup> In Ephesians the first stich of Ps 4:5 is cited, but the whole verse is interpreted. The verse was probably interpreted as meaning: if you get angry, do not sin (by holding a grudge); rather, forgive your neighbor in your heart before you go to sleep on the same day.

(Eph 4:26). In rabbinic contexts, righteous sages are reported as saying, "I have never gone to bed with my fellow's disgrace" (*b. Meg.* 28a; *y. Ta'an.* 3:13 [67a]; *Kallah Rab.* 3:10).<sup>76</sup> Yet, in the *Serekh* a charge against a fellow member may be brought before the Congregation only after reproofing him.

[2]. In CD 9:2–8 (henceforth: **CD1**) we read:<sup>77</sup>

וכל איש \*מבואי\* הברית אשר יביא על רעהו דבר אשר לא בהוכח לפני  
עדים והביאו בחרון אפו או ספר לזקניו להבוזותו נוקם הוא ונוטר ואין כתוב  
כי אם "נוקם הוא לצריו ונוטר הוא לאויביו."  
אם החריש לו מיום ליום ובחרון אפו בו דבר בו בדבר מות ענה בו יען  
אשר לא הקים את מצות אל אשר אמר לו "הוכח תוכיח את רעך ולא  
תשא עליו חטא."

[2.A] Any man from the members of the covenant who brings against his fellow a charge which has had no (prior) reproof before (or: by the evidence of)<sup>78</sup> witnesses, but brings it out of anger, or tells of it to his Elders in order to disgrace him (i.e., his fellow), he is (guilty of) taking revenge and holding a grudge; but it is written: "He takes revenge on his *enemies* and holds a grudge against his foes." (Nah 1:2)<sup>79</sup>

[2.B] If he was silent towards him from day to day<sup>80</sup> and (then) when he was angry at him...<sup>81</sup> testified against himself (?) concerning (?) a capital

<sup>76</sup> The wording in the rabbinic sources, especially when compared to Ephesians, seems to be derived from the end of the same biblical verse. Interestingly, there is no explicit rabbinic exegesis of the verse in this vein.

<sup>77</sup> The translation is based on that of Kugel (*In Potiphar's House*, 224), with several deviations.

<sup>78</sup> According to CD, לפני, according to 4Q270 6 iii 18 פי ל[ע]. The latter alludes to Deut 19:15.

<sup>79</sup> I.e., one should take revenge on one's enemies, as God does, but not on his fellows; see above, n. 5.

<sup>80</sup> אם החריש לו מיום ליום; 4Q267 9 i 1 reads מחודש לחודש, which Baumgarten reconstructs as מיום ליום [מחודש לחודש], "[from day to day and] from month to month" (J. M. Baumgarten, *Qumran Cave 4.XIII: The Damascus Document (4Q266–273)* [DJD 18; Oxford: Clarendon, 1996], 105). A similar expression occurs in 4Q306 1 2: [ש]ומחדש לחודש ליום ומחדש לחודש ליום (T. Lim, "306. 4QMen of the People Who Err," in *Qumran Cave 4.XXVI: Cryptic Texts and Miscellanea, Part 1* [ed. S. J. Pfann, P. S. Alexander et al.; DJD 36; Oxford: Clarendon, 2000], 252). Cf. also *Jub.* 49:7: "and do not adjourn it from day to day and from month to month." These occurrences do not support the suggestion that the expression reflects Esther 3:7 (thus J. Ben-Dov, "A Presumed Citation of Esther 3:7 in 4QD<sup>b</sup>," *DSD* 6 [1999]: 282–84): the argument that "the unique phrase מחודש לחודש occurs in the Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls in only one place, Esther 3:7," is less suggestive in light of the two occurrences of the phrase cited here.

<sup>81</sup> There is a lacuna here; see next note.



crime,<sup>82</sup> because he did not carry out the commandment of God who said to him, “You shall surely reprove your fellow lest you bear sin because of him.” (Lev 19:18)

The wording here is similar to the wording of the *Serekh*. The ruling that people should make peace on the very same day as the offence is related here to the prohibition of “holding a grudge” (Hebrew *noṭer*, literally “keeping [in his heart]),” which concerns interpersonal matters. “Anger” and “reproof” are treated here as opposites, exactly as in Sir 20:2.

We cannot be sure, however, that this procedure pertains only to interpersonal matters. The procedure might well have a legal dimension as well. To begin with, a clue to such a reading is the phrase “capital crime,” occurring in the passage. The wording, “silent towards him from day to day” is also significant. This wording is borrowed from Num 30:15: “but if her husband is silent towards her from day to day [concerning her vows], then he establishes all her vows.” The reason for applying this rule to relationships in the community is the similarity between the consequence of not appropriately reproving in Lev 19:17, **וְלֹא תִשָּׂא עָלָיו חַטָּא**, which may be translated “lest you bear his sin,”<sup>83</sup> and the consequence expressed in Num 30:16, **וְאִם הִפְרָ יִפְרֹ אֹתָם אַחֲרָי**, **שָׁמְעוּ וְנִשְׂאָ אֶת עֹנָהּ**, “but if he makes them null and void after he has heard of them [i.e., after the day in which the vows were pronounced], then *he shall bear her iniquity*.”<sup>84</sup> It seems, then, that this passage deals

<sup>82</sup> It is difficult to determine the exact context of the expression **בְּדַבַּר מוֹת** “a capital crime” in the text of CD 9:6. Does it refer to human or to divine punishment? It is clear, however, that severe transgressions of the Law are referred to here; note also the phrase **יְהִי נִקְיָיִם** at the end of this passage as it occurs in 5Q12 1 (J. T. Milik, “12. Document de Damas,” in M. Baillet, J. T. Milik, and R. de Vaux, *Les ‘Petites Grottes’ de Qumrân* [DJD 3; Oxford: Clarendon, 1962], 181). An unknown sin may affect the whole community if it is not reported in the right way. The text of CD differs here from that of 4Q270 6 iii 20–21 (Baumgarten, DJD 18.158); it seems that CD is corrupt at this point. See the tentative reconstructions suggested by Qimron; cf. E. Qimron, “The Riddle of the Missing Text in the *Damascus Document*,” in *Fifty Years of Dead Sea Scrolls Research: Studies in Memory of Jacob Licht* (ed. G. Brin and B. Nitzan; Jerusalem: Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi, 2001), 247, 249–50 (Hebrew).

<sup>83</sup> For the meaning of the expression in this verse, see J. Milgrom, *Leviticus 17–22: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (New York: Doubleday, 2000), 1648–49. I am concerned here only with possible interpretations of the expression, not with its original meaning.

<sup>84</sup> The same expression is used in Lev 5:1. Shemesh (“Rebuke,” 153–54) has suggested that Lev 19:17 and Lev 5:1 were related to each other according to the sect’s exegesis. He also drew attention to the use of **עֵינַי** in [1.C], but failed to note the similarity to Num 30:16 (contrast 154 n. 20). For the interpretation of Lev 5:1, cf. Kister, “Two Formulae in the *Book of Jubilees*,” 290 n. 4. See also below, n. 101, for the similarities between family relationships and relationships with other members of the sect.

not only with settling interpersonal conflicts, but also with violation of the Law.

[3]. Several lines after the preceding ruling (CD 9:16–24; henceforth: **CD2**), another rule of reproof is found:<sup>85</sup>

כל דבר אשר ימעל איש בתורה וראה רעיהו והוא אחד אם דבר מות הוא  
 וידיעהו לעיניו בהוכיח למבקר והמבקר יכתבהו בידו עד עשותו עוד לפני  
 אחד ושב והודיע למבקר אם ישוב וניתפש לפני אחר שלם משפטו... וביום  
 ראות האיש יודיעה למבקר

[3.A] Any matter in which a man sins against the law, and his fellow sees him and he is alone; if it is a capital matter, he shall report it in his [=the sinner's] presence, reproving him, to the *mebaqqer*, and the *mebaqqer* shall record it, until he does it again in the presence of someone. If he is caught again doing it in the presence of (another) one, his judgment is complete...

[3.B] On the (same) day on which he saw him, he shall make it known to the *mebaqqer*.

[4]. A fragmentary text, *4QBerakhot*, has much in common with the *Damascus Document*. The most important aspect that can be learned from the composite text established by Bilhah Nitzan<sup>86</sup> is that “reproving one before wi[tnesses]” is “in order to purify one’s deeds from every [sin].”<sup>87</sup> An interpersonal motive for reproof, mentioned in the *Serekh* and **CD1** (but absent in **CD2**) seems to be mentioned in the extremely fragmentary text of *4QBerakhot*.<sup>88</sup>

[5]. Another passage in the *Damascus Document* deals with reproof to be meted out by the *mebaqqer*, using language rather similar to the

<sup>85</sup> The translation follows García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*, 563, with several alterations.

<sup>86</sup> B. Nitzan, “286. 4QBerakhot,” in *Qumran Cave 4. VI: Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part 1* (ed. E. Eshel et al.; DJD 11; Oxford: Clarendon, 1998), 46–48. For a more detailed discussion see also B. Nitzan, “The Laws of Reproof in 4QBerakhot (4Q286–290) in Light of Their Parallels in the Damascus Covenant and Other Texts from Qumran,” in Bernstein, García Martínez and Kampen, *Legal Texts and Legal Issues*, 149–64.

<sup>87</sup> Lines 6–7 in the composite text (Nitzan, DJD 11.46).

<sup>88</sup> See also 4Q286 20a,b 7–10 (Nitzan, DJD 11.41–42, 46–48: composite text and reconstruction). Note the phrases: “Let no one take revenge for himself,” and “with anger and in the zeal of [wicked] spirit... anger” (my translation). Bilhah Nitzan reconstructs the fragment assuming that it refers to the reproofs of the *mebaqqer* and to sins in general. While the latter assumption is plausible (although not beyond any doubt), the former is less so.

*Serekh* [1.A–B]. According to CD 13:17–19+4Q266 9 iii 6–10, (henceforth **CD3**, cited here according to the composite text of Elisha Qimron),<sup>89</sup> the *mebaqqr* is supposed to do the following:

והו[א] ייסר את בניהם [ונשיהם?] וטפם [ברו]ח ענוה ובאהבת חסד ואל  
 יטור להם [ב] ו[ב]אף וע[בר]ע ל פשעיהם ואת אשר איננו נקשר בעד[ת]  
 אל לוא ישפוט במ[שפטיהם]

And he shall correct their sons [and wives?] and little children with humble [spi]rit and with merciful love, and he shall not hold a grudge against them [ ] and angrily, and for[give] their iniquities, and those who are not bound in the congrega[tion of God] he shall not judge in] their judgment.<sup>90</sup>

A fragmentary text, 4Q477, also lists reproofs administered apparently by the *mebaqqr*.<sup>91</sup> Unlike the other texts, specific members are reproved in this text for morally objectionable behavior.<sup>92</sup>

[6]. Another interesting passage concerning reproof occurs in *4QInstruction* (4Q417 2 i 1–8). The passage has not been correctly understood and translated. It seems that this passage is somehow related to **CD3** [5], but it is not clear whether it is addressed to a member of the community or to one of its leaders. It reads:

1. בכל עת פן ישבעכה וכרוחו דבר בו פן י<sup>ו</sup>
  2. בלוא הוכח הכשר עבור לו והנק שר <sup>ו</sup>
  3. וגם את רוחו לא תבלע כיא בדממה דברת[ה]
  4. ותוכחתו ספר מהר ואל תעבור על פשעיכה [בתוכחת רעכה כיא?]
  5. יצדק כמוכה הואה כיא הואה {כיא הואה} שר בש[רכה]
  6. יעשה כי מה הואה יח<י>ד ככול מעשה לבלתי ]
  7. vacat ואיש עול אל תחשוב עזר וגם אין שונא ]
  8. רשע מעשיו עם פקדתו ודע במה תתהלך עמו ]
- [לב]לתי [שכוח?]

<sup>89</sup> I am grateful to Prof. Elisha Qimron for the giving me the privilege of consulting his unpublished edition.

<sup>90</sup> Or: “punish in their punishments.”

<sup>91</sup> E. Eshel, “477. Rebukes Reported by the Overseer,” in Pfann and Alexander et al., DJD 36.474–83.

<sup>92</sup> Thus E. Eshel, “4Q477: The Rebukes of the Overseer,” *JJS* 45 (1994): 111–22, especially 121. Judging from the small fragments preserved out of this text, it does not seem that these reproofs referred to specific transgressions of the Law (see [3]), nor does it seem that the procedure of reproof in front of witnesses (see [2]) could be applied to the reproofs recorded in 4Q477. More plausibly, this fragment reflects a different procedure, a prerogative of the *mebaqqr*. It is still a puzzle, in what ways this procedure is related to CD 13:17–19.

1. [Do not speak? with him] at any time, lest he become weary of you.<sup>93</sup>  
Speak to him according to his spirit, lest he [~resist you? ...]
2. without reproof.<sup>94</sup> Forgive the pious,<sup>95</sup> and [reprove?] those bound (i.e., members of the community)<sup>96</sup> [
3. And also do not injure his spirit, but speak in silence<sup>97</sup> [
4. and tell his reproof quickly, and do not forgive (yourself) your own sins [when you are reproved by your neighbour, because]
5. he is righteous as you are, for he is your next of [kin]<sup>98</sup>
6. ...<sup>99</sup>
7. And a wicked man do not consider a helper, nor shall (God's) enemy be [...] as not [to forget?]
8. the wickedness of his deeds and (God's future) visitation, and know how you should behave with him

Many details are still obscure in this passage. The tenor of the passage is clear, however: in contradistinction to the wicked, the pious should be reproved immediately (cf. *Serekh* [1.C], **CD1** [2.B]) and then forgiven. One must forgive his fellow and, on the other hand, not easily forgive oneself. This same expression (“do not forgive yourself”) occurs again several lines below (4Q417 2 i 14–16), probably in the same context:

14. ואל תעבור על [פש] עיכה היה כאיש עני בריבך משפטי [תוכחתי?]
15. קח ואז יראה אל ושב אפו ועבר על חטאותכה [כי] א לפגני אפו
16. לוא יעמוד כול ומי יצדק במשפטו ובלי סליחה איכה [יקום לפניו]

14. And do not forgive (yourself) your own sins; behave as a humble man in your conflict, the judgment of [reproof?]
15. accept, and then God will see and his anger will abate, and He will forgive your sins. For before His anger
16. none can stand, and who is righteous in His judgment, and without forgiveness how can anyone stand before Him?

<sup>93</sup> ישבעכה (with *sin* rather than with *shin*), literally “be sated, surfeited.” The sentence is modeled after Prov 25:17: “Let your foot be seldom in your neighbor’s house, lest he become weary of you (פן ישבעך) and hate you.” Accordingly, the word וכרוחו opens a new sentence.

<sup>94</sup> Read *hokheah*.

<sup>95</sup> I read *hakkasher*, a word attested in the sense of “pious” in mishnaic Hebrew.

<sup>96</sup> Read והנקשר as one word, והנקשר (thus Elgvin, “An Analysis of 4QInstruction,” 197, and García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*, 854 [fragment 1 according to their numbering]). The word is parallel to “pious,” and is used in the same sense in which it is used in **CD3** [5].

<sup>97</sup> See BDB, s.v. דמם, 199. The general sense of the last three words (and therefore their translation) is uncertain. Could בדממה mean “not emotionally” (i.e., not “with anger”)? Note in this connection the words ודמו סלה (Ps 4:5; cf. above n. 75).

<sup>98</sup> Hebrew בשר בשר ; I read these words *sher besa[rkha]*, i.e., *she’er besarkha*. This reading has been suggested by García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*, 854.

<sup>99</sup> Tentative rendering: “he will do, for what is a single man worthy in any deed, so as not to [ .”

If one does not forgive his own sins, he will earn true forgiveness, i.e., God's forgiveness.<sup>100</sup> Reproving and being reproved take place in deep humility before God. Moreover, it is emphasized that any other group member is a "next of kin."<sup>101</sup> The fragment illustrates how the "humility and merciful love" mentioned in the *Serekh* [1] and **CD3** [5] are achieved. These affinities with sectarian halakhah and vocabulary furnish further evidence that *4QInstruction* is a sectarian text.<sup>102</sup>

[7]. Turning from sectarian writings to a writing that might well be nonsectarian, we may refer to the "reproof" mentioned in the *Prayer of Joseph* (4Q372 1 27–28). The text should be read and reconstructed as follows:

27. וללמד לפשעים חקיך ולכל עזביך תור[תך] ואין כל אח  
28. ורע אשר לא להכיחו עדותיך ולהגיד דברי צדקך

Apparently, the correct translation would be:

27. I teach<sup>103</sup> sinners Your laws, and to all those who abandon you  
(I teach) [your?] Torah [and there is no brother]  
28. and friend<sup>104</sup> that I should not reprove him with your teaching, and  
I tell<sup>105</sup> the words of your righteousness

<sup>100</sup> This idea is expressed also by Ben Sira, who wrote: "Should a man cherish anger against another, and seek healing from God? Should he have no mercy on a man like himself, and [yet] make supplication for his own sins?... Remember the commandments and do not hold a grudge against your neighbor, and (remember) the covenant of the Most High and diminish sins" (Sir 28:3–7). Ben Sira alludes to Lev 19:18, and this passage can be read together with Sir 19:13–17 (above, 213) as alluding to Lev 19:17.

<sup>101</sup> Note that the partnership between husband and wife is elsewhere in this work designated a יחד (above n. 31), while here the community, יחד, is perceived as an integral family.

<sup>102</sup> For another striking example see also M. Kister, "Physical and Metaphysical Measurements Ordained by God according to the Literature of Second Temple Period," in *Reworking the Bible: Apocryphal and Related Texts at Qumran: Proceedings of a Joint Symposium by the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature and the Hebrew University Institute for Advanced Studies Research Group on Qumran, 15–17 January, 2002* (ed. E. G. Chazon, D. Dimant and R. A. Clements; STDJ 58; Leiden: Brill, 2005), 170–71.

<sup>103</sup> The infinitive continues the finite verbs אהללך, ואגיד, ואקום, and therefore should be translated as a finite verb in the first person.

<sup>104</sup> The editors read להכיחי without suggesting any reconstruction on line 27, and translate: "and evil so that your testimonies do not reproach me," or, alternatively, "and a wicked person so that your testimonies do not reproach him" (E. M. Schuller and M. J. Bernstein, "372. 4QNarrative and Poetic Composition<sup>b</sup>," in *Qumran Cave 4.XXVII: Miscellanea, Part 2* [DJD 28; Oxford: Clarendon, 2001], 169–70). Qimron has suggested the translation "(and to teach) your testimonies to an evil which is beyond chastis-

This review of Qumran passages makes clear that, as has been argued for decades, Matt 18:15–17 has strong affinities to some of the sectarian passages: the specific combination of the law of reproof with the process of bearing witness against the sinner (or offender); the progression from reproof before two witnesses and bringing the matter to the congregation. The similarities, especially to the *Serekh* and **CD1**, are so striking even in details, that they imply a direct connection of the Matthean passage with these Qumranic texts.

The passage in Matthew enables us to envision the whole procedure: private reproof; then reproof before witnesses (to this, one may compare the teaching of the Amora Samuel); and at last, if necessary, bringing the matter to the congregation (ἡ ἐκκλησία; the Many; the Elders). The *Serekh* and **CD1** refer only to the last two stages in this procedure: reproof before the witnesses and “the Many” (but there is every reason to assume a preliminary stage, or at least a possibility, of private reproof, even without the parallel passage in Matthew). The Matthean passage, though an expansion of a saying attributed to Jesus, may well be a literal translation of an early *pre-Christian* manual of community regulations adopted by the Church,<sup>106</sup> and thus, paradoxically, could easily antedate any “authentic” saying of Jesus. While a comparison with the *Serekh* and **CD1** is illuminating, a comparison between the passage in Matthew and **CD2** will yield negative results.<sup>107</sup>

---

ing” (E. Qimron, “Observations on the Reading of ‘A Text about Joseph’ (4Q372, 1),” *RevQ* 15 [1992]: 604). Other translators are also off the mark; e.g., García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*, 737: “and the evil, so that your witnesses do not reproach me.” Both context and syntax are awkward if ער is understood as “evil,” while the rendering “friend,” suggested here, enables us to reconstruct a smooth text.

<sup>105</sup> For this translation see n. 103.

<sup>106</sup> This accounts also for some details. Thus Davies and Allison (following other commentators) wonder why there is no hint of a council of the elders, let alone an authoritative officer, like a bishop, and what the implications of this may be for Matthew’s community (*Critical and Exegetical Commentary* 2:786). However, the word ἐκκλησία is parallel to “the Many” (הרבים) in the *Serekh*. Whether or not it does reflect Matthew’s community, it certainly reproduces the sectarian ruling of some community similar to עצת היחוד. We also learn that the quotation of Deut 19:15 is definitely not a Matthean addition, as has been suggested by some commentators (see below, nn. 116–117). There is no “discrepancy between the number in v. 16a and the quotation of Deut 19:15” (T. R. Carmody, “Matt 18:15–17 in Relation to Three Texts from Qumran Literature,” in *To Touch the Text: Biblical and Related Studies in Honor of Joseph A. Fitzmyer S.J.* [ed. M. P. Horgan and P. J. Kobelsky; New York: Crossroads, 1989], 141–58, the quotation is from 153). The offended party is considered one witness, together with one or two others, before the congregation.

<sup>107</sup> Scholars who have not distinguished between **CD1** and **CD2** have indeed concluded that there was no connection between Matthew’s community and Qumran;

In Matthew we have a purely interpersonal procedure for settling conflicts. Weinfeld has pointed out that similar procedures had existed in non-Jewish organizations.<sup>108</sup> The Matthean procedure matches a similar one concerning forgiveness in the Palestinian Talmud, as we have seen. In the *Serekh* and **CD1** interpersonal elements are still dominant, but at least in **CD1** the procedure seems to have *also* a legal dimension. The procedure in **CD2** is almost entirely a judicial one. It seems to me, therefore, that the Matthean passage represents in this case the earliest form of the ruling, reworked in the passages from the Scrolls, where it received a new legal twist.

What is the reason for the judicial elements in the process at Qumran? They stem from an essential problem, namely: does the biblical verse in which reproof is commanded, Lev 19:17, refer only to interpersonal matters? Ben Sira 19:13–17, *T. Gad* 6:3, our passage in Matthew, and *Didache* 15:3<sup>109</sup> assume as much, and the parallels adduced by Weinfeld point in the same direction. But then, it must be asked: should one reprove his neighbor only for *personal* offenses but not for improper *religious* conduct, i.e., not for transgression of God's commandments? The plain meaning of the biblical verse does not seem to refer to the latter case,<sup>110</sup> but when the problem was raised during the Second Temple period, the answer to this question must have been that a sin against God is no less serious than an offense against a fellow. "Reproof" in

---

see F. García Martínez, "La reprension fraterna en Qumran y Mt 18, 15–17," *Filologia Neotestamentaria* 2 (1989): 23–40.

<sup>108</sup> M. Weinfeld, *The Organizational Pattern and the Penal Code of the Qumran Sect: A Comparison with Guilds and Religious Associations of the Hellenistic-Roman Period* (NTOA 2; Freiburg: Editions Universitaires Fribourg Suisse, 1986), 38–41 (see also 74–76).

<sup>109</sup> "And reprove one another not in wrath but in peace as you find in the Gospel, and let none speak with any who has done a wrong to his neighbour, nor let him hear a word from you until he repents" (K. Lake, *The Apostolic Fathers* [LCL; London: Heinemann, 1912], 1:331; cf. also *Didache* 14:2 [ibid., 1:331]). Although the text of 15:3 refers to "the Gospel" (perhaps Matt 18:15–17), the commandment to "reprove one another not in wrath" resembles 1QS 5:25 more than the wording of the Gospel; cf. W. Rordorf and A. Tuilier, *La doctrine des douze apôtres (Didache)* (Paris: Cerf, 1978), 194 n. 3. See more recently H. van der Sandt and D. Flusser, *The Didache: Its Jewish Sources and Its Place in Early Judaism and Christianity* (Assen: Van Gorcum, 2002), 49–50, 352. It should be noted in this context that while the *Didache* as we have it refers to interpersonal matters, a similar rule cited by Pseudo-Cyprian from "the Doctrine of the Apostles" (Rordorf and Tuilier, *La doctrine*, 194 n. 4) refers to sin and disobedience to the Law.

<sup>110</sup> Cf. Kugel, *In Potiphar's House*, 214–18.

[7]<sup>111</sup> applies to offenses against God's Law;<sup>112</sup> the duty of reproof in such a case is considered (if the reconstruction suggested above is accepted) to supersede any interpersonal considerations. The reproof for *either* type of sin underlies the procedure of **CD1** (especially [2.B]).

But then another problem arises: is reproof sufficient in such a case, when the Law was severely violated? This consideration would almost necessarily lead to an emphasis on the *judicial* dimension of reproof (especially in a closed community):<sup>113</sup> the procedure is considered obligatory; "reproof" and informing the sinner become a single act in **CD2**.<sup>114</sup>

Taking reproof in Lev 19:17 as applying to "sin" in general, rather than specifically to "sin against one's fellow," is the most important factor in the development of the law of reproof. Such an expansion of the issue can easily be recognized in Matt 18:15, where some manuscripts read "sin against you," whereas others read only "sin."<sup>115</sup>

<sup>111</sup> This text is not necessarily sectarian.

<sup>112</sup> Cf. also להוכיח פושעים (4Q418 222 3).

<sup>113</sup> Kugel writes: "where might these two very different understandings of our verse have come from? . . . The answer lies in the overall context of our verse. . . . The judicial approach . . . takes the opening sentence, 'You shall not do injustice in judgment' [Lev 19:15] as establishing a *judicial setting* for everything that follows" (*In Potiphar's House*, 229–31, Kugel's emphasis). He is followed by Shemesh, "Rebuke," 152, who adds: "The main principle shared [by the Dead Sea sect and rabbinic halakhah—M.K.] is the understanding of the biblical term 'edut (עדות) as implying . . . an element of warning. In order to fulfill both functions of 'edut the sect establishes a legal procedure [according to which] testimony functions simultaneously as a rebuke for a past transgression and [against] a repetition of the act in the future" (153, quoted from the English abstract). To my mind, by far the most important factor (if not the only one) is the inner exegetical-theological rationale suggested above. I maintain that the intrinsic dynamic of legal thinking played the major role in the emergence of the new approach in **CD2**, although other elements could have contributed to this.

<sup>114</sup> Another aspect of this distinction is the prohibition of hating one's brother. Reproof is basically an antidote to hatred (Lev 19:17). But hatred of the wicked (cf. Ps 139:21) was surely demanded in Second Temple Judaism. How could one, then, perceive violations of the Law (either "moral," such as murder and adultery, or "ritual") by his fellow, without hating the wrongdoer *in his heart*? An answer to this problem was given through the "judicial" concept of reproof: after reproofing his fellow and informing the authorities as a part of a judicial process, hatred can be removed from a single witness's heart. The rabbis, on the other hand, strictly forbade accepting the testimony of a single witness (and even punished the informer); thus, Rav taught that if one is a single witness of adultery, he may hate the sinner: although his testimony is not valid, he knows definitely that his fellow is a sinner (*b. Pesah. 113b*). It is revealing to see the interplay between these two similar exegetical systems and two legal rulings ("do not hate your brother" and the status of a single testimony), even without assuming that the rabbinic saying is reacting to the sectarian system (a possibility that cannot be ruled out).

<sup>115</sup> For the textual problem in Matthew see, e.g., B. M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (3d ed.; London: United Bible Societies, 1971), 45.



From this point of view, it seems that the different readings of Jesus' saying are related to ancient interpretations of Lev 19:17, and thus illuminate the ambiguous wording of the *Serekh* and **CD1**. The originality of the phrasing "sin *against you*" in Jesus' saying is proved by the clause "between you and him" in Matt 18:15 and by the context in Luke 17:4.<sup>116</sup> This is also confirmed by the parallels (*T. Gad* 6:3, *y. Yoma* 8:9 [45c]; cf. also *Didache* 15:3).<sup>117</sup> When seen from this perspective, Matt 18:15–17 may be taken as representing a purely interpersonal statute,<sup>118</sup> much of whose coloring was changed in the sectarian parallels (especially in the *Serekh* and **CD1**). The entirely interpersonal procedure (cf. Samuel's statement) became an entirely judicial procedure in **CD2**.

Sin in **CD2** is defined as transgression against the Torah. **CD2** deals with a case in which the one who reproves is the only witness of the sin, and he must reprove his fellow member in the presence of the *mebaqqer*; reproving and informing the authorities by testifying against the transgression are thus combined into a single act. The procedure outlined here is entirely different from the one in Matthew, and probably also from its cognates in the *Serekh* and **CD1**, where "witnesses," in the plural, are mentioned; where these are witnesses of the reproof, rather than of the sin itself; and where the charge is brought before the congregation rather than before the *mebaqqer*.<sup>119</sup> On the other hand,

<sup>116</sup> Similarly Davies and Allison, *Critical and Exegetical Commentary*, 2:782 n. 3. See also J. M. Baver, "Si peccaverit in te frater tuus... Mt. 18, 15," *Estudios Biblicos* 12 (1953): 195–98; H. van Vliet, *No Single Testimony: A Study on the Adoption of Deut 19:15 Par. into the New Testament* (STRT 4; Utrecht: Kemink & Zoon, 1958), 159 n. 864. A possible legal argument would be that the offended person himself cannot be a witness ("take with you one or two"; thus van Vliet, *No Single Testimony*, 87). The answer to this argument is that Matt 18:16 reflects a more lenient ruling, according to which those possible witnesses who have interest in the result of the testimony (נוגעים בעדותם) can be one of the two witnesses demanded by the Law, at least in some matters. A similar halakhah is apparently reflected in John 8:13–17. Although the words "against you" in Luke 17:3 are omitted in many manuscripts, I am convinced that they are original at least in the *tradition* reflected in both Luke and Matthew, and that Luke 17:3–4 deals with the same problem.

<sup>117</sup> Some commentators assume that the original text of Matthew did not include the words "against you"; thus, for instance, Carmody, "Matt 18:15–17," especially 150 n. 32 (see also Baver, "Si peccaverit"). On the other hand, Kugel (*In Potiphar's House*, 225) does not mention the reading without the words "against you" in Matthew (and Luke).

<sup>118</sup> It is not to be regarded as a conflation of the two distinct approaches (thus Kugel, *In Potiphar's House*, 225).

<sup>119</sup> These two distinct procedures were not differentiated in the discussions of Schiffman (*Sectarian Law*, 89–109) and Shemesh, "Rebuke," 152 n. 12; 167. Milikowsky has

there is no demand in the *Serekh* and **CD1** to bring a charge against the wrongdoer. According to the fragmentary text [4], which is closely related to the *Serekh* and **CD1**, the aim of the reproof is “to purify one’s deeds,” not to prove one guilty (if the sin is repeated), as it is in **CD2**. The concept of pure “judicial reproof” occurs, then, in **CD2**, whereas the other sources are modifications of the interpersonal concept of reproof.<sup>120</sup> The laws of the *Damascus Document*, then, include two rulings (stemming from two *sources* or two *layers* of tradition) with rather different attitudes.<sup>121</sup>

It seems that, according to Matthew, a reproved person is obligated to accept reproof and ask for forgiveness. The possibility of denying the accusation, or even of bringing a counter-accusation, is not conceivable in Matthew (unlike *T. Gad* 6:3–4; see above). Clearly, the assumption is that the members of the community must receive reproof without any argument. The ideological basis for such a code of behavior is given in *4QInstruction* [6].<sup>122</sup>

In Luke the text concerning reproof continues: “and if he sins against you seven times in the day, and turns to you seven times and says, ‘I repent,’ you must forgive him,” whereas in Matthew, Peter asks Jesus: “Lord, how often shall my brother sin against me and I forgive him? As many as seven times?” and Jesus answers: “I do not say to you seven times, but seventy-seven times.” This is reminiscent of the exegetical midrashic deduction from the employment of tautological infinitive in the Bible. The *Sifra* (to Lev 19:17) deduces from the repetition of the words *hokheah tokhiaḥ* that one has to reprove “four and five times.” This exegetical principle occurs elsewhere in tannaitic halakhic

---

hesitantly suggested distinguishing between them: “Are they [CD 9:2–8, CD 9:16–23-M.K.] dealing with different formal procedures, even though the language used is so similar? I do not know”; see C. Milikowsky, “Law at Qumran: A Critical Reaction to Lawrence H. Schiffman, *Sectarian Law in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Courts, Testimony and the Penal Code*,” *RevQ* 12 (1985/1986): 243–44.

<sup>120</sup> My category of “judicial reproof” (occurring, so I argue, only in **CD2**) as opposed to the category of “interpersonal-ethical reproof” is somewhat different from the categories suggested by Kugel. He does not deal at all with **CD2**, and his analysis of the sources reaches different conclusions.

<sup>121</sup> Probably these procedures were practiced simultaneously, at least for some time; perhaps they were conceived of as two kinds of reproof. Another kind of reproof practiced in Qumran is against behavior that is neither a specific personal offense nor an action with legal consequences (above, n. 92).

<sup>122</sup> See also 1QS 6:25–26.

midrashim that come from Rabbi Aqiva's circle, where it is deduced (from the doubling of the verb and the infinitive) "even a hundred times."<sup>123</sup> To be sure, this method of deduction from the repetition of words apparently existed prior to Rabbi Aqiva: this Semitic syntactical structure is rendered literarily in the Septuagint, and Philo explains one such case in a manner similar to Rabbi Aqiva.<sup>124</sup>

It is plausible, then, that this saying of Jesus on forgiveness was originally a direct continuation of the reproof saying (as in Luke 17:3-4),<sup>125</sup> implying an unlimited number of reproof and forgiveness procedures. In light of the rabbinic parallels, the saying might be a midrash on the tautological infinitive הוֹכַח תּוֹכִיחַ.

In concluding this part of the article, let me recapitulate. Basically, reproof of an offender belongs to the realm of interpersonal relationships, and is closely related to the forgiveness of the offended person. In several Qumranic texts, however, the procedure of reproof takes on a judicial dimension, while in other Qumranic texts it becomes a totally judicial procedure. I tried to demonstrate this shift from the interpersonal to the judicial realm, as well as the transformation of the notion of "reproof" as developed in Matthew and in two distinct layers in CD, and to explain its reason. The passage in Matthew, which represents the earliest purely interpersonal reproof procedure, enables us to better envisage the more complex system at Qumran as alluded to in the *Serekh* and CD1.<sup>126</sup> Moreover, it seems that the procedure as it is described in Matthew forms the link between the Qumranic pro-

<sup>123</sup> *Sifre Deut.* #116 (on פתח תפתח, Deut 15:8); *Sifre Deut.* #117 (גתון תתון, Deut 15:10); *Sifre Deut.* #119 (on הענק תעניק, Deut 15:14); *t. Baba Meši'a* 2:24 (on הקם תקים Deut 22:4; cf. *Sifre Deut.* #225: "five times"). Compare the *Sifra* on Lev 19:17: הוֹכַח תּוֹכִיחַ "four or five times"). It is perhaps worthwhile to note that whereas *t. Baba Meši'a* reads מאה פעמים "one hundred times"; a parallel source (*y. Baba Meši'a* 2:10 [8d]) reads מֵאָה פְּעָמִים בַּיּוֹם "one hundred times in the day"; compare "seven times in the day" in Luke!

<sup>124</sup> S. Belkin, "Some Obscure Traditions Mutually Clarified in Philo and Rabbinic Literature," *The Seventy-fifth Anniversary Volume of JQR* (1967): 93-96; idem, "Midrash Questions and Answers to Genesis and Exodus and its Relation to the Palestinian Midrash," *Horev* 14-15 (1960): 30-33 (Hebrew).

<sup>125</sup> Taking Luke 17:3-4 as dealing originally with one case, a personal offense committed by a fellow.

<sup>126</sup> The variant readings "sins against you" vs. "sins" in the text of Matt 18:15 and Luke 17:3-4 point us to a shift from a procedure of interpersonal rebuke to a more general process, a shift that we also noted in the Qumran documents.

cedure of reproof and the rabbinic process of asking for forgiveness, according to *y. Yoma* 8:9.

#### CONCLUSION

In both parts of the present article we have seen that a variety of sources should be employed for the elucidation of sayings attributed to Jesus. In the first part, we saw that texts from Qumran shed light on the ideological and exegetical premises of Jesus' saying concerning divorce, as well as its wording; the Qumranic element, however, should not be studied in isolation from other texts, e.g., Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, rabbinic and Samaritan texts. In the second part, although "Qumranic" passages are the closest parallels to reproof as described in Matthew, rabbinic sources are also essential to properly understanding the Matthean procedure. On the other hand, the Gospel passages are important for the study of Qumranic and rabbinic sources. Usually, and for good reasons, we seek to understand the Jewish background of the New Testament. It is not rare, however, that a passage in the Gospels supplies us with valuable evidence for the Jewish background of the Jewish texts that have come down to us.



EXEGETICAL PATTERNS COMMON TO THE DEAD SEA  
SCROLLS AND THE NEW TESTAMENT, AND  
THEIR IMPLICATIONS

SERGE RUZER

*The Hebrew University of Jerusalem*

I have recently discussed two telling instances of parallel patterns of biblical exegesis in the New Testament and the Dead Sea Scrolls: the double love command in Matt 22:34–40 (cf. Mark 12:28–31; Luke 10:25–28) and 1QS 1:1–12; and the exegesis of Amos 9:11–12 in Acts 15:13–21 and 4QFlorilegium 1:10–13.<sup>1</sup> In both cases, I argued that the two disparate sets of writings used common underlying exegetical patterns, even though the particular religious ideas to which the biblical interpretation is tailored in each case differ and sometimes even stand in sharp opposition. I further suggested that, rather than indicating direct influence, the appearance of these basic patterns in both the Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament indicates their broad circulation in the first century CE. In the present article I will continue the previously tested line of investigation and discuss an additional set of common exegetical patterns that may be discerned in Qumran texts and the New Testament—namely, those surrounding the issues of adultery, divorce and remarriage. Focusing on the meaning and implications of existing parallels, I will tentatively probe a not too obvious avenue of the relevance of the New Testament for better understanding Qumranic exegetical tendencies, as well as those of wider Jewish circulation.

I will start by briefly summarizing the preceding stages of this study, mentioned above. I have suggested that the opening paragraph of the

---

<sup>1</sup> See S. Ruzer, “The Double Love Precept in the New Testament and the *Rule of the Community*,” *Tarbiz* 71 (2002): 353–70 (Hebrew); the article has since appeared in English: “The Double Love Precept in the New Testament and the *Community Rule*,” in *Jesus’ Last Week* (ed. R. S. Notley, M. Turnage, and B. Becker; Jewish and Christian Perspectives Series 11; Leiden: Brill, 2005), 81–106; in this essay, the references are to the English version. See also S. Ruzer, “Who Is Unhappy with the Davidic Messiah? Notes on Biblical Exegesis in 4Q161, 4Q174, and the Book of Acts,” *Cristianesimo nella storia* 24 (2003): 229–55.

*Rule of the Community*, like the famous Gospel discussion in Matt 22:34–40// Mark 12:28–31// Luke 10:25–28, puts forward an exegetically reworked coupling of Deut 6:5 and Lev 19:18 as the core principle of religious teaching.<sup>2</sup> It is worth noting, however, that the interpretation given to the two “love commands” in the *Rule* differs in significant details from that advocated by the Gospels. An obvious difference in the Gospels is the lack of reference to possessions, הון, as an interpretation of the third component of the call in Deut 6:5 to love God “with all your might” (בכָּל מְאֹדֶךָ)—a dissimilarity in exegesis that may be plausibly connected to dissimilarity in social circumstances.<sup>3</sup> There is another no less important difference: taking into account the parable of the good Samaritan recorded in Luke’s version of the discourse (Luke 10:29–37), as well as the Sermon on the Mount, (Matt 5:43–48; cf. Luke 6:27–36), one may conclude that the exegesis of Lev 19:18 attributed to Jesus in the Gospels stands in sharp opposition to the admonition to hate outsiders found in the Qumranic passage in question.<sup>4</sup>

Owing to the differing directions of interpretation found in the *Rule* and the Gospels, there is apparently no particular reason for speaking about direct influence. However, despite all the differences in exegesis and rulings, both traditions seem to make use of a common basic exegetical structure. Hermeneutical reliance on the pair of love precepts from Deut 6:5 and Lev 19:18 is evidenced in both the *Rule* and the Gospels. In both traditions, the double love command is presented as a summation of the Torah of Moses (specifically “the law and the prophets,” in both Matthew and the *Rule*). In my opinion, the fact that both the *Rule* and the Gospels adopt the same hermeneutical pattern

<sup>2</sup> See Ruzer, “Double Love Precept.”

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Acts 4:32, where the social context does invite the community-of-goods-centered interpretation. See B. Gerhardsson, “Einige Bemerkungen zu Apg 4:32,” in idem, *The Shema in the New Testament: Deuteronomy 6:4–5 in Significant Passages* (Lund: Novapress, 1996), 239–46.

<sup>4</sup> IQS 1:9–11. On the attitudes of various sects in Second Temple Judaism towards outsiders, expressed, inter alia, through the interpretation of the concept of רֵעַ, friend or other, see D. Flusser, “Perushim, zeduqim we-isiim be-pesher Nahum,” in idem, *Judaism of the Second Temple Period: Qumran and Apocalypticism* (ed. S. Ruzer; Jerusalem: The Hebrew University Magnes Press and Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi, 2002), 201. For a comparison with philosophical schools in the Hellenistic world, see D. Flusser, “Ha-perushim we-haside ha-sto’ah lefi Yosefus,” in idem, *Judaism of the Second Temple Period: Sages and Literature* (ed. S. Ruzer; Jerusalem: The Hebrew University Magnes Press and Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi, 2002), 210–21, esp. 216. The emphasis on sharing one’s wealth also characterizes a number of Gospel traditions, e.g., Matt 19:16–24—without the exegetical link to Deut 6:5.

and that the latter is presented in the Gospels as a point of *agreement* between Jesus and the Pharisees<sup>5</sup> points to its broad circulation at the end of the Second Temple period. We seem to be dealing here with a common basic exegetical tradition shared by sometimes quite disparate groups, among them the early sages and the members of the Qumran community.<sup>6</sup> The opening paragraph of the *Rule*, with its pre-Christian dating, provides a clear indication of the existence of this type of exegetical pattern prior to Jesus.

As noted, the substantial dissimilarities in outlook among these groups found their expression in the different directions towards which each of them developed that basic hermeneutical pattern. It is of interest, however, that alongside the substantial divergences in exegesis, there is overlap in certain details; in fact, I suggest that the Gospel interpretation of the third component of the love command from Deut 6:5 (διόνοια, mind) is better understood in light of the exegesis found in Qumran.<sup>7</sup>

I have also analyzed the exegesis of Amos 9:11–12 (restoration of the “booth of David”) suggested in Acts 15:13–21 (James’s speech) and 4Q*Florilegium* 1:10–13.<sup>8</sup> The interpretation attested in Acts may be characterized as a polemical combination and reworking of exegetical traditions relating to a standard proof-text for messianic exegesis. A Davidic Messiah-centered interpretation is adopted in Acts; however, not unlike the direction taken by Qumranic *peshet*, the emphasis is shifted away from the triumph of the kingly Messiah.<sup>9</sup> The objective in Acts is different, however: not to introduce, as in the Qumran text, a competing messianic figure of priestly descent, but to substitute the gentiles’ “search for God” for Amos’s projection of the rule of a Davidic Messiah over the nations. The link between the “booth of David” and

---

<sup>5</sup> See discussion in Ruzer, “Double Love Precept.”

<sup>6</sup> By broad circulation I do not mean that this was the only way of thinking about the issue: cf. Philo (*Spec. Laws* 2.63), who defines the “two most especially important heads of all the innumerable particular lessons and doctrines” in relation not to Lev 19:18 and Deut 6:5, but to the Decalogue.

<sup>7</sup> See Ruzer, “Double Love Precept,” 91–94, 105–6.

<sup>8</sup> See discussion in Ruzer, “Who Is Unhappy.”

<sup>9</sup> See C. K. Barrett, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994), 726. For a discussion of the possible relation of James’ speech to Qumranic ideas, see R. Riesner, “James’ Speech (Acts 15:13–21), Simeon’s Hymn (Luke 2:29–32), and Luke’s Sources,” in *Jesus of Nazareth: Lord and Christ. Essays on the Historical Jesus and New Testament Christology* (ed. J. B. Green and M. Turner; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994), 276–77.



the (interpretation of the) Torah, attested in 4Q*Florilegium*, also undergoes a polemical reevaluation in James's speech: it is not exclusively via accepting the Torah, which is preached in all the synagogues of the Diaspora, but rather via the Gentiles' "turning to the God of Israel" that the "booth of David" is restored.<sup>10</sup>

The expectation of a Davidic Messiah clearly constituted a part of the broader spectrum of the Second Temple Judaism messianic beliefs.<sup>11</sup> In eschatologically oriented groups like Qumran or nascent Christianity, this engendered a problematic situation. On the one hand, the biblical books containing the prooftexts for the Davidic Messiah enjoyed in these groups the sacred status of Holy Writ; the corresponding exegetical traditions, e.g., the link between the "booth of David" and Torah study, could not simply be ignored. On the other hand, the salvation scenario developed around the Davidic Messiah was not an entirely comfortable fit for the priestly-oriented Qumran group, nor for the type of eschatological reality experienced by the nascent Jesus movement—that is, a reality in which the restoration of Israel's Davidic kingdom was visibly lacking. Therefore, each of these communities developed its own polemically flavored brand of exegesis, which was supposed to alleviate the problem. Here again, despite differences in direction, the traditions in question seem to rely on and make use of common exegetical patterns.

\* \* \*

I will now turn to a different exegetical problem, addressed in several places in the New Testament, as well as in CD-A 4:15–5:2: teasing out the proper attitude to marriage and divorce in the context of the eschatological outlooks reflected in these texts. Here, too, I will attempt to distinguish between the characteristic features of either Qumran or nascent Christian exegesis, on the one hand, and the exegetical patterns common to a variety of Second Temple Jewish groups, on the other.

<sup>10</sup> Cf. R. Bauckham, "James and the Gentiles (Acts 15.13–21)," in *History, Literature, and Society in the Book of Acts* (ed. B. Witherington; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 164–66, who suggests that the "booth of David" is interpreted in Acts 15—not unlike *miqdash adam* in 4Q*Florilegium*—as "the eschatological people of God, compounded of both Jews and Gentiles." According to Bauckham, this interpretation of Amos 9:12 may go back to the days of the Jerusalem Church.

<sup>11</sup> See, for example, D. Flusser, "Hishtaqfut emunot meshihiyot yehudiyot ba-nazrut ha-qeduma," *Judaism in the Second Temple Period: Sages*, 246–77; J. J. Collins, *The Scepter and the Star: The Messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Ancient Literature* (New York: Doubleday, 1995), 75–77. For additional references, see Ruzer, "Who is Unhappy," 229 nn. 1 and 2.

To that end, relevant instances of early rabbinic exegesis will be taken into consideration.

#### MATTHEW 19/MARK 10 AND THE DAMASCUS DOCUMENT

Lust, adultery, and divorce are bound together in the discourse on the commandment, "You shall not commit adultery" (Exod 20:13) in the Sermon on the Mount (Matt 5:27–32). In Matt 19:3–9 the issue of adultery (in connection with divorce) is addressed again but from a different exegetical angle:<sup>12</sup>

(3) And Pharisees came up to him and tested him by asking, "Is it lawful to divorce one's wife for any cause?" (4) He answered, "Have you not read that he who made them from the beginning made them male and female, (5) and said, 'For this reason a man shall leave his father and mother and be joined to his wife, and the two shall become one flesh'? (6) So they are no longer two but one flesh. What therefore God has joined together, let not man put asunder." (7) They said to him, "Why then did Moses command one to give a certificate of divorce, and to put her away?" (8) He said to them, "For your hardness of heart Moses allowed you to divorce your wives, but from the beginning it was not so. (9) And I say to you: whoever divorces his wife, except for unchastity, and marries another, commits adultery."

Early Jewish and Christian traditions presented idolatry and lust as the two basic expressions of the evil impulse; additionally, in a number of sources dating from the late Second Temple period and further on, idolatry was presented as having become obsolete.<sup>13</sup> Lust therefore came to be portrayed as the main outlet of the evil impulse—or rather as one of the limited number of "cardinal sins" constituting a major danger to the covenant. Such is the assessment attested in a number of later rabbinic

<sup>12</sup> The translation of biblical and New Testament passages used throughout this paper is that of the RSV. The tradition attested in Mark 10:2–12 is usually seen as the source of the Matthean version, thus it may be surmised that the Matthean redactor, mindful of the precedent in the Sermon on the Mount, inserted the ruling from Matt 5:32 into the later episode (Matt 19:9). See W. D. Davies and D. C. Allison, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to Saint Matthew* (3 vols.; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988–1997), 3:8–18.

<sup>13</sup> See S. Ruzer, "The Seat of Sin in Early Jewish and Christian Sources," in *Transforming the Inner Self in Ancient Religions* (ed. J. Assman and G. G. Stroumsa; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 367–91.

sources; and this seems also to be the stance of both Luke (16:12–18)<sup>14</sup> and the *Damascus Document* (CD-A 4:14–21, cf. 6Q15 1):<sup>15</sup>

... פשרו שלושת מצודות בליעל אשר אמר עליהם לוי בן יעקב אשר הוא תפש בהם בישראל ויתנם פניהם לשלושת מיני הצדק הראשונה היא הזנות השניה ההין השלישית טמא המקדש העולה מזה יתפש בזה והניצל מזה יתפש בזה בוני החיץ. . . הם ניתפשים בשתים בזנות לקחת שתי נשים בחייהם ויסוד הבריאה זכר ונקבה ברא אותם

(14) Its explanation: (15) They are Belial's three nets about which Levi, son of Jacob spoke, (16) in which he catches Israel and makes them appear before them like three types of (17) justice. The first is fornication; the second, wealth; the third, defilement of the temple. (18) He who eludes one is caught in another and he who is freed from that, is caught (19) in another. *Blank* The builders of the wall... (20) are caught twice in fornication: by taking (21) two wives in their lives, even though the principle of creation is "Male and female he created them." (Gen 1:27)<sup>16</sup>

The perception attested in Qumran, according to which the prohibition of adultery—understood in the *Damascus Document* in a rather peculiar sense—and other immoral behavior represents Torah prohibitions in general,<sup>17</sup> may indicate the centrality of the issue in a broader social context. And this in turn may inform our appraisal of the fact that the issue is repeatedly addressed not only in the Gospel passages mentioned above but also elsewhere in the New Testament.<sup>18</sup> It should also be noted that the pairing of lust/fornication with greed as another of Satan's

<sup>14</sup> "The Pharisees, who were lovers of money, heard all this, and they scoffed at him. But he said to them, 'You are those who justify yourselves before men, but God knows your hearts; for what is exalted among men is an abomination in the sight of God. The law and the prophets were until John; since then the good news of the kingdom of God is preached, and every one enters it violently. But it is easier for heaven and earth to pass away, than for one dot of the law to become void. Every one who divorces his wife and marries another, commits adultery, and he who marries a woman divorced from her husband commits adultery.'"

<sup>15</sup> The text of CD-A is that given in *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* (ed. F. García Martínez and E. J. C. Tigchelaar; Leiden: Brill, 1997–1998). For 6Q15 1 see M. Baillet, J. T. Milik, and R. de Vaux, *Les 'petites grottes' de Qumran* (DJD 3; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962), 128–31. In both Luke and the *Damascus Document* lust is coupled with greed as the major temptations that ensnare human beings. The addition of "defiling the Temple" (CD-A 4:18) is characteristic of Qumran community concerns. Cf. the addition of "idolatry" and a number of other negative behaviors in Paul's address to a Gentile audience in 1 Cor 6:9–10.

<sup>16</sup> Translation of the scrolls here and throughout the paper is indebted to *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated* (ed. F. García Martínez; trans. W. G. E. Watson; Leiden: Brill, 1994).

<sup>17</sup> See CD-A 7:6–9; 16:10–12.

<sup>18</sup> See Romans 7; 1 Corinthians 6; 1 Thessalonians 4.

snare, found in the invective of CD-A 4:15–19, likewise characterizes the Gospel section in question (Mark 10:17–31; Matt 19:16–30), as well as additional New Testament passages and some later rabbinic elaborations on the theme.<sup>19</sup> The appearance of this combination in Qumran and the New Testament indicates its broad circulation already in the Second Temple period, whereas the specifics of the application may be attributed to the differences in social context.

The exact halakhic intentions of both the Qumranic and Gospel passages in question have been thoroughly discussed in research.<sup>20</sup> I will focus on general observations on the nature of the exegetical patterns employed in each source, an issue which has not previously received much attention; and then I will consider possible implications for solving the halakhic conundrum.

#### MARRIAGE AND ESCHATOLOGY

First, it should be noted that the discussion in Matthew 19 (and Mark 10) is linked to the key theme of the Gospel—namely, the Kingdom of Heaven/of God. Flusser suggested that Jesus' Kingdom of Heaven held the intermediary position in the overall redemption scenario between the "covenantal past" and the *eschaton* of the last judgment;<sup>21</sup> and the passage from Matthew 19 may provide a useful test case for Flusser's thesis. My interpretation of the structure of the chapter is that the function of the episode with the little children brought to Jesus (Matt 19:13–15)<sup>22</sup> is to ameliorate the preceding sayings on eunuchs: although those "who have

<sup>19</sup> See Ruzer, "Seat of Sin." See also S. Ruzer, "The Death Motif in Late Antique Jewish Teshuva Narrative Patterns and in Paul's Thought," in *Transforming the Inner Self*, 151–65.

<sup>20</sup> See, for example, A. Schremer, "Qumran Polemic on Marital Law: CD 4:20–5:11 and Its Social Background," in *The Damascus Document: A Centennial of Discovery. Proceedings of the Third International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 4–8 February 1998* (ed. J. M. Baumgarten, E. G. Chazon, and A. Pinnick; STDJ 34; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 147–60; J. A. Fitzmyer, *To Advance the Gospel* (2d ed.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 83. See also M. Kister's essay in this volume.

<sup>21</sup> See D. Flusser, "The Stages of Redemption History According to John the Baptist and Jesus," in idem, *Jesus* (with the collaboration of R. S. Notley; 3d ed.; Jerusalem: The Hebrew University Magnes Press, 2001), 258–75.

<sup>22</sup> "Then children were brought to him that he might lay his hands on them and pray. The disciples rebuked the people; but Jesus said, 'Let the children come to me, and do not hinder them; for to such belongs the kingdom of heaven.' And he laid his hands on them and went away."

made themselves eunuchs for the sake of the kingdom of heaven” (Matt 19:12) are to be duly appreciated, this does not mean the rejection of marriage and childbearing. Moreover, if we take a cue from Matt 18:3<sup>23</sup> and similar sayings, it may be gleaned from our passage that children are accepted into the kingdom on account of some precious qualities supposedly pertaining to childhood, and *not* because the apocalyptic end of time is due to arrive within their lifetime. Flusser’s suggestion, then, sits well with the Gospel section under discussion.

A comparison with 1 Corinthians 7 will be instructive here: Paul’s advice against remarriage is put forward in that context as deriving not only from the needs of the “intermediate phase,” needs that in fact pertain to every time and every period,<sup>24</sup> but also from acute expectation of the imminent end (1 Cor 7:26, 29):

I think that in view of the present distress it is well for a person to remain as he is . . . I mean, brethren, the appointed time has grown very short; from now on, let those who have wives live as though they had none.

The New Testament treatment of the issue of marriage is thus characterized by a variety of both attitudes and arguments employed for their backing. Moreover, one may discern here a certain fluctuation in the meaning of the motif from a basically noneschatological sense to an eschatological one. Was the latter sense inherited or introduced by Paul? Paul himself finds it necessary to stress that this interpretation is the fruit of his own contemplation.<sup>25</sup> Whatever the case, the core motif of Paul’s elaboration is explicitly stated at the very beginning: “Now concerning the matters about which you wrote. It is well for a man not to touch a woman” (1 Cor 7:1). It is instructive that Jesus’ appraisal of marriage, as represented in the less eschatologically charged Matt 19:1–15, is definitely more positive.

---

<sup>23</sup> “And said: ‘Truly, I say to you, unless you turn and become like children, you will never enter the kingdom of heaven. Whoever humbles himself like this child, he is the greatest in the kingdom of heaven.’”

<sup>24</sup> 1 Cor 7:32–35: “I want you to be free from anxieties. The unmarried man is anxious about the affairs of the Lord, how to please the Lord; but the married man is anxious about worldly affairs, how to please his wife, and his interests are divided. And the unmarried woman or girl is anxious about the affairs of the Lord, how to be holy in body and spirit; but the married woman is anxious about worldly affairs, how to please her husband. I say this for your own benefit, not to lay any restraint upon you, but to promote good order and to secure your undivided devotion to the Lord.”

<sup>25</sup> 1 Cor 7:25, 40.

The Dead Sea Scrolls represent, not a uniform “sectarian” perspective on the end times, but a diversity of eschatologically flavored religious outlooks.<sup>26</sup> Some of them are centered exclusively on the upcoming end of days, while others focus mainly on the interim period characterized by the more or less prolonged existence of the sect, governed by its rule and surrounded by the sons of darkness. The link between the acuteness of eschatological expectation and the stance on marriage and divorce, observed in the New Testament evidence, should prompt us to ask, what measure of eschatological tension, if any, should be ascribed to the CD-A 4:21 ruling on marital halakhah? Or, taking the same question from an opposite point: How should this ruling inform our appraisal of the *Damascus Document*’s overall eschatological stance? In this context, it should be noted that the discussion of marital halakhah in the *Damascus Document* is prefixed to the section dealing with the new eschatological interpretation of the Torah, pertaining to the (intermediary) “age of wickedness,” where “wicked” wealth and the defilement of the Temple, the other two “snares of Satan” are again considered.<sup>27</sup>

#### PATTERNS OF MIDRASHIC DISCOURSE

In the Sermon on the Mount (Matt 5:31–32), the discussion of the divorce issue is presented in relation to Deut 24:1.<sup>28</sup> It is not the validity of the Torah ordinance but conflicting interpretations of a difficult

<sup>26</sup> For one suggestion concerning the relationship between the CD community and that of Qumran, see S. Iwry, “The Exegetical Method of the Damascus Document Reconsidered,” in *Methods of Investigation of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Khirbet Qumran Site: Present Realities and Future Prospects* (ed. M. O. Wise et al.; New York: New York Academy of Sciences, 1994), 329–37.

<sup>27</sup> See CD-A 6:11–16 (cf. 4Q266 3 ii; 4Q267 2; 4Q269 4 ii; 6Q15 3, 4): “But all those who have been brought into the covenant (12) shall not enter the temple to kindle his altar in vain. They will be the ones who close (13) the door, as God said (Mal 1:10): ‘Whoever amongst you will close its door so that you do not kindle my altar (14) in vain!’ Unless they are careful to act in accordance with the exact interpretation of the law for the age of wickedness: to separate themselves (15) from the sons of the pit; to abstain from wicked wealth which defiles, either by promise or by vow, (16) and from the wealth of the temple and from stealing from the poor of the people, from making their widows their spoils.” For 4Q266 see J. M. Baumgarten, *The Damascus Document* (DJD 18; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), 29–93; for 4Q267 see DJD 18.95–113; for 4Q269 see DJD 18.123–36; for 6Q15 see Baillet, Milik, and de Vaux, DJD 3.128–31.

<sup>28</sup> “When a man takes a wife and marries her, if then she finds no favor in his eyes because he has found some indecency in her, and he writes her a bill of divorce and puts it in her hand and sends her out of his house, and she departs out of his house...”

expression (ערוות דבר) found in the biblical verse that constitutes the exegetical crux of the polemic in the Sermon.<sup>29</sup> In contradistinction, the same verse is presented in Matt 19:7–8 as an ad hoc regulation with a limited time span of application:<sup>30</sup>

They said to him, “Why then did Moses command one to give a certificate of divorce, and to put her away?” He said to them, “For your hardness of heart Moses allowed you to divorce your wives, but from the beginning it was not so.”

An analogous exegetical move tailored to serve the purpose of “adjusting God’s pronounced demands” to Israel’s *de facto* performance may be discerned in CD-A 5:1–5.<sup>31</sup> The urge to tackle the problem of this discrepancy seems to have been shared by those who appealed to the ideal state of affairs prevailing in the days of creation. However, the solution offered in CD-A 5 is a far cry from presenting Moses as adding on his own initiative regulations to the “initial Torah”; it rather ascribes the concealment of the Torah to the problematic nature of certain periods of history, such as that of David. This seems to reflect the *Damascus Document’s* programmatic stance, according to which the written Torah, the one the members of the group share with the rest of Israel, forever

---

<sup>29</sup> See Matt 5:31–32. It has long been recognized that the conflicting opinions represented here correspond to the positions of the School of Hillel and the School of Shammai as reported in *m. Git* 9:10—with Jesus siding with the latter; see, for example, P. Sigal, *The Halakah of Jesus of Nazareth* (Lanham, Md.: University Press of America, 1986), 21; Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 1:522–32, esp. 530. The position of the Sermon on the validity of the Torah is stated in Matt 5:18: “For truly I tell you, until heaven and earth pass away, not one letter, not one stroke of a letter, will pass from the Torah (law) until all is accomplished.” For recent discussion, see B. Schaller, “The Character and Function of the Antitheses in Matthew 5:21–48 in the Light of Rabbinical Exegetical Disputes,” in *The Sermon on the Mount and Its Jewish Setting* (ed. H.-J. Becker and S. Ruzer; Cahiers de la Revue biblique 60; Paris: Gabalda, 2005), 70–88; S. Ruzer, “Antitheses in Matthew 5: Midrashic Aspects of Exegetical Techniques,” in *ibid.*, 89–116. V. Noam has suggested (“Divorce in Qumran in Light of Early Halakhah,” *JJS* 56 [2005]: 218–19) that Jesus may in fact have represented here a *dominant* halakhic position of his time.

<sup>30</sup> For an extensive treatment of this issue in relation to exegetical techniques employed in the Sermon on the Mount, see Ruzer, “Antitheses,” 102–16.

<sup>31</sup> “. . . And about the prince it is written: (2) ‘He should not multiply wives to himself’ (Deut 17:17). However, David had not read the sealed book of the law which (3) was in the ark, for it had not been open in Israel since the day of the death of Eleazar (4) and of Jehoshua, and Joshua and the elders who worshipped Ashtaroth. One had hidden (5) the public (copy) until Zadok’s entry into office. . .”

retains its status, while in actuality it is reinterpreted according to the revelation of the new covenant.<sup>32</sup>

Yet the notion of ad hoc Torah regulation is attested in later rabbinical sources, and Philo already creates a tripartite division of the Torah material: God's words, Moses' own deliberation, and a mix of the two.<sup>33</sup> So, it is rather vis-à-vis these tendencies, not CD-A 5, that one must examine the "liberal" position with regard to the Holy Writ attested in our Gospel pericope.<sup>34</sup> In any case, it seems that in this instance also the reasoning of Matthew's Jesus was supposed to reflect an inherited exegetical pattern: no uproar or opposition is recorded by the Gospel writer, who is generally only too eager to report clashes with Pharisees.<sup>35</sup>

Beyond that "liberal" quality of the statement in Matt 19:7–8, verses 4–6 establish that for the core principles of marital union one has to look to the story of creation. This is one of the characteristic midrashic features discerned in traditions ascribed to the school of Shammai—the same school that Jesus sides with, against the opinion ascribed to the school of Hillel, on the issue of divorce in Matt 19:9 (and, before that, in Matt 5:32).<sup>36</sup> According to the Mishnah, the school of Shammai posits the story of creation as one that establishes the basic structure of marital relationships. Although the specific halakhic decision at which the Mishnah arrives here may characterize only Shammai (or some of

<sup>32</sup> See P. R. Davies, "The Judaism(s) of the *Damascus Document*," in Baumgarten, Chazon, and Pinnick, *Damascus Document*, 33–34.

<sup>33</sup> See Philo, *De Vita Mosis* 2.188–191; *y. Hor.* 1:8 (46b); *b. Sanh.* 75b, 80b; *b. 'Abod. Zar.* 24b; *b. Hor.* 6a; *b. Zebah.* 119b; cf. *m. Parah* 7:6, 7; *t. Nid.* 1:9.

<sup>34</sup> An illuminating prophetic precedent questioning the value of Deut 24:1 is discussed in M. Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985), 308–12. Fishbane shows that the oracle in Jer 3:1 is engaged in polemical reassessment of the tradition attested in Deut 24:1 (the oracle equates Deut 24:1's עֲרוֹת דְּבַר with adultery), albeit in *aggadic* rather than *halakhic* terms. As the result, the tradition "is transformed in relation to the addressee (the audience) and the goal or intent of the address itself." See also M. Fishbane, "Torah and Tradition," in *Tradition and Theology in the Old Testament* (ed. D. A. Knight; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977), 285. It should be noted, however, that the Gospel pericope in question gives no indication whatsoever that Jesus is functioning here as a prophetically inspired exegete—instead his interpretation is portrayed as a piece of regular exegesis.

<sup>35</sup> See the discussion in B. Repschinski, "Taking on the Elite: The Matthean Controversy Stories," in *Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1999), 1–23. See also Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:19.

<sup>36</sup> See *m. Git.* 4:5. The saying from Gen 1:28 is used here to create a halakhic midrash: procreation is a core element of the human being's heavenly sanctioned vocation; hence one should adopt a lenient attitude to allow for an additional marriage union.



his followers), the technique of using the creation story to define basic principles of marriage seems to represent a wider midrashic trend.

Let us take a closer look at Matt 19:4–6:

(4) He answered, “Have you not read that he who made them from the beginning made them male and female, (5) and said, ‘For this reason a man shall leave his father and mother and be joined to his wife, and the two shall become one flesh’? (6) So they are no longer two but one flesh. What therefore God has joined together, let not man put asunder.”

Here the argument is presented as a midrashic combination of Gen 1:27 and 2:24. A number of later rabbinical sources put Gen 2:24 to halakhic use with regard to problems pertaining to marriage,<sup>37</sup> whereas Gen 1:27 is mostly referred to in connection with the androgyne-centered notion of the first man’s nature.<sup>38</sup>

Hence the importance of the early evidence from CD-A 4:20–21, where Gen 1:27 is referred to, as in Matthew 19, in connection with marital halakhah.<sup>39</sup>

הם ניתפשים בשתים בזנות לקחת שתי נשים בחייהם ויסוד הבריאה זכר  
ונקבה ברא אותם

<sup>37</sup> For example, the following is an interpretation in *b. Sanh.* 58a: “For it has been taught: *Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother*: R. Eliezer said: His father means ‘his father’s sister’; his mother, ‘his mother’s sister.’” R. Akiba said: His father means ‘his father’s wife’; his mother is literally meant. *And he shall cleave*, but not to a male; to his wife, but not to his neighbor’s wife; *and they shall be as one flesh*, applying to those that can become one flesh, thus excluding cattle and beasts, which cannot become one flesh with man.” (here and throughout the paper, English translation of Talmudic passages is indebted to the Soncino edition).

<sup>38</sup> See, for example, *Gen. Rab.* 8:1, *Lev. Rab.* 14:1, *Ps. Rab.* 139. There is a marriage-centered midrash on Gen 1:27 in *b. Yebam.* 63a, where R. Eleazar refers to Gen 5:2 (=Gen 1:27): “Any man who has no wife is not a proper man (Adam) for it is said, ‘Male and female created He them and called their name Adam.’” It is worth noting, however, that this discussion as reported in the Talmud centers on encouragement to marry—seemingly detached from the call to procreate—not on the prevention of divorce and/or remarriage. I have discussed elsewhere the possibility that the compilers of the Old Syriac Gospels recognized the overtones of the androgyne motif in the Greek version of Matthew 19 (Mark 10) and tried to subdue them in the Syriac; see S. Ruzer, “The Reflections on Genesis 1–2 in the Old Syriac Gospels,” in *The Book of Genesis in Jewish and Oriental Christian Interpretation: A Collection of Essays* (ed. J. Frishman and L. Van Rompay; *Traditio exegetica Graeca* 5; Louvain: Peeters, 1997), 91–102.

<sup>39</sup> M. Kister, “Some Observations on Vocabulary and Style in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *Diggers at the Well: Proceedings of a Third International Symposium on the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Ben Sira* (ed. T. Muraoka and J. F. Elwolde; *STDJ* 36; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 157–58, even suggests that the corresponding descriptions of the initial ideal state of affairs in Matt 19:8 (ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς) and CD-A 4 (יסוד הבריאה) might have been derived from the same formula. See also his essay in this volume.

They... are caught twice in fornication: by taking two wives in their lives, even though the principle of creation is (Gen 1:27) "male and female he created them."

As noted, there has been much discussion concerning the exact meaning of this admonition. The text may be understood as permitting a second marriage after the death of the first wife.<sup>40</sup> Should we then suppose that the same position is taken by Matt 19:9 (absent in the Marcan parallel, which sounds like a total rejection of divorce and remarriage)? Some scholars, however, put forward strong arguments for the antibigamy (antipolygamy?) leaning of the CD passage.<sup>41</sup> I shall return to this basic problem later, but for now suffice it to say that while halakhic and non-halakhic decisions derived from the discussions of the marriage–divorce issue might differ from tradition to tradition, the appeal to Genesis 1–2 and, even more specifically, to Gen 1:27, is common to the New Testament and Qumran and thus seems to represent—in both traditions—an inherited, and hence early, midrashic feature.<sup>42</sup>

#### PRO- AND ANTIMARRIAGE STANCE

There is, however, a telling difference between the Gospel and the *Damascus Document* passages in their choices of the additional biblical proof-text. As noted earlier, the tradition ascribed to Jesus in Matt

<sup>40</sup> So Fitzmyer, *To Advance the Gospel*, 83, where he suggests reading the passage from CD-A 4 in light of 11Q<sup>Temp</sup> 57:15–19. See Y. Yadin, *The Temple Scroll* (3 vols.; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, The Institute of Archaeology of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, The Shrine of the Book, 1977 [Hebrew]; rev. English ed. 1983):

(15) ואשה לוא ישא מכול vacat לכול עצה חוץ מהמה

(16) בנות הגויים כי אם מבית אביהו יקח לו אשה

(17) ממשפחת אביהו ולוא יקח עליה אשה אחרת כי

(18) היא לבדה תהיה עמו כול ימי חייה ואם מתה ונשא

(19) לו אחרת מבית אביהו ממשפחתו ולוא יטה משפט

<sup>41</sup> See, for example, Schremer, "Qumran Polemic"; Noam, "Divorce in Qumran," 206–23.

<sup>42</sup> W. D. Davies, *The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1964), 252, presented certain isolated sayings of the Sermon as expressions of polemics against the Essenes. J. Kampen reaches the conclusion that "there are larger bodies of material in the Gospel of Matthew which reflect some debate with a viewpoint we find represented in the preserved writings of Qumran" ("A Reexamination of the Relationship between Matthew 5:21–48 and the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers* [ed. D. J. Lull; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990], 34–59, p. 58). Both Davies and Kampen, however, analyze primarily the ideas expressed and positions taken (hence "debate"), while the present study emphasizes the shared exegetical structures and presuppositions underlying the debate.

19:3–6 midrashically combines Gen 1:27 and 2:24, presenting marriage as the restoration of the ideal bond described in Gen 1:27. Let me stress again that this move indicates a high appraisal of marriage, including the aspect of physical intimacy (εἶσιν...μία σάρξ=“they are one flesh”), with emphatic reiteration: “so they are no longer two but one flesh.” CD instead picks up Gen 7:9 (“two and two, male and female, went into the ark with Noah”),<sup>43</sup> where the distinction between the sexes is kept intact with no “union in flesh” in sight.<sup>44</sup> Since the *Damascus Document* seems to perceive sexual intercourse as intrinsically unclean, connected with “lust” (זנות) and permitted only for procreation, with the possible implication that some or even a majority of group members do not marry at all,<sup>45</sup> this disregard of Gen 2:24 may be more than mere coincidence. It is worth noting that this frowning upon the “flesh” is not restricted to the *Damascus Document* but, rather, constitutes a highly visible feature of a number of Qumran texts of central importance that propagate a stance of “flesh–spirit” dualism.<sup>46</sup>

In this instance also, Paul’s stance is instructive:

Do you not know that your bodies are members of Christ? Shall I therefore take the members of Christ and make them members of a prostitute? Never! Do you know that he who joins himself to a prostitute becomes one body with her? For, as it is written, “The two shall become one flesh.” But he who is united to the Lord becomes one spirit with him. Shun immorality (πορνεία). Every other sin which a man commits is outside the body; but the immoral man sins against his own body. Do you not know that your body is a temple of the Holy Spirit within you, which you have from God?... So glorify God in your body. (1 Cor 6:15–20)

<sup>43</sup> CD-A 5:1: ובאי התבה שנים שנים באו אל התבה.

<sup>44</sup> The motif of Noah’s and his sons’ abstinence from sexual intercourse while on board the ark would feature prominently in rabbinic midrash and in early Syriac Christian exegesis. See N. Koltun-Fromm, “Aphrahat and the Rabbis on Noah’s Righteousness in Light of the Jewish-Christian Polemic,” in Frishman and Van Rompey, *The Book of Genesis*, 57–72.

<sup>45</sup> See Davies, “Judaism(s) of the *Damascus Document*,” 34.

<sup>46</sup> See, for example, D. Flusser, “Ha-dualism ‘basar-ruah’ bi-megilot midbar Yehuda u-va-berit ha-hadasha,” in idem *Judaism of the Second Temple Period: Qumran*, 244–51; idem, “The Dead Sea Scrolls and Pre-Pauline Christianity,” in idem, *Judaism and the Origins of Christianity* (Jerusalem: The Hebrew University Magnes Press, 1988), 23–74, esp. 60–74. See also S. Metso, “The Relationship between the *Damascus Document* and the *Community Rule*,” in Baumgarten, Chazon, and Pinnick, *Damascus Document*, 85–93; C. Hempel, “The Laws of the *Damascus Document* and 4QMMT,” in *ibid.*, 69–84. In his essay in the present volume, M. Kister discusses a text from Qumran, 4QInstruction (4Q416 2 iii 20–21–iv 10), that *does* refer to “oneness in flesh” with approval, though it is far from being presented there as “יסוד הבריאה.”

Hard to believe, but in his passionate admonition against lust and immoral behavior Paul applies Gen 2:24 to disgraceful intercourse with a prostitute! In rabbinic sources there is a tendency to glean from the creation account rules pertaining to the marital laws of the Gentiles.<sup>47</sup> It is possible to speculate to which extent Paul's reasoning here is influenced by the fact that the Epistle addresses a Gentile audience and/or is linked to an existing midrashic tradition. In fact, there is a tradition, attested in a later rabbinic source, that both applies Gen 2:24 to the Gentiles and interprets the ending of the verse ("and cleaves to his wife, and they become one flesh") as describing sexual relations with a prostitute!<sup>48</sup> Whatever the case, Paul, unlike Jesus in Matthew 19, understands Gen 2:24 as an etiological saying describing a pitiful state of affairs and not as God's commandment<sup>49</sup>—an illuminating indication of how far reservations concerning the "flesh" could go.

It should be emphasized that while in his complex argumentation Paul uses an explicitly christological motif of members of the community as "members of Christ" (1 Cor 6:15), the rest of his reasoning is not immediately connected to the messianic *kerygma*. It stands to reason that before being incorporated into Paul's Christology this "nonkerygmatic" section could have had an existence of its own. We can then combine the evidence from the Gospels, Qumran, and Pauline writings to reconstruct the eschatologically flavored segment of the variety of attitudes toward marriage and flesh; in this perspective the attitude attested in

<sup>47</sup> The ruling from *m. Git.* 4:5 mentioned above deals with "half-slave, half-freedman" and may reflect that tendency.

<sup>48</sup> *Gen. Rab.* 18:24 (ed. J. Theodor and C. Albeck; Berlin: n.p., 1903, 167): **ודבק באשתו: זונה שהיא עומדת בשוק ובאו עליה שנים, הראשון פטור והשני חייב משום שהיא בעולת בעל וכי נתכוון הראשון לקנותה בבעילה הדא אמר בעילה בבני נח קונה שלא כדת.**

"*And shall cleave unto his wife:* If a harlot was standing in the street and two men had intercourse with her, the first is not culpable while the second is, on account of the verse, 'Behold, thou shalt die...' for she has been possessed by a man (Gen 20:3). But did the first intend to acquire her through cohabitation? Hence this proves that cohabitation in the case of the Noachides acquires, though that is not in accordance with [Jewish] law." (English translation is according to the Soncino edition of *Genesis Rabbah* [1983])

<sup>49</sup> One may wonder what Paul's interpretation would be for the beginning of the verse: "Therefore a man leaves his father and his mother." Judging by the opposition between  $\acute{o}$  κολλώμενος τῆ πόρνη (v. 16) and  $\acute{o}$  κολλώμενος τῷ κυρίῳ (v. 17), Paul might have in mind that the "father" is God Himself. A similar interpretation of Gen 2:24, with the Holy Spirit representing "mother," was developed—either relying on 1 Corinthians 6 or independently—in the 4th century by Aphrahat. See Aphrahat, *Demonstrations* 18.10 (D. I. Parisot, *Patrologia Syriaca* 1 [Paris: Didot et socii, 1894], 840).

Matthew 19 should be seen as belonging to the moderate side, with Paul and Qumran far at the other end of the spectrum.

THE NEW TESTAMENT AND THE MARRIAGE HALAKHAH OF THE  
DAMASCUS DOCUMENT

Suggestions concerning the exact meaning of the problematic admonition in CD—that is, whether it is directed against polygamy, divorce, remarriage, or some combination of these—have been based either on the philological analysis of the passage (inter alia, attempts to solve the problem of the masculine plural suffix of **בַּחִיָּהִם** in CD-A 4:21) or on reading it in the context of Qumranic, or even more generally Jewish, halakhic tendencies.<sup>50</sup> The New Testament evidence has only rarely been recruited to elucidate the meaning of CD-A 4:21, and then rather hesitantly. Tom Holmén, however, did refer to 1 Corinthians 7 as indicating that a particular interpretation of **בַּחִיָּהִם**, and correspondingly of the *Damascus Document* admonition as a whole, is possible—namely, that, although remarriage is not rejected in principle, it is acceptable only after the ex-wife/husband has died. As he put it, although this kind of approach “may seem baffling to us, it cannot be regarded as impossible for the Qumranites. At least Paul seems to have cherished the same kind of opinions.”<sup>51</sup> The wording seems to express doubt as to how one should evaluate Paul’s reasoning here, and whether it primarily reflects the apostle’s peculiar *kerygmatic* stance, his agenda vis-à-vis the Gentile audience, or inherited patterns of Jewish religious thought. As I have already suggested, the bulk of Paul’s reasoning on the issue probably bears witness to existing patterns of exegesis; hence, to my mind, the evidence from 1 Corinthians may be used with more confidence in the discussion of CD stance.

I would also like to introduce additional New Testament evidence that, as far as I am aware, has not yet been considered in this context:

---

<sup>50</sup> In addition to the studies referred to above, see also T. Holmén, “Divorce in CD 4:20–5:2 and in 11QT 57:17–18: Some Remarks on the Pertinence of the Question,” *RevQ* 18 (1998): 397–408; J. Kampen, “A Fresh Look at the Masculine Plural Suffix in CD IV, 21,” *RevQ* 16 (1993): 91–97.

<sup>51</sup> Holmén, “Divorce in CD,” 401.

- (1) Do you not know, brethren—for I am speaking to those who know the law (Torah)—that the law is binding on a person only during his life? (2) Thus a married woman is bound by law to her husband as long as he lives; but if her husband dies she is discharged from the law concerning the husband. (3) Accordingly, she will be called an adulteress if she lives with another man while her husband is alive. But if her husband dies she is free from that law, and if she marries another man she is not an adulteress. (4) Likewise, my brethren, you have died to the law through the body of Christ, so that you may belong to another, to him who has been raised from the dead in order that we may bear fruit for God. (Rom 7:1–4)

There have been attempts, not completely convincing in my opinion, to interpret the whole chapter as exclusively addressed to a Gentile audience.<sup>52</sup> Whatever the case, however, the opening (“Do not you know, brethren, for I speak to them that know the law/Torah”) presents the argument that follows as imbedded in traditional Torah-centered teaching. There is no special reason in this case to dismiss the apostle’s words as sheer rhetoric—as a rule, Paul’s discourse is distinguished by a sharp differentiation between various types of truth: revealed, transmitted by a tradition, or attained in the process of the apostle’s own contemplation.<sup>53</sup>

I suggest that the line of Paul’s argument here also allows for a differentiation: while vv. 2–3 represent the inherited *thema*, v. 4 promotes the new christological *rhema*. What parameters of the inherited tradition underlying Rom 7:2–3 may be gleaned from the text? The passage discusses the possibility of severing the marital bonds and presents such a dissolution as unlawful except following the death of the spouse. It deserves notice that the spouse’s death and the remarriage that follows are presented in Paul’s peculiar context as a desired development!<sup>54</sup> The wording here is characterized by repeated use of the expression “while her husband is alive / in his (the man’s / husband’s) life” (τῷ ζῶντι ἀνδρί, ζῶντος τοῦ ἀνδρός), a close parallel to the enigmatic םה״חב from CD-A 4:21.<sup>55</sup>

How can the observed characteristics of this passage from Romans 7 inform our interpretation of CD-A 4 and vice versa? Paul’s switch from “a person” (ἀνθρώπου) in v. 1 to “a married woman” (ὑπανδρος γυνή)

<sup>52</sup> Most recently, see J. Gager, *Reinventing Paul* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 126–28.

<sup>53</sup> See, for example, 1 Corinthians 7, Galatians 1.

<sup>54</sup> Cf. the discussion in 1 Corinthians 7.

<sup>55</sup> Cf. 1 Cor 7:39.

in v. 2 may indicate that the inherited argument employed here could in principle be applied in both directions; so we can hardly derive from this passage a clear indication regarding the gender behind **בחייהם** of CD-A 4:21. It is certain, however, that the meaning of “in his life” in Paul’s epistle cannot be reduced to “all the time while they *live together* (are married)” — an interpretation of the CD ruling suggested by Ginzberg.<sup>56</sup> Hence, the evidence from Romans 7 does not work in favor of the interpretation of the *Damascus Document* prohibition as concerned exclusively with polygamy.

Neither the option of polygamy nor that of divorce may be seen as underlying Paul’s reasoning here — neither of them would fit the message the apostle is trying to convey. Of course, this does not necessarily prove that the same is true for CD; although each of the two traditions build on the same basic pattern, it does not immediately follow that their contents are identical. Yet, to my mind, all limitations notwithstanding, Rom 7:1–3 should be taken seriously in any discussion of the *Damascus Document’s* position on this issue. At this initial stage of the inquiry, it may be suggested that since the perception of death as the natural limit for application of the Torah’s halakhah (not present in Matt 19:3–9!) underlies both sources, it seems to reflect a more general trend. Paul’s rhetorical claim in Rom 7:1 to present a traditional argument emerges as fairly adequate after all.

#### FURTHER INQUIRY

I will conclude this essay with suggestions for further inquiry. First, the introduction of Rom 7:1–4 into our discussion raises the question of genre. It is clear that Paul does not have any halakhic interest here — the marital-law-centered *thema* is used only as a pretext for promoting one of Paul’s core religious ideas: salvation through Jesus’ death and *not* through following the Torah commandments. Matthew 19:3–9 is also characterized by a mixture: after the ideal based on Genesis 1, 2 is presented, the practical halakhah is suggested, halakhah that turns out to be based on Jesus’ (=Shammai’s) interpretation of the same verse from Deuteronomy 24 that has just been branded a compromise initiated by Moses:

---

<sup>56</sup> See L. Ginzberg, *An Unknown Jewish Sect* (New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1976), 20 (originally appeared in German in 1922).

He said to them, “For your hardness of heart Moses allowed you to divorce your wives (in Deut 24:1), but from the beginning it was not so. And I say to you: whoever divorces his wife, except for unchastity (ערוות דבר) from Deut 24:1 interpreted as ערוה דבר), and marries another, commits adultery.” (Matt 19:8–9)

It has already been suggested that what CD-A 4:21–5:1 propagates is “the ideal of matrimony” and not a call to actually prohibit the current practice.<sup>57</sup> To what extent should the New Testament evidence strengthen that assessment and make us reconsider the perception of this passage of the *Damascus Document* as a piece of marital halakhah?

Second, the fact that neither Matt 19:3–9 nor Rom 7:1–4—nor 1 Corinthians 6 and 7 for that matter—pertains to polygamy should be given serious consideration. As noted, the polygamy-oriented interpretation of CD-A 4:21 may be sustained even vis-à-vis the opposing New Testament evidence. But if it is sustained, this should inform our understanding of the social background of the CD polemic,<sup>58</sup> and, more specifically, of the group that is represented by the “builders of the fence” (בּוּנֵי הַחֵץ). While many scholars, starting with Schechter, have identified the “builders of the fence” with the Pharisees,<sup>59</sup> others have seen the admonition as directed by the compiler against contemporary Jewish society in general.<sup>60</sup> It is instructive that in the New Testament not only Matthew, distinguished by his preference for the “controversy stories pattern” of Jesus vs. the Pharisees,<sup>61</sup> but also his Marcan source, present lenience in matters of *divorce* as the characteristic feature of the Pharisaic stance.<sup>62</sup> There is no particular reason to doubt this kind of presentation, which, on the one hand, does not seem to be influenced by any immediate messianic (*kerygmatic*) concern and, on the other hand, is substantiated by tannaitic evidence that attributes such an approach specifically to Hillelites. Moreover, among all Jesus’ controversies with the Pharisees, whether in the form of discussion or invective, polygamy never features.

<sup>57</sup> See Holmén, “Divorce in CD,” 407.

<sup>58</sup> See Schremer, “Qumran Polemic.”

<sup>59</sup> See S. Schechter, *Documents of Jewish Sectaries: Fragments of a Zadokite Work* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1910), 36 n. 22.

<sup>60</sup> This view was recently proposed by J. G. Campbell, *The Use of Scripture in the Damascus Document* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1995), 121–22.

<sup>61</sup> See Repschinski, “Taking on the Elite”; see also idem, *The Controversy Stories in the Gospel of Matthew: Their Redaction, Form and Relevance for the Relationship between the Matthean Community and Formative Judaism* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000).

<sup>62</sup> See Matt 19:3; Mark 10:2.



Thus if we adopt the restrictive polygamy-centered interpretation of the CD-A 4 invective, the least we should say is that Jesus' Pharisees and the "builders of the fence" do not represent the same distinctive outlook. Whether the difference should be explained as pointing to a diachronic development within the same group or to different groups is a question that warrants further deliberation.

#### CONCLUSION

It is clear that if the Qumran community and the nascent Jesus movement are perceived as merely two among a number of the Second Temple Jewish groups, a comparative study of the respective corpora—if not necessarily pointing to a direct development of New Testament traditions from earlier Qumran ones—may contribute to a better understanding of the Jewish setting of the former. Our discussion of exegetical parallels corroborates this basic position. I suggested a complementing direction, which can also be fruitful: we should more intensively introduce evidence from the New Testament into the discussion of texts from Qumran. Thus in this case, investigation of Paul's epistles has turned out to be useful for elucidating the meaning of the *Damascus Document's* marital halakhah, while the combined evidence of the epistles and the Gospels may be helpful in clarifying the nature of CD's eschatological stance and/or the identity of the opponents against whom the CD exegesis polemicizes.

And, of course, the two sets of writings should be studied comparatively (together with other relevant Jewish writings)<sup>63</sup> to outline both the common basic patterns and the variety of exegetical trends of late Second Temple Judaism. Precisely because there are significant differences in exegetical approach and religious ideas, clearly indicating that we are dealing with separate communities, the existence of common patterns testifies to their broad circulation. All this is especially valid when the New Testament traditions in question are not intrinsically connected with the messianic *kerygma*. The comparative study may, inter alia, provide an additional criterion for distinguishing peculiar Qumranic

---

<sup>63</sup> See, for example, M. Kister, "Observations on Aspects of Exegesis, Tradition, and Theology in Midrash, Pseudepigrapha, and Other Jewish Writings," in *Tracing the Threads: Studies in the Vitality of Jewish Pseudepigrapha* (ed. J. C. Reeves; SBLEJL 6; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994), 1–34.

ideas in the Scrolls themselves from those representing wider Jewish circles. Thus in the light of New Testament parallels, such CD patterns as relying on Gen 1:27 to establish marital halakhah, portraying lust as the main outlet of the evil impulse, or combining lust with greed as cardinal “snares of Satan,” should be seen as representing common Second Temple tendencies rather than particular sectarian exegesis. On the other hand, differences in attitudes towards “the flesh” allow us to better appreciate the nuanced variety of existing outlooks.

Admittedly the investigation of adultery–divorce provides at this stage mostly questions for further inquiry rather than definite solutions. But to my mind, it aptly illustrates both the potential and the limitations of such a comparative approach.



## DEMONS AND SAVIORS



MELCHIZEDEK: A MODEL FOR THE UNION OF  
KINGSHIP AND PRIESTHOOD IN THE HEBREW BIBLE,  
11QMELCHIZEDEK, AND THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS

ISRAEL KNOHL  
*The Hebrew University of Jerusalem*

A. MELCHIZEDEK IN THE HEBREW BIBLE

The title *Messiah* and the verbs connected with it appear in different contexts within different parts of the Hebrew Bible. In the Torah, in the book of Leviticus, the term משיח is applied to the High Priest, who is anointed with the holy oil. So we read in the law of the sin offering in Lev 4:3:

אם הכהן המשיח יחטא לאשמת העם

If the priest, the anointed one, do sin, bringing guilt on the people...<sup>1</sup>

The anointed one spoken of in Leviticus, the High Priest, is only a cultic leader. He has no political role. The priestly writings of the Pentateuch reject any combination of political and priestly roles. Thus, in the story of the rebellion of Korah, the 250 tribal chieftains who claimed priestly prerogatives were destroyed by fire: “And fire went forth from the Lord and consumed the two hundred and fifty men offering the incense” (Num 16:35).

This story appears to reflect the objection of the priesthood<sup>2</sup> to the tendency of the Israelite kings to claim the right of performing cultic acts. The best example of such a clash between the priests and the king

---

<sup>1</sup> See further Lev 6:15; 16:32; 21:10.

<sup>2</sup> In my view, this story stems from the “Holiness School”; see I. Knohl, *The Sanctuary of Silence: The Priestly Torah and the Holiness School* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995), 73–85. I believe that the tradition in Num 27:12–23 stems from the same school. The reference to inquiry through the Urim and Thummim in a time of war cannot be regarded as a priestly *political* role. This custom is mentioned in various places in the Bible (see Knohl, *Sanctuary*, 164 n. 157), but the priest plays only an instrumental role in it.

is the story told about King Uzziah in Chronicles, a text which itself reflects the priestly point of view:<sup>3</sup>

When he was strong, he grew so arrogant he acted corruptly: he trespassed against his God by entering the Temple of the Lord to offer incense on the incense altar. The priest Azariah, with eighty other brave priests of the Lord, followed him in and, confronting King Uzziah, said to him, "It is not for you, Uzziah, to offer incense to the Lord, but for the Aaronite priests, who have been consecrated, to offer incense. Get out of the Sanctuary, for you have trespassed, there will be no glory for you from the Lord God."

Uzziah, holding the censer and ready to burn incense, got angry; but as he got angry with the priests, leprosy broke out on his forehead in front of the priests in the House of the Lord beside the incense altar. When the chief priest Azariah and all the other priests looked at him, his forehead was leprous, so they rushed him out of there; he, too, made haste to get out for the Lord had struck him with a plague. (2 Chr 26:16–20)

The High Priest bore on his forehead a frontlet of pure gold, which was engraved with the inscription "Holy to the Lord" (Exod 28:36–38). Uzziah wanted to act as a High Priest but God struck him and his forehead became leprous. Instead of a symbol of holiness, his forehead was marked with a symbol of impurity!<sup>4</sup>

According to the Torah, and reflected in this passage from Chronicles, the only legitimate example of the combination of priesthood and kingship in the same person is to be found *outside* the people of Israel: Melchizedek, the Canaanite king of Shalem/Jerusalem, was at the same time a priest of God Most High (Gen 14:18).<sup>5</sup>

In other parts of the Bible, the title Messiah is fundamentally connected, not with the High Priest, but rather with the king. In the historical books we find this title given to the current king of Israel, who

<sup>3</sup> The Book of Chronicles usually follows the views of the priestly sources of the Pentateuch with regard to cultic issues; see E. L. Curtis and A. A. Madsen, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Chronicles* (ICC 11; New York: Scribner, 1910), 502.

<sup>4</sup> See Lev 13:45. On the story of Uzziah see E. Greenstein, "An Inner-Biblical Midrash of the Nadav and Avihu Episode," *Proceedings of the Eleventh World Congress of Jewish Studies. Division A: The Bible and Its World* (ed. D. Assaf; Jerusalem: World Union of Jewish Studies, 1994), 71–78 (Hebrew).

<sup>5</sup> For the evidence that Canaanite kings could also be priests, see J. Day, "The Canaanite Inheritance of the Israelite Monarchy," in *King and Messiah in Israel and the Ancient Near East: Proceedings of the Oxford Old Testament Seminar* (ed. J. Day; JSOTSup 270; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 74–75.

is anointed by a prophet with holy oil.<sup>6</sup> Similarly, in the Psalms the title Messiah is applied to the king who is the present ruler, who is to be anointed with the “oil of gladness.”<sup>7</sup>

The Messiah of the historical books and the psalms, the king, often performs priestly duties as well. Thus, we hear in the historical books about kings who function as priests, especially to dedicate new cultic sites. We read that David, when bringing the Holy Ark to Jerusalem, offered sacrifices and blessed the people in the manner of a priest:

... and David offered burnt-offerings and peace-offerings before the Lord. And as soon as David had finished offering the burnt-offerings and peace-offerings, he blessed the people in the name of the Lord of the hosts.<sup>8</sup>

It is also said that David’s sons were priests (2 Sam 8:18).

The same trend is to be found in the Psalms. In Psalm 110, we find the combination of priesthood and kingship that was rejected by the Torah. In order to justify this combination, the author of this psalm goes back to the pre-Israelite model of kingship: “You are a priest forever after the manner of Melchizedek” (Ps 110:4).<sup>9</sup>

This reference to the pre-Israelite model of Melchizedek should be understood in light of ancient Near Eastern conceptions of kingship.<sup>10</sup> In the ancient cultures of this region, the king typically had priestly prerogatives and functions. In fact, the king served as a high priest on important cultic occasions. The psalmist wants to adopt this model for the Israelite king by calling him a “priest forever after the manner of Melchizedek.” Besides the royal and cultic roles, Psalm 110 also assigns

<sup>6</sup> 1 Sam 10:1; 15:17; 16:12–13; 24:6, 10; 26:9, 15; 2 Sam 1:16; 5:3; 12:7; 23:1; 1 Kgs 1:34, 39, 45; 2 Kgs 9:3, 6; 11:12.

<sup>7</sup> See, Pss 2:2; 45:8; 89:39, 52. There are two references in the Hebrew Bible to the anointing of prophets (See 1 Kgs 19:16; Isa 61:1). However, in both cases this is a *metaphorical* use and there is no physical act of anointing with oil. The same is true with the references to anointing foreign kings (1 Kgs 19:16; Isa 45:1).

<sup>8</sup> 2 Sam 6:17–18; see further 1 Kgs 8:63–64; 2 Kgs 16:12–13 see also 1 Sam 13:9; 1 Kgs 3:4, 15; 12:32–33 and the discussion in Day, “The Canaanite Inheritance,” 75.

<sup>9</sup> See the review of scholarly debate on this psalm by Day, “The Canaanite Inheritance,” 73–74.

<sup>10</sup> On the ideology of divine kingship in the ancient Near East, see H. Frankfort, *Kingship and the Gods: A Study of Ancient Near Eastern Religion as the Integration of Society and Nature* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1948). S. Mowinckel (*The Psalms in Israel’s Worship* [trans. D. R. Ap-Thomas; 2 vols.; Oxford: Blackwell, 1962], 1:59) points out the absence of a practice of worshipping the kings in the Hebrew Bible, in contrast to the customs of the ancient Near East.



the king the role of judging the nations: “He will execute judgment among the nations, filling them with corpses” (110:6).

As we have said, the Torah’s priestly tradition is against giving political leaders priestly prerogatives and functions. This is also the case for the Book of Deuteronomy, within which no cultic or juridical roles are assigned to the king.<sup>11</sup> Moreover, Deuteronomy does not mention the anointing of the king.

I have argued at length elsewhere that this debate between the Torah, on the one hand, and the rest of the biblical tradition, on the other hand, is part of a general dispute about the idea of divine kingship: the other parts of the Hebrew Bible, apart from the Torah, accept the major elements of the ideology of divine kingship which had developed in the ancient Near East.<sup>12</sup> In the historical books and in the psalms, the king, who is titled “Messiah,” has a combination of royal, priestly and juridical rights and functions. In those sources, as well as in the prophetic writings, the king is described as a “Son of God”<sup>13</sup> and is given divine names.<sup>14</sup>

When we turn to the Torah we see a dramatically different picture. The word *משׁיח* is not a title but simply a word describing the anointment of the High Priest. There is a total separation between priesthood and kingship, and the king is not given juridical functions. The title “Son of God” is not given to the king, but rather to the people of Israel.<sup>15</sup> There is no word about the divine character of either the throne or the king’s name.

The fact that the Torah denies the king any cultic role is probably the result of a power struggle between the priesthood and the king. However, it seems that what we see here is not merely a power struggle. The limitations which the Torah puts on the authority and functions of

<sup>11</sup> See B. M. Levinson, “The Reconceptualization of Kingship in Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic History’s Transformation of Torah,” *VT* 51 (2001): 511–34.

<sup>12</sup> I. Knohl, *The Divine Symphony: The Bible’s Many Voices* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 2003), 87–99.

<sup>13</sup> 2 Sam 7:14; Isa 9:5 (on the identity of the child see J. J. Roberts, “Whose Child Is This?” *HTR* 90 [1997]: 115–29); Psalm 2:7 (see I. Knohl, “Religion and Politics in Psalm 2,” in *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov* [ed. S. M. Paul et al.; VTSup 94; Leiden: Brill, 2003], 725–27); Psalm 110:3 (according to several important versions; see the discussion by G. Cooke, “The Israelite King as Son of God,” *ZAW* 73 [1961]: 218–24).

<sup>14</sup> See Isa 9:5; Jer 23:5–6.

<sup>15</sup> See Exod 4:22–23; Deut 14:1.

the king emphasize that he is a limited human being and not a divine creature or a member of the divine family.

As a non-Israelite king, Melchizedek is not restrained by the limitations that the Torah puts on Israelite kings. He serves as a king and a priest at the same time. His priesthood is a legitimate one and thus Abraham gives him a tenth of the booty (Gen 14:20). Therefore, Melchizedek can serve as the ideal biblical model for the union of kingship and priesthood.

### B. 11QMELCHIZEDEK (11Q13)

The Melchizedek *peshar* found in Qumran Cave 11 is a very complex piece of writing. Unlike the majority of other *pesharim*, it does not relate to a single biblical text, but rather comments on a variety of texts from different parts of the Bible. As has been recognized,<sup>16</sup> however, the core of the work focuses on Isa 61:1–3, which the *peshar* constantly invokes in a direct or indirect manner. According to this *peshar*, the “mourners of Zion,” who were under the dominion of Melchizedek, have been captured and enslaved by Belial; but Melchizedek will judge Belial and “will exact the vengeance of God’s judgments” יְקוּם נִקָּם [ל] מִשְׁפָּטֵי א.<sup>17</sup> He will liberate the captives<sup>18</sup> and settle them in their inheritance, the inheritance of Melchizedek. In this way, the captives, the mourners of Zion, will be comforted.<sup>19</sup> The liberation of the captives by Melchizedek is to take place on the Day of Atonement in the tenth jubilee. This liberation from the rule of Belial will come about as a result of the remission of all their sins by Melchizedek and his proclamation

<sup>16</sup> See, M. P. Miller, “The Function of Isa 61:1–2 in 11Q Melchizedek,” *JBL* 88 (1969): 467–69; J. A. Sanders, “From Isaiah 61 to Luke 4,” in *Christianity, Judaism and other Greco-Roman Cults: Studies for Morton Smith at Sixty* (ed. J. Neusner; 4 vols.; SJLA 12; Leiden: Brill, 1975), 1:75–106; J. J. Collins, “A Herald of Good Tidings: Isaiah 61:3 and its Actualization in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *The Quest for Context and Meaning: Studies in Biblical Intertextuality in Honor of J. A. Sanders* (ed. C. A. Evans and S. Talmon; Biblical Interpretation Series 28; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 229–38.

<sup>17</sup> 11QMelchizedek 2:13 appears in *Qumran Cave 11.II (11Q2–18, 11Q20–31)* (ed. F. García Martínez, E. J. C. Tigchelaar, and A. S. van der Woude; DJD 23; Oxford: Clarendon, 1998), 225.

<sup>18</sup> 2:4–6.

<sup>19</sup> 2:20.

of “liberty to them, relieving them of the burden of all their iniquities” (וקרא להמה דרור לעזוב להמה [משא] כול עוונותיהמה).<sup>20</sup>

On the face of it, the struggle between Melchizedek and Belial is a struggle between two otherworldly entities. For this reason, scholars have identified the Melchizedek of the *peshet* with the angel Michael.<sup>21</sup> The identification of Melchizedek with an angel may initially seem to be supported by the expression, “the lot of Melchizedek” (2:8), since in the Qumran literature, lots were ascribed solely to heavenly figures, i.e., God and his angels.<sup>22</sup> I think, however, that this identification does not hold up when properly examined. If Michael is the main subject of the composition, why does the *peshet* use the name Melchizedek and not Michael? And, furthermore, if we are dealing with an angel, why should the *peshet* be based on Isaiah 61, which refers to a prophet of flesh and blood, anointed by the spirit of God to preach consolation (“The spirit of the Lord God is upon me; because the Lord hath anointed me to preach good tidings unto the meek”)?

In Isaiah 61:3, we read: “. . . that they might be called the trees of righteousness, the planting of the Lord, wherein he might glory” (וקרא להם) (אילי הצדק מטע ה' להתפאר). The prophet is speaking of the grieving captives of Zion who have been redeemed and comforted. According to the *peshet*, the mourners of Zion were members of the *Yahad* community of Qumran, who were captives of Belial. Melchizedek would set them free, and they would be given their rightful inheritance—the inheritance of Melchizedek. Henceforth, the mourners of Zion, i.e., the members of the Qumran community, would be called “trees of righteousness,” אילי הצדק. This biblical expression, אילי הצדק, was probably interpreted by the author of the *peshet* as אילי הצדק—“the gods of righteousness,” that is, *angels* of righteousness. As noted by J. T. Milik,<sup>23</sup> who is followed by É. Puech<sup>24</sup> and the editors of DJD 23,<sup>25</sup>

<sup>20</sup> 2:6. On this expression, see D. R. Schwartz, “On Quirinius, John the Baptist, the Benedictus, Melchizedek, Qumran and Ephesus,” *RevQ*, 13 (1988): 635–646, pp. 640–45.

<sup>21</sup> See P. J. Kobelski, *Melchizedek and Melchireša'* (CBQMS 10; Washington, D.C.: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1981), 71–74.

<sup>22</sup> Kobelski, *Melchizedek*, 57–58.

<sup>23</sup> J. T. Milik, “Milki-sedeq et Milki-resa dans les ancience ecrits juifs et chretiens,” *JJS* 23 (1972): 98, 106.

<sup>24</sup> É. Puech, “Notes sur le manuscrit de XIQMelkisedeq,” *RevQ* 12 (1987): 488, 497.

<sup>25</sup> On the spellings אילי for the angels, see García Martínez et al., DJD 23.232 (comment on 11QMelch 2:14).

it is possible that the phrase **אלי הצדק**, based on **אילי הצדק** of Isaiah 61, should be restored in 11QMelch 2:14: **[הצדק] כל אלי**.

At work in this passage, then, we see the recognized penchant of the members of the Qumran community to align themselves with the community of the angels. If the members of the community are perceived as “the gods of righteousness,” we can better understand the meaning of the name “Melchizedek.” The name “Melchizedek” may be interpreted as referring to the king of “the gods of righteousness”—that is, the leader of the Qumran community.

If Melchizedek is not the angel Michael but a human being, how is it that he possesses a “lot” (a spiritual inheritance)? How is it that he is described as someone who overcomes Belial? In order to answer this question we have to examine one of the peculiarities of the Melchizedek *peshet*.

One peculiarity of the Melchizedek *peshet* is the way it takes verses from the Bible concerning God and applies them to Melchizedek.<sup>26</sup> This practice may perhaps be comprehensible in the case of writings in which the titles “Elohim” or “El” appear in a legal context (Ps 82:1: “God [Elohim] stands in the congregation of God [El]; he judges among the gods [Elohim]” **אלהים נצב בעדת אל בקרב אלהים ישפט**); it is possible that the title “Elohim” may also have been used in the Bible as the title for an earthly judge (Exod 22:7–8). In this *peshet*, however, Melchizedek’s name is also substituted for the biblical Tetragrammaton. For instance, “the year of the Lord’s good pleasure,” **שנת רצון לה’** (Isaiah 61:2), is turned into “the year of Melchizedek’s good pleasure” **שנת רצון למלכיצדק** (2:9). A similar tendency is expressed in the words **גורל מל[כי] צדק** (2:8).<sup>27</sup>

What is the reason for this identification of Melchizedek with God? I think the identification is based on Jeremiah 23:5–6: “I shall raise unto David a righteous shoot and he shall reign as king and prosper, and execute judgment and justice in the land . . . and this is the name whereby he shall be called: ‘YHWH is our righteousness’” (**והקמותי לדוד צמח צדיק ומלך מלך והשכיל ועשה משפט וצדקה בארץ . . . וזה שמו אשר יקראו ה’ צדקו**). The “shoot of David”—i.e., the Messiah—is, according to this passage, a righteous king who will execute judgment and justice

<sup>26</sup> Kobelski, *Melchizedek*, 59–62.

<sup>27</sup> Kobelski, *Melchizedek*, 60.

in the land.<sup>28</sup> This righteous king shall be called ה' צדקנו "YHWH is our righteousness." Here there is a real basis for the identification of the "shoot of David"—the righteous king who is also the judge of the end-of-days—with God. This is, in fact, the only verse in the Hebrew Bible in which the Messiah is called by the Tetragrammaton! In my view, this exceptional passage serves as the basis for the unique use of the figure of Melchizedek made by the writer of the *peshet*. In the *peshet*, the figure of Melchizedek (= the "king of righteousness") symbolizes the Messiah. Following Jeremiah 23, the author of the *peshet* identifies the Messiah with the Lord. Melchizedek, then, is the righteous king called ה' צדקנו, "YHWH is our righteousness."

However, besides the tendency to identify Melchizedek with God, there is also another tendency in the *peshet*, namely, the preservation of a certain distinction between this figure and God. This tendency may be perceived in the words: "And Melchizedek will exact the vengeance of God's judgments": [ל] ומלכי צדק יקום נקם משפטי א[ל] (2:13). A clear distinction is retained here between Melchizedek and God, whose judgments are executed by Melchizedek. The biblical background of the *peshet*, which is constructed, as we said, primarily on the basis of Isaiah 61, necessitates such a distinction. The chapter begins with the words: "The spirit of the Lord is upon me, because the Lord hath anointed me to preach good tidings unto the meek." The person speaking is obviously not God, but has been anointed by God, who gives him the divine spirit.

Two lots are mentioned in the *peshet*: the "lot of Melchizedek" (2:8) and "Belial . . . and his lot" (12:2). The Day of Atonement is depicted in the *peshet* as the Last Judgment, the day of expiation and redemption (2:7–8). The context of the two lots and the Day of Atonement reveals a connection of this piece of writing with the ritual order of the Day of Atonement in the Law of Moses: "One lot for God and the other for Azazel" (גורל אחד לה' וגורל אחד לעזאזל). According to the equation Melchizedek = God, Azazel = Belial, this can be formulated, "one lot for Melchizedek and another for Belial." The *peshet* speaks of a day of vengeance on which God-Melchizedek will judge Belial, and all the evil spirits in his inheritance (lot) will be destroyed by fire (2:13, 3:7).

<sup>28</sup> For the various ways of understanding this verse, see J. Bright, *Jeremiah* (AB 21; Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1965), 144.

According to the *peshar*, on the eschatological Day of Atonement at the end of the tenth jubilee, the forces of evil will surrender to Melchizedek. The defeat of the forces of evil will liberate the members of the community, who were made captive by Belial. All their sins will be atoned for and they will return to their proper place and position in the inheritance of Melchizedek.

We have seen that Melchizedek of Psalm 110 is a priestly King, who rules over his people and judges the nations. The same combination is developed in *11Q Melchizedek*. The hero of this *peshar* is a messianic king who rules over his community, judges the evil spirits and atones for his people on the eschatological Day of Atonement.

While the question of a general dual conception of priestly and royal messiahs in the Qumran documents is debated among scholars,<sup>29</sup> the tendency clearly exists. As was pointed out by Talmon,<sup>30</sup> this dual conception was created in the biblical literature of the Persian period. The two בני היצהר “sons of oil” of Zech 4:14 are the two Messiahs, the High Priest and the Royal Messiah. *11Q Melchizedek*, however, rejects the separation of kingship and priesthood. The savior and redeemer of the eschatological Day of Atonement combines kingship and priesthood within a single personality. Thus, it is no wonder that he is described as heir to the biblical figure of Melchizedek.

However, it is important to note that the figure of Melchizedek in the *peshar* includes a significant element that is not to be found in the biblical Melchizedek. Melchizedek is described here as the redeemer

---

<sup>29</sup> See, D. Goodblatt, *The Monarchic Principle* (Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1994), 65–71; J. J. Collins, *The Scepter and the Star: The Messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Ancient Literature* (ABRL; New York: Doubleday, 1995), 74–101; M. Abegg, “The Messiah at Qumran: Are We Still Seeing Double?” *DSD* 2 (1995): 125–44; J. VanderKam, “Messianism in the Scrolls,” in *The Community of the Renewed Covenant: The Notre Dame Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. E. Ulrich and J. VanderKam; Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame, 1994), 212–34; F. M. Cross, “Notes on the Doctrine of the Two Messiahs at Qumran and the Extracanonical Daniel Apocalypse (4Q246),” in *Current Research and Technological Developments on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Conference on the Texts from the Judean Desert, Jerusalem, 30 April, 1995* (ed. D. W. Parry and S. D. Ricks; STDJ 20; Leiden: Brill, 1996), 1–4; W. M. Schniedewind, “Structural Aspects of Qumran Messianism in the Damascus Document,” in *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues* (ed. D. W. Parry and E. Ulrich; STDJ 30; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 523–36.

<sup>30</sup> S. Talmon, *King, Cult and Calendar in Ancient Israel: Collected Studies* (Jerusalem: The Hebrew University Magnes Press, 1986), 219–20.

of his people, who will liberate them from their captivity. As noted by Y. Kaufmann,<sup>31</sup> according to the Hebrew Bible, the redeemer of Israel is God and not the eschatological king. Thus, the combination that we find in the *peshet* of an eschatological King, High Priest, and Redeemer is a new phenomenon in the history of the messianic idea.

### C. MELCHIZEDEK IN THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS

In the first chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews we see a remarkable use of the aforementioned verses from the psalms and the prophets which concern the royal Messiah. According to Hebrews, Jesus is a divine Messiah. He is the Son of God, who is called "God" and was anointed with the oil of gladness (Heb 1:5–9). The words of Psalm 110 are also applied to Jesus (Heb 1:13). The main effort of the author in the coming chapters is to prove that Jesus has all the merits of priesthood at the same time. In making his argument, the author faced two serious problems:

1. According to the accepted Christian genealogy Jesus was a descendant of David and thus a member of the tribe of Judah (Heb 7:14). The priestly laws of the Torah clearly state that anyone who is not a descendant of the priestly house of Aaron cannot be a priest. (Num 17:40)
2. As we have seen above, according to the Torah, there must be a total separation between priesthood and kingship; the king is not given a ritual position in the cult and the priest has no royal power.

The solution for these problems was found in the biblical figure of Melchizedek. Since Melchizedek has no antecedents in the Hebrew Bible, he could be a model for a legitimate priest who is not a member of the house of Aaron (Heb 7:3). However, Melchizedek is at the same time "The *king* of righteousness" (Heb 7:2), and thus he may serve as a model for the union of priesthood and kingship in the figure of Jesus.

---

<sup>31</sup> Y. Kaufmann, *A History of Israelite Religion* (4 vols.; Jerusalem and Tel Aviv: Dvir, 1976), 3:648–49 (Hebrew).

To whom was the epistle addressed? Yigael Yadin<sup>32</sup> maintained that Hebrews was addressed to the Qumran community. He gave two main arguments:

1. The author argues that Jesus is superior to the angels (Heb 1:4–14). It seems that the addressees, in contrast, hold the view that the angels will have supreme importance in the eschatological time and they will have dominion over any eschatological figure. Similar views to those of the addressees are expressed in the Scrolls, mainly in the *War Scroll* and the *Rule of the Community*.<sup>33</sup>
2. The author sees Jesus as a combination of a royal Messiah and a priestly Messiah. It seems that the addressees, in contrast, hold the view that there must be two distinct Messiahs and that the priestly Messiah should be of the house of Aaron. Here, too, views similar to those of the addressees are expressed in the Scrolls, mainly in the *Damascus Covenant*.<sup>34</sup>

In response to Yadin's theory, I would begin by stating that I will not deal, in the present discussion, with the complex question of the identity of the addressees of Hebrews.<sup>35</sup> Rather, I will consider Yadin's understanding of the differences of opinion between the Qumran sect and the author of Hebrews. We can see now that the Qumran community was much less homogeneous with regard to the issues mentioned above than Yadin had supposed. As noted earlier,<sup>36</sup> there is still dispute among scholars concerning the conception of two Messiahs in the Dead Sea Scrolls. It would seem, therefore, that the author of Hebrews, rather than arguing with the Qumran community as a whole, is adopting a line that was maintained by at least part of the Qumran community.

I believe that this is also true with regard to the question of the superiority of the eschatological figure over the angels. The speaker of the *Self-Glorification Hymn* was identified by E. Eshel as the eschatological

---

<sup>32</sup> Y. Yadin, "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Epistle to the Hebrews," in *Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. C. Rabin and Y. Yadin; ScrHier 4; Jerusalem: The Hebrew University Magnes Press, 1958), 36–55.

<sup>33</sup> Yadin, "The Dead Sea Scrolls," 45–48.

<sup>34</sup> Yadin, "The Dead Sea Scrolls," 48–53.

<sup>35</sup> For a bibliography of scholarship on this subject, see W. L. Lane, *Hebrews 1–8* (WBC 47A; Dallas: Word Books, 1991), li–liii. The idea that Hebrews is a polemic against the Qumranic inclinations of the addressees was also expressed by H. Kosmala, *Hebräer—Essener—Christen: Studien zur Vorgeschichte der frühchristlichen Verkündigung* (StPB 1; Leiden: Brill, 1959), 1ff. Cf. the criticism of this approach by F. F. Bruce, "To the Hebrews' or 'To the Essenes?'" *NTS* 9 (1962–1963): 217–32.

<sup>36</sup> See above n. 29.



High Priest.<sup>37</sup> I tend to see him more as royal figure.<sup>38</sup> In any case, it is clear that this person claims to be superior to the angels. His words, מִי כַמּוֹנֵי בְּאַלִּים, “who is like me among the angels,”<sup>39</sup> are clear evidence in this direction.<sup>40</sup> A similar impression arises from the way this figure describes himself as sitting in heaven on a mighty chair, surrounded by the angels, בְּסֵא עוֹז בְּעֵדֶת אֱלִים.<sup>41</sup> Both the *Self-Glorification Hymn* and *11QMelchizedek* might represent an extreme messianic group within the Qumran community, which saw the Community’s own leader as the messianic king and priest. It is possible that there was some debate and struggle between those in the community who held the extreme view and between other members who held a more moderate line, a line that is expressed in other Qumranic texts.

Thus, we may conclude, in opposition to Yadin, that the author of Hebrews is not arguing with the views of the Qumran community as a whole. Given the very Hellenistic nature of Hebrews, one should ask if in fact there was *any* influence of Qumran literature on Hebrews.<sup>42</sup> We can ascertain that the author of Hebrews is adopting a line that views the Messiah according to the ideology of divine kingship rooted in several parts of the Hebrew Bible. As we have seen above, these biblical sources describe the king as having divine names and qualities. As such, it is natural to see him as superior to the angels, who are merely the servants of God. The union of kingship and priesthood in one figure attests to the perfection of the divine king. The model for this union is Melchizedek, the ancient king of Shalem-Jerusalem.

In the figure of Melchizedek in Hebrews, as in *11QMelchizedek*, we see the new combination of an eschatological King and High Priest, who is at the same time the redeemer of his people.

<sup>37</sup> E. Eshel, “4QSelf-Glorification Hymn,” in *Qumran Cave 4.XX: Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part 2* (ed. E. Chazon et al.; DJD 29; Oxford: Clarendon, 1998), 424–27.

<sup>38</sup> See I. Knohl, *The Messiah Before Jesus: The Suffering Servant of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000), 82–84.

<sup>39</sup> 4Q471b 1a 4; Eshel, “4QSelf-Glorification Hymn,” 427.

<sup>40</sup> See, Knohl, *The Messiah*, 83.

<sup>41</sup> 4Q491c 1 5 (=4Q491 11 i 12), see E. Eshel, “4QSelf-Glorification Hymn,” *RevQ* 17 (1996): 184.

<sup>42</sup> For scholars who negate any connection between Qumran and Hebrews, see Bruce, “To the Hebrews,” and the bibliography cited by W. G. Kümmel, *Introduction to the New Testament* (trans. H. C. Kee; London: SCM Press, 1975), 396 n. 30.

# DEMONOLOGY IN THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS AND THE NEW TESTAMENT

HERMANN LICHTENBERGER  
*Eberhard Karls University, Tübingen*

## I. INTRODUCTION: METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Qumran and the New Testament have attracted the interest of scholars and the public from the very beginning. Immediately after some of the discoveries in Cave 1 became known, scholars in Europe and the USA were attracted by the relationship of these texts to the New Testament. In 1950, for example, André Dupont-Sommer<sup>1</sup> portrayed Jesus as “une étonnante réincarnation du Maître de justice” and the Righteous Teacher as a “Messie de Dieu, le Messie rédempteur du monde.”<sup>2</sup> More careful were William H. Brownlee in his “A Comparison of the Covenanters of the Dead Sea Scrolls with Pre-Christian Jewish Sects,”<sup>3</sup> and Karl Georg Kuhn in his articles “Die in Palästina gefundenen hebräischen Texte und das Neue Testament”<sup>4</sup> and “Über den ursprünglichen Sinn des Abendmahls und sein Verhältnis zu den Gemeinschaftsmahlen der Sektenschrift (1QS)”<sup>5</sup>—all of which were also published in 1950.

In the following decades scholarship centered upon the relationship of New Testament figures, institutions, and theological concepts to the Dead Sea Scrolls in general and to the Qumran-Essene community in particular, and on the question of possible dependence.<sup>6</sup> I simply list here some of the more important topics treated from these points of

---

<sup>1</sup> A. Dupont-Sommer, *Aperçus préliminaires sur les manuscrits de la Mer Morte* (Paris: Maisonneuve, 1950).

<sup>2</sup> Dupont-Sommer, *Aperçus préliminaires*, 121; quoted in G. Jeremias, *Der Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit* (SUNT 2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1963), 319.

<sup>3</sup> *BA* 13 (1950): 50–72.

<sup>4</sup> *ZTK* 47 (1950): 192–211.

<sup>5</sup> *EvT* 10 (1950/51): 508–27.

<sup>6</sup> See for instance these collections: *Paul and Qumran* (ed. J. Murphy-O'Connor; London: G. Chapman, 1968); *John and Qumran* (ed. J. H. Charlesworth; London: G. Chapman, 1972); expanded and republished as *John and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. J. H. Charlesworth; Christian Origins Library; New York: Crossroad, 1990); *Qumran-Messianism: Studies on the Messianic Expectations in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. J. H. Charlesworth, H. Lichtenberger, and G. S. Oegema; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998).

view: Jesus and the Teacher of Righteousness; John the Baptist and the Essenes; the early Christian church and the Qumran-Essene community; the communal meals of Qumran and the Lord's Supper; dualism and predestination in the Dead Sea Scrolls and John's Gospel; justification by faith in the *Hodayot* and in Paul; messianism in the Dead Sea Scrolls and New Testament Christology. Alongside these general topics, special phrases and expressions also attracted comparative attention, such as *bne reṣono* and *anthropoi eudokias* (1QH<sup>a</sup> 12:34 [Sukenik 4:33] and Luke 2:14); *ma'ase ha-Torah* and *erga nomou* (4QMMT and Rom 3:20, 28; Gal 2:16; 3:2–10); and the alleged Essene character of 2 Cor 6:14–16.

Representative of this early period of research are the two volumes of Herbert Braun's *Qumran und das Neue Testament*,<sup>7</sup> in which the Qumran-Essene literature was read as some sort of a *praeparatio evangelica*. It does not come as a surprise that especially in Europe, research in the Dead Sea Scrolls was the domain of New Testament scholars. Their main interest was in finding concepts and ideas common to the Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament and in showing developments in terms of *Traditionsgeschichte* from Qumran-Essene concepts to New Testament theologoumena. Unintentionally, the historical hermeneutics of Ernest Renan continued to exert its influence, urging us to view Essenism as some sort of pre-Christianity and Christianity as some sort of post-Essenism.<sup>8</sup>

A fundamental shift in the perception of the Dead Sea Scrolls came with Lawrence Schiffman's *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls*,<sup>9</sup> which announced a new paradigm in its opening sentences: "This book aims to correct a fundamental misreading of the Dead Sea Scrolls. For some forty-five years, the scholars publishing and interpreting the scrolls have focused almost single-mindedly on the scrolls' significance for our understanding of early Christianity. This is the first book ever written to explain their significance in understanding the history of Judaism."<sup>10</sup> Historically and hermeneutically the present writer agrees fully with Schiffman: the Dead Sea Scrolls are Jewish texts, the Qumran-Essene community is a Jewish group (I avoid the term "sect"), and the texts

<sup>7</sup> 2 vols; Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1966.

<sup>8</sup> For E. Renan, *La vie de Jésus* (Paris: Lévy, 1863), see A. Schweitzer, *Geschichte der Leben-Jesu-Forschung* (Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1913), 180–92.

<sup>9</sup> L. H. Schiffman, *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls: The History of Judaism, the Background of Christianity, the Lost Library of Qumran* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1994).

<sup>10</sup> Schiffman, *Reclaiming*, xiii.

are to be read, first of all, in their Jewish context. The community is no longer to be understood as what Ginzberg termed "An Unknown Jewish Sect."<sup>11</sup>

But in my opinion we have to go one step further. Since early Christianity in the Land of Israel was, in its beginnings, nothing other than a Jewish group, we have not only to interrelate the New Testament and early Christianity to other Jewish groups of the time—and there were more than the three or four we know from Josephus—but we have also to ask whether and how the New Testament and early Christianity contribute to our understanding of early Judaism in general, and of the Qumran-Essene community in particular. This is not to be misunderstood as another New Testament-centered approach to Jewish texts and Judaism, but as an integration of the New Testament and early Christianity into their Jewish contexts. Or in other words: we read the New Testament as a Jewish text and as a source for our understanding of Judaism. To illustrate this, it is enough to refer to a single well-known fact: the oldest information we get about the *Pharisees* comes from the New Testament and Josephus, witnesses that can be quite tendentious. Perhaps in other instances the New Testament might better help us to understand early Judaism—e.g., with regard to some texts and concepts in the Dead Sea Scrolls.

It is this approach that I would like to apply and develop in my analysis of demonology in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament.

## II. SPIRITS AND DEMONS IN THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS

The Qumran-Essene writings share with a broad stream of traditions in the ancient world the notion that a human being is not master of his own person and free in his decisions. Rather, he is subject to powers that rule over him. Though these powers are active within him they are distinct from him and this is part of his powerless state.

A systematic statement of this basic concept is found in the well-known *Treatise on the Two Spirits* in 1QS 3:13–4:26.<sup>12</sup> This paragraph was

<sup>11</sup> See the title of the commentary on the *Damascus Document* by L. Ginzberg, *Eine unbekannte jüdische Sekte* (New York: privately published, 1922); English translation: *An Unknown Jewish Sect* (New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1976).

<sup>12</sup> For the discussion until 1980 see H. Lichtenberger, *Studien zum Menschenbild in Texten der Qumrangemeinde* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1980), 123–142.

for a long period thought to represent the essence of Qumran-Essene demonology. However, recent scholarship has come to the conclusion that the *Treatise* goes back to pre-Essene tradition and was later incorporated into the Qumran-Essene manuscript of 1QS.<sup>13</sup> Furthermore, it is evident that human destiny and action may also be circumscribed by nondemonological factors, e.g., astrological ones, as we find in the presence of horoscopes at Qumran<sup>14</sup>—although in a way these, too, are part of a demonological worldview. Determinism serves as yet another factor in establishing and circumscribing free human existence, as we find it, for example, in the concept of the heavenly tablets or books.<sup>15</sup> Notwithstanding these other facets, the prevailing force that limits human freedom is demonology.

This demonology, although consistently subordinated to Jewish monotheism, is nonetheless part of a cosmological dualism comprising *space* and *time*. *Space* encompasses the whole world, both humankind and angels—including the princes of the “good” angels on the one hand, and the demons, evil angels, and *their* princes (e.g., Belial) on the other; *time* ranges from primeval times to the present, and on to the eschaton: In the eschaton God will definitively destroy all negative powers (bad spirits, evil angels, demons, Belial, Mastema). The present age, however, is the time of the reign of Belial, to whom in his inscrutable mysteries God gives *space* and *time* for his reign.<sup>16</sup>

---

<sup>13</sup> See A. Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination. Weisheitliche Urordnung und Prädestination in den Textfunden von Qumran* (Leiden: Brill, 1995), 121–170. For the background in terms of the history of religions see, after the earlier studies by A. Dupont-Sommer and K. G. Kuhn (see Lichtenberger, *Menschenbild*, 196–200), M. Philonenko, “La doctrine qoumrânienne des deux esprits: Ses origines iraniennes et ses prolongements dans le judaïsme essénien et le christianisme antique,” in *Apocalyptique iranienne et dualisme qoumrânien* (ed. G. Widengren, A. Hultgård, and M. Philonenko; Paris: Adrien Maisonneuve, 1995), 163–211. See also the article by Jörg Frey in this volume.

<sup>14</sup> E.g., 4Q186.

<sup>15</sup> See Lange, *Prädestination*, 69–79.

<sup>16</sup> See 1QS 3:22–23.

A. *Spirits and Demons in 11QPsAp<sup>a</sup> (11Q11)*<sup>17</sup>

11QPs<sup>a</sup> 27:9–10<sup>18</sup> reports among “David’s Compositions” four “songs for making music over the stricken.”<sup>19</sup> J. P. M. van der Ploeg connected this notice of the “four songs” with 11QPsAp<sup>a</sup>: “Je me demande si les compositions ‘apocryphes’ de notre rouleau ne seraient pas les chants mentionnés dans le texte cité de 11QPs<sup>a</sup>.”<sup>20</sup> The manuscript of 11QPsAp<sup>a</sup> comprises at least three songs against the demons, which are rounded out by Psalm 91 as a fourth; James A. Sanders<sup>21</sup> had already identified

<sup>17</sup> Final edition: F. García Martínez, E. J. C. Tigchelaar, and A. S. van der Woude, *Qumran Cave 11.II: 11Q2–18, 11Q20–31* (DJD 23; Oxford: Clarendon, 1998), 181–205, Plates XXII–XXV. Earlier and/or preliminary editions: J. P. M. van der Ploeg, “Un petit rouleau de psaumes apocryphes (11QPsAp<sup>a</sup>),” in *Tradition und Glaube: Das frühe Christentum in seiner Umwelt* (ed. G. Jeremias, H.-W. Kuhn, and H. Stegemann; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971), 128–39; É. Puech, “11QPsAp<sup>a</sup>—Un rituel d’exorcismes: Essai de reconstruction,” *RevQ* 14 (1990): 377–408; idem, “Les deux derniers Psaumes davidiques du rituel d’exorcisme, 11QPsAp<sup>a</sup> IV 4–V 14,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research* (ed. D. Dimant and U. Rappaport; STDJ 10; Leiden: Brill; Jerusalem: Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi, 1992), 64–89; idem, “Les psaumes davidiques du rituel d’exorcisme (11Q11),” in *Sapiential, Liturgical and Poetical Texts from Qumran: Proceedings of the Third Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Oslo, 1998, Published in Memory of Maurice Baillet* (ed. D. K. Falk, F. García Martínez, and E. M. Schuller; STDJ 35; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 160–81; J. A. Sanders, “A Liturgy for Healing the Stricken (11QPsAp<sup>a</sup> = 11Q11),” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations, Vol. 4A: Pseudepigraphic and Non-Masoretic Psalms and Prayers* (ed. James H. Charlesworth and Henry W. L. Rietz; Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck]; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1997), 216–33. See also M. Delcor, “L’utilisation des psaumes contre les mauvais esprits à Qoumran,” in *La vie de la Parole. De L’Ancien au Nouveau Testament: Études d’exégèse et d’herméneutique bibliques offertes à Pierre Grelot* (Département des Études Bibliques de l’Institut Catholique de Paris; Paris: Desclée, 1987), 61–70; A. E. Sekki, *The Meaning of Ruah at Qumran* (SBLDS 110; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989), 145–71; B. Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer and Religious Poetry* (STDJ 12; Leiden: Brill, 1994); M. Kister, “Demons, Theology, and Abraham’s Covenant (CD 16:4–6 and Related Texts),” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls at Fifty: Proceedings of the 1997 Society of Biblical Literature Qumran Section Meetings* (ed. R. A. Kugler and E. M. Schuller; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1999), 167–84; M. Mach, “Demons,” *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. L. H. Schiffman and J. C. VanderKam; 2 vols.; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 1:189–92; E. Eshel, “Genres of Magical Texts in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *Die Dämonen: Die Dämonologie der israelitisch-jüdischen und frühchristlichen Literatur im Kontext ihrer Umwelt [Demons: The Demonology of Israelite-Jewish and Early Christian Literature in Context of their Environment]* (ed. A. Lange, H. Lichtenberger, and K. F. Diethard Römheld; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003), 395–415; H. Lichtenberger, “Ps 91 und die Exorzismen in 11QPsAp<sup>a</sup>,” in *Die Dämonen*, 416–21.

<sup>18</sup> J. A. Sanders, *The Psalms Scroll of Qumrân Cave 11 (11QPs<sup>a</sup>)* (DJD 4; Oxford: Clarendon, 1965), 91–93.

<sup>19</sup> Translation from Sanders, *Psalms Scroll*, 92.

<sup>20</sup> Van der Ploeg, *Rouleau*, 129.

<sup>21</sup> Sanders, *Psalms Scroll*, 93.

Psalm 91 as the psalm which, according to *rabbinic* tradition, is to be sung “over the stricken.”<sup>22</sup> In opposition to van der Ploeg’s argument, Maurice Baillet<sup>23</sup> identified the “Cantiques du Sage” (4Q510 and 511) with the collection for the stricken from 11QPs<sup>a</sup>. In my opinion van der Ploeg’s theory is more probable.

Spirits and demons (*[hrw]ḥwt[ ]whšedim*) are closely connected in 2:3; demons occur also in 2:4, “These are [the de]mons”; incantation terminology is present in 1:7, 3:4 and 4:1 (*mšbi’*). Presumably Solomon is the one who “shall invoke” (2:2); at his behest, “YHWH will strike you with a [grea]t b[low] to destroy you” (4:4),<sup>24</sup> “and in his fury [he will send] against you a powerful angel” (*ml’k tqip*) (4:5). The demon is banished to *thwm* (2:5; 3:1) and to *thwm rbh [wls’wl] htḥtih* “to the great abyss [and to] the deepest [Sheol]” (4:7–8).

Most important is the incantation against the demon in 5:4–11:

- (4) Of David. A[gainst...An incant]ation in the name of YHW[H. Invoke at an]y time
- (5) the heav[ens. When ]he comes to you in the nig[ht,] you shall [s]ay to him:
- (6) “Who are you, [Oh offspring of] man and of the seed of the ho[ly one]s? Your face is a face of
- (7) [delu]sion and your horns are horns of ill[us]ion, you are darkness and not light,
- (8) [injust]ice and not justice.[ ] the chief of the army, YHWH [will bring] you [down]
- (9) [to the] deepest [Sheo]l, [and he will shut the] two bronze [ga]tes th[rough which n]o
- (10) light [penetrates,] and [the] sun [will] not [shine for you] tha[t rises]
- (11) [upon the] just man to [ And]you will say:[:

This third psalm of the collection (5:4–6:3) foreshadows the quotation of the biblical Psalm 91:<sup>25</sup>

<sup>22</sup> See M. Jastrow, *A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature* (2 vols. in 1; New York: Judaica Press, 1975), 2:1135, s.v. **פגפג**.

<sup>23</sup> M. Baillet, *Qumran Cave 4.III (4Q482–4Q520)* (DJD 7; Oxford: Clarendon, 1982), 215.

<sup>24</sup> Translation here and in what follows according to García Martínez, Tigchelaar, and van der Woude, DJD 23.

<sup>25</sup> For text-critical observations see the earlier analysis of O. Eißfeldt, “Eine Qumran-Textform des 91. Psalms,” in *Bibel und Qumran: Beiträge zur Erforschung der Beziehungen zwischen Bibel- und Qumranwissenschaft* (ed. S. Wagner; Berlin: Evangelische Haupt-Bibelgesellschaft, 1968), 82–85. See further most of the studies cited in n. 6.

1. For danger in the night (5:5) see Ps 91:5.
2. On asking for the name<sup>26</sup> (of the demon) (*mi 'th*; 5:6), compare Ps 91:2.
3. The description of the demon's futility and nothingness ("your face is a face of [delu]sion and your horns [i.e., your might] are horns of ill[us]ion, you are darkness and not light, [injust]ice and not justice" [5:6–8]), may be compared with Ps 91:3–8, 10, 13.
4. For YHWH's army and its chief (*sr*) (5:8, cf. the "powerful angel" in 4:5), compare the Lord's host and His angel as the agents of human deliverance in Ps 91:11–12.

Ps 91 (in the manuscript, 6:3–14) is thus in its content clearly connected with the preceding psalms. It concludes the collection of incantations with the assurance of God's deliverance and functions as a sort of keystone for the whole. The inclusion of Psalm 91 with the collection shows that Psalm 91 itself serves the same purpose.<sup>27</sup> This becomes most evident from the fact that it is liturgically integrated into the collection by the tag, "Amen, Amen, Sela" (6:14; see 6:3 in the preceding psalm), and in its ascription to David (Psalm 91 is ascribed to David in the LXX, and here in 6:4: *ldwid*). But at the same time Ps 91:2 seems to offer a correction—the most effective incantation is to turn to God Himself:<sup>28</sup> ["He that lives ]in the shelter[ of the Most High, in the shadow of] the Almighty [he stays. ] He who says [to YHWH: 'My refuge] and [my] fortress,[ my God] is the safety in which [I trust.]"

#### B. 11QPs<sup>a</sup> 19:1–18 (*Plea of Deliverance*)<sup>29</sup>

David Flusser<sup>30</sup> has drawn attention to the *Plea of Deliverance* as an apotropaic prayer.<sup>31</sup> Lines 13–16 confirm this interpretation.<sup>32</sup>

<sup>26</sup> A close parallel in Philonenko, "Doctrine," 173.

<sup>27</sup> See the discussion of E. Eshel, "Apotropaic Prayers in the Second Temple Period," in *Liturgical Perspectives: Prayer and Poetry in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Proceedings of the Fifth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 19–23 January 2000* (ed. E. G. Chazon, in collaboration with R. A. Clements and A. Pinnick; STDJ 48; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 69–88, esp. 71–74. She suggests that the text of the psalm was altered editorially to adapt it here as one of the four apotropaic prayers, in keeping with "the tendency in the Second Temple period to adapt...Psalm 91 to the specific needs of apotropaic defense" (74).

<sup>28</sup> Text according to 6:3–4.

<sup>29</sup> The edition and translation is that of Sanders, DJD 4.76–79.

<sup>30</sup> D. Flusser, "Qumrân and Jewish 'Apotropaic' Prayers," *IEJ* 16 (1966): 194–205.

<sup>31</sup> I owe the hint to Sanders, "Liturgy," 217 n. 6.

<sup>32</sup> Translation according to Sanders, DJD 4.78.



Forgive my sin, O Lord,  
 and purify me from my iniquity.  
 Vouchsafe me a spirit of faith and knowledge,  
 And let me not be dishonored in ruin.  
 Let not Satan rule over me,  
 Nor an unclean spirit;  
 Neither let pain nor the evil inclination  
 Take possession of my bones.

Here we find the pair of opposites, *rwḥ ʾmwnh* (line 14) and *stn wrwḥ tmʾh* (line 15). A spirit of faithfulness, on the one hand, is connected with (the spirit of) knowledge; the dominion of Satan,<sup>33</sup> on the other, is linked with an unclean spirit, pain and *yṣr rʿ* (“evil inclination”).<sup>34</sup> “Unclean spirits were believed to derive from Satan, and to cause pain and disease. Disease, in turn, was seen as a result of sin, which again is a product of man’s evil inclination. In order to avert and banish these horrible dangers, the author of this Qumran prayer invoked the apotropaic protection of God.”<sup>35</sup>

### C. Spirit(s) in 1QGenesis Apocryphon

Crucial to our question is the passage in 1QApGen 20:16–32: after the praise of Sarai’s beauty by Hirqanos (lines 1–7), Pharaoh takes Sarai from Abraham by force (lines 7–11), and Abraham prays to God (lines 12–16). As a result, “That night, the God Most High sent him a chastising spirit (*rwḥ mkdš*), to afflict him and all the members of his household, an evil spirit (*rwḥ bʾišʾ*) that kept afflicting him and all the members of his household” (lines 16–17). For two years the evil spirit torments Pharaoh, preventing him from having sexual intercourse with Sarai. The Pharaoh calls for the healers of Egypt, but they cannot heal him, “for the spirit (*rwḥ*) attacked all of them and they fled” (lines 20–21). Hirqanos is told by Lot that these afflictions can only be halted by the return of Sarai to Abraham: “and this plague and the spirit (*rwḥ*) of purulent evils will cease to afflict you” (line 26). Abraham is asked by Pharaoh to pray for him and his household “so that this evil spirit (*rwḥ dʾ bʾišʾt*) will be banished from us. I prayed that [he might be] cured and laid my hands upon his [hea]d. The plague was removed

<sup>33</sup> See also the *Testament of Levi* (Flusser, “‘Apotropaic’ Prayers,” 194).

<sup>34</sup> The meaning of *yṣr rʿ* does not yet have the technical sense found in rabbinic literature; for *yṣr* see Lichtenberger, *Menschenbild*, 77–81.

<sup>35</sup> Flusser, “‘Apotropaic’ Prayers,” 205.

from him; the evil [spirit] (*[rwhʿ] b'ist'*) was banished [from him] and he recovered" (lines 28–29).<sup>36</sup>

The evil spirit here is clearly understood as a demon who inflicts plagues and punishment, rendering Pharaoh impotent for the duration of time that Sarai is in his control. Only by virtue of Abraham's prayer is the plague removed from him. A technical term for "demon" (e.g., *šd*) does not occur in this passage, but a demon ("evil spirit") has evidently taken possession of Pharaoh and his household. It is explicitly said that this spirit was sent by God in order to hinder Pharaoh from approaching Sarai. God alone—following Abraham's prayer—can remove it.<sup>37</sup>

#### D. *An Incantation Formula in 4Q560*<sup>38</sup>

Douglas Penney and Michael Wise note:

4Q560 preserves an Aramaic apotropaic magic formula that mentions concerns common to other similar texts: childbirth, demons and the diseases associated with them, sleep or dreams and perhaps safety of possessions. The preserved portions of the formula adjure the offending spirits, apparently by name.<sup>39</sup>

In the few preserved lines of this text, a whole panorama of ancient demonology is revealed before our eyes:

In line 1 of column 1, the name "Beel]zebul" may be read, as the one being addressed ("you"). Line 2 speaks of an "evil visitant," a *š[d*. Line 3 seems to be an incantation: "...I adjure you all who en]ter into the body, the male Wasting-demon and the female Wasting-demon";<sup>40</sup> line 4 obviously continues the incantation: "...I adjure you by the name of YHWH, 'He who re]moves iniquity and transgression,'<sup>41</sup> O Fever and Chills and Chest Pain." Line 5 eventually refers to "the male Shrine-spirit

<sup>36</sup> Translation according to F. García Martínez and E. J. C. Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* (2 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 1997–1998), 1:42–43.

<sup>37</sup> Prayer also plays a role in the "Prayer of Nabonidus," but there is no notion of a "spirit" or demon; for this text and the *Genesis Apocryphon* see W. Kirchschräger, "Exorzismus in Qumran?" *Kairos* 18 (1976): 135–53.

<sup>38</sup> Most important for the interpretation of this text is D. L. Penney and M. O. Wise, "By the Power of Beelzebul: An Aramaic Incantation Formula from Qumran (4Q560)," *JBL* 113 (1994): 627–50.

<sup>39</sup> Penney and Wise, "Beelzebul," 649.

<sup>40</sup> Translation according to Penney and Wise, "Beelzebul," 632.

<sup>41</sup> Quotation either from Exod 34:7 or Num 14:18, see Penney and Wise, "Beelzebul," 639.

and the female Shrine-spirit,<sup>42</sup> breacher-demons (?) of..." In column 2, line 5 reads, "And I adjure you, O spirit (*rwḥ*), [that you...]"

In this text, not prayer but adjuration serves to free the suffering person from spirits and demons who inflict suffering and pain. Although God had not sent the evil spirit(s) and demons, by calling upon the *name* of God "[Who re]moves iniquity and transgression," illness,<sup>43</sup> pain, and sleeplessness(?) will be driven out.

#### E. Summary

These four texts from the Dead Sea Scrolls show the great diversity of the activities of (evil) spirits and demons in human beings. They inflict suffering, lead one to sin, and threaten life in every respect. In the special case of Pharaoh this torment works for the benefit of the pious. We have encountered two ways to get rid of the evil spirits or demons: prayer to God and incantation in the name of God (YHWH). In the collection 11QPsAp<sup>a</sup> these two modes are combined: the first three psalms feature adjuration, while Ps. 91:2 offers direct appeal to God.

### III. SPIRITS AND DEMONS IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

#### A. Introduction

The worldview we encounter in these texts is best illustrated by New Testament demonology: in the dualism we find in the Gospel of John concerning the overcoming of the "Prince of this world" through the ministry and presence of Jesus (John 12:31: "Now is the judgment of this world; now shall the prince of this world be cast out"); in the satanic power of Babylon-Rome and the final destruction portrayed in Revelation; and most vividly in the exorcisms of Jesus: "But if it is by the finger of God that I cast out demons, then the kingdom of God has come upon you" (Luke 11:20). The *Plea of Deliverance* (11QPs<sup>a</sup> 19:13–16) is best illustrated by the Lord's Prayer: "And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from the evil (= the evil one)" (Matt 6:13).

<sup>42</sup> For *prk* and *mḥtwri* see Penney and Wise, "Beelzebub," 642–46.

<sup>43</sup> See in 11Q11 4:3 the name of Raphael.

B. *Jesus and the Demons*<sup>44</sup>

One of the undisputed activities of Jesus' ministry is the casting out of demons. Since the days of the *Religionsgeschichtliche Schule* this has been connected with exorcism and magic in the Greco-Roman world as it is presented in the *Papyri Graecae Magicae*.<sup>45</sup> In these texts, as well as in Philostratus's *Vita Apollonii*, for example, we find close parallels to Jesus' exorcisms, both in terms of overall worldview and in specific practices and formulas.<sup>46</sup>

Another branch of scholarship, highlighted by the seminal work of G. Vermes,<sup>47</sup> has dealt with the relevance of Josephus's accounts of magical practices<sup>48</sup> and of early Jewish miracle workers such as Ḥanina ben Dosa and Ḥoni ha-Meagel. Although fully aware of a demonological conception diffused throughout the Mediterranean world, these authors stress the Jewish setting of Jesus' exorcizing activity.<sup>49</sup>

The most important declaration of Jesus' self-understanding is to be found in Luke 11:20: "But if it is by the finger of God that I cast out demons, then the kingdom of God has come upon you." Most scholars support the authenticity of this saying, especially because it relates Jesus' exorcisms to the coming of the Kingdom of God, the center of Jesus' proclamation. Of special importance is the "I" brought into connection

<sup>44</sup> See O. Böcher, *Dämonenfurcht und Dämonenabwehr: Ein Beitrag zur Vorgeschichte der christlichen Taufe* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1970); idem, "Dämonen (böse Geister)," parts I and IV, *TRE* 8:270–74, 279–86; B. Kollmann, *Jesus und die Christen als Wundertäter: Studien zu Magie, Medizin und Schamanismus in Antike und Christentum* (FRLANT 170; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996); M. Rese, "Jesus und die Dämonen im Matthäusevangelium," in Lange et al., *Die Dämonen*, 463–75; U. Mittmann-Richert, "Die Dämonen und der Tod des Gottessohns im Markusevangelium," in Lange et al., *Die Dämonen*, 476–504; G. S. Oegema, "Jesus' Casting Out of Demons in the Gospel of Mark against Its Greco-Roman Background," in Lange et al., *Die Dämonen*, 505–18, and especially T. Söding, "Wenn ich mit dem Finger Gottes die Dämonen austreibe..." (Lk 11,20)," in Lange et al., *Die Dämonen*, 519–49.

<sup>45</sup> *Papyri Graecae Magicae: Die griechischen Zauberpapyri* (ed. K. Preisendanz et al.; Leipzig: Teubner, 1928–1931), hereafter *PGM*; for a selection and English translation see H. D. Betz, *The Greek Magical Papyri in Translation, Including the Demotic Spells* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986; 2d ed., 1992).

<sup>46</sup> For a recent discussion see Oegema, "Jesus' Casting Out of Demons."

<sup>47</sup> G. Vermes, *Jesus the Jew: A Historian's Reading of the Gospels* (London: Collins, 1973). See also M. Smith, *Jesus the Magician* (San Francisco: Harper&Row; London: Gollancz, 1978).

<sup>48</sup> See most recently R. Deines, "Josephus, Salomo und die von Gott verliehene *techné* gegen die Dämonen," in Lange et al., *Die Dämonen*, 365–94.

<sup>49</sup> For the most recent discussion see M. Becker, *Wunder und Wundertäter im frührabbinischen Judentum: Studien zum Phänomen und seiner Überlieferung im Horizont von Magie und Dämonismus* (WUNT 2.144; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002).

with God (“by the finger of God,” which implies “by the power of God”) and God’s *basileia*, which is not expected in some near or distant future but rather is present in Jesus’ ministry. Thus this verse not only mentions Jesus’ exorcizing activity, but also gives an interpretation: God’s Kingdom is made present in Jesus’ expulsion of the demons.

C. *What is the Role of Demons in the New Testament  
World of Jesus?*<sup>50</sup>

In the New Testament, the demons are called by such terms as “unclean spirit” (Mark 1:23 and elsewhere in Mark) or “evil spirit” (e.g., Luke 7:21); they have Satan as their *archon*, and whoever would expel them must do this with Satan’s help—and therefore seemingly must himself be possessed by *Beelzebub* (Mark 3:22). As “unclean” spirits they cut off those whom they control from contact with the pious; as “evil” spirits they confer harm and calamity. In this role, they cause illnesses; e.g., epilepsy (Mark 9:14–27), deafness (Mark 9:25), blindness (Matt 12:22), and more. Their proclivity for causing illness is one of the strongest links connecting New Testament demonology with some of the texts presented above; but it also belongs to the *Koine* of ancient demonology as a whole.<sup>51</sup>

The demons in the New Testament have knowledge of Jesus (Mark 1:24) and of his divinity (“the Holy One of God,” Mark 1:24); they know that he is the “Son of God” (Mark 3:11); they even know that there is only one God, the Most High (Mark 5:7). As Thomas Söding rightly states: “Die Dämonen sind in den Evangelien nicht, wie sonst oft, Häretiker, sondern auf teuflische Weise orthodox.”<sup>52</sup> They also know how to behave against their adversary, Jesus. They call him by name (e.g., Mark 1:24), in the same way that an exorcist must be able to name the demon(s) (note Jesus’ question at Mark 5:9: “What is your name?”).<sup>53</sup>

It is surprising that the demons in the New Testament are active during the daytime, not exclusively at night,<sup>54</sup> which anomaly demonstrates

<sup>50</sup> For this see Söding, “Wenn ich mit dem Finger Gottes...,” 522–25.

<sup>51</sup> Many such examples may be found in *PGM*.

<sup>52</sup> Söding, “Wenn ich mit dem Finger Gottes...,” 525.

<sup>53</sup> Compare the similar question, “Who are you?” in 11QapocrPs<sup>a</sup> 5:6; for the correct names of the demons see, e.g., *PGM* 7.579–90 (Betz, *Greek Magical Papyri*, 134); *PGM* 16.1–75 (Betz, *Greek Magical Papyri*, 252).

<sup>54</sup> As, for example, the demon Agrat; see also 11QapocrPs<sup>a</sup> 5:4 (“When he comes to you in the night”); *PGM* 13.124 (Betz, *Greek Magical Papyri*, 175).

their exceptional powers. Their power is also vividly illustrated by the sufferings they cause. Human beings are unable to free *themselves* from the demons and thereby from the diseases they cause; only Jesus, the exorcist empowered by God, is able to accomplish that. Rescue from the demons brings people back to the ordinary life from which they had been excluded and makes them followers and messengers of Jesus (Mark 5:18, 20).

To what place are the demons cast out? We get an ironic answer in the story of the demons in Gerasa, who are sent into pigs which then drown in Lake Gennesaret: their destination is death. But a demon which was expelled may also drift free for a time and then want to return:

When the unclean spirit has gone out of a person, it wanders through waterless regions for a resting place, but not finding any, it says, "I will return to my house from which I came." When it comes, it finds it swept and put in order. Then it goes and brings seven other spirits more evil than itself, and they enter and live there; and the last state of that person is worse than the first. (Luke 11:24–26 RSV)

This demonstrates the permanent danger posed by demons when and where Jesus is not present.

It goes without saying that others, too, are able to expel demons (Mark 9:38), but it is only Jesus whose activity initiates the Kingdom of God. This notion is deeply rooted in the dualistic worldview which sets the Kingdom of God in opposition to the realm of Satan as the *archōn tōn daimoniōn* (Mark 3:22 etc.) and the *archōn tou kosmou toutou* (John 12:31). Of course this is the special "Christian" variant of and solution to the problem of dualistic cosmology, demonology, and anthropology. But it shares and is part of a dualistic worldview common in Early Judaism.

The struggle between Jesus and Satan takes on cosmological dimensions. It will end with the downfall of God's enemy, i.e., Satan: "I watched how Satan fell, like lightning, out of the sky" (Luke 10:18 NEB).<sup>55</sup> This final casting down of God's enemy is to be accomplished in Jesus' death, in which he proves—paradoxically—victorious over Satan (see also John 12:31) and the evil powers. The expulsion of demons during Jesus' lifetime foreshadows his final victory as God's agent ("By the finger of God," Luke 11:20). Therefore legions (Mark 5:6) of demons must capitulate and are being destroyed. It is an asymmetrical conflict and

---

<sup>55</sup> See also the narrative of the casting down of Satan in Revelation 12; compare John 12:31: "Now the ruler of this world will be driven out" (RSV).

the showdown is at hand. Humanity is still threatened by the powers of evil, but no longer helplessly exposed. Jesus himself has broken into the house of the “strong man” (e.g., Satan), “has first tied the strong man up” (Mark 3:27) and has removed those who had previously been under the dominion of Satan, i.e., those possessed by demons.

The New Testament and the Dead Sea Scrolls share the notion that human beings are threatened by devastating powers not under their control. This situation is described as an aspect of a dualistic worldview comprising cosmology and anthropology and using demonology to explain and to solve this problem of powerlessness.

#### IV. CONCLUSION

The heading “Qumran and the New Testament” does not mean that we are dealing with two monolithic entities. Their relationship can not be described in terms of a development from the one to the other. Qumran is not a *praeparatio evangelica*. We are to realize that they share a common worldview which is deeply rooted in the Bible and in postbiblical developments in early Judaism. From this foundation they formulate their respective solutions to the one decisive question: Augustine’s *Unde malum?*<sup>56</sup>

---

<sup>56</sup> Augustine, *Confessions*, 7.5.7.

A MESSIAH IN HEAVEN? A RE-EVALUATION OF JEWISH AND  
CHRISTIAN APOCALYPTIC TRADITIONS\*

CANA WERMAN  
*Ben-Gurion University*

This two-part paper begins with an attempt to reconstruct an apocalyptic work from the first century CE. It then compares the nature of the messianic expectations found in this reconstructed text to messianic expectations at Qumran. I hope through this study to identify some features of Jewish messianism common to both, and thereby make a contribution to the larger question of the nature of Jewish messianic hopes from the first century BCE to the first century CE.

PART ONE: A PROPOSED RECONSTRUCTION OF AN APOCALYPTIC  
WORK FROM THE FIRST CENTURY CE: THE *ORACLE OF HYSTASPES*  
AND THE BOOK OF REVELATION

Scholarly opinion identifies the *Oracle of Hystaspes* as an apocalyptic work.<sup>1</sup> Since the *Oracle* predicts the fall of the Roman Empire (which was established in the second half of the first century BCE) and is first mentioned by Justin Martyr (writing in the early second century CE), its probable time of composition is the first century CE. The *Oracle* is placed in the mouth of a young boy and addressed to Hystaspes, that is, Vistasp, the king who was Zarathustra's benefactor. The role attributed to Hystaspes in the frame story of the *Oracle* is indicative of an environment in which Iranian traditions were well known and were utilized for anti-Roman propaganda. Indeed, the *Oracle* was forbidden reading throughout the Roman Empire for several generations after its composition.<sup>2</sup>

---

\* I would like to thank my colleague and friend Prof. Roland Deines for his comments and suggestions.

<sup>1</sup> See for example, E. Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ* (ed. G. Vermes, F. Millar, and M. Goodman; rev. ed.; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1986), 3:654.

<sup>2</sup> Thus Justin Martyr in his first *Apology* (chapter 44).



Although referred to by a number of writers in antiquity,<sup>3</sup> the contents of the *Oracle* are known to us only from Lactantius, the third-century CE Latin author. He quotes the *Oracle* in Book 7 of his *Divine Institutes*,<sup>4</sup> but does not specify what material derives from the *Oracle* and what reflects other sources. Consequently, scholars differ regarding the extent of the quotation from the *Oracle*; hence the lack of consensus as to whether the *Oracle* is of Jewish or Iranian origin.<sup>5</sup> In a comprehensive paper published thirty years ago, David Flusser demonstrated the strong likelihood of a Jewish origin for the *Oracle*.<sup>6</sup> Flusser also demonstrated that chapters 11 and 13 of the Book of Revelation should be considered part of the *Oracle*.

In light of Flusser's analysis and insights, we are able to posit the *Oracle*'s literary structure. It seems that, like other apocalyptic writings, the *Oracle* had two parts: a symbolic vision, shown to Hystaspes in a dream, and its interpretation, conveyed to Hystaspes by a boy.<sup>7</sup> The symbolic vision was used by John of Patmos and found its way into

<sup>3</sup> For a survey, see J. R. Hinnells, "The Zoroastrian Doctrine of Salvation," in *Man and His Salvation: Studies in Memory of S. G. F. Brandon* (ed. E. J. Sharpe and J. R. Hinnells; Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1973), 127–29.

<sup>4</sup> For translations of the *Institutes*, see *Lactantius: The Divine Institutes I–VII* (trans. M. F. McDonald; FC 49; Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1964); A. Bowen and P. Garnsey, *Lactantius, Divine Institutes, Translated with an Introduction and Notes* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2003).

<sup>5</sup> The discussion of what Lactantius has taken from the *Oracle*, and of the nature of the *Oracle* itself, is characterized by circular reasoning. Based on their assumptions regarding the provenance of the *Oracle*, scholars single out the paragraphs corresponding to their expectations. Thus, for example, Hinnells ("Zoroastrian Doctrine"), who considers only paragraphs taken neither from Jewish sources nor from the Sibyl (133), concludes that the *Oracle* is "a genuine Iranian—specifically, Zoroastrian—work" (146). Scholars who reject the authenticity of Jewish elements found in Lactantius as a genuine part of the *Oracle* are noted in Flusser's essay, "Hystaspes and John of Patmos," in idem, *Judaism and the Origins of Christianity* (Jerusalem: The Hebrew University Magnes Press, 1988), 392–93 n. 7. To Flusser's list we may add: Schürer (*History*, 655) and Boyce and Grenet (M. Boyce and F. Grenet, *A History of Zoroastrianism: Zoroastrianism Under Macedonian and Roman Rule* [Handbook of Oriental Studies. Section 1, The Near and Middle East: Religion 3; Leiden: Brill, 1991], 377–78 n. 63).

<sup>6</sup> Flusser, "Hystaspes," 390–453 and n. 7. To cite Flusser: "To save the Persian character of the *Oracle*, scholars had to disregard the Jewish elements in Lactantius and to suppose that they were introduced by Lactantius from his Christian sources. So they were obliged to perform a dangerous operation and cut off the Jewish elements from the story although they are an organic part of it" (398). Aune accepts Flusser's position regarding the relationship between the *Oracle* and Revelation. See D. E. Aune, *Revelation 6–16* (WBC 52B; Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1998), 590–92, 727.

<sup>7</sup> Flusser, "Hystaspes," 446–48; Aune, *Revelation*, 588–93.

Revelation; the interpretation of the vision was preserved in Lactantius.<sup>8</sup> The *Oracle* exhibits the characteristic features of a political apocalypse. It reflects the belief that a chain of kingdoms will rule the world, a chain of predetermined numbers and character. The *Oracle*'s writer focuses on the end of the chain, the links closest to his own time. To my mind,<sup>9</sup> he first mentions the Seleucid Empire, represented by the numbers 3 and 10 familiar to us from the book of Daniel<sup>10</sup> (and hinted at in Rev 13:1; Lactantius, *Divine Institutes* 7.16.1).<sup>11</sup> The Seleucid Empire, however, is swiftly conquered by an evil ruler (Rev 13:1–10; *Divine Institutes* 7.16.3), the next link in the chain. This evil ruler, Rome, will plunder and kill, change the law, alter the name of the kingdom, and move its seat of government.

The author, aware of the two phases in Roman history—the Republic and the Empire—does not portray the Republic as the final link in the chain. Rome's rule is to be followed by that of another kingdom, the Empire, whose leader will come from Syria and will kill the first evil ruler (*Divine Institutes* 7.17.2; cf. Rev 13:11–18).<sup>12</sup> The son of an evil spirit, this second ruler will present himself as the son of God and will force people to worship him. This is the antichrist,<sup>13</sup> who arouses the mob and tries, unsuccessfully, to destroy God's Temple.

---

<sup>8</sup> As Aune notes (*Revelation*, 592, 727–28), Lactantius does not quote Revelation directly in Book VII of the *Divine Institutes*. For a different evaluation, see P. Prigent, *Commentary on the Apocalypse of St. John* (trans. W. Pradels; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001), 52–54.

<sup>9</sup> At this point I am departing from Flusser's analysis.

<sup>10</sup> The fourth beast that comes out of the sea, according to Daniel chapter 7, has ten horns on her head, symbolizing the ten rulers from the beginning of the Seleucid empire, from the late fourth to mid-second centuries BCE. The last three horns (Antiochus Epiphanes' brother Seleucus IV and his two sons, Antiochus and Demetrius) are removed by the little, additional horn symbolizing Antiochus IV. See J. J. Collins, *Daniel: A Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993), 299, 321.

<sup>11</sup> The *Oracle* reworked Daniel 7, thus reusing the Canaanite myth found in Daniel as anti-Hellenistic propaganda (see J. J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Vision of the Book of Daniel* [HSM 16; Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1977], 95–118).

<sup>12</sup> Flusser ("Hystaspes," 396–97) and Aune (*Revelation*, 729) suggest that the second evil ruler represents the *Koinon* of Asia. However, since the *Oracle* presents itself as eastern, anti-Roman propaganda, a negative portrayal of the east is improbable.

<sup>13</sup> Flusser used this designation for the second ruler and I follow in his wake. Lactantius has "antichrist" as a title for the second ruler, in what seems to be his own interpolation (*Divine Institutes* 7.19.6). For a survey of the research on this term and its meaning, see L. J. Lietaert Peerbolte, *The Antecedents of Antichrist: A Traditio-*

Our author targets the antichrist, the last link in the chain. During his era, a prophet will be sent by God to preach and to bring the people back to God's way. At the conclusion of this prophet's mission the antichrist will put him to death (Rev 11:3–7; *Divine Institutes* 7.17.2).<sup>14</sup> The prophet's body will be left in the street for three days. On the third day he will be resurrected and will ascend to heaven (Rev 11:8–12; *Divine Institutes* 7.17.3). Total victory over the antichrist will be achieved only after years of terror, during which those who are faithful to God will be oppressed and will be forced to flee. Anyone captured will suffer violent death (Rev 13:15; *Divine Institutes* 7.17.7). This horror will end with the descent of a big sword from heaven, followed by the great king (Rev 19:11–15; *Divine Institutes* 7.19.5) who will judge the evildoers, fight the antichrist, and kill him at the fifth battle (Rev 19:16–21; *Divine Institutes* 7.19.5–8). Who is the "great king"? John of Patmos identified him as Jesus (19:13); so did Lactantius (*Divine Institutes* 7.19.6). The assumption that the *Oracle* depicted the coming of the true Messiah is thus not farfetched.

This is the outline of the *Oracle* in brief. Before proceeding, we should take note of details overlooked in the above summary. The vision *interpretation* found in Lactantius indeed refers to three successive, rival phases in world history: the Seleucid Empire, the Republic and the Empire. Revelation 13, on the other hand, refers only to the last two phases; John of Patmos mentions *two* beasts. To the first he gives the attributes belonging in the *Oracle* to the first phase, that of the Seleucid Empire: the numbers 7 and 10 (13:1). Furthermore, he portrays the relationship between the two beasts not as one of rivalry but as one of veneration: the second beast forces humanity to worship the first. I assume, however, that what we find in Revelation is a reworking of the original *Oracle* where the depiction of two beasts, one in combat with the other, was found. I propose the following explanation for Revelation's alteration of the original symbols. Unlike the boy who talks to Vistasp-

---

*Historical Study of the Earliest Christian Views on Eschatological Opponents* (JSJSup 49; Leiden: Brill, 1996), 3–15.

<sup>14</sup> In his examination of the *Oracle* and other sources discussed here, I. Knohl (*The Messiah before Jesus: The Suffering Servant of the Dead Sea Scrolls* [Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000]) fails to note that it was the prophet and not the Messiah who was killed by the antichrist. His attempt to reconstruct an historical event behind chapter 11 in which a Qumran community leader who perceived himself as a Messiah initiated a revolt after Herod's death and was subsequently killed, his body lying in the street for three days, is thus unfounded.

Hystaspes in the original *Oracle*, John of Patmos is a real person speaking directly to his audience. *Ex-eventu* prophecy—predictions concerning a chain of kingdoms supposedly to come in the future—would not have any effect on his addressees, who share his knowledge.<sup>15</sup> Thus John of Patmos converts the chain into a single image referring to the political situation of his time: one beast (Rome) is worshiped by humanity since the other beast (its emperors) force it to do so.

It is harder to find an explanation for the reworking of the *Oracle* in Revelation 11, the transformation of the persecution of one prophet into the persecution of two prophets.<sup>16</sup> Perhaps this represents the insertion of a biblical motif; note Zechariah's two (identical) messianic figures. However other Jewish and Christian motifs are also possible candidates. As was pointed out by Clements,<sup>17</sup> John of Patmos formed here a literary parallel of two beasts (chapter 13) and two prophets (chapter 11).<sup>18</sup>

From this understanding of the *Oracle's* outline, I would like now to go one step further and reconstruct an additional component of the original, now lost, first-century *Oracle of Hystaspes*. In my opinion, a story telling of the birth of the Messiah and his escape to God immediately after his birth was included in the *Oracle*. This component is discernible in Revelation 12. It has never been thought to be part of the *Oracle* because it is completely absent from Lactantius's book. My suggestion fills a gap in the *Oracle* as commonly reconstructed: It accounts for the existence of the Messiah in heaven. The fact that this birth story is missing from Lactantius can easily be explained. For a good Christian like Lactantius, the baby Messiah's ascent to God would contradict belief in the story of Jesus' earthly life. He would therefore

---

<sup>15</sup> On the question of Revelation as apocalyptic work, see R. J. Bauckham, *The Theology of the Book of Revelation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 2–17; F. D. Mazzaferri, *The Genre of the Book of Revelation from a Source-Critical Perspective* (BZNW 54; Berlin: De Gruyter, 1989), 259–64.

<sup>16</sup> See the discussion in Aune, *Revelation*, 598–603.

<sup>17</sup> R. Clements, personal communication.

<sup>18</sup> As noted above (see n. 14), Knohl (*The Messiah*), reconstructed a historical conflict related to the Qumran community behind chapter 11. The presence of two figures in Revelation is what brought Knohl to see chapter 11 as a reflection of the Qumran community's thoughts and actions. He perceived these two figures as the two Messiahs whose coming at the End of Days was expected in the Community. However, as will be shown below, at Qumran the two Messiahs are of different types and have different roles, while in Revelation 11 the two figures are identical. Furthermore, it is illogical to assume that, because Revelation 11 mentions two figures, it refers to a historical event that occurred in the Qumran Community and, at the same time, to reconstruct that historical event with only one figure.

choose not to include this episode in his book notwithstanding its presence in the original *Oracle*.

However, although we may plausibly understand the lack of a birth story in Lactantius as an intentional omission, plausibility in and of itself does not constitute proof for the existence of a birth story in the original *Oracle*. Not every first century BCE to first century CE work that tells of the Messiah's coming or testifies to belief in his activities contains a full account of the Messiah's origins. The best known example is the Gospel of Mark, which provides no information regarding Jesus' birth and infancy. To this we can add *Second Baruch* and also *Fourth Ezra*,<sup>19</sup> which mention the Messiah (2 *Baruch* 39–40, 70–72; 4 *Ezra* 7, 11–14) but provide no clear statement regarding his background, although it seems that both writings assume his preexistence.<sup>20</sup>

In favor of the existence of a birth story in the *Oracle* I would like to enlist two arguments—one internal and one external. The internal argument is the *Oracle's* portrayal of the Messiah as a human being, born of a human mother. The external argument is the existence of related, even parallel, writings that mention the Messiah's mother and contain elements recounting the Messiah's birth and ascent to heaven.

My evaluation of the internal argument takes as a starting point the question of *whether* the Messiah in the *Oracle* is a human being. In order to answer this question, we must first evaluate another figure found in the *Oracle*: the prophet. As I noted earlier, prior to his encounter with the Messiah who descends from heaven, the antichrist struggles with a prophet sent by God. According to the *Oracle* (*Divine Institutes* 7.17.2), this prophet possesses the ability to cause drought (see 1 Kings 16–17, where Elijah brings drought upon the earth) and to turn water into blood (see 2 Kings 3:22 where Elisha assists the kings of Israel and Judah in their war against the Moabites by causing water to appear to be blood). Furthermore, fire comes out of the prophet's mouth and burns his enemies (see 2 Kings 1:10–14 where Elijah exterminates with

---

<sup>19</sup> Note that neither 2 *Baruch* nor 4 *Ezra*, in accordance with their apocalyptic world-views, award centrality to the Messiah's role. Stone points to the inconsistency of the portrayal of the Messiah in 4 *Ezra* and concludes: "In terms of the overall thought of the book, it must be observed that the redeemer figure occurs predominantly in those parts of the book which claim to be drawing on prior traditions." See M. Stone, *Fourth Ezra* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress 1990), 213.

<sup>20</sup> Stone, *Fourth Ezra*, 207–13, esp. 212. See also L. W. Hurtado, "Pre-Existence," in *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters* (ed. G. F. Hawthorne and R. P. Martin; Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 1993), 743–46.

heavenly fire the messengers sent to him by Ahaziah). As Flusser notes, there is a strong affinity between the prophet described here and the biblical Elijah.<sup>21</sup>

Thus, the *Oracle's* prophet is likened to Elijah, or is perhaps even meant to be Elijah himself, as his end also resembles that of Elijah (note that, in the *Oracle*, after lying dead in the street for three days, the prophet ascends to heaven). If indeed Elijah is alluded to in the *Oracle*, then in the author's worldview special human beings may ascend to (biblical Elijah) and then descend from and reascend to heaven (Elijah in the *Oracle*), for a series of set times determined by God. Similarly, the Messiah who descends from heaven could be a human being. Furthermore, when the Messiah descends from heaven he is accompanied by a group of angels (Rev 19:14; *Divine Institutes* 7.19.5), yet the author nowhere explicitly states that the Messiah himself is an angel. We should also be aware of the fact that, in the *Oracle*, the Messiah has no role in any cosmic or heavenly transformation, nor does he change the order of nature.

I therefore propose that, like Elijah, the Messiah of the *Oracle* is a human being who dwells in heaven and is sent back to earth at the End of Days. We might then expect to find a story of how this human being came to ascend to heaven in the first place. For this purpose I turn to works contemporary with the *Oracle of Hystaspes* that include descriptions of the Messiah's ascent. There are works close to our author's time that relate, or hint at, the Messiah's ascent to heaven before his return to save the world. For example, in *Slavonic Enoch*, the young Melchizedek is taken to heaven for protection from the Flood (ch. 71).

As indicated earlier, I suggest that in the *Oracle*, the ascent was part of a birth story. To support this proposition I would like to evaluate a story from the tractate *Berakhot* in the Palestinian Talmud. As we shall see, a comparison of this story with Revelation chapter 12 is of importance for the question of the presence of a birth story in the *Oracle*.

The story in *y. Berakhot* (5a; with a parallel in *Lam. Rab.* 1:51 on Lam. 1:16)<sup>22</sup> tells of a Jew who, while plowing his field, learns that the Temple

<sup>21</sup> Flusser, "Hystaspes," 420–21.

<sup>22</sup> Martha Himmelfarb recently discussed this story in great detail. See M. Himmelfarb, "The Mother of the Messiah in the Talmud Yerushalmi and *Sefer Zerubabel*," in *The Talmud Yerushalmi and Graeco-Roman Culture III* (ed. P. Schäfer; TSAJ 93; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002), 367–89. See also: H. Newman "The Birth of the Messiah on the Day of Destruction—Historical and Anti-Historical Comments," in *For Uriel: Studies in the History of Israel in Antiquity Presented to Professor Uriel*

has been destroyed. At the same time he also learns that the Messiah, Menachem the son of Hezekiah,<sup>23</sup> “from the royal city, Bethlehem in Judah” has been born on the same day. Consequently, he decides to search for the baby Messiah. Wandering about as a trader of swaddling clothes for babies, he arrives at a certain village where he meets the Messiah’s mother. While chatting with the mother, he gives her a swaddling cloth for the baby. During their conversation the mother expresses her wish to strangle her baby, calling him the enemy of her people. Time passes and upon his return to that village, the mother informs the trader that strong winds had snatched the baby from her arms.

In the *Yerushalmi* the baby is in danger. Blaming him for the destruction that has befallen her people, his mother seeks his death. From the mother’s point of view, the kidnapping of the baby by the winds is an appropriate punishment. However, a second point of view is found in the story: that of the trader, who believes that the winds carried the baby to God to save him from his mother’s threat. This is also the narrator’s point of view, as seen from the choice of the rare term *al’ulin* “strong winds.” This word appears only one other time in all the Aramaic texts of that period, where it refers to Elijah’s ascent to Heaven.<sup>24</sup>

Scholars have noted the similarity between the story in the *Yerushalmi* and that of Jesus’ birth.<sup>25</sup> But the similarity is only superficial.<sup>26</sup> Jesus was alive and safe in his mother’s bosom, whereas in the *Yerushalmi* the main event is the baby’s disappearance. The comparison drawn by

---

*Rappaport* (ed. M. Mor et al.; Jerusalem: The Zalman Shazar Center for Jewish History, 2005), 85–110 (Hebrew).

<sup>23</sup> On this name as the traditionally expected name of the Messiah of the House of David see Newman, “The Birth,” 94–99.

<sup>24</sup> Y. Fraenkel, *‘Iyyunim be-‘Olam ha-ruchani shel sippur ha-aggadah* (Tel-Aviv: Hakibbutz Hameuchad, 1981), 163 n. 19.

<sup>25</sup> G. Hasan-Rokem, *Web of Life: Folklore and Midrash in Rabbinic Literature* (trans. Batya Stein; Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 2000), 152–60.

<sup>26</sup> See Himmelfarb, “Mother of the Messiah,” 373–76. Knohl (*The Messiah*) erred in his attempt to link the *Yerushalmi* to Revelation 11. Whereas Revelation 11 speaks about the ascent to heaven of an adult who completed his mission on earth, the *Yerushalmi* tells of a baby that ascended in order to be prepared for his future mission on earth. Thus, we cannot deduce the name of the hero referred to in Revelation 11 from the name of the hero in the *Yerushalmi*: Menachem. Accordingly, Knohl’s identification of the event told in Revelation 11 as the death and resurrection of Menachem the Essene is more than doubtful.

the German scholar Eberhard Vischer between Revelation 12 and the *Yerushalmi* is more instructive.<sup>27</sup>

In Revelation 12 a struggle takes place in heaven between a heavenly mother crowned by stars and a dragon who removes the celestial stars with its tail. The dragon seeks to swallow the newborn Messiah, but the latter is carried to God. The Messiah's mother is saved by the winds and transported to the desert.

The participants in the *Yerushalmi* are terrestrial. In Revelation the characters are cosmic: the crowned mother, the dragon, and the archangel Michael and his assistants, who fight the dragon and throw him down to earth.<sup>28</sup> D. Aune's discussion of chapter 12,<sup>29</sup> however, downplays the differences between the *Yerushalmi* and Revelation. Pointing to the lack of coherence between the components of chapter 12, Aune, following many others, argues that this chapter combines two different myths: the story of the baby, and the story of Michael and his helpers.

In discussing the origin of the myth of the mother, the dragon, the baby and the winds, most scholars accept to a greater or lesser degree A. Yarbro Collins's evaluation.<sup>30</sup> Demonstrating that the birth myth as found here exemplifies the use of cosmological myths for the purposes of anti-Hellenistic and anti-Roman propaganda, Yarbro Collins identified the closest parallel to the myth of the mother and the dragon as a cosmological myth prevalent in the western part of Asia Minor: the tradition of the pursuit of the goddess Leto by the dragon Python. When Python threatens the pregnant Leto, because he knows that Zeus's offspring Apollo is destined to kill him, Zeus sends the north wind to save Leto. Leto subsequently gives birth to Apollo and Artemis, and, ultimately, Apollo kills Python.<sup>31</sup>

According to Yarbro Collins, the childbirth story retold in Revelation originally took place on earth, not in heaven. When the myth of the archangel Michael was combined with that of the dragon and the

<sup>27</sup> E. Vischer, *Die Offenbarung Johannis: Eine jüdische Apokalypse in christlicher Bearbeitung* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1886). As Himmelfarb notes ("Mother of the Messiah," 371–72 and nn. 10–11), other scholars have adopted Vischer's suggestion.

<sup>28</sup> Because of this difference, Himmelfarb (p. 372) declined to see a close connection between Revelation and the *Yerushalmi*.

<sup>29</sup> Aune, *Revelation*, 664–65.

<sup>30</sup> Aune, *Revelation*, 670–74; A. Yarbro Collins, *The Combat Myth in the Book of Revelation* (HDR 9; Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1976), 116–19, 122–29.

<sup>31</sup> Kalms, however, points to the biblical and Jewish background. See J. U. Kalms, *Der Sturz des Gottesfeindes: Traditonsgeschichtliche Studien zu Apokalypse 12* (WMANT 93; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2001), 31–65.



woman, heavenly attributes were given to the latter. It seems to me that in the reworking of the myth another change took place as well: the beast found in the original story (a beast we know from Revelation 11 and 13) became a dragon, a character more fitting for heavenly combat.<sup>32</sup>

Thus, the similarity between the *Yerushalmi* and Revelation 12 is more striking than it seems at first sight. In both sources the baby is in danger on earth and is taken to dwell in God's shadow. The idea of combat—a struggle between destruction and salvation—is also shared by both stories. In Revelation the beast-dragon symbolizes Rome, eager to destroy the savior who threatens its existence. In the *Yerushalmi* the mother intends to destroy the savior because she perceives him as the agent of her nation's destruction.

It is the similarity between the *Yerushalmi* and Revelation that provides the basis upon which to assume that there was a story about the Messiah's birth in the *Oracle*. Thus while both Flusser and Aune view chapter 12 as a foreign body, intervening between the two chapters taken from the *Oracle*, I suggest that chapter 12 was taken from the *Oracle* as well. As I reconstruct it, in the original *Oracle* the antichrist (Revelation 13) opposes the helpless baby Messiah (Chapter 12) and the helpless prophet (Chapter 11) and will be killed by the powerful Messiah at the End of Days (Chapter 19). The argument that the story of the beast-dragon, the baby, and the mother was not known in Jewish tradition cannot be sustained in light of the *Yerushalmi*.

Two other sources are pertinent to, and support, my argument. The first is a Jewish apocalypse from circa the fifth century CE, *Sefer Zerubbabel*.<sup>33</sup> The textual evidence for this book is extremely confusing, making it difficult to reach any definite conclusions regarding the work. Nonetheless, scholars have noted similarities between the plot lines of *Sefer Zerubbabel* and the *Oracle of Hystaspes*, suggesting that the *Oracle* was one of its sources.<sup>34</sup> For our investigation, the important point is that all

---

<sup>32</sup> On the importance of the heavenly opponent and his defeat for the message of Revelation itself, see Lietaert Peerbolte, *Antecedents of Antichrist*, 133–38, 141.

<sup>33</sup> Personal communication by Dr. Hillel Newman of Haifa University, who has studied *Sefer Zerubbabel* for the last fifteen years. For a relatively recent English translation see M. Himmelfarb, "Sefer Zerubbabel," in *Rabbinic Fantasies: Imaginative Narrative from Classical Hebrew Literature* (ed. D. Satran and M. J. Mirsky; Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1990), 67–90.

<sup>34</sup> Flusser, "Hystaspes," 47–51.

the manuscripts testify to the existence of a female figure, the mother of the Messiah.

Admittedly, there is no birth story in *Sefer Zerubbabel*. The author, or the compiler, chose another scheme of salvation in his book, that of a Messiah who dwells in the evil city which is to be destroyed by him in the future (as in *b. Sanh.* 98a). The Messiah's mother does, however, play a significant role before the coming of her son, the savior, at the story's end. We must note that the mother's role in *Sefer Zerubbabel* was shaped by the author to fit his worldview of the role of empires in world history. Although *Sefer Zerubbabel*, like the *Oracle of Hystaspes* and other apocalyptic writings, refers to a chain of world kingdoms, in *Sefer Zerubbabel* the links are not connected, that is, one kingdom does not defeat the other but each kingdom is overcome by the people of Israel. The Messiah's mother, holding a magic scepter, is the people's leader. The compiler/author of *Sefer Zerubbabel* did not wish to portray the people of Israel as under foreign rule in their own land; rather, he presented the kingdoms as invaders who are eventually defeated. The Messiah's mother with her magic scepter is a focal part of this imaginary scenario.<sup>35</sup>

Thus, we cannot deduce from *Sefer Zerubbabel* the precise nature of the role played by the mother in its presumed source, the *Oracle of Hystaspes*. I propose that, in the *Oracle*, only the role of giving birth was assigned to the woman. Interestingly, in most of the manuscripts of *Sefer Zerubbabel* we find that the Messiah was taken up by God's wind (in this case, however, to Rome, not to heaven): "This is the Messiah of God . . . who was born to the House of David and God's wind carried him and hid him in this place until the End of Time." Indeed, according to a medieval midrash, *Ma'ase of Rabbi Yehoshua Ben Levi*, the messiah is not in Rome but in heaven.<sup>36</sup>

A second source with affinities to the *Oracle of Hystaspes* is the *Apocalypse of Elijah*.<sup>37</sup> In the *Apocalypse of Elijah*, in addition to the two

---

<sup>35</sup> Himmelfarb ("Mother of the Messiah," 384) suggests that the role of the Messiah's mother in *Sefer Zerubbabel* is a response to the figure of Mary as developed in the Byzantine era.

<sup>36</sup> A. Jellinek, *Bet ha-Midrash 2* (Jerusalem: Bamberger and Wahrman, 1938), 48–51.

<sup>37</sup> Aune, *Revelation*, 588–93. For discussion of *The Apocalypse of Elijah*'s date and provenance, see D. Frankfurter, *Elijah in Upper Egypt: The Apocalypse of Elijah and Early Egyptian Christianity* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992), 17–20. The last quarter of the third century is the *terminus ante quem* according to Frankfurter; the *terminus post*

prophets Enoch and Elijah (who descend from heaven and preach to an evil ruler, are killed by him, and are subsequently resurrected and preach again), there is a virgin with a role parallel to that of Enoch and Elijah. I submit that a woman is found in the *Apocalypse of Elijah* because there was a woman in its source. In other words, lacking a reason to invent a female figure, the author included her because she appeared in the source that he reworked.

The birth story of the *Yerushalmi*, its parallel in Revelation 12, the female figures in *Sefer Zerubbabel* and *Apocalypse of Elijah* all point to the missing component of the *Oracle*. Thus, I propose the following outline of the ancient *Oracle*: The first-century Jewish apocalyptic work was an account, presented through a symbolic vision and its interpretation, of confrontations between the antichrist and two personages whom he considered to be rivals, the newly-born Messiah and the prophet Elijah. Killed by the antichrist, the prophet was resurrected and returned to heaven. The Messiah, who was in danger from the moment of his birth, was saved by God who took him to heaven; from there he is to return to take revenge on the evil ruler.<sup>38</sup>

This proposed reconstruction enables the isolation of several features of early Jewish messianism. First, the *Oracle* provides additional evidence for Elijah's role in the messianic age. Furthermore, in this scheme, not only does Elijah appear, he also disappears again. He is to suffer, to be killed, undergo resurrection and reascend to heaven.<sup>39</sup> Second, even in

---

*quem* is the mid-second century. Most scholars assume this work to be an expansion of an early Jewish apocalypse (ibid., 10–17); Frankfurter himself emphasizes the role of Egyptian Christianity in the *Apocalypse's* evolution.

<sup>38</sup> This description can be considered an early interpretation of Psalm 110, where God calls the chosen one to “sit at My right hand” (v. 1), declaring “from the womb, from the dawn . . .” (v. 3). On Psalm 110 in pre-Christian literature, see D. M. Hay, *Glory at the Right Hand: Psalm 110 in Early Christianity* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1973), 21–27.

<sup>39</sup> We can also assume that he will reappear one more time. Thus we find in *Seder Olam Rabbah*: “In the second year of Ahaziah Elijah was hidden away and is not seen until the Messiah comes. In the days of the Messiah he will be seen and hidden away a second time and will not be seen until Gog will arrive. At present he records the deeds of all generations”; see C. Milikowsky, “Elijah and the Messiah,” *Jerusalem Studies in Jewish Thought* 2 (1982–1983): 491–96 (Hebrew). The date of *Seder Olam Rabbah* is discussed by idem, “Josephus between Rabbinic Culture and Hellenistic Historiography,” in *Shem in the Tents of Japhet: Essays on the Encounter of Judaism and Hellenism* (ed. J. Kugel; JSJSup 74; Leiden: Brill, 2002), 159–200, esp. 190, 199–200. Milikowsky suggests the first or second century CE as the probable date for *SOR*. Furthermore, he

a source from a Greek-speaking Diasporan milieu, the Messiah's role is that of warrior and not that of suffering servant. Third, both in the *Yerushalmi* and in *Sefer Zerubbabel*, the warrior Messiah is of the House of David. Thus, we are entitled to suggest that the *Oracle*, too, identified the Messiah as of Davidic lineage. In this case, we may point out that the story of his departure to heaven provides a solution to a major issue in the first century CE—who is the true heir to the House of David?<sup>40</sup> In the *Oracle* God provides the answer to this question: it is the one taken by Him, who is kept in heaven until the right time.

#### PART TWO: THE MESSIAH(S) IN QUMRAN

I now proceed to the second part of my paper, moving backward in time to Qumran, where we find a somewhat different perspective on the Messiah and the messianic role. The Qumranic worldview is complex. Counter to the notion that there are mythic forces who rebel against God, an idea found in both the early sections of *1 Enoch* and the second part of the book of Daniel, the Qumranites envisioned creation as combining both good and evil on three levels: cosmic, heavenly, and earthly.<sup>41</sup> In this worldview, God is the primary agent who brings evil to an end, and terrestrial figures play different and less significant roles.<sup>42</sup> This provides clues as to why the closest Qumran parallel to the *Oracle*

---

points to the existence of a “proto-*Seder Olam*” which was known by Josephus, i.e., which was written by the mid-first century CE at the latest.

<sup>40</sup> D. R. Schwartz (“The Messianic Departure from Judah [4Q Patriarchal Blessings]” *TZ* 37 [1986]: 257–66) found hints of this question in 4Q252.

<sup>41</sup> “In a spring of light emanates the nature of truth and from a well of darkness emerges the nature of deceit [cosmic level]; in the hand of the Prince of Lights (is) the dominion of all the Sons of Righteousness...but in the hand of the Angel of Darkness (is) the dominion of the Sons of Deceit [heavenly level]” (*Rule of the Community* 3:19–21; translation: J. H. Charlesworth and L. T. Stuckenbruck, “Rule of the Community,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek Texts with English Translations. Vol. 1: Rule of the Community and Related Documents* [ed. J. H. Charlesworth et al.; Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck); Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1994], 14); the sons of righteousness and of deceit represent the third, earthly level.

<sup>42</sup> See H. Lichtenberger, “Messianic Expectations and Messianic Figures,” in *Qumran-Messianism: Studies on the Messianic Expectations in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. J. H. Charlesworth, H. Lichtenberger, and G. S. Oegema; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998), 13. Lichtenberger comments that eschatological expectations do not have to include the coming of a Messiah.

of *Hystaspes*, the Pseudo-Daniel text 4Q246,<sup>43</sup> makes no mention of a Messiah.

The first part of 4Q246 did not survive. From the first few lines preserved we can deduce that a symbolic vision was shown to a ruler and that he received an elaboration on its content from an earthly speaker. I interpret the first part of the elaboration (cols 1:4–2:3) as referring to the last two links of the chain of kingdoms mentioned before. The Hellenistic kingdom, referred to as *מלך אתור [ומ] צרין*, the “king of Assyria and Egypt,” is defeated by Rome. Like King Antiochus in Daniel (7:8), Rome is pictured as rebelling against God: “He will be called son of God, and they will call him son of the Most High” (2:1).

However, as we read in col. 2:4–9, Rome will be defeated by *עם אל*, the people of God who will rule for eternity. Thus, we find at Qumran a work that is one step earlier (or rather, one link shorter) than the *Oracle of Hystaspes*, since the *Oracle* refers both to Rome and to the Roman Empire. However, as noted, no Messiah appears in 4Q246.<sup>44</sup>

If there is no need for a Messiah to battle the powers of evil at the End of Days, it is possible to attribute a different role to the Messiah. In *Peshet Melchizedek*,<sup>45</sup> the battle with the evil heavenly forces is assigned to a heavenly being, Melchizedek. The Messiah, called *משיח הרוח*, the “anointed of the spirit,” has no role in defeating the evil powers. Like many apocalyptic seers, his role is to teach—*להשכיל*—his people about the coming salvation: “To comfo[rt] the [afflicted]’: Its interpretation: to [in]struct them in all the ages of the w[orld]” (18–20).

However, as J. Collins notes, in the central writings of the Qumran Community (such as the *Damascus Document* and the *Rule of the Community*) we find a belief in the coming of two messiahs, the Davidic Messiah and the Priestly Messiah.<sup>46</sup> The portrayal of the Davidic Mes-

<sup>43</sup> E. Puech, “246. 4Qapocryphe de Daniel ar,” in *Qumran Cave 4.XVII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 3* (ed. G. J. Brooke et al.; DJD 22; Oxford: Clarendon, 1996), 165–84. For a discussion of the text, see J. J. Collins, *The Scepter and the Star: The Messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Ancient Literature* (New York: Doubleday, 1995), 154–69.

<sup>44</sup> See also M. Kister, “Notes on Some New Texts from Qumran,” *JJS* 44 (1993): 290 n. 48.

<sup>45</sup> F. García Martínez, E. J. C. Tigchelaar, and A. S. van der Woude, *Qumran Cave 11.II: 11Q2–18, 11Q20–31* (DJD 23; Oxford: Clarendon, 1998), 221–41.

<sup>46</sup> Collins, *Scepter*, 49–123; idem, “Jesus, Messianism and the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *Qumran-Messianism: Studies on the Messianic Expectations in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. J. H. Charlesworth, H. Lichtenberger, and G. S. Oegema; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998), 100–119.

siah at Qumran is clear. He is a warrior, who will lead the forces in the earthly battle of the End of Days, judge the nation with the breath of his mouth, and save Israel. He is called נשיא העדה or צמח דוד.

The second, priestly Messiah is called כוהן הראש in the *War Scroll*; in *Florilegium* as well as in the *Damascus Document* his title is דורש התורה (7:18–21). In the *Damascus Document*, as part of a well-known midrash, we also find him referred to as יורה הצדק (6:2–11). The fact that the titles דורש התורה and מורה צדק also serve the Qumranites to describe their leaders in the past creates a certain lack of clarity.<sup>47</sup>

I submit that there is no expectation in the Community for the return of their past leader. It is important to note that the *Damascus Document* provides not the name of the leader but his titles (מורה צדק and not מורה הצדק). דורש התורה, מורה צדק, are designations for the significant leader who helped the community to build and shape its way during the final generation of evil; the Qumran Community looks forward to the appearance of a leader at the End of Days who will fulfill the same role as its leader did in the past, helping to shape the life of the community at the End of Days by giving its members the proper tools for learning. There is expectation not for the coming of a lawgiver (hence there is no expectation for a second Moses) but for a second *teacher* who will be of priestly origin. As a priestly figure he will also take the main role in running the Temple to be built by God, and will atone for his generation (4Q541).<sup>48</sup>

<sup>47</sup> The *Damascus Document* col. 1 mentions מורה צדק as the leader who was sent by God to guide the Community according to God's heart; דורש התורה is the leader sent by God to create the appropriate tools to interpret the Torah, for exploring and deducing the correct halakhot (see A. Shemesh and C. Werman, "Hidden Things and their Revelation," *RevQ* 18 [1998]: 409–27). He is mentioned in the same paragraph which promises the coming of יורה הצדק at the End of Days: "and the מחקק is the interpreter of the Torah, of whom Isaiah said: He takes out a tool for his work" (Isa. 54:16).

<sup>48</sup> 4Q541 was published by E. Puech, in idem, *Qumran Cave 4.22: Texts Araméens: Première Partie (4Q529–549)* (DJD 31; Oxford: Clarendon, 2001), 241. J. M. Baumgarten, who discussed the role of the Messiah in CD ("Messianic Forgiveness of Sin in CD 14:19," in *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls* [ed. D. W. Parry and E. Ulrich; STDJ 30; Leiden: Brill, 1999], 537–44), suggests that the coming of the Messiah itself atones for the generation's sins. However, we know from the *War Scroll* and from other writings from Qumran that the time of the priestly leader at the Eschaton is also the time of the rebuilding of the Temple. Thus the atonement mentioned both in 4Q541 and in CD 14 could be achieved through the Temple cult to be carried out by the priestly leader.

Do the Qumranic Messiahs and the *Oracle's* Messiah share any features? As Flusser noted,<sup>49</sup> there is some resemblance between the *Oracle's* Messiah and the Qumranic Davidic Messiah. Both are warriors; both are apparently from the House of David; both fight the evil forces on earth; and both are expected to kill the leader of the evil forces (see 4Q285 7 1–5 for the Qumranic Davidic Messiah). Furthermore, a heavenly sword is associated with both. *War Scroll* col. 19 relates the defeat of the Kittim's army during the night by הרב אל: "In the morning [ ] they shall come to the [p]lace of the line [ the mi]ghty men of Kittim, the multitude of Asshur, and the army of all the nations assembled [ ] (the) slain [ ] have fallen there by the sword of God" (19:9–11; note the similarity to the story related in 2 Kings 19:35).

The Qumranic mighty leader, however, has fewer miraculous features than the one from the *Oracle*. He does not, as far as we know, come down from heaven, nor does he wield the heavenly sword, which is a free agent. Also less miraculous is the Qumranic prophet. While there are statements at Qumran regarding a prophet who will come together with the two Messiahs (1QS 9:11), neither dying nor resurrection nor second ascent is attributed to him.

We should not, however, ignore the existence of a heavenly character from Qumran who is an exalted human being. The speaker in 4Q491 (and related texts)<sup>50</sup> declares that he no longer has human needs and desire; he is among and above angels and holy ones; he is *the* teacher, who has also suffered disdain in the past.<sup>51</sup> It is not certain whether this figure should be perceived as a Messiah. I tend to think not. In describing his status, the speaker in 4Q491 exemplifies the spiritual condition that is promised to the *maskilim* at the End of Days in the book of Daniel. In Daniel the *maskilim* are to become, after the final judgment, like angels, and to achieve a rank that contrasts sharply with their sufferings and their humiliating deaths under Antiochus's decrees. In the Qumran worldview the most fitting person to reach the rank of

<sup>49</sup> D. Flusser, "The Death of the Evil King," in *A Light to Jacob: Studies in the Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls in Memory of Jacob Licht* (ed. Y. Hoffman and F. H. Polak; Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv University Press, 1997), 254–62 (Hebrew).

<sup>50</sup> See the text and a brief discussion in J. J. Collins and D. Dimant, "A Thrice-Told Hymn," *JQR* 85 (1994–95): 151–57, and the longer discussion in Collins, *Scepter*, 136–49.

<sup>51</sup> For a discussion of the many possible interpretations of this text, see Collins, *Scepter*, 136–53.

the *maskilim* at the End of Days is the leader of the community.<sup>52</sup> Coping with the same dilemma as the *maskilim* of “Daniel’s” day, that is, the problem of explaining the humiliation of a highly regarded person in his lifetime, the Community gives a similar answer by envisaging a high stature for its leader in the angelic world.<sup>53</sup>

Does this spiritual ex-leader have any role in the future? It is clear that the heavenly, enthroned human being of 4Q491 is different from the *Oracle’s* Messiah. Whereas in the *Oracle* the figure from heaven is a warrior whose role is to fight, the role attributed to the speaker of 4Q491 is, or was, to instruct. It is hard to imagine that this highly elevated, spiritual human being would agree to descend to fight the earthly forces as the *Oracle’s* Messiah does. Moreover, as we know, judgment can be carried out in heaven, too. The figure of the Son of Man in *1 Enoch’s* Book of Similitudes comes to mind: in the Similitudes, the Danielic Son of Man plays the role of judge, a role attributed to God in Daniel 7. Indeed, the word *טשפנ* does appear in 4Q491. However, in its context the meaning “law” seems more apt than the meaning, “judgment.” Thus, no future role is ascribed to our speaker.<sup>54</sup>

#### CONCLUSION

Qumran and the *Oracle of Hystaspes* point to the strong hold of the belief in the figure of the son of David as a savior, primarily as taking a role on the battlefield.<sup>55</sup> At Qumran the Davidic Messiah is less fantastic than the one in the *Oracle* and is accompanied by, and subject

---

<sup>52</sup> The fact that 4Q491 contains sections in which the End of Days is described (Collins and Dimant, “Thrice-Told Hymn,” 159) suggests, to my mind, that the speaker’s status is to be achieved only at the End of Days. This reasoning leads me to reject the suggestion made by J. W. van Henten (“Moses as Heavenly Messenger in *Assumptio Mosis* 10:2 and Qumran Passages,” *JJS* 54 [2003]: 220–27) that the speaker is Moses.

<sup>53</sup> I thus agree with M. Abegg (“4Q491, 4Q427, and the Teacher of Righteousness,” in *Eschatology, Messianism and the Dead Sea Scrolls* [ed. C. A. Evans and P. W. Flint; Grand Rapids, Michigan, Cambridge, England: W. B. Eerdmans, 1997]), who stated: “...it is possible that such a claim (to have ascended to heaven) was made on behalf of the Teacher of Righteousness by the author of the text...” (p. 72).

<sup>54</sup> This conclusion inevitably denies the ties Knohl posits between the speaker and the (reconstructed) Qumranic earthly warrior involved in a revolt after Herod’s death, further weakening Knohl’s theory regarding the Qumranic Messiah’s death and resurrection.

<sup>55</sup> See further K. Atkinson, “On the Herodian Origin of Militant Davidic Messianism at Qumran: New Light from *Psalms of Solomon* 17,” *JBL* 118 (1999): 435–60.



to, another figure. The priestly, halakhically oriented intellectuals at Qumran subscribed, in addition, to the promise of the future coming of a priestly teacher. Nonetheless, it is also possible that there was a circle at Qumran which had no messianic expectations, or which perhaps assigned to the Messiah only a role of teaching and explaining the coming of the End.

This last role, to my mind, was the one ascribed to John the Baptist. Jesus' self-image is harder to detect, hence its background is less transparent. His earthly mission might be compared to that articulated in another of the texts found in Qumran, 4Q521 (*4Q Messianic Apocalypse*).<sup>56</sup> 4Q521 portrays a Messiah with attributes similar to those of (biblical) Elijah and of Jesus:<sup>57</sup> Heaven and earth obey him. The consensus is that 4Q521 was not written by the Qumranites,<sup>58</sup> and the parallels with Jesus traditions indicate that these messianic attributes had some wider currency in the Second Temple era.<sup>59</sup> As to Jesus' own perception regarding his anticipated heavenly mission, the closest parallel seems to be the Enochic 'Son of Man' mentioned above.

A final word: Notwithstanding the variety of sources and messianic conceptions discussed here we find among them no expectation of the death and resurrection of any Messiah—neither at Qumran, nor in the *Oracle of Hystaspes*, nor in fragments or books from outside the Community. It seems to me that the extant sources lead to the conclusion

<sup>56</sup> É. Puech, "4Q521," in idem, *Qumrân Grotte 4.XVIII: Textes Hébreux (4Q521–4Q528, 4Q576–4Q579)* (DJD 25; Oxford: Clarendon, 1998), 10.

<sup>57</sup> Collins, *Scepter*, 117–22.

<sup>58</sup> 4Q521 expresses the belief in resurrection while, insofar as we know, the Qumranites did not believe in resurrection. See: J. J. Collins, *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (London: Routledge, 1997), 110–29; G. W. E. Nickelsburg, "Resurrection," *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. L. H. Schiffman and J. C. VanderKam; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 2:766; D. Dimant, "Resurrection, Restoration and Time-Curtailing in Qumran, Early Judaism and Christianity," *RevQ* 19 (2000): 527–29.

<sup>59</sup> Both S. Byrskog (*Jesus the Only Teacher* [ConBNT 24; Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksell International, 1994]) and R. Deines (*Die Gerechtigkeit der Tora im Reich des Messias: Mt 5,13–20 als Schlüsseltext der matthäischen Theologie* [Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004]) point to the role of Jesus as a teacher in Matthew. The difference between Matthew's Messiah and Qumran's priestly Messiah is that the Qumranic Messiah gives his followers the *tools* for learning new laws from Scripture, whereas Matthew's Jesus supplies a body of knowledge.

that Jesus' death was an unexpected event, which neither Jesus nor his followers either predicted or hoped for.<sup>60</sup>

---

<sup>60</sup> It is possible, however, that Jesus, knowing of John's death, did feel vulnerable. See B. Chilton, "Friends and Enemies," in *The Cambridge Companion to Jesus* (ed. M. Bockmuehl; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 72–86. I follow J. J. Collins ("Asking for the Meaning of a Fragmentary Qumran Text: The Referential Background of 4QAaron A," in *Texts and Contexts: Biblical Texts in their Textual and Situational Contexts* [ed. T. Fornberg and D. Hellholm; Oslo: Scandinavian University Press, 1995], 579–90) in taking issue with G. J. Brooke ("4QTestament of Levi d[?] and the Messianic Servant High Priest," in *From Jesus to John: Essays on Jesus and New Testament Christology in Honour of Marinus de Jonge* [ed. M. C. De Boer; JSNTSup 84; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993], 83–100), who found hints of a suffering Messiah in 4Q541. As is evident from nn. 14, 18, 26, 54 above, I completely reject Knohl's conclusions in his *The Messiah*. There is no evidence for an active Qumranic Messiah at the turn of the era, nor for his death and resurrection: Jesus had no prior scheme to follow.



## INDEX OF MODERN AUTHORS

- Abegg, M. G. 122, 199, 263, 297  
 Abrahams, I. 84  
 Ādna, J. 83  
 Aland, B. 29  
 Albeck, C. 182  
 Albright, W. F. 127–128  
 Alexander, P. S. 19, 216  
 Allegro, J. M. 18  
 Allison, D. 197, 211, 215, 223, 226,  
     235, 240, 241  
 Amir, Y. 59  
 Andorlini, I. 11  
 Ashton, J. 111, 114, 129  
 Atkinson, K. 297  
 Attridge, H. W. 70, 109, 115, 125  
 Aune, D. E. 31, 46, 130, 132, 135, 147,  
     148, 152, 154–155, 282, 283, 285,  
     289–290, 291  
  
 Baillet, M. 122–123, 236, 239, 272  
 Barag, D. 180–182  
 Barclay, J. 44  
 Barrett, C. K. 67, 233  
 Barthélemy, D. 26  
 Bar-Asher, M. 197  
 Bauckham, R. 45, 70, 96, 111, 114,  
     130–131, 137, 148, 151–155, 183, 234,  
     285  
 Baumgarten, A. I. 81, 137  
 Baumgarten, J. M. viii, 34, 72, 217,  
     218, 239, 295  
 Bayer, J. M. 226  
 Beall, T. S. 104  
 Beasley, G. R. 128  
 Becker, J. 135, 145  
 Becker, M. 277  
 Beckwith, R. T. 129  
 Belkin, S. 25, 228  
 Belle, G. van 110  
 Ben-Dov, J. 202, 217  
 Berger, K. 188, 200  
 Bergmeier, R. 135  
 Bernstein, M. J. 5, 14, 15, 17, 51, 222  
 Berrin, S. L. 3  
 Betegh, G. 8  
 Betz, H. D. 77, 83, 84, 278  
 Betz, O. 147, 197  
 Billerbeck, P. 207  
  
 Birnbaum, E. 185  
 Black, M. viii  
 Blank, J. 147  
 Boccaccini, G. 138  
 Böcher, O. 146, 277  
 Bockmuehl, M. 18, 24, 25, 29  
 Boismard, M.-É. 129  
 Bömer, F. 7  
 Booth, R. P. 75–76  
 Borgen, P. 24  
 Borg, M. J. 66, 77, 78, 83, 84  
 Bousset, W. 144  
 Bovon, F. 179  
 Bowley, J. 37, 40, 41, 42  
 Box, G. H. 208  
 Boyce, M. 282  
 Braun, F.-M. 129  
 Braun, H. viii, 109, 127, 134, 268  
 Breytenbach, C. 146  
 Bright, J. 262  
 Brin, G. 36, 40, 202, 208  
 Brooke, G. J. 3, 5, 14, 15, 16–17, 42,  
     90–91, 95, 96, 102, 110, 114, 299  
 Broshi, M. 37, 203  
 Browning, R. 7, 9  
 Brownlee, W. H. 3, 267  
 Brown, R. E. 70, 97, 98, 100, 101, 111,  
     113, 117, 119, 127–128, 129, 132,  
     135–136, 137, 184  
 Bruce, F. F. 265, 266  
 Buffière, F. 23, 24  
 Bultmann, R. 83, 101, 131, 135,  
     144–145, 185  
 Burchard, C. 152  
 Burrows, M. 42, 127  
 Byrskog, S. 298  
  
 Campbell, J. G. 249  
 Capper, B. N. 129  
 Carmignac, J. 15  
 Carmody, T. R. 223, 226  
 Cazeaux, J. 25  
 Charlesworth, J. H. viii, 3, 16, 110,  
     111, 114, 115, 123, 127–128, 129, 130,  
     132, 135, 136, 137, 139, 150, 195, 267,  
     293  
 Chatelion Counet, P. 110  
 Chazon, E. G. 119

- Chilton, B. 67, 83, 86, 299  
 Clark-Soles, J. 113  
 Collins, A. Yarbrow 79, 84, 289–290  
 Collins, J. J. 38, 39, 122, 123, 195, 234,  
 259, 263, 283, 294, 296, 297, 298, 299  
 Colson, F. H. 25, 59, 186  
 Congar, Y. 183  
 Conzelmann, H. 45  
 Cook, E. 199  
 Cooke, G. 258  
 Courtney, E. 12  
 Crawford, S. W. 5, 14, 15  
 Crosby, M. H. 78  
 Cross, F. M. 128, 164, 263  
 Crossan, J. D. 70, 77, 78, 79, 83, 85  
 Cullmann, O. 129  
 Culpepper, R. A. 110, 124  
 Curtis, E. L. 256
- Daley, B. 192  
 Daly, R. J. 67  
 Daly-Denton, M. 113  
 D'Ancona Costa, C. 11  
 Danielou, J. 215  
 Daube, D. 25, 202  
 Davenport, G. L. 87  
 Davies, P. R. 65, 241, 244  
 Davies, W. D. 69, 197, 211, 215, 223,  
 226, 235, 240, 241, 243  
 Dawson, D. 22, 24  
 Day, J. 256, 257  
 Day, P. L. 146  
 De Conick, A. 125  
 Deines, R. 277, 298  
 Delcor, M. 271  
 Del Fabbro, M. 10, 11, 28, 29  
 Delling, G. 185  
 Derrett, J. D. M. 209, 210  
 Destro, A. 132  
 Di Lella, A. A. 208  
 Dillmann, A.  
 Dimant, D. 38, 138, 141, 197, 296, 297,  
 298  
 Dodd, C. H. 131  
 Dorandi, T. 10, 11  
 Dörrie, H. 24  
 Dörries, H. 24  
 Doudna, G. L. 3  
 Duke, P. D. 124  
 Dunn, J. D. G. 43, 75–76, 78, 84, 96  
 Dupont-Sommer, A. 267, 270
- Eissfeldt, O. 7, 272  
 Elgvin, T. 199, 203, 221
- Elledge, C. D. 16  
 Elliger, K. 3  
 Endo, M. 152  
 Eppstein, V. 86  
 Eshel, E. 122, 220, 265–266, 271, 273  
 Eshel, H. 92–93, 95  
 Esler, P. F. 67, 78, 79, 81  
 Evans, C. A. 63, 84, 86, 87, 152, 184
- Falk, D. K. 5  
 Festugière, A. J. 11  
 Finkelberg, M. 6, 7, 10  
 Finkelstein, L. 54  
 Fishbane, M. 5, 241  
 Fitzmyer, J. A. 50, 69, 79, 110, 123,  
 211, 237, 243  
 Flusser, D. 22, 76, 77, 195–196, 224,  
 232, 234, 237, 244, 273, 274, 282–283,  
 287, 290, 296  
 Forbes, R. 7  
 Ford, A. 7, 10  
 Fraade, S. 51, 90–91, 95, 102, 103, 104  
 Fraenkel, Y. 288  
 Frankfort, H. 257  
 Frankfurter, D. 291–292  
 Fredriksen, P. 78  
 Freedman, D. N. 41  
 Frey, J. 127, 128, 130, 133, 134, 137,  
 138, 141, 142, 144, 145, 147, 149, 270  
 Friedman, S. 197
- Gagnon, R. A. J. 116  
 García Martínez, F. 14, 32, 199, 221,  
 223, 224, 259, 260, 271, 294  
 Gärtner, B. 183  
 Geffcken, J. 8  
 Geiger, A. 163  
 Gerhardsson, B. 232  
 Ginzberg, L. 202, 203, 248, 269  
 Goodblatt, D. 263  
 Gould, E. P. 83  
 Grabbe, L. L. 31, 32, 33  
 Grant, R. M. 23  
 Gray, R. 39  
 Greenstein, E. 256  
 Grenet, F. 282  
 Grossberg, A. 181  
 Guthmüller, B. 13
- Hacham, A. 167  
 Hadas, M. 23  
 Hadot, I. 12  
 Hagner, D. A. 215  
 Halbertal, M. 6

- Hanson, J. 24  
 Hanson, R. P. C. 3  
 Haran, M. 161, 162, 192  
 Harrington, D. J. 5, 38, 198, 199, 203, 204  
 Hart, J. H. A. 208  
 Hasan-Rokem, G. 288  
 Hay, D. M. 292  
 Healey, J. F. 7  
 Heitmüller, W. 144  
 Hempel, C. 74, 138, 139, 244  
 Hengel, M. 26, 84  
 Henten, J. W. van 297  
 Herr, M. D. 26  
 Hiers, R. H. 77, 84  
 Himmelfarb, M. 287, 288, 289, 290, 291  
 Hinnells, J. R. 282  
 Hogeterp, A. L. A. 69  
 Holmén, T. 246, 249  
 Honigman, S. 10, 23, 24  
 Horbury, W. 9, 20, 26, 27  
 Horgan, M. P. 3, 16, 17, 18, 65  
 Horst, P. W. van der 77  
 Hurtado, L. W. 286  
 Hurvitz, A. 55  
  
 Instone-Brewer, D. 15, 25, 199, 203  
 Irwy, S. 239  
  
 Janko, R. 8  
 Jasper, A. 110  
 Jastrow, M. 272  
 Jaubert, A. 113, 129  
 Jellinek, A. 291  
 Jenks, G. C. 147  
 Jeremias, G. 267  
 Jeremias, J. 55, 113  
  
 Kalms, J. U. 147, 289  
 Kampen, J. 90–91, 95, 96, 102, 211, 243, 246  
 Kaster, R. A. 7, 12, 13  
 Kaufmann, Y. 264  
 Keel, O. 166  
 Kerr, A. R. 183, 184  
 Kister, M. 22, 195, 196, 197, 198, 204, 207, 213, 218, 222, 242, 244, 250, 271, 294  
 Klawans, J. 65, 68, 72, 75, 76, 79  
 Klinzing, G. 66, 74  
 Kloppenborg, J. S. 75  
 Knight, J. 84  
 Knohl, I. 93–94, 171, 173, 174–175, 178–179, 181, 193, 255, 258, 266, 284–285, 288, 297, 299  
 Knox, W. L. 59  
 Kobelski, P. J. 123, 260, 261  
 Koester, C. R. 112, 184, 185, 194  
 Kollmann, B. 277  
 Koltun-Fromm, N. 244  
 Kooij, A. van der 26  
 Kosmala, H. 265  
 Kraft, R. A. 26  
 Kugel, J. 169, 196, 205, 213–214, 216, 217, 224, 225, 226, 227  
 Kuhn, H.-W. 132  
 Kuhn, K. G. 111, 127–128, 135, 136, 145, 267, 270  
 Kümmel, W. G. 266  
  
 Laird, A. 7  
 Laks, A. 8  
 Lambert, W. G. 167–168  
 Lamberton, R. 23  
 Lamedica, A. 8  
 Lanci, J. R. 68  
 Lane, W. L. 265  
 Lange, A. 138, 140, 141, 270  
 La Sor, W. S. viii  
 Lazenby, F. 9  
 Lehmann, M. R. 211  
 Leonhardt, J. 22  
 Lévêque, P. 10, 23  
 Levinson, B. M. 258  
 Lévi-Strauss, C. 115  
 Licht, J. 73, 215  
 Lichtenberger, H. 74, 138, 140, 141, 267, 269, 270, 271, 274, 293  
 Lieberman, S. 23, 24  
 Lierman, J. 57  
 Lietaert Peerbolte, L. J. 147, 283, 290  
 Lieu, J. 70  
 Lim, T. H. 3, 4, 5, 15, 17, 18, 19, 26, 51–53, 217  
 Lippold, A. 7  
 Löhr, W. A. 29  
 Lohse, E. 80  
 Long, A. 120  
 Lövestam, E. 201  
 Luppe, W. 10  
 Luzzato, S. D. 163  
  
 Mach, M. 271  
 MacRae, G. W., S.J. 124  
 Madsen, A. A. 256  
 Manetti, D. 11  
 Markus, J. 69, 75, 78

- Marshall, P. K. 12, 13  
 Matsushima, E. 162–163  
 Mazzaferrri, F. D. 285  
 McKelvey, J. 66  
 McNamee, K. 11  
 Meeks, W. A. 77, 80, 81  
 Meier, J. P. 76  
 Merz, A. 66, 68  
 Metso, S. 71, 115, 139, 140, 244  
 Metzger, B. M. 225  
 Milgrom, J. 218  
 Milik, J. T. 118, 260  
 Milikowsky, C. 226–227, 292–293  
 Miller, M. P. 259  
 Miller, P. D. 166  
 Mittmann-Richert, U. 277  
 Montanari, F. 7, 9  
 Moore, G. F. 54  
 Most, G. W. 8  
 Moule, C. F. D. 66  
 Mowinckel, S. 257  
 Müller, K. 19  
 Murphy, C. M. 77  
 Murphy-O'Connor, J. viii, 65, 267  
  
 Naeh, S. 173  
 Newlands, G. M. 4, 22  
 Newman, H. 287, 288, 290  
 Newsom, C. A. 138, 168, 169–170  
 Newton, M. 77  
 Nickelsburg, G. W. E. 202, 298  
 Nissinen, M. 31  
 Nitzan, B. 3, 35, 74, 219, 271  
 Noam, V. 56, 203, 240, 243  
 Nötscher, F. 166  
  
 Obbink, D. 7, 8  
 Oegema, G. S. 267, 277  
 Oesterly, W. O. 208  
 Olyan, S. 35  
 Oppenheim, L. 162  
  
 Pagels, E. 125  
 Paget, J. Carleton 22  
 Parson, P. J. 26  
 Pelling, C. B. R. 7  
 Penney, D. 275–276  
 Percy, E. 144, 147  
 Pesce, M. 132  
 Petersen, N. 112  
 Pfeiffer, R. 7, 8, 9, 22  
 Philonenko, M. 270, 273  
 Pike, D. M. 38  
 Ploeg, J. P. M. van der 271–272  
  
 Plummer, A. 50  
 Price, J. L. 115  
 Price, M. 181  
 Prigent, P. 283  
 Puech, É. 39, 260, 271, 294, 295,  
 298  
 Pummer, R. 210  
  
 Qimron, E. 33, 37, 64, 89, 91, 95, 197,  
 199, 203, 204, 218, 220, 222–223  
  
 Regev, E. 64, 65, 66, 70  
 Reicke, B. 99  
 Reinhartz, A. 81, 112  
 Reitzenstein, R. 144  
 Renan, E. 268  
 Repschinski, B. 241, 249  
 Rese, M. 277  
 Reynolds, L. D. 9, 12  
 Richardson, P. 84  
 Richter, G. 188  
 Riesner, R. 113–114, 233  
 Riley, G. 146  
 Roberts, J. J. M. 166, 258  
 Robinson, J. A. T. 112  
 Rofé, A. 37  
 Röllig, W. 7  
 Rönsch, A. 202  
 Rordorf, W. 224  
 Roselli, A. 11  
 Ruckstuhl, E. 129  
 Ruzer, S. 231–234, 235, 237, 240, 242  
  
 Sacchi, P. 138  
 Safrai, S. 77  
 Saito, T. 57  
 Sanders, E. P. 66, 67, 69, 73, 74, 78, 80,  
 83, 84, 86  
 Sanders, J. A. 35, 259, 271, 273  
 Sandt, H. van der 224  
 Schaefer, H. H. 144  
 Schaller, B. 240  
 Schechter, S. 201, 249  
 Schiffman, L. H. viii, ix, 72, 92, 95,  
 104, 165, 216, 226, 227, 268  
 Schnackenburg, R. 43, 101, 111, 149  
 Schniedewind, W. M. 263  
 Schremer, A. 201, 202, 207, 237, 243,  
 249  
 Schubert, K. 129  
 Schuller, E. M. 35, 222  
 Schürer, E. 128, 281, 282  
 Schwartz, D. R. 27, 55, 56, 57, 65, 66,  
 93, 95, 175, 179–180, 260, 293

- Schweitzer, A. 268  
 Sedley, D. N. 11, 120  
 Segal, A. F. 77, 80  
 Segal, M. H. 214  
 Sekki, A. E. 45, 271  
 Selz, G. 168  
 Shemesh, A. 173, 203, 216, 218, 225,  
 226, 295  
 Shutt, R. J. H. 23  
 Siegert, F. 8, 24, 25  
 Sigal, P. 240  
 Skarsten, L. 24  
 Skehan, P. W. 208  
 Skinner, A. C. 38  
 Smend, R. 209  
 Smith, D. M. 128  
 Smith, J. Z. 186  
 Smith, M. 114, 122, 123–125, 277  
 Söding, T. 277, 278  
 Sperber, A. 134  
 Staden, H. von 11  
 Staley, J. 110  
 Stegemann, H. 138, 140, 141  
 Stendahl, K. viii  
 Stone, M. 286  
 Strack, L. 207  
 Strohmaier, G. 11  
 Strugnell, J. 18, 33, 36, 38, 89, 91, 95,  
 96, 198, 199, 203, 204  
 Sussman, Y. 173  
  
 Talmon, S. 202, 263  
 Taylor, J. E. 76  
 Teeple, H. M. 39, 111  
 Thédenat, H. 7  
 Theissen, G. 66, 68  
 Thrall, M. E. 68  
 Thyen, H. 145  
 Tigchelaar, E. J. C. 14, 32, 199,  
 203–204, 221, 223, 259, 260, 271,  
 294  
 Tomson, P. J. 69  
 Tov, E. 20, 26  
 Trafton, J. L. 14, 15, 17  
 Trell, B. 181  
 Trojahn, S. 9, 10, 27  
 Tuilier, A. 224  
  
 Ulrich, E. 33, 50  
 Usener, H. 12  
  
 VanderKam, J. C. 19, 40, 94, 110, 129,  
 202, 206–207, 263  
 Veltri, G. 20  
 Vermes, G. 199, 202, 216, 277  
 Vischer, E. 289  
 Vliet, H. van 226  
 Von Wahldé, U. C. 110  
  
 Waard, J. de 202  
 Wagner, J. R. 17  
 Wagner, S. 272  
 Wan, S.-k. 24  
 Wehrli, F. 23  
 Weinfeld, M. 224  
 Weiss, R. 201  
 Weissert, D. 23, 24  
 Werman, C. 24, 295  
 Westerink, L. G. 11  
 Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, U. von 7  
 Williams, M. A. 116  
 Wilson, B. 81  
 Wilson, N. G. 7, 9, 11, 12  
 Wilson, S. G. 57  
 Winter, P. 201, 202  
 Wise, M. O. 175–276, 199  
 Witherington, B. 31  
 Wolfson, H. A. 25  
 Woude, A. S. van der 259, 260, 271,  
 294  
 Wuthnow, R. 80  
 Wyschogrod, M. 193  
  
 Xeravits, G. G. 38  
  
 Yadin, Y. 64, 243, 265–266  
  
 Zetzel, J. E. G. 12, 13  
 Ziegler, J. 208  
 Zimmermann, J. 39  
 Zuntz, G. 10, 27





## INDEX OF ANCIENT SOURCES

### BIBLE

Genesis		24:10–11 (LXX)	186
1–2	243, 248	24:11	186
1:3–5	152, 154	25:8	171
1:27	201, 202,	25:8 (LXX)	171
	211–212, 236,	25:30	181
	242–243, 244,	26:33b	186
	251	28:36–38	256
1:28	241	30:26–30	161
2:24	201, 203–208,	31:7–11	161
	209–212, 242,	33:20	187
	244–245	34:7	275
2:24 (Samaritan)	206, 210–211	34:10	134
3:16	205	34:23	175
5:2	201, 242	34:24	163
7:2	201	35:11–19	161
7:2 (Samaritan)	201	39:33–41	161
7:9	201, 244	40:2–15	161
7:10–8:13	14	40:18–33	161
9:24–27	14	40:34–35	164
14:18	256		
14:20	259	Leviticus	57, 59,
20	40		255
20:3	245	1:14–17	161
20:7	40	4:3	255
22:10–12	14	5:1	218
32:33	207	5:8–9	161
32:33 (LXX)	207	5:10a	161
49:3–20	14	6:15	255
49:4	14	13:45	256
49:10	14	16:1	15
		16:32	255
Exodus	59, 171, 182	18	57
	(LXX), 184	18:6	204
	(LXX)	18:8	204
4:22–23	258	18:12	204
9:15	103	18:13	54
18:27	133	19:15	225
20:13	235	19:17	213–214, 218,
20:23	176		222, 224–226,
22:7–8	261		227, 228
23:17	163–164,	19:17–18	214
	172–173	19:18	218, 222, 232,
23:17 (Samaritan)	182		233
24:9–11	171	21:2	204
24:9–11 (LXX)	171	21:10	255
24:9–11 (Samaritan)	171	23:11	56

( <i>Leviticus cont.</i> )		1-2 Samuel	52
23:15	56		
25:8	181	1 Samuel	
		1:22	172
Numbers	59	4:3	165
4:18-20	174, 175	4:5-8	165
4:20	166	6:19	175
9:13	189	10:1	257
10:35-36	164	13:9	257
12:7-8	56	15:17	257
14:18	275	16:12-13	257
16:35	255	24:6	257
17:40	264	24:10	257
21:18	26	26:9	257
22-24	37		
24:4	178	2 Samuel	
24:13	26	1:16	257
27:12-23	255	5:3	257
30:7-17	205	6:17-18	257
30:10	208	7	15
30:15-16	218	7:14	258
31:6	175	8:18	257
		12:7	257
Deuteronomy	102, 258	12:7-15	166
4:1	35	14:24	163
4:5	35	15:25-26	166
4:14	35	17:17	163
6:5	232-233	20:3	134
11:7	134	23:1	257
13	36, 39		
13:2-6	37	1-2 Kings	35, 52
14:1	258		
15:8	228	1 Kings	
15:10	228	1:34	257
15:14	228	1:39	257
16:6	163	1:45	257
17:17	240	3:4	257
18	36, 39	3:15	257
18:15	38, 43, 58, 59	8:8	175
18:18	38, 58, 59	8:63-64	257
18:20-22	37	12:32-33	257
19:15	217, 223	13:11-31	37
22:4	228	16-17	286
23:24	205	18:2	163
24:1	209-210, 211, 239, 241, 248-249	19:16	257
		22:1-28	37
24:1-2	210-211		
24:1-4	209-210	2 Kings	
30:1	51	1:10-14	286
31:11	163	3:22	286
32:7	51	9:3	257
33:19	73	9:6	257
34:10	56	11:12	257
		16:12-13	257

(2 <i>Kings cont.</i> )		89:39	257
19:35	296	89:52	257
20:3 (LXX)	134	90:1 (LXX)	273
		91	271–273
1 Chronicles		91:2	273, 276
6:34	55	91:3–8	273
		91:5	273
2 Chronicles		91:10	273
8:13	55	91:11–12	273
23:18	55	91:13	273
24:9	55	107:24	134
25:4	55	110	60, 257–258, 263–264, 292
26:16–20	256		
30:16	55	110:3	258
		110:4	257
Ezra		111:2	134
6:18	55	119:105	153
7:6	55	129	16
		139:21	225
Nehemiah		147:18	205
8:1	55		
13:1	55	Proverbs	
		2:13	134
Esther		2:13 (LXX)	134
3:7	217	6:23	133, 153
10:3 <i>c–f</i> (LXX)	19	16:15	133
10:3 <i>l</i> (LXX)	20	25:17	221
		27:5	
Job		Song of Songs	
6:26	205	1:13	176
8:2	205		
15:13	205	Isaiah	16, 17, 18, 33, 42, 59
33:30	133	1:1	16
		1:12	163
Psalms	37, 39, 49–50, 52, 153, 166, 192, 257	2:3	153
2:2	257	2:5	134, 153
2:7	258	2:5 (LXX)	134
4:5	216, 221	9:1	134
4:6	73	9:1 (LXX)	134
24:7–10	164	9:1–2	154
33:6	205	9:5	258
37	16	11:4	205
45:8	257	16:13–14	18
48	167, 178	20:2–6	44
48:13–15	167	26:10 (LXX)	134
51:21	73	40:3	34
55:14 (LXX)	134	42:6–7	154
56:14	133, 134	45:1	257
68	16	49:6	154
81:5 (LXX)	134	50:10	134
82:1	261	50:10 (LXX)	134
82:5	134	51:4	153
		52:7	35

<i>(Isaiah cont.)</i>		Hosea	16, 18, 42
54:11-12	34	4:1	134
54:16	295	Joel	42
58:7	209	2:28-32	46
59:9	134	Amos	33, 42
59:9 (LXX)	134	9:11-12	231, 233-234
60:1-3	154	Jonah	42
61	260	Micah	16, 42
61:1	257	4:9-10	16
61:1-3	259, 262	Nahum	16, 17-18
61:2	261	1:2	217
61:3	260-261	2:12	19
66:20	68	2:13	19
Jeremiah	18, 33, 42	Habakkuk	16, 17-18, 34,
3:1	241	2:5-6	42
23:5-6	258, 261-262	2:17	65
27:13	103	Zephaniah	16
28	37	Zechariah	9, 18, 33,
29:21-24	37	4:14	42
29:24-32	37	Malachi	263, 285
51:10	134	1:10	65, 239
Lamentations		1:14	16
1:16	287	3:22	55
Ezekiel	33, 42	3:23	39
Daniel	9, 33, 39,		
	42, 283, 293,		
	296		
7	283, 297		
7:8	294		
9:11	55		
12:3	133		

## APOCRYPHA

Baruch		Psalms 151	35
4:2	153, 154	Ben Sira	38, 212
Epistle of Jeremiah		Prologue	49, 51
11-19	165	Prologue 27	20
2 Maccabees		19:13-17	213-214, 222,
2:4-8	165		224
2:13	49, 51, 54	19:15 (Syriac)	213
7:9	133	20:2	218
15:36	53	20:2-3	214
4 Maccabees		24:8	112
15:3	133	24:22	112
		25:26	208-209
		28:3-7	222

<i>(Ben Sira cont.)</i>		13:6	134
36:20-21	35	14:4	34
39:1-3	38		
39:16	134	Wisdom of Solomon	
46:1	38	16:5	134
		18:4	153
Tobit		18:20	134
4:6	134		

NEW TESTAMENT

Matthew	199, 212, 228-230, 243, 298	13:19	146
1:22	42	13:35	42
1:23	42	13:57	43
2:5-6	42	14:5	43
2:13-14	20	15:7	42
2:15	42	15:11	75
2:17	42	15:17-20	75
3:2	76	16:14	43
3:3	42	16:18	196-197
3:6	76	18:3	238
3:8	76	18:10-14	77
3:11	76	18:15	225-226, 228
4:14	42	18:15-17	212-213, 215-216, 223-224, 226-227
5:3-6	77	18:16	226
5:12	42	18:20	213
5:18	240	18:21-22	212-213, 227
5:27-32	235	18:23-35	79
5:31	211	19	235, 237, 242, 245-246
5:31-32	239-240	19 (Syriac)	242
5:32	241	19:1-15	238
5:43-48	196, 232	19:3	249
6:13	146, 276	19:3-6	243-244
6:14-15	79	19:3-9	235, 248-250
6:19-21	77	19:3-12	200-201
6:24	77	19:4	199, 202
7:16	197	19:4-6	242
7:22	46	19:7-8	240, 241
8:17	42	19:8	202, 242
8:21-22	198	19:8-9	249
9:10-13	78	19:9	141, 211, 243
10:41	46	19:12	237-238
11:4-5	195	19:13-15	237
11:9	43	19:16-23	77
11:13	42	19:16-24	232
11:19	78	19:16-30	237
12:17	42	20:28	66, 79
12:22	278	21:4-5	42
12:24-27	146	21:11	43
12:39	42	21:12-13	83
13:14	42	21:26	43
13:17	42		

*(Matthew cont.)*

21:31-32	79	10:30	133
21:46	43	10:45	66, 79
22:34-40	231, 232-233	11:15	86
23:23	77	11:15-17	69-70, 83-87
23:25-26	75	11:25	79
23:29-31	42	12:28-31	231, 232-233
23:34	46	12:41-44	84, 85
24:15	42	13:1-2	69
26:26-28	67	14:22-24	67
26:56	42	14:57-59	70
26:68	45	14:65	45
26:69-75	118	14:66-72	118
27:9	42	Luke-Acts	66-67
Mark	286	Luke	29, 52, 56, 57-58, 70, 79, 114
1:2	42	1:9-20	66
1:5	76	1:67	46
1:23	278	1:68-79	46
1:24	278	1:70	35, 42
2:4-6	79	1:76	43
2:15-17	78	2:14	268
2:17	76	2:22	58
3:11	278	2:22-24	66
3:22	278, 279	2:25-38	66
3:22-26	146	2:29-32	233
3:27	280	2:36	46
4:15	146	2:41-50	66
5:6	279	2:49	66
5:7	278	3:3	76
5:9	278	3:4	42
5:18	279	3:7-14	79
5:20	279	3:8	76
6:15	43	4:17	42
7	80	4:27	42
7:1-23	75	5:29-32	78
7:4	75	6:20-31	77
7:6	42	6:27-36	232
7:13	196	6:44	197
7:15	75	7:21	278
7:21-23	75	7:21-22	195
9:14-27	278	7:29	79
9:25	278	7:34	78
9:38	279	7:39	43
10	235, 237, 242	7:41-43	77, 79
10:2-5	249	9:59-60	198
10:2-12	200-201, 235	10:18	146, 279
10:4-6	57	10:25-28	231, 232-233
10:6	202	10:29-37	232
10:11	211	10:30-37	77
10:17	133	11:15-19	146
10:17-25	77	11:20	146, 276, 277, 279
10:17-31	237	11:24-26	279
10:21	77		

( <i>Luke cont.</i> )		2:13–21	70, 83
11:38–41	75	2:16	83
11:42	77	2:19	183
12:33–34	77	2:19–22	184
13:6–9	77	2:21	112
13:28	42	2:21–22	183
14:33	77	2:23	112
15:1–2	78	3:3	148
15:3–7	77	3:12	125
15:8–10	77	3:13	125, 148
15:11–32	77, 79	3:14	121, 124, 126
16:8	134, 150	3:19	150, 152, 153
16:12–18	236	3:19–21	116, 145
16:13	77	3:21	119, 134, 151
17:3	226	3:31	148
17:3–4	212–213, 226, 228	3:33	150
17:4	226, 227–228	3:36	119, 133
18:9–14	77, 79	4:19	43
18:18–25	77	4:21–24	70
18:31	42	4:23	150
19:45–46	83	4:25	112
21:1–4	84, 85	5	113
22:10–12	67	5:16	112
22:39	66	5:24	119, 149
22:41	66	5:26	149
22:56–62	118	5:32	150
22:64	45	5:35	153
24:19	43	6	118
24:25	42	6:4	112
24:27	50, 52, 58, 59	6:14	43
24:44	49–50, 52	6:28	134
26:29	58	6:39	119
26:31	58	6:40	119
		6:45	42
		6:46	119
John	66, 70–71, 100, 111–126, 127–157, 183–185, 268	6:47	119
1:1–18 (Prologue)	115–117, 121, 152, 184–185	6:51–18	67
1:4	149	6:62	148
1:5	150	6:64	118
1:9	149, 151, 152	6:65	119
1:13	148	7:2	112
1:14	112, 184, 185, 187–189, 194	7:28	150
1:18	187	7:40	43
1:21	43	7:52	43
1:23	42	7:53–8:11	115
1:25	43	8	117
1:35–39	129	8:12	116, 133, 134, 150, 151, 153
1:41	112	8:13–17	226
2	112	8:14	150
		8:23	148
		8:26	150
		8:32	148
		8:42	148



<i>(John cont.)</i>		18:25-27	118
8:44	146, 149	18:35	150
8:45-46	150	18:37	150
8:47	119		
8:51-52	149	Acts	69, 96
8:52-53	45	2:16	42
9:3	134	2:17-18	46
9:4	151, 153	2:30	42
9:5	151	2:38	79
9:17	43	2:41	79
10	119	2:46	66-67
10:22	112	3:1-11	66-67
11:9	151	3:18	42
11:25	148, 149	3:22	42
11:26	149	3:22-23	43, 58
11:51	45	3:24	42
11:55	112	4:32	232
12:22	124	5:12	66-67
12:31	146, 147, 276	6:13	58
12:35	134	7	58
12:35-36	116	7:37	58
12:36	134, 150, 153, 279	7:42	42
		7:48	42
12:38	42	7:52	43
12:46	150, 151, 152	8:5-40	79
13	118	8:28-34	42
13:2	146	10:1-11:18	79
13:12-17	121	11:2-3	79
13:27	146	11:27-28	43-44
13:30	117	13:1	44
13:31	124	13:20	42
13:34	121	13:39	58
13:36-37	117	13:40	42
14:5	117	13:44-46	79
14:6	148, 149, 150	15	57
14:8	117	15:1	58
14:17	135	15:5	58
14:22	117	15:13-21	231, 233-234
14:30	146	15:32	44
15:1	149	18:13	58
15:13	121	18:15	58
15-17	145	18:18	59
15:18-25	117	18:24-19:7	27
15:26	135	19:6	45
16:7	150	21:9	46
16:11	146	21:10-11	44
16:13	135	21:23-25	66-67
17	119	21:23-26	69
17:5	124	21:28	58
17:6	119	22:3	58
17:15	146, 150	22:17	59
17:22	124	24:17	59
18:18	118	26:18	154
18:25	118	26:22	58

( <i>Acts cont.</i> )		7:40	238
28:23	58	10:16–21	68
28:25	42	11:4–5	44
		11:23–25	67
Romans		12:8–10	44
1:2	43	12:27	44
1:18–30	76	12:29	44
1:23–25	79	13:2	44
2:7	133	13:8–9	44
2:12–16	80	14:1	44
3:20	268	14:3–4	44
3:21–26	66, 79	14:5	44
3:28	268	14:6	44
5:21	133	14:22	44
6:1–11	66, 79	14:24	44
6:19	76, 77	14:29–33	44
6:22–23	133	14:39–40	44
7	236	15:3	66, 67, 79
7:1–3	248	16:12	27
7:1–4	247–248		
10:4–6	57	2 Corinthians	
11:3	43	2:11	146
11:16	69	2:14–15	68
12:1	68	4:6	155
12:6	44	5:17–21	66, 79
13:12–14	155	6:14–7:1	68, 143
15:16	68	6:14–16	268
16:20	146	6:15	143
1 Corinthians	246	6:16	183
1–4	124	11–12	125
1:12	27	11:14	146
3:4–6	27	12:7	146
3:16	67, 68	12:21	76, 77
3:16–17	183		
3:22	27	Galatians	97–98, 102
4:6	27	1	247
5:5	146	1:4	66, 79
5–6	76	1:6–9	97–98
5:9–13	76	2–4	102
5:13	146	2:9	97
6	236	2:11–14	79
6–7	249	2:16	268
6:9–10	80, 236	3:2–10	268
6:9–11	76	5:19–21	76, 77
6:15–20	244–245	5:19–26	80
6:19	68	6:8	133
7	238, 246, 247		
7:1	238	Ephesians	
7:25	238	2:2	147
7:26	238	2:20	44
7:29	238	2:20–22	183
7:32–35	238	3:5	44
7:39	247	4:11	44
		4:26	216–217

<i>(Ephesians cont.)</i>		2 Peter	97, 98–100, 102
5:3–5	77	1:21	42
5:5	80	2:16	42
5:8	134, 150, 155	3:2	43
5:22–23	205–206	1 John	97, 100–102, 129,
Philippians			149, 155
2:15	76	1:6	134, 149
2:17	68	2:1	100
Colossians	125	2:4	149
1:12–13	155	2:8	149, 151
1 Thessalonians		2:9	151
2:15	43	2:13–14	146
2:18	146	2:18	147
4	236	2:18–19	101
4:7	76	2:19	118
5:4–8	155	2:21	149
5:5	134, 150	2:27	149
5:20	44	3:8	146
1 Timothy		3:10	146
1:18	45	3:12	146
6:10	77	3:14	149
Hebrews	70–71, 109, 264–266	3:19	149
1:1	43	4:3	147
1:4–14	265	4:6	135, 148
1:5–9	264	4:13	147
1:13	264	5:6	149
2:9	190–191	5:18–19	146
6:1–6	80	5:20	149
7:2	264	2 John	
7:3	264	1	148
7:11–19	68	4	134, 148
7:14	264	7	147
9:5	189	3 John	
11:32	43	3	134
13:15–16	183	3–4	148
James		Jude	
3:6	77	14	42
3:17	77	Revelation	43, 70–71, 109,
4:8	77		171–172, 276,
5:10	43		281–293
1 Peter		1:2	45
1:10	42, 43	1:3	43
1:12	77	1:5	45
2:5	183	1:6	70
2:9	155	1:9	45
3:21	77	2:20	46
4:17	183	3:12	183
		3:14	202
		5:10	70

<i>(Revelation cont.)</i>		13:1-10	283
10:7	43	13:11-18	283
10:11	43	13:15	284
11	42, 282, 285, 288,	16:6	43
	290	18:20	44
11:1-2	183	18:24	43
11:3-7	284	19:4	287
11:8-12	284	19:10	45
11:9	70	19:11-15	284
11:10	43	19:16-21	284
11:15-19	172	20:6	70
11:18	43	21:22	70
12	279, 285, 287,	22:6	43
	289-290, 292	22:7	43
12:7-10	147	22:9	43
13	282, 284, 285,	22:10	43
	290	22:18	43
13:1	283, 284	22:19	43

PSEUDEPIGRAPHA, ETC.

<i>Apocalypse of Elijah</i>	291-292	<i>1 Enoch</i>	133, 138, 293
		10:10	133
<i>Aristobulus</i>		15:4	133
<i>Eusebius, Preparation for the Gospel</i>		15:6	133
8.9.38-8.10.17	23	15:9	202
13.12.9-11	152	37:4	133
13.12.9-16	23	37-71	297-298
		40:9	133
<i>Letter of Aristeas</i>	23-25	58:3	133
30-31	23	108:11	134
46	20	108:11-14	150
144-169	23		
		<i>2 Enoch</i>	
<i>Ascension of Isaiah</i>		24:4j	152
1:3	147	25	152
2:4	147	71	287
10:29	147		
		<i>4 Ezra</i>	153, 286
<i>2 Baruch</i>	153, 286	6:40	152
6:5-9	165	7	286
17:4	153	11-14	286
18:2	153	12:12	18
39-40	286	14:20-21	153
53	153		
53:9	153	<i>Joseph and Aseneth</i>	
56-72	153	8:9	133, 152, 154
59:2	153	15:12	154
70-72	286		
		<i>Jubilees</i>	15, 24, 138
<i>4 Baruch</i>		2:14	201-202
3:1-9	165	3:7	206-207
		3:8	201-202

<i>(Jubilees cont.)</i>			
23:21	87		
49:7	217		
<i>L.A.B. (Pseudo-Philo Biblical Antiquities)</i>			
9:8	153		
11:1	153		
15:6	153		
19:4	153		
26:112-115	165		
28:8-9	152		
33:3	153		
51:4	153		
51:6	153		
60:2	152		
<i>Odes of Solomon</i>			
11:16	155		
<i>Oracle of Hystaspes</i>		281-298	
<i>Psalms of Solomon</i>			
3:12	133		
		<i>Testaments of the 12 Patriarchs</i>	143
		<i>Testament of Benjamin</i>	
		5:3	154
		10:3	134
		<i>Testament of Gad</i>	
		5:7	154
		6:3	224, 226
		6:3-4	214-215, 227
		<i>Testament of Joseph</i>	
		19:3	154
		<i>Testament of Judah</i>	
		20:1-2	141
		20:1-25	135
		<i>Testament of Levi</i>	274
		18:2-4	153
		19:1	153, 154, 155
		<i>Testament of Solomon</i>	
		2:9	147
		3:5-6	147
		6:1	147

## DEAD SEA SCROLLS AND RELATED DOCUMENTS

1Q14 (pMic)	16	20:26	274
1QpHab		20:28-29	274-275
<i>(Peshar Habakkuk)</i>	16, 17, 18, 35, 65	1Q27 ( <i>Book of Mysteries</i> )	141
1:11	196	1QS ( <i>Rule of the Community</i> )	71-74, 112, 116, 119, 138, 139, 140, 265, 294
2:8-10	18	1:1-12	231-233
2:9	34	1:3	33
6:15-7:6	18	1:5	134, 136
7:1-14	18	1:7	196
7:5	34	1:9	134
7:8	34	1:9-11	232
8:8-13	65	1:12	196
8:11-12	86	1:16	139
12:7-10	65	1:16-3:13	140, 142
12:19	86	2:16	134
1Q15 (pZeph)	16	3:6-12	72
1Q16 (pPs)	16	3:7	45, 133
1QapGen ( <i>Genesis Apocryphon</i> )	40	3:8	196
20:1-7	274	3:13-4:26 ( <i>Treatise on the Two Spirits</i> )	111, 115, 116, 132, 135-143,
20:7-11	274		
20:12-16	274		
20:16-17	274		
20:16-32	274-275		

(IQS cont.)		1QH <sup>a</sup> ( <i>Hodayot</i> )	40, 268
	147–148,	12:16	36, 41
	269–270	12:34	268
3:13	134	14:24–27	196–197
3:18–19	135	15:13–15	119
3:19–21	293	19:25–26	86
3:21	134	3Q4 (pIsa)	16
3:22–23	270	3	33
3:24	134	4Q88	
3:25	134	8:14	36
4:6	134	4Q158	207
4:7	133	6 6	38
4:11	134	4Q159	
4:16	119	5 1	15
4:21	45, 135, 142	4Q161 (pIsa <sup>a</sup> )	16, 18
4:22	141	4Q162 (pIsa <sup>b</sup> )	16
4:23	135, 142	4Q163 (pIsa <sup>c</sup> )	16, 17
4:26	141	4Q164 (pIsa <sup>d</sup> )	16, 18, 34
5:2–3	71	4Q165 (pIsa <sup>e</sup> )	16, 18
5:3	73, 134,	1–2 1	33
	136	4Q166 (pHos <sup>a</sup> )	16, 18
5:12	73	4Q167 (pHos <sup>b</sup> )	16, 18
5:24–6:1	216–217,	4Q168 (pMic[?])	16
	223–227	4Q169 (pNah)	16, 17, 18
5:25	224	3–4 i 1–11	19
6:13–23	80	4Q170 (pZeph)	16
6:19–20	86	4Q171 (pPs <sup>a</sup> )	16, 35, 91
6:22	86	4Q172 (pUnid)	15, 16
6:25–26	227	4Q173 (pPs <sup>b</sup> )	16
8:2	134, 136	4Q173a	16
8:2–10	73	4Q174 ( <i>Florilegium</i> )	15, 74, 295
8:3	72, 134	1 i 10–13	231, 233–234
8:15–16	34	1 i 13	15
8:16	45	1 i 14	15
9:3	45	1 i 19	15
9:3–5	73	1–2 i 15	33
9:5	73	1–2 i 16	33
9:11	38, 296	1–3 ii 3	33
9:22	86	4Q175	37
9:25	73	5	38
1Q28a (Sa)		7	38
1:25	73	4Q177	
2:11–22	82	5–6 i 2	33
1QM ( <i>War Scroll</i> )	112, 136, 137,	5–6 i 5	33
	138, 139, 142,	7 3	33
	265, 295	12–13 i 5	135
1:1	134	4Q183	16
1:3	134	4Q186	26, 270
1:9	134	4Q198	
1:11	134	1 12	34
1:13	134	4Q215	119
2:1–6	82	4Q246 (“Son of God” text; <i>Aramaic</i> <i>Apocalypse</i> )	123, 294
10:9–11	32	1:4–2:3	294
13:10	135		
19:9–11	296		

(4Q246 cont.)		4Q372 ( <i>Prayer of Joseph</i> )	
2:1	294	1 27-28	222-223
2:4-9	294	4Q375	36-37, 39
4Q252, 253, 254, 254a		1 i	36
( <i>Commentary on Genesis</i> )	14	1 i 4	36
4Q252 (CommGenA)	5, 14-15, 293	1 i 6	36
4:5	14	4Q379 ( <i>Apocryphon of Joshua</i> <sup>b</sup> )	
5:3-4	14	22 ii	37
4Q253a ( <i>Commentary on Malachi B</i> )	15, 16	36 2	37
4Q258 (S <sup>d</sup> )	71, 140	4Q381	35
1 ii 5	216	69 4	35
2 ii 5-6	73	4Q382 (pap paraKings)	35
2 iii 6	86	31 5	35
4Q259 (S <sup>e</sup> )	71, 140	4Q383	
2:8-15	73	1	38
2:15	73	6	38
4Q265		6 1	38
1 3	33, 34	6 2	38
7 7-8	34	4Q385 (psEzek <sup>a</sup> )	15
4Q266 (D <sup>a</sup> )		2 5-7	33
3 ii	239	4Q385a (apocJer C <sup>a</sup> )	
3 iii 18	33	18 i-ii	38
9 iii 1-5	203	18 i a-b 2	33
9 iii 6-10	219-220	6	33
11 1-3	74	B 1	33
4Q267 (D <sup>b</sup> )		4Q385b (psEzek <sup>c</sup> )	
2	239	1 2	33
2 6	36	4Q386 (psEzek <sup>b</sup> )	
9 i 1	217	1 i 4	33
4Q269 (D <sup>d</sup> )		1 ii 5	197
4 i 2	36	4Q390	
4 ii	239	2 i 5	34
4Q270 (D <sup>e</sup> )		4Q392	
6 iii 18	217	1 i 4-7	152
6 iii 20-21	218	4Q394-399 ( <i>Miqsat Ma'ase Ha-Torah; MMT</i> )	viii-ix, 50-53, 64, 89-105, 268
7 i 15-17	74	B	95, 103
4Q280		B 12-13	95
2 2	142	B 13	103
4Q285		B 27	103
7 1	33	C	95, 102
7 1-5	296	C 7	89-95
4Q286 (4QBerakhot <sup>a</sup> )		C 9-11	50-53
7 ii 1-13	142	C 10	51, 94, 95
20a,b 6-7	219	C 20-24	14
20a,b 7-10	219	C 26-27	94, 103
4Q292	34	C 31-32	95, 103
2 4	34	4Q397 (MMT <sup>d</sup> )	
4Q306		14-21 10	33
1 2	217	14-21 15	33
4Q320		4Q398 (papMMT <sup>e</sup> )	
1 i 2-3	202	11-13 3-7	14
4Q339 ( <i>List of False Prophets</i> )	37		
4Q341	26		

4Q400–407 ( <i>Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice</i> )	138, 168–171	4Q541 ( <i>Aramaic Levi Document</i> )	295, 299
4Q403		9 i 3–5	153
1 i 30	169	4Q542	
1 i 41	169	1 i 10	135
1 i 41–45	169–170	4Q543–549 ( <i>Visions of Amram</i> )	150
1 ii 15	169	4Q543–547 ( <i>Visions of Amram</i> <sup>a–e</sup> )	123
4Q415–418 ( <i>Musar leMevin; Instruction</i> )	141	4Q548 ( <i>Visions of Amram</i> <sup>f</sup> )	
4Q416 ( <i>Instruction</i> <sup>b</sup> )		1–2 ii 8–9	134
2 iii–iv	203	1–2 ii 10–11	134
2 iii 20–21–iv 10	203–208, 212	1–2 ii 15–16	134
2 iv 3	204	4Q556	
2 iv 7–8	205	1 7	38
4Q417 ( <i>Instruction</i> <sup>c</sup> )		4Q558	
2 i 1–8	220–221, 227	1	39
2 i 2	221	4Q560	275–276
2 i 5	221	4Q562	
2 i 6	221	7 1	38
2 i 14–16	221–222	4Q570	
4Q418 ( <i>Instruction</i> <sup>d</sup> )		30 4	38
10b	203	5Q10 (5QpMal[?]; <i>Commentary on Malachi A</i> )	16
69 ii 4–6	198–199	5Q12	
69 ii 7	73	1	218
221 2	38	6Q15	
222 3	225	1	236
4Q418a ( <i>Instruction</i> <sup>e</sup> )		3	239
18	203	4	239
4Q429 ( <i>Hodayot</i> <sup>e</sup> )		11Q5 (Ps <sup>a</sup> ; <i>Psalms Scroll</i> )	
4 ii 7	196–197	19:1–18 ( <i>Plea of Deliverance</i> )	273–274
4Q444		19:13–16	273–274, 276
6 4	135	19:14	274
4Q468g	26	19:15	274
4Q471b ( <i>Self-Glorification Hymn</i> )	265–266	27:9–10	271–272
1a 4	266	22 ( <i>Apostrophe to Zion</i> )	35
4Q477	220	22:5	35
4Q491c (= 4Q491 11–12; <i>Self-Glorification Hymn</i> )	122–125,	22:5–6	35
296–297		22:12–14	35
11 i 12	122, 266	22:14	35, 36
11 i 13–15	122	27:10	33
11 i 16–18	122–123	28:8 (Psalm 151A)	33, 35
4Q502		28:13 (Psalm 151B)	33, 35
Frg.16	141	11Q11 (PsAp <sup>a</sup> =apocrPs; <i>Apocryphal Psalms</i> )	271–274, 276
4Q504		1:7	272
1–2 iii 12–13	34, 35	2:2	272
4Q510–511 ( <i>Songs of the Sage</i> )	272	2:3	272
4Q521 ( <i>Messianic Apocalypse</i> )	39, 123, 195, 298	2:4	272
		2:5	272
		3:1	272



(11Q11 <i>cont.</i> )		CD ( <i>Damascus Document</i> )	15, 16, 64,
3:4	272		72, 81–82,
4:1	272		86, 138,
4:4	272		139, 239,
4:5	272, 273		250–251,
4:7–8	272		265, 294,
5:4	278		295
5:4–11	272	1	295
5:4–6:3	272–273	1:11–20	64
5:5	273	2:2–13	142
5:6	273, 278	2:5–9	64
5:6–8	273	3:21	33
5:8	273	4:12b–19	72
6:3	273	4:13	33, 36
6:3–4	273	4:14–21	236–237
6:3–14	273	4:15	54
6:4	273	4:15–5:2	234,
6:14	273		243–244,
11Q13 ( <i>Melchizedek</i> )	15, 38,		246
	259–264, 294	4:15–19	237
2:4–6	259	4:18	236
2:6	260	4:19–5:1	201–203,
2:7–8	262		212
2:8	260, 261, 262	4:19–5:11	64
2:9	261	4:20–21	242–243
2:12	15	4:21	239, 246,
2:13	35, 259, 262		247–248,
2:14	260–261		249–250
2:15	33	4:21–5:1	249
2:17	15	5	57
2:18–20	294	5:1	244
2:20	259	5:1–5	240–241
3:7	262	5:7–8	196
12:2	262	5:7–11	71
11Q19 ( <i>Temple Scroll<sup>a</sup></i> )	viii; 15,	5:8	54
	36–37, 39, 64,	5:20–21	196
	138, 165, 178,	6:1–2	36
	182, 193	6:2–11	295
3:10–12	178	6:3–6	26
18:5	73	6:11–16	239
29	37	6:11–17	65
51:11–15	65	6:13–17	87
54:4	203	7:2–3	73
54:8–18	37	7:3–4	71
54:8	37	7:6–9	236
54:11	37	7:7	73
54:15	37	7:9–8:10	72
57:13	73	7:10	33
57:15–19	243	7:17	33
61:1–5	37	7:18–21	295
61:2	37	7:18–19	26
61:3	37	8:5	87
61:4	37	8:8	87
11Q20 ( <i>Temple Scroll<sup>b</sup></i> )	37	9:2–8	217–219,
16	37		223–227

(CD cont.)

9:5	196	Nahal Hever	
9:6	218	8 Hev1 (8HevXII gr; <i>Minor Prophets Scroll</i> )	26
9:16–24	219, 223–227	Masada	
11:20–21	74	Mas pap 721	20
12:21	73	PAM	
13:17	203	43.677 6	38
13:17–19	219–220	44.102 66 4	33
16:10–12	236		
14	295		
19:7	33, 36		

JOSEPHUS AND PHILO

Josephus	79, 91, 95, 96, 105, 180, 182, 193, 207, 269, 277, 293	<i>Hypothetica</i>	
		Eusebius, <i>Preparation for the Gospel</i>	
		8.7.13	22
<i>Jewish Antiquities</i>		<i>On the Confusion of Tongues</i>	
1.24	20	56	186
3.124–125	182	<i>On the Contemplative Life</i>	21–22, 25
3.127–128	182	28–29	21
13.172	119	75–78	21–22
13.311–313	39	<i>On the Creation of the World</i>	
13.372–383	19	29–35	152
14.71–72	180	<i>On the Life of Moses</i>	
15.371	20	2.37–40	25
15.373–379	39	2.188–191	241
17.345–348	39	<i>On the Migration of Abraham</i>	
18.18	119	89–93	24
18.117	76	<i>On Providence</i>	
<i>Jewish War</i>		2.64	25
1.78–80	39	<i>On the Special Laws</i>	25
1.90–98	19	2.63	233
1.152	180	<i>Questions and Answers</i>	
2.112–113	39	<i>on Exodus</i>	25
2.124	104, 111	2.94	186
<i>Life</i>		<i>Questions and Answers</i>	
12	120	<i>on Genesis</i>	25
Philo	21–22, 24–25, 29, 59, 178, 185–186, 198, 228	1.29	206
<i>Allegorical Interpretation</i>	25	<i>That Every Good Person is Free</i>	
		75	104
		80	21
		82	21

EARLY CHRISTIAN WRITINGS

Aphrahat		<i>Letter of Barnabas</i>	
<i>Demonstrations</i>		18.2	147
18.10	245		
Athanasius	185, 188–190	<i>1 Clement</i>	
<i>Letter to Adelphius</i>		59:2	155
7–8	189–190, 192, 194		

<i>Didache</i>		Justin Martyr	
14:2	224	<i>First Apology</i>	
15:3	224, 226	44	281
Eusebius		<i>Dialogue with Trypho</i>	
<i>Ecclesiastical History</i>		106.2–3	7
2.16–17	21		
<i>Gospel of Thomas</i>		Lactantius	
14	75	<i>Divine Institutes</i>	
64	83	7	282–287
71	85	7.16.1	283
89	75	7.16.3	283
		7.17.2	283, 284, 286
		7.17.3	284
Gregory of Nyssa		7.17.7	284
<i>To Theophilus, Against</i>		7.19.5	284, 287
<i>the Apollinarians</i>	187	7.19.5–8	284
		7.19.6	284
Shepherd of Hermas		Leo the Great	
<i>Mand.</i>		<i>Sermon</i>	
3:4	135	22.2	191
		23.1	191
Ignatius		Melito of Sardis	
<i>To the Ephesians</i>		<i>On Pascha</i>	
17:1	147	68	155
19:1	147		
<i>To the Magnesians</i>		P. Oxyrynchus 840	181, 182
1:2	147	2.1–2.7	178–180
<i>To the Philadelphians</i>			
6:2	147	Tertullian	
<i>To the Romans</i>		<i>Against Praxeas</i>	
7:1	147	14–16	187
<i>To the Trallians</i>			
4:2	147	Theodore of Mopsuestia	
		<i>Homily</i>	
Irenaeus		6:6	190
<i>Against Haeresies</i>			
4:20	187		

## RABBINIC TEXTS

Mishnah		<i>m. Kelim</i>	
<i>m. 'Abot</i>		1:8–9	174
3:6	213	<i>m. Parah</i>	
<i>m. Berakhot</i>		7:6	241
9:5	83	7:7	241
<i>m. Giṭṭin</i>		<i>m. Tamid</i>	
4:5	241, 245	7:4	133
9:10	211, 240		
<i>m. Ḥagigah</i>		Tosefta	
1:1	172	<i>t. Baba Meṣia</i>	
3:1	181–182	2:24	228
3:8	174	<i>t. Ḥagigah</i>	
<i>m. Hullin</i>		1:1	172–173
7:6	207	<i>t. Niddah</i>	
		1:9	241

Jerusalem Talmud		8:1	242
<i>y. Baba Meṣia</i>		18:5	210
2:10 (8d)	228	18:24	245
<i>y. Berakhot</i>		<i>Leviticus Rabbah</i>	
1:1 (5a)	287–290	14:1	242
<i>y. Hagigah</i>		<i>Numbers Rabbah</i>	
3:8 (79d)	174	5:9	166
<i>y. Horayot</i>		<i>Lamentations Rabbah</i>	
1:8 (46b)	241	1:51	287
<i>y. Ketubbot</i>		<i>Psalms Rabbah</i>	
11:3 (34b)	209	139	242
<i>y. Qiddushin</i>		<i>Megillat Ta'anit</i>	56
1:1 (58c)	206, 207, 210	<i>Mekhilta of Rabbi Ishmael</i>	
<i>y. Ta'anit</i>		Exod 18:27	133
3:13 (67a)	217	Exod 20:23	176–177
<i>y. Yoma</i>			
8:9 (45c)	215, 226, 229		
Babylonian Talmud		<i>Sifra</i>	
<i>b. 'Abodah Zarah</i>		Lev 19:17	227, 228
24b	241	Lev 21:2 ( <i>Emor</i> 1)	204
<i>b. Hagigah</i>		<i>Sifre Deuteronomy</i>	
26b	174	116 (Deut 15:8)	228
<i>b. Horayot</i>		117 (Deut 15:10)	228
6a	241	119 (Deut 15:14)	228
<i>b. Megillah</i>		225	228
28a	217	<i>Targum Jonathan</i>	
<i>b. Menahot</i>		Hosea 4:1	134
65a–b	56	<i>Kallah Rabbati</i>	
<i>b. Pesahim</i>		3:10	217
113b	225	<i>Midrash Mishle</i>	
<i>b. Sanhedrin</i>		6	178
58a	242	<i>Seder 'Olam Rabbah</i>	292–293
75b	241	<i>Sefer Zerubbabel</i>	290–291
76b	206	Judah Ha-Levi	
80b	241	<i>The Kuzari</i>	
98a	291	1:92	177
99a	56	<i>Ma'ase of R. Yehoshua</i>	
100b	209	<i>b. Levi</i>	291
<i>b. Yebamot</i>			
63a	202, 242		
<i>b. Yoma</i>			
54a	175–176, 177		
<i>b. Zebaḥim</i>			
119b	241		
Other Rabbinic Writings			
<i>Genesis Rabbah</i>			
3:8	152		

## GRECO-ROMAN SOURCES

Aelius Donatus <i>Commentary on Terence</i>	12-13	Maurus Servius <i>Commentary on Virgil</i>	12-13
Athenaeus <i>Deipnosophists</i> 15.12	9	<i>P. Thessaloniki (Derveni Papyrus)</i>	8, 10
C. Helvius Cinna <i>Zmyrna</i>	12	Philo of Byblos Eusebius, <i>Preparation for the Gospel</i> 1.9.24	7
Euphron <i>Hypomnemata on Plutus</i> of Aristophanes	8	Philostratus <i>Life of Apollonius of Tyana</i>	277
<i>Greek Magical Papyri</i> 7.579-90 13:124 16.1-75	277 278 278 278	Pomponius Porphyrio <i>Commentary on Horace</i>	12
Lucius Aelius <i>Commentary on</i> <i>Carmen Saliare</i>	8	Virgil <i>Aenead</i> 4.9	20