

JÖRG FREY

Qumran, Early Judaism, and New Testament Interpretation

Edited by
JACOB CERONE

*Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen
zum Neuen Testament
424*

Mohr Siebeck

Copyright 2019. Mohr Siebeck GmbH & Co. KG. All rights reserved. May not be reproduced in any form without permission from the publisher, except fair uses permitted under U.S. or applicable copyright law.

Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament

Herausgeber / Editor

Jörg Frey (Zürich)

Mitherausgeber / Associate Editors

Markus Bockmuehl (Oxford) · James A. Kelhoffer (Uppsala)

Tobias Nicklas (Regensburg) · Janet Spittler (Charlottesville, VA)

J. Ross Wagner (Durham, NC)

424



Jörg Frey

Qumran, Early Judaism, and New Testament Interpretation

Kleine Schriften III

edited by

Jacob N. Cerone

Mohr Siebeck

JÖRG FREY, born 1962; 1996 Dr. theol.; 1998 Habilitation; since 2010 Professor for New Testament at the University of Zurich.

JACOB N. CERONE, born 1985; 2011 M.Div., 2015 Th.M. from Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary; since 2016 PhD student at Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität in Munich.

ISBN 978-3-16-156015-6 / eISBN 978-3-16-158167-0
DOI 10.1628/978-3-16-158167-0

ISSN 0512-1604 / eISSN 2568-7476 (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament)

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

© 2019 Mohr Siebeck Tübingen, Germany. www.mohrsiebeck.com

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

The book was printed by Gulde Druck in Tübingen on non-aging paper and bound by Buchbinderei Spinner in Ottersweier.

Printed in Germany.

M. E. G.

Preface

It is with great joy and gratitude that I present the third volume of my collected essays – which follows “Die Herrlichkeit des Gekreuzigten” (WUNT 307) on the Johannine Literature and “Von Jesus zur neutestamentlichen Theologie” (WUNT 368) on various topics of New Testament theology – a volume containing studies on the Dead Sea Scrolls and their relevance for understanding the New Testament. Although I am primarily a New Testament scholar, and my main duty is teaching New Testament exegesis, the Qumran discoveries have been a particular source of fascination from the very beginning of my studies, and the community of Qumran scholarship has been a source of joy up to the present. In spite of all the scholarly calls for critical sobriety, this volume also intends to show that the scrolls are still a source of surprising discoveries and inspirations, and that the insights from the Dead Sea discoveries are still not sufficiently taken into consideration in New Testament scholarship.

Unlike the two earlier volumes of my “Kleine Schriften,” this volume is completely in English. I am particularly grateful that Jacob Cerone, who has worked for me as a language corrector and editor for a few years, was willing not only to translate hundreds of pages of rather technical texts, but also to take the editorial responsibility for the present volume, including the index of ancient sources and the preparation of the camera-ready version. Without his skillful, diligent, and meticulous work, the volume would not have been possible. I am also grateful to the Theological Faculty of the University of Zurich for granting support for the translation costs, to my co-editors in the WUNT series for accepting the suggested volume, and to Mohr Siebeck publishers, in particular Katharina Gutekunst, Elena Müller, and Matthias Spitzner, for all their support. All publishers of the original publications of the article presented here have generously expressed their consent for republication.

The volume is dedicated to the lovely person who did most to make me feel at home in Switzerland. She looked for evil and its origins, and thereby found me, and through her love she makes my life enjoyable and bright.

Zürich/Stäfa

July 2019

Table of Contents

Preface	VII
Abbreviations	XV

Introduction: Qumran, Ancient Judaism, and the New Testament	1
A. My Story with Qumran	2
B. Insights and Aims	12
C. The Present Volume	14

I. Introductory Essays

1. New Testament Scholarship and Ancient Judaism: Problems – Perceptions – Perspectives	19
A. Problems: The Perception of Judaism in Christian Exegesis	20
B. New Perceptions: The Qumran-Discoveries, the Insights into the Plurality of Ancient Judaism, and the Changed Questions about Jesus and Paul	26
C. Perspectives: Theses on the Hermeneutical Task of New Testament Research with Regard to Ancient Judaism	43
2. Qumran: An Overview	45
A. Location and Archaeology	45
B. The Textual Discoveries	51
C. Qumran, the Essenes, and the Yahad	66
D. The Textual Discoveries and their Significance for Early Christianity	70
E. Conclusion	81

II. Qumran and Early Jewish Texts

3. Qumran Research and Biblical Scholarship in Germany	85
A. The Context of Qumran Scholarship in the Period after the Second World War	85
B. Scholars, Insights, and Projects	95
4. Qumran and Archaeology	121
A. The Ruins of Khirbet Qumran up to their Interpretation by Roland de Vaux	122
B. The Revival of the Discussion about the Texts and the Advent of Alternative Archaeological Interpretations of Khirbet Qumran	131
C. The State of the Discussion and Remaining Questions	149
5. On the Historical Value of the Ancient Sources about the Essenes.....	163
A. Introduction.....	163
B. The Older Research: Walter Bauer's Framework as a Paradigm.....	166
C. The Problems of the Ancient Texts about the Essenes	168
D. Ronald Bergmeier's Source Analysis and Its Problems	173
E. The Ancient Reports about the Essenes and the Library of Qumran	184
6. The Qumran Discoveries and the Understanding of Apocalypticism.....	195
A. Preliminary Questions	195
B. Apocalypticism in the Texts from Qumran	205
C. The Contribution of the Qumran Texts to the Understanding of Apocalypticism	230
7. Different Patterns of Dualistic Thought in the Qumran Library: Reflections on their Background and History.....	243
A. Reopening the Issue	243
B. The Complex Pattern of Dualism in 1QS III 13–IV 26, its Sapiential Background and Reception	256
C. The Pattern of Sheer Cosmic Dualism, its Sectarian Reception	273
D. Conclusions and Perspectives for Further Discussion	295

8. Apocalyptic Dualism: Its Formation and Early History	301
A. Dualism as a Category of Scholarship.....	301
B. The Hebrew Bible and its Context	302
C. The Emergence of Dualistic Views in the Earliest Period of Jewish Apocalypticism	304
D. The Different Patterns of Dualism Represented in the Qumran Corpus.....	306
E. “This World and the World to Come”.....	320
F. The Reception of Apocalyptic Dualism in Early Christian Thought	322
9. On the Origins of the Genre “Literary Testament”: Farewell Discourses in the Qumran Library and Their Relevance for the History of the Genre.....	325
A. Literary Testaments and Farewell Discourses in Biblical Scholarship...	326
B. Criteria of the Genre “Testament”	328
C. The Evidence from the Qumran Library.....	331
D. Conclusions and Further Perspectives	344
10. The New Jerusalem Text in Its Historical and Traditio-Historical Context.....	349
A. Form and Genre of the New Jerusalem Text	352
B. Origin and Date	355
C. Traditio-Historical Context	364
11. The Testimonies about the Communal Meals from Qumran.....	369
A. The Qumranic Communal Meals in Scholarship	369
B. The Sources about the Essene Meals.....	377
C. The Meal Regulations of the <i>Yahad</i> from the Qumran Corpus.....	381
D. Consequences and Outlook: The Meals of the <i>Yahad</i> and the Lord’s Supper	398
12. The Authority of the Scriptures of Israel in the Qumran Corpus.....	403
A. The Qumran Library as a Paradigm-Shift in Canon-Research and the Pattern of a “Canonical Process”	405
B. The Qumran Corpus	409
C. Criteria of Authority or “Canonicity”.....	414
D. Writings Considered Authoritative.....	418
E. Conclusions.....	425

13. The Worldview in the Book of Jubilees	429
A. The Temporal Structure.....	430
B. The Spatial Structure.....	441
C. The Worldview in the Book of Jubilees and the Function of Chronology and Topography.....	457
14. Temple and Rival Temple: The Cases of Elephantine Mt. Gerizim, and Leontopolis.....	461
A. The Jewish Temple at Elephantine in Upper Egypt.....	463
B. The Samaritan Temple on Mt. Gerizim	471
C. Onias' Temple at Leontopolis in Lower Egypt	479
D. Some Points for Comparison.....	491

III. Qumran, the New Testament, and New Testament Scholarship

15. Critical Issues in the Investigation of the Scrolls and the New Testament.....	495
A. The Scrolls and New Testament Scholarship	498
B. Patterns of Relating the Scrolls and the New Testament or Early Christianity.....	499
C. Methodological Considerations.....	507
D. Insights on John the Baptist, Jesus, Paul, and John	510
E. Summary and Perspectives.....	523
16. The Impact of the Dead Sea Scrolls on New Testament Interpretation: Proposals, Problems, and Further Perspectives.....	527
A. Four Periods of Discussion	529
B. Four Problematic Patterns	539
C. Some Methodological Considerations.....	554
D. Two Major Test Cases.....	561
E. Conclusions and Perspectives for Further Research.....	576

17. The Textual Discoveries of Qumran and New Testament Scholarship: A Mediating Balance, Hermeneutical Considerations, and Concretions on the Jesus Tradition.....	579
A. A Double Introduction	579
B. The Change of the Questions: From Older to Newer Qumran Research.....	585
C. Methodological and Hermeneutical Considerations concerning the Comparison of Qumran and New Testament Texts.....	597
D. The “Historical” Jesus and the Jesus Tradition	600
E. Messianism and Christology	615
F. <i>Concluding Thoughts and Perspectives</i>	621
18. Jesus, Paul, and the Texts from the Dead Sea: Research History and Hermeneutical Perspectives.....	623
A. Qumran and the New Testament – The Questions of the Older and Newer Research.....	625
B. Hermeneutical Horizons: Qumran Texts between Politics, Religion, and Scholarship	641
19. The Character and Background of Matt 5:25–26: On the Value of Qumran Literature in New Testament Interpretation.....	649
A. The Court Scene of Matt 5:25–26 in its Matthean Context	652
B. Interpreting the Scene in Matthew and Luke.....	655
C. The Original Form: A Prudential Advice, Not a Parable.....	659
D. The Sapiential Background: Advice on Loans and Surety.....	662
E. The Social Background: Debt Imprisonment and Debt Slavery	669
20. Paul’s View of the Spirit in Light of Qumran	677
A. Preliminaries: “Paul and Qumran” and Changes in Scholarship.....	677
B. Early Experiences of the Spirit and the Development and Background of Paul’s Views	682
C. The Notion of Spirit in Qumran.....	688
D. Paul, Qumran, and the Spirit: Some Concluding Perspectives.....	696
21. Flesh and Spirit in the Palestinian Jewish Sapiential Tradition and in the Qumran Texts: An Inquiry into the Background of Pauline Usage.....	701
A. The Problem: The Antithesis of “Flesh” and “Spirit” in Paul.....	702
B. The Religio-Historical Issue in the Scholarly Debate.....	705
C. Flesh and Spirit in the Hellenistic-Jewish Tradition.....	710

D. The Classical Qumran Parallels.....	713
E. The New Evidence from 1Q/4QInstruction and 1Q/4QMysteries	721
F. Some Semantic and Tradition-Historical Trajectories	733
G. The Sapiential Traditions and the Pauline Usage of ΣΑΡΞ	739
22. Contextualizing Paul’s “Works of the Law”: MMT in New Testament Scholarship.....	743
A. The Scholarly Framework: The Qumran Discoveries and the New Testament	743
B. The “Works of the Law” and the Debate about Pauline Theology	746
C. <i>Other Parallels</i>	760
D. <i>Conclusion</i>	761
23. Recent Perspectives on Johannine Dualism and Its Background ..	763
A. A Fresh Look at Earlier Comparisons	766
B. Six Reasons for Revision.....	772
C. Dualism in the Johannine Corpus	778
D. Whence Johannine Dualism?.....	785
24. Qumran and the Biblical Canon	791
A. Aspects of the Theological Discussion of Canon	794
B. The Term “Canon” and Its Application to the Christian Collection of the Writings of the “Bible”.....	805
C. Questions and Perspectives concerning the Emergence of the New Testament and Christian Canon.....	810
D. The Text Discoveries of Qumran and the Question of the Development of the Emergence of the Hebrew Canon.....	819
Original Publication Information	837
Index of Ancient Sources.....	841
Author Index.....	887
Index of Subjects	899
Index of Aramaic, Hebrew, and Greek Words.....	906

Abbreviations

AASOR	Annual of the American Schools of Oriental Research
AB	Anchor Bible Commentary
ABD	<i>Anchor Bible Dictionary</i>
ABIG	Arbeiten zur Bibel und ihrer Geschichte
ABRL	Anchor Bible Reference Library
<i>AbrN</i>	<i>Abr-Nahrain</i>
ABW	<i>Archaeology in the Biblical World</i>
<i>AcT</i>	<i>Acta Theologica</i>
ADPV	Abhandlungen des Deutschen Palästinavereins
AGJU	Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums
AGSU	Arbeiten zur Geschichte des Spätjudentums und Urchristentums
AHAW	Abhandlungen der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften
AJEC	Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity
AKG	Arbeiten zur Kirchen- und Theologiegeschichte
ALGHJ	Arbeiten zur Literatur und Geschichte des hellenistischen Judentums
ALOB	<i>Analecta Lovaniensia Biblica et Orientalia</i>
ALW	<i>Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft</i>
AnBib	Analecta biblica
ANRW	<i>Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt: Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung</i>
ANTC	Abingdon New Testament Commentaries
ANTJ	Arbeiten zum Neuen Testament und Judentum
ANTZ	Arbeiten zur neutestamentlichen Textforschung
AOAT	Alter Orient und Altes Testament
ASAWH.PH	Abhandlung der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philologisch-historischen Klasse
<i>Asp</i>	<i>Asprenas: Rivista di scienze teologiche</i>
ATANT	Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments
ATD	Das Alte Testament Deutsch
AUL	Lunds Universitets Årsskrift
AUU	Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis
AVTRW	Aufsätze und Vorträge zur Theologie und Religionswissenschaft
BA	<i>Biblical Archaeologist</i>
BAC	Biblioteca de autores cristianos
BAR	<i>Biblical Archaeology Review</i>
BAZ	Biblische Archäologie und Zeitgeschichte
BBB	Bonner Biblische Beiträge
BCES	Bibliothèque des Centres d'Études supérieures spécialisés
BEATAJ	Beiträge zur Erforschung des Alten Testaments und des antiken Judentums
BECNT	Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament

BeO	Bibbia e oriente
BETL	Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium
BEvT	Beiträge zur evangelischen Theologie
BH	Bibliothèque Historique
BHH	<i>Biblich-historisches Handwörterbuch: Landeskunde, Geschichte, Religion, Kultur</i>
BHT	Beiträge zur historischen Theologie
<i>Bib</i>	<i>Biblica</i>
BibOr	Biblica et orientalia
<i>BJRL</i>	<i>Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester</i>
BJS	Brown University Judaic Studies
<i>BK</i>	<i>Bibel und Kirche</i>
BKAT	Biblischer Kommentar, Altes Testament
BMSEC	Baylor-Mohr Siebeck Studies in Early Christianity
<i>BN</i>	<i>Biblische Notizen</i>
<i>BRev</i>	<i>Bible Review</i>
BSAW.PH	Berichte der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philologisch-Historische Klasse
BThSt	Biblich-theologische Studien
BU	Biblische Untersuchungen
BWANT	Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament
<i>BZ</i>	<i>Biblische Zeitschrift</i>
BZAW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft
BZNW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft
CahRB	Cahiers de la Revue Biblique
CB.OT	Coniectanea Biblica. Old Testament Series
CBET	Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology
<i>CBQ</i>	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i>
CBQMS	Catholic Biblical Quarterly, Monograph Series
CJA	Canadian Jewish Archives
CJAn	Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity
<i>CNS</i>	<i>Cristianesimo nella storia</i>
ConBNT	Coniectanea Neotestamentica or Coniectanea Biblica: New Testament Series
CQS	Companion to the Qumran Scrolls
CRHPhR	Cahiers de la Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses
CRINT	Compendia rerum iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum
CSCO	Corpus scriptorum christianorum orientalium
CSCT	Columbia Studies in the Classical Tradition
CSPac	Colectánea San Paciano
<i>CTM</i>	<i>Concordia Theological Monthly</i>
<i>CV</i>	<i>Communio viatorum</i>
DBAT.B	Dielheimer Blätter zum Alten Testament und seiner Rezeption in der Alten Kirche, Beihefte
<i>DBSup</i>	<i>Dictionnaire de la Bible: Supplément</i>
<i>DCH</i>	<i>Dictionary of Classical Hebrew</i>
DiKi	Dialog der Kirchen
DJDJ	Discoveries of the Judean Desert of Jordan
DMOA	Documenta et Monumenta Orientis Antiqui

<i>DNP</i>	<i>Der neue Pauly: Enzyklopädie der Antike</i>
<i>DSD</i>	<i>Dead Sea Discoveries</i>
<i>DSSR</i>	Dead Sea Scrolls Reader
<i>EBib</i>	Études bibliques
<i>EdF</i>	Erträge der Forschung
<i>EDSS</i>	<i>Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls</i>
<i>EgT</i>	<i>Eglise et théologie</i>
<i>EHS.T</i>	Europäische Hochschulschriften. Theologie
<i>EKKNT</i>	Evangelisch-katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament
<i>EncJud</i>	<i>Encyclopaedia Judaica</i>
<i>ErJb</i>	<i>Eranos-Jahrbuch</i>
<i>Est</i>	Eichstätter Studien
<i>Est.NF</i>	Eichstätter Studien, Neue Folge
<i>EvK</i>	<i>Evangelische Kommentare</i>
<i>EvT</i>	<i>Evangelische Theologie</i>
<i>EWNT</i>	<i>Exegetisches Wörterbuch zum NT</i>
<i>ExpTim</i>	<i>Expository Times</i>
<i>FAT</i>	Forschungen zum Alten Testament
<i>FB</i>	Forschung zur Bibel
<i>FF</i>	<i>Forschungen und Fortschritte</i>
<i>FRLANT</i>	Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments
<i>FSThR</i>	Forschungen zur systematischen Theologie und Religionsphilosophie
<i>GAT</i>	Grundrisse zum Alten Testament
<i>GOF</i>	Göttinger Orientforschungen
<i>HALOT</i>	<i>The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament</i>
<i>HBS</i>	Herders biblische Studien
<i>HDO</i>	Handbook of Oriental Studies
<i>HeyJ</i>	<i>Heythrop Journal</i>
<i>HKAT</i>	Handkommentar zum Alten Testament
<i>HNT</i>	Handbuch zum Neuen Testament
<i>HR</i>	Historia Religionum
<i>HR</i>	History of Religions
<i>HSM</i>	Harvard Semitic Monographs
<i>HTKNT</i>	Herders theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament
<i>HTR</i>	<i>Harvard Theological Review</i>
<i>HTS</i>	Harvard Theological Studies
<i>HUCA</i>	<i>Hebrew Union College Annual</i>
<i>HUCM</i>	Monographs of the Hebrew Union College
<i>HUT</i>	Hermeneutische Untersuchungen zur Theologie
<i>ICC</i>	International Critical Commentary
<i>IEJ</i>	<i>Israel Exploration Journal</i>
<i>IOS</i>	<i>Israel Oriental Society</i>
<i>ISACR</i>	Interdisciplinary Studies in Ancient Culture and Religion
<i>ITQ</i>	<i>Irish Theological Quarterly</i>
<i>JAAR</i>	<i>Journal of the American Academy of Religion</i>
<i>JAC</i>	Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum
<i>JASup</i>	Journal of Ancient Judaism Supplemental Series
<i>JAOS</i>	<i>Journal of the American Oriental Society</i>
<i>JBL</i>	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>

<i>JBR</i>	<i>Journal of Bible and Religion</i>
<i>JBTh</i>	<i>Jahrbuch für biblische Theologie</i>
<i>JBW</i>	<i>Jahrbücher der biblischen Wissenschaft</i>
<i>JCPH.S</i>	<i>Jahrbücher für classische Philologie Supplementband</i>
<i>JE</i>	<i>Jewish Encyclopedia</i>
<i>JJS</i>	<i>Journal of Jewish Studies</i>
<i>JNES</i>	<i>Journal of Near Eastern Studies</i>
<i>JNSL</i>	<i>Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages</i>
<i>JQR</i>	<i>Jewish Quarterly Review</i>
<i>JRH</i>	<i>Journal of Religious History</i>
<i>JSDI</i>	<i>Jahrbuch des Simon-Dubnow-Instituts</i>
<i>JSHRZ</i>	<i>Jüdische Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit</i>
<i>JSJ</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of Judaism</i>
<i>JSJ.S</i>	Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism
<i>JSOTSup</i>	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series
<i>JSPSup</i>	Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha: Supplement Series
<i>JSS</i>	<i>Journal for Semitic Studies</i>
<i>JTS</i>	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>
<i>KAT</i>	Kommentar zum Alten Testament
<i>KAWA ALNR</i>	Verhandelingen der Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen, Afdeling Letterkunde
<i>KEK</i>	Kritisch exegetischer Kommentar
<i>KIT</i>	Kleine Texte für Vorlesungen und Übungen
<i>KStTh</i>	Studienbücher Theologie
<i>KuI</i>	<i>Kirche und Israel. Neukirchener theologische Zeitschrift</i>
<i>KuK</i>	Kirche und Kunst
<i>KZG</i>	<i>Kirchliche Zeitgeschichte</i>
<i>LAPO</i>	Littératures anciennes du Proche-Orient
<i>LeDiv</i>	Lectio Divina
<i>LHB</i>	Library of the Hebrew Bible
<i>LSTS</i>	Library of Second Temple Studies
<i>MGWJ</i>	<i>Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums</i>
<i>NEAEHL</i>	<i>The New Encyclopedia of Archaeological Excavations in the Holy Land</i>
<i>NEB.ATE</i>	Neue Echter-Bibel. Kommentar zum AT Ergänzungsband
<i>NEDTT</i>	<i>Nederlands theologisch tijdschrift</i>
<i>Neot</i>	<i>Neotestamentica</i>
<i>NHMS</i>	Nag Hammadi and Manichaean Studies
<i>NP</i>	<i>Neophilologus</i>
<i>NT.S</i>	Novum Testamentum Supplements
<i>NTAbh.NF</i>	Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen. Neue Folge
<i>NTApo</i>	Neutestamentliche Apokryphen in deutscher Übersetzung
<i>NTD</i>	Das Neue Testament Deutsch
<i>NTM</i>	New Testament Monographs
<i>NTOA</i>	Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus
<i>NTS</i>	<i>New Testament Studies</i>
<i>NTTS</i>	New Testament Tools and Studies
<i>OA</i>	Orbis Academicus
<i>OAI</i>	Orient ancien illustré
<i>OBO</i>	Orbis biblicus et orientalis

<i>OrChr</i>	<i>Oriens christianus</i>
ÖTK	Ökumenischer Taschenbuchkommentar zum Neuen Testament
OTP	Old Testament Pseudepigrapha
OTS	Old Testament Studies
<i>PEQ</i>	<i>Palestine Exploration Quarterly</i>
PG	Patrologia Cursus Completus Graeca
PL	Patrologia Cursus Completus Latina
PO	Patrologia orientalis
<i>PRE</i>	<i>Pauly's Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Alterthumswissenschaft</i>
<i>PRE.S</i>	<i>Pauly's Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Alterthumswissenschaft – Supplement</i>
<i>PSB</i>	<i>Princeton Seminary Bulletin</i>
PTSDDSP	Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project
PVTG	Pseudepigrapha Veteris Testamenti Graece
<i>QC</i>	<i>Qumran Chronicle</i>
QD	Quaestiones disputatae
QM	Qumranica Mogilensia
<i>RAC</i>	<i>Realenzyklopädie für Antike und Christentum</i>
<i>RB</i>	<i>Revue Biblique</i>
<i>RCT</i>	<i>Revista catalana de teologia</i>
RechBib	Recherches bibliques
<i>REJ</i>	<i>Revue des études juives</i>
<i>RevQ</i>	<i>Revue de Qumran</i>
<i>RGG</i>	<i>Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart</i>
<i>RHPR</i>	<i>Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses</i>
<i>RHR</i>	<i>Revue de l'histoire des religions</i>
<i>RIDC</i>	<i>Revue internationale de droit comparé</i>
RM	Die Religionen der Menschheit
RVV	Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche und Vorarbeiten
SAC	Studi di antichità cristiana
SANT	Studien zum Alten und Neuen Testaments
SAOC	Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilizations
SBAB	Stuttgarter biblische Aufsatzbände
SBEC	Studies on the Bible and Early Christianity
SBF.Cma	Studii biblici Franciscani Collectio Maior
SBLDS	Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series
SBLEJL	Society of Biblical Literature Early Judaism and Its Literature
SBLMS	Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series
SBLRBS	Society of Biblical Literature Resources for Biblical Study
<i>SBLSP</i>	<i>Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers</i>
SBSLymS	Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series
SBS	Stuttgarter Bibel-Studien
SBW	Studien der Bibliothek Warburg
<i>ScEs</i>	<i>Science et esprit</i>
<i>SCI</i>	<i>Scripta Classica Israelica</i>
ScrHier	Scripta hierosolymitana
SEÅ	Svensk exegetisk årsbok
<i>Sef</i>	<i>Sefarad</i>
SHAW.PH	Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der

	Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-Historische Klasse
SHCT	Studies in the History of Christian Tradition
SHR	Studies in the History of Religions (supplement to Numen)
SJ(S)	Studies in Judaica (Sydney)
SJLA	Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity
SNTSMS	Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series
<i>SNTSU</i>	<i>Studien zum Neuen Testament und seiner Umwelt</i>
<i>SNTU</i>	<i>Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments</i>
SPB	Studia Patristica et Byzantina
SPHKHAW	Schriften der Philosophisch-historischen Klasse der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften
SSA	Schriften der Sektion für Altertumswissenschaft
SSAW-PH	Sitzungsberichte der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig, Philologisch-historische Klasse
SSN	Studia semitica neerlandica
<i>STDJ</i>	<i>Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah</i>
<i>StGen</i>	<i>Studium generale</i>
StHier	Studia Hierosolymitana
StPB	Studia post-biblica
StT	Studi e testi
<i>StTh</i>	<i>Studia Theologica</i>
SUNT	Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments
SVTP	Studia in Veteris Testamenti pseudepigraphica
<i>TAD</i>	<i>Textbook of Aramaic Documents from Ancient Egypt: Newly Copied, Edited and Translated into Hebrew and English</i>
TANZ	Texte und Arbeiten zum neutestamentlichen Zeitalter
TB	Theologische Bücherei
<i>TBei</i>	<i>Theologische Beiträge</i>
TBT	Theologische Bibliothek Töpelmann
<i>TD</i>	<i>Theology Digest</i>
<i>TDNT</i>	<i>Theological Dictionary of the New Testament</i>
<i>THAT</i>	<i>Theologisches Handwörterbuch zum Alten Testament</i>
<i>ThBLNT</i>	<i>Theologisches Begriffslexikon zum Neuen Testament</i>
THKNT	Theologischer Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament
ThSt	Theologische Studien
ThTS	Theologische Texte und Studien
ThW	Theologische Wissenschaft
<i>ThWAT</i>	<i>Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament</i>
<i>ThZ</i>	<i>Theologische Zeitschrift</i>
<i>TLZ</i>	<i>Theologische Literaturzeitung</i>
<i>TRE</i>	<i>Theologische Realenzyklopädie</i>
<i>TRev</i>	<i>Theologische Revue</i>
<i>TRu</i>	<i>Theologische Rundschau</i>
TS	Texts and Studies
TSAJ	Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism
<i>TWNT</i>	<i>Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament</i>
<i>TynBul</i>	<i>Tyndale Bulletin</i>
U-TB	Urban-Taschenbücher
VC	<i>Vigiliae christianae</i>

<i>VT</i>	<i>Vetus Testamentum</i>
VTSup	Vetus Testamentum Supplements
WdF	Wege der Forschung
WMANT	Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
ZAC	<i>Journal of Ancient Christianity</i>
ZAH	<i>Zeitschrift für Althebräistik</i>
ZAW	<i>Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>
ZBK	Zürcher Bibelkommentare
ZDMG	<i>Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft</i>
ZDPV	<i>Zeitschrift des deutschen Palästina-Vereins</i>
ZNW	<i>Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>
ZPE	<i>Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik</i>
ZRGG	<i>Zeitschrift für Religions- und Geistesgeschichte</i>
ZTK	<i>Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche</i>

Introduction: Qumran, Ancient Judaism, and the New Testament

The present volume – the third volume of my collected essays or “Kleine Schriften”¹ – collects my work on the Dead Sea Scrolls and their relevance for and relation to the understanding of New Testament texts. The studies presented here, some for the first time in English translation, cover a time span of over 20 years, from the mid 1990s until the present. In this period, the official edition of the Qumran corpus was completed and fervent debates on archaeological issues were performed in a greater public, but due to the larger database and to refined methodologies or research also the insights concerning a large number of texts were considerably multiplied. Although the number of scholars occupied with the Dead Sea Scrolls has increased considerably on an international level with a much more intense involvement of Jewish colleagues and Hebrew language scholarship, Qumran scholarship has also become a highly specialized area, whose issues and problems are often hidden to scholars without this specialization, so that their knowledge and even the basic knowledge spread in classroom books often is outdated and untouched by the insights gained in the last 25 or 30 years.

The studies collected in the present volume are an attempt to bridge the gap between Qumran and Biblical or New Testament studies. Presented partly in the context of specialized Dead Sea Scrolls scholarship, partly in a wider context of biblical scholars or theologians, they aim at transmitting new textual observations and refined methodological considerations into biblical scholarship in order to enable biblical scholars to adequately perceive the insights from the Qumran corpus and the benefits they lend to the understanding of early Christian texts.

¹ I owe the subtitle to my academic teacher, Martin Hengel, whose collected essays also appeared as “Kleine Schriften” in seven volumes in the WUNT series. Cf. my first two volumes on Johannine Literature and on selected historical and theological issues in the New Testament: Jörg Frey, *Die Herrlichkeit des Gekreuzigten: Studien zu den johanneischen Schriften 1* (ed. J. Schlegel; WUNT 307; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013); idem, *Von Jesus zur neutestamentlichen Theologie: Kleine Schriften 2* (ed. B. Schliesser; WUNT 368; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016).

A. My Story with Qumran

My own interest in the Dead Sea Scrolls was stimulated quite early. In my first semester of studying theology at the University of Tübingen, in the autumn semester of 1983, I attended Martin Hengel's lectures on "Christology of the New Testament," and in these unforgettable dense lectures, I was quickly confronted with evidence from the wealth of early Jewish texts, from the late layers of the Hebrew Bible, the Enochic tradition and Apocalypticism, from early Rabbinic traditions and the Hekhalot literature and – within this wide spectrum – also from the Qumran discoveries. When I was asked to serve as Hengel's student assistant in the following year, for proofreading his articles and checking references, I came across a great wealth of texts and scholarly views and so became aware of the crucial importance of the Qumran corpus. However, the period in the mid-1980s was still a time in which the majority of the fragmentary documents was not yet accessible to the greater scholarly public, but only to an 'inner circle' of the editors entrusted with the texts. In addition, some privileged younger scholars were asked to assist the editors, and were thus granted limited access to certain texts. I still remember Hengel's polemical remarks about the slow speed of the editorial process and the alleged laziness of some of the editors who – according to his words – just 'sat' on their texts, instead of making them accessible to the interested scholarly public. When I studied for a year in Jerusalem, in 1987–88, in the German study program at the Dormition Abbey on Mt. Zion, I was fascinated by a lecture by the late John Strugnell in the École Biblique on a text which was then called an "Angelic Liturgy" and is now well-known as the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*. I eagerly captured some information about an alleged letter of the Teacher of Righteousness now known as 4QMMT which immediately stimulated the interest of Pauline scholars, but then became the object of a fervent legal battle about the authorial rights of the scholars entrusted with editing them, in conflict with the public eagerness for information and access.²

This was also the period in which conspiracy theories flourished, mostly focused on the alleged obscurantists in the Vatican who were readily accused of hiding the truth about the historical origins of Christianity or even hiding some important documents from the greater public.³ The book market in those years was dominated by pseudo-scholarly unveiling literature, and

² On the text and the circumstances of its publication, see the article on "MMT and the New Testament" in this volume.

³ The most successful work was the novelistic but purportedly historical book by M. Baigent and R. Leigh, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Deception* (New York: Summit Books, 1991), with its German translation entitled *Verschlussache Jesus: Die Qumranrollen und die Wahrheit über das frühe Christentum* (trans. P. S. Dachs and B. Neumeister-Taroni; Munich: Droemer Knaur, 1991).

scholars had a hard job cultivating a sober discussion oriented on facts in contrast to such fabricated claims, as long as the bulk of the hitherto unedited fragments was still not publicly accessible. I still remember well how, during that time, when I worked as a doctoral student and as a vicar in southern Germany, there was a widespread interest and concern about what the ‘hidden’ texts could reveal about Jesus and early Christianity, and I was frequently asked for information about the contents and possible relevance of the finds for a comprehensive understanding of early Christian history and doctrine.

Times changed rapidly, and with the release of the microfiches of the scrolls and fragments entrusted to several libraries in the world for security reasons, by the California based Huntington Library and the publication of the facsimile edition in 1991,⁴ the door was open to a new period in Qumran scholarship, a new “Qumran springtime,” with the quick release of editions of a large number of new texts by the enlarged editorial team under the leadership of Emanuel Tov. When I returned to Tübingen university in 1994 to work as an Assistant (lecturer) to Prof. Hermann Lichtenberger, the successor of Martin Hengel at the Tübingen *Institut für Antikes Judentum und Hellenistische Religionsgeschichte*, I became involved in the rapid development of Qumran scholarship and the conceptualization of new projects, e.g., of a synoptic edition of the biblical texts from Qumran conceptualized by Hermann Lichtenberger with my then colleague Armin Lange and some other colleagues from the institute, such as Friedrich Avemarie and Gerbern S. Oegema.⁵ In Lichtenberger’s research seminar we started to read the newly released texts, first from the famous Wacholder-Abegg edition⁶ compiled electronically from a privately printed preliminary concordance that had been crafted in the 1950s by some members of the first editorial team.⁷ With that edition, legible Hebrew texts were available long before the ‘official’ edition of those texts appeared. For my own studies, the reading of the new Wisdom texts was particularly enlightening. In these texts, I discovered hitherto un-

⁴ R. H. Eisenman and J. M. Robinson, eds., *A Facsimile Edition of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Prepared with an Introduction and Index* (2 vols.; Washington, DC: Biblical Archaeology Society, 1991); cf. later E. Tov, ed., with the collaboration of S. J. Pfann, *The Dead Sea Scrolls on Microfiche: A Comprehensive Facsimile Edition of the Texts from the Judean Desert* (Leiden: Brill, 1993).

⁵ The first volume of that presentation appeared not before 2005: B. Ego et al., eds., *Minor Prophets* (Biblia Qumranica 3b; Leiden: Brill, 2005).

⁶ B. Z. Wacholder and M. G. Abegg, Jr., eds., *A Preliminary Edition of the Unpublished Dead Sea Scrolls: The Hebrew and Aramaic Texts from Cave Four* (3 fasc.; Washington, DC: Biblical Archaeology Society, 1991–1995).

⁷ On these editions, see E. J. C. Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning for the Understanding Ones: Reading and Reconstructing the Fragmentary Early Jewish Sapiential Text 4QInstruction*, STDJ 26, Leiden: Brill, 2001, 7–9.

known parallels to the Pauline language of “flesh” (and the opposition of “flesh” and “spirit”) which I first presented in my Habilitation lecture in 1998 at the Faculty of Protestant Theology of the University of Tübingen.⁸

Whereas my main scholarly work in those years was about New Testament texts, in particular the Johannine Literature,⁹ but also Revelation¹⁰ and Hebrews,¹¹ I was introduced into the ongoing progress of the edition and early evaluation of the ‘new’ texts from Qumran, through the collaboration with Hermann Lichtenberger and his second assistant, my then colleague Armin Lange. While Lange wrote his dissertation on the issue of determinism and predestination in the new Wisdom texts from Qumran,¹² I developed an analysis of the various types of dualism in the Qumran corpus with the main aim of refining the comparisons between the dualism in Qumran and the dualism in the Johannine literature. Again, the Qumran Wisdom texts could shed new light on the origins of Qumran dualism and also help to see the diversity of dualisms in the Qumran corpus which had to lead to a considerable modification of some earlier comparisons between Qumran and the New Testament. My initial research, presented in 1995 at the meeting of the IOQS in Cambridge was, then, developed into a large article¹³ which provided the basis for

⁸ The lecture was published in German in 1999: J. Frey, “Die paulinische Antithese von ‘Fleisch’ und ‘Geist’ und die palästinisch-jüdische Weisheitstradition,” *ZNW* 90 (1999): 45–77; cf. also the slightly shortened English conference paper (presented at the meeting of the IOQS in Oslo in 1998, under the title “The Notion of ‘Flesh’ in 4QInstruction and the Background of Pauline Usage,” in *Poetical, Liturgical, and Sapiential Texts: Proceedings of the Third Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Oslo, 1998* (ed. D. K. Falk, F. García Martínez, and E. M. Schuller; STDJ 35; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 197–226, and the more extensive presentation from a Tübingen conference: “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, republished in this volume 701–741.

⁹ See in particular J. Frey, *Die johanneische Eschatologie* (3 vols.; WUNT 96, 110, 117; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997, 1998, 2000).

¹⁰ J. Frey, “Erwägungen zum Verhältnis der Johannesapokalypse zu den übrigen Schriften im Corpus Johanneum,” in M. Hengel, *Die johanneische Frage. Ein Lösungsversuch, mit einem Beitrag zur Apokalypse von Jörg Frey* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1993), 326–429.

¹¹ J. Frey, “Die alte und die neue διαθήκη nach dem Hebräerbrief,” in *Bund und Tora. Studien zu ihrer Begriffsgeschichte im Frühjudentum und Urchristentum* (ed. H. Lichtenberger and F. Avemarie; WUNT 92, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996), 263–310.

¹² A. Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination: Weisheitliche Urordnung und Prädestination in den Textfunden von Qumran* (STDJ 18; Leiden: Brill, 1995).

¹³ J. Frey, “Different Patterns of Dualistic Thought in the Qumran Library: Reflections on Their Background and History,” in *Legal Texts and Legal Issues: Proceedings of the*

two other extensive German articles focusing on the comparison with Johannine dualism¹⁴ and the function of dualistic language in the Gospel of John. These three extensive articles (two of them now available in English)¹⁵ form a kind of successive ‘trilogy’ on dualism in Qumran and John.

During my time in Tübingen (1993–1997), I benefited immensely from the collaboration with Hermann Lichtenberger and Armin Lange, and since the IOQS conference in Cambridge in 1995, where I encountered a very friendly and helpful discussion of my considerations by John Collins, Joseph Fitzmyer, and Florentino García Martínez, I happily experienced the friendly and collegial atmosphere in the community of Qumran scholars, a relatively limited circle of researchers specialized on different texts but always open for exchange of information and mutual support. From German professors, I could never have expected such friendly and non-hierarchical responses as those I received among the scrolls scholars’ community, e.g., from John Collins, George Brooke, Hanan and Esther Eshel, Charlotte Hempel, Larry Schiffman, Eileen Schuller, Annette Steudel, Eibert Tigchelaar, and many others.

After I had been called in 1997 to the Friedrich-Schiller Universität Jena, and then in 1999 to the Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität in München as successor of the Qumran scholar Heinz-Wolfgang Kuhn, the Dead Sea Scrolls were a regular part of my teaching program in the field of New Testament

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: Brill, 1997), 275–335 (in this volume, 243–299).

¹⁴ J. Frey, “Licht aus den Höhlen? Der ‘Johanneische Dualismus’ und die Texte von Qumran,” in *Kontexte des Johannesevangeliums: Das vierte Evangelium in religions- und traditionsgeschichtlicher Perspektive* (ed. J. Frey and U. Schnelle, in collaboration with J. Schlegel; WUNT 175; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004), 117–203, where the widespread assumptions of a close relationship between Qumran and the Gospel of John are thoroughly questioned, and idem, “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 (English translation: “Johannine Dualism: Reflections on Its Background and Function,” in idem, *The Glory of the Crucified One: Theology and Christology in the Fourth Gospel* (trans. W. Coppins and C. Heilig; BMSEC; Waco, Tx.: Baylor University Press, 2018), 101–167. See also the shorter presentation: idem, “Recent Perspectives on Johannine Dualism and its Background,” in *Text, Thought, and Practice in Qumran and Early Christianity* (ed. R. A. Clements and D. Schwartz; Leiden: Brill, 2009), 127–57 (in this volume, 763–790), and idem, “Dualism and the World in the Gospel and Letters of John,” in *The Oxford Handbook of Johannine Studies* (ed. J. M. Lieu and M. C. de Boer; Oxford: OUP, 2018), 274–291.

¹⁵ Instead of translating the extensive second article, “Licht aus den Höhlen? Der ‘Johanneische Dualismus’ und die Texte von Qumran,” we decided to include in the present collection a shorter version of those considerations, the article, “Recent Perspectives on Johannine Dualism and its Background.”

and Ancient Judaism. In 1999, I was asked to give a comprehensive paper on the relevance of the Qumran texts for the understanding of the New Testament at a symposium held in connection with a Qumran exhibition in the beautiful monastery library (Stiftsbibliothek) in Sankt Gallen (Switzerland), and I organized an excursion with some of my students from Jena to attend the conference and visit the exhibition. My paper, first published in German,¹⁶ was the basis for a number of other shortened or more expanded and updated further publications on what now became my main focus in Qumran research: the impact of the new discoveries on New Testament scholarship and their relevance for understanding New Testament texts.¹⁷

In Munich I first considered joining the project to create a new catena of Qumran parallels to the New Testament, conceptualized but worked out only for the authentic Pauline epistles by my predecessor Heinz-Wolfgang Kuhn, but I soon got the impression that the problems had to be presented in a different form and that the structure of a catena was too inflexible for the presentation of the new texts and insights that could be gained from the rapidly edited new texts. This was particularly evident after a sounding conference had also brought the insight that the project of a “New Billerbeck” including the Dead Sea Scrolls and a variety of other ancient Jewish texts was not feasible for various reasons.¹⁸ In 2002, I received a call to the University of Göttingen to take up the chair of the distinguished Qumran scholar Hartmut Stegemann, but the *Qumran-Forschungsstelle* had already been transferred to the Old Testament department and to Reinhard G. Kratz, and for various reasons I declined the Göttingen offer and remained several more years at the

¹⁶ J. Frey, “Die Bedeutung der Qumran-Funde 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 [Switzerland]: Universitätsverlag and Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2001), 129–208.

¹⁷ See the shorter versions: J. Frey, “Zur Bedeutung der Qumran-Funde für das Verständnis des Neuen Testaments,” in *Qumran – Bibelwissenschaft – Antikes Judentum* (ed. U. Dahmen, H. Stegemann, and G. Stemberger; Einblicke 9; Paderborn: Bonifatius-Verlag, 2006), 33–65, and idem, “The Relevance of the Dead Sea Scrolls for New Testament Interpretation. With a bibliographical appendix,” *AcT* 23/2 (2003), 86–116, as well as the partly expanded version “The Impact of the Dead Sea Scrolls on New Testament Interpretation: Proposals, Problems and Further Perspectives,” in *The Scrolls and Christian Origins*, vol. 3 of *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Princeton Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. J. H. Charlesworth; Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2006), 407–461, which is republished in this volume 527–578.

¹⁸ Cf. my contribution to that sounding conference in Jerusalem: J. Frey, “On the Character and Background of Mt 5:25–26: A Case Study for the Value of Qumran Literature in New Testament Interpretation,” 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), 3–39, republished in this volume 649–676.

Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität in Munich until I moved to Zurich in 2010 and Loren T Stuckenbruck became my successor in Munich.

An important stimulus for my continuous occupation with Qumran issues was the series of Qumran conferences, originally conceptualized by Hartmut Stegemann as a platform for intellectual exchange for German speaking Qumran scholars, in the Katholische Akademie Schwerte, an enjoyable conference destination near Dortmund. Having already contributed to the first two conferences,¹⁹ I was, then, commissioned to succeed Hartmut Stegemann in organizing those conferences on a biennial basis. The subsequent conferences on the topics “Qumran and Apocalyptic” (2003),²⁰ “Qumran and the Biblical Canon” (2006),²¹ “Qumran and Archaeology” (2008),²² “Jesus, Paul and the Texts from Qumran” (2009),²³ “Dualism, Demonology, and Evil Figures” (2013),²⁴ “Women in Early Judaism and Early Christianity” (2015),²⁵ “Recent Perspectives on the Qumran Community” (2017),²⁶ and “Purity in Early Judaism and Early Christianity” (2019)²⁷ enjoyed increasingly international representation and, at the same time, focused on including and introducing upcoming scholars into the field of Qumran studies and its wider context. In the organization of the conferences, kindly supported by the Schwerte academy, I could collaborate with the Göttingen Qumranforschungsstelle, represented by Annette Steudel, with Heinz-Josef Fabry

¹⁹ J. Frey, “Zur historischen Auswertung der antiken Essenerberichte: Ein Beitrag zum Gespräch mit Roland Bergmeier,” in *Qumran kontrovers* (ed. J. Frey and H. Stegemann, with M. Becker and A. Maurer; Einblicke 6; Paderborn: Bonifatius-Verlag, 2003), 23–56; idem, “Zur Bedeutung der Qumran-Funde für das Verständnis des Neuen Testaments,” in *Qumran – Bibelwissenschaft – Antikes Judentum* (ed. U. Dahmen, H. Stegemann, and G. Stemberger (Einblicke 9; Paderborn: Bonifatius-Verlag, 2006), 33–65.

²⁰ Cf. *Apokalyptik und Qumran* (ed. J. Frey and M. Becker; Einblicke 10; Paderborn: Bonifatius, 2007).

²¹ Cf. *Qumran und der biblische Kanon* (ed. M. Becker and J. Frey; BThSt 92; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 2009).

²² Cf. *Qumran und die Archäologie: Texte und Kontexte* (ed. J. Frey, C. Claußen, and N. Kessler; WUNT 278; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011).

²³ Cf. *Jesus, Paulus und die Texte von Qumran* (ed. J. Frey and E. E. Popkes, with S. Tätweiler; WUNT II/390; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015).

²⁴ Cf. *Dualismus, Dämonologie und diabolische Figuren: Religionshistorische Beobachtungen und theologische Reflexionen* (ed. J. Frey and E. E. Popkes, in collaboration with S.-C. Hertel-Holst; WUNT II/484; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2018).

²⁵ Cf. *Frauen im antiken Judentum und frühen Christentum* (ed. J. Frey and N. Rupschus; WUNT II/489; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2019).

²⁶ The conference volume is scheduled in 2020/21 under the title *Recent Perspectives on the Qumran Community* (ed. J. Frey and S. Tätweiler; WUNT II; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck).

²⁷ The conference volume is scheduled in 2020/21 under the title *Purity in Early Judaism and Early Christianity* (ed. L. Doering and J. Frey; in collaboration with Laura von Bartenwerffer; WUNT; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck).

from the University of Bonn, and in 2019 with Lutz Doering from the *Institutum Judaicum Delitzschianum* in Münster, and include also my own doctoral and habilitation students, such as Michael Becker, Carsten Claußen, Enno E. Popkes, Nicole Rupschus, Michael R. Jost, and Sophie Tätweiler. The introductions written for the conference volumes provided me with the opportunity to comprehensively discuss the problems within the field and to develop my own views on the topics and on the relevance of the Qumran findings for an appropriate understanding, e.g., of apocalyptic in early Judaism and early Christianity,²⁸ the relevance of the insights from Qumran for the conception of the biblical canon and the “canonical process,”²⁹ the interpretation of the archaeological remains at Qumran,³⁰ and the relevance of the Qumran discoveries for scholarship on Jesus and Paul.³¹ In the Schwerte conferences, I have increasingly aimed at widening the scope beyond the Qumran corpus to include other testimonies from ancient Judaism, its Greco-Roman context, and from early Christianity. Other conferences organized in Zurich also covered a wider range of early Jewish testimonies, including the Samaritan traditions,³² Apocalypticism,³³ Jewish and Christian concepts of angels,³⁴ and the interpretive processes in the making of ‘para-scriptural’ texts.³⁵

²⁸ Cf. J. Frey, “Die Bedeutung der Qumran-Funde für das Verständnis der Apokalyptik im Frühjudentum und im Urchristentum, in *Apokalyptik und Qumran* (ed. J. Frey and M. Becker; Paderborn: Bonifatius-Verlag, 2007), 11–62 (English translation in this volume under the title “Qumran and Apocalyptic”).

²⁹ Cf. J. Frey, “Qumran und der biblische Kanon: Eine thematische Einführung,” in *Qumran und der biblische Kanon* (ed. M. Becker and J. Frey; BThSt 92; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2009), 1–63 (English translation in this volume under the title “Qumran and the Biblical Canon”); cf. also more briefly idem, “Die Herausbildung des biblischen Kanons im antiken Judentum und im frühen Christentum,” *Das Mittelalter* 18 (2013), 7–26.

³⁰ Cf. J. Frey, “Qumran und die Archäologie. Eine thematische Einführung,” in *Qumran und die Archäologie* (ed. J. Frey; C. Claußen, and N. Kessler; WUNT 278; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 3–49 (English translation in this volume under the title “Qumran and Archaeology”).

³¹ Cf. J. Frey, “Jesus, Paulus und die Texte vom Toten Meer. Forschungsgeschichtliche und hermeneutische Perspektiven,” in *Jesus, Paulus und Qumran* (ed. J. Frey and E. E. Popkes, under collaboration of S. Tätweiler; WUNT II/390; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015), 1–29 (in this volume under the title “Jesus, Paul, and the Texts from the Dead Sea: Research History and Hermeneutical Perspectives”).

³² Cf. *Die Samaritaner und die Bibel. Historische und literarische Wechselwirkungen zwischen biblischen und samaritanischen Traditionen – The Samaritans and the Bible. Historical and Literary Interactions between Biblical and Samaritan Traditions* (ed. J. Frey, U. Schattner-Rieser, and K. Schmid; Studia Samaritana 7; Berlin and Boston: de Gruyter, 2012).

³³ Cf. *Autorschaft und Autorisierungsstrategien in apokalyptischen Texten* (ed. J. Frey, M. Jost, and F. Tóth, with Johannes Stettner; WUNT; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2019).

Not only in the organization of conferences but also in the strife for new insights, I have benefitted enormously from the collaboration with my assistants and habilitation students in Munich. Michael Becker who had already been involved in the Qumran project of my predecessor Heinz-Wolfgang Kuhn published his important PhD work on miracles in the early rabbinic tradition and in Josephus and their relevance for the Jesus tradition,³⁶ but also on 4Q521³⁷ and the framework of the acts of Jesus,³⁸ the relation between 4 Ezra and the early rabbinic tradition,³⁹ on the making of the Hebrew Canon,⁴⁰ ancient Magic,⁴¹ and on Qumran meals.⁴² Carsten Claußen who had done his

³⁴ *Gottesdienst und Engel im antiken Judentum und frühen Christentum* (WUNT II/446; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2017).

³⁵ *Between Canonical and Apocryphal Texts: Processes of Reception, Rewriting and Interpretation in Early Judaism and Early Christianity* (ed. J. Frey, C. Clivaz, and T. Nicklas, in collaboration with J. Röder; WUNT, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2019).

³⁶ M. Becker, *Wunder und Wundertäter im frührabbinischen Judentum: Studien zum Phänomen und seiner Überlieferung im Horizont von Magie und Dämonismus* (WUNT II/144; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002); idem "The Miracle-Traditions in Early Rabbinic Literature: Some Questions on their Pragmatics," in *Wonders never Cease: The Purpose of Narrating Miracle Stories in the New Testament and Its Religious Environment* (ed. M. Labahn and B. Jan Lietaert Perbolte; JSNT.S 288; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2006), 48–69.

³⁷ M. Becker, "4Q521 und die Gesalbten," *RevQ* 18/1 (1997): 73–96.

³⁸ M. Becker, "Die 'messianische Apokalypse' 4Q521 und der Interpretationsrahmen der Taten Jesu," in *Apokalyptik und Qumran*, 237–303.

³⁹ M. Becker, "Apokalyptisches nach dem Fall Jerusalems: Anmerkungen zum frührabbinischen Verständnis," in *Apokalyptik als Herausforderung neutestamentlicher Theologie* (ed. M. Becker and M. Öhler, WUNT II/214; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006), 283–360.

⁴⁰ M. Becker, "Rewriting the Bible – 4 Ezra and the canonization of Scripture," in *Rewritten Bible reconsidered: Proceedings of the conference in Karkku, Finland, August 24 – 26, 2006* (ed. A. Laato and J. van Ruiten; Studies in Rewritten Bible 1; Turku: Åbo Akad. Univ. 2008), 79–101; idem, "Grenzziehungen des Kanons im frühen Judentum und die Neuschrift der Bibel nach dem 4. Buch Esra," in *Qumran und der biblische Kanon*, 195–253.

⁴¹ M. Becker, "Die 'Magie'-Problematik der Antike: Genügt eine sozialwissenschaftliche Erfassung?" *ZRGG* 54 (2002), 1–22; idem, "MAGOI – Astrologers, Ecstatics, Deceitful Prophets: New Testament Understanding in Jewish and pagan context," in *A kind of Magic: Understanding Magic in the New Testament and its Religious Environment* (ed. M. Labahn and B. Jan Lietaert Peerbolte; LNTS 306; London: T & T Clark, 2007), 87–106.

⁴² M. Becker, "Mahlvorstellungen und Mahlpraxis in der Yaḥad-Gemeinschaft," in *Der eine Gott und das gemeinschaftliche Mahl: Inklusion und Exklusion biblischer Vorstellungen von Mahl und Gemeinschaft im Kontext antiker Festkultur* (ed. W. Weiß; BThSt 113; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2012), 44–75; idem, "Zwischen Kult, Verein und Eschaton. Zur Diskussion der Mähler in der yaḥad-Gemeinschaft," in *Jesus, Paulus und die Texte von Qumran*, 331–357.

dissertation on diaspora synagogues⁴³ and then worked for two years in Princeton with James Charlesworth where he got involved in the Princeton Dead Sea Scrolls project,⁴⁴ contributed on archaeological issues⁴⁵ and on the relationship between Qumran and the Fourth Gospel.⁴⁶ Enno E. Popkes not only collaborated in the organization and edition of the Schwerte conferences but also occasionally published some work on the Scrolls and the New Testament.⁴⁷

After being called to the University of Zurich in 2010, I received funding to encourage doctoral students to work with texts from ancient Judaism and, in particular, from Qumran. The studies finished under my supervision include a comprehensive discussion of early Jewish and early Christian concepts of the origins of evil,⁴⁸ a comprehensive and thorough evaluation of the regulations for women in the sectarian texts compared with the archaeologi-

⁴³ C. Claußen, *Versammlung, Gemeinde, Synagoge. Das hellenistisch-jüdische Umfeld der frühchristlichen Gemeinden* (SUNT 27; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2002); cf. idem, “Meeting, Community, Synagogue – Different Frameworks of Ancient Jewish Congregations in the Diaspora,” in *The Ancient Synagogue from Its Origins until 200 C.E.* (ed. B. Olsson and M. Zetterholm; ConBNT 39; Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 2003), 144–167.

⁴⁴ J. H. Charlesworth and C. Claußen, “Halakah A (4Q251),” “Halakah B (4Q264a),” “Halakah C (4Q472a),” “Harvesting (4Q284a),” in *Damascus Document II, Some Works of the Torah, and Related Documents*, vol. 2 of *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translation* (ed. J. H. Charlesworth and H. W. M. Rietz; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck and Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2006), 271–297.

⁴⁵ C. Claußen, “Synagogen Palästinas in neutestamentlicher Zeit,” in *Zeichen aus Text und Stein: Studien auf dem Weg zu einer Archäologie des Neuen Testaments* (ed. S. Alkier and J. Zangenberg; TANZ 42; Tübingen and Basel: Francke, 2003), 351–380; idem, “Die Identifizierung der Grabungsstätte Khirbet Qumran. Eine forschungsgeschichtliche Annäherung,” in *Qumran und die Archäologie*, 51–72.

⁴⁶ C. Claußen, “The Concept of Unity at Qumran and in the Johannine Literature,” in *Qumran Studies: New Approaches, New Questions* (ed. M. T. Davis and B. A. Strawn; Grand Rapids, MI and Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2007), 232–253; idem, “John, Qumran, and the Question of Sectarianism,” *Perspectives in religious studies* 37/4 (2010), 421–440.

⁴⁷ E. E. Popkes, “About the differing approach to a theological heritage: Comments on the relationship between Qumran, the Gospel of John and the Gospel of Thomas,” in *Qumran and Christian Origins*, 271–309; idem, “Vorstellungen von der Einwohnung Gottes in der Tempelrolle: Beobachtungen zu 11QT 29,7b–10 und möglichen traditionsgeschichtlichen Vergleichsgrößen,” in *Das Geheimnis der Gegenwart Gottes: Zur Schechina-Vorstellung in Judentum und Christentum* (ed. B. Janowski and E. E. Popkes; WUNT 318; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014), 85–101; idem, “Essenisch-qumranische Psalmen-Rezeptionen als Kontrastgröße zur paulinischen Psalter-Hermeneutik,” in *Jesus, Paulus und die Texte von Qumran*, 231–250.

⁴⁸ M. E. Götte, *Von den Wächtern zu Adam: Frühjüdische Mythen über die Ursprünge des Bösen und ihre frühchristliche Rezeption* (WUNT II/426; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016).

cal evidence and the data from the ancient texts about the Essenes,⁴⁹ and a new and comprehensive evaluation of the motif of the community with angels in Qumran (with particular consideration of the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice) and in the New Testament.⁵⁰ My habilitation student Franz Tóth intensely focused on Jewish Rewritten Bible texts related to the Gospel of Matthew.⁵¹ Further work, e.g., on the Barki Nafshi texts and early Jewish prayer,⁵² and on early Jewish messianology, especially ‘superhuman’ concepts of messianic figures,⁵³ is in progress. Supervising such students is one of the most enjoyable parts of my work, and so has been the collaboration with numerous scholars in the field all over the world, including my successor in Munich, Loren T. Stuckenbruck, John J. Collins at Yale, Eibert Tigchelaar in Leuven, Daniel R. Schwartz in Jerusalem, and many other colleagues.

Whereas a book-length publication on Qumran I had been contracted for was cancelled by the publishing house due to the opinion that the topic had lost its marketability to the general public, I had the opportunity to summarize my views on Qumran and its relevance for the New Testament or early Christianity in the *Realenzyklopädie für Antike und Christentum*,⁵⁴ and, more briefly, in *The Eerdmans Dictionary of Judaism*⁵⁵ and in the German online encyclopedia *WiBiLex*.⁵⁶ A programmatic sketch of my view of the relevance of early Judaism and the fertility of the insights from the Qumran corpus for New Testament studies and Christian theology was presented in my Zurich inaugural lecture on the chair to “New Testament scholarship with focus on Ancient Judaism and Hermeneutics” in 2011.⁵⁷ Further perspectives on the relevance of the Qumran discoveries for New Testament studies will also be programmatically expressed at the “Colloquium Biblicum Lovaniense” at the

⁴⁹ N. Rupschus, *Frauen in Qumran* (WUNT II/457; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2017).

⁵⁰ M. Jost, *Engelgemeinschaft im irdischen Gottesdienst. Studien zu Texten aus Qumran und dem Neuen Testament* (WUNT II; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2019).

⁵¹ F. Tóth, *Exodusdiskurse im Matthäusevangelium: Studien zur Exodusrezeption im Matthäusevangelium vor dem Hintergrund biblischer und frühjüdischer Schriftdiskurse* (WUNT; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2019).

⁵² The dissertation by Sophie Tätweiler will probably be finished in 2020/21.

⁵³ The dissertation by Ruben Bühner will probably be finished in 2020.

⁵⁴ J. Frey, “Qumran,” *RAC* 28 (2017), 550–592 (English translation in this volume under the title “Qumran: An Overview”).

⁵⁵ J. Frey, “Essenes,” in *The Eerdmans Dictionary of Early Judaism* (ed. J. J. Collins and D. C. Harlow; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), 599–602.

⁵⁶ J. Frey, “Essener,” *WiBiLex* (2015), online <https://www.bibelwissenschaft.de/stichwort/51882/>.

⁵⁷ J. Frey, “Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und antikes Judentum: Probleme – Wahrnehmungen – Perspektiven,” *ZTK* 109 (2012): 445–471 (English translation in this volume under the title: “New Testament Scholarship and Ancient Judaism: Problems – Perceptions – Perspectives”).

Catholic University of Leuven in 2022 on the topic “Qumran and the New Testament,” which I have been asked to conceptualize and preside.

For more than ten years, I have served on the editorial board of the journal *Dead Sea Discoveries*, but also in my various other editorial responsibilities, I have always been determined to include work on ancient Jewish history and texts into the monograph series or journals I have to care for. Thus, a thematic issue of *Early Christianity* in 2011 was dedicated to the discussion of “Christology from Jewish Roots,”⁵⁸ and another one in 2013 to “Apocalypticism and the New Testament,”⁵⁹ and in the monograph series “Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament,” the consideration of studies on the LXX, Josephus and Philo, Qumran and early rabbinic texts is a long-standing tradition established by the earlier editors Joachim Jeremias, Otto Michel, and, in particular, Martin Hengel.

B. Insights and Aims

My scholarly work with ancient Jewish texts and, in particular, the Qumran discoveries mirrors the conviction I inherited from my academic mentor Martin Hengel that progress in biblical scholarship is primarily stimulated through the consideration of new evidence, rather than through the application of new methods and scholarly trends. The texts and artefacts preserved from antiquity or freshly discovered can help to draw a realistic, evidence-based image of the past. Methodological skills and reflections are indispensable, but the task of the historian and also the exegete is first and foremost to study the available sources and to open-mindedly include new evidence into the general picture.

My own approach in Qumran studies has always been that of a New Testament scholar. Due to the lack of any special training in Hebrew philology, codicology, archaeology, or other scientific methods, I had to leave the fundamental work of deciphering, material reconstruction, and editorial preparation to others and limit myself to the thorough compilation and reflection of the numerous detailed findings. My aims are to present the findings and insights from the Qumran corpus to ‘normal’ biblical scholars, because the insights are by no means limited to parallels regarding words, phrases, or motifs, but go much further to basic assumptions about the methods of interpretation, literature production, and canonical processes. The general effect of the Qumran discoveries has been a rediscovery of the Jewish roots of the early Jesus movement in New Testament scholarship, and these insights must

⁵⁸ Cf. the editorial: J. Frey, “Christology from Jewish Roots,” *EC* 2 (2011): 1–3.

⁵⁹ Cf. the editorial: J. Frey, “Apokalyptik und das Neue Testament,” *EC* 4 (2013): 1–6

be maintained notwithstanding the correction of early overstatements and untenable speculations.

For the understanding of early Christian texts, the knowledge of the ancient Jewish context and background is indispensable, although any kind of one-sidedness in history-of-religions issues should be avoided. But it is first and foremost the Jewish world, more precisely Palestinian Judaism, where Jesus lived and acted and where his preaching and also the earliest testimonies about communities of his followers originate. And as the evidence from Qumran has confirmed, fundamental elements of the New Testament language and the vast majority of the Christological concepts were taken from or shaped by contemporary Jewish traditions. The reference to the Jewish world Jesus and his early followers were part of is, therefore, an indispensable element of New Testament scholarship and Christian theology. It is not merely historically or philologically warranted but also of theological relevance, as it secures the concreteness of the Christian message and helps to avoid abstraction and ideologization which is always the danger if the primary contexts are pushed aside in favor of other contexts. Notwithstanding the right of modern 'contextual' theologies, the biblical and Jewish roots of the gospel cannot be removed or replaced without severely endangering or changing its identity.

From the more recent insights into the Qumran corpus, first of all the increased awareness of the diversity of the corpus must be stressed. What has been discovered in the caves is not merely the library or ideological production of a sect at the margins of contemporary Judaism but a relatively wide panorama of the literary production of Palestinian Judaism from a period of two or three centuries, including writings that represent the particular views of the Qumran community or the *yahad* and others adopted from precursor groups or from outside the *yahad* for various reasons. This has considerably changed any kind of comparison: While previously scholars often narrowly asked about the relationship between New Testament texts and "the Essenes," comparisons can now be done much more precisely, by asking whether the similarities are with the group-specific texts or also with other texts, so that the result can be a more precise answer whether a given term, phrase, or idea is only paralleled in texts from the *yahad* or, instead, only in 'non-sectarian' texts – or in both. The result is often that the Qumran parallels demonstrate the Jewish or rather Palestinian Jewish backgrounds of New Testament language or ideas, but not necessarily a connection with the specific group of the *yahad*. The whole paradigm of comparative research has changed between the 1950s and 1960s and the late 1980s, 1990s and the time since then, but this is still not sufficiently noticed by the majority of biblical scholars.

A second fundamental insight from the Qumran corpus is the diversity of contemporary Judaism, not only in the diaspora but also in Jewish Palestine. It is, of course, debatable whether scholarship should use the provocative plural "Judaisms," but it is certainly true that Judaism in the late Second

Temple period was much more variegated than Christian and Jewish scholarship before the Qumran discoveries had imagined. Labels such as “common Judaism,” though widespread in New Testament scholarship, are unsupported from the sources and should be abandoned, as there were mutually exclusive concepts of participation in the divine covenant which cannot be harmonized on an abstract level. The insights into the diversity of late Second Temple Judaism also affects the imagination of the place of the Jesus movement within that variegated contemporary Judaism and the view of the criteria or mechanisms that finally led to a separation between synagogal Judaism and emerging Christianity, as there was no central institution or authority that could have had the right or power to define the ‘borders’ of Judaism or decide what was ‘beyond’ those borders and thus to be considered ‘outside,’ heretical, or non-Jewish. This is true for the time before 70 CE, but also for a certain period thereafter, and this means that many of the popular views of the so-called ‘parting of the ways’ have to be revised.

A great number of further insights, with regard to Jesus, Paul, the Johannine writings and Revelation, but also to methodology of exegesis, messianism and Christology, pneumatology, etc. are articulated in the articles in this volume. As far as I can see, there is still much to discover and to reflect on, and the potential of the Qumran discoveries is by far not sufficiently exploited yet.

C. The Present Volume

The present volume includes studies with a clear focus on the findings from the analysis of the Qumran corpus and studies with a comparative interest, and even in the more Qumranic studies, the horizon of comparison is often already in view. This is a particular feature of my perspectives within Qumran scholarship, and here I see the task for scholars of my specialization: Qumran scholarship should not become a mere domain of specialists unconnected with the wider sphere of biblical studies, and within biblical studies, it should not merely be left to Hebrew Bible scholars. Although New Testament scholars are often better trained in Greek and the Greco-Roman culture, it would be a fatal error to ignore the texts of the Hebrew, Aramaic (and also Syriac) sphere, and the Palestinian Jewish traditions which influenced not only the earthly Jesus but many of his followers.

The volume is opened by an introductory section that includes my programmatic Zurich inauguration lecture and the comprehensive article from the *RAC*. These two articles present in advance some insights which are more thoroughly elaborated in later articles.

A second section focuses on Qumran and other early Jewish texts with relatively little reference to the New Testament. This part includes a compre-

hensive account of Qumran research in the German speaking context, a comprehensive discussion of the archaeological remains at Khirbet Qumran, and a discussion of the historical source value of the Greek and Latin texts on the Essenes in view of the Hebrew original “sectarian” texts. Then, there is a comprehensive evaluation of the relevance of the Qumran discoveries for the understanding of Jewish and early Christian apocalypticism, a thorough and comprehensive analysis of the various types of dualism and a shorter, but slightly modified account of the history of dualism in ancient Judaism. Based on a number of early apocalyptic texts, the Jewish roots of the genre of the ‘literary testament’ or ‘farewell discourses’ are explored. A study of the Aramaic “New Jerusalem Document” includes a brief outlook on the New Testament Apocalypse, a discussion of the Qumran “sectarian” testimonies on the community meals also explores the implications for the study of the Lord’s Supper, and a survey on the authority of the Scriptures in the Qumran community.

The two last articles in this section widen the scope beyond the Qumran corpus by discussing the temporal and spatial world-view of the Book of Jubilees and the phenomenon of Jewish temples apart from the Jerusalem temple with reference to Elephantine, the Samaritan temple on Mt. Gerizim, and the Temple of Onias III in Leontopolis.

A third part includes more detailed evaluations of the Qumran findings with regard to New Testament texts or New Testament scholarship. A comprehensive article on the impact of the Dead Sea Scrolls on New Testament interpretation presents various patterns of relating Qumran and early Christianity, thorough methodological consideration on the appropriate way of comparisons and exemplary analyses with regard to John the Baptist and Paul. A second, more recent article presents a slightly different interim balance of Qumran scholarship and an exemplary analysis of the relevance of the scrolls for understanding the Jesus tradition and early Christology. Further studies focus on a particular Synoptic example, which is illuminated from the Qumran wisdom texts, a discussion of Pauline pneumatology on the background of Qumran, a thorough discussion of the talk about sinful ‘flesh’ in Paul and its Palestinian Jewish backgrounds, a discussion of the MMT text and its relevance for understanding the “works of the Law” in Paul, and a brief discussion of the relationship between the dualistic language elements in John and the dualisms in the Qumran library. The last piece in the present volume turns on the matters of the “canonical process” and the insights on the nature of such processes developed from the analysis of the Qumran corpus. In my view, these insights are likewise valuable for the understanding of the development of the New Testament or the Christian canon. Again, the Qumran corpus proves to be of major relevance for wider areas of biblical scholarship.

There is some overlap between a number of the studies, as basic insights and methodological considerations had to be articulated repeatedly and relat-

ed to various fields of comparison. Other presentations grew and developed over time, so that I could omit earlier versions and only present the most elaborate stage in the present collection. In any case, it is obvious that the amount and depth of insights into the various texts of the Qumran corpus and also the processes of literature production or group developments have grown considerably during the last 20 years or, in particular, since the release of the majority of the fragments in 1991.

However, apart from very few additions, mostly references to my own further publications, I have refrained from updating or expanding the earlier articles, as this would have become an endless task. Thus, each article generally represents the state of the discussion at the time of its original publication. I do hope that they will be nevertheless a source of insights for those who are interested in relating the Dead Sea discoveries to the origins and early phases of developing Christianity.

Readers will also notice that the terminology used in my various articles over the course of more than 20 years is not always consistent. I like to vary terms like “group-specific” and “sectarian.” With regard to the use of the term “Essenes”/“Essene,” I have become somewhat more cautious in recent years, although I still think that the Qumran community was linked with or part of the group(s) called “Essenes” or “Essaeans” in the Greek and Latin texts. But readers may observe that in the earlier texts of the present collection, I more openly use qualifications like “Essene,” “pre-Essene,” or “non-Essene,” and I did not totally remove this in the translation. What is clear, however, is that the identity of all those Palestinian-Jewish groups has to be developed from their own texts, i.e., from the Hebrew sources, rather than from the secondary accounts written by outsiders in a certain *interpretation graeca*. The more precise issues, whether the *yahad* was identical with, part of, or only related to what other texts call the “Essenes,” are still debated in current scholarship, and I do not see any chance that the debate will cease unless clarifying new evidence will be discovered somewhere.

It would not be the worst impact of the Qumran discoveries on biblical scholarship if there were a turn from critical hypotheses toward a better appreciation of the contemporary textual and material evidence as now provided from Qumran and some other sites around the Dead Sea. The wealth of discoveries in and also the poor state of preservation of so many texts that demonstrates how much has been lost from antiquity can humble us historians and exegetes and inspire a kind of gratitude to the numerous circumstances that have provided us with those very fragmentary, but so fascinating discoveries.

I. Introductory Overviews

1. New Testament Scholarship and Ancient Judaism: Problems – Perceptions – Perspectives*

Jesus of Nazareth was a Jew. His followers and his disciples were also Jews. Peter, Paul, and the great majority of the tradents and authors whose testimonies and writings are collected in the New Testament were Jews. Whether in Palestine or in the Diaspora, they were influenced by the writings and the faith traditions of Israel. Christianity began as a Jewish “sect,” as a messianic, universalistically oriented but entirely *Jewish* movement.¹ Christianity would eventually move out of its Jewish framework and would – sooner or later – come to a “parting of the ways” between the synagogue and the increasingly Gentile Christian church.² This separation led to a mutual delimitation and polemic between the separated groups, and then to a painful history of supposed Christian animosity towards Jews, a fact which belongs to the tragedy of a shared common origin, to the out-breaking of a “new” faith from an already existing one, and to the continued formation of unique identities in mutual demarcation from one another. The “Jewish Christianity” of the early centuries had fallen through the cracks and had probably disappeared in the

* This article was originally delivered as an inaugural lecture at the University of Zurich on May 9, 2011. Its text has been slightly expanded, but the original lecture framework has been left intact. Within the article, I would like to take up the title of my chair “New Testament Studies with an Emphasis on Ancient Judaism and Hermeneutics” and demonstrate how these three aspects are able to come together: New Testament scholarship, Second Temple Judaism, and hermeneutics (the art of and reflection on understanding). More precisely, my purpose is to reflect on the understanding of ancient Jewish texts within the framework of Christian theological study of the Bible. I am grateful to my retired colleague Hans Weder for his critical discussions and my former assistants Prof. Dr. Benjamin Schließer and Dr. Nadine Ueberschaer for their support.

¹ M. Hengel, “Das früheste Christentum als eine jüdische messianische und universalistische Bewegung,” in *Judaica, Hellenistica et Christiana. Kleine Schriften II* (ed. idem; WUNT 109; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999), 200–218.

² Though there is no denying that such a separation took place, the time of this separation is debatable. What is debated is when, how uniform/varied, and with what consequences did it occur. Cf. (with the thesis of a long-standing co-existence between Christians and Jews) A. H. Becker and A. Y. Reed, eds., *The Ways that Never Parted: Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages* (TSAJ 95; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003); D. Boyarin, *Border Lines: The Partition of Judaeo-Christianity* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004).

fifth century.³ Christian tradition, however, carries the indissoluble seed of Judaism within it, as is evidenced in the person of Jesus, in the writings of Paul, and in the other witnesses. It shares with its Jewish contemporaries not only the argument of the Scriptures of the so-called “Old Testament,” but also the methods of its interpretation, such as the imprinting of Jewish forms of thought and belief that come from the time of the “Second Temple.” For example, the apocalyptic and wisdom traditions, the reference to the temple of Jerusalem, and the forms of piety developed in the Diaspora. Thus, in its fundamental tradition, Christianity contains a substratum that it has overtaken: it contains something foreign within itself, and it cannot “save” itself from this foreign influence, it cannot “reject” it, but instead it is permanently dependent on it and in conversation with it. Perhaps this capacity to integrate and adapt is one of the greatest strengths of the Christian (as before, the biblical-Jewish) faith. On the other hand, all attempts to throw off the “Jewish veneer” always lead to a dangerous imbalance.

From here, it follows that we can understand Early Christianity and the texts of the New Testament only if we are familiar with the world in which Jesus and the Apostles lived, only if we are familiar with contemporary Judaism, its history, and its piety. Therefore, New Testament scholarship, which aims to understand the meaning and scope of early Christian testimonies in their original context, is necessarily dependent on the study of ancient Judaism: the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, the works of Josephus and Philo, the texts from the Dead Sea, and also the early rabbinical literature. The deeper we dig here, or the more we look beyond the boundaries of the New Testament texts, the more fresh insights open up, which are also theologically significant. The study of ancient Judaism is no miscellaneous matter within the framework of theological studies! Rather, it is a return back to the perhaps alienated roots of one’s own traditions and ultimately a rediscovery of one’s own sources.

A. Problems: The Perception of Judaism in Christian Exegesis

However, the history of the perception of Judaism in Christian theology and exegesis has largely been a history of polemic, contrast, and neutralization, as well as misunderstanding and ignorance. I can provide only a very brief sketch of this history here.

³ On the history of Jewish Christianity, see J. Frey, “Die Fragmente judenchristlicher Evangelien,” in *Evangelien und Verwandtes*, vol. 1 of *Antike christliche Apokryphen in deutscher Übersetzung* (ed. C. Marksches and J. Schröter [with help from A. Heiser]; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012), 560–660.

It is true that some Church Fathers, primarily Origen and Hieronymus, had already taken up Jewish traditions within their biblical interpretations.⁴ However, the dominant interest of the Christian engagement with Judaism throughout the centuries was ultimately the exposition of the truth of the Christian faith and polemical defense against competing claims. Even when Christian Hebraists⁵ (e.g., Johann Buxtorf⁶ or John Lightfoot⁷) had accumulated great knowledge of Jewish tradition-literature and immense collections of parallels with the New Testament, the primary aim was to demonstrate the truth of the Christian doctrine of the Messiah from the Hebrew tradition in contrast with classical and contemporary Judaism.⁸

This should not be surprising in pre-Enlightenment theology. But even within the epoch in which historical-critical biblical scholarship emerged, analogous tendencies can be seen, even if they are in a slightly different guise. The Jewish features became the negative background against which the true, universal religion could then radiate; Judaism was the veneer that Early Christianity had taken off and put aside: For Johann Salomo Semler,⁹ one of the founders of critical biblical scholarship, Judaism was a particularistic, nationally limited religious expression that had to be removed in order to give way to the universalistic Christian religion. Jewish notions and concepts con-

⁴ For an overview, see W. Horbury, "Old Testament Interpretation in the Writings of the Church Fathers," in *Mikra* (ed. M. J. Mulder; CRINT II 1; Assen/Philadelphia: Van Gorcum, 1988), 727–787; see also A. Salvesen, "A Convergence of the Ways? The Judaizing of Christian Scripture by Origen and Jerome," in *The Ways that Never Parted: Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages* (ed. A. H. Becker and A. Y. Reed; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003), 233–258.

⁵ On the controversial theology of the Christian Hebraists, see S. Krauss, *From the Earliest Times to 1789*, vol. 1 of *The Jewish-Christian Controversy* (ed. and revised by W. Horbury; TSAJ 56; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1995), 109–122.

⁶ On this point, cf. S. G. Burnett, *From Christian Hebraism to Jewish Studies. Johannes Buxtorf (1564-1629) and Hebrew Learning in the Seventeenth Century* (SHCT 68; Leiden, et al.: Brill, 1996); idem, "Johannes Buxtorfs Charakterisierung des Judentums. Reformierte Orthodoxie und Christliche Hebraistik," in *Bundeseinheit und Gottesvolk. Reformierter Protestantismus und Judentum im Europa des 16. und 17. Jahrhunderts* (ed. A. Detmers and J. M. J. Lange van Ravenswaay; Wuppertal: Foedus, 2005), 189–210. Online: <http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/classicsfacpub/99/>.

⁷ John Lightfoot, *Horae Hebraicae et Talmudicae* (5 vols.; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1658–1674).

⁸ W. Horbury, "Die jüdischen Wurzeln der Christologie," *Early Christianity* 2 (2011): 5–21, here 16f. on C. Schöttgen, *Horae Hebraicae et Talmudicae in universum Novum Testamentum* (2 vols.; Dresden and Leipzig: Christoph Hekel & Son, 1733–1742).

⁹ Cf. H.-G. Waubke, *Die Pharisäer in der protestantischen Bibelwissenschaft des 19. Jahrhunderts* (BHT 107; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998), 28–42; now also A. Gerdmar, *Roots of Theological Anti-Semitism. German Biblical Interpretation and the Jews, from Herder and Semler to Kittel and Bultmann* (Studies in Jewish History and Culture 20; Leiden et al.: Brill, 2010), 39–49.

cerning Jesus and the Apostles can, therefore, only be understood as temporally conditioned “accommodations” to the contemporary audience.¹⁰ One’s goal is to distinguish between these temporally conditioned accommodations and the true heart of the proclamation. Friedrich Schleiermacher, the ‘church father of the 19th century,’ effectively expanded the idea of Judaism as a dead,¹¹ external religion: Jesus was able to stand out categorically because of the “constant strength of his God-consciousness.”¹² Historically, most 19th century interpreters saw post-biblical Judaism as a phenomenon of “degeneration,”¹³ from the religion of the prophets to the failed ideals of a theocracy, messianic apocalyptic illusions, and legal rigidity – all of which existed in sharp contrast to the ideals of a modern, liberal Christianity or even of a universal enlightened religion.

These historical-philosophical and theological value judgments remained in effect as the anchoring of early Christian texts in their historical surroundings became increasingly clearer over time. For example, Julius Wellhausen clearly formulated the thesis that Jesus was “not a Christian, but a Jew.”¹⁴ But the image that Wellhausen, or his contemporary Emil Schürer, drew of ancient Judaism was dark: Schürer, who at 30 years old wrote *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*¹⁵ and with it founded a new discipline known as “History of New Testament Times [Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte],” saw that Judaism was essentially represented by the Pharisees,

¹⁰ On the theory of accommodation, see G. Horning, *Die Anfänge der historisch-kritischen Theologie. Johann Salomo Semlers Schriftverständnis und seine Stellung zu Luther* (FSThR 8; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1961), 211–236.

¹¹ In the fifth of his discourses entitled “On Religion: Speeches to Its Cultured Despisers” (F. D. E. Schleiermacher, “Über die Religion. Reden an die Gebildeten unter ihren Verächtern,” in *Kritische Gesamtausgabe, Vol I.2. Schriften aus der Berliner Zeit 1769–1799* [ed. G. Meckenstock; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1984], 185–326, here 314), Schleiermacher describes Judaism, in its post-biblical existence, as “a dead religion” and an “incorporeal mummy”; see also Waubke, *Pharisäer*, 43, 336; also Gerdmar, *Roots*, 61–76.

¹² F. D. E. Schleiermacher, “Der christliche Glaube nach den Grundsätzen der evangelischen Kirche im Zusammenhange dargestellt,” in *Kritische Gesamtausgabe* (ed. R. Schäfer; vol. I.13.2; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2003), 52 (§ 94); original German reads, “stetige Kräftigkeit seines Gottesbewusstseins.”

¹³ Thus W. M. L. de Wette, *Lehrbuch der christlichen Dogmatik, in ihrer historischen Entwicklung dargestellt. Erster Theil: Biblische Dogmatik Alten und Neuen Testaments oder kritische Darstellung der Religionslehre des hebraismus, des Judenthums und des Urchristenthums* (Berlin: in der Realschulbuchhandlung, 1813), 114: “Judaism is a degenerate, rigid Hebraism.”

¹⁴ J. Wellhausen, *Einleitung in die drei ersten Evangelien* (Berlin: Reimer, 1905), 113; see also H. D. Betz, “Wellhausen’s Dictum ‘Jesus was not a Christian, but a Jew’ in Light of Present Scholarship,” *StTh* 45 (1991): 83–110.

¹⁵ E. Schürer, *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*, I–III/2 (2nd rev. ed.; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1890–1910). The first edition of this work appeared under the title, *Lehrbuch der neutestamentlichen Zeitgeschichte*, 1874.

whom he believed to be characterized by casuistic legality and driven by wages and achievement, but “far from ... true piety.”¹⁶ Jesus was viewed in stark contrast to these scholars’ view of Judaism.¹⁷ For, in these liberal scholars’ opinion, Jesus opposed the works based way of thinking, arrogance, and intellectual snobbery in favor of “the highest moral ideal,”¹⁸ the simple service of one’s neighbor.¹⁹ These authors have a monolithic view of Judaism: They saw its “norm” best expressed in Pharisaic Judaism and later in the rabbinic current in Palestine, as well as some apocalyptic texts;²⁰ however, other texts like Josephus and Philo, as well as the group of the Essenes (attested by Josephus and Philo), are regarded as marginal and atypical.²¹

This picture of a legal, stifled, external “late-Judaism,” characterized by an emphasis on reward and merit, has disastrously shaped the work from which many theologians drew their knowledge of ancient Jewish thought. One example can be found in the compiled collection of parallel passages from the Talmud and Midrash to the New Testament by the Lutheran pastor, *Paul Billerbeck*.²² Above all, the comments and excurses – which are shaped by Lutheran doctrine – continue to be problematic. For example, in an exemplary sentence within the introduction to the Sermon on the Mount, Billerbeck writes: “The old Jewish religion is hereafter ... a religion of the most radical self-sufficiency; it has no room for a savior-redeemer who dies for the sins of

¹⁶ Schürer, *Lehrbuch*, 498.

¹⁷ S. E. Schürer, *Die Predigt Jesu Christi in ihrem Verhältniß zum Alten Testament und zum Judenthum* (Darmstadt: F. Würtz’sche Buchhandlung, 1882), 29.

¹⁸ J. Wellhausen, *Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte* (Berlin: Reimer, 1894), 309 (See also the entire chapter on “Das Evangelium,” 308–323; In the 3rd edition, 1897, this chapter is placed at the end, 374–388).

¹⁹ Wellhausen, *Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte* (1st ed.), 310f.

²⁰ On the image of the Pharisees in both, see R. Deines, *Die Pharisäer. Ihr Verständnis im Spiegel der christlichen und jüdischen Forschung seit Wellhausen und Graetz* (WUNT 101; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997), 40–95; Waubke, *Pharisäer*, 196–256.

²¹ Thus also in the complete representations of W. Bousset and H. Gressmann, *Die Religion des Judentums im späthellenistischen Zeitalter* (HNT 21; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1926), 1926 (1st edition: W. Bousset, *Die Religion des Judentums im späthellenistischen Zeitalter*, 1903).

²² (H. L. Strack) and P. Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch* (6 vols.; Munich: Beck, 1926–1961). For a careful analysis of this work, see B. Schaller, “Paul Billerbecks ‘Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch.’ Wege und Abwege, Leistung und Fehlleistung christlicher Judaistik,” in *Judaistik und neutestamentliche Wissenschaft. Standorte – Grenzen – Beziehungen* (ed. L. Doering, H.-G. Waubke, and F. Wilk; FRLANT 226; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2008), 61–84; for further background of the interest in the “Jewish mission” in the context of H.-L. Strack’s work, see also P. von der Osten-Sacken, “Liebe, mehr noch: Gerechtigkeit. Hermann L. Strack und das Institutum Judaicum in Berlin in ihrem Verhältnis zum Judentum,” *Jud* 66 (2010): 40–71.

the world.”²³ Thus, in this dogmatic construction, a picture is developed that one-sidedly distorts the rabbinical findings and portrays the Jewish texts in dark shades that are brought into sharp contrast with Jesus and his Sermon on the Mount, as well as the Lutheran doctrine of justification. Thus, the “hermeneutic trap” is discernable even in the highest achievements of Christian scholarship on Judaism: this trap is that texts are not read in their own framework and in their own right, but are used in support of one’s own theological constructions.

I do not wish to discuss in any depth the aberrations of those who, in the wake of the Third Reich, speculated²⁴ about a non-Jewish, “Aryan” Jesus and attempted to also “de-Judaize” the New Testament. As a final example of the structural repression of Jewish elements within New Testament scholarship, there is one exegete who would seem to be the least susceptible to anti-Judaism: Rudolf Bultmann. For Bultmann, the earthly Jesus is, of course, a Jew. As such, in his historical appearance, Jesus belongs only to the presuppositions of Christian faith or New Testament theology. And yet he is diligently removed from Judaism: His proclamation was a protest against the Jewish law, he hardly ever takes part in the apocalyptic speculations of his contemporaries, and his life was an un-messianic existence.²⁵ Here again we see a hermeneutic of contrast: In his history-of-religions reconstruction, Bultmann explains the *kerygma*, the emergence of Christology in Paul and other witnesses, primarily by non-Jewish influences,²⁶ from a Hellenistic

²³ (Strack) and Billerbeck, *Exkurse zu einzelnen Stellen des Neuen Testaments*, vol. 4 of *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch* (2nd ed. Munich: Beck, 1956), 6.

²⁴ Thus especially effective was the New Testament scholar from Jena, Walter Grundmann: W. Grundmann, *Jesus, der Galiläer* (Leipzig: Wigand, 1940); see the differentiated analysis by R. Deines, “Jesus der Galiläer. Traditionsgeschichte und Genese eines antisemitischen Konstrukts bei Walter Grundmann,” in *Walter Grundmann. Ein Neutestamentler im Dritten Reich* (ed. R. Deines, V. Leppin, and K.-W. Niebuhr; AKG 21; Leipzig: Evang. Verlag, 2007), 43–132, as well as the contributions in *Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und antikes Judentum* 109.4 (2012); see further P. von der Osten-Sacken, ed., *Das mißbrauchte Evangelium. Studien zur Theologie und Praxis der Thüringer Deutschen Christen* (Berlin: Institut Kirche und Judentum, 2002), as well as S. Heshel, “Nazifying Christian Theology: Walter Grundmann and the Institute for the Study and Eradication of Jewish Influence on German Church Life,” *Church History* 63 (1994): 587–605. Finally, see Gerdmar, *Roots*, 531–576.

²⁵ R. Bultmann, *Theologie des Neuen Testaments* (9th ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984), 33, in reception of W. Wrede, *Das Messiasgeheimnis in den Evangelien: zugleich ein Beitrag zum Verständnis des Markusevangeliums* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1901).

²⁶ In the background are the theses of the history-of-religions school, which are summarized by W. Bousset, *Kyrios Christos. Geschichte des Christusglaubens von den Anfängen des Christentums bis Irenaeus* (FRLANT NF 4; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1913; 2nd ed. 1921), where a deep ditch between the Palestinian-Jewish piety and the con-

mystery cult, a gnostic redemption myth, and other mostly non-Jewish sources. Thus, an ugly ditch exists between the Jewish proclaimer and the Christian proclamation; the Jewish side remains quite irrelevant to the understanding of Paul, and even more so for the understanding of John – Judaism is a religion like others, a cipher for a faulty understanding of existence, and ultimately lacking any material significance for understanding the Christian faith. In the background stands the hermeneutic of “generalizing” from concrete history to abstract existence. Within this hermeneutic, the historical framework of the *kerygma* becomes irrelevant in favor of the universality of its interpreted significance. That means, however, that even in the top achievements in the field of hermeneutics, there is the danger that such a hermeneutic is misused for the neutralization of Judaism as the root of Christianity.

It has only been in the last 50 years that a substantial reorientation of New Testament scholarship has taken place. The realization of the deadly effects of anti-Judaism, to which the church and theology had contributed, and consequently the scholarly investigation of Judaism in theological faculties as well as investigations within its own, separate discipline within the German-speaking world, played a decisive role in this reorientation.²⁷ More importantly, however, was the discovery and development of new sources, particularly the textual discoveries from the Dead Sea, which made it possible to more accurately draw the picture of pre-70 CE Judaism as more diverse and multifaceted than was previously thought. One result has been the fact that New Testament texts now can be more precisely depicted within their contexts against this background, revealing that they were more “Jewish” than previously thought. Finally, it is noteworthy that Jewish scholars are increasingly taking part in the recent discussion about not only Qumran and other Jewish sources, but also about early Christian texts. These scholars are rediscovering that the early Christian traditions are also a part of their own tradition, and they are, therefore, contributing to the discussion new aspects for a better perception of those traditions.²⁸

ceptions of Gentile Christian communities is seen. It was only in those communities that the worship of the *kyrios* and also the Pauline form and further development of significant forms of Christian belief had come. Foundational was W. Heitmüller, “Zum Problem Paulus und Jesus,” *ZNW* 13 (1912): 320–337.

²⁷ On the history, see G. Stemberger, “Judaistik und neutestamentliche Wissenschaft,” in *Judaistik und neutestamentliche Wissenschaft. Standorte – Grenzen – Beziehungen* (ed. Doering and Waubke; FRLANT 226; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2008), 15–31.

²⁸ On the Jesus research, see D. Jaffé, *Jésus sous la plume des historiens juifs du XXe siècle. Approche historique, perspectives historiographiques, analyses méthodologiques* (Paris: Cerf, 2009); on the Pauline research, see S. Meissner, *Die Heimholung des Ketzers. Studien zur jüdischen Auseinandersetzung mit Paulus* (WUNT II/87; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996).

B. New Perceptions: The Qumran-Discoveries, the Insights into the Plurality of Ancient Judaism, and the Changed Questions about Jesus and Paul

In the following, I would like to illustrate such recent perceptions within the scholarly work on Jesus and Paul, particularly the insights gained from the texts from the Dead Sea.²⁹ Naturally, Qumran is only a limited part of the wealth of testimony of ancient Judaism. However, this piece has been chosen as an example because these findings and their analysis have given rise to many new perspectives on the New Testament texts.

I. The Qumran Discoveries and the Image of Contemporary Judaism

The discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls³⁰ presented researchers, for the first time, with an extensive number of texts in Hebrew and Aramaic from around the turn of the era, between the Hebrew Bible and the later rabbinic literature. Among these discoveries were more than 900 mostly, very fragmentary manuscripts, including more than 200 biblical manuscripts, the other manuscripts of some previously known works (e.g., Enoch and *Jubilees*), as well as many

²⁹ See my contributions: J. Frey, “Die Bedeutung der Qumran-Funde für das Verständnis des Neuen Testaments,” in *Qumran – die Schriftrollen vom Toten Meer* (ed. M. Fieger, K. Schmid, and P. Schwagmeier; NTOA 47; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2001), 129–208; idem, “The Impact of the Dead Sea Scrolls on New Testament Interpretation: Proposals, Problems and Further Perspectives,” in *The Scrolls and Christian Origins*, vol. 3 of *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Princeton Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. J. H. Charlesworth; Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2006), 407–461 (in this volume, 527–578); idem, “Critical Issues in the Investigation of the Scrolls and the New Testament,” in *Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. J. J. Collins and T. H. Lim; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 517–545 (in this volume, 495–525); idem, “Die Textfunde von Qumran und die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft. Eine Zwischenbilanz, hermeneutische Überlegungen und Konkretionen zur Jesusüberlieferung,” in *Qumran aktuell* (ed. St. Beyerle and J. Frey; BThSt 120; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2011), 225–293 (English translation “The Textual Discoveries of Qumran and New Testament Scholarship,” in this volume, 579–622); idem, “Qumran Research and Biblical Scholarship in Germany,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Perspective. A History of Research* (ed. D. Dimant; STDJ 99; Leiden et al.: Brill, 2012), 529–564 (in this volume, 85–119).

³⁰ For an introduction, see H. Stegemann, *Die Essener, Qumran, Johannes der Täufer und Jesus. Nachwort von G. Jeremias* (10th ed.; Freiburg: Herder, 2007) English translation: idem, *The Library of Qumran: On the Essenes, Qumran, John the Baptist, and Jesus* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans and Leiden: Brill, 1998); J. C. VanderKam, *Einführung in die Qumranforschung. Geschichte und Bedeutung der Schriften vom Toten Meer* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998). For the current state of the research, see J. J. Collins and T. Lim, eds., *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010).

other texts that were previously unknown:³¹ the continuation of biblical narratives and prophetic books, Bible commentaries, rule texts that are concerned with the life of a particular community, hymns and prayers, wisdom texts, calendar texts, and much more. The significance of these findings cannot be understated because, as we now see, the spectrum of these writings does not simply reflect the viewpoint of a certain group or sect,³² but the rich literary production in Palestinian Judaism between the 3rd and 1st centuries BCE. The Qumran discoveries are fundamental for a new perception of the origins of the Hebrew Bible and the history, piety, and literary production of Palestinian Judaism around the turn of the era.

In light of the new finds, this Judaism proves to be by no means uniform, but rather exists in various discourses and disputes both internally and in relationship with its environment. Not only Diaspora Judaism, but also Palestinian Judaism was substantially more diverse than older research had assumed. There was no(t yet a) “normative” Judaism before 70 CE: Neither the temple nor the “people’s movement” of the Pharisees were able to establish and enforce such a “norm.” In this vibrant diversity, there were harsh conflicts – not least between the Qumran community, the *yahad*, and other Palestinian-Jewish groups. Within the framework of this now discernable diversity, we also find the beginnings of the “Jewish sect” of the Jesus movement.

II. *Qumran and Early Christianity: Old and New Research Perspectives*

Since the early 1990s, all the fragmentary texts from Qumran have become freely accessible in photographs and scholarly editions. Due to the availability of the texts to all researchers, the current situation of research differs considerably from the 1950s and the 1960s when the majority of the discoveries were not yet accessible to the scholarly public.

³¹ On the description of the caves and the findings, see in particular Stegemann, *Essener*, 98–115.

³² This is true even though the community that has to be assumed in the background of the library, the so-called “Qumran community,” represented a specific group within contemporary Judaism and – according to the majority of Qumran scholars – are connected with the group Philo, Josephus, and Pliny the Younger refer to as the “Essenes.” On this point, see J. Frey, “Zur historischen Auswertung der antiken Essenerberichte,” in *Qumran kontrovers: Beiträge zu den Textfunden vom Toten Meer* (ed. idem and H. Stegemann; Paderborn: Bonifatius, 2002), 23–56 (English translation “On the Historical Value of the Ancient Sources about the Essenes,” in this volume, 163–194); idem, “Art. Essenes,” in *The Eerdmans Dictionary of Early Judaism* (ed. J. J. Collins and D. C. Harlow; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), 599–602.

Immediately after the first text discoveries, a series of leading scholars³³ linked the caves of the discoveries with the ruins of Khirbet Qumran and attributed the texts to the group known from ancient authors as the “Essenes.” Almost all new, non-biblical texts were attributed to this group. Within the framework of this hypothesis, the primary questions centered on the connections or differences Jesus and primitive Christianity had with this – as one said – Jewish “sect.”³⁴ In this, the spirit of the old contrast hermeneutic is seen when, for example, Karl Georg Kuhn speculated that this “heterodox Judaism” became the gateway through which a non-Jewish, especially Zoroastrian, thought could penetrate even the New Testament.³⁵ Such scholars wanted to keep Jesus and primitive Christianity as far away from “classical” Pharisaic Judaism as possible – and they did not yet see that the Qumran community was much more “particularistic” and halakically conservative than Pharisaic and later rabbinic Judaism.

It is now clear that all the previous and popular assignments of Jesus to the Essenes or to Qumran are to be relegated to the realm of unfounded speculation or fiction. None of the Dead Sea texts are Christian, not a single one of the texts speaks of John the Baptist, Jesus or James, and the New Testament nowhere speaks of the “Essenes” or of Qumran. There are no detectable personal or social connections between this group and the primitive community.³⁶

Since the publication of the many fragments from Cave 4, which were inaccessible for a long time and which contained more than 550 manuscripts, Qumran research has demonstrated that only a minor portion of the non-biblical texts originate from within the *yahad*. The majority of the “new” texts, such as all the Aramaic texts, many wisdom texts, the continuation of biblical texts, and even a text like the famous “Treatise on the Two Spirits,”

³³ It is worth nothing that the first was a Jewish researcher, Eleazar Lipa Sukenik, in a Hebrew publication from 1948. This work was followed by many others, such as André Dupont-Sommer, Karl Georg Kuhn, Roland de Vaux, and William Brownlee.

³⁴ It should be borne in mind that the “Essenes” of the ancient texts had already had a long history of interpretation: Since Eusebius (*Hist. eccl.* II 16f), scholars viewed the Essenes or Philo’s “Therapeutics” as Christian ascetics. During the Enlightenment, the Essenes were regarded as a (Jewish) group that was particularly open to foreign (e.g., Egyptian, Greek, Persian) wisdom; some of the authors also associated Jesus with the Essenes (thus, J. G. Wachter, *De primordiis Christianae religionis libri duo, quorum prior agit de Essaeis Christianorum inchoatoribus, alter de Christianis, Essaeorum posteris*, 1713). Even in the 19th century, Ernest Renan saw in Christianity the successful expression of Esseneism: “Le christianisme est un essénisme qui a largement réussi” (*Œuvres Complètes. Édition définitive* [ed. H. Psichari; vol. 6; Paris: Calmann-Lévy, 1953, 1301]); cf. idem, *La Vie de Jésus*, Paris (Paris: Calmann-Lévy, 1863), 73f.

³⁵ K. G. Kuhn, “Die in Palästina gefundenen hebräischen Texte und das Neue Testament,” *ZTK* (47), 1950: 192–211, here 211.

³⁶ On this point, Frey, “Bedeutung,” 133–152.

texts have arisen outside or before the time of this community, have come into the community's possession in various ways, and were copied and received (and remained preserved only in the caves for posterity). Therefore, the Qumran "library" mirrors a wider spectrum of Jewish groups and their literary work. The discovery of important parallels to the New Testament in these non-group specific texts,³⁷ in the sapiential, exegetical, and poetic texts, has also altered the questions posed concerning Jesus and primitive Christianity: The question is no longer about the relationship of Jesus and primitive Christianity to a particular group or "sect," but about the fact that the New Testament texts are linguistically and thematically anchored in the discourses of Palestinian Judaism and, therein, gain their profile.

Thus, in contrast with older research, it becomes increasingly clear that the earthly Jesus did not encounter a monolithic block of Judaism in his time; his positions on various subjects fit in with contemporary discourses that can now be more clearly traced. The distortive polemic of the Gospels and the later Christian contrast hermeneutic are to be corrected here. This also applies to the question of the contemporary messianic representations and, with it, a particularly difficult field of Christian-Jewish discussions. The classical controversy throughout the centuries was, "Is or was Jesus *the* Messiah or not?" During this time, scholars wrestled with a firm image of how the Messiah was expected to appear; a Jewish "messianic dogmatism" was presupposed that expected a political messiah who would free the people from the Romans and reestablish the kingdom of David. This view posed the problem of explaining how, against this background, Jesus' followers could identify him as the Χριστός, and thus the "Messiah," from an early time and in an entirely uniform manner even though he did not correspond to *this* messianic image. With such a firmly established picture of the messiah as a political figure, it was only possible to postulate that Jesus simply did not appear in this manner and then to suspect that he wished to criticize this form of expectation or to subtly transform it (thus, for example, J. Wellhausen³⁸). Another interpretive explanation was to assume (as W. Wrede and R. Bultmann³⁹) that Jesus had appeared in an "unmessianic" manner, and his image was turned into messianic traits only by his post-Easter followers. According to those views, the use of Messiah as a designation for Jesus within the context of an emerging Christology was a post-Easter development that falsified the real, "historical" image of Jesus. Against those earlier interpretations, the new sources have

³⁷ In English, these texts are usually referred to as "non-sectarian" texts. In German, the use of the word "sect" is misleading.

³⁸ J. Wellhausen, *Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte* (9th ed.; Berlin: Reimer, 1907), 315.

³⁹ Foundational is Wrede, *Messiasgeheimnis*; see the reception in Bultmann, *Theologie*, 33.

opened up the possibility of new perspectives, which also make it possible to better understand the emergence of Christology from a pluralistic world of messianic ideas.

III. The Qumran Discoveries and Jesus Research

First, I briefly mention some references and parallels that Qumran research has already shown for some time and that is already a part of accepted knowledge.⁴⁰

(a) *Interpretation of Scripture and Eschatology*: It was noticed early on that the characteristic Bible commentaries from Qumran, the pesharim, interpret the prophetic writings with reference to their own present, believing that they themselves were living in the end-time, the time spoken of in the prophetic texts. This is a remarkable parallel to the interpretation of Scripture characteristic of primitive Christianity. The simultaneous expectation of the future and the certainty of the presence of the eschatological period finally offers scholars an important parallel to Jesus' eschatology,⁴¹ in which the βασιλεία is simultaneously regarded as still to come and yet already present.⁴² However, the reasons for the certainty of the presence of salvation differ: Within the *yahad*, this certainty comes from the knowledge of the eschatological gift of the proper understanding of the Torah. This proper understanding of the Torah enables a life of purity and holiness. Furthermore, certainty is granted from their election to a communion with the heavenly beings, to which they currently have access. With Jesus, this certainty is much more based upon the manifestation of God's kingdom in his exorcisms and healings (Luke 11:20). But the fact that such a thought (i.e., the eschatological present) was possible and not – as is often the case in modern research – seen to be contradictory to the eschatological expectation is of great im-

⁴⁰ See in detail Frey, "Textual Discoveries," 258–290 (in this volume, 600–621); more recently, H.-W. Kuhn, "Jesus im Licht der Qumrangemeinde," in *The Study of Jesus*, vol. 2 of *Handbook for the Study of the Historical Jesus* (ed. T. Holmén and S. E. Porter; Leiden et al.: Brill, 2010), 1245–1285; L. T. Stuckenbruck, "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament," in *Qumran and the Bible. Studying the Jewish and Christian Scriptures in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. N. Dávid and A. Lange; CBET 57; Leuven: Peeters, 2010), 131–170).

⁴¹ Foundational is H.-W. Kuhn, *Enderwartung und gegenwärtiges Heil. Untersuchungen zu den Gemeindeliedern von Qumran mit einem Anhang über Eschatologie und Gegenwart in der Verkündigung Jesu* (SUNT 4; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966), 189–204.

⁴² A fundamental and still applicable study is W. G. Kümmel, *Verheißung und Erfüllung. Untersuchungen zur eschatologischen Verkündigung Jesu* (ATANT 6; 2nd ed.; Zürich: Zwingli-Verlag, 1953). The eschatological interpretation of the Lord's Prayer of Matt 6:10/Luke 11:2 is rarely disputed as are the specific present statements in Luke 11:20; 17:20f.

portance for our understanding of Jesus' preaching. The tension between "already" and "not yet" present throughout early Christian eschatology⁴³ – although with different accepts – is based on a model of Jewish eschatological thought.

(b) *The Status of the Torah*: Of course, Jesus' attitude towards the Torah and halakah was also compared to the Qumran rule texts early on. These comparisons have found some interesting correlations as well as some conspicuous differences: Thus, for example, Jesus' strict ban on the use of oaths in Matthew 5:33–37 has a parallel in the *Damascus Document* (CD XV 1–2), a Palestinian-Jewish text. Albeit, the *Damascus Document* differs in that it is primarily concerned with the holiness of the divine name and forbids the use of an oath in connection with Elohim, Adonai, and the Torah, but permits the use of a solemn oath in order to enter the community. Jesus, however, forbids the use any oath in order to grant assurances and does not discuss individual cases.⁴⁴ Jesus' "radicalization" of the Torah differs from Qumran in this respect. Also, the rigorous prohibition of divorce in Mark 10:6–9 has an analogy in the *Damascus Document* (CD IV 21), and both texts refer back to Gen 1:27 as the basis of their recognition of God's original will; however, the *Damascus Document* is not at all concerned with divorce but only with the rejection of remarriage, even in the event of the wife's death. The shared reference to the creation story serves different purposes. However, the comparison – even in light of the differences in details – helps us better understand the profile of Jesus' command.⁴⁵

(c) In some cases, Jesus' position is less rigid than or is almost the exact opposite of what we see in the Qumran texts, as we see with the Qumran community's rigorous observance of the *Sabbath* halakah: According to CD XI 31f., one should not help a troubled animal out of a pit on the Sabbath. Other Jewish groups judged differently here, and Jesus' words (Luke 13:5f.; Matt 12:11) which point out that an animal was untied on the Sabbath in order to drink and that a sheep that had fallen into a pit was pulled out addressed hearers who thought this was legitimate.⁴⁶ In the clearest contrast to

⁴³ J. Frey, "Eschatology in the New Testament. An Introduction," in *Eschatology in the New Testament and Some Related Documents* (ed. J. G. van der Watt; WUNT II/315; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 3–32.

⁴⁴ Stuckenbruck, "Dead Sea Scrolls," 152.

⁴⁵ Cf. Stuckenbruck, "Dead Sea Scrolls," 150f; furthermore, L. Doering, "Marriage and Creation in Mark 10 and CD 4–5," in *Echoes from the Caves. Qumran and the New Testament* (ed. F. Garcia Martínez; STDJ 85; Leiden et al.: Brill, 2009), 133–163, and M. Kister, "Divorce, Reproof and Other Sayings in the Synoptic Gospels. Jesus Traditions in the Context of 'Qumranic' and Other Texts," in *Text, Thought, and Practice in Qumran and Early Christianity* (ed. R. Clements and D. R. Schwartz; STDJ 84; Leiden et al.: Brill, 2008), 195–229.

⁴⁶ As is pointed out by Stuckenbruck, "Dead Sea Scrolls," 158.

the rigorous purity of the *yahad*, Jesus considered “nothing outside a person by going in ... but the things that come out” (Mark 7:15) to be unclean and demonstrated this by eating with tax collectors and sinners and invited the blind and the lepers to have table fellowship with him (Luke 14:12–14, 21). On the other hand, the *yahad* excluded all those with physical defects from the assembly because they would be inappropriate in the presence of the holy angels (1QSa II 3–11).⁴⁷ New members were permitted to touch “the pure (food) of the Many” and “the drink of the Many” (1QS VI 4–16, 20–23) only after years of probation and repeated examination.⁴⁸ We can even ask if the citation from Matt 5:43 that “You shall love your neighbor and hate your enemy!” is not taken up from views as uttered in the communal liturgy 1QS I 9f., which demands love for the fellow members and hatred for the outsiders of all who wish to enter into the “covenant” of the *yahad*.⁴⁹ Such a direct reference, of course, cannot be positively proven.

(d) The comparisons described above were made within the “old” paradigm wherein the primary concern was how Jesus’ positions relate to the Qumran community. The new texts – especially those that are probably not from the *yahad*⁵⁰ – have not only brought new parallels but have also fundamentally altered the questions. It is no longer a question of “Jesus and the Essenes” or “primitive Christianity and the Qumran community,” but a question of the deep anchoring of the Jesus tradition in the language, traditions, and literary forms of contemporary Judaism. The following represents a few examples:

Some words and phrases from the Jesus tradition are now, for the first time, attested in a Hebrew or an Aramaic parallel. Thus, for example, the “poor in spirit” of Matt 5:3 has direct parallels only in the Qumran writings⁵¹ and can be interpreted from there as “humble” or “desperate.”

With regard to the history of literary genres, the series of sapiential beatitudes (makarisms) attested in 4Q525 is particularly interesting. Like Matt 5:3–10, this series ends with an extended beatitude which, like Matt 5:3–10, mentions the attitude posture “with a pure heart.” Thus, it becomes clear that the form of Jesus’ makarisms themselves and, in particular, their Matthean

⁴⁷ Cf. also 4Q267 17 i 6–9. The exclusion of physically disabled individuals is also encountered in the eschatological war, which requires special cultic purity, and is also mentioned in the Temple Scroll as a rule for the holy city (11QT^a XLV 21, 26).

⁴⁸ Cf. Kuhn, “Jesus,” 1263.

⁴⁹ 1QS I 9f.: “to love all the children of the light but to hate all the children of the darkness.”

⁵⁰ On this aspect, see G. J. Brooke, “The Pre-Sectarian Jesus,” in *Echoes*, 33–48.

⁵¹ Cf. 1QM XIV 7 and 1QH^a VI 14 (cf. 1QS XI 1), where *‘nāwê rū^qh* should be understood in the sense of “humble” = “humbled in the spirit” or “desperate” – which also makes the most sense in Matt 5:3. Cf. U. Luz, *Mt 1–7*, vol. 1 of *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus* (EKK I/1; 5th ed.; Zürich: Benziger, 2002), 278f.

expression as a series with sapiential characteristics are shaped by a Palestinian-Jewish matrix.⁵²

In general, the new wisdom texts found at Qumran (particularly 1Q/4Q Instruction and 1Q/4Q Mysteries) are of the utmost importance. For in them, we find a previously unknown form of Jewish wisdom⁵³ that existed at the same time as Ben Sira's, in which the wisdom tradition is combined with apocalyptic elements such as ideas of a primordial fall, a final judgment, and a hidden wisdom concerning the order of beings that is only accessible to a few ("Mystery of Being" [*rāz nihyæh*]).⁵⁴ Thus, the alternative between a primarily or even entirely sapiential and an apocalyptic understanding of Jesus – which is occasionally set up in (especially North American) Jesus research – has proven to be inadequate.⁵⁵ Both elements are already connected in the Palestinian-Jewish wisdom tradition, and it would be problematic to create strict separations between the two in the Jesus tradition.

Another text, 4Q500, provides an interpretation of the vineyard from Isa 5 as a reference to Jerusalem and the temple. This is methodologically revolutionary because exegesis had held the opinion for a long time that all allegorical references in Jesus' parables (e.g., even in Mark 12:1–11) are a later addition, understandable only to the Hellenistic community. But if such references are now documented in a Palestinian-Jewish interpretation, these new sources provide us significant justification for revising the formal-historical

⁵² On this point, see H. Lichtenberger, "Makarismen in den Qumrantexten und im Neuen Testament," in *Wisdom and Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Biblical Tradition* (ed. F. García Martínez; BETL 168; Leuven et al.; Brill: 2003), 395–411; G. H. Brooke, "The Wisdom of Matthew's Beatitudes," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament* (ed. idem; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2005), 217–234.

⁵³ D. J. Harrington, "Two Early Jewish Approaches to Wisdom," *DSD* 4 (1997): 245–254; for an overview, see M. J. Goff, *Discerning Wisdom. The Sapiential Literature of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (VTSup 116; Leiden et al.: Brill, 2007).

⁵⁴ On the important text of 4QInstruction, see E. J. C. Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning for the Understanding Ones. Reading and Reconstructing the Fragmentary Early Jewish Sapiential Text 4QInstruction* (STDJ 44; Leiden et al.: Brill, 2001); M. J. Goff, *The Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom of 4QInstruction* (STDJ 50; Leiden et al.: Brill, 2003); J.-S. Rey, *4QInstruction. Sagesse et eschatologie* (STDJ 81; Leiden et al.: Brill, 2009).

⁵⁵ J. Frey, "Die Apokalyptik als Herausforderung der neutestamentlichen Wissenschaft. Zum Problem: Jesus und die Apokalyptik," in *Apokalyptik als Herausforderung neutestamentlicher Theologie* (ed. M. Becker and M. Öhler; WUNT II/214; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006), 23–94 (also in idem, *Von Jesus zur neutestamentlichen Theologie: Kleine Schriften 2* (ed. Benjamin Schliesser; WUNT 368; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016, 85–157); J. J. Collins, "Wisdom, Apocalypticism and Generic Compatibility," in *Seers, Sibyls and Sages in Hellenistic-Roman Judaism* (ed. idem; JSJS 54; Leiden et al.: Brill, 1997), 385–404.

assumptions that claim that allegorical references in Jesus' parables were necessarily secondary additions.⁵⁶

New parallels also emerged with regard to the concept of God's kingdom or royal rule. About 25 years ago, it was clear that this motif played "no significant role" in early Judaism,⁵⁷ and some interpreters even wanted to explain the concept from Hellenistic-Jewish thought.⁵⁸ Meanwhile – apart from the book of Daniel, some pseudigraphic texts, and some Jewish prayers⁵⁹ – the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*, an "angelic liturgy" for the thirteen Sabbaths in a quarter found in Qumran and also Masada, included the praise of God's heavenly kingship (*malkût*) in great density. It becomes clear that the kingdom, which is expected and hoped for in other texts, is already connected in ancient Jewish thought with the kingdom of God, which is already realized in heaven.⁶⁰ This kingdom is a spatial dimension that must be entered into. At the same time, however, the earthly community is already able to participate in this kingdom through its praise. Jesus' proclamation of God's *malkût* / βασιλεία should be understood within this context. This motif has – if one adds to it the synagogal prayers – a greater significance in contemporary discourse than research (in the interest of maintaining the "originality" of Jesus) was willing to concede for some time.

IV. *The Qumran Discoveries and the Beginnings of Christology*

As already mentioned, the Qumran discoveries help us understand the beginnings of Christology, its roots, and its earliest development as a completely inner-Jewish phenomenon. Through these discoveries, our sources in reference to the eschatological and messianic hopes around the turn of an era have

⁵⁶ See G. J. Brooke, "4Q500 1 and the Use of Scripture in the Parable of the Vineyard," in *Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. idem), 235–260.

⁵⁷ O. Camponovo, *Königtum, Königsherrschaft und Reich Gottes in den frühjüdischen Schriften* (OBO 58; Freiburg: Schweiz Universität Verlag, 1984), 437; on the other hand, see M. Hengel and A. M. Schwemer, "Vorwort," in *Königsherrschaft Gottes und himmlischer Kult im Judentum, Urchristentum und in der hellenistischen Welt* (WUNT 55; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1991), 1–19, here 1f.

⁵⁸ B. L. Mack, "The Kingdom Sayings in Mark" *Forum* 3.1 (1987): 3–47), 16; for a critical response, see 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; Leiden et al.: Brill, 1999), 2:573–598, here 2:575–578.

⁵⁹ Important here is the 11th benediction of the Amidah (the Eighteen Benedictions) as well as the Qaddish which is often considered closely with the Lord's Prayer, but is difficult to date (see A. Lehnardt, *Qaddish. Entstehung und Rezeption eines jüdischen Gebets* (TSAJ 87; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002).

⁶⁰ Evans, "Jesus," 583; see the detailed presentation in A. M. Schwemer, "Gott als König und seine Königsherrschaft in den Sabbatliedern aus Qumran," in *Königsherrschaft*, 45–118.

been substantially broadened,⁶¹ and a much more multifaceted image has emerged that definitely eliminates the idea of a fixed ‘messianic doctrine.’ Pluriform eschatological expectations, with or without a salvific figure and with various “categories” of expected figures, stand side by side: Royal, prophetic, and priestly traits occur in various texts from Qumran, and these traits occasionally coalesce.⁶² In addition to the “classical” expectation of a royal, Davidic Messiah, which was common not least thanks to its liturgical reception in the synagogal use of the Amidah,⁶³ there was the hope for an end-time high priest (in texts close to the Levi-tradition⁶⁴) or a priestly “messianic Aaron”,⁶⁵ furthermore, other texts take up prophetic traditions of (an) anointed one(s)⁶⁶ or expect a prophet like Moses.⁶⁷ In individual texts, there is talk of an elevation or enthronement,⁶⁸ or even the salvific figure himself bears heavenly references as in the *Melchizedek Midrash* (11QMelch). Specific to Qumran is only the expectation of two “messiahs,” one priestly and one political-military (CD XIX 33–XX 1). However, this does not appear in all group-specific texts, which shows that even in the *yahad*, there existed no uniform, hard and fast image of the messiah and that one could obviously live with the variety of hopes.

One (non-group-specific) text provides essential insights into the background of messianism as related to Jesus, the so-called *Messianic Apocalypse*

⁶¹ Foundational is J. J. Collins, *The Scepter and the Star. Messianism in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (2nd ed.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010); J. Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte aus Qumran. Königliche, priesterliche und prophetische Messiasvorstellungen in den Schriftfunden von Qumran* (WUNT II/104; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998); On eschatology, see now A. L. A. Hogeterp, *Expectations of the End. A Comparative Tradition-Historical Study of Eschatological, Apocalyptic and Messianic Ideas in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament* (STDJ 83; Leiden et al.: Brill, 2009).

⁶² See the articulate overview in Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte*.

⁶³ Cf. in Qumran texts the discourse of the “shoot of David” in 4Q174 III 11 (the “*Midrash on Eschatology*,” formerly called Florilegium) and in the commentary on Genesis 4Q252 I V 3; the discourse of the “prince” of the community (1QSb V 20ff., etc.) or even the discourse of the “Son of God”/“Son of the Most High” in the controversial text 4Q246; Also, the “Messiah of Israel” belongs in the “double” messianic expectation of some texts (1QS IX 11; 4Q175 14–20; cf. CD XII 22–XIII 1; XIV 18; XIX 10f.; XX 1).

⁶⁴ For example, 4Q541 speaks of an eschatological high priest, but without any mention of an “anointing.”

⁶⁵ Thus in the texts that mention a “double” messianic expectation as seen above in n. 63.

⁶⁶ In particular, 4Q521 2 II 1 (see below) and in connection with the priestly elements, see 11QMelch.

⁶⁷ Thus, the relationship between Deut 18:15 and 4Q175 5–8 – in connection with the Davidic hope (4Q175 14–20).

⁶⁸ Thus in the difficult to interpret *Self Enthronement Hymn* of 4Q491 11 I.

4Q521.⁶⁹ In column II, line 1 of this text, it reads, “The heavens and the earth will listen to his anointed one(s) (*yišm’û limšihô/limšihāw*).” Is this, then, a reference to a or “the” Messiah? Or is it a reference to several anointed ones, for example, the prophets?⁷⁰ After this, a series of events is announced whose subject is not the anointed but God himself. These events will evidently take place during the end-time:

“And his spirit will ‘hover’ over the poor; and he will renew the faithful with his strength. Yes, he will honor the pious on the throne of his eternal kingdom. He frees the prisoners, he opens the eyes of the blind, he directs the twisted ones Then he will heal the slain and will bring the dead back to life. He will proclaim glad tidings to the poor. He satisfies the humble, he leads the deserted, and he makes those who hunger rich”⁷¹

Eschatological promises from Scripture, above all from the book of Isaiah (Isa 26:35; 61; among others) and Ps 146 are combined here, and it is clear how close these passages come to Jesus’ response to the Baptist (Luke 7:22 || Matt 11:5) where he says, “the blind see, the lame walk, the lepers are made clean, the deaf hear the dead are risen, good news is proclaimed to the poor, the good will to the one who takes no offense at me.”

The text shows what was hoped for in certain circles of Palestinian Judaism for the messianic age, making it clear that Jesus’ healings and exorcisms as well as his proclamation to the poor of his contemporaries could be interpreted as signs of the messianic time against such a background marked by biblical hopes. This makes it plausible that messianic hopes were carried over to Jesus and then formed the occasion that he himself would be denounced as a messianic pretender and crucified as such by the ordinance of the Romans. The swift and uniform post-Easter use of the title “the Christ” for Jesus can only be explained if his appearance had aroused messianic expectations and if this also played a certain role in the events surrounding his death.⁷² Texts like 4Q521 reveal the framework in which this could take place.

⁶⁹ The literature is extensive. In particular, see M. Becker, “Die ‘messianische Apokalypse’ 4Q521 und der Interpretationsrahmen der Taten Jesu,” in *Apokalyptik und Qumran* (Einblicke 10; Paderborn: Bonifatius, 2007), 237–303.

⁷⁰ The singular reading would be the more orthographically normal one, but from other fragments of the text a pluralistic reading is plausible as in M. Becker, “4Q521 und die Gesalbten,” *RevQ* 18 (1997): 73–96 and K.-W. Niebuhr, “4Q 521,2 II – ein eschatologischer Psalm,” in *Mogilany 1995. Papers on the Dead Sea Scrolls Offered in Memory of Aleksy Klawek* (ed. Z. J. Kapera; Kraków: Enigma Press, 1998), 151–168. See the discussion in Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte*, 379–389.

⁷¹ Translation according to Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte*, 344f. Line 13 completed according to J. Maier, *Die Qumran-Essener. Die Texte vom Toten Meer* (Stuttgart: UTB, 1995), 2:684.

⁷² See J. Frey, “Der historische Jesus und der Christus der Evangelien,” in *Der historische Jesus. Tendenzen und Perspektiven der gegenwärtigen Forschung* (ed. J. Schröter and R. Brucker; BZNW 114; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2002), 273–336, here 301–313, also in idem,

The textual discoveries at Qumran make it possible to reconstruct the development of Christology in a new context. Many earlier conceptions of what was thought to be “non-Jewish” and therefore only explainable in light of pagan influences are now outdated. The new, much broader insight into the interpretive practice and literary production of early Judaism during the latter part of the Second Temple period allows us to explain the emergence of early Christology on the basis of Jewish roots. The theses of the history-of-religions school and their successors, which claim that speech about the exaltation of Christ to the right hand of God, about the “Son of God,” about the *kyrios*, and about the “cultic” invocation of Christ would be unthinkable within a Palestinian-Jewish framework and could only be explained within a Hellenistic environment, are now to be abandoned. Accordingly, numerous scholars are reconstructing the processes in an entirely Jewish framework,⁷³ in the context of contemporary messianic thought, of ideas about the elevation of biblical figures such as Enoch, Moses, and Elijah, of traditions about angels and mediators, and of certain forms of the eschatological interpretation of Scripture. The development of early Christology did not necessarily lead to the so-called “parting of the ways” between the Jesus movement and synagogal Judaism. The break with the synagogue took place much later and for different reasons.⁷⁴ On the other hand, the development of early Christology

Von Jesus zur neutestamentlichen Theologie: Kleine Schriften 2 (ed. Benjamin Schliesser; WUNT 368; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016, 29–84, here 59–73); also M. Hengel, “Jesus der Messias Israels,” in *Der messianische Anspruch Jesu und die Anfänge der Christologie* (WUNT 138; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001), 1–80.

⁷³ See the report of A. Chester, “High Christology – Whence, When, and Why?” *Early Christianity 2* (2011): 22–50; Foundational are the works of M. Hengel, *Studien zur Christologie. Kleine Schriften IV* (ed. C. J. Thornton; WUNT 201; Mohr Siebeck, 2006) as well as the pronounced counter proposal to the history-of-religions school by L. W. Hurtado, *Lord Jesus Christ. Devotion to Jesus in Earliest Christianity* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003). Cf. also my article J. Frey, “Eine neue religionsgeschichtliche Perspektive. Larry W. Hurtados *Lord Jesus Christ* und die Herausbildung der frühen Christologie,” in *Reflections on Early Christian History of Religion / Erwägungen zur frühchristlichen Religionsgeschichte* (ed. C. Breytenbach and J. Frey; AJEC 81; Leiden et al.: Brill, 2012), 117–169.

⁷⁴ On the “parting of ways,” see J. Frey, “Temple and Identity in Early Christianity and in the Johannine Community. Reflections on the ‘Parting of the Ways,’” in *Was 70 CE a Watershed in Jewish History? On Jews and Judaism before and after the Destruction of the Second Temple* (ed. D. R. Schwartz and Z. Weiss; AJEC 78; Leiden et al.: Brill, 2012), 447–50; idem, “Von Paulus zu Johannes. Die Diversität ‘christlicher’ Gemeindekreise und die ‘Trennungsprozesse’ zwischen der Synagoge und den Gemeinden der Jesusnachfolger in Ephesus im ersten Jahrhundert,” in *The Rise and Expansion of Early Christianity* (ed. C. K. Rothschild and J. Schröter; WUNT 301; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), 235–278; idem, “Toward Reconfiguring Our Views on the ‘Parting of the Ways’: Ephesus as a Test Case,” in *John and Judaism: A Contested Relationship in Context* (eds. R. A. Culpepper and P. N. Anderson; SBLRBS 87; Atlanta: SBL-Press, 2017), 221–239.

can be conceived of within the framework of the plural strands of early Judaism that have now become recognizable.

V. The Qumran Discoveries and Paul's Roots in Judaism

The relevance of the Qumran discoveries also applies to Paul, which I can only briefly address here. Especially for the apostle to the Gentiles, scholars often adopted a distance from Judaism and explained his christological-soteriological ideas from pagan influences. Accordingly, Paul appeared to be the true founder of Christianity.⁷⁵ Viewing Paul's thought in this light opened up a deep chasm between him and the religion of Palestinian Judaism and thus with the religion of Jesus and his first disciples. This approach was not only a result of a skeptical attitude regarding the truthfulness of the claim in Acts 5:34 that Paul studied Pharisaic law in Jerusalem,⁷⁶ but was also a result of the simple lack of sources from Palestinian Judaism before 70 CE.

It is, therefore, of great importance that the Qumran discoveries have brought to light a number of linguistic phrases that can be regarded as parallels to Pauline formulations and the Palestinian-Jewish roots of Pauline thought, or at least some of its elements. The Jewish imprint and identity of the oldest Christian author has been reaffirmed from this point onwards. This imprint and identity entirely corresponds to Paul's own self-testimony, for he never wanted to be anything but a member of the divine people and, as such, an apostle of Christ and a messenger of salvation.⁷⁷

The parallels in the group-specific texts from Qumran cannot be evaluated in the sense of a direct Qumranic influence. Paul had probably never read the texts of the *yahad*, in which a strict arcane discipline reigned.⁷⁸ But the parallels prove that Paul's formulations rely on Jewish linguistic forms, and if Qumran offers the only clear parallels, one can more precisely identify them as Palestinian-Jewish. Here, I will mention only the most important parallels

⁷⁵ Lastly, with recourse to the history-of-religions school, see G. Lüdemann, *Paulus, der Gründer des Christentums* (Lüneburg: zu Klampen Verlag, 2001); from a Jewish (outsider-) perspective, see also H. Maccoby, *The Mythmaker. Paul and the Invention of Christianity* (London: Harper & Row, 1986).

⁷⁶ It was inferred from Gal 1:22f. that Paul had never been to Jerusalem; Heitmüller, "Problem." See also W. Wrede *Paulus* (Halle: Gebauer-Schwetschke, 1904).

⁷⁷ J. Frey, "Das Judentum des Paulus," in *Paulus. Leben – Umwelt – Werk – Briefe* (ed. O. Wischmeyer; 2nd ed.; UTB; Tübingen: Francke, 2012), 25–65; idem, "Paul's Jewish Identity," in *Jewish Identity in the Greco-Roman World* (ed. idem, D. R. Schwartz, and S. Gripentrog; AJECT 71; Leiden et al.: Brill, 285–321); Also foundational is K.-W. Niebuhr, *Heidenapostel aus Israel. Die jüdische Identität des Paulus nach ihrer Darstellung in seinen Briefen* (WUNT 62; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1992); lastly, M. Tiewald, *Hebräer von Hebräern. Paulus auf dem Hintergrund frühjüdischer Argumentation und biblischer Interpretation* (HBS 52; Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 2008).

⁷⁸ Cf. 1QS IV 5f.; IX 16f.; X 24f.; also Josephus, *J.W.* II 141.

that have been known for some time, and then I will interpret a more important text.⁷⁹

(a) If Paul calls the Christians “children of light” or “of the day,” then he uses a semantically colored term, which often occurs in Qumran as the self-designation of the community members (1QS I 9–11; II 16; 1QM I 1, 3, 9; among others). However, this phrase occurs in pre-Qumranic texts⁸⁰ and cannot be considered to be a direct influence. Nevertheless, it attests to a Palestinian-Jewish linguistic tradition behind Paul’s theological language.

(b) The central Pauline concept of the “righteousness of God” has no exact parallels in the Hebrew Bible. In the Qumran texts, the Hebrew phrase that corresponds to the Greek δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ was found for the first time.⁸¹ In the hymns of the *yahad*, in the *Hodayot*, there is a loose parallel to the “revelation of the righteousness of God” (Rom 1:17).⁸²

(c) The image of the community as a “temple” in 1 Cor 3:16f. has close parallels in Qumran and other early Jewish texts. The Qumran community understood itself to be a “temple of men” (4Q174 = 4QMidrEschat III 6) and the “house of Aaron” (1QS VIII 5; cf. IX 6) in which God’s holiness is present. Both in Qumran (1QS VIII 5; XI 8; also *Jub.* 1:16f.) and in Paul (1 Cor 3:9–17), the idea of the temple and construction is connected with the broader concept of a “planting” God.⁸³ Paul, therefore, takes up concepts that are widespread in the Jewish tradition and that are already connected with each other – even when he is writing to a primarily Gentile Christian audience.

⁷⁹ Cf. J. A. Fitzmyer, “Paul and the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *Dead Sea Scrolls*, 599–621; H.-W. Kuhn, “Qumran und Paulus. Unter traditionsgeschichtlichem Aspekt ausgewählte Parallelen,” in *Das Urchristentum in seiner literarischen Geschichte*. FS J. Becker (ed. U. Mell and U. B. Müller; BZNW 100; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1999), 227–246; T. Lim, “Paul, Letters of,” *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. L. H. Schiffman and J. C. VanderKam; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 2:638–641.

⁸⁰ Thus in the Visions of Amram in 4QAmram^f (4Q548) frg. 1, line 16 (there at line 10, 13 also “sons of darkness.” This cosmic dualism is not originally from Qumran; see, in detail, J. Frey, “Different Patterns of Dualism in the Qumran Library,” in *Legal Texts and Legal Issues. Proceedings of the Second Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Cambridge, 1995* (ed. M. J. Bernstein, F. García Martínez, and J. Kampen; STDJ 25; Leiden et al.: Brill, 1997), 275–335, here 295–300 and 313–326 (in this volume, 243–299, here 262–267 and 278–290).

⁸¹ *šidqat ’el* (1QS X 25; XI 12) or *šædaq ’el* (1QM IV 6). See Fitzmyer, “Paul,” 614f.

⁸² *w^enig^ltah šidqatō* 1QH^a VI 26f. (=XIV 15f. ed. Sukenik). Here, it is clear that the understanding of righteousness is different; however, the fact that it can be revealed is parallel.

⁸³ The image of the planting stands for the antecedent of the *yahad* in CD I 9. On the connection between the two metaphors in Paul, see A. L. A. Hogeterp, *Paul and God’s Temple. A Historical Interpretation of Cultic Imagery in the Corinthian Correspondence* (Biblical Tools and Studies 2; Leuven: Peeters, 2006), 316–322.

(d) The dualistic antithesis of “flesh” and “spirit” (Gal 5:17; Rom 8:4ff.) and primarily the notion of “flesh” as a power hostile to God that forcefully agitates individuals towards sin, which occurs in this form within the New Testament only in Paul, cannot be explained from the Old Testament or Hellenistic Judaism (Wis, Philo).⁸⁴ However, it has the closest parallels in Qumran texts wherein “flesh” (*bāsār*) is associated with “transgression” and “sin” (1QS XI 9–14; 1QHa XII 30f.). Of course, it can hardly be said that Paul was influenced by the texts of the *yahad*. The dilemma concerning the connection between these texts is solved when the new wisdom texts, probably derived from predecessor groups of the *yahad*, revealed how this negative connotation of *bāsār* had gradually emerged and was then received by, among other groups, the Qumran community. This means, then, that Paul uses a motif that comes from a branch of the Palestinian-Jewish wisdom tradition that was heretofore unknown to us.⁸⁵

(e) Many other linguistic and, above all, material parallels could be presented. But I would like to present a text that has particularly animated the discussion concerning Paul for the past three decades. That is, the disputed understanding of the phrase “works of the law” (ἔργα νόμου: Gal 2:16; 3:2, 5, 10; Rom 3:20, 28; Phil 3:9). As with the previous examples, this term is also absent from the Hebrew Bible and the question of what Paul means with the phrase “no man will be justified by the works of the law” (Gal 2:16; Rom 3:20) would become a shibboleth within recent Pauline research. Is it meant that the attempt to obey the law of God is in itself mistaken, as was prominently formulated in the Lutheran tradition by Rudolf Bultmann⁸⁶ – with the old image of Judaism as a religion of merit and of the law as a “path to salvation” in the background? Does Paul wish to say that no one is in fact justified by works because all people are guilty before God? Or does he use “the works of the law” as a reference to specific provisions that defined the boundaries of Judaism such as circumcision and dietary restrictions (i.e., those requirements of the law that became problematic within communities

⁸⁴ The attempt by E. Brandenburger, *Fleisch und Geist. Paulus und die dualistische Weisheit* (WMANT 29; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1968), to explain these elements from Philo and primarily Wisdom of Solomon is not convincing.

⁸⁵ Foundational is J. Frey, “Die paulinische Antithese von ‘Fleisch’ und ‘Geist’ und die palästinisch-jüdische Weisheitstradition,” *ZNW* 90 (1999): 45–77; also in idem, *Von Jesus zur neutestamentlichen Theologie: Kleine Schriften 2* (ed. B. Schliesser; WUNT 368; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016), 265–300; most recently and approvingly Stuckenbruck, “The Dead Sea Scrolls,” 166–168.

⁸⁶ R. Bultmann, “Christus des Gesetzes Ende,” in *Glauben und Verstehen* (ed. idem; 6th ed.; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1993), 2:32–58, specifically 2:45: “The will, as an act of will, is evil from the outset because, even when it wants to do what the law wants (i.e., to do the law in order to live), it also wants to do evil (i.e., to set up one’s own righteousness).” Cf. also idem, *Theologie*, 264f.

that included Jewish and Gentile Christians), as James Dunn has put forward in the context of the “New Perspective on Paul”⁸⁷ Or does “works of the law” mean human acts that confirm to the law⁸⁸ or simply the precepts of the Torah without any consideration of their fulfilment?⁸⁹ How can Paul “depreciate” the Torah, which plays a central role in Jewish thinking, without betraying his Judaism? These issues cannot be further explored in this essay.⁹⁰ However, it is clear that, within this context, the underlying images of Judaism and of Paul’s position in the framework of contemporary Judaism are of central importance.

A text has now been found in Qumran that contains the syntagma “works of the law” (Hebrew *ma ‘ašê hattôrâh*): It is a text that probably belongs to the beginnings of the Qumran movement⁹¹ or the *yahad* and contains a speaker – one is reminded at times of the “Teacher of Righteousness” himself – who presents the inherent significance of the Torah in individual halakic questions (primarily questions pertaining to purity). The text was named 4QMMT after this passage *Miqšat Ma ‘ašê hat-Tora* (“Some of the Works of the Law”):

“We have written to you some of the “works” (or the “regulations”) of the Torah which we have found to be good for you and your people. For we saw that you have intelligence and knowledge of the Law. Consider all these things and ask from him that he might guide your counsel and remove evil intentions from you and the plan of Belial, so that you might experience joy at the end of time when you find that something in our words is right. And

⁸⁷ Foundational is J. D. G. Dunn, “The New Perspective on Paul,” in *The New Perspective on Paul. Collected Essays* (ed. idem; WUNT 185; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005), 89–110; see also the careful modifications of his thesis in the introduction to the very same volume: idem, “The New Perspective: Whence, What, and Whither?” 1–88.

⁸⁸ F. Avemarie, “ἔργον,” *ThBLNT* (ed. L. Coenen and K. Haacker; 2nd ed.; Witten: SCM R. Brockhaus, 2012), 57–59; A. A. Das, *Paul and the Jews* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2003), 40–42.

⁸⁹ Michael Bachmann in a series of essays, initially M. Bachmann, “Rechtfertigung und Gesetzeswerke bei Paulus,” in *Antijudaismus im Galaterbrief? Exegetische Studien zu einem polemischen Schreiben und zur Theologie des Apostels Paulus* (ed. idem; NTOA 40; Freiburg: Schweiz University Verlag, 1999), 1–31; idem, “4QMMT und Galaterbrief. התורה מנשׁי וEPGA NOMOY,” in *Antijudaismus*, 33–56; finally, idem, “Keil oder Mikroskop? Zur jüngeren Diskussion um den Ausdruck “Werke” des Gesetzes,” in *Von Paulus zur Apokalypse – und weiter. Exegetische und rezeptionsgeschichtliche Studien zum Neuen Testament* (ed. idem; NTOA/SUNT 91; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011), 99–160.

⁹⁰ See my remarks on this topic in Frey, “Judentum,” 44–63, specifically 55–63, and the new essay “Contextualizing Paul’s ‘Works of the Law’: MMT in New Testament Scholarship,” in this volume, 743–762.

⁹¹ I consider the connection of the *yahad* with the Essenes, who are known from ancient texts, to be the most convincing hypothesis. On this connection, see Frey, “Auswertung”; also see VanderKam, *Einführung*, 92–114.

it will be reckoned to you as righteousness if you do what is upright and good in his sight for your own sake and for the sake of Israel.”⁹²

The single exact parallel for the otherwise unattested Greek syntagma demonstrates that even here Paul uses terminology that appeals to a Palestinian-Jewish discussion about Torah interpretation. This text is, of course, about individual determinations of a cultic nature by which a distinction is made between two groups. This could serve as an argument in favor of Dunn’s position that the term primarily means boundary markers, which does not exclude the possibility that Paul used the term in Rom 3:20 (among other places) in a more fundamental or broader manner. And even if we can translate *ma’^āšê hat-tôrāh* here as “regulations of the law,” it is nevertheless clear that these are aimed at appropriate action.⁹³ Their observance, which is “good and right” in God’s eyes, “will be counted by God as righteousness” at the end of time. The fundamental horizon of a final judicial assessment of man found here also appears in Paul.

The controversy over the semantics of the Pauline syntagma and more generally over the Pauline interpretation cannot be decided on the basis of such a parallel. However, the text makes it clear that, in his “doctrine of justification,” Paul is more likely to use Jewish terms and discourses than was often thought. The theological, primarily Reformation oriented interpretation of Paul has for too long placed the apostle in contrast to the Judaism of his time and thereby operated with a distorted image of Judaism, which presented the law as a “path to salvation” and thus a “religion of works righteousness.” This distorted image is broken not only by the “New Perspective,” but also by the multifaceted image of Judaism found in the new sources. From many Jewish sources it is clear that the Torah was a joy and not a burden, a calling and not slavery for the one committed to it. Of primary importance is grace in the form of election – even to a life with the Torah. This is also documented in other Qumran texts such as the *Hodayot*. Since Paul, as a former Pharisee, takes the obligation to live according to the Torah more radically than some of his contemporaries, this means that he can hold the position that no human being actually lives up to this standard. Accordingly, he can then redefine righteousness as the gift of God through Christ. But in its struggle over how Gentiles are to be integrated into the end-time people of God, this position is

⁹² 4QMMT C 27–31 in E. Qimron and J. Strugnell, *Qumran Cave 4.V: Miqṣat Ma’āšê Ha-Torah. Discoveries in the Judaean Desert 10* (Leiden: Brill, 1994), 62f.

⁹³ First H.-W. Kuhn, “Die Bedeutung der Qumrantexte für das Verständnis des Galaterbriefs. Aus dem Münchener Projekt: Qumran und das Neue Testament,” in *New Qumran Texts and Studies. Proceedings of the First Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Paris, 1992* (ed. G. J. Brooke; STDJ 15; Leiden et al.: Brill, 1994), 2010; now modified in idem, “Qumran,” 232: “some works, which are to be done according to the law.”

also a Jewish one; it is more strongly influenced by the questions of the Diaspora, but it is entirely within the framework of the discourse of the plural Judaism of its time. This new, plural image of ancient Judaism, which is essentially brought to light through the extended source basis of the Dead Sea literature, also helps us better understand Paul's texts within their discourse context and to correct fatal theological misconceptions.

One might now object that, in the argument presented here, the hermeneutical task of reading Jewish texts in their own right was not fulfilled. I, too, have used some of the texts as a "quarry" for parallels and have chosen them according to their "usefulness" in interpreting the New Testament. Often, the references can be presented in no other way. However, the hermeneutical requirement should be met by the fact that we now have an entirely new, general picture of a pluralistic Judaism with lively discourses and manifold eschatological hopes, a new view of apocalypticism and the wisdom tradition, and also a new image of the initially wholly Jewish Jesus movement. From here, the theological discussion can also proceed on a new foundation.

C. Perspectives: Theses on the Hermeneutical Task of New Testament Research with Regard to Ancient Judaism

(1) New Testament research must investigate the Jewish world around Jesus and of Early Christianity if it wants to perceive rightly the origin of the New Testament texts, the relevant questions and discourses, and the patterns of speech and manners of thinking therein. Practically all the New Testament texts come from within this milieu. We must be familiar with this milieu if we do not want to interpret the texts according to old prejudices, ecclesiastical traditions, or ideas foreign to the texts themselves. Perception of historical contexts is also an elementary theological task of biblical scholarship inspired by the Reformation.

(2) Of significant interest from a historical perspective, particularly in the context of *ancient* Judaism, is the Second Temple period, in particular the time of Judaism's encounter with the Hellenistic world and the Roman Empire, the Jewish struggles for identity and freedom, and also the period of consolidation of Judaism and the codification of its tradition after the destruction of the temple until the end of late antiquity.

(3) In this respect, scholarly interests in teaching and researching ancient Judaism also belong within the purview of a theological faculty and its biblical studies department, even though the Judaism of this period is also the subject of Jewish studies, study of religion, or ancient history within the context of the Classics. In international and interdisciplinary discourse on the texts and topics, these specialist cultures come together. This has long been

self-evident in the fields of Qumran research or research on Josephus and Philo.

(4) The theological research of the Bible, which has a special interest in the early Jewish texts and contexts, carries a special historical mortgage: It comes with a history of devaluation and distortion of Jewish views and has, for a long time, used the exploration of Judaism for its own theological reasoning and viewed Jewish studies as well as the study of religions rather as “maids of theology” (*ancillae theologiae*), i.e., as disciplines that had to serve theological aims. Both have become independent and self-confident enough to oppose this and to pose different questions of the shared texts, and this is a gain, not a loss, for New Testament scholarship.

(5) All this is possible only because New Testament biblical studies is practiced at the *university*, in the interdisciplinary and international exchange of ideas and not in the nook of an ecclesiastical or group-specific institution where the danger of dependence on group interests, ideology, or even simply the supposedly pious act of self-restraint are always at play. The presence of biblical studies in the university is, therefore, of the greatest theological *and* ecclesiastical interest precisely because here it experiences the benefits of challenges to its perspectives by other competing disciplines and viewpoints.

(6) The fact that this discourse is conducted is, at the same time, of high social importance because Jewish-Christian tradition, as one of the essential foundations of our Western culture, is characterized by a special ability it has achieved in its history in numerous struggles and processes: the ability to integrate that which is strange into itself, whereby it is not simply transformed, but always remains bulky and thus keeps the discourse open both internally and externally.

(7) The Judaism at the root of the Christian faith assures the historical concreteness of the Christian faith. It offers a counterbalance to any tendency to ideologize and is indispensable to the preservation of the identity founded at its beginning. To investigate that which is strange in one’s own framework as an advocate of its right to reclaim what belongs to it in the text and to understand anew one’s own origins in light of that which is strange is the hermeneutical task of New Testament research.

2. Qumran: An Overview*

Qumran is the site of the most important discovery of ancient Jewish writings that has brought fundamentally new insights into the Hebrew Bible and its origins; the history, literature, and thought of Palestinian Judaism; and the Jewish roots of Christianity. For the first time, significant Hebrew and Aramaic texts from around the time of the turn of the era came to light from eleven caves. Previously, the older research on Judaism between the closure of the Hebrew Bible and the early rabbinic literature had relied entirely on Greek texts (primarily Josephus) and texts in secondary translations (Latin, Syrian, Ethiopian, Slavonic, etc.). Given the importance of the issues for the understanding of Jesus and Early Christianity, the findings stimulated broad public interest, provoked conspiracy theories, inspired novelists, and unleashed legal and political disputes over property rights and access to texts. The questions to be addressed here are the relationship between textual studies and archaeology, the interpretation of the ruins, the identification of their ancient users, and the variety of the texts and their significance for the understanding of early Christian texts.

A. Location and Archaeology

I. The Location

Khirbet Qumran is located on a marl terrace over the western shore of the Dead Sea, north of Wadi Qumran, and had several periods of settlement from the Iron Age down to the Byzantine period. Although Qumran was not completely secluded in antiquity, it was off the beaten track. West of the Dead Sea, there was only a small mule track that was unsuitable for suprarregional

* The present overview was written in 2016 for the *Realenzyklopädie für Antike und Christentum (RAC)*, and due to the aims of this encyclopedia, its focus is on the significance of Qumran and its textual discoveries for the understanding of Early Christianity, rather than ancient Judasim. In some of its sections, it provides a recent summary of findings which are more thoroughly discussed in other articles in the present volume. I am grateful to Francesco Zanella for his editorial advice on behalf of the *RAC* redaction, and to the publishers Mohr Siebeck (especially Katharina Gutekunst) and Hiersemann for settling the copyright issues in this case.

trade.¹ As early as the 19th century, the ruins and graves were noted and interpreted as remnants of the biblical Gomorrah, as a Roman fortress, or as a burial ground of a tribe of Ahab. A connection was presumed with the *‘ir-ammælah* = “salt city” named in Josh 15:62.² A religious interpretation of the site, however, arose only after the textual discoveries within the context of the Qumran-Essene hypothesis.³ It is possible that the term *mešad ḥasîdîn* (“fortress of the pious”), which appears in a letter from the Bar Kochba period that came from Wadi Murabba’at (Mur 45 6), is a reference to this location.⁴

II. The Archeological Discoveries

The ruins of Qumran were explored by Ronald de Vaux from 1951–1956; his (incomplete) excavation report⁵ has had a significant influence on the Qumran-Essene hypothesis. The interpretation of the compound is disputed: the “consensus hypothesis”⁶ interprets the compound in connection with the textual discoveries; alternative interpretations initially or generally abstain from this connection, interpreting Qumran primarily in the regional context and in a partially non-religious context, or even postulate that there are no links between the compound and the texts.⁷ However, more recent investigations concerning the ink and clay seem to exclude a complete separation of location and the textual discoveries.⁸

¹ J. E. Taylor and S. Gibson, “Qumran Connected: The Qumran Pass and Paths of the North-Western,” in *Qumran und die Archäologie* (ed. J. Frey, C. Claußen, and N. Kessler; WUNT 278; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 163–209.

² N. Noth, *Das Buch Josua* (HdbAT 1, 7; Tübingen: Mohr, 1938), 72.

³ C. Claußen, “Die Identifizierung der Grabungsstätte Khirbet Qumran,” in *Qumran und die Archäologie* (ed. J. Frey, C. Claußen, and N. Kessler; WUNT 278; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 51–72.

⁴ H. Stegemann, *Die Essener, Qumran, Johannes der Täufer und Jesus* (10th ed.; Freiburg: Herder, 2007), 53–54.

⁵ R. de Vaux, *Archeology and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (London: Oxford University Press, 1973).

⁶ J. Magness and E. M. Meyers, “Khirbet Qumran and Its Environs,” in *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. T. H. Lim and J. J. Collins; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 21–45.

⁷ N. Golb, *Who Wrote the Dead Sea Scrolls? The Search for the Secret of Qumran* (New York: Touchstone, 1995); Y. Hirschfeld, *Qumran in Context: Reassessing the Archaeological Evidence* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2004); Y. Magen and Y. Peleg, “Back to Qumran: Ten Years of Excavation and Research, 1993–2004,” in *Back to Qumran: Ten Years of Excavation and Research, 1993–2004* (ed. K. Galor, J.-B. Humbert, and J. Zangenberg; STDJ 57; Leiden: Brill, 2005), 55–113.

⁸ For a discussion of this point, see H.-J. Fabry, “Archäologie und Text. Versuch einer Verhältnisbestimmung am Beispiel von Chirbet Qumran,” in *Texte – Fakten – Artefakte. Beiträge zur Bedeutung der Archäologie für die neutestamentliche Forschung* (ed. M.

In the Iron Age (8th–7th century BCE), there was a Judean building with a courtyard and a cistern that were probably destroyed with the fall of Judah in 586 BCE. After a settlement break of over 400 years, the repopulation of the area took place in two phases. However, Phase Ia (130–100 BCE), identified by de Vaux, cannot be distinguished from the numismatically clearly datable phase Ib (ca. 100–31 BCE or longer), so that recently only a shorter Phase I (ca. 100–50 BCE until the earthquake of 31 BCE or later) is assumed, which is to be distinguished from Phase II (4 BCE–68CE). The damage caused by the earthquake of 31 BCE (burn marks, cracks in the ritual baths) is clearly visible, but the gap in settlement between 31 BCE up until the death of Herod in 4 CE suspected by de Vaux is questionable.⁹ Qumran was destroyed in 68 CE by Vespasian's troops (Josephus, *J.W.* IV 477–478). This was followed by a short use (Phase III) of parts of the compound by Roman occupying forces, who left the location (probably after the fall of Masada in 73 CE). Qumran served as a shelter for fighters in the Bar Kokhba War (132–135 CE) and was then abandoned. Despite a few coins from the Byzantine (and Islamic) time, use of the building by Christian monks cannot be proven.

The compound (ca. 80 x 100 m) is characterized by an elaborate water supply system: Water was supplied from the wadi via an aqueduct and was stored in cisterns. Ten ritual baths with staircases show a high degree of interest in ritual purity, which speaks for the compound's use by a religious group, although some of the "pools" may have also been used for the purposes of craftsmanship. In the central two-storied building (15 x 15 m) with a masonry defense tower, inkwells and long benches were discovered, probably from the upper floor. From the presence of these items, de Vaux concluded that the area functioned as a "scriptorium," and he suspected that the ground floor functioned as a library.¹⁰ Attested within the compound are a pottery room with two kilns as well as a meeting room (ca. 22 x 4.5 m), which can be identified as a dining room by the dishes in the next room and by the fact that it could be flooded with water. The maximum number of inhabitants can be estimated to be about 80–100 people. Since the buildings offered hardly any housing for this number, it is likely that many residents slept in tents or in nearby caves. The ceramics found in the compound (clay jugs, inkwell, crockery) correspond to those found in the caves, but are also comparable to the ceramics of neighboring sites. Glassware, coins, and everyday objects were also found, as well as "buried" animal bones in the vicinity of the building, probably leftovers whose background has not yet been adequately ex-

Küchler and K. M. Schmidt; NTOA 59; Fribourg and Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2006), 69–102; J. Frey, "Qumran and Archaeology," in this volume.

⁹ J. Magness, *The Archaeology of Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Grand Rapids and Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2002), 47–72.

¹⁰ Stegemann, *Essener*, 59–62.

plained.¹¹ It is, however, questionable to conclude from these buried bones some type of cultic sacrifice.¹²

The compound consists of three cemeteries with approximately 1100–1200 graves,¹³ the largest of which is located directly to the east with about 1000 graves. Unfortunately, less than 50 of these have been researched; some skeletons could be investigated anthropologically.¹⁴ Within these graves, individuals are almost entirely buried in a north-south direction, without burial objects, mostly comprised of men, but with the presence of some women and children who primarily occupy the eastern cemetery.

The archaeological findings also include the caves with the texts. Caves 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10 on the marl terrace are accessible only through the system so that the transport of manuscripts to the caves was only possible with the help of the inhabitants. Caves 1, 2, 3, 6, and 11 are located on the cliff. In addition to the scrolls (partly wrapped in linen and stowed away in clay jugs, some unpacked, unrolled texts, fallen single sheets, and blank material, mostly weathered), *Tefillin* and *Mezuzot* were found, along with a “copper scroll” (whose connection with the other writings is disputed) in Cave 3.

Functionally connected with Qumran was a compound of agricultural buildings and cultivated land in Ein Feshkha, 2–3 km south of Qumran, near the shore of the Dead Sea, on a fresh water pond (fountain). This site probably functioned as a means to cultivate date palms and vegetables, as well as other products, all of which likely supplied for their own needs and as a means of trade. Stegemann proposed that a specific form of leather tanning took place here.¹⁵

III. The Interpretation of the Compound

De Vaux interpreted Qumran as the center of the “sect” of the Essenes, whom he regarded as a celibate male community separated from the Temple.¹⁶ The

¹¹ J. Zangenberg, “Zwischen Zufall und Einzigartigkeit: Bemerkungen zur jüngsten Diskussion über die Funktion von Khirbet Qumran und die Rolle einiger ausgewählter archäologischer Befunde,” in *Qumran und die Archäologie: Texte und Kontexte* (WUNT 278; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 121–146.

¹² J.-B. Humbert, “L’espace sacré à Qumran. Propositions pour l’archéologie,” *RB* 101 (1994): 161–214.

¹³ Fabry, “Archäologie”; R. Hachlili, “The Qumran Cemetery Reassessed,” in *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. T. H. Lim and J. J. Collins; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 46–78. See now also the thorough description in N. Rupschus, *Frauen in Qumran* (WUNT II/457; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2017), 37–84.

¹⁴ O. Röhrer-Ertl, et al., “Über die Gräberfelder von Qumran,” *RevQ* 19 (1999): 3–46; S. G. Sheridan, “Scholars, Soldiers, Craftsmen, Elites?: Analysis of French Collection of Human Remains from Qumran,” *DSD* 9 (2002): 199–248.

¹⁵ Stegemann, *Essener*, 56.

¹⁶ 1QS serves as the basis for de Vaux’s judgement.

isolation of the location, the unadorned pottery, etc. were interpreted as signs of the plain and separated existence of this community in work, prayer, and end-time expectation. However, the interpretation in the interplay with the texts (only the texts from Cave 1 were available at an early date) aroused the suspicion of circular reasoning. With the insight into the variety of the textual discoveries came alternative interpretations which denied the “Essene thesis” and attempted to interpret Qumran not as a singular religious phenomenon, but to interpret it within other contexts. In this vein, the competing interpretations include (a) a Roman fortress,¹⁷ (b) a manor (*villa rustica*) with a promising *triclinium*,¹⁸ with the variant that it was later used by the Essenes as a place of worship,¹⁹ (c) a caravansary,²⁰ (d) a center for balsam and perfume production,²¹ and (e) a scroll manufactory of the Essenes with an accompanying leather tannery.²²

The conflict between religious and secular interpretation or between the uniqueness and the regional contextualization²³ has methodological and scientific-theoretical dimensions. The archaeological and topographic findings are unfavorable to the interpretation of Qumran as a fort, country house, or rest area; even the acceptance of the theory of a leather tannery on the Dead Sea has as of yet remained unconfirmed by chemical tests. The connection between the compound and the scrolls is very likely given the fact that some of the caves are only accessible through the site. However, the famous *yahad*-ostrakon²⁴ cannot prove that the rule texts regarding community were fol-

¹⁷ Golb’s thesis was based on the assumption that the scrolls came from the Temple library and were outsourced from Jerusalem (*Who Wrote*).

¹⁸ R. Donceel and P. Donceel-Voute, “The Archaeology of Chirbet Qumran,” in *Methods of Investigation of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Khirbet Qumran Site: Present Realities and Future Prospects* (ed. M. Wise et al.; New York: New York Academy of Sciences, 1994), 51–72.

¹⁹ J.-B. Humbert, “L’espace sacré à Qumran. Propositions pour l’archéologie,” *RB* 101 (1994): 161–214.

²⁰ L. Cansdale, *Qumran and the Essenes: A Re-Evaluation of the Evidence* (TSAJ 60; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997).

²¹ Hirschfeld, *Qumran*; cf. J. Zangenberg, “Wildnis unter Palmen? Khirbet Qumran im regionalen Kontext des Toten Meeres,” in *Jericho und Qumran*, 129–164; idem, “Qumran und Archäologie: Überlegungen zu einer umstrittenen Ortslage,” in *Zeichen aus Text und Stein* (TANZ 42; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003), 262–306.

²² Stegemann, *Essener*, 77–82.

²³ J. Zangenberg, “Region oder Religion? Überlegungen zum interpretatorischen Kontext von Chirbet Qumran,” in *Texte – Fakten – Artefakte. Beiträge zur Bedeutung der Archäologie für die neutestamentliche Forschung* (ed. M. Küchler and K. M. Schmidt; NTOA 59; Fribourg and Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2006), 25–68.

²⁴ F. M. Cross and E. Eshel, “Ostraca from Khirbet Qumran,” *IEJ* 47 (1997): 17–28.

lowed, because the word *yahad* is not an assured reading on that ostrakon.²⁵ Nevertheless, since the documentary text 4Q477, which records the censure of a member by the supervisor, was hardly brought from a foreign community but rather comes from Qumran, this text would be another confirmation of the practice of the rules of IQS in Qumran and thus an argument for the combination of the location and texts.

New data comes from material investigations: It has been demonstrably proven that the ink of the significant manuscript of the *Thanksgiving Hymns* 1QH^a was mixed with water from the Dead Sea,²⁶ so it is certain that this manuscript was not brought from Jerusalem. Furthermore, according to investigations of the clay, part of the Qumran jars were made from clay from the Qumran wadi, while other jars were “imported.”²⁷ Thus, we can be assured that scribal work took place at the Dead Sea, as well as the production of pottery and regional trade. The interpretation of the compound without consideration of the texts found there is, therefore, implausible. The use of the compound by a religious and purity oriented group does not exclude, but implies that it engaged in agriculture, craftsmanship, and trade. Nevertheless, the skeletons that have been examined show that the men buried there died rather young and did no heavy (field) work.²⁸ Riddles about the activities of the inhabitants of Qumran therefore remain.

The Qumran-Essene hypothesis can only be accepted today in a modified form since the community recognizable behind the texts (the *yahad*) is itself to be understood as a differentiated movement that was located at many places, one of which was Qumran, which could hardly be said to be its “center,” but at most an establishment that served a special purpose. The most important rule texts of the *yahad* (IQS, IQSa, CD) are probably all composed before the commissioning of the buildings at Qumran and therefore are not designed specifically for this location. For what specific reason the members of the *yahad* (temporarily or permanently) lived in Qumran is unclear. Furthermore, the relatively large number of graves raises issues, especially since the further exploration of the cemeteries is legally impossible today. However, the existence of women’s and children’s graves (admittedly, a rather small number) and the mention of women in some of the rule texts (CD, IQSa) must lead to the conclusion that the *yahad* was not a completely celibate

²⁵ A. Yardeni, “A Draft of a Deed on an Ostrakon from Khirbet Qumrân,” *IEJ* 47 (1997): 233–237.

²⁶ I. Rabin, O. Hahn, T. Wolff, A. Masic, and G. Weinberg, “On the Origin of the Ink of the Thanksgiving Scroll (1QHodayot^a),” *DSD* 16 (2009): 97–106.

²⁷ J. Gunneweg and M. Balla, “Was the Qumran settlement a mere pottery production center? What Instrumental Neutron Activation revealed,” in *Holistic Qumran: Trans-Disciplinary Research of Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. J. Gunneweg, A. Adriaens, and J. Dik; STDJ 87; Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2010), 39–62.

²⁸ Röhrer-Ertl, “Gräberfelder.”

group, and that the classical Qumran Essene hypothesis, which is tied to a “monastic” paradigm, is not consistent with the data.

B. The Textual Discoveries

I. Textual Discoveries in Antiquity

The discovery of texts in caves at the Dead Sea is documented from antiquity: Origen had another Greek version of the Psalter available for his Hexapla, which was “found in a clay jar near Jericho in the time of Antonius, the son of Severus.”²⁹ The Nestorian patriarch Timothy I of Seleukia (= Baghdad) reports in a letter ca. 800 CE that a hunter had discovered “books” in a cave near Jericho and the Jews from Jerusalem had found old and different Hebrew writings, including 200 Psalms of David.³⁰ The discoveries in some of the caves at Qumran confirm that writings were taken from those caves long before their modern discovery, such that detached leaves were further exposed to decay.³¹

II. The Inventory of Text Discoveries in Overview

The history of modern text discoveries begins in 1946–47 with the discovery of the first Bedouin cave.³² After the quick edition of the well-preserved texts from Cave 1, which determined the research for a long time, it took more than 50 years until the entire collection was officially published in the series *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert*. The texts from Cave 1,³³ the *Temple Scroll*,³⁴ and the Enoch manuscripts³⁵ are all edited outside of *DJD*, and some texts are reedited elsewhere with improved readings and reconstructions.

²⁹ Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* VI 16.3; Cf. Epiphanius, *De mensuris et ponderibus*, in PG 43, 265–268; PsAthanasius, *Synopsis*, in PG 28, 432.

³⁰ See P. Kahle, *Die Kairoer Genisa* (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1962), 16f.

³¹ Stegemann, *Essener*, 101–111, 113.

³² Concerning the history of the discoveries, see W. W. Fields, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A Full History* (vol. 1; Leiden: Brill, 2009).

³³ N. Avigad and E. L. Sukenik, *The Dead Sea Scrolls of the Hebrew University* (Jerusalem: The Magnes Press, 1955); M. Burrows, *The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery* (2 vols.; New Haven: The American Schools of Oriental Research, 1950 and 1951); N. Avigad and Y. Yadin, *A Genesis Apocryphon. A scroll from the wilderness of Judaea* (Jerusalem: Agnes Press of the Hebrew University and Heikhal Ha-Sefer, 1956).

³⁴ Y. Yadin, *Megillat ha-Miqdash – The Temple Scroll* (3 vols.; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1977–83).

³⁵ J. T. Milik, *The Books of Enoch. Aramaic fragments of Qumrân Cave 4* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976).

The remains of more than 900 manuscripts have been documented from the 11 caves.³⁶ In light of the removal of texts by earlier finds (especially from Caves 3, 7, 8, and 9) and further losses by the destruction or disappearance of texts, it can be estimated that a stock of a “library” of well over 1,000 manuscripts existed, which were brought into the caves before the arrival of Roman troops around 68 CE. The more distant Cave 1 and Cave 11 probably contained more valuable manuscripts packed in linen and clay jars; in the nearby Cave 4, the mass of remaining manuscripts were probably hidden in a hurry along with unused materials. Some caves with textual remains were primarily living or working spaces.

The “library” stock is ideologically heterogeneous and reflects a broad segment of the literature of Palestinian Judaism from the 3rd century BCE to the 1st century CE, yet certain criteria of selection (dominance of the Hebrew; many texts with solar calendars; absence of 1 and 2 Macc; etc.) can be proven. So far, there has been little acceptance of the suggestion that the inventory represents several “libraries,” part of which are “buried” manuscripts of a Genizah³⁷ or that the shipment must have taken place in several phases, before the earthquake and before the arrival of the Romans.³⁸

Only 10 out of more than 900 manuscripts contain more than half of the text, while the rest are, in part, extremely fragmentary. The language of the manuscripts is mostly Hebrew (16 in Paleo-Hebrew script), 130 are Aramaic, 27 Greek, and 2 Nabatean. Fifty-four of the manuscripts show forms of cryptic writing. The stock shows impressively the dominance of Hebrew in the traditions of the “library,” and also suggests that the Aramaic texts have likely been brought in from outside. The material is mostly leather, 152 of the texts (including 19 documentary) are on papyrus, plus a few ostraca. Twenty-one manuscripts are written on both sides, but contained within these 21 manuscripts are no biblical texts.³⁹

Paleographically, the manuscripts were classified into “archaic,” Hasmonean, and Herodian phases and were thus assigned to the time of 250

³⁶ E. Tov and S. Pfann, “List of the Texts from the Judaean Desert,” in *The Texts from the Judaean Desert* (ed. E. Tov; DJD 39; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2002), 27–112.

³⁷ J. E. Taylor, “Buried Manuscripts and Empty Tombs: The Genizah Hypothesis Reconsidered,” in “Go Out and Study the Land” (*Judg. 18:2*): *Archaeological, Historical and Textual Studies in Honor of Hanan Eshel* (ed. A. Maeir, J. Magness, and L. Schiffman; JSJS 148; Leiden: Brill, 2011), 269–315.

³⁸ Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra, “Wie viele Bibliotheken gab es in Qumran?” in *Qumran und die Archäologie: Texte und Kontexte* (WUNT 278; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 327–346.

³⁹ E. Tov, “Lists of Specific Groups of Texts from the Judaean Desert,” in *The Texts from the Judaean Desert* (ed. E. Tov; DJD 39; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2002), 203–228.

BCE up until 40 CE.⁴⁰ The Carbon-14 analysis carried out for some manuscripts confirmed the classification in principle.⁴¹ Thus, the ancient origins of the manuscripts are firm, and speculation that claims the texts were encoded by early Christian figures such as James and Paul have been definitively refuted.⁴²

III. Biblical Texts

A good 200 of the more than 900 manuscripts from Qumran contain biblical texts,⁴³ as well as some manuscripts from other discovery sites (Murabba'at, Nahal Hever, Masada). Their importance to the textual and canonical history of the Hebrew and Greek Bible is immense. Important aspects include:⁴⁴

(a) Among the biblical manuscripts from Qumran, 200–202 are Hebrew, 3 Aramaic, and 5 Greek, plus the *Tefillin* and *Mezuzot*; 11–12 are in Paleo-Hebrew writing and 4 are on papyrus. In some cases, the border between biblical text, extensive recensions, anthologies, and “parabiblical” text is fluid. Of the books of the Hebrew Bible, all but Esther are attested. In terms of numbers, Psalms, Isaiah, and Deuteronomy dominate. Interestingly, these are also the most frequently cited writings within the NT. Tov counts 19 manuscripts of Genesis, 17 of Exodus, 13 of Leviticus, 7 of Numbers, 30 of Deuteronomy, 2 of Joshua, 3 of Judges, 4 of 1–2 Samuel, 3 of 1–2 Kings, 21 of Isaiah, 6 of Jeremiah, 6 of Ezekiel, 8–9 of the Book of the Twelve, 36 of Psalms, 4 of Job, 2 of Proverbs, 4 of Ruth, 4 of Songs of Solomon, 2 of Ecclesiastes, 1 of Lamentations, 8 of Daniel, 1 of Ezra–Nehemiah, and 1 of 1–2 Chronicles.⁴⁵ Among the Greek biblical manuscripts are Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy (as well as the Book of the Twelve from Nahal Hever); among the Targums are also 1 manuscript of Leviticus and 2 of Job.

(b) With the discovery of a complete Isaiah scroll (1QIsa^a) from the end of the 2nd century BCE, the textual basis for the Hebrew biblical text was traced back around a thousand years from the earliest previously known witnesses

⁴⁰ F. M. Cross, “Palaeography and the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years* (ed. P. W. Flint and J. C. VanderKam; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 1:379–402.

⁴¹ J. C. VanderKam and P. Flint, *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York: Harper One, 2002), 27–32.

⁴² R. H. Eisenman, *James the Just in the Habakkuk Peshet* (Leiden: Brill, 1986); B. Thiering, *Jesus von Qumran: sein Leben – neu geschrieben* (Gütersloh, Gütersloher Verlag, 1993).

⁴³ E. Ulrich, *The Biblical Qumran Scrolls: Transcriptions and Textual Variants* (VTSup 134; Leiden: Brill, 2010); A. Lange, *Die Handschriften biblischer Bücher von Qumran und den anderen Fundorten*, vol. 1 of *Handbuch der Textfunde vom Toten Meer* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009).

⁴⁴ VanderKam and Flint, *Meaning*, 103–153.

⁴⁵ E. Tov, “Categorized List of the ‘Biblical Texts,’” in *The Texts from the Judaean Desert* (ed. E. Tov; DJD 39; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2002), 165–184.

(e.g., the Aleppo Codex). Despite the numerous, mostly orthographic variants, this text was rightly regarded as a confirmation of the fidelity of the Jewish textual tradition. The oldest biblical manuscripts (4QExod–Lev^f and 4QSam^b) are believed to date back to ca. 250 BCE, a scroll of Job (4QpalaeoJob^a) to ca. 200 BCE, and a scroll of the Book of the Twelve (4QXII^a) to ca. 150 BCE.⁴⁶

(c) The Pentateuch accounts for almost all of the paleo-Hebrew manuscripts. Six manuscripts contain more than one book of the Pentateuch, suggesting that it was already considered “canonical” and a unit. The text is, however, still not entirely fixed: In some manuscripts, there are sections of texts that have been inserted or offset; particularly puzzling is the “Reworked Pentateuch” (4Q158; 4Q364–367), which, among other things, contains an extended Song of Miriam, thus making it a matter of dispute as to whether this is a “biblical” text or a late “recension.”

(d) Quotations in non-biblical texts from Qumran and the development of the form of the commentary (pesharim) show that many books (Pentateuch, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, the Book of the Twelve, etc.) were already considered to be “canonical,” and there are of course other writings that were not included in the selection of the Hebrew canon (the *Book of Jubilees* and the books of *Enoch*), which were considered to have a “quasi-canonical” authority.

(e) The “canonical” rating of individual books does not preclude that, for example, Jeremiah and Samuel were used side-by-side in several book forms. For Jeremiah, in addition to the Masoretic long form, a Hebrew version of the abbreviated LXX version of the book is also attested, a phenomenon that can no longer be attributed to the freedom of a translator. From the Psalter, there are five different editions side-by-side, whose arrangement strongly differs from the Masoretic tradition mainly in Psalms 91–150, and in addition to this there are “apocryphal” psalms (LXX Ps 151 and others) as well as (in 11QPs^a) additional information about David as an author.

(f) The discoveries have led to a more differentiated understanding of the formation of the Old Testament canon as a multi-level “canonical process” which is probably locally or socially differentiated from the authority of individual writings concerning the formation and authorization of the collections, the conclusion or the demarcation of the same to the final form of the text.⁴⁷

(g) With respect to textual forms, in Qumran proto-Masoretic, proto-LXX, and pre-Samaritan, as well as “free” texts co-exist, whereby the explanation

⁴⁶ B. Webster, “Chronological Index of the Texts from the Judaean Desert,” in *The Texts from the Judaean Desert* (ed. E. Tov; DJD 39; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2002), 351–446.

⁴⁷ J. A. Sanders, “The Scrolls and the Canonical Process,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years* (ed. P. W. Flint and J. C. VanderKam; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 2:1–23.

of these findings are contentiously debated as to whether the variations arose from local texts, social group-specific texts, or different editions.⁴⁸

IV. Deuterocanonical/Apocryphal Texts and Pseudepigrapha

In addition to biblical texts, a multitude of manuscripts of texts of the LXX that were previously known only in their translated form, “Pseudepigrapha,” and new “parabiblical texts” came to light in Qumran:⁴⁹

(a) Tobit is now attested in 4 Aramaic manuscripts and in 1 Hebrew manuscript. Sirach (whose Hebrew edition was already attested from Cairo Geniza) was found in two manuscripts (2QS^r and a manuscript from Masada), and Sirach 51:13–30 is also encountered in 11QPs^a. Psalm 151 of the LXX was found in a more “Davidic” Hebrew form, which actually includes two psalms. Furthermore, in 11QPs^a, Psalms 154 and 155, which were previously known only in Syriac from the Peshitta, were also discovered. The Greek *Epistle of Jeremiah* (*Baruch* 6) was found among the Greek manuscripts of Cave 7 (7Q2).

(b) Of considerable worth are the discoveries of texts from the Enoch tradition, which, due to their calendrical orientation, probably had special authority for the *yahad*:⁵⁰ 4 Aramaic manuscripts of the Astronomical Book (*I En.* 72–82), 7 manuscripts with pieces from some of the other parts of the (Ethiopian) book of *Enoch* with the exception of the Similitudes (*I En.* 37–71), as well as 10 manuscripts of Book of the Giants, otherwise only known from the later Manichaean tradition. The oldest manuscript of the Astronomical Book dates to ca. 200 BCE, and the oldest manuscript of the Book of the Watchers (4QEn^a) dates from the first half of the 2nd century BCE, so that this part of the Enoch tradition can also be dated to the 3rd century BCE. Individual manuscripts already connect different parts of the book of Enoch so that here, too, we gain insights into the growth of a corpus. A fragment (4Q247) even offers a Peshet commentary on the Apocalypse of Weeks. With these findings, the question of the beginnings and nature of Jewish apocalypticism is placed on a new footing.⁵¹ Also, the *Book of Jubilees* (= *Jub.*), which up until this time was only preserved in the Ethiopian tradition, was found in Hebrew within 15–16 manuscripts from 5 caves. In addition to these, there

⁴⁸ R. S. Hendel, “Assessing the Text-Critical Theories of the Hebrew Bible,” in *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. T. H. Lim and J. J. Collins; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 281–302; E. Ulrich, *Scrolls*.

⁴⁹ VanderKam and Flint, *Meaning*, 182–205.

⁵⁰ See J. C. VanderKam, “The Book of Enoch and the Qumran Scrolls,” in *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. T. H. Lim and J. J. Collins; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 254–277.

⁵¹ See J. Frey, “The Qumran Discoveries and the Understanding of Apocalypticism,” in this volume, 195–241.

were also three texts associated with *Jubilees* (*PsJub.*), a text that quotes *Jubilees* (4Q228), as well as a manuscript (*PsJub.?*) from Masada (Mas 1j).

(c) Other *Parabiblical Texts* can be mentioned here only selectively.⁵² An Aramaic “Genesis Apocryphon” from Cave 1 offers a largely expanded retelling of Gen 5:28–15:4 with narratives of Noah and Abraham. Like *Jubilees*, the text belongs to the group of “Rewritten Bible” texts. The manuscript dates from the beginning of the 1st century BCE, however the text could be much older.

Some texts are part of the environment of the later *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*: There are three Aramaic compositions that are linked with the patriarchs of the line between Levi and Moses/Aaron (Levi, Qahat, Amram). An *Aramaic Levi Document*, attested to in probably 6 manuscripts (4QLevi^{a-f} ar) and perhaps also in 1Q21, partly corresponds to a manuscript from Cairo Geniza and to a Greek manuscript from Mt. Athos. In addition to this, there is also another Levi Apocryphon (4Q540–541). Levi’s son Qahat is assigned to a fragmentary *Testament of Qahat* (4Q542), and his son Amram is the protagonist of the “Visions of Amram,” which are handed down in 6 manuscripts (4Q543–548). In the first of these, we encounter what is probably the later form-schematic of the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*.⁵³ The text, which probably dates back to the 3rd century BCE, contains a brusquely dualistic juxtaposition of two “angels,” one of whom is called Melkiresha (“Prince of Iniquity”), and the name of the other (possibly “Melkizedek”) has been lost. Here, before the beginnings of the *yahad*, there is a dualism of light and darkness⁵⁴ with the phrases “sons of light” and “sons of darkness” and “sons of falsehood” and “sons of truth.” The selection of figures and themes of purity and sacrifice in these texts reveal an interest in the priesthood, which is inspired by the inheritance of its ideal forefathers.

Some texts are continuations of prophetic traditions. They show how prophetic traditions were continued after the conclusion of those respective prophetic books. Thus, not only a multitude of texts related to Moses existed, but also several Jeremiah apocrypha. A pseudo-Ezekiel text proves that the idea of the resurrection by the spirit of Ezekiel 37, which was originally related to the resurrection of Israel, was now interpreted with regard to an individual resurrection of the dead (4Q385 frag. 2), an interpretation that is of significance to the early Christian interpretation of Jesus’ resurrection (Rom 1:3–4). There are Pseudo-Daniel texts that attest to a broader Aramaic Daniel tradition which is no longer included in the canonical versions of Daniel as well

⁵² D. K. Falk, *The Parabiblical Texts: Strategies for Extending the Scriptures in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (CQS 8; LSTS 63; London: T&T Clark, 2007).

⁵³ See J. Frey, “On the Origins of the Genre of the ‘Literary Testament,’” in this volume.

⁵⁴ See J. Frey, “Apocalyptic Dualism,” in this volume.

as texts related to Daniel such as an apocryphon in which Daniel is explicitly mentioned (4QPsDaniel^{a-c}) and an Aramaic prayer of thanks: there is the *Prayer of Nabonidus* (4Q242), which offers a parallel to Dan 4, there is a text about the Four Kingdoms (4Q552–553), and there is a text about a figure called “son of God” (4Q246). In the last of these texts, it is disputed whether this is a positive messianic figure or a negative one shaped after the image of Antiochus IV Epiphanes.

Another important text is an Aramaic description of the New Jerusalem (*New Jerusalem Text*),⁵⁵ which is documented in 7 manuscripts from 5 caves. There, a visionary is led around by an angel in the eschatological Jerusalem where the dimensions of the walls, gates, streets, and houses are specified exactly. Striking are the links to Ezek 40–48 and Zech 2:5–8 (and parallels in 11QT^a); on the other hand, the text offers an important parallel to Rev 21.

V. Exegetical Texts

Exegetical texts show the *yahad*'s interest in Scripture and the interpretation of Scripture: essential is the first formation of the genre of biblical commentary, the *peshtarim*. This genre⁵⁶ was found only in Qumran and can stand as a new, specific type of literature from the *yahad*. It is important to make a distinction between thematic *peshtarim*, in which scriptural citations are gathered together around relevant themes and are interpreted, and continuous *peshtarim*, which interpret a biblical book in whole or in part. Structurally, the biblical quotation is followed in each case by the *pesher* formula (“its interpretation is”) and an interpretation that relates the quotation to the present (the community, its history, its opponents). The *peshtarim* are an important parallel to the eschatological interpretation of Scripture in Early Christianity.

Among the first developed form of the thematic *peshtarim* belong the *Midrash on Eschatology*, a work testified to in two manuscripts (4Q174 and 177) from the 1st century BCE, in which the messianic eschatological passages (2 Sam 7) and select passages in the Psalms are interpreted in reference to the (present) end-time (the time of the purification preceding the future arrival of the anointed one). The somewhat earlier *Melchizedek* Midrash (11QM^{elch}) is also a thematic *pesher*. In it Melchizedek appears as a heavenly redeemer figure who performs priestly and prophetic functions and announces God's Jubilee for the pious in Israel according to Isa 61:1–3. It is based on a chronological schema established in Enoch's Apocalypse of Weeks.

Continuous *peshtarim* are attested for the books of Isaiah, Micah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, and Psalms (although probably only parts of the books

⁵⁵ See J. Frey, “The New Jerusalem Text in Its Historical and Traditio-Historical Context,” in this volume.

⁵⁶ On the idea of *peshtarim* as genre, see T. H. Lim, *Peshtarim* (CQS 3; London: T&T Clark, 2002).

were commented upon for Isaiah and Psalms). The *Habakkuk Peshar* (1QpHab), which is very well preserved in a Herodian manuscript, offers an interpretation of the words of the prophets for the coming of the “Kittim” (= Romans) and is therefore likely to be dated after the conquest of Jerusalem by Pompey (63 BCE). It is assumed that the prophet himself did not know the object of his statements and that the community only now recognizes their eschatological meaning. The text offers important passages about the fate of the “Teacher of Righteousness,” the founding figure of the *yahad* and his quarrels with the “Wicked Priest,” the “Man of Lies,” and the lawbreakers; it is, therefore, a central source for the history of the Qumran community. In 1QpHab VII–VIII, it is discussed that the hoped for end of time is “delayed” beyond the initially assumed date, which is an important analogy to the early Christian difficulties with the delays in Christ’s return. At the same time, the peshar offers an important textual witness to Hab 2:4 and a parallel to the reception of the passage in Rom 1:17.

VI. Halakic Texts and Rule Texts

The full weight of halakic texts and themes in Qumran became clear in the course of the edition of the 4Q fragments.

(a) *Temple Scroll*: The publication of the nearly 9 m long *Temple Scroll* from Cave 11 sparked a shift in research towards more “Jewish” themes. The text of 11QT^a (and 1–2 other manuscripts) connects Pentateuchal texts with additional pieces, thus presenting a new Torah in which (in intensifying contrast to Moses’ speech in Deuteronomy) God himself speaks in the 1st person, and the texts from the Pentateuch are modified accordingly. The basic idea is that of a sanctity graduated from the holy of holies in concentric circles, diminishing into the other parts of the Temple, the forecourts, the city, and the land of Israel, for which 11QT^a contains detailed safeguards. The Temple, quadratic as in Ezek 40–48 and Rev 21, and significantly increased in its dimensions when compared to Ezek 40–48, is described in detail, as well as individual cultic acts and festivals. Scholars date this text well before the beginnings of the *yahad*. The text shows the intensity of the discussion about the temple and about alternative models of Temple and priesthood at the time of the existent Second Temple. To what extent the rules of the text (e.g., prohibition of sexual intercourse and also the prohibition of relieving oneself within the holy city) were followed in Qumran or in the settlements of the *yahad* community is questionable.

(b) 4QMMT: A central text from the early period of the *yahad* is a halakic letter *Miqṣat Ma’asê hat-Tora* (= “Some of the Works of the Law”), which survives in six highly fragmentary manuscripts (4Q394–399) and is only partially reconstructable. Part A offers a solar calendar (similar to *Jubilees* and other Qumran texts); B is a collection of 22 *halakhot*, in which the writer

and the addressee differ; and C is an exhortation to the addressee to join the *halakhot* mentioned in the present end times and to distance himself from Belial. The writer represents a “we” group that says they have separated themselves from the people because of these halakic differences. Their positions are attributed partly to the Sadducees in later rabbinic texts. The addressee is addressed as a leader of the people so that here one can assume a Hasmonean ruler (possibly Jonathan). The text was interpreted early as the letter of the “Teacher of Righteousness” to the “Wicked Priest” Jonathan assumed to be mentioned in 4QpPs^a,⁵⁷ but such a precise attribution remains controversial. The text has gained in importance because here, for the first time in the Jewish texts, a parallel with Paul is found in the syntagma “works of the law” (Rom 3:28; Gal 2:16; et al.), which proves that Paul refers to concrete contemporary discourses about the Torah’s requirements and its correct fulfillment.

(c) The *Rule of the Community* (1QS): The most important halakic manuscript from the early published inventory from Cave 1 is 1QS.⁵⁸ This text in particular shaped the image of Qumran; in it scholars saw the valid rule of the Qumran “sect” (hence “Sektenrolle”). In the early period of Qumran scholarship, 1QS was completely read on the basis of the local situation at Qumran, which was admittedly settled only after the text had already been written.

According to more recent insights, the very well-preserved manuscript 1QS is a composite manuscript⁵⁹ that combines several partially independent texts. Eleven other manuscripts (4QS^{a-j} and 5Q11) provide parts of the material, partly in another compilation. Different versions of the rule existed side-by-side even after the “long” version had already been compiled.⁶⁰ The paradigm of an absolutely valid (monastic) Rule must therefore be abandoned. 1QS was crafted between 100 and 75 BCE, some of its sub-texts date back to the 2nd century BCE. The original rule was not written for Qumran but for local communities of the *yahad* (1QS VI 3). After an introduction that enumerates the goals of entering into the “covenant” (i.e., the *yahad* community), a liturgy (a “covenant” celebration [I 19–III 12]) follows that dualistically specifies blessings for the members and curses the outsiders. The “Treatise on the Two Spirits” (III 13–IV 26), an independent text that draws on a “pre-Qumranic” wisdom tradition,⁶¹ is attached here and offers a dualistic prede-

⁵⁷ Stegemann, *Essener*, 149–151.

⁵⁸ See also J. Frey, “The Rule of the Community,” in *Early Jewish Literature. An Anthology* (ed. B. Embry, R. Herms, and A. T. Wright; 2 vols.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2017), 2:95–127.

⁵⁹ A. Lange and H. Lichtenberger, “Qumran,” *TRE* 28:54–59.

⁶⁰ S. Metso, *The Textual Development of the Qumran Community Rule* (STDJ 21; Leiden: Brill, 1997).

⁶¹ A. Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination* (STDJ 18; Leiden: Brill, 1995); J. Frey, “Different Patterns of Dualism in the Qumran Library,” in this volume.

tinarian explanation of the course of the world by recourse to two God-created, world ruling “spirits” (= angels). This piece was not included in all manuscripts of the Serekh material, and should therefore not be regarded as the ideological basis of the *yahad*. V 1–IX 26 forms the actual “*Rule of the Community*” with rules for entrance and assembly and an attached catalog of penalties for offenses. In VIII 12–16, Isa 40:3 is cited, and the preparation of the way for YHWH in the wilderness is specified here as the study of the Torah. Accordingly, one can ask whether this interpretation prompted the development of a compound like Qumran. The self-understanding of the *yahad* as a plant in Israel and as a temple for the atonement of the land (1QS VIII 5–10; IX 3–7) as well as its expectation of two messiahs, a priestly and political (1QS IX 10–11), are discussed within this text. The conclusion of the text is formed by a set of prayer times and a “psalm” (1QS IX 26–XI 22) that expresses a deep sense of sin and a commitment to be worthy of the blessed revelation.

(d) “*Rule of the Congregation*” (1QSa): Physically linked to 1QS (that is, copied on the same scroll) was a second, presumably older rule, whose themes and provisions differ from 1QS. The rule “for the community of Israel in the last days” is not meant for a far-off time but for the present, which is interpreted as the end time. Unlike 1QS, 1QSa also mentions women and children as a part of the congregation and addressees of instruction (I 4). A list follows that includes the responsibilities for members according to their various ages and a list of physical or mental defects that excluded individuals from the gathering because, within it, they are in the presence of angels. The conclusion is an ordinance for the meal in the presence of the Messiah (1QSa II 11–22), with a precise seating arrangement that maintains the primacy of the priests, ordered above even the Messiah, which demonstrates the priests’ absolute priority before non-priests.

(e) *Damascus Document* (D): Probably the last and most comprehensive rule text from the *yahad* is the *Damascus Document*, whose title was “The Last Exploration of the Torah” (contained in 4QD^a 18 V 20). A version of this document was already known before the Qumran discoveries from two manuscripts (CD A and B) found in 1897 in the Cairo Geniza. CD was associated with Qumran ever since the discoveries at Qumran, but it was only after the publication of the 12 manuscripts from Caves 4, 5, and 6 that the situation was clarified: CD is a medieval epitome based on the work D of the *yahad*. The work could have possibly come to the medieval Karaites (and to the Karaite Cairo Geniza) through ancient discoveries of texts such as the discoveries mentioned above by Timotheus of Seleucia.

D combines an admonition and a community rule. The admonition (CD I–VIII, XIX–XX with additions from 4QD^{a-h}) provides reviews of the history of Israel and theological reflections. In doing so, D places the community after the exile within his chronological schema of Israel’s history (390 years

after Nebuchadnezzar and 20 years of groping for their way before the appearance of the Teacher of Righteousness). Supposedly, 40 years of the Teacher's ministry and 40 years until the final judgment should be counted, resulting in a cycle of 490 years (as in the Apocalypse of Weeks). The text was written after the death of the teacher, probably around 100 BCE;⁶² it represents a predestinarian concept of history and a tense expectation of the end. The thematically diverse rule section also contains (in contrast to 1QS) provisions concerning women and marriage as well as a different admission procedure for members.

The relationship between the three rules from the *yahad* (1QSa, S, D) is discussed intensely within the literature. There, discussions revolve around whether these texts reflect diachronic developments or differing subgroups of a movement or both. A further aspect of discussion is the status of the rules in the *yahad* community given the differences between them (and the different versions of S and D).⁶³

(f) *War Rule* (M): The final "rule" to be named here is the "*War Rule*" 1QM, an "order" for the eschatological battle between the "sons of light" and the "sons of darkness" (1QM I 1). There are also parallels from Cave 4 (4QM^{a-g} [= 4Q491–496 and 471b]) to this relatively well-preserved rule from Herodian time that was well-known since the first discoveries. These parallels suggest a two-stage formation of the text: While the earlier (early) Hasmonean form is conserved in 4QM^{a, c, g}, the subsequent appropriation of the material by the *yahad* occurs in 1QM. The text is the main witness of a type of cosmic dualism that goes back to the priestly circles of the time before the *yahad*,⁶⁴ according to which two opposed camps, led by Michael and Belial, fight one another. The eschatological war between the armies of light and darkness is structured liturgically, with rules for preparation and implementation, prayers, blessings, and speeches. After three "lots" (= units of time) of the superiority of light and darkness, God destroys the powers of Belial in the seventh "lot." The battle thus follows a "Sabbath structure," and, despite the references to Maccabean military technology, the depiction is obviously utopian in nature. In the background are traditions of the "Holy War" and motifs from Daniel, where people and nations are also represented by heavenly powers (Dan 10:20–21) and Michael enters for Israel (Dan 11:40–12:1). The temporal structure corresponds to the Zoroastrian motif of the Horomazes (Ahura Mazda) and Areimanios (Ahriman) recounted by Plu-

⁶² A. Lange and H. Lichtenberger, "Qumran," *TRE* 28:60.

⁶³ A. Schofield, *From Qumran to the Yahad. A New Paradigm of Textual Development for the Community Rule* (STDJ 77; Leiden: Brill 2009); J. J. Collins, "Sectarian Communities in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *The Scepter and the Star: Messianism in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. J. J. Collins and Lim; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), 151–172.

⁶⁴ Frey, "Patterns."

tarch of Theopomp (*Is. Os.* 45–47). From this, it can be assumed that the type of dualistic thinking in M has a Persian influence.⁶⁵

VII. Calendrical Texts

Striking is the large number of calendrical works found at Qumran,⁶⁶ a collection that reflects a specific interest of the *yahad*. The *yahad* followed a solar 364-day calendar (according to *1 En.* 72–82 and *Jub.*), presumably the old priestly calendar, which had been changed to the lunisolar 354-day calendar in Seleucid times,⁶⁷ implying a clear separation from the Jerusalem cult. Thus, not only are *Enoch* and *Jubilees* conspicuously present in Qumran, but also a multitude of texts that define years, quarters, months, festivals, and Sabbaths, or that offer synchronization of both calendars. Another significant feature is the collection of calendrical tables for the weekly service (Mishmarot) of the 24 priestly families (1 Chr 24:7–18) at the Jerusalem temple, who were assigned according to the 364-day calendar to the 52 weeks of the year such that the service time of the families should rotate over the years. The collection of these texts shows that the priestly led *yahad* hoped for a restitution of the temple.

VIII. Poetic and Liturgical Texts

The large number of liturgical texts, hymns, and prayers significantly enrich our knowledge of the history of Jewish liturgy and Jewish prayers.⁶⁸ 1QS already contains a piece of a covenant liturgy (I 11–III 12), a list of prayer times (IX 26–X 5), and a collection of blessings contained in a text attached to 1QS and 1QSa (1QSB). Many texts continue the biblical psalmic poetry through the addition of new psalms (11QPs^a) and new collections (*Dibre ha-Me'orot* [“words of the (heavenly) lights”: 4Q504–4Q506]; “festival prayers” 4Q507–509; “Non-Canonical Psalms” 4Q380–381; 11Q Apocryphal Psalms; Barki Nafshi [“praise, my soul”] 4Q434–438, among others). Revealing for the ceremonies of the *yahad* are texts with blessing and cursing formulations (4QBerakhot^{a-c} 4Q286–290) as well as exorcistic texts and incantations

⁶⁵ J. J. Collins, “The Mythology of Holy War in Daniel and the Qumran War Scroll,” *VT* 25 (1975): 596–612, specifically 604–7.

⁶⁶ A. Lange and U. Mittmann-Richert, “Annotated List of the Texts from the Judaean Desert Classified by Content and Genre,” in *The Texts from the Judaean Desert* (ed. E. Tov; DJD 39; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2002), 115–164.

⁶⁷ Cf. Dan 7:25; 1 Macc 1:59; 2 Macc 6:7; see M. Albani, “Der 364-Tage-Kalender in der gegenwärtigen Forschung,” in *Studies in the Book of Jubilees* (ed. M. Albani, J. Frey, and A. Lange; TSAJ 65; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997), 79–125.

⁶⁸ D. K. Falk, *Daily, Sabbath, and Festival prayers in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (STDJ 27; Leiden: Brill, 1997); B. Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer and Religious Poetry* (STDJ 12; Leiden: Brill, 1994).

(“Songs of the Maskil” 4Q510–511), by which the recitation of the instructor should ward off destructive angelic beings, demons, Lilith, and seductive spirits. Narrative texts also offer prayers in Hebrew and Aramaic, thus closing the gap with later rabbinic prayers and, not least, illuminating the prayer language used in the Lord’s Prayer.⁶⁹

The most important poetic text is the *Thanksgiving Hymns* (*Hodayot*, 1QH^a), which was reconstructed in its arrangement after the first edition⁷⁰ by H. Stegemann and is now to be cited according to *DJD* 40 (whereby old and new counts of columns and lines are still being confused within the scholarly literature⁷¹). Here, too, seven other manuscripts (1QH^b; 4QH^{a-f}) exist, which differ in textual content and arrangement, so that 1QH^a appears to be a combination of several sub-collections. In the middle section, one encounters individual religious poems that were quickly attributed to the “Teacher of Righteousness” (but this attribution is disputed), while the framing material provides communal poems and hymns. The texts have a subtle imagery and reflect a theological thinking that, despite all knowledge of one’s own lowliness, praises God for his grace. They are “the main document of spiritual piety” of the Qumran community and the main source for “their image of man and God, as well as their struggle for deeper insight into God’s unfathomable plan of salvation.”⁷²

A peculiar text is the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* (*Šhiroṭ ‘Olat ha-Šabbat*), which is documented in 9 manuscripts from Qumran and 1 manuscript from Masada and represents a collection of 13 songs for the Sabbaths of a quarter (on a solar calendar), in which the praise of various classes of angelic beings is described and is (re-)cited. The text could quite possibly date back to the temple priesthood, but was of particular interest within the *yahad* because here, in the community, one saw oneself as being in the company of angels and being in sync with the heavenly worship through the use of the “correct” calendar. The texts are based on motifs from Ezek 1 and 10

⁶⁹ U. Schattner-Rieser, “Das Aramäische zur Zeit Jesu und das Vaterunser. Reflexionen zur Muttersprache Jesu anhand der Texte von Qumran,” in *Jesus, Paulus und die Texte vom Toten Meer* (ed. J. Frey and Enno Edzard Popkes; WUNT II/390; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015), 83–144.

⁷⁰ Sukenik, *Scrolls*.

⁷¹ Thus, e.g., the widespread “Study Edition” (F. García Martínez and E. Tigchelaar, eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* [2 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 1997–1998]); or also the German translation of the texts by Johann Maier (J. Maier, *Die Qumran-Essener: Die Texte vom Toten Meer* [2 vols.; Munich: Reinhardt, 1995]) quote the *Hodayot* according to the ‘correct’ column numbers (as Stegemann reconstructed them), but still according to the ‘incorrect’ counting of the lines (according to Sukenik’s *editio princeps*) where the lines of the fragments were just counted starting with 1, but not correctly placed on the columns of the scroll.

⁷² Stegemann, *Essener*, 152.

and stand between the biblical passages about God's throne and the later Merkaba- or Hekhalot-mysticism. A central theme is the praise of the kingdom of God, with which the texts provide an additional source for the background of the theme in Jesus' proclamation.

IX. Wisdom Texts

Of particular note are new wisdom texts that greatly enrich the image of Jewish wisdom between Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Sirach, and the Greek texts such as Wisdom of Solomon, and represent another parallel to Sirach's tradition of Palestinian Jewish wisdom.⁷³ Essential are a composition called *Instruction* (or "Musar le Mevin" [= *Instruction for the Knowledgeable*]) and the "Book of Mysteries" (1Q27; 4Q299–301), which is attested in 4 manuscripts – The "Treatise on the Two Spirits" of 1QS III 13–IV 26 also stands within this tradition.⁷⁴ Both works, which probably originated at the end of the 3rd or the beginning of the 2nd century BCE (i.e., before the founding of the *yahad*), combine wisdom based admonitions (on dealing with women, property, etc.) with dualistic and eschatological elements, such that one can speak of a combination of wisdom and apocalypticism in Palestinian Judaism. Unlike in the other wisdom literature, here we find an interest in the temple and issues related to sacrifices and purity with the result that one might suspect these texts arose in a priestly milieu within the vicinity of the temple. In the wake of the emerging dualism, the use of the term "flesh" (which was taken up into the *Hodayot* and has particular reverberations in Paul [Gal 5:16; Rom 8:4–8]) occurs for the first time in the sense of a measure of ungodliness.⁷⁵

Other noteworthy new wisdom texts from Qumran include 4QBeatitudes (4Q525) with a series of wisdom based beatitudes, which offers important parallels to Matt 5:3–10, as well as 4Q184 "Wiles of the Wicked Woman" with a continuation of Prov 1–9 that contains a warning concerning foreign women.⁷⁶

⁷³ A. Lange, "Die Weisheitstexte von Qumran: Eine Einleitung," in *The Wisdom Texts from Qumran and the Development of Sapiential Thought* (ed. C. Hempel, A. Lange, and H. Lichtenberger; BETL 159; Leuven: Peeters, 2002), 3–30.

⁷⁴ A. Lange, "Weisheit und Prädestination. Weisheitliche Urordnung und Prädestination in den Textfunden von Qumran," in *Handbuch der Textfunde vom Toten Meer* (vol. 1; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009).

⁷⁵ J. Frey, "Flesh and Spirit in the Palestinian Jewish Sapiential Tradition and in the Qumran Texts. An Inquiry into the Background of Pauline Usage," in this volume.

⁷⁶ M. J. Goff, *Discerning Wisdom: The Sapiential Literature of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (VTSup 116; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 104–121.

X. Other Texts

A number of texts offer astrological and divinatory wisdom, such as an Aramaic Brontologion (4Q318), which provides predictions of thunder and the moon in various constellations; an Aramaic physiognomic text (4Q561) that reads the nature of a person's character from physiognomic features; and a cryptically written Hebrew text (4Q186) that combines physiognomy with zodiac astrology and describes the mind of a human being of light and darkness (in ninths). It was hypothesized that such tools of contemporary science were used in the *yahad* to assess candidates or members, but much remains uncertain in the absence of parallels.⁷⁷

One of the few texts from Qumran that names "historic" personalities (without aliases) is 4Q448, which congratulates king "Jonathan" (= Alexander Jannai) on his victory over the Seleucid Demetrios III. Apparently, despite the fundamental criticism of the Hasmoneans by the *yahad*, such a remark could be made, though it remains questionable as to whether the letter was actually sent or was held back.⁷⁸

"Rebukes of the Overseer" (4Q477) lists reprimands of members by the "overseer" (cf. Matt 18:15–18), but without mentioning the punishments. However, the text could prove that the penalties for offenses referred to in 1QS were actually applied in the locality of Khirbet Qumran since it is implausible that such a list was sent from one community to another.

XI. "Sectarian" and "Non-Sectarian"

In view of the variety of texts and genres in the collection, the image of Qumran has changed: The library should no longer be characterized as "sectarian" because, although the inventory demonstrates a criteria of selection, it is one that reaches far beyond merely group-specific texts. Indeed, large parts of the literary production of Palestinian Judaism from the 3rd century BCE to the last century CE are represented therein. That is, most of the texts are not written by members of the *yahad* (= "sectarian"). The criteria for sectarian are not entirely clear, and the classification is often contentious, but one can (based on the genre of pesharim, which only occurs in Qumran) refer to a specific community terminology ("council of the congregation [*yahad*]"; "the men of the congregation"; "covenant"),⁷⁹ even if its absence does not necessarily prove a development outside of the *yahad*; other criteria are the lan-

⁷⁷ See M. Albani, "Horoscopes in the Qumran Scrolls," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years* (ed. P. W. Flint and J. C. VanderKam; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 2:279–330; M. Popović, *Reading the Human Body: Physiognomics and Astrology in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Hellenistic-Early Roman Period Judaism* (Leiden: Brill, 2007).

⁷⁸ Stegemann, *Essener*, 188.

⁷⁹ D. Dimant, "Qumran Sectarian Literature," in *Jewish writings of the Second Temple Period* (ed. M. E. Stone; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1984), 482–550.

guage (Aramaic texts are probably brought in from outside the community), the citation of other group-specific writings, and the naming of persons and groups from the history of the *yaḥad*; on the other hand, the free use of the tetragrammaton rather points to a development outside or before the *yaḥad*.⁸⁰ Therefore, the majority of the parabiblical, sapiential, and exegetical texts and the entirety of the Aramaic texts are not group-specific, but have been taken over from precursor groups or came into the possession of the *yaḥad* from the outside, and were then stored there, possibly copied, read, and hidden. Precisely because the Qumran corpus is not just the library of a marginal “sect,” the texts add even more representation to the enlightenment of Palestinian Judaism and the Jewish environment of the early Jesus movement.

C. Qumran, the Essenes, and the *Yaḥad*

In 1948, immediately after the discoveries, Eleazar Lipa Sukenik was the first scholar who brought the interpretation of the texts and the location of the finds into connection with the group of the “Essenes” or the “Essaioi” testified to by the ancient texts. The texts from Cave 1 (primarily the *Community Rule* 1QS) and the interpretation of the compound by de Vaux as the center of a monastic-like male community made the “Qumran-Essene hypothesis” the dominant paradigm of research until it was questioned by scholars from 1980 onwards. Whether and to what extent the *yaḥad*, which is attested to in the Qumran texts, can be connected with the Essenes of the ancient testimonies remains debatable; in the Qumran research, the term “Essene” is increasingly being used with caution and is instead replaced by “sectarian,” “*yaḥadic*,” “group-specific,” or other similar terminology.

I. The “Essene Hypothesis” and its Implications

The connection of the finds with the Essenes was based on the information provided by Pliny the Elder (*Nat. V 73*), where the Essenes are described as a “tribe” (*gens*) living in the area around the Dead Sea “without women” and only with palm trees. The paradigm was of course not unencumbered. Ever since Eusebius (*Hist. eccl. II 16–17*), and all the way up to the middle ages, the Essenes (and Philo’s *therapeutai*) were considered to be not Jewish but Christian ascetics; during the Enlightenment, they were thought to be representatives of a still undogmatic form of Christianity or a group open to Egyptian or Persian wisdom or Greek mysteries. Even the history-of-religions school saw in them the gateway through which Iranian or Pythagorean ele-

⁸⁰ See Lange and Lichtenberger, “Qumran,” 45–46.

ments came into Early Christianity.⁸¹ These paradigms also influenced early Qumran research when the Qumran “sect” was interpreted as a forerunner of Christianity,⁸² or “heterodox Judaism” was considered to be a mediator of Zoroastrian thought to Early Christianity.⁸³ The Essene thesis not only led to an anachronistic “monastic” interpretation of Qumran, it also led to the fact that these texts were initially removed from classical Judaism. Thus, it remained unrecognized that the *yahad* represents a strictly conservative, tradition conscious, priestly influenced, particularistic milieu. Since the ancient descriptions of the Essenes are all from an external perspective – provided the Qumran-Essene connection is correct – only the group-specific Qumran texts can provide information about the group’s self-understanding.

II. The Ancient Sources about the Essenes and the Qumran Texts

A group of the “Essenes” (Ἐσσηῖται, Ἐσσηνοί; *Esseni*) is testified to in Philo *Prob.* 75–91; *apol. pro. Iud.* (in Eus. *Praep. ev.* XIII 11.1–18); Philo *De vita contemplativa* (where a group of *therapeutai* are described); Pliny *Nat.* V 73; Josephus *J.W.* I 78–80; II 11–113; 119–161; 566–568; III 9–12; V 142–145; *Ant.* XIII 171f.; 311–313; XV 371–379; XVII 346–368; XVIII 18–22; *Vita* 10–12.⁸⁴ In the second place, Hippolytus, *Haer.* IX 18.2–28.2; Solinus, *Memorabilia* XXXV 10f.; and Dio Chrysostum (according to a note in Synesios of Cyrene, Dio 3.2) are additional sources, though it is debated whether they offer additional, independent information.⁸⁵ Martianus Capella, *De Nuptiis Philologiae* VI 679 is a shortened form of Pliny;⁸⁶ Porphyrius (*De Absti-*

⁸¹ J. Frey, “Jesus, Paul, and the Texts from the Dead Sea: A History of Research and Hermeneutical Perspectives,” 12f. (in this volume, 633f.); S. Wagner, *Die Essener in der wissenschaftlichen Diskussion vom Ausgang des 18. bis zum Beginn des 20. Jahrhunderts* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 79; Berlin: Töpelmann, 1960); J. Riaud, “Les Thérapeutes d’Alexandrie dans la tradition et dans la recherche critique jusqu’aux découvertes de Qumran,” *ANRW II* 20:1189–1295.

⁸² A. Dupont-Sommer, *Aperçus préliminaires sur les manuscrits de la Mer Morte* (Paris: Maisonneuve, 1950), 119–122.

⁸³ K. G. Kuhn, “Die in Palästina gefundenen hebräischen Texte und das Neue Testament,” *ZTK* 47.2 (1950): 192–211, here 211.

⁸⁴ See the sources in A. Adam and C. Burchard, eds., *Antike Berichte über die Essener* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1972); G. Vermes and M. D. Goodman, eds., *The Essenes according to the Classical Sources* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989).

⁸⁵ See M. Stern, *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism* (Jerusalem: The Israel Academy of Science and Humanities, 1980), 2:118–119; É. Puëch, *La croyance des Esséniens en la vie future. Immortalité, résurrection, vie éternelle?* (EBib 22; J. Gabalda: Paris, 1993), 2:710–712; VanderKam and Flint, *Meaning*, 241–242; J. E. Taylor, “The Classical Sources on the Essenes and the Scrolls Communities,” in *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. T. H. Lim and J. J. Collins; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 184–188.

⁸⁶ Taylor, “Sources,” 174.

mentia IV 11–13) is based on Josephus; and Epiphanius (*Pan.* XIX 1.1; 2.3), in his account of the “Ossaioi” on the east side of the Dead Sea, which he confuses with the Elkasaites, offers little trustworthy information. The most important testimonies are the large report by Josephus (*J.W.* II 119–161) and the shorter reports in Philo (*Prob.* and *apol. pro. Iud.*) and Pliny. In addition, Josephus mentions individual Essenes/Essaioi and speaks several times of the three “schools”/“religious parties” of the Pharisees, Sadducees, and Essenes.

Pliny the Elder mentions the *Esseni* in his *Nat.* V 73 as a strange “tribe” (*gens*) on the west bank of the Dead Sea, living “without any wives . . . , without money, in the company of palms” and propagated only by the influx of individuals tired of life. Downstream (*infra hos*) from them, he mentions the places Engada (= Ein Gedi) and Masada. The assignment of Qumran to the Essenes is based on this localization. But for Pliny, who visited Judea in the spring of 70 CE with Vespasian, a personal knowledge of the Dead Sea is questionable. The ethnographic note seems to have come from a source of curiosities.⁸⁷ Therefore, his note contributes little to the image of the Essenes.

Philo mentions the Essenes three times as an example of the noble character of the Jewish religion (*Prob.* 75–91, *apol. pro. Iud.*; and an additional lost writing named *De virtutibus*). The 4,000 ἑσσαιῶται in Palestine are a group of the same ideal category as the Persian magi and Indian gymnosophists. As true “worshippers” (θεραπεύται), on account of their holiness, they were called ἑσσαιῶται (which Philo derives from ὅσιος = holy), since they worship God by sanctifying their minds rather than by animal sacrifices (*Prob.* 75). Philo describes their simple virtuous life with philosophical traits of completeness; he mentions life in communities, common clothing and food, abandonment of slaves, no concern with the production of arms and with trade, and care for the sick and elderly (*Prob.* 78–87). Whether one can infer from it the rejection of sacrifice and radical pacifism is questionable.⁸⁸ It is likely that Philo draws on sources, but renders the information in the light of philosophical ideals. As a counterpart to the active group of the Essenes, he describes a contemplative group of Therapeutai at Lake Mariout near Alexandria. But it is not very likely that a real “branch” of the Essenes is behind this description, but rather perhaps an (also ideally depicted) Alexandrian group.⁸⁹ Philo’s description of the Essenes is to be regarded as an ideal report, without personal knowledge.

⁸⁷ Stegemann, *Essener*, 86–87; Taylor, “Sources,” 183–184.

⁸⁸ Taylor, “Sources,” 175.

⁸⁹ Taylor, “Sources,” 177.

Josephus offers the most detailed presentations. It is debatable whether and to what extent he is dependent upon sources⁹⁰ or whether his notes testify to his own knowledge.⁹¹ After all, he may have known Essenes personally because of his role in the Jewish War (*J.W.* II 567; III 11). Of course, Josephus offers only an outsider's perspective. The Essenes are first mentioned among the three "religious parties" (αἱρέσεις), the Pharisees, Saducees, and Essenes, which Josephus describes in analogy to the schools of the Stoics, Epicureans, and Pythagoreans and characterizes in Hellenistic terms according to their positions on fate and immortality. The schema could have arisen from a source. But Josephus expands this schema to the "fourth philosophy," the zealots, who were responsible for the war. The other philosophies, especially the Essenes, Josephus describes as being peaceful. Anecdotes about the named "Essenes" – Judas, Simon, and Menachem – testify to political prophecy or criticism of rulers (specifically the Hasmoneans). In *J.W.* II 119–61 and *Ant.* XVIII 18–22, the lifestyle and the teachings of the Essenes are described in detail. Josephus, with a clear apologetic intent, describes the Essenes as an ideal group of virtuous, peaceful, and pious Jews (*Ant.* XVIII 20). In so doing, Josephus mentions its probationary procedure, its oath of "hating the wicked" and "loving the truth," the obligation to bring possessions into the community, rigid punishments for offense, communal meals, and even details such as the covering of excrement.⁹² This report also represents an external perspective, uses more Greek than Jewish terms, and shows no knowledge of the Essenes' worldview and interpretations of the Scriptures. However, enigmatic details such as the mention of prayers before dawn "to the sun" (*J.W.* II 128) are hardly indicative of Pythagorean influences, but rather show an imprecise understanding of the practice of prayer and worship of the sun. While many similarities with the rules of IQS also remain relatively unspecific, e.g., the similarities concerning communal goods and communal meals, two details in particular suggest a reference to the rule and other rules of the *yahad* to these or related groups: the prohibition against spitting (II 147; cf. IQS VII 13) and the avoidance of oil (*J.W.* II 122), which is understandable if oil transfers impurity (4QMMT B 55–58; CD XII 15–17). It would be implausible to attribute such detailed rules to very different

⁹⁰ R. Bergmeier, *Die Essener-Berichte des Flavius Josephus. Quellenstudien zu den Essenertexten im Werk des jüdischen Historiographen* (Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1993); J. Frey, "On the Historical Value of the Ancient Texts about the Essenes," in this volume.

⁹¹ S. Mason, "Josephus and the Authorship of War 2.119–161," *JSJ* 25 (1994): 207–221.

⁹² T. S. Beall, *Josephus' Description of the Essenes Illustrated by the Dead Sea Scrolls* (SNTSMS 58; Cambridge et al.: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 123–127.

circles. Therefore, a connection between the *yaḥad* and the Essenes is plausible.⁹³

III. The *Yaḥad*

However, the historical value of these testimonies and the self-understanding of the *yaḥad* can only be determined from the primary sources, the group-specific texts. Of course, these too, especially the rules such as 1QS (with the varying 4QS manuscripts), 1QSa, and CD (or, if available, the slightly different 4QD version), lack unity. Although the earlier research has referred to all these texts (and this often combined with the local situation of Qumran) as belonging to one community (“Qumran Community”), recent research asks in more detail how the *yaḥad* is to be understood.⁹⁴ The differences between the rules are of primary relevance: While D speaks of several settlements (“camps”) whose inhabitants are married and have children, and in 1QSa women and children also belong to the community, S speaks of several communities (with a quorum of 10 men) that exclude the mention of women and children. The variations between the manuscripts of D and S show that both texts co-existed in different recensions.⁹⁵ This shows that the *yaḥad* was not a uniform organization, but rather an “umbrella organization” of communities in different places.⁹⁶ The different “recensions” may have been brought from these places to Qumran.⁹⁷ Thus, the religious and monastic paradigm inherent in the old “Essene thesis” is definitely outdated.

D. The Textual Discoveries and their Significance for Early Christianity

Since the publication of the textual discoveries, their evaluation was accompanied by the question of their importance for the understanding of Jesus and Early Christianity. Parallels were discussed between the Teacher of Qumran and Jesus, between the Qumran immersion practice and Christian baptism, the communal meals of Qumran and the Lord’s Supper, the rule texts and the first Christian church orders, and also between scriptural interpretation, eschatology, and the messianic expectation in Qumran the texts and the NT.

⁹³ J. C. VanderKam, “Identity and History of the Community,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years* (ed. P. W. Flint and J. C. VanderKam; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 2:488–90; Taylor, “Sources,” 193.

⁹⁴ Collins, “Communities”; idem, “The *Yaḥad* and ‘The Qumran Community,’” in *Beyond the Qumran Community* (ed. John J. Collins; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009).

⁹⁵ Metso, *Development*.

⁹⁶ Collins, “*Yaḥad*,” 85–86.

⁹⁷ Schofield, *Qumran*; J. J. Collins, “Communities.”

The Christian questions of interest dominated early research. The parallels collected there⁹⁸ and the “old” patterns of relating the two corpora, which were mostly based on a small collection of texts (from Cave 1), are to be methodologically more accurately reflected on the basis of the complete corpus and more recent insights.

I. Models for Determining Relationship

How can Qumran (the location, the *yahad*, or the text discoveries) be related to Early Christianity, to New Testament texts, or to individual authors? Four models proposed in the research are now considered inaccurate:⁹⁹

(a) The assumption made in 1950 by Dupont-Sommer¹⁰⁰ that the Qumran community was a kind of precursor to the Christian community or the “Teacher of Righteousness” as a model for the appearance of Jesus or a prototype for his later presentation in the gospels, was soon recognizable as exaggerated due to the incorrect reading of some texts in accordance with his thesis: The Teacher did not understand himself as a Messiah and was not interpreted that way, and none of the text speaks of his death. Parallels between purity rites and baptism, meals in Qumran and the Lord’s Supper, etc. are too general to establish a relationship between the two groups.

(b) The hypothesis put forward in the 1980s by R. Eisenman¹⁰¹ and expanded in popular works, that the textual finds covertly speak of early Christian figures (such as Paul and James) and thus caused the early Christian history to be written quite differently, is untenable due to the dates of the texts. 1QpHab and the *Hodayot* are clearly of pre-Christian origin.

(c) The assumption that there could be New Testament texts among the Greek texts from Cave 7 (and that 7Q5 is to be identified with Mark 6:52–53) must be considered falsified in view of the extant and readable letters on the fragment 7Q5. In Qumran, there is no witness to the text of Mark.¹⁰² The Qumran library contains no Christian texts.

(d) The thesis that local and personal connections existed between a Jerusalem “Essene quarter” and the Early Christian Community¹⁰³ cannot be ascertained. Even though Essenes lived in Jerusalem, the assumption of an Essene quarter behind Josephus’ “gate of the Essenes” (*J.W.* V 145) cannot

⁹⁸ See H. Braun, *Qumran und das Neue Testament* (2 vols.; Tübingen: Mohr, 1966).

⁹⁹ J. Frey, “Impact,” 419–434 (in this volume, 539–558); idem, “Critical Issues in the Investigation of the Scrolls and the New Testament,” 519–525 (in this volume, 490–507).

¹⁰⁰ Dupont-Sommer, *Aperçus*, 119–122.

¹⁰¹ Eisenman, *James*.

¹⁰² S. Enste, *Kein Markustext in Qumran* (Freiburg: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000).

¹⁰³ B. Pixner, *An Essene Quarter on Mount Zion?* (StHier I; SBF.CMa 22; Jerusalem: Franciscan Printing Press, 1976), 245–85; R. Riesner, *Essener und Urgemeinde in Jerusalem: neue Funde und Quellen* (2nd ed.; Giessen: Brunnen Verlag, 1998).

be proven by ritual baths on the area of Mount Zion. The localization of the last meal there took place due to liturgical interests in a later period and differs from the data of the oldest pilgrim reports.¹⁰⁴ That means a line from an Essenian “monastery” to the early Christian and Jerusalem Jewish Christianity cannot be confirmed.

Since none of the texts found in Qumran speak of Jesus or any known person of Early Christianity and since the NT nowhere mentions the Essenes or members of the Qumran community, all attempts to see them behind the mention of Pharisees, scribes, or Herodians in NT texts are speculative. Methodologically, influences of the Qumran or *yahad* community on early Christian authors, circles, and practices are only plausible if there are significant parallels in group-specific texts (and not elsewhere).

Many of the parallels are more general analogies between sociologically comparable groups (meals, rules concerning admission, disciplinary regulations, structures of management), and they point to a common reference of tradition to the Scriptures or to early Jewish traditions and motifs. These are significant for the NT in that they provide evidence for a Jewish (as opposed to a pagan or a gnostic), or more precisely to a Palestinian-Jewish (as opposed to a Hellenistic or Diaspora Jewish) background of the respective NT texts, even if no specific “Essenian” or “*yahadic*” influences are present. Rather, the Qumran texts contribute to the perception of the (Palestinian) Jewish matrix¹⁰⁵ in which Jesus and the early church – but also Paul, the Synoptics, and the Johannine – tradition share a part in. Since the *yahad* was subject to a strict, arcane discipline in view of its specific beliefs (IQS IX 16–7; X 24–5; Jos. *J.W.* II 141), and it is questionable whether the internal rules, views and interpretations, and texts such as the pesharim or the *Hodayot* were accessible to outsiders, the non-group-specific texts (parabiblical, exegetical, wisdom, halakic texts, and prayers) deserve special weight for comparison with the NT and for clarifying the context of the proclamation of Jesus and his followers.¹⁰⁶ As a whole, the text discoveries have led to a stronger perception of Jewish contexts and have ended the temporary favoring of pagan-gnostic horizons in New Testament scholarship.

¹⁰⁴ K. Bieberstein, “Die Hagia Sion in Jerusalem: Zur Entwicklung ihrer Traditionen im Spiegel der Pilgerberichte,” in *Akten des XII. Internationalen Kongresses für Christliche Archäologie, Bonn, 22.–28. September 1991* (ed. E. Dassmann and J. Engemann; Münster: Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1995), 1:543–551.

¹⁰⁵ Fitzmyer, “The Qumran Scrolls and the New Testament After Forty Years,” *RevQ* 13 (1988), 609–620, here 610.

¹⁰⁶ G. J. Brooke, “The Presectarian Jesus,” in *Echoes from the Caves: Qumran and the New Testament* (ed. F. García Martínez; STDJ 85; Leiden: Brill, 2009).

II. John the Baptist

In earlier research, the Baptist was often interpreted as a (possibly former, then “excommunicated”) “Essene”:¹⁰⁷ His work in the desert, his ascetic food and clothing, the expectation of the proximity of the end, and the water ritual he practiced could give the impression of not just a spatial proximity to Qumran. Of course, many of the parallels are not sufficiently significant. The differences are also enlightening: While the Gospels use Isa 40:3 as a reference to the Baptist and see his “path-making” in his proclamation and baptismal rite (Mark 1:3–4) or his testimony to Christ (John 1:23), and the Baptist, if he himself referred to Isa 40:3 or Mal 3:1–3) appeared as Elijah *redivivus*, the warning before Judgment Day, 1QS VIII 14–15 takes up the same passage but interprets “preparing the way” as studying the Torah. There are also significant differences between the Qumran daily ritual purity baths and the bath “for the forgiveness of sins” given once before the judgment. That baptism of the Baptist as a ritual anticipation of judgment by fire announced in Mal 3 cannot be derived from the Essene ritual baths. The Qumran texts rather illuminate the difference between the prophetic form of the Baptist and the *yaḥad*.¹⁰⁸

III. Jesus and Christology

All the popular theses that Jesus had listened to the Essenes, learned from them (e.g., healing), or survived the crucifixion through their care are historically absurd. A personal connection cannot be proven. Nevertheless, the Qumran texts illuminate many aspects of Jesus’ proclamation, his motifs, contexts, and linguistic forms,¹⁰⁹ and the formation of early Christology in the context of the diversity of contemporary messianic thought.¹¹⁰

The early comparisons of Jesus with the “Teacher of Righteousness”¹¹¹ also show differences rather than parallels:¹¹² the “Teacher” was a priest

¹⁰⁷ Braun, *Qumran*, 1:29.

¹⁰⁸ Stegemann, *Essener*, 292–313; Frey, “Impact,” 443–450 (in this volume, 561–568).

¹⁰⁹ C. Evans, “Jesus in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years* (ed. P. W. Flint and J. C. VanderKam; vol. 2; Leiden: Brill, 1999); H.-W. Kuhn, “Jesus im Licht der Qumrangemeinde,” in *Handbook for the Study of the Historical Jesus* (ed. T. Holmen and S. E. Porter; Leiden: Brill, 2011), 2:1245–1285.

¹¹⁰ J. Frey, “Die Textfunde von Qumran und die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft. Eine Zwischenbilanz, hermeneutische Überlegungen und Konkretionen zur Jesusüberlieferung,” in *Qumran aktuell* (ed. J. Frey and E. E. Popkes, with assistance from S. Tätweiler; WUNT II/390; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015), 225–293, in particular 258–290 (English translation “The Text Discoveries from Qumran and New Testament Scholarship,” in this volume, 600–621).

¹¹¹ Dupont-Sommer, *Aperçus*, 119–122; Braun, *Qumran*, 2:54–74.

¹¹² G. Jeremias, *Der Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit* (SNTSU 2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1963), 319–353.

(4QpPs^a III 15–17), presumably even the high priest;¹¹³ Jesus was not. The “Teacher” was probably pursued by his rival (1QpHab XI 2–8), but died of natural causes (CD XIX 35–XX 1; XX 13–4). Messianic claims were never raised by the “Teacher,” nor was he ever associated with (expectant) messianic figures. On the other hand, the Teacher was an authoritative Torah interpreter (cf. 4QMMT; cf. Matt 5:21–48), and the *Hodayot*, which possibly refers to him, speaks of an “I” claiming to be “a sign of the righteous one chosen” by God (1QH^a X 15) and “the trap for wrongdoers, but for the salvation for all who repent of iniquity” (1QH^a X 10–11). This “functional claim” is comparable to Jesus’ claims with regard to his mission (Luke 12:8–9 || Matt 10:32). The *yahad*, founded by the “Teacher,” which claimed to represent all of Israel in the present end-time, is to be compared to the circle of the Twelve “created” by Jesus, which remained a wandering “fringe group,” symbolically aimed at the renewal of Israel, but only developing institutional structures after Easter.

The clearest differences are found in the teaching and practice of the Torah: While the *yahad* represented a priestly, strictly observant halakic-oriented position (4QMMT) and therein saw the revelation of God’s will granted to it, Jesus’ position and practice concerning the Torah is different: His revelation is not “better” Torah interpretation, but that he himself is the manifestation of salvation.

(a) Eschatology and God’s kingdom: the Qumran texts offer important insights about Jesus’ proclamation of the βασιλεία. The term (Hebrew מַלְכוּת), along with some other evidence,¹¹⁴ occurs in close connection with the “angel liturgy” of the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*, in which God’s kingship is praised in heaven, yet the earthly community in its reading and liturgical activity participates within it. The βασιλεία in Palestinian Jewish thought is not just an earthly expectation but is also entangled with the heavenly. Jesus’ “dual-time” idea of a βασιλεία as one coming (Luke 11:2) and one that is “already present” (Luke 11:20; 17:20–21) is understandable in this context. It has an analogy in the eschatology of the *yahad*, insofar as, in addition to the expectation of the end, there is belief that as the “human temple” (4QMidrEschat III 6; cf. 1QS VIII 5) they are connected with the angels in “a circle of the holy building” (1QS XI 7–8) and participate in the cult of the angels (1QSb III 25–6; 1QH^a XIX 17, 28–9). But the consciousness of present salvation in Qumran is grounded in the insight into the proper interpretation of the Torah, while in Jesus it is connected with and differently grounded in his exorcisms and healings (Luke 10:18; 11:20), that is, the salvation that takes place in his ministry (Matt 12:41–2).

¹¹³ Stegemann, *Essener*, 205–206.

¹¹⁴ Evans, “Jesus,” 580–585.

(b) Torah and Halakah: Although Jesus represented a radicalization of the Torah on some points (Matt 5:28–29; 5:34), his doctrine and practice of the Sabbath, purity, and food halakah seem to be less rigid. Jesus taught a stricter understanding of marriage in comparison to the rabbis and in this way is parallel to Qumran. The prohibition against divorce in Mark 10:6–9 with reference to God’s will in creation (Gen 1:27; 2:24) has a parallel in the reference to Gen 1:27 in CD IV 21. However, there it is not the divorce but remarriage that is in view in the case of the death of the woman. Thus, the halakic parallel is only roughly, but not exactly present.¹¹⁵ Even Jesus’ rigid prohibition against oaths has a Qumran parallel (CD XV 1–2), but while Jesus forbids oaths in everything connected with God’s rule, CD deals with the protection of the name of God and CD XV 6–8 expressly allows the oaths to be used in view of the “covenant” (i.e., entering). The “radicalization” of Jesus also differs here from the Qumran halaka. Statements that the covetous gaze equals adultery and the hateful word equals that of killing (Matt 5:22, 28) do not so much aim at a radicalized practice or even literal fulfillment (Matt 5:29), but provide a correction of the relationship of God in light of the dawning of the βασιλεία.

In contrast to Qumran, there is an emphasis on purity practices: Jesus interpreted “impurity” ethically (Mark 7:15) and ate with sinners, while in Qumran even new members were only allowed to touch the food and drink with the community after years of trial (1QS VI 14–16, 20–23). The *yahad* expelled the physically-afflicted from the congregation (1QSa II 3–11), while Jesus included them in the community of salvation. While the *yahad* rigidly upheld the Sabbath,¹¹⁶ Jesus healed on the Sabbath. According to CD XI 13–14, one should not help an injured animal on the Sabbath; In Luke 13:15–16 and Matt 12:11, Jesus’ words address more “liberal” interlocutors, who consider this permissible in order to justify his practice *a fortiori*. It is conceivable that the doctrine taught in Matt 5:43, “to love one’s neighbor and hate the enemy,” alludes to a position such as 1QS I 9f. or I 16–II 18, but this is by no means certain.

(c) Forms of Speech and Terms: Other parallels offer insights into synoptic forms of speech: Thus, in Qumran, a parallel to “poor in spirit” from Matt 5:3 is attested (1QM XIV 7; 1QH^a VI 14), which is understood in the sense of being “humble.” In 4Q525, there is a series of wisdom statements that has a parallel in the form of Matt 5:3–10 and shows that the Matthean form of the

¹¹⁵ L. T. Stuckenbruck, “The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament,” in *Qumran and the Bible: Studying the Jewish and Christian Scriptures in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. N. Dávid and A. Lange; CBET 57; Leuven: Peeters, 2010), 150–151; L. Doering, “Marriage and Creation in Macc 10 and CD 4f.,” in *Echoes from the Caves* (ed. F. García Martínez; STDJ 85; Leiden: Brill, 2009), 133–164.

¹¹⁶ *Jub.* 50:5–13 calls for the death penalty for Sabbath breaking; but cf. differently CD XII 3–4.

beatitudes stands in a line with sapiential traditions in Palestinian Judaism.¹¹⁷ 4Q500 offers an interpretation of the vineyard of Isaiah 5, relating it to Jerusalem and the temple, which shows that allegories were present in Palestinian exegesis and therefore cannot be excluded *eo ipso* in Jesus' parables, such as Mark 12:1–11.¹¹⁸ This observation should lead to a revision of the principles of parable interpretation, in particular of the view that any allegory must be a secondary addition. The new wisdom texts from Qumran in particular have shown that the alternative between an apocalyptic and a sapiential non-apocalyptic understanding of Jesus is wrong because wisdom traditions around Jesus were already associated with apocalyptic elements.¹¹⁹

(d) Messianism and Christology: The Qumran discoveries contribute significantly to the understanding of the beginnings of Christology and its unfolding as an intra-Jewish phenomenon. The source basis in terms of eschatological and messianic hopes is now significantly broadened.¹²⁰ The idea of a fixed messianic “dogma” in late Second Temple Judaism is definitely obsolete. Diverse eschatological expectations, with or without a form of salvation, “messianic” figures with royal, prophetic, priestly, or angelic features occur, are in part combined, and exist side-by-side. In addition to the expectation of a Davidic Messiah,¹²¹ there is the expectation of a priestly “Aaronic Messiah” or an end-time high priest (in the Levi text 4Q541) or of a prophet like Moses according to Deut 18:15.¹²² In some texts, there is talk of exaltation or enthronement (4Q491 [4QM^a] 11 i 10–14), or the Redeemer figure has heavenly features as in 11QMelch. The specific expectation of two messiahs (priestly and political: CD XIX 33–XX 1) does not appear in all the texts of the *yahad*, in which there was no unity of the Messianic imagination, but a plurality of hopes. 4Q246 documents a figure called “Son of God” and a close linguistic parallel to Luke 1:32–35, although the identity of this figure (messianic or rather opposed to God) is unclear. 4Q521 offers close parallels with Jesus' answer to the Baptist (Luke 7:22 || Matt 11:5), which shows that Jesus could refer to common beliefs about God's end-time action. The parallel helps us to

¹¹⁷ G. J. Brooke, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament* (London: Fortress Press, 2005), 235–260.

¹¹⁸ Brooke, *Scrolls*, 235–260.

¹¹⁹ J. J. Collins, “Wisdom, Apocalypticism and Generic Compatibility,” in *Seers, Sibyls and Sages in Hellenistic-Roman Judaism* (ed. idem; JSJ.S 54; Leiden et al.: Brill, 1997), 385–404.

¹²⁰ Collins, *Scepter*; J. Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte aus Qumran* (WUNT II/104; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998); A. L. A. Hogeterp, *Expectations of the End: A Comparative Tradio-Historical Study of Eschatological, Apocalyptic, and Messianic Ideas in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament* (STDJ 83; Leiden: Brill, 2009).

¹²¹ “Messiah of Israel” 1QS IX 11 and 4Q175 14–20; “Shoot of David” 4Q174 III 11; “Ruler of the Community” 1QSb V 20ff.

¹²² Thus 4Q175 5–8 – combined with the Davidic hope 4Q175 14–20.

understand how Jesus, through his healings and exorcisms and through his proclamation, could awaken messianic impressions.¹²³ The Qumran discoveries illuminate the formation of Christology from Jewish roots, within the framework of the plural and variegated Judaism of the late Second Temple period. Earlier theses that christological titles such as “Son of God” and “Kyrios” could only have developed on Hellenistic soil are now obsolete.

IV. Paul and His Jewish Background

In earlier research, Paul’s language and thought was considered to be in a wide distance from Palestinian Judaism and was rather explained from Hellenistic or gnostic concepts. Paul appeared as the true founder of Christianity, ruggedly separated from the religion of Jesus and the first disciples. Behind this was the skepticism about Acts 5:34 and the lack of sources from Palestinian Judaism before 70 CE. The Qumran finds have closed this gap, and some motifs previously regarded as “non-Jewish” can now be understood as Jewish in this context. The Jewish character and identity of the apostle was thus impressively confirmed in accordance with his testimony (Rom 9:3; 11:1; 2 Cor 11:22).

However, direct connections between Paul and Qumran or Paul and the Essenes cannot be assumed: Speculations that the refuge of the “Teacher of Righteousness” in the “land of Damascus” mentioned in CD VII 18–20 was in fact not Damascus but Qumran, or that Paul has his turn (Acts 9:2) in Qumran¹²⁴ are based on gross misinterpretations of CD and are unfounded in Paul’s view. Paul was not an Essene and probably never read the texts of the *yahad*. He could have encountered only the non-group specific (sapiential, exegetical) texts from the Qumran corpus. The terminological and factual parallels in the Qumran texts show, however, that in many motifs Paul uses a Palestinian-Jewish language matrix.¹²⁵ Here are just a few examples:

(a) The talk of “children of light” or “of the day” for the members of the community in 1 Thess 5:5 has its most important parallel in the self-designation of the *yahad* in some group-specific texts, albeit already in older texts such as the Visions of Amram and the Treatise on the Two Spirits IQS III 13–IV 26. In וְיֹאדָם... (= כְּנִי ...), there is a Semitic, Palestinian-Jewish influence.

¹²³ M. Becker, “Die ‘messianische Apokalypse’ 4Q521 und Interpretationsrahmen der Taten Jesu,” in *Apokalyptik und Qumran* (ed. J. Frey and M. Becker; Einblicke 10; Paderborn: Bonifatius, 2007), 237–303.

¹²⁴ P. Lapide, *Paulus zwischen Damaskus und Qumran* (Gütersloh: Mohn, 1993).

¹²⁵ J. A. Fitzmyer, “Paul and the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment* (ed. P. W. Flint and J. C. VanderKam; 2 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 2:599–621. H.-W. Kuhn, *Qumran und Paulus: Das Urchristentum in seiner literarischen Geschichte* (BZNW 100; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1999), 222–246.

(b) The term “works of the law” (ἔργα νόμου: Gal 2:16; 3:2, 5:10; Rom 3:20, 28), to which no parallels exist either in the Hebrew Bible or in rabbinic literature, can be found in the Qumran library. In 1QS V 21, “his works in the law” is attested; the exact expression is found in 4QMMT (C27): מַעֲשֵׂי הַתּוֹרָה (= works of the Torah). There, it designates halakic specifics, “works, which are to be done according to the law” and are things the addressee should obey and teach so that this would be “counted for righteousness.” Paul takes up a term that was used in the discussion of halakic questions and was also connected there with the motif of “righteousness” in an eschatological context.

(c) Furthermore, the phrase δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ has no exact parallels in the OT. For the first time, an analogous Hebrew phrase is used in the Qumran texts: צְדָקַת אֱלֹהִים (1QS X 25; XI 12) and צְדָקָה אֱלֹהִים (1QM IV 6). In 1QH^a VI 26–7, there is a parallel to the “revelation of the righteousness of God” (Rom 1:17): “and your [God’s] righteousness will be revealed (וּנְגַלְתָּה צְדָקַתְךָ) before all your creatures.” The understanding of righteousness is different, but the parallel is that it is “revealed.”¹²⁶

(d) The Qumran community saw itself as a “temple of humans” (4Q174 = 4QMidrEschat III 6) and “Aaron’s house” (1QS VIII 5; cf. IX 6), in which God’s holiness is present. Both in Qumran (1QS VIII 5; XI 8; cf. *Jub.* 1:16–17) and in Paul (1 Cor 3:9–17) the notion of temple and building is associated with the equally broader notion of one “planting” of God (see CD I 9). Paul takes pictures that are spread throughout the Jewish tradition and are already connected – even using them with respect to his dominantly Gentile-Christian addressees.

(e) The dualistic antithesis of “flesh” and “spirit” (Gal 5:17; Rom 8:4ff.) and especially the talk of “flesh” as a sin-stirring force that is hostile to God, which occurs in the New Testament only in Paul, cannot be explained either by the OT or Hellenistic Judaism (Wis; Philo). It does, however, have close parallels in Qumran texts in which “flesh” (בָּשָׂר) is associated with “iniquity” and “sin” (1QS XI 9–14; 1QH^a XII 30–1) and an astonishing awareness of one’s own baseness and sin. The idea of the “sinful,” not only sluggish, due to the material existence, but downright anti-divine “flesh,” goes back to pre-sectarian wisdom texts (*Instruction*), in which it can be seen how the negative connotation of בָּשָׂר successively arose and then was received by the *yahad*. Thus, here, Paul takes up a motif from a hitherto unknown branch of the Palestinian-Jewish wisdom tradition.¹²⁷

¹²⁶ Cf. F. Zanella, “Das Vokabular für ‘Gerechtigkeit’ in den Qumranschriften und Paulus,” in *Jesus, Paulus und die Texte von Qumran* (ed. Jörg Frey and Enno Edzard Popkes, with assistance from S. Tätweiler; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015), 363–290.

¹²⁷ Jörg Frey, “Flesh and Spirit in the Palestinian Jewish Sapiential Traditions and in the Qumran Texts: An Inquiry into the Background of Pauline Usage,” in this volume; Stuckenbruck, “Scrolls,” 166–168.

(f) The scriptural interpretation of Paul is illuminated by the exegetical texts of Qumran in many ways. An example is the text of Hab 2:4, cited in Rom 1:17 and Gal 3:11, which is cited in 1QpHab VIII 1–3 in a form other than that of the MT and the LXX. Here, the text “the righteous one shall live by his faithfulness” is not related to God’s faithfulness but to the faithfulness of “doers of the Torah” to the “Teacher of Righteousness,” which comes close to the interpretation of Paul, for whom the objective subject of πίστις is δίκαιος, rather than God.

(g) A new explanation is given in Gal 3:13, where Deut 21:33 (“cursed is the one who hangs on the wood”) is cited. Interpreting this as a reference to a crucified person was without analogy before the Qumran discoveries. Now, evidence to such an interpretation comes from 4QpNah 3–4 I 4–9 and the *Temple Scroll* 11QT^a LXIV 6–13.

(h) The Pauline talk of the κοινή κτίσις (Gal 6:15; 2 Cor 5:17) takes up a syntagma common in Qumran and related texts (*Jub.* 1:29; 4:26; 4QPsJub^a 1:7; cf. further 1QH^a V 28–29; 1QS IV 25; 4Q434 II 2–3); in Paul, the eschatological idea is used to express the state of salvation in the faith.

(i) Concerning the (in its controversial Pauline origin) dualistic section of 2 Cor 6:14–7:1, in which the dualism of “righteousness and unrighteousness,” “light and darkness,” and “Christ and Belial” (6:14–15) occur, the group-specific Qumran texts offer the closest parallels. In them, a comparable cosmic dualism is present, and “Belial” is the most characteristic name for the devil; the Greek form Βελιάρ occurs often in the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*.

V. The Gospel of John and his “Dualism”

Early on, the significance of the Qumran finds for the understanding of John was recognized,¹²⁸ especially since Hellenistic and Gnostic explanations of the language and way of thinking (especially John’s dualism) of the Gospel prevailed around 1950. The Qumran texts (especially 1QS and 1QM) appeared to offer a dualism closer to that of Gnosticism, such that scholars – especially those opposed to the school of Rudolf Bultmann – now wanted to find the background of John in Qumran and saw the evangelist as influenced by the Essenes,¹²⁹ or even as a converted Essene who had internalized the Treatise on the Two Spirits (1QS III 13–IV 26) and its dualism of light and darkness.¹³⁰ The discoveries have also triggered a turning point in the re-

¹²⁸ K. G. Kuhn, “Texte,” 210.

¹²⁹ R. E. Brown, “The Qumran scrolls and the Johannine Gospel and Epistles,” *CBQ* 17 (1955): 403–19, 559–74.

¹³⁰ J. H. Charlesworth, “A Critical Comparison of the Dualism in 1QS 3, 13f., 26 and the ‘Dualism’ Contained in the Fourth Gospel,” *NTS* 15 (1969): 389–418; idem, “The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Gospel according to John,” in *Exploring the Gospel of John: In Honor*

search of John towards greater attention to Jewish contexts. However, the recent research has questioned a direct influence.¹³¹ Three arguments are essential:

(a) The Treatise on the Two Spirits was no “catechism” of the Essenes; it is not even attested in all S-texts and may come from a wisdom precursor group.¹³² Its dualism, which encompasses cosmic, ethical, and “psychological” dimensions, differs from the eschatological combat dualism of the 1QM *War Scroll* and from the clearly defined cosmic dualism of the *yahad*, for which light and darkness are separated from each other at the boarder of the community.¹³³ An influence from the *yahad* would be more visible in traces of this dualism than in parallels with the Treatise on the Two Spirits.¹³⁴

(b) The parallels between the Treatise on the Two Spirits and the Johannine texts are impressive at first glance,¹³⁵ but many are not specific enough to allow for a textual influence. Although “sons of the light” (John 12:36) is frequently documented in Qumran (1QS I 9; I 16; III 13, 24–5; 1QM I 1, 3, 9, 11, 13; etc.) as a self-designation of the community, it was already received before John in 1 Thess 5:5 and Luke 16:8 (cf. Eph 5:8) so that a direct influence from Qumran is implausible. Furthermore, the syntagma already occurs in pre-sectarian Aramaic texts such as the Visions of Amram (4Q548 1–2 ii 10–11, 15–16; cf. “sons of truth” and “sons of lies” 4Q548 1–2 ii 8–9); it is not a new formation by the *yahad* and can also be mediated outside of it. “Spirit of truth” is used differently in the Johannine writings (John 14:17; 15:25; 16:13; 1 John 4:6) than in 1QS III 18–19; IV 21, 23 (cf. 4Q177 12–13 I 5 and 4Q542 1 i 10); this term is also found outside of the *yahad* in *T. Jud.* 20:1–5 and independent of John in *Herm. Mand* III 4 so that the second designation of the Spirit-Paraclete in John cannot be explained from Qumran.¹³⁶ In addition to this, “doing the truth” can be found outside of Qumran in Isa

of D. Moody Smith (ed. R. A. Culpepper and C. C. Black; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1996), 65–97.

¹³¹ R. Bauckham, “Qumran and the Fourth Gospel,” in *Scrolls and Scriptures* (ed. S. E. Porter and C. E. Evans; Sheffield: T&T Clark, 1997), 267–279; Aune, “Dualism in the Fourth Gospel and the Dead Sea Scrolls: A reassessment of the problem,” in *Neotestamentica et Philonica: Studies in Honor of Peder Borgen* (ed. D. E. Aune, T. Seland, and J. H. Ulrichsen; NT.S 106; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 281–303; J. Frey, “Licht aus den Höhlen: Der ‘johanneische Dualismus’ und die Texte von Qumran,” in *Kontexte des Johannesvangeliums* (ed. J. Frey and U. Schnelle; WUNT 175; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004), 117–203; id., “Recent Perspectives on Johannine Dualism and its Background,” in *Text, Thought, and Practice in Qumran and Early Christianity* (ed. R. Clements and D. R. Schwartz; STDJ 84; Leiden: Brill, 2008), 127–157 (in this volume, 763–790).

¹³² Lange, *Prädestination*; Frey, “Patterns.”

¹³³ Frey, “Patterns”; idem, “Apocalyptic Dualism.”

¹³⁴ Frey, “Licht,” 168–170.

¹³⁵ Charlesworth, “Comparison.”

¹³⁶ Aune, “Dualism,” 297–300.

26:10 LXX and Tob 4:6, 13:6, and *T. Benj.* 10:3; “walk in the truth” in LXX 2 Kings 20:3; “to walk in the light/darkness” is also documented in the LXX and the Hebrew OT, “light of life” occurs in the Psalter (Ps 56:14; et al.), and “eternal life” occurs first in Dan 12:3 and then is documented in numerous Jewish and early Christian texts. Those terms show the anchoring of Johannine language in Jewish traditions, but do not prove any influence of Qumran since John could have drawn from many Jewish and early Christian traditions.

(c) Finally, John’s dualistic motifs are not simply to be understood from a religious milieu, but in their literary function. John does not accept a given “worldview,” but uses dualistic motifs with the intention that the readers move from death to life or from darkness to light.¹³⁷ Thus, John fundamentally differs from Qumran. An immediate influence of Qumran texts or the Essenes on the book of John is, therefore, not to be assumed, even if the Qumran texts have led scholars to see once again the Jewish elements of John.

E. Conclusion

The Qumran discoveries have changed the image of the Jewish contexts of Early Christianity like no other textual discoveries. This concerns the use and interpretation of Scripture, eschatology and messianism, angelology and demonology, the juxtaposition of religious parties and halakic discourses, calendars and festivals, the development of wisdom and apocalypticism, literary genres and liturgical traditions. None of this could be adequately understood without the texts of Qumran. But all speculation about direct links between the Essenes and early Christians is unfounded. More important than the question of the “Essene” influences are the outcrops that arise through analogies and parallels in the (group-specific and other) texts and help to understand the formation of the early Christian movement within the pluri-form contemporary Judaism.

¹³⁷ J. Frey, “Johannine Dualism. Reflections on Its Background and Function,” in *The Glory of the Crucified One. Christology and Theology in the Gospel of John* (trans. W. Coppins and C. Heilig; BMSEC; Waco, Tx: Baylor University Press), 101–167.

II. Qumran and Early Judaism

3. Qumran Research and Biblical Scholarship in Germany*

A comprehensive history of Qumran research is a complex matter, and the present article can only develop selected aspects from a German viewpoint.¹ It focuses on the issue of Qumran and the Bible, with special consideration of the Qumran contribution to the interpretation of the New Testament and Early Christianity.

A. The Context of Qumran Scholarship in the Period after the Second World War

The beginnings and early history of German Qumran scholarship can be adequately considered only in light of the state of biblical scholarship at faculties of theology – mostly Protestant – in the years after the Second World War, and of the tradition of German exegetical (primarily New Testament) scholarship. Some aspects are significant.

In the German academic system, biblical studies are taught in theology faculties, where there is a clear distinction between chairs in Old and New Testament. Apart from this, there were some positions for Semitic or Oriental studies at philosophical faculties, whereas most of the chairs in Jewish studies were installed only later.² This may explain why in Germany Qumran

* This article was written during my research leave at the Alfried-Krupp-Wissenschaftskolleg in Greifswald in the 2008–2009 academic year. Sincere thanks are due to the Krupp Foundation for granting this prestigious scholarship, and to Devorah Dimant for all her patience and friendly support, including the correction of my non-native English.

¹ “German” is used here in the sense of German-speaking scholarship, including that of Austrian and Swiss scholars.

² Of course, there had been a long-standing tradition of Jewish scholarship in Germany, the *Wissenschaft des Judentums*, including scholars such as Leopold Zunz, Heinrich Graetz, Abraham Geiger, and more recently Leo Baeck. But those scholars did not teach at universities, and the *Wissenschaft des Judentums* came to an end with the emigration of most Jewish scholars from Germany in the 1920s and 1930s, and finally with the annihilation of most of European Jewry in the years of persecution and the Shoah. There was also an earlier tradition of Christian theological institutions exploring Judaism, the *Instituta Judaica* in Leipzig (Franz Delitzsch) and Berlin (Hermann L. Strack), but some scholars of that tradition held a rather negative view of post-biblical Judaism as the dark background

scholarship was primarily guided by a “Christian” perspective on the relevance of the Scrolls for Early Christianity and by the “Christian” quest for the relevance of the new discoveries for understanding Early Christianity.³

Furthermore, in the early post-war period Protestant theology,⁴ as well as New Testament scholarship, underwent total restructuring. Several leading scholars in the field had died during the war or immediately after,⁵ and others were at least temporarily excluded from university service due to their activities during the Nazi period.⁶ So with few competitors,⁷ the famous Marburg

of Christianity; others from those institutions became involved in the ideological *Forschungen zur Judenfrage* during the Nazi period. Whereas the Delitzsch-Institute was reopened in 1948 by Karl H. Rengstorff in Münster, to prepare a new Jewish-Christian encounter and another *Institutum Judaicum* was then founded in Tübingen by Otto Michel, specialist institutions for Judaic studies at German-language universities were only founded from 1966 (see G. Stemberger, “Judaistik,” *TRE* 17:290–304, here 294–5). Only a few Jewish scholars continued to publish in German after their emigration (such as Joseph Klausner, or later David Flusser), but their contributions belong to the context of scholarship in Israel and are not included here.

³ In the first two decades, this was the most prominent question in the Qumran debate in Germany but also in France (André Dupont-Sommer) and in the English-speaking context. Note the title of the first Leuven conference devoted to Qumran in 1957: J. van der Ploeg, ed., *La secte de Qumrân et les origines du Christianisme* (RechBib 4; Paris: Desclée et Brouwer, 1959).

⁴ Roman Catholic exegesis was not wholly free to engage in critical biblical scholarship before the Second Vatican Council, but afterwards it entered promptly into the exegetical debate having speedily adopted most of the methods and results of earlier Protestant scholarship. In the Qumran field, however, some of the first scholars, above all from the French *École Biblique et Archéologique* in Jerusalem, were Roman Catholics. Later, some rather popular suspicions were nourished that Qumran scholars might hide some texts that could endanger the truth of Christianity, but they were totally unjustified.

⁵ Hans Lietzmann had died in 1942, Hans von Soden in 1945, and Martin Dibelius in 1947; Ernst Lohmeyer was murdered by Russian occupation troops in 1946, and in 1948 Julius Schniewind died, who had given the most profound response to Rudolf Bultmann’s famous lecture on demythologizing the New Testament (J. Schniewind, “Antwort an Rudolf Bultmann: Thesen zum Problem der Entmythologisierung,” in *Kerygma und Mythos* [ed. H. W. Bartsch; 2 vols.; Hamburg-Volksdorf: Reich, 1948], 1:77–121).

⁶ E.g., Gerhard Kittel from Tübingen (1888–1948), who had inaugurated the *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, and his student Walter Grundmann, who had become Professor of New Testament in Jena (1906–1976). Both had been intensely involved in anti-Jewish writing, and Grundmann especially speculated that Jesus was of a non-Jewish (i.e., “Arian”) descent (see W. Grundmann, *Jesus der Galiläer und das Judentum* [Leipzig: Wigand, 1940]; on Grundmann see R. Deines, ed., *Walter Grundmann – ein Neutestamentler im Dritten Reich* [Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2007]). Kittel died in 1948. Grundmann, however, became active again in East Germany and wrote influential commentaries on the Synoptics. Together with Johannes Leipoldt, he wrote a popular classroom book on the *Umwelt* of the New Testament during the 1950s and 1960s. On Karl Georg Kuhn, a former student of Kittel, see below.

scholar Rudolf Bultmann and some of his students⁸ achieved the predominant position in New Testament studies, which they held at least until the 1970s. They generally advocated a “modern” interpretation of the New Testament with the focus mainly on a Hellenistic or Gnostic background to Early Christianity, but showed little interest in (or knowledge of) Jewish sources. Accordingly, Bultmann himself and most of his former students (with the exception of Herbert Braun) paid little attention to the Qumran discoveries. The more conservative wing of scholarship, still unsatisfied with the Bultmannian interpretation, turned to consider these new sources.

In the early years following the discovery of the Scrolls, mainly Hebraists and Old Testament scholars noted and commented on the new textual discoveries.⁹ In the 1950s and 1960s, debates on the Scrolls chiefly engaged New Testament scholars, such as Claus-Hunno Hunzinger, the only German member of the initial Scrolls’ editorial team,¹⁰ and Karl Georg Kuhn, who became the most respected German Qumran specialist and director of the Qumran-

⁷ The most prominent opponents of Bultmann’s approach were Joachim Jeremias in Göttingen and Oscar Cullmann in Basel. Other non-Bultmannian New Testament scholars with a certain influence were Otto Michel in Tübingen, Karl-Heinrich Rengstorf in Münster, Ethelbert Stauffer in Erlangen, and – in East Germany – Gerhard Delling in Halle.

⁸ Important among them as New Testament scholars were Ernst Käsemann (Göttingen and Tübingen), Gunther Bornkamm (Heidelberg), Herbert Braun (Mainz), Hans Conzelmann (Göttingen), and Philipp Vielhauer (Bonn); later Erich Gräßer (Bonn), Günter Klein (Münster), Willi Marxsen (Münster), and Otto Merk (Erlangen); in the North American context Helmut Koester (Harvard), and indirectly Hans Dieter Betz (Chicago). In the postwar context, the Bultmann school appeared trustworthy, since Bultmann himself could not be accused of any anti-Semitic attitudes, and some of his students had been imprisoned (Käsemann) or were at least members of the oppositional ‘Bekennende Kirche’ (Bornkamm, Braun); others were younger and graduated only in the early 1950s.

⁹ The first reports on the Scrolls in German were P. Thomsen, “Handschriftenfund in Palästina,” *TLZ* 73 (1948): 690; W. Baumgartner, “Der palästinische Handschriftenfund,” *TRu* 17 (1948–1949): 329–46; 19 (1951): 97–154; O. Eißfeldt and P. Kahle, “Der gegenwärtige Stand der Erforschung der in Palästina neu gefundenen hebräischen Handschriften,” *TLZ* 74 (1949): 91–98, 221–8, 595–600 (continued by several authors in the following volumes of *TLZ*); J. Hempel, “Vorläufige Mitteilungen über die am Nordwestrande des Toten Meeres gefundenen hebräischen Handschriften,” in *Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Phil.-Hist. Kl.* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1949), 411–38; O. Eißfeldt, “Die Bedeutung der 1947 in Palästina aufgefundenen alten hebräischen und aramäischen Handschriften,” *FF* 25 (1949): 196–200, 302; K. Schubert, “Ein Höhlenfund bei Jericho,” *Wort und Wahrheit* (1949): 636–40; “Die Texte aus der Sektiererhöhle bei Jericho,” in *Alttestamentliche Studien: Friedrich Nötscher zum sechzigsten Geburtstag, 19 Juli 1950, gewidmet von Kollegen, Freunden und Schülern* (ed. H. Junker and J. Botterweck; BBB 1; Bonn: Hanstein, 1950), 224–45.

¹⁰ Claus-Hunno Hunzinger (*1929) became Professor of New Testament and Late Ancient History of Religions at the Protestant Theological Faculty of the University of Hamburg in 1962. Having provisionally edited a few materials, he left the team quite early, and the French scholar Maurice Baillet took his place.

forschungsstelle in Heidelberg, where he trained and inspired numerous students.¹¹ But other scholars also contributed to the field, such as Otto Betz in Tübingen, Oscar Cullmann in Basel, and Herbert Braun in Mainz.¹² With a few exceptions,¹³ German scholars of the Hebrew Bible (or the Old Testament) were less involved in early Qumran debates and entered the field relatively late.¹⁴

The reason for this is evident in the nature of the earliest discoveries and in the predominantly Christian agenda of research. Of course, specialists of the Hebrew Bible quickly noted the relevance of the Great Isaiah Scroll and some

¹¹ Karl Georg Kuhn (1906–1976), later director of the Qumranforschungsstelle in Heidelberg (see below), became an Extraordinary Professor of New Testament in Göttingen in 1949 and moved to Heidelberg in 1954 where he occupied a second chair for New Testament at the Theological Faculty which he held until his retirement. Kuhn trained a large number of students in Qumran research who later became professors of New Testament at different German universities (Jürgen Becker in Kiel, Christoph Burchard in Heidelberg, Gert Jeremias in Marburg and Tübingen, Heinz-Wolfgang Kuhn in Munich, Hermann Lichtenberger in Münster and Tübingen, and Hartmut Stegemann in Marburg and Göttingen). Stegemann was given responsibility for the famous Qumranforschungsstelle, and he transferred it first to Marburg and then to Göttingen. On the biography and research of Karl Georg Kuhn, see Gerhard Lindemann, “Theological Research about Judaism in Different Political Contexts: The Example of K. G. Kuhn,” *KZG* 17 (2004): 339–51, and most recently G. Jeremias, “Karl Georg Kuhn (1906–1976),” in *Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft nach 1945: Hauptvertreter der deutschsprachigen Exegese in der Darstellung ihrer Schüler* (ed. C. Breitenbach and R. Hoppe; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 2008), 297–312, and G. Theissen, *Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft vor und nach 1945: Karl Georg Kuhn und Günther Bornkamm* (SPHKHAW 47; Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter, 2009), 15–149.

¹² Herbert Braun was the only member of the Bultmann school who published extensively on Qumran. His work on Jesus and Qumran (H. Braun, *Spätjüdisch-häretischer und frühchristlicher Radikalismus: Jesus von Nazareth und die essenische Qumransekte* [2 vols.; BHT 24; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1957]) is guided by the basic hermeneutical issues of the Bultmann school. His extensive report on the first ten years of research on Qumran and the New Testament (*Qumran und das Neue Testament* [2 vols.; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1966]) became a standard work but is also strongly influenced by the Bultmannian views on history-of-religion issues.

¹³ Notably Kurt Schubert (Vienna) and Johann Maier (Cologne), both of whom had started as Roman Catholic theologians but became professors of Jewish studies; the Old Testament scholars Hans Bardtke in Leipzig and Rudolf Meyer in Jena, and Georg Molin, who taught Semitic languages in Graz in Austria.

¹⁴ E.g., Odil Hannes Steck, who held the chair in Old Testament in Zurich, his former student Reinhard Gregor Kratz, who is now director of the Qumranforschungsstelle in Göttingen, Heinz-Josef Fabry, who holds the chair in Old Testament exegesis at the Catholic Theological Faculty in Bonn, and Armin Lange who wrote a Habilitation thesis in Old Testament in Tübingen and is now Professor of Second Temple Studies at the University of Vienna. On these scholars see below.

other manuscripts to the biblical text,¹⁵ and Hebraists had also noticed the importance of the new discoveries for linguistic matters.¹⁶ But since most of the biblical manuscripts, and also the parabiblical texts, were published only in the 1990s a more complete appreciation of the textual and related issues could not have arisen earlier. Instead, the agenda was set by the quest for the origins of Christianity and by issues raised from the contents of the *Community Rule*, the *War Scroll* and the other non-biblical texts from Cave 1.¹⁷ Thus, scholars started to explore and discuss the dualism found in some of the Scrolls¹⁸ and the linguistic and history-of-religions background of some New Testament texts, especially the Gospel of John.¹⁹ They analyzed scriptural

¹⁵ E.g., O. Eißfeldt, "Varianten der Jesajarolle," *TLZ* 74 (1949): 221–6; *Variae lectiones rotulorum manuscriptorum anno 1947 prope Mare Mortuum repertorum ad Jes 1–66 et Hab 1–2 pertinentes* (Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1951); P. Kahle, "Die Auffindung der Rollen und ihr Ankauf: Die textkritische Bedeutung der Jesaja-Rolle (IQIsa): Der Anlaß für das Verbergen der Rollen," *TLZ* 74 (1949): 91–94; *Die hebräischen Handschriften aus der Höhle* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1951); "Die im August 1952 entdeckte Lederrolle mit dem griechischen Text der kleinen Propheten und das Problem der Septuaginta," *TLZ* 79 (1954): 81–94.

¹⁶ See R. Meyer, "Zur Sprache von 'Ain Feschcha," *TLZ* 75 (1950): 721–6; "Das Problem der Dialektmischung in den hebräischen Texten von Qumran," *VT* 7 (1957): 139–48; "Bemerkungen zu den hebräischen Aussprachetraditionen von Chirbet Qumran," *ZAW* 70 (1958): 39–48; "Spuren eines westsemitischen Präsens-Futur in den Texten von Chirbet Qumran," in *Von Ugarit nach Qumran: Beiträge zur alttestamentlichen und altorientalischen Forschung: Otto Eißfeldt zum 1. September 1957 dargebracht von Freunden und Schülern* (ed. J. Hempel and L. Rost with W. F. Albright; BZAW 77; Berlin: Töpelmann, 1958), 118–28.

¹⁷ In German research, this was stated first by K. G. Kuhn, "Die Bedeutung der neuen palästinischen Handschriften für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft," *TLZ* 75 (1950): 81–86, who stressed the relevance of a "late Jewish sect" in temporal and spatial proximity to Jesus and the Primitive Community. In this early note, Kuhn points out the analogy of sharing property; in subsequent articles, he extensively discussed the issue of dualism and its historical explanation (see next footnote).

¹⁸ K. G. Kuhn, "Die in Palästina gefundenen hebräischen Texte und das Neue Testament," *ZTK* 47 (1950): 192–211; "Πειρασμός – ἁμαρτία – σάρξ im Neuen Testament und die damit zusammenhängenden Vorstellungen," *ZTK* 49 (1952): 200–222; "Die Sekten-schrift (IQS) und die iranische Religion," *ZTK* 49 (1952): 296–316.

¹⁹ E.g., Kuhn, "Die in Palästina gefundenen hebräischen Texte," 209–10, and later "Johannes-Evangelium und Qumrantexte," in *Neotestamentica et Patristica: Eine Freundesgabe Herrn Professor Dr. Oscar Cullmann zu seinem 60. Geburtstag überreicht* (ed. W. C. van Unnik; NT.S 6; Leiden: Brill, 1962), 111–22; cf. also O. Cullmann, "The Significance of the Qumran Texts for Research into the Beginnings of the New Testament," in *The Scrolls and The New Testament* (ed. K. Stendahl; New York: Harper, 1957), 18–32; "L'opposition contre le temple de Jérusalem, motif commun de la théologie Johannique et du monde ambiant," *NTS* 5 (1959): 157–73; G. Baumbach, *Qumran und das Johannes-Evangelium: Eine vergleichende Untersuchung der dualistischen Aussagen der Ordensregel von Qumrān und des Johannes-Evangeliums mit Berücksichtigung der spätjüdischen*

interpretation²⁰ and eschatology²¹ at Qumran, the figure of the Teacher of Righteousness in comparison with Jesus,²² and the character of the community as against the Primitive Community.²³ The nature of the community meals was compared with the Eucharist,²⁴ and the immersions with John the Baptist's purification rite and with early Christian baptism.²⁵ The calendrical differences provoked attempts to solve the problems of the chronology of the account of Jesus' passion by references to the Qumran calendar.²⁶ Moreover, scholars found numerous helpful parallels to various New Testament themes and texts. The early debate is summarized in a *catena* on the New Testament and thematic essays by Herbert Braun.²⁷

The parallels between the Qumran "sect" and Early Christianity are also treated extensively in the comprehensive introductions to the new discoveries by the Austrian Semitist Georg Molin,²⁸ the Vienna professor of Jewish studies Kurt Schubert,²⁹ and the East German Old Testament scholar Hans

Apokalypsen (AVTRW 6; Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1958); and O. Böcher, *Der johanneische Dualismus im Zusammenhang des nachbiblischen Judentums* (Gütersloh: Mohn, 1965). A little later the aspect of predestination was thoroughly analyzed and compared with the Johannine view by R. Bergmeier, *Glaube als Gabe nach Johannes* (BWANT 112; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1980).

²⁰ O. Betz, *Offenbarung und Schriftforschung in der Qumransekte* (WUNT 6; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1960). On the radicalization of the Torah see also Braun, *Spätjüdisch-häretischer und frühchristlicher Radikalismus*.

²¹ H. -W. Kuhn, *Enderwartung und gegenwärtiges Heil: Untersuchungen zu den Gemeindeliedern von Qumran mit einem Anhang über Eschatologie und Gegenwart in der Verkündigung Jesu* (SUNT 4; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966).

²² G. Jeremias, *Der Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit* (SUNT 2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1963).

²³ O. Betz, "Die Geburt der Gemeinde durch den Lehrer," *NTS* (1957): 314–26; "Das Volk seiner Kraft," *NTS* 4 (1958): 67–75; "Felsenmann und Felsengemeinde: Eine Parallele zu Mt 16,17–19 in den Qumranpsalmen," *ZNW* 48 (1957): 49–77.

²⁴ K. G. Kuhn, "Über den ursprünglichen Sinn des Abendmahls und sein Verhältnis zu den Gemeinschaftsmahlen der Sektenschrift (IQS)," *EvT* 10 (1950–1951): 508–27.

²⁵ O. Betz, "Die Proselytentaufe der Qumransekte und die Taufe im Neuen Testament," *RevQ* 1 (1958): 213–34.

²⁶ E.g., originally A. Jaubert, "La Date de la dernière Cène," *RHR* 146 (1954): 104–73; *La Date de la Cène* (Paris: Gabalda, 1957); "Jésus et le calendrier de Qumrân," *NTS* 7 (1960–1961): 1–30; in German research, see the conservative Roman Catholic scholars J. Blinzler, "Qumran-Kalender und Passionschronologie," *ZNW* 39 (1958): 223–51, and later E. Ruckstuhl, "Zur Chronologie der Leidensgeschichte Jesu: I. Teil," *SNTU* 10 (1985): 27–61, "Zur Chronologie der Leidensgeschichte Jesu: II. Teil," *SNTU* 11 (1986): 97–129.

²⁷ Braun, *Qumran und das Neue Testament*.

²⁸ G. Molin, *Die Söhne des Lichtes: Zeit und Stellung der Handschriften vom Toten Meer* (Vienna and Munich: Herold, 1954).

²⁹ K. Schubert, *Die Gemeinde vom Toten Meer: Ihre Entstehung und ihre Lehren* (Munich: Reinhardt, 1958); later reprinted in several editions in: J. Maier and K. Schubert, *Die*

Bardtke.³⁰ But such parallels were not uncommon in the early discussion of the Qumran findings. Extensive comparisons of the Scrolls with the New Testament entailing far-reaching conclusions were already made in 1950 by the French scholar André Dupont-Sommer, and later, in a more balanced manner, by Millar Burrows and Frank Moore Cross.³¹ The focus on the comparison between Qumran and Early Christianity was not solely a particular German phenomenon but a common trait of the early phase of Qumran research.

The impact of the Qumran discoveries on New Testament scholarship in Germany must be viewed in the context of the dominating exegetical school of Rudolf Bultmann. His views, like those of most of his students', were shaped overall by the history-of-religions school with a strong focus on the Hellenistic-oriental and allegedly gnostic background of the New Testament, together with a lack of interest in contemporary or rabbinic Judaism. Unlike some of his students, Bultmann refused to look for the historical Jesus and focused his work largely on Paul and John. He interpreted the two from the perspective of an alleged pre-Christian gnostic worldview and by the use of existentialist hermeneutics inspired by the philosophy of the early Martin Heidegger. Bultmann's approach of "demythologizing" the New Testament, first presented in a famous lecture in 1941 but published only in 1948,³² became very influential in German Protestantism after the Second World War. In the 1950s and 1960s, it sparked sharp controversy among academic theologians and between theologians and those in conservative Church circles.

Against the totality of Bultmann's theology and hermeneutics, with its lack of interest in the Jewish background of Early Christianity, the discovery of hitherto unknown Jewish documents in the Judean Desert could enhance scholarly interest in contemporary Judaism. For conservative scholars, the new texts also provided a better framework for an alternative interpretation, especially regarding the history of the religious background of the New Testament. The parallels between the texts from Cave 1 and the fourth Gospel especially could also serve to advocate more "conservative" views of the

Qumran-Essener: der Schriftrollen und Lebensbild der Gemeinde (Munich: Reinhardt, 1973).

³⁰ H. Bardtke, *Die Handschriftenfunde am Toten Meer: Die Sekte von Qumran* (Berlin: Evangelische Haupt-Bibelgesellschaft, 1958).

³¹ Dupont-Sommer, *Aperçus préliminaires*; M. Burrows, *The Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York: Viking, 1957); *More Light on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York: Viking, 1958); Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran*. But see the early article (autumn 1948) by M. Burrows, "The Contents and Significance of the Manuscripts," *BA* 11 (1948): 58–61 (59): "The fact that the manuscripts were found not far from the Dead Sea suggests at once that this group may have been the sect of the Essenes"

³² R. Bultmann, "Neues Testament und Mythologie," in *Kerygma und Mythos*, 1:15–48.

transmission and historical reliability of the Jesus tradition³³ and a stronger Palestinian Jewish influence on Paul.³⁴ As a result of the criticism of Bultmann's school, German scholars were more cautious than others. In general the Scrolls helped to draw German New Testament scholarship away from Gnosticism and to re-orient it to a more robust consideration of Jewish and especially Palestinian Jewish contexts.

Most significant is the shift in the study of the Gospel of John, in relation to which Bultmann had established his views in numerous articles and in his magisterial commentary.³⁵ From the very beginning, the type of dualism found at Qumran (primarily in 1QS III 14–IV 26) seemed to provide a closer parallel to the type of dualism in the Johannine writings than the Gnostic parallels adduced by Bultmann from the later movements of Mandaeism and Manichaeism. Quite significantly, the type of Judaism found in the Dead Sea Scrolls also differed from the types known from apocalyptic sources, and even more from later rabbinic thought. Karl Georg Kuhn claimed quite early that the non-orthodox type of Judaism found at Qumran was the “native soil” of Johannine language and thought.³⁶ He even concluded that Qumran dualism, or “more widely” the Essene sect, was the door through which Zoroastrian ideas were transmitted into the world of Early Christianity. Therefore, the “Qumran paradigm” was thought to replace the leading Gnostic paradigm.³⁷ Consequently, the focus of scholarship did not shift from Gnosticism to a common or even “normative” type of Judaism but to a type that was

³³ This is especially true for some American scholars, e.g., W. F. Albright, “Recent Discoveries in Palestine and the Gospel of St. John,” in *The Background of the New Testament and Its Eschatology: In Honour of Charles Harold Dodd* (ed. W. D. Davies and D. Daube; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1956), 153–71, who viewed the Scrolls as a confirmation that the fourth Gospel contained no less than “the memories of the Apostle John” himself (170–71), and Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran*, 161–2: “John preserves authentic historical material which first took form in an Aramaic or Hebrew milieu where Essene currents still ran strong.”

³⁴ Cf. W. D. Davies, “Additional notes,” in *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism* (2nd ed.; London: SPCK, 1955), 352–3; “Paul and the Dead Sea Scrolls: Flesh and Spirit,” in *The Scrolls and the New Testament*, 157–82, 276–82.

³⁵ Cf. R. Bultmann, *Das Evangelium des Johannes* (KEK 2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht), 1948.

³⁶ E.g., K. G. Kuhn, “Die in Palästina gefundenen hebräischen Texte,” 210: “In these new texts, we grasp the native soil of the Gospel of John, and this native soil is Palestinian-Jewish. However, it is not Pharisaic-rabbinic Judaism, but rather is a Palestinian-Jewish sectarian piety of gnostic structure.”

³⁷ See J. Frey, “Auf der Suche nach dem Kontext des Johannesevangeliums,” in *Kontexte des Johannesevangeliums: Das vierte Evangelium in religions-und traditionsgeschichtliche Perspektive* (ed. J. Frey and U. Schnelle, with J. Schlegel; WUNT 175; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004), 3–43, here 26–28.

different from Pharisaic or rabbinic thought, a “sectarian” or “heterodox” type of Judaism.

This was not a mere coincidence but was linked to the hermeneutical pattern adopted when the Qumran texts had been attributed to the Essenes. The attribution, originally suggested by Eliezer Lipa Sukenik³⁸ simply because Pliny had localized the Essenes near the Dead Sea, opened up a hermeneutical paradigm with a long prehistory, some implications of which should not go unnoticed.³⁹

As is well known, most of the Church fathers, beginning with Eusebius,⁴⁰ considered Philo’s *therapeutae* to be Christian ascetics, hence the Essenes and Therapeutae were viewed as Christians through the Middle Ages and later, the notable exception to this view being held by some Reformation theologians.⁴¹ Some authors, especially from the Carmelite order, even claimed that John the Baptist, Jesus, his mother, and the Apostles were Essenes (and Carmelites).⁴² With the enlightenment era the paradigm was modified and, chiefly within the Freemasonry movement, the Essenes were then considered an ideal enlightened association, open to Egyptian wisdom, Greek mysteries and Pythagorean teaching, or even the ideal, enlightened type of non-dogmatic and universalist Christianity. Some authors even thought that Jesus himself had been taught “therapeutical” wisdom by the Essenes⁴³ and some Rationalists aspired to explain his miracles or even his “resurrection” (or survival of apparent death) by such knowledge or by the assistance of the Essenes.⁴⁴ Long before the Qumran discoveries, the Essenes were viewed as a

³⁸ E. L. Sukenik, *Megillot Genuzot: Scrolls that Were Stored Away from an Ancient Genizah Found in the Judean Desert, First Survey* (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1948), 1:16–17 (Hebrew). Cf. also Burrows, “The Contents and Significance of the Manuscripts,” 59.

³⁹ For the following passage, cf. the extensive survey by S. Wagner, *Die Essener in der wissenschaftliche Diskussion: Vom Ausgang des 18. bis zum Beginn des 20. Jahrhunderts* (BZAW 79; Berlin: Töpelmann, 1960).

⁴⁰ Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* II 16–17. Cf. also Jerome, *Vir. ill.* 11 where even Philo is considered a Christian.

⁴¹ See Wagner, *Die Essener*, 3–4.

⁴² See Wagner, *Die Essener*, 5.

⁴³ The first author to suggest this was J. G. Wachter in *De primordiis Christianae religionis libri duo, quorum prior agit de Essaeis Christianorum inchoatoribus, alter de Christianis, Essaeorum posteris* (1713); see Wagner, *Die Essener*, 2. The work is now reprinted in: J. G. Wachter, *De primordiis Christianae religionis: Elucidarius cabalisticus* (Winfried Schroder, ed.; vol. 1,2 of *Freidenker der europäichen Aufklärung*; Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt: Fromman-Holzboog, 1995).

⁴⁴ Modern novelists, such as Michael Baigent and Richard Leigh, or Dan Brown, draw on material borrowed from those early Enlightenment authors. Cf. C. F. Bahrdr, *Ausführung des Planes und Zweckes Jesu* (12 vols.; Berlin: Mylius, 1784–1793), and K. H. Ven-

precursor group of Christianity; later the French historian Ernest Renan expressed this idea in viewing Christianity as an Essenism that had succeeded.⁴⁵ The broad range of scholarly views on the Essenes notwithstanding, they were often considered – based on the ancient descriptions from Philo and Josephus – a relatively open-minded group within Judaism, strongly influenced by non-Jewish (Persian, Egyptian, Greek, or even Buddhist) ideas, rendering it possible for non-Jewish elements to be transmitted to Early Christianity by the Essenes.⁴⁶ Even the Jewish scholar Joseph Klausner sought to explain all non-Pharisaic elements in Early Christianity by means of the Essenes.⁴⁷

This paradigm was effective once the Qumran texts had been ascribed to the Essenes. Although the character of that group could now be determined from very different sources, the idea of the Essenes as precursors of the Primitive Community,⁴⁸ as a quasi-“monastic” group,⁴⁹ or as the doorway for non-Jewish religious influences on Early Christianity could be adopted for the interpretation of the new texts, suggesting a direct line between Qumran and Early Christianity. This is just a variation of those earlier views, when Karl Georg Kuhn expressed the idea that the influence of Zoroastrianism on Early Christianity was mediated by the Essenes “heterodox” type of Judaism (or alternatively the dualism from Qumran). The Essenes were now the source of

turini, *Natürliche Geschichte des großen Propheten von Nazareth* (4 vols.; Bethlehem [Copenhagen]: Schubothe, 1800–1802).

⁴⁵ “Le christianisme est un essénisme qui a largement réussi.” See E. Renan, *Œuvres Complètes: Édition définitive* (vol. 6; ed. Henriette Psicharied; Paris: Calman-Levy, 1953), 1301. Cf. also E. Renan, *Vie de Jésus* (Paris: Levy, 1863), 73–74, where the author is more circumspect but notes numerous similarities between Essenism and Jesus, who are considered the enlightened people of that time. Cf. Wagner, *Die Essener*, 178.

⁴⁶ Cf. W. Bousset, *Die Religion des Judentums im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter* (2nd ed.; Berlin: Reuther & Reichard, 1906), 535–7: “This sect appears to be the channel through which some foreign elements (sacramentalism, the rejection of the cult?) flowed into young Christianity in its first development. The connection between them and also the Judaeo-Christian sects of the East Jordan, which were not irrelevant for the religious history of the following centuries, is obvious.”

⁴⁷ J. Klausner, *Jesus von Nazareth* (Berlin: Jüdischer Verlag, 1930), 284: “James, Jesus’s brother in the flesh, lived entirely as an Essene: as an ascetic and a hermit. Thus Christianity had took on much from the Essenes in the time shortly before and immediately after Jesus. Even Jesus himself is closely aligned with the Essenes in many ways. ... Thus, we can almost say with certainty that everything that does not come from Pharisaism in Early Christianity comes from the Essenes.”

⁴⁸ E.g., Dupont-Sommer, *Aperçus préliminaires*, 121, where he quotes the saying by Renan.

⁴⁹ Cf. already Bousset, *Die Religion des Judentums* (2nd ed.), 524: “the first appearance of an organized monastery.” So this paradigm was adopted when Qumran was taken to be an Essene monastery.

the “liberal” and universalistic tendencies in Early Christianity, which were notably different from the “normal,” Pharisaic, or rabbinic type of Judaism.

B. Scholars, Insights, and Projects

The second part of this article highlights the works of the most important German-speaking scholars active in Qumran research and some methodological developments and insights achieved in the first 40 years of discussion and after the full release of the Qumran fragments in 1991. A sketch of the most important projects developed in the last two decades and of those in progress concludes the article.

I. Editorial Work⁵⁰

The eight scholars first entrusted with the publication of the fragments kept in the Palestine Archaeological Museum (later Rockefeller Museum) included one German, the young Protestant New Testament scholar Claus-Hunno Hunzinger. He was to edit the fragments of the *War Scroll* from Cave 4 and some liturgical text fragments. But Hunzinger (later replaced by Maurice Baillet⁵¹) left the team quite quickly, having published only a few articles. One of them deserves mention because of the pioneering methodology used to discover different redactional layers in the *War Scroll*, evinced by a careful comparison of a Cave 1 scroll (1QM) with Cave 4 texts (4QM).⁵² The 1955 article shows how early scholars concluded that different manuscripts of allegedly the same work could provide different stages of development or even different recensions.⁵³ Hunzinger’s observations were an important step

⁵⁰ On this aspect, see also the article by A. Steudel, “Basic Research, Methods and Approaches to the Qumran Scrolls in German-Speaking Countries,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Scholarly Perspective: A History of Research* (ed. D. Dimant, with the assistance of I. Kottsieper; STDJ 99; Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2012), 565–99.

⁵¹ Cf. the introduction by Maurice Baillet, *Qumrân Grotte 4.III* (DJD VII; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982), xi–xiv.

⁵² C.-H. Hunzinger, “Fragmente einer älteren Fassung des Buches Milhamā aus Höhle 4 von Qumran,” *ZAW* 69 (1957): 131–51. Hunzinger concluded that 4QM^a is a copy of the old non-Qumranic text of the book *Milhamah*, whereas 1QM is a “Qumranized” version (150). His general conclusions were adopted in research only much later, when scholars generally recognized the diversity among the different texts from Qumran and the need to distinguish the different works, or even different redactional layers within a single work. Cf. also his article “Beobachtungen zur Entwicklung der Disziplinarordnung der Gemeinde von Qumran,” in *Qumran-Probleme: Vorträge des Leipziger Symposiums über Qumran-Probleme vom 9. bis 14. Oktober 1961* (ed. H. Bardtke; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1963), 231–47.

⁵³ Decades later, similar observations were made regarding other texts, e.g., the *Community Rule*. Cf. the analysis by S. Metso, *The Textual Development of the Qumran Com-*

that furthered the realization of the internal variety within the library and the later distinction between “pre-sectarian” and “sectarian” texts.

The German contribution to the editing of the Qumran fragments was generally rather limited. After Hunzinger’s departure the international team had no German member, and only after its expansion under the direction of Emanuel Tov in the 1990s were other German scholars involved with preparing the official editions of the texts in the DJD series. Before that, only four phylacteries, acquired by Karl Georg Kuhn for the Heidelberg University Library, were edited elsewhere.⁵⁴ Later Hartmut Stegemann was invited to join the editorial team. He re-edited some fragments from the Cave 4 copies of the *Damascus Document*⁵⁵ and his edition of the *Hodayot* was issued posthumously by Eileen Schuller.⁵⁶ Annette Steudel⁵⁷ and Armin Lange⁵⁸ were also charged with editorial tasks in this context. Noteworthy are Steudel’s thorough re-edition of manuscripts 4Q174 and 4Q177 in her doctoral dissertation⁵⁹ and especially Klaus Beyer’s preliminary edition of numerous Aramaic texts in the supplement to his magisterial linguistic work where he provides access to numerous Aramaic fragments still unedited at that time.⁶⁰

munity Rule (STDJ 21; Leiden: Brill, 1997); “The Textual Traditions of the Qumran Community Rule,” 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. Moshe Bernstein, F. GARCÍA Martínez, and J. Kampen; STDJ 23; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 141–8.

⁵⁴ K. G. Kuhn, *Phylakterien aus Höhle 4 von Qumran* (AHAW, Philologisch-historische Klasse 1/1957; Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1957). They were re-edited in DJD VI by J. T. Milik.

⁵⁵ Hartmut Stegemann, “4QDamascus Documentd frgs. 10, 11 (Re-edition), 15, 16,” in *Qumran Cave 4: XXVI: Cryptic Texts and Miscellanea, Part 1* (ed. S. Pfann et al.; DJD XXXVI; Oxford: Clarendon, 2000), 201–15.

⁵⁶ H. Stegemann, E. Schuller, and C. Newsom, *IQHodayot^a with Incorporation of IQHodayot^b and 4QHodayot^{c-f}* (DJD XL; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2008).

⁵⁷ Annette Steudel edited some sapiential texts (4Q411, 412, 425 and 426) in DJD XX (159–68, 203–24) and further miscellanea (4Q Vision of Moses^{c?} and 4QVision and Interpretation) in DJD XXXVI (316–32).

⁵⁸ Armin Lange edited some miscellanea in DJD XXXVI (347f., 412–19, 492f.), some more in collaboration with Dorothee Ernst (422–32), and prepared the “Annotated List of the Texts from the Judaean Desert Classified by Content and Genre” in DJD XXXIX, 115–64, together with Ulrike Mittmann-Richert.

⁵⁹ A. Steudel, *Der Midrasch zur Eschatologie aus der Qumrangemeinde (4QMidrEschat^{a,b}): Materielle Rekonstruktion, Textbestand, Gattung und traditionsge-schichtlich Einordnung des durch 4Q174 (“Florilegium”) und 4Q177 (“Catena A”) repräsentierten Werks aus den Qumranfunden* (STDJ 13; Leiden: Brill, 1994).

⁶⁰ K. Beyer, *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer: Samt den Inschriften aus Palästina, dem Testament Levis aus der Kairoer Genisa, der Fastenrolle und den talmudischen Zitaten; aramaisische Einleitung, Text, Übersetzung, Deutung, Grammatik/Wörterbuch, deutsch-aramäische Wortliste, Register* (Ergänzungsband; Göttingen:

II. Karl Georg Kuhn and the Tradition of the Qumranforschungsstelle

But long before the first editorial team was established, another German scholar had entered the debate and established himself as the leading expert of the new discoveries. This was Karl Georg Kuhn, later to become director of the Qumranforschungsstelle in Heidelberg. He was the first German to point out the relevance of the new textual discoveries for understanding Early Christianity, and he soon developed a comprehensive “history-of-religions” interpretation of the Scrolls in a series of articles between 1950 and 1952.⁶¹ Trained in Oriental and Semitic languages (including Persian) as well as in the New Testament, he was well qualified to commence work on the newly discovered texts and to interpret them in a broader context.

However, we are unable to omit a brief note on Kuhn’s “pre-Qumran” scholarly phase.⁶² Anyone who admires Kuhn’s work as a Qumran scholar might be shocked to learn of his earlier works on the *Judenfrage* in the Nazi period. It is still hard to understand how such a learned scholar could be ensnared by the ideology of that time, and yet how quickly he was rehabilitated and built up a new scholarly reputation in an entirely fresh field of research.

Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1994); enl. edition under the same title was published as vol. 2 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004).

⁶¹ See the titles mentioned above: Kuhn, “Die Bedeutung der neuen palästinischen Handschriften”; “Die in Palästina gefundenen hebräischen Texte”; “Die Sektenschrift und die iranische Religion”; “Πειρασμός – ἁμαρτία – σάραξ”; “Über den ursprünglichen Sinn des Abendmahls”; “Jesus in Gethsemane;” *EvT* 12 (1952–1953): 260–85.

⁶² The most thorough and balanced survey of the career of Karl Georg Kuhn is by G. Theissen, *Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft vor und nach 1945: Karl Georg Kuhn und Günther Bornkamm* (SPHKHAW 47; Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter, 2009), where Kuhn’s career is compared with that of his Heidelberg colleague Günther Bornkamm. Cf. also the article by Kuhn’s former student Jeremias, “Karl Georg Kuhn (1906–1976),” in *Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft nach 1945*, 297–312, who gives important information but is determined to give an apologetic interpretation. The brief article by H. W. Kuhn, “Kuhn, Karl Georg,” in *Dictionary of Biblical Interpretation* (ed. J. H. Hayes; Nashville: Abingdon, 1999), 2:39–40, passes in complete silence over the activities of Kuhn during the Nazi period. But see Lindemann, “Theological Research about Judaism,” 331–8, where significant quotations from Kuhn’s anti-Semitic speeches and publications between 1933 and 1945 are given. Cf. also the book by W. Fenske, *Wie Jesus zum ‘Arier’ wurde: Auswirkungen der Entjudaisierung Christi im 19. und zu Beginn des 20. Jahrhunderts* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2005), 221–4, although the analysis suffers from problems concerning its historiographical method; A. E. Steinweis, *Studying the Jew: Scholarly Antisemitism in Nazi Germany* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2006), 76–91, and H. Junginger, “‘Judenforschung’ in Tübingen: Von der jüdischen zur antijüdischen Religionswissenschaft,” *JSDI* 5 (2006): 375–98; “Das Bild des Juden in der nationalsozialistischen Judenforschung,” in *Die kulturelle Seite des Antisemitismus zwischen Aufklärung und Shoah* (ed. A. Hoffmann et al.; Tübingen: Tübinger Vereinigung für Volkskunde e.V, 2006), 171–220.

As a student of Gerhard Kittel and Enno Littmann, Kuhn earned his doctorate in 1931 in Tübingen with a pioneering and highly respected translation and commentary of the rabbinic Midrash *Sifre Numeri*. His Habilitation thesis (accepted in 1934) was about the textual tradition of the Psalms of Solomon.⁶³ As a student of Kittel, he was also asked to write several articles in volumes 1–4 of the *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*⁶⁴ and to review and update the sections about Jewish sources in other articles. Remarkably, there is no open anti-Semitism in those articles,⁶⁵ although at least some of them were written at the time when Kuhn was deeply involved in a line of research that ultimately served to legitimize the anti-Jewish actions of the Nazi regime. Having joined the NSDAP (Nazi party) for whatever reasons⁶⁶ in 1932, Kuhn was the only public speaker at an evening event in Tübingen on April 1, 1933 to advocate the boycott of Jewish shops.⁶⁷ On becoming a *Dozent* in Tübingen, he delivered his lectures dressed in SA uniform. In his inaugural lecture on the internal conditions of Jewish proliferation,⁶⁸ he interpreted it as “the alleged unchangeable character of the ‘Jewish

⁶³ Publication of the dissertation was only in 1959. See K. G. Kuhn, *Der tannaitische Midrasch Sifre zu Numeri ... bearbeitet und erklärt* (Rabbinische Texte 2.3; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1933–1959). The Habilitation thesis was published under the title *Die älteste Textgestalt der Psalmen Salomos auf Grund der syrischen Übersetzung neu untersucht mit einer Bearbeitung und Übersetzung der Psalmen Salomos 13–17* (BWANT 73; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1937).

⁶⁴ K. G. Kuhn, “Αβηλ – Κάιν,” *TWNT* 1:6–7; “Der Heiligkeitsbegriff im rabbinischen Judentum,” *TWNT* 1:97–101; “Βαβυλών,” *TWNT* 1:512–4; “Βαλαάμ,” *TWNT* 1:521–3; “מלכות שמים” in der rabbinischen Literatur,” *TWNT* 1:570–73; “Γῶγ καὶ Μαγῶγ,” *TWNT* 1:790–792; “Die rabbinischen Gottesbezeichnungen,” *TWNT* 3:93–95; “Ἰσραήλ, Ἰουδαῖος, Ἑβραῖος in der nachalttestamentlichen jüdischen Literatur,” *TWNT* 3:360–370; “μαρναναθά,” *TWNT* 4:470–75; “προσηλυτος,” *TWNT* 6:727–43.

⁶⁵ This has been shown by J. S. Vos, “Antijudaismus/Antisemitismus im Theologischen Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament,” *NEDTT* 38 (1984): 89–110. As was customary at that time, Kuhn uses the term “Spätjudentum” (*TWNT* 1:6, 522), and some of the categories used appear too schematic and simplistic from today’s perspective. Although the language in some articles (e.g. in *TWNT* 3:360 on Ἰσραήλ and Ἰουδαῖος) is similar to that of contemporary anti-Semitic writings, there is only a very subtle devaluation of Judaism, in marked contrast with Kuhn’s writings in the context of his research on the “Jewish question” and also with articles of some other authors in the *TWNT* (see Theissen, *Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft vor und nach 1945*, 15 n. 2).

⁶⁶ Jeremias, “Karl Georg Kuhn,” 301 explains this as a mere reaction to the fact that his former fiancée joined the Communist party; cf. the more extensive discussion in Theissen, *Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft vor und nach 1945*, 18–19.

⁶⁷ Cf. Lindemann, “Theological Research about Judaism,” 339–40; Theissen, *Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft vor und nach 1945*, 19–21.

⁶⁸ K. G. Kuhn, “Die inneren Voraussetzungen der jüdischen Ausbreitung,” *Deutsche Theologie* 2 (1935): 9–17.

people,”⁶⁹ with extensive reference to racial patterns.⁷⁰ Thereafter he devoted himself increasingly to work on the *Judenfrage*. As an orientalist and Protestant theologian, he served (together with Kittel) as an expert of the Forschungsabteilung Judenfrage within the Reichsinstitut für Geschichte des neuen Deutschland, and contributed a number of articles to the “scientific” work of this institute in the service of Nazi ideology.⁷¹ In an address at the fourth annual conference of that institute from November 30 to December 3, 1938,⁷² published quickly as a separate booklet, he concluded that Jewry was now reaping what it had sown. His text closes with praise of the Führer for creating for the first time the conditions that allow for a true solution to the “Jewish question.”⁷³ After 1945, Kuhn distanced himself from this publication (only). He did so in a personal footnote to an article he was allowed to publish in the journal *Evangelische Theologie*, which was closely linked to theological circles belonging to the German resistance in the Protestant Church (“Bekennende Kirche”) and to the theological school of Karl Barth.⁷⁴ But the *retractatio* could appear somewhat ambiguous and half-hearted, given that Kuhn had published more anti-Jewish articles than the single pamphlet he mentions there. In a letter written in the late 1960s, he explicitly refused to retract his other articles written in the context of the Reichsinsti-

⁶⁹ Cf. Lindemann, “Theological Research about Judaism,” 334.

⁷⁰ E.g., in K. G. Kuhn, *Die Judenfrage als weltgeschichtliches Problem* (Hamburg: Hanseatische Verlagsanstalt, 1939), 29: “Therefore, the only explanation of this Jewish essence ... remains the explanation of the racial characteristics of the Jewish people, of their biological hereditary disposition.”

⁷¹ Cf. K. G. Kuhn, “Die Entstehung des talmudischen Denkens,” *Forschungen zur Judenfrage* 1 (1937): 63–80; “Das Weltjudentum in der Antike,” *Forschungen zur Judenfrage* 2 (1937): 9–29, 64–80; “Ursprung und Wesen der talmudischen Einstellung zum Nichtjuden,” *Forschungen zur Judenfrage* 3 (1938): 199–34; and – most comprehensively – *Die Judenfrage*. Cf. also his article “Der Talmud, das Gesetzbuch der Juden,” in *Zur Geschichte und rechtlichen Stellung der Juden in Stadt und Universität Tübingen: Aus den Jahrbänden der wissenschaftliche Akademie des NSD-Dozentenbundes / Wissenschaftliche Akademie Tübingen des NSD-Dozentenbundes I (1937–1939)* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1941), 226–33. On this article see Lindemann, “Theological Research about Judaism,” 335.

⁷² This was only a few weeks after synagogues were burnt all over Germany in the so-called *Reichskristallnacht* on November 9, 1938.

⁷³ Kuhn, *Die Judenfrage*, 46–47. For more quotations from this pamphlet in English translation, see Lindemann, “Theological Research about Judaism,” 335–7.

⁷⁴ The note is worth quoting: “I, for myself, can say in this context that I regret that I wrote *Die Judenfrage als weltgeschichtliches Problem*, Hanseatische Verlagsanstalt Hamburg 1939, 51 pages, and that I formally reject this writing. I regret that I was so blind at the time and did not see that the path of Hitler’s Jewish policy went into the abyss of horror and that it was unstoppable” (K. G. Kuhn, “Die Schriftrollen vom Toten Meer: Zum heutigen Stand ihrer Veröffentlichung,” *EvT* 11 [1951–1952]: 72–75 [73 note 4]).

tut.⁷⁵ “From today’s perspective it appears strange that in June 1940 Kuhn entered the occupied Warsaw Ghetto, accompanied by an SS officer, to confiscate Jewish manuscripts and other items for research in the institutes for the *Judenfrage*.”⁷⁶

Soon after his dismissal from his teaching position at Tübingen University by the French military administration in 1946, Kuhn was invited to the Theological Faculty at the University of Göttingen as an expert in rabbinic Judaism. Having started teaching in May 1949, he presented a small monograph on the Jewish *Shmone Esre* prayer and the Lord’s Prayer.⁷⁷ He also published extensively on the newly discovered Qumran texts. For him, this fascinating new field of research provided the opportunity to build up a new scholarly existence in an area where he was not obliged to refer to his earlier publications. Kuhn’s (relatively few) later publications show no traces of overt anti-Semitism. But the enigma of his scholarly biography still awaits further explanation.

In Göttingen, Kuhn initiated the study of the new Qumran texts with a group of students and colleagues. This “workshop” became a fascinating experience especially for students, who thereby enjoyed an opportunity to participate in current research. This type of work continued when Kuhn was called to a chair at the University of Heidelberg in 1954, and it became the nucleus of the well-known Qumranforschungsstelle (nicknamed the ‘Qumran Höhle’), founded in 1957. In this context, the Scrolls were studied with extremely accurate and advanced philological and historical-critical methods free from theological constraints, and thus attracted numerous guest scholars from abroad.⁷⁸

In Heidelberg, the “workshop” team developed tools for further research, such as a “reversed” Hebrew dictionary which could help to fill the lacunae

⁷⁵ The letter is quoted and cautiously considered in Theissen, *Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft vor und nach 1945*, 138–43.

⁷⁶ Cf. H.-J. Barkenings, “Spuren im Warschauer Ghetto,” in *Christlicher Antijudaismus und Antisemitismus: Theologische und kirchliche Programme Deutscher Christen* (ed. L. Siegele-Wenschkewitz; Arnoldshainer Texte 85; Frankfurt a. M.: Haag & Herchen, 1994), 111–24 (115–17), and Theissen, *Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft vor und nach 1945*, 41–42.

⁷⁷ K. G. Kuhn, *Achtzehngebet und Vaterunser und der Reim* (WUNT 1; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1950). The brief but philologically accurate study was the first volume of a new monograph series, founded by Joachim Jeremias and Otto Michel. In addition to the articles on the new textual discoveries, it helped to establish Kuhn’s reputation as the philologically most able expert on the Judaism of the New Testament period.

⁷⁸ Cf. the impressions noted by M. Delcor, “Où en sont les études Qumrâniennes?,” in *Qumrân, sa piété*, 11–46, here 17–21. See also the impressive account in Jeremias, “Karl Georg Kuhn.”

in corrupted texts,⁷⁹ the first printed concordance of the non-biblical texts,⁸⁰ and a two-volume bibliography on the Scrolls.⁸¹ Kuhn and his team also conceptualized a linguistic dictionary of the non-biblical texts from Qumran that would set out the Qumran terms distinct from biblical parlance, and thus supplement the existing Hebrew and Aramaic dictionaries. The slow publication process of the Cave 4 texts during the 1970s and 1980s prevented the completion of this dictionary. This remained the case even after the Qumranforschungsstelle came under the direction of Hartmut Stegemann, and was moved to Marburg in 1973 and to Göttingen in 1980. The project was interrupted in 1988.⁸² It resumed in Göttingen in 2002 under the direction of Reinhard Kratz and Annette Steudel.

Probably the most fruitful results of the Heidelberg institute were the works of the large number of doctoral students. Almost all the German Qumran scholars of the second generation were trained by Kuhn, and most of their works touched on important aspects of the early Qumran discussions and debates, which were also relevant for comparison with New Testament texts and early Christian phenomena. Gert Jeremias provided a comprehensive analysis of Qumran passages relevant to the “Teacher of Righteousness” together with a sober comparison of them with the historical Jesus.⁸³ Jürgen Becker analyzed the terms related to “salvation” at Qumran and compared them with soteriological concepts in the preaching of Jesus, in Johannine dualism, and in the theology of Paul and the Fourth Gospel.⁸⁴ He concluded that the author of the Fourth Gospel used and reshaped a Qumranic type of dualism rather than a Gnostic one,⁸⁵ but also that Paul’s ideas about sin were influenced by the Essenes.⁸⁶ Heinz-Wolfgang Kuhn (not related to his teacher) examined the notion of the eschaton present within the community of

⁷⁹ K. G. Kuhn (with H. Stegemann and G. Klinzing), *Rückläufiges hebräisches Wörterbuch* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1958).

⁸⁰ K. G. Kuhn (with A. M. Denis, R. Deichgräber, W. Eiss, G. Jeremias, and H.-W. Kuhn), *Konkordanz zu den Qumrantexten* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1960); “Nachträge zur Konkordanz zu den Qumrantexten,” *RevQ* 4 (1963): 163–234.

⁸¹ C. Burchard, *Bibliographie zu den Handschriften vom Toten Meer* (BZNW 76; Berlin: Töpelmann, 1957); *Bibliographie zu den Handschriften vom Toten Meer* (vol. 2; BZNW 89; Berlin: Töpelmann, 1965).

⁸² Cf. the account of H. Stegemann, “Die Qumranforschungsstelle Marburg und ihre Aufgabenstellung: Ein Bericht,” in *Qumrân, sa piété*, 47–54.

⁸³ G. Jeremias, *Der Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit* (SUNT 2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1963).

⁸⁴ J. Becker, *Das Heil Gottes: Heils- und Sündenbegriffe in den Qumrantexten und im Neuen Testament* (SUNT 3; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1964).

⁸⁵ Becker, *Das Heil Gottes*, 236.

⁸⁶ Becker, *Das Heil Gottes*, 243, cf. 276.

Qumran texts, especially in *Hodayot*.⁸⁷ He was able to establish the distinction between the hymns of the Teacher and of the community more accurately than others.⁸⁸ Kuhn's thesis also provided an important parallel for understanding the particular eschatology of the historical Jesus. Georg Klinzing investigated the transformation of cultic terms in Qumran texts and in the New Testament.⁸⁹ Hermann Lichtenberger (who had studied with Kuhn, but completed his dissertation later with Stegemann) made a comprehensive study of the anthropology of the Qumran community, including aspects of creation, predestination, dualism, and resurrection.⁹⁰ Roland Bergmeier (who completed his dissertation with Hartwig Thyen) established the view that the Qumran ideas on predestination are the closest parallel and possible background to the respective views in the Johannine writings. Although Bergmeier could not continue a university career, he still published extensively on themes related to Qumran and the New Testament.⁹¹

III. Hartmut Stegemann and the "Material Reconstruction of Fragmentary Scrolls"

The works by Hartmut Stegemann were the most important. Although they remained unpublished until his untimely death in 2005, they were widely circulated in photocopies from which they were quoted. These works established Stegemann's international reputation as the leading German Qumran scholar of the second generation, who continued the Qumranforschungsstelle, which he took first to Marburg and then to Göttingen. In his philological dissertation⁹² Stegemann developed his method of the material reconstruction of scrolls from scattered fragments,⁹³ which became an indispensable tool for

⁸⁷ H.-W. Kuhn, *Enderwartung und gegenwärtiges Heil: Untersuchungen zu den Gemeindeliedern von Qumran mit einem Anhang über Eschatologie und Gegenwart in der Verkündigung Jesu* (SUNT 4; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966).

⁸⁸ E.g. G. Morawe, *Aufbau und Abgrenzung der Loblieder von Qumran* (Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1961).

⁸⁹ G. Klinzing, *Die Umdeutung des Kultus in der Qumrangemeinde und im NT* (SUNT 7; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971).

⁹⁰ H. Lichtenberger, *Studien zum Menschenbild in Texten der Qumrangemeinde* (SUNT 15; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1980).

⁹¹ R. Bergmeier, *Die Essener-Berichte des Flavius Josephus; Quellenstudien zu den Essener-Texten im Werk des jüdischen Historiographen* (Kampen: Kok, 1993); "Beobachtungen zu 4Q521 f. 2 II, 1–13," *ZDMG* 145 (1995): 38–48.

⁹² H. Stegemann, *Rekonstruktion der Hodayot: Ursprüngliche Gestalt und kritisch bearbeiteter Text der Hymnenrolle aus Höhle 1 von Qumran* (typescript; Heidelberg, 1963).

⁹³ On this method see H. Stegemann, "Methods for the Reconstruction of Scrolls from Scattered Fragments," in *Archaeology and History in the Dead Sea Scrolls: The New York University Conference in Memory of Yigael Yadin* (ed. L. H. Schiffman; JSPSup 8; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990), 189–220; "The Material Reconstruction of the Hodayot," in Schiffman, Tov, and VanderKam, ed., *The Dead Sea Scrolls. Fifty Years, 272–84*. See also

the publication of numerous texts, especially those from Caves 4 and 11. In his work on the *Hodayot* scroll from Cave 1 (1QH^a), edited early on by Eliezer Lipa Sukenik, Stegemann discovered that the *editio princeps* had arranged the columns and the line numbering incorrectly. Using the shape of the fragments and their margins, together with traces of physical decay caused by humidity, he was able to rearrange the columns and insert numerous additional fragments in their correct positions. His results were later independently confirmed by Émile Puech.⁹⁴ They have been incorporated in most of the subsequent editions and translations, marking Stegemann's new arrangement and numbering beside Sukenik's original numbering.⁹⁵ Throughout his career, Stegemann continued to work on improving his edition, introducing new readings and inserting more fragments. He finally collaborated with the editor of the Cave 4 *Hodayot* fragments, Eileen Schuller. His work is now published posthumously together with the Cave 4 fragments, edited by Schuller in DJD XL.⁹⁶

Beyond the *Hodayot*, Stegemann's method has become accepted as a fundamental tool for the study of other fragmentary manuscripts. Stegemann helped numerous other scholars worldwide with their reconstructions. Mention should be made particularly of the work of his doctoral student Annette Studel who suggested that manuscripts 4Q174 (the so-called Florilegium) and 4Q177 (the so-called Catena A) are actually two manuscripts representing different parts of the same work, which she called "Midrash on Eschatology."⁹⁷ Another achievement accomplished using his method is Sarianna Metso's thorough analysis of the Cave 4 *Community Rule* copies. She established that the manuscripts differ greatly in length and content, and concluded that there was never a "definitive" or "valid" form of the *Rule* material at Qumran.⁹⁸

Stegemann's second major work, which also remained unpublished but was circulated in private copies, was his second (theological) dissertation on

A. Studel, "Assembling and Reconstructing Manuscripts," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years* (ed. P. W. Flint and J. C. VanderKam; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 1:516–34.

⁹⁴ É. Puech, "Quelques aspects de la restauration du Rouleau des Hymnes (1QH)," *JJS* 39 (1988): 38–55; cf. E. Schuller, "Introduction and History of the Edition" in *1QHodayot^a* (DJD XL), 1–11 (4–5).

⁹⁵ E.g. F. GARCÍA Martínez and E. Tigchelaar, eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* (2 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 1997–1998); M. O. Wise, M. Abegg, and E. Cook, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Translation* (San Francisco: Harper San Francisco, 1996), and also the German translation by Johann Maier, see J. Maier, *Die Qumran-Essener: Die Texte vom Toten Meer* (2 vols.; Munich: Reinhardt, 1995).

⁹⁶ Stegemann, Schuller, and Newsom, *1QHodayot^a*.

⁹⁷ Studel, *Der Midrasch zur Eschatologie aus der Qumrangemeinde*.

⁹⁸ S. Metso, *The Textual Development of the Qumran Community Rule*.

the emergence of the Qumran community.⁹⁹ Taking as his point of departure the work on the Teacher of Righteousness by Gert Jeremias, Stegemann utilized the data of a new text, the pesher of Psalm 37 (4Q171 = 4QpPs^a), and analyzed the polemics embedded in it and its terminology describing the community's opponents. He thereby reconstructed the developments that led to the creation of the Qumran community of the Teacher, the *Yahad*. In this context he developed his views that the Teacher of Righteousness was a priestly figure, more precisely¹⁰⁰ a high priest, probably the one who followed on after the death of Jakim-Alkimos until Hasmonean Jonathan removed him from office and assumed the position himself. True, Josephus and his sources do not mention a high priest in Jerusalem for the years 159–152 BCE, but in Stegemann's opinion Temple service could not possibly function without a high priest in office. In his reconstruction, the deposed high priest, with his claim to represent the spiritual authority and tradition of Israel as a whole, escaped and found refuge in conservative groups who opposed the Hasmonean rule. He was accepted there as the legitimate leader and teacher, as opposed to the illegitimate one in Jerusalem, and thus influenced and shaped the *Yahad* as an association of opposing groups. This association was – according to Stegemann's own arguments – not a “sect” but the legitimate and main “community” of Israel, where, according to its interpretation, the law was interpreted in the correct and faithful manner under the guidance of the divine inspiration accorded to the Teacher. Stegemann's unpublished work is still one of the most important and comprehensive contributions to the early history of the community. It remains indispensable for research in this field. A condensed summary of Stegemann's views was later published in the Madrid congress volume.¹⁰¹ The only book Stegemann published by himself is his popular textbook with the somewhat misleading title *Die Essener, Qumran, Johannes der Täufer und Jesus*, in English more accurately titled *The Library of Qumran*.¹⁰² Here Stegemann presents a wealth of observations about the caves and the character of the most important manuscripts and works. He also includes a summary of his views on the Essene movement and of the site of Qumran as a “publishing house” of the Essenes. He provides important in-

⁹⁹ H. Stegemann, *Die Entstehung der Qumrangemeinde* (Th.D., Bonn, 1965; privately published, repr. 1971). His Habilitation thesis on the usage of the divine name and its development in Early Judaism and in the New Testament also remained unpublished: *Kyrios o Theos und Kyrios Jesus: Aufkommen und Ausbreitung des religiösen Gebrauchs von Kyrios und seine Verwendung im NT* (Habilitationsschrift, Bonn 1969).

¹⁰⁰ Cf. especially the historical synthesis, 198–246 and the summary, 247–52.

¹⁰¹ H. Stegemann, “The Qumran Essenes: Local Members of the Main Jewish Union in Late Second Temple Times,” in *The Madrid Qumran Congress*, 1:83–166.

¹⁰² H. Stegemann, *Die Essener, Qumran, Johannes der Täufer und Jesus* (Freiburg: Herder, 1993); English trans.: *The Library of Qumran: On the Essenes, Qumran, John the Baptist, and Jesus* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998).

sights on the similarities and differences between John the Baptist and the Qumran community, and of the relationship between the teaching of the historical Jesus and the Essenes.

IV. Other Miscellaneous Scholars and Works

Without striving for comprehensiveness, a number of other scholars who were not connected with the Qumranforschungsstelle in Heidelberg should be mentioned.

The theological faculties in East Germany functioned under much more difficult circumstances than those in the West. Nevertheless, Hans Bardtke of the University of Leipzig, a scholar who had remained in church service during the war, was one of the very first European scholars to work on the Qumran texts. As early as 1952 he published a complete German translation and interpretation of the first texts. In 1958 he issued a second volume with additions, namely the ancient texts on the Essenes and a more comprehensive commentary.¹⁰³ Bardtke's work was the first monograph on the new discoveries to be published in German. Until his death in 1975 he also provided translations of Qumran texts and accounts of relevant scholarly publications in the *Theologische Literaturzeitung* and in the *Theologische Rundschau*.¹⁰⁴ An often neglected but quite important contribution to the history of research was the dissertation of his student Siegfried Wagner on the Essenes in the scholarly debate before the Qumran discoveries.¹⁰⁵

Another East German scholar who worked extensively on Qumran texts was the Hebraist and Old Testament scholar at Jena, Rudolf Meyer (1909–1991). He wrote numerous articles and reviews, especially on the language of the Qumran texts,¹⁰⁶ but also an important monograph on the *Prayer of Na-*

¹⁰³ H. Bardtke, *Die Handschriftenfunde am Toten Meer* (Berlin: Evangelische Haupt-Bibelgesellschaft, 1952; 3rd ed. 1961); *Die Sekte von Qumrān*, vol. 2 of *Die Handschriftenfunde am Toten Meer* (2nd ed.; Berlin: Evangelische Haupt-Bibelgesellschaft, 1961).

¹⁰⁴ H. Bardtke, "Qumran und seine Funde," *TRu* 29 (1963): 261–92; 30 (1964): 281–315; "Qumran und seine Probleme," *TRu* 33 (1968): 97–119, 185–236; "Literaturbericht über Qumran V. Teil," *TRu* 35 (1970): 196–230; "Literaturbericht über Qumran VI. Teil: 1. Die Kriegerrolle 1QM," *TRu* 37 (1972): 97–120; "Literaturbericht über Qumran VI. Teil: II Das Genesis-Apocryphon 1QGenAp; III. Das Hiobtargum aus Höhle XI von Qumran (11QtgJob)," *TRu* 37 (1972): 193–204, 205–19; "Literaturbericht über Qumran VII. Teil: Die Sektenrolle 1QS," *TRu* 39 (1974): 257–91; "Literaturbericht über Qumran VIII Teil: Die Damaskusschrift CD," *TRu* 39 (1974): 189–221; "Literaturbericht über Qumran IX. Teil: Die Loblieder (Hodayoth) von Qumran," *TRu* 40 (1975): 210–26; "Literaturbericht über Qumran X. Teil: Der Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit und die Geschichte der Qumrangemeinde," *TRu* 41 (1976): 97–140.

¹⁰⁵ Wagner, *Die Essener*.

¹⁰⁶ Cf. his reviews: R. Meyer, "Die Fragmente der Höhle I," *TLZ* 82 (1957): 21–26; "Die vier Höhlen von Murabba'at," *TLZ* 88 (1963): 19–28; "Die sogenannten 'Kleinen

bonidus.¹⁰⁷ Due to the efforts and the reviewing activity of scholars such as Bardtke and Meyer especially, Qumran scholarship was noted and accessible in the academic context of East Germany, behind the Iron Curtain. Two other doctoral dissertations are also noteworthy: the unpublished dissertation by Meyer's student Waltraut Bernhardt, the first thorough analysis of the *New Jerusalem* fragments from Cave 1,¹⁰⁸ and the work by the New Testament scholar Günther Baumbach on Johannine dualism in comparison with the Qumran texts.¹⁰⁹

Another scholar who worked on the Scrolls independently of Kuhn's and Stegemann's Qumranforschungsstelle was Otto Betz in Tübingen. Drawing on his broad knowledge of Josephus and rabbinic traditions, he published numerous articles with interesting exegetical ideas, mainly focused on the relevance of Qumran texts for understanding Jesus and the New Testament.¹¹⁰ Note too the late Hans Burgmann, who also published extensively on the

Höhlen' von Qumran," *TLZ* 90 (1965): 331–42; also his articles "Zur Sprache von 'Ain Feschcha"; "Das Problem der Dialektmischung;" "Bemerkungen zu den hebräischen Aussprachetraditionen;" "Spuren eines westsemitischen Präsens-Futur," in *Von Ugarit nach Qumran*. See his collected articles in Waltraut Bernhardt, ed., *Zur Geschichte und Theologie des Judentums in hellenistisch-römischer Zeit: Ausgewählte Abhandlungen* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1989); Waltraut Bernhardt, ed., *Beiträge zur Geschichte von Text und Sprache des Alten Testaments: Gesammelte Aufsätze* (BZAW 209; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1993).

¹⁰⁷ R. Meyer, *Das Gebet des Nabonid: Eine in den Qumran-Handschriften wiederentdeckte Weisheits Erzählung* (SSAW.PH 3/107; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1962).

¹⁰⁸ W. Bernhardt, *Die kultur- und religionsgeschichtlich Bedeutung des Qumranfragmentes 5Q15* (Th.Diss., Jena, 1970).

¹⁰⁹ G. Baumbach, *Qumrān und das Johannes-Evangelium: eine vergleichende Untersuchung der dualistischen Aussagen der Ordensregel von Qumrān und des Johannes-Evangeliums mit Berücksichtigung der spätjüdischen Apokalypsen* (Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1958).

¹¹⁰ See O. Betz, *Der Paraklet: Fürsprecher im häretischen Spätjudentum, im Johannes Evangelium und in neu gefundenen gnostischen Schriften* (AGSU 2; Leiden: Brill, 1963); "Rechtfertigung in Qumran," in *Rechtfertigung: Festschrift für Ernst Käsemann zum 70. Geburtstag* (ed. J. Friedrich, W. Pohlmann, and P. Stuhlmacher; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1976), 17–36; "Probleme des Prozesses Jesu," in *ANRW* 2.25.1 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1982), 566–647; "Early Christian Cult in the Light of Qumran," *Religious Studies Bulletin* 2/2 (1982): 73–85; "Die Bedeutung der Qumranschriften für die Evangelien des Neuen Testaments," *BK* 40 (1985): 54–64; "Der Tod des Choni-Onias im Licht der Tempelrolle von Qumran," in *Jesus der Messias Israels* (WUNT 42; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1987), 59–74; "Jesus and the Temple Scroll," in *Jesus and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. J. H. Charlesworth; New York: Doubleday, 1992), 75–103; "The Qumran Halakhah in Miqṣat Ma'āse Ha-Torah (4QMMT) and Sadducean, Essene and Early Pharisaic Tradition," in *The Aramaic Bible: Targums in Their Historical Context* (ed. D. R. G. Beattie and M. J. McNamara; JSOTSup 166; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1994), 176–202.

history of the Qumran community until his death in 1992 but received little academic attention in Germany.¹¹¹

Apart from Bardtke's translations, two other translated editions were quite influential in Germany. The first is the early bilingual textbook by the New Testament scholar and then Lutheran bishop Eduard Lohse. His edition offered the Hebrew text of the most important Scrolls with a Masoretic vocalization to make it accessible to non-specialists and regular theology students with knowledge of Biblical Hebrew alone.¹¹² Another important early work was the German translation of the texts by one of the pioneers of Jewish studies in Germany, Johann Maier of the University of Cologne, with a separate volume of annotations.¹¹³ Maier's translation was later republished (without the notes) together with the popular introduction by Kurt Schubert in a students' edition, which was long the most accessible German introduction to Qumran for non-specialists.¹¹⁴ Soon after the release of the unpublished material in 1991, Maier provided a comprehensive two-volume edition of almost all the texts, cautiously translating the fragments without trying to combine them into a "composite text."¹¹⁵ This translation is still the most reliable and comprehensive edition of the Qumran material in German. A third volume provided much historical information but also a comprehensive index of terms to the texts.¹¹⁶ Although Maier was much more than a Qumran specialist and published in the whole area of Jewish history, and therefore did not contribute a "school" of his own in Qumran research, he was especially interested in cultic and calendrical aspects and provided the first German analysis

¹¹¹ H. Burgmann, *Vorgeschichte und Frühgeschichte der Gemeinden von Qumrân und Damaskus* (ANTJ 7; Frankfurt a. M.: Lang, 1987); *Zwei lösbarer Qumranprobleme: Die Person des Lügenmannes; Die Interkalation im Kalender* (Frankfurt a. M.: Lang, 1986); *Die essenischen Gemeinden von Qumran und Damaskus in der Zeit der Hasmonäer und Herodier* (Frankfurt a. M.: Lang, 1988); *Der 'Sitz im Leben' in den Josuafluch-Texten in 4Q379 22 II und 4QTestimonia* (QM 1; Krakow: Enigma, 1990); *Weitere lösbarer Qumranprobleme* (ed. Z. Kapera; Krakow: Enigma, 1992).

¹¹² E. Lohse, ed., *Die Texte aus Qumran: Hebräisch und Deutsch; Mit masoretischer Punktation Übersetzung, Einführung und Anmerkungen* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1971). A second volume appeared thirty years later, after the release of the new texts in the 1990s: A. Steudel, ed., *Die Texte aus Qumran II* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2001).

¹¹³ J. Maier, *Die Texte vom Toten Meer* (2 vols.; Munich: Reinhardt, 1960).

¹¹⁴ J. Maier and K. Schubert, *Die Qumran-Essener Schriftrollen und Lebensbild der Gemeinde* (Munich: Reinhardt, 1973; paperback edition, Uni-Taschenbücher 224; Munich: Reinhardt, 1982).

¹¹⁵ J. Maier, *Die Qumran-Essener. Die Texte vom Toten Meer* (2 vols.; Munich: Reinhardt, 1995).

¹¹⁶ J. Maier, *Einführung, Zeitrechnung, Register und Bibliographie*, vol. 3 of *Die Qumran-Essener* (Munich: Reinhardt, 1996).

of the *Temple Scroll*.¹¹⁷ With his broader background, Maier was one of the first German-speaking scholars to leave the original focus on the relevance of the Scrolls for biblical scholarship, or even for the origins of Early Christianity, in order to focus on other issues that seemed important in Jewish tradition and thought.¹¹⁸

The delay in the publication of new texts and the decline of the “Qumran fever” that had raged in the first two decades lessened public interest in the Qumran texts in Germany, especially from the late 1960s to the early 1990s. It was sparked again around 1991, when a mass of new texts became accessible. Another factor was the suspicion cast on the Scrolls by Michael Baigent and Richard Leigh’s best-seller, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Deception*. In their novelistic manner, the two authors claimed to unveil the true nature of the Scrolls and Christianity, as suggested by the title of the German translation.¹¹⁹ Playing on the suspicions regarding the Vatican¹²⁰ that were widespread at the time in Germany, the book circulated widely in several editions. It propagated Robert Eisenman’s theory¹²¹ that the Scrolls were, in fact, about Jesus, James, and Paul, but also that the insights gained from the Scrolls could endanger Christian teaching and that this might be the true reason for the delay

¹¹⁷ J. Maier, *Die Tempelrolle vom Toten Meer* (Munich: Reinhardt, 1978); English trans.: *The Temple Scroll* (Sheffield: Sheffield University Press, 1982); enl. ed.: *Die Tempelrolle vom Toten Meer und Das ‘Neue Jerusalem’: 11Q19 und 11Q20; 1Q32, 2Q24, 4Q554–555, 5Q15 und 11Q18; Übersetzung und Erläuterung mit Grundrissen der Tempelhofanlage und Skizzen zur Stadtplanung* (3rd enl. ed.; completely renewed and extended; Munich: Reinhardt, 1997).

¹¹⁸ Cf., e.g., J. Maier, “Zu Kult und Liturgie der Qumrangemeinde,” *RevQ* 14 (1990): 543–86; “Die Bedeutung der Qumranfunde für das Verständnis des Judentums,” *BK* 48 (1993): 2–9; “Purity at Qumran: Cultic and Domestic,” in *Judaism in Late Antiquity, Part 5: The Judaism of Qumran: A Systemic Reading of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. A. J. Avery-Peck, J. Neusner, and B. D. Chilton; 2 vols.; Handbook of Oriental Studies 1.56; Leiden: Brill, 2001), 1:91–124; “Liturgische Funktionen der Gebete in den Qumrantexten,” in *Identität durch Gebet: Zur gemeinschaftsbildenden Funktion institutionalisierten Betens in Judentum und Christentum* (ed. A. Gerhards, A. Doeker, and P. Ebenbauer; Studien zu Judentum und Christentum; Paderborn: Schöningh, 2003), 59–112.

¹¹⁹ M. Baigent and R. Leigh, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Deception* (New York: Summit Books, 1991); German trans.: *Verschlußsache Jesus: Die Qumranrollen und die Wahrheit über das frühe Christentum* (Munich: Droemer Knaur, 1991).

¹²⁰ The suspicion was reinforced after the Vatican Institution for Faith and Doctrine (then directed by the German Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger, later Pope Benedict XVI) withdrew teaching permission from well-known German Roman Catholic theologians, first the Tübingen ecumenicist Hans Küng, and then, in 1991, the psychologist, preacher, and Bible interpreter Eugen Drewermann.

¹²¹ R. Eisenman, *Maccabees, Zadokites, Christians and Qumran: A New Hypothesis of Qumran Origins* (StPB 34; Leiden: Brill, 1983); *James the just in the Habakkuk Peshet* (Leiden: Brill, 1986).

in the publication. The book elicited powerful negative scholarly reactions,¹²² but it brought Qumran back to the center of public debate. The release of the microfiches of the hitherto unpublished Scrolls, and the Eisenman-Wise pirated edition of new texts,¹²³ ushered in a new phase of the debate about the Scrolls. However, at that time only a few German biblical scholars were trained to work with the Qumran texts and take part in the discussion regarding the newly released texts.

Apart from the new fields of study suggested by the recently published texts, other lines of research continue the focus on the relationship of Qumran and Early Christianity, but rather in the margins of Qumran studies. Mention should be made of the assumption of an Essene quarter in Jerusalem, supposedly located on the southwestern hill of the city, near the Dormition Abbey, where later tradition locates the Last Supper and Pentecost. The idea was developed by the Tyrolean Benedictine archaeologist Bargil Pixner, who had also excavated the Essene Gate in that area, partly with the German New Testament scholar Rainer Riesner.¹²⁴ If this view had proved correct, it would have opened up the possibility of major Essene influences on the Primitive Community and on Christianity in general. Yet despite some support by other scholars not only in Germany, the hypothesis could not stand up under critical scrutiny. The continued search for Christians and Christian traces in Qumran texts¹²⁵ was also apparent in the persistence of an earlier suggestion that some of the Greek texts from Cave 7 could represent New Testament texts. This suggestion, originally proposed by the Spanish papyrologist Jose O'Callaghan in 1972,¹²⁶ but immediately rejected by some leading specialists

¹²² Cf. M. Hengel, "Die Qumranrollen und der Umgang mit der Wahrheit," *TBei* 23 (1992): 233–7; K. Berger, *Qumran und Jesus: Wahrheit unter Verschluss* (Stuttgart: Quell, 1993); O. Betz and R. Riesner, *Jesus, Qumran und der Vatikan* (Gießen: Brunnen, 1993).

¹²³ R. Eisenman and M. O. Wise, *Jesus und die Urchristen: Die Qumran-Rollen entschlüsselt* (Munich: Bertelsmann, 1993). In contrast to the English title, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Uncovered*, the German title referred directly to the New Testament and incorrectly suggested a direct connection between it and the texts reproduced in the edition.

¹²⁴ B. Pixner, "An Essene Quarter on Mount Zion?," in *Studia Hierosolymitana on onore di P. Bellarmino Bagatti* (2 vols; Jerusalem: Franciscan Print Press, 1976), 1:245–85; R. Riesner, "Essener und Urkirche in Jerusalem," *BK* 40 (1985): 64–76; B. Pixner, *Wege des Messias und Stätten der Urkirche: Jesus und das Judentum im Licht neuer archäologischer Erkenntnisse* (ed. R. Riesner; BAZ 2; Giessen: Brunnen, 1991); "Jerusalem's Essene Gateway: Where the Community Lived in Jesus Time," *BAR* 23 (1997): 22–31, 64–66; R. Riesner, "Jesus, the Primitive Community, and the Essene Quarter of Jerusalem," in *Jesus and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 198–234; *Essener und Urgemeinde in Jerusalem* (BAZ 6; Gießen: Brunnen, 1998).

¹²⁵ Cf. B. Mayer, ed., *Christen und Christliches in Qumran?* (ESt.NF 32; Regensburg: Pustet, 1992).

¹²⁶ J. O'Callaghan, "¿Papiros neotestamentarios en la cueva 7 de Qumran?," *Bib* 53 (1972): 91–100.

in Qumran studies as well as in papyrology and textual criticism, was taken up in 1984 by the German Carsten Peter Thiede, a specialist in English literature but also an autodidact in papyrological studies. His defense of the identification of 7Q5 with Mark 6:52–53 by the utilization of new technological tools for improving the legibility of the fragment was especially popularized in Evangelical and Fundamentalist circles,¹²⁷ but the better photographs confirmed experts' rejection of the proposed identification.¹²⁸ The hypothesis became popular in those circles because Thiede's identification, if proven, would have meant an earlier date for the Gospel of Mark than about 70 CE, as usually suggested by historical-critical scholarship. The case amply demonstrates how Qumran is always in danger of being utilized for ideological purposes. It shows how the general public is unable to understand the complexity and the tentative character of historical arguments and therefore tends to accept simple identifications.

Only rather late did a (limited) number of German Old Testament scholars engage in Qumran research. This was due to the growing realization of the relevance of the Qumran discoveries for the reconstruction of the biblical text and the redaction and assembly of the canonical Hebrew Bible. At the same time there was a shift in German Old Testament scholarship, which was traditionally interested in the most "genuine" strata of the biblical books, their secondary parts being deemed less important. In particular the Zurich scholar Odil Hannes Steck stimulated greater attention to the late redactional strata of the books of the prophets (especially Isaiah and the Minor Prophets), taking into consideration the data culled from the Qumran texts. Steck's efforts resulted in a thorough interpretation of the exegesis of the Qumran pesharim, but also in a remarkable monograph on the Qumran version of the book of Isaiah according to the *Great Isaiah Scroll* from Cave 1.¹²⁹ His former student Reinhard Kratz then worked on the book of Daniel and other late traditions of the Hebrew Bible, and later became the director of the Qumran-

¹²⁷ C. P. Thiede, "7Q: Eine Rückkehr zu den neutestamentlichen Papyrusfragmenten in der siebten Höhle von Qumran," *Bib* 65 (1984): 538–59; cf. Thiede, *Die älteste Evangelien-Handschrift? Das Markusfragment von Qumran und die Anfänge der schriftlichen Überlieferung des Neuen Testaments* (Wuppertal: Brockhaus, 1986); C. P. Thiede and M. D'Ancona, *Der Jesus-Papyrus: Die Entdeckung einer Evangelien-Handschrift aus der Zeit der Augenzeugen* (Munich: Luchterhand, 1997).

¹²⁸ Summarized in German by S. Enste, *Kein Markustext in Qumran: Eine Untersuchung der These: Qumran-Fragment 7Q5 = Mk 6,52–53* (NTOA 45; Freiburg-Göttingen: Academic Press-Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000).

¹²⁹ O. H. Steck, *Die erste Jesajarolle von Qumran (1QIsa^a)* (2 vols.; SBS 173; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1998); "Bemerkungen zur Abschnittsgliederung in den Jesaja-Handschriften aus der Wüste Juda: Ein Vergleich auf der Grundlage von 1QIsa^a," in *Die Textfunde vom Toten Meer und der Text der Hebräischen Bibel* (ed. U. Dahmen, A. Lange, and H. Lichtenberger; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 2000), 53–90.

forschungsstelle in Göttingen after the retirement of Hartmut Stegemann. Together with Stegemann's student Annette Steudel, he trained young scholars such as Roman Vielhauer and Peter Porzig in work on the Scrolls,¹³⁰ and launched a new joint project on the interpretation of the book of Genesis in the Scrolls, together with Devorah Dimant of the University of Haifa.

Another Hebrew Bible scholar who engaged in Qumran research before the release of texts in the 1990s is the Roman Catholic scholar Heinz-Josef Fabry in Bonn. As early as his doctoral dissertation, submitted to the University of Bonn in 1975, he provided a thorough examination of the root שׁוּב in the Qumran texts.¹³¹ In his Habilitation thesis he analyzed community terminology in the Scrolls. This work was published almost entirely in articles of the *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament*, edited by his teacher Johannes Botterweck, and since 1981 with Fabry as a co-editor. As the leading Roman Catholic Qumran specialist in Germany, Fabry has worked continually to impart Qumran insights to other German-speaking biblical scholars, and to utilize the Scrolls to improve the semantics of biblical terms and to understand better the textual history and canonization of the Hebrew Bible.¹³²

¹³⁰ R. Vielhauer, *Das Werden des Buches Hosea: Eine redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung* (BZAW 349; Berlin-New York: de Gruyter, 2007); see also "Materielle Rekonstruktion und historische Einordnung der beiden Pescharim zum Hoseabuch (4QpHos[a] und 4QpHos[b])," *RevQ* 20 (2001): 39–91; P. Porzig, *Die Lade Jahwes im Alten Testament und in den Texten vom Toten Meer* (BZAW 397; Berlin-New York: de Gruyter, 2009).

¹³¹ H.-J. Fabry, *Die Wurzel שׁוּב in der Qumran-Literatur: Zur Semantik eines Grundbegriffes* (BBB 53; Cologne: Hanstein, 1975).

¹³² H.-J. Fabry, "11QPs^a und die Kanonizität des Psalters," in *Freude an der Weisung des Herrn: Beiträge zur Theologie der Psalmen; Festgabe zum 70. Geburtstag von Heinrich Gross* (ed. F.-L. Hossfeld and E. Haag; 2nd ed.; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1987), 45–67; "Der Makarismus – mehr als nur eine weisheitliche Lehrform: Gedanken zu dem neu-edierten Text 4Q525," in *Alttestamentlicher Glaube und Biblische Theologie: Festschrift für Horst Dietrich Preuß zum 65. Geburtstag* (ed. J. Hausmann and H.-J. Zobel; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1992), 362–71; "Der Umgang mit der kanonisierten Tora in Qumran," in *Die Tora als Kanon für Juden und Christen* (ed. E. Zenger; HBS 10; Freiburg i. B.: Herder, 1996), 293–327; "Der Psalter in Qumran," in *Der Psalter in Judentum und Christentum* (ed. E. Zenger; HBS 18; Freiburg i. B.: Herder, 1998), 137–63; "Die Schriftfunde aus Qumran und ihre Bedeutung für den hebräischen Bibeltext," 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-Göttingen: Academic Press-Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2001), 111–28; "Die Messiaserwartung in den Handschriften von Qumran," in *Wisdom and Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Biblical Tradition* (ed. F. G. Martínez; BETL 168; Leuven: University Press, 2003), 357–84; "Zadokiden und Aaroniden in Qumran," in *Das Manna fällt auch heute noch: Beiträge zur Geschichte und Theologie des Alten, Ersten Testaments* (ed. F.-L. Hossfeld; HBS 44; Freiburg i. B.: Herder, 2004), 201–17.

He has also linked Qumran research with the study of the Septuagint;¹³³ he likewise takes into account archaeological studies and the relation between textual and material remains of the past.¹³⁴ His student Ulrich Dahmen wrote his Habilitation thesis on the relevance of the Psalms Scroll from Cave 11 (11QPs^a) for the canonical history of the Psalter.¹³⁵

Of note too is the Hebrew Bible scholar Klaus Koch from Hamburg, whose works on apocalypticism and especially on the book of Daniel integrate insights obtained from the Qumran texts.¹³⁶ His student Uwe Gleßmer contributed to Qumran research by analyzing the calendar, in particular its use by the *mishmarot* texts.¹³⁷ Together with Matthias Albani, another younger Hebrew Bible scholar and one of the leading experts in astronomical and calendrical issues,¹³⁸ he discovered in the storerooms of the Rockefeller Museum an object identified as a sundial from the Qumran site.¹³⁹

¹³³ H.-J. Fabry, "The reception of Nahum and Habakkuk in the Septuagint and Qumran," in *Emanuel*, 241–56.

¹³⁴ See, e.g., H.-J. Fabry, "Die Friedhöfe von Chirbet Qumran," in *Qumran kontrovers* (ed. J. Frey and H. Stegemann; Einblicke 6; Paderborn: Bonifatius, 2003), 173–91; "Archäologie und Text: Versuch einer Verhältnisbestimmung am Beispiel von Chirbet Qumran," in *Texte, Fakten, Artefakte: Beiträge zur Bedeutung der Archäologie für die neutestamentliche Forschung* (ed. M. Küchler and K. M. Schmidt; NTOA 59; Fribourg Göttingen: Academic Press-Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2006), 69–101.

¹³⁵ U. Dahmen, *Psalmen und Psalter-Rezeption im Frühjudentum: Rekonstruktion, Textbestand, Struktur und Pragmatik der Psalmenrolle 11QP^a aus Qumran* (STDJ 49; Leiden: Brill, 2003); "Psalmentext und Psalmenammlung: Eine Auseinandersetzung mit P. W. Flint," in *Die Textfunde vom Toten Meer*, 109–26.

¹³⁶ Cf. the collections: K. Koch, *Die Reiche der Welt und der kommende Menschensohn: Studien zum Danielbuch*, vol. 2 of *Gesammelte Aufsätze* (ed. M. Rösel; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1995); *Vor der Wende der Zeiten: Beiträge zur apokalyptischen Literatur*, vol. 3 of *Gesammelte Aufsätze* (ed. U. Gleßmer and M. Krause; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1996); *Daniel: Dan 1–4* (BK 22/1; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 2005).

¹³⁷ Cf. his published Habilitation thesis: U. Gleßmer, *Die ideale Kultordnung: 24 Priesterordnungen in den Chronikbüchern, kalendarischen Qumrantexten und in synagogalen Inschriften* (STDJ 24; Leiden: Brill, 1998).

¹³⁸ Cf. his published doctoral dissertation: M. Albani, *Astronomie und Schöpfungsglaube: Untersuchungen zum astronomischen Henochbuch* (WMANT 68; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1994). See "Zur Rekonstruktion eines verdrängten Konzepts: Der 364-Tage Kalender in der gegenwärtigen Forschung," in *Studies in the Book of Jubilees* (ed. M. Albani, J. Frey, and A. Lange; TSAJ 65; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 1997), 79–125. See also his published Habilitation thesis *Der eine Gott und die himmlischen Heerscharen: Zur Begründung des Monotheismus bei Deuterijosaja im Horizont der Astralisierung des Gottesverständnisses im Alten Orient* (ABIG 1; Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2000).

¹³⁹ M. Albani and U. Gleßmer, "Un instrument de mesures astronomiques à Qumrân," *RB* 104 (1997): 88–115; "An Astronomical Measuring Instrument from Qumran," in *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New*

One last Hebrew Bible scholar who has specialized almost exclusively on Qumran is Armin Lange. Trained by Hans-Peter Müller, Hermann Lichtenberger, and Bernd Janowski, he started to work on the new Qumran Wisdom texts in the early 1990s in Münster and Tübingen¹⁴⁰ and is now director of the Institute of Judaic Studies at the University of Vienna. Among numerous other projects, he published a comprehensive categorization of the non-biblical Qumran texts according to literary genres,¹⁴¹ and an extensive introduction to the biblical manuscripts along with the long-term project of a synoptic presentation in the *Biblia Qumranica*.¹⁴²

During the 1990s, German Qumran research was located at only a few centers, mainly Göttingen (with Hartmut Stegemann), Tübingen (with Hermann Lichtenberger), Munich (with Heinz-Wolfgang Kuhn), and Bonn (with Heinz-Josef Fabry). The release of the hitherto unpublished texts from 1991 rekindled interest in Qumran among biblical scholars, including a larger number of Hebrew Bible scholars. It is noteworthy that the leading scholars of that period were still those who had been trained in the Qumran-forschungsstelle in Heidelberg. In Tübingen, where Martin Hengel had always included Qumran in his overall reconstruction of the history of Judaism in the Hellenistic period,¹⁴³ the focus was strongly on New Testament connections and the relevance of Qumran for New Testament scholarship. In Hengel's famous research seminar, the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* were read and analyzed with regard to the notion of the kingdom of God and the New Testament writings.¹⁴⁴ At the initiative and under the guidance of Her-

Texts, and Reformulated Issues (ed. D. W. Parry and E. Ulrich; STDJ 30; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 407–42.

¹⁴⁰ A. Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination: Weisheitliche Ordnung und Prädestination in den Textfunden von Qumran* (STDJ 18; Leiden: Brill, 1995). Among his numerous articles see especially “Die Weisheitstexte aus Qumran: Eine Einleitung,” in *The Wisdom Texts from Qumran and the Development of Sapiential Thought* (ed. C. Hempel, A. Lange, and H. Lichtenberger; BETL 159; Leuven: University Press, 2002), 3–30.

¹⁴¹ A. Lange and U. Mittmann-Richert, “Annotated List of the Texts from the Judaean Desert Classified by Content and Genre,” in *The Texts from the Judaean Desert: Indices and an Introduction to the Discoveries in the Judaean Desert Series* (ed. E. Tov; DJD XXXIX; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2002), 115–64.

¹⁴² A. Lange, *Die Handschriften biblischer Bücher von Qumran und den anderen Fundorten*, vol. 1 of *Handbuch der Textfunde zum Toten Meer* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009). On the *Biblia Qumranica* see below.

¹⁴³ Already in his well-known work, M. Hengel, *Judentum und Hellenismus* (WUNT 10; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1973). See further Hengel, “Qumran und der Hellenismus,” in *Judaica et Hellenistica* (WUNT 90; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996), 258–94, and lately “Qumran und das frühe Christentum,” in *Studien zum Urchristentum* (ed. C.-J. Thornton; WUNT 234; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 488–96.

¹⁴⁴ Cf. M. Hengel and A. M. Schwemer, eds., *Königsherrschaft Gottes und himmlischer Kult im Judentum, Urchristentum und in der hellenistischen Welt* (WUNT 55; Tübingen:

mann Lichtenberger, who himself published numerous articles on Qumran and New Testament parallels,¹⁴⁵ the themes of wisdom, dualism, and messianism were investigated afresh on the basis of the newly released texts. Here Armin Lange developed his views on wisdom and determinism,¹⁴⁶ and Johannes Zimmermann wrote a comprehensive monograph on the messianic texts from Qumran.¹⁴⁷ Jörg Frey investigated the development of dualism in connection with the dualistic terminology in the Gospel of John and in Pauline anthropology,¹⁴⁸ and developed general perspectives on the relation of the Qumran texts to New Testament themes.¹⁴⁹ In Munich, Heinz-Wolfgang

Mohr Siebeck, 1991); see especially A. M. Schwemer, "Gott als König und seine Königsherrschaft: in den Sabbatliedern aus Qumran," in *Königsherrschaft Gottes*, 48–118; H. Löhr, "Thronversammlung und preisender Tempel: Beobachtungen am himmlischen Heiligtum im Hebräerbrief und in den Sabbatopferliedern aus Qumran," in *Königsherrschaft Gottes*, 185–205.

¹⁴⁵ Cf. e.g., H. Lichtenberger, "Johannes der Täufer und die Texte von Qumran," in *Papers on the Dead Sea Scrolls Offered in Memory of Jean Carmignac Part I: General Research on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Qumran and the New Testament, the Present State of Qumranology* (ed. Z. J. Kapera; QM 2; Krakow: Enigma Press, 1993), 139–52; "Die Texte von Qumran und das Urchristentum," *Judaica* 50 (1994): 68–82; "Messianische Erwartungen und Messianische Gestalten in der Zeit des Zweiten Tempels," in *Messias-Vorstellungen bei Juden und Christen* (ed. E. Stegemann; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1993), 9–20; "Auferstehung in den Qumranfunden," in *Auferstehung-Resurrection* (ed. F. Avemarie and H. Lichtenberger; WUNT 135; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001), 79–91; "Messiasvorstellungen in Qumran und die neutestamentliche Christologie," *CV* 44 (2002): 139–60; "Makarismen in den Qumrantexten und im Neuen Testament," in *Wisdom and Apocalypticism*, 395–411; "Qumran and the New Testament," in *The Changing Face of Judaism, Christianity and Other Greco-Roman Religions in Antiquity* (ed. I. H. Henderson and G. S. Oegema; Studien zu den Jüdischen Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit 2; Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 2006), 103–29.

¹⁴⁶ Cf. Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination*; cf. also the papers of a Tübingen conference: "The Wisdom Texts from Qumran and the Development of Sapiential Thought," in *The Wisdom Texts From Qumran*.

¹⁴⁷ J. Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte aus Qumran: Königliche, priesterliche und prophetische Messiasvorstellungen in den Schriftfunden von Qumran* (WUNT II/104; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998).

¹⁴⁸ J. Frey, "Different Patterns of Dualistic Thought in the Qumran Library: Reflections on Their Background and History," in Bernstein, García Martínez and Kampen, *Legal Texts and Legal Issues*, 275–335 (in this volume, 243–299); "Licht aus den Höhlen? Der 'johanneische Dualismus' und die Texte von Qumran," in *Kontexte des Johannesevangeliums*, 117–203; "Die paulinische Antithese von 'Fleisch' und 'Geist' und die palstinischjüdische Weisheitstradition," *ZNW* 90 (1999): 45–77; "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*, 367–404 (in this volume, 701–741).

¹⁴⁹ J. Frey, "Die Bedeutung der Qumranfunde für das Verständnis des Neuen Testaments," in *Qumran – Die Schriftrollen vom Toten Meer*, 129–208; "The Character and

Kuhn established a project for the detailed examination of all Qumran parallels to the genuine Pauline epistles, accompanied by numerous articles.¹⁵⁰ Michael Becker analyzed parallels between Qumran, apocalypticism and the Jesus tradition.¹⁵¹ In Göttingen, the work of Hartmut Stegemann and his team in the Forschungsstelle was less focused on the “Christian” topics and more on the reconstruction of manuscripts, and on texts, genres, and historical reconstruction. The influence of this center radiates out to many other scholars who are working on the Qumran texts.

V. Current Projects

Although few German-speaking scholars concentrate on Qumran research, some promising projects organized and directed by German scholars or in German-speaking academic contexts are currently underway. The first is centered at the Qumranforschungsstelle in Göttingen, with the renewed lexical project of the *Qumran Wörterbuch*.¹⁵² The project was funded by the

Background of Matt 5:25–26: On the Value of Qumran Literature in New Testament Interpretation,” in *The Sermon on the Mount and Its Jewish Setting* (ed. H.-J. Becker and S. Ruzer; CahRB 60; Paris: Gabalda, 2005), 3–39; “Die Bedeutung der Qumran-Funde für das Verständnis der Apokalyptik im Frühjudentum und im Urchristentum,” in *Apokalyptik und Qumran* (ed. J. Frey and M. Becker; Einblicke 10; Paderborn: Bonifatius, 2007), 11–62. Cf. also the comprehensive presentation “Qumran,” *Realenzyklopädie für Antike und Christentum*, vol. 28 (Stuttgart: Hiersemann, 2017), 550–92 (in this volume under the title, “Qumran: An Overview”).

¹⁵⁰ Cf., e.g., H.-W Kuhn, “Die Bedeutung der Qumrantexte für das Verständnis des Ersten Thessalonicherbriefes: Vorstellung des Münchener Projekts: Qumran und das Neue Testament – The Impact of the Qumran Scrolls on the Understanding of Paul’s First Letter to the Thessalonians; Presentation of the Munich Project on Qumran and the New Testament,” in *The Madrid Qumran Congress*, 1:340–53; “The Impact of the Qumran Scrolls on the Understanding of Paul,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research* (ed. D. Dimant and U. Rappaport; STDJ 10; Leiden-Jerusalem: Brill-Magnes, 1992), 327–39; “Die Bedeutung der Qumrantexte für das Verständnis des Galaterbriefes aus dem Münchener Projekt: Qumran und das Neue Testament,” in *New Qumran Texts and Studies: Proceedings of the First Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Paris 1992* (ed. G. J. Brooke and F. GARCÍA Martínez; STDJ 15; Leiden: Brill, 1994), 169–221; “Qumran und Paulus: Unter traditionsgeschichtlichem 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: de Gruyter, 1999), 227–46; “Qumran Texts and the Historical Jesus: Parallels in Contrast,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls. Fifty Years, 573–80*.

¹⁵¹ M. Becker, “4Q521 und die Gesalbten,” *RevQ* 18 (1997): 73–96; “Die ‘messianische Apokalypse’ 4Q521 und der Interpretationsrahmen der Taten Jesu,” in *Apokalyptik und Qumran*, 237–303.

¹⁵² The aims are stated on the website (<http://www.qwb.adw-goettingen.gwdg.de/> [cited 27 February 2011]): “Development of a philological dictionary that covers the entire vo-

Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG) and the Göttingen Academy of Sciences, so that the completion of this long-term project, headed by Reinhard Kratz and Annette Steudel, could be expected in due course,¹⁵³ until a cut in the funding in 2018 again caused some uncertainty. Another project, on interpretation and subject matter, is the *Theologische Wörterbuch zu den Qumrantexten (ThWQ)*, based in Bonn. It was launched by Heinz-Josef Fabry of the University of Bonn as a supplement to the *Theologisches Wörterbuch Zum Alten Testament (ThWAT)*.¹⁵⁴ Notably, both these dictionary projects are run by Hebrew Bible scholars. Another significant project plans to produce a synoptic edition of the Qumran biblical manuscripts, together with the Masoretic text and the Septuagint, under the title *Biblia Qumranica*. It was originally conceptualized in the 1990s by Hermann Lichtenberger and Armin Lange in Tübingen and is now edited jointly by Beate Ego, Kristin de Troyer, Armin Lange, and Hermann Lichtenberger.¹⁵⁵ A further promising project is an introduction to all Qumran manuscripts and works by Armin Lange in Vienna, of which the volume on the biblical manuscripts was published in 2009.¹⁵⁶ The Munich Qumran-Projekt of Heinz-Wolfgang Kuhn is devoted to the Qumran parallels to the New Testament, currently Paul's letters. Of note finally is the series of bi-annual Qumran conferences at the Schwerte Catholic Academy (near Dortmund), originally launched by the late Hartmut Stegemann as a forum of exchange for German-speaking Qumran scholars. It is now run by Jörg Frey with a wider range of contributors from the European context.¹⁵⁷

cabulary of non-biblical texts from the Dead Sea and prepares the material etymologically, morphologically, and semantically.”

¹⁵³ R. G. Kratz, A. Steudel, and I. Kottsieper, eds., *Hebräisches und aramäisches Wörterbuch zu den Texten vom Toten Meer einschließlich der Manuskripte aus der Kairoer Geniza* (vol. 1: Aleph–Beth; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2017); vol. 2: Gimel – Zajin (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2019).

¹⁵⁴ H.-J. Fabry and U. Dahmen, eds., *Theologisches Wörterbuch zu den Qumrantexten* (3 vols.; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2011–16).

¹⁵⁵ See the first volume, Beate Ego et al., eds., *Minor Prophets* (Biblia Qumranica 3b; Leiden: Brill, 2005).

¹⁵⁶ Armin, *Die Handschriften biblischer Bücher von Qumran*.

¹⁵⁷ Cf. the conference volumes: *Qumran kontrovers* (ed. J. Frey and H. Stegemann, with M. Becker and M. Maurer; Einblicke 6; Paderborn: Bonifatius-Verlag, 2003); *Qumran – Bibelwissenschaften – Antike Judaistik* (ed. U. Dahmen, H. Stegemann, and G. Stemberger; Einblicke 9; Paderborn: Bonifatius, 2006); *Apokalyptik und Qumran* (ed. J. Frey and M. Becker; Einblicke 10; Paderborn: Bonifatius, 2007); *Qumran und der biblische Kanon* (ed. M. Becker and J. Frey; BThSt 92; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 2009); *Qumran und die Archäologie: Texte und Kontexte* (ed. J. Frey, C. Claußen, and N. Kessler; WUNT 278; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011); *Jesus, Paulus und die Texte von Qumran* (ed. J. Frey and E. E. Popkes, with S. Tätweiler; WUNT II/390; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015); *Dualismus, Dämonologie und diabolische Figuren: Religionshistorische Beobachtungen*

VI. Future Perspectives

German Qumran scholarship shares in the general shift in Qumran studies away from issues of Early Christianity to other topics, mostly those specific to the Qumran context. The two dictionary projects as well as the *Biblia Qumranica* are directed by scholars of the Hebrew Bible or of Second Temple Judaism. Qumran texts are increasingly used to clarify aspects of the redaction and textual history of Hebrew Bible books, scriptural interpretation and canonization, the characterization of apocalypticism, Palestinian wisdom traditions, and other contemporary Jewish groups.

Some of these aspects are still important for interpreting early Christian traditions. But in contrast to the early period of Qumran research, nowadays the large number of non-sectarian texts – parabiblical, sapiential, liturgical, and the like – provide the most important and intriguing parallels for the New Testament. Accordingly, the scholarly focus has also moved from the Essene group or the “Qumran community,” with its particular piety and theology, toward the numerous non-sectarian traditions and texts, or to the diversity of Second Temple Judaism as revealed through the Qumran library.

Most of the early assumptions of close links between the Qumran community or the Essenes and Early Christianity have been abandoned. German research is generally in agreement that no Christian texts exist among the Qumran texts, and that the Qumran group or the Essenes are not mentioned in the New Testament. Neither John the Baptist, Jesus, Paul, the author of the Fourth Gospel, nor any other New Testament author can be associated convincingly with the “sectarian” texts or even be considered influenced by the Qumran community. Therefore the issues to be discussed now are no longer the possible relation between the Qumran community and Early Christianity but rather the links between terms, themes, and genres in early Christian texts and contemporary Judaism as a whole, in its variegated and diverse traditions and groups, at present better recognized through the texts from the Qumran library. The main value of the Scrolls is found in the wide selection of literary products belonging to Second Temple Judaism in the centuries before the turn of the era, and not in their representation of the library of a particular Jewish group. Without the information gleaned from the Scrolls, an adequate view of the literature and thought of Palestinian Judaism at that time would not be possible. The most important contribution of the Scrolls to an understanding of the New Testament is the information they contain on a whole range of issues developed in Second Temple Judaism: the process of scriptural canonization, techniques and forms of Bible interpretation, literary forms

und theologische Reflexionen (ed. J. Frey and E. E. Popkes, under collaboration of S.-C. Hertel-Holst; WUNT II/484; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2019); *Frauen im antiken Judentum und frühen Christentum* (ed. J. Frey and N. Rupschus; WUNT II/489; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2019).

and genres, apocalyptic and wisdom thought, the variety of eschatological or messianic figures and agents, the last judgment, life after death, angels and demons, halakah and purity, calendar and festivals.

One of the results of the Qumran debate is that New Testament scholarship – not only in Germany – has come to recognize the fundamental Jewishness of early Christian texts, even if there is a critical debate with and distancing from other Jewish groups. This is a major achievement, especially in view of the persistent theological traditions that view “the law,” and with it also Judaism as a whole, in a somewhat negative light. Based on the insights gained from the Qumran library, New Testament texts can now be read as part of the Jewish literature of the late Second Temple period (and later). However, in contrast to an earlier type of “pan-Qumranism,” consideration of the contemporary Jewish context calls for a broader perspective encompassing not only the Scrolls but also the Septuagint, the entirety of “intertestamental” literature, evidence from the Jewish Diaspora, and also the early rabbinic texts; a much deeper analysis than simply collecting parallels is needed. Instead, every parallel adduced from Qumran or elsewhere deserves cautious interpretation, taking into account its own original context, the possible methods of transmission, the number of analogies and differences, the possible reasons for them, and also alternative explanations. The abating of the “Qumran fever” of the early decades also reduced the interest among many German New Testament scholars, and many of them do not realize the real challenges of Qumran research. Only a few of them are still engaged in Scrolls research. By contrast, Old Testament scholars in Germany are engaging more and more in the Qumran discussion. Yet even they do not take full note of the data and challenges of the Qumran texts.

Of course, the Scrolls have transformed scholarship on Jesus, John, and even Paul, and have served to modify New Testament scholars’ views of contemporary Judaism. We can measure the tremendous change by comparing the present views on the Jewish context of the early Christian authors with those expressed early in the twentieth century by the history-of-religions school, before the Qumran discoveries. See, for instance, the views of that time regarding “normative Judaism,” or the non-Jewish background of the most important christological terms and titles, or of the Hellenistic-Oriental, or even Gnostic, background of the religious language of the Fourth Gospel. These views have changed considerably. The fresh textual data today allow for much more diversity in Second Temple Judaism, even within the context of Palestine. This enables scholars to fit Jesus and the early Christians into it, rather than to look for non-Jewish elements in their position and preaching. Qumran has opened up new perspectives allowing for novel explanations, particularly in respect of dualistic language. Dualistic elements in Paul or John are no longer seen as being Hellenistic or Gnostic and non-Jewish, but can be explained as having developed from the Palestinian Jewish back-

ground and language, although the direct influence of the sectarian texts is quite improbable.¹⁵⁸

Moreover, the Qumran discoveries have considerably changed our views on apocalypticism, the Palestinian Jewish wisdom traditions, and on the relationship between them. This is especially relevant to the views on the earliest Jesus tradition. For the scholarly polarity between the description of Jesus' teaching as being apocalyptic or purely "sapiential," i.e., non-apocalyptic, appears increasingly inadequate. There has also been a considerable change regarding Christology. Most views of Christ in the New Testament can now be identified with the various Jewish messianic ideas registered in the Scrolls. Explaining them as originating in pagan Hellenism seems unwarranted for most of the christological "titles," as it is for the development towards a decidedly "high" Christology.

The Palestinian Jewish elements of Paul's language and argument are now noticed and have led to a correction of the one-sided Hellenistic image that previously dominated Pauline research. The Fourth Gospel especially now seems much more Jewish than before the Qumran discoveries, although there is no reason to locate its particular background in the Qumran corpus. In contrast to the pan-Qumranism that was prevalent in the first decades of the Qumran debate, scholars are now aware that in history-of-religion matters any monolithic explanation is too simplistic. Methodologically then, it is important also to keep in mind Greco-Roman parallels and – especially – the Jewish Diaspora background that contributed considerably to the language and views of New Testament authors. It is neither the "Essene" paradigm nor the specific sectarian texts but rather the variety of non-sectarian parabiblical, exegetical, sapiential, and liturgical texts that help us to determine more precisely the history-of-religions perspective of early Christian texts.

¹⁵⁸ See the articles by J. Frey, "Different Patterns of Dualistic Thought in the Qumran Library"; "Licht aus den Höhlen?"; "Die paulinische Antithese von 'Fleisch' und 'Geist'"; "Flesh and Spirit"; "Die Bedeutung der Qumranfunde für das Verständnis des Neuen Testaments"; "The Character and Background of Matt 5:25–26"; "Die Bedeutung der Qumran-Funde für das Verständnis der Apokalypik im Frühjudentum und im Urchristentum."

4. Qumran and Archaeology*

In the discussion about the Qumran discoveries, archaeology has become more and more important in recent years. Long and widely held views concerning the character and function of the Khirbet Qumran settlement, as well as the identity of its inhabitants, which have partly taken place within the broad eye of the media public, have been called into question, partly to the extent that the link between the scrolls and the residents of the settlement has been generally doubted.¹ Defenders of the previous scholarly consensus and representatives of “revolutionary” new perspectives faced off against one another in a striking and, at times, unsympathetic manner. In particular, scholars who focused on the texts of Qumran and some, although not all,² representatives of Qumran archaeology seemed to be at odds with one another. One might see in this an “emancipation” of archaeology from the interpretational priority of the texts or textual scholarship and exegesis, which was common within the context of the biblical studies.³ However, the separation

* The present article was originally developed from the introduction to a Qumran conference held in April 2008 at the Catholic Academy in Schwerte, as an introduction to the documentation volume that was meant to sum up and react to the controversies that had dominated the discussion in the first decade of the 21st century, including fervent debates between archaeologists and biblical scholars: *Qumran und die Archäologie* (ed. J. Frey, C. Claußen, and N. Kessler; WUNT 278; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011). I have not updated the article with regard to the publications and developments since 2010, but the perspectives sketched below already show the way. In recent years, the discussion has calmed down, even though a large number of issues still remain open and controversial.

¹ Cf. especially the exciting work of Y. Hirschfeld, *Qumran in Context. Reassessing the Archaeological Evidence* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2004); the German version of the same: idem, *Qumran – die ganze Wahrheit. Die Funde der Archäologie neu bewertet* (Gütersloh: Gütersloh Verlagshaus, 2004).

² A (modified) continuation of the previous consensus hypothesis was expressed by a string of archaeologists such as Jodi Magness, Magen Broshi, Hanan Eshel, or even Erik Meyers. Cf. J. Magness, *The Archaeology of Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002); M. Broshi, “Qumran: Archaeology,” in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. L. H. Schiffman and J. C. VanderKam; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 733–739; H. Eshel, “Qumran Studies in Light of the Archaeological Excavations Between 1967 and 1997,” *JRH* 26.2 (2002): 179–188; idem, “Qumran Archaeology (Review: Yizhar Hirschfeld, *Qumran in Context*),” *JAOS* 125.3 (2005): 389–394; E. M. Meyers, “Khirbet Qumran and Its Environs,” in *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. T. H. Lim and J. J. Collins; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 21–45.

³ Thus, a variety of representatives of modern archaeology, cf. also in the volume this essay was originally meant to introduce: D. Vieweger, “Text und (Be)fund: Archäologie

between the two perspectives also meant that there was a loss with respect to the common task of interpreting past reality.

At the same time, the discussions about the texts – especially since the opening of free access to the previously unpublished fragments in 1991 – as well as the archaeological discourses have gained in a degree of complexity such that outsiders, “normal” biblical scholars, and even Qumran scholars of a different specialization could no longer succeed in perceiving the issues. In the following, I would like to provide an introductory overview discussing the sequence of the discoveries and some of the most significant findings, while also taking into account certain “side aspects” that will aid in understanding the fierce nature of the debate. Finally, I will identify a series of open questions.

A. The Ruins of Khirbet Qumran up to their Interpretation by Roland de Vaux

The fact that the ruins of Khirbet Qumran in the desolate area of the north-eastern banks of the Dead Sea remained for centuries since their last documented use during the time of the Bar Kokhba revolt⁴ with only a few taking notice of them is hardly surprising. While it is true that people who sought refuge in the caves on the rocky precipice of the Judean desert took notice of the ruins,⁵ they no longer inhabited them. The buildings were presumably also noticed in the early centuries by those who had already made exciting

und Exegese als Geschichtswissenschaften,” in *Qumran und die Archäologie* (ed. J. Frey, C. Claußen, and N. Kessler; WUNT 278; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 73–99; S. Hüttig, “Archäologie versus Textforschung? Einige grundsätzliche Überlegungen zum Verhältnis von Archäologie und Textforschung am Beispiel der Erforschung von Khirbet Qumran,” in *Qumran und die Archäologie* (ed. J. Frey, C. Claußen, and N. Kessler; WUNT 278; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 101–118; J. Zangenberg, “Qumran, die Essener und die gegenwärtige archäologische Forschung,” in *Qumran – die ganze Wahrheit*, 7–22, formulates the tenor of the conversation when he welcomes the new debate “that archaeology is finally freed from the role of the selective illustrator or apologist and is recognized as an independent, self-productive voice” (10).

⁴ The last coins found on the grounds of Qumran were from this period, which show that some of the rebels of the second Jewish uprising of 132–135 sought refuge here and lived here for some time. On the topic of the coins discovered at Qumran, see R. de Vaux, *Archaeology and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (London: British Academy, 1973), 45. De Vaux mentions an Aelia Capitolina coin from the time of Antonius Pius (138–161), about which he says, “It is an isolated example which must have been lost by a passer-by” (67).

⁵ This could account for a few coins that come from later Roman, Byzantine, and Islamic periods that have been found on the plateau of Qumran. On this point, see Y. Farhi and R. Price, “The Numismatic Finds from the Qumran Plateau Excavations 2004–2006, and 2008 Seasons,” *DSD* 17 (2010): 210–225, here 217 and 221.

discoveries of certain manuscripts and probably taken texts from some of the eleven Qumran caves known to us to have contained ancient texts.⁶ The ruins were also noticed by travelers to Palestine in modern times, but the location was not considered worthy of further note.⁷ The philologically incorrect linkage of Qumran with the biblical Gomorrah,⁸ or the later identification with one of the cities of Josh 15:62⁹ could still awaken interest in the horizon of the Bible; however, the assignment of the graves to a pre-Muslim, Arabic

⁶ Origin's note (in Eusebius *Hist. eccl.* VI 16.3) indicates that another textual edition of the Greek Psalter was available to him for his work on the Hexapla: "[the other edition] was discovered in Jericho in a jar in the time of Antoninus, the son of Severus" (trans. R. J. Deferrari, *The Fathers of the Church* [Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 1955], 29:30–31). Also, Epiphanius (*De mensuris et ponderibus*, in PG 43, 265–268) claims that "in the seventh year of Antoninus, the son of Severus ... in clay jugs in Jericho, the Septuagint along with other Hebrew and Greek writings were found." This dates to around the years of 216–217 CE. The Nestorian patriarch Timothy I of Seleukia (= Baghdad) reports another discovery of writings in a later epoch, writing in a letter about the fact that about ten years prior, in a cave near Jericho, "books," namely Old Testament and other texts written in the Hebrew language, had been found (see P. Kahle, *Die Kairoer Genisa* [Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1962], 16f.). This corresponds to the fact that Caves 3, 7, 8, and 9 show evidence that scrolls were taken from Qumran before the modern discovery of the caves and their contents by the Bedouins and modern researchers. Cf. H. Stegemann, *Die Essener, Qumran, Johannes der Täufer und Jesus* (10th ed.; Freiburg: Herder, 2007), 101, 111–113.

⁷ See C. Claußen, "Die Identifizierung der Grabungsstätte Khirbet Qumran. Eine forschungsgeschichtliche Annäherung," in *Qumran und die Archäologie* (ed. J. Frey, C. Claußen, and N. Kessler; WUNT 278; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 51–72; also J. Magness, *Archaeology*, 22–24; J. C. VanderKam and P. Flint, *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York: Harper One, 2002), 34–36; and the more detailed summary of the older reports in J. E. Taylor, "Khirbet Qumran in the Nineteenth Century and the Name of the Site," *PEQ* 134 (2002): 144–164.

⁸ Thus, the Flemish Palestine traveler de Saulcy in the middle of the 19th century; see Magness, *Archaeology*, 22f.

⁹ Thus, M. Noth, *Das Buch Josua* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1938), 72, where Noth refers to Qumran as "Ir-hammelaḥ" (= city of salt); see the later clarification in M. Noth "Der alttestamentliche Name der Siedlung auf chirbet qumrān," *ZDPV* 71 (1955): 111–123. On the basis of the references in the Copper Scroll, other authors have understood Qumran to be the Secacah mentioned in Josh 15:61. This view was first described by J. M. Allegro, *The Treasure of the Copper Scroll: The Opening and Decipherment of the Most Mysterious of the Dead Sea Scrolls, a Unique Inventory of Buried Treasure* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1960), 68–74; lastly, the view is approved by J. Magness, *Archaeology*, 25. For older discussions, see R. de Vaux, *Archaeology and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (London: Oxford University Press, 1973), 92f.; for more recent discussions, see H. Eshel, "The Identification of the City of Salt," *IEJ* 45 (1995): 37–40.

tribe or the interpretation of the ruins as a Roman fortress, as was proposed by Gustaf Dalman as early as 1914,¹⁰ did not stimulate sustained interest.

The ruins gained importance within the scholarly world only through the sensational textual discoveries that were made near the complex in 1947. While the first caves were still a good kilometer from the complex, Caves 4–10, which were found later between 1952 and 1955, were in the immediate vicinity of the complex and were partially visible from there or were in the marl terrace directly below the site. A connection between the location of the discoveries – the caves and the complex – was suggested by the topographical proximity. Soon after the first texts and the excavations of Cave 1 became known in 1949,¹¹ intensive investigations into the building complexes began in 1951 through 1956 by the Jordanian Department of Antiquities as well as the French *École Biblique et Archéologique* and the Palestinian Archaeological Museum (now called the Rockefeller Museum), both of which were located in the eastern part of Jerusalem, under the direction of the French Dominican Father, Roland de Vaux (1903–1971).¹² De Vaux was an Orientalist, a biblical scholar, and an autodidactically trained archaeologist.¹³ With his interpretation of the excavations, de Vaux offered what would be the “canonical” view of the site for a few decades,¹⁴ but admittedly his authoritative presentation of the data marked “a stagnation in the archaeological discussion of Qumran”¹⁵ for some time.

According to his interpretation of the excavation, the Qumran compound was the center of a highly organized religious “sect,” the Essenes, whose members not only lived there but also lived dispersed in the surrounding area.¹⁶ These members would gather together in the compound for communal

¹⁰ See G. Dalman, *Palästinajahrbook des deutschen evangelischen Instituts für Altertumswissenschaft des Heiligen Landes zu Jerusalem* (Berlin: Mittler, 1914), 9–11.

¹¹ R. de Vaux, “La grotte des manuscrits hébreux,” *RB* 56 (1949): 589–609.

¹² B. T. Viviano, “Vaux, R. É. G. de,” *Dictionary of Biblical Interpretation* (Nashville: Abdingdon Press, 1999), 2:606f.

¹³ Viviano, “Vaux, R. É. G. de,” 2:606.

¹⁴ The summary interpretation can be found in R. de Vaux, *L’archéologie et les manuscrites de la Mer Morte* (London: Oxford University Press, 1961); in a revised English version, idem, *Archaeology and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (London: Oxford University Press, 1973). See also the post-printing short essay idem, “Qumran, Khirbet and ‘Ein Feshkha,” *NEAEHL* 4 (Jerusalem: Carta, 1993): 1235–1241, which is provided by M. Broshi (idem, 1241) as a short appendix about 20 years after the death of de Vaux.

¹⁵ J. Zangenberg, “Qumran und Archäologie. Überlegungen zu einer umstrittenen Ortslage,” in *Zeichen aus Text und Stein. Studien auf dem Weg zu einer Archäologie des Neuen Testaments* (ed. S. Alkier and J. Zangenberg; Tübingen: Francke, 2003), 262–306, here 269.

¹⁶ De Vaux, “Qumran, Khirbet and ‘Ein Feshkha,” 1240: “It has therefore been concluded that Khirbet Qumran was the center of a sect, most of whose members lived dispersed throughout the area.” This conclusion is based on the discrepancy between the size

rites, work in the workshops in Qumran, or work as agriculturists in Ein Feshkha. When they died, the members would be buried in the large cemeteries in Qumran. De Vaux sees the burial form, the large assembly room, and the carefully “buried” remains of meals and bones as indications of the special religious character of the group. Therefore, it is granted that “the archaeological discoveries at Khirbet Qumran and Ein Feshkha were interpreted in the context of a living community.”¹⁷ That the inhabitants were the Essenes is “not contradicted by the archaeological evidence, which indeed provides corroboration.”¹⁸ The plateau of Qumran is the only possible place between Ein Gedi and the north end of the Dead Sea, the area which Pliny the Elder (*Nat. V 73*) identifies as the place of residence of the Essenes.¹⁹ Particularly illuminating is the conclusion of his argument in the last of his Schweich Lectures:

“It must be recognized that this particular passage in Pliny is not *in itself* decisive. But if the writings of Qumran exhibit certain points of resemblance to what is known from other sources about the Essenes, and if the ruins of Qumran correspond to what Pliny tells us about the dwelling-place of the Essenes, his evidence can be accepted as true. And this evidence in its turn serves to confirm that the community was Essene in character. This is no vicious circle, but rather an argument by convergence, culminating in that kind of certitude with which the historian of ancient times often has to content himself.”²⁰

Although de Vaux is sober and prudent in his portrayal (as opposed to some later writers) and is aware of the findings in the excavations in Khirbet Qumran, in the caves of Ein Feshka, and in the surrounding environment before he draws a link to the texts,²¹ it is nevertheless clear that even for him the textual discoveries are of primary interest and research of the compound should ultimately be conducted as a means of better understanding these texts and the group from which they emerged.²² Programmatically formulated, de Vaux writes, “In the study of the Qumran documents, archaeology plays only a

of the facility and the number of graves at the cemeteries. Concerning the broader argument, see de Vaux, *Archaeology*, 109ff., where he relies heavily on the texts and then deals with the older theories of the 1950s and 1960s.

¹⁷ De Vaux, “Qumran, Khirbet and ‘Ein Feshkha,” 1241.

¹⁸ De Vaux, “Qumran, Khirbet and ‘Ein Feshkha,” 1241.

¹⁹ De Vaux, “Qumran, Khirbet and ‘Ein Feshkha,” 1241.

²⁰ De Vaux, *Archaeology*, 137.

²¹ De Vaux emphasized this in his series of three “Schweich Lectures” now contained in *Archaeology*, viii; there, see 109ff.

²² Concerning de Vaux’s programmatic approach, see de Vaux, *Archaeology*, viii, where he writes: “All these discoveries have aroused enormous interest, and it is justifiable that interest in them should be concentrated above all on the texts which have in this way been made available to us. But the archaeologist can make a contribution to understanding the texts by indicating the nature of the setting in which they were discovered and so perhaps making it possible to reconstruct the character of the human group from which they emerged.”

secondary role.”²³ On the other hand, de Vaux maintains that archaeology can contribute more “objective” data in comparison to the fragmentary and enigmatic texts of Qumran,²⁴ and therefore could serve as a control for the interpretations collected from the texts.²⁵ Here, the classical “convergence model” of the relationship between textual studies and archaeology can be seen,²⁶ wherein the leading aspects of the interpretation of the (at the time closed) textual discoveries were made available and archaeology was more likely to function as an “auxiliary science.”

It is important to note, however, that the interpretation of the findings is based not only on the previously known texts (i.e., primary texts from Cave 1 and the *Damascus Document*), but also on the very early connection made by Eleazar Lipa Sukenik²⁷ – on the basis of the above cited reference from Pliny the Elder – between the scrolls (and the inhabitants of Qumran) and the

²³ De Vaux, *Archaeology*, 138.

²⁴ De Vaux, *Archaeology*, 138: “But it has the advantage of supplying dates and bringing to bear material facts, the interpretation of which can be more objective than that of the texts which are often so enigmatic or incomplete.”

²⁵ De Vaux, *Archaeology*, 138: “all that archaeology can contribute is to provide a yardstick by which to test the conclusions arrived at from the documents.” On the other hand, de Vaux obtains critical judgments from the excavation finds (e.g., the settlement’s chronology) about some of the representative attempts at the time to interpret the texts or the circles behind them in a different manner.

²⁶ Concerning the characteristics of the convergence, variance, and divergence models, see J. Zangenberg, “Region oder Religion? Überlegungen zum interpretatorischen Kontext von Chirbet Qumran,” in *Texte – Fakten – Artefakte. Beiträge zur Bedeutung der Archäologie für die neutestamentliche Forschung* (ed. M. Küchler and K. M. Schmidt; NTOA = SUNT 49; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2006), 25–68, here 57f. For a somewhat different taxonomy of the models, see C. Frevel, “‘Dies ist der Ort, von dem geschrieben steht ...’ Zum Verhältnis von Bibelwissenschaft und Palästinaarchäologie,” *BN* 47 (1989): 35–89, who makes a distinction between a model of affirmation, an *ancilla* model, a model of cooperation, and a model of distinction (40–44). In this case, an *ancilla* model would probably be present. Concerning the use of a four-model paradigm, see also F. Rohrhirsch, *Wissenschaftstheorie und Qumran* (Freiburg: Universitätsverlag, 1996), 84f.

²⁷ E. L. Sukenik, *מגילת נגזות מתוך נגזת קדומה ונמצאה במדבר יהודה* (Jerusalem: Bialik Foundation, 1948), 1:16f.; cf. N. Avigad and E. L. Sukenik, *The Dead Sea Scrolls of the Hebrew University* (Jerusalem: The Magnes Press, 1955), 29. The hypothesis was soon taken over by numerous researchers including A. Dupont-Sommer, *Aperçus préliminaires sur les manuscrits de la Mer Morte* (Paris: Maisonneuve, 1950), 105ff. and also by K. G. Kuhn and W. Brownlee. On this, see H. Stegemann, “The Qumran Essenes – Local Members of the Main Jewish Union in Late Second Temple Times,” in *The Madrid Qumran Congress. Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls Madrid 18–21 March 1991* (ed. J. Trebolle Barrera and L. V. Montaner; STDJ 11.1; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 83–166, here 86ff.; J. C. VanderKam, “Identity and History of the Community,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years* (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 2:487–533, here 2:488–490.

“sect” of the Essenes. De Vaux himself once again defended this assignment against all suggested alternatives in the early period of Qumran research.²⁸

It is important to bear in mind that, in this early analysis of the ancient reports about the Essenes, important differences between the ancient testimonies about the Essenes and their specific orientation remain ignored: After all, Pliny alone speaks of a group at the Dead Sea, while the Essenes in Philo and Josephus speak of them living throughout all of Judea; on the other hand, the Essenes appear to him to be a “tribe” (*gens*) without the slightest indication that they were a Jewish group, while in Philo and Josephus it is, of course, a (in part largely philosophically stylized) Jewish group. Also, the existence of a group purely composed of men “sine ulla femina” is contained in the “paradoxographical” note from Pliny, while Philo and Josephus’ reports of the Essenes attest, in part, to the existence of married Essenes. The ability to maintain that Qumran was the “center” of the Essenes as a celibate and ascetic Jewish community can only be maintained by an all too uncritical combination of these notes.²⁹

With this argument, archaeology seemed to confirm the (Scrolls)-*Essene-Hypothesis*, which became the *Qumran-Essene-Hypothesis*,³⁰ and this view came to dominate scholarship and public discussion of the Dead Sea Scrolls for quite some time. Conversely, the significance of the findings from the excavations was largely interpreted in the light of the texts (which had already been combined with the ancient testimonies about the Essenes), in particular IQS, the *Rule of the Community*, whose provisions were primarily

²⁸ De Vaux, *Archaeology*, 117–137, in view of the assignment of the findings to zealot (C. Roth, G. R. Driver), Jewish Christian (J. L. Teicher), Sadducee (R. North) and Pharisaic (C. Rabin) groups.

²⁹ I have established elsewhere that it is, in my opinion, possible to link the supporters of the Qumran library with the group of the Essenes. On this point, see J. Frey, “Zur historischen Auswertung der antiken Essenerberichte. Ein Beitrag zum Gespräch mit Roland Bergmeier,” in *Qumran kontrovers* (ed. J. Frey and H. Stegemann; Einblicke 6; Paderborn: Bonifatius, 2003), 23–56 (English translation “On the Historical Value of the Ancient Sources about the Essenes,” in this volume, 163–194); idem, “Essenes,” in *The Eerdmans Dictionary of Early Judaism* (ed. J. J. Collins and D. C. Harlow; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), 599–602. A more detailed and more precise interpretation of the different notes can be found, for example, in H. Stegemann, “Local Members of the Main Jewish Union in Late Second Temple Times,” in *The Madrid Qumran Congress. Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls Madrid 18–21 March 1991* (ed. J. Trebelle Barrera and L. V. Montaner; 2 vols.; STDJ 11.1–2; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 83–166; see also J. H. VanderKam, “Identity and History of the Community,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years* (ed. P. W. Flint and J. C. VanderKam; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 2:487–533.

³⁰ For an analysis of the argument’s structure, see the presentation in W. Ullmann-Margalit, *Out of the Cave: A Philosophical Inquiry into the Dead Sea Scrolls Research* (Cambridge, Mass and London: Harvard University Press, 2006), 41–53; see also Zangenberg, “Qumran und Archäologie,” 264–268.

understood to be related to the community living in Qumran itself.³¹ Although de Vaux himself reflected carefully on the possibilities and problems of archaeology³² and warned against a mixture of the arguments from textual interpretation and archaeology, the impression remains that there is a considerable admixture of textual interpretation and archaeology or, at least, there exists a circular structure of argumentation. De Vaux's assertion of the greater "objectivity" of archaeology in comparison with the interpretation of texts is also questionable in view of his own factual approach.³³

Since the archaeological findings were interpreted in the early 1950s in the light of the Qumran texts *known at that time*, it is important to keep in mind that at this time practically only the large scrolls from Cave 1 were available, including the important, even from today's point of view, "group-specific" (= "sectarian") manuscripts such as 1QS (with 1QSa and 1QSb), 1QH (= today called 1QH^a), 1QM, and 1QpHab,³⁴ as well as both Isaiah manuscripts 1QIsa^a and 1QIsa^b. Even up until the publication of de Vaux's comprehensive account in his Schweich Lectures of 1959, published in French in 1961, this situation had not significantly changed. The mass and the variety of the texts, especially from Cave 4, had not yet been processed and edited. In light of the texts from Cave 1 (and the identification of the community described in 1QS, the *yahad*, with the αἰρεσις of the Essenes), the evidence seemed to suggest that the compound of Khirbet Qumran should be interpreted as a settlement, indeed the center of this Essene "sect." Thus, for example, the statements about the celibacy of the Essenes in some (not all!) of the relevant testimonies and the lack of provisions for women in 1QS (but not in 1QSa!) were considered to refer to the compound of Qumran, whose secluded location was interpreted as an expression of separation from the Temple in Jerusalem and

³¹ Current research judges differently here. Because of the date of the settlement at the compound, the rule texts in 1QS should not be related to the community living at Qumran, but to groups in different places of Judea; on this point, see primarily 1QS VI 1–8; for a discussion on this matter, see J. J. Collins, "The Yahad and 'The Qumran Community,'" in *Biblical Traditions: Essays in Honour of Michael A. Knibb* (ed. C. Hempel and J. M. Lieu; JSJ.S 111; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 81–96; S. Metso, *The Serekh Texts* (LSTS 62; London: T&T Clark, 2007), 30f.

³² For example, de Vaux, "On Right and Wrong Uses of Archaeology," in *Near Eastern Archaeology in the Twentieth Century. Essays in Honour of N. Glueck* (ed. J. A. Sanders; New York: Doubleday and Company, 1970), 64–80; as well as the reflections of S. Hüttig, "Archäologie versus Textforschung?" in *Qumran und die Archäologie*, 101–118.

³³ Thus ultimately the conclusion in Ullmann-Margalit, *Out of the Cave*, 60. Cf. already idem, "Writings, Ruins and their Reading. The Dead Sea Discoveries as a Case Study in Theory Formation and Scientific Interpretation," *Social Research* 65 (1998): 839–870.

³⁴ It is hard to imagine how the research would have been carried out if the well-preserved, relatively strong, group-specific texts from Cave 1 had not been available first, but rather the very fragmentary texts from Cave 4 or Cave 11 of which only a modest part can be considered to originate from the *yahad* had been available.

also of separation from the world. Thus, writes de Vaux, the “sect” had “detached ... from the official Judaism in Jerusalem. The sect led a separate existence in the desert, absorbed in prayer and labor while awaiting the Messiah.”³⁵

“*Ora et labora*,” celibacy, pious messianic expectations – these characteristics of the settlement made it all too easy to interpret the compound as an Essenian “monastery” according to the paradigm of Christian monasticism, and the designation of individual places as “refectory,” “scriptorium,” etc. has only served to strengthen this view.³⁶ The fact that de Vaux was a Roman Catholic priest meant that his interpretation of the settlement as a(n) Essenian “monastery” became an easy target for the attacks of later critics.³⁷ It served as evidence of a hermeneutical circle within de Vaux’s interpretation, whereby he imposed his own paradigm upon the phenomena and interpreted the data accordingly. Even if this pithy critique is too quickly taken hold of, it is probably true that the interpretation of the excavations of Khirbet Qumran were too quickly made in light of the textual discoveries and the Essene hypothesis that was already established at the time. It is also likely true that de Vaux, simply by his chosen vocabulary, attributed to his interpretation a high degree of “suggestive power.”

A second shortcoming of de Vaux’s work was and is that, apart from the scarce reports on the excavations³⁸ and a summary presentation in the form of his “Schweich Lectures,”³⁹ he did not publish any comprehensive documentation of the excavation,⁴⁰ with the result that many details remain unclear be-

³⁵ De Vaux, *Qumran*, 1241.

³⁶ One can ask to what extent the old interpretation of the Essenes as Christian ascetics, popular among the Church Fathers since the time of Eusebius, had an influence on this thesis. However, recent research has generally accepted the Jewish (admittedly *heterodox*-Jewish) identity of this group. On the interpretation of the Essenes before the Qumran discoveries, see S. Wagner, *Die Essener in der wissenschaftlichlen Diskussion vom Ausgang des 18. bis zum Beginn des 20. Jahrhunderts* (BZAW 79; Berlin: Töpelmann, 1960); for the older time, see M. del Medico, *Le mythe des Esséniens des origines à la fin du Moyen Âge* (Paris: Plon, 1958).

³⁷ Thus Ullmann-Margalit, *Out of the Cave*, 52: “But the target that has remained the main focus of numerous challenges to the linkage argument throughout the years is the link supplied by de Vaux’s archaeological work. ...It is precisely his work which interprets the site of Qumran as the motherhouse of a communal, celibate, and ascetic religious sect.”

³⁸ R. de Vaux, “Fouille au Khirbet Qumran. Rapport préliminaire,” *RB* 60 (1953): 83–106; idem, “Fouilles au Khirbet Qumran. Rapport préliminaire sur la deuxième campagne,” *RB* 61 (1954): 206–236; idem, “Fouilles au Khirbet Qumran. Rapport préliminaire sur les 3e, 4e et 5e campagnes,” *RB* 63 (1956): 533–557; idem, “Fouilles de Feshkha: Rapport préliminaire,” *RB* 66 (1959): 225–255.

³⁹ R. de Vaux, *L’archaeologie*; English version *Archaeology*.

⁴⁰ Posthumously published are the following volumes from the excavations: J.-B. Humbert and A. Chambon, eds., *Fouilles de Khirbet Qumran et de Ain Feshkha I: Album de*

cause of the lack of an exact stratigraphy or the absence of exact documentation. Also, some discoveries, which de Vaux did not find relevant for his interpretation (for example parts of ceramics, glassware, metal objects, or coins), were not documented at all.⁴¹ The incomplete publication of the excavation findings for this location – as well as the publication of the text discoveries – was partly for political reasons. After the Six-Day War in 1967 and the conquest of east Jerusalem by Israel, the objects first found under the British mandate and managed by the Jordanian antiquities authorities came under Israeli control. Due to the legally uncertain or disputed situation, the work on the excavation finds and their edition by the *École Biblique et Archéologique Française* as well as the work on the edition of the texts came to a halt.⁴² Moreover, access to the excavations of Khirbet Qumran was, as usual, only granted to the head of the excavation and his institution (i.e., *École Biblique*).⁴³ This led to the fact that, after de Vaux's death in 1971, the discoveries that had not been published by himself remained inaccessible to the public until 1986 when the *École Biblique* once again began processing the edition of the excavation notes and artifacts.⁴⁴

photographies. Répertoire du fonds photographique. Synthèse des notes de chantier du Père Roland de Vaux OP (NTOA.SA 1; Freiburg: Universitätsverlag, 1994); F. Rohrhirsch and B. Hofmeir, *Die Ausgrabungen von Qumran und Ein Feshkha. Die Grabungstagebücher von Roland de Vaux OP* (Freiburg: Universitätsverlag, 1996); S. Pfann, *The Excavations of Khirbet Qumran and Ain Feshkha: Synthesis of Roland de Vaux's Field Notes* (NTOA.SA 3; Freiburg: Universitätsverlag, 2003); J.-B. Humbert and J. Gunneweg, eds., *Khirbet Qumran et Ain Feshkha. Band II: Études d'anthropologie, de physique et de chimie. Studies of Anthropology, Physics and Chemistry* (NTOA.SA 3; Freiburg: Universitätsverlag, 2003), *Khirbet Qumran et de Ain Feshkha IIIa: Fouilles du P. Roland de Vaux* (NTOA.SA 5a; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2016).

⁴¹ See the criticisms of J. Zangenberg, "Region oder Religion," 26f.; also G. Fassbeck, "Die Archäologie Qumrans und ihre Interpretation – Bemerkungen zur aktuellen Diskussion," in *Jericho und Qumran. Neues zum Umfeld der Bibel* (ed. B. Mayer; Est 45; Regensburg: Verlag Friedrich Pustet, 2000), 111–128; and Galor and Zangenberg, "Introduction," 2. The work on the publication of the excavation documentation is ongoing, so that the documentation will be supplemented as much as possible.

⁴² An indication of these changes is the renaming of the official series of the publications from "Discoveries of the Judean Desert of Jordan" (DJDJ) to "Discoveries of the Judean Desert" (DJD) from volume 6 on, which appeared in 1977 after a nine-year break in publication. On the politics of the *École Biblique*, see also K. Galor and J. Zangenberg, "Qumran Archaeology in Search of a Consensus," in *The Site of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Archaeological Interpretations and Debates* (ed. K. Galor, J.-B. Humbert, and J. Zangenberg; STDJ 57; Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2006), 1–15, here 2.

⁴³ J. Magness, "Methods and Theories in the Archaeology of Qumran," in *Rediscovering the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Assessment of Old and New Approaches and Methods* (ed. M. Grossman; Grand Rapids and Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2010), 89–107, here 91.

⁴⁴ See also K. Galor and J. Zangenberg, "Qumran Archaeology in Search of a Consensus," 2.

It is understandable that these delays and the limited access to material provoked the suspicion of a “conspiracy” – if not, on the one side, by the Vatican, then by an “established” clique of scholars who allegedly tried to “save” their own theories and maintain an interpretive monopoly. Unfortunately, it has been confirmed again and again that the usefulness of such conspiracy theories was to increase book sales that promised to expose “the truth”⁴⁵ about the settlement, the Dead Sea Scrolls, or even the origins of Early Christianity.

B. The Revival of the Discussion about the Texts and the Advent of Alternative Archaeological Interpretations of Khirbet Qumran

I. Archaeological Studies after the Excavations of de Vaux

Because of the incomplete documentation of the excavations by de Vaux, the only hope for research (apart from the expectation of the definitive excavation reports) was for new surveys and supplementary excavations in the area of Khirbet Qumran and the surrounding area. However, de Vaux had almost completely dug up the settlement, making the possibility of new excavations rather limited. Until well into the 1980s, de Vaux’s interpretation of the compound was accepted anyway.⁴⁶ And apart from the poorly documented, supplementary excavations of the settlement in the 1960s by John Allegro⁴⁷ and later by R. W. Dajjani,⁴⁸ as well as those of the cemetery by S. Steckoll,⁴⁹ and

⁴⁵ Thus the title of the German edition of Y. Hirschfeld’s study, presented by Gütersloher Verlagshaus (cf. n. 1); similarly, see the American bestseller – closer in genre to that of a novel – by M. Baigent and R. Leigh, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Deception*, which appeared under the German title *Verschlußsache Jesus. Die Qumranrollen und die Wahrheit über das frühe Christentum* (1991). Concerning the nature of these works, see the sharp, sarcastic review by M. Hengel, “Die Qumranrollen und der Umgang mit der Wahrheit,” *EvK* 23 (1992): 233–37.

⁴⁶ An interpretation that differs at numerous individual points was, however, offered by a participant of the excavations; E.-M. Laperrousaz, *Qoumran: L’Etablissement essénien des bords de la Mer Morte: Histoire et archéologie du site* (Paris: A. & J. Picard, 1976), whose later chronology of the settlement – with the thesis that the settlement began in Qumran around 104/103 BCE – has found many adherents.

⁴⁷ During these excavations in 1960, Allegro evidently wanted to find the treasures believed to be hidden according to the Copper Scroll from Cave 3. On this, see J. A. Brown, *John Marco Allegro: The Maverick of the Scrolls* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 118–133. De Vaux later accused Allegro of destroying the findings at the sites of his digging. See R. de Vaux, “Review of J. Allegro, ‘The Treasure of the Copper Scroll,’” *RB* 68 (1961), 147.

⁴⁸ This small excavation was carried out in the course of restoration work under the responsibility of the Jordanian Antiquities Authority in 1967; See Y. Hirschfeld, *Qumran in Context*, 21.

the investigation of the caves and paths by Joseph Patrich and Yigael Yadin in 1984/1985,⁵⁰ archaeological investigations in the settlement of Khirbet Qumran only began in the 1990s: After that, there was Amir Drori's and Yizhak Magen's investigation in the framework of the "Operation Scroll" in 1993/94 as well as supplementary investigations in Qumran and its surroundings; Magen Broshi's and Hanan Eshel's excavations of some of the caves in 1995/96;⁵¹ J. Strange's geophysical surveys of the plateau in 1996;⁵² Yizhar Hirschfeld's investigations of the water supply system during 1997–1999;⁵³ and the continued excavations of Yizhak Magen and Yuval Peleg between 1996–1999 and 2001–2004,⁵⁴ as well as those by Randall Price and Oren Gutfeld on the Qumran plateau since 2002.⁵⁵ The excavations, which included, for example, a number of "waste pits," brought many new finds. Some of those findings included glassware, ceramics, lamps, metal goods, and coins, as well as further collections of "buried bones," which now defines the nature of the discussion.

II. Coincidences: New Perspectives on the Texts and the Library

Interestingly enough, the revival of the archaeological discussion coincided with the new discussion about the texts, which was reopened in the late 1980s and early 1990s. For also in view of the texts there had been a prolonged phase of lethargy in the research: After the "Qumran fever" of the 1950s and 1960s had subsided and the publication of the textual findings from the caves continued to drag on, only new insights into the profile of the library brought about some change in the classical view, dominant up until that time. The

⁴⁹ S. Steckoll, "Preliminary Excavation Report in the Qumran Cemetery," *RevQ* 6 (1968): 323–344.

⁵⁰ J. Patrich, "Khirbet Qumran in the Light of New Archaeological Explorations in the Qumran Caves," 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; Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences 722; New York: New York Academy of Sciences, 1994), 73–95.

⁵¹ M. Broshi and H. Eshel, "Residential Caves at Qumran," *DSD* 6 (1999): 328–348.

⁵² J. F. Strange, "The 1996 Excavations at Qumran and the Context of the New Hebrew Ostrakon," in *The Site of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Archaeological Interpretations and Debates* (ed. K. Galor, J.-B. Humbert, and J. Zangenberg; STDJ 57; Leiden: Brill, 2005), 41–54.

⁵³ See Y. Hirschfeld, *Qumran in Context*, 23.

⁵⁴ Y. Magen and Y. Peleg, "Back to Qumran: Ten Years of Excavation and Research, 1993–2004," in *Back to Qumran: Ten Years of Excavation and Research, 1993–2004* (ed. K. Galor, J.-B. Humbert, and J. Zangenberg; STDJ 57; Leiden: Brill, 2005), 55–113; idem, *The Qumran Excavations 1993–2004: Preliminary Report, Judea & Samaria Publications 6* (Jerusalem: Israel Antiquities Authority, 2007).

⁵⁵ See Y. Farhi and R. Price, "The Numismatic Finds from the Qumran Plateau Excavations 2004–2006, and 2008 Seasons," *DSD* 17 (2010): 210–225.

first impetus was the publication of the *Temple Scroll* in 1977 by Yigael Yadin,⁵⁶ along with the slow “leakage” of information about the yet to be published fragments from Cave 4 and a few preliminary publications that directed the special attention of the Qumran discussion from the themes that had dominated the discussion up until that time (e.g., questions about the findings’ relationship to our understanding of Early Christianity) to other themes such as halakah, cultic issues, and calendric issues.⁵⁷ This ultimately built up a substantial amount of pressure from the public and led to the “release” of access to the photographs of all unpublished manuscripts in 1991. With the new insight into the variety of genres and themes in the library arose the plausibility of recognizing that only a very limited portion of the texts can be considered to be “group specific” for the group testified in some of the texts, the *yahad*, while an increasing number of the non-biblical texts – probably all the Aramaic texts, many wisdom texts, the majority of the “parabiblical” texts, the previously unknown Pseudepigrapha, and possibly even a text such as the famous “Treatise on the Two Spirits” (1QS III 13–IV 26) – did not come from the circles of the “Qumran community” or the *yahad*, but arose from precursor groups or from “outside” the community and were taken into the library.⁵⁸ With this insight into the internal diversity of the library, questions had to arise about the classical characterization of the library as an Essenian “sect library,” and a significant modification of the older assessments prevailed in specialist circles at the beginning of the 1990s – albeit, this was perceived by outsiders only gradually and some further polemics against the “consensus thesis” were still articulated against such an outdated, general view of the texts which had already been abandoned by the leading Qumran specialists.

The perception of the library’s diversity and the numerous new sapiential, halakic, calendric, and liturgical texts also had repercussions on how scholars assessed the tradents of the library: The library’s association with the Es-

⁵⁶ Y. Yadin, *Megillat ha-Miqdash – The Temple Scroll* (vol. 3; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1977).

⁵⁷ See the sketch by Ullmann-Margalit, *Out of the Cave*, 136–146.

⁵⁸ The question of “explicitly” group-specific literature was first programmatically raised by C. Newsom, “‘Sectually Explicit,’ Literature from Qumran,” in *The Hebrew Bible and Its Interpreters* (ed. W. H. Propp, B. Halpern, and D. N. Freedman; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1990), 167–187; see further D. Dimant, “The Qumran Manuscripts: Contents and Significance,” in *Time to Prepare the Way in the Wilderness. Papers on the Qumran Scrolls by Fellows of the Institute of Advanced Studies of the Hebrew University, Jerusalem 1989–1990* (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; idem, “Kriterien essenischer Texte,” in *Qumran kontrovers* (Einblicke 6; Paderborn: Bonifatius, 2003), 59–70. See also the essay by D. Dimant, “The Vocabulary of the Qumran Sectarian Texts,” in *Qumran und die Archäologie* *ed. J. Frey, C. Claußen, and N. Kessler; WUNT 278; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 347–395.

senes, primarily established by rule texts such as IQS, was partially softened, and new alternative suggestions (e.g., a Sadducean identity of the tradents⁵⁹ or even a general questioning of the Qumran group's connection with the Essenes of the ancient Essene texts⁶⁰) could receive new argumentative strength. This development in the realm of textual research also had an influence on the archaeological assessment⁶¹ – either in the sense of a differentiating modification of the previously prevailing “consensus model” or in the sense of a complete questioning of the Qumran-Essene hypothesis (i.e., the interpretation of Khirbet Qumran as a compound used by the Essenes or within the context of the textual discoveries).

III. Alternative Interpretive Models since the 1990s

The insights into the diversity and heterogeneity of the library also had to lead to a new questioning of the “classic” Qumran-Essene thesis. And the 1990s was the heyday of alternative interpretive models of the Khirbet Qumran settlement. A select number of these proposals will be briefly presented here. These proposals demonstrated the development of the discussion from a “consensus model” to a multiplicity of interpretative proposals concerning the interpretation of the Khirbet Qumran settlement. The contradictory nature of these proposals, however, provides an unsettling picture that ultimately shows how archaeological interpretations are often neither “objective” nor secure, even though the discipline increasingly casts aside the interference from textual data and tries to emancipate itself from textual science.

1. Qumran as an Essene Scroll Manufactory: Hartmut Stegemann's Thesis

One of the first new models, or to be more precise a modification of de Vaux's interpretation, came from a textual analyst, who – often in the background – contributed significantly to the new and differentiated understand-

⁵⁹ As argued in L. H. Schiffman, *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls: The History of Judaism, the Background of Christianity, the Lost Library of Qumran* (New York: Doubleday, 1995).

⁶⁰ Thus, for example, on the basis of a source critical analysis of Josephus' reports in R. Bergmeier, *Die Essener-Berichte des Flavius Josephus* (Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1993); idem “Zum historischen Wert der Essenerberichte von Philo und Josephus,” in *Qumran kontrovers* (ed. J. Frey and H. Stegemann; Einblicke 6; Paderborn: Bonifatixius, 2003), 11–22.

⁶¹ G. Fassbeck, “Archäologie,” 118. “For the recent archaeological discussion, the influence of scroll research should not be underestimated. To the extent that the voices critical of the Essene theory increased there, the interpretation of the buildings within the framework of this theory also seemed questionable.” See also Galor and Zangenberg, “Introduction,” 2: “It is ironic that new ideas from textual research were needed to open up a new chapter in Qumran archaeology ...”

ing of the scroll library, Hartmut Stegemann from the Göttingen Qumran research center. Stegemann had conducted pioneering research by developing a method for the material reconstruction of scrolls,⁶² which he had first applied to the scroll of the *Hodayot* from Cave 1 for which he could provide a new reconstruction with an improved numbering of the columns and lines.⁶³ His method also provided crucial insight into the mutual relationship between the S manuscripts or also the D manuscripts and thus helped to reconstruct the transmission history of the respective pieces. Stegemann's method also made it possible to determine the scope and the arrangement of many other texts.⁶⁴ He also contributed significantly to the newer view of the library, according to which only a small number of the manuscripts represent group-specific or "Essenian" texts.⁶⁵ He also presented a modified Essene hypothesis, proposing that the inhabitants of Qumran formed a local branch of the *yahad* or the religious party of the Essenes, which Stegemann rightly characterizes as their claim to be the "main Jewish union,"⁶⁶ that is, as the definitive representation of the true Israel of the end times, even if it appeared from the outside as only one religious party among the many. Consequently, the Qumran Essenes (i.e., the inhabitants of the compound) are only "local members

⁶² H. Stegemann, "Methods for the Reconstruction of Scrolls from Scattered Fragments," in *Archaeology and History in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. L. H. Schiffman; JSPSup 8; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990), 189–221; idem, "How to Connect Dead Sea Scrolls Fragments," in *Understanding the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. H. Schanks; New York: Vintage, 1992), 245–255; see A. Steudel, "Assembling and Reconstructing Manuscripts," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years* (ed. P. Flint and J. C. VanderKam; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 1:516–534; idem, "Probleme und Methoden der Rekonstruktion von Schriftrollen," in *Qumran – Die Schriftrollen vom Toten Meer* (ed. M. Fieger, K. Schmid, and P. Schwagmeier; NTOA 47; Freiburg Schweiz – Göttingen: Academic Press Fribourg, 2001), 97–110.

⁶³ H. Stegemann, "Die Rekonstruktion der *Hodayot*" (Dissertation at Heidelberg, 1963); posthumously incorporated into the official publication of *Hodayot*: H. Stegemann and E. Schuller, *Qumran Cave 1.III, 1QHodayot^a with incorporation of 1QHodayot^a and 4QHodayot^{a-f}* (STDJ 40; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2009).

⁶⁴ A prime example is the work of A. Steudel, *Der Midrasch zur Eschatologie aus der Qumrangemeinde (QMidrEschat^{a,b})* (STDJ 13; Leiden: Brill, 1994).

⁶⁵ See, already in 1983, his programmatic statements in H. Stegemann, "Die Bedeutung der Qumranfunde zur Erforschung der Apokalyptik," in *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East* (ed. D. Hellholm; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1983), 495–530, here 511; cf. also his description of the library in idem, *Die Essener, Qumran, Johannes der Täufer und Jesus*, 116–193 (from there, "some writings of the Essenes," 148ff.). Cf. a similar view in H. Lichtenberger and A. Lange, "Qumran," *TRE* 27:45–79.

⁶⁶ H. Stegemann, "The Qumran Essenes – Local Members of the Main Jewish Union in late Second Temple Times," in *The Madrid Qumran Congress. Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls Madrid 18–21 March 1991* (ed. J. Trebolle Barreira and L. Vegas Montaner; STDJ 11/1–2; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 2:83–166.

of the main Jewish union.”⁶⁷ If this group is not a “sect” in the “German sense” of the word, that is, a marginal, secluded, and ultimately marginalized group,⁶⁸ then Qumran no longer has to be the local center of this community, but at best a “study center for members wherever they usually lived.”⁶⁹ Members had come to this remote place for a certain time, occasionally with their families, but mostly alone, and would then return after their time of study.⁷⁰

In his summary presentation, Stegemann tries to further clarify the purpose of the Qumran settlement (in connection with the economic facilities at Ein Feshkha) and concludes from the construction concept of the compound that it is precisely “concerned with the production of scrolls including all preliminary stages of leather production and the further processing of leather,” and only secondarily in connection with their study. The expansion of the compound towards the end of the 2nd century BCE was planned from the outset,⁷¹ and also the study functioned, above all, for the “familiarization of scroll copyists with the texts.” For Stegemann, the choice of the location at the Dead Sea is based on the assumption that the Essenes had developed a method of leather tanning by using minerals from the Dead Sea, which made the usual use of tannin as a tanning agent unnecessary.⁷² The Ein Feshkha compound plays an important role in the production of scrolls, as well as the water installations and individual rooms of the building complex, which Stegemann defines as a tannery, a scrolls production room, library with sample manuscripts, and a writing room.⁷³

⁶⁷ Thus in the title of the contribution mentioned in the previous note.

⁶⁸ In English usage, “sect”/“sectarian” does not have this implication and can be more fully understood according to sociological criteria (separation from a larger structure, strong inner cohesion); see C. Hempel, “Kriterien zur Bestimmung ‘essenischer Verfässhchaft’ von Qumrantexten,” in *Qumran kontrovers* (ed. J. Frey and Hartmut Stegemann; Einblicke 6; Paderborn: Bonifatius, 2003), 71f. Recently, in a more refined categorization, texts that are not group specific to the *yahad* but belong to precursor groups (such as the book of *Jubilees*) have also been designated as “sectarian.” On this point, see the contribution of Devorah Dimant “The Vocabulary of the Qumran Sectarian Texts,” in *Qumran und die Archäologie*.

⁶⁹ Stegemann, “Qumran Essenes,” 161.

⁷⁰ Stegemann, “Qumran Essenes,” 162, Stegemann adds restrictively: “except for those who died there or spent the rest of their lives in meditation, or teaching.” Whether or not this can explain the size of the cemeteries remains questionable.

⁷¹ Stegemann, “Die Essener,” 77.

⁷² Stegemann, “Die Stegemann,” 77–82. Admittedly, the postulate of a newly developed tanning process springs from the fact that no traces of a tanning agent were found at the location (see also, p. 79). Criticism of this view can be found in F. Rohrhirsch, *Wissenschaftstheorie und Qumran* (NTOA 32; Freiburg Schweiz and Göttingen: Universitätsverlag, 1996), 168–175f.

⁷³ Stegemann, “Die Essener,” 80.

Stegemann's interpretation clearly starts from the knowledge gained about the textual findings and attempts to clarify and correct the archaeological point of view established by de Vaux. The main difficulty of his thesis, in which the functional identity of the individual rooms in the compound are ingeniously designed, lies in the fact that an otherwise unknown, novel chemical process for leather tanning from the salts of the Dead Sea could not be detected. Thus, the decisive location of Qumran for the production of scrolls cannot be proven.⁷⁴ In addition, the installations that Stegemann claims are a part of this manufacturing process "all belong to the latest phase of the compound and cannot, therefore, be associated with the foundation and original function of the settlement."⁷⁵ Accordingly, the thesis of the leather tannery and the scroll manufactory in Qumran remains unfounded. The criticism, however, does not mean that the thesis that scrolls could have also been made at Qumran is excluded. This is possible, but it cannot be considered the main purpose of the settlement. It should also be noted that Stegemann's modified Essene thesis overcomes essential difficulties in the old perspective: Qumran is neither a monastery nor the center of the Essenes; the residents are also no longer viewed as a marginal sect, but as members of a widespread religious party with a claim to the entirety of Israel; and the compound is conceived of as a combination of religious activity (i.e., Scripture study) and economic activity.

2. *Qumran as a villa rustica: The Secular Reinterpretation of Khirbet Qumran by Robert Donceel and Pauline Donceel-Voute*

The second development we will look at here are those works which provided the impetus for critically questioning the Essenian assignment of Khirbet Qumran in favor of a decidedly secular interpretation of the compound: The publications of the Belgian archaeologists Robert Donceel and Pauline Donceel-Voute, who contributed to the processing of the materials from de Vaux's excavations as a part of the École Biblique team of 1989–1990. The discovery of glassware, stone vessels, and other artifacts among the excavated finds, which were in the compound and which de Vaux unfortunately did not make public,⁷⁶ led the Donceels to the conclusion that the settlement in

⁷⁴ Cf. the presentation of Rohrhirsch, *Wissenschaftstheorie*, 171–174 and the investigations of the chemical composition of the samples taken from the jars at Ein Feshkha (see also p. 306); cf. further F. Rohrhirsch, *Die Geltungsbegründungen der Industrie-Rollen-Theorie zu Chirbet Qumran und En Feshkha auf dem methodologischen Prüfstand. Relativierung und Wiederlegung* (DSD 6; Freiburg, Schweiz: Universität Verlag: 1996), 267–281.

⁷⁵ Thus J. Zangenberg, "Region oder Religion?" 30.

⁷⁶ P. Donceel-Voute, "Les Ruines de Qumran réinterprétées," *Archéologia* 298 (1994): 24–35.

Qumran was by no means as poor and isolated as de Vaux had assumed, but rather represented greater prosperity (evidenced by the presence of imported goods) than was previously thought. But since the simplicity of the furnishings was an essential pillar of de Vaux's Essenian interpretation, the Donceels were the first, for some time, to interpret the compound outside of a religious context. Instead, the glass and stoneware, the metal objects, and the numerous coins indicated that the compound was a secular one, a "*villa rustica*," the manor of a wealthy family.⁷⁷ The room, which de Vaux, Stegemann, and many others interpreted as a writing space (*scriptorium*), was now interpreted as a promising dining room, as a *triclinium*.⁷⁸

Of course, critics have quickly pointed out that the Qumran compound lacks some aspects typical of other rural villas such as mosaic floors, interior decoration, or even a bathhouse.⁷⁹ Thus, the Donceels' thesis has found little positive response, but it seems to have broken the spell of the classical interpretation. Later, Yizhar Hirschfeld continues the interpretive line adopted within the Donceels' hypothesis in his estate hypothesis.⁸⁰

3. Qumran as a Hasmonean Country House and (Later) Essenian Cultic Place: The Two-Phase Hypothesis of Jean-Baptiste Humbert

Shortly after the Donceels' thesis, the archaeologist Jean-Baptiste Humbert – who was a part of the École Biblique and had been entrusted by de Vaux with the excavation material – presented his own interpretation of the function of Khirbet Qumran in an interesting two-phase theory. According to Humbert, the compound could have initially been built as a Hasmonean country house, possibly to supply the nearby fortress Hyrcania, but was then reoccupied after destruction and a time of decay by the Essenes – which is the deciding factor for this hypothesis – and later used as a cultic facility.⁸¹ This interpretation, on the other hand, continues the Essene interpretation advocated by de Vaux

⁷⁷ R. Donceel and P. Donceel-Voute, "The Archaeology of Chirbet Qumran," in *Methods of Investigation of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Khirbet Qumran Site: Present Realities and Future Prospects* (ed. M. Wise et al.; New York: New York Academy of Sciences, 1994), 51–72.

⁷⁸ P. Donceel-Voute, "Coenaculum – La salle à l'étage du locus 30 à Khirbet Qumrán sur la Mer Morte," in *Banquets d'Orient, Res Orientales IV* (Leuven: Peeters, 1992): 61–84.

⁷⁹ Cf. J. Magness, "A Villa at Chirbet Qumran?" *RevQ* 63 (1994): 397–419.

⁸⁰ Y. Hirschfeld, "The Architectural Context of Qumran," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls. Fifty Years After Their Discovery* (ed. L. H. Schiffman, E. Tov, and J. C. VanderKam; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2000), 673–683; further idem, *Qumran in Context. Reassessing the Archaeological Evidence* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2004).

⁸¹ J.-B. Humbert, "L'espace sacré à Qumran. Propositions pour l'archéologie," *RB* 101 (1994): 161–214; idem, "Chirbet Qumrán. Un site énigmatique," *Le Monde de la Bible* 86 (1994): 12–21.

but links it to the Donceels' *villa rustica* thesis. A non-Essene use of the compound during the first building phase is explained by the presence of Hasmonean coins, the use of which is hard to imagine for the Essenes. The interpretation of Locus 77 as a cultic room, otherwise considered to be a dining room, is based on the interpretation of the square stumps present in the eastern part of the room (which could possibly be the remnants of pillars) as altars and is also based on the interpretation of the enigmatic, animal bone discoveries as proof of a peculiar Essenian sacrificial practice.

Humbert's interpretation has attracted a great deal of criticism. The absence of bathing facilities as well as interior decoration could be cited here as evidence against its interpretation as a Hasmonean villa,⁸² and the argument that the presence of Hasmonean coins must speak against Essenian users during the Hasmonean era is not strictly justified on the basis of archaeological or literary evidence. In general, the assumed change of residences or users of the compound eludes an archaeological justification. Finally, the interpretation of the enigmatic "bone deposits" as an Essenian "replacement" for participation in the temple cult is a speculative interpretation that cannot be substantiated by the well-known forms of Jewish cultic practice, the ancient Essene texts, or from the scroll discoveries.⁸³ It has also been pointed out that the numerous plates and vessels – interpreted by de Vaux as eating utensils and by Humbert as cultic instruments – are to be dated back to an earlier period of use, which would lead to the problematic assumption that the Essenes adopted foreign dishes and utensils for their cultic practice.

4. *Qumran as a Fortress and the Origin of the Scrolls from Jerusalem: The Theses of Norman Golb*

While the previously mentioned theses remained largely in the circles of professionals, the book of the Chicago professor Norman Golb aroused particular public interest because it explicitly linked the archaeological question with the question of the scrolls' origin: Under the title "Who Wrote the Dead Sea Scrolls?,"⁸⁴ he linked the idea of the settlement (expressed long before

⁸² Cf. J. Magness, "A Villa at Chirbet Qumran?" in *RevQ* 63 (1994): 397–419.

⁸³ See the critical remarks on Humbert's interpretation by F. Rohrhirsch, *Wissenschaftstheorie*, 307–317.

⁸⁴ N. Golb, *Who Wrote the Dead Sea Scrolls? The Search for the Secret of Qumran* (New York: Touchstone, 1995). The German version is *Wer schrieb die Schriftrollen vom Toten Meer* (Hamburg: Hoffmann und Campe, 1994). Idem, "Khirbet Qumran and the Manuscript Finds in the Judean Wilderness," in *Methods of Investigation of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Khirbet Qumran Site. Present Realities and Future Prospects* (ed. M. O. Wise; New York: New York Academy of Sciences, 1994), 51–72; before this, idem, "Who Hid the Dead Sea Scrolls," *BA* 48 (1985): 68–82; idem, "Khirbet Qumran and the Manuscripts of the Judean Wilderness: Observations on the Logic of Their Investigation," *JNES* 49 (1990): 103–114.

the textual discoveries by Dalman) as a Roman fortress that had been under the command of Jewish guerillas before its destruction with Heinrich Rengstorf's thesis⁸⁵ that the scrolls themselves had nothing to do with the residents of Khirbet Qumran but were taken from Jerusalem to safety in the caves. However, while Rengstorf wanted to see the Jerusalem Temple library in the scrolls, Golb attributed the holdings to various libraries whose holdings had been hidden by insurgents fleeing from the Romans. According to this theory, a religious sect never inhabited Qumran. With this denial of the Essene or "sectarian" background of the Qumran inhabitants as well as the scroll library, Golb triggered particularly heated discussions and became the first prominent critic of the Qumran Essene hypothesis. However, the interpretation of the compound as a fortress can hardly withstand critical questions. For example, the outer walls of the compound are weaker than the inner walls, which is the opposite of what one would expect.⁸⁶ Golb considers the evidence of fighting in the settlement as well as the cemeteries as an indication of the compound's military function and sets this in contrast to the group of the Essenes who are described in ancient texts as a very peaceful group. However, his interpretation of the cemeteries as military cemeteries does not do justice to the peculiarities of the Qumran tombs.⁸⁷ It is true that a specific Essene character of the Qumran users cannot be proven strictly from archaeological arguments. But Golb's archaeological arguments seem to be subordinated to the proof of his main point that the scrolls do not come from an Essene community, but from Jerusalem. In this regard, Golb's book marked a breakthrough in the broader questioning of the library's Essene character.

5. *Qumran as a Rest Area, Warehouse, and Customs Depot: The Views of Alan D. Crown and Lena Cansdale*

A further variant of the interpretations was also presented in 1994 by the Australian Samaritan studies scholar Alan D. Crown and his student Lena Cansdale, as well as in Cansdale's subsequent PhD dissertation.⁸⁸ For the first time, these two researchers suggested that Khirbet Qumran was a fortified station along the nearby trade routes, used primarily for economic purposes.

⁸⁵ K. H. Rengstorf, *Hir-bet Qumran und die Bibliothek vom Toten Meer* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1960).

⁸⁶ For criticism of this thesis, see F. Rohrhirsch, *Wissenschaftstheorie und Qumran*, 320 (specifically, see 318–328).

⁸⁷ See the criticism of Rohrhirsch, *Wissenschaftstheorie und Qumran*, 322–325.

⁸⁸ A. D. Crown and L. Cansdale, "Was it an Essene Settlement?" *BAR* 20 (1994), Heft 5, 24–35, 73–74, 76–78; the subsequent dissertation by L. Cansdale, *Qumran and the Essenes: A Re-Evaluation of the Evidence* (TSAJ 60; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997).

Also, according to these authors, the scrolls (as an emergency measure or for storage) were transported to Qumran from somewhere else, while the users of the compound could have supplied the jars in which they were found. In order to contest the Essene thesis, the authors first presented in detail a number of characteristics from the ancient texts about the Essenes, which were then contrasted with the archaeological findings from Qumran, whereby the interpretation of the ancient Essene texts as well as the Qumran texts occasionally lacks differentiation. From the presence of the glassware in Qumran, the authors conclude, as the Donceels, that balsam and perfume production existed at the compound. The *proprium* of this approach lies in the fact that now the ancient trade routes around the Dead Sea and also the shipping lanes on the sea are being used as evidence.⁸⁹ In their opinion, there was a trade route along the west bank of the Dead Sea, making Khirbet Qumran appear to be a fortified customs depot that also contained a place for balsam and ceramic production. The cemeteries would have been connected with a hospice that might have been maintained there. Cansdale even suspects that patients would have primarily been wounded soldiers,⁹⁰ a thesis that is, however, supported by only one of the skeleton finds published by Steckoll.⁹¹

The model sketched above has found little acceptance overall, which is primarily due to the fact that the size of the cemeteries with the large numbers of graves are not adequately interpreted within the totality of this hypothesis.⁹² Its lack of acceptance is also due to the fact that it does not provide a plausible explanation for the origin of the scrolls. The matter of trade routes around Qumran, however, creates avenues for other interpretive approaches.

6. *Qumran as a Rural Estate and an Agricultural Center of Production: The Archaeological "Contextualization" of the Compound by Yizhar Hirschfeld*

Incorporating aspects of the theses of Donceel/Donceel-Voute and others, the Israeli archaeologist Yizhar Hirschfeld renewed the archaeological discussion in 2004 with his book "Qumran in Context"⁹³ and, in contrast to the old consensus theory, presented a consistent, "secular," and, more importantly, *contextual* interpretation of the findings. For Hirschfeld, who had dug himself in Ein Feshkha and Ein Gedi, but never at Khirbet Qumran, the crucial question is no longer the one about the peculiarities of the Qumran findings, but the

⁸⁹ Crown and Cansdale, "Was it an Essene Settlement?" 32.

⁹⁰ Thus the summary of the results in Cansdale, *Qumran and the Essenes*, 196.

⁹¹ Cansdale, *Qumran and the Essenes*, 168f.

⁹² See the criticisms in Rohrhirsch, *Wissenschaftstheorie*, 333.

⁹³ Y. Hirschfeld, *Qumran in Context: Reassessing the Archaeological Evidence* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2004); German version idem, *Qumran. Die ganze Wahrheit* (trans. by K. H. Nicolai; ed. by J. Zangenberg; Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlag, 2006).

contextual links with ceramics, economic life, and the architectural nature of the buildings in the area around the Dead Sea. Jürgen Zangenberg celebrated this affront to the old consensus as “a turning point in international research” and also, in part, enjoyed greater media attention and further development within the German speaking world.⁹⁴ However, this position also triggered fierce opposition from scholars focusing on the text and from archaeological specialists.⁹⁵ Nevertheless, even after Hirschfeld’s early death, his position has set the tenor for the discussion even up until today.

In the background is the insight that 2000 years ago the area around the Dead Sea was less hostile, was occupied by a number of settlements, and permitted a modest, specialized form of agricultural production. It was also an area that was traversed by trade routes. Therefore, in accordance with the Donceel thesis, the installations of Ein Feshka and Khirbet Qumran are interpreted as prosperous agricultural production sites. Hirschfeld, contrary to other suggestions (leather tanning, fish farming, production of indigo dye, date and honey wine), prefers to see the two interconnected installations as responsible for small scale, industrial production of balsam and perfume.⁹⁶

For Hirschfeld, Qumran (in connection with Ein Feshkha), in its last phase of construction, is an estate and an agricultural center of production.⁹⁷ In an

⁹⁴ J. Zangenberg, “Qumran, die Essener und die gegenwärtige archäologische Forschung: Einführung,” in *Qumran: Die ganze Wahrheit* (ed. Y. Hirschfeld; Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlag, 2006), 7–22, n.7. See in detail J. Zangenberg, “Wildnis unter Palmen? Khirbet Qumran im regionalen Kontext des Toten Meeres,” in *Jericho und Qumran*, 129–164; idem, “Qumran und Archäologie: Überlegungen zu einer umstrittenen Ortslage,” in *Zeichen aus Text und Stein* (TANZ 42; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003), 262–306; idem, “Region oder Religion? Überlegungen zum interpretatorischen Kontext von Chirbet Qumran,” in *Texte – Fakten – Artefakte. Beiträge zur Bedeutung der Archäologie für die neutestamentliche Forschung* (ed. M. Küchler and K. M. Schmidt; NTOA 59; Fribourg and Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2006), 25–68.

⁹⁵ See first the very critical review of Hirschfeld by the archaeologist and text researcher Hanan Eshel: H. Eshel, “Review of Y. Hirschfeld, ‘Qumran in Context,’” *JAOS* 125 (2005): 389–394, and also the polemical critique of Zangenberg’s presentation in H.-J. Fabry, “Archäologie und Text. Versuch einer Verhältnisbestimmung am Beispiel von Chirbet Qumran,” in *Texte – Fakten – Artefakte. Beiträge zur Bedeutung der Archäologie für die neutestamentliche Forschung* (ed. M. Küchler and K. M. Schmidt; NTOA 59; Fribourg and Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2006), 69–102. This was not the last documented controversy between Zangenberg and Fabry, which caused the editors of this volume to organize a symposium on the subject, bringing differing positions into conversation.

⁹⁶ Hirschfeld, *Die ganze Wahrheit*, 267–269.

⁹⁷ Hirschfeld previously argued this thesis in his essays Y. Hirschfeld, “Early Roman Manor Houses in Judea and the Site of Khirbet Qumran,” *JNES* 57 (1998): 161–189; idem, “The Architectural Context of Khirbet Qumran,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years after Their Discovery* (ed. L. H. Schiffman, E. Tov, J. C. VanderKam; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2000), 673–683.

early phase, during the Hasmonean era, the compound first functioned as a fortress that was never inhabited by religious ascetics.⁹⁸

The way in which Hirschfeld tries to distance the Essenes from Qumran, however, deserves a critical eye. An essential criterion of his thesis is, for example, the belief that the Essenes were vegetarians. However, the late textual sources of Jerome and Porphyry⁹⁹ demonstrate how uncritically and inadequately he deals with ancient textual sources. In fact, none of the older, historically analyzable Essenian presentations of Philo, Pliny, or Josephus attest to a vegetarianism of the Essenes, and the reference to Josephus and his comparison of the Essenes with the Pythagoreans (*Ant.* XV 371)¹⁰⁰ can by no means justify such a conclusion, but instead represents either an over explanation of a source Josephus used or represents this author's interest in making the Jewish parties understandable to his Roman audience. The argument that the inhabitants of Qumran, because of the fact that they ate meat, could not be Essenes is absurd. Also, the assumption that the very unusual "burial" of animal bones within the settlement was intended to function as fertilization for the soil is insufficiently developed.

Hirschfeld's theory offers an explanation that is decidedly independent of the Essenes or any other religious group – and perhaps the purpose of this interpretation is set not only against de Vaux's older, "monastic" interpretation, but also, when set within the context of the discussions within Israeli archaeology, set against a "religious" appropriation of archaeological finds. The scientific-theoretical argument of the problematic connection between archaeology and textual analysis¹⁰¹ presented by other researchers is not at the forefront of Hirschfeld's attention. Rather, it is much more a matter of the researcher's disinterest and inability to include the complexity of the textual discoveries into his reflections. As one might expect, this "disengagement"¹⁰² comes at a cost: the presence of the scrolls cannot be adequately explained and the thesis, therefore, contains certain embarrassments in this regard. In his book, the discoveries within the caves are hardly even described, and are pushed aside by reference to the lack of unity within the texts found at the location. Ultimately, he vaguely resorts to Golb's thesis that the scrolls were

⁹⁸ Hirschfeld wants to locate the Essene settlement, mentioned above in Pliny, at Ein Gedi; there, there was an installation that could have met ascetic living conditions. See Hirschfeld, *Die ganze Wahrheit*, 297–303 (= English edition 233–238). Of course, this "center of the Essenes" (297) presumes that they were in fact vegetarians (303; English ed. 238).

⁹⁹ Hirschfeld, *Die ganze Wahrheit*, 303 (not in the English version, which only states on page 238, "sources that the Essenes were vegetarians." He does not mention what these – all late and historically unreliable – sources are.

¹⁰⁰ Hirschfeld, *Die ganze Wahrheit*, 159 (English ed. 111).

¹⁰¹ Thus programmatically in Rohrhirsch, *Wissenschaftstheorie*.

¹⁰² Thus the review of Eshel, "Review Hirschfeld," 389.

probably from Jerusalem and then were shipped by various people into the caves. Given the caves' close proximity to the installations of Qumran, this is – as is already the case with Golb – a poor and unsatisfactory proposal that does not adequately reflect the composition of the discoveries in the individual caves.¹⁰³

Hirschfeld's book has received a devastating review from the Israeli archaeologist and Qumran scholar Hanan Eshel. Eshel points out that, for example, Caves 8 and 9 are accessible only through Khirbet Qumran. Furthermore, Caves 4, 5, 7, and 10 are ultimately part of the location¹⁰⁴ and should therefore be included within an archaeological interpretation of the site. Eshel also points to the large amounts of crockery that remains without an explanation if one concludes that only a small population resided in the "country estate." Even the cemeteries remain without a sufficient explanation if one simply claims that they functioned as military cemeteries that were unrelated to the compound.¹⁰⁵ Hirschfeld is unable to provide another, similar estate within the vicinity that contains such cemeteries, no other estate that has such a large number of ritual baths, the presence of which is particularly striking considering the arid climate. In light of the numerous mistakes and inaccuracies that Eshel details in his review of Hirschfeld – not only with regard to the textual research – Eshel's characterization strikes upon the state of the discussion: "Hirschfeld's book reflects the disengagement that exists between the archaeologists who deal with Khirbet Qumran and the scholars who study the scrolls."¹⁰⁶ His own summary is, "Hirschfeld's book teaches more about the limitations of archaeology than about Qumran in the Second Temple period."¹⁰⁷ According to Eshel, not taking into account the textual discoveries, the fortress, or the countryside location would be incomprehensible within the context of the discovery. Thus, Eshel's plea is as follows: "There is no reason at all to decouple Khirbet Qumran from the scrolls."¹⁰⁸ The dispute between the textual and exclusively archaeological interpretation can be clearly recognized here and continues to determine the current state of the conversation. At the level of book publications, this dispute is continued in the juxtaposition of the presentations by Hirschfeld and Jodi Magness, who, as "pure" archaeologists, defend the old "consensus" hypothesis, albeit with

¹⁰³ Concerning these facts, see the considerations of Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra, "Wie viele Bibliotheken gab es in Qumran?" in *Qumran und die Archäologie: Texte und Kontexte* (WUNT 278; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 327–346.

¹⁰⁴ Eshel, "Review Hirschfeld," 391.

¹⁰⁵ Eshel, "Review Hirschfeld," 392.

¹⁰⁶ Eshel, "Review Hirschfeld," 389.

¹⁰⁷ Eshel, "Review Hirschfeld," 394.

¹⁰⁸ Eshel, "Review Hirschfeld," 394.

an altered chronology from de Vaux's and with other modernizations and modifications.¹⁰⁹

IV. The Discussion after Hirschfeld

1. The Brown Conference and the Interpretation of Magen and Peleg

The continuation of the discussion can only be briefly summarized here. A conference was held at Brown University in the fall of 2002 to document the state of the debate and the plurality of the interpretations, wherein it was clear that the organizers preferred the views of "regional" or "contextual" archaeology and the "secular" interpretations of Khirbet Qumran.¹¹⁰ Of particular importance within the documentary volume is a detailed research and excavation report by Yizhak Magen and Yuval Peleg,¹¹¹ which meticulously lists a multitude of discoveries, rejects any religious usage of the Qumran compound, knows nothing of an agricultural production site, and ultimately concludes that the site was used for the production of ceramics.¹¹²

As with Hirschfeld, in this analysis, there is a decided "disengagement" with the textual discoveries: "From the outset, we decided not to become involved with the issue of the scrolls and the Essenes but only to analyze the archaeological finds at the site from the perspective of the field archaeologist."¹¹³ The authors suggest that the scrolls were probably shipped by refugees from Judea and probably came from different synagogue communities.¹¹⁴ The other contributors to the volume are relatively disparate and

¹⁰⁹ J. Magness, *The Archaeology of Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Grand Rapids and Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2002); cf. idem, *Debating Qumran: Collected Essays on Its Archaeology* (ISACR 4; Leuven: Peeters, 2004). Concerning the modifications, see below.

¹¹⁰ K. Galor, J.-B. Humbert, and J. Zangenberg, *Qumran – The Site of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Archaeological Interpretations and Debates* (STDJ 57; Leiden and Boston; 2006); see the introduction of K. Galor and J. Zangenberg, "Introduction," 1–15. See the criticism of this volume by H.-J. Fabry, "Review of *The Site of the Dead Sea Scrolls*," *DSD* 16 (2009): 129–138, which notes, "The present book aims to re-locate Qumran with the methods of 'field archeology,' but ultimately offers the unholy confusion of old, new, and contradictory hypotheses" (129). Also, Farby accuses the organizers of the symposium of a one-sided bias in the selection of speakers (130).

¹¹¹ Y. Magen and Y. Peleg, "Back to Qumran: Ten Years of Excavation and Research, 1993–2004," in *Qumran – The Site of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Archaeological Interpretations and Debates* (ed. K. Galor, B. Humber, and J. Zangenberg; STDJ 57; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 55–113.

¹¹² Y. Magen and Y. Peleg, "Back to Qumran," 92–94, 99–101.

¹¹³ Y. Magen and Y. Peleg, "Back to Qumran," 111.

¹¹⁴ Y. Magen and Y. Peleg, "Back to Qumran," 112f.

demonstrate that, at this point, the study of Qumran has not yet succeeded in bringing together archaeology and textual analysis.¹¹⁵

2. *The Controversy between Jürgen Zangenberg and Heinz-Josef Fabry*

In the German-speaking world, there was a sharp controversy between Jürgen Zangenberg (the most important of the context archaeologists) and Heinz-Josef Fabry at the 2005 conference of the German-speaking Catholic New Testament scholars in Fribourg (Switzerland), which also dominates the documentary volume of that conference:¹¹⁶ Zangenberg first called attention to the shortcomings of the documentation and argumentation in de Vaux in order to then unfold the “regional” perspective as the decisive advance in Qumran archaeological studies. This included the observation that the area was more populated and, moreover, was of strategic importance during the Hasmonean and Herodian eras. In Roman-Byzantine era different conditions prevailed so that an adapted economy (e.g., date palm agriculture) could exist. It is also important to observe that the network of paths through the location, at least “by mule tracks,”¹¹⁷ was connected to larger traffic routes. Furthermore, the ceramics in Qumran are not as ascetically simple as de Vaux had assumed for his secluded Essenes.¹¹⁸ While it is admitted that there are fewer imported ceramics in Qumran than in other representative locations, it is crucial “that the profile of the ceramic ensemble is not sufficiently different to distinguish it from the regional context on religious grounds.”¹¹⁹ The water systems and even the cemeteries “do not require ... a connection of the location with the ‘Essenes.’”¹²⁰

The formulations show that, methodologically, for context archaeology, the burden of proof lies where one wishes to justify a specific religious interpretation of the findings, which raises the question of whether and to what extent this is possible. Zangenberg resolutely opposes the old, “convergence

¹¹⁵ Thus, the conclusion of the review by Fabry, “Review of *The Site of the Dead Sea Scrolls*,” 138.

¹¹⁶ J. Zangenberg, “Region oder Religion? Überlegungen zum interpretatorischen Kontext von Chirbet Qumran,” in *Texte – Fakten – Artefakte* (ed. M. Küchler and K. M. Schmidt; Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2006), 25–68; H.-J. Fabry, “Archäologie und Text. Versuch einer Verhältnisbestimmung am Beispiel von Chirbet Qumran,” in *Texte – Fakten – Artefakte*, 69–102.

¹¹⁷ Carefully presented by Zangenberg, “Region oder Religion,” 40.

¹¹⁸ Zangenberg, “Region oder Religion,” 42f.

¹¹⁹ Zangenberg, “Region oder Religion,” 44.

¹²⁰ Zangenberg, “Region oder Religion,” 50. Concerning the cemeteries, see Zangenberg, “Region oder Religion,” 53–57; based on the still unpublished “Habilitationsschrift” by J. Zangenberg, “*Haus der Ewigkeit*.” *Archäologische und literarische Studien zur jüdischen und frühchristlichen Bestattungskultur in Palästina* (Habilitation thesis; Wuppertal, 2003).

model” that stresses the relationship between archaeology and textual analysis, favoring instead a “model of divergence,”¹²¹ wherein archaeological and textual interpretation stand next to each other but unconnected.

Fabry, instead, vehemently opposes this methodologically restrained divergence: “Presently, it is considered modern and avant-garde to ignore the existence of the manuscripts altogether.... From now on, scholars should interpret Qumran theology-free (i.e., manuscript-free). But this is misleading since such archaeology deliberately excludes a locally and temporally synchronous textual discovery from the interpretation.”¹²² This argument is similar to the above referenced plea by Hanan Eshel in his critical discussion of Hirschfeld’s work, but Fabry’s understanding of the Qumran library is even more differentiated than Eshel’s.

Fabry cites some important reasons for his disagreement with Zangenberg’s – partly consistent with Hirschfeld – interpretive model:

- Qumran was not on any caravan route, as it had no connection to the south.¹²³
- “The assumption of an ancient shipping route on the Dead Sea to a greater extent ... is unproven.”¹²⁴
- “Due to the higher seawater level in ancient times, there were only narrow strips of the shore that ... could be used for agriculture but only with great effort.”¹²⁵
- “To see that the inhabitants of Qumran were farmers contradicts the anthropological research on the bones from the main cemetery.”¹²⁶

Finally, Fabry undertakes the often-missed attempt to explain why the compound of Khirbet Qumran and the textual finds should be interpreted together.¹²⁷ It may be appropriate to list the central arguments here:

- Caves 5 and 7–10 are residential caves and are, therefore, functionally attached to the compound. Furthermore, fragments of Scripture were found in all the caves with the exception of Cave 9. All the caves, even Caves 1–4, 6, and 11 are connected by the fact that ceramics and fragments of Scripture were found within them.¹²⁸
- The ceramics (scroll jars) connect both the caves and the compound.¹²⁹ Even if it is possible to interpret this finding in a different manner and the

¹²¹ Zangenberg, “Region oder Religion,” 58.

¹²² Fabry, *Archäologie und Text*, 71.

¹²³ Fabry, *Archäologie und Text*, 84.

¹²⁴ Fabry, *Archäologie und Text*, 84.

¹²⁵ Fabry, *Archäologie und Text*, 85.

¹²⁶ Fabry, *Archäologie und Text*, 85.

¹²⁷ Fabry, *Archäologie und Text*, 87–94.

¹²⁸ Fabry, *Archäologie und Text*, 87f.

¹²⁹ Fabry, *Archäologie und Text*, 88.

Qumran ceramics (which would be hard to expect) is of course not entirely unique, the finding nevertheless remains significant.

- Also, one exemplar of the so-called (!) “Essene hatchet” was found in both the compound and in Cave 11. Even if one cannot immediately identify this tool with the tool mentioned in Josephus’ description of how the Essenes covered nature’s call (*J.W.* II 148), the presence of a similar tool is, at the very least, a link between the caves and the compound.
- “The texts in 1Q–11Q belong,” despite their diversity, “to a dedicated collection with a specific theological and literary profile.”¹³⁰ “The Temple-hostile content of many of the texts as well as the calendric texts with references to a solar calendar show that it cannot be related to a library taken out of Jerusalem.”¹³¹ The assumption of a random agglomeration of several different libraries from various groups or synagogues also fails to explain the findings in Cave 4, where almost all of the attested textual genres are present.
- The inkwells in the compound and another in Ein Feshkha prove that writing took place within the compound,¹³² although it remains open as to what exactly was written.
- The famous Ostracon 1 could be the crucial link that proves the practice of a rule from 1QS – the transfer of ownership of an entrant to the community – among the inhabitants, that is if the reading of the *yahad* were certain. This, however, is not the case.¹³³
- The text 4Q477 “Rebukes of the Overseer” attests to the rebuke of a member of the *yahad* by the overseer. “Such a course of action is related to a particular community and is ... only relevant to that particular community. Importing such a list from the outside is not very plausible. That’s why there is a good chance that this text was written at the compound.”¹³⁴
- Also, the cemeteries clearly belong to the compound.¹³⁵ Their separate interpretation (e.g., as military cemeteries) is, therefore, implausible. Although too few graves have been researched,¹³⁶ the findings can be evaluat-

¹³⁰ Fabry, *Archäologie und Text*, 88. One cannot consider the talk of a “library” as inappropriate in this case simply because the architectural construction of libraries look different than they do at Khirbet Qumran. This argument from Hirschfeld (*Qumran in Context*, 47f.) is hardly convincing.

¹³¹ Fabry, *Archäologie und Text*, 88f.

¹³² Fabry, *Archäologie und Text*, 89.

¹³³ Fundamental is the discussion in F. M. Cross and E. Eshel, “Ostraca from Khirbet Qumrân,” *IEJ* 47 (1997): 17–28; for criticisms, see A. Yardeni, “Breaking the Missing Link,” *BAR* 24.3 (1998): 44–47.

¹³⁴ Fabry, “Archäologie und Text,” 90f.

¹³⁵ Fabry, “Archäologie und Text,” 91, where Fabry points out that “many burial shafts have been filled with specific Qumran ceramics.”

¹³⁶ As is pointed to by Zangenberg, “Region oder Religion?” 55.

ed with regard to the residents or users of Khirbet Qumran. Of course, the burial form is not unique, but is attested in some other cemeteries.

According to Fabry, these “links” suggest that Khirbet Qumran and the manuscripts should be interpreted together,¹³⁷ without any prejudice to any particular method. In light of the textual issues that have been raised against the Essene hypothesis, Fabry prefers to forego any identification with the Essenes and instead speaks of a priestly special group.¹³⁸ Irrespective of this, however, he maintains that neither a theory of scientific purism nor a post-modern relinquishing of the postulate of the “unity of reality” may exclude the attempt to cooperate between archaeology and textual analysis.¹³⁹

C. The State of the Discussion and Remaining Questions

After the flood of competing interpretive models – since Hirschfeld and Magen/Peleg – no other comprehensive, overall interpretations were presented.¹⁴⁰ In addition to further digs at Qumran, current research is concerned with the evaluation of the now available findings and primarily deals with the increasingly differentiated application of scientific methods. However, these can only be accomplished by highly specialized researchers and are difficult to understand in their methodological and technical details, even by “normal” archaeologists and even more conventional Qumran researchers. On the one hand, this makes the discussion more difficult; on the other hand, it is only in this way that contributions to the solution of individual open problems can be achieved.¹⁴¹

¹³⁷ Fabry, “Archäologie und Text,” 93f.

¹³⁸ Fabry, “Archäologie und Text,” 96–99.

¹³⁹ Fabry, “Archäologie und Text,” 100.

¹⁴⁰ See the recent report by E. M. Meyers, “Khirbet Qumran and its Environs,” in *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. T. H. Lim and J. J. Collins; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 21–45. – The explanatory model presented by the Finnish researchers M. and K. Lönnqvist need not be discussed here in detail, as it occupies the role of a complete outsider in the research and wishes to explain the entire Qumran movement by the connection with the Jewish temple of Onias in Leontopolis and thus from the Hellenistic mystery piety; see M. Lönnqvist and K. Lönnqvist, *Archaeology of the Hidden Qumran: The New Paradigm* (Helsinki: University of Helsinki Press, 2002); idem, *Spatial Approach to the Ruins of Khirbet Qumran at the Dead Sea* (Helsinki: University of Helsinki Press, 2004).

¹⁴¹ See the volume of collected essays edited by J. Gunneweg, *Holistic Qumran. Trans-Disciplinary Research of Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (STDJ 87; Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2010), as well as J. Gunneweg, “Qumran vis-à-vis Science-based Archaeology,” in *Qumran und die Archäologie*.

(1) In view of the varying alternative interpretive models and their antithesis to the still prevalent “classical” model, which the majority of text analysts consider plausible, some fundamental questions are to be highlighted. (2) Following this, it will be explained to what extent the classic interpretive model has since been modified and, in my opinion, can be further modified in order to take into account the expanded amount of data available. (3) Finally, there are some open problems whose further clarification can be anticipated not least by new scientific investigative methods. An “objective” decision, an archaeological “proof” will hardly be possible on the basis of the material. Furthermore, the complexity of the findings and a certain plurality of interpretations of the material will probably persist since the interpretation of the ruins of Qumran also moves in the framework of the hermeneutic circle, which is indispensable for any historical interpretations.

I. Controversial Foundational Questions

First of all, let us take a look at the controversial fundamental questions that sometimes took the rank of “questions of faith” in the discussion, and have separated the interlocutors into separate camps.

(a) One such dimension seems to resonate partly between a “*secular*” and a “*religious*” interpretation of the compound. Of primary interest here is the preservation of the autonomy of archaeological arguments against textual research, the study of religion, or even (Christian or Jewish) “theological” influences on the interpretation. This also includes a distancing from the widely observable Christian-religious or national Jewish appropriation of the Qumran texts and the apparently related compound. Such an approach has resulted in the distancing of a generation of archaeologists from the models and interests of their predecessors, both in the *École Biblique* (R. de Vaux) and in Israeli archaeology (e.g., Y. Yadin).¹⁴² In any case, the ferocity of the discussion and primarily the polemics against the “classical” interpretations suggest that this is about more than purely scientific issues, but is, at the same time, about the identity and affiliation of the participating scientists themselves.¹⁴³ Beyond these “belief” and “party issues,” the factual demand is

¹⁴² A comparable distancing also exists, for example, in the interpretation of Iron Age structures, which were attributed by the older generation of archaeologists such as Yadin to the Davidic-Solomonic era (and were therefore “appropriated” as national-political objects), while a younger generation pushed the date of these structures to a later period and thus considerably reduced the initially believed splendor of the Davidic-Solomonic “foundational era.” Particularly influential in this regard is I. Finkelstein and N. A. Silberman, *The Bible Unearthed: Archaeology’s New Vision of Ancient Israel and the Origin of Its Sacred Texts* (New York: Touchstone, 2002), German edition: *Keine Posaunen vor Jericho. Die archäologische Wahrheit über die Bibel* (München: Beck, 2002).

¹⁴³ It is to the merit of Ullmann-Margalit’s work *Out of the cave*, to have sensitized researchers to such questions of the “sectarianism” background (Christian or Jewish, con-

justified as to whether and to what extent the archaeology can use the relics available to it to elevate the religiousness or religious affiliation of the residents or users of such a compound. As a rule, it relies upon textual witnesses because stones remain mute and ambiguous in this regard, and even the possible correspondence with other attested religious uses or practices like, for example, Jewish purity halakah, is not conclusive in the strictest sense: Whether inkwells indicate scroll production, alleged pillar stumps were actually altars, and “buried bones” prove sacrificial practice must remain contentious, especially since such sacrificial practice remains strange even in the horizon of all available textual data. And even if the majority of water installations have to be interpreted as *Miqvaot*, this would prove nothing more than a Jewish religious practice, not a specific “Essenian” practice.

(b) Closely related to these issues is the question that is occasionally formulated as an alternative of whether the Qumran compound is truly “*unique*” in certain aspects or whether the phenomena perceived here (architectural form of the buildings, water systems, ceramics, funerary customs) have *parallels* in the narrower or wider context.¹⁴⁴ In the background stands the argument that can be found in de Vaux that it is precisely the uniqueness of the compound, its isolation from the possible contexts, its spatial remoteness, structural austerity, and, for example, the simplicity of the pottery that particularly indicates the identity of the users as a withdrawn, ascetic and thus religious group. This argument must, of course, appear as a *petitio principii* that may have derived too much from a monastic paradigm and leads to a general degree of doubt concerning the compound’s “religious” use once the presence of glassware, imported ceramics, a large stock of coins, etc. became known.

In this regard, looking at archaeological contexts could also lead to an entirely wrong-headed alternative: Why should religious inhabitants and users specifically create different types of buildings, and why should they use different types of dishes or supply a different type of food than was appropriate to the regional circumstances? Even in the context of the “Essene hypothesis,” the economic activity of the inhabitants of Khirbet Qumran can in no way be ruled out. This means that just as the claim that the compound’s isolation was able to provide little justification of a religious usage, so also contextuality of the compound is unable to exclude such a usage. In the balance of possibilities and probabilities, the question of the “burden of proof” occa-

servative or liberal), and respective “agendas” of the researchers themselves (see there particularly 135–151).

¹⁴⁴ See J. Zangenberg, “Zwischen Zufall und Einzigartigkeit: Bemerkungen zur jüngsten Diskussion über die Funktion von Khirbet Qumran und die Rolle einiger ausgewählter archäologischer Befunde,” in *Qumran und die Archäologie: Texte und Kontexte* (WUNT 278; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 121–146.

sionally becomes virulent when it is asked whether the peculiarities of a building's architecture, of the water systems, or the ceramics are such that they "require" a "contextual" interpretation for specific religious reasons.¹⁴⁵ This will not be the case, perhaps with the exception of the *Miqvaot*, in most instances. It is, however, questionable whether the hypothesis of an Essene use has to be proven at all – and whether the "bar" for alternative, contextual hypotheses (e.g., an industrial ceramic or balsam production compound) can be set lower. Even these interpretations are hardly "provable" and partly ignore the textual discoveries or seek auxiliary hypotheses (such as Golb's theses) in order to maintain the lack of coherence between Khirbet Qumran and the written material. Is, therefore, a stringency of proof required – and is it at all possible, or is it only the compatibility of an interpretation with the findings that demands a certain degree of plausibility – because one cannot achieve more definitiveness within archaeological interpretation?

The real peculiarity of the discoveries from Khirbet Qumran is, of course, also given when all the structural and material relics can be classified in the context of the area around the Dead Sea: that in direct connection with the compound are the places where the scrolls were discovered, which – in connection with, above all, the water systems, cemeteries, or ceramic findings – justify the specific character of the local situation of Qumran.

(c) The third question, often answered "confessionally," is that of the relationship between the *location of the compound* and the *scrolls*. Even if the synthesis of de Vaux's Qumran-Essene hypothesis was gained in a manner that was too unclear in methodological terms, it would hardly be permissible to take refuge in a "scientific theoretical fundamentalism," which, in principle, excludes a historical link between textual and archaeological insights on the basis of insufficient controllability.¹⁴⁶ The thesis of the unity of reality may be discussed philosophically and scientifically, but the factual task of historiography to illuminate past realities cannot be solved other than by correlating the different witnesses of past worlds in an appropriately critical manner. The overall picture then gains plausibility if it can unite the various sources and data as comprehensively as possible without too many inconsistencies. Although de Vaux's synthesis – especially the inclusion of the ancient Essene texts – led to all too "speculative" interpretations of, for example, the function of individual *loci* of Khirbet Qumran and brought the archaeological data directly to passages, for example, from the communal rule 1QS, it must be concluded that the explanatory problems tend to be greater if one assumes

¹⁴⁵ See Zangenberg, "Region oder Religion," 44, 50.

¹⁴⁶ This is done in the work of F. Rohrhirsch, *Wissenschaftstheorie und Qumran*, 87f., who rejects the recourse to "a reality" as an unverifiable hypothesis, but remains within the framework of the philosophical premises of critical rationalism (Popper's imprint), which he set forth at the outset.

that the scrolls were shipped to the caves from Jerusalem – either from the Temple library or from different community or private libraries – without supposing that the inhabitants and users of the compound had anything to do with this act (or several acts). If, on the other hand, the users of Khirbet Qumran provided logistical assistance (and perhaps provided the jars) when the scrolls were transported to the caves, then this relationship is again in need of an explanation. Was this just a “service,” or is it likely to have had an ideological affinity? These hypotheses do not do justice to either the very selective nature of the total “library”¹⁴⁷ or to the convoluted nature of the texts found in the caves, which make it hardly possible to separate the texts into different libraries (with the possible exception of the only Greek texts in Cave 7 and the Copper Scroll from Cave 3).¹⁴⁸ This is because of the fact that nearly all the text types are attested in Cave 4. The broadly discussed, but not plausibly justified, assumption (which more than anything served as an alibi for continued disinterest in the contents of the scrolls) by Golb and authors such as Hirschfeld and Magen/Peleg that the scrolls would have somehow come from Jerusalem but had nothing to do with the compound and its inhabitants/users or would have simply been hidden by refugees who used the jars that already existed in Qumran¹⁴⁹ thus ultimately remains extremely superficial and – despite all the appreciation of the archaeological arguments – weakens the overall interpretation of the authors concerned. It is, however, understandable that scholars, with reference to their own limited expertise, do not wish to venture into unfamiliar territory – but then an overall interpretation can only take place in dialogue with the experts in the other field. The task of integrating the entirety of the available data as far as possible as a bare minimum for providing a plausible interpretation remains unaffected. The task that a plausible interpretation has to integrate the entirety of the available data as far as possible remains unaffected. As Hanan Eshel¹⁵⁰ already pleaded in reference to Hirschfeld’s work that *all* findings should be

¹⁴⁷ Reference can be made, for example, to the multitude of manuscripts with an “alternative” calendar or to the absence of the pro-Hasmonean Maccabees, which point to a selective interest of the tradents, even if the library contains individual texts that certainly did not correspond to the thinking of the *yaḥad*.

¹⁴⁸ However, see the argument by Daniel Stökl Ben-Ezra, “Wie viele Bibliotheken gab es in Qumran?” in *Qumran und die Archäologie: Texte und Kontexte* (WUNT 278; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 327–346.

¹⁴⁹ Thus, for example, Y. Magen and Y. Peleg, “Back to Qumran,” 113, who then wish to attribute the texts in part to “sectarian libraries.” Similarly, Y. Hirschfeld, *Qumran in Context*, 230, 243, who suspects that it has been shipped from priestly libraries in Jerusalem – and thus incorporates Norman Golb’s thesis.

¹⁵⁰ See above at note 108, cf. also note 151.

included,¹⁵¹ so also Eric M. Meyers has, in my opinion, rightly stated that, “To ignore the scrolls completely in a consideration of the site of the Qumran settlement ... seems ... to be avoiding the obvious.”¹⁵²

II. Modifications to the Consensus Model

The alternative models, often presented with greater enthusiasm, have often gained their power from their striking juxtaposition with a very simply portrayed consensus model, whereby it goes unnoticed that the majority of textual analysts, as well as the majority of “consensus model” archaeologists, have now modified the theory in significant ways.

The polemical and not always fair representation of the work of de Vaux characterizes the work of Norman Golb to Yizhar Hirschfeld and Jürgen Zangenberg. With the partly legitimate criticism of de Vaux’s argument and his excavation documentation, the basic line of his explanatory model is far from being wrong. The reasoning against the “consensus model” becomes disproportionately striking where it comes to alternative concepts in which the “counter image” is primarily sought in the ancient Essene texts without heeding their inner differences, their possible dependence upon sources, and their “idealized” form of representation primarily in Philo and Josephus. The quick distancing of the textual or archaeological Qumran findings from these (supposedly pacifist, celibate-monkish, or Pythagorean) Essenes, such as is found in Norman Golb, Lena Cansdale, or even Yizhar Hirschfeld with his completely unfounded thesis of Essene vegetarianism (see above), does not do justice to the complexity of the references.¹⁵³

The fact that de Vaux’s interpretation can no longer simply be continued because of the extended archaeological database, the more pluralistic perceptions of the scrolls, and the more reflective methodological consciousness appears perfectly clear to most of those involved, even among the text analysts. Yet, at the same time, when this is connected to the modifications of the classical interpretation by the archaeologists who are inclined towards it,

¹⁵¹ Eshel, “Review of Hirschfeld,” 384: “The ruins at Qumran should be understood in the same way as any other archaeological site, on the basis of all the finds discovered there.”

¹⁵² Meyers, “Khirbet Qumran,” 29.

¹⁵³ Concerning the relationship between the Essenes and the Qumran tradents, see my considerations in Frey, “Zur historischen Auswertung,” 28–30 (English translation “On the Historical Value,” in this volume, 169–171). An extensive and balanced discussion is presented in J. C. VanderKam, “Identity and History of the Community,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years* (ed. P. Flint and J. C. VanderKam; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 2:487–533.

there is the expectation that the old consensus can be strengthened and made more plausible.¹⁵⁴

(a) A significant modification of the classical archaeological interpretation, as is done for example in Jodi Magness, is concerned with the settlement chronology. Now, on the basis of numismatic findings, it turns out that the chronology is clearly “shorter” than previously thought. Magness calculates that the commissioning of the compound took place no earlier than 100 BCE.¹⁵⁵ Also, the “settlement gap” assumed by de Vaux, which was originally considered to cover the entire time span between the 31 BCE earthquake (which coincided with the reign of Herod the Great) and the reign of Archelaus in 4 BCE, should – if it existed at all – have been much shorter.¹⁵⁶

(b) With the shorter settlement chronology, the assumption in the early days of research that the rules of the community rule texts (1QS V 1–IX 26) were direct references to the Qumran compound was no longer applicable. The rules in 1QS simply did not reflect the order of the Qumran “resident” community, but rather were compiled for groups of the *yaḥad* at various (different) locations in the country long before the Qumran compound was commissioned. This does not exclude the possibility that a part of this group also followed these provisions at a later time in Qumran, studied them, and then handed them down in various versions.¹⁵⁷ However, the interpretation of Khirbet Qumran as the “center” of the *yaḥad*¹⁵⁸ along with all the images of a monastic male community still prevalent in the popular consciousness are held here as untenable.¹⁵⁹

¹⁵⁴ Thus in E. M. Meyers, “Khirbet Qumran,” 24: “We will offer a few of these alterations in the hopes of strengthening the older consensus.”

¹⁵⁵ See J. Magness, *Archaeology*, 68; see also Meyers, “Khirbet Qumran,” 30f.

¹⁵⁶ Thus Magness, *Archaeology*, 68; Meyers, “Khirbet Qumran,” 31.

¹⁵⁷ If one follows Sarianna Metso’s reconstruction of the textual history of the material, then it should be noted that even after the existence of the extensive manuscript 1QS, which possibly functioned as a master copy, other manuscripts were copied that contained a shorter edition of the S material and partly older versions of the *Rule of the Community*; see the foundational work of S. Metso, *The Textual Development of the Qumran Community Rule* (STDJ 21; Leiden: Brill, 1997); Now also see eadem, *The Serekh Texts* (LSTS 62; London: T&T Clark, 2007). A slightly different reconstruction by Alison Schofield suggests a juxtaposition of different, independent versions of the rules and penal codes; see A. Schofield, *From Qumran to the Yahad: A New Paradigm of Textual Development for the Community Rule* (STDJ 77; Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2009).

¹⁵⁸ Thus in agreement with de Vaux; see also H. Eshel, *Qumran: Scrolls, Caves, History* (Jerusalem: Carta, 2009), 53.

¹⁵⁹ The question of the presence of women (and children) is (or could be) only answered by a further examination of the cemeteries, especially since the rule documents derived from the *yaḥad* (1QS V 1–XI 22; 1QSa; CD with the 4QD texts) are as inconsistent in this regard as are also the ancient Essene texts. If one cannot “explain away” (Zangenberg, “Region oder Religion,” 55 and Fabry, “Archäologie und Text,” 93) the women’s and

(c) In general, a proper consideration of the textual findings implies that one must not expect the *yahad* community to have completely uniform or even unchangeable rules (e.g., with regard to the community's internal organization and way of life). Rather, it must be assumed that a certain diversity¹⁶⁰ and inner development existed, as is suggested in the differences between the various rule texts (e.g., 1QSa; 1QS V–IX with the parallels in 4QS; CD with its parallels in 4QD). The diversity of the textual versions – both of the biblical texts as well as the rule texts such as the *Rule of the Community* or the *Damascus Document* – calls for other models of validity, authority, or canonicity since they have come to us from the Christian tradition and its concepts of the canon.¹⁶¹

(d) Not all representatives of the archaeological consensus model are willing to associate the *yahad* community with the term “Essene”¹⁶² (a term not at all attested in Qumran), nor are they willing to categorize the *yahad* in the wider sense as part of the Essenian “movement,” nor even consider it as the “Essenian union.”¹⁶³ However, where this step is taken – usually due to a small number of particularly significant coincidences between the rule texts and the ancient Essene reports primarily taken from Josephus – the ideological interests of Philo and Josephus and the persistent questions regarding sources,¹⁶⁴ specifically Josephus' use of sources, must also be considered when interpreting these texts. By no means can the ancient reports on the

children's graves (e.g., as graves of “neighboring cemeteries” or as entirely modern graves), but must attribute the same age to them as the male graves, their presence as well as the striking “surplus” of men in the cemeteries must be explained. Concerning the problem from a textual perspective, see A. Stuedel, “Ehelosigkeit bei den Essenern,” in *Qumran kontrovers* (ed. J. Frey and H. Stegemann; Einblicke 6; Paderborn: Bonifatius, 2003), 115–124. See now also the comprehensive interpretation of the archaeological and textual evidence in the work of my doctoral student N. Rupschus, *Frauen in Qumran* (WUNT II/457; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2017).

¹⁶⁰ See J. J. Collins, *Beyond the Qumran Community: The Sectarian Movement of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010).

¹⁶¹ See C. Hempel, “Vielgestaltigkeit und Verbindlichkeit: Serekh ha-Yachad in Qumran,” in *Qumran und der biblische Kanon* (ed. M. Becker and J. Frey; BThSt 92; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2009), 101–120, here 116: “With the question, ‘Which manuscript of the Community Rule is the current one, the valid one?’, we are asking for something that was not evidently important to the authors of this text. Inconsistency was obviously tolerated. It was a matter of living with disagreement.”

¹⁶² For example, Fabry, “Archäologie und Text,” 96–99.

¹⁶³ Thus the concept in H. Stegemann, *Essener*, 206, according to whose reconstruction the *yahad* was a union of the various “precursor groups” (anti-Hellenistic, Asiatic, or even wisdom groups, possibly even of Enochic influence) that was formed under a dominant priestly influence.

¹⁶⁴ Fundamental for this work, though in my opinion too optimistic in his reconstruction, is R. Bergmeier, *Die Essenerberichte des Flavius Josephus* (Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1993); For a historical evaluation, see my article in this volume, “On the Historical Value.”

Essenes be read uncritically as a historical source. The image of a pacifist philosophical community, talk of the immortality of the soul, comparisons with the Pythagoreans, etc. (which have prompted speculation over the centuries about these Essenes as a particularly philosophical, cosmopolitan, or liberal group) can be explained from the apologetic tendency (or even the use of some sources) ascertainable in Philo and Josephus, as an *interpretatio Graeca*, but are hardly likely for a strongly Torah oriented, Palestinian-Jewish group. If the identification is indeed correct, an adequate image of the views of the *yahad* can only be reconstructed from the group-specific texts of Qumran, which, in this case, would be the primary sources of information about the “Essenes.” On the other hand, the aspects mentioned in the ancient texts on the Essenes can hardly be used to explain the findings of Khirbet Qumran (nor can they be used in an uncritical way to substantiate the thesis that there was no way Essenes could have lived in Qumran¹⁶⁵).

(e) Further modifications of the classical interpretation are associated with some of the observations presented in and partly associated with the alternative models: Even in case of the usage by a religious group, Khirbet Qumran was not necessarily as isolated as de Vaux had assumed. In connection with this it is still controversial how far the compound was integrated into the road network.¹⁶⁶ Moreover, a religious use of Khirbet Qumran – as a place for the study of Torah or possibly even a place to produce scrolls – must not be opposed to a usage of the compound at the same time for agricultural or artisanal work (e.g., for the production of ceramics) as well as for a (modest) trade.

(f) In view of this flexibility of the classical interpretation, in my opinion, there are still a number of archaeological reasons for the thesis that a religious-Jewish group used Khirbet Qumran as a community facility. This is supported by the existence of ten ritual baths,¹⁶⁷ most of which have staircases towards the entry as well as a separating line in the middle that likely functioned as a dividing line between the impure that were entering the bath and the pure that were exiting.¹⁶⁸ Such baths were also found elsewhere, especially in Jerusalem near the Temple grounds and can therefore hardly be interpreted as an Essenian peculiarity – as was initially assumed – but was more likely a construction for more frequented ritual baths and thus as an indica-

¹⁶⁵ See the above discussion concerning Hirschfeld’s thesis about the vegetarianism of the Essenes.

¹⁶⁶ See J. Taylor and S. Gibson, “Qumran connected: The Qumran Pass and Paths of the North-Western Dead Sea,” in *Qumran und die Archäologie: Texte und Kontexte* (WUNT 278; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 164–210.

¹⁶⁷ Thus Broshi, “Qumran,” 735: “The most conspicuous feature of this site is the sixteen water installations, ten of which are immersion pools.”

¹⁶⁸ Broshi, “Qumran,” 735; Meyers, “Khirbet Qumran,” 33f.

tion that the users were strongly interested in the practice of ritual purity.¹⁶⁹ The largest room (Locus 77), which de Vaux interpreted as a dining room, is still best interpreted as a meeting and dining room, especially considering the enormous amount of crockery found in the adjoining room. Its size may then have determined the maximum number of residents/users of the compound: if one estimates about 120–150 people,¹⁷⁰ then this is only possible in connection with the assumption that most of them lived outside of the compound (e.g., in residential caves or even in tents).¹⁷¹ A ceramic production is suggested by the pottery kiln and is proven by the scientific investigations of the clay composition of individual artifacts.¹⁷² Of course, it is precisely the religious aspect of the use that can hardly be justified on archaeological grounds. At best, the large number and size of the ritual baths can only prove that the community or users had a high interest in ritual purity. However, the precise determination of the function of the “dining room” or other rooms and *loci* is then still more difficult to determine with certainty.

(g) Even if one now brings into play the connection between the scrolls and the use of the compound by a branch or its residence (temporary or permanent) by members of the *yahad* community, the precise *function of the compound* still remains largely unclear. It is then possible to assume, on the basis of the library, that the writings were studied in Khirbet Qumran and the surrounding residential caves, and that at least some of the manuscripts were even copied there. One very important finding that supports this is that – as Ira Rabin and her research team have recently shown by the chemical analysis of the bromine concentration in the ink of the *Hodayot* scroll from Cave 1 (1QH^a) – this particular scroll must have been produced at least in the proximity of the Dead Sea.¹⁷³ Whether it was written in the compound of Khirbet Qumran or even in the “scriptorium” there remains completely open and unprovable. However, this evidence decisively calls into question the “con-

¹⁶⁹ Cf. Magness, *Archaeology*, 146f. and particularly R. Reich, “Miqwa`ot at Khirbet Qumran and the Jerusalem Connection,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years after Their Discovery* (ed. L. H. Schiffman, E. Tov, and J. C. VanderKam; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2000), 728–731.

¹⁷⁰ Thus Broshi, “Qumran,” 735.

¹⁷¹ Cf. Broshi and Eshel, “Residential Caves.”

¹⁷² See J. Gunneweg and M. Balla, “Was the Qumran settlement a mere pottery production center? What Instrumental Neutron Activation revealed,” in *Holistic Qumran: Trans-Disciplinary Research of Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. J. Gunneweg, A. Adriaens, and J. Dik; STDJ 87; Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2010), 39–62.

¹⁷³ I. Rabin, O. Hahn, T. Wolff, A. Masic, and G. Weinberg, “On the Origin of the Ink of the Thanksgiving Scroll (1QHod^a),” *DSD* 16 (2009): 97–106; Concerning the procedure, see I. Rabin, O. Hahn, T. Wolff, E. Kindzorra, A. Masic, and G. Weinberg, “Characterization of the Writing Media of the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *Holistic Qumran: Trans-Disciplinary Research of Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. J. Gunneweg, A. Adriaens, J. Dik; Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2010), 124–134.

venient evasion” of some authors, who suggest that the scrolls came entirely from one or more libraries in Jerusalem. Added to this is the archaeometric demonstration by Jan Gunneweg that even some of the clay jars from Qumran have an indigenous clay profile, which means that they must have been made at Qumran or nearby.¹⁷⁴ Other artifacts at the compound come from other locations, confirming the hypothesis that there were trade links with Qumran. Nevertheless, even if one accepts the use of the compound by members of the Essene community and accepts the possibility of the activities of the study and production of scrolls, and also a certain degree of agrarian and artisanal activity, many questions remain open, which archaeology is hardly capable of answering:

If the number of residents or users of the compound is ultimately uncertain, there is the further question of whether individuals lived in Qumran permanently or only for a certain period of time. If individuals only lived there temporarily, how can we explain the large number of graves at the compound? And if the numerical ratio of men, women, and children can be extrapolated from the small number of graves examined, how is this to be explained? Why did people ever go to this place and why did they die there? Was it for the purpose of studying the Torah (cf. 1QS VIII 12–16; cf. Isa 40:3), that is, for “spiritual” reasons? Or, rather, did they come for the production of certain goods (and which ones), possibly because of the special circumstances that existed at the Dead Sea? All these questions – which are essential for the interpretation of the compound – require further investigation that might bring us, at least partially, further insights.

III. Open Questions

(a) With regard to the settlement chronology, the question of how different phases of colonization and use can be delineated is persistent. Of course, it is hardly possible to further elucidate the chronology, given the lack of clarity that still exists concerning the stratigraphy of the compound – which may perhaps be further clarified by the complete publication of the excavation reports and diaries.¹⁷⁵ In particular, a change of residents or users (as in the hypotheses of Humbert, Hirschfeld, and Magen/Peleg) mostly escapes archaeological demonstrability.

(b) It continues to be discussed to what degree Khirbet Qumran was remote or “connected” during the time in question. The trade route along the western shore of the Dead Sea along Ein Gedi, assumed by some authors, is vehemently denied by others due to the steep rock falls and the higher water

¹⁷⁴ See J. Gunneweg, “Qumran vis-à-vis Science-based Archaeology: How to go about?” in *Qumran und die Archäologie*, 147–162, as well as J. Gunneweg and M. Balla, “Was the Qumran Settlement.”

¹⁷⁵ See Meyers, “Khirbet Qumran,” 30f.

level during ancient times.¹⁷⁶ Other trade routes were at least some distance past Qumran. Between the certainly exaggerated assumption of Qumran's direct connection to the great caravan routes (Crown and Cansdale) and the assumption of a complete "monastic" remoteness (de Vaux), an appropriate middle ground has yet to be found and adequately described.¹⁷⁷

(c) The possible existence of trade relations and the question of the degree of prosperity in Khirbet Qumran can be taken up by the further evaluation of the autochthonous and imported ceramics, the glassware, and the coin discoveries. What is certain is that Qumran was not isolated in terms of material culture, but was strongly "connected," as Jürgen Zangenberg¹⁷⁸ and others emphasized. On the other hand, it must be asked whether the use of some types of vessels can be considered an expression of a special interest in ritual purity.¹⁷⁹ In any case, coins, glassware, and imported ceramics cannot provide a compelling argument against "Essene" use, especially since these imported goods could also come from trade with "like-minded people" in Jerusalem and elsewhere.

(d) Of course, the cemeteries and the anthropological evaluation of the (relatively few) available skeletons should be given special attention. The results of the anthropological studies of Olav Röhrer-Ertl¹⁸⁰ that those buried had died relatively young and had done no heavy physical work in their lives could provide evidence that these were not employees or even slaves of an agricultural or artisanal production site. Another issue related to the analysis of the skeletons found at Qumran is the conclusion that "bread was eaten only in small quantities."¹⁸¹ Finally, it is still debatable whether and to what extent the burials in Qumran can be explained solely by local customs or whether

¹⁷⁶ For example, Fabry, *Archäologie und Text*, 84.

¹⁷⁷ See J. Taylor and S. Gibson, "Qumran connected."

¹⁷⁸ J. Zangenberg, "Qumran und Archäologie," 276–288; now also in agreement is Meyers, "Khirbet Qumran," 38, and R. Bar-Nathan, "Qumran and the Hasmonaean and Herodian Winter Palaces at Jericho: The Implications of the Pottery Finds for the Interpretation of the Settlement at Qumran," in *Qumran, the Site of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. K. Galor, J.-B. Humbert, and J. Zangenberg; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 263–277.

¹⁷⁹ Meyers, "Khirbet Qumran," 40, referring to J. Magness, "Why Scroll Jars?" in *Religion and Society in Roman Palestine: Old Questions and New Approaches* (ed. D. R. Edwards; New York and London: Routledge, 2004), 146–161.

¹⁸⁰ See Fabry, *Archäologie und Text*, 91; see O. Röhrer-Ertl, among other places, "Über die Gräberfelder von Kirbet Qumran, insbesondere die Funde der Campagne 1956, Teil 2: Naturwissenschaftliche Datenvorlage und Befunddiskussion, besonders der Collectio Kurth," in *Jericho und Qumran*, 227–276.

¹⁸¹ Fabry, *Archäologie und Text*, 91.

specific religious aspects also play a role here (for example, the absence of objects within the graves or the striking northern orientation of the graves).¹⁸²

(e) Can the economic activity in the Qumran compound be further defined? The theses of balsam production (Hirschfeld) or ceramic production (Magen and Peleg) would have to be further tested by targeted chemical investigations of the compound. It should be kept in mind that the clay sludge in the pools is not necessarily indicative of the production of industrial ceramics – even though the possibility of forming vessels from the clay of the Qumran plateau has been confirmed by the studies of Gunneweg and Balla¹⁸³ – but could also have been flushed from other places in the wadi by the water.¹⁸⁴

(f) The most puzzling question is probably, “How can the phenomenon of the enigmatic animal bones be explained?” Are they remnants of meals? If so, why were they “buried”? Or are these deposits an indication of a sacrificial character, which would be difficult to explain on the basis of Jewish texts? How can we explain the fact that these bones are deposited in different places, relatively “unsystematically”?¹⁸⁵ Here, we will have to wait for the further presentation of the material and continued scientific investigations.

¹⁸² See the note by Fabry, *Archäologie und Text*, 91–94; idem, “Die Friedhöfe von Khirbet Qumran,” in *Qumran kontrovers*, 173–191. In contrast, see Zangenberg, “Region oder Religion,” 53–57.

¹⁸³ Gunneweg and Balla, “Was the Qumran settlement a mere pottery production center?”

¹⁸⁴ Meyers, “Khirbet Qumran,” 24.

¹⁸⁵ See J. Zangenberg, “Zwischen Zufall und Einzigartigkeit: Bemerkungen zur jüngsten Diskussion über die Funktion von Khirbet Qumran und die Rolle einiger ausgewählter archäologischer Befunde,” in *Qumran und die Archäologie*, 121–146.

5. On the Historical Value of the Ancient Sources about the Essenes*

A. Introduction

The historical value of the ancient texts about the Essenes¹ and their relationship to the textual discoveries of Qumran remains controversial. The wide-

* This article was originally written in 1998 as a contribution for a dispute with Roland Bergmeier, focusing on his hypothesis on the sources of Josephus, but the perspective and conclusions go beyond that purpose. This article was one of my earliest studies on Qumran. I have modified the text with regard to terminology and have added a number of clarifying remarks. Of course, the bibliography could be updated at numerous points, but this did not seem necessary for the argument presented here. Only occasionally have I added some references, including references to some of my own later works.

¹ The *sources* are compiled in A. Adam, *Antike Berichte über die Essener* (2nd revised and expanded edition by C. Burchard; KIT 182; Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 1972; a German translation of the most important texts can be found in H. Bardtke, *Die Handschriftenfunde am Toten Meer. Die Sekte von Qumran* [Berlin: Evangelische Haupt-Bibelgesellschaft, 1961]), 303–333. See further M. Stern, *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism 1–2* (Jerusalem: The Israel Academy of Science and Humanities, 1974–1980); G. Vermes and M. D. Goodman, eds., *The Essenes according to the Classical Sources* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989). For an *overview*, see the following encyclopedia articles: K. Kohler, “Essenes,” *JE* 5 (1903), 224–232; G. Hölscher, “Josephus 2: Der Schriftsteller,” *PRE* 9:1934–2000; W. Bauer, “Essener,” *PRE.S* 4:386–430 (= idem, *Aufsätze und Kleine Schriften* [Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1967], 1–59); I. Heine- mann, “Therapeutai,” *PRE* II/5:2321–2346; K. G. Kuhn, “Essener,” *RGK* 2 (3rd ed.; 1958), 701–703; O. Betz, “Essener und Therapeuten,” *TRE* 10:386–391; J. J. Collins, “Art. Es- senes,” *ABD* 2:619–626; idem, “Dead Sea Scrolls,” *ABD* 2:85–101; J. Murphy O’Connor, “Qumran, Khirbet,” *ABD* 5:590–594; A. Lange and H. Lichtenberger, “Qumran,” *TRE* 28:45–79; A. Lange, “Essener,” *DNP* 4 (1998), 141–146; cf. further the *monographs*: T. S. Beall, *Josephus’ Description of the Essenes Illustrated by the Dead Sea Scrolls* (SNTSMS 58; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988); R. Bergmeier, *Die Essener-Berichte des Flavius Josephus. Quellenstudien zu den Essenertexten im Werk des jüdischen Historiographen* (Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1993); H. Stegemann, *Die Essener, Qumran, Johannes der Täufer und Jesus* (Freiburg: Herder, 1993); J. C. VanderKam, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994); the *essays*: H. Stegemann, “The Qumran Essenes – Local Members of the Main Jewish Union in Late Second Temple Times,” in *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls Madrid 18–21 March 1991* (ed. J. Trebolle Barrera and L. Vegas Montaner; STDJ 11.1; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 83–166; T. Rajak, “Ciò che Flavio Giuseppe vide: Josephus and the Essenes,” in *Josephus and the History of the Greco-Roman World: Essays in Memory*

spread talk of “Qumran-Essenes” and the associated, relative consensus of the Qumran research have been questioned in recent years from various angles. This questioning was prompted by the rapid developments in the exploration and publication of the textual discoveries from Qumran in the 1980s and 1990s. Taking into consideration the numerous newly published texts, a number of points have emerged that create problems for the image of the Qumran library developed on the basis of the findings from Cave 1, the relationship of the Qumran texts to the ruins of Khirbet Qumran, and the identity of the inhabitants and users of this compound.²

The ancient texts about the Essenes and their problems only took up a relatively small space within these discussions. The older research had already had a tough time making sense of them, and of course the new texts were more fascinating. Because of this, the most recent works on the relationship between the Essenes and Qumran are based on a picture of the Essenes composed of the testimonies of Philo and Josephus, which can hardly do justice to the complexities of these testimonies. Roland Bergmeier’s monograph on Josephus’ reports about the Essenes from 1993 recalled the problems of these texts and presented a careful analysis of Josephus’ sources, a topic that was very much in need of discussion.³ The result of Bergmeier’s research was the following:

of Morton Smith (ed. F. Parente and J. Sievers; Leiden: Brill, 1994), 141–160; P. Bilde, “The Essenes in Philo and Josephus,” in *Qumran between the Old and New Testaments* (ed. F. H. Cryer and T. L. Thompson; LHB 290; Copenhagen International Seminar 6; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 32–68. From more recent research, see in particular J. E. Taylor, “The Classical Sources on the Essenes and the Scrolls Communities,” in *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. T. H. Lim and J. J. Collins; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010); eadem, *The Essenes, the Scrolls, and the Dead Sea* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), cf. also my own more recent studies “Qumran and Archaeology” and “Qumran” (chs. 4 and 2 in the present volume), and the brief overview in J. Frey, “Essenes,” in *The Eerdmans Dictionary of Early Judaism* (ed. J. J. Collins and D. C. Harlow; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), 599–602. See also the thorough evaluation of the relationship between the Qumran sectarian texts and the ancient texts on the Essenes with special focus on the aspect of women in the work of my doctoral student N. Rupschus, *Frauen in Qumran* (WUNT II/457; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2017).

² See here a few select works such as N. Golb, *Qumran. Wer schrieb die Schriftrollen vom Toten Meer?* (Hamburg: Hoffmann and Campe, 1994); L. Cansdale, *Qumran and the Essenes: A Re-Evaluation of the Evidence* (TSAJ 60; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997); L. H. Schiffman, *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls* (2nd ed.; New York: Doubleday, 1995), 78–80; K. Berger, *Qumran. Funde – Texte – Geschichte* (Reclams Universal-Bibliothek 9668; Stuttgart: Reclam, 1998), 108ff.

³ Bergmeier, *Essener-Berichte*. See also Bergmeier’s more recent study *Die Qumran-Essener-Hypothese: Die Handschriftenfunde bei Khirbet Qumran, ihr spezifischer Trägerkreis und die essenische Gemeinschaftsbewegung* (BThSt 133; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 2013).

“The references to the Essenes in Josephus are based ... primarily, if not exclusively, on source material, so they must not be read as authentic accounts of a contemporary witness, let alone the account of an insider.... The classic Essene texts draw from sources with their own literary intentions, and these same intentions explain the divergences with the authentic testimonies of the Qumran community.”⁴

Bergmeier does not want to completely deny the relationship between the Qumran texts and the Essenes. However, from his attribution of the reports to Josephus’ variously aligned sources, it becomes evident that “later in the first century CE, the Greek names Ἐσσηαῖοι or Ἐσσηνοί are only a literary-historical creation and no longer [correspond to] a living reality.”⁵ Thus, the relevance of the Essene reports for understanding the Qumran texts and for the historical classification of their traditions is severely limited.

From a methodological perspective, the differentiations made by Bergmeier are well-founded. In view of the differences that have materialized in recent years with respect to our picture of the Qumran library and in view of the texts that have been preserved,⁶ it is justified to demand that the ancient Essene texts should not be used for a comparison without an analysis of their literary character and their historical value.⁷ The mere compilation of similarities and differences between the reports about the Essenes and – often quite uncritically culled – statements from the Qumran texts does not do justice either to the state of Qumran research or to the complex problems of the ancient reports about the Essenes.⁸

⁴ Bergmeier, *Essener-Berichte*, 114.

⁵ Bergmeier, *Essener-Berichte*, 117.

⁶ Both the differences regarding the composition of the texts (see also the contributions of A. Lange, “Kriterien essenischer Texte,” in *Qumran kontrovers: Beiträge zu den Textfunden vom Toten Meer* [ed. J. Frey and H. Stegemann, in collaboration with M. Becker and A. Maurer; Paderborn: Bonifatius, 2003], 59–70 and C. Hempel, *Qumran kontrovers*, 71–88) as well as the now recognizable complex editorial and transmission processes of individual texts – which is now detectable because of the publication of additional manuscripts – should be noted; see for example S. Metso’s work on the *Community Rule* documents in *The Textual Development of the Qumran Community Rule* (STDJ 21; Leiden: Brill, 1997); concerning the *Damascus Document*, see the work of C. Hempel, *The Laws of the Damascus Document* (STDJ 29; Leiden: Brill, 1998); concerning the *Hodayot*, see the work of E. Schuller in, for example, “The Cave 4 Hodayot Manuscripts: A Preliminary Description (4QH),” *JQR* 85 (1995): 137–150.

⁷ Thus Bergmeier, *Essener-Berichte*, 11; cf. J. Maier, *Zwischen den Testamenten: Geschichte und Religion in der Zeit des zweiten Temples* (NEB.ATE 3; Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1990): “... in any case, the description in Josephus should always be considered separately.”

⁸ This objection also applies to the work of T. S. Beall, *Josephus’ Description of the Essenes Illustrated by the Dead Sea Scrolls* (SNTSMS 58; Cambridge et al.: Cambridge University Press, 1988), which consults “the sectarian literature” (p. 8) from the Qumran library, including the *Temple Scroll*, whose origin from the Qumran community is extremely controversial. Furthermore, in its line-up of parallels occasionally it uses texts

On the other hand, it is not at least the experiences of Qumran research that stand in the way of having substantial confidence in source criticism.⁹ Where there are no exact text parallels, as there are, e.g., in the case of the Synoptic Gospels, the issue of reconstructing literary sources becomes very uncertain. Moreover, where one must reckon with very independent writers who use sources, rarely follow them slavishly, but rather eclectically and occasionally paraphrase them, there is hardly a methodological way to safely isolate sources or even determine the literary character of the sources that have been used. Here, I believe, is the biggest problem with Bergmeier's analyses.¹⁰

B. The Older Research: Walter Bauer's Framework as a Paradigm

The problem hinted at in Essene research showed up long before the textual finds at Qumran. The results of the earlier work are summarized in the large article by Walter Bauer in *Paulys Realenzyklopädie*.¹¹ In this article, it becomes clear, in comparison with Bergmeier, how much Bauer is aware of the hypothetical character of his own analyses and ultimately the uncertainty of his theses.¹²

For *Josephus*, Bauer reckons with the use of sources,¹³ which seem to him to indicate a dependence on Philo on the basis of content and linguistic parallels.¹⁴ Josephus is based in part on the testimonies received from Philo and in his special material perhaps on a writing of Philo that has not been preserved

from *1 Enoch* or the Aramaic *Genesis Apocryphon*. See also the critical remarks by F. García Martínez in his review of this work in *JSJ* 20 (1989): 84–88. Nevertheless, the list of parallels and differences offered by Beall (*Josephus' Description*, 123–129) are quite instructive, provided they are used critically.

⁹ Based on the history of the research of the *Community Rule* (1QS and parallels), it could be shown how many hypotheses – which were established at times when only the manuscript 1QS was known – about the emergence of this text were removed on the basis of the findings of the 4QS manuscripts.

¹⁰ See the criticism in S. Mason, *Flavius Josephus und das Neue Testament* (Tübingen and Basel: Francke, 2000), 48.

¹¹ Bauer, "Essener."

¹² Essentially more apodictic is the concurrently published third edition of the account by W. Bousset and H. Gressmann, *The Religion of Judaism in the Late Hellenistic Age* (3rd ed.; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1926), 456–465. Its picture of the Essenes is essentially a compilation of the reports of Philo and Josephus. They hardly enter into the differences between them or the problems of the sources.

¹³ Bauer, "Essener," 404; *De vita contemplativa* 11, 403.

¹⁴ Bauer, "Essener," 405f.

“About the Active Life or the Essenes.”¹⁵ Bauer knows, however, that the philological proof of this hypothesis cannot be obtained, since “it [can] never be ruled out with certainty for Josephus that he uses other sources gained from personal experience and collected information in addition to the works of Philo.”¹⁶

For *Philo*, Bauer states that he “is at least responsible for the external appearance of his report. Form and content, however, cannot be cleanly distinguished from one another here or in other places.”¹⁷ That is, “one does not know where Philo stops and the E[ssenes] begin.”¹⁸ But since Philo can only have his knowledge from the reports of others, we must ask about his sources. The idea of well-known authors such as Alexander Polyhistor and Nicolaus of Damascus is rejected,¹⁹ and it is more fruitful to ask about the literary character of the works from which Philo drew.²⁰ How this is methodologically possible since the sources cannot be safely determined remains unclear. Bauer suspects, however, that Philo’s source is an ethnographic writing with a paradoxographic impact strongly influenced by tendencies to idealize certain relationships.²¹

The historical evaluation of the text only leads to a meager result: Little can be said about the “people”²² of the Essenes; Bauer initially even questions their Jewish character.²³ The most secure historical kernel of truth could simply be “what Pliny has brought to the tightest expression.”²⁴ The notes about the trowel, the apron, and the white dress, as well as the remark about spitting out could be historically correct, while the note about the Sabbath rest of the Essenes must appear as “suspicious” of a certain *Tendenzkritik*. Bauer’s conclusion is “that we can no longer determine the facts about the Essenes with great certainty.”²⁵ So meager – and so obviously questionable at points such as the Jewish identity or the Sabbath rest – is the result that Bauer (one of the most careful and knowledgeable philologists of the early 20th century) has gained from the ancient reports about the Essenes with the help of *Tendenzkritik*. However, a look at Bauer’s design shows that the paths

¹⁵ Bauer, “Essener,” 404 and 407.

¹⁶ Bauer, “Essener,” 407.

¹⁷ Bauer, “Essener,” 395.

¹⁸ Bauer, “Essener,” 396.

¹⁹ Bauer, “Essener,” 408: “We should not overlook assumptions of a loose nature.”

²⁰ Bauer, “Essener,” 409.

²¹ Bauer, “Essener,” 416.

²² Bauer, “Essener,” 416.

²³ Bauer, “Essener,” 422. Later (427), Bauer admits that the Essenes “were ultimately Jews,” however their peculiarity was “not exactly their position on the religion of their fathers.” Therefore, the Essenes should be regarded as “a product of religious syncretism.”

²⁴ Bauer, “Essener,” 422.

²⁵ Bauer, “Essener,” 419.

taken by Bergmeier have already been tried methodologically and objectively by the older research before the discovery of the Qumran texts. The problems of the texts and the *aporia* of the attempted solutions have already become profoundly clear.

C. The Problems of the Ancient Texts about the Essenes

The problems arise not only in comparison with the statements of the Qumran texts, but with a careful reading of these texts themselves.²⁶ Here, we can restrict ourselves to the three main witnesses: Philo of Alexandria, Flavius Josephus, and Pliny the Elder, on whom the later authors are entirely (or at least almost entirely²⁷) dependent. Only the most important questions are to be mentioned:

(a) The differences between the *names* is striking: Philo speaks of the *Essaeans* (Ἐσσαῖοι), Pliny of the *Essenes* (Esseni), and Josephus apparently knows both terms (Ἐσσαῖοι and Ἐσσηνοί) and uses them in his work side-by-side, although he seems to use both terms to refer to one and the same group.²⁸ But is this identification justified? Does the terminological difference merely result from the transcription of two different forms of the same Semitic root?²⁹ Is the interchangeability of the term in Josephus an indication

²⁶ See the texts in Adam and Burchard, *Antike Texte*, 1–22 (Philo), 23–28 (Josephus), and 38 (Pliny) and the translations in Vermes and Goodman, *Essenes*.

²⁷ The question of whether there is an independent, older tradition can be discussed for some of Josephus' differing statements in Hippolytus; on this, see C. Burchard, "Die Essener bei Hippolyt. Ref. IX 18,2–28,2 und Josephus, *J.W.* 2, 119–161," *JSJ* 8 (1977): 1–41; See also Adam and Burchard, *Antike Texte*, 41 as well as (concentrated on the question of a belief in the resurrection testified to in Ref. IX 27.1) the skeptical treatment of Bergmeier, *Die Essener-Berichte*, 23; in view of the notes about the Essene's belief in the resurrection, É. Puech, *La croyance des Esséniens en la vie future: immortalité, résurrection, vie éternelle?*, vol. 1–2, particularly vol. 2 (EBib N. S. 21/22; Paris: Librairie Lecoffre, 1993), reckons with a true tradition in Hippolytus. Furthermore, a comment in Solinus' report, which goes back to Pliny, may also contain an independent tradition, see C. Burchard, "Solin et les Esséniens," *RB* 74 (1967): 392–407, here 400f.; cf. Adam and Burchard, *Die Antike Texte*, 62. Finally, mention should be made of Dio Chrysostom who, according to the note contained in Synesius of Cyrene 3.2, praised the Essenes as a happy community on the Dead Sea. Since this note significantly deviates from the Pliny text, it is likely to be considered an independent witness, but of course Dio Chrysostom's text is unfortunately not preserved.

²⁸ The circumstance pointed out by Bergmeier (*Die Essener-Berichte*, 13) that "texts about the Essaeans and Essenes are used unrelated side-by-side" confirms that both terms refer to the same group in Josephus.

²⁹ The plural of the Aramaic ܦܫܘܢܐ (= pious) sounds like ܦܫܘܢܐ (= Ἐσσηνοί), the *status emphaticus* ܦܫܘܢܐ (= Ἐσσαῖοι), insofar as both terms mean "the pious," as already argued in Bousset and Gressmann, *The Religion of Judaism*, 457 and Bauer, "Essener," 419. The

of the use of different sources?³⁰ Do different notions or even historical facts connect with the different names behind the sources? Here, the questions of source criticism and the etymology of names are connected.³¹

(b) In terms of the *ethnic and geographical classification* of the Essenes, there are significant differences between the ancient testimonies: While they were clearly Jews according to Philo and Josephus, and in Josephus they were more specifically designated as a Jewish school of philosophy, Pliny speaks of them as a peculiar “people” or “tribe” (*gens*), without mentioning their affiliation with Judaism. Pliny mentions the place of the Essenes’ residence as the area at the Dead Sea – which offered research with the first clue concerning the connection of the Qumran finds with the Essenes, who were well-known from the ancient texts about them.³² Philo and Josephus, on the other hand, are silent about this region; they do not name any geographical area as the center, but rather speak of the Essaeans or Essenes in all the cities and villages of Judea. The fact that Philo also talks about a group of so-called *therapeutai* (θεραπευταί) in Egypt exposes additional problems that cannot be discussed here.³³

(c) There are significant doubts concerning the *historical reliability* of the three oldest witnesses. The first witness of literary quality is the work of Philo of Alexandria. In two of Philo’s works written before 40 CE – *Quod omnis probus liber sit* (= *Prob.*) 75–91 and *Pro Judaeis defensio* (= *Apol.*; in Eusebius, *Praeparatio evangelica* [= *Praep. ev.*] VIII 11.1–18) – Philo writes about the Essaeans, even though he had only visited Jerusalem on the occa-

association with ὅσιοι (= holy ones) in Philo (*Prob.* 75, 91; cf. Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* VIII 11.1) is probably no more than a play on words, see also E. Schürer, G. Vermes, and F. Millar, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ* (Edinburg: T&T Clark, 1979), 2:559.

³⁰ As is already seen in Bauer, “Essener,” 419.

³¹ The numerous older attempts of deriving the origin of the name are listed in J. B. Lightfoot, *Saint Paul’s Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon* (2nd ed.; London and New York: Macmillan, 1879), 345–354.

³² For a history of the research, see Stegemann, “The Qumran Essenes,” 83–85.

³³ The ideal character of Philo’s presentation in *De vita contemplativa* gives rise to doubts about the historical reliability of his picture and therefore makes the view of the *therapeutai* as an Egyptian branch of the Essenes (thus Schürer, Vermes, and Millar, *History*, 597; Betz, “Essener und Therapeuten,” 43) questionable. Whether it is possible to agree with Bergmeier that the Philonic *therapeutai* at Lake Mariout near Alexandria presents an additional echo of a source about an Essene settlement on the Dead Sea is an open question. Bergmeier (loc. cit.) rightly states: “In short, the writing as an encomium of the life in contemplation of God is fictional rather than historiographical, the ascetic philosophers are more of an ideal image of pious Jews (naturally including proselytes) ..., than the description of a special Jewish community of the 1st century.” On the *therapeutai*, see the foundational work of P. Wendland, “Die Therapeuten und die philonische Schrift vom beschaulichen Leben,” *JCPH.S* 22 (1896): 695–772 and I. Heinemann, “Therapeuten.”

sion of only one or possibly a few more pilgrimages.³⁴ It is also unlikely that Pliny the Elder, who dealt with the Essenes in the fifth book of his natural history finished *ca.* 77 CE, actually saw for himself the “people” of the Essenes on the Dead Sea. He was with Titus as an officer in Jerusalem perhaps in the spring of 70 CE,³⁵ but by that time Qumran had already been conquered and converted into a Roman military post. He also seems to presuppose the destruction of Ein Gedi.³⁶ His image of the “people” of the Essenes, however, is untouched by warlike events; it is rather a collection of curiosities that could have come from “tourist information” obtained in Jerusalem.³⁷ In any case, this report is also by a foreign, probably non-Jewish hand.³⁸ Finally, the third main witness, Josephus Flavius, reports about the Essenes in three works from between 73 and 100 CE: *Vita* 10–12; *De bellum Judaico* [= *J.W.*], most extensively in II 119–161; and *Antiquitates Judaicae* [= *Ant.*] XIII 171–173. and XVIII 11, 18–22. Josephus communicates individual anecdotes about Essaeans or Essenes, claims to have had personal experiences with the groups of the Pharisees, Sadducees, and Essenes, and claims to have even “passed through” all three schools. But his smug account of his upbringing and early career in *Vita* 8–12 is anything but believable for chronological reasons.³⁹ Josephus may, therefore, have possessed no insider knowledge of the Essenes. But – as Walter Bauer already noticed – we can never exclude the possibility that he, as a participant in the Jewish War, “personally had

³⁴ Only in one place, in *De Providentia* fr. 2.64 (= Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* VIII 14), does Philo casually report of such a pilgrimage. F. W. Colson (Philo, *LCL*. Vol. 9 [Cambridge and London, 1960], 501) points out, however, that this passage cannot prove that the journey was the only pilgrimage Philo made.

³⁵ Thus W. Kroll in K. Ziegler, W. Kroll, H. Gundel, W. Aly, and R. Hanslik, “Plinius d.Ä.,” *PRE* 21.1:271–439, here 279f.

³⁶ Cf. the formulation (*Naturalis Historia* V 73): “Infra hos Engada oppidum fuit.”

³⁷ Thus Stegemann, “The Qumran Essenes,” 84f.

³⁸ Thus Adam and Burchard, *Antike Texte*, 38.

³⁹ In the three years from his 16th to 19th birthday, when he finally joined the Pharisees, the young aristocrat not only claims to have gone through the three religious parties but also lived for three years with the hermit Bannus in the desert. Within this context, there would have been a probationary period for the Essenes, in which the way to full membership described in *J.W.*: II 137f. would have taken three years alone. Furthermore, a similar period of intensive instruction in the other two groups would not allow for enough room in terms of chronology. The facts are, therefore, to be explained either by chronological negligence or with reference to the multitude of rhetorical *topoi*, which Josephus’ report boasts about his career. On the chronological problems with the pedigree Josephus presents, see E. E. Schürer, G. Vermes, and F. Millar, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1973), 1:46 n. 3; on the rhetorical conventions in *Vita* 1–12, see Mason, *Flavius Josephus und das Neue Testament*, 55–61.

experiences” and possibly even “made inquiries” with the various groups in Palestine.⁴⁰

In this regard, Josephus would be the only one of the three witnesses who could have direct knowledge of the Essenes, but even this must remain uncertain – he certainly did not possess an insider’s knowledge of this group. For the other two witnesses, Pliny and Philo, the historical question can *only* be raised as a question about the reliability of their sources. Whether and to what extent this also applies to Josephus is at least an open question.⁴¹

(d) Significant differences between the reports about the Essenes make it difficult to relate the information contained in Pliny, Philo, and Josephus to one and the same historical group. Even if we leave aside both the Philonic account of the *therapeutai* and also the ethnographic account of Pliny, there are still a number of factual discrepancies between the texts in Philo and Josephus, and even among the various texts in Josephus, of which only a few particularly striking examples can be mentioned:

- While the concise episodes about the Essaeans Judas (*J.W.* I 78–80; *Ant.* XIII 311–313), Simon (*J.W.* II 112f.; *Ant.* XVII 345–348), and Manaem (*Ant.* XV 373–379) know of prophetic or mantically gifted individuals, each appearing in a political context, the other reports on the Essenes in Josephus, as well as Philo’s texts on the Essaeans, speak of an ideal philosophic community without any signs of manticism or prophetic activity. The question of whether and to what extent the Essenes in general or individual Essenes acted as prophets is, therefore, debatable.⁴²
- While Josephus at one point (*J.W.* II 567) knows of an Essene named John, who served as a commander in the Jewish War, elsewhere he depicts the Essenes as death-despising martyrs (*J.W.* II 152f.) who at most carry a weapon with them because of robbers (*J.W.* II 125). Philo, on the other hand, describes the Essenes as those who neither produce nor deal with weapons (*Prob.* 78), that is they are a pacifist community.⁴³
- Philo writes that the Essenes did not offer any animals for sacrifice (*Prob.* 75). On the other hand, Josephus reports that the Essenes made their sacrifices according to different purity practices and, because of this, were ex-

⁴⁰ Bauer, “Essener, 407.

⁴¹ This is postulated by Bergmeier, *Essener-Berichte*, passim.

⁴² For the tradents of the Qumran library, A. Lange, “The Essene Position on Magic and Divination,” in *Legal Texts and Legal Issues* (ed. M. Bernstein, F. García Martínez, and J. Kampen; STDJ 23; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 377–435, has convincingly demonstrated that they avoided mantic practices (with the exception of the oracle) and divination, and in their place practiced the interpretation of inspired Scripture. Thus, Lange considers the episodes about divining Essenes, as reported by Josephus, to be legendary, while the Essene report in *J.W.* II 159 conspicuously combines divination with the study of Scripture (Lange, “The Essene Position on Magic and Divination,” 424f.).

⁴³ This is wrongly rejected in Bilde, “The Essenes in Philo and Josephus,” 48.

cluded from the common sanctuary. Instead, they offered sacrifices themselves and sent votive offerings to the sanctuary (*Ant.* XVIII 19). On the other hand, Josephus also mentions an Essene in the temple precinct (*J.W.* I 78–80; *Ant.* XIII 311–313). The sacrificial practice of the Essenes is at this point hardly conclusive on the basis of the ancient texts.

- Even the passages about marriage and celibacy are divergent in the texts: Philo (*Apol.* 14–17) ascribes to the Essenes a general hostility towards women, which tends to coincide with Pliny’s note that the Essenes lived “without any woman, lacking every lust” and lived “only in the company of palm trees” (*Hist. Nat.* V 73). In contrast, Josephus asserts in *J.W.* II 121 that the Essenes did not esteem marriage but did not want to abolish it altogether. Rather, they wanted to secure themselves against the unfaithfulness of women. A short time later in his work, Josephus mentions another branch of the Essenes who, after a long trial of the women, marry. However, this is only for the purpose of reproduction (*J.W.* II 160f.). Whether the Essenes generally lived celibate lives or not, and for what motives this celibacy was carried out, remains unclear in the light of the ancient testimonies.

(e) The differences in the individual details could be supplemented. In addition to those already mentioned, there is a large amount of information that only occurs in one of the two authors or only in individual texts. Regardless, there are amazing similarities between the Essene texts of Philo and Josephus if we view them in their context. This has been impressively demonstrated by Per Bilde.⁴⁴ The article demonstrates that both authors present a broadly consistent overall picture of the Essenes:

“They are described as an admirable voluntary association of pious and extremely virtuous men, living a simple, disciplined and healthy common life The Essenes are pictured as a peculiar social group, clearly separated from the society as a whole, distinguished by a high degree of fellowship and common economy, working hard with their hands in agriculture and crafts. Their piety is characterized by intensive study of the Holy Scriptures, by spiritualization of such traditional religious values as Scripture and Temple, by prayer, by severe ethical demands, by frugality and by a certain degree of asceticism.”⁴⁵

According to Bilde’s judgment, the image of the Essenes is equally positive in both Philo and Josephus. If both endeavor to represent Judaism as a sort of ideal philosophy, then the Essenes (or, in the case of Philo, also the *therapeutai*) appear as the Jewish elite,⁴⁶ as the Jewish contribution to the general discussion about the ideal form of the human community. But while the ideals of equality, communal goods, asceticism, or the simple (rural) lifestyle

⁴⁴ Bilde, “The Essenes in Philo and Josephus,” see the comparative compilations on 45f. and 56–61.

⁴⁵ Bilde, “The Essenes in Philo and Josephus,” 62.

⁴⁶ Bilde, “The Essenes in Philo and Josephus,” 62.

were represented by many philosophical schools and represented in numerous ethical and utopian writings, Philo and Josephus could refer to the Essenes as a real group that truly existed and thus showcased in a particularly strong manner the religious and social value of Judaism.⁴⁷ This may have contributed significantly to why the Essenes (or *therapeutai*) were given such a prominent position in the apologetic arguments of both authors.⁴⁸

(f) The differences between the individual texts and above all the similarities in the overall picture have led many authors to believe that Philo's and Josephus' statements about the Essenes are dependent on one or more, presumably written sources.⁴⁹ While most of the recent authors at this point – including Bilde – hold off from presuming about source usage⁵⁰ and exercise restraint on a closer definition of the respective source material both in Philo and Josephus,⁵¹ Roland Bergmeier has taken the trouble of setting up a detailed source hypothesis for the Essene texts of Josephus, which – as has already been shown – is based on the approaches of older research but also goes its own way in some details. His analysis is characterized by a great trust in the possibilities of literary-critical reconstruction while skeptical of the knowledge of the ancient authors, especially of Josephus.

D. Roland Bergmeier's Source Analysis and Its Problems

In his astute analysis of the Essene texts of Josephus (and their parallels in Philo and Pliny), Bergmeier arrives at the thesis that Josephus had processed a total of four different sources for his reports about the Essaeans or Essenes: – a series of anecdotes about Essaeans, perhaps originally collected with paradoxographical intent from the world history of Nicolaus of Damascus,⁵² which depicted the Essenes as mantics,

⁴⁷ Bilde, "The Essenes in Philo and Josephus," 63.

⁴⁸ Bilde, "The Essenes in Philo and Josephus," 64.

⁴⁹ Thus, already within the older research of the 19th century. On this, see S. Wagner, *Die Essener in der wissenschaftlichen Diskussion vom Ausgang des 18. bis zum Beginn des 20. Jahrhunderts* (BZAW 79; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1960), 193–209 and 234–237; the sum of this discussion forms the above referenced article by Walter Bauer. On this, see Wagner, *Die Essener in der wissenschaftlichen Diskussion*, 235: "With him, the discussion of the classical Essene sources had reached its peak and, so to speak, its conclusion."

⁵⁰ Bilde, "The Essenes in Philo and Josephus," 65; M. Hengel also suspects a common source in "Qumran und der Hellenismus," in *Qumran. Sa piété, sa théologie et son milieu* (ed. M. Delcor; BETL 46; Paris and Leuven, 1978), 333–372, here 340, reprinted in *Judaica et Hellenistica. Kleine Schriften I* (WUNT 90; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996), 258–294, here 264.

⁵¹ On this, see Mason, *Flavius Josephus und das Neue Testament*, 48f.

⁵² Bergmeier, *Die Essener-Texte*, 114; cf. further Mason, *Flavius Josephus und das Neue Testament*, 13–19 and 52–56.

- a “doxographic three-school-source,” which was probably influenced by Stoicism and from which Josephus takes over the scheme of the speech of the Pharisees, Sadducees, and Essenes as three schools of philosophy, which he then expanded himself to include a “fourth philosophy” called the Zealots,⁵³
- a “Hellenistic-Jewish Essaeans-source,” which Philo and Josephus used and was “probably in the service of missionary or apologetic interest for the recommendation of Judaism to Hellenistic readers,”⁵⁴ and finally
- for the “lion’s share of his Essene references” a Pythagorean source, which was characterized “by astonishingly good and detailed knowledge of the Qumran community”⁵⁵ and from which Josephus, perhaps even Philo, drew for his presentation of his “*therapeutai*” and Pliny for his notes about the Essenes.

The wealth of observations and interpretations that Bergmeier cites in each of Josephus’ Essene texts cannot be adequately appreciated in the present context. On the contrary, the methodological problems of the procedure and the different degrees of probability attributed to the individual components of Bergmeier’s source hypothesis should be pointed out before the question of the historical value of Essene texts and their relationship to the textual findings of Qumran can be addressed.

(a) Bergmeier develops his source thesis from diverse and very precise observations about the differences between the individual reports on the Essaeans or Essenes, their tensions concerning their respective contexts, the thematic and linguistic parallels in Philo’s texts, further comparisons with the Qumran texts, as well as references to other Hellenistic-Jewish and pagan texts. In the end, Bergmeier – somewhat as an afterthought – refers to the linguistic observation that the extended Essene report in *J.W.* II 119–166 has an above-average number of hapaxlegomena,⁵⁶ which is considered to be

⁵³ Bergmeier, *Die Essener-Texte*, 114; cf. further Mason, *Flavius Josephus und das Neue Testament*, 19–22 and 56–66.

⁵⁴ Bergmeier, *Die Essener-Texte*, 115; cf. further Mason, *Flavius Josephus und das Neue Testament*, 23–41 and 66–79.

⁵⁵ Bergmeier, *Die Essener-Texte*, 116; cf. further Mason, *Flavius Josephus und das Neue Testament*, 41–48 and 79–107.

⁵⁶ However, the presented arithmetic seems quite idiosyncratic and hardly reflective in terms of methodology. For different sections of the text, the number of hapaxlegomena that occur compared to the number of paragraphs (according to the Niese edition) is given in percentages. 100% would be a ratio of one hapaxlegomena per paragraph. However, there are instances where a two- or three-fold occurrence of a word within the same book is detected as a hapaxlegomenon (which, of course, influences the outcome). Above all, it does not reflect the conditions under which such statistical observations are relevant, whether individual findings can only be explained by the use of sources or also for themat-

another indication of the use of source material in this passage. But Bergmeier admits that he cannot base these observations on “extensive linguistic investigations into the complete works of Josephus.”⁵⁷ In so doing, however, he indicates that there is a methodological problem with his analyzes at this point: He “would like to identify different sources in the reports about the Essenes on the basis of stylistic criticism, but without considering the linguistic characteristics of Josephus by and large.”⁵⁸ But only on this basis could a continuous source analysis in Josephus' work be methodologically secured. Whether such an analysis is still feasible or whether in the end the aporia remain is, in my view, an open question in view of the paths of the older research. The problem of Bergmeier's thesis is, therefore, not the question of whether Josephus could have used such sources, but in the certainty of proof in the question of the reconstructability of the sources accepted by Bergmeier. It lies in the “limits of the knowledge possible,” not least of which is the motto that Bergmeier used as a preface for his book.⁵⁹

(b) Josephus undoubtedly used sources in his works, and in many places he himself points out this fact.⁶⁰ In other places, where he certainly uses sources, such hints are missing. In this respect, of course, it is to be expected that Josephus also used and incorporated sources for the portrayal of epochs of which he himself has knowledge.⁶¹ However, if one wants to determine the

ic or other reasons, and to what extent other statistical observations must be added to mere word statistics so that the conclusions can be considered valid.

⁵⁷ Mason, *Flavius Josephus und das Neue Testament*, 108.

⁵⁸ Thus, the criticism in Mason, *Flavius Josephus und das Neue Testament*, 48.

⁵⁹ It deals with a citation from the great ancient historian Eduard Norden: “A look at the immense author indices of Pliny should not be missed by anyone who has to study sources so that he can learn to think more timidly beyond the limits of knowledge (E. North, “Josephus and Tacitus on Jesus Christ and a messianic prophecy,” in *To Josephus Research* (ed. A. Schalit; EdF 84; Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1973), 27–69, here 67.

⁶⁰ Concerning the question of sources in Josephus, see the summary of the older research in G. Hölscher, “Josephus,” *PRE* 9:1834–2000; Concerning the recent research, see L. H. Feldman, “A Selective Critical Bibliography of Josephus,” in *Josephus, the Bible, and History* (ed. G. Hata; Leiden: Brill, 1989), 330–448, here 400ff. See also the methodological considerations in D. R. Schwartz, *Reading the First Century: On Reading Josephus and Studying Jewish History of the First Century* (WUNT 300; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013).

⁶¹ In this sense, for example, B. H. Linder, *Die Geschichtsauffassung des Flavius Josephus im Bellum Judaicum. Gleichzeitig ein Beitrag zur Quellenfrage* (AGJU 12; Leiden: Brill, 1972), 95–132, tried to prove the existence of a continuous Flavian source in *J.W.* IV 659–VI 322 by inclusion in an older hypothesis. On this, see also K.-S. Krieger, *Geschichtsschreibung als Apologetik bei Flavius Josephus* (TANZ 9; Tübingen and Basel: Francke, 1994), 19, who thinks “it is difficult to refute that Josephus used Roman records in the presentation of military operations. But these had hardly any literary quality and were not at all published.” Concerning this source, cf. *Vita* 341f. and 358.

existence and the tendency of such sources more precisely, then this requires a comprehensive knowledge of the writing method of the respective author and his stylistic peculiarities. And especially if, according to recent research, Josephus is not to be regarded as a mere compiler but as an author, as an independent writing personality who does not take over his sources *en bloc* or only lightly retouches them, but reproduced the traditional messages with his own substantive accents and his own independent linguistic design, then the precise determination of the scope of the sources, their individual contents, or even their linguistic form is hardly methodologically possible. In this sense, Karl Heinrich Rengstorf states in the introduction of his great Josephus concordance that one can rarely determine with this author where he follows a source exactly or even selects it, and that “often it is not certain in an individual case whether he quotes or whether he paraphrased or even edited in a certain way and with a certain intention, thus he formulates it himself even though he admits to using a source.”⁶² It is, therefore, not surprising that Josephus research has lost its teeth with respect to the problem of sources.

(c) Bergmeier is in agreement with the criticism of the autobiographical report in *Vita* 8–12 where Josephus claims to have passed through the three religious parties of the Pharisees, Sadducees, and Essenes between the ages of 16–19 and then lived for three years with the ascetic Bannus until he returned to Jerusalem at the age of 19 and joined the Pharisees. First, this account is chronologically implausible and, second, full of literary commonplaces⁶³ about the “wonder child” and the philosophical “years of learning and wandering” of the young aristocrat. It is, therefore, unfounded to say that Josephus knew the religious parties of his time “all first-hand”⁶⁴ – he was certainly no Essene “novice” before joining the party of the Pharisees.

Nevertheless, as the offspring of an influential Jerusalem family, as an ally commander in Galilee, and as a later adviser to the Roman troops, Josephus must have known more about the balance of power in Palestine making it unlikely that his reports are based merely on book knowledge. Thus, Bergmeier’s concluding thesis that “the Hellenistic-Jewish way of thinking and living of the Judean Essaeans or Essenes [is] only a *literary* phenomenon”⁶⁵ seems to be a consistent conclusion from his stated source theory. But it is not yet decided whether the Essaeans or Essenes were also just a literary and not a historical phenomenon for Josephus himself. Historically, it is only

⁶² K. H. Rengstorf, *A Complete Concordance to Flavius Josephus I* (Leiden: Brill, 1973), XXVI.

⁶³ Thus S. J. D. Cohen, *Josephus in Galilee and Rome: His Vita and Development as a Historian* (CSCT 8; Leiden: Brill, 1979), 105–107; additionally, Bergmeier, *Die Essener-Berichte*, 20 n. 44; see also Mason, *Flavius Josephus und das Neue Testament*, 58–61.

⁶⁴ Thus C. K. Barrett and C.-J. Thornton, eds., *Texte zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments* (UTB 1591; Tübingen: UTB, 1991), 308.

⁶⁵ Bergmeier, *Die Essener-Berichte*, 120f.

probable that Josephus had a more or less concrete idea of the groups he described as Essaeans or Essenes and that he could somehow relate this idea to the familiar situation in Palestine before the year 70 CE.

(d) It is plausible that Josephus does not wish to designate different groups with the two terms Essaeans and Essenes. In any case, no distinction is made between the two. The phenomenon quoted by Bergmeier that “Essaeans and Essenes texts are unrelated to each other”⁶⁶ may well be considered an indication of the use of sources, but at the same time implies that Josephus wants to classify the notes on the Essaeans as well as those on the Essenes within one and the same framework. In support of this is Bergmeier's observation that Josephus, in his second work, the *Antiquities*, before the originally earliest testimony on the Essaeans, *Ant.* XIII 311–313, he presents a more general passage on the three philosophical schools (*Ant.* XIII 171–173) and introduces Judas as an Essene in XIII 311.⁶⁷ An even clearer proof is the immediate compilation of the note about the oath (which uses the name “Essaeon”) and the subsequent Manaem episode (which uses the name “Essene”) in *Ant.* XV 371f. and 373ff. It is precisely the passage in XV 372 which proves that Josephus wishes to use both names as a designation for the same group of individuals: He wants to say more about these people elsewhere (sc. the Essaeans, who were exempt from the oath), but (μὲν ... δέ) explain why Herod appreciated the Essenes and towards that goal introduces the following episode (sc. about Manaem the Essene).

Therefore, it is possible to agree with the thesis that the anecdotes about the prophetic Essaeon individuals, particularly the anecdotes about Judas and Simon (*J.W.* I 78–80 par. *Ant.* XVII 345–348), originate from a source. Both talk about Essaeans (not of Essenes), both are relatively loosely embedded in their context, and both are narrative from a non-Jewish, paradoxographical⁶⁸ perspective. It is a legitimate conjecture – admittedly little more than that – to attribute these anecdotes to the world history written by Nicolaus of Damascus which was one of the sources of Josephus.⁶⁹

For the Manaem anecdote (*Ant.* XV 373–379), the facts are not as clear. Here, Josephus speaks of an Essene, although the note of the freedom from the oath is previously spoken of for the Essaeans (*Ant.* XV 371f.). Whether the anecdote actually comes from another source – as suggested by Bergmeier on the basis of the strong Hellenistic-Jewish perspective and the factual references to *J.W.* II 159⁷⁰ – or whether Josephus, who here (*Ant.* XV 372,

⁶⁶ Bergmeier, *Die Essener-Berichte*, 13.

⁶⁷ Bergmeier, *Die Essener-Berichte*, 13.

⁶⁸ Bergmeier, *Die Essener-Berichte*, 17: Josephus himself points to paradoxographic contexts, see *J.W.* I 78; *Ant.* XIII 311.

⁶⁹ Bergmeier, *Die Essener-Berichte*, 18, with reference to other authors.

⁷⁰ Bergmeier, *Die Essener-Berichte*, 18.

379) as well as in the Judas anecdote (*J.W.* I 78; *Ant.* XIII 311) refers to the paradoxographical contexts, in which the continuance of this narrative has intervened, can no longer be said with certainty. Nevertheless, it too could have been available to Josephus.

The historical value of these anecdotes has not yet been decided. Certain features cannot be dismissed out of hand, despite their anecdotal design:

First, it should be noted that in *J.W.* I 78–80, an *Essaios* is mentioned for the first time in Josephus' work in the context of the story of Aristobulus and Antigonus, which occurred in 104–103 BCE.⁷¹ The fact that this *Essaios* Judas appears with his disciples in the temple area is not at all an insurmountable problem,⁷² considering that the separation of the Essenes from the sacrificial cult (cf. *Ant.* XVIII 19) must by no means have precluded entering the temple district for teaching and prayer.⁷³ The prophecies reported by Judas and Simon, of course, cannot be directly connected with the interpretation of Scripture known from the Qumran texts – the episode of Judas, the *Essaios*, primarily highlights the predictive accuracy of this pious man, and the Simon anecdote shows at best a loose reference to Joseph's dreams in Gen 40⁷⁴ and has a greater proximity to Artemidoros' pagan interpretation of dreams.⁷⁵ On the other hand, it cannot be overlooked that in both cases there is a concrete, political prophecy: a divine judgement against a ruler is present. Judas prophesizes the approaching death of the king's brother, Antigonus,⁷⁶ and Simon interprets a dream about the imminent deposition of Archelaus. The same applies to the Manaem episode *Ant.* XV 373–379: An Essene predicts "the kingship to the young Herod, which at the same time precedes the downfall of the Hasmoneans."⁷⁷ From this, we see that all three episodes are

⁷¹ In *Ant.* XIII 298, the Essenes are already mentioned within the context of the origin of John Hyrcannus (135–104 BCE).

⁷² Contra Bergmeier, *Die Essener-Berichte*, 15, who considers the contradiction at *Ant.* XVIII 19 a further indication of the lack of the unrelated nature of the texts about the Essaeans and Essenes. Other authors suppose that the separation of the Essenes from the temple had not yet taken place during the period of time in question, thus, for example, B. O. Michel and O. Bauernfeind, eds., *Flavius Josephus: De Bello Judaico – Der Jüdische Krieg I* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1959), 406.

⁷³ Cf. Stegemann, *Die Essener*, 244f.

⁷⁴ This was pointed out by R. Beckwith, "The Significance of the Calendar for Interpreting Essene Chronology and Eschatology," *RevQ* 10 (1980): 167–202, here 201; cf. T. S. Beall, *Josephus' Description*, 109.

⁷⁵ In this sense, cf. already M. Hengel, *Judentum und Hellenismus* (3rd ed.; WUNT 10; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1988), 439f. with note 775 taken up in Bergmeier, *Die Essener-Berichte*, 16.

⁷⁶ Cf. M. Hengel, *Die Zeloten* (2nd ed.; AGJU 1; Leiden and Köln: Brill, 1976), 242 n. 1, who points out that the visit to the temple, immediately after the campaign (*Ant.* XIII 304–306), could be understood as sacrilegious.

⁷⁷ Hengel, *Die Zeloten*, loc. cit.

formulated from an external perspective and mantic skills are often considered part of the image of pious personalities.⁷⁸ But at the same time, we cannot deny a certain connection with the respective, contemporary situation.

(e) For the second source – the *doxographic Three-Schools-Source* – postulated by Bergmeier, there is positive evidence. Josephus uses this schema to describe the Jewish religious parties as philosophical schools and connect it in several places with the three Greek schools of the Stoics, Epicureans, and Pythagoreans, which is done for obvious apologetic motives: He wants to set the “forth” party (*Ant.* XVIII 9, 23) of the Zealots, which goes back to Judas the Galilean, against the other three schools and to maintain the honor of Judaism by demonstrating that this party of insurgents has nothing in common with the traditional religious parties of the Pharisees, Sadducees, and Essenes (*J.W.* II 118; cf. *Ant.* XVIII 9).⁷⁹ Thus, the talk of the “fourth” school certainly arises from Josephus; the talk of the others is always in a list (although the sequence is not consistent⁸⁰) and a description that is *doxographically* oriented on the teaching about fate (*heimarmene*) and perhaps also on the immortality of the soul.⁸¹ That the detailed description of the Essenes in *J.W.* II 119–161 is beyond the scope of the presentation of the three schools is to be regarded – in agreement with Bergmeier – as a strong argument that the three schools schema was already extant for Josephus as a source. It makes sense to regard the orientation of the representation of the doctrine of the *heimarmene* as an indication of the source’s Stoic character.⁸²

Admittedly, the scope and literary form of the source cannot be determined further. In this respect, it is also not possible to determine the source’s origin. However, the strong *interpretatio graeca* of the doctrines of the three groups concerning predestination and freedom as well as the “soul” (or the resurrection), in my opinion, does not require a non-Jewish origination;⁸³ rather, such a presentation can be sufficiently explained by the apologetics and propagan-

⁷⁸ Nicolaus of Damascus also attributed the mantic abilities to the Pharisees (*Ant.* XVII 41–43), on this, see Bergmeier, *Die Essener-Berichte*, 56.

⁷⁹ On this point, see Hengel, *Die Zeloten*, 79ff.

⁸⁰ *J.W.* II 119 and *Ant.* XIII 171: Pharisees – Sadducees – Essenes, similarly in *Vita* 10; *Ant.* XVIII 11: Essenes – Sadducees – Pharisees.

⁸¹ The sequence of the description also varies: In *J.W.* II 119–165, the Essenes are presented (in great detail), followed by the Pharisees and the Sadducees. In *Ant.* XIII 171–173, the Pharisees are listed first, then the Essenes, and the Sadducees are placed at the end. In *Ant.* XVIII 14–18, the sequence is Pharisees – Sadducees – Essenes, which is also the sequence in *Vita* 10.

⁸² Cf. Bergmeier, *Die Essener-Berichte*, 60; cf. already idem, *Glaube als Gabe nach Johannes* (WMANT 112; Stuttgart et al.: Kohlhammer, 1980), 57.

⁸³ One such origin is suggested by Bergmeier, *Die Essener-Berichte*, 60, when he ascribes the designation of Jews as philosophers to the oldest Hellenistic writers. But such an external view should always correspond to a self-representation, which seeks to convey a corresponding philosophical image to outsiders.

da of Hellenistic Judaism. This is all the more true if the statements of the source – albeit “in Hellenistic ... alienation”⁸⁴ – show quite adequate knowledge, particularly with regard to the differences between Pharisees and Sadducees, but also with regard to the Essene view of predestination.⁸⁵ However, Bergmeier rightly points out that this could “not be done ... without comparison with other sources, especially authentic ones.”⁸⁶

More problematic, however, are the other two sources postulated by Bergmeier, which are particularly concerned with the larger report about the Essenes in *J.W.* II 119–161. For these two sources, the proof does not appear to me to be convincing.

(f) For the *Hellenistic-Jewish Esseans Source*, Bergmeier supposes that it should have been available to Philo and Josephus equally. The fact that there are overlaps in the material in both authors as well as overlaps in individual common formulations has been perceived by researchers for a long time and attempts have been made to explain them with various hypotheses. Bauer supposed that Josephus was dependent upon Philo, knowing that this could not be philologically proven;⁸⁷ Bergmeier considers such dependency unlikely because “the language and style of Josephus’ texts ... [are] independent ... of Philo’s.”⁸⁸ However, this immediately raises the question as to whether Josephus only formulated independent of Philo or whether such independence should not be presupposed in relationship to another possible source, which would make proving it considerably more difficult. Formulated differently, should it be the case that only Philo utilized his source with such great free-

⁸⁴ Thus, Bergmeier, *Die Essener-Berichte*, 64.

⁸⁵ Of course, this applies only if one is allowed to associate the Essenes described here with the Qumran community and the texts derived from it and their concept of predestination. On the conception of predestination in the “Essene” texts from Qumran, see the detailed work of A. Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination. Weisheitliche Urordnung und Prädestination in den Textfunden von Qumran* (STDJ 18; Leiden, New York and Köln: Brill, 1995).

⁸⁶ Bergmeier, *Die Essener-Berichte*, 66.

⁸⁷ A dependence of Philo on Josephus has also been supposed by T. Rajak, “Ciò che Flavio Giuseppe vide,” which is presented in a differentiated way: For *Ant.* XVIII, Rajak accepts a dependence on *Prob.*, primarily because of the numerical data of 4000 Essenes (Rajak, “Ciò che Flavio Giuseppe vide,” 147f.), whereas in *J.W.* II he refers only to Philo’s models with respect to the manner of presentation, and to the idealizing conception, but not in the individual material (Rajak, “Ciò che Flavio Giuseppe vide,” 154f.). Unlike Bergmeier, Rajak reckons with a higher portion of proper knowledge in Josephus’ extensive account on the Essenes (Rajak, “Ciò che Flavio Giuseppe vide,” 156ff.). Of course, with regard to both views, the problem arises as to why Josephus offers so little material in his later work, the *Antiquities* than in the (better informed) *J.W.* (cf. below at n. 98). An explanation, which reflects the different literary situations of both works is much more historically plausible than one that remains at the source-critical level.

⁸⁸ Bergmeier, *Die Essener-Berichte*, 38f.

dom “that it is often difficult to determine where the source ends and Philo begins,”⁸⁹ or would this not have also been the true for Josephus?⁹⁰ And can we then turn the parallels into a common source or even delimit its existence?

If we look more closely at the parallels with the help of Bergmeier's synopsis, a rough correspondence is found in numerous *topoi*, including following the order in *J.W.* II 119ff. the names given to the group, abstinence, marriage, slavery, communal property, trade, oath, and Sabbath. The impressive list of parallels, however, is put into perspective by the fact that the sequence of *topoi*⁹¹ in the various texts of Philo (*Apol.* 1–18 and *Prob.* 75–91) varies considerably in part,⁹² and the linguistic parallels are not very close: There are hardly any sustained parallels in phrasing between the two authors; only occasionally are the same lexemes used, more frequently stem-related lexemes. From this finding, the question of a presumed⁹³ source can be hardly proven with certainty. There is not enough material to determine its scope and literary character. For such conclusions, both authors (Philo and Josephus) are much too eclectic and independent.⁹⁴

A problem for the assumption of a common source remains that Philo speaks consistently of Essaeans, while Josephus in his larger reports speaks of Essenes. Bergmeier is therefore obliged to assume that Josephus has replaced the name Ἐσσαῖοι in *J.W.* II 119–161 as well as in the Manaem episode by the name form Ἐσσηνοί taken over from the Three-Schools-Source.⁹⁵ However, this assumption hardly makes sense, since Josephus would have been anything but consistent in this case. In fact, he has repeatedly retained the name Ἐσσαῖοι (presumably from the source of the corresponding pieces), and in *Ant.* XV 371ff. both terms are left side by side with-

⁸⁹ Bergmeier, *Die Essener-Berichte*, 39.

⁹⁰ Cf. the above-cited remarks by K. H. Rengstorf in n. 62.

⁹¹ Bergmeier, *Die Essener-Berichte*, 26ff.

⁹² Unfortunately, this is obscured in Bergmeier's synopsis because it compiles the statements of Philo's various texts into a single column, wherein the picture is “filled up” for *Apol.* by additional information from *Prob.* Methodologically, it would be more accurate to compare each passage separately with each other (as in Bilde, “The Essenes in Philo and Josephus”). This affects, for example, the conclusion of the source postulated by Bergmeier with statements about “reactions of political powers to the Essene community ... on the one hand honoring them” (Philo, *Apol.* 18; Josephus *Ant.* XV 378) and “on the other hand persecuting them” (Philo, *Prob.* 89f.; Josephus *J.W.* II 152f.). Here, statements that are distributed across four different texts are combined in an inappropriately bold manner.

⁹³ One such supposition – of course not more – is also expressed by Hengel, *Qumran und der Hellenismus*, 340 (= 264).

⁹⁴ If it were unthinkable in New Testament exegesis to reconstruct Mark from Matthew and Luke, how was it possible to reconstruct a common source from such independently working authors such as Philo and Josephus?

⁹⁵ Bergmeier, *Die Essener-Berichte*, 67.

in a tight context. It is, therefore, difficult to understand why he changed the name here. Therefore, Bergmeier's thesis remains an implausible speculation.

Josephus' literary handling of the source assumed by Bergmeier cannot be conclusively explained, its textual content and its linguistic form can no longer be determined precisely, and it remains unsure which statements about the Essaeans or Essenes of the (idealizing) tendency can be attributed to this source and which statements go back to Philo's or Josephus' design.

(g) The problems multiply for Bergmeier's presupposed fourth source, the *Pythagorizing Essenes source* to which Josephus owes the main part of his Essene references in the second book of his *Jewish War*. Its textual content results precisely from the subtraction of all the passages attributable to the "Three-Schools-Source" and the "Hellenistic Jewish Essaeans source" from the large units on the Essenes in *J.W.* II 119–161 and *Ant.* XVIII 18–22.⁹⁶ Here, without any further external arguments, the division and attribution of the text becomes necessarily circular.

The duplicate traditions to which Bergmeier additionally refers do not provide a valid argument for the use of different sources.⁹⁷ Furthermore, the observation that some elements of Philo's report about the Therapeutai in *De vita contemplativa* are uniquely paralleled in the report on the Essenes in *J.W.* II (and not in *Ant.* XVIII)⁹⁸ cannot be interpreted as support for the assumption of a source different from the previously postulated source.⁹⁹ Although parallels from texts about the Pythagoreans are indeed illuminating for the determination of the tendency of the presentation, these external arguments cannot contribute to the proof of the existence of a separate pythagorizing

⁹⁶ Bergmeier, *Die Essener-Berichte*, 79.

⁹⁷ Cf. Bergmeier, *Die Essener-Berichte*, 80. Important to mention are the references to communal goods *J.W.* II 122 and *Ant.* XVII 20 (where also the number of 4,000 men is repeated – should that have been in two sources?), the administrators *J.W.* II 123 and *Ant.* XVIII 22, and the mention of immortality *J.W.* II 154–158 and (very briefly!) *Ant.* XVIII 18. The statements about studying the Scriptures and prophecy *J.W.* II 139 and 159 do not really constitute a duplication so that the only the duplication that remains is the statement about marriage in *J.W.* II 120f and 160f (though related to different groups) and in *Ant.* XVIII only in the sense of *J.W.* II 120f. However, the duplications between the report in *J.W.* II and in *Ant.* XVIII are not compelling enough for the assumption of different sources since the author in his later text (*Ant.*) could have his earlier writing and perhaps also the sources used for its drafting available.

⁹⁸ Cf. the table in Bergmeier, *Die Essener-Berichte*, 46–48.

⁹⁹ After all, one must ask here why Josephus did not repeat these passages from *J.W.* in *Ant.* Did he no longer have access to the one source but only to the other? Or was the literary interest of the author different than Josephus'? As soon as one determines Josephus is an *author*, a multitude of new possibilities and questions arise. See, in this sense, Rajak, "Ciò che Flavio Giuseppe vide," 148f. and 159f.). Bergmeier's source-critical construction sounds plausible only as long as one discards with Josephus as author, his knowledge, and his literary interest.

source. If, in the statements which Bergmeier wishes to assign to this source, there is a particular density of factual correspondences with the Qumran texts¹⁰⁰ and thus a concrete background in the doctrine and *praxis* of an existing group is obvious, then the precise assignment of these passages to a literary source becomes even more difficult.

In my opinion, the limits of the possibility of a source-critical reconstruction are overextended at this point. The hypothesis of a shared use of the Pythagorean source by Philo in his description of the Therapeutai (but not in his other Essene texts) and by Josephus in *J.W.* II (but not in his later *Antiquities*) is a bold construction, whose validation from the available material probably cannot succeed. Finally, it is even more speculative that Pliny's note is also based on this source and has a parallel in the – also geographically oriented – *Vorlage* of Philo's Therapeutai text.¹⁰¹

As plausible as it is that Josephus draws from sources in his extended report on the Essenes, which far exceeds the pattern of the three schools, neither the origin of the material in detail nor the textual content of the alleged source(s), nor Josephus' portion can be recognized with sufficient certainty. Throughout is a moment of idealization of the community described here, and whether one can strictly separate between the philosophical stylization (according to a Hellenistic-Jewish picture) and the stylization after a fictional image of the Pythagoreans fiction (e.g., in the notes on the four ranks of the Essenes, their longevity, frugality, and immortality¹⁰²) remains doubtful. Of course, in all these statements there is no appreciation for the central theological concerns of the Qumran community and their priestly desire for purity, and other *topoi* such as the belief in immortality (*J.W.* II 154f.) and the "worship of the sun" of the Essenes (*J.W.* II 128) probably occur in a Hellenistic or pythagorizing distortion. But this is still no sure indication of a division of the material into different sources, especially since it must first be noted that the Judean priest Flavius Josephus was obviously able to make these statements without correcting them as a clearly intolerable distortion of Jewish thought but apparently considered them appropriate in view of his Roman readers.

With regard to the source assignment of the Essene passages in Josephus, many questions remain open after the analysis of Roland Bergmeier. The

¹⁰⁰ This is shown in Bergmeier, *Die Essener-Berichte*, 94–104.

¹⁰¹ Bergmeier, *Die Essener-Berichte*, 44f. and 107. The considerations about the Dead Sea and Lake Mariout reveal the problems that are present here. If the geographic confusion has already taken place in the source, how does Pliny come to the "correct" assignment to the Dead Sea? If the source spoke of the Essenes at the Dead Sea, then the confusion must attributed to Philo, and the question arises as to why Josephus – if he has used this source – does not at all speak of the Essenes at the Dead Sea. Here, the hypothesis building gets entangled in irreconcilable aporia.

¹⁰² *J.W.* II 150f., 154; see Bergmeier, *Die Essener-Berichte*, 104.

greatest value of the work seems to me to be that it has again demonstrated the complexity of the problems and the limits of possibilities for solutions.

For the *historical* value of the reports about the Essenes, the old problems remain. In fact, the question of the historical value of the ancient reports about the Essenes seems to be unsolvable unless one is able to use primary sources for comparison and, with their help, to specify the degree of *interpretation graeca* or *pythagorica*. Without this possibility, the extant aporia have already become clear in the older research, and at this point Bergmeier's source-analysis does not go beyond the earlier attempts.

Of course, a fundamental insight should not be ignored, and it should be valid even if the distinction between the different sources in the passage on the Essenes in *J.W.* II is not as precise as Bergmeier wants to assume: The Hellenizing and, above all, the Pythagorizing traits of the reports about the Essenes are rooted in the idealizing or typifying presentation of the ancient authors or their sources. These traits (and among them the always "offensive" point concerning the worship of the sun in *J.W.* II 128¹⁰³) were thus attributed to the Essenes from an external perspective.¹⁰⁴ Therefore, it is really obsolete to ask about the Pythagorean influences on the Essenes themselves.¹⁰⁵ The pythagorizing Essenes – which were heavily debated in the older research – are, in this respect, really a literary phenomenon and should be distinguished from the historical group of the Essenes.

E. The Ancient Reports about the Essenes and the Library of Qumran

What can be historically said about the Essenes on the basis of the ancient reports about them remains uncertain as long as no other sources can provide clearer information. If, however, primary sources are available, then the secondary sources – which do not report first-hand but from different external

¹⁰³ Bergmeier himself points to the fact that the observations in this regard gave rise to his own analyses (*Die Esserner-Berichte*, 5).

¹⁰⁴ To what extent one must postulate a non-Jewish identity for this external perspective or must reckon with such views within (Hellenistic) Judaism is an open question. The example of Josephus shows how such a view could have been received within Judaism and used apologetically.

¹⁰⁵ For Hellenism as such, however, this is not true. Here, even in the debate, there are parallels, see Hengel, *Qumran and Hellenism*; cf. also the demonstration of formal analogies of the community structures in the Rule texts from Qumran with Hellenistic organizational structures in M. Weinfeld, *The Organizational Pattern and the Penal Code of the Qumran Sect: A Comparison with Guilds and Religious Communities of the Hellenistic-Roman Period* (NTOA 2; Fribourg and Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986).

perspectives – can and must be critically evaluated.¹⁰⁶ However, priority is given to the primary sources.¹⁰⁷ So if it can be established with sufficient certainty that the texts attributed to the Qumran tradents, to the יַהַד (*yahad*), are original Essene testimonies, then one will have to take into account the historical value of the secondary testimonies – regardless of whether or not they used information from a source or from Josephus himself – for the historical clarification and to determine the historical value of the secondary sources in light of the primary sources. In this case, then, Josephus and Philo offer “good examples of a verifiable *interpretatio graeca* of Jewish events.”¹⁰⁸

The question of whether we have primary Essene sources in the Qumran texts (and which texts from the library of Qumran can be considered as such) has been discussed again and again ever since the first discovery of Qumran and the development of the “Qumran Essene hypothesis”¹⁰⁹ by the first generation of Qumran researchers. Numerous publications from the 1990s and early 2000s as well as the attempts at a reappraisal of the archaeological finds have revived the discussion about the sustainability of that “majority hypothesis.”¹¹⁰ While the majority of the attempts to problematize the “Essene hypothesis” accept the ancient reports about the Essenes rather uncritically¹¹¹ and primarily place them alongside the Qumran texts and the archaeological finds, Bergmeier took on the other side by exposing problems with the uniformity of the Essene image extracted from the ancient testimonies. At the

¹⁰⁶ This is also practiced by Bergmeier when he asks the individual sources about their relation to the Qumran texts (*Die Essener-Berichte*, 49ff.). At this point, there is a methodological consensus.

¹⁰⁷ The problem is methodologically similar to the question of the relationship between the true Pauline letters and the account of Paul in Acts.

¹⁰⁸ C. Burchard, “Vorwort,” in *Antike Berichte*, V.

¹⁰⁹ The first researcher who expressed this thesis – apparently on the basis of Pliny’s text – was the Israeli editor of the first three scrolls from Cave 1, Eleazar Lipa Sukenik in a book that appeared in Ivrit entitled *יהודה במדבר יהודה ונמצה ונמונה קדומה ננוה מתוך ננוה* (Jerusalem: Bialik Foundation, 1948), 1:16f. (on this, see Stegemann, *The Qumran Essenes*, 83). The hypothesis was then accepted by numerous researchers and further developed, among others, by the excavator of the Qumran ruins, Roland de Vaux (cf. H. Stegemann, *The Qumran Essenes*, 86ff.; J. C. VanderKam, “Identity and History of the Community,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years* [ed. P. W. Flint and J. C. VanderKam; Leiden, Boston, and Köln: Brill, 1999], 2:487–533, here 2:488–490).

¹¹⁰ See n. 2 for the literature specified there.

¹¹¹ For example, Cansdale, *Qumran and the Essenes*, 192, can speak of a “community of Essenes, as defined by the ancient authors” (emphasis mine) and then deny such to Qumran. In view of the tendencies of the ancient authors (and their sources), it cannot be about simply transferring a somehow “defined” image from the ancient testimonies to the Qumran community. Concerning the otherwise extremely flawed work of Cansdale, see the critical reviews by J. Magness in *DJD* 5 (1998): 99–104 and A. Lange in *TLZ* 124 (1999): 391–393.

same time, “the possibility of a simple equation between the ‘Essenes’ and the ‘Qumran community’ ... was called into question in a new way”¹¹² because, as a consequence of his analysis of sources, the traditional picture of the Essenes disintegrates into a number of individual notes and pictures of different origin and value so that the final question is whether one is even permitted speak of the Essenes as a coherent historical group within ancient Judaism or whether such a judgment and the accompanying identification with the tradents of the Qumran library is prohibited for source-critical reasons.

Of course, Bergmeier himself does not draw the conclusion that the Qumran texts have nothing to do with the “Essenes.” Rather, he undertakes extensive, detailed comparisons and assumes that the Pythagorean Essenes source (or its unknown author) “actually had knowledge about Qumran”¹¹³ or the related communities. However, the knowledge of the author Josephus is widely regarded as book knowledge, which permits no further historical evaluation and even Bergmeier’s investigations into the literary intentions and tendencies of the authors Philo and Josephus fail to establish his claim of the presumed tendencies of the collected sources.

In this critical overview of Bergmeier’s source analysis, I have attempted to point out the problems of this approach, which lags behind the insights of more recent Josephus research.¹¹⁴ Other – mostly less detailed – investigations on the subject that do not ignore the question of possible sources,¹¹⁵ but consider the literary intentions of Philo and Josephus and partly the probability of Josephus’ personal knowledge,¹¹⁶ offer a less one-sided perspective here. If one supposes with these approaches that the author Josephus must have had at least a certain idea of the “Essenes” or the “Essaeans” as a group living in Palestine, which cannot simply be reduced to book knowledge, then it might still make sense to inquire about the Essenes as a historical phenomenon on the basis of the critical comparison between the ancient testimonies and the Qumran texts. Therefore, in the following, I intent to provide a sketch that will indicate to what extent the tradents of the Qumran library can also

¹¹² J. Maier, “Die Qumrangemeinde im Rahmen des frühen Judentums,” in *Die Schriftrollen von Qumran: Zur aufregenden Geschichte ihrer Erforschung und Deutung* (ed. S. Talmon; Regensburg: Pustet, 1998), 51–70, here 54f.

¹¹³ Bergmeier, *Die Essener-Berichte*, 54f.

¹¹⁴ See the criticism of Mason, *Flavius Josephus und das Neue Testament*, 48f.

¹¹⁵ For example, Bilde, *The Essenes in Philo und Josephus*, 61.

¹¹⁶ Bilde, *The Essenes in Philo und Josephus*, 62f. (cf. also P. Bilde *Flavius Josephus between Jerusalem and Rome. His Live, his Works, and their Importance* [JSPS 2; Sheffield: T&T Clark, 1988], 173–206) and Rajak, “Ciò che Flavio Guiseppe vide.”

be connected with the Essenes of the ancient testimonies, even after and in light of Bergmeier's work:¹¹⁷

(a) The designation "Essenes" (or "Essaeans") is never used in the ancient testimonies as a self-designation of a corresponding group. It only occurs in Philo, Pliny, and Josephus and possibly in their sources as a *foreign designation*. Whether the relevant circles used the same designation or not is uncertain and improbable in light of the Qumran texts in which other terms are used for the *yahad*. A connection with the Ἀσιδαῖοι (= חסידיים, "Hasideans" = "the pious ones") of the Maccabean era (1 Macc 2:42; 7:13; 2 Macc 14:6) is conceivable, but the group thus designated is in no way identical with the later Qumran community, the *yahad*, even if the *yahad* was constituted from the circles of the Hasideans of the Maccabean area and could have received a corresponding designation.¹¹⁸ To be considered is, then, an explanation of Ἐσσαῖοι as the Greek reproduction of the Aramaic *status-determinatus* form of חסייא (*h^asayyā* = the pious ones) and of Ἐσσηνοί as a transcription of the plural *status-absolutus* form of חסיין (*h^asin*). Historically,¹¹⁹ this association has long been a more plausible explanation of the designation Ἐσσαῖοι or Ἐσσηνοί than the attempts to derive the name from the Greek ὅσιοι "the holy ones" (thus already in Philo), from אסיא ('*asyā* = "healer"),¹²⁰ עשה (see 1QpHab VII 11: עושי התורה: '*ōsey ha-tōrah* = "those who do the Torah"),¹²¹ from the name of the geographical place Ἐσσα (thus, "the people from Essa"),¹²² or even from the ascetics in the Ephesian temple of Artemis who were

¹¹⁷ Of course, one should not talk about a simple equation, especially since the period of validity of the respective statements cannot be determined unequivocally: For the news of the reports of the ancient Essene texts, it is unclear to which time and situation of the group they refer. Also, the Qumran community the Rule texts in particular, along with their redaction history, show that one must reckon with the changes in individual structures and determinations over the course of time.

¹¹⁸ Concerning the συναγωγὴ Ἀσιδαίων (עדת חסידיים), see Stegemann, "The Qumran Essenes," 144–146, 158–160.

¹¹⁹ Cf. Hengel, "Qumran und der Hellenismus," 319f.; R. Meyer, "Σαδδουκαῖος," *ThWNT* 7:39 n. 26.

¹²⁰ G. Vermes, "The Etymology of 'Essenes,'" *RevQ* 2 (1959–60): 427–443, cf. the talk of θεραπεισταί in Philo, *Contempl.* 1 and *Prob.* 12 or also Jos. *J.W.* II 136.

¹²¹ See, for example, S. Goranson, "'Essenes': Etymology from עשה," *RevQ* 11 (1984): 483–498; idem, "Essenes," in *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Archaeology in the Near East* (ed. E. M. Meyers; New York: Oxford, 1997), 2:268; VanderKam, "Identity and History," 494–499.

¹²² Cf. R. Bergmeier, "Die Leute aus Essa," *ZDPV* 113 (1997): 75–87, who, following an old observation by A. Hilgenfeld, wants to interpret Ἐσσαῖος as an ancestral name and bring it together with the city of Gerasa. However, this creates a rather daring double-name hypothesis.

called ἑσσηνεῖς.¹²³ For some time there were philological reservations because an Aramaic equivalent to the Syriac *ḥasi* (= pious) was not provable in Judaism at the time.¹²⁴

More recently, the texts of the Qumran library have provided further clues that may very well explain the long-debated question of etymology: In the *Aramaic Levi Document* (4Q213a 3–4, 6), which was probably written before the founding of the *yahad*, the form חסייה occurs as a reference for the “pious ones.”¹²⁵ On the other hand, the Hebrew equivalent חסיד, precisely the plural form חסידים, occurs in a letter dated to 134 or 135 CE from the Wadi Murabba‘at (Mur 45 6) as a part of a name of a location מצדה חסידים (*mšd ḥsydyn* = fortress of the pious ones), which the editor J. T. Milik had even used to refer to the ruins of Qumran.¹²⁶ Even if the reference of this passage to the ruins of Qumran and with it the reference of *ḥsydyn* or *ḥsydym* to their (former) residents cannot be guaranteed, the document offers another piece of support for the proposed etymology.¹²⁷

If Flavius Josephus uses the terms Ἐσσηνοί and Ἐσσηαῖοι, possibly on the basis of different sources, but clearly for one and the same group of which he himself should have at least had a rudimentary knowledge as a witness, then it confirms *a posteriori* that this movement – regardless of all the internal differentiations and the historical developments – could be detected as a coherent religious party (ἄλφησις).

¹²³ Cf. J. Kampen, *The Hasideans and the Origins of Pharisaism: A Study in 1 and 2 Maccabees* (SBLSCS 24; Atlanta: SBL, 1988), 174; idem, “A Reconsideration of the Name ‘Essene’ in Greco-Jewish Literature in Light of Recent Perceptions of the Qumran Sect,” *HUCA* 57 (1986): 61–81; A. H. Jones, *Essenes: The Elect of Israel and the Priests of Artemis* (Lanham: University Press of America, 1985); cf. also the considerations in Bergmeier, *Die Essener-Berichte*, 119f., where the author still considered it conceivable that the name was formed on the basis of that of ἑσσηνεῖς; however, against this, see idem, “Die Leute aus Essa,” 75.

¹²⁴ Thus the objection in Schürer, Vermes, and Millar, *History*, 2.559.

¹²⁵ Cf. A. Lange, “Essener,” *NP* 4 (1998), 141; see the text by M. E. Stone and J. C. Greenfield, “Aramaic Levi Document,” in *Qumran Cave 4 XVII: Parabiblical Texts*, Part 3 (ed. G. Brooke, et al.; DJD 22; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), 1–72, here 33: ולא מתמחה שם חסיה מן כול עמתיא [א] לעלם “and the name of the pious ones will not be extinguished forever” (4Q213a frags. 3–4, line 6). Moreover, the Philonic explanation of the name by reference to the ὄσοι may also be indicative of an Aramaic root. On this, see R. Meyer, “Σαδδουκαῖος,” *ThWNT* 7:39; Hengel, *Judentum und Hellenismus*, 319. – Stone and Greenfield (“Aramaic Levi Document”) indicate that the root is also attested in old Aramaic, namely in the Carpentras-Stele (KAI Num. 269).

¹²⁶ Thus the interpretation of J. T. Milik, “45. Lettre,” in *Les grottes de Murabba‘at* (ed. P. Benoit, J. T. Milik, and R. de Vaux; DJD 2; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1961), 163f. (with plate XLVII).

¹²⁷ So also A. Lange, “Essener,” *NP* 4 (1998), 141. If the reference at the ruins of Qumran is applicable, then this means that during the Bar Kochba era in the circles of the insurgents one knew of a branch of the “pious ones,” *ḥsydym*, in the area of Qumran.

(b) That there was a close connection between the Qumran texts and the users of the compounds of Ein Feshka and Khirbet Qumran should not be denied today. This is supported, on the one hand, by the ceramics found in the caves, in particular by the jugs used to store the rolls that are identical to the jugs found in the settlement and probably also made there.¹²⁸ Secondly, the ostrakon found *in situ* in the settlement which – corresponding entirely to the situation in 1QS I 12 – mentions the transfer of a new member’s possession to the *yahad* (wherein, unfortunately, the word *yahad* can only be read with considerable uncertainty).¹²⁹ Finally, the fact that a specific community belongs to the texts is confirmed by a fragment (4Q477: Rebukes by the Overseers) that provides a list of individuals who had been notified according to the rules in CD/4QD and 1/4QS, and thus confirms that the rules of these rule texts were practiced by the users of the library.¹³⁰

(c) The connection between the Qumran texts and their group of tradents, on the one hand, and the ἀῤρησις of the Essenes/Essaeans in the Essene-references in Josephus, on the other hand, must be determined on the basis of a comparison with the texts of the Qumran library and the ancient reports about the Essenes. Their similarities and differences were most recently listed in detail and discussed by Todd S. Beall – albeit too uncritically.¹³¹ Since the Qumran texts do not have a uniform picture in themselves and the reports about the Essenes are problematic to evaluate, substantial additional considerations are required for both text corpora: As significant for the tradents of the Qumran library are only those texts that, due to certain characteristics, can be expected to be composed within this community.¹³² These texts, in particular the rule texts (1QS and parallels, 1QSa, CD and 4QD and 4QMMT), offer a variegated picture in many individual regulations, which should probably be interpreted with regard to an inner diversity of this group or in the sense of a historical development.¹³³ On the other hand, in the evalu-

¹²⁸ Cf. R. de Vaux, *Archaeology and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (London: Oxford University, 1973), 52–55; J. Magness, “The Community at Qumran in Light of its Pottery,” in *Methods of Investigation of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Khirbet Qumran Site: Present Realities and Future Prospects* (Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences 722; New York: New York Academy of Sciences, 1994), 39–50, here 40.

¹²⁹ See F. M. Cross and E. Eshel, “Ostraca from Khirbet Qumrân,” *IEJ* 47 (1997): 17–28; F. M. Cross, “The Missing Link: Does a New Inscription Establish a Connection between Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls?” *BAR* 24 (1998): 48–53, here 69.

¹³⁰ Concerning this text, see E. Eshel, “4Q477: The Rebukes by the Overseer,” *JJS* 45 (1994): 111–122.

¹³¹ Beall, *Josephus’ Description of the Essenes*.

¹³² See the contributions by A. Lange and C. Hempel in *Qumran kontrovers* (ed. J. Frey and H. Stegemann; Bonifatius: Paderborn, 2003).

¹³³ This is documented by regulations in the catalogs of penalties that differ between 1QS and 4QS, or by the modification of individual terms used to describe the organization within the manuscript 1QS, which are explained in terms of editorial development. On this,

ation of the Essene texts, the tendencies in the presentation of the ancient authors and/or their sources must be taken into account to a greater extent than has been the case in previous research.

The discussion of the many similarities and differences between the passages on the Essenes in Josephus (primarily *J.W.* II) and the group-specific texts from Qumran cannot be exhaustively taken up here. Of particular importance in favor of the argument for a close connection between Josephus' depiction of the Essenes and their relation to Qumran are not so much the "idealizable" statements about communal property, community meals, or the ritual of admission, but rather the following two notes:

- The rejection of oil, which Josephus testified to but insufficiently explained – that is to say from an external perspective – seems to describe a behavior that can be explained by the regulations of individual Qumran texts that testify to the idea that oil transfers ritual impurity (CD XII 15–17; 4Q513 13 4; cf. 4QMMT B 55–58).¹³⁴
- The prohibition testified to by Josephus (*J.W.* II 147) against spitting "into the midst [of the community] or to the right side" has a very striking parallel in 1QS VII 13, according to which a man who spits in the middle of the meeting of the full members is to be punished.

Such factually rather marginal but therefore all the more significant similarities in statements about the way of life of those described can most clearly show the connection between the Essene passages in Josephus and the group-specific texts from Qumran. Other correspondences, such as communal property, communal meals, or the ritual of admission, appear less specific, but complement the findings obtained by the more specific information.

In view of the specific similarities mentioned above, along with many other similarities, it seems legitimate to use the name given to the tradents of the Qumran texts in the ancient testimonies and to speak of Essene texts in relation to this circle of "Essenes" and in relation to the texts authored within this community. At the same time, due to both the Qumran texts and in view of the ancient texts about the Essenes, one must reckon with the parallel existence of different forms within a wider movement as well as also with a historical development, whereby both dimensions are hardly accessible to us from the available sources. The "Essene hypothesis," however, leaves room for such differentiations and clarifications, and their necessity does not compel us, in my opinion, to abandon this well-founded hypothesis as a whole.¹³⁵

see Metso, *The Textual Development*, 124–128; eadem, "In Search of the Sitz im Leben of the Community Rule," in *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. D. W. Parry and E. Ulrich; STDJ 30; Leiden, Boston, and Köln: Brill, 1999), 306–315.

¹³⁴ Thus accurately presented by Bergmeier, *Die Essener-Berichte*, 95; see also VanderKam, *Einführung in die Qumranforschung*, 102f.

¹³⁵ So also Lange and Lichtenberger, "Qumran," 65f.

(d) The differences that exist between the testimonies of the ancient authors and the texts of the *yahad* have different reasons, but they are to be found on the side of secondary sources, their understanding, and their presentation of interests. Unfortunately, it will not always be possible to differentiate clearly between the ancient authors and their possible sources.

Basically, here one must reckon with the phenomenon of the idealization of the groups mentioned, which are presented as “Jewish philosophers” and correspondingly in accordance with the widespread ideals as community-oriented, virtuous, and peace-loving. On the whole, this form of representation, recognizable in Philo as well as in Josephus, is to be understood as an *interpretatio graeca* crafted according to an advertising or apologetic intention. The attempt to systematize the Jewish religious parties and their analogous settings with the three philosophical orientations of the Greeks – the Stoics, Epicureans, and Pythagoreans – belongs within the same context. It goes without saying that within the framework of such a division of the Jewish parties, as determined by philosophy, there are also statements about the soul, the beliefs about immortality, or the *heimarmene*, which are far removed from the original views from within the “Essene” communities. They do not talk about the *heimarmene* but about divine predestination, and instead of the immortality of the soul, they focus on the resurrection of the dead.

Taken as a whole, it is striking that the greatest similarities exist in the curious details of the Essenian way of life, while essential *theologumena* of the original Essenian sources are absent or only exist in a strongly distorted form. This demonstrates that the ancient reports about the Essenes are just testimonies from an external perspective. But then the differences and discrepancies between the statements of Josephus and the original testimonies,¹³⁶ as can be seen for example with respect to the ritual of admission (*J.W.* II 137–139; 1QS VI 13–23), are hardly surprising. If these differences are also largely based on ambiguity in the individual texts,¹³⁷ then here too there seems to be more of an example of the correspondence between Josephus’ passages and the original Essene texts.

(e) The historical value of the ancient reports and the historical picture of the Essenes must, therefore, be determined according to the texts of the *yahad* which can be clearly classified as primary sources. The ancient texts about the Essenes as well as the Qumran texts, whose origin in the *yahad* is uncertain, can only be used in critical analysis where they are fundamentally identical with the picture of the genuine community writings and where their tendency cannot be attributed to their own literary intention. The history of the “Essene” movement is, therefore, to be raised from the Qumran texts

¹³⁶ Beall, *Josephus’ Description*, 129, rightly points out that the real differences in relation to the certain and probable parallels are not very numerous.

¹³⁷ Cf. VanderKam, *Einführung in die Qumransforschung*, 109–111.

themselves – and here, despite a series of interesting models,¹³⁸ research still faces many unanswered questions.

(f) In any case, the paradigm of a monastic community – first derived from the ancient testimonies (and the history of the influence of these testimonies on Patristic writers) – must be abandoned. This is also true for the interpretive patterns that were attractive in the time of the Enlightenment and continue to be attractive today in esoteric circles such as hypotheses about the Essenes as a Pythagorean philosophical community, a circle of enlightened philanthropists, or a group of healing sun worshippers.

The historical image of the “real” Essenes is that of an extremely conservative, halakically rigid community or movement that was interested in issues of ritual purity and the eschatological interpretation of the Scriptures. This movement existed according to the consistent testimony of the ancient Essene texts and the Qumran texts, not only in Qumran but also in other places in Palestine,¹³⁹ and it had at least at times a not so insignificant influence.¹⁴⁰ In Philo (*Prob.* 75) and Josephus (*Ant.* XVIII 20), the consistent mention of 4,000 Essenes (which Josephus contrasts in *Ant.* XVII 42 with the number of 6,000 Pharisees) should be considered as nothing more than a “snapshot,”¹⁴¹ if it can be regarded as having any historical value at all.¹⁴² However, if one at least took the numeric ratio seriously, then the Essenes should not be regarded as a marginal “sect” during the period in question – nor, of course, as the “main Jewish union”¹⁴³ in the sense that it could unite the entire

¹³⁸ See the overview in VanderKam, “Identity and History,” 507ff., the monograph by P. R. Callaway, *The History of the Qumran Community* (JSPSup 3; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1988), as well as the pronounced positions in Stegemann, “The Qumran Essenes,” and F. García Martínez, “Qumran Origins and Early History: A Groningen Hypothesis,” *Folia Orientalia* 25 (1988): 113–136; idem, “The History of the Qumran Community in the Light of Recently Available Texts,” in *Qumran between the Old and New Testaments* (ed. F. H. Cryer and T. L. Thompson; LHB 290; Copenhagen International Seminar 6; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 194–216.

¹³⁹ Despite the Philonic texts, there is little that can be said with historical certainty.

¹⁴⁰ Stegemann, “Qumran Essenes,” wants to see in the Essenes the “Main Jewish Union in Late Second Temple Times” (according to the heading) and emphasizes this aspect in particular.

¹⁴¹ Thus Bergmeier, *Essener-Berichte*, 75, who relates the number to the time of the writing of the Hellenistic Jewish Essene source.

¹⁴² On the other hand, B. Schaller has expressed grave doubts in “4000 Essener – 6000 Phariseer: zum Hintergrund und Wert antiker Zahlenangaben,” in *Antikes Judentum und frühes Christentum: Festschrift für Hartmut Stegemann zum 65. Geburtstag* (ed. B. Kollmann, W. Reinbold, and A. Steudel; BZNW 97; Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 1999), 172–182. There, he refers to the conventional character of such figures in ancient literature.

¹⁴³ Thus, the term formed by Stegemann against the classical sectarian paradigm; see idem, “Qumran-Essenes,” 83 and 165.

Jewish people. In fact, at no time was the Essene movement the representative of all Israel, and at the latest it experienced a further weakening as the rival movement of the Pharisees became constituted and was able to have a greater influence among the people.¹⁴⁴ The rivalry between the two groups is impressively documented in the Qumran texts.

The picture of three Jewish religious parties, the Pharisees, the Sadducees, and the Essenes, which Josephus – entirely on the basis of a source strongly shaped by Hellenism – has conveyed to us, indeed needs further historical differentiation. But as a rough description of the religious situation in Palestine at the turn of the century, it is not without value. The Essenes are an essential part of this doxographic overview – their own view of things, of course, can only be authentically raised from their own texts.

¹⁴⁴ Cf. Schaller, “4000 Essener,” who says, “The ... numerical predominance of the Pharisees against the Essenes is likely to apply” (182). He also writes, “... there is ... no reason to question the prevalence of the Pharisees” (182 n. 84).

6. The Qumran Discoveries and the Understanding of Apocalypticism*

In illuminating the mutual relationship between “apocalypticism” and “Qumran” we will pick up on a classic topic of biblical research as well as two highly complex and differentiated areas of research, in which the categories themselves are not fixed but are always in flux. Thus, it is first necessary to sift through the field and to specify the questions.

A. Preliminary Questions

I. Three Dimensions of the Question

There are three basic dimensions of the question at hand:

First, the literary level of the *texts*: the *textual discoveries from the Dead Sea* and the *apocalyptic literature*. Here, the focus is on issues concerning the literary relations, the literary historical development, and the literary forms and genres. We have to ask what is meant by an “apocalypse” and whether there are such “apocalypses” in the Qumran library. But it is also worth considering whether we can label texts as “apocalyptic” that are not, formally speaking, apocalypses.

Second, there are questions related to the *groups* behind the texts: the relationship between the Qumran “movement” and “apocalyptic” circles, however they may be described. This raises the problem of how texts can be deduced from groups, how these groups can be defined, and possibly demarcated. Are only those groups “apocalyptic” who write “apocalypses”? What characterizes such groups and their thinking, and to what extent can the tradents behind the Qumran texts be held responsible here? For the Qumran

* The present essay was originally written as an introduction to a Qumran conference held in the Catholic Academy Schwerte in February 2003 in honor of the late Hartmut Stegemann who had stimulated the reflections on the topic of Qumran and Apocalypticism with his thought-provoking contribution at the seminal conference on Apocalypticism in Uppsala in 1979, H. Stegemann, “Die Bedeutung der Qumranfunde zur Erforschung der Apokalyptik,” in *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East* (ed. D. Hellholm; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1983; 2nd ed. 1989), 495–530. It was, then, expanded for the documentary volume of the conference (*Apokalyptik und Qumran* [ed. M. Becker and J. Frey; Einblicke 10; Paderborn: Bonifatius, 2007]), and has been thoroughly reworked for the present translated version.

texts, the source material for the sociological inference to a specific group of tradents is relatively favorable. In all other texts, however, scholarship faces greatest methodological problems.

Third, there is the question of the various apocalyptic *themes* and *motifs*, which are found in the texts from Qumran and which are linked to other texts, even from the New Testament. But scholars dispute which themes and motifs can be described as “apocalyptic.” Is a particular eschatology the benchmark? Which other characteristics can be decisive for this categorization? Does messianism belong in this category or not, or maybe just a certain kind of messianic hope? In any case, apocalyptic motifs can also be found in texts that are hardly apocalyptic. Here, not least on the basis of the Qumran texts, we can ask to what extent such themes and motives have shaped the thought of contemporary Judaism and also Early Christianity, how widespread they were, and how they were treated.

If the three above-mentioned levels are differentiated in principle, some of the confusion in the previous discussion can be avoided. Thus, we cannot simply ask whether or how far the “Qumran people” or the “Essenes” were apocalyptic. In order to be able to ask and answer this question, we would need a clear concept of “the” Qumran people as well as “the” apocalypticists. Therefore, the present contribution will pose the questions in a different manner, seeking to gain perspectives for an in-depth understanding of the phenomena: *What have the Qumran texts contributed and what can they continue to contribute to our understanding of the phenomenon of apocalypticism in ancient Judaism and Early Christianity?*

II. *Differing Relationships*

The connection of the two complex themes of “Qumran discoveries” and “apocalyptic” goes back to the beginning of Qumran research. This is hardly a surprise, as one of the first discoveries from Cave 1 was the famous *War Scroll* (1QM), describing a war of the sons of light against the sons of darkness, whose content is strongly reminiscent of the book of Daniel in some details. The early connection of the discoveries with a group known from ancient texts as the Essenes¹ also suggested a connection with apocalyptic

¹ The identification of the Qumran community with the Essenes goes back to E. L. Sukenik (see first his 1948 work that appeared in Hebrew, *Megillot genuzot mitokh geniza q^eduma šānimza bemidbar j^ehuda* [Jerusalem: Bialik Foundation, 1948], 16f.) It was adopted early by A. Dupont-Sommer (*Aperçus préliminaires sur les manuscrits de la Mer Morte* [Paris: Maisonneuve, 1950], 105ff.), W. H. Brownlee (“A Comparison of the Covenants of the Dead Sea Scrolls with Pre-Christian Jewish Sects,” *BA* 13 [1950]: 50–72), G. Vermes (“La secte juive de la nouvelle alliance d’après ses hymnes récemmant découverts,” *Cahiers Sioniens* 4 [1950]: 178–202), and the excavator of the Qumran ruins R. de Vaux (cf. his summary report: *L’archéologie et les manuscrites de la Mer Morte* [Lon-

circles, since the Essenes had long been related to the apocalyptic writings that had gradually become known since the mid-19th century, long before the Qumran discoveries.² Thus, for example, Millar Burrows, in his widespread introduction to the theology of Qumran, found “an intellectual connection with apocalyptic literature,”³ and Frank Moore Cross called the Qumran community an apocalyptic community in his classic volume on the ancient library of Qumran.⁴ Finally, in his work on “Judaism and Hellenism,” Martin Hengel interpreted the Hasidic movement as the “first pinnacle of Jewish apocalypticism”⁵ and the thought of the Essenes, which, according to his opinion, “emerged from the Hasidim”⁶ as “a further development of the apocalyptic view of history.”⁷

On the other side of the “scale” stands the verdict of Hartmut Stegemann, whose major contribution to the international congress on apocalypticism in Uppsala in 1979 argues that the Qumran community was “not an ‘apocalyptic movement,’” but that the apocalyptic had received at best as much interest as

don: Oxford University Press, 1961]). For justification of what is in my opinion the still valid connection between the Qumran discoveries and the Essenes known from ancient sources, see J. Frey, “Zur historischen Auswertung der antiken Essenerberichte. Ein Beitrag zum Gespräch mit Roland Bergmeier,” in *Qumran kontrovers* (ed. J. Frey and H. Stegemann with assistance from M. Becker and A. Maurer; Einblicke 6; Paderborn: Bonifatius, 2003), 23–56 (English translation “On the Historical Value of the Ancient Sources about the Essenes,” in the present volume, 163–193).

² A. Dupont-Sommer, *Die essenischen Schriften vom Toten Meer* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1960), 398f., refers to the highly esteemed French scholar Ernest Renan, who described Christianity as a variant of Essenism in the 19th century. Cf. also the instructive study by S. Wagner, *Die Essener in der wissenschaftlichen Diskussion. Vom Ausgang des 18. bis zum Beginn des 20. Jahrhunderts* (BZAW 79; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1960). The project by A. Hilgenfeld (*Die jüdische Apokalypik in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung. Ein Beitrag zur Vorgeschichte des Christentums* [Jena: Mauke, 1857]) was also significant in terms of the history of research, as Hilgenfeld called Essenism “an outflow of the apocalyptic school” (252) and at the same time the “next and most immediate precursor of Christianity” (16). On Hilgenfeld, cf. J. M. Schmidt, *Die jüdische Apokalypik. Die Geschichte ihrer Erforschung von den Anfängen bis zu den Textfunden von Qumran* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchner Verlag, 1969), 139–142.

³ M. Burrows, *Die Schriftrollen vom Toten Meer* (München: Beck, 1956), 181.

⁴ F. M. Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical Studies* (New York and London: Doubleday, 1958), 56: “an apocalyptic community”; cf. the German translation idem, *Die antike Bibliothek von Qumran und die moderne biblische Wissenschaft* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirche Verlag, 1967), 85f.: “eine apokalyptische Gemeinde, eine Heilsgemeinde” (trans.: “an apocalyptic community, a salvific community.”)

⁵ M. Hengel, *Judentum und Hellenismus* (3rd ed.; WUNT 10; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1988), 319ff.

⁶ M. Hengel, *Judentum und Hellenismus*, 320.

⁷ M. Hengel, *Judentum und Hellenismus*, 395.

it has in our biblical canon of the Old and New Testaments,⁸ a *marginal* interest.

However, although Stegemann's contribution had made decisive clarifications in light of the classification of essential Qumran testimonies, his final view of the Qumran texts' relationship to apocalyptic has not received unanimous approval within scholarship.⁹ Other Qumran researchers like Florentino García Martínez and John J. Collins have affirmed the view that apocalypticism is a fundamental prerequisite for understanding the thought of the Qumran community.¹⁰ But they agree with Stegemann that the Qumran findings have provided a complete change of the situation in the study of Jewish apocalypticism.¹¹

These controversial assessments demonstrate how important it is to determine precisely and appropriately what we each understand about "apocalyptic" or "apocalypse"¹² and that, in addition, a sufficiently differentiated picture of the Qumran discoveries is required if the issue of their relationship with the traditions of the library or with the authors or author circles of individual writings is to be reflected.

⁸ H. Stegemann, "Die Bedeutung der Qumranfunde zur Erforschung der Apokalyptik." Cf. also idem, "Some Aspects of Eschatology in Texts from the Qumran Community and in the Teachings of Jesus," in *Biblical Archaeology Today* (ed. J. Amitai; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1985), 408–426. This assessment also had predecessors, in particular in the work of the great French researcher J. Carmignac, "Qu'est-ce que l'Apocalyptique? Son emploi à Qumrân," *RevQ* 10 (1979/81): 3–33.

⁹ The reason for this probably lies in Stegemann's delimitation of apocalypticism to a purely literary phenomenon, that is to texts that belong to the genre of "apocalypse." Such a restriction, which is in no way required by the Qumran discoveries, proves to be of little help in dealing with the phenomenon.

¹⁰ F. García Martínez, "Foreword," in *Qumran and Apocalyptic. Studies on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran* (ed. F. García Martínez; STDJ 9; Leiden: Brill, 1992), ix–xvi, here x; cf. also idem, "Les traditions apocalyptiques à Qumrân," in *Apocalypses et voyages dans l'au-delà* (ed. C. Kappler; Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1987), 201–235; see further J. J. Collins, "Was the Dead Sea Sect an Apocalyptic Movement," in *Seers, Sibyls and Sages in Hellenistic and Roman Judaism* (ed. J. J. Collins; JSJ.S 54; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 261–286; idem, *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (London: Routledge, 1997); idem, "Apocalypticism and Literary Genre in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years* (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 2:403–430.

¹¹ F. García Martínez, "Foreword," xi.

¹² Of significance is the formulation by F. García Martínez, "Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *Encyclopedia of Apocalypticism* (New York and London: Bloomsbury, 2000), 1:162–192: "If 'Apocalypticism' is broadly defined (as it is in this Encyclopedia) ... there can be no doubt that the Qumran community was an 'apocalyptic' community." Conversely, Stegemann's judgment of the existence of only marginal relations is due to a very narrow definition (see H. Stegemann, "Bedeutung," 525).

III. Clarifications concerning the Concept of Apocalyptic

First of all, I would like to briefly explain my understanding of apocalyptic. The term itself is indeed a modern-day *research term* introduced into exegetical research by Friedrich Lücke, a disciple of the German theologian and philosopher Friedrich Schleiermacher.¹³ The term was adopted from the beginning of the New Testament revelation (ἀποκάλυψις Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ), and biblical apocalypticism, i.e. the canonical books of Daniel and Revelation were central to the early definition and understanding of the concept. The stock of sources available to Lücke and his followers (Eduard Reuss¹⁴ and Adolf Hilgenfeld¹⁵) around the mid-19th century was relatively meager: in addition to the two canonical books, only *4 Ezra* (known from the Vulgate), the Greek *Sibylline Oracles*, and the book of Enoch, which was available in an English translation since 1821 were available.¹⁶ As more and more apocalyptic writings became known over the course of the 19th century,¹⁷ the mate-

¹³ F. Lücke, *Commentar über die Schriften des Evangelisten Johannes. Vierter Theil, erster Band: Versuch einer vollständigen Einleitung in die Offenbarung Johannis und in die gesammte apokalyptische Litteratur* (Bonn: Weber, 1832), 22–155. According to some statements (p. 23), Lücke relies on a writing of Karl Immanuel Nitzsch (*Bericht an die Mitglieder des Rehkopfschen Prediger-Vereins über die Verhandlungen v. J. 1820* [Wittenberg, 1822]). Cf. Schmidt, *Apokalyptik*, 98–100; A. Christophersen, *Friedrich Lücke (1791–1855)* (2 vols.; TBT 94; Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 1999), 1:368–373. Nitzsch's work has since disappeared (see Christophersen, *Friedrich Lücke*, 368f., n. 2).

¹⁴ E. Reuss, "Johannes Apokalypse," *EuGII* (1843), 22:79–94; see Schmidt, *Apokalyptik*, 120–126; W. Zager, *Begriff und Wertung der Apokalyptik in der neutestamentlichen Forschung* (EHS.T 358; Frankfurt am Main: Lang, 1989), 40–48.

¹⁵ Hilgenfeld, *Apokalyptik*; see Schmidt, *Apokalyptik*, 127–147; Zager, *Begriff*, 48–55.

¹⁶ While previously only the Greek fragments from the chronography of Synkellos had been known in the western world, the British traveler James Bruce brought back three manuscripts of the Ethiopian version of Enoch from his search for the source of the Nile, parts of which were published in 1800 in a Latin translation. The full text was first published in an English translation in 1821, followed by the influential works of A. G. Hoffmann, *Das Buch Henoch. In vollständiger Uebersetzung mit fortlaufendem Commentar, ausführlicher Einleitung und erläuternden Exkursen* (2 vols.; Jena: Crocker, 1833/1838) and A. Dillmann, *Liber Henoch Aethiopicæ* (Leipzig: Vogel, 1851); idem, *Das Buch Henoch übersetzt und erklärt* (Leipzig, 1853). Cf. the history of the rediscovery of the work by G. W. E. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001), 1:109f.

¹⁷ Cf. the compilation in K. Koch, "Einleitung zur Apokalyptik," in *Von der Wende der Zeiten. Beiträge zur apokalyptischen Literatur* (ed. K. Koch; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchner, 1996), 109–134, here 111f. In 1863, the Ascension of Moses was published from the Latin by A. M. Ceriani. In 1866, Ceriani also published the Syriac version of *2 Baruch*. In 1877, the Ascension of Isaiah was published by A. Dillmann on the basis of Ethiopian manuscripts. In 1886, the Slavonic and in 1896 the Greek text of *3 Baruch* was published by M. R. James. In 1896, N. Bonwetsch published the Slavonic book of *2 Enoch*. In 1897, Bonwetsch also published the *Apocalypse of Abraham* from the Slavonic. In 1899, frag-

rial base expanded greatly and the overall picture of what could be termed “apocalypse” shifted considerably.¹⁸ However, with the growing interest of some researchers in the history-of-religions,¹⁹ there was at the same time a tendency of marginalization, or even suppression, of the apocalyptic ideas with regard to their theological validity. Liberal theology – for example, the influential Old Testament scholar Julius Wellhausen – saw in “Late Jewish” apocalyptic a decay, speculative-fantastic, and thorough utopianism, a result of pious wishful thinking²⁰ that could not be theologically significant and which both the great prophets, on the one hand, and Jesus and the apostles, on the other hand, had tried to move far away from. The existential interpretation which became influential in the subsequent period almost seamlessly followed these judgments.²¹

ments of a Coptic *Apocalypse of Elijah* was published by G. Steindorff. And, in 1910, M. R. James published the *Apocalypse of Peter* in Ethiopian.

¹⁸ K. Koch, “Einleitung,” 112: “It turns out that in addition to simple visions and heavenly-earthly doctrinal conversations, journeys to heaven and to hell by chosen men of God are presented under the title of *apocalypse*.”

¹⁹ For example, cf. H. Gunkel, *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1896); W. Baldensperger, *Die messianisch-apokalyptischen Hoffnungen des Judentums (= Das Selbstbewusstsein Jesu im Lichte der messianischen Hoffnungen seiner Zeit. Erste Hälfte)* (3rd ed.; Straßburg: Heitz, 1903); W. Bousset, *Die jüdische Apokalypstik, ihre Religionsgeschichtliche Herkunft und ihre Bedeutung für das Neue Testament* (Berlin: Reuther & Reichard, 1903); idem, *Die Religion des Judentums im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter* (Berlin: Reuther & Reichard, 1906); P. Volz, *Jüdische Eschatologie von Daniel bis Akiba* (Tübingen and Leipzig: Mohr Siebeck, 1903); idem, *Die Eschatologie der jüdischen Gemeinde im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter nach den Quellen der rabbinischen, apokalyptischen und apokryphen Literatur* (Tübingen and Leipzig: Mohr Siebeck, 1934).

²⁰ J. Wellhausen, *Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte* (Berlin: Reimer, 1958), 195f.: “Its God is a God of desires and illusions. On paper, it paints an ideal to which in reality no bridge traverses, which is to be suddenly set into action by the intervention of a *deus ex machina*. It does not, like the old, genuine prophecy, anticipate what is already in the process of becoming, nor does it set up any goals for human action, which are or should have validity in the present. It does not look at the living activity of the Godhead, but adheres to the sacred letter, in which it sees the securitization of its wishes and treats it as the source of its dogmatic speculation.” Concerning the assessment of liberal theology, cf. also Zager, *Begriff*, 171ff., see his assessment of Wellhausen on 176–178; see further K. Müller, “Die frühjüdische Apokalypstik,” in *Studien zur frühjüdischen Apokalypstik* (ed. K. Müller; SBAB 11; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1991), 35–173, here 38–40.

²¹ Even for Rudolf Bultmann, apocalypticism was “primitive” and “speculative” and the overcoming of apocalyptic ideas by a “real” eschatological understanding, which Bultmann already saw in the New Testament (in Paul and more fully in John), was one of the basic components of his program of the “demythologization” of the New Testament tradition. Cf. J. Frey, *Die johanneische Eschatologie I: Ihre Probleme im Spiegel der Forschung seit Reimarus* (WUNT 96; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997), 103ff.; concerning the concept of apocalypticism and its evaluation in Bultmann, see Zager, *Begriff*, 223ff.

Scholarship on apocalypticism *before* the Qumran discoveries was, therefore, largely under the burden of its theological devaluation and marginalization,²² and one can – with a nice dictum by Klaus Koch – understand major parts of scholarship in the 19th and early 20th centuries as the desperate attempt “to save Jesus from apocalypticism” and also to distance the apostles, as far as possible, from that Jewish tradition.²³ In the Old Testament scholarship, this tendency towards marginalization has taken effect not least in the grand design of Gerhard von Rad’s theology, in which – especially in view of the interpretation of Old Testament traditions within the framework of a theology of history – apocalypticism appears out of place as a “basically ahistorical form of thought.”²⁴

Marginalization has also dictated the attempts to determine the “essence” of apocalypticism. Above all, there is a focus on end-time expectation and end-time speculation so that for most of the New Testament scholars the consequence was suggested that Jesus’ proclamation or the early Christian kerygma should stand out as clearly as possible from such a speculative tradition.²⁵ This basic tendency is revealed, for example, in the characteristics that Philipp Vielhauer cites in his influential and introductory handbook article:²⁶ Apocalyptic is characterized there by *pseudonymous authorship, visionary design, fictitious-futuristic overviews of history (vaticinia ex eventu)*, as well as a mixture of literary forms. According to Vielhauer, the dominant ideas of apocalyptic are *the dualism of the two aeons, pessimism toward history and the hope of a hereafter, universalism and individualism, determinism and an imminent expectation of the end*, and again a *lack of unity* of the world of ideas. The portrayal of these characteristics is clearly marked by contempt for

²² This was, for other reasons, practiced by contemporary Jewish research (cf., K. Müller, “Apokalyptik,” 36 for information about the great Jewish historian Heinrich Graetz’s history of Judaism).

²³ K. Koch, *Ratlos vor der Apokalyptik. Eine Streitschrift über ein vernachlässigtes Gebiet der Bibelwissenschaft und die schädlichen Auswirkungen auf Theologie und Philosophie* (Gütersloh: Mohn, 1970), 55. Cf. the English translation of the work under the title: *The Rediscovery of Apocalyptic* (transl. M. Kohl; London: SCM Press, 1972).

²⁴ G. von Rad, *Theologie des Alten Testaments* (ed. 8th; München: Kaiser, 1984), 2:322.

²⁵ See the overview in Zager, *Begriff*.

²⁶ P. Vielhauer, “Einleitung,” in *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen II: Apostolisches. Apokalypsen und Verwandtes* (3rd ed.; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1963), 407–427; idem, “Apokalyptik des Urchristentums. Einleitung,” in *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen*, 2:428–454. His contribution to Jewish apocalypticism was only slightly updated in the later editions under the co-authorship of Georg Strecker: cf. P. Vielhauer and G. Strecker, “Introduction,” in *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen II: Apostolisches. Apokalypsen und Verwandtes* (6th ed.; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997); idem, “Apokalyptik des Urchristentums. Einleitung,” in *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen* (6th ed.), 2:516–547.

these traditions: Apocalyptic represents a “dehistoricization of history,”²⁷ scholars speak of the “pious deceit” of authors who take refuge from a deficiency of their own authority among Israel’s great figures, into a constructed “bookish wisdom,” whose relationship to the “real” religious experience remains unclear, of pessimism with respect to this world, speculation about the hereafter, and arbitrary periodization. Above all, however, the temporal dimension, that is speculation about the future, or more precisely, imminent expectation is proclaimed to be the main characteristic of apocalyptic, so that in view of the fact that the end of the world has not yet occurred, the *proprium* of this form of piety must be regarded as highly problematic from the outset. Such a concept of “apocalypticism” could serve as a negative foil from which Jesus, Paul, and John were positively contrasted. On the basis of this definition, the contrast between mythological-speculative “apocalyptic” and (present) “eschatology” could be built in such a way that one could precisely see the “true Christian self-consciousness” in an unapocalyptic and present-oriented “eschatology” and the critical interpretation of the apocalyptic “vener” of early Christian texts could be considered the indispensable task of an existential-“demythologizing” interpretation of the New Testament. It is obvious that such a designation of the concept and nature of apocalypticism, guided by a particular kerygmatic, existential-theological interest, could not really do justice to the phenomenon of early Jewish and early Christian apocalypticism.

Since 1945 or even a bit later, scholarship has been influenced by entirely new impulses. On the one hand, this was the result of the discovery of new texts in Qumran in 1947 as well as the discovery of thirteen Coptic codices in Nag Hammadi in Upper Egypt in 1945, and among these mostly Gnostic writings, there were at least a number of texts that contained “apocalypse” within the title. Another changing influence was the increasing internationalization of scholarship, including the involvement of Jewish scholars, accompanied by the decline in the influence of specific theological interests and value judgments and an increasing openness to general history-of-religious perspectives. This last aspect determined the important Uppsala congress on Apocalypticism in 1979, where the problem of an adequate definition of “apocalyptic” was more clearly recognized in light of analogous phenomena from Egypt, Mesopotamia, Iran, or the Greco-Roman area.²⁸ The resignative conclusion of this conference was the demand *contra definitionem, pro descriptione*, i.e. the suggestion to describe the phenomena without trying to define their essence.²⁹ Nevertheless, the tendency to provide definitions or at

²⁷ P. Vielhauer, *NTApo* (3rd ed.), 416 = (*NTApo* [6th ed.], 502), citation of Bultmann, *Geschichte und Eschatologie*, 35.

²⁸ Cf. the contributions in D. Hellholm, ed., *Apocalypticism*.

²⁹ Cf. D. Hellholm, “Introduction,” in *Apocalypticism*, 1–5.

least determine common characteristics of apocalypticism is difficult to avoid.

Another important impulse came from genre research. If it is difficult to ask about the abstract concept of “apocalyptic,”³⁰ it may be easier to determine the literary genre of an “apocalypse.” Here, John Collins has proposed the widely accepted working definition: “‘Apocalypse’ is a genre of revelatory literature with a narrative framework, in which a revelation is mediated by an otherworldly being to a human recipient, disclosing a supernatural reality which is both temporal, insofar as it envisages eschatological salvation, and spatial, insofar as it involves another, supernatural world.”³¹ This definition includes both literary and substantive elements in sufficient generality, so that it can also cover related phenomena in the world around without being too prejudiced, for example, with regard to a particular conception of history or eschatology. Most significantly, it covers not only the temporal but also the spatial dimension which had often been neglected in earlier research. On this basis, further differentiations were made, for example, between “historical” apocalypses (e.g., in Daniel 10–12), symbolic apocalypses (e.g., the Enochic Animal Apocalypse *1 Enoch* 85–90), and heavenly journeys (e.g., the cosmic journeys of Enoch in the Book of the Watchers, *1 Enoch* 17ff.),³² but this cannot be further developed here.

And yet it is essential that, on the basis of this definition of the genre, there exists a correspondence in content in the texts recorded as “apocalypses.” This suggests that early Jewish apocalypticism is not just a literary phenomenon but encompasses a conceptual world or at least a variety of concepts.³³ On the other hand, with a step beyond the literary genre the concise definition loses some of its precision. For the apocalyptic “conceptual world” is known to be disparate, not all material is equally present in all apocalypses, and, for example, the character of eschatology varies considerably between different apocalypses. It is also indisputable that “apocalyptic” elements (i.e., the

³⁰ The definition in D. Hellholm, “Apokalyptik I: Begriffsdefinition als religionsgeschichtliches Problem,” *RGG*⁴, 1:590f., is not without logical problems if he wants to grasp the phenomenon of apocalyptic as (among other things) a “mediation of revelation.”

³¹ J. J. Collins, “Introduction: Towards the Morphology of a Genre,” in *Apocalypse: The Morphology of a Genre* (ed. J. J. Collins; Semeia 14; Missoula: SBL Press, 1979), 1–20, here 9.

³² Cf. Collins, “Introduction”; for subsequent reflections, see J. J. Collins, “Genre, Ideology and Social Movements in Jewish Apocalypticism,” in *Mysteries and Revelations. Apocalyptic Studies since the Uppsala Colloquium* (ed. J. J. Collins and J. H. Charlesworth; JSP.S 9; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991), 11–32, here 15f.

³³ Cf. Collins, “Genre,” 15, contra the thesis of Stegemann, “Bedeutung,” 498, who states, “I refer to ‘apocalyptic’ exclusively as a literary phenomenon, namely the production of ‘revelations’ that ‘reveal’ things that cannot be deduced from inner-worldly circumstances, for example, from normal ‘experiential knowledge,’ but rather is only opened up to the author and the reader by recourse to the ‘heavenly, revelatory knowledge.’”

themes and motifs that are concentrated in the texts characterized as “apocalypses”) also appear in other texts.³⁴ It makes little sense to exclude *by definition* these texts and the motifs that appear in them from the investigation of the phenomenon of apocalypticism.

The function of the apocalyptic genre can also vary according to historical circumstances.³⁵ So the question has to discuss whether or not apocalypses primarily react to an external crisis, providing comfort in distress? This is what the older scholarship had suggested, drawing on the thesis of the emergence of Jewish apocalyptic with the book of Daniel in the Maccabean period and of the composition of Revelation in a period of persecution under Domitian. But regardless of the circumstances of the composition of these two canonical books, such a view is certainly too one-sided. Not all apocalypses can be derived from acute situations of oppression or persecution. More appropriate is, therefore, the more general view that an apocalypse seeks to interpret the present earthly conditions in light of the supernatural world and the future in order to influence both the understanding and the behavior of the addressees by reference to divine authority.³⁶ Whether it is still possible to assume that apocalypticism is a symptom of crisis can be further discussed in view of the variety of texts and related situations. The crisis in the background can also be a perceived or feared crisis or, vice versa, the subsequent processing of a past crisis, but it is also possible that existing apocalyptic traditions were transmitted and integrated in an overarching understanding without any direct reference to a current crisis.

³⁴ Seeing things differently is Stegemann, “Bedeutung,” 499: “‘Apocalyptic’ are genres, ways of thinking, subjects and motifs only within the framework of apocalypses, not beyond. ... Therefore, any extension of the term ‘apocalyptic’ beyond apocalypses is not permitted.” Cf., however, García Martínez, “Apocalypticism,” 164: “Everybody ... agrees that apocalypticism cannot be reduced to the literary genre apocalypse.” Similarly, H.-J. Fabry, “Die frühjüdische Apokalyptik als Reaktion auf Fremdherrschaft,” in *Antikes Judentum und frühes Christentum, Festschrift Hartmut Stegemann* (ed. B. Kollmann, W. Reinbold, and A. Steudel; BZNW 97; Berlin and New York, 1999), 84–98, here 87: “‘Apocalyptic literature’ and ‘apocalypses’ are in no way equivalent.” Considering the insights from genre theory that genres can provide another framework (into which other subgenres are then integrated), the view of Collins and Fabry is certainly more appropriate. The genre of “apocalypse” appears in some cases as a “highly complex literary composition that encompasses much more than what is commonly called ‘Apocalypse’” (Fabry, “Apokalyptik,” 88).

³⁵ Cf. Collins, “Genre,” 19.

³⁶ A. Yarbro Collins, “Introduction: Early Christian Apocalypticism,” in *Early Christian Apocalypticism: Genre and Social Setting* (ed. A. Yarbro Collins; Semeia 36; Decatur: SBL, 1986), 1–11, here 7: “intended to interpret present, earthly circumstances in light of the supernatural world and of the future, and to influence both the understanding and the behavior of the audience by means of divine authority.” This formulation is explicitly intended as a supplement to the above definition by J. J. Collins.

Terminologically, it makes sense to distinguish three dimensions, as is suggested by Paul D. Hanson in the *Anchor Bible Dictionary*:³⁷

- “*apocalypse*” as a specific genre (which, of course, does not exist only where the title of the book occurs but also occurs as a sub-genre in other macro-genres),
- “*apocalypticism*” as a movement or an intellectual current that is characterized by a specific world of ideas, which provides the setting in which apocalypses were composed but which can also be found in other texts,
- and “*apocalyptic eschatology*” as a term for eschatological ideas and concepts expressed in some Jewish apocalypses.

It is important, however, to add that this type of eschatology is neither the common property of Jewish apocalypses nor a meaningful characteristic of Jewish apocalypticism in general. The phenomenon thus described is, in my opinion, the least suitable for adequately describing apocalypticism, and there is a need for correction here in comparison with older research, which has too schematically constructed contrasts between apocalypticism and prophecy, apocalypticism and eschatology, etc., due to its substantial theological interests.

B. Apocalypticism in the Texts from Qumran

Let us use this rough definitional grid to address the Qumran texts and ask if and to what extent apocalypses occur among these texts, to what extent elements of the “apocalyptic imaginative world” are significant, and how the Qumran community or the Essene movement itself behaved in relation to the apocalyptic ideas. For that purpose, we have to consider the textual discoveries of Qumran as differentiated as possible, drawing on the widely accepted consensus that not all texts, not even all non-biblical texts, come from the community, which can be identified as the tradents of the scrolls library (and which we still may associate with the group of the “Essenes,” mentioned in some ancient Greek and Latin sources³⁸). Rather, a multitude of texts that have been collected in this library come from precursor groups or simply from the repertoire of the literary production of ancient Judaism between the 3rd century BCE and the 1st century CE, without being a specific expression

³⁷ P. D. Hanson, “Apocalypses and Apocalypticism: Introductory Overview,” *ABD* 1:280–282. Cf. also J. J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination* (New York: Crossroad, 1984), 2–11. A somewhat different distinction between apocalypse and apocalyptic already occurs in M. E. Stone, “Lists of Revealed Things in Apocalyptic Literature,” in *Magnalia Dei. The Mighty Acts of God* (ed. F. M. Cross; Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1976), 414–452.

³⁸ Cf. J. Frey, “Historical Value.”

of the theological thinking of that community.³⁹ Even if the criteria (such as language, terminology, theology, or the assumed calendar) are not completely uncontroversial, we cannot dispense with determining whether or not a text can be considered group-specific (“sectarian”), that is, “Essene.”⁴⁰

Of course, the judgments presumed here also influence how one assesses the character of the Qumran community. Where one is inclined to attribute a large number of the texts to the community itself or to extend the concept of “Essenian” so broadly that almost the entire Enoch tradition is absorbed into it, it will be easier to attribute to the community an apocalyptic character than would be the case if the criteria of “Essene” or group-specific writings is more strictly managed. In agreement with Hartmut Stegemann, Armin Lange, and others, I would like to adhere to these stricter criteria of attribution with the caveat that, in the view of the *yahad* community, more apocalyptic elements can be found by way of *reception* than Stegemann was willing to concede in his programmatic lecture in Uppsala.

I. “Apocalypses” in the Qumran Library

If we ask about the existence of “apocalypses” in the Qumran library,⁴¹ then it should not be overlooked that a considerable number of manuscripts of the book of Daniel and other texts related to Daniel and – even more sensational – a still larger number of Enoch manuscripts have been handed down within this library.

(a) With regard to the *Daniel* texts, which reflect the explicit reception of the only apocalyptic writing of the Hebrew canon,⁴² there are eight fragmentary manuscripts in the library (two in Cave 1, five in Cave 4, and a papyrus manuscript in Cave 6). This number is, after all, more than the number of manuscripts found from the books of Jeremiah (6) or Ezekiel (6). All the

³⁹ Of course, this library also represents selectivity. It is no coincidence that the books of 1–2 Maccabees are not found among the collection – they probably contradicted the Essenian views too much.

⁴⁰ See A. Lange, “Kriterien essenischer Texte,” in *Qumran kontrovers* (ed. J. Frey and H. Stegemann; with help from M. Becker and A. Maurer; Einblicke 6; Paderborn: Bonifatius, 2003), 59–69; somewhat different is C. Hempel, “Kriterien zur Bestimmung ‘essenischer Verfasserschaft’ von Qumrantexten,” in *Qumran kontrovers*, 71–85; cf. already A. Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination* (STDJ 18; Leiden: Brill, 1995), 6ff.; A. Lange and H. Lichtenberger, “Art. Qumran,” *TRE* 28:45f.

⁴¹ Cf. the fundamental work of D. Dimant, “Apocalyptic Texts at Qumran,” in *The Community of the Renewed Covenant: The Notre Dame Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. E. Ulrich and J. C. VanderKam; CJA 10; Notre Dame: Notre Dame Press, 1994), 77–93; Collins, “Apocalypticism and Literary Genre,” 403–430.

⁴² Strictly speaking, only the final part, as well as the final form of Dan 2 and Dan 7, make the whole writing an “apocalypse”; cf. R. G. Kratz, “Apokalyphtik II: Altes Testament,” *RGG* (4th ed.), 1:591f.

chapters of Daniel are attested in Qumran with the exception of Dan 12.⁴³ This shows the appreciation of the book in the circles of the Essene movement or more precisely the library tradents from the Qumran community. The intense reception of the only apocalyptic writing in the canon casts doubts on the view that these circles were only “marginally” interested in apocalypticism.

There are also a number of materials related to Daniel and the Daniel tradition. There is, first, the *Prayer of Nabonidus*, which is closely connected to Daniel 4, but this text can be omitted from the discussion here, since it is in no way an apocalypse, nor does it mention Daniel’s name.⁴⁴ More important are three Aramaic manuscripts of pseudo-Daniel texts (4Q243–245), of which the first two overlap, whereas the third probably represents a different work.⁴⁵ However, the relationship of both texts to each other and to the canonical text of Daniel remains relatively unclear, and the genre of the texts is difficult to determine from the fragments. 4Q243 and 244 could formally be a court scene, similar to that in Dan 3–6. The content here is probably a historical overview with an eschatological outlook.⁴⁶ Such an outlook seems to be also presented in 4Q245.⁴⁷ However, it remains unclear whether the texts can formally be called apocalypses,⁴⁸ and their origin remains also unclear. They

⁴³ Cf. E. Tov, “Categorized List of the ‘Biblical Texts,’” in *The Texts from the Judean Desert: Indices and Introduction to the Discoveries in the Judean Desert Series* (ed. E. Tov; DJD 39; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 165–184, here 176; concerning the extant texts, cf. E. Ulrich, “Index of Passages in the ‘Biblical Texts,’” in *The Texts from the Judean Desert*, 185–201, here 200. Concerning the Daniel manuscripts, see P. W. Flint, “The Prophet Daniel at Qumran,” in *Eschatology, Messianism, and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. C. A. Evans and P. W. Flint; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 41–60, here 41ff.; cf. also Collins, “Apocalypticism – Literary Genre,” 410–413.

⁴⁴ Thus also Collins, “Apocalypticism – Literary Genre,” 410f. Concerning this text, cf. A. Lange and M. Sieker, “Gattung und Quellenwert des Gebets des Nabonid,” in *Qumranstudien* (Schriften des Institutum Judaicum Delitzschianum 4; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996), 3–34.

⁴⁵ Cf. J. J. Collins and P. W. Flint, “Pseudo-Daniel,” in *Qumran Cave 4 XVIII: Parabiblical Texts*, Part 3 (DJD 22; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), 95–163, here 133, 153.

⁴⁶ As such, at least 4Q243 24 is valued. A textual connection with 4Q245 2, as carried out by F. García Martínez, “4QPseudo Daniel Aramaic and the Pseudo-Danielic Literature,” in *Qumran and Apocalyptic*, 137–161, here 140, cannot be substantiated.

⁴⁷ 4Q245 2; see P. W. Flint, “4QPseudo-Daniel ar^c (4Q245) and the Restoration of Priesthood,” *RevQ* 17 (1996): 137–150; Collins, “Apocalypticism – Literary Genre,” 412.

⁴⁸ Thus Collins, “Apocalypticism – Literary Genre,” 413. F. García Martínez, “4QPseudo Daniel,” 137–161, here 149, called the text a “clearly apocalyptic composition.” The classification under the heading “Apocalypses: Non-symbolic Apocalypses” in A. Lange and U. Mittmann-Richert, “Annotated List of the Texts from the Judean Desert Classified by Content and Genre,” in *The Texts from the Judean Desert. Indices and Introduction to the Discoveries in the Judean Desert Series* (DJD 39; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 115–164, here 127, therefore remains uncertain.

do not carry specific hints to the Qumran community, and due to the Aramaic language, it is very likely that the community simply adopted these texts, as well as the canonical book of Daniel, from other circles.⁴⁹

Particularly interesting is the famous “Son of God Text” (4Q246), which was initially described by its editor as an “Aramaic apocalypse,”⁵⁰ but is now classified in the official edition merely as an *Apocryphon of Daniel*.⁵¹ Although the name of Daniel is not mentioned in the surviving fragment, linguistic echoes, notably to Dan 7, are obvious.⁵² Formally, the text seems to be a conversation between Daniel and a king. Also, the apocalyptic character of the themes is uncontroversial. It provides an overview of history with an epochal breakdown, wherein a great oppression and then the rising of the people (thus a collective) and the “eternal kingdom” are envisaged. However, the identity of the “Son of God” figure is controversial: Is he a messianic figure, as is the “Son of God” in New Testament texts, or is he rather an anti-messianic figure, who usurps a divine dignity for himself?⁵³ Whose kingdom is then “eternal”? Is it the kingdom of the messiah, or of the people who have been raised up as a “messianic collective,”⁵⁴ or – under the condition of a change of subject – the dominion of God himself? Unfortunately, I cannot discuss these matters further here. But with regard to the origin of the text, it seems again certain, due to the Aramaic language, that the Qumran community also adopted this text from other groups.

Another text that should be mentioned here is the so-called 4Q Four Kingdoms text, which has been preserved in two manuscripts (4Q552/553).⁵⁵ This text is probably a visionary report, which seems to use the familiar four king-

⁴⁹ Thus Collins, “Apocalypticism – Literary Genre,” 413.

⁵⁰ É. Puech, “Fragment d’une Apocalypse en Araméen (4Q246 = pseudo-Dan^d) et le ‘Royaume de Dieu,’” *RB* 99 (1992): 98–131; idem, “Notes sur le fragment d’apocalypse 4Q246 – ‘le fils d Dieu,’” *RB* 101 (1994): 533–558. Cf. J. Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte aus Qumran* (WUNT II/104; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998), 128–169.

⁵¹ É. Puech, “4QApocryphe de Daniel ar,” in *Qumran Cave 4 XVII* (ed. G. Brooke et al.; DJD 22; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), 165–184.

⁵² Collins, “Apocalypticism – Literary Genre,” 414; Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte*, 165.

⁵³ While the majority of interpreters now regard this figure as a negative figure, Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte*, 158ff. attempts to maintain a positive interpretation (i.e., a connection of this “Son of God” figure with the “Son of Man” in Dan 7). F. García Martínez also interprets this figure as a positively intervening figure (Michael, Melchizedek). Contrary to these depictions, for example, is H.-J. Fabry, who sees a positive turn only in column 2, lines 4/5, when “the people arise.” See H.-J. Fabry and K. Scholtissek, *Der Messias* (NEB Themen 5; Würzburg: Echter, 2002), 46; furthermore Fabry, “Apokalyp-tik,” 84–98, specifically 97f.

⁵⁴ Cf. A. Steudel, “The Eternal Reign of the People of God – Collective Expectations in Qumranic Texts (4Q246 and 1QM),” in *RevQ* 7 (1996): 507–525.

⁵⁵ Cf. Collins, “Apocalypticism – Literary Genre,” 415–417.

doms schema from Dan 2 and Dan 7. Of four trees, the first is identified with Babylon. Due to the text's fragmentary state, it is unfortunately not discernible how the four kingdoms are assigned and which kind of eschatological outlook is connected with the text. The text's content and visionary form make it plausible that the genre is that of an apocalypse. But the Aramaic language also indicates that the text was not composed within the Qumran community but only adopted and read by some of its members.

Although the members of the *yahad* or the Qumran community itself did not write any of the above-mentioned texts, the Qumran library nevertheless evidences an astonishing reception of the book of Daniel and related texts that may be associated with the Daniel tradition in a broader sense. This shows the obvious interest of the community in the motifs represented within these texts.

(b) Even more important than the Daniel discoveries are the manuscripts that document texts from the Enochic tradition.⁵⁶ Because of these findings, scholarship has received completely new evidence on the dating and characterization of the earliest Jewish apocalyptic writings. Until the Qumran discoveries the composition of *1 Enoch* was fully known only in the Ethiopian language. Apart from this, some fragments in Greek and short citations in Syriac, Coptic, and Latin were known. Against this background, it was sensational that the library of Qumran brought to light numerous Aramaic manuscripts. These contain material from all parts of the Ethiopian book of *1 Enoch*, with the exception of the so-called Parables of Enoch (*1 Enoch* 37–71), as well as the Book of the Giants, which was previously known only in the Manichean tradition.⁵⁷

Above all, it was sensational that of the four manuscripts of the Astronomical Book (4Q208–211), the first (4QEnastr^a) is to still be dated to the late 3rd or early 2nd century BCE.⁵⁸ This means that the Astronomical Book must have been published *no later* than around 200 BCE; probably it was finished much earlier.⁵⁹ Interestingly, the Aramaic version found in Qumran is longer

⁵⁶ Cf. the foundational work of J. T. Milik, *The Books of Enoch: The Aramaic Fragments from Qumran* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1976). See further G. W. E. Nickelsburg, "The Books of Enoch at Qumran. What We Know and What We Need to Think about," in *Antikes Judentum und Frühes Christentum, Festschrift Hartmut Stegemann* (ed. B. Kollmann, W. Reinbold, and A. Steudel; BZNW 97; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1999), 99–113; idem, *1 Enoch*, 1:9–12.

⁵⁷ Cf. L. T. Stuckenbruck, *The Book of Giants from Qumran* (TSAJ 63; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997).

⁵⁸ Cf. Milik, *Books of Enoch*, 7, 273; J. C. VanderKam, *Enoch and the Growth of an Apocalyptic Tradition* (CBQMS 16; Washington, D.C.: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1984), 80ff.

⁵⁹ Cf. M. Albani, *Astronomie und Schöpfungsglaube. Untersuchungen zum Astronomischen Henochbuch* (WMANT 68; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchner Verlag, 1994), 40f.

than the Ethiopian texts, which has meanwhile been evaluated in such a way that the Ethiopian text-form represents a later epitome of the Aramaic version. Regardless of whether the Astronomical Book can be described as “apocalyptic,”⁶⁰ the discovery is of the greatest significance for the question of the beginnings and original motifs of early Jewish apocalyptic.

While the Qumran manuscripts of the Astronomical Book contain only this work, in other manuscripts with Enoch material, texts from the Book of the Watchers, the Book of Dream Vision as well as the Epistle of Enoch are already gathered together in one manuscript (4QEn^c ar). From the existence of this collection, new information could be gained with regard to the time of the collection of the Enoch material.⁶¹ Here, too, the age of one of the manuscripts is of significance. On the basis of paleography, the oldest manuscript 4QEn^a ar can be dated to the first half of the 2nd century BCE.⁶² The extant fragments contain parts of the Book of the Watchers, including its opening chapter, which may represent the final editorial form of the book. Thus, the Book of the Watchers, at the very least its core, the narrative of the fall of the watchers (*1 Enoch* 6–16), also may go back to the 3rd century BCE. Accordingly, the emergence of the Book of the Watchers as an indisputably apocalyptic text moves much further back than scholars had recognized prior to the Qumran discoveries.⁶³ The chronological result of the Qumran discoveries is, therefore, that of the various parts of the Enochic tradition, at least the Astronomical Book, the Book of the Watchers, and probably also the Book of Giants should have originated before the Maccabean period, that is, before the final redaction of the Book of Daniel.

Furthermore, the *number* of manuscripts is impressive. The newest list of the texts enumerates 9 or 10 manuscripts of the Book of Giants, 4 manuscripts of the Astronomical Book, and 7 manuscripts containing other parts of *1 Enoch* (the Book of the Watchers, the Book of Dream Visions, and the Epistle of Enoch, some of which are even already partially linked with one another). The Epistle of Enoch is also represented in Cave 7 in a Greek papyrus. In view of this intense reception, one may ask whether the Enoch tradition in the Qumran community enjoyed an almost canonical reputation, espe-

⁶⁰ This essentially depends on the literary critical questions of the original affiliation of *1 Enoch* 80–81; see M. Albani, *Astronomie und Schöpfungsglaube*, 33–38; VanderKam, *Enoch*, 79.

⁶¹ Cf. the hypotheses of G. W. E. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch I*, 21–26.

⁶² Cf. Milik, *Books of Enoch*, 140; see also Stegemann, “Bedeutung,” 503f.

⁶³ Cf., for example, E. Schürer, *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi* (3rd ed.; Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1898), 2:510, who assumed that a “Grundschrift” for the book of Enoch” was composed in the last third of the 2nd century BCE.

cially as a number of other texts draw on Enoch material.⁶⁴ The Aramaic language and the age of the material also suggest that these texts did not originate from within the Qumran community. It is true that there has recently been an intense debate about whether the latter is not simply part of an “Enochic” branch of Judaism.⁶⁵ However, substantial difference between the Enochic writings and the group-specific Qumran texts cannot be overlooked. While one may be permitted to identify the “lambs” in the Enochic Animal Apocalypse as the Hasidim of the Maccabean era,⁶⁶ these texts do not indicate that a figure like the later “Teacher of Righteousness” has already appeared. Furthermore, the Enochic writings show less interest in the Torah, no dominant priestly interests (as is present in the Essene rule texts), and no specific interest in the organization of a community behind them. In this respect, there is much to be said for clearly distinguishing between the circles in which this material originated and was handed down and the later Qumran community. Nevertheless, the significance of the Enoch traditions for the community behind Qumran is evident, and this too speaks for their interest in apocalyptic motifs and for the – at least partial – influence of apocalyptic thinking on the Qumran community.

(c) Some more texts related to the Enochic tradition can be mentioned.⁶⁷ First, there is a small fragment (4Q247) classified by the editors as a Peshet on the Apocalypse of Weeks. The text is Hebrew, and the reference to a weekly chronology is clear, although the genre of the text remains somewhat unclear, as the technical term “peshet” (= interpretation) does not occur in the extant fragment.⁶⁸ But if the Apocalypse of Weeks (*1 Enoch* 93:1–10; 91:11–17) were in fact interpreted by the Qumran community in a peshet-style writing, this would strongly point to a quasi-canonical character of at least some parts of the Enochic tradition.

It is much more important that *Jubilees*, which until now was also known fully only within the Ethiopian language, is attested in 14 or 15 Hebrew man-

⁶⁴ Cf. G. W. E. Nickelsburg, “Enoch, Books of,” *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. L. H. Schiffman and J. C. VanderKam; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 1:249–253, here 1:252.

⁶⁵ Cf. G. Boccaccini, *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis: The Parting of the Ways between Qumran and Enochic Judaism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998). For the discussion about these matters, see M. Albani, “‘Zadokite Judaism,’ ‘Enochic Judaism’ und Qumran: Zur aktuellen Diskussion um G. Boccaccinis ‘Beyond the Essene Hypothesis,’” in *Apokalyptik und Qumran* (ed. J. Frey and M. Becker; Paderborn: Bonifatius, 2007), 85–104.

⁶⁶ Cf. the discussion in P. A. Tiller, *A Commentary on the Animal Apocalypse of 1 Enoch* (SBLJL 4; Atlanta: SBL, 1993), 109–115; see also Collins, “Apocalypticism – Literary,” 408.

⁶⁷ Cf. also Nickelsburg, “Books of Enoch,” 104–109.

⁶⁸ Cf. M. Broshi, “4QPeshet on the Apocalypse of Weeks,” in *Qumran Cave 4 XXVI: Cryptic Texts* (ed. S. J. Pfann; DJD 36; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000), 187–191.

uscripts from Qumran. In addition to this, there are also some related texts: three manuscripts of “Pseudo-Jubilees” (4Q225–227) and a manuscript citing *Jubilees* (4Q228). This writing, whose original language is clearly Hebrew and which may have had a quasi-canonical authority in the Qumran community, is in many respects linked to the Enochic tradition. It refers to Enoch’s testimony (*Jub.* 4:24) and takes up material from the Book of Enoch (*Jub.* 4:21–26; 5:1–13; 7:20–39; 8:1–4; 10:10–18),⁶⁹ and thus clearly proves to be a part of the Enochic tradition, retelling the story of Genesis and Exodus within the framework of an Enochic calendar. Scholars usually consider the writing a “rewritten Bible” text,⁷⁰ but due to its literary design as an angel’s dictation to Moses from the heavenly tablets, it could also be classified as an “apocalypse” in the sense of J. J. Collins’ definition.⁷¹

The importance of the work to the Qumran community is evident from the number of manuscripts and the texts that incorporated elements from *Jubilees*.⁷² However, nothing in the book indicates the existence of a community organization, as it then appears in the *Rule of the Community* (1QS) or in the *Damascus Document*. Therefore, *Jubilees* is not a product of this community. Rather it documents the close connection between apocalyptic tradition and halakic interests which was adopted and further developed within the Qumran community.⁷³

Parallels to *Jubilees*⁷⁴ can be found within the *Apocryphon of Jeremiah*, which was previously considered a Pseudo-Moses text.⁷⁵ In terms of content, this work shows a developed demonology,⁷⁶ in the context of which the do-

⁶⁹ Cf. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch*, 1:72f.

⁷⁰ Thus Lange and Mittmann-Richert, “Annotated List,” 124

⁷¹ Cf. carefully, Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination*, 66f. Another judgment comes when one determines the proximity or distance to apocalyptic on the criterion of the treatment of divinatory dreams as with A. Lange, “Divinatorische Träume und Apokalyptik im Jubiläenbuch,” in *Studies in the Book of Jubilees* (ed. M. Albani, J. Frey, and A. Lange; TSAJ 65; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997), 25–38.

⁷² The title of the book is mentioned in the *Damascus Document*: CD XVI 3–4.

⁷³ See also Collins, “Apocalypticism and Literary Genre,” 409.

⁷⁴ Cf. D. Dimant, “New Light from Qumran on the Jewish Pseudepigrapha – 4Q390,” in *The Madrid Qumran Congress* (ed. J. Trebelle Barrera, L. Vegas Montaner; STDJ 11/2; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 2:405–448; Collins, “Apocalypticism and Literary Genre,” 420.

⁷⁵ The manuscripts now assigned to this text are 4Q385a, 387, 388a, 389, 390, 397a. Cf. D. Dimant, “4QApocryphon of Jeremiah,” in *Qumran Cave 4 XXI: Parabiblical Texts, Part 4: Pseudo-Prophetic Texts* (ed. D. Dimant; DJD 30; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2001), 91ff. In Lange and Mittmann-Richert, “Annotated List,” 127, it is considered that 4Q384 should also be assigned to the same text. The genre assigned there is that of the “non-symbolic apocalypses.”

⁷⁶ See also J. Frey, “Different Patterns of Dualism in the Qumran Library,” in *Legal Texts and Legal Issues: Proceedings of the Second Meeting of the International Organization of Qumran Studies, Cambridge 1995. Published in Honour of Joseph M. Baumgarten*

minion of Belial is mentioned. Perhaps the text ended with a view of a court scene. But the literary form of the whole is unclear. Furthermore, this text shows no particular evidence of a Qumran “sectarian” or group-specific authorship; in particular there is no reference to the particular community formation. In my opinion, it could also have come from a predecessor group of the Qumran community.⁷⁷

(d) When asking about apocalypses in the Qumran findings, we must definitely mention the Aramaic *New Jerusalem* text. This work is preserved in six manuscripts, and contains a narrative about a visionary who is led around by an angel who interprets what he sees. At the same time, the text also considers the architectural features of the Holy City, whose model is influenced by Ezek 40–48. In this case, one can speak formally of an apocalypse, according to Collins’ definition,⁷⁸ although the beginning and the end of the text have not been preserved and it remains unclear who the recipient of the revelation is. Though the origin of this writing is no longer completely clear, the fact that it is written in Aramaic speaks clearly against a Qumran “sectarian” authorship.

(e) Another text with an apocalyptic character is the *Visions of Amram*. The text is identified by the title (4Q543 1 1 = 4Q545 1 1) as a transcription of the words of the vision of Amram, which determines that the genre is more likely to be that of a “testament.” In addition to looking back, prospective looks, and exhortations, the content of this work includes a conspicuous, dualistic scene of the dispute between two angels. Amram is required to choose between these two angels. This cosmic dualism of powers⁷⁹ clearly points to a dualistic thought structure that probably originated in priestly circles, as is suggested by the choice of the “hero,” Amram, the grandfather of Levi. Incidentally, this dualism is already characterized by metaphorical elements of light: the terms “sons of light” versus “sons of darkness” (4Q548 1 ii–2 10f., 15f.) as well as “sons of lies” versus “sons of truth” (4Q548 1 ii–2 8f.), which later became characteristic for the Qumran community, are already mentioned in this text and also in the closely related *Testament of Qahat* (4Q542). The Aramaic language is also evidence that this work had a place of origin outside of or in the precursors to the *yahad* community.

(ed. M. J. Bernstein, F. García Martínez, and J. Kampen; STDJ 25; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 275–335, here 325f. (reprinted in this volume 243–299, here 290f.).

⁷⁷ Cf. also D. Dimant, “New Light,” 405–448, here 447; idem, “4QApocryphon of Jeremiah,” 116.

⁷⁸ See Frey, “The New Jerusalem Text in Its Historical and Traditio-Historical Context,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls – 50 Years After Their Discovery 1947–1997: Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20–25, 1997* (ed. L. H. Schiffman, E. Tov, and J. C. VanderKam; Jerusalem: Israel Museum, 2000), 800–816, here 804 (reprinted in this volume, 349–368, here 354). Cf. also Stegemann, “Bedeutung,” 517f.

⁷⁹ See J. Frey, “Different Patterns of Dualism,” 316–326ff. (in this volume, 281–290).

(f) A small but interesting text still to be mentioned is one whose beginning remains intact, thus allowing us to make a relatively easy assessment of its genre. The fragment 4Q529 begins with the words, “Words of the book that Michael spoke to the angels” After this are heavenly, topographical details followed by a historical, theological, and eschatological prophecy that apparently comes from a heavenly book. It is clear that this text is an apocalypse. Nevertheless, the fact that it too is written in Aramaic means it can hardly be attributable to the community itself.

(g) If we look back at the writings previously mentioned, we find that the overwhelming number of texts classified as “Apocalypse” (Daniel, Enochic writings, the New Jerusalem Scroll, perhaps the Visions of Amram; Words of Michael) are composed in the Aramaic language. Only *Jubilees* (which assumes a hybrid position in regard to genre but does not originate with the community) and the Pseudo Jeremiah text related to it (which is also unlikely to have been drafted within the *yahad*) were composed in Hebrew.

There are also some cases where it was discussed in terms of the genre whether it is an apocalypse or not. Since a negative answer has become relatively clear, I mention these now only briefly:

- The book about the birth of Noah (1Q19/19a; “Book of Noah”) may be related to the Enochic literature, but does not bear apocalyptic features.⁸⁰
- Also, the pseudo-Ezekiel text (4Q385, 4Q385b, 4Q385c, 4Q386, 4Q388 and 4Q391) does not formally contain any of the recognizable traits of an apocalypse, but belongs instead – perhaps similar to the Pseudo Jeremiah text – to the group of “parabiblical” texts (i.e., the paraphrases of or updates to prophetic texts). This is true even though the scene of the dry bones is already much more realistic in this text (i.e., probably in the context of a changed view of the resurrection of the dead). However, even these points of contact are merely similarities in content with apocalyptic eschatology.⁸¹ This text also does not show specific features of being authored by the *yahad* community.
- Another text that has attracted a good deal of attention is 4Q521, which was initially described by its editor Émile Puech as a “*Messianic Apocalypse*.” Regardless of the question of whether the “Messiah” or rather several anointed ones (e.g., the prophets) are meant with the term *lms̄hw* (4Q521 2 II 1) in this text,⁸² it is clear that the text that speaks of God’s

⁸⁰ I am not able to go into detail here about the remaining Noah materials in the *Genesis Apocryphon* from Cave 1, in *1 Enoch* 106f., or in the oft discussed 4Q534. For a discussion of these materials, see F. García Martínez, *Qumran and Apocalyptic* (STDJ 9; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 1–44; Collins, “Apocalypticism – Literary Genre,” 409.

⁸¹ Collins, “Apocalypticism – Literary Genre,” 421, continues: The text “may well be a fragmentary apocalypse, and this is also possible in the case of Pseudo-Moses.”

⁸² K.-W. Niebuhr, “4Q521,2 II – ein eschatologischer Psalm,” in *Mogilany 1995: Papers on the Dead Sea Scrolls Offered in Memory of Aleksy Klawek* (ed. Z. J. Kapera; Qum-

end-time salvation and above all the raising of the dead is not an “apocalypse” but rather an exegetical composition drawing on passages from the prophets and the psalms.⁸³

- In the genre specific sense of the word, the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifices* are also by no means apocalypses. These songs share an interest with apocalypses in angelology and the heavenly world but are not even dressed in the form of a heavenly revelation.⁸⁴
- Discussed again and again in the context of apocalyptic,⁸⁵ though by no means an apocalypse but rather a primarily sapiential text is 1Q/4Q *Mysteries*. The fact that this is not an apocalypse has become clear in light of the complete release of the wisdom texts from Qumran. At the same time, however, it should be noted that in this text, as in the related larger text of 1Q/4Q *Instruction*, wisdom traditions and practical instructions are combined with cosmological and eschatological or even apocalyptic motifs.
- Finally, the famous *War Scroll* 1QM, which had directed the interest of early Qumran scholarship toward apocalyptic motifs, cannot be classified as an apocalypse. This applies in any case with respect to the question of genre: The work belongs to the rule texts, as it does not present a vision but rather a “liturgical” rule for the eschatological war between the sons of light and the sons of darkness. In terms of content, of course, one will certainly find apocalyptic elements in this text.

As an interim conclusion, it should be noted that there are apocalypses of different kinds (heavenly journeys, symbolic apocalypses, non-symbolic apocalypses) among the Qumran discoveries, but these are written mainly in the Aramaic language. Hebrew apocalypses if one wishes to evaluate *Jubilees* as such, are rare.⁸⁶ Of course, it is restrictive to note that an assignment of genre cannot be made sufficiently certain for all relevant texts.

Since the apocalypses within the Qumran library (with the possible exception of *Jubilees*) are all written in the Aramaic language, it must also be noted

ranica Mogilanensia; Krakó: Enigma Press, 1996), 151–168; M. Becker, “4Q521 und die Gesalbten,” *RevQ* 18.1 (1997): 73–96. See the detailed discussion of this text in Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte*, 343–388; See also M. Becker, “Die ‘messianische Apokalypse’ 4Q521 und der Interpretationsrahmen der Taten Jesu,” in *Apokalyptik und Qumran*, 237–303.

⁸³ Cf. Niebuhr, “4Q521,2 II.”

⁸⁴ Rightly so in Collins, “Apocalypticism – Literary Genre,” 420; cf. idem, *Apocalypticism – Scrolls*, 136–143; for a detailed treatment of the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*, cf. A. M. Schwemer, “Gott als König und seine Königsherrschaft in den Sabbatliedern aus Qumran,” in *Königsherrschaft Gottes und himmlischer Kult im Judentum, Urchristentum und in der hellenistischen Welt* (ed. M. Hengel and A. M. Schwemer; WUNT 55; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1991), 45–118.

⁸⁵ Cf., for example, Koch, “Einleitung,” 116.

⁸⁶ Thus, for example, Collins, “Apocalypticism – Literary Genre,” 421.

that they are not the literary products of the group that appears and is referred to as the *yahad* within the rule texts. According to the linguistic usage presupposed here, these are non-Essene or at least probably pre-Essene texts. The more uncertain origin of the pseudo Jeremiah and pseudo-Ezekiel texts cannot overturn this general image. As to the productive reception of the literary genre of apocalypse, the conclusion of Hartmut Stegemann stands: the Essene community did not cultivate the literary form of the apocalypse.⁸⁷ If one asks about the reasons for this, the most plausible explanation, in my opinion, is that within this community another form of revelatory communication replaced the divinatory dream visions and heavenly journeys, namely the inspired interpretation of Scripture,⁸⁸ the Torah, the prophets, and the Psalms, as was presumably practiced by the figure of the Teacher and then continued in specific literary forms such as the *pesharim*.⁸⁹

Of course, this does not exclude that this community was able to receive apocalyptic content in a wide range. This is already supported by the reception of older apocalypses like the book of Daniel, the Enochic writings, the *New Jerusalem Text*, or the Visions of Amram within the library, as well as several manuscripts and explicit references to some of these texts.

II. Apocalyptic Content in the Texts from the Yahad

If we take another step and ask how apocalyptic material was incorporated into the group-specific texts of Qumran, then the picture changes. I would like to discuss the problem in three different subject areas, wherein the facts are variously presented: (1) the understanding of time and history, (2) the question of the origin of evil and the associated dualistic structures of thought, and (3) the motif of communion with the angels. I will leave aside other themes that deserve to be discussed in a similar manner, such as the motif of the eschatological war,⁹⁰ the notions of the messianic or eschatologi-

⁸⁷ Stegemann, "Bedeutung," 520f.

⁸⁸ See the detailed analysis by A. Lange, "The Essene Position on Magic and Divination," in *Legal Texts and Legal Issues: Proceedings of the Second Meeting of the International Organization of Qumran Studies, Cambridge 1995, Published in Honor of J. M. Baumgarten* (ed. M. J. Bernstein, F. García Martínez, and J. Kampen; STDJ 25; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 377–435, above all pages 377–435; furthermore, see idem, "Interpretation als Offenbarung. Zum Verhältnis von Schriftauslegung und Offenbarung in apokalyptischer und nichtapokalyptischer Literatur," in *Wisdom* (ed. F. García Martínez), 17–34.

⁸⁹ Cf. also Collins, "Dead Sea Sect," 261–286: "With the arrival of the Teacher of Righteousness, the sect had no need to rely on the authority of legendary heroes such as Enoch. The authority accorded to the contemporary figure of the Teacher is probably a major reason why the sectarians dispensed with the literary form of the apocalypse" (279).

⁹⁰ Cf. F. García Martínez, "Apocalypticism," 184–190.

cal figures⁹¹ (which are related to apocalyptic motifs but do not represent their core), and even the complex theme of the expectation of an eschatological judgment and a resurrection of the dead.⁹²

1. The *Yahad's* Understanding of Time and History

Following a line of reasoning by John Collins,⁹³ I would like to use observations concerning the understanding of time and history in the *Damascus Document*. This text is certainly no apocalypse, but it is a text in which – probably under the title “The Last Exploration of the Torah”⁹⁴ – halakic rules are offered to the community. These rules are introduced by way of sapiential discourses, in which a paraenetic view of Israel’s history until the time of the emergence of the “Essenes” or the *yahad* community is presented. The *Damascus Document* certainly belongs to the group-specific texts and was most likely written around 100 BCE. The ten manuscripts from the Qumran library have a more extensive text compared to the version already discovered in the Cairo Geniza in 1897 (hence the abbreviation CD = Cairo Genizah copy of the *Damascus Document*). The text already looks back on the work (CD I 11) and death of the “Teacher of Righteousness” (CD XX 14) and localizes their own present in the last era after his death, which should last for about 40 years (CD XX 15). That is to say, this writing, which is highly significant for the community, depends on an epoch-structured course of history, which is fixed by God for all times (CD II 9f.). In addition to the law of Moses, CD XVI 2 references the “book of the division of ages after their jubilees and their weeks (of years),” which is presumably a reference to *Jubilees*, whose chronological structuring of time, in addition to the Mosaic Torah, was found

⁹¹ Cf. J. J. Collins, *The Scepter and the Star* (New York: Anchor Bible, 1995); idem, *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 71ff.; J. C. VanderKam, “Messianism and Apocalypticism,” in *Encyclopedia of Apocalypticism I: The Origins of Apocalypticism in Judaism and Christianity* (New York: Bloomsbury, 2002), 193–228; H. Lichtenberger, “Messianic Expectations and Messianic Figures During the Second Temple Period,” in *Qumran-Messianism* (ed. J. H. Charlesworth, H. Lichtenberger, and G. S. Oegema; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1988), 9–20; G. S. Oegema, “Messianic Expectations in the Qumran Writings: Theses on their Development,” in *Qumran-Messianism*, 191–203; H.-J. Fabry, “Die Messiaserwartung in den Handschriften von Qumran,” in *Wisdom* (ed. F. García Martínez), 357–384.

⁹² Cf. Collins, “Apocalypticism – Literary Genre,” 110ff.; cf. also H. Lichtenberger, “Auferstehung in den Qumranfunden,” in *Auferstehung – Resurrection* (ed. F. Avemarie and H. Lichtenberger; WUNT 135; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001), 79–91.

⁹³ Collins, “Dead Sea Sect,” 280ff.

⁹⁴ Cf. 4Q266 XI 18–21.

dational for the community. This means that the *yahad* took its understanding of the periodization of history from apocalyptic traditions.⁹⁵

The basic data are included in CD I: First of all – in good Deuteronomic terms – the destruction of Jerusalem and the exile are interpreted as punishment for previous sins, as a sign that God had abandoned them (I 3f.). But the picture of history presented here differs from what is formulated, for example, in Dan 9: The post-exilic period is regarded as the “time of wrath” (*gez ḥaron*), and the presence of the community is still seen under this sign.⁹⁶ In this “time of wrath,” a remnant in Israel is not abandoned for destruction, but from it a sprout of a plant emerges (cf. *I Enoch* 10:16; 93:10).⁹⁷ This can now be combined with the (ideal) chronology offered in CD I: 390 years after the exile, the visitation begins, the reverse movement of the remnant. Twenty more years, it is said, were the repentant “like the blind” and those who fumble about (I 9f.). Then God raised up a teacher for them. If we add about 40 years for the time of the teacher’s ministry and another 40 years from the time of his departure to the end of this particularly troubled time, then there would be a timeframe of 490 years, that is, 70 weeks of years (Dan 9) or ten jubilees for the “time of wrath.” It is during this particularly violent, final period of time, in close expectation of the end, that the addressees of the *Damascus Document* live.⁹⁸

If the presence of the community is located in the “time of wrath,” then this is expressed in CD by saying that “in all these years Belial will be set against Israel” (CD IV 13), trying to seduce the pious with his three “nets” (CD IV 15). In CD XVI 5, instead of the name “Belial” the term “*malakh hamastema*” (angel of enmity) is encountered. This name is evidently a reference to the name “Mastema,” used in *Jubilees* for the prince of demons. CD XII 2 speaks of the “spirits of Belial” reigning over a man (cf. *Jub.* 1:20; spirit of Belial). This shows that the *Damascus Document* is connected with *Jubilees* even with respect to the use of names for the eschatological adver-

⁹⁵ Collins, “Dead Sea Sect,” 280: “There is good reason, then, to believe that the members of the new covenant acquired their periodization of history from apocalyptic sources.”

⁹⁶ CD I 5 does not mean that this time would be over with the visitation of the remnant.

⁹⁷ Interestingly enough, the *Apocalypse of Weeks* in the book of Enoch also speaks of a “planting of righteousness” during the 7th week which is the period, in which the addressees are probably located.

⁹⁸ Surely there are uncertainties here: The 390 years could be derived from Ezek 4:5 making a calculation starting with the year of the Temple destruction impossible. Two other numbers are given in the *Damascus Document*. The duration of the Teacher’s ministry must be conjectured. But the number of 40 years is not only “biblical,” it could also approximate historical reality.

sary.⁹⁹ But interestingly, the *Damascus Document* does not refer to the names of the two spirits as presented in the (in my opinion, pre-sectarian) Treatise on the Two Spirits (1QS III 13–IV 26, whose determinism, on the other hand, is very well received).¹⁰⁰

Without explaining the nature of “Belial,” his effectiveness is presupposed in the *Damascus Document* as well as in other “sectarian” Qumran texts: Belial is considered to be unleashed against Israel during the time of the community’s existence. Only those who have entered into the covenant are preserved from his afflictions. Indeed, with the entrance into the covenant, the “angel of enmity” abates. Here we encounter an essential aspect of the community’s elitist consciousness of being specifically elected. This is also the difference between earlier concepts of dualism in which the opposition is still set between Israel and the nations, whereas the dividing line now runs within Israel, namely between insiders and outsiders, between the members and non-members of the *yahad* community.¹⁰¹

The *Damascus Document*’s theology of history thus has its closest predecessors in texts such as the Enochic Apocalypse of Weeks or the *Book of Jubilees*. The author of the *Damascus Document* has adopted the chronological schemes from these works. According to the determinism of the *Damascus Document*, God has established the times in advance, according to a heptadic structure of jubilees and “weeks” of years, so that even the end can be chronologically recorded. Later, in the *Pesher Habakkuk*, it must even be argued why this “last age” (*gez ha-aḥaron*) extends beyond the supposed date of the end (1QpHab VII). These remarks probably do not mean *stricto sensu* an “end of the world.” Rather, the concept envisages the end of the “time of wrath” together with the destruction of the wicked (CD XX 14; end of all the “men of the fight”) to be followed by a new era of unrestricted salvation of the pious (CD XX 33f.). This perspective also corresponds to the Apocalypse of Weeks or to the particular apocalyptic outlook in *Jubilees 23*.

We can now place a number of other Qumran texts alongside this text. I will only mention the text called *Ages of Creation* (4Q180–181) and the famous Melchizedek Midrash (11QMelch). It is clear from all these texts that the Qumran community located itself in the last period of history. The term

⁹⁹ The choice of the name “Belial” in CD IV 13, as Daniel Schwartz has supposed, may have been drawn from 1 Sam 2:12. Cf. D. R. Schwartz, “To Join Oneself to the House of Judah (*Damascus Document* IV 11),” *RevQ* 10 (1981): 435–446, here 439f.

¹⁰⁰ See Lange, *Weisheit*, 251ff.; J. Frey, “Different Patterns of Dualism,” 301–307 (in this volume, 267–273).

¹⁰¹ Cf. Frey, “Patterns,” 301–307 (in this volume, 267–273); idem, “Licht aus den Höhlen? Der ‘johanneische Dualismus’ und die Texte von Qumran,” in *Kontexte des Johannesevangeliums. Das vierte Evangelium in religions- und traditionsgeschichtlicher Perspektive* (ed. J. Frey and U. Schnell, with collaboration from J. Schlegel; WUNT; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004), 117–203, here 165–167.

“end of days” (אֲחֵרֵי הַיָּמִים) has almost become a technical term for this idea.¹⁰²

The dawning of this “end time” is also established in the halakic text 4QMMT in an almost proclamatory manner,¹⁰³ and the early “Essene” *Rule of the Congregation* 1QSa is understood as a rule for the community of Israel in the end times. This period is a time of testing, but also a time of hope for the imminent salvation or cessation of lawlessness and, in particular, of the defilement of the Temple. And the *yahad* community seems to have not only expected but also calculated this end on the basis of (differing) models of a history of periodization in the heptadic schema.

It must be noted that the *yahad* community has adopted essential elements of the view of history from pre-sectarian or “pre-Essene” apocalypses and adapted this image to its own consciousness of election and special revelation. This is an apocalyptic view of time and history, and it is questionable not to call it apocalyptic just because it is not presented within the literary genre of an “apocalypse,” nor mediated by means of divination, such as the interpretation of dreams, or in the framework of a heavenly journey. It does not directly claim heavenly authority but emerges from the authority of an inspired interpretation of the Torah with the help of apocalyptic traditions. The Qumran community’s image of history is so overtly characterized by apocalypses and apocalyptic thinking that a definitional provision that seeks to exclude the adjective “apocalyptic” would appear to be inappropriate.

2. *The Question of the Origin of Evil and “Qumranic” Dualism*¹⁰⁴

The heterogeneity of what is “apocalyptic” or what is being negotiated in “apocalypses” can also be seen in the problem of the different explanations for the origin of evil. It would be difficult to create a consistent picture here. The older research was already aware of the fact that the solutions to this question presented in *4 Ezra* or in *2 Baruch* look very different than in the older Enoch tradition, in which the sinful conditions in the world are not associated with Adam, but are explained by the rebellion of Shmyaza and

¹⁰² Cf. A. Steudel, “אֲחֵרֵי הַיָּמִים in the texts from Qumran,” *RevQ* 16 (1993): 225–246.

¹⁰³ Cf. 4QMMT C 21.

¹⁰⁴ J. J. Collins, “The Origin of Evil in Apocalyptic Literature and in the Qumran Community,” in *Seers, Sibyls and Sages in Hellenistic-Roman Judaism* (ed. J. J. Collins; JSJ.S 54; Leiden: Brill 1997), 287–300; García Martínez, “Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *The Encyclopedia of Apocalypticism* (ed. J. J. Collins; New York: Bloomsbury, 2002), 1:162–192, here 1:166–172. On the variety of concepts, see now M. Götte, *Von den Wächtern zu Adam: Frühjüdische Mythen über die Ursprünge des Bösen und ihre frühchristliche Rezeption* (WUNT II/426; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016).

Azazel (i.e., the fall of the Watchers).¹⁰⁵ Only in later apocalyptic texts is the myth of the Watchers connected with other motifs. This impressively demonstrates the imaginative variety of apocalyptic traditions and texts.

If we begin from here and look at the Qumran texts, a negative finding is first uncovered. The narrative of the watchers is indeed received within *Jubilees*, but is otherwise hardly taken into consideration within the other Qumran writings. The *Damascus Document* (CD II 15f.) alludes to the watchers, but they only function as a paradigmatic warning for sinners.¹⁰⁶ Within these texts, the watchers are not utilized as an explanation for the sinfulness of the world.

In the Qumran texts, on the other hand, there is another prominent model that explains the existence of evil in the world and the temptation of the pious. The Treatise on the Two Spirits in 1QS III 13–IV 26 offers a much more rigorous image determined by God’s predestination, leaving no room for an original “fall” or a primordial fall of the angelic beings.¹⁰⁷ Instead, God created and instituted two spirits from the very beginning that they guide humankind in different ways according to his predestination and lead them to different ethical actions as well as conflicting eschatological ends. The pious see themselves as a part of this struggle, which, interestingly enough, has seized their own hearts and will rage in them until the God-established end. With this last statement, it is likely that we find the real starting point for understanding the issue. The dualistic doctrine expressed within the instruction can be understood as an attempt to overcome the problem that evil exists in the world, that it even touches the circles of the pious, and that they too are tempted and sin. The contrasts regarding the ethical and religious orientation experienced in the world and in one’s own existence are now being clarified with the help of the light metaphor, that is the opposition of light and darkness. This metaphor represents the conflicting spirits and is attributed to the two angelic powers who are engaged in a continual struggle with one another. Ultimately, however, the two spirits also go back to the establishment and the order of the Creator God, who has put an end to their struggle and who will, at the appointed time, eliminate evil, purify the pious, and will therefore ac-

¹⁰⁵ Cf. the connection with the fall of Satan, the angels, and Adam in 2 *Enoch* 18:3; Cf. also the connection of the dualism of two spirits with the fall of the watchers in the collection of the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* etc. Concerning these matters, see Collins “Origin,” 297f. On the history of reception of the myth of the Watchers, see Götte, *Von den Wächtern zu Adam*, 78–165.

¹⁰⁶ Cf. the New Testament’s mention of the watchers in Jude 6, and again in 2 Peter 2:4f.

¹⁰⁷ For an interpretation of these texts, see H. Lichtenberger, *Studien zum Menschenbild in Texten der Qumrangemeinde* (SUNT 15; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1980), 123ff.; E. Brandenburger, *Das Böse* (ThSt 132; Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1982), 38–48; Lange, *Weisheit*, 143–170; Frey, “Patterns,” 289–307 (in this volume, 256–273).

compish the universal enforcement of his order and his will. In this respect, the Treatise on the Two Spirits also aims at providing a theodicy.

The answer given here to the problem of evil is quite different from that of the Book of the Watchers. Similarities between the two texts are the angelological framework and the conviction that in the end there will be a judgment wherein all impurity and the entire activity of darkness will be destroyed. But the angelic powers in the Treatise on the Two Spirits texts are inserted into a different system and are unambiguously attributed to God's creation and thus his will. This concept of the beginning has been traced back to the Iranian idea of two primordially equal spirits, Ahura Mazda and Ahri-man.¹⁰⁸ However, an immediate takeover of the Iranian myth is unlikely. Dualistic thinking, as it exists in the Treatise on the Two Spirits, is alien to the canonical texts of the Hebrew Bible, but it seems to have developed within the Palestinian-Jewish tradition and indeed in streams of wisdom tradition over a few intermediate stages.¹⁰⁹

These connections became apparent after the previously unknown wisdom texts from the Qumran library, in particular the so-called book of *Mysteries* and the great wisdom text *Musar le-Mevin* (whose title, in the official edition, is *Instruction*),¹¹⁰ were published in the 1990s.

These texts have given research essential new impulses¹¹¹ because they reveal a hitherto unknown tradition of Palestinian-Jewish wisdom that differs significantly from Ecclesiastes or Ben Sira (and even more so from the Greek Wisdom of Solomon).¹¹² These texts are also significant because they reflect

¹⁰⁸ Cf. already the work of K. G. Kuhn, "Die Sektenschrift und die iranische Religion," *ZTK* 49 (1952): 296–316.

¹⁰⁹ Concerning this development, cf. Frey, "Patterns," 295–307 (in this volume, 262–273).

¹¹⁰ Cf. most recently A. Lange, "Die Weisheitstexte aus Qumran: Eine Einleitung," in *The Wisdom Texts from Qumran and the Development of Sapiential Thought* (ed. C. Hempel, A. Lange, and H. Lichtenberger; BETL 159; Leuven: Peeters, 2002), 3–30.

¹¹¹ Cf. the volume of collected essays by C. Hempel, A. Lange, and H. Lichtenberger, eds., *The Wisdom Texts from Qumran and the Development of Sapiential Thought* (BETL 159; Leuven: Peeters, 2002); F. García Martínez, ed., *Wisdom and Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Biblical Tradition* (BETL 168; Leuven: Peeters 2003); and J. J. Collins, G. Sterling, and R. Clements, eds., *Sapiential Perspective: Wisdom in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (STDJ 51; Leiden: Brill, 2004). Cf. also the monographs: E. J. C. Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning for the Understanding Ones: Reading and Reconstructing the Fragmentary Early Jewish Sapiential Text 4QInstruction* (STDJ 44; Leiden: Brill 2001); M. J. Goff, *The Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom of 4QInstruction* (STDJ 50; Leiden: Brill 2003).

¹¹² Cf. D. J. Harrington, "Two Early Jewish Approaches to Wisdom: Sirach and Qumran Sapiential Work A," in *The Wisdom Texts from Qumran and the Development of Sapiential Thought* (ed. C. Hempel, A. Lange, and H. Lichtenberger; BETL 159; Leuven: Brill, 2002), 263–276. For a comparison with Ecclesiastes, see A. Lange, "In Diskussion mit

their own cosmic-protological and eschatological perspective. One branch of the Palestinian-Jewish wisdom tradition has been eschatologized or even “apocalypticized,” and the Qumran library preserves documents that attest to this branch of the tradition.

This eschatologization or “apocalypticization” first appears in the introduction of themes that are lacking in other, earlier wisdom traditions, especially the expectation of an eschatological judgment¹¹³ and the notion of the post-mortem glorification of the righteous (Dan 12:3).¹¹⁴ It also shows itself in further conceptual shifts. The book of *Mysteries* speaks of the eschatological destruction of iniquity and darkness by *the eschatological revelation of wisdom*: Only after the annihilation of iniquity will “justice ... be revealed ... and knowledge will fill the earth, and folly will no longer exist there” (1Q27 I 5–7 par 4Q300 4–6). This is a clear modification of the older wisdom tradition or even the wisdom tradition attested in Ben Sira. Finally, in the book of *Mysteries*, and more frequently in *Instruction*, there is talk of the “*raz nihyah*” (רַז נִהְיָה), the “mystery of becoming.”¹¹⁵ This enigmatic term, which encapsulates the epistemology of these texts, points to a creation order and order of being that encompasses protological-cosmological and eschatological dimensions. This preexistent primordial order is engraved on heavenly tablets and recorded in an “explanatory vision” (4Q417 I 1 15f.), that is, probably a revelatory writing. The discerning person should study this “mys-

dem Tempel. Zur Auseinandersetzung zwischen Kohelet und weisheitlichen Kreisen am Jerusalemer Tempel,” in *Qohelet in the Context of Wisdom* (ed. A. Schoors; BETL 136; Leuven: Brill, 1998), 113–159; idem, “Eschatological Wisdom in the Book of Qohelet and the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Fifty Years After Their Discovery* (ed. L. Schiffman, J. C. VanderKam, and E. Tov; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society in cooperation with The Shrine of the Book, Israel Museum, 2000), 817–825. For a comparison with the Wisdom of Solomon, see J. J. Collins, “The Mysteries of God. Creation and Eschatology in 4QInstruction and the Wisdom of Solomon,” in *Wisdom and Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Biblical Tradition* (ed. F. García Martínez; BETL 168; Leuven: Peeters, 2003), 287–305.

¹¹³ On this topic, see Goff, *Wisdom*, 171–176. Cf., for example, 4Q416 I 10–13; 4Q417 I 1 13–15; 4Q418 69 II 6–14; 4Q418 127 4–6, as well as a variety of other, short mentions.

¹¹⁴ Concerning 4Q418 69 II 7, see the most recent work by Goff, *Wisdom*, 176–179; cf. Collins, “Mysteries,” 296f.; idem., “The Eschatologizing of Wisdom in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *Sapiential Perspectives: Wisdom Literature in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. J. J. Collins, G. Sterling, and R. Clements; STDJ 51; Leiden: Brill, 2004. Cf. also T. Elgvin, “Early Essene Eschatology: Judgment and Salvation according to Sapiential Work A,” in *Current Research and Technological Development* (ed. D. W. Parry and S. T. Ricks; STDJ 20, Leiden 1996), 126–165; idem., “Wisdom and Apocalypticism in the Early Second Century BCE: The Evidence of 4QInstruction,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. L. Schiffman, J. C. VanderKam, and E. Tov), 226–247.

¹¹⁵ Thus the translation by Lange, *Weisheit*, 57. For an interpretation of the term, see the work of M. J. Goff, *The Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom*, 51–79; idem., “The Mystery of Creation in 4QInstruction,” *DSD* 10 (2003): 1–24.

tery of becoming,” though it is said that this wisdom (unlike the “classical” experiential wisdom) is not openly accessible but is given only to a few chosen.¹¹⁶ Meanwhile, the “spirit of the flesh,” that is, all those who are at enmity with God are unable to distinguish between good and evil. Thus, the texts point to a revealed wisdom that has its origins in heavenly wisdom and from which only those who have insight can gain understanding. This form of wisdom – in contrast to, for example, Ben Sira – is a revealed, ultimately heavenly wisdom that is accessible only to the limited group of the elect. Therein, it demonstrates correspondences with apocalypticism.

I cannot go into further detail about these wisdom texts here. They probably form the tradition-historical background from which the Treatise on the Two Spirits grew. All these texts, including the Treatise on the Two Spirits, go back to the time before the constitution of the *yahad*. Nevertheless, the “Essene” circles intensively received this tradition of eschatological wisdom. *Instruction* and the book of *Mysteries* are attested to in the Qumran library in 7–8 or 4 manuscripts respectively. The Treatise on the Two Spirits, which is linguistically related¹¹⁷ to both the book of *Mysteries* and *Instruction* and continues the essential propositions of this tradition, was later of great importance to the *yahad* community, as is evidenced by the fact that it was included in the collective manuscript 1QS, is quoted in various passages in group-specific texts and is alluded to in other places.¹¹⁸

It is interesting, however, that the Treatise on the Two Spirits only selectively adopts the eschatology of the texts mentioned above: Instead of the protological explanations of the mediation of heavenly wisdom, there is talk of the creation of the two “spirits.” But in the strict predestination dualism of the community, the Treatise participates in the elements laid out in the wisdom texts mentioned above. Furthermore, references to the eschatological judgment or the annihilation of the spirit of iniquity also participate in these elements. In this respect, too, the Treatise on the Two Spirits is “apocalyptically” formed – not in the sense of a direct borrowing of its conceptions from the Enochic or Danielic traditions, nor by the stylization of the text itself as a heavenly revelation, but rather in its dependency on a tradition of wisdom that integrates a series of themes that can be found in parallel apocalyptic texts.

The reception of the Treatise on the Two Spirits, not only in the comprehensive manuscript 1QS but also in other group-specific or “Essene” texts, shows that this instruction exerted a considerable influence on the Essene movement. Of course, it is not the only source of the dualism characteristic of

¹¹⁶ Cf. also Goff, *Wisdom*, 92–94.

¹¹⁷ Cf. Lange, “Weisheitstexte,” 25f.

¹¹⁸ Cf. Lange, *Weisheit*, 132–135; Frey, “Patterns,” 302–306 (in this volume, 268–273).

the Qumran community.¹¹⁹ Nowhere in the Qumran texts is the idea of the two spirits recorded – the closest parallel can be found in the *Testaments of the Patriarchs* (T. Jud. 20:1–2) – and the subtle structure of the dualism present here, which reckons with a struggle reaching into the heart of all humans, can only be found in a considerably modified form in the later community texts. There, the expression of dualism is much clearer and sharper, with a clear opposition between the sons of darkness and the sons of light, who are identified as the members of the community. Rather, what has been taken up in quotations is the idea of an eternal election (1QS IV 22, 26), which was of central importance for the theology of the *yahad*.¹²⁰ For the specific sectarian structure of cosmic dualism, as is seen more clearly in the *War Scroll* (1QM), there are other important influences that should be considered such as from the Visions of Amram or the *Testament of Qahat*.¹²¹ Here, long before the founding of the *yahad* community, there is mention of “sons of light” and “sons of darkness” or even “sons of lies” or “of the truth,” which is then of great importance within the Essene or Qumran sectarian texts as a designation for those who belong to both sides of the conflict.

It is important to note, however, that the dualistic thinking of the community is indebted to traditions and circles that have absorbed more or less strongly apocalyptic ideas: on the one hand, the wisdom circles responsible for *Instruction* and the book of *Mysteries*, and, on the other hand, the priestly writers thought to be assumed behind texts such as the Visions of Amram. In view of the *question about the origin of evil and its defeat*, which is central to the older Enoch apocalyptic tradition, it becomes clear that this subject was reflected in the Qumran community in a completely independent manner, which was distinctly different from the Enochic tradition. This demonstrates that the Essene movement and the Qumran community are not to be derived exclusively from the Enochic tradition or an apocalyptic tradition formed completely under Enochic influence.¹²² On the other hand, however, it becomes clear that even in the currents of Palestinian wisdom, perhaps also

¹¹⁹ See the foundational work by J. Frey, “Different Patterns.”

¹²⁰ Cf. CD II 7; 1QH^a VI 23f. (= XIV 11f. Sukenik) and 4Q181 1 II 5; See the detailed discussion in J. Frey, “Different Patterns,” 302f. (in this volume, 268–269).

¹²¹ See J. Frey, “Different Patterns,” 316–322 (in this volume, 281–286).

¹²² This is critically opposed to the far-reaching view that the Qumran understanding of the origin of evil derives explicitly from the Enochic tradition, as is advocated by García Martínez, “Apocalypticism,” 171f. within the context of the so-called Groningen-hypothesis. Concerning the influential thesis of G. Boccaccini, who assumes the original type of “Enochic Judaism” from which the Qumran movement then separated, cf. the critical essay by M. Albani “‘Zadokite Judaism,’ ‘Enochic Judaism’ und Qumran,” 85–104.

under the influence of the Enochic tradition developed within other circles¹²³ but without the use of the genre of an “apocalypse,” patterns of thought could emerge that must be considered apocalyptic in the broader sense: These include the idea of a celestial revelation laid down in some books (similar to the heavenly tablets in *Jubilees*), a (successively more sophisticated) angelology, a cosmic dualism of light and darkness, and the notion of an eschatological judgment. There is, of course, a difference with regard to the mediation of the revelation. This is not done by visions, the interpretation of dreams, pseudepigraphic fictions about the mediation of a pre-historic figure, but rather by the study of Scriptures and the penetration of the order of the creation by a certain type of wisdom, which is certainly not merely derived from the Mosaic Torah, but also is hardly far off from it.

In view of the precise relationships of the individual factions and traditions in the Palestinian Judaism of the 3rd and 2nd centuries BCE, many questions remain unanswered, but the key finding from the new wisdom texts from Qumran is that of an increasingly eschatological, dualistically marked flow of Palestinian-Jewish wisdom that stands alongside the traditions of Ben Sira and that apparently had a lasting influence on the Essene movement and the *yahad* community. In this sense, later Essenism becomes the bearer of apocalyptic traditions.

*III. Communion with the Heavenly Beings*¹²⁴

A third motif, which is to be regarded as “apocalyptic” in the broader sense, has to be briefly considered. It is the idea of communion with the heavenly beings, which was considered central in the *yahad* community. This theme shows similarities and specific differences in comparison with the older apocalyptic texts.

It is well known that angelology occupies a great deal of the book of Daniel, and even more of the Enochic tradition. Myriads stand before God, in organized structures and various ranks. Angels perform very different functions, and many are even named individually.¹²⁵ In the Enochic tradition (not

¹²³ The thesis of a direct reference to the Enochic tradition, which was presented in several essays by Torleif Elgvin, cannot be maintained according to the lucid analyses of L. T. Stuckenbruck, “4QInstruction and the Possible Influence of Early Enochic Traditions: An Evaluation,” in *The Wisdom Texts*, 245–261. Of course, the possibility of influences cannot be ruled out.

¹²⁴ Cf. García Martínez, “Apocalypticism,” 179–184; Cf. already H.-W. Kuhn, *Enderwartung und gegenwärtiges Heil. Untersuchungen zu den Gemeindeliedern von Qumran mit einem Anhang über Eschatologie und Gegenwart in der Verkündigung Jesu* (SUNT 4; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966).

¹²⁵ Concerning early Jewish angelology, see the foundational work of M. Mach, *Entwicklungsstadien des jüdischen Engelglaubens in vorrabbinischer Zeit* (TSAJ 34; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1992); M. J. Davidson, *Angels at Qumran: a comparative study*

in Daniel), the interest in the heavenly world is expressed in terms of a heavenly topography. Within the framework of a heavenly journey, Enoch experiences places of punishment and salvation, penetrates to the throne of God, and learns of God's power and greatness in an impressive way. The visionary Enoch becomes a part of the heavenly world, and, through his book, he communicates the message of this world to the earthly community.

With the apocalyptic texts like Daniel and Enoch or even the Visions of Amram, the Qumran community shares an interest in angelology and demonology. Of course, these angelological interests are not only limited to, in the narrower sense, apocalyptic texts. An example of this is the possibly pre-sectarian composition of the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*,¹²⁶ which cannot be classified as an apocalypse but displays a very differentiated view of the heavenly world and could certainly convey a similar reading experience such as the description of a heavenly journey.¹²⁷ The Qumran community has adopted this "worldview" with the texts and traditions that they have received.

However, in the organization of the *yaḥad*, there is a decisive modification of the motifs of the older apocalyptic. For in the group-specific texts, the conviction is now explicitly expressed that the community of the pious itself is a "temple," a "human temple" (אָדָם מִקְדָּשׁ), as is formulated in the famous "Florilegium" (4Q174), which is now considered a part of the "Midrash on Eschatology" (4QMidrEschat III 6).¹²⁸ The temple terminology is metaphorically transferred to the community itself. The community is the sanctuary where "works of gratitude" (תּוֹרָה יִמְעֵשׂ) are offered to God (4QMidrEschat III 7)¹²⁹ – The community's rigid observance of the Torah and its strict purity halakah replaced the sacrifices, which could not be practiced outside of the

of 1 Enoch 1–36, 72–108 and sectarian writings from Qumran (JSP.S 11, Sheffield: Bloomsbury, 1992).

¹²⁶ Contra García Martínez, "Apocalypticism," 181f., who evaluates the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* as the most elaborate evidence of the Essene angelology.

¹²⁷ Thus, rightly argued by Collins "Apocalypticism – Literary Genre," 141. Cf. now the study of my PhD student Michael R. Jost, *Gemeinschaft mit Engeln im irdischen Gottesdienst* (WUNT II; Tübingen: 2019), who adduces strong arguments for a Qumran sectarian origin of that composition.

¹²⁸ On the reconstruction of this text, cf. A. Steudel, *Der Midrasch zur Eschatologie aus der Qumrangemeinde (4QMidrEschat^{a,b}). Materielle Rekonstruktion, Textbestand, Gattung und traditions-geschichtliche Einordnung des durch 4Q174 ("Florilegium") und 4Q177 ("Catena A") repräsentierten Werkes aus den Qumranfunden* (STDJ 13; Leiden: Brill, 1994).

¹²⁹ Cf. Steudel, *Midrasch*, 165f. Whether it is appropriate to speak of "spiritualization" here is, in my opinion, questionable. Concerning the whole, see G. Klinzing, *Die Umdeutung des Kultes in der Qumrangemeinde und im Neuen Testament* (SUNT 7; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971).

Jerusalem Temple.¹³⁰ In an interesting parallel from the *Rule of the Community* of 1QS VIII 5, the community is referred to as a “holy house for Israel” and, in 1QS IX 6, it is once again said that the community should be separated and united as “the most holy,” as “the house of the community (יהוד בית) for Israel, who walk in perfection.” For the Qumran community, this was not a hope related to any future epochs but a conviction that referred to the present, in which the earthly sanctuary, the Jerusalem Temple, was regarded as contaminated and the concrete participation in a halakically “correct” sacrificial cult was impossible.

Closely linked to this is the specific idea of the present possibility of communion with the angels.¹³¹ In a significant passage of the *Hodayot*, in reference to one’s entry into the community, it is said that the depraved spirit, cleansed by God, “takes its place with the army of the holy ones and enters into communion with the community of the sons of heaven.”¹³² In 1QS XI 7f., it is analogously formulated that God “made [the elect] heirs in the lot of the holy ones ... and he has united their community with the sons of heaven in a common council of the community and in a circle of the sacred building.” That is, those who entered into the end-time covenant are now explicitly considered to be a part of a community of heavenly and earthly beings, and the members of the community were convinced that in their earthly cult, i.e., the gathering of their community (and in their status of purity) they participated in the heavenly cult (cf. 1QSb III 25f.).¹³³

This idea, based on the metaphor of the temple, but further intensified, is linked with the Essenian struggle for a high priestly purity of all the members of the community.¹³⁴ This also has implications for the rules of admission or non-admission if, according to the “*Rule of the Congregation*” 1QSa II 3–9, no lame, blind, or stuttering people are allowed to participate in the congregation assembly “for the angels of holiness are in their community.”¹³⁵ The idea is met in a somewhat different way in the precepts for the eschatological war, wherein, according to the *War Scroll* (as also in the biblical instructions for the “Holy War”), special cultic purity is demanded (1QM VII 5f.).

In the present context, I cannot go deeper into the issues of precursors and parallels for this complex of ideas. It is clear, however, that the reception of

¹³⁰ Concerning the reception of the paradise traditions, cf. G. J. Brooke, “Miqdash Adam, Eden, and the Qumran Community,” in *Gemeinde ohne Tempel: Community without Temple* (ed. B. Ego, A. Lange, and P. Pilhofer; WUNT 118; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999), 285–301.

¹³¹ See the compilation of essential passages in Kuhn, *Enderwartung*, 67f.

¹³² 1QH III 21–23 Sukenik (= 1QH^a XI 22–24 according to Hartmut Stegemann’s reconstruction).

¹³³ Cf. 1QH XI 14, 25f. Sukenik (=1QH^a XIX 17, 28f. Stegemann).

¹³⁴ Thus Kuhn, *Enderwartung*, 67f.

¹³⁵ Cf. 4Q267 17 I 6–9.

the angelological ideas of the Enochic literature under the auspices of this conviction of the present communion with the heavenly world and the participation in a “lot of the light” that encompasses angels and humans could happen in a particularly intense manner. Within this framework, the Qumran community has developed a specific consciousness of the present eschatological “salvation,” as it is manifested in the eschatological gift of Torah knowledge and appropriate interpretation of the prophetic Scriptures, in the knowledge of one’s own election in the last age, and the fellowship with the angels already granted here. This specific form of present-day eschatology is not opposed to the eschatological expectation of an imminent end, an annihilation of the wicked, and a fulfillment of divine salvation, which is also shared by the Qumran group, but rather combines with it to form a “double” eschatology: Expectations for the future and the certainty of the present do not contradict one another, but the certainty of the experience of salvation and communion with the angels, as experienced in the *yahad*, is precisely an expression of an increased form of apocalyptic thought.

IV. Summary

It has become clear that the Qumran community’s thinking is deeply rooted in many aspects of apocalyptic traditions. The strong reception of Danielic and Enochic traditions, the numerous manuscripts of *Jubilees*, or the reception of other associated texts that belong to the genre “apocalypse,” prove this finding, as well as the differentiated reception of a number of motifs that belong *de facto* to the stock of apocalyptic thought. Even the peculiar certainty of the present eschatological salvation could only oppose this characterization of Essenian thought if one still wanted to define “apocalyptic” – in the line of the older, mainly German research – from the temporal expectation of and speculation about an eschatological future. These assessments,¹³⁶ which are still represented in handbooks, should definitely be overcome by the Qumran discoveries.

Of course, calling the Qumran community’s view of history “apocalyptic” does not mean that the circles that are assumed to be behind the older Enochic texts can be considered the exclusive or direct forerunners of the *yahad*. Rather, in addition to the connections with the Enoch traditions there are other lines of continuity or reception such as with the Daniel tradition, pre-Essene wisdom circles, or even the priestly traditions linked with figures such as Amram, Qahat, or Levi.¹³⁷

It would, therefore, be too simplistic to call the *yahad* community an “apocalyptic community,” especially when the precise meaning of “apocalyp-

¹³⁶ See, for example, the above cited article by P. Vielhauer, “Einführung” (or Vielhauer and Stecker, “Einführung”).

¹³⁷ Cf. Collins, *Apocalypticism – Literary Genre*, 29.

tic” is also disputed.¹³⁸ But it is even more inappropriate to say that the apocalyptic element was only of marginal interest in this community. The opposite is the case: the intense character of this interest is obvious in the reception of different apocalyptic motifs that cannot be attributed to a single source or a single type of apocalyptic tradition. Instead, different motifs are combined: the calendric wisdom developed in the Enochic tradition; the unfolding of angelology from both Enoch and some priestly circles; the cosmic-eschatological dualism developed from a sapiential tradition; the heptadic chronological schema drawing on Jeremiah’s prophecy and its later interpretation by Daniel, and the hope for an imminent end of the age of this world, with the violent distress and final battles expected before the end. All of these motifs are, however, overlaid by the community’s specific awareness of its election and the character of the present, as well as by its focus on the interpretation of inspired writings. Therefore, specifically apocalyptic forms of revelatory mediation and the authorization of particular insights by the pseudonymous reference to certain forefathers can be left aside in the group-specific texts without the apocalyptic motifs becoming less significant.

C. The Contribution of the Qumran Texts to the Understanding of Apocalypticism

In what form and to what extent have the Qumran discoveries changed our view of the history and the essence of early Jewish and early Christian apocalypticism? I can only mention a few important aspects here.

(1) Since the textual discoveries at Qumran, the question of the beginnings of early Jewish and Christian apocalyptic tradition has indeed been put in a completely new light. Earlier research has mostly seen the Maccabean crisis and its immediate pre-history as the occasion or reason for the emergence of apocalypticism, and the book of Daniel was considered its first document.¹³⁹

¹³⁸ In the above-cited statement (n. 4) by F. M. Cross, this term seems simply to be an equivalent to “salvific community,” which suggests a rather imprecise version of “apocalyptic.”

¹³⁹ Individual authors localized the beginnings in earlier stages of Israelite prophecy such as in Ezekiel or in Trito-Isaiah (cf. P. D. Hanson, *The Dawn of Apocalyptic: The Historical and Sociological Roots of Jewish Apocalyptic Eschatology* [Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979], who proposes a very conservative dating of the beginnings of apocalyptic in the 6th century BCE), or in the night visions of Zechariah as a first apocalypse (as in H. Gese, “Anfang und Ende der Apokalyptik, dargestellt am Sacharjabuch,” in *Vom Sinai zum Zion* [ed. H. Gese; BEvT 64; München: Kaiser, 1974], 202–230), however most authors concentrate on the book of Daniel. Incidentally, the aforementioned attempts at early dating are based on a specific, “prophetic,” that is, historical-theological understanding of apocalyptic.

Due to the Qumran discoveries, it is now quite clear that the beginnings of apocalyptic tradition formation can be found much earlier, in the earliest stages of the Enochic tradition, i.e., the Book of the Watchers, and – if one already wants to talk about apocalypticism here¹⁴⁰ – in the Astronomical Book. *In any case, Jewish apocalypticism is older than was recognized before the Qumran discoveries.*

Depending on the new insights in the origins of apocalypticism, the question of its tradition-historical roots, its leading motifs, and its character and essence must be answered differently than in earlier phases of scholarship. Apocalyptic is not first and foremost occupied with speculations about the future. Its earliest testimonies are primarily conceptualized spatially, rather than temporally, and the reason for the development of the ideas of a bodily resurrection or a last judgment and their function can be understood from the whole of the worldview developed, e.g., in the Book of the Watchers.¹⁴¹ Such insights are highly significant also for the theological interpretation individual subjects belonging to the inventory of apocalyptic in later early Jewish and Christian texts.

(2) If the Book of the Watchers is the first “real” apocalyptic writing, then it is clear that the *themes* that characterize this work – the primordial fall and the eschatological judgment, heavenly journeys and places of punishment, the divine throne and classes of angels – *were formulated before the Maccabean period.*

This has, for example, consequences for *the question of the beginnings of the belief in the resurrection of the dead* in the late Old Testament period: While in earlier research, scholars understood Dan 12:2f. as the first clear evidence of such an expectation and, in texts like Isa 26:19, a reference to the resurrection of the dead was either disputed¹⁴² or – if this meaning seemed unavoidable – the entire passage of Isa 26:15–19¹⁴³ or at the very least v. 19¹⁴⁴ was regarded as late addition from the Danielic (or later) time, such

¹⁴⁰ This is the decision of Stegemann, “Bedeutung,” 505–507.

¹⁴¹ See, e.g., the sketch of the worldview in Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch*, 1:37–56.

¹⁴² Thus, for example, B. G. Fohrer, *Das Buch Jesaja*, vol. 2, Chapters 24–39 (2nd edition; ZBK, Zürich and Stuttgart: Theologischer Verlag, 1967), 31f.; also H. Wildberger, *Jesaja, Teilband 2: Jesaja 13–27* (BKAT X/2; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchner Verlag, 1978), 995, wants to see the restoration of Israel here.

¹⁴³ Thus J. Lindblom, *Die Jesaja-Apokalypse* (AUL 38/3; Lund: Lunds Universitets Årsskrift, 1938), 63ff., evaluates the passage as an element from around the time of 145. O. Procksch, *Jesaja I* (KAT IX/1; Leipzig: Deichert, 1930) places the dating around 146 BCE; B. Duhm, *Das Buch Jesaja* (4th ed.; HKAT III/1; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1922) sees the dating around 107 BCE.

¹⁴⁴ Cf., for example, the view of Isa 26:19 with 25:8a as late additions from the second half of the 2nd century BCE in O. Kaiser, *Der Prophet Jesaja. Kapitel 13–39* (3rd ed.; ATD 18; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1983), 173–177; Kaiser makes an analogous

constructions are now in need of revision. For well before the time of the writing of Dan 12 (and perhaps in temporal proximity to the emergence of the “Isaiah Apocalypse” Isa 24–27), a text such as *1 Enoch* 22 deals in great detail with the issues of the whereabouts of the dead and probably also in a nutshell, the resurrection of the righteous (*1 Enoch* 22:13b).¹⁴⁵ Referring to other passages of the older Enoch tradition such as *1 Enoch* 91:10, 93:2, and 104:1–6 (cf. *Jub.* 23:31), J. J. Collins states, “that the belief in resurrection and judgment after death was well established in the apocalyptic circles that produced the Enoch literature in the early second century B.C.E.”¹⁴⁶ With reference to the Enoch traditions, the history of development of these ideas in the Persian and Hellenistic period has to be completely rewritten.¹⁴⁷ Hebrew Bible scholars, not only in Germany, have thus far only partially realized this.¹⁴⁸

(3) One of the classical issues of scholarship on apocalypticism was the question of whether this late development within Old Testament theology can be deduced from the further development of classical *prophecy*¹⁴⁹ or if it is – as Gerhard von Rad tried to demonstrate – more likely to be explained by the

judgment of Ezek 37:7a, 8b–10a (idem, *Der Gott des Alten Testaments. Theologie des AT 3: Jahwes Gerechtigkeit* [UTB 2392; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2003], 308f.).

¹⁴⁵ Concerning this chapter, see the detailed work of M.-T. Wacker, *Weltordnung und Gericht. Studien zu 1 Henoch 22* (FB 45; Würzburg: Echter, 1982); G. W. E. Nicklsburg, *1 Enoch*, vol 1, 300–309.

¹⁴⁶ J. J. Collins, *Daniel* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993), 396.

¹⁴⁷ Cf. Nicklsburg, *1 Enoch*, 1:304: “Our dating of the present section of 1 Enoch in the third century B. C. E. makes the earliest form of 22:1–4 one of the two earliest extant Jewish testimonies to the belief in a postmortem judgment, and chap. 22 and 24:2–27:2 constitute the earliest detailed treatment of the fate of the dead. Taken together, these chapters provide a scenario that was probably taken for granted by the author of Daniel 12:2.” Cf. Collins, *Daniel*, 396.

¹⁴⁸ Cf., however, Nicklsburg, *1 Enoch*, 1:304 n. 14, who explicitly revises the interpretation he offered in an earlier work (idem, *Resurrection, Immortality and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism* [HTS 26; Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1972], 134). If he had put *1 Enoch* 22 after Dan 12 there, he must now reverse the relationship. His methodological reflection at this point is enlightening: “it is a good example of data falling victim to typology.” O. Kaiser, *Gott*, 3:316, explains Dan 12:1–3 on the basis of *1 Enoch* 22, but without this having an effect on the assessment of the Isaianic and Ezekielian parallels as an extremely late element.

¹⁴⁹ The comparison with classical prophecy goes back to the research of the 19th century, especially in the works of Eduard Reuß and Adolf Hilgenfeld. On this point, see Schmidt, *Apokalyptik*, 120–122, 149, 265ff. In the 20th century, this thesis has been classically maintained by O. Plöger, *Theokratie und Eschatologie* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchner Verlag, 1959); P. von der Osten-Sacken, *Die Apokalyptik in ihrem Verhältnis zu Prophetie und Weisheit* (München: Kaiser, 1969); as well as by Hanson, *Dawn*. Cf. this discussion in A. Bedenbender, *Der Gott der Welt tritt auf den Sinai* (ANTZ 8; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2000), 68–70.

Old Testament *wisdom* tradition. However, von Rad's discussion of the issue was too strongly influenced by his particular theological categories such as the fundamental historical reference of the Ancient Israelite traditions – categories that have since then been widely seen to be problematic.

If the beginnings of apocalypticism are not to be found in the book of Daniel, but in the Enochic traditions, the spectrum of possible derivations of early Jewish apocalypticism shifts again. No matter whether one wishes to see the first examples of early Jewish apocalyptic in the Book of the Watchers or in the still earlier Astronomic Book,¹⁵⁰ it can be established for both that here we find the primary links to a “pre-scientific” astronomical calendar and cosmographic wisdom (often called a “mantic” wisdom).¹⁵¹ Wisdom also strongly shapes the tradition of the Daniel narratives (Dan 1–6). Only in the “historical” apocalypse of the book of Daniel and in the testimonies influenced by it can a more intense reception of the prophetic traditions be demonstrated.¹⁵² Thus, the textual discoveries from Qumran could ultimately contribute to the breakthrough of von Rad's thesis in a modified form by demonstrating that *in its beginnings early-Jewish apocalypticism was a stage of reflection on wisdom traditions*.¹⁵³ (which, of course, does not preclude the fact that its subsequent witnesses, i.e., already in the book of Daniel, strongly connected apocalypticism to prophetic traditions and texts).

(4) As a characteristic of apocalyptic literature in various history-of-religion contexts, it is often said that this is revelatory literature in the context

¹⁵⁰ Thus Stegemann, “Bedeutung,” 505–507, who sharply rejects any connection to prophecy; concerning the thesis of Mesopotamian backgrounds of both the Enochic figure and the Danielic “Son of Man” figure, see H. S. Kvanvig, *Roots of Apocalyptic: The Mesopotamian Background of the Enoch Figure and of the Son of Man* (WMANT 61; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchner Verlag, 1988). In this sense, see also Collins, *Daniel*, 709: “The tradition shows strong Mesopotamian influence which suggests that it originated in the eastern Diaspora. In the case of Daniel, ... too, the evidence points to an eastern matrix for the tradition, although the visions were certainly composed in Israel.”

¹⁵¹ The derivation from mantic wisdom is first maintained by H.-P. Müller, “Mantische Weisheit und Apokalyptik,” in *Congress Volume: Uppsala 1971* (ed. G. W. Anderson et al.; VTSup 22; Leiden: Brill, 1972), 268–293; cf. further 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: Bloomsbury, 1986), 163–178; K. Koch, “Die Anfänge der Apokalyptik in Israel und die Rolle des astronomischen Henochbuchs,” in *Von der Wende der Zeiten. Beiträge zur apokalyptischen Literatur* (ed. K. Koch; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchner Verlag, 1996), 3–39.

¹⁵² Collins, *Daniel*, 71: “In both *Enoch* and *Daniel*, ... the development of the historical type of apocalypses is associated with the crisis of the maccabean period and involves an extensive reappropriation of the prophetic tradition, especially in *Daniel*.” Cf., in particular, the additional consideration arising from the comparison of Zech 9–14 and the Book of the Watchers in E. J. C. Tigchelaar, *Prophets of Old and the Day of the End* (OTS 35; Leiden: Brill, 1996), 263–265.

¹⁵³ In this sense, cf. also Lange, *Weisheit*, 305f.

of religious or political crises or upheavals, even to the point of calling it “crisis literature.” This explanation has long been used with respect to the book of Daniel, which has been given its final shape in the context of the religious crisis of the Maccabean period around 165 BCE; and it was applied in an analogous way for the Apocalypse of John, which was traditionally considered to be a reaction to a persecution in the later period of Emperor Domitian.¹⁵⁴ Some other texts, such as 4 Ezra or even the Egyptian Potter’s Oracle can also be understood as a literary expression of “crisis management.”¹⁵⁵

The explanation could quite easily be applied to the phenomenon of apocalypticism as a whole, as long as the origins of the apocalyptic tradition could be located in the most severe political crisis of the Second Temple period. But this has changed now, and the facts are by no means so simple as to suggest that the apocalyptic hope as a whole should be understood as a mere reaction to external political or religious crises, or even as a mere utopian compensation for deplorable states of the present (and thus as an expression of religious wishful thinking).¹⁵⁶ It is also problematic to assign the development of apocalyptic material essentially to the productivity of “circles of lower classes,”¹⁵⁷ so long as the significance of the social “class affiliation” for the religious options negotiated here cannot be sufficiently clarified. And it is quite questionable whether the tradents of the Enochic literature, well-versed in various types of wisdom, were simply “lower class” circles.

The problems are more complex, and any mono-causal explanation falls short. To be sure, the formation of some apocalyptic texts may have been preceded by concrete political events, and the focus of the periodization of history in Dan 2 and Dan 7 implies an unmistakable form of the critique of

¹⁵⁴ However, this thesis is now problematic because, on the one hand, the evidence of a great persecution of the Christian community under Domitian is lacking and only one single martyr is mentioned by name within Revelation. Larger parts of recent research, therefore, do not expect an actual crisis of the community, but rather a crisis that the author merely perceived (or feared). On this problem, see A. Yarbro Collins, *Crisis and Catharsis: The Power of the Apocalypse* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1984); L. L. Thompson, *The Book of Revelation: Apocalypse and Empire* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990).

¹⁵⁵ See, for example, Fabry, “Apokalyptik,” 84–98.

¹⁵⁶ Cf. the above cited (n. 20) judgment by J. Wellhausen, *Israelitische und Jüdische Geschichte*, 195f., for whom the God of the apocalyptic(ists) is “a God of wishes and illusions.” Similar judgments can frequently be found in the older research from the 19th century. See the presentation in Zager, *Begriff*, passim.

¹⁵⁷ Cf. R. Albertz, *Religionsgeschichte Israels in alttestamentlicher Zeit* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1992), 2:643ff. concerning Isa 24–27; for further apocalyptic, Albertz speaks of “resistance theology” (pp. 649ff.). Concerning the problems presented here, cf. also G. W. E. Nickelsburg, “Social Aspects of Palestinian Jewish Apocalypticism,” in *Apocalypticism*, 641–654.

domination. However, such aspects are less obvious to the older Enochic apocalyptic. Whether and to what extent these texts also react to internal or external crises must remain uncertain since the location of the tradents and authors cannot be precisely determined, as for example in the “historical” apocalypse Dan 10–12 with its clearly recognizable *vaticinium-ex-eventu* form. To be sure, we also find a high degree of criticism of the violence prevalent on earth or of individual cultural trappings (*1 Enoch* 7:1; 8:1–3; 9:6f.), but this criticism remains relatively general and the texts of the Book of the Watchers are themselves strongly under the influence of Hellenistic culture, if one considers, for example, the echoes of the Asael myth related to the Greek Prometheus traditions or even the correspondences between *1 Enoch* 22 and the Greek concept of Hades.¹⁵⁸ In view of the Enochic traditions, it is clear that there were well-educated circles behind the formation of apocalypticism, which combined Israelite and non-Israelite elements into a new “symbolic world.” Such processes are only capable of being explained by multiple factors.

(5) It follows from the observations already presented that *the development of early Jewish apocalypticism cannot be considered to be a straightforward process*¹⁵⁹ and *cannot be attributed to a single, sociological grouping of the Judaism of the time of the Second Temple*. Contrary to all attempts to group the circles of apocalyptic traditions under a broad tent of “Enochic Judaism” or other terminological creations, one must distinguish at least between the tradents of the Danielic and “Enochic” traditions.¹⁶⁰ There are also clear differences between the ideas of the Visions of Amram (which can probably be traced back to priestly circles) and the Enochic traditions. Thus, we have to assume that the respective texts originate from groups of different shapes and interests.

That means, however, that the various texts and strands of apocalyptic tradition that arose in the 3rd and 2nd centuries BCE cannot be reduced to a single, coherent apocalyptic “movement.” On the contrary, different circles and groups, who probably had a lively exchange with one another and with their environment and who produced a considerable amount of literature, must be reckoned with. Therefore, the earlier, often proposed reduction of apocalyp-

¹⁵⁸ Cf. G. W. E. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch*, 1:62, 1:191–193; Concerning *1 Enoch* 22, see also M. Hengel, *Judentum und Hellenismus*, 360–362.

¹⁵⁹ Collins, *Daniel*, 71: “The development of apocalypticism, ... cannot be plotted on a straight line.”

¹⁶⁰ J. J. Collins, “The Place of Apocalypticism in the Religion of Israel,” in *Seers, Sibyls and Sages in Hellenistic-Roman Judaism* (ed. J. J. Collins; JSJ 54; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 39–57, here 55–57.

ticism to a “sect-like,” enclosed conventicle or marginalized circles¹⁶¹ who are opposed to a *mainstream* Judaism oriented around the temple cult can hardly be maintained. Some of the older apocalyptic texts (such as the Visions of Amram) reveal priestly imprinting, the Qumran findings of the apocalypticization of wisdom are believed to have their place near the Temple,¹⁶² and *Jubilees* documents a priestly reception of the Enochic apocalyptic traditions. At least since the time of the Maccabees, some apocalyptic *theologoumena* such as the hope for an eschatological resurrection (at least for the righteous) became rather widespread within Palestinian Judaism (and, as 2 Macc 7 shows, even beyond).

The group of the “Essene” *yahad* which can be identified behind the Qumran “sectarian” writings is, however, the first sociologically more precise group formation that is strongly characterized by apocalyptic. In this regard, the Qumran texts provide a new and fruitful object of study for sociological research.

(6) Traditionally, the characterization of Jewish apocalypticism was developed primarily from the book of Daniel (in connection with the other “canonical” apocalypse from the New Testament), supplemented by using other works such as *4 Ezra*, *2 Baruch*, etc. In this horizon, pseudonymous authorship and a fundamental, eschatological orientation – in the sense of the expectation of the end of the world and the “new aeon” in connection with a periodization and deterministic view of history – were regarded as the essential characteristics of early Jewish apocalyptic thought.¹⁶³ This picture goes back to the beginnings of apocalyptic research in the 19th century, which considered apocalypticism to be essentially a form of a theology of history (thus with a positive assessment by Freidrich Lücke) or as a posture that is oriented towards the future or formed by an imminent expectation (thus with a negative assessment by Eduard Reuß). In any case, apocalypticism appeared as a form of eschatology or – in the horizon of kerygma theology – the inferior opposite of a “true” Christian eschatology.

This opposition between apocalyptic and eschatology must be definitely abandoned given the Enochic texts attested to in Qumran, for *in their origins apocalyptic has very little to do with (present or futuristic) eschatology, and future expectations or speculation about history are not their initial, primary motifs.*

¹⁶¹ So, for example, the thesis of O. Plöger, *Theokratie*, who attempted to reduce apocalypticism to oppositional, prophetic conventicles that were in opposition to the temple priesthood and the official Judean religion dominated by them.

¹⁶² Cf. A. Lange, “In Diskussion mit dem Tempel,” in *Qohelet in the Context of Wisdom* (ed. A. Schoors; BETL 136; Leuven: Peeters, 1998), 113–159.

¹⁶³ In this sense, see the handbook article by P. Vielhauer, “Einleitung.”

The oldest, unambiguously apocalyptic texts of ancient Judaism – both the Astronomical Book of Enoch and the Book of the Watchers – show that in the beginnings of apocalypticism there was no future, end, or even imminent expectation; rather, these texts take on the wisdom of “pre-scientific” traditions, a “heavenly knowledge” that could offer orientation in the questions of their world. The reception of such wisdom in apocalyptic traditions indicates that the circles behind the development of apocalypticism were also looking for orientation in the present.¹⁶⁴

The oldest apocalyptic texts deal with the problem of why the world is the way it is, that is they address the question of evil, its origins,¹⁶⁵ and how it will be overcome, or, in other words, the question of the righteousness of God, the validity of his order, and, not least, the problem of theodicy. For this purpose, mythological traditions about the primordial fall of the angels, astronomical, cosmological, and meteorological explanations (i.e., “pre-scientific” heavenly knowledge) are presented as parts of the “symbolical universe” of these texts and, in connection with this, are pictorial ideas about the elimination of evil and the realization of salvation. But even where these horizons appear, they are not primarily about a future expectation, which emerges only hesitantly, but rather the struggle for a belief that clings to God’s world order and dominion despite all the adversities of the present.

The dualistic opposites that are taken up in this literature (cosmic: God / humankind; spatial: heaven / earth; temporal: the time of salvation / the present) reflect the experience of one’s own present as a time of injustice and violence, or, from the perspective of the traditional faith, a time of contradictions. The apocalyptic view of reality counteracts these experiences with an artful, poetic “counter-world”: Images of the final overcoming of evil and the realization of the time of salvation, images of the dissolution of the painfully experienced dualities that – even if salvation is still presented in the future – mean assurance and the strengthening of identity in the present. The reception of these apocalyptic traditions and their further development suggests that this form of interpretation and management of reality was perceived in different circles as an orienting and sustaining force.

The religious value of these pictorial worlds can be seen in the horizon of methodological concepts such as the theory of myths and metaphors or the sociology of knowledge in a much more appropriate manner than the older research was capable of achieving with their liberal or kerygmatic-theological value judgments.

¹⁶⁴ Naturally, neither the present or future nor the temporal or spatial orientation of the apocalyptic authors are likely to have been radically opposed. On this, see Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch*, 1:37–40. Cf. the lucid presentation on the “Worldview and Religious Thought” of the book of Enoch in Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch*, 1:37–56, as well as Collins, “Place,” 47ff.

¹⁶⁵ Cf. Collins, “Origin,” 287–300.

(7) Through the textual discoveries of Qumran, which not only offer the literary legacy of a particular religious faction but also represent a wide range of the literary production of ancient Judaism in the two to three centuries before the turn of the era, *the importance of apocalyptic for the development of traditions in this period has become undeniably clear*. It must be kept in mind that a group, which itself had probably not written any apocalypses, is nevertheless so strongly defined in its thinking by the reception of apocalyptic motifs. Following the developments and experiences of the Maccabean period, apocalyptic *theologumena* – acquired not least through the book of Daniel – have entered into broad circles of Judaism in the late Second Temple period. In a different selection and manner, they have shaped the thinking of the Essene circles as well as the Pharisaic movement, and of course also of those zealot circles whose increasing radicalization eventually led to the catastrophe of the Jewish War. And despite the marginalization of the apocalyptic traditions (with the simultaneous adoption of apocalyptic *theologumena*) in the rabbinic tradition,¹⁶⁶ the production of apocalyptic literature continued in late ancient Judaism.¹⁶⁷ The marginalization of apocalypticism, which found its continuation for various reasons in modern Christian and Jewish scholarship, must be contradicted for historical reasons. Rather, apocalypticism is one of the essential intellectual currents of Judaism of the time between the Testaments. But although apocalyptic traditions provide a bridge between the latest traditions of the Hebrew Bible and the early Jesus movement, it should not be unduly “appropriated” from a Christian perspective as a “link” between the Testaments.¹⁶⁸

Nevertheless, contrary to a firmly established tradition of New Testament scholarship, it can be said that *large parts of Early Christianity and its traditions cannot be historically understood without the contribution of apocalyptic thinking*. This applies to the historical Jesus of Nazareth¹⁶⁹ and his talk of the “Son of Man,” the “kingdom of God,” or the “coming aeon,” to the earli-

¹⁶⁶ Thought should be given here to the *theologumena* of the resurrection of the dead and the judgment, of “this aeon,” and of “the coming aeon”; see M. Becker, “Apokalyptisches nach dem Fall Jerusalems. Anmerkungen zum früh-rabbinischen Verständnis,” in *Apokalyptik als Herausforderung neutestamentlicher Theologie* (ed. M. Becker and M. Öhler; WUNT II/214; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006), 283–360, here 343ff.

¹⁶⁷ See G. S. Oegema, *Zwischen Gericht und Heil. Untersuchungen zur Rezeption der Apokalyptik im frühen Christentum und Judentum* (WMANT 82; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchner Verlag, 1999).

¹⁶⁸ It should be kept in mind that the majority of Jewish apocalyptic documents was finally kept outside the Hebrew (and Greek) canon.

¹⁶⁹ Cf. my more detailed contribution in J. Frey, “Die Apokalyptik als Herausforderung der neutestamentlichen Wissenschaft. Zum Problem: Jesus und die Apokalyptik,” in *Apokalyptik als Herausforderung neutestamentlicher Theologie* (ed. M. Becker and M. Öhler; WUNT II/214; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 2006), 23–94.

est interpretation of the risen Lord's appearance in light of apocalyptic concepts of resurrection or enthronement¹⁷⁰ and the early Christian expectation of the Parousia (for example in the "eschatological outlook" at the Lord's Supper in Mark 14:25). It also applies to the theology of Paul¹⁷¹ and even to the theological development in the Johannine circle, to the motifs of "the antichrist" and "the last hour," to the resurrection, to the transformation of believers, and to the eschatological judgment.¹⁷²

In the following, I would like to mention only three further aspects in which the insights from the Qumran discoveries may be important for the interpretation of these motifs in the New Testament:

(8) The publication of the wisdom texts from Qumran has documented that the interweaving of wisdom and apocalyptic traditions in Palestinian Judaism took place in the early 2nd century BCE at the latest. Texts such as *Instruction* or the book of *Mysteries* and even the Treatise on the Two Spirits handed down in IQS III–IV are witnesses to such an apocalyptic wisdom tradition. Thus, the image of the wisdom traditions that has been presupposed for Judaism around the turn of the era has changed decisively. The thesis that the Jewish wisdom tradition lacked an eschatological character (or even had an "eschatological disinterest") based on the texts available at the time before the Qumran discoveries (primarily Sirach and the Wisdom of Solomon) can no longer be upheld in view of the new findings.

This is of crucial relevance for some discourses in connection with the earliest Jesus traditions. If, in recent Jesus research, particularly in North America, scholars attempt to present a hypothetical, oldest substratum of the Sayings Source (Q), consisting of pure, non-eschatological wisdom material, and thus characterize the "true" historical Jesus as a wholly unapocalyptic wisdom teacher or popular philosopher, then it must be suggested that such a thesis has been unduly guided by apologetic tendencies. We cannot discuss here the complex reasoning that led to such conclusions,¹⁷³ but it is clear that the oft-claimed incompatibility and alternative between wisdom and apocalyptic thought or between the genre of wisdom (such as the postulated genre

¹⁷⁰ See M. Hengel, "Setze dich zu meiner Rechten. Psalm 110,1 und die Inthronisation Christi zur Rechten Gottes," in *Le trône de Dieu* (ed. M. Philonenko; WUNT 69; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1993), 108–194.

¹⁷¹ Cf. M. Hengel, "Paulus und die frühchristliche Apokalyptik," in *Paulus und Jakobus. Kleine Schriften III* (ed. M. Hengel; WUNT 141; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002), 302–417.

¹⁷² Cf. J. Frey, *Die johanneische Eschatologie: Die eschatologische Verkündigung in den johanneischen Texten* (WUNT 116; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000), passim (particularly 13–44 for a discussion of the community tradition).

¹⁷³ For a further discussion, see J. J. Collins, "Wisdom, Apocalypticism and Generic Compatibility," in *Seers, Sibyls and Sages in Hellenistic-Roman Judaism*; see also the detailed discussion in Frey, "Apokalyptik."

of “*Logoi Sophon*”¹⁷⁴ for the Sayings Source) and apocalyptic forms of speech cannot be proved from the sources. In view of the new insights into the Jewish wisdom tradition, some of the arguments put forward in favor of an “unapocalyptic” Jesus or an “unapocalyptic” earliest logia tradition appear to need revision.

(9) An insight already recorded in the early days of Qumran research concerns the conspicuous “double” eschatology of the *Hodayot* and of other group-specific Qumran texts. This striking “juxtaposition” of a certainty of present salvation and an eschatological expectation of a future deliverance can be compared with the eschatology of Jesus,¹⁷⁵ in which, according to the insight of New Testament exegesis, there is also talk of an “already present” and a still outstanding, though imminent, “nearness” of the kingdom of God. The perceived tension of the “already now” and “not yet” in the eschatology of the earthly Jesus stretches through all the traditions of Early Christianity with characteristic changes of emphasis. However, while large parts of New Testament research – triggered by the early rationalist critique of the eschatological expectation¹⁷⁶ – felt a contradiction and pressed for its dissolution (either in the sense of the presence of the kingdom or in the sense of a consistent, eschatological view), the observations in the Qumran texts indicate that such an alternative derives from theological interests but is problematic from a historical perspective. For the thought of the Essene or Qumran sectarian authors, no irreconcilable contradiction can be discerned between the (self-evidently held) end-time expectation and the certainty of participating in the fellowship with the angels already now. Not only the widely accepted alternative between “apocalyptic” and (unapocalyptic) “eschatology,” but also the alternative between (mythological) “futuristic” and (more highly esteemed) “present” eschatology are historically inappropriate.

Thus, the Qumran texts provide an opportunity to reflect on the structures of the “symbolic world” of such an eschatological manner of thought and perhaps to grasp even the thinking of Early Christianity more adequately than was possible in the horizons of liberal theology, “consistent eschatology,” or existential theological interpretation.

(10) The concrete endorsement of the Qumran community, supported by the scribal calculation, has also led to the supposedly fixed date for the end (cf. 11QMelch II 5–7; CD XX 13–15) that passed. As a result, the reasons for the expiration of this date were taken up in the famous *Pesher Habakkuk*

¹⁷⁴ Cf. J. M. Robinson, “*LOGOI SOPHON* – Zur Gattung der Spruchquelle Q,” in *Entwicklungslinien durch die Welt des frühen Christentums* (ed. H. Koester and J. M. Robinson; Mohr Siebeck: Tübingen 1971), 70–106.

¹⁷⁵ So Kuhn, *Enderwartung*, 189–204.

¹⁷⁶ On the early impulses for the criticism, cf. J. Frey, *Die johanneische Eschatologie: Ihre Probleme im Spiegel der Forschung seit Reimarus* (WUNT 96, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997), 10ff.

(1QpHab VII 1–14) and had to be considered without completely abandoning the former end-time expectation or without the dissolution of the group of tradents who had expected the end, due to the lengthening of time. Thus, the Qumran texts provide a contemporary parallel to the phenomenon of “delay of the Parousia” or the “stretching of time,” which has not yet been adequately evaluated in New Testament research.¹⁷⁷

These points, which could be sketched only briefly here could be easily multiplied. However, the significance of the Qumran textual discoveries for our understanding of early Jewish and early Christian apocalypticism may become as clear as the wealth of new perspectives and insights that arise from the consideration of these sources for the discussion of “classical” exegetical subjects. A marginalization of apocalypticism is no longer justified in light of this source material, and it is time to realize that the long-standing aspiration in Christian exegesis “to save Jesus [and also the apostles] from apocalypticism”¹⁷⁸ is not only pointless, but it is also theologically obsolete. However, there is still the problem of a proper interpretation of the apocalyptic texts and motifs in Early Christianity. The foundations for this have changed radically since the discovery of the Qumran texts, and New Testament research is faced with the task of absorbing and reflecting on these impulses.

¹⁷⁷ Cf. the last major monograph on this phenomenon: K. Erlemann, *Naherwartung und Parusieverzögerung im Neuen Testament. Ein Beitrag zur Frage religiöser Zeiterfahrung* (TANZ 17; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1995), for a review of this work, see J. Frey, in *ThBeitr* 27 (1996): 240–243.

¹⁷⁸ See the above cited dictum from Koch, *Ratlos*, 55.

7. Different Patterns of Dualistic Thought in the Qumran Library:” Reflections on their Background and History^{*}

A. Reopening the Issue

Dualism is commonly recognized as one of the most characteristic elements of thought in the Dead Sea Scrolls.¹ An eschatological battle, as documented in the *War Scroll* (1QM) between the “sons of light” and the “sons of darkness,” is alien to the Hebrew Bible,² and where the term בלִיעַל occurs in Scripture, it basically denotes something like “uselessness” or “wickedness,” but not yet a personal heavenly figure opposed to God.³ The dualistic terminology of the Qumran texts (or better: of *some* of them) is also absent from most of the previously known Pseudepigrapha (with the exception of some

^{*} This is my very first paper on Qumran issues, originally written for a short presentation at the IOQS meeting in Cambridge, 1995 and expanded for publication afterwards. The article is not updated or substantially changed, as a few modifications of my views are now documented in the next article in the present collection, the comprehensive presentation of “Apocalyptic Dualism.” I am greatly obliged to my former Tübingen colleague Armin Lange (now Vienna) and to John J. Collins (Yale) for helpful information and discussions and also to Helen Hofmann, M. Div. (Canterbury), who carefully corrected a draft of the English text.

¹ See, e.g., D. Dimant, “Qumran Sectarian Literature,” in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period* (ed. M. E. Stone; CRINT 2/2; Assen: van Gorcum and Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984), 483–550, here 533–36 and the comprehensive treatments by H. W. Huppenbauer, *Der Mensch zwischen zwei Welten* (ATANT 34; Zürich: Zwingli Verlag, 1959), and P. von der Osten-Sacken, *Gott und Belial* (SUNT 6; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1969).

² For a parallel, Dan 10:20–21 might be referred to, where Michael and Gabriel struggle against the princes of Persia and Greece. But there are notable differences, as J. J. Collins has shown in “The Mythology of Holy War in Daniel and the Qumran War Scroll: A Point of Transition in Jewish Apocalyptic,” *VT* 25 (1975): 596–612.

³ *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament* (ed. L. Köhler, W. Baumgartner, J. J. Stamm; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1994), 1:134; *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew* (ed. D. A. Clines; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 2:178–79; B. Otzen, “בלִיעַל,” in *ThWAT* (ed. J. Botterweck, H. Ringgren; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1973), 1:654–58. This is true, even if there are some traits of personification already in the biblical use of the term (such as the lack of any plural form); see S. D. Sperling, “Belial,” in *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible* (ed. K. van der Toorn, B. Becking, P. W. van der Horst; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1995), 323.

passages in the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, or in *Jubilees*),⁴ and from the earlier rabbinic literature as well.⁵ The most striking analogies have been found instead in NT texts where similar terms occur, such as υἱοὶ (τοῦ) φωτός corresponding to the frequent sectarian self-designation בני אור⁶ or ποιεῖν τὴν ἀληθειάν which is equivalent to עשה אמת⁷ and so on. Influenced by these observations, the early discussion on Qumran dualism was focused chiefly on two issues: its *religious background*, the question of extra-biblical, presumably Persian origin,⁸ and its *relations to New Testament language and thought*.⁹ Other problems concerning the history and function of dualistic

⁴ Cf., e.g., *T. Levi* 19:1, *T. Jud.* 20:1–3, *T. Dan* 6:1–5, *T. Asher* 1:3–4, 5:3, *T. Benj.* 6:1.

⁵ Any notion of “two powers in heaven” is strongly rejected by the Rabbis, but A. F. Segal (*Two Powers in Heaven: Early Rabbinic Reports about Christianity and Gnosticism* [SJLA 25; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1977]) has shown that these utterances did not mean dualistic concepts with the notion of an opposed evil power but primarily the idea of any mediator figure. According to the Mishna (*m. Ber.* 9:5), God is to be blessed for evil no less than for good. So the Mishnah does not have any peculiar Satanology. As an explanation for evil, there is the strong doctrine of the צַר הָרַע instead (*b. B. Bat.* 16a). Where Satan occurs in the Midrashim, or in later rabbinic literature, he may be responsible for the sins of humanity (*b. Sanh.* 107a; *b. Šabb.* 89a). But he is a created being, of course, and not a threat to the uniqueness of God. As a sign of that, there is one day in the year when he is powerless, the Day of Atonement (*b. Yoma* 20a); cf. V. P. Hamilton, “Satan,” in *ABD* 5:985–989, here 988.

⁶ 1 Thess 5:5, Luke 16:8, John 12:36, cf. also Eph 5:8 τέκνα φωτός.

⁷ John 3:21, 1 John 1:6; cf. 1QS I 5, V 3, VIII 2. Other remarkable terms are ἐξουσία τοῦ σκοτός; Luke 22:53, ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου John 12:31, 14:30, 16:11, ὁ θεός τοῦ αἰῶνος τοῦτου 2 Cor 4:4, the opposition of Christ and Beliar 2 Cor 6:15 or of Satan and the Angel of Light 2 Cor 11:14; in Johannine terminology there is the use of oppositions of light and darkness or truth and lie: τὸ φῶς τῆς ζωῆς; John 8:12, περιπατεῖν ἐν τῇ σκοτία John 8:12, 12:35; μαρτυρεῖν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ 2 John 4, 3 John 3; μαρτυρεῖν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ John 5:33, 18:37, 3 John 3, and the terms ἔργα τοῦ θεοῦ John 6:28, 9:3 and ἔργα πονηρὰ John 3:19, 7:7.

⁸ Cf. K. G. Kuhn, “Die Sektenschrift und die iranische Religion,” *ZTK* 49 (1952): 296–316; A. Dupont-Sommer, “Le problème des influences étrangères sur la secte juive de Qumrân,” *RHPR* 35 (1955): 75–94; H. Michaud, “Un mythe zervanite dans un des manuscrits de Qumrân,” *VT* 5 (1955): 133–47; R. J. Jones, “The Manual of Discipline (1QS), Persian Religion, and the Old Testament,” in *The Teacher’s Yoke: Studies in Memory of Henry Trantham* (ed. E. J. Vardeman and J. L. Garret, Jr.; Waco, TX: Baylor University, 1964), 94–108; D. Winston, “The Iranian component in the Bible, Apocrypha, and Qumran: A Review of the Evidence,” *HR* 5 (1966): 183–216.

⁹ Cf. the discussion in *The Scrolls and the New Testament* (ed. K. Stendahl; New York: Harper, 1957); *The Scrolls and Christianity* (ed. M. Black; London: T. Nelson, 1969); *Paul and Qumran* (ed. J. Murphy-O’Connor; London: Chapman, 1972); *John and Qumran* (ed. J. H. Charlesworth; London: Chapman, 1972; 2nd rev. ed. under the title *John and the Dead Sea Scrolls* [New York: Crossroad, 1990]); *Jesus and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. J. H. Charlesworth; New York: Doubleday, 1992), and comprehensively H. Braun, *Qumran und das Neue Testament* (2 vols.; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1966). For the comparison of Qum-

thought seemed to attract less interest or had to be left unanswered for lack of sources. But with regard to the material from Cave 4, new questions can be proposed, and former views deserve revision. Basically three observations call for a new discussion:

(a) *Only a limited portion of the material is characterized by explicit dualistic terminology and thought.*¹⁰ The following passages can be mentioned:¹¹

- parts of 1QS, mainly III 13–IV 26, but also I 1–II 18, and XI 2b–22;¹²
- parts of the *Damascus Document*, chiefly CD II 2–13 and IV 12–VI 11;
- the *War Rule*, not as a whole, however, but chiefly 1QM I, XIII, and XV–XIX;
- a few passages of the *Hodayot*, perhaps 1QH^a XI 20–37 (= III 19–36 Sukenik); XII 6–XIII 6 (= IV 5–V 4 Sukenik), and VII (= XV Sukenik);
- a few passages of the pesharim: 1QpHab IV 17b–V 12a and 4QpPs 37 II 1–IV 18;
- some sapiential texts such as 4Q184 (4Q Wiles of the Wicked Woman), 4QSapiential Work A, the Book of Mysteries (1Q27 I 2–II 10 with textual parallels in 4Q299 and 4Q300), and a small fragment from 4Q413;¹³
- the Aramaic testaments ascribed to Levi, Qahat, and Amram;
- a pseudo-Moses text documented in 4Q390 and some other manuscripts;
- the apotropaic incantation poems of 11QApPs^a, and the exorcistic Songs of the Maskil of 4Q510 and 4Q511.
- the “peshar on the periods” (4Q180) and the related text 4Q181;

ran dualism with NT (mainly Johannine) texts, see G. Baumbach, *Qumran und das Johannees-Evangelium* (Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1958); O. Böcher, *Der johanneische Dualismus im Zusammenhang des nachbiblischen Judentums* (Gütersloh: Mohn, 1965); 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*, 76–101, and G. Bergmeier, *Glaube als Gabe nach Johannes* (BWANT 112; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1980).

¹⁰ This was observed already by H. Wildberger, “Der Dualismus in den Qumrānschriften,” *Asiatische Studien* 8 (1954): 63–77, here 76, but, on the presupposition that the Treatise on the Two Spirits 1QS III 13–IV 26 represents the basic doctrine of the sect, the observation was almost completely neglected.

¹¹ J. Duhaime, “Le dualisme de Qumrān et la littérature de sagesse vétérotestamentaire,” *EgT* 19 (1988): 401–422, here 403–4, gives a list of texts and passages which I have extended substantially.

¹² Cf. the respective parallels in 4QS^{a,b,c,j} according to the table given in by E. Qimron and J. H. Charlesworth, “Rule of the Community,” in *Rule of the Community and Related Documents* (ed. J. H. Charlesworth; The Dead Sea Scrolls 1; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr and Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1994), 1–106, here 55–6.

¹³ See now E. Qimron, “A Work concerning Divine Providence: 4Q413,” in *Solving Riddles and Untying Knots. Biblical, Epigraphic, and Semitic Studies in Honor of Jonas C. Greenfield* (ed. Z. Zevit, S. Gittin, and M. Sokoloff; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1995), 191–202.

- the Melchizedek text from Cave 11 (11QMelch);
- the so-called Midrash on Eschatology (4Q174 and 177);
- some of the blessings and curses from 4Q280, 4Q286, and 4Q287;
- the physiognomic text 4Q186 (4QCry) with an aramaic parallel in 4Q561;
- some more passages where Belial or any other angelic leader figure appears.¹⁴

At first glance this table of passages with some dualistic traits appears to be quite lengthy. However, in view of the vast number of manuscripts of various types documented in the Qumran library¹⁵ the number of texts that can be characterized as “dualistic” is rather limited.

(b) Even the texts and sections labelled “dualistic” show notable *differences in content and terminology*. Many of them use the metaphors of light and darkness, which may be an element of dualistic thought. But this is not at all unique for the Qumran texts.¹⁶ Also, only a part of the Qumran literature stresses the opposition of heavenly beings, whereas other parts do not. Further, only a part of the texts is characterized by ethical terms such as righteousness and wickedness, but not all of them. Very few passages speak of a type of internal dichotomy within the heart or flesh of every human being, but most of the documents mentioned seem wholly untouched by such an idea. These observations consequently show that *the uniform picture of dualism in the Qumran texts needs further refinement*.¹⁷

(c) There is the problem of the *origin of the texts*. During the first decades of research, nearly all the documents, except biblical texts and previously known pseudepigrapha, were considered sectarian compositions. Recent research, though, has developed criteria to distinguish between “sectarian”

¹⁴ Cf. the attestations mentioned in *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew* 2:178–79: 4QMMT^c 14–17 ii 5; 11QT^a LV 3; 4Q386 (4QpsEzek^b) 1 ii 3; 4Q175 (4QTestim) 23; 4Q253 (4QpGen^b) 4 4.

¹⁵ Cf. the list of texts in the *Companion Volume to The Dead Sea Scrolls on Microfiche* (ed. E. Tov with the collaboration of S. J. Pfann; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1993), the generically classified table by D. Dimant, “The Qumran Manuscripts: Contents and Significance,” in *Time to Prepare the Way in the Wilderness. Papers on the Qumran Scrolls by Fellows of the Institute for Advanced Studies of the Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 1989–1990* (ed. D. Dimant and L. H. Schiffman; STDJ 16; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1995), 23–58, and the translated collections by F. García Martínez, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1994), and J. Maier, *Die Qumran-Essener: Die Texte vom Toten Meer* (3 vols.; München and Basel: E. Reinhardt, 1995–6).

¹⁶ See S. Aalen, *Die Begriffe “Licht” und “Finsternis” im Alten Testament, im Spätjudentum und im Rabbinismus* (Oslo: J. Dybwad, 1951). For the early adoption of light metaphors, see B. Janowski, “JHWH und der Sonnengott. Aspekte der Solarisierung JHWHs in vorexilischer Zeit,” in *Pluralismus und Identität* (ed. J. Mehlhausen; Gütersloh: Chr. Kaiser/Gütersloher, 1995), 214–241.

¹⁷ Thus H. Lichtenberger, *Studien zum Menschenbild in Texten der Qumrangemeinde* (SUNT 15; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1980), 175.

and “non-sectarian” texts, such as orthography, the use of the Divine Name, the specific community terminology, and calendaric or other thematic peculiarities.¹⁸ Even if we take it for granted that the people living at Qumran belonged to a religious group which may be called “Essenes” and that a considerable number of important texts not only were copied but also composed within this community (e.g., the pesharim, the *Hodayot*, or the community rules in their final form), we have to note a tendency in recent scholarship to ascribe even the majority of non-biblical texts documented in the library of Qumran to authors outside the community or to a time before its foundation and separation.¹⁹ So the Qumran sectarian of many important documents, e.g., the *Temple Scroll*,²⁰ the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*,²¹ the *War Rule*,²² wisdom texts,²³ numerous pseudepigraphical and testamentary works,²⁴ and

¹⁸ E. Tov, “The Orthography and Language of the Hebrew Scrolls Found at Qumran and the Origin of These Scrolls,” *Textus* 13 (1986): 31–57; H. Stegemann, “Religionsgeschichtliche Erwägungen zu den Gottesbezeichnungen in den Qumrantexten,” in *Qumran: Sa piété, sa théologie et son milieu* (ed. M. Delkor; BETL 46; Paris: Duculot and Leuven: Leuven Univ. Press, 1978), 195–217; C. Newsom, “‘Sectually Explicit’ Literature from Qumran,” in *The Hebrew Bible and its Interpreters* (ed. W. H. Propp, B. Halpern, D. N. Freedman; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1990), 167–87; and most recently D. Dimant, “Qumran Manuscripts.” A comprehensive list of the criteria is given in A. Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination. Weisheitliche Urordnung und Prädestination in den Textfunden von Qumran* (STDJ 18; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1995), 6–20, and in A. Lange and H. Lichtenberger, “Qumran,” in *TRE* 28:45–79, here 45f.

¹⁹ See, e.g., H. Stegemann, *Die Essener, Qumran, Johannes der Täufer und Jesus* (Freiburg i. B.: Herder, 1993), 136–148, and D. Dimant, “Qumran Manuscripts.”

²⁰ L. H. Schiffman, *Sectarian Law in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Chico, Ca.: Scholars Press; 1983), 13–17; H. Stegemann, “The Origins of the Temple Scroll,” in *Congress Volume. Jerusalem 1986* (ed. J. Emerton; VTSup 40, Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1988), 235–56; id., “The Institutions of Israel in the Temple Scroll,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research* (ed. D. Dimant and U. Rappaport; STDJ 10; Leiden: E. J. Brill / Jerusalem: The Magnes Press and Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi, 1992), 156–85, and recently A. Lange and H. Lichtenberger, “Qumran,” in *TRE* 28:53. who propose a date of origin in the third century BCE.

²¹ Thus C. Newsom, “Literature from Qumran,” 179–85, in revision of her previous assumption of Qumran origin; J. Maier, “Shîrê ‘Olat hash-Shabbat: Some Observations on their Calendric Implications and on their Style,” 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: E. J. Brill, 1992), 2:543–560, esp. 559–60; H. Stegemann, *Essener*, 141–42.

²² H. Stegemann, *Essener*, 145–48, and A. Lange and H. Lichtenberger, “Qumran,” in *TRE* 28:60–62.

²³ D. J. Harrington, “Wisdom at Qumran,” in *The Community of the Renewed Covenant* (ed. E. Ulrich and J. C. VanderKam; Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame, 1993), 137–152, here 151; A. S. van der Woude, “Wisdom at Qumran,” in *Wisdom in ancient Israel: Essays in honour of J. A. Emerton* (ed. J. Day, R. P. Gordon, and H. G. M. Wil-

perhaps all the documents written in Aramaic²⁵ is very debatable. Consequently, not all of the texts and passages mentioned above as “dualistic” can actually be considered as a witness of the thought of the Qumran-people or the Essene movement any longer. Some of them may go back to previous times or different groups in Judaism of the third or early second century BCE, before the constitution of the *yahad*, so we need to distinguish between their probable original context and meaning and their sectarian reception and comprehension.

Due to these observations and developments in scholarly research, the issue of the dualism, in its different types, (possibly also different) backgrounds and history as documented in the Dead Sea Scrolls, has to be reopened. Further research in this field may provide a more reasonable understanding of the ideology of the Essene movement and its history and offer fresh insights on the different groups and streams in early second century Judaism and their relations to later Essenism. It should also help to find a more precise starting point for religio-historical comparison of the Qumran literature with other Jewish or early Christian texts.

I. On Definition and Classification

But before entering discussion of the texts, there is the problem of definition and classification: “Dualism” is a label which has been attached to so many philosophical and religious attitudes, that terminological precision is needed for the use of the category to make any sense.²⁶ We should not forget that during the beginning of modern scholarship the term was used to denote specifically the Zoroastrian teaching “according to which there exists an Evil

liamson; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 244–256, here 254–55; A. Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination*, 47–9 and 95–6.

²⁴ See already the sketch by J. T. Milik, “Écrits préesséniens de Qumrân: d’Hénoch à Amram,” in *Qumrân*, 91–106.

²⁵ Thus D. Dimant, “Qumrân Manuscripts,” 34–35, and, earlier, S. Segert, “Die Sprachenfragen in der Qumrängemeinschaft,” in *Qumran-Probleme* (ed. H. Bardtke; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1963), 315–39, here 322–23.

²⁶ Cf. U. Bianchi, “Dualism,” in *The Encyclopedia of Religion* (ed. M. Eliade; New York and London: Macmillan, 1987), 4:506–512; G. van der Leeuw, “Dualismus,” in *RGG* (2nd ed.; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1928), 1:2032–2034; G. Mensching and G. Gloege, “Dualismus,” in *RGG* (3rd ed.; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1958), 2:272–276; J. Duchesne-Guillemin, “Dualismus,” in *RAC* (ed. T. Klausner; Stuttgart: Hiersemann, 1959), 4:334–350; G. Lanczkowski, “Dualismus,” in *TRE* 9:199–202. See, further, S. Petrement, *Le dualisme chez Platon, les Gnostiques et les Manichéens* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France; 1947); and the voluminous but not very thorough work by P. F. M. Fontaine, *The Light and the Dark. A Cultural History of Dualism* (8 vols.; Amsterdam: J. C. Gieben, 1986–1993).

Being coordinate and co-eternal with the primal Good.”²⁷ Thus its aptness for the description of thoughts within the fundamentally monotheistic framework of ancient Judaism and earliest Christianity seems to be at least debatable.²⁸ If we employ the term as most present scholars do we must specify which type of dualism is meant.

Starting with a rather comprehensive definition by Ugo Bianchi, dualism can be held as “*the doctrine of the two principles*.” More precisely, dualistic are all those religions, systems, conceptions of life which admit the dichotomy of principles which, coeternal or not, cause the existence of that which does or seems to exist in the world.²⁹

However, this definition deserves further specification. Which dimensions of reality are conceived in dualistic categories; which principles or even beings form the fundamental opposition? Whether their dichotomy is conceived as absolute and irreducible or as relative to a certain all-embracing unity, as antithetic or only complementary, and whether their struggle is thought to be lasting forever or eschatologically confined needs to be determined.³⁰ According to the tables given by James H. Charlesworth, John G. Gammie, and Jean Duhaime, we may distinguish at least *ten dimensions of dualistic thought* which occur in various combinations in the relevant literature, its parallels, or at least in scholarly discussion:³¹

²⁷ R. Eucken, “Dualism,” in *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics* (ed. J. Hastings; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1966), 5:100, refers to T. Hyde, *Historia religionis veterum Persarum* (published in 1700).

²⁸ Cf. the warning of S. Shaked, “Qumran and Iran. Further Considerations,” *IOS* 2 (1972): 433–446, here 433–34.

²⁹ U. Bianchi, “The Category of Dualism in the Historical Phenomenology of Religion,” *Temenos* 16 (1980), 15. Cf., further, U. Bianchi’s article “Dualism,” in *The Encyclopedia of Religion* (ed. M. Eliade; New York and London: Macmillan, 1987), 4:506–12. Note the specifications there: “Not every duality or polarity is dualistic, but only those that involve the duality or polarity of causal principles. Thus not every pair of opposites ... can be labeled as dualistic, even when their opposition is emphasized.” Further: “a concept of mere ethical dualism, stressing the moral opposition between good and evil and their respective protagonists ... is not properly dualistic in the religio-historical and phenomenological sense unless good and evil are also connected with opposite ontological principles, as in Zoroastrianism and in Manichaeism. The simple contrasting of good and evil, life and death, light and darkness, and so on is in fact coextensive with religion itself and cannot be equated with the much more specific phenomenon of dualism” (506).

³⁰ See U. Bianchi, *The Encyclopedia of Religion*, 4:506–7; G. Lanczkowski, *TRE* 9:199.

³¹ J. H. Charlesworth, “Comparison,” 389 n. 1; J. G. Gammie, “Spatial and Ethical Dualism in Jewish Wisdom and Apocalyptic Literature,” *JBL* 93 (1974): 356–85, and J. Duhaime, “Le dualisme de Qumrân et la littérature de sagesse vétérotestamentaire,” *EgT* 19 (1988): 401–22; id., “Dualistic Reworking in the Scrolls from Qumran,” *CBQ* 49 (1987): 32–56, in particular 33–35. In the following passage I intend to unify and to clarify the distinctions and definitions of the authors mentioned.

(a) *Metaphysical* dualism is the type of dualism that was at first labelled with the term. It signifies the opposition of two dominating causal powers of equal rank, as, e.g., in Zoroastrian tradition, Ahura Mazda, and Ahriman.³² In Jewish and early Christian thought, there is no case of metaphysical dualism like that. Even the opposition of God and Satan cannot be mentioned as such because Satan is never co-eternal with God, and his power is always eschatologically confined.³³ The same holds for the struggle between God and Belial in some Qumran texts.³⁴ If we, then, speak of “dualism” in the Jewish and early Christian context, there is usually not a metaphysical dualism meant but at most a cosmic dualism.

(b) The rather broad label “*cosmic* dualism” denotes the division of the world (κόσμος) and of humanity into two opposing forces of good and evil, darkness and light. But in contrast to metaphysical dualism, these forces are viewed as neither co-eternal nor strictly causal. The fundamental cosmic division may be conceived in various ways and expressed by the use of different terms. Sometimes the struggle of the opposing forces is only described

³² Cf., e.g., Yasna 30:3–5: “Now at the beginning the twin spirits have declared their nature, the better and the evil, in thought and word and deed. And between the two the wise ones choose well, not so the foolish. And when these two spirits came together, in the beginning they established life and non-life, and that at the last the worst existence should be for the wicked, but for the righteous one the best mind. Of these two spirits the evil one chose to do the worst things; but the most holy spirit ... joined himself unto righteousness.” Further 45:2: “I will speak of the two spirits, of whom the holier said unto the destroyer at the beginning of existence: ‘Neither our thoughts nor our doctrines, nor our minds’ forces, neither our choices nor our words nor our deeds, neither our consciences nor our souls agree’” (J. Duchesne-Guillemin, *The Hymns of Zoroaster* [trans. by M. Henning; London: John Murray; 1952]), 93 and 103–5. In these hymns we have the fundamental separation of two spirits from the very beginning; cf. G. Lanczkowski, “Iranische Religionen,” in *TRE* 16:251. As M. Boyce (*A History of Zoroastrianism Vol. 1: The Early Period* [Handbuch der Orientalistik; Leiden and Köln: E. J. Brill, 1975]) points out, the later Zurvanite idea that the two powers, as “twins” (Y. 30:3), have one father, namely Zurvan (or Time), is obviously different from the original Zoroastrian teaching and “was rejected by orthodox Zoroastrians as flat heresy” (193). “It remains doctrinally utterly alien to the Gāthās and to the whole orthodox Zoroastrian tradition that evil should in any way originate from Ahura Mazdā” (194). It should be noted, however, that even in Zoroastrianism there is no perfect symmetry between the good and the evil powers, cf. S. Shaked, “Qumran and Iran,” 433–4 and 444.

³³ E.g., Rev 20:2, 10. So the definition given J. H. Charlesworth (“Comparison,” 389 n. 1): “metaphysical dualism signifies the opposition between God and Satan” is not very helpful and deserves further specification. Cf. E. Sjöberg, “πνεῦμα, III: ריח in Palestinian Judaism,” in *TDNT* 6:376: “Judaism has no place for an evil power standing in eternal confrontation with God. Its dualism is relative, not absolute.” The same holds for early Christian thought as well.

³⁴ Cf. H. W. Huppenbauer, “Belial in den Qumrantexten,” *ThZ* 2 (1959), 81–9; P. von der Osten-Sacken, *Gott und Belial*, 73–8; B. Otzen, “בליעל,” in *ThWAT* 1:654–58.

by the metaphorical use of the light/darkness terminology, in other cases there is mention of certain hosts of human or spiritual beings, and in some texts we find heavenly leader figures such as Michael and Belial, the Prince of Light and the Angel of Darkness, and so on.³⁵ Thus even the label “cosmic dualism” circumscribes already a broader variety of dualistic worldviews and may allow further distinction. The view of a fundamental cosmic dichotomy can be linked with other dimensions of dualistic thought, such as spatial, ethical, anthropological, or psychological dualism.

(c) *Spatial* dualism signifies the division of the world in two spatially divided parts such as heaven and earth, above and below, etc.³⁶ Spatial terminology can be used to express cosmic dualism, but it should be noted that not every opposition of, e.g., heaven and earth can be labeled as dualistic.³⁷

(d) *Eschatological* dualism denotes the division of the world into two temporally divided parts, i.e., “the rigid division of time between the present aeon and the future one.”³⁸ The phenomenon could more appropriately be called *temporal dualism*. But as eschatological expectation is quite often expressed without any distinct opposition of periods, we should restrict our use of the term “eschatological dualism” to the idea of two opposed עולמים or αιώνες, as programmatically uttered in *4 Ezra* 7:50: “The Most High has created not one world, but two.” On the contrary this means that not every expectation of last judgment or of a final extinction of evil can rightly be called “eschatological dualism,” nor should we speak of an “eschatological dualism” if the opposition of (cosmic) powers is only thought to be manifest or acted out in an eschatological struggle (e.g., in 1QM).

(e) *Ethical* dualism signifies “the bifurcation of mankind into two mutually exclusive groups according to virtues and vices”³⁹ and is expressed usually in ethical terms such as righteous and wicked, good and evil. It may be com-

³⁵ They are, however, not co-eternal but belong to the created world, otherwise we have to speak of metaphysical dualism. The distinction between the terms “cosmic” and “cosmological” dualism (for metaphysical dualism), as proposed by H. W. Huppenbauer, *Mensch*, 9–10 is unclear and should be avoided.

³⁶ Cf. J. G. Gammie, “Spatial and Ethical Dualism,” 360–72.

³⁷ Note that in biblical, as well as in much ancient Oriental thought, there is frequently the notion of some correspondence or mutual influence between heavenly and earthly locations (e.g., the sanctuary) and processes (e.g., kingship, liturgy). In other cases the duality of heaven and earth refers to creation as a whole (e.g., Gen 1:1), with the duality of terms merely expressing wholeness. Certainly these expressions of duality or correspondence cannot be labelled as dualistic. Cf. the explanation of Bianchi cited above (n. 29): “Not every duality or polarity is dualistic, but only those that involve the duality or polarity of causal principles.”

³⁸ J. H. Charlesworth, “Comparison,” 389 n. 1.

³⁹ J. H. Charlesworth, “Comparison,” 389 n. 1; cf., e.g., the antitheses in biblical Wisdom literature, see J. G. Gammie, “Spatial and Ethical Dualism,” 372–84, and J. Duhaime, “Le dualisme de Qumrân,” 414–6.

bined with a supreme cosmic dualism or occur separately for paraenetical purposes.

(f) *Soteriological* dualism denotes “the division of mankind caused by faith (acceptance) or disbelief (rejection) in a savior”⁴⁰ or by participation or not in a certain salvific act. It is to be distinguished from ethical dualism insofar as the decisive criterion is not ethical behavior but faith. Thus the opposed groups of human beings consist of believers and nonbelievers, and because of their sharing in salvation or non-salvation they are considered as eschatologically saved or lost.

(g) *Theological* dualism – or even, though less adequately, prophetic dualism⁴¹ – serves as a rather imprecise label for the contrast between God and humanity, or creator and creation, and is sometimes related to spatial dualism.⁴² But since this contrast, which is fundamentally present in biblical thought does not deal with two causal principles, we should avoid labelling it as “dualistic,” at least if the opposition or antagonism between the two is not specifically emphasized.

(h) *Physical* dualism denotes “the absolute division between matter and spirit.”⁴³

(i) *Anthropological* dualism signifies the opposition of body and soul as distinct principles of being. It is therefore in some way related to physical dualism.

(j) In *psychological* dualism “the contrast between good and evil is internalized and seen to be an opposition not between two groups of people but between principles or impulses waging battle within man,” e.g., the opposition of *יצר הרע* and *יצר הטוב*.⁴⁴ This type should be distinguished carefully from what we called anthropological dualism.

Precise classification of dualistic texts and adequate discussion of their possible religio-historical relations require not only the distinction of the different levels of dualistic thought as described above, but also specific attention to the various combinations in which they occur. Is, for example, the cosmic level linked with an ethical, a spatial, or a physical level? Does ethical dualism include any psychological level or not? Specific questions like this also will help to get a more precise view of the differences and developments within the Qumran literature.

⁴⁰ J. H. Charlesworth, “Comparison,” 389 n. 1.

⁴¹ Thus R. J. Z. Werblowski, “Dualism,” *EncJud* 6.245. Even more confusing, Huppenbauer, *Mensch*, 10, labels the opposition between creator and creation as “metaphysical” dualism.

⁴² J. G. Gammie, “Spatial and Ethical Dualism,” 358.

⁴³ J. H. Charlesworth, “Comparison,” 389 n. 1.

⁴⁴ J. G. Gammie, “Spatial and Ethical Dualism,” 358.

II. Two Opposed Theories: Peter von der Osten-Sacken and Jean Duhaime

Earlier studies have been content mainly with a phenomenological description of Qumran dualism.⁴⁵ However, basically two conflicting theories of its *historical development* have been traced. The first one considers the idea of the eschatological war between God and Belial as the beginning of a checkered history of dualistic thought in the Qumran movement, whereas the other one takes the ethical dualism of later sapiential literature as its starting point and regards cosmic dualism, and especially the notion of opposed angelic figures, as a later state of development. Interestingly enough, both views are based on a slightly different redactional-critical analysis of the *locus classicus* of Qumran dualism: the “Treatise on the Two Spirits” (1QS III 13–IV 26).

(a) In his monograph on the history of Qumran dualism, *Gott und Belial*, Peter von der Osten-Sacken considered the cosmic dualism as documented in 1QM I as the most original type of dualistic thought in the Qumran texts and largely dependent on the book of Daniel and the experiences of the Maccabean wars. Compared with this early type, which he called “eschatological war-dualism,”⁴⁶ the thought of the Treatise on the Two Spirits is seen as a secondary development and, in its final form, the result of a three-stage growth process. Within this text, 1QS III 13–IV 14 is supposed to represent the primary stratum, which was then expanded and interpreted by IV 15–23a and IV 23b–26. 1QS III 13–IV 14 is viewed as a testimony of the transformation of the original “eschatological war-dualism” of 1QM I into a secondary type of ethical dualism, which was, however, reinterpreted again in eschatological (IV 15–23a) and subsequently anthropological (IV 23b–26) terms. The history of Qumran dualism later runs in two distinct lines: the ethical type is carried on in the Pseudepigrapha, especially in the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, whereas the “war-dualism” and the notion of opposed heavenly powers recurs in 11QM^{elch} and later in the NT in Rev 12:7–12.

(b) A strictly opposite view has been put forth in a series of articles by Jean Duhaime.⁴⁷ According to him, the most original type of dualism in the

⁴⁵ E.g., H. W. Huppenbauer, *Mensch*; G. Baumbach, *Qumran und das Johannes-Evangelium*; and, including the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, O. Böcher, *Der johanneische Dualismus*.

⁴⁶ P. von der Osten-Sacken, *Gott und Belial*, 84: “eschatologischer Kampfdualismus.”

⁴⁷ J. Duhaime, “L’Instruction sur les deux esprits et les interpolations dualistes à Qumrân (1QS III,13 – IV,26),” *RB* 84 (1977): 566–94; id., “Dualistic Reworking in the Scrolls from Qumran,” *CBQ* 49 (1987): 32–56; id., “Le dualisme de Qumrân et la littérature de sagesse vétérotestamentaire,” *EgT* 19 (1988): 401–22; particularly concerning the *War Rule*, id., “La rédaction de 1QM XIII et l’évolution du dualisme à Qumrân,” *RB* 84 (1977): 210–38; “La Règle de la Guerre de Qumrân et l’Apocalyptique,” *ScEs* 36 (1984): 67–88; id., “The War Scroll from Qumran and Greco-Roman Tactical Treatises,” *RevQ* 13 (1988): 133–152; id., “Étude comparative de 4QM^a fgg. 1–3 et 1QM,” *RevQ* 14 (1989/90): 459–

Qumran texts is not the cosmic type but the ethical opposition of the righteous and the wicked with their respective deeds, as it is already found in later wisdom literature. Refining von der Osten-Sacken's redactional-critical analysis of 1QS III 13–IV 26 to a five-stage pattern, Duhaime considers even III 18b–23a and 23b–25a as secondary additions to the original Treatise. Thus any notion of the two spirits is thought to be a later addition. At first, the text taught a purely ethical dualism (III 13–18a, 25b–26a and IV 1–14), which was then transformed to a cosmic type by the insertion of the passages mentioning the two spirits (III 18b–23a and III 23b–25a) and then (following von der Osten-Sacken) reinterpreted eschatologically and anthropologically. Similarly dualistic reworking is presupposed in the *War Scroll* (1QM XIII 9b–12a and XVII 4–8b) and the *Damascus Document* (CD V 17c–19) as well.⁴⁸ According to Duhaime's general theory, any notion of a heavenly mediator or opponent figures such as Michael, Belial, the Prince of Light, or the Angel of Darkness must be ascribed to a secondary redactional process.⁴⁹

Without entering a lengthy discussion of the two theories mentioned, we have to note that neither of them can explain the textual data sufficiently. The ascription of all kinds of cosmic dualism to a later redactional stage lacks textual evidence in the *Community Rule* as well as in the *Damascus Document* and the *War Rule*.⁵⁰ As a number of presumably pre-Essene texts from Qumran Cave 4 can show, the idea of struggling heavenly figures is certainly not a late development, but is present in at least some Jewish circles before the formation of the Essene movement and seems to be present within it from the beginning. Therefore Duhaime's general assumption of the secondary character of cosmic dualism in the *Community Rule* and in the *Damascus Document* is certainly untenable. But even von der Osten-Sacken's attempt to delineate the type of dualism in the Treatise on the Two Spirits from the

72. Cf. further Duhaime's introduction in "War Scroll," in *Damascus Document, War Scroll, and Related Documents* (ed. J. H. Charlesworth; The Dead Sea Scrolls 2; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr and Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1995), 80–203, where he is very cautious concerning his theories of literary development.

⁴⁸ J. Duhaime, "L'Instruction sur les deux esprits," 211.

⁴⁹ J. Duhaime, "Dualistic Reworking," 42.

⁵⁰ It could be expected that a thorough analysis of the 4QM manuscripts would clarify the complicated textual history of that work, but such an analysis is still lacking (cf., however, A. Lange and H. Lichtenberger, "Qumran," in *TRE* 28:60–62). For the textual development of the *Community Rule* see S. Metso, "The Textual Traditions of the Qumran Community Rule (1QS, 4QS, 5QS)," 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: Brill, 1997], 141–47), and her previous article "The Primary Results of the Reconstruction of 4QS^c," *JJS* 44 (1993): 303–8.

thought of IQM I has not found much support in scholarship.⁵¹ His view of the origin, date, and development of IQM is at least debatable, and his redactional-critical analysis of the dualistic section in IQS based on assumed terminological differences and on the alleged discrepancy between the content of the passage and its introduction (III 13–15a) is far from convincing. On the contrary, there is a growing consensus that the Treatise on the Two Spirits should be interpreted against the background of later sapiential theology.⁵² But it is still an open question as to how these divergent data can be brought together into a coherent view.

III. A New Suggestion: Different but Conflating Patterns of Dualistic Thought

In the following, I will try to put forward a new suggestion by integrating the valuable observations of the two attempts outlined above and some of the recently utilized evidence, but without postulating a unilinear development of dualistic thought.⁵³ Obviously the failure of the two theories lies in their presupposition of an entirely unilinear development of dualism in the Qumran documents. This generalizes the observations made on a certain document without considering whether distinctions are needed concerning the origin and background of the respective texts.

It seems to me to be more reasonable to see *different patterns of dualistic terminology and thought at the beginning of the Essene movement which subsequently conflate in the thought of the community and undergo further development*. Tentatively stated, we can distinguish (at least) *a sapiential type of multi-dimensional, ethically oriented cosmic dualism* (as represented by IQS III 13–IV 26, but also partially anticipated by other sapiential texts adopted by the community) and also a presumably *priestly type of sheer cosmic dualism dominated by the opposition of two angelic powers* (as documented by the *War Rule*, but also in pre-Essene texts such as the Visions of Amram or 11QApPs^a). Certainly the two streams of tradition and their respective bearers should not be considered as strictly separated. Of course, there must have been interrelations between sapiential and priestly thought in

⁵¹ See the reviews by P. R. Davies, in *RB* 78 (1971), 447–50; J. A. Fitzmyer, in *CBQ* 32 (1970), 468–9; H. W. Huppenbauer, in *RevQ* 7 (1970–71), 293–5; P. Wernberg-Møller, in *JJS* 14 (1969), 275. Criticism has also been expressed by E. Brandenburger, *Das Böse* (ThSt 132; Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1986), 39–41 notes 72–73 and 79; H. Lichtenberger, *Menschenbild*, 200, and A. Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination*, 131.

⁵² Cf. the older studies of K. Baltzer, *Das Bundesformular* (WMANT 4; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchner Verlag, 1964), 106–107, and B. Otzen, “Old Testament Wisdom Literature and Dualistic Thinking in Late Judaism,” in *Congress Volume: Edinburgh 1974* (VTSup 28; Leiden: E. J. Brill; 1975), 146–57, and, more recently, E. Brandenburger, *Das Böse*, 38–48 and A. Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination*, 121–170.

⁵³ According to J. J. Collins, “Dualism and Eschatology in IQM,” *VT* 29 (1979): 212–215, here 213.

the early second century BCE and the respective groups. But the different patterns of dualistic thought are clearly visible, especially in pre-sectarian texts.

In the texts originating in the community they blend together, but traces of the two formerly independent types are nevertheless discernible. So there is not one uniform type of Essene dualism, nor a unilinear development of thought, but a complicated web of different threads of dualistic thought. These possibly originate in the different precursor groups of the Essene movement and were adopted in the texts of the community, being mixed and modified according to the development and experiences of its sectarian existence. In various Qumran sectarian texts, though, they even seem to have been left aside completely.

These are the outlines of the view I would suggest as more appropriate than the two theories sketched above. In any case, such a reconstruction can only be given tentatively, due to the fragmentary state of preservation of some of the most interesting texts. Being aware of these basic limitations, I shall now present the textual evidence beginning with a short analysis of the *locus classicus* of Qumran dualism, the passage on the two spirits from 1QS.

B. The Complex Pattern of Dualism in 1QS III 13–IV 26, its Sapiential Background and Reception

I. The Treatise on the Two Spirits and its Dualistic Teaching

The “Treatise on the Two Spirits” in 1QS III 13–IV 26 is the most impressive example of the pattern of dualism which I characterize as sapiential. It is *multi-dimensional*, but nevertheless coherent: Though basically *cosmic*, it includes a strong *ethical* dimension and distinctive *psychological* aspects.⁵⁴

1. 1QS III 13–IV 26 as an Independent Text

1QS III 13–IV 26 has to be interpreted as an originally independent passage, as recent research on the manuscript 1QS and its textual parallels from Caves 4 and 5 have shown decisively. Of course, the complicated textual development of the 1QS material cannot be discussed in the present context,⁵⁵ but it

⁵⁴ Cf. the similar classification in M. J. Davidson, *Angels at Qumran* (JSPSup 11; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992), 160–1.

⁵⁵ H. Stegemann, “Zu Textbestand und Grundgedanken von 1QS III,13–IV,16,” *RevQ* 13 (1988): 95–131, here 96–100; A. Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination*, 121–126. A full presentation of the material will be given by S. Metso in her doctoral dissertation (submitted to the University of Helsinki) on the 4QS fragments; cf. preliminarily her summary “The Textual Traditions,” and “The Primary Results.”

is to be noted that of the eleven manuscripts containing material parallel to 1QS (4QS^{a-j} and 5Q11) there is only one (4QS^c) with a parallel to 1QS III 13–IV 26.⁵⁶ At least two others (4QS^{d,e}) did not contain the passage, since they began only with the text parallel to 1QS V 1. One of them (4QS^d) was copied considerably later than 1QS.⁵⁷ These observations confirm the view that the manuscript 1QS does not contain any final or even fixed state of the text of a definite community rule, nor any literary unity, but only a collection of different texts of various origins⁵⁸ within a continuously flowing process of redaction and editing. Nor can the dualistic section 1QS III 13–IV 26 any longer be considered the definitive summary of the community's ideology.

In 1QS, the Treatise on the Two Spirits occurs as an appendix to the preceding liturgical section, I 16–III 12. However, the background and origin of the passage seem to be quite different, so that our interpretation must distinguish between the original meaning and its reception in the context of the manuscript.

2. The Multi-Dimensional Pattern of Dualism in 1QS III 13–IV 26

The passage of the Treatise 1QS III 13–IV 26 seems to be carefully composed. An outline of its contents is given in the heading (III 13–15a) and followed throughout its structure.⁵⁹ The lengthy heading is followed by a creation hymn (III 15b–18), a first explicatory passage on the two spirits (III 18–IV 1); a second one on the corresponding virtues and vices (IV 2–14); and a third one on the human acts according to the two spirits and the present and future visitations (IV 15–18, 18–23), until the final passage (IV 23–26) resumes the main topics of the passage. This fits well the overview given in the heading: the Treatise provides insight

into the history of all the sons of man, concerning all the ranks of their spirits, in accordance with their signs (cf. III 18–IV 1), concerning their deeds in their generations (cf. IV 2–14 and IV 15–18) and concerning the visitation of their punishment and the periods of their salvation (cf. IV 18–23).

⁵⁶ Cf. the table given by J. H. Charlesworth, in: *The Dead Sea Scrolls 1: Rule of the Community and Related Documents* (ed. J. H. Charlesworth; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr and Louisville: Westminster John Knox 1994), 55–6.

⁵⁷ According to the table given by S. Metso in “The Textual Traditions,” 4QS^d is to be dated between 30 and 1 BCE, whereas 1QS is to be dated at about 100–75 BCE.

⁵⁸ Thus S. Metso “The Textual Traditions,” and H. Stegemann, “Zu Textbestand,” 96–100.

⁵⁹ For details, cf. the most recent analysis by A. Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination*, 140–3, and also É. Puech, *La croyance des Esséniens en la vie future: immortalité, résurrection, vie éternelle? Vol. 2: Les données Qumraniennes et classiques* (EBib 22; Paris: Gabalda, 1993), 431.

In view of the correspondence between the heading and structure there is no reason for any literary-critical dissection of the passage. The Treatise has to be interpreted as a compositional unity.⁶⁰

Theologically the teaching begins with the *creation*.⁶¹ In the initial hymn (III 15–18) “all that exists and will exist” (כּוֹל הַיְיָה וְנִהְיִיה) ‘being’ as a whole,⁶² is traced back to God, the creator and preserver of the world, with a term frequently attested in Qumran texts, אֱלֹהֵי הַרְעוּחָה.⁶³ The reference to creation is confirmed by the use of the semantic fields for God, spirit, light and darkness coupled with the notion of a fundamental division thereby forming a clear allusion to Genesis 1.⁶⁴ The idea of creation even forms the framework of *eschatological expectation*: not only the order and course of the world is determined by the creator, but also the time of “visitation” (III 18), the final abolition of wickedness, the purification of the elect and the perfection of the covenant (IV 18–23). Within this framework, the teaching of ethics and anthropology presumably reflects the most urgent problems of the group addressed: the occurrence of sin even within the community of the pious (III 21–22), the experience of present affliction and hostility (IV 6–8) and the reality of struggle in the world, even in the heart of every human being.⁶⁵ However, the meaning is not confined to anthropology, but the teaching of anthropological issues is presented in the framework of cosmological and eschatological thought.⁶⁶ Within this context, dualistic thought structures occur at least on three levels:

(a) The first level is that of *cosmic dualism*: the opposition of *two spiritual beings*, the spirit of truth and the spirit of wickedness, additionally called “Prince of Light” and “Angel of Darkness” in III 20–21. In III 24 the spirit of truth also is called “angel of his [sc. God’s] truth.”⁶⁷ The various names show

⁶⁰ Contrary to P. von der Osten-Sacken, *Gott und Belial*, 17–28, and J. Duhaime, “L’Instruction sur les deux esprits,” 567–68, and id., “Dualistic Reworking,” 40–43.

⁶¹ Cf. K. Baltzer, *Das Bundesformular*, 106–7; E. Brandenburger, *Das Böse*, 38–48.

⁶² Cf. A. Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination*, 151: The phrase is used for the whole of existence in 4Q180 I 1–2 as well. נִהְיִיה is also conceived of as a future in Sir 42:19 LXX, where it is translated by τὰ ἐσοόμενα (151 note 125).

⁶³ Cf. A. Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination*, 129 and 151. He suggests that the term comes from the Hebrew original behind the LXX of 1 Sam. 2:3 (151 n. 124).

⁶⁴ This is also confirmed by the allusion to Gen. 1:26–28 in IQS III 17. Cf. B. Schaller, *Gen. 1.2 im antiken Judentum: Untersuchungen über Verwendung und Deutung der Schöpfungsaussagen von Gen. 1.2 im antiken Judentum* (theological dissertation, University of Göttingen, 1961; unpublished), 71, and H. Lichtenberger, *Menschenbild*, 125.

⁶⁵ E.g., H. Lichtenberger, *Menschenbild*, 141–2, and M. J. Davidson, *Angels*, 144–5.

⁶⁶ H. G. May, “Cosmological Reference in the Qumran Doctrine of the Two Spirits and in Old Testament Imagery,” *JBL* 82 (1963): 1–14.

⁶⁷ Obviously the respective terms interpret each other and mean respectively the same spiritual or angelic figure, see M. J. Davidson, *Angels*, 146–147; and P. Wernberg-Møller, *The Manual of Discipline* (STDJ 1; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1957), 72 n. 76.

the linkage of the cosmic metaphors of light and darkness with the ethical terminology of truth (and lie) and the idea of personal angelic beings. So the two “spirits” do not serve only as another term for ethical convictions.⁶⁸ Even if in some passages רִיח is used in a merely ethical sense (cf. IV 3, 4, 9, 22) this does not match the primordial use of רִיח in a cosmic sense denoting supernatural beings as found in the beginning of the passage (III 18–19, 25) which seems to influence the sense of רִיח in IV 23–26 as well.⁶⁹ Of course the two spirits are subject to the one God, who has created and appointed them (III 17, 25) and even determined the eschatological end of their rule (IV 25). Not until the final “visitation” will the permanent struggle between them and “their divisions” (מַפְלְגוּתָם IV 17) come to an end. Then God’s love to the one and his detestation of the other will be manifest (III 26–IV 1) and wickedness will be eradicated forever (IV 19). But presently the course of history (III 13) is under their rule.

Their realm comprises the *human beings* who share in the respective “lot” (לֹט IV 24) and their deeds which are inspired by the one or the other (IV 2–14, 17–18). Moreover there seems to be present the idea of an additional host of spirits: at least for the Angel of Darkness, III 24–25 mentions the “spirits of his lot” which try to bring about the downfall of the sons of light.⁷⁰ Equally, the “dominion of his enmity” (מִמְשַׁלְתּוֹ) in III 23 seems to denote the dominion by which the Angel of Darkness causes the sons of light to stumble.⁷¹ The Angel of Darkness is thought to be ruling over a host of evil angels. There is no explicit hint of a corresponding entourage of good angels for the Prince of Lights, but the assumption seems to be very likely.⁷²

(b) On the level of *ethical dualism* there is the opposition of two classes of human beings with virtues and vices according to their share in the respective

⁶⁸ Such was the later interpretation of P. Wernberg-Møller in “A Reconsideration of the Two Spirits in the Rule of the Community (1Q Serek III,13–IV,26),” *RevQ* 3 (1961/62): 413–441, here 419. Probably his former view was more adequate; see his commentary *The Manual of Discipline*, 67, and also H. G. May, “Cosmological Reference.”

⁶⁹ Even in 1QS III 24, רִיחֵי clearly denotes beings. Its use in IV 20 is also not to be reduced to a mere attitude. In this passage there are strong material expressions used, e.g., “bloodstreams of his flesh.” Cf. the short survey of the semantic range of רִיחֵי M. J. Davidson, *Angels*, 153–6; A. A. Anderson, “The Use of ‘Ruah’ in 1QS, 1QH and 1QM,” *JSS* 7 (1962): 293–303 and A. E. Sekki, *The Meaning of RUAḤ at Qumran* (SBLDS 110; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989), 7–67, where the scholarly discussion is comprehensively reviewed.

⁷⁰ For this idea see particularly *I Enoch* 19:1 and *Jub.* 8:1–4 and 11:4–8.

⁷¹ Thus the Treatise seems to presuppose a quite elaborate angelology as it is known from the Book of the Watchers (*I Enoch* 1–36). But notably there is no explicit reference to the myth of the watchers, as stressed by J. J. Collins, “The Origin of Evil in Apocalyptic Literature and the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *Congress Volume Paris 1992* (ed. J. A. Emerton; VTSup 61; Leiden: E. J. Brill; 1995), 2–38, in particular 31.

⁷² Cf. M. J. Davidson, *Angels*, 156, and A. A. Anderson, “The Use of Ruah,” 299.

lot (IV 24). They are characterized by the use of ethical terms such as truth (אמת), justice (צדק), and wickedness (עולה/עול). Participation in the two spirits and subjection to their influence is expressed by metaphors of source (III 19) and foundation (III 25), terms of dominion (“in the hand” ביד: III 20; cf. III 16), spatial interiority (“walk in” בהלך: III 18; IV 6, 12, 15; “be in” IV 15), and spiritual participation (IV 17, 20–22, 24–26).

According to III 20–21, all humanity is divided up. People follow opposing aims and face an opposite eschatological fate, depending upon the realm of the spirit to which they belong. This fundamental division and even the lot of every single human being is thought to be decided in the predestined order of creation (cf. IV 26). To which party a person belongs seems to be visible through the general tendency of her deeds (as taught in the catalogues of virtues and vices), but will not become definitely manifest until the final visitation, when God will judge the wicked and purify the elect. Up to that time, however, even the elect are not totally pure, nor only subject to the influence of the spirit of truth. The two spirits, indeed, are seen as struggling not only in the world (in the enmity faced by the pious), but even in the heart of every human being (IV 23), and in the contest and temptation, experienced by any single member of the “sons of light.”

(c) On this third, *psychological* level of dualism we can possibly see the problem which the author of the Treatise wanted to be answered: it seems to have been the fact that even the sons of light commit sin and thus share in the spirit of wickedness (IV 24) as well, at least to a certain extent.

How the presence of the two spirits in the human heart or flesh (IV 20–21) could be conceived is evident in the cryptic astrological text 4Q186.⁷³ In this document, the participation of people in the “house of light” and the “house of darkness” is linked with physiognomic features, which correspond to the position of the signs of the zodiac at the moment of birth, and numerically decided by the distribution of a person’s nine parts. The partition of any human being into the odd number of nine parts grants that always one of the

⁷³ Cf. the interpretation by H. Lichtenberger, *Menschenbild*, 142–147, M. Albani, “Der Zodiakos in 4Q318,” *Theologische Fakultät Leipzig. Forschungsstelle Judentum. Mitteilungen und Beiträge* 7 (1993): 3–42, in particular 6–7 and 41–2, and A. Lange, “The Essene Position on Magie and Divination” 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: Brill, 1997), 377–435). The text 4Q186 is written in cryptic characters and a close parallel in 4Q561 is written in Aramaic. Presumably both documents are copies of the same text. The fact that one of the documents is written in Aramaic points to a pre-Essene origin. Within the Essene community it might have been used to examine the candidates for membership (for details see the essay by A. Lange).

two spirits, light or darkness, keeps the upper hand, so that the person as a whole can be assigned to the one or the other realm.

In 1QS III 13–IV 26 the idea is slightly different. According to this text, the ratio of light and darkness within a person is not visible by outward physiognomic features, nor is the share of any single person determined by the sidereal time of his or her birth but only by God’s sovereign predestination which is expressed by the image of throwing the lot (IV 26).⁷⁴ But the basic pattern of dualism with human beings participating in both spirits and being under the influence of both realms seems to be analogous. In 1QS III 13–IV 26 this psychological dualism is linked with the hope for eschatological purification of the elect (IV 20). In the expected final visitation, they will become unambiguously perfect participants of the covenant for which they are chosen.

Looking at the different dimensions of dualistic thought, we can observe that the opposition of the *cosmic (and metaphorically used) classifications* of light and darkness together with the ethical terms of truth, justice, and wickedness comprise all three levels. The type of dualistic thought in the Treatise is thus to be determined as *creation founded and eschatologically confined cosmic dualism with a subordinate ethical dualism*⁷⁵ that comes to effect not only in the respective deeds, but even in a *psychological division* within every single person as well. There is not the slightest notion of metaphysical dualism, nor a real “theological”⁷⁶ or “anthropological” dualism,⁷⁷ nor should we even speak of an “eschatological” dualism in this text, for in spite of clearly uttered eschatological expectations there is no suggestion of the partition of time into two opposed aeons.⁷⁸

The cosmological and eschatological teaching, however, is seemingly developed against the background of quite urgent questions and troubles in the circle of addressees, the “sons of light.” If it is true that their crucial problem was the existence of evil, the occurrence of sin and apostasy even among the pious, and their afflictions and struggle in the world, then the Treatise can be understood as a pioneering and well reflected attempt to explain the presence of evil and to circumscribe the area of its activity whilst emphatically maintaining the fundamental thought of God’s unity and his sole responsibility for

⁷⁴ H. Lichtenberger, *Menschenbild*, 147.

⁷⁵ In accordance with J. H. Charlesworth, “Comparison,” 402.

⁷⁶ Notably, opposition between God and man is wholly unstressed even in III 15–18.

⁷⁷ Confusingly, some authors call “anthropological” what we label more precisely as “psychological” dualism. But the terms “flesh” and “spirit” do not occur in any significant opposition in our text.

⁷⁸ Significantly, there is not only the singular קַץ אַחֲרָיוֹן (IV 16) but also the plural קִצֵּי עוֹלָמִים (IV 16) and, in the heading קִצֵּי שְׁלוֹמִים (III 15), so that there is no clear idea of two opposed עוֹלָמִים or קִצֵּים. The term “eschatological dualism” is used in J. Duhaime, “Le dualisme de Qumrân,” 419 and 421 and even in M. J. Davidson, *Angels*, 161.

creation.⁷⁹ Evil is not only explained by the rebellion of some fallen angels (*I Enoch* 6:1–6; 7:1; 10:8–9; *Jub.* 5:1–2), nor by Adam’s disobedience (*Apoc. Abr.* 26) or from the evil inclination within man (*m. Ber.* 9:5), but conceived as part of the mysterious plan of the creator himself,⁸⁰ the predestined order of being and history, which the “sons of light” are taught in order to walk steadfastly on the path of wisdom (1QS IV 24) until the completion of the eschatological covenant. Cosmic dualism and the idea of opposed angelic figures seem to be utilized precisely for the purpose of enabling the addressees to cope with the experience of evil and temptation and to encourage them to remain on the way they have already been walking. The Treatise thereby shows a notable ‘pastoral’ sensitivity for the internal struggles possibly caused by the decision to obey ethical principles or precepts.

II. The Pre-Sectarian Origin and the Sapiential Background of the Treatise

With the foregoing interpretation, we have already alluded to the background of the passage. We carefully should avoid reading it rashly in the context provided by 1QS or even the entire corpus. I do not doubt that the text was of considerable importance for the community. However, for a long time Qumran scholars seem to have overstated the case by taking the Treatise as the authoritative account of the sect’s worldview, thereby misconceiving its purpose as well as its actual background.⁸¹ Drawing on recent insights into the character of 1QS and the original independence of the Treatise on the Two Spirits,⁸² there is good reason to assume that this passage originates not in the community itself but in the time before the Essene separation and the formation of the so-called *yahad*.

The arguments for this view have been put forward convincingly by Armin Lange.⁸³ He points out that in its terminology the passage differs significantly from the clearly ‘sectarian’ texts: יְהוָה as a name of the community, עֲצֵה, הוֹק, and תּוֹרָה are missing. Strikingly enough, the issue of the correct understanding and observance of the Torah, which was of central importance for the Essenes and should readily be expected in an Treatise like the present one, is

⁷⁹ H. Lichtenberger, *Menschenbild*, 141, and also É. Puech, *La croyance*, 2:432.

⁸⁰ J. H. Charlesworth, “Comparison,” 393–4, and, for the discussion on the origin of evil also J. J. Collins, “The Origin of Evil.”

⁸¹ See e.g., A. R. G. Leaney, *The Rule of Qumran and its Meaning* (London: SCM Press; 1966), 143, where the Treatise is titled as “the doctrine of the community.” Even D. Dimant (“Qumran Sectarian Literature”) characterized the Treatise as “a summary of the sect’s main theological ideas” (498; cf. 533–4).

⁸² H. Stegemann, *Essener*, 152–9, and previously in “Zu Textbestand,” 96–100; A. Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination*, 121–126; A. Lange and H. Lichtenberger, “Qumran,” in *TRE* 28:56f.; S. Metso, “The Textual Traditions.”

⁸³ A. Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination*, 127–128. Cf. also H. Stegemann, *Essener*, 154: The text is “certainly of pre-Essene origin.”

not even picked up in the catalogue of virtues and vices. We find **אל ישראל** as a divine name which is documented almost only in non-sectarian texts. For the opposing power, there is remarkably no use of the name **בליעל** which is so common in sectarian texts. Finally, **ברית** is used in IV 22 only to denote a covenant to be fulfilled at the time of final purification. It is not used according to the common sectarian use for the present reality of the covenant between God and the Israelites represented in the *yahad*.⁸⁴ These peculiarities suggest that the Treatise has its origin in pre- or proto-sectarian circles and is not a late development. It thus represents (at least one part of) the beginning of dualistic thought in the community.

The *traditio-historical background* of the Treatise seems to be the theology of later wisdom texts and their reflections on the predestined order of creation. Already in the earlier sapiential literature there is a pronounced ethical dualism formed by the antithetic opposition of the scoffer and the wise or the wicked and the righteous, with a “mutual antipathy ... between the members of the respective groups” (Prov 29:27).⁸⁵ Later on, in the work of Ben Sira, the ethical dualities are interpreted in the context of the whole creation structured in pairs: “All things are twofold, one opposite the other, and he has made nothing deficient” (Sir 42:24). In this context we also find an initial mention of the opposition between good and evil as part of the ontological structure of creation: In Sir 33:14–15, at the end of a lengthy passage on the created order of sacred feasts and numbered weekdays (Sir 33:9; cf. Gen 1:14; 2:3), we find the ethical antagonism of the good and the wicked as part of the divine order of creation:

As the evil contrasts with good, and death with life,
so are sinners in contrast with the just
See now all the works of the Most High:
they come in pairs, the one the opposite of the other.⁸⁶

In this passage, the fundamental division of humanity into the good and the wicked is seen in analogy to the created division of the world into light and darkness (Gen 1:4).⁸⁷ The opposition of ethically good and bad people is explained, as well as the opposition of light and darkness, as a part of the pre-

⁸⁴ A. Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination*, 131. All the texts originating from the time after the separation and formation of the Essene union use **ברית** only for the presently realized covenant (see, e.g., IQS I 8, 16; II 10, 12; III 11–12; V 5–8, 18ff. etc.); cf. H. Lichtenberger and E. Stegemann, “Zur Theologie des Bundes in Qumran und im Neuen Testament,” *Kul* 6 (1991): 134–146.

⁸⁵ J. G. Gammie, “Spatial and Ethical Dualism,” 372; cf. J. Duhaime, “Le dualisme de Qumrân.”

⁸⁶ Translation from P. W. Skehan, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira* (AB 39; New York: Doubleday, 1987), 396.

⁸⁷ Cf. E. Brandenburger, *Das Böse*, 36 n. 69.

existent order of creation which the wise can discern (Sir 33:16ff.). Ben Sira, however, does not yet teach any determinism of the destiny or even of the acts of human beings.⁸⁸ But the fact that people adhere to one or the other ethical disposition is considered part of the order of creation: like a potter,⁸⁹ God has created human beings and organized their ways differently (Sir 33:10, 14).⁹⁰

The final purpose of this sapiential teaching on the creation and its organization into pairs of opposites is to maintain the idea of the perfection and appropriateness of the creation (39:16, 24–34 and 42:22–25) and also the Torah, even though wickedness is manifest in the world and God's justice can be questioned in various ways.⁹¹

The sapiential idea of the predestined order of creation, as documented in Sirach 33, is the ideological background of the teaching in 1QS III 13–IV 26, where it seems to recur in a more developed form.⁹² This can be demonstrated more clearly by looking at some other sapiential texts which are partially preserved in the Qumran library, the so-called Sapiential Work A (4QSap A, later called Instruction) and the Book of Mysteries.

The preserved fragments of 4QSap A, a presumably pre-sectarian wisdom text,⁹³ remarkably often mention the so-called *רְוֵי נְהִיָּה*. This term, which can

⁸⁸ Ben Sira stands by the freedom of human will with respect to piety (cf. 15:11–20; 21:11); cf. M. Hengel, *Judentum und Hellenismus* (WUNT 10; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 3rd ed., 1988), 255–6 and 298.

⁸⁹ For the image of the potter cf. Isa 29:16, 45:9, 64:7, Jer 18:6 and later Rom 9:19–23.

⁹⁰ A parenetical application of this idea occurs later in the doctrine of the two ways, which seems to be documented in 4Q473 (Blessing of the Two Ways) as well. This text is preliminarily published in: B. Z. Wacholder and M. Abegg, *A Preliminary Edition of the Unpublished Dead Sea Scrolls. The Hebrew and Aramaic Texts from Cave Four 3* (Washington D. C.: Biblical Archaeological Society; 1995), 361. The doctrine is largely worked out in the introduction to the teaching in *T. Asher* 1:3–6:6: “God has granted two ways to the sons of men, two mind-sets, two lines of action, two models, and two goals. Accordingly, everything is in pairs, the one over against the other. The two ways are good and evil; concerning them are two dispositions within our breasts that choose between them” (transl. by H. C. Kee, OTP 1.816–17). Cf., for the age and the tradition-historical background of this Treatise, J. Becker, *Untersuchungen zur Entstehungsgeschichte der Testamente der zwölf Patriarchen* (AGJU 8; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1970), 366–369. Becker emphasizes the more Hellenized character of the doctrine of the two ways in the *Testament of Asher*. The term “two ways” first seems to be documented in Sir 2:12, however in the sense that the sinner, in his inner ambiguity, walks on two ways at once.

⁹¹ Cf. M. Hengel, *Judentum und Hellenismus*, 262.

⁹² E. Brandenburger, *Das Böse*, 38. M. Hengel, *Judentum und Hellenismus*, 267, views in Ben Sira “a – still non-mythological – preliminary stage of the dualism of Qumran.”

⁹³ Cf., for introductory matters, A. Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination*, 45–50. Essene origin is excluded because of terminology and contents (48–9). For the date of the text, the time between the end of the third and the middle of the second century is proposed (47); similarly D. J. Harrington, “Wisdom at Qumran,” in *The Community of the Renewed Cove-*

be translated as “mystery of being,”⁹⁴ denotes a pre-existent order of the world which comprises the Torah as well as the structure of the world and the course of history and is thought to be fixed on heavenly tablets (4Q417 2 I 15–18).⁹⁵ People are obliged to study it (4Q416 2 I 5 and 2 III 14) in order to get insight into good and bad, and to act accordingly. In the contemplation of the “mystery,” they are even thought to discern any human being’s share in good or bad (4Q417 1 I 10–11). Obviously the text presupposes a division of humanity according to ethical strife and eschatological fate, with the respective lot of any human being laid down in the order of creation since primeval times. But, contrary to the opinion of Ben Sira, the order of creation is not thought to be understandable to anyone, but is a matter of divine revelation and therefore conceived and realized only by a minority.

This may become even clearer in the “Book of Mysteries,”⁹⁶ which seems to originate from the same circle as 4QSap A or even be influenced by that text because of the similar use of the term *רִי נְהִיָּה* (1Q27 1 i 3–4). The pre-existent order of being is thought to be realized in the last time, by revelation of wisdom and justice and by the extinction of the wicked, but, in contrast to the previously discussed texts, now the wicked seem to be viewed in the tradition of the fallen angels.⁹⁷ Thus, in the Book of Mysteries, the ethical dualism of wisdom and foolishness, justice and wickedness, as inherited from sapiential tradition, seems to slide over into a cosmic dualism. Now the op-

nant. The Notre Dame Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls (ed. E. Ulrich and J. VanderKam; CJAn 10; Notre Dame, In.: Notre Dame University; 1994), 137–152, here 151–2. H. Stegemann, *Die Essener*, 143, proposes an even earlier date in the fourth or third century.

⁹⁴ Cf. for the translation see D. J. Harrington, “Wisdom,” 150: “mystery of what is to be/come” or simply ‘mystery of being,’” cf. also p. 145; for the occurrence and meaning A. Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination*, 57–61.

⁹⁵ A. Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination*, 91–2.

⁹⁶ 1Q27 and 4Q299–301. See the edition of 1Q27 in *DJD* 1, 102–107 and for the 4Q material B. Z. Wacholder and M. Abegg, *A Preliminary Edition of the Unpublished Dead Sea Scrolls, The Hebrew and Aramaic Texts from Cave Four* (Washington, D.C.: Biblical Archaeology Society, 1992), 2:1–37; L. H. Schiffman, “4Q Mysteries^a: A Preliminary Edition and Translation,” in *Solving Riddles and Untying Knots*, 207–260, “4QMysteries^b. A Preliminary Edition,” *RevQ* 16 (1994): 203–23 and “4Q Mysteries: A Preliminary Translation,” in *Proceedings of the Eleventh World Congress of Jewish Studies. Division A: The Bible and its World* (Jerusalem: World Union of Jewish Studies, 1994), 199–206. For introductory matters, see A. Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination*, 93–6, and, for the non-sectarian origin of the text, 95–6.

⁹⁷ A. Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination*, 120. This interpretation is based on the reading *רִי נְהִיָּה פְּלֵא* in 1Q27 1 i 7 (cf. 100ff.). The wicked who “will not exist any more” are people who stand, wrongly, as it seems, by the *רִי נְהִיָּה פְּלֵא*, the wonderful mysteries, and are punished therefore. The most reasonable explanation for this is the parallel in *1 Enoch* 6–19, where the fallen angels teach men and women heavenly knowledge and magical practices (*1 Enoch* 8:3; cf. *Jub.* 8:3). Cf. also the interpretation by A. Lange, “The Essene Position.”

posed sides are characterized not only by ethical terms but also by the use of the metaphorical language of light and darkness (1Q27 1 i 6f.). Also, at least one of the two parties, the negative one, seems to comprise not only human but even angelic beings.⁹⁸

Although the preserved fragments of these two works do not deal with an antagonism of cosmic or demonic powers nor even have the notion of “two spirits,” they clearly represent the line of dualistic thought which can be found – somewhat more developed – in the Treatise on the Two Spirits. 1QS III 15 mentions the אֱלֹהֵי הַרְעוּתָא (equally as 4Q417 2 I 8) who has laid down the order of being and history. The purpose of the Treatise is to provide insight into the order of creation so that the sons of light will discern good and wicked and walk in wisdom on the right path (IV 24).

The pattern of dualism that combines a dominating ethical opposition with the metaphorical terms of light and darkness and the notion of evil angelic beings (cf. 1QS III 24) is paralleled or even prepared in other texts of sapiential character (e.g., the “Book of Mysteries”). What actually seems to be a novelty in Jewish religious thought is only the idea of the “two spirits.” But even this idea might be explained as a stage of further development of the ethically oriented sapiential dualism in the context of the plainly documented angelology of the early second century BCE without assuming an immediate foreign influence.

Of course, a general impact of Persian thought on Judaism of the postexilic period cannot be ruled out, nor the fact that there are some interesting parallels between Persian ideas or terms and Qumran texts.⁹⁹ But against the theory of large-scale adoption, the objection of J. Barr deserves consideration: It is invalid methodologically to think that the conceptions paralleled by non-Jewish texts could not possibly have developed from the earlier biblical or Jewish traditions. “All that is required is a hypothesis that could account for the same facts on an inner-Jewish basis.”¹⁰⁰ In this, the insight into the basically sapiential background of the Treatise on the Two Spirits may cause some change in scholarly judgement: The main idea of the doctrine is derivable from the sapiential idea of a predestined order of being and history, which comprises the existence of evil as well as the opposite ways of human beings. Thus the fundamental level of ethical dualism in the Treatise on the Two

⁹⁸ Cf. A. Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination*, 120.

⁹⁹ Cf. S. Shaked, “Qumran and Iran”; N. Frye, “Qumran and Iran,” in *Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults. Studies for Morton Smith at Sixty* (ed. J. Neusner; SJLA 12; Leiden: E. J. Brill; 1975), 3:167, 174, in particular 171. In this essay, Frye slightly revises his former opinion which was strictly opposed to any assumption of Iranian influence on the Qumran literature, cf. his earlier essay “Reitzenstein and Qumrân Revisited by an Iranian,” *HTR* 55 (1962): 261–268.

¹⁰⁰ J. Barr, “The Question of Religious Influence: The Case of Zoroastrianism, Judaism and Christianity,” *JAAR* 53 (1985): 201–235, here 205.

Spirits cannot serve as an argument for the dependence on Zoroastrianism any more.¹⁰¹

III. The Qumran Sectarian Reception of the Treatise and of its Dualistic Teaching

How the Treatise on the Two Spirits was understood within the community and what its influence actually was may be seen from IQS and some other texts of probable sectarian origin that cite or allude to the Treatise.

(a) In *IQS*, the Treatise on the Two Spirits functions as an appendix to the preceding liturgy of the renewal of the covenant, well adjoined to it by the corresponding terminology of purification and covenant. In its context, it seems to serve as an explanation for the evil which is effectual in the world and experienced by the members of the community, and also for the necessity of a ritual purification act for all the people entering the covenant.¹⁰²

The inserted vacats and scribal signs in the manuscript document the very understanding of the sectarian scribe. The scribal design reinforces the dualistic notion of the Treatise as a whole by suggesting a stronger bipartite text structure: by a *vacat* in IV 8–9, the passage on virtues and vices (IV 2–14) is divided into two parts and the assignment of the two catalogues to the respective spirits consequently appears to be more definite. What had been formerly an instruction on the divine order of being and history was now conceived as a dualistically structured text describing a cosmic struggle between the Spirit of Light and the Spirit of Darkness.¹⁰³

This is confirmed by observations concerning the redactional context of IQS. The Treatise is read in light of the passage preceding it (IQS I 16–III 12), which is dominated by the opposition of God and Belial (I 16–26) and cites the liturgical blessing on the men of God's lot and the curse on the men of Belial's lot (II 2–10). As a result, the opposition of the two spirits in III 13–IV 26 is found close to the aforementioned opposition of God and Belial. The redactional context seems to suggest at least that the figure of the Spirit of Wickedness or the Angel of Darkness was conceived in the usual terms of the community and therefore identified with Belial. But we should not fail to recognize the terminological difference: a sapiential text of pre-Essene origin, which in itself did not use the designation בליעל, is now conceived in its secondary context with the notion of a sharpened cosmic dualism in the terminological framework of the community: the opposition of God and Belial.

¹⁰¹ In the earlier phase of Qumran scholarship it was mainly the ethical (and not physical) character of dualism which was thought to prove Zoroastrian influence and rule out Gnostic sources, cf. K. G. Kuhn, "Sektenschrift," 305, where IQS III 13–IV 26 was compared with Yasna 30:3–5.

¹⁰² A. Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination*, 167–8.

¹⁰³ Cf. the detailed analysis by A. Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination*, 165–167.

So our examination of 1QS confirms the hypothesis of a *strengthening of cosmic dualism within the Qumran community*.

(b) The sectarian reception of the dualism documented in 1QS III 13–IV 26 may also be seen from other sectarian texts which cite or allude to the Treatise on the Two Spirits. Without striving for completeness, the following passages can be mentioned:¹⁰⁴

1QH^a VI 11–12 (= ed. Sukenik XIV 11–12) could be an allusion to 1QS IV 26, with the motif of God's throwing the lot. The same passage seems to be alluded to in 4Q181 1 ii 5 as well. The *Damascus Document* (CD) quite clearly cites the Treatise twice in the same passage (CD II 6–7 cf. 1QS IV 14 and IV 22), and the curse formula preserved in 4Q280 2 4–5 presumably also cites the phrase of 1QS IV 14 concerning the final extinction of the wicked “without a remnant.” The lengthiest citation appears in a fragment of the text which the editor M. Baillet thought to be a marriage ritual (4Q502).¹⁰⁵ From this text, frg. 16 consists only of the citation and takes up a whole passage from the catalogue of virtues in 1QS IV 4–6. But since the sectarian origin of 4Q502 is questionable, the fragment cannot illustrate the sectarian reception of 1QS III 13–IV 26.¹⁰⁶

But even the remaining allusions and citations documenting the impact of the Treatise on the Qumran community provide remarkable observations:

In spite of the considerable number of texts adopting the Treatise, we must note that the topic which was most interesting for the Essene authors seems to be neither the dualistic terminology, nor the teaching of the two opposing spirits or angels, but the theological idea of eternal election. This idea was given in 1QS IV 26 by the image of God casting the lot (cf. 4Q181 1 ii 5 and 1QH^a VI 11–12) and, in a different form, in 1QS IV 22 which is cited in CD II 7. The other element cited is a phrase on the total extinction of the wicked (1QS IV 14) which recurs in the curse of 4Q280 and in CD II 6. But remarkably, there is no citation of the passage mentioning the two spirits or any adoption of the idea of their internal struggle within every human being. This

¹⁰⁴ The examples are from the table given in A. Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination*, 132–135. The list possibly could be expanded by a fully computerized analysis of the occurrence of any word or word formation in the whole Qumran material (for the relation of CD II 2–13 to 1QS III 13–IV 14, cf. the extended list by Lange, 242), but, for the given purpose, the examples should suffice. I further omit the proposed allusion to 1QS III 13–15 in the Songs of the Sage 4Q511 63 iii 2–3, where the parallel is only theological and not terminological, cf. C. Newsom, “Literature from Qumran,” 183.

¹⁰⁵ Cf. M. Baillet, “Débris de textes sur papyrus de Ja grotte 4 de Qumrân,” *RB* 71 (1964): 353–71. See the text in *DJD* 7:86. The classification as a marriage ritual has been questioned by J. M. Baumgarten, “4Q502: Marriage or Golden Age Ritual?” *JJS* 34 (1983): 125–35.

¹⁰⁶ A. Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination*, 132 n. 50, with reference to C. Newsom, “Literature from Qumran,” 176.

observation suggests that *the threefold pattern of dualism documented in the Treatise on the Two Spirits was adopted only in a deeply modified and simplified form*. This is to be confirmed by looking at two of the sectarian texts mentioned, CD II 2–13 and 4Q181.

(c) Of considerable interest is the sapiential teaching in CD II 2–13, in which there are two literary citations of and even more affinities to 1QS III 13–IV 26.¹⁰⁷ The passage belongs to the first part of the work, the admonition,¹⁰⁸ and provides a theological reflection between two lengthy historical passages (CD I 1–II 1 and II 14–VI 11). Though largely depending on sapiential tradition and terms, the text certainly originates within the community, as is evident from the reception not only of 1QS III 13–IV 26 but also other

¹⁰⁷ Cf., for this passage, the exegesis by A. Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination*, 244–270, and, for the parallels with 1QS III 13–IV 26, the extended table, 242. For issues of introduction, see A. Lange and H. Lichtenberger, “Qumran,” in *TRE* 28:59f; P. R. Davies, “Damascus Rule (CD),” in *ABD* 2:8–10, and, for the history of research, P. R. Davies, *The Damascus Covenant: An Interpretation of the “Damascus Document”* (JSOTSup 25; Sheffield: Sheffield Univ. Press, 1983), 3–47; H. Bardtke, “Literaturbericht über Qumran,” *TRu* 40 (1975): 189–221; A. S. van der Woude, “Fünfzehn Jahre Qumranforschung (1974–1988),” *TRu* 57 (1992): 49–56. For the 4QD manuscripts, see J. M. Baumgarten, “The Laws of the Damascus Document in Current Research,” *The Damascus Document Reconsidered* (ed. M. Broshi; Jerusalem: The Israel Exploration Society, 1992), 51–62, here 51–55; “The Qumran Cave 4 Fragments of the Damascus Document,” in *Biblical Archaeology Today, 1990: Proceedings of the Second International Congress on Biblical Archaeology, Jerusalem, June–July 1990* (ed. A. Biram et. al.; Jerusalem: Keter Press, 1993), 391–7, and most recently J. M. Baumgarten and D. R. Schwartz, “Damascus Document (CD),” in *Damascus Document, War Scroll, and Related Documents* (ed. J. H. Charlesworth; The Dead Sea Scrolls 2; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr and Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1995), 4–57, and J. M. Baumgarten with M. D. Tamir, “Cave IV, V, VI Fragments Related to the Damascus Document (4Q266–273 = 4QD^{a-h}, 5Q12 = 5QD, 6Q15 = 6QD),” in *Damascus Document, War Scroll, and Related Documents*, 59–79.

¹⁰⁸ Cf. the overview of the text structure in A. Lange and H. Lichtenberger, “Qumran,” in *TRE* 28:59f. The admonition consists of CD I 1–VIII 21 and XIX 1–XX 34 and additional 4QD material. The second part of the work, a comprehensive rule of the community, consists of CD VIII 21–XVI 19 and 4QD material. As the 4QD texts show, the two manuscripts from the Cairo Geniza version (CD) represent a shortened recension of the original work. Therefore, until the final publication of the 4QD documents, I would prefer cautious skepticism against all the theories of literary development concerning the *Damascus Document* which were based solely on the medieval epitome of the work as documented in the Cairo Geniza, cf., e.g., J. Murphy O’Connor, “An Essene Missionary Document? CD II,14–VI,1,” *RB* 77 (1970): 201–229; P. R. Davies, *The Damascus Covenant: An Interpretation of the “Damascus Document”* (JSOTSup 25; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1983), 47–55 and 198–204; for a review of the discussion see Ph. R. Callaway, *The History of the Qumran Community* (JSPSup 3; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1988), 91–99.

passages from 1QS and 1QH¹⁰⁹ as well as the use of ברית for a present reality.¹¹⁰

Against the background of the previously recounted history of the community (I 1–II 1), the passage pronounces the teaching of the preexistent order of being and history, but adapts it to the sectarian existence and experience of the community. The fundamental opposition is no longer simply between the just and the wicked, but it rather divides from the people who have repented from wickedness (שבי פשע II 5) and entered the covenant (באי ברית II 2) the wicked who turn aside from the path and abominate the precept (II 6). It divides between the chosen members of the covenant and those outside awaiting final extinction. As in 1QS III 13–IV 26, the respective share in one or the other group is thought to be subject to divine predestination. But, although prominent in the pre-sectarian Treatise, the idea of an internal struggle between good and evil within the heart of any human being has been abandoned completely. Now the ethical criteria of good and evil seem to be firmly related to definite social groups, the members of the covenant and those who remain outside it.

Thus, in the adoption of the 1QS III 14–IV 26 and its central idea, the dualistic teaching is deeply modified: the ethical opposition of the just and the wicked is hardened by its application to clearly defined groups. Consequently, the psychological dimension of dualism can be left aside because the membership unambiguously shows the lot of each person. Where good and evil are separated at the border of a sociologically defined group, there is no warrant for thinking of any internal ambivalence.

In CD II 2–13, due to the prevailing sapiential character of this passage, dualism is expressed merely in ethical terms, without any notion of angelic leaders.¹¹¹ However, in the context of the *Damascus Document*, the ethical dualism of the passage is integrated into the framework of a dualistic conception of history and finally interpreted in terms of cosmic dualism (CD IV 12–VI 11). In CD V 17–19 the struggle between Moses and Aaron and the Egyp-

¹⁰⁹ Cf., additionally, the parallel 1QS X 21 with CD II 6 and 1QH^a IX 9 (Suknik I 7) with CD II 7–8; cf. A. Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination*, 242. The chronological sequence of the texts is reversed in P. von der Osten-Sacken, *Gott und Belial*, 123–31 and G. Bergmeier, *Glaube als Gabe nach Johannes*, 68–70.

¹¹⁰ In contrast to 1QS III 13–IV 26, the hearers of the teaching are addressed as ברית (CD II 2). For the date of composition, see A. Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination*, 243f., who suggests a plausible date at about 100 BCE. The oldest manuscript 4QD^a was written in the first half of the first century BCE; on the other side, the passage CD XIX 35–XX 1, 13ff. seems to have been written soon after the death of the Teacher of Righteousness, which might have happened at about 110 BCE. Cf. also H. Stegemann, *Essener*, 166.

¹¹¹ CD II 6 mentions “all the angels of destruction,” but only in the plural form. The concentration on ethical dualism and the absence of any cosmic dimension show the strong sapiential character of the passage.

tian magicians Jannes and Jambres is depicted as the struggle between the Prince of Light (שר האורים) and Belial. Moreover, Belial functions as the origin of temptation in Israel's past and present history (IV 13, 15 [cf. 1QpHab X 3] and XII 2) and as the Angel of Destruction punishing the wicked (VIII 2–3 and XIX 14).¹¹²

So our observations concerning 1QS gain further confirmation: the sapiential tradition of an ethically interested dualism is adopted within the framework of a reinforced cosmic dualism, with the division of humanity according to the membership of a clearly defined group. Correspondingly, any notion of internal ambivalence has been dropped. When light and darkness are considered strictly separated at the borderline of the community, the idea of a struggle between the two within the heart of its members can be abandoned. This transformation of dualistic thought can easily be interpreted as reflecting the sectarian existence of the community.

(d) The second text to be dealt with here is 4Q181. It is most probably of Essene origin,¹¹³ but is difficult to classify due to the fragmentary state of preservation.¹¹⁴ In 4Q181 1 ii 5 there is an allusion to the idea of God's casting the lot as uttered in 1QS IV 26. In the same fragment (4Q181 1 II 1–4) we find the dualistic worldview of a predestined division of human and angelic beings into two strictly opposed classes. The “community of wickedness” comprising the “sons of heaven and earth” who face final destruction is opposed by a “community of divine beings” or “holy assembly in the state of

¹¹² The halakic section of CD mentions the Angel of Hostility (מלאך המשטה, CD XVI 5, cf. 1QS III 23) dominating the people outside the community and moving away from all who repent and enter the covenant. Whatever the origin of this designation, in the context of CD this figure is probably thought to be identical with Belial.

¹¹³ A. Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination*, 133 n. 53 mentions the use of the terms יָהָר and עָרָה for the description of sociological groups as a quite clear criterion of Essene origin. Cf. the edition in *DJD* 5:79–80 and the comments by J. Strugnell in *RevQ* 7 (1969/71), 254. See, further, the improved transcription by D. Dimant, “The ‘Peshier on the Periods’ (4Q180) and 4Q181,” *IOS* 9 (1979): 77–102 (87–88). D. Dimant shows convincingly that 4Q181 must be conceived of as a work of its own, not identical with the so-called “Peshier on the Periods” 4Q180. However, the overlap between 4Q180 frg. 1 and 4Q181 frg. 2 proves that there must be close relations between 4Q180 and 4Q181: either one text cites the other or both cite a common source (89). Anyhow, the view of J. T. Milik who considered the two documents as additional copies of the Melchizedek text from Cave 11, has to be abandoned, cf. J. T. Milik, “Milkî-šedeq et Milkî-reša‘ dans les anciens écrits juifs et chrétiens,” *JJS* 23 (1972): 95–144, here 109–124.

¹¹⁴ J. Strugnell wanted to classify the text as a sectarian wisdom composition; see his “Notes en marge du volume V des ‘Discoveries in the Judean Desert of Jordan’,” *RevQ* 7 (1969–71): 163–276, here 252–4. However, he might have overstated his observation concerning a few sapiential terms. At least equally important is the mention of the “seventieth week (of years)” (frg. 2) which points to the genre of biblical interpretation. Possibly the text is to be viewed as thematic peshier, but there is no peshier formula preserved (cf., however, the related text 4Q180).

eternal life.” The latter consists of a small number of elect from the “sons of earth” together with “his saints.” Presumably, the members of the community saw themselves as the few of the “sons of the earth” who were admitted by God’s grace to communion with the angels. The community of wickedness, on the other hand, is to be identified with the eternally rejected remainder of the world and the fallen angels.¹¹⁵

Thus we may note that, although the Treatise on the Two Spirits is adopted in 4Q181, its pattern of dualism has undergone thorough transformation: now the cosmic level is clearly pre-eminent,¹¹⁶ the ethical dimension seems to be of reduced importance, because the fundamental division of humanity occurs simply at the borderline of the community. This confirms our previous observations so that we now can summarize our examination of the sectarian reception and modification of the dualism from 1QS III 13–IV 26.

(e) The specific pattern of dualistic thought combining cosmic, ethical, and psychological dimensions, as developed in the Treatise on the Two Spirits, recurs nowhere else in the Qumran library. Even where the pre-sectarian Treatise is cited literally or alluded to, its dualistic teaching is not adopted without thorough modifications.

(α) The *psychological dualism* of struggling spirits within any human being is not adopted anywhere else in the group-specific, sectarian literature but seems to be wholly ignored.

(β) The *ethical opposition* of the good and the wicked and the respective virtues and vices seems to be *rigidified* and firmly applied to the sociologically defined opposition between members of the community and those outside. So the ethical dimension of the dualism inherited from sapiential tradition loses its importance and undergoes *transformation into a sheer cosmic dualism*.

(γ) But sectarian texts use different terms when they express *cosmic dualism*: They never speak of the “two spirits” but mostly use the name “Belial” which significantly is absent from 1QS III 13–IV 26 as well as from the preserved parts of 4QSap A and the Book of Mysteries.¹¹⁷ Although the sectarian

¹¹⁵ As the mention of the “sons of heaven” suggests, the text presupposes the mythological tale of the fall of the watchers which is preserved in the Book of the Watchers (*I Enoch* 6–19), in *Jub.* (5:1ff and 10:5) and was familiar to the Essenes as well. Cf. also 4Q180 which attests the idea of a pre-existent order of being and history engraved on heavenly tablets combined with an interpretation of the tale of Azazel and the fallen angels (cf. A. Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination*, 275–281).

¹¹⁶ The preserved fragments do not use the light/darkness terminology, nor do they speak of a certain head of the wicked spirits. But possibly there was some mention of Azazel (as in 4Q180 1 7) which is now lost.

¹¹⁷ In 4Q300 (4QMyst^b) 3 6 (with the text exactly paralleled by 1Q27 1 i 7) L. H. Schiffman (“4Q Mysteries: A Preliminary Translation,” 203–4) proposes the conjecture רזי בליעל instead of רזי פלא. But there is actually no reason for the conjecture in the text.

understanding of 1QS III 13–IV 26 certainly identified the spirit of perversity or darkness (1QS III 18–19, 25) with “Belial” (1QS I 18, 24; II 5, 19; X 21), the notion of “Belial” or, better, the personification of the biblical term בלִיעַל seems to represent a trace of tradition different from the sapiential one.¹¹⁸ So even the cosmic dualism of the Treatise undergoes a *thorough change in interpretation* in the sectarian writings.

Thus the actual sectarian type of dualistic thought was not at all the dualism represented by the Treatise on the Two Spirits, but to a larger extent a sheer cosmic dualism characterized by a strictly predestined division of humanity along the borderline of the community and dominated by opposing heavenly figures. This pattern of dualism is evident in the liturgical curse formulae preserved in 4Q280 2 and 4Q286 7, and also in the liturgical passage 1QS II 4–10 or in 1QM XIII 1–6. It should be distinguished carefully from the multi-dimensional pattern of dualistic teaching comprising cosmic, ethical, and even psychological elements as developed in the pre-Essene sapiential tradition and preserved in the Treatise on the Two Spirits in 1QS III 13–IV 26.

C. The Pattern of Sheer Cosmic Dualism, its Priestly Origins, and its Sectarian Reception

The most prominent (and perhaps even most problematic) example of cosmic dualism is the *War Rule*, which will be analyzed next. Then we will discuss the earliest attestations of this pattern and its reception within the community.

I. The War Rule and Its Pattern of Cosmic Dualism

1. The Origin of the War Rule and the Background of Its Tradition

The origin and literary history of the *War Rule* material presently remains an open question.¹¹⁹ Even with regard to the 4QM manuscripts,¹²⁰ most details

Since the exact wording is present in two parallel manuscripts (1Q27 and 4Q300), we should try to interpret the given text. The same holds true concerning Schiffman’s conjectures in 4Q299 (4QMyst^a) 2a–c ii 5, where he conjectures מִחֲשַׁבַּת בְּבִלְיַעַל where only a מ is preserved, cf. his “4Q Mysteries^a: A Preliminary Edition and Translation,” 217 and 211 n. 12. Correctly, A. Lange states: “Belial is never mentioned in the preserved parts of all the manuscripts of Mysteries, including 4Q301” (“The Essene Position on Magic and Divination,” note 112).

¹¹⁸ The problem is seen in M. J. Davidson, *Angels*, 163–165, but Davidson fails to draw the conclusions because he interprets the Treatise on the Two Spirits only in the context of 1QS as a whole.

¹¹⁹ Cf. the questions of P. R. Davies in his article “War Rule,” in *ABD* 6:875–6.

remain uncertain. But whereas former views depended only on the literary critical analyses of the single manuscript 1QM and thus remained rather speculative,¹²¹ we may hope that at least some of the questions can be clarified by a detailed comparison of the 4QM parallels. Following the recent discussion, the preserved manuscripts 1QM and 4QM^{a-g} (= 4Q491–496 and 471b) seem to represent at least two different stages of the textual development of the *War Rule* material.¹²²

The manuscript 1QM as well as 4QM^b (4Q492), 4QM^d (4Q494), 4QM^e (4Q495), and 4QM^f (4Q496) seem to represent the later stage. The final form

¹²⁰ Note the edition of the 4QM fragments by M. Baillet in *DJD* 7:12–72 and the previous description by the editor: “Les manuscrits de la Règle de Ja Guerre de Ja grotte 4 de Qumrân,” *RB* 79 (1972): 217–226. Cf. now the comprehensive edition by J. Duhaime, “War Scroll.” Unfortunately the dissertation by M. Abegg (*The War Scroll from Qumran Caves 1 and 4: A Critical Edition* [Ph. D. dissertation; Hebrew Union College Jewish Institute of Religion: Cincinnati, 1992]) was not available to me. Therefore I can only refer to his essays (see below n. 122).

¹²¹ Cf. the reports by H. Bardtke, *TRu* 37 (1972): 103–114; H. Lichtenberger, *Mensch-enbild*, 20–27; A. S. van der Woude, *TRu* 57 (1992): 121–26, and also the major literary critical suggestions by J. G. M. van der Ploeg, “Zur literarischen Komposition der Kriegerrolle,” in *Qumran-Probleme* (ed. H. Bardtke; Leipzig: Akademie-Verlag, 1963), 293–8; J. Becker, *Das Heil Gottes* (SUNT 3; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1964), 43–50; P. von der Osten-Sacken, *Gott und Belial*, 42–72 and 88ff.; P. R. Davies, *1QM, the War Scroll from Qumran: Its Structure and History* (BibOr 32; Rome: Biblical Institute, 1977), and J. Duhaime, “La redaction.”

¹²² There is some discussion, however, on the attribution of the numerous fragments of 4Q491. Recently, M. G. Abegg made the proposal to distinguish three different manuscripts: 4Q491a, 4Q491b, and 4Q491c. According to him, “4Q491a consists of Baillet’s fragments 8–10, 11 ii, 12–15, 18, 25–28, 31–33, 35; 4Q491b: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 16, 17, 19, 20, 21, 23; and 4Q491c: 11 i, 12” (M. A. Abegg, “4Q471: A Case of Mistaken Identity?” in *Pursuing the Text: Studies in Honor of Ben Zion Wacholder on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday* [ed. J. C. Reeves and J. Kampen; JSOTSup 184; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995], 136–147 [137 n. 6], and “4Q491 (4QMilhamaa) – An ‘Ensemble’ of Manuscripts?” in *Abstracts–American Academy of Religion/Society of Biblical Literature 1990* (Atlanta: Scholars, 1990), 378. But it seems questionable how the two columns of frg. 11 should be attributed to different manuscripts. It is to be conceded that the text of the two columns is of quite different character, but could not this be explained by the fact that the earlier stage of tradition contained material which the latter does not contain any more? Further, it is uncertain whether 4Q497 (which is preserved quite badly) is actually a copy of the *War Rule* and whether 4Q285 can be considered as one of the lost sections of the *Milhama* text; thus J. T. Milik, “Milki-šedeq et Milki-reša’,” 143, and M. G. Abegg “Messianic Hope and 4Q285: A Reassessment,” *JBL* 113 (1994): 81–91. Moreover, Abegg (“4Q471: A Case of Mistaken Identity?” 139–146) wants to consider 11Q14 as a *War Scroll* text as well, but questions the classification of 4Q471 as 4QM^g, cf. also E. Eshel and M. Kister, “A Polemical Qumran Fragment,” *JJS* 43 (1992): 277–81 and E. and H. Eshel, “4Q471 Fragment 1 and Ma’amadot in the War Scroll,” in *The Madrid Qumran Congress*, 2:611–620.

of the *War Rule* represented by these manuscripts seems to be composed during the second half of the first century BCE.¹²³ The older stage, which probably originates from Maccabean times,¹²⁴ might have been preserved fragmentarily in 4QM^a (4Q491),¹²⁵ 4QM^c (4Q493), and 4QM^h (4Q471 b). The state of preservation of the 4Q manuscripts allows neither a reconstruction of the overall shape of the older stage of the material nor a determination of how much of the older material has been eliminated, and how many portions have been added in the later recension. However, a comparison of parallel passages may provide at least some valuable observations.¹²⁶

The earlier version was characterized by a strongly nationalistic, but not yet sectarian viewpoint, whereas in the younger one the victorious group is no longer the people of God as a whole, but described more precisely as its holy remnant.¹²⁷ Secondly, the Mishmarot passage in 4QM^h (4Q471 frg. 1) mentions only priests, whereas the version in 1QM II (and 4QM^d) introduces elements describing “the participation of laymen in the Temple, permanently and in courses.”¹²⁸ This may reflect the distance from the sanctuary in Jerusalem as well as the sectarian idea of a spiritual temple consisting of human beings (as in the so-called “Midrash on Eschatology” III 6 [4Q174 1–3 I 6]). Thirdly, the older version represented in 4QM^c 13 mentions sabbath trumpets (הַצִּיצְרוֹרִיתִּים) which were probably used at the sabbath offering in the Jerusalem temple,¹²⁹ whereas the 1QM does not mention this type of instrument. Their omission might be explained also by the community’s separation from the Jerusalem sanctuary. These observations suggest that the earlier stage of the *War Rule* tradition originated in pre- or non-Essene priestly circles. These held a pan-Israelitic, but not yet sectarian point of view, and were

¹²³ Cf. A. Lange and H. Lichtenberger, “Qumran,” in *TRE* 28:61. In the final text the כְּתִיבִים can hardly reflect any other enemy than the Romans. The מִלֶּךְ כְּתִיבִים (1QM XV 2) even suggests that Rome was already governed by an emperor.

¹²⁴ According to M. Baillet, *DJD* 7:50, and id., “Les manuscrits,” 226, the manuscript 4QM^c is written in late Hasmonean script and thus to be dated in the 1st half of the first century BCE. Also the weapons described in 4QM^c seem to be typical for Hellenistic warfare (thus M. Baillet, *DJD* 7:50). This points to a date of the older version in Hellenistic times, possibly at the end of the second century BCE, as state A. Lange and H. Lichtenberger, “Qumran,” in *TRE* 28:60f.

¹²⁵ According to M. Abegg only in 4Q491b = frgs. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 16, 17, 19, 20, 21, 23.

¹²⁶ Cf. the article by A. Lange and H. Lichtenberger, “Qumran,” in *TRE* 28:62, and also H. Stegemann, *Essener*, 145–146.

¹²⁷ This has already been shown convincingly in an early study by C.-H. Hunzinger (“Fragmente einer älteren Fassung des Buches Milhāmā aus Höhle 4 von Qumran,” *ZAW* 69 [1957]: 131–49) by the comparison of 4QM^a 8–10 with 1QM XIV.

¹²⁸ Cf. E. and H. Eshel, “4Q471 Fragment 1,” 617.

¹²⁹ Cf. J. M. Baumgarten, “The Sabbath Trumpets in 4Q493 M^c,” *RevQ* 12 (1985–87): 555–559, here 557.

related to the temple cult. The later stage, then, which is preserved in 1QM, represents the sectarian reception and redaction of the *War Rule*.¹³⁰

2. Dualism in the War Rule and the Differences from IQS III 13–IV 26

The dualism in the *War Rule* is to be classified as a purely cosmic one. The dualistically opposed pairs in the Rule are mainly the “sons of light” and the “sons of darkness,” Michael and Belial with the angels of the respective dominion, and the all-encompassing terms “God’s lot” and “Belial’s lot.”¹³¹ Notably, it appears that there is an exact equilibrium of the forces between the two lots. Both win three times each (1QM I 13–14) until the decisive seventh period of the battle when Belial is defeated and destroyed by the hand of God (I 14–15).

However, the prominent opposition is not between Belial and God himself but between the two angelic leaders, Michael, or the “Prince of Light,” and Belial, or the “Prince of the dominion of wickedness” (שר ממשלת רשעה; 1QM XVII 5–6, cf. 1QM XIII 10). God is the creator of everything (1QM V 8–13), including Belial (1QM XIII 10–12), and even the final victory over Belial is attributed primarily to Michael (XVII 6): “God’s absolute sovereignty seems to leave him remote from the dualistic struggle depicted.”¹³² Even the dualism of the *War Rule* is not metaphysical, but merely cosmic.

In spite of some similarities in terminology,¹³³ this pattern of so-called “war dualism”¹³⁴ should be distinguished carefully from the sapiential type of dualism documented in the later wisdom literature and, in a more developed form, in the Treatise on the Two Spirits, IQS III 13–IV 26.¹³⁵ Of course, there are common elements, such as the self-designation “sons of light,” the

¹³⁰ Cf. P. M. Davies, *1QM, the War Scroll from Qumran*, 113ff., and “Dualism and Eschatology in the Qumran War Scroll” *VT* 28 (1978), 28–36. For the view, however, that all the dualistic expressions in 1QM represent only the later stage of redaction, Davies is compelled to assume numerous additions in many sections of the scroll but with no convincing reasons. Cf. the reply by J. J. Collins, “Dualism and Eschatology in 1QM: A Reply to P. R. Davies,” *VT* 29 (1979): 212–215.

¹³¹ “Belial’s lot”: 1QM I 1, 5, 11; IV 2; XIII 2, 4, 5, 11–12; “God’s lot”: I 5, XIII 5, XV 1; XVII 1. Note further: “lot of light” XIII 9; “lot to be redeemed”: XVII 6; “the lot of thy truth”: XIII 12; “sons of Light”: 1QM I 1, 3, 9, 11, 13; “sons of darkness”: 1QM I 1, 7–8, 10, 16; III 6, 9; XIII 16; XIV 17; XI 11; “Belial”: 1QM I 1, 5, 13; IV 2; XI 8; XIII 2, 4, 11; XIV 9; XV 3; XVIII 1, 3; “Michael”: 1QM XVII 6–7; note differently IX 15–16.

¹³² S. L. Mattila, “Two Contrasting Eschatologies at Qumran (4Q246 vs 1QM),” *Bib* 75 (1994), 531–2.

¹³³ The similarity has been overstated by P. von der Osten-Sacken, *Gott und Belial*, 28, who saw 1QM in closest terminological proximity to IQS III 13–IV 26 and consequently put the two different patterns of dualistic thought into one tradition-historical line.

¹³⁴ Thus the term by P. von der Osten-Sacken, *Gott und Belial*, 84.

¹³⁵ The difference is observed by S. L. Mattila, *Bib* 75 (1994), 532–3; cf. also J. Schroedel, “Zur Bedeutung von *brwk* in 1QM XIII, 1–5,” *BN* 13 (1980): 49–54.

idea of a struggle of two opposed spirits or spiritual leader figures with their respective lots characterized by light and darkness, the expectation of a final extinction of evil, and, looking in detail, the occurrence of “angels of destruction” (1QS IV 12, cf. 1QM XIII 12). But there are important differences, not only concerning the use of the terms, but even more significantly concerning the pattern of dualistic thought as a whole. Without being able to go into every detail, I shall note at least the most important items:

(a) The *mutual relation of the opposed forces and their description* are notably different. The Treatise on the Two Spirits shows a strong interest in the union of God and “the angel of his truth” (1QS III 24). So the forces of the spirit of truth and the spirit of wickedness seem to be quite unequal. The *War Rule*, however, depicts Michael and Belial to a larger extent as agents of equal rank, each of them winning three battles. The idea that the lot of darkness could win in one of the decisive battles seems to be alien to the thought of 1QS III 13–IV 26. This may reflect the fact that the main concern of the sapiential concept as developed in the Treatise is to present an explanation of evil and sin under the strict presupposition of the unity of the order of creation. The *War Rule*, however, depicts the hosts of light and darkness, or of Michael and Belial, as seemingly independent forces.

(b) The “*angels of destruction*,” as a terminological link between 1QM and 1QS III 13–IV 26, seem to represent different concepts in both texts. In 1QM XIII 11–12, they are supposed to share Belial’s wicked plan (XIII 4) and therefore belong to Belial’s lot, whereas in 1QS IV 12 and also in CD II 6 the term seems to denote angels voluntarily serving God in executing punishment. From this observation, M. J. Davidson cautiously suggests that “perhaps two traditions are operating in the Qumran literature.” According to the first one punishment is executed by Belial and his forces, whereas the second one understands God’s obedient servants executing the final judgement.¹³⁶

(c) While *Belial* as the angelic leader of the forces of evil is most prominent in the *War Rule* (and in the terminology of the Qumran sectarian texts as well, cf. 1QS I 16–III 12), the name is notably absent from the Treatise on the Two Spirits. Moreover, it does not occur in any of the pre-Essene sapiential compositions mentioned above. Thus, even though there are similar concepts to the “Angel of Darkness” in 1QS III 20–21, the absence of the name בליעל seems to be most significant and points to some difference in the underlying tradition.

(d) The *overall pattern of dualistic thought* is remarkably different in the two texts. Whereas in the Treatise on the Two Spirits there is a subtle combination of dualistic opposition at cosmic, ethical, and psychological levels, the *War Rule* expresses a pure type of cosmic dualism.

¹³⁶ M. J. Davidson, *Angels*, 158.

(e) There is no ethical dualism in the *War Rule*, and the notion of justice or sin, virtues or vices is almost completely lacking. The participation of any human being in the opposed “lots” of God or Belial is not linked with the description of, or exhortation to, a certain ethical attitude (except ritual purity, corresponding to the Holy War tradition).¹³⁷

(f) The *psychological level of dualism*, with the idea of two conflicting tendencies within the human heart, is completely alien to the type of dualism represented in the *War Rule*.

(g) The eschatological extinction of evil consequently is viewed only as the complete extermination of the lot of Belial without any remnant,¹³⁸ and not as an act of purification within the community of the sons of light or even within the heart of the individual members (as in 1QS IV 18–23).

In view of these terminological and structural differences it seems to be a crude oversimplification to conflate the dualisms of the *War Rule* and of the *Treatise on the Two Spirits* into a single type of “Qumran dualism.” However, the differences have been overlooked especially in the first periods of Qumran research when only the scrolls from Cave 1 were known and scholars ascribed most of the non-biblical texts from the Qumran library (and also 1QM and 1QS as a whole) to the community itself.¹³⁹ Since this view deserves correction, a distinction should also be made, consequently, between the patterns of dualistic thought in these documents and their respective background.

3. *The Priestly Background and Pre-Sectarian Origin of War Rule Dualism*

The main ideas of the *War Rule* seem to be similar to some motifs from the book of Daniel,¹⁴⁰ such as the idea of “holy war,” the representation of human armies by heavenly leaders (Dan 10:20–21), the mention of Michael as the

¹³⁷ Even in 1QM XIII 9–10, 12 the terms truth, justice, evil, and wickedness are used in a quite unspecific way. They are clearly subordinated to the predominant pattern of cosmic oppositions. It is simply not correct, like J. Duhaime, to stress the strong ethical notion of 1QM XIII 9b–12a, cf. J. Duhaime, “La redaction,” 219.

¹³⁸ 1QM I 4–5, 6–7, 9–10; III 9–10, IV 1–2, 4, 12–13, IX 6–7, XI 10–11, XIII 16, XIV 5, 7–8; XV 2, XVIII 1–5, 11 where the extinction of all the enemies is stressed. See S. L. Mattila, “Two Contrasting Eschatologies at Qumran (4Q246 vs 1QM),” *Bib* 75 (1994): 518–538, in particular 533. In contrast, the hymn 1QM XIX 2–8 seems to contain the completely different notion of the submission of the gentiles.

¹³⁹ This unifying perspective prevails even now in many studies. Note, e.g., the recent study by M. J. Davidson, *Angels*, who seems to discover some differences between 1QS III 13–IV 26 and the remainder of 1QS, and even between the patterns of thought in the *Treatise on the Two Spirits* and 1QM. But since he considers 1QS and 1QM equally as sectarian texts, he does not make use of these observations.

¹⁴⁰ See J. J. Collins, “The Mythology of Holy War in Daniel and the Qumran War Scroll: A Point of Transition in Jewish Apocalyptic,” *VT* 25 (1975): 596–612, here 600–3.

heavenly warrior who fights for Israel (cf. the earlier concept in Deut. 32:8–9) and gains the final victory (1QM XVII 7; cf. Dan 12:1), or the notion of the “violators of the covenant” (מְרִשְׁעֵי בְרִית 1QM I 2; cf. Dan. 11:32).¹⁴¹ But the differences from the Danielic ideas are evident as well: Belial is not the prince of a single gentile nation but the “prince of the dominion of wickedness” (1QM XVII 6), and Michael is not simply an angel of the Lord fighting for Israel but the Prince of Light (1QM XIII 10). Interestingly, both agents appear as equal adversaries in the battle, each one winning three lots, before the hand of God decides the struggle in the seventh lot (1QM I 13–15; and similarly in 1QM XV–XIX).¹⁴²

This pattern of war does not just represent a type of “sabbatical eschatology.” It corresponds quite remarkably to Plutarch’s account (cited from Theopompus from Chios, who was born ca. 378 BCE) of the Zoroastrian idea of the struggle between the two gods Horomazes (Ahura Mazda) and Areimanius (Ahriman). This struggle was thought to last for three thousand years until one of them was overpowered, and then for another three thousand years, until the other was overpowered. Then Hades would disappear, the people would be in perfect happiness, and the creator God (ὁ πάντα μηχανησάμενος θεός) would rest for a time.¹⁴³ As John J. Collins has pointed out, the striking correspondence of the details with the chronology of the eschatological war in the *War Rule* may be explained by the adoption of Persian mythology. Even though the precise form of Persian thought in the fourth or early third century BCE is notably difficult to extract from the later Pahlavi sources, Plutarch’s account (extracted from a 4th century source) shows quite well how the Persian ideas could have been perceived by the Hellenistic west.¹⁴⁴

For our purpose, the question might be left open as to whether the *War Rule* actually represents a more developed stage of the Danielic tradition, which is much more dualistic and possibly transformed under the continuous influence of Persian ideas,¹⁴⁵ or only a parallel development of the Holy War tradition originating from different circles.¹⁴⁶ While the Danielic tradition is

¹⁴¹ J. J. Collins, “The Mythology,” 604–8, and, briefly, his commentary, *Daniel* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1993), 73–4.

¹⁴² Cf. J. J. Collins, “The Mythology,” 605–606.

¹⁴³ Plutarch, *De Iside et Osiride* 45–47 (see Plutarch, *Moralia, with an English Translation by F. C. Babbitt* [Loeb’s Classical Library; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press; and London: Heinemann, 1969], 144).

¹⁴⁴ Cf. J. J. Collins, “The Mythology,” 604–7 and also M. Hengel, *Judentum und Hellenismus*, 418–20.

¹⁴⁵ Such is the suggestion by J. J. Collins, *Daniel*, 73–4; cf. P. von der Osten-Sacken, *Gott und Belial*, 30–34.

¹⁴⁶ Thus the assumption of H. Stegmann, *Die Essener*, 145–6.

characterized by sapiential and laic ideas,¹⁴⁷ the *War Rule* stresses the idea of ritual purity in the eschatological war and ascribes leadership to the priests. So we have to label even the pattern of dualistic thought as documented in the *War Rule* as *priestly*.

But what about the origin of this pattern? Are the dualistic elements only a reflection of the ideology of the sectarian community which has adopted and reworked the earlier traditions of holy warfare? Do they even belong to the latest stage of redaction, thus reinterpreting an older, non-dualistic *War Rule* in dualistic terms, as Philip R. Davies states?¹⁴⁸ Could the strongly dualistic sections in 1QM XIII 9b–12a and XVII 4–8b even be late insertions into the traditional text, as Jean Duhaime has suggested?¹⁴⁹ Or does the dualism of the *War Rule* go back to the Maccabean times, as was the basic assumption of Peter von der Osten-Sacken?¹⁵⁰ Of course, the answer to these questions depends strongly on the understanding of the literary development of the *War Rule* which will now be discussed against the background of the recent discussion of the 4QM material outlined above.

Methodologically, we may grant the assumption of Davies that the redaction of the *War Rule* found its primary expression in the opening passage (1QM I), which is, indeed, one of the most strongly dualistic sections of the text.¹⁵¹ However, even 1QM I seems to represent a pan-Israelite, and not a sectarian perspective.¹⁵² Even in this chapter, the enemies are not only Jewish adversaries of the author's group, as might be denoted by the term "violators of the covenant" (1QM I 2, cf. Dan 11:32), but the "lot of the sons of darkness" is made up of the classical gentile enemies of Israel as well: Edomites, Moabites, Ammonites, Amalekites, Philistines, and also the "Kittim of Assur" (1QM I 2), probably representing the Seleucids.

Should there be any mention of the gentile enemies of Israel if the dualism of opposed lots, as documented in 1QM I was due only to the latest sectarian

¹⁴⁷ Cf. the activity of the מַשְׁכִּילִים in Dan 11:33; cf. J. J. Collins, *Daniel*, 69.

¹⁴⁸ Cf. P. R. Davies, "Dualism and Eschatology in the Qumran War Scroll," *VT* 28 (1978): 28–36; "Dualism and Eschatology in 1QM. A Rejoinder," *VT* 30 (1980): 93–7, and his monographic study *1QM, the War Scroll from Qumran*.

¹⁴⁹ Cf. J. Duhaime, "La redaction." Duhaime's assumption of an original praise of the God of the Fathers underlying 1QM XIII is based mostly on contents and is therefore not convincing. The fact that we can observe the literary technique of resumption cannot be a sufficient argument for the hypothesis that the text has undergone later reworking.

¹⁵⁰ Cf. J. J. Collins, "The Mythology," 596–612; id., "Dualism and Eschatology in 1QM."

¹⁵¹ Cf. P. R. Davies, *1QM, the War Scroll from Qumran*, 113ff., and also id., "Dualism and Eschatology in the Qumran War Scroll."

¹⁵² "We find no indication in the older section of the War Scroll (cols. I, XV–XIX) that the author saw himself as part of a remnant or elite within Israel" (J. J. Collins, "The Mythology," 610). This means, however, that there is no suggestion that the strongly dualistic sections of the *War Rule* are shaped entirely by the late sectarian redaction.

redaction? Even if it was correct that 1QM II–IX, where dualistic expressions are largely missing, is an earlier manual of warfare, the dualistic passages of 1QM I, XIII–XIV, and XV–XIX would seem to be not just a late redactional development, but rather set forth the basic ideas of the earlier *War Rule* tradition.¹⁵³

This view is confirmed by the 4QM fragments. Already in the earlier stage of the tradition there is mention of the “dominion of Belial,” the “mysteries of his enmity,” the “men of his dominion” (4QM^a 8–10 i 6–7 = 1QM XIV 9–10), the final destruction of the “sons of darkness” (4QM^a 8–10 i 14 = 1QM XIV 17), and – though somewhat unclear – a “host of angels” (4QM^a 5–6 1). Thus the dualistic terminology of the *War Rule*, at least in its basic pattern, is to be presupposed already at the time of the non-sectarian priestly rule of eschatological warfare. The opposition of God and Belial and of the two hosts of the “sons of light” and the “sons of darkness” was already present in the older version, but from a perspective which conceived Israel as a whole as the victorious group and not merely its holy remnant or the sectarian community.

In the later sectarian context, however, the traditional terminology easily could be adopted and interpreted as referring to the members of the community and its enemies. So we may conclude that not just the *War Rule* tradition in general, but even its dualistic terminology seems to originate in priestly circles of pre-sectarian times. It subsequently was adopted and worked out by the Qumran community, in which its ideas seem to have been esteemed especially in later times.¹⁵⁴

II. *Pre-Sectarian Examples of the Priestly Pattern of Cosmic Dualism*

That the cosmic dualism of opposed heavenly powers existed already in pre-Essene times and originate presumably from priestly circles can be shown from a number of texts which probably precede the foundation and separation of the Qumran community.

1. *Cosmic Dualism in the Aramaic Testaments of Levi, Qahat, and Amram*

Mention should first be made of some Aramaic texts related to the figures of Levi (1Q21, 4Q213–214, 540–541),¹⁵⁵ his son Qahat (4Q542), and his grand-

¹⁵³ J. J. Collins, “Dualism and Eschatology in 1QM.”

¹⁵⁴ The number of copies preserved and the rather late date of the manuscripts suggest that the *War Rule* was rather popular in the later times of the Essene community, cf. M. Baillet, “Manuscrits de la règle de Guerre,” *RB* 79 (1972): 217–26.

¹⁵⁵ For these manuscripts previously seen as representing one and the same work the editor É. Puech has suggested a further distinction. He wants to consider 4Q213–214 and 1Q21 as manuscripts of the Testament of Levi and 4Q537 and 4Q540–541 as copies of another Apocryphon of Levi, cf. É. Puech, “Fragments d’un apocryphe de Levi et le per-

son Amram (4Q543–548), the father of Aaron, Moses, and Miriam. They belong to the type of testamentary literature¹⁵⁶ and may even “point to a collection of priestly testaments.”¹⁵⁷

The heading of the Testament of Amram seems to stress the genealogical line between the three patriarchal figures Levi, Qahat, and Amram,¹⁵⁸ as does the *Testament of Qahat* in 4Q542 1 ii 9–11. When Qahat addresses his son Amram giving instructions for himself, his sons, “and their sons” (4Q542 1 ii 10), the people finally to be addressed are certainly the ‘sons of Aaron,’ the priests. Accordingly, all these texts show strong features of priestly character: they are interested in priesthood,¹⁵⁹ ritual purity (4Q214 1 3; 4Q542 1 i 8–9, 13), and details of sacrifice (4Q214 1 3–6; 4Q541 2 ii 4). Although these elements are linked with biographical narration (4Q544 1 1–8; 4Q545; 4Q547), sapiential teaching (4Q213 5 i–ii; 4Q541 2–6), and eschatological perspectives (4Q541 9 i 1–7; 4Q542 1 ii 5–8; 4Q548), thus fitting the genre of testamentary literature, the priestly interest is clearly prominent. The addressees are exhorted to conserve the heritage given to their fathers, priestly holiness and purity (4Q542 1 i 8–13), the priests are exalted forever (4Q547 1 6) and even expected to take part in the Last Judgement (4Q542 1 ii 5), and the eschatological figure expected in the Levi text (4Q541 9 i 2–3) seems to be of priestly character as well as teaching God’s will and expiating for his generation.

Admitting that the state of preservation of all three texts is very fragmentary and that the question of dating them is a quite difficult matter, we have to note that nothing points to an Essene origin.¹⁶⁰ The Aramaic language, the

sonage eschatologique, 4QLev^{c-d} (?) and 4QAJa,” in *The Madrid Qumran Congress*, 2:449–502.

¹⁵⁶ Cf. the generic classification of 4QAmram by E. v. Nordheim, *Die Lehre der Alten* (Leiden: E. J. Brill; 1985), 2:115ff; further K. Beyer, *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer, Ergänzungsband* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993), 71–92.

¹⁵⁷ G. W. E. Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1981), 234. The relation between the three texts is also stressed by K. Beyer, *Texte*, 2:83, and É. Puech, “Fragments,” 487.

¹⁵⁸ Cf. P. J. Kobelski, *Melchizedek and Melchireša’* (CBQMS 10; Washington D. C.: Catholic Biblical Association, 1981), 24; É. Puech, *La croyance*, 2.532.

¹⁵⁹ Note the mention of the priesthood (of Levi) in 4Q213 3 1, the “kingdom of high priesthood” 1Q21 1 2, the promise of priesthood in 4Q547 1 6–7 and 4Q213 5 ii 15; the exhortation to priesthood 4Q542 1 i 4–13 and 4Q542 1 ii 9–13. Note also the mention of the reception of the tithe 4Q213 2 8 and 3 4–5. The “great name” the sons of Qahat have come to know (4Q542 1 i 1) may possibly refer to the priestly blessing (cf. Num. 6:27), cf. A. Caquot, “Grandeur et pureté du sacerdoce: Remarques sur le Testament de Qahat (4Q542),” in *Solving Riddles and Untying Knots*, 39–40.

¹⁶⁰ P. J. Kobelski, *Melchizedek and Melchireša’*, 25, wants to understand the Testament of Amram as an Essene composition from the earliest stages of the community, but his argument that the same type of light-darkness duality and the figure of Melchizedek recur

lack of any specific community terminology,¹⁶¹ and the quite early date of some of the manuscripts¹⁶² suggest that these pseudepigrapha are composed in priestly circles before the constitution of the Essene movement. So the elements of dualistic thought documented in these texts may shed light on the tracing of a priestly pattern of dualistic thought that goes back possibly to the 3rd century BCE.

(a) A manuscript of the Aramaic Testament of Levi¹⁶³ attests to a prayer of Levi which is paralleled textually by some additional sections in a manuscript of the Greek *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*.¹⁶⁴ In this prayer, Levi prays for purification from the unrighteous spirit and protection from every evil using the phrase “and let not any satan have power over me to make me stray from your path” (καὶ μὴ κατισχυάτω με πᾶς σατανᾶς πλανήσαι με ἀπὸ τῆς ὁδοῦ σου; the Aramaic text reads: אַל תְּשַׁלֵּט בִּי כָל שַׁטָּן [4Q213 1 17]).¹⁶⁵

The word “satan” does not yet seem to be used here as a personal name for a single leader of evil spirits, but as “a category of evil spirit” and not as a proper noun.¹⁶⁶ Such a usage is foreshadowed in 1 Chr 21:1¹⁶⁷ and paralleled

in other writings of the community is not compelling at all. From the textual evidence, one equally could draw the opposite conclusion, namely that the Amram text had a formative influence on Essene terminology and thought.

¹⁶¹ Cf. especially D. Dimant, “Qumran Manuscripts,” 34–35, and “Sectarian Literature,” 488: “Practically all the sectarian writings published to date are written in Hebrew, while the Aramaic is reserved for Apocryphal and narrative works.”

¹⁶² 4QAmram^b is one of the earliest non-biblical manuscripts from the Qumran library; cf. J. T. Milik, “4QVisions de ‘Amram et une citation d’Origène,” *RB* 79 (1972): 77–97, here 78. At least two manuscripts of the Testament of Levi (4Q213 and 214) originate in the late second century BCE as well, cf. J. T. Milik, “Le Testament de Levi en arameen:

Fragment de la grotte 4 de Qumrân,” *RB* 62 (1955): 398–406, here 399, and id., *The Books of Enoch* (Oxford: Clarendon Press; 1976), 23.

¹⁶³ Cf. J. T. Milik, “Le Testament de Lévi en araméen,” and M. E. Stone and J. C. Greenfield, “The Prayer of Levi,” *JBL* 112 (1993): 247–266. The manuscript originates from the late second century, the composition of the work is dated by Milik in the third century, “if not towards the end of the fourth” (J. T. Milik, *The Books of Enoch*, 24). A third century date of Aramaic Levi is argued for by M. Stone, “Enoch, Aramaic Levi and Sectarian Origins,” *Selected Studies in Pseudepigrapha and Apocrypha with Special Reference to the Armenian Tradition* (SVTP 9; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1991), 247–258, in particular 247–48 n. 2.

¹⁶⁴ M. E. Stone and J. C. Greenfield, “The Prayer of Levi,” 247. In the manuscript, the Prayer of Levi corresponding to 4QTestLevi^a ar is inserted after *T. Levi* 2:3.

¹⁶⁵ Stone and Greenfield hint to similar formulations in the Hebrew text of the third Syriac psalm as attested in the Psalms Scroll from Cave 11 (11QPs^a XXIV 12) and especially to the Plea of Deliverance in the same scroll (11QPs^a XIX 15–16): אַל תְּלַט בִּי שַׁטָּן: “let not Satan (a satan) have power over me”; see “The Prayer of Levi,” 262, and similarly D. Flusser, “Qumrân and Jewish ‘Apotropaic’ Prayers,” *IEJ* 16 (1966): 194–205.

¹⁶⁶ M. E. Stone and J. C. Grenfield, “The Prayer of Levi,” 262.

in the later similitudes *I Enoch* 40:7 and 65:6. But, according to Michael Stone and Jonas Greenfield, 4Q213 1–2 i 17 is “the earliest occurrence of this meaning of the word ‘satan’”¹⁶⁸ for a class of evil spirits misleading human beings. Obviously, the text is aware of some sort of rebellion of the evil powers against God’s rule, although there is no single leader figure mentioned. The occurrence of Enoch and Noah in 4Q213 frg. 8, which may represent a part of a testamentary speech of Levi addressed to his sons, suggests that the Aramaic Testament of Levi does actually presuppose the demonology developed in the Book of the Watchers, which already has been linked with the terms of light and darkness (4Q213 8 2–5, 10).¹⁶⁹

(b) In the *Testament of Qahat*¹⁷⁰ we can find the dualistic opposition between the “sons of truth” and the “sons of wickedness” facing eschatological destruction (4Q542 1 ii 8). Another fragment (frg. 2) attests to the opposition of light and darkness as well, but the context cannot be reconstructed. K. Beyer assumed that this text originates in conservative priestly circles before the Maccabean wars, i.e., the first third of the second century BCE.¹⁷¹ Thus, for the priestly worldview of that time, the text attests to a strong cosmic dualism and the light/darkness terminology but (in the extant fragments) not the idea of opposed heavenly leader figures.

(c) This idea is most clearly documented in the related text called *Visions or Testament of Amram*,¹⁷² which, according to Milik, originates in the first

¹⁶⁷ For the development of the meaning of שָׂטָן in the biblical tradition, cf. P. L. Day, *An Adversary in Heaven: Šāṭān in the Hebrew Bible* (HSM 43; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988).

¹⁶⁸ M. E. Stone and J. C. Grenfield, “The Prayer of Levi,” 264.

¹⁶⁹ J. T. Milik, *The Books of Enoch*, 23–4.

¹⁷⁰ J. T. Milik, “4QVisions”; É. Puech, “Le Testament de Qahat en araméen de la grotte 4 (4QTQah),” *RevQ* 15 (1991): 23–54; K. Beyer, *Texte*, 2:82–85.

¹⁷¹ K. Beyer, *Texte*, 2:82. Unfortunately the dating of the text presents severe difficulties: Paleography suggests a date for the manuscript in the late Hasmonean period, but the radiocarbon test carried out recently resulted in a date more than two centuries earlier, cf. “Report and Discussion Concerning Radiocarbon Dating of Fourteen Dead Sea Scrolls,” *Methods of Investigation of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Khirbet Qumran Site. Present Realities and Future Prospects* (ed. by M. O. Wise, N. Golb, J. J. Collins, and D. G. Pardee; Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences 722; New York: The New York Academy of Sciences, 1994), 441–8. Confusingly this is the only major difference between the earlier datings determined by paleography and the radiocarbon method. Whatever the reason for the difference (e.g., chemical contamination or the use of an extremely old piece of leather), the evidence should give additional support for a composition of the text at least in the mid-second century, or earlier.

¹⁷² The text is preserved in six manuscripts (4QAmram^{a-f} = 4Q543–548), cf. J. T. Milik, “4QVisions,” 77–79; id., “Milki-šedeq et Milkī-reša’,” 95–144; P. J. Kobelski, *Melchizedek and Melchireša’*, 24–36; F. García Martínez, “4Q ‘Amram B i,14: Melkiresa o Melki-sedeq?” *RevQ* 12 (1985): 111–114; K. Beyer, *Texte*, 2.85–92, and, most recently, the reconstruction by É. Puech, *La croyance*, 2:531–536.

half of the 2nd century as well,¹⁷³ if not earlier, in a priestly precursor group of the Qumran community. In a passage preserved in 4QAmram^b (4Q544), Amram tells of a vision of two angelic beings, described as belonging to the watchers (cf. 4Q546 2 1),¹⁷⁴ who hold a contest over him. They ask Amram to choose one of them to rule over him. He then learns from the two angels that they claim to rule over the world and every human being. One rules over all darkness and the people belonging to darkness, the other over the reign of light and all the sons of light.

Unfortunately the description of their appearance and the information about their names is very fragmentary, but due to the reconstruction by J. T. Milik, F. García Martínez, and É. Puech, at least the description has been made sufficiently clear.¹⁷⁵ The first angel has a dreadful face, wears colored clothes,¹⁷⁶ and is obscured by darkness, whereas the second one is characterized by a bright appearance and a smiling face.¹⁷⁷ There is mention of the bright figure having three names, but unfortunately none of the names is preserved. Only one of the names of the dark angel is preserved, Melchiresha (4Q546 2 3). Assuming that the two opposed figures are depicted correspondingly, Milik has suggested a reconstruction of the respective names. They are, of course, somewhat speculative but they have found wide acceptance: “Belial, Prince of Darkness, and Melchiresha” and “Michael, Prince of Light, and Melchizedek.”¹⁷⁸ If Milik’s reconstruction is correct, 4QAmram is the earliest

¹⁷³ J. T. Milik, “Milki-šedeq et Milki-reša,” 127, considers *Jub.* 46:6–47:9 as dependent on 4QAmram. K. Beyer, *Texte*, 2:86, assumes that the mention of the Philistines presupposes the wars of Judas Maccabaeus against the Philistines (163–161 BCE). P. J. Kobelski, *Melchizedek and Melchiresha*, 25 interprets the text as a sectarian document, but assumes vaguely an earlier source for the idea of struggling angels (75).

¹⁷⁴ But note that there is a slight uncertainty of this identification because the reading “watchers” depends only on the insertion of the small fragment from 4Q546 into the context of the other fragments, cf. the reconstruction by É. Puech, *La croyance*, 2:532–533, and the critical remarks by M. J. Davidson, *Angels*, 265–266.

¹⁷⁵ Note the improvement of the reading by F. García Martínez, “4Q ‘Amram B i,14: Melkiresa o Melki-sedeq?’” taken up by É. Puech, *La croyance*, 2:534, suggesting that a short *vacat* at the end of I 13 indicates that the description of the second watcher, the bright one, begins in the next line. So, actually, we have not only the picture of Melchiresha, but also the picture of Melchizedek.

¹⁷⁶ Possibly this is thought to be a means of temptation, cf. J. T. Milik, “4QVisions,” 81.

¹⁷⁷ Cf. the reconstruction by É. Puech, *La croyance*, 2:534.

¹⁷⁸ J. T. Milik, “4QVisions,” 79, and also P. J. Kobelski, *Melchizedek and Melchiresa*, 28; É. Puech, *La croyance*, 2:535–6. The correspondence is shown by the linguistic analogy between Milki-zedek and Milki-resha. The further reconstruction of the names is suggested by the identification of Milki-zedek with Michael in 11QMelch, and of Milki-zedek with the Prince of Light in 1QM XIII 9–13. Michael or Melchizedek is characterized by light and brightness on the other side, Melchiresha appears as a parallel to Belial in the curse-formulations, cf. 4Q280 2 and 1QS II 4.

preserved document attesting to the opposition of Melchizedek and Melchiresha, and also of Michael and Belial, or the Prince of Light and the Prince of Darkness. Moreover, this text seems to be the earliest ancient Jewish example of a strong cosmic dualism of opposed angelic powers dominating the world and struggling for possession of human beings.¹⁷⁹

The other fragments of the Testament of Amram clearly show that the notion of heavenly leaders is linked already with the division of humanity into the spheres of light and darkness. In addition, the designations “sons of light” or “sons of darkness” and also “sons of lie” or “sons of truth” (4QAmram^f = 4Q547 1 ii 8) connect each person with a respective eschatological fate characterized as going to the light or going to the shades, death, destruction, and annihilation (4Q547 1 ii 12–14). Thus we can see *a strongly expressed cosmic dualism with the notion of opposed heavenly powers and the strict division of humanity into two opposed groups dominated by the respective leaders and facing opposite eschatological fates.*

Unfortunately, the fragments do not show clearly the criteria by which people are considered to belong to one or the other group. However, we should note the almost complete lack of specific ethical precepts or any concrete mention of virtues, vices, or sins. Even the mention of “truth” and “lie” remains as unspecific as the light/darkness terminology which plays a dominant role in the text. Thus the pattern of dualistic thought in this pre-Essene priestly document must be classified as *merely cosmic*, drawing on an angelology of opposed heavenly figures. There is no distinctive ethical opposition in this text. Needless to say, any form of psychological awareness of internal ambivalence, as documented in the sapiential Treatise on the Two Spirits, is completely alien to this text.

2. Demonology and Cosmic Dualism in 11QApPs^a

The pre-Essenic origin of the cosmic dualism with opposed powers is demonstrated as well by the apotropaic songs 11QApPs^a.¹⁸⁰ The only extant copy of

¹⁷⁹ As for the use of “a satan” in 4QTestLevi one could ask whether this idea is foreshadowed by the biblical notions of the heavenly accuser: in Job 1:6–12, and especially in Zech 3:1–2 where the Angel of the Lord and the heavenly accuser, מַלְאָךְ הַיְהוָה, dispute on the justice and purity of the High Priest Joshua. Of course the dispute is in the heavenly court, and the two figures do not act on their own behalf (especially the מַלְאָךְ הַיְהוָה). Also, מַלְאָךְ הַיְהוָה seems to designate more a function than a single celestial being (cf. P. L. Day, *An Adversary in Heaven*, 107–126 and 147–150), but the scene may have prepared further developments. Notably, Zechariah 3 is part of a specific post-exilic priestly tradition.

¹⁸⁰ Note the editions by J. P. M. van der Ploeg, “Un petit rouleau de psaumes apocryphes (11QPsAPa),” in *Tradition und Glaube, Festgabe für Karl Georg Kuhn zum 65. Geburtstag* (ed. G. Jeremias, H.-W. Kuhn, and H. Stegemann; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971), 128–39; É. Puech, “11QPsAp^a: un rituel d’exorcismes. Essai de reconstruction,” *RevQ* 14 (1990): 377–408; id., “Les deux derniers Psaumes davidiques du rituel

this text seems to have been written in Herodian times, but the text itself precedes the time of the Essene movement and might have been written at least in the third or early second century BCE.¹⁸¹ This is shown by the attribution of the songs to David and, particularly, by the free use of the tetragrammaton in this text.¹⁸² The collection contains three apocryphal “psalms” and ends with a fourth song, equally considered apotropaic, the biblical Psalm 91 (11QApPs^a V 3–14). The individual is taught to recite magical songs for his or her protection, addressed to the individual demon and explicitly mentioning the Divine Name. In the third incantation (IV 4–V 3), Belial is addressed: “Who are you, [accursed amongst] men and amongst the seed of the holy ones? You are darkness and not light, [s]in and not justice.”¹⁸³

Obviously, the worldview of the whole composition is dualistic. Belial and a host of evil spirits and demons (cf. I 4–5) come and besiege humanity (I 6[?]; II 7–8; IV 5), but the Lord will send his powerful angel against them (III 3, 5). Evil spirits probably cause several kinds of illness, but Raphael is thought to heal the pious (IV 3). “Satan” occurs as the accuser at the time of Judgement, but the just enjoy the support of an angel (IV 12). Finally, the Lord will judge the demons and incarcerate Belial in deepest Sheol where no light penetrates (IV 9).

Thus the pious addressees, together with the angels or “holy seed” (cf. II 6; IV 6), are opposed to a plurality of enemies, particularly evil spirits and devils (I 4–5) under the guidance of Belial, the “prince of enmity” (I 5). The notion of the struggle of Belial and his spirits with the angel(s) presiding over the lot of the just underlies the whole composition.¹⁸⁴ This idea is combined with the light-darkness paradigm and some ethical expressions (sin/justice).

d'exorcisme. 11QPsAp^a IV,4–V,14,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls. Forty Years of Research* (ed. D. Dimant and U. Rappaport; STDJ 10; Leiden: E. J. Brill and Jerusalem: The Magnes Press, 1992), 64–89; id., *La croyance*, 2:617–626. Note also, B. Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer and Religious Poetry* (STDJ 12; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1994), 232–38.

¹⁸¹ É. Puech, *La croyance*, 2:618; id., “Les deux derniers Psaumes,” 79–81; A. Lange, “The Essene Position on Magic and Divination.”

¹⁸² For the free use of the tetragrammaton up to the early second century, see H. Stegemann, “Religionsgeschichtliche Erwägungen,” 200ff. É. Puech does not accept the use of the tetragrammaton as an argument for pre-Essene origin, cf. “11QPsAp^a,” 400–402, “Les deux derniers Psaumes,” 80–88. He states that the Divine Name was being used constantly for exorcistic purposes. However, in the later *Testament of Solomon* it is replaced by other phrases (*T. Sol.* 4:12; 11:6), cf. A. Lange, “The Essene Position on Magic and Divination.”

¹⁸³ Translation by F. García Martínez, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated*, 377, depending on the reconstruction by E. Puech (“11QPsAp^a,” 381–383. The passage is difficult to interpret, cf. Puech’s later revision of his reading in “Les deux derniers Psaumes,” 68–71, and the different suggestion by M. J. Bernstein in his review in *JSS* 40 (1995): 130–135, here.

¹⁸⁴ Cf. É. Puech, *La croyance*, 2:624.

Despite the few ethical and juridical terms used, the pattern of dualism may be labelled mainly as cosmic.

The character and terminology of this text are clearly far removed from the sapiential reflection on anthropological and ethical issues as documented in 1QS III 13–IV 26. However, 11QApPs^a does not show any peculiar priestly interests. Its demonology which is closely parallel to the Book of the Watchers (cf. *1 Enoch* 10:4–7) seems to have been more widespread and not confined to a specific line of tradition in third century Judaism, but there are close parallels, e.g., to Aramaic Levi as well. The rise of an elaborated demonology and angelology, therefore, seems to have been an important contribution to the development of the pattern of cosmic dualism as it is documented fully in the later *War Rule*.

3. Demonology and Cosmic Dualism in Jubilees and 4Q390

(a) One of the most interesting documents containing pre-sectarian priestly thought is the *Book of Jubilees*. The large number of 14 or 15 copies in the Qumran library¹⁸⁵ and the fact that *Jubilees* is cited as an authoritative text in CD XVI 3–4 show that the book was highly esteemed in Qumran sectarian circles. But, despite the calendaric and theological parallels to later Qumran thought, *Jubilees* cannot be considered sectarian. There is no mention of any significant break within the national body of Israel.¹⁸⁶ Consequently, *Jubilees* must have been written before the split between the Maccabees and the Essenes, which is to be dated most probably in 152 BCE.¹⁸⁷

¹⁸⁵ See the table in J. C. VanderKam, “The Jubilees Fragments from Qumran Cave 4,” in *The Madrid Qumran Congress*, 2:642–3. The documents are 1Q17, 1Q18, 2Q19, 2Q20, 3Q5; 4Q176 (in some of the fragments), 4Q216, 4Q217 (?), 4Q218, 4Q219, 4Q220, 4Q221, 4Q222, 4Q223–224, 11QJub. Additionally, there are some similar documents, labelled as Pseudo-Jubilees (4Q225, 4Q226, and 4Q227) and another text that possibly cites *Jubilees* (4Q228). Note the edition of the 4QJub fragments by J. T. Milik and J. C. VanderKam in *DJD* 13 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995), 1–185.

¹⁸⁶ Cf. B. Noack, “Qumran and the Book of Jubilees,” *SEÅ* 22–23 (1957–58): 191–207; J. C. VanderKam, *Textual and Historical Studies in the Book of Jubilees* (HSM 14; Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1977), 255–82; O. S. Wintermute, “Jubilees,” in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (ed. J. H. Charlesworth; Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday, 1985), 2:43–4.

¹⁸⁷ Thus J. C. VanderKam, *Textual and Historical Studies*, 284. Other authors propose a slightly earlier date. G. Nickelsburg, “The Bible Rewritten and Expanded,” in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period*, 102–3 suggests a composition close to 168 BCE. A date between 145 and 140 BCE, as is suggested by K. Berger (*Das Buch der Jubiläen* [JSHRZ II/3; Gütersloh: G. Mohn, 1981], 300), seems to be more problematic. For the date of the separation of the Essenes from the temple and the linkage of these events with the intersacerdotium 159–152 BCE, see H. Stegemann, *Die Entstehung der Qumrangemeinde* (privately published Th. D. Dissertation, University of Bonn, 1971).

The author comes from conservative priestly circles, as is suggested from his interest in the calendar, chronology, the origin of feasts and ritual details, and from his radical interpretation of purity and sabbath law. Levi is given priority over Jacob's sons (31:15), and he is entrusted with books containing the heavenly lore revealed to Jacob as well as with the sacred traditions passed down from the earlier patriarchs (46:15; cf. 32:24–25). Most probably, the author understood himself as belonging to the line of priestly writers going back to Levi and thus licensed and commissioned to repeat, or even renew, the ancient traditions for his own generation.¹⁸⁸ It is disputed, however, whether or not *Jubilees* can be aptly labelled “dualistic.”¹⁸⁹ Within the concept that history as a whole is predestined and determined on heavenly tablets, evil is seen as superhuman, caused not by God, but by the fallen Watchers (4:15, 22; 5:1ff.; 7:21) who led astray the human daughters. Despite the binding of the Watchers and the destruction of their sons, the giants (5:6–10), there is a host of evil spirits which went forth from the bodies of the slain giants and misled human beings (10:1–5). They belong to the realm of the “Prince Mastema” (11:5, 11, 19; 17:16; 18:9, 12; 48:2, 9, 12, 15) or only “Mastema” (10:8; cf. 19:28), or “Satan” (10:11).¹⁹⁰ It is Mastema who tempts Abraham to kill Isaac, who tries to kill Moses on his way to Egypt, and who provokes the Egyptians to pursue Israel.

Of course, Mastema is a created being, and he may be bound by God at will (48:15). In the time of salvation, however, there will be no “Satan” and no evil (23:29; 50:5) anymore, as during Joseph's rule in Egypt (40:9; 46:2) which seems to foreshadow eschatological salvation. But during the course of history, Mastema is the angelic leader of the enemies of Israel, whereas God's angels assist Israel against his power and the afflictions of his spirits (48:4, 13).

Besides Mastema, there is also mention of Beliar (1:20; 15:33). Those who do not circumcise their sons are called “sons of Beliar.” When Moses prays that Israel would not be ruled by any evil spirit he calls that spirit “the spirit of Beliar” (1:20). Since *Jubilees* tells us about the “spirit of Mastema” (19:28) in a quite similar way, the two figures probably should be understood as identical.

Jubilees attests to a clear division within the angelic world and, accordingly, a division of humanity between Israel (except the apostates) and the Gen-

¹⁸⁸ Thus the plausible suggestion of O. S. Wintermute, *OTP*, 2:45.

¹⁸⁹ This is denied, e. g., by P. von der Osten Sacken, *Gott und Belial*, 197. Cf., however, O. S. Wintermute, *OTP* 2:47–8, and M. Testuz, *Les idées religieuses du livre des Jubilés* (Geneva: E. Droz and Paris: Minard, 1960), 75–92.

¹⁹⁰ The identification is clear from the correspondence of 10:8 with 10:11, and is suggested even from etymology: R. H. Charles, *The Book of Jubilees or Little Genesis* (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1902), 80. “Satan” is mentioned further in 23:29; 40:9; 46:2; 50:5.

tile nations led by evil spirits (15:32). Thus, even if there is no mention of an eschatological war (as in 1QM) or of directly opposed heavenly leaders (as in 4QAmram), the book attests to basic elements of a growing cosmic dualism and the reception of an elaborate demonology (depending on the Book of the Watchers and related to 11QApPs^a) within the context of pre-sectarian priestly thought.

(b) 4Q390 is the best preserved manuscript of a Moses pseudepigraphon which seems to be extant in five copies in the Qumran library.¹⁹¹ It mentions – with a strange double plural – “the angels of Mastemot” (מלאכי המשטמות).¹⁹² These angels seem to have the function of misleading the Israelites when they violate the covenant. But the question whether or not they belong to a certain angelic leader remains textually uncertain: Belial is mentioned once in 4Q390 2 i 4 and the singular משטמה is not preserved in the extant fragments. But, since משטמה serves as a proper name for the prince of evil spirits in *Jubilees*, we may assume that “the Angels of Mastemot” represent “the evil angels under the authority of Mastema.”¹⁹³ In *Jubilees*, they are labelled demons or evil spirits (e.g., 10:2, 8; 48:12, 16), in later Qumran sectarian texts “spirits of (the lot of) Belial” (cf. 11QMelch II 12¹⁹⁴).

Similarities of form, style, and chronology, some verbal overlaps, and especially the mention of the angels of Mastemot suggest that the pseudo-Moses text 4Q390 depends on the book of *Jubilees*. As D. Dimant assumes, it may also originate in a priestly parent-group of the Qumran community which “did not yet have the peculiar community-ideology, or the specific ideas about dualism” but the text attests to a stage in the development of these ideas.¹⁹⁵

The community seems to have adopted the ideas from *Jubilees* and also from 4Q390. Mastema is mentioned, notably, in the passage of the *Damascus Document* where *Jubilees* is referred to (CD XVI 3–4): The Angel Mastema (מלאך משטמה) will turn aside from those who repent and return to the law of Moses (CD XVI 5). Most probably, the Qumran covenanters identified the “Angel Mastema” with Belial, as does the *War Rule* in 1QM XIII 11.¹⁹⁶

¹⁹¹ Cf. D. Dimant, “New Light on Jewish Pseudepigrapha – 4Q390,” in *The Madrid Qumran Congress*, 2.405–448. The 5 manuscripts are PsMos^a (= 4Q385a frgs. 13, 20, 40, 41, 42, 44), PsMos^b (= 4Q387a frgs. 1, 2, 3, 5), PsMos^c (= 4Q388a frgs. 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 9, 17, 19), PsMos^d (= 4Q389 frgs. 1, 2, 8, 9), and PsMos^e (= 4Q390 in its entirety), see p. 412.

¹⁹² 4Q390 1 11, 2 i 7, and 4Q387 3 iii 4. These are “the only instances of this double-plural attributive construct” (D. Dimant, “New Light,” 426).

¹⁹³ D. Dimant, “New Light,” 426.

¹⁹⁴ Cf. É. Puech, “Notes sur Je manuscrit de 11QMelchizédeq,” *RevQ* 12 (1987): 483–513, here 488.

¹⁹⁵ D. Dimant, “New Light,” 447, for dependence upon *Jubilees*, see 437–38.

¹⁹⁶ 1QS III 24 speaks of ממלח משטמות, with משטמה as a proper noun.

III. The Sectarian Reception of the Pattern of Cosmic Dualism

The Qumran sectarian adoption of the priestly pattern of cosmic dualism is evident from the reception of the various names of angels and the notion of their fundamental opposition. Melchizedek and Melchiresha, Mastema, and, above all, Belial appear in various sectarian texts.

1. Sheer Cosmic Dualism in the Curses of the Community

Most notable is the recurrence of the name Melchiresha in the curse formula 4Q280 2 2.¹⁹⁷ The “sons of light” curse Melchiresha wishing him God’s vengeance and damnation. Similarly, they curse the group of people who carry out his plans and plot against the covenant of God, as well as “all those who refuse to enter” the covenant.¹⁹⁸ From the use of the term בְּרִית, it is obvious that the text is a group-specific text. Thus the self-designation “sons of light” refers to the members of the community who curse all the people outside the covenant and Melchiresha as the angelic leader who was assumed to cause all kinds of enmity against the community.

A very similar curse against the men of Belial’s lot is documented in the liturgical passage 1QS II 4–25.¹⁹⁹ Even more interesting is a series of curses documented in the Berakhot text 4Q286 7 ii 1–13²⁰⁰ where the “council of the community” (עֲצַת הַיְיָ) curses Belial himself (2) and then “all the spirits of his lot” or the “lot of darkness” (3–4) as well as the “sons of Belial” (6) who

¹⁹⁷ J. T. Milik, “Milki-šedeq et Milki-reša’,” 127, and P. J. Kobelski, *Melchizedek and Melchireša’*, 37–38. The manuscript usually is dated in the first half of the first century BCE; the composition may originate from the end of the second century, cf. É. Puech, *La croyance*, 2:541–542 with n. 66.

¹⁹⁸ Cf. the reading and reconstruction by Milik, “Milki-šedeq et Milki-reša’,” 127–128, which is somewhat speculative.

¹⁹⁹ The similarities have been shown convincingly by P. J. Kobelski, *Melchizedek and Melchireša’*, 38–42. However, the issue of the relation of the two texts to each other or of the sequence of their composition must be left open; cf. É. Puech, *La croyance*, 2:542 n. 66.

²⁰⁰ Cf. the text given by J. T. Milik, “Milki-šedeq et Milki-reša’,” 134–135, P. J. Kobelski, *Melchizedek and Melchireša’*, 43–44, and, recently, by É. Puech, *La croyance*, 2:544–545. The numbering of the fragments differs, however: Milik, Kobelski, and Puech number the fragment mentioned above as frg. 10, whereas F. García Martínez (*The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated*, 435) and J. Maier (*Die Qumran Essener: Die Texte vom Toten Meer*, 2.247–8) number it as frg. 7. Cf. B. Nitzan, “4Q Berakhot (4Q286–4Q290): A Preliminary Report,” in *New Qumran Texts and Studies* (ed. G. J. Brooke; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1994), 53–74, in particular 53 n. 2. On the dualistic ideology of the curses from 4QBerakhot see further B. Nitzan, “4QBERAKHOT^{a-c} (4Q286–290): A Covenantal Ceremony in the Light of Related Texts,” *RevQ* 16 (1995): 487–506, here 495, where the close relationship between the curses in 4QBerakhot and the dualistic antagonism of the Melchizedek and Melchiresha Tradition in 4Q’Amram and 1QM XIII 4–6 is stressed.

then are damned to punishment in the eternal pit. Moreover, Belial is called by some different names: *הַרְשִׁיעַ* (5) in the sense of “the Wicked one,” “Angel of the Pit” (7), and “Spirit of Abaddon” (7).²⁰¹ A comparison of the curses shows that Belial and Melchiresha as names for the leader of the evil powers were interchangeable, although Belial was used most commonly.

The purely cosmic dualism documented in the curses of the community links the idea of opposed heavenly leaders (or at least a heavenly leader of the enemies of the community) with the strong use of the light-darkness terminology. Here, however, the notion of ethical or even psychological dualism is quite obvious. The curses of the community form an immediate continuation of the pre-Qumranian pattern of mere cosmic dualism documented in the Testament of Amram or, similarly, in the material of the *War Scroll*.

2. Demonology and Cosmic Dualism in the “Songs of the Maskil”

The sectarian adoption of pre-sectarian demonology as documented in 11QApPs^a can be seen in the exorcistic “Songs of the Maskil” (4Q510 and 511).²⁰² In this piece of magical poetry, there is a list of evil spirits which mentions the spirits of destroying angels, the spirits of the giants, and some other demons (4Q510 1 4–6). All the harmful forces which are known from the Book of the Watchers, from *Jubilees*, or from earlier magic incantations such as 11QApPs^a are thought to be frightened away by the praise of the Lord. Obviously the covenanters thought that they were united with the different classes of good angels (“his holy ones”) to the lot of God (cf. 4Q511 2 i 7f.). By magic praise, they thought they participated in the cosmic struggle of God’s lot against all forces of evil.²⁰³ Thus the Songs attest to the reception of traditional demonology within the sectarian framework of cosmic dualism.

3. Cosmic Dualism in Thematic Midrashim 11QMelch and 4QMidrEschat

(a) An interesting adoption of the terminology attested in 4QAmram appears in the Melchizedek text from Cave 11.²⁰⁴ This text seems to be the oldest

²⁰¹ The last two names depend on Milik’s reconstruction (“Milki-šedeq et Milki-reša’;” 131) but seem to be plausible in relation to the occurrence of the same terms in 1QH^a XI 17–20 (= III 16–19 ed. Sukenik).

²⁰² Cf. the edition by M. Baillet in *DJD* 7:215–261. See, further, B. Nitzan, “Hymns from Qumran – 4Q510–4Q511,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 53–63, and *Qumran Prayer and Religious Poetry*, 235–263, and A. Lange, “The Essene Position on Magic and Divination.”

²⁰³ It is stressed thereby, that the power of the evil spirits is confined to the present “age of the dominion of wickedness” (4Q510 1 6–7). However, a clear opposition of ages is not mentioned. Therefore we should not speak of an “eschatological dualism” in this text.

²⁰⁴ See the edition by A. S. van der Woude, “Melchisedek als himmlische Erlösergestalt in den neugefundenen eschatologischen Midraschim aus Qumran Höhle XI,”

preserved example of a genre of sectarian scriptural interpretation usually called “thematic pesharim” or “thematic midrashim.”²⁰⁵ Without discussing the various problems of the text, we have to note the presence of two angelic beings, Melchizedek and Belial. Belial and “the spirits of his lot” (11QMelch II 12) are characterized by rebellion against God’s precepts and molestation of the people of Melchizedek’s lot (cf. II 8, 12, 13). Melchizedek holds the functions which are ascribed to Michael in other texts. He leads the hosts of angels against the forces of Belial (II 13–14)²⁰⁶ and is therefore seen as an agent of God’s final Judgement (II 13). He proclaims God’s release (II 2–6, 15–16) and seems to have priestly functions as well, even though this is not mentioned in the preserved text but suggested by the biblical sources of the figure (Gen 14:18; Ps 110:4).²⁰⁷ Presumably the author knew the Testament of Amram where Michael and Melchizedek are identified and opposed to the figure of Belial, or Melchiresha.

The Melchizedek text from Cave 11 attests to a form of sectarian reception of the priestly tradition of cosmic dualism. As in 4QAmram and the *War Rule*, 11QMelch does not contain any elements of ethical dualism. But there is a peculiar difference we should note: the reigns of Belial and Michael-Melchizedek are not conceived as parallel and contemporary but, due to the specific interest in the chronological structure of history (possibly dependent upon Daniel²⁰⁸ and the *Book of Jubilees*), as succeeding dominions. In 11QMelch, Melchizedek is an eschatological figure. His proclamation of God’s release will take place in the first week (of years) of the tenth jubilee, and the final day of atonement will be at the end of that jubilee (II 7). If anywhere in the Qumran literature the term “eschatological dualism” might be appropriate, it is here. But the underlying structure is that of a pure cosmic dualism.

Oudtestamentische Studiën 14 (1965): 354–373, the important essay by J. T. Milik, “Milkî-sedeq et Milkî-reša’,” the monographical treatments by P. J. Kobelski, *Melchizedek and Melchiresha’*, 3–23 and 49–74 and F. L. Horton, *The Melchizedek Tradition* (SNTSMS 30; Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1976), and the new edition of the text with improved readings by É. Puech, “Notes.”

²⁰⁵ For the classification, see A. Steudel, *Der Midrasch zur Eschatologie aus der Qumrangemeinde (4QMidrEschat^{a,b}): Materielle Rekonstruktion, Textbestand, Gattung und traditionsgeschichtliche Einordnung des durch 4Q174 (“Florilegium”) und 4Q177 (“Catena A”) repräsentierten Werkes aus den Qumranfunden* (STDJ 13; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1994), 182. According to Steudel (196), the text is to be dated in the second half of the second century BCE, probably at about 110 BCE.

²⁰⁶ Michael is mentioned in 1QM XVII 5, Dan 10:13, 21; *1 Enoch* 20:5; *T. Dan* 6:2 and *T. Levi* 5:6. Cf. M. J. Davidson, *Angels*, 263.

²⁰⁷ Cf. P. J. Kobelski, *Melchizedek and Melchiresha’*, 64–65.

²⁰⁸ Cf. 11QMelch II 18 וְהַמְבַשֵּׁר הוּא אֱהִי מִשִּׁיחַ הַרְוִיחַ אֲשֶׁר אָמַר דְּנִי אֵל עָלָיו. According to A. Steudel, “אחרית הימים” in the texts from Qumran,” *RevQ* 16 (1994): 225–246, here 234, this is the “oldest proof for Daniel as a recognized scriptural authority.”

(b) This is confirmed by the fact that the same pattern of cosmic dualism occurs in another thematic midrash which has been called the “Midrash on Eschatology” by A. Steudel in her careful reconstruction of the text from the two manuscripts 4Q174 (4QFlorilegium) and 4Q177 (4QCatena A).²⁰⁹ In this text, probably originating in the early first century BCE, Belial appears responsible for the enmity against the “House of Judah” (4QMidrEschat II 14–15 [4Q174 4 3–4]; cf. CD IV 10–13). He has a “plan” (4QMidrEschat III 8 [4Q174 1–3 I 8]), in which the “sons of Belial” participate (4QMidrEschat III 7 [4Q174 1–3 I 7]), to make the “sons of light” stumble. This is the sectarian reception of the idea attested in 1QS III 24. The community itself is mentioned in traditional (the “just” 4QMidrEschat IV 4a [4Q174 1–3 II 4a]) and technical terms (“men of the union” 4QMidrEschat VIII 1 [4Q177 5–6 I], IX 9–10 [4Q177 11 9]); “council of the union” X 5 [4Q177 14 5], or even “human temple” [מִקְדָּשׁ אָדָם] III 6 [4Q174 1–3 I 6]) and also is labelled with dualistic terms such as “sons of light” (בְּנֵי (ה)אֵוֶר) 4QMidrEschat III 8–9 [4Q174 1–3 I 8–9]; IX 7 [4Q177 10–11 7]) or “lot of light” (גֹּרֶל אֵוֶר) 4QMidrEschat X 8 [4Q177 1–4 8]). The opponents of the community, notably a Jewish group (presumably the Pharisees), are labelled as “men of Belial” (4QMidrEschat IX 4 [4Q177 10–11 4]), “sons of Belial” (III 8 [4Q174 1–3 I 8]), or “spirits of Belial” (X 10 [4Q177 1–4 10]) and thus characterized as the means by which the plan and the power of Belial come into effect.²¹⁰

Thus the Midrash on Eschatology attests to a clear cosmic dualism. Humanity is divided into two lots, characterized by light or darkness, which are thought to be separated at the boundary of the community. Notably, the criteria of participation are not ethical, even if there are some ethical terms in the text. The opposing lot simply does not share the sectarian way of interpreting the Torah. Both lots are thought to belong to the realm of the respective angelic leaders, Belial and the “Angel of his [sc. God’s] truth” (מַלְאֲךְ אֱמֶתָה) in 4QMidrEschat XI 12, 14 (cf. 1QS III 24–5). The frequent mention of the term אַחֲרֵי־הַיָּמִים (denoting the last period of time before the time of salvation) shows that cosmic dualism is linked with a type of eschatological dualism. But in contrast to 11QMelch, the realms of darkness and light are understood as contemporary dominions. 4QMidrEschat, therefore, shows how the pre-sectarian pattern of cosmic dualism was adopted within the Qumran commu-

²⁰⁹ See A. Steudel, *Der Midrasch zur Eschatologie*; for the unity of the work, 129ff.; for its Essene origin, 163–4; for the definition of the genre and the classification as thematic midrash, 190–2; for the dating, 198–9. Steudel’s results have been accepted meanwhile by É. Puech, *La croyance*, 2:572ff., and by A. Lange and H. Lichtenberger, “Qumran,” *TRE* 28:48–50. In the references above I follow the reconstruction by Steudel and give parallels in terms of the standard numeration.

²¹⁰ Cf. A. Steudel, *Der Midrasch zur Eschatologie*, 163–69. Of course, the Gentiles are thought to belong to the realm of Belial as well, but their mention in 4QMidrEschat III 18–9 (4Q174 1–3 I 19) where Ps 2:1–2 is cited remains wholly unstressed (see p. 169).

nity. The only change it underwent seems to be that light and darkness were now thought to be divided at the boundary of the community.

D. Conclusions and Perspectives for Further Discussion

(1) In our argument we have put forward the case for a distinction of at least two different patterns of dualistic thought in the Qumran library. They differ in structure and terminology as well as in their respective origins. On the one hand, there is a sapiential tradition of ethically interested, but subsequently ontologized and cosmologized dualism. Its most developed example is the *Treatise on the Two Spirits* 1QS III 13–IV 26 where cosmic, ethical, and psychological levels of dualistic expression are woven together. On the other hand, there is a pattern of pure cosmic dualism, without ethical or even psychological aspects, which is characterized by the opposition of leading angelic powers and their respective hosts of spiritual and human beings as well as by a strong use of the light-darkness paradigm. The most prominent example of this pattern is the *War Rule*, but there is earlier attestation in a few other pre-sectarian texts which equally point to an origin in priestly circles. The Qumran sectarian reception of the two pre-sectarian patterns is quite different as well. Whereas the priestly pattern of cosmic dualism was fully adopted and in some texts extended by eschatological aspects, the sapiential tradition of ethical dualism underwent thorough cosmologization. The complex pattern of dualism in the 1QS III 13–IV 26 was fully received nowhere else in Qumran literature.

(2) Due to the fragmentary state of preservation of the majority of texts and the considerable lack of clearly dated sources for the third and early second century BCE, the reconstruction of historical developments and lines of thought is of course quite hypothetical.

Presumably, there are even more lines of tradition which were adopted by the community and gained influence through its worldview. Mention should be made only of the Enochic and the Danielic tradition which are both attested in Qumran by numerous documents and manuscripts. However, in the discussion of Qumran dualism, they might be left aside. The earlier Enochic tradition as documented in Qumran does not single out any peculiar angelic leader figure. Thus, even though the Enochic angelology (e.g., the *Book of the Watchers*) has influenced the development of angelology, demonology, and dualism in some of the aforementioned texts, the Enochic tradition itself cannot be labelled dualistic. The same holds true for the book of Daniel.

Of course, there is the question of the mutual interplay between the different lines of tradition, which cannot be conceived as wholly isolated. The *Book of Daniel*, e.g., attests to the linkage between sapiential narratives and Holy War traditions, and *Jubilees* attests to the reception of the sapiential

concept of predestined history within priestly thought. “People may be informed and influenced by more than one strand of tradition,”²¹¹ as John Collins aptly states, and this may hold true especially for the cramped situation in Judaea of the third and early second century. Thus one could even ask whether the idea of the two spirits in 1QS III 13–IV 26 and the name “Prince of Lights” (שֵׁר אֹרִיִּים) in 1QS III 20²¹² are influenced by earlier descriptions of Michael as presented in 4QAmram or similar texts.²¹³ However, the dualistic pattern is quite different in the two texts and should not be identified inappropriately.²¹⁴

(3) The issue of the origin of dualistic thought remains complicated. Of course, we cannot rule out the possibility of foreign religious influences. But caution is necessary because of the difficulties in isolating the earlier stages of Persian thought from later sources and in understanding the process of their adoption and transmission.²¹⁵ In view of the distinctions made above, the question is whether or not there are different degrees of influence on the respective patterns of dualism, or even on the different texts attesting the same pattern. In my view, e.g., it is more reasonable to assume a foreign influence on the idea of the eschatological battle found in the *War Rule* because its overall structure exactly corresponds to the record of Zoroastrian myths by Theopompus.²¹⁶ In contrast, most elements of the *Treatise on the Two Spirits* can be explained from later sapiential thought within the context of developing angelology, but without assuming an immediate foreign influence.²¹⁷ A decision, however, on these issues cannot be made in the given

²¹¹ J. J. Collins, “The Origin of Evil,” 37.

²¹² Cf. its reception in שֵׁר הָאֹרִיִּים (CD V 18) and also the term שֵׁר מְאֹרֵר in 1QM XIII 10.

²¹³ Cf. the assumption of É. Puech, *La croyance*, 2:532 n. 39. Puech, however, even seems to assume the identity of the dualistic teaching of 1QS III 13–IV 26 with 4QAmram. This is certainly erroneous and is perhaps due to Puech’s refusal to accept the predestinarian ideas (and consequently the sapiential character) of the *Treatise*.

²¹⁴ The differences are overlooked as well by M. J. Davidson, *Angels*, 266–267.

²¹⁵ Note the cautious remarks by scholars of Persian religion as J. Duchesne-Guillemin, *RAC* 4:336, and C. Colpe, “Die Lichtsymbolik im alten Iran und antiken Judentum,” *StGen* 18 (1965): 116–33.

²¹⁶ A. Hultgård, “Prêtres Juifs et mages Zoroastriens – influences religieuses à l’époque hellénistique,” *RHPR* 68 (1988): 415–28, sees the possibility of Zoroastrian influences especially in priestly writings such as Aramaic Levi, *Jubilees*, or the *Testament of Amram*.

²¹⁷ M. Hengel’s assumption of a Hellenistic, perhaps Alexandrian, source that might have transmitted Persian dualistic thought to Palestinian Judaism deserves serious consideration, cf. *Judentum und Hellenismus*, 418–420, and “Qumran und der Hellenismus,” *Qumran*, 333–372, in particular 358–360. Cf. also J. Barr, “The Question of Religious Influence,” 229, and J. Maier, “The Judaic System of the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *Judaism in Late Antiquity: Part Two: Historical Syntheses* (HdO I/17; ed. J. Neusner; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1995), 2.100.

context, but would require a broader analysis of the possible lines of transmission in Persian and Hellenistic times.

(4) Consideration of the ideology of the Qumran community may lead to interesting findings. Whereas former studies have stressed the unity, uniqueness, and predominantly ethical character of Qumran dualism,²¹⁸ it must now be stated that the various texts (and text genres) of sectarian origin show striking differences with respect to dualistic thought and expression.

(a) Many sectarian texts are not dualistic at all, e.g., the early *Community Rule* 1QSa, the fundamental halakic document 4QMMT,²¹⁹ the Hymns Scroll 1QH,²²⁰ especially in the individual hymns which have been ascribed to the ‘Teacher of Righteousness,’ and even many of the preserved Pesharim.²²¹ So at least for the earlier times of the community (as attested by 1QSa, 4QMMT, and the *Hodayot*), a co-existence of dualistic worldviews inherited by different precursor groups (as documented in 1QS III 13–IV 26 and other sapiential texts, or in the Aramaic testaments, 11QApPs^a, or *Jubilees*) and other non-dualistic utterances (as documented e.g., in 1QSa, 4QMMT) should be accepted.²²²

(b) Within the thought of the community, cosmic dualism seems to have been reinforced. This is shown by the understanding of 1QS III 13–IV 26 within the context of 1QS, or the transformation of ethical dualism to a cosmic one in the dualistic record of Israel’s history in the *Damascus Document*.²²³ The considerable importance of cosmic dualism in the Qumran community is documented by the liturgical curses of the community and by the sectarian adoption and reception of the *War Rule*, which is preserved in a notably large number of late manuscripts. The type of dualism which can be considered characteristic for the thought of the Qumran community was almost certainly a strong cosmic dualism with the notion of opposed heavenly powers (as documented in the curses and in the sectarian redaction of the *War Rule*, or in texts such as 4QMidrEschat), and was assuredly not the subtle

²¹⁸ Cf. K. G. Kuhn, “Sektenschrift,” 305.

²¹⁹ There is only one mention of Belial, in the term “counsel of Belial” (4Q398 14 ii 5 = 4QMMT C 29) which probably reflects the Torah exegesis practiced at the temple in Jerusalem which the Essene author(s) considered as wrong.

²²⁰ Cf. H. Lichtenberger, *Menschenbild*, 195; H. W. Huppenbauer, “Belial in den Qumrantexten,” *ThZ* 15 (1959): 81–89, here 83. The lack of dualism may be due to a certain degree to generic reasons (thus M. Hengel, *Judentum und Hellenismus*, 406 n. 674). But, against this, cf. the argument of H. Lichtenberger (*Menschenbild*, 195) that “there would have been sufficient opportunity to speak dualistically in both the Songs of the Teacher” as well as the “Community Songs.”

²²¹ Cf. A. Steudel, *Der Midrasch zur Eschatologie*, 200. Cf. only 4Q253 4 4 and 4QpPs^a (4Q171) II 11 with the term פְּדוּי בְּלִיעַל “traps of Belial.”

²²² Cf. Lichtenberger, *Menschenbild*, 196.

²²³ Cf. A. Lange and H. Lichtenberger, “Qumran,” in *TRE* 28:59.

web of different levels of dualistic thought as documented in 1QS III 13–IV 24.

(5) A further issue of interest might be the transmission of dualistic thought independently from the Essene movement. In scholarly discussion, dualism has been treated for the most part as a specific unique element of the Qumran covenanters' thought. This view changes, however, if it is true that the dualistic ideas documented in the scrolls do not originate in Essenism or in the sect's peculiar reception of foreign religious ideas, but in different Jewish precursor groups, as documented by a considerable number of pre-sectarian dualistic texts.

Unfortunately, we do not have knowledge of other comparable Jewish libraries of that time besides that of Qumran. But the assumption is quite reasonable that most of the pre-sectarian documents might have been read and transmitted not just in Qumran sectarian circles. One could assume that a type of demonology as documented in the apotropaic prayers of 11QPsAp^a would have been quite popular. Other pre-Essene texts such as the Enochic literature or *Jubilees* have survived in Greek or in other languages, thus documenting ways of transmission apart from Essenism. The *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* form a very important line of transmission of dualistic thought. They depend on the earlier Aramaic testamentary texts and attest to a more ethical dualism in presumably Hellenistic Jewish circles.²²⁴ In this tradition, apart from the Qumran community, we find two spirits of truth and deceit (*T. Jud* 20:1–2), a doctrine of Two Ways (*T. Asher* 1:3–5) and frequent references to Beliar (= Belial). In *T. Asher* 6:6, the Angel of Peace and the evil spirit occur in a context similar to that in 4QAmram.²²⁵ A very late trace of the textual tradition of the Aramaic Testament of Levi has been preserved even in medieval Greek manuscripts of the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*.²²⁶ From these observations, we may conclude that the ideas documented in the Aramaic testaments, including their pattern of dualism, were transmitted not only within Essenism, but also in other groups of contemporary Judaism.

(6) The observation that there are different patterns of dualistic thought in the Qumran texts has consequences for religio-historical comparisons with other Jewish or early Christian texts. Many of the comparisons of the NT text with Qumran literature have drawn on the outdated uniform picture of Qum-

²²⁴ Obviously, the Greek *T. Levi* depends on Aramaic Levi or a similar source. The term ἀντίγραφον, which is so characteristic for the beginning of each part of the *T. 12 Patr.*, occurs in its Aramaic equivalent פִּרְשָׁן in 4QAmram (4Q543 I 1).

²²⁵ Possibly, the ἄγγελος τῆς εἰρήνης depends on an expression like מְלֹאךְ שְׁלוֹם (4Q228 I I 8), which is probably a re-reading of מְלֹךְ שְׁלוֹם, one of the designations of Melchizedek in Gen 14:18. Cf. P. Kobelski, *Melchizedek and Melchireša'*, 79.

²²⁶ Cf. above note 164; R. H. Charles, *The Creek Versions of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1908), 245–256.

ran dualism. Further comparisons should try to detect more precisely which lines of tradition have been adopted in the respective texts. It is no longer possible to use a mixture of IQS and IQM as a starting point for comparison with NT texts. Moreover, if the Treatise on the Two Spirits in IQS III 13–IV 26 is not a representative, or even authoritative, account of Qumran sectarian ideology, it is no longer possible to take this text as the starting point for a comparison with, e.g., Johannine dualism, as J. H. Charlesworth did in his influential essay.²²⁷ If there are links between Qumran dualism and Early Christianity, they should be seen not so much in terms of ethical dualism, but rather in the elements of pure cosmic dualism. Thus, NT scholarship will also profit from a refined Qumranic database depending on an accurate distinction between the different patterns of dualistic thought within the library of Qumran.

²²⁷ J. H. Charlesworth, “Comparison.”

8. Apocalyptic Dualism: Its Formation and Early History*

A. Dualism as a Category of Scholarship

“Dualism” is a scholarly term used to characterize a number of philosophical and religious thought systems shaped by a fundamental physical or metaphysical duality, a teaching of two powers, principles, or states of being which cannot be explained as originating in or leading to an overall unity. The term has no equivalent in antiquity. It was first coined in 1700 by the English Orientalist Thomas Hyde with regard to the Zoroastrian doctrine of two primordial and co-eternal entities: the one good, causing light and life (Ahura Mazda), the other bad, causing darkness and death (Ahriman). Of course, such a strict dualism is not conceivable within the context of biblical monotheism and creation thought. Thus, in Jewish (and Christian) contexts, “dualistic” worldviews are at least modified by the biblical view of the one creator, so that evil (or Satan) is never thought to be co-eternal with the one God.

The term, however, has been further modified, in order to be applicable to various fundamental dichotomies. Since, in 1734, the German enlightenment philosopher Christian Wolff had transferred the term to the philosophical dichotomy of mind and matter, “dualism” has also become a technical term for some elements in philosophy, in particular the division of material and spiritual aspects in cosmology, anthropology, and epistemology. In the history-of-religions, the term was also applied to phenomena and doctrines beyond Zoroastrianism, especially to Gnosticism or Manichaeism, but also to biblical thought patterns (e.g., in the Johannine literature). Especially the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls has brought to knowledge various examples of a dualistic worldview within early Judaism, most prominently the Treatise on the Two Spirits (1QS III 13–IV 26) and the *War Scroll* (1QM), but the development of these patterns goes back to pre-Qumranic apocalyptic and sapiential thought. Other early Jewish traditions and authors (and also early Christian texts) also provide examples of different types of dualistic worldviews. Gen-

* This article, originally written for the *Oxford Handbook of Apocalyptic Literature* (ed. J. J. Collins), briefly adopts the findings presented in “Different Patterns of Dualistic Thought in the Qumran Library” (in this volume), but also modifies the reconstruction of the making of Qumran dualism in light of more recent research. I am grateful to John Collins (Yale) for suggestions and support.

erally, dualism is considered to be a characteristic feature of apocalyptic thought.

Different *taxonomies* of dualism have been suggested.¹ Scholars distinguished between *radical* or *moderate* dualisms, between *dialectic* dualisms (with an everlasting antagonism) and *eschatological* dualisms (with a final battle or decision), or between *cosmic* (with the world created by the good principle) and *anticosmic* dualisms (with the world being a creation of the demiurge or Satan). The terms, however, are not used consistently. In biblical studies other characterizations have been used, not all of them with a clearly defined or mutually exclusive meaning. Given the variation of terms, several dimensions can be discerned:²

- *metaphysical* dualism: God-Satan/Belial etc. (which is, in the biblical context never “absolute” but only relative: Even Satan is never on the same level or co-eternal with God)
- *cosmic* dualism: Michael – Belial (or also light – darkness) with the world (humans and also angels/spirits) divided into two opposing groups, camps or forces
- *spatial* dualism: above – below; heavenly world – earthly world (although the duality of “heaven and earth” is most often not dualistic but simply used for the whole of the creation)
- *eschatological* or *temporal* dualism: this world – the world to come
- *ethical* dualism: good – evil; the good – the wicked
- *soteriological* dualism: the saved and the rejected or lost (due to a salvific act or decision)
- *theological / creational* dualism: creator – creation; God – world
- *physical* dualism: matter – spirit
- *anthropological* dualism: body – soul/spirit
- *psychological* dualism: good inclination – evil inclination (with the contrast or struggle between good and evil within the human heart or mind)

B. The Hebrew Bible and its Contexts

“Apocalyptic dualism” was apparently developed in post-exilic times, in the Persian period.³ But the Persian sources are late (from the Sassanian period or

¹ Cf. U. Bianchi, *Il dualismo religioso: Saggio storico ed etnologico* (2nd ed.; Nuovi saggi 86; Rome: Ateneo), 1983.

² J. Frey, “Different Patterns of Dualistic Thought in the Qumran Library,” in *Legal Texts and Legal Issues* (ed. M. Bernstein, F. Garcia Martinez, and J. Kampen; STDJ 23; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 275–335, here 281–285 (in this volume, 243–299, here 249–252).

³ E. M. Meyers, “From Myth to Apocalyptic: Dualism in the Hebrew Bible,” in *Light Against Darkness. Dualism in Ancient Mediterranean Religion and the Contemporary*

later), and the chronological analysis and isolation of older materials is quite difficult, so it does not seem appropriate to invoke too easily Iranian “influence” or rather “Zoroastrianism” to explain novel features in post-exilic Judaism.⁴ Without precluding certain influences from the wider history-of-religions context, it is at least equally important to look for inner-Jewish explanations and developments.

Generally, the Hebrew Bible has little to offer with respect to dualistic views. This is particularly true for preexilic texts. Death or evil are never viewed as powers rivalling the God of Israel, and “heaven and earth” in Gen 1:1 are still a duality that expresses the whole of creation. Despite mythic underpinnings in the Hebrew Bible with JHWH fighting chaotic powers, the prophets defend the view that there is no power equal to the one God, who is the creator of light and darkness, good and evil, as Deutero-Isaiah explicitly (and polemically) states (Isa 45:7). Opposing figures like “Satan” are always subject to God (cf. Job 1–2), and the tendency to make Satan responsible for negative acts only occurs at the very margin of the canon, in 1 Chronicles 21 (compared with 1 Sam 24), and the idea of a fight between Michael and other angels is only attested in the apocalyptic book of Daniel (Dan 10:20–21; cf. 12:1).

The development of dualistic thought can be located in the postexilic (Persian) period, but the precise reason is still unclear: Is it simply a matter of external (Persian or Zoroastrian) influence, or is the rise of dualism due to internal Israelite or inner-Jewish developments? Whereas earlier research often suggested the former, more recent research considers dualism also as an inner-Jewish development which might be in some respect “triggered” by the general climate of thought. The reason for this change in research is not only the problem of the analysis of the Persian sources but also the difficulty of imagining how mainstream or other Zoroastrian views might have actually been adopted in late Hebrew Bible texts. It is true, however, that some elements of Persian teaching were known to western Greek authors (such as Theopompus in the 4th century BCE, quoted by Plutarch in *Is. Os.* 45–47), and since Judeans lived in the eastern Diaspora (Mesopotamia, Persia), where we can assume that some (esp. Aramaic) writings have their origins (e.g., *Astronomic Enoch*, Tobit, and also Aramaic Levi traditions), it is not inconceivable that the views current in that area also influenced Jewish tradition.

World (ed. A. Lange et al.; JAJSup 2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011), 92–106, here 94–95.

⁴ P. Oktor Skjaervø, “Zoroastrian Dualism,” in *Light Against Darkness. Dualism in Ancient Mediterranean Religion and the Contemporary World* (ed. A. Lange et al.; JAJSup 2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht), 55–91, here 76.

C. The Emergence of Dualistic Views in the Earliest Period of Jewish Apocalypticism

In the latest parts of the Hebrew Bible (esp. in the book of Daniel), and in contemporary (or even slightly earlier) texts such as the Book of Watchers or in the Aramaic Visions of Amram (preserved in the Qumran corpus), dualistic views emerge in various forms.

In the Book of the Watchers (*1 Enoch* 1–36), the earliest truly apocalyptic composition, the worldview is characterized by different aspects of dualism: First, there is a marked cosmic dualism, mostly in a vertical dimension. There is a fundamental division between the heavenly and the earthly world, and “disaster occurs when the realms are confounded.”⁵ The descent of the watchers from their realm to the human sphere and their mixing with human wives pollute the earth and produce destructive powers and demons. Thus, the first mythological explanation of the origins of “evil,” given in the myth of the watchers, is based on the fundamental separation of the heavenly realm from the earthly. “Heaven and earth” are no longer a synthetic unity (as in Gen 1:1), but a duality of two separated realms. Angels may work as mediators, they report human deeds in the divine realm and descend to execute judgment. On the other hand, Enoch is chosen to ascend to the heavenly throne room (*1 En.* 14). This provides a pattern for later visions of the heavenly throne or temple or for various types of ascent mysticism in the Hekhalot literature.⁶ The (limited) permeability between the two worlds rather stresses the fundamental separation and distance between the divine realm and the world of human beings. Now, heaven is described as a parallel universe, different and separate from the world of mortal humans with the struggle between good and evil. Apart from that predominant vertical dimension, there is also a “horizontal” dimension in the Book of the Watchers’ cosmological views: The cosmic journeys bring Enoch to places beyond the realm of human habitation, to the original paradise, or to the place where the souls of the righteous and the sinners are kept.

Another important aspect is the temporal and eschatological one: The present world, shaped by injustice, is put in contrast with a future judgment or cleansing. Injustice and demonic powers will come to an end, the sinners will be punished and the righteous will be rewarded (cf. *1 En.* 1:9–10). The idea of a coming judgment considered to bring a restitution of the divine order and

⁵ G. W. E. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch, Chapters 1–36; 81–108* (Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress. Nickelsburg 2001), 40.

⁶ Cf. P. S. Alexander, “The Dualism of Heaven and Earth in Early Jewish Literature and Its Implication,” in *Light Against Darkness. Dualism in Ancient Mediterranean Religion and the Contemporary World* (JAJSup 2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011), 331–53.

the eradication of all evil powers (cf. *1 En.* 16) and the hope for a future period of justice, radically different from the present experience of injustice (later phrased in terms such as “this world” – “the world to come”) is a common feature of all types of an apocalyptic worldview in later texts. The same is true for the view of an opposed eschatological destiny of the righteous and the sinners, which depends on their deeds, but is decided in the final judgment of God or his agent. Such an eschatological dualism is a common feature of most early Jewish (and also early Christian) apocalyptic traditions.

The earliest Enoch traditions show that in the beginnings of Jewish apocalypticism, the spatial and vertical aspects were predominant whereas only in the subsequent development, in the composition of historical apocalypses such as the Apocalypse of Weeks, the Animal Apocalypse, or parts of the Book of Daniel (Dan 2; 7; 8; 10–11), the focus is laid on the temporal dimension and on the hope for a new period of God’s kingdom or of a renewed world without evil powers, ultimately resulting in the dualism of “this world” and “the world to come” (cf. *4 Ezra* and rabbinic texts).

Texts of the later Enochic tradition increasingly consider demonic powers to be active in the world of humans. Such “evil spirits” are already mentioned in the Book of the Watchers, where they come from the dead bodies of the Giants, as their immortal spirits, carrying on their malicious work. Their lawlessness is explained from their origin in the perversion of the created order, and as their ultimate fate they face the great judgment (*1 En.* 15:11–16:1). In *Jubilees*, those “spirits” are assigned a chief or leader, called Mastema (*Jub.* 10:8), who is apparently identical with the figure elsewhere called Satan or Belial. Thus the traditions of the Watchers and of Satan (whose state was ambivalent in biblical texts) are merged. When Noah intercedes for his sons against the attacks of the demonic spirits and God commands the angels to bind all the demons, Mastema asks for some of them to remain and act under his power to lead astray the humans. On his petition, God changes his former decree and allows the tenth part of the demons to stay while nine parts are given over to condemnation (*Jub.* 10:8–9). Here, Mastema not only acts as the leader of the malicious demons but still as a figure in God’s realm, petitioning or even negotiating with God (cf. Job 1–2). He seems to have a function in the divine economy, and with the assistance of demonic powers he is then able to fulfil his role and punish or lead astray humans. The demons belong to his dominion, but it is clear that he himself is subject to the authority of God, who has assigned authority to him.⁷ It is clear that this view with a “Satanic” figure as the leader of the host of malicious demons is not a radical, but at best a modified type of dualism. The leader of

⁷ Cf. P. S. Alexander, “Demonology of the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Year* (ed. P. Flint and J. C. VanderKam; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 2:331–53, here 2:342–3.

the evil forces has a limited realm and a limited time of authority over his demonic forces and also over humans.

D. The Different Patterns of Dualism Represented in the Qumran Corpus

As already noted, the discussion on dualism and its roots was particularly triggered by the massive growth of the range of sources due to the discoveries from Qumran. Most importantly, the discovery of Aramaic manuscripts of the *Book of Enoch* in the Qumran library (and their early dating) has established the Enochic tradition as the main source of emerging apocalyptic thought. But one of the most fascinating discoveries made soon after the release of the scrolls from Cave 1 was a hitherto unknown Jewish type of dualistic thought, which differed widely from the ideas of the Hebrew Bible as well as from those of the Rabbis. These findings in the *War Scroll* (1QM) and in the *Community Rule* (1QS) caught the interest of scholars, especially from the perspective of New Testament scholarship. The discovery gave rise to a vivid debate on the background of the dualistic language in some New Testament texts, especially the Gospel of John, which had been explained by leading scholars from a Gnostic background, largely attested in late Mandaean and Manichaean texts. In view of these scholarly constructions and their exegetical consequences, the appearance of a novel Jewish type of dualism was a fascinating discovery. Already in 1950, scholars claimed to have discovered the “native soil” of the Johannine language and thought in a “non-orthodox” (or as they originally thought, Gnostic) type of Palestinian Judaism, which was at least historically closer to the Gospel tradition than the sources adduced for reconstructing a Gnostic foil.⁸ The Qumran discoveries thus opened up a fresh opportunity to discuss New Testament problems, and this scholarly framework influenced much of the early research on Qumran texts. The *Community Rule* (1QS) and especially the passage 1QS III 13–IV 26 and the *War Scroll* (1QM) were studied as first examples of a cosmic and ethical dualism comparable to New Testament texts, and – from a more recent perspective – they were read in a somewhat harmonizing manner as testimonies of “the” dualism of the Qumran community (or sect). But all the early ideas were developed on the basis of a few texts, mainly the scrolls from Cave 1

⁸ Cf. J. Frey, “Recent Perspectives on Johannine Dualism and Its Background,” in *Text, Thought, and Practice in Qumran and Early Christianity* (ed. R. Clements and D. R. Schwartz; STDJ 84; Leiden: Brill, 2008), 127–157 (in this volume, 763–790) and idem, “Qumran Research and Biblical Scholarship in Germany,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Scholarly Perspective. A History of Research* (ed. D. Dimant; Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2011), 529–564 (in this volume, 85–119).

which had been published quickly, whereas the bulk of fragments from Cave 4 was inaccessible to most scholars until the 1990s.

With the release of the majority of the 4Q fragments, scholars increasingly became aware that the Qumran corpus includes not only a collection of sectarian works but a wide range of texts from the literary production of Palestinian Judaism in the two or three centuries BCE, the majority of which was composed not by the sectarians themselves, but originated in other groups preceding the *yahad*, and was simply collected, read, copied, and transmitted. Thus, not all the texts actually represent the viewpoint of the sectarians. It is, rather, necessary to distinguish between texts adopted from other groups and texts that represent the particular views of the community, on the basis of criteria which are still open to discussion. Also the dualistic views in the Qumran corpus are by no means consistent. In recent years, scholars have distinguished different patterns of dualistic thought in the Qumran library⁹ and pointed to three traditions which might ultimately explain the development of the particular dualistic worldview of the Qumran sectarians:¹⁰ first an early type of dualism in Aramaic priestly texts, then a previously unknown tradition of dualistic wisdom thought, and third a pattern of an eschatological war dualism developed in the *War Scroll* material. The distinctively dualistic views of the Qumran sectarians were inspired by these three traditions. They can be found in some of the texts composed within the community and especially in the liturgies (such as 1QS I 16–III 13) and the blessings and curses of the community. Although the dualism to be discussed is never an absolute one, but at best a moderate one, with the one God as the creator and redeemer, it is not useful to avoid or dismiss the use of the term;¹¹ rather, it should be described with sufficient differentiation. And although the Qumran sectarians most probably did not produce apocalypses themselves, their worldview is thoroughly shaped by apocalyptic ideas,¹² including the activity of opposing powers and the hope for a final defeat of all evil forces. Thus, the dualistic thought patterns as preserved in the Qumran library and also the distinctively

⁹ Cf. J. Frey, “Different Patterns of Dualistic Thought in the Qumran Library.”

¹⁰ Cf. S. Hultgren, *From the Damascus Document to Covenant of the Community: Literary, Historical, and Theological Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (STDJ 66; Leiden: Brill, 2007).

¹¹ As Heger suggests in Paul Heger, “Another Look at Dualism in Qumran Writings,” in *Dualism in Qumran* (ed. G. G. Xeravits; LSTS 76; London and New York: T&T Clark, 2010), 39–101.

¹² Cf. J. J. Collins, *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (London: Routledge, 1997); J. Frey, “Die Bedeutung der Qumran-Funde für das Verständnis der Apokalyphtik im Frühjudentum und im Urchristentum,” in *Apokalyphtik und Qumran* (ed. J. Frey and M. Becker; Einblicke 10. Paderborn: Bonifatius-Verlag, 2007), 11–62 (English translation, “The Qumran Discoveries and the Understanding of Apocalypticism,” in this volume, 195–241).

Qumran sectarian type of dualism can be labelled “apocalyptic” and considered to be a part of the development of apocalyptic dualism.

I. An Early Type of Cosmic Dualism in Aramaic (Pre-Sectarian) Priestly Texts

An early form of dualism, with a straight opposition of angelic powers, appears in an Aramaic text preserved in six or seven fragmentary manuscripts (4Q543–548, 549?) in the Qumran library, the so-called Visions of Amram.¹³ The visionary description, attributed to Amram, the father of Moses and Aaron, belongs to a group of Aramaic texts which includes another fragmentary text, attributed to Amram’s father Qahat (the *Testament of Qahat* 4Q542), and various documents linked with Qahat’s father Levi (1Q21, 4Q213–214, 540–541). The Aramaic language and palaeography point to a relatively early date, clearly before the time of the Qumran community, in the early 2nd or even in the 3rd century BCE. The selection of the biblical figures of the line between Levi and Aaron/Moses and other thematic features (purity, sacrifice) show the interest in priesthood and priests, who are to be instructed by the testamentary heritage of their ideal forefathers. According to Hultgren¹⁴ these priestly circles draw on early Enochic literature, which first developed a similar demonology¹⁵ and the view of an opposite fate of the righteous and the wicked (*1 En.* 1:8–9). The Visions of Amram are also the earliest text in which the pattern of the “literary testament” (adopted later schematically in the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*) is developed.¹⁶

In a passage preserved in 4QAmram^b (= 4Q544), Amram retells a vision of two angelic beings quarrelling over him. They ask him by which of the two he chooses to be ruled. He is then told that the two claim rule over the world and every human being, the one over all darkness and the people belonging to darkness, the other over the reign of light and all “sons of light.” The first angel has a dreadful face, is wearing colored clothes and obscured by darkness, whereas the other has a bright appearance and a smiling face. From the three names of both figures only one is preserved: The dark angel is called Malkireša (4Q544 2 3), which leads to the assumption that the other might be called Malkizedeq (cf. 11QMelch). Both names have been linked with others,

¹³ Cf. Hultgren, *From the Damascus Document to Covenant of the Community*, 320–9; Frey, “Different Patterns of Dualistic Thought in the Qumran Community,” 316–322 (in this volume, 281–286).

¹⁴ Hultgren, *From the Damascus Document to Covenant of the Community*, 323–5.

¹⁵ Cf. Mastema in *Jubilees*.

¹⁶ J. Frey, “On the Origins of the Genre of the ‘Literary Testament’: Farewell Discourses in the Qumran Library and their Relevance for the History of the Genre,” in *Qumranica Aramaica. The Aramaic Texts from Qumran* (ed. K. Berthelot and D. Stoekl Ben Ezra; Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2010), 345–375 (in this volume, 325–348).

such as Michael, Prince of Light, or Belial, Prince of Darkness,¹⁷ but this is only guesswork. In any case this is a very early, probably the earliest example of a cosmic dualism of opposed angelic powers dominating the world and struggling for possession over human beings. Other fragments of the text show the division of humanity into the two spheres of light and darkness, so that humans can be called “sons of light” and “sons of darkness” and also “sons of the lie” and “sons of truth” (4QAmram^f = 4Q547 1 ii 8), and their respective fate is either going to the light or going to the shades, to death (4Q547 1 ii 12–14). In the fragments of the *Testament of Qahat* we can find the opposition between the “Sons of Truth” and the “Sons of Wickedness” facing eschatological destruction (4Q542 1 ii 8). Another fragment contains also the opposition of light and darkness, but the context cannot be reconstructed any further.

It is unclear in these texts, for what reason humans belong to the one group or to the other. Remarkably, there is almost no mention of particular ethical criteria or precepts. Is the fate of humans somehow predestined, or is the choice simply left to the human being as expressed in Amram’s vision? And how is the two angels’ rule over humans imagined? There are other traditions, more obviously inspired by the heavenly courtroom motif (cf. Zech 3:1), in which two angels (or “Michael and the Devil”) contest about the corpse of Moses, i.e., his eternal belonging (thus Jude 9, and its source, probably the lost ending of the *Testament of Moses*). But in our case, the dominion apparently affects the life of Amram, and if his vision is communicated in his literary testament to his followers, they are implicitly exhorted to choose correctly and to follow the bright, not the sinister angel. Thus the text functions as an implicit exhortation to follow the bright angel, not the dark one, whatever that may mean ethically or with respect to the priestly service. The dualism developed here, possibly still in the 3rd century BCE, is a strict cosmic dualism with the opposition of angelic powers and the division of humanity into two opposed groups, dominated by the respective leaders and facing opposite eschatological fates. There is no ethical dualism here, nor any kind of anthropological or psychological divide (as we find it in the *Treatise on the Two Spirits*), nor is there any notion of an eschatological war (as we find it in the *War Scroll*). The name Malkireša also occurs in Qumran sectarian texts where the figure is probably identified with Belial. It is, furthermore, interesting that the term “sons of light” which occurs later as the predominant self-designation of the members of the Qumran community and is also used in early Christian texts (1 Thess 5:5; Luke 16:8; John 12:32), is not a Qumran sectarian invention, but apparently originates in an earlier priestly milieu where this type of cosmic dualism was developed.

¹⁷ J. T. Milik, “4Q visions de ‘Amram et une citation d’Origene,” *RB* 79 (1972): 77–97, here 79.

II. The Multi-Level Dualism in the Treatise on the Two Spirits as a Development of a Particular Line of Palestinian Jewish Sapiential Thought

A very subtle type of dualism is presented in the so-called Treatise on the Two Spirits from the Qumran *Community Rule* (1QS III 13–IV 26). This is probably the most debated passage from the Qumran scrolls, especially due to the fact that it was often considered the “basic ideology” of the Qumran sectarians and the fundamental paradigm of Qumran dualism. More recent research has pointed not only to the inconsistencies and differences between the dualism in this text, in the *War Scroll*, and other Qumran texts, but also to the particular character of 1QS in light of the 4QS parallels¹⁸ and in comparison with other rules such as 1QS^a, CD, etc. 1QS was not the single and definitive rule of the sectarians but only one of several forms in which rule material was developed¹⁹ and combined with other materials. The manuscript 1QS is, instead, a compilation of different texts of various genres which are not equally preserved in the parallel copies (4QS^{a-j} and 5Q11). 1QS begins with a liturgy for the renewal of the covenant (1QS I 1–III 12) with a particular dualistic structure, and the Treatise on the Two Spirits (III 13–IV 26) appears as an appendix to that liturgy. Only thereafter, the *Community Rule* proper follows, introduced by a new heading (V 1). It includes a severe penal code (VI 23–VII 25) and is closed by instructions for the wise teacher (IX 11–26). The final part is a list of the appointed times for God’s praise, concluded by a “psalm” (IX 26–XI 22). Originally the two now separate manuscripts 1QSa (a different rule for the congregation considered to be “in the end time”) and 1Q Sb (a collection of blessings) were part of the same scroll. The parallel manuscripts from 4QS differ in many ways from 1QS: None of them contains parallels to 1QSa and 1Q Sb. One of them (4QS^e) closes with a calendrical text instead of the final psalm, two others (4QS^{d,e}) only begin with the rule material (paralleled in 1QS V 1ff.) and lack the community liturgy and the Treatise on the Two Spirits. The latter is actually paralleled in only one further copy (4QS^e).

The Treatise is, thus, an originally independent text, adopted in some (at least two) of the rule manuscripts as an appendix to the introductory communal liturgy (1QS I 1–III 13), but omitted in others. Its distinctive dualism differs from the dualism of the preceding liturgy, encompassing three levels, a basically *cosmic* dualism, a strong *ethical* dimension, and a distinctive *psychological* dimension of a struggle of opposed strivings within the heart of any human being. Especially this idea of an inner struggle is not adopted in

¹⁸ S. Metso, *The Textual Development of the Qumran Community Rule* (Leiden: Brill, 1997).

¹⁹ Cf. A. Schofield, *Pram Qumran to the Yahad: A New Paradigm of Textual Development for The Community Rule* (STDJ 77; Leiden: Brill, 2009).

any of the other community texts. For several reasons,²⁰ the Treatise should be considered an independent composition of rather pre-sectarian origin (i.e., composed before the foundation of the *yahad*). It represents a particular development in Palestinian Jewish sapiential thought of the 2nd century BCE, which can now be partially reconstructed in view of the sapiential texts from the Qumran library. It is certainly not the summary of the community's worldview, and its dualism differs from the more straightforward ideas developed within the *yahad*.

Earlier scholarship had proposed comprehensive hypotheses about the literary development of IQS from a basic kernel or in different literary layers, and also the Treatise on the Two Spirits was thought to be a product of several literary stages.²¹ It seems, however, more appropriate to read the passage separately as a compositional unity, inserted into IQS without (or with only minimal) editorial changes.²² The structure is already indicated in the lengthy heading (III 13–15a) and made visible by structuring textual elements.²³ In IQS the text is addressed to the “instructor” who has to teach the “sons of light,” but this may be a sectarian adaptation. According to the heading, the text provides insight “into the history of all the sons of man, concerning all the ranks of their spirits, in accordance with their signs (cf. III 18–IV 1), concerning their deeds in their generations (cf. IV 2–14 and IV 15–18) and the visitation of their punishment and the periods of their salvation (cf. IV 18–23).” Accordingly, the heading is followed by an introductory hymn on the creator God (III 15b–18). A first passage, then, introduces and explains the two spirits (III 18–IV 1), a second one the corresponding virtues and vices (IV 2–14), and a third one the human acts according to the two spirits and the present and future “visitations” (IV 15–18, 18–23), the eschatological purification, and the end of evil. Finally, IV 23–26 resumes the main topics.

The worldview is based on the creation: “All that exists and will exist,” i.e., being as a whole, including history, is attributed to God the creator, by whom the order of the world, its history, and the eschatological “visitation” are predetermined (III 18). The teaching is probably to be interpreted as a kind of theodicy, an attempt to explain the experience of affliction and hostility (IV 6–8) and the fact that even the pious can go astray and sin (III 21–22), and to ensure the final perfection of the covenant, the purification of the

²⁰ Cf. A. Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination: Weisheitliche Urordnung und Prädestination in den Textfunden von Qumran* (STDJ 18. Leiden: Brill, 1995), 127–8.

²¹ P. von der Osten-Sacken, *Gott und Belial. Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zum Dualismus in den Texten aus Qumran* (SUNT 6. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1969).

²² C. Hempel, “The Treatise on the Two Spirits and the Literary History of the Rule of the Community” in *Dualism in Qumran* (ed. G. G. Xeravits; LSTS 76. London and New York: T&T Clark, 2010), 102–20.

²³ Cf. Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination*, 140–3.

elect, and the removal of all evil. The teaching also explains the reality of the struggle in the world and also within human hearts. Good and evil are explained as parts of the divine creation and plan, but their rule and struggle are limited, and their end is already determined. Contrary to some earlier assumptions, the text is not simply about the human mindset and human attitudes, but these are presented in a cosmological and eschatological framework. The “two spirits” are considered angelic beings effectively governing and afflicting human life. Dualistic oppositions occur on the cosmic, ethical, and anthropological or psychological level:²⁴

* The *cosmic dualism* is made up by the opposition of two spiritual beings, the “Spirit of Truth” and the “Spirit of Wickedness,” additionally called “Prince of Light” and “Angel of Darkness” (III 20–1, 24), and their respective “divisions,” consisting of humans and angels/demons (although the latter is only said for the lot of darkness). The names show the combination of cosmic metaphors (light/darkness) with ethical terms (truth/lie), and show that the “spirits” introduced here are considered angelic beings (although *ruah* is used with a broader range of meanings in the later parts of the text). Clearly, they are not independent or even divine figures but subject to God, who has created and appointed them (III 17, 25) and also determined the end of their dominion (IV 25). The struggle between them and “their divisions” (IV 17) will last until the end. Then, with certainty, evil will be eradicated forever (IV 19). But at present, the world is under their rule, and the evil spirit causes affliction and the experience of evil. All humans have a certain share in the respective “lot” (IV 24), and their deeds are inspired by the two spirits.

* An *ethical dualism* is embedded in the cosmic structure: Humans practice virtues and vices according to their share in the respective lot. They are characterized by use of ethical terms such as truth, justice, or wickedness. According to their belonging, humans follow opposite strivings and face an opposite eschatological fate. Their share is predestined in the order of creation (cf. IV 26) and their character is visible in their respective deeds and will become manifest at the end when God will judge the wicked and purify the elect. Until then, however, even the elect are not totally pure, nor completely under the influence of the good spirit. Thus, both spirits are seen as still struggling not only in the world, as experienced in the enmity faced by the good ones, but even in the heart of every human being, in the temptation also experienced by all those who are called “sons of light.”

²⁴ Cf. Frey, “Different Patterns of Dualistic Thought in the Qumran Library,” 290–5 (in this volume, 256–262); Hultgren, *From the Damascus Document to Covenant of the Community*, 341–62; J. Leonhardt-Balzer, “Dualism,” in *The Eerdmans Dictionary of Early Judaism* (ed. J. J. Collins and D. Harlow; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), 553–6.

* This is the third level, an *anthropological or psychological* dualism, expressed in the final part of the Treatise: The opposition between good and evil is even present within the human heart. Here we can possibly see the problem the instruction is intended to answer. Even the “sons of light” doubt, commit sins, and are afflicted by the spirit of wickedness (III 24), and thus there is an internal ambiguity even in those who belong to the lot of light. This very perceptible element of the concept is not repeated in any other of the Qumran texts, whereas other aspects of the Treatise, such as the predestination motif, are adopted frequently. Only one other probably non-sectarian text, 4Q186, a zodiacal physiognomy,²⁵ mentions a partial share in light and darkness. But while that text deals with the human character as visible by outward features and determined by the time of birth, the Treatise simply presupposes such a “mixture” and considers each one’s share to be predestined by the creator. Most important is that the psychological dualism is linked with the hope for eschatological purification of the elect (IV 20). In the final visitation they will become unambiguously perfect members of the covenant to which they are chosen.

The dualism in the Treatise is a *creation-founded and eschatologically confined cosmic dualism with a subordinate ethical dualism* that has an effect on not only the respective deeds but even *an internal struggle* within every single human being. In contrast with the twins in Zoroastrian thought, it is quite clear that the two spirits are not eternal. They are created, and their struggle will find an end at the final visitation and purification. Pragmatically, the idea of the two spirits helps to explain the occurrence of evil, sin, and apostasy, even among the wise and pious. It aims at an understanding of their struggle in the world, and the instruction as a whole can be considered an attempt not only to explain this situation but also to assure its addressees that the rule of the evil powers is limited. As such, it emphatically underlines God’s unity and creational sovereignty. Rather than explaining evil from the rebellion of some angels, from Adam’s disobedience, or even from the power of an envious second being apart from God, the Treatise understands it as part of the mysterious plan of the creator himself, rooted in his predestined order of being and history. The “sons of light” are to be taught about this order and the dual structure of the creation so that they will remain steadfast on the way of wisdom (IQS IV 24) until the final completion.

It was not until the release of the previously unknown sapiential texts from Qumran Cave 4 (*Instruction, Mysteries*) that the particular background of the Treatise on the Two Spirits could be determined. These texts attest to a tradition of wisdom thought in Palestinian Judaism (different from Sirach and the

²⁵ Cf. M. Popovic, “Light and Darkness in the Treatise on the Two Spirits (IQS III 13–IV 26) and in 4Q168,” in *Dualism in Qumran* (ed. G. G. Xeravits; LSTS 76. London and New York: T&T Clark, 2010), 148–65.

canonical wisdom texts) in which sapiential themes are linked with an apocalyptic view of the world and with developing dualism.

Canonical sapiential literature (e.g., Proverbs) is characterized by the ethical opposition of the righteous and the wicked, or the wise and the foolish, but this does not yet constitute a dualistic opposition. The wisdom of Ben Sira, then, interprets ethical dualities as an indication that creation is structured in pairs (Sir 33:14; 42:24). So the opposition between good and evil, life and death is also part of the order of creation (33:14). God has created humans and organized their ways differently (33:10). For Ben Sira, however, human deeds and destiny are not predestined but left to free will (15:11–20). His teaching intends to maintain the idea of perfection of the creation and the Torah in spite of the existence of wickedness in the world.²⁶

The sapiential idea of the order of creation is, then, further developed in some other sapiential texts (roughly contemporary with Ben Sira) and also in 1QS III 13–IV 26. In the most important “new” wisdom text from the Qumran library, *Instruction*,²⁷ preserved in six or seven manuscripts (1Q26, 4Q415–418, 418a?, 423), and in another related text, *Mysteries* (1Q27; 4Q299–301), classical wisdom themes (on poverty, marriage, etc.) are mixed with cosmological and eschatological (or even apocalyptic) motifs such as final judgment, the elimination of evil, and the salvation of the righteous. In this context, there is mention of a deeper (and even primordial) division of humankind, not only into good and wicked people, but also into a “fleshly spirit” and the “spiritual people” (4Q417 1 I 13–18). Although many details of that passage are still discussed,²⁸ it is obvious that wisdom is not accessible to everyone, but limited to a certain group of people, and that the fact that only the knowledgeable have access to that hidden wisdom is explained from a primordial act in which insight was revealed to the “spiritual people,” not to the “fleshly spirit.” The technical term used for that kind of wisdom is *raz nihyeh*, the “mystery of being” or “mystery of becoming.”²⁹ The term points to a pre-existent order of the world, including creation, history, and final

²⁶ Cf. Hultgren, *From the Damascus Document to Covenant of the Community*, 335.

²⁷ Cf. M. Goff, *The Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom of 4QInstruction* (STDJ 50; Leiden: Brill, 2003); J.-S. Rey, *4QInstruction: Sagesse et eschatology* (STDJ 81; Leiden: Brill, 2009).

²⁸ Cf. Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination*, 45–92; differently Goff, *The Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom of 4QInstruction*; E. Tigchelaar, “‘Spiritual People,’ ‘Fleshly Spirit,’ and ‘Vision of Meditation’: Reflections on 4QInstruction and 1 Corinthians,” in *Echoes From the Caves: Qumran and the New Testament* (ed. F. García Martínez; Leiden: Brill, 2009): 103–118.

²⁹ D. J. Harrington, “Wisdom at Qumran,” in *The Community of the Renewed Covenant* (ed. E. Ulrich and J. C. VanderKam; Notre Dame University Press, 1994), 137–152, here 150; cf. Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination*, 60; Hultgren, *From the Damascus Document to Covenant of the Community*, 334

destiny, which is considered to be engraved on heavenly tablets (4Q417 1 I 15–18; cf. also *Jub.* 1). It may include the Torah (though it is not identical with it), but also a rational structure of the world. The knowledgeable have to study that “mystery” in order to get insight about good and evil and act accordingly, whereas that knowledge is hidden from the opposed group of people, the “fleshly spirit” (*ruah basar*) who will not understand and will finally face destruction.³⁰ Here, humanity is divided into two parts concerning ethical strife and final destiny. And in contrast with Ben Sira, wisdom about the order of creation is not accessible to everyone, but a matter of divine revelation, so that only a minority will understand. According to the *Book of Mysteries* (1Q27 1 i 3–4) the “mystery of becoming” will be realized in the end time, by the revelation of wisdom and justice and the extinction of the wicked. It is obvious that the ethical dualism inherited from the earlier wisdom tradition has been transferred into a cosmic dualism, in which the opposed sides are characterized not only by ethical terms but also by metaphors of light and darkness (1Q27 1 i 6f.), and which is linked with the idea of a final judgment, in which justice is revealed and evil finally defeated. Although the preserved fragments neither mention a struggle of cosmic or demonic powers nor refer to the “two spirits,” they do prefigure the line of thought which is, then, further developed in the Treatise on the Two Spirits. There are numerous common features between those three texts,³¹ not least the fact that 1QS III 15 uses the rare term *el hade ‘ot* “God of insights”) which is also used in 4Q417 1 i 8.

Thus, in contrast to earlier views in which the dualism of the Treatise on the Two Spirits was simply considered a “tamed” version of the Zoroastrian pattern of the two primordial twins, the general pattern of dualism is better explained as a further stage of development of the ethically oriented sapiential dualism in the context of the developed angelology of the early 2nd century BCE. Although an influence of Persian thought cannot be precluded generally, an inner-Jewish explanation, if possible, is methodologically to be preferred. So we can now see that, departing from a sapiential type of ethical dualism and the sapiential idea of a predestined order of being and history, a more cosmological type of dualism was developed, including aspects of creation and of eschatological judgment or completion. In the Treatise, this view is uniquely developed into a multi-level dualism, including an inner-human, psychological dimension, and the hope for a final purification of the elect.

³⁰ Cf. J. Frey, “Flesh and Spirit in the Palestinian Jewish Sapiential Tradition and in the Qumran Texts. An Inquiry into the Background of Pauline Usage,” in *The Wisdom Texts from Qumran and the Development of Sapiential Thought* (ed. C. Hempel, A. Lange, and H. Lichtenberger; BETL 159; Leuven: Peeters, 2002), 367–404 (in this volume, 701–741).

³¹ A. Lange, “Die Weisheitstexte aus Qumran: Eine Einleitung,” in *The Wisdom Texts from Qumran and the Development of Sapiential Thought* (ed. C. Hempel, A. Lange, and H. Lichtenberger; BETL 159; Leuven: Peeters, 2002), 3–30, here 25–6.

III. The Cosmic and Eschatological War Dualism of the War Scroll (1QM)

The dualism as expressed in the *War Scroll* from Qumran Cave 1 (1QM) and its parallel manuscripts from Cave 4 obviously differs from the multi-level dualism in the Treatise on the Two Spirits, but also from the cosmic type of dualism in the Aramaic priestly texts. There is no idea of an internal ambiguity, nor is there any focus on the ethical dimension. The *War Scroll* rather represents a sheer cosmic dualism with the idea that different camps of angels and humans (characterized by the metaphors of light and darkness) fight until the end, when God will bring his lot to its final victory.

The composition and literary history of the *War Rule* material cannot be discussed here.³² There are numerous inconsistencies in 1QM; but the hypotheses proposed with respect to the 1QM version had to be strongly modified in view of the 4QM parallels. The manuscripts 4QM^{a-g} (= 4Q491–496 and 471b), though fragmentary, seem to confirm the view of two stages of the development, an earlier one preserved in 4QM^a (4Q491), 4QM^c (4Q493), and 4QM^g (4Q471b), the younger one (or a combination of the two) in 1QM. Since 1QM was produced in early Herodian times, this is the *terminus ad quem* for the later stage, but the original composition may go back to the early Hasmonean period. The younger version might be a sectarian appropriation and reworking of an earlier text originally composed in non-sectarian, priestly circles, but it seems impossible to attribute all expressions of dualism only to the late, probably sectarian version.

The *War Rule* not only describes an eschatological war between the forces of light and the forces of darkness, but rather gives liturgical regulations concerning the preparation and execution of the war, including prayers, blessings, and speeches, with a detailed description of the sequence of the war. Although reflecting some military techniques of the Maccabean period, and thus probably originating in views about the war between Israel and the nations, the views as developed in the *War Rule* are quite removed from any real war and transferred to an ideal, eschatological and cosmic dimension.

The *dualism in the War Scroll* is a purely *cosmic* one. The opposed pairs are mainly the “sons of light” and the “sons of darkness” (1QM I 1), on a second level Michael and Belial and their respective angels, or comprehensively “God’s lot” and “Belial’s lot.” The prominent opposition is between the two angelic leaders, Michael (or the “Prince of Light”: XIII 10) and Belial (XVII 6). Apparently, there is an equilibrium of forces: Both lots win three times each (I 13–14) until in the seventh “lot” Belial and his lot are defeated and destroyed by the hand of God (I 14–15). Thus, the eschatological war

³² Cf. J. Duhaime, *The War Texts: 1QM and Related Manuscripts* (London: T&T Clark, 2004) and B. Schultz, “Compositional Layers in the War Scroll (1QM),” in *Qumran Cave 1 Revisited: Texts from Cave 1 Sixty Years after Their Discovery* (ed. D. K. Falk et al.; STDJ 91; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 153–65.

has an ideal Sabbath structure (cf. the chronology of some works such as *Jubilees* or the *Apocalypse of Weeks*). God, as the creator of everything (X 8–13), including Belial (XIII 10–12), remains in the background and only strengthens his lot (I 14) or helps Michael to gain the final victory (XVII 6). So God is never a direct adversary of Belial. *War Scroll* dualism is not a metaphysical dualism, but a distinctly cosmic dualism, with a strong focus on eschatology.

In spite of a number of common elements, the eschatological war dualism notably differs from the sapiential type of dualism as represented in the *Treatise on the Two Spirits*. The leader of the evil forces is here named Belial, as in the Qumran sectarian texts (cf. 1QS I 16–III 12), whereas Belial is not mentioned in any of the sapiential texts discussed, nor in the *Treatise on the Two Spirits*. Moreover, the ethical aspect and the anthropological focus are totally missing here. Apart from a single passage (1QM XIII 9–12), there is no further interest in justice or sin, virtues and vices; the only focus is on ritual purity, depending on the holy war tradition. Especially the idea of conflicting tendencies within the human heart is alien to the *War Rule*. Consequently, the eschatological extinction of evil is viewed only as the complete extermination of the lot of Belial without any remnant, not as an act of purification in the community of the “sons of light” or even within the heart of its members (as in 1QS IV 18–23). Thus, in spite of the common idea of a struggle of two opposed lots (with angelic leaders) in both texts, it would be a crude simplification to harmonize both concepts to a single type of “Qumran dualism” (as was common in the earlier periods of Qumran research).

The main ideas of the *War Scroll* are not sapiential, but rather dependent on biblical holy war traditions (especially with the interest in ritual purity), and on motifs of the book of Daniel,³³ where human hosts are also represented by heavenly leaders (Dan 10:20–1) and Michael functions as the heavenly warrior for Israel and the leader in the eschatological war (Dan 11:40–12:1). In Daniel we can also find the notion of the “violators of the covenant” (1QM I 2; cf. Dan 11:32). But there are also clear differences, and the *War Scroll* goes far beyond the Danielic concepts: Belial is not the prince of a foreign nation, but the “prince of the dominion of wickedness” (1QM XVII 6), and Michael is not simply an angel fighting for Israel but the Prince of Light (XIII 10). Most striking is the temporal structure of the battle: Each one wins three lots (= units of time), before the hand of God decides the battle in the seventh lot (I 13–15). This pattern not only represents a “sabbatical eschatology,” it is also in a striking correspondence with Plutarch’s account (cited from Theopompus, 4th century BCE) of the Zoroastrian idea of the struggle between the two gods Horomazes (Ahura Mazda) and Areimanios (Ahriman),

³³ Cf. J. J. Collins, “The Mythology of Holy War in Daniel and the Qumran War Scroll,” *VT* 25 (1975): 596–612.

in which one prevails for three thousand years and then for another three thousand years the other prevails, until Hades shall disappear, the people shall be in perfect happiness, and the creator God shall have rest for a time (*Is. Os.* 45–47). This is such a striking parallel that we can hardly avoid the explanation that the Persian mythology of time was adopted here,³⁴ since it could appear to Jews as a perfect confirmation of their own view of a hebdomadic structure of the creation. The difficulty of extracting the early Zoroastrian views from the later Pahlavi sources is removed here by Plutarch's account that shows how Persian ideas could have been perceived in the west.

IV. The Pattern of Cosmic Dualism in the Qumran Sectarian Texts

From the three patterns mentioned, we have to distinguish the dualism proper to the Qumran sectarians. Although texts such as 1QS III 13–IV 26 and the *War Scroll* (and even some of the Aramaic priestly texts) were read in the community, or at least by some of their members, their respective patterns of dualism do not represent the actual dualistic thought pattern of the community as we can find it in some of the Qumran sectarian documents, e.g., in CD II 2–13, in the liturgy of 1QS I 16–III 13, and in the curses of *4QBerakhot*.

An important testimony is CD II 2–13, a sapiential teaching that links the historical accounts of CD I 1–II 1 and CD II 14–VI 11 and adopts some elements from the Treatise on the Two Spirits.³⁵ Here, the sapiential idea of the pre-existent order of being is adapted to the community's sectarian experience. The fundamental opposition is no longer between the wise and the foolish, or between righteous and the wicked, but between those who have entered the covenant (*berit*: CD II 2) and those who turn aside from the path, i.e., between members of the community and those outside awaiting the final judgment. As in the Treatise on the Two Spirits, the share in one or the other group is predestined. And although the opposition is expressed in ethical terms, without any notion of angelic leaders, the passage should be read in the framework of the whole document: In CD V 17–19 the struggle between Moses and Aaron and the Egyptian magicians Jannes and Jambres is depicted as the struggle between the Prince of Light and Belial. Belial functions as the origin of temptation in Israel's history and presence (IV 13, 15; XII 2) and as the Angel of Destruction punishing the wicked (VIII 2–3; XIX 14). Thus, the sapiential tradition of an ethical dualism is clearly embedded into a reinforced cosmic dualism, with the division of humankind at the border of the community. Consequently, the idea of an ambivalence within the heart of any of the members is dropped.

³⁴ Cf. Collins, "The Mythology of Holy War in Daniel and the Qumran War Scroll," 604–7.

³⁵ Cf. Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination*, 242.

The observations are confirmed by the liturgy for the covenantal ceremony in 1QS I 16–III 12. The passage is shaped by the opposition of God and Belial (or their lots), with the liturgical blessings of the men of God's lot (II 1–4) and the curses on the men of Belial's lot (II 4–10) explicitly quoted. The latter are fiercely accused and delivered to God's wrath, and all the men of God's lot are required to confirm this unanimously by their "Amen" (1QS II 10, 18). The introduction in 1QS I 1–16 requires the "sons of light" to hate all the "sons of darkness." So, there is absolutely no room for ambiguity, and any sign of doubt would be questioning the real share in God's lot.

This is confirmed in other liturgical texts. In the collection of the Berakhot (4Q280 and 286), curses are uttered by use of various names of opponents. In 4Q286 7 ii 1–13, the "council of the community" accuses Belial and "all the spirits of his lot" or the "lot of darkness." The "sons of Belial" are damned to punishment in the eternal pit. Belial is called by names such as "the Wicked one" (4Q286 1 5), and possibly "Angel of the Pit" (1 7) and "Spirit of Abaddon" (1 7).³⁶ Another curse (4Q280 2 2), to be uttered by the "sons of light," is addressed to Malkiresa, the group of people carrying out his plans and plotting against the covenant of God and "all those who refuse to enter." Here, the angelic leader is called by the name known from the Visions of Amram. The curse, however, is quite similar to the curses against the Belial's lot in 1QS II 4–25.³⁷

This is also confirmed by exegetical texts. In the earliest preserved example of the "thematic midrashim," the Melchizedek text (11QMelch), the patterns from the *Vision of Amram*, or also the *War* material seem to be adopted: Two angelic beings are mentioned, Melchizedek and Belial. Belial and "the spirits of his lot" (11QMelch II 12) are in rebellion against God's precepts and molesting the people of Melchizedek's lot (cf. II 8). Melchizedek functions in a way similar to Michael in other texts (Dan 10:13, 21; 1QM XVII 5; *1 En.* 20:5; *T. Dan.* 6:2; *T. Levi* 5), and possibly the author knew the Visions of Amram where both seem to be identical. Melchizedek leads the hosts of angels against the forces of Belial (11QMelch II 13–14), he acts as an agent of God's final judgment (II 13), and proclaims God's final release (II 2–6, 15–16). There is no ethical dualism in this text, and the focus is on the eschatological chronology (cf. the mention of a jubilee: 11QMelch II 7) and the idea that the present dominion of Belial is finally abolished by the dominion of (Michael-)Melchizedek. The same structure is found in another text of the same genre, the *Midrash on Eschatology* (4Q174 and 177). Again, Belial is portrayed as being responsible for the enmity against the "House of Judah"

³⁶ Based on Milik's reconstruction ("4Q visions de 'Amram et une citation d'Origène"); but cf. 1QH^a XI 17.

³⁷ P. J. Kobelski, *Melchizedek and Melchireša'* (Washington D.C.: Catholic Biblical Association, 1981), 38–42.

(4Q174 II 14; cf. CD IV 10–13), he has a “plan” (III 8) to let the “sons of light” stumble. The community is mentioned in traditional (“the just”: IV 4a) and technical terms (“men of the union”: VIII 1, IX 10–11; “counsel of the union”: X 5) and labelled with dualistic terms such as “sons of light” (III 8–9; IX 7) or “lot of light” (X 8), whereas its opponents are called “men of Belial” (IX 4) or “sons of Belial” (III 8).

The texts of different genres demonstrate the changes with regards to the three traditional patterns of dualism: The most striking novelty is that the Qumran sectarians now considered themselves the “sons of light” or even “God’s lot” (1QS II 2), whereas those who stayed apart from the community are considered the “lot of Belial.” The border between the realms of God and Belial or light and darkness is drawn not between Israel and the nations, nor between the good and the wicked, but simply at the margin of *yahad*, the community. The overall perspective is now a definitely sectarian one. This was prefigured in the sapiential texts according to which insight is only revealed to a small and limited group, but this kind of “sectarianism” differs from the views of the *yahad*. For the Qumran sectarians, the idea is unacceptable that there might still be some struggle or division within the heart of one of their members, so this element of the Treatise on the Two Spirits is nowhere adopted in the sectarian texts, whereas the idea of divine predestination (1QS IV 22) or God casting the lot (1QS IV 26) was taken up intensively (cf. CD II 7 adopting 1QS IV 22; 1QH^a VI 11–12 and 4Q181 1 ii 5 adopting 1QS IV 26). Whereas the name of the opposing angelic leader figures vary in the pre-sectarian texts, the opponent is now predominantly called Belial.

Qumran sectarian dualism is, thus, a sheer cosmic dualism shaped by a division of humanity into those inside and those outside, characterized by metaphors of light and darkness and by the link with God (or an angelic leader) and Belial. The present is considered the dominion of Belial (1QS II 19), but there is hope for his destruction and his lot, by the victory of God or his agents. But unlike the *War Scroll*, the sectarian texts are focused not on a future battle but on the present situation of conflict and distress.

E. “This World and the World to Come”: Eschatological Dualism in Later Apocalyptic Writings (4 Ezra, 2 Baruch)

The most important documents of the later apocalyptic tradition are *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch*, both composed after the destruction of the Second Temple and wrestling with the question why God has delivered Israel into the hands of their enemies, the Romans (cf. *4 Ezra* 3:30). This fundamental question shows initially that the worldview of *4 Ezra* is completely monotheistic and creation-oriented; that there is no room left for the activity of any Satanic

power that could be blamed for the suffering of God's people. Evil is primarily attributed to the evil heart within humans (3:20), and ultimately to the transgression of Adam (3:21 and 7:118); but the suffering of God's people results from God's delivering Jerusalem into the hands of its enemies (3:27). In this respect, *4 Ezra* is not dualistic at all, and the same is also true for *2 Baruch*.

There is, however another duality that can be considered here: the temporal duality between the present time and a time to come, or rather: the present world and a world to come. The programmatic phrase is: "God has created not one aeon but two" (*4 Ezra* 7:50), but the two aeons or worlds meant here are not parallel (as are heaven and earth in the Book of the Watchers), but in a temporal sequence: "this aeon" (4:2, 27; 6:9; 7:12; 8:1), "this time" (7:113), "this world" (9:19) or "the first world" (6:55) and "the aeon to come" (7:47), "the world to come" (8:1) or also "the great aeon" (7:13). At the appointed time, at the end of days (12:32), the present world will come to an end, and the new world will appear. This is expressed in various ways in the visions of the book: In one vision (9:26–10:59), a mourning woman (Zion) is suddenly transfigured into a glorious city, i.e., the New Jerusalem which is thought to be already present in the divine realm and which is to be revealed at a certain point in time (7:26; cf. Rev 21:1). In much more detail, the sequence of events is described in *4 Ezra* 7:26–44: After the present period of suffering and distress, when the predicted "signs" (often described as the "birth-pangs" of salvation) will come to pass, there will be first the time of the Messiah: The invisible city shall appear, and the hidden land shall be disclosed (7:26), the Messiah will reveal himself and make the people happy for 400 years (7:26; cf. Rev 20:4–6). After that, the Messiah will die and all humans as well, and the world will return to silence for seven days. Then, after that, the (new) world will be roused, the earth will give back the dead, judgment will happen and take one "week of years" (7:43). Thus, the aeon to come is the new eschatological age, radically separated from this world by the messianic period and providing the eschatological completion for the elect. This sequence of events is considered predestined and now revealed to Ezra (7:44). In *2 Baruch*, there is also the expectation of a messianic kingdom, with paradise-like fruitfulness (29:5–8; 73:1–74:1). Thereafter, this world comes to an end (40:3), and a new aeon (thought of in spiritual, transcendent categories) will appear.

These views adopt and develop eschatological traditions known from the earlier apocalyptic writings, especially the so-called "historical apocalypses": Dan 12:1 envisages a period of final and unsurpassed tribulation immediately before the final salvation. Texts such as *1 Enoch* 99:3–5 and 100:1–6 mention numerous catastrophic alterations in nature and social life, and this is adopted in *4 Ezra* 4:51–5:13, 6:13–24, and 8:63–9:6 or also in *2 Bar.* 25:1–29, 48:30–37, and 70:2–10. The juxtaposition between the period of distress and tribula-

tion and the new world of everlasting peace is also present in the apocalypses of the earlier period, but the “dualistic” view that there are two “worlds” created to represent successive periods in history is not expressed before *4 Ezra*, and the technical terms “this world” (*‘olam haze*) – “the world to come” (*‘olam haba*) which are also most prominent in rabbinic texts, are also not fully developed before *4 Ezra*, although a number of New Testament passages shows that the terms could be used and were understood already in the middle of the first century CE.

F. The Reception of Apocalyptic Dualism in Early Christian Thought

Early Christian Theology is not conceivable without the thorough impact of contemporary Jewish apocalypticism, or – at least – of some of its motifs. The thought world of the earthly Jesus of Nazareth was strongly shaped by apocalyptic motifs and terms,³⁸ probably originally inspired by John the Baptist. Prominent concepts and terms such as the “Kingdom of God,” the “Son of Man,” the eschatological judgment, the resurrection of the dead, the imagery of a struggle between a strong one and an even stronger one, the imagery of an eschatological meal, and the announcement of an eschatological change of the situation of the poor, the hungry, and the weeping in the earliest makarisms are all signs of a clearly apocalyptic thought world, and even the idea of the kingdom which is yet to come and – in his works – already present, attests to a reinforced rather than reduced apocalyptic viewpoint.

With the apocalyptic thought world, early Christian authors and texts also adopted various elements of apocalyptic dualism, although a direct borrowing, e.g., from Qumran, cannot be confirmed. As in Judaism, “dualism” can at most be “moderate,” not “radical” or “absolute”: No power can be considered equal to God, the creator and ruler of the universe. Within these limits, different types of dualism were adopted: Cosmic dualism (God/Christ vs. Satan), ethical (good vs. evil; spirit vs. flesh), and eschatological (final/eternal salvation or punishment) dualism.

Jesus reckoned with demonic spirits causing illness and destruction. They are considered to be subject to a governing power, “Satan” (Luke 10:18; Mark 3:23), or “Beelzebul” (Mark 3:22), although the concept is not totally consistent. New Testament texts rather stress the conviction that Satan’s power is already broken by the power of the kingdom, as made manifest in

³⁸ Cf. J. Frey, “Die Apokalyptik als Herausforderung der neutestamentlichen Wissenschaft. Zum Problem: Jesus und die Apokalyptik,” in *Apokalyptik als Herausforderung neutestamentlicher Theologie* (ed. M. Becker and M. Öhler; WUNT II/214. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006), 23–94.

Jesus' exorcisms. Paul refers to "Satan" as one who tempts and deceives (1 Cor 7:5; 2 Cor 2:11), and he even calls him "the God of this Aeon" (2 Cor 4:4; cf. also "Beliar" in 2 Cor 6:15), but at the same time he is convinced that Satan will be defeated shortly (Rom 16:20). Post-Pauline epistles mention Satan (or now the "diabolos"; cf. Eph 4:27; 6:11; 1 Tim 3:6–7; 1 Pet 5:8) as the one who stimulates heresy, sin, and apostasy. Only Jude 6 and 2 Pet 2:4 adopt the tale of the fall of the angels (Gen 6). Jude 9 furthermore adopts the struggle of Michael and the devil over Moses' corpse from the lost ending of the *Testament of Moses*.

The Johannine writings are most thoroughly shaped by elements of dualistic language. They not only mention opposing powers such as Satan (John 13:27), the *diabolos* (John 8:44; 13:2), and the "ruler of the/world" (John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11), whose power is considered to be broken in Jesus' death (John 12:31; cf. Rev 12:9). Even more significant is the intense use of pairs of opposites such as "light" / "darkness," "truth" / "lie," "death" / "life," and "above" / "below." This language was often thought to be adopted from a particular history-of-religions background, either Gnostic or Qumranian.³⁹ But the differences are more remarkable than the similarities. The various terms point to different backgrounds, and they are used in John with a particular rhetorical intention to draw readers from darkness to light,⁴⁰ rather than as a fixed worldview.

The notion of a Satanic adversary is most fully developed in the only apocalyptic writing in the New Testament, in Revelation, where Satan's "names" are accumulated (12:9), he and his host are said to face eternal punishment (20:10), but at present they have the permission to harm the Christians (12:12–17). Even here, the "dualism" is a very moderate one: All evil powers are subject to and limited by the power of the one God. Dualistic concepts are rather used to qualify the enemies of the communities, the Roman power as well as the synagogue (Rev 2:9; 3:9), the Jews, and also deviant or "heretic" Christians. Thus 1 and 2 John explicitly draw on the concept of an "antichrist," and label the deviant teachers as "antichrist(s)" (2 John 7; cf. 1 John 2:18; 4:3).

This survey of the reception of dualistic concepts in early Christian texts shows how deeply Early Christianity is indebted to Jewish concepts, and not least to the apocalyptic thought world. The views of eschatological opponents, the idea of demonic spirits, the concept of a struggle with evil or misleading powers, the expectation of the end and a world to come (cf. Rev 21),

³⁹ Thus J. H. Charlesworth, "A Critical Comparison of the Dualism in IQS 3:13–4:26 and the Dualism contained in the Gospel of John," *NTS* 15 (1968–9): 389–418.

⁴⁰ J. Frey "Recent Perspectives on Johannine Dualism and Its Background," in *Text, Thought, and Practice in Qumran and Early Christianity* (ed. R. Clements and D. R. Schwartz; STDJ 84; Leiden: Brill, 2008), 127–157.

and the eschatological division between those who will be saved and those who will be rejected are all traces of concepts from the dualisms developed in early Jewish apocalypticism.

9. On the Origins of the Genre “Literary Testament”: Farewell Discourses in the Qumran Library and Their Relevance for the History of the Genre*

In biblical scholarship, numerous passages or even books are viewed as examples of a particular genre, the so-called “literary testament.”¹ In this genre, a corpus of admonitions, instructions, or prophecies is presented as the literary heritage of an important figure of the past, who, according to the literary fiction, is about to die. By means of such a literary design, the last speech or the final letter of that person is given particular weight.

In the present paper, I will give a brief overview on some of the most important examples of this genre and sketch the characteristic features that served to define the genre in some foundational studies. Then I will turn to the documents from the Qumran library that have been linked with the genre “testament” and discuss for which works and to what degree such a classification may be justified. Finally, I will draw some conclusions with regard to the history and development of the genre and, more precisely, the background of the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*.

* The paper was written for a conference on the Aramaic texts from Qumran held at Aix-en-Provence. I am grateful to Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra (Paris) for an engaging discussion, to James Kelhoffer (Uppsala) for reading and correcting an early draft, and to Ursula Schattner-Rieser (Innsbruck/Cologne) for many valuable hints, furthermore to my former collaborators Alison Deborah Sauer and Ann-Sophie Wich for their help in the correction process.

¹ Cf. J. Becker, “Die Gattung des literarischen Testaments,” in *Das Evangelium nach Johannes. Kapitel 11–21* (ed. J. Becker; ÖTK 4,2; 3rd ed.; Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn and Würzburg: Echter, 1991), 523–529; see already E. Fascher, “Testament,” *PRE* 2/5:856–1010, here 858–861; E. Stauffer, “Abschiedsreden,” in *RAC* 1:29–35; E. Cortès, *Los discursos de adiós de Gn 49 a Jn 13–17. Pistas para la historia de un género literario en la antigua literatura judía* (CSPac 23; Barcelona: Herder, 1976); J. Bergman, “Discours d’Adieu – Testament – Discours Posthume,” in *Sagesse et Religion. Colloque de Strasbourg* (Paris: Presses Univ. de France, 1979), 21–50; M. Küchler, *Frühjüdische Weisheitstraditionen* (OBO 26; Freiburg Schweiz: Universitätsverlag and Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979), 415–547; E. von Nordheim, *Die Lehre der Alten* (2 vols.; ALGHJ 13; Leiden: Brill, 1985); J. Neusner, “Death-Scenes and farewell Stories,” *HTR* 79 (1986): 186–197; and M. Winter, *Das Vermächtnis Jesu und die Abschiedsworte der Väter* (FRLANT 161; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1994).

A. Literary Testaments and Farewell Discourses in Biblical Scholarship

Broadly speaking, examples of such a literary design can already be found in teachings from Ancient Egypt and Mesopotamia.² There are also numerous loose parallels in the Hellenistic Roman world, especially in the genre of the *τελευτοί* or *exitus illustrium virorum*,³ although most of these texts only present brief "final words," not extensive discourses.⁴

In the Hebrew Bible, the most prominent and influential example is Deuteronomy, which is as a whole designed as an extensive farewell discourse of Moses before his death. Thus, the book claims to represent the final summary of his teaching and commandments for the Israelites in the land they are about to enter.⁵ Other examples from the Hebrew Bible can be added, such as the blessings of the patriarchs (Genesis 27:1–40; 47:29–31 and 49–50) and the farewells of Joshua (Joshua 23–24), Samuel (1 Samuel 12), and David (1 Kings 2:1–10; 1 Chronicles 28–29).⁶

From the so-called Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha numerous other texts deserve to be mentioned, but the most prominent collection of testamentary texts and thus the clearest pattern of the genre is the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*.⁷ In these texts, the testamentary character is made explicit by the

² Cf. the examples discussed by von Nordheim, *Lehre*, 2:94–142, who states that there is no real parallel in Mesopotamian texts, whereas biographical inscriptions and teachings from Egypt provide parallels by being situated in the context of imminent death. There are, however, Mesopotamian examples. Cf., e.g., most recently V. A. Hurowitz, "The Wisdom of Šupe-ameli – A Deathbed Debate between a Father and Son," in *Wisdom Literature in Mesopotamia and Israel* (ed. R. J. Clifford; SBLSymS 36; Atlanta: SBL, 2007). I am grateful to Jonathan Ben-Dov for mentioning to me this article.

³ Cf. the description by K. Berger, "Hellenistische Gattungen im Neuen Testament," in *ANRW* (II 25,2; Berlin-New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1984), 1031–1432, 1831–1885; see 125–1259. In these texts, the death of a ruler or a philosopher is described, including some last words. A title "*exitus virorum illustrium*" is mentioned in Pliny, *Ep.* 8.12.4–5; cf. also Tacitus, *Ann.* 15.60.4. An earlier and influential example of a testamentary scene is Plato's *Phaedo* where Socrates leaves his disciples as orphans (61B) and dies with a last word (115–118). On "last words," see W. Schmidt, *De ultimis morientium verbis* (Marpurgi: Schaaf, 1914); A. Ronconi, "*Exitus illustrium virorum*," in *RAC* 6:1258–1268.

⁴ Cf. Winter, *Vermächtnis*, 39.

⁵ Cf. Winter, *Vermächtnis*, 65–67, pointing out that not only the last chapters (Deut 31–34) serve as literary testament. The literary fiction of Moses speaking starts in the beginning (Deut 1:1–4:43) and is present also in the main part.

⁶ Cf. Winter, *Vermächtnis*, 45–111.

⁷ Cf. von Nordheim, *Lehre*, 1:12–107; A. Hultgård, *L'eschatologie des Testaments des Douze Patriarchs* (2 vols.; Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1977/82), 2:53–91; J. Becker, *Untersuchungen zur Entstehungsgeschichte der Testamente der zwölf Patriarchen* (AGJU 8, Leiden: Brill, 1969); see also the discussion in J. J. Collins, "Testaments," in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period. Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian*

keyword διαθήκη as used in the titles and the beginnings of the texts as a technical term for the genre of a literary farewell discourse.⁸

Apart from the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, there are numerous other testamentary texts among the so-called Pseudepigrapha,⁹ such as the *Testament of Abraham* (sometimes taken together with a *Testament of Isaac* and a *Testament of Jacob* as a collection of the *Testaments of the Three Patriarchs*), the *Testament of Job*, the *Testament of Solomon*, and the *Testament of Moses* (or *Assumptio of Mosis*) and the *Ascension of Isaiah*.¹⁰ Although there is some uncertainty to what degree those texts are still Jewish, particularly since some of them are preserved only in translations in Christian oriental languages,¹¹ the sheer number of “testaments” suggests that the genre became rather popular in the later Second Temple Period. This is also confirmed by the fact that some other testamentary texts occur within larger collections such as *1 Enoch* (*1 En.* 81–82; 91–105; 106–108) and *2 Enoch* (*2 En.* 55–67) or the *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum* (*L.A.B.* 19:1–16 etc.).¹² Thus, the most important material for defining the genre is normally taken from the Second Temple literature, especially the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* and other Pseudepigrapha.

In emerging Christianity, not only the literary testaments of biblical patriarchs and heroes were adopted, expanded, and transmitted, but there was also a production of new testamentary passages and texts, now attributed to important figures of emerging Christianity, to Jesus and to the predominant apostles. The most prominent example is the Farewell Discourse of Jesus in the Gospel of John (John 13:31–17:26), which is almost unparalleled in the Synoptic Gospels.¹³ Other examples are Jesus’ commission to the disciples in

Writings, Philo, Josephus (ed. M. E. Stone; CRINT II.2; Assen and Philadelphia: Van Gorcum and Fortress Press, 1984), 325–355.

⁸ Cf. *T. Reu.* 1:1: Ἀντίγραφον διαθήκης Ῥουβήμ, and similarly in numerous other texts of the *T. 12 Patr.* Only in the Christian passage *T. Benj.* 3:8, διαθήκη is used with the notion “covenant.” Cf. J. Becker, *Die Testamente der zwölf Patriarchen* (JSHRZ; Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1974), 32.

⁹ Cf. also J. H. Charlesworth, “Introduction,” in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha 1: Apocalyptic Literature and Testaments* (ed. J. H. Charlesworth; London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1983), 773, and Collins, “Testaments.”

¹⁰ On these texts, cf. von Nordheim, *Lehre*, 1:119–220.

¹¹ Thus, e.g. *Testament of Isaac*, *Testament of Jacob*, *Testament of Adam*, and *Ascension of Isaiah*.

¹² Cf. von Nordheim, *Lehre*, 1:220–229, and Winter, *Vermächtnis*, 125–149.

¹³ On the general problems of the interpretation of this passage, see J. Frey, *Die johanneische Eschatologie 3: Die eschatologische Verkündigung in den johanneischen Texten* (WUNT 117; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000), 104–239, esp. 104–118. On the problems of the genre of this text, see especially Becker, “Die Gattung des literarischen Testaments,” and Winter, *Vermächtnis*; but see also the most recent study by G. L. Parsenius, *Departure*

Matthew 28:16–20; Paul’s farewell address to the Ephesian elders in Acts 20:17–38¹⁴ and, among the later epistles, 2 Timothy and 2 Peter, which both present a literary testament of respectively Paul or Peter in post-apostolic times. Later examples include last part of the *Vita Antonii* of Athanasius¹⁵ and other hagiographic texts, the ecclesiastical rule book *Testamentum Domini Nostri Jesu Christi*,¹⁶ or the Arabian *Instruction of David to Solomon*¹⁷ which demonstrate that the literary pattern stayed alive in different cultural areas.¹⁸

B. Criteria of the Genre “Testament”

In their description of the genre “testament,” Enric Cortès and Eckhard von Nordheim as well as Jürgen Becker and Anders Hultgård¹⁹ basically draw on the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*. Martin Winter includes a much broader scale of texts starting with Deuteronomy, but does not deny the formative role of the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*.²⁰ But due to his focus on John 13–17 and in view of the fact that both terms, “testament” and “farewell discourse” seem not totally appropriate for his purpose, he introduces a new label “testamentary discourse” (“Vermächtnisrede”).²¹ This is conceivable, since John 13–17 is a testamentary “farewell discourse” but not a literary work that could be called a “literary testament.” For our purposes, however, these distinctions are not so important, and the label “(literary) testament” seems not to be inappropriate.²² For description of the genre, the

and Consolation. The Johannine Farewell Discourses in light of GrecoRoman Literature (NT.S 117; Leiden: Brill, 2005), with a slightly differing view.

¹⁴ Cf. H.-J. Michel, *Die Abschiedsrede des Paulus an die Kirche Apg 20,17–38* (SANT 35; München: Kösel, 1973).

¹⁵ PG 26:837–976, specifically 969–973.

¹⁶ I. E. Rahmani, *Testamentum domini nostri Jesu Christi. Nunc primum edidit, latine reddidit et illustravit* (Moguntiae: Kirchheim, 1899); S. Grebaut, “Le Testamenten Galilee de Nötre-Seigneur Jesus-Christ” (PO 9.3; Paris: 1913), 143–236.

¹⁷ L. Leroy, “Instruction de David à Salomon. Fragment traduit de l’arabe,” *Revue de l’orientchretien* 20 (1915–17): 329–331.

¹⁸ On these examples see the brief survey by von Nordheim, *Lehre*, 2:146–148; see also Stauffer, “Abschiedsreden,” 33–34.

¹⁹ J. Becker, “Die Gattung des literarischen Testaments,” cf. idem, *Untersuchungen zur Entstehungsgeschichte der Testamente der zwölf Patriarchen* (AGSU 8; Leiden: Brill, 1970); Hultgard, *L’eschatologie*, 2:53–91.

²⁰ Remarkably enough, he only discusses one of the twelve testaments of the collection.

²¹ Winter, *Vermächtnis*, 37–38. According to Winter, this is a particular form of the wider genre “farewell discourse.”

²² Winter (*Vermächtnis*, 37) infers that the title “testament” (διαθήκη) is not mandatory for the genre, that some “testaments” do not have the title “testament,” and that not all writings that belong to the “Testamentenliteratur” are really “testaments.” Whereas the

Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs provide a relatively coherent point of departure, although one should avoid a too narrow description, since there is some variety within the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* and even more when other works are compared.²³ Therefore, von Nordheim and other scholars do not define a fixed pattern but only give a list of generic elements with a wider variability in detail.

The most detailed description of the genre (literary) "testament" is still the one given by von Nordheim.²⁴ According to this, the external or stylistic criteria²⁵ of the genre are as follows:

In the beginning (framework):

- title of the work and the name of its fictive author
- mention of the addressees
- hints to the imminent death of the speaker
- the age of the speaker (often with a date given for comparison)
- description of the situation of the speech
- introduction formula;

In the main part:

- address of the person who is about to die to the children, friends, or representatives of the people who are gathered
- containing a retrospect to the past, instructions for further behavior, and predictions for the future;²⁶

In the closure:

- closing formula
- (possibly) instructions for burial
- a note on the death of the speaker (and his burial).

Becker, with special consideration of John 13–17, mentions some other possible features, especially a last meal as situation of the speech, and the commissioning of an office or function from the dying patriarch to his successor, his progeny or others.²⁷

first two observations are quite important, the third point only indicates that the label "Testamentenliteratur" is too unprecise.

²³ Cf. also Charlesworth, "Introduction," 773: "No binding genre was employed by the authors of the testaments, but one can discern among them a loose format."

²⁴ See von Nordheim, *Lehre*, 1:229–239; cf. also Winter, *Vermächtnis*, 212; Becker, "Die Gattung des literarischen Testaments."

²⁵ Von Nordheim, *Lehre*, 1:229–230.

²⁶ Here, there is particular variability. The stress can be laid on the retrospective or on the prediction or even apocalyptic view of the future. However, a hortatory purpose, an interest on instructing the progeny or disciples, is characteristic for the testamentary genre (cf. von Nordheim, *Lehre*, 1:232–237).

²⁷ Becker, "Die Gattung des literarischen Testaments," 526–529.

Both von Nordheim and Becker stress that not every writing necessarily contains all of these features. Some of them can be expanded or stressed, whereas others may be absent. But according to von Nordheim, some of the criteria mentioned are strictly necessary to make a writing a testament, namely:²⁸

- the (announcement of the) death of the speaker
- a speech (or writing) related to the imminent death
- instructions for the addressees who stay behind.

From the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* and its early Jewish parallels, von Nordheim points out that these three essentials are not yet sufficient to define the genre "testament." Additionally, one should take into consideration the intention of the speech which is, as a whole, paraenetic (also in its retrospective and predictive parts), its argument which is predominantly rational (with arguments drawn from the history or the life of the patriarch) or sapiential, and finally the motivation of the speech: In transmitting experiences from the past, it wants to help to cope with challenges which are in the future of the protagonist, but may actually be in the present of the addressees. It is not the death of the patriarch which makes up the problem resulting in the composition of such a literary testament but only the present situation of the progeny that gives reason to sum up past experiences and ethical instructions as a "testament" of their forefather.²⁹

Of course, definitions and descriptions of genres are always arbitrary in some respect. Texts can be grouped in a manner that helps us to understand them, to distinguish them from other texts, and to pose scholarly questions of function, meaning, and historical development. Thus, it seems appropriate for our purpose of investigating the alleged "testaments" from the Qumran library to adopt von Nordheim's description, which is strongly shaped by the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, in order to ask for texts of similar form, intention, and motivation in the Qumran library, or even for possible historical developments.

Both Becker and von Nordheim already mention the existence of Qumran texts, which might be considered as belonging to the same genre. Based on an article by Jozef Tadeusz Milik,³⁰ von Nordheim discusses the "Testament" of Amram and observes the close resemblance with the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*.³¹ In the beginning section which is preserved, five ele-

²⁸ Von Nordheim, *Lehre*, 1:230.

²⁹ Von Nordheim, *Lehre*, 1:232–239.

³⁰ J. T. Milik, "4Q Visions de 'Amram et une citation d'Origene,'" *RB* 79 (1972): 77–97.

³¹ Von Nordheim, *Lehre*, 1:115–118. Apart from this text, von Nordheim discusses the Hebrew *Testament of Nephthali* from the chronicle of Jerachmeel, which is classified as a "testament" in modified form, but was composed in a considerably later period (*Lehre*, 1:114). A brief note on some fragments related to the "Testament" of Levi (*Lehre*, 1:108)

ments do exactly correspond to the framework of that collection.³² The only difference is that the contents of the writing is called “vision.” But also in other parts of the text, as preliminarily given by Milik in his essay, von Nordheim observed similarities: The “Testament” of Amram seems to contain also ethical admonitions and predictions for the future. According to von Nordheim, the similarity can only be due to literary knowledge, i.e., the genre of the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* has its predecessor in texts such as Visions of Amram. The age of this document is, therefore, an argument for the possible age of the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*,³³ or at least of the literary pattern adopted in them. Unlike von Nordheim, Becker is more cautious regarding the Qumran parallels and states that it is far from certain that the documents mentioned as being related to the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* can aptly be called testaments.³⁴ Remarkably, Winter’s Habilitationsschrift from 1992 totally ignores the Qumran evidence for reconstructing the genre of the “testamentary discourse.”

C. The Evidence from the Qumran Library

Evidence from Qumran was still scarcely used in the works of von Nordheim and Hultgård.³⁵ But before the early 1990s, authors were almost completely dependent on the information given by Milik in his preliminary publications on Visions of Amram, the *Aramaic Levi Document* and other related texts.³⁶ Now, since the preliminary and – in most cases also – the official³⁷ publication of all the relevant texts and fragments have been published, it is possible to have a second look at the alleged testamentary character of some of the

as collected by R. H. Charles in his edition (see R. H. Charles, *The Greek Versions of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* [Oxford: Clarendon, 1908], 245–256).

³² Von Nordheim, *Lehre*, 1:116, mentions: “internal text heading,” “designation of the addressees ... , his sons,” “reference to the impending death of the Patriarch,” “the age of ‘Amram,’” and “a comparative dating of the year of the death to the years of Israel’s stay in Egypt.”

³³ Von Nordheim, *Lehre*, 1:117.

³⁴ Becker, *Gattung*, 526.

³⁵ Thus von Nordheim, *Lehre*, 1:107–108, 115–119; Hultgård, *L’eschatologie*, 2:92–107 who cautiously speaks of an “Apocryphe de Lévi,” not of a “Testament de Levi.”

³⁶ Cf. J. T. Milik, “4Q Visions de ‘Amram,” in idem, “Le Testament de Lévi en araméen: Fragment de la Grotte 4 de Qumrân,” *RB* 62 (1955): 398–406; idem, “1Q21. Testament de Levi,” in *Qumran Cave I* (ed. D. Bartlelemy and J. T. Milik; DJD 1; Oxford: Clarendon, 1955): 87–91; idem, “Écrits préesséniens de Qumrân: d’Henoch à ‘Amram,” in *Qumrân. Sa piété, sa théologie et son milieu* (ed. M. Delcor; BETL 46; Paris: Gembloux, 1978), 91–106.

³⁷ Regrettably, Émile Puech’s volume *DJD XXXVII* with the official edition of the Aramaic texts 4Q550–575 and 4Q580–582 was not yet available when the article was written.

texts from the Qumran library and on their possible impact on the genre “literary testament.”

Among the Qumran discoveries, several texts have been classified as “testamentary.” According to the list compiled by Armin Lange and Ulrike Mittmann-Richert,³⁸ there is an Aramaic Testament of Jacob (4Q537), two Hebrew manuscripts named Testament of Judah (3Q7; 4Q484) and an Aramaic text also called Testament of Judah, but possibly related to Benjamin (4Q538), the Aramaic Visions of Amram (4Q543–549) and another Aramaic text often linked with the Aramaic *Levi Document* (4QapocrLevi^{a-b} now separated here as “Unidentified Testament” (4Q540–541). Some other texts, classified as “texts of mixed genre” might be included in the discussion, because they were sometimes called a “testament,” especially Hebrew texts of Naphthali (4Q215) and a “*Testament of Joseph*” (4Q539), the Aramaic *Testament of Qahat* (4Q542) and also the *Aramaic Levi Document*, which was often discussed under the title “*Testament of Levi*” (1Q21; 4Q213, 213a, 213b, 214, 214a, 214b).³⁹ Most of those texts, however, are very fragmentary, so that an analysis of the genre provides major difficulties. On the other hand, the sheer number of texts which might all predate the composition of the Greek *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* can provide a bulk of further information on the history of the genre.

So we will have to discuss how these texts increase our knowledge of the history of the genre. How do the “new” texts from Qumran alter our view of the development of the genre “testament”? To answer this we will have to analyze which elements and criteria of the genre are visible in the preserved portions of the respective texts. What reasons are there for classifying them as a “testament”?

³⁸ A. Lange and U. Mittmann-Richert, “Annotated List of the Texts from the Judaean Desert Classified by Content and Genre,” in *The Texts from the Judaean Desert: Indices and an Introduction to the Discoveries in the Judaean Desert Series* (ed. E. Tov; DJD 39; Oxford: Clarendon, 2002), 115–164.

³⁹ Cf. the first edition of 1Q21 by Milik in *DJD* I, 87–91.

I. The So-Called Testament of Jacob 4Q537⁴⁰

In the DJD edition, Émile Puech states it is “reasonable to classify these fragments as a ‘Testament,’”⁴¹ and according to Klaus Beyer, the text “sounds like a farewell discourse.”⁴² However, the work is hard to classify due to the fragmentary state of preservation of the only surviving manuscript. Although fragments 1–3 seem to present the opening of a vision, the beginning of the text and also its end are lost. In spite of this, Émile Puech and also Florentino García Martínez and Eibert Tigchelaar (in *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*) and Don Parry and Emanuel Tov (in *The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader*) call it a *Testament of Jacob* (with [so Puech and García Martínez/Tigchelaar] or without [so Parry/Tov] a question mark).

The name Jacob, however, is not preserved; instead, there is only “Bethel” and other local names in that region (Beer-Zeit, Rimmon, and Ramat Hazor⁴³), so that a link with Jacob is quite probable. In the first person singular, the patriarch narrates a vision of an angel descending from heaven, in which he was given seven heavenly tablets from which he had to read. In this vision he is also addressed concerning his “seed” (4Q537 1–3 1). The tablets apparently contain different revelations. One of them probably refers to what should happen to Jacob during his life,⁴⁴ but other fragments also seem to contain revelations on the fate of his progeny.⁴⁵ There is mention of future periods of welfare in the land, of going “in the ways of error” (4Q537 5), furthermore of the construction of a sanctuary and of priestly sacrifices and a “city” with waters from underneath its walls (4Q537 12 2–3). Possibly this is a criticism of the sanctuary built by Jeroboam and a reference to the city of Jerusalem with the source of Gihon.

Due to the lack of the literary framework in the surviving sources, things remain quite uncertain, but the contents of the revelation seem to be rather an

⁴⁰ Cf. É. Puech, “4QTestament de Jacob? ar (4QTJa? ar),” in *Qumrân Grotte 4 XXII: Textes Araméens, première partie, 4Q529–549* (ed. E. Puech; DJD 31, Oxford: Clarendon, 2001), 171–201; see previously idem, “Fragments d’un apocryphe de Lévi et le personnage eschatologique, 4QTestLévi^{c-d} (?) et 4QAJa,” in *The Madrid Qumran Congress* (ed. J. Trebelle Barrera and L. Vegas Montaner; 2 vols.; STDJ 11,2; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 2:449–501 (488–96). See also K. Beyer, *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer 2* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004), 102–103; “4Q537: Jakob in Bethel,” in *Parabiblical Texts* (DSSR 3; ed. D. W. Parry & E. Tov; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 402–407: “Testament of Jacob.”

⁴¹ Puech, *DJD XXXI*, 172.

⁴² Beyer, *Texte*, 2:102: “klingt wie eine Abschiedsrede.”

⁴³ 4Q537 14 2–3 and 4Q537 24 2. On the location of these places see Puech, *DJD XXXI*, 184 and 189.

⁴⁴ 4Q537 1–3 4: “everything that would happen to [me during the hundred and forty-seven years of my life.”

⁴⁵ 4Q537 5 1–3.

overview of future events than an ethical exhortation. From the fragments preserved, it is also unclear whether the patriarch directly addresses his progeny or whether he only reads or summarizes the address from the tablets he was given. The vision reported in fragments 1–3 is probably located at Bethel (cf. Genesis 28). Therefore one of the tablets seems to predict all that should happen to Jacob during the rest of his life. The fragment 12 where it is told how the sanctuary should be built and how the priests should serve might also report a vision,⁴⁶ but it remains unclear whether it belongs to the same visionary framework or whether this is a second vision reported within the work. Of course, this does not preclude that the address or the narration of the vision(s) might be situated at the time of Jacob's death, but such a situation is not suggested by any of the preserved fragments.

Generally, the literary design of the work seems to differ more widely from the *T. 12 Patr.* and the genre "testament" as outlined above. Puech, therefore, points rather to parallels in the Visions of Amram or the *Aramaic Levi Document*,⁴⁷ however, it is an open question whether those works might be appropriately called "testament." The mention of heavenly tablets links the work with the book of *Jubilees*, where the true history of humankind is read from the heavenly tablets given to Moses, but the most significant feature, the detailed chronology, is missing. Thus, the work seems to narrate a revelation of the future of Israel including cultic instructions. It is a pseudepigraphic work, designed as a narration of Jacob, but the strictly testamentary character is questionable due to the lack of any kind of exhortation and to the absence of any reference to the death of the protagonist in the extant fragments. So the text should rather cautiously be called *Apocryphon of Jacob*, not *Testament of Jacob*.

II. The So-Called Testaments of Judah (3Q7 and 4Q484)⁴⁸

The two Hebrew documents classified as Testament of Judah are so badly preserved that only a few words are readable, among them the names "Levi" (3Q7 6); "Issachar" (4Q484 1 1), possibly "Eden" (4Q484 7) and, notably, the "Angel of the Presence" (3Q7 5 3). This is certainly not enough to determine a literary genre. The designation Testament of Judah is mere speculation and should be abandoned. The only thing to be said is that the text men-

⁴⁶ Cf. the suggestion: "I saw" by the translator Michael Wise, in *Parabiblical Texts*, 405.

⁴⁷ Puech, *DJD XXXI*, 172–173.

⁴⁸ Cf. the cautious edition by M. Baillet, "Un apocryphe mentionnant l'Ange de la Présence," in *Les 'Petites Grottes' de Qumrân* (ed. M. Baillet, J. T. Milik and R. de Vaux; *DJD 3*; Oxford: Clarendon, 1962), 99; but see also J. T. Milik, "Écrits préesséniens de Qumrân: d'Henoch à 'Amram," 98. On 4Q484 see M. Baillet, "Testament de Juda(?)," in *Qumrân Grotte 4 III (4Q482–4Q520)* (ed. M. Baillet; *DJD 7*; Oxford: Clarendon, 1982), 3.

tions some of the patriarchs. But not every text mentioning the patriarchs is a “testament.” The context, the mode of communication, and the literary design cannot be determined any further.

III. The So-Called “Testament of Benjamin” (4Q538)⁴⁹

The situation is better for the work which was officially edited by Puech as an Aramaic Testament of Judah, but is now classified as a text related to Benjamin, or even as a Testament of Benjamin.⁵⁰ Obviously the text retells the scene of Joseph in Egypt when he meets his brothers (Genesis 42–46). The name “Joseph” is preserved at least twice,⁵¹ we can also find “his brothers”⁵² and the local name Goshen.⁵³ But from the biblical story (Gen 44:14), the person who tells in the first person singular that he (Joseph) “fell upon my neck and he kissed me,” can only be Benjamin.⁵⁴ Thus, the fragments apparently provide a narration of the biblical story from the perspective of Benjamin.

Therefore, the title *Testament of Judah* is most probably erroneous. Moreover, to classify the work as a “testament” is also unsubstantiated. All the features of a literary testament, most prominently the mention of the death of the patriarch, but also the element of an exhortative speech, are missing. Of course, the re-narration of the story of Joseph and his brothers may be part of a more extensive work, but we must leave the questions open whether the whole work might have been ascribed to Benjamin or even designed as a testament. For the extant fragments, esp. fragments 1–2, a classification with-

⁴⁹ É. Puech, “4QTestament de Juda ar,” in *Qumrân Grotte 4 XXII: Textes Arameens, première partie, 4Q529–549* (ed. E. Puech; DJD 31, Oxford: Clarendon, 2001), 191–199; cf. *Parabiblical Texts*, 410–413.

⁵⁰ See *Parabiblical Texts*, 410: “Testament of Benjamin.” Puech, *DJD XXXI*, 191, mentions that already Jean Starcky had named the work “Testament de Benjamin.” Cf. also D. Dimant, “4Q538 היר כתב של לשיבו בנימין: אלא דברי יהודה” [Not the ‘Testament of Judah’ but ‘The Words of Benjamin’: On the Nature of 4Q538], in *שערי לשון: מחקרים בלשון העברת. בארמית ובלשונות היהודים מונים למשה בר-אשר* [Sh’arei Lashon: Studies in Hebrew, Aramaic, and Jewish Languages Presented to Moshe Bar-Asher] (ed. A. Maman, S. E. Fassberg, and Y. Breuer; 3 vols.; Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 2007), 1:10–26.

⁵¹ 4Q538 1–2 3 and 1–2 7.

⁵² 4Q538 1–2 5 and possibly also in line 1 and 7.

⁵³ 4Q538 1–2 8.

⁵⁴ Cf. Lange and Mittmann-Richert, “Annotated List,” 125, n. 7: “As 4Q538 1 6 reports that Joseph fell upon the neck of the narrator and because this is reported in Gen 44:14 only of Benjamin, the narrator of the text attested by 4Q538 should be identified as Benjamin and not Judah.” This is adopted in *Parabiblical Texts*, 410.

in the wide range of examples of “rewritten Bible” and a designation such as “Apocryphon of Benjamin”⁵⁵ might be more appropriate.

IV. The So-Called “Testament of Joseph” (4Q539)⁵⁶

The Aramaic work was first identified by Milik and then edited by Puech as “*Testament de Joseph*,” whereas García Martínez and Tigchelaar cautiously named it “4QApocryphon of Joseph B”⁵⁷ and Lange and Mittmann-Richert list it among the “texts of mixed genre.”⁵⁸ However, in the surviving portions, this document seems to contain more elements of a literary testament than all the other texts discussed so far. Although the beginning and end of the text are not preserved either, we have the address to “my children,” most probably to be reconstructed as “listen, my children” (שׁמְעוּ בְנֵי), and the address “my beloved” (הַבְּיָבִי).⁵⁹ In the same part (fragments 2–3), there is mention of “Jacob” (1 1), “my father” (1 2), “my brothers” (1 2), and also of “the sons of my great-uncle, [Ish]ma[el]” (בְּנֵי דָדִי יִשְׁמַעֵאל ל),⁶⁰ i.e., the Ishmaelites who sold Joseph to Egypt according to the biblical story (Gen 37:25, 27). We can conclude from this that the speaker is Joseph, who addresses his beloved children in an unknown situation and retells the story how his brothers had sold him to Egypt. Some of the details invite for comparison with the Greek Testament of Joseph (ch. 15–16) from the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*. The other fragments cannot clearly be linked with this story, so that we do not really know whether the narration led to an exhortatory speech or not, although fragment 5 might point to some kind of admonition.⁶¹

So, with all due caution, this work might be labelled as a testamentary address of Joseph, although the situation of death is not mentioned in the extant portion of the text. But the patriarch addresses his children, and the speech contains a retrospective tale of events of his life and most probably also pieces of admonition. Additionally, the use of a sapiential formula of teaching (“Lehreröffnungsformel”) points more strongly in the direction of the genre

⁵⁵ Cf. the article by Dimant, “4Q538 לְאֵלֵי צְוֹנֵת יְהוּדָה אֵלֵי דְבָרֵי בְנֵימִין: לְשִׁיבוּ שֶׁל כְּתָב הַיָּד” who suggests “The Words of Benjamin.”

⁵⁶ É. Puech, “4QTestament de Joseph ar,” in *Qumrân Grotte 4 XXII: Textes Araméens, première partie, 4Q529–549* (ed. E. Puech; DJD 31; Oxford: Clarendon, 2001), 201–211; cf. the preliminary report by Milik, “Écrits préesséniens de Qumrân,” 101–102.

⁵⁷ Cf. the Hebrew work 4QApocryphon of Joseph^{a-c} (4Q371–373). There is, however, no relation between these two works; cf. Puech, *DJD XXXI*, 201, n. 1.

⁵⁸ Lange/Mittmann-Richert, “Annotated List,” 125.

⁵⁹ Both in 4Q539 2–3 2.

⁶⁰ Line 3; cf. the reconstruction by Puech, *DJD XXXI*, 207.

⁶¹ If the reconstruction by M. Wise in *Parabiblical Texts*, 565 was correct, the טוֹבְהָא in fragment 5 line 3 would introduce a new phrase with a makarism. This could point to a sapiential milieu. But the text is too fragmentary to decide on the syntax here. Cf. the different reconstruction by Puech, *DJD XXXI*, 210.

“testament.” But things remain quite uncertain due to the very fragmentary state of preservation, and it would be unwise to fill the gaps simply by conjecturing from other testamentary texts.

V. The So-Called “Testament of Naphtali” (4Q215)⁶²

The Hebrew text previously called “*Testament of Naphtali*” (4Q215), but now just named “Naphtali,”⁶³ seems to retell the story of the birth of the sons of Jacob from the narrative perspective of Naphtali. This inference is substantiated by a passage in which the speaker mentions Bilhah as his mother and Dan as his brother (4Q215 1–3 10). In the extant fragment(s), the work briefly enumerates the marriage and birthing of Jacob’s wives including their ancestry, e.g. Hannah, who is said to be the mother of both Zilpah and Bilhah. Thus the text expands the biblical narrative and the genealogy given there, with the tendency to unite all the wives of Jacob in one ancestral line in order to make the children of Jacob all “descendants of the same ancestral stock.”⁶⁴ The reason for such a reworking of the biblical genealogy is obviously the strife for ethnic homogeneity at a time when Israel’s identity was thought to be endangered.

The work is a biographical or family-related narrative from the perspective of Naphtali, but in the extant portion, there is no hint that it is meant to be a testamentary address. Nor is there any ethical instruction. The only argument for calling the work a “testament” were the parallels in the narrative material with the later Greek *Testament of Naphthali* from the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*.⁶⁵ Michael Stone even points to possible influences on the eleventh century R. Moses of Narbonne and Midrash *Bereshit Rabbati*,⁶⁶ although the way of transmission remains unclear. But if we have to restrict ourselves to the portion preserved in the Qumran library, regardless of possible later expansions, translations or receptions, the genre of the present work cannot be said to be a “testament.” 4Q215 should be classified as an example of “rewritten Bible.”

⁶² Thus M. E. Stone, “The Hebrew Testament of Naphtali,” *JJS* 47 (1996): 311–321; idem, “4QTestament of Naphtali,” in *Qumran Cave 4 XVII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 3* (ed. G. Brooke et al.; DJD 22; Oxford: Clarendon, 1996), 73–82. Cf. *Parabiblical Texts*, 562f.: “Naphtali” (without “testament!”).

⁶³ *Parabiblical Texts*, 562.

⁶⁴ Stone, *DJD XXII*, 75.

⁶⁵ Cf., e. g., G.-W. Nebe, “Qumranica I: Zu veröffentlichten Handschriften aus Höhle 4 von Qumran,” *ZAW* 106 (1994): 307–322, here 315–322.

⁶⁶ See the references by Stone, *DJD XXII*, 74–7 5.

VI. The Visions of Amram (4Q543–549)⁶⁷

A much better manuscript situation is given for the work which was previously also called "Testament"⁶⁸ but is now usually named Visions of Amram.⁶⁹ Six or seven⁷⁰ manuscripts of this work survive. Moreover, the beginning of the text seems to be extant in three manuscripts whose contents overlap (4Q543, 545 and 546), so it can be reconstructed quite well. In the section thereby reconstructed, we have the beginning of the text, including the title "Words of the Vision of Amram, son of Qahat, son of Levi."⁷¹ The wording is:

(1) A Copy of the writing of "The Words of the Vision of Amram, son of Qahat, son of Levi." All that (2) he told his sons and all that he commanded them on the day of his death, in the year one hundred (3) and thirty-six, the year of his death: in the year one hundred (4) and fifty-two of the exile of Israel in Egypt. When the time came (5) upon him, he sent and called to Uzzi'el his youngest brother and gave (6) him Miriam his daughter in marriage when she was thirty years old. And he gave (7) a feast for seven days and ate and drank during the feast and rejoiced. Then (8) when the days of the feast were over, he sent for Aaron (9) his son, who was about twenty years old and he said to him: "Summon me, my son, (10) the messengers, your brothers, from the house...."

Here we can find a large number of features which are characteristic for the beginnings of the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*:

- There is the name of the fictive author or speaker and the title of the work – with the only difference that it is not explicitly called "testament" but "vision," but even the term "copy" (פִּרְשָׁן) is used, which corresponds to the characteristic technical term ἀπογραφή in the Greek *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*.
- There is mention of the addressees, the son Aaron and his brothers, the sons of Amram.
- The imminent death of Amram is mentioned.
- The age of Amram is given, together with a comparative date, related to the sojourn of Israel in Egypt.
- The situation is given: the gathering happens after Amram had given his daughter in marriage, and after the wedding feast.

⁶⁷ See É. Puech, "4Q543–4Q549 4QVisions de 'Amram' ar: Introduction," in *Qumrân Grotte 4 XXII: Textes Araméens, première partie, 4Q529–549* (ed. É. Puech; *DJD* 31; Oxford: Clarendon, 2001), 283–288 and the edition of the manuscripts pp. 289–405.

⁶⁸ Cf. Von Nordheim, *Lehre*, 1:115. See also Beyer, *Texte*, 2:117: "Die Abschiedsrede Amrams."

⁶⁹ Thus Puech, *DJD* XXXI, 282, although he states that it is "incontestablement un testament 338ompare à ceux de Lévi et de Qahat" (p. 282); cf. also *Parabiblical Texts*, 412–443.

⁷⁰ For 4Q549 it is uncertain, whether it belongs to the same work, see Puech, *DJD* XXXI, 399; see also *Parabiblical Texts*, 442–443.

⁷¹ 4Q543 1a–c 1 (cf. *DJD* XXXI, 292).

- The contents of the book are also given in the framework: “all that he told his sons and all that he commanded (פִּקְדָּו) them.” Thus, the whole of the work is characterized as an instruction, a collection of commandments to his sons, i.e. as a “testamentary” text.

There is no need to go into detail on the characteristic type of dualism in this document,⁷² but it should be noted that the vision of two heavenly figures, the one called Malkiresha and the other one – perhaps – Malkizedek or Michael is narrated.⁷³ It was possibly this vision that caused the whole work to be entitled “words of the vision of Amram ...” But there are also other passages in which the patriarch tells stories of his father Qahat.⁷⁴ Apart from this, we also find predictive passages on the coming priesthood of his son Aaron.⁷⁵ There is an opening formula “and now, my sons, hear what ...,”⁷⁶ there is mention of “all the generations of Israel,”⁷⁷ and some passages seem to imply an eschatological outlook. Thus, also the main part of the writing, which is only preserved in numerous small fragments, appears largely in accordance with the form of the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, with the most remarkable difference of the visionary introduction. The end of the work seems not to survive. If 4Q549 is a manuscript of the same work, we might also have a mention of the death of the patriarch.⁷⁸ However, the name Amram is not preserved in 4Q549, although the genealogy could point to this figure.⁷⁹

Thus, with regard to formal criteria, the Visions of Amram might be the work from the Qumran library for which the genre “testament” is most appropriate, although in its title the work is called “words of the vision of Amram ...,” not “(words of the) testament ...”

⁷² Cf. J. Frey, “Different Patterns of Dualism in the Qumran Library,” in *Legal Texts and Legal Issues. Proceedings of the Second Meeting of the International Organization of Qumran Studies, Cambridge 1995* (FS J. M. Baumgarten; eds. M. J. Bemstern, F. García Martínez and J. Kampen; STDJ 25; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 275–335, here 316–322 (in this volume, 243–299, here 281–286).

⁷³ Cf. J. T. Milik, “Milkî- šedeq et Milkî-reša‘ dans les anciens écrits juifs et chrétiens,” *JJS* 23 (1972): 95–144.

⁷⁴ Cf. 4Q544 1; 4Q545 la–b ii 11–19.

⁷⁵ 4Q545 4; 4Q546 12.

⁷⁶ 4Q546 14 4.

⁷⁷ 4Q548 l ii–2 6.

⁷⁸ 4Q549 2 6: “departed to his eternal home.”

⁷⁹ Cf. the commentaries by Puech, *DJD XXXI*, 404–405.

VII. The So-Called Testament of Qahat (4Q542)⁸⁰

Another work, ascribed to Qahat, Amram's father, has always been viewed in close connection with the Visions of Amram and the so-called "*Testament of Levi*"⁸¹ or *Aramaic Levi Document*.⁸² But in contrast with the Visions of Amram, the beginning of this work and its title are not preserved, nor is the name of the speaker explicitly mentioned. But the patriarch is obviously Qahat, the son of Levi, whose ancestors are enumerated repeatedly (1 i 8, 11), and who addresses not only his "sons," but also directly Amram as his "son" (1 ii 9). After an initial blessing (4Q542 1 i 1–4), there is an opening formula "and now, my sons ..." (1 i 4), with an exhortation to keep the inheritance of Abraham, Jacob, Levi and the speaker (1 i 8), an inheritance which particularly implies priesthood (1 i 13). Apart from these instructions, the text contains the promise of blessings for all generations together with the announcement of judgment and especially of the passing away of the wicked (1 ii 5, 8).

This work, as far as we can see, seems to be more strongly oriented towards exhortation. There is no hint to any vision or heavenly tablets, but a stronger stress on the conduct of the progeny and on the future or eschatological fate of the just and the wicked. Although the death of Qahat is not explicitly mentioned, the testamentary character of the address is relatively clear. Since a testament can easily include blessings, words of praise or eschatological predictions, the classification of the work among the "texts of mixed genre" is in my view questionable: the work could equally be considered among the "testaments."⁸³

VIII. The So-Called "Unidentified Testament" or "Apocryphon of Levi" (4Q540–541)

It is not possible to resume the extensive debate on the manuscripts and history of the Aramaic Levi texts (1Q21; 4Q213–214 and 4Q540–541).⁸⁴ For the present discussion I assume the decision of the DJD editors to separate the

⁸⁰ See É. Puech, "4QTestament de Qahat ar," in *Qumrân Grotte 4 XXII: Textes Araméens, première partie, 4Q529–549* (ed. É. Puech; DJD 31, Oxford: Clarendon, 2001), 257–282; idem, "Le testament de Qahat en araméen de la grotte 4 (4QTQah)," *RevQ* 15 (1991): 23–54.

⁸¹ Thus the early naming of that work, see below n. 85.

⁸² Cf. also the mention of these three patriarchs in the title of the Visions of Amram.

⁸³ Thus Puech, *DJD XXXI*, 258–260.

⁸⁴ Cf., most recently, the edition and commentary: *The Aramaic Levi Document: edition, translation, commentary* (ed. J. C. Greenfield, M. Stone, and E. Eshel; SVTP 19; Leiden: Brill, 2004), and the monograph by H. Drawnel, *An Aramaic Wisdom Text from Qumran. A New Interpretation of the Levi Document* (JSJ.S 86; Leiden: Brill, 2004).

work represented by the two manuscripts 4Q540–541 from the Aramaic Levi Document represented by 1Q21 and 4Q213–214.⁸⁵

The work which is attested by the two manuscripts 4Q540 and 4Q541 was provisionally named 4QAha (i.e., an “Aharonic” work) and is now edited by Émile Puech under the title “4QApocryphe de Lévi^{a-b?}.” The editors of the *Dead Sea Scrolls Reader* cautiously call it “unidentified testament,” but consider it to be a “testament,” following the list by Lange and Mittmann-Richert in *DJD XXXIX*.⁸⁶ But, due to the fragmentary state of preservation, things remain rather uncertain.

In most of the fragments, the text appears to be a speech of a patriarchal figure. No title is preserved, nor is there the name of Levi or another one of the fathers, although one might conclude from 4Q541 24 ii 5 that the “father” who is speaking, could probably be Levi.⁸⁷ The patriarch seems to narrate some events, possibly a vision in which he receives a writing,⁸⁸ and is in dialogue with some other (heavenly?) figure.⁸⁹ Other fragments seem to predict future events. Some fragments deal with a particular salvific figure, an eschatological priest who is a mediator of wisdom,⁹⁰ “shall make atonement for all those of his generation”⁹¹ and bring about an eschatological state of everlasting light.⁹² If we take these data together, we have the narration of a patriarch who tells a vision (in which he probably receives a writing), predicts future events, which are at least partly related to priesthood and cult, and contains the announcement of an eschatological figure of sapiential and, especially, priestly character. Thus, a certain testamentary character of the speech can hardly be denied, although there is neither mention of the death of Levi nor of the situation of his speaking his final words. Moreover, the hortatory character of the speech is less clear than, e.g., in the *Testament of Qahat*. Therefore, the classification of the text as a “testament” is still uncertain and

⁸⁵ Cf. J. T. Milik, “1Q21. Testament de Lévi,” in *Qumran Cave I* (ed. D. Barthélemy and J. T. Milik; DJD I; Oxford: Clarendon 1955), 87–91; the edition of 4Q213, 213a, 213b, 214, 214a, and 214b: M. E. Stone and J. C. Greenfield, “Aramaic Levi Document,” in *Qumran Cave 4 XVII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 3* (ed. G. Brooke et al.; DJD 22; Oxford: Clarendon, 1996), 1–72, and of 4Q540 and 541 by É. Puech, “Apocryphe de Lévi,” in *Qumrân Grotte 4 XXII: Textes Araméens, première partie, 4Q529–549* (ed. É. Puech; DJD 31, Oxford: Clarendon, 2001). Beyer, in his edition, names both texts Das Testament Levis I” and “Das Testament Levis II” (*Texte*, 2:104–114).

⁸⁶ Cf. *Parabiblical Texts*, 444–453; Lange and Mittmann-Richert, “Annotated List,” 129, name it “4QapocrLevi^{a-b?} ar” (as does Puech in *DJD XXXI*) and list it under the genre “testaments.”

⁸⁷ Cf. Beyer, *Texte*, 2:111.

⁸⁸ 4Q541 2 i 6.

⁸⁹ 4Q541 2 i 9.

⁹⁰ 4Q541 9 i 2; cf. 4Q541 7 4: “Then the books of wis[dom] shall be opened [...].”

⁹¹ 4Q541 9 i 2.

⁹² 4Q541 9 i 3–4.

was largely suggested on the mere basis of some parallels in contents between the eschatological priest and *Testament of Levi* 18 from the *Greek Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*. But since a later adoption of the text does not tell anything certain about the genre of the "Vorlage," we should continue to call the work represented by 4Q540–541 "*Apocryphon of Levi*," rather than "*Testament of Levi*."

IX. The Aramaic Levi Document

The last work to be discussed here is the work represented by the manuscripts 1Q21 and 4Q213–214 (now divided up into 4Q213, 213b, 214, 214a, and 214b).⁹³ For this work the debate goes back to the beginning of the 20th century⁹⁴ when the first Aramaic fragments of a work were published that appeared to be close to the Greek *Testament of Levi* from the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*.⁹⁵ Due to those parallels and the alleged influence of the Aramaic work on the Greek composition, the work was often simply called "(Fragments of a) *Testament of Levi*,"⁹⁶ and the term continued to be used even after the discovery of the Qumran fragments, e.g., by Milik in his edition of the manuscript from Cave 1, but also in his announcements of the Cave 4 manuscripts.⁹⁷ The name was later changed by Greenfield and Stone during their editorial work on the Cave 4 fragments,⁹⁸ presumably due to the improved view of the differences between the Aramaic composition as a whole and the Greek *Testament of Levi*. Since about 1990 the neutral name *Aramaic Levi Document* has become the standard designation.⁹⁹

⁹³ Cf. Stone and Greenfield, *DJD XXII*, 1–72.

⁹⁴ On the history of research, see Drawnel, *An Aramaic Wisdom Text*, 4–14.

⁹⁵ H. L. Pass and J. Arendzen, "Fragments of an Aramaic Text of the Testament of Levi," *JQR* 12 (1900): 651–661.

⁹⁶ Cf. also M. de Jonge, "The Fragments of a Jewish Testament of Levi," in *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Study of their Text, Composition and Origin* (Van Gorcum's Theologische Bibliotheek 25; Assen: Van Gorcum, 1975), 129–131.

⁹⁷ Cf. Milik, *DJD I*, 87; idem, "Le Testament de Lévi en araméen. Fragment de la grotte 4 de Qumrân," *RB* 62 (1955): 398–399. Cf. still the first article by J. C. Greenfield and M. E. Stone, "Remarks on the Aramaic Testament of Levi from the Geniza," *RB* 86 (1979): 216–230.

⁹⁸ Cf. J. C. Greenfield and M. E. Stone, "The Aramaic and Greek Fragments of a Levi Document: Appendix III," in *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Commentary* (ed. H. W. Hollander and M. de Jonge; SVTP 8; Leiden: Brill, 1985), 457–469; idem, "Two Notes on the Aramaic Levi Document," in *Of Scribes and Scrolls. Studies on the Hebrew Bible, Intertestamental Judaism, and Christian Origins presented to John Strugnell* (ed. Harold W. Attridge et al.; College Theology Society Resources in Religion 5; Lanham, Md: University Press of America, 1990), 153–161.

⁹⁹ It was first used in Greenfield and Stone, "Two Notes on the Aramaic Levi Document."

The change in the name reflects an advanced view of the literary genre. In earlier research, and strongly supported by Milik, the work was regarded to be a testament, closely connected with the Visions of Amram and the *Testament of Qahat*. Some doubts were already expressed by Christoph Burchard in 1965.¹⁰⁰ In the meantime, there is a “growing scholarly consensus that the Aramaic work is not a testament, although it contains testamentary features that later appear in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs.”¹⁰¹ Thus, in the classified list by Lange and Mittmann-Richert the *Aramaic Levi Document* is now listed under the very broad label: “Stories Based on Biblical Items.”¹⁰²

I cannot engage here the issues concerning the reconstruction and arrangement of the Qumran fragments, which is largely dependent on the reconstruction of much later manuscripts.¹⁰³ But if the reconstruction as given by Henryk Drawnel can be taken as a plausible starting point,¹⁰⁴ the document may be seen to include a large number of genres, including a prayer, a vision, the narration of different events of his life, an extensive sapiential instruction on various topics, and a genealogical and autobiographical tale. One of those elements may be a kind of farewell discourse,¹⁰⁵ put at the end of an autobiographical tale and introduced by a narrative quite similar to the formal introduction of the texts from the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*.¹⁰⁶ Levi speaks in the first person singular, mentioning his age of 137 years (according to Exod 6:16) and even his death (*ALD* 81), which seems to have happened before he starts to instruct his children. His address can be classified as a Wisdom Poem,¹⁰⁷ and leads to some perspectives for the future. If we can assume the same textual sequence for the Qumran texts (which do not cover all the parts extant in the medieval manuscripts), the formal introduction of the sapiential “poem” or instruction is remarkable. In contrast to what we can find in the Greek *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, the age of the patriarch is not mentioned in a narrative introduction, but by the speaker himself, and, even more remarkably, he also narrates his own death:

¹⁰⁰ C. Burchard, “Review of Marinus de Jonge, *Testamenta XII Patriarcharum*: Edited according to Cambridge University Library MS Ff. 1.24 fol. 1.24 203a–262b,” *RevQ* 5 (1965): 281–284, here 283 n. 2; cf. the reference in Drawnel, *Wisdom Text*, 86. See also von Nordheim, *Lehre*, 1:108: “Verses 81–33 in the middle part resemble the formal elements of the initial frame of the testaments examined so far, but it cannot be determined with certainty whether they actually qualify the present speech as the speech of a dying person.”

¹⁰¹ Drawnel, *Wisdom Text*, 87.

¹⁰² Lange and Mittmann-Richert, “Annotated List,” 122.

¹⁰³ See the discussion in Drawnel, *Wisdom Text*, 32–55.

¹⁰⁴ Cf. the table in Drawnel, *Wisdom Text*, 97–98, and the text pp. 98–204.

¹⁰⁵ Drawnel calls it a “Wisdom Poem.”

¹⁰⁶ This was already mentioned by von Nordheim, *Lehre*, 1:108.

¹⁰⁷ Drawnel, *Wisdom Text*, 318.

"And I saw my sons of the third generation before I died."¹⁰⁸ Thus, the pseudepigraphy is made clearly visible, and the patriarch does not speak from the perspective of imminent death but rather from a perspective or state after his death: This "is an important indication for the literary genre of the whole Levi composition. He does not address his children lying on his deathbed, a characteristic of the testamentary literary form. He speaks from another perspective, of one who is already dead"¹⁰⁹ or, one might add, of one who is already glorified.

The observation that in the Greek composition of the *Testament of Levi* (19:4) the mention of Levi's death is put at the end and transferred to the third person singular shows that the composers of this work had to change an important feature of the older tradition to adjust it to their literary purpose and the genre they wanted to create.¹¹⁰ Moreover, the following instruction (*ALD* 82ff) is not placed in the year of Levi's death but in another situation, when he was 118 years old and his brother Joseph died. This does not preclude that the speech has a "testamentary" character, it is, however, not a farewell discourse or an address of the dying patriarch.

So we can conclude that the *Aramaic Levi Document* provides elements that are quite close to the later form of the "testamentary discourse" without exactly matching that literary design. As a whole, the work is not a literary testament but a composite work with a complicated communication structure and authorial fiction which deserves detailed analysis and reflection and differs considerably from the genre as customary in the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*.

D. Conclusions and Further Perspectives

(a) This brief analysis of the numerous alleged "testaments" from the Qumran library has shown that at least some of the documents discussed were called "testament" or included among the range of "Testamentenliteratur" without sufficient textual reason.

Not every text that mentions one of the sons of Jacob is, for that reason, a testament. This is quite clear in the case of the two Hebrew manuscripts which were unduly said to represent a *Testament of Judah* (3Q7 and 4Q484), although there are only very few words readable, and among them—quite accidentally—the names Levi and Issachar. We simply cannot know any more what those works were like and which literary genre they belonged to.

¹⁰⁸ *Aramaic Levi Document* 81, according to Drawnel, *Wisdom Text*, 157.

¹⁰⁹ Drawnel, *Wisdom Text*, 318.

¹¹⁰ Thus Drawnel, *Wisdom Text*, 318.

The designation “testament” should also be abandoned (as several scholars already have suggested) for the Hebrew document represented by 4Q215, where the story of the birth of Jacob’s sons is retold from the perspective of Naphtali, but the genre “testament” is not suggested by any of the textual elements.

The same is true for the Aramaic document that was edited as a *Testament of Judah*, but most clearly a work pseudonymously attributed to Benjamin who retells the story of Joseph and his brothers, without the characteristic elements of a literary testament. It is unclear, of course, whether the preserved parts are only a small portion of a larger work, however, we can only draw conclusions from the extant parts of the text, and for them a testamentary character cannot be substantiated.

Quite questionable is also the classification as a “testament” for the so-called “*Testament of Jacob*”: (4Q537) which is – in its preserved portions – the narrative of a vision Jacob had at Bethel. Although the address – or the reading from the tablets given to him – provides a prophetic perspective on the future life of Jacob and his progeny, including “eschatological” elements, it remains unclear how the autobiographical narrative or the narrative of the vision is situated. A setting on the deathbed is not suggested by any textual element. So the work might rather be called “Jacob at Bethel,” “Vision of Jacob” or “Apocryphon of Jacob.”

Finally, following a growing consensus in scholarship, the *Aramaic Levi Document* should not be called a “testament,” although parts of it – especially the last section – show some elements of a testamentary address, which is, however, not situated in the situation of the death of the patriarch.

(b) On the other hand, the clearest example of the genre “literary testament” in the Qumran library is the document called Visions of Amram. Here we can find not only the closest parallels to the openings of the testamentary works collected in the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, but also a hortatory intention of the address and an eschatological outlook. The lack of the title “testament” and the use of a slightly different title is no reason to deny the testamentary character of this work. But it is only the fact that the beginning of the text is preserved, which gives us the opportunity to get a rather firm view on the intention of the whole work.

Due to the fragmentary character of most of the manuscripts, the certainty of classification is lower with regard to other works, and we always must consider the possibility that some important features of a text, especially in its opening part, are simply lost. Therefore we should not be too rigid in excluding the testamentary character for all texts where, e.g., the situation of the address or the impending death of the patriarch is not (anymore) extant. A testamentary character is also rather clear for the *Testament of Qahat* (4Q542), and it is plausible for the “Unidentified Testament” or *Apocryphon of Levi* (4Q540–541), although in both works, the situation of the address is

not preserved, nor is there any hint to the closeness of the death of the patriarch. And, although the situation of death is not indicated, the hortatory character of the address to the "sons," together with retrospective parts might justify a cautious attribution of the text represented by 4Q539, the so-called *Testament of Joseph* (or *Apocryphon of Joseph ar*), to the genre "testament."

(c) The case of the *Aramaic Levi Document* shows that testamentary elements (at least in a wider sense) can be included into a macro-genre that differs from the genre of the "testament." On the other hand, "testaments" might encompass other genres, such as visions, prayers, poems, hymns, etc. The latter seems to be most obvious for the *Visions of Amram*, which are designed quite clearly as a "testament," situated in the time of the death of the patriarch, addressing his progeny, yet even shaped in a manner which is very close to the openings of the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*. But this "testament" contains the narrative of an impressive vision which could cause the whole work being called "words of the visions of Amram"

(d) The present paper intends to provide only a generic comparison, not an analysis of literary dependence. Therefore, the numerous parallels between some of the Qumran texts discussed and the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* regarding narrative details and sequences or even particular wordings could not be discussed here. Such parallels may point to sources or earlier stages of the material of the later *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, but they cannot make a case for the correspondence of genre. Earlier research has often concluded from the genre of the later texts (i.e., the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*) to the genre of the earlier documents. But even if some kind of reception or adoption of the earlier materials could be demonstrated, there is no reason to conclude that the earlier text represented the same genre. The replacement of the death of Levi in *Testament of Levi* 19:4 over against *Aramaic Levi Document* 81 (according to the medieval manuscripts) points to the problems most clearly.

(e) The *Visions of Amram* shows that the form of the literary testament, as an address to the sons, in the situation of the death, with the name of the patriarch and his age given in the opening, including narrative of events of the patriarch's life and glimpses to the (eschatological) future, but focused on a hortatory intention, was already present in the early Aramaic texts preserved in the Qumran library. The *Visions of Amram* and the other "testaments," at least the *Testament of Qahat* and possibly also some others, show that the genre was developed in Jewish circles long before the composition of the Greek *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* or its different parts.

(f) The age of some of the manuscripts, especially of the *Visions of Amram*, and the non-sectarian character of all the works discussed points to the insight that the development of the genre "testament" predates the constitu-

tion of the “Qumran community” or the *yahad*.¹¹¹ The form of the Visions of Amram (and possibly also of the related texts ascribed to Qahat and Levi) was developed in circles with priestly interests probably in the third century BCE. There is no reason to assume that the literary form of the *Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs* should be developed only late in Christian circles. Of course, the problem of the origin of the *Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs* cannot be discussed here. However, against the suggestion that the literary framework or even the composition as a whole is merely late and Christian,¹¹² one cannot only infer that Christian interpolations are not very numerous and rather clearly identifiable but, moreover, that the links with other Second Temple texts are so tight that not only parts of the material but also the literary design is strongly preformed within Jewish circles of this period.

(g) The early “testaments” (and with them the characteristic type of dualism as represented by the Visions of Amram and the *Testament of Qahat*) have influenced the thought of the Qumran group, but it is also quite probable that such a type of thought came to be known and was then, transmitted by wider circles in Early Judaism. There is no reason to assume that the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* are shaped by Essene or Qumran sectarian thought. Rather, they adopt elements from documents which were created in a pre-sectarian milieu, transmitted not only by the Qumran group, but also in wider circles, although they happen to be preserved only within the Qumran library.¹¹³

(h) The origin of the particular genre of the literary testament as developed in Second Temple Judaism and adopted in the early Christian tradition is, therefore, not the tradition of the patriarchal blessings in Genesis, nor the book of Deuteronomy, but a type of priestly wisdom which was shaped in a particular literary form as testaments of the heroes of the priestly line, Levi, Qahat, and Amram. Apart from the interest in purity and priestly matters, it is characterized by a specific kind of cosmic dualism and by elements of an apocalyptic eschatology. The later adoption of the genre has reduced the priestly elements and strengthened the ethical aspects, as can be seen in the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*.

Thus the documents from the Qumran library with more or less “testamentary” character ascribed to Amram, Qahat, Levi, eventually Joseph or even other figures provide insights not only into the prehistory of some of the

¹¹¹ None of the texts discussed shows any sign of Qumran “sectarian” provenance.

¹¹² This is the view influentially suggested by Marinus de Jonge, cf., e.g., M. de Jonge, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. A Study of their Text, Composition and Origins* (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1953); idem, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. A Critical Edition of the Greek text* (PVTG 1, Leiden: Brill, 1978); idem, *Studies on the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. Text and Interpretation* (ed. H. J. de Jonge· SVTP 3· Leiden: Brill, 1975).

¹¹³ On this, cf. Frey, “Different patterns of dualism,” 334–335 (in this volume, 298).

traditions later found in the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, but also an enlarged basis for reconstructing the history and background of this genre within early Judaism.

10. The New Jerusalem Text in Its Historical and Traditio-Historical Context*

The Aramaic composition commonly called Description of the New Jerusalem (1Q32, 2Q24, 4Q554, 4Q554a[?], 4Q555, 5Q15, and 11Q18)¹ is one of the most interesting texts preserved in the Qumran library. In this document, a human visionary is led around a city by an angelic being.² The angel

* This paper was written in 1997 for the Jerusalem conference celebrating the 50th anniversary of the Qumran discoveries. It has been slightly updated, especially with regard to the now extant official publication of the 4Q and 11Q manuscripts, but the argument has been left mostly untouched. I am particularly indebted to my former Tübingen colleague Armin Lange (now Vienna) for sharing some then unpublished work with me and for a number of further valuable suggestions and discussions.

¹ Whether the document 4Q232 represents a Hebrew translation of the Description of the New Jerusalem (as suggested Milik in *The Books of Enoch. Aramaic Fragments of Qumrân Cave 4* [Oxford: Clarendon, 1976], 59) remains totally uncertain, because there is only one small fragment of the manuscript.

² For the publications of the different manuscripts, see J. T. Milik, “‘Description de la Jérusalem Nouvelle’ (?) (Pl. XXXI),” in D. Barthélémy and J. T. Milik, *Qumran Cave I* (DJD I; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955), 134–136 and pl. XXXI; M. Baillet, “Fragments araméens de Qumrân 2: description de la Jérusalem Nouvelle,” *RB* 62 (1955): 222–245, pl. I–II (preliminary edition of 2Q24); idem, “24. Description de la Jérusalem Nouvelle,” in M. Baillet, J. T. Milik, and R. de Vaux, *Les ‘petites grottes’ de Qumrân* (DJD III; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962), 84–89 and pl. XVI (official edition of 2Q24); J. T. Milik, “15. Description de la Jérusalem Nouvelle,” in Baillet, Milik, and de Vaux, *Les ‘petites grottes’ de Qumrân*, 184–193 and pl. XL–XLI (official edition of 5Q15). For 11Q18, see F. García Martínez, E. Tigchelaar, and A. S. van der Woude, “11QNew Jerusalem ar,” in *Qumran Cave 11 II: 11Q2–18, 11Q 20–31, DJD 23* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998), 305–356; É. Puech, “Jérusalem Nouvelle,” in *Qumrân Grotte 4 XXVII: Textes Araméens Deuxième Partie 4Q550–4Q575a, 4Q580–4Q587* (DJD 37; Oxford: Clarendon, 2009), 91–152. See also the preliminary publications of the manuscripts: For 11Q18, see B. Jongeling, “Publication provisoire d’un fragment provenant de la grotte 11 de Qumrân (11QJér Nouv ar),” *JSJ* 1 (1970): 58–64; idem, “Note additionnelle,” *JSJ* 1 (1970), 185f.; F. García Martínez, “The Last Surviving Columns of 11QNJ,” in *The Scriptures and the Scrolls. Studies in Honour of A. S. van der Woude on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday* (ed. F. García Martínez, A. Hilhorst, and C. J. Labuschagne; VTSup 49; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1992), 178–192, pl. 3–9. The official edition of 11Q18 is now published in DJD XXIII, 305–335, pl. XXVXL, LIII. For 4Q554, see J. Starcky, “Jérusalem et les manuscrits de la Mer Morte,” *Le Monde de la Bible* 1 (1977): 38–40; É. Puech, *La Croissance des Esséniens en la vie future: Immortalité, résurrection, vie éternelle?* (2 Vols.; EBib N. S. 21/22; Paris: Gabalda, 1993), 2:591–596; R. Eisenman and M. Wise, *Jesus und die Urchristen. Die Qumran-*

measures the walls and gates of the town and the streets and blocks of houses within, and the visionary records all the measurements, thereby precisely describing a detailed plan. The name “Jerusalem” is not attested in the preserved fragments.³ However, the description of the temple and cultic ceremonies, and especially the formal and terminological dependence on Ezekiel 40–48 suggest that the city depicted in the document can be none other than Jerusalem.⁴ The designation “New Jerusalem,” then, obviously borrowed from the assumed parallel in Rev 21:2 (cf. Rev 3:12; *T. Dan.* 5:12), seems to be acceptable, even if it is not easy to decide whether the temple city described is to be conceived of as eschatological (“new”), heavenly, or ideal and utopian in a more general sense.⁵

Rollen entschlüsselt (München: Bertelsmann, 1992), 45–52, pl. 3; cf. additionally the photographs in R. Eisenman and J. M. Robinson, *A Facsimile Edition of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (2 Vols.; Washington D.C.: Biblical Archaeology Society, 1991), pl. 1512, 1536. The identification of some parts of 4Q554 as a separate manuscript named 4Q554a is proposed by É. Puech, “A propos de la Jérusalem Nouvelle d’après les manuscrits de la mer Morte,” *Semitica* 43–44 (1995): 89–102. See also the small fragments of 4Q555 in op. cit., pl. 1541 (middle right). The published manuscripts are conveniently collected and translated in K. Beyer, *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984), 214–222; idem, *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer. Ergänzungsband* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1994), 95–104; J. Maier, *Die Tempelrolle vom Toten Meer und das “Neue Jerusalem”* (3rd ed.; UTB 829; München: Reinhard, 1997), 316–339. Cf. also comprehensively L. Di Tommaso, *The Dead Sea New Jerusalem Text: Contents and Contexts* (TSAJ 110; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005)

³ But cf. Ezek 40–48, or even the *Temple Scroll*, where Jerusalem is not named either, but only circumscribed by a variety of phrases such as “my city,” “the city of the temple,” “the city of my temple,” etc. (see F. García Martínez, “The ‘New Jerusalem’ and the Future Temple of the Manuscripts from Qumran,” in *Qumran and Apocalyptic. Studies on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran* [STDJ 9; Leiden, Köln and New York: E. J. Brill, 1992], 180–213, here 182).

⁴ For the terminological borrowings, see S. Fujita, *The Temple Theology of the Qumran Sect and the Book of Ezekiel: The Relationship to Jewish Literature of the Last Two Centuries B.C.* (Diss. Princeton, 1970), 306–315. On the basis of the manuscripts from Caves 1, 2, and 5, Fujita demonstrates that the *New Jerusalem Text* uses numerous architectural terms which correspond exactly to the Targumic renderings of the terms from Ezekiel’s vision.

⁵ There is no clear indication that the temple described is conceived of as a heavenly entity. The mention of priests (and not angels) celebrating the cultic ceremonies points to earthly realities. That the city and its temple are seen as eschatological entities might be suggested by the mention of an eschatological battle in 4Q554 2 iii. However, the relationship between the existence of the temple and the final subjugation of the Israel’s enemies remains uncertain. Are the temple and the city to be built only after the final battle, or should they exist even before? The latter might be suggested by the fact that the column preceding the mention of the final battle in 4Q554 already deals with the description of the city and its towers. If this is correct, the temple is, strictly speaking, not an eschatological

Even though the copies from Caves 1 and 2 were published as early as 1955, long before the discovery of the *Temple Scroll*, the text has not attracted much scholarly attention up to now:⁶ Two or three of the six or seven manuscripts still await final publication, and except for Waltraut Bernhard's unpublished dissertation from 1970 there was no book-length treatment of the *New Jerusalem Text* until 1997.⁷ Some tentative attempts have been made to arrange the preserved fragments in a plausible text sequence,⁸ but many prob-

entity belonging to the "new creation" (cf. *Jub.* 1:26–27, 29 or *1 Enoch* 90:29), but rather the temple of an expected future era, or more generally, an ideal or utopian temple.

⁶ The contributions to research on the text are not very numerous: Besides the preliminary and final editions of the manuscripts mentioned in n. 2 above, see J. Greenfield, "The Small Caves of Qumran," *JAOS* 89 (1969): 130–135; J. Licht, "An Ideal Town Plan from Qumran: The Description of the New Jerusalem," *IEJ* 29 (1979): 45–59; M. Wise, *A Critical Study of the Temple Scroll from Qumran Cave 11* (SAOC 49; Chicago: The Oriental Institute, 1990), 64–86; M. Broshi, "Visionary Architecture and Town Planning in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *Time to Prepare the Way in the Wilderness*, 9–22; F. García Martínez, "The 'New Jerusalem' and the Future Temple"; idem, "The Temple Scroll and the New Jerusalem," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years*, 2:431–460; and M. Chyutin, "The New Jerusalem: Ideal City," in *DSD* 1 (1994), 71–97.

⁷ W. Bernhardt, *Die kultur- und religionsgeschichtliche Bedeutung des Qumranfragmentes 5Q15* (Diss. Jena, 1970). The dissertation was written under the supervision of the late Prof. Rudolf Meyer. The author gives a detailed commentary on the text preserved in 5Q15 (pp. 11–80), compares the city plan depicted here with ancient oriental and hellenistic city-plans, discusses the possible influence of ancient city planning on the conception from 5Q15 (pp. 81–128), and deals with the city from 5Q15 within the context of the expectation of an eschatological Jerusalem (pp. 129–151). Finally she evaluates the document as an example of the inner-worldly eschatology of the Zadokite circles in Qumran (pp. 152–155). In 1997 the architect Michael Chyutin published his study *The New Jerusalem Scroll from Qumran: A Comprehensive Reconstruction* (JSPSup 25; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), where he claims to provide the first comprehensive reconstruction. In fact, however, he integrates all known fragments into a single entity without discussing the material aspects of the different manuscripts and the problems of locating the single fragments, so that the result is actually a new text, not an edition or reconstruction of the different manuscripts. Therefore, this attempt of a non-specialist in text reconstruction should be used – if ever – with considerable caution; cf. the detailed criticism of E. Tigchelaar in his review in *JSJ* 30 (1998): 453–457.

⁸ See mainly M. Wise, *A Critical Study of the Temple Scroll from Qumran Cave 11*, 66. Wise suggests following a constant direction of movement from outside the Temple City to the inner court. Thus his sequence runs as follows:

1. 4Q col. i – outside the Temple City
2. 4Q col. ii–iii / 5Q15 i – second column of the text, within the Temple City (2Q24 i = 5Q15 i 01–2)
3. 4Q col. iv–v / 5Q15 ii–iii – within the Temple City; (the reconstruction of 5Q15 ii is quite uncertain)
4. 1Q32 xiv–xvi (with the other 1Q fragments?) – in the inner court
5. 2Q23 iii – the table of incense, within the inner court
6. 2Q24 iv – the ritual of the shewbread, in the inner court (11QNJ 1–7 = 2Q24 iv 8–15)

lems remain unsolvable, at least so long as we do not have a material reconstruction of the manuscripts according to Hartmut Stegemann's method.⁹ From the number of preserved fragments such a reconstruction might be possible at least for the copy from Cave 11.¹⁰ At the present state of publication and reconstruction, I can only discuss a few introductory issues concerning the historical and tradition-historical location of the text.

A. Form and Genre of the New Jerusalem Text

First of all, there is the question of form and genre of the text. Even though we do not know the beginning and end of the text, usually the best markers of genre, we can classify the text broadly as a narrative description of visionary

7. 2Q24 v–viii – the altar and its sanctum; the dimensions of the inner court(?).”

Wise's suggestions do not yet include the text of 11Q18, except for the column published by Jongeling (“Publication provisoire d'un fragment provenant de la grotte 11 de Qumrân [11QJér Nouv ar]).” A part of these fragments has been published by F. García Martínez (“The Last Surviving Columns”). They show that a relatively large portion of the document contains the description of cultic ceremonies and most probably the sanctuary as well, but up to the present the text sequence in this part of the document is unclear.

⁹ See H. Stegemann, “Methods for the Reconstruction of Scrolls from Scattered Fragments,” in *Archaeology and History in the Dead Sea Scrolls: The New York University Conference in Memory of Yigael Yadin* (ed. L. H. Schiffman; Sheffield: JSOT, 1990), 189–221; idem, “How to Connect Dead Sea Scroll Fragments,” *BRev* 4 (1988): 24–29, here 43; see also idem, “The Material Reconstruction of the Hodayot,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls – 50 Years After Their Discovery 1947 – 1997. Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20–25, 1997, Jerusalem* (ed. L. H. Schiffman, E. Tov, and J. C. VanderKam; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2000), 272–84. For the mathematical details, cf. D. Stoll, “Die Schriftrollen vom Toten Meer: mathematisch: oder Wie kann man einer Rekonstruktion Gestalt verleihen?” in *Qumranstudien. Vorträge und Beiträge auf dem internationalen Treffen der Society of Biblical Literature, Münster, 25.–26. Juli 1993* (ed. H.-J. Fabry, A. Lange, and H. Lichtenberger; Schriften des Institutum Judaicum Delitzschianum 4; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996), 215–218. The fruitfulness of the method is documented, e.g., by the reconstructions of the manuscripts of the *Midrash on Eschatology* (4QMidrEschat^{a,b}) by A. Steudel (*Der Midrasch zur Eschatologie aus der Qumrange-meinde [4QMidrEschat^{a,b}]. Materielle Rekonstruktion, Textbestand, Gattung und traditionsgeschichtliche Einordnung des durch 4Q174 [“Florilegium”] und 4Q177 [“CatenaA”] repräsentierten Werkes aus den Qumranfunden* [STDJ 13; Leiden: Brill, 1994]), and of the 4QS documents by S. Metso (*The Textual Development of the Qumran Community Rule* [STDJ 21; Leiden: Brill, 1997]).

¹⁰ See the information given in F. García Martínez, “The Last Surviving Columns,” 178ff., and J. P. van der Ploeg, “Les manuscrits de la grotte XI de Qumrân,” *RevQ* 12 (1985–87): 3–15, here 14, where the process of unrolling is described. But even the editors of the volume DJD XXXIII (see n. 2 above) did not succeed in reconstructing the original sequence of the extant fragments because of the specific problems of this manuscript. See now the account of the difficulties in DJD XXIII, 305–308.

revelation. This is evident from the repeated use of visionary terminology, mainly phrases with *חזיה*, also frequent in the description of dream visions in the Aramaic portions of Daniel and other visionary texts.¹¹ The human visionary is represented by the 1st person singular, he reports what he did,¹² or saw,¹³ and what the angel did,¹⁴ or said, for example that he invited him to take a look at something,¹⁵ or showed him certain subjects.¹⁶ By repeated use of such phrases, the author retains the narrative fiction that everything described in his text – the city, the temple, and the cultic ceremonies – is part of the visionary revelation, transmitted to the human narrator by an angelic mediator during a visionary journey.

Thus far, the *New Jerusalem Text* formally corresponds to Ezekiel's temple vision Ezek 40–48 (cf. also Zech 2:5–9).¹⁷ The visionary terminology, however, seems to be more frequent in our text than in Ezek 40–48, and it is most clearly paralleled in the Aramaic records of Daniel's dream visions, or

¹¹ Dan 2:26, 31, 34, 41, 43, 45; 3:25, 4:2, 6, 7, 10, 15, 17, 20; 5:5, 7:1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 9, 11, 13, 21. Cf. also Enoch's vision in *1 Enoch* 89:2, 3, [7], the visions of the Giants in the Book of Giants (4QEnGiants^b 1 II 6), the *Testament of Amram* (4Q546 2 1), the introduction to Abraham's dream vision in the *Genesis Apocryphon* (1QGenAp XIX 14) and also Noah's record of visions 1QGenAp VI 11, 14 (which presumably belongs to a *Book of the Words of Noah* [cf. 1QGenAp V 29; see now the preliminary edition by M. Morgenstern, E. Qimron, and D. Sivan, "The Hitherto Unpublished Columns of the Genesis Apocryphon," *AbrN* 33 [1995]: 30–54). In the Aramaic Book of the Watchers (*1 Enoch* 14:[2], 4, [8]) and in the *Aramaic Levi Document* (4Q213a II 15) *חזיה* is used to designate the vision during a heavenly journey. For the information in this section am strongly indebted to Armin Lange for some important hints concerning the visionary terminology and the formulaic use of *חזיה* in visionary texts. Unfortunately, his article "חזיה" (and also the articles "הלם" and "פשר") originally scheduled for in the long delayed Aramaic volume of the *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament* were not included in the now published volume *Aramäisches Wörterbuch* (ed. H. Gzella; vol. 9 of *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament*; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2016), where the respective articles are written by H. Gzella ("חזיה" pp. 258–63; "הלם", pp. 281–86) and Eibert Tigchelaar ("פשר", pp. 612–16).

¹² See, e.g., 2Q24 iv 11, 15, 17.

¹³ See, e.g., in the document 11Q18 the respective phrases 11Q18 I 6–7 (see F. García Martínez, "The Last Surviving Columns," 192) or *ואחזי אני* in 11Q18 VI 1 (p. 186).

¹⁴ It is most frequently said that the angel "measured" (2Q24 iii 2; 4Q554 1 i 16, 20, 22; 1 ii 7, 9 10, 18, 21; 1 iii 15; 5Q15 1 i 17; 1 ii 12 [and also very badly preserved in 5Q15 frags. 10 and 13]), but also that he brought the visionary to a certain place (4Q554 1 ii 12; 1 iii 16; 5Q15 1 i 18; 1 ii 6).

¹⁵ See 11Q18 V 5 (cf. F. García Martínez, "The Last Surviving Columns," 187): *מר לי חזיא* 11Q18 VIII 24 *חזיא אנתה* (p. 184). This kind of usage seems to be quite specific for visionary revelations, cf. A. Lange, "חזיה."

¹⁶ Thus certain measurements (2Q24 13; 4Q554 1 ii 15; 5Q15 1 i 8, 10, 15; 1 ii 10), details (5Q15 1 ii 2); a document (11Q18 XIII 6 [F. García Martínez, "The Last Surviving Columns," 184]: *מחזיא לי כתב*).

¹⁷ Cf. the introductory *ראה* in Ezek 40:4 and 44:5.

related to heavenly journeys such as those described in the Book of the Watchers and in the *Aramaic Levi Document*.¹⁸ A certain difference from Ezekiel's vision may be seen in the fact that the latter includes a passage of divine instructions concerning the cultic ceremonies in Ezek 44:5–46:18, while in our text, as far as we know it, there is no instructive or legislative passage.

In the preserved portions of our text there is only one passage not merely descriptive: In 4Q554 2 iii 15–22 we have a part of a direct speech, probably addressing the human visionary and forecasting a future battle between his progeny and their enemies, in which the names of the Kittim, Babel, Edom, Moab, and Ammon are preserved. This passage is important in many respects:

- (a) It clarifies that the vision, at least partly, refers to eschatological realities, even though we cannot specify the position of the eschatological forecasts within the document as a whole, nor the precise relation between the eschatological events mentioned and the construction or existence of the New Jerusalem and its temple.¹⁹
- (b) The adversary of the peoples mentioned is most probably the eschatological Israel as a whole, and not just a part of it (such as the priests), a remnant of the righteous, or a sectarian group.²⁰
- (c) This observation may lead to the assumption that the visionary whose name is not preserved is probably one of the ancestors of Israel.²¹

The visionary character of the text and the fact that the only lengthy passage of direct speech is a forecast of eschatological events suggest the classification of the text as “apocalyptic,” or even as belonging to the genre “apocalypse.”²² In fact, the document corresponds quite well to the definition of the

¹⁸ *I Enoch* 14:[2], 4, [8] and in the *Aramaic Levi Document* (4Q213a II 15), cf. A. Lange, “חזו.”

¹⁹ See the argument presented in n. 5 above.

²⁰ This is also suggested by other passages where our text mentions Israel as a whole; see the unpublished fragments from Cave 11, transcribed from the photographs in K. Beyer, *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer. Ergänzungsband*, 100 (there frags. 8 and 9).

²¹ Thus K. Beyer, *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer. Ergänzungsband*, 95, 98. He suggests tentatively Jacob or even Levi, Qahat, or Amram (as ancestors of the priests). R. Eisenman and M. Wise (*Jesus und die Urchristen*) suggest that the visionary is Ezekiel, but in view of the passage mentioned above this is less plausible. However, this issue remains quite speculative.

²² Thus, e.g., K. Beyer, *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer*, 214. Cf. also J. Carmignac, “Qu'est-ce que l'Apocalyptique? Son emploi à Qumrân,” *RevQ* 10 (1979/81): 3–33, here 27f., and the cautious comments of H. Stegemann, “Die Bedeutung der Qumranfunde für die Erforschung der Apokalyphtik,” in *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East. Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Apocalypticism Uppsala*,

genre as formulated by John Collins: It has (1) a narrative framework, there is (2) a revelation mediated by an other-worldly being to a human recipient, which is (3) a revelation of transcendent realities, insofar as the realities described are either eschatological or at least transcend the reality of the author's time. Consequently, the *New Jerusalem Text* might be called an *apocalypse*.²³

Even if we do not know the name of the visionary, the apocalypse shows clear features of a pseudepigraphic composition. The unknown seer – perhaps one of the ancestors of Israel – is the narrator of the vision and therefore most probably the fictional author of the text. Consequently, like other contemporary or later apocalypses, the document should be regarded as a parabiblical text belonging to the *pseudepigrapha*.

B. Origin and Date

I. The *New Jerusalem Text* and the *Temple Scroll*

For the discussion of the origin of the *New Jerusalem Text* it might be helpful to look very briefly at the *Temple Scroll* and to point to the contrast between our text and the *Temple Scroll*. Both deal with similar subjects, the eschatological or ideal temple and its city, but in a very different manner:

(a) The differences concerning the direction of description between the two texts are clear: Whereas the *New Jerusalem Text* probably started with the description of the outer wall of the city and moved from the outside in (cf. Ezek 40–41),²⁴ the *Temple Scroll* goes the other way round, from the temple to the different outer courts, the city, and the land.

(b) Whereas the *New Jerusalem Text* in its preserved passages is almost completely descriptive, without any legislative passages, the character of the *Temple Scroll* is wholly legislative

(c) The revelation in the *New Jerusalem Text* is a visionary one, transmitted to a human seer and mediated by an angel, while the legislation of the *Temple Scroll* has the form of an immediate divine revelation to Israel at

August 12–17, 1979 (ed. D. Hellholm; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1983), 495–530, here 518.

²³ See the most common definition of the genre: J. J. Collins, “Introduction: Towards the Morphology of a Genre,” in *Apocalypse. The Morphology of a Genre* (ed. J. J. Collins; Semeia 14; Missoula, MT: Scholars, 1979), 1–20, here 9. Most recently, a classification of the document as apocalypse is also proposed by F. García Martínez, “The Temple Scroll and the New Jerusalem,” 452f.

²⁴ See above, n. 8.

Mount Sinai, by which the legislative intermediacy of Moses is in fact eliminated.²⁵

(d) Whereas *New Jerusalem Text* formally draws on the pattern of Ezekiel's temple vision, fitting in other elements from prophetic traditions,²⁶ the *Temple Scroll*, even if its author might be well aware of the details of Ezekiel's vision,²⁷ adopts the situation of Exod 34 (11QT^a II) and draws primarily on the text of the Torah.²⁸

(e) The general outline of the city plan in the *New Jerusalem Text* is quite different from the shape of the temple courts according to the *Temple Scroll*. While the latter have the ideal shape of a square according to Ezekiel's vision, the city wall of the New Jerusalem has the shape of a large rectangle. This is also a remarkable difference that should be taken into consideration.

The thoroughgoing formal contrast between the Aramaic apocalypse describing the New Jerusalem and Hebrew *Temple Scroll* may lead to the conclusion that, in spite of the similarity of subjects and the correspondence in some details,²⁹ there is a wider gap between the two documents.

It is not possible to discuss all the details that have led some scholars to the assumption that the two documents are "programmatically related."³⁰ But neither the frequent occurrence of the number seven and its multiples in both works nor the use of some specific architectural terms can prove such an

²⁵ Thus L. H. Schiffman, "Temple Scroll," *ABD* 6:348–350, here 349; cf. also Y. Yadin, *The Temple Scroll* (3 vols.; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1983), 1:71–73.

²⁶ See, e.g., the gates made of precious stones in 2Q24 iii 2, as in Isa 54:12 (cf. Tob 13:17).

²⁷ Many architectural details show that the *Temple Scroll* is familiar with the description of the Temple in Ezek 40–48. See the analysis of scriptural references in Y. Yadin, *The Temple Scroll*, 1:46–70; for the relationship between the two descriptions cf. T. A. Busink, *Der Tempel von Jerusalem von Solomon bis Herodes* (2 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 1970–80), 2:1424–26; J. Maier, "Die Hofanlagen im Tempel-Entwurf des Ezechiel im Licht der 'Tempelrolle' von Qumran," in *Prophecy: Essays Presented to Georg Fohrer on his Sixty-Fifth Birthday* (ed. J. A. Emerton; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1980), 55–67.

²⁸ For the use of the Bible in the *Temple Scroll*, see the investigation by D. D. Swanson, *The Temple Scroll and the Bible: The Methodology of 11 QT* (STDJ 14; Leiden: Brill, 1995).

²⁹ Cf. the references to the *New Jerusalem Text* in Y. Yadin, *The Temple Scroll* (see the index, 2:480). The relation between the two works is stressed by M. Broshi, "Visionary Architecture," 10–13; see also M. O. Wise, *A Critical Study of the Temple Scroll from Qumran Cave 11*, 64–86. This view has been thoroughly criticized by F. García Martínez ("The 'New Jerusalem' and the Future Temple of the Manuscripts from Qumran," 182–185).

³⁰ M. O. Wise, *A Critical Study*, 66. The points of comparison mentioned by Wise are a common ideology of measurements (66ff.), i.e., the frequent and programmatic use of the number seven, secondly, the description of identical structures and rituals (71ff.), and thirdly, the presence of some general phenomena in both texts (79ff.).

assumption.³¹ Florentino García Martínez has pointed out rightly that “the only element that ... could prove that NJ and 11QT^a are programmatically related would be the presence in both texts of structures or rituals that are not attested in other compositions.”³² But analyzing the four instances adduced by Michael Wise he finds that the evidence is not at all conclusive.³³ The “only real instance of agreement between the two texts is the well-known correspondence of the names of the gates of the temple in 11QT^a with those of the city in NJ.”³⁴ However, the same order of gates which differs significantly from the order in Ezek 48:30–35 has also been found in a manuscript of the so-called Reworked Pentateuch.³⁵ The only structure which is really common to the *Temple Scroll* and the *New Jerusalem Text* is, therefore, better explained as dependent on a more widespread tradition in addition to or expanding the text of the Torah.³⁶

³¹ See M. O. Wise, *A Critical Study*, 80f.

³² F. García Martínez, “The ‘New Jerusalem’ and the Future Temple of the Manuscripts from Qumran,” 183.

³³ F. García Martínez, “The ‘New Jerusalem’ and the Future Temple of the Manuscripts from Qumran,” 183–185; cf. M. O. Wise, *A Critical Study of the Temple Scroll from Qumran Cave 11*, 71ff.

³⁴ F. García Martínez, “The ‘New Jerusalem,’” 185.

³⁵ In the earlier presentation of the text by J. Strugnell and in the translated editions by F. García Martínez (*The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated* [Leiden, New York and Köln: Brill, 1994], 223) and J. Maier (*Die Qumran Essener: Die Texte vom Toten Meer* [3 vols.; München and Basel: Reinhardt, 1995–6], 2:313) the fragment is numbered as 4Q365 fr. 2, thus the relevant passage is 4Q365 28 ii 1–4. The DJD edition of the Reworked Pentateuch by E. Tov and S. White (“Reworked Pentateuch,” DJD XIII, 187–352; cf. previously E. Tov, “The Textual Status of 4Q364–37 [4QPP],” in *The Madrid Qumran Congress*, 2:43–82, here 48f.), separates the fragments containing nonbiblical material from the other parts of 4Q365 calling them 4Q365a or “4QTemple?” (the relevant passage is now numbered 4Q365a 2 ii 1–4). The question mark, however, must be underlined, because the separation is only based on content, whereas the five fragments which are now called 4Q365a are “written by the same hand as the main body of 4Q365” (S. White, “365a. 4QTemple?,” in *Qumran Cave 4. VIII. Parabiblical Texts, Part 1*, 319–334, here 319). Therefore, the fragments put together as 4Q365a physically belong to the same manuscript as 4Q365 and cannot be regarded as part of another copy of the *Temple Scroll*. Or should we assume that the author copied two extensive works such as the Reworked Pentateuch and the *Temple Scroll* on the same scroll? This is completely incredible. Therefore, we cannot escape the conclusion – even if this may change our view of the “canonical” text – that the manuscript 4Q365 is an expanded version of the “(Reworked) Pentateuch” containing a larger amount of “extra-biblical” material.

³⁶ Cf. F. García Martínez, “The ‘New Jerusalem’ and the Future Temple of the Manuscripts from Qumran,” 185, and the comparison by M. O. Wise, *A Critical Study*, 78f. For the problems of the passage from the Reworked Pentateuch, see the previous footnote.

The evidence leads to the conclusion that we cannot assume any unilinear or even literary dependence between the two documents.³⁷ This is ruled out by the fact that the two documents do not have any specific formal structures in common. Especially decisive is the observation that the direction of the description is quite the opposite in the two documents.

Even the assumption that both texts must derive from the same circle is questionable³⁸ when we consider the fact that their formal features and even basic view of divine revelation are so completely different. We should rather assume that common traditions of temple building and town planning as partly preserved in Ezekiel's vision have been developed in very different directions – a process that might have occurred even in different circles.³⁹ I cannot go into the discussion on the literary development or the origins of the *Temple Scroll* here,⁴⁰ but if it is true that the *Temple Scroll* comes from priestly or levitical groups, then the *New Jerusalem Text* might better be ascribed to an apocalyptic circle.

II. *The Non-Sectarian Origin of the New Jerusalem Text*

The *New Jerusalem Text* does not originate from the group of the Qumran inhabitants or the Essene movement. The arguments for a Qumran sectarian origin of the text were collected and advocated some years ago by Florentino

³⁷ For such an assumption, cf. on the one side B. Z. Wacholder, *The Dawn of Qumran: The Sectarian Torah and the Teacher of Righteousness* (HUCM 8; Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1983), 96, with the opinion that the *New Jerusalem Text* is dependent on the *Temple Scroll*, and on the other side M. O. Wise, *A Critical Study*, who argues that the *New Jerusalem Text* is closely related with the so-called “Temple Source,” one of the assumed sources of the *Temple Scroll*.

³⁸ Cf. M. O. Wise, *A Critical Study*, 81, who comes to the conclusion that the “Temple Source” and the *New Jerusalem Text* “derive from the same traditions and priestly circles.” M. Broshi (“Visionary Architecture,” 11) states that the *Temple Scroll* and the *New Jerusalem Text* “must have been composed in the same period.”

³⁹ There is a widespread tradition of square orthogonal or even square temple and city planning in antiquity. On square temples in ancient Nabatea and Syria, see T. Busink, *Der Tempel von Jerusalem*, 2:1262–1294; on rectangle cities in antiquity, see H. Rosenau, *The Ideal City* (London: Methuen, 1983), 9–21. Ancient Babylon had a rectangular plan, and an orthogonal and modular city plan has been found, e.g., in the slave village at El Amarna in Egypt (see M. Chyutin, “The New Jerusalem: Ideal City,” DSD 1 [1994], 71–97, here 96–97). On some ancient traditions of town planning and their correspondence with archaeological findings in Jerusalem, see also S. Margalit, “Aelia Capitolina,” *Judaica* 45 (1989): 45–54, here 49–51. I am indebted to Shlomo Margalit for helpful comments on my paper read at the Jerusalem congress.

⁴⁰ There seems to be a growing consensus to regard the *Temple Scroll* as a text which precedes the Essene movement and comes from priestly or levitical circles presumably in the 3rd or early 2nd century BCE. For this view, see A. Lange and H. Lichtenberger, “Qumran,” *TRE* 28:51–53. Cf. also D. D. Swanson, *The Temple Scroll and the Bible*, 235–243.

García Martínez,⁴¹ but, as I would like to demonstrate in the following passages, they are not conclusive.

(a) There is at first the argument raised from the relatively large number of six or seven copies from five different caves. But this argument is not decisive because *Jubilees* or the *Books of Enoch* are represented much more frequently,⁴² whereas a specific sectarian text like *Pesher Habakkuk* is attested only once in the Qumran library. Even the relatively late date of the manuscripts (early Herodian or later) can prove nothing more than the prevailing interest of the Qumran inhabitants in the subject of the temple, purity, and the eschatological cult.⁴³

(b) There is, secondly, the linguistic argument, but it is ambiguous: The *New Jerusalem Text* was originally composed in Aramaic,⁴⁴ in a state of language comparable to that of the *Genesis Apocryphon* and later than that of the book of Daniel.⁴⁵ This may roughly point to the second or first century BCE, but does not allow a precise⁴⁶ dating, nor does it speak either in favor of or against the Qumranic origin of the work.

⁴¹ F. García Martínez ("The 'New Jerusalem' and the Future Temple of the Manuscripts from Qumran," 202–213. An earlier Spanish version of the article was published in 1986: "La 'Nueva Jerusalem' y el templo futuro de los Mss. de Qumran," in *Salvación en la Palabra: Targum – Derash – Berith. En memoria del professor A. Díez Macho* (ed. D. Muñoz Leon; Madrid: Cristiandad, 1986), 563–590. Most recently, García Martínez has revised his view. He now proposes an origin in priestly circles at the temple environment, and a date at the beginning of the 2nd century BCE; cf. "The Temple Scroll and the New Jerusalem," 454–457.

⁴² See the listings in D. Dimant, "The Qumran Manuscripts," in *Time to Prepare the Way in the Wilderness*, 23–58.

⁴³ 1Q32, 4Q554, 4Q555, and 5Q15 can be classified as early Herodian, 2Q24 and 11Q18 seem to have been copied even later, see F. García Martínez, "The 'New Jerusalem' and the Future Temple of the Manuscripts from Qumran," 202f.; É. Puech, *La croyance Essénien en la vie future*, 2:591f.

⁴⁴ Even if there existed a Hebrew version of the text (but this is completely uncertain, see above, n. 2), it could be a translation of the original document. There are only few Hebraisms, see J. T. Milik (DJD III, 88) and additionally J. C. Greenfield, "The Small Caves of Qumran," 130, 132–135; see further K. Beyer, *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer*, 215–216, and F. García Martínez, "The 'New Jerusalem' and the Future Temple," 193 n. 42.

⁴⁵ J. T. Milik, DJD III, 184. For the linguistic analysis of the *Genesis Apocryphon*, see E. Y. Kutscher, "The Language of the '1Q Genesis Apocryphon.' A Preliminary Study," in *Scripta Hierosolymitana IV: Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. C. Rabin and Y. Yadin; Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1957), 1–35, and idem, "Dating the Language of the Genesis Apocryphon," *JBL* 76 (1957): 288–292.

⁴⁶ The final redaction of the Book of Daniel is usually dated at about 165 BCE. However, its Aramaic portions, or Dan 1–6 as a whole, seem to have been composed earlier, at the beginning of the 2nd or even in the 3rd century BCE (cf. for the different theories J. J. Collins, *Daniel* [Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993], 24–38, and H. Niehr, "Das Buch

(c) Another linguistic argument seems to be much more decisive. The specific sectarian community terminology has been found only in documents composed in Hebrew,⁴⁷ not in the Aramaic documents from Qumran. Therefore, some scholars assume that the community of the *yahad* only wrote in Hebrew, and that all the documents composed in Aramaic are of non-sectarian origin.⁴⁸ This is certainly true for the *Books of Enoch*, and most probably also for the *Prayer of Nabonidus*, the *Testaments of Amram, Qahat, and Levi*, and the *Genesis Apocryphon*. The fact that the *New Jerusalem Text* is written in Aramaic, therefore, speaks quite strongly against its Qumran sectarian, or Essene, origin.

(d) Can we confirm this position in regard to the contents of the text? Although the picture of an ideal cultic center suggests that its author held a critical position towards the contemporary temple cult, the *New Jerusalem* composition does not reflect any elements of the Qumranic conception of the community as a temple.

Whereas a specific sectarian document such as the Eschatological Midrash⁴⁹ spiritualizes the notion of the temple by use of the term מְקֹדֶשׁ אֲדָם (4QMdrEschat^a III 6)⁵⁰ for the community itself, the *New Jerusalem Text*

Daniel,” in *Einleitung in das Alte Testament* [ed. E. Zenger et al.; KStTh 1.1; Stuttgart, Berlin and Köln: Kohlhammer], 360–369, here 363f. The *Genesis Apocryphon* is usually dated at the end of the 1st century BCE or the beginning of the 1st century CE (see J. A. Fitzmyer, *The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave I* [2nd ed.; BibOr Sa; Rome, 1971], 15; E. Kutscher, “Dating the Language of the Genesis Apocryphon,” 289; A. Lange and H. Lichtenberger, “Qumran,” in *TRE* 28:47). But the hitherto unknown columns (recently published by M. Morgenstern, E. Qimron, and D. Sivan, “The Hitherto Unpublished Columns of the Genesis Apocryphon,” *AbrN* 33 [1995]: 30–54) show that the work seems to incorporate a lengthy source called “Book of the words of Noah” (the heading is preserved in 1QGenAp V 29, preceded by a *vacat* line), therefore it is open to discussion whether the other parts of the work equally take up earlier sources. Consequently, the language of the *Genesis Apocryphon* is not a safe starting point for the attempt to date the *New Jerusalem Text* by linguistic peculiarities.

⁴⁷ Specific terms of sectarian texts are, e.g., הַיְחָד, עֲצַת, הַיְחָד, אֲנָשִׁי, עֲדָת, הַבְּרִית, denoting a present reality. For a description of the community terminology see D. Dimant, “The Qumran Manuscripts,” 27–29.

⁴⁸ See D. Dimant, “The Qumran Manuscripts,” 34, and already S. Segert, “Die Sprachenfragen in der Qumrängemeinschaft,” in *Qumran-Probleme* (ed. H. Bardtke; SSA 42; Berlin, 1963), 315–339, here 322. Cf. recently A. Lange and H. Lichtenberger, “Qumran,” in *TRE* 28.

⁴⁹ Cf. on this text A. Steudel, *Der Midrasch zur Eschatologie aus der Qumrangemeinde*.

⁵⁰ See A. Steudel, *Der Midrasch zur Eschatologie aus der Qumrangemeinde*, 166f. The interpretation of the term מְקֹדֶשׁ אֲדָם by F. García Martínez (“The ‘New Jerusalem’ and the Future Temple,” 209) as a mere expression of the “clash between the present defiled temple ... and the final temple” is not convincing. The מְקֹדֶשׁ אֲדָם in 4Q174 III 6 is not the

does not spiritualize the temple or the city. The difference may be shown by another detail: Whereas the *New Jerusalem Text* describes the gates of the city as built with precious stones (2Q24 iii 2), the Essene Peshier on Isaiah from Cave 4 (4QpIsa^d 6f.) relates the same tradition from Isa 54:12 to the council of the community.⁵¹

Whereas sectarian thought spiritualized the details of the splendor of Zion in the last days, the apocalypse describing the New Jerusalem does not. This is an additional argument against the sectarian origin and character of our text.

(e) The non-sectarian character of the *New Jerusalem Text* is also obvious from another element which has been mentioned already: The expectation of the eschatological war between the seer's descendants and their enemies from Babel, Edom, Moab, Ammon, and the Kittim in 4Q554 2 iii 15–22 shows that the winners in the eschatological battle will be Israel as a whole, not a specific sectarian group or a holy remnant of the righteous. This is also suggested by the occurrence of the term כל ישראל in some of the fragments from 11Q18.⁵² The *New Jerusalem Text* has a pan-Israelite perspective, not a sectarian one.

III. Searching for an Appropriate Date

Dating the text is much more difficult than arguing against a sectarian origin. This is due to the fact that in the preserved portions of our text there is no allusion to a certain historical situation or political event. Thus the range of possible historical settings is wide. Magen Broshi has concluded from some architectural details that the document cannot predate the Hellenistic era.⁵³ At the other end, the *terminus ante quem* is supplied by the date of the earliest manuscripts, written in an Early Herodian script. But how can we find appropriate criteria for a more precise dating of our text within the given range?

One could suggest that the composition was inspired by building activities in Jerusalem or in the temple area. The most important building activities took place under the rule of Herod the Great.⁵⁴ But since the earliest manuscripts are written in an early Herodian hand and, of course, it is very unlike-

eschatological temple mentioned in 11QT^a XXIX 9 or 1QM II 1–6 but the holy congregation of the Essene covenanters.

⁵¹ The tradition is also used in Tob 13:17 and the Hebrew *Apocalypse of Elijah* (10:16).

⁵² See the transcriptions in K. Beyer, *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer. Ergänzungsband*, 100 (frgs. 8 and 9).

⁵³ M. Broshi, "Visionary Architecture," 18ff., where he points to the presence of a tower with a spiral staircase (5Q15 ii 2–5, cf. 11QT^a XXX 3–XXXI 9 and *m. Mid.* 4:5), a peristyle (5Q15 ii 4–5), and the construction of the city according to the Hippodomic system transmitted to the East after the conquests of Alexander the Great.

⁵⁴ On Herod's building activities see Josephus, *J.W.* I 407; T. Busink, *Der Tempel von Jerusalem*, 2:1017ff.; on the Temple 1063ff.; cf. also E. Otto, *Jerusalem: die Geschichte der Heiligen Stadt* (UTB 308; Stuttgart et al.: Kohlhammer, 1980), 129ff.

ly that one of the preserved manuscripts is the autograph, the composition of the *New Jerusalem Text* most probably predates Herod's temple-building activities. Conversely we should rather expect that the temple restoration under Herod's rule was inspired by the presence of texts such as the *New Jerusalem Text* describing the splendor or the future temple and the eschatological temple city.⁵⁵ We should therefore take into consideration earlier building activities in the temple area or in Jerusalem.⁵⁶

The most important intervention in the temple cult occurred under the rule of Antiochus IV, when the temple was consecrated to Zeus Olympios⁵⁷ and the "abomination of desolation" (Dan 9:27; 11:31; 12:11; cf. 1 Macc 1:54) was built on the altar of burnt-offering. However, if the image of the ideal temple and the ideal temple city as depicted in the *New Jerusalem Text* originated in the events of the Hellenistic crisis, we should expect clearer traces of the threats to Jewish faith, such as those in Daniel or in the book of *Jubilees*. In the preserved fragments of our text, however, there is no indication of this.

There were, of course, other building activities in the temple area during the Late Persian and Hellenistic period: There are some references to the period of Nehemiah, who might have built not only the walls of Jerusalem but also the "gates of the fortress of the house" (Neh 2:8) and perhaps other features of the Temple precinct.⁵⁸ The historical value of these references is, however, very uncertain.⁵⁹ During the Ptolemaic period there might have been some repairs to the Temple under the reign of Ptolemaios II Philadelphos.⁶⁰ In early Seleucid times, the High Priest Simon, son of Onias II, is said to have restored the Temple and its fortifications (Sir 50:1–2).⁶¹ After the Maccabean crisis, it is primarily the Maccabean ruler Simon, High Priest, military commander and ethnarch (1 Macc 14:41), who is recorded to have heightened the walls of Jerusalem (1 Macc 14:37),⁶² glorified the Temple (1 Macc 14:15: τὰ ἄγια ἐδόξασεν) fortified the Temple Mount (1 Macc 13:53), and increased the vessels of the Sanctuary (1 Macc 14:15).⁶³ The restorations

⁵⁵ Cf. already Isa 54:11ff. and also *T. Benj.* 9:2.

⁵⁶ For an extensive survey of building activities in the Hellenistic and Hasmonean period, see T. Busink, *Der Tempel von Jerusalem*, 2:853–903.

⁵⁷ Cf. 1 Macc 1:44ff.; 2 Macc 6:1ff.

⁵⁸ Cf. Neh 13:7; see C. Meyers, "Temple, Jerusalem," in *ABD* 6:350–369, here 364. On Nehemiah's Temple building activities see Josephus, *Ant. Jud.* XI 165 and 2 Macc 1:18 which is, however, quite legendary.

⁵⁹ The temple building activity of Nehemiah is completely denied by T. Busink, *Der Tempel von Jerusalem*, 2:845. Cf., however, J. Blenkinsopp, *Ezra–Nehemiah* (OTL; London: SCM Press, 1989), 215 (on Neh 2:8).

⁶⁰ Cf. *Let. Aris.* 42.

⁶¹ Cf. C. Meyers, "Temple, Jerusalem," in *ABD* 6:350–369, here 364; T. Busink, *Der Tempel von Jerusalem*, 2:865.

⁶² Cf., however, the similar record for Jonathan in 1 Macc 12:36.

⁶³ Cf. T. Busink, *Der Tempel von Jerusalem*, 2:886ff.

of the Temple and the city walls possibly inspired some apocalyptic circles to conceptualize an ideal Temple city with an ideal cult. However, the preserved parts of our text do not lead to any specification. There are no traces of pro-Maccabean or pro-Hasmonean ideology (such as in 1 Macc), nor of anti-Maccabean or anti-Hasmonean polemics (as in many Essene texts).

Yet we have to consider the possibility that the writing of our text was not stimulated by certain building activities within the Temple area.⁶⁴ Possibly the primary concern is not the temple itself, but the eschatological city described at the beginning of the text: the ideal place where Israel will live in the end of times. It is remarkable that in the residential area described all Israelites dwell in houses of the same type, and, as far as the text is preserved, there is no difference between poor and rich, nor is there any distinction between the area of the Priests, the Levites, and the common Israelites (in contrast in Ezekiel's description of the *terumah* (Ezek 48:9–22)). In spite of the theme of the Temple and its ceremonies, the text shows no specific interest in the privileges of the Levites or Priests (as does, for example, the *Aramaic Levi Document* or the book of *Jubilees*). Therefore, the *New Jerusalem Text* might also be conceived of as a utopian reaction to the social differences which divided Israel throughout the Hellenistic period and inspired various apocalyptic concepts.⁶⁵

But these suggestions do not lead to a more precise date of the text within the given range. From the non-sectarian character of the text we cannot conclude with certainty that it predates the Essene community. However, most scholars who accept the possibility of a non-sectarian origin of the text actually suppose that the text antedates the time of the Essene movement or the Hasmonean period⁶⁶ and that it belonged “to the literary heritage known to the sect in its early years.”⁶⁷ The linguistic evidence does not oppose this suggestion.⁶⁸ The only external argument, however, is based on some peculiarities of the buildings described in our text. According to Magen Broshi, a

⁶⁴ The same is probably true for the *Temple Scroll*, which seems to have been composed at a time when the Temple functioned without any major problems. Utopian concepts are not necessarily caused by a major crisis.

⁶⁵ Cf. R. Albertz, *Religionsgeschichte Israels in alttestamentlicher Zeit* (2nd ed.; GAT 8; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1997), 2:591ff., 633ff.

⁶⁶ Thus M. O. Wise, *A Critical Study of the Temple Scroll from Qumran Cave 11*, writes, “It may well be a third century text, or at least reflect third century ideas” (86).

⁶⁷ L. H. Schiffman, *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls. Their True Meaning for Judaism and Christianity* (The Anchor Bible Reference Library; New York: Doubleday, 1995), 393.

⁶⁸ See above n. 46. Cf. also M. Wise, *A Critical Study*, 86f. n. 90. After a lengthy discussion of the suggestions by E. Y. Kutscher (“The Language of the Genesis Apocryphon”) and K. Beyer (*Die aramäische Texte vom Toten Meer*, 34f.), Wise concludes: “Linguistic analysis is thus useless for dating the NJ, since the possible dates of its composition all fall within the period in which Standard Literary Aramaic was used.”

tower with a spiral staircase (5Q15 1 ii 2–5), the mention of a peristyle (which is, admittedly, uncertain: 5Q15 1 4f.), and the Hippodomic plan of the city as a whole suggest that the description of the New Jerusalem might have been composed at about 200 BCE.⁶⁹ But even these observations can only give a *terminus post quem* and confirm that the composition does not predate the 3rd century BCE.

Unless we come to know something about the specific situation that led an apocalyptic circle to work out the imagery of the eschatological temple city, all the suggested datings for the *New Jerusalem Text* within the given range remain speculative.

C. Traditio-Historical Context

Since the early editions by Baillet and Milik, the *New Jerusalem Text* has been tradition in the traditio-historical line of Temple conceptions running from Ezekiel’s vision, through Rev 21–22, and down to the *Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch* and *Mishna Middot*. This is true in a very general sense, but there are significant differences between our text and the texts mentioned (and other relevant passages).⁷⁰ Here I can only enumerate some important points of comparison and point to the questions which remain open.

(a) The *New Jerusalem Text* obviously depends on the tradition of Ezekiel’s temple vision. But in Ezekiel 40–48, the *terumah* (45:1–8; 48:8–22), as well as the city itself (48:16, 30–35) and also the temple area (42:15–20), the temple court (40:47), the temple building (41:13–14), the altar (43:13–17), and the Holy of Holies (41:1–4), all have the regular shape of a square.⁷¹ The same is true for the Temple and its courts as described in the *Temple Scroll*.

⁶⁹ M. Broshi, “Visionary Architecture,” 22. Especially the tower with a staircase is “a characteristic Hellenistic edifice that appears frequently from the third century BCE” (19).

⁷⁰ See the extensive survey of the motives related with the New Jerusalem in W. W. Reader, *Die Stadt Gottes in der Johannesapokalypse* (Diss. Göttingen, 1971), 5ff.; cf. also A. Causse, “La mythe de la nouvelle Jérusalem du Deutéro-Esaïe à la III^e Sibylle,” *RHPR* 38 (1938): 377–414; K. L. Schmidt, “Jerusalem als Urbild und Abbild,” *ErJb* 18 (1950): 207–248; H. Bietenhard, *Die himmlische Welt im Urchristentum und Spätjudentum* (WUNT 2; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1951), 192–204; G. Jeremias, “Die Gemeinde- das himmlische Jerusalem,” in *Der Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit* (SUNT 2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1963), 245–247; O. Böcher, *Die Johannesapokalypse* (EdF 41; Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1980), 106–120; U. B. Müller, *Die Offenbarung des Johannes* (ÖTK 19; Gütersloh: G. Mohn, 1984), 348ff.; C. Deutsch, “Transformation of Symbols: The New Jerusalem in Rv 21,3–22,5,” *ZNW* 78 (1987): 106–126; J. A. du Rand, “The Imagery of the Heavenly Jerusalem (Revelation 21.9–22.5),” *Neot* 22 (1988): 65–86.

⁷¹ As a square the Temple of Ezekiel does not correspond to the Temple of Solomon (or of Zerubbabel), but rather to the traditions of the camp of Israel in the wilderness (Num 2).

The square is also the basic shape for the New Jerusalem in Rev 21:1–22:5, although the city is extended in a fantastic manner,⁷² making up a cube of equal length, width, and height (21:16).⁷³ In view of the broad tradition of square temple and city plans,⁷⁴ it is the more remarkable that the *New Jerusalem Text* seems to depict the eschatological Temple city not as a square,⁷⁵ but with the less perfect shape of a large rectangle of 100 x 140 *res* (or *stadia*), i.e., approximately 20 x 28 km (4Q554 1 i 9–22).

Of course there have been attempts to conjecture that even the city of the *New Jerusalem Text* is a square. Jacob Licht, who assumed “that the author adhered to Ezekiel’s specifications quite closely,”⁷⁶ wanted to understand the large wall not as the city wall but as a wall enclosing the whole of Ezekiel’s *terumah*. He then conjectures that the residential area is much smaller covering (as in Ezek 48:16–17) a square of approximately 5000 x 5000 cubits. But Licht’s calculations do not come out exactly,⁷⁷ moreover, there is no indication that the wall described in 4Q554 1 ii 9–22 is not the city wall. The next column of the same fragment first describes the gates of the wall mentioned before, and then continues with the record of entering the city and measuring the blocks of houses.⁷⁸ Consequently, we must assume that the city described has the shape of the rectangle as described in 4Q554 1 i 9–22.

This is the most important point where the *New Jerusalem Text* differs from the traditio-historical line running from Ezekiel down to Revelation, and it is hard to imagine why the author did not retain the image of the square known to him from Ezekiel’s vision.

⁷² See J. Roloff, “Irdisches und himmlisches Jerusalem nach der Johannesoffenbarung,” in *Zion: Ort de Begegnung. Festschrift für Laurentius Klein* (ed. F. Hahn et al.; BBB 90, Frankfurt a. M.: A. Hain, 1993), 85–106

⁷³ Cf. also Herm. *Vis.* 3.2.4f., where the heavenly city is built as a square on a cubic rock (Herm. *Sim.* 9.2.1), although the imagery is difficult to interpret; see N. Brox, *Der Hirt des Hermas* (Kommentar zu den Apostolischen Vätern 7; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991), 118f.

⁷⁴ See above, n. 39.

⁷⁵ The altar, however, described in 2Q24 v–vi 2, 5, seems to have the shape of a square.

⁷⁶ J. Licht, “An Ideal Town Plan from Qumran,” 50.

⁷⁷ From the figures given for the width of the house blocks and the streets, Licht calculates that there must be 12 x 12 *insulae* making up a total of 4970 cubits in the north-south axis and of 4888 cubits in the east west axis (Licht, “An Ideal Town Plan from Qumran,” 50f.). Although Licht was satisfied with such an approximate solution we might expect that an author who gives all his measurements exactly would have given these figures in a way that the calculation comes out exactly, if he really wanted to present the picture of a square city.

⁷⁸ This is an additional argument against the reconstruction by M. Chyutin, “The New Jerusalem: Ideal City,” in *DSD* 1 (1994): 71–97, who similarly conjectures that the residential area of the New Jerusalem is much smaller than the area surrounded by the large walls of 4Q554 1 ii 9–22. On Chyutin’s reconstructions, see also above, n. 7.

(b) As has been already mentioned, the tremendous size is one of the most important features of the New Jerusalem. The city of Ezek 48:30–35 is a square measuring 4500 x 4500 cubits, surrounded by a 250 cubit-wide strip of land, and the outer court of the Temple according to the *Temple Scroll* is a square of about 1600 x 1600 cubits (11QT^a LVff.). It should be noted that even these figures are very large compared with the dimensions of Jerusalem in Persian times, or in the First and Second Temple periods.

In the apocalyptic tradition, the size of the eschatological city will become even larger. Already according to Zech 2:8f., Jerusalem will be an open area, not enclosed by a wall with fixed measurements.⁷⁹ According to *1 Enoch* 90:29, 36 the new Jerusalem shall be “large and broad,”⁸⁰ “greater and loftier than the first one,” and in *4 Ezra* 10:55 Ezra is told that his eyes will not be able to see the splendor and vastness of the heavenly Jerusalem completely.

The city described in the apocalypse of the *New Jerusalem Text* is much larger than all the cities contemplated in earlier tradition. It covers a larger area than the whole of Ezekiel’s *terumah*, and the perimeter of its walls is even much greater than the perimeter of ancient Babylon under Nebuchadnezzar, or that of Alexandria in New Testament times. While the size of the houses given in our text is quite realistic, the gates, streets, wall, and city as a whole are remarkably over-sized.⁸¹ According to a later apocalyptic tradition (*Sib. Or.* 5.251f.), the walls of Jerusalem go down to Joppa (so that the size of Jerusalem is adjusted to the dimensions of the land of Israel) and have such a height that they touch the clouds of the sky. These traditions may be compared to our text which is, as far as we know, the first document extending the eschatological city to a size which is obviously “too large to be realistic.”⁸² This exaggeration may be a first step in the development leading to the image of the gigantic cubic city in Rev 21:16 with the equal length, width, and height of 12,000 stadia, or to the tradition in the late Hebrew *Apocalypse of Elijah* (10:5), according to which Jerusalem will have 3000 towers with 20 *ris* (= stadia) between one tower and another. As the tradition develops, the eschatological Jerusalem becomes larger and larger.

(c) A quite interesting feature are the gates described in the *New Jerusalem Text*. Like the city described in Ezek 48:30–35 and the Temple area described in the *Temple Scroll*, the city has twelve gates named according to the tribes of Israel. This tradition is adopted in Rev 21:12 as well. The description in

⁷⁹ Cf., however, the later tradition in Zech 14:10, where the extensions of Jerusalem are given exactly. Moreover, the mention of gates implies that this author views Jerusalem in the end times as a walled town, contrary to Zech 2:9.

⁸⁰ It is called “new house,” cf. M. Black, *The Book of Enoch or 1 Enoch: A New English Edition* (VTSup 7; Leiden: Brill, 1985), 278.

⁸¹ This observation has been made already by W. Bernhardt, *Die kultur- und religionsgeschichtliche Bedeutung des Qumranfragmentes 5Q15* (Diss. Jena, 1970), 124f.

⁸² J. Licht, “An Ideal Town Plan from Qumran,” 45.

4Q554 1 ii 7–11 shows the order of the gates corresponding to that in the *Temple Scroll* (11QT^a XL 13ff.) and in the Reworked Pentateuch (4Q365a 2 ii),⁸³ but differing significantly from the order of gates in Ezek 48:30–35 and from the order of the camps of tribes in Num 2:3ff.⁸⁴ The arrangement in Num 2 follows a pattern peculiar to the book of Numbers (cf. also Num 7:12ff. and 10:14ff.), omitting Levi and dividing the tribes according to the mothers of the sons of Jacob. The order of the gates in Ezek 48:30–35 retains the element of the maternal relations of Num 2, but inserts Levi and modifies the order according to the ideal distribution of the land in Ezek 48:1–29.⁸⁵ The arrangement attested in the Reworked Pentateuch, the *Temple Scroll*, and the *New Jerusalem Text* places the gate of Levi in the middle of the eastern side and omits Ephraim and Manasseh.⁸⁶ Moreover, it seems to follow a peculiar order corresponding to the sequence of tribes as it is mentioned in the context of the wood-offering (11QT^a XXIII).⁸⁷ Therefore, the arrangement of tribes documented in these texts might correspond with certain cultic practices rather than being merely theoretical.

(d) In 2Q24 iii 2 there is mention of a gate of sapphire. Although the context is very fragmentary, we can suppose that this gate is not a gate of the outer wall, but a gate within the city or even within the Temple area.⁸⁸ In addition, 4Q554 2 ii 15 describes a building (perhaps the Temple building) as consisting of precious stones. In this matter our text seems to draw on the tradition of Isa 54:12f. that the New Jerusalem will be built of precious stones. The tradition is taken up again in Tob 13:17 and spiritualized in 4QpIsa^d 6f. where the notion of the sapphire gates is related to the council of the community. The *New Jerusalem Text*, however, is another witness to the realistic view of the Deutero-Isaian prophecy adopted later in Rev 21:11, 18–21 and in the Hebrew *Apocalypse of Elijah* 10:6) as well.

Space does not permit discussion of more elements of our visionary *New Jerusalem Text*. We should note that the document describes not only the eschatological city but also the temple and some cultic ceremonies, even though the state of preservation of these passages is regrettably poor. In contrast to the *Temple Scroll*, it describes the city and the residential area in un-

⁸³ See above, n. 35.

⁸⁴ The difference is discussed by Y. Yadin, *The Temple Scroll*, 1:255f.; M. O. Wise, *A Critical Study of the Temple Scroll from Qumran Cave 11*, 78f.

⁸⁵ See W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 2* (BK 15.2; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchner; 2nd ed., 1979), 1238.

⁸⁶ Cf. Y. Yadin, *The Temple Scroll*, 1:256.

⁸⁷ Cf. J. Maier, *Die Tempelrolle vom Toten Meer* (München and Basel: E. Reinhardt, 1978), 112f.

⁸⁸ M. Baillet (DJD III, 86) thought that the passage describes the table of the bread of presence. But this is questionable since we cannot ascertain the exact location of the passage within the whole document.

paralleled detail, drawing mainly on Ezekiel’s vision and other prophetic traditions. Contrary to Zechariah’s refusal to give exact measurements of Jerusalem (Zech 2:9) and preferring to follow the line of Trito-Zechariah’s imagination (Zech 14:10), our text calculates the proportions of the eschatological abode of Israel. The frequency of detailed measurements reported in our text shows the importance of numerical details, especially of the number seven, for its apocalyptic author.⁸⁹ The most important element of description, however, seems to be the extraordinary scale of the temple city, covering an area much larger than Ezekiel’s whole *terumah*. This expansion of the Temple city might be a step towards the image of the gigantic cubic city descending from Heaven in Rev 21:2.

Even if we cannot prove that the author of Revelation knew our text,⁹⁰ we can see that he drew on numerous traditions which are also witnessed by the *New Jerusalem Text* from the Qumran library. There is, of course, a tradition-historical line relating Ezekiel 40–48 with Revelation 21–22. However, this line is not straight and perhaps more ramified than has been thought before the discovery of the *New Jerusalem Text*.

⁸⁹ In this respect our text can also be compared to the *Book of Jubilees*. On the chronological and topographical system in *Jubilees*, see also J. Frey, “Zum Weltbild im Jubiläenbuch,” in *Studies in the Book of Jubilees* (ed. M. Albani, J. Frey, and A. Lange; TSAJ 65; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997), 261–293 (English Translation “The Worldview in the Book of Jubilees,” in this volume 429–460).

⁹⁰ We also cannot rule out the possibility that the author of Revelation was acquainted with the text (cf. already J. T. Milik [DJD 3, 186]: “Il n’est pas impossible que l’autour de l’Apocalypse grecque du Nouveau Testament ait connu notre Description araméenne de la Jérusalem Nouvelle.” He used Ezekiel and Daniel programmatically (cf. G. K. Beale, *The Use of Daniel in Jewish Apocalyptic Literature and in the Revelation of St. John* [Lanham, 1984]; J.-P. Ruiz, *Ezekiel in the Apocalypse The Transformation of Prophetie Language in Revelation 16,17–19, 10* [EHS.T 376; Frankfurt a. M. et al.: Lang, 1989]), but he was acquainted with a wealth of other apocalyptic traditions. For the influence of biblical language on Revelation, see J. Frey, “Erwägungen zum Verhältnis der Johannesapokalypse zu den übrigen Schriften des Corpus Johanneum,” in *Die johanneische Frage* (ed. M. Hengel; WUNT 67; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1993), 326–429, here 373ff.

11. The Testimonies about the Communal Meals from Qumran

What can the testimonies about the communal meals in the textual corpus from Qumran contribute to the discussion about the Lord's Supper or the early Christian meals? About what do these texts testify, what do they want to say, and how should they be interpreted? The present article focuses on texts that bear witness to the so-called "Qumran community" or to the *yaḥad*,¹ which – as is assumed here in agreement with recent research – is not simply identical to the inhabitants of Khirbet Qumran, but may have included communities in a larger network throughout Judea.²

A. The Qumranic Communal Meals in Scholarship

Soon after their discovery in 1947 and the publication of the first scrolls from Cave 1 of Qumran, the textual discoveries from the Dead Sea were a sensa-

¹ In earlier research, the texts that will be discussed here, primarily IQS VI 1–8 or the entire *Community Rule* document named IQS, were often related only to the community living in Qumran. This is problematic both in terms of the dating of the rules in IQS as well as in view of the statements of the textual fragments themselves (see below at section 2.2.1). In the following, therefore, the *yaḥad* is referred to as an overarching movement or a composite of local communities to which the community living in Qumran also belonged as a specific subgroup. The term "Qumran community," which has long been popular, is misleading. Concerning this problem, see J. J. Collins, "The Yaḥad and 'The Qumran Community,'" in *Beyond the Qumran Community* (ed. J. J. Collins; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009), 359–361.

² The archaeological questions about the practice connected with the compound at Khirbet Qumran and the specific character of the meals cannot be discussed here. On this, see J. Magness, "Were Sacrifices Offered at Qumran? The Animal Bone Deposits Reconsidered," in *The Eucharist – Its Origins and Contexts: Sacred Meal, Communal Meal, Table Fellowship in Late Antiquity, Early Judaism, and Early Christianity* (ed. D. Sänger and D. Hellhom; WUNT 376; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2017), 131–154; cf. eadem, "Communal Meals and Sacred Space at Qumran: Asceticism and the Essenes," in *Debating Qumran. Collected Essays on its Archaeology* (ISACR 4; Leuven: Peeters, 2004), 81–112. On the archaeological problems, see also J. Frey, "Qumran und die Archäologie. Eine thematische Einführung," in *Qumran und die Archäologie* (ed. J. Frey, C. Claußen, and N. Kessler; WUNT 278; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 3–49 (English translation "Qumran and Archaeology," in this volume 121–161).

tion.³ Their discovery brought to light for the first time Palestinian-Jewish texts in Hebrew and Aramaic from the time between the most recent texts of the Hebrew Bible (mid 2nd century BCE) and the editing of the Mishnah (late 2nd century CE), i.e., from the time of Jesus and of Early Christianity.⁴ Thus, it did not take long for the dominant research interest to be how these texts could contribute to our understanding of Jesus and Early Christianity.⁵ The fact that the first discovered, edited, and altogether well-preserved scrolls from Cave 1 contained texts that mention a specific community, the *yahad* (= “union”), whose rules of life contain prayer and the interpretation of Scripture,⁶ and the fact that this *yahad* of Qumran was quickly identified with the

³ See J. Frey, “Die Bedeutung der Qumran-Funde 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. Schwagmaier; NTOA 47; Freiburg and Göttingen: Academic Press, 2001), 129–208; idem, “Die Textfunde von Qumran und die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft,” in *Qumran aktuell. Texte und Themen der Schriften vom Toten Meer* (ed. S. Beyerle and J. Frey; BThSt 120; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchner Verlag, 2011), 225–293 (English translation “The Textual Discoveries of Qumran and New Testament Scholarship,” in this volume 579–622).

⁴ Previously, the reconstruction of Palestinian Judaism at that time relied mainly on Greek texts such as the works of Flavius Josephus, on additional writings obtained in the Septuagint, and on some Pseudepigrapha, some of which we can assume were originally written in Hebrew or Aramaic but were only obtained in secondary translations, such as *1 Enoch* (Ethiopian), the book of *Jubilees* (Ethiopian), *4 Ezra* (Latin), or *2 Baruch* (Syriac). The great standard works on the Judaism of the New Testament period (E. Schürer, *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi* [3 vols; Leipzig; J. C. Hinrichs, 1901–1909]; W. Bousset and H. Gressmann, *Die Religion des Judentums im späthellenistischen Zeitalter* [Tübingen: Mohr, 1926]) reflect this state of the research with respect to sources.

⁵ Interestingly enough, among the first scholars to study the Qumran findings in the early stages of research were often New Testament scholars (including Karl Georg Kuhn, Joseph A. Fitzmyer, Raymond E. Brown, Matthew Black, Herbert Braun, and later James H. Charlesworth). In the German-speaking research, this continued even longer and included, among others, Otto Betz in Tübingen, Hartmut Stegemann in Marburg and Göttingen, Jürgen Becker in Kiel, Gert Jeremias in Tübingen, Heiz-Wolfgang Kuhn in München, and Hermann Lichtenberger in Münster and Tübingen. Cf. J. Frey, “Qumran Research and Biblical Scholarship in Germany,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Scholarly Perspective: A History of Research* (ed. D. Dimant; STDJ 99; Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2012), 529–564 (in this volume, 85–119).

⁶ In particular, these are the *Community Rule* 1QS with its appendixes 1QSa (*Rule of the Congregation*) and 1QSB (*Rule of Blessings*), the *Hodayot Scroll* (1QH^a), the *Habakkuk Peshet* (1QP^{Hab}), which are still considered today to be group specific texts of the *yahad*, as well as the *War Scroll* (1QM), whose origins many scholars believe to have taken place in part outside of the *yahad* even though it was initially considered to be a text of the Qumran “sect.” The *Damascus Document* (CD), already discovered 50 years earlier in Cairo Geniza, was rightly interpreted in close connection with these finds from the very beginning. Manuscripts of this text (in an older text-form) were then discovered in Cave 4

Jewish “sect” of the “Essenes”⁷ – a group testified to in some ancient texts (primarily in Philo of Alexandria, Flavius Josephus, and Pliny the Elder) – inspired large-scale comparisons with texts and phenomena of the early Jesus movement: On both sides of the comparison was a formidable entrepreneurial personality, on the one hand, the “teacher of righteousness” and, on the other hand, Jesus of Nazareth; water rituals and communal meals were practiced on both sides; and the forms of scriptural interpretation, dualistic and eschatological ideas, aspects of communal ordering, and interesting linguistic parallels were all ripe for comparison.⁸ Thus, just a few years after the discoveries, scholars proposed far-reaching hypotheses about a possible connection be-

of Qumran. However, it would be an interesting thought-experiment to ask how the history of research would have gone if these texts had not been discovered first, but instead the multitude of very diverse and quite fragmentary texts from Cave 4.

⁷ On these Essene texts, see A. Adam, *Antike Berichte über die Essener* (2nd rev. and exp. ed. by Christoph Burchard; KIT 182; Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 1972). G. Vermes and M. Goodman, *The Essenes: According to the Classical Sources* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989). The first research to voice the identification of the community testified about in the texts as the Essenes (“Essene hypothesis”), apparently on the basis of the localization of the Essenes at the Dead Sea by Pliny, *Nat.* V 73, was the Israeli editor of the first three scrolls from Cave 1, E. L. Sukenik in a book that appeared in Hebrew (מגילת גנוזות מתוך גנוזה קדומה ונמצאה במדבר יהודה) [Jerusalem: Bialik Foundation, 1948], 1:16f.; on this, see H. Stegemann, “The Qumran Essenes – Local Members of the Main Jewish Union in Late Second Temple Times,” in *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Madrid 18–21 March, 1991* (ed. J. T. Barrera and L. V. Montaner; STDJ 11; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 2:83–166. The hypothesis was soon taken over and expanded by numerous scholars including Karl Georg Kuhn, André Dupont-Sommer, William Brownlee, and the excavator of the ruins at Qumran, Roland de Vaux. Since the 1980s, due to insight into the diversity of the finds (primarily those from Cave 4) and due to the increased perceptions of the differences between the Qumran texts and the ancient reports about the Essenes, this association has been increasingly questioned. Nevertheless, it is still a widely held position among Qumran specialists today. However, the relationship of the *yahad* community with the (probably broader) Essene movement is no longer fixed in the sense of a clear identification. On this matter, see J. C. VanderKam, “Identity and History of the Community,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today* (ed. P. W. Flint and J. C. VanderKam; 2nd ed.; Leiden, Boston, and Köln: Brill, 1999), 487–533; J. Frey, “Zur historischen Auswertung der antiken Essenerberichte. Ein Beitrag zum Gespräch mit Roland Bergmeier,” in *Qumran kontrovers* (ed. J. Frey and H. Stegemann with assistance from M. Becker and A. Maurer; Einblicke 6; Paderborn: Bonifatius-Verlag, 2003), 23–56 (English translation “The Historical Value of the Ancient Sources about the Essenes,” in this volume 163–194); as well as J. J. Collins, “Beyond the Qumran Community: Social Organization in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” *DSD* 16 (2009): 351–369.

⁸ The early research into this “Christian” agenda, with its attempt to use the Qumran texts to understand the New Testament, is well-documented in Herbert Braun, *Qumran und das Neue Testament* (2 vols.; Tübingen: Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1966). There, see the questions about the Qumran meals and the Lord’s Supper in 2:29–54.

tween the Qumran community and the Jerusalem early church community or between the texts from Qumran and the New Testament.⁹ Of course all assumptions of a direct historical, literary, or personal connection between Qumran and Early Christianity soon turned out to be overstated and untenable.¹⁰ Nevertheless, even after the early Qumran fever subsided and in light of the now practically completed publication of the texts from the Qumran corpus, the comparison of individual motifs is still an instructive way of research.¹¹ This also applies to the question of the mention of meals in some Qumran texts and in the ancient reports about the Essenes and their significance for the understanding of the Lord's Supper or the early Christian tradition of meals.¹² Since then, the testimonies about the regulations for the meals

⁹ In the boldest manner, the French Orientalist André Dupont-Sommer formulated this thesis in a book in 1950: A. Dupont-Sommer, *Aperçus préliminaires sur les manuscrits de la Mer Morte* (L'Orient ancien illustré 4; Paris: Maisonneuve, 1950), 119–122 (“La ‘Nouvelle Alliance’ Juive et al ‘Nouvelle Alliance’ Chrétienne”), where he – in his reception of the theses of the French scholar Ernest Renan from the 19th century about the Essenes as a forerunner of Christianity in the community of the New Covenant attested to in Qumran – wished to see what he called the Damascus “New Covenant” a precursor to the Christian “New Covenant.”

¹⁰ For an overview of the various attempts to connect Qumran with Early Christianity, see Frey, “Die Bedeutung der Qumran-Funde für das Verständnis des Neuen Testaments,” 133–155; cf. idem, “The Impact of the Dead Sea Scrolls on New Testament Scholarship” (in this volume), 527–578.

¹¹ On the methodological problems and these comparisons, see Frey, “Die Bedeutung der Qumran-Funde für das Verständnis des Neuen Testaments,” 155–163; idem, “Critical Issues in the Investigation of the Scrolls and the New Testament” (in this volume); idem, “The Impact of the Dead Sea Scrolls on New Testament Interpretation” (in this volume).

¹² See the research report up to shortly before 1960 in Braun, *Qumran und das Neue Testament*, 29–53; a fundamental and constant point of reference of the later discussion is the earliest but thorough essay by K. G. Kuhn, “Über den ursprünglichen Sinn des Abendmahls und sein Verhältnis zu den Gemeinschaftsmahlen der Sektenschrift (1QS),” *EvT* 10 (1950/51): 508–527; English translation “The Lord's Supper and the Communal Meal at Qumran,” in *The Scrolls and the New Testament* (ed. K. Stendahl; New York: Harper & Brothers, 1957), 65–93; cf. further the earlier research of J. van der Ploeg, “The Meals of the Essenes,” *Journal of Semitic Studies* 2.2 (1957): 163–175; E. F. Sutcliffe, “Sacred Meals at Qumran,” *HeyJ* 1 (1960): 48–65; J. Gnllka, “Das Gemeinschaftsmahl der Essener,” *BZ* 5 (1961): 39–55; J. F. Priest, “The Messiah and the Meal in 1QSa,” *JBL* 82 (1963): 95–100; J. Pryke, “The Sacraments of Holy Baptism and Holy Communion in the Light of the Ritual Washings and Sacred Meals at Qumran,” *RevQ* 5 (1964–66): 543–552; H. Haag, “Das liturgische Leben der Qumrangemeinde,” *ALW* 10 (1967/68): 78–109; M. Delcor, “Repas culturels esséniens et thérapeutes, thiasés et haburoth,” *RevQ* 6 (1967/68): 401–425; J. E. Groh, “The Qumran Meal and the Last Supper,” *CTM* 41 (1970): 279–295; L. Cirillo, “La problematica contemporanea sulle origini dell'Eucaristia nel Nuovo Testamento. Il banchetto della Comunità di Qumrân: anticipazione giudaica dell'Eucaristia Cristiana,” *Asp* 12 (1965): 115–142, 369–411; H. Burgmann, “Das Kultmahl der Qumrangemeinde und der politische Gegensatz zum Makkabäer Jonathan,” *ThZ* 27 (1971): 385–398.

in the texts from Qumran form (at times in connection with the references in the ancient reports about the Essenes) one of the religious-historical contexts (among others) for understanding early Christian meals or the Eucharist.¹³

The fascination which the testimonies about the Qumran communal meals meant for interpreters of the 1950s and 1960s can be easily recognized from the early essay by Karl Georg Kuhn in 1951: At a time when significant schools of New Testament exegesis – the school of Rudolf Bultman and before him the History-of-Religions School – believed that “cultic” worship of Christ was possible only in the Hellenistic-Gentile-Christian community, and thus regarded the synoptic words on the Lord’s Supper only as a relatively late formation, the evidence of sacral or allegedly “sacramental” meals in a group of Palestinian Judaism could be evaluated as an indication that even the Markan “cultic formula in its ... ‘pre-Markan expression’ ... could not have originated only in the Hellenistic community.”¹⁴ Unlike the explanation of the Markan words of institution from the context of the Passover meal – which was advocated by Joachim Jeremias, but rejected by Rudolf Bultmann – the Qumran meal texts could offer parallels for aspects that could not be explained from the Passover situation.¹⁵ The exegetical reception of the Qumran

From the new research, D. E. Smith, “The Messianic Banquet Reconsidered,” in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls I* (ed. Lawrence H. Schiffman and James C. VanderKam; Oxford: Oxford University, 2000), 530–532; P. Bilde, “The Common Meal in the Qumran-Essene Communities,” in *Meals in a Social Context: Aspects of the Communal Meal in the Hellenistic and Roman World* (ed. I. Nielsen and H. S. Nielsen; Aarhus: Aarhus University, 1998), 145–166; D. E. Smith, “Meals”; and in particular H.-W. Kuhn, “The Qumran Meal and the Lord’s Supper in Paul in the Context of the Greco-Roman World,” in *Paul, Luke and the Greco-Roman World: Essays in Honour of Alexander J. M. Wedderburn* (ed. A. Christophersen, C. Claussen, J. Frey, and B. Longenecker; JSNT.S 217; Sheffield: Sheffield, 2002), 221–248; and M. Becker, “Mahlvorstellungen und Mahlpraxis in der Yahad-Gemeinschaft,” in *Der eine Gott und das gemeinschaftliche Mahl. Inklusion und Exklusion biblischer Vorstellungen von Mahl und Gemeinschaft im Kontext antiker Festkultur* (ed. W. Weiss; BThSt 113; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchner Verlag, 2011), 44–75.

¹³ Thus, with different questions and evaluations in the monographs and works on the Lord’s Supper, exemplary is H.-J. Klauck, *Herrenmahl und hellenistischer Kult. Eine religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zum ersten Korintherbrief* (NTAbh.NF 15; Münster: Aschendorff, 1982), 177–184, who interprets the meals attested to in Qumran alongside the meal of the Therapeutai attested to in Philo as mystery banquets in Judaism, and M. Klinghardt, *Gemeinschaftsmahl und Mahlgemeinschaft. Soziologie und Liturgie und Liturgie frühchristlicher Mahlfeiern* (TANZ 13; Tübingen and Basel: Francke, 1996), 217–250, who interprets the Qumran meals within the context of banquets within Hellenistic associations.

¹⁴ Kuhn, “Sinn,” 514.

¹⁵ Kuhn, “Sinn,” 519, calls attention to (a) the exclusive participation of men, (b) the participation of only community members, (c) the phenomenon that not the householder, but a duly appointed chairman functions as the lord of the table, and (d) that the lord of the table speaks the benediction over the bread and over the wine.

testimonies thus took place in a specific theological context and with specific argumentative interests in the background. This is the only way to understand why scholarship has been so fiercely debating whether or not the Qumran meals can be described as “sacramental.”¹⁶

These early scholarly approaches, inspired by a Christian-theological interest in the significance of the Qumran texts for understanding Early Christianity and the New Testament texts,¹⁷ can be problematized in many respects from today’s perspective on the Qumran corpus:

(a) The examination of the Qumran meals under the one-sided question of whether they have any parallels to Jesus’ Last Supper or to the early Christian Eucharist led to the transference of inadequate categories such as the category of “sacramental” to the Qumran texts. Here, recent research, under the influence of Jewish discussion partners, has become much more cautious, looking for an appropriate classification of the texts within the Jewish meal practices and meal traditions¹⁸ and also relating them to the regulations of Greco-Roman associations.¹⁹ The old questions about the theological implication of the Qumran meals, their sacral or even “sacramental” character, and their connection with Early Christianity have been largely replaced by questions more appropriately related to Qumran and by social-historical and ritual-theoretical issues.

(b) The two central texts 1QS VI 1–8 (with textual parallels in 4QS manuscripts) and 1QSa II 7–8 are still the only primary witnesses for community meals within the *yahad* community. The *Community Rule* with the appended catalog of punishments (1QS V 1–IX 26) and the *Rule of the Congregation* 1QSa are unanimously considered as group specific (i.e., sectarian) texts, which arose in the *yahad* or, if one wishes to use the term, in the “Qumran

¹⁶ See the sober presentation of Braun, *Qumran und das Neue Testament*, 2:36: “If one assumes as a definition of sacrament that it works *ex opera operato* and gives by means of a supernatural medium eternal life, then the Qumran meals are not a sacrament.”

¹⁷ See Frey, “Qumran Research and Biblical Scholarship in Germany.” The shift in research was marked by the work of the Jewish Qumran scholar L. H. Schiffman, *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls: The History of Judaism, the Background of Christianity, the Lost Library of Qumran* (Philadelphia and Jerusalem: Jerusalem Publication Society, 1994).

¹⁸ See the careful argumentation in Kuhn, “The Qumran Meal and the Lord’s Supper,” 229–234.

¹⁹ Cf. the foundational work of 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 and Göttingen: Freiburg Academic, 1986); see also M. Klinghardt, *Gemeinschaftsmahl und Mahlgemeinschaft*, 227–245. Finally, see also Y. M. Gillihan, *Civic Ideology, Organization, and Law in the Rule Scrolls: A Comparative Study of the Covenanters’ Sect and Contemporary Voluntary Associations in Political Context* (STDJ 97; Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2012), 339–363 (on 1QS VI) and 500–502 (on 1QSa II).

community”²⁰ so that at least partial aspects of the meal practice of this group can be reconstructed from them.

After the early publication of these two texts, which were intensively debated from the beginning, the further publication of the fragments from the other caves did not reveal any further texts relevant to the discussion of meals so that one could ask whether early research has not overestimated the significance of the meals for Qumran’s own self-understanding. From the ritual-theoretical point of view, of course, it should be noted that rituals are formative for the life of a community and its ethos, even if they are not constantly re-explicated and reflected upon. Rather, the meal regulations testify to essential aspects of the community’s order of life, and it is in this regard that the Qumran regulations are first and foremost to be interpreted. They show which aspects had central importance for the order and the life of the community. Their “yield” for the understanding of other Jewish or early Christian meals, in comparison with this goal is secondary.

(c) From a contemporary perspective, only the smaller part of the Qumran corpus is to be regarded as group-specific while a larger part of the parabiblical, sapiential, and exegetical texts as well as, for example, all the Aramaic texts are very likely not authored by the *yahad* community or the tradent circles of the “library” of Qumran, but likely came into their possession from outside where they were simply read, copied, and finally deposited in the caves. Although the criteria for the assignment (of the texts) are not entirely clear and are therefore controversial,²¹ there is now a widespread consensus that the Qumran corpus as such represents much more than a mere “sectarian library”: it represents a wide spectrum of literary production of the Judaism of the three “pre-Christian” centuries. To that extent, the Qumran texts contribute to an even more comprehensive way of elucidating the Palestinian-Jewish environment of the early Jesus movement.

(d) However, there is also no consistency between the texts that have arisen within the *yahad*. Scholarship has revealed numerous significant differences between the instructions of the *Community Rule* in 1QS (and its parallels in the 4QS manuscripts), the *Rule of the Congregation* 1QSa, the *Damas-*

²⁰ Concerning the differentiation, see above at n. 1.

²¹ On this discussion, see J. Frey, “The Textual Discoveries of Qumran and New Testament Scholarship: A Mediating Balance, Hermeneutical Considerations, and Concretions on the Jesus Tradition,” in this volume; see the foundational work of 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 1; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1990), 167–187; also, A. Lange, “Kriterien essenischer Texte,” in *Qumran kontrovers* (ed. J. Frey and H. Stegemann; Einblicke 6; Paderborn: Bonifatius, 2003), 59–69; and finally D. Dimant, “The Vocabulary of the Qumran Sectarian Texts,” in *Qumran und die Archäologie. Texte und Kontexte* (ed. J. Frey, C. Claussen, and N. Kessler; WUNT 278; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 347–395.

cus Document CD (with its parallels in the 4QD texts), and other rule texts, which are now being intensively discussed.²² From this fact, it can be deduced that historical developments and certainly also differing subgroups can be expected within the movement, which is well over 200 years old.²³ This should also be taken into account when interpreting the relevant text from 1QS and 1QSa.

(e) Having read the Qumran texts from the beginning as testimonies of the “Essene” movement in the light of the ancient texts about the Essenes, the earlier scholarship has been severely challenged over the past 30 years. The differences between the Qumran texts and the ancient reports about the Essenes came more into focus, and the simple identification of the *yahad* with the Essenes has become problematic. In my opinion, there are still good reasons why the *yahad* spoken of in the Qumran texts is related to the “Essene” group as an “umbrella organization”²⁴ and thus the group-specific texts reveal something of the “inner perspective” of this group. The ancient texts about the Essenes, instead, present an “outsiders’ perspective” or an “*interpretatio graeca*.”²⁵ Thus, the Qumran meal texts deserve a reading that does not enter into a discussion about the provisions from the reports about the Essenes, but reads the texts – even in the gaps that exist in the information provided – in their own right.

(f) Finally, the instructions of the *Community Rule* 1QS were often related to the local situation of Khirbet Qumran and the community living there, and so the meals described in the rule texts were also located there. Of course, such a reading presupposes, first of all, a direct relationship between the local situation or the community living there and the texts, which has been vigorously contested by some authors, although, in my opinion, such a connection still provides the best hypothesis for explaining the overall archaeological findings.²⁶ With regard to the meals, it must be taken into account that large quantities of crockery have been found in the Khirbet Qumran compound, which makes it probable that meals were held in the largest room of the compound, right next to the location where the crockery was kept. Nevertheless,

²² See the recent work of A. Schofield, *From Qumran to the Yahad: A New Paradigm of Textual Development for the Community Rule* (STDJ 77; Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2009).

²³ On the understanding of the *yahad* as an “umbrella” term, cf. J. J. Collins, *Beyond the Qumran Community*, 85f.

²⁴ Cf. Collins, “The Yahad and ‘The Qumran Community,’” in *Biblical Traditions in Transmission: Essays in Honour of Michael A. Knibb* (ed. C. Hempel and J. M. Lieu; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 81–96.

²⁵ See my argument in Frey, “The Historical Value of the Ancient Reports about the Essenes,” in this volume.

²⁶ See Frey, “Qumran and Archaeology,” in this volume; see also Jodi Magness, *The Archaeology of Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Grand Rapids and Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2002).

the *Community Rule* and the *Rule of the Congregation* are probably older than the commissioning of the Khirbet Qumran compound.²⁷ That is, the formulation of the corresponding instructions and their observance were probably initially independent of the local situation of Khirbet Qumran and were instead formulated in circles of the *yahad* in other places somewhere within Palestine. As much as it may be true that Qumran held meals and some of the traditional meal instructions were likely to have been followed, the textual statements are to be interpreted independent of the archaeological “outlook” of the Qumran compound and our (still unclear) notions of the life and the activity of its users.

B. The Sources about the Essene Meals

Among the source texts discussed are the ancient texts about the Essenes (or Essaiioi),²⁸ which must first of all be differentiated from the rest since their respective reference to the *yahad* is unclear. On the other hand, they have a number of parallels which – if other reasons are found to justify the assign-

²⁷ According to the currently valid chronology of the settlement, the commissioning of the compound could not have been possible prior to 100 BCE. The handwriting of 1QS is usually dated between 100 and 75 BCE, but the parallel manuscript of 4QSa is probably still at the end of the 2nd century BCE (see also Magness, *The Archaeology of Qumran*, 68). Parts of the texts compiled in 1QS, therefore, go back to the 2nd century BCE. On the development of the S-material, see in particular Sarianna Metso, *The Textual Development of the Qumran Community Rule* (STDJ 21; Leiden: Brill, 1997); eadem, *The Serekh Texts* (LSTS 62; London: T&T Clark, 2007).

²⁸ See the compilation of the sources in A. Adam, *Antike Berichte über die Essener* (2nd revised and expanded edition by C. Burchard; K1T 182; Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 1972), a translation is available in Vermès and Goodman, *The Essenes*. For a discussion about the value of the sources, see T. S. Beall, *Josephus' Description of the Essenes Illustrated by the Dead Sea Scrolls* (SNTSMS 58; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988); H. Stegemann, “The Qumran Essenes – Local Members of the Main Jewish Union in Late Second Temple Times,” in *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls Madrid 18–21 March 1991* (ed. J. Trebolle Barrera and L. Vegas Montaner; STDJ 11,1; Leiden: Brill, 1992): 83–166; idem., *Die Essener, Qumran, Johannes der Täufer und Jesus* (Freiburg: Herder, 1993); R. Bergmeier, *Die Essener-Berichte des Flavius Josephus. Quellenstudien zu den Essenertexten im Werk des jüdischen Historiographen* (Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1993); a critical assessment in J. Frey, “Historical Value,” in this volume; and most recently, J. E. Taylor, *The Essenes, the Scrolls and the Dead Sea* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012) and Roland Bergmeier, *Die Qumran-Essener Hypothese. Die Handschriftenfunde bei Khirbet Qumran, ihr spezifischer Trägerkreis und die essenische Gemeinschaftsbewegung* (BThSt 133; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchner Verlag, 2013).

ment of the *yaḥad* with the Essene movement²⁹ – can serve as secondary information about the wider framework of the *yaḥad*. Therefore, these sources should at least be briefly mentioned here and be referred to with respect to their statts about the meals.

(a) The greatest uncertainty is about the so-called “Therapeutai,” about whom Philo of Alexandria reports in his work *De vita contemplativa*,³⁰ because in view of his idealized depiction of this group “poetry and truth [are] even more difficult to divorce than usual”³¹ and neither their localization nor their relation to the “Essaioi” mentioned by Philo can be really clarified in other writings.³² What is reported about their meals is therefore interesting only in terms of (idealized) forms of Jewish meal practices,³³ but in reality it moves away from the meals of the “Qumran community” or their texts.

More important are reports about the Essenes in Flavius Josephus and in Philo, insofar as their external perspective, which clearly reflects an *interpretation graeca*, reflects the movement to which the Qumran community belonged, whose life is also mirrored in the rule texts from Qumran.³⁴ But even these texts must be methodologically differentiated from the original testimonies and should not be used as the key to their interpretation. Rather, it is the other way around. The details of the Greek testimonies on the Essenes can be elucidated from the Hebrew original texts of the *yaḥad* preserved at Qumran.

(b) In his work *That Every Good Person is Free (Quod omnis probus liber sit)*, Philo describes the Essenes as a philosophical community within Judaism according to Greco-Roman ideals. Among other things, he reports that the Essenes do not offer animal sacrifices, they live in communal property,

²⁹ See Frey, “Historical Value”; idem, “Essenes,” in *The Eerdmans Dictionary of Early Judaism* (ed. J. J. Collins and D. C. Harlow; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), 599–602.

³⁰ Philo distinguishes these from the Essenes, about whom he may have written in a lost treatise that preceded *De Vita contemplativa* (see Philo, *Contempl.* 1).

³¹ Thus Klauck, *Herrenmahl und hellenistischer Kult*, 184. On the *Therapeutai* meals, see pp. 184–187; cf. also Klinghardt, *Gemeinschaftsmahl und Mahlgemeinschaft*, 183–216.

³² A common thesis is that the *Therapeutai* “represented an Egyptian off-shoot of the Palestinian ascetic movement of the Essenes” (thus Vermes and Goodman, *The Essenes*, 17; there, see 16f. also a brief comparison with the passages about the Essenes). Taylor, *The Essenes, the Scrolls and the Dead Sea*, 47, assigns them to a different, mystical-ascetic community and to the allegorical school of exegetes in Alexandria. For R. Bergmeier, the *Therapeutai* are Diaspora Jews in Egypt, described in light of philosophical ideals; see Bergmeier, *Die Qumran-Essener Hypothese*, 144–176.

³³ On the *Therapeutai* meals, see also Klauck, *Herrenmahl und hellenistischer Kult*, 168–172, 184–187; Klinghardt, *Gemeinschaftsmahl und Mahlgemeinschaft*, 183–216; and finally more concisely in S. Al-Suadi, *Essen als Christusgläubig. Ritualtheoretische Exegese paulinischer Texte* (TANZ 55; Tübingen and Basel: A. Francke Verlag, 2011); further literature in Becker, “Mahlvorstellungen und Mahlpraxis in der Yaḥad-Gemeinschaft,” 63.

³⁴ See my argument in Frey, “Historical Value,” in this volume.

have clothes and food in common ownership, and have meals together.³⁵ Also in his *Apologia pro Ioudaeis*,³⁶ which is fragmentarily cited by Eusebius, Philo describes the Essenes as a group that lives in many places in Judea,³⁷ is organized in associations or brotherhoods, and maintains communal meals,³⁸ for which a steward from the common treasury obtain what is necessary.³⁹

(c) Somewhat more detailed is Josephus' testimony about the meal practices of the Essenes. Although we have reason to doubt his claim that he also spent time in the religious party of the Essenes,⁴⁰ he may have come into contact with members of this group as the son of a Palestinian priest and as a leader in the war against the Roman occupying forces, and thus some of the Essenes way of life may have become known to him. In this respect, even if his extensive passage on the Essenes (*J.W.* II 119–161) might have been acquired from a source, a certain amount of knowledge must be reckoned with, even though this knowledge may remain superficial and represent an external perspective.

In this text, Josephus also reports about the meetings of the Essenes and their meal practices: For the meal at lunchtime or after the fifth hour⁴¹ is preceded by ablutions so that the Essenes then “[enter] into the dining room; as into a certain holy temple.”⁴² There it says:

“and quietly set themselves down; upon which the baker lays them loaves in order; the cook also brings a single place of one sort of food, and sets it before every one of them; (131) but a priest says grace before meal; and it is unlawful for any one to taste of the food before grace be said. The same priest, when he hath dined, says grace again after meal; and when they begin, and when they end, they praise God, as he is the one who bestows life.”⁴³

Then, he reports about a second meal, in the evening, at which guests could apparently also be present. They eat:

³⁵ Philo, *Prob.* 75–91 (85f), text in Vermes and Goodman, *The Essenes*, 22f.

³⁶ In Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* VIII 11.1–18. On the problems of transmission, see S. Inowlocki, *Eusebius and the Jewish Authors: His Citation Technique in an Apologetic Context* (AJEC 64; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 290–293.

³⁷ *Apol.* 11.1.

³⁸ *Apol.* 11.5

³⁹ *Apol.* 11.10f.

⁴⁰ *Jos. Vita* 10f.

⁴¹ *Jos. J.W.* II 129.

⁴² *J.W.* II 129; Flavius Josephus and W. Whiston, *The Works of Josephus: Complete and Unabridged* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1987), 605. For an explanation, see the detailed commentary of S. Mason and H. Chapman, *Judean War 2: Translation and Commentary* (Flavius Josephus. Translation and Commentary, Vol. 1B; Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2008), as well as Beall, *Josephus; Description of the Essenes*, 52–54.

⁴³ *J.W.* II 130f.; Flavius Josephus and William Whiston, *The Works of Josephus*, 605 (slightly changed at the end).

“after the same manner; and if there be any strangers there, they set down with them. Nor is there ever any clamor or disturbance to pollute their house, but they give every one leave to speak in their turn; which silence thus kept in their house, appears to foreigners like some tremendous mystery; the cause of which is that perpetual sobriety they exercise, and the same settled measure of meat and drink that is allotted to them, and that such as is abundantly sufficient for them.”⁴⁴

The meal reports are inserted in a presentation of the daily routine of the Essenes, from the prayer before sunrise⁴⁵ over the morning work, the midday meal in purity, and the afternoon work up until the evening meal.⁴⁶ Characteristic of the two daily meals are an extraordinary purity practice, special garments, the framing by prayers of the priest and a final joint praise, and a strict table order with respect to speaking and silence. Particularly noteworthy for Josephus is the moderation in food and drink, the sobriety, and the fact that everyone gets the same amount of food. From the closure of the section, it is clear that Josephus pursues apologetic interests with his description and wants to arouse in his readers echoes of Greek mysteries.⁴⁷ However, some of the traits mentioned are also supported by statements in the Qumran rule texts and, to that extent, the report may well be read as a representation of the meal practices in a *yahad* like or related group.

The particular concern for purity and the practice of the purity rites is amply documented in the texts of the *yahad*, as well as the primacy of the priests at the table and in the blessing,⁴⁸ the limitation of the participants to full members of the community,⁴⁹ who are not under punishment by exclusion from the “purity of the many,”⁵⁰ for participation in the meetings and for the meals, and the order of the speeches is clearly arranged by rank.⁵¹

Apart from the emphasis that everyone gets the same amount of food and everyone gets only one dish, Josephus’ account of the meals says little. Bread

⁴⁴ *J.W.* II 132f.; Flavius Josephus and William Whiston, *The Works of Josephus*, 605.

⁴⁵ When Josephus speaks of prayers “to the sun,” he uses elements from the imaginative world of the Greco-Roman reader (see Mason and Chapman, *Judean War* 2, 105f.). But for Jewish piety, this would hardly be imaginable. In this respect, there is certainly an *interpretatio graeca*. The Qumran texts themselves speak of prayers at the time of sunrise. Josephus’ description is relatively close to the catalog of prayer times in 1QS X 1–3, included again in 1QS X 10 (see Beall, *Josephus’ Description of the Essenes*, 52–54).

⁴⁶ It is interesting that the evening meal is held with guests. However, it is probably not the “other minds” that were expressly excluded in the description of the midday meal, but rather like-minded travelers, members of an external “Habura” (see Beall, *Josephus’ Description of the Essenes*, 61).

⁴⁷ *Jos. J.W.* II 133; see also *Jos. Ag. Ap.* II 189; cf. Mason and Chapman, *Judean War* 2, 108 n. 827.

⁴⁸ Cf. 1QS VI 4f. and 1QSa II 17–21

⁴⁹ Cf. 1QS V 13 and 1QS VI 22; see Beall, *Josephus’ Description of the Essenes*, 58.

⁵⁰ Cf. 1QS VI 24f.; VII 2f.; VII 15f., etc.

⁵¹ Cf. 1QS VI 10–13; CD XIV 6.

is a very general and unspecific type of food.⁵² Also, it is not explained what status the guests have who are mentioned in connection with the evening meal. Possibly, traveling members of other “local communities” are meant, so that the same purity would have been assumed for them as well. The question to what extent the meal described here can be considered sacral does not receive a clear answer in the text. However, it should be remembered that the entire life of the Essenes in this report has a sacral character and that the community is especially concerned about purity. The table blessing as such belongs to an ordinary Jewish meal and does not guarantee a special sacredness. Rather, Josephus’ primary concern above all is to give his readers the impression of the sacred (by pointing to the silence, the ablutions and prayers, and the comparison of the dining room with the holy temple).⁵³ Since the meal described here does not seem to have a salvific character or to be related to specific religious content,⁵⁴ the text offers no reason to speak of a sacramental act or even a “sacrificial act.” For the comparison with early Christian meals, it only has limited analogies.

C. The Meal Regulations of the *Yahad* from the Qumran Corpus

If we move away from these “secondary sources” to the primary sources, the group-specific texts about meals from the *yahad* or the “Qumran community,” then there are only the two short sections in the rule texts (genre: *særækh*⁵⁵) IQS and IQSa, in which meal-related instructions are given but also remain quite concise and incomplete in their statements. In analyzing these texts, one should neither harmonize the divergent statements nor fill in their respective gaps from the ancient texts about the Essenes.

Both texts were written on one and the same scroll, the manuscript IQS, whose main contents (columns I–XI) is called today the *Community Rule* (previously “Sectarian Rule”), whereas two parts of the same scroll were physically separated from the columns I–XI from the beginning of the scientific exploration and were therefore referred to as IQSa (*Rule of the Congregation*) and IQSb (*Rule of Blessings*⁵⁶), with a separate count of columns. Thus, IQSa was originally part of the scroll of IQS, copied by the same

⁵² In the meals of the Qumran texts, bread and “wine” or must (*tyrwš*) appear. In his mention of the *Therapeutai* meals, Philo emphasizes that “simple bread” and spring water are served (Philo, *Contempl.* 27), which highlights the simplicity of the meal.

⁵³ *J.W.* II 129.

⁵⁴ The meal here is certainly not depicted as a “priestly [] sacrificial act,” as is still supposed by Klauck, *Herrenmahl und hellenistischer Kult*, 181 (along with 1 QS VI 2–6).

⁵⁵ See the overview by Metso, *The Serekh Texts*.

⁵⁶ The term is erroneous insofar as there is no rule but a collection of blessings; see Metso, *The Serekh Texts*, 54.

scribe, it was physically connected with IQS I–XI, just forming columns 12 and 13 of the same scroll.⁵⁷

Thus, the original scroll of IQS did not provide the coherent text of a single rule but is a collection of texts⁵⁸ to which (possibly in a lightly edited form⁵⁹) several partly originally independent texts have been compiled:⁶⁰ a covenant liturgy (IQS I 1–III 12), the so-called Treatise on the Two Spirits (IQS III 13–IV 26), the actual *Community Rule* (*særaekh ha-yahad*) with the attached catalog of punishments (IQS V 1–IX 26), a text on prayer times with a concluding “Psalm” (IQS IX 26–XI 22), as well as the two pieces of the *Rule of the Congregation* (*særaekh ha-yahad*) IQSa and the *Rule of Blessings* IQSb, which were already separated when the scroll got in the hands of scholarship but clearly belonged to that same scroll and were copied onto it by the same scribe.⁶¹

The compilation of divergent rules in a single manuscript and the fact that even after the preparation of the large manuscript of IQS even older versions of the rule IQS were further copied partly in combination with different texts⁶² calls into question traditional ideas about the character and degree of commitment to these rules. Perhaps they are at least in some parts (e.g., in the catalog of punishments) more like records of decisions of certain community committees, which could be different here and there, rather than general and permanently binding rules.⁶³ Also with regard to the meal practices there might have been differences and developments.

⁵⁷ See D. Barthélemy, “Annexes à la règle de la Communauté,” in *Qumran Cave I* (ed. D. Barthélemy and J. T. Milik; DJD 1; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1955), 107f.; H. Stegemann, “Some Remarks to IQSa, to IQSb, and to Qumran Messianism,” *RevQ* 17 (1996): 479–505, here 484–486.

⁵⁸ A. Lange and H. Lichtenberger, “Qumran,” 54f.; H. Stegemann, *Die Essener, Qumran, Johannes der Täufer und Jesus: Ein Sachbuch* (10th ed.; Freiburg, Basel, and Wein: Herder, 2007), 152–164.

⁵⁹ Thus the view recently taken by Charlotte Hempel based on the Treatise on the Two Spirits: C. Hempel, “The *Treatise on the Two Spirits* and the Literary History of the *Rule of the Community*,” in *Dualism in Qumran* (ed. G. G. Xeravits; LSTS 76; London and New York: T&T Clark, 2010), 102–120.

⁶⁰ Evidence for the autonomy of the texts can be seen by the fact that all parts of the texts except IX 26–XI 22 have their own heading, as well as IQSa and IQSb.

⁶¹ See Barthélemy, “Annexes à la règle de la communauté,” 107. Stegemann, “Some Remarks,” 480–486. Whether these pieces have been separated by their Bedouin discoverers or were found already detached can no longer be determined; the affiliation with IQS is out of the question for reasons of material and writing.

⁶² This is the result of the foundational research by Metso, *The Textual Development of the Qumran Community Rule*.

⁶³ Cf., for example, Schofield, *From Qumran to the Yahad*, 183–188. Concerning the Qumranic handling with the differences and differing rules, see C. Hempel, “Vielgestaltigkeit und Verbindlichkeit: Serekh ha-Yachad in Qumran,” in *Qumran und der biblische*

The two meal texts from Qumran have no further support from outside of the Qumran corpus. This suggests that they reflect the specific practice and mindset of the *yahad*-community, which is to be regarded as a tradent circle of the Qumran library. It also included the inhabitants of Khirbet Qumran, who eventually shipped the scrolls into the caves. Whether texts that differ in some details also reflect the meal practices of Khirbet Qumran cannot be determined with certainty since both texts are earlier than the commissioning of this compound. Furthermore, 1QS^a, above all, poses specific interpretational issues.⁶⁴

I. The Instructions for Meals in the Community Rule 1QS VI 2–8

The first pieces of information can be found in the *Community Rule* 1QS V–VII, in subsection 1QS VI 2–8,⁶⁵ which contains rules for the community life, including aspects of the communal meals. These notes are closely linked to statements about the communal prayer, the communal counseling, and the study of the Torah, so that the meals themselves are placed in a spiritual-cultic framework which shapes the whole of the communal life of the *yahad* and therefore does not indicate a specific, “sacramental,” salvation-mediating function of the meal. The text says:

In these (precepts) 2 they shall walk in all their dwelling places. Wherever they are found each one with his respect to his fellow: the lesser one shall obey the greater with respect to work and money. And they shall eat (in) unity, 3 say benedictions (in) unity, and give counsel (in) unity. And in every place where there are ten men (belonging to) the Council of the Community, there must not be lacking among them a man (who is) 4 a priest. And each member shall sit according to his rank (תַּכְּוִי) before him, and in thus they shall be asked for their counsel concerning every matter. When the table has been prepared for eating, or the new wine 5 for drinking, the priest shall be the first to stretch out his hand, in

Kanon (ed. M. Becker and J. Frey; BThSt 92; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchner, 2009), 101–120.

⁶⁴ The main discussion here is whether this regulation of the meal in the presence of the Messiah only describes an eschatological expected situation or whether this regulation also relates to the present situation of the community as an “eventuality” and is significant to the community. See below at 3.2.2.

⁶⁵ Fragmentary parallels to this section are contained in 4QS^d (4Q258) II 7–10 (on lines 2–7), in 4QSⁱ (4Q263) 4–5 (on lines 3–4), and in 4QS^g (4Q261) frg. 2a–c (on lines 3–5). The text is distorted in lines 5–6 by a dittography; on this, see J. H. Charlesworth and E. Qimron, “Rule of the Community (1QS),” in *Rule of the Community and Related Documents*, vol. 1 of *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations* (ed. J. H. Charlesworth; PTS DSSP 1; Tübingen and Louisville: Mohr Siebeck, 1994), 26. On the interpretation of this passage, see Metso, *The Serekh Texts*, 10f. and 30–32, as well as the detailed work of H.-W. Kuhn, “The Qumran Meal and the Lord’s Supper in Paul in the Context of the Graeco-Roman World,” 222–236, and finally Becker, “Mahlvorstellungen und Mahlpraxis in der *Yahad*-Gemeinschaft,” 46–57.

order to bless the first (produce of) the bread⁶⁶ 6 and the new wine. And when there are ten (members) there must not be lacking a man who studies the Torah day and night 7 continually, each man relieving another. The Many shall spend the third part of every night of the year in unity, reading the Book, studying judgment, 8 and saying benedictions in unity. This is the rule for the session of the Many: each (member) in his order. The priests shall sit first, the elders second, and the rest of 9 all people shall sit each (member) in his order.⁶⁷

At the end, the section is delimited by a *spatium* and is followed by a new heading, “This is the rule for the session of the many (רבים),” i.e., the full members, and offers instructions for the meeting of the “many” who were already named in line 7.

The beginning is not clearly marked. But the beginning of the context is probably not until line 3: “and in every place ...,” but the previous clause should be added as a heading or a transition from the preceding provisions (V 20–VI 1). The phrase “in these (precepts) they shall walk in all their dwelling places ...” already indicates that the instructions refer to different places or local communities, and in no case only to those in one place such as Khirbet Qumran. The subsequent programmatic instruction (VI 2–3), “the lesser one shall obey the greater with respect to work and money. And they shall eat (in) unity (*yahad*), 3 say benedictions (in) unity (*yahad*), and give counsel (in) unity (*yahad*),” makes it clear that the prominent interest of the text is in the hierarchy and obedience on the one hand and on communality or communal life on the other hand. The adverb *yahad* (=collectively, in unity) occurs three times, and the word (as a noun) has also become a self-designation of the community, whose interests the rule aims to order.⁶⁸ Hierarchy and community are also dealt with in the following instructions, including those about the communal meal, which is mentioned as only one aspect among others concerning communal life.

At the beginning of the section, there is an instruction for the assembly of the “Council of the Community.” It is questionable whether this phrase (as the numerous other places in 1QS⁶⁹) is intended to refer also to the assembly of the full members or whether it is about the meeting of a special body, similar to 1QS VIII 1, where it is stated that the “Council of the Community” consists of twelve men and three priests. The fact that the rules for the assembly of the “Many” (רבים) are introduced after the section VI 1–8 in VI 8ff. with a new headline might suggest such a distinction, especially since the following section also mentions the “Council of the Community (VI 10), inasmuch as everyone should present his insight to the “Council of the Com-

⁶⁶ There is a dittography in the manuscript which is rightly omitted here.

⁶⁷ The translation here and in the following is according to the Princeton Dead Sea Scrolls Edition: Charlesworth and Qimron, “Rule of the Community (1QS),” 26f.

⁶⁸ Cf. the heading in 1QS V 1: “And this is the rule for the men of the *yahad*”

⁶⁹ Cf. 1QS III 2; V 7; VI 10, 12f., 16; VII 2, 22–24.

munity” in the gathering of the “Many.” In connection with the gathering of the “Many,” however, there is no mention of a meal. On the other hand, a communal provision for the members of the *yahad* also seems to be suggested by the catalog of punishments if it makes sense that, for example, a member should be deprived of a quarter of his food for violations (cf. 1QS VI 25).⁷⁰

The assembly of the “Council of the Community” requires a quorum of ten, male full members, with the emphasis that a priest should “not be absent.” This instruction would be nonsensical if the rule was to apply only to the group living in Qumran, where certainly more than ten full members and also priests were present. Rather, the rule as a whole (along with its sub-provisions) was initially conceived probably not for this settlement, but for different (sometimes probably smaller) communities in the country in which such a quorum was not always present.⁷¹ This quorum, which the rabbis later call “*minyān*,”⁷² can only be found in 1QS (but similarly in CD XIII 2f.), which is why some interpreters considered the passage an interpolation.⁷³ Admittedly, the text of the rules in 1QS V–VII is not completely coherent, which is probably due to the fact that it was composed of various parts which cannot be fully systematized.⁷⁴ However, this makes it more difficult to classify the meal statements offered within this context.

The second named requirement for the gathering of the “Council of the Community” that (at least) one priest (cf. 1QS VIII 1: three priests) be present seems equally aimed at smaller, dispersed *yahad* groups and emphasizes the priestly claim to leadership for the *yahad* as a whole, which is then also explicitly used with respect to the seating order when it is said that the men

⁷⁰ Thus rightly assessed by Gillihan, *Civic Ideology, Organization, and Law in the Rule Scrolls*, 341, who admits, “Exactly, how commensality, blessing and deliberation went together, we do not know. ... We do not know if assemblies of the Many followed, preceded, or included common meals.”

⁷¹ Of course the community rules as a whole are not designed for the settlement in Qumran but for other groups, presumably before the commissioning of the compound.

⁷² For a worship service, cf. *m. Ber.* 7:3; *m. Ab.* 3:6; and *m. Meg.* 4.3, with *b. Meg.* 3B; also *m. Sanh.* 1:3 for the image of a council of judges and *t. Pes.* 4:3 as well as *Jos. J.W.* VI 423 for the eating of the Passover lamb.

⁷³ Cf. Metso, *The Serekh Texts*, 11f. and 30f. This hypothesis, which was initially primarily established on the assumption that the other instructions in 1QS should apply specifically to the Community in Qumran (for which the quorum would then be nonsensical), of course, does not explain what eventually led to the insertion of this section (thus the justified criticism of Becker, “Mahlvorstellungen und Mahlpraxis in der *Yahad*-Gemeinschaft,” 49f.). All in all, the rules have come from different groups and therefore are not completely coherent.

⁷⁴ “[T]he passage in 1QS 6 is no more distinct literarily than other pericopes in the Rule.” (Collins, “The *Yahad* and ‘The Qumran Community,’” 88).

should sit “before him,” i.e., the priest, according to their rank and be asked for their advice.⁷⁵

Immediately following this instruction is the brief note about the meal, followed by another statement parallel to the previous one that in the place where there are ten men, there should “not be lacking a man who studies the Torah – during the day and at night – always, one man trading off with his neighbor” (VI 6–7). Thus, in the *yahad* communities, there must be at least ten men for an uninterrupted, alternating study of the Torah. Finally, an analogous passage is added about the “Many,” who watch together for one third of the nights, read in the book (probably the Torah), study law, and – this is added here – should worship together (VI 7–8). Here again one must ask whether these “Many” are identical with the aforementioned meeting of at least ten men or if the passage indicates a larger circle. Perhaps the addition of this instruction to the “Many” is already to be understood as a transition to the next section in which – after a *vacat* and under a new heading – rules for the “gathering of the Many” are given. In this respect, it is also questionable whether the triad of reading in the book, study of law, and common worship is originally connected with the preceding instruction concerning meals, i.e., whether it is as easy as it has often happened to see the men in a “worship service” setting of Scripture interpretation and praise. For literary reasons, there are doubts that this is the case and it is unclear whether all the actions mentioned here are carried out by the same group or even in the same meeting. The simple assumption of a “worship service” with Scripture interpretation, meal, and songs of praise is based on an overly bold conjecture⁷⁶ – the text does not describe one, nor does it prescribe it in a particularly liturgical process.

The concise statement about the meal, inserted between the statements describing the assembly of the Council of the Community and the study of the Torah of the Many, describes only one individual aspect of the meal ordinance: “When the table has been prepared for eating, or the new wine 5 for

⁷⁵ The assembly of the “Many” mentioned in VI 8ff. is then differentiated into three groups: priests, elders, and the rest of the whole people. This may also reflect the different stages of the community.

⁷⁶ Klinghardt, *Gemeinschaftsmahl und Mahlgemeinschaft*, 229–244, particularly 230, wants to derive this from a harmonious reading of IQS and 1QSa and the following comparison with the meals in Hellenistic associations. However, first, in view of the differences and the inconsistencies within IQS V–IX, such a reading is hardly permissible, and, second, the comparison of the events of such a reading with Hellenistic texts proves absolutely nothing. The thesis that even after IQS VIff. “the communal events [are composed] of three parts and besides the meal itself includes prayer and a council meeting” (Klinghardt, *Gemeinschaftsmahl und Mahlgemeinschaft*, 48), is simply based on too inaccurate a reading of the text, to which the objection of Lawrence H. Schiffman (*Sectarian Law in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 191) remains justified.

drinking, the priest shall be the first to stretch out his hand, in order to bless the first (produce of) the bread 6 and the new wine.”⁷⁷ This instruction is also concerned primarily with the priestly primacy, which is made concrete here in the order of the blessing: the priest, who presides over the assembly, has to speak the *Beracha* over the bread and the cup. It is significant that the task otherwise assigned to the master of the house in a Jewish meal is entrusted to the priest as chairman of the congregation.⁷⁸ However, the meal does not acquire a specifically sacral character through this blessing of the table and the cup, unless one takes from the formulation a “liturgical” process according to which blessing over bread and wine precedes the meal in a different way than in a normal meal, which could then be interpreted as a tendency to “detach the blessing of bread and wine from the meal time as an isolated cultic act.”⁷⁹ In that case, of course, there would be an analogy to early Christian phenomena, but such a course, in my opinion, cannot be deduced from the abbreviated text.

In general, it should be borne in mind that the text leaves several aspects of the communal meal unclear because they were familiar or perhaps were not of such great importance to the participants that they needed to be regulated. Some elements may be inferred from the context, but caution is needed here over daring conjectures.

- It is initially unclear who the participants of the meal are and when the meal takes place. Does it refer specifically to the aforementioned “Council of the Community” as a special body or, more generally, to the common constituents of the *yahad* groups mentioned in the heading of the section (“and they are to eat together”)? If the “Council of the Community” also designates the assembly of all the full members here (i.e., analogous to the “Many” in lines 7 and 8ff.), it would still be unclear whether the meal instruction refers to the daily meals or to one specific meal. It can be reasonably assumed that only the full members of the community participate in the meal. Since 1QS, unlike 1QSa I 4–5, only speaks of men and not of women and children, this could mean that only men are involved in this meal. However, 1QSa states that this was not the only and everywhere valid position of the *yahad*.
- It is also not further specified what was actually served at the meals. Bread and wine are metonymic for the entire meal. The extensive discussion of what exactly is meant by the term תִּירוֹשׁ⁸⁰ need not be discussed here. If the assumption is true that the reference here is to not entirely unfermented

⁷⁷ Thus the text corrupted by dittography.

⁷⁸ This has already been pointed out by Karl Georg Kuhn in his early essay.

⁷⁹ Thus, in my opinion, contra Klauck, *Herrenmahl und hellenistischer Kult*, 178.

⁸⁰ See Kuhn, “The Qumran Meal and the Lord’s Supper in Paul in the Context of the Graeco-Roman World,” 225–228.

grape juice but instead to new wine (cf. 11QT^a XXI 4–10),⁸¹ then there would be an internal relation to the first-fruits explicitly mentioned in this context or the “first-fruits of the bread.” It is hardly conceivable for daily or weekly meals in the course of the year that new wine and first-fruits were always available, but on the other hand, there is no hint that the rule would only refer to a one-off feast of harvest or of the first-fruits. It is therefore more likely that this statement transfers aspects of such a banquet to the regular meals of the community. In connection with this, some interpreters referred to the otherwise unknown wine festival in the *Temple Scroll* (11QT^a XXI 3–10 and XLIII 3, 7–9),⁸² in which first-fruits also play a role. “Since these belong to the priestly tithes, their consumption guarantees purity.”⁸³ If this aspect were at least metaphorically transferred to the regular meals in the *yaḥad*, then at the same time there would be a connection to the primacy of the priests and to their actions. Even if the “normal” meals of the *yaḥad* – be they with all the full members or a specific body – may not have always consisted of first-fruits and new wine, this formulation would hold a claim to a particular purity that corresponds to the ritual purity cultivated by the *yaḥad*.

- Finally, many aspects of the meal process remain unclear, and thus the question about the extent to which the meal should be connected with the council, the study of the Torah, and songs of praise, and thus the extent to which it assumes the character of a “worship service” remains. From the brief remark, no “liturgical” processes can be deduced, and thus one cannot assume – as in the case with the synoptic Gospels’ presentation of the words of the Lord’s Supper – a sequence of blessing the bread, blessing the cup, and the concluding meal. In this respect, it can be assumed that the daily meals in the *yaḥad* did not occur in any decisively different way from daily meals held in contemporary Judaism. The (later) sources from the Mishna and Tosefta do not offer such a close arrangement of bread and wine,⁸⁴ but this arrangement in the present text is not an indication of a different meal process, but is instead only interested in the fact that the benedictions in both cases be spoken by a priest. In this sense, 1QS VI offers no indication of an “isolated cultic act”,⁸⁵ the priestly benediction over the bread called first-fruits and over the cup called “new wine” – whatever it

⁸¹ See the argument in Kuhn, “The Qumran Meal and the Lord’s Supper in Paul in the Context of the Graeco-Roman World,” 225–228.

⁸² Cf. Kuhn, “The Qumran Meal and the Lord’s Supper in Paul in the Context of the Graeco-Roman World,” 228; Becker, “Mahlvorstellungen und Mahlpraxis in der Yaḥad-Gemeinschaft,” 54.

⁸³ Becker, “Mahlvorstellungen und Mahlpraxis in der Yaḥad-Gemeinschaft,” 54.

⁸⁴ This is shown in detail by Kuhn, “The Qumran Meal and the Lord’s Supper in Paul in the Context of the Graeco-Roman World,” 229–233.

⁸⁵ Contra Klauck, *Herrenmahl und hellenistischer Kult*, 178.

contained – only reflects the interest in priestly primacy which, perhaps, is found in the original context of temple festivals but now shows the purity orientation and priestly supremacy in the *yahad*.

The priestly primacy, which is also emphasized in the seating order in the gathering, thus comes to expression in the meals of the *yahad* and is at the same time “ritually” affirmed. That is, here the meal is primarily addressed in relationship to its function as a representation of the social structure of the community.⁸⁶ Another “meaning” cannot be clearly deduced from this text, which is why it is problematic to see parallels between the meal with respect to its other – largely unclear – aspects and the early Christian meal.

II. The So-Called “Messianic Meal” according to the Rule of the Congregation 1QSa II 17–22

The second meal text of the *yahad* occurs in the *Rule of the Congregation* 1QSa II 17–22. The text, however, has come down to us with gaps and offers numerous interpretational problems. Compared with the brief meal instruction in 1QS VI, the present description of a meal in the presence of the Messiah is more detailed and raises the question of the precise meaning of this noteworthy text and of the literary or tradition-historical context of the various meal rules, as well as their relationship to a form of the *yahad*.

1. The Problems of the Classification and Interpretation of 1QSa

The rule is attested only in 1QSa.⁸⁷ The two columns were copied as a part of the manuscript 1QS between 100 and 75 BCE by the same scribe who also wrote 1QS. The text is probably older and possibly goes back to the 2nd century BCE, perhaps as far back as the middle of the 2nd century.⁸⁸ 1QSa would then be the oldest of the received rule texts from the *yahad*, older than the

⁸⁶ Gillihan, *Civic Ideology, Organization, and Law in the Rule Scrolls*, 500f., formulates for 1QS VI and 1QSa II: “The regular procedure for dining communally is elaborated only to enforce the hierarchy of the sect, which placed priests above laity.”

⁸⁷ There are parallels to this text in nine possible manuscripts (4Q249^{a-i} = 4Qpap crypta 4QSerekh ha-‘Edah^{a-i}) in cryptic writing, see Stephen J. Pfann, “Cryptic Texts,” 515–574. Pfann suspects an older text from the beginning of the 2nd century BCE exists in the fragments form. But this can hardly be proven with sufficient certainty. The parallels do not offer much help for the reconstruction of the text.

⁸⁸ Cf. also Lange and Lichtenberger, “Qumran,” 59. Stegemann, “Some Remarks to 1QSa, to 1QSa, and to Qumran Messianism,” 493, primarily points to the Messianic concept of the text: “1QSa was composed at a time when the Essenes already longed for the coming of the Royal Messiah, but did not yet develop the concept of a Priestly Messiah. This stage of development is prior to the insertion of 1QS VIII 15b–IX 11 into the former text of this work and also prior to the concept of 4QTestimonia, which also include a Priestly Messiah.”

rule from 1QS V–VI (respectively its form preserved in 1QS).⁸⁹ In any case, in its present form, the terminology used in 1QSa suggests that the rule is a group-specific text” of the *yahad*.⁹⁰

Of course, there can hardly be any more certainty about the various hypotheses about the text and prehistory of the rule. Charlotte Hempel has suggested that in 1QSa I 6–II 11 there is a community rule which is in some respects related to D, but stems from a precursor movement to the *yahad* and that was later subjected to a “Zadokite” recension.⁹¹ Only in this later recension were the eschatological aspects in I 1–3 and II 12–22 and the emphasis of the priestly primacy added. Even bolder are the conjectures of Stephen Pfann, who tries to reconstruct a multilevel textual history from the small papyrus fragments of 4Q249^{a-i} in cryptic script, but the paleographical analysis of these texts is extremely difficult due to the lack of sufficient texts for comparison.⁹² In my opinion, these attempts are too uncertain to allow further conclusions.

In its preserved text, the rule establishes itself as a rule for the assembly of all Israel “at the end of the days” (i.e., in the end times). In this respect, a holistic Israelite claim is made, but at the same time it becomes clear that this assembly is an “elitist” group that has separated itself from the “way” of the people and is anxious to comply with God’s covenant in the midst of the evil, even to the point of making atonement for the entire country without any further explanation provided about how that is to take place.⁹³ It is equally clear in the opening that this community is under the direction of the “sons of the Zadoq,” the priest, “and the men of the covenant.”

In its present form,⁹⁴ after a heading and an introduction (1QSa I 1–5), the *Rule of the Congregation* contains a list of the ages and possible functions of

⁸⁹ Thus Stegemann, “Some Remarks to 1QSa, to 1QSB, and to Qumran Messianism,” 488: “an early rule-book of the Essenes.” See also idem, *Die Essener, Qumran, Johannes der Täufer und Jesus*, 159f. Perhaps both rules have older precursors: From the 4QS parallels to 1QS V–VI (especially to 1QS V 2, 9) one can possibly also recognize an older form of the community rule that was not yet marked by the priestly supremacy and possibly comes from the early days of the community (thus Lange and Lichtenberger, “Qumran,” 57). But for 1QSa, there is also the thesis of an older basic form with a “Zadikite” revision, which of course cannot be substantiated by manuscript parallels; cf. Charlotte Hempel, “The Earthly Essene Nucleus of 1QSa.”

⁹⁰ Terms such as *yahad* (1QSa I 26, 27; II 2, 11, 17, 18, 21), phrases such as “Council of the Community,” and certain theologumena clearly show their affiliation.

⁹¹ Hempel, “The Earthly Essene Nucleus of 1QSa,” 269.

⁹² Pfann, “Cryptic Texts,” 534 and 544–546.

⁹³ 1QSa I 3; cf. 1QS III 6–12.

⁹⁴ Its history of origin is controversial. S. J. Pfann says the 4Q249^{a-i} papyrus fragment represents a longer and older text and 1QSa offers an abbreviated text (see Pfann, “Cryptic Texts,” 534–543), but the reconstruction of the cryptic fragments of the papyrus is paleographically uncertain. Other authors suggest the text was composed of two originally

a man (I 6–19) and a list of reasons for exclusion from functions (I 19–22), then instructions for the Levites (I 22–25), instructions for the assembly of the community for judgment, council or war, and a special list of those who are called to the “Council of the Community” (I 25–II 3), and those who, for example, are excluded due to physical defects (II 3–11). The last part is the rule for the feast in the presence of the Messiah (II 11–22), which is at the center of our interest here.

The *Rule of the Congregation* differs from The *Community Rule* 1QS Vff. not only in the spectrum of topics covered but also in important details. One aspect deserves particular attention: While the congregation, about which 1QS speaks, seems to be a gathering of men, the congregation mentioned in 1QSa I 5 apparently also includes women and children who were equally included in the “precepts of the covenant” (1QSa I 5). Whether these should also be presented in the meal described in Column II (where they are not mentioned) cannot be guaranteed, but neither can they be ruled out.

Of course, the relationship of 1QSa to the other rules in 1QS V–VI and in the *Damascus Document* (CD) is subject to complex discussions.⁹⁵ We cannot attribute the different rules to entirely different groups on the basis of the existing differences, but neither can these three Rules be considered a linear progression of any of the others.⁹⁶ The most plausible explanation is probably the assumption that the rules were developed relatively independently side-by-side and thus point to different subgroups within the “umbrella organization” of the *yahad*.⁹⁷

The main interpretational problem lies in the question of whether the text (and thus also the rule for the meal in the presence of the Messiah) offers an

independent parts, an uneschatological community order (1QSa I 6–II 11) and an eschatological treatise (1QSa I 1–3 and II 11–22), says Hempel, “The Earthly Essene Nucleus of 1QSa,” 253–269; see also, G. G. Xeravits, “Rule of the Congregation (1Q28a),” in *The Eerdmans Dictionary of Early Judaism* (ed. J. J. Collins and D. C. Harlow; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), 1171f.

⁹⁵ Cf. the recent contributions to the discussion, primarily Schofield, *From Qumran to the Yahad*; and J. J. Collins, “Beyond the Qumran Community”; and Gillihan, *Civic Ideology, Organization, and Law in the Rule Scrolls*.

⁹⁶ The most obvious are the parallels between Sa and D.

⁹⁷ Thus, most recently in Schofield, *From Qumran to the Yahad*, who suggests a “radical-dialogical” model of a partially independent development of the Rule versions for different, though contiguous circles of addressees. This can be combined with the relatively flexible model proposed by John Collins, according to which the *yahad* was an “umbrella organization” of different groups (possibly even differently composed groups), but are nevertheless connected in many details. Cf. Collins, “The Yahad and ‘the Qumran Community,’” and idem, *Beyond the Qumran Community: The Sectarian Movement of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Grand Rapids and Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2010).

eschatological utopia for an expected Messianic age,⁹⁸ or whether it offers rules for the *yahad* in the present day and thus also reflects its meal practice of and its ideas about the meal. The heading “Rule for the Whole Congregation of Israel in the End of Days” is often interpreted in the first way,⁹⁹ but of course within Qumran אחרית הימים is a *terminus technicus* for the end times which have already begun.¹⁰⁰ Therefore, despite the later mention of the Messiah, one should not relate the text to a “distant” future, but should also see in it a mirror of the ideas and practice of the community at the time of the text’s writing. Provisions such as I 19–22, which regulate the exclusion of people with physical and mental defects, would hardly be necessary in an anticipated Messianic time. That is to say, the rules offered in IQSa – the regulations concerning the age of life, those concerning community functions, those concerning exclusion, and also the final regulation concerning the meal – are not to refer to an eschatological future¹⁰¹ but rather to the meals currently held in the community.¹⁰²

2. *The “Festive Gathering” and the Meal in the Presence of the Messiah*

The meal instruction in the concluding part of the rule has been handed down with numerous gaps, and the context itself presents us with a number of problems. Here, I provide James H. Charlesworth’s translation (which has occasionally been modified¹⁰³):

⁹⁸ Thus the assumption in L. H. Schiffman, *The Eschatological Community of the Dead Sea Scrolls: A Study of the Rule of the Congregation* (SBLMS 38; Atlanta: SBL Press, 1989), 34 and 53.

⁹⁹ Thus the recent contribution by Gillihan, *Civic Ideology, Organization, and Law in the Rule Scrolls*, 456.

¹⁰⁰ Cf. A. Steudel, אחרית הימים in the Texts from Qumran,” *RevQ* 17 (1996): 479–505, as well as Stegemann, *Die Essener, Qumran, Johannes der Täufer und Jesus*, 160f.

¹⁰¹ Thus, the older authors such as Priest, “The Messiah and the Meal in IQSa,” who later changed his opinion: “It seems more probable that the Qumran community understood their regular communal meals as anticipations of the great meal which would be celebrated when the Messiah appeared among them” (J. F. Priest, “A Note on the Messianic Banquet,” in *The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity* [ed. J. H. Charlesworth; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992], 228f.).

¹⁰² F. M. Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran* (3rd ed.; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995), 90: This is a “liturgical anticipation of the Messianic banquet.”

¹⁰³ J. H. Charlesworth and L. T. Stuckenbruck, “Rule of the Congregation (IQSa),” in *Rule of the Community and Related Documents*, vol. 1 of *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations* (PTSDSSP 1; Tübingen and Louisville: Mohr Siebeck, 1994), 116f.; cf. also Maier, *Die Qumran-Essener*, 1:243f.; J. Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte aus Qumran: Königliche, priesterliche und prophetische Messiasvorstellungen in den Schriftfunden von Qumran* (WUNT 104; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998). Becker, “Mahlvorstellungen und Mahlpraxis in der Yahad-Gemeinschaft,” 58f.

This is the session of the men of the name who are invited to the feast for the Council of the Community when 12 God leads forth the Messiah (to be) with them: The Priest shall enter at the head of all the congregation of Israel and all 13 his brothers, the Sons of Aaron, the priests who are invited to the feast, the men of the name. And they shall sit 14 before him each man according to his glory. And after (them) the Messiah of Israel shall enter. And the heads of 15 the thousands of Israel shall sit before him each man according to his glory (And they shall sit before the two of them, each) according to his rank in their camps and their journeys. And all 16 the heads of the magistrates of the Congregation with their sages and their knowledgeable ones shall sit before them, each man according to 17 his glory.

And when they solemnly meet together at a table of the Community to set out bread and new wine, and to arrange the table of 18 the Community to eat and to drink new wine, no man shall stretch out his hand to the first portion of 19 the bread or the new wine before the priest; for he shall bless the first portion of the bread 20 and the new wine, and shall stretch out his hand to the bread first of all. And after this has occurred the Messiah of Israel shall stretch out his hands 21 to the bread. And after that all the Congregation of the Community shall bless and partake, each man according to his glory. And they shall act according to this statue 22 whenever the meal is arranged, when as many as ten men meet together.

The section is clearly divided: After the heading (line 11f.), the first section deals with questions about the arrangement of the camp (lines 12–17), the second section addresses the questions about the arrangement of the meal (lines 17–21), and finally there is a last sentence that concludes the section (lines 21–22).

The most debated textual problem revolves around the reading of the last word in line 11,¹⁰⁴ where it is necessary to decide between יוֹלִיד (yōlīd) and יוֹלִיק (yōlīk). While the first reading has sparked much speculation about “the birth of the Messiah” or “the begetting of the Messiah” in the community, and many other readings have been proposed, Milik’s emendation that proposes the unreadable letter should be read as a *kaph* seems like the best reading.¹⁰⁵ It is probably about [God] bringing up the Messiah (i.e., that this one – presumably a “kingly” or “military” figure¹⁰⁶ – appears at the assembly of Israel). This is, therefore, a hypothetical situation that corresponds to the hope of the *yahad*, but because of the consciousness that they are living in the end time, it has the character of a “real utopia.” Consequently, it is about what is to be observed in the “festive gathering” [מוֹעֵד] of Israel in the presence of the Messiah. The term מוֹעֵד is supplemented by two others: “Council

¹⁰⁴ The supplementary and interpretative suggestions are listed by Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte aus Qumran*, 30–32.

¹⁰⁵ Thus also Charlesworth and Stuckenbruck, “Rule of the Congregation (1QS_a),” 109 and 116f.

¹⁰⁶ Here, there is talk of an anointed one with the article, who is seated before the military leaders, insofar as it is clear that a political concept of the Messiah stands in the background.

of the Community” occurs as an explanation and therefore might designate the entire assembly of Israel, whereby the previously introduced term of the “men of renown” (אנשי השם) also makes it doubtful if the participation of women is intended. This is at least questionable for the military seating order in lines 12–17.

The seating order shows a strict orientation on rank with the simultaneous division into laity and priest, emphasizing that the anointed or “Messiah” belongs to the layman (and then at the top). First, however, the priestly side is described. At the top of the entire community of Israel is the (high) priest, before him – i.e., probably assigned to him or on his side – sit the “sons of Aaron, the priests,” as is emphasized: “everyone corresponding to his dignity (כבוד).” Then – and this order is obviously important – comes “the anointed one/Messiah of Israel” and before him sit, “each one according to his dignity,” the heads of the thousands and the heads of the clans of the community, and the wise ones. The Messiah, therefore, stands at the head of a lay group that consists of military leaders in the first rank, who have earned their honor in military campaigns, and in the second rank are the clan chiefs, sages, and other notable individuals. On the whole, however, this hierarchically organized assembly of the people is divided into two: the priests, who sit first marking their priority; and the laity and the military, who follow them. Here, too, the Messiah is not only subordinate to the priest (that is, to the high priest), but also in a certain sense to all the priests, even though he stands at the head of the second group, the “laymen.”

This same hierarchical structuring can also be seen in the subsequent meal ordering, wherein it is not clear whether this meal should be conceived as taking place in the same meeting or whether it is a meal in a different constellation and according to a different seating order. But here, too, the primacy of the (high) priest is emphasized with respect to the blessing (and the consumption) of bread and new wine.

Many aspects are in accordance with the ordinance of IQS VI: the emphasis on “communal” when in lines 17–18 the “communal table” (השולחן הדיהר) is mentioned twice, the talk of the “first-fruits” of the bread (line 18f.) and of new wine (תירש), and of course the primacy of the priest in view of the *Beracha*, the praise over the first-fruits of the bread and new wine (and then also in view of the grasping of the bread, i.e., the food). While the other members of the community – each according to his dignity – should speak the *Beracha*, interestingly enough, there is no talk of a *Beracha* in view of the Messiah. Again, this may not be a coincidence, but it is the intention of the whole section to emphasize that (even) the Messiah is subordinate to the priests as an emphatically “worldly” figure, which is a principle that of course applies *a fortiori* to all other non-priests.

Interesting is the conclusion of the passage, which now transmits the (hypothetical) situation of the presence of the Messiah as an instruction to all

groups of ten full members and to all the meals. This makes it perfectly clear that the order presented here should be practiced in all the sub-groups of the *yahad* affected by the rule (provided that the quorum of ten men is reached) and “in every preparation” (i.e., meal).

That is to say, even if IQSa II 17–22 does not explicitly describe the meal of the community or the “Council of the Community” as in IQS VI 4–6, but focuses on an eschatological special case – namely the festive gathering and the meal “when God brings the Messiah” – this special case is referred back to every communal meal by way of the concluding expression of application. Thus, it is clear that the order presented in the special case serves primarily to inculcate this principle for the present practice of the community: The order valid for the time of the presence of the Messiah should already be in practice at the time when the Messiah has not yet come.¹⁰⁷ In this respect, this text is concerned with an eschatologically justified rule for the presence. Certainly the community expected a meal or the repeated communal meal for the time of the Messiah’s presence.¹⁰⁸ But the text does not describe those meals in more detail. It does not design a “vision of the future,” but rather the aspect that matters is to determine the “culti[c] rank of the Messiah of Israel” in relation to the “priest.” This primacy “of the priest” or “the priests” should also apply “to the smallest possible local community”;¹⁰⁹ the order of precedence, in principle, affects even the Messiah of Israel and limits his function and dignity. This cultic theology, indeed, “ontological” theology is a part of this present text. For this reason, it is not permissible to enter into the text the notion of a “Messianic double reference” to a priestly and a political Davidic Messiah.¹¹⁰ This idea cannot be substantiated for IQSa, and it was probably

¹⁰⁷ Incidentally, even the presence of the Messiah does not seem to give the meal itself any other character or meaning, which first of all questions all comparisons with the Christian Lord’s Supper.

¹⁰⁸ According to Schiffman, *The Eschatological Community of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 6, this Messianic time is only set after the eschatological battle. Of course, for example, the meal aspect is absent from IQM such that one cannot establish a consistent “schema” of eschatological events. See Priest, “A Note on the Messianic Banquet,” 229.

¹⁰⁹ Stegemann, *Die Essener, Qumran, Johannes der Täufer und Jesus*, writes, “The high priest would always rank higher than the Messiah anyway. The problem dealt with could only arise in the country for the many simple priests in all places. The Messiah had to be explicitly subordinated to them so that the primacy of all priests in the future would remain untouched” (163).

¹¹⁰ Contra Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte aus Qumran*, 33f. It is true, of course, that in the hypothetical situation of the presence of the Messiah his counterpart, the head of the community of Israel, is to be presented as a high priest, as the high priest of the Messianic age. However, this is not simply identical with the “Messiah of Aaron,” who stands next to the “Messiah of Israel” in IQS IX 11. The interpretation of the corresponding texts of the *Damascus Document* (CD XII 23–XIII 1, XIV 19, XIX 10f., XX 1) is difficult since משיח

only developed after the writing of 1QSa in (parts of) the *yahad* community.¹¹¹

Not only the meal ordinance in the narrower sense, but the entire section from line 11 on is determined by the division of priestly and “secular”-military elements. Already in the previously described “festive assembly” of the “men of renown” (II 11), which probably does not include the women and children mentioned in I 4f., this division exists when it is shown that at the head of the community of Israel is the (high)priest, and then the priests, and after that – when they have taken their places and sat down – the “Messiah of Israel,” and then the officers, and – subordinated once more – the other men of dignity. In this ordering, which is strongly oriented in its structure on the model of the camp order of Israel, cultic and profane, priests and non-priests are clearly spatially (in the sitting arrangement) differentiated (in the succession of entry or the individual setting). This expresses the Zadokite priestly primacy that shapes the structure of the community. And the “Messiah of Israel” as a layman may preside over the *Chilarchen* and other notable men, but he is inferior in rank to “the priest,” indeed ultimately to all the priests, just as all laity are subordinate to the priests.

This order is lengthened and concretized in the concluding meal situation, which – as must always be taken into account – is formulated in view of the regular community members without the presence of the Messiah.

The rest of the description of the meal is similarly scarce as in 1QS VI 2–8, and similar ambiguities remain as they do there:

- Ultimately, it is unclear who attends the meal. First of all, it may seem obvious that the participants in the meal are also the participants in the previously mentioned festive assembly, but this is not said anywhere.¹¹² In any case, the military element in lines 17–21 is emphasized less, the seating order or the compound order is not described, and only “the priest,” “the Messiah of Israel,” and “the entire congregation of the community” are mentioned. This openness may be due to the fact that a special situation is used as a paradigm for the “normal case.”
- The meal process itself cannot be better reconstructed than in 1QS VI. The sequence of eating (“the hand stretched out to the bread”) or the beginning of the meal is regulated, but whether it can be seen from the presentation that the priest should speak the *Beracha* at the beginning of the meal over the bread and wine in a combined double act (and this is to be repeated in-

is in the singular. See the problem in Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte aus Qumran*, 40–45.

¹¹¹ Cf. Stegemann, *Die Essener, Qumran, Johannes der Täufer und Jesus*, 162f. and 286.

¹¹² It is also not explicitly stated that the women and children mentioned in column I are not present even though the heading of this section only mentions the “men of renown,” suggesting that the session described is not a “full assembly” of the community.

dividually by every single participant) is rather questionable. The emphasis on these two “elements of the meal” simply stems from the fact that they are connected to a *Beracha*. The regular meals of the communities will have oriented themselves on the usual procedure for the meals, and a specific liturgy is not recognizable.

- With regard to the components of the meal – of bread (called first-fruits) and wine (again referred to as תִּירוֹשׁ = new wine) – the same questions remain as they were phrased with regard to 1QS VI 2–8. Bread and wine are probably metonymic for eating and drinking in general,¹¹³ especially since, in view of the “blessing procedure” presented, it is only these two elements that must be mentioned. The *Beracha* spoken over the bread includes all the food. It would be a misleading conclusion here if one wanted to speak of a “sacral” character of the meal on the basis of these two elements and the *Beracha*.¹¹⁴ In any case, no other form of “sacrality” can be discerned than that the strict purity requirements of the community are respected.
- The blessings over the bread and wine, the emphasis on cultic purity, and the special role of the priests can therefore be fully explained against the background of contemporary ritual practice.¹¹⁵ It is not suggested that the meals take the place of the sacrifices in the temple.¹¹⁶ If anything is derived from the temple context, it is the purity of the community, and if possible, the purity of the meals, which is associated with the priestly consumption of first-fruits and new wine.
- Also striking is the brevity of the meal instructions. Not once is the food explicitly mentioned, least of all other aspects of the meal such as the table conversation, counseling, etc. Once again, it is only the position of the Messiah of Israel and primacy of the priest or priests that are central here. The meal ordinance and, of course, the meal practice is therefore to be understood first and foremost as a reflection of the social structure of the

¹¹³ Cf. Schiffman, *The Eschatological Community of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 56; J. Magness, “Communal Meals and Sacred Space at Qumran: Ancient Jewish Asceticism (sic) and the Essenes,” in *Debating Qumran: Collected Essays on its Archaeology* (ed. J. Magness; ISACR 4; Leuven: Peeters, 2004), 81–112.

¹¹⁴ Thus rightly Schiffman, *The Eschatological Community of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 59, against 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* (Cambridge: Cambridge, 1965), 10–13; cf. also Delcor, “Repas culturels esséniens et thérapeutes, thiasés et haburoth,” who wanted to see a substitute for the temple cult in the meals.

¹¹⁵ Thus, Schiffman, *The Eschatological Community of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 61.

¹¹⁶ Thus, Yadin, *War Scroll*, 200. On the other hand, see Schiffman, *Sectarian Law in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 193.

community and at the same time as a means of consolidating it in every meal.¹¹⁷

D. Consequences and Outlook: The Meals of the *Yahad* and the Lord's Supper

What remains of the initial enthusiasm of scholarship for the meals in Qumran and to what extent are they still to be considered an element in the wider context of the texts of the early Christian celebration? If one interprets the two Qumran meal testimonies in their own literary and historical context and renounces a methodology that fills in the gaps from the Essene texts of Josephus and Philo and from anachronistic early Christian categories, the yield is clearly more modest. At best, the texts from Qumran provide indirect analogies since there is no direct personal or social link between the "Qumran community" and Jesus or the early Christian community.

It should also be noted that we know less about the meals in the *yahad* or its subgroups than scholarship had long wished to believe. The fact that the *yahad* communities had common meals with the full members who provided the food from a common supply and who – as in the life of the community in general – had a very high standard of Levitical purity is not disputed. It is also probable that the otherwise present primacy of the priests within the community came to expression in these meals through the speaking of the benediction, thereby complying with and strengthening the already established hierarchy within the *yahad*.

On the other hand, it is unclear whether the meals of this kind were actually held daily or even twice a day, as Josephus says, or whether all the meals of the members were actually communal.¹¹⁸ It is also unclear whether only men participated in these meals or whether the women and children who also belonged to these communities participated in the communal meals – which remains unmentioned in the brief and very focused meal provisions of IQSa II 17–22, which deals solely with the primacy of the priests. It remains unclear whether there should be a distinction between the meals of the members and the meetings of a particular council or governing body, as the literary inconsistencies in IQS VI might suggest. It is also questionable whether all meals beyond the *Beracha* were connected with the praise of God, Torah study, council, or even legal decisions. This suggestion¹¹⁹ does not appear to

¹¹⁷ Thus, Becker, "Mahlvorstellungen und Mahlpraxis in der *Yahad*-Gemeinschaft," 51.

¹¹⁸ Concerning IQS VI, Schiffman, *Sectarian Law in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, rightly states, "The passage indicates no obligation that all meals be communal" (192).

¹¹⁹ On the one hand, in older research, it is often found to be an unreflective and anachronistic entry from the perspective of Christian meal celebrations; on the other hand, it

be justified by the text of 1QS VI. But if this is not the case, the meals of the *yahad* cannot be seen as specific “liturgical” events analogous to the early Christian meal celebrations.

The crucial point is the question of whether the meals in the *yahad* should be considered “sacred” – one should not speak of “sacramental” in this context anyway. On the one hand, one can detect a certain overall “sacrality” for the *yahad* and its communal life – if one views the *yahad*’s strict orientation on the Torah and a specific interpretation of it, as well as an intensified engagement in Levitical purity as “sacred,” then a differentiation between the meals and other aspects of the communal life would be moot. In view of the “meals,” however, a special “sacrality” cannot be detected.¹²⁰ There is nothing special about the edible matter nor is there special sacrality with respect to its consumption, nor is there anything particularly sacral with respect to the presence and function of one or more priests. Furthermore, one can see no connection between the meal and the “idea of sacrifice.” Finally, there is no specific sacral reference to the meals. Overall, the course of the communal meals remains as unclear as the nature of the food actually served. In both meal texts, talk of “first-fruits” and “new wine” suggests that – since both were not available year-round – these terms were transferred from certain temple contexts into the texts of the community and thus rather metaphorically highlight the special purity of the food, which existed even if *de facto* no first-fruits and no new wine was served or was available.

The points enumerated by Karl-Georg Kuhn,¹²¹ according to which the Qumran meals offer new and specific parallels to the tradition of the Lord’s Supper, are in part no longer valid: The fact that only men participated in the Qumran meals, as with Jesus, is known to be questionable not only in view of the Qumran testimonies, but also for the meal communities of the earthly Jesus and possibly even for his Last Supper. The fact that a meal is reserved for members of the community alone, i.e., full members or, in Christianity, baptized Christians, connects the *yahad* only with later manifestations of the Eucharistic celebration, while such an exclusivity cannot yet be proved for the early days of the Jesus community. The fact that in Qumran – as in a private meal – it is not the father of the house but an appointed master of the table who speaks the benediction is in fact an analogy between Qumran and the tradition of the Lord’s Supper, although this is not uncommon in meals of voluntary associations. Incidentally, the question of roles and powers in the context of the Lord’s Supper have been slow to emerge, while in the first two

occurs in other explanatory models in Klinghardt *Gemeinschaftsmahl und Mahlgemeinschaft*, 230ff. Here, Schiffman is rightly critical in *Sectarian Law in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 191.

¹²⁰ Thus rightly argued by Schiffman, *Sectarian Law in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 192–197.

¹²¹ Kuhn, “Sinn,” 519.

generations of the Jesus movement no rules whatsoever have been determined here.

There are perhaps two aspects that deserve attention, given the loose analogy of having community meals in two different and differently structured communities:

(a) With regard to the *yahad*, we must reckon with a community that understood itself in the beginning of the end-time and offers a certain analogy to Jesus' proclamation or the understanding of time in Early Christianity. The precise reason for this understanding of time differs.¹²² In the Jesus movement, it is the knowledge of the coming of the Messiah, the work of the eschatological Spirit, and the opening of the Kingdom of God; in Qumran, it is the insight given to the teacher and through him into the true interpretation of the Torah and the meaning of the words of the prophets that allows for purity and perfect living. Both are related to the lifestyle of the community as a whole, not specifically the meals. Of course, the purity of the community in the Qumran meals is particularly evident. But the crucial difference is that the Qumran meals have no apparent "spiritual" meaning, they are not a salvation historical commemoration and anticipation of an eschatological feast, and a "liturgical" character or the gathering for food, songs of praise, and counseling in a single event cannot be, in my opinion, proven from IQS VI.¹²³

(b) Interestingly, according to IQSa, the *yahad* held its meals according to an order related to the coming of the Messiah, or even valid for the expected time of his coming. In a sense, this provides an analogy to the early Christian communal meals after Easter. Of course, these were at the same time referring to the coming of God or to Jesus' Parousia and to a new, eschatological meal with the Messiah Jesus (cf. 1 Cor 11:26; Mark 14:26), referring back to a specific Last Supper of Jesus or to the meal communities in the time of his earthly presence, and from this last meal they experienced their decisive meaning. Such a "salvation-historical" reference, which could attribute a specific meaning to the meals, is just as unrecognizable in the Qumran meal texts as in the ancient testimonies about the Essenes. Here, an early Christian specificity is reflected.

(c) Finally, a specific meal ordinance or even a socially defined ranking of the meal participants in the early Christian meal texts is not yet recognizable. In these texts, neither a specific focus on the "purity" or "holiness" of the participants is raised – however much the aspect of "holiness" (in an ethical sense) plays a role – nor is any kind of primacy of certain "priestly" persons recognizable. Instead, there is a conspicuous distance of New Testament texts from (Jewish or Pagan) cultically determined terms. Here are the major and,

¹²² See Frey, "Die Textfunde vom Toten Meer und die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft," 267–272.

¹²³ Contra Klinghardt, *Gemeinschaftsmahl und Mahlgemeinschaft*, 230.

in my opinion, far more significant differences within all the parallels between the early Christian movement and the *yahad* attested to in the Qumran corpus.

12. The Authority of the Scriptures of Israel in the Qumran Corpus¹

In the discussion about the concepts of scriptural authority and the variations of the range of authoritative scriptures in the period of the emerging biblical canon, we can turn to the evidence of the Dead Sea Scrolls, in particular the Qumran Corpus or the Qumran Library, if the category is appropriate.² The textual discoveries from the Dead Sea, in particular from the 11 (or now perhaps 12)³ caves near *Khirbet Qumran*, but also other locations such as *Masa-*

¹ The present article is a reworked paper from the Barcelona conference in May 2017. For language corrections and editorial help I am grateful to Jacob Cerone. For earlier considerations on Qumran and issues of the biblical canon, see J. Frey, “Qumran und der biblische Kanon: Eine thematische Einführung,” in *Qumran und der biblische Kanon* (ed. M. Becker and J. Frey; BThSt 92; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 2009), 1–63 (English translation in this volume under the title “Qumran and the Biblical Canon,” 791–836), and idem, “Die Herausbildung des biblischen Kanons im antiken Judentum und im frühen Christentum,” *Das Mittelalter* 18 (2013): 7–26; a comprehensive assessment of the Qumran discoveries with particular consideration of their impact on understanding early Christianity is published in: idem, “Qumran,” *RAC* 28: 550–592 (English translation in this volume under the title “Qumran: An Introduction,” 791–836).

² The terms are not completely exchangeable. “Dead Sea Scrolls” can include the entirety of texts from the Qumran Caves and some other locations in the Judean Desert or near the Dead Sea, especially the biblical manuscripts found at Masada, Wadi Mruabba’at, and Naḥal Hever, but it is less useful to include all the writings from very different historical periods. “Qumran Corpus” is the most neutral term, as it only points to the entirety of written documents found at the location of Qumran, while “Qumran Library” includes some assumptions about the character of a library, such as a conscious collection, preservation, usage, and perhaps even storage of the writings by a certain group of owners or users. In my view, the Qumran Corpus shows traits of such an activity, in spite of its diversity, as its presence at Qumran and in the Caves is not merely accidental. Cf. A. Lange, “The Qumran Dead Sea Scrolls – Library or Manuscript Corpus?” in *From 4QMMT to Resurrection: Melanges qumraniens en hommage a Emile Puech* (ed. F. García Martínez, A. Steudel, and E. Tigchelaar; STDJ 61; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 177–93. – For an introduction into the Qumran Corpus, see D. Stökl Ben Ezra, *Qumran: Die Texte vom Toten Meer und das Antike Judentum* (Jüdische Studien 3; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016); further H. Stegemann, *The Library of Qumran: On the Essenes, Qumran, John the Baptist, and Jesus* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), and J. C. VanderKam and P. W. Flint, *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (San Francisco: Harper San Francisco, 2002).

³ In winter 2016/17, archaeologists of the Hebrew University discovered an additional cave where they found arrowheads and pottery, including storage jars and scroll fragments,

da or *Naḥal Hever*, have brought to light an enormous gain of evidence that allows scholars to close the gap between the time of the composition of the scriptures that now make up the Hebrew Bible and the formation of the (rabbinic) Hebrew canon. Before 1947, only a scant number of Hebrew fragments from that period were known, such as the small Papyrus Nash.⁴ As a result, scholarship was mostly dependent upon the testimony of Greek sources (e.g., Philo and Josephus, some passages from the Septuagint and the New Testament writings, and some Pseudepigrapha handed down to us in secondary translations) for reconstructing the development of the biblical canon. From Qumran, we got hold of a bulk of Hebrew and Aramaic manuscripts for the first time from the period between the final redaction of the latest texts of the Hebrew Bible (i.e., the book of Daniel in the mid-2nd century BCE) and the collection of the Mishnah, in the second century CE. From the more than 900 manuscripts that have been preserved at Qumran (at least in small fragments), more than 200 are biblical manuscripts and many others quote or refer to biblical texts in various ways. Thus, the Qumran Library has brought new light from material evidence (i.e., real manuscripts) where previous scholarship only could refer to external evidence or lists of narrative writings. From that additional evidence, we can now gain insights into the processes of writing and composing texts, quoting and commenting on earlier or authoritative writings, and assembling writings into major groups or collections.

However, there are some caveats that need to be made in advance in order to proceed cautiously with our analysis: The material evidence itself needs interpretation, and scholars have intensely debated the issue of criteria of “scriptural” authority at Qumran. Furthermore, it is also necessary to distinguish between the image represented by the entirety of the “Qumran Library” and the evidence given from individual writings or manuscripts. We must also distinguish between the views that can be reconstructed from the writings attributable to the group or community linked with the library (i.e., the “sectarian” writings) and the views expressed in writings with an origin outside that group. In spite of all uncertainties, these distinctions, hard won within the scholarly discussions and literature, should not be abandoned in favor of a less refined and monolithic picture.⁵

but no scrolls themselves. See the press information of the Hebrew University from February 2017 at <http://new.huji.ac.il/en/article/33424>.

⁴ Papyrus Nash from the 2nd century BCE contains the Ten Commandments in a mixed textual form and the *Shema Israel*. Up until 1947, the papyrus was considered the earliest extant manuscript of a Hebrew Bible text.

⁵ See below, section B.II. In view of the uncertainties of the attribution and the problems of the categories such as “sectarian,” Florentino García Martínez has suggested that scholars abandon that distinction, cf. F. García Martínez, “¿Sectario, no-sectario, o qué? Problemas de una taxonomía correcta de los textos qumránicos,” *RevQ* 23 (2008): 383–94. The problems are avoided when the Groningen school now uses the category of a “textual community,” but there is the danger that precise historical distinctions are lost in the great “cultural” picture, cf. M. Popović, “Reading, Writing, and Memorizing Together: Reading

Furthermore, we should be very cautious with the terms used to describe the phenomena: As we shall see below, the term “canon” which has been taken from later Christian conciliar decisions, is anachronistic and thus problematic for Second Temple Judaism in general. In particular its judicial implications are inappropriate for the whole period (including the New Testament), because in Ancient Judaism, there was no single official body that could have the function to decide on the “canon” as a fixed or even closed list of authoritative writings.⁶ Also, “Bible,” a term that implies the singularity of one book, should not be used for the period before the Hebrew scriptures were bound together in a codex.⁷ So, these terms, when unavoidable, will be used in scare quotes to mark their inappropriateness, even if they are used due to the lack of better terms.

Rather than interpreting the Qumran evidence with the concepts adopted from church tradition, we should try to rethink our traditional categories from the evidence available during the period when “the Bible” or “the canon” was made, reconsidering how the “authority” of scriptures or authors was constructed and marked, and how that authority was dealt with in the life (or other writings) of the related communities.

Therefore, I will first describe the conceptual changes demanded by the Qumran discoveries (1), and then give a brief sketch of the contents of the Qumran corpus and some important insights regarding the classification of the relevant manuscripts (2). Subsequently, I will discuss some criteria of authority or even “canonicity” (3) and present the evidence for some selected texts (4). In the end, I will present a few conclusions (5) with regard to the authority of Scriptures in the Qumran community and with regard to the canon debate in general.

A. The Qumran Library as a Paradigm-Shift in Canon-Research and the Pattern of a “Canonical Process”

In Christian theology, but also in Jewish scholarship, the issue of scriptural authority and canonicity is an issue which has always been overshadowed by “dogmatic” viewpoints. Whereas “conservative” views usually tend to date

Culture in Ancient Judaism and the Dead Sea Scrolls in a Mediterranean Context,” *Dead Sea Discoveries* 24 (2017): 447–470; idem, “Qumran as Scroll Storehouse in Times of Crisis? A Comparative Perspective on Judaean Desert Manuscript Collections,” *JSJ* 43 (2012): 551–94, and idem, “The Ancient Library of Qumran between Urban and Rural Culture,” in *The Scrolls from Qumran and the Concept of a Library* (ed. S. White Crawford and C. Wassen; STDJ 116; Leiden: Brill, 2016), 155–67.

⁶ See T. H. Lim, “Authoritative Scriptures and the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. T. H. Lim and J. J. Collins; Oxford: University Press, 2010), 303–322, here 304.

⁷ Thus also Lim, “Authoritative Scriptures and the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 304.

the authority of the relevant writings as early as possible, often simply uncritically accepting the fictional historical data provided within these texts that was used by the author or receiving communities as a means of authorizing the text, “critical” views are more inclined to accept a later date or to allow for a longer period of ambivalence, with the implication that in the formative or even normative period, the debates are still considered open and flexible. The common assumption on both ends of the spectrum is that age or “originality” is an argument for higher validity and authority. Sometimes, there are arguments supporting the “maximalists” and others supporting the “minimalists.” In those cases, a view of a gradual development can help to cope with the evidence or bridge the wide gap between the different viewpoints. This is what has happened in scholarship on the “canon” of the Hebrew Bible in the discussions following the Qumran discoveries, in particular the biblical manuscripts, and their scholarly assessment.

Before that period, a major paradigm was widely accepted, namely the view of a three-stage development of the tripartite Hebrew canon. The view was based on indirect evidence of certain narrative accounts and so-called “canon lists,” such as Nehemiah 8–9 and Ben Sira’s “Praise of the Fathers” (Sir 49:8–10), 2 Maccabees 2:13–15, the prologue to the Greek translation of Ben Sira (LXX Sir prol.), Josephus’ apology against Apion (*Ag. Ap.* I 37–42), 4 Ezra 14:37–48 and also a few rabbinic passages (*m. Yadayim* 3:2–5, 4:6, and *b. Baba Batra* 14b–15a).⁸ From those sources, it was usually suggested that the Pentateuch was canonized already around 400 BCE (according to Nehemiah 8), the collection of the prophets was, then, added around 200 BCE (as is suggested by the “Praise of the Fathers” Sir 44–50), and the decision on the writings was made by the Rabbis at a certain “Synod of Jamnia” or Javneh between 70 and 100 CE where, according to this pattern, the final shape of the Hebrew canon and its text were also defined. This “canon” was considered to be a clearly defined list of writings with the implication that it had always been quite clear which writings were considered canonical and which other writings were considered non-canonical. If a writing was not mentioned in a certain list or catalogue, it was considered to be excluded. Finally, scholars thought that canonization also implied a fixed and unchangeable text.⁹ The pattern was basically introduced by the Jewish histori-

⁸ See the sources in L. M. McDonald, “Appendix A: Primary Sources for the Study of the Old Testament / Hebrew Bible Canon,” in *The Canon Debate* (eds L. M. McDonald and J. A. Sanders; Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2002), 580–582. For discussion of these testimonies, cf. Michael Becker, “Grenzziehungen des Kanons im frühen Judentum und die Neuschrift der Bibel nach dem 4. Buch Esra,” in *Qumran und der biblische Kanon* (ed. M. Becker and J. Frey; BThSt 92; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 2009), 195–253, here 218–248.

⁹ Cf. the description of the “old” paradigm in E. Tigchelaar, “Wie haben die Qumran-texte unsere Sicht des kanonischen Prozesses verändert?” in *Qumran und der biblische Kanon* (ed. M. Becker and J. Frey; BThSt 92 (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 2009),

an Heinrich Graetz in the late 19th century,¹⁰ who also introduced the anachronistic term of a “synod” or “council” of Javneh.¹¹

The traditional pattern which could be found in most standard introductions has been criticized at numerous points. In the meantime, it has largely been abandoned or modified, not at least due to the influence of the Qumran discoveries. A view that was merely based on a few lists of texts had to be considered insufficient, especially when the genre and function of those lists was not considered, and when the new material evidence provided a considerably better basis for inquiry. The “old” pattern did not aptly consider different degrees of authority or the fact that a writing could have authority in certain factions or regions without being universally accepted. Finally, the link between canonical authority and textual fixation can no longer be maintained in view of the insights from Qumran.

Due to the Qumran discoveries, the strict three-stage pattern has been changed to concepts of a more flexible and fluid development of the Hebrew canon,¹² as a process that might have begun early and been finished late, without clear-cut points of decision or clear-cut borders. The new paradigm has become known under the term “Canonical Process,” introduced by Jack Sanders¹³ in view of his edition of the Psalms scroll from Qumran Cave 11

65–87, here 66–67, and M. Becker, “Grenzziehungen des Kanons im frühen Judentum,” 195–198.

¹⁰ H. Graetz, “Der Abschluß des Kanons des Alten Testaments und die Differenz von kanonischen und extrakanonischen Büchern nach Josephus und Talmud,” *WGWJ* 35 (1886): 281–298.

¹¹ See J. P. Lewis, “Jamnia Revisited,” in *The Canon Debate* (ed. L. M. McDonald and J. A. Sanders; Peabody: Hendrickson, 2002), 146–162; cf. also D. E. Aune, “On the Origins of the ‘Council of Javneh’ Myth,” *JBL* 110 (1991): 491–493, who assumes that Graetz followed a remark by the Jewish philosopher Baruch Spinoza about a “concilium Pharisaeorum.”

¹² Cf. Tigchelaar, “Wie haben die Qumrantexte unsere Sicht des kanonischen Prozesses verändert?” 68–76.

¹³ Cf. cf. J. A. Sanders, “The Scrolls and the Canonical Process,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years* (ed. J. C. VanderKam and P. W. Flint; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 2:1–22, here 7–10; idem, “The Canonical Process,” in *The Cambridge History of Judaism IV: The Late Roman-Rabbinic Period* (Cambridge: CUP, 2006), 230–243; idem, “The Issue of the Closure in the Canonical Process,” in *The Canon Debate* (ed. L. M. McDonald and J. A. Sanders; Peabody: Hendrickson, 2002), 252–263; see also A. Lange, “The Status of the Biblical Texts in the Qumran Corpus and the Canonical Process,” in *The Bible as Book: The Hebrew Bible and the Judaean Desert Discoveries* (ed. E. D. Herbert and E. Tov; London: British Library, 2002), 21–30; idem, “The Parabiblical Literature of the Qumran Library and the Canonical History of the Bible,” 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), 305–321; J. VanderKam, “Questions of Canon Viewed Through the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *The Canon Debate* (ed. L. M. McDonald and J. A. Sanders; Peabody: Hendrickson, 2002), 91–109; E. C. Ulrich, “From Literature to Scripture. Reflections on the Growth of a Text’s Authoritativeness,” *DSD* 10 (2003): 3–25; G. J. Brooke,

(11QPs^a).¹⁴ The discovery of such a “biblical” manuscript has puzzled interpreters: In this manuscript, the Psalter is certainly considered authoritative, inspired, or even “canonical” as a composition of David, but the arrangement of the Psalms differs from the later canonical form, and a number of “apocryphal” pieces are included, such as Psalm 151 from the LXX, two of the psalms known only from Syriac tradition, a passage from Sirach 51, and a kind of “bibliography of David” claiming him as poet and author. The crucial question was: Is this a biblical manuscript, or should we consider this version of the psalter to be a different composition, an “apocryphal” writing? These were the observations that called for a change of the ruling patterns of thought and caused a paradigm shift in the views of the growth of the canon.

Within the new framework of a *Canonical Process*, we can distinguish between various steps of authorization: (a) the authorization of books, (b) the collection of authoritative books in (sub-)collections which may be still open for additions or, at some point, considered complete, (c) the explicit closure of a collection by the exclusion of other, less authoritative or unacceptable books, mostly due to some challenges that call for such a decision, and (d) the finalization and fixation of the text.¹⁵ Such a process might be observed with regard to various sub-collections separately. Furthermore, these processes are, to a certain extent, group-specific. In the Second Temple period, different Jewish factions (Pharisees, Sadducees, Qumran “Sectarians,” or various groups of Diaspora Judaism) could draw on different “collections” of books with more or less authority until, finally, the rabbinic movement shaped its Hebrew canon. This final canon certainly differed from what was considered authoritative previously at Qumran or what was read in the Diaspora. But during the Second Temple period, there was no “orthodoxy” or “normative” institution to efficiently decide on the validity and authority of certain writings within the entirety of contemporary Judaism.

The pattern of a “canonical process” implies that the growth of a canon is an extended and complex development that was not usually controlled by a single institution. The process is not considered from a teleological perspective. That is to say, during the process the final result is still open, so it is inappropriate to understand the process only from its final product, the resulting “canon.” And even when a canon has been closed by decision of a certain

“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* (ed. E. G. Chazon, D. Dimant, and R. Clements; STDJ 58; Leiden: Brill, 2005), 85–104.

¹⁴ J. A. Sanders, *The Psalms Scroll of Qumrân Cave 11 (11QPs^a)* (DJD 4; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965).

¹⁵ Cf. also E. Ulrich, “The Notion and Definition of Canon,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Developmental Composition of the Bible* (VT.S 169; Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2015), 265–279; see also idem, “The Developmental Composition of the Biblical Text,” idem, in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Developmental Composition of the Bible* (VT.S 169; Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2015), 1–15.

institution or just practically, the canonical process has not necessarily arrived at an end: debates about the interpretation and the mutual relation of the canonical writings can go on, producing something like a “canon within the canon” or other interpretive rules for managing internal diversity.

B. The Qumran Corpus

Having presented the particular relevance of the Qumran evidence for canon research, we can now turn to the evidence itself, the Qumran corpus (i.e., the writings found in the 11 caves from Qumran).¹⁶

I. The Qumran Corpus – an Overview

As is widely known, the corpus of roughly 900 manuscripts includes more than 200 manuscripts of biblical texts.¹⁷ Around 20 more biblical texts have been found at some other locations near the Dead Sea.¹⁸ The precise numbers vary since assembling fragments to distinct manuscripts is often uncertain and subject to debate and revisions, and – even more importantly – it is for some manuscripts debatable or uncertain whether or not they are “biblical” manuscripts.¹⁹ Furthermore, with regard to manuscripts attested only by a few

¹⁶ Cf. my more extensive description of the corpus in Frey, “Qumran,” 557–572 (in this volume, 51–66).

¹⁷ Cf. the precise presentation in E. Ulrich, *Die Handschriften biblischer Bücher von Qumran und den anderen Fundorten*, vol. 1 of *The Biblical Qumran Scrolls* (Leiden: Brill, 2010); A. Lange, *Handbuch der Textfunde vom Toten Meer* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009).

¹⁸ In recent years, a number of additional fragments have been published from private collections, but their connection with other extant manuscripts is unclear, and the authenticity of unprovenanced artefacts has been questioned in a number of cases. Other questions arise from the debates about the legal and ethical issues concerning artefacts from the private antiquities market. See, e.g., the collection *Gleanings from the Caves: Dead Sea Scrolls and Artefacts from The Schøyen Collection* (ed. T. Elgvin with K. Davis and M. Langlois; LSTS 71; London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2016), and the list of unprovenanced fragments by E. Tigchelaar, “A Provisional List of Unprovenanced, Twenty-First Century, Dead Sea Scrolls-like Fragments,” *DSD* 24 (2017): 173–188; cf. also the discussion about the authenticity of some fragments in K. Davis, “Caves of Dispute: Patterns of Correspondence and Suspicion in the Post-2002 ‘Dead Sea Scrolls’ Fragments,” *DSD* 24 (2017): 229–270, and K. Davis et al., “Nine Dubious ‘Dead Sea Scrolls’ Fragments from the Twenty-First Century,” *DSD* 24 (2017): 189–228, where nine newly presented fragments are classified as modern forgeries.

¹⁹ An example for this is the Psalms scroll from Cave 11 (11QPs^a) mentioned above; another interesting case is the so-called “Reworked Pentateuch” (4Q158, 4Q364–4Q367), a series of manuscripts of (several) books of the Pentateuch with remarkable additions or patchworks of various passages (thus, e.g., in 4Q158 fr. 1 a combination of elements from Gen 32 and Exod 4).

fragments, we cannot really decide whether they contained a whole biblical book or only parts of it (as a florilegium, for liturgical use, etc.).²⁰ But more important than the actual numbers are the proportions: According to the comprehensive list of texts in volume 39 of the *Discoveries of the Judaean Desert* series,²¹ from the entirety of the biblical manuscripts from Qumran (except the Tefillin and Mesusot), ca. 200 are in Hebrew, 5 in Greek, and 3 (so-called Targums) in Aramaic. Eleven or twelve biblical manuscripts are written in palaeo-Hebrew script. Only 4 are written on Papyrus, 2 of them are in Greek. From the books of the Hebrew Bible, only Esther is missing. Genesis with 19 and Exodus with 16, Deuteronomy with 30, Isaiah with 21 and the Psalms with 36 manuscripts are attested most frequently; the historical books are attested less frequently.²² Greek manuscripts only represent the Pentateuch,²³ and Aramaic Targums have been found on Leviticus and Job. The most ancient biblical manuscripts (4QEx–Lev^f and 4QSam^b) might originate at ca. 250 BCE, a palaeo-Hebrew scroll of Job (4QpaleoJob^a) possibly around 200 BCE, and a scroll of the Twelve Prophets around 150 BCE,²⁴ although the vast majority of copies come from the 1st cent. BCE or 1st cent. CE.

Apart from the biblical manuscripts, the corpus includes Hebrew or Aramaic manuscripts of writings previously known from the Septuagint (Tobit, Ben Sira, Ps 151 LXX, Bar 6) or other “Pseudepigrapha,” hitherto known only from ancient translations, in particular texts from the Enochic tradition (all parts of the composition of *1 Enoch*, except the “Parables” *1 En.* 37–71) in a total of 11 Aramaic manuscripts, the Book of Giants in 10 manuscripts, and *Jubilees* in 15 or 16 manuscripts and some related texts). Furthermore, there is a large number of “new” parabiblical texts, such as the Aramaic *Genesis Apocryphon* from Qumran Cave I (1QapGen); other Aramaic composi-

²⁰ Cf. most recently the investigation of the Psalms manuscripts by E. Jain, *Psalmen oder Psalter? Materielle Rekonstruktion und inhaltliche Untersuchung er Psalmenschriften aus der Wüste Juda* (StT DJ 109; Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2014), who assumes that some of the Qumran manuscripts of the Psalter (4Q83 and 4Q88) are not a psalter preceding the protomasoretic psalter but rather shaped from particular needs within the context of the *yahad* (cf. *ibid.*, 292, 296, 300).

²¹ E. Tov, “Categorized List of the ‘Biblical Texts’,” in *The Texts from the Judaean Desert: Indices and An Introduction in the Discoveries in the Judaean Desert Series* (ed. E. Tov; DJD 39; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2002), 165–184; cf. also the VanderKam and Flint, *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 103–153.

²² See Tov, “Categorized List,”: Genesis 19 or 20; Exodus 17; Leviticus 13; Numbers 7; Deuteronomy 30; Joshua 2; Judges 3; 1–2 Samuel 4; 1–2 Kings 3; Isaiah 21; Jeremiah 6; Ezekiel 6; Minor Prophets (in one book) 8 or 9; Psalms 36; Job 4; Proverbs 2; Ruth 4; Canticles 4; Ecclesiastes 2; Lamentations 4; Daniel 8; Ezra–Nehemiah (in one book) 1; and 1–2 Chronicles 1.

²³ But cf. the large Minor Prophets Scroll from Naḥal Ḥever (8HevXII gr).

²⁴ See B. Webster, “Chronological Index of the Texts from the Judean Desert,” in *The Texts from the Judaean Desert: Indices and An Introduction in the Discoveries in the Judaean Desert Series* (ed. E. Tov; DJD 39; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2002), 351–446.

tions linked with priestly forefathers such as Levi, Qahat, and Amram; continuations of prophetic traditions and books; writings linked with Jeremiah; a Pseudo-Ezekiel-Text and an Aramaic description of the New Jerusalem, which is also linked to Ezekiel; as well as several writings from the Danielic tradition. Apart from that, we find a noticeable number of exegetical texts. This includes the new (and exclusively Qumranic) genre of Bible commentaries (*pesharim*) which quote the texts together with an explanation (using the word *peshet* = interpretation) that relates the text to aspects of the history or present experience of the community, or contains expositions of eschatological texts, or has expositions of Scripture in the context of the present “Last Days.”²⁵

Most important among the “new” texts are the Rule texts (in particular the *Community Rule* 1QS (with numerous additional manuscripts),²⁶ the *Rule of the Congregation* 1QSa, and the *Damascus Document* (CD, already discovered in the Cairo Geniza at the beginning of the 20th century, but now attested in numerous manuscripts from Qumran Cave 4). These texts not only include the rules of a distinct community often called “*yahad*,” but also provide a halakic interpretation of Scripture, accounts of the history of Israel and the community, and aspects of a dualistic sapiential teaching (in particular in the “Treatise on the Two Spirits” 1QS III 13–IV 26). The *War Rule* (1QM, with additional manuscripts from Cave 4) provides a liturgical instruction concerning a final war between the Sons of Light and the Sons of Darkness, but also this text is more a “liturgical” rule than an apocalyptic prediction. One could also mention the *Temple Scroll* (11QTemp) among the Rule-texts, although that impressive scroll could also be considered a “parabiblical” work drawing intensely on Deuteronomy and the final section of Ezekiel.

A very important group of texts within the corpus is also the large number of calendrical texts, many of them following the (Enochic) 364-day solar-calendar, or providing synchronisms and calculations between that calendar and the lunisolar calendar followed by the Jerusalem Temple. Another important group are the poetic and liturgical texts, collections of prayers (most importantly the “*Hodayot*” 1QH^a with numerous additional manuscripts), blessings, curses, or an “angelic liturgy” known as *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*, which is also attested in numerous manuscripts. Furthermore, there is a group of sapiential texts that represent a type of Israelite wisdom which differs from that of the canonical books and that already links wisdom with dualistic or apocalyptic elements. Other texts provide astrological or physiognomic knowledge. One text in particular reports a list of rebukes by a

²⁵ Cf. the more complete descriptions of the contents of the library in Frey, “Qumran”; Stegemann, *The Library of Qumran*, 80–138, and VanderKam and Flint, *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 209–310.

²⁶ For a recent introduction, cf. J. Frey, “The Rule of the Community,” in *Early Jewish Literature. An Anthology* (ed. B. Embry, R. Herms, and A. T. Wright; 2 vols.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2017), 2:95–127.

community official (which might be from a local community archive), another text congratulates a king named Jonathan (probably Alexander Jannai). Despite the range of genres represented in Qumran, there is a striking lack of historical documents or “documentary texts” within the library.

II. The Important Distinction between “Group-specific” Texts and Texts from Outside

The vast diversity of the texts present in the corpus has raised questions about its unity. Does such a wide variety of ideologically different texts constitute a well-collected library?²⁷ Does it represent the collecting activity of one single group, living at Qumran, or even one single “sect” within ancient Judaism, or do we have to conclude that the corpus has been assembled from various collections, libraries, or places? Are parts of the corpus “imported” into Qumran from some other place, possibly from Jerusalem? And were they hidden at once, shortly before the arrival of Roman troops in 67 CE, or were there several separate disposals of manuscripts, with the corpus consisting of several different collections?²⁸

Be that as it may – and in my view the arguments for the unity of the corpus as a possession of the group inhabiting or using Khirbet Qumran are still strong – one distinction should not be overlooked: Not only the biblical texts but also the vast majority of the other texts (pseudepigrapha, parabiblical texts, etc.) are not composed by the “yahad” or the particular community to which the users of the Qumran settlement belonged. They were read and possibly even copied and finally stored there, but the texts do not originate within the Qumran community and only at some point in time did they become a property of the community living at Qumran. This means that the Qumran library is far more than merely the literary heritage of a certain Jewish “sect”;²⁹ rather, it is a (somewhat selective, but still very broad) representation of the literary heritage of Palestinian Judaism between the 3rd century BCE and the destruction of the Second Temple in 70 CE. Although the criteria for “sectarian” or “non-sectarian” texts are often a point of dispute, and

²⁷ Cf. now the discussions in the volume *The Dead Sea Scrolls at Qumran and the Concept of a Library* (ed. S. White Crawford and C. Wassen; StTDJ 116; Leiden: Brill, 2016); see also S. Ben Ezra, *Qumran*, 150–162.

²⁸ Cf., for an overview, the article by M. Popović, “Qumran as Scroll Storehouse in Times of Crisis?” 579–585. See for more details the proposals by S. Pfann, “Reassessing the Judean Desert Caves: Libraries, Archives, *Genizas* and Hiding Places,” *BAIAS* 25 (2007): 147–70, and D. Stokl Ben Ezra, “Old Caves and Young Caves: A Statistical Reevaluation of a Qumran Consensus,” *DSD* 14 (2007): 313–33.

²⁹ In the discussion of non-specialists, this term is often linked with the idea of a marginal, irrelevant group, although a sociological definition of the term does not necessarily imply this.

some uncertainties remain,³⁰ we can assume that only a minority of texts, in particular the large rule texts (1QS, 1QSa, CD, MMT), the *Hodayot* and other prayer collections, and the pesharim were authored within the *yahad*, some other texts were adopted and possibly reworked by the *yahad* (thus, e.g., the War Rule), but the majority of parabiblical, exegetical, and sapiential texts and in particular all non-Hebrew texts are probably adopted from precursor groups or from outside the community and were only read, copied, and stored by the people living at Qumran.³¹ But this insight enhances rather than diminishes the scholarly importance of the corpus: It is not simply the heritage of a “marginal” group but provides a wide spectrum of the literary production of Second Temple Judaism (with only some well-known texts missing, such as 1–2 Maccabees, the Wisdom of Solomon, etc.).

Thus, for reconstructing the views or the halakah of the *yahad*, we have to draw on the “sectarian” or “group-specific” texts, whereas more general aspects of scriptural interpretation or theological motifs (and also many aspects which are relevant for understanding the language and thought of New Testament texts) can be discussed on the background of the entire library. For some issues the “non-sectarian” texts prove to be even more illuminating than the “sectarian” texts. The questions regarding the authority of certain texts or collections of the later canon can, therefore, be applied to the various and not always clearly distinguished parts of the Qumran corpus or to the corpus as a whole, and depending on the way the questions are designed, the answers will differ. We have to decide, therefore, what we are looking for: Are we simply looking for the views of the Qumran Community or the *yahad*, asking, for example, which writings were kept, used, or considered authoritative within that particular group, how were they quoted, or how was scriptural authority defined, marked, or dealt with? Or do we use the Qumran corpus as a source for reconstructing the wider process of composing, continuing, supplementing, collecting, and “canonizing” writings which ultimately resulted in vari-

³⁰ See the important articles by D. Dimant, “Qumran Sectarian Literature,” *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period* (CRINT 2; Assen: van Gorcum, 1984), 483–550; and – more nuanced – eadem, “The Vocabulary of the Qumran Sectarian Texts,” in *Qumran und die Archäologie* (ed. J. Frey, C. Claußen, and N. Kessler; WUNT 278; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 347–395; additionally, see A. Lange, “Kriterien essenischer Texte,” in: *Qumran kontrovers* (ed. J. Frey and H. Stegemann; Einblicke 6; Paderborn: Bonifatius, 2003), 59–70; C. Hempel, “Kriterien zur Bestimmung ‘essenischer Verfasserschaft’ von Qumrantexten,” in *Qumran kontrovers* (ed. J. Frey and H. Stegemann; Einblicke 6; Paderborn: Bonifatius, 2003), 71–84.

³¹ D. Dimant, in her (now updated) article “The Qumran Manuscripts: Contents and Significance,” in eadem, *Interpretation in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Collected Studies* (FAT 90; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014), 27–56 considers that the “sectarian” texts occupy only held a third of the collection. Cf. eadem, “The Library of Qumran in Recent Scholarship,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls at Qumran and the Concept of a Library* (ed. S. White Crawford and C. Wassen; StTDJ 116; Leiden: Brill, 2016), 7–14, here 8.

ous “canons”: the Hebrew Rabbinic canon and, due to a different and more extended process, the Greek collection of the Septuagint.

C. Criteria of Authority or “Canonicity”

For assessing the authority of Scriptures within the Qumran corpus, a number of criteria have been considered, but their validity deserves some reflection.

At first, scholars simply began by counting which books from the later Hebrew canon have been found at Qumran and determined how many copies of each individual work have been preserved. Such an inquiry can show that those writings (all books except Esther) were known at least to some people in the community, and that some of the books were read and copied more frequently than others. But what does the mere presence of a writing in the corpus tell us about its actual authority or scriptural status? And what does it mean that other writings which were not included in the later Hebrew canon (e.g., *Jubilees*, Enochic books, etc.) were found much more frequently than, for example, the books of Kings or Ezra/Nehemiah? So, what can be relevant criteria for ascribing scriptural authority to a writing?

In an attempt to assemble what he popularly (and anachronistically) calls a “Dead Sea Scrolls Bible,” Peter Flint has considered nine criteria that indicate the authoritative recognition or “canonical” claims of a particular writing:³² His criteria deserve to be enumerated here:

(a) A first indication is explicit “statements that indicate scriptural status.”³³ This criterion means that authors are classified as prophets, such as Ezekiel (in CD III 20–IV 2), or a book is called the book of a prophet, such as Daniel in the Midrash on Eschatology³⁴ (4Q174 II 3).

It should be noted, however, that there is also text in which the Book of *Jubilees* is cited in the same manner (4Q228). In that poorly preserved composition, *Jubilees* seems to be referred to by its Hebrew title *Division of Times*, with the quotation formula “For thus it is written in the Divisions [of the Times]” (4Q228 I i 9; cf. I 1),³⁵ and the authoritative status of *Jubilees* is

³² P. W. Flint, “Scriptures in the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Evidence from Qumran,” in *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov* (ed. S. Paul et al.; VT.Supp 94; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 269–304, here 294–304. See also the abbreviated presentation in VanderKam and Flint, *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 172–177.

³³ Flint, “Scriptures in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 294.

³⁴ On this composition, see A. Steudel, *Der Midrasch zur Eschatologie aus der Qumrangemeinde (4QMidrEschat^{ab}): Materielle Rekonstruktion, Textbestand, Gattung und traditions-geschichtliche Einordnung des durch 4Q174 (“Florilegium”) und 4Q177 (“Catena A”) repräsentierten Werkes aus den Qumranfunden* (STDJ 13; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1994).

³⁵ VanderKam/Flint, *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 172.

further confirmed by a quotation in an explicit reference to "the rules ... laid out in detail in the Book of Time Divisions by Jubilees and Weeks" (CD XVI 2–4).³⁶

(b) A second criterion is "the appeal to prophecy."³⁷ Such an appeal is obvious in the passage on "David's compositions" in the Psalms Scroll from Cave 11 (11QPs^a XXVII 2–11) where it is said that David wrote 3600 psalms and songs (of course including those in the present book) with the explicit remark: "All these he composed through prophecy which was given him from before the Most High."³⁸ This means that 11QPs^a – or, rather, any form of the Psalter – is considered a prophetic or "inspired" book, regardless of whether or not its textual arrangement and form corresponds to the form of the later canonical psalter.

(c) A third aspect is particular "claims of Divine authority."³⁹ Such a claim of high authority is also implied in the note that the message of a book is from God or from an angel. A prominent example is *Jubilees*, which claims to be an angelic rendering of what is written on heavenly tablets. Likewise, the *Temple Scroll* presents itself as a revelation by God himself, spoken in the first person, so that it even supersedes the Mosaic speech of the book of Deuteronomy. However, both books, the *Temple Scroll* and *Jubilees*, were most likely not composed in the *yahad*. It is, therefore, a different question because we are now asking what authority was ascribed to these two books in the *yahad* community. Thus, the Qumran evidence shows that, at least within the community related to the library, not just books contained within the later Hebrew canon enjoyed scriptural authority.

Within the *yahad*, a similar claim of authority is made with regard to the "righteous teacher," probably the founding figure of the *yahad* whom God has given insight to understand the Scriptures. This means that within the *yahad* community, the claim of inspiration and authority is (also) made for the interpretation given to the foundational teacher whose interpretation of the Scriptures and in particular the halakic issues is ascribed to a particular revelation of divine insight.

(d) A fourth criterium linked with the former one but particularly related to the Psalter is the presence of "Davidic superscriptions" in manuscripts of the Psalter. While the Qumran manuscripts normally do not add Davidic superscriptions to non-Davidic psalms, the introduction of the two autobiographical Psalms 151A and 151B in 11QPs^a makes a Davidic claim and thus also the claim of a scriptural status for those two psalms.⁴⁰

(e) Only at the fifth position does Flint mention the criterion of the "quantity of manuscripts preserved," showing that writings were "extensively used

³⁶ VanderKam/Flint, *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 172.

³⁷ Flint, "Scriptures in the Dead Sea Scrolls," 294.

³⁸ Flint, "Scriptures in the Dead Sea Scrolls," 294–95.

³⁹ Flint, "Scriptures in the Dead Sea Scrolls," 295.

⁴⁰ Flint, "Scriptures in the Dead Sea Scrolls," 295–96.

at Qumran which indicates their popularity and most likely their authoritative status.”⁴¹ The mention of this criterion after the explicit claims mentioned before shows that the sheer quantity of manuscripts is already a weaker argument, a fact that may be due to certain accidental circumstances and deserves further interpretation.

In the Qumran corpus, it is striking that in the list of the writings represented by a particularly high number of manuscripts, *Jubilees* is number 6 (after Psalms, Deuteronomy, Isaiah, Genesis, and Exodus), and *1 Enoch* is number 8 (after Leviticus). On the other hand, it is unclear what it means if a writing included in the later Hebrew canon is only scarcely attested in the library. Does the non-attestation of Esther mean that the writing (or Purim) was rejected? Or is it by pure accident that Esther is the only writing of the later Hebrew Bible that is missing in the Qumran corpus?

The number of manuscripts obviously depends on numerous accidental factors. Which manuscripts were preserved and what has been lost through the centuries? Which manuscripts were taken out of the caves centuries ago and which remained there until their discovery? Was a particular writing important for certain topics, such as *Jubilees* for debates about the calendar or chronology? In any case, the figures provide researchers with information about the Qumran community’s interest in particular books or about which books the covenanters occupied themselves with in terms of intense exegetical work. The correspondences with the numbers of scriptural quotations in New Testament writings (where Genesis, Deuteronomy, Isaiah, and the Psalms are also the most frequently quoted or alluded to) can further indicate that these writings (or, the Torah as a whole, Isaiah, and the Psalms) were considered to be among the most important books in a broader range of Jewish groups in the first century CE.

(f) An additional criterion is the existence of translations of a certain text into Greek or into an Aramaic (Targum) version,⁴² which may indicate its authority or importance. Greek translations were found from books of the Pentateuch (Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy), from the Twelve Prophets (at Naḥal Ḥever), and most likely also from *1 Enoch* (pap7QEn gr). Targums are also present in Qumran for the books of Leviticus and (in two versions) Job which has also been considered a Mosaic writing, that is, a writing of the very old days (cf. *b. Baba Batra* 14b and 15a).

(g) The authority of biblical texts at Qumran is most strongly documented by the existence of commentary works, in particular the unique type of the pesharim which explicitly quote and interpret the Scriptures either following a biblical text or assembling quotations referring to a particular topic,⁴³ but also other commentaries.⁴⁴ Since the genre of the peshar commentary is only

⁴¹ Flint, “Scriptures in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 296.

⁴² Flint, “Scriptures in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 296.

⁴³ Examples are the *Midrash on Eschatology* and the *11QMelkizedek* text.

⁴⁴ Flint, “Scriptures in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 296.

found at Qumran, it is probable that the *yahad* community actually “invented” this kind of interpretation. Peter Flint counts six pesherim on Isaiah, two each on Hosea, Micah, and Zephaniah, one each on Nahum and Habakkuk, and three on the Psalms. Some others are unidentified or doubtful. Most interesting is the fact that there is also a fragmentary pesher on the Enochic *Apocalypse of Weeks* (4Q247), a section from *1 Enoch* which was apparently important for eschatological calculation.⁴⁵

Apart from the very special pesher-commentaries, there are a number of other exegetical works probably from the *yahad*, for example, a Paraphrase of Genesis and Exodus stories (4Q252) which cannot be easily classified.⁴⁶ For the vast number of so-called “parabiblical” texts remodeling scriptural figures, certain aspects of the Pentateuch, or the prophetic writings, it cannot be ascertained whether they were composed within the *yahad* community or not. If the criteria of “sectarian” origin, in particular a certain community terminology, are valid, these texts rather testify to a usage, continuation, or creative combination of other writings already considered authoritative or exemplary in wider circles of Second Temple Judaism.

(h) Another important criterion is that books are “quoted or alluded to as authorities.”⁴⁷ But the category of quotations is difficult to evaluate, “because the difference between definite allusion and general scriptural imagery is not always clear.”⁴⁸ Within the group-specific (or “sectarian”) writings, we can distinguish between quotations with introductory formulae like “as God said” (referring to Mal 1:10 in CD VI 13–14), “as he said” (in the Midrash on Eschatology, 4Q174 III 7 introducing 2 Sam 7:11), or “it is written” (as in CD XI 19–21, introducing a quotation from Proverbs), or, in other passages, quotes from Isaiah or Jeremiah.⁴⁹ Other quotations from various writings (Genesis, Leviticus, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Psalms, Proverbs, Lamentations, but also *Jubilees*) lack a clear introductory formula but also point to some kind of authority.⁵⁰

(i) The last criterion mentioned by Flint is more generally a “dependence on earlier books”: “Several Qumranic texts show a more general dependence on particular earlier works, which suggests that those works were authoritative to the later writers.”⁵¹ This is already true for books most probably composed outside the *yahad*, such as the *Genesis Apocryphon*, remodeling

⁴⁵ Flint, “Scriptures in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 297.

⁴⁶ Cf. A. Steudel, “Die Rezeption autoritativer Texte in Qumran,” in *Qumran und der Biblische Kanon* (ed. M. Becker and J. Frey; BThSt 92; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 2009), 89–100, here 92.

⁴⁷ Flint, “Scriptures in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 297; see *ibid.* 297–99; also VanderKam and Flint, *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 175–76.

⁴⁸ Flint, “Scriptures in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 297.

⁴⁹ Flint, “Scriptures in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 298.

⁵⁰ Flint, “Scriptures in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 298–99.

⁵¹ Flint, “Scriptures in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 299.

Genesis stories; the *Book of Jubilees*, drawing on Genesis and Exodus; or the *Temple Scroll*, heavily drawing on Exodus through Deuteronomy. In those cases, it is not always clear what authority is actually ascribed to the scriptural writings and how these writings are in some manner superseded by the Parabiblical Texts, which seem to claim an even higher degree of revelation, such as the *Temple Scroll* or also the *Book of Jubilees*. Flint also mentions Ezra (providing the term “*yahad*” = community in Ezra 4:3) and Kings (as a source of a retelling of Elijah stories in 4Q481a and 4Q482), but in view of the small number of manuscripts of both scriptural writings, it is doubtful what authority was actually ascribed to these books.

In addition to Flint’s criteria, further evidence might be added that could point to a particular and somewhat “canonical” authority, especially from the observation of the manuscripts and their material shape. Here we might consider the use of palaeo-Hebrew in a number of manuscripts (especially of the Torah), or also observations from the so-called scribal marks (which are admittedly still difficult to interpret). But as the late Odil Hannes Steck has shown for the great Isaiah Scroll, those scribal marks in 1QIsa^a seem to refer to a particular structuring and reading of a text, that is these scribal marks are evidence of exegetical work done on the text of Isaiah.⁵²

D. Writings Considered Authoritative

We can now use these criteria (and additional observations) with reference to the Qumran corpus, and – in a narrower selection – to the writings that probably originated in the *yahad*,⁵³ to ask what can be said about the authoritative character of the Scriptures of Israel, in the later period of Qumran (1st century BCE – 1st century CE), in which the majority of manuscripts were crafted? What can be said about the views of the community and its practice regarding Scriptures and their authority, and what can be said about the situation and developments in the wider context of contemporary Palestinian Judaism? In

⁵² See O. H. Steck, *Die erste Jesajarolle von Qumran(1QIs^a): Schreibweise als Leseanleitung für ein Prophetenbuch* (SBS 173/1; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1998).

⁵³ Such a selection is presented in Flint, “Scriptures in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 301, including 1QS, CD and the D texts, 1QM and the other War texts, 1QH^a, 4QFlor (= 4Q174) and 4QTest (= 4Q175), 11QMelch and the pesharim. Of course, this selection could be questioned at various points, e.g.: Is the whole of 1QS “sectarian,” or instead is the Treatise on the Two Spirits “pre-sectarian”? Or: Is the War Scroll based on a pre-sectarian version which was, then, expanded and reworked? All these questions cannot be discussed here and show that every selection of “sectarian” texts is subject to questions. In any case, there is the expectation to come closer to the historical truth by focusing on the material that shows most clearly the signs of the *yahad* community.

the present context we can only discuss some important cases and hint at the remaining problems.⁵⁴

(a) An authoritative or even “canonical” status seems to be clearly indicated for the Torah as a whole: Almost all palaeo-Hebrew manuscripts are manuscripts from the Pentateuch, and six manuscripts actually contain more than one book of the Torah, which points to the fact that the Pentateuch was already considered a unit. The Torah is often quoted as authoritative in the texts of the *yahad*⁵⁵ and beyond, and also the quantity of manuscripts preserved is impressive, with a peak for Deuteronomy.⁵⁶

However, in spite of the authoritative status of the book(s) of the Torah, it is quite striking that the text was still not completely unchangeable. In some manuscripts, passages are inserted or presented at a different place. Thus 4QpaleoLev contains material from Numbers, 4QDeut^a has Exod 12:43–46 after Deut 8:20–21, and 4QNum^b contains some inserted parts of speech from Deuteronomy. The problems are most obvious but not limited to the manuscripts of the so-called “Reworked Pentateuch” 4Q158 and 4Q364–367, in which we can find a different song of Miriam which is much longer than the short hymn from Exod 15:21, and also some other insertions and expansions.

Of course, this is not the case in the majority of the Torah manuscripts (as far as we can see from the preserved fragments), but at least such an expansion was still possible at a time when the authority of the books of the Torah was already unquestioned. The intense scholarly discussion whether this is a biblical manuscript or simply an Apocryphal composition only shows that our categories of “biblical” or “canonical” may contain undue implications and that our common idea of what “canonicity” means is still inappropriate for the time when these Torah manuscripts were crafted.

(b) *Prophets*: The authoritative status of the prophetic books also seems to be clear. Isaiah is attested in a large number of manuscripts (21), interpreted in various pesher commentaries, and quite frequently quoted in the writings from the *yahad* (e.g., the *Damascus Document* and *11QMelchizedek*). Jeremiah and Ezekiel are less frequently attested among the biblical manuscripts, and there are no pesharim preserved on these two books. But Ezekiel is also quoted in the *Damascus Document* and in the Midrash on Eschatology.⁵⁷ Furthermore, it is expanded upon and interpreted in the (perhaps “non-sectarian”) Pseudo-Ezekiel text. Jeremiah is also quoted in some other texts

⁵⁴ On the biblical manuscripts, see the information in Lange, *Handbuch der Textfunde vom Toten Meer*, and the presentation of the readings in Ulrich, *The Biblical Qumran Scrolls*.

⁵⁵ See the table in Flint, “Scriptures in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 302.

⁵⁶ See the table in Flint, “Scriptures in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 302 and also the numbers given above.

⁵⁷ See the table in Flint, “Scriptures in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 302–3 and also VanderKam/Flint, *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 179.

(4Q177, 4Q396, 397),⁵⁸ chapters 40–44 are remodeled in the Jeremiah Apocryphon, and Lamentations is also quoted in 4Q179 (A Lament for Zion).⁵⁹ Nevertheless, the origin of these texts in the *yahad* cannot be ascertained. However, Jeremiah and Ezekiel were clearly considered authoritative in the *yahad*, and Lamentations was probably included as a Jeremiah tradition, even if the status of the book is hard to ascertain.⁶⁰ The authority of the book of the Twelve Prophets is also quite clear: It is considered to be a unified work as is attested in, for example, the large Greek manuscript from Naḥal Ḥever (8HevXIIgr).⁶¹ This unity is also likely attested to in the majority of the Hebrew manuscripts from Qumran. But of course it cannot be ascertained that all the other manuscripts representing parts of the Twelve actually contained the whole book. We have a number of pesharim on single parts of the book, on Hosea, Nahum, and Habakkuk, which clearly demonstrate that these books were considered prophetic and inspired in the *yahad* community, even with the interesting implication (expressed in 1QpHab VII 4–5) that the prophet himself, as the author of the book, did not know the real meaning of the words he uttered, so that only the present community, through the revelation given to the righteous teacher (and, through him, to the *yahad*) can now understand what the words actually referred to.

A general problem can be considered with regard to the Jeremiah tradition. The book of Jeremiah, clearly considered an authoritative writing, is included within the Qumran corpus in different textual versions, the shorter version later known from the LXX, and the longer version, known from the Masoretic canon. As both texts are present in Hebrew in the Qumran corpus, we must conclude that they were read and studied simultaneously in the Qumran community. This means, that even if the book was considered authoritative or even “canonical,” its shape was not yet definitely finished. Again, our image of “canonicity” appears to be inappropriate with regard to the period in which the Qumran manuscripts were crafted and used. The question is whether this plurality of versions was merely a specific feature of a “sectarian” community or of a group of learned scribes and scholars, whereas the majority of contemporary Jews were already on the “pre-Masoretic” track. But maybe such an explanation would be an all-too smooth excuse for keeping up with our familiar views of authority and canonicity. We should rather reckon with the possibility that such a plurality of traditions was still extant in the wider context of contemporary Palestinian Judaism and that such a plurality of texts

⁵⁸ See the table in Flint, “Scriptures in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 302–3.

⁵⁹ Flint, “Scriptures in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 299.

⁶⁰ Cf. also recently E. Tigchelaar, “Jeremiah’s Scriptures in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Growth of a Tradition,” in *Jeremiah’s Scriptures* (ed. H. Najman and K. Schmid; JSJSup 173; Leiden: Brill, 2016), 289–306.

⁶¹ VanderKam and Flint, *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 139 summarize that “seven manuscripts indicate this to be so; the other three (4QXII^d, 4QXII^f and 5Qamos) are so fragmentary that each contains parts of only one book.”

and traditions was still available or even made up the scriptural basis in the time of the formation of the early Christian traditions.

(c) It is particularly striking that the book of Daniel, finalized only shortly before the period of the *yahad* community, is attested in eight Qumran manuscripts, that is, in more copies than Jeremiah or Ezekiel.⁶² The fragments cover all chapters of the book with the exception of chapter 12.⁶³ Despite lacking chapter 12 in the Daniel manuscripts, we have a quotation of Dan 12:10 in the Midrash on Eschatology introduced with the phrase that it is “written in the book of Daniel the Prophet” (4Q174 II 3–4). So, it is clear that Daniel was already considered to be a prophet in the *yahad* community, although in the later formation of the Hebrew canon, the book was compiled within the writings, whereas the collection of the Septuagint and the later Christian tradition keeps it as a prophetic book. Furthermore, the Qumran corpus presents a number of additional Aramaic Daniel traditions, including three Pseudo-Daniel texts (4Q243–245), the *Prayer of Nabonidus*, as a close parallel to Daniel 4, the so-called “Son-of-God Text” 4Q246, related to Daniel 7, and the so-called Four-Kingdoms Text 4Q552–553 related to the pattern presented in Daniel 2 and 7. These texts draw upon material already contained within the book of Daniel. The Qumran corpus, therefore, shows not only the prophetic status and scriptural authority of the book of Daniel but also gives some glimpses into the formative period of the book or the traditions used there and, thus, in the formative period of Jewish Apocalypticism with which the Qumran community was closely related from its very roots.⁶⁴

(d) What about the “prophetic” or “historical” writings from Joshua through Kings? Joshua is in the background of an “Apocryphon of Joshua,” which is also quoted in 4QTestimonia (4Q175), a messianic florilegium probably written by the same scribe who also copied the large manuscript 1QS. Although in contrast with the carefully crafted manuscript of 1QS, 4Q175 might be instead a private work, collecting some quotations put together by a learned member of the community. In any case, we can conclude that Joshua was studied by certain people in the *yahad*. Furthermore, the Qumran manuscripts include the two different versions of the book, known from the Maso-

⁶² On the Daniel manuscripts, see VanderKam and Flint, *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 137–138, and also P. W. Flint, “The Prophet Daniel at Qumran,” in *Eschatology, Messianism, and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. C. A. Evans and P. W. Flint; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 41–60.

⁶³ Concerning the extant texts, cf. E. Ulrich, “Index of Passages in the ‘Biblical Texts,’” in *The Texts from the Judean Desert: Indices and Introduction to the Discoveries in the Judean Desert Series* (ed. E. Tov; DJD 39; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2002), 185–201, here 200.

⁶⁴ See also J. Frey, “Zur Bedeutung der Qumran-Texte zum Verständnis der Apokalyp- tik im Frühjudentum und im Urchristentum,” in *Apokalyptik und Qumran* (ed. J. Frey and M. Becker; Einblicke 10; Paderborn: Bonifatius, 2007), 11–62, here 23–26 (English translation in this volume under the title “The Qumran Discoveries and the Understanding of Apocalypticism,” 195–241, here 206–209).

retic text and the Septuagint. Therefore, the phenomenon of textual plurality observed for the book of Jeremiah is similar for the book of Joshua.

Messianic passages of 2 Samuel are used in the Midrash on Eschatology (4Q174), demonstrating that this book – or relevant parts of it – were also considered authoritative in the community. However, the general number of manuscripts of all those works from Joshua to Kings is much lower than that of the books of Isaiah or of the Twelve Prophets.⁶⁵ What was their authority? Were the books considered authoritative, “canonical,” or even “divinely inspired”? Or were they simply considered important as a report of Israel’s sacred history? Were they transmitted together with the other prophetic writings that refer to the same period of Israel’s history, but validated only with regard to some pivotal passages or sayings? It is very likely that we simply do not have the appropriate categories to evaluate their status within the community.

(e) We can only briefly discuss the Psalter, which is attested in the large number of 36 (mostly quite fragmentary) manuscripts. Psalms are quoted frequently, used as prophetic texts, considered Davidic and inspired, and serve as a model for the poetry of the *Hodayot* and other poetic and liturgical texts composed in the *yahad*. But the problem of different book forms discovered with regard to Jeremiah is probably also posed in view of the Psalms, as not only the unique scroll 11QPs^a with its additional pieces (“David’s Compositions,” Sirach 51, an “Apostrophe to Zion,” and the Psalm 151A–B, known from the Septuagint)⁶⁶ are included but also some other Psalms manuscripts seem to represent a different sequence of the Psalms than the Masoretic Psalter. Scholarship has, therefore, developed the view that there were different Psalters simultaneously used within the Qumran community, or at least present within the Qumran corpus.⁶⁷ But many questions regarding the interpretation of the evidence are open due to the fact that most manuscripts

⁶⁵ See the table in Flint, “Scriptures in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 304, who provides the various manuscript statistics: Joshua: 2; Judges: 3; 1 Samuel: 4; 2 Samuel: 3; 1 Kings: 3; 2 Kings: 1.

⁶⁶ See VanderKam and Flint, *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 125–127 and, more recently, the contents analysis by C. Böhm, *Die Rezeption der Psalmen in den Qumranhandschriften, bei Philo von Alexandrien und im Corpus Paulinum* (WUNT II/437; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2017), 5–84.

⁶⁷ Cf. P. W. Flint, *The Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls and the Book of Psalms* (STDJ 17; Leiden: Brill, 1997); idem, “The Book of Psalms in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls,” *VT* 48 (1998): 453–472; H.-J. Fabry, “Der Psalter in Qumran,” in *Der Psalter in Judentum und Christentum* (ed. E. Zenger; HBS 18; Freiburg i. B.: Herder, 1998), 137–163; U. Dahmen, “Psalmentext und Psalmensammlung: Eine Auseinandersetzung mit P. W. Flint,” in *Die Textfunde vom Toten Meer und der Text der Hebräischen Bibel* (ed. U. Dahmen and A. Lange; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 2000), 109–126; idem, *Psalmen- und Psalterrezeption im Frühjudentum: Rekonstruktion, Textbestand, Struktur und Pragmatik der Psalmenrolle 11QPs^a aus Qumran* (STDJ 49; Leiden: Brill, 2003).

are very fragmentary and do not support overly confident conclusions.⁶⁸ But even if the great Psalms scroll from 11Q is considered an “apocryphal” composition and the peculiarities of some of the other Qumran psalms manuscripts might be explained from particular interests of usage, as Eva Jain claims in her recent monograph,⁶⁹ the call for revision of traditional views about scriptural authority cannot be considered obsolete, as the similar situation – a plurality of textual forms in spite of the authority of the book or its author – is also present with regard to Jeremiah.

(f) An interesting instance is also the book of Job, for which we also have a manuscript in palaeo-Hebrew and also an Aramaic Targum of Job. These manuscripts point to the status of the book as an authoritative and supposedly very old writing. Other books from the Ketuvim, such as Song of Songs, Ecclesiastes, or Sirach, as well as Chronicles and Ezra are uncertain in their status with a rather low number of manuscripts.⁷⁰

(g) Most interesting is the question of whether books that did not make it into the later Hebrew canon actually had a higher authority, or even a “canonical” status within the Qumran community or – at least – in parts or certain periods of the community. Important candidates for such an inquiry are Tobit, certain parts of the Enochic corpus, and the book of *Jubilees*.

With regard to Tobit, caution is appropriate.⁷¹ The writing, attested in the Qumran corpus in four Aramaic manuscripts and a Hebrew manuscript, was certainly read and retold within the community, but there is no indication that the narrative was ever considered authoritative or “scriptural.”

Things are quite different with regard to the Enochic traditions,⁷² from which we have a strikingly large number of twelve Aramaic manuscripts, including four manuscripts of the Astronomical Book (4Q208–211), the first (4QEnastr^a) is to still be dated in the late 3rd or early 2nd century BCE,⁷³ so that the Qumran discoveries have led to a thorough reconsideration of the

⁶⁸ This is the main conclusion in the recent work by E. Jain, *Psalmen oder Psalter: Materielle Rekonstruktion und inhaltliche Untersuchung der Psalmenhandschriften aus der Wüste Juda* (STDJ 109; Leiden: Brill, 2014).

⁶⁹ Even that conclusion is, however, an interpretation, and even if Jain tries to stick as much as possible to the sheer material evidence, she cannot avoid interpreting the evidence. The questions are, therefore, still open, and Jain’s possibly all-too cautious conclusions remain somewhat disappointing.

⁷⁰ See VanderKam and Flint, *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 180.

⁷¹ See VanderKam and Flint, *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 182.

⁷² On the Enoch tradition in the Qumran corpus, see also Frey, “Zur Bedeutung der Qumran-Texte zum Verständnis der Apokalyphtik,” 26–29.

⁷³ On the dating, see basically J. T. Milik, *The Books of Enoch: The Aramaic Fragments from Qumran* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1976), 7 and 273; on the manuscripts, see further G. W. E. Nickelsburg, “The Books of Enoch at Qumran. What We Know and What We Need to Think about,” in *Antikes Judentum und Frühes Christentum, Festschrift Hartmut Stegemann* (ed. B. Kollmann, W. Reinbold, and A. Steudel; BZNW 97; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1999), 99–113; idem, *I Enoch I* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001), 9–12.

roots and origins of the Jewish Apocalyptic tradition – long before the Maccabean crisis or the finalization of the Book of Daniel.⁷⁴ All parts of *1 Enoch* with the only exception being the Parables (chapters 37–71) have been discovered at Qumran, including a Greek version of the Letter of Enoch in Cave 7 (7Q4, 7Q8, and 7Q12).⁷⁵ Furthermore, some of the Aramaic manuscripts even contain several parts of *1 Enoch*. Thus, the evidence already points to the growing (but not yet “finalized”) Enochic corpus.

The age of some of the manuscripts might lead to the conclusion that the book was held in high esteem but also that this manuscript was not regularly used. Was Enoch considered a prophetic book, as we can see later in the New Testament (e.g., in Jude 14 where Enoch is quoted and called a prophet)?⁷⁶ An argument for such a conclusion could be that there is also a pesher commentary on the Apocalypse of Weeks (4Q247), and if the attribution is correct, this means that the *yahad* community actually commented on that foundational chronological passage from the Enochic tradition as it did with other prophetic writings or the Psalms.⁷⁷ But interestingly, the Qumran rule texts do not quote or draw on Enochic passages. This is surprising, in light of the calendrical authority of the Enochic tradition (including the *Book of Jubilees*) and its significance regarding an eschatological chronology. This may be because the book was probably still in a state of growth and reshaping, and its status was not definitely fixed. It is, therefore, questionable when Flint considers it a certainty that *1 Enoch* had canonical status among the Qumran community and therefore includes it among the number of prophetic books.⁷⁸

(h) The best candidate for “canonicity” of a writing that did not make it into the later Hebrew canon is *Jubilees*. The book is attested in the Qumran corpus in 14 or 15 Hebrew manuscripts. In addition to this, there are also some related texts: three manuscripts of “Pseudo-Jubilees” (4Q225–227) and a manuscript that cites Jubilees by mentioning its Hebrew title (4Q228). Furthermore, *Jubilees* is referred to as an authoritative tradition in the *Damascus Document* (CD XVI 3–4).⁷⁹ There is also a text drawing on *Jubilees* (thus called Pseudo-Jubilees) in a manner, other texts continue or draw on canonical prophets. These observations, together with the sheer number of manuscripts which far exceeds the attestation of most of the later “canonical” writings, most clearly points to an authoritative or even quasi-canonical position

⁷⁴ See Frey, “Zur Bedeutung der Qumran-Texte zum Verständnis der Apokalyptik,” *passim*.

⁷⁵ Cf. É. Puech, “Sept fragments de la Lettre d’Hénoch (1 Hén 100, 103 et 105) dans la grotte 7 de Qumrân (=7QHén gr),” *RevQ* 18 (1997): 313–23.

⁷⁶ On the reception of Enoch in Jude, see J. Frey, *Jude. 2 Peter: A Theological Commentary* (transl. K. Ess; Waco: Baylor University Press, 2018), 119–124.

⁷⁷ The word *pesher*, however, is not preserved in the extant fragments.

⁷⁸ VanderKam and Flint, *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 179.

⁷⁹ Cf. Flint, “Scriptures in the Dead Sea Scrolls” 294; VanderKam and Flint, *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 178 and 196–99.

of *Jubilees* at least for parts of the Qumran community.⁸⁰ *Jubilees*, which is also part of the Enochic tradition, was apparently considered more authoritative than the other Enochic works or any other writing from the range of texts we are used to calling “Pseudepigrapha.”

(i) There were possibly some other writings considered authoritative in the Qumran community:

A famous quotation of such a “non-canonical” text occurs in the Messianic florilegium 4QTestimonia, where the “Apocryphon of Joshua” is quoted as an authority or source for Messianic issues. After the mention of the Prophet like Moses (Exod 20:21 according to the Samaritan tradition), the Royal Messiah (Num 24:15–17) and the Priestly Messiah (Deut 33:8–10), the writing is quoted for introducing a negative “anti-Messianic” figure in contrast with the three positive Messianic figures. But as mentioned above, the text of only one sheet is probably a private note for study or discussion than a public text, and it is striking that the entry about the three Messianic figures in 1QS, probably crafted or copied by the same scribe as 4QTestimonia, does not contain the reference to the figure from the Apocryphon of Joshua.

There are some more references to other texts as a kind of authority. In CD IV 14–18, there is an allusion to a writing of Levi, the son of Jacob, although we do not know an exact parallel in the preserved writings ascribed to Levi. The next parallel is in the Greek Testament of Dan 2:4 (from the later *Testaments of the 12 Patriarchs*). The example, however, shows that it was possible to refer to some other texts as authoritative, most of which are no longer extant. Mention should also be made of the enigmatic *Book of Hagi/Hagu*, mentioned several times in the Qumran writings and also the pre-sectarian sapiential texts (*1Q/4QInstruction*),⁸¹ but the shape and contents of that book are unclear.

E. Conclusions

Is it possible to compose a “Dead Sea Scrolls Bible,” an enterprise undertaken by T&T Clark publishers and clearly inspired from a publishers’ selling perspective?⁸² This book, boldly entitled “Bible,” presenting English translations of the portions and fragments of “biblical” books as actually preserved in the Qumran corpus is structured in three parts, according to the later Hebrew canon. The first one is called “Torah,” that is, writings related to Moses, including the five books of the actual Torah, the Pentateuch, and *Jubilees*,

⁸⁰ Cf. also Steudel, “Die Rezeption autoritativer Texte in Qumran,” 95.

⁸¹ Cf. Steudel, “Die Rezeption autoritativer Texte in Qumran,” 95.

⁸² M. G. Abegg, P. W. Flint, and E. Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible: The Oldest Known Bible Translated for the First Time Into English* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1999). For the scholarly basis, see also the tables and argument in VanderKam and Flint, *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 178–180.

which actually belongs to the Enochic tradition but is also related to Moses. The question remains whether *Jubilees* can simply be added to the Torah, or whether the book actually aims at superseding the Pentateuch with an even “higher” form of revelation, an angel dictating to Moses from the heavenly tablets. These conceptual problems are not considered in the so-called “Dead Sea Scrolls Bible.” Furthermore, possibly due to a publisher’s concern to not disturb readers, the portions from the *Book of Jubilees* preserved at Qumran are not included in the present “Bible,” in spite of a heading and introductory passage on *Jubilees* within the first part of the “Torah.”⁸³ The concept of that book is, therefore, quite incoherent and problematic.

The second part “Prophets,” then, includes the preserved portions from the books of the second part of the Hebrew canon, Joshua through Kings, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the Twelve, along with 1 Enoch and Daniel. Thus, Daniel is added to the prophets along with 1 Enoch (of which only larger portions are preserved at Qumran whereas the part of the Parables was possibly still in the making), whereas the Enochic Book of Jubilees is presented in the context of the Torah. Again, the portions from Enoch are not presented in translation, although their “canonicity” is suggested in the introductory section,⁸⁴ with a rather poor reason given for that omission: “because the text is available elsewhere, and because of the admittedly speculative nature of including it even in a Dead Sea Scrolls Bible.”⁸⁵ But if things are admittedly so speculative, why create a separate part? And if Enoch could be considered authoritative, why not present the texts of that book (and of Jubilees)?

The third part, called “Other Books,” includes the Writings from the later Hebrew canon without Esther (which is only mentioned as missing in the Qumran corpus with some considerations about the reasons⁸⁶) but with the addition of Ben Sira, the Epistle of Jeremiah, and Tobit, which are presented in their extant portions, although the authoritative character of Tobit is quite questionable. On the other hand, the portions from the books later considered part of the Hebrew canon, but uncertain in their status at Qumran (e.g., Chronicles or Ezra–Nehemiah) are presented in the “Dead Sea Scrolls Bible.”

This procedure of simply adding some writings to the three categories of the later Hebrew canon (and attributing Daniel to the Prophets) is certainly questionable as we do not know about the precise status of authority of many of those writings. And of course, the term “Bible” (with the implication that all those books are included in one book) is anachronistic and misleading.

This is not only a problem of a popularizing English “edition” of the scriptures considered authoritative for the Qumran community. The leading German standard introduction to the Old Testament states “In general, the canon

⁸³ Cf. Abegg, Flint, and Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible*, 196–198.

⁸⁴ Cf. Abegg, Flint, and Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible*, 480–81.

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, 481.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, 630–31.

of Qumran is equal to the canon of the Hebrew Bible.”⁸⁷ This statement is wrong, even with the qualification that the Qumranites did not yet have a closed “list” of books that made up their Bible. The historical truth is more complicated, in various respects:

(a) We have to see that the Qumran corpus (thus representing wide parts of the literary activity in Judaea in the period before 70 CE) does not yet give evidence for a fixed list of “canonical” texts, although there certainly was a strong feeling about the authority of certain texts, including the Pentateuch, of course; the Prophets, in particular Isaiah and the Twelve; and also the Psalms, read in a prophetic manner.⁸⁸ We could consider this “core group” of texts a kind of “Canon within the Canon.”⁸⁹ however, it is still a question whether we should actually speak of such a wider canon including, for example, Ezra–Nehemiah or Chronicles, which are almost unattested in Qumran.

It is also striking that, for halakic reasoning, Qumran “sectarian” writings usually refer to those texts known from the later Hebrew canon, rather than to others. Enoch, for example, is not cited for halakic issues, although its relevance for calendar issues is obvious. Consequently, the idea of a totally “open” canon might also be inappropriate.

(b) “Canonical” authority seems to be presupposed in particular for the Pentateuch, even in the debate with outsiders: This can be shown from the halakic text 4QMMT where quotes from the Torah are used in part B to support the particular halakic views of the “we-group” in debate with an outside viewpoint, and prophetic texts from the Torah are used in part C to support a particular view of history.⁹⁰ At least with regard to the Torah, the authority was considered a literary authority, not an oral or mediated one. This is evidenced by the rule in 1QS VI 6–8 which demands that members should study in the *book* of the Law.

On the other hand, a diachronic analysis of 1QS might suggest that earlier versions of the rule were still lacking some scriptural quotations, so that we may assume that the references to the scriptures, not only the Torah but also the Prophets, was gradually enhanced during the lifetime of the Qumran community. The community is, thus, in a period or process of “scripturalization.” Most interesting is the fact that the writings composed in the *yahad* after the redaction of the *Damascus Document* (ca. 100 BCE) were only exegetical writings, thematic and continuous pesharim.⁹¹

(c) The authority of those books was felt strongly in spite of various book forms, which were studied, transmitted, and stored together without any insti-

⁸⁷ H.-J. Fabry, “Der Text und seine Geschichte,” in *Die Entstehung des Alten Testaments* (ed. E. Zenger; 7th ed.; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2008), 36–59, here 45.

⁸⁸ Cf. Steudel, “Die Rezeption autoritativer Texte in Qumran,” 90

⁸⁹ Thus Tigchelaar, “Wie haben die Qumrantexte unsere Sicht der kanonischen Prozesse verändert?” 81.

⁹⁰ Cf. Steudel, “Die Rezeption autoritativer Texte in Qumran,” 98

⁹¹ Thus Steudel, “Die Rezeption autoritativer Texte in Qumran,” 99.

tutional need of harmonizing or standardizing the texts to a “valid” form. This is, possibly, the most important observation from the Qumran evidence: In spite of the authority of the books mentioned, there was still a certain openness of the form of some books, and an even greater fluidity of the text. Although the Pentateuch was certainly attributed canonical authority, it was not impossible to insert additions, such as those in the Reworked Pentateuch, and the debate whether this is a biblical manuscript or an “Apocryphal” composition obviously mirrors our problems with the categories: This is not an ancient debate. Thus, it is generally difficult to draw a clear border between Scripture and a “reworked,” “continued,” or interpreted Scripture. Did the Qumranites really see a difference between the book of Jeremiah and Lamentations, or between the book of Ezekiel and continuations such as Pseudo-Ezekiel texts?⁹²

(d) The most general methodological point the Qumran corpus has brought for our understanding is the reshaping of our concept of authority and canonicity in terms of the pattern of a canonical process which is not determined by its “end product,” nor directed by a distinctive institution, but that goes on differently in different groups and at different places. This process started early and was not finished even with the debates of the Rabbis in the Tannaitic period. While a book or its alleged author could be considered prophetic, the text was still open to some changes, relocations, or expansions, and the fact that various forms existed side by side was no decisive problem for its readers or interpreters. Moreover, the body of writings considered by the Qumran covenanters to be authoritative was not uniform. Judges and/or Kings are certainly less important than the Psalms and Isaiah, and even a very particular text such as the Apocalypse of Weeks could stimulate pesher interpretation.

It is this understanding of fluid authority or also spiritually interpreted authority which could also inspire our views about the scriptures, in various Jewish groups of that period, including the early Jesus movement and the New Testament.

⁹² Cf. Tigchelaar, “Wie haben die Qumrantexte unsere Sicht der kanonischen Prozesse verändert?” 82

13. The Worldview in the Book of Jubilees

How the ancients “formed” and imagined their world is not just relevant to the question of the state of their scientific knowledge of the world, the precision of their observations, and the breadth of their horizon. What the image of the world in ancient texts and its structures of order, which are first oriented around sensory perception,¹ reveal is something else, and it is something much more than the mere description of topographical or chronological phenomena according to the knowledge of the respective time.

In his *Philosophy of Symbolic Forms*, the Jewish thinker Ernst Cassirer addressed the categories of the understanding of the world in mythical thought. According to him, the division of space and the order of time are never merely external, accidental, and meaningless for such a way of thinking; rather, a certain accent of meaning is always associated with times, places, numbers, and directions.² It matters what time something takes place or where something happens in space. For “every ... definition of space receives a particular divine or demonic, friendly or hostile, holy or unholy ‘character.’ The East is [conceived of] as the source of light as well as the source and origin of all life – the West is [conceived of] as the place of the sinking sun, where the terrors of death blow over.”³ In their chronological and topographical structures, texts shaped by such structures of order must be taken seriously as complex symbolic systems that convey to their recipients, by means of a spatial-temporal orientation, not only a picture of the world and their own

¹ Cf. H. Gese, “Zur Frage des Weltbildes,” in *Zur biblischen Theologie. Alttestamentliche Vorträge* (ed. H. Gese; München: Kaiser, 1976), 206f. On the problem of the worldview in the ancient Orient and in the biblical tradition, see further H. A. Frankfort, J. A. Wilson, and T. Jacobsen, *Frühlicht des Geistes. Wandlungen des Weltbildes im Alten Orient* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1954), passim; O. Keel, *Die Welt der altorientalischen Bildsymbolik und das Alte Testament. Am Beispiel der Psalmen* (3rd ed.; Zürich: Benziger, 1984), 13–52; idem, “Das sogenannte altorientalische Weltbild,” *BK40* (1985): 157–161; B. Janowski, *Alter Orient*, vol. 1 of *Rettungsgewißheit und Epiphanie des Heils. Das Motiv der Hilfe Gottes “am Morgen” im Alten Orient und im Alten Testament* (WMANT 59; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1989), 19–29 (Lit.); I. Cornelius, “The Visual Representation of the World in the Ancient Near East and the Hebrew Bible,” *JNSL* 20 (1994): 193–218 (Lit.), as well as the articles by D. Michel, “Weltbild,” *BHH III*, 2161f.; K. Koch, “Weltbild,” in *Reclams Bibellexikon* (3rd ed.), 539f.; and R. A. Oden Jr., “Cosmogony, Cosmology,” *ABD* 1:1162–1171.

² E. Cassirer, *Philosophie der symbolischen Formen II. Das mythische Denken* (5th ed.; Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1969), 119.

³ Cassirer, *Philosophie*, 122.

place in the world structure, but also values and structures of meaning; and thus these texts contribute to the recipients' personal identity and the protection of their identity.

The *Book of Jubilees* is a writing that works programmatically with the categories of time and numbers and recites its interpretation of the world in its retelling of the biblical story of Gen 1–Exod 12 not only by means of a particularly impressive chronological structuring of events, but also by means of a specific interpretation of the topographical material. The interlocking of these two dimensions is significant for the entire work: The *spatial order*, which manifests itself in the position of the sanctuaries and in the division of the earth, and the *temporal order*, which underlies the chronological concept, hang together as the one, providential *world order* from which Israel is to recognize its vocation and place among the peoples.

A. The Temporal Structure

It is obvious that the chronological order of events is of particular interest to the author and the circles standing behind him. But of primary interest in his presentation of Israel's pre-history is not the 364-day calendar represented in this work,⁴ the *chronological microstructure* of the division of the year into days, weeks, and months, and the festival calendar associated with it. Much more conspicuous is the *chronological macrostructure*⁵ with which the author connects the material he has narrated and which runs through the entire work like a red thread: the division of time and history into jubile weeks of years, and years.

I. The Chronological Macrostructure: The World Chronology

Both the title and the introductory chapter, as well as the final chapter of the work, point to *Jubilees*' continuous interest in the chronological structuring of narrated history and thus, at the same time, in the chronology of the world. These parts of *Jubilees* describe the contents of the work with the concept of the "division of the times" or "the days" and with reference to the trio of

⁴ On this, see the work of M. Albani, "Zur Rekonstruktion eines verdrängten Konzepts: Der 364-Tage-Kalender in der gegenwärtigen Forschung," in *Studies in the Book of Jubilees* (ed. M. Albani, J. Frey, and A. Lange; TSAJ 65; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997), 79–126; and U. Glessmer, "Explizite Aussagen über kalendarische Konflikte im Jubiläenbuch: Jub. 6,22–32.33–38," in *Studies in the Book of Jubilees* (ed. M. Albani, J. Frey, and A. Lange; TSAJ 65; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997), 127–164.

⁵ Cf. J. C. VanderKam, "Das chronologische Konzept des Jubiläenbuches," *ZAW* 107 (1995): 80–100; and already E. Wiesenberg, "The Jubilee of Jubilees," *RevQ* 3 (1961/62): 3–40: "His chronology, not his calendar is the object of primary interest to the writer of the Book of Jubilees" (4).

years, weeks (of years), and jubilees.⁶ The chronological schema itself is not explained in detail; it may have been familiar to the circles from which the work originated.

Similar heptadic structures of history are encountered, for example, in the Danielic interpretation of the 70 years of Jer 25:11f. and 29:10 with the weeks (of years) in Dan 9:2, 24–27, or in the so-called Apocalypse of Weeks of *1 Enoch* 93:1–10 and 91:11–17,⁷ in which a one week unit seems to designate a period of 490 years.⁸ In addition to this, there are some Qumran texts that suggest a similar chronological order in their mention of weeks or jubilees.⁹

⁶ Thus, the prologue says, “The words of the division of the times of the law and the testimony of the event of the *years*, the weeks (of years) of their *jubilees* throughout all the Years of the World” (J. C. VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees* [CSCO 510–11, Scriptorum Aethiopicorum 87–88; Leuven: Peeters, 1989], 2:1). Cf. the reference to the presumably original title in CD XVI 4f.: “The book of the divisions of the times according to their *jubilees* and their *Weeks of Years*”). Further notes to the chronological schema occur in *Jub.* 1:4, 26, 29; 50:4, 13.

⁷ See K. Koch, “Sabbatstruktur der Geschichte. Die sogenannte Zehn-Wochen-Apokalypse (1 Hen 93_{1–10} 91_{11–17}) und das Ringen um die alttestamentlichen Chronologien im späten Israelitentum,” *ZAW* 95 (1983): 403–430; J. C. VanderKam, *Enoch and the Growth of an Apocalyptic Tradition* (CBQMS 16; Washington, D.C.: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1984), 153ff.; as well as the attempt at a synchronization of the Apocalypse of Weeks with *Jubilees* by D. Dimant, “The Seventy Weeks Chronology (Dan 9,24–27) in the Light of New Qumranic Texts,” in *The Book of Daniel in the Light of New Findings* (ed. A. S. van der Woude; BETL 106; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1993), 57–78, here 70–72.

⁸ See Koch, “Sabbatstruktur,” 414–420; idem, “Die mysteriösen Zahlen der jüdischen Könige und die apokalyptischen Jahr-Wochen,” *VT* 28 (1978): 433–441; and in addition to these, the interesting modifying suggestion by Dimant, “Seventy Weeks,” loc. cit., who assumes a double length (i.e., 980 years) for the first week and then determines the parallelism of the events of the second week of the Apocalypse of Weeks with the third decade of jubilees according to *Jubilees*, the third week with the fourth decade, and so on.

⁹ It is important to mention here the so-called Ps.-Jubilees Texts (see J. C. VanderKam and J. T. Milik, “Jubilees,” in *Qumran Cave 4 VIII. Parabiblical Texts*, Part 1 [ed. DJD XIII; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994], 141–175), see, for example, 4Q226 I 5f.; 4Q226 2 3, 4Q227 2 2; cf. also 4Q228 (J. T. Milik, “Jubilees,” 177–185), where, as in *Jub.* 1, there are many references to the “divisions of the time” (4Q228 I 2, 4, 7, 9), and above all the text of Ps.-Moses 4Q390, which is supposedly dependent on *Jubilees* (see D. Dimant, “New Light on Jewish Pseudepigrapha – 4Q390,” in *The Madrid Qumran Congress. Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid 18–21 March 1991* [ed. J. Treballe Barrera and L. Vegas Montaner; STDJ 11; Leiden: Brill, 1992], 437f.), where chronological notes used the unit “week of years” (1 2; 2 I 4, 6) and “jubilees” (4Q390 I 7; 2 I 4) (similarly, cf. 4Q387 3 ii 3–4); furthermore, a part of the Mišmarot-texts (in a series of chronological units, 4QMišmarot A 4 II 10–13 names days, Sabbaths, months, years, “weeks of years,” and “jubilees”; cf. 4QMišmarot A 2 I 5f.), see further 4Q181 II 3ff., where “70 weeks of years” are mentioned, and 4Q247 (J. T. Milik, *The Books of Enoch*

Although the terms “week” or “jubilee” are not used consistently in these works,¹⁰ their use in *Jubilees* clearly indicates the designation of a “week” as a period of 7 years and a “jubilee” as a period of 7 weeks.¹¹ The scale of world chronology then formed the sequence of jubilees, according to which an absolute chronological classification of all events since the creation becomes possible.

According to VanderKam’s count,¹² there are 133 events that the author places into the order of his world chronology using the schema of jubilees, weeks (of years), and years. This includes not only the narrative highlighting of events, but also, for example, the birth, marriage, and death of the ancestors of Adam to Moses, the first building of houses and cities (*Jub.* 4:9), the beginning of viticulture (*Jub.* 7:1), or the birth or the naming of the sons of Jacob, which in *Jub.* 28:11–24 and 32:33 is dated especially accurately, indicating month and day.¹³ In terms of density and precision, these figures go far

[Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976], 256). Also, 11QMelch II 7 presupposes a series of 10 “jubilees,” whose tenth jubilee should bring in eschatological salvation. A chronology in *Jubilees* can also be found in the “Book of Noah,” which has now become accessible through the preliminary publication of the remaining columns of the *Genesis Apocryphon* (1QGenAp) (see the heading in 1QGenAp V 29; cf. M. Morgenstern, E. Qimron, and D. Sivan, “The Hitherto Unpublished Columns of the Genesis Apocryphon [with an appendix by G. Bearman and S. Spiro],” *AbrN* 33 [1995]: 30–54, here 41ff.). There, Noah states his age at the marriage of his sons with 10 jubilees (1QGenAp VI 10 [see *ibid.*, 41]; cf. Gen 5:32 and *Jub.* 4:28, 33).

¹⁰ Cf., for example, the divergent schemata in the Apocalypse of Weeks for “week” and in 11QMelch for “jubilee,” which in this context does not refer to a 49-year period (but perhaps – like “week” in the Apocalypse of Weeks – a period of 490 years).

¹¹ Cf. *Jub.* 45:13. Uncertainties exist only with regard to the larger units of time, which the author no longer seems to calculate according to the system of seventies. Here, only the jubilees are counted. When there is mention of a “week of jubilees” in *Jub.* 4:18 – the text is difficult to interpret here – this has no special meaning for the presentation in *Jubilees*: Neither the 7th (or 8th) nor the 14th (or 15th) etc. jubilee is somehow emphasized (cf. VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees*, 2:26 [*Jub.* 4:18]; contra Milik, *Enoch*, 61, who wishes to maintain that the “week of jubilees” is the greatest unit of the chronology of *Jubilees*). Of course, this is different with regard to the jubilee of jubilees, the 50th jubilee, which is of the greatest importance for *Jubilees* (see Wiesenber, “The Jubilee of Jubilees”; J. C. Vanderkam, “Konzept”).

¹² VanderKam, “Konzept,” 88–91. Of course, there are also dates that the author only makes with the indication of day and month, without the indication of years, weeks of years, and jubilees, thus, for example, the Fall (3:17) or the expulsion from the garden of Eden (3:32), etc.

¹³ On this text, cf. J. C. Endres, *Biblical Interpretation in the Book of Jubilees* (CBQMS 19; Washington D.C.: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1987), 106f., who, however, does not elaborate on the problems of Jacob’s sons’ dates of birth; see R. H. Charles, *The Book of Jubilees, or the Little Genesis* (A. and C. Black: London, 1902, reprint 1972), 170–172; and H. Rönsch, *Das Buch der Jubiläen oder die kleine Genesis* (Leipzig: Fues, 1874), 327–329.

beyond those offered in Gen 1–Exod 12 (in a different form in each textual tradition¹⁴). Although much of it will of course be purely fictional, the density of the chronological notes reveals the significance the author attaches to the temporal structure of his presentation: The course of the world from creation to the entry of Israel into the land of Canaan, which according to *Jubilees* is indeed fixed on heavenly tablets,¹⁵ is subdivided according to a pre-arranged “Sabbath structure” and thus corresponds “to the model that God has established in the creation week.”¹⁶ For its part, the history of the world testifies to the incontrovertibility of the order that God put into effect in the past and that Israel pledged for preservation.¹⁷

The course of history is divided by this structure into differently qualified periods of time. This fact is indicated by, e.g., the remark that although Adam and Eve spent only a year in the garden of Eden, and of course practiced sexual austerity there,¹⁸ because of the sacredness of the place, they remained childless not only during that time, but throughout their first year of service.¹⁹ Cain’s fratricide occurs at the beginning of the third jubilee (*Jub.* 4:2), and the construction of houses and cities begins with the fifth jubilee (*Jub.* 4:9). The death of Adam and the death of Cain, on whose circumstances *Jubilees* attaches particular importance,²⁰ occur in the last two years of a jubilee, namely of the 19th (*Jub.* 4:31). The author seems to want to point out with this classification that the conclusion of a historical connection has been reached, especially since his presentation skips a long chronological gap and only begins again in the 25th jubilee with the note of Noah’s marriage and the

¹⁴ See Glessmer, “Explizite Aussagen,” 138f.

¹⁵ Cf. *Jub.* 1:27, 29. See also F. García Martínez, “The Heavenly Tablets in the Book of Jubilees,” in *Studies in the Book of Jubilees* (ed. M. Albani, J. Frey, and A. Lange; TSAJ 65; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997), 243–260, here 247ff.

¹⁶ VanderKam, “Konzept,” 97; cf. Koch, “Sabbatstruktur.”

¹⁷ On the close connection between the Sabbath halakah and chronology, see above all the concluding chapter of *Jubilees*; cf. *Jub.* 50:3f. and 50:12f. On this, see L. Doering, “The Concept of the Sabbath in the Book of Jubilees,” in *Studies in the Book of Jubilees* (ed. M. Albani, J. Frey, and A. Lange; TSAJ 65; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997), 179–206.

¹⁸ Concerning the requirement of austerity in the sanctuary, cf. 11QT^a XL 11f.; CD XI 21–XII 2 and 4QTohorot A (=4Q274) 1 I 8f. See J. T. A. G. M. van Ruiten, “The Garden of Eden and Jubilees 3,1–31,” *Bijdragen* 57 (1996): 305–317, here 311f. and G. Anderson, “Celibacy or Consummation in the Garden? Reflections on Early Jewish and Christian Interpretations of the Garden of Eden,” *HTR* 82 (1989): 121–148, here 128–130.

¹⁹ J. R. Levison, *Portraits of Adam in Early Judaism. From Sirach to 2 Baruch* (JSP.S 1; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1988), 96, accurately states that this is not due to speculation about Adam, but only to the tendency and the specific chronological interest of *Jubilees*.

²⁰ With the death of Cain by means of a stone that falls from his collapsing house, the *talion* principle is satisfied, which *Jub.* 4:32 emphasizes especially as an ordinance written on heavenly tablets; cf. Exod 21:25; Wis 11:16; Ps.-Philo, *L.A.B.* 44:10.

birth of his sons (*Jub.* 4:33) and the subsequent report about angels marrying humans (5:1: “in the beginning of this [i.e., the 25th] jubilee”).

Individual jubilees are particularly associated with fateful events, such as the 25th with the marriage of angels with humans (*Jub.* 5:1) or the 33rd with the division of the earth, the temptation by the demons, and the building of the tower of Babylon (*Jub.* 8:10; 10:1, 20).²¹ Although the author rarely makes use of the opportunity to move remarkable events to the beginning of a jubilee and thereby emphasize their significance,²² it is no coincidence that the fateful allocation of the earth occurs at the beginning of the 33rd jubilee, while Noah’s sons attempt to divide the earth among themselves in the 6th year of the 7th week of the 32nd jubilee failed.²³

In the chronological schema of *Jubilees*, a set of contextual events is highlighted above all, the exodus of Israel from Egypt and the conquering of the land of Canaan: In the 50th jubilee, Israel moved out of Egypt. At the time of the revelation on Sinai, where Moses is situated within the fictitious framework of the book, when the angel of the presence dictates to him the present revelation,²⁴ 9 years of this jubilee have passed, and seizure of this land is thus completed at the close of the 50th jubilee, in the 2,450th year of the course of the world. The meaning of this chronological construction is derived from the biblical provisions concerning the year of jubilee in Lev 25, a passage with which Num 50:2–5 is also connected.²⁵ After 49 years elapsed, the 50th year, the year of “jubilee,” is the year of release from debt bondage and the restitution of their original inheritance for all Israelites. This conception, which according to Lev 25 should benefit the individual Israelite, is now

²¹ Cf. VanderKam, “Konzept,” 97 n. 37.

²² With the exception of the division of the earth (*Jub.* 8:10), only in *Jub.* 4:2 with the fratricide and in 4:9 with the beginning of the building of houses. Other notes that move events to the beginning of a jubilee only reference less significant events (cf. *Jub.* 8:1: Arpachshad’s wedding; *Jub.* 19:1: Abraham’s return to Hebron; *Jub.* 24:21: Isaac at the well; and *Jub.* 35:1: Jacob with Rebecca).

²³ Cf. VanderKam, “Putting them in their Place. Geography as an Evaluative Tool,” in *Pursuing the Text. Studies in Honor of Ben Zion Wacholder on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday* (ed. J. C. Reeves and J. Kampen; JSOTSup 184; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1995), 57.

²⁴ Cf. *Jub.* 1:27 and also the *hipfil* לְהַכְתִּיב in 4QJub^a IV 6, which now allows a clear solution to the old problem of the authorial fiction and confirms the previous conjecture that the Ethiopian text misunderstood a Hebrew *hifil* as a *Qal*; on this problem, see Vanderkam and Milik, “Jubilees,” 11, as well as the earlier work of VanderKam, “The Putative Author of the Book of Jubilees,” *JSS* 26 (1981): 209–217; idem, *The Book of Jubilees*, 2:6 (on *Jub.* 1:27).

²⁵ Cf. VanderKam, “Konzept,” 98f. Concerning the year of jubilee, see E. S. Gerstenberger, *Das 3. Buch Mose. Leviticus* (ATD 6; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993), 337ff., particularly 344ff.; E. Otto, *Theologische Ethik des Alten Testaments* (ThW 3.2; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1994), 249–256.

extended in *Jubilees* to the larger units of time of the jubilees and related to the welfare of the whole people: Just as in the year of jubilee each individual Israelite should be released from slavery and have his ancestral land returned to him, Israel had experienced in its 50th jubilee (i.e., in the “jubilee of jubilees”) release from slavery in Egypt and the (re-)appropriation of its land.

The whole chronological system of *Jubilees* aims at this interpretation of the exodus, or, more precisely, the conquest, and one must assume that the author or the circles behind him have introduced many chronological data only to emulate or deviate from other textual traditions to facilitate this interpretation and to emphasize the importance of the gift of land to Israel. This approach is not only an expression of theoretical speculation about a long-gone history, but behind it seems to stand a very concrete theological-historical and geopolitical interest.

The reference to the ordinance concerning the biblical jubilee initially serves to assure Israel of the legality of its inheritance in the “land of Canaan.” Despite the foreign domination that had lasted for centuries, it should be noted that this country is in fact entitled to Israel.²⁶ This claim is justified not only in Joshua’s conquest or in the promise to the fathers, but rather in the conquest of the land in the 50th jubilee, that divine ordinance, by virtue of which Israel, after the period of slavery, regained its property, its original inheritance.

The interest in the legitimacy of Israel’s ownership of the land shows that even where the author retraces the course of history in Gen 1–Exod 12 in a modified form, he is not primarily interested in the narrated past of prehistoric or patriarchal history, but rather in Israel’s presence and future in the land of Canaan. Explicit references to the time after the conquest are rarely encountered in *Jubilees*, but in addition to the eschatological views in *Jub.* 1:26f., 29, especially *Jub.* 50:2–5, the structure of years, weeks of years, and jubilees should not be limited to the timeframe covered by the presentation in *Jubilees*, but as a divine ordering of time that encompasses the entire history, i.e., the time in which Israel lived in its land.²⁷ A continuation of this structure or the beginning of a new cycle of jubilees suggests not least the chrono-

²⁶ Israel was still under the Seleucid rule at the most probable time of writing *Jubilees*. The thesis of D. Mendels (*The Land of Israel as a Political Concept in Hasmonean Literature* [TSAJ 15; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1987], 57ff.) that the Maccabean-Hasmonean conquests and the compulsory Judaization of the respective tribes is justified according to *Jubilees* (and thus could not have been written until around 125 BCE) is not convincing. On the dating, see VanderKam, “The Origins and Purposes of the Book of Jubilees,” in *Studies in the Book of Jubilees* (ed. M. Albani, J. Frey, and A. Lange; TSAJ 65; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997), 17ff.

²⁷ Especially if the division of times presented in *Jubilees* is understood as a premundane divine order, it would be extremely surprising if this structure were not also and especially seen as determinative for Israel’s existence in the land.

logical classification of the conquest given in *Jub.* 50:4: If the passage through the Jordan was made in the last year of the 50th jubilee, then the start of the count of years begins again with the first year in the land of Canaan.²⁸ *Jubilees* therefore corresponds to the view presupposed in Lev 25:2 that the Sabbath and jubilee cycles should be counted and observed from the time of taking the land.

Connected with this fact is the author's conviction that the continuing history of Israel and his own present, in spite of all transgressions, is encompassed by the divine ordering of time, and – like the narrated past – is recorded on those tablets from which the angel of the presence dictates the present revelation.²⁹

At the same time, this raises the question of the eschatological perspective of the author and the classification of his own present in the divine temporal order. This question is therefore particularly difficult to answer because *Jubilees* does not allow its "location" to be recognized by a *vaticinium ex eventu* reaching into one's own present, such as in the book of Daniel (cf. Dan 11:40ff.). Thus the apocalypse of *Jub.* 23:9–32 remains obscure in its allusions. The eschatological outlook³⁰ offered in *Jub.* 23 is broken into two sections: the first of which (v. 9–25) shows a gradual worsening of human living conditions – recognizable by the shortening of lifespans and the image of geriatric infants³¹ – and during the second section, introduced with the formula "and in those days" (v. 26), promises a restitution of living conditions beginning with the return of "those who seek the law." Although it cannot be ascertained whether the author already believes that the worst phase described in v. 24f. is over, one can surmise that he and his circles in some way

²⁸ *Jub.* 50:2 ("But we have not told you its year until you come into the land ...") seems to refer to the date on which the number of the country's Sabbaths and jubilees mentioned in 50:2 should begin (K. Berger, *Das Buch der Jubiläen* [JSHRZ II 3; Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus], 552), and *Jub.* 50:4 ("for this reason I have ordained for you ...") makes it clear that the calculation, according to which the entry into the land is to take place with the completion of the 50th anniversary, is necessary in order to "know" the named year of the jubilee in *Jub.* 50:3. The passage clearly proves that for the "time of the Torah" the jubilee ordinance is presupposed in the described manner. Another argument arises from the fact that the errors and offenses of subsequent generations (e.g., in *Jub.* 1:14) are foretold with reference to the Torah as a whole, but more specifically with reference to the "sabbath and feast and jubilee, and ordinance." This, too, presupposes, in the opinion of the author, that the chronology of the jubilees is (or should be) valid until his own present day.

²⁹ Cf. *Jub.* 1:27. On the pending history or the eschatological events as the content of the heavenly tablets, cf. *Jub.* 1:29; 5:13–18; 16:9; 23:32; 24:33; 31:31f.; 32:21f.

³⁰ On this text, see G. L. Davenport, *The Eschatology of the Book of Jubilees* (SPB 20; Leiden: Brill, 1971), 32ff. as well as the recent work of J. Kugel, "The Jubilees Apocalypse," in *Dead Sea Discoveries* 1 (1994): 322–337.

³¹ Cf. *Sib. Or.* 2.155 and Hesiod, *Op.* 180f.

want to be associated with those “children” who “begin to seek the laws” (23:26) and begin to turn back. This would mean that the turning point of the course of the world would be, in a no closer specified manner, during the present of the author. However, this is of little value in answering the question of the duration or the chronological structure of the course of the world since *Jub.* 23:26ff. does not include a sudden redemption or an imminent end. Instead, *Jubilees* describes but a slow restitution of the previously narrated decay of the lifespan for the righteous until the lifespan of almost a thousand years and a “golden age” of joy and peace is restored. With this perspective of gradual, step-by-step redemption, *Jubilees* is strikingly analogous to the concept of the Apocalypse of Weeks 1 *Enoch* 93:1–10; 91:11–18, which, from the time of the election of the righteous (93:10) to the appearance of the new heavens and the eschatological peace of the earth (91:17), presupposes at least the period of time from the end of the seventh “week” to the end of the tenth “week,” that is a period of well over a thousand years, for the process of salvation. Perhaps there are clues that can be gained from *Jubilees* for the idea of the further course of history since there are close correspondences between the chronological structure of *Jubilees* and that of the Apocalypse of Weeks: According to the work of Koch and Dimant, “one week” within the Apocalypse of Weeks seems to correspond to a decade of jubilees in *Jubilees* (i.e., a time period of 490 years), whereby a period of possibly twice the normal length must be assumed for just the first (and possibly for the last) “week” in the Apocalypse of Weeks.³²

According to 1 *Enoch* 93:4, the fall (i.e., marriage) of the angels, the flood, and the salvation of Noah occurred in the 2nd “week,” while in *Jubilees* these events took place in the 3rd decade of jubilees. In *Enoch*, the election of Abraham occurred at the end of the 3rd “week” (1 *Enoch* 93:5), while according to *Jubilees* it happened in the 40th jubilee, i.e., at the end of the 4th decade of jubilees. Furthermore, the giving of the law took place at the end of the 4th “week” (1 *Enoch* 93:6), while in *Jubilees* it took place in the 50th jubilee. Dimant concludes from these parallels that the “normal value” for a “week” in the Apocalypse of Weeks is 490 years or 70 weeks of years, but takes the position that the first “week,” which encompasses the lifespan of Adam and *Enoch* (1 *Enoch* 93:3f.), corresponds to the first 20 jubilees in *Jubilees* (Adam dies after at the end of the 19th jubilee in *Jubilees* 4:29), and is, thus, twice the normal length.

If we continue from the Sinai event at the end of the 4th “week or the 50th jubilee, the destruction of the temple at the end of the 6th “week” (which would reach 584/3 BCE) would coincide quite accurately with the actual date

³² Cf. Dimant, “Seventy Weeks,” 66f., 70–72, in his modifications of the record of the observations by K. Koch, “Die mysteriösen Zahlen der jüdischen Könige und die apokalyptischen Jahrwochen,” *VT* 28 (1978): 403–441 and idem, “Sabbatstruktur.”

of the temple destruction in 587/6 BCE. With the election of the righteous at the end of the seventh week (*I Enoch* 93:10), the Apocalypse of Weeks would likely focus on their own present, which, according to the chronology of *Jubilees* would be set towards the end of the 8th decade of jubilees.

What is the result of these parallels for the question of the duration of the course of the world? According to the synchronization proposed by Dimant, the 10th decade of jubilees would coincide with the 9th “week” of the ten-week apocalypse, culminating in a universal tribunal, the annihilation of the wicked, and the repentance of all humankind.³³ This could justify the assumption expressed by other authors that *Jubilees* considers 100 jubilees = 4,900 years³⁴ to be the beginning of the eschatological period of salvation. The events of the exodus, Sinai, and conquest would then be exactly in the middle of the course of world history, in the 50th jubilee. Perhaps the setting of two other events as support or the assumption of a course of the world that runs for 100 jubilees can be evaluated: the disastrous marriage of angels to humans in the 25th jubilee and the fateful division of the earth in the 33rd jubilee would have occurred just after a quarter or one third of the expected course of the world.

The author makes no effort to emphasize his own location (which may well be about the 79th jubilee) by mathematically laying out his placement at a particularly important point in time. Instead, he seems to reckon with a relatively long period of time between the present-day repentance of the “law seekers” (*Jub.* 23:26f.) and the eschatological time of salvation. However, in the sense of a “distant expectation,” *Jubilees* is clearly aimed at such an es-

³³ The judgment of the 10th “week” seems primarily to affect the heavenly world (*I Enoch* 91:15f.).

³⁴ Cf. Wacholder, “The Date of the Eschaton in the Book of Jubilees. A Commentary on *Jub.* 49:22–50:5; CD 1:1–10, and 16:2–3,” *HUCA* 56 (1985): 87–101, here 99; a more careful treatment can be found in VanderKam, “Konzept,” 100. If the 50th jubilee was also to be understood as the first jubilee of a new cycle of jubilees, the second “jubilee of jubilees” would occur in the 99th jubilee. Dimant, “Seventy Weeks,” 67, seems to take that into account (cf. also Wiesenber, “Jubilees”). Such a count would correspond to the year count in *Jubilees*, which calculates cycles of 49 years and not cycles of 49 + 1 years. Cf. also M. Testuz, *Les idées religieuses du Livre des Jubilés* (Geneve: Droz, 1960), 138–140, who arrives at the number 2,401 years = 49 jubilees from the expulsion from paradise in the 8th year and the exodus in the 2,410th year (cf. O. S. Wintermute, “Jubilees,” *OTP* 2 [1985]: 35–142, heres 39). However, *Jubilees* does not otherwise relate his chronological information to the beginning of Adam’s stay outside of Eden, but to creation. Regarding the counting of jubilees, therefore, the rationale presented above suggests itself: If Israel’s conquest takes place at the end of the 50th jubilee, then it is more likely that a new cycle begins at the beginning of Israel’s existence in the land of Canaan (with the 51st jubilee as the first) and to mark the second “jubilee of jubilees” with the final redemption of the earth in the 100th jubilee.

chatological restitution, which corresponds to the event in the first “jubilee of jubilees” and surpasses it eschatologically.³⁵

II. The Chronological Microstructure: Calendar, Sabbaths, and Festivals

The chronological macrostructure, the heptadical division of time and history, for their part, of course, is closely related to the chronological microstructure presented by *Jubilees*: the division of the year into days, weeks, and months.³⁶ If the world as a whole is subdivided into heptadic cycles, then this could not at least create an additional, overarching plausibility for the rigid demand that the division of the year practiced in Israel should also be in accordance with the law of sevens and that, for this reason, only a calendar that corresponds to this law can be legitimate: the pure solar calendar with a year length of 364 days = 52 weeks = 4 quarters with 13 weeks or 91 days.³⁷ Only this schema guarantees that a given date falls on the same day of the week in each year, and thus that the feasts fixed according to their dates do not conflict with a Sabbath.³⁸ Only the 364-day calendar can preserve the safeguard against the confusion of holy and unholy days (*Jub.* 6:37), against the “destruction” of the festivals and the forgetting of the Sabbaths (6:22, 34), and thus protect against the “corruption” of the age (6:33, 36); only this calendar preserves the strict Sabbath observance required by *Jubilees* and the correct setting of the festivals. Therefore, *Jubilees* strongly warns against the change of the length of the year (*Jub.* 6:30, 32, 38), the disregard of the beginning of the month, and the quarter days (6:28f.), and against the inclusion of the moon in the calendrical calculations (*Jub.* 6:36ff.). Thus, the ultimate reason why *Jubilees* insists so strongly on this – known to be inconsistent with as-

³⁵ Thus, for example, in the hope of the purification of sin and transgression and the removal of Satan (*Jub.* 50:5; 23:29; on this, see J. Frey, “Different Patterns of Dualism in the Qumran Library,” 325 (in this volume, 289), as well as the newly created and eternally existing sanctuary in Zion (*Jub.* 1:26f., 29).

³⁶ This relationship is explicit where individual dates indicate not only the year (as a part of the number of jubilees and weeks of years), but also the month and day, thus primarily in view of the birth of Jacob’s sons in *Jub.* 28:11ff.

³⁷ In any case, the regulation could not be practiced for a long time without some form of intercalation. But *Jub.* 6:31f. also appears to polemicize any kind of intercalation. On the divisions of the calendar system, cf. the work of Albani, “Konzepts,” and Gleßner, “Assuagen,” as well as J. Tubach, “Die Herkunft der spätantiken Sonnenreligion nach christlich-orientalischen Quellen” (Habil. Bonn, 1988), 90ff.; concerning the traditional-historical background of the present conception in the Astronomical Book of Enoch, see M. Albani, *Astronomie und Schöpfungsglaube. Untersuchungen zum Astronomischen Henochbuch* (WMANT 68; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1994); on the historical context, see VanderKam, “The Origin, Character, and Early History of the 364-Day Calendar. A Reassessment of Jaubert’s Hypothesis,” *CBQ* 41 (1979): 390–411.

³⁸ See the tables in VanderKam, “Origin,” 399.

tronomical reality³⁹ – determination of the length of the year seems to be the commandment of Sabbath observance, which, according to the view of *Jubilees*, has absolutely fundamental significance for the existence and identity of Israel. It is no coincidence that the theme of the Sabbath determines the two chapters that frame the body of *Jubilees* (*Jub.* 2 and 50). The Sabbath commandment⁴⁰ is the first commandment in *Jubilees* (*Jub.* 2:24), it is founded directly in God's work of creation (*Jub.* 2:16ff.), and Israel is the only people chosen to keep the Sabbath rest with God himself and the two highest classes of angels (*Jub.* 2:18f.). The passage of the elect Israel is thus closely linked with the Sabbath commandment. Israel's identity as the holy and blessed people is associated with the call to Sabbath observance (*Jub.* 2:19, 21, 31). Especially in the Sabbath celebration, Israel is equal to the upper classes of angels and superior to the lower classes who have no duty to observe the Sabbath rest.⁴¹ Therefore, it is also of fundamental importance to the existence of Israel as the holy people that the Sabbath celebration (as well as the celebration of the rest of the festivals) is in accordance with the order that is valid in the heavenly world and grounded in the creation.

In light of the fundamental importance of the Sabbath ordinance for Israel's status, it is only consistent that *Jubilees* threatens the transgression of the rigid Sabbath halakah with the death penalty (*Jub.* 50:8, 12f.) and sees every change in calendric calculations to be a critical threat to Israel's identity. In this work, therefore, the "laws of the time" (*Jub.* 50:13) are presented in such a minute manner, both the chronological microstructure of the Sabbath, festival, and calendar ordering as well as the macrostructure of the world's chronology oriented around the number seven. Both are closely related to the author's understanding and the chronologically enriched retelling of prehistory ultimately serves the purpose of exhibiting the universal validity of the structure of seven established in creation and the purpose of supporting Israel's absolute commitment to observing this temporal order.

The references to the chronological structure of world events obviously mean more to the author than just an accumulation of data and facts; they are certainly not just an expression of speculative fantasy or rigid schematism. For the author and the circles behind him, it has a value setting and at the same time knowledge-creating function. In the recording of Genesis' years and ages and in the supplement of a plethora of fictional data, the author conveys the message that the order established on the heavenly tablets (*Jub.* 50:13) and the course of history revealed to Moses, despite all the trials and

³⁹ See the discussion of the associated problems in Albani, "Rekonstruktion," 103ff.

⁴⁰ On this, see the essay by L. Doering, "The Concept of the Sabbath in the Book of Jubilees," in *Studies in the Book of Jubilees* (ed. M. Albani, J. Frey, and A. Lange; TSAJ 65; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997), 179–206.

⁴¹ Cf. Tubach, "Herkunft," 97 n. 2.

tribulations, is unbreakably fixed in the present and is eschatologically valid. On the one hand, he assures his Israelite readers of the legitimacy of their inheritance in the land of Canaan and, on the other hand, motivates them not to deny the order given to Israel and – in calendars, Sabbath observance, and other halakic questions – to refrain from blatant transgressions and to live according to Israel’s calling and its eschatologically promised salvation.

B. The Spatial Structure

The spatial orientation of *Jubilees* corresponds to the temporal structure, which the author conveys to his readers. The references to the spatial conditions do not fit like the chronological notes within a continuous framework of representation, but convey a very clear picture of the world and its order by means of some outstanding passages. This framework is also of fundamental significance to the question of Israel’s identity and situation in its environment.

I. The Sanctuaries and Their Location

The two notes on the position of sacred places in *Jub.* 4:26 and 8:19 provide an essential contribution to the spatial structure of *Jubilees*. In the last mentioned place, there are three sanctuaries listed in the area of the sons of Shem: the garden of Eden, Mount Sinai, and Mount Zion. On the other hand, *Jub.* 4:26 speaks of four sacred places: At the end of the Enoch episode and following the account of Enoch’s sacrifice “on the mountain of Noon” (= the South)⁴² (*Jub.* 4:25):

“For the Lord has four (sacred) places upon the earth: The garden of Eden and the mountain of the East and this mountain which you are upon today, Mount Sinai, and Mount Zion, which will be sanctified in the new creation for the sanctification of the earth” (trans. Wintermute).

Three of the four places named in *Jub.* 4:26 are mentioned again in 8:19: The garden of *Eden*,⁴³ which no man is allowed to enter according to Gen 3:23f.,⁴⁴

⁴² Thus the rendering of the Ethiopic text in Berger, “Jubiläen,” 346. On the problems of the text, see Berger, “Jubiläen,” 346, and Wintermute, “Jubilees,” 63, according to whom the place mentioned in 4:25 “is undoubtedly to be identified with the mountain of the East in vs. 26.”

⁴³ The Syr. tradition speaks here of the “mountain of paradise” (*twr’ dprdyš*). The naming of a mountain could, in analogy to the other three sanctuaries, be quite original. The Ethiopian version would then have been adapted to the more familiar phrase “the garden of Eden,” see VanderKam, *Enoch*, 187; idem, *The Book of Jubilees*, 1:263; 2:29, 2:332.

⁴⁴ Of Enoch it was said that he was brought to Eden (*1 Enoch* 89:52; *Jub.* 4:23), as well as Elijah (*1 Enoch* 89:52). On this tradition, see R. H. Charles, *The Book of Enoch* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1912; reprint 1973), 115f.

is “the holy of holies” according to *Jub.* 8:10, and thus the most holy place on earth and “the dwelling of the Most High.”⁴⁵ This idea of Eden as a sanctuary is interpreted halakically in *Jub.* 3:9–13 when the ordinance about the time of the impurity of a woman after the birth of a boy or a girl is derived from the day in which Adam and Eve were brought into the garden of Eden after their creation (*Jub.* 3:9).⁴⁶ On the day of his expulsion from the garden of Eden, according to *Jub.* 3:27, Adam brings an incense offering and acts as a priest in the first sanctuary on earth, the garden of Eden.⁴⁷ That Mount *Sinai* – where, according to *Jub.* 1:2, the glory of the Lord has settled and on which Moses is situated at the time of revelation according to the fictional concept of *Jubilees* – is regarded as a sanctuary clearly arises from Exod 3:5. Finally, Mount Zion is the site of the present temple and also the site of the eschatological sanctuary to be built on the day of the eschatological re-creation “in

⁴⁵ As early as *Jub.* 3:12., the character of Eden as a sanctuary is emphasized. This corresponds to the fact that Adam and Eve had no sexual relations in the garden of Eden according to *Jub.* 3:34. It was only later, indeed only in the 2nd jubilee, that Adam “knows” Eve. The events in which Adam first “knows” Eve and pronounces this recognition (*Jub.* 3:6; cf. Gen 2:23) takes place according to *Jubilees* not in the garden of Eden since both Adam and Eve were created outside of the garden and then allowed to be introduced to the garden of Eden as the sanctuary 33 or 66 days after their creation. On these details, see B. Ego, “Heilige Zeit – heiliger Raum – heiliger Mensch. Beobachtungen zur Struktur der Gesetzesbegründung in der Schöpfungs- und Paradiesgeschichte des Jubiläenbuchs,” in *Studies in the Book of Jubilees* (ed. M. Albani, J. Frey, and A. Lange; TSAJ 65; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997), 211–215; J. T. A. G. M. van Ruiten, “The Garden of Eden and Jubilees 3,1–31,” *Bijdragen* 57 (1996), 310ff., and G. Anderson, “Celibacy or Consummation in the Garden? Reflections on Early Jewish and Christian Interpretations of the Garden of Eden,” *HTR* 82 (1989): 121–148, here 129.

⁴⁶ Cf. Ego, “Heilige Zeit,” loc. cit.; J. M. Baumgarten, “Purification after Childbirth and the Sacred Garden in 4Q265 and Jubilees,” in *New Qumran Texts and Studies. Proceedings of the First Meeting of the IOQS, Paris 1992* (ed. G. J. Brooke, F. García Martínez; STDJ 15; Leiden: Brill, 1994), 4–10; on the idea of Eden as a sanctuary, see Anderson, “Celibacy,” 129ff.; see also 4Q265 and *T. Levi* 18:6–10.

⁴⁷ On Adam’s priestly function in *Jubilees*, see Levison, *Portraits*, 93f. and van Ruiten, “Garden,” 315f.; on the tradition about Adam as a priest, see C. T. R. Hayward, “The Figure of Adam in Pseudo-Philo’s Biblical Antiquities,” *JSJ* 23 (1992): 1–20, here 6f. n. 25. Cf. also *Apoc. Mos.* 29:3–6; *Tg. Ps.-J* at Gen 8:20; bAZ 8a; b. *Šabb.* 28b; *Gen. Rab.* 34:9; PRE 31,3. That Adam’s sacrifice takes place not in the sanctuary, but after the expulsion of Adam and Eve from the garden in front of the sanctuary corresponds only to the fact that there is no incense in the “Holy of Holies” (8:19) and that this must take place before the Holy of Holies (cf. Exod 30:7f., 36b). The fact that Adam also covers his nakedness (*Jub.* 3:22, 27) corresponds to the biblical order of the priests (Exod 20:26; 28:42). The morning incense offering, with which Adam begins life outside of Eden, is marked as legitimate (*Jub.* 3:27, “sweet-smelling fragrance”). Within *Jubilees*, it corresponds to the evening incense offering of Enoch, which also takes place in or near paradise (*Jub.* 4:25).

Jerusalem on Mount Zion” (*Jub.* 1:29).⁴⁸ The identity and the sanctity of these three places is beyond doubt. But what about the fourth sanctuary of *Jub.* 4:26, the “*Mount of Morning*” (or “of the East”)?

To answer this question, the function of *Jub.* 4:26 must first be noted within its context: In 4:25, there was talk of Enoch’s incense offering in the evening “in the sanctuary, which was accepted before the Lord on the Mount of noon” (4:25; trans. according to Berger).

Such a sacrifice is unknown to the older Enoch tradition.⁴⁹ Verse 26, which immediately follows, provides a foundation that apparently explains the acceptance of this sacrifice and does so precisely by reference to the sacrificial place mentioned in v. 25, one of those places on earth that belong to the Lord and are his sanctuaries.⁵⁰ In any case, the context of v. 25 and 26 seems meaningful only if the mountain of the sacrifice of Enoch mentioned in v. 25 is identical with one of the places mentioned in v. 26. This is certainly not the case according to the Ethiopian text, which refers to a “mountain of noon” or “South” in v. 25 while mentioning an otherwise unknown “mountain of the morning” or “East” in v. 26 (cf. Gen 10:30). Numerous attempts have been made to solve this textual (and factual) problem:

⁴⁸ It is probable that a conjecture must be made in *Jub.* 1:29 in comparison with the Ethiopian text: E. Rau, “Kosmologie, Eschatologie und die Lehrautorität Henochs. Traditionen- und formgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zum äthiopischen Henochbuch und zu verwandten Schriften” (Diss. Hamburg, 1974), 180 n. 11, prefers “from the day” instead of “to the day of the (new) creation”; Furthermore, M. Stone, “Apocryphal Notes and Readings,” *IOS* 1 (1971), 125f., suspects a breakdown due to *homoioteleuton*: “from [the day of the creation to] the day of the new creation” (as well as VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees*, 2:7), who also points to the attempts to improve the text in some Ethiopian manuscripts. Unfortunately the text-critical problem cannot be clarified on the basis of the 4Q texts since 4QJub^a IV stops with *Jub.* 1:28 and 4QJub^b 1–2 is filled with too many holes (see VanderKam and Milik, “Jubilees,” 11f., 24–27). Historically, the statement of *1 En.* 72:1 (“until the new work is made”; cf. Isa 43:19) likely stands behind *Jub.* 1:29.

⁴⁹ Cf. VanderKam, *Enoch*, 186, who points out that the priestly function of Enoch in *Jubilees* results from his classification into the succession of generations of all the sons of Seth, who passed on the priestly ordinances from generation to generation according to *Jubilees* (cf. *Jub.* 7:38f.; 21:20). In keeping with the sense of *Jubilees*, we must trace this line back to Adam, the original priest and inaugurator of the first incense offering (see above). The priestly function of Enoch could, however, be deduced from the tradition that according to *1 En.* 14:15, Enoch was transferred to the heavenly holy of holies on his heavenly journey. On the primeval derivation of the priestly ministry, cf. also *2 En.* 68:5ff. (on this passage, see C. Böttrich, *Weltweisheit Menschheitsethik Urkult. Untersuchungen zum slavischen Henochbuch* [WUNT II/50; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1992], 196ff.).

⁵⁰ It is by no means compulsory to ascribe this verse to a secondary, sacred redaction, as is done by Davenport, *Eschatology*, 15f., 85 (and U. Mell, *Neue Schöpfung. Eine traditionsgeschichtliche und exegetische Studie zu einem soteriologischen Grundsatz paulinischer Theologie* [BZNW 56, Berlin: de Gruyter, 1989], 158, who follows him).

(a) All those proposals that try to identify the “mountain of the East” in v. 26 without reference to v. 25 are inappropriate, thus, for example, identifying it with Mount Ephraim,⁵¹ with the Mount of Olives,⁵² or even with Mount Lubar (named in *Jub.* 5:28; 7:1; 10:15) in the mountains of Ararat where Noah gets off the ark, sacrifices, and is finally buried.⁵³ According to the biblical tradition, the “mountain of the East” (Gen 10:30: הַר הַקָּרָם; LXX: ὄρος ἀνατολῶν) could be associated with Arabia,⁵⁴ but before such a reference can be considered, the connection to the context with v. 25 must first be noted. Can the mountain named there be associated with one of the sanctuaries of v. 26?

(b) The most unlikely option is an identification of this mountain with Sinai.⁵⁵ Moses appears on Sinai within the fiction of the *Book of Jubilees*, and the angel addresses him directly in v. 26. Had the author of *Jubilees* located Enoch’s offering here, he would have formulated it differently in v. 25.

(c) Rau has suggested identifying the “Mount of noon” or “of the South” with Mt. Zion. Enoch, who first recognized the order of the times and the

⁵¹ Thus the Prague Chief Rabbi Rapoport in a letter to B. Beer (in *ZDMG* 11 [1857], 730–733), who in turn developed the thesis of the Samaritan origin of *Jubilees* (B. Beer, *Das Buch der Jubiläen und sein Verhältnis zu den Midraschim* [Leipzig: Wolfgang Gerhard, 1856]; on this, see VanderKam, “Origins,” 5). On this matter, see Rönsch, *Jubiläen*, 432. Of course, the view of Zion as the eschatological sanctuary definitely excludes this thesis. The author is not a Samaritan.

⁵² Thus a later Christian interpretation in the Ethiopian Book of Secrets (J. Perruchon, *Le Livre des Mysteres du Ciel et de la Terre* [PO 1,1; Paris: Firmin-Didot, 1947], 80, 135; see K. Berger, *Jubiläen*, 346).

⁵³ This interpretation by Rönsch (*Jubiläen*, 505f., taken over by Rau, “Kosmologie,” 395) not only presupposes that one localized Ararat in the east from Palestine, although it was actually far to the northeast, it primarily interprets *Jub.* 4:26 as a definitive compendium of all sanctuaries so that the place of sacrifice of Noah, which is not mentioned in this context, must also be represented in this verse. But the various places where the patriarchs sacrifice (according to the tradition of Genesis as also according to *Jubilees*, e.g., Abraham at Bethel *Jub.* 13:4, 8f., 15f.; in Beersheba 16:20, 24; Jacob and Levi in Bethel 32:5–8) are also not mentioned in the series of the sanctuaries of *Jub.* 4:26.

⁵⁴ According to Israelite-Jewish usage, קָרָם alludes specifically to Arabia (Gen 25:6; Judg 6:3; Isa 11:14; Jer 49:28; 1 Kgs 4:30) so that the mountain on the Arabian highlands or the large *Mount of Incense* in southern Arabia would be alluded to (thus Rönsch, *Jubiläen*, 505; cf. C. Westermann, *Genesis. Kapitel 1–11* [BK 1.1.; 3rd ed.; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1983]; T. Kronholm, “קָרָם, qædæm,” *ThWAT* 2:1163). A precise location is, of course, not possible, see É. Lipinski, “Les Sémites selon Gen 10.21–30 et 1 Chr 1,17–23,” *ZAH* 6 (1993): 193–215, here 214.

⁵⁵ S. Rosenkranz, “Vom Paradies zum Tempel,” in *Tempelkult und Tempelzerstörung, FS Clemens Thoma* (ed. S. Lauer and H. Ernst; Bern: Lang, 1995), 27–132, here 37, comes to this misunderstanding because she wants to see Enoch addressed in *Jub.* 4:26. However, Enoch, unlike in *1 En.*, is not addressed at all in *Jubilees*. The whole Enoch pericope is a record about Enoch and a part of the revelation to Moses.

history up until the day of judgement, would then have sacrificed at the site of the eschatological sanctuary.⁵⁶ But Zion was introduced in 1:29 as the site of the eschatological temple, and it seems puzzling why the author would place Enoch's sacrifice there and then in v. 25 not explicitly mention Zion, and why he justified the acceptance of the sacrifice in v. 26 if it had taken place there.

(d) It would be more appropriate to locate Enoch's sacrifice in paradise (or on the mount of paradise), which according to Gen 2:8 and *1 En.* 32:3 lies in the east.⁵⁷ For *Jub.* 4:23 speaks of Enoch being led into the garden of Eden in his rapture and acting there as a court clerk. V. 24f., then, probably lead to the fact that the flood did not cover the garden of Eden, to the presence of Enoch in Eden and his sacrifice,⁵⁸ so that the Mount of Incense named in v. 25 must at least be connected with Eden.

But there are also problems with this solution: If the "Mount of noon" of *Jub.* 4:25 was to be identified with the garden of Eden or the "Mount of the garden of Eden"⁵⁹ in v. 26, what would be the meaning of the "Mount of the East"? Should not one rather identify the "Mount of Evening," on which Enoch sacrifices, with the "Mount of the East" of v. 26, which would then be more precisely related to the garden of Eden?⁶⁰

(e) Tisserant has pointed to the possibility of relating "Mount of the South" and the "Mount of the East" to one and the same place on the basis of the Syriac version. This version renders both places with the phrase *ṭwr'*

⁵⁶ Rau, "Kosmologie," 395: "that at the center of the eschatological event is not Sinai, on which Moses resides, but Zion, where Enoch made his sacrifice." Concerning the emphasis on Zion, see also Mell, *Schöpfung*, 159.

⁵⁷ Milik, *Enoch*, 102, 290.

⁵⁸ V. 24 poses text-critical problems. Contra K. Berger, *Jubiläen*, the text is about Eden and not about Edom. VanderKam (*The Book of Jubilees*, 2:28; cf. idem, "Enoch Traditions in Jubilees and Other Second-Century Sources," *SBLSP* 1 [1978]: 229–251, here 236) shows that the text provided by Dillmann and Charles depends upon a scribal error in writing. Therefore, it is to be translated, "Because of him the flood water did not come on any land of Eden because he was placed there as a sign and to testify against all people"

⁵⁹ That Paradise, the dwelling place of God (*Jub.* 8:19; cf. *1 En.* 25:3), is to be represented as a mountain is already suggested by Ezek 28:14 and then primarily in *1 En.* 24:3 and 25:3 (see also *1 En.* 87:3). In *Jubilees* – as the Syriac text attests – the phrase could have originally been about the "Mount of the garden of Eden" (See VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees* 2:29).

⁶⁰ Thus É. Tisserant, "Fragments syriaques du livre des Jubilés," *RB* 30 (1921): 55–86, here 74–77; A. Caquot, "Jubilés," in *La Bible. Écrits intertestamentaires*, Paris: Gallimard, 1987), 627–810, here 656; Mell, *Schöpfung*, 102, refers to the later tradition of the Syriac *Cave of Treasures*, according to which Adam and then the sons of Seth dwelled on a sacred mountain near (of course to the east) Paradise; cf. Syriac *Cave of Treasures* 5:15, 18, 27; 6:21, 32; 7:3.

dtymn’, which can denote “Mount of the South” but also “Mount Taiman.”⁶¹ However, such a unified rendering of the two passages gives rise to the suspicion of being a secondary interpretation by the translator,⁶² who would have appropriately connected the incense offering of Enoch with the Oasis of Taiman (cf. *Jub.* 6:19).⁶³

(f) A different possibility seems to be more plausible: At the end of v. 25, the best Ethiopic manuscripts read *ba-dabra qatr*. *qatr* means “noon” or “south,”⁶⁴ but could simply be based on the transcription of the Hebrew קַטְרֵת, which the Greek translator would have read as a *nomen loci* (perhaps ἐν τῷ ὄρει Κετάρρα). This would produce a plausible meaning: v. 25 could have originally been used of Enoch’s sacrifice on the “Mount of Incense.”⁶⁵ On the other hand, in v. 26, the “Mount of the East” is said to be the name of the mountain mentioned in Gen 10:30, located somewhere on the Arabian peninsula. On the basis of the correspondence of v. 25 and v. 26, the “Mount of the East” may be identical for the author of *Jubilees* to the “Mount of Incense,”⁶⁶ on which Enoch offered his sacrifice and which must be located close to Paradise according to v. 23. This mountain, on which Enoch offered an incense offering according to *Jub.* 4:25 and which the Ethiopian version calls the “Mount of noon” or “of the South” because of a translational error, is highlighted by the author as a sanctuary. Accordingly, he mentions it in 4:26 with the biblical name the “Mount of the East” (see Gen 10:30) in the series of prominent sanctuaries, in which he now moves into a position of rivalry with the already named garden of Eden, or – according to the Syrian tradition – the Mount of Paradise.

⁶¹ Tisserant, “Fragments,” 74–77; see the Syriac timeline 38:26–39:1 = *Jub.* 4:25f. in VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees*, 1:263 and 2:332 [cf. 2:28g.]; idem, *Enoch*, 186f.; as well as Wintermute, “Jubilees,” 63; A. Caquot, “Deux notes sur la géographie des Jubilés,” in *Hommages à Georges Vajda. Etudes d’histoire et de pensée juives* (ed. G. Nahon and C. Touati; Leuven: Peeters, 1980), 37–42, here 40–42.

⁶² Tisserant, “Fragments,” 76f.; cf. VanderKam, *Enoch*, 186f.

⁶³ On this point, see E. A. Knauf, *Ismael. Untersuchungen zur Geschichte Palästinas und Nordarabiens im 1. Jahrtausend v. Chr.* (ADPV; 2nd ed.; Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1989), 74–80; idem, “Tema,” *ABD* (1992), 6:346f.

⁶⁴ Thus Dillmann, “Das Buch der Jubiläen oder die kleine Genesis,” *JBW* 1 (1848): 230–256, heres 241; E. Littmann, “Das Buch der Jubiläen,” in *Die Apokryphen un Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testaments*, 2. Band: *Die Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testaments* (ed. E. Kautzsch; Tübingen: Mohr, 1900), 31–119, here 47; cf. also Caquot, “Deux notes,” 40; While *qatr* is usually translated into Greek with μεσημβρία (= noon), μεσημβρία is used in Dan 8:4, 9 for the Hebrew צָפֹן (= south); cf. VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees*, 2:29.

⁶⁵ Tisserant, “Fragments,” 77; VanderKam, *Enoch*, 187; idem, *The Book of Jubilees*, 2:29.

⁶⁶ That the Syriac version brought this into connection with the oasis of Taiman would only be plausible.

A certain inconsistency remains between the statement that Enoch was transported to Paradise (*Jub.* 4:23; cf. *1 En.* 32:2), and the fact that his incense offering, when paralleled with Adam's offering (*Jub.* 3:27), must have taken place before Paradise (as the "Holy of Holies"). However, for the author of *Jubilees*, there was possibly one and the same holy place behind the mountains mentioned in 4:25f. as the Mount "of noon" (or "the South"), the (mountain of) Paradise, and the Mount "of morning" (or "the East").⁶⁷

For the author, who brings together different traditions about the "Mount of the East" and the garden of Eden or the Mount of Paradise,⁶⁸ the four shrines mentioned in 4:26 should agree with the three he mentions in 8:19 as places within the inheritance of Shem: The garden of Eden, Sinai, and Zion. Thus, these three are the prominent sanctuaries for the *Book of Jubilees*. Mount Lubar, on which Noah made his offering according to *Jub.* 6:2ff. and 7:3ff., is not listed among these, nor are other places such as Bethel or Beersheba, in which the patriarchs erected altars and made sacrifices according to the book of Genesis or *Jub.* 13:4ff.; 16:20, 24; or 32:5–8. It is not the aim of *Jub.* 4:26 to name all conceivable places where sacrifices take place in the sense of a delimiting enumeration. Rather, it is a matter of classifying the mountain on which Enoch made his sacrifice as one of the prominent sanctuaries and highlighting his sacrifice⁶⁹ in order to equate the astronomical and calendrical revelation derived from him with the order of creation and the Sabbath established in Eden, the Torah given at Sinai, and the temple service arranged for Zion.⁷⁰

In the list of the four sanctuaries of *Jub.* 4:26, it is noticeable that the last sanctuary mentioned, Zion, is particularly emphasized by a detailed expansion. It has a specific eschatological relevance; it will be "sanctified in the new creation for the sanctification of the earth" (cf. *Jub.* 1:28f.; 50:5). The importance of Zion as a central cultic location regarding its eschatological

⁶⁷ Contra VanderKam, *Enoch*, 187, who identifies the "Mount of Incense" in v. 25 with the Mount of Paradise in v. 26 on the basis of the critical textual decisions above, which then leaves matters unclear as to why a "Mount of the East" is mentioned in v. 26.

⁶⁸ Underlying talk of the "Mount of the East" (*Gen* 10:30) are the biblical traditions and above all the traditions of Paradise that unfold in the Book of the Watchers: According to *1 En.* 18:6–8 and 24:1ff., the throne of God is evidently presented to the northwest of the earth and surrounded by the garden with the tree of life (24:3–25:7). Next to it is the tradition based on *Gen* 2:8 about the garden in the East, in which the tree of knowledge stands (*1 En.* 32). Compare this remarkable duplication of Paradise in P. Grelot, "La géographie d'Hénoch et ses sources orientales," *RB* 65 (1958): 33–69, specifically 38–47 (p. 46 has a graphical illustration of the "mythical geography" of the Book of the Watchers; cf. Milik, "Jubilees," 40).

⁶⁹ Enoch's evening incense offering corresponds to Adam's morning incense offering before the gates of Paradise (*Jub.* 3:27) and offers a prehistorical foundation of the incense to be brought in the morning and the evening (cf. *Exod* 30:7f.).

⁷⁰ Mell, *Schöpfung*, 159.

dimension, which the author develops here, comes to expression in connection with a very specific topographical presentation in the second list of the three sanctuaries of *Jub.* 8:19:

“And he [Noah] recognized that the garden of Eden was the holy of holies and the dwelling of the Lord and Mount Sinai (was) in the midst of the desert, and Mount Zion (was) in the midst of the navel of the earth. The three of these were created as holy sanctuaries, one facing the other” (trans. Wintermute, modified).

Among the explanations given here about the three prominent sanctuaries, there are two that are particularly revealing: The designation of Zion as “the navel of the earth” and the phrase “one facing the other,” which obviously expresses in abbreviated form a certain geometric arrangement of the three sanctuaries with respect to one another. According to Alexander and Caquot, it should be said that these three places lie on two lines that intersect at right angles: “They are at rightangles to each other, i.e., a median runs through the centre of Paradise and Zion, and another north-south through Zion and Sinai.”⁷¹ While the garden of Eden is traditionally thought to be in the east of the earth and Sinai – here as the “middle of the desert” – in the south, Zion is at the center of the right-angled lines: it is the “middle of the navel of the earth.” Thus, in the reception of Ezek 38:12 *טְבוּרֵי הָאָרֶץ*, Jerusalem and Zion are identified as the central point of earth, which is conceived of as a circular or oval-shaped disk.

The idea of the “navel of the earth” or the *ὄμφαλος τῆς γῆς* is attested in Hellenism, primarily the temple at Delphi,⁷² but also other Greek temples like

⁷¹ P. S. Alexander, “Notes on the ‘Imago Mundi’ of the Book of Jubilees,” *JJS* 33 (1982): 197–213, here 204; cf. the earlier work of Alexander, “The Toponymy of the Targumim” (Diss. phil. Oxford, 1974); likewise Caquot, “Deux notes,” 41 n. 16; also argued for in more recent literature by F. Schmidt, “Jewish Representations of the Inhabited Earth During the Hellenistic and Roman Periods,” in *Greece and Rome in Eretz Israel* (ed. A. Kasher et al.; Jerusalem: Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi, 1990), 119–134, here 128, and J. M. Scott, *Paul and the Nations* (WUNT 84; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1995), 21. According to Agathemerus (geogr. Inf. 1:5), Dicaearchus in his *περίοδος τῆς γῆς* presented a map with a description in which the world is no longer circular but is depicted with a semicircle in one rectangle where, for the first time, a *διάφραγμα* extends to the pillars of Heracles (the Strait of Gibraltar) up to the mountains of Taurus to the mountains of Imaos and the Mediterranean Sea in a southern and northern half, when a meridian runs at right angles through Syene and Lysimacheia (Dikaiarchos fr. 110 in F. Wehrli, *Die Schule des Aristoteles* 1 [2nd ed.; Stuttgart: Schwabe, 1967], 35; cf. Alexander, “Imago Mundi,” loc. cit.; H. Berger, *Geschichte der wissenschaftlichen Erdkunde der Griechen* [2nd ed.; Leipzig: Veit, 1902], 370–383). It is conceivable that *Jubilees* ties in with such an idea. The difference would then primarily lie in the fact that the meridian runs through Sinai and Zion and that Zion forms the point of intersection, the “navel of the world.”

⁷² Cf. Strabo, geogr. IX 3.6; Pausanias X 16.3; Plutarch, def. or. 409e. The older, mainly poetic testimonies for the Delphic Omphalos are gathered together by W. H. Roscher (*Omphalos* [ASAWH.PH 29; Leipzig: Teubner, 1913], 54ff.). On this matter, see Roscher,

Brachidai (Didyma) or Epidaurus,⁷³ as well as far beyond in the ancient Orient⁷⁴ and other cultures.⁷⁵ Even in the biblical tradition, there is at least some evidence for the idea of the center of the earth:⁷⁶ As early as the table of nations in Gen 10, the people seem to be grouped “around Israel as the center point,” “which, however, is not itself named.”⁷⁷ The position of Israel in the midst of the peoples in the “genealogical vestibule”⁷⁸ of the chronology in 1 Chr 1:1–2:2 is more clearly recognizable⁷⁹ and is made explicit in Ezek 5:5

Omphalos, 54–105, idem, *Neue Omphalosstudien* [ASAWH.PH 31; Leipzig: Teubner, 1915], 33–58, as well as H.-V. Herrmann, *Omphalos* (Münster: Aschendorff, 1959), passim. According to the recent state of research, the myth of the earth’s navel is secondary to the older sense of the Omphalos stones related to chthonic cults (Herrmann, *Omphalos*, 21f.). For the time relevant here, however, the myth of the navel is presupposed to be a Delphic claim.

⁷³ See Roscher, *Omphalos*, 36–54 (on Branchidai), 111ff. (on Epidaurus) and 105ff., 126ff. (on other Greek temples); idem, *Omphalosstudien*, 28–31 (on Branchidai) and 58–60 (on other temples).

⁷⁴ See A. J. Wensinck, *The Ideas of the Western Semites Concerning the Navel of the Earth* (KAWA ALNR 17.1; Amsterdam: J. Müller, 1916), however the sources gathered here are predominately late; A. Jeremias, *Handbuch der altorientalischen Geisteskultur* (Leipzig: Hinrichs’sche Buchhandlung, 1929), 141f. For Babylon, such an idea can be surmised on the basis of the Babylonian map of the world (see, for example, E. Unger, *Babylon, die heilige Stadt nach der Beschreibung der Babylonier* [Berlin: de Gruyter, 1931], 20–24; for more about this map, see Z. H. Horowitz, “The Babylonian Map of the World,” *Iraq* 50 [1988]: 147–163).

⁷⁵ On this, see Roscher, *Omphalos*, 20–36; idem, *Omphalosgedanke*, passim. In Rome, milestone 1 served at the forum as omphalos (see A. Jeremias, *Handbuch*, 142). In the Christian tradition, Golgotha becomes the bearer of the navel metaphors (see J. Jeremias, “Golgotha und der heilige Felsen,” *ΑΓΓΕΛΟΣ* 2 [1926]: 74–128, here 80ff.). Jerusalem is the center of the earth, e.g., in the Jewish-Christian Pseudo Clementines (*Ps.-Clem. Rec. I* 30.3 [GCS *Ps.-Clem.* 2.25.20f.]) or also in Laktanz (Inst. VII 24.6 [CSEL 19.659.9ff.]). Later, the navel mythology passes on to Rome (see W. Müller, *Die Heilige Stadt* [Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1961]), and to Mecca in the Islamic tradition (see also Roscher, *Der Omphalosgedanke bei verschiedenen Völkern, besonders den semitischen* [BSAW.PH 70.2; Leipzig: Teuber, 1918], 57ff.).

⁷⁶ See also S. Terrien, “The Omphalos Myth and Hebrew Religion,” *VT* 20 (1970): 315–337; G. R. H. Wright, “The Mythology of Pre-Israelite Shechem,” *VT* 20 (1970): 75–82; and L. I. J. Stadelmann, *The Hebrew Conception of the World. A Philological and Literary Study* (AnBib 39; Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1970). Apart from Zion, such ideas seem to have been applied to Shechem (Judg 9:37) or Gerizim according to the Samaritan tradition and to Bethel (Gen 28:19). The extent to which these ideas were connected with ideas of the cult of chthonic deities does not need to be discussed here.

⁷⁷ H. Graf Reventlow, “Völkertafel,” *BHH* 3, 2113–2115.

⁷⁸ Thus the subtitle of the work by M. Oeming, *Das wahre Israel. Die “genealogische Vorhalle” 1 Chronik 1–9* (BWANT 128; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1990).

⁷⁹ This is emphasized by M. Kartveit, *Motive und Schichten der Landtheologie in 1 Chronik 1–9* (CB.OT 28; Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1989), 116: “1 [Chr] 1 is not only a genealogy but also a *mappa mundi*, perhaps even an expression of a *imago mundi*,

and Deut 32:8. The LXX translates טְבוּרַת הָאָרֶץ in Judg 9:37 and Ezek 38:12 with the term clearly testified in the Greek world $\delta\mu\varphi\alpha\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ τῆς γῆς. According to *1 En.* 26:1, Jerusalem with Zion – and according to *1 En.* 90:26 also Gehenna – is in the middle of the earth. The passage in *Jub.* 8:19 seems to be based on this tradition, which is represented by the table of nations of Gen 10, Ezek 38:12, and *1 En.* 26:1.⁸⁰ In its own way, this passage points out the significance and sanctity, which functions as the center of the eschatological re-creation (*Jub.* 1:29; 4:26), and thereby simultaneously emphasizes the holiness of the whole land surrounding Zion.

For *Jubilees'* conception of the world, it is also of great importance that not only Zion but also the two other prominent sanctuaries according to *Jub.* 8:19, Sinai and the garden of Eden, Mount Lubar, on which Noah offered his sacrifice (cf. *Jub.* 8:21), as well as all the other sacrificial sites of the patriarchs lie in that part of the earth that has been given to Noah's son Shem and his progeny. According to *Jub.* 8:18, God would take up residence in this part of the earth (cf. *Jub.* 7:11f.). For it is in this place that the sanctuaries are concentrated. Also in this part of the world is the center point of the earth and the place of God's eschatological abode. *Jubilees* claims that Israel would take up residence around this center point as the holy people in the land that has been assigned to it.

II. The Division of the Earth and the Problem of Canaan

The statement about the location of the three sanctuaries in the region of Shem in *Jub.* 8:19 is within the framework of the most significant section for *Jubilees'* ordering of the world, which reports on the division of the earth among Noah's sons and their descendants, taking up the tradition of the table of nations from Gen 10.⁸¹ *Jub.* 8–9, however, undertakes a bold interpreta-

where Israel lies in the middle." According to Oeming, *Israel*, 90f., "The sequence of names in v. 28ff. [reflects] a semi-circular view from the point of view of Judah/Jerusalem. ...The geographical position is thus centered on Israel and thus expresses the central position of Israel in the world of peoples." Cf. M. Kartveit, *Motive*, 210: The design is based on a "model of concentric sacredness," at the center of which is Jerusalem with the temple. The next parallel – to which Oeming certainly does not refer – is the assumed pre-Essene *Temple Scroll* from Qumran (11QT^{a,b,c?}).

⁸⁰ In addition to biblical specifications, the author also takes up elements of the Enoch tradition in particular, but this happens in a clear reduction of the traditions gathered there. The remaining inconsistencies point to the diversity of the underlying traditions; cf. Grelot, "La géographie d'Hénoch," 47.

⁸¹ This formed the basis of geographic and ethnographic orientation in early Judaism and Early Christianity. On the interpretation of the table of nations in *Jubilees*, cf. VanderKam, "Putting"; J. Maier, "Zu ethnologisch-geographischen Überlieferungen über Japhetiten (Gen 10,2–4) im frühen Judentum," *Henoch* 13 (1991): 157–194, Scott, *Paul*, 15–29; concerning the reception history, see Scott, *Paul*, 29–53; idem, "The Division of

tion, in which the predominantly genealogical table of nations is now interpreted geographically.

This interpretation first sheds light on the author's geographic knowledge and ideas: Vivid details of the description (e.g., the three sea inlets mentioned in 9:11, which depict the shoreline of the Mediterranean Sea) suggest that the author may have access to some kind of map.⁸²

Of course, their shape can hardly be reliably reconstructed.⁸³ Lots of information is missing with respect to coasts, paths, and primarily distances. The text describes outlines and some scenic peculiarities of the individual areas and allows little more than a rough sketch of their placement in relationship to the intersecting axes in Zion. According to *Jub.* 8:22f., the east with the garden of Eden may have been located on the top side of the map and the South to the right. In this orientation to the east, *Jubilees* is in agreement with *1 En.* 76:2f.; there is an essential difference with respect to the Greek cartographers.⁸⁴

It is therefore hardly possible to deduce the map of *Jubilees* from the known iconic world map, as has been attempted by Hölscher and more recently by Alexander.⁸⁵ The author's imagination certainly seems to agree in some respects with the tradition of the Ionian geographers, for example in the image of the earth as a round surface surrounded by water,⁸⁶ with a central point (8:19), and divided into three zones or continents, which connects to the three sons of Noah. One can conclude from this that the author participates in a certain geographical common knowledge of his time. Nevertheless, the author was certainly not simply interested in presenting elements of the bibli-

the Earth in *Jubilees* 8:11–9:15 and Early Christian Chronography," *Studies in the Book of Jubilees* (ed. M. Albani, J. Frey, and A. Lange; TSAJ 65; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997), 297–325.

⁸² Thus Alexander, "Notes," 197; Schmidt, "Representations," 128; Scott, *Paul*, 24. It is, after all, conceivable that cartographic representations were also available in Jerusalem at the temple since the gifts from the Diaspora had to be classified in some way. Otherwise, the center of cartographic scholarship in Hellenistic times was Alexandria.

⁸³ See the attempts by Hölscher, *Drei Erdkarten. Ein Beitrag zu Erdkenntnis des hebräischen Altertums* (SHAW.PH 48; Heidelberg: Winter, 1949), 3:58; M. Testuz, *Les idées religieuses du Livre des Jubilés* (Geneve: Droz, 1960), 58; Alexander, "Notes," 213; idem, "Geography and the Bible (Early Jewish)," *ABD* 2:977–988, here 982; O. Keel, M. Küchler, and C. Uehlinger, *Orte und Landschaften der Bibel I: Geographisch-geschichtliche Landeskunde* (Zürich: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984), 403; Schmidt, "Representations," 122; VanderKam, "Putting," 64f. (with an instructive synopsis of the representations).

⁸⁴ Cf. Schmidt, "Representations," 128f.; Scott, *Paul*, 21 n. 58.

⁸⁵ Cf. Hölscher, *Erdkarten*, 57f.; Alexander, "Notes," 198f.; critically assessed by VanderKam, "Putting," 62f.

⁸⁶ Although this is not expressly stated in *Jubilees*, one can provide a conjecture on the basis of biblical tradition from passages such as Job 26:10 and Prov 8:27, which is further supported by the statement of the "navel" in 8:19.

cal table of nations within the framework of a “scientific” world map of his time.⁸⁷ His sharp anti-Hellenistic position contradicts the thesis of a simple adoption of Hellenistic geographic models.⁸⁸

If, in contrast to the “conservative” interpretations of the table of nations in Josephus (*Ant.* I 22–147)⁸⁹ or in Pseudo-Philo (*L.A.B.* 4:1–17),⁹⁰ the author has reworked the genealogical enumeration of the peoples into a detailed geographical description, then this is because such a reworking serves his historical, theological, and geographical purposes.⁹¹ Therefore, the topographic representation of *Jubilees* by no means provides only information about the extent of the author’s geographic knowledge and the origin of his traditions. Analogous to the concern that was discernible behind the chronological structure of the structuring of the jubilees, but more pointedly, this topographical account pursues the interest to justify Israel’s original and inalienable right to the land traditionally called the “land of Canaan.”

The problem is already indicated in the preceding episode by the sons of Noah (*Jub.* 7:6ff.; *Gen* 9:18ff.): Ham sees his father’s nakedness and tells his brothers about it; they in turn approach their father and cover his nakedness without looking. Already in *Gen* 9:18, 22, Ham is conspicuously referred to as the “father of Canaan,” and the curse of Noah in the subsequent episode is not against Ham but against Canaan,⁹² who is to be the slave of his “brothers”

⁸⁷ Contra Alexander, “Notes,” 199f. In his article (“Geography,” 982), Alexander distances himself from his earlier view and also offers a completely different (contra “Notes,” 213) reconstruction of the world map: “The *Jubilees mappa mundi* is more than a piece of disinterested cartography which tries to reconcile the Bible with the science of its day. Like many other maps, it is a political statement.”

⁸⁸ Schmidt, “Representations,” 132–134; cf. Scott, *Paul*, 22; Maier, “Überlieferungen,” 179.

⁸⁹ On this point, see Schmidt, “Representations,” 130f.; Scott, *Paul*, 40ff., and the detailed work of T. W. Franxman, “Genesis and the ‘Jewish Antiquities’ of Flavius Josephus” (BeO 35; Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1979), 100–116.

⁹⁰ On this, see C. Dietzfelbinger, “Pseudo-Philo, Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum” (Diss. Göttingen, 1964), 4–5, who states that the table of nations in Ps-Philo, despite the numerous names going beyond the biblical stock, is received without actual references. Cf. also H. Jacobson, *A Commentary on Pseudo-Philo’s Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum. With Latin Text and English Translation*, I–II (AGJU 31; Leiden: Brill, 1996), 331–347.

⁹¹ VanderKam, “Putting,” 66.

⁹² The epithet “the father of Canann,” which was emphasized twice (*Gen* 9:18, 22), as well as the design of vv. 25–27, might suggest that the sin of Ham, according to the sense of the narrator of *Gen* 9:18–27, may well have something to do with “Canaan” and, from Israel’s point of view, with the “typical Canaanite” (so G. von Rad, *Das erste Buch Mose. Genesis, übersetzt und erklärt* [ATD 2–4; 10th ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1972], 103), which would make the story about more than a domestic family offense concerning the exposure of the father or concerning the respectful behavior towards the father (thus Westermann, *Genesis*, 648f., 653f.). The question of how the textual inconsistencies came about (cf., for example, von Rad, *Genesis*, 102) will not be discussed here.

Shem and Japheth. Due to this textual inconsistency, the question remains in the text of Genesis as to whether the curse affects Canaan or – as it corresponds to the narrative in v. 18ff. – Ham. Genesis does not report any concrete effects of the curse. *Jub.* 7:10 clarifies this situation: The curse of Noah clearly applies to Canaan, the son of Ham, and this cursing of Canaan is of great importance for the subsequent reports.⁹³ In addition, the transformation of the blessing of Japheth in 7:12 shows that only Shem receives the blessing: “May God expand Japheth, that he live in the tents of Shem, and let Canaan be his servant” (Gen 9:27) now becomes “May the Lord expand Japheth, and may the Lord dwell in the abode of Shem, and let Canaan be their slave.”⁹⁴ *Jubilees* no longer formulates that Japheth is “to live in the tents of Shem” – this would be contrary to his concern for territorial integrity – but that God himself is to live “in the abode of Shem”: Thus the blessing of Japheth is used as the qualification of Shem’s inheritance, which is to be designated as the place of God’s dwelling.

The passage following *Jub.* 7:13ff. about the behavior of Noah’s sons corresponds to the words pronounced in Noah’s blessing and those spoken in the curse: Ham separates himself from his father; Japheth pursues his brother; and only Shem remains with his father, thus corresponding to *Jubilees*’ important ideal of family harmony. The names of the cities built by the three sons express this: While Ham’s city is called Na’eltama’uk (= נְהֵלַת מְהוּיִק “Inheritance of the Destroyed”), Shem’s city is named Sedeqetelebab (= סֵדֶקֶת לְבָב “Justice of the Heart”).⁹⁵ The direction in which the cities of the three sons were located – as seen from Mount Lubar – already anticipates the later division of the earth: Ham’s city lies in the south; Japheth’s is in the west; but Shem’s city is close to the mountain on which his father lives, and – like Paradise – is in the east.

The division in chapters 8–9 follows the episode of Noah’s sons. It is noteworthy that the division – unlike according to Genesis – takes place during Noah’s lifetime: It is done at the beginning of the 33rd jubilee by the father for his sons by means of the lot and takes place in the presence of one of the angels of presence (8:10) and thus under the quasi “supervision of a notary.” The division of the earth that is described appears as a divine providence and as an immutable territorial ordinance. Its eternal validity is emphasized several times (8:12, 21, 24, 29), the sons are obligated under oath to it, and they agree to threaten every transgressor with the curse (9:14f.). The geopolitical interest of the *Book of Jubilees* is emphatically demonstrated by this

⁹³ On this point, see VanderKam, “Putting,” 55.

⁹⁴ Here (as in Shem’s blessing in v. 11), some Ethiopian MSS formulate “his slave” (see VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees*, 2:45; idem, “Putting,” 55).

⁹⁵ The name of the city of Japheth is not so easily interpreted (cf. VanderKam, “Putting,” 56 n. 27).

repeated safeguarding of division of the land. Accordingly, the individual areas are described unequivocally, first in the form of a circumnavigation of their borders (8:12–17, 22f., 25–29) and then once again in the context of the allocation of the territories to the sons of Noah’s sons – i.e., to the individual peoples – through the enumeration of the associated landscapes (9:1–13). Obviously, the author wants to exclude every possibility of “border displacement” by means of the greatest possible clarity.

It is hardly a matter of chance that Shem’s “lot” is described first: He owns “the center of the earth” (8:12), i.e., the region around Zion (8:19). To Noah’s delight, the fate of his favorite son Shem fell on this land, which is especially beautiful, “a blessed and wide land” (8:21). It includes all the sanctuaries, the garden of Eden, Mount Sinai, Zion, and also Mount Lubar, on which Noah distributes the earth.⁹⁶ Thus, in the allotment of this area to Shem, Noah’s pronouncement of blessing in *Jub.* 8:18, wherein Shem’s place of dwelling was referred to as the dwelling place of God, is fulfilled.

Also, Ham’s territory in the south is assigned to be an eternal possession for him and his sons (8:22–25), as is Japheth’s area in the north (8:26–30). The only assessment given to these areas relates to climatic conditions: Japheth’s land is cold, whereas Ham’s is hot; Shem’s land is climatically described as the golden middle (8:30), thus proving his lot to be the best. The judgments about the climate especially demonstrate that the author depicts an ideal-typical image that does not correspond to reality at essential points, but pursues other goals. His concerns are particularly clear when he speaks in *Jub.* 9 of the assignment of countries to the individual peoples.

First, in the division of the inheritance of Shem, “all of the land of the region of Chaldaea toward the east of the Euphrates, which is near the Red Sea, and all of the waters of the desert as far as the vicinity of the tongue of the sea that faces toward Egypt, all of the land of Lebanon and Senir and Amana as far as the vicinity of Euphrates,”⁹⁷ i.e., both the land of the Chaldeans and the land that will be later called the “land of Canaan,” which was assigned to Arpachshad, i.e., to Shem’s son, from whose lineage will later come Abraham and thus Israel. This allotment ensures that the subsequent migration of Abraham from Ur into Chaldea via Haran into the land of Lebanon and the “land of Canaan” (*Jub.* 12:15; 13:1; cf. Gen 11:21; 12:4ff.) does not transgress the given territorial order, which is why, according to *Jubilees*, it is not in a foreign land but only in another part of that area which was assigned to

⁹⁶ *Jub.* 8:21: “all the mountains of Ararat.”

⁹⁷ *Jub.* 9:4 (trans. Wintermute). Senir probably designates Hermon or the Antilebanon (cf. Deut 3:9; Song 4:8; 1QGenAp XXII 11; on this, see K. Berger, *Jubiläen*, 373, 376; Wintermute, “Jubilees,” 74).

his fathers as an inheritance from the beginning⁹⁸ and which was only later named “land of Canaan” because of a violation of the actual ordinance (cf. *Jub.* 10:34).

As a part of the division of the land of Japheth, it is striking that the territories of Japheth’s son Javan (i.e., Greece) are entirely confined to “the islands,” while Asia Minor as a whole belongs to Shem’s inheritance. This inconspicuous detail shows how much the author of *Jubilees* disapproves of the spread of the Greeks and their culture to the east; conversely, it can be seen how the geopolitical and cultural options of the author – in deviation from the factual situation – affect the representation of the distribution of land.

It is hardly a coincidence that difficulties are reported with regard to the areas located in the extreme west, furthest from Eden, and regarding the peoples to which these are assigned. Madai, i.e., the Medes, receives an area in the far west of Japheth, such as western Europe along with the offshore islands.⁹⁹ But *Jub.* 10:35 reports that he did not like this land, so that he, who had married into the clan of Shem, requested land from the Shemites, and henceforth dwelled there.¹⁰⁰ This process, although it is in fact a transgression of the divine spatial order, is only marginally reported upon and not explicitly condemned. The author’s interest obviously is not concerned with the Medes or the Persians.

Quite different is the second episode mentioned, which is about Canaan, the bearer of the curse (7:1). In this episode, Canaan receives an area to the far west of Ham, directly on the dangerous Mauk sea. For this positioning, the author is able to call upon the series of the sons of Ham in Gen 10, where Canaan follows Cush (Ethiopia), Mizraim (Egypt), and Put (Libia) as the fourth (Gen 10:6–19).¹⁰¹ If this sequence is transferred to the geographical situations, Canaan must have settled approximately in modern day Morocco. Herewith, the author explicitly contradicts the geographical location of the

⁹⁸ Not only the taking of land under Joshua, but also the entrance of Abraham into the land of Canaan thus receives the character of a (re)appropriation of what was assigned to Israel from the beginning. “The stage is set for presenting the history of the patriarchal acquisition of the Land as a restoration story” (B. Halpern-Amaru, *Rewriting the Bible. Land and Covenant in Postbiblical Jewish Literature* [Valley Forge: Trinity Press International, 1994], 30).

⁹⁹ Hölscher, *Erdkarten*, 72; K. Berger, *Jubiläen*, 385.

¹⁰⁰ The purpose of this note is to explain how the Medes came to the land of Shem. Cf. VanderKam, “Putting,” 62; Hölscher, *Erdkarten*, 72: “The *Book of Jubilees*’ presentation of the migration of the Medes from western Europe to Media reflects the memory of the migration of the Medes to Asia.”

¹⁰¹ Maier (“Überlieferungen,” 1, 84) claims that the Phoenician colonization in western North Africa is the real reason for this classification, and Hölscher (*Erdkarten*, 42, 53) suspected that this is already presupposed in Gen 10.

Canaanite clans in the land of Canaan in Gen 10:19. In any case, the designation of this land (as “the land of Canaan”) in his opinion does not correspond to the spatial order mandated by God. *Jub.* 10:27ff. explains why this is the case: Canaan does not at all enjoy seeing the inheritance given to him by his father, but remains right in the beautiful area between Lebanon and the brook of Egypt, ignoring the warning of his father and the curse that he was threatened with, and instead settles there in the land of Shem. It is for this reason, as *Jub.* 10:34 explains, that this land where Canaan and his sons dwell “to this day” is actually called the “land of Canaan.”

Here, the geopolitical interest of the author comes to its clearest expression. The land of Canaan is not named as such because it belongs or was given to Canaan, but because Canaan has appropriated it as a usurper, in disobedience to the eternal order. He is therefore subject to the curse of the sons of Noah, and extermination is decreed upon him (10:31). Until then, Canaan, as a cursed individual, can perform at most the service of a slave for Shem, the bearer of the blessing. In truth, however, Canaan and his sons have no business in this land. They belong, as the author wishes to explain, at the greatest possible distance from Eden, on the edge of the abyss.

With its interpretation of the biblical table of nations, *Jubilees* is “the most impressive Jewish testimony of geographic knowledge in antiquity,”¹⁰² documenting a geographically-ethnographic tradition cultivated in the – Levitical or perhaps even priestly¹⁰³ – circles behind *Jubilees*, which participated in a geographic general knowledge of its time,¹⁰⁴ but at the same time was shaped by the biblical prescription of the table of nations and the cultic image of the sanctity of Zion and its surrounding land.¹⁰⁵ This interest explains not only the central position of Zion as the site of the eschatological sanctuary, but also the emphasis on its particular holiness (*Jub.* 1:28; 4:26) and the purity of the land brought about in the “New Creation” from Zion (*Jub.* 4:26; 50:5), as well as the allocation of the best part of the earth. In contrast to other inter-

¹⁰² Maier, “Überlieferungen,” 179.

¹⁰³ On this point, see VanderKam, “Origins,” 19; K. Berger, *Jubiläen*, 298f.; Wintermute, “Jubilees,” 45. Contra now the work of F. Schubert, “Tradition und Erneuerung. Studien zum Jubiläenbuch und seinem Trägerkreis” (Diss. Leipzig, 1995), passim, who sees that there is a primarily Levitical – not in the narrower sense of priestly – tradent group behind the *Book of Jubilees*. For further discussion, see also Endres, *Biblical Interpretation*, 238ff., whose cautious conclusion is that “It would be rash to identify a Levitical tendency or even an ideology with a Levitical alternative or party. Jubilees may represent a reforming group or movement which views itself as part of the Jerusalem priesthood rather than an Opposition party” (244).

¹⁰⁴ Maier, “Überlieferungen,” 161, points to the need for geographic orientation for trade and military. Furthermore, it is of importance for the Jerusalem temple and its relations with Jewish Diaspora.

¹⁰⁵ Cf. Maier, “Überlieferungen,” 162, “The geography of the land or the borders of the holy regions was an important part of the priestly-cultic wisdom tradition.”

pretations of the biblical table of nations, such as those in Josephus or in Pseudo-Philo's *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*, *Jubilees*' presentation expresses an extraordinarily strong geopolitical interest. The allotment of the territories is presented as a pre-ordained and eternally valid order in which Shem – and in his lineage, Israel – is given the best and holiest area around the navel of the earth, and with equal decisiveness any claim of Canaan to the territories in Shem's inheritance are denied and ruin is announced for the usurper (*Jub.* 10:32; cf. 9:14f.).¹⁰⁶

Jubilees emphatically represents the idea of the immutability of the once drawn borders and the territorial integrity of the individual inheritances, and does so from an exclusively Israelite perspective. The basic concern of the regulatory structures given here is the legitimacy of Israel's ownership of the land, the defense against any blurring of the borders, and the denial of all claims of strangers – e.g., the “Canaanite” – to the land around Zion.

C. The Worldview in the *Book of Jubilees* and the Function of Chronology and Topography

The spatial order in the interpretation of the table of nations shows – just as is recognizable in the calendar and world chronology – a picture of the whole world that was previously and irreversibly ordered by God. Any change to the order laid down here, any deviation in calendrical terms, and any dislocation of territorial boundaries is an indication of a culpable corruption of the divine decree which leads to the curse or to eschatological ruin for its perpetrators (*Jub.* 10:32; cf. 23:22ff., 30, etc). In this way, the author raises a harsh opposition to the conditions of his own time, wherein, in his opinion, this order, primarily with regard to cult and calendar, is corrupt and the temple service is contaminated (cf. especially *Jub.* 23:21), so that the purity of people and land can be addressed only as a distant hope (*Jub.* 50:5).

The background of these statements, according to a broad research consensus, are most probably the consequences of Hellenistic reform in Jerusalem under the leadership of the high priests Jason (175–172 BCE) and Menelaos (172–162 BCE),¹⁰⁷ through which Israel's religious identity was challenged

¹⁰⁶ Cf. *Jub.* 9:14f.; 10:32.

¹⁰⁷ Concerning the dating, see J. C. VanderKam, *Textual and Historical Studies in the Book of Jubilees* (HSM 14; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1977), 207ff. (there, he also provides references to other dating suggestions); idem, “Origins,” 19 (with the justification of a date of writing between 160 and 150 BCE); K. Berger, *Jubiläen*, 299f.; “Jubilees,” 43f.; E. Schwarz, *Identität durch Abgrenzung. Abgrenzungsprozesse in Israel im 2. vorchristlichen Jahrhundert und ihre traditionsgeschichtlichen Voraussetzungen. Zugleich ein Beitrag zur Erforschung des Jubiläenbuchs* (EHS.T 162; Frankfurt, Bern 1982), 119ff. On the events surrounding the Hellenistic reform, see 1 Macc 1:10ff. and 2 Macc 4; on the whole, see M.

in an unprecedented manner.¹⁰⁸ The fact that *Jubilees* reacts to the Hellenistic crisis is particularly evident in the ban on nudity *Jub.* 3:31 (cf. 7:20), which was probably due to the establishment of a gymnasium in Jerusalem in 175 BCE,¹⁰⁹ in the command to circumcise as an eternal ordinance (*Jub.* 15:29ff.),¹¹⁰ as well as in the polemical rejection of the 354-day calendar (*Jub.* 6:36), which is most closely related to the background of the calendric reforms mentioned in Dan 7:25 and primarily 2 Macc 6:7 and 1 Macc 1:59, to which the installation of the syncretistic cult on Zion is linked to the introduction of the Seleucid cultic calendar in 167 BCE.¹¹¹

Compared to the advocates for assimilation in his own people,¹¹² the author takes the clearest position: Israel should not follow the error of the Gentiles in calendrical and other questions of the halakah (*Jub.* 6:35), but should live according to its election out of all peoples, which is grounded in the story of creation (*Jub.* 2:19; 22:16ff.).¹¹³ Besides the rigidly interpreted Sabbath commandment (*Jub.* 50:12f.), the author emphasizes the prohibition against mixed marriages (*Jub.* 22:20),¹¹⁴ which he views as a particular danger to Israel's identity. The presentation of the law as an eternal order based on the

Hengel, *Judentum und Hellenismus. Studien zu ihrer Begegnung unter besonderer Berücksichtigung Palästinas bis zur Mitte des 2. Jh.s v. Chr.* (WUNT 10; 3rd ed.; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1988), 486ff.

¹⁰⁸ It was particularly serious that Israel's crisis was not primarily triggered by external compulsion, such as the establishment of the Akra in Jerusalem and of a pagan military colony there, by the prohibition of Jewish worship, including circumcision and possession of Torah scrolls (cf. 1 Macc 1:41ff.), or by the establishment of a syncretistic cult in the Jerusalem sanctuary, but that the driving forces of apostasy had instead come from Israel itself, not least from its priestly aristocracy.

¹⁰⁹ Cf. 1 Macc 1:14f.; 2 Macc 4:9–14; Josephus *Ant.* XII 251; on this, see Hengel, *Judentum und Hellenismus*, 130ff.

¹¹⁰ Cf. also the note about the failure to circumcise and the threat of punishment that follows. Here, there is a reference to the prohibition of circumcision under Antiochus IV (cf. 1 Macc 1:48) or to failure to circumcise by Jews who were willing to assimilate (or even mention of epispasm in 1 Macc 1:15). On this matter, see Hengel, *Judentum und Hellenismus*, 137, 527f.

¹¹¹ See particularly J. C. VanderKam, "2 Macc 6:7a and Calendrical Change in Jerusalem," *JSJ* 12 (1981): 52–74; idem, "Origin," 410f.

¹¹² Cf. Endres, *Biblical Interpretation*, 236–238: "Jubilees articulated a program for the restorative reformers struggling against adaptation and assimilation," 238.

¹¹³ On this point, cf. the work of Schwarz, *Identität*, and also C. Werman, "The Attitude Towards Gentiles in the Book of Jubilees and Qumran Literature Compared with Early Tannaic halakha and Contemporary Pseudepigrapha" (Diss. Jerusalem, 1995).

¹¹⁴ Cf. further *Jub.* 20:4; 25:1ff.; 30:7, 11, 13ff.; cf. Endres, *Biblical Interpretation*, 133ff. In his interpretation of *Jub.* 22:16, Schwarz emphasizes, in addition to the commandment against mixed marriages, the prohibition of contractual agreements with Gentiles. *Jubilees*, therefore, represents the precise counter position to the position of the those who assimilate as reported by 1 Macc 1:11.

heavenly tablets and the *exempla* of the patriarchs and their Torah observance (even before the time of Moses) will help to assure Israel of its identity as the people chosen for holiness, to protect it from adaptation to Hellenistic pagan practices, and to call as many Israelites as possible back to the eternally valid and inviolable order. With such a conversion to the law, which the author already perceives in the circles to which he himself belongs, the author combines the hope of a gradual improvement of the conditions with the transition over many generations to the state of eschatological salvation (*Jub.* 23:26).

The chronological and topographical data of *Jubilees* also fulfill specific functions within this framework that correspond to the overall aims of the book:

The chronology of the world, with the date of Israel's conquest at the conclusion of the "jubilee of jubilees," as well as the geographical interpretation of the biblical table of nations, seeks to assure Israel of its claim to the land of Canaan and sharply defend against all possible claims of other peoples within this area. This situation – expressed by means of chronological design – corresponds to the spatial division of the earth among Noah's sons, which shows with the same degree of unambiguity that Canaan is not the rightful owner of the land named after him, but rather he has appropriated it unlawfully. In the interest of establishing Israel's ownership of the land, *Jubilees'* ordering of time coincides entirely with the ordering of space within *Jub.* 8–9. Moreover, since, according to *Jubilees'* claim, the entire content of Moses' transmitted revelation, the reported course of history, as well as the "division of the years" in their "numbers and jubilees" (*Jub.* 1:29) is but an excerpt from the heavenly tablets on which law and history are listed in advance, then Israel's right to its inheritance is grounded in the pre-ordained divine order and is therefore legitimized in an unsurpassable way.

At the same time, *Jubilees'* chronology of the world serves to justify the universal validity of the sabbatical structure of history prescribed in creation, and thus to motivate the rigid Sabbath observance demanded by *Jubilees*, to which Israel, unlike all other peoples, is called. The fact that Israel fulfills its vocation in the celebration of the Sabbath and the feasts in synchrony with God himself and the upper classes of the angels is the goal of the calendrical instructions which are especially emphasized within *Jubilees*. *With its focus on the cultic order, the chronological dates of Jubilees correspond to the concerns of the topography presented here and to its orientation on the aspect of the holiness and purity of the land.* Thus, according to the author, all the sanctuaries of the earth are located within Shem's inheritance and the eschatological sanctuary on Zion is located at the navel of the earth, with the land of the holy people, which should be sanctified and pure, being situated around this center.

Therefore, the topographical and chronological data of *Jubilees* fit together in their orientation on the motifs of the land and of holiness. Against the

backdrop of the crisis brought on by Hellenization – also and especially in the priestly circles of Jerusalem – the author draws a picture of the world in which Israel’s vocation to purity and its identity in its commitment to God and his commandments and in isolation from the nations is inalterably predetermined. The chronology and topography of the book reinforce the paraenetic elements of *Jubilees*: They help strengthen the Israelite readers of the book in their identity as members of a people who are called to be sacred and holy; help confirm their right to the sacred inheritance of the “land of Canaan”; and help motivate them to consistently isolate themselves from everything that might endanger their identity. The temporal and spatial representational elements are functional components of this impressive design of collective identity.

14. Temple and Rival Temple – The Cases of Elephantine, Mt. Gerizim, and Leontopolis¹

According to the Deuteronomic law, the cultic veneration of JHWH, the God of Israel should be confined to the one place which he had chosen: the Temple of Jerusalem.² There should be no slaughtered sacrifices elsewhere, neither at any other place in Israel, for instance on the old high places, nor outside of Israel, in an environment which was always suspect of impurity.³

During the Second Temple period, however, there were at least three other sanctuaries, which must be regarded in some respect as “Israelite” or “Jewish.” One of them was located in Israel and the two others in Egypt. Each of them existed for a century or more concurrent with the Jerusalem Temple and in a certain state of rivalry with it:

- The colony of Judaeans or Israelite mercenaries at Elephantine (Aram.: *yēb*, Eg.: *’ibw*, *’bw*) near Aswan in Upper Egypt had a temple dedicated to the God Yāhō which existed certainly during the 5th century BCE.
- The Samaritan temple on Mt. Gerizim is said to have existed for about two centuries until it was destroyed by John Hyrcanus in 128 BCE, and its Israelite or even Jewish character cannot be denied, as it basically drew on Israelite traditions.
- Beyond dispute is the Jewish character of the temple at Leontopolis in Lower Egypt which was built in the 2nd century BCE by a member of the Zadokite High Priestly family and existed until its closure by the Romans in 73 CE.

There are, of course, notable differences between the three sanctuaries. They are situated in different centuries and located in different areas. Nevertheless, these three rival temples in the Second Temple period allow a comparison⁴ and invite a study of the phenomenon of temple rivalry in Ancient Judaism.

¹ This paper was written for a conference held in Greifswald in 1998, and the resulting article was, then, dedicated to Heinz-Wolfgang Kuhn, whom I succeeded on the chair for New Testament with the focus on Ancient Judaism at the University of Munich in 1999. I am still grateful to the late Hanan Eshel (Jerusalem) and also to Siegfried Mittmann (Tübingen) for some valuable suggestions, and to Helen Hofmann M. Div. for correcting the language of the article.

² Deut 12:13f.; cf. 6:4.

³ Cf., e.g., Hos 9:3ff.; Amos 7:17; Jer 16:13; Ezek 4:13 etc.

⁴ To my knowledge, a systematic comparison between the three cases has not been made up to the present. Cf., however, the short note by F. Staehelin, “Elephantine und

Moreover, within the range of subjects related to the theme “*Community without Temple*” we have to ask how some more or less Jewish communities could build and maintain their own sanctuary apart from Jerusalem, whereas others did not. The contrast is obvious: The Judaeans captives in Babylon did not build a sanctuary there, but the mercenaries in Upper Egypt did.⁵ The Essenes did not start a sacrificial cult in the desert while the Zadokite Onias IV and some priests went to Egypt and built a temple there.

In discussing the three cases of temple rivalry, we should try to answer at least some of the following questions: Which circumstances and what sort of motives led to the foundation of the rival temple? Are there decisive religious differences, or are there primarily political interests favoring cultic separation? What can we say about the role the temple played in the identity of the respective community? Did the worshippers regard themselves and their sanctuary as opposed to Jerusalem or even as schismatic? And what do we know about the attitude of the leading circles in Jerusalem towards the rival temple? Asking these questions, we may see the similarities and the differences between the three cases of temple rivalry. Such an investigation may also shed light on the growing centrality and uniqueness of Jerusalem and its Temple within the formation of Ancient Judaism.

Due to limitations of space, we cannot discuss the numerous other sites which may have had some cultic activity during the Second Temple period.⁶ But the omission seems to be justifiable, because for the majority of these places either the enduring cultic activity in Second Temple times is question-

Leontopolis,” *ZAW* 28 (1908): 180–2; and, more recently, the important article by M. Delcor, “Sanctuaires Juifs,” *DBSup* 11:1286–1329. See also the brief remarks in B. Porten, *Archives from Elephantine: The Life of an Ancient Jewish Military Colony* (Berkeley/Los Angeles: University of California, 1968), 116–8; F. Schmidt, *La pensée du Temple: De Jérusalem à Qoumrân: identité et lien social dans le judaïsme ancien* (Paris: Seuil, 1994), 112–6, and E. F. Campbell, “Jewish Shrines of the Hellenistic and Persian Periods,” *Symposia Celebrating the Seventy-Fifth Anniversary of the Founding of the American Schools of Oriental Research (1900–1975)* (ed. F. M. Cross; Zion Research Foundation Occasional Publications, 2 vols.; Cambridge, Mass.: American Schools of Oriental Research, 1979), 159–68.

⁵ Cf. on this issue L. Bronner, “Sacrificial Cult Among the Exiles in Egypt but not Babylon – Why?” *Dor le Dor* 9 (1980): 61–71 and, briefly, R. Albertz, *Religionsgeschichte Israels in alttestamentlicher Zeit* (2 vols.; GAT 8/1–2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1992), 2:379–82. For Babylon, cf. E. J. Bickerman, “The Babylonian Captivity,” in *The Cambridge History of Judaism* (ed. W. D. Davies and L. Finkelstein; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984), 1:342–58; for Egypt cf. B. Porten, “The Jews in Egypt” in *The Cambridge History of Judaism* (ed. W. D. Davies and L. Finkelstein; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984), 1:372–400. Some exegetes, however, suggest on the basis of Zech 5:5ff. that a sanctuary was built by the Babylonian captives as well, thus, e.g., M. Smith, *Palestine Parties and Politics that Shaped the Old Testament* (New York and London: Columbia University Press, 1971), 90f. and 240 n. 52. But the argument is not convincing.

able or the Israelite or Jewish character of the sanctuary is dubious. So, I will concentrate on the three sites mentioned and add only a short comment on a fourth example, the *Qasr el-'Abd* at *'Araq el-Emir* in Transjordan, which provides a contemporary parallel to the Oniad sanctuary at Leontopolis. For the three main examples, I will briefly give the main historical data and then discuss the aforementioned questions.

A. The Jewish Temple at Elephantine in Upper Egypt

I. The Colony at Elephantine

Elephantine is the Greek name of an island in the Nile, opposite Aswan, in Upper Egypt.⁷ It has yielded treasures of papyri mostly in Hieratic, Demotic, Aramaic, and Greek.⁸ The numerous Aramaic papyri which were acquired or found since the beginning of the 19th century⁹ bear witness to the life of an ancient Jewish military colony. Next to Elephantine, at ancient Syene (= Aswan), there was another colony of Aramaean mercenaries in close connection with the Jewish community.¹⁰ Most important for our investigation are

⁶ See, e.g. Smith, *Palestine Parties and Politics*, 90–3; M. Stone, *Scriptures, Sects and Visions: A Profile of Judaism from Ezra to the Jewish Revolts* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980), 77–81; Campbell, “Jewish Shrines of the Hellenistic and Persian Periods” and J. Schwartz, “Jubilees, Bethel and the Temple of Jacob,” *HUCA* 56 (1985): 63–85, here 79f.

⁷ On the site, its history, and the excavations see, generally, L. Habachi “Elephantine,” *Lexikon der Ägyptologie* 1:1217–25; L. Hennequin, “Eléphantine,” *DBSup* 2:962–1032; and Porten, *Archives from Elephantine*.

⁸ A few other documents from Elephantine are in Coptic, Arabic, and Latin (cf. Porten, ed., *The Elephantine Papyri in English: Three Millennia of Cross-Cultural Continuity and Change* [DMOA 22; Leiden, New York, and Köln: E. J. Brill, 1996], 569–609).

⁹ On the history of discoveries and acquisitions, see Porten, “Elephantine Papyri,” *ABD* 2:445–55, here 245–47. Cf. the major editions of the Aramaic papyri by A. Cowley, *Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century BC* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1923); E. G. H. Kraeling, *The Brooklyn Museum Aramaic Papyri* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1953); and recently the comprehensive collection by B. Porten and A. Yardeni, *Textbook of Aramaic Documents from Ancient Egypt: Newly Copied, Edited and Translated into Hebrew and English* (3 vols.; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1986–93) (= *TAD*) and the translation edition by Porten, *The Elephantine Papyri in English*, 74–276. Cf. further the important commentary by P. Grelot, *Documents araméens d'Égypte: Introduction, traduction, présentation* (LAPO 5; Paris: Cerf, 1972); and Porten, *Archives from Elephantine*. The documents are quoted according to the edition by Porten and Yardeni (*TAD* A–C = vols. 1–3). Notably, there are also numerous Aramaic ostraca from Elephantine; see the list in Silverman. The Elephantine inscriptions on potsherd, stone, and wood will be collected in the forthcoming vol. 4 of Porten and Yardeni, *TAD*.

¹⁰ On the relations between the two colonies, see Porten, *Archives from Elephantine*, 8–27. It is disputed, however, whether the two groups can be distinguished clearly; cf. K. van der Toorn, “Anat-Yahu, some Other Deities, and the Jews of Elephantine,” *Numen* 39

the letters from the archive of a communal leader and perhaps chief priest Jedaniah b. Gemariah, the so-called Jedaniah archive,¹¹ that attest to the existence of a temple of Yāhō within the colony.

It is a matter of dispute as to when Israelites or Judaeans first came to Upper Egypt, and by whom the military colony was installed.¹² The documentary evidence covers the whole 5th century BCE: The oldest papyrus attesting to the Jewish colony is dated from the 27th year of Darius I (= 495 BCE).¹³ The last one records the end of the Persian rule over Egypt and the seizure of the throne by Nephertites I, the founder of the 29th dynasty in 399 BCE.¹⁴ One of the documents claims that the Jewish sanctuary at Elephantine was even built before the Persian conquest of Egypt by Cambyses in 525 BCE.¹⁵ The biblical sources record that at the end of the Judaeans monarchy, especially after the murder of Gedaliah, considerable groups of Judaeans fled to Egypt (2 Kgs 25:25f.; Jer 41:17f.; 42; 43:7; 44:1). Among the places where they settled, Jer 44:1 mentions a place called Patros which might denote Upper Egypt.¹⁶ In later times, the *Epistle of (Ps.-)Aristeas* claims that the Jews had already served as auxiliary troops under the Egyptian king Psammetich against the Ethiopians (*Ep. Arist.* 13). Unfortunately, it is not specified whether Psammetich I (664–610 BCE) or Psammetich II (595–589 BCE) is meant, because both made war against the king of the Ethiopians. The warfare of Psammetich II is also attested by Herodotus (*Hist.* 2.161). Since the area of Elephantine and Syene with the first Nile cataract was strategically

(1992): 80–101, here 96; on the other hand, see H.-J. Stoebe, “Überlegungen zum Synkretismus der jüdischen Tempelgemeinde in Elephantine,” in *Beiträge zur Kulturgeschichte Vorderasiens: Festschrift für Michael Boehmer* (ed. U. Finkbeiner, R. Dittmann, and H. Hauptmann; Mainz: Philipp von Zabern, 1995), 621.

¹¹ TAD A 4.1–10; cf. Porten, *The Elephantine Papyri in English*, 125–51.

¹² Cf. the overview in Porten, *Archives from Elephantine*, 3ff.; J. M. Modrzejewski, *Les Juifs d’Égypte: De Ramsès II à Hadrien* (Paris: Editions Errance, 1991), 21ff., and H. Donner, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel und seiner Nachbarn in Grunzügen* (2 vols.; GAT 4/1–2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986), 2:382. See also E. C. B. MacLaurin, “The Date of the Foundation of the Jewish Colony at Elephantine,” *JNES* 27 (1968): 89–96. There is also evidence for other Jewish groups in Upper Egypt; cf. W. Kornfeld, “Unbekanntes Diasporajudentum in Oberägypten im 5./4. Jh. v. Chr.,” *Kairos* 18 (1976): 55–9.

¹³ TAD B 5.1. = Cowley, *Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century*, Nr. 1; cf. Grelot, *Documents*, 76–8.

¹⁴ TAD A 3.9 = Kraeling, *The Brooklyn Museum Aramaic Papyri*, Nr. 13; cf. Grelot, *Documents*, 420–3.

¹⁵ TAD A 4.7 line 14f. *recto* paralleled by TAD A 4.8 line 12f. *recto*. On this letter which is preserved in a first and a second draft, see the discussion below.

¹⁶ Cf. Donner, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel und seiner Nachbarn in Grunzügen*, 2:382. Patros is also mentioned in Isa 11:11, but this text belongs to a later stratum in Isaiah, so it cannot serve as an attestation to a Jewish colony in Upper Egypt in the 8th century BCE (contrary to Porten, *Archives from Elephantine*, 8; cf. H. Wilderberger, *Jesaja: Kapitel 1–12* [BKAT 10/1; 2nd; ed.; Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1980], 1:469).

important for the Saitic rulers of the 26th dynasty, it is quite plausible that the colonies of foreign mercenaries originated from that time. So, we can assume the presence of Jewish and other auxiliary troops at Elephantine or Syene in the first half of the 6th century BCE.¹⁷ But the precise date of its foundation and of the erection of the temple of Yāhō – probably before 525 BCE – cannot be ascertained.

II. The “Syncretism” of the Elephantine Jews

Even more puzzling is the issue of the religious attitudes of the Jewish mercenaries and chiefly the kind and degree of their syncretism.¹⁸ The documents show that the Jews of Elephantine – or at least some of them – seem to have known other deities besides Yāhō, mainly a goddess called ‘Anāt-Yāhō or even ‘Anāt-Bêt’ēl, obviously a female counterpart (πάρεδρος) to Yāhō or Bêt’ēl, and a male god named ‘Ašim-Bêt’ēl. Judicial oaths were taken using the names of deities such as *Herem-Bêt’ēl* and ‘Anāt-Yāhō,¹⁹ and some letters seem to invoke other deities as well.²⁰ Admittedly, from the contracts and greeting formulae as such we cannot be sure “that the Jewish correspondents actually acknowledged or worshipped deities other than YHW.”²¹ Even more puzzling is another document, a collection list²² enumerating the “names of the Jewish garrison who gave silver to YHW the God, each [o]ne [2 shekels of] silver” (line 1). At the end of the list (lines 126–8), the collections are summed up: from the total of 318 shekels, there are 126 for Yāhō, 70 for ‘Ašim-Bêt’ēl, and 120 for ‘Anāt-Bêt’ēl. This strange division is not explained adequately by the suggestion that all the people contributing to deities other than Yāhō must have been non-Jews.²³ In fact, the deities mentioned besides Yāhō are probably of Aramaean origin,²⁴ but can we infer that they were only

¹⁷ Cf. Donner, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel und seiner Nachbarn in Grundzügen*, 2:382f. An origin as early as in the 7th century is less plausible, but cf. Porten, “The Jews of Egypt,” 378f. who suggests an emigration of Judaeans already under Psammetich I during the reign of the Judaeen king Manasse.

¹⁸ Cf. A. Vincent, *La religion des Judéo-Araméens d’Éléphantine* (Paris: Ganthner, 1937); B. Porten, “The Religion of the Jews of Elephantine in Light of the Hermopolis Papyri,” *JNES* 28 (1969): 116–21; Stoebe, “Überlegungen zum Sykretismus der jüdischen Tempelgemeinde in Elephantine”; and van der Toorn, “Anat-Yahu.”

¹⁹ Thus, e.g., *TAD B 7.3* = Cowley, *Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century*, Nr. 44; cf. the restoration in Porten, *Archives from Elephantine*, 317–8, and the discussion *op. cit.*, 154–6.

²⁰ Cf. Porten, *Archives from Elephantine*, 151–60.

²¹ Thus, Porten, *Archives from Elephantine*, 160.

²² *TAD C 3.5* (= Cowley, *Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century*, Nr. 22); cf. the restoration in Porten, *Archives from Elephantine*, 319–27.

²³ Cf. Porten, *Archives from Elephantine*, 163 n. 41, who seems to be inclined to purify the religion of the Elephantine Jews to a greater extent than the sources allow.

²⁴ On this, cf. recently van der Toorn, “Anat-Yahu,” 85ff.

invoked by Aramaeans, not by Jews, or that they were mentioned by Jews only in negotiations with non-Jews? This might be a too “orthodox” interpretation of the Elephantine Jews.

Another explanation might be preferred. In an investigation of the theophorous names from Elephantine, Silverman concludes: “The four divine beings compounded with *šm*, *h̄rm*, *’nt*, and *byt’l* are respectively *’šmbyt’l*, ‘sacrifice of God,’ *h̄rmbyt’l*, ‘sacredness of God,’ and *’ntbyt’l* and *’ntyhw*, ‘song of God.’ They are conceived as servants of the Jewish God Yhw and may receive worship legitimately as his subordinates.” If this is true, the “divine” figures could have been conceived as hypostatic substitutes of the one God, even if their theophorous elements recall the proper names of beings attested elsewhere as distinct deities such as *byt’l*.²⁵ Drawing on a similar explanation,²⁶ Stoebe also states that the religion of the Elephantine Jews should not be classified as a true syncretism. Indeed, there is no clear attestation of syncretistic elements in the temple worship of the Elephantine Jews.²⁷

But even if these considerations are right, and the so-called syncretism of the Elephantine Jews is in fact a very moderate one,²⁸ it is obvious that neither their religious terms nor their sacrificial cult could actually fit the prescriptions of the Deuteronomic law. Most probably, they did not yet know Deuteronomy. As far as we can know, their library did not contain any of the biblical or proto-biblical texts. The only literary texts found at Elephantine have been the Aramaic *Words of Aḥiqar*²⁹ and a copy of the *Bisitun Inscription* recording the victory of the Persian king Darius I.³⁰

²⁵ M. H. Silverman, *Religious Values in the Jewish Proper Names at Elephantine* (AOAT 217; Kevelaer: Butzon & Bercker, and Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1985), 230.

²⁶ H. Gese, “Die Religionen Altsyriens,” in *Die Religionen Altsyriens, Altarabiens und der Mandäer* (ed. H. Gese, M. Höfner, and K. Rudolph; RM 10/2; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1970), 3–232, here 190, explains the name *Ešmun* from *šēm* as a hypostasis denoting the presence of the deity during the cultic worship. According to Stoebe, “Überlegungen zum Synkretismus der jüdischen Tempelgemeinde in Elephantine,” 624, this is also valid for the component *’šm* in the name *’Ašim Bet’el*.

²⁷ Stoebe, “Überlegungen zum Synkretismus der jüdischen Tempelgemeinde in Elephantine,” 626.

²⁸ Porten, *Archives from Elephantine*, 173–9; idem, “The Jews in Egypt,” 385; this verdict is accepted by Albertz, *Religionsgeschichte Israels in alttestamentlicher Zeit*, 2:381 n. 26.

²⁹ TAD C 1.1.

³⁰ TAD C 2.1; cf. J. C. Greenfield and B. Porten, *The Bisitun Inscription of Darius the Great: Aramaic Version* (Corpus Inscriptionum Iranicarum I/5; London: School of Oriental and African Studies, 1982).

On the other hand, we must suppose that the Jewish mercenaries of Elephantine understood themselves to be true worshippers of *Yāhō*³¹ who is also called “Lord of Hosts” and “God of Heaven.”³² A large number of them had Yahwistic theophorous names.³³ They knew of the Sabbath,³⁴ practiced the Passover³⁵ and perhaps other cultic festivals as well. In their temple, they offered meal, incense and burnt offerings to *Yāhō*,³⁶ and they were proud of the fact that the Persian conqueror Cambyses had overthrown the temples of the Egyptians but not done any damage to the sanctuary of the Jewish colonists.³⁷

III. The Destruction of the Sanctuary and the Struggle for its Reconstruction

The most important documents referring to the Jewish temple of Elephantine are only from the late 5th century. They reflect the situation in 410 BCE when the temple had been destroyed by the Persian general in Elephantine-Syene, Vidranga, on request of Egyptian Khnum priests.³⁸ The Jewish community tells the story of its destruction in a letter dated from 408 BCE. From this letter which is preserved in two versions – a first and a second draft³⁹ – some details of the history of the sanctuary and some aspects of the relations be-

³¹ Many names contain the element YH or YHW; cf. Porten, *Archives from Elephantine*, 133ff.; Silverman, *Religious Values in the Jewish Proper Names at Elephantine*, *passim*.

³² Cf. Porten, *Archives from Elephantine*, 105ff. The term “God of Heaven” or “Lord of Heaven” is also attested in other Jewish documents addressed to Persian authorities, it appears in the Bible as well (Ezra 5:11f.; 6:9f.; 7:2, 21, 23), and may correspond to the Persian notion of the great God of Heavens, Ahura Mazda (cf. Delcor, “Sanctuaires Juifs,” 1293).

³³ Cf. Porten, *Archives from Elephantine*, 133ff., and the comprehensive investigation by Silverman (*Religious Values in the Jewish Proper Names at Elephantine*).

³⁴ The Sabbath is mentioned on four private ostraca and rather rarely in personal names such as Shabbatay (cf. Porten, *Archives from Elephantine*, 126–8; Delcor, “Sanctuaires juifs,” 1296). Of course, “it is hard to deduce ... the degree of observance prevalent among the Elephantine Jews” (Porten, *Archives from Elephantine*, 127), especially if they were in military service.

³⁵ Cf. the so-called Paschal Papyrus, *TAD A 4.1* (= Cowley, *Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century BC*, Nr. 21); cf. Grelot, *Documents*, 378–86; idem, “Sur le ‘papyrus pascal,’” Delcor, “Sanctuaires juifs,” 1296f.

³⁶ *TAD A 4.8* line 24f. *recto*.

³⁷ *TAD A 4.8* line 13 *recto*. This remark shows that they were at least well aware of the religious distinction between themselves and the Egyptians.

³⁸ Porten suggests that the Khnum priests disapproved of the Jewish “habit of offering up lambs in their Temple, whether as a paschal sacrifice or otherwise” (*Archives from Elephantine*, 286).

³⁹ *TAD A 4.7* and *4.8*. (= Cowley, *Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century BC*, Nr. 30 and 31); cf. Grelot, *Documents*, 406–15; Porten, *The Elephantine Papyri in English*, 139ff.

tween the Elephantine Jews and the authorities in Jerusalem and Samaria can be reconstructed.

The document is a request for a letter of recommendation, written by “Jedaniah and his colleagues the priests who are in Elephantine” in the name of the whole community and addressed to Bagohi (here: Bagahvaja), the governor of Judah. From an addendum we learn that the Elephantine Jews had sent their petition not only to the governor of Judah, but also similarly to Delaiah and Shelemiah, the sons of Sanballat, the governor of Samaria.

Initially the letter tells how Vidranga sent troops to demolish the temple when Arsanes, the satrap of Egypt, was abroad.⁴⁰ It is explicitly stated that Arsanes did not know of the destruction which was in contradiction to the general Persian policy, as Jedaniah shows by mentioning how Cambyses had acted when he had entered Egypt. It is also told that Vidranga was punished for his unauthorized hostile act, but that any attempt to rebuild the sanctuary has been hindered up to now.⁴¹

Jedaniah describes the mourning of the Jews due to the destruction of their temple. Immediately after the destruction they had written a first letter to the governor of Judah, to the High Priest Johanan from Jerusalem with his priests, to a certain Ostanēs, the brother of Anani, and to the nobles of the Jews. But – as is said emphatically – they did not answer at all. Since all attempts to rebuild the sanctuary had been without success, the colonists started a second attempt, now requesting for a letter of recommendation to the Persian authorities in Egypt concerning the projected reconstruction of the temple. Now the request is addressed to the political authorities only, not to the High Priest from Jerusalem, and notably to the authorities of Jerusalem and Samaria. At the end of his letter, Jedaniah promises that should the temple be rebuilt the Jews of Elephantine would pray for the governor of Judah and offer meal offerings, incense and burnt offerings in his name on the altar of YHW at Elephantine.

This time the letter of the Elephantine community did not remain unanswered. In the Jedaniah archive there is a short memorandum recording a message dictated jointly by Bagohi, the governor of Judah, and Delaiah, the

⁴⁰ From this description we can get some information on the form and equipment of the temple: But many details remain unclear. Against the general assumption that the temple had some similarities with the Temple of Solomon, D. Kellermann and M. Kellermann, “YHW-Tempel und Sabbatfeier auf Elephantine,” *Festgabe für Hans-Rudolf Singer* (ed. M. Forstner; Publikationen des Fachbereichs Angewandte Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Mainz A/13; Frankfurt, Bern, New York, and Paris: P. Lang, 1991), 433–52, here 438ff., think that the temple at Elephantine had the shape of a *bāhmāh*.

⁴¹ Here it remains unclear whether the Persians or the Egyptians hindered the reconstruction.

son of Sanballat, the governor of Samaria.⁴² Here it is related that the Elephantine Jews were to confirm before Arsanes, the satrap of Egypt, that according to the view of the authorities in Judah and Samaria “the Altar house of the God of Heaven” was to be rebuilt “as it was formerly.” By repeating the fact that the Jewish temple at Elephantine already existed before Cambyses, the governors “emphasize the Temple’s legitimacy in the eyes of the Persians.”⁴³

However, concerning the sacrifices there is an important difference between the petition of Jedaniah and the memorandum of Bagohi and Delaiah. They only mention meal and incense offerings, whereas the burnt offerings are not cited at all. This deliberate omission may indicate that in their view burnt offerings were limited to Jerusalem, whereas incense and meal offerings could be tolerated elsewhere (cf. Mal 1:11). On the other hand, the slaughter of sheep could also have offended the Egyptian priests of the ram-headed god Khnum, and one might even ask whether these kind of sacrifices had stimulated the hostility that finally led to the destruction of the Jewish temple.⁴⁴ But the decisive motive for Bagohi’s and Delaiah’s silence on the burnt offerings may have been the conviction ultimately of the Jerusalemites that slaughtered sacrifices should be offered only at the place that God had chosen (cf. Deut 12:13f.), i.e., at the Temple in Jerusalem.

As another document of the Jedaniah archive shows, the leaders of the Jewish community at Elephantine accepted the restriction,⁴⁵ and the temple was rebuilt again.⁴⁶ The date and circumstances of its final destruction or closure during the time of the 29th or 30th Egyptian dynasty remain unclear.⁴⁷

IV. Conclusions

These documents from the Jedaniah archive allow at least a short glimpse at the history of the Jewish temple at Elephantine and on the relations between

⁴² TAD A 4.9 (= Cowley, *Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century BC*, Nr. 32); cf. Grelot, *Documents*, 416f.; Porten, *The Elephantine Papyri in English*, 148f.

⁴³ Porten, *The Elephantine Papyri in English*, 149 n. 9.

⁴⁴ Cf. D. and M. Kellermann, “YHW-Tempel und Sabbatfeier auf Elephantine,” 437. Albertz, *Religionsgeschichte Israels in alttestamentlicher Zeit*, 2:587, suggests that the rejection of burnt offerings could also meet the Persian contempt of bloody sacrifices. But this argument is not plausible, if we are not to assume that the Persians similarly disapproved of the Jerusalem cult which they had re-established before.

⁴⁵ TAD A 4.10 line 10f. *recto*.

⁴⁶ There is a contract in Anani’s archive, dating from 402 BCE, which mentions the temple of Yāhō within the fortress (TAD B 3.1 = Kraeling, *The Brooklyn Museum Aramaic Papyri*, Nr. 12; cf. Grelot, *Documents*, 255–62). See the discussion in Porten, *Archives from Elephantine*, 294–6.

⁴⁷ Cf. the archaeological considerations in Porten, *Archives from Elephantine*, 296–8.

the Elephantine Jews and the political authorities in Jerusalem and Samaria. A few points deserve special attention.

(1) Jedaniah and his colleagues were roughly informed about the political situation in Palestine: They knew the names of the authorities in Jerusalem and Samaria, they even knew that the sons of Sanballat were acting in the name of their father. We should not assume, therefore that they were unaware of the growing tension between Jerusalem and Samaria.⁴⁸ But in need of political support they tried to get both sides to recommend the reconstruction of the sanctuary. This does not mean that the satrap of Egypt could not have given the permission by himself,⁴⁹ but the Jews thought that his decision could be expediated by a letter of recommendation from the authorities of the two primarily Jewish provinces.

(2) The Elephantine Jews had first written to Jerusalem, addressing – among others – the High Priest Johanan. This shows that they did not regard themselves as schismatic, nor even opposed to the claims of the Temple at Jerusalem. We can assume that they felt it to be right to offer slaughtered sacrifices, at least until they were told otherwise. The connections between Upper Egypt and Judaea seem to have been quite loose, so that the claims of the Deuteronomic teaching had not yet reached the colonists in the remote Diaspora. But if Porten's archaeological reconstruction is correct that the Jewish temple at Elephantine was oriented to the north-east, i.e., towards Jerusalem,⁵⁰ we might conclude that this was also the basic spiritual orientation of the Jewish community from the very beginning of its cult, probably before the Persian conquest of Egypt in 525 BCE.

(3) On the other hand, the fact that the first letter addressed to the Jerusalem authorities remained unanswered may indicate that they disapproved of the existence of a Jewish temple at Elephantine. The High Priest could simply have ignored the lamentations of the Egyptian Jews. The governor of Judah might have kept silence taking into consideration the disapproval of the Temple factions. But he had to react at the second letter because we knew that a similar request had been addressed to his colleagues in Samaria. Now it was a matter of foreign affairs, and he could act jointly together with his Samaritan colleague, but without the participation of the High Priest.

⁴⁸ A sister of Delaiah and Shelemiah was married to a brother of the High Priest Johanan. But, even if the High Priest was driven out by Nehemiah (Neh 13:28), Delaiah and Bagohi, Nehemiah's successor, could act jointly.

⁴⁹ This is assumed by Donner, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel und seiner Nachbarn in Grundzügen*, 2:434.

⁵⁰ Cf. Porten, *Archives from Elephantine*, 121. Porten comes to his conclusions from the interpretation of boundary descriptions in some of the Elephantine Papyri, *Archives from Elephantine*, 308–10, and idem, "The Structure and Orientation." Unfortunately, the archaeological search for the temple has not been successful up to now; cf. Campbell, 159, 166, and the extensive report by Kraeling, *The Brooklyn Museum Aramaic Papyri*, 64–82.

(4) One can imagine that the temple was an important factor for the Jewish mercenaries in maintaining their Jewish identity in the Egyptian context.⁵¹ It seems, however, that it served the aims of the respective authorities as well. In any case they had to permit the installation or reconstruction of a temple. The Persian authorities in Egypt obviously protected and even regulated⁵² the Jewish cult at Elephantine. Possibly they provided even material support,⁵³ while the Jews were offering their prayers and sacrifices for the welfare of the rulers.⁵⁴ If it is true that the temple was built before the Persian conquest of Egypt, the consent of the former Saitic rulers must be presupposed as well. By supporting the cult of the Jewish mercenaries, they could strengthen the loyalty of the colony at a time when the area where the Jewish mercenaries came from was under the influence of the Babylonians or under Persian rule. So, the foundation and maintenance of the Jewish cult at Elephantine was – at least partly – a result of political, not just religious, motives.

B. The Samaritan Temple on Mt. Gerizim

The discussion on the sanctuary on Mt. Gerizim⁵⁵ involves the complicated issue of the schism between Samaritans and Jews. But, methodologically, we should not presuppose an immediate connection between the building of the temple and the emerging schism. If the latter is the final result of a longer process of alienation⁵⁶ between the groups which were later called Samaritans

⁵¹ Cf. Stoebe, “Überlegungen zum Synkretismus der jüdischen Tempelgemeinde in Elephantine,” 626, who suggests that the sanctuary must have been attractive even for non-Jewish, Aramaean members of the military colony.

⁵² Cf. the instruction for Passover in the so-called Paschal Papyrus (see above, n. 43).

⁵³ Cf. the edict of king Darius in Ezra 6:9ff. regulating the support of the offerings in Jerusalem. On the public support of religious cults in the Persian empire, see Koch, *Die religiösen Verhältnisse der Dareioszeit: Untersuchungen an Hand der elamitischen Persepolisstafelchen* (GOF 3/4; Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1977); idem, *Es kündigt Dareius der König ... Vom Leben im persischen Großreich* (Kulturgeschichte der Antiken Welt 55; Mainz: Philipp von Zabern, 1992), 276–86. (I am thankful to I. Willi-Plein for drawing my attention to these titles.)

⁵⁴ This is what Jedaniah offered in his letter to Bagohi. It can be assumed that the Jews of Elephantine similarly prayed for the satrap of Egypt or the king of Persia who had given the permission to maintain their temple.

⁵⁵ Cf. on the sanctuary Delcor, “Sanctuaires juifs,” 1310–7; P. Antoine, “Garizim,” *DBSup* 3:535–61, here 543–52.

⁵⁶ Cf. the conclusion by L. H. Feldman, “Josephus’ Attitude towards the Samaritans,” in *Studies in Hellenistic Judaism* (AGJU 30; Leiden, New York, and Köln: E. J. Brill, 1996), 136: “It would appear that the separation of the Jews and the Samaritans ... was not sudden but took place over a considerable period of time and was accompanied ... by considerable debate.” See also Dexinger, “Der Ursprung der Samaritaner im Spiegel der frühen Quellen,” in *Die Samaritaner* (ed. F. Dexinger and R. Pummer; WdF 604; Darmstadt:

and Jews,⁵⁷ the sanctuary on Mt. Gerizim might be only one step towards the definite separation. Even though it was an important step, it seems to be not the last and definitive one. So, the evidence for the sanctuary on Mt. Gerizim should be considered without the idea that its existence already implied a definite separation between Samaritans and Jews. This question is complicated enough, and the views are changing rapidly due to recent archaeological findings on Mt. Geim and their ongoing publication.

I. The Documentary Evidence and the Account of Josephus

The documentary evidence for the temple on Mt. Gerizim is quite late. The Hebrew Bible does not even mention it. The earliest clear attestation is 2 Macc 6:2, where it is said that in 167/6 BCE the inhabitants of the place – or more precisely: the Hellenized “Sidonians of Shechem” Josephus, *Ant.* XII 258)⁵⁸ – made the request to rename the temple on Mt. Gerizim dedicating it to Ζεὺς Ἐένιος; the Hospitable Zeus,⁵⁹ while the Temple in Jerusalem was renamed after the Ζεὺς Ὀλύμπιος.⁶⁰ Consequently, the sanctuary on Mt.

Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1992), 140. However, this seems to be the only point where the different views agree. The date of the schism is heavily disputed (cf. the information in R. T. Anderson, “Samaritans,” *ABD* 5:940–7; Albertz, *Religionsgeschichte Israels in alttestamentlicher Zeit*, 2:576f., and M. Mor, “The Persian, Hellenistic, and Hasmonaean Period,” in *The Samaritans* [ed. A. D. Crown; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1989], 1–18). However, the dispute only confirms the view that the definitive schism was the result of a longer process of alienation (cf. H. G. Kippenberg, *Garizim und Synagoge: Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zur samaritanischen Religion der aramäischen Periode* [RVV 30; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1971], 43).

⁵⁷ In the earlier period one should rather call the groups Samaritans or Proto-Samaritans and Judaeans. Dexinger proposes a quite useful distinction between Samaritans (denoting the originally pagan upper class in Samaria) and Proto-Samaritans (denoting the Yahwistic population which had not been deported by the Assyrians).

⁵⁸ The term is already used for the semi-Greek population of Samaria in Josephus, *Ant.* XI 344; cf. M. Hengel, *Judentum und Hellenismus: Studien zu ihrer Begegnung unter besonderer Berücksichtigung Palästinas bis zur Mitte des 2. Jh.s v. Chr.* (2nd ed.; WUNT 10; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1973), 535 n. 215.

⁵⁹ The petition is quoted by Josephus, *Ant.* XII 258–61 (cf. the reply of the king XI 262–4) where the name is reported as Ζεὺς Ἑλληνιος (XII 261, 263). But this seems to be a secondary version (Hengel, *Judentum und Hellenismus*, 536 n. 216; Kippenberg, *Garizim und Synagoge*, 79f.). On the basic authenticity of the document quoted by Josephus, see Bickermann, “Un document relative à persecution d’Antiochos IV Épiphane,” *RHR* 115 (1937): 188–223”; idem, *Der Gott der Makkabäer: Untersuchungen über Sinn und Ursprung der makkabäischen Erhebung* (Berlin: Schocken, 1937), 177–9. Cf., however, the dissenting view by Rappaport, “The Samaritans in the Hellenistic Period,” in *New Samaritan Studies of the Société d’Études Samaritaines* (ed. A. D. Crown and L. Davey, SJS[S] 5; Sydney: Mandelbaum, 1986), 284–6.

⁶⁰ On the implications of the cultic reform, see Hengel, *Judentum und Hellenismus*, 537ff.; on the Hellenization of the cult on Mt. Zion and on Mt. Gerizim, cf. most recently

Gerizim must have existed at least during the time of Antiochus IV.⁶¹ In his *Jewish Antiquities*, Flavius Josephus relates the destruction of the sanctuary by the Hasmonaean ruler John Hyrcanus (*Ant.* XIII 254ff.; cf. also *J.W.* I 62), which is to be dated most plausibly in 128 BCE.⁶²

But when was it built and under which circumstances? Our only documentary source for this incident is Josephus who relates a colorful story of the foundation of the temple on Mt. Gerizim (*Ant.* XI 302–47):

Under the reign of king Darius III (338–331 BCE), the brother of the High Priest Jaddua (cf. Neh 12:22), a certain Manasse, married Nikaso, the daughter of the Samaritan governor Sanballat (*Ant.* XI 302f.). But the elders of Jerusalem told him either to divorce his wife or not to approach the altar (XI 308). So, Manasse went to his father-in-law, who promised to ask king Darius for permission to build a sanctuary on Mt. Gerizim, similar to that in Jerusalem. Manasse stayed with Sanballat, and so did many priests and Israelites who were involved in similar marriages (XI 311f.). Meanwhile, king Darius had been beaten near Issos, and Alexander was conquering Palestine. Whereas the High Priest Jaddua remained faithful to Darius (XI 317–20), Sanballat took hold of the opportunity, submitted to Alexander and asked for consent to build a temple on Mt. Gerizim, mentioning that a division of the Jewish nation could also be an advantage for the king himself (XI 321–3). With the consent of Alexander, Sanballat built the temple and installed Manasse as High Priest, before he died nine months later (XI 324f.).

This account of Josephus is our only source for these incidents, and its historical value has been heavily disputed for several reasons.⁶³ Josephus tells the story with an anti-Samaritan bias “to blacken the origins of Samaritan

C. Breitenbach, “Zeus und Jupiter auf dem Zion und dem Berg Garizim: Die Hellenisierung und Romanisierung der Kultstätten des Höchsten,” *JSJ* 28 (1997): 369–80.

⁶¹ Additionally, there are two Greek inscriptions from Delos attesting to the custom of Samaritans in sending offerings to Mt. Gerizim. Unfortunately, the date of the two inscriptions is not very precise. The editor dates the first one between 150 and 50 BCE and the second one between 250 and 175 BCE (cf. R. Pummer, “Samaritan Material Remains and Archaeology,” in *The Samaritans* [ed. A. D. Crown; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1989], 150f., 172–4). But the inscriptions confirm the existence of a sanctuary on Mt. Gerizim at least for the early or mid-second century BCE. They even show that the temple already had supporters in the Diaspora at that time.

⁶² There is also some discussion on the precise date of the destruction of the sanctuary on Mt. Gerizim during the reign of John Hyrcanus (cf. B. Hall, “From John Hyrcanus to Baba Rabbah,” in *The Samaritans* [ed. A. D. Crown; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1989], 32–54, here 33f.). Most scholars, however, seem to accept a date in the early period of his reign, 129/8 BCE (cf. Kippenberg, *Garizim und Synagoge*, 87).

⁶³ Cf. Donner, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel und seiner Nachbarn in Grundzügen*, 2:435: “in the realm of legend.” Cf. also the criticism by R. T. Anderson, *Josephus’ Account of the Temple Building: History, Literature or Politics* (Proceedings of the Eastern Great Lakes and Midwest Biblical Societies 9; Grand Rapids: Biblical Society, 1989).

priesthood.”⁶⁴ However, this may not equally reflect his sources.⁶⁵ But for numerous interpreters, the most puzzling element in the account of Josephus is the parallel between Josephus’ account in *Ant.* XI 302–24 with the note in Neh 13:28 where there is also mention of a certain Sanballat, the governor of Samaria, who is the father-in-law of a son of the High Priest. From this parallel, scholars concluded that Josephus had made a chronological mistake concerning the figure of Sanballat,⁶⁶ or simply assumed that he had “fabricated his account from the incident in Nehemiah and dated it a century later.”⁶⁷

More recently, the documents found at *Wadi-ed-Daliyeh* from the 4th century BCE have shown that there was in fact another governor of Samaria called Sanballat and that the position could be passed on within the family. So Josephus’ mention of Sanballat has lost its implausibility.⁶⁸ Following the suggestions of Cross, we have to distinguish between Sanballat I, “the Horonite” from the late 5th century, known from Nehemiah and the Elephantine papyri, Sanballat II from the early 4th century, known from the so-called “Samaria Papyri” from *Wadi-ed-Daliyeh*, and Sanballat III from the late 4th

⁶⁴ Mor, “The Persian, Hellenistic, and Hasmonaean Period,” 5. This holds true chiefly for the comment *Ant.* XI 340–4. On Josephus’ treatment of the Samaritans, see L. H. Feldman, “Josephus’ Attitude towards the Samaritans” and R. J. Coggins, “The Samaritans in Josephus,” in *Josephus, Judaism, and Christianity* (ed. L. H. Feldman, G. Hata; Leiden, New York, and Köln: E. J. Brill, 1987), 257–73. Note, however, the dissenting view of R. Egger, *Josephus Flavius und die Samaritaner* (NTOA 4; Freiburg, Schweiz: Universitätsverlag, and Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986), 310f., who rejects the theory of an anti-Samaritan bias in Josephus.

⁶⁵ We can not go into the complicated debate on Josephus’ sources here, where certainty is not to be gained. See the earlier treatments of the story and its alleged sources by A. Büchler, “La relation de Josèphe concernant Alexandre le Grand,” *REJ* 36 (1898): 1–26; R. Marcus, “Josephus and the Samaritan Schism,” in *Josephus in Nine Volumes, vol. VI: Jewish Antiquities, Books XI–XII, with an English Translation by R. Marcus* (LCL; Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, and London: William Heinemann, 1937) more recently Kippenberg, *Garizim und Synagoge*, 50–7; Dexinger, “Ursprung,” 102–16, and the balanced discussion by Albertz, *Religionsgeschichte Israels in alttestamentlicher Zeit*, 2:582–4.

⁶⁶ Cf. among others Marcus, “Josephus and the Samaritan Schism,” 507f.; V. Tcherikover, *Hellenistic Civilization and the Jews* (trans. S. Applebaum; Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, and Jerusalem: Magnes, 1959), 44.

⁶⁷ Thus the description by H. G. M. Williamson, “Sanballat,” *ABD* 5:974. The hypothesis was held, e.g., already by J. A. Montgomery, *The Samaritans: The Earliest Jewish Sect: Their History, Theology, and Literature* (New York: KTAB, 1907), 67–9; cf. also H. H. Rowley, “Sanballat and the Samaritan Temple,” in *Men of God: Studies in Old Testament History and Prophecy* (London and Edinburgh: Nelson, 1963), 249f., 265.

⁶⁸ Dexinger, “Ursprung,” 105; Albertz, *Religionsgeschichte Israels in alttestamentlicher Zeit*, 2:583; but cf. the critical view by Williamson, “Sanballat,” 974f.

century, who is known from the account of Josephus.⁶⁹ Nor should we think it to be implausible that the leading families of Jerusalem and Samaria practiced intermarriage for more than one generation.⁷⁰ So, even if there remain some problems in the Josephus account, most scholars basically accepted his dating of the temple.⁷¹ Some aspects of the circumstances mentioned in his account sound quite plausible as well.

(1) The power vacuum between the Persians and Alexander seems to be an appropriate context for the construction of the temple. Mor states, “The Samaritans used this interim period to build their temple,” and “the hasty construction of the temple was their attempt to realize their goals before this period of uncertainty ended.”⁷²

(2) It is quite plausible that the Judaeon policy of demarcation contributed to the alienation between Judaeans and Samaritans in the Persian period.⁷³ After the constitution of Jehud as an independent province in 445 BCE, worshippers of JHWH from Samaria were foreigners in Jerusalem.⁷⁴ If they

⁶⁹ Cf. basically F. M. Cross, “Aspects of Samaritan and Jewish History in Late Persian and Hellenistic Times,” *HTR* 59 (1966): 201–11,” 203; idem, “The Papyri and their Historical Implications,” in *Discoveries in the Wādī ed-Dāliyah* (ed. P. W. Lapp and N. L. Lapp; AASOR 41; Cambridge, Mass.: American Schools of Oriental Research, 1974), 17–29 who reconstructs the line of the Samaritan governors: Sanballat I was installed in 445 BCE, his son Delaiah in 407, then Sanballat II, his son Hananiah in 354, and after – if we are allowed to deduce from the papyri – his son Sanballat III, who is mentioned by Josephus. Cf. also Schmidt, *La pensée du Temple*, 112f.

⁷⁰ Cf., however, A. Crown, “Another Look at Samaritan Origins,” in *New Samaritan Studies of the Société d’Études Samaritaines* (ed. A. D. Crown and L. Davey; SJ[S] 5; Sydney: Mandelbaum, 1986), 146. See the sequence of governors proposed by Crown, 146f.

⁷¹ Thus Kippenberg, *Garizim und Synagoge*, 56f.; Mor, “The Persian, Hellenistic, and Hasmonaean Period,” 7; Dexinger, “Ursprung,” 109; N. Schur, *History of the Samaritans* (BEATAJ 18; Frankfurt a. M., Bern, New York, and Paris: P. Lang, 1989), 35ff.; Albertz, *Religionsgeschichte Israels in alttestamentlicher Zeit*, 2:582–4; Breytenbach, *Religionsgeschichte Israels in alttestamentlicher Zeit*, 372. Cf. also Anderson, “Samaritans,” 942.

⁷² Mor, “The Persian, Hellenistic, and Hasmonaean Period,” 7. Cf. his slight correction on p. 7f., where he writes, “Even if Sanballat had asked for Alexander’s permission to build the temple, this request was probably made after the temple was built as a petition for formal approval.”

⁷³ Cf. chiefly A. Alt, “Die Rolle Samarias bei der Entstehung des Judentums,” in *Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte Israels* (München: Beck, 1953), 2:316–37.

⁷⁴ Already Ezra 4:1–5 records the exclusion of Samaritans from the restoration of the Jerusalem Temple. The historical value of the note is, of course, doubtful but the story may be typical for the relations between Samaritans and Judaeans in later times.

wanted to go there, they had to go abroad.⁷⁵ In this situation, the rulers of Samaria could have been interested in the foundation of a cultic center within their own territory.

(3) As Neh 13:28 shows, intermarriage was a severe problem for the leaders of the Judaeen restitution. It was practiced by noble families such as the clans of Sanballat (Neh 13:23) and Tobias (Neh 6:18; 13:4, 7), to increase their position in Jerusalem. On the other hand, the Judaeen nobles, including some High Priestly families, might have intended to strengthen the unity and welfare of the entire Jewish nation by marriage with Samaritan wives (cf. Josephus, *Ant.* XI 303). The Judaeen priests who according to Josephus followed Manasse to Samaria certainly did not see themselves as schismatics or even apostates.⁷⁶ Perhaps they were convinced that they helped the brethren in the North to lead their lives according to the law within their mixed religious context.

II. Recent Archaeological Findings

The above considerations, based on the documentary evidence only, are brought into question again by new archaeological evidence. The earlier excavations on Mt. Gerizim and *Tell er-Rās* appeared to have produced only doubtful results.⁷⁷ On *Tell er-Rās*, a Roman temple had been uncovered, based on a substructure which the excavator Bull dated to the Hellenistic period and connected with the temple of Sanballat,⁷⁸ but his interpretation was questioned by other scholars.⁷⁹ In later excavations, on the top of Mt. Gerizim, a Hellenistic city with a large sacred precinct had been found. It was built during the time of Antiochus III and destroyed at the end of the 2nd cen-

⁷⁵ On Bethel which seems to have been Judaeen in post-exilic times (cf. Ezra 2:28; Neh 7:32; 2 Chr 12:19; 1 Macc 9:50), see Albertz, *Religionsgeschichte Israels in alttestamentlicher Zeit*, 2:586 n. 44.

⁷⁶ Cf. Albertz, *Religionsgeschichte Israels in alttestamentlicher Zeit*, 2:589; contrary to Josephus, *Ant.* XI 334.

⁷⁷ Cf. Pummer, "Samaritan Material Remains," 165ff.; I. Magen, "Gerizim, Mount," in *New Encyclopedia of Archaeological Excavations in the Holy Land*, 2:484–92.

⁷⁸ Cf. R. J. Bull, "Tell er-Ras (Mount Gerizim)," in *Die Samaritaner* (ed. E. Dexinger and R. Pummer; WdF 604; Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1992), 427. Cf. Magen, "Gerizim, Mount," 489, where he comments on the earlier suggestions by Bull, who had directed the excavations from 1964 to 1968.

⁷⁹ Cf. Magen, "Gerizim, Mount," 489: "The fill of the walls contained finds Bull attributed to the Hellenistic period. ... Bull proposed that these walls were remnants of the Samaritan temple." But, "The pottery vessels and the coins of the Hellenistic period found in the fill originated in the Hellenistic city, whose northern gate was close to the temple (ca. 150 m from it)." So, Magen can resume, "A re-examination of Bull's excavations shows, however, in the writer's opinion, that there was no Hellenistic temple at *Tell er-Ras*, and that both building phases belong to the Roman period" ("Gerizim, Mount," 489).

tury BCE, probably by John Hyrcanus.⁸⁰ If this was the town and the sanctuary which John Hyrcanus destroyed, one could conclude that it had been built not earlier than at the beginning of the 2nd century BCE. In his article on Mt. Gerizim in the *New Encyclopedia of Archaeological Excavations in the Holy Land* which appeared in 1993, Magen stated, “The excavations have so far produced no evidence of a temple or settlement from the time of the Ptolemies.”⁸¹

Most recently the excavators Naveh and Magen have published further results of their excavations. Beneath the sacred precinct from the early 2nd century BCE, they discovered an older layer which covered the same area and goes back to the Persian period.⁸² Now they think that the place of the Samaritan temple has been found. It was indeed on top of Mt. Gerizim, the outline of the sanctuary was substantially different from that of the Jerusalem Temple, and – most importantly – it is older than most of the scholars thought before. In their summary, Naveh and Magen conclude, “While Josephus dates the construction to the reign of Alexander the Great, we now know that it was built in the time of Nehemiah.”⁸³

The detailed description and further evaluation of these recent discoveries on Mt. Gerizim is awaited. But, of course, the new archaeological evidence questions again the historical value of the story told by Josephus. If it is possible to ascertain that the first building stage on Mt. Gerizim, even within the sacred precinct, antedates the time of Alexander the Great and goes back to Persian times, the issue of the origin of the Samaritan temple and the circumstances that led to its construction must be considered again. Unfortunately, there is no documentary source for the construction of the Samaritan sanctuary in the late Persian period. Does the cultic tradition on Mt. Gerizim actually go back to pre-exilic times, to the *bāhmôt* of Northern Israel (cf. 2 Kgs 17:29 and 23:19f.)? The Israelites who were not deported could have pre-

⁸⁰ Magen, “Gerizim, Mount,” 485–7. This is already noted by Albertz, *Religionsgeschichte Israels in alttestamentlicher Zeit*, 2:582f.

⁸¹ Magen, “Gerizim, Mount,” 487. Similarly Pummer, “Samaritan Material Remains,” 172: “No traces of a temple have been found so far. But ... the excavations are still in their beginning stage.” Cf. Pummer, “Samaritan Material Remains,” 169–72.

⁸² J. Naveh and Y. Magen, “Aramaic and Hebrew Inscriptions of the Second-Century BCE at Mount Gerizim,” *Atiqot* 32 (1997): 9*–17*, here 9*.

⁸³ Naveh and Magen, “Aramaic and Hebrew Inscriptions of the Second-Century BCE at Mount Gerizim,” 10*.

served these traditions.⁸⁴ If this is true, the building of a temple on Mt. Gerizim could draw on older Yahwistic traditions connected with that place.⁸⁵

III. Preliminary Considerations

(1) The specific occasion for the Samaritan temple project still remains unclear. Ezra 4:1–5 shows that there were already tensions between Samaria and Jerusalem when the sanctuary at Jerusalem was rebuilt under Zerubbabel. It might have been the Samaritan upper class, the former Assyrian aristocrats settled in Samaria (cf. 2 Kgs 17:24) who first tried to support the Jerusalem Temple project. But the leaders of the Judaeen restoration rejected them and, consequently, provoked resistance against the Judaeen Temple project.⁸⁶ Most probably, the rivalry between Samaria, the capital of the hyparchy, and Jerusalem, the emerging cultic center, was strengthened in the subsequent decades, especially when Judah became an independent province, with Nehemiah as *peḥāh* (cf. Neh 5:14f.; 12:26), and Sanballat was *peḥāh* in Samaria. One might even suppose, however, that these events gave an appropriate occasion for the Samaritan authorities to establish their own sanctuary on the summit of Mt. Gerizim with its Yahwistic sacred tradition. One could even ask whether the temple project was paid for by the Persian authorities thereby compensating Samaria for the loss of a part of its hyparchy and – probably – the shortage of tax incomes.⁸⁷

(2) Generally, we may conclude, that also in the present case of temple rivalry the political interests on both sides seem to have provided the most important reasons for the establishment of the Samaritan sanctuary.⁸⁸ On the Judaeen side there was the self-confidence of the leaders of the Judaeen restoration which excluded not only the assimilated upper class from Samaria but even the Yahwistic population of the north, the *'am hā'āreṣ*, from the restoration in Jerusalem. On the side of Samaria there was the pride of the former Assyrian aristocrats, loath to acknowledge the supremacy of the southern

⁸⁴ 2 Kgs 23:15–20 shows that the *bāhmôt* survived the Assyrian conquest and that the sanctuary at Bethel existed at least until the time of king Josiah. This does not preclude, however, that Israelite worshippers of JHWH also made the pilgrimage to Jerusalem, as Jer 41:4f., 11 attests (cf. Dexinger “Ursprung,” 87f.). Cf. also 2 Chr 35:18.

⁸⁵ Cf. Dexinger, “Ursprung,” 116: “It is safe to assume that Garizim was a cultic city of the proto-Samaritans, even when there was no temple there yet.”

⁸⁶ Cf. Dexinger, “Ursprung,” 98–100; Donner, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel und seiner Nachbarn in Grundzügen*, 2:414f.

⁸⁷ Crown who dates the temple on Mt. Gerizim later in the time of Sanballat III has a similar assumption. He thinks that “Sanballat III was being rewarded by the Persians for having refused to take part in the Tennes rebellion” (151).

⁸⁸ This was already the position of Alt; cf. also Albertz, *Religionsgeschichte Israels in alttestamentlicher Zeit*, 2:589.

rival which finally led to the foundation of their own Samaritan temple on Mt. Gerizim.

(3) Even if the temple was not modelled after the Temple in Jerusalem, as we now learn from the excavations on Mt. Gerizim,⁸⁹ we have no reason to think that doctrinal, halakic, or liturgical differences were the basic motivation for the Samaritans' cultic separation. The attempts to justify Mt. Gerizim as the elect place of adoration which can be found in the Samaritan Pentateuch and the Samaritan literature are of later origin.⁹⁰

(4) The legitimacy of the Samaritan sanctuary was subject to discussion for a long time.⁹¹ Josephus relates a dispute between Samaritans and Jews in Alexandria (*Ant.* XII 74–9), and even the Fourth Gospel reflects discussions on the right place of adoration (John 4:21–3). So, the dispute survived the sanctuary, and one might well say that one of the most important factors that firmly established the schism was the destruction of the Samaritan temple by John Hyrcanus and his violent policy of Judaizing.⁹²

C. Onias' Temple at Leontopolis in Lower Egypt

The third case of temple rivalry to be considered is the Jewish temple at Leontopolis,⁹³ a place which is commonly identified with *Tell el-Yehudieh*, circa

⁸⁹ Cf. the information in Naveh and Magen, "Aramaic and Hebrew Inscriptions of the Second-Century BCE at Mount Gerizim," 9*.

⁹⁰ These ideological alterations of the Samaritan biblical text are not yet contained in the so-called Proto-Samaritan texts, e.g., 4QPalaeoEx^m, 4QNum^b, or 4QDtnⁿ; on the pre-Samaritan textual tradition, cf. E. Tov, "Proto-Samaritan Texts and the Samaritan Pentateuch," in *The Samaritans* (ed. A. D. Crown; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1989), 397–407"; idem, *Der Text der hebräischen Bibel: Handbuch der Textkritik* (transl. by H.-J. Fabry; Stuttgart, Berlin, and Köln: Kohlhammer, 1997), 65–82, see p. 77f. on the peculiar Samaritan alterations; cf. also F. Dexinger, "Das Garizimgebot im Dekalog der Samaritaner," in *Studien zum Pentateuch: Walter Kornfeld zum 60. Geburtstag* (ed. G. Braulikö; Wien, Freiburg, and Basel: Herder, 1977).

⁹¹ On the discussions in the *Mishna*, see Montgomery, *Samaritans*, 224f.

⁹² Cf. Albrecht, *Religionsgeschichte Israels in alttestamentlicher Zeit*, 2:584; Schmidt, *La pensée du Temple*, 116ff.; R. Pummer, "Antisamaritanische Polemik in jüdischen Schriften aus der intertestamentarischen Zeit," *BZ* 26 (1982): 224–42, here 224.

⁹³ On Leontopolis and the Jewish temple, see A. Barucq, "Léontopolis," *DBSup* 6:359–72; A. Schalit, "Onias' Temple," *EncJud* 12:1404–5; Delcor, "Le Temple d'Onias en Égypte: Réexamen d'un vieux problème," *RB* 75 (1968): 188–203; idem, "Sanctuaires juifs," 1317–28; Modrzejewski, *Les Juifs d'Égypte*, 101ff.; Hayward, "The Jewish Temple at Leontopolis: A Reconsideration," *JJS* 33 (1982): 429–43; G. Bohak, *Joseph and Aseneth and the Jewish Temple in Heliopolis* (SBLEJL 10; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996), 19–40; idem, "CPJ III, 520: The Egyptian Reaction to Onias' Temple," *JSJ* 26 (1995): 32–41; D. R. Schwartz, "The Jews of Egypt between the Temple of Onias, the Temple of Jerusalem,

30 miles north-west of Memphis in Lower Egypt.⁹⁴ According to Josephus, the place belonged to the district (νόμος) of Heliopolis (*J.W.* VII 426; *Ant.* XX 236), and the area was called “the land of Onias” (ἡ Ὀνίου χώρα, *Ant.* XIV 131; cf. *J.W.* I 190).⁹⁵ The inscriptions from *Tell el-Yehudieh* show that there was a large, well-established and self-conscious Jewish community at that place.⁹⁶ But, contrary to the claim of the famous British archaeologist Flinders Petrie, Onias’ temple has not been found there.⁹⁷

and Heaven,” *Zion* 57 (1997): 5–22 [Hebrew with English summary]; and E. Gruen, “The Origins and Objectives of Onias’ Temple,” *SCI* 16 (1997): 47–70.

⁹⁴ Cf. E. Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ*, vol. 3/1, p. 47; Modrzejewski, *Les Juifs d’Egypte*, 101ff.; A. Kasher, *The Jews in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt: The Struggle for Equal Rights* (TSAJ 7; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1985), 109. The identification is questioned, however, by Bohak, *Joseph and Aseneth*, 27–9, who locates the temple at Heliopolis. Bohak concedes that *Tell el-Yehudieh* was an Oniad settlement. Examining the distance from Memphis given by Josephus (*J.W.* VII 426), he infers that the location of the temple points instead to Heliopolis. Secondly, Bohak draws on the mention of the “city of the sun” in the original reading of Isa 19:18 (as preserved in IQIsa^a) which also points to Heliopolis. But there is no reason why this passage could not be used to argue for a place in the district of Heliopolis. The location of the Jewish temple at Heliopolis provides an important link for Bojak’s attempt to connect the story of Joseph and Aseneth with the Jewish temple mentioned by Josephus. Certainly, his symbolic interpretation of the honeycomb scene in *Jos. Asen.* 14:1–17:10 deserves serious discussion. But the theory is quite speculative and should not form the basis of the interpretation of the Jewish temple which was, according to Josephus, located in the νόμος of Heliopolis and, we should add more precisely, at a place called Leontopolis.

⁹⁵ That a district in Egypt was named after Onias is also confirmed by a fragment from Strabo, quoted by Josephus in *Ant.* XIII 287 (cf. M. Stern, *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism* [2 vols.; Jerusalem: Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 1976/80], 2:268f., no. 99). The designation is further confirmed by a metrical epitaph from the necropole of *Tell el-Yehudieh*: Ὀνίου γὰ τρουφὸς ἀμετέρᾳ (*CIJ* II, no. 1530); cf. E. Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ*, vol. 3/1, p. 48. See the inscription in W. Horbury and D. Noy, *Jewish Inscriptions of Graeco-Roman Egypt* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 90–4 (no. 38); cf. also Modrzejewski, *Les Juifs d’Egypte*, 109f.

⁹⁶ Cf. Horbury and Noy, *Jewish Inscriptions of Graeco-Roman Egypt*, and especially D. Noy, “The Jewish Communities of Leontopolis and Venosa,” *Studies in Early Jewish Epigraphy* (ed. J. W. van Henten and P. W. van der Horst; AGJU 21; Leiden, New York, and Köln: E. J. Brill, 1994), 162–72. On the archaeological evidence for the large size of the Jewish community, see also Kasher, *The Jews in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt*, 119–30.

⁹⁷ Thus Modrzejewski, *Les Juifs d’Egypte*, 106: “On n’en a jamais retrouvé le moindre vestige.” But he continues: “Le site de Tell el-Yahoudiyeh a été plusieurs fois exploré, mais jamais systématiquement fouillé.” Cf. also Bohak, *Joseph and Aseneth*, 28. On the excavations, see E. Naville, *The Mound of the Jews and the City of Onias* (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner, 1890); W. M. Flinders Petrie, *Egypt and Israel* (new ed.; London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1911), 97–180.

Our main source concerning the Jewish temple at Leontopolis is again Josephus who mentions the sanctuary in *J.W.* I 33; VII 426–36 and in *Ant.* XII 388; XIII 62–73, 285; X 236. In his *Jewish War*, he briefly mentions its foundation (I 33) and relates its final closure in 73 or 74 CE (VII 426–36). In his later *Antiquities*, he tells the story of its foundation in greater detail (XIII 62–73). In contrast to the extensive accounts of Josephus, the sanctuary is never mentioned by Philo. This might suggest that its function was quite limited, even for the Egyptian Diaspora.⁹⁸ There may be some more implicit references in the *Pseudepigrapha*.⁹⁹ Later discussions on the halakic status of

⁹⁸ “In the whole of Judaeo-Alexandrian literature there is no trace of Onias’ temple” (Tcherikover, *Hellenistic Civilization and the Jews*, 278). Cf. D. R. Schwartz, “The Jews of Egypt between the Temple of Onias, the Temple of Jerusalem, and Heaven,” who points to a “general lack of Alexandrian Jewish interest in temples and sacrificial religion – consistent with the circumstances of Jews of the Diaspora” and illustrates this from 2 Maccabees.

⁹⁹ In the 3rd book of the *Sibylline Oracles*, which is usually located in Egypt, there is no explicit reference to Leontopolis, and the temple referred to is certainly the Jerusalem Temple. However, the emphasis on warfare and the pro-Ptolemaic position seems to point to a follower of Onias rather than to an Alexandrian Jew. Collins therefore conjectures that the book was written “in the circles of Onias,” but “before the new temple was built” (“Sibylline Oracles,” in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (2 vols.; ed. J. H. Charlesworth; Garden City and New York: Doubleday, 1983), 356; cf. idem, *The Sibylline Oracles of Egyptian Judaism* (SBLDS 13; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1974), 51; see also the discussion by Delcor, “Sanctuaires juifs,” 1319f.).

Most recently, Bohak links the story of *Joseph and Aseneth* with the Jews in the district of Heliopolis. He interprets its central scene (*Jos. Asen.* 14:1–17:10) as “an apocalyptic revelation scene, in which an angel shows Aseneth, in a symbolic vision, how one day a group of Jewish priests would leave the Jerusalem temple and build an identical temple in Heliopolis, how other priests would try, and fail, to harm this project, and how the Jerusalem temple itself would be destroyed” (Bohak, *Joseph and Aseneth*, 101). So, the story is to be read “as a fictional history which ‘foretells,’ and justifies, the establishment of the Jewish temple in Heliopolis” (p. 102). On the other hand, Burchard states that the “complete lack of cultic interest ... would seem to rule out Leontopolis with its ‘Temple in Exile’ ..., even though it is situated in the county of Heliopolis” (“Joseph and Aseneth,” *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* [2 vols.; ed. J. H. Charlesworth; Garden City and New York: Doubleday, 1983], 187). Burchard then proposes an origin in an urban context in Egypt, not in the countryside (“Joseph and Aseneth,” 187).

The link with Heliopolis is also present in a fragment of the historian Artapanus, cited by Eusebius in his *Praeparatio evangelica* (IX 23.1–4). There, it is told, that Joseph when he had become administrator of Egypt, “married Aseneth, the daughter of a Heliopolitan priest, and begot children by her,” and that Jacob and his sons “were settled in Heliopolis and Saïs.” This seems to be an attempt to predate and legitimate the Jewish presence in the district of Heliopolis or even the presence of a Jewish sanctuary within the context of ancient Egyptian temples (cf. Josephus, *Ant.* II 188 who also relates that Jacob was settled in Heliopolis).

Onias' temple are referred to in the Mishna and the Babylonian Talmud,¹⁰⁰ and a strange papyrus fragment from the late second or third century CE (CPJ III, 520) possibly mirrors the Egyptian reaction to the Jewish settlement in the "land of Onias."¹⁰¹ But without the data from Josephus we would not be able to say anything about the history of the temple at Leontopolis.¹⁰² So, I will concentrate on his accts and their historical problems.

I. The Identity of Onias and the Date of the Foundation of his Temple

One of the most striking problems is the confusion concerning the identity of Onias the founder of the temple. In his *Jewish War*, Josephus ascribes the foundation to Onias III, the son of Simon the Just, the last legitimate High Priest in Jerusalem, who was then murdered at Daphne near Antioch (2 Macc 4:30–8¹⁰³). Notably, the Talmudic sources also ascribe the shrine to Onias the son of Simon. But the attempts of some scholars to discredit the sober tale of Onias' murder at Daphne¹⁰⁴ are not convincing. Nor is it probable that the author of 2 Maccabees using the work of Jason from Cyrene deliberately omitted Onias III's flight to Egypt and the establishment of the temple there.¹⁰⁵ So, Gruen correctly concludes, "The account in II Maccabees can

¹⁰⁰ The *Mishna* (*m. Menah* 13:10) cites R. Simeon stating that the priests who ministered in the temple of Onias could not serve in the Jerusalem Temple. However, the worshippers of Onias' temple are clearly distinguished from idolators. The *Talmud Babli* also confirms that Onias' temple was no idolatrous one (*b. Menah* 109b; cf. *t. Menah* 13:12–15; see also *y. Yoma* 6:3). See the discussion by S. A. Hirsch, "The Temple of Onias," *Jews' College Jubilee Volume* (London: Luzac & C., 1906), 39–80; cf. also Schalit, "Onias' Temple."

¹⁰¹ On this document, which has some parallels to the so-called Potter's Oracle, see the interesting article by Bohak, "The Egyptian Reaction to Onias' Temple."

¹⁰² This is the problem of the thorough article by Gruen, "The Origins and Objectives of Onias' Temple." He discards the accounts from the *Jewish War* and the *Antiquities* as unreliable (p. 57f.), but when he draws on the prophecy of Isa 19:18f. as the main legitimation for the sanctuary, he also draws on Josephus. The other sources can only provide fragmentary additions to the picture.

¹⁰³ Cf. also Dan 9:26; 11:22; *I En* 90:8.

¹⁰⁴ Cf. the most recent attempt by F. Parente, see "Onias III's Death and the Founding of the Temple of Leontopolis," in *Josephus and the History of the Greco-Roman Period: Proceedings of the Josephus Colloquium 1992 in San Miniato (Italy): Essays in Honor of Morton Smith* (ed. F. Parente and J. Sievers; SPB 41; Leiden, New York, and Köln: E. J. Brill, 1994), 69–98. Notably, the passage in 2 Macc 4 is not a martyr tale but a short and restrained account which basically deserves historical credit. Cf. M. Stern, "The Death of Onias III," *Zion* 25 (1960): 1–16 (in Hebrew) and Hengel, *Judentum und Hellenismus*, 504 with n. 124, and 510 n. 134: "Unhistorical is only 4:36–38, the revenge of the king on Andronikos as a result of the killing of the former High Priest."

¹⁰⁵ This is the argument by I. L. Seeligman, *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1948), 91–4, and, more recently, by Parente, "Le témoignage de Théodore de

stand. Onias III perished in Daphne and could not have led a Jewish exile community to Heliopolis.”¹⁰⁶ Josephus' (and the Rabbis') ascription of Onias' temple to the High Priest Onias III is erroneous.

In his *Jewish Antiquities*, Josephus himself supplies a different rendition. He tells of the death of Onias III early in the reign of Antiochus IV and the occupation of the High Priesthood by his brother Jason and, later, by Menelaos (*Ant.* XII 237–9¹⁰⁷). According to this account, the founder of the rival temple was Onias IV, the son of Onias III. He had been left as an infant when his father was murdered (*Ant.* XII 387),¹⁰⁸ but he could see himself as the true heir of the High Priesthood which had been held by his family until it was usurped by Menelaos. Josephus tells that at the time when the High Priesthood was conferred from Menelaos to the non-Zadokite Alcimos, Onias settled in Egypt (*Ant.* XII 387). “There he received a place in the home of Heliopolis where he built a temple similar to that in Jerusalem” (*Ant.* XII 388).

In a later passage (*Ant.* XIII 62–72), Josephus explains that Onias had first lived in Alexandria, then he sent to king Ptolemy VI Philometor and queen Cleopatra requesting authority to build a temple and appoint Levites and priests (*Ant.* XIII 63). Josephus even cites the two letters of Onias and Ptolemy (*Ant.* XIII 65–8 and 69–71). From these letters we learn that Onias built the sanctuary on the ruins of a former Egyptian sanctuary dedicated to Bubastis. Onias mentions his former military services on behalf of Ptolemy in Coele-Syria and Phoenicia.¹⁰⁹ He promises that the sanctuary would unify the

Mopsueste sur le sort d' Onias III et la foundation du temple de Léontopolis,,” *REJ* 154 (1995): 429–36, here 434f.

¹⁰⁶ Gruen, “The Origins and Objectives of Onias' Temple,” 51 (cf. 49–51; see also Delcor, “Sanctuaires juifs,” 1318 and 1324f.).

¹⁰⁷ There are some difficulties in this passage. Josephus links Menelaos with the Oniad family and says that he was the youngest brother of Onias III and Jason. This is certainly incorrect (cf. Hengel, *Judentum und Hellenismus*, 509 with n. 133). In fact, Menelaos was a Zadokite, but he was the first High Priest who did not belong to the Oniad family. Probably he was protected by the Tobiads. His successor, Alcimus, was the first non-Zadokite who became High Priest. So, it has some plausibility that Onias IV lost hope of gaining the High Priesthood when he saw that the office was passed on to a simple priest who did not even belong to the noble Zadokite families.

¹⁰⁸ The age of Onias IV, however, cannot be ascertained. It is, therefore, not possible to preclude that the young noble gained military experience in the service of the Ptolemies only a few years after the assassination of his father. On the murder of Onias III cf. 2 Macc 4:34; Dan 9:26; 11:22; *1 En.* 90:8. See also M. Stern, “The Death of Onias III,” and, with problematic conclusions, Parente, “Onias III's Death.”

¹⁰⁹ It is not clear, however, in which war Onias served. At the time of the war between Ptolemy VI and Antiochus IV which took place between 170 and 168 BCE, Onias might have been very young. The later struggles between Ptolemy VI and his brother and rival Ptolemy VIII Euergetes did not take place in Coele-Syria or Phoenicia. But despite these difficulties, it is not justifiable to distrust the account completely (as does Gruen, “The Origins and Objectives,” 53), because we can not ascertain how young Onias actually was

Jews of Egypt and also support the Ptolemaic interests, and, finally, he cites the prophecy of Isaiah that “there shall be an altar in Egypt to the Lord God” (Isa 19:19). In their reply Ptolemy and Cleopatra wonder whether it will be pleasing to God that a temple be built at the place of a former Egyptian sanctuary, but then they permit the project – “if this is to be in accordance with the law” (εἰ μέλλει τοῦτο ἔσθθαι κατὰ νόμον) – because of the prophecy of Isaiah. So, the Egyptian rulers appear as pious protectors of the Jewish faith. They seem to be even more concerned not to sin against God than the priestly offspring Onias. In any case, Josephus says that with the permission of Ptolemy, Onias IV built the sanctuary at the requested place in Leontopolis, “similar to that at Jerusalem, but smaller and poorer” (*Ant.* XII 72).¹¹⁰

But, as the picture of the pious Ptolemaic rulers shows, the letters cited by Josephus are forgeries.¹¹¹ This does not preclude that they might contain valuable historical information, but it is obvious that the information given in the *Jewish Antiquities* is to be interpreted critically as well. It is certainly true that Onias IV is the founder of the temple at Leontopolis. On this point, Josephus has corrected his earlier account, possibly on the basis of an improved study of his sources. But his further explanations and especially the date of Onias’ flight to Egypt deserve discussion.

For the date of the foundation, Josephus’ figures are also confusing. In *J.W.* VII 436 Josephus says that the temple stood for 343 years. This would suggest the date 270 BCE, which is certainly erroneous.¹¹² If Onias went to Egypt when Alcimus was appointed High Priest, this happened at about 162 BCE, or later. But we cannot preclude the possibility that Onias went to Egypt a few years earlier, especially if he stood in the service of the Ptole-

when his father was murdered (probably in 172 or 171 BCE). If νῆπιος (*Ant.* XII 237) and παῖς (*Ant.* XII 387) can mean that he was actually an adolescent (cf. *J.W.* II 220 for Agrippa at the age of seventeen; cf. also *Ant.* XIX 354 and Gal 4:1–2), this does not preclude that the young noble could have gained experiences in military service two or three years after the death of his father (contrary to P. A. Rainbow, “The Last Oniad and the Teacher of Righteousness,” *JJS* 48 (1997): 30–52, here 40f., who conjectures that Onias Egypticus could not have been the son of Onias III. Rainbow then assumes that Onias Egypticus was in fact the nephew of Menelaos, whereas the son of Onias III, whom he calls Simon III, might be the “last Oniad” and the only true son of Zadok of his time, so that Rainbow considers identifying him with the Teacher of Righteousness (p. 51). This learned, but highly speculative theory cannot be discussed here.

¹¹⁰ Details about its dimensions and vessels were already described in *J.W.* VII 426ff.

¹¹¹ Cf. the strong verdict by Gruen, “The Origins and Objectives of Onias’ Temple,” 53: “Only the most determined or committed will find anything of historical value in the exchange of letters between Onias and Ptolemy, supplied by Josephus.”

¹¹² The number 343 must be of symbolic value, because 343 makes up the whole of 7 x 7 x 7 years, that is 7 jubilees. Such an early date, however, was proposed by Hirsch, “*The Temple of Onias*,” 54f. and 74–7. An early date is also suggested by Jerome, *commentarii in Daniele prophetam* III.9.14 who gives the year 250 BCE.

mees. One puzzling document could suggest such an earlier date for his departure: A papyrus letter (CPJI, 132), dated the September 21, 164 BCE, was sent by the διοικητής Herodes to an official of high status whose name has been reconstructed as Ὀνιά (‘‘to Onias’’). But unfortunately, only one letter from the name of the addressee is clearly legible, therefore the document ‘‘cannot serve as a sound basis on which to build complex historical hypotheses.’’¹¹³ So we can only draw on the explanations given by Josephus in his *Jewish Antiquities*.

Following his account, we can say that the sanctuary must have been built between Ptolemy VI Philometor’s return from Rome in 163 BCE and his death in 145 BCE. After Onias’ departure to Egypt a certain amount of time should be allowed for until the project could have been carried out. Josephus’ explanation for the temple project sounds plausible: Onias tried to build a sanctuary when he saw that there was no chance that the High Priestly office would be conferred back to his family, or respectively, to himself. For him, the decisive event was not the defilement of the Temple by Antiochus IV, nor the usurpation of the High Priesthood by Menelaos, but the subsequent appointment of a non-Zadokite as High Priest. One might assume, then, that Onias realized his project not too long after that time.¹¹⁴ Probably the area of Leontopolis had been a settlement of pro- Ptolemaic Judaeans groups or even a military colony before he arrived.¹¹⁵

II. The Motives of Onias and his Followers

If these considerations are basically correct, the reason for the temple project was not the concern for a purified cult nor, e.g., the dispute on calendrical or other halakic issues. Onias was certainly not ‘‘orthodox,’’ but a Hellenized and enlightened member of the Palestinian aristocracy:¹¹⁶ His father Onias III had fled to a pagan sanctuary near Antioch, his uncle Jason had been one of the promoters of the Hellenistic reform in Jerusalem, and the young noble who could not succeed his father and his uncle in the High Priestly office seems to have been concerned more with politics than with piety. He built his rival temple at a time when the sanctuary in Jerusalem had been re-sanctified

¹¹³ Thus Bohak, *Joseph and Aseneth*, 21.

¹¹⁴ Thus Hengel, *Judentum und Hellenismus*, 186 n. 330; cf. Delcor, ‘‘Le Temple d’Onias,’’ 196, who puts the date of the foundation later at 152 BCE; Tcherikover, *Hellenistic Civilization and the Jews*, 279f., even considers a date as late as 145 BCE. But even if a date in the late period of Ptolemy VI cannot be ruled out, an earlier date has more plausibility.

¹¹⁵ Cf. Delcor, ‘‘Sanctuaires juifs,’’ 1326, who conjectures that the place of the temple was already a fortified place, probably a Jewish colony where Onias already had a leading function. See also Tcherikover, *Hellenistic Civilization and the Jews*, 278–80; Modrzejewski, *Les Juifs d’Egypte*, 128.

¹¹⁶ Cf. Hengel, *Judentum und Hellenismus*, 504.

(164 BCE), and, notably, the non-Zadokite High Priest Alcimus was acknowledged even by the Ḥasidim.¹¹⁷

The conservative and pious groups only felt offended when Jonathan in 152 BCE accepted the High Priesthood in addition to his function as political and military leader. Probably this was the reason why the so-called Teacher of Righteousness withdrew from the temple and its cult and formed a community of the pious which is commonly called “Essenes.”¹¹⁸ But the Essenes did not build a schismatic sanctuary or install a new sacrificial cult. They seem to have “spiritualized” important aspects of the Temple cult. But although separate from the Temple, they remained faithful to Jerusalem, in their prayers and in the eschatological expectation of a renewed and purified sanctuary on Mt. Zion. This is the striking difference between two contemporary Zadokite leaders, the Teacher of Righteousness and Onias IV, and their respective groups.¹¹⁹

On the other hand, we might consider the function of the temple at Leontopolis for the Jews in Egypt. Did Onias serve their needs when he requested permission to build a temple at Leontopolis? Tcherikover has shown that the Alexandrian Jews did not need such a sanctuary. They held Jerusalem in high esteem,¹²⁰ and indeed, the temple of Leontopolis is mentioned not even once in Alexandrian Jewish literature, neither in the *Epistle of Aristeas*, nor in 3 Maccabees, nor in the works of Philo.¹²¹ The disregard for Onias’ temple can also be explained by a general lack of interest in the temple cult among the Jews of the Diaspora.¹²² In Egypt, there were already synagogues at that

¹¹⁷ Cf. Tcherikover, *Hellenistic Civilization and the Jews*, 277.

¹¹⁸ Cf. generally A. Lange and H. Lichtenberger, “Qumran,” *TRE* 28:66; H. Stegemann, *Die Essener, Qumran, Johannes der Täufer und Jesus* (Freiburg i. Br.: Herder, 1993), 205ff.; J. Vanderkam, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994), 103f. On the Qumranites’ withdrawal from the Temple, see also the contribution by L. H. Schiffman, “Community without Temple: The Qumran Community’s Withdrawal from the Jerusalem Temple,” in *Gemeinde ohne Tempel – Community Without Temple* (ed. B. Ego, A. Lange, and P. Pilhofer; WUNT 118; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999), 267.

¹¹⁹ It is, therefore, absolutely improbable that the Zadokites at Qumran came from Onias’ temple, as S. H. Steckoll, “The Qumran Sect in Relation to the Temple of Leontopolis,” *RevQ* 6 (1967–68): 55–69, had conjectured.

¹²⁰ Josephus reports that at the time of Ptolemy VI Philometor Alexandrian Jews argued vehemently for the legality of the Jerusalem site against Samaritan claims for Mt. Gerizim (*Ant.* XIII 74–9).

¹²¹ Tcherikover, *Hellenistic Civilization and the Jews*, 278. To explain Philo’s silence, Bohak also recalls the situation in Roman Egypt, when the Oniad settlement had lost its strategic location, and Roman legislation caused a rapid decline of the power of the temples in Egypt – a development which must have affected Onias’ temple as well (*Joseph and Aseneth*, 36f.).

¹²² Thus D. R. Schwartz, “The Jews of Egypt between the Temple of Onias, the Temple of Jerusalem, and Heaven.”

time.¹²³ These facts only confirm the view that there was no urgent need for having their own temple among the Jews of the Egyptian Diaspora.

So, Josephus may be correct when he says that Onias' motives were primarily personal ambitions, the desire "to acquire for himself eternal fame and glory" (*Ant.* XIII 63). "When he came to Egypt, having given up on the chances of assuming the high-priesthood of the Jerusalem temple, he had one major wish: to establish a new temple, in which the Oniads – the legitimate high-priestly line – would serve."¹²⁴

On the other hand, his ambitions must have appeared opportune to Ptolemy VI and Cleopatra II, whose reign had been shaken by numerous external and internal threats during the decade from 170 to 160 BCE.¹²⁵ The Ptolemies had to ascertain the loyalty of the Egyptian Jews, especially since Palestine was under Syrian control. Onias' request could provide a chance to secure their support.¹²⁶ Moreover, "the opportunity of establishing a strong and loyal military commander" at a strategically important location in the eastern part of the Delta, could serve "two important Ptolemaic goals: on the one hand it would defend Egypt against future invasions from the north-east, and on the other hand Onias would keep an eye on the native population whose loyalty could never be taken for granted."¹²⁷ It was certainly not too difficult for Onias to convince Ptolemy that it was in his own interest to grant permission for a Jewish shrine.

Of course there were also religious arguments which could legitimate the construction of a temple in Egypt, especially in the district of Heliopolis.¹²⁸ Josephus mentions the prophecy of Isa 19:18–9, the foretelling of an altar in Egypt (*J.W.* VII 432; *Ant.* XIII 68). A few generations ago, exegetes liked to see that passage as a *vaticinium ex eventu*, a late gloss from Hasmonaean times, which was inserted into the text as a reaction to Onias' temple.¹²⁹ But since the passage is also attested in 1QIsa^a, this suggestion has been put to rest.¹³⁰ The prophecy is certainly older than the erection of Onias' temple. So,

¹²³ The first synagogues emerged in Egypt in the 3rd century BCE, cf. Hengel, "Proseuche und Synagoge: Jüdische Gemeinde, Gotteshaus und Gottesdienst in der Diaspora und in Palästina," in *Judaica et Hellenistica: Kleine Schriften I* (WUNT 90; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1996), 172f.

¹²⁴ Thus Bohak, "The Egyptian Reaction," 36.

¹²⁵ Cf. Bohak, "The Egyptian Reaction," 36.

¹²⁶ This is stressed by Josephus in *J.W.* VII 425.

¹²⁷ Bohak, "The Egyptian Reaction," 37f.

¹²⁸ Thus Gruen, "The Origins and Objectives of Onias' Temple," 60: "The installation of a temple in the Heliopolite nome had religious and cultural meaning, no simple appendage to a soldiers' settlement."

¹²⁹ Cf., e.g., B. Duhm, *Das Buch Jesaja* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1892), 121f.; G. B. Gray, *Isaiah* (ICC; Edinburgh: Clark, 1912), 335.

¹³⁰ Cf. Bohak, *Joseph and Aseneth*, 22. On the textual variants, see pp. 90–2; on the interpretation of Isa 19:18, see Barucq, "Léontopolis," 366–71.

it might have served as legitimation for the temple project of Onias, supplying strong authority for it. "Isaiah's forecast that an altar to Yahweh would someday rise in the midst of Egypt doubtless bolstered Onias' purpose."¹³¹ Any criticism based on Deuteronomy 12 could be rejected on the basis of the prophetic utterance by which the Lord had chosen not only Jerusalem but also a certain place in Egypt. "To Egyptian Jews eager for a holy shrine of their own, a similar rationalization might well suffice."¹³² Moreover, if the passage mentioned "the town of the sun" (*'ir haḥeres*; preserved in 1QIsa^a), this could provide the decisive reason for choosing a place in the district of Heliopolis.

But how did Onias and his followers view their temple? Did they regard themselves as schismatic, as a challenge to Jerusalem? Notably, there are no hints of halakic or doctrinal differences, neither in Josephus nor in the later rabbinic discussions. Even if the temple at Leontopolis was not an exact copy of the Jerusalem Temple,¹³³ the cult must have been basically the same as in Jerusalem. It was certainly not just an incense offering cult (as Mal 1:11 concedes for every place), but a sacrificial cult like that in Jerusalem. That Onias and his group practiced such a cult away from Jerusalem, could be rationalized by use of the Isaian prophecy. But not even Josephus says that the mere existence of such a cult was an offense to the biblical law.

III. Conclusions and Further Considerations

(1) From the accounts of Josephus we can see that the temple rivalry between Jerusalem and Leontopolis was mainly due to the rivalry of priestly families and, in a wider sense, to the political rivalry between the Seleucids and Ptolemes.

(2) The influence of Onias' temple, however, should not be overestimated. The Jews of Egypt esteemed Jerusalem as a center of pilgrimage (cf. *Ep. Arist.* 84–104), and we can not see that the presence of a Jewish shrine in Egypt diminished their loyalty in any way. Perhaps the sanctuary had merely a local influence for the colony in the "land of Onias," a settlement of primar-

¹³¹ Gruen, "The Origins and Objectives of Onias' Temple," 61. There he mentions the remarkable fact that even Josephus "nowhere states or implies that the institution violated Jewish law or practice" (p. 61.).

¹³² Cf. Gruen, "The Origins and Objectives of Onias' Temple," 61.

¹³³ Josephus stresses repeatedly that Onias built his temple "similar to that in Jerusalem" (*J.W.* I 33; *Ant.* XII 388; XIII 67), but in the passage on its closure he describes the differences (*J.W.* VII 428). The most important difference from Jerusalem is that Onias did not make a Menorah, but a single lamp of gold which symbolized the sun as the only source of light and thus the presence of God (cf. Delcor, "Sanctuaire juifs," 1322). Probably, Onias could not make an exact copy of the Jerusalem Temple, so he seems to have developed a different kind of cosmic symbolism which fit better into the context of the Egyptian Diaspora (cf. Delcor, "Sanctuaire juifs"; Hayward, "The Jewish Temple at Leontopolis," 434).

ily strategic importance. Alexandrian Jewish literature does not mention Onias' temple, and even in Palestinian Jewish texts there is no explicit or even polemic reference to the temple of Onias.¹³⁴

(3) Perhaps we can see at another point how the Jerusalem institutions tried to deal with the phenomenon of temple rivalry. In Hasmonaean times there were several attempts to strengthen the spiritual influence of Jerusalem on the inhabitants of the Diaspora. One of these attempts might have been the letters to the "brethren" in Egypt which are preserved in 2 Macc 1:1–9 and 1:10–2:18. The second of these letters, probably a forgery, composed before 63 BCE, mentions the archive of the Temple (2 Macc 2:13f.) and offers frankly the "export" of religious and historical texts to anyone in the Diaspora who would need them. Another attempt to link the Diaspora with Jerusalem was the steady efforts to correct or revise the text of the Septuagint in order to achieve a better correspondence with the (pre-Masoretic) Hebrew text.¹³⁵ Through these efforts we can see how Jerusalem tried more offensively to counter the challenge provided by the phenomenon of the Diaspora in general and – in a specific way – by the existence of a rival temple such as Leontopolis.¹³⁶

IV. Excursus: A Contemporary Parallel to Leontopolis: 'Araq el-Emir

An interesting parallel to the temple of Leontopolis is the building at 'Araq el-Emir in Transjordan, 29 km east of Jericho which is most probably the fortress Tyros built by the Tobiad Hyrcanus in the early 2nd century BCE.¹³⁷ Hyrcanus was the son of the famous Tobiad Joseph, but when his father had died, he lost the struggle against his elder brothers and withdrew to Transjordan, where he built up a fortified residence. Josephus says that he ruled there for seven years, until he committed suicide when Antiochus IV had occupied the throne in 175 BCE (*Ant.* XII 234). The identification of the site with a Tobiad center is confirmed by two "Tobiah" inscriptions and the name *Qaşr el-'Abd*, which means "Fortress of the Servant" and refers clearly to "Tobiah

¹³⁴ Even the Rabbis seem to have acknowledged some degree of sanctity; cf. *m. Menah* 13:10.

¹³⁵ On the Jewish recensions of the Septuagint, see M. Harl, G. Dorival, and O. Munich, *La Bible grecque des Septante: Du judaïsme hellénistique au christianisme ancien* (Paris: Cerf, 1988), 142–58. These recensions go back to the pre-Christian era, some examples have been found at Qumran, e.g., 4QLXXNum (= 4Q121) or papLXXExod (= 7Q1); see Harl, Dorival, and Munich, *La Bible grecque des Septante*, 157f.

¹³⁶ Cf. Hengel, *Judentum und Hellenismus*, 186.

¹³⁷ Cf. Josephus, *Ant.* XII 229–36. On the site see P. W. Lapp and N. L. Lapp, "Iraq el-Emir," *New Encyclopedia of Archaeological Excavations in the Holy Land*, 2:646–9; Campbell, "Jewish Shrines of the Hellenistic and Persian Periods," 162–4, and Hengel, *Judentum und Hellenismus*, 496–503.

the servant, the Ammonite” (Neh 2:10).¹³⁸ Pottery in the fill of the building confirms a date in the early 2nd century. The fact that this is “the only occupation in the vicinity ... between the Early Bronze Age and the Byzantine period, ... provides clear support for Josephus’ attribution of the *Qasr* to Hyrcanus.”¹³⁹

Since the first surveys, scholars have assumed that the building was not just a fortress or a residence, but also a temple.¹⁴⁰ The excavations by Lapp made a compelling case for asserting that the structure is in fact a temple building, “standing comfortably within the developing tradition of Syrian architecture as influenced by Greek canons.”¹⁴¹ But the building was not completed, because “it was abandoned before it was finished,”¹⁴² probably because of the death of Hyrcanus. Even though it might have been used by the followers of Hyrcanus or even other groups of Jews who were “disenchanted with the Jerusalem temple and politically opposed to the Jerusalem alignments.”¹⁴³ The character of the cult, then, was probably more hellenized or even syncretistic, as the lion frieze and other features of the building suggest.¹⁴⁴

Equally interesting are the political implications of the case. Hyrcanus “appears to have sustained an anti-Seleucid posture over against his brothers and Simon the Just in Jerusalem by going to *Iraq el-Emir* in 182 BCE with many dissidents accompanying him; there he held out until the accession of Antiochus Epiphanes probably played its part in leading him to suicide.”¹⁴⁵ This makes up a remarkable parallel to the flight of Onias IV to Egypt about two decades later. Of course, the primary interests of the Tobiad offspring were not cultic, but political and probably economic ones. Unlike Onias, he was not a priest. But, similarly, he withdrew, when he had to abandon his hope for an influential position in Jerusalem. He might have seen the danger that some of his Jewish followers could remain loyal to the Temple which was dominated by his adversaries, his elder brothers and the Oniad High Priests Simon and Onias III.¹⁴⁶ So, with his residence, he also planned a sanctuary in order to secure the loyalty of his followers. This remarkable parallel

¹³⁸ Cf. P. W. Lapp and N. L. Lapp, “*Iraq el-Emir*,” 646.

¹³⁹ P. W. Lapp and N. L. Lapp, “*Iraq el-Emir*,” 648.

¹⁴⁰ See the references in Hengel, *Judentum und Hellenismus*, 496.

¹⁴¹ Thus Campbell, “Jewish Shrines of the Hellenistic and Persian Periods,” 163; cf. also P. W. Lapp and L. Lapp, “*Iraq el-Emir*,” 468. Josephus, however, does not mention that Hyrcanus also built a temple.

¹⁴² Campbell, “Jewish Shrines of the Hellenistic and Persian Periods,” 163.

¹⁴³ Campbell, “Jewish Shrines of the Hellenistic and Persian Periods,” 163.

¹⁴⁴ Thus Hengel, *Judentum und Hellenismus*, 500; cf. for the description of the frieze p. 498, and P. W. Lapp and L. Lapp, “*Iraq el-Emir*,” 468.

¹⁴⁵ Campbell, “Jewish Shrines of the Hellenistic and Persian Periods,” 163f.

¹⁴⁶ Cf. Hengel, *Judentum und Hellenismus*, 499f.

to the case of Leontopolis confirms the impression that the most important motives in the installation of rival temples were always political ones.

D. Some Points for Comparison

(1) None of the three rival temples mentioned was intended to install a new religious tradition separating the respective community from Jerusalem or even from Judaism.

(a) The Elephantine temple was possibly oriented towards Jerusalem, and the leaders of the community show their loyalty to the political authorities in Jerusalem and Samaria concerning the issue of burnt offerings. Although there were some quasi-syncretistic elements in their religious life and in spite of the poor state of information on the development of the biblical tradition they understood themselves to be Jewish and they were concerned to maintain their identity in the Diaspora of Upper Egypt.

(b) The followers of Onias were certainly aware that their cult was founded by a legitimate member of the High Priestly family, whereas in Jerusalem the High Priesthood was given to other families. It is hard to say, whether they saw their temple as a mere interim solution.¹⁴⁷ But even if this was not the case,¹⁴⁸ they certainly regarded themselves as true meals of the Jewish Diaspora.

(c) Even for the Samaritan sanctuary we have to suppose that its founders intended to practice a true Yahwistic cult comparable to that in Jerusalem. The alterations in the Samaritan textual tradition of the Pentateuch and the refusal to accept the Prophets, the Scriptures and the Oral Torah only mirror the later development which resulted in the final division of the religious traditions of Samaritans and Jews. But these final consequences were not implied in the foundation of the sanctuary on Mt. Gerizim.

(2) The most striking point in common is that in each case political motives seem to have been the predominant factor for the building of a temple. Such an institution could not be built and maintained without the permission and support of the political authorities: The temple at Elephantine was obviously supported by the Persian authorities who regulated even specialized matters like the Passover instructions. Its reconstruction was dependent on their permission as well. One might even suppose that the Persians also provided resources for the sacrificial cult, as is attested for the Temple of Jerusalem (Ezra 7:11–26). For the Jewish temple of Leontopolis, the support of Ptolemy

¹⁴⁷ Here the Essenes provide a comparison. They expected the end of the defilement of the Temple and the erection of a new, purified sanctuary in Jerusalem.

¹⁴⁸ Notably the temple at Leontopolis survived the Jerusalem Temple by three years until it was closed by the Romans in 73 CE.

VI is clearly stated by Josephus, and even if the precise circumstances of the foundation of the Samaritan sanctuary remain unclear, we can certainly assume that it was supported by the governor Sanballat or his successors.

In any case, Jerusalem and the respective rival temple were separated by the borderline between two rival powers. As Bickerman has stated, “the fact that Jerusalem, the Spiritual Center of the Diaspora, belonged to one of the rival powers cast suspicion on the loyalty of the Jews under the dominion of the other.”¹⁴⁹ This might have caused the Saitic, Persian, and Ptolemaic rulers to support the Jews under their dominion and to meet their wishes, especially if they were soldiers in their service such as the mercenaries of Elephantine or Onias IV and his followers. A similar political rivalry can also be assumed for Samaria and Jerusalem after Jehud had become an independent province in the time of Nehemiah.

(3) All three rival temples were located outside of Judaea.¹⁵⁰ This might indicate that, especially in later times, no other shrine could compete with the emerging central sanctuary of Judaism. When later Philo (*Spec.* 1.67) and Josephus (*Ant.* IV 200–1; *Ag. Ap.* II 193) highlight that the unity of the temple corresponds to the unity and universality of God,¹⁵¹ this claim did not completely fit the situation in the Diaspora, where another Jewish temple which existed till 73 CE actually stood. But on the other hand, Philo’s argument indicates especially that in his days the temple of Leontopolis could be easily ignored, even by a member of the Egyptian Diaspora. This temple, therefore, was no real threat to the unique position of Jerusalem any more.

The unique function of the Jerusalem Temple for emerging Judaism is also shown by the fact that synagogues first emerged in the Diaspora in the 3rd century BCE,¹⁵² whereas the Palestinian evidence for them is only relatively late. Moreover, in Palestine, they are not called *προσευχή*, as in the Diaspora, but *συναγωγή*, *bêt hakkēneset*, i.e., they are given a quite profane designation which avoids any danger of rivalry with the Temple of Jerusalem.¹⁵³ Only after the destruction of the Second Temple were synagogues able to acquire a more sacred character.¹⁵⁴ These observations confirm that the Tem-

¹⁴⁹ Bickermann, *From Ezra to the Last of the Maccabees: Foundations of Post-Biblical Judaism* (New York: Schocken, 1962), 73.

¹⁵⁰ It is possible that Bethel belonged to Judah in the post-exilic times, but it is not certain that the cult at Bethel continued during that time.

¹⁵¹ Cf. Schmidt, *La pensée du Temple*, 115

¹⁵² Cf. Hengel, “Proseuche und Synagoge,” 172f.

¹⁵³ Cf. Hengel, “Proseuche und Synagoge,” 191.

¹⁵⁴ On the development of the synagogue from a to a more sacred building, see the article by F. G. Hüttenmeister, “Die Synagoge: Ihre Entwicklung von einer multifunktionalen Einrichtung zum reinen Tempelbau,” in *Gemeinde ohne Tempel – Community Without Temple* (ed. B. Ego, A. Lange, and P. Pilhofer; WUNT 118; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999).

ple of Jerusalem had become the unique spiritual center of Judaism. After its destruction in 70 CE, apart from the short episode under the emperor Julian the Apostate,¹⁵⁵ there were no attempts to build a new temple, neither in Jerusalem nor at any place in the Diaspora.

¹⁵⁵ On that incident and the Jewish reactions, see the article by S. Schreiner, “Wo man die Tora lernt, braucht man keinen Tempel – einige Anmerkungen zum Problem der Tempelsubstitution im rabbinischen Judentum,” in *Gemeinde ohne Tempel – Community Without Temple* (ed. B. Ego, A. Lange, and P. Pilhofer; WUNT 118; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999).

III. Qumran and the New Testament

15. Critical Issues in the Investigation of the Scrolls and the New Testament*

From the very earliest period after the first discoveries, the Qumran scrolls have been of major interest to NT scholars, and, in retrospect, the impact of the scrolls has considerably shifted the debate in central areas of NT scholarship. But the utilization of the insights gained from the scrolls provides numerous methodological problems. Thus, caution and the exercise of critical sobriety are required in view of speculative tendencies and sensationalism that have been prominent in the public debate on the scrolls. The debate touches the essence of history-of-religions research, the question of how to explain alleged “parallels” and how to prove “influences” on the level of texts, authors, or religious groups. The issues discussed are most generally the Jewish (as opposed to Gentile, Gnostic), or more distinctly the Palestinian (as opposed to Hellenistic-Jewish), or even particularly the “Qumranian” or “Essene” impact on the teaching of Jesus and the Apostles, the primitive community, or the religious language and theology of NT texts. Quite apart from the question of “influences,” the scrolls provide a wealth of information that helps in the interpretation of the New Testament – on the Palestinian-Jewish “context” of emerging “Christianity,” factions and groups, themes and tendencies of scriptural interpretation, literary production and literary genres, language development and contemporary Aramaic and Hebrew, etc. Especially after the publication of the variety of texts from Qumran, we can see their highest value in illuminating all these fields, much more than simply establishing the existence of a Jewish “sect.”

* The present handbook article provides in some parts a shortened summary of what I had discussed more extensively in two earlier articles: Jörg Frey, “Die Bedeutung der Qumran-Funde 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 (Switzerland): Universitätsverlag and Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2001), 129–208, and idem, “The Impact of the Dead Sea Scrolls on New Testament Interpretation: Proposals, Problems and Further Perspectives,” in *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Princeton Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Vol. 3: The Scrolls and Christian Origins* (ed. J. H. Charlesworth; Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2006), 407–461 (in this volume, pp. 527–578).

A. The Scrolls and New Testament Scholarship

After the earliest years, during which time the discoveries were first noticed by Hebrew Bible scholars (interested in the Isaiah Scroll from Cave 1), the debate of the 1950s and 1960s was dominated by NT scholars. In that period of intense discussion (sometimes called the “Qumran fever”), the focus was trained on the impact of the scrolls on our knowledge of Christian origins. Due to the character of the scrolls from Cave 1 which were published first, to the predominant role of Christian scholars in that period, and to an agenda set by the quest for the origins of Christianity, scholars started inquiring into the dualism found in the scrolls as decisive for the history-of-religions background of NT texts, especially the Gospel of John. They sought analogies in scriptural interpretation, for example, between Habakkuk Peshet and Early Christian exegesis, and parallels in messianism and eschatology, in the figure of the Teacher of Righteousness and his fate and in the character and internal discipline of his community, in the communal meals as related to the Lord’s Supper, in immersions as related to John’s baptism and Christian baptism, and in numerous other real or alleged “parallels.”

Scholars involved in those discussions were, among others, André Dupont-Sommer and Jean Carmignac in France, Karl Georg Kuhn and Otto Betz in Germany, Oscar Cullmann in Switzerland, Matthew Black, William D. Davies, H. H. Rowley and Geza Vermes in Britain, and William H. Brownlee, Joseph A. Fitzmyer, and Raymond E. Brown in North America. The debate is summarized in four collective volumes¹ and in the two-volume account of research by Herbert Braun, a member of the school of Rudolf Bultmann.²

The influence of the Bultmann school also formed the context of the interest of mostly conservative NT scholars in the scrolls. In contrast to Bultmann’s views of a Gnostic background of Paul and, especially, John, the scrolls provided a novel type of dualistic thought supposed to provide the “native soil” of the Johannine language in a non-orthodox type of Judaism,³ thus fostering an alternative reading of John within a more Jewish, or even Palestinian, context.⁴ The Qumran calendar was adduced to explain the diver-

¹ K. Stendahl, ed., *The Scrolls and the New Testament* (New York: Harper, 1957); J. Murphy-O’Connor, ed., *Paul and Qumran* (London: Chapman, 1968); M. Black, *The Scrolls and Christian Origins* (New York: Scribner, 1969), J. H. Charlesworth, “A Critical Comparison of the Dualism in IQS 3:13–4:26 and the ‘Dualism’ Contained in the Gospel of John,” *NTS* 15 (1972): 389–418.

² H. Braun, *Qumran und das Neue Testament* (2 vols.; Tübingen: Mohr, 1966).

³ K. G. Kuhn, “Die in Palästina gefundenen hebräischen Texte und das Neue Testament,” *ZTK* 47 (1950): 192–211, here 209–10.

⁴ 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;

sities in the dating of the Last Supper,⁵ and John the Baptist was linked with the Qumranites,⁶ thus providing also a possible link between the scrolls and the Jesus movement.

It should be noted, however, that all these observations and conclusions were based upon the evidence of only a few scrolls from Cave 1 that were accidentally discovered first, extraordinarily well preserved, and then published quickly after the discoveries. Due to the stagnation of the publication of the large number of smaller fragments, the debate trickled away at the end of the 1960s and was only stimulated again by the publication of the *Temple Scroll*⁷ and then since 1991 by the release of all of the texts from Cave 4.

B. Patterns of Relating the Scrolls and the New Testament or Early Christianity

In scholarship and public discussion, the relationships between Qumran and the NT have been described in various ways. Authors advocating a close connection between the Qumran library and the NT or between the Qumran community (or the “Essenes”) and Early Christianity developed a number of patterns of relating both parts, which seem to be altogether inadequate or at least questionable from the point of view of current scholarship. But due to their popularity, they should be discussed briefly before advocating a more cautious view of the relationship between the Qum library and Early Christian texts.⁸

I. The Qumran Community as a “Prototype” of Christianity? Startling Analogies

One of the first patterns of interpretation was advanced early on by the French scholar André Dupont-Sommer and popularized by the American journalist Edmund Wilson. Dupont-Sommer cautiously retracted some of his

Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1956), 153–71; cf. R. E. Brown, “The Qumran Scrolls and the Johannine Gospel and Epistles,” *CBQ* 17 (1955): 403–19, 559–74.

⁵ A. Jaubert, *La date de la Cène: calendrier biblique et liturgie chrétienne* (Paris: J. Gabalda, 1957).

⁶ W. Brownlee, “John the Baptist in the New Light of Ancient Scrolls,” in *The Scrolls and the New Testament* (ed. K. Stendahl; New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957), 71–90.

⁷ Y. Yadin, *Megillat ham-miqdash: The Temple Scroll* (3 vols. + suppl.; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1977); English edition idem, Y. Yadin, *The Temple Scroll* (3 vols. in 4; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1983).

⁸ The following passages are a shortened summary from Frey, “The Impact of the Dead Sea Scrolls on New Testament Interpretation: Proposals, Problems, and Further Perspectives,” 419–35 (in this volume, 539–554).

early assumptions. According to this pattern, the Qumran community was seen as a forerunner of Early Christianity, and the Righteous Teacher as a prototype of the manner in which Jesus acted or was subsequently described. Even if these views have been completely abandoned in scholarship, some of their implications are still influential in public discussion.

Dupont-Sommer was one of the first scholars to identify the community described in the scrolls with the group of the Essenes mentioned by ancient authors. He was struck by some similarities between the community of the scrolls and Early Christianity. The fact that the community used the term “New Covenant” (1QpHab II 3; cf. CD VI 19, VIII 21, etc.) as a self-designation inspired him to a widescale comparison between this Jewish “New Covenant” and the Christian “New Covenant”:⁹

Everything in the Jewish New Covenant heralds and prepares the way for the Christian New Covenant. The Galilean Master ... appears in many respects as an astonishing reincarnation of the Teacher of Righteousness. Like the latter, He preached penitence, poverty, humility, love of one’s neighbor, chastity. Like him, He prescribed the observance of the Law of Moses Like him, He was the Elect and the Messiah of God, the Messiah redeemer of the world. Like him, He was the object of the hostility of the priests, the party of the Sadducees. Like him, he was condemned and put to death Like him, at the end of time, He will be the supreme judge. Like him, He founded a Church whose adherents fervently awaited His glorious return. In the Christian Church, just as in the Essene Church, the essential rite is the sacred meal. ... And the ideal of both Churches is essentially that of unity, communion in love—even going so far as the sharing of common property The question at once arises, to which of the two sects, the Jewish or the Christian, does the priority belong? Which of the two was able to influence the other? ... In every case ... a borrowing ... was on the part of Christianity. But on the other hand, the appearance of the faith in Jesus – the foundation of the New Church – can scarcely be explained without the real historic activity of a new Prophet, a new Messiah, who has rekindled the flame and concentrated on himself the adoration of men.

These views, originally formulated already in 1950, were then picked up and popularized in 1955 by the American journalist Edmund Wilson.¹⁰ Though realizing that Dupont-Sommer’s analogies were overstated, he viewed the Qumran community and Early Christianity as the successive phases of a single movement. Raising the question why NT scholars had not taken up the subject, he uttered the suspicion that the data from these documents were suppressed because they could be seen as a danger for Christianity by questioning the uniqueness of Christ. In the conviction that it would be an advantage for civilization if the rise of Christianity could be viewed “as simply

⁹ A. Dupont-Sommer, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A Preliminary Survey* (Eng. Translation; Oxford: Blackwell, 1952), 99–100.

¹⁰ E. Wilson, *The Scrolls from the Dead Sea* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1955), 85–6.

an episode of human history rather than ... divine revelation,"¹¹ he hoped that the study of the scrolls would lead to more insight into the historical relativity of Christian claims of uniqueness. Wilson's book had a strong impact on the North American public and spread the idea that there was a greater proximity between the scrolls and Early Christianity than some Christian scholars were willing to concede and that some institutions might be interested in hiding the truth. Such a suspicion served later as a tool to sell popularizing books and novels.¹²

For a learned theologian, however, there is nothing to fear in the idea that Jesus' teaching and the phenomena of Early Christianity have analogies in biblical and post-biblical Judaism. But the wide scale analogies initially drawn by Dupont-Sommer were based on some misreadings of the scrolls. In fact, there is no evidence that the Righteous Teacher viewed himself as a Messiah, nor that his followers considered him a messianic figure.¹³ In spite of the passage that mentions a persecution of the Teacher (1QpHab XI 2–8), none of the documents gives evidence for a violent death, let alone crucifixion.¹⁴

More recently, the idea that some scroll texts evidence or even were written by a Messianic figure was renewed in different ways by Michael O. Wise and Israel Knohl who suggested respectively that the Messiah of the scrolls was a certain Judah who died around 72 BCE¹⁵ or the Essene prophet Menachem who was killed in the upheavals after Herod's death in 4 BCE.¹⁶ Both figures are mentioned by Josephus as Essenes, but there is no evidence that either of them authored texts like, for example, the exaltation hymn 4Q491. Apart from the question of the identity and date of the Teacher of Righteousness, the parallels drawn by both authors are over-hypothetical and far-fetched to allow for the assumption of a suffering and at the same time divine messianic figure in the scrolls.¹⁷ Thus, the idea that the fate of Jesus or the

¹¹ E. Wilson, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: 1947–1969* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1969), 107.

¹² E.g., M. Baigent and R. Leigh, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Deception* (New York: Summit, 1991).

¹³ G. Jeremias, *Der Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1963), 285; J. Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte aus Qumran* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998), 455–8.

¹⁴ On 4Q285 fr. 5, see J. J. Collins, *The Scepter and the Star: The Messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Ancient Literature* (New York: Doubleday, 1998), 105–6.

¹⁵ M. O. Wise, *The First Messiah: Investigating the Saviour Before Jesus* (San Francisco: Harper San Francisco, 1999).

¹⁶ I. Knohl, *The Messiah before Jesus: The Suffering Servant of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000).

¹⁷ For criticism, see J. J. Collins, "A Messiah Before Jesus?" in *Christian Beginnings and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 2006), 15–35.

essence of his claims were prefigured in the Teacher or other figures of the scrolls does not stand up to critical scrutiny.

Other analogies between the Qumran community and Early Christianity might be explained either by sharing common Jewish traditions or by sociological analogies, but none of them proves any particular influence of the Qumran group on Jesus or on the Primitive Community. Dupont-Sommer's views, inspired by the idea of the nineteenth-century author Ernest Renan that Christianity was the successful branch of Essenism, cannot be maintained. The Qumran community is not a prototype of Early Christianity.

II. Qumran Texts as a Window on Early Christian History?

Another popular theory has to be mentioned briefly, although it is completely misleading. A few scholars have claimed that the scrolls actually tell the history of Early Christianity in an allegorical manner. Thus, the American scholar Robert Eisenman¹⁸ expressed the view that there was a "Zadokite" movement encompassing Ezra, Judas Maccabaeus, John the Baptist, Jesus, and his brother James. Jesus with his group and the Qumran group are regarded by Eisenman as parts of a single movement of Jewish protest against Rome. The starting point for these views is the superficial similarity between the term "Righteous Teacher" and the epithet of James "the Just" (added subsequently), which caused Eisenman to identify the teacher with James, the brother of Jesus and, consequently, the "Liar," a figure who opposed the Righteous Teacher, with Paul. Based on the assumption that the Qumran authors used a particular method of wordplay to conceal the historical events behind dark allusions, the scrolls are read as mirroring Jewish-Christian-Zealot polemic against the apostle Paul, who is viewed not only as an apostate from Judaism but also as an agent of the Romans.

Another, even more fantastic view was developed by the Australian scholar Barbara Thiering.¹⁹ Like Eisenman advocating a late Herodian, i.e. first-century CE date of the scrolls, she identifies the Righteous Teacher with John the Baptist, while the "Wicked Priest" and the "Liar" are thought to point to Jesus himself. Reading not only the scrolls but also the NT texts as allegories, Thiering constructed a bizarre account of the "new" life of Jesus, from his birth near Qumran, his education by the Essenes, and his initiation into the Community by John the Baptist, until his marriages with Mary of Magdala

¹⁸ R. Eisenman, *Maccabees, Zadokites, Christians and Qumran: A New Hypothesis of Qumran Origins* (Leiden: Brill, 1983), idem, *James the Just in the Habakkuk Peshier* (Leiden: Brill, 1986), idem, *James the Brother of Jesus: the Key to Unlocking the Secrets of Early Christianity and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York: Viking, 1996).

¹⁹ B. Thiering, *Redating the Teacher of Righteousness* (Sydney: Theological Explorations, 1979); idem, *Jesus and the Riddle of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Unlocking the Secrets of His Life Story* (San Francisco, CA: Harper Collins, 1992).

and, later, with Lydia of Philippi, and a journey to Rome where traces of him finally disappear.

The argument that destroys all these constructions is the dating of the texts. A Christian date of the majority of the scrolls was already excluded by palaeography,²⁰ and the uncertainties were finally removed by the application of the radiocarbon method that has widely confirmed the earlier palaeographical dating.²¹ Eisenman and Thiering neglect or even reject the results of the scientific dating methods. Their fantastic readings are, therefore, beyond the range of sound scholarship. In fact, the Qumran texts are not a reflection of Early Christian history, and none of the figures known from Early Christianity are mentioned in the scrolls.

III. Christian Documents within the Qumran Library? The Problem of Cave 7

A view popularized in conservative Christian circles is about the fragments from Cave 7, some of which were purported to represent NT texts. In this cave only Greek fragments were found. Some of them were identified earlier, one (7Q1) as part of a manuscript of the LXX of Exodus, another (7Q2) as a copy of the Epistle of Jeremiah. Others remained unidentified in the DJD edition since the few legible letters did not allow identification with any known text. In 1972, the Catalan papyrologist Jose O'Callaghan proposed an identification of 7Q5 with Mark 6:52–3 and 7Q4 with 1 Tim 3:16–4:3.²² If this were true, it would suggest a date of Mark and 1 Timothy considerably before 68 CE, contrary to the majority views in NT scholarship. The idea that such an early date could help defend Mark's historical reliability and the authenticity of 1 Timothy explains the wide appeal of the theory among some Evangelicals.

The suggestions, however, were immediately rejected by some of the leading scholars on the scrolls,²³ on papyrology²⁴ and NT textual history.²⁵ But in 1984, Carsten Peter Thiede – a specialist in literature, but an autodidact in

²⁰ F. M. Cross, "The Development of the Jewish Scripts," in *The Bible and the Ancient Near East* (ed. G. E. Wright; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1961), 133–202.

²¹ J. C. VanderKam and P. W. Flint, *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York: Harper San Francisco, 2002), 20–33.

²² J. O'Callaghan, "¿Papiros neotestamentarios en la Cueva 7 de Qumrán," *RevQ* 13 (1972): 629–33.

²³ M. Baillet, "Les manuscrits de la grotte 7 de Qumrán et le Nouveau Testament," *Biblica* 53 (1972/73): 508–61; 54: 340–50.

²⁴ C. H. Roberts, "On Some Presumed Papyrus Fragments of the New Testament from Qumran," *JTS* 23 (1972): 446–7.

²⁵ K. Aland, "Neue neutestamentliche Papyri III: (1) Die Papyri aus Höhle 7 von Qumran und ihre Zuschreibung zum Neuen Testament durch J. O'Callaghan," *NTS* 20 (1974): 358–76.

papyrology – started to defend the identification of 7Q5 with Mark 6:52–3.²⁶ Thiede also suggested unusually early dates for other Gospel papyri and utilized new technological tools for improving the legibility of 7Q5,²⁷ but the better images that they produced have instead allowed experts to reject even more firmly the proposed identification. On the tiny fragment of 7Q5 only twenty partial or whole letters are clearly legible, spread over four subsequent lines, and the only complete word is a simple “and” (KAI). The identification with Mark 6:52–3 was originally based on the sequence of letters *NNHS* which could be part of the local name “Gennesaret” but also part of a Greek verb form such as *egennēsen* or some such. If the identification with Mark 6:52–3 were correct, then there would be three major differences within three lines from the presumed original text of Mark, one of the variants proposed being syntactically quite impossible. Thus, the identification must be regarded as definitively falsified.²⁸

Notably, other fragments from Cave 7 could be identified as parts of *I Enoch*,²⁹ and for 7Q5 alternative identifications with Zech 7:3c–5 and *I Enoch* 15:9d–10 were proposed.³⁰ All these suggestions fit much better into the context of the Qumran Library than do NT texts.

The result is clear. None of the fragments from Qumran contains the text of a Gospel or an Epistle from the NT. There is no textual bridge between the NT and the Qumran Library. So, there is also no reason to speculate on the presence of Christians at Qumran.

²⁶ C. P. Thiede, “7Q – Eine Rückkehr zu den neutestamentlichen Papyrusfragmenten in der siebten Höhle von Qumran,” *Biblica* 65 (1984): 538–59; idem, *The Earliest Gospel Manuscript? The Qumran Papyrus 7Q5 and Its Significance for New Testament Studies* (London: Paternoster, 1992).

²⁷ C. P. Thiede and G. Masuch, “Confocal Laser Scanning and the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years after Their Discovery* (ed. E. Tov, G. Marquis, and L. H. Schiffman; Israel: Israel Exploration Society, 2000): 895–905.

²⁸ G. Stanton, *Gospel Truth? New Light on Jesus and the Gospels* (London: HarperCollins, 1995), 28–9; R. H. Gundry, “No NU in Line 2 of 7Q5: A Final Disidentification of 7Q5 with Mark 6:52–53,” *JBL* 118 (1999): 698–707; S. Enste, *Kein Markustext in Qumran: Eine Untersuchung der These: Qumran-Fragment 7Q5=Mk 6,52–53* (Freiburg: Universitätsverlag; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000).

²⁹ G. Nebe, “7Q4 – Möglichkeit und Grenze einer Identifikation,” *RevQ* 13 (1988): 629–33; E. A. Muro, “The Greek Fragments of Enoch from Qumran Cave 7,” *RevQ* 18 (1997): 307–12; É. Puech, “Sept fragments de la lettre d’Hénoch (1 Hén 100, 103 et 105) dans la grotte 7 de Qumrân,” *RQ* 18 (1997): 313–24.

³⁰ M. V. Spottorno, “Can Methodological Limits be Set in the Debate on the Identification of 7Q5?” *DSD* 6 (1999): 66–77, here 72–6.

IV. Personal Links between Essenes and the Primitive Church? The Hypothesis of an Essene Quarter in Jerusalem

A fourth pattern suggests not textual but local and personal links between the Essene movement and Early Christianity, due to the presence of an Essene quarter situated on the southwestern hill of Jerusalem (Mt. Zion) where moreover later tradition locates the Last Supper and Pentecost.³¹ If the evidence were conclusive, this archaeological identification might open up the possibility of Essene influences on the Primitive Community. But the interpretation of the data is not indisputable and the conclusions drawn are not beyond serious doubts.³²

First, the argument is based on the view that the inhabitants of Qumran belonged to the Essenes, who were not only in Qumran but, according to Josephus (*J.W.* II 124), spread all over Judaea. From the excavator of Qumran, Roland de Vaux, scholars adopted the view that the site was abandoned for a period of time, presumably due to an earthquake (and fire) in 31 BCE.³³ According to de Vaux, the resettlement did not happen before the period of Archelaus (4 BCE–6 CE). Taking into consideration that, according to Josephus, Herod the Great (37–4 BCE) favored the Essenes (*Ant.* XV 373–8), “scholars have raised the possibility that the Essenes inhabited the Holy City during a period when the political climate was in their favor.”³⁴ This suggestion, however, is weakened by a more recent assessment of the archaeological and numismatic evidence that suggests that the settlement was abandoned not before 9/8 BCE and that it was reoccupied soon thereafter.³⁵ Thus the link between the time of Herod and the presumed abandonment of Khirbet Qumran can no longer be maintained.

A second, rather fundamental argument is based on Josephus’ mention of a gate within the city wall of Jerusalem named the “gate of the Essenes” and a place called “Bethso” in *J.W.* V 145. The “Essene gate” was identified with a

³¹ B. Pixner, “An Essene Quarter on Mount Zion?” in *Studia Hierosolymitana I* (Jerusalem: Franciscan Printing, 1976), 245–85; idem, “The History of the ‘Essene Gate’ Area,” *ZDPV* 105 (1989): 96–104; R. Riesner, “Jesus, the Primitive Community, and the Essene Quarter of Jerusalem,” in *Jesus and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. J. Charlesworth; New York: Doubleday, 1992), 198–234.

³² R. H. Bauckham, “The Early Jerusalem Church, Qumran and the Essenes,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls as Background to Postbiblical Judaism and Early Christianity* (ed. J. Davila; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 63–89, here 66–74; M. Küchler, *Jerusalem* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2007), 648–51.

³³ Josephus, *J.W.* I 370–380; *Ant.* XV 121–47.

³⁴ Riesner, “Jesus, the Primitive Community, and the Essene Quarter in Jerusalem,” 207.

³⁵ J. Magness, “The Chronology of the Settlement at Qumran in the Herodian Period,” *DSD* 2 (1995), 58–75; idem, *The Archaeology of Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2002), 47–72.

location discovered by F. J. Bliss as early as 1894, and excavated – albeit not too accurately – between 1977 and 1985.³⁶ The term “Bethso,” interpreted as a transliteration of Aramaic *bêt tso’âh* (“latrine”), was related to a passage in 11QT^a XLVI 13–16 on the construction of a latrine outside the city. Thus, it was conjectured that the “gate of the Essenes” was the separate gate used only by the Essenes (according to their purity rules) when going to the latrines outside the city walls. The inference is that their living quarter would be nearby. But even if the interpretation of “Bethso” is correct, it remains uncertain whether and to what extent the laws of the Temple Scroll were observed by the Essenes in Qumran and elsewhere and, moreover, how the “gate of the Essenes” should link with the places where they lived inside or outside the city.

Advocates of the hypothesis try to fill the lacuna by pointing to a number of ritual baths or *miqvaoth* found on Mt. Zion in the area of the supposed Essene quarter, including a double bath outside the city wall with a separate entrance and exit, which are often interpreted as a particular feature of Essene baths due to similar constructions at Qumran. However, recent excavations, e.g. near the Temple Mount, have shown that baths like that were much more common and cannot be interpreted as particularly Essene constructions. They are simply public baths.³⁷ Thus, the Essene character of the ritual baths on Mt. Zion cannot be ascertained.

The last pillar of the theory involves traces of Jewish Christian presence on the southwestern hill in late Roman times.³⁸ The evidence adduced for an early Jewish-Christian use of the site includes a niche in the room known as David’s tomb which is oriented towards the rock of Golgatha and some graffiti which suggest a Jewish-Christian use of the building. But the tradition of the location of the Last Supper in that area is rather late and cannot be indubitably traced back to the Herodian period. Thus, a Jewish-Christian presence or veneration of the place in the first two centuries is far from established. Even more speculative, therefore, is the view that the earliest Jewish-Christian community in Jerusalem (i.e., the apostles) was in proximity to or even personal continuity with a living quarter of the Essenes. Although it is quite plausible that Essenes lived in Jerusalem, the attempts to locate their living quarter precisely or to link it with the earliest Christian community cannot be established with certainty. There is no indisputable evidence for the

³⁶ B. Pixner, D. Chen, and S. Margalit, “Mount Zion: The ‘Gate of the Essenes’ Re-excavated,” *ZDPV* 105 (1989): 85–95; R. Riesner, *Essener und Urgemeinde in Jerusalem* (2nd ed.; Gießen: Brunnen, 1998), 14–30.

³⁷ Magness, *The Archaeology of Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 146–7; R. Reich, “Miqwa’ot at Khirbet Qumran and the Jerusalem Connection,” in *Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years After Their Discovery* (Israel: Israel Exploration Society, 2000), 728–31.

³⁸ Riesner, “Jesus, the Primitive Community, and the Essene Quarter of Jerusalem,” 198–206; idem, *Essener und Urgemeinde in Jerusalem*, 38–55.

idea that Jesus and the Apostles were related to the Essenes or that Essenes joined or influenced the Primitive Community. These speculations cannot provide a historical framework for interpreting the relationship between the NT and Qumran texts.

C. Methodological Considerations³⁹

When positing a link between the scrolls and the NT, we have to face two problems:

- (a) Neither Jesus nor any other person known from Early Christianity is mentioned in the documents from the Qumran library.
- (b) There is no mention of Qumran or of the group of the Essenes in any NT text.

The latter observation is even more astonishing and calls for explanation. Why do NT authors mention Pharisees and Sadducees but no “Essenes,” although – according to Josephus (*Ant.* XVIII 20; cf. Philo, *Prob.* 75) – they were not a mere marginal sect but a religious party with a considerable influence. Does the silence of the NT authors signify distance between Early Christianity and the Qumran group or Essenism, or close relations? Are the Essenes hidden behind or among other terms, such as Sadducees, Pharisees, Scribes, “Herodians” (Mark 3:6, 12:13; Matt 22:16), or “Priests” (Acts 6:7)? On these issues one can only speculate. The sources do not provide any clear evidence. In particular, there is no textual evidence for any personal or historical relationship between the Essenes and Jesus or earliest Christianity.

It is, of course, possible that Jesus met Essenes – at least in Jerusalem, where Essenes were most likely present, but also in Galilee. It is also possible or even probable that the earliest Christian community and other followers of Jesus came in contact with some members of this faction, especially in Jerusalem. But considering that Essenes or the members of the Qumran community were bound to conceal “the secrets of knowledge” (1QS IV 5–6; cf. X 24–5; Josephus, *J.W.* II 141), and that the instructor should not “argue with the men of the pit” but “hide the counsel of the law in the midst of the men of injustice” (1QS IX 16–17), we cannot presuppose that the particular insights of that group were discussed publicly. Josephus’ account of the Essenes shows how an “outsider” could perceive the particularities of the Essenes but ignore their ideological, scriptural motivation.

Of course, a certain influence on the Jesus movement cannot be ruled out, but the sources remain silent, and analogies in community organization,

³⁹ The following paragraph is a reworking of Frey, “The Impact of the Dead Sea Scrolls on New Testament Interpretation: Proposals, Problems and Further Perspectives,” 435–443 (in this volume, 554–561).

communal meals, the community of goods, or some other issues might better be explained by similarities in the situation of the respective groups or by the common reception of biblical and post-biblical traditions. The question is, therefore, which textual parallels require us to assume a textual or even personal “influence.”

It is also possible that some Essenes became followers of Jesus, in the early period (as is sometimes conjectured from Acts 6:7) or later, after the destruction of Qumran and the Temple in 68 and 70 CE.⁴⁰ But in view of the radical position of the Qumran texts on ritual purity, such conversions would be more astonishing than that of the Pharisee Saul/Paul. The development within the early Christian community, its growing openness for non-Jews, and the increasing liberality in purity matters were more offensive to a member of the Essenes than to a Pharisee. One cannot assume, therefore, that after 70 CE they simply had to move from one “messianic” movement to another.⁴¹ Therefore the assumption of a reinforced Essene influence in the NT documents of the third generation (e.g., Matthew, John, Ephesians, or Hebrews) is even more questionable than the speculations on an Essene influence on Jesus or the Jesus movement in the earliest period.

The aporias call for an approach that is not based on speculation but on the sober comparison of the textual evidence. And, in contrast to the early periods of the Qumran debate, the consideration of a large number of manuscripts and fragments and of the recent developments in Qumran research leads to a more sophisticated set of questions.

The most important change in research (in contrast with the early debate) was caused by the publication of the fragments from Cave 4, representing a vast variety of parabiblical, calendrical, sapiential, liturgical, and halakic texts. As a result, the Qumran library now appears much more diverse and multifaceted than before. Moreover, beginning with the publication of the *Temple Scroll* and Lawrence H. Schiffman’s Jewish “reclaiming” of the scrolls⁴² the agenda has switched from more “Christian” topics to other issues of literary genre, biblical interpretation, and especially halakic matters.

The appreciation of the diversity within the library leads to a widely accepted distinction between “sectarian” and “non-sectarian” documents. It is to be considered now that the majority of documents preserved at Qumran were originally composed not by members of the Qumran group, the “Essenes” or the *yahad*, but within other Jewish groups, and were only copied or simply

⁴⁰ J. H. Charlesworth, “The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Gospel according to John,” in *Exploring the Gospel of John* (ed. R. A. Culpepper and C. C. Black; Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 1996), 65–97, here 89.

⁴¹ Thus Charlesworth, “The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Gospel according to John.”

⁴² L. H. Schiffman, *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Philadelphia, PA: Jewish Publication Society, 1994).

studied and collected by members of the community. They are, therefore, not necessarily significant for the group's views, but give evidence of a variety of views held within other Jewish groups of the third to first centuries BCE. Probably all the Aramaic documents, most of the sapiential texts, the majority of the parabiblical texts and previously unknown pseudepigrapha, and even a passage such as the well-known "Treatise on the Two Spirits" (1QS III 13–IV 26) belong to the literary treasure the Qumran community inherited from other Jewish circles, or from precursor groups of the *yahad*. Thus, the significance of the Dead Sea Scrolls for biblical exegesis is based not only on the "sectarian" texts of the Qumran community, but even more on the non-sectarian texts. These documents have opened up a new and broader perspective on the Jewish literature of the Second Temple period, and they demonstrate that Judaism at that time was much more pluriform and multifaceted than scholars previously thought. For the interpretation of the NT, it is relevant that we can now draw a much more detailed picture of the religious groups in contemporary Judaism. This also helps us place emerging Christianity within its Jewish context.

Before the Qumran discoveries, there were practically no Hebrew or Aramaic documents from Palestinian Judaism at the turn of the era. Information was available from the Books of the Maccabees, from various pseudepigrapha (mostly preserved solely in secondary translations), from Josephus and Philo, and from later rabbinic sources. Scholars spoke of a "normative" type of Palestinian Judaism in the world around Jesus drawing on the rabbinic literature and some apocalyptic writings such as *4 Ezra* or *2 Baruch*. In view of the variety within the documents from Qumran, this has changed completely.⁴³ Now it is obvious that there was no normativity, but rich diversity, in Palestinian Judaism before 70 CE, and even the construction of a "common Judaism" is questionable in light of the scrolls. It is now possible to describe Jesus and Primitive Christianity not only in contrast with some "normative" type of Judaism, but within a wide matrix of Palestinian Jewish traditions. Numerous terms from the New Testament that were thought to be influenced by non-Jewish, Hellenistic, syncretistic, or gnostic ideas can now be explained from the multitude of Jewish traditions evident within the Qumran library.

So, the type of questions to be asked has changed. Whereas earlier scholarship simply asked for "parallels" and often drew premature conclusions about an alleged influence of the Qumran community or the Essenes on Early Christianity, the questions deserve to be asked with greater distinction:

⁴³ Fitzmyer, "The Qumran Scrolls and the New Testament After Forty Years," *RevQ* 13 (1988): 609–20, here 609–10.

- (1) First of all, there is need to describe clearly and classify the parallels: What is parallel? Is it a single term or a specific notion, is it a phrase, an idea, a literary structure or genre, or a feature of the life of a community behind the texts? And what is the “degree” of the parallel? Is there a very close (or even verbal) correspondence, or is there only a loose analogy?
- (2) Considering the distinction between “sectarian” and “non-sectarian” documents, the issue must be refined: Is the assumed Qumran parallel a particular feature of “sectarian” (or Essene) documents or does it occur also in other, “non-sectarian” and possibly earlier documents? Are there differences or hints of a development within the Qumran library? And if so, which type or stage comes closest to the NT parallel? Only from such a more precise inquiry can we consider textual relations or influences. In this respect, the “non-sectarian” documents (e.g., the parabiblical or sapiential documents) provide more “direct” relations with NT texts than the “sectarian” or texts that were most probably not accessible to non-members of the group. In many cases, it is more legitimate to interpret the Qumran parallels as a part of the Palestinian-Jewish matrix⁴⁴ shared by Qumran and NT texts than as evidence of Qumranian or Essene influences on Early Christianity or NT authors.
- (3) In order to develop an adequate view of the history-of-religions, it is also important to keep in mind that the search for Qumran parallels should not lead to a one-sided view of, for example, Paul or the Gospel tradition. Not everything in the NT texts can be explained from the matrix of Palestinian Judaism. We must also take into consideration the impact of Hellenistic Judaism, not only in the Diaspora but also in Palestine, and – to a lesser extent – the impact of the Gentile world. When considering Qumran “parallels,” we should be prepared to ask whether other parallels from other traditions can eventually provide a better explanation for the phrases and ideas in the NT.

D. Insights on John the Baptist, Jesus, Paul, and John

It is not possible to give a comprehensive account of parallels or possible connections between Qumran and NT texts. Instead, the focus will be on four major areas of NT research. Here a variety of methodological problems can be studied, and scholars can gain a broad variety of insights different from the patterns sketched above.

⁴⁴ Fitzmyer, “The Qumran Scrolls and the New Testament After Forty Years,” 610.

I. John the Baptist: A Test Case for Analogies and Differences

An interesting test case for the discussion of similarities and dissimilarities is the figure of John the Baptist, who is often considered to be closely related to Qumran or the Essenes. His priestly descent, his ascetic lifestyle in the desert, and the possible proximity to the place of Qumran led scholars to consider a closer relationship with the community.⁴⁵ John's concern for eschatological purity and his rite of purification by immersion invite comparison with the Essene purification rites. Both are linked to repentance (1QS V 1, 8, 14), to atonement of sins (1QS III 6–9), and the notion of an eschatological cleansing (1QS IV 21). Moreover, John's diet and clothing were interpreted not only as a sign of a prophet but also as the refusal to accept provisions from others according to the Essene purity rules (1QS V 16–17; Jos., *J.W.* II 143), or, even more precisely, as a practice of Essene dietary law (CD XII 12–15).⁴⁶ Scholars have, therefore, speculated that John was possibly raised by the Essenes (cf. Luke 1:80), that he was influenced by the Qumran community, or was a member until he left them or was expelled and then began his own baptizing ministry, all the while still feeling obliged to the vows of celibacy and separation.⁴⁷ But most interpreters have remained skeptical of such conjectures,⁴⁸ because most of the parallels are far from unique, and the differences are also striking.

First, the link with the Judean wilderness or even the proximity to Qumran does not constitute a relationship, and the early speculations were too strongly based on the view that linked the "Essenes" only with Qumran and the desert. Second, the expectation of the eschatological judgement and of an eschatological figure was widespread in contemporary Judaism and by no

⁴⁵ Brownlee, "John the Baptist in the New Light of Ancient Scrolls"; J. A. T. Robinson, "The Baptism of John and the Qumran Community," in *Twelve New Testament Studies* (London: SCM, 1962), 11–27; cf. Braun, *Qumran und das Neue Testament*, 1–29; C. H. H. Scobie, "John the Baptist," in *The Scrolls and Christianity* (ed. M. Black; London: SPCK, 1969), 58–69.

⁴⁶ S. L. Davies, "John the Baptist and Essene Kashruth," *NTS* 29 (1983): 569–71; J. H. Charlesworth, "John the Baptizer and Qumran Barriers in Light of the Rule of the Community," in *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. D. W. Parry and E. Ulrich; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 353–75, here 367–8; but see J. A. Kelhoffer, "Did John the Baptist eat like a former Essene? Locust-eating in the ancient Near East and at Qumran," *DSD* 11 (2004): 293–314.

⁴⁷ Charlesworth, "John the Baptizer and Qumran Barriers in Light of the Rule of the Community."

⁴⁸ H. H. Rowley, "The Baptism of John and the Qumran Sect," in *New Testament Essays* (ed. A. J. B. Higgins; Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1959), 218–29; J. Pryke, "John the Baptist and the Qumran Community," *RevQ* 4 (1964): 483–96; J. E. Taylor, *The Immerser: John the Baptist within Second Temple Judaism* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1997).

means confined to the Qumran group, although the Qumran library provides us with many interesting examples. The same is true for the ideological distance from the Jerusalem temple establishment and the contemporary society. Most interesting is the striking analogy in the reference to Isa 40:3 in the *Community Rule* (1QS VIII 12–16; IX 19–20) and in NT texts on the Baptist, in Mark 1:3 (cf. Matt 3:3, Luke 3:4–6) and in John 1:23, where it is even placed on the lips of John himself. Although the use of the passage by the historical John cannot be established, the link between Isa 40:3 and the prophecy of the return of Elijah make it plausible that John was inspired by that passage: Isa 40:3 is also alluded to in Mal 3:1 where the messenger to be sent is closely related to Elijah (cf. Mal 3:23). Here we find the image of judgement with fire (Mal 3:2–3 and 3:19), and the message of repentance (Mal 3:7 and 3:24). Elijah is mentioned as the last one who warns before the “great and terrible day” of judgement (Mal 3:23–4).

The reference to Elijah is also important for the place where John acted: according to 2 Kgs 2:6–8, Elijah crossed the river Jordan where Israel had entered the Land, and was then carried away beyond the Jordan. John preached and baptized “beyond the Jordan” (John 1:28), possibly near the trade route where people entered the land, thus acting as a new Elijah, calling for repentance and offering a baptism of forgiveness of sins. Whereas most elements are anticipated in Mal 3, Isa 40:3 adds the notion of the desert. Thus, John’s appearance could be viewed as a verbal fulfilment of the prophecy of Isa 40:3: “In the desert prepare a way for the Lord.” By contrast, the use of Isa 40:3 in 1QS is completely different. There, “preparing the way of the Lord” is linked with the communal study of the Torah: “This is the study of the Torah which he commanded through Moses to do” (1QS VIII 15). The communal attention to sacred Scriptures is viewed as the fulfilment of the prophecy, and one might ask whether the mention of the desert could motivate some members to go to study the Scriptures. Drawing on the same scriptural passage, the Essenes and John envisage a divergent mode of “fulfilment”: for the Baptizer, it is linked with the Elijah tradition, which finds no counterpart in the Essene understanding; moreover, the Essene interpretation of Isa 40:3 is unrelated to the community’s ablutions or the motif of sin and repentance.

Even more striking differences can be seen in the purification rites: whereas for the Essenes immersion was a regular, or even daily practice, John’s baptism was granted once. The Essenes practiced immersion by themselves; the Baptizer practiced baptism in the Jordan. The ablutions of the Essenes were limited to full members who had passed through the stages of initiation, whereas John preached publicly and baptized people willing to repent immediately. Essene purification rituals could be carried out at any place, whereas John baptized in the Jordan, where Israel once had entered the Holy Land and

Elijah had been taken away. Thus, the eschatological ritual of John's baptism differs significantly from the Essene purity rites.⁴⁹

In the wider context of contemporary Judaism, John's "spiritual" brothers are not primarily the Essenes but the eschatological prophets. His baptism cannot be explained from the Essene rites. But the Qumran texts on purity, eschatology, and scriptural interpretation do provide a much more refined tool for understanding the Baptizer in the context of his religious environment.

II. The "Historical" Jesus, and New Insights on Messianism and Christology

The situation is much more complex regarding the historical Jesus and Early Christology. Here the quest for parallels is hindered by the methodological difficulties of isolating the earliest tradition or even reconstructing Jesus' authentic sayings. In spite of this, the texts from Qumran can illuminate numerous issues in research of the Jesus tradition, of themes, texts, genres, etc.⁵⁰ The evidence clearly supports the view that Jesus' words and works are firmly embedded in the debates and language of Palestinian Jewish tradition, and it provides a broader background for explaining emerging Christology from the variety of Jewish Messianic ideas. In the present context, I can only give a brief and selective overview about some of the most important issues.

Initially it must be repeated that all the earlier theories (influenced in part by the age of Enlightenment) that Jesus was linked with the Essenes, that he had developed his universalistic views in such a "heterodox" Jewish milieu (in contrast with Jewish "orthodoxy"), that he was instructed as a healer by the Essenes (cf. Philo's *Therapeutae*), or that he even survived crucifixion through their therapy to start a "second life," can be dismissed. All these ideas may serve fiction, but are no part of serious scholarship. Nor can the view be ascertained that Jesus might have celebrated the Last Supper according to the Essene calendar⁵¹ or in the "Essene quarter." The differences between the passion chronology in the Synoptics and John cannot be bridged by the assumption that Jesus (or John) used the Qumran calendar.

Soon after the first discoveries, Jesus was often compared with the Righteous Teacher,⁵² but the differences between the two personalities, their situation and intentions, are greater than the parallels. This seems quite obvious

⁴⁹ H. Stegemann, *Die Essener, Qumran, Johannes der Täufer und Jesus* (Freiburg: Herder, 1993), 306–11.

⁵⁰ C. A. Evans, "Jesus in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years* (1999), 2:573–98.

⁵¹ A. Jaubert, "The Calendar of Qumran and the Passion Narrative in John," in *John and Qumran* (ed. J. H. Charlesworth; London: Chapman, 1962), 62–77.

⁵² Dupont-Sommer, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*; Braun, *Qumran und das Neue Testament*, 54–74; Jeremias, *Der Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit*.

regarding the Torah and purity matters: whereas the Teacher advocates a radically conservative, purity-oriented praxis of the Torah, Jesus' intentions are focused not on the Torah but on the "kingdom of God." Although phrasing an ethical radicalization of the law in some issues (cf. Matt 5:28–9, 34), he did not merely contrast his own halakah with other contemporary views. Instead, he addressed more fundamentally the relation of humans to God, with an argument from creation (e.g., on the Sabbath in Mark 2:27 or on divorce in Matt 19:8), or on his own authority ("I say to you"). Thus, although his antitheses in Matt 5:21–48 can be formally compared with phrases in 4QMMT B 55, 65, 73 ("but we say ..."), the authority claimed by Jesus differs.

In some issues, Jesus took a rather liberal position towards ritual purity (cf. Mark 7:15 on food), or deliberately transgressed some of the borders when eating with tax collectors and sinners (Mark 2:15–17; Luke 5:29–30, etc.). This is in marked contrast with the rigid purity praxis at the communal meal in 1QS VI 16–20. The strongest contrast is between Jesus' approaching the lame, blind, crippled, and lepers, whereas the *yahad* (1QSa II 3–11; cf. Lev 21:16–24) excluded all those with physical deficiencies from the community, and the *Temple Scroll* placed lepers as outcasts in a particular section (11QT^a XLVI). When Jesus invites them to partake at the table (Luke 14:12–14, 21), he almost seems to present "an opposing agenda."⁵³ One might even ask whether the phrase to "love your neighbor and hate your enemy" (Matt 5:43), which is not from the Hebrew Bible, may point to a view such as is expressed in 1QS I 9–10 or in the communal liturgy 1QS I 16–II 18.

In contrast to a widespread view that the notion of the "kingdom of God" was poorly attested to in contemporary Judaism, the scrolls provide a new variety of the use of the term kingdom (*malkut*), especially in the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*. There, the term denotes a heavenly kingdom,⁵⁴ but in the scrolls there is evidence that the heavenly kingdom of God and the kingdom to be given to Israel and/or to her Messiah "in a certain sense merge,"⁵⁵ or, more generally, that "Jesus' proclamation of the kingdom of God finds itself right at home in Jewish Palestine."⁵⁶ Moreover, Jesus' particular idea of the kingdom as still to be hoped and prayed for (Luke 11:2) but also already present (Luke 11:20) in exorcisms and healings has a marked parallel in the Essene awareness of the present communion with angels, the conviction that

⁵³ H.-W. Kuhn, "Jesus," in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 404–8, here 405.

⁵⁴ A. M. Schwemer, "Gott als König und seine Königsherrschaft in den Sabbatliedern aus Qumran," in *Königsherrschaft Gottes und himmlischer Kult im Judentum, Urchristentum und in der hellenistischen Welt* (ed. M. Hengel and A. Maria Schwemer; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1991), 45–118.

⁵⁵ Schwemer, "Gott als König und seine Königsherrschaft in den Sabbatliedern aus Qumran."

⁵⁶ Evans, "Jesus and the Dead Sea Scrolls," 584.

salvation and “new creation” (1QH^a IX 21) are present in the community although still expected in the cosmic dimension.⁵⁷ However, while the general structure of the “already-not yet” is comparable, the detailed understanding is different. More generally, the new evidence of a line of Palestinian-Jewish wisdom tradition which is deeply merged with apocalyptic and dualistic ideas in texts such as Instruction or the Book of Mysteries demonstrates that the construct of a “purely” sapiential, non-apocalyptic Jesus cannot be established within the context of contemporary Judaism and should rather be dismissed as a product of modern exegetical fantasy.

Other parallels give insights into the history of genres, such as the sapiential series of beatitudes in 4Q525, which provides an important parallel for the sapiential reshaping of Jesus’ original beatitudes in Matt 5:3–10,⁵⁸ and the document 4Q500 which shows that the vineyard parable Isa 5:1–7 was already related to Jerusalem and the Temple so that the design of the parable Mark 12:1–11 is not necessarily a late development of the Hellenistic community⁵⁹ – an insight which questions the form-critical “dogma” that Jesus’ parables could not have allegorical overtones and that all scriptural allusions were secondary additions. The *Temple Scroll*, to mention one last example, provides invaluable information about the praxis of crucifixion in Second Temple Judaism (cf. also 4QpNah 3–4 I 6–9): notably, crucifixion is called “hanging (*tlh*) on a tree” (11QT^a XLVI 6–9); it is linked with Deut 21:22–3; the curse is mentioned (cf. Gal 3:13), and also the demand to bury the crucified “on the same day” (11QT^a LXIV 11–13; cf. Mark 15:43).

An often debated text is the non-sectarian document 4Q521. It mentions the “Messiah(s?)” (4Q521 2 ii 1) and enumerates (in 4Q521 2 II 6–13) the works to be done by God himself in the messianic era, including the raising of the dead. The list combines prophecies from Isaiah (chs. 26, 35, and 61) and is most closely paralleled by the list of the works of Jesus in Matt 11:5 par Luke 7:22. It is not certain that the works expected in 4Q521 here should be done through a messianic agent. But against the background of scriptural interpretations such as are documented here, it is quite conceivable that Jesus’ works could be perceived as works of the messianic time and that his exorcisms and healings of the lame and blind together with the message of God’s kingdom and grace inspired people to view him as a messianic figure.

⁵⁷ H.-W. Kuhn, *Enderwartung und gegenwärtiges Heil* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966); idem, “Jesus,” 405–6.

⁵⁸ cf. H. Lichtenberger, “Makarismen in den Qumrantexten und im Neuen Testament,” in *Wisdom and Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Biblical Tradition* (Leuven: Peeters, 2003), 195–211; G. J. Brooke, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 2005), 217–34.

⁵⁹ Brooke, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament*, 235–60.

4Q521 thus provides an important clue for the framework in which Jesus' works could be interpreted.⁶⁰

More generally the variety of messianic ideas and concepts in the Qumran library is a striking insight, especially after the release of the numerous parabiblical texts: next to texts without any messianic figure, we can find concepts with a royal, a prophetic, or a priestly messianic agent,⁶¹ and at times these aspects are merged or even combined (such as in the well-known concept of "the two Messiahs," priestly and political, from CD XIX 33–XX 1). In contrast with earlier scholarship, it is now clear that there was no unified, "dogmatic" conception of "the Messiah" (as a political, Davidic figure) in contemporary Judaism, but rather a variety of eschatological concepts. Within that context it was therefore possible to ascribe "Messianic" hopes to Jesus even if he was not of Davidic descent and did not act as a political liberator. There are even texts in which a messianic figure is linked with the heavenly world, such as Michael-Melchizedek in 11QMelch or in 4Q491 where the ascent of a human being is described.⁶² And although the identity of the enigmatic "son of God" of 4Q246 is heavily disputed, and a negative reference of the term (e.g., to Antiochus IV Epiphanes) is also advocated,⁶³ the text provides a striking parallel to Luke 1:32–5. In any case, the use of the title demonstrates that the christological title "son of God" can be well explained from Palestinian Judaism and is by no means a sign that Christology should be rooted in a Hellenistic, non-Jewish milieu.⁶⁴

It is, therefore, no exaggeration to state that, in the light of the scrolls, the question of the roots of Christology must be discussed afresh and that many earlier views on the distance or incompatibility of Judaism and (especially "high") Christology are to be revised. The Qumran texts show that even the later stages were developed in a largely Jewish matrix of thought.

III. Paul and Palestinian Jewish Terms: New Light from Non-Sectarian Texts

Another field of remarkable insights is the study of the apostle Paul and the issue of his interpretation of Scripture and, especially, the background of his

⁶⁰ See M. Becker, "Die 'messianische Apokalypse' 4Q521 und der Interpretationsrahmen der Taten Jesu," in *Apokalyptik und Qumran* (ed. J. Frey and M. Becker; Paderborn: Bonifatius, 2007), 237–303.

⁶¹ Cf. J. J. Collins, *The Scepter and the Star: The Messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Ancient Literature* (New York: Doubleday, 1995); J. Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte aus Qumran* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998).

⁶² M. Smith, "Two Ascended to Heaven – Jesus and Author of 4Q491," in *Jesus and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. J. H. Charlesworth; New York: Doubleday, 1992), 290–301; Evans, "Jesus in the Dead Sea Scrolls."

⁶³ On the debate, see Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte aus Qumran*, 153–70.

⁶⁴ See M. Hengel, *The Son of God* (London: SCM, 1976); Y. Collins, A. Collins, and J. J. Collins, *King and Messiah as Son of God* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2008).

language and theology. In earlier history-of-religions research, Paul's language and thought was often viewed as strongly separated from Palestinian Jewish religion and rather explained from Hellenistic Judaism or even more from pagan concepts of redemption and of dying and rising gods which were thought to have influenced Paul in Tarsus during his youth. This was not only due to scholarly skepticism about Luke's account of Paul's Pharisaic studies in Jerusalem (cf. Acts 5:34), but also due to the lack of Hebrew or Aramaic texts from post-biblical Palestinian Judaism before 70 CE. Especially Paul's claim to be a Pharisee (Phil 3:5; cf. Acts 22:3) could not be affirmed from contemporary sources without making use of the later rabbinic writings. But if it is plausible that Paul's "pre-Christian" life brought him to Jerusalem to study (Pharisaic) law,⁶⁵ one should assume that the themes, terms, and techniques of Palestinian Judaism should have influenced him even more. The Qumran parallels provide the sources to study this, and they have actually contributed to a deeper understanding of the influence of Palestinian Jewish traditions on Paul's theological language.

The problem is, however, that direct contact between Paul and Qumran cannot be established: Paul's addressees and his missionary activities were outside of Palestine. Although he could read Hebrew and Aramaic, he wrote in Greek. There is no evidence that Paul ever read "sectarian" texts, or that he ever visited a place like Qumran. Based on early readings of the "Damascus Document" it was even speculated that Paul's "Damascus" is actually Qumran. But the story of Paul being converted at Qumran is mere fantasy and cannot be seriously considered as an idea of sound scholarship.

The Qumran texts have brought out a number of terminological and exegetical parallels which can demonstrate the Palestinian-Jewish roots of Pauline thought or, at least, of numerous elements of it.⁶⁶ Most significant is the term "works of the law" (Gal 2:16; 3:2, 5, 10; Rom 3:20, 28) which was unparalleled before the Qumran finds, and without any equivalent in the Hebrew Bible and in later rabbinic writings. But now we have the halakic text 4QMMT (4Q498 14–17 ii 2–3) where the writer affirms: "We have sent you some of the precepts of the Torah" (see also 1QS V 21; VI 18: "his works in the law"). In spite of the difficulties of interpretation and the fact that

⁶⁵ M. Hengel and R. Deines, *The Pre-Christian Paul* (London: SCM, 1991).

⁶⁶ H.-W. Kuhn, "The Impact of the Qumran Scrolls on the Understanding of Paul," in *Dead Sea Scrolls Forty Years After Research* (ed. D. Dimant and U. Rappaport; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 1:327–39; idem, "Qumran und Paulus. Unter traditionsgeschichtlichen Aspekten ausgewählte Parallelen," in *Das Urchristentum und in seiner literarischen Geschichte* (Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 1999), 227–46; J. A. Fitzmyer, "Paul and the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *Dead Sea Scrolls Forty Years After Research* (ed. D. Dimant and U. Rappaport; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 2:599–621; T. Lim, "Studying the Qumran Scrolls and Paul in their Historical Context," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls as Background to Postbiblical Judaism and Early Christianity* (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 135–56.

4QMMT is written about two centuries before the Pauline epistles, the parallel shows that the Pauline usage draws on a broader discussion within Palestinian Judaism on the deeds prescribed by the law.⁶⁷

The Qumran finds have also unveiled the first exact linguistic parallel for the Pauline phrase “the righteousness of God” (Rom 1:17; 3:5, 21, 22; 10:3; and 2 Cor 5:21) in 1QS X 25 and XII 12 (cf. 1QM IV 6), so that we can now see that “Paul did not invent the phrase but rather derived it from a genuine Palestinian tradition.”⁶⁸

Most interesting – especially in view of the Qumran texts – are the dualistic expressions in the Pauline epistles. In 1 Thess 5:5 Christians are called “Sons of Light” and “Sons of the Day.” The phrases make use of the Semitic construction “sons of” (*b^eney* ...) for the classification of human beings. Such a “dualistic” bifurcation of humanity is unparalleled in the Hebrew Bible but frequent in the sectarian writings of Qumran (cf. 1QS I 9–11). Whereas earlier scholarship was inclined to explain the “dualistic” elements in Paul’s theology from Hellenistic or even Gnostic sources, the Qumran texts have shown that such a type of thought was also developed within Palestinian Judaism.

Most interesting are Paul’s anthropological terms.⁶⁹ The striking use of “flesh” with the notion of sin (Gal 5:17; Rom 8:5–8), which is also unparalleled in the Hebrew Bible and unknown to the Rabbis, and his view of justification by divine grace⁷⁰ can now be illustrated by impressive parallels from the Qumran documents. In the hymn at the end of the *Community Rule*, the author confesses: “I belong to evil humankind, to the assembly of unfaithful flesh (*basar* ‘awäl) ...” (1QS XI 9), but then praises the experience of divine grace: “As for me, if I stumble, the mercies of God shall be my salvation always, and if I fall by the sin of the flesh (*ba* ‘awon *basar*), in the justice of God ... shall my judgment be” (1QS XI 11–12). In spite of some specific differences, these texts show remarkable closeness to Paul’s idea of justification of the ungodly (Rom 3:23–6; 4:5). Particularly the notion of “flesh” (*basar*) as a sphere characterized by sin and upheaval, or even as a power which provokes and causes evil deeds goes far beyond the range of meanings of *basar* in the Hebrew Bible and comes closer to the Pauline usage,⁷¹ especially in his antithesis of “flesh” and “spirit” (Gal 5:17, Rom 8:5–9), than any

⁶⁷ H.-W. Kuhn, “Qumran und Paulus,” 232.

⁶⁸ Fitzmyer, *Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament*, 615.

⁶⁹ Cf. J. Frey, “Flesh and Spirit in the Palestinian Jewish Sapiential Tradition and in the Qumran Texts. An Inquiry into the Background of Pauline Usage,” in *The Wisdom Texts from Qumran and the Development of Sapiential Thought* (ed. C. Hempel, A. Lange, and H. Lichtenberger; Leuven: Peeters, 2002), 367–404 (in this volume, 701–741).

⁷⁰ Fitzmyer, *Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament*, 602.

⁷¹ J. Becker, *Das Heil Gottes* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Rupprecht, 1964), 111–12,

other parallel, e.g., from Hellenistic Judaism.⁷² But the problem was still that Paul most probably did not read the “sectarian” documents to be influenced by Essene thought.⁷³

The aporia is now solved by the publication of the sapiential texts from the Qumran library which are “non-sectarian” and probably originate in the time before the formation of the *yahad*. In the Book of Mysteries (1Q27 and 4Q299–301) and the larger Instruction (1Q26 and 4Q415–418, 423), “flesh” (*basar*) is used quite frequently, and already with a negative, sinful notion: the reader is told that he is separated by God from the “fleshly spirit” and from all that God hates (4Q418 81 1–2), yet all “fleshly spirit” shall be destroyed in the end (4Q416 1 12–13). Here “flesh” is used in a dualistic antithesis between two groups of beings, a kind of cosmic and eschatological dualism which is similar to the type of dualism in the Treatise on the Two Spirits, 1QS III 13–IV 26.⁷⁴ These texts were highly esteemed by the Essenes, who read, copied, and even cited them and adopted some of their ideas into their own compositions. But the sapiential ideas were also open to others; some of their dualistic views may have been transmitted in Greek in the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*.

Thus, the Pauline usage of “flesh” can now be explained by the fact that he shares traditions of Palestinian Jewish wisdom which might have been discussed in the circles of the sages in Palestine. It is rooted neither in pagan Hellenism, nor in the developments of Hellenistic Judaism, but in Palestinian Jewish traditions that were not confined to the Essenes but are now only preserved in fragmentary texts from the Qumran library. Such a new history-of-religions view has also an impact on the interpretation of the meaning of “flesh” in Paul, which was later interpreted largely under the influence of Hellenistic traditions hostile to the human body. Thus, the insights from the Qumran texts are by no means theologically irrelevant.

IV. The Gospel of John and its Dualistic Language: No Qumran Influence

Dualistic language (of light and darkness, life and death, etc.) is also a particular element in the Gospel of John, and since the very earliest period of Qumran research scholars have assumed that the “native soil” of Johannine language can be found in Qumran,⁷⁵ especially in the dualistic Treatise on the

⁷² R. Jewett, *Paul's Anthropological Terms* (Leiden: Brill, 1971), 92–3.

⁷³ Becker, *Das Heil Gottes*, 249–50.

⁷⁴ J. Frey, “Different Patterns of Dualistic Thought in the Qumran Library,” in *Legal Texts and Legal Issues* (ed. M. Bernstein, F. García Martínez; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 298–9 (in this volume, 264–265).

⁷⁵ K. G. Kuhn, “Die in Palästina gefundenen hebräischen Texte und das Neue Testament,” 210; Brown, “The Qumran Scrolls and the Johannine Gospel and Epistles,” 1955, cf. Braun, *Qumran und das Neue Testament*, 2:118–44.

Two Spirits (1QS III 13–IV 26) which was thought to provide the basic ideology of the Essenes.⁷⁶ Scholars further speculated that the Evangelist was not merely a former disciple of John the Baptist (cf. John 1:35–9) and thus influenced by Essenes⁷⁷ but even more a former member of the Essene sect,⁷⁸ or that the Gospel was written to teach Essenes.⁷⁹ However, in recent scholarship these speculations have been subjected to severe criticism.⁸⁰ A brief look at the methodological problems is needed.

It is true that the Qumran discoveries caused a “shift in Johannine scholarship towards recognizing the thoroughly Jewish character of Johannine theology.”⁸¹ And, at first glance, the number of Johannine terms paralleled in Qumran is impressive. It includes the 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.⁸² But when carefully analyzed according to the refined set of questions (as outlined above), the Qumran parallels cannot prove a particular Qumranian or “Essene” background of John. Some of them are simply general shared ideas, others refer to or mirror similarities that can rather be explained by sociological analogies. Textual or historical relations could only be supported by precise linguistic and terminological parallels which are unique to the sectarian texts from Qumran and John.

⁷⁶ 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.

⁷⁷ Brown, “The Qumran Scrolls and the Johannine Gospel and Epistles,” 1955.

⁷⁸ Charlesworth, “The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Gospel according to John,” 1996.

⁷⁹ K. Schubert, *Die Gemeinde vom Toten Meer* (Munich: Reinhardt, 1958), 131.

⁸⁰ R. H. Bauckham, “Qumran and the Fourth Gospel: Is there a Connection?” in *The Scrolls and the Scriptures* (ed. S. E. Porter and C. A. Evans; Sheffield: Academic Press, 1997), 267–79; D. E. Aune, “Dualism in the Fourth Gospel and the Dead Sea Scrolls: A Reassessment of the Problem,” in *Neotestamentica et Philonica* (ed. D. E. Aune, T. Seland, and J. H. Ulrichsen; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 281–303; J. Frey, “Recent Perspectives on Johannine Dualism and its Background,” in *Text, Thought, and Practice in Qumran and Early Christianity* (ed. R. A. Clements and D. Schwartz; Leiden: Brill, 2009), 127–57 (in this volume, 763–790).

⁸¹ Bauckham, “Qumran and the Fourth Gospel,” 279.

⁸² Brown, “The Qumran Scrolls and the Johannine Gospel and Epistles”; 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.

Here, I can only note some significant observations. The term “sons of light” (John 12:36) is unparalleled in the Hebrew Bible but frequent in Qumran texts as a community self-designation (1QS I 9; II 16; III 13, 24, 25; 1QM I 1, 3, 9, 11, 13, etc.). But when we see that the term can also be found in Paul (1 Thess 5:5) and in the synoptic tradition (Luke 16:8; cf. Eph 5:8), and that in both cases it is equally opposed to the notion of darkness, the idea of an immediate Qumranian influence on John loses its cogency. In addition, we can note that the phrase in Aramaic is already used in “non-sectarian” writings such as the Visions of Amram (4Q548 1–2 ii 10–11, 15–16; cf. “sons of truth” / “sons of lie” in 4Q548 1–2 ii 8–9), so that we must conclude that the term did not originate in the *yahad* but earlier in some priestly circles, and could also be transmitted outside the Qumran community. The (single) occurrence of “sons of light” in John is by no means a proof of a Qumranian influence on John.

A similar argument can be adduced regarding the phrase “spirit of truth” (John 14:17; 15:26; 16:13; cf. 1 John 4:6). Not only is there a remarkable difference between the usage of this phrase in the Treatise on the Two Spirits (1QS III 18–19; IV 21, 23; cf. 4Q177 frgs. 12–13 I 5 and in Aramaic 4Q542 I i 10) and in the Fourth Gospel, but the term can also be found in the *Testament of Judah* (20:1–5; cf. 1 John 4:6) and independently of John – in the Shepherd of Hermas (*Mand.* 3.4). Thus even the particular term for the Holy Spirit in John cannot be explained from Qumran usage.⁸³

The same can be demonstrated for other terms and phrases: “To do the truth” can be found already in Isa 26:10 LXX, Tobit 4:6 and 13:6, and *T. Benj.* 10:3. “To walk in truth” is also paralleled in the LXX (4 Kgs 20:3), “to walk in the light / the darkness” have LXX or Masoretic parallels, “light of life” occurs not only in Qumran, but primarily in the Bible (Ps 56:14 etc.), and “eternal life” basically draws on Dan 12:3 and can be found in numerous Jewish and Early Christian texts, so that the parallel in 1QS IV 7 does not point to any particular relationship. The most impressive argument for a Qumran influence on John, however, was taken not from particular parallels, but rather from a more general structural similarity between the dualism in Qumran texts (1QS III 13–IV 26) and in John, especially in contrast with the Gnostic type of dualism used to explain the Johannine language in the Bultmann school. In contrast with the Gnostic type of “ontological” dualism, the observation of an ethical and eschatological dualism in Jewish sources was so impressive that scholars had to abandon the Gnostic paradigm in Johannine studies and to look for a Jewish explanation of the Johannine language. But those early comparisons did not yet recognize the variety of “dualisms” within the scrolls (e.g., the differences between 1QS III 13–IV 26 and 1QM), nor the fact that only a limited number of the Qumran documents shares a dualis-

⁸³ Aune, “Dualism in the Fourth Gospel and the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 297–300.

tic concept. The distinction between sectarian and non-sectarian texts was not yet established, and scholars could not yet imagine that even a text such as the “Treatise on the Two Spirits” might be a pre-Essene composition⁸⁴ which was then included in the collective manuscript of 1QS (while missing in other S-manuscripts from Cave 4) but could not be viewed as the normal type of Qumran sectarian dualism. The angelic leader called “the Spirit of Wickedness” (1QS III 19) is otherwise called “Belial,” and the idea of “two spirits” is adopted nowhere else in the scrolls, but occurs again only in Greek in *T. Jud* 20:1–2. Moreover, the idea of the struggle of two spirits or strivings within the human heart, even pious ones, was hardly satisfying for those who held a strong division between the sons of the light and the sons of the darkness. 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 and outside of the community and dominated by opposing angelic figures. Such a pattern can be found in CD II 2–13, in the liturgy of 1QS I 16–III 13, or in the curses of *4QBerakhot* or in the *War Rule*.⁸⁵

If we ask, then, for the possible influence of Qumran sectarian dualism on Early Christian authors, 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 language of that mode of dualistic thought (cf. 2 Cor 6:15), not the language of a doctrine that the Qumranites themselves had adopted only partially and with considerable modification.

On the other hand, Johannine “dualism,” or rather the dualistic elements in John (names of opposing eschatological figures, light/darkness, truth/lie, life/death, above/below) does not form a unity, but the single elements can be explained from different backgrounds. In John, they are used with a particular rhetorical intention, and with a strong christological focus. Thus, the “dualistic” terms do not only mirror a traditional religious milieu or a fixed language code that an author might have learned or adopted from somewhere. Therefore the common patterns of explanation established in the early period of Qumran research call for a thorough revision. The contrast between light and darkness that is the most obvious common feature of John and some Qumran texts might have been developed from various sources. Bauckham⁸⁶ points to

⁸⁴ A. Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination: Weisheitliche Urordnung und Prädestination in den Textfunden von Qumran* (STDJ 18; Leiden: Brill, 1995), 126–8; Frey, “Different Patterns,” 295–300 (in this volume, 262–267).

⁸⁵ Frey, “Different Patterns.”

⁸⁶ Bauckham, “Qumran and the Fourth Gospel,” 275–8.

the tradition of Jewish exegesis of the creation narrative, to the use of the light metaphor for the Torah and to some messianic passages in Isaiah (Isa 9:1–2; 42:6–7; 49:6; 60:1–3). Aune⁸⁷ additionally points to Jewish conversion language in which the transfer “from darkness into light” is described (*Jos. Asen.* 8:9, cf. 15:12), and which was also adopted in the Early Christian mission (Acts 26:18; Col 1:12–3; Eph 5:8; 1 Pet 2:9; and paraenetically 1 Thess 5:4–8; Rom 13:12–14).

Consequently, there is no need to conjecture direct or even indirect Qumran influence to explain the use of the light/darkness terminology. The view that Johannine dualism, as a whole or in part, is influenced by the scrolls 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. The Qumran discoveries helped to rediscover the Jewish character of the traditions behind the Fourth Gospel. But there are a large number of Jewish parallels from other literary contexts, and some of them provide closer analogies to the Johannine terms and phrases and, moreover, to the structure and function of the dualistic language. The Johannine author and his school seem to be rather eclectic, adopting and developing motifs and phrases from different contexts into their works.

E. Summary and Perspectives

What, then, is the result of sixty years of comparison between Qumran and the NT texts? A mere collection of “parallels” cannot suffice, since “parallels” have to be explained within a wide historical context. More than mere parallels, other insights from the scrolls provide an invaluable wealth of information on the world of Second Temple Judaism in which the Jesus movement began and of which at least part of the NT texts tell.

(1) One negative insight should be mentioned first: all speculations about direct links between “Essenes” and Early Christianity are useless and cannot be demonstrated with an acceptable degree of certainty. Neither John the Baptist nor Jesus, Paul, the author of the Fourth Gospel, or any other NT author can be linked in a reasonable manner with the “sectarian” texts or viewed to be influenced by the Qumran community or “Essenes.” As a consequence, the issue to be discussed is no longer the possible relationship between the Essenes and Early Christianity but rather, and more precisely, the links between language and theology in Early Christian texts and contemporary Judaism as a whole in its many and diverse traditions and groups.

(2) The value of the scrolls is not so much in the fact that they represent the library of a particular Jewish group, but rather, that in this library we face

⁸⁷ Aune, “Dualism in the Fourth Gospel and the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 289–91.

a broad selection of the literary production of Second Temple Judaism in the three centuries before the turn of the era. Despite the fragmentary character of most of the scrolls, it would be impossible to get an adequate view of the literature and thought of ancient Palestinian Judaism without the information provided by the scrolls.

(3) It is of major relevance for NT studies that the scrolls provide information on the textual development, collection, and “canonization” of the Scriptures, on the development, techniques, and forms of scriptural interpretation, on issues of halakah, purity, calendar, and festivals, on the development of literary forms and genres, on the origins and developments of Jewish apocalypticism and wisdom thought, on the variety and plurality of the idea of eschatological or messianic figures and agents, on the ideas about a last judgement, life after death, angels and demons, etc. etc. Without the information from these texts it would be impossible to get an adequate view of any of these topics. In that respect, the scrolls are the most important and most fascinating corpus of texts from the world around the NT.

(4) One of the consequences of the Qumran debate is that NT scholarship has come to recognize the fundamental Jewishness of NT texts – even if critical debate continues and the distance from other Jewish groups is recognized. NT texts can be read as part of the Jewish literature of the late Second Temple period (and beyond). The “parting of the ways” that led to an opposition of two separated religions is not yet finished at the end of the first century CE.

(5) Reading the NT texts in their contemporary Jewish context calls for a broader perspective which includes not only the scrolls but – as a matter of course – the LXX and all the “intertestamental” literature (partly transmitted in translations). Furthermore, we have to consider the texts from the Jewish Diaspora, Josephus, and Philo, and as far as possible also the early rabbinic texts, nor should we ignore the field of non-Jewish texts and genres from the Hellenistic-Roman world. Only by such a wide range of research is it possible to reasonably decide on the background of a certain NT phrase and its underlying concepts.

(6) Simply collecting parallels (a symptom of “parallelomania”) is futile and misleading. Instead, every parallel deserves cautious interpretation, considering its own original context, the possible ways of transmission, the nature of the suggested analogies, their possible reasons, and also alternative explanations.

(7) For interpretation, hermeneutical consideration is indispensable: what is the consequence (or the possible benefit) if an idea can be demonstrated to be originally Jewish (or, on the other hand, Hellenistic or pagan)? Does this imply that it is more purely “biblical” and, therefore, more “valuable”? But what if Second Temple Judaism itself (and also the Qumran texts) already adopted Babylonian, Persian, and Hellenistic ideas? And what would it mean

if, for example, aspects of Jesus' teaching could be traced back to an earlier "precursor" figure such as the Teacher of Righteousness? Would this endanger the "originality" of the Christian teaching? Such questions can only be mentioned here, but they also deserve consideration. As modern theory of historiography has shown, every reconstruction of history and "origins" is also a means of defining one's own individual or social identity. Therefore, scholars should beware of the "ideological" issues and agendas that are sometimes "behind" textual and historical theories and the public debates in the field of Qumran.

(8) The scrolls are a test case for the method of history-of-religions research. In view of the fascination that has often stimulated one-sided views and public sensationalism, philological accuracy and caution is absolutely indispensable. Scholars must avoid filling the lacunae in a manner that makes the texts fit their own theory. Due to the fragmentary state of preservation, numerous aspects can no longer be "explained." It is especially impossible to find evidence for any "direct" influence on Jesus, Paul, John, or any other New Testament author. And rather than "explain" the origin of certain motifs and ideas, the library of Qumran can help illuminate their wider contexts and particular profiles.

But when adduced with such hermeneutical caution and with the utmost philological skill, Qumran texts provide a still-underestimated wealth of information which helps to understand the background and message of numerous NT texts and Early Christian ideas.

16. The Impact of the Dead Sea Scrolls on New Testament Interpretation: Proposals, Problems, and Further Perspectives*

For biblical scholarship, the Dead Sea Scrolls¹ (or better, the “library of Qumran”) are by far the most important documentary finds of the twentieth century. Not only the public interest, but also the amount of scholarly publications the Dead Sea Scrolls have caused go far beyond the impact of other quite sensational finds such as the cuneiform tablets from *Ras Shamra* (Ugarit) in Northern Syria, discovered in 1929,² or the thirteen codices of the Coptic Gnostic library found in 1945 in Nag Hammadi in Middle Egypt.³ From the late 1940s up to the present, the library of Qumran has caused to arise a library of its own, consisting of roughly more than twenty thousand publications.⁴ More than fifty years after the first discoveries, a highly specialized

* The present article is a reworked version of J. Frey, “Die Bedeutung der Qumran-Funde 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 [Switzerland]: Universitätsverlag and Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2001), 129–208, written in 2004 for the three-volume collection of a Princeton symposium I had not attended. I am grateful to J. H. Charlesworth for the invitation to contribute to his conference volume and for the editorial assistance.

¹ Normally, this term is used to denote the number of about nine hundred manuscripts found in eleven caves near Khirbet Qumran at the NW side of the Dead Sea. Except from some texts discovered at Masada, the other documentary finds from sites near the Dead Sea – such as Wadi Murabba’at, Wadi ed-Daliyeh, Khirbet Mird, and Ketef Jericho – are not related with the texts from Qumran, even if they are sometimes included in the term “Dead Sea Scrolls.”

² Cf. M. Yon, D. Pardee, and P. Bordreuil, “Ugarit,” *ABD* 6:695–721; on the impact on biblical scholarship, see O. Loretz, *Ugarit und die Bibel: Kanaanäische Götter und Religion im Alten Testament* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1990).

³ Cf. B. A. Pearson, “Nag Hammadi,” *ABD* 4:982–93; see the translation of the texts in J. M. Robinson and R. Smith, eds., *The Nag Hammadi Library in English: Translated and Introduced by Members of the Coptic Gnostic Library Project of the Institute for Antiquity and Christianity, Claremont, California* (4th, rev. ed.; Leiden: Brill, 1996); and for the impact on biblical scholarship, the reference work by C. A. Evans, R. L. Webb, and R. A. Wiehe, eds., *Nag Hammadi Texts and the Bible* (NTTS 18; Leiden: Brill, 1993).

⁴ Thus the estimation from 2004. In 1998, H. Stegemann, “Qumran, Qumran – und längst kein Ende,” *TRev* 94 (1998): 483–88, esp. 483, calculated about 15,000 titles. A. S. van der Woude, “Fifty Years of Qumran Research,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty*

branch of scholarship is doing research on details of the smallest fragments, using the most-refined technological tools such as infrared photography, digital image processing, radiocarbon dating, DNA analysis, and other scientific methodologies⁵ in order to obtain the most-detailed information on the provenance and content of every single manuscript. However, the public interest in the Dead Sea Scrolls is stimulated most vigorously when their impact on our understanding of Jesus and the origins of Christianity is considered.⁶ There have always been attempts to put the scrolls in a close relation with Jesus and earliest Christianity, and these attempts have had a strong impact on Qumran research, at least in its early periods.⁷ To evaluate the state of research, we look briefly at the periods of Qumran research.

Years: A Comprehensive Assessment (ed. P. W. Flint, J. C. VanderKam, and A. E. Alvarez; 2 vols; Leiden: Brill, 1998–1999), 1:1–45; esp. 1, counting “more than 10,000 publications that have been itemized in the bibliographies of C. Burchard, W. S. LaSor, B. Jongeling, and F. García Martínez and D. W. Parry.” Cf. C. Burchard, *Bibliographie zu den Handschriften vom Toten Meer* (2 vols.; BZAW 76, 89; Berlin: Töpelmann, 1957–65); B. Jongeling, *A Classified Bibliography of the Finds in the Desert of Judah 1958–1969* (STDJ 7; Leiden: Brill, 1971); W. S. LaSor, *Bibliography of the Dead Sea Scrolls, 1948–1957* (Pasadena, CA: Fuller Theological Summary, 1958); F. García Martínez and D. W. Parry, *A Bibliography of the Finds in the Desert of Judah 1970–1995* (STDJ 19, Leiden: Brill, 1996). Also, see the current bibliography in the *Revue de Qumran*, and the bibliography of the Orion Institute at the Hebrew University (Jerusalem), online: <http://orion.mscc.huji.ac.il>.

⁵ Cf. the different technical contributions in D. W. Parry and E. C. Ulrich, eds., *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues* (STDJ 30; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 5–43; as well as three essays in *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment* (ed. P. W. Flint, J. C. VanderKam, and A. E. Alvarez; 2 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 1998–1999): G. L. Doudna, *Dating the Scrolls on the Basis of Radiocarbon Analysis*,” 1:430–71; G. H. Bearman, S. J. Pfann, and S. I. Spiro, “Imaging the Scrolls: Photographic and Direct Digital Acquisition,” 1:472–95; and D. W. Parry et al., “New Technological Advances: DNA, Electronic Databases, Imaging Radar,” 1:496–515.

⁶ Cf. J. H. Charlesworth’s remarks in his preface to *Jesus and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. J. H. Charlesworth; ABRL; New York: Doubleday, 1992), xv.

⁷ This is obvious in view of the number of inquiries into Qumran messianism and related topics. Somewhat later, with the ongoing publication of the documents from Cave 4 and with the increasing number of Jewish scholars entering Qumran research, other important issues of the texts such as purity and other legal issues have gained more attention. Cf. L. H. Schiffman, *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls: Their True Meaning for Judaism and Christianity* (ABRL; New York: Doubleday, 1995), xxiii–xxiv.

A. Four Periods of Discussion

The scholarly discussion on the relations between the Qumran texts and the New Testament can be divided into four quite different periods:

I. First Discoveries and Premature Assumptions (1947–ca. 1955)

The first discoveries were made in 1947 (or possibly earlier) by Bedouins in the area of Khirbet Qumran. The news about the find of ancient manuscripts spread quickly and raised interest among scholars and in public discussion in Europe and North America.⁸ But from the nine hundred manuscripts (as we can count today), only the scrolls from Cave 1 were edited and translated by 1956,⁹ so the discussion was based almost exclusively on those few but well-preserved manuscripts, chiefly the great Isaiah Scroll or *Isaiah Scroll A* (1QIsa^a), the so-called *Rule of the Community* or *Manual of Discipline* (1QS), the *Habakkuk Peshar* (1QpHab), the *Thanksgiving Hymns* or *Hodayot* (1QH^a), and the *War Scroll* (1QM). But at that time scholarly research on these texts was only at its very beginning.

Based on such narrow evidence, it was impossible even to estimate the wealth of the library and the vast diversity within. Scholars read the scrolls as the heritage of a Jewish sect (which had been identified quite early as the group of Essenes known from ancient authors) and compared their words and motifs with the Hebrew Bible and with later rabbinic sources. The marked difference from both seemingly confirmed the sectarian character of the scrolls and the related group.

For the general public, however, the most sensational discovery was the *Great Isaiah Scroll*. The discovery of a biblical scroll that was more than a thousand years older than the earliest Masoretic codices¹⁰ but witnessed to the

⁸ The publications of this period (1948–55) are collected most completely in Burchard, *Bibliographie*, vol. 1.

⁹ M. Burrows, J. C. Trever, and W. H. Brownlee, eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery*, vol. 1, *The Isaiah Manuscript and the Habakkuk Commentary*, and vol. 2, *Plates and Transcriptions of the Manual of Discipline* (New Haven: American Schools of Oriental Research, 1950–51). The other scrolls from Cave 1 were edited some years later, between 1954 and 1956. The editions are E. L. Sukenik, *Ošar Ham-megillot Hagenezot* (Jerusalem: Mosad Bialik and The Hebrew University, 1954), ET: *The Dead Sea Scrolls of the Hebrew University* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1955); N. Avigad and Y. Yadin, *A Genesis Apocryphon: A Scroll from the Wilderness of Judaea* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1956); and D. Barthélemy and J. T. Milik, *Qumran Cave I* (DJD 1; Oxford: Clarendon, 1955).

¹⁰ Codex Petropolitanus (previously, Leningradensis B 19A) was copied in 1008–9 CE, and the Aleppo Codex at about 925 CE; some other medieval codices can be dated only a few years earlier. From antiquity, only a single Hebrew fragment of the biblical text was extant, the Papyrus Nash, dating presumably from the second century BCE but containing only a form of the Decalogue and the *Shema Jisrael* from Deut 6:4. Cf. E. Ulrich, “The

complete book of Isaiah with only a few orthographical and textual differences could be interpreted as an impressive evidence for the accuracy of the transmission of the biblical text.¹¹ This was the message for the public in the earliest period after the discoveries. Consequently, the public interest in the scrolls focused primarily on their significance for the Hebrew Bible.

In that early period, only a few specialists also noticed the significance of the scrolls for understanding the New Testament. We should mention the French scholar Andre Dupont-Sommer,¹² who saw wide-scale analogies between Jesus and the Righteous Teacher of the Qumran texts,¹³ and the German Karl Georg Kuhn,¹⁴ who suggested that the scrolls revealed the native

Dead Sea Scrolls and the Biblical Text,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment* (ed. P. W. Flint and J. C. VanderKam; Leiden: Brill, 1998–99), 1:79–100, esp. 79; and E. Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1992), 118.

¹¹ The observations concerning the accuracy of the text transmission remain valid, however, even though our view of the earliest textual history of the Hebrew Bible has become much more complex since the publication of the bulk of the biblical manuscripts from the Qumran library. On the present state of research, see the concise surveys by Ulrich, “The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Biblical Text,” 79–100; J. A. Sanders, “The Judaean Desert Scrolls and the History of the Text of the Hebrew Bible,” in *Caves of Enlightenment: Proceedings of the American Schools of Oriental Research Dead Sea Scrolls Jubilee Symposium (1949–1997)* (ed. J. H. Charlesworth; North Richland Hills, TX: BIBAL Press, 1998), 1–18; and the comprehensive work by Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*.

¹² Cf. A. Dupont-Sommer, *Aperçus préliminaires sur les manuscrits de la Mer Morte* (L’orient ancien illustre 4; Paris: Maisonneuve, 1950), ET: *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A Preliminary Survey* (trans. E. M. Rowley; Oxford: Blackwell, 1952); idem, *Nouveaux aperçus sur les manuscrits de la Mer Morte* (L’orient ancien illustre 5; Paris: Maisonneuve, 1953); ET: *The Jewish Sect of Qumran and the Essenes: New Studies on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (trans. R. D. Barnett; London: Vallentine, Mitchell, 1954). For his later positions, cf. idem, *Les écrits Esséniens découverts près de la Mer Morte* (BH; Paris: Payot, 1959); ET: *The Essene Writings from Qumran* (trans. G. Vermes; Oxford: Blackwell, 1961).

¹³ Dupont-Sommer, *Aperçus préliminaires*, 119–22. On these views, cf. sec. 2 (below).

¹⁴ Cf. the articles: K. G. Kuhn, “Zur Bedeutung der neuen palästinischen Handschriftenfunde für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft,” *TLZ* 75 (1950): 81–86; idem, “Die in Palästina gefundenen hebräischen Texte und das Neue Testament,” *ZTK* 47 (1950): 192–211; idem, “Über den ursprünglichen Sinn des Abendmahls und sein Verhältnis zu den Gemeinschaftsmahlen der Sektenschrift (1QS),” *EvT* 10 (1950/51): 508–27; ET: “The Lord’s Supper and the Communal Meal at Qumran,” in *The Scrolls and the New Testament* (ed. K. Stendahl; New York: Harper, 1957), 65–93, notes on 259–65; idem, “Die Sektenschrift und die iranische Religion,” *ZTK* 49 (1952): 296–316; idem, “Πειρασμός – ἁμαρτία – σάραξ im Neuen Testament und die damit zusammenhängenden Vorstellungen,” *ZTK* 49 (1952): 200–22; ET: “New Light on Temptation, Sin, and Flesh in the New Testament,” in *The Scrolls and the New Testament* (ed. K. Stendahl; New York: Harper, 1957), 94–113, notes on 265–70; and idem, “Jesus in Gethsemane,” *EvT* 12 (1952–53): 279–85. On Karl Georg Kuhn, see the biographical article by his former student H.-W. Kuhn,

soil of Johannine Christianity within a sectarian type of gnostic Judaism.¹⁵ From a later viewpoint, most of the early suggestions seem to be crudely overstated. Yet the effect of these publications was that more New Testament specialists began to look at the scrolls and discuss their significance for the understanding of the background and history of Early Christianity.

II. The “Qumran Fever” and the Early Discussion of the Material (ca. 1955–ca. 1970)

We can characterize a second period of discussion, from the 1950s till the end of the 1960s, as what many call “Qumran fever.” By 1956, all the scrolls from Cave 1 had been edited, and a larger number of scholars had the opportunity to get acquainted with the documents. Archaeologists had investigated the area of Khirbet Qumran and its ruins,¹⁶ and between 1952 and 1956 Bedouins and archaeologists had discovered ten more caves with thousands of fragments. Moreover, some of the ideas of the earliest Qumran research were popularized by scholars such as John Allegro¹⁷ and by journalists such as Edmund Wilson. At least the American public took a good part of its knowledge about the significance of Qumran from Wilson’s lengthy article in the *New Yorker*, which quickly appeared as a book and became the first best seller about Qumran.¹⁸

“Kuhn, Karl Georg,” in *Dictionary of Biblical Interpretation* (ed. J. H. Hayes; Nashville: Abingdon, 1999), 2:39–40.

¹⁵ K. G. Kuhn, “Die in Palästina gefundenen hebräischen Texte,” esp. 209–10.

¹⁶ See the preliminary reports by R. de Vaux, “Fouilles au Khirbet Qumrân: Rapport préliminaire,” *RB* 60 (1953): 83–106; idem, “Fouilles au Khirbet Qumrân: Rapport préliminaire sur la deuxième campagne,” *RB* 61 (1954): 206–36; idem, “Fouilles au Khirbet Qumrân: Rapport préliminaire sur les 3e, 4e, et 5e campagnes,” *RB* 63 (1956): 533–77; idem, “Fouilles de Feshkha,” *RB* 66 (1959): 225–55; idem, *L’archéologie et les manuscrits de la Mer Morte* (Schweich Lectures, 1959; London: Oxford University Press, 1961); ET: *Archaeology and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Schweich Lectures 1959; rev. ed.; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1973). See also idem, the posthumously published *Fouilles de Khirbet Qumrân et de Ain Feshkha* (presented by J.-B. Humbert and A. Chambon; NTOA: Series Archaeologica 1; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1994); idem, *Die Ausgrabungen von Qumran und En Feschcha*, vol. 1A, *Die Grabungstagebücher* (ed. F. Rohrhirsch and B. Hofmeir; NTOA: Series Archaeologica 1A; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996); and S. J. Pfann, *The Excavations of Khirbet Qumran and Ain Feshkha: Synthesis of Roland de Vaux’s Field Notes* (ed. J.-B. Humbert and A. Chambon; NTOA: Series Archaeologica 1B; Fribourg: Academic Press, 2003).

¹⁷ Cf. J. M. Allegro, *The Dead Sea Scrolls* (Pelican A376; Baltimore: Penguin, 1956); idem, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of Christianity* (New York: Criterion Books, 1957).

¹⁸ E. Wilson, “A Reporter at Large,” *The New Yorker* 31 (May 14, 1955), 45–121; idem, *The Scrolls from the Dead Sea* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1955); idem, *The Dead Sea Scrolls, 1947–1969* (rev., expanded ed.; London: W. H. Allen, 1969).

The public discussion, however, was dominated by some rash identifications between the data of the Qumran texts and ideas or even persons known from the New Testament. Capable parties had to critically discuss early overstatements, and so the public dispute on the scrolls also stimulated scholarly efforts. Scholars such as the distinguished American archaeologist William F. Albright;¹⁹ the coeditor of the first scrolls, Millar Burrows;²⁰ the Roman Catholics François-Marie Braun²¹ and Jean Daniélou;²² and the Protestant Oscar Cullmann²³ – all entered the discussion on the links between Qumran and the New Testament. Young scholars such as Otto Betz,²⁴ Matthew

¹⁹ Cf. 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, 1954), 153–71.

²⁰ M. Burrows, *The Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York: Viking, 1955); idem, *More Light on the Dead Sea Scrolls: New Scrolls and New Interpretation* (New York: Viking, 1958), with an extensive survey on the scrolls and the New Testament.

²¹ Cf. F.-M. Braun, “L’arrière-fond Judaïque du quatrième évangile et la communauté de l’alliance,” *RB* 62 (1955): 5–44; and other studies by idem, primarily on the relation between John and Qumran.

²² J. Daniélou, *Les manuscrits de la Mer Morte et les origines du Christianisme* (Paris: Editions de l’Orante, 1957); ET: *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Primitive Christianity* (trans. S. Attanasio; Baltimore: Helicon, 1958).

²³ O. Cullmann, “Die neuentdeckten Qumrantexte und das Judentum der Pseudoklementinen,” in *Neutestamentliche Studien für Rudolf Bultmann zu seinem siebenzigsten Geburtstag* (ed. W. Eltester; BZNW 21, Berlin: Töpelmann, 1954), 35–51; idem, “The Significance of the Qumran Texts for Research into the Beginnings of Christianity,” *JBL* 74 (1955): 213–26; idem, “Secte de Qumran, Hellénistes des Actes et Quatrième Évangile,” in *Les manuscrits de la mer morte: Colloque de Strasbourg 25–27 Mai 1955* (BCESS; Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1957), 61–74; idem, “L’opposition contre le temple de Jérusalem, motif commun de la théologie Johannique et du monde ambiant,” *NTS* 5 (1958–1959): 157–73.

²⁴ O. Betz, “Felsenmann und Felsengemeinde: Eine Parallele zu Matt 16,17–19 in den Qumransalmen,” *ZNW* 48 (1957): 49–77; idem, “Le ministère cultuel dans la secte de Qumrân et dans le Christianisme primitif,” in *La secte de Qumrân et les origines du Christianisme* (ed. J. van der Ploeg; RechBib 4; Paris: Desclée de Brauer, 1959), 163–202; idem, *Offenbarung und Schriftforschung in der Qumransekte* (WUNT 6; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1960); idem, *Der Paraklet: Fürsprecher häretischen Spätjudentum, im Johannes-Evangelium und in neu gefundenen gnostisch Schriften* (AGSU 2, Leiden: Brill, 1963). Cf. some of his later articles in idem, *Jesus: Der Messias Israels; Aufsätze zur biblischen Theologie* (WUNT 42, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1987), esp. 39–58: “Rechtfertigung in Qumran,” and 318–32: “Die Bedeutung der Qumranschriften für die Evangelien des Neuen Testaments”; and also several articles in idem, *Jesus: Der Herr der Kirche; Aufsätze zur biblischen Theologie II* (WUNT 52; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1990): “Der heilige Dienst in der Qumrangemeinde und bei den ersten Christen,” 3–20; “Die Proselytentaufe der Qumrangemeinde und die Taufe im Neuen Testament,” 21–48; “The Eschatological Interpretation of the Sinai-Tradition in Qumran and in the New Testament,” 66–88; and “Göttliche und menschliche Gerechtigkeit in der Gemeinde von Qumran und ihre Bedeutung für

Black,²⁵ Raymond E. Brown,²⁶ Joseph A. Fitzmyer,²⁷ James H. Charlesworth,²⁸ David Flusser,²⁹ and Heinz-Wolfgang Kuhn³⁰ began to work with the

das Neue Testament," 275–92. Cf. also idem, "Qumran and the New Testament: Forty Years of Research," in *Mogilany 1989: Papers on the Dead Sea Scrolls Offered in Memory of Jean Carmignac. Part I: General Research on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Qumran, and the New Testament. The Present State of Qumranology* (ed. Z. J. Kapera; Proceedings of the Second International Colloquium on the Dead Sea Scrolls [Mogilany, Poland, 1989]. QM 2; Kraków: Enigma, 1993), 79–100; and idem, "Was bedeuten die neuen Qumranfragmente für die Wahrheit des Neuen Testaments?" *QC* 2 (1992–1993): 183–90.

²⁵ M. Black, *The Scrolls and Christian Origins: Studies in the Jewish Background of the New Testament* (New York: Scribner, 1961); idem, *The Essene Problem* (London: Dr. William's Trust, 1961); idem, "The Scrolls and the New Testament," *NTS* 13 (1966–1967): 81–89; idem, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Christian Doctrine: A Discussion of Three Parallels to be Found in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Sacredotal Messiah, the Atonement, and Eschatology* (Ethel M. Wood Lectures; London: Athlone, 1966).

²⁶ R. E. Brown, "The Qumran Scrolls and the Johannine Gospel and Epistles," *CBQ* 17 (1955): 403–19, 559–74; idem, "The Semitic Background of the New Testament Mystery," *Bib* 39 (1958): 426–48; idem, "The Messianism of Qumran," *CBQ* 19 (1957): 53–82; idem, "Second Thoughts, X: The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament," *ExpTim* 78 (1966–1967): 19–23; idem, "The Teacher of Righteousness and the Messiah(s)," in *The Scrolls and Christianity* (ed. M. Black; London: SPCK, 1969), 37–44.

²⁷ J. A. Fitzmyer, "The Qumran Scrolls, the Ebionites, and their Literature," *TS* 16 (1955): 335–72; idem, "4QTestimonia and the New Testament," *TS* 18 (1957): 513–37; idem, "A Feature of Qumran Angelology and the Angels of I Cor. XI.10," *NTS* 4 (1957–1958): 48–58; idem, "The Use of Explicit Old Testament Quotations in Qumran Literature and in the New Testament," *NTS* 7 (1960–1961): 297–333; idem, "Qumran and the Interpolated Paragraph in 2 Cor 6,14–7,1," *CBQ* 23 (1961): 271–80; two essays in his collected work, *Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament* (London: Chapman, 1971): "4QTestimonia' and the New Testament," 59–89; and "Jewish Christianity in Acts in the Light of the Qumran Scrolls," 271–303; idem, "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament after Thirty Years," *TD* 29 (1981): 351–67; two essays presented in his collection, *To Advance the Gospel: New Testament Studies* (New York: Crossroads, 1981): "The Matthean Divorce Texts and Some New Palestinian Evidence," 79–111; and "Crucifixion in Ancient Palestine, Qumran Literature, and the New Testament," 125–46; idem, "The Qumran Scrolls and the New Testament after Forty Years," *RevQ* 13 (1988): 609–20; idem, "A Palestinian Collection of Beatitudes," in *The Four Gospels, 1992: Festschrift Frans Neirynck* (ed. F. van Segbraeck et al.; Leuven: Peeters, 1992), 1:309–12; idem, "The Palestinian Background of 'Son of God' as a Title for Jesus," in *Texts and Contexts: Biblical Texts in Their Textual and Situational Contexts: Essays in Honor of Lars Hartman* (ed. T. Fornberg and D. Hellholm; Oslo: Scandinavian University Press, 1995), 567–77; idem, "The Dead Sea Scrolls and Christian Origins: General Methodological Considerations," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Christian Faith: In Celebration of the Jubilee Year of the Discovery of Qumran Cave I* (ed. J. H. Charlesworth and W. P. Weaver; Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 1998), 1–19; idem, "Paul and the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment* (ed. P. W. Flint, J. C. VanderKam, and A. E. Alvarez; 2 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 1998–1999), 2:599–621.

²⁸ Cf. J. H. Charlesworth, "A Critical Comparison of the Dualism in IQS III:13–IV:26 and the 'Dualism' Contained in the Gospel of John," in *John and Qumran* (ed. J. H. Charlesworth; London: Chapman, 1972), 76–106; and since then numerous other articles, e.g., idem, "Reinterpreting John: How the Dead Sea Scrolls Have Revolutionized Our Understanding of the Gospel of John," *BRev* 9 (1993): 18–25, 54; idem, "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Historical Jesus," in *Jesus and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 1–74; idem, "John the Baptizer and Qumran Barriers in Light of the Rule of the Community," in *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues* (ed. D. W. Parry and E. C. Ulrich; STDJ 30; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 353–75; idem, "The Dead Sea Scrolls: Fifty Years of Discovery and Controversy," *PSB* 19, no. 2 (1998): 116–33; idem, "Have the Dead Sea Scrolls Revolutionized Our Understanding of the New Testament?" 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 and the Shrine of the Book, 2000), 116–32. Also, see Charlesworth's contributions in the J. H. Charlesworth, ed., *The Scrolls and Christian Origins*, vol 3 of *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Princeton Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Waco, TX.: Baylor: 2006).

²⁹ 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: Magnes, 1958), 215–66; idem, "Blessed Are the Poor in Spirit," *IEJ* 10 (1960): 1–13; cf. idem, *Judaism and the Origins of Christianity* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1988).

³⁰ H.-W. Kuhn, *Endenwartung und gegenwärtiges Heil: Untersuchungen zu Gemeindefiedern von Qumran, mit einem Anhang über Eschatologie und Gegenwart in der Verkündigung Jesu* (SUNT 4; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966); cf. his later articles, e.g., "The Impact of the Qumran Scrolls on the Understanding of Paul," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research* (ed. D. Dimant and U. Rappaport; STDJ 10; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 327–39; idem, "Die Bedeutung der Qumrantexte für das Verständnis des Ersten Thessalonicherbriefes," in *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid, 18–21 March 1991* (ed. J. C. Trebolle Barrera and L. Vegas Montaner; 2 vols.; STDJ 11; Madrid: Editorial Complutense; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 1:339–53; idem, "Die Bedeutung der Qumrantexte für das Verständnis des Galaterbriefes aus dem Münchener Projekt: Qumran und das Neue Testament," in *New Qumran Texts and Studies: Proceedings of the First Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Paris 1992* (ed. G. J. Brooke and F. Garcia Martínez; STDJ 15; Leiden: Brill, 1994), 169–221; idem, "A Legal Issue in 1 Corinthians 5 and in Qumran," in *Legal Texts and Legal Issues: Proceedings of the Second Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies Published in Honour of Joseph M. Baumgarten* (ed. M. J. Bernstein, F. Garcia Martínez, and J. Kampen; STDJ 23; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 489–99; idem, "Qumran und Paulus: Unter traditionsgeschichtlichem Aspekt ausgewählte Parallelen," in *Das Urchristentum in seiner literarischen Geschichte Festschrift für Jürgen Becker zum 65. Geburtstag* (ed. U. Mell and U. B. Müller; ZNW 100; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1999), 227–46; idem, "Qumran Texts and the Historical Jesus: Parallels in Contrast," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years after Their Discovery: Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20–25, 1997* (ed. L. H. Schiffman, E. Tov, and J. C. VanderKam; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society and the Shrine of the Book, 2000), 573–80; idem, "The Qumran Meal and the Lord's Supper in Paul in the Context of the Graeco-Roman World," in *Paul, Luke and the Graeco-Roman World: Essays in Honour of Alexan-*

scrolls at the beginning of their careers and integrated the Qumran documents into a new picture of the background of Early Christianity. In that period people discussed almost every aspect of possible relations between Qumran and the New Testament. In the scrolls they sought reflections of New Testament messianism and eschatology, baptism and the Last Supper, ideas of the Spirit and dualism and predestination, the Christian use of the Scriptures, and the organization of the early church. They interpreted Jesus, Paul, John the Baptist, and the Fourth Evangelist on the background of possible Qumran influences.³¹

The results, however, remained controversial. Some scholars from a rather conservative viewpoint emphasized the relations between the New Testament and Qumran in order to strengthen the deep rootedness of Early Christianity within the traditions of Palestinian Judaism.³² Other authors remained skeptical and continued to see the predominant background of, for example, Pauline and Johannine thought in Hellenistic Judaism, paganism, or even Gnosticism. Significantly, the doyens of New Testament interpretation in German and British scholarship, Rudolf Bultmann and Charles H. Dodd, did not alter their general views on the religio-historical background of the New Testament. In the context of the Bultmann school, the detailed report on the scholarly discussion by Herbert Braun in the *Theologische Rundschau*³³ and his comprehensive two-volume study *Qumran und das Neue Testament*³⁴ presented a rather reserved position.

der J. M. Wedderburn (ed. A. Christophersen et al.; JSNTSup 217; London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002), 221–48.

³¹ The discussions of those years are documented in a number of volumes; see K. Stendahl, ed., *The Scrolls and the New Testament* (New York: Harper, 1957); J. P. M. van der Ploeg, ed., *La secte de Qumrân et les origines du Christianisme* (RechBib 4; Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1959); J. Murphy-O'Connor, ed., *Paul and Qumran: Studies in New Testament Exegesis* (London: SPCK, 1969); J. H. Charlesworth, ed., *John and Qumran* (London: Chapman, 1972).

³² Cf., e.g., the works on the Fourth Gospel by 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, 1954), 153–71; and F.-M. Braun, “L’arrière-fond Judaïque.”

³³ H. Braun, “Qumran und das Neue Testament: Ein Bericht über 10 Jahre Forschung (1950–1959),” *TRu* 28 (1962): 97–234; 29 (1963): 142–76, 189–260; 30 (1964): 1–38, 89–137.

³⁴ H. Braun, *Qumran und das Neue Testament* (2 vols.; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1966); vol. 1 reprints the articles mentioned in n. 33 (above); vol. 2 presents discussion on several important topics. The study has been most influential since it has the form of a catena, presenting the scholarly views within a convenient arrangement according to the sequence of the New Testament texts. Cf. also two chapters in his *Gesammelte Studien zum Neuen Testament und seiner Umwelt* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1962): “Die Bedeutung der Qumranfunde für das Verständnis Jesu von Nazareth,” 86–99; and “Römer 7,7–25 und das Selbstverständnis des Qumran-Frommen,” 100–19.

In retrospect, we can see that many of the crucial issues concerning the relations between the Qumran texts and the New Testament could not be answered sufficiently in that period. The discussion was still limited to the texts from Cave 1 and included only a small portion of other Qumran documents. So, scholars could not adequately see that the character and the diversity of the Qumran library could not be seen adequately at that time. Furthermore, most of the scholars viewed the Qumran community as a marginal “sect” in separation from the predominant traditions of contemporary Judaism. On the basis of this view it was hard to interpret the linguistic and traditio-historical parallels with New Testament texts. The result of the discussion was, then, an impressive collection of more or less convincing parallels. But the historical links between the Qumran texts and Early Christianity could not be specified convincingly at that time.

III. Stagnation (ca. 1970–1991)

We can characterize the third period, from the beginning of the 1970s to the end of the 1980s, as the period of stagnation. There were no more new discoveries, and the publication of the thousands of small fragments from Cave 4 proceeded slowly. The bulk of fragments was accessible to only a small group of scholars entrusted with their publication. Hence, Qumran scholarship became more and more an area of study of a more or less hermetic circle of specialists who had access to the unpublished material. Even if their work with the fragments continued, the public did not notice it, and many biblical scholars became frustrated and lost their interest in the scrolls. Bible commentators could draw on only the earlier discussions and quote some of the well-known parallels in the texts from Cave 1. But except for some reflections on the significance of the *Temple Scroll*, edited by Yigael Yadin in 1977,³⁵ there were only few studies on the relations between Qumran and the New Testament.

IV. A New “Qumran Springtime” (since 1991)

The situation changed rapidly in 1991, when the bulk of previously unknown texts became accessible by the publication of computer-generated text-reconstructions, compiled from a card concordance from the 1950s by Ben Zion Wacholder and Martin G. Abegg,³⁶ by the release of the facsimile and

³⁵ Y. Yadin, *Megillat ham-miqdash: The Temple Scroll* (3 vols. + suppl.; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1977).

³⁶ B. Z. Wacholder and M. G. Abegg, Jr., eds., *A Preliminary Edition of the Unpublished Dead Sea Scrolls: The Hebrew and Aramaic Texts from Cave Four* (3 fasc.; Washington, DC: Biblical Archaeology Society, 1991–1995).

the microfiche edition of photographs of all the scrolls,³⁷ and definitely by the rapid sequence of new volumes in the series Discoveries in the Judaean Desert (DJD) under the chief editorship of Emanuel Tov.³⁸ In 1992, Martin Hengel correctly predicted a new “Qumran springtime.”³⁹ Now, after the turn of the millennium and more than fifty years after the first discoveries, the DJD series of official editions is complete, with few exceptions, and all Qumran texts are accessible at least in a preliminary transcription and translation. For everyone, it is possible now to look at them and to make up one’s own mind about the problems. Moreover, all the important texts are presented together with scholarly tools in electronic databases,⁴⁰ which provide numerous new possibilities for evaluating the evidence.

During the last ten or fifteen years, the situation of Qumran research has changed fundamentally. In contrast to the earlier periods of research, we can now appreciate the real wealth of the Qumran library and the pluriformity of the documents, especially those from Cave 4. Given the publication of previously unknown pseudepigraphic, calendric, and halakic documents, sapiential and liturgical texts, scholars had to rethink all the earlier statements on Qumran and its library, the classification of the texts, and their relations with the different traditions of early Judaism and Early Christianity. Contributions in great number from a growing community of scholars provide detailed and thorough analyses of the new documents and a fresh evaluation of the earlier-published texts. Well-known assumptions on Qumran and its meaning became questionable, and new ideas are about to rise. This is also true for the issue of the relations between Qumran, the Essenes or the Qumran library, and the New Testament or Early Christianity, even if the questions prominent in the discussion during the 1950s and 1960s have lost their pivotal position.

But the documents published in the 1990s also provide a great number of new terminological and ideological parallels with New Testament texts. Therefore, scholars have started to analyze and evaluate the whole body of

³⁷ R. H. Eisenman and J. M. Robinson, eds., *A Facsimile Edition of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Prepared with an Introduction and Index* (2 vols.; Washington, DC: Biblical Archaeology Society, 1991); and E. Tov, ed., with the collaboration of S. J. Pfann, *The Dead Sea Scrolls on Microfiche: A Comprehensive Facsimile Edition of the Texts from the Judaean Desert* (Leiden: Brill, 1993).

³⁸ On the development since 1989, see the balanced information in P. W. Flint and J. C. VanderKam, *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Their Significance for Understanding the Bible, Judaism, Jesus and Christianity* (London: HarperCollins, 2002), 390–402.

³⁹ M. Hengel, “Die Qumranrollen und der Umgang mit der Wahrheit,” *TBei* 23 (1992): 233–37, esp. 235: “We may ... expect something like a new Qumran spring.”

⁴⁰ T. H. Lim, ed., in consultation with P. S. Alexander, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Electronic Reference Library* (Disk 1; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997); E. Tov, ed., *The Dead Sea Scrolls Electronic Reference Library* (Disk 2; Leiden: Brill, 1999).

material again.⁴¹ From the perspective of the new texts, a large number of scholarly studies provide fresh insights on the significance of the Qumran documents for the interpretation of the New Testament. On the other hand, earlier assumptions that appear to be overstated in the light of the new evidence can be corrected and modified.

However, the discussion has only started, and it will be a lot of work until its results can be summed up. But hopefully in some years we will be able to provide a new evaluated collection of all the material from Qumran that can help us to understand the documents of Early Christianity within their context of early Judaism.

At the University of Munich, my predecessor, Heinz-Wolfgang Kuhn, has worked on the project of a new “kind of ‘Billerbeck’ on Qumran,”⁴² a commented collection of the Qumran parallels for New Testament exegeses. The Munich Qumran project then focused on the authentic Letters of Paul. Its results are being preliminarily published in a number of articles, until the book-length publication will appear in due time. The most recent comprehensive discussion of the links between Qumran and the New Testament is the two-volume study by Herbert Braun from 1966, which covers the scholarly literature only from 1950–59. This study is clearly outdated. It is also based on a number of assumptions on early Judaism and on the place of the New

⁴¹ On messianism, e.g., the important study by J. Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte aus Qumran: Königliche, priesterliche und prophetisch Meessiasvorstellungen in den Schriftfunden von Qumran* (WUNT II/104; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998), provides an extensive analysis of the whole material and can replace the former Standard monograph by A. S. van der Woude, *Die messianischen Vorstellungen der Gemeinde von Qumran* (SSN 3; Assen: van Gorcum, 1957). Cf. also J. H. Charlesworth, “Challenging the Consensus Communis regarding Qumran Messianism (1QS, 4QS MSS),” 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), 120–34. On the issue of Qumran dualism and its alleged relations with Johannine thought, cf. J. Frey, “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; Published in Honour of J. M. Baumgarten* (ed. M. J. Bernstein, F. García Martínez, and J. Kampen; STDJ 23; Leiden, New York: Brill, 1997), 275–335 (in this volume, 243–299); idem, “Licht aus den Höhlen? Der ‘Johanneische Dualismus’ und die Texte von Qumran,” in *Kontexte des Johannesevangeliums: Das vierte Evangelium in religions- und traditions-geschichtlicher Perspektive* (ed. J. Frey and U. Schnelle, in collaboration with J. Schlegel; WUNT 175; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004), 117–203, thoroughly questioning the widespread assumptions of a close relationship between Qumran and the Gospel of John. See also Frey, “Recent Perspectives on Johannine Dualism and its Background,” in *Text, Thought, and Practice in Qumran and Early Christianity* (ed. R. A. Clements and D. Schwartz; Leiden: Brill, 2009), 127–57 (in this volume, 763–790).

⁴² Cf. H.-W. Kuhn, “The Impact of the Qumran Scrolls,” 327–39, esp. 327. Cf., since then, the articles mentioned in n. 30 (above).

Testament within the history-of-religions that cannot be shared any more.⁴³ So, in view of the progress of discussion and, especially, the recently published Qumran texts, we urgently need a new collection and critical evaluation of the Qumran parallels to New Testament texts.

In the present paper I would like to discuss some outlines of the problems and perspectives of the issue. At first I will give a critical assessment of four problematical patterns of relating Qumran documents with Early Christianity. Then, I will consider a few methodological aspects that are important for the approach in view of the recently published material. Finally, I will present three test cases to show in what way and to what extent the Qumran documents can enrich the interpretation of New Testament texts.

B. Four Problematical Patterns

Within scholarship and public discussion, the relations between Qumran and the New Testament were described in very different ways. Authors who have seen a close connection between the Qumran library and the New Testament or between the Qumran community and Early Christianity make use of a number of patterns that seem to be inadequate or at least questionable. But since some of these patterns are quite popular, I briefly discuss their problems, to advance a more cautious view of the relations between the Qumran library and Early-Christian traditions.

I. Pattern 1: The Qumran Community as a “Prototype” of Early Christianity (Dupont-Sommer, Wilson)

One of the first patterns of interpretation was inaugurated already by André Dupont-Sommer and then popularized by the journalist Edmund Wilson; eventually Dupont-Sommer himself took back some of his early assumptions. Within this pattern, the Qumran community is seen as a forerunner of Early Christianity, and the so-called “Righteous Teacher” as a prototype of the manner in which Jesus acted or was depicted afterward. Even if these views have been completely abandoned in serious scholarship, some of their implications are still influential, chiefly in public discussion.

André Dupont-Sommer, professor of Semitic languages and civilizations at the Sorbonne, was one of the first scholars who commented on the documents

⁴³ To mention only one example, H. Braun stays fully within the Bultmannian concept when he interprets New Testament predestinational dualism in terms of gnostic syncretism; cf. H. Braun, *Qumran und das Neue Testament*, 2:250. Bultmann himself takes up the Qumran finds only as evidence for a gnostic type of Judaism; cf. R. K. Bultmann, *Theologie des Neuen Testaments* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1951), 361 n. 1.

discovered in Cave 1 from Qumran.⁴⁴ He was struck by the similarities between some features of the community mentioned in the new documents and Early Christianity.⁴⁵ His observation that the community used the term “new covenant”⁴⁶ as a self-designation inspired him to a wide-scale comparison between this Jewish “new covenant” and the Christian “new covenant”:⁴⁷

Everything in the Jewish New Covenant heralds and prepares the way for the Christian New Covenant. The Galilean Master, as He is presented to us in the writings of the New Testament, appears in many respects as an astonishing reincarnation of the Teacher of Righteousness. Like the latter, He preached penitence, poverty, humility, love of one’s neighbor, chastity. Like him, He prescribed the observance of the Law of Moses, the Law finished and perfected, thanks to His own revelations. Like him, He was the Elect and the Messiah of God, the Messiah redeemer of the world. Like him, He was the object of the hostility of the priests, the party of the Sadducees. Like him, he was condemned and put to death. Like him, he pronounced judgment on Jerusalem, which was taken and destroyed by the Romans for having put Him to death. Like him, at the end of time, He will be the supreme judge. Like him, He founded a Church whose adherents fervently awaited His glorious return. In the Christian Church, just as in the Essene Church, the essential rite is the sacred meal, which is presided over by the priests. Here and there, at the head of each community, there is the overseer, the “bishop.” And the ideal of both Churches is essentially that of unity, communion in love – even going so far as the sharing of common property. All these similarities – and here I only touch upon the subject – taken together, constitute a very impressive whole. The question at once arises, to which of the two sects, the Jewish or the Christian, does the priority belong? Which of the two was able to influence the other? The reply leaves no room for doubt. The Teacher of Righteousness died about 65–53 BCE; Jesus the Nazarene died about 30 CE. In every case in which the resemblance compels or invites us to think of a borrowing, this was on the part of Christianity. But on the other hand, the appearance of the faith in Jesus – the foundation of the New Church – can scarcely be explained without the real historic activity of a new Prophet, a new Messiah, who has rekindled the flame and concentrated on himself the adoration of men.

These assumptions, published by Dupont-Sommer in 1950, were then picked up and popularized by Edmund Wilson.⁴⁸ Although he already realized that

⁴⁴ Cf. the publications mentioned in n. 12 (above).

⁴⁵ Dupont-Sommer was also one of the first scholars who identified the community described in the Qumran texts with the group of the Essenes, mentioned by ancient authors such as Josephus, Philo, and Pliny.

⁴⁶ 1QpHab II 3; cf. also CD VI 19; VIII 21; XIX 33–34; XX 12.

⁴⁷ Cf. Dupont-Sommer, *Aperçus préliminaires*, 119–22: “La ‘Nouvelle Alliance’ Juive et la ‘Nouvelle Alliance’ Chrétienne”; the following quotation is from the ET: *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A Preliminary Survey*, 99–100.

⁴⁸ Wilson quotes the extensive passage in *The Scrolls from the Dead Sea*; cf. idem, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: 1947–1969* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1969), 85–86.

Dupont-Sommer's interpretation was overstated,⁴⁹ he conceptualized the relation of the Qumran community or the Essenes to Jesus and the first Christians as the successive phases of a single movement. Raising the question of why New Testament scholars had not taken up the subject of the scrolls, Wilson expressed the suspicion that the observations from these documents were suppressed because they could be seen as a danger for Christian faith by questioning the uniqueness of Christ. On the other hand, he claimed that liberals saw the scrolls as a danger for their conviction "that the doctrines known as Christian were not really formulated till several generations after Jesus' death."⁵⁰ Therefore, he asked "whether anyone but a secular scholar is really quite free to grapple with the problems of the Dead Sea discoveries."⁵¹ Wilson himself shared the conviction that "it would seem an immense advantage for cultural and social intercourse – that is, for civilization – that the rise of Christianity should, at last, be generally understood as simply an episode of human history rather than propagated as dogma and divine revelation."⁵² He thought that "the study of the Dead Sea Scrolls ... cannot fail ... to conduce to this."⁵³

Wilson's view was obviously guided by an antidogmatic attitude, which led him to expect the progress of enlightenment and human civilization from the insight in the historical relativity of Christian claims of uniqueness. Therefore, Dupont-Sommer's views became so attractive for him, even though he had to admit that the French scholar had gone too far in his alleged analogies between the teacher and Jesus. Written brilliantly, Wilson's book had a considerable influence on the general public. Hence, it spread the suspicion that there might have been a greater proximity between the scrolls and Early Christianity than some Christian scholars were willing to concede, and that the scrolls could be a danger for some doctrines of Christianity so that some circles might be interested in hiding the truth.⁵⁴ It might be needless to mention that for any learned theologian or historian, there is nothing new and

⁴⁹ One can clearly see this from the earliest scholarly discussion of Dupont-Sommer's views; cf. W. Baumgartner, "Der palästinensische Handschriftenfund," *TRu* 19 (1951): 97–154, here 149–50.

⁵⁰ Wilson, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: 1947–1969*, 99.

⁵¹ Wilson, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: 1947–1969*, 100.

⁵² Wilson, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: 1947–1969*, 107.

⁵³ Wilson, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: 1947–1969*.

⁵⁴ The later discussion has shown that such a suspicion does at least help in selling a book. The idea of "unlocking" the truth about Jesus or Early Christianity has made the poor story by M. Baigent and R. Leigh, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Deception* (New York: Summit Books, 1991) a best seller, even more so in Germany, where it was published in a translated version that reinforced the widespread suspicions against the Vatican, and with "Jesus" in the title: *Verschlussache Jesus: Die Qumranrollen und die Wahrheit über das frühe Christentum* (trans. P. S. Dachs and B. Neumeister-Taroni; Munich: Droemer Knaur, 1991).

nothing dangerous in the idea that the teaching of Jesus and the phenomena of Early Christianity have analogies in biblical and postbiblical Judaism. So, Wilson's hope for further enlightenment from the Qumran Scrolls was based on an insufficient view of the state of affairs – at least in exegetical scholarship. On the other hand, the wide-scale analogies drawn by Dupont-Sommer were based on some early misreadings of the Qumran documents. The Righteous Teacher mentioned in the scrolls⁵⁵ was obviously a prophetic figure: he claimed to interpret the Scriptures by divine inspiration (1QpHab VII 4–5). Moreover, there are good reasons for the view that he was of high-priestly origin (4Q171 = 4QpPs^a III 15) and united different pious opposition groups during the time of the Maccabean wars in the *yahad* (יהד), the “Essene union.”⁵⁶ But he did not view himself as the (or a) Messiah, nor did his followers view him as a messianic figure.⁵⁷ In fact, most of the passages mentioning

⁵⁵ On this figure, cf. the fundamental study by G. Jeremias, *Der Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit* (SUNT 2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1963); and also H. Stegemann, *Die Entstehung der Qumrangemeinde* (Habilitationsschrift; privately published; Bonn: Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität, 1971). Other interpreters are convinced that there was not a single Righteous Teacher at the formative stage of the Qumran community; see, e.g., A. S. van der Woude, “Wicked Priest or Wicked Priests? Reflections on the Identification of the Wicked Priests in the Habakkuk Commentary,” *JJS* 33 (1982): 349–59; F. García Martínez, “The Origins of the Essene Movement and of the Qumran Sect,” in *The People of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Their Writings, Beliefs, and Practices* (ed. F. García Martínez and J. C. Treballe Barrera; trans. W. G. E. Watson; Leiden: Brill, 1995), 77–96; cf. M. A. Knibb, “Teacher of Righteousness,” in *EDSS* 2:918–21. In my view, we should still prefer the arguments by Jeremias and Stegemann over the so-called Groningen hypothesis advocated by van der Woude and García Martínez, which posits that the Essenes originated before the Maccabean revolt, but the Qumran sect emerged later and eventually broke away from the Essenes, not under the leadership of a sole Righteous Teacher. Cf. the argument of Hartmut Stegemann, “The Qumran Essenes – Local Members of the Main Jewish Union in Late Second Temple Times,” in *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid, 18–21 March 1991* (ed. J. C. Treballe Barrera and L. Vegas Montaner; 2 vols.; STDJ 11; Madrid: Editorial Complutense; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 1:83–166, esp. 100–104.

⁵⁶ This is the theory developed in H. Stegemann, *Die Entstehung der Qumrangemeinde*, passim. Cf. see also idem, “The Qumran Essenes-Local Members,” 153–60; idem, *Die Essener, Qumran, Johannes der Täufer und Jesus* (Freiburg: Herder, 1993), 205–6; *ET: The Library of Qumran: On the Essenes, Qumran, John the Baptist, and Jesus* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998). On the identification of the *Yahad* with the Essenes mentioned in Philo, Josephus, and Pliny, which is disputed by numerous scholars, see J. Frey, “Zur historischen Auswertung der antiken Essenerberichte: Ein Beitrag zum Gespräch mit Roland Bergmeier,” in *Qumran kontrovers: Beiträge zu den Textfunden vom Toten Meer* (ed. J. Frey and H. Stegemann; Einblicke 6; Paderborn: Bonifatius, 2003), 23–56 (in the present volume in English under the title: “On the Historical Value of the Ancient Sources about the Essenes,” 163–193).

⁵⁷ Thus Jeremias, *Der Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit*, 285: “Nothing is said about the fact that the historical teacher would also be the eschatological teacher. ...Nothing identifies

the Teacher make a clear distinction between the historical figure that coined the community and the eschatological prophet (cf. Deut 18:15–18) expected for the future (cf. 1QS IX 11).⁵⁸ There is also evidence that the Righteous Teacher was persecuted by his enemies (1QpHab XI 2–8), but none of the documents attest to a violent death of the Righteous Teacher, let alone crucifixion.

This is also correct in view of fragment 5 of 4Q285, a fragment for which such claims were made afresh.⁵⁹ This small fragment, however, does not mention the Righteous Teacher but a messianic figure, the Prince of the Congregation or “Bud of David” (cf. Isa 11:1), who is said to kill his enemies (4Q285 5 4; cf. 4Q161 8–10 iii 21–22; 1QSb [1Q28b] V 24–29), as predicted in Isa 11:4b.⁶⁰

Thus, even though there are some analogies between Jesus and the Righteous Teacher,⁶¹ the idea that the fate of Jesus was prefigured in the fate of the Righteous Teacher is completely mistaken. Other analogies between the Qumran Community and Early Christianity in matters such as purification rites and communal meals, the community of goods, and in some doctrines

him with the messiah.” Cf., more recently, Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte aus Qumran*, 455–58.

⁵⁸ Cf. the early statement of R. E. Brown, “The Messianism of Qumran,” *CBQ* 19 (1957): 53–82, here 73–74. The identification was advocated by van der Woude, *Die messianischen Vorstellungen*, 84. Cf. also Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte aus Qumran*, 456.

⁵⁹ *The New York Times*, Nov. 8, 1991; *The Times* (London), Nov. 8, 1991. The claim was spread by M. O. Wise and R. H. Eisenman, *Jesus und die Urchristen: Die Qumran-Rollen entschlüsselt* (Munich: Bertelsmann, 1993), 36, suggesting the translation “and they will kill the leader of the community, the bran[ch of David]”; cf. The English original, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Uncovered* (Dorset: Element Books, 1992).

⁶⁰ Even if the translation mentioned in n. 59 (above) is grammatically possible, it is strongly preferable to translate the phrase וְהַמִּיתוֹ נְשִׂיא הַעֲרָה in line 4 differently: “And the Prince of the Congregation, the Bran[ch of David] will kill him.” The reason for this interpretation is the scriptural reference to Isa 10:34–11:1 in lines 1–2 of the same fragment, which makes an interpretation of line 5 in terms of Isa 11:4c–d most probable. Cf. Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte aus Qumran*, 83, 86–87; and, earlier, M. Bockmuehl, “A Slain Messiah in 4Q Serekh Milhamah (4QS285)?” *TynBul* 43, no. 1 (1992): 155–69, esp. 159; O. Betz and R. Riesner, *Jesus, Qumran und der Vatikan* (3rd ed.; Giessen: Brunnen, 1993), 103–20; ET: *Jesus, Qumran and the Vatican: Clarifications* (trans. J. Bowden; London: SCM, 1994); and J. J. Collins, “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, esp. 105–6.

⁶¹ Cf. already Jeremias, *Der Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit*, 319–53; more recently H. Stegemann, “The Teacher of Righteousness’ and Jesus: Two Types of Religious Leadership in Judaism at the Turn of the Era,” in *Jewish Civilization in the Hellenistic–Roman Period* (ed. S. Talmon; Philadelphia: Trinity Press International, 1991), 196–213.

deserve serious consideration. But Dupont-Sommer's idea, based on a hypothesis of the nineteenth century author Ernest Renan that Christianity is a kind of Essenism that has become successful,⁶² cannot be maintained in view of the Qumran texts. The Qumran community is definitely not the prototype of Early Christianity.

II. Pattern 2: The Qumran Texts as Reflections of Early Christian History (Eisenman, Thiering)

Another popular theory on the relation between the Qumran documents and Early Christianity should be mentioned here, even if it has to be assessed as completely erroneous and misleading: It is the claim of some authors that the Qumran documents are actually documents of the Early Christian movement, telling the history of Early Christianity in an otherwise unknown or even allegorical manner. Even if these ideas are based only on very superficial textual data, they are a fertile basis for writing novels that can claim to draw a new picture of Jesus and the Early Christians which is completely different from all that we know from the New Testament. By means of such works, the theory has become quite popular, and this is the only reason for mentioning it here.

One example is the view of Robert Eisenman, also used as the underlying theory of the best seller *The Dead Sea Scrolls Deception*, by Michael Baigent and Richard Leigh.⁶³ In numerous publications, Eisenman⁶⁴ has put forward

⁶² Dupont-Sommer, *Aperçus préliminaires*, 121: "Le christianisme est un essénisme qui a largement réussi"; cf. Ernest Renan, *Oeuvres complètes*, vol. 6, *Histoire du peuple d'Israël* (ed. H. Psichari; Paris: Calmann-Levy, 1953), 1301. Before the discovery of the Qumran texts, scholars based their views of Essenism only on the evidence from ancient writers, including ecclesiastical authors such as Eusebius. Their views were shaped by a long tradition of linking the Essenes (or the Therapeutae in Philo) with later Christian asceticism or monasticism. On these views, see the study by S. Wagner, *Die Essener in der wissenschaftlich Diskussion vom Ausgang des 18. bis zum Beginn des 20. Jahrhunderts* (BZAW 79; Berlin: Töpelmann, 1960).

⁶³ See n. 54 (above). On the aspect of truth mentioned in the subtitle of the German version, see Hengel, "Die Qumranrollen und der Umgang mit der Wahrheit," 233–37.

⁶⁴ Cf. R. H. Eisenman, *Maccabees, Zadokites, Christians and Qumran: A New Hypothesis of Qumran Origins* (StPB 34; Leiden: Brill, 1983); idem, *James the Just in the Habakkuk Peshet* (Leiden: Brill, 1986); idem, "Playing on and Transmuting Words: Interpreting 'Abeit-Galuto' Offered in the Habakkuk-Peshet," in *Mogilany 1989: Papers on the Dead Sea Scrolls Offered in Memory of Jean Carmignac. Part II: The Teacher of Righteousness. Literary Studies* (ed. Z. J. Kapera; Proceedings of the Second International Colloquium on the Dead Sea Scrolls [Mogilany, Poland, 1989]; QM 3; Kraków: Enigma, 1991), 177–96; idem, "Theory of Judeo-Christian Origins: The Last Column of the Damascus Document," in *Methods of Investigation of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Khirbet Qumran Site: Present Realities and Future Prospects* (ed. M. O. Wise et al.; New York: Academy of Sciences,

the view that there was a coherent “Zadokite” movement that included Ezra, Judas Maccabaeus, John the Baptist, Jesus, and his brother James. So, Jesus with his followers and the Qumran group are regarded as parts of that movement, which is also identified with Zealotism, the Jewish protest against Rome. Eisenman’s starting point is the superficial similarity between the designation “Righteous Teacher” and the later epithet for “James the Just.” The similarity between both leads Eisenman to the identification of both figures. So, he interprets 1QpHab XI 4–8 as a comment on the persecution of “James the Just” by the high priest Ananus II, as reported in Josephus (*Ant.* XX 200–203). Consequently, he identifies the “Liar,” another figure mentioned in the Qumran texts as opposed to the Righteous Teacher and his group, with Paul the apostle. So he sees the Qumran documents as mirroring Jewish-Christian-Zealot polemic against Paul, whom he views not only as an apostate from Judaism but also as an agent of the Romans. This quite fantastic theory is based on the assumption that the authors of the Qumran texts used a peculiar method of wordplay to conceal the historical events behind allusions so that the modern interpreter has to use his or her speculative fantasy in order to detect the real meaning behind the words.⁶⁵

Another and even more fantastic model was developed by the Australian Qumran scholar and novelist Barbara Thiering. Like Eisenman, she defends a late Herodian date of the Dead Sea Scrolls,⁶⁶ but identifies the Righteous Teacher with John the Baptist, whereas the “Wicked Priest” and the “Liar” (who are most probably two different figures in the Qumran texts) can be nobody else than Jesus himself. The result is a bizarre novel of the “new” life of Jesus, from his birth near Qumran, his education by the Essenes, and his initiation into the Qumran community by John the Baptist – until his marriage with Mary of Magdala and, later, with Lydia of Philippi, and his journey to Rome, where his traces are lost. This story is constructed not only from the Qumran texts but also from the Gospels, which are read not on the simple literal level but on another level of meaning, as kinds of allegories.

The decisive argument that destroys all these constructions is the argument from the dating of the texts. Early palaeographical studies had already ex-

1994), 355–70; idem, *James the Brother of Jesus: The Key to Unlocking the Secrets of Early Christianity and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York: Viking, 1996).

⁶⁵ Cf. Eisenman, “Playing On and Transmuting Words.” See the critical assessment of the method in Betz and Riesner, *Jesus, Qumran und der Vatikan*, 97–98; cf. 88–102, with an extensive criticism of Eisenman’s constructions.

⁶⁶ Cf. B. E. Thiering’s early study *Redating the Teacher of Righteousness* (Sydney: Theological Explorations, 1979). She develops her full story in *Jesus and the Riddle of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Unlocking the Secrets of His Life Story* (San Francisco: Harper Collins, 1992). Cf. the criticism in Betz and Riesner, *Qumran und der Vatikan*, 121–38.

cluded a Christian date for the majority of the Dead Sea Scrolls.⁶⁷ But the uncertainties of the palaeographical method were mostly removed by the use of the radiocarbon method, which was applied to an increasing number of fragments from Qumran and has widely confirmed the earlier palaeographical dates.⁶⁸ The fact that authors like Eisenman and Thiering are forced to neglect or even reject the results of the scientific dating methods show most clearly that their constructions are not compatible with what we can know today. Their stories are novelistic and largely beyond the range of sound scholarship. Even if some of the Qumran manuscripts were written in the first century CE (Herodian era), many others were written in Hasmonean times or earlier. The conclusion is inevitable: The Qumran texts are not a reflection of early-Christian history, and none of the figures known from Early Christianity are mentioned in the scrolls.

III. Pattern 3: Christian Documents within the Qumran Library: The Problem of the 7Q Documents (O'Callaghan, Thiede)

A theory that has been defended chiefly in conservative Christian circles is about the fragments from Qumran Cave 7, some of which were suggested to be fragments of New Testament texts. It is a striking fact that in this cave, only Greek documents were found. Seemingly the cave – probably a working room of one of the inhabitants from Qumran – was already opened in ancient times, so that the excavators who discovered the cave in 1955 could only find what its first visitors had left or lost on the floor.⁶⁹ Hence, there are no large

⁶⁷ Cf. the fundamental study by F. M. Cross, “The Development of the Jewish Scripts,” in *The Bible and the Ancient Near East: Essays in Honor of William Foxwell Albright* (ed. G. E. Wright; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1961), 133–202.

⁶⁸ Cf. G. Bonani et al., “Radiocarbon Dating of Fourteen Dead Sea Scrolls,” *Radiocarbon* 34 (1992): 843–49; A. J. T. Jull et al., “Radiocarbon Dating of Scrolls and Linen Fragments from the Judean Desert,” *Radiocarbon* 37 (1995): 11–19; repr. in *Atiqot* 28 (1996): 85–91. Most recently, cf. G. L. Doudna, “Dating and Radiocarbon Analysis,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment* (ed. P. W. Flint and J. C. VanderKam; Leiden: Brill, 1998–1999), 1:430–65, here 463–64, who thinks that even the scrolls with “Herodian” scripts should be dated earlier, in the first century BCE. See the comprehensive report in Flint and VanderKam, *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 20–33.

⁶⁹ Stegemann, *Die Essener, Qumran, Johannes*, 111–12, notes that Origen, when he composed his famous Hexapla, used an additional version of the Greek Psalter, which during the time of Antonius, son of Severus (211–217 CE), had been found near Jericho, in a jar with other Hebrew and Greek manuscripts. From the ninth century, another report on the discovery of Hebrew books near Jericho is preserved in a letter of the Nestorian patriarch Timothy I (cf. *idem*). On the information from Origen, cf. G. Mercati, *Note di letteratura biblica cristiana antica* (StT 5; Rome: Tip. vaticana, 1901), 28–60; H. B. Swete, *Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek* (2nd ed.; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1902), 53–55; on 1 Timothy and his letter, see O. Braun, “Der Brief des Katholikos

portions of texts in Cave 7 but only small fragments of twenty manuscripts. Some of them were identified, one (7Q1) as part of a manuscript of the Septuagint of Exodus; another (7Q2) is a copy of the Letter of Jeremiah. The other fragments remained unidentified in the DJD edition;⁷⁰ the few legible letters did not allow identification with any other previously known text.

In 1972, the Spanish papyrologist José O'Callaghan proposed an identification of some of the fragments with New Testament texts, chiefly of 7Q5 with Mark 6:52–53 and 7Q4 with 1 Tim 3:16–4:3.⁷¹ These assumptions proved to be quite explosive: if they were right, this would challenge the usual dates for New Testament texts and require a date before 68 CE, not only for the Gospel of Mark but also for 1 Timothy, which is commonly viewed as a pseudepigraphic letter from the beginning of the second century CE. The possible impact on issues of New Testament introduction (authorship, authenticity, and date of New Testament texts) might be the reason why the 7Q documents have caused such a fierce debate. For those who advocate the identification of 7Q5 with a part of Mark, this creates a possibility to date the earliest Gospel about twenty years earlier than usual and to claim a greater historical value for the Gospel tradition. It must be recognized, however, that an earlier date for Mark does not necessarily imply an improved historical reliability. Therefore, the historical or theological consequences of such an earlier date would remain quite uncertain. Another open question would be why and how the text of the Gospel was brought to Qumran, and in what interest somebody might have worked with that text. But there is no need to speculate on this when the identification of the texts cannot be maintained.

Soon after the publication of O'Callaghan's article, his proposals were rejected by some of the leading scholars in New Testament textual history, papyrology, and Qumranology.⁷² However, in 1984, Carsten Peter Thiede – a

Timotheos I über biblische Studien des 9. Jahrhunderts,” *OrChr* 1 (1901): 299–313; idem, “Der Katholikos Timotheos I und seine Briefe,” *OrChr* 1 (1901): 138–52.

⁷⁰ M. Baillet, “Grotte 7,” in *Les ‘Petites Grottes’ de Qumrân: Exploration de la falaise, les grottes 2Q, 3Q, 5Q, 6Q, 7Q à 10Q, le rouleau de cuivre* (ed. M. Baillet, J. T. Milik, and R. de Vaux; DJD 3; Oxford: Clarendon, 1962), 142–46, pl. 30.

⁷¹ J. O'Callaghan, “¿Papiros neotestamentarios en la cueva 7 de Qumrân?” *Bib* 53 (1972): 91–100; cf. more fully in idem, *Los papiros griegos de la cueva 7 de Qumrân* (BAC 353; Madrid: Editorial católica, 1974); and recently idem, *Los primeros testimonios del Nuevo Testamento: Papirología neotestamentaria* (Córdoba: Ediciones El Almendro, 1995).

⁷² K. Aland, “Neue neutestamentliche Papyri III: (1) Die Papyri aus Höhle 7 von Qumran und Zuschreibung zum Neuen Testament durch J. O'Callaghan,” *NTS* 20 (1974): 358–76; idem, “Über die Möglichkeit der Identifikation kleiner Fragmente neutestamentlicher Handschriften mit Hilfe des Computers,” in *Studies in New Testament Language and Text: Essays in Honor of George D. Kilpatrick* (ed. J. K. Elliott; Leiden: Brill, 1976), 14–38; C. M. Martini, “Note sui papiri della grotta 7 di Qumrân,” *Bib* 53 (1972): 101–4; cf. the negative comments by the papyrologist C. H. Roberts, “On Some Presumed Papyrus

specialist in English literature but an autodidact in papyrological studies – began to defend O’Callaghan’s identification of 7Q5 with Mark 6:52–53.⁷³ His renewal of O’Callaghan’s thesis was discussed in a series of articles⁷⁴ and in a conference at Eichstätt in 1992.⁷⁵ Thiede has also utilized new technological tools for improving the legibility of the fragment,⁷⁶ but the better photographs confirmed experts even more in their rejection of the proposed identification of 7Q5 with Mark 6:52–53.⁷⁷

On the tiny fragment, only ten letters are clearly legible; they are spread on four consecutive lines, and the only certain word is a simple “and” (KAI). The identification with Mark 6:52–53 was first inspired by the sequence of letters NNHΣ, which could be part of the local name “Gennesaret” (NNHΣ) or part of a Greek verb form such as *εγεννησεν* or something else. If the

Fragments of the New Testament from Qumran,” *JTS* 23 (1972): 446–47; the Qumran scholar M. Baillet, “Les manuscrits de la grotte 7 de Qumrân et le Nouveau Testament,” *Bib* 53 (1972): 508–16; 54 (1973): 340–50; also, the evangelical scholars C. J. Hemer, “New Testament Fragments at Qumran,” *TynBul* 23 (1972): 125–28; and G. D. Fee, “Some Dissenting Notes on 7Q5 = Mark 6:52–53,” *JBL* 92 (1973): 109–12.

⁷³ C. P. Thiede, “7Q – Eine Rückkehr zu den neutestamentlichen Papyrusfragmenten in der siebten Höhle von Qumran,” *Bib* 65 (1994): 538–59; cf. idem, *Die älteste Evangelien-Handschrift? Das Markusfragment von Qumran und die Anfänge der schriftlichen Überlieferung des Neuen Testaments* (Wuppertal: Brockhaus, 1986); idem, *The Earliest Gospel Manuscript? The Qumran Papyrus 7Q5 and Its Significance for New Testament Studies* (London: Paternoster, 1992); most recently, C. P. Thiede and M. D’Ancona, *Eyewitness to Jesus: Amazing New Manuscript Evidence about the Origin of the Gospels* (New York: Doubleday, 1996); German translation: *Der Jesus-Papyrus: Die Entdeckung einer Evangelien-Handschrift aus der Zeit der Augenzeugen* (2nd ed.; Reinbek: Rowohlt, 1997); C. P. Thiede, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Jewish Origins of Christianity* (Oxford: Lion, 2000).

⁷⁴ Cf. H.-U. Rosenbaum, “Cave 7Q5! Gegen die erneute Inanspruchnahme des Qumranfragments 7Q5 als Bruchstück der ältesten Evangelien-Handschrift,” *BZ* 31 (1987): 189–205. Cf. also the articles mentioned in notes 75, 77–83 (below).

⁷⁵ Cf. the discussions in the congress volume, B. Mayer, ed., *Christen und Christliches in Qumran?* Est, NS 32; Regensburg: Pustet, 1992); C. Focant, “7Q5 = Mk 6,52–53: A Questionable and Questioning Identification,” 11–25; and S. R. Pickering, “Paleographical Details of the Qumran Fragment 7Q5,” 27–31.

⁷⁶ C. P. Thiede, “Bericht über die kriminaltechnische Untersuchung des Fragments 7Q5 in Jerusalem,” in *Christen und Christliches in Qumran?* (ed. B. Mayer; Est, NS 32; Regensburg: Pustet, 1992), 239–45; C. P. Thiede and G. Masuch, “Confocal Laser Scanning and the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *The Dead Sea 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 and the Shrine of the Book, 2000), 895–905.

⁷⁷ Cf. G. N. Stanton, *Gospel Truth? New Light on Jesus and the Gospels* (London: HarperCollins, 1995), 28–29; G. D. Fee, in *ABW* 3 (1995): 24–25; and R. Riesner, *Essener und Urgemeinde in Jerusalem: Neue Funde und Quellen* (2nd ed.; BAZ 6; Giessen: Brunnen, 1998), 133–34. This is remarkable, because in an earlier publication, Riesner had left the issue open; cf. Betz and Riesner, *Jesus, Qumran und der Vatikan*, 139–50.

identification with Mark 6:52–53 were correct, there would be at least three major textual differences from the Gospel text within that small portion of text: The words *επι την γην* (6:53) cannot be placed within the space left; the word *διαπερασσαντες* (6:53) would have been crudely miswritten, because the fragment reads a τ instead of δ (TI ...), but a form like *τιαπερασσαντες* is quite improbable.⁷⁸ Finally, in line 2 the proposed reading *αυ]τωνη[καρδια* is impossible, because the text cannot be transcribed ΤΩΝ but as ΤΩΙ with iota subscript (τῶ), which makes up a completely different grammatical form.⁷⁹ Therefore, it is definitely impossible that 7Q5 represents the text of Mark 6:52–53.⁸⁰

For some other fragments from Cave 7, scholars have proposed alternative identifications with other texts, mainly parts of *1 Enoch*.⁸¹ For 7Q4, the identification with parts of 1 Timothy is definitely falsified;⁸² and for 7Q5, alternative identifications with Zech 7:3c–5⁸³ and also *1 En.* 15:9d–10 were proposed.⁸⁴ All these texts fit much more within the context of the Qumran library than New Testament texts do.

Since the proposed identification of 7Q5 with Mark 6:52–53 is textually impossible, there is reason to abandon the hope of finding New Testament documents at Qumran. O’Callaghan and especially Thiede, however, are not very open to the scholarly criticism of their theories; they pretend that their readings and identifications were definitely proved and certain.⁸⁵ But the

⁷⁸ Cf. the argument in Rosenbaum, “Cave 7Q5!” esp. 198–202; and further in M.-É. Boismard, “A propos de 7Q5 et Mc 6,52–53,” *RB* 102 (1995): 585–88.

⁷⁹ Thus already, see Baillet, “Grotte 7” (DJD 3), 144, pl. 30. See now also Riesner, *Essener und Urgemeinde*, 134; and – on the basis of a new microscopic analysis of the fragment – R. H. Gundry, “No NU in Line 2 of 7Q5: A Final Disidentification of 7Q5 with Mark 6:52–53,” *JBL* 118 (1999): 698–707.

⁸⁰ Cf. also the monograph by S. Enste, *Kein Markustext in Qumran; Ein Untersuchung der These: Qumran-Fragment 7Q5 = Mk 6,52–53* (NTOA 45; Freiburg, Schweiz: Universitätsverlag, 2000).

⁸¹ G. Wilhelm Nebe, “7Q4 – Möglichkeit und Grenze einer Identifikation,” *RQ* 13 (1988): 629–33; É. Puech, “Notes sur les fragments grecs du manuscrit 7Q4 = 1 Hénoch 103 et 105,” *RB* 103 (1996): 592–600; idem, “Sept fragments de la lettre d’Hénoch (1 Hén 100, 103 et 105) dans la grotte 7 de Qumrân,” *RQ* 18 (1997): 313–24; E. A. Muro, Jr., “The Greek Fragments of Enoch from Qumran Cave 7,” *RQ* 18 (1997): 307–12.

⁸² Cf. É. Puech, “Des fragments Grecs de la grotte 7 et le Nouveau Testament? 7Q4 et 7Q5 et la Papyrus Magdalen Grec 17 = P64,” *RB* 102 (1995): 570–84.

⁸³ M. Vittoria Spottorno, “Una nueva posible identificación de 7Q5,” *Sef* 52 (1992): 541–43; cf. the revised proposal in idem, “Can Methodological Limits Be Set in the Debate on the Identification of 7Q5?” *DSD* 6 (1999): 66–77, here 72.

⁸⁴ Cf. Spottorno, “Can Methodological Limits Be Set?” 66–77, esp. 76–77.

⁸⁵ Cf. the quotations from an interview with José O’Callaghan (in the journal *Vida y Espiritualidad*) in Spottorno, “Can Methodological Limits Be Set?” 66–77, here 66–67 notes 2–7. Thiede tried to redate a well-known papyrus with text from the Gospel of Matthew (P. Magd. Gr. 17 = P64) from 200 CE to 50 CE; cf. C. P. Thiede, “Papyrus Magdalen

discussion has shown – in my view definitively – that none of the fragments from Qumran can be proved to contain the text of a Gospel or an Epistle from the New Testament. There is no textual bridge between the New Testament and the library of Qumran. Hence, there is no reason to speculate on the presence of Christians or Christian documents at Qumran.

IV. Pattern 4: Personal Links Between Essenism and the Primitive Church: The Hypothesis of an Essene Quarter in Jerusalem (Pixner, Riesner)

A fourth pattern suggests not textual but local and personal links between the Essene movement and Early Christianity. The basic argument is the assumption of an Essene quarter in Jerusalem, which is supposed to be located on the southwestern hill of Jerusalem, today called Mt. Zion, in the area of the Dormition Abbey. Traditionally, the Last Supper and Pentecost are located in this area. So, if the view developed by the Benedictine archaeologist Bargil Pixner and the German New Testament scholar Rainer Riesner⁸⁶ is correct, this would open up the possibility for major Essene influences on the primitive Christian community and on Christianity in general. The theory of the Essene quarter is based on a few major historical data, some of which are not free from uncertainties. They have to be considered briefly.

Greek 17 (Gregory-Aland P64): A Reappraisal,” *ZPE* 105 (1995): 13–20, and pl. 9; Thiede and D’Ancona, *Eyewitness to Jesus*; idem, *Der Jesus-Papyrus*. His arguments, however, have been thoroughly criticized by experts: cf. S. R. Pickering, “Controversy Surrounding Fragments of the Gospel of Matthew in Magdalen College, Oxford,” in *New Testament Textual Research Update* 3 (1995): 22–25; D. C. Parker, “Was Matthew Written before 50 CE? The Magdalen Papyrus of Matthew,” *ExpTim* 107 (1996): 40–43; K. Wachtel, “P^{64/67}: Fragmente des Matthäusevangeliums aus dem 1. Jahrhundert?” *ZPE* 107 (1995): 73–80; R. Riesner, “Rückfrage nach Jesus,” *TBei* 30 (1999): 328–41, here 337–39.

⁸⁶ Cf. B. Pixner, “An Essene Quarter on Mount Zion?” in *Studia Hierosolymitana: Studi archeologi; In onore di P. Bellarmino Bagatti* (directed by T. Emmanuele et al.; SBF: Collectio major 22; Jerusalem: Franciscan Printing Press, 1976), 1:245–85; idem, “The History of the ‘Essene Gate’ Area,” *ZDPV* 105 (1989): 96–104; idem, “Church of the Apostles Found on Mt. Zion,” *BAR* 16, no. 3 (1990): 16–35, 60; idem, *Wege des Messias und Stätten der Urkirche: Jesus und das Judenchristentum im Licht neuer archäologischer Erkenntnisse* (ed. R. Riesner; BAZ 2; Giessen: Brunnen, 1991); idem, “Jerusalem’s Essene Gateway: Where the Community Lived in Jesus’ Time,” *BAR* 23 (1997): 22–31, 64–66; Rainer Riesner, “Essener und Urkirche in Jerusalem,” *BK* 40 (1985): 64–76; idem, “Josephus’ ‘Gate of the Essenes’ in Modern Discussion,” *ZDPV* 105 (1989): 105–9; idem, “Jesus, the Primitive Community, and the Essene Quarter of Jerusalem,” in *Jesus and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. J. H. Charlesworth; ABRL; New York: Doubleday, 1992), 198–234; idem, “Das Jerusalemer Essenerviertel und die Urgemeinde: Josephus, Bellum Judaicum V 145; 11QMiqdash 46, 13–16; Apostelgeschichte 1–6 und die Archäologie,” *ANRW* 26.2:1775–1992; repr. with addendum in idem, *Essener und Urgemeinde in Jerusalem*.

First, the argument is based on the widespread conviction that the people who inhabited Qumran belonged to the larger group of the Essenes,⁸⁷ which was not limited to the place in the desert but, according to Josephus,⁸⁸ was widespread among all the towns of Judea. From the reports of the excavator of Qumran, Roland de Vaux, most scholars have taken the view that there must have been a period when the Qumran site was abandoned. Based on the evidence from the coins found at Qumran and from Josephus' reports on a massive earthquake in 31 BCE,⁸⁹ de Vaux conjectured that the period when the settlement was uninhabited was exactly during the time of Herod the Great (37–4 BCE). According to de Vaux's view, Qumranites had left the settlement probably because of the destructions caused by the earthquake and by a fire, and there was no resettlement before the period of Archelaus (4 BCE–6 CE). This view is linked with Josephus' note that Herod had favored the Essenes.⁹⁰ Hence, "scholars have raised the possibility that the Essenes inhabited the Holy City during a period when the political climate was in their favor."⁹¹ Riesner points to the fact that after the restoration the Qumran settlement was smaller than during the earlier period.⁹² So, he asks whether apart of the Essenes might have remained in Jerusalem while another and more-radical wing returned to Qumran.⁹³

This construction, however, is weakened by a more-recent interpretation of the archaeological and numismatic evidence from Qumran, which suggests that the settlement was abandoned – possibly because of a violent destruction – not before 9 or 8 BCE, and that it was reoccupied soon thereafter.⁹⁴ Of course, this does not preclude an Essene presence in Jerusalem during the time of Herod. But the close link between the reign of Herod, his favor for

⁸⁷ Some scholars question this view, but we cannot discuss their argument here. Cf., however, A. Lange, "Essener," *DNP* 4:141–46; John J. Collins, "Essenes," *ABD* 2:619–26; Frey, "Zur historischen Auswertung der antiken Essenerberichte," (in this volume under the title "On the Historical Value of the Ancient Sources about the Essenes," 163–193).

⁸⁸ Josephus, *J.W.* II 124; cf. Philo, *Hypothetica* (see Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* XIII 11–12).

⁸⁹ Josephus, *J.W.* I 370–80; *Ant.* XV 121–47.

⁹⁰ Josephus, *Ant.* XV 373–78.

⁹¹ Riesner, "Jesus, the Primitive Community, and the Essene Quarter," 198–234, esp. 207.

⁹² Riesner, *Essener und Urgemeinde in Jerusalem*, 9; cf. de Vaux, *Archaeology and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 24–27.

⁹³ De Vaux, *Archaeology and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 24–27, cf. also Riesner, "Jesus, the Primitive Community, and the Essene Quarter," 198–234, esp. 207.

⁹⁴ J. Magness, "Qumran Archaeology: Past Perspectives and Future Prospects," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment* (ed. P. W. Flint and J. C. VanderKam; Leiden: Brill, 1998–1999), 1:47–77, here 50–53; eadem, "The Chronology of the Settlement at Qumran in the Herodian Period," *DSD* 2 (1995): 58–65. Cf. the comprehensive study by eadem, *The Archaeology of Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002), 47–72.

the Essenes (probably corresponding to his conflict with the Sadducean families), and an Essene settlement in Jerusalem – such a link is not as certain as the advocates of the Essene quarter hypothesis think.

A second argument is based on Josephus' mention of a gate in the city wall of Jerusalem named the "gate of the Essenes" (ἡ Ἐσσηνῶν) and of a piece of land nearby called "Bethso" (Βηθσω) in *J.W.* V 145. Pixner identified the gate with a location that had been already discovered by the archaeologist Frederick J. Bliss, who excavated the Herodian gate structure in 1977 and – together with other archaeologists – its surroundings between 1979 and 1985.⁹⁵ But, if the identification is correct, it is uncertain what the name of the gate meant: Was the location of the Essenes outside the town so that they used the gate to go there,⁹⁶ or was their dwelling inside the city walls so that they used the gate to leave the city? From the Essene position on purity, scholars had concluded that the Essenes might have used a separate gate. Pixner and Riesner interpret the term "Bethso" as a transcription of the Aramaic *בֵּית צוּאָה* which means a latrine, and they refer to a passage in the *Temple Scroll*, 11QT^a (11Q19) XLVI 13–16, where the construction of a latrine outside the city is commanded. So, the "gate of the Essenes" could be the gate used by the Essenes to leave the city to reach their toilets. But even if the philological interpretation of "Bethso" is correct, it is not clear whether or to what extent the laws of the *Temple Scroll* were obeyed by Essenes in Qumran and elsewhere. Therefore, uncertainties remain regarding the function of the gate and also regarding the place where Essenes possibly lived in Jerusalem.

Pixner and Riesner try to solve these problems by use of a third argument, based on the network of ritual baths found on the area of the supposed Essene quarter, including a double bath outside the city wall which might have been used for cleansing after the use of the toilet. At one side of the double bath, the entrance and exit are separated. This is often interpreted as a peculiarity of Essene baths because similar constructions have also been found at Qumran.⁹⁷ But recent excavations have shown that constructions like that were much more frequent: they were used, for example, near the Temple Mount as well. Thus, they cannot be interpreted as an Essene peculiarity but only as a construction that was useful for public baths or for baths used frequently.⁹⁸

⁹⁵ Cf. B. Pixner, "History of the 'Essene Gate' Area," *ZDPV* 105 (1989): 96–104; B. Pixner, D. Chen, and S. Margalit, "Mount Zion: The 'Gate of the Essenes' Re-excavated," *ZDPV* 105 (1989): 85–95, with plates 8–16; cf. the extensive report in Riesner, *Essener und Urgemeinde in Jerusalem*, 14–18.

⁹⁶ Thus, e.g., E. Otto, *Jerusalem – die Geschichte der Heiligen Stadt* (U-TB 380; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1980), 125.

⁹⁷ Cf. Riesner, *Essener und Urgemeinde in Jerusalem*, 38, and pictures on 183.

⁹⁸ Cf. Magness, *Archaeology of Qumran*, 146–47, and the literature mentioned on 161; cf. further R. Reich, "Miqwa'ot at Khirbet Qumran and the Jerusalem Connection," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years after Their Discovery: Proceedings of the Jerusalem Con-*

The Essene character of the ritual baths on the area of Mt. Zion can, therefore, not be ascertained.

The fourth pillar of the theory depends on traces of Jewish-Christian presence on the southwestern hill in late Roman times.⁹⁹ These early remains may at least raise the question whether there were any links between the inhabitants of the area in Herodian times and the later Jewish Christians. The archaeological evidence adduced for an early Jewish-Christian use of the site are a niche in the room known as David's tomb that is oriented toward the rock of Golgatha, and some graffiti that suggest a Jewish-Christian use of the building.¹⁰⁰ But the tradition of the Last Supper's location in that area is rather late and cannot be traced back without problems.¹⁰¹

The other attempts to fill the lacunae in the argument by some pieces of evidence from New Testament texts are even more questionable: The mention of a man carrying a pitcher of water (Mark 14:13–14) cannot prove that Jesus had the Last Supper in the environment of Essene monks.¹⁰² Nor can the reference to the use of the Essene calendar (by Jesus or the evangelists) solve the problem of the different chronologies of the passion when comparing the Synoptics with the Fourth Gospel.¹⁰³ And the note about the conversion of priests in Acts 6:7 is no valid evidence for the assumption of personal links between Essenism and primitive Christianity.¹⁰⁴

gress, July 20–25, 1997 (ed. L. H. Schiffman, E. Tov, and J. C. VanderKam; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society and the Shrine of the Book, 2000), 728–31.

⁹⁹ Cf. Riesner, *Essener und Urgemeinde in Jerusalem*, 38–55; idem, “Jesus, the Primitive Community, and the Essene Quarter,” 198–234, esp. 198–206.

¹⁰⁰ Cf. Riesner, *Essener und Urgemeinde in Jerusalem*, 58–62.

¹⁰¹ Cf. the argument in Riesner, *Essener und Urgemeinde in Jerusalem*, 78–83, 138–41. In favor of a late formation of the tradition from liturgical reasons, cf. K. Bieberstein, “Die Hagia Sion in Jerusalem,” in *Akten des XII. internationalen Kongresses für Christliche Archäologie, Bonn 22.–28. September 1991* (ed. E. Dassmann and J. Engemann; SAC 52; JAC: Ergänzungsband 20; Münster: Aschendorff, 1995), 1:543–51.

¹⁰² Thus Pixner, *Wege des Messias und Stätten der Urkirche*, 219–22. This argument gives too much weight to the idea that the Essenes formed a monastic community of unmarried men. Such a view was prominent in the earliest periods of Qumran research, but it can not be maintained anymore. See below, n. 118.

¹⁰³ Cf. J. Frey, *Die johanneische Eschatologie II: Das johanneische, Zeitverständnis* (WUNT 110; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998), 183, n. 130. E. Ruckstuhl, “Zur Chronologie der Leidensgeschichte Jesu,” in *Jesus im Horizont der Evangelien* (ed. E. Ruckstuhl; SBAB 3; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1988), 101–84, esp. 130–33 and 180–81, suggests that Jesus held a Passover meal according the Essene calendar, on Tuesday evening in the Passover week. For Ruckstuhl, the Johannine “Beloved Disciple” in John, who has the prominent place at Jesus’ breast John 13:23), is a monk of the monastic community of the Essenes in Jerusalem. Cf. also B. J. Capper, “‘With the Oldest Monks ...’: Light from Essene History on the Career of the Beloved Disciple,” *JTS* 49 (1998): 1–55.

¹⁰⁴ Cf. J. A. Fitzmyer, *The Acts of the Apostles* (AB 31; New York: Doubleday, 1998), 351; C. K. Barrett, *The Acts of the Apostles* (ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994), 1:317:

Hence, even if it is quite plausible that Essenes lived in Jerusalem,¹⁰⁵ there remain a number of problems with the assumption of an Essene quarter, and the links between the Essenes in Jerusalem and the earliest Christian community cannot be established without doubt. There is no undisputable evidence that Jesus and the apostles were in relation with Essene circles or that Essenes joined or even influenced earliest Christianity.¹⁰⁶ Therefore, assumptions like that of an Essene quarter cannot provide a historical framework for the interpretation of the relations between New Testament and Qumran texts.

C. Some Methodological Considerations

I. Twofold Negative Evidence and Numerous Questions

To reach an adequate point of departure for relating the Qumran texts with the New Testament, we basically have to consider twofold negative evidence:

First, the documents from the Qumran library mention neither Jesus nor any other person known from Early Christian texts. And second, the New Testament texts make no mention of Qumran or the group of the Essenes.

The last observation is even more astonishing and calls for explanation. Why do New Testament authors mention Pharisees and Sadducees but no “Essenes,” who – according to Josephus – held an equally important position in Palestinian Judaism at that time?¹⁰⁷ If Josephus is basically right – and I assume he is¹⁰⁸ – the Essenes were not only a marginal sect in a remote mon-

“Theories of influence on the primitive church from Qumran ... cannot be built on this verse.”

¹⁰⁵ There might be some additional evidence for that in the tombs found at Beit Safafa, which are quite similar to some of the tombs at Qumran; cf. B. Zissu, “‘Qumran Type’ Graves in Jerusalem: Archaeological Evidence of the Essene Community?” *DSD* 5 (1998): 158–71; idem, “Odd Tomb Out: Has Jerusalem’s Essene Cemetery Been Found?” *BAR* 25 (1999): 50–55, 62; but there are still many questions regarding the cemeteries of Qumran and their context.

¹⁰⁶ It is another question whether Essene converts entered Christian circles after the catastrophe of 70 CE; cf. O. Cullmann, “Ebioniten,” *RGG* 2:297–98; K. G. Kuhn, “Essener,” *RGG* 2:701–3.

¹⁰⁷ Both Josephus, *Ant.* XVIII 20, and Philo, *Prob.* 75, give the number of 4,000 Essenes; Josephus, *Ant.* XVII 41–42, additionally mentions 6,000 Pharisees.

¹⁰⁸ According to B. Schaller, “4000 Essener–6000 Pharisäer: Zum Hintergrund und Wert antiker Zahlenangaben,” in *Antikes Judentum und frühes Christentum: Festschrift für Hartmut Stegemann zum 65. Geburtstag* (ed. B. Kollmann, W. Reinbold, and A. Steudel; BZ NW 97; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1999), 172–82, such numbers are a topos of ancient historiography and cannot claim historical accuracy. Of course, it is possible that these numbers are based not on Philo’s or Josephus’ own calculations but on some kind of source (as Schaller, 174, assumes). For Josephus, however, we should assume that he had some knowledge of the Palestinian Jewish groups and their influence. So we should accept

astery in the desert, but also had some influence as the third religious party (as the term ἀῤρησις should be translated) in Jewish Palestine. The silence of the New Testament authors and texts is thus even more remarkable. Is it due to a greater distance between earliest “Christianity” and the Qumran group or Essenism as a whole, or can we interpret it as a sign of close relations between the two movements?¹⁰⁹ Are the Essenes hidden behind another New Testament term? Were the “Herodians” who are mentioned three times (Mark 3:6; 12:13; Matt 22:16) actually Essenes?¹¹⁰ Did New Testament authors view the Essenes as part of the Pharisees, who gained the leading position in Judaism after 70 CE? Or did they view Essenes and Sadducees as one group because of the priestly elements in Essene rules?¹¹¹

II. The Issue of Historical Relations: Possibilities but Not Probabilities

On these issues one can only speculate. The sources – in the New Testament or in the Qumran library – do not provide any safe evidence to give an answer with certainty. In particular, there is no textual evidence to postulate a close personal or historical relationship between the Essenes and Jesus or earliest Christianity. There are many possibilities, but hardly one of them can be made certain.

It is, of course, possible that Jesus met Essenes – at least in Jerusalem, where an Essene presence is most likely.¹¹² But in Galilee, where Jesus

the fact that there were more Pharisees than Essenes, but that both groups had some influence in religion and society during the period before the Jewish War. Cf. the more extensive argument in Frey, “Zur historischen Auswertung der antiken Essenerberichte,” 55–56 (in this volume under the title “On the Historical Value,” 192–193).

¹⁰⁹ Thus H. Kosmala, e.g., held the view that the Essenes were the group with which earliest Christianity was related most closely; see his article “Jerusalem,” *BHH* 2:820–50, esp. 846.

¹¹⁰ This was suggested by C. Daniel, “Les ‘Hérodiens’ du Nouveau Testament sont-ils des Esséniens?” *RevQ* 6 (1967): 31–53; idem, “Nouveaux arguments en faveur de l’identification des Hérodiens et des Esséniens,” *RevQ* 7 (1970): 397–402; Y. Yadin, *The Temple Scroll* (3 vols. in 4; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1983), 1:138–39 (with mistaken reference to Mark 8:17); cf. W. Braun, “Were the New Testament Herodians Essenes? A Critique of an Hypothesis,” *RevQ* 14 (1989), 75–88.

¹¹¹ Some scholars attribute the Qumran texts to a Sadducean origin; cf. L. H. Schiffman, *The Halakhah at Qumran* (Leiden: Brill, 1975); idem, *Sectarian Laws in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Courts, Testimony, and the Penal Code* (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1983); idem, “The Sadducean Origins of the Dead Sea Scroll Sect,” in *Understanding the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. H. Shanks; New York: Random House, 1992), 35–49; J. M. Baumgarten, *Studies in Qumran Law* (SJLA 24; Leiden: Brill, 1977).

¹¹² Independently from the theory of an Essene quarter, this might be confirmed by the recent tomb finds at Beit Zafafa near Jerusalem. Cf. the articles mentioned in n. 105 (above); and B. Rochman, “The Missing Link? Rare Tombs Could Provide Evidence of Jerusalem Essenes,” *BAR* 23, no. 4 (1997): 20–21.

preached and chose his disciples (Mark 1:16–20), a presence of Essenes cannot be ascertained.

It is also possible or even likely that primitive Christianity could have come into contact with some members of the Essene party, especially in Jerusalem. But we should consider that the Qumran *Rule of the Community* and also Josephus' account on the Essenes tell us that the members of the community were bound to conceal "the secrets of knowledge" (1QS IV 5–6; cf. X 24–25; Josephus, *J.W.* II 141), and that the instructor should not "argue with the men of the pit" but "hide the counsel of the law in the midst of the men of injustice" (1QS IX 16–17). Thus, we cannot presuppose that peculiar sectarian insights were open for everybody or even discussed publicly. Nevertheless, Essene influence on the Palestinian Jesus movement cannot be ruled out. But the sources of both groups remain silent, and their silence can be interpreted in various ways. Moreover, not all the parallels adduced can prove an Essene influence: similarities of the community organization, communal meals, the community of goods or some theological issues might also be explained by similarities of the respective groups' situation, or by the common reception of biblical and postbiblical traditions. It is a question, therefore, of how many of the textual parallels actually allow the assumption of textual or other Essene influences.

It is also possible that some Essenes – or former Essenes – became Christians in the period of the Palestinian Jesus movement¹¹³ and also in later times, after the destruction of Qumran in 68 CE and of the temple in 70 CE, when the war against Rome ended.¹¹⁴ But in the light of the radical position on the Law and on ritual purity, we can ask whether Essenes could have joined the Palestinian Jesus movement so easily and in such a number to enact a considerable influence on Christian theology after 70 CE. A conversion of an Essene would have been an even greater miracle than the calling of the Pharisee Paul in his way to Damascus: the development within the early-Christian community, the growing openness for non-Jews, and the liberality toward issues of purity – these should have been even more offending for a member of the Essenes than for a Pharisee. The assumption of a reinforced Essene influence in the New Testament documents of the third generation,

¹¹³ This was assumed on the basis of Acts 6:7; cf. Riesner, *Essener und Urgemeinde in Jerusalem*, 85–86; but see the critical statements cited in n. 104 (above).

¹¹⁴ Such an assumption was frequently made in view of the Fourth Evangelist, who was then interpreted as a former Essene; cf. J. Ashton, *Understanding the Fourth Gospel* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1991), 236–37; and with a different reconstruction. E. Ruckstuhl, "Der Jünger, den Jesus liebte," in *Jesus im Horizont der Evangelien* (ed. E. Ruckstuhl; SBAB 3; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1988), 355–95, esp. 393–95. Cf. also 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. C. Black; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1996), 65–97, here 89.

the period after the Jewish War, seems to be even more questionable than an influence on Jesus or the Jesus movement in the earliest period.

If all these assumptions are only possibilities that cannot be ascertained from explicit textual evidence, the problem of the personal and institutional relations between Essenism and earliest Christianity cannot yet be solved with certainty. The aporias call for an approach based not on vague speculations but on the texts themselves. The similarities and differences between the documents from the Qumran library and New Testament texts must be analyzed with all sophistication. But the situation is much more complicated than in the early periods of research, if the recent developments in Qumranology are taken into consideration.

III. Diversity Within the Qumran Library

One of the most important results of Qumran research that has been widely accepted since the late 1980s¹¹⁵ is the distinction between “sectarian” and “nonsectarian” (or Essene and non-Essene¹¹⁶) documents. During the first decades of Qumran research, scholars viewed the nonbiblical scrolls mostly as documents originating in the Qumran community. Actually, among the scrolls from Cave 1 that were published first, there were some of the most characteristic community texts: the *Rule of the Community* (1QS), the *Thanksgiving Hymns* (1QH^a), the *Habakkuk Peshier* (1QpHab), and the *War Scroll* (1QM).¹¹⁷ Of course, there are remarkable differences even between these documents. For example, not all the rule texts presuppose unmarried

¹¹⁵ The first assumptions in that direction were uttered already in 1957 by the German member of the editorial team C.-H. Hunzinger, in a small study on the fragments of the *War Scroll*; cf. Claus-Hunno Hunzinger, “Fragmente einer älteren Fassung des Buches Milḥama aus Höhle 4 von Qumran,” *ZAW* 69 (1957): 131–51, here 149–50; cf. also H. Lichtenberger, *Studien zum Menschenbild in Texten der Qumrangemeinde* (SUNT 15; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1980), 13–20.

¹¹⁶ In the English language, the terms “sectarian” or “sect” do not have the strongly negative implications of the German terms “Sekte” and “sektiererisch,” which denote a religious splinter group and its behavior in contrast to a normative or mainstream religion. Therefore, in German scholarship the terms “essenisch” and “nicht-essenisch” are much more useful even if they do not take into account the problem identifying the Qumran *Yahad* with the Essenes. On these problems, see C. Hempel, “Kriterien zur Bestimmung ‘essenischer Verfasserschaft’ von Qumrantexten,” in *Qumran Kontroversen: Beiträge zu den Textfunden vom Toten Meer* (ed. J. Frey and H. Stegemann; Einblicke 6; Paderborn: Bonifatius, 2003), 71–85, here 71–75.

¹¹⁷ However, we must assume that the *War Scroll* is a previously non-Essene text reworked within the community. Cf. A. Lange and Hermann Lichtenberger, “Qumran,” in *TRE* 28:45–78, esp. 60–61; and Frey, “Different Patterns of Dualistic Thought,” 275–335, esp. 308–10 (in this volume, 243–299, esp. 278–281).

members, and some of them also give rules for married persons.¹¹⁸ From such observations scholars had to conclude that those rules were not obligatory for all members and not at all times, but that we must take into consideration different audiences and diachronic developments.¹¹⁹ The increasing number of documents published since 1991 has demonstrated the great diversity within the Qumran library, which contained texts of quite different language, literary genre,¹²⁰ and theological position. In view of such a variety, scholarship has discovered significant differences and developed criteria for the identification of Essene (sectarian) authorship.¹²¹

Now it is widely accepted that a large number of the nonbiblical texts from the Qumran library were not composed by the group that inhabited Qumran and hid the scrolls in the caves. This is obvious regarding the biblical texts and the well-known Pseudepigrapha such as *1 Enoch* or *Jubilees*. But many of the remaining nonbiblical documents even lack the peculiar reference to the community and in particular the community terminology that is so characteristic, for example, in the *Thanksgiving Hymns*, the *Habakkuk Pesher*, or the *Rule of the Community*.¹²² Many of these documents take a pan-Israelite, not a particularist and “sectarian” position. Hence, we have to take into consideration that they were composed by authors who did not belong to the Essene *yahad* but to other Jewish groups, and yet they were studied or even copied by members of the Qumran community. They are, therefore, not sig-

¹¹⁸ Cf. H. Stegemann, “The Qumran Essenes,” 126–34, and most recently A. Steudel, “Ehelosigkeit bei den Essenern,” in *Qumran kontrovers: Beiträge zu den Textfunden vom Toten Meer* (ed. J. Frey and H. Stegemann; Einblicke 6; Paderborn: Bonifatius, 2003), 115–24, who concludes that there were married and unmarried Essenes.

¹¹⁹ On the 4QS material, cf. the pioneering study by S. Metso, *The Textual Development of the Qumran Community Rule* (STDJ 21; Leiden: Brill, 1997).

¹²⁰ Cf. A. Lange with U. Mittmann-Richert, “Annotated List of the Texts from the Judaean Desert Classified by Content and Genre,” in *The Text from the Judaean Desert: Indices and an Introduction to the Discoveries in the Judaean Desert Series* (ed. E. Tov et al.; DJD 39; Oxford: Clarendon, 2002), 115–64, distinguishing among texts parabiblical, exegetical, on religious law, calendrical, poetic and liturgical, sapiential, historical and with tales, apocalyptic and eschatological, magical and on divination, documentary, with a treasure list (the *Copper Scroll*), letters, and/or scribal exercises

¹²¹ Cf. Lange and Lichtenberger, “Qumran,” 45–46; A. Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination: Weisheitliche Unordnung und Prädestination in den Textfunden von Qumran* (STDJ 18; Leiden: Brill, 1995), 6–20; idem, “Kriterien essenischer Texte,” in *Qumran kontrovers: Beiträge zu den Textfunden vom Toten Meer* (ed. J. Frey and H. Stegemann; Einblicke 6; Paderborn: Bonifatius, 2003), 59–69; Hempel, “Kriterien zur Bestimmung,” 71–85.

¹²² On the community terminology, see D. Dimant, “The Qumran Manuscripts: Contents and Significance,” in *Time to Prepare the Way in the Wilderness: Papers on the Qumran Scrolls by Fellows of the Institute of Advances Studies of the Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 1989–1990* (ed. D. Dimant and L. H. Schiffman; STDJ 16; Leiden: Brill, 1995), 23–58; cf. also discussions in the studies mentioned in n. 121 (above).

nificant for the Essene position but give evidence of views held within other Jewish groups of the third to first centuries BCE. Probably all the documents written in Aramaic, most of the sapiential texts, the majority of the new parabiblical texts such as previously unknown pseudepigrapha, and even a passage like the well-known Doctrine of the Two Spirits (1QS III 13–IV 26) seem to belong to the literary treasure the Essenes inherited from other Jewish circles, probably from precursor groups. Possibly the texts came into their possession as the property of new members who entered the community; possibly they were deliberately acquired for purpose of study. They were added to the library, studied, copied or at least preserved, and finally hidden in the caves before the attack of the Romans in 68 CE.

In my view, the significance of the Dead Sea Scrolls for biblical exegesis is based not only on the “sectarian” texts of the Qumran community, but even more on the numerous nonsectarian texts. These documents have opened up a new and broader perspective on the Jewish literature of the Second Temple period: they demonstrate that Judaism at that time was much more pluriform and multifaceted than scholars earlier thought. Before the Qumran finds, there were practically no Hebrew or Aramaic documents from Palestinian Judaism at the turn of the era. Scholars gathered their information only from the books of the Maccabees, from various pseudepigrapha that had been transmitted in secondary translations, from the writings of Josephus and Philo, and from later rabbinic sources. Under the impression of the rabbinic view, scholars spoke of a “normative type” of Palestinian Judaism as a background for Jesus and the Palestinian Jesus movement.¹²³ In view of the variety within the documents from Qumran, this view has completely changed. Now we can see that there was no normativity but rich diversity in Palestinian Judaism before 70 CE. It is, therefore, possible to describe Jesus and primitive Christianity not only in contrast to some “normative” type of Judaism, but also within the wide matrix of Palestinian Jewish traditions. Many New Testament terms earlier thought to be influenced by non Jewish, Hellenistic, syncretistic, or gnostic ideas can now be explained from the multitude of Jewish traditions, as evident within the Qumran library.

IV. A New Set of Questions

The type of questions to be asked has therefore changed. Although earlier scholarship primarily asked for “Qumran parallels” and discussed the issue of

¹²³ Thus, e.g., G. F. Moore, *Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era: The Age of the Tannaim* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1927), 1:3, 236; cf. J. A. Fitzmyer, “The Qumran Scrolls and the New Testament after Forty Years,” *RevQ*, 13 (1988): 609–20, here 609–10.

Qumranian or Essene influence on Early Christianity,¹²⁴ the questions deserve to be asked in a more sophisticated manner and with further distinction.

1. Description and Classification of Parallels

First of all, there is need of a clear description and classification of parallels. In other words, what is parallel between an assumed parallel and the New Testament? Is it a single term or a specific notion of a term? Is it a phrase, an idea, a literary structure, or a feature of the community behind the texts? And what is the “degree” of the parallel? Is there a quite close (or even verbal) correspondence between a text from the Qumran library and a New Testament text, or is there only a loose relation of similarity or analogy?

In view of the distinctions between “sectarian” and “nonsectarian” documents, we have to refine the question of parallels. Is the assumed Qumran parallel a peculiarity of “sectarian” (Essene) documents, or does it occur also in other, “nonsectarian” (non-Essene) documents?¹²⁵ Is it possible to show an internal distinction or development within the documents from the Qumran library? And if there are different types or patterns of the idea within the Qumran library,¹²⁶ which one comes closest to the New Testament parallel? Only from such a sophisticated inquiry can we ask about the consequences regarding the assumption of possible textual or personal relations between the documents from Qumran or the different Jewish traditions or circles and the Palestinian Jesus movement. This is quite important because, in view of the plurality within the Qumran library and the distinction between “sectarian” and “nonsectarian” texts, parallels can no longer be interpreted automatically as an indication of Essene influence on Early Christianity. In many cases, it is more adequate to interpret them as part of the Palestinian-Jewish matrix of Early Christianity,¹²⁷ which is shared by Jesus and the Palestinian Jesus movement but also to some extent by Paul, Matthew, and the Fourth Gospel.

2. Negotiating the Viewpoints

To develop an adequate view of the history-of-religions, it is also important to keep in mind that the search for Qumran parallels should not lead to a one-sided view of, for example, Paul or the Gospel tradition. Not everything in the New Testament texts can be explained from the matrix of Palestinian

¹²⁴ This is the type of discussion in H. Braun, *Qumran und das Neue Testament*.

¹²⁵ On these questions, see most recently H.-W. Kuhn, “Qumran und Paulus,” 227–46, esp. 228–29.

¹²⁶ As examples of such a sophisticated inquiry, cf. Jörg Frey, “Different Patterns of Dualistic Thought,” (in this volume, 243–299); idem, “Die paulinische Antithese von ‘Fleisch’ und ‘Geist’ und die palästinisch-jüdische Weisheitstradition,” *ZNW* 90 (1999): 45–77.

¹²⁷ Cf. Fitzmyer, “The Qumran Scrolls and the New Testament,” 609–20, esp. 610.

Judaism: we must also take into consideration the impact of Hellenistic Judaism, not only in the Diaspora but also in Palestine,¹²⁸ and – to a lesser extent – the impact of the Gentile world. So, when Qumranic “parallels” are considered, we should be prepared to ask whether other parallels from other traditions can eventually provide a better explanation for the phrases and ideas in the New Testament. Hence, scholars of different specializations must work together and discuss the relevance of their respective traditions for the understanding of the New Testament. This is the only way to establish a sound and balanced view of the religio-historical relations.

3. *Changes in Scholarship*

Last, from the viewpoint of the history of New Testament research, it is interesting to ask: In what way did the Qumran finds and the subsequent waves of publication change our religio-historical views and, as a consequence, also our theological interpretation of New Testament texts? What interpretations were proposed in view of the Qumran parallels, and how many of them were abandoned soon afterward? In what way did the scrolls definitely change our view of the historical Jesus, of Paul, or of the Fourth Gospel? Asking and answering these questions will finally show the real impact of the discovery of the Qumran library on the study of the New Testament.

D. Two Major Test Cases

1. *The Impact of Qumran on the Interpretation of John the Baptizer*

As a first test case for the discussion of similarities and dissimilarities between the documents from Qumran and the New Testament, I take John the Baptizer. This is the figure from the New Testament that most scholars have considered to be closely related with Qumran or the Essenes.¹²⁹

¹²⁸ This is the basic result of the groundbreaking studies of M. Hengel on the Hellenization of Judaism; see M. Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in Their Encounter in Palestine in the Early Hellenistic Period* (trans. J. Bowden; 2 vols.; London: SCM, 1974); idem, *The Hellenization of Judaea in the First Century after Christ* (in collaboration with C. Marksches; trans. J. Bowden; London: SCM, 1989); idem, “Qumran und der Hellenismus,” in *Judaica et Hellenistica* (WUNT 90; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996), 258–94; idem, “Jerusalem als jüdische und hellenistische Stadt,” in *Judaica, Hellenistica et Christiana* (WUNT 109; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999), 115–56.

¹²⁹ The scholarly literature is immense; cf. only the more recent contributions: O. Betz, “Was John the Baptist an Essene?” *BRev* 18 (1990): 18–25; H. Lichtenberger, “The Dead Sea Scrolls and John the Baptist: Reflections on Josephus’ Account of John the Baptist,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research* (ed. D. Dimant and U. Rappaport; STDJ 10; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 340–46; idem, “Johannes der Täufer und die Texte von Qumran,” in *Mogilany 1989: Papers on the Dead Sea Scrolls Offered in Memory of Jean Carmignac*.

In one of the most certain traditions within the New Testament, Jesus was baptized by John and received John's "baptism of repentance for the forgiveness of sins" (Mark 1:4).¹³⁰ But within Early Christian tradition, there is a tendency to veil the fact that Jesus received a baptism of repentance.¹³¹ In the Fourth Gospel, the image of the Baptizer is transformed into the image of a pure witness for Jesus' dignity and salvific mission,¹³² or even of the first believer in Christ.¹³³ The transformation shows how problematic the figure of the Baptizer was for Early Christianity; the problems were caused not only by the rivalry between the growing church and communities who revered the Baptizer as Messiah or salvific figure.¹³⁴

Even for modern historical-critical interpretation, the figure of the Baptizer was enigmatic. How could we explain his preaching in the desert and his baptism of repentance? They certainly did not fit into any kind of "normative Judaism." So it is no wonder that scholars began to connect him with Qumran soon after the first discoveries.¹³⁵ John seemed an especially fitting candidate

Part I: General Research on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Qumran, and the New Testament. The Present State of Qumranology (ed. Z. J. Kapera; Proceedings of the Second International Colloquium on the Dead Sea Scrolls [Mogilany, Poland, 1989]. QM 2; Krakow: Enigma, 1993), 139–52; idem, "Die Texte von Qumran und das Urchristentum," *Judaica* 50 (1994): 68–91; Stegemann, *Die Essener, Qumran*, 292–313; S. J. Pfann, "The Essene Yearly Renewal Ceremony and the Baptism of Repentance," in *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues* (ed. D. W. Parry and E. C. Ulrich; STDJ 30; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 337–52; Charlesworth, "John the Baptizer and Qumran Barriers," 353–75; J. I. H. McDonald, "What Did You Go Out to See? John the Baptist, the Scrolls and Late Second Temple Judaism," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Their Historical Context* (ed. T. H. Lim; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2000), 53–64; M. Öhler, "The Expectation of Elijah and the Presence of the Kingdom of God," *JBL* 118 (1999): 461–76. Cf. also J. E. Taylor, *The Immerser: John the Baptist within Second Temple Judaism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997).

¹³⁰ Cf. Lichtenberger, "The DSS and John the Baptist," 341: "That Jesus received a baptism of repentance for the forgiveness of sins can hardly have been invented by the early Church."

¹³¹ In Matt 3:14, John tries to refuse to baptize Jesus; the Fourth Gospel omits the record of Jesus' baptism and tells only that the Spirit came down on him like a dove. But even this only serves as a sign to identify him as the one who baptizes with the Holy Spirit (John 1:32–34).

¹³² Cf. John 1:26–27, 29–35; 3:27–30.

¹³³ Cf. D.-A. Koch, "Der Täufer als Zeuge des Offenbarers: Das Täuferbild von Joh 1,19–34 auf dem Hintergrund von Mk 1,2–11," in *The Four Gospels, 1992: Festschrift Frans Neirynck* (ed. F. van Segbroeck et al.; Leuven: Peeters, 1992), 3:1963–84.

¹³⁴ On this rivalry, cf. H. Lichtenberger, "Täufergemeinden und frühchristliche Täuferpolemik im letzten Drittel des 1. Jahrhunderts," *ZTK* 84 (1987): 36–57.

¹³⁵ Cf. the report in H. Braun, *Qumran und das Neue Testament*, 2:21–29; and also the discussions in J. Pryke, "John the Baptist and the Qumran Community," *RevQ* 4 (1963–1964): 483–96; C. H. H. Scobie, "John the Baptist," in *The Scrolls and Christianity* (ed. M. Black; London: SPCK, 1969), 58–69. Even before the Qumran discoveries, based only on

for possible contacts with Qumran for several reasons.¹³⁶ The rigorous priestly movement in the desert and its purification rites seemed to provide the framework for the interpretation of this enigmatic figure.

According to Luke, the Baptizer was of priestly descent (1:5–25) and lived in the desert until he appeared publicly (1:80). The place where he baptized in the desert, “beyond the Jordan,”¹³⁷ was probably not too far from Qumran.¹³⁸ His alleged celibacy (1:15) and his ascetic lifestyle (Mark 1:6) make up a striking similarity, even if we consider that not all members of the Essenes were unmarried. His diet and clothing are signs of radical self-sufficiency or of a life of repentance and have parallels in some texts as characterizing prophets,¹³⁹ but could also be interpreted as the refusal to take something from others, as commanded by the Essene purity rules (cf. 1QS V 16–17; Josephus, *J.W.* II 143).¹⁴⁰ This might be confirmed by the observation that the Baptist’s food, locusts and honey, seems to be in accordance with

the ancient texts on the Essenes, scholars had the idea that John’s immersion rite was linked with the Essenes; cf. K. Kahler and S. Krauss, “Baptism,” *JE* 2:499–500; J. Thomass, *Le mouvement baptiste en Palestine et Syrie* (Gembloux: Duculot, 1935), 87.

¹³⁶ J. C. VanderKam, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994), 168. Cf. basically W. H. Brownlee, “John the Baptist in the New Light of Ancient Scrolls,” in *The Scrolls and the New Testament* (ed. K. Stendahl; New York: Harper, 1957), 71–90; K. Schubert, *Die Gemeinde vom Toten Meer: Ihre Entstehung und ihre Lehren* (Munich: Reinhardt, 1958), 109.

¹³⁷ The localization of the places where John baptized is quite difficult. N. Krieger, “Fiktive Orte der Johannestaufe,” *ZNW* 45 (1954): 121–23, wanted to abandon the search because he thought that all the places mentioned in the Gospels were fictive. But this view is certainly too skeptical. One traditional place is located near Jericho (cf. Matt 3:1, “in the Judean desert”) but on the eastern side of the river. John 1:28 also mentions a place called Bethany “beyond the Jordan.” The fact that John was finally arrested and executed by Herod Antipas, the tetrarch of Galilee and Perea, is a good confirmation of the tradition that he baptized on the eastern side of the river Jordan. It is not convincing to theorize that the place mentioned in John 1:28 is located in the north, near the sea of Galilee, or should be identified with the region of Batanaea, as proposed by Pixner, *Wege des Messias und Stätten der Urkirche*, 166–79; and R. Riesner, “Bethany beyond the Jordan [John 1:28]: Topography, Theology and History in the Fourth Gospel,” *TynBul* 38 (1987): 29–63; cf. Frey, *Die johanneische Eschatologie*, 2:200–201.

¹³⁸ H. Stegmann, “Die Bedeutung der Qumranfunde für das Verständnis Jesu und des frühen Christentums,” *BK* 48 (1993): 10–19, here 12, estimates a distance of about 15 km between the two places, taking about five hours to walk. Charlesworth, “John the Baptizer and Qumran Barriers,” 357, estimates “less than three hours’ walk.”

¹³⁹ Cf. the *Ascen. Isa.* 2:10; Heb 11:37–38; *1 Clem.* 17:1; cf. R. Pesch, *Das Markusevangelium* (HTKNT 2.1; Freiburg: Herder, 1976), 1:81. On John’s diet and its early interpretation, cf. the monograph by J. A. Kelhoffer, *The Diet of John the Baptist: “Locusts and Wild Honey” in Synoptic and Patristic Interpretation* (WUNT 176; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005).

¹⁴⁰ Cf. Charlesworth, “John the Baptizer and Qumran Barriers,” 366–67.

Essene dietary law.¹⁴¹ John's message of the impending doom of the final judgment (Luke 3:7–9; Matt 3:7–10) has numerous parallels in the Qumran texts but also in biblical and postbiblical apocalyptic traditions.¹⁴² Finally, John's concern for eschatological purity and his baptism as a rite of purification by living water have close parallels with the Essene purification rites, even though the practice and interpretation of his baptism shows remarkable differences from Essenism.

On the whole, the similarities are remarkable, and in addition, the image of the Baptizer as depicted by Josephus (*Ant.* XVIII 116–119) seems to strengthen the relation between John and Essenism.¹⁴³ But it is unclear why John is presented in Essene terms without being called an Essene. Should the Baptizer be presented as a pious and just personality, despite his political prophecy? Or can we simply assume that Josephus knew the facts: Had John really “at one time been an Essene, but by the time of his public preaching had separated himself from the sect, and could no longer with accuracy be called an Essene?”¹⁴⁴ However, the accuracy of Josephus' accounts is a much-disputed matter,¹⁴⁵ and we must always consider his interests as an interpreter of Jewish history. One could assume, then, that his depiction of the Baptizer is inspired by apologetic interests. In the short episodes on the Essene prophets Judas, Menachem, and Simon,¹⁴⁶ Josephus wants to conceal the aspect of political prophecy by stressing the piety and virtue of these prophets and of the group to which they belonged, the Essenes. Similarly, in his presentation of the Baptizer, he stresses justice and piety as part of his preaching, depicting him as a “good man” (*Ant.* XVIII 116), even though he

¹⁴¹ Cf. Charlesworth, “John the Baptizer and Qumran Barriers,” 367–68; CD XII 11–15 seems to permit honey that has been filtered.

¹⁴² Cf. the parallels mentioned in J. A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke* (AB 28; New York: Doubleday, 1981), 1:468.

¹⁴³ As Lichtenberger demonstrates, Josephus presents the Baptizer as an Essene, even if he does not call him an Essene; see Lichtenberger, “The Dead Sea Scrolls and John the Baptist,” 340–46, who mentions parallels between Josephus' note of the Baptizer and his reports on the Essenes concerning purification rites, the contents of his preaching, and his political prophecy.

¹⁴⁴ Cf. Lichtenberger, “The Dead Sea Scrolls and John the Baptist,” 346.

¹⁴⁵ Cf. most recently the argument by R. Bergmeier, *Die Essener-Berichte des Flavius Josephus: Quellenstudien zu den Essenertexten im Werk des jüdischen Historiographen* (Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1993). I do not think that Bergmeier's reconstruction of sources can be established. It must be considered, however, that Josephus' accounts show a strong tendency of interpretation (which indeed is not uniform), so that his accounts cannot be read uncritically, as if they were historically accurate. Cf. the discussion in Frey, “Zur historischen Auswertung der antiken Essenerberichte” (English translation in this volume under the title “On the Historical Value.”)

¹⁴⁶ Cf. the notes on Judas (*J.W.* I 78–80; *Ant.* XIII 311–13), Menachem (*Ant.* XV 373–79), and Simon (*J.W.* II 113; *Ant.* XVII 345–48).

was put to death by Herod Antipas.¹⁴⁷ Thus, if Josephus presents John in Essene terms, this is in good accord with his apologetic interests and should not be taken as an accurate description of the historical reality. Whether John ever had been an Essene or not cannot be deduced from the terms used by Josephus.

The striking similarities mentioned above have caused many scholars to assume that the preacher in the desert had once been an Essene before he was expelled or separated himself from the community. Recently, James H. Charlesworth has formulated a more precise hypothesis why John had left the community.¹⁴⁸ He could have “progressed through the early stages of initiation” (cf. 1QS VI 21) and “taken the vows of celibacy and absolute separation from others.”¹⁴⁹ John could have been impressed and attracted by many items of Essene theology. But possibly he could not accept the curses on the “men of Belial” that were pronounced in the ritual of the covenantal renewal (1QS II 4–10, 11–18), so he kept silent when all said “Amen, Amen,” and this was the first step of his segregation from the community.¹⁵⁰ From that moment on, John would have been bound by his vows, but cut off from the community. This could be an explanation of his strange diet.

But even if the scenario sounds plausible, there is the question whether John’s segregation from the Essenes is reconstructed in a too modern way. In view of traditions like Luke 3:7 or 3:9, it can be doubted whether the “younger” John should have had difficulties with the curses from the covenantal ceremony. In my opinion, we cannot with certainty reconstruct the reason why John should have left the community; but then, it is also uncertain whether he ever was a member of it. Hermann Lichtenberger states – correctly, in my view – that the assumption that John had first entered and then left the community puts one hypothesis on the other and is, therefore, even less probable than the idea that John was an Essene during the time he preached. Therefore, he concludes that the brothers of John are rather prophetic or eschatological figures than the enigmatic Bannus¹⁵¹ or the Qumranites.¹⁵² From

¹⁴⁷ Cf. R. L. Webb, *John the Baptizer and Prophet* (JSNTSup 62; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991), 38.

¹⁴⁸ Cf. Charlesworth, “John the Baptizer and Qumran Barriers,” 353–75. See also Charlesworth’s essay on the Baptizer, “John the Baptizer and the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls. The Princeton Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls*, vol. 3: *The Scrolls and Christian Origins* (ed. J. H. Charlesworth; Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2006), 1–36.

¹⁴⁹ Charlesworth, “John the Baptizer and Qumran Barriers,” 361.

¹⁵⁰ Charlesworth, “John the Baptizer and Qumran Barriers,” 363–64.

¹⁵¹ Josephus, *Vita* 11.

¹⁵² Lichtenberger, “Die Texte von Qumran und das Urchristentum,” 68–82, esp. 77–78.

the sources we have, it is equally impossible to conjecture a “Life of John the Baptizer” as it is impossible to write a “Life of Jesus.”¹⁵³

We cannot conclusively answer the question whether John the Baptizer was a former Essene. If we ask questions like that, we can only discuss different possibilities without being able to ascertain them. It is more fruitful to turn the question round and to ask in what way the Qumran texts help us to understand the profile of the Baptizer more precisely. Here, in the analogies, the differences are most instructive. I discuss two important points of comparison: the scriptural quotation from Isa 40:3 and the peculiar character of John’s rite of baptism.

One of the striking similarities between the Qumran texts and the reports on John the Baptizer is that they are linked with the same biblical passage, Isa 40:3: “the voice of one crying out in the wilderness: Prepare the way of the Lord “ The prophetic utterance is quoted in the *Rule of the Community* (1QS VIII 14; cf. IX 19–20) and in the New Testament, when describing the Baptizer’s appearance (Mark 1:3; cf. Matt 3:3; Luke 3:4–6) or giving his self-definition (John 1:23): In the Christian view, the prophecy characterizes the Baptizer as the one who prepares the way for the Lord, as the precursor of Christ. But it is a question of whether the quotation is only a later Christian interpretation that summarizes the Baptizer’s function in retrospect. Thus, Isa 40:3 is already alluded to in Mal 3:1, where the messenger to be sent is closely related to (or identified with) Elijah (cf. Mal 3:23 [4:5 ET]). Apart from the Qumran library, Isa 40:1–5 is referred to in numerous traditions of contemporary Judaism.¹⁵⁴ Hence, it is quite plausible that the reference to Isa 40:3 comes from the circle of the Baptizer or, possibly, from himself. In relation with Mal 3, the last chapter within the canon of the prophets, this passage provides the key for understanding the appearance and message of the Baptizer.¹⁵⁵ This chapter twice presents the image of judgment with fire (Mal 3:2–3, 19 [4:1]; cf. Matt 3:12; Luke 3:9), the message of repentance is prominent (Mal 3:7; 3:24 [4:6]), and Elijah is mentioned as the last warner before the “great and terrible day” of judgment (3:23–24 [4:5–6]). The reference to Elijah seems to have been important also for the place where John acted: According to 2 Kgs 2:6–8, Elijah crossed the river Jordan at the place where Israel had entered the Holy Land under Joshua, and beyond the Jordan, on the

¹⁵³ This has been demonstrated by the most-brilliant history of research, published early in the twentieth century: A. Schweitzer, *Von Reimarus zu Wrede* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1906); 2nd edition: *Geschichte der Leben-Jesu-Forschung* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1913); ET: *The Quest of the Historical Jesus* (trans. J. Bowden; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001).

¹⁵⁴ Cf. Bar 5:7; Sir 48:24; 1 En. 1:6; *Ascen. Mos.* (T. Mos.) 10:4; *Lev. Rab.* on 1:14; *Deut. Rab.* on 4:11; *Pesiq. Rab.* 29, 30, 33; see W. D. Davies and D. C. Allison, *The Gospel According to Saint Matthew* (ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1988), 1:294.

¹⁵⁵ Cf. Stegemann, *Die Essener, Qumran, Johannes*, 299–301.

eastern side, he was carried away to heaven. In close correspondence with this, John preached and baptized on the eastern side of the river Jordan, possibly near the trade route where Israelites came across and entered the land. Just where Elijah had been carried away, John acted as the last warner, calling for repentance and offering a baptism of forgiveness of sins. Isaiah 40:3, the basic text to which Mal 3:1 refers, includes the notion of the desert, which Mal 3:1 does not repeat. Hence, people could view John's appearance as a quite verbal fulfillment of the prophecy of Isa 40:3: "In the desert prepare a way for the Lord."

Completely different is the reference to Isa 40:3 in the *Rule of the Community* (1QS VIII 14–16): "In the wilderness prepare the way of the Lord, make level in the desert a highway for our God. This (alludes to) the study of the Torah wh[ic]h he commanded through Moses to do, according to everything that has been revealed (from) time to time, and according to that which the prophets have revealed by his holy spirit."¹⁵⁶ Here, the preparation of the way of the Lord is linked with the communal study of the Torah (מדרש ; התיוררה; cf. Ezra 7:10). The communal attention to sacred Scriptures, so decisive for the Essene community in its formative period, is seen as the fulfillment of Isaiah's prophecy.¹⁵⁷ If we take into consideration that this part of the *Rule of the Community* as composed certainly before the Essene settlement at Qumran, we can assume that the idea that the Isaianic prophecy was being fulfilled within communal study of the Torah was an additional reason for the foundation of the settlement "in the desert." There the Essenes could study the Torah in complete segregation from the world outside, and they saw this as fulfillment of Isa 40:3 (cf. 1QS VIII 13–14).

From the comparison, we can see that the Essenes (and later the Qumran Essenes) and John used the same scriptural tradition, but they interpreted and fulfilled it quite differently. For the Baptizer, the fulfillment is linked with the Elijah tradition, which is of no relevance for the Essene understanding of the prophecy. For him, it is linked with the call for repentance from Mal 3:7 and 3:24 (4:6) and with the purifying rite of baptism, whereas the Essene interpretation of Isa 40:3 is not linked with the Essene purification rites.

¹⁵⁶ Translation from E. Qimron and J. H. Charlesworth, "Rule of the Community," in *The Rule of the Community and Related Documents* (PTS DSSP 1), 37. The text is also preserved in 4QS^e (4Q259) 3 5–6. The quotation is omitted (but with shortened allusion to the same biblical passage) in 4QS^d (4Q258) 2 i 6–7; cf. most recently the edition in DJD: P. S. Alexander and G. Vermes, eds., *Qumran Cave 4. XIX: 4QSerekh Ha-Yahad* (DJD 26; Oxford: Clarendon, 1998).

¹⁵⁷ Cf. T. H. Lim, "Midrash Peshet in the Pauline Letters," in *The Scrolls and the Scriptures: Qumran Fifty Years After* (ed. S. E. Porter and C. A. Evans; JSPSup 26; Roehampton Institute London Papers 3; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 280–92, here 286.

We can see even more striking differences in comparing the different purification rites, even though there are some similarities.¹⁵⁸ The Essenes were strongly interested in purity, as we can see from a number of texts and also from the water supply arranged for the Qumran settlement. The description of the ablution ritual in 1QS II 25–III 12 links atonement with repentance and with the ritual application of water. Although for the Essenes immersion was a regular or even daily practice, John’s baptism was granted only once.¹⁵⁹ The Essenes practiced immersion by themselves; baptism in the Jordan was carried out by the Baptizer. The ablutions of the Essenes were limited to full members, and all who wanted to take part had to pass through the stages of initiation. In contrast, the Baptizer preached and baptized publicly, and in view of the coming day of judgment, there was no time to wait. Thus, the people who came along the trade route and heard his preaching could repent and be immediately baptized. The purification rituals of the Essenes could be carried out at any place where Essenes lived; John baptized in the Jordan, at the place where Israel once had entered the Holy Land and Elijah had been taken up by the heavenly chariot. These differences show that we cannot parallel the eschatological purification ritual of John’s baptism with the purity rites of the Essenes. Even though repentance and forgiveness of sins played a significant role in their understanding of purity, the eschatological purification ritual carried out by the Baptizer is different, and its distinctive character is visible, in contrast to the Essene purity rites.¹⁶⁰ So, John’s brothers are not primarily the Essenes nor a figure like Bannus, but the series of eschatological prophets. Likewise, we cannot use the Essene purification rites to explain John’s baptism, nor can we account for the difference between the two by the suggestion that John held a more universalistic view of salvation than the Essenes. Yet it would be impossible to describe John and his appearance – and chiefly the differences from the Essenes – without the texts from Qumran.¹⁶¹ In this respect, the Qumran texts provide the decisive tool for understanding John the Baptizer in the context of his religious environment.

¹⁵⁸ These differences should not be diminished by the fact that there are also some general similarities between John’s baptism and the initiation (not the daily purity rites) of the Essenes. These similarities are described by Pfann, “The Essene Yearly Renewal Ceremony,” 337–52, esp. 347–48.

¹⁵⁹ This is doubted by B. D. Chilton, “John the Purifier,” in *Judaic Approaches to the Gospels* (University of South Florida International Studies in Formative Christianity and Judaism 2; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994), 1–37, here 26–27. Of course, there is no statement that baptism could not be repeated, but its character as a purification before the coming last judgment marks it as differing from all other rites of purification.

¹⁶⁰ Cf. Stegemann, *Die Essener, Qumran, Johannes*, 306–11.

¹⁶¹ Stegemann, *Die Essener, Qumran, Johannes*, 311.

II. Paul and His Anthropological Terminology: Flesh and Spirit

My second example comes from the religio-historical debate on Paul.¹⁶² It is well-known that the older, religio-historical school tried to interpret Paul's terminology and thought chiefly from Hellenistic Judaism,¹⁶³ or even paganism.¹⁶⁴ This is understandable because before the Qumran finds, there was a considerable lack of Hebrew or Aramaic texts from postbiblical Palestinian Judaism before 70 CE. Especially, scholars could not affirm Paul's claim to be a former Pharisee (Phil 3:5; cf. Acts 22:3) from contemporary sources without making use of the later rabbinic writings.

It is, therefore, a most-important fact that the Qumran finds have brought out a large number of phrases and ideas that are clearly parallel to passages in Paul's letters. They can show the Palestinian-Jewish roots of Pauline thought or, at least, of some of its elements. In the present context, I can mention only a few examples.¹⁶⁵

The expression "works of the law" (ἔργα νόμου), quite significant for the Pauline argument in Galatians and Romans,¹⁶⁶ was unparalleled before the Qumran finds. Scholars could not find an equivalent for the Greek phrase in either the Hebrew Bible or in the rabbinic writings.¹⁶⁷ But now there are sig-

¹⁶² See the more extensive argument in Frey, "Die paulinische Antithese," 45–77; idem "The Notion of 'Flesh' in 4QInstruction and the Background of Pauline Usage," in *Poetical, Liturgical, and Sapiential Texts: Proceedings of the Third Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Oslo, 1998* (ed. D. K. Falk, F. García Martínez, and E. M. Schuller; STDJ35; 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 (in this volume, 701–741).

¹⁶³ Cf. E. Brandenburger, *Fleisch und Geist: Paulus und die dualistische Weisheit* (WMANT 29; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1968); H. Paulsen, *Überlieferung und Auslegung in Römer 8* (WMANT 43; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1974), 45–47.

¹⁶⁴ Cf., e.g., the most influential work by W. Bousset, *Kyrios Christos: Geschichte des Christusglaubens von den Anfängen des Christentums bis Irenaeus* (2nd ed.; FRLANT 21 [NS 4]; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1921), 134.

¹⁶⁵ Cf. Fitzmyer, "Paul and the DSS," 599–621; H.-W. Kuhn, "Qumran und Paulus," 227–46; cf. also the essay by H.-W. Kuhn, "The Impact of Selected Qumran Texts on the Understanding of Pauline Theology," in *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls. The Princeton Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls, vol. 3: The Scrolls and Christian Origins* (ed. James H. Charlesworth; Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2006), 153–186.

¹⁶⁶ Cf. Gal 2:16; 3:2, 5, 10; Rom 3:20, 28. See J. D. G. Dunn, "4Q394–399 [4QMMT] and Paul's Galatians," in *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls. The Princeton Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls, vol. 3: The Scrolls and Christian Origins* (ed. J. H. Charlesworth; Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2006), 187–202.

¹⁶⁷ Cf. Fitzmyer, "Paul and the DSS," 614–615.

nificant parallels in the Qumran library. The closest parallel occurs in the early Essene “halakic” work 4QMMT¹⁶⁸ where the writer affirms: “We have sent you some of the precepts of the Torah ... “(מעשיו בתורה).¹⁶⁹ This is the only Qumran phrase that completely matches the Pauline phrase.¹⁷⁰ Two other passages in the *Rule of the Community* (1QS V 21; VI 18) provide a slightly different phrase: “his deeds in the law” (מעשיו בתורה). So, even though *Some Works of the Law* (4QMMT^{a-f} = 4Q394–399) is written about two centuries earlier than the Pauline letters, the parallel shows that the Pauline usage of “works of the law” refers to a discussion within Palestinian Judaism on the deeds prescribed by the Law.¹⁷¹

Another phrase that is quite important in Paul’s teaching on justification is “the righteousness of God” (δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ), which Paul uses in Rom 1:17; 3:5, 21, 22; 10:3; and 2 Cor 5:21. Although many passages in the Hebrew Bible call God “righteous” (צדק) or speak of his “righteousness” (צדקה), readers could not find a precise Hebrew equivalent of the cited phrase in the Hebrew Bible.¹⁷² But now, in the Qumran texts, we can see equivalents showing that “Paul did not invent the phrase but rather derived it from a genuine Palestinian tradition.”¹⁷³ Most interesting – especially in view of the Qumran texts – are the dualistic expressions that can also be found in the Pauline Epistles. In 1 Thess 5:5 Christians are called “sons of light” and “sons of the day.” The phrases make use of the Semitic expression “sons of” (בני) or the designation of “Christians” as a class of human beings.¹⁷⁴ Such a

¹⁶⁸ 4QMMT^c (4Q398) 2 ii 2–3 (= C26–27).

¹⁶⁹ Text and translation according to E. Qimron and J. Strugnell, eds., *Qumran Cave 4.V: Miqsat Ma’ase ha-Torah* (ed. E. Qimron and J. Strugnell; DJD 10; Oxford: Clarendon, 1994), 62–63, and cf. 39: the passage seems also to be attested in the manuscript 4QMMT^f (4Q399) 1 i 10–11 (but with a slight difference in the word sequence).

¹⁷⁰ In 4QFlor (4Q174) 1–3 II 1–3 = 4QMidrEschat^a III 7, the reading is מעשיו תורה; cf. A. Steudel, *Der Midrasch zur Eschatologie aus der Qumrangemeinde (4QMidrEschat^{a,b}): Materielle Rekonstruktion, Textbestand, Gattung und traditions-geschichtliche Einordnung des durch 4Q174 (“Florilegium”) und 4Q177 (“Catena A”) repräsentierten Werks aus den Qumranfunden* (STDJ 13; Brill: Leiden, 1994), 44; H.-W. Kuhn, “Die Bedeutung der Qumrantexte für das Verständnis des Galaterbriefes,” 169–221, esp. 202–13.

¹⁷¹ On the Pauline understanding of the passage, cf. M. Bachmann, “4QMMT und der Galaterbrief, מעשיו התורה und ERGA NOMOU,” *ZNW* 89 (1998): 91–113; and J. D. G. Dunn, “4QMMT and Galatians,” *NTS* 43 (1997): 147–53, reprinted in *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls. The Princeton Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls*, vol. 3: *The Scrolls and Christian Origins* under the title “4Q394–399 [4QMMT] and Paul’s Galatians.”

¹⁷² The closest expression is צדקה יהוה (Deut 33:21). Cf. generally P. Stuhlmacher, *Gerechtigkeit Gottes bei Paulus* (FRLANT 87; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1965), 102–84.

¹⁷³ Fitzmyer, “Paul and the DSS,” 615. Cf. צדק אל (1QM IV 6); צדקת אל (1QS X 25; XI 12).

¹⁷⁴ Cf. Fitzmyer, “Paul and the DSS,” 615.

bifurcation of humanity is unparalleled in the Hebrew Bible but frequent appears in the sectarian writings of Qumran, where the members of the community are called “Sons of Light” and all others “Sons of Darkness” (cf. IQS I 9–11). Although Paul does not use the phrase “sons of darkness,” his expression “works of the darkness” in Rom 13:12 strongly reminds one of the dualistic opposition between light and darkness, which is prominent in the sectarian texts from Qumran.

We can also show theological parallels between Paul and the Dead Sea Scrolls. Chiefly, we can illustrate the Pauline notion of “sinful flesh” and his view of justification by divine grace by citing impressive parallels from the Qumran documents.¹⁷⁵ This most clearly appears in the hymn with which the *Rule of the Community* (in IQS) is concluded:¹⁷⁶

However, I belong to evil humankind, to the assembly of unfaithful flesh (בִּשְׂר עוֹל); my failings, my iniquities, my sins with the depravities of my heart let me belong to the assembly of worms and of those who walk in darkness (IQS XI 9–10).

A few lines after this confession of sins, the author praises the experience of divine grace:¹⁷⁷

As for me, if I stumble, the mercies of God shall be my salvation always, and if I fall by the sin of the flesh (בְּעוֹן בִּשְׂר), in the justice of God, which endures eternally, shall my judgment be; if my distress commences, he will free my soul from the pit and make my steps steady on the path; he will draw me near in his mercies, and by kindnesses set in motion my judgment; he will judge me in the justice of his truth, and in his plentiful goodness always atone for all my sins; in his justice he will cleanse me from the uncleanness of the human being and from the sin of the sons of man, so that I can give God thanks for his justice and The Highest for his majesty (IQS XI 11–15).

In this hymn and a number of parallels in the *Thanksgiving Hymns*, we can see a far-reaching consciousness of sin. The author and the members of the community reciting the hymns know that they are predestined to participate in salvation even though they share the sinful lot of all human beings. In spite of characteristic differences,¹⁷⁸ these texts show remarkable similarities with Paul’s idea of justification of the ungodly (Rom 3:23–26; 4:5).¹⁷⁹

¹⁷⁵ On the Pauline notion of “flesh” and its background, see the articles mentioned in n. 161 (above); on justification, cf. Fitzmyer, “Paul and the DSS,” 602.

¹⁷⁶ Translation according to F. García Martínez and E. J. C. Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* (Leiden: Brill, 1997–1998), 1:97–99 (modified at the beginning of line 10).

¹⁷⁷ Translation, García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*, 99 (modified in line 12).

¹⁷⁸ Cf. Fitzmyer, “Paul and the DSS,” 604–5.

¹⁷⁹ Cf. also S. Schulz, “Zur Rechtfertigung aus Gnaden in Quman und bei Paulus: Zugleich ein Beitrag zur Form und Überlieferungsgeschichte der Qumantexte,” *ZTK* 56

One aspect deserves special consideration. In 1QS XI 9, 12 and also in some other passages in the *Thanksgiving Hymns*,¹⁸⁰ there is the notion of “flesh” (בשר) as a sphere that is characterized basically by sin and upheaval, or even as a power that provokes and causes evil deeds.¹⁸¹ A similar use of “flesh” (בשר) known from the Pauline Epistles, especially in the antithesis between “flesh” and “spirit” (רוח), as in Gal 5:17 or Rom 8:5–9:

For the Flesh is actively inclined against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the Flesh. Indeed, these two powers constitute a pair of opposites at war with one another, the result being that you do not actually do the very things you wish to do (Gal 5:17).¹⁸²

For those who exist in terms of the flesh take the side of the flesh, whereas those who exist in terms of the Spirit take the side of the Spirit. For the flesh’s way of thinking is death, whereas the Spirit’s way of thinking is life and peace. Because the flesh’s way of thinking is hostility toward God, for it does not submit itself to the law of God; for it cannot. And those who are in the flesh are not able to please God (Rom 8:5–8).¹⁸³

Such a negative use of “flesh” goes far beyond the range of meanings of בשר in the Bible. There, בשר can denote the human body and its physical substance or, generally, the created being in its weakness and mortality.¹⁸⁴ But the passages quoted use the Greek term σάρξ with a strong notion of evil and iniquity. It even seems to denote a sphere or power opposed to God and his will. Scholars have, therefore, tried to explain the Pauline antithesis of “flesh” and “spirit” and chiefly the background to his negative usage of “flesh” in terms of Hellenistic or gnostic ideas.¹⁸⁵ More recently, a Hellenistic

(1959): 155–85; J. Becker, *Das Heil Gottes: Heils- und Sündenbegriffe in den Qumrantexten und im Neuen Testament* (SUNT 3; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1964).

¹⁸⁰ Cf. 1QH^a V 30–33 (= XIII 13–16 Sukenik), 1QH^a VII 34–35 (= XV 21 Sukenik) and especially 1QH^a XII 30–31 (= IV 29–30 Sukenik). References to the manuscript 1QH^a are quoted according to the counting of columns and lines in H. Stegemann’s reconstruction of the scroll. The reference according to the *editio princeps* by E. L. Sukenik is given in brackets.

¹⁸¹ Cf. Becker, *Das Heil Gottes*, 111–12.

¹⁸² Translation from J. Louis Martyn, *Galatians* (AB 33A; New York: Doubleday, 1998), 479.

¹⁸³ Translation from J. D. G. Dunn, *Romans 1–8* (WBC 38A; Waco: Word, 1988), 414.

¹⁸⁴ Cf. *DCH* 2:277; L. Koehler, W. Baumgartner, and J. J. Stamm, eds., *HALOT* (Leiden: Brill, 1994), 1:164; see more extensively G. Gerleman, “בָּשָׂר, *bāšār* Fleisch,” *THAT* 1:376–79; and N. P. Bratsiotis, “בָּשָׂר,” *ThWAT* 1:850–67; ET: *TDOT* 2:317–32.

¹⁸⁵ With regard to Paul’s negative use of “flesh,” during the nineteenth century adherents of the Tübingen school of Ferdinand Christian Baur attributed it to pagan Hellenistic thought. The explanation from Hellenism or Hellenistic syncretism was then continued by the scholars of the *Religionsgeschichtliche Schule*, e.g., by W. Bousset, as in *Kyrios Christos*, 134; and R. Reitzenstein, *Die hellenistischen Mysterienreligion* (3rd ed.; Leipzig: Teubner, 1927), 86, characterizing Paul as the greatest of all gnostics. The explanation from Gnosticism was also accepted in the influential works of R. Bultmann, as in “Paulus,” *RGK* (2ⁿ ed.; 1930), 4:1019–45, here 1035; and his student E. Käsemann, in *Leib und Leib Christi: Eine Untersuchung zur paulinischen Begrifflichkeit* (BHT 9; Tübingen: J. C. B.

Jewish concept of dualistic wisdom was presented as an explanation for the antithesis in Paul.¹⁸⁶ But the textual evidence for such a concept is weak. A dualistic antithesis of σάρξ and πνεῦμα comparable to the Pauline usage can be found neither in the Wisdom of Solomon nor in the works of Philo, where “flesh” (σάρξ) like “body” (σῶμα) is viewed as a part of the earthly sphere, but not as the reason or occasion for sin,¹⁸⁷ nor as a quasi-demonic power with cosmic dimensions. Therefore, summarizing the discussion, Robert Jewett correctly points out that “on the key issue of the precedent for Paul’s cosmic σάρξ usage, the Qumran tradition offers a somewhat closer correlation than Hellenistic Judaism.”¹⁸⁸

However, the suggestion that the apostle could have used the terms of the Qumran community¹⁸⁹ was too bald to be accepted. It is unlikely that Paul – even when he was a Pharisaic student of the Torah in Jerusalem¹⁹⁰ – had the opportunity to read the “sectarian” texts of the Essenes.¹⁹¹ But now, the publication of the new sapiential documents from Qumran Cave 4¹⁹² has opened

Mohr, 1933), 105. On the history of research see R. Jewett, *Paul’s Anthropological Terms: A Study of Their Use in Context Settings* (AGJU 10; Leiden: Brill, 1971), 49–94; A. Sand, *Der Begriff “Fleisch” in den paulinischen Hauptbriefen* (BU, NS 2; Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet, 1967), 1–121; Frey, “Die paulinische Antithese,” 45–48.

¹⁸⁶ Cf. basically Brandenburger, *Fleisch und Geist*.

¹⁸⁷ This holds true for Philo, *Giants* 29 as well, where “flesh” is said to be “the chief cause for ignorance” (cf. 4Q532 1–6 ii 2–5). But in this Philonic passage, flesh denotes only the duties of daily life, marriage, rearing of children, provision of necessities, and the business of private and public life, which tie the human being to the earthly sphere and hinder the growth of wisdom.

¹⁸⁸ Jewett, *Paul’s Anthropological Terms*, 92–93.

¹⁸⁹ Cf. Schulz, “Zur Rechtfertigung aus Gnaden,” 155–85, esp. 184: “there is no doubt ... that Paul knew and took up the theological views of this sect.” Becker, *Das Heil Gottes*, 249–50, asserts an indirect Essene influence on the Pauline terminology of sin. Cf. also J. Murphy-O’Connor, “Truth: Paul and Qumran,” in *Paul and Qumran: Studies in New Testament Exegesis* (ed. J. Murphy O’Connor Chicago: Prioory, 1968), 179–230, here 179: “That there are traces of Essene influence in the Pauline corpus is now generally admitted.”

¹⁹⁰ On the general trustworthiness of the note on Paul’s studies in Jerusalem (Acts 22:3), see M. Hengel and R. Deines, *The Pre-Christian Paul* (London: SCM, 1991), 29–34, 40–43.

¹⁹¹ Even if they had contacts with outsiders, Essenes were obliged to hide the peculiar knowledge of the community from them: cf. 1QS IX 16–17; X 24–25; Josephus, *J.W.* II 141.

¹⁹² The scholarly breakthrough was Wacholder and Abegg, *A Preliminary Edition of the Unpublished DSS*, fasc. 2:1–203. The official edition of these documents is in vols. 20 and 34 of the DJD series: T. Elgvin et al., eds., *Qumran Cave 4.XV: Sapiential Texts, Part 1* (DJD 20; Oxford: Clarendon, 1997); J. Strugnell et al., eds., in *Qumran Cave 4.XXIV: Sapiential Texts, Part 2; 4QInstruction (Musal le Mevin): 4Q415ff, with a Re-edition of 1Q26 and an Edition of 4Q423* (DJD 34; Oxford: Clarendon, 1999). On the character of the texts, cf. generally D. J. Harrington, *Wisdom Texts from Qumran* (London: Routledge,

up new perspectives on the semantic and religio-historical issues, because these “nonsectarian” texts help us understand the background of the use of **בשר** in the Qumran texts mentioned above. And in my opinion, they confirm the view that the negative use of $\sigma\rho\upsilon\chi$ in Paul has its roots not in Hellenism, nor in the theological developments of Hellenistic Judaism, but in Palestinian Jewish sapiential traditions.

First of all, these documents provide a great number of new instances for **בשר**, most of them within the document 4Q415–418, called *Sapiential Work A* and also edited under the title *4QInstruction*. One other example is from a manuscript of the *Mysteries* (4QMyst^c = 4Q301).¹⁹³ In these texts, there are also passages on the creaturely humility of the human being and on the “spirit of flesh” (or “fleshly spirit,” **רוח בשר**). In 4Q418 frag. 81 lines 1–2, the addressee is told:

He separated tradition every fleshly spirit, So that thou mightest be separated from everything He hates, And (mightest) hold thyself aloof from all that His soul abominates.¹⁹⁴

This passage links the notion of “flesh” with “everything that God hates.”¹⁹⁵ In this, it clearly goes beyond the notion of “flesh” in any text of the Hebrew Bible. Another passage announcing an eschatological judgment reads: “And every spirit of flesh will be destroyed,” while the “sons of Heave[n] s[hall rejoice in the day]” (4Q416 1 12–13). Here, **בשר** is not used in the sense of pure humanity but of *sinful* humanity, and we can see a dualistic antithesis between two groups of beings, a kind of cosmic and eschatological dualism

1996); idem, “Ten Reasons Why the Qumran Wisdom Texts Are Important,” *DSD* 4 (1997): 245–54; J. J. Collins, *Jewish Wisdom in the Hellenistic Age* (OTL; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1997), 112–15; A. Lange, “Die Weisheitstexte aus Qumran: Eine Einleitung,” 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), 3–30, and 445–54, with an extensive bibliography.

¹⁹³ Cf. A. Lange, “Physiognomie oder Gotteslob? 4Q301 3,” *DSD* 4 (1997): 282–96, here 283, showing that 4Q301 is another manuscript of the *Book of Mysteries*; but cf. the differing view in L. H. Schiffman, “Mysteries,” in *Qumran Cave 4.XV: Sapiential Texts, Part 1* (ed. T. Elgvin et al.; DJD 20; Oxford: Clarendon, 1997), 31–123.

¹⁹⁴ Translation from J. Strugnell and D. J. Harrington, “Instruction,” in *Qumran Cave 4.XXN: Sapiential Texts, Part 2* (DJD 34), 302.

¹⁹⁵ Another passage is 4Q417 frag. 1 I 15–18, where the “spirit of flesh” is characterized by the fact that it did not know the difference between good and evil (in preliminary editions, as in García Martínez, *The DSS Translated*, this was counted as frag. 2 [= 2 I 15–18]; the DJD edition (vol. 34) has changed the numbering). On this text, cf. Frey, “Die paulinische Antithese,” 45–77, esp. 62–63; and the extensive interpretation in Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination*, 50–52.

that is similar to the type of dualism in the Treatise on the Two Spirits in IQS III 13–IV 26.¹⁹⁶

The great sapiential instruction – possibly dated from the late-third or the first half of the second century BCE and thus roughly contemporary with Ben Sira¹⁹⁷ – provides the first examples for the use of “flesh” (בשר) with the notion of sin or hostility against God. In contrast to the biblical usage, “flesh” is not only created and mortal humanity but also characterizes the whole of sinful humanity, which will be destroyed in the final judgment and from which the pious are kept separated.

As shown by the number of manuscripts in the Qumran library, these texts were highly esteemed by the Essenes.¹⁹⁸ They read and copied them; moreover, they cited passages in their own texts, as in the *Thanksgiving Hymns*,¹⁹⁹ and took up phrases from them, such as the term “the mystery to become” (רִי נִהְיֶה), which is also used in IQS XI 3, and the phrase “spirit of flesh” (רִיחַ בֶּשֶׂר), used in the *Thanksgiving Hymns*.²⁰⁰

From the “new” pre-Essene sapiential documents from the Qumran library, we can see that the notion of “flesh” as a sphere that is sinful and hostile against God is a sapiential tradition developed in Palestine, in the postbiblical period of sapiential discussion. So, when Paul in later times uses the term “flesh” (σάρξ) with the notion of sin and in a clear dualistic opposition against God’s “Spirit,” his usage shows striking similarities with Essene and with non-Essene texts. As we can see now, the Pauline usage does not neces-

¹⁹⁶ Cf. Frey, “Different Patterns of Dualistic Thought,” 275–335, esp. 298–99 (in this volume, 243–299, esp. 264–265); cf. also D. J. Harrington, “Two Early Jewish Approaches to Wisdom: Sirach and Qumran Sapiential Work A,” *JSP* 16 (1997): 25–38, here 35: “The world view of Sapiential Work A seems midway between Ben Sira’s timid doctrine of the pairs and the fully fleshed out dualistic schema of IQS 3–4.”

¹⁹⁷ Cf. the most thorough argument in A. Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination*, 47; idem, “In Diskussion mit dem Tempel: Zur Auseinandersetzung zwischen Kohelet und weisheitlichen Kreisen am Jerusalemer Tempel,” in *Qohelet in the Context of Wisdom* (ed. A. Schoors; BETL 136; Leuven: Peeters, 1998), 113–59, here 129–30; idem, “Die Endgestalt des protomasoretischen Psalters,” in *Der Psalter im Judentum und Christentum* (ed. E. Zenger; Freiburg: Herder, 1998), 101–36, here 122; idem, “Die Weisheitstexte aus Qumran,” 24. For the *terminus post quem*, Lange proposes linguistic arguments using, e.g., the Persian loanword “mystery” (ii) and other words and constructions that occur only late; the *terminus ante quem* is given by the fact that the work is cited in the *Thanksgiving Hymns*, composed within the second half of the second century BCE.

¹⁹⁸ In the Qumran library, there are at least six (1Q26; 4Q415, 416, 417, 418, 423) or even – if 4Q418a and 4Q418c represent separate copies – eight manuscripts of Instruction (= *Sapiential Works*) from Caves 1 and 4. They are all written “in the Herodian formal hand of the late first century B.C.E. or early first century C.E.” Cf. Harrington, *Wisdom Texts from Qumran*, 40.

¹⁹⁹ 1QH^a XVIII 29–30 (= X 27f. Sukenik) cites 4Q418 55 10, and 1QH^a IX 28–29 (= I 26–27 Sukenik) alludes to 4Q417 2 I 8; cf. A. Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination*, 46.

²⁰⁰ Cf. 1QH^a V 30 (= XIII 13 Sukenik); cf. also 4Q301 5 3.

sarily call for the assumption of an immediate Essene influence. It is rather to be explained by the fact that he shares traditions of Palestinian Jewish wisdom that might have been discussed in the circles of the sages in Palestine but have been preserved only within the library of Qumran.

The religio-historical explanation is also important for theological interpretation. When Paul uses the term “flesh,” this should not be understood from Hellenistic thought, with its dualism of body and soul and derogatory view of the bodily existence, but rather from the biblical and postbiblical sapiential tradition, in which the strife of human beings was seen as inclined toward evil and hostile to God’s will. This could be demonstrated only on the background of the Dead Sea Scrolls. The recently published wisdom texts show, however, that Paul is not immediately dependent on Qumran sectarian thought, but uses terms that were common to a larger tradition of sapiential discussion.

E. Conclusions and Perspectives for Further Research

Within the present context, I could discuss only two test cases.²⁰¹ More precise studies of verbal and phraseological parallels, similarities in peculiar motifs, and traditio-historical relations are necessary to obtain a full image of the many and diverse relations between the texts from the Qumran library and the New Testament. But we can generalize some of the insights from above, which might provide some perspectives for further research.

(1) *A change in scholarship.* We can demonstrate that the release of the numerous fragments from Cave 4 has changed considerably the context of Qumran and related scholarship, and it will take some time for scholars to notice the changes and adapt their views. The number of documents from Cave 4 has opened up the view that the Qumran library was much more than a collection of purely “sectarian” documents. It rather provides an idea of the diversity within Palestinian Judaism of the two or three centuries before the turn of the era. As a consequence, scholars can no longer concentrate their interest solely on the relation between Early Christianity and the Essenes, but must widen their purview toward investigating relations between Early Christianity and contemporary Judaism in its many and diverse traditions and groups. For such an inquiry, the Qumran library provides an essential and indispensable treasure of sources. We can recognize its real value only if we

²⁰¹ An additional test case could be the relation between the Johannine literature and the library of Qumran. On this, cf. the extensive discussion in J. Frey, “Licht aus den Höhlen?” 117–203; cf. also the shorter English version: idem, “Recent Perspectives on Johannine Dualism and Its Background” (in this volume, 763–790).

take into consideration the views held by New Testament scholars before the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls.

(2) *A conspicuous absence of personal references.* If we take as a fact that neither John the Baptizer, nor Jesus, nor any member of the primitive church is mentioned in the Dead Sea Scrolls, and that – likewise – the Essenes are not mentioned within New Testament texts, the search for immediate personal links between the larger group of the Essenes – or even more peculiarly, the Qumran Essenes – and earliest Christianity becomes quite speculative. Of course, there are possibilities that cannot be completely ruled out. Relations on the different stages of development of Early Christianity are possible, and in some instances, one can sketch a quite plausible scenario. But the constructions remain quite hypothetical, and scholars cannot firmly establish them and thus base other assumptions or interpretations on them. In contrast, it seems to be more promising to capture the impact of the Qumran texts on New Testament interpretation by studying linguistic parallels, tradition-historical relations, and the common use and development of literary forms.

(3) *A linguistic resource.* One of the most obvious points where the Dead Sea Scrolls have been fruitful for New Testament scholarship is in assessing a great number of verbal or phraseological parallels. We can now explain words and phrases in New Testament Greek by citing Hebrew or Aramaic parallels from the library of Qumran. Of course, we cannot overlook the linguistic differences between the Hebrew or Aramaic of the majority of the Qumran texts and the Greek of the New Testament, and theoretically, Greek texts have to be understood in Greek terms. But “earliest Christianity” is a tradition that goes back to the linguistic milieu of first-century Palestine. The mother tongue of Jesus and his disciples was Aramaic, and Paul was familiar with Hebrew and probably also Aramaic. For the authors of the Fourth Gospel, Revelation, and other New Testament texts, the same is quite probably true. Therefore, the Hebrew and Aramaic documents from the time before 70 CE provide an important key for understanding the language of the New Testament authors and grasping the concepts behind the words and phrases they use.

In any case, it is necessary to determine the proximity of the correspondence. And – if possible – the peculiar tradition from which the parallels are taken. Additionally, we must compare the parallels from the Dead Sea Scrolls with other parallels from the Hebrew Bible, the Septuagint, the targumic tradition, the Pseudepigrapha and the early rabbinic traditions, the writings by Josephus and Philo, as well as with parallels from the Hellenistic-Roman world. Only by such a wide range of research is it possible to decide on the derivation and semantic field of a certain New Testament phrase and its underlying concepts.

(4) *A religious and interpretive reevaluation.* The history of scholarship demonstrates that the discovery of the Qumran library was a decisive turning

point for the religio-historical classification and interpretation of the New Testament. Before the Qumran finds – or even before the publication of a sufficient amount of texts – many elements of Early Christian tradition were viewed as un-Jewish, perhaps resulting from a Hellenistic or syncretistic influence on Early Christianity. Based on the earlier view that there was a kind of “normative Judaism” in Palestine before 70 CE, scholars could assume this for a great number of phrases and concepts to which the Hebrew Bible does not attest, the major pseudepigrapha, and the early rabbinic writings. In the light of the Dead Sea Scrolls, we can see that Judaism of that time was characterized by a greater diversity, and that concepts such as the notion of the sinful “flesh,” predestination, or cosmic dualism were developed within pre-Christian Palestinian Judaism.

(5) *A rediscovery of the Jewishness of Jesus and Early Christianity.* The Qumran library has, therefore, changed our view of Early Christianity considerably. It has shown its rootedness within contemporary Judaism and its many and diverse traditions. One could say, therefore, that the Qumran texts have served to rediscover the Jewishness of Jesus and Early Christianity (including Paul and the Johannine literature). This is perhaps the most important impact of the Qumran finds on New Testament scholarship.

Rediscovery of the common threads binding Early Christianity to first-century Judaism, in all its dynamic diversity, is important in theological terms, as well. The message of Jesus and his disciples did not come overnight, and we are bound to understand them within their historical context. We therefore need to realize that the Christian message is essentially linked with the elements of its native Jewish soil, even in issues like the view of Christ or the Law, where Early Christian positions differ markedly from most of the other positions held within contemporary Judaism.

(6) *An interreligious effort.* An important impact of the Qumran finds is also the fact that Jewish scholars have entered the discussion on Early Christian documents and their background. Of course, Qumran scholarship has always been an interdenominational and interreligious endeavor. But more recently, in view of the rediscovery of the Jewishness of Early Christianity, a greater number of Jewish scholars have felt encouraged to contribute to New Testament issues from their own specific point of view.

(7) *A cautionary tale.* Finally, the Qumran library has shown how fragmentary our knowledge of the past is. The documents that have been preserved are only a small part of antiquity, and it might be pure chance that they have not been completely lost, rotting in the mud. This knowledge should stimulate our attention to the sources we have, and it can motivate us to study them with all effort in order to obtain a more adequate view of the world in which Christian faith had its beginnings.

17. The Textual Discoveries of Qumran and New Testament Scholarship: A Mediating Balance, Hermeneutical Considerations, and Concretions on the Jesus Tradition

A. A Double Introduction

What is the significance of the Qumran texts for the study of the New Testament? How has the discussion developed since the 1990s, and where do we stand today now that the texts are completely edited? The present essay¹ offers an interim balance from the vantage point of the New Testament, which offers a narrow selection from the abundance of material that exists. (A) After briefly looking at the location of the Qumran discussion in the study of theology and in public discussion, I will discuss (B) the development and status of Qumran research and (C) some methodological and hermeneutical questions before (D) finally compiling a selection of results of the Qumran discussion in light of the question of the historical Jesus and the further transmission of the Jesus tradition, as well as (E) the emergence of Christolo-

¹ This contribution is the revised version of the presentation that was held by the study session in Greifswald on the 19th of January 2009. It is at the same time a fruit of the research period that I was able to enjoy as Senior Fellow at the Alfred-Krupp-Wissenschaftskolleg Greifswald in the academic year 2008/2009 and that was devoted to a substantial part of the work on Qumran projects. I am grateful to Stefan Beyerle for the cooperation, and also to Nicole Rupschus for her help with the edition of the original article. – This essay draws on a number of my own works, some of which overlap, but over time have been supplemented and expanded: J. Frey, “Die paulinische Antithese von Fleisch und Geist und die palästinisch-jüdische Weisheitstradition,” *ZNW* 90 (1999): 45–77; idem, “Die Bedeutung der Qumran-Funde für das Verständnis des Neuen Testaments,” *Qumran – die Schriftrollen vom Toten Meer. Vorträge des St. Galler Qumran-Symposiums vom 2./3. Juli 1999* (ed. M. Fieger, K. Schmid, and P. Schwagmaier; NTOA 47; Freiburg, Schweiz, and Göttingen: Universität Verlag, 2001), 129–208; idem, “The Impact of the Dead Sea Scrolls on New Testament Interpretation: Proposals, Problems, and Further Perspectives,” in this volume, 527–578; idem, “On the Historical Value of the Ancient Texts about the Essenes,” in this volume, 163–194; idem, “Critical Issues in the Investigation of the Scrolls and the New Testament,” in this volume 495–525; idem, “Qumran Research and Biblical Scholarship in Germany,” in this volume 85–119.

gy. Further perspectives on John the Baptist, as well as on the study of Paul and John have been presented in other contexts.²

I. Qumran and the Study of the New Testament Today

Why should New Testament scholars study Qumran texts? And why should Qumran texts also be perceived in the New Testament as a part of the study of theology?

To put this question in this way shows where the theological training stands in the German-speaking world today under the constraints of the increasingly reduced curricula to the supposed “essentials.” At the same time, it becomes clear how much the scholarly discussion has changed more than 60 or even 70 years after the first text was found at Qumran and 20 years after the inauguration of “free” access to the many texts that were still unedited and their cataloguing in the 1990s.³

The first phase of discussions about the Qumran discoveries in the 1950s and 1960s – which animated a broad social and ecclesial public and primarily involved those interested in Early Christianity – is long gone, and biblical scholars turned to other questions after the “Qumran fever” died down, primarily because the expected editions of the fragments from Cave 4 took longer and longer to come. On the other hand, Qumran research has “emigrated” into the circle of specialists and has become an esoteric science that is hardly comprehensible to many. In the USA, in Israel, and in other countries, it is being intensively pursued, while in Germany it seems to slip between the fields of biblical scholarship, “Old Testament” and “New Testament.” The work on the Qumran texts is only being done primarily by a few scholars in the German-speaking world.⁴ This is understandable insofar

² On John the Baptist, see Frey, “Bedeutung,” 164–177; idem, “Impact,” 443–450 (in this volume, 561–568); on Paul, see “Antithese”; idem, “The Notion of ‘Flesh’ in 4QInstruction and the Background of Pauline Usage,” in *Sapiential, Poetical and Liturgical Texts* (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 this volume 701–741; idem, “Bedeutung,” 177–191; on the Gospel of John, see “Licht aus den Höhlen? Der johanneische ‘Dualismus’ und das Schrifttum vom Qumran,” in *Die Herrlichkeit des Gekreuzigten: Studien zu den Johanneischen Schriften I* (ed. J. Schlegel; WUNT 307; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), 147–237; idem, “Recent Perspectives on Johannine Dualism and its Background,” in this volume 763–790.

³ This free access was created in 1991 when an American library, the Huntington Library, which, like a number of other libraries, had been entrusted with a set of photographs of the still unpublished texts from Qumran for safety reasons, no longer felt bound by the requirement to keep them under lock and key until the official publication by the responsible editorial team appeared, such that shortly thereafter a facsimile of the microfilms was published (R. H. Eisenman and J. M. Robinson, *A Facsimile Edition of the Dead Sea Scrolls* [2 vols.; Washington: Biblical Archaeology Society, 1991]), whereupon the “official” editions of practically all known texts in the “Discoveries of the Judean Desert” (DJD) series appeared between the 1990s and 2010, edited by a now greatly expanded team of editors under the aegis of Emanuel Tov.

⁴ Some examples of those participating in the study of Qumran texts within the context of theological faculties are Reinhard G. Kratz in Göttingen and Heinz-Josef Fabry in Bonn.

as most of the texts are Hebrew and Aramaic and therefore fall into the department of Hebrew, Semitic, Jewish, or Old Testament studies, and because significant new insights emerge from Qumran texts, especially for the processes of collection and canonization of the Hebrew Bible (which, of course, have not all been “settled” among all Old Testament scholars). New Testament scholars, on the other hand, have instead receded in the Qumran discussion, even though the discussion in the first phase of the research was intensely determined by New Testament scholars and the question of what significance the Qumran discoveries have for the beginnings of Christianity dominated the discussion for a time.⁵

Although Qumran texts are quoted in commentaries and occasionally touched on even in dissertations, it is mostly the texts that have been known since the 1950s – primarily the great texts from Cave 1, such as the *Community Rule* (1QS) and the “War Rule” (1QM), the *Habakkuk Peshier* (1QpHab), and the *Hodayot* (1QH), as well as those texts found in the Cairo Genizah at the end of the 19th century and then paralleled by discoveries from Qumran such as the *Damascus Document* (CD) – which have penetrated into the general consciousness of biblical scholarship, along with a few other texts such as 4QMMT, 4Q521, or the *Temple Scroll* 11QT^a. Only a few of the younger generation’s New Testament scholars have been more deeply absorbed in these texts. Some lack the required knowledge of Hebrew and Aramaic, and in some places there is the methodological (mis)judgment that Hebrew texts provide no insights into the semantics of the Greek New Testament. For some, the texts seem irrelevant or absurd, or one still sees in them – as in the now outdated image of the 1950s and 1960s – testimonies of a marginal “Jewish sect.” And wrongly so!

The texts from Qumran also offer insights for the New Testament that students and researchers cannot ignore, and the more recent discussion offers a multitude of deeper and innovative insights for the New Testament, not only in terms of semantics and the history-of-religions, but also methodologically or, with regard to the production and transmission of literature, the processes of collection and canonization – including those processes in Early Christianity.⁶ The Qumran discoveries are the most important finds of the 20th century for biblical scholarship, even more important and central than the finds of Ugarit and Nag Hammadi. They are of utmost importance for the reconstruction of the text of the Hebrew Bible⁷ and offer essential new insights into the

In addition to these, Qumran research has been established in some places within the framework of Judaism, such as the chair of Armin Lange in Vienna.

⁵ On the research history within the German speaking framework, see Frey, “Qumran Research.”

⁶ On the later, see J. Frey, “Qumran und der biblische Kanon: Eine thematische Einführung,” in *Qumran und der biblische Kanon* (ed. M. Becker and J. Frey; BThSt 92; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2009), 1–63 (in this volume under the English title “Qumran and the Biblical Canon,” 791–836), where the paradigm of “canonical processes” developed in Qumran research is connected with the questions of the formation of the New Testament canon and the biblical canon in general.

⁷ See the essay by E. Tov, “Die griechischen Bibelhandschriften der jüdischen Wüste,” in *Qumran aktuell: Texte und Themen der Schriften vom Toten Meer* (ed. S. Beyerle and J. Frey; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Theologie, 2011), 27–66; as well as idem, “Der

formative phase of the Hebrew canon. They are the most important sources for the reconstruction of the literary and theological history of Judaism in the Second Temple period, and they offer essential insights into the Palestinian-Jewish background and context of the appearance of Jesus and the beginnings of the Jesus movement. If one asks the right questions and avoids the speculative aberrations and hermeneutical “traps” of history-of-religions work, some treasures are to be mined here and discoveries are to be made!

II. The Essenes among the Novelists and Esoterics

One reason for serious study of the Qumran texts is the recurring popular and novelistic literature on Qumran. Here, the connection between Qumran and Jesus or primitive Christians within book titles is made in an attempt to enhance sales.⁸ Furthermore, many unfounded speculations are launched, and often the suspicion reigns in the background that the findings of Qumran could turn the previous knowledge about Early Christianity upside down. This suspicion is often combined with the theory that the (Roman Catholic) Church or correspondingly dogmatic scholars suppressed Qumran texts or research of them in order to preserve their own teachings, and that it is only now, through new revelations, that this sensational new insight has been brought to light. Books that propose such theories often reach bestseller lists, and unfortunately, all too often, determine the conversation in news journals and television magazines.

Among the illustrious series of such speculations, which entertain sensational theses but are ultimately absurd and untenable from a scholarly perspective, is the thesis of the Jewish theologian Pinchas Lapide, who had become known in the German-Jewish-Christian dialogue. Lapide proposed that Paul did not experience his call in Damascus but actually in Qumran, where he stayed for three years.⁹ Analogous speculations were made to an even

Text der hebräischen Bibel. Handbuch der Textkritik” (trans. H.-J. Fabry; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1997).

⁸ So, for example, in the German edition by M. Baigent and R. Leigh, *Verschlußsache Jesus. Die Qumranrollen und die Wahrheit über das frühe Christentum* (München: Droemer Knaur, 1991; English original: *The Dead Sea Scrolls Deception* [New York: Simon and Schuster, 1991]), or in R. H. Eisenman and M. O. Wise, *Jesus und die Urchristen. Die Qumran-Rollen entschlüsselt* (München: Bertelsmann, 1993; English original: *The Dead Sea Scrolls Uncovered. The First Complete Translation and Interpretation of 50 Key Documents Withheld for over 35 Years* [Dorset: Element, 1992]), a work that in no way actually deals with Jesus and the primitive Christians but presents a series of new Qumran texts and in some places provides questionable explanations about an anti-Roman movement that allegedly united the primitive Christians.

⁹ P. Lapide, *Paulus zwischen Damaskus und Qumran. Fehldeutungen und Übersetzungsfehler* (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlag, 1993). Behind this is the identification (inspired by the *Damascus Document* and its talk about the “New Covenant in the land of Damascus”) of the place of Paul’s vision in Acts 9:2f. with Qumran.

greater extent with regard to Jesus. For example, the Australian author Barbara Thiering developed in several books, including *Jesus the Man* (German translation: *Jesus von Qumran*), the alleged scholarly theory that Jesus was in Qumran and crucified there, but survived the crucifixion through the use of an anesthetic substance and recovered in a cave. Incidentally, he had been married to Mary Magdalene and had conceived a daughter with her before the crucifixion, and two sons thereafter. After his divorce from her, he married Lydia from Philippi and lived in Rome for 30 years after the crucifixion until his natural death from old age. Thiering wished to prove all this from the Qumran texts through a kind of allegorical reading. From a scholarly perspective, this is completely untenable, especially in view of the dating of the manuscripts from Qumran, most of which are paleographically and scientifically (including the radiocarbon method) dated to the pre-Christian period or around the turn of the century, and therefore cannot yet speak of those from the primitive Christian period.¹⁰ But such a method spins material that appeals to the imagination of many contemporaries and that lends itself to novel like depictions. Above all, such depictions and characterizations serve these authors' marketing agendas.¹¹ No serious scholar has accepted these theses, but the moment researchers or church representatives oppose such fantasies, they are perceived immediately by the public media as conservative defenders of dogmatic truths and "dominant" theories or are viewed protecting shadowy figures who want to keep the truth about the beginnings of Christianity under lock and key.¹² Conspiracy theories are then close at hand, and the connection with the Vatican and the Roman Church¹³ provides theorists with more material to cash in on the mystery of

¹⁰ It is then revealing that authors like Thiering or Robert Eisenman, who want to read the Qumran texts as a source of information about the early Christian movement, ignore or even question the results of scientific dating.

¹¹ B. Thiering, *Jesus von Qumran. Sein Leben neu geschrieben* (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlag, 1993; English original: *Jesus the Man. A New Interpretation from the Dead Sea Scrolls* [London: Doubleday, 1993]; cf. eadem, *Jesus and the Riddle of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Unlocking His Life Story* (San Francisco: Harper Collins, 1992). The so-called "Peshet method," actually an allegorical interpretation of the Qumran texts and the Gospels (which allows almost everything to be inserted into the texts), was later applied by the author to the apocalypse, see eadem, *Jesus of the Apocalypse. The Life of Jesus after the Crucifixion* (London: Doubleday, 1996). The results are similarly abstruse.

¹² Thus particularly effective in the second bestseller of the 1990s, the work of Baigent and Leigh, *Jesus*, which was based on the theories of the American scholarly outsider Robert Eisenman, who has great merit in opening access to the Qumran fragments but whose identification of the "Teacher of Righteousness" with the Lord's brother James (who in later Jewish Christianity bears the honorary title of "the Just") likewise found no approval in the scholarly community. See finally R. H. Eisenman, *Jakobus, der Bruder von Jesus. Der Schlüssel zum Geheimnis des Frühchristentums und der Qumran-Rollen* (München: Bertelsmann, 1998; English original: *James the Brother of Jesus. The Key to Unlocking the Secrets of Early Christianity and Dead Sea Scrolls* [New York: Penguin, 1996]). The dating of the corresponding Qumran texts is also clearly contrary to this view.

¹³ This motif in Baigent and Leigh, *Verschlußsache Jesus*, goes back to the 1950s when the American journalist Edmund Wilson introduced the American public to the early and soon-to-be-known as premature theses of the great French Orientalist Andre Dupont-Sommer that the Qumran Teacher of Righteousness, analogous to Jesus, was a quasi-Messiah before Jesus, from which primarily Wilson then concluded that Christianity's claim to revelation was over and that the Qumran texts were a threat to the faith of the

caves and manuscripts, sex and crime, and the unveiling pathos of a self-proclaimed “enlightenment.”

Of course many elements of this presentation are not new, but go back to older novelistic representations of Jesus from the Enlightenment era, in which it had already been speculated in a similar way that Jesus had been educated by the “order” of the Essenes and introduced to medicine, that he had survived the crucifixion as one who appeared dead (which would have done away with the impulse given by the resurrection), and that he was well cared for by the healing Essenes. And even in these early novel portrayals of Jesus Christ, Jesus is touched by the charms of Mary Magdalene.¹⁴ The modern bestsellers – up to Dan Brown’s “sacrilegious” work – are so far not so new in their material, only the old sources are largely forgotten and reproducible without copyright. Regrettably, in its ideas about Jesus (and Mary Magdalene), the general public is often more influenced by such depictions than by serious information.

In particular, the group of the “Essenes,”¹⁵ testified to by ancient authors and stylized by Josephus, and even more so by Philo, as the ideal “philosophical” community, has fascinated interpreters since the time of the Fathers of the Church. Since Eusebius (*Hist. eccl.* II 16f.), this group had not usually been viewed as a Jewish group, but as Christian ascetics or a prefiguration of Christian monasticism. Later, in the Age of the Enlightenment, Masonic circles in particular saw in the Essenes a particularly pure “order,” as it were a “Ur-lodge”; others recognized in them a particularly pure (still) undogmatic form of Christianity or a particular grouping open to Egyptian or Persian wisdom, Greek mystery, or Zoroastrian thinking.¹⁶ Recourse to the Essenes is still popular in the so-called “New Apocrypha” and Esoteric movement. The so-called “Essene Letter,” a forgery of the 19th century, spread as a new revelation of the very idea (known from the mentioned novels) that Jesus survived the crucifixion as an Essene by means of Essene science and the art of healing,¹⁷ and the “Essene Gospel of Peace,” allegedly found and translated by Edmond B.

church (see E. Wilson, *The Scrolls from the Dead Sea* [New York: Oxford University Press, 1955]). The long delay in the publication of the many fragments from Qumran (mainly from Cave 4), which for various reasons has led to the suspicion that this would be prevented by Vatican circles or, more specifically by Catholic priests in the editorial team, kept arising again and again.

¹⁴ See, for example, C. Friedrich Bahrdt, *Ausführung des Planes und Zweckes Jesu* (12 vols.; Berlin: August Mylius, 1784–1793) and K. Heinrich Venturini, *Natürliche Geschichte des großen Propheten von Nazareth* (4 vols.; Bethlehem [= Copenhagen]: Schubotho, 1800–1802). Unsurpassed in this discussion of rationalistic Jesus novels is A. Schweitzer, *Geschichte der Leben-Jesu-Forschung* (9th ed.; Tübingen: Mohr, 1984; 2nd ed. 1913), 79–87; see also S. Wagner, *Die Essener in der wissenschaftlichen Diskussion vom Ausgang des 18. bis zum Beginn des 20. Jahrhunderts* (BZAW 79; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1960), 39–49.

¹⁵ On this point, see J. Frey, “Essenes,” in *The Eerdmans Dictionary of Early Judaism* (ed. J. J. Collins and D. C. Harlow; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), 599–602; idem, “Evaluation.”

¹⁶ See the overview in Wagner, *Essener*, 21–38.

¹⁷ On this, see J. Finger, *Jesus – Essener, Guru, Esoteriker?* (Mainz and Stuttgart: Matthias-Grünwald Verlag, 1993), 44–47; N. Klatt, “Der Essäerbrief. Zur geistesgeschichtlichen Einordnung einer Fälschung,” *ZRGG* 38 (1986): 32–48. See also R. Henrich, *Rationalistische Christentumskritik in essenischem Gewand. Der Streit um die “Enthüllungen über die wirkliche Todesart Jesu”* (Zürich: Theologische Verlag, 1988).

Szekely, propagates vegetarianism in the name of the Essenes.¹⁸ A brief look at the esoteric market presents a colorful variety of Essene references: “Memories or the Essenes” is presented with the subtitle “The spiritual teachings of Jesus”¹⁹; another book combines “ancient therapies of the Essenes” with esoteric techniques such as aura reading²⁰ – the list of titles could be substantially expanded. Even a good, natural wholegrain bread is branded as “Essene Bread.”²¹

None of this has a hint of evidence in the Qumran texts, and hardly anything of it is present in the ancient reports about the Essenes. But one must be well informed in order to know one’s way around the concentrated ignorance and diffuse misinformation in popular media culture and on the esoteric-religious market. For this reason alone, solid information about the texts and an examination of the results of research belong in the study of theology.

The true sensations of the Qumran discoveries cannot of course be spread in a blatant manner, and they have less to do with Jesus and the primitive Christians directly. Nevertheless, it is obvious that the Qumran texts revolutionized biblical scholarship – including New Testament scholarship – in many respects and can provide many more insights. So now we turn to the serious research.

B. The Change of the Questions: From Older to Newer Qumran Research

For New Testament biblical scholarship, the text discoveries of Qumran are of monumental importance because these finds brought to light for the first time a large number of original Hebrew and Aramaic texts from Palestinian Judaism at the time of the turn of the century. As a result, the sources for illuminating the Jewish environment of Jesus and primitive Christianity have improved decisively.

Before the discoveries from Qumran, only a single fragment of the Hebrew text from ancient times was known: the Nash papyrus, which dates from the 1st or 2nd century BCE. But this papyrus only contains a form of the decalogue and the *Shema Israel* of Deut 6:4.²²

¹⁸ On this, see Finger, *Jesus*, 33–36.

¹⁹ A. and D. Meurois-Givaudan, *Essener-Erinnerungen. Die spirituellen Lehren Jesu* (2nd ed.; München: Hugendubel, 1988).

²⁰ A. Givaudan and A. Achram, *Auralesen und alte Therapien der Essener* (Güllesheim: Silberschnur, 2007).

²¹ Here, too, reference is made to the fake “Gospel of Peace of the Essenes,” which allegedly produced flatbread from germinated grain (see <http://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Essenerbrot>).

²² On this, see Tov, “Text,” 99; E. Ulrich, “The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Biblical Text,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years* (ed. P. W. Flint and J. C. VanderKam; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 1:79–109, here 79.

In addition, for the period between the last parts of the Hebrew Bible (i.e., the book of Daniel) and the redaction of the Mishnah (end of the 2nd cent. CE), only Greek texts from Palestinian Judaism were available, such as the works of Flavius Josephus, additional pieces preserved in the Septuagint, and, for example, the Psalms of Solomon and other Pseudepigrapha, some of which could be assumed to be written in Hebrew or Aramaic but which were only preserved in secondary translations (e.g., *1 Enoch* [Ethiopic], *Jubilees* [Ethiopic], *4 Ezra* [Latin], or *2 Baruch* [Syriac]). The representations of the religion of Palestinian Judaism from the period before the Qumran discoveries²³ are largely based on these sources, which scholars then more or less strongly associated with the later rabbinical texts. Also, in the reconstruction of Jesus' mother tongue, for example, by Joachim Jeremias,²⁴ research was largely dependent on conclusions from Galilean pieces from the Babylonian Talmud and some Midrashim to be dated much later. However, sources for contemporary Aramaic were missing.²⁵

In this respect, the Qumran texts were particularly interesting to New Testament scholars from the beginning, and the first phase of the Qumran discussion until about 1970 was, at least in the German-speaking world, determined by New Testaments scholars. This can be seen primarily in the work of Karl Georg Kuhn,²⁶ an Orientalist and New Testament scholar who published on the new finds as early as 1949 and later headed the Qumran Research Center in Heidelberg, where a large number of young scholars were introduced to Qumran studies. Also to be mentioned are Claus-Hunno Hunzinger, the one and only German among the team that was commissioned in the 1950s to

²³ So, for example, the textbook presentation by E. Schürer, *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi* (3 vols.; Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1901–1909), or by W. Bousset and H. Gressmann, *Die Religion des Judentums im späthellenistischen Zeitalter* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1926).

²⁴ Cf. J. Jeremias, *Neutestamentliche Theologie I. Teil: Die Verkündigung Jesu* (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlag, 1971), 15.

²⁵ See now the comprehensive work of U. Schattner-Rieser, *Grammaire*, vol. 1 of *L'araméen des manuscrits de la mer Morte* (Lausanne: Editions du Zèbre, 2004), as well as eadem, "Die Sprache Jesu im Licht der Texte von Qumran – das Vaterunser als Beispiel," in *Jesus, Paulus und Qumran* (ed. J. Frey and E. Edzard Popkes; WUNT II/390; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012).

²⁶ Karl-Georg Kuhn (1906–1976) was appointed to an associate professorship in Göttingen and then called to Heidelberg in 1954. He has published on the Qumran texts since 1949, whereby the new field of research could help make his problematic past as a part of the Third Reich temporarily forgotten. On this, see Frey, "Qumran Research," 79–101; detailed in G. Lindemann, "Theological Research about Judaism in different Political Contexts. The Example of Karl Georg Kuhn (1906–1976)," *KZG* 17 (2004): 339–351; G. Jeremias, "Karl Georg Kuhn (1906–1976)," in *Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft nach 1945. Hauptvertreter der deutschsprachigen Exegese in der Darstellung ihrer Schüler* (ed. C. Breitenbach and R. Hoppe; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchner Verlag, 2008), 297–312; G. Theissen, *Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft vor und nach 1945: Karl Georg Kuhn und Günther Bornkamm* (SPHKHAW 47; Heidelberg: Winter, 2009), 15–149.

publish the fragments from Cave 4,²⁷ Otto Betz in Tübingen, Oscar Cullmann in Basel, and the Bultmann student Herbert Braun in Mainz. Later came the second generation of Qumran researchers, including Hartmut Stegemann in Marburg and Göttingen, Jürgen Becker in Kiel, Gert Jeremias in Tübingen, Heinz-Wolfgang Kuhn in München, or Hermann Lichtenberger in Münster and Tübingen, all of whom held chairs in the New Testament.²⁸

I. The Questions in Early Qumran Research

The first phase of Qumran research was strongly determined by a “Christian agenda”:²⁹ The scholarly interest, as well as the public’s interest, was centered on the question of what parallels the discoveries provided with Jesus and the early Christian texts. Very early on, for example, scholars discussed the dualism found in the new texts (1QS and 1QM) in relationship with the dualism in the Gospel of John and other New Testament texts, the relationship of the interpretation of Scripture in the *Habakkuk Pesher* (1QpHab) with early Christian exegesis, and further parallels with the concept of the messiah and eschatology in the New Testament. Of particular interest was the figure of the Teacher of Righteousness, which some scholars initially moved into a particularly close analogy with Jesus of Nazareth as “founder” of a community, preacher and teacher, initiator of ritual ablutions and a “holy meal,” and possibly even as a persecuted or – as it was sometimes thought, killed – individual on the basis of his teaching.³⁰ The internal structure of the Qumran

²⁷ Hunzinger became professor of New Testament in Hamburg in 1962 and soon thereafter retired from the official editorial team. Later, others from the German speaking-world were added to the now expanded team, including Hartmut Stegemann (see below), later head of the Qumran Research Center, and his student Annette Steudel (Göttingen), and Armin Lange (now professor of Jewish studies in Vienna).

²⁸ See in greater detail Frey, “Qumran Research.” With certain restrictions, it can also be stated internationally that it was initially many New Testament scholars who familiarized themselves with the Qumran texts soon after their discovery and attempted to evaluate them. Mention should be made of the British scholars William D. Davies and Matthew Black, and the North Americans Raymond E. Brown, Joseph A. Fitzmyer, and James H. Charlesworth.

²⁹ This is also due to the fact that – with the exception of Eleazar Lipa Sukenik, who acquired some of the first scrolls and was the first to suggest the identification of the Qumran group with the Essenes, along with his son Yigael Yadin – Israeli researchers were hardly involved in the research at this stage. For apart from the scrolls first found and then purchased by the State of Israel, the fragments that were found were initially under the authority of the Jordanian Antiquities, and the “Scroller,” the site where the fragments were processed, lay in the Palestine Archaeological Museum, today’s Rockefeller Museum, in East Jerusalem.

³⁰ A. Dupont-Sommer (following the thoughts of his French compatriot Ernest Renan) argued very early on for the thesis that the “Teacher of Righteousness” had already appeared as a messiah 100 years before Jesus; preached conversion, humility, charity, and

community and parallels with primitive Christianity (e.g., with regard to the matter of communal goods), their community meals in comparison with the Lord's Supper, their immersion baths and purification rites in comparison to primitive Christian baptism, or even the practice of John the Baptist were discussed. Linguistic and material parallels were compiled with virtually all New Testament texts, and Herbert Braun's³¹ two volumes thematically document the lively discussion of the 1950s and early 1960s in a catena-like compilation – although with a skeptical tendency towards the assumption of a connection between Qumran and primitive Christianity.

It can be seen that the discussions of early Qumran research are also to be classified in the exegetical "climate" of that time. New Testament scholarship in the German speaking world was dominated by the Bultmann School in the 1950s, which saw the history-of-religions background of the Pauline and particularly Johannine thought within the Hellenistic and partly Gnostic world of thought, showed no particular interest in Judaism, and at times was influenced by a negative view of "late Judaism." The interest in the Qumran texts and their evaluation was stronger in the case of scholars who were critical of Bultmann's hermeneutics and now saw in these texts an indication of a stronger rooting of the early Christian authors in the Jewish tradition and also indications of a more "conservative" evaluation of the gospel tradition.

Thus, especially in view of the Gospel of John, scholars very quickly expressed the view that the dualism present in the Qumran texts is historically much closer to the Gospel of John and was therefore more suitable as a parallel than the Gnostic dualism constructed and presupposed for the Early Christian period by Bultmann from different, and in the case of Manichaean and Mandaean texts,³² very late sources.³³ As early as 1950, Karl Georg Kuhn suspected that the Qumran texts reveal the native soil of the Johannine language,

abstinence; and founded a kind of church in which a holy meal was held. He too had attracted the enmity of the priests and had finally been sentenced and killed. In this respect, the Teacher was considered a prototype of Jesus and Jesus is a "reincarnation" of the Teacher: Dupont-Sommer, *Aperçus préliminaires sur les manuscrits de la Mer Morte* (OAI 4; Paris: Maisonneuve, 1950), 121f.

³¹ H. Braun, *Qumran und das Neue Testament* (2 vols.; Tübingen: Mohr, 1966).

³² Thus first in R. Bultmann, "Die Bedeutung der neu erschlossenen mandäischen und manichäischen Quellen für das Verständnis des Johannesevangeliums (1925)," in *Exegetica* (ed. R. Bultmann; Tübingen: Mohr, 1967), 55–104; see the critical evaluation in J. Frey, *Die johanneische Eschatologie I: Ihre Probleme im Spiegel der Forschung seit Reimarus* (WUNT 96; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997), 129–141.

³³ K. G. Kuhn, "Die in Palästina gefundenen hebräischen Texte und das Neue Testament," *ZTK* 47 (1950): 192–211; idem, "Johannes-Evangelium und Qumrantexte," in *Neotestamentica et Patristica, FS O. Cullmann* (Leiden: Brill, 1962), 111–122. Cf. further R. E. Brown, "The Qumran-Scrolls and the Johannine Gospel and Epistles," *CBQ* 17 (1955): 403–419, 559–574 (German trans. "Die Schriftrollen von Qumran und das Johannesevangelium und die Johannesbriefe," in *Johannes und sein Evangelium* [ed. K. Heinrich Rengstorf; WdF 82; Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1973], 486–528), as well as J. H. Charlesworth, "A Critical Comparison of the Dualism in 1QS 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: Herder, 1990), 76–106.

which lies therefore in heterodox (!) Judaism.³⁴ From this newfound Jewish embedding of the Gospel of John, other scholars attempted to prove that the Johannine tradition was of greater historical trustworthiness than previously thought.³⁵ In view of the perceived linguistic parallels, it was further asked whether the fourth evangelist might have been Essene himself³⁶ or whether he had written his work as a Christian doctrine for the Essenes³⁷ and therefore used their language. The 364-day calendar attested to in the Qumran texts, which differs from the “official” temple calendar, was used to explain the differences in the Passion chronology between the Gospel of John and the Synoptics.³⁸ Of all the New Testament figures, John the Baptist was most strongly associated with the Qumran community. The assumption that the Baptist was at one time an Essene and was then excluded from the community³⁹ would of course also have implied a more or less direction connection between the Qumran community and the Jesus movement, especially since some of Jesus’ disciples would have come from the circle of the disciples of the Baptist according to John 1:35–51.

However, in view of these early discussion topics and theses, it must be noted that these comparisons were all made on a very narrow textual basis. In the 1950s, the only texts that were published and accessible were almost exclusively from Cave 1 of Qumran: seven larger scrolls (in addition to the two Isaiah scrolls, the then so-called “Sectarian Rule” 1QS, the *War Rule* 1QM, the *Hodayot* 1QH, the *Habakkuk Peshar* 1QpHab, and a little later the *Genesis Apocryphon* 1QGenAp), which were all preserved relatively well and could be quickly edited. In addition to these texts, only a small number of additional texts or already published fragments were available. These few texts, which from today’s perspective also conveyed a somewhat one-sided image of the Qumran library, determined the discussion.

³⁴ Kuhn, “Palästina,” 209: “In these new texts, we discover the native soil of the Gospel of John and this soil is Palestinian Judaism, but not Pharisaic-rabbinic Judaism, rather a Palestinian-Jewish pious sect of Gnostic structure.”

³⁵ Thus W. F. Albright, “Recent Discoveries in Palestine and the Gospel of St. John,” in *The Background of the New Testament*, FS Charles H. Dodd (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1956), 153–171, here 170f.

³⁶ Thus J. Ashton, *Understanding the Fourth Gospel* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991), 205, 235ff.; also Charlesworth, “Comparison.”

³⁷ K. Schubert, *Die Gemeinde vom Toten Meer. Ihre Entstehung und ihre Lehren* (München: Reinhardt, 1958), 136.

³⁸ Thus first in A. Jaubert, *La Date de la Cène* (Paris: Gabalda, 1957).

³⁹ Thus early on in W. H. Brownlee, “John the Baptist in the New Light of Ancient Scrolls,” in *The Scrolls and the New Testament* (ed. K. Stendahl; New York: Harper, 1957), 33–53; O. Betz, “Die Proselytentaufe der Qumransekte und die Taufe im Neuen Testament,” *RevQ* 2 (1958/59): 213–234; Schubert, *Gemeinde*, 109. More recently, J. H. Charlesworth, “John the Baptizer and Qumran Barriers in Light of the Rule of the Community,” in *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. D. W. Parry and E. Ulrich; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 353–375; however see the criticism of J. A. Kelhoffer, “Did John the Baptist Eat Like a Former Essene? Locust-Eating in the Ancient Near East and at Qumran,” *DSD* 11 (2004): 294–314.

The large inventory of the library that contains over 900 manuscripts (most of which, of course, are only very fragmentarily preserved) was not accessible at this time. Furthermore, the evaluation of the numerous fragments from Cave 4 took longer than expected for many reasons. The diversity of the texts now recognized had remained hidden, and for a relatively long time one could easily gain the impression that the library was a “sectarian library.” And in the previously unknown texts, one could only see the literary products of a more or less marginal “sect” or a “heterodox” Judaism that had been divorced from the Pharisaic-rabbinical branch of Judaism.⁴⁰

The entire discussion about the importance of the Qumran writings for the understanding of the New Testament must now be conducted on the basis of the completely accessible texts. The old theses and models of a connection between Qumran texts and early Christian texts or even the Qumran community and the primitive church or individual figures of it now seem much too undifferentiated and outdated, even if they are still occasionally repeated by individual researchers and above all in popular discourse.

A more detailed presentation and refutation is therefore no longer necessary here.⁴¹ I limit myself to a brief summary of the most important theses from today’s perspective:

(a) The thesis that the Qumran community represented a quasi “prototype” of the primitive Christian church or that the Qumran Teacher was a prefiguration or “model” for the appearance of Jesus or his representation in the Gospels was recognized very early on as inaccurate, though it was repeatedly taken up within popular contexts. Despite the repetition of this view⁴² in popular contexts, it is demonstrably inaccurate because the general analogies between two groups that refer (in different ways) to a founding figure and that have rituals of washing and holy meals are too unspecific and can be accounted for sociologically, while the specific differences that exist between both groups (in particular with respect to the question of Torah observance) are more important. Moreover, no direct connection between the two groups is discernible. In particular, all speculations about a violent death of the Teacher of Righteousness (as a “model” for the crucified Messiah of Early Christianity) are meaningless; they were based on readings of individual Qumran texts that have since been recognized to be erroneous.

Accordingly, the suspicion that the Qumran texts could turn the historically individual Jesus of history into a mere “copy” and thus endanger the “claim to revelation” of the Christian faith such that certain church circles could therefore have had an interest in preventing the publication of the texts loses its substance. It should be clear to every edu-

⁴⁰ See the quotation quoted above (n. 34) by Karl Georg Kuhn. This met with some efforts to distance Jesus and the primitive Christians from “classical” or “normative” Judaism and to associate them at most with such a “heterodox” branch. In my opinion, the old research traditions continue here, according to which the Essenes had a more “open,” universalist constitution in opposition to “classical” rabbinic Judaism. The fact that the Essenes were indeed even more conservative, purity oriented, and “exclusive” is evident only on the basis of the Qumran library.

⁴¹ On this, see Frey, “Bedeutung,” 133–152; idem, “Impact,” 419–435 (in this volume, 539–554).

⁴² See above n. 30, for details on the views of André Dupont-Sommer.

cated theologian that Jesus' message and the proclamation of the primitive church did not fall from heaven, but in many of its elements is related to the biblical and contemporary expressions of Jewish tradition, and that on the other hand every historical phenomenon is to be appreciated in its individual form. In this respect, narrower or broader references to early Jewish texts and phenomena are by no means a danger to the Christian faith, but only contribute to its contextualization.

(b) The thesis that the Qumran texts dealt with New Testament or early Christian figures and reported a "different" history of Early Christianity in coded form is excluded due to the dating of the texts. There is no mention of John the Baptist, James the Just, Jesus, or Paul in the Qumran texts, so there is no personal connection between the Qumran church and Early Christianity.

Also invalid is the expectation (which is brought up again and again in reference to new textual discoveries and also the Early Christian Apocrypha) that the new sources could bring about a "completely different" history of Early Christianity at that time and completely overturn the initial history handed down by the church and/or raised by the critical scholarly investigation of the Bible on the basis of the oldest tradition. This has not at all happened for all the new insights into the details, even in view of the Qumran texts.

(c) Just as unlikely to prove is the thesis that fragments of Greek texts in Qumran – concentrated in Cave 7 – represent New Testament texts. This thesis, which was particularly well-received by conservative followers of the early dating of New Testament texts (especially the Gospel of Mark) to a time well before the year 70 CE, has now been clearly falsified by the exact analysis of the few secure letters of fragment 7Q5.⁴³ The Greek texts from Cave 7 can probably be assigned to a textual work on LXX traditions or even to other Apocryphal or Pseudepigraphal texts (as in the Greek book of Enoch), but not to a presence of early Christian texts in Qumran.

(d) Finally, the assumption of an "Essene Quarter" on the southwest hill of Jerusalem, today's Mount Zion, cannot be proven and therefore cannot be used to establish local and personal connections between the early church and Essenism. The thesis put forward by Benedictine archaeologist Bargil Pixner, on the basis of the identification of the "Essene gate" mentioned by Josephus, that the residential district of the Essenes was located in the district behind this gate, and the connection of this assumption with ancient church traditions about the place of Jesus' Last Supper and the nucleus of the primitive church on Mount Zion,⁴⁴ combines a number of different, sometimes very speculative hypotheses.⁴⁵ It can be assumed according to Josephus' testimony that Essenes lived in Jerusalem, but it is no longer certain whether they lived in a closed "district" and where it might have been located. It is implausible that traditions about the seat of the early church on Mt Zion goes back to early Christian times since the pilgrim Etheria apparently did not yet know anything about a localization of the Last Supper there in the 4th century. The orientation of a half-circle niche in the space of the contemporary assignment of David's tomb to the hill

⁴³ See the summary in S. Enste, *Kein Markustext in Qumran. Eine Untersuchung der These: Qumran-Fragment 7Q5 = Mk 6,52–53* (NTOA 45; Freiburg, Schweiz and Göttingen: Universität Verlag, 2000).

⁴⁴ Cf. the summary in R. Riesner, *Essener und Urkirche in Jerusalem. Neue Funde und Quellen* (2nd ed.; BAZ 6; Gießen: Brunnen, 1998).

⁴⁵ Cf. M. Küchler, *Jerusalem. Ein Handbuch und Studienreiseführer zur Heiligen Stadt* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2007), 649: "Many stones of the mosaic ... have already been broken out again, other overly hypothetical connecting stones will soon no longer be able to withstand."

of Golgotha can hardly identify this building as a Jewish Christian synagogue, certainly not as the place where the early church must have come together.⁴⁶ A local or even personal “bridge” from the early church to an Essene community that came before it, therefore, remains a product of pious imagination that must be abandoned within scholarship.

In this respect, there is neither archaeologically nor textually sufficient evidence that Jesus and the apostles had a close relationship with the “Essenes” or the Qumran community. Nor is there evidence that this specific group could have significantly influenced the early church and its theology. Instead, the following twofold negative finding should be taken seriously:

- Neither Jesus nor any other figure from the New Testament is mentioned in the Qumran texts.
- There is also no mention of “Essenes” or members of the Qumran group in the New Testament.

The latter is particularly striking since Pharisees and Sadducees are often mentioned there, while the Essene-based religious party, with whom the Qumran library is in my opinion still rightly associated,⁴⁷ is not mentioned in the New Testament.

The assumption of a direct encounter or connection between the Qumran community and Jesus and his followers, as well as the assumption that “converted” Essenes influenced early church practice or New Testament texts with Qumran ideas remains purely speculative.⁴⁸ Furthermore, it is very unlikely that the group-specific texts from Qumran were read by outsiders who did not belong to the *yahad* community, especially in light of the “arcane discipline” documented both in the Qumran rules and testified to by Josephus, according to which the members were to “hide the council of the law amid the people of iniquity.”⁴⁹

⁴⁶ On this, see Küchler, *Jerusalem*, 639.

⁴⁷ See Frey, “Impact”; idem, “Essenes.” These were, if one is permitted to ascribe only a vague sense of reality to the content provided by Philo and Josephus, not only a marginal “sect,” but one of three relevant religious parties that were widespread in Judea and were by no means limited to the area around the Dead Sea.

⁴⁸ Such assumptions were occasionally linked to the note in Acts 6:7 that priests had also joined the Jesus movement. Of course, there is no claim made there that they came from Essene circles. For the time after the catastrophe of the year 70 CE, James Charlesworth speculated about the conversion of Essenes to the Jesus movement (as another Messianic movement), but this is hardly credible due to the clearly differing attitude, for example, to questions of purity. Cf. J. H. Charlesworth, “The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Gospel according to John,” in *Exploring the Gospel of John, FS for D. Moody Smith* (ed. R. A. Culpepper and C. Clifton Black; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1996), 65–97.

⁴⁹ 1QS IX 16f.; cf. X 24f.; Josephus, *J.W.* II 141.

II. *The Change of Questions in Recent Research*

What is the picture of the Qumran discoveries after the publication of the complete library inventory? What changes has the Qumran research gone through, and how have the questions themselves changed with respect to New Testament scholarship? The changes in the research landscape began in the 1970s:⁵⁰ After the first “Qumran fever” of the 1950s and 1960s subsided and after most of the connections between the texts and the New Testament were collected and discussed, there was at first a certain amount of lethargy in the research. Though scholars knew about the fragments from Cave 4, they were not at the time freely accessible and for legal reasons were only available to the editors in charge until their publication. Thus, only isolated information about the additional, unpublished but eagerly awaited texts were leaked or became known in essays and partial pre-publications of individual texts.

In any case, some important information already led to insights in early publications that would gradually change the image of the research.

To mention a few here, there was an early essay by Claus-Hunno Hunzinger⁵¹ which announced that manuscripts of the *War Rule* from Cave 4 differed from 1QM so that one probably has to distinguish between an older and a younger version of this text within the library, whereby the older version occupied in 4QM^a does not yet have some details typical for the Qumran Community, while 1QM then seems to represent a “Qumranic” version of the Rule.⁵²

The general insight, which has already been hinted at here, but only enforced much later, is that one must not regard the Qumran texts as a united entity, but must perceive the differences within the library and must also reckon with the complex tradition-historical processes in the transmission of individual texts – recognizable where there are several manuscripts of the “same” text. How diverse the Qumran library actually is, however, could only be recognized after the numerous new texts became known. There are three levels of differentiation to be considered:

⁵⁰ On the various phases of the Qumran research, see Frey, “Impact,” 408–419 (in this volume, 529–539). There, I make the distinctions between the first phase, “First Discoveries and Premature Assumptions (1947–ca. 1955),” a second phase “The ‘Qumran Fever’ and the Discusure of the Material (ca. 1955–ca. 1970),” then a third phase “Stagnation (ca. 1970–1991),” and a fourth phase “A New ‘Qumran Springtime’ (since 1991).” After this “Spring” of the 1990s, in which new texts were edited in rapid succession, a new phase of the research could start wherein the entire corpus of texts is now processed with, in part, new methods and questions. For a current overview, see M. L. Grossman, ed., *Rediscovering the Dead Sea Scrolls. An Assessment of Old and New Approaches and Methods* (Grand Rapids and Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2010); and Lim and Collins, eds., *Oxford Handbook*.

⁵¹ C.-H. Hunzinger, “Fragmente einer älteren Fassung des Buches Milhamā aus Höhle 4 von Qumran,” *ZAW* 69 (1957): 131–151.

⁵² Hunzinger, “Fragmente,” 150.

- (a) differentiation between various writings or works,
- (b) differentiation between various “editions” of individual works,
- (c) and differentiations between various groups of authors, that is, in particular between texts which bear specific characteristics of the composition of the community mentioned in the texts, the *yahad*, and other texts which do not bear such marks and which therefore originated outside of the community or before the creation of that community.

Concerning (a) While early research was still relatively undifferentiated in terms of a uniform “Qumran theology,” it has now become a matter of common knowledge to distinguish between the various works we have received and to assign each one its own value.

Thus, for example, the *dualism* of the War Rule 1QM is to be distinguished clearly in its structure from the dualism that is mentioned in the “Treatise on the Two Spirits” 1QS III 13–IV 26 which was regarded for some time as the paradigm of “Qumranian dualism.” It is also to be distinguished clearly from the dualism of the blessings and the curses in the liturgical part of 1QS I 1–III 13.⁵³ From today’s perspective, there is no “uniform” Qumran view of dualism, no “uniform” view of scriptural interpretation, and not even a “uniform” view of the Rules characteristic of the *yahad*, for there are significant differences between the *Damascus Document* (CD) on the one hand and the *Community Rule* in 1QS V–IX. For example, the regulations do not always presuppose that all members would be unmarried (e.g., 1QS V 1); some passages (1QSa I 4, 16; CD VII 6–8) even speak of married couples or women.⁵⁴ It can be concluded from this that one cannot expect that these rules were equally valid for all members at all times; rather, internal differentiations and diachronic developments can also be expected within the *yahad* or (by no means introduced only in Qumran) the “Qumran community.”

Concerning (b) Different versions or stages of development are also to be expected in the tradition of individual works. This could be clearly seen only when parallel manuscripts and their fragments from the findings in Cave 4 became known and individual writings could be evaluated comparatively, for example, regarding the *Community Rule* 1QS, the War Rule 1QM, the *Hodayot* 1QH, or the *Damascus Document* CD. Now, processes of transmission and editing could be studied on the basis of the material inventory of the manuscripts, and some of the hypotheses for the creation of the corresponding works, which had previously been put forward, collapsed on themselves. It is particularly revealing to note that the material of the *Community Rule* 1QS was handed down because it was shown here that the manuscripts from Cave 4 did indeed contain parallel material, but did not simply contain the

⁵³ On this, see J. Frey, “Different Patterns of Dualism in the Qumran Library,” in this volume.

⁵⁴ For more on this discussion, see A. Steudel, “Ehelosigkeit bei den Essenern,” in *Qumran kontrovers. Beiträge zu den Textfunden vom Toten Meer* (ed. J. Frey and H. Stegemann; Paderborn: Bonifatius, 2003), 115–124.

same content. Rather, it contained different selections of the partial texts collected in IQS or other partial texts.

It became apparent that the *Community Rule* in IQS V 1–IX 26 was preceded by an older version, which was (still) less strongly marked by the dominance of priestly elements, so that one must assume a literary development of the rule text. Moreover, it could be seen from the dating of the manuscripts that even after the composition of the “complete” or most comprehensive text in IQS, the older text forms were apparently not abandoned, but continued to be copied.⁵⁵ This shows that the group in which these texts were produced and handed down was not interested in a “valid” or “definitive” text, but could live with different versions of the rule texts and penal provisions therein.⁵⁶ This insight is fundamental to the assessment of the Qumran concept of textual authority or even “canonicity,” for the same plurality of textual versions and forms is also evident in some books of the Hebrew Bible, of which different versions are attested to in manuscripts from Qumran.

Concerning (c) Perhaps the most significant differentiation is distinguishing between those writings whose authorship can be traced back to the “Qumran community” or the *yahad* and those writings which very likely originated outside this community or before its constitution, possibly in precursor groups, and which were “adopted,” read, preserved, copied, and in part cited by the *yahad*. This distinction has slowly emerged since the 1980s and found wider acceptance among scholars for the first time at the Madrid Qumran Congress of 1991. Previously, it had been widely judged that all non-biblical “new” texts within the “sectarian library” would have also arisen within the Qumran community.⁵⁷ After early doubts had been expressed about the Aramaic texts (e.g., the *Genesis Apocryphon*),⁵⁸ more and more texts from Cave 4 became known in the 1980s, representing a multitude of genres and themes, but lacking the terminology characteristic of the *yahad*, which is familiar from the Rule texts, the *Hodayot*, and some other Qumranian works. The absence of characteristic terminology, an “entire Israelite” perspective not specifically related to the community of the *yahad*, and significant differences in relation to individual theological topics such as the understanding of

⁵⁵ These were the results of the work of S. Metso, *The Textual Development of the Qumran Community Rule* (STDJ 21; Leiden: Brill, 1997).

⁵⁶ On this, see C. Hempel, “Vielgestaltigkeit und Verbindlichkeit: Serekh ha-Yachad in Qumran,” in *Qumran und der biblische Kanon* (ed. M. Becker and J. Frey; BThSt 92; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchner Verlag, 2009), 101–121.

⁵⁷ One reason for this can be accounted for by the coincidences of the history of the finds. Among the texts from Cave 1 that appeared and were published at first were precisely those texts that are still regarded as the “classical” testimonies of the community: the *Community Rule* IQS, the *Hymn Scroll* 1QH^a, the *Habakkuk-Peshier* 1QpHab, and the *War Scroll* 1QM.

⁵⁸ S. Segert, “Die Sprachenfrage in der Qumrängemeinschaft,” in *Qumran-Probleme* (ed. H. Bardtke; Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1963), 315–319.

the “covenant”⁵⁹ could then serve as criteria by means of which individual texts could be attributed to writing circles other than the “Qumran community” or the *yahad*.⁶⁰ Of course, the criteria are not completely definable (and a certain “grey area” will probably always remain). Furthermore, the terminology used to describe and classify the texts is particularly difficult:⁶¹

In the Anglo-Saxon-speaking world, the terms “sectarian texts” and “non-sectarian” or “pre-sectarian texts” are usually used, whereby “sectarian” then refers to an authorship by the *yahad*. Of course, some of the forerunner groups, to which perhaps individual texts go back, could also be characterized as “sectarian” (from a sociological point of view), so that the terminology conceals blurriness. Within the German-speaking world, the talk of a “sect” is still laden with other burdens because it implies the opposition to a “majority church” and thus a marginal status. For this reason, one should not speak of the “texts of a sect” or “sectarian texts.” Provided that the Qumran library’s tradents are linked to the group of the Essenes mentioned in ancient reports, one can speak of “Essene” and “non-Essene” or “pre-Essene” texts. However, such terminology can only be used by scholars who connect the *yahad* with the Essenes. If one wishes to use a more general terminology, then “group-specific” and “non-group-specific” texts (i.e., texts created outside the group) are also options. Talk of “Qumran” or “pre-Qumran” texts is too imprecise and should be avoided because it is too closely linked to a local reference, even though today the term “Qumran community” is broadly defined and is understood to extend far beyond the people living in Qumran and includes the community in “all its branches” (1QS VI 2).⁶²

But despite these terminological problems, the facts are clear: Today, one must conclude that only a small part of the non-biblical texts in the Qumran

⁵⁹ On this, see A. Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination. Weisheitliche Urordnung und Prädestination in den Textfunden von Qumran* (STDJ 18; Leiden: Brill, 1995), 131.

⁶⁰ Cf. D. Dimant, “The Qumran Manuscripts. Contents and Significance,” in *Time to Prepare the Way in the Wilderness. Papers on the Qumran Scrolls by Fellows of the Institute of Advanced Studies of the Hebrew University, Jerusalem 1989–1990* (ed. D. Dimant and L. H. Schiffman; STDJ 16; Leiden: Brill, 1995), 23–58; C. Newsom, “‘Sectually Explicit’ Literature from Qumran,” in *The Hebrew Bible and Its Interpreters* (ed. W. H. Propp, B. Halpern, and D. Noel Freedman; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1990), 167–187; Lange, *Weisheit*, 6–29; A. Lange and H. Lichtenberger, “Qumran,” *TRE* 28:45–97, here 45ff.; A. Lange, “Kriterien essenischer Texte,” in *Qumran kontrovers*, 59–69; and finally even more differentiating in D. Dimant, “The Vocabulary of the Qumran Sectarian Texts,” in *Qumran und die Archäologie. Texte und Kontexte* (ed. J. Frey, C. Claußen, and N. Kessler; WUNT 278; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 345–395.

⁶¹ On this, see the questions in C. Hempel, “Kriterien zur Bestimmung ‘essenischer Verfasserschaft’ von Qumrantexten,” in *Qumran kontrovers*, 71–84; and finally, in my opinion, the somewhat too far-reaching contention of the value of these classifications by F. García Martínez, “¿Sectario, No-sectario, o Qué?,” *RevQ* 23 (2008): 383–394; idem, “Aramaica qumranica apocalypica?,” in *Aramaic Qumranica. The Aix-en-Provence Colloquium on the Aramaic Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. K. Berthelot and D. Stoekl Ben Ezra; STDJ 94; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 435–448.

⁶² Thus finally, H.-W. Kuhn, “Jesus im Licht der Qumrangemeinde,” in *Handbook for the Study of the Historical Jesus* (ed. T. Holmén and S. E. Porter; Leiden: Brill, 2011), 2:1245–1285, here 1247.

library were actually written by authors who belonged to the “Essene” community or to the *yaḥad*.⁶³ The majority of the texts found here come from other circles of the Judaism of the three pre-Christian centuries. They were read or received even if they did not fully correspond to the views of the group living in Qumran, and they are of wider significance as testimonies to the interpretation of Scripture, theological thought, and literary production of a wider spectrum of Judaism at that time. Probably all texts in Aramaic, most of the sapiential texts found in Qumran, a large part of the new pseudepigraphal or “parabiblical” texts,⁶⁴ even a passage such as the well-known Treatise on the Two Spirits (1QS III 13–IV 26)⁶⁵ must be regarded as part of the literary heritage that the Qumran library’s tradents took up from other carrier circles, for example, from precursor movements of the *yaḥad*, which is known to us today only because it has survived the centuries in the caves of Qumran. The immense importance of the Qumran library can be seen in the fact that it represents not only the legacy of a single, more or less marginal “sect,” but a broad cross-section of large parts of the literary production of Palestinian Judaism in the two or three centuries before the turn of the era. This offers new possibilities and challenges for the analysis of the history-of-religions and for the comparison with early Christian texts.

C. Methodological and Hermeneutical Considerations concerning the Comparison of Qumran and New Testament Texts

The evaluation of Qumran texts in New Testament scholarship initially concentrated on the collection of parallels, whose presentation was classically brought in the form of a continuous catena to the New Testament by Herbert Braun.⁶⁶ Of significance for the differentiations between schools of New

⁶³ Of course, the production of the manuscripts must be distinguished from the writing of the texts. The discussion about the extent to which the manuscripts of the library itself were produced in Qumran is concerned with the archaeological question about the function of the layout of Khirbet Qumran, which has been hotly debated in recent years. See J. Frey, “Qumran and Archaeology,” in this volume.

⁶⁴ See the enumeration of Hebrew texts for which a Qumran-specific origin cannot be proven in L. T. Stuckenbruck, “The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament,” in *Qumran and the Bible. Studying the Jewish and Christian Scriptures in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. N. Dávid and A. Lange; CBET 57; Leuven: Peeters, 2010), 131–170, here 136.

⁶⁵ On this, see H. Stegemann, *Die Essener, Qumran, Johannes der Täufer und Jesus* (10th ed.; Freiburg: Herder, 2007), 154–156; Lange, *Weisheit*, 126ff.; Frey, “Patterns,” 295–300 (in this volume, 262–267).

⁶⁶ Braun, *Qumran*. The form is taken over in the numerous essays by Heinz-Wolfgang Kuhn on the subject “Paul and Qumran,” see first: H.-W. Kuhn, “Die Bedeutung der Qum-

Testament scholarship is the respective evaluation of the parallels: While some emphasized the surprising proximity of individual Qumran statements to New Testament formulations and phenomena, others pointed to the profound differences and thus usually to the “*proprium*” of the Christian kerygma, which should not be flattened by Jewish parallels.

Of course, the mere collection of Qumran parallels can hardly satisfy the state of recent research. It requires not only a further differentiation, which incorporates the variety and complexity of the Qumran library, but also a thorough hermeneutical reflection on the relevance of these parallels:

What relevance does it have that one finds in these Jewish texts something linguistically or materially comparable to the New Testament? What do parallels actually “explain?” Or do they “explain” nothing in themselves and, for their part, demand appropriate explanations?

“Parallelomania”⁶⁷ must always be juxtaposed with the knowledge of the individuality of each historical phenomenon. Are parallel phenomena simply to be interpreted as analogies between different, in some respects (e.g., sociologically or in their reference to tradition) comparable groups, or can concrete dependencies be demonstrated? At what level can such dependencies or influences be localized? Do they exist at the textual level (textual reception; intertextuality), at the level of the individual (knowledge of traditions and forms of language; individual “encyclopedia”), or at the level of groups or religious milieus (common language patterns and discourses)?

In view of Early Christianity or the background of the proclamation of Jesus and the apostles, three levels of questions must be distinguished: Can this background be defined:

- as generally *Jewish* (in distinction from pagan-Hellenistic or gnostic),
- as specifically *Palestinian-Jewish* (in distinction from Diaspora or Hellenistic-Jewish), or
- as (group-)specific *Qumranic/Essene*?

This differentiation is an essential consequence of the insight into the differentiation of the Qumran library.⁶⁸

rantexte für das Verständnis des Ersten Thessalonicherbriefes. Vorstellung des Münchener Projekts: Qumran und das Neue Testament,” in *The Madrid Qumran Congress* (ed. J. Trebolle Barrera and L. Vegas Montaner; STDJ 11; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 1:340–353; idem, “Die Bedeutung der Qumrantexte für das Verständnis des Galaterbriefes aus dem Münchener Projekt: Qumran und das Neue Testament,” in *New Qumran Texts and Studies. Proceedings of the First Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Paris 1992* (ed. G. J. Brooke and F. García Martínez; STDJ 15; Leiden: Brill, 1994), 169–221; as well as additional essays.

⁶⁷ S. Sandmel, “Parallelomania,” *JBL* 81 (1962): 1–13.

⁶⁸ See the more detailed considerations and the catalog of questions in Frey, “Bedeutung,” 161–163; idem, “Impact,” 441–443 (in this volume, 559–561), as well as H.-W. Kuhn, “Qumran und Paulus. Unter traditionsgeschichtlichem Aspekt ausgewählte

The selected parallels can no longer – as was customary in the older research – be regarded as indicative of specific Essene influences, but are to be understood at first only as components of a (Palestinian-)Jewish matrix⁶⁹ of Early Christianity, in which Jesus and primitive Christianity, as well as Paul, the Synoptic, and the Johannine traditions take part.

Furthermore, the semantic evaluation of Qumran parallels should not be conducted without reflection. Occasionally, these provide an important clarification for the understanding of New Testament (Greek) terminology, but this is by no means always the case. It should also be taken into consideration that the New Testament use of these terms within their “new” context may have a different connotation and therefore their meaning is not to be determined by the demonstration of parallels in another textual and historical context.

At the same time, it should be kept in mind that the evaluation of the Qumran parallels should not lead to a one-sided, “pan-Qumranistic” view. Rather, the Qumran parallels are to be evaluated in the context (and possibly in “competition”) of different horizons of the history of religion. Of course, not all linguistic forms and conceptions of primitive Christianity can be explained in terms of Palestinian Judaism; on the contrary, it is just as likely to be influenced by Hellenistic (i.e., shaped by the Greek language and culture) Judaism – even in Palestine – and also by the numerous similarities with the pagan environment.

Within the horizon of recent research, many of the old conclusions drawn by Qumran specialists and New Testament scholars on the basis of the Qumran texts have to be abandoned. As already mentioned, this does not only apply to the untenable assumptions of direct personal or textual connections between Qumran and primitive Christianity. Also unsupported are assumptions about the way that a New Testament author was directly influenced by Essene ideas⁷⁰ or wrote for addressees of such a milieu.⁷¹ The frequently

Parallelen,” in *Das Urchristentum in seiner literarischen Geschichte*, FS Jürgen Becker (ed. U. Mell and U. B. Müller; BZNW 100; Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 1999), 227–246, here 228f.

⁶⁹ Thus J. A. Fitzmyer, “The Qumran Scrolls and the New Testament After Forty Years,” *RevQ* 13 (1988): 609–620, here 610.

⁷⁰ Thus often accepted for John the Evangelist, most recently, in Charlesworth, “Dead Sea Scrolls,” in whose view the evangelist had “the vivid memory of an Essene who had become a Christian” (88) and knew by heart the Treatise on the Two Spirits. Cf. also Ashton, *Understanding*, 237, “the evangelist had dualism in his bones, ... [and] may well have started life as one of those Essenes who were to be found, according to Josephus, ‘in large numbers in every town.’” Still more speculative, E. Ruckstuhl, “Der Jünger, den Jesus liebte,” *SNTU* 11 (1986): 131–167, here 165f.; idem, “Zur Chronologie der Leidensgeschichte Jesu, I. Teil,” *SNTU* 10 (1985): 27–61, here 55f., wished to identify the Johannine Beloved Disciple (as an author) with the “guest monk” of the Jerusalem Essene settlement, who prepared the Passover for Jesus and his disciples.

expressed assumption that certain words of Jesus are formulated directly in acceptance of,⁷² or in opposition to,⁷³ Qumran-Essenes doctrines cannot be conclusively substantiated,⁷⁴ and the respective parallels demand a more differentiated and hermeneutically circumspect evaluation.

In the following, I can only try to present the yields and perspectives of such comparisons for a few select examples of the Jesus tradition. It will show how diverse the results are, how closeness and distance, correspondence and difference are juxtaposed in detail and require specific treatment in each individual case.

D. The “Historical” Jesus and the Jesus Tradition

The question of the meaning of the Qumran texts for the understanding of the Jesus tradition is particularly complex because, in the case of the Jesus tradition, we have to deal with particularly difficult methodological questions⁷⁵

⁷¹ Thus, for example, K. Schubert, *Die Gemeinde vom Toten Meer* (München and Basel: Reinhardt, 1958), 131, wished to see a Christology in the Essenes, and M.-É. Boismard, “The First Epistle of John and the Writings of Qumran,” in *John*, 156–166, who saw 1 John as a letter to converted Essenes. Cf. also the conjectures of Yigael Yadin, the publisher of the *Temple Scroll*, on the Letter to the Hebrews, in 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: Magnes, 1958), 36–55, here 38–45, as well as still further H. Kosmala, *Hebräer – Essener – Christen* (Studien zur Vorgeschichte der frühchristlichen Verkündigung; SPB 1; Leiden: Brill, 1959), who regarded the letter to the Hebrews as a writing that wanted to gain Essenes for the belief in Christ.

⁷² Thus often in view of the prohibition against divorce in Mark 10:2–9 or the prohibition against oaths in Matthew 5:33–38.

⁷³ For example, in view of the commandment to love one’s enemy or, in the words of Matthew 5:43, that “It is said, ‘You shall love your neighbor and hate your enemy.’” Thus already in E. Stauffer, *Die Botschaft Jesu. Damals und heute* (Bern: Francke, 1959), 128f.; cf. Also Braun, *Qumran*, 1:17f.

⁷⁴ On the whole, see Stuckenbruck, “Dead Sea Scrolls,” 134f.

⁷⁵ See the foundational presentation by M. Hengel and A. M. Schwemer, *Jesus und das Judentum* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007). Presentations that take into account the Jewish background of Jesus’ ministry are also G. Vermes, *Jesus the Jew. A Historian’s Reading of the Gospels* (London: Collins Fontana, 1973); E. P. Sanders, *Jesus and Judaism* (London: SCM Press, 1985); J. H. Charlesworth, *Jesus within Judaism. New Light from Exciting Archaeological Discoveries* (New York et al.: Doubleday, 1988); B. Chilton and C. A. Evans, *Jesus in Context. Temple, Purity and Restoration* (AGJU 39; Leiden: Brill, 1997); J. P. Meier, *A Marginal Jew. Rethinking the Historical Jesus* (4 vols.; New York et al.: Doubleday, 1999–2007); D. C. Allison, Jr., *Resurrecting Jesus. The Earliest Christian Tradition and Its Interpreters* (London: T&T Clark, 2005); M. Casey, *Jesus of Nazareth. An Independent Historian’s Account of His Life and Teaching* (London and New York: T&T Clark, 2010).

and because it can only be determined with persistent uncertainty how to reconstruct the oldest Jesus tradition or even the "ipsissima vox"⁷⁶ of Jesus. While the Gospel tradition soon affected a change from Aramaic into Greek and the canonical Gospels probably all originated outside of Palestine, the proclamation of the earthly Jesus as well as the earliest post-Easter tradition is still in the same geographical, linguistic, and religious context as the Qumran community. In this respect, the Qumran texts are of the utmost interest, especially for the understanding of Jesus' proclamation, because despite the methodological problems regarding the authenticity and archetype form of Jesus' words, these texts – and in particular the *non-group-specific*,⁷⁷ "parabiblical," sapiential, liturgical, and halakic texts – provide countless "contextualizations" that demonstrate how Jesus' message and his actions are anchored in the discussions of Palestinian Judaism and how this background can provide insights into his profile.

Last but not least, the Qumran texts reveal a broad palette of messianic ideas and terms, through which the framework of contemporary Palestinian-Jewish messianism becomes recognizable, which can significantly contribute to the understanding of the origins of early Christology. In some cases, the previously popular recourse to Hellenistic or even pagan ideas to explain the origins of early Christology becomes superfluous.⁷⁸ Furthermore, in view of the later Jesus tradition and its canonical shape, numerous linguistic, material, and generic parallels can be drawn from the Qumran library. From the abundance of contributions⁷⁹ and aspects, I can only cite a few selected points here

⁷⁶ This term has been coined by Joachim Jeremias. See the entirety of Jeremias, *Neutestamentliche Theologie*.

⁷⁷ On this aspect, see in particular G. J. Brooke, "The Pre-sectarian Jesus," in *Echoes from the Caves. Qumran and the New Testament* (ed. F. García Martínez; STDJ 85; Leiden: Brill, 2009), 33–48.

⁷⁸ See the detailed treatment by J. Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte aus Qumran. Königliche, priesterliche und prophetische Messiasvorstellungen in den Schriftfunden von Qumran* (WUNT II/104; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998); J. J. Collins, "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; A. Yarbro Collins and J. J. Collins, *King and Messiah as Son of God. Divine, Human, and Angelic Messianic Figures in Biblical and Related Literature* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008); see also J. Frey, "Der historische Jesus und der Christus der Evangelien," in *Der historische Jesus. Tendenzen und Perspektiven der gegenwärtigen Forschung* (ed. J. Schröter and R. Brucker; BZNW 114; Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 2002), 273–336, here 299–313. For more, see below at section E.

⁷⁹ On this subject, see Kuhn, "Jesus," 1281–1285 (bibliography); Stuckenbruck, "Dead Sea Scrolls," 150–155; Brooke, "Pre-Sectarian Jesus"; idem, "Jesus, the Dead Sea Scrolls and Scrolls Scholarship," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005), 19–26; see further the volume of collected essays by J. H. Charlesworth,

and do so without discussing in detail the problems related to the transmission of the Synoptic accounts.

I. Jesus and the Essenes – A Negative Report

First, it is important to note once again that all older theories (dating back before the Qumran discoveries and even to the Age of the Enlightenment⁸⁰) about Jesus having had contact with the “Essenes,” that he had, for example, developed his universalistic type of proclamation under the influence of such “heterodox” Judaism, or that he had been introduced to the group of healers and even survived the wounds of his crucifixion by their “care,” are outlandish in light of the Qumran texts.

A positive connection between Jesus and the Essenes cannot be proven, and the comparison of essential contents of his teaching with the Essene “original texts” from Qumran makes all such assumptions seem to be groundless. If the group-specific Qumran texts reflected the ideological profile of the Essenian movement more authentically than the Grecized reports about the Essenes in Philo and Josephus,⁸¹ then this religious party was by no means a more open-minded or more “universalistic” group in comparison to Pharisaic or later rabbinic Judaism, but rather an even more purity-oriented, law-stringent religious party which had probably already accused the Pharisees of alleviating and “making more practical” certain Torah provisions and fought against them under the alias of “the people who speak smooth things.”

Furthermore, we know nothing of a specific healing practice of the Essenes⁸² from the group-specific Qumran texts: The passages that present interesting parallels with Jesus’ exorcisms such as the exorcistic activity of Tobias in the book of Tobit (Tob 8:1ff.) and the presentation of Abraham as a healer and exorcist in the Aramaic *Genesis Apocryphon* (1QApoCrGen XX

ed., *Jesus and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York: Doubleday, 1993); C. A. Evans, “Jesus and the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *Dead Sea Scrolls*, 2:573–598; M. Hengel, “Jesus der Messias Israels,” in *Der messianische Anspruch Jesu und die Anfänge der Christologie* (ed. M. Hengel and A. M. Schwemer; WUNT 138; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001), 1–80, here 34–45.

⁸⁰ The first scholarly author who wished to see Jesus as an Essene was in 1713 in J. Georg Wachter, *De primordiis Christianae religionis. Elucidarius cabalisticus*; on this, see Wagner, *Essener*, 2. The work is reprinted in J. Georg Wachter, *De primordiis Christianae religionis. Elucidarius cabalisticus* (ed. W. Schröder; Freidenker der europäischen Aufklärung vol. 1 and 2; Stuttgart and Bad Cannstatt: Friedrich Frommann Verlag, 1995).

⁸¹ See the justification in Frey, “On the Historical Value”; idem, “Essenes.”

⁸² This was mentioned in Josephus *J.W.* II 136 and also in the group designation “*Therapeuai*” in Philo, but this (difficult to interpret) term is unlikely to refer to the physical activity of healing, but rather to the worship of God. Apart from the difficulty in interpreting the term itself, it is difficult to appeal to the idealized picture drawn by Philo as a true representation of the real, living Essenes in Palestine.

16–30; cf. also the prayer of Nabonidus in 4Q242 and the Aramaic exorcism text 4Q560) are not exactly group-specific "Essene" texts. The same probably applies to the exorcistic prayers in 1QApPs^a (11Q11). These and several other texts indeed offer interesting illustrations of the effectiveness of exorcists and charismatics in Jesus' environment, which can be compared with the traditions of Jesus' ministry.⁸³ In particular, the "messianic apocalypse" 4Q521 provides a framework in which the healing of the sick can be understood as an element of the ministry of God in the salvific era.⁸⁴ Nevertheless, 4Q521 is not an Essene or group-specific text, and a "proximity" between Jesus and the Essenes or the Qumran community is not substantiated by all these parallels.⁸⁵

II. Jesus and the "Teacher of Righteousness"

Also popular at the beginning of Qumran research were comparisons between Jesus and the "foundational figure," who is present in some of the group-specific Qumran texts and is named the "Righteous Teacher" or the "Teacher of Righteousness" (מורה הצדק). However, these comparisons did not lead very far.⁸⁶ Among the points of comparison that had initially been cited by André Dupont-Sommer, and on account of which the synoptic Jesus could almost appear to be a "copy" of the older teacher,⁸⁷ only a few remain as points of true comparison. Many analogies, such as similarities between the Qumran purifications and Christian baptism, between the Qumran meals and the Lord's Supper, etc., are more concerned with the structure and practice of later communities than their "founding figures."

On the other hand, there are significant differences between the appearance of Jesus and that of the Teacher of Righteousness: The "Qumran" teach-

⁸³ This was already an essential component of the depiction of Jesus by Vermes, *Jesus*, 65–69.

⁸⁴ In detail in M. Becker, "Die 'messianische Apokalypse' 4Q521 und der Interpretationsrahmen der Taten Jesu," in *Apokalptik und Qumran* (ed. J. Frey and M. Becker; Einblicke 10; Paderborn: Bonifatius: 2007), 237–303.

⁸⁵ For discussion, see Brooke, "Pre-sectarian Jesus," 37–490, who in conclusion remarks that the illustration of Jesus' deeds is only possible through some early, pre-Essene ("pre-sectarian") texts.

⁸⁶ See recently Kuhn, "Jesus," 1278–1281. Cf. the foundational work of G. Jeremias, *Der Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit* (SUNT 2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1963), 319–353, as well as H. Stegemann, "The 'Teacher of Righteousness' and Jesus. Two Types of Religious Leadership in Judaism at the Turn of the Era," in *Jewish Civilization in the Hellenistic-Roman Period* (ed. S. Talmon; JSPE.S 10; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991), 196–213; idem, "Jesus and the Teacher of Righteousness. Similarities and Differences," *BRev* 10 (1994), 42–47 and 63.

⁸⁷ See above at n. 30.

er was a priest (4QpPs^a III 15–17) or perhaps even a high priest,⁸⁸ Jesus came from simple, non-priestly lineage;⁸⁹ the Teacher died of natural causes around 110 BCE,⁹⁰ Jesus was crucified by the Romans as a messianic pretender because of a politically effective denunciation by the temple aristocracy. The Teacher probably did not make a messianic claim, and the Qumran texts do not make a connection with him and the messiah or (in some texts) the expected messiah;⁹¹ however, messianic categories seem to have been applied to Jesus by his followers as well as (for the purpose of political denunciation) by his adversaries, regardless of whether he himself explicitly used that term (which is unlikely) or merely made an “implicit” messianic, eschatological claim with regard to his mission.⁹²

The Teacher apparently acted according to his high priestly interpretive authority as an interpreter of the Torah.⁹³ Long after his death it is said of him that God has revealed to him all the secrets of the prophets (1QpHab VII 4–

⁸⁸ Evidence for this identification of the Teacher comes from the application of the term קַטְוֶה to him. The use of the definite article makes the Teacher appear to be the priest *kat' exochen* and to be the highest authority with respect to Torah interpretation. Thus, the thesis by Hartmut Stegemann, who assigns the date of the Teacher of Righteous' tenure as the (presupposed) high priest in those years in which Josephus names no high priest, after the death of Alkimos (159 BCE) until the usurping of the office by the Hasmonean Jonathan (152 BCE), which was later kept secret by the pro-Hasmonean book of 1 Maccabees (which functions as Josephus' only source for this period of time). With this “office of authority,” the Teacher later, after 152 BCE, united the scattered resistance groups into the “Essenian Union” and at the same time established a priestly supremacy within this grouping. On this, see Stegemann, *Essener*, 205f.; idem, “The Qumran Essenes – Local Members of the Main Jewish Union in Late Second Temple Times,” in *The Madrid Qumran Congress. Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. J. Trebolle Barrera and L. Vegas Montaner; STDJ 11.1–2; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 1:83–166.

⁸⁹ The New Testament letter to the Hebrews has to justify the possibility of the (high) priesthood of the non-Levite Jesus through a rather complicated construction of Scripture (see Heb 7:1–12).

⁹⁰ On this, see CD XIX 35–XX 1; XX 13f.

⁹¹ Thus rightly argued by Jeremias, *Lehrer*, 268–307; cf. also Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte*, 455–458.

⁹² On this, see Frey, “Jesus”; idem, “Continuity and Discontinuity between ‘Jesus’ and ‘Christ.’ The Possibilities of an Implicit Christology,” *RCT* 36.1 (2011), 69–98; also the detailed work of Hengel, “Jesus der Messias Israels”; see further in Hengel and Schwemer, *Jesus und das Judentum*, 461–548.

⁹³ Perhaps the halakic specifications in 4QMMT can be traced back to the authority of this Teacher's personality, even though the text itself is not explicitly identifiable as a letter of the Teacher of Righteousness to the high priest in Jerusalem. The “antitheses” to the Torah interpretation of the addressed “you”-group are at least “on equal terms” and with an extremely high level of self-confidence.

5), and in the individual songs of the *Hodayot*,⁹⁴ which may be attributed to the Teacher himself, an "I" speaks, claiming to have been set up "as a sign for the righteous ones chosen" by God (1QH^a X 15) and "as a trap for the wrongdoers, but as healing for all who repent of iniquity" (1QH^a X 10f.). Jesus' sending claim that eschatological salvation is decided by the stance that one adopts toward him (Luke 12:8f. // Matt 10:32f.) and his message is of at least equal importance to this "claim to an office." However, while the Teacher in his "office of authority" shaped a religious party that was distanced from the temple, yet was institutionally strictly ordered, and at least ideologically claimed to represent Israel in the end times,⁹⁵ the circle of disciples "created" by Jesus is a small, wandering, "fringe group" that symbolically sought to accomplish the renewal of Israel,⁹⁶ but had not yet developed any institutional structures. Only after the "rupture" and the new beginning in light of the Easter events did it become a "community" whose structures and ritual practice now invite a comparison with the Qumran community, but at a different level.

The crucial differences between the Qumran Teacher and Jesus of Nazareth are shown in the content of their respective messages, especially in the interpretation of the Torah provisions about purity, food, and Sabbath observance: While the Teacher and his *yahad* represented a priestly formed position oriented on a precise interpretation and observance of a specific purity halakhot and saw in this Torah knowledge of the specific revelation of the will of God granted to him and his community, Jesus' position on the Torah appears clearly different, sometimes explicitly critical, and the core of his message is marked by a completely different term, namely by the speech of the "kingly rule of God." In the concise compilation of parallels and differences between the oldest Jesus tradition and the texts from Qumran, the value of the Qumran texts for the contextualization of the figure of Jesus can

⁹⁴ Thus the thesis in Jeremias, *Lehrer*, 168–177; H.-W. Kuhn, *Enderwartung und gegenwärtiges Heil* (SUNT 4; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966), 21–24; Stegemann, "Teacher of Righteousness," 197.

⁹⁵ In this respect, Stegemann's term "Main Jewish Union" is justified.

⁹⁶ This is so particularly if one does not deny the creation of the circle of the Twelve (evidenced in 1 Cor 15:5 as well as in the old formula "Judas, one of the Twelve" in Mark 14:43, among other places) to the historical Jesus, and interprets it with reference to the renewal of Israel according to Matt 19:28 // Luke 22:30. See the detailed reasoning of J. P. Meier, "The Circle of the Twelve: Did It Exist during Jesus' Public Ministry?" *JBL* 116 (1997): 635–672; also Hengel and Schwemer, *Jesus und das Judentum*, 365–371; J. Frey "Apostelbegriff, Apostelamt und 'Apostolizität' der Kirche," in *Das kirchliche Amt in apostolischer Nachfolge I* (ed. T. Schneider and G. Wenz; Dialog der Kirchen 12; Freiburg i. B. and Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004), 91–188, here 140–142 – contra Kuhn, "Jesus," 1256, and particularly radical in G. Klein, *Die zwölf Apostel. Ursprung und Gehalt einer Idee* (FRLANT 77; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1961), 34–38, who considered the motif to be an invention of Luke's.

be emphasized more precisely than is possible with the comparisons of the two “founding figures.”

III. The Kingdom of God and the Eschatology of Jesus

The central concept of the proclamation of Jesus is known to be the “kingdom of God.” This motif occurs more frequently in the Synoptics than in all other contemporary texts; it is particularly concentrated in Jesus’ words and at the same time is articulated in very specific linguistic expression.⁹⁷ But while it could still be said in the specialist literature some 35 years ago that the theme of the kingdom of God played “no outstanding role”⁹⁸ in the surviving early Jewish writings, such that some interpreters wished to understand the term instead from a Hellenistic-Jewish background,⁹⁹ the “new” Qumran texts published in the 1990s have resulted in a change in the evaluation of the sources. In addition to the Book of Daniel, in which the term is of central importance,¹⁰⁰ and a number of other late Old Testament and pseudepigraphic texts in which the expression is encountered,¹⁰¹ reference must now be made primarily to the so-called *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*, a kind of “angelic liturgy” for the 13 Sabbaths of a quarter. This text was found in Qumran and Masada, and in it God’s מַלְכוּת, that is, his heavenly kingdom, is

⁹⁷ On this, see Jeremias, *Neutestamentliche Theologie*, 1:40–44; see also Ulrich Luz, “βασιλεία,” *EWNT* 1:481–491, here 483.

⁹⁸ Thus O. Camponovo, *Königtum, Königsherrschaft und Reich Gottes in den frühjüdischen Schriften* (OBO 58; Freiburg, Schweiz and Göttingen: Universitäts-Verlag, 1984), 437; cf. A. Lindemann, “Gottesherrschaft II: Neues Testament,” *TRE* 15:196–218, here 200. This judgment was already problematic at the time because it was based on the exclusion of the early Jewish prayers, “in which the kingdom of God played a decisive role and some of which clearly date back to the time of the Second Temple” (M. Hengel and A. M. Schwemer, “Foreword,” in *Königsherrschaft Gottes und himmlischer Kult im Judentum, Urchristentum und in der hellenistischen Welt* [ed. M. Hengel and A. M. Schwemer; WUNT 55; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1991], 1–19, here 1f.).

⁹⁹ B. L. Mack, *A Myth of Innocence. Mark and Christian Origins* (Philadelphia: Augsburg Fortress, 1988), 73 n. 16; idem, “The Kingdom Sayings in Mark,” *Forum* 3.1 (1987): 3–47, here 16, which indicates that the exact Greek phrase βασιλεία (τοῦ) θεοῦ occurs outside of early Christian literature only in three places (Philo *Spec.* 4.164; Wis 10:10; *Sent. Sextus* 310–312), and namely in Hellenistic-Jewish writings, and concludes “that the language of a ‘kingdom’ of God emerged mainly among Hellenistic-Jewish thinkers” (“Kingdom Sayings,” 16). From this methodologically failed investigation, Mack constructs a cynical Jesus. For criticism of this, see Evans, “Jesus,” 575–578.

¹⁰⁰ Thus already in Camponovo, *Königtum*, 437.

¹⁰¹ On this, see Evans, “Jesus,” 580–585, who apart from the mention of the kingdom of YHWH in the Hebrew Bible refers to *Jub.* 1:28; *I En.* 9:4; 12:3; 25:3–5, 7; 27:3; 84:2; *Pss. Sol.* 17:3 (with the relatively exact phrase ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν) as well as to the already known Qumran texts such as IQM VI 6; XII 7; IQSb IV 25f.; V 21 and to newer texts such as 4Q252 I V 3f.; 4Q286 7 i 5; and 4Q491 11 II 17.

praised in great density. It becomes clear that the royal rule, which is expected and hoped for in other texts – such as the Lord's Prayer – is not merely an earthly entity, but is related closely in ancient Jewish thought with the rule of God already realized in heaven.¹⁰² It is a space in which one enters, and at the same time it is a reality in which the earthly community already participates in worship. Jesus' proclamation of the kingdom of God as a coming and at the same time "already present" reality is anchored in this circle of tradition, which – if one adds synagogue prayers – has a not so insignificant importance in contemporary discourse.¹⁰³

The phenomenon that is particularly conspicuous in the Jesus tradition, that the reign of God is spoken of on the one hand in the apocalyptic sense as something expected in the future (most clearly in the Lord's Prayer in Matt 6:9f.) and on the other hand also as already present in Jesus' deeds or in his fellowship (Luke 11:20; 17:20f., etc.), now has an interesting parallel in specific conceptions of the Qumran community.¹⁰⁴ While parts of New Testament scholarship – prompted by the early rationalist criticism of eschatological expectation¹⁰⁵ – judged the "double" eschatology in the Jesus tradition to be a contradiction and pushed for its dissolution either in the sense of the presence of the kingdom or in the sense of a "consistent" eschatological view,¹⁰⁶ Werner Georg Kümmel¹⁰⁷ showed for the first time that not only a single series of statements can be regarded as authentic, that is, that the conception of the βασιλεία in the earthly Jesus is characterized by a peculiar "bitemporality." This evidence is still valid even in view of recent attempts to reconstruct a "non-eschatological Jesus."¹⁰⁸ That such a view of the future

¹⁰² Thus Evans, "Jesus," 583; see the detailed presentation in A. M. Schwemer, "Gott als König und seine Königsherrschaft in den Sabbatliedern aus Qumran," in *Königsherrschaft Gottes*, 45–118.

¹⁰³ We should refer in particular to the eleventh prayer of the Eighteen Benedictions (the Amida), which was prayed daily in the synagogue, and also to the Qaddish prayer, which has particularly close parallels to the Lord's Prayer, although its dating is admittedly difficult and uncertain. See A. Lehnardt, *Qaddish. Entstehung und Rezeption eines jüdischen Gebets* (TSAJ 87; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002).

¹⁰⁴ On this, see the foundational work of Kuhn, *Enderwartung*, 189–204.

¹⁰⁵ Concerning these early impulses for criticism, cf. Frey, *Eschatologie*, 1:10ff.

¹⁰⁶ For the liberal (present) and the "consistent-eschatological" interpretation at a glance, see G. Theissen and A. Merz, *Der historische Jesus. Ein Lehrbuch* (2nd ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1997), 223–226; for further research, see Hengel and Schwemer, *Jesus and Judaism*, 406–418; as well as J. Frey, "Die Apokalyptik als Herausforderung der neutestamentlichen Wissenschaft. Zum Problem: Jesus und die Apokalyptik," in *Apokalyptik als Herausforderung neutestamentlicher Theologie* (ed. M. Becker and Öhler; WUNT II/214; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006), 23–94, here 55–58, 68–79.

¹⁰⁷ W. G. Kümmel, *Verheißung und Erfüllung* (2nd ed.; ATANT 6; Zürich: Zwingli-Verlag, 1953).

¹⁰⁸ On this discussion, see Frey, "Apokalyptik," 55–58.

and at the same time – in a certain respect – the presence of the βασιλεία did not necessarily appear as an irreconcilable contradiction in the contemporary Jewish context can be seen in the Qumran texts, in which such a coexistence also occurs with the end-time expectation (shared by the community as a matter of course) *and* the conviction to participate in salvation in the present time.

Of course, there are also significant differences in the analogy. The group-specific texts of the Essenes express the conviction that their community is a “temple of *adam* (humans)” (4Q174 = 4QMidrEschat III 6), in which strict Torah observance and purity practice takes the place of the cultic sacrifice in the Temple. The community is “a holy house for Israel” (1QS VIII 5; cf. IX 6); indeed, the elect are “heirs to the lot of the saints” and are “connected . . . with the sons of heaven to a council of the community and to a circle of the holy building” (1QS XI 7f). The community was convinced that, in its community gathering and in its status of purity, it participated in the heavenly cult and praised God together with the angels.¹⁰⁹ Therefore, its members understood themselves as a community comprised of both heavenly and earthly beings. This conviction was founded upon the fact that every member of the community adhered to the strict observance of priestly purity laws.¹¹⁰ A consequence of this conviction that they communed with angels was that, for example, no disabled, blind, or otherwise physically hindered individual was allowed within the regular community congregation according to the “*Community Rule*” 1QSa II 3–9, “for the angels of holiness are in their community.”¹¹¹

The specific consciousness of the presence of eschatological salvation becomes concrete in Qumran in the knowledge of the eschatological gift of the correct understanding of the Torah and the interpretation of Scripture, as well as in the knowledge of one’s own election to the already present reality of communion with the heavenly beings. Thus, in particular some passages in the *Hodayot* impressively bring to expression the praise of God’s salutary action, which “lifts the poor from the dust.”¹¹² God has given the pious man insight into his wonderful counsel and even placed his spirit in him.¹¹³ So, in

¹⁰⁹ Cf. 1QH^a XIX 17, 28f.

¹¹⁰ Thus Kuhn, *Enderwartung*, 67f.

¹¹¹ Cf. also 4Q267 17 i 6–9. The exclusion of the physically handicapped is similarly encountered in the speech of the eschatological struggle, in which special ritual purity is demanded according to the *War Scroll* (1QM VII 5f.; cf. Lev 21:17–24), as well as in the *Temple Scroll* for the Holy City (11QTemp XLV 21, 26). In this exclusion of all those with physical blemishes, there is of course a specific contrast with Jesus’ treatment of the sick, the disabled, the lepers, and the religious outcasts, which was not marked by distance but rather aimed at healing and integration (see below).

¹¹² 1QH^a XXVI 26–28; See Kuhn, “Jesus,” 1277.

¹¹³ 1QH^a XX 13–17.

the present, the Qumran devout has a share in God's salvific work, even though he still knows that he is sinful and belongs to the "flesh."¹¹⁴ But "despite the assumption of eschatologically present salvation the futuristic eschatology [is] not abolished."¹¹⁵ Of course, the Qumran pious expect the imminent end,¹¹⁶ the appearance of "messianic" figures,¹¹⁷ the annihilation of Belial or the purification of the pious (1QS IV 20–33), so that here too a peculiar "double-temporal" eschatology appears.

In this "duality" lies the decisive analogy to Jesus' eschatology. However, in this analogy, the presence of the kingdom of God or its present in-breaking is bound to completely different characteristics: to casting out of demons, which Jesus himself exorcises "with the finger of God" (Luke 11:20), to the disempowerment of Satan (Luke 10:18), to the healing of the sick, and to the proclamation of the good news to the poor (Luke 7:22; cf. also Luke 6:20f.).¹¹⁸ When Jesus in his proclamation connects the quality of the present time with his own actions, with the "greater than Jonah" and "greater than Solomon" (Matt 12:41f.), and with the fact that the fulfillment of what the prophets desired to see happen at present, the certainty of the presence of salvation clearly differs from that of the Qumranites. But the bitemporal structure of Jesus' eschatology becomes understandable from the Essene texts. In this respect, the Qumran texts also cause us to critically reflect on the appropriateness of the alternatives and paradigms established in New Testament scholarship, such as the opposition of "futuristic" and "present" eschatology. The new insights into a previously unknown area of ancient Jewish thought have expanded the framework of what is exegetically "plausible."

IV. Torah and Halakah

The central area where the differences (but also certain similarities) between the proclamation of Jesus and the Qumran texts can be seen is their understanding of the Torah and Halakah. Here, too, it is helpful to list a few obvious similarities before highlighting the profound differences.

¹¹⁴ In this striking simultaneity of sin consciousness and redemption consciousness, texts from the *Hodayot* or 1QS XI 9–12 come close to a position of the *simul peccator – simul iustus*. On this, cf. Frey, "Antithese"; Frey, "Flesh."

¹¹⁵ Thus, rightly in Kuhn, *Enderwartung*, 176.

¹¹⁶ This was even scheduled and expected about 40 years after the teacher's death (CD XX 15), so that the *Habakkuk Pesher*, which was written after this date, then determines and reflects on the absence of the end and the stretching of time (1QpHab VI 12–VI 17). Of course, this is also a parallel to the phenomenon of the delay of the Parousia in Early Christianity.

¹¹⁷ Cf. 1QS IX 10f.; CD XI 23–XIII 1; XIV 18f.; XI 33–XX 1, among other places.

¹¹⁸ According to the non-Essene text 4Q521, these phenomena were regarded as signs of God's work in the last days. On this, see section E of this article.

Apparently in agreement with Qumran, Jesus teaches a stricter understanding of marriage than the later rabbinical rules. When he categorically forbids divorce in Mark 10:6–9, this is justified by reference to the original will of the Creator (Gen 1:27; 2:24). The reference to Gen 1:27 plays a similar role in CD IV 21, wherein divorce is not in view but rather the rejection of several consecutive marriages (even in the case of the death of the wife). That is, the reference to creation serves different purposes, and a halakic commonality only exists conceptually.¹¹⁹ However, if one appreciates the similarities and the differences, then it becomes all the clearer how much the comparison can serve to see the nuances and the conceptual accents in the two texts.¹²⁰

Furthermore, the oft cited example of the commandment not to swear oaths in Matt 5:33–37, which has an important parallel in CD XV 1–2, offers clear differences upon closer inspection: While the Jesus logion forbids the use of the oath in connection with everything that is connected to God’s rule, but does not explicitly mention the name of God, CD XV 1 is concerned with the protection of the name of God by saying that one is not to make an oath “with the aleph and the lamed” (= “Elohim”) and not “with the aleph and dalet” (= “Adonai”). And while the *Damascus Document* (CD XV 6–8) expressly permits the use of oaths in view of the “covenant” (i.e., at the entrance of an individual into the community), the earthly Jesus seems to reject oaths of any kind.¹²¹ Jesus’ “radicalization” of the Torah does not simply correspond to the rigid Torah regulations of the Essenes. In particular, the statements that even the covetous gaze is equivalent to adultery and the hateful word to that of murder (Matt 5:22, 28) are aimed less at a radicalized practice or even at a literal fulfilment of removing the eyes (Matt 5:29), but rather at a fundamental correction of one’s relationship to God in light of the in-breaking rule of God.

In contrast to the radicalization mentioned above, there is a peculiar liberality of Jesus with respect to questions of purity. Conversely, purity issues were particularly central to the Qumran community. The most important evidence is the logion in Mark 7:15, “There is nothing that goes into a man from the outside that can make him unclean, but what comes out of a man is what makes him impure.” This statement would have been offensive in the Jewish context, but, nevertheless formulated in this way, this wise word could hardly be an invention of the early Jewish or even Gentile Christian commu-

¹¹⁹ See the discussion in Stuckenbruck, “Dead Sea Scrolls,” 150f. See further L. Doering, “Marriage and Creation in Mark 10 and CD 4–5,” in *Echoes*, 133–163, and M. Kister, “Divorce, Reproof and Other Sayings in the Synoptic Gospels. Jesus Traditions in the Context of ‘Qumranic’ and Other Texts,” in *Text, Thought, and Practice*, 195–229.

¹²⁰ Thus the conclusion in Doering, “Marriage,” 163, “Pointing out differences as well as commonalities ... only reinforces the importance of comparison, allowing us to see nuances in the compared texts and to relate them to conceptual emphases in each of them.”

¹²¹ See Stuckenbruck, “Dead Sea Scrolls,” 152.

nity. Jesus formulates his statement in contrast to the widespread purity and food halakah of his environment, and he "intensifies ... the Torah by contrasting external food ingestion and ethical attitudes" and at the same time comes up against "a border to the nullification of the Torah."¹²² In so doing, Heinz Wolfgang Kuhn points out that even here Jesus makes an argument from creation or from humanity. Such a line of reasoning fits with other sayings of Jesus, such as those about the Sabbath and marriage.¹²³ In contrast to the strict emphasis on the ritual purity laws in the Qumran texts, Jesus seems to marginalize the practice of ritual purity on the basis of the will of the Creator God or the creatureliness of man.

This is also evident with regard to the Sabbath commandment. The Essenes practiced a rigid Sabbath halakah. According to the book of *Jubilees* (*Jub.* 50:6–13; cf. 2:17–33), which is a particularly important text for the community, the death penalty is prescribed for numerous acts done on the Sabbath (contra CD XII 3f.). According to the *Damascus Document*, one should not even help an animal in distress on the Sabbath (CD XI 13f.). Other Jewish halakic opinions were evidently different on this point, and the words in Luke 13:5f. and in Matt 12:11 concerning an animal being untied to drink on the Sabbath and a sheep being pulled out of a pit engages in an argument with Jewish interlocutors who apparently considered this assistance to be permissible. From this, these New Testament texts conclude *a minore ad maius* that if one helps an animal out of the pit on the Sabbath, how much more should a person be helped. This argument is intended as a justification of Jesus' acts of healing on the Sabbath. It is impossible to prove that Jesus' statements presuppose the knowledge of Qumranic positions on these matters, even less possible to prove that they are formulated against the Essene teachings.¹²⁴ Nevertheless, there exists here a substantial contrast between these two viewpoints.

If, according to Jesus, the Sabbath (rooted in creation) was created for humankind (Mark 2:27), this is not only to be interpreted ethically and philanthropically, but at the same time raises the question about by what law and with what authority he teaches these things or legitimizes such a reinterpretation of the commandment on the basis of creation. Here again we must refer to the eschatological situation, the proximity of the kingdom of God, whose inbreaking was evident by Jesus' healings and exorcisms, and finally to Je-

¹²² Kuhn, "Jesus," 1261.

¹²³ Kuhn, "Jesus," 1261.

¹²⁴ On this, see Stuckenbruck, "Dead Sea Scrolls," 158, who also points out that the statements appear to be directed to listeners who agree with Jesus' position on rescuing animals on the Sabbath. In Matt 12:14 these listeners are the Pharisees, and in Luke 14:3 they are the scribes and the Pharisees.

sus' peculiar claim of authority, by which the relativizing of an otherwise strict adherence to the Torah commandments could appear justified.

Even in his table fellowship with tax collectors and sinners, Jesus seems to have consciously crossed the boundaries of what is religiously customary in his environment. Not least the attitude of the Qumran community reveals the sharpest contrast here. Only after several years and repeated testing were novices permitted to touch "the purity (of the food) of the many" and "the drink of the many" (1QS VI 14–16, 20–23).¹²⁵ There is an analogous contradiction, as already mentioned, where Jesus encounters the lame, the blind, the crippled, and the leprous without fear of touching them, while the *yahad* (1QSa II 3–11) excludes all those who are physically defective from the community assembly. Furthermore, according to the (pre-Essene) version of the *Temple Scroll*, lepers were to live in a special municipality on the edge of the Holy City. When Jesus invites these sorts of people to join the table (Luke 14:12–14, 21), he seems to be pursuing "a program of contrast against the Qumran pious."¹²⁶

However, whether Jesus "[moves] on the border of what at that time seems to be possible within Judaism"¹²⁷ or whether he even "blows up" these borders – as Ernst Käsemann¹²⁸ believed – cannot be positively answered because there were no defined boundaries of "the" Judaism at that time. In Hellenistic Judaism, there are examples of parallels in which impurity was above all viewed as injustice.¹²⁹ Within the framework of Palestinian Judaism, such thinking seems relatively "radical." However, it does of course take place within Jewish discourse, whose breadth and diversity the Qumran texts have allowed us to recognize. It must also be remembered that the earthly Jesus, as a former follower of John the Baptist whose proclamation he continued in essential aspects, also called for repentance. Interestingly, however, he forewent the Baptist's immersion rite – and thus withdrew from cultic aspects as his mentor had already done.¹³⁰

¹²⁵ Cf. Kuhn, "Jesus," 1263.

¹²⁶ Kuhn, "Jesus," 1264; cf. Kuhn, "Jesus," in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. L. H. Schiffman and J. VanderKam; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 1:404–408, here 405.

¹²⁷ Kuhn, "Jesus," 1263.

¹²⁸ Formulated by E. Käsemann, "Das Problem des historischen Jesus," in *Exegetische Versuche und Besinnungen* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1960), 1:197–214, here 207; see also Theissen and Merz, *Jesus*, 326.

¹²⁹ Cf., for example, *Ps.-Phocylides* 228 or *Philo Spec.* 3.208f.

¹³⁰ Even in the case of the Baptist, it is noticeable that, with his offer of a ritual of atonement, without reference to the temple, he moved in an astonishing distance away from the temple despite the fact that he himself practiced a ritual act. In Jesus, the distance from the temple is also perceptible, but even with him the ritual of baptism seems to have fallen away.

We do not know, however, whether and to what extent Jesus had the practice of the Essenes in view when he phrased his words. Even though one could indeed associate Jesus' quotation of the doctrine in Matt 5:43 that "You have heard that it is said by the ancient ones, 'You should love your neighbor but hate your enemy'" with the programmatic propositions of the *Community Rule* (1QS I 9f.) "to love all children of the light but to hate all the children of darkness," this confrontation cannot be positively substantiated.¹³¹

V. Linguistic and Factual Explanations

Some other linguistic, factual, and genre-specific aspects, in which the Qumran texts contribute substantially to the understanding of the Jesus tradition – even in its later stages – can only be mentioned here briefly.

(a) A series of New Testament words and phrases are documented in Qumran in Hebrew or Aramaic parallels for the first time. For example, in addition to a series of Pauline terms,¹³² this includes the difficult to understand speech in Matt 5:3 about the "poor in spirit," which can hardly be attributed to Jesus himself, but may have been formulated in the Matthean tradition or only by the evangelist himself as an extension of the beatitude concerning the poor (Luke 6:20). The meaning of this phrase has now become clearer from its use in 1QM XIV 7 and 1QH^a VI 14 (cf. already 1QS XI 1), where ענוי רוח is to be understood in the sense of "humble = low in mind." The phrase can even mean "desperate," which is the most plausible sense in the Matthean context.¹³³

(b) The series of sapiential beatitudes present in 4Q525 is particularly interesting in terms of understanding the history of literary genres.¹³⁴ It consists of 4 + 1 beatitudes, the last of which (as in Matt 5:3–12) is much longer. There are also terminological compounds that are interesting, such as the expression "with a pure heart" mentioned in 4Q525. Without needing to discuss the matter of dependencies here, the remarkable parallel to the Matthean series of beatitudes in Matt 5:3–10 shows that not only is the form of Je-

¹³¹ Thus application in Kuhn, "Jesus," 1267f.; see also Stuckenbruck, "Dead Sea Scrolls," 134f.

¹³² On this, see in short Frey, "Bedeutung," 177–179; idem, "Impact," 451–453 (in this volume, 569–571); idem, "New Testament Scholarship and Ancient Judaism," in this volume.

¹³³ On this, see U. Luz, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus* (5th ed.; EKK I.1; Düsseldorf et al.: Patmos, 2002), 1:278f.

¹³⁴ On this, see J. H. Charlesworth, "The Qumran Beatitudes (4Q525) and the New Testament (Mt 5:3–11; Lk 6:20–26)" *RHPR* 80 (2000): 13–35; H. Lichtenberger, "Makarismen in den Qumrantexten und im Neuen Testament," in *Wisdom and Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Biblical Tradition* (ed. F. García Martínez; BETL 169; Leuven: Peeters, 2003), 395–411; G. J. Brooke, "The Wisdom of Matthew's Beatitudes," in *Dead Sea Scrolls*, 217–234.

sus' beatitudes characterized by a Palestinian-Jewish linguistic convention, but also that its configuration into a series like we find in Matthew is characterized by the same distinctive stamp. At the same time, the sapiential form of the beatitudes could provide an explanation for the fact that the more original, "apocalyptic" beatitudes of Jesus¹³⁵ transmitted in Luke, which refer to a rapid change in circumstances, could be transformed under the influence of Jewish wisdom tradition into the Matthean form, so that they could no longer refer only to the "impoverished" situation of the addressees, but also and increasingly to ethical qualities (e.g., the "pure heart," gentleness, or even "poverty in spirit") and thus also to a wider circle of readers.

(c) In general, the importance of the new sapiential texts found in Qumran should not be underestimated. They show that, at approximately the same time as the book of Jesus Sirach, a previously unknown expression of Jewish wisdom existed. In this expression, the sapiential tradition is combined with apocalyptic elements and with ideas about a prehistoric fall and a final judgment, about a hidden decision of God, or about the so-called "mystery of being" or "mystery of becoming" (רִי נִהְיֶה), which is not accessible to all people but is to be studied by the wise men.¹³⁶ These texts prove incorrect the sharp contrast between a primarily sapiential (and therefore "unapocalyptic") and a primarily apocalyptic understanding of Jesus' proclamation, which had been used in various parts of Jesus research. Already in Palestinian Judaism before the time of Jesus, both lines of tradition were united into a peculiar form of sapiential thought so that especially those attempts at reconstructing an "unapocalyptic" Jesus are to be abandoned in the light of the new evidence from Palestinian Judaism.¹³⁷

¹³⁵ In my opinion the form documented in Luke 6:20f., with its 2nd person address and emphasis on a futuristic promise of salvation, is the more original form.

¹³⁶ The literature on the new wisdom texts, in particular 1Q/4QInstruction and 1Q/4QMysteries, has grown considerably in the meantime. See the volumes of collected essays by Hempel, Lange, and Lichtenberger, eds., *Wisdom Texts* and J. J. Collins, G. E. Sterling, and R. A. Clements, eds., *Sapiential Perspectives. Wisdom Literature in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (STDJ 51; Leiden: Brill, 2004). See further D. J. Harrington, "Two Early Jewish Approaches to Wisdom," *DSD* 4 (1997): 245–254, idem, "Sirach and Qumran Sapiential Work A," in *Wisdom Texts*, 263–275; A. Lange, "Die Weisheitstexte aus Qumran. Eine Einleitung," in *Wisdom Texts*, 3–30; idem, *Weisheit*; E. J. C. Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning for the Understanding Ones. Reading and Reconstructing the Fragmentary Early Jewish Sapiential Text 4QInstruction* (STDJ 44; Leiden: Brill, 2001); M. J. Goff, *The Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom of 4QInstruction* (4QSTDJ 50; Leiden: Brill, 2003); idem, *Discerning Wisdom. The Sapiential Literature of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (VTSup 116; Leiden: Brill, 2007); J.-S. Rey, *4QInstruction. Sagesse et eschatology* (STDJ 81; Leiden: Brill, 2008).

¹³⁷ On this problem, see Frey, "Apokalyptik"; in addition, see specifically J. J. Collins, "Wisdom, Apocalypticism and Generic Compatibility," in *Seers, Sibyls and Sages in Hellenistic-Roman Judaism* (ed. J. J. Collins; JSJ.S 54; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 285–404.

(d) Another text, 4Q500, offers an interpretation of the vineyard of Isa 5 that connects Jerusalem and the temple, that is, uses an allegorical means of interpreting Isaiah's vineyard. This is of great methodological interest because exegetes had held the opinion that the allegorical interpretation was practically completely limited to Hellenistic Judaism (Philo) and could only have penetrated into Christianity from that point of origin. Moreover, in the classical interpretation of the parable, it was considered a methodological principle that all allegorizing features in Jesus' parables, including the parable of the "evil vintners" in Mark 12:1–11, could only be an addition that originated in and was understandable by a later Hellenistic community. If such traits are already documented in Palestinian-Jewish interpretation, this does not yet imply an exegetical decision for the history of the origin of Mark 12:1–11. But since the supposition (based on the doctrine of classical form criticism) that Jesus himself never referred to Scripture has become questionable, one will no longer be able to say from the outset that allegorical traits are necessarily secondary additions. New sources also question basic methodological assumptions, and biblical studies does well to accept the new evidence and to modify its often uncritically accepted presuppositions.

E. Messianism and Christology

A final and in my opinion particularly essential point should conclude this overview: the question about the beginnings of New Testament Christology. As before, I am limited here to only provide a few particularly important texts and insights. The Qumran texts have had a decisive influence in helping modern scholars realize the pluriformity of Jewish messianic ideas and hopes¹³⁸ and have helped them understand the Jewish backgrounds of early Christian Christology as well as its early development as an inner-Jewish phenomenon that can be widely understood without the assumption of non-Jewish, Hellenistic or even Gnostic influences.

This applies to terms such as "Son of God" or "Son of the Most High," which are used in Luke 1:31f., 35 in conjunction with a passive verb (κληθήσεται) for the announcement of the Messiah. The background of this title was seen for some time largely within the realm of the Greek-speaking Diaspora or in Hellenistic Jewish Christianity.¹³⁹ After preliminary notices, an Aramaic text (4Q246), which only became fully accessible in the 1990s

¹³⁸ See the overview in J. J. Collins, *The Scepter and the Star. The Messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Ancient Literature* (New York: Anchor Bible, 1995), Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte*.

¹³⁹ M. Hengel, *Der Sohn Gottes* (2nd ed.; Tübingen: Mohr, 1977), who had already pointed to the relevance of the Qumran texts for the understanding of the announcement, had argued against this (71f.).

and which is probably a part of the Daniel tradition, shows that talk of a “Son of the Most High” existed in Palestinian Judaism. Moreover, both “Son of God” and “Son of the Most High” occur as titles in this text, once again in connection with verbs of “being called,” in exact Aramaic correspondence to the Greek of Luke 1:32, 35, “He will be called Son of God, and they will call him Son of the Most High” (4Q246 II 1). As in Luke 1:33, 4Q246 speaks of a “perpetual royal kingdom” (4Q246 II 2), such that there actually seems to be an extremely close parallel in terms of content and linguistics. Of course, the fragmentary Qumran text is not without its own ambiguities. Among the interpreters of this text, it is debatable as to whether the figure in view represents a negative, hostile figure (in the line of Antiochus Epiphanes), against whom the rule of the people of God should then be established,¹⁴⁰ or whether the “Son of God” and the “Son of the Most High” is a positive, Jewish-messianic figure, who plays a decisive role in establishing eschatological peace.¹⁴¹ If the latter were true, then the “Son of God” in this Qumran text would closely parallel its use in Dan 7, or in the reception of Dan 7 in later tradition (cf. *4 Ezra* 13; the parabolic speeches of Enoch), where this figure is also identified with the messiah.¹⁴² This too would be an essential traditional historical guideline for understanding the early Christian conceptual development in which the terms “Son of Man” (from the linguistic usage of the earthly Jesus), “Messiah,” and “Son of God” were used to refer to one and the same individual very early on.

In any case, 4Q246 proves that it was already possible that a ruling or messianic figure could be called the “Son of God” in Palestinian Judaism, before the time of Jesus. On the basis of these findings, it is no longer possible to defer to Hellenistic Christianity to find an explanation for this christological title. This text exemplifies how our source base has broadened with regard to early Jewish messianic and eschatological hopes and with the reception and interpretation of the writings by the Qumran texts. This broadening

¹⁴⁰ Thus following the theses by Milik, A. Steudel, “The Eternal Reign of the People of God – Collective Expectations in Qumran Texts (4Q246 and 1QM),” *RevQ* 65–58 (1996): 507–525; also H.-J. Fabry, “Die frühjüdische Apokalypitk als Reaktion auf Fremdherrschaft. Zur Funktion von 4Q246,” in *Antikes Judentum und frühes Christentum, FS for Hartmut Stegemann* (ed. B. Kollmann, W. Reinhold, and A. Steudel; BZNW 97; Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 1998), 84–98.

¹⁴¹ Thus J. A. Fitzmyer, “The Aramaic ‘Son of God’ Text from Qumran Cave 4 (4Q246),” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Christian Origins* (ed. J. A. Fitzmyer; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 41–61; Collins, *Scepter*, 154–172; see also the extensive discussion in Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte*, 153–170.

¹⁴² Thus Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte*, 166–168. On the significance of the reception history of the Danielic Son of Man up to the parabolic speeches of the book of Enoch as an analogy to the terminological developments in the early Christian linguistic tradition, see the provocative essay by D. Boyarin, “How Enoch Can Teach Us about Jesus,” *Early Christianity* 2 (2011): 51–76.

at last falsifies the view, which had been in force for a long time, that there was a firmly established “doctrine of the Messiah” in ancient Judaism at the time of Jesus, a general picture of how “the Messiah” should appear.

In earlier scholarly literature, this was considered the image of a Davidic, royal, political “Messiah” liberating the people from foreign rule. Judging by such an image, it could only be stated with regard to the historical particularity of Jesus that he had appeared “non-Messianic”¹⁴³ if one did not want to assume that he had subtly bent the popular image of the Messiah.¹⁴⁴

In view of the textual discoveries of Qumran, it is now clearer how many different eschatological expectations existed side-by-side in the Palestinian Judaism of the Hellenistic Roman time and how they could in part be connected with one another: expectations with a specific salvific form (which does not always have to be designated as “anointed”), or even ones without such a salvific character. Kingly, prophetic, and priestly traits occur in various texts, and eventually these traits merge into the description of individual figures.¹⁴⁵

Of course, the “classical” expectation of a ruling, more precisely *royal*, *Davidic Messiah*, which was not least spread by its liturgical reception in the synagogal prayer of the Eighteen Benedictions, is represented in Qumran texts. For example, 4Q174 III 11 (the midrash on eschatology) and the commentary on Genesis 4Q252 1 V 3 mention the “offspring of David,” and other texts speak of the “prince” of the community (e.g., 1QSB V 20ff.). The expectation of the “Son of God” in 4Q246 can also be attributed to the “royal” idea of the messiah. More difficult to attribute is mention of the “chosen ones of God” in 4Q534 1 I 10, which is used by many in connection with the Noahic figure,¹⁴⁶ but also with texts about the birth of the Messiah (Isa 7:14ff.). In addition to this, *priestly concepts of the anointed one*, especially prominent in Qumran, are found in the combination with a priestly “anointed ones of Aaron” and a political “anointed Israel” in the group-specific texts of 1QS IX 11 and 4QTestimonia (4Q175 14–20), as well as – in the linguistically contracted form “the anointed ones of Aaron and of Israel” – in the *Damascus Document* (CD XII 22–XII 1; XIV 18; XIX 10f.; XX 1).¹⁴⁷ In addition, there are

¹⁴³ Thus the classical portrayal by W. Wrede, *Das Messiasgeheimnis in den Evangelien* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1901), who drew the conclusion that the view of Jesus as Messiah only occurred to the community after Easter. R. Bultmann (*Theology of the New Testament* [9th ed.; Tübingen: Mohr, 1984], 33) and his disciples widely adopted this view. For a critical assessment, see Hengel, “Jesus der Messias Israels,” 18–27.

¹⁴⁴ This is in particular the view of J. Wellhausen, *Israelite and Jewish History* (6th ed.; Berlin: G. Reimer, 1907), 315.

¹⁴⁵ See the broad, structured overview in Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte*.

¹⁴⁶ See Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte*, 190f.

¹⁴⁷ Cf. still 1QSa II 11–22, where the text is not talking about two messiahs, but only about the subordination of the Messiah of Israel to the priests at the eschatological com-

priestly concepts of the anointed one, especially in pre-Essene texts of the Aramaic Levi tradition such as 4Q541, a text that speaks of an eschatological high priest but does not mention an “anointing” (cf. also 4Q375/376). Other texts exist that speak of the anointing of prophets (1 Kgs 19:15f.; Isa 61:1ff.), *ideas of a prophetic anointed one* (in particular in 4Q521 2 II 1 and – in connection with priestly elements – in 11QMelch), and primarily the expectation of an eschatological prophet like Moses (thus 4Q175 5–8). Some texts even speak of the exaltation or enthronement of an eschatological or angelic figure, as in the difficult to interpret enthronement text 4Q491 11 I.¹⁴⁸ In other texts, the redeemer figure himself takes on heavenly characteristics, as in the famous Melchizedek Midrash 11QMelch, where (Michael-) Melchizedek proclaims the “year of grace of the Lord” as a heavenly salvific figure in connection with Isa 61.¹⁴⁹

The evaluation of the larger number of texts with varying characteristics shows that there are not strict opposites between the various conceptions of eschatological expectation. They also show that different aspects could be emphasized and combined, especially in the prolific interpretation of traditional motifs. Therefore, for the study of messianic or eschatological hopes in the New Testament, it is not methodologically necessary “to isolate conceptually fixed lines of tradition and trident groups, but to shed light on the process of prolific interpretation of inherited, variegated traditions in light of new experience.”¹⁵⁰ In any case, the differentiated phenomenon of “messianic” ideas is not sufficiently grasped when one restricts conversation about “messianic” terminology to only those texts in which one of the “classical” Messianic texts of the Old Testament is taken up and the “eschatological salvific king of Israel”¹⁵¹ is determined to be in view. If one were to make judgments according to this definition, they could only conclude that the earthly Jesus could not have been “the Messiah.”¹⁵² At the same time, howev-

munal meal. Strictly speaking, this only marks the priestly supremacy – even over the coming (political) Messiah.

¹⁴⁸ On this, see Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte*, 285–310; Collins, *Scepter*, 136–153, as well as Evans, “Jesus,” 591–593.

¹⁴⁹ See the detailed treatment in Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte*, 389–413.

¹⁵⁰ Thus rightly argued for by S. Schreiber, *Gesalbter und König. Titel und Konzeptionen der königlichen Gesalbtenenerwartung in frühjüdischen und christlichen Schriften* (BZNW 105; Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 2000), 541.

¹⁵¹ That is, according to the terminological definition found in O. Hofius, “Ist Jesus der Messias? Thesen,” *JBTh* 8 (1993): 103–129, here 104, from which the further conclusions necessarily arise about the alleged incompatibility of the New Testament image of Jesus with Jewish-messianic statements. No greater historical plausibility was achieved by this definition and the subsequent conclusions. Hofius’ contribution is an example of an exegetical guided entirely by dogmatic concerns, the results of which are correspondingly unfruitful.

¹⁵² Hofius, “Jesus,” 128.

er, the broad application of the title “Messiah” or “Christ” to him in the early post-Easter tradition would remain historically mysterious. It is therefore more appropriate to define the category of the “Messiah” in another sense, one that corresponds to early Jewish sources;¹⁵³ to perceive it in all its demonstrable diversity, even in its convergences and interferences; and not to underestimate its significance both for ancient Judaism or for the emergence of early Christology.¹⁵⁴

In view of the wide range of eschatological and “messianic” expectations in Palestinian Judaism around the turn of the era, it is historically more understandable that Jesus’ exorcistic and healing ministry and his proclamation of the in-breaking kingdom of God invoked associations with messianic categories in his contemporaries that were then circulated among the people.

Finally, I will present a text briefly because it has played a particularly strong role in the discussion about messianism and the question of the connection between the Qumran texts and the Jesus tradition: the so-called “Messianic Apocalypse” 4Q521 2 II + 4 1. In the first line, it says, “The heaven and earth will listen to his Anointed One(s)” (ישמעו למשיחו). The consonantal Hebrew text leaves a certain ambiguity as to whether “the Messiah” or several “messiahs” or simply anointed ones (e.g., the prophets) are in view.¹⁵⁵ However, the singular reading here is the more usual orthographic reading. Following this line is the announcement of a series of acts that are most likely to be performed by God himself and that are to take place apparently in the last days:

“And his spirit will hover upon the poor, and the faithful he renews through his strength. Yes, he will honor the pious on the throne of eternal kingdom. He will free the prisoners, open the eyes of the blind, make straight the twisted. ... Then he will heal the slain and

¹⁵³ On this, see also Collins, *Scepter*, 11–14.

¹⁵⁴ See also W. Horbury, *Jewish Messianism and the Cult of Christ* (London: SCM, 1998), who, in contrast to the tendency in more recent Old Testament scholarship to deal with the “messianic” motif under the keywords “royal ideology” or “apocalyptic” and then determine a failure of messianic ideas, writes, “Messianism grew up in Old Testament times; the Old Testament books, especially in their edited and collected form, offered what were understood in the post-exilic age and later as a series of messianic prophecies; and this series formed the heart of a coherent set of expectations which profoundly influenced ancient Judaism and early Christianity” (6).

¹⁵⁵ Thus M. Becker, “4Q521 und die Gesalbten,” *RevQ* 18 (1997): 73–86; also K.-W. Niebuhr, “4Q 521,2 II – ein eschatologischer Psalm,” in *Mogilany 1995. Papers on the Dead Sea Scrolls offered in memory of Aleksy Klawek* (ed. Zdzislaw J. Kapera; Kraków: Enigma Press, 1998), 151–168. See the discussion in J. Maier, *Die Qumran – Essener: Die Texte vom Toten Meer* (München: UTB, 1995), 2:683 n. 651 and Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte*, 379ff.

bring the dead back to life. He will proclaim good news to the poor. He will feed the lowly, lead the abandoned, and make hungry the rich¹⁵⁶

Here, in a combination of eschatological promises from Scripture, especially from the book of Isaiah (Isa 26; 35; 61; and others) and from Ps 146, it is easily recognizable how close these statements come to the synoptic presentation of Jesus' answer to the Baptist (Luke 7:22 // Matt 11:5), where he says, "the blind see, the lame walk, lepers are cleansed, the deaf hear, the dead are brought back to life, the poor have the good news preached to them, and blessed is the one who is not offended by me."

This text which does not show any signs of group-specific or 'Essene' origin can show what in certain circles of Palestinian Judaism was hoped the messianic period would look like, and it makes it understandable that the healings and exorcisms of Jesus and his proclamation to his poor contemporaries could be interpreted as a sign of the messianic period when viewed against the background of biblical statements of hope. From here it is understandable that messianic hopes were placed upon Jesus, which then formed the occasion for him to be denounced as an alleged royal candidate – disrespectfully referred to as "king of the Jews" – and crucified accordingly by Roman authority. The manner in which people spoke about Jesus as the "Christ" so soon and uniformly after his crucifixion can only be explained if he had already evoked messianic expectations during his life. Texts like 4Q521 provide a framework in which this could have taken place.

The textual discoveries of Qumran therefore provide the opportunity to reconstruct the emergence and formation of early Christology. Many older views about what is "non-Jewish" and therefore only explicable by means of pagan influence can no longer be maintained today. The new sources now make it possible (in conjunction with other early Jewish texts) to explain the formation of Christology from Jewish roots and to abandon¹⁵⁷ the old theses that the presence of material such as the "Son of God," Christ's exaltation to the right hand of God, or even the early invocation of the exalted one was only possible on Hellenistic soil. In the meantime – largely inspired by the works of Martin Hengel – a broader "school" has developed that understands the development of the christological titles of sovereignty and the early veneration of the exalted one as "Kyrios" and the "Son of God" as a development that took place very early on and that still existed entirely within a Jewish framework.¹⁵⁸ In addition to contemporary messianism, ideas about the eleva-

¹⁵⁶ Translated according to Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte*, 344f. Line 13 has been completed by Maier, *Qumran-Essener*, 2:684.

¹⁵⁷ See W. Horbury, "Die jüdischen Wurzeln der Christologie," *Early Christianity* 2 (2011): 5–21.

¹⁵⁸ On this, see the summarizing report by A. Chester, "High Christology – Whence, When and Why?" *Early Christianity* 2 (2011): 22–50; as well as the summary in L. Hurta-

tion of biblical figures such as Enoch, Moses, and Elijah; traditions about angels and intermediate beings; and certain forms of eschatological scriptural interpretation are also important. This is by no means a “leveling” of early Christian statements. The new perceptions and experiences lay an essential role in the formation of new forms of expression within hymns, prayer, and confession. Nevertheless, a more precise view of the language and ideological material to which the early Christian could refer allows a deeper and more differentiated understanding of those processes in which the confession of Christ was formed.

F. Concluding Thoughts and Perspectives

What does work on the Qumran texts bring to the table in our understanding of the New Testament? What is the yield now after 70 years of history-of-religions comparisons? Have the textual discoveries changed our understanding of Early Christianity and our understanding of the New Testament? They have certainly not been as radical as some sensationalists would have us believe. Nevertheless, one can hardly overestimate the scholarly contribution of the textual discoveries to our understanding of primitive Christianity:

(a) Even if no direct lines can be drawn between the Essenes and Jesus or the primitive Christian church, nor between the Qumran texts and the primitive Christian Scriptures, and all assumptions of direct dependence remain unprovable, the Qumran texts have contributed enormously to the contextualization of the primitive Christian texts, groups, and ideas. This applies not only to the proclamation and practice of Jesus of Nazareth, the early Palestinian Jesus movement and the synoptic tradition, but also – which could not be demonstrated here – to the interpretation and theology of Paul and to the post-Pauline texts from the Diaspora, including the Johannine corpus. The Qumran texts document (in the group-specific and non-group-specific texts) the Palestinian Jewish linguistic matrix, in which the majority of early Christian traditions and authors still participated. In many cases, the Qumran parallels help to make sense of the peculiarity of the statements in the New Testament.

(b) The Qumran texts have given us a multitude of linguistic parallels through which New Testament terms and phrases are now for the first time documented in a Hebrew or Aramaic equivalent. Even if one can only determine the precise sense of a formulation from the immediate context, the in-

do, *Lord Jesus Christ. Devotion to Jesus in Earliest Christianity* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005). See the foundational studies now reprinted in a volume of collected essays by M. Hengel, *Studien zur Christologie. Kleine Schriften IV* (WUNT 201; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006).

sight into the Semitic background of some phrases makes it possible to grasp the meaning of the primitive Christian statements and otherwise indiscernible connotations.

(c) The Qumran discoveries have filled an enormous gap in the stock of sources available to us from that time period, and thus make a decisive contribution to a more appropriate history-of-religions assessment of Early Christianity. Whereas original Hebrew or Aramaic sources of Palestinian Judaism from the time of Jesus were not available before these text discoveries, and only Greek (Josephus, Psalms of Solomon, etc.) or secondarily translated (Enoch, other apocalypses, etc.) texts, as well as the later rabbinic sources could be taken into consideration, the results of the analysis now offer a broad cross-section of Palestinian-Jewish literature from the three pre-Christian centuries. The result is a more diverse and differentiated picture of Judaism at that time. At the same time, it became clear that many New Testament motifs that had been regarded as “non-Jewish” prior to this point can be very well explained in the context of contemporary Judaism. In this regard, the Qumran texts have made our image of primitive Christianity and the primitive Christian texts more Jewish in many details.

(d) Far beyond the evaluation of semantic or material parallels, the knowledge of the Qumran library and its manifold problems should also open up insights for New Testament scholars regarding the character of Palestinian-Jewish literature and the processes of tradition and text production, the forms of literary interpretation and understanding, and the emergence and history of individual literary forms and genres. Therefore, these texts also offer an invaluable object of study for the methodology of the analysis of New Testament texts. However, a mere collection of “parallels” corresponds less and less to the state of the discussion; rather, the many parallels and analogies must be explained and evaluated within a broader framework. More than the mere parallels, other insights such as the way one deals with varying textual editions (and the resulting-methodological consequences),¹⁵⁹ the nature of reception and collection processes, or the lasting effectiveness of Jewish linguistic forms and thought in the early Christian tradition are all likely to stimulate further avenues of investigation in New Testament studies.

The insights that the Qumran texts offer (as well as a constantly deepened analysis and evaluation of Qumran scholarship) should continue to stimulate the scholarly investigation of the New Testament for some time. The complexity of the facts may deter some, but what is to be gained makes it clear that we cannot truly understand the early Christian texts without deepened insights into the world of ancient Judaism at the turn of the era, in which the Jesus movement began and in which the Christian faith, accordingly, has its roots.

¹⁵⁹ See the notes in Stuckenbruck, “Dead Sea Scrolls,” 138–141.

18. Jesus, Paul, and the Texts from the Dead Sea: Research History and Hermeneutical Perspectives*

“Jesus, Paul, and the Texts from the Dead Sea” – the choice of subject for the sixth Schwerte Qumran conference from November 2009¹ – was chosen in correspondence to the life work of the Munich New Testament scholar and Qumran researcher Heinz-Wolfgang Kuhn, in whose honor the meeting took place. His life-time work on Qumran, from his dissertation on the “double” eschatology in Qumran and the historical Jesus² to the numerous essays on Qumranic parallels in Paul from the Munich Qumran project³ provide the two

* The essay was originally written as an introduction to the proceedings of the sixth Schwerte Qumran conference from November 2009 on the same topic “Jesus, Paulus und Qumran,” held in honor of Heinz-Wolfgang Kuhn, on the occasion of his 75th birthday. The publication was, however, considerably delayed. For a more extensive discussion of some of the aspects, see the article “*The Textual Discoveries of Qumran and New Testament Scholarship*,” in this volume.

¹ See the publications of some of the previous Schwerte Qumran conferences: J. Frey and H. Stegemann, eds., with M. Becker and A. Maurer, *Qumran kontrovers. Beiträge zu den Textfunden vom Toten Meer* (Einblicke 6; Paderborn: Bonifatius, 2003); U. Dahmen, H. Stegemann, and G. Stemberger, eds., *Qumran Bibelwissenschaften – Antike Judaistik* (Einblicke 9; Paderborn: Bonifatius, 2006); J. Frey and M. Becker, eds., *Apokalyptik und Qumran* (Einblicke 10; Paderborn: Bonifatius, 2007); M. Becker and J. Frey, eds., *Qumran und der biblische Kanon* (BThSt 92; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchner Verlag, 2009); J. Frey, C. Claußen, and N. Kessler, eds., *Qumran und die Archäologie* (WUNT 278; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011).

² H.-W. Kuhn, *Enderwartung und gegenwärtiges Heil. Untersuchungen zu den Gemeindeliedern von Qumran mit einem Anhang über Eschatologie und Gegenwart in der Verkündigung Jesu* (SUNT 4; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966). Cf. more recently idem, “Jesus im Licht der Qumrangemeinde,” in *The Study of Jesus*, vol. 2 of *Handbook for the Study of the Historical Jesus* (ed. T. Holmén and S. E. Porter; Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2011), 1245–1285.

³ H.-W. Kuhn, “The Impact of the Qumran Scrolls on the Understanding of Paul,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research* (ed. D. Dimant and U. Rappaport; STDJ 10; Leiden et al.: Brill, 1992), 327–339; idem, “Die Bedeutung der Qumrantexte für das Verständnis des Ersten Thessalonicherbriefes. Vorstellung des Münchener Projekts: Qumran und das Neue Testament – The Impact of the Qumran Scrolls on the Understanding of Paul’s First Letter to the Thessalonians. Presentation of the Munich Project on Qumran and the New Testament,” in *The Madrid Qumran Congress. Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid 18–21 March, 1991* (ed. J. Trebolle Barrera and L. Vegas Montaner; STDJ 11/1; Leiden et al.: Brill, 1992), 339–353; idem, “Die drei wichtigsten Qumranparallelen zum Galaterbrief. Unbekannte Wege der Tradition,” in

focal points: Jesus and Paul.⁴ With the juxtaposition of the Qumran texts on the one hand and New Testament figures and texts on the other, the title picks up a theme that has almost dominated Qumran scholarship in its early days until the 1970s.⁵ In the later phase of research, from about the mid 1980s, which was determined by the publication of the many parabiblical, calendrical, halakic, and sapiential texts and fragments (primarily from Cave 4), research on “New Testament” topics decreased significantly because focus shifted to other issues and references. But now that the entire textual corpus

Konsequente Traditionsgeschichte: Festschrift für Klaus Baltzer zum 65. Geburtstag (ed. R. Bartelmus et al.; OBO 126; Fribourg [CH] and Göttingen: Academic Press, 1993), 227–254; idem, “Die Bedeutung der Qumrantexte für das Verständnis des Galaterbriefes. Aus dem Münchener Projekt: Qumran und das Neue Testament,” in *New Qumran Texts and Studies. Proceedings of the First Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies Paris 1992* (ed. G. J. Brooke and F. García Martínez; STDJ 15; Leiden et al.: Brill, 1994), 169–221; idem., “Röm 1,3f und der davidische Messias als Gottessohn in den Qumrantexten,” in *Lesezeichen für Annelies Findeiß zum 65. Geburtstag am 15 März 1984* (ed. C. Burchard and G. Theissen; DBAT.B 3; Heidelberg: Esprint Dr. und Verlag, 1984), 103–112; idem., “A Legal Issue in 1 Corinthians 5 and in Qumran,” in *Legal Texts and Legal Issues. Proceedings of the Second Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Cambridge 1995: FS J. M. Baumgarten* (ed. M. Bernstein et al.; STDJ 23; Leiden et al.: Brill, 1997), 489–499; idem., “Konkordanzen und Indizes zu den nicht-biblichen Qumrantexten auf Papier und Microfiche – aus dem Münchener Projekt: Qumran und das Neue Testament (2., völlig neu bearb. Fassung),” in *Antikes Judentum und Frühes Christentum: FS H. Stegemann* (BZNW 97; Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 1999), 197–209; idem., “Qumran und Paulus. Unter traditionsgeschichtlichem Aspekt ausgewählte Parallelen,” in *Das Urchristentum in seiner literarischen Geschichte: FS J. Becker* (ed. U. Mell and U. B. Müller; BZNW 100; Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 1999), 227–246; “The Wisdom Passage in 1 Corinthians 2:6–16 between Qumran and Proto-Gnosticism,” in *Sapiential, Liturgical and Poetical Texts from Qumran. Proceedings of the Third Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Oslo 1998* (D. K. Falk et al.; STDJ 35; Leiden et al.: Brill, 2000), 240–253; idem., “The Qumran Meal and the Lord’s Supper in Paul in the Context of the Graeco-Roman World,” in *Paul, Luke and the Graeco-Roman World: FS A. Wedderburn* (ed. A. Christophersen, C. Claußen, J. Frey, and B. Longenecker; JSNT.S 217; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002), 221–248; idem., “‘Gemeinde Gottes’ in den Qumrantexten und bei Paulus unter Berücksichtigung des Toraverständnisses,” in *Das Gesetz im frühen Judentum und im Neuen Testament: FS C. Burchard* (ed. D. Sänger and M. Konrad; NTOA and SUNT 57; Göttingen and Fribourg [CH]: Academic Press, 2006), 153–169.

⁴ See H.-W. Kuhn, “Überlegungen zu Jesus im Licht der Qumrangemeinde und Bemerkungen zum Projekt ‘Qumran und Paulus,’” in *Jesus, Paulus und die Texte von Qumran* (ed. J. Frey and E. Popkes, with S. Tätweiler; WUNT II/390; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015), 417–472.

⁵ Concerning the stages of Qumran research, see J. Frey, “The Impact of the Dead Sea Scrolls on New Testament Interpretation: Proposals, Problems, and Further Perspectives,” in *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Princeton Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. J. H. Charlesworth; Waco, Texas: Baylor University Press, 2006), 3:407–471, here 408–419 (in this volume, 527–578, here 529–539).

has been edited, a new discussion of the links between the textual findings and early Christian texts appears appropriate. Many of the paradigms of early research are now in question or appear on an expanded material basis in a completely new context so that the relevance of the Qumran texts for understanding New Testament texts and themes is to be reconsidered and are, in part, to be evaluated differently. Although the discussion of Qumran and the New Testament will scarcely ever again regain such a central place in Qumran scholarship, it will continue to be one of its segments and, at the same time, an important aspect in the work of the contextualization of early Christian texts.⁶ A series of international conferences and volumes of collected essays have been devoted to the relationship between Qumran and the New Testament in recent years,⁷ and the volume introduced by the present article fits into this series.

In the following, I would like to present some aspects regarding research history and methodology before we reflect on the hermeneutical issue, what we actually do when relating figures, phenomena, and texts from the New Testament to those from the Qumran library, and what function and meaning this can have for the scholarly and public discourse.

A. Qumran and the New Testament – The Questions of the Older and Newer Research

I. Aspects of the History of the Research

1. The “Christian” Agenda of the Older Research

What is the significance of the textual discoveries at Qumran for the understanding of the “historical” Jesus and the message of Paul and other early Christian authors? This genuinely “Christian” question, which grew out of the interest in understanding Early Christianity and its texts, has largely accompanied the study of the Qumran texts since their discovery in 1947.

⁶ For the contribution of Qumran scholarship to New Testament scholarship, see the perspectives I have laid out in my Zurich inaugural lecture, J. Frey, “Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und antikes Judentum. Probleme – Wahrnehmungen – Perspektiven,” *ZTK* 109 (2012): 445–471 (in this volume under the English title “New Testament Scholarship and Ancient Judaism: Problems – Perceptions – Perspectives,” 19–44).

⁷ Thus the Jerusalem Orion-Symposium of 2004 published in R. Clements and D. R. Schwartz, eds., *Text, Thought, and Practice in Qumran and Early Christianity* (STDJ 84; Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2009); furthermore, on the basis of a Leuven symposium, see F. García Martínez, ed., *Echoes from the Caves: Qumran and the New Testament* (STDJ 85; Leiden et al., 2009); as well as – from a meeting held in Metz in 2011 – J.-S. Rey, ed., *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Pauline Literature* (STDJ 102; Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2014).

From the point of view of current Qumran research, which deals much more with the classification of texts within the horizon of Jewish tradition, this may be a surprise. However, the early, primarily “Christian” motivated evaluation of the textual finds was due to the fact that, in the 1950s and 1960s, mainly biblical scholars, including many New Testament scholars worked on the new textual discoveries.⁸ In the German-speaking space, the first to be mentioned here is the orientalist Karl Georg Kuhn,⁹ who founded the Qumran Research Center in Heidelberg, through which numerous young scholars were introduced to Qumran studies. Then there were Claus-Hunno Hunzinger, the only German on the team that was entrusted with the editing of the texts in the 1950s, Otto Betz in Tübingen, Oscar Cullman in Basel, and Herbert Braun in Mainz. From the second generation of Qumran researchers came Hartmut Stegemann. He became the subsequent leader of the Göttingen Qumran Research Center, which had “moved” to Marburg and then Göttingen. Among this generation was also Jürgen Becker, Gert Jeremias, Heinz Wolfgang Kuhn, and Hermann Lichtenberger, all of whom held positions as professors of New Testament studies.¹⁰

Finally, the “Christian” frame of reference was also given to a broader public in Europe and North America, which became interested in the Qumran texts no later than the mid-1950s.¹¹ Of course, this popularization has all too

⁸ See the history of Qumran research now in D. Dimant, ed., *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Scholarly Perspective: A History of Research* (STDJ 99; Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2012); On the research conducted in the German language, see J. Frey, “Qumran Research and Biblical Scholarship in Germany,” in this volume.

⁹ On this, see Frey, “Qumran Research,” 541–546 (in this volume, 97–101); G. Jeremias, “Karl Georg Kuhn (1906–1976),” in *Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft nach 1945. Hauptvertreter der deutschsprachigen Exegese in der Darstellung ihrer Schüler* (eds. C. Breytenbach and R. Hoppe; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchner Verlag, 2008), 297–312; and G. Theissen, *Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft vor und nach 1945: Karl Georg Kuhn und Günther Bornkamm* (SPHKHAW 47; Heidelberg: Winter, 2009), 15–149.

¹⁰ See Frey, “Qumran Research,” 531f. (in this volume, 86–88). It has been also noted for the Anglo-Saxon context that it was predominately New Testament scholars who, in the early stages after the findings, familiarized themselves with the Qumran texts and endeavored to evaluate them, thus, for example, William D. Davies and Matthew Black in Great Britain and Raymond E. Brown, Joseph A. Fitzmyer, and later James H. Charlesworth in North America.

¹¹ An essential contribution to stimulating public interest in North America was provided by the *New Yorker* (then a book-based publication) account of the journalist Edmund Wilson, who took up the early theses of the French Orientalist André Dupont-Sommer, who argued that the Qumran Teacher of Righteousness is a quasi-messiah before the time of Jesus and that the Qumran community was a “prototype” of the primitive Christian church, with which Wilson viewed a matter of the “originality” and thus the revelatory claim of Christianity. Cf. E. Wilson, “A Reporter at Large,” *The New Yorker* 31.13 (14.5; 1955), 45–121; in book form, then E. Wilson, *The Scrolls from the Dead Sea* (New York: Oxford University Press); and reprinted in an expanded edition in idem, *The Dead Sea*

often been accompanied by problematic theses when, for example, the “Teacher of Righteousness” was stylized to be the prototype of the Messiah Jesus,¹² or the conversion of Paul was speculatively set in Qumran, which was prematurely identified with the Pauline “Damascus” on the basis of the *Damascus Document* (CD).¹³ Quite often, the Qumran texts were evaluated with the implicit question of whether these textual discoveries did not give rise to a complete overhaul of our picture of the history of Jesus and Early Christianity, or even with the suspicion that this, in truth, was quite different from the picture conveyed to us through the biblical and ecclesiastical tradition and also through critical biblical studies. Such assumptions could then easily be linked to the suspicion that ecclesiastical obscurantists, not least in the Vatican or its affiliated circles, would endeavor to withhold the knowledge from the scrolls or even the scrolls themselves from the public in order to save their own “truths.”¹⁴ Popular Qumran books could thus appear as “revelatory literature” and become bestsellers with “Enlightenment” pathos, especially in the phase around 1990 when, after the long delay of their publication, the still “hidden” fragments and texts were opened to a broader public (initially only in a facsimile edition¹⁵).

But apart from the questionable theses of the semi-sensual and fictitious literature about Qumran, the discussion about the Dead Sea textual finds was

Scrolls 1947–1969 (London: Oxford University Press, 1969). On this matter, see J. Frey, “Die Bedeutung der Qumran-Funde für das Verständnis des Neuen Testaments,” in *Qumran—die Schriftrollen vom Toten Meer* (ed. M. Fieger, K. Schmid, and P. Schwagmaier; NTOA 47; Freiburg [CH] and Göttingen: Universität Verlag, 2001), 129–298, here 133ff.; idem, “The Impact of the Dead Sea Scrolls on New Testament Interpretation,” in this volume, 529–536.

¹² A. Dupont-Sommer, *Aperçus préliminaires sur les manuscrits de la Mer Morte* (OAI 4; Paris: Maisonneuve, 1950), see in particular the comparison between the “new covenant” of Qumran and Early Christianity on pp. 119–122.

¹³ An example can be found in P. Lapidé, *Paulus zwischen Damaskus und Qumran. Fehldeutungen und Übersetzungsfehler* (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlag, 1993).

¹⁴ Thus (reinforced in the German edition) in bestseller by M. Baigent and R. Leigh, which was presented as a “book of revealing,” entitled *Verschlussache Jesus. Die Qumranrollen und die Wahrheit über das frühe Christentum* (München: Droemer Knaur, 1991). The English title is *The Dead Sea Scrolls Deception* (New York: Summit Books, 1991). This same idea presented itself in scientific garb in R. H. Eisenmann and M. O. Wise, *Jesus und die Urchristen: die Qumran-Rollen entschlüsselt* (München: Bertelsmann, 1993); this book problematically interpreted the Qumran movement and Early Christianity as components of a single anti-Roman movement. In addition to Robert Eisenman, whose theses also determined the book by Baigent and Leigh, the British “outsider” among the original editorial team, John Allegro, had previously propagated the idea that insights from the Qumran scrolls could be dangerous to Christianity. On his influence, see J. A. Brown, *John Marco Allegro: The Maverick of the Scrolls* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005).

¹⁵ R. H. Eisenman and J. M. Robinson, *A Facsimile Edition of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (2 vols.; Washington: Biblical Archaeology Society, 1991 and 1992).

marked by “Christian” questions and themes for a long time.¹⁶ The research report of Herbert Braun documents the main points of this discussion up until 1960.¹⁷ The figure of John the Baptist, his baptism, and the Christian baptism were interpreted against the background of the ritual baths and purification rites at Qumran, as well as the Lord’s Supper with the Qumran community meals. One compared Jesus’ appearance and history with the supposedly reconstructible history of the Qumranic “Righteous Teacher” and the order of the Qumran community with aspects of the early Christian community such as, for example, the communal goods of the early church according to Acts or the approaches to church order in Matthew. Topics such as dualism and predestination, messiah and eschatology, the concept of the spirit and the interpretation of Scripture dominated the discussion. The Jewish character of the texts and their halakic details were often not adequately reflected in this discussion, and the place of the texts within the Jewish tradition was not in the focus of that research. The texts rather functioned as a background or a “foil” for understanding the New Testament texts, being used within the horizon of Christian biblical scholarship.

This form of interest in the Qumran texts can be explained at least in part from the state of the exegetical discussion of that period. New Testament research in the post-war period in Germany – less so in the Anglo-Saxon world – was determined by the hermeneutics of Rudolf Bultmann and his central history-of-religions thesis of a Gnostic redemption myth, which was seen in the background of Pauline and Johannine thought and would have “furnished” the soteriological concepts therein. For researchers who were critically opposed to this reconstruction and to the hermeneutics of Bultmann and his disciples, the Qumran finds offered fascinating new evidence for the counter-thesis that the early Christian message was ultimately rooted more firmly in the Jewish tradition, and their ideas of Messianism and eschatology, revelation and salvation are to be understood more from Jewish piety and linguistic tradition than from pagan-Hellenistic or even Gnostic texts. Above all, the dualism shown in the texts from Cave 1, in (parts of) 1QM and 1QS, offered an alternative explanatory model to the gnostic dualism presupposed by Bultmann in the background of the New Testament texts.¹⁸

¹⁶ For more detail, see J. Frey, “Qumran Research,” 532–538 (in this volume, 88–95); for the North American context, see J. J. Collins, “The Scrolls and Christianity in American Scholarship,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Scholarly Perspective* (ed. D. Dimant; STDJ 99; Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2012), 197–216.

¹⁷ H. Braun, *Qumran und das Neue Testament* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1966); see the discussion of individual themes in vol. 2.

¹⁸ With regard to the discussion of John, see in more detail J. Frey, “Licht aus den Höhlen? Der johanneische ‘Dualismus’ und das Schriftum von Qumran,” in J. Frey, *Die Herrlichkeit des Gekruzigten. Studien zu den johanneischen Schriften* (ed. J. Schlegel; WUNT 317; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), 147–237; idem, “Recent Perspectives on Johannine

2. Starting Points of the Older Research

(a) Particularly in view of the *Gospel of John*, the view was expressed quickly that the dualism within the Qumran texts (especially in the Treatise on the Two Spirits 1QS III 13–IV 26) is historically much closer to the Fourth Gospel and therefore should be considered the background of Johannine dualism, rather than the postulated pre-Christian Gnostic dualism, reconstructed by Rudolf Bultmann from late Manichaean and Mandaean sources.¹⁹ As early as 1950, Karl Georg Kuhn expressed the assumption that the native soil of the Johannine language was to be found in Qumran (i.e., in Judaism), albeit not in some form of Pharisaic or rabbinic Judaism but in heterodox Judaism.²⁰ Other authors such as William F. Albright also attempted to conclude that the Gospel of John was more historically trustworthy than previously thought on the basis of its more Jewish character.²¹ In the context of the scholarly dichotomy of “Jewish” versus “Hellenistic”/“Gnostic,” the Qumran discoveries were used predominately in the argument of “conservative” exegetes in favor of a more Jewish line of tradition.²² And although some hasty judgments about the background of the evangelist and his congregation or the character of the Johannine tradition have since had to be revised,²³ the lasting benefit of

Dualism and its Background,” in *Text, Thought, and Practice in Qumran and Early Christianity* (ed. R. Clements and D. R. Schwartz; STDJ 84; Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2008), 127–157.

¹⁹ See fundamentally R. Bultmann, “Die Bedeutung der neuerschlossenen mandäischen und manichäischen Quellen für das Verständnis des Johannesevangelium (1925),” in idem, *Exegetica: Aufsätze zur Erforschung des Neuen Testaments* (ed. E. Dinkler; Tübingen: Mohr, 1867), 55–104.

²⁰ K. G. Kuhn, “Die in Palästina gefundenen hebräischen Texte und das Neue Testament,” *ZTK* 47 (1950): 192–211, here 209, “In these new texts, we discover native soil of Gospel of John and this soil is Palestinian Judaism, but not Pharisaic-rabbinic Judaism, rather a Palestinian-Jewish pious sect of Gnostic structure.” Cf. further idem, “Johannesevangelium und Qumrantexte,” in *Neotestamentica et Patristica (Festschrift O. Cullmann)* (Leiden: Brill, 1962), 111–122.

²¹ W. F. Albright, “Recent Discoveries in Palestine and the Gospel of St. John,” in *The Background of the New Testament (Festschrift C. H. Dodd)* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1956), 153–171, here 170f. Much more cautiously judged in R. E. Brown, “The Qumran-Scrolls and the Johannine Gospel and Epistles,” *CBQ* 17 (1955), 403–419, 559–574 (German translation: “Die Schriftrollen von Qumran und das Johannesevangelium und die Johannesbriefe,” in *Johannes und sein Evangelium* [ed. K. H. Rengstorff; WdF 82; Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1973], 486–528).

²² On the significance of the Qumran texts in the history-of-religions discussion about the Gospel of John, see also J. Frey, “Auf der Suche nach dem Kontext des vierten Evangeliums. Zur religions- und traditions-geschichtlichen Einordnung,” in J. Frey, *Die Herrlichkeit des Gekreuzigten* (ed. J. Schlegel; WUNT 307; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), 45–87, here 69f.

²³ On this, see J. Frey, “Licht aus den Höhlen?”; furthermore, see idem, “Recent Perspectives on Johannine Dualism and its Background.”

the Qumran finds for Johannine scholarship is certainly to be seen in a greater return to the perception of (various Palestinian *and* Hellenistic) Jewish contexts of the Fourth Gospel.

(b) In relation to Paul, dualistic statements were also the focus of interest in the earliest Qumran discussion.²⁴ Like John, Paul's concept of salvation had been explained by Hellenistic or partly Gnostic contexts since the 19th century and within the history-of-religions school, while the relationship with Palestinian (Pharisaic or apocalyptic) Judaism was seen more as one of distance. Here, too, the discovery of terminological parallels in Hebrew have ultimately provided a decisive impulse for the new emphasis on Palestinian-Jewish aspects in Paul's thinking.²⁵ However, the impetus for the reorientation in parts of scholarship also took place here – as in Johannine research – under the impression of the dualistic texts from Qumran.²⁶ In particular, the antithesis of “flesh” and “spirit,” which scholars had always attributed to pagan-Hellenistic or Gnostic thought,²⁷ and the negative talk of “flesh” as a sinful or anti-God quantity could now be explained by reference to Palestinian-Jewish parallels.²⁸ Furthermore, the deep sense of the consciousness of sin

²⁴ For an overview of the discussion, see H. Braun, *Qumran und das Neue Testament*, 2:165–180.

²⁵ See in general the above mentioned articles in n. 3 by H.-W. Kuhn, but also the summary in J. A. Fitzmyer, “Paul and the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years* (ed. P. W. Flint and J. S. VanderKam; 2 vols.; Leiden et al.: Brill, 1999), 2:599–621, here 619.

²⁶ Thus first in K. G. Kuhn, “Πειρασμός–ἁμαρτία–σάρξ im Neuen Testament und die damit zusammenhängenden Vorstellungen,” *ZTK* 49 (1952): 200–222, here 209ff.; W. D. Davies, “Paul and the Dead Sea Scrolls: Flesh and Spirit,” in *The Scrolls and the New Testament* (ed. K. Stendahl; New York: Harper, 1957), 157–182, 276–282. Last but not least, the judgments in Braun, *Qumran und das Neue Testament*, 2:175, where attempts are still made to regard the Qumran dualism as gnostic and thus to contribute to the maintenance of the reconstructions of the Bultmann school.

²⁷ See the overview in J. Frey, “Die paulinische Antithese von ‘Fleisch’ und ‘Geist’ und die palästinisch-jüdische Weisheitstradition,” *ZNW* 90 (1999): 45–77, here 46–48; a more detailed treatment can be found in O. Kuss, *Der Römerbrief* (Regensburg: Pustet, 1959), 2:521–540; A. Sand, *Der Begriff ‘Fleisch’ in den paulinischen Hauptbriefen* (Regensburg: Pustet, 1967), 1–121.

²⁸ The problem that the parallels in *Hodayot* or even in IQS XI arose from an internal writing from the Qumran community, which Paul himself could hardly have read, was only solved by the publication of the new wisdom texts in which the negative connotation of כֶּסֶף was only attested in pre-Qumranic usage; see J. Frey, “Die paulinische Antithese”; idem, “The Notion of ‘Flesh’ in 4QInstruction and the Background of Pauline Usage,” in *Sapiential, Liturgical and Poetical Texts from Qumran* (ed. D. K. Falk, F. García Martínez, and E. M. Schuller; STDJ 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*

and the simultaneous praise for successful salvation through God's mercy, which is attested in IQS XI 9–14 and in some sections of the *Hodayot*, impressed interpreters as a striking analogy with the Pauline doctrine of justification or even with the assumed Pauline structure of the “*simul iustus et peccator*.”²⁹ This analogous language even prompted some scholars to consider a direct Qumran influence on Pauline thought.³⁰ Even if it cannot be denied that the Diaspora Jew Paul was essentially influenced from Diaspora thought and – thus mediated – by the Greco-Roman world, the perception of the Qumran parallels in Pauline research ultimately led to a stronger emphasis on the Jewish elements in the Pauline interpretation of Scripture, eschatology, anthropology, and soteriology.

(c) With respect to *Jesus* and the *Jesus tradition*, the research situation was somewhat different from that of Paul. The fact that the earthly Jesus was a Palestinian Jew and that his proclamation cannot be understood either from the pagan Hellenistic or later Christian categories could have been considered to be a consensus in the critical research after 1945.³¹ Nonetheless, Protestant

Thought in the Ancient Near East, the Hebrew Bible, Ancient Judaism and the New Testament (BETL 159; Leuven: Peeters, 2002), 367–404 (in this volume, 701–741).

²⁹ Whether such a “simul” is to be presupposed in Paul is decided by the interpretation of Rom 7 (and in my opinion, according to Rom 7:5f., it is rather inaccurate, especially since Rom 7:25b may possibly be considered a gloss). That the above-mentioned formula does not even correspond to the theology of Martin Luther and represents a coarsening of it goes beyond the discourse sketched here and can only be noted (on this, see O. H. Pesch, “Simul iustus et peccator: Sinn und Stellenwert einer Formel Martin Luthers,” in *Gerecht und Sünder zugleich. Ökumenische Klärungen* (Göttingen and Freiburg: Herder, 2001), 146–167).

³⁰ Thus, for example, S. Schulz, “Zur Rechtfertigung aus Gnaden in Qumran und bei Paulus,” *ZTK* 56 (1959): 155–185, here 184, “no doubt ... that Paul knew and took up the theological views of this sect.” J. Becker, *Das Heil Gottes. Heilsund Sündenbegriffe in den Qumrantexten und im Neuen Testament* (SUNT 3; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1964), 249f., suspected an indirect influence of Qumran on the Pauline sin terminology. Still rightly argued by H.-W. Kuhn, “Qumran und Paulus. Unter traditionsgeschichtlichem Aspekt ausgewählte Parallelen,” in *Das Urchristentum in seiner literarischen Geschichte (Festschrift Jürgen Becker)* (U. Mell and U. B. Müller; BZNW 100; Berlin and New York: Berlin, 1999), 227–246. Even more carefully, see 244, “It can only be speculated about how Qumran traditions could have reached Paul before 70 CE.”

³¹ See the programmatic statement by Julius Wellhausen, “Jesus was a Jew, not a Christian,” in idem, *Einleitung in die drei ersten Evangelien* (Berlin: Reimer, 1905), 113, and the classification of Jesus as a Jewish prophet in R. Bultmann, *Jesus* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1926), 43, and idem, *Theologie des Neuen Testaments* (ed. O. Merk; 9th ed.; Tübingen: Mohr, 1984), 3f. – The speculation, which was scattered among individual researchers during the Nazi era, that, as a Galilean, Jesus could also have been ethnically non-Jewish can be ignored here. W. Fenske, *Wie Jesus zum ‘Arier’ wurde. Auswirkungen der Entjudaisierung Christi im 19. und zu Beginn des 20. Jahrhunderts* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2005), offers a compilation of these ideological aberrations.

scholarship in particular repeatedly tended to move Jesus away from classical Judaism, not least in the interest of his “uniqueness.” From a history-of-religions perspective, his critical position on the Torah and the universalism of his message were considered opposed to the rather nomistic and particularistic attitude of Pharisaic-Hebrew Judaism or Palestinian-Jewish apocalypticism, and these traits were then explained in part from non-Jewish, Greek, or (mediated by the Jewish apocalypticism even) Iranian influences. Karl Georg Kuhn was able to build on this line when, in his early essay on the Dead Sea Scrolls, he expressed the supposition that the heterodox Judaism attested therein had been the gateway through which non-Jewish, and in particular Zoroastrian, thought could have penetrated into primitive Christianity.³²

The question of the relationship between the Jesus tradition and the Qumran texts is methodologically complex because of the fact that the image and the proclamation of the earthly Jesus can only be ascertained through a critical analysis of the Synoptic tradition and also because of the fact that the images of the “historical Jesus” of different authors vary significantly from one another. The literary-historical reconstruction and contextualization thus can only be done in a vicious hermeneutical circle. In any case, it is necessary to ask whether the respective parallels between Qumran texts and the Synoptic tradition illuminate the proclamation of the earthly Jesus, the tradition of the earlier (Aramaic or Greek-speaking) primitive communities, or the later stages of development or the redaction of the individual evangelists.

The early Qumran discussion did not adequately reflect on all these methodological difficulties, especially since the classification and interpretation of the new texts was, in many ways, unclear. So there were soon rather uncritical and sweeping comparisons between Jesus and the Qumran “Teacher of Righteousness”³³ before it was even tentatively clear whether and, if so, which texts could be used for the Teacher and how the dark references to his person and his destiny should be interpreted historically. Speculations about the “Teacher of Righteousness” as a “Messianic” salvific figure, as a “divine” figure, about his violent death or the community’s hope for him to return at the end soon had to be taken back as misinterpretations.³⁴ These speculations, however, illustrate how strongly the early interpretation of the new texts was conducted, in analogy to early Christian texts, in a hermeneutic circle which was determined by comparison with the figure of Jesus.

³² K. G. Kuhn, “Die in Palästina gefundenen hebräischen Texte und das Neue Testament,” *ZTK* 47 (1950): 192–211, here 211.

³³ See the foundational work of A. Dupont-Sommer, *Aperçus préliminaires*.

³⁴ See the presentation in H. Braun, *Qumran und das Neue Testament*, 2:54–74; on the other hand, see the very sober and appropriate presentation in G. Jeremias, *Der Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit* (SUNT 2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1963).

Then, there is the fact that the assignment of the Qumran texts had been identified very early on to the group known from the ancient texts as the Essenes, which was interpreted to be a “sect” – with the implication that it was a movement at the fringes of contemporary Judaism. With this assignment, first expressed by the Israeli archaeologist Eleazar Lipa Sukenik,³⁵ Qumran research began to follow a long tradition of interpretation in which these “Essenes” or “Essaioi” were interpreted not as a Jewish faction but as Christians and were linked with Jesus and his early followers. This often overlooked fact is still something that needs to be clarified.

Excursus: The Older Interpretation of the “Essenes” and its Influence on Early Qumran Research

The majority of Church Fathers had understood Philo of Alexandria’s and Flavius Josephus’ descriptions of the Essenes/Essaioi to be Christian ascetics and thus an early form of monasticism. At first, Eusebius (Hist. eccl. II 16f.) had pointed to similarities between the “Therapeutai” described in Philo (*De vita contemplativa*) and the ascetics of his day; Jerome followed him in this interpretation and even counted Philo among the Christian writers (Vir. ill. 11). This created a paradigm that, with a few exceptions (e.g., Photius, Bibl. 103f.), lasted throughout the Middle Ages.

Criticism of this interpretation only arose in some Reformation theologians who wanted to reject “monasticism” as a late relapse into Jewish law and interpreted the Therapeutai and Philo’s Essenes as Jewish ascetics, whereas the apologists of the Roman Church, referring to the testimony of the Church Fathers, defended the Christian identity of the Therapeutai and the Essenes (and thus also of monasticism), and thereby partly made Jesus and his mother, John the Baptist and the apostles into Essenes.³⁶ The most extensive interpretations in this regard were representatives of the Carmelite Order, according to which not only the Essenes, but also Mary, Jesus, and the apostles as Essenes were thought to have been members of their order, which was supposedly founded by Elijah and Elisha on Mount Carmel.³⁷

During the Age of the Enlightenment, the paradigm changed and the Essenes appeared primarily to Masonic circles as a particularly pure “order,” a type of “Ur-Lodge,” in which a one wished to see a particularly pure, still undogmatic form of Christianity, or even a particularly open-minded grouping of Egyptian or Persian wisdom, Greek mysteries, or Zoroastrian thought.³⁸ Later, as one of the first “scholarly” authors, Johann Georg Wachter,

³⁵ E. L. Sukenik, *מגילת נגזות מתוך נזיה קדושה ונסצה במדבר יהודה* (Jerusalem: Bialik Foundation, 1948), 1:16f. The book has also been posthumously published in English, E. L. Sukenik, *The Collection of the Hidden Scrolls in the Possession of the Hebrew University* (ed. N. Avigad; Jerusalem: Bialik Foundation, 1954), 26.

³⁶ See the brief overview in S. Wagner, *Die Essener in der wissenschaftlichen Diskussion vom Ausgang des 18. zum Beginn des 20. Jahrhunderts. Eine wissenschaftsgeschichtliche Studie* (BZAW 79; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1960), 3f.

³⁷ See the supporting references in S. Wagner, *Essener*, 5f., who writes, “A detailed treatment of the Essene research before 1800 has yet to come” (S. Wagner, *Essener*, 8). This example of the polemical use of ancient tradition deserves a detailed treatment. However, cf. P. E. Lucius, *Die Therapeuten und ihre Geschichte in der Stellung der Askese* (Straßburg: Schmidt, 1879), 204–210.

³⁸ See the overview in Wagner, *Essener*, 21–38.

in his book *De primordiis Christianae religionis libri duo, quorum prior agit de Essaeis Christianorum inchoatoribus, alter de Christianis, Essaeorum posteris* (1713), regarded Jesus as “therapeutically” instructed by the Essenes,³⁹ and rationalist authors could then refer to such influences in order “to explain,” e.g., his “resurrection.”⁴⁰ Despite increasingly sober and critical examinations of the sources, the Essenes also appeared to scholars of the 19th and 20th centuries as a movement that was “very closely related to Christianity” and had an influence on especially Jewish Christian “sects” like the Ebionites or on Christian Baptist sects.⁴¹ In this horizon we can understand the famous quote of the French scholar Ernest Renan, according to which Christianity is a form of Essenism which finally reached its ultimate conclusion.⁴² Last but not least, the Jewish scholar Joseph Klausner, in his book on Jesus, explained all non-Pharisees in Early Christianity by influences from Essenism.⁴³

Among scholars with history-of-religions interests, Essenism was interpreted in light of its differences from classical Judaism and was explained as the product of non-Jewish influences such as Pythagoreanism, Parsism, or even Buddhism.⁴⁴ Numerous writings from the Pseudepigrapha were associated with Essenism.⁴⁵ Interestingly, this did not happen with the Damascus Document, which was found in 1897 in the Cairo Geniza and published as a “Zadokite work.” It was linked with the Essenes only when Eleazar Lipa Sukenik had

³⁹ This work has been reprinted in J. G. Wachter, *De primordiis Christianae religionis. Elucidarius cabalisticus* (ed. W. Schröder; Freidenker der europäischen Aufklärung vol. 1 and 2; Stuttgart and Bad Cannstatt: Friedrich Frommann Verlag, 1995).

⁴⁰ Unfortunately, it is often overlooked that the materials of modern Jesus novels (e.g., in the context of Qumran) are largely taken from the novelistic representations of Jesus in the Enlightenment, thus primarily in C. F. Bahrdt, *Ausführung des Planes und Zweckes Jesu* (12 vols; Berlin: August Mylius, 1784–1793) and K. H. Venturini, *Natürliche Geschichte des großen Propheten von Nazareth* (4 vols.; Bethlehem [i.e., Kopenhagen]: Schubothe, 1800–1802). On this, see the presentation by A. Schweitzer, *Geschichte der Leben-Jesu-Forschung* (9th ed.; Tübingen: Mohr, 1984; 2nd ed. 1913), 79–87.

⁴¹ Thus the presentation at K. A. Credner in Wagner, *Essener*, 186.

⁴² “Christianity is a form of Essenism that has largely succeeded” (E. Renan, *Œuvres Complètes. Édition définitive* [ed. H. Psichari; vol. 6; Paris: Calmann-Lévy, 1953], 1301; also in idem, *Histoire du Peuple d’Israël* [Paris: Calmann-Lévy, 1893], 5:70). Also in his *Life of Jesus* (E. Renan, *Vie de Jésus* [Berlin: Springer, 1864], 73f.), Renan details many similarities between Jesus and Essenism (see Wagner, *Essener*, 178).

⁴³ J. Klausner, *Jesus von Nazareth* (Berlin: Jüdischer Verlag, 1930), 284, writes, “James, the physical brother of Jesus, lived like an Essene: as an ascetic and a hermit. Christianity, therefore, took many things from Essenism just before and just after Jesus. Even Jesus himself is near to the Essenes in some sense. ... So we can almost certainly say that all non-Pharisees in Early Christianity came from the Essenes.”

⁴⁴ See the overview in Wagner, *Essener*, 133–146, 224–227.

⁴⁵ Works suggested as byproducts of Essenism included *Life of Adam and Eve*, the 4th book of the *Sibylline Oracles*, *Assumption of Moses*, *Greek Apocalypse of Ezra*, *Apocalypse of Abraham*, *Book of Jubilees*, the *Book of Enoch* (or parts of it), the *Testaments of the 12 Patriarchs*, and the *Testament of Job*. An especially large number of Essenian attributions can be found in P. Riessler, *Altjüdisches Schrifttum außerhalb der Bibel übersetzt und erläutert* (Augsburg: Filser, 1928), in the French Catholic M.-J. Lagrange, *Le Judaïsme avant Jesus-Christ* (Paris: Lecoffre, 1931), and in the essays of the Jewish scholar Kaufmann Kohler. See the overview in Wagner, *Essener*, 215–224.

made the connection between the Dead Sea Scroll discoveries (probably due to the geographical indications in the famous note in Pliny) and the Essenes.⁴⁶

The origin and accuracy of the “Essene hypothesis” with regard to the Qumran finds will not be discussed here. It is clear, however, that with the early reception of the Essene paradigm, a long tradition of interpreting and discussing the ancient reports about the Essenes was received, which gave the interpretation of the Qumran texts in their beginnings essential (and sometimes also problematic) aspects:

- The tendency to disassociate the texts of (classical, Pharisaic) Judaism and connect them with a “sect” or “heterodox” Judaism
- The idea that the community was particularly (and more than other Jewish groups) syncretistically influenced by Iranian or Greek/Pythagorean sources
- The old tradition of a close connection between Essenism and Early Christianity, which had a strong influence on the question of “Qumran and Jesus.”

In two very early statements from important Qumran scholars, these ancient scholarly traditions meet in a revealing manner. The French orientalist André Dupont-Sommer adopted and continued the statement of his 19th century compatriot Ernest Renan that Christianity was the form of Essenism that had come to success,⁴⁷ and the German orientalist Karl Georg Kuhn stated very early after the first Qumran discoveries that the “heterodox Judaism” of the Essenes would have mediated Zoroastrian thought into Early Christianity.⁴⁸ Here, too, the spirit of the old contrast hermeneutic is particularly evident, insofar as it is emphatically a “heterodox” Judaism which influences Early Christianity and has taught it non-Jewish material.

3. The Changed Research Context

From the present vantage point, these statements naturally seem outdated, and the current state of the research is essentially different.

First, it should be noted that the comparisons and discussions of the previous era – basically up to the 1990s – were conducted on a rather narrow textual basis. In the 1950s, the discoveries almost exclusively from Cave 1 were published and accessible: seven large scrolls (in addition to the two Isaiah scrolls, the then so-called *Rule of the Community* 1QS, the *War Rule* 1QM,

⁴⁶ E. L. Sukenik, מנילת נזוֹת, 16. See also L. H. Schiffman, “From the Cairo Genizah to Qumran. The Influence of the Zadokite Fragments on the Study of the Qumran Scrolls,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Texts and Context* (ed. C. Hempel; STDJ 90; Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2010), 451–466, here 455f.

⁴⁷ A. Dupont-Sommer, *Aprerçus preliminaries*, 121.

⁴⁸ K. G. Kuhn, *Die in Palästina gefundenen hebräischen Texte*, 211.

the *Hymn Scroll* 1QH, the *Habakkuk Pesher* 1QpHab, and a little later the *Genesis Apocryphon* 1QGenAp), which were all preserved relatively well and were quickly edited. In addition to these texts, only a small number of additional texts or already published fragments were available. The “coincidence” that this cave was discovered first and the fact that the scrolls from this cave were relatively well-preserved greatly influenced the course of the formation of the early views on the Qumran library. It is difficult to conceive of how the course of research would have unfolded if the numerous small fragments from Cave 4 had been known at the time.⁴⁹ After all, among the texts from Cave 1 are some documents that, even according to today’s consensus, belong to the most important “group-specific” texts of the Qumran Community, in particular the *Community Rule* 1QS with its appendices 1QSa and 1QSb, the *Hymn Scroll* 1QHa, and the *Habakkuk Pesher* 1QpHab, as well as possibly the *War Rule* 1QM. But today the texts from Cave 1 appear within a significantly changed overall framework, and the findings of early research are in many ways reassessed.⁵⁰

However, the image of a rather marginal “sectarian library” determined by these texts was questioned as more and more texts and fragments from more than 900 fragmentarily preserved manuscripts became known through pre-publications and official editions. Two aspects of this are to be mentioned here:

- Yigael Yadin’s publication of *Temple Scroll* from Cave 11, which had been seized in the house of the antique dealer Kandu in Bethlehem in 1967, marked a turning point in scholarship. Now, Jewish-halakic themes came to the forefront of the research, especially as more and more Jewish scholars such as Joseph Baumgarten and Lawrence H. Schiffman saw the task that the Qumran texts needed to be brought back into Jewish discourses.⁵¹ Research interest turned – even now with more involvement of Jewish scholars – to the halakic details of texts like the *Temple Scroll*, 4QMMT, the 4QD manuscripts, the calendric texts (e.g., the *mishmarot*), and the liturgical texts (e.g., the *Song of the Sabbath Sacrifice*), all of which were to be understood in the context of specific Jewish traditions. The numerous connections to both the biblical and later rabbinic tradition have shown that the Qumran corpus in the context of contemporary Judaism by no means represents only marginal positions, but that the Judaism of the time

⁴⁹ Cf. also D. Dimant, “Introduction,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Scholarly Perspective*, 1–10, “Scholarship at large was unaware that this portrait was based on a very partial view of the Qumran library.”

⁵⁰ On this, cf. D. K. Falk, et al., eds., *Qumran Cave I Revisited* (STDJ 91; Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2010).

⁵¹ See the programmatic publication by L. H. Schiffman, *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls: The History of Judaism, the Background of Christianity, the Lost Library of Qumran* (Philadelphia and Jerusalem: Jewish Publication Society, 1994).

of the Second Temple in itself is livelier and diverser than the older research was able to see. Since the 1980s, the text corpus of Qumran has therefore been perceived much more strongly as a Jewish corpus than it was in the earlier days of research, and more and more it has been recognized as a corpus that cannot be adequately interpreted with an interest limited to references to Early Christianity. Conversely, a major trend of research is precisely to classify the texts of the early Jesus movement as initially Jewish texts in the context of the now much more pluralized Judaism of the first, “post-Christian” century.

- At the same time, with the publication of the fragments of numerous new, non-biblical texts, the unified image of a “sectarian library” gradually softened. A number of new, non-biblical texts lacked the specific characteristics of the language and ideology of the *yahad* and therefore had to be traced back to different groupings of contemporary Judaism “before” or “contemporaneous” with the *yahad*. From today’s perspective, only a small part of the Qumran corpus can be regarded as group specific, while the larger part of the parabiblical, wisdom, and exegetical texts, as well as supposedly all the Aramaic texts, were probably not authored by members of the *yahad* community or the tradents of the Qumran “library,”⁵² but may have come into their possession from outside the community and only read and copied there before finally being deposited in the caves. Despite all discussions about the details, there is now a broad consensus that the Qumran corpus as such is much more than a mere “sectarian library”: It represents a broad spectrum of the literary production of the Judaism of the first three “pre-Christian” centuries, and it is precisely therein that the immense importance of the textual discoveries can be recognized.⁵³ However, this diversity poses methodological challenges for the history-of-religions evaluation of the corpus with respect to early Christian texts and phenomena.

⁵² The criteria for assignment are of course not entirely clear. It is already a matter of dispute as to what can be collected under the label “sectarian,” and also the shape of the *yahad* has become uncertain in recent research. But all this points more to a greater disparity, and thus is evidence that the assumption of a relatively unified, “sectarian library” should probably be shelved. See the essential discussion in 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 1; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1990), 167–187; see further A. Lange, “Kriterien essenischer Texte,” in *Qumran kontrovers*, 59–69; and finally D. Dimant, “The Vocabulary of the Qumran Sectarian Texts,” in *Qumran und die Archäologie*, 347–395.

⁵³ It can even be formulated, *cum grano salis*, that scholarly research has shown that the non-group specific (“non-sectarian”) texts are more significant (also for the question of yield for the understanding of the Jewish movement) compared to the group-specific texts written in the *yahad*. On this, see in particular G. J. Brooke, “The Pre-Sectarian Jesus,” in *Echoes from the Caves*, 33–48.

Of course, the early assumptions that the tradents of the Qumran “library” were to be associated with the Essenes of the ancient testimonies⁵⁴ and the related interpretations of the archaeological discoveries of Khirbet Qumran were also questioned.⁵⁵ The archaeological questions are relevant to the current discussion only to the extent that it is likely that a large number of texts of the Qumran corpus were written before the Khirbet Qumran compound was functional, and also that the essential rule texts of the *yahad* were not developed within this settlement and the way of life cultivated there, but rather belonged to subgroups of this movement located in very different places within Palestine. Due to the greater awareness of the factual diversity of the Qumran texts, as well as the ancient reports about the Essenes, even the simple identification of the *yahad* with the “Qumran community” is questionable. Although there are good reasons why the *yahad* is related – possibly as a plural “umbrella organization”⁵⁶ – to the (equally non-unified) movement of the “Essenes” and thus the group-specific Qumran texts reveal something of the “inner perspective” of this group, while the ancient reports about the Essenes are written instead from an “external perspective” or from the perspective of an “interpretatio graeca,”⁵⁷ recent research no longer interprets the text corpus in the light of the ancient reports about the Essenes, and rightly so.

II. Methodological Differences

The discussion about Jesus and Paul’s relationship to “Qumran” is now to be based on these developments, which is a departure from foundations of the first decades of Qumran research.

⁵⁴ On this, see among others N. Golb, *Who Wrote the Dead Sea Scrolls? The Search for the Secret of Qumran* (New York: Scribner Book Company, 1995); German trans. idem, *Wer schrieb die Schriftrollen vom Toten Meer* (Hamburg: Hoffmann und Campe, 1994); L. H. Schiffman, *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls*; L. Cansdale, *Qumran and the Essenes. A Re-Evaluation of the Evidence* (TSAJ 60; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997); K. Berger, *Qumran. Funde – Texte – Geschichte* (Stuttgart: Reclam, 1998); Y. Hirschfeld, *Qumran in Context. Reassessing the Archaeological Evidence* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2004); German trans. idem, *Qumran. Die ganze Wahrheit* (trans. K. H. Nicolai; ed. J. Zangenberg; Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlag, 2006).

⁵⁵ Concerning the state of the research and the discussion with the most important models, see J. Frey, “Qumran and the Archaeology,” 3–49 (in this volume, 121–161).

⁵⁶ Cf. J. J. Collins, “The *Yahad* and ‘The Qumran Community,’” in *Biblical Traditions in Transmission. Essays in Honour of Michael A. Knibb* (ed. C. Hempel and J. M. Leiui; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 81–96; idem, *Beyond the Qumran Community. The Sectarian Movement of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Grand Rapids and Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2010).

⁵⁷ Concerning this discussion, see J. Frey, “On the Historical Value of the Ancient Reports about the Essenes,” 23–56 (in this volume, 163–193).

The old theses and models of relations between the Qumran community and Early Christianity or between the Qumran texts and New Testament texts have all proved to be outdated and undifferentiated.⁵⁸ Contrary to all speculative attempts at identification, especially in view of the texts from Cave 7, it is now definitively clear that Christian texts cannot be found in the Qumran corpus. Nor do the Qumran texts reveal any (possibly hidden or ciphered) references to Jesus, Paul, James, or other figures of the Jesus movement as, for example, Robert Eisenman and the novelists then claimed. Personnel and local connections between a suspected “Essene quarter” in Jerusalem and the primitive church can also not be demonstrated, and the assumption that the Qumran community or the Essenes formed a precursor movement of Early Christianity, or that its teacher was a prototype for the appearance of Jesus or for the image presented of him in the Gospels can be regarded as an untenable relic of the Essene interpretation from the time before the discoveries of Qumran.

The strange fact that, even in the New Testament, there are no clear references to the faction of the Essenes or to a position associated with the circles of Qumran means that all assumptions about direct connections between the *yahad* and John the Baptist, Jesus, or his successors are unprovable speculations. Furthermore, the assumption that “converted” Essenes with a worldview shaped by Qumran would have influenced primitive Christian practice (i.e., communal property) or New Testament texts (i.e., with dualistic language) cannot, in my opinion, be substantiated.

From a methodological point of view, the need for substantial differentiation arises from the current state of research. The mere exposition of “parallels” from the Qumran corpus and its distortion in New Testament commentaries and monographs can no longer suffice; rather, their scope and relevance must be more carefully determined and reflected.⁵⁹ In view of the differentiations in the Qumran library, it is no longer possible to make linguistic and content parallels a general measure of Qumran or “Essene” influence. Rather, these parallels are to be understood first as part of the Palestinian-Jewish

⁵⁸ See the comprehensive treatment in J. Frey, “Die Bedeutung der Qumran-Funde für das Verständnis des Neuen Testaments,” 133–152; idem, “Critical Issues in the Investigation of the Scrolls and the New Testament,” in *Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. J. J. Collins and T. Lim; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 517–545, here 519–525; idem, “*The Textual Discoveries of Qumran and New Testament Scholarship: An Interim Balance, Hermeneutical Considerations, and Concrete Observations Related to on the Jesus Tradition*,” in this volume.

⁵⁹ In the following are considerations that are first formulated in J. Frey, “Die Bedeutung der Qumran-Funde für das Verständnis des Neuen Testaments,” 133–152; idem, “The Impact of the Dead Sea Scrolls on New Testament Interpretation,” in this volume 554–561.

linguistic and conceptual matrix⁶⁰ in which Jesus and the early church, as well as Pauline, the Synoptic, and the Johannine traditions, took part.⁶¹

- Parallels are to be clearly described and classified: In what respect is there a parallel? Is the “parallel” in a single term or a specific semantic value? Is there a motif, a literary form, or an institution of the community behind the textual parallel? And what “degree” of parallelism can be stated? Is there a very close, or even literal, correspondence between a text from the Qumran library and a New Testament text, or is there only an approximate analogy, or even a more distant similarity?
- Does the parallel occur in group-specific texts of the *yahad* or also (or exclusively) in non-group specific texts? Is it possible to show any internal differentiation or even a development within the documents of the Qumran library? And if this is the case, which type of representation or stage of development is the closest to the New Testament parallel?⁶²
- For further reflection, one must ask how to explain such parallels: Are parallel phenomena simply to be seen as analogies between different, in some respects (i.e., sociologically or in their adoption of earlier traditions) comparable groups, or can concrete dependencies be found? At what level can such dependencies or influences be localized? Are they at the level of texts (textual reception), at the level of persons (knowledge of traditions and linguistic forms, individual “encyclopedia”), or at the level of groups or religious milieus (common linguistic patterns and discourses)?

In view of Early Christianity or the background of the proclamation of Jesus and the apostles, therefore, several levels of inquiry are to be distinguished: Can this background be determined to be

- generally *Jewish* (in distinction to pagan-Hellenistic or gnostic),
- specific *Palestinian-Jewish* (in distinction to Diaspora or Hellenistic-Jewish), or
- (group-)specific *Qumranic* (“*yahadish*”) or *Essenian*?

Such a differentiated analysis can therefore no longer lead to a pan-Qumranic perspective, but the findings of the Qumran corpus are to be evaluated as evidence for a wider range of literary production of the Palestinian Judaism of the Second Temple period, for which other texts are also used.

⁶⁰ This terminology goes back to J. A. Fitzmyer, “The Qumran Scrolls and the New Testament After Forty Years,” *RevQ* 13 (1988): 609–620, here 610.

⁶¹ Cf. also already the work of H.-W. Kuhn, “Qumran und Paulus,” 228f.

⁶² Here, the observation has its place that in some respects, especially the non-group-specific or wisdom texts, these texts have particularly close references to those of the New Testament, see G. J. Brooke, “The Pre-Sectarian Jesus.”

At least for Paul and the later stages of Early Christianity – the influences of Hellenistic Judaism (also in Jewish Palestine⁶³), as well as the Hellenistic-Roman world mediated by Hellenistic Judaism, are to be equally considered. Thus, the assessment of the Qumran parallels should always be done with the question of whether texts from other traditions offer closer parallels to the New Testament phenomena and thus are more suitable to an explanation.

While older research often focused on individual figures (asking, for example, whether Jesus or Paul had been influenced by “Essenism”), or wanted to highlight relationships between groups (e.g., the Jesus movement or the Johannine community and the Essenes), recent research has moved away from focusing on individuals and is aware of the issues of conclusions about groups. It compares beloved texts, in the required differentiation – in terms of language, motifs, and theology. It asks about parallels and their evaluation, as well as about the “usefulness” or value of these parallels for understanding the New Testament texts and for what has changed or perhaps could change through these texts in the light of the research.

The hermeneutical question is essential (though often overlooked): So what are we doing when we put Qumran texts next to New Testament texts, when we compare such Jewish texts with Christian ones? And in what interest is this comparison taking place?

B. Hermeneutical Horizons: Qumran Texts between Politics, Religion, and Scholarship

Asking this question is to be aware that interpretation can never take place in a “vacuum” and rarely happens in completely “uninterested” objectivity and strict neutrality. Interpretation of texts usually happens with a more or less intense view of one’s own present. This dimension is particularly clear in religious texts, especially in biblical texts, and it is reflected not least in the variety of interpretations which cannot simply be reduced to a single, “correct” interpretation with exegetical methodology and sufficient knowledge.

Interpretation always implies an opinion about the relevance of the interpretations to the interpreters, their community (believer or researcher), and their time. Interpretation, hermeneutically speaking, is always also a “posi-

⁶³ See the foundational work of M. Hengel, *Judentum und Hellenismus* (3rd ed.; WUNT 10; Tübingen: Mohr, 1988); idem, *Juden, Griechen und Barbaren. Aspekte der Hellenisierung des Judentums in vorchristlicher Zeit* (SBS 76; Stuttgart: KBW Veflag, 1976); idem and C. Marksches, “Das Problem der ‘Hellenisierung’ Judäas im 1. Jahrhundert nach Christus,” in *Judaica et Hellenistica. Kleine Schriften I* (ed. M. Hengel; WUNT 90; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996), 1–90; idem, “Jerusalem als jüdische und hellenistische Stadt,” in *Judaica, Hellenistica et Christiana, Kleine Schriften II* (ed. M. Hengel; WUNT 109; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999), 115–156.

tioning” of the interpreters themselves. It participates in the broader discourses of identity, and biblical scholarship (and also Qumran scholarship) must be aware of this dimension. It is possible that Qumran scholarship still has much to learn from biblical studies, where the reflection of the history of research and the classification of certain positions in a broader theological or ideological horizon has been practiced for some time.

I. Qumran Texts as a Political Issue

The archaeological discoveries (texts or artifacts) are also a political issue, and both the interested public and little by little also the scholarship are becoming increasingly aware of this fact⁶⁴ – not only because of the horror-stricken destruction of pre-Islamic images by radical-Islamic iconoclasts in Afghanistan, but also because of repeated calls to Western museums for the return of valuable artifacts to countries such as Egypt, Greece, or Turkey. Such artifacts are not just assets that can be used for tourism and business. Archeological treasures such as the Parthenon Frieze of the Acropolis of Athens or the bust of Nefertiti in the Berlin Pergamon Museum are today considered to be the cultural property of independent states which was taken away by colonialists in former times under different legal circumstances. They are also symbols of a cultural and national identity that can be effective in creating identity in the present or even support a national “myth,” at least if the respective state or nation considers its identity rooted in the cultural epoch represented by those artefacts.

That the Qumran texts have such a function for the state of Israel as an impressive document of Jewish life in the Dead Sea area is sufficiently clear. The circumstances surrounding the purchase of the first rolls from Cave 1 by the State of Israel show this, as well as the presentation of the scrolls as a national sanctuary in the “Shrine of the Book” in the Israel Museum in Jerusalem.

The processing of the Qumran finds was also particularly affected by the political changes in the region: The first finds were made under the British Palestine mandate, amidst the turmoil of the foundation of the Israel State. The numerous fragments from Cave 4 were then kept and scientifically processed in the “scrollerly” in the “Palestine Archaeological Museum” or (then) the “Rockefeller Museum” in East Jerusalem, and the research team originally entrusted with the edition did not contain any Israeli or Jewish scholars. This changed when, after 1967, the Israel Antiquities Authority took control of the texts and the “Shrine of the Book” was built. A number of Qumran scholars, not least those among the French *École Biblique*, made no secret of a pro-Palestinian attitude, and DJD’s temporary editor, John Strugnell, had to give up his position because of anti-Jewish remarks. Under

⁶⁴ On this, see the volume edited by the Israel Exploration Society: N. A. Silbermann and E. S. Frerichs, eds., *Archaeology and Society in the 21st Century. The Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Case Studies* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2001).

the aegis of Emanuel Tov, more and more Jewish scholars entered into international Qumran research. The change in the political framework is reflected not least in the change in name of the official publication series “Discoveries of the Judaean Desert of Jordan” (DJDJ) to “Discoveries of the Judaean Desert” (DJD) in the first volume, which was published after 1967.⁶⁵

The significance of the Qumran texts, not only as an early document of Jewish religious life in the region around the Dead Sea, but also as a symbol of Israel’s national identity, became clear when the international congress commemorating the 50th anniversary of the Qumran discoveries in Jerusalem in 1997 was solemnly opened with a speech by the then Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu. The fact that meanwhile the state of Jordan also showed an interest in the Qumran texts, developed activities to explore some of the documents in Amman, and finally, on the occasion of an exhibition of Qumran texts in Canada, even demanded that the texts not be returned to Israel until the question of their ownership had been clarified⁶⁶ indicates that these facts have also been identified among Israel’s Arab neighbors and efforts have been made to scientifically address Israel’s political appropriation of the discoveries or even to politically acknowledge these discoveries and to use the public interest in them for their own political interest.⁶⁷

II. *Qumran Texts in Religious Discussions of Identity*

More than merely political, the Qumran texts are also a religious symbol, in different ways of course, for both Jewish and Christian groups.

(a) The role of the textual discoveries within the context of Jewish identity discourses was initially still unclear, not least in view of the long tradition of considering the Essenes as a heterodox “sect” – as measured against classical or “normative” (Pharisaic) rabbinic Judaism – even if some initial assumptions that the Qumran texts themselves were of Christian origin⁶⁸ had soon been refuted.

Although the increased entry of Jewish scholars into the work with the texts only took place after 1967, and the “reclaiming” of the corpus for inner-

⁶⁵ This change took place in the volume DJD VI: R. de Vaux and J. T. Milik, eds., *Qumrân grotte 4 II* (DJD 6; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977), in which the then series editor Pierre Benoit explains the change in the preface.

⁶⁶ See the press release in Haaretz: <http://www.haaretz.com/news/jordan-demands-return-of-dead-sea-scrolls-seized-by-israel-1.261384>.

⁶⁷ Of course this complicates all attempts to present original texts outside of Israel because, as the lender, the Israeli Antiquities Authority understandably demands top-level political guarantees for their return.

⁶⁸ Thus primarily in the Cambridge Judaic scholar Jacob Leon Teicher, see J. L. Teicher, “The Dead Sea Scrolls. Documents of the Jewish-Christian Sect of Ebionites,” *JJS* 2 (1950–51): 67–99; on this, see G. J. Brooke, “Dead Sea Scrolls Scholarship in the United Kingdom,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Scholarly Perspective*, 449–486, here 465.

Jewish discourses⁶⁹ could only be done on the basis of the many later edited texts, the immense significance of the discoveries for the understanding of Judaism at the time of the Second Temple could be seen immediately and the interest of many religious and secular-Jewish researchers grew exceedingly fast. Of course, it must be remembered that the scholarly recognition of the plurality of the Judaism of this era, the lack of a “normative” instance, and also the plurality of the textual editions of the Hebrew biblical texts do not correspond to traditional views of Judaism. However, it seems that these facts are less irritating for a traditional Jewish-religious understanding than for a conservative-Protestant understanding, which is oriented around the idea of a normative biblical text.

In scholarship, the fervent inner-Jewish debates about Jewish identity at present and in the state of Israel, the disputes between “religious” and “secular” scholars, seem to be reflected in particular in the archaeological debates, with the “secular” interpretation of Khirbet Qumran by Yizhar Hirschfeld, who claims that in his interpretation the site is “freed” from the religious significance⁷⁰ attributed to it by other interpretations. Thus critical archaeologists confront the often decidedly Zionistic or national interests of an older generation of archaeologists, and so the scholarly debate about the interpretation of artefacts sometimes overlaps with political options.

(b) It has already been mentioned that the Qumran texts were important from the beginning for Christian discourses. It was initially conservative, primarily Protestant circles, that took a particular interest in the discoveries, especially because of their relevance for the study of the Bible and the biblical texts. For among the earliest discoveries was the sensational find of an Isaiah scroll that was more than a thousand years older than the previously known Hebrew textual witness, and that contained the text of the “whole” of Isaiah, including chapters 40–66, with only very slight variations. The discovery of this scroll provided an indication of the fidelity of the biblical tradition process. Furthermore, the discoveries in Qumran contained witnesses to (almost) all of the Scriptures of the Hebrew canon and provided a confirmation of the significance of these Scriptures at the time of Jesus and Early Christianity. Here, especially in North America, it is evident that a broader public interest and conservative positions⁷¹ in research could coincide.

Even in European theology, the scholarly interest in the finds was initially more strongly sparked among conservative scholars who were critically op-

⁶⁹ Cf. the book title by L. H. Schiffman, *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls*.

⁷⁰ Y. Hirschfeld, *Qumran in Context*, 5: “By suggesting that Jerusalem is the source of the scrolls, we liberate Qumran from the burden of religious significance. It allows us to give the site a secular interpretation.”

⁷¹ To name a few from the early days of research, for example, there were William F. Albright and William Brownlee (see J. J. Collins, “The Scrolls and Christianity in America,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Scholarly Perspective*, 197–215, here 197f.).

posed to the dominant tendency of the Bultmann school and could now use the new discoveries as evidence for their views of the Gospel of John or the development of the early church. The milieu of John the Baptist was now considered more Qumranic than Gnostic, as was the background of John's Gospel. The Qumran calendar was used to search for a possible harmonization of the Synoptic and the Johannine chronology, and Pauline research also emphasized the Jewish background rather than Hellenistic-Gnostic contexts. Conservative-fundamentalist circles then all too readily embraced the idea that New Testament texts from the Gospel of Mark or even the Pastoral epistles could have been found in Qumran – especially in Cave 7 – thus providing “proof” of the age of these Scriptures (well before 70 CE) and a falsification of the views of critical scholarship. The questionable agenda behind some of those approaches⁷² shows the ideological susceptibility of biblical scholarship as well as Qumran research, especially when it has the goal of serving a particular religious interest. The same could be observed with regard to the paradigms of the Essenian “monastery” or of an “Essene district” in Jerusalem that was supposedly influential to the piety of the early church.

(c) The same applies, of course, to the opposite “interests” which have influenced research or wider public discourse. For example, the suspicion shared by some authors that the Qumran texts could bring to light evidence of a “completely different” Jesus or a figure of the early Christian movement that contradicts the previous picture or could jeopardize a supposed claim of “uniqueness” or “novelty” of Christianity. Behind the “revelatory pathos” of some of the authors involved – from Edmund Wilson and John Allegro to Robert Eisenman – there was a specific “Enlightenment” agenda that was interested in delegitimizing the Christian religion (or certain expressions of it) by questioning its (perhaps all-too simply understood) claim to revelation in the demonstration of a “Christianity before Christ” and with reference to conspiracy theories (especially those with reference to the Vatican). Qumran texts, more or less appropriately interpreted and popularized, have always had an important function in such arguments.

⁷² For example, see the diverse works of Anglicist and self-made papyrologist Carsten Peter Thiede on the 7Q texts: C.-P. Thiede, “7Q – Eine Rückkehr zu den neutestamentlichen Papyrusfragmenten in der siebten Höhle von Qumran,” *Bib* 65 (1994): 538–559; idem, *Die älteste Evangelien-Handschrift? Das Markusfragment von Qumran und die Anfänge der schriftlichen Überlieferung des Neuen Testaments* (Wuppertal: Brockhaus, 1986); see further C.-P. Thiede and M. D’Ancona, *Der Jesus-Papyrus. Die Entdeckung einer Evangelien-Handschrift aus der Zeit der Augenzeugen* (Reinbek: Rowohlt, 1997); for criticism, see W. Wischmeyer, “Zu den neuen Frühdatierungen von Carsten Peter Thiede,” *ZAC* I (1997): 280–290; S. Enste, *Kein Markustext in Qumran. Eine Untersuchung der These, Qumran-Fragment 7Q5 = Mk 6, 52-53* (NTOA 45; Freiburg [CH] and Göttingen: Universität Verlag, 2000).

These brief remarks should suffice to show that the work on Qumran texts (as well as on other historical comparative texts) can hardly ever be “neutral” and “uninterested,” regardless of any relevance, but is embedded in public religious or “religious-political” identity discourses that influence the questions posed and occasionally the results. The scholarly discourses are also embedded in these contexts and are affected by corresponding “tendencies,” with all the methodological efforts to be sure of their appropriateness and “objectivity.”

III. Qumran-Texts in New Testament Scholarly Discourses: Discontinuity or Continuity with Judaism

This was particularly evident in the early days of Qumran research: The textual discoveries were quickly – and are in part even to this day – used as support for “conservative” research positions, e.g., with respect to the faithfulness to the tradition and historical interpretation of the Gospel of John, and to the more Jewish character of Paul’s thought (in contrast to the prevailing derivations from Hellenistic-Gnostic contexts). With regard to the history of research, it is quite a clear effect of the Qumran discoveries that Paul and John now appear more “Jewish” than would be possible without the parallels from the Qumran corpus, even if this does not exclude the influence of Hellenistic-Jewish and Hellenistic forms of thought.

However, from the very beginning – also in light of the earlier interpretations of the Essenes – the problem arose as to which lines of Jewish tradition the early Christian texts follow. As long as research could reckon with a normative position of Pharisaic Judaism in the time before 70 CE, the study of the history of religion would gladly count on the influence of other currents, of Alexandrian thought, as evidenced by Philo, of Iranian-influenced apocalypticism, or even of Essenism, which again and again had been considered to be a forerunner of later trends of Christianity. Parts of early Qumran research could follow this line when locating Jesus and Early Christianity in a Jewish context, but defining this framework as “heterodox” and in distance from “classical” Judaism.

With the insights that there was no such normative Judaism at the time of Jesus and the primitive church, and that some of the most essential parallels from Qumran for the understanding of Jesus or Christology were discovered in ‘non-sectarian’ or non-Essene texts, the research situation has changed significantly. The emerging Christian tradition is to be understood on the background of a wide variety of Jewish traditions, literary forms, or scriptural interpretations, not on the background of a narrow ‘sectarian’ group at the fringes of contemporary Judaism. Nevertheless, biblical scholarship still faces the challenge of reflecting on what it means that not only the earthly

Jesus, but also Paul and possibly the Gospel of John are to be understood much more within Jewish discourses than in contrast to them.

All too often, New Testament exegesis has in the past referred to aspects of contemporary Jewish thought as a dark (particularistic and legalistic) foil,⁷³ from which the early Christian or already Jesus' proclamation should stand out "brightly" in its universalism and its critique of legalism. But even if these crude and striking opposites are avoided, in view of the evaluation of the Qumran findings, "conservative" theological positions appear to be guided by concern for the "peculiarity" of Jesus and Early Christianity, while more liberal positions are less prompted to contrast Jesus and Early Christianity with contemporary Judaism.⁷⁴

In contrast to these latent research tendencies and interests, the question arises as to whether Jesus' "uniqueness" or the peculiarity and novelty of the Christian kerygma are in fact jeopardized by the stronger historical embedding of Jesus and New Testament witnesses in contemporary Jewish discourses. Does not historical individuality always consist of a combination of the given and the new, or the reinterpretation of the old in the light of certain events? For a historically enlightened theological thinking had to be clear even before the Qumran finds that the Gospel did not simply fall "from the sky," but that it was ultimately shaped by elements of the biblical and early Jewish tradition, which then was reinterpreted and transformed into a new message in light of the way and the fate of Jesus.

The challenge is to describe the specific profile of Jesus' proclamation, as well as of Pauline and Johannine thought within the linguistic fabric of contemporary Judaism – no matter which factors then (probably later and gradually) lead to the separation of the ways between the church, which was then largely comprised of Gentile Christians, and the synagogue, which consolidated itself with primary reference to the Hebrew tradition after the events of 70 CE.

But the hermeneutical-critical question can also be reversed: What is "won" when Pauline or Johannine texts in turn appear as part of a still inner-Jewish discourse? Does this line of argument in the context of a post-Shoah exegesis, which has become more sensitive in view of the anti-Jewish tendencies of New Testament texts, perhaps only serve to "rescue" certain problematic texts from the accusation of anti-Judaism "from the outside"? Hermeneutically, however, nothing would be gained and the problem of the anti-Jewish effect of the texts would not be "remedied."

In this sense, the classification and grouping of texts in the terminology of the history-of-religions is always linked to the positioning that exegetes make for themselves and the texts they interpret, questions of "significance" and "validity," and sometimes also aspects of "political correctness." New Testament research, in the context of Christian theology, should make known as much as

⁷³ On this, see J. Frey, "Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und antikes Judentum. Probleme – Wahrnehmungen – Perspektiven," *ZTK* 109 (2012): 445–446 (in this volume chapter 1, see 19–44).

⁷⁴ Cf. K. Stendahl, "The Scrolls and the New Testament. An Introduction and a Perspective," in *The Scrolls and the New Testament* (ed. K. Stendahl; New York: Harper, 1957), 1–17; see also E. Ullmann-Margalit, *Out of the Cave. A Philosophical Inquiry into Dead Sea Scrolls Research* (Cambridge, Mass. and London: Harvard University Press, 2006), 137f.

possible such hermeneutical aspects and also their own positions and perspectives. And by their openness, they should read the texts with philological and historical precision and hermeneutical-(self-)critical awareness.

19. The Character and Background of Matt 5:25–26: On the Value of Qumran Literature in New Testament Interpretation*

A new, comprehensive collection of parallels to and explanations of the New Testament from Jewish sources is a major challenge for scholarship on the history-of-religions. The work should be able to replace the work of Strack-Billerbeck,¹ with its wealth of information, because in spite of its merits Billerbeck's collection is not only outdated but also controversial on account of its persistent theological or ideological bias against the piety of rabbinic Judaism.² Of course, Billerbeck's huge work has provided many exegetes unable to read rabbinic sources with a wealth of texts from all parts of talmudic and midrashic literature. But in view of more recent research, that unclassified collection of texts is objectionable because it ignores the chronological distinctions established in more recent critical scholarship. In historical interpretation, neither the New Testament nor the Talmud and Midrashim can be read as a unity or a coherent "system" of thought. The historical and

* The considerations in this chapter were originally delivered as a paper in July 2000 at a Jerusalem conference exploring the possibilities of creating a "New Billerbeck," a collection of Jewish parallels to the New Testament not only from rabbinic texts but from the wide range of Jewish sources. In March 2003, I presented the paper as a guest lecture at the Reformed Theological Faculty of the University of Potchefstroom (South Africa). Nadine Ueberschaer and Jutta Leonhardt-Balzer provided valuable support regarding content and language of the article.

¹ H. L. Strack and P. Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch* (5 vols.; Munich: Beck, 1926–28).

² Billerbeck's own view is inspired by traditional Lutheran theology and by the earlier interpretation of rabbinic Judaism by Ferdinand Weber. So he often fails to appreciate the intention or the context of the texts he quotes. This is noticeable chiefly in the explanations and articles in vols. 4/1–4/2 – for example, in the passage on the soteriological "system" of the Synagogue (vol. 4/1, 3–33) and on the teachings on reward (vol. 4/1, 484–500). See F. Avemarie, *Tora und Leben. Untersuchungen zur Heilsbedeutung der Tora in der frühen rabbinischen Literatur* (TSAJ 55; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996), 12–19 (on Weber and Billerbeck). Avemarie's magisterial monograph shows how views have changed since Billerbeck. Even though he was also a Lutheran theologian (cf. now his posthumously collected essays: F. Avemarie, *Neues Testament und früh-rabbinisches Judentum* [ed. J. Frey and A. Standhartinger; WUNT 316; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013]), his thorough analysis of the tannaitic sources draws a completely different picture of early rabbinic soteriology.

tradition-historical analysis of rabbinic texts poses numerous problems; yet an attempt must be made to distinguish between earlier and later strata in the traditions.³ In the search for Jewish parallels that might explain the teachings of Jesus and his followers in the first century CE, traditions originating in the fifth or sixth century may be worthless or even completely misleading. So, from the mass of texts provided by Billerbeck (and other compendia), only traditions deriving from the early period of rabbinic Judaism, or even from pre-rabbinic traditions, can be used as valid parallels to the New Testament.

Furthermore, Billerbeck's sourcebook is by no means sufficient, since Judaism in New Testament times is not equivalent to rabbinic Judaism. Only as an exception does Billerbeck refer to some non-rabbinic sources – for example, from the *Book of Jubilees* or *4 Ezra* – but these references seem to be quite accidental. Parallels from Hellenistic Judaism that are quite important for the interpretation of many New Testament authors are completely omitted. However, the most obvious shortcoming of Billerbeck's work is that the texts from Qumran and the other sites near the Dead Sea were not able to be included, given that the Dead Sea Scrolls were found only in 1947 and thereafter.⁴

In any attempt to adduce parallels to New Testament texts from Jewish sources, the relevance of the texts from the Qumran library cannot be underestimated. Many premature hypotheses on the relationship between the Qumran community and Early Christian groups have been proposed, most of which must be dismissed in the light of sober scholarship.⁵ Nevertheless, the discovery and release of the Dead Sea Scrolls has dramatically changed the situation, since the texts from the Qumran library provide a new set of

³ See G. Stemberger, *Einleitung in Talmud und Midrasch* (8th ed.; Munich: Beck, 1992); and the introduction in P. Schäfer, *Studien zur Geschichte und Theologie des rabbinischen Judentums* (AGJU 15; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1978), 1–8. For rabbinic soteriology, see the work by Avemarie, *Tora und Leben*. For the traditions on miracles and miracle workers, see the most recent study by M. Becker, *Wunder und Wundertäter im frührabbinischen Judentum. Studien zum Phänomen und seiner Überlieferung im Horizont von Magie und Dämonismus* (WUNT II/144; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002).

⁴ But even the *Damascus Document*, which was found in the Cairo Geniza and edited in 1910, was not included in Billerbeck's collection; see the index to his work: H. L. Strack and P. Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch 5–6: Rabbinischer Index. Verzeichnis der Schriftgelehrten. Geographisches Register* (ed. J. Jeremias; Munich: Beck, 1963).

⁵ See the critical discussion of different hypotheses in 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 2.13. Juli 1999* (ed. M. Fieger, K. Schmid, and P. Schwagmeier; NTOA 47; Freiburg/Göttingen: Universitätsverlag/Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2001), 129–208, here 133–52, and idem, "The Impact of the Dead Sea Scrolls on New Testament Interpretation: Proposals, Problems, and Further Perspectives," in this volume, 527–578, here 539–554).

sources for the understanding of Palestinian Judaism at the turn of the era. Before the Qumran finds, practically no Hebrew or Aramaic documents from Palestinian Judaism from the time before 70 CE existed. Scholars would take their views from the Gospels, the Maccabean literature, the various Pseudepigrapha, the writings of Josephus and Philo, and especially from later rabbinic sources. Influenced by the rabbinic view, some scholars spoke of a “normative type” of Palestinian Judaism as the background of Jesus and Early Christianity.⁶ In view of the documents from Qumran, this view has changed completely. We now have a mass of nonbiblical texts originating between the third century BCE and the first century CE written not merely by a small “sectarian” group but representing a rich diversity of theological traditions. It is therefore possible to interpret Jesus and Early Christianity not just against the foil of a single “normative” type of Judaism, but within a wider range of traditions and discussions of their Jewish contemporaries. And many ideas and terms in the New Testament previously classified as non-Jewish, Hellenistic, syncretistic, or even Gnostic can now be explained from the multitude of Jewish traditions evidenced in the Qumran library.⁷

This paper is intended to be a case study of the value of the Qumran texts for interpreting the New Testament. As a test case, I will take a small, often neglected piece of the Sermon on the Mount: the saying on reconciliation before the judgment in Matt 5:25–26, which is now embedded in the first antithesis, Matt 5:21–26. At first glance, the passage appears to be “a strange saying which is not easily explained.”⁸ In the light of some “new” sapiential parallels from the Qumran library, I will try to describe the sociohistorical background of the passage that can be seen in the problem of debts and the need for their quick repayment. The Matthean version – but perhaps also the parallel in Luke, which goes back to the Sayings Source – draws on some

⁶ Thus, for example, G. F. Moore, *Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era: The Age of the Tannaim* (3 vols.; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1927–30), 1:125, and 3:v–vii. Despite the differences between Moore and Billerbeck, the two scholars largely agree in their view that rabbinic Judaism provides an adequate picture of “mainstream” Judaism in Jesus’ times.

⁷ The Pauline antithesis between “flesh” and “spirit,” for example, was earlier explained largely on the basis of Hellenism or Hellenistic Judaism; but it has closer parallels not only in some Qumran “sectarian” texts such as the *Hodayot* and the final psalm in 1QS XI but also in some of the recently published sapiential texts from Qumran. See J. Frey, “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 3rd Meeting of the IQQS, Oslo 1998* (D. Falk, F. García Martínez, and E. Schuller; STJD 35; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 197–226, and idem, “Flesh and Spirit in the Palestinian Jewish Sapiential Tradition and in the Qumran Texts,” in this volume, 701–741.

⁸ S. van Tilborg, *The Sermon on the Mount as an Ideological Intervention* (Assen/Maastricht/Wolfeboro: van Gorcum, 1986), 56.

piece of sapiential instruction concerning debts, sureties and the danger of debt imprisonment. It should be assumed that such problems were of considerable importance for many people in first-century Palestine, in the time of Jesus and in the period of the Early Christian community.

A. The Court Scene of Matt 5:25–26 in its Matthean Context

In scholarly commentaries on Matthew or the Sermon on the Mount, the two applications or illustrations of the first antithesis, Matt 5:23–24 and 25–26, are often commented on only very briefly.⁹ But this relatively minor interest seems unjustified: Even if the two short cases might be later additions to the original antithesis in Matt 5:21–22, the Synoptic parallels¹⁰ show that they must have been taken from an older tradition. In the present context, “they were not chosen without reason.”¹¹ They illustrate the commandment against uncontrolled anger (Matt 5:22) and affirm the necessity for reconciliation. The illustration is given from two different real-life situations concerning matters of cult (Matt 5:23–24) and court (Matt 5:25–26), as shown by the compositional structure of the first antithesis, “on murder” (Matt 5:21–26).¹²

⁹ See the very brief comments in W. Grundmann, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus* (THKNT 1; Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1968), 157–58; E. Schweizer, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus* (NTD 1; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1976), 72–73; U. Luz, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus. 1. Teilband Matthäus 1–7* (EKK 1,1; Zurich: Benziger, 1985), 259–60 (see now the completely revised 5th edition [Düsseldorf and Zürich: Benziger, and Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 2002], 345–46, with an extended and slightly modified interpretation); J. Gnilka, *Das Matthäusevangelium, Part I* (HTKNT 1,1; Freiburg, Basel, and Vienna: Herder, 1986), 155–57; G. Strecker, *Die Bergpredigt. Ein exegetischer Kommentar* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984), 70–72; D. A. Hagner, *Matthew 1–13* (WBC 33A; Dallas: Word, 1993), 117–18. The verses are totally neglected in H. Frankemölle, *Matthäus: Kommentar* (vol. 1; Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1994). A more thorough commentary is given only in E. Lohmeyer and W. Schmauch, *Das Evangelium des Matthäus* (KEK; Sonderband and Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1956), 121–25; H. Weder, *Die ‘Rede der Reden’. Eine Auslegung der Bergpredigt heute* (Zurich: Theologischer Verlag, 1985), 108–11; W. D. Davies and D. C. Allison, *The Gospel according to Saint Matthew* (ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988), 1:516–21; H. D. Betz, *The Sermon on the Mount* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1995), 222–30. Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch*, 1:288–94, gives some explanations on synagogal courts and on different types of coins. Notably, he recognizes that the case addresses financial affairs: “Vermögensrechtliche Streitsachen” (289).

¹⁰ See Luke 12:57–59 (on Matt 5:25–26) and Mark 11:25 (on Matt 5:23–24).

¹¹ Betz, *Sermon*, 222.

¹² See Davies and Allison, *Gospel*, 509–10.

A	Antithesis	vv. 21–22
A	Traditional teaching (command / punishment)	v. 21
A2	Jesus; teaching	v. 22
	First assertion (infraction / punishment)	v. 22a
	Second assertion (infraction / punishment)	v. 22b
	Third assertion (infraction / punishment)	v. 22c
B	Two Illustrations	vv. 23–26
B1	First illustration	vv. 23–24
	Situation (conditional)	v. 23
	Action commanded (imperative)	v. 24
B2	Second illustration	vv. 25–26
	Action commanded (imperative)	v. 25a
	Result of disobedience (negative final clause)	v. 25b
	Concluding announcement (threatening)	v. 26

As the table shows, the passage consists of an antithesis (vv. 21–22) in which Jesus quotes a traditional commandment and then gives his own contrasting teaching in a triadic form. The antithesis is followed by two sayings (vv. 23–24 and 25–26), which form a kind of appendix. These sayings are not formally paralleled but are related semantically to each other and to the preceding antithesis.

In the antithesis, the traditional commandment οὐ φονεύσεις (You shall not murder) (Exod 20:15; Deut 5:18) and the reference to the due punishment (being liable to κρίσις)¹³ are contrasted with the teaching of Jesus, which goes beyond the commandment of the law and demands an end to anger and hateful speech in general. In contrast to the traditional teaching, the teaching of Jesus in v. 22 has a triadic structure: three subsequent assertions pronounce the punishment due for the preceding kind of infraction. They were often thought to form a climactic structure; but this view is based neither on the three infractions mentioned (being angry, saying ῥακά, and saying μωρέ)¹⁴ nor on the series of punishments (κρίσις, συνέδριον, γέεννα) as a whole, but only on the last punishment mentioned, the judgment in the fiery hell.¹⁵

¹³ This term is open to a broad range of meanings: trial, penalty, judgment, legal proceedings, judicial sentence, or the court; see Davies and Allison, *Gospel*, 511. See also the discussion by S. Ruzer, “Matt 6:1–18: Collation of Two Avenues to God’s Forgiveness,” in *The Sermon on the Mount and Its Jewish Setting* (ed. H.-J. Becker and S. Ruzer; CahRB 60 Paris: Gabalda 2005), 151–242.

¹⁴ ῥακά and μωρέ are “practically indistinguishable” (Davies and Allison, *Gospel*, 514); they do not form a climax. See Luz, *Evangelium 1*, 252.

¹⁵ The first punishment mentioned, ἔνοχος ἔσται τῇ κρίσει, just repeats v. 21, and only if it is understood in the sense of “local court” is it a lower court than the συνέδριον. More

Consequently, there is no real climax within v. 22. It is more appropriate to state that the second and third assertions form an explication of the first one.¹⁶ The mention of the fiery hell (see Matt 18:9) in the last assertion underlines the severity of the infractions and, on the other hand, the necessity to replace anger and hatred by reconciliation. So it also prepares for the imperatives demanding reconciliation in the subsequent scenes.

In contrast to vv. 21–22, which address the hearers in the second person plural and are then followed by three general conditional structures in the third person singular (πᾶς ὁ ... , ὃς δ' ἂν ...), the two illustrations address their hearers in the second person singular and with imperative forms. The two scenes differ in their narrative structure. Verses 23–24 are wholly structured by a conditional clause. The protasis with ἔάν + present subjunctive (ἐάν ... προσφέρῃς ... κάκει μνησθῆς ...) is continued in the apodosis in imperative forms (ἄφες ... ὕπαγε πρῶτον διαλλάγηθι ... καὶ τότε ἔλθων πρόσφερε ...). So a possible situation is narrated, and a command is given about how to act in this case. The hearers or readers have to change their priorities: Leave your gift ... and go, be reconciled first ..., and then offer your gift.” The priority of reconciliation over sacrifice then, is strongly expressed.

The second scene in vv. 25–26 is structured differently. There is no narrative description of the situation at the beginning. Instead, the scene begins with an imperative form (ἴσθι εὐνοῶν τῷ ἀντιδίκῳ σου), and only at the end of the scene does it become clear that the situation is a court trial on financial matters. The structure of the scene is as follows: imperative (with a temporal complement) + negative final clause (μήποτε ...: describing the consequences of disobedience) + concluding announcement (with the opening formula ἀμὴν λέγω σοι).

Despite the different structure of the two scenes, there are several links between them: Both are shaped by the second person singular, and both contain a command regarding reconciliation or “making friends” with one’s brother or opponent. They both illustrate that anger should be replaced by reconciliation. Moreover, the final threatening expression “you will never get out from there ...” (v. 26) may remind the reader of the mention of the γέεννα τοῦ πυρός v. 22c.¹⁷ The scenes are thus also linked with the preceding antithesis.

The final announcement in v. 26 has caused interpreters to understand the whole saying as a parable on the Last Judgment.¹⁸ However, this interpreta-

probably the term has the same meaning as in v. 21, where nothing suggests that it refers only to a local court.

¹⁶ Luz, *Evangelium I*, 253.

¹⁷ See Davies and Allison, *Gospel*, 521.

¹⁸ See, for example, R. Bultmann, *Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition* (2nd ed.; FRLANT 29; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1931), 185, on Luke 12:57–59: “a

tion gives rise to numerous problems. To mention only two of them: If the trial is basically a metaphor for the impending judgment, who is the opponent with whom the hearer or reader has to make friends “on the way”? Is it a human being, who is likely to accuse his fellow man at the Last Judgment?¹⁹ Is the opponent God himself,²⁰ or, if he is the judge, is the accuser another figure, perhaps the devil?²¹ Even if exegetes infer that it is not permissible to allegorize a simple parable,²² the question remains open and provides an argument against the interpretation of the scene as a mere parable of the Parousia. Another problem is even more compelling: Should anyone get out of the fiery hell by repaying his last quarter-penny? If this idea is thought to be impossible, then why does v. 26 speak in such concrete terms? Or is the meaning that the saying should be understood in a real-life, not a parabolic, sense?

B. Interpreting the Scene in Matthew and Luke

The parabolic and eschatological interpretation of Matt 5:25–26 was mainly inspired by the Synoptic parallel in Luke 12:58–59, where the scene on the court trial is embedded in the context of other eschatological parables (Luke 12:35–48) and sayings – for example, on the impending division within houses and families (12:51–53) or discerning the time (12:54–56). For this reason, Joachim Jeremias claimed that the saying is an eschatological parable of the κρίσις (Krisisgleichnis).²³ Of course he observes that Matthew uses the scene

parable developed from an illustrative word”; J. Jeremias, *Die Gleichnisse Jesu* (9th ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1977), 40: “Krisisgleichnis”; Weder, *Rede*, 109.

¹⁹ J. Schniewind, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus* (NTD 2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1936), 61.

²⁰ S. Schulz, *Q – Die Spruchquelle der Evangelisten* (Zurich: Theologischer Verlag, 1972), 423–24.

²¹ E. Klostermann, *Das Lukasevangelium* (2nd ed., HNT 3; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1929), 141.

²² From a rigorously critical viewpoint, this question might be rejected by pointing out that every “pure” parable has only one point of comparison. But such scholarly “orthodoxy” seems inappropriate to many of the parables. See, for example, on recent developments in parable research, K. Erlemann, *Gleichnisauslegung* (UTB 2003; Tübingen/Basel: Francke, 1999).

²³ Jeremias, *Gleichnisse*, 40: “There can be no doubt that Luke is right: we have before us an eschatological parable, a parable of the κρίσις (Krisisgleichnis).” Interestingly, the classification is even adopted by Klaus Berger: see H. D. Preuss and K. Berger, *Bibelkunde des Alten und Neuen Testaments* (UTB 972; Heidelberg/Wiesbaden: Quelle & Mayer, 1980), 2:251 (on Matt 5:25–26). In K. Berger, *Formgeschichte des Neuen Testaments* (Heidelberg: Quelle & Mayer, 1984), 57, Luke 12:57–59 is characterized as “parabolic discourse (Gleichnis-Diskurs).”

as an instruction for everyday life; but in his view, Luke has preserved its original setting, whereas Matthew attests to a shift of emphasis from eschatology to exhortation.²⁴ So he comments on the Matthean version that the motivation of the instruction “sounds dangerously commonplace.”²⁵ This remark reveals that Jeremias’ reconstruction depends largely on his overall picture of the (strongly eschatological) teaching of Jesus and the interpretative (de-eschatologizing) tendencies in Early Christianity. The more eschatological version, then, is likely to be authentic, whereas commonplace instructions are suspected of originating in the de-eschatologizing and moralizing tendencies of the Early Church. And, of course, an eschatological motivation for the advice is theologically legitimate, whereas a piece of advice from everyday life or even a merely casuistic instruction would be less valuable, even “dangerous.”²⁶

The predominant view is disputed by, among others, Joseph Fitzmyer, who criticizes “the tendency of modern commentators to allegorize the would-be parable ... and interpret Jesus’ words in terms of a greater Lucan context.”²⁷ Fitzmyer not only points to the traces of Lucan redaction in Luke 12:58–59; he also states that “the Matthean setting is really more apt” for these verses.²⁸ So he can say that the episode “is a piece of prudential advice, stemming from Jesus, which has lost its specific reference and is best interpreted even here as no more than that.”²⁹

Fitzmyer’s view of the Lucan version is important also for interpreting the scene in Matthew. He can show that the context in Luke does not demand a parabolic understanding. Although some eschatological passages precede the verses (such as the parable 12:35–48 and the sayings 12:49–50, 51–53 and 54–56), their semantic connection with Luke 12:58–59 remains uncertain.³⁰ The preceding verse, Luke 12:57, is likely to be a redactional transition³¹

²⁴ Jeremias, *Gleichnisse*, 40. See also W. D. Davies, *The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963), 384.

²⁵ Jeremias, *Gleichnisse*, 40: “that the motivation of this instruction sounds dangerously commonplace.”

²⁶ See also A. Schlatter, *Der Evangelist Matthäus* (7th ed.; Stuttgart: Calwer, 1982), 174, who considers the prudential interpretation of Matt 5:25f. but infers: “In this version, the saying – because it approaches casuistry – falls below the preceding and following sentences, which do not order details, but command that the whole behavior of the disciples is to be purified from the inside out.”

²⁷ J. A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel according to Luke X–XXIV* (AB 28A; New York: Doubleday, 1985), 1002.

²⁸ J. A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel according to Luke X–XXIV*, 1001.

²⁹ J. A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel according to Luke X–XXIV*, 1002.

³⁰ Fitzmyer even thinks that the topic is “completely unrelated” (*The Gospel according to Luke X–XXIV*, 1001).

³¹ See already Bultmann, *Geschichte*, 95 and 185–86; Schulz, *Q*, 421; J. Jeremias, *Die Sprache des Lukasevangeliums* (KEK Sonderband; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht,

intended to connect vv. 54–56 with vv. 58–59 and to introduce vv. 58–59. In contrast to these verses, which are phrased in the second person singular, in v. 57 the second person plural is used. It is unlikely therefore that v. 57 served as the original introduction to vv. 58–59 in the Lucan tradition.³² Instead, it is more plausible that Luke himself created the link with a specific address to his readers, who are called upon to judge for themselves what τὸ δίκαιον (the right thing) is. Luke himself, then, seems to point to the ethical consequences for his readers as a result of their insight concerning the “time” (v. 56). Does this mean that Luke himself understood the saying in vv. 58–59 in predominantly ethical terms?³³

Regarding the subsequent passage, Luke 13:1–5, we can see that there is also a redactional link in v. 1.³⁴ Verses 1–5 then comment on an incident from history, the murder of certain Galilean pilgrims by Pilate. This incident is interpreted in eschatological terms (see 13:3–5) and conditioned by a short parable on the coming judgment (13:6–9). Both passages are drawn from Luke’s own tradition, not from the Sayings Source, and because Luke 13:1 is a redactional transition shaped by Luke himself, the passage cannot provide a firm basis for the understanding of Luke 12:58–59. At most, we can say that Luke has put the two verses into a context with some eschatological elements. But since Luke 12:57 and 13:1 are redactional transitions, the pre-Lucan meaning of Luke 12:58–59 cannot be discerned from Luke’s context. The context in Luke does not provide a compelling argument to understand Luke 12:58–59 (or Matt 5:25–26) as a parable of the Parousia. The question is, then, whether such an argument can be drawn from the probable pre-Lucan context. Usually, Matt 5:25–26 and Luke 12:58–59 are attributed to the Sayings Source (Q).³⁵ However, due to the remarkable differences between the Lucan and Matthean versions, not all interpreters accept the view

1980), 224; J. Nolland, *Luke 1:1–24:53* (3 vols., WBC 35A–C; Dallas: Word, 1989–1993), 2:714.

³² This is D. L. Bock’s argument, *Luke 9:51–24:53* (BECNT 3B; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker, 1998), 1198. A different view has been put forward by H. Schürmann, “Sprachliche Reminiszenzen an abgeänderte Bestandteile der Redenquelle im Lukas- und Matthäusevangelium,” in idem, *Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen* (Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1968), 111–26, here 116; he is supported by C. P. März, “Lk 12,54b–56 par Mt 16,2b.3 und die Akoluthie der Redenquelle,” *SNTU* 11 (1986): 83–96, here 87.

³³ See F. Bovon, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas. 2. Teilband: Lukas 9,51–14,53* (EKK 3,2; Zurich/Düsseldorf: Benziger and Neukirchen/Vluyt: Neukirchener Verlag, 1996), 361–62.

³⁴ On the redactional elements in v. 1, see Jeremias, *Sprache*, 226–28.

³⁵ See most recently J. M. Robinson, P. Hoffmann, and J. S. Kloppenborg, eds., *The Critical Edition of Q* (Leuven: Peeters, 2000), 394–99; P. Sellew “Reconstruction of Q 12:33–59,” in *Society of Biblical Literature, Seminar Papers* (vol. 26; Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1987), 645–68, here 661–62. On the discussion in detail, see J. M. Robinson, S. Carruth, and A. Garsky, eds., *Q 12:49–59* (Documenta Q; Leuven: Peeters, 1997).

that the two parallel passages both depend on Q. Most recently, two commentators, François Bovon and Darrell L. Bock, have suggested that only the passage in Matthew comes from the Sayings Source, whereas the Lucan version was transmitted by Luke's own tradition (Sondergut).³⁶

It is not the purpose of this paper to enter into the complicated discussion on the shape and development of the Sayings Source. For the present purpose, I would like to presuppose that the source existed, possibly in two different versions (Q^{Lk} and Q^{Mt}). Even though we can never preclude that the influence of other written or oral traditions could have shaped one or the other version, we can take the Q-hypothesis as a starting hypothesis and then see how far we get with these assumptions.

The first problem, however, is the text sequence in Q. Most interpreters assume that Luke has largely maintained the text sequence he found in his sources.³⁷ Only such a presupposition can provide a basis for reconstructing the text sequence in Q. However, there can be no certainty in such assumptions, since there are also passages for which scholars have suggested that Matthew might have maintained the Q order more adequately than Luke.³⁸ Most of the interpreters who accept that Luke 12:58–59 comes from the Sayings Source assume that Luke 12:49–59 draws on a text sequence in the source (then called Q 12:49–59).³⁹ But questions remain regarding the verses not paralleled in Matthew (Luke 12:50, 52, 57) and the text sequence. If Luke 12:57 is a redactional link inserted by Luke to introduce the traditional vv. 58–59, we cannot ascertain how the episode on the court trial was connected with the sayings on knowing the time in pre-Lucan tradition. Was the “bridge” between vv. 54–56 and vv. 58–59 formed by a slightly different transition,⁴⁰ or was there no transition at all? Or were vv. 58–59 taken from

³⁶ See Bovon, *Evangelium*, 348; Bock, *Luke*, 1190 and 1198–99. According to Bock, not only vv. 58–59 come from Luke's tradition but also v. 57.

³⁷ See J. M. Robinson, “The Sequence of Q: The Lament over Jerusalem,” in *Von Jesus zum Christus: Christologische Studien. Festgabe für Paul Hoffmann zum 65. Geburtstag* (ed. R. Hoppe and U. Busse; BZNW 93; Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 1998), 225–60, here 226.

³⁸ Robinson, “The Sequence of Q,” 227–32.

³⁹ See Robinson, Hoffmann, and Kloppenborg, *Edition*, 376–99; or, for example, C.-P. März, “Feuer auf die Erde zu werfen, bin ich gekommen ... Zum Verständnis und zur Entstehung von Lk 12,49,” in *A cause de l'Évangile. Études sur les Synoptiques et les Actes offertes au J. Dupont* (LeDiv 123; Paris: Cerf, 1985), 479–511, esp. 500; A. Kirk, *The Composition of the Sayings Source: Genre, Synchrony, and Wisdom Redaction in Q* (NT.S 91; Leiden, Boston, and Cologne: Brill, 1998), 23 8–41.

⁴⁰ For an attempt to interpret Luke 12:54–59 as a coherent unit within the Sayings Source, see H. Schürmann, “Sprachliche Reminiszenzen,” 116f.; he wants to reconstruct an original connection between διακρίνειν (in Luke 12:54–56*; cf. Matt 16:3) and κρίνειν (in Luke 12:57). But for this argument, he has to assume that Luke changed from διακρίνειν to δοκιμάζειν. So the reconstruction remains quite implausible.

another context in the Sayings Source,⁴¹ or even – as is sometimes assumed – from another source? These problems cannot be discussed here, but the questions show how uncertain are all the considerations regarding the text sequence and shape, not to mention the development and redactional history of the Sayings Source.⁴² For the present purpose, it must suffice to state that even the context in Q cannot provide a compelling argument for assuming that Luke 12:58–59 originally was an eschatological parable. Rather, the Lucan introduction in Luke 12:57 might have caused exegetes to understand the scene as a parable of the impending κρίσις or the Parousia.⁴³

C. The Original Form: A Prudential Advice, Not a Parable

In view of the above mentioned problems, it might be almost impossible to reconstruct an original text from the two preserved versions.⁴⁴ Of course, such an enterprise could provide only a hypothetical “virtual” text. Even so, a comparison of the versions may help us glean some information on the structure and function of the text in the earlier tradition.

Matt 5:25f.

ἴσθι εὐνοῶν τῷ ἀντιδίκῳ σου ταχὺ,

ἕως ὅτου εἶ μετ’ αὐτοῦ ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ

Luke 12:58f.

ὡς γὰρ ὑπάγεις μετὰ τοῦ ἀντιδίκου σου ἐπ’ ἄρχοντά

ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ δὸς ἐργασίαν ἀπηλλάχθαι ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ,

⁴¹ Interestingly, the International Q Project leaves this possibility open; see Robinson, Hoffmann, and Kloppenborg, *Edition*, 394 n. 1.

⁴² I remain therefore quite skeptical regarding the numerous attempts to determine not only the content and wording of the Sayings Source but also its possible stages of development. They are too hypothetical to allow of firm conclusions.

⁴³ See Luz, *Evangelium 1*, 252.

⁴⁴ H. T. Wrege, *Die Überlieferungsgeschichte der Bergpredigt* (WUNT 9; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1968), 61–64, rejects the reconstruction of a common written source. See also p. 62, where he writes, “I find no traces here of a common, written *Vorlage*”; Furthermore, Wrege says, “the parable ... has, therefore, circulated in two independent versions” (63). See, in addition, Bovon, *Evangelium*, 349; R. Piper, *Wisdom in the Q Tradition* (SNTSMS 61; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 105: “Considerable differences in the formulation, context and function of this logion in Matthew and Luke hinder attempts to gain a clear understanding of its use in the underlying tradition.” Other exegetes have suggested a reconstruction of the text of the Sayings Source. See S. Schulz, *Q*, 258–60; D. Zeller, *Die weisheitlichen Mahnsprüche bei den Synoptikern* (FB 17; Würzburg: Echter, 1983), 64–65; or, finally, the reconstruction proposed by the International Q-Project in Robinson, Hoffmann, and Kloppenborg, *Edition*, 394–99.

μήποτε σε παραδώ ὁ ἀντίδικος τῷ
καὶ κριτῇ καὶ ὁ κριτὴς τῷ ὑπέρητι

καὶ εἰς φυλακὴν βληθήσῃ·

ἀμὴν λέγω σοι.

οὐ μὴ ἐξέλθῃς ἐκεῖθεν.

ἕως ἂν ἀποδώσ τὸν ἔσχατον
κοδράντην.

μήποτε κατασύρη σε πρὸς τὸν κριτὴν
ὁ κριτὴς σε παραδώσει τῷ πράκτορι,

καὶ ὁ πράκτωρ σε βαλεῖ εἰς φυλακὴν.

λέγω σοι.

οὐ μὴ ἐξέλθῃς ἐκεῖθεν.

ἕως καὶ τὸ ἔσχατον λεπτόν ἀποδώσ.

The synopsis shows that there are many differences, not only in the wording but also in the word order or sentence structure. There are more words in common in the second and third part of the scene than at the beginning, where the correspondence is limited to the term ἀντίδικος + pronoun and to the phrase ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ. So only the end of the passage provides any plausibility to the assumption of a written source of the scene,⁴⁵ and we are entitled to ask which alterations might be due to the evangelists.

It is somewhat plausible that Matthew added ἀμὴν in v. 26.⁴⁶ He also seems to have inserted ἂν and dropped the καὶ from the source. Luke might have moved the verb to the end.⁴⁷ Quite interesting is the difference in the coins: In Matthew it is a quadrans (κοδράντη), whereas Luke mentions a λεπτόν, the smallest denomination of all, with a value of half a quadrans (see Mark 12:42). Both coins were common in Palestine at the time of Jesus, and it is difficult to decide which of them might have been mentioned in the earliest version of the text. There are however some arguments for the view that the quadrans is the original and that Luke tried to omit the Latin loan word (as he does in Luke 21:2, par. Mark 12:42) and inserted instead the name of the coin with the very smallest value.⁴⁸

Most interesting are the differences concerning the persons involved in the trial: The ἄρχων, mentioned only by Luke, seems to be a Lucan insertion, since Luke felt the need to tell where the two opponents “on their way to-

⁴⁵ Thus Davies and Allison, *Gospel*, 521 (on the agreement οὐ μὴ ἐξέλθῃς ἐκεῖθεν).

⁴⁶ See Luz, *Evangelium*, 1:252. Cf., however, Davies and Allison, *Gospel*, 520: “Matthew sometimes added ‘amen’ (Mt: 30–1; Mk: 13; Lk: 6) to his sources, Luke has sometimes dropped it from Mark so that we cannot be certain whether or not it was here in Q.” Whether Matthew also inserted the ταχύ in v. 25, as Luz (*Evangelium 1*) suggests, cannot be ascertained.

⁴⁷ See Davies and Allison, *Gospel*, 521.

⁴⁸ See Jeremias, *Sprache*, 225; and Davies and Allison, *Gospel*, 521. Unconvincingly, H. Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGNT; Exeter: Paternoster, 1978), 552, argues that Luke is more likely to be original because the λεπτόν was said to be equivalent to the Jewish *p^erutah* (cf. *m. Qid.* 1:1).

gether” are heading.⁴⁹ And if the ἄρχων and the κριτής are different persons,⁵⁰ the Lucan version entails that the trial concerns two different levels of legal authority. Both versions agree on the terms ἀντίδικος and κριτής. But Luke mentions a πράκτωρ, whereas Matthew uses the word ὑπηρέτης. It was often supposed here that Luke wanted to mention a Roman official instead of a synagogue official, as he was thinking in terms of a Roman court trial.⁵¹ This view may be correct, but it has to be inferred that the term ὑπηρέτης was used not only for an official in Jewish synagogues but also in Hellenistic practice “to describe the court official who executed the sentence imposed by the court.”⁵² So there is no reason to conjecture that the original version must have mentioned a synagogue official. Rather, the difference between the two terms lies in the precise function of the official: A πράκτωρ was the bailiff who dealt with debts and was in charge of the debtors’ prison. So Luke’s version is not the result of a higher degree of Hellenization; Luke merely chose a more specific term.⁵³

On the beginning of the scene, we can only speculate. Some authors think that δὸς ἐργασίαν is a Lucan term.⁵⁴ It is hardly possible to decide whether ἀπηλλάθαι or εὐνοῦν was the original; but on the whole, it seems more likely that Matthew has preserved the original structure, with an imperative at the beginning, which Luke had to adjust to his context – or at least to his introduction in v. 57.⁵⁵ So we can cautiously assume that the word order and in some parts also the wording of the scene are retained more originally in

⁴⁹ See Bovon, *Evangelium*, 362; Schulz, *Q*, 421–22. And see already A. v. Harnack, *Sprüche und Reden Jesu, Beiträge zur Einleitung in das Neue Testament 2* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1907), 43.

⁵⁰ Many exegetes thought that the “magistrate” and the “judge” should be interpreted as being the same person. See B. Weiss, *Die Evangelien des Markus und Lukas* (KEK; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1901), 501; Bovon, *Evangelium*, 363. Cf., however, J. D. M. Derrett, *Law in the New Testament* (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1970), 183. But if Derrett thinks that the κριτής must be God, he comes to a quite problematic understanding of the passage: see J. D. M. Derrett, *Law in the New Testament*, 182–82 and 186, where he refers to G. B. Caird, “The Defendant (Matthew 5,25f.; Luke 12,58f.),” *ExpT* 77 (1966), 36–39.

⁵¹ See Jeremias, *Gleichnisse*, 39 n. 3.

⁵² Thus Marshall, *Luke*, 551. See also K. H. Rengstorf, “ὑπερέτης κτλ.,” in *TWNT* 8:530–44, here 540.

⁵³ See Nolland, *Luke*, 714; Bock, *Luke*, 1199. And see already Harnack, *Sprüche*, 43.

⁵⁴ See Jeremias, *Sprache*, 225; Marshall, *Luke*, 551. ἐργασία is used in Acts 16:16, 19; 19:24–25. δίδωμι ἐργασίαν is a Latinism that had become quite common: see Bovon, *Evangelium*, 363. The origin of the phrase in the tradition is defended by D. Zeller, *Mahnsprüche*, 64.

⁵⁵ By inserting γὰρ and changing the word order, Luke seems to have linked the tradition with his redactional transition, v. 57.

Matthew.⁵⁶ If this is correct, it is an additional argument for the view that the interpretation was not guided by the Lucan version or its Lucan context.

Consequently, it is more appropriate to read the scene not as a parable but as a prudential or sapiential admonition.⁵⁷ This is true for the Lucan version⁵⁸ and – even more so – for the passage in the context of the Sermon on the Mount,⁵⁹ with the imperative at its beginning (ἴσθι εὐμοῶν). The addressee is admonished, and a negative final clause describes the impending consequences if he does not act according to the advice. All the material, including the threat at the end, is taken from the world of justice and finance.

D. The Sapiential Background: Advice on Loans and Surety

The sapiential interpretation of the saying is confirmed by comparison with other kinds of sapiential advice on financial matters from Palestinian Judaism.

I. *Proverbs*

One of the most important passages is Prov 6:1–5, a fundamental warning against standing surety for someone.⁶⁰ Shaking hands on a guarantee is an incautious act (see Prov 17:18). It is equated with losing one's liberty (Prov 6:2), and the danger is that the surety may also lose his own living, home or bed (Prov 22:27). So if one has accepted to stand surety for someone, there is only one urgent course of action: to try to get free by beseeching the debtor to pay his debts. Only thus can the surety also be saved from the claims of the creditor and from the danger of falling into poverty together with his fellow.

⁵⁶ See Schulz, *Q*, 421. A possible reconstruction of the traditional wording according to the argument above is: ἴσθι ἐνοῶν (or ἀπαλλάγηθι) τῷ ἀντιδίῳ σου ταχὺ, ἕως ὅτου εἶ μετ'αὐτοῦ ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ, μήποτε σε παραδῶ ὁ ἀντίδικος τῷ κριτῇ καὶ ὁ κριτῆς τῷ ὑπηρέτῃ καὶ εἰς φυλακὴν βληθήσῃ· λέγω σοι, οὐ μὴ ἐξέλθῃς ἐκεῖθεν, ἕως καὶ ἀποδώσῃ τὸν ἔσχατον κοδράντην. However, this is only a “virtual” text, there remain numerous uncertainties. See for example, the different reconstruction of the International Q Project in Robinson, Hoffmann, and Kloppenborg, *Edition*, 394–99, with the footnotes that mention the doubts about the decisions made.

⁵⁷ Thus Luz, *Evangelium*, 1:252. See also Zeller, *Mahnsprüche*, 64–67; Piper, *Wisdom*, 106; H. v. Lips, *Weisheitliche Traditionen im Neuen Testament* (WMANT 64; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1990), 212. It is remarkable that the monograph by M. Ebner, *Jesus – ein Weisheitslehrer?* (HBS 15; Freiburg: Herder, 1998) does not discuss the passage.

⁵⁸ See Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 1003: “[it] is best interpreted even here as no more than that.”

⁵⁹ See Betz, *Sermon*, 227 n. 234.

⁶⁰ Other passages within Proverbs share this tendency. See Prov 11:15, 17:18, 20:16, 22:26f., 27:13.

This kind of advice seems to be given from the perspective of the poor. For them, standing surety means taking a risk that should be avoided at all costs.

II. *Ben Sira*

A quite different view is taken in the work of Ben Sira. From his perception of contemporary society,⁶¹ it is a good thing to enjoy one's goods (Sir 14:11) and to use these goods to help one's friends (14:13). So lending (Sir 29:1) and standing surety (Sir 29:14) are acts of virtue, even if the risks are seen realistically (Sir 19:18):⁶²

Going surety has ruined many prosperous people
and tossed them about like the surging sea,
Has exiled the prominent
and sent them wandering through foreign lands.

Ben Sira is well informed about how many debtors did not pay their debts on time and kept their creditors waiting (29:5),⁶³ thus causing hostility between the creditors and themselves (29:6). However, from the perspective of a wealthy man he can give this advice: "Go surety for your neighbor according to your means, but take care lest you fall thereby" (29:20).⁶⁴ For a wise man it is better to give away his money to help others, before the money gets rusty or is divided by lot among the heirs (14:15).

A debtor, for his part, is advised to return the loan in due time (29:2). But interestingly, the reason given for this advice is not that the debtor will thereby win back his freedom; it is only an appeal to decency. Repaying one's debts is a social duty and a matter of gratitude to the creditor who earlier offered his help. Only sinners do not act accordingly: "The wicked turns the favor of a pledge into disaster, and the ungrateful schemer abandons his protector" (29:16f.).⁶⁵

But even if Ben Sira usually adopts the viewpoint of the better off, he also knows the moral dangers of financial affairs, which have brought many people into sin (27:1). Occasionally, he will also take the perspective of the powerless. In 8:1–2, he recommends not quarreling with the great or the rich. Similarly, he advises not lending to a person who is more powerful than oneself (8:12); and if this has happened, one should consider the loan as lost. The

⁶¹ See O. Wischmeyer, *Die Kultur des Buches Jesus Sirach* (BZNW 77; Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 1995), 49–69.

⁶² ET according to P. Skehan and A. A. di Lella, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira* (AB 39; New York: Doubleday, 1987), 369.

⁶³ Sir 29:4ff. enumerates the various tricks by which a debtor tries to win time or escape the duty to repay the loan.

⁶⁴ ET according to Skehan and di Lella, *Ben Sira*, 369.

⁶⁵ Skehan and di Lella, *Ben Sira*, 369.

problem is, obviously, that a weak or poor person has “no way of effectively ensuring repayment.”⁶⁶

III. *1Q/4QInstruction*

Additional pieces of advice on financial matters are now provided by the sapiential texts from the Qumran library.⁶⁷ Most of these documents can be classified as “non-sectarian” or “non-Essene” documents.⁶⁸ This is especially true for the most extensive and important document previously known as 4QSapiential Work A,⁶⁹ or *Mūsār l^a-Mēbīn* (“Instruction for the Knowledgeable”) and edited in the DJD series with the short title 1Q/4QInstruction.⁷⁰

It is not necessary to discuss here the details of the introductory material.⁷¹ The sapiential character of the work is clearly shown by the terminological

⁶⁶ Thus Skehan and di Lella, *Ben Sira*, 213. See also G. Sauer, *Jesus Sirach/Ben Sira* (ATD; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000), 97.

⁶⁷ See the edition of the texts in *Qumran Cave 4 XXIV. Sapiential Texts, Part 2: 4Q Instruction (Mūsār l^a-Mēbīn): 4Q415ff.* (ed. J. Strugnell and D. J. Harrington; DJD 34; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999), esp. the general introduction, 1–41; A. Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination: Weisheitliche Urordnung und Prädestination in den Textfunden von Qumran* (STDJ 18; Leiden: Brill, 1995), 45–92; idem, “In Diskussion mit dem Tempel: Zur Auseinandersetzung zwischen Kohelet und weisheitlichen Kreisen am Jerusalemer Tempel,” in *Qohelet in the Context of Wisdom* (ed. A. Schoors; BETL 136; Leuven: Peeters, 1998), 113–59; idem, “Die Weisheitstexte aus Qumran: Eine Einleitung,” in *The Wisdom Texts from Qumran and the Development of Sapiential Thought* (ed. C. Hempel, A. Lange, and H. Lichtenberger; BETL 159; Leuven: Peeters, 2002), 3–30.

⁶⁸ On this distinction, see 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. On the criteria see, most recently, A. Lange, “Kriterien essenischer Texte,” in *Qumran kontrovers* (ed. J. Frey and H. Stegemann; Einblicke 6; Paderborn, 2002), 59–70; C. Hempel, “Kriterien zur Bestimmung ‘essenischer Verfasserschaft’ von Qumrantexten,” in loc. cit., 71–88. On the origin of the sapiential literature from the Qumran library, see already W. L. Lipscomb and J. A. Sanders, “Wisdom at Qumran,” in *Israelite Wisdom: Theological and Literary Essays in Honor of Samuel Terrien* (ed. J. G. Gammie; New York: Scholars Press, 1978), 277–85, here 278: “There are no true wisdom texts among the scrolls of undisputed Essene authorship.” A possible exception could be the document 4Q420–421 (4QWays of Righteousness). On this document, see T. Elgvin, “Wisdom in the Yahad. 4QWays of Righteousness,” *RevQ* 17 (1996): 205–32, here 205f.

⁶⁹ See E. Tov and S. J. Pfann, eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls on Microfiche: Companion Volume* (Leiden: Brill, 1993), 43.

⁷⁰ Thus the edition by J. Strugnell and D. J. Harrington, in *Sapiential Texts, Part 2*.

⁷¹ See the general introduction by Strugnell and Harrington in *Sapiential Texts, Part 2*, 1–40; and, most recently, A. Lange, “Die Weisheitstexte aus Qumran.” See also the most recent monographs by E. J. C. Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning for the Understanding Ones: Reading and Reconstructing the Fragmentary Early Jewish Sapiential Text*

survey of the editors.⁷² But in spite of the seven or eight manuscripts preserved,⁷³ it has, so far, not been possible to clarify the outline and overall structure of the work⁷⁴ or the history of its literary development.⁷⁵ The suggested dates of composition vary between the late third century and the first half of the second century BCE.⁷⁶ The composition is, then, roughly contemporary with the work of Ben Sira,⁷⁷ and it demonstrates that the sapiential tradition within Palestinian Judaism of the second century BCE was much more pluriform than we could know before the publication of the fragments from the Qumran library.

The composition combines instruction on practical issues, such as family relations and financial matters, with theoretical reflections, its admonitions being presented within a cosmological and eschatological framework.⁷⁸

4QInstruction (STDJ 44; Leiden: Brill, 2001); and M. J. Goff, *The Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom of 4QInstruction* (STDJ 50; Leiden: Brill, 2003).

⁷² Strugnell and Harrington, *Sapiential Texts*, Part 2, 22ff. See also J. Strugnell, "The Sapiential Work 4Q415ff. and pre-Qumranic Works from Qumran: Lexicographic Considerations," in *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: New Texts, Reformulated Issues, and Technological Innovations* (ed. D. W. Parry and E. Ulrich; STDJ 30; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 595–608.

⁷³ 4Q415, 4Q416, 4Q417, 4Q418, 4Q418a, 4Q423 and 1Q26 are certainly copies of this work, whereas the editors put a question mark after the 4Q418c because it is not totally certain that the single fragment now numbered 4Q418c (formerly 4Q418 fr. 161) represents a separate manuscript. See Strugnell and Harrington, *Sapiential Texts*, Part 2, 501.

⁷⁴ "It was loosely structured at best" (J. J. Collins, *Jewish Wisdom in the Hellenistic Age* [OTL; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1997], 118).

⁷⁵ From the material reconstruction of the manuscripts 4Q416, 4Q417 and 4Q418, B. Lucassen and A. Steudel suggest that 4Q416 and 4Q417 represent different stages of redaction: 4Q417 seems to be a copy of an earlier version of the work, whereas 4Q416 represents a later stage of redaction, which is also represented by 4Q418; see the reports by A. Lange, "In Diskussion mit dem Tempel," 127–28; and Strugnell and Harrington, *Sapiential Texts*, Part 2, 18–9. See also the discussion by E. Tigchelaar, "Towards a Reconstruction of the Beginning of 4QInstruction (4Q416 Fragment 1 and Parallels)," in *The Wisdom Texts from Qumran and the Development of Sapiential Thought* (ed. C. Hempel, A. Lange, and H. Lichtenberger; BETL 159; Leuven: Peeters, 2003), 99–126; idem, *To Increase Learning for the Understanding Ones*.

⁷⁶ See Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination*, 47; idem, "In Diskussion mit dem Tempel," 129–30.

⁷⁷ On the comparison with Ben Sira, see Strugnell and Harrington, *Sapiential Texts*, Part 2, 34–35; and D. J. Harrington, "Two Early Jewish Approaches to Wisdom: Sirach and Qumran Sapiential Work A," *JSP* 16 (1997): 25–38; a slightly revised reprint appears in Hempel et al., *The Wisdom Texts*, 263–76.

⁷⁸ See T. Elgvin, "Wisdom, Revelation and Eschatology in an Early Essene Writing," *SBLSP* 34 (1995): 440–63; idem, "Early Essene Eschatology: Judgment and Salvation according to Sapiential Work A," in *Current Research and Technological Developments on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. D. W. Parry and S. D. Ricks; STDJ 20; Leiden: Brill, 1996), 126–65. On the eschatological dualism of the work, see J. Frey, "Different Patterns of

1Q/4QInstruction thus provides evidence of an early merging of sapiential with eschatological or even apocalyptic thought. Usually the person addressed is a (male) junior sage, called **מְבִינ**. Such a “knowledgeable” person receives advice for different situations in life, one area of advice being financial matters, including loans, pledges, and surety.

First of all, some pieces of advice reflect the situation of a person who finds himself in a position of honor, which may also include some wealth. But 4Q416 2 9–12 indicates that the addressee probably comes from a lower social level: his head is lifted up out of poverty, he is raised to splendor and seated with the nobles. So he is advised to consider the origins of the “mystery that is to come”⁷⁹ and to praise God, who glorifies and seek his pleasure continuously.⁸⁰ Prosperity is, then, a gift from God; one should not reject it but “walk in it” and be thankful to God.⁸¹

Most of the instructions, however, reflect a situation of ongoing poverty. Frequently, the addressee is called “poor” (**רָשׁ** or **אֲבִיּוֹן**),⁸² and this term should not be interpreted merely in the sense of the spiritual ideal of poverty and humility. The addressee is even warned: “Do not esteem yourself highly for poverty when you are a pauper, lest you bring into contempt your own life” (4Q416 2 II 20–21). And he is told: “You are needy (**אֲבִיּוֹן אֶתָּה**): Do not say: I am poor, I will not study wisdom” (4Q416 2 III 12–13); his poverty cannot serve as an excuse for laziness or lack of insight. This proves that the poverty mentioned in this document is real: not just a pious ideal. Poverty, obviously, is an element of the social world of this text. In this respect, there is a marked difference between 1Q/4QInstruction and the work of Ben Sira, which is directed much more toward the well-to-do. *Instruction* reflects the severe social discrepancies in the Judean society of later post-exilic times, especially under Hellenistic administration.

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* (STDJ 23; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 275–335, esp. 298–99 (in this volume, 243–299, esp. 264–265); J. J. Collins, “The Mysteries of God: Creation and Eschatology in 4QInstruction and the Wisdom of Solomon,” in *Wisdom and Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Biblical Tradition* (ed. F. García Martínez; BETL 168; Leuven: Peeters, 2003), 287–306.

⁷⁹ This is a very frequent term in 4QInstruction. See Collins, *Jewish Wisdom*, 121–25; A. Lange, “In Diskussion mit dem Tempel,” 134.

⁸⁰ **רְצוֹנוֹ שֶׁחַר תְּמִיד** (4Q416 2 III 12). On **שֶׁחַר רְצוֹנוֹ**, see Prov 11:27. However, **רְצוֹנוֹ** might mean “pleasure,” not “good will” – as it is translated in Strugnell and Harrington, *Sapiential Texts*, Part 2, 113.

⁸¹ 4Q416 2 III 9. See also 4Q416 2 II 3: “And in his poverty thou shalt not make the poor stumble because of it. [Nor] because of[his] shame shalt thou hide thy face ...” (Strugnell and Harrington, *Sapiential Texts*, Part 2, 93).

⁸² See 4Q416 2 III 2, 8, 12, 19 etc. with parallels from 4Q418.

The addressee is admonished to be moderate and self-sufficient, not to seek luxury when there is not enough for subsistence:

Do not sate thyself with food when there is no clothing, and do not drink wine when there is no food. Do not seek after delicacies when thou [*vacat*] lackest (even) bread.⁸³

Here is further proof that there was a real danger of having insufficient food or clothing and being in need of help. In this case, the text encourages borrowing and trusting in God to provide all necessities.⁸⁴ But the dangers of borrowing are also mentioned quite clearly:

[Do not se]ll thyself for a price. It is good to become a servant in the spirit, And to serve thy oppressors freely. But for [no] price [s]ell thy glory, Or pledge money for thy inheritance. Lest it dispossess also thy body....⁸⁵

The passage is difficult to interpret, but the warning clearly points to the danger that a person could lose his inheritance and, consequently, his living and freedom. There is mention of “oppressors” (נוגשים), and the advice is to serve them freely, as a “servant in the spirit” – whatever that might mean. But there is a severe warning not to give away one’s inheritance and personal freedom.

In another passages, the addressee is warned against taking a loan from a stranger:

Moreover, from any man whom thou hast not known take no money, Lest he/it increase thy poverty. And if he put the responsibility of it on thy head, Until death take charge of it.⁸⁶

By taking a loan, the pauper could be deprived of his inheritance, his living and his independence. He might also be reproached or even flogged and hit

⁸³ 4Q416 2 II 18–20 (Strugnell and Harrington, *Sapiential Texts*, Part 2, 93). See also 4Q416 2 III 8: “Thou art needy; do not desire something beyond thy share/inheritance ...” Strugnell and Harrington, *Sapiential Texts*, Part 2, 177), and 4Q417 2 I 17: “And thou, if thou lackest food in thy poverty, ...” (Strugnell and Harrington, *Sapiential Texts*, Part 2, 176).

⁸⁴ If the reconstruction and interpretation of the editors is correct, 4Q417 2 I 19 reads: “And if thou art in poverty, for what thou lackest, borrow without saving any money.” The reading is *לוא תחסר לוא מבלי הון מחסורכה*, the editors read *לוא*, as an imperative *qal* of *לואה*, with a quite unusual spelling, because it fits the theme and language of the subsequent lines (see the commentary on the reading in Strugnell and Harrington, *Sapiential Texts*, Part 2, 187, and the text Strugnell and Harrington, *Sapiential Texts*, Part 2, 173 [translation, 1761]). The subsequent passage is only very fragmentary, but the argument seems to be that God as creator can provide everything that is needed.

⁸⁵ 4Q416 1 II 17–18 (Strugnell and Harrington, *Sapiential Texts*, Part 2, 93). Perhaps something similar is meant some lines earlier (4Q416 2 II 6), where the editors translate: “For no price exchange (?) thy holy spirit, For there is no price equal in value to it” (p. 93). Should this mean that financial problems can lead to sin?

⁸⁶ 4Q416 2 III 5–6 (Strugnell and Harrington, *Sapiential Texts*, Part 2, 112).

with a rod⁸⁷ if he is not able to return the loan on time. So the text urges the addressee to be honest with his creditor and return the due amount as quickly as possible:

If thou borrowest m[e]n's money for thy poverty, Let there be no [sleep for th]ee day or night, and no rest for thy soul, [Until] thou hast restored to [thy] credito[r] his [loan]. Do not lie to him, lest thou shouldst bear guilt (for it)⁸⁸

Immediate repayment is necessary, not only because lying to the creditor who has helped in a desperate situation is unjust and sinful behavior,⁸⁹ but because when the debtor acts dishonestly, the creditor may “close his hand” and refuse to help when help is urgently needed again.⁹⁰ And the strong warning “let there be no sleep for thee day or night ...” can be understood if we see the danger of severe consequences for the debtor. If he is unable to return what he borrowed earlier, he might suffer under the obligation for a long time, perhaps for the rest of his life, or he might be deprived of his inheritance or freedom. Facing such dangers, the debtor is bound to be restless until he has returned his debt. This formula may be inspired by Prov 6:4 (cf. Ps 132:4), but there is also a close parallel in the Sayings of Ahiqar:

Do not take a heavy loan from an evil man. And if you take a loan (at all), give yourself no peace until [you have re]pa[id] it.⁹¹

The same advice is given in the event that the addressee has agreed to stand surety for a friend:

As much as [a man's creditor has lent him in money, hastily] pay it back, And thou wilt be on an equal footing with him (i.e. the creditor). If the purse containing thy treasure [thou hast] entrus[ted to thy creditor, On account of thy friends thou hast giv]en away all thy life with it. Hasten and give what is his, And take back [thy] purse⁹²

The reasoning in this analogy is clear: In Hellenistic private law, the surety “rather resembles a joint debtor,” because “it was left to the creditor’s discretion to seize whom of the two he wished.”⁹³ Standing surety, then, was as dangerous as borrowing, and the surety should take care that the creditor gets

⁸⁷ See 4Q417 2 I 24ff. The text is very fragmentary here, so the context cannot be further restored.

⁸⁸ 4Q417 2 I 21–23 (Strugnell and Harrington, *Sapiential Texts*, Part 2, 177).

⁸⁹ Such is the argument in Sir 29:16f.

⁹⁰ 4Q417 2 I 24 (Strugnell and Harrington, *Sapiential Texts*, Part 2, 177)

⁹¹ *Ahiqar* 43, translation according to J. M. Lindenberger, in J. H. Charlesworth, ed., *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (New York: Doubleday, 1985), 2:479–508, here 503. On the parallel with Instruction, see H. Niehr, “Die Weisheit des Achikar und der musar lammebin im Vergleich,” in *The Wisdom Texts*, 173–86, esp. 177.

⁹² 4Q416 1 II 4–6 (Strugnell and Harrington, *Sapiential Texts*, Part 2, 93).

⁹³ H. J. Wolff, “Hellenistic Private Law,” in *The Jewish People in the First Century* (ed. S. Safrai and M. Stern; CRINT I/1; Assen: van Gorcum, 1974), 534–60, here 552.

back his money as quickly as possible so the surety himself will be restored to be “on equal footing with him” – that is, free from obligations and independent again.

As we have seen, the text “gives advice about paying back loans or surety bonds quickly, maintaining integrity in business and in serving others.”⁹⁴ Such advice is “fairly conventional,”⁹⁵ as the parallel from the Book of Ahiqar demonstrates. But 1Q/4QInstruction obviously addresses a social situation in which the economic and financial independence of the addressee is greatly endangered. Herein we can see a remarkable difference from the social perception and perspective of Ben Sira. On the other hand, in contrast with other documents from the second century BCE, such as the Epistle of Enoch (*1 Enoch* 92–106),⁹⁶ the text “expresses no anger against the rich.”⁹⁷ So the perspective of 1Q/4QInstruction on financial affairs differs from the majority of the hitherto known sapiential texts as well as from the apocalyptic traditions. It is clear that our knowledge of the kinds of positions that could be adopted toward economics in early Jewish literature is considerably broadened by the new sapiential texts from the Qumran library.

E. The Social Background: Debt Imprisonment and Debt Slavery

The above survey of advice on financial matters shows that guidance on borrowing, pledging, and surety were an essential part of Palestinian Jewish sapiential tradition. Such advice was necessary for people who shared the experience of their life being often in danger, and that war, famine, or “adversaries” could deprive them of their land, shelter, or inheritance, even of their personal freedom. This was a real possibility for a large part of the population in Hellenistic and Roman Palestine. Such experiences go back to the Persian era, and especially under Hellenistic administration and Hellenistic law, the problems became quite acute.

The situation under Persian rule is described in Nehemiah 5:1–5.⁹⁸ According to this passage, the social gulfs within the society in post-exilic Jehud

⁹⁴ D. J. Harrington, *Wisdom Texts from Qumran* (London/New York: Routledge, 1996), 40.

⁹⁵ Harrington, *Wisdom Texts from Qumran*, 46.

⁹⁶ See, for example, *1 Enoch* 94:8.

⁹⁷ Collins, *Jewish Wisdom*, 119.

⁹⁸ On this passage, see M. Hengel, *Judentum und Hellenismus* (3rd ed.; WUNT 10; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1988), 94–97; H.-G. Kippenberg, *Religion und Klassenbildung im antiken Judäa. Eine religionssoziologische Studie zum Verhältnis von Tradition und gesellschaftlicher Entwicklung* (2nd ed., SUNT 14; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978), 55–62; R. Albertz, *Religionsgeschichte Israels in alttestamentlicher Zeit* (GAT 8, 2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1992), 2:538–39.

must have been severe. People had to mortgage their fields to acquire funds to pay the king's tax.⁹⁹ Others had to place their children in bondage or even sell them into slavery to obtain grain during a period of famine. Moreover, the creditors were themselves Judeans who caused their own brethren to be bonded into slavery (Neh 5:7–8). A chasm thus opened up within Judean society.¹⁰⁰ The same incremental stages of poverty are also presupposed in the law of holiness in Lev 25, which shows that an Israelite might sell his land or house (vv. 26, 29, 31) or incur a debt with the obligation to pay interest (vv. 35–37). He could also be claimed as a pledge and possibly be sold to an Israelite (v. 39) or even to a foreigner (v. 47). As interest rates were extremely high,¹⁰¹ the danger of a debtor becoming unable to return the loan together with the due interest was very real. Quite frequently creditors had to claim the pledge – not only the land and its fruits but also the debtor's labor or that of his family members. Laws such as Deut 15:2 (the canceling of the debts of every Israelite in the seventh year) and Lev 25:26–28 and 25:35–55 (the redemption of the land and the release of personal obligations in the jubilee year)¹⁰² were intended to protect Israelites – but not foreigners¹⁰³ – from the social consequences of such practices; and regulations such as Neh 5:6–13 and 10:31–32 represent attempts to root them out. How effective these numerous attempts were, however, remains doubtful. There is no evidence that the Jubilee program described in Lev 25 was ever put into practice.¹⁰⁴ And in the event of an Israelite being unable to obtain a loan from his countrymen, he would have had to resort to foreigners, who were not obliged to adhere to such an ideal. Joel 4:6 attests that in late Persian times Judeans and Jerusalemites were indeed sold into slavery by Phoenician traders.¹⁰⁵

⁹⁹ Persian tax policy mandated that taxes had to be paid not in kind but in cash (see Herodotus, *Hist.* 3.89). So the peasants had to produce not only what they needed for subsistence but also a surplus that could be sold for money. It can be assumed that such a change in the economic structure caused severe problems, especially when the harvest was bad or when the labor potential of a family was reduced by illness or by being required elsewhere – for example, in Nehemiah's wall project. See Albertz, *Religionsgeschichte*, 539.

¹⁰⁰ See Kippenberg, *Religion*, 59–62.

¹⁰¹ A document from Elephantine (Papyrus Cowley 10) mentions an interest rate of 60 percent. See A. E. Cowley, *Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century BC* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1923), 30. See also H. G. Kippenberg, *Religion*, 58.

¹⁰² On the laws of the Jubilee and their social intentions, see E. Otto, *Theologische Ethik des Alten Testaments* (Theologische Wissenschaft 3,2; Stuttgart, Berlin, and Cologne: Kohlhammer, 1994), 249–56.

¹⁰³ See Deut 15:3; Lev 25:44–46. See also Otto, *Ethik*, 256.

¹⁰⁴ See Otto, *Ethik*, 255: “The OT does not indicate whether the Jubilee Year program had been implemented. ...It probably remained a program.”

¹⁰⁵ On the date of the passage, see H.-W. Wolff, *Dodekapropheten 2: Joel und Amos* (BK 14,2, 2nd ed.; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1975), 93–94.

With the beginning of Hellenistic rule, the economic situation of the majority of Judeans became even worse. Under the rule of the Ptolemes, the administrative system of Ptolemaic Egypt was transferred to the royal province known as Syria and Phoenicia,¹⁰⁶ and the tributes exacted by the new rulers seem to have been much higher than those under Persian rule. In the Hellenistic period, the gap between the small upper class and the rest of the population widened considerably. This was due not only to the intensified trading possibilities but also to the indigenous aristocracy becoming integrated into the system of tax collection.¹⁰⁷ In certain districts tax collection was leased to private individuals who assumed both the risks and the benefits of the enterprise. So their interest was to collect the due amounts rigorously and to obtain their own surplus. The system introduced by the Ptolemes seems to have remained almost unchanged under the Seleucids and also under the Romans.¹⁰⁸ It was developed further under Herod and then remained basically untouched until the end of the first century CE.¹⁰⁹ As a consequence, a relatively small number of families were able to increase their wealth and derive profit from their various economic connections, whereas the majority of the population suffered severe economic hardship and indebtedness.

Debts, pledges, and surety were thus a severe problem in first century Palestine, and the Jesus tradition “shows an intimate acquaintance and concern with debt in the first half of the first-century CE.”¹¹⁰ This concern is confirmed by various passages from the Sayings Source, not only the passage

¹⁰⁶ See M. Hengel, *Judentum und Hellenismus*, 39; and see, generally, pp. 32–104; idem, *Juden, Griechen und Barbaren* (SBS 76; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1975), 35–63; idem, “The Political and Social History of Palestine from Alexander to Antiochus III (333–187 BCE),” in *The Cambridge History of Judaism* (W. D. Davies and L. Finkelstein; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 2:35–78.

¹⁰⁷ On the tax collecting system in Palestine, see F. Herrenbrück, *Jesus und die Zöllner* (WUNT II/41; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1990), 162–227.

¹⁰⁸ The precise character of the tax system under Hasmonean rule remains unclear due to the lack of sources (see Herrenbrück, *Jesus und die Zöllner*, 183f.). However, it is quite possible that they changed only some of the taxes but retained the general system of tax collection: “We know very little about the system of taxation which the Hasmoneans created, but it is very likely that they did not change the system adopted by the Seleucids and that Pompeius adopted the same system from them” (M. I. Rostoftzeff, *Gesellschafts- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte der hellenistischen Welt* [3 vols.; Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft 1955], 2:792).

¹⁰⁹ See Herrenbrück, *Jesus und die Zöllner*, 188–89.

¹¹⁰ D. E. Oakman, “The Lord’s Prayer in Social Perspective,” in *Authenticating the Words of Jesus* (ed. B. Chilton and C. A. Evans; NTT 28,1; Leiden, Boston and Cologne: Brill, 1999), 137–86, here 164. See also idem, “Jesus and Agrarian Palestine: The Factor of Debt,” in *Society of Biblical Literature 1985 Seminar Papers* (ed. K. H. Richards; SBLSP 24; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985); idem, *Jesus and the Economic Questions of His Day* (SBEC 8; Lewiston, NY/ Queenston, ONT: Edwin Meilen 1986), 72–77.

discussed here but also the story of the unforgiving servant (Matt 18:23–35), the parable of the two debtors (Luke 7:41–42), the episode of the widow’s coin (Mark 12:41–44), and especially the two parables of the talents (Luke 19:12–27, par. Matt 25:14–30) and of the unjust steward (Luke 16:1–8). The relevance of the debt problem is confirmed also by Josephus, who recorded that in the Jewish War the *sicarii* burned down the communal archive in order to destroy the debt records and thereby gain support of the poor.¹¹¹ Matt 5:25–26 and Luke 12:58–59 provide an insight into how debts could be recovered if the creditor was unwilling or unable to pay his taxes or to return the debts he had incurred. It is often inferred here that imprisonment for debt was not a part of traditional Jewish law.¹¹² On the other hand, it was an element of the Greek¹¹³ and Roman¹¹⁴ legal systems, and its use is documented in papyri and inscriptions from Greco-Roman Egypt.¹¹⁵ From the beginning of the Ptolemean era, Hellenistic private law could also be practiced in Palestine, especially if the person involved was a Greek or a person in the service of the Hellenistic system. Debt imprisonment thus also became a legal practice in Hellenistic and Roman Palestine.¹¹⁶

This situation might explain the advice in 4QInstruction not to borrow from a foreigner,¹¹⁷ because indebtedness to such a person could have much more severe consequences than borrowing from a relative or neighbor. Notwithstanding the Jewish religious traditions, a defaulting debtor (or even his relatives) could be imprisoned until the debt was paid. Such imprisonment was primarily a means to apply pressure on the family of a debtor until they

¹¹¹ Josephus, *J.W.* II 425–29. See J. Pastor, *Land and Economy in Ancient Palestine* (London: Routledge, 1997), 157–58; M. Hengel, *Die Zeloten* (2nd ed.; AGJU 1; Leiden and Cologne: Brill, 1976), 368–69. A similar incident from Antioch is also recounted by Josephus. There, some people who were in debt “burned the market-place and the public records, hoping to rid themselves of obligations” (Josephus, *J.W.* VI 60–61). See also Pastor, *Land and Economy in Ancient Palestine*, 158.

¹¹² See Jeremias, *Gleichnisse*, 179; Luz, *Evangelium*, 1:260; Gnllka, *Matthäusevangelium*, 157; M. Reiser, *Die Gerichtspredigt Jesu* (ATANT 23; Münster: Aschendorff, 1990), 264.

¹¹³ See S. Arbandt, W. Macheiner, and C. Colpe, “Gefangenschaft,” *RAC* 9:318–45, here 327f., 335f. See also Kippenberg, *Religion*, 141–42.

¹¹⁴ On the issue in Roman law, see T. Mommsen, *Römisches Strafrecht* (reprint Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1961), 906 with n. 2 and 960 with n. 2.

¹¹⁵ See A. Deissman, *Licht vom Osten* (4th ed.; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1923), 229–31; H. Lewald, *Zur Personalexekution im Recht der Papyri* (Leipzig: Veit, 1910).

¹¹⁶ On the practice of debt imprisonment, see R. Sugranyes de Franch, *Études sur le droit palestinien à l’époque évangélique: La contrainte par corps* (Fribourg: Librairie de l’Université, 1946), 114–15.

¹¹⁷ 4Q416 2 III 5–6 (see above, n. 86).

became willing to pay back the loan.¹¹⁸ Debtors were usually kept in a public prison,¹¹⁹ which means that public courts were in charge of guaranteeing the execution of private contracts.

It is more than plausible, then, that the practice of imprisonment for debt was well known to Palestinian Jews from the time of Jesus and that this practice is also presupposed in Matt 5:25–26, par Luke 12:58–59¹²⁰ and, similarly, in Matt 18:30. Douglas E. Oakman plausibly suggests that the episode most likely “refers to the courts within the jurisdiction of Herod Antipas.”¹²¹

F. The Meaning of Matt 5:25–26

Against this background, the sapiential advice on financial matters in Matt 5:25–26 and Luke 12:58–59 is quite clear; the passages require no metaphorical interpretation or reading as a parable of the coming eschatological judgment.¹²²

The addressee is in a situation of owing a sum of money to another (characterized as his opponent), either as a debtor himself or as a surety for someone else. The opponent, called ἀντίδικος, the creditor, has the legal right to summon him to court in order to recover the amount owing. It is presupposed that the legal position of the debtor is almost hopeless. He cannot stand “on equal footing” with his creditor. The most likely consequence of a court trial is that the debtor will be imprisoned, and he is likely to remain in prison until the loan has been fully repaid, either by the debtor himself or by someone else. Simple prudence suggests avoiding such a trial and resolving the problem quickly, either by paying the amount due or by reaching a settlement out of court.

I cannot see that the text envisages remission as a real possibility. Remission is possible only if the whole matter of obligations is understood as a metaphor for sins. In a real-life setting, the only realistic option seems to be to arrange for deferment of repayment. Every effort should be made to reach an agreement and avoid a court trial with its foreseeable consequences. In Matthew, the adverb ταχὺ (sometimes interpreted as alluding to the impending

¹¹⁸ A similar situation is narrated by Josephus (*J.W.* II 273) concerning the administration of Albinus.

¹¹⁹ M. Kaser, *Das römische Zivilprozessrecht* (HAW 10,3,4; Munich: Beck, 1966), 407 n. 11. Such a public prison might also be presupposed in Josephus’ note on Albinus, who set free all those who had been imprisoned “because of robbery” if their relatives were able to pay ransom for them (Josephus, *J.W.* II 273; see also Kippenberg, *Religion*, 142).

¹²⁰ This was already noted by Deissman, *Licht vom Osten*, 229.

¹²¹ Oakman, “The Lord’s Prayer,” 168.

¹²² In contrast, Matt 18:23–35 is explicitly presented as a parable of the kingdom of God.

ing divine judgment) is best understood from the internal logic of the situation. As in Prov 6:4 or in 4QInstruction, there can be no rest for the debtor until he is relieved of the obligation.

The sapiential advice to reach out-of-court settlement is also consistent with the position regarding pagan courts that was held in Diaspora Judaism¹²³ and in Early Christianity.¹²⁴ However, in the passage under discussion, whether the judge is a pagan judge is a moot point and is, in any case, irrelevant. The only point is that the debtor will have no chance to avoid imprisonment.

The idea of repaying debts can, of course, be interpreted metaphorically,¹²⁵ but in the present context there is no compelling reason for an interpretation whereby the reader should pray to God as the real judge who will finally deliver him from his human opponents;¹²⁶ nor is there any reason to see “the way” as a metaphor for the human life that will eventually lead to the throne of God, the judge. All these interpretations go beyond the given text.

In Luke, the advice is embedded in the introduction (v. 57), which urges the addressee to make a just decision and do that which has to be done. The verse thus takes on a metaphorical sense, illustrating the urgency of the decision demanded by the Gospel. In Matthew, the saying is used to demonstrate the urgent need for reconciliation. But basically it is a piece of “prudential advice ... which has lost its specific reference, and is best interpreted ... as no more than that.”¹²⁷

Whether such a saying was originally uttered by Jesus¹²⁸ or not is hard to decide. Of course, if the passage is understood as simply a piece of “prudential advice,” it is difficult to see how it relates to the central themes of Jesus’ preaching. But since we cannot assume that Jesus uttered only parables or eschatological sayings, there is no compelling reason to deny that a simple piece of advice of a sapiential nature could also be an authentic saying.

¹²³ On the Jews of Sardes, see Josephus, *Ant.* XIV 235; for rabbinic Judaism, the Baraita of R. Tarphon (*b. Gitt.* 88b). See also E. Schürer, G. Vermes, and F. Millar, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ* (rev. ed.; 4 vols.; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1973–87), 2:208–9; B. Cohen, “Arbitration in Jewish and Roman Law,” *RIDC* 5 (1958): 165–222.

¹²⁴ See 1 Cor 6:1ff.

¹²⁵ This is mentioned by Betz, *Sermon*, 229.

¹²⁶ Thus Derrett, *Law*, 183.

¹²⁷ Thus Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 1002.

¹²⁸ As claimed by Fitzmyer, *Luke*, loc. cit.

G. Conclusion

In closing, I would like to point to the importance of the Dead Sea Scrolls for the interpretation of this short pericope. Matt 5:25–26 does not allude to any specific item of the Qumran texts or even to the Qumran community. The sapiential work discussed here is one of the non-sectarian documents from the Qumran library. But these documents are perhaps even more important than the sectarian texts, because they allow a much more detailed view of the traditions within Judaism in the two or three centuries BCE. In our case, the sapiential instruction entails a considerable change of our view of wisdom traditions in Palestinian Judaism. It provides evidence of a kind of wisdom that is quite different from that in Ben Sira. Moreover, this kind of wisdom seems to relate more closely to the lower strata of Palestinian society and might therefore provide more parallels to the traditions current in the early Jesus movement. In taking the perspective of the poor, this kind of wisdom tradition provides important parallels to the Synoptic texts dealing with the problem of debts and pledges.

It is obvious that any “companion to the New Testament from Jewish sources” today must include texts from the Qumran library, insofar as they provide real parallels to New Testament texts. For the passage Matt 5:25–26, the texts quoted from Ahiqar, Ben Sira and 4QInstruction provide much closer parallels than most of the rabbinic passages quoted by Billerbeck.¹²⁹ They should indeed be included in the series of parallels given in a “new Billerbeck,” if such a collection should ever be compiled.

¹²⁹ Billerbeck, *Kommentar*, 1:288–94.

20. Paul's View of the Spirit in the Light of Qumran¹

A. Preliminaries: "Paul and Qumran" and Changes in Scholarship

"Paul and Qumran" has been a classical topic of scholarship from the earliest years after the discovery of the first Qumran Scrolls.² We can silently pass over the more questionable speculative ideas, e.g., the view that Paul the apostle had his "conversion" not near Damascus but actually at Qumran³ or that he might be alluded to in one of the figures mentioned in the Qumran texts, such as the "wicked priest" or the "man of lie."⁴ Unlike such daring

¹ The present paper is part of a larger project "The Historical Origins of the Holy Spirit," launched by myself together with Prof. John R. Levison (Seattle Pacific University) and jointly funded by the German Alexander-von-Humboldt Foundation and the American International Catacomb Society (cf. the website of the pneumatology project: <http://www.christianpneumatology.com/index.html>). In this project, a team of specialists from different fields explores the historical origins of the early Christian notion of the Spirit by evaluating different, early Jewish and Greco-Roman textual corpora, in particular the Dead Sea Scrolls, Jewish mystical traditions, Hellenistic Judaism, Greco-Roman divination, Greco-Roman philosophy, and Ancient Medical Texts. The publication of the papers from a conference held in Leiden, Sept. 1–3, 2011, has been published in the series "Ekstasis" with de Gruyter publishers (J. Frey and J. R. Levison, eds., *The Holy Spirit, Inspiration, and the Cultures of Ancient Antiquity* [Berlin: de Gruyter, 2014]). This interdisciplinary project demonstrates that only such a broad and multi-perspective inquiry can put together all the relevant aspects for an appropriate historical understanding of the early Christian notion of the Spirit. The Scrolls are only one part of that multi-dimensional web, albeit an important one. This should be kept in mind whenever we analyze Qumran texts with regard to the New Testament. I am deeply indebted to my colleague Jean-Sebastien Rey for the invitation to participate in and even co-organize the symposium at the University of Metz and also for the continuing dialogue on the relevance of Qumran for the understanding of New Testament texts. I am also grateful to John R. Levison for reading my article and for numerous suggestions.

² The compendium by H. Braun, *Qumran und das Neue Testament* (2 vols.; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1966), gives a concise summary of the early discussion. An important collective volume of the early period is J. Murphy-O'Connor, ed., *Paul and Qumran: Studies in New Testament Exegesis* (Chicago: Priory, 1968).

³ Thus even recently the Jewish author P. Lapide, *Paulus zwischen Damaskus und Qumran. Fehldeutungen und Übersetzungsfehler* (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1993) based on a widespread misinterpretation of the "new covenant in the land of Damascus" mentioned in the Damascus Document as background of Acts 9:2.

⁴ Thus already in the 1950s J. L. Teicher who considered the Scrolls to be later Jewish-Christian documents, thus interpreting the "wicked priest" as a reference to Paul (cf.

speculations many observations made by scholars of the early period, mostly from a New Testament background,⁵ are still valuable. The predominant fields of comparison were scriptural interpretation; messianism and eschatology; the awareness of sin and justification; and the expression of dualism in examples such as flesh and spirit, light and darkness, God and Belial.⁶ Scholars were fascinated by what they perceived to be remarkable theological depth, e.g., in the *Hodayot*, and so arrived at a very positive view of Qumran piety, or even “theology,” at a time when many New Testament scholars were still strongly influenced by traditional paradigms of contrasting Jewish and early Christian texts and thought.

Methodologically, earlier research was largely occupied with assembling parallels, thus running the risk of what Samuel Sandmel once called “parallelomania.”⁷ The catena with parallels to the whole New Testament assembled from early research by Herbert Braun is still the most comprehensive collection of the insights from the first 15 years after the discovery, but it is, of course, limited to those texts available at that time. In continuation of Braun’s work, it has been the life-long effort of my predecessor in Munich, Heinz-Wolfgang Kuhn, to collect parallels between Qumran and the genuine Pauline epistles from the increasing number of texts published and to evalu-

Braun, *Qumran*, 1:159); cf. recently the constructions of Robert Eisenman, who also considered the Scrolls to be an allegory of early Christian history and identified the “Teacher of Righteousness” with “James the Just,” the brother of Jesus, and, consequently, James’ opponent Paul with the “wicked priest.” Cf. R. H. Eisenman, *Maccabees, Zadokites, Christians and Qumran: A New Hypothesis of Qumran Origins* (StPB 34; Leiden: Brill, 1983); idem, *James the Just in the Habakkuk Peshet* (StPB 35; Leiden: Brill, 1986); idem, “Theory of Judeo-Christian Origins: The Last Column of the Damascus Document,” in *Methods of Investigation of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Khirbet Qumran Site: Present Realities and Future Prospects* (ed. M. O. Wise et al.; New York: Academy of Sciences, 1994), 355–70; idem, *James the Brother of Jesus: The Key to Unlocking the Secrets of Early Christianity and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York: Viking, 1996). These identifications, however, have been thoroughly falsified by the dating of the texts which in the meantime has been confirmed by scientific investigations; these results had to be ignored by scholars who wanted to advocate a late post-Christian setting of the texts.

⁵ It is an interesting fact that the early discussion of Qumran was almost dominated by scholars from a New Testament background. For German-speaking scholarship, I have discussed this in my article: J. Frey, “Qumran Research and Biblical Scholarship in Germany,” in *Qumran Research and Biblical Scholarship: A History of Research* (ed. D. Dimant with the assistance of L. Kottsieper; STDJ 99; Leiden: Brill, 2012), 529–64, here 531–35 (in this volume, 85–119, here 87–91). From other scholarly contexts, mention should be made of W. D. Davies, M. Black, J. A. Fitzmyer, R. E. Brown, and J. H. Charlesworth.

⁶ Cf. the account in Braun, *Qumran*, 2:165–80.

⁷ S. Sandmel, “Parallelomania,” *JBL* 81 (1962), 1–13.

ate them more accurately than others did before.⁸ These parallels, some of which precisely match Pauline expressions (such as δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ, ἔργα νόμου et al.), are a strong reminder that Paul draws intensely on Jewish sources and discussions. And although writing in Greek and adopting paradigms and terms also from his Diaspora context, he cannot be understood correctly apart from the conceptual background in Scripture and interpretation via Palestinian Judaism. It is to a great extent due to the Qumran discoveries that Pauline scholars now increasingly acknowledge that the apostle's language and thought is predominantly shaped by his Jewish background.⁹ In

⁸ The number of lengthy papers discussing parts of the evidence or single topics is impressive, cf. e.g. H.-W. Kuhn, "The Impact of the Qumran Scrolls on the Understanding of Paul," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research* (ed. D. Dimant and U. Rappaport; STDJ 10; Leiden: Brill and Jerusalem: Magness Press and Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi, 1992), 327–39; idem, "Die Bedeutung der Qumrantexte für das Verständnis des Ersten Thessalonicherbriefes," in *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid, 18–21 March 1991* (ed. J. Treballe Barrera and L. Vegas Montaner; STDJ 11.1–2; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 2:339–53; idem, "Die Bedeutung der Qumrantexte für das Verständnis des Galaterbriefes aus dem Münchener Projekt: Qumran und das Neue Testament," in *New Qumran Texts and Studies: Proceedings of the First Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Paris 1992* (ed. G. J. Brooke and F. García Martínez; STDJ 15; Leiden: Brill 1994), 169–221; idem, "A Legal Issue in 1 Corinthians 5 and in Qumran," in *Legal Texts and Legal Issues: Proceedings of the Second Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Published in Honour of J. M. Baumgarten* (ed. M. J. Bernstein, F. García Martínez, and J. Kampen; STDJ 23; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 489–99; idem, "Qumran und Paulus: Unter traditionsgeschichtlichem Aspekt ausgewählte Parallelen," in *Das Urchristentum in seiner literarischen Geschichte* (FS Jürgen Becker; ed. U. Mell and U. B. Müller; BZNW 100; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1999), 227–46; idem, "Qumran Texts and the Historical Jesus: Parallels in Contrast," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Fifty Years after Their Discovery. Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20–25, 1997* (ed. L. H. Schiffman, E. Tov, and J. C. VanderKam; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2000), 573–80; idem, "The Qumran Meal and the Lord's Supper in Paul in the Context of the Graeco-Roman World," in *Paul, Luke and the Graeco-Roman World: Essays in Honour of Alexander J. M. Wedderburn* (ed. A. Christophersen et al.; JSNTSup 217; London and New York: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002), 221–48; idem, "The Impact of Selected Qumran Texts on the Understanding of Pauline Theology," in *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls. The Second Princeton Symposium on Judaism and Christian Origins, Vol. 3: The Scrolls and Christian Origins* (ed. J. H. Charlesworth, Waco: Baylor University Press, 2006), 153–85; idem, "'Gemeinde Gottes' in den Qumrantexten und bei Paulus unter Berücksichtigung des Toraverständnisses," in *Das Gesetz im frühen Judentum und im Neuen Testament* (FS C. Burchard; ed. D. Sänger and M. Konrad; NTOA 57; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2006), 153–69. However, the enormous increase of texts since the 1990s has made the task immense. We can only hope that Kuhn will be able to publish his thorough comparisons on all Pauline epistles, although comprehensiveness is becoming more and more impossible.

⁹ Cf. my discussion in J. Frey, "Paul's Jewish Identity," in *Jewish Identity in the Greco-Roman World. Jüdische Identität in der griechisch-römischen Welt* (ed. J. Frey, D. R.

contrast to the tendency in scholarship of the 1950s and 1960s, which was still shaped by a traditionally Protestant view of the fundamental contrast between law and gospel (as derived from Galatians), Pauline scholarship today can more easily acknowledge that Paul still acted and preached within a Jewish context. Paul's Jewish identity as such is not a major problem any more; the question of how we can determine more precisely his position within the Judaism of his time is more so. Again, the Qumran texts are a major tool for discussing these issues – together with other contemporary Jewish texts from the Palestinian tradition or from the Diaspora.

Scholarship has changed considerably since the early Qumran discoveries, of course, especially in the field of Qumran studies. After periods of initial fascination and others of temporary stagnation,¹⁰ the release of all the previously unknown manuscripts since the 1990s now enables us to draw a new picture on the basis of the full range of the material and also to appreciate the variety of interpretations, genres, and viewpoints within the Scrolls. It is obvious now that the library of Qumran is not merely a collection of sectarian texts but includes a wide variety of writings from the literary production in Palestinian Judaism between the third century BCE and the first century CE. This is of crucial relevance for the methods and patterns of relating the Qumran discoveries to early Christian (and other early Jewish) texts. The task is no longer simply collecting parallels, nor determining literary dependence, but rather contextualizing some writings by means of other texts, putting them in perspective, and reconstructing discourses not only between Jews and Jesus-followers, but rather within a wider Jewish framework from which the early Christian tradition emerged.

Although Paul presumably was never able to read the “sectarian” texts from Qumran, as they were only accessible to the members of the community, he may have come in touch with scriptural interpretations, sapiential traditions, liturgical formulae, and halakic viewpoints as expressed in some of the Scrolls from the Qumran library. Based on this wide variety of texts, we can now better evaluate what was imaginable, debatable, or acceptable in the time of Jesus and his early followers – since we are able to glimpse into the vibrant debates and creative interpretations within Palestinian Judaism of that period.

Schwartz, and S. Gripentrog; AJEC 71; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 285–321, more comprehensively idem, “The Jewishness of Paul,” in *Paul: Life, Setting, Work, Letters* (ed. O. Wischmeyer; London and New York: T&T Clark, 2012), 57–95. See most recently the collection of articles by T. G. Casey and J. Taylor, eds., *Paul's Jewish Matrix* (Bible in Dialogue 2; Rome: Gregorian and Biblical Press, 2011).

¹⁰ On the periods in discussion see J. Frey, “The Impact of the Dead Sea Scrolls on New Testament Interpretation: Proposals, Problems, and Further Perspectives,” in *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 407–61, here 408–19 (in this volume, 527–578, here 529–539).

So, after the release of all the previously unpublished texts, it is time for a fresh discussion of these matters.¹¹ It is also time for an improved and more balanced method of comparison – in contrast to earlier, often one-sided or overstated approaches. This means, we should no longer simply collect parallels and must be very careful in evaluating the parallels and in relating them to others, also from Josephus, Philo, rabbinic traditions, and also from Greco-Roman literature. Questions in the history-of-religions require an interdisciplinary discourse, with specialists of the different textual corpora, and perhaps also from different scholarly contexts and traditions.

For the New Testament scholar whose primary focus is a relatively small book, such a wide perspective is even necessary. As my academic teacher Martin Hengel repeatedly said, "A New Testament scholar who only knows the New Testament, knows nothing about the New Testament."¹² Thus, for my own discipline, it is of crucial importance to take into consideration the insights from Qumran, and especially those that can be gained from the full access to the material.¹³ The benefit is manifold. We can hope to understand better some of Paul's enigmatic texts, in a fresh manner and somewhat detached from traditional and dogmatic paths of interpretation, and we can try to learn from the different scholarly perspectives. We can hope to find some of the ideas that shaped his views and also to meet some of his partners in dialogue, being however aware that other contemporaries exist and await us in Corinth, or Alexandria, or wherever the journey will finally take us.

¹¹ Cf. also the introductory article by F. García Martínez, "Qumran between the Old and the New Testament," in *Echoes from the Caves: Qumran and the New Testament* (ed. F. García Martínez; STDJ 85; Leiden: Brill, 2009), 16.

¹² Cf. M. Hengel, "Aufgaben der neutestamentlichen Wissenschaft," *NTS* 40 (1994): 321–57, here 321; reprinted in idem, *Theologische, historische und biographische Skizzen. Kleine Schriften 7* (ed. C.-J. Thornton; WUNT 253; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 242–78, here 242; see also the abbreviated English version: "Tasks of New Testament Scholarship," *BBR* 6 (1996): 67–86 (67). See also idem, "Eine junge theologische Disziplin in der Krise," in *Theologische, historische und biographische Skizzen*, 279–91 (280–81).

¹³ Some of the insights for Jesus research and Pauline studies are sketched in my programmatic inaugural lecture: J. Frey, "Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und Antikes Judentum: Probleme-Wahrnehmungen-Perspektiven," *ZTK* 109 (2012): 445–71 (in this volume under the English title "New Testament Scholarship and Ancient Judaism: Problems – Perceptions – Perspectives," 19–44).

B. Early Experiences of the Spirit and the Development and Background of Paul's Views

Turning now to the origins of early Christian views of the Spirit,¹⁴ we should be aware that some kind of experience, rather than theology, was at the origin of the early Christian notion of “the Spirit,” whereas concepts, taken from the Scriptures, from early Jewish and – somewhat later – also Hellenistic Jewish and Greco-Roman thought were used to describe and to understand these experiences.¹⁵

I. The Earliest Jesus Movement

The first early Christian author to develop a theology of the Holy Spirit, however, is Paul. Earlier experiences of the spirit are mirrored in some early post-Easter confessions and partly reported in Acts, although it is often difficult to distinguish them from the later viewpoint of Luke. Apparently, the earliest followers of Jesus shared the view that the spirit which had empowered the earthly Jesus to act and preach (cf. Isa 61:1f.), had now been given to

¹⁴ For the following passages, cf. my more extensive discussion of the material in in *Der Heilige Geist* (Jahrbuch für Biblische Theologie 24 [2009]; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2011), 121–54, here; see also idem, “How did the Spirit become a Person?,” in *The Holy Spirit, Inspiration, and the Cultures of Antiquity. Multidisciplinary Perspectives* (ed. J. Frey and John R. Levison; with A. Bowden; Ekstasis 5, Berlin – New York: de Gruyter; 2014), 343–371.

¹⁵ The priority of experience over theology was one of the distinctive views of the history-of-religions school around 1900, in which a number of important works on the Spirit originated: H. Gunkel, *Die Wirkungen des heiligen Geistes nach der populären Anschauung der apostolischen Zeit und nach der Lehre des Apostels Paulus* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1888); H. Weinel, *Die Wirkungen des Geistes und der Geister im nachapostolischen Zeitalter bis auf Irenäus* (Freiburg: Mohr, 1899); M. Dibelius, *Die Geisterwelt im Glauben des Paulus* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1909); P. Volz, *Der Geist Gottes und die verwandten Erscheinungen im Alten Testament und im anschließenden Judentum* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1910); in the English speaking world E. de Witt Burton, *Spirit, Soul, and Flesh* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1918). Recently, John Levison has pointed to the fundamental truth in this experience-based approach of the history-of-religions school, which was subsequently suppressed by other theological currents. Cf. J. R. Levison, *Filled with the Spirit* (Grand Rapids and Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2009); see also idem, “Assessing the Origins of Modern Pneumatology: The Life and Legacy of Hermann Gunkel,” in *Christian Body, Christian Self: Concepts of Early Christian Personhood* (ed. C. K. Rothschild and T. W. Thompson; WUNT 284; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 313–31.; see also idem, “Assessing the Origins of Modern Pneumatology: The Life and Legacy of Hermann Gunkel,” in *Christian Body, Christian Self: Concepts of Early Christian Personhood* (ed. C. K. Rothschild and T. W. Thompson; WUNT 284; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 313–31.

his followers, empowering them and dwelling among or even within them.¹⁶ The expression of such views is often held to be part of baptism formulae, but the connection of the gift of the spirit to the act of baptism may be a secondary development.¹⁷ The view that the spirit that had empowered Jesus was now given to the believers can be considered one of the earliest and most crucial ideas among early Jesus followers, probably caused by strong experiences of newness and by the vibrant dynamics that characterized the movement in its first period.

At a very early stage, Jesus' resurrection was attributed to the power of the divine spirit, so that it could be considered the beginning of a new period of God's eschatological salvation and the manifestation of the spirit of the end of time. This is still visible in an early christological formula preserved in Rom 1:4 which attributes Jesus' resurrection and exaltation to the power of the "spirit of holiness."¹⁸ This view is rooted in the Scriptures, especially in Ezekiel 37 where the resurrection of Israel is attributed to the Spirit, and the reception of Ezekiel 37 in postbiblical Judaism uses that passage as support for the hope of individual resurrection of the dead,¹⁹ which can now be considered a work of the divine spirit in the eschatological period.

The visions of the risen Christ, interpreted in the context of the common belief in the eschatological resurrection of the dead, could therefore be conceived of as a sign that the eschatological period of restitution and salvation had now begun. Based on such an interpretation of the Easter experiences, the earliest Christian mission started and spread in the conviction that God's eschatological salvation had started and that the Spirit of God that had empowered the Messiah was now dispensed to his disciples and the community of believers (cf. Acts 2:3).

II. The Question for the Development and Background of Paul's Views

But apart from those early experiences, partly preserved in a few brief confession formulae, Paul was the first Christian mind to reflect the Spirit and its

¹⁶ "God has given us the Spirit" (cf. Rom 5:5; 2 Cor 1:22; 5:5; 1 Thess 4:8; Acts 5:32; 15:8 etc.); those who believe have "received the Spirit" (cf. Rom 8:15; 1 Cor 2:12; 2 Cor 11:4; Gal 3:2, 14; 1 John 2:27) or "The Spirit of God dwells within you" (cf. Rom 8:9; 1 Cor 3:9).

¹⁷ Cf. F. Hahn, "Das biblische Verständnis des Geistes," in idem, *Studien zum Neuen Testament* (ed. J. Frey and J. Schlegel; WUNT 192; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 2006), 2:61–77, here 69–70.

¹⁸ The phrase sounds thoroughly Semitic, so the formula probably originated in the early Aramaic speaking community.

¹⁹ Here, the most important insights can be gained from the Pseudo-Ezekiel text preserved fragmentarily in the Qumran library: On 4Q385 frg. 2, see A. L. A. Hogeterp, "Resurrection and Biblical Tradition: Pseudo-Ezekiel Reconsidered," *Biblica* 89 (2008): 59–69.

(or his²⁰) work theologically.²¹ His views are, however, hard to systematize, for different reasons. First, they are still fluid, developing, depending on his own experiences and also phrased in reaction to the phenomena he had to deal with in his communities (e.g., in Corinth). Furthermore, some of the aspects expressed in his letters are presumably taken from the views and experiences of his partners in dialogue. They might therefore be influenced by other preachers or by the views Paul's addressees had adopted from their pre-Christian background. But Paul himself was, from the beginning of his mission, part of the spirit movement, acting himself as a "charismatic." Paul was well-acquainted with phenomena such as prophecy (1 Thess 5:19) and ecstatic speech (glossolalia; 1 Cor 14:18), and he could validly claim that his preaching was accompanied by "signs and wonders" (1 Thess 1:5–6; Gal 3:5; Rom 15:18–19). He had visions (2 Cor 12:1) and auditive experiences (2 Cor 12:4), and his calling, interpreted as an encounter with the risen Christ (1 Cor 9:1), can even be considered as such.²² So we should study his views with sensitivity for such experiences and, of course, with the background of his Jewish education and categories. Paul's pre-Christian views are influential in his ministry and theology, and we can only understand the apostle if we also consider the Jewish Paul and his Palestinian and Diaspora Jewish concepts.

III. Some Distinctive Features of Paul's Concept of the Spirit

What is distinctive in Paul's view of the spirit? This is a difficult question because at first Paul has so much to say about the spirit. John R. Levison phrases it nicely: "Antiquity has bequeathed to us no writer more enamored of the spirit than the Apostle Paul whose letters are awash in the spirit, so much so that isolating a single point of entrée is a monumental task."²³

²⁰ Here, the language already indicates a problem because the notion of a "personal" character of the spirit develops initially in Paul and then, more strongly, in Johannine theology, cf. J. Frey, "Vom Windbrausen zum Geist Christi und zur trinitarischen Person," 137–43 and 146–53, and idem, "How did the Spirit become a Person?"

²¹ On Paul's view of the Spirit, cf. also M. Wolter, "Der heilige Geist bei Paulus," in *Der Heilige Geist*, 93–119; U. Schnelle, *Theologie des Neuen Testaments* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2007), 244–50; see also the thorough work by G. D. Fee, *God's Empowering Presence: The Holy Spirit in the Letters of Paul* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1994); and recently Levison, *Filled with the Spirit*, 253–316.

²² On these phenomena, see B. Heininger, *Paulus als Visionär* (HBS 9; Freiburg: Herder, 1996); C. Meier, *Mystik bei Paulus: Zur Phänomenologie religiöser Erfahrung im Neuen Testament* (TANZ 26; Tübingen and Basel: Francke, 1998); B. Kollmann, "Paulus als Wundertäter," in *Paulinische Christologie* (FS H. Hübner; ed. U. Schnelle and T. Söding; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000), 76–96.

²³ Cf. Levison, *Filled with the Spirit*, 253.

But if we take a historical approach, starting with Paul's earliest letter which is often viewed as a window into Paul's early theology,²⁴ we can already see in 1 Thessalonians a distinctive view of the spirit. It includes the claim that Paul's own preaching happened in power and the Holy Spirit, i.e. with accompanying signs and miracles (1 Thess 1:5), that the spirit of prophecy is active in the community and should not be quenched (1 Thess 5:19f.), and that God gave (or even in the present tense: "gives") his Holy Spirit to the Thessalonians (1 Thess 4:8). The letter to the Galatians²⁵ also presupposes that the addressees initially experienced the manifestation of the spirit (Gal 3:2–5) and – even as Gentiles – received "the promise of the spirit" (Gal 3:14) when they came to believe. The phrase "the promise of the spirit" points to the Scriptures, to the prophetic expectation that the spirit will be poured out in the end of time (cf. Ezek 36:26f.) on Israel – or, in Paul's view, not only on Israel, but now even on Gentiles.²⁶ From the scriptural background, one could also infer that this bestowal of the Spirit was expected to be linked with visionary and prophetic phenomena (Joel 3:1–5). Ezekiel and Joel are – apart from some passages in Isaiah – the main sources for this view of the eschatological bestowal of the Spirit upon people.²⁷ Paul adopts this idea in a wider sense, now also related to the Gentiles, and with the implication that it is the spirit which purifies or sanctifies the Gentiles for God (Rom 15:16).

In the Pauline epistles we can discern a number of consequences or effects of the eschatological gift of the spirit as interpreted by Paul.

(a) Quite prominent among the Corinthians was the manifestation of ecstatic speech (glossolalia) which could be interpreted by the Corinthians, and possibly also by Paul himself, as "tongues of the angels" (1 Cor 13:1) which were now given to the believers for God's praise (1 Cor 14:2). But since outsiders could consider these phenomena a kind of maniac behavior, known in paganism, especially in Dionysiac circles, Paul decisively stresses the

²⁴ Cf., e.g., U. Schnelle, *Apostle Paul: His Life and Theology* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2005), 171–91. The problem of such a pattern of theological development in Paul is, however, that the epistles preserved are from a relatively short period of his ministry, after Paul had already lived as a follower of Jesus and worked as an apostle for more than 15 years. Thus the most important developments were probably in those "unknown" early years; cf. especially M. Hengel and A. M. Schwemer, *Paul Between Damascus and Antioch: The Unknown Years* (London: SCM, 1997), 11–15.

²⁵ The dating of Galatians is particularly difficult. It might be Paul's second letter, although some interpreters locate it close to Romans, for merely thematic reasons. Cf. J. Frey, "Galatians," in *Paul: Life, Setting, Work, Letters*, 199–222.

²⁶ On Paul's adoption of Ezekiel's vision see also Levison, *Filled with the Spirit*, 253–63.

²⁷ Cf. F. Philip, *The Origins of Pauline Pneumatology* (WUNT II/194; Tübingen, 2005), 34–76; see also Wolter, "Der Heilige Geist bei Paulus," 95–96.

prophetic, revelatory function of the spirit, distinct from the “tongues.” This distinction was not customary in other early Christian circles. It occurs for the first time in 1 Corinthians 14, and it seems to be introduced by Paul himself, in reaction to the Corinthian situation, whereas his addressees probably regarded those phenomena as part of “prophecy.” But as the decisive aspect in the early Christian gatherings is the message that people attending the community meetings should understand in order to repent and believe (1 Cor 14:24–25), Paul puts all the weight on the aspect of comprehensibility, on speaking in clear and understandable words (1 Cor 14:5, 12, 14–19). In this manner, in notable difference to his addressees and other early Christian circles, Paul subordinates extraordinary manifestations of the spirit to its revelatory function.

(b) In critical dialogue with the Corinthian group particularly appreciating wisdom and wisdom speech or rhetoric, possibly influenced by Alexandrian traditions, introduced by Apollos (1 Cor 1:18–4:21), Paul adopts the concept of the hidden wisdom of God (1 Cor 2:6–16). He explicitly states that this kind of wisdom is pronounced through the spirit (1 Cor 2:10, so that it can be understood by those who have the Spirit, or even by “spiritual” beings, whereas the creatural being is incapable of understanding (1 Cor 2:13–16). Like Lady Wisdom in some traditions of Jewish wisdom theology (esp. Wis 7–9), it is ultimately the Spirit, which (or who) conveys the true meaning of the Scriptures and reveals the hidden plan of God’s work. So it is ultimately the Spirit that communicates the message of the cross and leads humans to repentance and salvation.

(c) Because the spirit dwells in the community, the community is a temple of God (1 Cor 3:16). The sanctity of the community (and of single believers) which is implicit in this concept, has ethical implications. Paul is concerned with the purity of the communities, especially with regard to serious sins, and including sexual behavior. Thus the community member in Corinth who lived in an incestuous relationship must be excluded by a ritual act, which is commanded by Paul in his “spiritual” presence (1 Cor 5:1–5). The aspect of sanctity is also stressed with regard to the individual community members who are called “temple of the holy spirit” (1 Cor 6:19) since the Spirit is thought to be present in every single member. This is again phrased with ethical consequences in view, especially with regard to the body and bodily (sexual) relations (1 Cor 6:20).²⁸

(d) A distinctive function of the spirit, based on Ezekiel 37, is that it brings life or brings to life. Paul can even speak of the “life-giving Spirit.”²⁹ Based on the conviction that God raised Jesus from the dead through the spirit, it is also the spirit that assures the believers of their resurrection from the dead

²⁸ The concern for sexual purity is already present in 1 Thess 4:8f.

²⁹ πνεῦμα ζωοποιού: 1 Cor 15:45; cf. Rom 8:11; 2 Cor 3:6.

(Rom 8:11). So the spirit can be called ἀραββών (pledge: 2 Cor 1:22; 5:5) or ἀπαρχή (“first born” or “first fruit”: Rom 8:23; 1 Cor 15:20, 23), it guarantees the expected eschatological fulfillment. This idea is, of course, strongly dependent on the basic structure of early Christian eschatology which is shaped by the tension between “now” and “not yet” (between Easter and the parousia).³⁰

(e) Another tendency that can be observed in Paul is that the work of the Spirit is increasingly in parallel with the work of the exalted Christ: The Spirit is sent (Gal 4:6) as Christ was sent (Gal 4:4), the Spirit represents the believers before God (Rom 8:26) as does Christ (Rom 8:34), liberates from the deathly power of the law (Rom 8:2) as did Christ (Gal 5:1), gives gifts to anyone “according to his will” (1 Cor 12:11; cf. 12:6), and the Spirit has its own “intention” (φρόνημα Rom 8:6, 27).³¹ These analogies increasingly lead to understanding the Spirit as a “personal” figure. Paul can even say: “The Lord is the Spirit” (ὁ δὲ κύριος τὸ πνεῦμα ἐστίν, 2 Cor 3:17). This does not mean that the Spirit and the risen Christ are identical, but that there is a parallel, insofar as the reign of the Spirit is expressed in analogy with the lordship of Christ.³²

IV. Qumran and the Issue of Methodology

The primary source of Paul’s (and more generally the early Christian) views of the Spirit is certainly Scripture. Some aspects may come from ideas of the Greco-Roman world, and certain elements of early Christian pneumatology are distinctively Christian developments. It is, therefore, a methodological task to consider cautiously where and how Qumran texts can be introduced into the discussion. How can we evaluate adequately parallels from Qumran, from either the non-sectarian or the sectarian writings? Due to the fact that these texts all point to particularly Jewish concepts, or more precisely: to *Palestinian* Jewish concepts, we can probably identify some additional (and non-biblical) Jewish elements Paul could draw on when developing his own views. In case there are parallels with distinctively Qumran sectarian ideas,

³⁰ On this, cf. J. Frey, “Eschatology in the New Testament: An Introduction,” in *Eschatology in the New Testament and Some Related Documents* (ed. J. G. van der Watt; WUNT II/315; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 3–32, here 15–20.

³¹ Cf. Frey, “Vom Windbrausen zum Geist Christi und zur trinitarischen Person,” 141–43.

³² The tendency is strengthened in later writings, e.g., in the Gospel of John (cf. John 16:13–15), and finally leads to the Christian idea of the Spirit as a divine being and part of the Trinity. But this is, of course, still far beyond Paul’s own views. Cf., on the later development, Frey, “Vom Windbrausen zum Geist Christi und zur trinitarischen Person,” 143–53.

we will have to discuss further how they can be explained – given the fact that Paul was not directly acquainted with the sectarian texts.

C. The Notion of Spirit in Qumran

Qumran usage of the term רוח is, with some specific differences, in continuity with the usage in the Hebrew Bible.³³ There, the range of meanings is rather wide, from the physical meaning of wind or breath through the anthropological meaning of mindset or spiritual condition down to the meaning of “spirit” as God’s spirit or even the “holy spirit.”³⁴ Notably, the expression “holy spirit” occurs in Hebrew only in two rather late passages (Isa 63:10–11; Ps 51:13) and in Aramaic in two passages in Daniel (Dan 5:12; 6:4). However, it is increasingly clear that God’s spirit is connected with God’s own “holiness,” and can thus be called not only “God’s spirit” but also “holy spirit.”³⁵ This term is, then, much more frequent in postbiblical literature, including Qumran,³⁶ but most interestingly, it is absent in Philo and Josephus and also

³³ Cf. basically H.-J. Fabry, “רוח VII: Qumran,” *ThWAT* 7:419–25 (419). The work by A. E. Sekki, *The Meaning of Ruah at Qumran* (SBLDS 110; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989) is outdated.

³⁴ Apart from the relevant dictionary-articles, see M. Dreytza, *Der theologische Gebrauch von Ruah im Alten Testament: Eine wort- und satzsemantische Studie* (Giessen and Basel: Brunnen, 1990); R. Koch, *Der Geist Gottes im Alten Testament* (Frankfurt a.M.: Peter Lang, 1991); A. H. J. Gunneweg, “Aspekte des alttestamentlichen Geistverständnisses,” in *Sola scriptura: Beiträge zu Exegese und Hermeneutik des Alten Testaments* (ed. P. Höffken; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1975), 96–106; J. Schreiner, “Wirken des Geistes Gottes in alttestamentlicher Sicht,” in *Der eine Gott Israels: Gesammelte Schriften zur Theologie des Alten Testaments* (ed. E. Zenger; Würzburg: Echter, 1992), 2:83–136, and K.-D. Schunck, “Wesen und Wirksamkeit des Geistes nach der Überlieferung des Alten Testaments,” in *Altes Testament und Heiliges Land: Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament und zur biblischen Landeskunde* (Frankfurt a.M.: Peter Lang, 1989), 1:137–51.

³⁵ Cf. Wolter, “Der Heilige Geist bei Paulus,” 93–94.

³⁶ Cf., e.g., in the Daniel tradition in the LXX: Dan 5:12; 6:3 LXX (and more instances in the Theodotion version); cf. also Sus 34 (θ'). On these passages, see Levison, *Filled with the Spirit*, 127–30; Cf. also Wis 1:5; 7:22; 9:17; *Pss. Sol.* 17:37; *Jub.* 1:21–23; *L.A.B.* 18:11; 28:6; 32:14; 60:1; 62:2; *T. Levi* 3:6 (Greenfield, Stone, and Eshel); *T. Ab.* 20:15; *T. Job* 51:2; *Apoc. Zeph.* (in Clement of Alexandria, Strom. 5:77:2); some passages in the *As. Mos.* might be Christian. In Qumran, cf. 1QS III 7; IV 21; VIII 16; IX 3; 1QS^b II 24; 1QH^a IV 38; VI 24; VIII 20, 21, 25, 30; XV 10; XVI 13; XVII 32; XX 15; XXIII 29, 33; CD II 12–13; V 11; VII 4; 4Q270 2 ii 11; 4Q287 10 13; 4Q213a 113; 4Q416 2 ii 6 par 4Q418 8 6; 4Q418 76 1–3; 4Q422 I 7; 4Q444 1–41 + 5 1; 4Q504 1 + 2 v recto 11–18; 4Q504 4 5 par 4Q506 131–132 11; 1Q39 1 6; 4Q434 1 I 11. A related expression, “spirits of the holiest holiness,” used in the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* (4Q400–407; 11Q17), refers to angelic beings. I am grateful to my colleague Eibert Tigchelaar for a collection of relevant texts I could use for my research.

in non Jewish Greek literature.³⁷ From this, we may conclude that the concept of the “holy spirit” (or a “holy spirit”), sharing in and conveying God’s holiness, is most probably a concept rooted and developed within the Palestinian Jewish tradition. The remarkable fact that this term becomes so frequent in the New Testament, can only be explained from the Palestinian Jewish (although not specifically Qumranian) background, and it shows that the experiences of and reflections on the spirit stem from the experiences and interpretive concepts of the earliest community of Jewish Jesus-believers in Jerusalem and its vicinity.

As in the Hebrew Bible, the notion of רִיחַ in Qumran is broad and multifaceted.³⁸ A detailed investigation based on all the texts now accessible is still a desideratum, but we can say that רִיחַ roughly covers the same range of meanings as in the Hebrew Bible, but with some changes and extensions. The most important extension is that the word is very often used for personal “spirits,” i.e., angels and demons, most prominently in the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*. This is a development linked with the rise of angelic motifs and dualistic concepts, e.g., in the Enochic tradition and, then, in major traditions of postbiblical Judaism. However, for the present purpose, we can leave aside all those references, and focus on the texts that help to understand the idea of the divine or holy spirit. For the sake of convenience, we will limit the investigation to a discussion of some elements in the *Treatise on the Two Spirits* in 1QS, and then, more closely, to the *Hodayot* in which the expression “holy spirit” occurs most frequently. Finally, some aspects will be added from other texts, before we enter into a comparison with Pauline views.

*I. The Treatise on the Two Spirits and the Holy Spirit*³⁹

Let me start with some brief remarks on the document which has dominated the discussion since the beginning of the Qumran debate: the so-called *Treatise on the Two Spirits* (1QS III 13–IV 26). This prominent text is often erroneously considered foundational for the Qumran sectarian worldview: yet it should be interpreted as originally independent, a sapiential passage of pre-sectarian origin which was incorporated into the manuscript 1QS (but not in

³⁷ Cf., however, in Latin, Seneca, *Epist.* 41:2: “*sacer intra nos spiritus sedet.*”

³⁸ Cf., for an overview, Fabry, “רִיחַ VII: Qumran,” which, however, does not cover the texts released since the 1990s.

³⁹ On the interpretation of this text, see my discussion in J. Frey, “Different Patterns of Dualist Thought in the Qumran Library,” in *Legal Texts and Legal Issues. Proceedings of the Second Meeting of the International Organization of Qumran Studies, Cambridge 1995, Published in Honor of J. M. Baumgarten* (ed. M. J. Bernstein, F. García Martínez, J. Kampen; Leiden and Boston: Brill, 1997), 275–335, here 289–300 (in this volume, 243–299, here 256–267).

all 4QS manuscripts⁴⁰) as an appendix to the preceding liturgical section.⁴¹ The instruction was probably composed before the constitution of the *yahad*⁴² in sapiential circles, and in this context it aims at explaining why even the pious and wise can stumble and fall. That is, the instruction provides an explanation of the presence and power of evil, not only in the world in general, but especially in its influence on the pious, and expresses an ultimate perspective of hope for the final extinction of evil and the purification of the righteous. In spite of some inconsistencies in the text, I am reluctant to subscribe to suggestions of a multi-stage development of the text, and even redactional adaptations are difficult to ascertain.⁴³

From the very beginning, scholars have discussed whether the two “spirits” mentioned at the beginning of the instruction (1QS III 18) are merely human attitudes and ethical orientations,⁴⁴ or rather angelic beings that have power over humans. In view of other Qumran texts such as the *War Rule* (1QM) or especially the *Shirot Olat haShabbat*, there can be little doubt that contemporary readers saw an angelic reality behind the two spirits, as is especially suggested by the fact that the “spirits” are later called “Prince of Light” and “Angel of Darkness” (1QS III 20f.). A second question concerns the relationship between the “Spirit of Truth” (1QS III 18–19) and the “holy spirit” mentioned in 1QS IV 21, especially since the terms are used inter-

⁴⁰ Apart from 1QS, it is attested only in the preserved parts of one other manuscript (4QS^c), while it was definitely not contained in 4QS^d and 4QS^e, see S. Metso, *The Textual Development of the Qumran Community Rule* (STDJ 21; Leiden: Brill, 1997). In language and content, it is closely related to pre-sectarian sapiential texts from the Qumran Library (Instruction; Book of Mysteries) in which sapiential and apocalyptic ideas are combined and a dualistic worldview is developed.

⁴¹ Cf. Frey, “Different Patterns of Dualistic Thought,” 289–90 (in this volume, 256–257).

⁴² The text lacks most of the significant terms in the writings from the *yahad* and introduces other terms instead, e.g., “Angel of Darkness” for the opposing power instead of “Belial.” The observance of the Torah is not even mentioned in the catalogue of virtues, and, most distinctively, the “covenant” is not understood as a present reality (as in the *yahad* texts, e.g., 1QS I 1–III 12) but as a future reality to be established in the end (1QS IV 22). Terminological links exist with the pre-sectarian wisdom texts where we can find earlier traces of dualistic thought and the idea of a predestined world order expressed most clearly in this treatise. Cf. A. Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination: Weisheitliche Ordnung und Prädestination in den Textfunden von Qumran* (STDJ 18; Leiden: Brill, 1995), 126–32; A. Lange and H. Lichtenberger, “Qumran,” *TRE* 28:45–79 (56–57), and Frey, “Different Patterns of Dualistic Thought,” 295–300 (in this volume, 262–267).

⁴³ Cf., e.g., C. Hempel, “The Teaching on the Two Spirits and the Literary Development of the Rule of the Community,” in *Dualism in Qumran* (ed. G. Xeravits; LSTJ 76; London and New York: T&T Clark, 2010), 102–20.

⁴⁴ Thus, e.g., P. Wernberg-Møller, “A Reconsideration of the Two Spirits in the Rule of the Community (1QSerek III, 13–IV, 26),” *RevQ* 3 (1961/62): 413–41, here 419.

changeably for the same figure, the “paraclete,” in the Gospel of John.⁴⁵ As the text stands, however, the holy spirit introduced in IQS IV 21 is not identical with the “Spirit of Truth,” set in dominion over his lot of humans. It differs since it is not described as a primordial figure, put in charge of his dominion with the creation, nor as a figure acting within human history, but only as an eschatological means of purification,⁴⁶ expected to purify humans (or their inner parts) at the time of visitation. But on the other hand, the “holy spirit” is closely paralleled with the “Spirit of Truth.” The text reads (IQS IV 20–23):⁴⁷

“Then God will purify by his truth⁴⁸ all the works of man and purge for himself the sons of man. He will utterly destroy the spirit of deceit from the veins of (21) his flesh. He will purify him by the Holy Spirit from all ungodly acts and sprinkle upon him the Spirit of Truth like waters of purification, (to purify him) from all the abominations of falsehood and from being polluted (22) by a spirit of impurity, so that upright ones may have insight into the knowledge of the Most High and the wisdom of the sons of heaven, and the perfect in the Way may receive understanding. For those God has chosen for an eternal covenant, (23) and all the glory of Adam shall be theirs without deceit. All false works will be put to shame.”

Before the appointed time of the eschatological visitation, humans have a share in the “positive” “Spirit of Truth” and also a portion in the “negative” spirit, and the two spirits struggle within every human heart, even within the pious and wise one (IQS IV 23).⁴⁹ But it is not said that they share a portion of the holy spirit. Only in the end is the acting of God’s own spirit (as holy spirit) mentioned, and it is imagined that an exchange is supposed to take place: the spirit of deceit in human veins (i.e., his inner self) is to be destroyed, and (the) holy spirit purifies the human being from all impurity. Furthermore, it opens up insight into divine knowledge and heavenly wisdom (IQS IV 22).⁵⁰ Thus, in addition to its purifying function, the holy spirit shall

⁴⁵ “Spirit of Truth”: John 14:17; 15:26; 16:13; “Holy Spirit”: John 14:26; cf. 1:33 and 20:22.

⁴⁶ Cf. also Sekki, *The Meaning of Ruah at Qumran*, 207f., who notes the advocates of the different views.

⁴⁷ Translation according to E. Qimron and J. H. Charlesworth, “Rule of the Community,” in *Rule of the Community and Related Documents* (The Dead Sea Scrolls. Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations 1; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck and Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1994), 1–52, here 19, slightly adjusted.

⁴⁸ Or, his faithfulness.

⁴⁹ This is probably the most important difference from the Qumran sectarian view in which the demarcation between the realm of light and the realm of darkness is viewed much more clearly at the borders of the community. The idea that the human is in itself divided and that there are two opposed powers fighting within the human heart is never adopted in the sectarian compositions.

⁵⁰ On the background for these views in biblical texts, esp. Ps 51, cf. A. Klein, “From the ‘Right Spirit’ to the ‘Spirit of Truth’: Observations on Psalm 51 and IQS,” in *The*

also have a revelatory function to make the way of the chosen ones perfect. It is the eschatological revelation of the true meaning of the Torah, which is expected to be conveyed through the holy spirit – still in the future, at the time of the “visitation.”

To be more precise, when the “holy spirit” is introduced in this passage, it seems to be quite different from the angelic beings called “Spirit of Truth” or “Prince of Lights” in III 18–19. A few lines later, however, it comes rather close to the “Spirit of Truth,” especially in the parallelism in 1QS III 21:

“He will purify him by the Holy Spirit from all ungodly acts and sprinkle upon him the Spirit of Truth like waters of purification”

But rather than simple identification, it seems wise to maintain a distinction between the primordial “Spirit of Truth” in 1QS III 18–19, set in dominion over humans, and the eschatological spirit introduced with the same term, but sprinkled over humans like purifying water.⁵¹ What is expressed here as a hope for the end of time is very similar to what the sectarian texts claim to be realized in the *yahad* community: Knowledge of the divine mysteries, increased purity and a place in the community of the angels is claimed to be fulfilled within the *yahad*, but only hoped for in the Treatise on the Two Spirits.

II. The *Hodayot*

Turning now to the typically sectarian views, I will focus, for the sake of convenience, on the text in which the term רוח occurs most frequently, the Hymns Scroll or *Hodayot* (1QH^a).⁵² The concordance of the new DJD edition of the text lists 82 occurrences of רוח,⁵³ including only those which are preserved in the manuscript 1QH^a or its 4Q-parallels. This text, therefore, uses the term רוח, even more densely than Paul does in his letters. The range of meanings is, however, remarkably broad and covers roughly all the meanings רוח can have in the Hebrew Bible and in Qumran.

Dynamics of Language and Exegesis at Qumran (ed. D. Dimant and R. G. Kratz; FAT II/35; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009), 171–91.

⁵¹ Cf. Sekki, *The Meaning of Ruah at Qumran*, 208f., who points to the very different conceptual framework.

⁵² I will refer to this document according to the new reconstruction and edition by Hartmut Stegemann, completed posthumously by Eileen Schuller: H. Stegemann and E. Schuller, *1QHodayot^a with Incorporation of 1QHodayot^b and 4QHodayot^{a-f}* (Qumran Cave 1 III; DJD 40; Oxford: Clarendon, 2009). All earlier editions, especially the *editio princeps* by E. L. Sukenik (according to which most earlier scholars referred to the text) and also the editions that changed the counting of columns correctly but kept the counting of the lines according to the *editio princeps*, are now outdated.

⁵³ See Stegemann and Schuller, *1QHodayot^a*, 323–402 (391–92).

- There are instances where רוח means wind (1QH^a VI 41; XIV 26; XV 26; XVIII 34; XXI 26) or breath (IX 30–31; XV 32).
- There are passages where it is used for angelic beings (1QH^a V 25; IX 13; XVI 13; XIX 16) and also for demons (XXV 6, 8, 23 [?]).
- It is also used for human spirits or the mindset of the human spirit as in the expression “the humble in spirit” (1QH^a VI 14; cf. XXIII 16).
- רוח can also simply mean creature (1QH^a XVIII 24).
- The mention of the human spirit (1QH^a IX 17, 34) can be linked with positive (VIII 24: a spirit of understanding; VIII 28) or negative (VIII 16: a stubborn spirit) ethical orientations.
- The negative expression occurs sometimes in the specific form of confessions of sinfulness (1QH^a V 32; VIII 16; IX 24; XI 22).
- Some passages directly adopt the teaching of the Treatise on the Two Spirits that God has fashioned every spirit and determined the humans’ fate according to their spirits (1QH^a VI 22; VII 26, 35).
- Interestingly, the human is also called a “spirit of flesh” (i.e., a fleshly being which cannot stand before God: 1QH^a IV 27; V 14, XV 30).
- A number of passages also speak of the spirit as God’s spirit or his “holy spirit.”

But we can observe here, that the number of passages that refer to God’s spirit is much smaller than in the Hebrew Bible where roughly a third of the instances of רוח refers to God’s spirit. This shows that the *Hodayot* are more concerned with anthropology than the average Hebrew Bible texts. But whereas the expression “holy spirit” is very rarely used in the Hebrew Bible (and only slightly more frequently in the LXX), most of the *Hodayot* passages mentioning God’s spirit use the term “holy” to characterize it.

A number of texts and some relevant parallels are especially interesting. In 1QH^a IV 38 the speaker prays: “Blessed are you, God Most High, that you have *spread your holy spirit upon your servant and have purified ... his heart.*”⁵⁴ Similarly in 1QH^a XV 9 “I thank you, O Lord, ... that you have spread your holy spirit upon me so that I am not shaken” An individual can praise God for sprinkling or dispensing his holy spirit upon him (i.e., from above) with the effect of purification of the heart, or, as in the other passage, of strengthening him in his struggles against wickedness. As in the final passage of the Treatise on the Two Spirits, the image is that of sprinkling purification water, but the purification is considered fulfilled, not simply expected in the eschatological time of “visitation.”

In a somewhat fragmentary passage of col. VIII, the speaker praises God for having changed his inner being. First he speaks of a “perverted spirit” (1QH^a VIII 18) that ruled over a “vessel of dust,” then we can read “from

⁵⁴ All translations follow C. Newsom.

dust” and “righteousness” (1QH^a VIII 19), and in the end “by means of *your holy spirit which you placed in me*” (1QH^a VIII 20). In the light of other similar passages, the interpretation is rather clear: God’s holy spirit is the means of exaltation of the human being from dust, the means of removing the “perverted spirit,” or even the means of “justification,” and it is stated explicitly that humans as such cannot achieve it by themselves, but only by an action of God’s grace.

Not all similar passages use the adjective “holy,” others express the same ideas without it. For instance, a few lines later in the aforementioned passage, it is said: “I entreat you with the spirit that you have given to me” (1QH^a VIII 29). A similar phrase, focusing on knowledge, occurs in 1QH^a V 36: “and I, your servant, know by means of the spirit you have given me,” or similarly in 1QH^a XXI 34: “I know by the spirit that you have placed in me ...” The last two passages refer to knowledge, or revelation. But all three hymns use the image that God has given his spirit to (or into) a human being. And the spirit meant is undoubtedly the “holy spirit” as in 1QH^a VIII 20.

In 1QH^a VIII 29–30, we even learn of a “two stage” process: “I entreat you with the spirit that you have given to me that you make your kindness to your servant complete forever, cleansing me by your holy spirit and drawing me nearer by your good favour.” The cleansing expressed here is not imagined as an eschatological cleansing (as hoped for in 1QS IV 21–23), but rather a continuous process of growing closeness to God which is granted by his kindness and favor. God has chosen to favor those who love him, has given them his spirit, and in the spirit they pray for further purification and fulfillment, in order to get still closer to him.

Thus the spirit also enables one to pray – an important aspect also for Paul – and it enables one to know and choose the truth: Thus 1QH^a VI 36 says: “you have favoured me with the spirit of knowledge to choose truth.” God’s spirit furthermore brings joy, as XVII 32 expresses: “in your holy spirit you have made me rejoice.” 1QH^a XX 13–17 is the most explicit passage:

And I, the Instructor (*Maskil*), I know you, my God,
by the spirit that you have placed in me.

Faithfully have I heeded your wondrous secret counsel.
By your holy spirit you have opened up knowledge within me
through the mystery of your wisdom and the fountainhead of your power
in the midst of those who fear you, for abundant kindness

Here we can find a number of important aspects that are closely connected. The text mentions the “holy spirit” and the “spirit” synonymously, it uses the metaphor that God gave or placed the spirit into the human individual, and the effect of that gift is the revelation of God’s mysteries and, even more, knowledge of God himself.

Apart from purity, the spirit primarily grants knowledge, as was expected for the future in the pre-sectarian Treatise on the Two Spirits. Here, the knowledge and revelation about God's mysteries or even about God himself is considered a present gift, obtainable within the community. The divine spirit is further described as the power that draws the individual closer to God, changes the fundamental orientation of life, or elevates the human from dust into the community of angels. It motivates prayer and strengthens for the struggle against evil and causes joy. With such a concept of the "holy spirit" we are quite close to many of the early Christian and, especially, Pauline views.

One question, however, cannot be totally clarified. Is it "the" spirit or "a" spirit from God? The singularity of that spirit, together with its "personal" character, is not totally clear in the passages from the *Hodayot*. 1QH^a VI 24 can say: "I know ... that through your goodwill toward a person *you multiply his portion in your holy spirit*." According to this phrase, a portion of God's holy spirit can be increased or strengthened. The degree of sharing in the holy spirit is at stake, and there is no clear-cut distinction between the human spirit, which may have some portion of the divine spirit or of the "Spirit of Truth," and the divine power of God's spirit. Even if the Qumran sectarians confess that God gave his holy spirit to them or placed it in them, there might be some uncertainty about the portion given or about the "totality" of the gift. But this may also concur with some expressions in early Christian texts according to which the spirit (given to the believers) can be hindered or quenched (1 Thess 5:19).

A certain lack of clarity is also illustrated by another sectarian text, the closure of the liturgical section in 1QS III 6–9. Here, the "spirit" is related to the atonement of sins. This is said to happen "by the spirit of the true counsel of God" (1QS III 6); or, in the parallel line, "by the holy spirit of the community" (1QS III 7); or "by an upright and humble spirit" (1QS III 8); or "by humbling his soul" and "sprinkling with waters of purification" (1QS III 8–9). As we can see, there is no contrast here between spirit and ritual, no clear-cut distinction between the human spirit, the spirit considered present in the community, and the spirit that belongs to God. These distinctions are clearer in Paul where there is less confidence in a divine portion of the human spirit or the ethical facilities of the human nature or "soul," and the "gift" of the spirit is considered to be totally new.

Another aspect which should finally be mentioned is how the revelation of the spirit is conceptualized. It is most remarkable that there is no reference to the prophetic spirit, nor any mention of ecstatic or otherwise altered states of consciousness in the Qumran texts. Instead, revelation is described as an aid to choosing the truth and to proceeding in the perfect way, in life according to God's commandments. We may, therefore, conclude that the revelation of the spirit is primarily conceived of as interpretation of the Scriptures or of the

true meaning of the Scriptures, basically the law. This matches the insight stated elsewhere that the Qumran sectarian texts do not show any traces of mantic practices or of the interpretation of dreams and visions. Within the Qumran community, such religious practices, quite widespread in Second Temple Judaism, appear to be replaced by the interpretation of Scripture; the term “interpretation” (*peshet*), which refers to dreams and visions in other early Jewish texts, is only evoked for Scripture in the texts from the community.⁵⁵ So the revelatory work of the holy spirit should be seen as the revelation of the true meaning of the Scriptures.

D. Paul, Qumran, and the Spirit: Some Concluding Perspectives

Having focused on a limited number of Qumran texts, and – in the preceding paragraphs – on some texts originating within the Qumran community, we should now again address the methodological issues. How can we compare the two textual corpora adequately and evaluate the observations, the parallels and also the differences?

Although Paul probably never read the sectarian writings from Qumran, it is noteworthy, that, regarding the notion of the spirit, there are interesting parallels not only to non-sectarian documents but also to those originating in the Qumran community. The concepts found, e.g., in the *Hodayot* cannot prove any direct dependence of Paul on them or on the Qumran community, but they may help to explain the background of Paul's view of the spirit in the Palestinian Jewish tradition. On the other hand, there is no need to stress that some aspects of Pauline pneumatology are so strongly shaped by Paul's Christian experience that we cannot expect to find analogies at Qumran. But in spite of these differences, often emphasized in the early periods of the Qumran debate,⁵⁶ striking conceptual parallels can be noted. In the following passages, I will focus on some examples where the Qumran background

⁵⁵ Cf. A. Lange, “The Essene Position on Magic and Divination,” in *Legal Texts and Legal Issues*, 377–435.

⁵⁶ While some scholars tried to explain for instance the frequency of the term “Holy Spirit” in the New Testament from Qumran usage – some even arguing that it was mediated by John the Baptist (for instance the article by F. F. Bruce, “Holy Spirit in the Qumran Texts,” *Annual of Leeds University Oriental Society* 6 [1966/68]: 49–55) – others emphasized the basic difference, e.g., that the Qumranians did not yet know of “the” Holy Spirit but only of “a” holy spirit (cf. J. Coppens, “Les documents du désert de Juda et les origines du christianisme,” *ALOB* 2.39 [1953]: 23–39), or that the “personal” concept of the Spirit or even more his “trinitarian” understanding was still lacking in Qumran (cf. G. Graystone, “The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament,” *ITQ* 22 [1955]: 214–30; 23 [1956]: 25–48; F. Nötscher, *Zur theologischen Terminologie der Qumran-Texte* [BBB 10; Bonn: Hanstein, 1956], 42).

matches or helps to explain aspects of the Pauline (or wider early Christian) views:

(a) A first aspect may be important. At the very beginning of the early Christian tradition – or rather in its background, there was the preaching of John the Baptist who announced a “baptism” in or with the Holy Spirit (Mark 1:8; Matt 3:11 par. Luke 3:16). At least in the New Testament context, the spirit mentioned here is primarily understood as the spirit that empowers the “stronger one,” an agent of God, an anointed one or, rather, the Messiah (cf. Isa 11:1f.; 61:1; cf. *Pss. Sol.* 17:37 etc.). But the comparison with the water of John’s immersion rite also shows that the spirit is understood as an eschatological means of purification (based on Ezek 36:25–27). Uttered by the Baptizer, an eschatological prophet probably unrelated with the Qumran community,⁵⁷ this is not a particularly Qumranian concept, but the Qumran parallels show that the view of the spirit as an eschatological means of purification was widespread within contemporary Palestinian Judaism and formed one of the earliest ideas of the Jesus movement. The background of Ezekiel 36–37 also explains the view (e.g., in Rom 1:3–4) that Jesus’ resurrection was affected by God in the power of his holy spirit, or – phrased in a Semitic fashion frequently attested at Qumran – through “the spirit of holiness.” Thus the Pauline view of the spirit as life-giving spirit and the idea that the spirit purifies and sanctifies the Gentiles, can be linked to this background. It is paralleled in Qumran (cf. 1QS III 6–8; IV 20–23), of course without any reference to the Gentiles, which is, then, a central part of the Pauline reception of the idea. The *Hodayot* texts adopt the idea of the gift of the spirit to express revelation of wisdom and incorporation into the community of the godly beings (the community and the angels). This is not far from Paul’s use of the spirit language to express the vivification of humans by faith.

(b) A second aspect is also quite well-known but often rather neglected. The gift of the spirit sanctifies the community as well as individuals, making both the community and the body of any believer a temple. The parallels between the Qumran view of the community as a temple (1QS V 5–6; VIII 5–6; IX 3–6 etc.) and some Pauline views (cf. 1 Cor 3:16) are often noticed. In Qumran, the idea that the community is a temple is certainly not understood as meaning a replacement of the Temple, but the Qumran community with its high standards of purity does represent the sanctity of the temple. The same is true for Paul. Although the relevance of the Jerusalem Temple was very lim-

⁵⁷ Cf. the discussion in J. Frey, “The Impact of the Dead Sea Scrolls on New Testament Interpretation: Proposals, Problems and Further Perspectives,” in *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 407–61, here 443–50 (in this volume, 527–578, here 561–568); idem, “Critical Issues in the Investigation of the Scrolls and the New Testament,” in *Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. J. J. Collins and T. Lim; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 517–45, here 528–30 (in this volume, 497–525, here 511–513).

ited for Paul's Diaspora communities, the Temple is not meant to be replaced by the community, but the metaphorical application of temple imagery to the community expresses an ethical challenge. In 1 Thess 4:3–8 it is stressed that the dwelling of the Holy Spirit within the believers has ethical consequences (cf. also 1 Cor 6:19). Paul reminds his addressees to follow a life of sanctity which especially has to do with sexual control, regardless of how σκεῦος = "vessel" is to be translated. The term may point either to the wife or to the sexual organ, but to "use one's vessel" not as the Gentiles, not in impurity but in holiness, refers to a lifestyle which is different from the manner characterized as "gentile," particularly regarding sexual matters. So we should not only note the possible verbal parallel of "vessel" (Hebr. כֵּלָה) for the sexual organ or the wife in 1 Thess 4:4 and the Instruction from Qumran (4Q416 2 II 21)⁵⁸ but the broader view that the gift of the spirit demands ethical behavior. This is a particularly Jewish idea.⁵⁹

(c) Although in Paul the distinction between the natural human spirit and the Holy Spirit given to believers is much stricter than, e.g., in the *Hodayot*, there are some rather hidden traces that (a or the) Holy Spirit was also considered as a virtue or linked with virtues. As John R. Levison correctly points out, we can observe particular vestiges of a view which is much more broadly attested in Qumran. 2 Cor 6:6–7 provides a traditional list of virtues in which the Holy Spirit is included: "by purity, by knowledge, by patience, by kindness, by (a) holy spirit, by genuine love, by truthful speech, and by the power of god." In this list, the holy spirit may refer to the human spirit which is pure and holy,⁶⁰ and the exhortation shows the conviction that the human spirit in a Christian believer "can become holy by the practice of virtue" or "by a process of self-cleansing (2 Cor 7:1)."⁶¹

(d) Of course, Paul's view of the Holy Spirit cannot be explained fully by Qumran usage. It is strongly shaped by other experiences and encounters. Apart from all particular linguistic parallels or more or less specific similarities of ideas, the Qumran parallels share the view that the gift of the spirit or the possession of the spirit is "not merely an experience of euphoria or anguish, an entrée to ecstasy, a sequence of actions or emotions" but – now put in Christian terms – "the way in which the values of the gospel are concretized."⁶² The spirit reveals God's will, wisdom, and plan; that acts verbally and leads to a bodily life in accord with the insight gained. The spirit inserts

⁵⁸ Cf. T. Elgvin, "To Master his own vessel. 1 Thes 4.4 in the Light of New Qumran Evidence," *NTS* 43 (1997): 604–19.

⁵⁹ Cf. Levison, *Filled with the Spirit*, 263–67.

⁶⁰ Cf. Levison, *Filled with the Spirit*, 238–39, who mentions two other passages: 1 Cor 5:5: "that his spirit may be saved ...," and 2 Cor 7:1: cleanse themselves "from every defilement of body and of spirit, making holiness perfect in the fear of God."

⁶¹ Levison, *Filled with the Spirit*, 239.

⁶² Levison, *Filled with the Spirit*, 269.

into the community. These elements can now be characterized as the particularly Jewish contribution to the early Christian notion of the Holy Spirit. Of course, early Judaism and especially its Hellenistic traditions were not totally lacking visionary, ecstatic, and enthusiastic elements linked with the spirit. But the fact that Paul – much more so than some of his addressees – stresses the verbal and revelatory functions of the spirit can be regarded as a special parallel to the Qumran (sectarian) ideas and as a distinctively Jewish element.

21. Flesh and Spirit in the Palestinian Jewish Sapiential Tradition and in the Qumran Texts: An Inquiry into the Background of Pauline Usage*

The scholarly significance of the recently published sapiential texts from the Qumran library can hardly be overestimated.¹ They demonstrate that sapiential thought within Palestinian Judaism included a much wider variety of ideas and literary forms than previously available when only the canonical Wisdom texts, the Wisdom of Ben Sira, and some later traditions from the Diaspora could be analyzed. The new documents seem to provide an important “missing link” between earlier biblical traditions and later ideas and help us to reconstruct some aspects of the semantic and literary development “between the testament.” Although most of the sapiential documents from the Qumran library are not “sectarian,” but seem to have been composed within earlier “pre-Essene” circles, they might nevertheless shed light on the development of the later “Essene” or “sectarian” traditions.

In this article, I will show the importance of the new sapiential documents for the history-of-religions by means of an example which has also a great deal of significance for New Testament interpretation. The “pre-Essene” Wisdom texts are the earliest documents from Early Jewish tradition in which the term “flesh” is used in a strongly negative sense, linked with sin and disobedience to God and his will. Such a negative usage of “flesh” can also be seen in the Qumran “sectarian” texts and, then, in the letters of the Apostle Paul. Therefore, the new Wisdom texts from Qumran could provide the clue to the long-debated problem of the origin of the Pauline usage of “flesh” and his characteristic antithesis of “flesh” and “spirit.” The religio-historical issue of the background of Paul’s anthropological terms (or, at least, some of them)

* This article was originally written for a Tübingen conference on the sapiential texts from Qumran. Some passages of this paper are taken from my article “The Notion of ‘Flesh’ in 4QInstruction and the Background of Pauline Usage,” in *Sapiential, Liturgical and Poetical Texts from Qumran* (ed. D. K. Falk, F. García Martínez, and E. M. Schuller; STDJ 35; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 197–226; other aspects are discussed more extensively in my article “Die paulinische Antithese von ‘Fleisch’ und ‘Geist’ und die palästinisch-jüdische Weisheitstradition,” *ZNW* 90 (1999): 45–77. I am grateful to Charlotte Hempel and to my former assistants Michael Becker and Enno E. Popkes for corrections and helpful suggestions.

¹ Cf. D. J. Harrington, “Ten Reasons Why the Qumran Wisdom Texts are Important,” in *DSD* 4 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997), 245–55.

can be discussed afresh on the basis of the new sapiential texts from the Qumran library.

A. The Problem: The Antithesis of “Flesh” and “Spirit” in Paul

In some passages of his letters, Paul uses the term “flesh” (σάρξ) in a sense which goes far beyond the range of meanings of רֶשֶׁת in the Hebrew Bible. There, רֶשֶׁת can denote the human body and its physical substance or, generally, the created human being in its weakness and mortality.² But in Paul, at least in some passages, the use of the term σάρξ is strongly associated with the notion of evil and iniquity. It even seems to denote a sphere or power opposed to God and his will, most obviously when it is used in contrast with the term “spirit” (πνεῦμα), e.g., in Gal 5:17 or Rom 8:5ff:

For the Flesh is actively inclined against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the Flesh. Indeed these two powers constitute a pair of opposites at war with one another, the result being that you do not actually do the very things you wish to do (Gal 5:17).³

For those who exist in terms of the flesh take the side of the flesh, whereas those who exist in terms of the Spirit take the side of the Spirit. For the flesh’s way of thinking is death, whereas the Spirit’s way of thinking is life and peace. Because the flesh’s way of thinking is hostility toward God, for it does not submit itself to the law of God; for it cannot. And those who are in the flesh are not able to please God (Rom 8:5–8).⁴

This dualistic use of “flesh” and “spirit” as opposed powers is unparalleled in Earliest Christianity,⁵ and when the terms are used in later writings, their

² In other passages, רֶשֶׁת can denote also a family relative, a part of the human body, e.g., genitals, or an animal body – dead or alive – or part of an animal body, e.g., meat or an offering; cf. D. J. A. Clines, ed., *DCH* 2:277; L. Koehler, W. Baumgartner, and J. J. Stamm, eds., *HALOT* 1:164; see more extensively F. Baumgärtel, “σάρξ: B. Flesh in the Old Testament,” in *TDNT* 7:105–108; G. Gerleman, “ רֶשֶׁת bāsār Fleisch,” in *THAT* 1:376–379; N. Bratsiotis, “ רֶשֶׁת ,” in *ThWAT*, 850–867.

³ Translation from J. L. Martyn, *Galatians* (AB 33A; New York: Doubleday, 1998), 479. Text: Ἡ γὰρ σὰρξ ἐπιθυμεῖ κατὰ τοῦ πνεύματος, τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα κατὰ τῆς σαρκός, ταῦτα γὰρ ἀλλήλοις ἀντίκειται, ἵνα ἂ ἐὰν θέλητε ταῦτα ποιῆτε.

⁴ Translation from J. D. G. Dunn, *Romans 1–8* (WBC 38A; Dallas: Word Books, 1988), 414. Text: Οἱ γὰρ κατὰ σάρκα ὄντες τὰ τῆς σαρκός φρονοῦσιν, οἱ δὲ κατὰ πνεῦμα τὰ τοῦ πνεύματος. Τὸ γὰρ φρόνημα τῆς σαρκός θάνατος, τὸ δὲ φρόνημα τοῦ πνεύματος ζωὴ καὶ εἰρήνη· διότι τὸ φρόνημα τῆς σαρκός ἔχθρα εἰς θεόν, τῷ νόμῳ τοῦ θεοῦ οὐχ ὑποτάσσεται, οὐδὲ γὰρ δύναται· οἱ δὲ ἐν σαρκὶ ὄντες θεῷ ἀρέσαι οὐ δύνανται.

⁵ The terms σάρξ und πνεῦμα are used in the pre-Pauline formula Rom 1:3f., but the usage in this early christological confession differs significantly from the usage of the antithesis by Paul himself. In Rom 1:3, σάρξ is used (as in Rom 9:5) to denote the earthly origin of Jesus ἐκ σπέρματος Δαβὶδ. This corresponds completely with the biblical usage of the term (cf. 2 Sam 7:12–14). The expression πνεῦμα ἁγιοσύνης (note the Semitic

meaning differs significantly from the meaning in the aforementioned passages.⁶ Thus, the peculiarities of the Pauline usage of the antithesis pose a number of theological, but also historical and religio-historical questions.

Theologically important is the issue of the precise meaning of the antithesis and its significance within the anthropology and soteriology of the Apostle: What is “flesh” in Paul? Does the term denote the human being as a whole, as a created being, or only its material or physical substance? And what is the “spirit,” opposed to the “flesh”? Does Paul mean the Holy Spirit, or does he think of a spiritual dimension within the human being? And how can we understand that Paul sees “flesh” and “Spirit” actively inclined against each other (Gal 5:17)? Does he really mean that both powers enact some authority over the Christians, so that they “do not do the very things they wish to do”?⁷ Or should we read the passage as a kind of abbreviation,

construction!) is used to characterize the resurrection of Jesus as a mighty work of the spirit. On the formula in Rom 1:3 cf. also M. Hengel, *Der Sohn Gottes. Die Entstehung der Christologie und die jüdische-hellenistische Religionsgeschichte* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1975), 93–104; P. Stuhlmacher, *Biblische Theologie des Neuen Testaments* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1992), 1:186–188. So, the pre-Pauline confession formula does not provide a real analogy to the Pauline usage of the terms such as, e.g., in Gal 5:17 or Rom 7–8 (cf. F. W. Horn, *Das Angeld des Geistes. Studien zur paulinischen Pneumatologie* [FRLANT 154; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1992], 278).

⁶ In Colossians and Ephesians, the terms are taken up in some passages, but, in contrast with Paul, the antithesis is toned down or used in the mere sense of the Hellenistic idea of different spheres (cf. E. Schweizer, “σάρξ,” in *TDNT*, 119–151, here 136f.). In the Pastorals, the antithesis is used only in the christological hymn 1 Tim 3:16 ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί, ἐδικαιώθη ἐν πνεύματι where σάρξ and πνεῦμα are not viewed as opposed powers but also as two different spheres (cf. E. Schweizer, “σάρξ,” esp. 137f.; J. Roloff, *Der erste Brief an Timotheus* [EKKNT 15; Zurich: Benziger and Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1988], 203). The Johannine use of the terms is completely different from Paul (cf. E. Schweizer, “σάρξ,” esp. 138–140). In the Fourth Gospel and the Johannine Epistles, σάρξ characterizes the true humanity of the Logos-Son (John 1:14; cf. 1 John 4:2; 2 John 7 et al.). Besides, σάρξ is used to denote the human way of existence and thought (John 7:27; 8:15). In two passages, John 3:6 and John 6:63, there is an opposition of σάρξ and πνεῦμα. But even in these passages, σάρξ is not linked with sin, so the antithesis differs significantly from the Pauline use of the terms. In the Apostolic Fathers the use of σάρξ is even more hellenized (cf. E. Schweizer, “σάρξ,” esp. 144–147). An early misunderstanding of the Pauline antithesis is also shown by the gloss in Rom 7:25b, cf. H. Lichtenberger, “Der Beginn der Auslegungsgeschichte von Römer 7: Römer 7,25b,” *ZNW* 88 (1997): 284–295.

⁷ This is the interpretation by H. Schlier, *Der Brief an die Galater* (13th ed.; KEK 7; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1965), 249: “The opposition of flesh and spirit, which comes to an end in mutual hostile desire, takes place with the intention and goal of interpreting the respective will of man, which is provoked by the claim of the flesh or the spirit, and of not letting the act come to fruition.” Cf. also P. Althaus, “... Damit ihr nicht tut, was ihr wollt”. Zur Auslegung von Gal 5,17,” *TLZ* 76 (1951): 15–18, who interprets in the light of Rom 7:5. But most interpreters share the conviction that Rom 7 does not de-

that is, in the sense that only one of the two powers has such an influence on believers?⁸ And what is the relation between God's or Christ's Spirit and the human self, or – even more complicated – between “flesh” and the physical existence of the created human being?⁹ The answer to these theological questions depends on some historical and religio-historical issues.

Historically, there is the question whether we can interpret Gal 5:17 in terms of Rom 7–8 or not. Is the puzzling statement on the two “powers” a traditional formulation which is, then, modified in Gal 5:18 and later on worked out more thoroughly in Rom 7–8?¹⁰ Or more generally: Did Paul's view on “flesh” and “spirit” undergo some development? What is the back-

scribe the existence of the Christian, but rather the existence of the non-Christian as it is viewed in the light of the Christian revelation (cf. R. Bultmann, “Das Problem der Ethik bei Paulus,” *ZNW* 23 (1924): 123–140, here 130; W. G. Kümmel, “Römer 7 und die Bekehrung des Paulus,” in *Römer 7 und das Bild des Menschen im Neuen Testament* [TB 53; Munich: Kaiser, 1974], 1–160, here 138).

⁸ Both possibilities to interpret the ἵνα μὴ ... in Gal 5:17 have been described precisely by R. Bultmann, “Christus des Gesetzes Ende,” in *Glauben und Verstehen. Gesammelte Aufsätze* (3rd ed.; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1961), 2:32–58, here 2:46 n. 6: “It is either spoken from the point of view of the πνεῦμα: the πνεῦμα wars against the σάρξ so that man does not do what he – that is to say the σάρξ – wants to do; or from the point of view of the Spirit: the πνεῦμα wars against the πνεῦμα so that the man does not do what he really wants to do, namely that which the Spirit also wants: that he lives (Rom 7:14ff).” Bultmann prefers the latter possibility. The former one is chosen by A. Suhl, “Der Galaterbrief – Situation und Argumentation,” in *ANRW* II 25.4 (Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 1987), 3124. A completely different view is taken by F. Mussner, *Der Galaterbrief* (HTKNT 9; Freiburg i. B.: Herder, 1974), 377f., who suggests that the two powers neutralize each other so that the result is a new freedom for the Christian to choose between good and evil. But there is nothing in the text of Gal 5:17 in favor of such a suggestion, cf. the criticism by H. D. Betz, *Galatians. A Commentary on Paul's Letter to the Churches in Galatia* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979), 281 n. 83. According to Gal 5:17, the struggle actually takes place.

⁹ In the background, there is the question whether the Pauline use of σάρξ, e.g., in the phrase σάρξ ἁμαρτίας (Rom 8:3), does actually imply a devaluation of the bodily existence or, especially, human sexuality. It should be noted that some Pauline passages at least contributed to such a view. On the history of interpretation, e.g., of 1 Cor 6:12ff. and 1 Cor 7, see W. Schrage, *Der erste Brief an die Korinther. 2. Teilband 1 Kor 6,12–11,6* (EKKNT 7.2; Solothurn: Benziger and Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchner Verlag, 1995), 2:38ff., 74ff., 113ff., 183ff., 207ff.

¹⁰ Cf. the observation by H. D. Betz, *Galatians*, 280: “It appears that in v 17 Paul submits his anthropological presuppositions in rather simple terms, but he leaves open the question how his soteriology affects his anthropology. In v 18 the soteriological presuppositions are brought in, but the theory in v 17 is left untouched. This situation forces us to conclude that the theory in v 17 is basically ‘pre-Pauline.’ It states the common anthropological doctrine on the basis of which Paul works out his own doctrine, but his own doctrine is much more complex. In Romans 7–8 we find an even more developed and more complex reworking of the elements which occur also in Galatians 5.”

ground of his antithetical use of “flesh” and “spirit” and of his strongly negative view of the “flesh” as the “breeding-ground for everything which is hostile to God”?¹¹ Are they relics of his pre-Christian past or a consequence of his conversion experience?¹² Or are they a result of his struggle with the churches in Galatia and Corinth?¹³ In other words: Did Paul himself form the antithesis? Or could he have adopted it – or at least some aspects – from an earlier Christian, Jewish or even Pagan tradition? And if this is true, where do the terms or concepts come from?

B. The Religio-Historical Issue in the Scholarly Debate

In the present context, I can only give a brief account of the major suggestions and of the most important steps of the religio-historical discussion.¹⁴

(a) In a first period of research, since the middle of the 19th century,¹⁵ there was a discussion between the purely biblical and a Hellenistic-Pagan explanation of the Pauline terms. It was inaugurated by the Tübingen School of Ferdinand Christian Baur and his pupils. According to their idealistic view of early Christian history, there was a fundamental antagonism between Paulinism and Jewish Christianity (as represented by James and others). Consequently, Paul and his thought were seen in a considerable distance from any kind of Jewish tradition and interpreted on the background of Hellenistic Paganism. On the basis of Rom 6:6, Baur had defined *σάρξ* in Paul as the

¹¹ Cf. H. Lietzmann, *An die Römer* (4th ed.; HNK 8; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1933), 81: “The breeding ground of all things ungodly.”

¹² This was supposed by some earlier interpreters, e.g., P. Feine, *Das gesetzesfreie Evangelium des Paulus nach seinem Werdegang dargestellt* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1899), 223: “The negative judgments about the *σάρξ* are only the correlates to his experience and his understanding of the *πνεῦμα*”; similarly A. Juncker, *Die Ethik des Paulus* (Halle a.d.S.: Niemeyer, 1904), 75, who supposes that Paul’s conversion caused a deeper moral judgment and, consequently, the negative view of *σάρξ*. On these authors, cf. R. Jewett, *Paul’s Anthropological Terms. A Study of Their Use in Conflict Settings* (AGJU 10; Leiden: Brill, 1971), 58f, 93f.

¹³ Thus R. Jewett, *Terms*, who explains the use of the Pauline anthropological terms on the background of the different situations underlying the various letters; a different explanation is given by F. W. Horn, *Das Angeld des Geistes*, 278f.

¹⁴ Cf. the more extensive accounts in C. H. Lindijer, *Het begrip Sarx bij Paulus* (Assen: van Gorcum, 1952), 11–69; O. Kuss, *Der Römerbrief. Zweite Lieferung* (Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet, 1959), 506–540; A. Sand, *Der Begriff “Fleisch” in den paulinischen Hauptbriefen* (BU 2; Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet, 1967), 1–121, and R. Jewett, *Terms*, 49–94.

¹⁵ The first monograph on the issue was written by C. Holsten in 1855 (*Die Bedeutung des wortes σάρξ im Lehrbegriffe des Paulus*, 1855; republished in idem, *Zum Evangelium des Paulus und des Petrus* [Rostock: Stiller, 1868]).

material body.¹⁶ The basic dilemma of the human being was, then, “that the good intentions of his νοῦς are immobilized by the sensual σάρξ.”¹⁷ Thus, Carl Holsten, who wrote the first monograph on the issue, could interpret the antithesis of σάρξ and πνεῦμα as an influence of the Hellenistic dualism of matter and spirit.¹⁸ Even though the simple identification of σάρξ with the material substance had to be abandoned,¹⁹ the view that Paul’s use of σάρξ was influenced by Hellenistic thought was accepted by the majority of critical exegetes until the end of the 19th century.²⁰ It was also advocated by Heinrich Julius Holtzmann’s New Testament theology, where Pauline anthropology is described as a result of the Hellenistic impact on Jewish thought, but the main focus is clearly on the Hellenistic side.²¹

(b) The idealistic view of σάρξ and πνεῦμα was then put aside by the works of the religio-historical school. Hermann Gunkel’s early study on the spirit in Paul²² turned attention to the dynamistic aspect of the early Christian understanding of the spirit. So, it was no longer possible to interpret the Pauline antithesis in terms of the dualism of matter and spirit. But the scholars of the religio-historical school maintained the view that the Pauline antithesis

¹⁶ R. Jewett, *Terms*, 51; F. C. Baur, *Vorlesungen*, 161.

¹⁷ R. Jewett, *Terms*, 51.

¹⁸ C. Holsten, *Die bedeutung des wortes σάρξ*, 367, 375f., 392f. (cf., on this study, H. H. Wendt, *Begriffe*, 80–83; O. Kuss, *Der Römerbrief*, 521–524; A. Sand, *Fleisch*, 15–19; R. Jewett, *Terms*, 51f.

¹⁹ Cf., especially, the study by H. Lüdemann, *Die Anthropologie des Apostels Paulus und ihre Stellung innerhalb seiner Heilslehre. Nach den 4 Hauptbriefen dargestellt* (Kiel: Toeche, 1872), on this study see W. G. Kümmel, *Das Neue Testament. Geschichte der Erforschung seiner Probleme* (OA III.3; Freiburg and Munich: Karl Alber, 1958), 235f.; O. Kuss, *Der Römerbrief*, 524–527; A. Sand, *Fleisch*, 22–27; R. Jewett, *Terms*, 52–54.

²⁰ Cf. R. Schmidt, *Die paulinische Christologie in ihrem Zusammenhange mit der Heilslehre des Apostels dargestellt* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1870), 8–46; O. Pfleiderer, *Das Urchristentum, seine Schriften und Lehren in geschichtlichem Zusammenhang* (Berlin: Reimer, 1887), 191f.; C. Weizsäcker, *Das apostolische Zeitalter der urchristlichen Kirche* (2nd ed.; Freiburg i. B.: Mohr, 1892), 127f.

²¹ H. J. Holtzmann, *Lehrbuch der neutestamentlichen Theologie* (2nd ed.; 2 vols.; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1911), 2:18. Cf. p. 24, where Holtzmann writes, “that within Pauline thought the opposition of physically different substances has become a dualism of ethically conflicting principles.” Cf. also 12ff. and 42ff. On Holtzmann’s view, see A. Schweitzer, *Geschichte der paulinischen Forschung von der Reformation bis auf die Gegenwart* (2nd ed.; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1933), 79ff., especially 86–90; W. G. Kümmel, *Das Neue Testament*, 239–242.

²² H. Gunkel, *Die Wirkungen des heiligen Geistes nach der populären Anschauung der apostolischen Zeit und nach der Lehre des Apostels Paulus* (2nd ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1899). Cf., on this study, W. G. Kümmel, *Das Neue Testament*, 307–309, and R. Jewett, *Terms*, 61.

should be interpreted against the background of Hellenistic thought²³ or of the so-called Hellenistic-Oriental syncretism. Wilhelm Bousset and Richard Reitzenstein refer to the ancient mystery cults or to the mysticism of the Hermetic literature²⁴ which are both seen as a purely pagan kind of Gnosticism.²⁵ According to Bousset, Paul is influenced by this kind of thought in his pessimistic anthropology and his dualistic and supranatural type of soteriology.²⁶ Reitzenstein goes even so far as to call Paul “the greatest of all Gnostics.”²⁷

(c) The influential school of Rudolf Bultmann²⁸ widely adopted the views of the religio-historical school. Even though Paul is not seen as a Gnostic himself, Bultmann thinks that he is influenced by Gnostic terms, which he adopts to formulate his own Christian teaching.²⁹ These anthropological terms allow him to describe the structure of the human existence, which is basically maintained in the state of the believer as in the “pre-Christian” state. According to Bultmann’s interpretation, “flesh” in Paul is

“neither matter in the Greek sense as the material which is derived ... from the Spirit, nor in the sense of Gnostic dualism ... as the lower, bad materiality in contrast with the soul,

²³ According to the compendium of W. Bousset and H. Gressman, *Die Religion des Judentums im späthellenistischen Zeitalter* (2nd ed.; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1926), 405, Paul’s view of *σάρξ* is a strictly Hellenistic one. C. Clemen, *Religionsgeschichtliche Erklärung des Neuen Testaments. Die Abhängigkeit des ältesten Christentums von nichtjüdischen Religionen und philosophischen Systemen* (2nd ed.; Gießen: Töpelmann, 1924), 133, hints at a Platonic background (*Phaido* 66b–67b). Cf., however, the insightful remark by H. Gunkel, *Wirkungen*, 98, who asks at the end of his study: “If the pessimistic view that prevailed in Hellenistic Judaism at the time of Christ, and according to which the sensuality of man, the body of flesh that binds him to this world of senses, is the ultimate cause of sinfulness, had the pessimistic view also found its way into Palestinian Judaism?” Gunkel leaves the question open, but he points already in the direction which would be opened up later on by the finds from the Qumran library.

²⁴ W. Bousset, *Kyrios Christos. Geschichte des Christusglaubens von den Anfängen des Christentums bis Irenaeus* (6th ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1967), 130: “We will have to turn our attention to those mixed formations in which philosophy and orientally determined faith, intellectual reflection and ancient mystery nature, speculation and religious ecstatic mysticism devour themselves into wondrous new formations.” Cf. also R. Reitzenstein, *Die hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen: nach ihren Grundgedanken und Wirkungen* (3rd ed.; Leipzig and Berlin: Teubner, 1927), 308ff.

²⁵ W. Bousset, *Kyrios Christos*, 133: “Hellenistic, purely pagan ‘Gnosis.’”

²⁶ W. Bousset, *Kyrios Christos*, 134.

²⁷ R. Reitzenstein, *Mysterienreligionen*, 86: “the greatest of all the Gnostics.”

²⁸ Cf. the important article by R. Bultmann, “Paulus,” in *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart. Handwörterbuch für Theologie und Religionswissenschaft* (3rd ed. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1930), 1019–1045, and the comprehensive account of Paul’s theology in R. Bultmann, *Theologie des Neuen Testaments* (9th ed., Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1984), 187–353.

²⁹ R. Bultmann, *Paulus*, c. 1030.

but instead is the world of the existing, which through man's attitude towards it first becomes sin."³⁰

Theologically, Bultmann's existential interpretation of Pauline terms was quite fruitful. Historically, however, it was firmly based on the assumption that Paul had adopted his anthropological terms and also the antithesis of σάρξ and πνεῦμα from pre-Christian Gnostic thought.³¹ Within the framework of this construction, the early Ernst Käsemann could even say that σάρξ in Paul is "something like a Gnostic aeon."³²

(d) The next turning-point of the discussion was the discovery of the Qumran texts. Now, for the first time, Hebrew and Aramaic documents from Palestinian Judaism of post-biblical and pre-rabbinic times became available, and these finds could throw new light on the background of Early Christianity. So, only a short time after the first discoveries, Karl Georg Kuhn pointed to the significance of the new finds³³ and suggested to understand the use of σάρξ and πνεῦμα in the New Testament against the background of Qumran.³⁴ He could demonstrate that in some passages of the new documents the connection between flesh and sin is much closer than in the Hebrew Bible.

³⁰ R. Bultmann, *Paulus*, c. 1035.

³¹ R. Bultmann, *Paulus*, c. 1030f. Idem, *Theologie*, 171. On Bultmann's construct of a pre-Christian Gnostic myth and its hermeneutical function for his theology, cf. J. Frey, *Die johanneische Eschatologie I. Ihre Probleme im Spiegel der Forschung seit Reimarus* (WUNT 96; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997), 129ff. Notwithstanding the thorough criticism of this construction (cf. C. Colpe, *Die religionsgeschichtliche Schule. Darstellung und Kritik ihres Bildes vom gnostischen Erlösermythos* [FRLANT 78; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1963]; M. Hengel, *Sohn Gottes*, 53ff.; idem, "Die Ursprünge der Gnosis und das Urchristentum," in *Evangelium – Schriftauslegung – Kirche* [ed. J. Ådna et al.; FS Peter Stuhlmacher; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1997], 190–223, here 203ff.; J. Frey, *Eschatologie* 1:133ff.), a Gnostic explanation of the Pauline terms is advocated by W. Schmithals, *Die Gnosis in Korinth. Eine Untersuchung zu den Korintherbriefen* (2nd ed.; FRLANT 48; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1965), 152 and 158; idem, *Anthropologie*, 84, and G. Strecker, *Theologie*, 133.

³² E. Käsemann, *Leib und Leib Christi. Eine Untersuchung zur paulinischen Begrifflichkeit* (BHT 9; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1933), 105: "something like a gnostic Aeon."

³³ K. G. Kuhn, "Zur Bedeutung der neuen palästinischen Handschriftenfunde für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft," *TLZ* 75 (1950): 81–86; idem, "Die in Palästina gefundenen hebräischen Texte und das Neue Testament," *ZTK* 47 (1950): 192–211.

³⁴ K. G. Kuhn, "Πειρασμός – ἁμαρτία – σάρξ im Neuen Testament und die damit zusammenhängenden Vorstellungen," *ZTK* 49 (1952): 200–222, here 209ff. (English translation: "New Light on Temptation in the New Testament," in *The Scrolls and the New Testament* [ed. K. Stendahl; New York: Harper, 1957], 94–113, 265–270); cf. idem, "Die Sektenschrift und die iranische Religion," *ZTK* 49 (1952): 296–316, here 301f.; idem, "Jesus in Gethsemane," *EvT* 12 (1952/53): 260–285, here 281. On the significance of Kuhn's early articles, see H. Lichtenberger, *Studien zum Menschenbild in Texten der Qumrangemeinde* (SUNT 15; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1980), 49f.; R. Jewett, *Terms*, 82f.

But since there is no full correspondence with the antithetical usage in Paul's letters,³⁵ the suggestion that the Pauline antithesis was developed under Qumranian influence³⁶ did not find wide acceptance within New Testament scholarship. Nevertheless, the Qumran discoveries have turned the eyes of New Testament exegetes back to the biblical and post-biblical traditions of Palestinian Judaism. They thus contributed to overcome the "pan-Gnosticism": which was characteristic for the interpretation within the Bultmann school.

(e) But soon after the subsidence of the first Qumran discussion, the focus of the religio-historical discussion seems to have turned again towards the side of Hellenism or, more precisely, of Hellenistic Judaism. Inspired by the study of Egon Brandenburger,³⁷ the majority of scholars today explain the Pauline antithesis on the background of Hellenistic Jewish Wisdom.³⁸ In his comprehensive study, Brandenburger tries to give evidence for a dualistic type of Wisdom thought mainly from the Book of Wisdom and from the

³⁵ Cf. H. Lichtenberger, *Menschenbild*, 50; cf. also H. Huppenbauer, "בשר 'Fleisch' in den Texten von Qumran," *ThZ* 13 (1957): 298–300; F. Nötscher, *Zur theologische Terminologie der Qumrantexte* (BBB 17; Bonn: Hanstein, 1956), 86f.; idem, "Geist und Geister in den Texten von Qumran," in *Vom Alten zum Neuen Testament. Gesammelte Aufsätze* (ed. F. Nötscher; Bonn: Hanstein, 1962), 175–187; H. Braun, "Römer 7,7–25 und das Selbstverständnis des Qumran-Frommen," *ZTK* 56 (1959): 1–18; idem, *Qumran und das Neue Testament* (2 vols.; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1966), 1:178f., 212–214, and 2:177; R. Meyer, "σάρξ C. Flesh in Judaism," in *TDNT* 7:109–118; J. Pryke, "'Spirit' and 'Flesh' in the Qumran Documents and Some New Testament Texts," *RevQ* 5 (1965): 345–360; R. E. Murphy, "BŠR in the Qumrān Literature and Sarks in the Epistle to the Romans," in *Sacra Pagina* (ed. J. Coppens; Paris and Gembloux: Duculot, 1959), 2:60–76, and A. Sand, *Fleisch*, 253–273.

³⁶ Cf. similarly S. Johnson, "Paul and the Manual of Discipline," *HTR* 48 (1955): 157–165, here 161; W. D. Davies, "Paul and the Dead Sea Scrolls: Flesh and Spirit," in *The Scrolls and the New Testament* (New York: Harper, 1957), 157–182, 276–282; D. Flusser, "Dead Sea Sect and Pre-Pauline Christianity," in *Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. C. Rabin and Y. Yadin; ScrHier 4; Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1958), 215–266, here 252–263; O. Betz, *Offenbarung und Schriftforschung in der Qumransekte* (WUNT 6; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1960), 120ff.; S. Schulz, "Zur Rechtfertigung aus Gnaden in Qumran und bei Paulus," *ZTK* 56 (1959): 155–185; and J. Becker, *Das Heil Gottes. Heils- und Sündenbegriffe in den Qumrantexten und im Neuen Testament* (SUNT 3; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1964), 243, who suggested, "that Paul is under an Essenian influence in his statements about sin." On the discussion see R. Jewett, *Terms*, 82ff.; O. Kuss, *Römerbrief*, 531–533.

³⁷ E. Brandenburger, *Fleisch und Geist. Paulus und die dualistischer Weisheit* (WMANT 29; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchner Verlag, 1968).

³⁸ Cf. H. Paulsen, *Überlieferung und Auslegung in Römer 8* (WMNAT 43; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchner Verlag, 1974), 45–47; U. Wilckens, *Der Brief an die Römer 1–3* (Evangelisch-katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament VI/1–3; Zurich: Benzinger and Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchner Verlag, 1978–1982), 2:67f.; U. Schnelle, *Neutestamentliche Anthropologie: Jesus – Paulus – Johannes* (BtS 18; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchner Verlag, 1991), 74f.

works of Philo. It is conjectured, then, that Paul came across such a concept in the circles of Hellenistic-Jewish Christians in Syro-Palestine³⁹ or – more precisely – at Antioch.⁴⁰ However, it must be inferred critically that the textual evidence for such a conception in Hellenistic Judaism is rather weak. Moreover, the lines from Palestinian Jewish traditions can be strengthened in the light of the recently published Wisdom texts from Qumran. Therefore, in my opinion, the development of the Pauline antithesis should be described in a different way.

C. Flesh and Spirit in the Hellenistic-Jewish Tradition

In order to demonstrate this, we have to enter a critical discussion of the evidence for a Hellenistic Jewish background of the Pauline antithesis. In his pioneering study, Brandenburger tries to show the “dualization” of Hellenistic Jewish tradition primarily from two Alexandrian witnesses, the *Book of Wisdom* and the works of Philo. Other Hellenistic Jewish works such as *4 Maccabees* are left aside, similarly other Alexandrian authors and works such as Aristobulos, Demetrios, Ps. Aristeas or the Third Book of the *Sibylline Oracles* where *σάρξ* and *πνεῦμα σοφίας* are not used in an anthropological sense or – at least – not linked with each other.

(a) The *Book of Wisdom* conveys biblical traditions within the framework of Platonic and Stoic concepts.⁴¹ In the center of the book, there is the praise of wisdom (Wis 6:22–11:1) who, as God’s throne-companion (9:4; cf. 8:3f.) and mediator of the creation (9:1f.), pervades the cosmos (8:1), orders the ways of Israel and grants virtue and understanding (8:7f.), salvation and immortality (8:17). But an examination of the anthropological terms in the *Book of Wisdom* causes skepticism against Brandenburger’s suggestions: *σάρξ* is used only three times in the whole book, and there is only one passage, in which the term is used in an anthropological sense:⁴² In Wis 7:1 the author in the royal garments of Pseudo-Solomon points out that he is a mortal man like all the rest, wrought into flesh (*ἐγλύφην σάρξ*) in his mother’s womb. Then,

³⁹ E. Brandenburger, *Fleisch und Geist*, 228.

⁴⁰ Antioch is mentioned by A. Dauer, *Paulus und die christlichen Gemeinden im syrischen Antiochia* (BbB 106; Weinheim: Philo, 1996), 77f., 114f.; K. Berger, *Theologiegeschichte des Urchristentums* (Tübingen and Basel: Francke, 1994), 387; J. Becker, *Paulus. Der Apostel der Völker* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1989), 108f.

⁴¹ Cf. H. Hübner, *Die Sapientia Salomonis und die antike Philosophie*; on the origin and date of the work, see S. Schroer, “Weisheit,” in *Einleitung in das Alte Testament* (ed. E. Zenger; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1995), 277–84.. The origin from Alexandria is disputed, however, by D. Georgi, *Weisheit Salomos*, 395f.

⁴² In two passages (Wis 12:5 and 19:21) the plural is used in a completely different sense.

six verses later he tells us that he prayed, and the “spirit of wisdom” (πνεῦμα σοφίας) was given to him (7:7; cf. 1 Kings 8:12–53). σάρξ and πνεῦμα do not have a predominant position in this passage: The term σάρξ, paralleled with αἷμα (7:2), denotes nothing else than the transitoriness of the human being,⁴³ and in the composite term πνεῦμα σοφίας (7:7), the predominant element is σοφία, not πνεῦμα.⁴⁴ So, it is not possible to take this passage as an argument for any kind of fixed opposition between σάρξ and πνεῦμα⁴⁵ in *Wisdom* or in Hellenistic Jewish circles.

(b) As primary witnesses to the tradition of dualistic wisdom within Hellenistic Judaism, Brandenburger quotes the works of Philo. But even if it is true that there are numerous examples for the negative view on human corporality, there is no clear evidence for the dualistic antithesis of σάρξ and πνεῦμα.

Firstly, the term σάρξ is not very frequent in Philo. Compared with σάρξ, he uses σῶμα more than ten times as much.⁴⁶ When he uses σάρξ, he often takes the plural (αἱ σάρκες), and when he uses the singular, this is most frequently caused by the scriptural passage he interprets.⁴⁷ So we can conclude that Philo adopts his use of σάρξ from the Bible, but when he formulates freely, he prefers the term σῶμα which is of little significance in the Septuagint.⁴⁸ Moreover, we can observe that there is much variety in Philo’s language. He is able to use σάρξ in numerous different phrases and put it in contrast to various other nouns such as ψυχή, νοῦς, πνεῦμα, λόγος, or σοφία, so that the result is a considerable number of different antitheses.⁴⁹

⁴³ This is shown by εἰμι μὲν κἀγὼ θνητὸς ἄνθρωπος (Wis 7:1) which is followed by a series of phrases describing the ideal author’s participation in human destiny.

⁴⁴ This is confirmed by the fact that σοφία is used 15 times in Wis 7–9, whereas πνεῦμα is used only 5 times. Cf. also B. L. Mack, *Logos und Sophia*, 64 n. 6: “Pneuma is used [only] to explicate the essence of wisdom, and not vice versa.”

⁴⁵ Cf. E. Brandenburger, *Fleisch und Geist*, 106, who wants to see a “opposition of flesh and spirit” in this passage.

⁴⁶ Cf. J. Leisegang, *Index*, 703 (1 1/2 columns) and 748–758 (about 20 columns). In Paul, σάρξ and σῶμα are used with roughly the same frequency; in the Septuagint, σάρξ is used more often than σῶμα.

⁴⁷ Cf. on Gen 2:24: *Giants* 64; *Alleg. Interp.* 2:49f.; on Lev 17:11: *Worse* 84f.; *Heir* 55ff.; on Gen 6:12: *Unchangeable* 140ff.; on Gen 6:3: *Giants* 19:29ff.; *Unchangeable* 2; on Lev 18:6: *Giants* 32; etc.

⁴⁸ Cf. E. Hatch and H. A. Redpath, *A Concordance to the Septuagint: And the Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament* (2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1998). In most instances, σάρξ is the translation of Hebrew בשר. On the contrary, σῶμα has no Hebrew equivalent. So, most of the passages where σῶμα is used are from the late books of the Septuagint which were written in Greek (Wis; 1–4 Macc) or from books where the Greek translation is quite free (e.g., Job).

⁴⁹ See, e.g., the opposition of σῶμα – ψυχή: *Giants* 12; *Unchangeable* 55, σῶμα – νοῦς: *Giants* 9; *Heir* 274, σῶμα – σοφία: *Alleg. Interp.* 3:151f., σῶμα (and γῆ) –

One of these is the word pair σάρξ – πνεῦμα which occurs in several passages.⁵⁰ I can only comment on two of them.

In Philo's tract *On the Giants* 29ff., both terms are taken from Gen 6:3: "My Spirit shall not abide forever among men, because they are flesh" (διὰ τὸ εἶναι αὐτοὺς σάρκας). In contrast to the Hebrew text, Philo applies the term πνεῦμα not to the divine breath and the gift of life but to the spirit of pure insight (ἀκήρατος ἐπιστήμη), which is hindered by the fleshly nature of the human beings (ἡ σαρκῶν φύσις). In this passage, flesh is even called "the chief cause of ignorance." But what Philo means by "flesh" he demonstrates in an enumeration which is obviously inspired by Platon's *Phaedo* (66b–67b):⁵¹ "Flesh" is a comprehensive term for the duties of daily life, marriage, rearing of children, provision of necessities, and the business of private and public life which tie the human being to the earthly sphere and hinder the growth of wisdom. So, like σῶμα, the term σάρξ denotes the material and bodily life which burdens the soul and prevents it from its ascent to the divine sphere.

The only passage in which πνεῦμα and σάρξ are used in the same context to describe different ways of existence, is *Who is the Heir* 57. But even in this passage the terms are not used in a fixed opposition. Instead, the author switches between σάρξ and αἷμα⁵² and, similarly, between πνεῦμα and νοῦς or λογισμός. His description of two opposed ways of existence has the purpose to admonish the readers not to remain in the servitude of the bodily life but to emigrate from sensuality and to become heirs of the spiritual things.⁵³ So, the "dualism" in this passage is embedded into the framework of an ascent mysticism. Therefore, the distinction between the lower and the upper sphere, the earthly things and the spiritual things seems to be the only kind of "dualism" in this passage. Of course, the earthly is inferior to the spiritual, and σάρξ belongs, like σῶμα, to the earthly sphere. But in contrast to Paul, σάρξ is considered neither to be the reason or occasion for sin, nor to be seen as a quasi-daemonic power with cosmic dimensions.⁵⁴ Even where Philo

πνεῦμα: *Alleg. Interp.* 161, σάρξ – ψυχή: *Giants* 40; *Drunkenness* 69f.; *Unchangeable* 55f.; *Alleg. Interp.* 3:158, σάρξ – νοῦς: *Giants* 40; *Alleg. Interp.* 2:49f.; *Heir* 267f., 274; *Worse* 84f.; *Spec. Laws* 4:122f., σάρξ – λόγος; *Alleg. Interp.* 3:158 (cf. *Drunkenness* 87), σάρξ – σοφία: *Unchangeable* 141–143; *Alleg. Interp.* 3:152.

⁵⁰ Cf. *Giants* 19f., 29, *Unchangeable* 2, *Worse* 84f., *Spec. Laws* 4:122f.; *Heir* 55ff.; see E. Brandenburger, *Fleisch und Geist*, 116 n. 5.

⁵¹ More parallels are given in D. Winston and J. Dillon, *Two Treatises of Philo of Alexandria. A Commentary on De Gigantibus and Quod Deus Sit Immutabilis* (BJS, 25; Chico, Calif.: Brill, 1983), 250f.

⁵² This is developed on the basis of Lev 17:11, 14.

⁵³ *Heir* 66; cf. 68ff.

⁵⁴ Cf. G. Sellin, *Der Streit*, 131: It is "a sphere in which man ... can become entangled, but not ... a demonic potency with its own ungodly subject."

describes the flesh with personal images, he always withdraws them immediately and avoids any kind of mythic dualism.⁵⁵ Brandenburger's interpretation, instead, "tends to exaggerate the cosmic dimensions of the dualistic motifs, resulting in a picture of Hellenistic Judaism's wisdom speculation which is virtually Manichaean."⁵⁶

The religio-historical construction of the "dualization" of sapiential tradition within Hellenistic Judaism can not be demonstrated strictly. Summarizing the religio-historical discussion, Robert Jewett correctly points out that "on the key issue of the precedent for Paul's cosmic σάρξ usage, the Qumran tradition offers a somewhat closer correlation than Hellenistic Judaism."⁵⁷ These parallels shall be discussed in the following section.

D. The Classical Qumran Parallels

Some of the parallels for the Pauline usage of "flesh" from the manuscripts from Cave 1 are well known. They were discussed already in the 1950s by Karl Georg Kuhn, William D. Davies, and others.⁵⁸ With the exception of these passages, the vast majority of occurrences of בשר in Qumran remain firmly within the biblical range of meanings.⁵⁹ For the present purpose, I can omit all of these passages and discuss only the few texts where בשר is strongly linked with the idea of sin and iniquity or even seems to represent a sort of cosmic power.

(a) Firstly, there are some terminological parallels in the *War Rule* and in the concluding "psalm" in 1QS where בשר is used in connection with terms of sin, as in בשר עול (1QM IV 4; 1QS XI 9) and בשר אשמה (1QM XII 12⁶⁰) which correspond to the Pauline expression σὰρξ ἁμαρτίας in Rom 8:3.⁶¹

⁵⁵ Cf. G. Sellin, *Der Streit*, 131 n. 148.

⁵⁶ R. Jewett, *Terms*, 90.

⁵⁷ R. Jewett, *Terms*, 92f.

⁵⁸ Cf. K. G. Kuhn, Πειρασμός – ἁμαρτία – σάρξ, 209ff.; idem, *New Light on Temptation*; W. D. Davies, "Paul and the Dead Sea Scrolls"; idem, "Additional Notes," in *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism. Some Rabbinic Elements in Pauline Theology* (2nd ed.; London: SPCK, 1995); D. Flusser, "The Dead Sea Sect," 252–263. On the early discussion, see H. Braun, *Qumran und das Neue Testament*, 2:175–177.

⁵⁹ This was already stated by H. Huppenbauer, *Fleisch*, and F. Nötscher, *Terminologie*, 85; cf. also R. Meyer, "σάρξ," 112–114.

⁶⁰ Cf. the parallel passage without אשמה in 1QM XIX 4 from which some authors conjectured that אשמה 1QM XII 12 is an interpretative addition, cf. J. Carmignac, *La Règle de la Guerre*, 182; J. van der Ploeg, *Guerre*, 148; J. Becker, *Das Heil Gottes Heils- und Sündenbegriffe in den Qumrantexten und im Neuen Testament* (SUNT 3; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1964), 111.

⁶¹ Thus already K. G. Kuhn, "Πειρασμός," 210 n. 2; cf. also J. Becker, *Heil Gottes*, 248; H. Braun, *Qumran und das Neue Testament*, 1:178.

But the semantic differences should not be overlooked: In the *War Rule*, “sinful flesh” is used to denote “the wicked” (1QM IV 4), “Belial and all the men of his lot” (1QM IV 2), or the hostile “nations” (1QM XII 11; cf. XIV 7; XV 2), who will be destroyed in the eschatological war by the power of God. But in the phrases in 1QM IV 4 and XII 12 the notion of sin or guilt is conveyed by the words **עול** and **אשמה**. Therefore, strictly speaking, the meaning of **בשר** in these passages does not go beyond the biblical range of meanings. **בשר** simply denotes a kind of human being,⁶² which is characterized more precisely only by the terms **עול** and **אשמה**. The composite terms **בשר עול** and **בשר אשמה**, then, refer to the nations as wicked and opposed to Israel or opposed to the sons of light.⁶³ But in spite of the semantic differences, phraseologically **בשר עול** is much closer to the term $\sigma\alpha\rho\acute{\xi}\ \acute{\alpha}\mu\alpha\rho\tau\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma$ (Rom 8:3) than any of the Greek parallels.⁶⁴

(b) Even closer to the Pauline usage semantically are some passages in the *Hodayot* and, similarly, in the “psalm” attached to the *Community Rule* in 1QS. In these passages, the notion of sin is conveyed by the term **בשר** itself, not just by its complements. We should also note that some passages of the *Hodayot* even show a certain opposition of **בשר** and **רוח** even if it is quite far removed from the Pauline antithesis.

(α) In QH^a V 30–33 (= XIII 13–16 Sukenik),⁶⁵ one of the characteristic passages which Heinz-Wolfgang Kuhn has called “Niedrigkeitsdoxologien,”⁶⁶ the author says:

In the mysteries of your insight

⁶² H. Huppenbauer, *Fleisch*, 299.

⁶³ Cf. J. Becker, *Heil Gottes*, 111.

⁶⁴ The closest Greek parallel seems to be *Apocalypse of Moses* 25: $\acute{\alpha}\mu\alpha\rho\tau\acute{\iota}\alpha\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \sigma\alpha\rho\acute{\kappa}\acute{o}\varsigma$.

⁶⁵ References to the manuscript 1QH^a are quoted according to the counting of columns and lines in H. Stegemann’s reconstruction of the scroll. The reference according to the *editio princeps* by E. L. Sukenik is given in brackets. Cf. H. Stegemann, *Rekonstruktion der Hodayot. Ursprüngliche Gestalt und kritisch bearbeiteter Text der Hymnenrolle aus Höhle 1 von Qumran* (Heidelberg: Philological Dissertation [typoscript], 1963). I owe thanks to Prof. Stegemann for permission to use his unpublished dissertation and to quote according to his reconstruction of the *Hodayot*.

⁶⁶ See the definition of this genre in H.-W. Kuhn, *Enderwartung und gegenwärtiges Heil. Untersuchungen zu den Gemeindeliedern von Qumran* (SUNT 4; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966), 27f.; cf. also H. Lichtenberger, *Menschenbild*, 73f., and J. Becker, *Heil Gottes*, 136f. The term is coined as a parallel to “Gerichtsdoxologie,” which is a specific genre the biblical tradition (cf. Exod 9:27f.; Lam 1:18–22; Job 4f.; Ezra 9; Neh 9; Dan 3:31–4:34; 9); on this genre, see F. Horst, “Die Doxologien im Amosbuch,” *ZAW* 47 (1929): 45–54 (republished in idem, *Gottes Recht. Gesammelte Studien zum Recht im Alten Testament* [Theologische Bibliothek 12; Munich: Kaiser, 1961], 155–166); G. v. Rad, “Gerichtsdoxologie,” in *Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament* (ed. G. v. Rad; Theologische Bibliothek 48; Munich: C. Kaiser, 1973), 2:245–254.

[you] have apportioned all these things,
to make your glory known.
[However, what is] the *spirit of flesh*⁶⁷
to understand all these matters
and to have insight in [your wondrous] and great counsel?
What is someone born of a woman among all your awesome works?
He is a structure of dust fashioned with water,
his counsel is the [iniquity] of sin, shame of dishonor and so[urce of] impurity, and a
depraved spirit rules over him.⁶⁸

In this passage the term *רוח בשר*, “spirit of flesh,”⁶⁹ refers to the human spirit,⁷⁰ which is characterized as fleshly, that is, not capable of grasping God’s counsel and his wondrous deeds. *בשר* refers to the created existence of the human being, which is also described by *ילוד אשה* “born of a woman,” and *מבנה עפר*, “structure of dust,” and finally characterized in terms of sin, impurity, and depravation. But in this passage, the author chiefly stresses the incapability of the human being to understand God’s counsel and to appreciate his glory. Humanity is unable to have insight, is ruled by a depraved spirit (*רוח נעוה*), and, consequently, acts in sin and impurity.

Having stated the human incapability of understanding, the hymn goes on to highlight the miracle of revelation and salvation. This is continued by the confession:

And I, your servant, have known
thanks to *the spirit* you have placed in me [...].⁷¹

Whereas human nature is unable to appreciate the works of God, the author is led towards salvation by the divine spirit which provides knowledge. In some respects, the passage even plays with the contrast between “flesh” and “spirit” whereas the “fleshly” human nature, called *רוח בשר*, is unable to gain insight, the blindness of the flesh is healed by the gift of the spirit.⁷² However, the contrast could also be expressed as the opposition of two different “spirits,” the “spirit of depravation” ruling over the “fleshly” human being, and the spirit providing insight.

⁶⁷ Cf. 4Q301 5 3; on this passage, see below.

⁶⁸ English translation according to García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Study Edition* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), 1:150f., where the lines are counted differently (lines 19f.). Cf. the discussion of restorations in H. Lichtenberger, *Menschenbild*, 91.

⁶⁹ See also 1QH^a IV 37 (= XVII 25 Sukenik). In 1QH^a XII 30 (= IV 29 Sukenik), the composite term is replaced by the single word *בשר*.

⁷⁰ A. E. Sekki, *The Meaning of ruah at Qumran* (SBLDS 110; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989), 104 n. 24.

⁷¹ 1QH^a V 35f. (= XIII 18f. Sukenik).

⁷² Cf. H. Lichtenberger, *Menschenbild*, 91

(β) A contextual opposition of “flesh” and “spirit” can be found more clearly in 1QH^a VII 34f. (= XV 21 Sukenik). The statement on the spirit in this passage is also preceded by a “Niedrigkeitsdoxologie” which uses בִּשְׂרֵנוּ to denote human incapability of understanding the divine mysteries.

What, then, is flesh, to understand [your mysteries]?
 How can dust direct its steps?
 Then, the author continues:
 You have fashioned the spirit
 and have organized its task [before the centuries].
 From you comes the path of every living being.⁷³

In this passage, the human being, as a mere creature of dust, is contrasted with God, who has predestined the ways of every creature and “in his hand is the inclination (צַר) of every spirit (כּוֹל רוּחַ).”⁷⁴ The context shows that the opposition of “flesh” and “spirit” in this passage must be understood in anthropological terms. Whereas “flesh” characterizes the nature of the created being, “spirit” denotes the predestined inclination, or even the predestined existence of every human being.⁷⁵ This usage is quite close to the way predestination is expressed in the pre-Essene Treatise on the Two Spirits in 1QS III 13–IV 26.⁷⁶

⁷³ 1QH^a VII 34f. (= XV 21f. Sukenik).

⁷⁴ 1QH^a VII 27 (= XV 14 Sukenik).

⁷⁵ Cf. H.-W. Kuhn, *Enderwartung*, 120–130, esp. 123.

⁷⁶ See esp. 1QS III 15–18. In this text, however, the main opposition is that of two spirits governing human beings, not the opposition of “flesh” and “spirit.” This is clearly visible in 1QS IV 20f. (transl. from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition* 1:79):

“Then God will refine, with his truth, all man’s deeds,
 and will purify for himself the structure of man,
 ripping out all spirit of injustice from the innermost part of his flesh,
 and cleansing him with the spirit of holiness from every wicked deed.”

Even though there is a marked contrast between the human flesh and the two different spirits, the main opposition is between the spirit of deceit and the spirit of holiness, whereas the flesh is capable of being purified; cf. H.-J. Fabry, “רוּחַ רִיחַ rūaḥ VII–VIII,” in *ThWAT* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1990), 419–425, here 420, and already H. Braun, *Qumran und das Neue Testament* I:179. On the character and origin of the dualism expressed in the doctrine of the two spirits cf. J. Frey, “Different Patterns of Dualistic Thought in the Qumran Library. Reflections on their Background and History” in *Legal Texts and Legal Issues. Proceedings of the Second Meeting of the International Organisation for Qumran Studies Cambridge 1995. FS J. M. Baumgarten* (STDJ 23; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 275–335, here 290–295 (in this volume, 243–299, here 256–267); on the interpretation of this passage, see generally A. Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination. Weisheitliche Urordnung und Prädestination in den Textfunden von Qumran* (STDJ 18; Leiden: Brill, 1995), 121–170. On the pre-Essene character of the text, see also A. Lange and H. Lichtenberger, “Qumran,” in *TRE* 28:45–79, here 56f.

(γ) In another passage, 1QH^a XII 30f. (= IV 29f. Sukenik), flesh is explicitly characterized as sinful:

What is flesh compared to this?
 What creature of clay can do wonders?
 He is in sin (בְּעוֹן) from his maternal womb
 And in guilty iniquity (בְּאִשְׁמַת מַעַל) right to old age.⁷⁷

This passage can also be classified as “Niedrigkeitsdoxologie.” It refers to the preceding praise of God’s wondrous counsel and his powerful acts.⁷⁸ In contrast with this, the human being, called “flesh” and “creature of clay,” is not only weak and frail, but even blind to God’s glory and basically sinful and guilty. עוֹן and אִשְׁמַת are part of the life of a human from the beginning to the end. In view of the construction with ב, Jürgen Becker has suggested that the author considers human beings within a sphere of sinfulness. Dominated by that sphere, they do evil deeds, and this characterizes them as בֶּשֶׂר.⁷⁹ “Human beings, as such, are sinful from their conception to their old age, and they stand under the judgment of the God who alone is righteous.”⁸⁰

The passage is followed by a confession of salvation, introduced by the phrase וְאֲנִי יִדְעֵתִי כִי.⁸¹ Here the author states that it is God alone who provides salvation and insight, “by the spirit which he created” for the human being (בְּרוּחַ יִצְרֵ אֱלֹהִים).⁸² Only his “spirit” can perfect the path of the sons of Adam. So, the opposition between “flesh” and “spirit” expressed in this passage is chiefly formed by the contrast between human inability and God’s saving power. Only through the “spirit” created by God can “flesh” grasp the power and glory of God, that is, only through his predestination can a human being participate in salvation.⁸³ The praise of God’s salvific acts is strengthened by the corresponding confession of human incapability.

⁷⁷ Translation according to García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*, 1:169 (there lines 29f.).

⁷⁸ 1QH^a XII 29 (= VI 28 Sukenik).

⁷⁹ J. Becker, *Heil Gottes*, 13.

⁸⁰ G. W. E. Nickelsburg, “The Qumranic Transformation of a Cosmological and Eschatological Tradition (1QH 4:29–40),” 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, 1994), 2:649–659, here 654; cf. *ibid.*: “This motif of universal judgment parallels 1 Enoch 1:7, 9.”

⁸¹ On the genre of “Heilsbekenntnis” and its characteristics, see H.-W. Kuhn, *Enderwartung*, 26.

⁸² 1QH^a XII 32 (= IV 31 Sukenik).

⁸³ In this passage, רִיחַ is an expression of God’s predestination, as in 1QH^a VII 34f. (= XV 21f. Sukenik; see above) and IX 10f. (= I 8f. Sukenik), cf. H.-W. Kuhn, *Enderwartung*, 120–130. The notion of God’s predestination is also expressed in the following passage (1QH^a XII 39 [= IX 38 Sukenik]): “For you created the just and the wicked”

1QH^a XII 30f. (= IV 29f. Sukenik) provides also the most explicit linkage between “flesh” and “sin” within the *Hodayot*. Here, בָּשָׂר does not only express human weakness and frailty, but also a state of being characterized by inescapable sinfulness and basic opposition with the creator. And, in contrast with the passages mentioned above from the *War Rule*, the sinfulness of the “flesh” is not only related to the hostile nations or the “lot of Belial,” (i.e., to people outside the pious community); the author himself and the members of the community praying the *Hodayot* also confess that they are “flesh” and sinners – and as such they are called to have insight into God’s wondrous counsel and to participate in salvation.

As Jürgen Becker has observed,⁸⁴ this kind of negative usage of בָּשָׂר can be found only in those passages of the *Hodayot* which are often called the hymns of the community, not in the individual *Thanksgiving Hymns*, the so-called hymns of the teacher. In the individual hymns, בָּשָׂר is used only three times, firmly within the biblical range of meaning, without any notion of sin or iniquity.⁸⁵ The use of the term as an expression of sin is confined to the communal hymns.⁸⁶

This observation might be an additional argument for the validity of the distinction between “Lehrerlieder” and “Gemeindelieder,” developed in the early sixties by Gert Jeremias and Heinz-Wolfgang Kuhn.⁸⁷

⁸⁴ J. Becker, *Heil Gottes*, 67.

⁸⁵ In 1QH^a XVI 32, 34 (= VIII 31, 33 Sukenik), “בָּשָׂר denotes the (weak) substance or power of the body (cf. J. Becker, *Heil Gottes*, 67 n. 1), and in the expression מַחֲסֵי בָּשָׂר in 1QH^a XV 20 (= VII 17 Sukenik) it also conveys the notion of weakness, but not the slightest allusion to sin. Cf. *ibid.*, 67: “So here man is not yet radically understood as a sinner who can do nothing but sin, as it is later clearly articulated ... in the Essene congregation with regard to the term בָּשָׂר.”

⁸⁶ 1QH^a XII 30ff. (= IV 29ff. Sukenik) was originally seen as part of the individual hymn 1QH^a XII 6–XIII 6 (= IV 5–V 4 Sukenik; cf. G. Jeremias, *Der Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit* [SUNT 2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1963], 204ff.). But J. Becker assumes more precisely that this passage (1QH^a XII 30b–XIII 6 [= IV 29b–V 4 Sukenik]) is a later expansion of the individual hymn 1QH^a XII 6–30a (= IV 5–29a Sukenik) by the community (cf. *Heil Gottes*, 54f.). This view is also confirmed by H.-W. Kuhn, *Enderwartung*, 23 n. 3.

⁸⁷ On this distinction, cf. generally G. Jeremias, *Der Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit*, 168ff.; H.-W. Kuhn, *Enderwartung*, 21ff.; cf. the formal distinction within the *Hodayot* in G. Morawe, *Aufbau und Abgrenzung der Loblieder von Qumran. Studien zur gattungsgeschichtlichen Einordnung der Hodajoth* (Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1960). The distinction is primarily based on arguments of contents and language, cf. G. Jeremias, *Der Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit*, 72ff. More recently, it seems to be confirmed by manuscript evidence as well. According to E. Schuller’s reconstruction of the 4QH-manuscripts, the manuscript 4Q429 (4QH^c) only contained individual hymns, 4Q427 (4QH^a) only communal hymns, and 4Q432 (4QH^c) was also a copy which concentrated on individual hymns (cf. E. Schuller, “The Cave 4 Hôdâyôt Manuscripts: A Preliminary Description,” in *Qumranstudien* [ed. H.-J. Farby, A. Lange, and H. Lichtenberger; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck &

(c) A passage similar to the communal hymns can be found in 1QS, in the psalm-like composition 1QS IX 26–XI 22 which is attached to the *Community Rule* in that collective manuscript.⁸⁸ Within the final passage of that composition, **בִּשְׂר** is used three times in a sense corresponding to the usage in the *Hodayot*.

In 1QS XI 7, the author says that he has been given knowledge which is hidden from the assembly of flesh (**כֹּהֵן בִּשְׂר**). In this phrase, **בִּשְׂר** could refer to humanity as a whole, but the context suggests that the phrase “assembly of flesh” denotes the group of all people who do not belong to the “lot of the holy ones” (XI 7f.), i.e., to the community. Here, as in 1QM, **בִּשְׂר** seems to be a mere characterization of the people remaining outside the Essene community.

But only a few lines later, in 1QS XI 9f., the confession of salvation is followed by a kind of “Niedrigkeitsdoxologie” which is quite similar to those in the communal hymns of the *Hodayot*. Here, the author confesses:

However, I belong to evil humankind (**וְאֲנִי לְאָדָם רָשָׁעָה**)
to the assembly of unfaithful flesh (**וְלִסְוֵד בִּשְׂר עוֹל**)
my failings (**עוֹנוֹתַי**), my iniquities (**פְּשׁוֹי**), my sins (**הַטְּאוֹתַי**)
with the depravities of my heart (**עִם נְעוּיֹת לִבִּי**)
let me belong to the assembly of worms
and to those who walk in darkness.⁸⁹

In this passage, as in 1QH^a XII 30f (= IV 29f. Sukenik), the member of the community himself confesses sharing the lot of sinful humanity, because he is **בִּשְׂר**. According to the preceding confession, he knows that he is predestined to participate in salvation, he also claims to have insight into God’s wonders and into the “mystery of existence” (**רִזְ נְהִיָּה**: 1QS XI 3f.), even though he confesses that he belongs to the assembly of sinful flesh and shares the lot of evil humankind.⁹⁰

A few lines later (1QS XI 11f.) he confesses:

As for me, if I stumble,

Ruprecht, 1995], 87–100, here 97f.). In 1QH^a the individual hymns are arranged in the middle part of the scroll, whereas the framework is made up of communal hymns. This shows that, at least during the stage of the collection of the *Hodayot*, the community was well aware of the specific character of the individual hymns (cf. H. Lichtenberger, *Menschenbild*, 31).

⁸⁸ On the description of 1QS, see A. Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination*, 121ff.; A. Lange and H. Lichtenberger, *Qumran*, 54–59. On the textual development of the material, cf. S. Metso, *The Textual Development of the Qumran Community Rule* (STDJ 21; Leiden: Brill, 1997). The problems of the composition cannot be dealt with here.

⁸⁹ Translation according to García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition* 1:97–99 (modified at the beginning of line 10).

⁹⁰ In the light of lines 9–10, the phrase in **כֹּהֵן בִּשְׂר** I.7 also receives strong negative overtones.

the mercies of God shall be my salvation always,
and if I fall by the sin of the flesh (בעוון בשר),
in the justice of God which endures eternally, shall my judgment be.⁹¹

The rendering of the phrase בעוון בשר is quite decisive. Many interpreters have tried to weaken the expression in order to keep it close to the biblical usage of בשר,⁹² and the majority of the English translations lack clarity.⁹³ As Jürgen Becker has stated, in the phrase בעוון בשר the word בשר has the function of a *genetivus auctoris*: consequently, flesh is the cause of the evil deed and it is the power that provokes evil deeds.⁹⁴

(d) Summarizing these passages, we can confirm the view of some earlier authors: whereas the vast majority of the Qumran passages use בשר within the range of meanings given in the Hebrew Bible, there are some instances which go beyond this range. Here, flesh is deeply linked with sin and impurity and in some way opposed to the spirit of God who gives insight and knowledge. Moreover, flesh seems to represent an evil sphere or even power that causes human sin and causes the pious to stumble.

But in contrast to the usage in the *War Rule*, the *Hodayot* and the final psalm in IQS do not just consider “the others,” the enemies of the community or the sinful nations, to be flesh. Most interestingly, the people praying the *Hodayot* themselves confess to participation in the fleshly nature of human beings. They are flesh and sinners, and as such they are elected to participate simultaneously in revelation and salvation.

In these passages, we have the closest parallels to the Pauline usage of flesh as a sphere or even power opposed to God and his Spirit. However, the suggestion that the apostle could have known and used the terms of the Qumran sect⁹⁵ has been far too bold to be accepted in the discussion. It is unlikely

⁹¹ Translation according to García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition* 1:99 (modified in line 12).

⁹² Thus, e.g., F. Nötscher, *Terminologie*, 86: “if I fall as a weak man”; H. Huppenbauer, *Fleisch*, 299: “if I fall in my nature as man,” or R. Meyer, “φαρισαίος,” in *TDNT* 9:112: “sinfulness of the flesh.” E. Brandenburger, *Fleisch und Geist*, 101, gives a paraphrase which is also far too weak: “stumble by the flesh exposed to sin without resistance.”

⁹³ This holds true for the translation by F. García Martínez, *Dead Sea Scrolls Translated*, 18: “if I fall in the sin of the flesh” (= *Study Edition*, 1:99), similarly the translation by J. H. Charlesworth, et al., eds., *Dead Sea Scrolls. Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations* (vols. 1–4B; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck and Louisville: WJK, 1994–1999), 1:49. The best translation of the passage is in G. Vermes, *The Dead Sea Scrolls in English* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1987), 88: “If I stagger because of the sin of flesh.”

⁹⁴ J. Becker, *Heil Gottes*, 111f.: “In any case, 11:12 (‘if I stumble through the sin of my flesh’) makes it clear that here בשר is the cause of sin, the power that leads to sin.” Cf. also *ibid.* n. 8: “One falls away from salvation through the concrete act of sin that is brought about by the בשר.”

⁹⁵ See, e.g., S. Schulz, “Rechtfertigung,” 184: “no doubt ... that Paul knew and took up the theological views of this sect”; J. Becker, *Heil Gottes*, 249f., who asserts an indirect

that Paul – even when he was a Pharisaic student of law – had close contacts with Qumranites or other Essene groups. Therefore, the question whether or not there is a historical or traditio-historical connection between the Qumranite and the Pauline usage of “flesh” has remained open and has caused many exegetes to explain Paul’s language in terms of Hellenistic parallels instead.

E. The New Evidence from 1Q/4QInstruction and 1Q/4QMysteries

The publication of the hitherto unknown sapiential texts from Cave 4⁹⁶ has opened up new perspectives on these semantic and religio-historical issues. These documents can help to understand the background of the use of בשר in the Qumran texts mentioned above. And, in my opinion, they confirm the view that the negative usage of σάρξ in Paul has its roots not in the theological developments of the Jewish Diaspora, but in Palestinian Jewish sapiential traditions.

First of all we have to note that the new sapiential texts provide a great number of new attestations of בשר: of the 63 references in the index volume of Wacholder’s and Abegg’s edition,⁹⁷ 22 are from additional manuscripts of the *Damascus Document*, the *Hodayot*, or *Serek ha-Yahad*. 21 of the 41 remaining references are found in sapiential texts,⁹⁸ 16 of them in different

Essene influence on the Pauline terminology of sin. Cf. also J. Murphy O’Connor, “Truth: Paul and Qumran,” in *Paul and Qumran* (ed. J. Murphy O’Connor; London: Chapman, 1968), 179–230, here 179: “That there are traces of Essene influence in the Pauline corpus is now generally admitted.” Recent scholarship has cautiously left open the question of the links between Qumranian and Pauline thought, cf., e.g., H.-W. Kuhn, “Qumran und Paulus. Unter traditionsgeschichtlichem Aspekt ausgewählte Parallelen,” in *Das Urchristentum in seiner literarischen Geschichte. FS J. Becker* (ed. U. Mell and U. B. Müller; BZNW 100; Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 1999), 227–246, here 244: “In this regard, we can only speculate as to how Qumran traditions could have reached Paul before 70 CE.”

⁹⁶ The scholarly breakthrough was the release of computerized reconstructions of the texts from transcriptions made in the fifties and preserved in a preliminary concordance: B. Z. Wacholder and M. G. Abegg, *A Preliminary Edition of the Unpublished Dead Sea Scrolls. The Hebrew and Aramaic Texts from Cave Four* (Washington DC: Biblical Archaeology Society, 1995). The reconstruction of the sapiential texts was presented in fasc. 2, 1–203. The official edition of these documents has appeared in 1997 and 1999 in vol. 20 and vol. 34 of the DJD-series.

⁹⁷ B. Z. Wacholder and M. G. Abegg, *A Preliminary Edition of the Unpublished Dead Sea Scrolls. The Hebrew and Aramaic Texts from Cave Four*, Fasc. 4: *Concordance of Fascicles 1–3* (Washington DC: Biblical Archaeology Society, 1996), 95f.

⁹⁸ 4Q301; 4Q306; 4Q411; 4Q416–418; 4Q426; 4Q525.

manuscripts of a single work which was originally called *Sapiential Work A*⁹⁹ and is now renamed 1Q/4QInstruction (or *Musar l^eMevin*, i.e., “Instruction for the Knowledgeable”).¹⁰⁰ One further important reference, 4Q301 5 3¹⁰¹ is from a manuscript which probably represents the so-called Book of Mysteries (1Q/4QMyst)¹⁰² which is closely related to 1Q/4QInstruction in content and terminology.¹⁰³ The context of the four other references¹⁰⁴ remains unclear. I will, therefore, focus the discussion on the use of בשר and its relation with רוח in 4QInstruction and 4QMysteries.

I. Some Introductory Issues

In the context of the present volume, it is not necessary to discuss the complicated issues concerning the origin and character of 1Q/4QInstruction and the related texts.¹⁰⁵ Only some of the most important observations can be mentioned briefly:

According to the editors, the work is preserved in seven or eight manuscripts (1Q26; 4Q415–418; 4Q418a; 4Q423).¹⁰⁶ They are all written in a

⁹⁹ E. Tov and S. J. Pfann, eds., *Companion Volume to the Dead Sea Scrolls Microfiche Edition* (2nd ed.; Leiden: Brill and IDC, 1995), 43.

¹⁰⁰ Thus the official edition by J. Strugnell, D. J. Harrington, and T. Elgvin, eds., *Qumran Cave 4. XXIV. Sapiential Texts, Part 2. 4QInstruction (Musar l^eMevin): 4Q415ff., with a Re-edition of 1Q26* (DJD 34; Oxford: Clarendon, 1999). Regrettably, the original Hebrew name of the text has not been preserved.

¹⁰¹ This passage might be quite important, because בשר seems to be used within a kind of “Niedrigkeitsdoxologie” similar to the passages in the communal hymns of the *Hodayot* discussed above. The text reads ... מ[נ]ה בשר כיא ..., “what is flesh, that ...?”

¹⁰² For the arguments for the view that 4Q301 is one of three 4Q-manuscripts of the *Book of Mysteries* (4QMyst^e), see A. Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination*, 93 n. 2; idem, “Physiognomie oder Gotteslob? 4Q301 3,” in *DSD* 4 (1997), 282–296, here 283; but cf. the differing view in L. H. Schiffman, “Mysteries,” in *Qumran Cave 4. XV. Sapiential Texts. Part 1* (ed. T. Elgvin, M. Kister, T. Lim, B. Nitzan, S. Pfann, E. Qimron, L. H. Schiffman, and A. Steudel; DJD 20; Oxford: Clarendon, 1997), 31–123, here 31 and 113f., who considers 4Q301 as a different composition resembling the Enochic literature.

¹⁰³ On the thematic and terminological similarities between 1Q/4Q Mysteries and 1Q/4QInstruction, see A. Lange, “In Diskussion mit dem Tempel. Zur Auseinandersetzung zwischen Kohelet und weisheitlichen Kreisen am Jerusalemer Tempel,” in *Kohelet in the Context of Wisdom* (ed. A. Schoors; BETL 136; Leuven: Peeters, 1998), 113–159.

¹⁰⁴ 4Q306 1 4; 4Q411 1 11; 4Q426 4 4; 4Q525 8 5.

¹⁰⁵ Cf. the general introduction in the edition in J. Strugnell, D. J. Harrington, and T. Elgvin, *Qumran Cave 4. XXIV*, 1–40 and the article by A. Lange, “Die Weisheitstexte aus Qumran: Eine Einleitung,” in *The Wisdom Texts from Qumran and the Development of Sapiential Thought* (ed. C. Hempel, A. Lange, and H. Lichtenberger; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2002), 3–30.

¹⁰⁶ Cf. the cautious comments of the editors J. Strugnell, D. J. Harrington, and T. Elgvin, *Qumran Cave 4. XXIV*, 475–477 and 501, on the allocation of the fragments which were

Herodian hand (i.e., from the late first century BCE).¹⁰⁷ The number of copies and the relatively late date of copying show that the work was highly esteemed by the Qumranites. This is also confirmed by the fact that one of the copies was hidden in Cave 1 among the most important documents of the community.¹⁰⁸ The terminological survey by John Strugnell and Daniel J. Harrington shows clearly that the work is a wisdom composition,¹⁰⁹ and from the available evidence we can see that “it was loosely structured at best.”¹¹⁰ But although there are substantial passages preserved from the manuscripts 4Q416, 4Q417, and 4Q418 with some textual overlaps between the three, it is not yet possible to get certainty on the general outline or the redactional history of the composition.

A sound judgement on these issues can only be reached on the basis of a material reconstruction of the manuscripts.¹¹¹ According to Annette Steudel and Birgit Lucassen, 4Q416 frg. 1 with its broad right margin was the beginning of that manuscript,¹¹² whereas 4Q417 frg. 1 (formerly frg. 2) might have been the beginning of the manuscript 4Q417. If both suggestions are correct, the manuscripts 4Q416 and 4Q417 represent different stages of redaction. 4Q417, then, is a copy of an earlier version of the work, whereas 4Q416 represents a later stage of redaction which is also represented by 4Q418.¹¹³

Obviously, the composition combines traditional types of instruction on practical issues like poverty and finances, social and family relations, with theoretical, theological reflections. The sapiential admonitions are presented within a cosmological and eschatological framework.¹¹⁴ Consequently,

formerly collected under the siglum 4Q418 but are now edited as 4Q418a (4QInstruction⁶) and 4Q418c (4QInstruction⁷).

¹⁰⁷ Cf. J. Stugnell, D. J. Harrington, and T. Elgvin, *Qumran Cave 4*. XXIV, 21.

¹⁰⁸ Cf. H. Stegemann, *Die Essener*, 89f.

¹⁰⁹ Cf. J. Stugnell, D. J. Harrington, and T. Elgvin, *Qumran Cave 4*. XXIV, 8ff. and 22ff.

¹¹⁰ Thus J. J. Collins, *Jewish Wisdom in the Hellenistic Age* (OTL; Louisville: WJK, 1997), 118.

¹¹¹ A first attempt was published by T. Elgvin, “The Reconstruction of Sapiential Work A,” *RevQ* 16 (1993–1995): 559–580, cf. also his doctoral thesis analysis in which his reconstruction makes up the basis of his further analysis. Independently from Elgvin, A. Steudel and B. Lucassen have produced a material reconstruction, cf. the short report in J. Strugnell, D. J. Harrington, and T. Elgvin, *Qumran Cave 4*. XXIV, 18f.

¹¹² Thus already D. J. Harrington, *Wisdom Texts from Qumran* (The Literature of the Dead Sea Scrolls; London and New York: Routledge, 1996), 41.

¹¹³ Cf. also A. Lange, “In Diskussion mit dem Tempel,” 127f., and idem, “Die Weisheitstexte aus Qumran.”

¹¹⁴ Cf. also T. Elgvin, “Wisdom, Revelation and Eschatology in an Early Essene Writing,” *SBLSP* 34 (1995): 440–463; idem, “Early Essene Eschatology: Judgment and Salvation according to Sapiential Work A,” in *Current Research and Technological Developments* (ed. D. W. Parry and S. T. Ricks; STDJ 20; Leiden: Brill, 1996), 126–165. On the eschatological dualism of the work, see also J. Frey, *Dualistic Thought*, 298f.

4QInstruction provides evidence of an early merging of sapiential with eschatological or even apocalyptic thought. It should also be pointed out that there are no clear indications of Qumran “sectarian” origin.¹¹⁵ The terminology differs markedly from that of the typical “sectarian” documents. There are no indications linking it to a specific religious community, let alone a community separated from the Temple, and the admonitions are concerned with daily life. Therefore, like most of the other sapiential texts from Qumran,¹¹⁶ the work should be classified as a non-sectarian, or non-Essene, or – more precisely – pre-Essene work. This is valid although there may be different redactional stages. Even in the later version there are no clear traces of “sectarian” redaction or authorship.

As Armin Lange has shown from the treatment of cultic issues, the document seems to have originated in sapiential circles which were connected with and interested in the Temple.¹¹⁷ So, 1Q/4QInstruction can be classified clearly as a product of the Palestinian Jewish sapiential tradition.

The suggested dates of composition vary from the 4th or 3rd century¹¹⁸ to the middle of the 2nd century BCE.¹¹⁹ Most plausible is a date at the end of the 3rd or in the first half of the 2nd century, i.e., roughly contemporary with the work of Ben Sira.¹²⁰ The composition is cited in the *Hodayot*,¹²¹ and the

¹¹⁵ See, most recently, the thorough terminological analysis by J. Strugnell, D. J. Harrington, and T. Elgvin, *Qumran Cave 4. XXIV*, 22ff.; cf. previously A. Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination*, 48f.; D. J. Harrington, “Wisdom at Qumran,” in *The Community of the Renewed Covenant. The Notre Dame Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (CJAn 10; Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1994), 148; idem, *Wisdom Texts from Qumran*, 41, 85. T. Elgvin also states that “our composition predates the *yahad* as an established community” (“Early Essene Eschatology,” 133). It is, therefore, somewhat bewildering that he nevertheless wants to call the work “a wider representative of the Essene movement, not of the *yahad*” (ibid.).

¹¹⁶ Thus already W. L. Lipscomb and J. A. Sanders, “Wisdom at Qumran,” in *Israelite Wisdom. FS S. Terrien* (ed. J. G. Gammie, W. A. Brueggemann, W. Humphreys, and J. M. Ward; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1978), 277–285, here 278: “There are no true wisdom texts among the scrolls of undisputed Essene authorship”; cf. also H. Stegemann, *Die Essener, Qumran, Johannes der Täufer und Jesus* (Freiburg i. B.: Herder, 1993), 143. A possible exception could be 4Q420–421 (4QWays of Righteousness), cf. T. Elgvin, “Wisdom in the *Yahad*. 4QWays of Righteousness,” *RevQ17* (1996): 205–232, here 205f.

¹¹⁷ Cf. A. Lange, “In Diskussion mit dem Tempel,” 131; idem, “Die Endgestalt des protomasoretischen Psalters und die Toraweisheit. Zur Bedeutung der nicht essenischen Weisheitlichen Kreisen am Jerusalemer Tempel,” in *Der Psalter in Judentum und Christentum* (ed. E. Zenger; HBS 18; Freiburg: i.B. Herder, 1998), 101–136, here 122. See also idem, “Die Weisheitstexte aus Qumran.”

¹¹⁸ H. Stegemann, *Die Essener*, 143.

¹¹⁹ T. Elgvin, “Early Essene Eschatology,” 133.

¹²⁰ Cf. A. Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination*, 47; idem, “In Diskussion mit dem Tempel,” 129f.; idem, “Die Endgestalt des protomasoretischen Psalters,” 122. For the terminus *post quem*, Lange proposes linguistic arguments using, e.g., the Persian loan word 𐎧, and

term **רז נהיה** which is characteristic of this work and of the Book of Mysteries¹²² is used only in one more passage from Qumran, the final “psalm” of the manuscript 1QS.¹²³ Thus, the documents which take up some elements from the tradition of 1Q/4QInstruction (or 1Q/4QMysteries) are obviously those texts which also use the term **בשר** in a very negative sense.

This observation leads to the question: Does the Qumran tradition derive its negative view of **בשר** from this pre-Essene sapiential tradition? Is a similar usage of **בשר** already visible in 1Q/4QInstruction and 1Q/4QMysteries?

II. The Usage of **בשר** in 1Q/4QInstruction: An Overview

(α) Some of the 16 passages mentioned in the index of Wacholder and Abegg are uncertain or too fragmentary to be interpreted or classified semantically. This is true for the following instances:

- 4Q418 19 4: Only an uncertain **בשרכה** is legible. The reading is questioned additionally by the DJD edition, where *dalet* is preferred over *res* (the result is **שרכה**), but a *bet* is also thought to be possible.¹²⁴
- 4Q418 103 I 9: The reading **בשר** is certain, but without any context. The editors propose **הבשר**, **ובשר** or **הבשר**.¹²⁵
- 4Q417 3 4: Here we have the reading **עם תענית** **בשר** (“flesh with fasting”), but the context remains entirely unclear.
- 4Q417 1 II 14 (formerly 2 II 14):¹²⁶ The term **נבונות בשר** “understanding of the flesh” is used in a series of prohibitions or warnings, not to be mislead or not to be led astray. The editors propose that the text gives “a description of God’s thoughts which are free of fleshliness.”¹²⁷ It should be noted, however, that in the context there is a reference to an evil **יצר** (4Q417 1 II 12), even if the precise sense to be given to **יצר** is uncertain.¹²⁸

other words and constructions which occur only late; the terminus *ante quem* is given by the citation in the *Hodayot* which were composed within the second half of the 2nd century BCE.

¹²¹ 1QH^a XVIII 29f. (= X 27f. Sukenik) cites 4Q418 55 10, and 1QH^a IX 28f. (= I 26f. Sukenik) alludes to 4Q417 2 I 8; cf. A. Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination*, 46.

¹²² In the preserved fragments of 1Q/4QInstruction, it is used more than 20 times; in the preserved fragments of 1Q/4QMysteries, it is documented 4 times.

¹²³ 1QS XI 3.

¹²⁴ J. Stignell, D. J. Harrington, and T. Elgvin, *Qumran Cave 4. XXIV*, 242f.

¹²⁵ J. Stignell, D. J. Harrington, and T. Elgvin, *Qumran Cave 4. XXIV*, 329.

¹²⁶ It should be noted that the authors of the DJD edition have changed the numbering of the fragments of 4Q417. The former frg. 1 is now frg. 2; the former frg. 2 is now frg. 1. In the present article, I follow the new numbering.

¹²⁷ J. Stignell, D. J. Harrington, and T. Elgvin, *Qumran Cave 4. XXIV*, 172. Cf. the similar interpretation of A. Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination*, 54, who renders **בלוא בשר** “without his offering insights into the flesh.”

¹²⁸ J. Stignell, D. J. Harrington, and T. Elgvin, *Qumran Cave 4. XXIV*, 171.

Therefore, the passage remains quite unclear, but it may be suggested that the use of **בשר** within the phrase “understanding of the flesh” has a rather negative connotation.

- 4Q418 101 II 5: is used in a context which probably deals with matters of property: The line reads **בשרו לוא ימעל בבשרו**.¹²⁹ The first **בשרו** could be the end of the foregoing phrase, which is lost. Then the text goes on: “He shall not do harm to (*or* act unfaithfully against) his *own kin*[.”¹³⁰ So, even if the precise meaning of the passage remains unclear, it is probable that **בשר** is used in the sense of “kinsfolk.” Thus, the use of **בשר** in this passage is within the range of biblical usage.

(β) There are seven other passages in which **בשר** is obviously used within the biblical range of meanings:

- 4Q416 2 IV 4: **לבשר אחר** is a quotation of Gen 2:24.
- 4Q416 2 III 21 (= 4Q418 10 6): In this passage, the addressee’s wife is referred to as the **עזר בשרכה**, “the help of your flesh.” The phrase seems to combine Gen 2:18 **עזר בשרכה** and Gen 2:23 **בשר מבשרי**.
- 4Q418 103 II 9 reads **הונכה עם בשרכה** “your property with your flesh.” The property of a person is taken together with his “flesh.” Here, **בשר** might be used to denote the physical life of a person. The context is a halakah on mixed things. Another suggestion is made by Strugnell and Harrington: They propose to take **בשר** in the sense of “cattle” or “animal property,” which is then contrasted with material wealth.¹³¹ In any case, the usage of “flesh” in this passage remains fully within the biblical range of meanings.
- In a passage which is preserved three times (4Q416 2 II 2f.; 4Q417 1 II 4; and 4Q418 81),¹³² the phrase “if he shuts his hand, then there will be gathered the spirit of all flesh” takes up terms from Deut 15:7 (“you shall not close your hand”) and Job 34:14 “if he were to ... recall his life-giving spirit, all that lives would perish ...”¹³³ As in the Hebrew Bible, the phrase **כל בשר** denotes creation or humanity as a whole.

¹²⁹ Thus J. Stugnell, D. J. Harrington, and T. Elgvin, *Qumran Cave 4*. XXIV, 326: “**בשרך** is to be excluded (unless much of the *kap* has been carried away), but *waw* or *yod* would also be very difficult.”

¹³⁰ Thus the translation by J. Stugnell, D. J. Harrington, and T. Elgvin, *Qumran Cave 4*. XXIV, 326.

¹³¹ J. Stugnell, D. J. Harrington, and T. Elgvin, *Qumran Cave 4*. XXIV, 334.

¹³² Translation according to J. Stugnell, D. J. Harrington, and T. Elgvin, *Qumran Cave 4*. XXIV, 93. Cf. *ibid.*, 65: “Note that the whole phrase, protasis and apodosis, is found also in a different work, 4Q419 8 ii 7; it is more likely, historically, that 4Q419 came later and was quoting from 4Q415ff.”

¹³³ Translation according to the *New English Bible*.

(γ) Besides the passages mentioned above, there are three passages in 1Q/4QInstruction in which the term **בשר** is used clearly beyond the range of meanings in biblical Hebrew. These passages show that already in this pre-Essene sapiential document “flesh” is closely associated with sin, upheaval, and impurity. Most interestingly, all these passages use the term **רוח בשר** “spirit of flesh” which is also attested in the *Hodayot*.¹³⁴ In two of the passages, the term is used for a single human being, so that the expression **כל רוח בשר** can be formed. But in one passage, it seems to denote a collective spiritual entity (i.e., sinful humanity as a whole). The three passages deserve to be commented on in more detail.

III. The Negative Usage of **בשר** in 1Q/4QInstruction

(α) The first passage where **בשר** has the meaning of “sinful flesh” is 4Q418 frg. 81. In this passage, the addressee is admonished to keep himself separate from all abomination, since God has separated him from all “spirit of flesh”:

“He has separated you from all spirit of the flesh; and you, keep separate from all that he hates and keep yourself apart from all abomination of the soul”¹³⁵

In this passage, **כול רוח בשר** is paralleled by “all that he [= God] hates,” so the “all spirit of flesh” is a sphere or entity opposed to God and his will. The context is predestinarian: God has assigned a portion to every being, and he has placed the addressee, probably the student of Wisdom,¹³⁶ in an outstanding position, to “rule over his treasure.”¹³⁷ He is, therefore, called to sanctify himself and to keep himself apart from the abominations that characterize the “spirit of flesh.”

(β) In 4Q416 frg 1, which was probably located at the very beginning of this manuscript,¹³⁸ we find an announcement of the eschatological judgment. In 4Q416 1 10–13 we read:

¹³⁴ 1QH^a V 30 (= XIII 13 Sukenik) and IV 37 (= XVII 25 Sukenik).

¹³⁵ 4Q418 81 1–2, translation according to F. Garía Martínez, *Dead Sea Scrolls Translated*, 391, but “keep yourself apart” instead of “keep yourselves apart” for the imp. sg. **הברל**.

¹³⁶ There is also the possibility that the addressee is Israel as a whole, but if the document was read and studied by individuals in a wisdom circle or school, they could simply consider themselves to be addressed.

¹³⁷ 4Q418 81 9. The interpretation is uncertain. God’s treasure could be wisdom, so that the insightful is a ruler over God’s treasure. But it could also be the Tora.

¹³⁸ Cf. D. J. Harrington, *Wisdom Texts from Qumran*, 41. T. Elgvin, “Wisdom, Revelation, and Eschatology in an Early Essene Writing,” *SBLSP* 34 (1995): 440–464, here 456–459; idem., “Early Essene Eschatology,” 146–164 interprets the fragment in accordance with his extensive textual reconstructions based on the alleged overlaps with fragments from 4Q418. But if it is true that 4Q416 1 is the beginning of the manuscript, Elgvin’s reconstruction cannot be maintained. Therefore, the fragment is interpreted on the basis of

In the heavens he will judge every work of wickedness, but all sons of the truth he will favor [...] its end (scil. of iniquity?). And all those who wallow in it (= iniquity?) will tremble and shout, for ... , the waters and the abysses will tremble and every spirit of flesh will be destroyed (יִתְעַרְעְרוּ כּוֹל רוּחַ בָּשָׂר), but the sons of the heavens [...] his judgment, and all injustice will end

In spite of the textual lacunae, the antithetic structure of the passage is obvious. Two groups of beings face an opposing eschatological fate. The first group is characterized by wickedness, iniquity, and injustice, and its members will face judgment, they will tremble with fear and suffer final destruction. The other group is characterized by truth, and its members will be favored by God. The members of the first group wallow in something (most probably iniquity), and are named by the collective term כּוֹל רוּחַ בָּשָׂר. The other group seems to comprise the sons of heaven and the sons of the truth (i.e., the angels together with the just human beings). The statement is quite clear: when God will enact his eschatological judgment and put an end to all kinds of injustice, every “spirit of flesh” will be destroyed.¹³⁹ Thus, the “spirit of flesh” is clearly opposed to the “sons of the truth” and the “sons of the heavens.” It is characterized by wickedness and injustice, and will face eschatological destruction.

The use of בָּשָׂר in this passage is clearly negative, and the context shows that כּוֹל רוּחַ בָּשָׂר is basically linked with iniquity and sin. It is obvious, however, that not all human beings are characterized as בָּשָׂר. Apart from כּוֹל רוּחַ בָּשָׂר there are other human beings called “sons of the truth” who will not be destroyed, but favored in the final judgment. Like in 4Q418 81 1f., בָּשָׂר does not characterize humanity as a whole but sinful humanity. The author and the readers consider themselves separate from the “fleshly spirits.” Therefore, the anthropological teaching of 1Q/4QInstruction is characterized by a kind of cosmic and eschatological dualism which has at least some similarities with the dualistic teaching in the Treatise on the Two Spirits in 1QS III 13–IV 26.¹⁴⁰

the transcription by B. Z. Wacholder and M. G. Abegg, *Preliminary Edition* 2:54. In the DJD edition, J. Strugnell and D. J. Harrington cautiously accept only the overlaps with 4Q418 1–2, but not the overlap with 4Q418 201 suggested by T. Elgvin, “Early Essene Eschatology,” 46–153; cf. J. Strugnell, D. J. Harrington, and Elgvin, *Qumran Cave 4. XXIV*, 83f.

¹³⁹ The verbal form יִתְעַרְעְרוּ is probably a hitpalpel of עָרַר which is used in Jer 51:58 to denote the destruction of the city walls of Babylon. Therefore, it seems to be an expression for eschatological destruction. Cf. A. Lange, “In Diskussion mit dem Tempel,” 143 n. 101.

¹⁴⁰ Cf. J. Frey, “Dualistic Thought,” 298f. (in this volume, 264f.); cf. also D. J. Harrington, “Two Early Jewish Approaches to Wisdom. Sirach and Qumran Sapiential Work A,” *Journal for the Study of Pseudepigrapha* 16 (1997): 25–38, here 35: “The world view of Sapiential Work A seems midway between Ben Sira’s timid doctrine of the pairs and the fully fleshed out dualistic schema of 1QS 3–4.”

(γ) The cosmic background of the dualism in 1Q/4QInstruction is even more obvious in 4Q417 frg. 1 (formerly frg. 2). If the reconstruction of Annette Steudel and Birgit Lucassen is correct, the passage was the beginning of the earlier version of 1Q/4QInstruction¹⁴¹ presenting a kind of epistemological introduction to the work as a whole. Here, the insightful (מְבִיֵן) is admonished to study the רִזְ נְהִיָה, the “mystery of being” (or: “mystery that is to come”)¹⁴² in order to discern truth and iniquity, wisdom and folly (4Q417 1 I 6f. par. 4Q418 43 4).

A few lines later, there is mention of a heavenly book:

Engraved is the ordinance, and ordained is all the punishment. For engraved is that which is ordained by God against all the iniquities of the children of Seth. And written in his presence is the book of memorial of those who keep his word. And the vision of Hago is the book of memorial. And he gave it as an inheritance to Enosh (אֶנוֹשׁ) together with the people of the spirit (עַם בְּשָׂר). For according to the pattern of the holy ones is his fashioning. But no more has meditation been given to the spirit of flesh (רוּחַ בְּשָׂר), for it knew not the difference between good and evil according to the judgment of its spirit (4Q417 1 I 15–18).¹⁴³

The book of memorial¹⁴⁴ mentioned here is probably the Book of Hago which is known from some other Qumran texts.¹⁴⁵ Its contents might be an extract from heavenly tablets, comprising the ordinances of God, but also the coming judgment (i.e., the order of being). This book of heavenly knowledge is to be studied by the addressee of 1Q/4QInstruction.

And the present passage gives a mythological explanation, why it can be studied, or why the insightful can gain heavenly insight. The book, it is said, was given to אֶנוֹשׁ. This word does not only denote humankind. Here, after the mention of the sons of Seth and their iniquities (I 15), it seems to denote – as a proper name – Enosh, the son of Seth who is mentioned in Gen 4:26; 5:6, 9–11; 1 Chr 1:1; and Sir 49:16, and who was, according to *Jubilees* 4:12, the first human being to invoke the name of the Lord.¹⁴⁶ The passage seems to

¹⁴¹ See above, n. 111; cf. A. Lange, “In Diskussion mit dem Tempel,” 127f.

¹⁴² On the interpretation of this term, cf. A. Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination*, 57f.; J. Collins, *Jewish Wisdom*, 121–125, and, most recently, T. Elgvin, “The Mystery to Come. Early Essene Theology of Revelation,” in *Qumran Between the Old and New Testaments* (ed. F. H. Cryer and T. L. Thompson; Copenhagen International Seminar 6; JSOTSS 290; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 113–150.

¹⁴³ Translation according to D. J. Harrington, “Wisdom at Qumran,” 53 with minor alterations according to A. Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination*, 53.

¹⁴⁴ Cf. Mal 3:16.

¹⁴⁵ 1QSa I 6f.; CD X 6; XIV 6–8.

¹⁴⁶ Cf. A. Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination*, 87f. On the post-biblical interpretation of Enosh, see also S. D. Fraade, *Enosh and his Generation. Pre-Israelite Hero and History in Postbiblical Interpretation* (SBLMS 30; Cico CA: Scholars Press, 1958), and P. Schäfer, “Der Götzendienst des Enosh,” in *Studien zur Geschichte und Theologie des rabbinischen Judentums* (AGJU 15; Leiden: Brill, 1978), 134–152. Whereas rabbinic traditions

refer to a mythological tradition of the fall of angels during the time of the sons of Seth, which presented Enosh and the **עַם רוּחַ**, the “people of the spirit,” as the only pious of their time.¹⁴⁷ So this primeval father and the **עַם רוּחַ** (i.e., the obedient angels) gained the heavenly memorial as inheritance. In contrast, the book was not given to the **רוּחַ בֶּשֶׂר**, because it was not able to discern between good and evil (I 17f.).

This passage on the **רוּחַ בֶּשֶׂר** is also clearly characterized by an ethical and eschatological dualism. The “spirit of flesh” (i.e., sinful humanity) is characterized by opposition to God and the inability to discern between good and evil. As regards ethical behavior and – even more importantly – the possibility of gaining heavenly wisdom, it is opposed to Enosh and the obedient angels. The addressee of 1Q/4QInstruction, who is admonished to study the “mystery that is to come,”¹⁴⁸ can understand himself as an heir of the primeval father Enosh to whom the book of heavenly knowledge was given as an inheritance. So, the addressee is given an explanation as to why he is honored with the gain of heavenly wisdom, which is not revealed to sinful humanity.

IV. *The Relation between בֶּשֶׂר and יִצְר*

In 4Q416 1 16, at the end of the announcement of judgement which was discussed above, the term **בֶּשֶׂר** occurs again. Between two lacunae, the reading **תּוֹתָן וּמִבְּיִנּוֹתָן יִצְר בֶּשֶׂר הוּאָה** is preserved, and from the parallel in 4Q418 2 8, it is possible to add **כִּי**, so that the reading is **כִּי יִצְר בֶּשֶׂר הוּאָה**.¹⁴⁹ However, the meaning of the phrase, and especially of the term **יִצְר**, remains unclear. Should it be translated by “[because] an object of flesh is he”? Or does **יִצְר** denote the “inclination,” so that the translation is “[the in]clination of flesh is he?”¹⁵⁰ Cautiously, Strugnell and Harrington propose that, if **יִצְר** is preceded by a **כִּי**, “**כִּי יִצְר**” could refer to man or his sinful *yeṣer*.¹⁵¹ It can be asked whether the idea of the evil inclination (**יִצְר הרע**) which is quite frequent in later rabbinic literature is already present in 1Q/4QInstruction and whether it is related in any way to the idea of sinful flesh.¹⁵²

interpret Enosh as a representative of his idolatrous contemporaries, all non-rabbinic traditions interpret Gen 4:26 as a positive statement on the individual patriarch. It is this line of interpretation to which 4Q417 1 I 16 belongs.

¹⁴⁷ Cf. A. Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination*, 88.

¹⁴⁸ 4Q417 1 I 6 (par 4Q418 43 4) and 1 I 18.

¹⁴⁹ Cf. J. Strugnell, D. J. Harrington, and T. Elgvin, *Qumran Cave 4. XXIV*, 225.

¹⁵⁰ Cf. J. Strugnell, D. J. Harrington, and T. Elgvin, *Qumran Cave 4. XXIV*, 83.

¹⁵¹ J. Strugnell, D. J. Harrington, and T. Elgvin, *Qumran Cave 4. XXIV*, 88.

¹⁵² The use of **יִצְר** in Qumran literature and other pre-rabbinic sources (e.g., *Jubilees*) can not be discussed here, but cf. R. E. Murphy, “Yēṣer in the Qumran Literature,” *Biblica* 39 (1958): 334–344.

This may be confirmed by two other passages where the term יצר or even רע יצר is used: In 4Q417 1 II 12,¹⁵³ within a series of warnings, it is said: רע יצר רען אל תפתכה מחשבת יצר רען: “Let not the thought of an evil inclination mislead thee”¹⁵⁴ Strugnell and Harrington note that the phrase is related to Gen 6:5 כל יצר מחשבות לבו רק תרע but they leave the question open whether the phrase “indicated something ill-fashioned or something that plans, or intends, it evilly.”¹⁵⁵ In view of the term מחשבת, however, the latter seems to be more plausible.

The passage 4Q417 1 I 13ff. shows that יצר is conceived within a dualistic framework. In 4Q417 1 I 17 it is said that the יצר of Enosh was according to the pattern of the Holy Ones (i.e., the angels), so that he and the “spiritual people” (עם רוח) received the “book of memorial.” On the contrary, the “spirit of the flesh” (רוח בשר) was not able to discern between good and evil, so that the heavenly revelation was not given to the רוח בשר. The passage shows that 1Q/4QInstruction shares the idea of two different inclinations.” The “good” one is associated with the ancestral hero, the angels, and – probably – the students of wisdom. The “bad” inclination can be linked with the fleshly spirit.” This might also explain the notion of יצר רע in 4Q417 1 II 12 where the student is warned not to be misled by a “bad” יצר and the term נבענת בשר (“understandings of the flesh”) is used in the subsequent line.

From these two passages, it is very probable that the term יצר בשר in 4Q416 1 16 must be understood within the same dualistic framework. Even if the precise meaning of the phrase can not be grasped, בשר carries the same negative connotation as a few lines above, in 4Q416 1 12.

V. רוח בשר and the Contextual Relation of בשר and רוח in 1Q/4QInstruction

A remarkable terminological feature of our sapiential tradition is the composite expression רוח בשר which is used in the three passages discussed above and in the *Hodayot*.¹⁵⁶ But even if the negative connotation of the composite term is quite clear, it is not easy to determine its meaning. Does רוח בשר denote a single human being characterized by “flesh,”¹⁵⁷ or rather a collective, or spiritual, or psychological phenomenon?¹⁵⁸ What is the semantic value of רוח within the composite term? And how is רוח בשר linked with

¹⁵³ Formerly 4Q417 2 II 12.

¹⁵⁴ Translation from J. Strugnell, D. J. Harrington, and T. Elgvin, *Qumran Cave 4. XXIV*, 170.

¹⁵⁵ J. Strugnell, D. J. Harrington, and T. Elgvin, *Qumran Cave 4. XXIV*, 172.

¹⁵⁶ 1QH^a IV 37 (= XVII 25 Sukenik); V 30 (= XIII 13 Sukenik).

¹⁵⁷ This could be suggested by the phrase כל רוח בשר.

¹⁵⁸ This was suggested on the basis of the usage within the *Hodayot*, cf. A. E. Sekki, *The Meaning of ruah*, p. 104: “the spirit of man.”

other kinds of “spirit” in the present composition? Since it is not possible to present a comprehensive analysis of the use of רוח in 1Q/4QInstruction, I will limit my investigation to the three passages where the composite term occurs.

The expression כ(ול) רוח בשר in 4Q416 1 12 and 4Q418 81 1f. shows that the composite term רוח בשר can be used to denote any single human being who is characterized by flesh, so that the collective expression is formed by the addition of כל or כול. On the other hand, the usage without כול in 4Q417 1 I 17 (formerly 2 I 17) shows that the term can also be used for a collective or even for the evil part of humanity as a whole.¹⁵⁹ So, the use in 1Q/4QInstruction differs from the later use of רוח בשר in the *Hodayot* where the term seems to denote a kind of spiritual ability¹⁶⁰ or rather the lack of such an ability.¹⁶¹ In 1Q/4QInstruction, however, the basic meaning is that of a “fleshly being,” that is, a living creature (therefore רוח) which is governed by “flesh” in its thoughts and deeds.

In 1Q/4QInstruction, there is no clear terminological antithesis between רוח and בשר. Only in the passage 4Q417 1 I 15ff., there is a contextual opposition between רוח בשר, the fleshly spirit on the one side and the עם רוח, the spiritual people,¹⁶² on the other side. Within the dualistic framework of this passage, there is a contextual antagonism between the two terms, which are both used to qualify a specific group, a part of humanity, or a group of heavenly beings. Of course, the term רוח is used not very precisely and has quite different meanings within this work.¹⁶³ But in spite of all differences in detail, it is not too bold to say that this passage is the earliest parallel to the later Pauline antithesis of “flesh” and “spirit.”

VI. *Preliminary Conclusions*

There are, of course, numerous passages in 1Q/4QInstruction, in which בשר is used within the biblical range of meanings. In the Hebrew Bible, בשר denotes the frailty of the creature, but there is no clear connection with disobe-

¹⁵⁹ In their translation, the editors tentatively insert an indefinite article (“to a [?] fleshly spirit”; cf. J. Strugnell, D. J. Harrington, and T. Elgvin, *Qumran Cave 4. XXIV*, p. 155.), but this seems to be a harmonizing interpretation. Their commentary is correct: “The statement, ... concerning a group of the righteous ... is contrasted with the collective רוח בשר, which describes not so much a psychological principle but the group of evil humanity” (ibid., p. 165).

¹⁶⁰ Cf. A. Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination*, 87: “an unspecified form of human cognitive faculty.”

¹⁶¹ The negative connotation of the רוח בשר in 1Q/4QInstruction suggests that the passages in the *Hodayot* have a similar negative connotation.

¹⁶² Cf. A. Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination*, 89: “a heavenly, spiritual people”

¹⁶³ The same is true for the later Qumran usage, cf. H.-J. Fabry, “רִנָּה.”

dience or sin.¹⁶⁴ The three passages mentioned above clearly go beyond the biblical usage and use **בִּשְׂר** – or more precisely **רוּחַ בִּשְׂר** – as a term to denote a sinful human being or sinful humanity. In these passages, “flesh” (**בִּשְׂר**) is clearly characterized by its opposition to God and its inability to discern between good and evil. The chosen and wise have to be aware that they are separated from the “spirit of flesh,” and all “spirit of flesh” will be destroyed in the eschatological judgement, when iniquity will finally cease.

If it is correct to distinguish between two redactional stages of 1Q/4QInstruction, an earlier one represented by 4Q417 and a later one represented by 4Q416 and 4Q418, there is no difference between the two in respect of the negative usage of **בִּשְׂר** and the dualistic framework in which **בִּשְׂר** or **רוּחַ בִּשְׂר** is mentioned. Since 1Q/4QInstruction is a composition that predates the *yahad*, the passages mentioned above give evidence that the negative usage of **בִּשְׂר** was not a Qumran sectarian development. The terminological development obviously predates the *yahad*. It rather originates in pre-Essene sapiential circles which might have been in close connection with the Jerusalem Temple. It is, therefore, definitely a Palestinian Jewish development, not an achievement of the Diaspora.¹⁶⁵

F. Some Semantic and Traditio-Historical Trajectories

The observations in 1Q/4QInstruction open up new perspectives for the description of semantic developments. How was the range of meanings of the Hebrew word **בִּשְׂר** widened beyond the borders which are documented within the Hebrew Bible? And how did other circles or later writings adopt the new

¹⁶⁴ This holds true even for the two passages, where **בִּשְׂר** and **רוּחַ** occur in contextual opposition, Isa 31:3 and Gen 6:3. In Isa 31:3 **בִּשְׂר** denotes the weakness of the Egyptian horses compared with the saving power of God, and in Gen 6:3 it characterizes the frailty of the human being, who cannot last without God’s life-giving breath. The passages mentioned by N. Bratsiotis, “בִּשְׂר,” cc. 863f., also express human weakness in contrast with God’s power (Jer 17:5; Ps 56:5; 2 Chr 32:8), human frailty (Ps 78:39) or the human point of view compared with the divine one (Job 10:4). Cf. also H. D. Preuss, *Theologie des Alten Testaments* (2 vols.: Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1991–1992), 2:117 with n. 73

¹⁶⁵ This is true, even if it is an open question to what extent there were Hellenistic influences in the circles or schools of wisdom in Jerusalem. Such an influence can be seen in the work of Ben Sira or even earlier, in Qohelet. On Hellenistic influence in Palestine, see basically M. Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism. Studies in their Encounter in Palestine in the Early Hellenistic Period* (2 vols.; trans. J. Bowden; London: SCM and Philadelphia: Fortress, 1974) on Hellenism in the Qumran texts, see idem, “Qumran und der Hellenismus,” in *Qumrân. Sa piété, sa théologie et son milieu* (ed. M. Delcor; BETL 46; Paris and Leuven: Peeters, 1978), 333–372; most recently idem, “Jerusalem als jüdische und hellenistische Stadt,” in *Judaica Hellenistica et Christiana. Kleine Schriften 2* (ed. M. Hengel; WUNT 109; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999), 115–156.

kind of usage? Of course, the amount of sources is rather limited, but it is at least possible to give some suggestions.

I. The Development of the pre-Essene Sapiential View of בִּשְׂר

The development of the negative usage of בִּשְׂר can be explained by two observations, a generic and a traditio-historical one.

(α) In the pre-Essene sapiential tradition, we can find the earliest examples of the genre “Niedrigkeitsdoxologie” which is widely used, later, in the *Ho-dayot*.¹⁶⁶ This new genre is normally viewed as a development from the biblical genre “Gerichtsdoxologie”¹⁶⁷ in which a confession of human frailty is added to the confession of sin.¹⁶⁸ However, both ideas are already related in the context of the earlier wisdom tradition, in Job 4:17–21; 14:1–4; and 15:14–16. The only element which is missing in these passages in Job is the term בִּשְׂר,¹⁶⁹ but this term is used in another passage in Job where human frailty is also expressed, in Job 34:14f.: “if he were to ... recall his life-giving spirit, all that lives would perish, to the dust would man return.” There is a clear reference to this tradition in 1Q/4QInstruction: 4Q416 2 II 2f. (paralleled by 4Q417 1 II 4 and 4Q418 8 1) reads: “If he shuts his hand, then they will be gathered in the spirit of all flesh.”¹⁷⁰ Thus, we can see that 1Q/4QInstruction takes up and combines phrases of the earlier wisdom tradition, e.g., in Job. It is, then, only a small step to insert the term בִּשְׂר into the traditional phrases and to link this term with the expressions on human injustice or sin which occur, e.g., in Job 4:17–21; 14:1–4 and 15:14–16. In 4QMyst^c (4Q301 5 3), then, the term בִּשְׂר is used within the framework of a “Niedrigkeitsdoxologie.” This shows that the sapiential circles responsible for 1Q/4QInstruction and 1Q/4QMysteries actually combined the two traditions.

¹⁶⁶ Cf. 4Q417 2 I 15–17 (formerly 1 I 16): “Who will be declared righteous when He gives judgement? ...”; cf. 1QH^a XV 31 (= VII 28 Sukenik); see also 4QMyst^c = 4Q301 5 3: “What is flesh that ...” (*m*)*h bsr ky*’ [...], where בִּשְׂר occurs for the first time in a “Niedrigkeitsdoxologie.”

¹⁶⁷ Cf. Exod 9:27f.; Lam 1:18–22; Job 4f.; Ezra 9; Neh 9; Dan 3:31–4:34; 9.

¹⁶⁸ Cf. H.-W. Kuhn, *Enderwartung*, 27; H. Lichtenberger, *Studien zum Menschenbild*, 73; J. Becker, *Heil Gottes*, 136. On the biblical genre “Gerichtsdoxologie,” see F. Horst, “Die Doxologien im Amosbuch”; G. v. Rad, *Gerichtsdoxologie*.

¹⁶⁹ Other terms are used: The human being is called “born by a woman” (יְלִיד אִשָּׁה) Job 14:1; 15:4; there is mention of dust and mud (Job 4:19), of dying (Job 4:19, 21), linked with terms of impurity (Job 4:17; 14:4; 15:14) and upheaval (עִילָה Job 15:16).

¹⁷⁰ Translation according to J. Strugnell, D. J. Harrington, and T. Elgvin, *Qumran Cave 4. XXIV*, 93. Cf. also the parallel in 4Q419 8 ii 7 which is possibly a quotation from 1Q/4QInstruction (thus J. Strugnell, D. J. Harrington, and T. Elgvin, *Qumran Cave 4. XXIV*, 95).

(β) A traditio-historical observation can be added. The earliest example of the negative usage of **בשר** in 4Q417 1 I 15ff. occurs within the framework of a mythological tradition on upheaval or apostasy in primeval times. In 4Q416 1 12 it is used within an announcement of eschatological judgment and of the final elimination of wickedness. Both passages show that in 1Q/4Q Instruction, sapiential tradition is closely linked with apocalyptic elements. In the light of these apocalyptic traditions, the antagonism of the pious and the wicked acquires cosmic and eschatological dimensions. Only on the basis of the connection between traditionally sapiential ideas and cosmic-eschatological traditions, **בשר** or **רוח בשר** can be conceived as something hostile to God or, later, as a collective or a cosmic spiritual power.

(γ) The mythological tradition adopted in 4Q417 1 I 15ff. on the primeval apostasy seems to be a parallel to the tradition of the fall of the watchers which is basically rooted in Gen 6:1f., 4 and then expanded in *1 En.* 15.¹⁷¹ Anyhow, it should be noted that in *1 En.* 15:4, 6, 8 there is also a development towards dualistic structures when the contrast between the “spiritual” angels and the “flesh” of the human wives and of the giants is distinctively stressed. One could even suppose that Gen 6:1ff. was the tradition that largely inspired the terminological development. In Gen 6:3 there is a contextual opposition between the divine “spirit” and the human “flesh.”¹⁷² Even though the scriptural passage did not link the notion of “flesh” with sin or upheaval, the context could inspire such a view, because in Gen 6:5 reference is made to the wickedness of all human beings and to all the inclinations and thoughts of the human heart. Therefore, this passage could provide the basis not only for the connection of “flesh” and wickedness, but also for the combination of “flesh” and the “evil inclination.” The (earliest) occurrence of **צר רע** in 4Q417 1 II 12 (formerly 2 II 12) is actually related to Gen 6:5. This might confirm the suggestion that Gen 6:1ff. together with other parallel traditions that are not preserved in the Bible could lead to the terminological developments described above.

II. The Reception in the Texts of the *Yahad*

The pre-Essene sapiential tradition, then, had an impact on the “sectarian writings” of the Essenes. 1Q/4QInstruction is cited in the communal hymns of the *Hodayot*,¹⁷³ and the term **רו נהיה** which is so characteristic for 1Q/4QInstruction and 1Q/4QMysteries is taken up once in the final “psalm”

¹⁷¹ The relations between 1Q/4QInstruction and the earlier Enochic tradition deserve serious consideration. Cf., however, the suggestions in T. Elgvin, “Wisdom in the *Yahad*,” 448; and idem, “Early Essene Eschatology.”

¹⁷² Interestingly, Gen 6:3 is the only biblical passage where the Targumim interpret “flesh” in terms of sin.

¹⁷³ Cf. A. Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination*, 46.

in 1QS XI 3. Moreover, the literary genre “Niedrigkeitsdoxologie” which seems to originate in the pre-Essene sapiential tradition, is adopted quite frequently in *Hodayot* and in 1QS XI 9ff.

Given the impact of the pre-Essene sapiential tradition on the texts of the *yahad*, especially the communal hymns of the *Hodayot* and the final section of 2QS, we can assume that this is also the traditio-historical route on which the negative usage of the term *בשר* was passed on to the Essene community.

In the Essene texts, the pre-Essene terminology was adopted and further developed. In the *Hodayot*, we find again the term *רוח בשר* (1QH^a IV 37 [= XVII 25 Sukenik] und V 30 [= XIII 13 Sukenik]). From the usage in 1Q/4QInstruction we can see now that the term is not quite as neutral as was often supposed,¹⁷⁴ but was used also with a negative connotation. As in the pre-Essene sapiential tradition, “flesh” is now linked with the notion of both the human inability to grasp God’s revelation and also human iniquity and sinfulness. In one passage it seems to be viewed even as a misleading power.

The most important difference between the pre-Essene sapiential tradition (and also the *War Rule*) and the Essene texts, such as the *Hodayot* and the final psalm in 1QS, is that in these documents *בשר* denotes not just people outside the community of the pious or the sinful nations facing final destruction. Indeed the members of the *yahad* praying the *Hodayot* are aware now that they are *בשר* themselves and share the sinful flesh. They are not merely separated from the *רוח בשר* (4Q418 81 1f.), but they are sinners themselves, and as such they are elect to serve God, to know his will, and to keep his commandments. This view is a peculiarity of the Essene documents which is paralleled later in some respect by the Pauline view.¹⁷⁵

The new evidence from the pre-Essene sapiential documents shows that the negative usage of *בשר* as a term for human sinfulness does not originate in the Qumran sectarian group or the Essene circles but in sapiential circles of the late 3rd or early 2nd century BCE. The religio-historical background of the Essene usage of *בשר* is the ethical and cosmic-eschatological dualism which was formed within these pre-Essene sapiential circles. Their views were adopted and further developed by members of the Essene community, who also read and esteemed the pre-Essene sapiential texts.¹⁷⁶

¹⁷⁴ Cf. A. E. Sekki, *The Meaning of ruah*, 104, who refers to this view as a *communis opinio*.

¹⁷⁵ There are, however, major differences depending on the different views of the Torah and its position (see below and, more extensively, my article: “Die paulinische Antithese von ‘Fleisch’ und ‘Geist’ und die palästinische-jüdische Weisheitstradition,” *ZNW* 90 [1999]: 45–77, here 74f.).

¹⁷⁶ There is also evidence for the suggestion that the “Treatise on the Two Spirits” 1QS III 13–IV 26 originated in the same pre-Essene sapiential circles; on this, cf. J. Frey, *Different Patterns of Dualistic Thought*, 295ff.; A. Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination*, 127f.

III. The Reception Outside the Essene Movement

It is, however, highly probable that the ideas of the pre-Essene sapiential tradition were not just adopted by the Essenes. We should rather assume that these texts, like Sirach, *Jubilees*, or the Enochic traditions were read and discussed in wider circles, most probably in Jerusalem, in the context of the *Hakhamim*, the sages surrounding the Temple.

A trace of these traditions may be seen in the *Testaments of the 12 Patriarchs* which generally seem to be a quite important line of transmission of dualistic thought. They attest not only the idea of the “Two Ways” (*T. Asher* 1:3–5), which can be found in the fragmentary sapiential document on the Two Ways (4Q473 1 3),¹⁷⁷ as well as the idea of the “two spirits” of truth and deceit (*T. Jud.* 20:lff.) resembling the pre-Essene “Treatise on the Two Spirits” (1QS III 13–IV 26), but also the notion of the sinful flesh, as shown in *T. Jud.* 19:4:

The prince of error blinded me, and I was ignorant as a human being, as flesh, corrupt in sins (ὡς σάρξ ἐν ἁμαρτίαις φθαρείς).¹⁷⁸

Another passage in *T. Zebulun* 9:7f. reads:

He does not bring a charge and wickedness against the sons of men, since they are flesh and err in their wicked deeds.¹⁷⁹

Contrary to earlier assumptions, these passages are not influenced by the Essenes, because all peculiarities of community terminology are lacking.¹⁸⁰ Nor do these passages show any clear traces of Christian reworking or glossing. There is nothing in them that could not be explained against the background of Early Jewish thought. Even the observation that the *Testaments of the 12 Patriarchs* in their present form certainly were collected and reshaped

¹⁷⁷ See the edition by T. Elgvin, “473. 4QThe Two Ways,” in *Qumran Cave 4. XVII. Parabiblical Texts Part 3* (DJD 22; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), 289–294.

¹⁷⁸ Transl. according to H. C. Kee, “The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs,” in *Pseudepigrapha* (ed. J. H. Charlesworth; Garden City: Doubleday, 1983), 1:800. However, Kee’s rendering “as flesh, in my corrupt sins,” is incorrect.

¹⁷⁹ H. C. Kee, “Testaments,” 807, translates according to another textual tradition: “they are flesh and the spirits of deceit lead them astray in all their actions.” But cf. J. Becker, *Die Testamente der Zwölf Patriarchen* (JSHRZ III.1; Gütersloh: Mohn, 1974), 90, where the shorter reading is chosen.

¹⁸⁰ This theory was defended by M. Philonenko, *Les interpolations chrétiennes des Testaments des Douze Patriarches et les Manuscrits de Qumrân* (CRHPhR 35; Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1960), and A. Dupont-Sommer, *Les écrits esséniens découverts près de la Mer Morte* (4th ed.; Paris: Payot, 1980), 310–318; cf. also A. Dupont-Sommer and M. Philonenko, eds., *Écrits intertestamentaires, LXXV–LXXVI*. Cf., against this assumption, J. Becker, *Studien zur Entstehungsgeschichte der Zwölf Patriarchen* (JSHRZ III.1; Gütersloh: Mohn, 1974), 149–152; idem, *Testamente*, 26f.

in Christian circles¹⁸¹ should not lead to the conclusion that they are not basically Jewish.¹⁸² The evidence mentioned above suggests that they attest a wider influence of the sapiential traditions of Palestinian Judaism represented in 1Q/4QInstruction, 1Q/4QMysteries, and also the “Treatise on the Two Spirits.”

Another piece of evidence for the wider influence of the pre-Essene view of sinful flesh is found in the *Life of Adam and Eve* 25:3. Here, Eve promises:

Lord, Lord, save me and I will never again turn to the sin of the flesh (καὶ οὐ μὴ ἐπιστρέψω εἰς τὴν ἁμαρτίαν τῆς σαρκός).¹⁸³

Even if the textual history of the Adam literature is quite complicated and the precise age of this passage must remain uncertain, the promise of Eve seems not to be dependent on Christian ideas, or even on the Pauline view of sin. Rather it shows that the idea of sinful flesh was present in wider circles of Early Judaism and was not confined to the Essenes or the Qumran sectarian group. It could be translated into Greek terms as well. But even in the *Testaments of the 12 Patriarchs*, which represent a Diaspora setting, the idea is not shaped by the Hellenistic view of flesh as a material substance of minor value but by the Palestinian Jewish dualism as documented in the pre-Essene and Essene documents from the Qumran library.

¹⁸¹ This is conceded also by J. Becker, *Testamente*, 23. The view that the origin of the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* is generally Christian, was developed by M. de Jonge, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. A Study of Their Text, Composition, and Origin* (Assen: van Gorcum, 1953), 117–128. Since then, de Jonge has modified his position several times, cf. especially idem, “Christian Influence in the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs,” in *Studies on the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. Text and Interpretation* (SVTP 3; Leiden: Brill, 1975), 193–246, and idem, “The Main Issues in the Study of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs,” *NTS* 26 (1980): 508–524.

¹⁸² On introductory issues, see generally J. Becker, *Testamente*, 23–27; A.-M. Denis, *Introduction aux Pseudépigraphe Grecs d’Ancien Testament* (SVTP 1; Leiden: Brill, 1970), 49ff; A. Hultgård, *Composition de l’ouvrage, textes et traductions*, vol. 2 of *L’eschatologie des Testaments de Douze Patriarches* (AAU: HR 7; Uppsala: Almqvist and Wiksell, 1982), 2:214ff., and the balanced discussion in K.-W. Niebuhr, *Gesetz und Paränese. Katechismusartige Weisungsreihen in der frühjüdischen Literatur* (WUNT II/28; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1987), 73–86.

¹⁸³ Translation according to M. D. Johnson, “Life of Adam and Eve,” in *Pseudepigrapha II* (ed. Charlesworth; New York: Doubleday, 1983), 249–295, here 283, who hints at close parallels in *b. Nid.* 31b and *Gen. Rab.* 20:7. On this text see J. Doehorn, “‘Sie wird dir nicht ihre Kraft geben’ – Adam, Kain und der Ackerbau in 4Q423 2₃ und Apc Mos 24,” in *The Wisdom Texts from Qumran and the Development of Sapiential Thought* (ed. C. Hempel, A. Lange, and H. Lichtenberger; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2002), 351–364.

G. The Sapiential Traditions and the Pauline Usage of ΣΑΡΞ

Returning to the issue of the religio-historical background of the Pauline usage of σάρξ especially in the characteristic antithesis of σάρξ and πνεῦμα, I can only comment on some of the most important issues.¹⁸⁴

(a) An immediate literary influence of the Palestinian wisdom texts on the Pauline epistles cannot be proved. The problem is, however, a methodological one. Paul obviously adopts sapiential traditions. But it is hard to prove that he used traditions which are not documented in the biblical wisdom literature or in the Wisdom of Solomon, but which are peculiar to the tradition of 1Q/4QInstruction or 1Q/4QMysteries.

(b) In the pre-Essene sapiential traditions and the Essene texts, we can find the most interesting parallels to the Pauline notion of flesh as sinful and disobedient. Taken together, these traditions offer a much closer correlation to the Pauline views than all the parallels from Hellenistic Judaism.

(c) 1Q/4QInstruction and 1Q/4QMysteries are not Qumran “sectarian” texts. They cannot be pushed aside, therefore, as products of an esoteric circle to which non-members could not get access. They rather originate from sapiential circles surrounding the Jerusalem Temple, and their ideas were discussed and further developed not only by the Essenes but also among the other groups of contemporary Judaism, especially the wise men (חכמים) in Jerusalem. There, in connection with the Temple, the transmission of Wisdom had an institutional framework, and it is likely that the early Pharisaic sages (who were also called חכמים)¹⁸⁵ knew and discussed these ideas as well. Their transmission is also documented in Greek by the *Testaments of the 12 Patriarchs* and, perhaps, by the *Life of Adam and Eve*.

(d) It is, therefore, quite probable that Paul, when he was a Pharisaic student in Jerusalem,¹⁸⁶ also came across sapiential traditions such as 1Q/4QInstruction or 1Q/4QMysteries. In any case, an acquaintance with the traditions represented by these sapiential documents is more probable than a

¹⁸⁴ For a more detailed discussion, cf. my article: J. Frey, “Paulinische Antithese.”

¹⁸⁵ Cf. R. Meyer, “Φαρισαῖος,” 20–22.

¹⁸⁶ The wide-spread skepticism against this information which is provided only by Luke (Acts 22:3; 26:4f.) seems unjustified, cf. already G. Bornkamm, “Paulus,” in *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart. Handwörterbuch für Theologie und Religionswissenschaft* 5 (3rd ed.; ed. K. Galling; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1961), 166–190, here 168, and more recently M. Hengel, *The pre-Christian Paul* (London: SCM and Philadelphia: Trinity, 1991), 18ff., and R. Riesner, *Die Frühzeit des Apostels Paulus* (WUNT 71; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1994), 6–26. Apart from the notes on his provenance from Tarsus and his studies in Jerusalem there is a close correspondence between the Pauline and the Lucan testimony on Paul’s religious origins. M. Hengel correctly states that before 70 CE Jerusalem “was the only proper place for strict Jews – and Paul came from a strict Jewish family and was himself one – to study the Torah” (*The pre-Christian Paul*, 27).

knowledge of Essene “sectarian” documents such as the *Hodayot* or the *Rule of the Community*.

(e) Whatever the means by which Paul came across these traditions, semantically his view of $\sigma\acute{\alpha}\rho\kappa\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ as a power hostile to God that rules and misleads human beings cannot be derived from Hellenistic ontology of the earthly and the spiritual sphere. It is much closer to the type of dualism of the Palestinian Jewish sapiential tradition, represented in works such as 1Q/4QInstruction or 1Q/4QMysteries and developed further in the Essene texts. Only in this tradition is flesh linked directly with sin and iniquity and viewed as a ruling and misleading power in a framework of predestinational thought. These are exactly the elements in which the Pauline usage of $\sigma\acute{\alpha}\rho\kappa\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ goes beyond the biblical usage of בִּשְׂר .

(f) Against the background of these parallels, we can assume that the apostle knew about the idea of sinful flesh from his Jewish background. Originally, this idea is not Christian, but was shaped in advance by traditions of contemporary Judaism which can be determined now with the publication of the non-Essene sapiential documents from Qumran Cave 4.

(g) There is no fixed antithesis between “flesh” and “spirit” in early Jewish thought, neither in the Wisdom of Solomon, nor in the works of Philo, nor in Qumran. Some passages in the *Hodayot* and also the passage in 4Q417 2 I 15ff. attest a contextual opposition between בִּשְׂר and רוּח , but it is not yet fixed semantically. However, if Paul knew about the negative usage of בִּשְׂר or $\sigma\acute{\alpha}\rho\kappa\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ from the Jewish tradition, he could, then, form such an opposition drawing on his own experience of the life-giving spirit in his vision near Damascus.

(h) Paul’s use of these terms is deeply rooted in Jewish tradition, or more precisely: in Palestinian Jewish tradition. The opposition of flesh against the spirit is not formed through an ontological distance between the created and the spiritual world but by the disobedience of humanity against God and his word. Human beings are flesh as a whole, not only in their material or sexual dimension, and this statement is not derogatory of their nature as created beings, but a verdict on their general direction of existence. Quite similarly, Paul always sees the human being as a whole. A human being wholly flesh and dominated by sin, if it is not dead to and directed by the spirit (Rom 7).¹⁸⁷

(i) Of course, there are major differences between the Jewish traditions and Paul, mainly in respect of the position towards the law. Whereas in Qumran the pious are elect to obey the Torah even more accurately, for Paul the call for circumcision in the Galatian communities is an attempt to be justified still according to the flesh (Gal 3:3). The reason is given in Gal 5:19 where Paul states that those who are “in Christ” have “crucified” their flesh and, conse-

¹⁸⁷ Cf. E. Käsemann, “Zur paulinischen Anthropologie,” in *Paulinische Perspektiven* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1969), 9–60, here 50–52.

quently died to the law, so that they are no longer “under the law” (ὕπὸ νόμου). But even in these passages, which seem to be so different from all kinds of “mainstream Judaism,” Paul’s usage of σάρξ as a striving opposed to God’s will and to his salvific acts proves to be deeply rooted in the Palestinian Jewish tradition.

22. Contextualizing Paul’s “Works of the Law”: MMT in New Testament Scholarship*

A. The Scholarly Framework: The Qumran Discoveries and the New Testament

From the very beginning of the Dead Sea discoveries, the Scrolls were related to and utilized for the interpretation of early Christian documents. The discovery of new Hebrew and Aramaic texts from the 1st centuries BCE and CE filled a severe lacuna in our sources of Second Temple Judaism because before 1947 Hebrew and Aramaic sources from the time between the latest Hebrew Bible texts (Daniel) and the earliest rabbinic texts were almost unknown, which meant that scholars could only draw on Greek authors and texts (LXX, Philo, Josephus) or some Pseudepigrapha preserved in other ancient languages (Syriac, Latin, Ethiopic, Slavonic, etc.) when discussing the history and traditions of that period of Judaism. This lacuna strongly limited the possibilities for appropriately assessing the Jewish background of early Christian texts. Against this backdrop, the discovery and scholarly evaluation of more than 900 fragmentary manuscripts in the 11 caves near Khirbet Qumran has enormously contributed to a rediscovery of the Jewish roots of the Jesus movement and Early Christianity and to the overcoming of the then dominant history-of-religions paradigm for explaining Pauline or Johannine thought against a non-Jewish background or even an alleged pre-Christian Gnosticism.¹

* This article was written for a new edition of MMT by my Göttingen colleague Reinhard G. Kratz to be published with contextualizing essays in the SAPERE series (Mohr Siebeck, Tübingen), originally scheduled for 2018 but now somewhat delayed. I am grateful to Reinhard Kratz and to the publisher Mohr Siebeck for their consent to an almost simultaneous publication in the present volume. For a reading of the draft and some valuable suggestions I am grateful to my doctoral student Christoph Heilig.

¹ Cf. J. Frey, “The Impact of the Dead Sea Scrolls on New Testament Interpretation: Proposals, Problems and Further Perspectives,” in *The Scrolls and Christian Origins*, vol. 3 of *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls. The Princeton Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. J. H. Charlesworth; Waco: Baylor, 2006), 458–461 (in this volume, 527–578) and idem, J. Frey, “Qumran Research and Biblical Scholarship in Germany,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Scholarly Perspective. A History of Research* (ed. D. Dimant; STDJ 99; Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2012), 529–564, here 535–536 (in this volume, 85–119, here 91–93). For an overview, cf. my comprehensive RAC article: J. Frey “Qumran,” *RAC* 28:550–592 (in this volume, 45–81).

During the first two or three decades after the discoveries, the Qumran debate was limited to the small number of texts published in the early period, i.e., mostly the important Scrolls from Cave 1 (1QS, 1QH^a, 1QM, 1QpIsa) and the so-called *Damascus Document* (CD) already known from the Cairo Geniza, whereas the vast majority of texts, especially the numerous fragments from Cave 4, were still inaccessible to wider scholarship. The themes discussed in this early period include topics of primarily "Christian" interest, such as Messianism and scriptural interpretation, dualism and eschatology, purification rites and community meals, the Qumran calendar, and the comparison of the Qumran community and the community of the Jesus followers with regard to their offices, structure, admission procedure, and discipline.² Some scholars even boldly suggested a direct analogy between the "new covenant" of the Scrolls and the Christian "new covenant"³ or a historical connection between John the Baptist, Jesus, or the author of the Fourth Gospel and the Qumran community.⁴

The scholarly focus changed when, after the publication of the *Temple Scroll*⁵ in 1977, not only a wide variety of different parabiblical, liturgical, calendrical, and sapiential texts was made known⁶ but also the importance of halakic issues was more widely acknowledged and the more "Jewish" themes of halakic debates became dominant in subsequent research.⁷ The impatience among scholars grew when the publication of the numerous promising texts was further delayed and only some preliminary information had been given to the public, with the texts themselves still being kept in secrecy. This was the soil on which conspiracy theories grew, including the suspicion that the new texts could totally change the traditional and scholarly views about Jesus and

² J. Frey, "Qumran Research and Biblical Scholarship in Germany," 533–4 (in this volume, 89–90). A survey of early research (from a sceptical perspective) is provided by H. Braun, *Qumran und das Neue Testament* (2 vols.; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1966).

³ Thus in an early attempt A. Dupont-Sommer, *Aperçus préliminaires sur les manuscrits de la Mer Morte* (OAI 4; Paris: Librairie Maisonneuve, 1950), 119–122. For critical evaluation, see J. Frey, "Impact of the Dead Sea Scrolls," 419–424 (in this volume, 539–544).

⁴ Cf. J. Frey, "Jesus, Paulus und die Texte vom Toten Meer: Forschungsgeschichtliche und hermeneutische Perspektiven," in *Jesus, Paulus und die Texte vom Toten Meer* (ed. J. Frey and E. E. Popkes, with S. Tätweiler; WUNT II/390; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015), 15–18.

⁵ Y. Yadin, *The Temple Scroll* (Hebrew; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1997).

⁶ D. Dimant, ed., *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Scholarly Perspective. A History of Research* (STDJ 99; Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2012), 6: "it was realized that the library is not a homogeneous sectarian-apocalyptic collection."

⁷ Cf. L. T. Schiffman, *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Philadelphia: Doubleday, 1994), there on MMT pp. 83–89. Cf. Dimant, *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Scholarly Perspective*, 7: The publication of MMT "turned the Qumran halakhah into a major research pre-occupation."

the early Christians.⁸ It is no coincidence that MMT was the example where the battle was fought with leaked or unauthorized publications and finally a lawsuit about the authors' rights with regard to his reconstructions.⁹

The information about an "Unpublished Halakhic Letter from Qumran" stimulated the discussion not only among specialists of Jewish halakah and calendar issues but also among New Testament scholars, for various reasons: There was, first, the suggestion that this letter might have been written by the "Teacher of Righteousness" himself, which would mean that it could provide first-hand knowledge about this enigmatic figure.¹⁰ The juxtaposition of two interpretations of the Torah reminded scholars of the antitheses of Jesus in the Sermon on the Mount with the prominent formula "you have heard that the ancients were told ..., but I say to you ..." (Matt 5:21–48). The mention of the separation of a group by use of the verb פָּרַשׁ (*parash* = to separate oneself) evoked questions about the separation of the Pharisees¹¹ or about other Jewish factions or "sects." Furthermore, the presence of a polemical letter in the Qumran corpus suggested itself for comparison with Paul's polemical letters, especially Galatians. Finally (and most importantly) the phrase *miqṣat ma'asê ha-tora* ("some of the works of the Torah"), which was quoted in the preliminary notification on the text and even chosen as the scholarly name of the composition,¹² appeared to be a sensational discovery:

⁸ The main scholar behind such suspicions was Robert Eisenman. Cf. R. Eisenman and M. O. Wise, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Uncovered* (New York: Penguin Books, 1992; with the German translation published under the rather inappropriate title *Jesus und die Urchristen* [München: Bertelsmann, 1993]).

⁹ Cf. P. W. Flint and J. C. VanderKam, *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Their Significance or Understanding the Bible, Judaism, Jesus and Christianity* (New York: Harper One, 2002), 392–397.

¹⁰ Thus E. Qimron and J. Strugnell, "An Unpublished Halachic Letter from Qumran," in *Biblical Archaeology Today: Proceedings of the International Congress on Biblical Archaeology, April 1984* (Jerusalem: Biblical Archaeology Society, 1985); cf. also H. Stegemann, *The Library of Qumran: On the Essenes, Qumran, John the Baptist, and Jesus* (Grand Rapids, MI and Cambridge: Eerdmans, 1998), 104–7 with the heading "The Directive of the Teacher to Jonathan (4QMMT)," and O. Betz, "The Qumran halakhah text *Miqṣat Ma'asê ha-Tôrah* (4QMMT) and Sadducean, Essene, and early Pharisaic Tradition," in *The Aramaic Bible: Targums in their Historical Context* (ed. D. G. Beattie and M. J. McNamara; JSOTSupp 166; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994), 194, with reference to the remark in 4Q171 (4QpPs37) IV 7–10. The idea was eagerly adopted among non-specialists and NT scholars.

¹¹ This term, probably used not by the Pharisees themselves but only by outsiders, is derived from the verbal root פָּרַשׁ. In the present context, it seems to be used positively by a member of a group that separated itself from another group, probably the majority of Israel.

¹² An original title is not preserved. Earlier names include 4QMishn or just "a Halakhic Letter." Cf. John Strugnell in E. Qimron and J. Strugnell, *Qumran Cave 4 V: Miqṣat Ma'asê Ha-Torah* (DJD 10; Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1994), vii.

It was the first and still is the only exact Jewish parallel to the Pauline phrase ἔργα νόμου ("works of the law"), which is intensely debated with regard to its meaning and has a pivotal position in the debate about Paul's view of justification and the Jewish Law.

This discovery was just made public when a new debate had started to occupy New Testament scholarship, the debate about the so-called "New Perspective on Paul" as opposed to an "Old" or Lutheran perspective on Paul.¹³ The latter was represented by interpreters in the tradition of the Reformation, including the Bultmann school. In this debate, basic elements of the traditional interpretation of Pauline theology (and thus the center of the Protestant doctrine of justification) were at stake, and interpreters in the Lutheran tradition, especially from Germany, were accused of an inappropriate view of Judaism or even of a distinctive anti-Jewish bias. In this increasingly fervent debate, the new parallel was quickly utilized as an argument for the "New Perspective" – although its real meaning and its applicability for the understanding of Paul were still unclear at that time.

B. The "Works of the Law" and the Debate about Pauline Theology

I. The Early Reactions among Qumran and New Testament Scholars

After an early mention of the Text in the "Revue Biblique" in 1956,¹⁴ information on the text with some quotations was published by Qimron and Strugnell in the proceedings of a 1984 conference¹⁵ and in another brief article.¹⁶ It is no coincidence that the debate on this "revolutionary"¹⁷ text started

¹³ The debate exploded after a series of earlier publications, one such was the provoking book by E. P. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion* (London: SCM Press, 1977), as well as the stimulating article with the name "New Perspective on Paul" given by J. D. G. Dunn, "The New Perspective on Paul," *BJRL* 65 (1983): 95–122. This term, however, had already been used before by N. T. Wright (cf. J. D. G. Dunn, "The New Perspective; whence, what, and whither?" in *The New Perspective on Paul. Collected Essays* (WUNT 185; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005), 7 n. 24). On the debate between Old and New Perspective, see S. Westerholm, *Perspectives Old and New on Paul: The 'Lutheran' Paul and His Critics* (Grand Rapids and Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2004).

¹⁴ Cf. Qimron and Strugnell, *Qumran Cave 4 V*, vii.

¹⁵ E. Qimron and J. Strugnell, "An Unpublished Halachic Letter from Qumran," in *Biblical Archaeology Today: Proceedings of the International Congress on Biblical Archaeology, April 1984* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1985): 400–407

¹⁶ E. Qimron and J. Strugnell, "An Unpublished Halachic Letter from Qumran," *The Israel Museum Journal* 4 (1985): 9–12.

long before its "official" publication in 1994. In 1990, the textual reconstruction (as crafted jointly by Elisha Qimron and John Strugnell), which had been confidentially distributed at a conference, was "anonymously" published together with a preliminary English translation in the Polish journal "The Qumran Chronicle."¹⁸ This text was, then, also reprinted by Hershel Shanks in the original "Publisher's Foreword" of the "Facsimile Edition" of the Scrolls.¹⁹ A different (and, as we can now see, erroneous) reconstruction of MMT as originally two (!) letters was published by Robert H. Eisenman and Michael O. Wise, together with the interpretation that the views uttered in MMT might concur with the position of James (as opposed to Paul) on justification. Playing with sensationalism about the "uncovered" texts, the book by Eisenman and Wise ultimately was to support Eisenman's idiosyncratic views that the Qumran texts (regardless of their palaeographical and radio-carbon date) contained encrypted information about the early Jesus movement (with James as the "righteous teacher" and Paul as the "wicked priest").²⁰ An early article by Martin G. Abegg in "Biblical Archaeology Review" focused on the relevance of this for the understanding of Paul, suggesting that Paul in his letters is "reacting to the kind of theology espoused by MMT"²¹ and speculating whether "Essene or other Jewish sectaries who were familiar with the phrase "works of the law" had become followers of Jesus."²²

¹⁷ Thus M. G. Abegg, "Paul, 'Works of the Law' and MMT," *BAR* 20 (1994): 52–55, here 55: "nothing short of revolutionary."

¹⁸ "An Anonymously Received Pre-Publication of the 4QMMT," *QC* 2 (December 1990): 2–9. In spite of the dubious circumstances, the fact that the text was now made known to a greater public was enthusiastically welcomed by many NT scholars, who were eagerly waiting for the release of the hidden Qumran texts.

¹⁹ "Figure 8: Transcription of MMT from *The Qumran Chronicle*–12/90," in the original extended "Publisher's Foreword" by Hershel Shanks (in R. H. Eisenman and J. M. Robinson, eds., *A Facsimile Edition of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Prepared with an Introduction and Index* [2 vols.; Washington, DC: Biblical Archaeology Society, 1991], 1:xii–xlv), xxxi. Cf. also Shanks' report in H. Shanks, *Freeing the Dead Sea Scrolls. And Other Adventures of an Archaeology Outsider* (London and New York: Continuum, 2010), 164. Because of this republication, the Biblical Archaeological Society was sued by Elisha Qimron for copyright infringement. Cf. Flint and VanderKam, *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 392–3. The page with "figure 8" was, then, removed from all copies of the Facsimile Edition following the lawsuit, with the longer Publisher's Foreword quoting a lot of material on the delay of publication of the Scrolls replaced by a brief one (now xiii–xiv).

²⁰ Eisenman and Wise, *Jesus und die Urchristen*, 203. Cf. R. H. Eisenman, *Maccabees, Zadokites, Christians and Qumran* (Leiden: Brill, 1983); idem, *James the Just in the Habakkuk Peshet* (Leiden: Brill, 1986). For criticism, see Frey, "The Impact of the Dead Sea Scrolls," 424–426 (in this volume, 544–546).

²¹ Abegg, "Paul, 'Works of the Law' and MMT," 54.

²² Abegg, "Paul, 'Works of the Law' and MMT," 55.

Other scholars were also quick to adopt the preliminary information and comment on the relevance of MMT for the understanding of Galatians and the phrase ἔργα νόμου in Paul.²³ The eminent British New Testament scholar James D. G. Dunn, who had coined the term "New Perspective on Paul," provided a first comprehensive comparison of MMT and Galatians,²⁴ which was quickly followed by a critique from his steady rival, N. T. Wright, the other "champion" of the "New Perspective," who tried to argue that the issues taken up in MMT and in Paul are so different that MMT cannot be used to illuminate the worldview of the apostle.²⁵ A few number of other contributions followed,²⁶ but about ten years after the release of the text, the debate calmed down. Although NT scholars have rarely discussed the wider framework of the text and its relevance within the Qumran debate, nor even noticed the difficulties of its reconstruction and interpretation, the passage about the "works of the Torah" from MMT C 27 (= MMT vii 13 Kratz) is regularly quoted in works on Paul and the Jewish Law, although the interpretations of Paul and the issue of contemporary Jewish "nomism(s)"²⁷ it is claimed to

²³ Cf. M. Bachmann, "Rechtfertigung und Gesetzeswerke bei Paulus," *ThZ* 49 (1993): 1–33, here 27–31; H.-W. Kuhn, "Die Bedeutung der Qumrantexte zum Verständnis des Galaterbriefes. Aus dem Münchener Projekt: Qumran und das Neue Testament," in *New Qumran Texts and Studies* (ed. G. J. Brooke; STDJ 15; Leiden: Brill, 1994), 209–213; P. Grelot, "Les oeuvres de la Loi (A propos de 4Q394–398)," *RevQ* 16 (1994): 441–448, here 445–448; less specific Betz, "The Qumran halakhah text Miqṣat Ma'asê ha-Tôrah (4QMMT)"; and D. Flusser, "Die Gesetzeswerke in Qumran und bei Paulus," in *Geschichte – Tradition – Reflexion. Festschrift für Martin Hengel zum 70. Geburtstag* (ed. H. Cancik, H. Lichtenberger, and P. Schäfer; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996), 1:395–403.

²⁴ J. D. G. Dunn, "4QMMT and Galatians," *NTS* 43 (1997): 147–153; see his own retrospective in Dunn, "The New Perspective; whence, what, and whither?" 14.

²⁵ N. T. Wright, "Paul and Qumran: When Paul shuns the 'works of the law, is he referring to the very works commended by the Dead Sea Scroll known as MMT?" *BRev* 14 (1998): 18 and 54; also the more extensive article N. T. Wright, "4QMMT and Paul: Justification, 'Works,' and Eschatology," in *History and Exegesis: New Testament Essays in Honor of Dr. E. Earle Ellis for His 80th Birthday* (New York and London: T&T Clark, 2006) (cf. the retrospective in idem, *Pauline Perspectives* [Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2013], 332).

²⁶ Cf. M. G. Abegg Jr., "4QMMT C 27, 31 and 'Works Righteousness,'" *DSD* 6 (1999): 139–147; idem, "4QMMT, Paul and 'Works of the Law,'" in *The Bible at Qumran: Text, shape, and interpretation* (ed. P. W. Flint; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001); Flusser, "Die Gesetzeswerke in Qumran und bei Paulus," Wright, "4QMMT and Paul"; A. L. A. Hogeterp, "4QMMT and Paradigms of Second Temple Jewish Nomism," *DSD* 15 (2008): 359–379; comprehensively but with some misinterpretations J. C. R. de Roo, *Works of the Law in Qumran and in Paul* (NTM 13; Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2007).

²⁷ J. D. G. Dunn, "Noch einmal 'Works of the Law': The Dialogue Continues," in *Fair Play: Diversity and Conflicts in Early Christianity. Essays in Honour of Heikki Räsänen* (ed. I. Dunderberg, C. Tuckett, and K. Syreeni; Leiden: Brill, 2002), 274, notes that he discovered MMT to be supportive of his interpretation as originally phrased in Dunn, "The

support differ significantly. Although the new parallel from MMT cannot decide the exegetical matters, the passage helps to contextualizing Paul’s issue with his Judaizing opponents and his use of the Greek phrase ἔργα νόμου.

II. Aspects of the Pauline Debate: Justification, “Works of the Law,” and the “New Perspective”

In the present context, the main issues in the Pauline debate and the various possibilities of interpretation can be sketched only very briefly:²⁸ ἔργα νόμου is the Greek term used by Paul in Gal 2:16; 3:2, 5, 20, and in Rom 3:20, 28, when he argues for the view that “a human is not justified by the works of the Law but through faith in Christ Jesus” (thus Gal 2:16: οὐ δικαιοῦται ἄνθρωπος ἐξ ἔργων νόμου ἐὰν μὴ διὰ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ).²⁹ In Galatians, Paul polemically refutes the position of rivaling missionaries who tried to convince the Gentile converts in Galatia to accept circumcision in addition to their faith in Christ. Such a view (based on the idea that Gentile converts should formally become Jewish in order to fully participate in the salvation through Christ) was about to undermine Paul’s gospel of grace. So the apostle had to point out that when being circumcised the former Gentiles would be liable to observe the Jewish Law in its entirety and that in case of transgression the curses on the transgressors would also fall on them (Gal 3:10; cf. Deut 27:26). As Paul (not in his pre-Christian period but as Jesus follower and Apostle) was convinced that no human fully observed the law, he was equally convinced that the curses of the law threatened everyone who had not been liberated from the power of sin (Rom 7:7–25) and from the curse on the sinner, by the one who took the curse on himself, Christ in his vicarious death (Gal 3:10). Thus, the additional acceptance of circumcision would be a relapse behind God’s grace granted to them on behalf of Christ, or even a denial of God’s grace in Christ. This is the reason why Paul argues so polemically against the judaizing counter-missionaries who preached the soteriological necessity of circumcision and thus implicitly of doing the law.

In Romans, where Paul unfolds his teaching more independently from immediate polemical interests, the principle is repeated that “by the works of the Law no flesh will be justified in His sight” (Rom 3:20) or that “a human is

New Perspective on Paul.” On the various forms of nomism and the relevance of MMT, see Hogeterp, “4QMMT and Paradigms of Second Temple Nomism.”

²⁸ Cf. my overview in J. Frey, “The Jewishness of Paul,” in *Paul: Life, Setting, Work, Letters* (ed. O. Wischmeyer (London and New York: T&T Clark, 2012).

²⁹ I cannot enter the discussion about the suggestion by Richard Hays and others according to which the phrase διὰ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ should be interpreted in terms of a subjective genitive (“through the faithfulness of Jesus Christ”). In my view, the reading is inappropriate for contextual and theological reasons.

justified by faith apart from works of the law" (Rom 3:28). Unlike in Galatians 2:11–21, there is no link to particular boundary markers or to the specific issues of circumcision, food, or purity. Here, Paul seems to express a more general soteriological principle, not merely related to a particular situation or practical issues of his mission to the Gentiles. God will justify anyone, the circumcised and the uncircumcised, through faith (Rom 3:29), and any kind of boasting of election or observance of the law is excluded (Rom 2:23; 1 Cor 1:29; 3:21).³⁰

The precise understanding and even the theological centrality of Paul's teaching on justification have been intensely debated in New Testament scholarship. While traditional interpreters in the tradition of (particularly Lutheran) Reformation theology usually consider Paul's teaching of the justification of the ungodly through faith in Christ the pivotal idea of Pauline theology, rooted in his own conversion experience or his Pharisaic background, others consider Paul's distinctive views on justification merely a late development in his thought (as they only appear in Galatians and Romans)³¹ or a rather marginal idea within a wider concept of Pauline "mysticism"³² or participation in the covenant or eschatological salvation. While traditional (in particular Lutheran) interpreters often saw a sharp contrast between Paul's doctrine of grace and contemporary Judaism (often misconceived of as a "religion of works" done for "earning" eschatological salvation, hence a religion of "self-redemption"), more recent research (not only in the context of the "New Perspective") has called for a number of modifications and changes, and the abandonment of traditional clichés of Judaism.

The so-called "New Perspective" was first prepared by the work of the Lutheran bishop and Harvard professor Krister Stendahl³³ who made clear that Pauline interpretation in the West (since Augustine) had suffered from a narrow focus on individual sin and salvation and that (unlike Luther) Paul before his conversion had not suffered under the burden of sins or longed for a merciful God, but rather had a robust conscience. Thus, the Reformation paradigm was proven inadequate for interpreting Paul's biography. The most important change in scholarship was stimulated by the monograph by E. P.

³⁰ Cf. S. J. Gathercole, *Where is Boasting? Early Jewish Soteriology and Paul's Response in Romans 1–5* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002).

³¹ Thus U. Schnelle, *Apostle Paul. His Life and Theology* (trans. E. Boring; Grand Rapids: Baker, 2005). See earlier idem, *Wandlungen im paulinischen Denken* (Stuttgart: Kath. Bibelwerk, 1989). For criticism, see J. Frey, "Rechtfertigungstheologie im Ersten Korintherbrief," in *Von Jesus zur neutestamentlichen Theologie* (ed. J. Frey; WUNT 368; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016), 415–441.

³² Thus already W. Wrede, *Paulus* (Halle: Gebauer-Schwetschke, 1904), A. Schweitzer, *Die Mystik des Apostels Paulus* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1930).

³³ K. Stendahl, "The Apostle Paul and the Introspective Conscience of the West," *HTR* 56 (1963): 199–215.

Sanders,³⁴ who polemically rejected the still widespread cliché that Judaism in the time of Paul was a religion of works and merit or even "self-redemption." According to his analysis of a large number of texts, Second Temple Judaism should also be considered a religion of grace, as manifest in Israel's election and the gift of the covenant. Thus, God's grace, not human dignity, is the reason for election and for entering the realm of salvation (or rather: the covenant). Lawful works are not required to enter but merely to stay within the realm of the covenant. In this perspective, the religion of Second Temple Judaism and the religion of Paul share a common structure of "covenantal nomism" according to which "getting in" is granted by grace whereas "staying in" is ensured by appropriate conduct. Critically building on the views of Stendahl and Sanders, but further applying sociological categories, James Dunn has developed the view that Paul's primary concern was not about the salvation of individual humans but about the inclusion of the Gentiles in the people of God and that when excluding the "works of the law," Paul primarily criticises his fellow-Jews in their use of "boundary markers" such as circumcision, purity, and food laws as a means of distancing and excluding the Gentiles.³⁵

In response to Sanders' provocative views, the question has been raised whether such a concept can really be considered the common general structure in Second Temple Judaism or whether it is too much an abstraction that ignores the differences in detail. According to the critics, those differences between various factions and texts should better be considered in order to discern various types of nomism (or even various Judaisms).³⁶ Other scholars have expressed the critical question whether the "New Perspective" focuses too much on sociological issues of community formation and identity but underestimates the eschatological dimension (of judgment) and Paul's forensic language.³⁷ A deepened investigation of various Second Temple and rab-

³⁴ Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*.

³⁵ Dunn, "The New Perspective on Paul"; cf. in retrospective Dunn, "The New Perspective; whence, what, and whither?"

³⁶ Cf. D. Carson, P. T. O'Brien, and M. Seifrid, eds., *The Complexities of Second Temple Judaism*, vol. 1 of *Justification and Variegated Nomism* (WUNT II/140; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001). In particular, the views about the covenant (and about the question of who is within the covenant and who is not) are quite different in various groups. Thus, e.g., Qumran covenanters held a concept that excluded the majority of other Jews. Therefore, it is not without problems to find all factions united in one common "covenantal nomism." Similarly, John Barclay has recently shown that Sanders' concept of "grace" is monolithic as well: "Grace is everywhere in the theology of Second Temple Judaism, but not everywhere the same." (J. M. Barclay, *Paul and the Gift* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2015], 565).

³⁷ P. Stuhlmacher, *Revisiting Paul's Doctrine of Justification: A Challenge in the New Perspective* (Downers Grove: IVP, 2001), 14–16 and 40–1; Gathercole, *Where is Boasting?*, 223. See also the critical evaluation in Frey, "The Jewishness of Paul."

binic texts could further show that (in spite of the priority of grace and the covenant) human deeds were still considered important in face of the eschatological judgment.³⁸ After more than 35 years, the debate has created various sub-debates, and the lines between advocates of the "new" and the "old" perspective have partly blurred, so that the important changes inspired by Sanders and Dunn and the remaining legacy of aspects of the "Lutheran" perspective can even be combined.³⁹

In this whole discussion, a pivotal issue has been the meaning of the term "works of the law": Does Paul reject even the human attempt to fulfil the law⁴⁰ (as a misguided human attempt to gain salvation by works)? Such a view, as prominently advocated by the Lutheran existentialist Rudolf Bultmann, is almost totally abandoned today. It is widely accepted, instead, that Paul was not against "doing" good or lawful works as such and that also for Paul the Jewish Law demands that it be fulfilled (Rom 2:13). Paul simply denies the soteriological value of "works of the law" as he also denies the soteriological relevance of circumcision. But here the problems get even more difficult: Does the phrase refer to the whole law or only to a selection of laws such as, e.g., cultic laws,⁴¹ or to particular boundary markers, such as circumcision and food and purity laws, which could serve as a demarcation line between Jews and Gentiles?⁴² And does it point to lawful "works,"⁴³ with the focus on "doing" or even on the merits of obedience, or does it merely mean precepts without implying the human activity or obedience,⁴⁴ or is it

³⁸ On the rabbinic material, see F. Avemarie, "Erwählung und Vergeltung. Zur optionalen Struktur rabbinischer Soteriologie," *NTS* 45 (1999): 108–126; on Pharisaism, see R. Deines, "The Pharisees Between 'Judaisms' and 'Common Judaism,'" in *The Complexities of Second Temple Judaism* and, for a comprehensive critique of Sander's views, see M. Hengel and R. Deines, "E. P. Sanders' 'Common Judaism,' Jesus and the Pharisees," *JTS* 46 (1995): 1–70.

³⁹ Cf. Westerholm, *Perspectives Old and New on Paul*; cf. also Barclay, *Paul and the Gift*.

⁴⁰ Thus prominently R. Bultmann, *Theologie des Neuen Testaments*, 263.

⁴¹ K. Haacker, *Der Brief des Paulus an die Römer* (THKNT 6; Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1999), 83f., and idem, "Verdienste und Grenzen der 'neuen Perspektive' der Paulus-Auslegung," in *Lutherische und neue Paulusperspektive* (WUNT 182; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005), 13–14.

⁴² Dunn, "The New Perspective on Paul."

⁴³ Thus A. Das, *Paul and the Jews* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2003), 40–42, and F. Avemarie, "ἔργον," *TBLNT* (2nd ed., 1996), 1:57–59 and Avemarie, "Die Werke des Gesetzes im Spiegel des Jakobusbriefs. A Very Old Perspective on Paul," *ZTK* 98 (2001): 282–309.

⁴⁴ Thus Bachmann, "Rechtfertigung und Gesetzeswerke bei Paulus"; idem, "4QMMT und Galaterbrief, מַעֲשֵׂי הַתִּירָה und ΕΡΓΑ ΝΟΜΟΥ," in *Antijudaismus im Galaterbrief* (NTOA 40; Freiburg [Schweiz] and Göttingen: Universitätsverlag, 1999); idem, "Keil oder Mikroskop. Zur jüngeren Diskussion um den Ausdruck 'Werke' des Gesetzes," in *Lutherische und neue Paulusperspektive* (ed. M. Bachmann; WUNT 182; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005), and in a number of further publications, the most recent one is idem, "Luther-

inappropriate to separate those two aspects, so that both aspects are linked together?⁴⁵

III. The Contribution of MMT to the Debate on the “Works of the Law”

These issues were intensely debated when MMT was made public. But what does this halakic letter as a whole and the phrase *מעשה התורה* (*ma^ʿšê hat-tora*) in particular contribute to the Pauline discussion? Is the parallel a real parallel, or does it actually represent a different perspective and focus on different aspects, so that it cannot be used to illuminate the context of the Pauline usage? What is really “revolutionary”⁴⁶ about MMT, or were the (early) claims about its importance an overstatement? From the aspects highlighted by various scholars, some common features might be too general, while others can be helpful for understanding Paul and his contemporaries.

1. Some More General Analogies

Some features of MMT provide more general analogies with aspects of the Pauline letters. Whereas they might not help interpreting the phrase *ἔργα νόμου*, they provide a larger framework for comparing the “halakic letter” with Pauline epistolography.

(a) If MMT can be considered an admonishing and/or polemical letter or a letter treatise, it generally contributes to the Jewish context of Pauline epistolography.⁴⁷ The fact that the writing was later copied and studied within the community does not contradict the idea that it was first written as a letter addressing a figure outside or even opposed to the “we”-group.⁴⁸ Similar phenomena can also be presupposed with regard to the Pauline letters, which were collected and studied within communities that differed from the original

ische oder Neue Paulusperspektive? Merkwürdigkeiten bei der Wahrnehmung der betreffenden exegetischen Diskussionen,” *BZ* 60 (2016): 73–101; cf. also R. Bergmeier, *Gerechtigkeit, Gesetz und Glaube bei Paulus. Der judenchristliche Heidenapostel im Streit um das Gesetz und seine Werke* (BThSt 115; Neukirchen-Vluyn; Neukirchner Verlag, 2010), 27–30.

⁴⁵ Flusser, “Die Gesetzeswerke in Qumran und bei Paulus”; cf. Bachmann, “Keil oder Mikroskop,” 88–9.

⁴⁶ Abegg, “Paul, ‘Works of the Law’ and MMT,” 55.

⁴⁷ Cf. L. Doering, *Ancient Jewish Letters and the Beginnings of Christian Epistolography* (WUNT 298; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012), 194–214, 424 and 503; most recently M. L. Miller, *Performances of ancient Jewish letters: from Elephantine to MMT* (JAJSup 20; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 2015). On the genre of MMT and its epistolographic elements, see also the contribution by L. Doering in the present volume.

⁴⁸ Cf. the criticism in S. D. Fraade, “To Whom it may Concern: ‘4QMMT’ and its Addressee(s),” *RevQ* 19 (2000): 507–526 and the discussion in Doering, *Ancient Jewish Letters and the Beginnings of Christian Epistolography*, 194–199.

addressees. The fact that the letter was preserved and copied rather points to the importance of its content or its author for later group members.

(b) The author is using the plural "we," which is also used occasionally in Paul. The meaning and implications of such a plural ("we" as an "authorial" plural with the meaning "I" or "we" representing a real plurality of senders) have been intensely debated in Pauline research. In MMT, the "we" obviously refers to a plurality, represented by the author, namely to the group that has "separated" itself from a larger body of the people and actually practices the halakah exposed in MMT, and occasionally, the writing also refers to a "they"-group. These references are not only an interesting clue for figuring out the development of factions and groups at the time of composition of MMT,⁴⁹ they can also be compared with the communication structure in Pauline (and other NT) epistles.⁵⁰ In MMT, the author addresses a "you" as a ruler or representative of Israel, with the aim to convince the addressee of his own legal viewpoint for his own benefit and also that of the whole of Israel.⁵¹ In spite of the separation or opposition, the tone of the letter is not hostile but apparently still open enough to convince the addressee, although it is unclear whether the addressee should be associated with all the dissenting views mentioned in MMT part B. In Galatians, the communication structure is clearer: Paul (using "I" or also "we") addresses a "you" group (i.e., the communities he wants to convince) but also mentions a "they" group of rival preachers or opponents who are not directly addressed but only indirectly mentioned and polemically rejected.

(c) Another similarity can be linked with the thematic variety in MMT and also in some of the Pauline epistles in which various halakhot (MMT) or topics (Paul) are dealt with in certain sequence.⁵² MMT connects the teaching on the various halakhot by the markers *ועל* (*w'el*) or *ועל פ'ל* (*w'p 'l*), whereas Paul in 1 Corinthians introduces the topics or problems he was asked for in

⁴⁹ Qimron and Strugnell, *Qumran Cave 4 V*, identify the "they"-group with the Pharisees or their predecessors, whereas other authors want to see the Pharisees in the background of the "you"-group, see Deines, "The Pharisees Between 'Judaisms' and 'Common Judaism,'" 465–474.

⁵⁰ Cf. Doering, *Ancient Jewish Letters and the Beginnings of Christian Epistolography*, 200–207, also J. Kampen, "4QMMT and New Testament Studies," in *Reading 4QMMT: New Perspectives on Qumran Law and History* (ed. J. Kampen; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996), 129–135.

⁵¹ Cf. also Deines, "The Pharisees Between 'Judaism' and 'Common Judaism,'" 463–465.

⁵² For a discussion of Paul's ethical perspectives (focussing on 1 Corinthians) in the context of Jewish halakah see P. J. Tomson, *Paul and the Jewish Law: Halakha in the Letters of the Apostle to the Gentiles* (Assen: Uitgeverij Van Gorcum, 1991).

the letter of the community (cf. 1 Cor 7:1) by the use of the structuring $\pi\epsilon\rho\iota\ \delta\acute{\epsilon}$ (1 Cor 7:1, 25; 8:1; 12:1; 16:1, 12).⁵³

(d) It has further been mentioned that both writings refer to calendrical matters, but while the calendrical instruction (regardless of original or a later addition) is a major part of MMT (part A, at least in the manuscript 4Q394), the reference to the observance of days, months, seasons, and years (Gal 4:10) is only a minor issue in Galatians.

2. Four Important Parallels

While the aspects mentioned above merely provide a wider framework of comparison, we can focus on the more significant aspects for NT interpretation and, in particular, the debate about the “works of the Law” in Paul.

(a) Following the writer’s self-description “we have separated ourselves ...” (MMT C 7 = MMT vii 19 Kratz), we can see that “separation was motivated by purity concerns.”⁵⁴ This confirms the motives for separation in a wider context of Ancient Judaism, between Jews of different “parties,” and even more so between Jews and Gentiles or Jewish followers of Jesus and Gentile converts, as is reported in Gal 2:12. This does not imply, however, that the Galatian Jesus followers had been confronted with detailed teachings of the sort found in MMT⁵⁵ or that the concerns of Peter in Antioch or other Jewish Jesus followers were similar to the detailed halakhot taught in MMT. The parallel only confirms that purity concerns were a reason for separation in Second Temple Judaism, whereas the precise views or halakhot might have differed from case to case.

(b) A significant parallel between MMT and Galatians is that both writings draw on the blessings and curses from Deuteronomy (esp. Deut 27–30). MMT C 20 (= MMT vi 7–8 Kratz) considers some of the blessings and curses already fulfilled, and according to MMT C 13–14 (= MMT viii 6–7 Kratz) it is expected that other words are yet to come true. Such a double eschatology (which is well-known also from other Qumran texts, such as the *Hodayot*) provides a close parallel to the eschatology of the “already” and “not yet” in the early Jesus movement and probably already in the proclamation of Jesus himself,⁵⁶ although there is a notable difference with regard to the reason for

⁵³ Cf. Qimron and Strugnell, *Qumran Cave 4 V*, 113–4; cf. the discussion in Doering, *Ancient Jewish Letters and the Beginnings of Christian Epistolography*, 202–5, who also points to parallels in Greek documentary letters. See also the article by Doering in the present volume.

⁵⁴ Dunn, “4QMMT and Galatians,” 147.

⁵⁵ Thus Wright, “4QMMT and Paul,” 337.

⁵⁶ See the comprehensive early study by H.-W. Kuhn, *Enderwartung und gegenwärtige Heil. Untersuchungen zu den Gemeindeliedern von Qumran mit einem Anhang über Eschatologie und Gegenwart in der Verkündigung Jesu* (SUNT 4; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1968).

the assessment that some aspects are considered already present or fulfilled. The more important aspect here is that in Gal 3:8–14 Paul also adopts the reflection on Israel's blessings and curses when discussing matters of the Torah. However, while MMT is about the welfare of Israel, Paul thinks of the blessing to the Gentiles, and while MMT sticks to Deut 27–30, Paul additionally refers to the blessing to Abraham to counterbalance the curses on the trespassers of the Law. When Wright says that the parallel is merely used to interpret both passages within a "covenantal" context,⁵⁷ this is far too superficial, as the focus in MMT is on the decision between curse and blessing, and Paul is looking for a different blessing, which can finally outweigh the curse linked with the precepts of the law.

(c) The most "revolutionary" point for the discussion was, however, the term *מעשי התורה* which had been unattested before in pre-Pauline Greek as well as in the Hebrew Bible and in rabbinic literature. Apart from a number of less exact parallels,⁵⁸ 4QMMT C 27 (= MMT viii 13 Kratz) with its mention of *מעשי התורה* provides the only exact Hebrew parallel to the syntagma *ἔργα νόμου* in Ancient Hebrew literature. If Paul was aware of a Hebrew rendering of his syntagma (as we can assume), it is most probably the phrase *מעשי התורה*.⁵⁹ If there is any chance to philologically and contextually clarify the enigmatic term *ἔργα νόμου* in Paul, the evidence provided by MMT must be the point of departure, although the semantic range of the phrase cannot be limited by this text, because it obviously represents a type of

hoeck and Ruprecht, 1966); cf. also J. Frey, "Die Textfunde von Qumran und die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft. Eine Zwischenbilanz, hermeneutische Überlegungen und Konkretionen zur Jesusüberlieferung," in *Qumran aktuell* (ed. S. Beyerle and J. Frey; BThSt 120; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchner Verlag, 2011), 267–272 and J. Frey, "Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und Antikes Judentum. Probleme – Wahrnehmungen – Perspektiven," *ZTK* 109 (2012): 445–471, here 456–7 (English translation under the title "New Testament Scholarship and Ancient Judaism: Problems – Perceptions – Perspectives," in this volume 19–44)

⁵⁷ Thus Wright, *Pauline Perspectives*, 339–342 who considers the common deuteronomic thought pattern rather than the phrase 'works of the law' the most important parallel between MMT and Paul (cf. idem, *Pauline Perspectives*, 345–6).

⁵⁸ Thus 1QS V 21 *מעשי בתורה* "works in the law" (cf. 1QS V 23) also 1QS VI 18 with suffix *מעשי בתורה* and other phrases such as "works of righteousness," etc. The passage in 4Q174 1–2 i 7 = 4QMidrEsch^a III 7, which has often been quoted as a parallel, most probably reads a *dalet* instead of a *resh*, so that the syntagma there is *מעשי בתורה* ("works of praise"); cf. Kuhn, "Die Bedeutung der Qumrantexte zum Verständnis des Galaterbriefes," 205–207; Grelot, "Les oeuvres de la Loi (A propos de 4Q394–398)," 446, following É. Puech, *La croyance des Esséniens en la vie future: immortalité, résurrection, vie éternelle?* (EBib 22; Paris: Peeters, 1993), 578; A. Steudel, *Der Midrasch zur Eschatologie aus der Qumrangemeinde (4QMidrEschat^{a,b})* (STDJ 13; Leiden: Brill, 1994), 44.

⁵⁹ Abegg, "Paul, 'Works of the Law' and MMT," 139.

thought different from Paul as well as from the Jewish Jesus followers he is in debate with.

In MMT, the term *מעשי התורה* clearly points to the halakic regulations or teachings mentioned before in part B. But it is a severe misinterpretation to limit the term (in MMT and even more so in Paul) to mere precepts, as MMT strongly presupposes that these teachings ought to be practiced by the addressee or the group he represents. The focus is on doing “what is right and good before him,” i.e., on the lawful works, so that the term should not be translated as “precepts of the law,” as it is always implied that they are precepts that the law demands to be obeyed. Paul likewise draws on “works” that were apparently supposed to make a human righteous (before God, in an eschatological judgment), so that also in Paul it is implausible to limit these *ἔργα* to mere precepts or halakhot without considering *the practice* of those precepts as well.

(d) This is confirmed by the fact that, only four lines later, the author writes: “... it will be reckoned to you as righteousness, in that you have done what is right and good before him” (MMT C 31–32 = MMT viii 17–18 Kratz). Again, the author stresses “doing” what is right before God, and this refers quite clearly to the “works of the law,” the precepts or halakhot as presented before. The phrase “reckoned to one as righteousness” echoes the MT of Psalm 106:31 (rather than Gen 15:6 where not the *nif'al* but the *qal* of *כִּשְׁב* is used).⁶⁰ It can be assumed that the subject of such a “reckoning” or the one who can consider the addressee righteous (because of his practice of lawful works) is God. The addressee will “rejoice in the end” if he has accepted the teaching and practiced the works accordingly so that he will be considered righteous. Here, righteousness occurs in a clearly eschatological framework in which the human (here: the addressee) is judged by God, and the criterion of being considered righteous is the teaching and practice of lawful works, based on the adoption of the correct halakic interpretation.

3. Summing Up the Findings for the Pauline Debate

The question is, whether and to what extent the context of MMT can be used to illuminate the meaning of *ἔργα νόμου* in Paul. Was Paul aware of the context of the usage of this phrase in Palestinian-Jewish discourses, and, if so, how far did this affect his usage and the meaning of the Greek syntagma? Here, we can distinguish different levels of certainty:

(a) First of all, Paul uses legal terminology which points to legal discourses between various factions in Palestinian Judaism. Regardless which faction the author of MMT, his addressee, Paul, and his opponents belong to, the reference to the Jewish law and the debate about its interpretation and prac-

⁶⁰ Abegg, “Paul, ‘Works of the Law’ and MMT,” 207–212.

tice was what united and divided them. And although we cannot know whether Paul's opponents themselves used the phrase "works of the law" (or something similar), Paul's usage demonstrates his acquaintance with Palestinian Jewish debates and his capability of entering legal discourses with his fellow Jews. Together with a number of other linguistic parallels from Qumran, the phrase from MMT illuminates Paul's own religious background in contemporary Judaism, not only of the Diaspora but also within the Land of Israel.⁶¹ The Qumran discoveries have helped to rediscover the Jewish Paul and his background in Palestinian (and according to his own claims: Pharisaic) Judaism. Thus, it is improbable that in his rejection of the Judaizers, Paul has largely misunderstood contemporary Judaism, misrepresented the objectives of (at least some of) his fellow Jews, or even "created a straw man to bolster his own teaching regarding the Jewish law."⁶²

(b) In MMT, the term *מעשי התורה* (*ma'asê hat-tora*), especially with the supplement *מקצת* (*miqsat*) is clearly related to the list of halakhot presented in part B, which are mostly concerned about the boundaries between pure and impure. This may confirm the idea that ἔργα νόμου in Gal 2 also refers to boundary markers, albeit not those from MMT, marking the line between the group of the author and the group of the addressee(s) or other Jews. At least in Gal 2:16, Paul has in mind boundary markers between Jews and Gentiles, such as circumcision and food and purity regulations.⁶³ But as in MMT part B, the list of halakhot presented is only a selection ("some of"), the term *מעשי התורה* / ἔργα νόμου cannot be limited to those particular issues, nor generally to matters of purity, nor simply to particular issues between Jews and Gentiles.⁶⁴ Thus, the phrase can refer to a wider range of aspects of legal practice or to matters of the practice of the Law in general, as is the case in Rom 3:20, 28. While Dunn has taken MMT as a confirmation of his views, Wright instead stresses the point that for Paul, the status of the Torah has changed in a more fundamental manner, it has been relativized in the new age inaugurated by Jesus' death and resurrection and "is of no use" any more "when it comes to defining the eschatological people of God."⁶⁵

⁶¹ J. Frey, "New Testament Scholarship and Ancient Judaism," 464–469 (in this volume, 19–44, here 38–43), and J. Frey, "Die religiöse Prägung: Weisheit, Apokalyptik, Schriftauslegung," in *Paulus Handbuch* (ed. F. W. Horn; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), 59–66.

⁶² Cf. Abegg, "Paul, 'Works of the Law' and MMT," 55.

⁶³ Dunn, "The New Perspective on Paul" and "4QMMT and Galatians."

⁶⁴ It should be noted that Dunn, "The New Perspective; whence, what, and whither?" 25–6, has cautiously clarified his earlier views from Dunn, "The New Perspective on Paul." He does not want to narrow the "'works of the law' to boundary issues" (Dunn, "The New Perspective; whence, what, and whither?" 25), but rightly maintains that these issues can be considered a particular "test case" for living according to law's commands.

⁶⁵ Wright, "4QMMT and Paul," 124–125.

(c) In MMT, the phrase refers to halakhot or precepts, but it is inappropriate to limit the semantic range of the term to the mere aspect of "precepts" while excluding the idea that they should be practiced and done.⁶⁶ This is even more true in light of the fact that MMT C 31–32 (=MMT viii 17–18 Kratz) explicitly includes the aspect that the lawful practice shall be reckoned (eschatologically, by God) as righteousness. Bachmann's attempt to interpret ἔργα νόμου as mere precepts, without any consideration of their observance, practice, and deeds, is not supported but questioned from the only exact Jewish parallel. In fact, Paul says that "through the practice of works as prescribed by the law" no one (neither Jew nor Gentile) can actually be considered righteous before God.

(d) Considering the eschatological context of (God's final) judgment and the relevance of Torah practice as the criterion for judging Israel and the nations in numerous other Jewish texts, it is too one-sided to characterize Second Temple Judaism merely as a "religion of grace" without any kind of "optional" structure in its soteriology.⁶⁷ Furthermore, Paul's concerns are not merely social or ethnic problems of his mission, his aim is not only to overcome the national pride or exclusiveness of some of his fellow Jews following Jesus. In his theological reasoning (in particular in Romans), he arrives at a more fundamental consideration of the soteriological situation of humans in face of the eschatological judgment, and in this situation any pride in election or boasting in lawful "works" is excluded.⁶⁸ While Dunn and also Abegg have considered MMT a general confirmation of the "New Perspective on Paul," some aspects of the text give reason for a more cautious evaluation according to which some insights of the more traditional view should not be dismissed all-too easily.

In any case, the publication of MMT has provided Pauline scholarship with a most valuable parallel that illuminates discourses in the background of Paul's own language and terminology. While the situation of the Qumran text and its objectives widely differ from that of Paul and of his addressees and opponents, the text points to a common discourse about the relevance of halakic interpretation and the related practice of the law for the identity of various factions and their mutual relations. As any history-of-religions material, MMT cannot clarify the precise meaning of the Pauline text but can only help to evaluate the various arguments and overall interpretations.

⁶⁶ This was the view suggested by Bachmann, "Rechtfertigung und Gesetzeswerke bei Paulus," 14; cf. *ibid.* 27–28 and Bachmann, "4QMMT und Galaterbrief." The view has been repeated in a number of articles, cf. most extensively Bachmann, "Keil oder Mikroskop."

⁶⁷ Cf. the term in the description of rabbinic soteriology in Avemarie, "Erwählung und Vergeltung."

⁶⁸ Cf. Gathercole, *Where is Boasting?* and also S. Grindheim, *The Crux of Election* (WUNT II/202; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005) in critical response to Dunn.

C. Other Parallels

Other suggested parallels between MMT and early Christian texts⁶⁹ are less specific, and the respective comparison can better be established with reference to other Qumran texts. So, a quick mention of further points of comparison can suffice.

(a) From the very beginning, and due to the initial attribution of MMT to the "Teacher of Righteousness," scholars have utilized the text for comparing the teaching authority or even the religious personality of the teacher and supposed founder of the *yahad* and the teacher and founder of the Jesus movement.⁷⁰ But such a comparison is unsubstantiated if MMT cannot be attributed to the teacher and even more so since this figure is still so enigmatic and the references in a few texts (CD I 10–11; 1QpHab; 4QpPs37; Peshar Habakkuk; Peshar on Psalm 37 etc) are hard to interpret.

(b) A more promising comparison is the one between the teaching style in MMT (part B) and the teaching of Jesus according to the Synoptic tradition, in particular the antithetical teaching about the Mosaic Law in the Sermon on the Mount (Matt 5:21–48). Both texts use particular formulae for referring to the traditional or rejected teaching and for introducing their own interpretation, and both introduce their own teaching with a remarkable authority. In MMT, the authority of the author and his group (as speaking in the plural) is contrasted to the authority and interpretation of the addressee or his group. Compared with such a debate between two Torah interpreters, the claim in the Matthaean antitheses in the Sermon on the Mount seems to go even further: As the formula, ἠκούσατε ὅτι ἐρρέθη τοῖς ἀρχαίοις ("you have heard that the ancients were told") can refer to biblical commandments or to teachings or interpretations beyond from the Torah, the authoritative ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν ("but I say to you") can introduce teachings opposed to other interpretations but also teachings opposed to or going beyond the wording of the Torah. Jesus' authority is juxtaposed not only to the teachings of others but also

⁶⁹ Cf. the survey by Kampen, "4QMMT and New Testament Studies," in *Reading 4QMMT: New Perspectives on Qumran Law and History* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996), 129–144.

⁷⁰ Cf. H. Stegemann, "The 'Teacher of Righteousness' and Jesus. Two Types of Religious Leadership in Judaism at the Turn of the Era," in *Jewish Civilization in the Hellenistic-Roman Period* (ed. S. Talmon; JSPE.S 10; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991), 196–213; more briefly in H. Stegemann, "Jesus and the Teacher of Righteousness – Similarities and Differences," *BRev* 10 (1994): 42–47 and 63; cf. the early, but overstated comparison in Dupont-Sommer, *Aperçus préliminaires*, 119–122 and, much more cautiously, G. Jeremias, *Der Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit* (SUNT 2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1963). Cf. also Frey, "The Textual Discoveries of Qumran and New Testament Scholarship," 263–266 (in this volume, 603–606).

presented as an authoritative interpretation of the words of the Torah.⁷¹ It is disputed whether this particular type of interpretation of the Scriptures goes back to the Jesus of history or whether it was designed within the later community, but at least in the view of the gospel writers, Jesus' authority can appear above the wording of the Torah and the authority of Moses, thus going beyond the authority of other interpreters, including the author of MMT.

(c) There are other issues that have always been of interest for New Testament scholars, even though they go beyond the narrow range of New Testament interpretation. Mention should be made of the issue of scriptural citations, although this is not a specific issue in MMT, and the whole Qumran corpus has intensely helped to shed light on the forms and techniques of quoting and interpreting the Scriptures in the NT. A more specific issue is given by MMT C 9–10 (= MMT viii 2–4 Kratz) and the mention of “the book of Moses, the books of the prophets, and David,” that has been interpreted as an early testimony to the tripartite biblical canon with David already representing the section of the writings,⁷² but due to the uncertain date of MMT, the fragmentary preservation of the passage and the complicated history of the canonical process,⁷³ the text leaves more questions open than it solves.

D. Conclusion

MMT is of considerable importance for one of the fiercest debates in NT interpretation, the issue of Paul and the “works of the Law,” providing (in Hebrew) the only exact verbal parallel to the Greek term used by Paul and thus confirming that the thought of the Apostle is deeply rooted within the debates of (Palestinian) Second Temple Judaism. As MMT was released only late, many other issues of the relationship between the Scrolls and the New Testament had been discussed earlier and based on other texts published

⁷¹ Cf. Frey, “The Textual Discoveries of Qumran and New Testament Scholarship,” 272–277 (in this volume, 609–613); on the example of marriage and divorce, cf. L. Doering, “Marriage and Creation in Mark 10 and CD 4–5,” in *Echoes from the Caves: Qumran and the New Testament* (ed. F. García Martínez; STDJ 85; Leiden: Brill, 2009), 133–163; see also H.-W. Kuhn, “Jesus im Licht der Qumrangemeinde,” in *Handbook of the Study of the Historical Jesus* (ed. T. Holmen and S. E. Porter; Leiden: Brill, 2011), 2:1245–1285.

⁷² Qimron and Strugnell, *Qumran Cave 4 V*, 59 and 112–113; but cf. the important critical rejection by K. Berthelot, “4QMMT et la question du canon de la Bible hébraïque,” in *From 4QMMT to Resurrection: Mélanges en hommage à Émile Puech* (ed. F. García Martínez; STDJ 61; Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2006), 1–14.

⁷³ Cf. J. Frey, “Qumran und der biblische Kanon: Eine thematische Einführung,” in *Qumran und der biblische Kanon* (ed. M. Becker, J. Frey; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2009), 1–63 (translated in this volume under the title “Qumran and the Biblical Canon,” 791–836).

earlier. On the contrary, MMT could appear particularly “sensational,” since it had been hidden from the eyes of scholars for such a long time. Its reception by NT scholars first “exploded,” but calmed down soon thereafter, and by now the text is left to Scrolls specialists. MMT sheds light on early Jewish factionalism and on the subtleties of Torah interpretation in the context or even at the outset of the Qumran movement. Although authorship and date of the text cannot be ascertained and the debate between a location of the text in the formative period of the Qumran community and a dating of (at least) the full composition (including the calendar) in a later period will continue, the fact that this is one of very few letters in the corpus encourages comparison and helps to shed light on the techniques and varieties of early Jewish (and early Christian) letter writing, the emergence of scriptural authority and – in particular – the terminological background of Paul’s theology of grace.

23. Recent Perspectives on Johannine Dualism and Its Background*

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.¹ Put forward already in 1950 by Karl Georg Kuhn,² the Qumran hypothesis was then advocated with more or less caution by scholars such as Millar Burrows,³ William F. Albright,⁴ Raymond E. Brown,⁵ and James H. Charlesworth.⁶ It was adopted in commentaries on the Johannine literature;

* This article is a brief presentation of findings discussed more extensively in other articles, see J. Frey, "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, and, for an extended discussion of Johannine "dualism," see my idem, "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 (English translation in J. Frey, *The Glory of the Crucified One: Theology and Christology in the Fourth Gospel* [transl. W. Coppins and C. Heilig; BMSSEC; Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2018], 101–167). – I am most grateful to Jutta Leonhardt-Balzer and Daniel Schwartz for their suggestions regarding the contents and language of this article, and to Nadine Ueberschaer 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).

¹ 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.

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

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

⁴ 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.

⁵ 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; WdF 82; Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1973), 486–528.

⁶ J. H. Charlesworth, "A Critical Comparison of the Dualism in IQS 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), 76–

for example, the works of Raymond E. Brown,⁷ George Beasley-Murray, and D. Moody Smith, from whom we learn of “close contacts”⁸ and “remarkable similarities”⁹ between the Scrolls and the Gospel, or even between the Essene sect and the Johannine author.

While Kuhn only claimed to have found the “native soil” of Johannine thought in Palestinian Judaism of a nonorthodox, or – as he thought – gnostic, type,¹⁰ other scholars such as Frank Cross and William Albright went even further and drew conclusions 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,¹¹ the parallels in the Scrolls now appeared as a proof of “authentic historical material which first took form in an Aramaic or Hebrew milieu.”¹² The Scrolls were taken as a confirmation that the Fourth Gospel contained no less than “the memories of the Apostle John” himself.¹³

Historical speculations grew even further. Scholars tried to utilize the Qumran calendar to bridge the gap between the Synoptic and Johannine

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 Johannevangeliums* (ed. P. L. Hofrichter; ThTS 9; Hildesheim: Olms, 2002), 73–114.

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

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

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

¹⁰ Cf. Kuhn, “Die in Palästina gefundenen hebräischen Texte,” 210: “In these new texts, we get to grasp the native soil of the Gospel of John, and this native soil is Palestinian-Jewish, but is not Pharisaic-rabbinic Judaism, but is a Palestinian-Jewish sectarian piety of a gnostic structure.”

¹¹ 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, cf. J. Frey, *Die johanneische Eschatologie I: 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,” in *Vorträge der theologischen Konferenz zu Giessen* (Giessen: Ricker, 1889), 5:41–73; reprinted in *Rengstorff, Johannes und sein Evangelium*, 1–27.

¹² 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.”

¹³ 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.”

chronologies of Jesus' death,¹⁴ 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.¹⁵ It was often suggested that the Evangelist himself was a former member of the Essene sect, so that he had read the sectarian documents¹⁶ or memorized the Essene teaching.¹⁷ Others conjectured that he was a former disciple of John the Baptist,¹⁸ so that the Baptist became the mediator between Qumran and Johannine teaching. Some scholars also drew conclusions vis-a-vis the intended audience of the Johannine literature and interpreted the Fourth Gospel as a Christian teaching for Essenes,¹⁹ or the first Epistle as addressing former Essenes who had become Christians.²⁰

The most elaborate hypothesis was put forward recently by James H. Charlesworth. Based on his earlier articles on the Qumran background of

¹⁴ Cf. A. Jaubert, *La Date de la Cène* (Paris: Gabalda, 1957); eadem, "Jesus et le calendrier de Qumrân," *NTS* 7 (1960/61): 1–30; eadem, "The Calendar of Qumran and the Passion Narrative in John," in *John and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 62–75; E. Ruckstuhl, "Zur Chronologie der Leidensgeschichte Jesu, I. Teil," *SNTU* 10 (1985): 27–61, here 55–56, reprinted in idem, *Jesus im Horizont der Evangelien* (SBAB 3; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1988), 101–40, here 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, *Pram 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.

¹⁵ E. Ruckstuhl, "Der Jünger, den Jesus liebte: Geschichtliche Umrisse," in *BK* 40 (1985): 77–83, here 77; idem, "Der Jünger, den Jesus liebte," *SNTU* 11 (1986): 131–67, here 165–66, reprinted in idem, *Jesus im Horizont der Evangelien*, 355–394, here 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.

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

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

¹⁸ 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, here 24–25; Charlesworth, "A Critical Comparison," 105.

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

²⁰ M.-E. Boismard, "The First Epistle of John and the Writings of Qumran," in Charlesworth, *John and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 156–66, here 165–66.

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,” that is, 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.²¹

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, for example, by Richard Bauckham,²² David Aune,²³ and myself.²⁴ 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.

A. 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.

²¹ Charlesworth, “The Priority of John?” 102.

²² 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.

²³ 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; NT.S 106; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 281–303.

²⁴ 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, here 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. Garda Martinez, and J. Kampen; STDJ 23; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 275–335, here 335 (in this volume, 243–299).

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 Hellenistic²⁵ or even gnostic²⁶ 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.”²⁷ But, as Bauckham aptly comments, “this appears to have been a case of drawing the correct conclusion from the wrong evidence,”²⁸ 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 analogies, and cannot prove a historical or tradition-historical relationship.
- (c) Precise linguistic and terminological parallels.²⁹ 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.

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

²⁶ Cf. R. Bultmann’s foundational essay, “Die Bedeutung der neuerschlossenen mandäischen 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]).

²⁷ Bauckham, “Qumran and the Fourth Gospel,” 279.

²⁸ Bauckham, “Qumran and the Fourth Gospel,” 279.

²⁹ Cf. Aune, “Dualism,” 283.

At first glance, the number of Johannine terms paralleled in Qumran is quite impressive.³⁰ 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.³¹

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?³² Can we detect an internal development of terms or ideas within the documents from Qumran? And if there are different patterns of an idea within the library,³³ which is the one that comes closest to the New Testament parallels? Only through questions like these can we decide

³⁰ 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.

³¹ Cf. Charlesworth, “A Critical Comparison,” whose analysis is totally focused 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; SJLA 5.2; Leiden: Brill, 2001), 201–29.

³² On these questions, cf. also H.-W. Kuhn, “Qumran und Paulus: Unter traditionsge-schichtlichem Aspekt ausgewählte Parallelen,” in *Das Urchristentum in seiner literari-schen 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, here 228–29.

³³ For examples of such an inquiry, cf. J. Frey, “Different Patterns”; idem, “Die pau-linische Antithese von ‘Fleisch’ und ‘Geist’ und die palästinisch-jüdische Weisheitstradi-tion,” *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. Falle, F. García Martínez, and E. M. Schuller; STJD 35; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 197–226; idem, “Flesh and Spirit in the Palestini-an 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 (in this volume, 701–741).

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*,³⁴ the *Psalms of Solomon*, *Joseph and Aseneth*, 2 and 4 Maccabees,³⁵ in Early Christianity,³⁶ and in rabbinic texts,³⁷ so that the parallel in 1QS IV 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 III 7), which is not exclusively Qumranic, but primarily biblical.³⁸ The Johannine passage on the enduring wrath of God (John 3:36) has its closest parallel in the Wisdom of Solomon,³⁹ not in Qumran. The expression “to do the truth” (John 3:21; 1 John 1:6/1QS I 5; V 3; VIII 2) can be found already in the LXX of Isaiah,⁴⁰ in Tobit,⁴¹ and in the *Testaments of the 12 Patriarchs*.⁴² “Works of God” and the related phrase “works of the Lord” can also be found in the Bible,⁴³ 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

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

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

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

³⁷ Cf., e.g., *m. Tamid* 7:4; *Mek.* on Exod 18:27 (cf. *Mechilta d’Rabbi Ismael* [ed. H. S. Horowitz and L. A. Rabin; 2nd 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.

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

³⁹ 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. Löhr; WUNT 73; Tübingen: Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1994), 153–205, here 196–97; idem, *Die johanneische Eschatologie*, 3:305–6.

⁴⁰ Isa 26:10 LXX.

⁴¹ Tob 4:6; 13:6.

⁴² *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* (2nd ed.; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 391; cf. already H. Braun, *Qumran und das Neue Testament*, 1:113.

⁴³ 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).

John 4; 3 John 3/1QS IV 6; VIII 3) is also paralleled in the LXX;⁴⁴ the expressions “to walk in the light” or “in the darkness” (John 8:12; 12:35/1QS III 21; IV 11) similarly have LXX or MT parallels.⁴⁵

Most interesting are the observations regarding the term “sons of light” (υἱοὶ φωτός) John 12:36, which is unparalleled in the Hebrew Bible but frequent in Qumran texts as a community self-designation.⁴⁶ But considering that the term can also be found in Paul (1 Thess 5:5) and in the synoptic tradition (Luke 16:8),⁴⁷ 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*.⁴⁸ 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 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.”⁴⁹ Not only is there a remarkable difference between the usage of this phrase in the *Treatise on the Two Spirits*⁵⁰ and in the Fourth Gospel, but the term can also be found in the *Testament of Judah* (20:1–25),⁵¹ 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.⁵²

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

⁴⁴ 4 Kingdoms 20:3 (LXX); cf. 2 Sam 20:3 (MT).

⁴⁵ 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).

⁴⁶ Cf. the frequent use of this phrase in 1QS I 9; II 16; III 13, 24, 25; IQM I 1, 3, 9, 11, 13, etc.

⁴⁷ Cf. also the form τέκνα φωτός; Eph 5:8; see also *1 En.* 108:11.

⁴⁸ 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.

⁴⁹ John 14:17; 15:26; 16:13; cf. 1 John 4:6.

⁵⁰ 1QS III 18–19; IV 21, 23; cf. also 4Q177 12–13 I 5 and (for the same expression in Aramaic) 4Q542 1 i 10; in the plural IQM XIII 10; 4Q444 6 4.

⁵¹ Here there is a dualistic opposition comparable to 1 John 4:6.

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

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 Mandaean 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-religions interpretation of John, the foil of Gnosticism was simply replaced by that of Qumran dualism.⁵³ This was all the easier, to the extent that the common structure of Qumranic and Johannine dualism could be traced back to Iranian roots.⁵⁴

In his influential article, Raymond Brown⁵⁵ 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 IQS III–IV "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,⁵⁶ provides an even more detailed analysis. The essay is totally focused on the Treatise on the Two Spirits (IQS III 13–IV 26), which is seen as "representative of the dualism found elsewhere in the Scrolls."⁵⁷ 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

⁵³ 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* (2nd ed.; NT.S 6; Leiden: Brill, 1962), 111–22, here 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.

⁵⁴ Cf., among others, already Kuhn, "Die Sektenschrift und die iranische Religion."

⁵⁵ Brown, "The Qumran Scrolls and the Johannine Gospels and Epistles."

⁵⁶ Charlesworth, "A Critical Comparison."

⁵⁷ Charlesworth, "A Critical Comparison," 77 n. 3. The differences between the Treatise and other Qumran texts such as IQM are viewed as insignificant.

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 *שמת*), does not occur within IQS III 13–IV 26, but rather in the passages that precede and follow it in the manuscript,⁵⁸ 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 IQS (or another exact copy of that text).⁵⁹

B. Six Reasons for Revision

As mentioned above, the analyses by Brown, Charlesworth, and others have been criticized 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."⁶⁰ 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, for example, 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.

I. 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."⁶¹ The designations "Essene" and "non-

⁵⁸ Cf. IQS I 5; V 3; VIII 2.

⁵⁹ See the explanation in Charlesworth, "A Critical Comparison," 77 n. 3.

⁶⁰ Bauckham, "Qumran Community," 106.

⁶¹ On the "sects," see A. I. Baumgarten, *The Flourishing of Jewish Sects in the Maccabean Era* (JSJ.S 55; Leiden: Brill, 1997).

Essene” are even more disputed, since not only is the identification of the *yahad* with the Essenes contested,⁶² but the term Essene is often used in a sense that is much broader than that of the *yahad*.⁶³ As for me, I use the term Essene precisely for the *yahad* as it is visible in the community rules from Qumran.⁶⁴

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 IQS and the *Damascus Document*, we have to apply criteria for identifying the texts which do express the ideas of this community.⁶⁵ 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, *yahad*. 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 *yahad*;⁶⁶ and even the *War Rule* might be based on older traditions from outside the community.⁶⁷

⁶² 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 (English translation in this volume under the title “On the Historical Value of the Ancient Sources on the Essenes,” 163–193).

⁶³ 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).

⁶⁴ Cf. Frey, “On the Historical Value.”

⁶⁵ 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, here 45–46; A. Lange, “Kriterien essenischer Texte,” in *Qumran kontrovers*, 59–69; C. Hempel, “Kriterien zur Bestimmung ‘essenischer Verfasserschaft’ von Qumrantexten,” in *Qumran kontrovers*, 71–85.

⁶⁶ See J. Frey, “Different Patterns,” 295–300 (in this volume, 262–267); see also H. Stegemann, “Zu Textbestand und Grundgedanken von IQS III, 13–IV, 16,” *RevQ* 13 (1988): 95–131; A. Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination*, 126–28.

⁶⁷ Cf. already C.-H. Hunzinger, “Fragmente einer älteren Fassung des Buches Milhama aus Höhle 4 von Qumran,” *ZAW* 69 (1957): 131–51, here 149–50; more recently Lange and Lichtenberger, “Qumran,” 45–46.

II. 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 theological views of the *yahad*, it seems impossible to get a coherent and unified picture from all those texts. There are notable differences between the directives in *Serekh ha-Yahad* 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 *yahad* or the Essene movement.⁶⁸ 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, for example, 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,⁶⁹ 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.

⁶⁸ 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 *Legal Texts and Legal Issues*, 338–48.

⁶⁹ 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* (PTSDDSP; Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck] and Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1994), 1–53, here 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 I 16).

III. 1QS as a Compiled Manuscript

More recent publications have given us additional insights into the character and development of 1QS and the Serekh material.⁷⁰ From comparison with the 4QS manuscripts, it is obvious that 1QS is a compiled manuscript which encompasses at least five different literary units.⁷¹ 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^{d,c}). One of them (4QS^d) 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.⁷² The consequence is that “there never existed a single, legitimate and up-to-date version of the *Community Rule*.”⁷³ 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.

IV. The Treatise of 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 (I 16–III 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 text at that time.⁷⁴ This may hint at a rather early date of composition for the Treatise. If we see, then, that the passage lacks peculiar community terminology,⁷⁵ that it does not use the term Belial, and that, unlike the *yahad*, it puts forward a view of

⁷⁰ 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 *Legal Texts and Legal Issues*, 141–48.

⁷¹ Cf. H. Stegemann, “Zu Textbestand und Grundgedanken von 1QS III,13–IV,26,” *RevQ* 13 (1988): 95–131, here 96–100; A. Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination*, 121–26; Lange and Lichtenberger, “Qumran,” 54–59.

⁷² Cf. Metso, “Textual Traditions,” 146–47.

⁷³ Metso, *Textual Development*, 154.

⁷⁴ Cf. Lange and Lichtenberger, “Qumran,” 37–38, 57.

⁷⁵ Cf. the criteria as established by Dimant, “Qumran Manuscripts.”

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,⁷⁶ deeply rooted in the tradition of the pre-Essene sapiential texts such as the *Musar leMevin (Instruction)* or the *Book of Mysteries*.⁷⁷

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*⁷⁸ (and possibly even in a text from outside the community).⁷⁹ 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.

V. The Qumranian 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,⁸⁰ 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 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 IV 23), or that, in the end, the hearts of the elected ones shall be purified by God’s Holy Spirit (1QS IV 21). There is a marked contrast be-

⁷⁶ See the comprehensive analysis by Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination*, 1:126–28; cf. also Stegemann, *The Library of Qumran*, 108–110, and Frey, “Different Patterns,” 295–96 (in this volume, 262–263).

⁷⁷ Cf., most recently, A. Lange, “Die Weisheitstexte aus Qumran,” in *The Wisdom Texts from Qumran and the Development of Sapiential Thought*, 3–30, here 25–26; cf. also Frey, “Different Patterns,” 296–300 (in this volume, 263–267).

⁷⁸ Cf. Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination*, 132–35; Frey, “Different Patterns,” 300–301.

⁷⁹ 4Q502 frg. 16; cf. Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination*, 132 n. 50; Lange and Lichtenberger, “Qumran,” 57, 36.

⁸⁰ Cf. Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination*, 167–68; see also Frey, “Different Patterns,” 301–7 (in this volume, 267–273).

tween 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.⁸¹

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 II 2–13, in the liturgy of 1QS I 16–III 13, and in the curses of *4QBerakhot*,⁸² or – with slight modifications – in the *War Rule*.

VI. How Could Early Christian Authors have Adopted Qumran Dualism?

If we ask, then, for the possible influence of Qumran 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, for example, where the name Belial is used extensively.⁸³ The mere use of the light vs. darkness

⁸¹ Cf., e.g., CD II 2–13 (especially II 2, 5) and 4Q181 lii 5.

⁸² 4Q280 2 2; 4Q286 7 ii 1–13. Cf. Frey, “Different Patterns,” 327–28 (in this volume, 291–292).

⁸³ 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 12 Patriarchs*) is used in a dualistic framework. Exegetes have suggested that this passage (2 Cor 6:14–7:1) is an insertion by an interpola-

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 III–IV 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.

C. 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.

I. 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.⁸⁴ Earlier scholars from the history-of-religions school such as Heitmüller or Bousset⁸⁵ 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,⁸⁶ did dual-

tor, who took it from an Essene context. This assumption, however, cannot be discussed here.

⁸⁴ In his devastating review of the book by E. Percy, *Untersuchungen über den Ursprung der johanneischen Theologie* (Lund: Gleerup, 1939), Bultmann asserted: “The Johannine language is a whole, within which the individual term first acquires its fixed meaning.” See Bultmann, “Johanneische Schriften und Gnosis,” 233.

⁸⁵ Cf., e.g., W. Heitmüller, “Das Johannes-Evangelium,” in *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments* (ed. J. Weiss; 2 vols.; 2nd ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1907–1908), 2:685–861, 698–99; W. Bousset, *Kyrios Christos* (2nd ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1921), 182–83.

⁸⁶ 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*

ism – 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.⁸⁷ 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.⁸⁸ 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 coherent system and against a coherent history-of-religions background, namely the dualistic language of Gnosticism.⁸⁹

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.⁹⁰ 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,⁹¹ who found different types of dualistic opposition in the

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. Schaefer, “Der ‘Mensch’ im Prolog des IV. Evangeliums,” in *Studien zum antiken Synkretismus aus Iran und Griechenland* (ed. R. Reitzenstein and H. H. Schaefer; 3 vols.; SBW 7; Leipzig: Teubner, 1926), 3:306–41.

⁸⁷ On the hermeneutical relevance of the Gnosis hypothesis for Bultmann's interpretation, see Frey, *Die johanneische Eschatologie*, 1:130–41.

⁸⁸ Cf. Bultmann, “Johanneische Schriften und Gnosis,” 233.

⁸⁹ Cf. the claim by H. Thyen, “Aus der Literatur zum Johannesevangelium I,” *TRu* 39 (1974): 1–69, here 49: “All those investigations which follow this maxim, that is, that try to understand all details as structural moments of the whole and to determine their functional value within the unified system, are to be taken seriously.”

⁹⁰ 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, here 135; idem, *Theologie des Neuen Testaments* (rev. by O. Merk; 9th ed.; Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1984), 367–85.

⁹¹ Cf. J. Becker, *Das Heil Gottes* (SUNT 3; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1964).

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.⁹² Even if such an analysis provokes a great number of methodological questions,⁹³ it has demonstrated that Johannine dualism – if we can aptly call it dualism – is not a religious-historical unity. Of course, 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.

II. 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,”⁹⁴ “Devil,”⁹⁵ “the evil one,”⁹⁶ or – in a peculiar Johannine idiom – the “prince of this world” (ὁ ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου τούτου).⁹⁷

Σατανᾶς (as the transcription of *śātān*) represents a concept which developed in late biblical and early Jewish apocalyptic tradition⁹⁸ and was adopted likewise by Jesus,⁹⁹ Paul, and the Synoptics. Διάβολος simply the LXX translation of *śātān*, and ὁ πονηρός can also be used to replace the term Satan.¹⁰⁰ But in New Testament usage there is some kind of development: The Hebrew loanword Σατανᾶς is predominant in Paul and Mark, whereas

⁹² Cf. J. Becker, “Beobachtungen zum Dualismus im Johannesevangelium,” *ZNW* 65 (1974): 71–87; idem, *Das Evangelium nach Johannes* (2 vols.; 3rd ed.; ÖTK 4; Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Mohn; Würzburg: Echter, 1991), 1:175–79.

⁹³ See the criticism of Becker’s approach in Frey, *Die johanneische Eschatologie*, 1:278–87.

⁹⁴ Σατανᾶς John 13:27.

⁹⁵ διάβολος John 8:44; 13:2; 1 John 3:8, 10.

⁹⁶ 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.

⁹⁷ John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11.

⁹⁸ 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; 2nd rev. ed.; Leiden: Brill; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), 726–32; G. J. Riley, “Devil,” *Dictionary of Deities and Demons*, 244–49.

⁹⁹ For the use of “Satan,” see 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.

¹⁰⁰ Cf. Matt 13:19 with Mark 4:15.

διάβολος is not used in these earlier documents but becomes the predominant term in later New Testament texts and in the Johannine literature.¹⁰¹ The “evil one” (ὁ πονηρός) used once in Paul¹⁰² and then later in Matthew¹⁰³ 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, but the Hebrew loanword Σατανᾶς is used only once, being normally replaced by its Greek equivalents.

With “prince of this world,”¹⁰⁴ John also shapes a term that is rooted in Jewish apocalypticism but unparalleled in earlier Christian tradition.¹⁰⁵ 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 12:31¹⁰⁶ 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.¹⁰⁷ It is obvious that all the names

¹⁰¹ Cf. Böcher, “διάβολος” 714–15.

¹⁰² 1 Cor 5:13.

¹⁰³ Cf. Matt 13:19 (replacing “Satan” used in Mark 4:15); Matt 6:13.

¹⁰⁴ Cf. D. E. Aune, “Archon,” in *Dictionary of Deities and Demons*, 82–85.

¹⁰⁵ 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; 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.”

¹⁰⁶ Cf. the more colorful mythological parallel in Rev 12:7–10. On the relation between these two texts, see J. U. Kalmus, *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, here 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.

¹⁰⁷ 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* (JSJS 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

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 IQS III–IV. On the other hand, whereas in IQS III–IV, the phrase “spirit of truth” designates the angelic leader of the “lot of light,” its Johannine use as a designation for the Holy Spirit does not occur in a dualistic framework.¹⁰⁸ 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 a combination of the traditional notion of the “spirit” (πνεῦμα) with the peculiar Johannine idea of Christ himself and Christ’s revelation as “the truth.”¹⁰⁹

III. 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.”¹¹⁰ The opponents are “from below” or “from this world,”¹¹¹ whereas the Son or Son of Man is “from above,”¹¹² “from Heaven,”¹¹³ 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.”¹¹⁴

school. See on the Johannine use of the term, J. Frey, *Die johanneische Eschatologie*, 3:23–29.

¹⁰⁸ 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.

¹⁰⁹ 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.

¹¹⁰ Aune, “Dualism,” 285.

¹¹¹ John 8:23; cf. 3:31.

¹¹² John 3:31; 8:23; cf. 6:62.

¹¹³ John 3:13; cf. John 8:42: “from the Father.”

¹¹⁴ Both quotations can be found in the same wording in Bauckham, “Qumran and the Fourth Gospel,” 269; idem, “The Qumran Community,” 107.

IV. 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 and to the Logos;¹¹⁵ the Son has life in himself,¹¹⁶ he gives and even is life.¹¹⁷ Eternal life is given to those who believe in him, so that they have been transferred from death to life¹¹⁸ and will not “taste death”¹¹⁹ but live, even if they die.¹²⁰ 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.¹²¹ 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.¹²²

V. 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,¹²³ 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 himself¹²⁴ – he is even called “the truth” incarnate – it is an

¹¹⁵ John 1:4.

¹¹⁶ John 5:26.

¹¹⁷ John 11:25; 14:6.

¹¹⁸ John 5:24; 1 John 3:14.

¹¹⁹ John 8:51–52.

¹²⁰ John 11:26.

¹²¹ On the Johannine notion of life and its background, cf. Frey, *Die johanneische Eschatologie*, 3:262–70.

¹²² Cf., e.g., R. Schnackenburg, *Das Johannesevangelium* (4 vols.; HTKNT 4; 6th ed.; Freiburg: Herder, 1986), 1:113: “That might be the strongest argument for the fact that the Johannine ‘dualism’ could not have been taken over from Qumran.”

¹²³ 1 John 1:6; 2:4, 21, 27. In the Gospel, only the devil is called a “liar” (John 8:44).

¹²⁴ 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

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” (פִּשְׁעִים), which is unparalleled in the Johannine literature.

VI. 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 focused on the christological idea that Christ is the light,¹²⁵ or that the light has come and shines into the darkness¹²⁶ 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 אֵוֶר). But as mentioned above, the term already occurs in earlier Christianity: in Paul, then in Luke, and – slightly modified – in Ephesians,¹²⁷ 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 Visions of Amram, so we may assume that its use was more widespread among the traditions and groups of Second Temple Judaism.¹²⁸ A Qumran influence on John is also made implausible by 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

1:9; cf. 1 John 2:8), the true vineyard (John 15:1), and even the truth 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).

¹²⁵ John 8:12; 12:46.

¹²⁶ John 3:19; cf. 1:5.

¹²⁷ 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.”

¹²⁸ Cf. also the parallel in *I En.* 108:11–14.

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.”¹²⁹

On the contrary, “expressions which characterize the Johannine use of the light/darkness imagery have no parallels in the Qumran texts.”¹³⁰ As examples, Bauckham mentions the phrases “the true light,”¹³¹ “the light of the world,”¹³² to “come to the light”¹³³ or to “remain in the darkness,”¹³⁴ and also the contrast between day and night.¹³⁵

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.

D. 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, 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.¹³⁶ He

¹²⁹ Bauckham, “Qumran Community,” 109; idem, “Qumran and the Fourth Gospel,” 272–73.

¹³⁰ Bauckham, “Qumran Community,” 110; idem, “Qumran and the Fourth Gospel,” 273.

¹³¹ John 1:9; 1 John 2:8.

¹³² John 8:12; 9:5.

¹³³ John 3:21.

¹³⁴ John 8:12; 12:46; 1 John 2:9.

¹³⁵ John 9:4; 11:9.

¹³⁶ 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.

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)¹³⁷ in the exegesis of the light of the first day (Gen 1:3–5). Such a starting point is supported by the Johannine Prologue,¹³⁸ 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.”¹³⁹ 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 light,”¹⁴⁰ 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

Endo, *Creation and Christology: A Study on the Johannine Prologue in the Light of Early Jewish Creation Accounts* (WUNT II/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.

¹³⁷ Bauckham, “Qumran Community,” 110; idem, “Qumran and the Fourth Gospel,” 274.

¹³⁸ 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).

¹³⁹ Quotation according to C. Burchard, “Joseph and Asenath,” *OTP* 2:177–248, here 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; 4Q392 1 i 4–7; *2 En.* 24:4j; 25; Aristobulus, *ap. Eusebius, Praep. ev.* XIII 12.9–11; Philo, *Opif.* 29–35, and *Gen. Rab.* 3:8.

¹⁴⁰ 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).

literature, and the prophets;¹⁴¹ it seems to be particularly prominent in Jewish texts which are roughly contemporary with the Fourth Gospel, for example, the *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*,¹⁴² *4 Ezra*,¹⁴³ and *2 Baruch*.¹⁴⁴ *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.¹⁴⁵ 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 the Fourth Gospel says about Jesus Christ as the light of the world.”¹⁴⁶ 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”,¹⁴⁷ for example, *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

¹⁴¹ 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.”

¹⁴² 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).

¹⁴³ 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 ...”).

¹⁴⁴ 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”).

¹⁴⁵ 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).

¹⁴⁶ Bauckham, “Qumran Community,” 113; idem, “Qumran and the Fourth Gospel,” 277.

¹⁴⁷ Bauckham, “Qumran Community,” 113; idem, “Qumran and the Fourth Gospel,” 277.

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.¹⁴⁸ 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,¹⁴⁹ 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.¹⁵⁰ A similar metaphorical use of the terms is visible, for example, when Paul describes his conversion 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.”¹⁵¹ In other passages, such as 1 Thess 5:4–8 and Rom 13:12–14, the paradigm is adopted to a paraenetic framework.¹⁵²

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

¹⁴⁸ Cf. Aune, “Dualism,” 289–91.

¹⁴⁹ 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).

¹⁵⁰ Cf. also *Jos. Asen.* 15:12, where Aseneth is rescued “from the darkness.”

¹⁵¹ 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).

¹⁵² Cf. also *T. Levi* 19:1.

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 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.

E. 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 paral-

els 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.

24. Qumran and the Biblical Canon*

The theme “Qumran and the Biblical Canon” has both a “*canon theological*” and a “*Qumranistic*” side, and the combination of the two appears to be particularly interesting. In the arrangement of both fields of research, the question is raised as to what knowledge the finds from the Dead Sea, whose official publication has now been completed, have brought with respect to the development and existence of the biblical canon or the “canonical process”¹ of redacting, collecting, authorizing, and fixing Israel’s Scriptures and the Christian Bible.

However, at least two serious anachronisms are already contained in the formulation of this title. Both the Greek term “canon,” which only began to be used in the 4th century to describe the “norm” of the writings valid in the Christian church,² and the speech of “the” *Bible* in the singular, as a “unity” composed of a plurality of writings (*biblia* = τὰ βιβλία), are not yet applicable in the strict sense for the time period in which the Qumran texts emerged.

And yet the fact that the tradents of the Qumran library lived at the same time as the appearance of Jesus of Nazareth, the earliest primitive church, and the work of the apostle Paul implies that these concepts used so naturally in theological discourse cannot be applied without reservation, even in view of the time of the origin of the early Christian writings. Even the Scriptures (ἡ γραφή or in the plural αἱ γραφαί) quoted in the New Testament and recorded as a unity in some respects is not yet a “Bible,” insofar as neither a fixed or even “sacrosanct” textual form nor a clear delimitation of the authoritative books or their compilation into one “book” can be assumed for this period of time or for the New Testament authors. To put it bluntly, there is no “canon”

* This article was originally written as the main introduction for a conference volume following the Schwerte Qumran conference published under the same title: *Qumran und der biblische Kanon* (ed. M. Becker and J. Frey; BThSt 92; Neukirchener Verlag: Neukirchen-Vluyn, 2009), The volume was co-edited by my long-time collaborator Michael Becker who passed away all-too early in April 2018. I am still thankful to him for his enormous help with the original form of this article and the whole book, and also to Ursula Schattner-Rieser (Innsbruck/Cologne) for her valuable advice.

¹ On this question, see below at section D.III as well as the essay by E. Tigchelaar, “Wie haben die Qumrantexte unsere Sicht des kanonischen Prozesses verändert?” in *Qumran und der biblische Kanon* (Neukirchener Verlag: Neukirchen-Vluyn, 2009), 65–87.

² On this, see section B.

in Judaism at the time of the 2nd Temple Period,³ and furthermore the term “Bible” is not yet applicable for this time if one does not wish to accept serious misunderstandings. This applies equally to the emerging Christianity of the first and the beginning of the second centuries.

We cannot caution enough about the anachronisms that people in an age of countless printed books and universally available electronic media all too easily fall prey to because they lack any experience in dealing with manuscripts, their laborious production, their often-limited availability, etc. The often-unguarded speech of the “canon” or the “Bible” in Qumran,⁴ in ancient Judaism, or in Early Christianity, as well as constructions such as “The Apocryphal Bible”⁵ or “The Bible of the Heretics”⁶ conceal the problem.

Significant and highly questionable is, for example, the title of the English edition of the Qumran biblical manuscripts “The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible,” in which the editors put forth according to a disputable criterion⁷ “the oldest known versions of the books of the Bible.”⁸ Furthermore, the first edition by the publisher Harper San Francisco bore the lurid subtitle “The Oldest Known Bible.”⁹ This “Bible,” under the heading “Torah,” contains the book of *Jubilees* next to or after the Pentateuch; under the heading “Prophets,” it offers Former and Later Prophets of the Hebrew canon, *1 Enoch* and Daniel; and under the heading of Writings, it includes Ben Sirach, the *Epistle of Jeremiah*, and Tobit. The design of the canon of the “writings” is left undecided, but what astonishes most is the decision to assign Daniel to the Prophets, as in the LXX, but against the Hebrew canon. With regard to *1 Enoch*, the publishers decided not to include the elsewhere accessible Qumran texts of the parts of the Enochic tradition, so that they could avoid a clear decision about which parts of the later established Enochic ‘pentateuch’ they actually regard as part of their Qumran Bible. At least they point out that the fragments of the Astronomical Book (*1 Enoch* 72–82) offer a longer text and vice versa the Parables of Enoch (*1 Enoch* 37–71) are

³ J. C. VanderKam, “Questions of Canon Viewed through the Dead Sea Scrolls,” *BBR* 11 (2001): 269–292, here 269. Similarly, summarizing his observations, E. Ulrich writes, “there is no clear evidence for a canon in Scripture” (“Qumran and the Canon of the Old Testament,” in *The Biblical Canons* [ed. J.-M. Auwers and H. J. de Jonge; BETL 163; Leuven: Peeters, 2003], 57–80, here 77).

⁴ For example, the collection of essays by P. W. Flint, ed., *The Bible at Qumran. Text, Shape, and Interpretation* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001), whose editor used quotation marks around the term “Bible” in the foreword (vii) and in the introduction (1) to the volume.

⁵ Thus the title of the otherwise excellent booklet by H.-J. Klauck, *Die apokryphe Bibel. Ein anderer Zugang zum frühen Christentum* (Tria Corda 4; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008).

⁶ Thus the translation of the Nag Hammadi Codices: G. Lüdemann and M. Janssen, *Die Bibel der Häretiker. Die gnostischen Schriften aus Nag Hammadi – Erste deutsche Gesamtübersetzung* (Stuttgart: Radius, 1997).

⁷ See P. W. Flint, “Scriptures in the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Evidence from Qumran,” 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), 269–304.

⁸ Thus the title in the edition of T&T Clark by M. G. Abegg, P. W. Flint, and E. Ulrich, eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1999).

⁹ M. G. Abegg, P. W. Flint, and E. Ulrich, eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible. The Oldest Known Bible*. The British printing by T&T Clark rightly waived this subtitle.

missing in Qumran. An assignment to the canon of the Prophets can hardly be justified. Similarly, the decision to move Daniel and *I Enoch* to the end of the canon of the Prophets, but to assign this part, unlike the LXX, not to the final position but the middle position, as in the Masoretic canon, is a comprise that only shows how anachronistic and inappropriate the composition of such a “Dead Sea Scrolls Bible” is, not to mention the subtitle of the American edition, which – led by publishing concerns – was possibly a decision that could not have been influenced by the authors or editors. When we consider the fact that a “canon” is not just a selection of books that are considered authoritative, but also that it suggests a certain perspective of interpretation by virtue of how it is arranged, as can be seen in the differences between the Masoretic canon and the LXX, we must see that such an edition despite all its merits offers its readers a misleading anachronism. Such a canon, in this arrangement, and such a “Bible,” never existed in ancient Judaism.¹⁰

The great distance between the implications of talk about the “canon” at the time of the New Testament and contemporary Judaism should be emphasized in relation to such popularizing enterprises. This can be seen not least in the findings of the manuscripts from the Dead Sea. Their careful study, therefore, also has significant implications for our views about how early Christian authors were able to deal with Israel’s Scriptures and their authority.

The subject “Qumran and the Biblical Canon” is therefore not at all only an “Old Testament” problem, merely addressing issues surrounding the formation of the Hebrew canon, but one that is also relevant to the notions of the development and the essence of the entire “Christian Bible.” The textual discoveries from the Dead Sea are in any case an ideal and unsurpassed object of study with regard to the processes of redaction, collection, authorizing, updating, and commenting on religious texts in the Palestinian Judaism of the Second Temple. Only through the “chance discovery” of the scrolls at Qumran and of other manuscripts at other sites in the region have original Hebrew and Aramaic texts from the time period around the turn of the era become accessible in a considerable number. Because of the discoveries of these texts, it is now possible to study the processes mentioned above. Without these material witnesses, research into the development of the “Old Testament” canon would have been essentially dependent on the hypothetical redaction critical observations of the texts of the “Hebrew Bible”¹¹ and on the

¹⁰ The editors of the great new synoptic edition of the biblical manuscripts from the Dead Sea, however, carefully formulate in the first published volume, “The name *Biblia Qumranica* does not refer to a synoptic edition of the Bible as read in Qumran, but rather to a synopsis of the biblical books that are found among the Dead Sea Scrolls” (B. Ego, A. Lange, H. Lichtenberger, and K. de Troyer, eds., *Minor Prophets*, vol. 3B of *Biblia Qumranica* [Leiden: Brill, 2005], ix).

¹¹ This designation is also anachronistic for the time period in question, since the rabbinic canon was fixed much later. The same applies to the Christian talk of the “Old Testament,” which – in a complicated assignment of the New Testament’s talk of the *παλαιὰ διαθήκη* (2 Cor 3:14; cf. Heb 8:13) – refers to a collection of books for the first time in the late second century. The first reference appears in a letter by Melito of Sardis to a certain

few indirect witnesses from mostly Greek-speaking authors¹² as well as later and difficult to interpret rabbinic notes concerning the “fixation” of the Hebrew biblical canon.

In order to introduce the subject matter broadly, (A) first I will take up some aspects of the current theological discussion of canon, (B) then develop some perspectives on the concept (C) and origin of the late, ancient Christian canon, and (D) finally identify some of the impulses that the discussion about the texts of Qumran can contribute to the development and the essence of the canon of the Hebrew Bible as well as the two-part “Christian Bible.”

A. Aspects of the Theological Discussion of Canon

At the moment, the subject of “canon” is particularly *en vogue*. At least three thematic volumes have been published within a short timeframe in the German-speaking world: one volume by the *Zeitschrift für Neues Testament*,¹³ one volume by the *Berliner Theologische Zeitschrift*¹⁴ on “Canon and Scriptural Interpretation,” and a thematic issue of *Verkündigung und Forschung* focused on New Testament research on “canon.”¹⁵ Internationally, we must

Onesimus (ca. 170 CE), where a list of the “books of the old covenant” (τὰ τῆς παλαιᾶς διαθήκης βιβλία) is listed (Eusebius *Hist. eccl.* IV 26.13f.). Similarly, in *Hist. eccl.* V 17.2f. Eusebius cites an anti-Montanist author, writing around 192/193 CE, who provides a list of the prophets κατὰ τὴν καινὴν in contrast to the prophets κατὰ τὴν παλαιάν (on this process, see H. v. Campenhausen, *Die Entstehung der christlichen Bibel* [BHT 39; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1968, reprinted 2nd ed. 2003], 305–310).

¹² See in particular the prologue of the Greek translation of the book of Sirach, Josephus, *Ag. Ap.* I 37–41, Philo *De vita contemplative* (in Eusebius *Praep. ev.* XIII 7.12f.), 4 *Ezra* 14:45, etc. The testimonies are collected in the appendix of L. M. McDonald and J. A. Sanders, eds., *The Canon Debate. On the Origins and Formation of the Bible* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2002), 580–582. On this, see M. Becker, “Grenzziehungen des Kanons im frühen Judentum und die Neuschrift der Bibel nach dem 4. Buch Esra,” in *Qumran und der biblische Kanon* (ed. M. Becker and J. Frey, BThSt 92; Neukirchener Verlag: Neukirchen-Vluyn, 2009), 195–253.

¹³ Volume 12.6 (2003). There, see in particular the essays by H. Hübner, “Kanon – Geschichte – Gott,” 3–17; H. Löhr, “Der Kanon in der Bibliothek,” 18–26; as well as the controversy surrounding the emergence of the canon between M. Oeming, “Das Hervorwachsen des Verbindlichen aus der Geschichte des Gottesvolkes. Grundzüge einer prozessual-soziologischen Kanon-Theorie,” 52–58, and M. Klinghardt, “Die Veröffentlichung der christlichen Bibel und der Kanon,” 59–64.

¹⁴ Volume 2 (2005). There, see the essays by B. Janowski, “Kanonhermeneutik. Eine problemgeschichtliche Skizze,” 161–180; J. Schröter, “Jesus und der Kanon. Die frühe Jesusüberlieferung im Kontext der Entstehung des neutestamentlichen Kanons,” 181–201; W. Löhr, “Norm und Kontext-Kanonslisten der Spätantike,” 202–229.

¹⁵ Volume 1 (2006). There, see the essays by H. v. Lips, “Was bedeutet uns der Kanon? Neuere Diskussionen zur theologischen Bedeutung des Kanons,” 41–56; K. Greschat, “Die

also mention the documentary volume of the Colloquium Biblicum Lovaniense of 2001 that was published under the title “The Biblical Canons,”¹⁶ as well as a large number of thematic volumes¹⁷ and monographs.¹⁸ The Leuven conference volume also reflects on the contribution of the Qumran discoveries (in the context of its discussion of the Old Testament canon) in an essay by Eugene Ulrich, who has published numerous biblical manu-

Entstehung des neutestamentlichen Kanons. Fragestellungen und Themen der neueren Forschung,” 56–63; C. van der Kooij, “Kirche als Lesegemeinschaft. Schrifthermeneutik und Kanon,” 63–72.

¹⁶ J.-M. Auwers and H. J. de Jonge, eds., *The Biblical Canons* (BETL 158; Leuven: Peeters, 2003). There, see the introduction by T. Söding, “Der Kanon des Alten und Neuen Testaments. Zur Frage nach seinem theologischen Anspruch,” xlvii–lxxxviii, as well as numerous special contributions.

¹⁷ Cf., for example, G. Stemberger and I. Baldermann, eds., “Zum Problem des biblischen Kanons,” *JBTh* 3 (1988); C. Dohmen and M. Oeming, eds., *Biblischer Kanon, warum und wozu? Eine Kanontheologie* (QD 137; Freiburg i. Br. et al.: Herder, 1992); the weighty volume of reports from the Ecumenical Working Group of Evangelical and Catholic Theologians by W. Pannenberg and T. Schneider, eds., *Verbindliches Zeugnis I. Kanon – Schrift – Tradition* (DiKi 7; Freiburg i. Br. et al.: Herder, 1992), the volume by F. L. Hossfeld, ed., *Wieviel Systematik erlaubt die Schrift? Auf der Suche nach einer gesamt-biblischen Theologie* (QD 185; Freiburg i. Br. et al.: Herder, 2001), the conference volume by J. Barton and M. Wolter, eds., *Die Einheit der Schrift und die Vielfalt des Kanons* (BZNW 118; Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 2003); C. Bultmann, C.-P. März, and V. N. Makrides, eds., *Heilige Schriften. Ursprung, Geltung und Gebrauch* (Münster: Aschendorff Verlag, 2005), and B. Janowski, ed., *Kanonhermeneutik. Vom Lesen und Verstehen der christlichen Bibel* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchner Verlag, 2007). Within the English and French speaking world, see further J.-D. Kaestli and O. Wermelinger, eds., *Le canon de l’Ancien Testament. Sa formation et son histoire* (Genève: Labor et Fides, 1984); A. van der Kooij, eds., *Canonization and Decanonization* (SHR 82; Leiden: Brill, 1998); McDonald and Sanders, eds., *The Canon Debate*; M. Finkelberg and G. G. Stroumsa, eds., *Homer, the Bible and Beyond. Literary and Religious Canons in the Ancient World* (Jerusalem Studies in Religion and Culture 2; Leiden: Brill, 2003); C. Helmer and C. Landmesser, eds., *One Scripture or Many? Canon from Biblical, Theological and Philosophical Perspectives* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004); E. Norell, ed., *Recueils normatifs et canons dans l’Antiquité. Perspectives nouvelles sur la formation des canons juif et chrétien dans leur contexte culturel* (Lausanne: Editions du Zebre, 2004).

¹⁸ See, for example, H. Y. Gamble, *The New Testament Canon. Its Making and Meaning* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985); R. T. Beckwith, *The Old Testament Canon of the New Testament Church and its Background in Early Judaism* (Grand Rapids: SPCK, 1985); B. M. Metzger, *The Canon of the New Testament. Its Origin, Development, and Significance* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987); L. M. McDonald, *The Biblical Canon. Its Origin, Transmission, and Authority* (3rd ed.; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007; originally published 1987; idem, *The Formation of the Christian Biblical Canon* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1995); J. Barton, *Holy Writings, Sacred Text. The Canon in Early Christianity* (Louisville: WJK, 1997); H. v. Lips, *Der neutestamentliche Kanon* (Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 2004); T. Söding, *Einheit der Heiligen Schrift? Zur Theologie des biblischen Kanons* (QD 211, Freiburg et al.: Herder, 2005).

scripts from Qumran.¹⁹ While the perception of the Qumran discoveries in the exegetical (or even wider theological) discussion of canon so far – if at all – only seems quite rudimentary,²⁰ the questions of authoritative writings and text forms and the factors in the “canonical process” of Israel’s collection of Scriptures in Qumran are a constant companion in Qumran research, especially since the series “Discoveries in the Judean Desert”²¹ has published all the biblical manuscripts from Qumran.²² The *theological relevance* of the canon theme results from different, partly contradictory discourses.²³

¹⁹ Ulrich, “Qumran,” 57–80.

²⁰ If they occur at all, recent scholarly introductions to the Qumran discoveries and their significance for the development of the Old Testament canon are still very rudimentary. See the very brief references in K. Schmid, *Literaturgeschichte des Alten Testaments* (Darmstadt: WBG, 2008), 212. More detailed are the findings in H.-J. Fabry’s Zenger’schen introduction to the Old Testament – albeit in the part on textual history: H.-J. Fabry, “Der Text und seine Geschichte,” in *Einleitung in das Alte Testament* (ed. E. Zenger et al.; 7th ed.; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2008), 36–59, here 44–46: The “canon” of Qumran. On the other hand, Qumran insights are missing in the Old Testament introductions of R. Smend, *Die Entstehung des Alten Testaments* (5th ed.; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1995); W. H. Schmidt, *Einführung in das Alte Testament* (5th ed.; Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 1995); O. Kaiser, *Grundriß der Einleitung in die kanonischen und deuterokanonischen Schriften des Alten Testaments* (vols. 1–3; Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlag, 1992–1994); and also completely in H. C. Schmidt, *Arbeitsbuch zum Alten Testament* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2005).

²¹ The volume *DJD XXXII* on the manuscripts of Isaiah from Qumran Cave 1, published in 2011 marked the completion of the Discoveries in the Judean Desert series.

²² Cf. the volume by E. Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible* (Grand Rapids et al.: Eerdmans, 1999); the volume of collected essays by P. W. Flint, *Bible*, with contributions by J. A. Sanders, “Canon as Dialogue,” 7–26; B. K. Waltke, “How We Got the Hebrew Bible: The Text and Canon of the Old Testament,” 27–50, E. Ulrich, “The Bible in the Making: The Scriptures Found at Qumran,” 51–66, as well as C. A. Evans, “The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Canon of Scripture in the Time of Jesus,” 67–79; see further the essays by G. J. Brooke, “‘The Canon within the Canon’ at Qumran and in the New Testament,” in *The Scrolls and the Scriptures. Qumran Fifty Years After* (ed. S. E. Porter and C. A. Evans; JSPE.S 26; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 242–266; J. A. Sanders, “The Scrolls and the Canonical Process,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years* (J. C. VanderKam and P. W. Flint; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 2:1–22; E. Ulrich, “Canon,” in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. L. H. Schiffman and J. C. VanderKam; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 1:117–120; J. Trebelle, “‘Canon within a Canon’: Two Series of Old Testament Books Differently Transmitted, Interpreted, and Authorized,” *RevQ* 19 (2000): 383–399; J. C. Vanderkam, “Questions”; A. Lange, “The Status of the Biblical Texts in the Qumran Corpus and the Canonical Process,” in *The Bible as Book: The Hebrew Bible and the Judean Desert Discoveries* (ed. E. D. Herbert and E. Tov; London: Oak Knoll, 2002), 21–30; E. C. Ulrich, “From Literature to Scripture. Reflections on the Growth of a Text’s Authoritativeness,” *DSD* 10 (2003): 3–25; A. Lange, “The Parabiblical Literature of the Qumran Library and the Canonical History of the Hebrew Bible,” 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), 305–321; A.

I. The Theological Claim of the Canon and its Crisis

Of course, the center of interest, against which the pluralizing discourse of modernity and postmodernity “work,” is the Christian canon of the two-part Bible. Regardless of the different demarcations in the various Christian traditions,²⁴ the biblical canon is traditionally associated with an enormous *theological claim*: “What is at stake is the truth of the Gospel, the normativity of the origin, the inconstancy of the beginning, which claims to determine everything to come, and the necessity of constant remembrance of a past event and testimony.”²⁵

For large parts of the Christian tradition – especially true of the Reformation churches – the boundary of the canon marks the distinction between “true” and “false,” or at least between “binding” and “non-binding.” Thus, under the influence of the doctrine of inspiration, canonical writings were categorially distinguished as “inspired” in contrast to non-canonical writings that were not inspired, whereby further hermeneutical differentiations, for

Lange, “From Literature to Scripture. The Unity and Plurality of the Hebrew Scriptures in Light of the Qumran Library,” in *Scripture* (ed. Helmer and Landmesser), 51–107; 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* (ed. E. G. Chazon, D. Dimant, and R. Clements; STDJ 58; Leiden: Brill, 2005), 85–104; J. A. Sanders, “The Canonical Process,” in *The Cambridge History of Judaism IV: The Late Roman-Rabbinic Period* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 230–243; H. von Weissenberg, “Canon and Identity at Qumran. An Overview and Challenges for Future Research,” in *Scripture in Transition: Essays on Septuagint, Hebrew Bible, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honour of Raija Sollamo* (ed. A. Voitila and J. Jokiranta; JSJ.S 126; Leiden: Brill, 2008), 629–640.

²³ Cf. recently the comprehensive handbook by E.-M. Becker and S. Scholz, eds., *Kanon in Konstruktion und Dekonstruktion Kanonisierungsprozesse religiöser Texte von der Antike bis zur Gegenwart – Ein Handbuch* (Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 2012).

²⁴ Just briefly we could mention the different status accorded the Apocrypha or Deuterocanonical writings of the Old Testament in the Roman Catholic, Lutheran, and Reformed tradition. While these were determined to be canonical at the Council of Trent, they are considered to be subordinate in the Lutheran tradition and entirely non-canonical in the Reformed tradition. There are also differences between the LXX used by the Orthodox churches and the Vulgate. In individual Oriental churches, such as the Ethiopian church, the canon has a wider scope and includes, for example, the *Greek Apocalypse of Ezra*, the book of *Jubilees*, and the Book of Enoch, but also the *Didaskalia Apostolorum*, the Testament of the Lord Jesus Christ, and other Scriptures; on this, see K. Wendt, “Der Kampf um den Kanon heiliger Schriften in der äthiopischen Kirche der Reformen des XV. Jahrhunderts,” *JSS* 9 (1964): 107–113, and E. Hammerschmidt, “Das pseudo-apostolische Schrifttum in äthiopischer Überlieferung,” *JSS* 9 (1964): 114–121. In the East Syrian tradition, for example, the minor Catholic Epistles (2–3 John, Jude, 2 Peter) are to this day not included in the canon; on this, see J. S. Siker, “The Canonical Status of the Catholic Epistles in the Syriac New Testament,” *JTS* 38 (1987): 311–340.

²⁵ Söding, “Kanon,” xlvii.

example between “law” and “gospel” or between different salvation-historical “epochs,”²⁶ permitted a closer definition of the validity and boundary of the respective biblical passages.

With the onset of Enlightenment theology and the “free examination of the canon,”²⁷ that is, the historical examination of the claims of authorship and claims to authority, and with the beginning of the historical-critical examination of these claims, a tectonic shift began. As a result of these investigations, the canonical Scriptures could no longer be awarded a special quality and its associated “privilege of truth.” The canon itself was now considered a historical phenomenon, and “canonicity” appeared to be a predicate that was only subsequently awarded to the biblical Scriptures by later recipients, that is, by the church.²⁸ With the insight into the historical development of the canon (and the factors effective therein), the scriptural principle of Protestant theology fell into a massive crisis.²⁹

In light of the perceived theological discrepancies in the New Testament canon, a further questioning was phrased by Ernst Käsemann, according to whose view the canon in fact does not establish the unity of the church, but rather the diversity of the denominations,³⁰ so that, according to his conviction, within the canon itself an “examination of the spirits”³¹ should be carried out and a “canon within the canon” should be determined. For Käse-

²⁶ So, for example, in the reformed covenant theology of Johannes Coccejus. With the help of such hermeneutical distinctions, Old Testament content such as the polygamy of the patriarchs or the temple cult could be regarded as no longer binding.

²⁷ See the programmatic writing by J. S. Semler, *Abhandlung von freier Untersuchung des Canon* (vols. I–IV; Halle, 1771–75).

²⁸ Decidedly in W. Wrede, “Über Aufgabe und Methode der sogenannten Neutestamentlichen Theologie” (1897), reprinted in G. Strecker, ed., *Das Problem der Theologie des Neuen Testaments* (WdF 267; Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1975), 81–154, here 85, who questions the authority of the canon for historical reasons. Cf. further G. Krüger, *Das Dogma vom Neuen Testament* (Gießen, 1896). The process of the crisis of the principle of Scripture is carefully described and interpreted by J. Lauster, *Prinzip und Methode. Die Transformation des protestantischen Schriftprinzips durch die historische Kritik von Schleiermacher bis zur Gegenwart* (HUTh 46; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004).

²⁹ For Roman Catholic theology, this could at times be interpreted as if the primacy of the ecclesial tradition or the ecclesiastical magisterium of bishops and synods before that of the Scripture could be demonstrated historically (see the references in Söding, “Kanon,” xlviii f.). For the recent ecumenical discussion of the question of Scripture and tradition, see W. Pannenberg and T. Schneider, eds., *Verbindliches Zeugnis II–III* (DiKi 9–10; Freiburg and Göttingen: Herder, 1995 and 1998).

³⁰ E. Käsemann, “Begründet der neutestamentliche Kanon die Einheit der Kirche (1951),” in *Exegetische Versuche und Besinnungen* (ed. Käsemann; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1960), 1:214–223; see also documentation edited by Käsemann in *Das Neue Testament als Kanon* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1970), 124–133.

³¹ E. Käsemann, “Zusammenfassung,” in *Das Neue Testament*, 399–410, here 405.

mann, a decidedly Lutheran theologian, this “canon within the canon” could lie alone in the Pauline theology of the cross and doctrine of justification. Substantial parts of the New Testament itself therefore became suspected of heresy, not only the late writings regarded as “early catholic” such as the Pastoral Epistles, Jude, and 2 Peter, but also Luke-Acts and – at least for Käsemann – the Gospel of John. However, the search for such a reduced “canon within the canon” proved to be a dead end in the following period. The problems posed by this approach cannot be discussed here.³² However, the fact remains that since the Enlightenment a formal-dogmatic handling of the canon is no longer possible for theology in light of the canon’s historical development. This applies – with the exception of fundamentalist circles – all the more within the “postmodern” situation of advanced pluralization.

The question about the nature of the Christian canon and its theological meaning must be reconsidered due to these questions, and this is one of the impulses of the more recent theological discussion of the canon.

II. The Question of a Comprehensive Biblical Theology

It is of significance that this discussion about the theological validity of the Christian canon was conducted largely on the basis of the New Testament since the Old Testament texts were only considered binding to a limited degree or in a broken manner.

An important countermovement, however, was established primarily by Old Testament scholars such as Gerhard von Rad, Walter Zimmerli, and Hartmut Gese who introduced in the 1960s and 1970s³³ a new search for the possibility of a “comprehensive biblical theology”³⁴ and for the inner coher-

³² See the overview of the question of the unity of New Testament theology in J. Frey, “Zum Problem der Aufgabe und Durchführung einer Theologie des Neuen Testaments,” in *Aufgabe und Durchführung einer Theologie des Neuen Testaments* (ed. C. Breytenbach and J. Frey; WUNT 205; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007), 3–53.

³³ On this, see M. Oeming, *Gesamtbiblische Theologien der Gegenwart. Das Verhältnis von AT und NT in der theologischen Diskussion seit Gerhard von Rad* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer 1985); J. H. Schmid, *Biblische Theologie in der Sicht heutiger Alttestamentler* (2nd ed.; Gießen: Brunner Verlag 1988). See also H. Gese, *Vom Sinai zum Zion* (3rd ed.; München: Kaiser, 1990); idem, *Zur biblischen Theologie* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1990).

³⁴ Concerning the weighty design of the New Testament scholar P. Stuhlmacher, see Stuhlmacher, *Biblische Theologie des Neuen Testaments I–II* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1992, 1999; 3rd ed. 2006), as well as the remarkable attempt at a comprehensive biblical theology by the Old Testament scholar B. S. Childs, *Biblical Theology of the Old and New Testaments: Theological Reflection on the Christian Bible* (London: SCM, 1992). For outlines of a comprehensive biblical theology, see also the volume by C. Dohmen and T. Söding, eds., *Eine Bibel – zwei Testamente. Positionen biblischer Theologie* (UTB 1893; Paderborn et al.: Bonifatius, 1995). A critical balance is present in J. Barr, *The Concept of Biblical Theology* (London: SCM, 1999). See also the sloppily written book by

ence within the two-part canon of the “Christian Bible.”³⁵ The variations and problems of this line of research cannot be explored *en détail* here.³⁶ However, there are three issues that come to the fore with particular urgency with respect to the canon:

(a) First, there is the problem that the “Old Testament” has (at least) a “double post history”: It is the first part of the Christian Bible and the Tanakh of the Jewish tradition.³⁷

The self-evident practice of *interpretatio Christiana* of the Old Testament by the New Testament and through to the Church Fathers up until modern times was not only massively questioned by historical critics because it differs from the “historical-critical” meaning of Old Testament texts.³⁸ In the Christian-Jewish dialogue, it was also accused of a dis-inheriting “usurpation” of Israel’s Scriptures. This problem cannot be discussed here. It should be kept in mind, however, that the New Testament authors see themselves throughout as witnesses of a “fulfillment event” such that the New Testament itself absolutely requires reference to Israel’s Scriptures and would not be comprehensible without the Old. Israel’s Scriptures – however their scope and inventory are to be determined³⁹ – are rather

M. W. Elliott, *The Reality of Biblical Theology* (Religions and Discourse 39; Oxford et al.: Peter Lang, 2007).

³⁵ See programmatically, for example, B. Janowski, “Der eine Gott der beiden Testamente. Grundfragen einer Biblischen Theologie (1998),” in *Die rettende Gerechtigkeit* (Beiträge zur Theologie des Alten Testaments 2; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchner Verlag 1999), 249–284.

³⁶ For an Old Testament perspective, see the well-written overview by J. Barthel, “Die kanonhermeneutische Debatte seit Gerhard von Rad. Anmerkungen zu neueren Entwürfen,” in *Kanonhermeneutik* (ed. B. Janowski), 1–26; see pages 6–26 for discussions of Childs, Rendtorff, and Steins.

³⁷ On this, see K. Koch, “Der doppelte Ausgang des Alten Testaments in Judentum und Christentum,” *JBTh* 6 (1991): 215–242; E. Blum, ed., *Die Hebräische Bibel und ihre zweifache Nachgeschichte*, FS R. Rendtorff (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchner Verlag, 1990). The Hebrew Bible is, of course, also not simply the “Jewish Bible” either; rather, the “Jewish Bible” is much more the Tanakh in the light of the later Jewish tradition of interpretation. On this, see H. Liss, *Tanach. Lehrbuch der jüdischen Bibel* (2nd ed.; Schriften der Hochschule für Jüdische Studien Heidelberg 8; Heidelberg: Winter, 2008), 16.

³⁸ See the circumspect work of N. Walter, “Zur theologischen Problematik des christologischen Schriftbeweises im Neuen Testament, *NTS* 41 (1995): 338–357. The “original postulate,” according to which only the meaning originally intended by the author may be the true one, is rightly criticized by Koch, “Ausgang,” 222; see also idem, “Rezeptionsgeschichte als notwendige Voraussetzung Biblischer Theologie,” in *Sola Scriptura. Das reformatorische Schriftprinzip in einer säkularen Welt* (ed. H. H. Schmid and J. Mehlhausen; Gütersloh: Mohn, 1991), 143–155.

³⁹ Here in particular the tradition of the Septuagint must be considered. On this, see the essay by M. Tilly, “Griechische Bibelübersetzungen im antiken Judentum und im Urchristentum,” in *Qumran und der biblische Kanon* (ed. M. Becker and J. Frey; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchner Verlag, 2009), 169–193. See now also J. Frey, “The Contribution of the Septuagint to New Testament Theology,” in *Epiphanies of the Divine in the New Tes-*

precisely the authoritative frame of reference, indeed the *cum grano salis*, the “Bible” of primitive Christianity; they form the “fundamental part of the Bible to which the New Testament writings only gradually adjoined themselves.”⁴⁰

The question of a biblical theology is more urgent from a New Testament perspective than from an Old Testament one. Conversely, the outcome of the Old Testament in the New is “not to be understood as a historical or tradition historical necessity, but only as a retrospective reception based on the Christian faith.”⁴¹ What is required, however, is a new “reflection on the hermeneutic relevance of the canon from a reception-historical perspective.”⁴²

(b) This also raises the question of the historical and theological relationship between the Testaments and the continuities and discontinuities between them.

Since the classical determinations of relationships (e.g., in the sense of “promise and fulfillment”) have proved inadequate, the discussion on this question is conducted from the New Testament side with very different approaches. Hans Hübner, for example, does not wish to attach a Christian-theological commitment to the Old Testament *per se*, but only to the “*Vetus Testamentum in Novo receptum*” (which is primarily represented by the Septuagint tradition) as a basically different and new entity in contrast to the Hebrew Bible.⁴³ Peter Stuhlmacher, instead, has worked out comprehensively the tradition historical continuity between the Old and New Testament, such that the New Testament authors’ way of thinking is determined to a much greater extent by Old Testament and early Jewish traditions.

These attempts also imply a substantial promotion of importance of the “inter-testamentary” literature, which had been devalued by Reformation theology, under the influence of humanism, as “apocryphal” in its canonical rank (according to Luther and the Lutheran confessions) or completely removed from the canon (according to the Reformed confessions), but which is indispensable for the historical and theological understanding of essential motifs of the New Testament witness. Stuhlmacher, therefore, rightly pleads for the theological value of the Septuagint canon.⁴⁴

But in fact the framework of the Septuagint cannot be regarded as a “canon” either because such a “canon” would be equally anachronistic for the time period of primitive

tament and the Septuagint (ed. R. Deines and M. Wreford; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2019), in press

⁴⁰ Rightly so in Stuhlmacher, *Biblische Theologie I*, 5.

⁴¹ Thus Barthel, “Debatte,” 3f.

⁴² Barthel, “Debatte,” 3.

⁴³ H. Hübner, “Vetus Testamentum und Vetus Testamentum in Novo receptum. Die Frage nach dem Kanon des Alten Testaments aus neutestamentlicher Sicht,” *JBTh* 3 (1988): 147–162.

⁴⁴ On this, see Stuhlmacher, *Biblische Theologie I*, 8: “Seen from the New Testament, the (primitive) Christian Old Testament does not simply consist of the ‘Hebrew Bible,’ but it comprises the scriptural writings of the Septuagint.” See in the background H. Gese, “Erwägungen zur Einheit der biblischen Theologie,” in *Sinai*, 11–30, specifically 16f.

Christianity.⁴⁵ With the tradition-historical approach, additional writings such as the Enoch tradition (cf. the quote in Jude 14f.) or other writings from the so-called “Pseudepigrapha” come into focus, not least the literature from Qumran, insofar as forms of scriptural interpretation and development of tradition are documented there, which are historically and objectively essential for the understanding of early Christian thought.

The question about the continuity of tradition (and possibly perceptible discontinuities) between contemporary Judaism and the emerging Jesus movement or the NT authors leads to a sustainable problematization of the Christian OT canon and brings the historical questions of the formation of both the “Old Testament” and the two-part Christian canon onto the agenda.

(c) The approach of a canonical reading of the Old Testament (or even the entire Bible), as represented by Brevard S. Childs in North American and Rolf Rendtorff as well as more recently Georg Steins in the German speaking world,⁴⁶ combines a number of conflicting interests.

On the one hand, the growing skepticism against the source-critical fragmentation of the biblical texts, as it is particularly present in German Old Testament scholarship, stands in the background: The fact that the highly hypothetical source and layer constructions, which rarely led to consensus, cannot be accorded a theologically binding character is obvious from afar.⁴⁷ On the other hand, in the past decades, Old Testament scholarship itself has turned from a fixation on the beginnings of the tradition to redaction and final composition phenomena, such that the canonical final form of the individual writings and corpus of writings came more into view.⁴⁸

The search for ways “of canonical reading” is also inspired by models of reception theory in literary studies. On the one hand, the question is asked about the totality of individual writings or even individual “parts of the canon” (e.g., Torah, Prophets) and about receiving and authorizing communities.

In the New Testament or the two-part Bible as a whole, such attempts have been rarely applied to date.⁴⁹ This is due to the specific form of the collection and transmission of the

⁴⁵ On this, see M. Hengel and R. Deines, “Die Septuaginta als christliche Schriftenammlung, ihre Vorgeschichte und das Problem ihres Kanons,” in *Die Septuaginta zwischen Judentum und Christentum* (ed. M. Hengel and A. M. Schwemer; WUNT 72; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1994), 182–284.

⁴⁶ On this, see Barthel, “Debatte,” 6–26.

⁴⁷ According to Barthel, Childs’ concern can certainly be seen as an attempt at “post-critical theology and exegesis (“Debatte,” 10), analogous to Karl Barth, to whom Childs himself refers. A comparable impulse that has been more strongly influenced by his encounter with the Jewish exegesis can be seen in the work of Rolf Rendtorff.

⁴⁸ Barthel, “Debatte,” 2, points this out, and refers primarily to the works of Odil Hannes Steck and his students. See also G. Steins, *Die Chronik als kanonisches Abschlußphänomen* (BBB 93; Weinheim: Belz Athenäum, 1995).

⁴⁹ See, however, T. Hieke and T. Nicklas, “Die Worte der Prophetie dieses Buches.” *Offenbarung 22,6–21 als Schlußstein der christlichen Bibel Alten und Neuen Testaments gelesen* (BThSt 62; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchner Verlag, 2003). See the foundational reflections by K.-W. Niebuhr, “Exegese im kanonischen Zusammenhang. Überlegungen

individual parts of the New Testament canon (Gospels / Pauline Corpus / Acts + Catholic Epistles / Apocalypse), which hardly permits an answer to the question of when and how it became the canonical form in the sequence of Scriptures we have today.⁵⁰ If the canon of the New Testament or the entire Bible was “fixed” in the fourth century at the earliest and is manifested, for example, in the magnificent codices of the period after Constantine,⁵¹ canonical reading is actually based on a reference point from this later period. Thus, in the attempts to read the New Testament canon or the entire Bible canonically, the problem always arises that several “levels” of meaning formation must be considered simultaneously, at least the level of the individual text or section, that of the canonically worded final form of the respective book, and finally that of the entire New Testament or the entire Bible. How the dimensions of meaning perceived at these various levels relate to one another and how they are to be weighted is a question yet to be satisfactorily resolved.

III. Canon in the Horizon of Cultural Studies

However, the main motive for the current discussion of canon seems to be even more strongly the cultural studies context. What is considered here is not only the biblical canon, but more broadly the various “canons” of different groups and movements and how they are understood as an essential element of the processes of determining and securing identity.⁵² In this horizon, the canon of the Bible is regarded as a codified “cultural memory” of the church or of Western Christian culture.⁵³

In this perspective, the groups and institutions involved in the respective processes, the phenomena of reception, demarcation, identity formation, and stabilization (including the securing of certain influences or positions of power) increasingly come into focus. This offers a variety of new impulses, especially for historical reconstruction.

This kind of description of canon formation and of the safeguarding of identity through canonization endeavors to be largely independent of the traditional claims to authority of the biblical canon and the related theological questions. Nevertheless, within the framework of this cultural scholarly paradigm, the “old” questions about the relationship of unity and diversity within the biblical canon and about its authority and binding character also arise.

zur theologischen Relevanz der Gestalt des neutestamentlichen Kanons,” in *Canons* (ed. Auwers and de Jonge), 557–584.

⁵⁰ See also the compilation of the canon lists and the large codices in Niebuhr, “Exegese im kanonischen Zusammenhang,” 563. If, in Athanasius, the Catholic Epistles still stand before the Corpus Paulinum, they are subordinate to it in the Vulgate. In the Decretum Gelasianum, even the apocalypse stands before the Catholic epistles. The internal arrangement in the Corpus Paulinum and the Catholic Epistles varies.

⁵¹ On this, see Löhr, “Norm,” 204.

⁵² On this, see the essays in the important volume by A. Assmann and J. Assmann, eds., *Kanon und Zensur, Beiträge zur Archäologie der literarischen Kommunikation* (vol. 2; München: Wilhelm Fink, 1987).

⁵³ Cf. Löhr, “Kanon,” 18.

IV. The Question of Truth in Public Discourse

The biblical canon's traditional claim to truth is still a nuisance for the post-modern high estimation of plurality. This traditional claim alleges that in these Scriptures *alone* and at the same time in these Scriptures *entirely* truth is contained. Such a claim is opposed to the numerous attempts to reconstruct and bring to light the "suppressed" truth of other writings that have not become canonical or are even viewed as "heretical," according to the principle *audiatur et altera pars*.

Book titles like "Was nicht in der Bibel steht," "Lost Scriptures," "Lost Christianities," or "Bibel der Häretiker"⁵⁴ represent this movement of the reevaluation of "apocryphal" texts and with it the leveling of the canon. This movement works under the assumption that even these allegedly repressed or censored texts (e.g., the *Coptic Gospel of Thomas* or the *Gospel of Mary*) contained essential spiritual impulses or aspects of the original Christian truth, that, for the sake of this truth, must be rediscovered in contrast to the "orthodox" ecclesial canon. This dispute over claims to validity is often conducted with the help of early dates or the postulate of the independence of these texts from the canonical Gospels, and work from the premise that establishing the historical fact of an early plurality could also justify the right of religious plurality for the present day.

These tendencies appear regularly within the public discourse when a new "apocryphal" text is presented to the public. Thus, the Berlin Gospel fragment (later named the "Gospel of the Savior") *Papyrus Berolinensis 22220*, first published on Easter 1997, was praised in the press as a text from the first or second century, whereby the early dating suggested that a claim comparable to the canonical Gospels might also exist. In the meantime, the research on this text has concluded that it was written later, and also that the application of the term "gospel" to it is questionable – by comparison with other Coptic "Apostle books" or "Apostolic memories" from the 4th or 5th century.⁵⁵ However, the broad interest could

⁵⁴ U.-K. Plisch, *Was nicht in der Bibel steht. Apokryphe Schriften des frühen Christentums* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2006); B. D. Ehrman, *Lost Scriptures. Books that Did Not Make It into the New Testament* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005); idem, *Lost Christianities. The Battle for Scripture and the Faiths We Never Knew* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003); Lüdemann and Janssen, *Bibel*.

⁵⁵ See the edition by C. Hedrick and P. Mirecki, *The Gospel of the Savior. A New Ancient Gospel* (Santa Rosa: Polebridge Press, 1999); cf. H.-M. Schenke, "Das sogenannte 'Unbekannte Berliner Evangelium,'" *ZAC* 2 (1998): 199–213; J. Frey, "Leidenskampf und Himmelsreise. Das Berliner Evangelienfragment (Papyrus Berolinensis 22220) und die Gethsemane-Tradition," *BZ* 46 (2002): 71–96; S. Emmel, "The Recently Published Gospel of the Savior (*unbekanntes Berliner Evangelium*): Righting the Order of Pages and Events," *HTR* 95 (2002): 45–72; idem, "Unbekanntes Berliner Evangelium = The Strasbourg Coptic Gospel: Prolegomena to a New Edition of the Strasbourg Fragments," in *For the Children, Perfect Instruction*, FS H.-M. Schenke (ed. H.-G. Bethge, et al.; NHMS 54; Leiden: Brill, 2002), 353–374; J. Hagen, "Ein anderer Kontext für die Berliner und Straßburger Evangelienfragmente. 'Das 'Evangelium des Erlösers' und andere Apostel-evangelien' in der koptischen Literatur," in *Jesusüberlieferung in apokryphen Evangelien* (ed. J. Frey and J. Schröter; WUNT; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009). Cf. now the comprehensive

only be achieved by playing with the suspicion that a valuable early Christian text could have been suppressed by the authoritarian selection of church authorities so that its modern “discoverers” are viewed as having an aura of being “Enlighteners.” The creation of a sensation for the public (which is also commercially profitable) is thus achieved; however, the historical truth usually proves to be much more complex a matter.

The same mechanisms were evident in the events surrounding publication of the “Gospel of Judas,” published on Easter 2006, from the Coptic codex Tchacos.⁵⁶ At first, this work was presented as if the figure of Judas appeared here in a purely positive light (i.e., the Gospel of Judas could appear to be an alternative to the generally negative evaluation of the figure of Judas in Christianity), so that the question could arise for the public’s consideration of whether, at some point in Early Christianity, a basically equally positive view of Judas and the entire event of Jesus’ passion had been suppressed and “censored.” This interpretation of the Gospel of Judas has also been criticized and further differentiations through new textual studies have been made.⁵⁷

For the present discussion, it can only be noted that with each “new” text, the apparently very virulent question arises again as to whether the Christian canon arose from an authoritarian decision of the Church, the “censorship” of bishops, and the rejection of truths that may originally have had equal rights.

The postmodern public often seems to place greater trust in non-canonical texts than in the traditional Christian canon, which is suspected of only documenting the “history of the victors” and of having suppressed or excluded other positions – “heretical” groups, Jewish-Christian circles, and not least women. This phenomenon shows how the public discussion continues to “work off of” the traditional claim to truth of the Christian canon.

B. The Term “Canon” and Its Application to the Christian Collection of the Writings of the “Bible”

But first, we have to ask about our use of terminology and its meaning: What is “canon” really? What is meant when this term is applied to the biblical collection of writings?

edition by A. Suci, *The Berlin-Strasbourg Apocryphon: A Coptic Apostolic Memoir* (WUNT 370; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2017).

⁵⁶ R. Kasser, M. Meyer, and G. Wurst, eds., *Das Evangelium des Judas* (Wiesbaden: Whit Star, 2006); see also Plisch, *Was nicht*; as well as the new edition by J. Brankaer and H.-G. Bethge, eds., *Codex Tchacos. Texte und Analysen* (TU 161; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2007).

⁵⁷ See the discussion in the volume by E. E. Popkes and G. Wurst, eds., *Das Judasevangelium* (WUNT; Tübingen: 2010).

I. The Implications of the Concept of “Canon”

The definitions offered in various theological dictionaries and handbooks are inconsistent.⁵⁸ Even if the strictly theological definition given by Eilert Herms is not taken up, which defines canon as “the exclusive epitome of that inscribed tradition which is permitted for use in worship,”⁵⁹ the concept is usually associated with idea of textuality, seclusion, and the binding characteristics. The term “canon” is associated with a clear, closed “list” of authoritative or even inspired writings. This list is the result of one or more conscious decisions based on certain criteria, and the corpus, defined in this way, forms the framework of the recognized “holy” writings of a community of faith.⁶⁰

This concept is of course the result of a long theological development, and it is very clearly a Christian concept, whose application to the phenomenon of ancient Judaism – as well as to the rabbinic “canon” – is extremely problematic.⁶¹ It is even less possible to transfer this concept to “the Scriptures” or “writings” at the time of the New Testament. In all discussions about the use of Scripture, scriptural citations, etc. in the New Testament, one must be aware that the idea of a clearly defined secluded, universally binding, and exclusive truthfulness of a canon of Scripture was as far away from the authors of the New Testament period as it was from the authors and traditions of the Qumran texts.

II. The Greek Term and Its Late Application

I would like to illustrate this with the term *κανών* and its application to the collection of biblical writings:

The word *κανών* (= “measuring stick, guideline”) “in Greek derives from a foreign word.”⁶² It is built upon a loanword from the Semitic (קָנָן⁶³) and designates in common usage a straight stick, a straight edge (a straight piece of wood with a measurement) in the

⁵⁸ Cf. the documentation in E. Ulrich, “The Notion and Definition of Canon,” in *Canon Debate* (ed. McDonald and Sanders), 21–35; idem, “Qumran,” 78f.

⁵⁹ E. Herms, “Was haben wir an der Bibel? Versuch einer Theologie des christlichen Kanons,” *JBTh* 12 (1997): 99–152, here 109.

⁶⁰ Thus the synthesis in Ulrich, “Notion,” 28f.

⁶¹ On this, see M. Morgenstern, “Halachische Schriftauslegung,” *ZTK* 103 (2006): 26–48, here 40f.

⁶² H. Ohme, *Kanon ekklesiastikos. Die Bedeutung des altkirchlichen Kanonbegriffs* (AKG 68; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1998), 21.

⁶³ This concept was also already present in the Hebrew designation for a yardstick or a unit of measure; see Ezra 40:3, 5; 42:16–19, or also a weight for scales (Isa 46:6). However, at no point does the LXX use *κανών* as a translation for these terms.

building trade,⁶⁴ in the figurative sense a form, for example, for the perfect form in art,⁶⁵ or, in Alexandrian grammar, a group of writers whose Greek was considered exemplary.⁶⁶ In further renderings, it can be related to the law, certain ideals, philosophical standards, or even be used in the sense of a “list, table,” e.g., for multiplication tables.

In the “Greek” sense, κανών occurs in the LXX in 4 Macc 7:21 for the “rule.” In Aquila Job 38:5, the concept refers to a concrete “measuring cord.” Philo uses κανών often in a manner similar to νόμος for rule, prescript, or law. Josephus speaks of σκόπος and κανών in *Ant.* X 49, a role model and a measuring cord.⁶⁷ In the New Testament, the lexeme occurs only in Paul, and there the word also has the meaning of “yardstick.” Galatians 6:16 speaks about the standard of living, and 2 Cor 10:13, 15 speak about the standard of Paul’s works.

This use of the term is still far from being used in the context of a normative collection of Scriptures. In the Christianity of the 2nd/3rd centuries, the term was used first in the phrase κανών τῆς πίστεως (= *regula fidei*) or κανών τῆς ἀλήθειας (= *regula veritatis*),⁶⁸ whereby what is designated is not a canon of Scripture, but a general norm of faith. It is only from the 4th century and onwards that κανών appears in Christian usage for synodal decisions and canonical regulations (*canones*). And for the first time, in the second half of the 4th century, the word is then regularly used to designate the list of ecclesiastically recognized writings.⁶⁹

Of course, in Judaism as well as in Early Christianity, authoritative or normative writings are listed beforehand: But a different terminology is used here – and the observation of the respective context shows in particular that the implications of the later concept of the canon for “ecclesiastical law” are still quite far off.

In what is supposed to be the oldest of the early Christian “canon lists,” the so-called “Canon Muratori” or better “Muratorian Fragment,”⁷⁰ there is only terminological talk of what “we accept” or what “should be read in the church” or what can be read, but not publicly in the church among the prophets or apostles, such as the Shepherd of Hermas, which was written “only recently in our times in our city.” However, the list not only includes the *Apocalypse of Peter*, but also the Wisdom of Solomon (in the series of “New Testament” texts!) among the writings accepted as authoritative. The local point of this

⁶⁴ H. Oppel, *Κανών. Zur Bedeutungsgeschichte des Wortes und seiner lateinischen Entsprechungen* (Leipzig: Dietrich, 1937), 2–10.

⁶⁵ Thus, for example, the spear carrier Ployclete, see Plinius the Elder, *Hist. At.* XXXIV 8.55.

⁶⁶ Quintilian, *Inst.* X 1.54, 59.

⁶⁷ On the whole, see H. W. Beyer, Article, “κάνων,” *ThWNT* 3:600–606, here 600.

⁶⁸ See Ohme, *Kanon*, 61–155. Cf. already Philo, *Alleg. Interp.* 3:233: κανών τῆς ἀλήθειας.

⁶⁹ Thus already T. Zahn, *Grundriß der Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons* (2nd ed.; Leipzig: Deichert, 1904), 7f.

⁷⁰ Concerning the problems associated with dating this fragment, see also below on pages 817–818.

constellation (“in our city”) and the character of a “reception phenomenon” (in the mention of “we assume”) can be clearly seen. However, the term *κανών* is not yet used here.

Even in Eusebius (*Hist. eccl.* III 25.1–7) there is not yet talk of a *κανών*, but of three groups of writings, unanimously accepted (*ὁμολογούμενα*), the disputed (*ἀντιλεγόμενα*) – to which James, Jude, 2 Peter, and 2 and 3 John belong, but also the writings that Eusebius himself considers spurious, such as Shepherd of Hermas, the *Apocalypse of Peter*, the *Epistle of Barnabas*, the *Didache*, the *Acts of Paul*, the Gospel of the Hebrews, and the Apocalypse of John – and finally the writings that should be rejected as heretical forgeries (for example the *Gospel of Peter* or the *Gospel of Thomas*, the *Acts of John*, etc.). In its “technical usage,” the term *κανών* occurs as a reference “to the Bible of both Testaments ... for the first time in the middle of the 4th century.”⁷¹ During this period, synods defined the scope of the sacred Scriptures. A frequently cited example is the 60th canon of the Synod of Laodicea, whose list “enumerates the canonical books of the Old and New Testaments,”⁷² which lacks the book of Revelation. Of course, this list is probably a secondary addition to the original synodal canons, in which the term *κανών* is still traditionally used in the sense of a church order and not for a collection of writings.⁷³

In the sense of a closed corpus of the writings of the Old and New Testaments, the term *κανών* is used for the first time by Athanasius of Alexandria. He quotes from the Shepherd of Hermas around 350/51 CE, but he adds *μη ὄν ἐκ τοῦ κανόνος*.⁷⁴ Behind this is the effort to refer to recognized authorities and to describe controversial ones as such. In his 39th Easter Letter in 367 CE, Athanasius then offers, for the first time, the complete list of the 27 writings of the New Testament (in the order Gospels – Catholic Epistles – Pauline Epistles – Revelation).

However, even this document, which is often (erroneously) used within the discussion of the canon as proof of its closure, also requires a more precise interpretation:

According to the investigation by Christoph Marksches, the introduction to the text shows that the Alexandrian bishop did not simply have this statement at his disposal, but rather that he had to put it together with a certain amount of effort. The demarcation of the New Testament canon was obviously not yet a matter of fact at this time. It is much more likely “that the exact scope of the New Testament was not known to simpler priests or even laymen.”⁷⁵

Furthermore, the church-political and institutional context must be considered: The statements about the *κανών* are motivated in this letter by Athanasius’ efforts, after he returned from his fifth exile, “to consolidate ... his own authority as the only bishop of the

⁷¹ Zahn, *Grundriß*, 1.

⁷² C. Marksches, *Kaiserzeitliche christliche Theologie und ihre Institutionen* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007), 222. Cf. now the English translation: Christoph Marksches, *Christian Theology and Its Institutions in the Early Roman Empire: Prolegomena to a History of Early Christian Theology* (trans. Wayne Coppins; Waco: Baylor, 2015).

⁷³ Thus Marksches, *Theologie*, 223.

⁷⁴ Ath. Decr. 18.3 (*Athanasius Werke*, vol. 2, 15.20 Opitz) cited according to Marksches, *Theologie*, 221.

⁷⁵ Marksches, *Theologie*, 225f.

Alexandrian church.”⁷⁶ With this intention, the demarcation against the Homoeans and the Meletians is carried out and the use of the Apocrypha is connected with these heresies.⁷⁷ The formulation of a canon of Holy Scriptures and the rejection of apocryphal and supposedly counterfeit writings⁷⁸ therefore takes place within the context of the enforcement of the monarchical episcopal office against other, free teachers, who possibly presupposed “another concept of the ‘canon’ and possible even defined the scope of the Holy Scriptures differently.”⁷⁹

This overview demonstrates how the concept of “canon” first slowly referred to a collection of writings that was then increasingly clearly defined with respect to its limits. Conversely, this shows that when talk of canon is applied to Old Testament early Jewish content, it is done “too often in an uncritical manner.”⁸⁰ Aspects such as the question of admission of certain texts within worship or of the status of the “only correct and authoritative testimony” cannot be unwaveringly adopted here, just as it cannot be adopted for the New Testament in light of the evidence from primitive Christianity.

III. Approaches to Terminological Differentiation

Since the talk of the canon in the theological discourses cannot be avoided, different proposals were made for clarification. Thus, in his monograph, Christoph Marksches uses single quotation marks to distinguish between the “notions of a ‘canon’ of normative Scriptures already common among Christians in the imperial period” on the one hand and the “notion and concept of a *κανών* of divinely inspired writings.”⁸¹ This is confirmed by the already repeatedly mentioned problem of the unguarded speech of the “canon” of the Bible, the Old or the New Testament in the time before the 4th century.

Eugene Ulrich, inspired by the evidence from Qumran, insists that distinctions must be made between different levels and forms of commitment, and these distinctions largely continue to be used today.⁸² Accordingly, distinctions must be made between:

- *an authoritative Scripture* (whereby it is to be determined for whom or for which group and in whose view this work has authority or validity),

⁷⁶ Marksches, *Theologie*, 228.

⁷⁷ Löhr, “Norm,” 217, however, points out that “it is unlikely that the use of the so-called Apocrypha was more intense in these groups than in the whole of contemporary Egyptian Christendom.”

⁷⁸ Athanasius explicitly mentions Enoch, Isaiah, and the writings of Moses, whose derivation from ancient times he considers misleading.

⁷⁹ Marksches, *Theologie*, 228.

⁸⁰ J. Maier, “Zur Frage des biblischen Kanons im Frühjudentum im Licht der Qumrandefunde,” *JBTh* 3 (1988): 135–146, here 137.

⁸¹ Marksches, *Theologie*, 216.

⁸² Ulrich, “Notion,” 29f. (adapted here).

- a collection of authoritative writings (to which one can then attribute “canonical” authority, even if there is not yet a canon in the actual sense and the collection is not yet negatively delimited),
- the Bible (in the singular) as a completed and closed collection of canonical books (possibly in one book) or the canon in actual sense as a similarly complete, clearly delimited list of religiously authoritative writings in its entirety.

The path from the redaction of the writings through their authorization and collection to the negative delimitation of the resulting authoritative collection can then be described as a “canonical process” – using a term that has essentially been developed within the Qumran discussion.⁸³

With the help of such differentiations, an attempt will be made in the following to capture more precisely the respective status of individual writings in the canonical process.

C. Questions and Perspectives concerning the Emergence of the New Testament and Christian Canon

The above example of Athanasius in his struggle for episcopal authority also shows to what extent the respective expressions depend on the respective ecclesial and institutional contexts and controversies. A “direct line” of development towards the later canon can hardly be described. This is only possible if one thinks of the entire process only from its end, the finished “product” of the Jewish or Christian canon. However, the phenomena appear to be much more complex in recent research:

In the introduction to his volume of collected essays *Das Neue Testament als Kanon*, Ernst Käsemann could still say that we are “excellently informed ... about the origin and history of the New Testament canon,” only its theological relevance is now “more controversial than ever before.”⁸⁴ From today’s point of view, scholars can no longer agree with the first part of this statement. Contrary to the view of Käsemann (who mainly referred to the classical depiction of Hans von Campenhausen⁸⁵), the historical processes are anything but

⁸³ On this term, see below at Section D.III.

⁸⁴ Concerning this terminology, see below at section D.III.

⁸⁵ von Campenhausen, *Entstehung*. Concerning the value of this monograph, see the epilogue by C. Marksches in von Campenhausen, *Entstehung*, 395–402. Von Campenhausen’s work in turn draws on the historical works of the great scholars of the late 19th and 20th centuries, in particular T. Zahn, *Geschichte des Neutestamentlichen Kanons* (2 vols.; Leipzig and Erlangen: Olms, 1888-92); idem, *Grundriß*; A. v. Harnack, *Das Neue Testament um das Jahr 200* (Freiburg: Mohr, 1889); H. Lietzmann, “Wie wurden die Bücher des Neuen Testaments heilige Schrift? (1907),” in *Kleine Schriften II* (ed. K. Aland; TU 68; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1958), 15–98, and J. Leiboldt, *Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons* (vols. 1 and 2; Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1907–08).

clear: a new research report lists “more questions than answers,”⁸⁶ and the discussion is historically and theologically “in full swing.”⁸⁷

The relatively simple model dominant in the textbooks claims that the formation of the ecclesiastical canon was a theologically necessary reaction to the provocation of the Marcion “canon” (and other challenges by Gnosticism and Montanism). But this hardly does justice to the historical complexity of the phenomena.⁸⁸ The new perception of these complex phenomena is connected with an increased attention to the material and institutional aspects: While von Campenhausen concentrated on the “idea of the Christian Bible” in his monograph and presented this history of ideas in a concentration that certainly simplified things in some cases,⁸⁹ since that time concrete questions related to writing media (papyri and codices), regional developments, social and institutional contexts of the formation and consolidation of a binding canon of writings have once again come more into focus.⁹⁰

I. The Foundational Theological Question: Self-Determined or Authoritatively Determined

In the background, however, there is still the theologically explosive question: Was the biblical canon determined by one or more ecclesiastical decisions or – as von Campenhausen or the systematic theologian Gerhard Ebeling contended⁹¹ – can one speak of a “self-determination” of the Scrip-

⁸⁶ Greschat, “Entstehung,” 63.

⁸⁷ Von Lips, “Kanon,” 42.

⁸⁸ Still representative of this position is Oeming, “Hervorwachsen,” 56, who advocates for the thesis that “three phenomena” (namely heretical teachers, pseudepigrapha, and Marcion) “decisively led to the idea that one had to bring about a closure of the canon.” This assumption is clearly incorrect for the phenomenon of the emergence of pseudepigraphal writings, since such texts existed long before the middle of the second century and even much earlier. Furthermore, their pseudonymity was rarely acknowledged and was by no means always regarded as a reason for their rejection. See now the differentiation in M. Frenschkowski, “Erkannte Pseudepigraphie? Ein Essay über Fiktionalität, Antike und Christentum,” in *Pseudepigraphie und Verfasserfiktion in frühchristlichen Briefen* (ed. J. Frey, J. Herzer, M. Janssen, and C. K. Rothschild; WUNT; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009), 181–232. On Marcion, see below at section C.II(c).

⁸⁹ C. Marksches, “Nachwort,” in von Campenhausen, *Entstehung*, 395–402, here 396. For criticism of the historical narrowness of this work, see also Greschat, “Entstehung,” 57.

⁹⁰ This is demonstrated in the new monographs by Metzger, *Canon*, and McDonald, *Formation*, as well as the quasi-mographical discussion in Marksches, *Theologie*, 215–336.

⁹¹ G. Ebeling, “‘Sola scriptura’ und das Problem der Tradition,” in *Wort Gottes und Tradition* (ed. Ebeling; 2nd ed.; KuK 7; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966), 91–143, here 103–112; see also A. M. Ritter, “Die Entstehung des neutestamentlichen Kanons:

tures. Does the canon owe its existence to the conscious act of an editorial staff⁹² or to the authoritarian decisions of bishops or synods, or does it reveal the historically much less tangible (and also less easily controllable) moment of the increasingly widely accepted authority of central texts?

This contentious issue has again been discussed in the thematic volume of the *Zeitschrift für Neues Testament*. There, a controversy takes place between Manfred Oeming⁹³ and Matthias Klinghardt,⁹⁴ which has David Trobisch's theses regarding a "final editing" of the New Testament in the background.⁹⁵ However, in this discussion, Trobisch's attempt to explain the collection of Pauline epistles by accepting an "author's edition"⁹⁶ did not prevail. Another equally problematic issue is the assumption that John 21:25 should be understood as an "editorial" remark concerning a Gospel collection.⁹⁷ But even if John 21 already had the synoptic gospels as a whole in view and thus marked an essential step on the way to a canon of four gospels,⁹⁸ it would hardly be possible to arrive at a "final form" of the entire New Testament from this collection of four gospels, especially with regard to the order of the various sub-collections as presented in the later codices.

But the canonical processes are much more complex and differentiated than can be grasped in the outlined alternatives between the two poles of authoritative decision and self-determined. This is especially true if one pays more precise attention to the material, regional, and institutional context of the testimonies highlighted in the recent research. To illustrate this point, I would like to present a few selected highlights on the canonical process of authori-

Selbstdurchsetzung oder autoritative Entscheidung?" in *Kanon* (ed. Assmann and Assman), 93–99.

⁹² D. Trobisch, *Die Endredaktion des Neuen Testaments. Eine Untersuchung zur Entstehung der christlichen Bibel* (NTOA 31; Freiburg [Schweiz] and Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996).

⁹³ Oeming, "Hervorwachsen."

⁹⁴ Klinghardt, "Veröffentlichung." I am unable to go into more detail here concerning the arguments made within this contribution, which are problematic in many respects. I can only say this much: The order of the individual writings in the later parts of the canon is not uniform within the canonical lists up to the Decretum Gelasianum in the 6th century. Also, the fact that 3 John also became a part of the canon can be explained by other reasons (testimony of the "presbyter," common tradition with 1 John) rather than appealing to a deliberate act of publication by a final editor of the canon. Furthermore, there would be need to explain for what reason or due to which interests this final editor included such a theologically rather unimportant letter.

⁹⁵ Trobisch, *Endredaktion*.

⁹⁶ D. Trobisch, *Die Entstehung der Paulusbriefsammlung. Studien zu den Anfängen christlicher Publizistik* (NTOA 10; Freiburg [Schweiz] and Göttingen, 1989).

⁹⁷ Trobisch, *Endredaktion*, 149f.

⁹⁸ On this, see also T. Heckel, *Vom Evangelium des Markus zum viergestaltigen Evangelium* (WUNT 20; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999), 158–191. Of course, it must be taken into account that John 1–20 already presupposes and takes up the synoptic tradition (at least Mark and Luke, not just the Johannine supplementary chapter).

zation and collection of the New Testament writings or the emergence of the Christian canon, without being able to take up the discussion in detail.

II. Highlights concerning Historical Differentiations

(a) Let me begin with an initial question: While the “canonization” of New Testament texts certainly represents a phenomenon of reception, it must be considered whether individual texts themselves make an implicit claim to religious validity and or a claim to having a binding character.

Let us consider the Gospel of John as an example. In John’s prologue, the author’s use of ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ... (John 1:1) surpasses all other “beginnings” (e.g., Mark 1:1) and is intended as an allusion to Genesis (Gen 1:1^{LXX}). As such, the author makes an implicit claim to a certain “biblicality” for his work, and he reinforces this claim further by other interpretative motifs within the work, such as his talk of the Paraclete (John 14:26; 16:13) or by his use of Jesus’ favorite disciple as a witness, who is placed “on Jesus’ breast” (cf. John 21:24f.; 13:23). Such a claim is even clearer for the book of Revelation with its concluding canonical formula in 22:18f., which explicitly sanctions the addition or removal of the words of prophecy contained in that book (cf. Deut 4:2; 13:1).⁹⁹ But this example demonstrates that a book’s claim to be Scripture does not mean that it has been received as such. Finally, the attempt at an authoritative interpretation is presented in the late epistle of 2 Peter, when Peter’s authority as an eyewitness is placed alongside the difficult to understand letters of “our dear brother Paul” (2 Peter 3:15f.) and thus even claims to determine how the Pauline letters should and should not be understood. The letter, probably written in the early second half of the 2nd century,¹⁰⁰ apparently already presupposes a collection of Pauline epistles, the extent of which, however, remains unclear. These letters are the subject of interpretation and obviously also controversy, that is, they are already fundamental in some ways. The mutual assignment of Paul and Peter implies, at the same time, a combination of gospel tradition and epistle literature which leads to the later canon.

(b) In the collection and distribution of the Pauline letters, scholars usually see the beginnings of Christian canon formation.¹⁰¹ Where and how this collection came about, however, is unclear.

References to the dissemination of letters occur in Gal 1:2 and 2 Cor 1:1b, and then, in the post-Pauline letter to the Colossians (4:16), there is mention of an exchange of letters between the churches of Colossae and Laodicea. Such an exchange implies the making of

⁹⁹ In this respect it can also be asked of Deuteronomy as to whether it has not already been “written in the consciousness of being Holy Scripture and eternal order for all of the future” (so Oeming, “Hervorwachsen,” 55).

¹⁰⁰ On this, see J. Frey, *Der Judasbrief. Der Zweite Petrusbrief* (THKNT 16.2; Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2010). Cf. also the English translation: J. Frey, *The Letter of Jude and the Second Letter of Peter: A Theological Commentary* (trans. Kathleen Ess; Waco: Baylor, 2018).

¹⁰¹ On this, see the overview in U. Schnelle, *Einleitung in das Neue Testament* (6th ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2007), 388–403.

copies. 2 Thessalonians 2:2 indicates the possibility of circulating “forged” letters.¹⁰² In addition to the letter to the Colossians, the letters to the Romans, Galatians, Philippians, and to Philemon are already presupposed in the letter to the Ephesians, and the older letters of Paul are also presupposed in the Pastoral Epistles, so that one can consider whether the Pastoral Epistles themselves were not created and distributed “in the course of a new edition of the previous corpus.”¹⁰³ Also, the letters of Ignatius, *1 Clement*, and probably Hebrews¹⁰⁴ testify to a reception of the Pauline letters. In this respect, the findings demonstrate the existence of “local, small collections”¹⁰⁵ in the centers of Pauline activity such as Ephesus, Corinth, and possibly Rome, which, however, may have differed mainly in their arrangement. For example, the manuscripts occasionally place Romans before Hebrews and 1 and 2 Corinthians (P 46), while the Canon Muratori places 1 and 2 Corinthians before Ephesians and Philemon, and the “version” used by Marcion begins with Galatians before Romans and 1 and 2 Corinthians.

(c) The previous point touches upon the influential thesis that the canon of the Church developed as a reaction to Marcion, who could therefore be regarded as the actual “creator” of the idea of a Christian canon.¹⁰⁶ Contrary to von Campenhausen’s thesis, which goes back to the work of Adolf von Harnack, recent research has developed a significantly different image of Marcion.¹⁰⁷ His edition of the *apostolos* is therefore not completely new, but may in turn already be based on a given collection. Furthermore, his own editorial activity and compilation of the *apostolos* with a Gospel is therefore less an attempt at “canonization” but rather “the result of a critical examination of the traditional Christian tradition with the recognized philological methods of the 2nd century.”¹⁰⁸ That is to say, “Marcion did not want to create a normative ‘canon’ of early Christian writings in the sense of a religious textual corpus, not to place a New Testament next to the Old, but to revise a text and

¹⁰² The intention of this statement in connection with the pseudonymous legitimation structure of 2 Thess is not entirely clear. It is conceivable that 1 Thess is to be discredited as a “forgery.”

¹⁰³ P. Trummer, “Corpus Paulinum – Corpus Pastorale,” in *Paulus in den neutestamentlichen Spätschriften* (ed. K. Kertelge; QD 89; Freiburg: Herder, 1981), 120–145, here 133.

¹⁰⁴ On this, see C. K. Rothschild, *Hebrews as Pseudepigraphon* (WUNT 235; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009), whose evidence of subtle allusions to Paul in Hebrews (beyond the closure of the letter) deserves being discussed.

¹⁰⁵ Schnelle, *Einleitung*, 391.

¹⁰⁶ von Campenhausen, *Entstehung*, 174.

¹⁰⁷ On Marcion, see J. Frey, “Marcion,” in *Klassiker der Theologie 1: Von Tertullian bis Calvin* (Munich: C. H. Beck, 2005), 11–27; furthermore, see the foundational work by B. Aland, Art. “Marcion / Marcioniten,” *TRE* 22:89–101; Concerning Marcion’s Pauline edition, see U. Schmid, *Marcion und sein Apostolos. Rekonstruktion und historische Einordnung der marcionitischen Paulusbriefausgabe* (Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 1995).

¹⁰⁸ Thus the conclusion of the thesis by R. M. Grant in Greschat, “Entstehung,” 62; see also Marksches, *Theologie*, 254f.

edit it as a literary corpus, which needed such a revision in his eyes. He himself may not have realized that he was of course indirectly ... canonizing (namely a certain textual recension).”¹⁰⁹

Contrary to Harnack, the “arch-heretic” is not “the creator of Christian Holy Scripture”¹¹⁰ nor the one who “was the first to designate a collection of authoritative early Christian writings.”¹¹¹ Rather, his attempt to philologically edit the text of the “Apostle” points “to its already existing authority,”¹¹² and the connection between the Pauline epistles and the Gospel of Luke – who was considered to be a disciple of Paul – was also obvious for the decidedly Pauline Marcion.

Therefore, the beginnings of the collection of Paul’s epistles have more to do with the fact that Paul’s letters were considered fundamental and significant in the churches concerned, so that they were collected, supplemented by further writings, and disseminated.

(d) Parallel to the problem of the collection of the Pauline epistles is also the question of the emergence of the fourfold Gospel canon or, at first, the collection of the four Gospels that later became canonical. Contrary to popular belief, it is unlikely that Irenaeus was the first to recognize the four Gospels at the end of the 2nd century. Rather, such a recognition likely took place earlier, for example, in the Gospel harmony of Tatian and possibly in Theophilus of Antioch. It may have even taken place as early as in Justin.¹¹³ Irenaeus has only provided justification for an entity that had already existed prior to him and for the number four, which initially appeared arbitrary.”¹¹⁴

(e) The questions that follow here are particularly concerned with the status of the apocryphal Gospels or those that were “becoming apocryphal”¹¹⁵ Gospels, which existed towards the end of the 2nd century and are partly quoted by Clement and Origen, such as the *Gospel of the Hebrews* and the *Gospel of the Egyptians*, but also the *Gospel of Thomas* or the *Gospel of Peter*.

¹⁰⁹ Markschies, *Theologie*, 253.

¹¹⁰ A. v. Harnack, *Marcion. Das Evangelium vom fremden Gott* (2nd ed. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1924), 151.

¹¹¹ Thus the formulation in Schnelle, *Einleitung*, 398, referring to the older works of Harnack and v. Campenhausen.

¹¹² Markschies, *Theologie*, 257.

¹¹³ See Markschies, *Theologie*, 260, 264f.

¹¹⁴ On this, see M. Hengel, *Die vier Evangelien und das eine Evangelium von Jesus Christus* (WUNT 224; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 15–22; Heckel, *Evangelium*, 350–353; concerning the Irenaeus passages, see B. Mutschler, *Das Corpus Johanneum bei Irenäus von Lyon* (WUNT 189; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005), 34–42, 249–280, and 503f.

¹¹⁵ Thus the precisely formulated title by D. Lührmann, *Die apokryph gewordenen Evangelien* (NT.S 112; Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2004).

Here, it is not enough simply to determine that a larger number of works existed, from which the church could then choose by selection and rejection. Rather, the character and claim of the individual works and also the manner of its use, which can be determined by examination of the material aspects of the received witnesses, must be defined in more detail. Were they used for worship in any congregation or were they only used for private reading, as edifying literature so to speak?

Insights can be gained, e.g., from the three witnesses of the Greek *Gospel of Thomas* (POxy 1, 654, 655), which differ in their codicological form and suggest usage “in personal or non-liturgical settings.”¹¹⁶ Hurtado concludes from his analysis, “We have no indication from these manuscripts that GThom functioned as ‘Scripture’ for their intended readers.”¹¹⁷

Another example is the *Gospel of Peter*, which has come down to us only in a fragment from the composite manuscript from an Egyptian excavation (P. Cair. 10759) in a later text form, but may also be contained in another fragment from Oxyrhynchus (POxy 2949).¹¹⁸ The Bishop Serapion of Antioch apparently had no problem with the fact that the text was read in the worship service in Rhossus. He initially approved its use without knowing the text and only examined it when he had doubts about the orthodoxy of the community.¹¹⁹ This demonstrates the existence of not only local differences between communities and the relatively little knowledge of a bishop, but also the fact that a “demarcation” only occurred when there was an external cause.

The discovery shows, however, that one cannot simply assume that the canonical and apocryphal Scriptures were “originally” equivalent. Rather, the respective claim and also the use (to be concluded from the material aspects of the witnesses) of each individual text must be observed closely.

(f) The frequently mentioned “criteria” for the inclusion of a writing into the New Testament canon such as conformity to the “regula fidei,” the assumption of apostolic authenticity, or its use within worship services are unclear and can, at most, only partially explain the later canonicity or non-canonicity of a writing.

The fact that there are writings within the canon that do not have an “apostolic” claim must be noted not only for the Gospels of Mark and Luke, which could be viewed as writings of the disciples of an apostle, but also for the letter to the Hebrews, which in any case does not openly claim to be written by Paul, even though he was later viewed as the author of

¹¹⁶ L. Hurtado, “The Greek Fragments of the Gospel of Thomas as Artefacts: Papyrological Observations on Papyrus Oxyrhynchus 1, Papyrus Oxyrhynchus 654 and Papyrus Oxyrhynchus 655,” in *Das Thomasevangelium. Entstehung – Rezeption – Theologie* (ed. J. Frey, E. E. Popkes, and J. Schröter, with assistance by Christine Jacobi; BZBW 157; Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 2008), 19–32, here 30.

¹¹⁷ Hurtado, “Fragments,” 30.

¹¹⁸ On this, see T. Nicklas, “Ein ‘neutestamentliches Apokryphon’? Zum umstrittenen Kanonbezug des sog. ‘Petrusevangeliums,’” *VC* 56 (2002): 262–265. On the Oxyrhynchus fragments 2949 and 4009, see Lüthmann, *Die apokryph gewordenen Evangelien*, 55–104.

¹¹⁹ Eusebius *Hist. eccl.* VI 12.1–6; on this, see Marksches, *Theologie*, 241f.

the letter,¹²⁰ and for the epistle of Jude, whose pseudonymous statement of authorship does not claim the authorship of an apostle but rather of the otherwise unknown brother of Jesus.¹²¹

The fact that the reading of a text in the worship service was also no clear criterion can be demonstrated from the example of how Bishop Serapion of Antioch handled the *Gospel of Peter*. From this example, we learn that a text could be released for reading in the worship service without the competent bishop knowing its contents, and the orthodoxy of the community seems to have been more essential than the orthodoxy of the text. It was only when this orthodoxy came into question that the bishop sought out more information about the content of the text.¹²² Conversely, it must remain uncertain whether texts such as 2 and 3 John that finally made it into the canon were really read in worship services.

(g) Foundational for research into the development of the Christian canon are the diverse canon lists. Nevertheless, these lists are of “no homogenous form” and are “to be understood from within their respective contexts.”¹²³ Thus, we must consider the differences: are texts being dealt with within a scientific-philological framework (e.g., with regard to their authenticity according to the criteria of ancient philology), are the canonical writings the subject of scholarly discussion, are they named as a part of a Christian educational program or as a framework for meditative private reading by Christians, are they read in church services or are they part of a discussion concerned with the formulation of orthodoxy in contrast to certain dissenting views? Observing these contexts leads to a much more differentiated way of dealing with the term “canon.”¹²⁴

One of the most important texts is the Muratorian Fragment,¹²⁵ which is a part of a composite manuscript discovered in Milan. This manuscript is traditionally dated around 200 CE and is therefore considered to be the oldest list of authoritative Scriptures.¹²⁶ However, this

¹²⁰ On the problem, see Rothschild, *Hebrews*, passim.

¹²¹ The later tradition then identified this Jude with the apostle Judas Thaddeus from the circle of the Twelve Disciples, so that the letter was then considered apostolic. This position was held up until the time of Johann Gottfried Herder in the late 18th century. On this matter, see Frey, *Judasbrief*.

¹²² On this, see Marksches, *Theologie*, 242.

¹²³ Löhr, “Norm,” 203, with reference to J.-D. Kaestli, “La place du Fragment de Muratori dans l’histoire du Canon. A propos de la these de Sundberg et Hahneman,” *CNS* 15 (1994): 609–634, here 616.

¹²⁴ See Löhr, “Norm,” 227.

¹²⁵ See the description in Marksches, *Theologie*, 230; the text is translated by W. Schneemelcher, ed., *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen* (6th ed.; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1990), 1:27–29; McDonald, *Canon*, 369–371.

¹²⁶ The late dating to the 4th century by A. C. Sundberg, “Canon Muratori: A Fourth-Century-List,” *HTR* 66 (1973): 1–41; G. M. Hahnemann, *The Muratorian Fragment and the Development of the Canon* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992), has triggered a heated debate and has convinced many interpreters, particularly in North America. Thus, McDonald, *Canon*, 373–378 also tends to follow the late dating. Although this discussion cannot be taken up here, it is my opinion that the objections against the traditional dating and a

text offers “not just a list” but “rather a detailed introduction ... to the received biblical books”¹²⁷ with explanatory remarks on some Scriptures, so that one cannot compare it in the strict sense with the later “canon lists.” At the end, there is a “we,” which reveals the perspective of the recipients, whereby the orientation towards Marcion and the Montanists becomes clear. The note that the Shepherd of Hermas was authored “recently and in our times”¹²⁸ and is therefore not to be publicly read in the churches possibly reveals an urban Roman context. Although the precise function of the text remains controversial, it should be noted that this is more than a provisional list on the way to a definitive scriptural canon, but also contains “a piece of theology of canon,” whose “institutional contexts ... can be inquired about.”¹²⁹ Through such questions, the history of the development of the biblical canon can be grasped in a more differentiated way.

(h) The collection and “canonization” of the Christian Bible (Old and New Testaments) was affected in a confusing local and regional diversity and influenced by various social and political factors. We should not underestimate the fact that many communities only possessed a part of the later canonical writings. The actual content of the individual community libraries (especially in smaller and poorer communities) was subject to a great deal of arbitrariness.

For example, this is the case in the discoveries of the Oxyrhynchus papyri. There, the Gospel of John is attested to 6 times, the Gospel of Matthew 5 times, and the letter to the Romans 3 times, while Mark, 2 Corinthians, Ephesians, Philippians, and Colossians, as well as the Pastorals, are missing. On the other hand, there are fragments with apocryphal logia of Jesus, seven copies of Shepherd of Hermas, and other apocryphal acts and apocalypses, as well as three copies of the *Gospel of Thomas*.¹³⁰

Even in the holding lists of other late ancient parish and private libraries examined by Christoph Marksches, one does not always find all the biblical writings. Even more striking is the inconsistency in the sequence of the writings and their frequent mixing with later patristic writings.¹³¹ But this shows that “the concept of a ‘canon’ of biblical writings ... even in post-Constantinian times still clearly differed from what the monarchic bishops and the synods standardized ...”¹³²

(i) The solidification of the canon of the imperial church was probably finally also driven forward by “external” aspects such as the production of large splendid codices, in which then, for the first time, the Gospels, the Pauline epistles, Acts and the Catholic epistles, and Revelation were no longer separated, but all New Testament writings were compiled in one book – possibly

western, possibly urban Roman origin have been widely and convincingly refuted by the argument of J. Verheyden, “The Canon Muratori: A Matter of Dispute,” in *Canons* (ed. Auwers and de Jonge), 487–556.

¹²⁷ Marksches, *Theologie*, 231f.

¹²⁸ Marksches, *Theologie*, 232.

¹²⁹ Marksches, *Theologie*, 235.

¹³⁰ These statistics come from Marksches, *Theologie*, 315f.

¹³¹ Marksches, *Theologie*, 323f.

¹³² Marksches, *Theologie*, 330.

even with the writings of the Septuagint.¹³³ Only with such editions could the idea of the (Christian) “Bible” become effective and at the same time liturgically visible.

Conversely, the use of Scripture and canon development in the churches outside of the Byzantine Empire could still undergo independent developments, as the canon of the Ethiopian church, which was only established in its final form in the 15th century, shows.¹³⁴

I must stop here. This sketch makes it clear that, historically, the question of “the” biblical canon or “the” biblical “canons”¹³⁵ is still one of the most difficult and complex questions of biblical scholarship and patristics. This is true with respect to the New Testament, however less so with respect to the so-called Old Testament from a Christian perspective and from the perspective of the reception of Israel’s Scriptures within the framework of the early church into the one Christian canon.

D. The Text Discoveries of Qumran and the Question of the Development of the Emergence of the Hebrew Canon

What does this extensive discussion have to do with the research of the text discoveries of Qumran? Which aspects and perspectives arise from here for the question of the development and nature of the canon?

First, the Qumran manuscripts provide us with observations concerning the formation not of the Christian canon, but of the Jewish canon, primarily of the Hebrew canon, or with a specific snapshot on the way to the authoritative collection of writings of the Tanakh and the Old Testament, which was later determined differently by the rabbis on the one hand and by the church on the other.¹³⁶ Of course, the terminology shaped by ecclesiastical law is missing here, and the “institutional framework” in which the collection and authorization of the writings took place is completely different from that in the early church. But in view of the manuscripts from Qumran, individual stages of the “canonical process” can be seen much more clearly than on the basis of the previous material. At the same time, these insights provide essential infor-

¹³³ See Löhner, “Norm,” 204.

¹³⁴ On this, see Wendt, “Kampf.”

¹³⁵ Thus the title of the documentary volume from the Leuven colloquium “The Biblical Canons.”

¹³⁶ Talk of the “snapshot” must be differentiated: The time in which the manuscripts from Qumran were composed – even the biblical manuscripts – took place within the timeframe of ca. 300 years, from between the second half of the 3rd century BCE to the middle of the 1st century CE. In this respect, only rough conclusions can be drawn from the mere presence or publication of copies in the library, without any assurance of further details for a certain point in time or a certain “phase” in the history of the tradent circles.

mation about the way in which the authoritative or even “canonical” character of individual writings were understood at the turn of the era. Thus – for Christian theology – essential analogies to the use and understanding of Scripture of Early Christianity arise.

The text discoveries from Qumran are an indispensable object of study for all these questions because, in them, original Hebrew and Aramaic texts from the time of the Second Temple became accessible for the first time to a considerable extent. Among them are a considerable proportion of manuscripts of biblical texts that date back more than a thousand years later than the previously known witnesses to the Masoretic tradition.

One must of course ask whether the insights to be gained here merely permit statements about a group-specific use of Scripture or “canon” or to what extent they are representative and generalizable for contemporary Judaism (in at least Palestine) at that time. This question also arises – and in my opinion even more strongly so – for the “canon testimonies” available before Qumran in texts like Ben Sira, Philo, Josephus, or in *4 Ezra*. For them, too, it is by no means certain whether the respective statements are representative of broad circles of Judaism.

Indeed, the Qumran library is most likely a group-specific library. The frequency of writings, which presuppose for example the 364-day solar calendar and vice versa the absence of the Hasmonean friendly Maccabean works or also the Psalms of Solomon (which is possibly attributable to the Pharisees), point in this direction. If the traditions of the library or the Qumran community – an attribution that is still disputed¹³⁷ but is, in my opinion, still the most viable hypothesis – can be connected in any way with the third religious party (αἱρεσις) mentioned by Josephus, the “Essenes” (Ἐσσηαῖοι or Ἐσσηνοί), then we have a more direct insight into this group’s understanding of the Scriptures, their preferences, and possibly even their “canon.” This in itself would constitute a significant gain in knowledge, for we do not have any original texts that can be assigned to the other religious parties mentioned in Josephus and the New Testament, the Pharisees and Sadducees.

But it should also be noted that the library of Qumran does not exclusively contain group-specific writings, but rather has a broad panorama of the literary production of ancient Judaism during the three centuries before the turn of the era. In particular, the Qumran biblical manuscripts attest to no group-specific textual variants, and their text form may have been brought to Qum-

¹³⁷ Thus also in H.-J. Fabry, “Die Tempelrolle und ihre kanongeschichtliche Bedeutung,” in *Qumran und biblische Kanon* (ed. M. Becker and J. Frey; BThSt 92; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchner Verlag, 2009), 121–144, who emphasizes the priestly element of the group-specific texts – however, this by no means excludes the Essene hypothesis, but only represents one of the (necessary) modifications compared to the simple identification of both groups made in the past. On the whole, see J. Frey, “Zur historischen Auswertung der antiken Essenerberichte. Ein Beitrag zum Gespräch mit Roland Bergmeier,” in *Qumran kontrovers* (ed. J. Frey and H. Stegemann, with assistance from M. Becker; Einblicke 6; Paderborn: Bonifatius-Verlag, 2003), 23–56 (translated in this volume under the title “On the Historical Value of the Ancient Reports about the Essenes,” 163–193).

ran from Jerusalem or from somewhere else. Therefore, the findings to be collected here also allow conclusions to be drawn that go beyond the boundaries of a specific group. That is, the relatively broad discoveries from the Qumran library, the large number of texts, and the resulting proportions offer a good opportunity to arrive at statements about other areas of contemporary Jewish life.

I. The Modification of Earlier Concepts Due to the Expanded Material Base

Although the Qumran discoveries have set the discussion about the “canon” in early Judaism on completely new footing, the insights to be gained here are far from exhausted and are not yet adopted by all biblical scholars within the current state of scholarship. The tone is often still set by older works, such as Frank Moore Cross’ meritorious and widespread presentation, which was based, however, on a much more limited range of sources.¹³⁸

The lengthy publication history of the Qumran texts must be considered here: The early discussion was almost exclusively determined by the early published, well preserved manuscripts from Cave 1 and by relatively random partial information about the long unedited fragments from Cave 4. Only since the 1990s did the complete corpus become accessible to the general public. In the meantime, the texts have been edited and philologically processed to such an extent that a summarizing evaluation can take place.

It should also be considered that the earlier discussion¹³⁹ was strongly determined by the questions of Christian theology and focused too much on the parallels with primitive Christianity in the eschatological interpretation of Scripture, on the question of the exegetical methods used in the Qumran texts, and on the analysis of scriptural quotations. From today’s perspective, we can see how the results then obtained could only be distorted because of the limited range of texts available at the time. For instance, it is possible that Qumran scholars as well as New Testament scholars thought they recognized a special esteem for the prophetic Scriptures because these texts were commented upon with running commentaries,¹⁴⁰ whereas many halakic and Torah oriented texts were not yet accessible to these scholars and the entire holdings of the biblical manuscripts had not yet been catalogued. A change in research in this regard was only initiated by the publication of the *Temple Scroll* in 1977,¹⁴¹ with which the Torah orientation of the Qumran tradents was

¹³⁸ F. M. Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical Studies* (Garden City: Doubleday, 1958).

¹³⁹ Summarized in H. Braun, *Qumran und das Neue Testament* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1966), 2:301–326; see also the early and influential presentation by K. Schubert, *Die Gemeinde vom Toten Meer. Ihre Entstehung und ihre Lehren* (München et al.: Reinhardt, 1958).

¹⁴⁰ See Braun, *Qumran*, 2:303, 323. As far as we know today, this is no longer the case: A clear example of a commentary on a Pentateuchal text is 4Q252, where a text of Genesis is commented upon – albeit not by use of the Peshar method. The Torah is also used authoritatively in numerous other text genres. For an overview, see M. J. Bernstein, “Pentateuchal Interpretation at Qumran,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years* (ed. P. W. Flint and J. C. VanderKam; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 128–159.

¹⁴¹ Y. Yadin, *Megillat ham-miqdash – The Temple Scroll* (3 vols; hebr.; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1977).

emphatically brought into focus¹⁴² and the agenda of Christian questions, which had previously dominated the discussion, gradually receded.¹⁴³

A second question that came to the fore early on was the textual tradition of the Hebrew Bible – stimulated by the sensational discovery of a complete Isaiah scroll (1QIsa^a). But here, too, the first impressions that were disseminated to the public – that the book of Isaiah was already complete in Qumran and that the text therein showed remarkably few deviations from the Masoretic text¹⁴⁴ – had to give way to a much more nuanced view, which resulted from the evaluation of the now available, more complete catalogue of biblical manuscripts: Thus, according to the current state of knowledge, we can recognize in the Qumran library a juxtaposition of different text forms, the so-called proto-Masoretic text, the pre-Samaritan text form,¹⁴⁵ the text form represented by the Septuagint in Greek, and another free text form (“non-aligned”) that cannot be assigned to one of the other text forms.¹⁴⁶

What at first seemed to be a very convenient discovery for “conservative” circles, which stimulated interest in the scrolls not least in North American, has now been replaced by a discovery that seems rather strange and confusing for perspectives of conservative Christian and Jewish circles because it shows an astonishing freedom in how some scribes dealt with the text of the Scriptures.

Both research historical developments show what a benefit it is to open up additional source material, but they also suggest cautious restraint in view of how fragmentary the material handed down to us actually is.

II. Some Basic Facts

With this caveat in mind, I would like to mention a few basic facts that will then be evaluated in light of the discussion of canon. I can largely dispense with detailed discussions here in view of the detailed contributions in this volume.

¹⁴² This is true even if the *Temple Scroll* is usually not counted among the group-specific or “Essene” texts today, see H.-J. Fabry, “Tempelrolle.”

¹⁴³ On this, see the programmatic presentation by L. H. Schiffman, *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls. Their True Meaning for Judaism and Christianity* (New York: Doubleday, 1995), xxiii–xxiv.

¹⁴⁴ This also is only partially true. In any case, the manuscript 1QIsa^b is much closer to the Masoretic tradition, while the 1QIsa^a scroll contains a larger number of orthographic deviations and additions.

¹⁴⁵ On this, see the essay by U. Schattner-Rieser, “Der samaritanische Pentateuch im Lichte der prä-samaritanischen Qumrantexte,” in *Qumran und der biblische Kanon* (Neukirchener Verlag: Neukirchen-Vluyn, 2009), 147–170.

¹⁴⁶ See E. Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (2nd ed.; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001), 114–116, who describes a fifth type of “Texts Written in the Qumran Practice,” but whose relationship to the “non aligned texts” is controversial. See also the overview by E. Ulrich, “The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Biblical Text,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years* (Leiden: Brill, 1998), 1:79–100.

1. The Writings of the Hebrew Canon

Of the approximately 900 mostly fragmentary manuscripts from Qumran, approximately 200 are biblical manuscripts.¹⁴⁷ Among them are all books that later belonged to the Hebrew canon, except for the book of Esther.¹⁴⁸

Until recently, Nehemiah could still be regarded as “absent” among the Qumran biblical manuscripts, even though it had to be considered that Ezra and Nehemiah were probably regarded as one book. However, James H. Charlesworth published a previously unknown Nehemiah fragment in 2007,¹⁴⁹ so that this (partial) book is now also documented.

At first, however, this only means that these writings were available and known at a certain point in time. It does not say anything about whether they were regarded as authoritative or even “canonical” whether and to what extent their book form or even their text form had been fixed.

The statement in the currently leading introduction to the Old Testament is hardly justified in this respect when it is formulated in the following manner: “Essentially, Qumran’s canon is congruent with the Hebrew Bible.”¹⁵⁰ Even with the addition that it can be assumed at the same time “the people of Qumran did not have a complete, well-defined list of books that constituted a Bible,” the fact that the Qumran community did not yet view God’s revelation as having been completed¹⁵¹ indicates that this statement goes beyond what can be claimed and does not address many irritating facts.

¹⁴⁷ The numbers can never be considered completely accurate because the assignment of individual fragments to manuscripts is subject to many uncertainties. Here, I am referring to the numbers provided by Lange, “Literature,” 64, who is citing E. Tov, “Categorized List of the ‘Biblical Texts,’” in *DJD XXXIX*, 165–183, here 167. Similarly, see E. Tov, “The Number of Manuscripts and Compositions Found at Qumran,” in *Feasts and Fasts*. FS Alan David Crown (ed. M. Dacy, J. Dowling, and S. Faigan; Sydney: Mandelbaum Publishing, 2005), 67–80.

¹⁴⁸ The manuscript 4Q550, which is classified as a proto-Esther text by J. T. Milik “Les Modèles araméens du livre d’Esther dans la grotte 4 de Qumrân,” *RevQ* 15 (1991/2): 321–399, can hardly be described as such; on this, see S. White Crawford, “Has Esther Been Found at Qumran? *4QProto-Esther* and the Esther Corpus,” *RevQ* 17 (1996): 307–325; K. de Troyter, “Once More, the So-Called Esther Fragments of Cave 4,” *RevQ* 19.3 (2000): 401–422. Cf. now the edition by E. Puech, “4QJuifs à la cour perse ar,” in *Qumran Cave 4.XXVII: Textes araméens, deuxième partie: 4Q550–575, 580–582* (*DJD XXXVII*; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 1–46. The absence of Esther could be a coincidence (thus Tov, *Textual Criticism*, 103); however, it is at the very least striking that the festival of Purim is not attested to in Qumran, just as the festival of Hanukkah along with the Maccabean books are missing. After all, there were still discussions about Esther and its “inspiration” for a long time in rabbinical times (even after “Jabne”!), although there is also the saying that Esther was composed for (memorized) recitation, not as a Scripture (see *b. Meg. 7a*).

¹⁴⁹ <http://www.ijco.org/?categoryId=28681>.

¹⁵⁰ Thus Fabry, “Text,” 45.

¹⁵¹ Thus Fabry, “Text,” 45 with reference to J. C. VanderKam.

The first thing to consider is the numerical ratio of the manuscripts. According to Emanuel Tov,¹⁵² the manuscripts of the Pentateuch (Gen: 19–20; Ex: 17; Lev: 13; Num: 7; Deut 30), the book of Isaiah (21), and the Psalms (36) are the most dominant texts in Qumran. Also, the book of the Twelve Prophets (8–9) and conspicuously the late book of Daniel (8) are relatively well-represented, Jeremiah (6) and Ezekiel (6) are clearly behind Isaiah, while other books such as Joshua (2), Judges (3), Kings (3), Proverbs (2), Ecclesiastes (2), Ezra and Nehemiah (1), Chronicles (1) are rarely attested in Qumran. This points to a smaller number of particularly important writings, a “canon within the canon” so to speak, to which Gen and Deut, Isa and Pss belong.¹⁵³ Other writings within this “canon within the canon” seem to have been of lesser significance. As George Brooke has demonstrated, this is also confirmed by the citations in other central (group-specific) texts from Qumran, which are particularly often taken from these writings as models for the composition of new works.¹⁵⁴

Strikingly, this “canon within the canon” coincides with the group of Old Testament writings most frequently cited in the New Testament, with Exodus and the Book of Twelve coming even more to the fore, but Isaiah and the Psalms at the top.¹⁵⁵ The facts prove the existence of a more general esteem for these writings within contemporary Judaism, including the early Jesus movement.

From a canon theological perspective, there is also an argument here for the fact that the most important writings have prevailed due to their own prolific presence (i.e., number of manuscripts) and their significance to the groups who received them.

Some observations concerning the condition of the manuscripts support the assumption that individual texts – especially the five books of the Torah – were attributed special authority. Of course, the findings are complex:

Some Torah manuscripts are written in Paleo-Hebrew script, which distinguishes them from “normal” literature and points to an older time period.¹⁵⁶ Of course, these manuscripts are only a small portion of the Qumran manuscripts of the five books of the Torah, and besides them there are also other books present there (e.g., a manuscript of Job and interestingly also a “parabiblical” work based on Joshua [4Qpalaeo paraJosh = 4Q123], as well as three unidentifiable texts) that are written in this script.¹⁵⁷

¹⁵² Tov, “List,” 165–183. In the case of manuscripts that contain two biblical books, a double count is made here.

¹⁵³ On this, see Brooke, “Canon within,” 244.

¹⁵⁴ Brooke, “Canon within,” 245–250.

¹⁵⁵ Brook, “Canon within,” 259.

¹⁵⁶ Tov, “List,” notes 11 manuscripts.

¹⁵⁷ Cf. E. Tov, “Lists of Specific Groups of Texts from the Judaean Desert,” in *DJD XXXIX*, 203–228.

Interestingly, five Torah manuscripts contain (at least) two consecutive books of the Torah,¹⁵⁸ suggesting that they had already been considered to be a unit. Of course, this does not mean that the library's tradents had included only these five books under the term the Torah of Moses.¹⁵⁹ Interestingly, similar compilations of several "books"¹⁶⁰ (which later come together as individual parts in the five-part composition of the [first] book of Enoch) are also encountered in the area of Enoch literature.¹⁶¹ However, not all five parts of the book of Enoch are documented in Qumran: the Book of Parables (*1 Enoch* 37–72) is missing, while conversely the later Manichaean Book of Giants is documented in some Qumran manuscripts.¹⁶²

One might conclude from this fact that the books of the Torah, which is already perceived as a collection, have advanced the furthest along the path of authorization and canonization. This could support the "classical" thesis of a gradual "canonization" of the Torah, Prophets, and Writings¹⁶³ – but this interpretation is questioned by a series of issues that will be outlined below.¹⁶⁴

2. "Apocrypha," "Pseudepigrapha," and Analogous Texts

The number of the manuscripts already leads to findings that question the simple picture of a linear development towards the later canon or even a canon almost completely reproduced in Qumran:

Thus, the text discoveries from the Dead Sea have made available a large number of "new" texts that represent the literary production of ancient Judaism during the Second Temple period and whose "status" is to be determined in relation to the writings of the later canon. In particular, the cataloging of the fragments from Cave 4 has brought to light a great wealth of new "parabiblical," halakic, sapiential, liturgical, poetic, and calendrical texts, many of which cannot be considered to be group-specific compositions of the tradents of

¹⁵⁸ Tov, "List," 167–169: 4QpalaeoGen–Exod¹, 4QGenExod^a, and 4QExod^b (also contains Gen), 4QExod–Lev^f, 4QLev–Num^a.

¹⁵⁹ Thus VanderKam, "Questions," 271.

¹⁶⁰ 4QEnoch^c ar contains the Book of the Watchers, the Book of Visions, and the Epistle of Enoch, 4QEnoch^d ar and 4QEnoch^e ar contain both the Book of the Watchers and the Book of Visions.

¹⁶¹ On this, see J. T. Milik, *The Books of Enoch. The Aramaic Fragments from Qumran* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976); G. W. E. Nickelsburg, "The Books of Enoch at Qumran. What We Know and What We Need to Think about," in *Antikes Judentum und Frühes Christentum*, FS Hartmut Stegemann (ed. B. Kollmann, W. Reinbold, and A. Steudel; BZNV 97; Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 1999), 99–113; idem, *1 Enoch* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001), 1:9–12.

¹⁶² On this, see L. T. Stuckenbruck, *The Book of Giants from Qumran* (TSAJ 63; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997).

¹⁶³ On this, see section III.1 as well as Michael Becker "Grenzziehungen."

¹⁶⁴ See in particular the disconcerting findings on the "Reworked Pentateuch" and in section II.6.

the “Essene” library but probably originate from other circles of contemporary Judaism or possibly as “precursor groups” to the Qumran community.

In addition to the writings of the later Hebrew canon, there are a number of texts that, although they are not included in the rabbinically defined canon, are included in the Greek canon of the Septuagint. Some of these later “apocryphal” or “deuterocanonical writings” occur also in Hebrew in the Qumran library (Sirach, Susanna, Ps 151 in 11QPs^a) or even in both Hebrew and Aramaic, as the book of Tobit. With a total of five manuscripts (4 Aramaic, 1 Hebrew), Tobit is more frequently attested than Samuel (4), Kings (3), or the book of Proverbs (2). The Letter of Jeremiah (= Baruch 6 [LXX]) is attested to in 7Q2.

Of particular interest are some of the texts that were not included in the later Hebrew or Greek canon but are so abundant in the Qumran corpus that one has to ask whether they also had a particularly authoritative status for the library tradents – but were then later not included in one of the canonical collections.

This applies especially to the texts of the Book of Enoch, which is attested to in eleven Aramaic manuscripts and one Greek manuscript,¹⁶⁵ in addition to ten manuscripts of the Enochic Book of Giants,¹⁶⁶ and also to *Jubilees*, which is attested to in Qumran within 15 to 16 manuscripts.¹⁶⁷ The latter is probably even cited in another work (4Q228) and in CD XVI 3–4 with its title “Book of the Divisions of the Times according to the Jubilees and the Weeks (of Years).” Besides Enoch (whose “form” remains unclear), the book of *Jubilees*, which can also be attributed to the Enoch tradition, seems to have had authoritative significance for the tradents of the Qumran community.

I will pass over a number of other texts that were apparently relatively popular with the users of the Qumran library (e.g., the Aramaic “apocalypse” of the “New Jerusalem,”¹⁶⁸ documented in six or seven manuscripts), that claimed significant authority (e.g., the *Temple Scroll*,¹⁶⁹ stylized as a speech given by God in the 1st person), or that were particularly inspiring for certain theological ideas of the Qumran community (e.g., the sapiential texts Musar

¹⁶⁵ A. Lange and U. Mittmann-Richert, “Annotated List of the Texts from the Judaean Desert,” in *DJD XXXIX*, 115–164, here 122f.

¹⁶⁶ Lange and Mittmann-Richert, “Annotated List,” 122.

¹⁶⁷ Lange and Mittmann-Richert, “Annotated List,” 124.

¹⁶⁸ 1Q32; 2Q24; 4Q554–555; 5Q15; 11Q18. On this text, see my discussion in J. Frey, “The New Jerusalem Text in Its Historical and Traditio-Historical Context,” in *The Dead Sea Scroll – 50 Years After Their Discovery 1947–1997. Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20–25, 1997* (ed. L. H. Schiffmann, E. Tov, and J. C. VanderKam; Jerusalem: Shrine of the Book, Israel Museum, 2000), 800–816 (in this volume, 349–368).

¹⁶⁹ 4Q524; 11Q18; 11Q20; 11Q21. On this text, see H.-J. Fabry, “Tempelrolle.”

l^c-Mevin [= Instruction] and the Book of Mysteries).¹⁷⁰ Instead, I will only mention one text that stimulated the canon discussion in particular: the Psalms Scroll from Cave 11 (11QPs^a). This manuscript contains Psalms from the later Hebrew Psalter, in particular the last two “books” (Pss 90–150). The Psalms from these two “books” are not arranged according to the later “canonical” order of the Psalms, but are instead mixed with other texts, such as Psalm 151 (previously known only in Greek from the LXX), Psalms 154 and 155 (otherwise only attested in the Syriac Old Testament), excerpts from 2 Samuel (2 Sam 23:7), and excerpts from the book of Sirach (51:13–20 and 30). Finally, a text in prose form reports on David’s poetic activities and shows that (unlike in the Masoretic text) the entire content of this “Psalter” was attributed to David as an author (as additional headings to individual Psalms prove).

The question here as to whether we are dealing with a relatively late Herodian manuscript with a “biblical” or an “apocryphal” text, or even just a “private” compilation leads to a dead end, especially since the sequence of Psalms testified to here, which deviates from the Masoretic Psalter, seems to have parallels in a number of other Psalms manuscripts from Qumran. The consequence is inevitable that the Psalter, at least in its last parts (i.e., from Pss 90–150), was not yet “finished” at the time of the collection of the Qumran library. The sequence of the Psalms was not yet clearly defined, and the boundary between later canonical and other parts of texts was still “open.”

It is clear that the circle of authoritative writings goes beyond the framework of the later Hebrew canon and in various ways includes texts of the Enoch tradition, the book of *Jubilees*, and possibly other writings. It remains to be seen in what respect and in what aspects these writings were attributed authority and whether in some way they were perceived as “rivals” to other later canonical writings. The Enochic writings and the book of *Jubilees* obviously had a special significance within the community, as they represented the solar 364-day calendar which also attested to in various group-specific writings. Thus, these texts clearly maintained a special calendrical and at the same time halakic significance for the tradents of the Qumran community.

3. From Expanding to Commenting

In addition to the so-called “parabiblical” texts, which offer a continuation of biblical traditions (the narratives of the Patriarchs, the Books of the Prophets, etc.) in various ways, the phenomenon of commentary should be considered. Commenting on a text usually occurs when it can no longer be rewritten or simply expanded because it is already a finished or fixed text. Therefore, the

¹⁷⁰ Instruction: 1Q26; 4Q415; 4Q417; 4Q418; 4Q418a; 4Q418c?; 4Q423; Mysteries: 1Q27; 4Q299; 4Q300; 4Q301.

Qumran commentary literature itself is an indication that the community recognized the authority of the texts upon which they commented.

The genre of the (thematic and continuous) pesharim, only attested to within Qumran, points to the authority of the texts commented upon with the peshar method. In addition to the (older) thematic Pesharim (such as the *Melchizedek* text 11QMelch and the “*Midrash on Eschatology*” [4Q174 and 177]),¹⁷¹ the prophetic books (Isaiah, Hosea, Micah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Malachi) and some Psalms are commented upon “continuously,” and the words of those texts are prophetically related to the present age of the community.

Since the pesharim are probably group-specific, “Essene” texts, the commentary is an indication that, in addition to the Torah, these writings had already been granted a far-reaching “canonical” authority. It may be irritating that, on the other hand, the Psalter was not yet in its final form. But this did not diminish the esteem of the Psalms as a prophetic and inspired poem “of David’s” (see 11QPs^a XXVII 11).

In an interesting investigation, Armin Lange compared the texts from the time between Alexander the Great and Jason (ca. 175 BCE) and those from the time between Jason and Pompeius (ca. 60 BCE) and ascertained that within the first phase parabiblical texts (i.e., “expansions”) of the Torah and the Prophets were more prominent, while in the second phase the exegetical literature (i.e., the pesharim and other commentaries) occupied a much larger space.¹⁷²

In the process, direct indications of progressive canonization become apparent: While in early times, expansions on the patriarchal narratives, on the prophets (Pseudo Jeremiah, Pseudo Ezekiel) or additions Daniel tradition (Pseudo Daniel, Four Kingdoms) dominate, in the time between Jason and Pompeius – probably especially within the Qumran community – the literal interpretation of the prophetic texts takes center stage. The number of citation formulas increases, which also suggests a changed position concerning the authority of the text.¹⁷³ The written text, possibly in its hidden meaning, is now decisive and is interpreted in more or less detail.¹⁷⁴

¹⁷¹ See A. Steudel, *Der Midrasch zur Eschatologie aus der Qumrangemeinde (4QMidrEschat^{a-b}): materielle Rekonstruktion, Textbestand, Gattung und traditions-geschichtliche Einordnung des durch 4Q174 (“Florilegium”) und 4Q177 (“Catena A”) repräsentierten Werkes aus den Qumranfunden* (STDJ 13; Leiden: Brill, 1994).

¹⁷² Lange, “Literature,” 73–103. Annette Steudel comes to similar conclusions in her essay “Die Rezeption autoritativer Texte in Qumran,” in *Qumran und der biblische Kanon* (Neukirchener Verlag: Neukirchen-Vluyn, 2009), 89–100, here 99.

¹⁷³ Thus Lange, “Literature,” 101, with examples from 4Q174 III 15; 4Q265 1 3.

¹⁷⁴ This corresponds to the community’s understanding of revelation. The community is convinced that God “revealed all secrets of the words of his servants, the prophets” to the “Teacher of Righteousness” (1QpHab VII 4–5).

4. Further Characteristics of Authorization: Translation, Citation, Scribal Notations

The authority of writings can also become visible when they are also available in Greek or Aramaic translation. This is the case for Pentateuch manuscripts,¹⁷⁵ the large scroll (not from Qumran but from Nahal Hever) of the Book of the Twelve Prophets (8HevXIIgr), and also a fragment of the book of Enoch (pap7QEngr),¹⁷⁶ and possibly also the book of Tobit, which is attested to in both Aramaic and Hebrew. Of the Targumim documented in Qumran, there are two of the book of Job (4QtgJob; 11QtgJob) and one of the book of Leviticus (4QtgLev).

The authority of the cited book is also testified to by the introduction of quotations.¹⁷⁷ Introductions such as “for thus it is written” (כִּי־א כֵן כָּתוּב) in 1QS V15 or “as it written” (כַּאֲשֶׁר כָּתוּב) in 1QS VIII 14, etc. testify to an authoritative character for the quoted texts. In CD IV 13 or 1QM X 6, it is explicitly stated that God spoke through the prophets Isaiah or through Moses; these respective writings contain God’s Word. Such citation introductions are used with the books of the prophets (Isaiah, Jeremiah, Malachi), but also with Psalms and – interestingly enough – the book of Proverbs.¹⁷⁸

Another sign of the authoritative esteem of texts can also be textual notations by the scribes, which are indeed difficult to interpret in individual cases, but are in part outlining notes that testify to intense exegetical work done on the corresponding texts. For the great Isaiah scroll, Odil Hannes Steck, in a groundbreaking investigation, interpreted this system of outlining and thereby worked out a specific form of the reception of the book of Isaiah – in close relation to the narratives about the prophet Isaiah (Isa 36–39).¹⁷⁹

With regard to the growing “canonical” authority of the later “biblical” books, it is also interesting to note¹⁸⁰ that quotations to justify halakic or historical-theological views are usually only taken from writings that have

¹⁷⁵ 7QpapLXXExod; 4QLXXLev^a, 4QpapLXXLev^b 4QLXXNum; 4QLXXDeut.

¹⁷⁶ E. A. Muro, “The Greek Fragments of Enoch from Qumran Cave 7 (7Q4, 7Q8, & 7Q12 = 7Qen gr = Enoch 103:3–4, 7–9),” *RevQ* 18 (1997): 307–312; E. Puech, “Sept fragments grecs de la Lettre d’Hénoch (1Hén 100 103 et 105) dans la grotte 7 de Qumrân (7Héng),” *RevQ* 18 (1997): 313–323. Greek texts of Josh, Judges, Isa, Ezra, the Book of the Twelve, and the Psalms have also been discovered at other Dead Sea locations, see Tov, “List,” 179–181.

¹⁷⁷ See already J. A. Fitzmyer, “The Use of Explicit Old Testament Quotations in Qumran Literature and in the New Testament,” *NTS* 7 (1960–61): 297–333.

¹⁷⁸ Thus the citation of Proverbs 15:8 in CD XI 19–21.

¹⁷⁹ See O. H. Steck, *Die erste Jesajarolle von Qumran (1QIs^a)* (SBS 173/1+2; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1998). A list of the Qumran manuscripts that contain scribal notations can be found in E. Tov, “Scribal Notations in the Texts from the Judaean Desert,” *DJD XXXIX*, 323–349.

¹⁸⁰ Thus A. Steudel, “Rezeption.”

later become canonical. This shows the special authority of these writings.¹⁸¹ Also, the book of Enoch does not seem to have been quoted as an authority (with the exception of Jude 14f.), and the assumption that there is a pesher for the Apocalypse of Weeks (4Q247)¹⁸² is uncertain in light of the fragmentary nature of the text. An exception is probably the book of *Jubilees*¹⁸³ and, strangely enough, a Joshua apocryphon known only from Qumran that is quoted in the exegetical work of 4QTestimonia (4Q175) in a series of “messianic” passages. Of course, the status of this work is unclear, and the validity of the passage could also be based on the fact that one saw in it an “exegetical” variant of Josh 6:26.¹⁸⁴

5. “Competing” Text and Book Forms

However, one observation must be emphasized that will irritate any “classical” understanding of canon: There are books to which a high authority, even a quasi-canonical reputation has already apparently been ascribed that exist in completely different textual and even editorial versions and are attested to side-by-side within the Qumran library. If one wishes to use canon terminology here, they must say: the book is “canonical,” but not (yet) the text.¹⁸⁵

* This corresponds to the plurality of the text forms of the biblical texts. The juxtaposition of proto-Masoretic, pre-Masoretic, proto-LXX, and free text forms in one and the same library and in relation to the same books can be explained neither by a regional nor by a group-specific assignment of these text types, but only by the assumption that the text of the books themselves was still relatively open, variable, and “fluid” at the time these manuscripts were written and also at the time the collectors gathered their material for the library. Varying traditions of books, which already enjoyed “canonical” authority in a certain sense, did not entail the community’s doubts about their authority.¹⁸⁶

The scholarly consequence, which is not drawn by all researchers but has good arguments, is formulated by Eugene Ulrich in this way, “The Qumran biblical scrolls, since they are our only pre-Revolt MSS and display no ‘sectarian’ features, should now become

¹⁸¹ However, this cannot be said for all later canonical writings. For texts such as Chronicles, Ezra-Nehemiah, and others, the sources are too bad, and the number of allusions is also low. See the list of quotations and allusions in P. W. Flint and J. C. VanderKam, *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York: Harper One, 2002), 427–433.

¹⁸² Cf. M. Broshi, “4QPesher on the Apocalypse of Weeks,” in *Qumran Cave 4 XXVI: Cryptic Texts, DJD 36* (ed. S. J. Pfann), 187–191. The word פֶּשֶׁר does not occur in the preserved fragment.

¹⁸³ See above at section 2 and see also Annette Steudel, “Rezeption.”

¹⁸⁴ A. Steudel, “Rezeption,” 95, offers a different explanation.

¹⁸⁵ Thus also Ulrich, “Notion,” 30.

¹⁸⁶ Tov, *Textual Criticism*, 117: “It stands to reason that they [sc.: the Qumranites] did not pay any special attention to differences of the types described here.” Perhaps such competing traditions were even perceived as providing exegetical leeway that could be used in the reception and interpretation of the Scriptures. Later rabbinic thought proceeds similarly with competing authoritative traditions.

the standard criteria for understanding and judging the Jewish Scriptures in late Second Temple Palestinian Judaism.”¹⁸⁷ That is to say, the Masoretic text, which later came to bear canonical standing in the Jewish tradition, cannot be regarded as the normative or standard text for the period in question.¹⁸⁸

* An analogy of even greater canon theological significance has to do with the tangible differences in the scope and arrangement of entire books. This applies to the Psalter, where the block of manuscripts that largely correspond to the arrangement of the Masoretic Psalter¹⁸⁹ is opposed by another series of manuscripts that (like 11QPs^a) contain a completely different sequence from Psalms 89–150.¹⁹⁰ “The evidence suggests that at least two major editions of Psalms are preserved in the scrolls.”¹⁹¹

There is also evidence of an irritating juxtaposition of different editorial forms for other books that are part of the collection of the prophets. This is most evident in the book of Jeremiah, for which manuscripts in the long version documented in the Masoretic tradition (4QJer^{a,c}) and manuscripts of the much shorter version preserved in the Septuagint (4QJer^{b,d}) are available side-by-side in the Qumran library.¹⁹² This is not only interesting in that, with the proof of a Hebrew version of the Septuagint text form, the editorial history of the book of Jeremiah is now placed on new footing, and that the Septuagint as a whole experiences a considerable promotion with the proof that it is partially based on its own Hebrew originals. Methodologically, these discoveries also raise long-term problems with the distinction between textual and literary criticism.¹⁹³ Perhaps more important than the possibility of reconstructing the textual growth of the book of Jeremiah on the basis of new textual discoveries (and the ability to test the old hypotheses) is the fact that the Qumran tradents apparently had two clearly divergent versions of a book in their library that undoubtedly enjoyed prophetic authority as such.

* Interestingly, the analogous observation can also be made for the Rule texts from the Qumran community.¹⁹⁴ In her detailed investigation of the manuscripts of the *Rule of the Community* (Serekh ha-Yahad) from Cave 4, Sarjanna Metso showed that an older and shorter editorial form of the community rule was still copied in Qumran long after a newer

¹⁸⁷ Ulrich, “Qumran,” 65; see also the overview in Ulrich, “Dead Sea Scrolls,” 79–100.

¹⁸⁸ This is now – in modification to an earlier tendency – even acknowledged by E. Tov. See E. Tov, “The Status of the Masoretic Text in Modern Text Editions of the Hebrew Bible,” in *Canon Debate* (ed. McDonald and Sanders), 234–251.

¹⁸⁹ However, “None of the Psalms scrolls from Qumran unambiguously confirms the arrangement of this Psalter, but it is evident in the second scroll from Masada (MasPs^b), which ends with Psalm 150” (Flint and VanderKam, *Meaning*, 122).

¹⁹⁰ Thus 11QPs^b and 4QPs^e, see Flint and VanderKam, *Meaning*, 122.

¹⁹¹ Flint and VanderKam, *Meaning*, 122.

¹⁹² See Tov, *Textual Criticism*, 320–327.

¹⁹³ On this, see in addition to Tov, *Textual Criticism*, 313–350 the essay by G. J. Brooke, “The Qumran Scrolls and the Demise of the Distinction Between Higher and Lower Criticism,” in *New Directions in Qumran Studies* (ed. J. G. Campbell, W. J. Lyon, and L. K. Pietersen; LSTS 52; London: Bloomsbury, 2005), 26–42.

¹⁹⁴ On this, see C. Hempel, “Vielgestaltigkeit und Verbindlichkeit: Serekh ha-Yachad in Qumran,” in *Qumran und der biblische Kanon* (Neukirchener Verlag: Neukirchen-Vluyn, 2009), 101–120.

and more detailed form – which was documented in IQS – was already available.¹⁹⁵ This is all the more surprising when, one can describe the manuscript IQS, as does Hartmut Stegemann, as a “mother manuscript.”¹⁹⁶ It follows from these discoveries “that there never existed a single, legitimate and up-to-date version of the Community Rule.”¹⁹⁷

This has consequences not only for how one can assess the various Rule texts of the community. They were certainly anything but “definitive” codes. But it also has consequences related to how we understand the attitude members of the Essene community (and perhaps their contemporaries as well) had towards “authoritative” and “valid” texts. This is not too surprising if one takes into consideration the way later rabbinical discussions were conducted. Nevertheless, it differs clearly from all later ideas of canonicity, where usually the seclusion, book form, and textual form are all implied.

6. *The Aporias of the “Reworked Pentateuch”*

The text that has been named the “Reworked Pentateuch” presents interpreters with the most irritating discovery from Qumran.¹⁹⁸ The discussion as to whether it is a biblical manuscript or a work of the type “Rewritten Bible,” and term “Reworked Pentateuch,” which was chosen as a compromise between the two options, demonstrates the problem: On the one hand, the text is identical with the text of the five books of the Pentateuch at long stretches; on the other hand, it contains small “additions” like the addition of the Song of Miriam to Exod 15 or after Lev 24:2 the wood festival which is also testified to in the *Temple Scroll*, but absent in the traditional Pentateuch.

One can consider these entries – partly from other Pentateuch passages, partly from other known texts, or from unknown sources (as, e.g., the Song of Miriam) – to be an “exegetical work” on the Bible text, and it would be interesting to compare this exegetical work with the work of the redaction of the Pentateuch,¹⁹⁹ the exegetical work of the author of Chronicles, or the exegetical work of the LXX translators.²⁰⁰

¹⁹⁵ 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 *Legal Texts and Legal Issues*, FS J. M. Baumgarten (ed. M. Bernstein, F. Garcia Martfnez, and J. Kampen; STDJ 23; Leiden et al.: Brill, 1997), 141–147, “The evidence of manuscripts 4QSB^d indicates that the community continued to copy an earlier version of the text even though a more extensive version of IQS was already available” (146f.). Cf. the stemma in Metso, “Textual Traditions,” 145.

¹⁹⁶ H. Stegemann, *Die Essener, Qumran, Johannes der Täufer und Jesus* (10th ed.; Freiburg: Herder, 2007), 152. The carefully preserved and packaged manuscript, which was found in Cave 1 and was found in good condition after about 170 years after its production, speaks for this of course.

¹⁹⁷ Metso, *Textual Development*, 154.

¹⁹⁸ 4Q158 and 4Q364–367. On this, see Tigchelaar, “Qumrantexte.”

¹⁹⁹ Fabry, “Text,” 44.

²⁰⁰ M. Meiser, “Historiographische Tendenzen in der LXX,” in *Die Apostelgeschichte im Kontext antiker Historiographie* (ed. J. Frey, C. K. Rothschild, and J. Schröter; BZNW 162; Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 2009), 77–100. The exegetical tendencies in the

For the “classical” view of the origin of the Old Testament canon, however, it is particularly disturbing that, even in the Pentateuch, whose “canonization” should have long since taken place according to previous theories, such additions beyond mere textual variants could take place. The work does not present itself to its recipients as something different from the Torah. This raises not only the question of what the “Torah of Moses” or the Pentateuch really was in the relevant period, but also, vice versa, what understanding of “canonicity” exists when such a free procedure is permissible with texts that are certainly already authoritative and “canonically” valid.

III. The Conceptual Gain

What is the outcome of this discussion? What consequences arise and what questions remain – or are again reopened?

The sketch that I have provided here makes clear that the Qumran discoveries vigorously revived questions about the development and the nature of the “biblical” canon or the concepts of “canonicity” in the Second Temple period – and thus also in the time of primitive Christianity.

1. The “Liquefaction” of the Classical Models

As Eibert Tigheelaar shows in an important essay,²⁰¹ the previously existing notions of the emergence of the Hebrew canon have clearly “liquified.”

The prevailing model so far, which basically goes back to the great Jewish scholar Heinrich Graetz in the late 19th century, was that of a three-stage development of the Hebrew canon,²⁰² according to which Torah, Prophets, and Writings were successively completed in three stages. The Torah had already been canonized relatively early – around the time of Ezra (i.e., ca. 400 BCE) – while the conclusion of the canon of the Prophets took place around the time of the book of Sirach at the end of the 3rd century BCE, as was concluded from the “praise of the fathers” (Sir 44–50). The definitive closure of the Hebrew canon was seen as taking place at the end of the 1st century CE, in the context of the assumed ‘synod’ of Jabne/Jamnia. There, it was assumed, the closure of the collection of the Writings and also the fixation of the Hebrew consonantal text was decided upon under the leadership of Eleazar ben Azariah.²⁰³

LXX (clarification of inaccurate information, avoidance of text-internal contradictions, historical corrections, tendencies of intertextual harmonization, tendencies of historical updating, theological tendencies) could also be suitable in different degrees to explain the variants in the Reworked Pentateuch.

²⁰¹ E. Tigheelaar, “Qumrantexte.”

²⁰² H. Graetz, *Kohelet oder der Salomonische Prediger* (Leipzig, 1871), 147–173, here 155f.; idem, “Der Abschluss des Kanons des Alten Testaments,” *Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums* 35 (1886): 281–298. See also M. Becker, “Grenzbeziehungen.”

²⁰³ It is possible that Graetz, on the one hand, was influenced by one of Spinozas’ remarks. Spinoza ascribed the decision concerning the canon to a “concilium Pharisaeorum,”

This model, which can still be found in many Old Testament introductions, was already questioned from various sides before the more precise evaluation of the Qumran discoveries. On the one hand, a closer analysis of the relevant rabbinical passages has shown that the construction of the “Synod of Jabne/Jamnia” cannot be held in this manner: First, talk of a “synod” introduces a pattern from later church history that is completely anachronistic for early rabbinical Judaism. Second, in this pattern, traditions about very different decisions of the Tannaitic sages in the time after Yohanan ben Zakkai are compiled. These decision processes extended over a longer period of time between 70 and 135 CE (or possibly even later) and were not necessarily taken in one place.²⁰⁴

With regard to the conclusion of the canon of the Writings, Roger Beckwith, for example, tried to include it as early as the Maccabean era,²⁰⁵ while other scholars pointed out that the books of Ecclesiastes and Song of Songs, which were discussed according to *m. Yad.* 3:5 in “Jabne,” are still the subject of discussion in later rabbinical documents, which means that the debates of the “Jabne/Jamnia” period did not completely put the issue to bed.²⁰⁶ That is, even in “Jabne” no final, binding decision was made.²⁰⁷

The linear three-stage formation of the Hebrew canon can no longer be maintained. The notions of the emergence of the Hebrew (and Greek) canon have been put on a new footing, not only in light of the Qumran findings, but also theoretically and terminologically. Today, one looks much less at the question of a selective act of canonization or a definitive closure of the canon, but rather at the lengthy and plural “canonical process.”

2. A “Canonical Process”

It was the Qumran scholar James A. Sanders who in the 1970s brought the pattern of a “canonical process” into play, mainly on the basis of his study of

and, with this formulation, he described the conclusion of the Jewish canon in analogy to the decision of the ecclesiastical synods or councils. This is suspected at least by D. E. Aune, “On the Origins of the ‘Council of Javneh’ Myth,” *JBL* 110 (1991): 491–493. Spinoza, however, did not just set this “concilium Pharisaeorum” during the time of the teaching house of Jabne (after 70 CE), but earlier, in the 1st century BCE, specifically during the time of Hillel and Shammai. This could have been due to the *t. Ed.* 1:1, where it says, “When the wise men went into the vineyard of Jabne, they said, ‘The time will come when man wants to discover a problem with the Torah but does not find it. ...’ They said, ‘Let us begin with (the teachings) of Hillel and Shammai.’”

²⁰⁴ See J. P. Lewis, “What Do We Mean By Jabne,” *JBR* 32 (1964): 125–132; R. C. Newman, “The Council of Jamnia and the Old Testament Canon,” *Westminster Journal of Theology* 38 (1976): 319–349; P. Schäfer, “Die sogenannte Synode von Jabne: Zur Trennung von Juden und Christen im ersten/ zweiten Jh. n.Chr.,” *Judaica* 31 (1975): 54–61, 116–124; G. Stemberger, “Die ‘Synode von Jabne’ und das frühe Christentum,” *Kairos* 19 (1977): 14–21; idem, “Jabne und der Kanon,” *JBTh* 3 (1988): 163–174.

²⁰⁵ Beckwith, *Old Testament Canon*.

²⁰⁶ See Lewis, “What,” 131 along with notes 76–86, which contain the dissenting voices (on the basis of *t. Yad.* 2:14; *b. Meg.* 7a, and Hieronymus, comm. on *Eccl.* 12:13f.).

²⁰⁷ Lewis, “What,” 132, “that the frequently made assertion that a binding decision was made at Jabneh covering all scripture is conjectural at best.”

the Psalms scroll from Cave 11.²⁰⁸ This term and the concept associated with it mean that the formation of the Hebrew canon cannot be understood as an act of authorization (for example through a “synod” or a scholar’s decision of “Jabne”),²⁰⁹ and also not as a linear process defined from a final result, but as an extended process not “controlled” by a single institution, in which the different groups of ancient Judaism were involved in a way that cannot always be determined. In the process of the development of the canon, it seems crucial that the different writings and texts in the individual groups and communities gained an identity-forming, crisis-proven, and authority-creating meaning and were therefore successively appropriated, adapted, and handed down.²¹⁰ We will highlight a few aspects here:

- (a) The decisive factor is the insight into the essential *diversity of ancient Judaism* during the time of the Second Temple (and beyond) promoted by the Qumran finds.
- (b) At the same time, the model of a “canonical process” was able to defuse considerably the debate about an earlier or later setting of the Hebrew canon. The question as to whether (or in which parts) this was already completed in the Hasmonaean period or only in “Jabne” or even later thus changed into the question of what degree of authority and religious commitment as well as possibly also of textual inalterability the individual writings or collections were assigned to, in which phase of the process, and – what is essential – for which group of ancient Judaism (or also of Early Christianity).
- (c) The thought model of the canonical process is able to grasp the different developments of the rabbinically fixed “canon” on the one hand and the canon of the Septuagint (which only came to an end in Christianity) on the other. For the authorization of the writings and collections, it appears to be less a matter of an authoritative entity or its decision as a decisive moment than the interplay between the traditions recognized as foundational and the community or group that receives and adapts them.
- (d) The hypothesis of the “canonical process” is therefore also a model to be considered equally for other authorization processes. The newer perspectives outlined above in the perception of the emergence of the New Testament canon or the two-part Christian canon in the tension between the early collection and authorization of individual writings (Gospels, Paul’s letters) and later, regionally differentiated fixation of the circle of “ca-

²⁰⁸ See Sanders, “Scrolls,” 7–10.

²⁰⁹ Concerning the problems of the Jabne-hypothesis, see also the M. Becker, “Grenzziehungen.”

²¹⁰ See further J. A. Sanders, “‘Spinning’ the Bible,” *BibRev* 14.3 (1998): 22–29, 44–45; D. Carr, “Canonization in the Context of Community,” in *A Gift of God in Due Season. Essays on Scripture and Community in Honor of James A. Sanders* (ed. Weis and D. Carr; JSOTSup 225; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1996), 22–62, here 49–64.

nonical” writings can also be grasped with the help of this hypothesis. In the long and by no means straight forward development between the gain in authority of individual writings over the gain in authority of (partial) collections up to the solidification of a list of writings and the decided exclusion of other writings lies a remarkable analogy between the “canonical process” that leads to the Hebrew Bible and the “canonical process” that leads to the two-part Christian Bible (of the church in the Byzantine empire and in part differently in the churches outside of the empire) within Early Christianity.

- (e) Despite the diffuseness of the canonical processes, whose course and guiding motives can probably no longer be reconstructed in detail, it can nevertheless be seen that essential writings – of both the later Jewish and the New Testament canons – have asserted themselves through their weight or significance for the communities that receive them, live with them, and have become the authoritative authority in the course of tradition.

In this respect, canonization processes are neither unilaterally an authoritarian decision by competent individuals or competent bodies, nor simply an act of self-assertion by the “word,” but rather dialogical processes in which the texts and their recipients, tradition, and community or different communities are involved.

That in such processes not only human contingency but also the work of the Holy Spirit may manifest itself is not a purely historical perception, but a view of that faith that assigns to these texts a fundamental and decisive meaning and orienting force.

Original Publication Information for Essays Included in this Volume

Introduction: Qumran, Ancient Judaism, and the New Testament

Unpublished.

1. New Testament Scholarship and Ancient Judaism: Problems – Perceptions – Perspectives

Translated from the German by Jacob Cerone. Original publication: J. Frey, “Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und antikes Judentum: Probleme – Wahrnehmungen – Perspektiven,” *ZTK* 109 (2012): 445–471.

2. Qumran: An Overview

Translated with special permission from Hiersemann publishers by Jacob Cerone. Original Publication: J. Frey, “Qumran,” *RAC* 28 (2017), 550–592.

3. Qumran Research and Biblical Scholarship in Germany

Republished with permission from Brill publishers. Original publication: “Qumran Research and Biblical Scholarship in Germany,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Perspective. A History of Research* (ed. D. Dimant; STDJ 99; Leiden et al.: Brill, 2012), 529–564.

4. Qumran and Archaeology

Republished with permission from Mohr Siebeck publishers, and translated from the German by Jacob Cerone. Original publication: J. Frey, “Qumran und die Archäologie. Eine thematische Einführung,” in *Qumran und die Archäologie* (ed. J. Frey; C. Claußen, and N. Kessler; WUNT 278; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 3–49, here only 3–44.

5. On the Historical Value of the Ancient Sources about the Essenes

Translated from the German by Jacob Cerone. Original publication: J. Frey, “Zur historischen Auswertung der antiken Essenerberichte: Ein Beitrag zum Gespräch mit Roland Bergmeier,” in *Qumran kontrovers* (ed. J. Frey and H. Stegemann, with M. Becker and A. Maurer; Einblicke 6; Paderborn: Bonifatius-Verlag, 2003), 23–56.

6. The Qumran Discoveries and the Understanding of Apocalypticism

Translated from the German by Jacob Cerone. Original Publication: J. Frey, “Die Bedeutung der Qumran-Funde für das Verständnis der Apokalypitk im Frühjudentum und

im Urchristentum, in *Apokalyptik und Qumran* (ed. J. Frey and M. Becker; Paderborn: Bonifatius-Verlag, 2007), 11–62.

7. Different Patterns of Dualistic Thought in the Qumran Library: Reflections on their Background and History

Republished with permission from Brill publishers: J. Frey, “Different Patterns of Dualism in the Qumran Library,” in *Legal Texts and Legal Issues. Proceedings of the Second Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Cambridge, 1995* (ed. M. J. Bernstein, F. García Martínez, and J. Kampen; STDJ 25; Leiden et al.: Brill, 1997), 275–335.

8. Apocalyptic Dualism: Its Formation and Early History

Republished with permission from Oxford University Press. Original publication: J. Frey, “Apocalyptic Dualism,” in *Oxford Handbook of Apocalypticism* (ed. J. J. Collins; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), 271–294.

9. On the Origins of the Genre of the “Literary Testament”: Farewell Discourses in the Qumran Library and Their Relevance for the History of the Genre

Republished with permission from Brill publishers. Original publication: J. Frey, “On the Origins of the Genre of the ‘Literary Testament’: Farewell Discourses in the Qumran Library and their Relevance for the History of the Genre,” in *Qumranica Aramaica. The Aramaic Texts from Qumran* (ed. K. Berthelot and D. Stoekl Ben Ezra; Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2010), 345–375.

10. The New Jerusalem Text in Its Historical and Traditio-Historical Context

Republished with permission from the publisher. Original publication: J. Frey, “The New Jerusalem Text in Its Historical and Traditio-Historical Context,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls – 50 Years After Their Discovery 1947–1997: Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20–25, 1997* (ed. L. H. Schiffman, E. Tov, and J. C. VanderKam; Jerusalem: Israel Museum, 2000), 800–816.

11. The Testimonies about the Communal Meals from Qumran

Translated from the German by Jacob Cerone. Original publication: “Die Zeugnisse über die Gemeinschaftsmähler aus Qumran,” in *The Eucharist – Its Origins and Contexts*, vol 1: *Old Testament, Early Judaism, New Testament* (ed. D. Hellholm and D. Sänger; WUNT 376/1; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2017), 101–130.

12. The Authority of the Scriptures of Israel in the Qumran Corpus

Hitherto unpublished. Originally written for the volume “The Authority of the Scriptures of Israel in the Qumran Corpus,” in *Authoritative Writings in Early Judaism and Early Christianity* (ed. T. Nicklas and J. Schröter; WUNT; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 2019/20,

in press). Pre-publication in this volume by friendly permission of the editors and Mohr Siebeck publishers.

13. The Worldview in the Book of Jubilees

Translated from the German by Jacob Cerone. Original publication: J. Frey, "Zum Weltbild im Jubiläenbuch," in *Studies in the Book of Jubilees* (ed. M. Albani, J. Frey, and A. Lange; TSAJ 65; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997), 261–293.

14. Temple and Rival Temple: The Cases of Elephantine, Mt. Gerizim, and Leontopolis

Republished with permission from Mohr Siebeck publishers. Original publication: "Temple and Rival Temple. The Cases of Elephantine, Garizim, and Leontopolis," in: *Gemeinde ohne Tempel – Community Without Temple*, (ed. B. Ego, A. Lange, and P. Pilhofer; WUNT 118; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999), 171–203.

15. Critical Issues in the Investigation of the Scrolls and the New Testament

Republished with permission from Oxford University Press. Original publication: "Critical Issues in the Investigation of the Scrolls and the New Testament," in *Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. J. J. Collins and T. H. Lim; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 517–545.

16. The Impact of the Dead Sea Scrolls on New Testament Interpretation: Proposals, Problems, and Further Perspectives

Republished with permission from Baylor University Press. Original publication: "The Impact of the Dead Sea Scrolls on New Testament Interpretation: Proposals, Problems and Further Perspectives," in *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Princeton Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls*, Vol. 3: *The Scrolls and Christian Origins* (ed. J. H. Charlesworth; Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2006), 407–461.

17. The Textual Discoveries of Qumran and New Testament Scholarship: A Mediating Balance, Hermeneutical Considerations, and Concretions on the Jesus Tradition

Translated from the German by Jacob Cerone. Original publication: "Die Textfunde von Qumran und die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft. Eine Zwischenbilanz, hermeneutische Überlegungen und Konkretionen zur Jesusüberlieferung," in *Qumran aktuell* (ed. St. Beyerle and J. Frey; BThSt 120; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2011), 225–293.

18. Jesus, Paul, and the Texts from the Dead Sea: Research History and Hermeneutical Perspectives

Translated from the German by Jacob Cerone. Original publication: J. Frey, "Jesus, Paulus und die Texte vom Toten Meer: Forschungsgeschichtliche und hermeneutische Perspektiven," in *Jesus, Paulus und die Texte vom Toten Meer* (ed. J. Frey and E. E.

Popkes, with S. Tätweiler; WUNT II/390; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015), 1–29, here only 1–28.

19. The Character and Background of Matt 5:25–26: On the Value of Qumran Literature in New Testament Interpretation

Republished with permission from Peeters publishers. Original publication: J. Frey, “On the Character and Background of Mt 5:25–26: A Case Study for the Value of Qumran Literature in New Testament Interpretation,” 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), 3–39.

20. Paul’s View of the Spirit in Light of Qumran

Republished with permission from Brill publishers. Original publication: “Paul’s View of the Spirit in the Light of Qumran,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Pauline Literature* (ed. J.-S. Rey; StTDJ 102; Leiden – Boston: Brill, 2013), 239–262.

21. Flesh and Spirit in the Palestinian Jewish Sapiential Tradition and in the Qumran Texts: An Inquiry into the Background of Pauline Usage.

Republished with permission from Peeters publishers. Original publication: “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.

22. Contextualizing Paul’s “Works of the Law”: MMT in New Testament Scholarship

Hitherto unpublished. Originally written for a volume on 4QMMT edited by Reinhard Gregor Kratz, scheduled in the SAPERE series. Pre-publication in this volume by friendly permission of Reinhard Gregor Kratz and Mohr Siebeck publishers.

23. Recent Perspectives on Johannine Dualism and Its Background

Republished with permission from Peeters publishers. Original publication: “Recent Perspectives on Johannine Dualism and its Background,” in *Text, Thought, and Practice in Qumran and Early Christianity* (ed. R. A. Clements and D. Schwartz; Leiden: Brill, 2009), 127–57.

24. Qumran and the Biblical Canon

Translated from the German by Jacob Cerone. Original publication: J. Frey, “Qumran und der biblische Kanon: Eine thematische Einführung,” in *Qumran und der biblische Kanon* (ed. M. Becker and J. Frey; BThSt 92; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2009), 1–63.

Index of Ancient Sources

Hebrew Bible

<i>Genesis</i>			
1–Exod 12	430, 433, 435	10:6–19	455
1:1	251n.37, 303–4	10:19	456
1:3–5	786, 788	10:30	443–44, 446, 447n.68
1:4	263	11:21	454
1:14	263	12:4ff.	454
1:26–28	258n.64	14:18	293, 298n.225
1:27	31, 75, 610	15:6	757
2:3	263	25:6	444n.54
2:8	445, 447n.68	27:1–40	326
2:18	726	28	334
2:23	442n.45, 726	28:19	449n.76
2:24	75, 610, 711n.47, 726	32	409n.19
3:23f.	441	37:25	336
4:26	729, 730n.146	37:27	336
5:6	729	42–46	335
5:9–11	729	44:14	335
5:28–15:4	56	47:29–31	326
5:32	432n.9	49–50	326
6	323		
6:1f.	735	<i>Exodus</i>	
6:1ff.	735	3:5	442
6:3	711n.47, 712, 733n.164, 735, 735n.172	4	409n.19
6:4	735	6:16	343
6:5	731, 735	9:27f.	714n.66, 734n.167
6:12	711n.47	12:43–46	419
9:11	451	15	832
9:18	452, 452n.92	15:21	419
9:18ff.	452–53	20:15	653
9:18–27	452, 452n.92	20:21	425
9:22	452, 452n.92	20:26	442n.47
9:25–27	452n.92	21:25	433n.20
9:27	453	28:42	442n.47
10	449–450, 455, 455n.101	30:7f.	442n.47, 447n.69
		34	356
		<i>Leviticus</i>	
		17:11	711n.47, 712n.52

17:14	712n.52	32:8–9	279
18:6	711n. 47	33:8–10	425
21:16–24	514	33:21	570n.172
21:17–24	608n.111		
24:2	832	<i>Joshua</i>	
25	434, 670	6:26	820
25:2	436	15:61	123n.9
25:26	670	15:62	46, 123
25:26–28	670	23–24	326
25:29	670		
25:31	670	<i>Judges</i>	
25:35–37	670	6:3	444n.54
25:35–55	670	9:37	449n.76, 450
25:39	670		
25:44–46	670n.103	<i>1 Samuel</i>	
25:47	670	2:12	219n.99
		12	326
<i>Numbers</i>		24	303
2	364n.71, 367	<i>2 Samuel</i>	
2:3ff.	367	7	57
6:27	282n.159	7:11	417
7:12ff.	367	7:12–14	702n.5
10:14ff.	367	20:3	770n.44
24:15–17	425	23:7	827
50:2–5	434		
		<i>1 Kings</i>	
<i>Deuteronomy</i>		2:1–10	326
1:1–4:43	326n.5	4:30	444n.54
3:9	454n.97	8:12–53	711
4:2	813	19:15f.	618
5:18	653		
6:4	461n.2, 529n.10, 585	<i>2 Kings</i>	
8:20–21	419	2:6–8	512, 566
11:7	769n.43	17:24	478
12	488	17:29	477
12:13f.	461n.2, 469	23:15–20	477n.84
13:1	813	23:19f.	477
15:2	670	25:25f.	464
15:3	670n.103		
15:7	726	<i>Isaiah</i>	
18:15	35n.67, 76	2:3	787n.141
18:15–18	543	2:5	770n.45, 787n.141
21:22–23	515	5	33, 76, 615
21:33	79	5:1–7	515
27–30	755–756	7:14ff.	617
27:26	749	9:1	770n.45
31–34	326n.5	9:1–2	523, 787
32:8	450	10:34–11:1	543n.60

11:1	543	18:6	264n.89, 711n.47
11:1f.	697	25:11f.	431
11:4b	543	29:10	431
11:4c–d	543n.60	40–44	420
11:11	464n.16	41:4f.	477n.84
11:14	444n.54	41:11	477n.84
19:18	480n.94	41:17f.	464
19:18–19	487	41:42	464
19:18f.	482n.102	43:7	464
19:19	484	44:1	464
24–27	232, 234n.157	49:28	444n.54
25:8a	231n.144	51:10	769n.43
26	515, 620	51:58	728n.139
26:15–19	231		
26:19	231, 231n.144	<i>Ezekiel</i>	
26:35	36	1	63
29:16	264n.89	4:5	218n.98
31:3	733n.164	4:13	461n.3
35	515, 620	5:5	449
36–39	829	10	63
40:1–5	566	28:14	445n.59
40–66	644	36–37	697
40:3	60, 73, 159, 512, 566–567	36:25–27	697
42:6	788	36:26f.	685
42:6–7	523, 787	37	56, 683, 686
43:19	443n.48	37:7a	231n.144
45:7	303	37:8b–10a	231n.144
45:9	264n.89	38:12	448, 450
46:6	806n.63	40–41	355
49:6	523, 787	40–44	420
50:10	770n.45	40–48	57–58, 213, 350, 350n.3, 353, 355, 356n.27, 364, 368
51:4	787n.141		353n.17
54:11ff.	362n.55	40:4	364
54:12	356n.25, 361	41:1–4	364
54:12f.	367	41:13–14	364
59:9	770n.45	42:15–20	364
60:1–3	523, 787	43:13–17	364
61:1	697	44:5	353n.17
61	36, 515, 618, 620	44:5–46:18	354
61:1f.	682	45:1–8	364
61:1ff.	618	48:1–29	367
61:1–3	57	48:8–22	364
63:10–11	688	48:9–22	363
64:7	264n.89	48:16	364
		48:16–17	365
<i>Jeremiah</i>		48:30–35	357, 364, 366–367
16:13	461n.3		
17:5	733n.164		

<i>Hosea</i>		56:14	81, 521, 770n.45
9:3ff.	461n.3	78:39	733n.164
		82:5	770n.45
<i>Joel</i>		89–150	831
3:1–5	685	90–150	827
4:6	670	91	287
		91–150	54
<i>Amos</i>		106:31	757
7:17	461n.3	107:24	769n.43
		110:4	293
<i>Habakkuk</i>		111:2	769n.43
2:4	58, 79	119:105	787n.141
		132:4	668
<i>Zechariah</i>		146	36, 620
2:5–8	57		
2:5–9	353	<i>Proverbs</i>	
2:8f.	366	1–9	64
2:9	366n.79, 368	2:13	770n.45
3:1	309	6:1–5	662
3:1–2	286n.179	6:2	662
3	286n.179	6:4	668, 674
5:5ff.	462n.5	6:23	769n.38, 787n.141
7:3c–5	504, 549	8:27	451n.86
9–14	233n.152	11:15	662n.60
14:10	366n.79, 368	11:27	666n.80
		15:8	829n.177
<i>Malachi</i>		16:15	769n.38
1:10	417	17:18	662, 662n.60
1:11	469, 488	20:16	662n.60
3:1	512, 566–567	22:26f.	662n.60
3:1–3	73	22:27	662
3	73, 512, 566	27:13	662n.60
3:2–3	512, 566	29:27	263
3:7	512, 566–67		
3:16	729n.144	<i>Job</i>	
3:19 [4:1]	512, 566	1–2	303, 305
3:23	512, 566	1:6–12	286n.179
3:23 [4:5]	512, 566	4f.	714n.66
3:23–24	512, 566	4:17	734n.169
3:23–24 [4:5–6]	512, 566	4:17–21	734
3:24	512, 566	4:19	734n.169
3:24 [4:6]	512, 566–67	4:21	734n.169
		10:4	733n.164
<i>Psalms</i>		14:1	734n.169
2:1–2	294n.210	14:1–4	734
37	104, 760	14:4	734n.169
51	691n.50	15:4	734n.169
51:13	688	15:14	734n.169
56:5	733n.164	15:14–16	734

15:16	734n.169	7:21	353n.11
26:10	451n.86	7:25	62n.67, 458
33:30	769n.38	8	305
34:14	726	8:4	446n.64
34:14f.	734	8:9	446n.64
		9	218
<i>Song of Solomon</i>		9:2	431
4:8	454n.97	9:24–27	431
		9:26	482n.103, 483n.108
<i>Lamentations</i>		9:27	362
1:18–22	714n.66, 734n.167	10–11	305
		10–12	203, 235
<i>Daniel</i>		10:13	293n.206, 319
1–6	233, 359n.46	10:20–21	61, 243n.2, 278, 303, 317
2	206n.42, 209, 234, 305, 421	10:21	293n.206, 319
2:4	425	11:22	482n.103, 483n.108
2:26	353n.11	11:31	362
2:31	353n.11	11:32	279, 280, 317
2:34	353n.11	11:33	280n.147
2:41	353n.11	11:40–12:1	61, 317
2:43	353n.11	11:40ff.	436
2:45	353n.11	12:1	279, 303, 321
3–6	207	12:1–3	232n.148
3:25	353n.11	12	207–208, 232, 232n.148, 421
3:31–4:34	714n.66, 734n.167	12:2	232n.147
4	57, 207, 421	12:2f.	231
4:2	353n.11	12:3	81, 223, 521, 769
4:6	353n.11	12:10	421
4:7	353n.11	12:11	362
4:9	714n.66, 734n.167		
4:10	353n.11	<i>Ezra</i>	
4:15	353n.11	2:28	475n.75
4:17	353n.11	4:1–5	475n.74, 478
4:20	353n.11	4:3	418
5:5	353n.11	5:11f.	467n.32
5:12	688	6:9f.	467n.32
6:4	688	6:9ff.	471n.53
7:1	353n.11	7:2	467n.32
7	206n.42, 208, 208n.52, 209, 234, 305, 421, 616	7:10	567
7:2	353n.11	7:11–26	491
7:4	353n.11	7:21	467n.32
7:6	353n.11	7:23	467n.32
7:7	353n.11	9	714n.66, 734n.167
7:9	353n.11	40:3	806n.63
7:11	353n.11	40:5	806n.63
7:13	353n.11	42:16–19	806n.63

<i>Nehemiah</i>		13:7	362, 476
2:8	362	13:23	476
2:10	489	13:28	470n.48, 474, 476
5:1–5	669		
5:6–13	670	<i>1 Chronicles</i>	
5:7–8	670	1:1	729
5:14f.	478	1:1–2:2	449
6:18	476	21	303
7:32	475n.75	21:1	283
8	406	24:7–18	62
8–9	406	28–29	326
9	714n.66, 734n.167		
10:31–32	670	<i>2 Chronicles</i>	
12:22	473	12:19	475n.75
12:26	478	32:8	733n.164
13:4	476	35:18	477n.84

Septuagint/Deuterocanonical Books

<i>Genesis</i>		1:59	62n.67, 458
10:30	444	2:42	187
		7:13	187
<i>Judges</i>		9:50	475n.75
9:37	450	12:36	362n.62
		13:53	362
<i>1 Kingdoms</i>		14:15	362
2:3	258n.63, 521	14:37	362
		14:41	362
<i>4 Kingdoms</i>		<i>2 Maccabees</i>	
20:3	81, 521, 770n.44	1:1–9	489
<i>Tobit</i>		1:10–2:18	489
4:6	81, 521, 769n.41	1:18	362n.58
8:1ff.	602	2:13–15	406
13:6	81, 521, 769n.41	2:13f.	489
13:17	356n.26, 361n.51, 367	4	457n.107, 482n.104
<i>1 Maccabees</i>		4:9–14	458n.109
1:10ff.	457n.107	4:30–38	482
1:11	458n.114	4:34	483n.108
1:14f.	458n.109	4:36–38	482n.104
1:15	458n.110	6:1ff.	362n.57
1:41ff.	458n.108	6:2	472
1:44ff.	362n.57	6:7	62n.67, 458
1:48	458n.110	7	236
1:54	362	7:9	769n.35
		14:6	187

<i>Psalms</i>		21:11	264n.88
55:14	770n.45	27:1	663
56:14	56:14	29:1	663
81:5	770n.45	29:2	663
151	54–55, 408, 410, 827	29:4ff.	663n.63
151A	415	29:5	663
151B	415	29:6	663
151A–B	422	29:14	663
154	55, 827	29:16f.	663, 668n.89
155	55, 827	29:20	663
		33	264
<i>Job</i>		33:9	263
38:5 (Aquila)	807	33:10	264, 314
		33:14	264, 314
<i>Proverbs</i>		33:14–15	263
2:13	770n.45	33:16ff.	264
		39:16	264, 769n.43
<i>Wisdom of Solomon</i>		39:24–34	264
1:5	688n.36	42:19	258n.62
6:22–11:1	710	42:22–25	264
7:1	710, 711n.43	42:24	263, 314
7–9	686, 711n.44	44–50	406, 833
7:2	711	48:24	566n.154
7:7	711	49:8–10	406
7:22	688n.36	49:16	729
8:1	710	50:1–2	362
8:3f.	710	51	408, 422
8:7f.	710	51:13–30	55, 827
8:17	710	51:30	827
9:1	710	<i>Isaiah</i>	
9:1f.	710	26:10	80–81, 521, 769n.40
9:4	710	59:9	770n.45
9:17	688n.36	<i>Baruch</i>	
10:10	606n.99	4:2	787n.141
11:16	433n.20	5:7	566n.154
12:5	710n.42	6	55, 410, 826
18:4	787	<i>Ezekiel</i>	
19:21	710n.42	38:12	450
<i>Sirach</i>		<i>Daniel</i>	
2:12	264n.90	5:12	688n.36
8:1–2	663	6:3	688n.36
8:12	663	<i>Susanna</i>	
14:11	663	24 (Theodotion)	688n.36
14:13	663		
14:15	663		
15:11–20	264n.88, 314		
19:18	663		

<i>4 Maccabees</i>		15:3	769n.35
7:21	807		

Old Testament Pseudepigrapha

<i>Apocalypse of Abraham</i>		1:6	566n.154
26	262	1:8–9	308
		1:9–10	304
<i>Apocalypse of Moses</i>		6:1–6	262
25	714n.64	6–16	210
29:3–6	442n.47	6–19	265n.97, 272, 272n.115
<i>Apocalypse of Elijah</i>		7:1	235, 262
10:5	366	8:1–3	235
10:6	367	8:3	265n.97
10:16	361n.51	9:4	606n.101
		9:6f.	235
<i>Ascension of Isaiah</i>		10:4–7	288
1:3	781n.105	10:8–9	262
2:4	781n.105	10:10	769n.34
2:10	563n.139	10:16	218
10:29	781n.105	12:3	606n.101
		14	304
<i>Cave of Treasures</i>		14:[2]	353n.11, 354n.18
5:15	445n.60	14:4	353n.11, 354n.18
5:18	445n.60	14:[8]	353n.11, 354n.18
5:27	445n.60	14:15	304n.49, 443n.49
6:21	445n.60	15	735
6:32	445n.60	15:4	735, 769n.34
7:3	445n.60	15:6	735, 769n.34
		15:8	735
<i>2 Baruch</i>		15:9d–10	504, 549
17:4	787n.144	15:11–16:1	305
18:2	787n.144	16	305
25:1–29	321	17ff.	203
29:5–8	321	18:6–8	447n.68
40:3	321	19:1	259n.70
48:30–37	321	20:5	293n.206, 319
53	787n.145	22:1–4	232n.147
53:9	787n.145	22	232, 232n.147–48, 235, 235n.158
56–72	787n.145		
59:2	787	22:13b	232
70:2–10	321	24:1ff.	18:6–8, 447n.68
73:1–74:1	321	24:2–27:2	232n.147
		24:3	445n.59
<i>1 Enoch</i>		24:3–25:7	447n.68
1–36	259n.71, 304	25:3	445n.59

25:3–5	606n.101	106–108	327
25:7	606n.101	108:11	770n.47
26:1	450	108:11–14	784n.128
27:3	606n.101		
32	447n.68	<i>2 Enoch</i>	
32:2	447	18:3	221n.105
32:3	445	24:4	786n.139
37–71	55, 209, 410, 424, 792	24:25	786n.139
37–72	825	55–67	327
37:4	769n.34	68:5ff.	443n.49
40:7	284	<i>4 Ezra</i>	
40:9	769n.34	book	9
58:3	769n.34	3:20	321
65:6	284	3:21	321
72:1	443n.48	3:27	321
72–82	55, 62, 792	3:30	320
76:2f.	451	4:2	321
80–81	210n.60	4:27	321
81–82	327	4:51–5:13	321
84:2	606n.101	6:9	321
85–90	203	6:13–24	321
87:3	445n.59	6:40	786n.139
89:2	353n.11	6:55	321
89:3	353n.11	7:12	321
89:7	353n.11	7:13	321
89:52	441n.44	7:26	321
90:8	482n.103, 483n.108	7:26–44	321
90:26	450	7:43	321
90:29	351n.5, 366	7:44	321
90:36	366	7:47	321
91–105	327	7:50	251, 321
91:10	232	7:113	321
91:11–17	211, 431	7:118	321
91:11–18	437	8:1	321
91:15f.	438n.33	8:63–9:6	321
91:17	437	9:19	321
92–106	669	9:26–10:59	321
93:1–10	211, 431, 437	10:55	366
93:2	232	12:32	321
93:3f.	437	13	616
93:4	437	14:20–21	787n.143
93:5	437	14:37–48	406
93:6	437	14:45	794n.12
93:10	218, 437–38		
94:8	669n.96	<i>Joseph and Aseneth</i>	
99:3–5	321	8:9	523, 769n.35, 786
100:1–6	321	14:1–17:10	480n.94, 481n.99
104:1–6	232	15:12	523, 788n.150

<i>Jubilees</i>			
1	315, 43n.9	4:24	212, 445n.58
1:2	442	4:24f.	436, 445
1:4	431n.6	4:25	441, 441n.42, 442n.47, 443–46, 447n.67
1:14	436n.28		
1:16–17	78	4:25f.	446n.61, 447
1:16f.	39	4:26	79, 441, 443, 443n.53, 443n.55, 444, 444n.53, 444n.55, 445–47, 447n.67, 450, 456
1:20	218, 289		
1:21–23	688n.36		
1:26	431n.6		
1:26–27	351n.5		
1:26f.	435, 439n.35	4:28	432n.9
1:27	433n.15, 434n.24, 436n.29	4:29	437
		4:31	433
1:28	443n.48, 456, 606n.101	4:32	433n.20
		4:33	432n.9, 434
1:28f.	447	5:1	434
1:29	79, 351n.5, 431n.6, 433n.15, 435, 439n.35, 443, 443n.48, 445, 450, 459	5:1ff.	272n.115, 289
		5:1–2	262
		5:1–13	212
		5:6–10	289
		5:13–18	436n.29
2	440	5:28	444
2:16ff.	440	6:2ff.	447
2:17–33	611	6:19	446
2:18f.	440	6:22	439
2:19	440, 458	6:28f.	439
2:21	440	6:30	439
2:24	440	6:31f.	439n.37
2:31	440	6:32	439
3:6	442n.45	6:33	439
3:9	442	6:34	439
3:9–13	442	6:35	458
3:12	442n.45	6:36	439, 458
3:17	432n.12	6:36ff.	439
3:22	442n.47	6:37	439
3:27	442, 442n.47, 447, 447n.69	6:38	439
		7:1	432, 444, 455
3:31	232, 458	7:3ff.	447
3:32	432n.12	7:6ff.	452
3:34	442n.45	7:10	453
4:2	433, 434n.22	7:11f.	450
4:9	432–33, 434n.22	7:12	453
4:12	729	7:13ff.	453
4:15	289	7:20	458
4:18	432n.11	7:20–39	212
4:21–26	212	7:21	289
4:22	289	7:38f.	443n.49
4:23	441n.44, 445–47	8:1	434n.22

8:1–4	212, 259n.70	13:4ff.	447
8–9	450, 453, 459	13:8f.	444n.53
8:3	265n.97	13:15f.	444n.53
8:10	434, 434n.22, 442, 453	15:29ff.	458
8:12	453–54	15:32	290
8:12–17	454	15:33	289
8:18	450, 454	16:9	436n.29
8:19	441, 442n.47, 445n.59, 447–48, 450–51, 451n.86, 454	16:20	444n.53, 447
8:21	450, 453–54, 454n.96	16:24	444n.53, 447
8:22f.	451, 454	17:16	289
8:22–25	454	18:9	289
8:24	453	18:12	289
8:25–29	454	19:1	434n.22
8:26–30	454	19:28	289
8:29	453	20:4	458n.114
8:30	454	21:20	443n.49
9:1–13	454	22:16	458n.114
9	454	22:16ff.	458
9:4	454n.97	22:20	458
9:11	451	23	219, 436
9:14f.	453, 457, 457n.106	23:9–25	436
10:1	434	23:9–32	436
10:1–5	289	23:21	457
10:2	290	23:22ff.	457
10:5	272n.115	23:24f.	436
10:8	289, 289n.190, 290, 305	23:26	436, 459
10:8–9	262, 305	23:26f.	437–438
10:10–18	212	23:26ff.	437
10:11	289, 289n.190	23:29	289, 289n.190, 439n.35
10:15	444	23:30	457
10:20	434	23:31	232
10:27ff.	456	23:32	436n.29
10:31	456	24:21	434n.22
10:32	457, 457n.106	24:33	436n.29
10:34	455–56	25:1ff.	458n.114
10:35	455	28:11ff.	439n.36
11:4–8	259n.70	28:11–24	432
11:5	289	30:7	458n.114
11:11	289	30:11	458n.114
11:19	289	30:13ff.	458n.114
12:15	454	31:15	289
13:1	454	31:31f.	436n.29
13:4	444n.53	32:5–8	444n.53, 447
		32:21f.	436n.29
		32:24–25	289
		32:33	432
		35:1	434n.22
		40:9	289, 289n.190

- | | | | |
|-----------------------------|--|------------------------------|------------------|
| 45:13 | 432n.11 | 15:6 | 787n.142 |
| 46:2 | 289, 289n.190 | 18:11 | 688n.36 |
| 46:6–47:9 | 285n.173 | 19:1–16 | 327 |
| 46:15 | 289 | 19:4 | 787n.142 |
| 48:2 | 289–90 | 28:6 | 688n.36 |
| 48:4 | 289 | 28:8–9 | 786n.139 |
| 48:9 | 289 | 32:14 | 688n.36 |
| 48:12 | 289–90 | 33:3 | 787n.142 |
| 48:13 | 289 | 44:10 | 433n.20 |
| 48:15 | 289 | 51:4 | 786n.140 |
| 48:16 | 290 | 51:6 | 786n.140 |
| 49:22–50:5 | 438n.34 | 60:1 | 688n.36 |
| 50 | 440 | 60:2 | 786n.139 |
| 50:2 | 436n.28 | 62:2 | 688n.36 |
| 50:2–5 | 435 | | |
| 50:3 | 436n.28 | <i>Pseudo-Phocylides</i> | |
| 50:3f. | 433n.17 | 228 | 612n.129 |
| 50:4 | 431n.6, 436,
436n.28 | <i>Sibylline Oracles</i> | |
| 50:5 | 289, 289n.190,
439n.35, 447, 456–
57 | 2.155 | 436n.31 |
| | | 3 | 481n.99 |
| 50:5–13 | 75n.116 | 5.251f. | 366 |
| 50:6–13 | 611 | | |
| 50:8 | 440 | <i>Testament of Asher</i> | |
| 50:12f. | 433n.17, 440, 458 | 1:3–4 | 244n.4 |
| 50:13 | 431n.6, 440 | 1:3–5 | 298, 737 |
| | | 1:3–6:6 | 264n.90 |
| <i>Life of Adam and Eve</i> | | 5:3 | 244n.4 |
| 23:3 | 738 | 6:6 | 298 |
| | | | |
| <i>Letter of Aristeeas</i> | | <i>Testament of Benjamin</i> | |
| 13 | 464 | 3:8 | 327n.8 |
| 42 | 362n.60 | 5:3 | 788n.149 |
| 84–104 | 488 | 6:1 | 244n.4 |
| | | 9:2 | 362n.55 |
| | | 10:3 | 81, 521, 769n.42 |
| <i>Odes of Solomon</i> | | | |
| 11:16 | 788n.151 | <i>Testament of Dan</i> | |
| | | 2:4 | 425 |
| <i>Psalms of Solomon</i> | | 5:12 | 350 |
| 3:12 | 769n.35 | 6:1–5 | 244n.4 |
| 17:3 | 606n.101 | 6:2 | 293n.206, 319 |
| 17:37 | 688n.36, 697 | | |
| | | <i>Testament of Gad</i> | |
| Pseudo Philo | | 5:7 | 788 |
| <i>L.A.B.</i> | | | |
| 4:1–7 | 452 | <i>Testament of Job</i> | |
| 9:8 | 787n.142 | 51:2 | 688n.36 |
| 11:1 | 787 | | |

<i>Testament of Joseph</i>		19:1	244n.4, 787n.141,
15–16	336		788n.149, 788n.152
19:3	788n.149	19:4	344, 346
<i>Testament of Judah</i>		<i>Testament of Reuben</i>	
19:4	737	1:1	327n.8
20:1ff.	522, 737	<i>Testament of Zebulun</i>	
20:1–2	225, 298, 776	9:7f.	737
20:1–3	244n.4	<i>Testament of Moses</i>	
20:1–5	80, 521	10:4	566n.154
20:1–25	770	<i>Testament of Solomon</i>	
<i>Testament of Levi</i>		2:9	781n.105
2:3	283n.164	3:5–6	781n.105
3:6	688n.36	4:12	287n.182
5	319	6:1	781n.105
5:6	293n.206	11:6	287n.182
18	342		
18:2–4	786n.140		
18:6–10	442n.46		

New Testament

<i>Matthew</i>		5:25b	653
3:1	563n.137	5:25	660n.46
3:3	512, 566	5:25f.	656n.26, 659–60
3:7–10	564	5:25–26	649–75, 651–52,
3:11	697		652n.10, 653–54,
3:12	566		657, 672–73, 675
3:14	562n.131	5:26	653–55, 659–60
5:3	32, 32n.51, 75, 613	5:28	75, 610
5:3–10	32, 64, 75, 515, 613	5:28–29	75, 514
5:3–12	613	5:29	75, 610
5:21	653	5:33–37	31, 610
5:21–22	652–54	5:33–38	600n.72
5:21–26	651, 652	5:34	75, 514
5:21–48	74, 514, 745, 760	5:43	32, 75, 514,
5:22a	653		600n.73, 613
5:22b	653	6:9f.	607
5:22c	653	6:10	30n.42
5:22	75, 610, 652–54	6:13	781n.103
5:23	653	10:32	74
5:23–24	652, 652n.10, 653–	10:32f.	605
	54	11:5	36, 76, 515, 620
5:23–26	653	12:11	31, 75, 611
5:24	653	12:14	611n.124
5:25a	653	12:24–27	780n.99

12:41f.	609	<i>Luke</i>	
12:41–42	74	1:5–25	563
13:19	780n.100, 781n.103	1:15	563
16:3	658n.40	1:31f.	615
18:9	654	1:32	616
18:15–18	65	1:32–35	76, 516
18:23–35	672, 673n.122	1:33	616
18:30	673	1:35	615–16
19:8	514	1:80	511, 563
19:28	605n.96	3:4–6	512, 566
22:16	507, 555	3:7	565
25:14–30	672	3:7–9	564
28:16–20	328	3:9	565, 566
		3:16	697
<i>Mark</i>		5:29–30	514
1:1	813	6:20	613
1:3	512, 566	6:20f.	609, 614n.135
1:3–4	73	7:22	36, 76, 515, 609,
1:4	562		620
1:6	563	7:41–42	672
1:8	697	10:18	74, 322, 609,
1:16–20	556		780n.99
2:15–17	514	11:2	30n.42, 74, 514
2:27	514, 611	11:15–19	780n.99
3:6	507, 555	11:20	30, 30n.42, 74, 514,
3:22	322		607, 609, 780n.99
3:22–26	780n.99	12:8f.	605
3:23	322	12:8–9	74
4:13–14	553	12:12–17	323
4:15	780n.100, 781n.103	12:35–48	655–56
6:52–53	71, 110, 503–4,	12:49–50	656, 658
	547–49	12:49–59	658
6:53	549	12:50	658
7:15	32, 75, 514	12:51–53	655–56
8:17	555n.110	12:52	658
10:2–9	600n.72	12:54–56	655–56, 658
10:6–9	31, 75, 610	12:54–59	658, 658n.40
10:17	769n.36	12:57	656, 658, 658n.36,
10:30	769n.36		659, 661, 661n.55,
11:25	652n.10		674
12:1–11	33, 76, 515, 615	12:57–59	652n.10, 654n.18,
12:13	507, 555		655n.23, 656–58,
12:41–44	672		658n.40, 659
12:42	660	12:58f.	659–660
14:13–14	553	12:58–59	655, 657–59, 672–
14:25	239		73
14:26	400	13:1	657
14:43	605	13:1–5	657
15:43	515	13:3–5	657

13:5f.	31, 611	5:32	784n.124
13:6–9	657	5:33	244n.7
13:15–16	75	5:35	786, 787n.144
14:3	611n.124	6:28	244n.7, 769
14:12–14	32, 514, 612	6:62	782n.112
14:21	32, 514, 612	6:63	703n.6
16:1–8	672	7:7	244n.7
16:8	80, 244n.6, 309, 521, 770, 784n.127	7:27	703n.6
17:20f.	30n.42, 607	7:28	784n.124
17:20–21	30n.42, 74, 607	8:12	244n.7, 769–70, 784n.125, 785n.132,
19:12–27	672		785n.134, 787n.142
21:2	659–60	8:14	784n.124
22:30	605n.96	8:15	703n.6
22:53	244n.7	8:23	782n.111–12
<i>John</i>		8:26	784n.124
1:1	813	8:32	782n.109
1–20	812n.98	8:42	782n.113
1:4	783n.115	8:44	323, 780n.95, 783n.124
1:5	784n.126	8:45–46	784n.124
1:9	784n.124, 785n.131, 786	8:51–52	783n.119
1:13	782	9:3	244n.7, 769
1:14	703n.6	9:4	785n.135, 787n.142
1:23	73, 512, 566	9:5	785n.132
1:26–27	562n.132	11:9	785n.135
1:28	512, 563n.137	11:25	782n.109, 783n.117
1:29–35	562n.132, 765n.18	11:26	783n.120
1:32–34	562n.131	12:36	80, 244n.6
1:33	691n.45	12:31	244n.7, 323, 780n.97
1:35–39	520, 765n.18	12:32	309
1:35–51	589	12:35	244n.7, 770
3:3	782	12:36	80, 244n.6, 521, 770, 784, 787n.142
3:6	703n.6	12:46	784n.125, 785n.134, 786
3:13	782n.113	13–17	328–29
3:19	244n.7, 783, 784n.126, 786, 787n.144	13:2	323, 780n.95, 783n.124
3:19–21	780	13:23	553n.103, 813
3:21	244n.7, 785n.133	13:27	323, 780n.94
3:27–30	562n.132,	13:31–17:26	327
3:31	782n.111–12	14:6	782n.109, 783n.117, 784n.124
3:33	784n.124	14:17	80, 521, 691n.45, 770n.49
3:36	769	14:26	691n.45, 813
4:21–23	479		
4:23	784n.124		
5:24	783n.118		
5:26	783n.116		

14:30	244n.7, 323, 780n.97	3:5 3:20	518, 570 40, 42, 78, 517, 569n.166, 749, 758
15:1	784n.124		
15–17	780	3:21	518, 570
15:25	80	3:22	518, 570
15:26	521, 691n.45, 770n.49	3:23–26 3:28	518, 571 40, 59, 78, 517, 569n.166, 749–50, 758
16:7	784n.124		
16:11	244n.7, 323, 780n.97	3:29	750
16:13	80, 521, 687n.32, 691n.45, 770n.49, 813	4:5 5:5 5:21	518, 571 683n.16 769n.36
16:13–15	687n.32	6:6	705
17:15	780n.96, 784n.124	6:22–23	769n.36
18:35	784n.124	7	631n.29, 703n.7, 740
18:37	244n.7, 784n.124		
20:22	691n.45	7–8	703n.5, 704
21:24f.	813	7:5 7:5f.	703n.7 631n.29
<i>Acts</i>		7:7–25	749
2:3	683	7:14ff.	704n.8
5:32	683n.16	7:25b	631n.29, 703n.6
5:34	38, 77, 517	8:2	687
6:7	507–8, 553, 556n.113, 592n.48	8:3 8:4–8	704n.9, 713–14 64
9:2	77, 677n.3	8:4ff.	40, 78
9:2f.	582n.9	8:5–8	518, 702
15:8	683n.16	8:5–9	518, 572
16:16	661n.54	8:5ff.	702
16:19	661n.54	8:6	687
19:24–25	661n.54	8:9	683n.16
20:17–38	328	8:11	686n.29, 687
22:3	517, 569, 573n.190, 739n.186	8:15 8:23	683n.16 687
26:4f.	739n.186	8:26	687
26:18	523, 788	8:27 8:34	687 687
<i>Romans</i>		9:3	77
1:3	702–3n.5	9:5	702n.5
1:3f.	702n.5	9:19–23	264n.89
1:3–4	56, 697	10:3	518, 570
1:4	683	11:1	77
1:17	39, 58, 78–79, 518, 570	13:12 13:12–14	523, 571 523, 788
2:7	769n.36	15:16	685
2:13	752	15:18–19	684
2:23	750	16:20	323, 780n.99

5:10	78	11:37–38	563n.139
5:16	64		
5:17	40, 78, 518, 572, 702–3, 703n.5, 704, 704n.8	<i>1 Peter</i>	
		2:9	523, 788
		5:8	323
5:18	704		
5:19	740	<i>2 Peter</i>	
6:8	769n.36	2:4	323
6:15	79	2:4f.	221n.106
6:16	807	3:15f.	813
<i>Ephesians</i>		<i>1 John</i>	
2:2	781n.105	1:6	244n.7, 769, 783n.123
4:27	323	2:4	783n.123
5:8	80, 244n.6, 521, 523, 770n.47, 784n.127, 788	2:8	784n.124, 785n.131
		2:9	785n.134
6:11	323	2:13–14	780n.96
		2:18	323, 781n.107
<i>Philippians</i>		2:21	783n.123–24
3:5	517, 569	2:27	683n.16, 783n.123– 24
3:9	40	3:8	780n.95
<i>Colossians</i>		3:10	780n.95
1:12–13	523, 788	3:12	780n.96
<i>1 Thessalonians</i>		3:14	783n.118
1:5	685	3:19	783n.124
1:5–6	684	4:2	703n.6
2:18	780n.99	4:3	323, 781n.107
4:3–8	698	4:6	80, 521, 770n.49, 782n.108
4:4	698	4:13	781n.107
4:8	683n.16, 685	5:6	783n.124
4:8f.	686n.28	5:18–19	780n.96
5:4–8	523, 788	5:19	780n.96
5:5	77, 80, 244n.6, 309, 518, 521, 570, 770, 784n.127	5:20	783n.123
5:19	684, 695	<i>2 John</i>	
5:19f.	685	1	782n.109
		4	244n.7, 769–70, 782n.109
<i>1 Timothy</i>		7	323, 703n.6, 781n.107
3:6–7	323	<i>3 John</i>	
3:16	703n.6	3	244n.7, 770
3:16–4:3	503, 547	3–4	782n.109
<i>Hebrews</i>			
7:1–12	604n.89		
8:13	793n.11		

<i>Jude</i>		12:12–17	323, 253
6	221n.106, 323	20:2	250n.33
9	309, 323	20:4–6	321
14	424	20:10	250n.33, 323
14f.	802, 830	21–22	364, 368
		21:1	321
<i>Revelation</i>		21	57–58, 323
2:9	323	21:1–22:5	365
3:9	323	21:2	350, 368
3:12	350	21:11	367
12:7–10	781n.106	21:12	366
12:7–12	253	21:16	365–66
12:9	323	21:18–21	367
12:10	323	22:18f.	813

Dead Sea Scrolls

<i>1Q–11Q</i>	148	<i>1Q32</i>	
		work	359n.43, 826n.168, 349, 826n.168
<i>1Q17</i>	288n.185	xiv–xvi	351n.8
<i>1Q18</i>	288n.185	<i>1Q39</i>	
<i>1Q19a</i>	214	1 6	688n.36
<i>1Q19</i>	214	<i>1QGenAp</i>	
		work	432n.9, 589, 636
<i>1Q21</i>		V 29	353n.11, 360n.46, 432n.9
work	281, 281n.155, 308, 322, 332n.39, 340– 42, 56	VI 10	432n.9
1 2	282n.159	VI 11	353n.11
		VI 14	353n.11
<i>1Q26</i>	314, 519, 575n.198, 665n.73, 722, 827n.170	IX 14	353n.11
		XIX 14	353n.11
		XX 16–30	602–3
		XXII 11	454n.97
<i>1Q27</i>		<i>1QH^a</i>	
work	64, 265n.96, 273n.117, 314, 519, 827n.170	work	63, 103, 411, 418n.53
1 i 3–4	265, 315	I 7	270n.109
1 i 6f.	266, 315	I 8f.	717n.83
1 i 7	265n.97, 272n.117	I 26f.	725n.121
I 2–II 10	245	I 26–27	575n.199
I 5–7	223	III 16–19	292n.201
		III 19–36	245
		III 21–23	228n.132

IV 5–V 4	245, 718n.86	VIII 30	688n.36
IV 27	693	VIII 31	718n.85
IV 29b–V 4	718n.86	VIII 33	718n.85
IV 29	715n.69	IX 9	270n.109
IV 29f.	717–19	IX 10f.	717n.83
IV 29ff.	718n.86	IX 13	693
IV 29–30	572n.180	IX 17	693
IV 31	717n.82	IX 21	515
IV 37	715n.69, 727n.134, 731n.156, 736	IX 24	693
IV 38	688n.36, 693	IX 28f.	725n.121
V 25	693	IX 28–29	575n.199
V 28–29	79	IX 30–31	693
V 30	575n.200, 727n.134, 731n.156, 736	IX 34	693
V 30–33	572n.180, 714–15c	IX 38	717n.83
V 32	693	X 10f.	605
V 35f.	715n.71	X 10–11	74
VI 11–12	268, 320	X 15	74, 605
VI 14	32n.51, 75, 613, 693	X 27f.	575n.199, 725n.121
VI 22	693	XI 14	228n.133
VI 23f.	225n.120	XI 17	319n.36
VI 24	688n.36, 695	XI 17–20	292n.201
VI 26f.	39n.82	XI 20–37	245
VI 26–27	78	XI 22	693
VI 34–35	572n.180	XI 22–24	228n.132
VI 36	694	XI 25f.	228n.133
VI 41	693	XII 6–30a	718n.86
VII	245	XII 6–XIII 6	245, 718n.86
VII 17	718n.85	XII 30b–XIII 6	718n.86
VII 26	693	XII 30	715n.69
VII 27	716n.74	XII 30f.	40, 717–19
VII 28	734n.166	XII 30ff.	718n.86
VII 32	694	XII 30–31	78, 572n.180
VII 34f.	716, 716n.73, 717n.83	XII 32	717n.82
VII 35	693	XII 39	717n.83
VIII 16	693	XIII 13	575n.200, 727n.134, 731n.156, 736
VIII 18	693	XIII 13–16	572n.180, 714
VIII 19	694	XIII 18f.	715n.71
VIII 20	688n.36, 694	XIV 11f.	225n.120
VIII 21	688n.36	XIV 11–12	268
VIII 24	693	XIV 15f.	39n.82
VIII 25	688n.36	XIV 26	693
VIII 28	693	XV	245
VIII 29	694	XV 9	693
VIII 29–30	694	XV 10	688n.36
		XV 14	716n.74
		XV 20	718n.85

XV 21	572n.180, 716, 717n.83	I 3	39, 80, 276n.131, 521, 770n.46
XV 21f.	716n.73	I 4–5	278n.138
XV 26	693	I 5	276n.131
XV 30	693	I 6–7	278n.138
XV 31	734n.166	I 7–8	276n.131
XV 32	693	I 9	39, 80, 276n.131, 521, 770n.46
XVI 13	688n.36, 693		
XVI 32	718n.85	I 9–10	278n.138
XVI 34	718n.85	I 10	276n.131
XVII 25	715n.69, 727n.134, 731n.156, 736	I 11	80, 276n.131, 521, 770n.46
XVII 32	688n.36	I 13	80, 276n.131, 521, 770n.46
XVIII 24	693		
XVIII 29f.	725n.121	I 13–14	276, 316
XVIII 29–30	575n.199	I 13–15	279, 317
XVIII 34	693	I 14	317
XIX 16	693	I 14–15	276, 316
XIX 17	74, 228n.133, 608	I 16	276n.131
XIX 28f.	228n.133, 608	II 1–6	361n.50
XIX 28–29	74	II	275
XX 13–17	608n.113, 694	II–IX	281
XX 15	688n.36	III 6	276n.131
XXI 26	693	III 9	276n.131
XXI 34	694	III 9–10	278n.138
XXIII 16	693	IV 1–2	278n.138
XXIII 29	688n.36	IV 2	276, 276n.131, 714
XXIII 33	688n.36	IV 4	278n.138, 713–14
XXV 6	693	IV 6	39n.81, 78, 518, 570n.173
XXV 8	693		
XXV 23	693	IV 12–13	278n.138
XXVI 26–28	608n.112	V 8–13	276
		VI 6	606n.101
<i>IQH^b</i>	63	VII 5f.	228, 608n.111
		IX 6–7	278n.138
<i>IQIsa^a</i>	53, 128, 418, 480n.94, 487–88, 529, 822, 822n.144	IX 15–16	276n.131
		X 6	829
		X 8–13	317
		XI 8	276n.131
<i>IQIsa^b</i>	128, 822n.144	XI 10–11	278n.138
		XI 11	276n.131
<i>IQM</i>		XII 6	276
I	245, 253, 255, 280– 81	XII 7	606n.101
		XII 11	714
I 1	39, 61, 80, 276n.131, 316, 521, 770n.46	XII 12	713, 713n.60, 714
		XIII 1–6	273
		XIII	245, 280
I 2	279–80, 317	XIII–XIV	281
		XIII 2	276n.131

XIII 4	276n.131, 277	VI 12–VI 17	609n.116
XIII 4–6	291n.200	VII 1–14	241
XIII 5	276n.131	VII	219
XIII 9b–12a	254, 278n.137, 280	VII–VIII	58
XIII 9	276n.131	VII 4–5	420, 542, 604–5, 828n.174
XIII 9–10	278n.137	VII 11	187
XIII 9–12	317	VIII 1–3	79
XIII 9–13	285n.178	XI 2–8	74, 501, 543
XIII 10	276, 279, 296, 316– 17, 770n.50	X 3	271
XIII 10–12	276n.131, 317	XI 4–8	545
XIII 11	276n.131, 290		
XIII 11–12	276, 277	<i>IQS</i>	
XIII 12	276n.131, 277, 278n.137	I 1–16	319
XIII 16	276n.131, 278n.138	I 1–II 1	270
XIV	275n.127	I 1–II 18	245
XIV 5	278n.138	I 1–III 12	310, 382, 690n.40
XIV 7	32n.51, 75, 613, 714	1–XI	381–82
XIV 7–8	278n.138	I 5	244n.7, 769, 772n.58
XIV 9	276n.131	I 8	263n.84
XIV 9–10	281	I 9	80, 521, 770n.46
XIV 17	276n.131, 281	I 9f.	32, 32n.49, 75, 613
XV–XIX	245, 279, 281	I 9–10	514
XV 1	276n.131	I 9–11	39, 518, 571
XV 2	275n.123, 278n.138, 714	I 11–III 12	62, 267, 277
XV 3	276n.131	I 11–III 13	310, 522, 594
XVII 1	276n.131	I 12	189
XVII 4–8b	254, 280	I 16	263n.84, 774n.69
XVII 5	293n.206, 319	I 16–26	267
XVII 5–6	276	I 16–II 18	75, 514
XVII 6	276n.131, 279, 316–17	I 16–III 12	257, 317, 319
XVII 6–7	276n.131	I 16–III 13	307, 318, 775, 777
XVII 7	279	I 18	273
XVIII 1	276n.131	I 19–III 12	59
XVIII 1–5	278n.138	I 24	273
XVIII 3	276n.131	II 1–4	319
XVIII 11	278n.138	II 2	270, 320
XIX 2–8	278n.138	II 2–10	267
XIX 4	713n.60	II 4	285n.178
		II 4–10	273, 319
<i>IQpHab</i>		II 4–25	291, 319
work	58, 71, 760	II 5	270, 273
II 3	500, 540n.46	II 6	270
IV 17b–V 12a	245	II 10	263n.84, 319
VI 4–5	828n.174	II 12	263n.84
		II 16	39, 521, 770n.46
		II 18	319
		II 19	273, 320

II 25–III 12	568	III 24	258, 259n.69, 266, 277, 290n.196, 294, 312–13, 521, 770n.46
III–IV	239, 771, 778		
III 2	384n.69		
III 6	695		
III 6–8	697	III 24–25	80, 259, 294
III 6–9	511, 695	III 25b–26a	254
III 6–12	390n.93	III 25	259–60, 273, 312, 521, 770n.46
III 7	688n.36, 695		
III 8	695	III 26–IV 1	259
III 8–9	695	IV 1–14	254
III 11–12	263n.84	IV 2–14	257, 259, 267, 311
III 13	80, 259, 521, 770n.46	IV 3	259
III 13–15a	255, 257, 311	IV 4–6	268
III 13–15	268n.104	IV 5f.	38n.78
III 13–18a	254	IV 5–6	507, 556
III 13–IV 14	253, 268n.104	IV 6	260, 770
III 13–IV 26	64, 77, 133, 219, 221, 245, 245n.10, 253–62, 264, 267, 267n.101, 268–69, 269n.107, 270, 270n.110, 272–73, 276–78, 288, 295– 99, 301, 306, 310, 314, 318, 382, 411, 509, 519–21, 575, 594, 597, 629, 689, 716, 728, 736n.176, 737, 771–72	IV 6–8	258, 311
III 14–IV 26	59, 79, 92	IV 7	521, 769
III 15	261n.78, 266, 315	IV 8–9	267
III 15b–18	257, 311	IV 9	259
III 15–18	258, 716n.76	IV 11	770
III 16	260	IV 12	260, 277
III 17	258n.64, 259, 312	IV	271
III 18b–23a	253–54	IV 14	268
III 18	258–60, 311, 690	IV 15	260
III 18–19	80, 273, 690, 692, 770n.50	IV 15–18	257, 261n.76, 311
III 18–IV 1	257, 311	IV 15–23a	253
III 19	260, 522	IV 16	261n.78
III 20	260, 296	IV 17	259–60, 312
III 20–21	258, 277, 312	IV 17–18	259
III 20f.	690	IV 18–23	257–58, 278, 311, 317
III 21	692, 770	IV 19	259, 312
III 21–22	258	IV 20	259n.69, 261, 313
III 23b–25a	253–54	IV 20–21	260
III 23	271n.112	IV 20–22	260, 311
		IV 20–23	609, 691, 697
		IV 20f.	716n.76
		IV 21	31, 80, 511, 521, 688n.36, 690–91, 776
		IV 21–23	694
		IV 22	225, 259, 263, 268, 320, 690n.40, 691, 776
		IV 23b–26	253
		IV 23	80, 260, 521, 691, 776
		IV 23–26	257, 259, 311

IV 24	259–60, 262, 266, 312–13	VI 6–8	427
IV 24–26	260	VI 7	384, 387
IV 25	79, 259, 312	VI 7–8	386
IV 26	225, 260–61, 268, 271, 312, 320, 776	VI 8ff.	384, 386n.75, 387
V 1	257, 310, 384n.68, 511, 594	VI 10	384, 384n.69
V–VI	390, 390n.89, 391	VI 10–13	380n.51
V–VII	383, 385	VI 12f.	384n.69
V–IX	386n.76, 594	VI 13–23	191
Vff.	391	VI 14–16	75, 612
V 2	390n.89	VI 16	384n.69
V 3	244n.7, 769, 772n.58	VI 16–20	514
V 5–6	697	VI 18	517, 570, 756n.58
V 5–8	263n.84	VI 20–23	32, 75, 612
V 7	384n.69	VI 22	380n.49
V 8	511	VI 23–VII 25	310
V 9	390n.89	VI 24f.	380n.50
V 13	380n.49	VI 25	385
V 14	511	VII 2	384n.69
V 15	829	VII 2f.	380n.50
V 16–17	511, 563	VII 13	69, 190
V 18ff.	263n.84	VII 15f.	380n.50
V 20–VI 1	384	VII 22–24	384n.69
V 21	78, 517, 570, 756n.58	VIII 1	384–85
V 23	756n.58	VIII 2	244n.7, 769, 772n.58
VI 1–8	128n.128, 369n.1, 374	VIII 3	770
VI	388–89, 389n.86, 394, 396, 398, 398n.118, 399–400	VIII 5	39, 74, 78, 228, 608
VIff.	386n.76	VIII 5–6	697
VI 1–8	384	VIII 5–10	60
VI 2	596	VIII 12–16	60, 159, 512
VI 2–3	384	VIII 13–14	567
VI 2–6	381n.54	VIII 14	566, 829
VI 2–8	383–89, 396–97	VIII 14–16	567
VI 3	59, 384	VIII 15b–IX 11	389n.88
VI 4f.	380n.48	VIII 15	512
VI 2–5	383	VIII 16	688n.36
VI 4–6	395	IX 3	688n.36
VI 4–16	32	IX 3–6	697
VI 5	386	IX 3–7	60
VI 5–9	384	IX 6	39, 78, 228, 608
VI 6	387	IX 10–11	60
VI 6–7	386	IX 10f.	609n.117
		IX 11	35n.63, 76n.121, 395, 543, 617
		IX 11–26	310
		IX 16f.	38n.78, 592n.49
		IX 16–17	72, 507, 556, 573n.191
		IX 19–20	512, 566

IX 26–X 5	62	I 26	390n.90
IX 26–XI 22	60, 310, 382, 382n.60, 719	I 27	390n.90
X 1–3	380n.45	II	374n.19, 389n.86, 391
X 10	380n.45	II 2	390n.90
X 21	270n.109, 273	II 3–9	228, 608
X 24f.	38n.78, 592n.49	II 3–11	32, 75, 391, 514, 612
X 24–25	72, 507, 556, 573n.191	II 7–8	374
X 25	39n.81, 78, 518, 570n.173	II 11	390n.90, 393, 396
XI 1	32n.51, 613	II 11–22	60, 391, 391n.94, 393, 617n.147
XI	630n.28, 651n.7	II 11f.	393
XI 2b–22	245	II 12–17	393–94
XI 3	575, 725n.123, 736	II 12–22	390
XI 3f.	719	II 17	390n.90
XI 7	719	II 17–18	394
XI 7f.	228, 608, 719	II 17–21	380n.48, 396
XI 7–8	74	II 17–22	389–98
XI 8	39, 78	II 18	390n.90
XI 9	518, 572, 713	II 18f.	394
XI 9f.	719	II 21	390n.90
XI 9ff.	736	II 21–22	393
XI 9–10	571	<i>IQSb</i>	
XI 9–12	609n.114	II 24	688n.36
XI 9–14	40, 78, 631	III 25–26	74
XI 11f.	719	III 25f.	228
XI 11–12	518	IV 25f.	606n.101
XI 11–15	571	V 20ff.	35n.63, 76n.121, 617
XI 12	39n.81, 78, 570n.173, 572	V 21	606n.101
XII 2	518	V 24–29	543
<i>IQSa</i>		<i>2Q19</i>	288n.185
I 1–3	390, 391n.94	<i>2Q20</i>	288n.185
I 1–5	390	<i>2Q23</i>	
I	396n.112	iii	351n.8
I 3	390n.93	<i>2Q24</i>	
I 4	60, 594	work	349, 359n.43, 826n.168
I 4–5	387	i	351n.8
I 4f.	396	iii 2	353n.13, 356n.25, 361, 367
I 5	391	iv	351n.8
I 6–19	391	iv 8–15	351n.8
I 6–II 11	390, 391n.94		
I 6f.	729n.145		
I 16	594		
I 19–22	391, 391n.94		
I 22–25	391		
I 25–II 3	391		

iv 11	353n.12	1-3 I 19	294n.210
iv 13	253n.16	1-3 II 1-3	570n.169
iv 15	353n.12	1-3 II 4a	294
iv 17	353n.12	II 3	414
v-vi 2	365n.75	II 3-4	421
v-vi 5	365n.75	II 14	320, 320
v-viii	352n.8	III 6	39, 78, 360n.50, 608
<i>2QS</i>	736	III 7	417
		III 8	320
<i>2QSir</i>	55	III 8-9	320
		III 11	35, 76, 76n.121, 617
<i>3Q5</i>	288n.185		
		III 15	828n.173
<i>3Q7</i>		IV 3-4	294
work	332, 334-35, 344	IV 4a	320
5 3	334		
6	334	<i>4Q175</i>	
		work	418n.53, 421, 830
<i>4Q83</i>	410n.20	5-8	35n.67, 76n.122, 618
<i>4Q88</i>	410n.20	14-20	35n.63, 35n.67, 76n.121-22, 617
<i>4Q121</i>	489n.135	23	246n.14
<i>4Q123</i>	824	<i>4Q176</i>	288n.185
<i>4Q158</i>	54, 409n.19, 419, 832n.198	<i>4Q177</i>	
I	409n.19	work	96, 103, 246, 294, 319, 420, 828
<i>4Q161</i>		1-4 8	294
8-10 iii 21-22	543	1-4 10	294
		5-6 1	294
<i>4Q171</i>		10-11 4	294
work	104	10-11 7	294
II 11	297n.221	11 9	294
III 15	542	12-13 I 5	80, 521, 770n.50
IV 7-10	745n.10	14 5	294
<i>4Q174</i>		<i>4Q179</i>	420
work	96, 103, 227, 246, 294, 319, 418n.53, 422, 828	<i>4Q180</i>	
		work	245, 271n.113, 271n.114, 272n.115
1-2 I 7	756n.58	I 1-2	258n.62
1-3 I 6	275, 294	I	271n.113
1-3 I 7	294	I 7	272n.116
1-3 I 8	294	II	271n.113-14
1-3 I 8-9	294	5	271n.113

<i>4Q180–181</i>	219	<i>4Q214</i>	
<i>4Q181</i>		work	283n.162, 332, 341n.85, 342
work	245, 269, 271, 271n.113, 272	1 3	282
1 II 1–4	271	1 3–6	282
1 II 5	225n.120, 268, 271, 320	<i>4Q215</i>	
II	271n.113	work	332, 337, 345
II 3ff.	431n.9	1–3 10	337
LIII 5	777n.81	<i>4Q216</i>	288n.185
<i>4Q184</i>	64, 245	<i>4Q217</i>	288n.185
<i>4Q186</i>	65, 246, 260, 260n.73, 313	<i>4Q218</i>	288n.185
<i>4Q208–211</i>	209, 423	<i>4Q219</i>	288n.185
<i>4Q213a</i>		<i>4Q220</i>	288n.185
work	332, 341n.85	<i>4Q221</i>	288n.185
I 13	688n.36	<i>4Q222</i>	288n.185
II 15	353n.11, 354n.18	<i>4Q223–224</i>	288n.185
III–IV 6	188, 188n.125	<i>4Q225</i>	288n.185
<i>4Q213b</i>	332, 341n.85, 342	<i>4Q225–227</i>	212, 424
<i>4Q213</i>		<i>4Q226</i>	
work	283n.162, 332, 341n.85, 342	work	288n.185
1–2 I 17	284	2 3	431n.9
1 17	283	I 5f.	431n. 9
2 8	282n.159	<i>4Q227</i>	
3 1	282n.158	work	288n.185
3 4–5	282n.159	2 2	431n.9
5 i–ii	282	<i>4Q228</i>	56
5 ii 15	282n.159	work	56, 212, 288n.185, 414, 424, 431n.9, 826
8	284	1 I 1	414
8 2–5	284	1 I 2	431n.9
8 10	284	1 I 8	298n.225
<i>4Q213–214</i>	281, 281, 281n.155, 308, 340–42	1 I 9	414
<i>4Q214a</i>	332, 341n.85, 342	2 I 4	431n.9
<i>4Q214b</i>	332, 341n.85, 342	2 I 6	431n.9

<i>4Q232</i>	349n.1	<i>4Q261</i>	
		3–5	383n.65
<i>4Q242</i>	57, 603	5–6	383n.65
<i>4Q243</i>		<i>4Q263</i>	
work	207, 207n.45	3–4	383n.65
24	207n.46		
<i>4Q243–245</i>	207, 421	<i>4Q265</i>	
		work	442n.46
<i>4Q244</i>	207	1 3	828n.173
<i>4Q245</i>		<i>4Q266</i>	
work	207, 207n.46–47	XI 18–21	217n.94
2	207n.43, 247n.47	<i>4Q267</i>	
<i>4Q246</i>		17 I 6–9	32n.47, 228n.135, 608n.111
work	35n.63, 57, 76, 208, 208n.50, 208n.54, 276n.132, 278n.138, 421, 516, 615–17	<i>4Q270</i>	
II 1	616	2 ii 11	688n.36
II 2	616	<i>4Q274</i>	
II 4–5	208n.53	1 I 8f.	433n.18
<i>4Q247</i>	55, 211, 417, 424, 431n.9, 830	<i>4Q280</i>	
<i>4Q249^{a-i}</i>	389n.86, 390, 390n.94	work	246, 319
<i>4Q252</i>		2	273, 285n.178
work	417, 821n.140	2 2	291, 319, 777n.82
1 V 3	35n.63, 617	2 4–5	268
1 V 3f.	606n.101	<i>4Q285</i>	
<i>4Q253</i>		work	274n.122
4 4	246n.14, 297n.221	5 1–2	543n.60
<i>4Q258</i>		5	501n.14, 543
2 I 6–7	567n.156	5 4	543, 543n.60
II 2–7	383n.65	5 5	543n.60
II 2–10		<i>4Q286</i>	
II 7–10	383n.65	work	246, 319
<i>4Q259</i>		1 5	319
3 5–6	567n.156	1 7	273, 319
		7 I 5	606n.101
		7 ii 1–13	290n.192, 319, 777n.82
		7 ii 2	290n.192
		7 ii 3–4	290n.192
		7 ii 5	290n.192
		7 ii 6	290n.192
		7 ii 7	290n.192

<i>4Q286–290</i>	62	<i>4Q376</i>	617
<i>4Q287</i>		<i>4Q380–381</i>	62
work	246	<i>4Q384</i>	212n.75
10 13	688n.36	<i>4Q385a</i>	
<i>4Q299</i>		work	212n.75
work	245, 827n.170	13	290n.191
2a–c ii 5	273n.117	20	290n.191
<i>4Q299–301</i>	64, 265n.96, 314, 519	40	290n.191
<i>4Q300</i>		41	290n.191
work	245, 273n.117, 827n.170	42	290n.191
3–6	272n.117	44	290n.191
4–6	223	<i>4Q385b</i>	214
<i>4Q301</i>		<i>4Q385c</i>	214
work	574, 574n.193, 721n.98, 722n.102, 827n.170	<i>4Q385</i>	
5 3	575n.200, 715n.67, 722, 734, 734n.166	work	214
<i>4Q306</i>		II	56
work	721n.98	<i>4Q386</i>	
1 4	722n.104	work	214
<i>4Q318</i>	65	1 ii 3	246n.14
<i>4Q327</i>		<i>4Q387a</i>	
1–3		1	290n.191
<i>4Q364–367</i>	54, 409n.19, 419, 832n.198	2	290n.191
<i>4Q365a</i>		3	290n.191
work	357n.35	5	290n.191
2 ii 1–4	357n.35	<i>4Q387</i>	
2	357n.35	work	212n.75
<i>4Q365</i>	357n.35	3 ii 3–4	431n.9
<i>4Q371–373</i>	336n.57	3 iii 4	290n.192
<i>4Q375</i>	617	<i>4Q388a</i>	
		work	212n.75
		1	290n.191
		2	290n.191
		3	290n.191
		4	290n.191
		6	290n.191
		9	290n.191
		17	290n.191
		19	290n.191

<i>4Q388</i>	214	<i>4Q413</i>	245
<i>4Q389</i>		<i>4Q415</i>	575n.198, 665n.73
work	212n.75	<i>4Q415–418</i>	314, 519, 574, 722
1	290n.191	<i>4Q415ff.</i>	726n.132
2	290n.191		
8	290n.191	<i>4Q416</i>	
9	290n.191	work	575n.198, 665n.73, 665n.75, 723, 733
<i>4Q390</i>		1	723, 727, 727n.138
work	212n.75, 245, 280– 90	1 10–13	223, 727–28
1 2		1 12	731–32, 735
1 7	431n.9	1 12–13	519, 574
1 11	290n.192	1 16	730–31
2 1 4	290, 431n.9	1 II 4–6	668n.92
2 1 7	290n.192	1 II 17–18	667n.85
<i>4Q391</i>		2 I 5	265
work	214	2 II 2f.	726, 734
8		2 II 3	666n.81
<i>4Q392</i>		2 II 6	667n.85, 688n.36
1 I 4–7	786n.139	2 II 18–20	667n.83
<i>4Q394</i>	755	2 II 20–21	666
<i>4Q394–399</i>	570	2 II 21	698
<i>4Q396</i>	420	2 III 2	666n.82
<i>4Q397a</i>	212n.75	2 III 5–6	667n.86, 672n.117
<i>4Q397</i>	420	2 III 8	666n.82, 667n.83
<i>4Q398</i>		2 III 9	666n.81
2 ii 2–3	570n.168	2 III 9–12	666
14 ii 5	297n.219	2 III 12	666n.80, 666n.82
<i>4Q399</i>		2 III 12–13	666
1 I 10–11	570n.169	2 III 14	265
<i>4Q400–407</i>	688n.36	2 III 19	666n.82
<i>4Q411</i>		2 III 21	726
work	96n.57, 721n.98	2 IV 4	726
1 11	722n.104	<i>4Q416–418</i>	721n.98
<i>4Q412</i>	96n.57	<i>4Q417</i>	
		work	575n.198, 665n.73, 665n.75, 723, 725n.126, 733, 827n.170
		1	723, 729
		1 I 6f.	729
		1 I 8	315
		1 I 10–11	265

1 I 13–15	223n.113	103 I 9	725
1 I 13–18	314	103 II 9	726
1 I 13ff.	731	127 4–6	223n.113
1 I 15	729	161	665n.73
1 I 15f.	223n.113	201	728n.138
1 I 15ff.	732, 735		
1 I 15–18	315, 574n.195, 729	<i>4Q418a</i>	314, 575n.198, 665n.73, 722, 723n.106, 827n.170
1 I 16	730n.146, 730n.148, 734n.166		
1 I 17	667n.83, 731–32		
1 I 17f.	730	<i>4Q418c</i>	575n.198, 665n.73, 723n.106, 827n.170
1 I 18	730n.148		
1 II 4	726, 734		
1 II 12	725, 731, 735	<i>4Q419</i>	
1 II 14	725	work	726n.132
2	723, 729	8 ii 7	726n.132, 734
2 I 8	266, 725n.121		
2 I 15–17	734n.166	<i>4Q420–421</i>	664n.68, 724n.116
2 I 15–18	265, 574n.195		
2 I 15ff.	740	<i>4Q422</i>	
2 I 17	732	I 7	688n.36
2 I 19	667n.84		
2 I 21–23	668n.88	<i>4Q423</i>	314, 519, 575n.198, 665n.73, 722, 827n.170
2 I 24	668n.90		
2 I 24ff.	668n.87		
2 II 12	731n.153, 735		
2 II 14	725	<i>4Q425</i>	96n.57
3 4	725		
<i>4Q418</i>		<i>4Q426</i>	
work	575n.198, 665n.73, 665n.75, 666n.82, 723, 723n.106, 727n.138, 733, 827n.170	work	96n.57, 721n.98
		4 4	722n.104
1–2	728n.138	<i>4Q427</i>	718n.87
2 8	575n.199, 730	<i>4Q429</i>	718n.87
8 1	726–27, 734		
8 6	688n.36	<i>4Q432</i>	718n.87
10 6	726	<i>4Q434</i>	
19 4	725	1 I 11	688n.36
43 4	729, 730n.148	II 2–3	79
55 10	575n.199, 725n.121	<i>4Q434–438</i>	62
69 II 6–14	223n.113		
76 1–3	688n.36	<i>4Q444</i>	
81 1–2	519, 574, 727n.135	1–41 + 5 1	688n.36
81 1f.	728, 732, 736	6 4	770n.50
81 9	727n.137		
101 II 5	726	<i>4Q448</i>	65

<i>4Q471</i>	274n.122, 275, 316	<i>4Q493</i>	275, 316
<i>4Q471b</i>	61, 274–75, 316	<i>4Q494</i>	274
<i>4Q473</i> work	264n.90	<i>4Q495</i>	274
1 3	737	<i>4Q496</i>	274
<i>4Q477</i>	50, 65, 148, 189	<i>4Q497</i>	274n.122
<i>4Q481a</i>	418	<i>4Q498</i> 14–17 ii 2–3	517
<i>4Q482</i>	418	<i>4Q500</i>	33, 76, 515, 615
<i>4Q484</i> work	332, 334–35, 334n.48, 344	<i>4Q502</i> 16	268
1 1	334	<i>4Q504</i> 1 + 2 v recto 11–18	688n.36
7	334	4 5	688n.36
<i>4Q491</i> work	274n.122, 275, 316, 501, 516	<i>4Q504–506</i>	62
11 I	35n.68, 618	<i>4Q506</i> 131–132 11	688n.36
11 I 10–14	76	<i>4Q507–509</i>	62
11 II 17	606n.101	<i>4Q510</i> work	245, 292
<i>4Q491a</i>	274n.122	1 4–6	292
<i>4Q491b</i>	274n.122	1 6–7	292n.203
1	275n.125	<i>4Q510–511</i>	63
2	275n.125	<i>4Q511</i> work	245, 292
3	275n.125	2 i 7f.	292
4	275n.125	iii 2–3	268, 358
5	275n.125	<i>4Q513</i> 13 4	190
6	275n.125	<i>4Q521</i> work	9, 36, 76, 515–16, 603, 609n.118, 620
7	275n.125	2 II + 4 1	619
16	275n.125	2 II 1	35n.66, 36, 214, 515, 618
17	275n.125		
19	275n.125		
20	275n.125		
21	275n.125		
23	275n.125		
<i>4Q491c</i>	274n.122		
<i>4Q491–496</i>	61, 274, 316		
<i>4Q492</i>	274		

2 II 6–13	515	<i>4Q540</i>	341n.85, 540
<i>4Q524</i>	826n.169	<i>4Q540–541</i>	56, 281, 281n.155, 332, 340–42, 345
<i>4Q525</i> work	32, 64, 75, 515, 613, 721n.98	<i>4Q541</i> work	76, 341, 341n.85, 618
8 5	722n.104	2 i 6	341n.88
<i>4Q529</i>	214	2 i 9	341n.89
<i>4Q532</i> 1–6 ii 2–5	573n.187	2 ii 4	282
<i>4Q534</i> 1 I 10	617	7 4	341n.90
<i>4Q537</i> work	281n.155, 332–34, 345	9 i 1–7	282
1–3 1	333	9 i 2	341n.90, 341n.91
1–3 4	333–34	9 i 2–3	282
1–3	333	9 i 3–4	341n.92
5 1–3	333n.45	9 i 3–5	786n.140
5	333	24 ii 5	341
12	334	<i>4Q542</i> work	56, 213, 281, 308, 332, 340, 345
12 2–3	333	1 I 1	282n.159
14 2–3	333n.43	1 I 1–4	340
24 2	333n.43	1 I 4	340
<i>4Q538</i> work	332, 335–36	1 I 4–13	282n.159
1 6	335n.54	1 I 8	340
1–2	335	1 I 8–9	282
1–2 1	335n.52	1 I 8–13	282
1–2 3	335n.51	1 I 10	80, 521
1–2 5	335n.52	1 I 11	340
1–2 7	335n.51, 335n.52	1 I 11	340
1–2 8	335n.53	1 I 13	282, 340
<i>4Q539</i> work	332, 336–37, 346	1 I 5	282, 340
1 1	336	1 II 5–8	282
1 2	336	1 II 8	284, 309, 340
2–3	336, 336n.60	1 II 9	340
2–3 2	336n.59	1 II 9–11	282
5	336	1 II 9–13	282n.159
5 3	336n.61	1 II 10	282
		<i>4Q543</i> work	338
		1a–c 1	338n.71
		1 1	213, 298n.224
		1 I 10	
		<i>4Q543–548</i>	56, 282, 284n.172, 308

<i>4Q543–549</i>	332	<i>4Q552–553</i>	57, 208, 421
<i>4Q544</i>		<i>4Q554</i>	
work	285, 308	work	349, 350n.5, 359n.43
1	339n.74	1 i 9–22	365
1 1–8	282	1 i 16	253n.14
2 3	308	1 i 20	253n.14
<i>4Q545</i>		1 i 22	253n.14
work	282, 338	1 ii 7	253n.14
1a–b ii 11–19	339n.74	1 ii 9	253n.14
1 1	213	1 ii 9–22	365n.78
4	339n.75	1 ii 10	253n.14
<i>4Q546</i>		1 ii 12	253n.14
work	285n.174, 338	1 ii 15	253n.16
2 1	285, 353n.11	1 ii 18	253n.14
2 3	285	1 ii 21	253n.14
12	339n.75	1 iii 15	253n.14
14 4	339n.76	1 iii 16	253n.14
<i>4Q547</i>		2 iii	350n.5
1 6	282	2 iii 15–22	354
1 6–7	282n.159	<i>4Q554–555</i>	826n.168
1 ii 8	286, 309	<i>4Q554a</i>	349
1 ii 12–14	286, 309	<i>4Q555</i>	349, 350n.2, 359n.43
<i>4Q548</i>		<i>4Q560</i>	603
work	282	<i>4Q561</i>	65, 260n.73
1 ii–2 6	339n.77	<i>4Q580–582</i>	331n.37
1 ii–2 8f.	213	<i>4QAmram^{a-f}</i>	284n.172
1 ii–2 10f.	213	<i>4QAmram^b</i>	283, 285, 308
1 ii–2 15f.	213	<i>4QAmram^f</i>	39n.80, 286, 309
1–2 ii 8–9	80, 521, 770n.48	<i>4QAmram</i>	290, 291n.200, 292, 296, 296n.213, 298n.224
1–2 ii 10–11	80, 521, 770n.48	<i>4QApocrLevi^{a-b}</i>	332, 341, 341n.86
1–2 ii 15–16	80, 521, 770n.48	<i>4QApocryphon of Joseph^{a-c}</i>	
I 10	39n.80		
I 13	39n.80		
I 16	39n.80		
<i>4Q549</i>			
work	308, 338n.70, 339		
2 6	339n.78		
<i>4Q550</i>	823n.148		
<i>4Q550–575</i>	331n.37		
<i>4Q552</i>	208		

work	336n.57	<i>4QJer^b</i>	831
<i>4QApocryphon of Joseph^b</i>		<i>4QJer^c</i>	831
work	336	<i>4QJer^d</i>	831
<i>4QBerakhot^{a-e}</i>	62	<i>4QJub^a</i>	
<i>4QCatena A</i>	294	IV	443n.48
		IV 6	434n.24
<i>4QD^a</i>		<i>4QJub^b</i>	
work	270n.110	1–2	443n.48
18 V 20	60	<i>4QLev^{a-f} ar</i>	56
<i>4QD</i>	70, 155, 269n.108	<i>4QLev^{c-d}</i>	282n.155
<i>4QD^{a-h}</i>	60	<i>4QLev–Num</i>	825n.158
<i>4QDeut^j</i>	419	<i>4QLXXDeut</i>	829n.175
<i>4QEn^a ar</i>	55, 210	<i>4QLXXLev^a</i>	829n.175
<i>4QEn^c ar</i>	210, 825n.160	<i>4QLXXNum</i>	489n.135, 829n.175
<i>4QEn^a astr^a</i>	209, 423	<i>4QM</i>	95, 273–74
<i>4QExod–Lev^f</i>	54, 410, 825n.158	<i>4QM^a</i>	
<i>4QGenExod^a</i>	825n.158	work	61, 95n.52, 275, 316
<i>4QGenExod^b</i>	825n.158	5–6 1	281
<i>4QGenGiantsb</i>		8–10	275n.127
1 II 6	353n.11	8–10 I 6–7	281
		8–10 I 14	281
		11 I 10–14	76
<i>4QFlorilegium</i>		<i>4QM^{a-g}</i>	61, 274
work	294, 418n.53	<i>4QM^b</i>	274–75
1–3 II 1–3	570n.170	<i>4QM^c</i>	
<i>4QH^a</i>	718n.87	work	275, 316
<i>4QH^c</i>	718n.87	13	275
<i>4QH^{a-f}</i>	63	<i>4QM^d</i>	274–75
<i>4QInstruction^e</i>	723n.106	<i>4QM^e</i>	61, 274
<i>4QInstruction^f</i>	723n.106	<i>4QM^f</i>	274
<i>4QJer^a</i>	831		

<i>4QM^g</i>	61, 274n.122, 316	7	755
		9–10	761
<i>4QM^h</i>	275	13–14	755
III 7	570n.170, 756n.58	20	755
		21	220n.103
<i>4QMidrEschat</i>		26–27	570n.168
work	292–95, 297	27	78, 748, 756
II 14–15	294	27–31	42n.92
III 6	39, 74, 78, 227, 275, 294, 360, 608	29	297n.219
III 7	227, 294, 570n.170, 756n.58	31–32	757, 759
III 8	294	<i>4QMMT</i>	
III 8–9	294	work	41, 58, 74, 220, 297
IV 4a	294	vi 7–8	755
VIII 1	294	vii 13	748, 756
IX 4	294	vii 19	755
IX 7	294	viii 2–4	761
IX 9–10	294	viii 6–7	755
X 5	294	viii 17–18	757, 759
X 10	294	14–17 ii 2–3	517
XI 12	294	<i>4QMyst^b</i>	
XI 14	294	3 6	272n.117
<i>4QMišmarot A</i>		<i>4QMyst^c</i>	
2 I 5f.	431n.9	work	574, 722n.102
4 II 10–13	431n.9	5 3	734, 734n.166
<i>4QMMT^{a-f}</i>	570	<i>4QNum^b</i>	419, 479n.90
<i>4QMMT^e</i>		<i>4QpalaeoGen–Exod</i>	
2 ii 2–3	570n.168	work	825n.158
14–17 ii 5	246n.14	<i>4QpalaeoEx^m</i>	479n.90
<i>4QMMT^f</i>		<i>4QpalaeoJob^a</i>	54, 410
1 I 10–11	570n.169	<i>4QpalaeoLev</i>	419
<i>4QMMT A</i>	58, 755	<i>4Qpap cryptA</i>	389n.87
<i>4QMMT B</i>		<i>4QpGen^b</i>	
work	58, 427, 754, 757– 58, 760	4 4	246n.14
55	514	<i>4QpIsa^d</i>	
55–58	69, 190	6f.	
65	514	<i>4QpNah</i>	
73	514	3–4 I 4–9	79
<i>4QMMT C</i>			
work	59, 427		

3-4 I 6-9	515	<i>4QS</i> ^g	
		2a-c	383n.65
<i>4QpPs</i> 37		<i>4QS</i> ⁱ	
work	760	4-5	383n.65
ii 1-IV 18	245, 745n.10		
iv 7-10		<i>4QTestLevi</i> ^a	283n.164
<i>4QpPs</i> ^a		<i>4QTestLevi</i>	286n.179
work	59, 104		
II 11	297n.221	<i>4QTestimonia</i>	
III 15	542	work	389n.88, 418n.53, 421, 425
III 15-17	74, 604	14-20	617
XXVII 2-11		23	246n.14
<i>4QPsDaniel</i> ^{a-c}	57	<i>4QTgLev</i>	829
<i>4QPs</i> ^e	831n.190	<i>4QTgJob</i>	829
<i>4QPsEzek</i> ^b		<i>4QTohorot A</i>	
1 ii 3	246n.14	1 I 8f.	433n.18
<i>4QPsJub</i> ^a		<i>4QXII</i> ^a	54
work	56	<i>5Q11</i>	257, 310
1:7	79	<i>5Q15</i>	
<i>4QPsMos</i> ^{a-e}	290n.191	work	349, 359n.43, 826n.168
<i>4QS</i>	70, 310, 319	1 4f.	364
<i>4QS</i> ^{a-j}	59, 245n.12, 257, 310	1 i 8	253n.16
<i>4QS</i> ^c	257, 690n.40	1 i 10	253n.16
<i>4QS</i> ^d		1 i 15	253n.16
work	257, 257n.57, 310, 690n.40, 775	1 i 17	253n.14
2 I 6-7	567n.156	1 i 18	253n.14
II 7-10	383n.65	1 ii 2-5	364
<i>4QS</i> ^e		1 ii 6	253n.14
work	257, 310, 690n.40, 775	1 ii 12	253n.14
3 5-6	567n.156	10	253n.14
<i>4QSam</i> ^b	54, 410	13	253n.14
<i>4QSerekh ha-'Edah</i> ^{a-i}		i	351n.8
work	389n.86	i 1-2	351n.8
		ii	351n.8
		ii-iii	351n.8
		ii 2-5	361n.53
		ii 4-5	361n.53
		<i>11Q11</i>	603

<i>11Q14</i>	274n.122	<i>11QApPs^a</i>	
		work	62, 245, 255, 286–88, 292, 297, 603
<i>11Q17</i>	688n.36	I 4–5	287
<i>11Q18</i>		I 5	287
work	253n.13, 349, 352n.8, 361, 826n.168–69	I 6	287
I 6–7	253n.13	II 6	287
VI 1	253n.13	II 7–8	287
V 5	253n.15	III 3	287
VIII 24	253n.15	III 5	287
XIII 6		IV 3	287
<i>7Q1</i>	489n.135, 503	IV 4–V 3	287
<i>7Q2</i>	55, 503, 826	IV 5	287
		IV 6	287
<i>7Q4</i>	424, 504, 549	IV 9	287
<i>7Q5</i>		IV 12	287
work	71, 110, 503–4, 548–49, 591	V 3–14	287
2	549	<i>11QMelchizedek</i>	
<i>7Q8</i>	424	work	35, 76, 219, 246, 253, 285n.178, 292–95, 308, 319, 418n.53, 419, 432n.10, 516, 618, 828
<i>7Q12</i>	424	II 2–6	293, 319
<i>7QEn</i>	416, 829	II 5–7	240
<i>7QpapLXXExod</i>	489n.135, 829n.175	II 7	293, 319, 432n.9
<i>11Q19</i>		II 8	293, 319
work	214	II 12	290, 293, 319
XLVI 13–16	552	II 13	293, 319
<i>11Q19</i>	214	II 13–14	293, 319
<i>11Q20</i>	826n.169	II 15–16	293, 319
<i>11Q21</i>		II 18	293n.208
work	36, 281, 281n.155, 308, 332, 332n.39, 340–41, 826n.169	<i>11QNJ</i>	
I 2	282n.159	1–7	351n.8
		<i>11QPs^a</i>	
		work	54–55, 62, 112, 408, 409n.19, 415, 422–23, 826–27, 831
		XIX 15–16	283n.165
		XXIV 12	283n.165
		XXVII 2–11	415
		<i>11QPs^b</i>	831

<i>11QT^a</i>		II 6	268, 270n.109, 270n.111, 277
work	57–58, 357, 450n.79	II 6–7	268
II	356	II 7	225n.120, 268, 320
XXI 3–10	388	II 7–8	270n.109
XXI 4–10	388	II 9f.	217
XXVII 11	828	II 12–13	688n.36
XXIX 9	361	II 14–VI 11	269
XXX 3–XXXI 9	361n.53	II 15f.	221
XL 11f.	433n.18	III 20–IV 2	414
XLIII 3	388	IV 10–13	294, 320
XLIII 7–9	388	IV 12–VI 11	245, 270
XLV 21	32n.47, 608n.111	IV 13	218, 219n.99, 271, 318, 829
XLV 26	32n.47, 608n.111	IV 14–18	425
XLVI	514	IV 15	218, 271, 318
XLVI 6–9	515	IV 21	75
XLVI 13–16	506, 552	V 11	688n.36
LVff.	366	V 17c–19	254
LV 3	246n.14	V 17–19	270, 318
LXIV 6–13	79	V 18	296n.212
LXIV 11–13	515	VI 13–14	417
<i>11QT^b</i>	450n.79,	VI 19	500, 540n.46
<i>11QT^c</i>	450n.79	VII 4	688n.36
<i>11QTgLev</i>	829	VII 6–8	594
		VII 18–20	77
		VIII 2–3	271, 318
		VIII 21	500, 540n.46
		VIII 21–XVI 19	269n.108
<i>Aramaic Levi Document</i>		X 6	729n.145
81	343, 344n.108, 346	XI 13–14	75
82ff.	344	XI 19–21	417
<i>CD</i>		XI 21–XII 2	433n.18
I	218	XI 23–XIII 1	395n.110, 609n.117
I 1–II 1	269, 318	XI 31f.	31, 611
I 1–VIII 21	269n.108	XI 33–XX 1	609n.117
I–VIII	60	XII 2	218, 271, 318
I 3f.	218	XII 3–4	75n.116
I 5	218n.96	XII 3f.	611
I 9	39n.83, 78	XII 11–15	564n.141
I 9f.	218	XII 12–15	511
I 10–11	760	XII 15–17	69, 190
I 11	217	XII 22–XII 1	35n.63, 617
II 2	270n.110, 318, 777n.81	XIII 2f.	385
II 2–13	245, 268n.104, 269–70, 318, 522, 777, 777n.81	XIV 6	380n.51
II 5	777n.81	XIV 6–8	729n.145
		XIV 18	35n.63, 617
		XIV 18f.	609n.117
		XIV 19	395n.110

XV 1	610	XX 1	35n.63, 395n.110, 617
XV 1–2	31, 75, 610	XX 12	540n.46
XV 6–8	75, 610	XX 13–14	74
XVI 2	217	XX 13–15	240
XVI 2–4	415	XX 13f.	270n.110, 604n.90
XVI 3–4	212n.72, 288, 290, 424, 826	XX 14	217, 219
XVI 5	218, 271n.112, 290	XX 15	217, 609n.116
XIX 1–XX 34	269n.108	XX 33f.	219
XIX–XX	60	<i>Ostrakon 1</i>	148
XIX 10f.	35n.63, 395n.110, 617	<i>Wadi Murraba 'at</i>	
XIX 14	271, 318	45 6	46, 188
XIX 33–34	540n.46	Nahal Hever	
XIX 33–XX 1	35, 76, 516	8HevXIIgr	410n.23, 420, 829
XIX 35–XX 1	74, 270n.110, 604n.90		

Philo

<i>Apologia pro Ioudaeis.</i>			378n.30, 633,
work	67–68, 169, 172, 379	1	794n.12
11.1	379n.37	27	187n.120, 378n.29
11.5	379n.38		381n.52
11.10f.	379n.39	<i>De opificio mundi</i>	
18	181	29–35	786n.139
<i>De ebrietate</i>		<i>De providentia</i>	170n.34
69f.	712n.49	<i>De specialibus legibus</i>	
87	712n.49	1.67	492
<i>De gigantibus</i>		3.208f.	612n.129
9	711n.49	4.122f.	712n.49, 712n.50
12	711n.49	4.164	606n.99
19f.	712n.50	<i>Hypothetica</i>	551n.88
19:29ff.	711n.47	<i>Legum Allegoriae</i>	
29	573n.186	2:49f.	711n.47, 712n.49
29ff.	712	3:151f.	711n.49
32	711n.47	3:152	712n.49
40	712n.49	3:158	712n.49
64	711n.47	3:233	807n.68
<i>De vita contemplativ</i>		55	711n.49
work	67, 166n.13, 169n.33, 182, 378,	55f.	712n.49
		140ff.	711n.47

141–143	712n.49	75–91	67–68, 169, 181, 379n.35
<i>Quod deterius potiori insidari soleat</i>		78	171
84f.	711n.47, 712n.49– 50	78–87	68
		85f.	379n.35
		89f.	181n.92
<i>Quod Deus sit immutabilis</i>		91	169n.29
2	711n.47, 712n.50		
		<i>Quis rerum divinarum heres sit?</i>	
<i>Quod omnis probus liber sit</i>		55f.	711n.47, 712n.50
work	378	66	712n.53
12	187n.120	68ff.	712n.53
75	68, 169n.29, 171, 192, 507, 554n.107	267f.	712n.49
		274	711n.49, 712n.49

Josephus

<i>Antiquitates Iudaicae</i>		XII 261	472n.59
I 22–147	452	XII 263	472n.59
II 188	481n.99	XII 387	483, 483n.109
IV 200–201	492	XII 388	480, 483, 488n.133
V 145	505	XIII 62–72	483
X 49	807	XIII 62–73	480
X 236	480	XIII 63	483, 487
XI 165	362n.58	XIII 65–68	483
XI 262–264	472n.59	XIII 67	488n.133
XI 302f.	473	XIII 68	487
XI 302–324	474	XIII 69–71	483
XI 302–347	473	XIII 74–79	486n.120
XI 303	476	XIII 171	67, 179n.80
XI 308	473	XIII 171–173	170, 177, 179n.81
XI 311f.	473	XIII 171f.	67
XI 317–320	473	XIII 254ff.	473
XI 321–323	473	XIII 285	480
XI 324f.	473	XIII 287	480n.95
XI 334	476n.76	XIII 298	178n.71
XI 340–344	474n.64	XIII 304–306	178n.76
XI 344	472n.58	XIII 311–313	67, 171–172, 177, 564n.146
XII 72	484		
XII 74–79	479	XIII 311	177–78
XII 229–236	489n.137	XIV 131	480
XII 234	489	XIV 235	674n.123
XII 237	483n.109	XV 121–147	505n.33, 551n.89
XII 237–239	483	XV 371	143
XII 251	458n.109	XV 371f.	177
XII 258	472	XV 371–379	67
XII 258–261	472n.59	XV 371ff.	181

XV 372	177	II 119–161	67–69, 170, 179–82, 379
XV 373–378	551n.90, 505, 551n.90	II 119–165	179n.81
XV 373–379	171, 177–78, 564n.146	II 119–166	174
XV 373ff.	177	II 119ff.	181
XV 378	181n.92	II 120f.	182n.97
XV 379	178	II 121	172
XVII 20	182n.97	II 122	69, 182n.97
XVII 41–42	554n.107	II 123	182n.97
XVII 41–43	179n.78	II 124	505, 551n.88
XVII 42	192	II 125	171
XVII 345–348	171, 177, 564n.146	II 128	69, 183–84
XVII 346–368	67	II 129	379n.41, 379n.42, 381n.53
XVIII	180n.87, 182, 182n.97	II 130f.	379n.43
XVIII 9	179	II 131	379
XVIII 11	170, 179n.80	II 132f.	380n.44
XVIII 14–18	179n.81	II 133	380n.47
XVIII 18	182n.97	II 136	187n.120, 602n.82
XVIII 18–22	67, 69, 170, 182	II 137–139	191
XVIII 19	172, 178, 178n.72	II 137f.	170n.39
XVIII 20	69, 192, 507, 554n.107	II 139	182n.97
XVIII 22	182n.97	II 141	38n.78, 72, 507, 556, 573, 573n.191, 592n.49
XVIII 23	179	II 143	511, 563
XVIII 116	564	II 147	69, 190
XVIII 116–119	564	II 148	148
XIX 354	483n.109	II 150f.	183n.102
XX 236	480	II 152f.	171, 181n.92
<i>Bellum Iudaicum</i>		II 154	183n.102
I 33	480, 488n.133	II 154–158	182n.97
I 62	473	II 154f.	183
I 78	177n.68, 178	II 159	171n.42, 177, 182n.97
I 78–80	67, 171–72, 177–78, 564n.146	II 160f.	172, 182n.97
I 190	480	II 220	483n.109, 483n.109
I 370–380	505n.33, 551n.89	II 273	673n.118, 673n.119
I 407	361n.54	II 425–429	672n.111
II	180n.87, 182, 182n.97, 183–84, 190	II 566–568	67
II 11–113	67	II 567	69, 171
II 112f.	171	III 9–12	67
II 113	564n.146	III 11	69
II 118	179	IV 477–478	47
II 119	179n.80	IV 659–VI 322	175n.61
		V 142–145	67
		V 145	72, 505, 552
		VI 423	385n.72
		VI 60–61	672n.111

VII 425	487n.126	10	179n.80, 179n.81
VII 426	479n.94, 480	10f.	379n.40
VII 426ff.	484n.110	10–12	67, 170
VII 426–436	480	11	565n.151
VII 428	488n.133	341f.	175n.61
VII 432	487	358	175n.61
VII 436	484	<i>Contra Apionem</i>	
XX 200–203	545	I 37–41	794n.12
		I 37–42	406
<i>Vita</i>		II 189	380n.47
8–12	170, 176	II 193	492

Rabbinic Literature

<i>b. Baba Batra</i>		9:5	244n.5, 262
14b	416		
14b–15a	406	<i>m. Megillah</i>	
15a	416	4:3	385n.72
16a	244n.5		
<i>b. Giṭṭin</i>		<i>m. Menahot</i>	
88b	674n.123	13:10	481n.100, 489n.134
<i>b. Megillah</i>		<i>m. Middot</i>	
3b	385n.72	4:5	361n.53
7a	823n.148, 834n.206	<i>m. Qiddušin</i>	
<i>b. Menahot</i>		1:1	660n.48
109b	481n.100	<i>m. Sanhedrin</i>	
<i>b. Niddah</i>		1:3	385n.72
31b	738n.183	<i>m. Tamid</i>	
<i>b. Sanhedrin</i>		7:4	769n.37
107a	244n.5	<i>m. Yadayim</i>	
<i>b. Šabbat</i>		3:2–5	406
28b	442n.47	3:5	834
89a	244n.5	4:6	406
<i>b. Yoma</i>		Eighteen	
20a	244n.5	Benedictions	34n.59
<i>m. 'Abot</i>		<i>Qaddish</i>	34n.59
3:6	385n.72		
<i>m. Berakot</i>		<i>Mechilta d'Rabbi Ismael</i>	
7:3	385n.72	On Exodus	
		18:27	769n.37

<i>Pesiqta Rabbati</i>		<i>t. 'Eduyyot</i>	
29	566n.154	1:1	834n.203
30	566n.154		
33	566n.154	<i>t. Menahot</i>	
		13:12–15	481n.100
<i>Rabbah Genesis</i>		<i>t. Pesahim</i>	
3:8	786n.139	4:3	385n.72
20:7	738n.183		
34:9	442n.47	<i>t. Yadayim</i>	
		2:14	834n.206
<i>Rabbah Leviticus</i>		<i>y. Yoma</i>	
1:14	566n.154	6:3	481n.100
<i>Rabbah Deuteronomy</i>			
4:11	566n.154		

Early Christian Literature

Apostolic Fathers		Eusebius	
<i>1 Clement</i>		<i>Historia ecclesiastica</i>	
17:1	563n.139	II 16f.	28n.34, 584, 633
59:2	788	II 16–17	66, 93n.40
		III 25.1–7	808
<i>Barnabus</i>		IV 26.13f.	794n.11
18:2	781n.105	V 17.2f.	794n.11
Shepherd of Hermas		VI 12.1–6	816n.119
<i>Mandate</i>		VI 16.3	51n.29, 123n.6
3.4	80, 521, 770	<i>Praeparatio evangelica</i>	
<i>Similitude</i>		VIII 11.1	169n.29
9.2.1	365n.73	VIII 11.1–18	67, 169, 379n.36
		VIII 14	170n.34
<i>Vision</i>		IX 23.1–4	481n.99
3.2.4f.	365n.73	XIII 7.12f.	794n.12
Athanasius		XIII 11.1–18	67
<i>De decretis</i>		XIII 11–12	551n.88
18.3	808n.74	XIII 12.9–11	786n.139
Clement of Alexandria		Hippolytus	
<i>Stromata</i>		<i>Refutatio omnium haeresium</i>	
5:77:2	688n.36	IX 18.2–28.2	67
Epiphanius		Ignatius	
<i>Panarion</i>		<i>Ephesians</i>	
XIX 1.1	68	17:1	781n.105
XIX 2.3	68	19:1	781n.105

<i>Magnesians</i>		<i>De viris illustribus</i>	
1:2	781n.105	11	93n.40, 633
<i>Romans</i>		Melito of Sardis	
6:2	781n.105	<i>On Pascha</i>	
7:1	781n.105	68	78n.151
<i>To the Trallians</i>		Photius	
4:2	781n.105	<i>Lexicon</i>	
Jerome		103f.	633
<i>Commentary on Daniel the Prophet</i>		<i>Pseudo Clement</i>	
III.9.14	484n.112	GCS 2.25.20f.	449n.75
<i>Commentary on Ecclesiastes</i>		Rec. I 30.3	449n.75
12:13f.	834n.206	<i>Testamentum Domini Nostri Jesu Christi</i>	
		book	3

Graeco-Roman Authors

Aristobulus		Pliny the Elder	
<i>ap.</i>	786n.139	<i>Natural History</i>	
Herodotus		V 73	66–68, 125, 170n.36, 172, 371n.7
<i>Historiae</i>		XXXIV 8.55	807n.65
2.161	464	Pliny the Younger	
3.89	670n.99	<i>Epistulae</i>	
Hesiod		8.12.4–5	326n.3
<i>Opera et dies</i>		Plutarch	
180f.	436n.31	<i>De Iside et Osiride</i>	
Martianus Capella		45–47	62, 279n.143, 303, 318
<i>De Nuptiis Philologiae</i>		<i>De defectu oraculorum</i>	
VI 679	67	409e	448n.72
Pausanias		Porphyrius	
<i>Graeciae description</i>		<i>De Abstinencia</i>	
X 16.3	448n.72	IV 11–13	67–68
Plato			
<i>Phaedo</i>			
61B	326n.3		
66B–67B	712		

Quintilian		<i>Solinus Memorabilia</i>	
<i>Institutio oratoria</i>		XXXV 10f.	67
X 1.54	807n.66		
X 1.59	807n.66	Strabo	
		<i>Geographica</i>	
Seneca		IX 3.6	448n.72
<i>Epistulae morales</i>			
41:2	689n.37	Synesios of Cyrene	
		<i>Dio</i>	
<i>Sentences of Sextus</i>		3.2	67, 168n.27
310–312	606n.99		
		Tacitus	
		<i>Annales</i>	
		15.60.4	326n.3

Persian Literature

<i>Yasna</i>		30:3–5	250n.32, 267n.101
30:3	250n.32	45:2	250n.32

Papyri

CIJ II		P. Cowley	
1530	480n.95	10	670n.101
CPJ I		P. Nash	404n.4
132	484	POxy 1	816
CPJ III		POxy 654	816
520	481	POxy 655	816
P. Berol. 22220	804	POxy 2949	816
P. Cair. 10759	816		

Index of Authors

- Aalen, S. 246
Abegg, M. G. 3, 103, 264f., 274f.,
425f., 536, 573, 721, 747f., 753,
756–758, 792
Achram, A. 585
Adam, A. 67, 163, 165, 371, 377
Aland, K. 503, 547
Albani, M. 62, 65, 112, 209–211, 225,
260, 430, 439f.
Albertz, R. 234, 363, 462, 472, 474–
476, 478f., 669f.
Albright, W. F. 92, 498, 532, 535, 589,
629, 644, 763, 764
Alexander, P. S. 304f., 448, 451f., 547
Allegro, J. 131, 531, 627
Allison, D. C. 600, 652, 654f., 660
Al Suadi, S. 378
Alt, A. 475
Althaus, P. 703
Anderson, A. A. 259
Anderson, G. 433, 442
Anderson, R. T. 472, 475
Antoine, P. 471
Arbandt, S. 472
Arendzen, J. 342
Ashton, J. 556, 589, 599, 765
Assmann, A. 803
Assmann, J. 803
Aune, D. E. 80, 407, 520f., 766f., 770,
781, 788, 834
Avemarie, F. 3, 41, 649, 752, 759
Avigad, N. 51, 126, 529

Bachmann, M. 41, 570, 748, 752f., 759
Baeck, L. 85
Bahrdt, C. F. 93, 584, 634
Baigent, M. 2, 93, 108, 131, 501, 541,
582, 627
Baillet, M. 95, 268, 274f., 281, 292,
334, 349, 367, 503, 547, 549
Baldensperger, W. 200
Balla, M. 50, 158, 161
Baltzer, K. 255, 258
Bar-Nathan, R. 160

Barclay, J. M. 751
Bardtke, H. 88, 91, 105, 163, 269, 274
Barkenings H.-J. 100
Barr, J. 266, 296, 799
Barrett, C. K. 176, 553
Barth, K. 802
Barthel, J. 801f.
Barthélémy, D. 382, 529
Barton, J. 795
Barucq, A. 479
Bauckham, R. J. 80, 505, 520, 522,
766f., 771f., 782, 785–787
Baumbach, G. 89, 106, 245, 253
Baumgärtel, F. 702
Baumgarten, J. M. 268f., 275, 442, 772
Baumgartner, W. 87, 541
Bauer, W. 163, 166f., 171
Baur, F. C. 706
Beale, G. K. 368
Beall, T. S. 69, 163, 165f., 189, 191,
377, 379
Bearman, G. H. 528
Beasley-Murray, G. R. 764
Becker, A. H. 19
Becker, E.-M. 797
Becker, J. 101, 264, 274, 325–331,
518f., 572f., 631, 709f., 713f.,
717f., 720, 737f., 771, 779f.
Becker, M. 8f., 36, 77, 88, 115, 189,
215, 238, 373, 383, 388, 392, 398,
406f., 516, 603, 619, 650, 794, 825,
834f.
Beckwith, R. T. 765, 795, 834
Bedenbender, A. 232
Beer, B. 444
Ben-Dov, J. 326
Berger, K. 164, 326, 441, 445, 454–
457, 638, 655, 710
Bergmann, J. 325
Bergmeier, R. 69, 90, 102, 134, 156,
163–165, 168, 171, 173–187, 192,
245, 377, 564, 753
Bernhardt, W. 106, 351, 366
Bernstein, M. J. 287, 821

- Berthelot, K. 761
- Betz, H. D. 22, 87, 652, 662, 674, 704
- Betz, O. 88, 90, 106, 109, 163, 169,
532, 543, 545, 548, 561, 589, 709,
745, 748
- Beyer, H.-W. 807
- Beyer, K. 96, 282–285, 333, 338, 341,
350, 354, 361, 363,
- Bianchi, U. 248f., 302
- Bickermann, E. 462, 472, 492
- Bieberstein, K. 72, 552
- Bietenhardt, H. 364
- Bilde, P. 164, 171–173, 186, 373
- Billerbeck, P. 23f., 649f., 475
- Black, M. 366, 498, 533, 587
- Blenkinsopp, J. 362
- Blinzler, J. 90
- Boccaccini, G. 211, 225, 773
- Bock, D. L. 657f., 661
- Bockmuehl, M. 543
- Böcher, O. 90, 245, 364, 780f.
- Böttrich, C. 443
- Bohak, G. 479–482, 485, 487
- Boismard, M.-É. 549, 600, 765
- Bonani, G. 546
- Bonwetsch, N. 199
- Bordreuil, P. 527
- Bornkamm, G. 87, 97, 739
- Bousset, W. 23, 94, 166, 200, 370,
569, 572, 586, 707, 778
- Bovon, F. 658, 660f.
- Boyarin, D. 19, 616
- Boyce, M. 250
- Brandenburger, E. 40, 221, 255, 258,
263f., 569, 573, 709–712, 720
- Bratsiotis, N. P. 572, 733
- Braun, F.-M. 532, 535, 765
- Braun, H. 71, 73, 87f., 90, 244, 371f.,
374, 498, 511, 535, 539, 560, 562f.,
588, 628, 630, 632, 677f., 709, 713,
716, 763, 821
- Braun, O. 546f.
- Braun, W. 555
- Breytenbach, C. 473, 780
- Bronner, L. 462
- Brooke, G. 5, 32–34, 72, 76, 228, 515,
601, 603, 613, 637, 640, 643, 797,
824, 830
- Broshi, M. 121, 132, 157f., 211, 269,
351, 356, 358, 361, 364
- Brown, D. 93
- Brown, J. A. 131, 627
- Brown, R. E. 79, 519f., 533, 543,
587f., 629, 763–765, 768, 771
- Brownlee, W. 28, 196, 371, 499, 511,
529, 563, 589, 644
- Brox, N. 365
- Bruce, F. F. 696
- Büchler, A. 474
- Bühner, R. 11
- Bull, R. J. 476
- Bultmann, R. 24, 29, 40, 87, 91f., 200,
539, 572, 588, 617, 629, 631, 654,
656, 704, 707f., 752, 767, 778f.
- Burchard, C. 67, 88, 101, 163, 168,
185, 343, 371, 377, 481, 528, 786
- Burgmann, H. 107, 372
- Burnett, S. G. 21
- Burrows, M. 51, 91, 197, 529, 532, 763
- Busink, T. A. 356, 358, 361f.
- Buxtorf, J. 21
- Caird, G. B. 661
- Callaway, P. R. 269
- Campbell, E. F. 462f., 470, 489f.
- von Campenhausen, H. 810, 814f.
- Camponovo, O. 34, 606
- Cansdale, L. 49, 140f., 164, 185, 638
- Capper, B. J. 553
- Caquot, A. 282, 445f., 448
- Carmignac, J. 198, 354, 713
- Casey, M. 600
- Cassirer, E. 429
- Causse, A. 364
- Ceriani, A. M. 199
- Chambon, A. 129, 531
- Chapman, H. 379f.
- Charles, R. H. 289, 298, 331, 432, 442,
445
- Charlesworth, J. H. 79f., 245, 249–252,
257, 261f., 299, 323, 327, 329,
383f., 392f., 498, 508, 511, 520,
528, 533f., 538, 556, 562–565, 567,
569, 587–589, 592, 599, 601f., 613,
617, 691, 763–766, 768, 771f., 774
- Chester, A. 37, 620
- Childs, B. S. 799, 802
- Chilton, B. D. 568, 600
- Christophersen, A. 199
- Chyutin, M. 351, 358, 365
- Cirillo, L. 372
- Claußen, C. 8–10, 46, 123
- Clemen, C. 707
- Clines, D. J. A. 702
- Coggins, R. J. 474

- Cohen, B. 674
 Cohen, S. J. D. 176
 Collins, J. J. 5, 11, 26, 33, 35, 61f., 70, 76, 128, 156, 163, 189, 203f., 206–208, 212, 214–218, 220, 223, 227f., 232f., 235, 237, 239, 243, 255, 259, 262, 276, 278–281, 296, 307, 317f., 326, 355, 359, 369, 371, 376, 391, 481, 501, 516, 543, 574, 593, 601, 614f., 618f., 628, 638, 644, 665f., 669, 723
 Colpe, C. 296, 673, 708
 Colson, F. W. 170
 Conzelmann, H. 87
 Cook, E. 103
 Coppens, J. 696
 Cornelius, I. 429
 Cortès, E. 325
 Cowley, A. 463, 465, 670
 Cross, F. M. 49, 53, 92, 148, 189, 197, 230, 392, 462, 475, 503, 546, 764, 821
 Crown, A. D. 140f., 475
 Cullmann, O. 87–89, 532, 554

 Dahmen, U. 112, 116, 422
 Dajjani, R. W. 131
 Dalman, G. 124
 D'Ancona, M. 110, 548f., 645
 Daniel, C. 555
 Daniélou, J. 532
 Das, A. A. 41, 752
 Davenport, G. L. 436, 443
 Davidson, M. J. 226, 256, 258, 261, 273, 277f., 296
 Davies, P. R. 255, 269, 273, 276, 280
 Davies, W. D. 92, 511, 587, 630, 652, 654, 660, 709, 713
 Davis, K. 409
 Day, P. L. 283, 286, 780
 Deichgräber, R. 101
 Deines, R. 23f., 517, 573, 752, 754, 802
 Deissmann, A. 672f.
 Delcor, M. 462, 465, 471, 479, 482f., 485, 488
 Delitzsch, F. 85
 Delling, G. 87
 Denis, A. M. 101, 738
 Derrett, J. D. M. 661, 674
 Destro, A. 768
 Deutsch, C. 364
 Dexinger, F. 471, 474, 477–479

 Dibelius, M. 86, 682
 Dietzfelbinger, C. 452
 Di Lella A. A. 663f.
 Dillmann, A. 199, 445f.
 Dillon, J. 712
 Dimant, D. 65, 85, 133, 206, 212f., 243, 246–248, 271, 283, 290, 335, 359, 375, 413, 431, 437f., 558, 596, 626, 636f., 664, 744, 773, 775
 Doehhorn, J. 738
 Dodd, C. H. 767
 Doering, L. 31, 75, 433, 440, 610, 753f.
 Donceel, R. 49, 137f.
 Donceel-Voute, P. 49, 137f.
 Donner, H. 464f., 470, 473
 Dorival, G. 489
 Doudna, G. L. 528, 546
 Drawnel, H. 340, 342–344
 Dreytza, M. 688
 Drewermann, 108
 Driver, G. R. 127
 Duchesne-Guillemain, J. 248, 250, 296
 Duhaime, J. 245, 249, 251, 253f., 261, 263, 274, 278, 280, 316
 Duhm, B. 487
 Dunn, J. D. G. 41, 569f., 572, 702, 746, 748, 751, 755, 758
 Dupont-Sommer, A. 28, 67, 71, 73, 86, 91, 94, 126, 196f., 244, 371f., 500, 513, 530, 540f., 544, 587f., 590, 626, 635, 737, 744

 Ebeling, G. 811
 Ebner, M. 662
 Egger, R. 474
 Ehrman, B. 804
 Ego, B. 3, 442, 793
 Eisenman, R. H. 3, 53, 71, 108f., 349, 502, 537, 543–545, 580, 583, 627, 678, 745, 747
 Eiss, W. 101
 Eißfeldt O. 87, 89
 Elliott, M. W. 800
 Elgvin, T. 226, 664f., 698, 723f., 727f., 735
 Emmel, S. 804
 Endo, M. 786
 Endres, J. C. 432, 456, 458
 Enste, S. 71, 110, 504, 549, 591, 645
 Erlemann, K. 241, 655
 Eshel, E. 5, 49, 148, 189, 274, 340

- Eshel, H. 5, 121, 132, 142–144, 154, 158, 275
 Eucken, R. 249
 Evans, C. A. 34, 73f., 513f., 527, 600, 602, 606f., 617, 786, 796
- Fabry, H.-J. 46, 48, 88, 111, 142, 145–149, 154, 156, 160f., 208, 217, 234, 422, 427, 580, 616, 688f., 716, 732, 796, 820, 822–824, 826, 833
 Falk, D. K. 56, 62, 636
 Farhi, Y. 122, 132
 Fascher, E. 325
 Fassbeck, G. 130, 134
 Fee, G. D. 548, 648
 Feine, P. 705
 Feldman, L. H. 175, 471
 Fenske, W. 97, 631
 Fields, W. 51
 Finger, J. 584f.
 Finkelstein, I. 150
 Fitzmyer, J. 5, 39, 72, 77, 255, 350, 360, 509f., 518, 533, 553, 559f., 564, 569–571, 587, 599, 616, 640, 656, 662, 674, 829
 Flinders Petrie, W. M. 480
 Flint, P. W. 53, 55, 67, 123, 207, 410, 414–426, 503, 537, 546, 745, 792, 830
 Flusser, D. 86, 533f., 709, 713, 748, 753
 Focant, C. 548
 Fontaine, P. F. M. 248
 Fohrer, G. 231
 Fraade, S. D. 729, 753
 Frankfort, H. A. 429
 Franxman, T. W. 452
 Frerichs, E. S. 642
 Frye, N. 266
 Fujita, S. 350
- Gärtner, B. 397
 Galor, K. 130, 134, 145
 Gamble, H. Y. 795
 Gammie, J. G. 249, 251f., 263
 García Martínez, F. 5, 63, 103, 166, 191, 198, 204, 207f., 214, 216, 220, 225–227, 284f., 287, 291, 349, 351, 353, 357, 359f., 404, 433, 528, 542, 596, 681, 715, 720
 Gathercole, S. J. 750, 759
 Geiger, A. 85
 Georgi, D. 710
- Gerdmar, A. 21
 Gerleman, G. 572, 702
 Gerstenberger, E. 434
 Gese, H. 230, 429, 466, 799, 801
 Gibson, S. 46, 157, 160
 Gillihan, Y. M. 374, 385, 389, 392
 Glessmer, U. 112, 430, 433
 Gloege, G. 248
 Gnilka, J. 372, 652
 Götte, M. E. 10, 221
 Goodman, M. 67, 163, 371, 377f.
 Goff, M. J. 33, 64, 222–224, 314, 614, 665
 Golb, N. 46, 139f., 153, 164, 638
 Goranson, S. 187
 Gräßer, E. 87
 Graetz, H. 85, 201, 407, 833
 Gray, G. B. 487
 Graystone, G. 696
 Greenfield, J. C. 188, 283f., 340, 342, 351, 359, 466
 Grelot, P. 447, 450, 464, 467, 469, 746, 756
 Greschat, K. 811, 814
 Grindheim, S. 759
 Gressmann, H. 23, 166, 370, 586, 707
 Groh, J. E. 372
 Grossman, M. L. 593
 Gruen, E. 479, 482–484, 487f.
 Grundmann, W. 24, 86, 652
 Gundry, R. H. 549
 Gunkel, H. 200, 682, 706f.
 Gunneweg, A. H. J. 688
 Gunneweg, J. 50, 149, 158f., 161
 Gutfeld, O. 132
- Haacker, K. 752
 Haag, H. 372
 Habachi, L. 463
 Hachlili, R. 48
 Hagen, J. 804
 Hagner, D. A. 652
 Hahn, F. 683
 Hahn, O. 50, 158
 Hahnemann, G. M. 817
 Hall, B. 473
 Halpern-Amaru, B. 455
 Hamilton, V. P. 244
 Hammerschmidt, E. 797
 Hanson, P. D. 205, 230
 Harl, M. 489
 v. Harnack, A. 810

- Harrington, D. J. 33, 222, 247, 264,
314, 350, 573–575; 614, 664f.,
667–669, 722–729
- Hays, R. 749
- Hayward, C. T. R. 442, 479, 488, 701
- Heckel, T. 812, 815
- Hedrick, C. 804
- Heger, P. 307
- Heinemann, I. 163, 169
- Heininger, B. 684
- Heitmüller, W. 25, 778
- Hellholm, D. 202f.
- Hemer, C. J. 548
- Hempel, C. 5, 156, 165, 189, 206, 311,
382, 390f., 413, 557, 595, 664, 690,
773f., 832
- Hempel, J. 87
- Hendel, R. S. 55
- Hengel, M. 1–4, 12, 19, 34, 37, 109,
113, 131, 173, 178f., 181, 187f.,
197, 235, 239, 264, 279, 296f., 458,
472, 483, 485, 489f., 492, 516f.,
537, 544, 561, 573, 600, 602, 604–
606, 615, 621, 641, 669, 671f., 681,
685, 703, 708, 733, 739, 752, 802,
815
- Hennequin, L. 463
- Henrich, R. 584
- van Henten, J. W. 480
- Herrenbrück, F. 671
- Herrmann, H. V. 449
- Heshel, S. 24
- Hieke, T. 802
- Hilgenfeld, A. 197, 199
- Hirsch, S. A. 481, 484
- Hirschfeld, Y. 49, 121, 131f., 138,
141–144, 638
- Hölscher, G. 163, 175, 451, 455
- Hofius, O. 618
- Hoffmann, A. G. 199
- Hoffmann, P. 659, 662
- Hogeterp, A. L. A. 35, 39, 76, 683, 748
- Holsten, C. 705f.
- Holtzmann, C. J. 706
- Horbury, W. 21, 619f.
- Horn, F. W. 703
- Horning, G. 22
- Horst, F. 714
- van der Horst, P. W. 480, 780
- Hübner, H. 710, 794
- Hüttenmeister, F. G. 492
- Hüttig, S. 122, 128
- Hultgård, A. 296, 326, 328, 331, 738
- Hultgren, S. 307f., 314
- Humbert, J.-B. 48f., 129, 138f., 145,
531
- Hunzinger, C.-H. 87, 95, 275, 557,
587, 593, 773
- Huppenbauer, H. W. 243, 250, 253,
255, 297, 709, 713f., 720
- Hurowitz, V. A. 326
- Hurtado, L. H. 37, 620f., 816
- Hyde, T. 249
- Inowlocki S. 379
- Jacobsen, T. 429
- Jacobson, H. 452
- Jaffé, D. 25
- Jain, E. 410, 423
- James, M. R. 199f.
- Janowski, B. 246, 429, 794, 800
- Janssen, M. 792, 804, 811
- Jaubert, A. 90, 499, 513, 589, 765
- Jenks, G. C. 781
- Jeremias, A. 449
- Jeremias, G. 26, 73, 88, 98, 100f., 364,
501, 542f., 586, 603, 605, 626, 760
- Jeremias, J. 449, 586, 601, 606, 654–
656, 660f., 672, 718
- Jewett, R. 519, 573, 705f., 713
- Johnson, M. D. 738
- Johnson, S. 709
- Jones, A. H. 188
- Jones, R. J. 244
- de Jonge, M. 342, 347, 738
- Jongeling, B. 349, 528
- Jost, M. R. 8, 11, 227
- Jull, A. J. T. 546
- Junginger, H. 97
- Junker, A. 705
- Käsemann, E. 87, 572, 612, 708, 740,
798
- Kaestli, J.-D. 817
- Kahle, P. 51, 87, 89
- Kaiser, O. 231f., 796
- Kalms, J. U. 781
- Kampen, J. 188, 760
- Kartveit, M. 449f.
- Kaser, M. 673
- Kasher, A. 479f.
- Kee, H. C. 733
- Keel, O. 429, 451
- Kelhoffer, J. A. 511, 563, 589
- Kellermann, D. 468f.

- Kellermann, M. 468f.
 Kindzorra, E. 158
 Kippenberg, H.-G. 472–474, 669f.
 Kirk, A. 658
 Kister, M. 31, 274, 610
 Kittel, G. 86
 Klatt, N. 584
 Klauck, H.-J. 373, 378, 381, 387f., 792
 Klausner, J. 86, 94, 634
 Klein, A. 691
 Klein, G. 87, 605
 Klinghardt, M. 373, 378, 386, 400,
 794, 812
 Klinzing, G. 102, 227
 Kloppenborg, J. 659, 662
 Klostermann, E. 655
 Knauf, E. A. 446
 Knibb, M. 542
 Knohl, I. 501
 Kobelski, P. J. 282, 284f., 291, 293,
 298, 319
 Koch, D. A. 562
 Koch, K. 112, 199, 201, 215, 233, 241,
 431, 433, 437, 471, 800
 Koch, R. 688
 Koester, H. 87
 Kohler, K. 163
 Kollmann, B. 684
 van der Kooij, C. 795
 Kornfeld, W. 464
 Kosmala, H. 555, 600
 Kottsieper, I. 116
 Kraeling, E. G. H. 463, 469
 Kratz, R. G. 6, 88, 116, 206, 580
 Krauss, S. 21
 Krieger, K.-S. 175
 Krieger, N. 563
 Kroll, W. 170
 Kronholm, T. 444
 Krüger, G. 798
 Küchler, M. 325, 451, 505, 591f.
 Kümmel, W. G. 30, 607, 704, 706
 Küng, H. 108
 Kugel, J. 436
 Kuhn, H.-W. 5, 9, 30, 39, 42, 73, 77,
 88, 90, 97, 101f., 115, 226, 228,
 240, 370, 373f., 383, 387f., 514f.,
 517f., 530, 533f., 538, 560, 569,
 586, 596–598, 601, 603, 605, 607–
 609, 611f., 623f., 630f., 640, 679,
 714, 717f., 721, 734, 755f., 761,
 768
 Kuhn, K. G. 28, 67, 79, 86–90, 92, 96–
 101, 163, 222, 244, 267, 296, 370–
 373, 387, 399, 498, 519, 530f., 554,
 586, 588–580, 626, 629f., 632, 635,
 708
 Kuss, O. 630, 705f., 709, 713, 763f.,
 771
 Kutscher, E. Y. 359, 363
 Kvanvig, H. S. 233

 Lagrange, M.-J. 634
 Lanczkowski, G. 248, 250
 Lange, A. 3–5, 53, 59, 61f., 64, 66, 80,
 88, 96, 113f., 133, 163, 165, 171,
 180, 185, 188–190, 206f., 212, 216,
 219, 221–224, 233, 236, 247f.,
 254–258, 260, 262–273, 275, 287,
 297, 311, 314, 318, 332, 335, 341,
 343, 353, 358, 360, 375, 382, 403,
 407, 409, 413, 419, 486, 522, 557,
 574f., 581, 587, 596f., 614, 637,
 664–666, 690, 696, 716, 719, 722–
 725, 729f., 732, 735f., 773, 775f.,
 796, 823, 825, 828f.
 Laperoussaz, E.-M. 131
 Lapide, P. 77, 582, 627, 677
 Lapp, N. L. 489f.
 Lapp, P. W. 489f.
 LaSor, W. S. 528
 Lauster, J. 798
 Leaney, A. R. G. 262
 van der Leeuw, G. 248
 Lehnardt, A. 34, 607
 Leigh, R. 2, 93, 108, 131, 501, 541,
 582, 627
 Leipoldt, J. 86, 810
 Leisegang, J. 711
 Leonhardt-Balzer, J. 312
 Leroy, L. 328
 Levison, J. R. 433, 442, 677, 682, 684,
 688, 98
 Lewald, H. 672
 Lewis, J. P. 407, 834
 Licht, J. 351, 365f.
 Lichtenberger, H. 3, 5, 33, 59, 61, 66,
 102, 104, 163, 190, 217, 221f.,
 246f., 254f., 258, 260–262, 269,
 275, 297, 358, 360, 382, 389, 486,
 515, 557f., 561, 564f., 596, 613,
 664, 690, 703, 708f., 714f., 716,
 719, 734, 775
 Lietaert Peerbolte, L. J. 781
 Lietzmann, H. 86, 705, 810

- Lightfoot, J. 21
 Lightfoot, J. B. 169
 Lim, T. 26, 39, 57, 405, 517, 537, 567, 593
 Lindblom, J. 231
 Lindemann, G. 88, 98f., 606
 Linder, B. H. 175
 Lindenberger, J. M. 668
 Lindjer, C. H. 705
 Lipinski, É. 444
 v. Lips, H. 662, 794f., 811
 Lipscomb, W. L. 664, 724
 Liss, H. 800
 Littmann, E. 446
 Löhr, H. 114, 794
 Löhr, W. A. 803, 809, 817, 819
 Lohmeyer, E. 86, 652
 Lohse, E. 107
 Loretz, O. 527
 Lönnqvist, K. 149
 Lönnqvist, M. 149
 Lucassen, B. 665
 Lucius, P. E. 633
 Lücke, F. 199
 Lüdemann, G. 38, 706, 792, 804
 Lührmann, D. 815
 Luther, M. 631
 Luz, U. 32, 606, 613, 652, 654, 659, 662, 672
 Maccoby, H. 38
 McDonald, J. I. H. 562
 McDonald, L. M. 406, 794f., 817
 Mach, M. 226
 Macheiner, W. 672
 Mack, B. L. 34, 606, 711
 Maclaurin, E. C. B. 464
 März, C.-P. 657
 Magen, Y. 46, 132, 145, 153, 476–478
 Magness, J. 46f., 121, 130, 138f., 145, 154, 158, 160, 185, 369, 377, 397, 506, 551f.
 Maier, J. 36, 63, 88, 103, 107f., 186, 247, 291, 296, 350, 356, 367, 392, 450, 452, 455f., 505, 619, 809
 Marcus, R. 474
 Margalilt, S. 358, 506, 552
 Marksches, C. 561, 641, 808–811, 815–818
 Marshall, H. 660f.
 Martini, C. M. 547
 Martyn, J. L. 572, 702
 Marxsen, W. 87
 Masic, A. 50, 158
 Mason, S. 69, 166, 170, 173–176, 186, 379f.
 Masuch, G. 504, 548
 Mattila, S. L. 276, 278
 May, H. G. 258f.
 Mayer, B. 109, 54
 Meier, J. P. 600, 605
 Meiser, M. 833
 Meissner, S. 25
 Mell, U. 443, 445, 447
 Mendels, D. 435
 Mensching, G. 248
 Mercati, G. 546
 Merk, O. 87
 Merz, A. 607, 612
 Metso, S. 59, 70, 95f., 103, 128, 155, 190, 254, 257, 262, 310, 352, 377, 381–383, 385, 595, 690, 774f., 832
 Metzger, B. M. 795
 Meurois-Givaudan, A. 585
 Meurois-Givaudan, D. 585
 Meyer, R. 88f., 105f., 187, 709, 713, 739
 Meyers, C. 362
 Meyers, E. M. 46, 121, 149, 154f., 157, 159, 161, 187, 302
 Michaud, H. 244
 Michel, D. 429
 Michel, H-J. 328
 Michel, O. 86f., 100
 Millar, F. 169f., 188, 674
 Miller, M. L. 753
 Milik, J. T. 51, 188, 209f., 248, 271, 283–285, 288, 291–293, 309, 330f., 334, 336, 339, 341f., 349, 359, 368, 423, 431f., 445, 529, 823, 825
 Mirecki, P. 804
 Mittmann-Richert, U. 63, 113, 207, 212, 332, 335f., 341, 343, 558, 826
 Molin, G. 88, 90
 Modrzejewski, M. 464, 479f.
 Mommsen, T. 672
 Montgomery, J. A. 474, 479
 Moore, G. F. 559, 651
 Mor, M. 472, 474f.
 Morawe, G. 102
 Morgenstern, Matthew 353, 360, 432
 Morgenstern, Matthias 806
 Müller, H.-P. 233
 Müller, K. 200
 Müller, U. B. 364
 Müller, W. 449
 Munnich, O. 489

- Muro, E. A. 504, 549
 Murphy, R. E. 709, 730
 Murphy-O'Connor, J. 163, 269, 535,
 573, 677, 721
 Mussner, F. 704

 Naveh, J. 477f.
 Neusner, J. 325
 Nebe, G.-W. 337, 504, 549
 Newman, R. C. 834
 Newsom, C. 96, 103, 133, 247, 267,
 375, 596, 637, 692, 773
 Nickelsburg, G. W. E. 199, 209, 211f.,
 232, 235f., 282, 304, 423, 717, 825
 Nicklas, T. 802, 816
 Niebuhr, K. W. 36, 38, 214f., 619, 738,
 802f.
 Niehr, H. 359, 668
 Nitzan, B. 62, 287, 291f.
 Nitzsch, C. I. 199
 Noack, B. 288
 Nötscher, F. 696, 709, 720
 Nolland, J. 567
 Norden, E. 175
 v. Nordheim, E. 282, 325–331, 338,
 343
 North, R. 127, 175
 Noth, M. 46

 Oakman, D. E. 671, 673
 O'Callaghan, J. 109, 503, 547, 549
 Oden, R. A., Jr. 429
 Oegema, G. S. 3, 217, 238
 Öhler, M. 562
 Oeming, M. 449, 794, 799, 811–813
 Ohme, H. 806
 Oktor Skjærø, P. 303
 Oppel, H. 807
 von der Osten-Sacken, P. 23, 232, 243,
 250, 253, 270, 274, 276, 311
 Otto, E. 361, 434, 552, 670
 Otzen, B. 243, 255

 Pardee, D. 527
 Parente, F. 482f.
 Parker, D. C. 550
 Parry, D. W. 528
 Parsenios, G. 327
 Pass, H. L. 342
 Patrich, J. 132
 Paulsen, H. 569, 709
 Pearson, B. A. 527
 Peleg, Y. 46, 132, 145, 153

 Percy, E. 778, 781
 Peruchon, J. 444
 Pesce, M. 768
 Pesch, O. H. 631
 Pesch, R. 563
 Petrement, S. 248
 Pfann, S. J. 3, 52, 130, 246, 389, 412,
 528, 531, 537, 562, 664
 Pfliederer, O. 706
 Philip, F. 685
 Pickering, S. R. 550
 Piper, R. 659, 662
 Pixner, B. 71, 109, 505, 550–553, 563
 Plisch, U.-K. 804f.
 van der Ploeg, J. P. 86, 286, 352, 372,
 535, 713
 Plöger, O. 232, 236
 Popkes, E. E. 8, 10
 Popovic, M. 312, 404, 412
 Porten, B. 462–467, 469
 Porzig, P. 111
 Preuss, H.-D. 733
 Price, R. 122, 132
 Priest, J. F. 372, 395
 Pryke, J. 372, 709
 Procksch, O. 231
 Puech, É. 67, 103, 168, 208, 257, 262,
 284–287, 290, 296, 332–336, 338–
 340, 349f., 424, 504, 549, 823, 829
 Pummer, R. 473, 476f., 479
 Pyke, J. 511, 562

 Qimron, E. 42, 245, 353, 360, 383f.,
 567, 570, 691, 745f., 754f., 761

 Rabin, C. 127, 158
 Rabin, I. 50
 von Rad, G. 201, 452, 714, 734, 800
 Rahmani, I. E. 32
 Rainbow, P. A. 483
 Rajak, T. 163, 180, 182, 186
 Rappaport, U. 472
 Ratzinger, J. 108
 Rau, E. 443–445
 Reader, W. W. 644
 Reed, A. Y. 19
 Reich, R. 158, 506, 552
 Reitzenstein, R. 572, 707, 778
 Renan, E. 94, 197, 372, 634
 Rengstorf, K.-H. 86f., 140, 176, 181,
 661
 Reuss, E. 199
 Reventlow, H. Graf 449

- Rey, J.-S. 33, 314, 614
 Riaud, J. 67
 Riesner, R. 71, 109, 505, 543, 545,
 548, 550, 553, 556, 563, 591, 739
 Riessler, P. 634
 Riley, G. J. 780
 Ritter, A. M. 811
 Roberts, C. H. 503, 547
 Robinson, J. A. T. 511
 Robinson, J. M. 3, 240, 537, 580, 657–
 659, 662
 Rochman, B. 555
 Röhler-Ertl, O. 48, 50
 Rönsch, H. 432, 444
 Rohrhirsch, F. 126, 137, 139f., 143,
 152
 Roloff, J. 365
 de Roo, J. C. 748
 Roscher, W. H. 448f.
 Rosenau, H. 358
 Rosenbaum, H.-U. 548f.
 Rosenkranz, S. 444
 Roth, C. 127
 Rothschild, C. K. 814, 817
 Rowley, H. H. 474, 511
 Ruckstuhl, E. 90, 553, 556, 599, 765
 van Ruiten, J. A. T. M. G. 433, 442
 Ruiz, J.-P. 368
 Rupschus, N. 8, 11, 48, 156, 164
 Ruzer, S. 653

 Sacchi, P. 773
 Salvesen, A. 21
 Sand, A. 573, 630, 705f., 709
 Sanders, E. P. 600, 746, 751
 Sanders, J. A. 54, 407f., 530, 664, 724,
 794, 797, 835
 Sandmel, S. 598, 678
 Schaeder, H.-H. 779
 Schäfer, P. 729, 834
 Schalit, A. 479, 481
 Schaller, B. 23, 192f., 554
 Schattner-Rieser, U. 63, 586, 822
 Schenke, H.-M. 804
 Schmid, J. H. 799
 Schmid, K. 796
 Schmidt, F. 448, 451f., 462, 475, 479
 Schmidt, H.-C. 796
 Schmidt, J. M. 197, 199, 492
 Schmidt, K. L. 364
 Schmidt, R. 706
 Schmidt, W. H. 796

 Schofield, A. 61, 70, 155, 310, 376,
 382, 391
 Schiffman, L. H. 5, 134, 164, 247, 265,
 272f., 356, 363, 374, 386, 392, 395,
 397–399, 486, 508, 528, 555, 574,
 635f., 638, 644, 744, 822
 Schlatter, A. 656
 Schleiermacher, F. D. E. 22
 Schlier, H. 703
 Schmauch, W. 652
 Schmidt, W. 326
 Schmithals, W. 708
 Schnackenburg, R. 783
 Schniewind, J. 86, 654
 Schnelle, U. 684f., 709, 750, 813–815
 Schöttgen, C. 21
 Schofield, A. 61
 Scholtissek, K. 208
 Scholz, S. 797
 Schreiber, S. 618
 Schreiner, J. 688
 Schreiner, S. 493
 Schroedel, J. 276
 Schröer, S. 710
 Schröter, J. 794
 Schubert, F. 456
 Schubert, K. 87f., 90, 107, 520, 563,
 589, 600, 765
 Schürer, E. 22f., 169f., 188, 210, 370,
 479f., 586, 674, 764
 Schürmann, H. 657f.
 Schuller, E. 5, 96, 103, 165, 692, 718
 Schultz, B. 316
 Schulz, S. 571, 573, 631, 654, 659–
 662, 720
 Schunck, K.-D. 688
 Schur, N. 475
 Schwartz, D. R. 11, 175, 219, 269,
 479f., 486
 Schwartz, J. 463
 Schwarz, E. 457f.
 Schweitzer, A. 566, 584, 634, 706
 Schweizer, E. 652, 703
 Schwemer, A. M. 34, 113, 514, 600,
 602, 604–607, 685
 Scobie, C. H. H. 511, 562
 Scott, J. M. 448, 450, 452
 Seeligman, I. L. 482
 Segal, A. F. 244
 Segert, S. 248, 595
 Sekki, A. E. 259, 688, 691f., 715, 731,
 736
 Sellev, P. 657

- Sellin, G. 712f.
 Semler, J. S. 21, 798
 Shaked, S. 249, 266
 Shanks, H. 747
 Sheridan, S. G. 48
 Sieker, M. 207
 Siker, J. S. 797
 Silberman, N. A. 150, 642
 Silverman, M. H. 466f.
 Sivan, D. 353, 360
 Sjöberg, E. 250
 Skehan, P. 263, 663f.
 Smend, R. 796
 Smith, D. E. 373
 Smith, D. M. 764
 Smith, M. 462f., 516
 von Soden, H. 86
 Söding, T. 795, 797f.
 Sperling, S. D. 243
 de Spinoza, B. 834
 Spiro, S. I. 528
 Spottorno, M. V. 504, 549
 Stachelin, F. 461
 Stadelmann, L. I. J. 449
 Stanton, G. 504, 548
 Starcky, J. 349
 Stauffer, E. 87, 325, 600
 Steck, O. H. 88, 110, 418, 830
 Stegemann, E. 263
 Stegmann, H. 6f., 26f., 46–49, 51, 59,
 63, 65, 68, 74, 88, 96, 101–104,
 123, 126, 135–137, 156, 163, 178,
 185, 187, 191, 195, 198, 204, 213,
 216, 247, 256f., 262, 270, 279,
 287f., 352, 354, 371, 377, 382, 390,
 392, 395f., 403, 513, 527, 542f.,
 546, 558, 563, 566, 568, 572, 587,
 597, 603–605, 692, 714, 723f., 745,
 760, 775, 832
 Steindorff, G. 200
 Stemberger, G. 25, 86, 650, 834
 Stendahl, K. 498, 535, 647, 750
 Stern, M. 67, 163, 480, 482
 Steudel, A. 5, 95, 103, 107, 116, 135,
 156, 208, 220, 227, 293f., 296f.,
 352, 360, 392, 414, 417, 425, 427,
 558, 570, 587, 594, 616, 665, 828,
 830
 Stökl Ben Ezra, D. 52, 144, 153, 403,
 412
 Stone, M. 188, 205, 283f., 337, 340,
 342, 443
 Strack, H. L. 85, 649f.
 Strange, J. F. 132
 Strecker, G. 201, 652, 708
 Stoebe, H.-J. 464f., 471
 Stoll, D. 352
 Strugnell, J. 2, 42, 271, 570, 574, 665,
 667, 722, 724–726, 745f., 754f.,
 761
 Stuckenbruck, L. T. 7, 11, 30f., 75, 78,
 209, 226, 392f., 597, 601, 610f.,
 613, 622, 825
 Stuhlmacher, P. 570, 703, 751, 799,
 801
 Suciú, A. 805
 Sugranyes de Franch, R. 672
 Sukenik, E. L. 28, 51, 93, 103, 126,
 185, 196, 371, 529, 572, 587, 633,
 635, 714
 Suhl, A. 704
 Sundberg, A. C. 817
 Sutcliffe, E. F. 372
 Swanson, D. D. 356, 358
 Swete, H. B. 546
 Tätweiler, S. 8, 11
 Tamir, M. D. 269
 Taylor, J. E. 46, 52, 67f., 123, 157,
 160, 164, 377f., 511, 562
 Tcherikover, V. 474, 485
 Teicher, J. L. 127, 643, 677
 Testuz, M. 289, 438, 451
 Theissen, G. 88, 97, 100, 586, 607,
 610, 626
 Thiede, C. P. 110, 504, 548f., 645
 Thiering, B. 53, 502, 545, 583
 Thomas, J. 563
 Thomsen, P. 87
 Thornton, C.-J. 176
 Thyen, H. 779
 Tigchelaar, E. J. C. 3, 5, 11, 63, 103,
 222, 233, 314, 406f., 409, 420,
 427f., 614, 664f., 715, 791, 832f.
 van Tilborg, S. 651
 Tiller, P. A. 211
 Tisserant, É. 445f.
 Tiwald, M. 38
 Tomson, P. J. 754
 van der Toorn, K. 463, 465
 Tóth, F. 11
 Tov, E. 3, 52f., 207, 246f., 357, 410,
 479, 530, 537, 581, 585, 664, 822–
 825, 830f.
 Trebolle, J. 796
 Trever, J. 529

- Trobisch, D. 812
 Trummer, P. 814
 Tubach, J. 439f.
- Uehlinger, C. 451
 Ullmann-Margalit, W. 127–129, 133, 150, 647
 Ulrich, E. 53, 207, 407–409, 419, 421, 425f., 528f., 585, 792, 796, 806, 809, 822, 830f.
- VanderKam, J. C. 26, 41, 53, 55, 67, 70, 123, 127–130, 154, 163, 185, 191f., 211, 217, 233, 288, 371, 407, 410, 414f., 417, 420–424, 430, 432–435, 438f., 441, 443f., 446f., 452, 455, 457f., 486, 503, 537, 546, 563, 745, 765, 792, 796, 821, 824, 830
 de Vaux, R. 28, 46f., 124–127, 131, 155, 196, 531, 551
 Venturini, K. H. 93f., 584, 634
 Verheyden, J. 818
 Vermes, G. 67, 163, 169f., 188, 196, 371, 377f., 567, 600, 674, 720
 Vielhauer, P. 201f., 229, 236
 Vielhauer, R. 111
 Vieweger, D. 121
 Vincent, A. 465
 Viviano, B. 124
 Volz, P. 200, 682
 Vos, J. S. 98
- Wacholder, B. Z. 3, 264f., 358, 438, 536, 573, 721
 Wachtel, K. 550
 Wachter, J. G. 93, 602, 634
 Wacker, M.-T. 232
 Wagner, S. 67, 93, 105, 129, 173, 197, 544, 584, 633
 Waltke, B. K. 796
 Waubke, H. G. 21f.
 Webb, R. L. 527, 565
 Weber, F. 649
 Webster, B. 54, 410
 Weder, H. 652
 Wehrli, F. 448
 Weinberg, G. 50, 158
 Weinel, H. 682
 Weinfeld, M. 183, 374
 Weiss, B. 661
 von Weissenberg, H. 797
 Weitzsäcker, C. 706
- Wellhausen, J. 22f., 29, 200, 234, 617, 631
 Wendland, P. 169
 Wendt, K. 797, 819
 Wensinck, A. J. 449
 Werblowski, R. J. Z. 252
 Wernberg-Møller, P. 255, 258, 690
 Westerholm, S. 752
 Westermann, C. 444, 452
 de Wette, W. M. L. 22
 Whiston, W. 379f.
 White Crawford, S. 357, 823
 Wiehe, R. A. 527
 Wiesenberg, E. 430, 432
 Wilckens, U. 709
 Wildberger, H. 231, 245, 464
 Willi-Plein, I. 471
 Williamson, H. G. M. 474
 Wilson, E. 500, 531, 540f., 584, 626
 Wilson, J. A. 429
 Winston, D. 244, 712
 Winter, M. 325–329
 Wintermute, O. S. 288f., 438, 441, 454, 456
 Wischmeyer, O. 663
 Wise, M. O. 103, 109, 336, 349, 351f., 356–358, 363, 501, 543, 582, 627, 747
 de Witt Burton, E. 682
 van der Woude, A. S. 247, 274, 292, 527, 538, 542f.
 Wrede, W. 24, 29, 38, 617, 750, 798
 Wrege, H.-T. 659
 Wright, G. R. H. 449
 Wright, N. T. 746, 748, 755f., 758
 Wolff, H. J. 668
 Wolff, H.-W. 670
 Wolff, T. 50, 158
 Wolter, M. 684f.
- Xeravitz, G. 391
- Yadin, Y. 51, 133, 150, 356, 367, 397, 499, 529, 536, 555, 587, 600, 744, 822
 Yarbro Collins, A. 204, 234, 601
 Yardeni, A. 50, 463
 Yon, M. 527
- Zager, W. 199–201, 234
 Zahn, T. 807f., 810
 Zanella, F. 78

Zangenberg, J. 48f. 122, 124, 126f.,
130, 134, 137, 142, 145–148, 151f.,
160f., 638
Zeller, D. 659, 661
Zimmerli, W. 367

Zimmermann, J. 35f., 76, 114, 208,
392, 395f., 516, 538, 543, 601, 604,
616–620
Zissu, B. 554
Zunz, L. 85

Index of Subjects

- allegory/allegorical interpretation 33f., 656
- angels 8, 226–229
- communion with angels 226–229
- anti-Judaism 25, 86, 97–100
- apocalyptic 7–9, 12, 195–241
- and eschatology 202, 205
 - circles 195
 - literature 195f.
 - motifs 196
- apocalypticism 195–241
- and crisis 234
 - and prophecy 232f.
 - and Qumran 196–198, 205–230
 - and wisdom 238f.
 - characteristics 201, 236f.
 - history of research 199, 201f.
 - in the background of Christianity 238f.
 - origins 230f.
- apocalypse(s) 203–205
- genre 203–205
- Apocalypse of Elijah 367
- Apocalypse of John (= Revelation) 367f.
- Apocalypse of Weeks 55, 211, 424, 431
- Apocrypha/Deuterocanonical Writings 825f.
- apocryphal gospels 815f.
- Apocryphon of Levi 340f., 342–344
- Aramaic Levi Document 56
- ‘Araq el-Emir 463, 489–491
- archaeology 7, 45–51, 121–161
- and textual scholarship 121f., 126 143–149, 152f.
 - contextual archaeology 49f., 141–146, 151
 - “convergence model” 126, 154–157
 - “secular”/“non-religious” 141, 146 150f.
- “Aryan” Jesus 24
- Athanasios of Alexandria 808
- authority (of writings) 414–418, 827–830
- Babylon (exile) 462
- Belial 79, 219, 286–291
- Bible/*biblia* 791f.
- “Dead Sea Scrolls Bible” 425–427
- biblical studies 85
- Biblical Theology 799–803
- Billerbeck/“New Billerbeck” 649f.
- Bultmann school 91f., 498, 707f.
- Cairo Genizah 60
- calendar 62, 439, 498f.
- 364 day calendar 439
- calendrical texts 62, 411f.
- Canaan 435, 455f.
- Canon (of the Bible) 7f., 54, 403–408, 791–836
- at Qumran 425f., 820, 823f.
 - canon debate 794–796
 - canon lists 405, 807f., 817
 - “canon within the canon” 799
 - canonical interpretation 802
 - Canonical Process 8, 54, 404–408, 428, 809f., 818f., 827f., 833–836
 - canonicity (criteria of) 414–418, 427, 816f.
 - canonicity claims (in the NT) 813
 - concept(s) of canon 806, 821f., 833f.
 - criteria of canonicity 816f.
 - critical examination of the Canon 798f.
 - in public discourse 804f.
 - theological aspects of the canon 794–799, 811–813
- Carmelites (order) 93
- Cave 7 theory (about NT texts) 109f., 503f., 546–550, 639
- Christianity
- Jewish roots 19f., 44
- Christology 12 34–38, 76f.
- origins of Christology 34f., 37f., 516
- chronology (of the world) 430–435, 459
- commentary (on Biblical texts) 827f.
- conspiracy theories 108f.

- copper scroll 48
 cosmology 443
 court (scene) 658–662
- Damascus Document 60, 217–219
 Daniel (in Qumran) 421
 Daniel tradition 57, 206–209
 “Dead Sea Scrolls Bible” 792f.
 debts/debt imprisonment/debt slavery
 669–673
 – in Hellenistic times 671f.
 – in Persian times 669f.
 demonology 7, 289f.
 determinism 4
 dictionaries 111f., 115f.
 divorce 31
 dualism 4f., 7, 56, 61, 243–299, 763–
 790
 – definition 248f., 301f.
 – development 296–298
 – in Jewish Apocalypticism 304f.,
 308f., 320–322
 – in Johannine Literature 763–790
 – in the Hebrew Bible 243, 302f.
 – in the New Testament 244, 322f.,
 780
 – in the Qumran community 267–273,
 318–320, 776f.
 – in the Qumran corpus 245f., 306–
 320, 775–777
 – in the Rabbinic Literature 244
 – in Zoroastrianism 248f., 303
 – light/darkness 56, 61, 784f.
 – of eschatological opponents 780–782
 – origins 253–256, 296, 785–789
 – spacial 782f.
 – terminology 246
 – transmission outside the community
 298f.
 – types or patterns of dualism 249–
 252, 302
- Eden 441f., 445, 447f., 451
 editions (of Qumran texts) 95f.
 Eisenman, Robert (and his hypothesis)
 502f., 544–546, 745
 Elephantine 461, 463–471, 491
 – papyri 463f.
 – Jewish temple 467–469
 En Feshkha 48
 enlightenment (theology) 21f., 93
 Enoch (book) 199, 209–212
 – edition 199
- “Enochic Judaism” hypothesis 235
 Enoch tradition 55, 423
 – Astronomical Book 55, 209f., 423
 – Book of the Giants 55, 210
 – Book of the Watchers, 210f., 424
 – Similitudes 55
 Epistle of Jeremiah (Baruch 6) 55
 eschatological expectation 436–438
 eschatological opponents 780
 esotericism and the Essenes 584f.
 “Essene quarter” hypothesis 71f.,
 109f., 505–507, 550–554, 639
 “Essene Gospel of Peace” 584f.
 “Essene Letter” 584
 Essenes 13, 16, 28, 66–70, 154, 156f.,
 163–193, 633–635
 – ancient sources 67f., 168–173
 – ancient terms 168f., 187
 – and the *yahad* 156f.
 – as followers of Jesus 507f.
 – early research on E. 93f., 166–168,
 633–635
 – Essene individuals 171, 177f.
 – etymology 188
 – viewed as Christian ascetics 66f.,
 93f., 633
 – viewed as enlightened association 93,
 584, 633f.
 – viewed as “heterodox” Jews 67, 634
 – viewed as influenced by
 Zoroastrianism 67, 634
 – viewed as quasi-“monastic” group
 94, 584
- Eucharist/Lord’s Supper 369, 373f.
 – and Passover 373
 – and Qumran meals 374
 evil 7, 10, 237f.
 – origins of evil 237f.
 exegetical texts (at Qumran) 57f., 828
 exodus (of Israel from Egypt) 434
 Ezekiel 56, 356
 – Temple vision 356–358
 – Pseudo-Ezekiel 56
- flesh 40, 702–705, 710–741
 – and spirit 702–705
 freemasonry movement 93
- Genesis Apocryphon 56, 359
 Gerizim, Mt. (Samaritan Temple) 461,
 469–479, 491
- Hagi/Hagu (Book of) 425

- Halakic letter (= MMT) 745
 Halakic texts 58f.
 Ham (son of Noah) 452f.
 Hebraism/Hebraists 21
 heptadic structure 431f.
 history (understanding of) 217
 history-of-religions research 510, 525,
 529–531, 597–600, 640f.
 history-of-religions school 24, 37, 66,
 373, 706f.
 Hodayot 63, 103, 692–696
 – editions 63, 103
- identity matters (in scholarship) 642f.
 ink tests 50
 inspiration (of the Bible) 797f.
Instruction (wisdom text) 264f., 314f.
 Isaiah Scroll(s) from Qumran 53f.
- Jabne/Jamnia 406
 Jeremiah manuscripts 420, 831
 Jesus / “Historical Jesus”/ of history 7,
 19, 24, 29f., 74–76, 513–516, 600–
 615
 – allegories 515, 656
 – and Qumran 73–76, 513–516, 631f.
 – and the “Teacher of Righteousness”
 73f., 513f., 543f., 603–606, 632
 – and the Essenes 28, 32, 602f., 634
 – as a Jew/in his Jewish context 19, 22,
 612f.
 – as different from Judaism 23
 – antitheses 760f.
 – beatitudes 515, 613f.
 – crucifixion 515
 – eschatology 30f., 33, 74, 219f., 239–
 241, 514f., 606–609, 657
 – exorcisms 30
 – forms of speech 75f., 515
 – healings 30
 – fellowship with sinners 612
 – kingdom of God 30, 34, 74, 514,
 606–609
 – messiahship 29, 76, 515f.
 – on divorce and adultery 31, 60
 – on oaths 31, 610
 – on purity 514, 610f.
 – on Sabbath 31, 611f.
 – Scriptural interpretation 30f.
 – Torah 31, 74, 426, 609–613
 Jewish/Judaean Christianity 19
 Jewish Studies/Judaistik 25, 85
 – Wissenschaft des Judentums 85
- Jewishness of Early Christianity 578,
 646f.
 John (Gospel of) 10, 79–81, 519–523,
 763–790
 – and Qumran 92, 519–523, 629f.,
 763–790
 – dualism 79f., 220–226, 520–523,
 763f., 778–790
 – history-of-religions context 79f.,
 498, 519f., 629f., 763–768, 785–
 789
 – language 521f.
 – eschatological opponents/“prince of
 this world” 780f.
 – eternal life 769
 – light and darkness 78
 – life and death 783
 – light of life 769
 – sons of light 521, 770
 – Spirit-Paraclete 520f.
 – truth and deceit 521, 783f.
 John the Baptist (and Qumran) 73, 499,
 511–513, 561–568, 697
 – purification rite 512f., 568
 – wilderness motif 566f.
 Jonathan (Hasmonean) 486
 Josephus 69f., 170f.
 – life 176
 – on the Essenes 69f., 166f., 170–184,
 379–381
 – on the Samaritans 472–474
 – on the temple of Onias IV 480f.
 – sources 173–184
 – three schools pattern 179
 Joshua 421
 Jubilees 55f., 211f., 288–290, 423f.,
 430–460
 Judaism (in Antiquity) 13f., 43f.
 – diversity 27
 – in Christian interpretation 20–25
 – “heterodox” Judaism 28
 – “late Judaism”/“Spätjudentum” 23,
 200
 – “normative” Judaism 23, 27
- Khirbet Qumran 45–51, 122–161
 – bone deposits 161
 – buildings/compound 47
 – caves 48
 – cemeteries 48, 50, 160
 – ceramics 47
 – chronology of settlement 47, 155
 – coins 122

- connections 159f.
- excavations 46f., 124–134
- identification 46, 122–124
- inhabitants 47, 155
- interpretations of the compound 48–50, 104f., 123f., 129, 134–149, 158f.
- location 45f., 122f.
- related to the text discoveries 147–149, 188
- viewed as cult place 49, 138f.
- viewed as Roman fortress 49, 139f.
- viewed as rural production center 49, 141–144
- viewed as unique 151
- viewed as scroll manufactory 49, 134–137
- viewed as villa rustica 49, 137–139
- viewed as warehouse and caravansary 49, 140f.
- kingdom of God 34
- Kuhn, Karl Georg 88, 97–102

- land of Israel 435
- Leontopolis 461, 479–489, 491
- Levi 56
- Levi tradition 56, 281–286
- life / eternal life 769f.
- light 770f.
- literary testament 325–348
- loans 662–669
- Lord's Prayer 63
- Lord's Supper 369
- and Qumran meals 370f., 398–400
- Luke 656f.

- magic 9
- makarisms 32
- map of the world 451
- Marcion 814f.
- Mastema 289f.
- material investigations 50
- material reconstruction of Scrolls 102–105
- Matthew (Gospel) 11
- meals (at Qumran) 9, 377–392
- messianic meal 392–398
- priestly leadership 394
- Melchizedek 56, 285f., 293, 309
- Melchiresha 56, 285f., 309
- Messiah 35
- Davidic/political 35, 393f., 617f.
- heavenly/angelic 35, 618
- priestly 35, 617
- prophet like Moses 35
- prophetic 618
- messianic age 36
- “Messianic Apocalypse” (4Q521) 214f., 619f.
- messianism/messianology 11, 29, 35, 76f., 515f., 615–622
- Midrash on Eschatology 57, 294
- Miqsat Ma 'asê hat-Tora* (MMT) 2, 58f., 743–762
- Muratorian Fragment 807, 817f.
- Mysteries*, Book of 265f.
- mysteries (Greek) 93
- myth/mythical thought 429

- Nabonidus, Prayer of 57, 207
- Nag Hammadi 527
- navel of the earth 448–450
- Nazi period (scholarship) 86, 97–99
- New Jerusalem 350, 365
- traditions about 366f.
- New Jerusalem text 57, 350–368
- New Testament scholarship 43f.
- Noah 214
- Noah's sons 450–453
- novels (about Essenes and Qumran) 582–584

- oaths 31
- Old Testament (as part of Christian Bible) 800f.
- Old Testament/Tanakh (as part of the Jewish Bible) 404f., 800
- omphalos (see navel of the earth)
- Onias III 482f.
- Onias IV 462, 483–488
- opponents (eschatological) 780–782
- Origen 51, 123
- ostracon 1 (from Khirbet Qumran) 49, 148

- paleography 53
- parabiblical texts 8, 55, 410f., 827f.
- parables 655
- parallels (in history-of-religions research) 510
- “Parting of the Ways” 19, 37
- Paul 6f., 38–43, 77, 696f., 702–705
- and Qumran 38, 77, 516–519, 569–576, 630f., 677–699
- anthropology 518, 702–705
- biography 38

- collection of Epistles 813f.
- dualism 39, 40, 77–79, 518f.
- flesh 40, 571f.
- flesh and spirit 40, 78, 518f., 569–576, 702–741
- history-of-religions research 517, 569, 683f., 705–710
- Jewish roots 38–43
- justification 749–753
- New Perspective on Paul 748, 750–753
- related to Essenes 189–192
- righteousness of God 39, 78, 570
- Scriptural interpretation 79
- Spirit 684–687
- temple metaphors 39
- works of the Law 40–42, 78, 517f., 569f., 748–761
- Pauline letters (collection) 813f.
- Pentateuch 54, 419
- pesharim 57f., 827f.
- Pesher Habakkuk 58
- Pharisees 27
- Philo 68, 169f., 711f.
- on the Essenes 68, 167–170, 182f., 378
- on the Therapeutai 182, 378f.
- physiognomy 65
- Pliny the Elder 66, 125
- political relevance of Qumran 642f.
- prayer (Jewish) 11
- prayer texts 62f.
- predestination 4
- Prophets 419–421, 426
- Protestant theology 85f.
- Psalm manuscripts 55, 422f., 831
- Psalter 54, 422f., 831f.
- Pseudepigrapha 55, 410, 825f.
- purity 7
- Qumran**
 - archaeological site: see Khirbet Qumran
 - caves 52
 - history of discoveries 51
 - Qumran (corpus/library) 13, 26f., 51–66, 403f., 409–412
 - authoritative writings 418–425
 - Biblical manuscripts 53, 116, 404, 409f., 823f.
 - deuterocanonical/apocryphal texts 55, 410f., 825f.
 - diversity (“sectarian” and “non-sectarian”) 28f., 52, 65f., 133f., 412f., 510, 523f., 557–559, 595–597, 639f., 772–774
 - exegetical texts 57f.
 - halakhic texts 58f.
 - languages 52
 - manuscript dates 52–54, 71
 - parabiblical texts 55–57, 410f.
 - poetic texts 62f.
 - prayers 62f.
 - related to Essenes 189–192
 - rule texts 58–61, 411f.
 - scripts 52
 - spirit 688–696
 - wisdom texts 4, 33, 64, 223–224, 614f., 664–669, 701, 721–733, 734f.
 - Qumran and the NT 6, 11–13, 15, 71–81, 117f., 370–372, 497–525, 527–578, 579–622, 623–648, 687f., 789f.
 - patterns of relating the two 499–507, 539–554, 766–768
 - premature suggestions of analogy 540–544
 - relevance for NT scholarship 581f., 621f.
 - Qumran influence on NT scholarship 27, 91f., 117–119, 498f., 576–578, 621f., 646–648, 743f.
 - Qumran calendar 764f.
 - Qumran community/*yahad* 7, 13, 70
 - history 60f.
 - meals 374–398
 - Qumran scholarship 1–3, 70f., 85–119
 - after the 1967 war 130
 - after the 1991 events 133, 746f.
 - in Christian theology 644f.
 - in post-II-world-war Germany 86f.
 - in public discourse 645
 - in Judaism 643
 - periods 529–539, 580f., 585–597, 623f.
 - first period (“Christian questions”) 70f., 87f., 90f., 585–592, 625–628, 744
 - first period (shaped by early editions) 128, 744
 - second period (“Jewish questions”) 133, 593–597, 635–638, 744f.
 - Qumran-Essene hypothesis 50, 66f., 126f., 185

- modified Essene hypothesis 135f., 191–193
- Qumranforschungsstelle 88, 97, 100–102
- Rabbinic tradition 9
- radiocarbon analysis 53
- Rebukes of the Overseer* 65, 148
- regula fidei* 807
- resurrection 56, 231f.
- Reworked Pentateuch* 54, 419, 832f.
- rewritten Bible 12, 56
- Roman Catholic theology (exegesis) 86
- rule texts 59–62, 411
- Rule of the Community (1QS) 59f., 381–383
- Rule of the Congregation (1QSa) 60, 389–392
- Sabbath commandment 440
- Sabbath structure 431
- Sabbath halakha 31, 440
- Samaritans 461, 471–479
 - Samaritan tradition 8
- sanctuaries (in Jubilees) 441–450
- Sayings Source 658–662
- scientific methods 528
- Scriptural interpretation/exegesis 36, 57
- Scriptures 403–428, 823–825
- Septuagint (as Part of the Christian Bible) 801f.
- Sermon on the Mount 651–662, 760f.
- Shem 454f.
- simul iustus et peccator* 631
- Sinai 442f.
- Sirach 55, 663f.
- Son of God / Son of God text 208, 615–617
- Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice 2, 63f., 215
- Sons of Light 770–772
- Spirit 677, 682–699, 768
 - in Qumran 688–699
 - in the early Jesus Movement 682f.
 - in the Hodayot 692–696
 - in the Treatise on the Two Spirits 689–692
- spiritualization 30f.
- Stegemann, Hartmut 102–105
- surety 662–669
- symbolic systems 429f.
- syncretism 464–467
- table of the nations (Gen 10) 450–457
- Targums 423
- Teacher of Righteousness 103f., 747, 760
- Tefillin 48
- Temple (Jerusalem) 360, 461
 - defilement 362
 - precinct 363
 - spiritualization 360f.
- temple metaphors 39
- Temple Scroll 58, 350f., 355, 367
- temples (Jewish) 461, 491f.
- temporal structures 430–438
- terumah* 363
- testament (literary genre) 325–348
 - criteria 329f.
 - in the Bible 326
 - in the Greco-Roman world 326
 - in Judaism 326–328
 - in the Qumran corpus 331–344
 - origins 345–348
- Testament of Benjamin 335f.
- Testament of Joseph 336f.
- Testament of Judah 334f.
- Testament of Levi 283f.
- Testament of Moses 309
- Testament of Naphtali 337
- Testament of Qahat 56 284–286
- Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs 55, 283f., 327f.
- text discoveries (see also Qumran: corpus)
 - in Antiquity 51, 123
- textual forms (of the Bible) 54f.
- Therapeutae 67f., 93
- thunder 65
- time (understanding of) 217–219
- Timotheus I of Seleukia (Nestorian) 51, 123
- topography 459
- Treatise on the Two Spirits 59f., 79f., 221f., 224f., 256–267, 310–313, 522, 687–691, 775–777
 - background in Wisdom thought 262–267, 313–315
 - dualism: multi-dimensional, 257–262, 775–777
 - non-sectarian character 256f.
- Ugarit 527
- Vatican 108

- Vaux, Roland de 124–127
vision 352–354
visionary terminology 353f.
Visions of Amram 56, 213f., 282f.,
308f., 338f.
- Wadi Daliyeh Papyri 474f.
War Rule / War Scroll 61, 225, 273–
278, 316–318
week (of years) 433
women 7, 10
world order 429, 436
worldview 429, 457f.
- Wisdom (book of) 710f.
Wisdom texts (from Qumran) 4, 33,
64, 223–224, 614f., 664–669, 701,
721–733, 734f.
Works of the Law 746–749
Writings (ketuvim) 426
- yahad* 70, 381–398
– community organization 384f.
– community meal 386–388, 392–398
- Zion 443, 445, 456
Zoroastrianism 28, 61, 279

Index of Aramaic, Hebrew, and Greek Words

- b^ene* ... 77
'*asyā*' 187
bāšār 40, 78, 571–575, 713–721, 725–735, 734f.
ḥ^asayyā' 187
ḥ^asîn 187
malkūt 34, 74
mšd ḥsydyn 188
ma ^a*šê hattôrāh* 41, 78, 570, 756–759
ru^h 259
ru^h bāšār 574, 715f., 731
rāz nihyæh 264f., 735,
ḥzh 353
ješær 716, 730f., z736
šdq/š^cdāqāh 570
- Ἀσιδαῖοι 189
βασιλεία 34, 74
Βελιάρ 79
δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ 39, 570
ἔργα νόμου 40, 569f.
Ἑσσαῖοι 67, 168, 187f.
Ἑσσηνοὶ 67, 168, 187f.
καινὴ κτίσις 79
κανὼν 806f.
πνεῦμα 711f.
σάρξ 711f., 737, 739–741
υἱοὶ ... 77
υἱοὶ φωτός 770

Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament

Edited by Jörg Frey (Zürich)

Associate Editors:

Markus Bockmuehl (Oxford) · James A. Kelhoffer (Uppsala)
Tobias Nicklas (Regensburg) · Janet Spittler (Charlottesville, VA)
J. Ross Wagner (Durham, NC)

WUNT I is an international series dealing with the entire field of early Christianity and its Jewish and Graeco-Roman environment. Its historical-philological profile and interdisciplinary outlook, which its long-term editor Martin Hengel was instrumental in establishing, is maintained by an international team of editors representing a wide range of the traditions and themes of New Testament scholarship. The sole criteria for acceptance to the series are the scholarly quality and lasting merit of the work being submitted. Apart from the specialist monographs of experienced researchers, some of which may be habilitations, *WUNT I* features collections of essays by renowned scholars, source material collections and editions as well as conference proceedings in the form of a handbook on themes central to the discipline.

WUNT II complements the first series by offering a publishing platform in paperback for outstanding writing by up-and-coming young researchers. Dissertations and monographs are presented alongside innovative conference volumes on fundamental themes of New Testament research. Like Series I, it is marked by a historical-philological character and an international orientation that transcends exegetical schools and subject boundaries. The academic quality of Series II is overseen by the same team of editors.

WUNT I:

ISSN: 0512-1604

Suggested citation: WUNT I

All available volumes can be found at

www.mohrsiebeck.com/wunt1

WUNT II:

ISSN: 0340-9570

Suggested citation: WUNT II

All available volumes can be found

at www.mohrsiebeck.com/wunt2



Mohr Siebeck
www.mohrsiebeck.com

