SVENSK EXEGETISK 73 ÅRSBOK

På uppdrag av

Svenska Exegetiska Sällskapet

utgiven av

Stig Norin

Uppsala 2008

Svenska Exegetiska Sällskapet
Box 511
SE-751 20 UPPSALA, Sverige
WWW: http://www.teol.uu.se/homepage/SES/

Utgivare:
Stig Norin (stig.norin@teol.uu.se)

Redaktionssekreterare:
Thomas Kazen (thomas.kazen@ths.se)

Recensionsansvarig:
James Starr (james.starr@efs.svenskakyrkan.se)

Prenumerationspriser:
Sverige: SEK 200 (studenter SEK 100)
Övriga världen: SEK 300

SEÅ beställs hos Svenska Exegetiska Sällskapet via hemsidan eller postadress ovan, eller hos Bokrondellen, Stockholm (www.bokrondellen.se).

SEÅ may be ordered from Svenska Exegetiska Sällskapet either through the homepage or at the postal address above. In North America, however, *SEÅ* should be ordered from Eisenbrauns (www.eisenbrauns.com). Search under the title "Svensk Exegetisk Arsbok."

Utgiven med bidrag från Vetenskapsrådet.

Tidskriften är indexerad i Libris databas (www.kb.se/libris/).

This periodical is indexed in the ATLA Religion Database®,
published by the American Theological Library Association,
300 S. Wacker Dr., Suite 2100, Chicago, IL 60606;
E-mail: atla@atla.com; WWW: http://www.atla.com/.

ISSN 1100-2298
Uppsala 2008
Tryck: Elanders, Vällingby

Innehåll

Exegetiska dagen 2007/Exegetical Day 2007

Övriga artiklar/Other articles

Recensioner/Book Reviews

Medarbetare i denna årgång/Contributors in this issue:

Ellen Juhl Christiansen	ellen.finn.chr@tiscali.dk
Torleif Elgvin	telgvin@gmail.com
Birger Gerhardsson	kob.gerhardsson@comhem.se
Jonas Holmstrand	jonas.holmstrand@teol.uu.se
Jörgen Magnusson	jorgen.magnusson@teol.uu.se
Dieter Mitternacht	dieter.mitternacht@svenskakyrkan.se
Hans-Georg von Mutius	trivandrum@arcor.de
Birger Olsson	birger.olsson@teol.lu.se
Per Pettersson	tandapan@hotmail.com
Blaženka Scheuer	blazenka.scheuer@teol.lu.se

Sixty Years of Qumran Research: Implications for Biblical Studies

TORLEIF ELGVIN

The discovery of the scrolls, the delay in their publication from the 1960s to the early 1990s, and the knowledge of all the Qumran material since 1992 have stimulated public interest in the scrolls, in the Bible, and in biblical texts. We have conspiracy theories and speculative bestsellers, from Baigent and Leigh's *The Dead Sea Scrolls Deception* in 1991 to *The DaVinci Code*. But the public fascination with ancient writings that surfaced after 2000 years has given scholars and theologians a unique opportunity to interact with the public and share their knowledge.[1] In this survey article I will relate to some of the relevant fields of scholarship, concentrating on questions of authority/canonicity and the development of the biblical texts.

The literary and textual development of the biblical tradition, authority and canon

The last 15 years have given birth to new views on the formation of biblical texts and canon. The Scrolls have radically altered our picture of the development of the biblical textual tradition from the third century B.C.E. onwards. (The earliest biblical scrolls from Qumran are dated to ca. 250 B.C.E.) Textual history cannot be separated from literary history and canon history. Therefore textual criticism cannot be separated from the question of literary growth of biblical books. To a large extent the quest for an *Urtext* has been left behind. For a number of biblical books we deal with parallel recensions living side-by-side until the end of the Second

[1] A comprehensive and scholarly Danish edition of the scrolls has been published in its 2nd edition: Bodil Ejrnæs (ed.), *Dødehavsskrifterne og de antikke kilder om essæerne i ny oversættelse* (København: Anis, 2003). The Norwegian edition is more popular in style: Torleif Elgvin (ed.), *Dødehavsrullene* (Oslo: Bokklubbene, 2004). A Swedish translation is on its way. For another popular approach to these texts, see Torleif Elgvin, *Mine lepper spiller fløyte: Jødiske bønner før Jesus* (Oslo: Verbum, 2003). The latter publication has lead to the recast of two Qumran hymns for the next Norwegian hymnal.

Temple period and beyond (cf. the 4th century Christian codices of the Septuagint).

It has long been assumed that the elite group within the larger Essene movement to which the Qumran dwellers belonged, the *Yahad* ("the Community"), held to a wider corpus as authoritative than the collection later judged by the rabbis as "books that defile the hands," i.e., authoritative biblical books. *Jubilees* and Enochic books were seen within the *Yahad* as some kind of authoritative writings, and Esther was not viewed as authoritative even though the group knew this book.[2]

Further, the members of the *Yahad* saw their own community as a spirit-filled body, a spiritual temple that still was living in the biblical era. They enjoyed priestly and prophetic inspiration that did not recognize a border between the biblical period and biblical writings on the one side and the *Yahad*, their community, their hymns and writings on the other side. The liturgical performance of the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice and the Hodayot with its Teacher Hymns (cols. IX–XVIII) made the members partakers of the end-time community that was founded by their Teacher—a community that enjoyed communion with the angels in the heavenly temple. One could say that these two liturgical documents belonged to the *actual* and *formative canon* of the *Yahad*, even though they did not belong to its *formal canon*.[3]

If we go to Judaism at large, there is a pluriformity in the textual tradition of biblical books until the end of the Second Temple period. Various texts and families of texts with smaller or larger differences between them coexist until the time of Paul and Matthew.

For some biblical books we may discern two or three textual families and a number of independent orphans around. Our handicap is that until recently we judged all manuscripts by the Masoretic Text, a medieval collection of various texts brought together in a codex. We now see the masoretic text of a specific biblical book as one text among others in the late Second Temple period. The (proto-)masoretic version does not necessarily represent the earliest or best text of the book in question. The texts in the masoretic collection are plainly offsprings of biblical scrolls chosen

---

[2] Shemaryahu Talmon, "Was the Book of Esther Known at Qumran?" *Dead Sea Discoveries* 2 (1995): 249–267.

[3] Cf. Terje Stordalen, "The Canonization of Ancient Hebrew and Confucian Literature," *JSOT* 32 (2007): 3–22, here 20f. Later, the Siddur would belong to the actual canon of Judaism, but not to its formal canon. On the formative power of liturgy, see e.g. Ronald L. Grimes, *Beginnings in Ritual Studies* (rev. edn; Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1995), 51–53.

as quality scrolls in the temple during the generations following the Maccabean restoration in Judea.

Many scholars have accepted Emanuel Tov's division of the ca. 235 biblical scrolls from the Judean Desert (of these ca. 210 come from Qumran) into four families plus a number of orphans.[4]

Forty percent of these scrolls are proto-masoretic (designated "proto-rabbinic" by Frank Moore Cross). These texts are very close to the later masoretic text of each specific biblical book. They were copied by conservative scribes who did not consciously alter the text transmitted to them. The various texts in the masoretic collection of biblical books may differ from each other in their textual character.[5]

Twenty-one percent of the biblical scrolls are copied within Tov's "Qumran scribal school"[6]—which I prefer to call the "*Yahad* scribal school,"[7] as this school predates the settlement at Qumran that only took place in the 90s B.C.E.[8] These scrolls, among them the great Isaiah scroll

---

[4] For the following, see Emanuel Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judean Desert* (STDJ 54; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 125–129, 273; idem, "The Text of the Hebrew/Aramaic and Greek Bible Used in the Ancient Synagogues," in Birger Olsson and Magnus Zetterholm (eds.), *The Ancient Synagogue: From the Beginning to about 200 CE: Papers Presented at the International Conference Held at Lund University Oct. 14-17, 2001* (ConBNT 39; Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 2003), 239–262; Armin Lange, "'Nobody Dared to Add to Them, to Take From Them, or to Make Changes' (Josephus, *Ag. Ap.* 1:42): The Textual Standardization of Jewish Scriptures in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls," in Anthony Hilhorst, Émile Puech, Eibert Tigchelaar (eds.), *Flores Florentino: Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish Studies in Honour of Florentino García Martínez* (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 105–126.

[5] Tov notes on the proto-masoretic family, "it is unclear whether the scribal methods can be characterized by any criteria other than precision (usually), minimal scribal intervention (usually), and the appearance of a *de luxe* format, recognized especially in scrolls found at sites other than Qumran": *Scribal Practices*, 273.

[6] *Ibid.,* 187–197, 203–208, 218–221, 261–288, 337–343. Some of the scrolls from this scribal school were written long before the sectarian settlement at Qumran (the earliest are 4QQoh^{a} and 4QDibMeor^{a}—around 150 B.C.E.), which provides another indication that the *Yahad* should not be identified with the Qumran settlement only. According to Tov, ca. 28 percent of the non-biblical scrolls from Qumran were copied within the Qumran scribal school.

[7] Torleif Elgvin, "The *Yahad* Is More Than Qumran," in Gabriele Boccacini (ed.), *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 273–279, here 278.

[8] Rachel Bar-Natan, "Qumran and the Hasmonaean and Herodian Winter Palaces of Jericho: The Implication of the Pottery Finds for the Interpretation of the Settlement at Qumran," in Katharina Galor, Jean-Baptiste Humbert, Jürgen Zangenberg (eds.), *Qumran: The Site of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Archaeological Interpretations and Debates* (STDJ 57; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 263–277. The best overall presentation of Qumran archaeology is Jodi

from ca. 120 B.C.E., demonstrate a freedom in the textual tradition that allows for insertion of textual changes. The Qumran scribes are more careless and less trained than their colleagues in the group mentioned above.

Further, five percent of the biblical scrolls from Qumran are either pre-Samaritan pentateuchal texts (two scrolls) or Septuagintic (seven Greek and two Hebrew scrolls, 4QJer^{b}, 4QJer^{d}; also 4QLev^{d} and 4QDeut^{q} are related to the Septuagint). The pre-Samaritan texts do not demonstrate Samaritan sectarian characteristics. This textual family displays a harmonizing tendency; one book of Moses could be harmonized with another. Esther and Hanan Eshel conclude that the Samaritans took scrolls from this textual family with them, and that the textual schism within the pre-Samaritan textual family only occurred in the late second century B.C.E.[9] The remaining 35% of the biblical scrolls do not fit into any of these four families.

Within the proto-masoretic collection one can note a growing tendency towards uniformity as time goes on. Tov points to the remarkable fact that all scrolls found at other Judean desert sites, leftovers from the insurgents of the two Jewish revolts, from the textual side are not proto-masoretic but masoretic, virtually identical with the Masoretic text. Tov can only explain this fact by assuming master scrolls of the different biblical books in the Jerusalem temple, a custom evidenced in rabbinic writings. The rabbis refer to "corrected scrolls," scrolls that were proofread according to master scrolls. The zealots revolted for the sake of the temple, and their scrolls had to be "temple kosher." For Tov, the master scrolls in the temple were proto-masoretic at the latest in the second half of the first century B.C.E. One specific scroll, the Greek twelve prophet scroll from Wadi Hever, was corrected towards the masoretic text in this period. A number of similar corrections towards the proto-masoretic texts is evidenced in five further scrolls: 4QLXXNum (dated around the turn of the era), 1QIsa^{b},

---

Magness, *The Archaeology of Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002).

[9] Esther and Hanan Eshel, "Dating the Samaritan Pentateuch's Compilation in Light of the Qumran Biblical Scrolls," in Shalom M. Paul et. al. (eds.), *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov* (SupVT 94; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 215–240. The split within the pre-Samaritan textual family may be connected with John Hyrcan's destruction of the Samaritan centres Garizim and Shechem in 128 and 109 B.C.E.

4QJer[a], MurXII, and the Massada copy of Ezekiel.[10] In contrast to the textual freedom evidenced outside the temple (e.g. at Qumran), Tov assumes textual rigidity in the temple from the late Hasmonean period onwards.

Armin Lange finds textual diversity in Judea until the 1st century C.E. He argues that the movement towards textual standardisation started in Egyptian Jewry in the second century B.C.E., and finds evidence for this in the *Letter of Aristeas* (late 2nd century) and *Papyrus Fouad* 266b, a Greek papyrus of Deuteronomy that was corrected toward the masoretic text in the mid-first century B.C.E. The movement towards standardisation was inspired by Hellenistic ideals represented by the library of Alexandria, and gained terrain in Judea only after the Roman conquest in 63 B.C.E.[11] Lange notes that it is two *Greek* scrolls that present the earliest evidence of revising a text towards the proto-masoretic tradition in Judea (8HevXII, 4QLXXNum).[12]

The Qumran material has enlarged our knowledge of *variant recensions* of biblical books throughout the Second Temple period. The Septuagint preserves some biblical books (1 Samuel, 1 Kings, Jeremiah, Esther, Ezekiel, Daniel) with large-scale differences from the masoretic text on the literary level. Literary differences that betray different recensions are found also in other biblical books. Thorough comparison of biblical scrolls from Qumran with the LXX and the masoretic tradition has given new insights or confirmed earlier scholarly judgement.[13] Some examples: The LXX version of Jeremiah preserves a shorter recension radically different from the masoretic one. This recension, originally in Hebrew, existed parallel to the proto-masoretic one, and its literary form was closed earlier than that of its counterpart. When we come to First and Second Samuel, scholars since Driver have argued that the LXX preserves a better text than the masoretic one. 4QSamuel[a], the most important biblical

---

[10] Joseph T. Milik, *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert* II, 183f; Tov, *Scribal Practices,* 224; Lange, "Nobody Dared to Add to Them," 112. Tov suggests that the scribes corrected simple mistakes through a comparison with their base text, which agreed with the later Masoretic text.

[11] Lange, "Nobody Dared to Add to Them," 116–126.

[12] Lange also notes that 5QDeut was corrected toward the *Vorlage* of the LXX by supralinear corrections in the early Herodian period: Ibid., 115.

[13] E. Tov, "The Nature of the Large-Scale Differences Between the LXX and MT S T V, Compared with Similar Evidence from Qumran and the SP and with Reference to the Original Shape of the Bible," in Adrian Schenker (ed.), *The Earliest Text of the Hebrew Bible: the Relationship between the Masoretic Text and the Hebrew Base of the Septuagint Reconsidered* (IOSCS 52; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 2003), 121–144; idem, "3 Kingdoms Compared with Similar Rewritten Compositions," *Flores Florentino*, 345–366.

scroll from Qumran, can be deemed a cousin of the LXX, but only a fourth cousin of the Masoretic text. In a book such as Ezekiel, the LXX preserves a recension that later was developed into a slightly longer masoretic version. Qumran and Josephus testify to variant recensions also of Joshua and Judges.[14] It is now clear that variant recensions could coexist for a long time also after a certain book was commonly received as authoritative.[15]

The new picture of the texts has deep-ranging consequences for textual criticism and Bible translation that try to restore a meaningful eclectic OT text. Most recent Bible translations have to a limited extent used Qumran readings as a basis for leaving the masoretic version of specific verses. The ongoing Norwegian translation of the OT may be the first that will take the full text of 4QSamuel[a] seriously in a translation project.[16] However, when Bible translators that use MT as their starting point incorporate readings from LXX or Qumran scrolls they must now be aware that they may import readings from a recension different from MT. The LXX often

[14] Two Qumran copies of the Song of Songs, copied in the early Herodian period, reflect shorter recensions of this book, either consciously abbreviated versions (thus Tov) or witnesses of the literary growth of this collection of songs (suggested by Elgvin): Emanuel Tov, "Introduction to 4QCant[a-c]," *DJD* XVI (2000), 195–198; idem, "Three Manuscripts (Abbreviated Texts?) of Canticles from Cave 4," *JJS* 46 (1995) 88–111; Torleif Elgvin, "Nytt fra de siste års Qumranforskning. Hva har hule 4 åpenbart?" in Birger Olsson and Tryggve Kronholm (eds.), *Qumranlitteraturen: Fynden och forskningsresultaten* (Stockholm: Kungl. Vitterhets Historie och Antikvitets Akademien, 1996), 147–163, here 154.

[15] 11QPsalms[a], 11QPsalms[b], and perhaps 4QPsalms[e] preserve a different version of the Psalter than the recension of 150 or 151 psalms preserved by MT and LXX. The order of the preserved psalms is different from MT, and 11QPsalms[a] includes seven non-biblical compositions. James Sanders and Peter Flint have long argued that 11QPsalms[a] is a full-fledged biblical scroll. If they are right, two different recensions of Psalms were in use until the mid-1st century C.E., when 11QPsalms[a] was copied. Talmon, Goshen-Gottstein, and Skehan regard this Psalter as a liturgical collection and no biblical book (I side with the three latter scholars). For a recent update, see Peter Flint, "Five Surprises in the Qumran Psalms Scrolls," *Flores Florentino*, 183–195.

[16] The 1989 edition of NRSV inserted five extra lines from 4QSamuel[a] between 1 Sam 10:27 and 11:1 with the note "Q Ms Compare Josephus." This passage gives background for the following account of Saul's rescuing the Israelites of Jabesh-Gilead from the Ammonite king. Frank Moore Cross, the editor of 4QSamuel[a], was involved in the preparation of NRSV. The new Norwegian version (*GTR: SAM*; Oslo: Det Norske Bibelselskap, 2008) includes this passage as well as the longer LXX version of 1:24–25. Further, a number of variants from LXX or 4QSamuel[a] are either followed in the main text or noted in the apparatus.

reflects an earlier text,[17] but at a certain stage in the textual transmission different scrolls were chosen by temple authorities in Jerusalem.

How did the biblical collection come into being? Today's scholars disagree about *what* was deemed authoritative at *which* stages in the growing tradition of authoritative books. Some recent scholars suggest that a tripartite canon was fixed already by the mid-second century B.C.E.[18] Eugene Ulrich, in contrast, holds that although certain scriptures such as the Torah were widely accepted quite early, the contents of the rest of the authoritative corpus were more fluid at least until the late first century C.E.[19] More than Emanuel Tov, Eugene Ulrich stresses the pluriformity of the textual tradition as long as the temple stands.

George Brooke has rightly argued that the emergence of the Jewish canon was a long process going on through centuries of debate and discernment. And even after the choices were unanimous, the order of the different books within a biblical codex could differ. For a long time books could be attributed *authority* before they attained *canonicity*.[20] Brooke notes that authority and inspiration necessarily would be viewed differently in Hasmonean Jerusalem compared to the oppositional group of the *Yahad*.

But questions remain regarding books that perhaps tried to get into the Bible without success, such as *Jubilees*, the Temple Scroll, 4QReworked Pentateuch, and the books contained in *1 Enoch*. The Qumran material has given rise to genre designations such as "parabiblical writings" and "rewritten Bible."[21] The last decade scholars have boldly raised the question: can we really discern clearly between biblical and parabiblical books in the last three centuries of the Second Temple period? Why should we not

---

[17] Tov notes, "My own intuition tells me that more often than not the LXX reflects an earlier stage than MT both in the literary shape of the biblical books and in small detail": "Nature of the Large-Scale Differences," 143, n. 64.

[18] Julio Trebolle Barrera, "Origins of a Tripartite Old Testament Canon," in Lee Martin McDonald, James A. Sanders (eds.), *The Canon Debate* (Harrisburg: Hendrickson, 2002), 128–145; Elisha Qimron and John Strugnell, *DJD* X, 59 n. 10.

[19] Eugene Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999).

[20] "Between Authority and Canon: The Significance of Reworking the Bible for Understanding the Canonical Process," in Esther G. Chazon, Deborah Dimant, Ruth A. Clements (eds.), *Reworking the Bible: Apocryphal and Related Texts at Qumran* (STDJ 58; Leiden: Brill, 2005), 85–104; idem, "Canonisation Processes of the Jewish Bible in the Light of the Qumran Scrolls" (forthcoming at Aarhus University Press).

[21] Anders Klostergaard Petersen suggests the term "rewritten Scripture" instead of "rewritten Bible": "Rewritten Bible as a Borderline Phenomenon—Genre, Textual Strategy, or Canonical Anachronism?" in *Flores Florentino*, 285–306.

regard *Jubilees*, the Temple Scroll and 4QReworked Pentateuch as valid candidates to the collection of authoritative Jewish books? The Temple Scroll is preserved in three copies from Cave 4 and 11, one of them in a "luxury version," used for books of authority.[22] Reworked Pentateuch is represented by five copies from Cave 4. God himself is the speaker in the Temple Scroll's rendering of Deuteronomic material and additional temple halakha. And *Jubilees* pretends to be direct instruction to Moses by God's mediating angel. Should we regard also these as biblical books-to-be, intended to be read as biblical and authoritative, not as secondary reworking on a different level than the biblical books? During the 2007 Enoch congress that focused on *Jubilees*, Helge Kvanvig remarked that the problem with the term "Rewritten Bible" in the second century B.C.E. is not "Rewritten" but "Bible." Chronicles is a good example of a rewritten biblical text that did receive authoritative status without replacing Samuel and Kings. But written as early as the mid-fourth century, Chronicles would be seen by later interpreters as belonging to the "biblical period."

Emanuel Tov has recently changed his opinion on the status of some parabiblical writings.[23] He no longer sees a difference in (intended) status between the Septuagint versions of 1 Kings, Daniel, and Esther on the one side,[24] and rewritten Bible texts from Qumran on the other, viz. 4QReworked Pentateuch and the Temple Scroll cols. 51–66 that rework Deuteronomy. *Jubilees*, the Samaritan Pentateuch, and to some degree pre-Samaritan scrolls from Qumran go into the same category. All these belong to a dynamic process of working with the biblical text where reworked texts (at least by some circles) were not seen as less authoritative than their *Vorlagen*. Different from his previous opinion as editor of

---

[22] Emanuel Tov, "The Writing of Ancient Biblical Texts, with Special Attention to the Judean Desert Scrolls," in Chaim Cohen, Avi Hurwitz, Shalom M. Paul (eds.), *Sefer Moshe: The Moshe Weinfeld Jubilee Volume: Studies in the Bible and the Ancient Near East, Qumran, and Post-Biblical Judaism* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2004), 445–458, here 455–458.

[23] Emanuel Tov, "The Many Forms of Scripture: Reflections in Light of the LXX and 4QReworked Pentateuch," in József Zsengellér (ed.), *From Qumran to Aleppo: A Discussion with Emanuel Tov about the Textual History of Jewish Scriptures in Honor of his 65th Birthday* (Leiden: Brill, 2008, forthcoming). Tov does not carry forth his conclusions when it comes to the Genesis Apocryphon (1Q20), mentioned but hardly discussed in this paper.

[24] "The Greek versions of 1 Kings, Esther, and Daniel represent rewritten versions of MT ... All three Greek books were considered to be authoritative by ancient Judaism and Christianity alike": "3 Kingdoms Compared," 363. It stands to reason that at least some Jewish circles considered these versions authoritative before they entered the Christian canon.

4QReworked Pentateuch, Tov now sees it as a *biblical* book, and calls it "4QPentateuch."

Tov points to the following characteristics common for the two Qumranic compositions and the LXX reworking of proto-masoretic texts: 1) addition of large *narrative expansions* at key points in the story; 2) adding religious flavour to more "secular" passages; 3) addition of new ideas in small details. Two additional features also occur, viz. 4) duplication of material from one biblical book into another; and 5) theme summaries. Tov states that these compositions rework the "meticulously transmitted" proto-masoretic text. It is unclear if these new and free renderings were intended by their authors to receive an authoritative status similar to the text they rework. However, some of them would be attributed authority in subsequent centuries.

On these issues, the scholarly discussion is intense and no consensus has been reached. The *Yahad*'s pesher exegesis of prophetic and psalmic texts in the late second and early first century presupposes specific books as authoritative, as do references to "Daniel the prophet" in *Yahad* writings. In my view,[25] the Pentateuch, the books of Deuteronomic history and the prophets were seen as authoritative by most, perhaps all, Judeans at the time of Ben Sira, around 190 B.C.E. During the second century B.C.E. a number of further writings were deemed authoritative, centred around Davidic[26] and Solomonic books. But the borderline around the Scriptures was probably not clearly drawn during the Second Temple period. Only by the late first[27] or early second century C.E. was the inclusion of books such as Esther, Ecclesiastes, and the Song of Songs confirmed, while Sirach and Enochic books were deemed outside this collection. The acceptance of Song of Songs into the collection of authoritative writings was probably due to the allegoric interpretation of the book strongly advocated by rabbi Akiva, who saw this book as the most sacred in all Scripture (*m. Yad*. 3:5).

If we go back to the second century B.C.E., certain circles did regard Enochic books and *Jubilees* as divinely inspired. But we do not know how widely recognized these scrolls were, even though four NT writings seem

---

[25] Cf. Oskar Skarsaune, *In the Shadow of the Temple: Jewish Influences on Early Christianity* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 2002), 279–299.

[26] When smaller psalm scrolls grew into a Davidic Psalter of 150/151 psalms in the period 300–150 B.C.E. and were prefaced by Ps 1, the character of the Book of Psalms would gradually change from hymnal to scripture.

[27] Cf. Josephus' reference to 22 books, *Ag. Apion* 1.37–41.

to refer to the Enochic *Book of Watchers* as authoritative (cf. Matt 24:30f.; 1 Pet 3:19f.; 2 Pet 2:4, Jude 6:14f.).

We need to discern between different levels of authority and canonicity. I have argued above that the Hodayot and the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice belonged to the *actual* and *formative* canon of the *Yahad* without belonging to its *formal* canon. If the five books of Moses were commonly received as authoritative by the time of Ben Sira, new "mosaic" books such as 11QTemple and *Jubilees* were written too late to get a similar status, and their authors would be aware of this. The second century authors of 11QTemple, *Jubilees*, Reworked Pentateuch[28] and Enochic books knew that their writings had little chance or none to be accepted as authoritative by Israel at large, as they differed from the "standard" Pentateuch on the halakhic level.[29] But these authors intended their books to function authoritatively for circles with a world view and theology close to their own. Thus these books should be categorized as *sectarian canon*.[30] The specific Samaritan additions into the pre-Samaritan scrolls after the textual schism in the late second century were also meant to function as sectarian canon. The Samaritan scribes could not foresee a reception of this reworked text by Israel at large. Their reworked text would function apologetically within the community.

On the other side, the Genesis Apocryphon with its midrashic retelling of material from Genesis was not intended as sectarian canon. Its author had no intention of replacing the Genesis scroll or putting his own work on the same level as biblical books.

On the general level we must discern between the status intended by the writer/editor and later *Wirkungsgeschichte* of the book in question.

---

[28] Reworked Pentateuch can be categorized as sectarian or proto-sectarian rewriting from the 2nd century: R. S. Nam, "How to Rewrite Torah: The Case for Proto-Sectarian Ideology in the *Reworked Pentateuch (4QRP)*," *RevQ* 23 (2007): 153–165. In my view, RP was published too late and differed too much to be received as a valid substitute for the commonly received Pentateuch. Its inclusion of prescriptions on the festivals of oil and wood in Lev 23–24 pushes RP towards the category "sectarian canon" together with the Temple Scroll. *Pace* Tov, "Reworked Pentateuch" should still be the right designation for this composition. For a similar characterisation of RP, see Moshe J. Bernstein, "What has Happened to the Laws? The Treatment of Legal Material in 4QReworked Pentateuch," *Dead Sea Discoveries* 15 (2008): 24–49.

[29] I make an exception for the *Book of Watchers*. The core of this book (chs. 6–11, 12–16) goes back to the 3rd century. These authors could have intended their books to be received as authoritative by Israel at large.

[30] On 'sectarianism' in Jewish tradition, see David J. Chalcraft (ed.), *Sectarianism in Early Judaism: Sociological Advances* (London and Oakville: Equinox, 2007).

Some books that entered the Jewish canon (e.g. Esther, Song of Songs) may have been written without the intention of achieving authoritative status.[31]

Among texts written in the second century B.C.E., biblical texts recast in Greek language would have greater chance of achieving authoritative status than reworked Hebrew texts. The Greek texts would by necessity be used in the Greek-speaking diaspora and make their impact, first in Jewish communities and later in Christian ones. Jewish Christians would often function as bridge builders who brought Jewish literary traditions into Christian communities.[32]

The pluriformity of second temple Judaism

The Qumran caves preserve a *Jewish*[33] library or depositary,[34] not a Christian one. It shows the pluriformity of Jewish tradition in the Land of Israel during the last three centuries of the second temple period. This pluriformity caused the greatest scholar of rabbinic tradition of the last generation, Jacob Neusner, to talk about the *Judaisms* of the second temple period. The Judaism of Jesus' day was not a uniform pre-rabbinic Judaism, but a pluriform tradition where acceptance (in principle) of the temple and the Mosaic torah were the only common markers. According to Neusner, rabbinic Judaism developed gradually after the fall of the temple, and crystallized only in the encounter with Byzantine Christianity in late fourth century Palestine.

I would like to supplement Neusner's judgement somewhat. In my view, only the defeat in the 2nd century Bar Kochba revolt gives the impe-

---

[31] This would certainly be true for the initial composition of the various songs that later were included in the "Solomonic" collection Song of Songs.

[32] Cf. T. Elgvin, "Jewish Christian Editing of the Old Testament Apocrypha," in Oskar Skarsaune and Reidar Hvalvik (eds.), *Jewish Believers in Jesus: The Early Centuries* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2007), 278–304.

[33] Cf. Lawrence H. Schiffman's introduction to the scrolls: *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).

[34] Two scholars suggest that the eleven caves represent depositaries from different time periods: Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra, "Old Caves and Young Caves: A Statistical Reevaluation of a Qumran Consensus," *Dead Sea Discoveries* 14 (2007): 313–333; Stephen S. Pfann, "Reassessing the Judean Desert Caves: Libraries, Archives, *Genizas* and Hiding Places," *Bulletin of the Anglo-Israel Archaeological Society* 25 (2007): 147–170.

tus to rework Jewish tradition into a Judaism without the Temple.[35] And the formative rabbinic encounter with Christianity and specifically with Jewish Christianity started in the second, not the fourth century. As one example, Tannaitic texts on celebration of Passover show a conscious anti-Christian polemic. The earliest Pesach haggada is not the liturgy of Jesus' last meal (as presupposed in *En Bok om Nya Testamentet*, the basic Scandinavian introduction to the NT in the 1970s and 1980s), but a second and third century liturgy consciously framed to exclude Jewish Christians from table fellowship.[36] Mishnah Pesahim, the early rabbinic commentary *Mekilta de-Rabbi Ishmael*,[37] and the haggada reveal rabbinic polemic against early Christian tradition preserved by Justin and Melito's *On the Pascha.*

Legal elements of the much later rabbinic movement have been identified as halakhic viewpoints held by the adversaries of the *Yahad*, probably proto-pharisaic theologians supported by the Maccabean rulers. So elements of the rabbinic halakhic tradition are indeed early, with roots in the second century B.C.E. But proto-rabbinic halakha was not alone on the scene. Different Jewish groups contested the legal and interpretative positions held by their adversaries. This is evidenced in *Jubilees* (around 160 B.C.E.), the second century Damascus document, and the halakhic treatise MMT that is difficult to date.

Thus, the synagogue's traditional understanding that rabbinic tradition immediately followed Ezra and the biblical fathers,[38] must now be judged as a biased stylisation of history. In the aftermath of the speculative books on Vatican suppressing of scrolls that could endanger the church and its

---

[35] Michael Becker argues that rabbinic theology was widely received only after Bar Kochba's defeat: "Apokalyptisches nach dem Fall Jerusalems. Anmerkungen zum frührabbinischen Verständnis," in Michael Becker and Markus Öhler (eds.), *Apokalyptik als Herausforderung neutestamentlicher Theologie* (WUNT 214; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006), 283–360, here 307.

[36] Israel J. Yuval, "Easter and Passover as early Jewish-Christian dialogue," in Paul F. Bradshaw and Lawrence A. Hoffman (eds.), *Passover and Easter: Origin and History to Modern Times* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1999), 28–126.

[37] The following features may indicate anti-Christian polemic in *Mekilta*: the merits of the people of Israel and the redemptive power of Isaac's blood as reasons for God's saving acts ("As a reward for their performing these duties," "He sees the blood of the sacrifice of Isaac"); the downplaying of the role of Moses; the denial of any mediating angel slaying the Egyptians ("not through an angel nor through an agent"); the evil fourth son who excludes himself from and shall be excluded from the community: Mekilta to Exod 12:12–13, 29; 13:14. I am indebted to Annlaug Vegge for these references.

[38] Cf. the late (post-rabbinic?) tractate *Avot* ch. 1, and the earlier version in *Avot de Rabbi Nathan* ch. 1.

scriptures, Emanuel Tov, himself a Jew, remarked that the Scrolls do not endanger Christianity—as we basically deal with a pre-Christian collection. But the Scrolls could potentially be more dangerous to a narrow orthodox Judaism, as they demonstrate that the traditional rabbinic picture of the transition from the Hebrew Bible to Mishnah and Talmud cannot be historically upheld anymore.[39]

Qumran material together with other intertestamental texts and Josephus also challenge the rabbinic dictum that prophecy ceased with Malachi. The wider textual corpora show prophetic inspiration and prophetic literary products present in the Jewish people until the fall of the temple and beyond.[40]

When first century Judaism is acknowledged as a pluriform entity, it becomes clear that the early Jesus movement should be considered one Jewish stream among others. Among Jewish charismatics we can count Zechariah and his son John the Baptist, Simeon and Anna in the temple, Jesus, as well as Jewish Christian prophets reflected in *Didache* and the *Ascension of Isaiah*.

A variety of early Jewish literature

Among fields greatly influenced by the Qumran texts we can count the study of early Jewish history,[41] of the development of Jewish halakha,[42] of the apocrypha and pseudepigrapha,[43] of Jewish liturgy,[44] of messianism,[45]

---

[39] Personal communication.

[40] Rebecca Gray, *Prophetic Figures in Late Second Temple Jewish Palestine: The Evidence from Josephus* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993).

[41] See Hanan Eshel, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Hasmonean State* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008); Avital Pinnick and Daniel R. Schwartz (eds.), *Historical Perspectives: From the Hasmoneans to Bar Kochba in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (STDJ 37; Leiden: Brill, 2001).

[42] See Ya'akov Sussmann, "The History of the Halakha and the Dead Sea Scrolls. Preliminary Talmudic Observations on Miqsat Ma'ase ha-Torah (4QMMT)," in *DJD* X, 179–200; Steven D. Fraade, Aharon Shemesh, and Ruth A. Clement (eds.), *Rabbinic Perspectives: Rabbinic Literature and the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the Eighth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 7-9 January, 2003* (STDJ 62; Leiden: Brill, 2006).

[43] See e.g. Esther G. Chazon and Michael Stone (eds.), *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 12-14 January, 1997* (STDJ 31; Leiden: Brill, 1999).

[44] See e.g. Esther G. Chazon (ed.), *Liturgical Perspectives: Prayer and Poetry in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the Fifth International Symposium of the Orion*

and of the Jewish sapiential tradition.[46] Since the latter is of particular interest for New Testament studies, it will be briefly discussed here.

Wisdom features are prominent in a number of *Yahad* writings such as the Hodayot, the Community Rule, and the parenetic Words of the Maskil. But the caves also revealed a number of presectarian writings that show the development of the OT wisdom tradition. 4Q424 Sapiential Work preserves proverbial sentences similar to Proverbs. The same features are found in 4Q420/421, but this composition reflects sectarian editing: the first part of this work refers to the organisation of the *Yahad* and contains an earlier admonition to carry the yoke of Wisdom (cf. Sir 6:23–28; Matt 11:29). The personification of (Lady) Wisdom from Prov 1–9 finds its continuation not only in Sir 1 and 24 and Bar 3–4, but also in presectarian hymns and admonitions.[47] So there is a wide intertestamental textual background for the wisdom christology found in John 1:1–18; Matt 11:19, 25–29; Col 1:15–20, and Heb 1:3.[48]

"Lady Wisdom" does not figure clearly in the writings of the *Yahad* or the presectarian 4QInstruction: God's wisdom and power are intrinsically connected to God himself and not related to any derived hypostatic figure. I have argued that in these writings "Lady Wisdom" has been replaced by the apocalyptic concept *raz* or *raz nihyeh*, the unfolding mystery of God.[49]

Among the "new" sapiential writings, 4QInstruction and 1Q/4QMysteries have received particular attention. Both may be dated to the early 2nd century B.C.E., and refer to the hidden mysteries of God, *raz* or *raz nihyeh*. So there is now a wider background to Paul's references to the mysteries of God.

Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature (STDJ 48; Leiden: Brill, 2003).

[45] See e.g. John J. Collins, *The Scepter and the Star: The Messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Ancient Literature* (New York: Doubleday, 1995).

[46] For a good survey, see Matthew J. Goff, *Discerning Wisdom: The Sapiential Literature of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (SupVT 116; Leiden: Brill, 2007); and further Charlotte Hempel, Armin Lange, and Herman Lichtenberger (eds.), *The Wisdom Texts from Qumran and the Development of Sapiential Thought* (BETL 159; Leuven: Peeters, 2002).

[47] 4Q184 (4QWiles of the Wicked Woman); 4Q185 (4QSap. Work); 4Q525 (4QBeatitudes) 2 II 2–8; 2 III; 5 6–13; 11QPs[a] 154:5–15; 11QPs[a] Hymn to the Creator; 11QPs[a] Sirach; 4Q420/421 (4QWays of Righteousness).

[48] Daniel Harrington, "Wisdom Christology in the Light of Early Jewish and Qumran Texts," *Mishkan* 44 (2005): 36–42.

[49] "The Mystery to Come: Early Essene Theology of Revelation," in Frederick H. Cryer and Thomas L. Thompson (eds.), *Qumran Between the Old and the New Testament* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 113–150.

1Q/4QMysteries derives from circles close to the pre-Maccabean temple, and is preserved in one copy from Cave 1 and two or three from Cave 4. It is a composite work that contains wisdom instructions and wisdom sayings, rhetorical dialogues, eschatological outlooks, hymnic and hekhalot-like passages, references to priestly service, as well as reflections on creation and the ways of men.[50] Dualistic features abound.

4QInstruction is preserved in one copy from Cave 1 and seven from Cave 4 (all from the Herodian period) and must have been a popular work in the *Yahad*.[51] It is once quoted in the Hodayot and has also influenced the Community Rule and the Damascus Document. 4QInstruction has been characterized as *apocalyptic* wisdom. This work contains sections with short wisdom admonitions and others with more eschatological and apocalyptic flavour. At times admonitions and eschatological material are conflated.

4QInstruction, 1Q/4QMysteries and *1 Enoch* demonstrate that early Jewish apocalyptic grew out of the wisdom tradition. In times of crisis (Judea repeatedly experienced wars and devastation in 220–198 B.C.E. and again during the early Maccabean period) sages read the scriptures and their own times in eschatological and prophetic light.

Some NT scholars working on the Q source and the Gospel of Thomas (especially some connected to the American "Jesus Seminar") have suggested that the earliest gospel was a proto-Q that only preserved words of Jesus and was not interested in his birth, life, death, or resurrection. The latter themes, as well as apocalyptic sayings on the return of the Son of Man in glory, would be ascribed to a later Markan invention.[52] But 4QInstruction and 1Q/4QMysteries have demonstrated that sapiential and eschatological/apocalyptic tradition had converged by the early second

---

[50] Torleif Elgvin, "Priestly Sages? The Milieus of Origin of 4QMysteries and 4QInstruction," in John J. Collins, Gregory E. Sterling, and Ruth A. Clements (eds.), *Sapiential Perspectives: Wisdom Literature in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (STDJ 51; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 67–87; Eibert C. Tigchelaar, "Your Wisdom and Your Folly: The Case of 1-4QMysteries," in Florentino García Martínez (ed.), *Wisdom and Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Biblical Tradition* (BETL 168, Leuven: Peeters, 2003), 69–88.

[51] The literature on 4QInstruction is large. For a good introduction, see Matthew J. Goff, *The Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom of 4QInstruction* (STDJ 50; Leiden: Brill, 2003). On the research history, see Goff, *Wisdom*, 6–27; Benjamin G. Wold, *Women, Men and Angels: The Qumran Wisdom Document Musar leMevin and its Allusions to Genesis Creation Traditions* (WUNT 201; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005), 4–40.

[52] See e.g. Burton L. Mack, *The Christian Myth: Origins, Logic, and Legacy* (New York: Continuum, 2001); John S. Kloppenborg, *Excavating Q: the History and Setting of the Sayings Gospel* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 2000).

century B.C.E. The conflation of wisdom and apocalyptic material in many NT writings is therefore at home in the Judean context. A portrait of Jesus as a wisdom preacher in a Cynic-style tunic seems to be a modern scholarly invention without roots in first century Galilee.

The Jewish setting of the early Jesus movement

The Qumran depository or depositories represent a *Jewish* library, not a Christian one. There are no references to NT figures, as argued by a number of speculative books. However, the Qumran writings have greatly enlarged our knowledge of the Jewish matrix out of which the early Jewish Christian communities emerged. They place Jesus and his followers more clearly into the Jewish milieu of Galilee and Judea of the first century. Bultmann has been overhauled: the Gospel and the gospels must primarily be understood by comparison with the Jewish and Hebrew thought world of the first century, and not be judged as Greek mythology or Hellenistic products.[53]

A number of NT themes and passages are now understood more clearly in light of texts from Qumran. A few examples will be presented here.

Qumran texts shed light on New Testament *terminology*. Phrases such as "men of goodwill" (Luke 2:14; 4Q418 81 10; 4Q298 1–2 I, 3–4; $1QH^a$ XIX, 12 "sons of your goodwill"), "poor in spirit" (Matt 5:3; $1QH^a$ VI, 14; 1QM XIV, 7), and "sons of light" (Luke 16:8; Eph 5:8; cf. John 8:12) were for the first time documented in Hebrew. Further, these terms were used as "ecclesiological" self-designations for the Qumran community, a relevant factor for the interpretation of these NT passages.

Biblical interpretation from Qumran has shed light on the *interpretation of the OT* in NT writings. The pesher exegete of the *Yahad* read psalms and prophets eschatologically in light of contemporary developments. There are parallels to this form of interpretation in Matthew and other NT writings. But biblical interpretation in Qumran is much more than the atomistic pesher method. In the Damascus Document and the Florilegium (4Q174) we find thematic eschatological interpretation of

[53] Craig A. Evans, "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Jewishness of the Gospels," *Mishkan* 44 (2005): 9–17. At the same time, literary forms from the Greco-Roman tradition influenced NT writers.

biblical passages similar to that of Matthew and the use of Ps 2 in Acts 4:23–31.[54]

Earlier scholars pointed to many parallels between Qumran dualism and central concepts in John's gospel. Essene and Qumranic influence on John, Paul, and the community portrayed in Acts was asserted by scholars such as James Charlesworth and David Flusser. But Richard Bauckham has rightly argued that John and the *Yahad* rather should be seen as independent voices that interpret dualistic traditions from the wider Jewish milieu in the Land of Israel and its surroundings.[55]

There are parallels between the self-understanding of the *Yahad* and that of the early Jesus movement. In both movements there are intense eschatological expectations that provide interpretative keys for reading earlier texts. Both movements regarded themselves as Israel renewed, the Community of the last days, a messianic movement that would lead to the renewal of Israel at large. In both movements revelation of the divine plan of redemption was still an ongoing process. So there is no clear border between the writings of the Hebrew Bible and biblical Israel on one side, and the end-time New Israel with its continuing revelation on the other.

George Brooke remarks that there are both parallels and differences between these two faith communities: the *Yahad* looked intensely forward to the expected eschatological vindication of their cause and the fulfilment of prophecies that would restore them as leaders of Israel. In contrast, the NT communities generally looked back to the death and resurrection of Jesus as their vindication, and this paved the way for a more open attitude towards outsiders than that of the *Yahad*. Further, the Qumranites were Scripture-oriented; sacred Scripture set the agenda for faith and order. Exegesis of Scripture occasioned both commentaries and new writings that would supplement the previous collection. In contrast, from an experiential and christological starting point NT authors searched the scriptures for proof texts that could support their kerygmatic and charismatic agenda.[56]

I will close this section with some examples of NT themes enlightened by Qumran texts: First, crucifixion or "hanging on a tree." I have followed

---

[54] See George Brooke, "Eschatological Bible Interpretation in the Scrolls and in the New Testament," *Mishkan* 44 (2005): 18–25.

[55] "The Qumran Community and the 'Dualism' Contained in the Gospel of John," in Lawrence H. Schiffman, Emanuel Tov, and James C. VanderKam (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Fifty Years after Their Discovery. Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20-25, 1997* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2000), 105–115.

[56] Brooke," Eschatological Bible Interpretation," 21–24.

the lead of Jewish scholars who argue that priestly halakha, recorded in the Temple Scroll and reflected in other sources, asserts that blasphemy or betraying God's people should lead to executing the culprit by hanging him on the tree. This is based on reading Deut 21:22 regarding the capital offender who is put to death by being hanged on the tree as one who both has cursed God and is cursed by God. According to John 19:5–7, it was precisely the chief priests and their men who found Jesus guilty in blasphemy and shouted "crucify him, crucify him!" This tradition sheds light also on NT passages such as Acts 5:30; 1 Cor 12:3; Gal 3:12f.[57]

Second, according to Matt 19:12, some renounce marriage for the sake of the kingdom of heaven, cf. Paul's teaching in 1 Cor 7. Qumran gives us some Jewish forbearers for setting family aside for the sake of the name. The archaeology of Qumran and its cemetery reveals some kind of a male monastic setting, with temporary celibacy for the sake of the *Yahad*, the Community.[58] The same reality may be reflected in the Community Rule and in the Temple Scroll's vision of the temple city as a city not ritually defiled by sexual-related emissions.[59]

Apocalyptic and mystical trends in Jewish tradition

Qumran has enriched us both with apocalypses and apocalyptically influenced writings.[60] Most of the apocalypses are Aramaic writings, now generally viewed as pre-Qumranic literature. The 1973 publication of the Enoch texts from Qumran by Joseph T. Milik changed the face of scholarship. Apocalyptic has become a central issue in the study of Early Judaism with repercussions also for New Testament studies. An Enoch conference with a core of around 30 scholars now meets biannually in Italy.

---

[57] Torleif Elgvin, "The Messiah Who was Cursed on the Tree," *Themelios* 22 (1997): 14–21; Norwegian edition: "Forbannet er den som henger på treet," *Tidsskrift for teologi og kirke* 4 (1998): 253–262.

[58] Magness, *Archaeology of Qumran*, 163–187.

[59] Elisha Qimron, "Celibacy in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Two Kinds of Sectarians," in Julie Trebolle Barrera and Luis Vegas Montaner (eds.), *Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid, 18-21 March 1991* (STDJ 11; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 287–294. 11QT XLVI does not envisage any quarantines outside the temple city for menstruating women as in other cities of Israel (XLVIII, 14–17).

[60] See John J. Collins, *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (London and New York: Routledge, 1997); Jörg Frey and Michael Becker (eds.), *Apokalyptik und Qumran* (Paderborn: Bonifatius, 2007); Becker and Öhler, *Apokalyptik als Herausforderung neutestamentlicher Theologie*.

Both palaeographic evidence and literary contents place two Enochic documents well before the formation of Daniel. The core of the *Book of Watchers* (*1 En.* 6–16) and the *Book of Luminaries* (chs. 72–82) belong to the third century B.C.E. So Daniel is not the first Jewish apocalypse; it interacts with earlier Jewish apocalyptic texts and is again interpreted and reinterpreted in other books that follow.

The Qumran scrolls did not contain the *Book of Similitudes* (chs. 37–71) where Enoch is transformed into a heavenly Son of Man, some kind of God's viceroy. This fact has stimulated recent preoccupation with this particular Enochic book, and the 2005 Enoch conference was dedicated to it. There now seems to be a consensus that the *Similitudes* should be dated around the turn of the era.[61] As a pre-Christian writing this book bridges Daniel 7 and gospel texts, and it deserves more attention in the understanding of the Son of Man concept in the New Testament.

Mystical texts and motifs in the Qumran collection shed light on the background and development of Jewish mysticism. Some NT texts are highly relevant in this context. In 2 Cor 12:1–7 Paul talks about himself being elevated to the third heaven, to paradise, and hearing inexpressible things. Jesus and Stephen are pictured with visions into the heavenly realms (Luke 10:18, Acts 7:56). Hebrews and Revelation are books preoccupied with the heavenly sanctuary and the liturgical proceedings before the heavenly throne and the divine altar. The rabbinic corpus contains a few texts with similar features. Further, on the fringe of the late rabbinic movement we find a body of literature, the hekhalot or merkavah books, where Jewish mystics are heavily engaged with journeys into the heavenly temple. Through *1 Enoch* and Qumran texts such as the angelic Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifices one may draw a map on the development of a priestly/Levitical mystical tradition with roots in the OT, which may enable us to locate Hebrews and Revelation within the context of Levitical traditions of the first century.[62]

When it comes to Hebrews 7, three texts referring to Melchizedeq are of particular importance. The presectarian 4QVisions of Amram (200–150 B.C.E.) refers to Melchizedeq as the ruler of all sons of light, opposed to

---

[61] See the various contributions in Gabriele Boccacini (ed.), *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007).

[62] Philip Alexander, *Mystical Texts* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 2006); Håkan Ulfgard, "The Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice and the Heavenly Scene of the Book of Revelation," in Anders Klostergaard Petersen et al. (eds.), *Northern Light on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (forthcoming); Torleif Elgvin, "Temple Mysticism and the Temple of Men," in Charlotte Hempel (ed.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Text and Context* (forthcoming).

Melchiresha, the king of darkness. The preserved text of the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice once refers to Melchizedeq as angelic chief priest in the heavenly sanctuary. And the sectarian eschatological pesher 11QMelchizedeq portrays him as archangel (God's viceroy) and divine agent of vengeance and redemption at the day of judgement. In light of these texts it may be asserted that Hebrews shares an earlier Jewish exegetical tradition:[63] While Melchizedeq in the biblical text is without genealogy, for later levitical tradition he may be a divine agent with a guest visit on earth in Abraham's time. For the levitical author of Hebrews, Melchizedeq would be the natural antitype for Christ, who is both high priest in the heavens and a radiance of God's glory (1:3). This textual background explains the author's need to stress that Christ is higher than any of the angels (1:5–14).

The Levi Apocryphon 4Q541 may be seen as another forbearer of the nascent Christology of the early Jesus movement. Frg. 9 of this testament of Levi portrays an end-time priest with a unique teaching ministry. He will experience resistance from his own people, but is vindicated when his teaching reaches the ends of the earth and renews the cosmos:

> He will be sent to all the children of his people. The people will go astray in his days. They will speak many words and an abundance of lies against him. But his word will be like the word of the heavens, and his teaching according to the will of God. His eternal sun will shine, its fire will burn unto the ends of the earth and shine above the darkness. Then darkness will vanish from the earth and gloom from the dry land.

The last two servant songs of Isaiah 50 and 53, probably texts on a prophetic figure originally, are here interpreted as an eschatological priest.[64]

This pre-Qumranic Aramaic text probably served as model for the so-called Self-Glorification hymn. This hymn is preserved in two recensions in four manuscripts and was included in the Community's songbook, the Thanksgiving Hymns. In this hymn the psalmist sings in the first person on his unique teaching, his persecution and elevation to the heavenly realms as God's close friend in the midst of the angels.

---

[63] Anders Aschim, "Melchizedek and Jesus: 11QMelchizedek and the Epistle to the Hebrews," in Carey C. Newman, James R. Davila, and Gladys S. Lewis (eds.), *The Jewish Roots of Christological Monotheism: Papers from the St. Andrews Conference on the Historical Origins of the Worship of Jesus* (SupJSJ 63; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 129–147.

[64] Torleif Elgvin, "The Individual Interpretation of the Servant," *Mishkan* 43 (2005): 25–33.

> I am the friend of the King and companion of the holy angels. No one can be compared to my glory, for with the godlike ones is my position, and with the sons of the King is my glory. I am counted among the godlike ones, and my dwelling is in the holy congregation. Who bears all sorrow like me, and who suffers evil like me?—There is no one. I have been taught, and there is no teaching comparable to mine.[65]

While the Righteous Teacher might be the author or model for this hymn, it could later be attributed to the *maskil*, the leader of the community, acting as liturgical leader of the *Yahad*. And each member of the community would have a part in this charismatic liturgical elevation as he was partaking in the liturgy.[66]

The priestly and collective messianism reflected in this hymn and its usage has clear lines to the Christology of Hebrews, and to NT concepts of partaking with the risen Christ. As with other Qumran writings we see both parallel lines and differences that put the NT teaching into profile.

Jewish-Christian scholarly cooperation

The study of the Qumran scrolls has played a role in Jewish-Christian discourse and dialogue. Jewish scholars such as David Flusser and Geza Vermes have provided challenging contributions to the understanding of Jesus and many NT texts.[67] Both these scholars used Qumran material in their encounter with Jesus, the evangelists, and Paul. Flusser's close friend and collaborator Shmuel Safrai rather used rabbinic literature to illuminate NT passages. In this context we may mention the so-called "Jerusalem School of Synoptic Studies," where Flusser, Shmuel Safrai, and Hannah

---

[65] For the texts, see Florentino García Martínez and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 897, 953, 981.

[66] Cf. Alexander, *Mystical Texts*, 101–119, and Carol Newsom's discussion of the "Teacher hymns": *The Self as Symbolic Space: Constructing Identity and Community at Qumran* (STDJ 52; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 287–346.

[67] David Flusser's book on Jesus (1968) was radically updated in 1997: *Jesus* (Jerusalem: Magness, 1997, in collaboration with R. Steven Notley). See also Flusser's collection of articles: *Judaism and the Origins of Christianity* (Jerusalem: Magness, 1988). Vermes, one of the fathers of Qumran studies, has published a long range of books on the New Testament. Among them are *Jesus the Jew: A Historian's reading of the Gospels* (London: Collins, 1973); *Jesus and the World of Judaism* (London: SCM, 1983); *The Religion of Jesus the Jew* (London: SCM, 1993); *Jesus in his Jewish Context* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2003); *The Authentic Gospel of Jesus* (London: Penguin, 2003); *Scrolls, Scriptures and Early Christianity* (London: T&T Clark, 2005); *The Passion* (London: Penguin, 2005); *The Nativity: History and Legend* (London: Penguin, 2006).

Safrai cooperated with Christian scholars such as Robert Lindsey and Randall Buth.[68]

In Qumran scholarship there is a closer collaboration between Jewish and Christian scholars than in any other scholarly field I know. While there was an anti-Jewish bias in the publication team centred around the East Jerusalem Rockefeller Museum until the early 1980s, the reorganisation of the publication process by the Israel Antiquities Authorities in 1991 gave the impetus to wonderful scholarly cooperation in the following years. Scholars ceased to guard their turf, but shared their preliminary transcriptions and commentaries to receive feedback and support each other. The specific cooperation between Jewish and Christian scholars on these texts is an important part of the larger Jewish-Christian dialogue in the post-Holocaust era.

Sixty years have passed and the implications from Qumran for biblical scholarship have not been exhausted. We look forward to the next sixty years with eagerness and expectation. Many of us are grateful to the luck or divine providence that early 1947 brought the Bedouin to Cave 1.[69]

[68] For a good presentation of this school, see *Mishkan* 17–18 (1992–1993).

[69] For a good introduction to the discovery and the first generation of scrolls research, see now Weston W. Fields, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A Short History* (Leiden: Brill, 2006).