

UNDERSTANDING IN ALL THINGS

The Revelation and Transmission of Divine Insight in the Qumran Scrolls and the New Testament

by

James Edward Harding

For the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

The Department of Biblical Studies
University of Sheffield

July 2001

Abstract

This thesis examines the revelation and transmission of divine insight in particular Qumran scrolls (4Q380; 4Q381; 4QInstruction; 4QS; 4QD), the Synoptics, and certain NT epistles. The Qumran texts share a common use of sapiential language and are closely related with Daniel. In 4QInstruction heavenly wisdom is revealed through a מִשְׁכִּיל's instruction to a pupil (תַּלְמִיד). In *Serekh ha-Yahad* sapiential language represents a מִשְׁכִּיל's instruction, and this figure transmits community rulings revealed through the study of the law. Revelation and transmission in D overlap significantly with Daniel and S. Understanding in the Synoptics is explored using σύνεσις and συνίημι as the focus and Luke's Gospel as the framework. Daniel-Θ influenced the use of sapiential language in these Gospels. In Mark, the disciples' incomprehension is focused on the identity of Jesus, whereas in Matthew their *comprehension* is focused on his identity. In Luke, those around Jesus fail to understand his identity: Jesus is an exalted human reminiscent of Enoch and grants divine insight into his identity at the resurrection. The heavenly Christ presented in Luke is assumed in Paul, where he is the mediator of gospel and tradition. Paul is a human mediator, like the מִשְׁכִּיל, transmitting heavenly revelations to humans. The Pauline *homologoumena*, the Pastorals, and Hebrews all attest a Jewish understanding of the revelation of mysteries and the transmission of tradition; however, Paul's language of tradition is taken from earlier Greek usage. Hebrew tradition language employed by the rabbis is also based upon Greek usage. Each group of texts examined is to be read in connection with Jewish apocalyptic, which is characterised by the revelation of divine mysteries, including wisdom. Thus divine insight at Qumran, understanding of Jesus' identity in the Synoptics, and gospel and tradition in the Epistles belong within the matrix of first-century Judaism.

Dedication

This thesis is dedicated to the memory of

JOHN HAROLD

1913-1999

ELIZABETH MARGARET NOLAN

1950-2000

May they rest in peace and rise in glory

Table of contents

Abstract	ii
Dedication	iii
Contents	iv
Abbreviations	xii
Preface	xxii

Introduction

1. Preliminary remarks	1
2. Wisdom	3
3. Authority and tradition	10
4. The language of transmission	16
5. Thesis statement	17
6. Concluding remarks	19

Part One: THE QUMRAN SCROLLS

1. Introduction	21
2. Sapiential terminology in 4Q380 and 4Q381	27
2.1. בִּין	29
2.2. חכּם	34
2.3. ידע	36
2.4. למד	39
2.5. שכל	42
2.6. Summary	46
3. 4QInstruction	46

3.1. משכיל in 4QInstruction	49
3.1.1. עבד משכיל	50
3.1.2. בן משכיל	54
3.1.3. משכילכה	57
3.1.4. Summary	61
3.2. מבין in 4QInstruction	61
3.3. מבינים in 4QInstruction and related texts	66
3.4. Summary	68
4. <i>Serekh ha-Yahad</i>	68
4.1. בין in <i>Serekh ha-Yahad</i>	69
4.1.1. 1QS III, 13	69
4.1.2. 1QS IV, 22	70
4.1.3. 1QS VI, 15	72
4.1.4. 1QS XI, 19	73
4.1.5. Summary	75
4.2. מדרש למשכיל in 4QS^b IX, 1 and 4QS^d I, 1	76
4.2.1. מדרש in 1QS VI, 24	78
4.2.2. מדרש התורה in 1QS VIII, 15, CD XX, 6, and 4QD ^e 7 II, 15	79
4.2.3. מדרש in 1QS VIII, 26	83
4.2.4. מדרש in 4QFlor 1 I,21,2 14	84
4.2.5. Summary	85
4.3. משכיל and מדרש	86
4.3.1. דרש in the Qumran scrolls	87
4.3.1.1. דרש in <i>Serekh ha-Yahad</i> and related texts	87

4.3.1.2. שרש at Qumran apart from the <i>Serekh</i>	91
4.3.1.3. Summary	93
4.3.2. Summary: מדרש למשכיל	94
4.4. Summary: transmission in the <i>Serekh</i>	96
5. The 4QD fragments	97
5.1. The 4QD fragments and the משכיל	97
5.1.1. The textual affinities of 4QD ^a 1a-b 1	97
5.1.2. Separation in 4QD ^a 1a-b 1 and related texts	99
5.1.3. Separation and the teaching of hidden things	101
5.1.3.1. 1QS V, 10	101
5.1.3.2. 1QS VIII, 11	102
5.1.3.3. 1QS IX, 12-21	102
5.1.3.4. 4QD ^a and 4QD ^c	103
5.1.3.5. עמק in the Qumran scrolls and the HB	105
5.1.3.5.1. The Hebrew scrolls	105
5.1.3.5.2. The Aramaic scrolls	106
5.1.3.5.3. Psalm 64	107
5.1.3.5.4. Sapiential and prophetic texts	107
5.1.3.5.5. Summary	108
5.1.4. The משכיל and revelation	108
5.1.4.1. The book of Daniel	108
5.1.4.2. 4QD ^a 2 II, 5-6 (par. 4QD ^c 1 7-8)	109
5.1.4.3. The רז נהיה	110
5.1.4.4. 1QS X-XI	111
5.1.5. Summary	112

5.2. Sapiential terminology and community context in the 4QD fragments	112
5.2.1. 4QD ^a 1a-b 21, 24	112
5.2.2. 4QD ^a 2 I, 4-6	113
5.2.3. 4QD ^e 2 II, 19-21	115
5.2.4. 4QD ^a 2 I, 14	116
5.2.5. CD XIII, 2-8 (par. 4QD ^a 9 II, 18): מִשְׁכִּיל and מִבְּקָר	118
5.2.6. Summary	120
5.3. Summary	120
6. Synthesis and Conclusions	121

Part Two: THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS

1. Introduction	124
2. The wisdom of the child Jesus	128
2.1. The book of Daniel and the Lukan infancy narrative	130
2.1.1. Previous research	131
2.1.2. The verb συνίημι in Greek Daniel	136
2.1.3. The angel Gabriel	139
2.1.3.1. Jewish and Christian Gabriel traditions	139
<i>Excursus: Isaiah 6 and Dan 9:21 (Q)</i>	146
2.1.3.2. Gabriel and Ezekiel's visions	148
2.1.3.3. Summary	151
2.2. Greek and Latin texts relating to Luke 2:41-52	151
2.2.1. Plutarch: <i>Life of Alexander</i>	152
2.2.2. Philostratus: <i>Life of Apollonius of Tyana</i>	153
2.2.3. The child Moses	155
2.2.3.1. Josephus: <i>Jewish Antiquities</i>	155
2.2.3.2. Philo: <i>On the Life of Moses</i> 1	156

2.2.3.3. Pseudo-Philo: <i>Liber antiquitatum biblicarum</i>	157
2.3. Summary and conclusions	163
3. The apocalyptic context of the Synoptic Gospels	164
4. The Gospel of Mark	172
4.1. The מִשְׁכָּלֵי of Daniel and the disciples in Mark's Gospel	172
4.1.1. The מִשְׁכָּלֵי	173
4.1.2. Previous research: Seán Freyne	175
4.1.3. Μυστήριον (Mark 4:11)	177
4.1.4. Συνήμι	179
4.1.5. Summary	182
4.2. Lack of understanding in Mark	183
4.2.1. Lack of understanding in Mark in light of the OT	186
4.2.2. Isaiah 42-43 and understanding Jesus' identity	191
4.2.3. Mark 6:50, 52	193
4.2.4. Mark 8:17, 21	196
4.2.5. Summary	199
4.3. Summary	199
5. Συνήμι in Matthew	199
6. Understanding in Luke and the identity of Jesus	203
6.1. The transfiguration	206
6.1.1. The Ascension of Isaiah	207
6.1.2. Transformation	210
6.1.3. Intertextual resonances in Luke's transfiguration narrative	212
6.1.3.1. ἐξαστρέπτω	212
6.1.3.2. δόξα	214
6.1.3.3. νεφέλη	217
6.1.3.4. φοβέομαι	218

6.1.3.5. Summary	219
6.1.4. Transformation: Morray-Jones, “Transformational Mysticism in the Apocalyptic-Merkabah Tradition”	220
6.1.5. Divine agency speculation in ancient Judaism	223
6.1.5.1. Enoch	226
6.1.5.1.1. <i>Hebrew Enoch</i>	228
6.1.5.1.2. <i>Slavonic Enoch</i>	231
6.1.5.1.3. Summary	233
6.1.6. Summary	234
6.2. The resurrection	235
6.2.1. Luke 24:45 and the Greek and Hebrew Scriptures	235
6.2.2. “Opening the heart” in Hebrew texts outside the canon	239
6.2.2.1. Taylor-Schechter Box K1.117	241
6.2.2.2. Taylor-Schechter Box K 21.95 C fol. 2b	243
<i>Excursus: sar torah</i>	243
6.2.2.3. Summary	245
6.2.3. Summary	246
6.3. Summary	246
7. Conclusions	247
7.1. Summary of results	247
7.2. Retrospect and prospect	249
 Part Three: THE EPISTLES OF THE NEW TESTAMENT	
1. Introduction	251
2. Preliminary survey	252
2.1. Apocalyptic context: the theme of revealed wisdom	252
2.2. Revelation and mystery in the <i>corpus Paulinum</i>	256
2.3. The origin of Paul’s gospel: the work of Seyoon Kim	258

2.4. The glorified Christ	262
2.5. Apostle as mediator	265
2.6. Summary	267
3. Paul's language of transmission	268
3.1. Survey of pertinent references	268
3.2. Paul's understanding of the origin of the tradition	277
3.3 Παραδίδωμι and παραλαμβάνω in Greek and Jewish literature	283
3.3.1. Josephus, <i>C. Ap.</i> 1.60	284
3.3.2. Wis 14:15	285
3.3.3. Plato, <i>Theaet.</i> 198A-B	287
3.3.4. Diodorus of Sicily, <i>Bibl. Hist.</i> 5.2.3	288
3.3.5. Plato, <i>Phileb.</i> 16C	290
3.3.6. Diodorus of Sicily, <i>Bibl. Hist.</i> 12.12-19	291
3.3.7. Corpus hermeticum	291
3.3.8. Greek Magical Papyri	293
3.3.9. Plutarch, <i>Is. Os.</i> 352C	293
3.3.10. Epictetus, <i>Diatr.</i> 2.23.40	294
3.3.11. Summary	295
3.4. Summary	296
4. 2 Tim 2:1-7	296
4.1. Ἐνδυναμοῦ (2 Tim 2:1)	296
4.2. Παράθου (2 Tim 2:2)	297
4.2.1. Paul's self-understanding in 2 Timothy	300
4.2.2. Teaching and apostleship in 2 Timothy	301
4.2.3. Παραθήκη and διδασκαλία in the Pastorals	303
4.3. Νόει (2 Tim 2:7)	308
4.4. Summary	311
5. Hebrews 2:1-4	311

5.1. Overview	312
5.2. The angelic mediation of the revealed message	315
5.3. The law not revealed through angels?	321
5.4. Summary	328
6. Summary of results	328
Conclusions	
Synthesis and prospect	331
Bibliographies	
Section 1: Lexical and grammatical aids	335
Section 2: Concordances	336
Section 3: Primary sources	337
Section 4: Other works of reference	345
Section 5: Articles, essays, monographs, and dissertations cited	346

Abbreviations

ℵ	Codex Sinaiticus
A	Codex Alexandrinus
AB	Anchor Bible
ABD	<i>The Anchor Bible Dictionary</i> . Edited by D. N. Freedman, G. A. Herion, D. F. Graf, J. D. Pleins, and A. B. Beck. 6 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1992
ABRL	Anchor Bible Reference Library
AGJU	Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums
AnBib	Analecta Biblica
ANET	<i>Ancient Near Eastern Texts relating to the Old Testament</i> . Edited by J. B. Pritchard. 3rd ed. Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1969
ANYAS	Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences
aor.	aorist
ArBib	The Aramaic Bible
ASNU	Acta seminarii neotestamentici upsaliensis
ATDan	Acta theologica danica
B	Codex Vaticanus
B238	ms Budapest 238, in <i>Synopse zur Hekhalot-Literatur</i> (ed. P. Schäfer; TSAJ 2; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1981)
BAG	Bauer, W., W. F. Arndt, and F. W. Gingrich. <i>Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature</i> . Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957

BASORSup	Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research: Supplement Series
<i>BDB</i>	Brown, F., S. R. Driver, and C. A. Briggs. <i>The New Brown-Driver-Briggs-Gesenius Hebrew and English Lexicon with an Appendix containing the Biblical Aramaic</i> . Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1979
BETL	Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologiarum lovaniensium
<i>BHS</i>	<i>Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia</i> . Edited by K. Elliger and W. Rudolph. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1967-1977
<i>Bib</i>	<i>Biblica</i>
<i>BSac</i>	<i>Bibliotheca sacra</i>
BBB	Bonner biblische Beiträge
B.C.E.	before the Common Era
BH	Biblical Hebrew
BibSem	The Biblical Seminar
BLS	Bible and Literature Series
BRS	Biblical Resource Series
<i>BSOAS</i>	<i>Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies</i>
<i>BWL</i>	Lambert, W. G. <i>Babylonian Wisdom Literature</i> . Oxford: Clarendon, 1960
BZAW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft
ca.	circa
<i>CBQ</i>	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i>
CBQMS	Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series
<i>CDSSE</i>	Vermes, G. <i>The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English</i> . London: Penguin, 1997

C.E.	Common Era
CGLC	Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics
CGTC	Cambridge Greek Testament Commentary
CNT	Commentaire du Nouveau Testament
ConBNT	Coniectanea biblica: New Testament Series
<i>COS</i>	William W. Hallo, K. Lawson Younger, and David E. Orton, eds. <i>The Context of Scripture: Canonical Compositions, Monumental Inscriptions, and Archival Documents from the Biblical World</i> . Leiden: Brill, 1997-
CRINT	Compendia rerum iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum
D	Codex Bezae
D436	ms Dropsie 436, in <i>Synopse zur Hekhalot-Literatur</i> (ed. P. Schäfer; TSAJ 2; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1981)
<i>DCH</i>	<i>Dictionary of Classical Hebrew</i> . Edited by D. J. A. Clines and J. F. Elwolde. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993-
<i>DDD</i>	<i>Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible</i> . Edited by K. van der Toorn, B. Becking, and P. W. van der Horst. Leiden: Brill, 1995
DJD	Discoveries in the Judaean Desert
DJDJ	Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan
<i>DSD</i>	<i>Dead Sea Discoveries</i>
<i>DSSSE</i>	García Martínez, F. and E. J. C. Tigchelaar. <i>The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition</i> . Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000
<i>DSSNT</i>	Wise, M. O., M. G. Abegg, and E. M. Cook. <i>The Dead</i>

Sea Scrolls: A New Translation. London: Harper Collins, 1996

DSST García Martínez, F. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated: The Qumran Texts in English.* Translated by W. G. E. Watson. Leiden: Brill, 1996

Eng. English

EstBib *Estudios bíblicos*

EBib *Études bibliques*

ExpTim *Expository Times*

FBBS Facet Books biblical series

fem. feminine

fol. folio

frg. fragment

FRLANT Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments

Gk Greek

GKC *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar.* Edited by E. Kautzsch. Translated by A. E. Cowley. Oxford: Clarendon, 1910

HB Hebrew Bible

Heb. Hebrew

Hiph. Hiphil conjugation (Hebrew)

Hithpa. Hithpa'al conjugation (Aramaic)

HRCS Hatch, E., and H. A. Redpath. *Concordance to the Septuagint and Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament.* 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon, 1897. Suppl., 1906

HSM Harvard Semitic Monographs

HSS Harvard Semitic Studies

<i>HTR</i>	<i>Harvard Theological Review</i>
HUBP	Hebrew University Bible Project
<i>HvTSt</i>	<i>Hervormde teologiese studies</i>
ICC	International Critical Commentary
<i>IDBSup</i>	<i>The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible: Supplementary Volume.</i> Edited by K. Crim, L. R. Bailey, V. P. Furnish, and E. S. Bucke. Nashville: Abingdon, 1976
<i>IEJ</i>	<i>Israel Exploration Journal</i>
Imperf.	Imperfect
Inf. abs.	Infinitive absolute
<i>Int</i>	<i>Interpretation</i>
<i>JANESCU</i>	<i>Journal of the Ancient Near Eastern Society of Columbia University</i>
Jastrow	Jastrow, M. <i>A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature.</i> 2d ed. New York: Judaica, 1903
<i>JBL</i>	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
JHNES	John Hopkins Near Eastern Studies
<i>JJS</i>	<i>Journal of Jewish Studies</i>
Joüon	Joüon, P. <i>A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew.</i> Translated and revised by T. Muraoka. 2 vols. Subsidia biblica 14/1-2. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1991
JPS	Jewish Publication Society
<i>JQR</i>	<i>Jewish Quarterly Review</i>
<i>JSJ</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic and Roman Periods</i>
<i>JSNT</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the New Testament</i>

JSNTSup	Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series
JSOTSup	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series
JSPSup	Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha: Supplement Series
<i>JTS</i>	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>
Kt	Ketibh
Lat2	Second Latin translation of the Ascension of Isaiah
LEC	Library of Early Christianity
LBH	Late Biblical Hebrew
LCL	Loeb Classical Library
LDSS	Literature of the Dead Sea Scrolls
L&N	<i>Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament based on Semantic Domains</i> . Edited by J. P. Louw, E. A. Nida, R. B. Smith, and K. A. Munson. 2 vols. 2d ed. New York: United Bible Societies, 1989
LSJ	Liddell, H. G., R. Scott, H. S. Jones, R. McKenzie, A <i>Greek-English Lexicon</i> . 9th ed. with revised supplement. Oxford: Clarendon, 1996
LXX	Septuagint
M22, M40	mss Munich 22 and 40, in <i>Synopse zur Hekhalot- Literatur</i> (ed. P. Schäfer; TSAJ 2; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1981)
Masc.	Masculine
MH	Mishnaic Hebrew
ms(s)	manuscript(s)
MT	Masoretic Text

N8128	ms New York 8128, in <i>Synopse zur Hekhalot-Literatur</i> (ed. P. Schäfer; TSAJ 2; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1981)
NCB	New Century Bible
NICNT	New International Commentary on the New Testament
NIGTC	New International Greek Testament Commentary
NJB	New Jerusalem Bible
<i>NovT</i>	<i>Novum Testamentum</i>
NovTSup	Supplements to Novum Testamentum
NRSV	New Revised Standard Version
NT	New Testament
NTL	New Testament Library
O1531	ms Oxford 1531, in <i>Synopse zur Hekhalot-Literatur</i> (ed. P. Schäfer; TSAJ 2; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1981)
OBO	Orbis biblicus et orientalis
OG	Old Greek (Daniel)
OT	Old Testament
OTG	Old Testament Guides
OTL	Old Testament Library
OTM	Oxford Theological Monographs
<i>OTP</i>	<i>The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha</i> . Edited by J. H. Charlesworth. 2 vols. ABRL. New York: Doubleday, 1983-1985
PAM	Palestine Archaeological Museum
pass.	passive
PFES	Proceedings of the Finnish Exegetical Society
Pl.	Plural

PLO	Porta Linguarum Orientalium
PRS	Pittsburgh Reprints Series
PTSDSSP	Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project
PVTG	Pseudepigrapha Veteris Testamenti Graece
QdiH	Quaterni di Henoch
QH	Qumran Hebrew
Qr	Qere
<i>RB</i>	<i>Revue biblique</i>
rec.	recension
<i>RevQ</i>	<i>Revue de Qumran</i>
<i>RHPR</i>	<i>Revue d’histoire et de philosophie religieuses</i>
RNT	Regensburger Neues Testament
S	Codex Sinaiticus (Tobit)
SAC	Studies in Antiquity and Christianity
SANT	Studien zum Alten und Neuen Testaments
SBL	Society of Biblical Literature
SBLDS	Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series
SBM	Stuttgarter biblische Monographien
<i>ScrTh</i>	<i>Scripta theologica</i>
SDSSRL	Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature
<i>Sem</i>	<i>Semitica</i>
SHR	<i>Sepher ha-Razim</i>
SHRPref	Preface to <i>Sepher ha-Razim</i>
Sing.	Singular
SJLA	Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity
Slav	Slavonic
SNTIW	Studies in the New Testament and its World

SPCK	Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge
StudHell	Studia Hellenistica
<i>SubBi</i>	Subsidia biblica
SBLEJL	Society of Biblical Literature Early Judaism and Its Literature
<i>SBLSP</i>	<i>Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers</i>
SBM	Stuttgart biblische Monographien
SC	Sources chrétiennes. Paris: Cerf, 1943-
SJLA	Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity
<i>SJT</i>	<i>Scottish Journal of Theology</i>
SNTSMS	Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series
<i>SR</i>	<i>Studies in Religion</i>
<i>STDJ</i>	Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah
StudHell	Studia Hellenistica
SVTP	Studia in Veteris Testamenti pseudepigraphica
TANZ	Texte und Arbeiten zum neutestamentlichen Zeitalter
<i>TDNT</i>	<i>Theological Dictionary of the New Testament</i> . Edited by G. Kittel and G. Friedrich. Translated by G. W. Bromiley. 10 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964-1976
<i>TDOT</i>	<i>Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament</i> . Edited by G. J. Botterweck, H. Ringgren, and H.-J. Fabry. Translated by J. T. Willis, G. W. Bromiley, and D. E. Green. 8 vols. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1974-
TEDS	Translations of Early Documents Series
<i>Text</i>	<i>Textus</i>
Θ	Theodotion (Daniel)
THKNT	Theologischer Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament

<i>ThWAT</i>	<i>Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament.</i> Edited by G. J. Botterweck and H. Ringgren. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1970-
TR	Textus Receptus
<i>TS</i>	<i>Theological Studies</i>
TSAJ	Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum
<i>TynBul</i>	<i>Tyndale Bulletin</i>
<i>UF</i>	<i>Ugarit-Forschungen</i>
V228	ms Vatican 228, in <i>Synopse zur Hekhalot-Literatur</i> (ed. P. Schäfer; TSAJ 2; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1981)
<i>VC</i>	<i>Vigiliae christianae</i>
<i>VT</i>	<i>Vetus Testamentum</i>
VTSup	Supplements to Vetus Testamentum
Vulg.	Vulgate
WBC	Word Biblical Commentary
WMANT	Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
YJS	Yale Judaica Series
<i>ZAH</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für Althebräistik</i>
<i>ZAW</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>
<i>ZNW</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche</i>

PREFACE

עשות ספרים הרבה אין קץ ולהג הרבה יגעת בשר *Qoh 12:12b*

In his book *A Walk in the Woods*, Bill Bryson writes about “thru-hikers,” who complete the Appalachian Trail from end-to-end in a single season. He mentions an “ultra runner” who ran the length of the AT in 52 days 9 hours, who “by his own account became ‘a mental and emotional wreck’ and spent most of the period crossing Maine weeping copiously.”¹ Completing a PhD thesis is a feat of endurance and may be similarly damaging. Four years of doctoral research, interspersed with study for a Postgraduate Certificate in Higher Education and significant teaching loads, first in Sheffield (1997-2000) and then in Barbados (2000-), have been painful, at times soul-destroying. There have been times of joy and satisfaction during my research: I have formed relationships with many special and wonderful people, whom I would otherwise never have met, and I have been blessed with unique opportunities, of which I would otherwise have been ignorant. Yet this has been a difficult journey. My hope is that in some way, however small, some good will come from the work I have done or from the time I have spent doing it.

A few words are necessary on the style guide and system of reference employed. In general, the *SBL Handbook* has been adopted,² the major exception being the column and line numbers for 1QH^a. The SBL handbook inexplicably advocates the continued use of Sukenik’s numbering. The numbering now generally preferred (and adopted here) is that first employed systematically in Florentino García Martínez, *Textos de Qumrán* (Madrid: Editorial Trotta, 1992), based on the research of Émile Puech.³ Translations of

¹ Bill Bryson, *A Walk in the Woods* (London: Black Swan, 1998), 153.

² Patrick H. Alexander, John F. Kutsko, James D. Ernest, Shirley A. Decker-Lucke, and David L. Petersen, eds., *The SBL Handbook of Style for Ancient Near Eastern, Biblical, and Early Christian Studies* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1999).

³ Émile Puech, “Quelques aspects de la restauration de Rouleau des Hymnes (1QH),” *JJS* 39 (1988): 38-55; cf. García Martínez, *Textos*, 339-340.

primary sources written in Hebrew, Aramaic, Syriac, and Greek are my own unless otherwise stated; translations of primary sources in other languages are acknowledged at the appropriate point. Where the Enochic literature is referred to, the titles Ethiopic Enoch, Slavonic Enoch, and Hebrew Enoch are preferred in recognition of the fact that these works represent quite different traditions and are not a sequence of texts representing a single strand of tradition.⁴ However, following the *SBL Handbook* the abbreviations *1 En.*, *2 En.*, and *3 En.* are employed where specific chapters or verses are cited.

Many individuals and organisations have contributed in some way to this thesis, and while it would not be possible to name them all, some deserve special mention. The British Academy Humanities Research Board has provided funds for me to study for both the M.A. and the Ph.D. in Biblical Studies. Among the gifted teachers who have inspired me during my eight years at university special mention must be made of Prof. George Brooke and Prof. Adrian Curtis of the University of Manchester, who tutored me in the study of the Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls in the original and encouraged me to do further research, and of Prof. Philip Davies of the University of Sheffield, who supervised my thesis with wisdom, allowing me to explore all kinds of obtuse avenues of inquiry and reining me in before I became lost. The staff and students in the Department of Biblical Studies, University of Sheffield, have been a tremendous support, both academically and emotionally, as have the staff and students of Codrington College, Barbados, who have been patient and understanding as I struggled to fulfil my obligations to Sheffield during my first year of teaching there.

Among the friends who have supported me during this long and often turbulent journey, special thanks must go to Fiona Black and Andrew Wilson, and to John and Katie Lyons: your friendship means more to me than words can express and I treasure it deeply. John and Katie opened their home in Bristol to me when I returned from Barbados to finish the thesis, and Billie-Anne Robinson invited me to share her home in

⁴ Cf. W. R. Morfill and R. H. Charles, *The Book of the Secrets of Enoch* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1896), xi.

Sheffield when it became necessary to return there. Sincere thanks to you: you are welcome to share my home always, wherever I am. The people of Saint Matthew's church, Carver Street, have been a tremendous support to me since I arrived in September 1996. Special thanks must go to Alan Barker, who has given me the courage to be myself; to Liz and Roger Perriss, and to Don and Joan Gill.

This thesis is dedicated to the memory of two members of my family who passed away during the period of my research. Auntie Jessie and Uncle John have encouraged me throughout many years of study, something I will never forget; sadly, John did not live to see this thesis completed. Auntie Elizabeth died very suddenly less than a year ago. I remember Elizabeth as someone who saw the good in everyone she met and lived life to the full. This is an example we should all seek to follow.

Carpe diem.

Sheffield, England
July 2001

James E. Harding

Introduction

1. Preliminary remarks

The title of this study derives from 2 Tim 2:7, in which Paul¹ writes νόει ὁ λέγων· δώσει γάρ σοι ὁ κύριος σύνεσιν ἐν πᾶσιν, “ponder what I am saying, for the Lord will give you understanding in all things.” Timothy will gain from pondering Paul’s words because the Lord, either God the Father² or Jesus,³ will give him understanding. Behind Paul’s words lies a concept rooted in the HB and fundamental to the Judaism of the late Second Temple period: wisdom, insight, and understanding⁴ belong in heaven and must be revealed for

¹ The debate concerning the authorship of the Pastoral Epistles has dominated scholarly discussion about these documents since the “authenticity” of 1 Timothy was first seriously challenged by Friedrich D. E. Schleiermacher in 1807 (cf. C. Spicq, *Saint Paul: Les Épitres Pastorales* [EBib; Paris: Gabalda, 1947], XII). However, the problem of the authorship of the Pastorals does not substantially affect the present discussion, and a detailed consideration of the issues involved would take us away from the central focus of this study. For a comprehensive and up-to-date treatment, see I. Howard Marshall, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles* (ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1999), 57-92. Marshall remarks that the “reigning hypothesis,” that the Pastoral Epistles are pseudonymous, is “in danger of uncritical acceptance” (*Pastoral Epistles*, 58). Without examining Marshall’s belief that the Pastoral Epistles are allonymous, based on authentic Pauline materials but produced shortly after Paul’s death by an individual who was part of a group within the Pauline tradition (*Pastoral Epistles*, 83-92), the name “Paul” is here retained as an indicator of the author of 2 Timothy.

² Compare Prov 2:6 (LXX): ὅτι κύριος δίδωσιν σοφίαν, καὶ ἀπὸ προσώπου αὐτοῦ γνῶσις καὶ σύνεσις, “because [the] Lord gives wisdom, and from his face knowledge and understanding.” George W. Knight understands ὁ κύριος here to refer to the Father partly because Paul writes in Eph 3:2-4 of the Father giving understanding (*The Pastoral Epistles* [NIGTC; Carlisle: Paternoster, 1992], 396).

³ Marshall, *Pastoral Epistles*, 731. Marshall argues that ὁ κύριος here refers to Jesus, since anarthrous κύριος refers to God and arthrous κύριος refers to Jesus in the Pastorals (cf. Marshall, *Pastoral Epistles*, 720). He thus follows Heinrich Julius Holtzmann, who made the same point in reference to 2 Tim 1:2 (*Die Pastoralbriefe, kritisch und exegetisch behandelt* [Leipzig: Wilhelm Engelmann, 1880], 374-375). Holtzmann argued that although κύριος can stand for the Hebrew tetragrammaton, Christian use of language enabled the same word to indicate the Messiah as God’s representative. In 2 Tim 1:2, arthrous κύριος stands for Jesus Christ. In 2 Tim 1:18, arthrous κύριος must stand for Christ and anarthrous κύριος must stand for God, since on this understanding Christ enables a person to find mercy from God: the idea of God enabling a person to find mercy from Christ would not work. The exception is 2 Tim 2:19, where anarthrous κύριος, which occurs twice in citations from Scripture, can only refer to God. Christ is to be understood behind arthrous κύριος in 2 Tim 2:7, 14, 22; 3:11; 4:14, 17, 18, 22. God is to be understood behind anarthrous κύριος in 2 Tim 2:24. In 1 Timothy, God is to be understood behind anarthrous κύριος in 1 Tim 6:15, but Christ is to be understood behind arthrous κύριος in 1 Tim 1:2, 12, 14; 6:3, 14.

⁴ In this study, the terms “wisdom,” “insight,” and “understanding” are used interchangeably, since they generally represent the same complex of ideas. The Hebrew and Greek equivalents overlap to a very significant extent in meaning, as demonstrated by Prov 1:2-7, in which several related sapiential terms are used in parallel, making it extremely difficult to discern different shades of meaning (cf. Gerhard von Rad, *Wisdom in Israel* [trans. J. D. Martin; London: SCM, 1972], 12-13). The Greek term σύνεσις,

humans to acquire them. In 2 Tim 2:2 we read ἀ ἤκουσας παρ' ἐμοῦ διὰ πολλῶν μαρτύρων, ταῦτα παράθου πιστοῖς ἀνθρώποις, οἵτινες ἱκανοὶ ἔσονται καὶ ἑτέρους διδάξαι, “the things which you have heard from me through many witnesses: these things pass on to faithful men, who will be worthy to teach others also.” Here Timothy is commanded to pass on the tradition as he has received it within a chain of transmission. This also has parallels in the literature of early Judaism. Although the chain of transmission in 2 Tim 2:2 is not linked directly with the revelation of wisdom in 2 Tim 2:7, the two ideas ultimately belong together in the thought world of Second Temple Palestinian Judaism and nascent Christianity.

This study explores the ideas to which these verses bear witness, with special reference to three bodies of literature: the Qumran scrolls, the Synoptic Gospels, and certain NT epistles. The aim is to examine particular uses of language and particular motifs in texts, only separated chronologically by a short period, which have a common heritage in the books shared by the HB and the LXX, together with other Jewish works of the Second Temple period. By this means it is hoped that a significant contribution will be made to the scholarly study of: the influence of the language and thought of the book of Daniel (in its Hebrew-Aramaic and Greek forms); the language and thought of the Qumran scrolls, as well as the social context in which these texts were preserved and (in many cases) written; and the Jewish context of ideas present in the NT. Since this study touches upon the revelation of heavenly wisdom the phenomenon of apocalyptic is extremely important,⁵ though apocalyptic *per se* is not the main subject of this investigation; nor are the various manifestations of “mysticism” in early Judaism and Christianity, though *merkabah*

fundamental to this study, is used in the LXX to render several Hebrew words: בִּתְּחָלָה, תְּחִלָּה, תְּחִלָּה, מִתְּחִלָּה, מִתְּחִלָּה, and מִתְּחִלָּה (Michael V. Fox, *Proverbs 1-9: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* [AB 18A; New York: Doubleday, 2000], 69 n. 63).

⁵ Although each part of this study suggests apocalyptic as the background for all the major texts studied, a discussion of this complex and enigmatic phenomenon is delayed until part two, §3. The texts studied are thus allowed to speak for themselves before a definition of this phenomenon becomes unavoidable. The centrality of Michael Stone's and Christopher Rowland's approaches to apocalyptic for part two means that a discussion was unavoidable at that point, but not before.

mysticism and the *hekhalot* literature⁶ are significant at certain points.

We begin with a brief survey of the phenomenon of wisdom in ancient Near Eastern, and particularly Israelite and early Jewish literature, since the revelation of wisdom is essentially what is referred to in 2 Tim 2:7.

2. Wisdom

Texts categorised as “wisdom” are found in the literatures of many peoples.⁷ This is not to deny that there are considerable difficulties surrounding the blanket use of the term “wisdom.” In his classic work *Wisdom in Israel*, Gerhard von Rad comments “[i]t could even be that scholarship has gone too far in an uncritical use of this collective term; it could even be that by the use of this blanket term it is suggesting the existence of something which never existed and that it is in this way dangerously prejudicing the interpretation of varied material.”⁸ Nevertheless, it does seem possible to identify ideas and literary forms common to texts generally defined as “wisdom,”⁹ though wide differences in date and geographical origin often preclude the possibility of establishing direct historical connections between them.¹⁰ A particularly rich vein of wisdom literature has survived

⁶ Although the *hekhalot* tracts may be manifestations of *merkabah* mysticism, the contents of the former should not be regarded simply as synonymous with the latter, as Christopher Morray-Jones emphasises: “the expression ‘Merkabah mysticism’ is used to refer to an esoteric, visionary-mystical tradition centred upon the vision of God, seated on the celestial throne or Merkabah. It is not simply synonymous with the contents of the Hekhalot texts, which represent one development of that tradition (failure to observe this distinction has been a cause of much confusion)” (“Transformational Mysticism in the Apocalyptic-Merkabah Tradition,” *JJS* 43 [1992]: 2).

⁷ Cf. von Rad, *Wisdom*, 4; Katharine Dell, ‘Get Wisdom, Get Insight’: *An Introduction to Israel’s Wisdom Literature* (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 2000), 2. See the overview in M. L. West, *Hesiod: Works and Days* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1978), 3-25, and the comparative survey in Claus Westermann, *Roots of Wisdom: The Oldest Proverbs of Israel and Other Peoples* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1995), 140-164.

⁸ Von Rad, *Wisdom*, 7.

⁹ Concerned primarily with biblical wisdom literature, James L. Crenshaw suggests that “formally, wisdom consists of proverbial sentence or instruction, debate, intellectual reflection; thematically, wisdom comprises self-evident intuitions about mastering life for human betterment, gropings after life’s secrets with regard to innocent suffering, grappling with finitude, and quest for truth concealed in the created order and manifested in Dame Wisdom” (*Old Testament Wisdom: An Introduction* [Atlanta, Ga.: John Knox, 1981], 19).

¹⁰ Compare the following comment made by West: “We have seen that ‘wisdom literature’, in various forms ranging from a simple collection of precepts to a fully fashioned literary work with an elaborate narrative framework, is something that can be found among many peoples, ancient and modern, lettered and unlettered. No one will suppose that they are all historically connected” (*Hesiod*, 25-26).

from the ancient Near East, including Mesopotamia,¹¹ Egypt,¹² Anatolia,¹³ Syria,¹⁴ Greece, and Israel. The chronological and geographical proximity of the peoples who produced, preserved, and distributed these texts means that it is not inappropriate to suppose degrees of cross-fertilisation and to attempt to trace this process. For example, there can be little doubt that there is some kind of literary relationship between Prov 22:17-24:22 and the Egyptian *Teaching of Amenemope*.¹⁵ It is this ancient Near Eastern milieu which provided the context in which the wisdom traditions of the ancient Israelites emerged,¹⁶ together with the texts which bear witness to those traditions.¹⁷ Within the HB Job, Proverbs, and Ecclesiastes (Qohelet), together with a number of Psalms are usually associated with the category of wisdom, as are Sirach and the Wisdom of Solomon from the Hellenistic period. Cases have been put forward for understanding a significant number of other books and passages within the Palestinian and Alexandrian canons as “wisdom” in

¹¹ For a summary of these texts, see Stuart Weeks, *Early Israelite Wisdom* (OTM; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994), 179-188. For translations and further bibliographical details, see: W. G. Lambert, *Babylonian Wisdom Literature* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1960); *ANET*, 410-411, 425-427, 435-440, 449-452, 596-604; *COS* 1:151-155, 174-177, 179.

¹² Summary: Weeks, *Early Israelite Wisdom*, 163-178. Translations and further bibliographical details: *ANET*, 405-410, 412-425, 431-434, 441-449; *COS* 1:35-36, 46-48.

¹³ Translations: *COS* 1:215-217.

¹⁴ Weeks, *Early Israelite Wisdom*, 189; *ANET*, 427-430; A. E. Cowley, ed., *Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B.C.* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1923), 204-248; “Ahiqar,” translated by James M. Lindenberger, *OTP*, 2:479-507.

¹⁵ See, e.g., W. O. E. Oesterley, *The Wisdom of Egypt & the Old Testament in Light of the Newly Discovered ‘Teaching of Amen-em-ope’* (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1927), 36-74, 92-106; Westermann, *Roots of Wisdom*, 88-89, 155-159; Richard J. Clifford, *Proverbs: A Commentary* (OTL; Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox, 1999), 14, 17-18, 199-216. Westermann compares the two texts while remaining cautious on the question of direct literary dependence on the part of the compiler of Prov 22:17-24:22 (cf. *Roots of Wisdom*, 157). For the text of the *Teaching of Amenemope*, see *ANET*, 421-425.

¹⁶ Cf. Von Rad, *Wisdom*, 9, 317-318.

¹⁷ This study is not itself concerned with the relationship between ancient Near Eastern wisdom texts, though its conclusions depend entirely on the comparison of early Jewish and Christian texts dealing with heavenly wisdom, its revelation and transmission, and the language used to represent these concepts. William W. Hallo has recently distinguished between the “horizontal” dimension of ancient Near Eastern literature, that is the geographical, historical, political, and literary settings which gave rise to particular texts, and the “vertical” or “intertextual” dimension, that is the connection between earlier texts which helped inspire a particular text and later texts which reacted to it (“Introduction: Ancient Near Eastern Texts and their Relevance for Biblical Exegesis,” introduction to *Canonical Compositions from the Biblical World*, edited by William W. Hallo, K. Lawson Younger, and David E. Orton [vol. 1 of *The Context of Scripture: Canonical Compositions, Monumental Inscriptions, and Archival Documents from the Biblical World*; Leiden: Brill, 1997], xxv-xxvi). Both dimensions will be of significance to the discussions to follow.

some sense, though it has been correctly observed that there is a danger of broadening the category of wisdom beyond what is useful to the point where a lack of methodological rigour in defining wisdom results in the placing of a large proportion of the canon within that category without proper justification.¹⁸ A number of scrolls found in caves near Khirbet Qumran have also been understood as wisdom,¹⁹ several of which, including the important work 4QInstruction, have only been officially published very recently.

There are a number of literary forms and genres often categorised as wisdom, the most familiar of which are: (1) the instruction, characteristic in particular of Egyptian wisdom literature²⁰ (having originated in the Old Kingdom) and found in Hebrew chiefly in parts of Proverbs, Sirach, and 4QInstruction; and (2) the wisdom sentence.²¹ James Crenshaw divides wisdom literature form-critically into eight categories: (1) proverb (מִשְׁלָּה);²² (2) riddle (חֲדָקָה); (3) fable and allegory; (4) hymn and prayer; (5) dialogue (*Streitgespräch*); (6) confession (autobiographical narrative); (7) lists (onomastica); and (8) didactic narrative (poetry and prose).²³ He also seeks greater clarity in the study of wisdom by distinguishing between Wisdom literature, wisdom tradition, and wisdom thinking. In terms of wisdom literature he distinguishes between juridical, nature, practical, and theological. He also distinguishes between family/clan wisdom, court wisdom, and scribal

¹⁸ James L. Crenshaw, "Method in Determining Wisdom Influence upon 'Historical' Literature," in *Urgent Advice and Probing Questions: Collected Writings on Old Testament Wisdom* (Macon, Ga.: Mercer University Press, 1995), 312-25; repr. from *JBL* 88 (1969). Cf. Fox, *Proverbs 1-9*, 17 n. 25.

¹⁹ For a useful overview, including English translations of some of the texts, see Daniel J. Harrington, *Wisdom Texts from Qumran* (LDSS; London: Routledge, 1996). See also part one, §3 below.

²⁰ The *terminus technicus* for "instruction" is *sb'yt*. For some of the relevant texts, see ANET, 412-25, 432-34. See also the discussions in (inter alia): William McKane, *Proverbs: A New Approach* (OTL; London: SCM, 1970), 51-150; Miriam Lichtheim, *Late Egyptian Wisdom Literature in the International Context: A Study of Demotic Instructions* (OBO 52; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1983), 1-12; John S. Kloppenborg, *The Formation of Q: Trajectories in Ancient Wisdom Collections* (SAC; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987), 264-89; Clifford, *Proverbs*, 14-15; Fox, *Proverbs 1-9*, 19-23.

²¹ Concerning the co-existence of these two forms in Proverbs, see McKane, *Proverbs*, 1-10. McKane distinguishes between instruction and sentence literature; Weeks, however, urges caution in making such a clear-cut distinction (*Early Israelite Wisdom*, 9).

²² Concerning the definition of this form see McKane, *Proverbs*, 22-33.

²³ James L. Crenshaw, "Wisdom," in *Urgent Advice and Probing Questions: Collected Writings on Old Testament Wisdom* (Macon, Ga.: Mercer University Press, 1995), 45-77; repr. from *Old Testament Form Criticism* (ed. J. Hayes; San Antonio, Tex.: Trinity University Press, 1974).

wisdom.²⁴ However, a yet more basic distinction is to be made: as Katharine Dell has recently pointed out, it is important to distinguish between wisdom as a literary phenomenon and wisdom as a god-given attribute for which humans must strive.²⁵ Furthermore, different manifestations of wisdom developed along different trajectories. In his important study of Qohelet and *Sepher Yetzira*, Peter Hayman discerns three trajectories along which wisdom developed after Qohelet had largely moved beyond gnomic wisdom towards a more philosophical, speculative approach. The first, found in Ben Sira, absorbs gnomic wisdom into the observance of Torah.²⁶ The second draws on the idea that wisdom is hidden in the heavens, and was fundamental to the rise of apocalyptic (aspects of this trajectory will be explored in this study). The third is more universal in scope, drawing for its inspiration from beyond Israel and giving rise to such diverse works as the Wisdom of Solomon, *Sepher ha-Razim*, and *Sepher Yetzira*.²⁷

Wisdom as a concept is often understood as heavenly in origin,²⁸ as in 2 Tim 2:7. This idea is rooted in the ancient Near East. The Babylonian god Marduk is described in *Enuma Elish*²⁹ as “the wisest of gods,” or “sage of the gods,” and in another text he is “the lord of wisdom.”³⁰ In the Egyptian Instruction of Any we read “Tell the god who gave you wisdom: ‘Set them on your path!’”³¹ In the Ugaritic text The Palace of Baal, the virgin Anat and dame Athirat of the sea address El with the words “Your decree, El, is

²⁴ Crenshaw, “Method,” 313; idem, “Wisdom,” 46-47.

²⁵ Dell, ‘*Get Wisdom, Get Insight*,’ 1.

²⁶ Cf. Sir 24; Bar 4:1-4; 4 Macc 1:16-18; *m. ʔAbot* 1:1.

²⁷ A. Peter Hayman, “Qohelet and the Book of Creation,” *JSOT* 50 (1991): 105-109.

²⁸ Von Rad, *Wisdom*, 54-57. See also Walter Eichrodt, *Theology of the Old Testament* (trans. J. A. Baker; vol. 2; OTL; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1967), 89-91. Drawing on the equation of Wisdom and Torah made in Sir 24; Bar 3:9-4:4, Eichrodt understands one aspect of wisdom to be “God’s revelation within Israel.”

²⁹ “The Creation Epic,” translated by E. A. Speiser (*ANET*, 60-72); = “Epic of Creation,” translated by B. R. Foster (*COS* 1:111:390-402).

³⁰ “I Will Praise the Lord of Wisdom,” translated by Robert D. Biggs (*ANET*, 596-600); = “The Poem of the Righteous Sufferer,” translated by B. R. Foster (*COS* 1:153:486-492).

³¹ “Instruction of Any,” translated by Miriam Lichtheim (*COS* 1:46:114).

wise, your wisdom is everlasting.”³² A similar idea is found in the Words of Ahiqar, saying 13,³³ which glorifies wisdom’s divine origin and her benefits to both gods and men,³⁴ and designates wisdom as the special province of Baal Shamayn, one of the high gods of the Arameans,³⁵ in the same way that the Israelites considered wisdom a special attribute of YHWH.³⁶ This appears to be a case, otherwise unique outside the HB, of *personified* wisdom in an ancient Near Eastern text.³⁷

There are a number of texts in the HB which attribute wisdom not only to God, but to his heavenly household. Thus in 2 Sam 14:17 the wise woman of Tekoa compares David to the “angel of God” (מַלְאֲכֵי הָאֱלֹהִים), “to discern good and evil” (לְשַׁמֵּעַ הַטּוֹב וְהָרָע), and in 2 Sam 14:20, the same woman tells David he is “wise in accordance with the wisdom of the angel of God, to know everything that is on the earth” (חָכָם כְּחָכְמַת מַלְאֲכֵי הָאֱלֹהִים לְדַעַת אֶת-כָּל-אֲשֶׁר בָּאָרֶץ). In his seminal study of the development of Jewish beliefs about angels, Michael Mach notes that the heavenly household possesses a wisdom not characteristic of humans.³⁸ When Eliphaz asks in Job 15:8 “Have you listened to the council of God, and have you thus appropriated wisdom?” (הֲבִסֹד אֱלֹהִים הִשְׁמַע וְתִגְרַע אֵלֶיךָ חָכְמָה) he is asking rhetorically whether Job has heard the negotiations between God and his heavenly council and thus obtained wisdom. In Jer

³² CTA 3 E 38; 4 iv 41; cf. CTA 4 v 65. See also CTA 16 iv 3 (Keret). The citation is drawn from John C. L. Gibson, *Canaanite Myths and Legends* (2d ed.; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1977), 54, 60.

³³ For the Aramaic text see A. E. Cowley, *Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B. C.* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1923), 215; James M. Lindenberger, *The Aramaic Proverbs of Ahiqar* (JHNES; Baltimore, Md.: John Hopkins University Press, 1983), 68. Wisdom (חָכְמָה) is referred to in col. 7 line 94, and would provide an appropriate antecedent for the feminine singular adjective יְקִירָה, “precious,” the personal pronoun הִיא, “she,” and the feminine singular passive participle שִׁיבָה, “placed, set, appointed.” Cowley’s suggestion that this “is probably the continuation of l. 94” (*Aramaic Papyri*, 236) is thus plausible.

³⁴ James M. Lindenberger, “The Gods of Ahiqar,” *UF* 14 (1982): 114; idem, *Aramaic Proverbs*, 68.

³⁵ On the identification of בַּעַל קְדָשִׁין in saying 13 (col. 7 line 95), see Lindenberger, “Gods,” 114-116.

³⁶ E.g. 1 Kgs 3:9-12; 5:9-14; Isa 31:2; 40:13-14; Job 12:13, 16, 22; Prov 2:6; 3:19; Dan 2:20-23; Rom 11:33. This idea is also present in the doxology that closes the epistle to the Romans: μόνῳ σοφῷ θεῷ, διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ᾧ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, ἀμήν, “to the *only wise God*, through Jesus Christ, to him be the glory forever, amen” (Rom 16:27).

³⁷ Fox, *Proverbs 1-9*, 332-333.

³⁸ Michael Mach, *Entwicklungsstadien des jüdischen Engelglaubens in vorrabbinischer Zeit* (TSAJ 34; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1992), 26.

23:18, Jeremiah similarly derides the lying prophets: “For who has stood in the council of YHWH and seen, or listened to his message?” (כִּי מִי עָמַד בְּסוֹד יְהוָה וַיֵּרָא) (וַיִּשְׁמַע אֶת־דְּבָרוֹ). It is implied, according to Mach, that whilst false prophets do not stand in God’s counsel, true prophets do.³⁹ In this case and in the case of Isaiah’s call, the heavenly council has a role to play. In Prov 30:3, it is clear that the “holy ones” (קְדוֹשִׁים), the heavenly council, possess a special wisdom which does not exist as a human possession. In Daniel, before Daniel interprets Nebuchadnezzar’s dream, he refers to the wisdom of the gods, whose dwelling is not with humans (Dan 2:11: (אֱלֹהֵינָּהּ דִּי מְדַרְהוֹן עִם־בְּשָׂרָא לֹא אִיתְּוּהִי).

Mach suggests that in these ideas lies the possible origin of the apocalyptic *angelus interpretes* figure.⁴⁰ This is a distinct possibility. In terms of the origins of these ideas themselves, we must look to the broader context of the ancient Near East. Fundamental to these texts is the idea that in order for humans to possess wisdom, it must first be revealed,⁴¹ a concept which surfaces in one of its manifestations in the Mesopotamian mythology of the *apkallu* and *ummânû*, figures before and after the Flood who brought civilised arts to humans.⁴² One text, dating from 164 B.C.E., lists a sequence of such figures who transmitted heavenly wisdom to humans.⁴³ Clifford sees the Akkadian term *ummânû* as the background for the curious term אֱמֹן in Prov 8:30,⁴⁴ indicating that the personified figure of wisdom in Proverbs 8 is “a heavenly figure mediating to humans the

³⁹ Mach, *Entwicklungsstadien*, 27.

⁴⁰ Mach, *Entwicklungsstadien*, 27.

⁴¹ Cf. Hans Conzelmann, συνίημι, σύνεσις, συνετός, ἀσύνετος,” *TDNT* 7:888-896. Conzelmann understands insight not as a faculty native to man but as a gift from God.

⁴² Cf. James C. VanderKam, *Enoch and the Growth of an Apocalyptic Tradition* (CBQMS 16; Washington, D.C.: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1984), 45-51. VanderKam’s examination of the similarities between Enoch and Enmeduranki, king of Sippar and mediator of divine secrets, is most important for the study of the origins of both the Enoch traditions themselves and the mediation of divine secrets in Judaism generally (*Enoch*, 33-45, 188). Cf. *1 En.* 7:1; 8:1, 3; 9:6; 10:7, 8; 16:3.

⁴³ Clifford, *Proverbs*, 25-26.

⁴⁴ Cf. Henri Cazelles, “Ahiqar, *Ummân* and *Amun*, and Biblical Wisdom Texts,” in *Solving Riddles and Untying Knots: Biblical, Epigraphic, and Semitic Studies in Honor of Jonas C. Greenfield* (ed. Z. Zevit, S. Gitin, and M. Sokoloff; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1995), 45-55.

knowledge they need to be good and blessed servants of God.”⁴⁵

The idea of God imparting wisdom to humans occurs frequently in the HB.⁴⁶ In Exod 28:3, Moses is commanded to speak to those who are “wise of heart” (חֲכַמֵּי־לֵב), whom YHWH has filled with the “spirit of wisdom” (רוּחַ חֲכָמָה).⁴⁷ Similarly, YHWH gives Solomon a “wise and discerning heart” (1 Kgs 3:12: לֵב חָכָם וְנָבוֹן).⁴⁸ In Ezr 7:25, Artaxerxes refers to “the wisdom of your (viz. Ezra’s) God, which is in your hand” (חֲכָמַת אֱלֹהֶיךָ דִּי־בְיָדְךָ). During the Hellenistic period, the idea of God imparting his wisdom to specific individuals was developed by the apocalyptists, becoming linked with dualistic thought so that God’s wisdom was understood to be imparted to an elect group⁴⁹ through the mediation of heavenly beings, such as the archangel Gabriel, and inspired humans, such as Daniel and Enoch. In the court tales of the book of Daniel, knowledge and insight possessed by Daniel and his companions were given to them by God (Dan 1:17). In Daniel’s prayer, wisdom and power belong to God,⁵⁰ and he “gives wisdom to the wise and knowledge to those who know insight” (Dan 2:21: יְהִיב חֲכָמָתָא לְחַכְמִין וּמַנְדְּעָא לִידְעֵי בִינָה). Moreover, he has given wisdom and strength to Daniel himself (Dan 2:23).⁵¹ Later, insight is given to Daniel through the mediation of an angel (Dan 9:22), twice named as Gabriel (Dan 8:16; 9:21). The claim that what is revealed through Daniel is heavenly in origin lends authority both to what has been revealed and to the figure

⁴⁵ Clifford, *Proverbs*, 26. This view is refuted by Fox: *Proverbs 1-9*, 286.

⁴⁶ Cf. E. Earle Ellis, “‘Wisdom’ and ‘Knowledge’ in 1 Corinthians,” *TynBul* 25 (1974): 88-93. Ellis notes the affinity of wisdom with prophecy (particularly in the later OT writings and apocalyptic), and the role of prophetic and angelic mediation of the revealed message.

⁴⁷ Cf. Exod 35:31, 35.

⁴⁸ Cf. 1 Kgs 3:9, 28; 5:9, 26; 1 Chr 1:12. In the NT, cf. esp. 1 Cor 2:6-7; Eph 3:10; Jas 1:5.

⁴⁹ E.g. *1 En.* 5:9: “And then wisdom shall be given to the elect.” This refers to the eschatological revelation of wisdom to the elect group, thus linking the themes of the revelation of wisdom, the anthropological dualism of the elect and the damned, and the imminence of the eschaton. Translation: “1 (Ethiopic Apocalypse of) Enoch,” translated by E. Isaac (*OTP*, 1:15).

⁵⁰ Dan 2:20. See also Job 12:13; *Yasna* 22:25; 25:6 (cf. John J. Collins, *Daniel: A Commentary on the Book of Daniel* [Hermeneia; Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress, 1993], 160).

⁵¹ Cf. *Bahman Yasht* 1:1; 2:5-8; Collins, *Daniel*, 160.

through whom the revelation has been transmitted.⁵²

3. Authority and Tradition

The issues of authority and the legitimation of wisdom teaching are important.⁵³ Crenshaw asserts that “[t]he authority of the sage was that of the Creator himself, hence the prominence of the twin concepts of the *fear of* and *will of* God,” and suggests that the authority of the father-figure is that of “a father who has control over life and limb.”⁵⁴ John Kloppenborg notes that the instruction genre has an authoritative aspect, and that a dominant feature in both Egyptian and Israelite instructions is the attribution to a named and renowned sage.⁵⁵ This accounts for the attribution of material in the book of Proverbs to Solomon (Prov 1:1; 10:1; 25:1), who became known not simply as a wise king, but as an author and collector of wisdom.⁵⁶ The notion of authority accounts for the attribution of the book of Ecclesiastes to the “Son of David, King in Jerusalem” (Qoh 1:1: דְּבַרִּי קִהְלֹת בֶּן-דָּוִד מֶלֶךְ בִּירוּשָׁלַם, “words of a collector,⁵⁷ the son of David, king in Jerusalem”).⁵⁸ The authority of Solomon also lies, in part, behind his association with the Song of Songs (Cant 1:1, 5; 3:7, 9, 11; 8:11, 12),⁵⁹ Psalm 72 (Ps 72:1), the Odes of

⁵² Cf. John S. Kloppenborg, *The Formation of Q: Trajectories in Ancient Wisdom Collections* (SAC; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987), 286-287.

⁵³ Von Rad, *Wisdom*, 291-292; James G. Williams, *Those Who Ponder Proverbs: Aphoristic Thinking and Biblical Literature* (BLS 2; Sheffield: Almond, 1981), 40-42.

⁵⁴ James L. Crenshaw, *Prophetic Conflict: Its Effect Upon Israelite Religion* (BZAW 124; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1971), 108.

⁵⁵ Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 286. Cf. Weeks, *Early Israelite Wisdom*, 10-11; Dell, ‘Get Wisdom, Get Insight,’ 8-9.

⁵⁶ Crawford H. Toy, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Proverbs* (ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1899), xix-xx; McKane, *Proverbs*, 262; Clifford, *Proverbs*, 34; Fox, *Proverbs 1-9*, 56-58.

⁵⁷ Cf. BDB 875.

⁵⁸ James L. Crenshaw, *Ecclesiastes: A Commentary* (OTL; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1987), 57. Regardless of whether this introduction in fact refers to Solomon, an attribution to a son of David is itself a statement of authority. David himself was renowned for his wisdom: in 11QPs^a XXVII, 2-4 it is significant that not only is David “a wise man and a light like the sun” (חכם ואור כאור השמש), he has been given an “understanding and enlightening spirit” (רוח נבונה ואורה) by YHWH himself.

⁵⁹ Alternatively, the third person references to Solomon within the Song of Songs itself, or the statement in 1 Kgs 5:12 attributing the authorship of 1005 songs to Solomon may have prompted the attribution of the Song to him: Roland E. Murphy, *The Song of Songs: A Commentary on the Book of Canticles or the Song of Songs* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990), 3, 120-121.

Solomon, the Psalms of Solomon, the Testament of Solomon, and the Wisdom of Solomon.⁶⁰

Such attributions are neither confined to instructions nor confined to renowned sages. The literary fiction of the Mosaic authorship of Deuteronomy is intended to lend authority to the teaching of that book.⁶¹ The attribution of divinely granted insight to Daniel may be linked to his existing reputation, to which Ezek 14:14; 28:3 bear witness.⁶² Among the Pseudepigrapha the attribution of testaments to renowned figures of Israel's past falls into the same category. Pseudepigraphic apocalyptic texts (e.g. *4 Ezra* 14:37-48) often use the devices of the divine origin of revealed material⁶³ and attribution to a renowned figure⁶⁴ to create an air of authority, and, for Gilles Quispel, the names of R. Akiba and R. Ishmael were chosen by those responsible for the *Shiur Komah* material "to legitimize a mysticism which definitely and consciously desired to remain within the boundaries of rabbinic, orthodox, Pharisaic Judaism."⁶⁵

Related to the notion of authority is that of transmission. Authoritative material attributed to a particular figure is to be appropriated, guarded, and transmitted. This is connected to Wolfgang Roth's understanding of Sirach's hermeneutic-pedagogic theory: "from understanding to explanation, from assimilation to exposition, from learning to teaching, from apprenticeship to mastery."⁶⁶ Sirach 39:1-11, on part of which Roth's opinion is based, confirms this understanding. The sage begins by seeking understanding:

⁶⁰ Fox, *Proverbs 1-9*, 56.

⁶¹ Andrew D. H. Mayes, *Deuteronomy* (NCB; London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1979), 57.

⁶² Ezek 14:14 refers to Noah, Daniel, and Job as three men who could save their own souls "by their righteousness" (חֲסִידָתָם). They are extraordinary figures in the folklore behind Ezekiel, though their wisdom, which did become legendary, is not referred to.

⁶³ Cf. Christopher C. Rowland, *The Open Heaven: A Study of Apocalyptic in Judaism and Early Christianity* (London: SPCK, 1982), 19-20; VanderKam, *Enoch*, 189.

⁶⁴ Crenshaw, *Prophetic Conflict*, 107.

⁶⁵ Gilles Quispel, "Ezekiel 1:26 in Jewish Mysticism and Gnosis," *VC* 34 (1980): 11.

⁶⁶ Wolfgang Roth, "On the Gnostic-Disursive Wisdom of Jesus ben Sirach," *Semeia* 17 (1980): 63. Kloppenborg cites Roth's remark in support of his own analysis in *Formation*, 287.

אבל נותן נפשו ומתבונן בתורת עליון
 חכמת כל הראשונים ידרשו ובנבואות יהגה
 שיחת אנשי שם ישמר ובעמקי מליצות יבוא
 נסתרות משל ידרשו בחידות משל יתרשש

As for one who sets his soul, and ponders the law of the Most High:

He examines the wisdom of all the former things, and meditates on prophecies,

He guards the thought of men of renown, and enters the depths of metaphors,

He examines a proverb's secrets, and turns over⁶⁷ a proverb's riddles. Sir 39:1-3

The sage's understanding is dependent upon the will of YHWH. This recalls the idea that wisdom belongs in heaven and must be revealed to become known to humans. One who receives insight pours forth words of wisdom, thus passing on understanding given to him by God:

אם אל עליון ירצה רוח בינה ימלא
 הוא יביע דברי חכמה ויודה ליי בתפלה
 הוא יכין עצה ודעת טוב במסתריו יתבונן
 הוא יביע מוסר שכל ובתורת יי יתפאר

If God Most High pleases, he will be filled with a spirit of understanding,

He will pour forth words of wisdom, and give thanks to YYY in prayer,

He will establish counsel and knowledge, and ponder his hidden secrets,

He will pour forth insightful instruction, and glory in the law of YYY. Sir 39:6-8

As a result of his wisdom, passed on to others, the sage will be praised and his name never cut off:

יהללו בינתו רבים ועד עולם לא יכרת שמו

⁶⁷ LXX: ἀναστραφήσεται.

לא ישבת זכרו ושמו יהיה לדור דורים
חכמתו תשנה עדה ותהללתו יספר קהל

*Many will praise his understanding, and his name will never be cut off,
His memory will not cease, and his name will live for generation upon generation,
A congregation will recite his wisdom, and an assembly will recount his praise.*

Sir 39:9-10

A sage's insight begins with the study of the wisdom of the ancients. If God is willing, he grants a spirit of understanding⁶⁸ in response to prayer.⁶⁹ The sage can then pour forth wisdom, which is praised by others and recounted in assemblies in perpetuity.

In Sirach, the idea of transmission is also connected with the idea of succession: Joshua is the "successor" (διάδοχος)⁷⁰ of Moses in the prophetic office (Sir 46:1 [LXX]), Solomon succeeds David as king (Sir 47:12), and prophets, especially Elisha, are the successors of Elijah (Sir 48:8, 12).⁷¹ The ideas of succession and transmission underlie chains of tradition such as that preserved in *m. ʿAbot* 1:1, in which teaching is given through Moses and transmitted from generation to generation. The mention of Moses is itself a statement of authority, since Moses was "*fons et origo de la sagesse juive*."⁷² Here the body of teaching is not wisdom but Torah. However, Wisdom and Torah were often understood to be synonymous,⁷³ and in Jewish lore Torah came to be understood as belonging with the angels in heaven. The following chain of transmission, described by

⁶⁸ Cf. Isa 11:2; 61:1; Luke 4:18.

⁶⁹ Cf. 1 Kgs 3:6-9; 2 Chr 1:8-10; Dan 9:3-19.

⁷⁰ Ms B from the Cairo Genizah reads משרת at this point: Joshua was the "attendant of Moses in prophecy" (משרת משה בנבואה).

⁷¹ Martin Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in their Encounter in Palestine during the Early Hellenistic Period* (trans. J. Bowden; vol. 1; London: SCM, 1974; repr., London: Xpress Reprints, 1996), 136; John J. Collins, *Jewish Wisdom in the Hellenistic Age* (OTL; Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox, 1997), 99-100.

⁷² Elias Bickerman, "La chaîne de la tradition pharisienne," *RB* 59 (1952): 51.

⁷³ Sir 24:23-26; Bar 3:9-4:4.

Dieter Lührmann as “the classic formulation of the rabbinic understanding of tradition,”⁷⁴ is therefore grounded in the idea of the revelation and transmission of heavenly wisdom:

משה קבל תורה מסיני ומסרה ליהושע ויהושע לזקנים וזקנים לנביאים ונביאים
מסרה לאנשי כנסת הגדולה

Moses received Torah from Sinai and transmitted it to Joshua, and Joshua to the elders, the elders to the prophets, and the prophets transmitted it to the men of the great assembly.

This text refers to the tradition of oral Torah. Gershom Scholem has shown that the Second Temple period was the context in which, in Judaism, tradition as a special aspect of revelation was produced: tradition became the medium through which revelation could continue to be perceived.⁷⁵ This chain of transmission is elaborated upon in the parallel in *Avot of Rabbi Nathan*, and provides the framework for chains of transmission in 3 *En.* 48D:10 and the preface to *Sepher ha-Razim*. In Hebrew Enoch, revelation occurs through the mediation of Metatron, prince of the law. In *Sepher ha-Razim*, several different ideas converge. The book of the books of the mysteries is given to Noah from the mouth of the angel Raziel.⁷⁶ Using the framework of the chain of transmission in *m. Ḥabot* 1:1, it is recounted that the book is transmitted from generation to generation to Solomon, who thus acquired his extraordinary wisdom. Thus several themes are brought together: Solomon’s extraordinary wisdom, the heavenly origin of wisdom, and the idea of an angelic revealer.

Jewish texts from the Second Temple period and later bear witness to the heavenly

⁷⁴ Dieter Lührmann, *Das Offenbarungsverständnis bei Paulus und in paulinischen Gemeinden* (WMANT 16; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1965), 72 n. 6.

⁷⁵ Gershom G. Scholem, “Revelation and Tradition as Religious Categories in Judaism,” in *The Messianic Idea in Judaism and Other Essays on Jewish Spirituality* (New York: Schocken, 1971), 282-303.

⁷⁶ Lines 1-2: *זה ספר מספרי הרזים שנתן לנוח בן למך בן מתושלח בן חנוך בן ירד בן מהללאל בן קינן בן אנוש בן שת בן אדם מפיו רזיאל המלאך*, “The book from the books of the mysteries which was given to Noah son of Lamech, son of Methuselah, son of Enoch, son of Jared, son of Mahallel, son of Kenan, son of Enosh, son of Seth, son of Adam, from the mouth of Raziel the angel.” Text: Mordecai Margalioth, *ספר הרזים הוא ספר כשפים מתקופת התלמוד* (Jerusalem: Yediot Aharonot, 1966), 65. In connection with this genealogy compare Luke 3:36-38.

origin of more than wisdom alone. Divine mysteries revealed to a seer are transmitted.⁷⁷ In 4 *Ezra* 14:39-48 we read:

Then I opened my mouth, and behold, a full cup was offered to me; it was full of something like water, but its color was like fire. And I took it and drank; and when I had drunk it, my heart poured forth understanding, and wisdom increased in my breast, for my spirit retained its memory;⁷⁸ and my mouth was opened, and was no longer closed. And the Most High gave understanding to the five men, and by turns they wrote what was dictated, in characters which they did not know. They sat forty days, and wrote during the daytime, and ate their bread at night. As for me, I spoke in the daytime and was not silent at night. So during the forty days ninety-four books were written. And when the forty days were ended, the Most High spoke to me, saying, "Make public the twenty-four books that you wrote first and let the worthy and the unworthy read them; but keep the seventy that were written last, in order to give them to the wise among your people."⁷⁹ For in them is the spring of understanding, the fountain of wisdom, and the river of knowledge." And I did so.⁸⁰

Ezra and his companions do not simply receive wisdom from the Most High, but transmit what is revealed to them in written form. In the Ascension of Isaiah, Isaiah tells the vision he saw to Hezekiah, his son Josab, Micah, and the other prophets.⁸¹ This is a chain of transmission in which Isaiah passes revelation given to him on to others. Moreover, *Ascen. Isa.* 7:2-11:35 records revelations granted to Isaiah by an *angelus interpretes*. In 2 *En.* 68:7, the sign given by God through the agency of Enoch is to be transmitted from generation to generation. In 1 *Clem.* 42:1-2, the gospel is what is transmitted.⁸² The apostles "were evangelised" (εὐηγγελίσθησαν): they received the gospel from Christ who had been sent from God. Christ mediates the gospel from God who sent him to the apostles, who preached the Gospel to others (1 *Clem.* 42:3-4). This passage recalls not

⁷⁷ For Joseph P. Schultz, such mysteries are contained within the wisdom hidden from the beginning in heaven and revealed to initiates ("Angelic Opposition to the Ascension of Moses and the Revelation of the Law," *JQR* 61 [1970-1971]: 293); in other words, wisdom and mysteries are not separate: the latter are part of the former.

⁷⁸ Compare the concern in the *sar torah* material in the *hekhalot* literature with the memorisation of Torah, granted by an angel called the prince of the law.

⁷⁹ Cf. Dan 11:33.

⁸⁰ For the translation, see: "The Fourth Book of Ezra," translated by B. M. Metzger (*OTP*, 1:554-555).

⁸¹ *Ascen. Isa.* 7:1; cf. 8:24; 11:16, 36-37.

⁸² 1 *Clement* 42:1-2: οἱ ἀπόστολοι ἡμῖν εὐηγγελίσθησαν ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, Ἰησοῦς ὁ Χριστὸς ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐξεπέμφθη. ὁ Χριστὸς οὖν ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι ἀπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ. "The apostles received the Gospel for us from the Lord Jesus Christ, Jesus the Christ was sent from God. Thus the Christ is from God and the apostles from the Christ."

only the Johannine *Sendungschristologie*,⁸³ but a model of transmission evidenced in the NT.⁸⁴ In 2 Tim 2:2, Paul's teaching is transmitted through Timothy within a closed chain of transmission. In 1 Cor 11:23, Paul's teaching about the eucharist originates with a heavenly figure (the Lord) and this teaching is transmitted through Paul's mediation to the Corinthian church: ἐγὼ γὰρ παρέλαβον ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου, ὃ καὶ παρέδωκα ὑμῖν, "for I received from the Lord what I have also transmitted to you." At this point we need to raise the issue of technical language used for the transmission process.

4. The language of transmission

In 1 Cor 11:23; 15:3, Paul's words reflect not only the revelation and transmission of teaching that originates with a heavenly figure, but a technical language, in which παραλαμβάνω, "receive," and παραδίδωμι, "transmit," are used in conjunction to represent transmission. The texts with which we are concerned bear witness to the revelation and transmission of material of heavenly origin, but often also contain a technical language used to represent this idea. The probable origin of the Pauline use of παραλαμβάνω and παραδίδωμι in contemporary Greek usage will detain us later, but it is important to realise at this stage that there is evidence of an analogous technical language, whose origins lie in the Hebrew of post-exilic Palestine. It is made up of a small group of semitic roots, chiefly בִּין and שָׁלַח,⁸⁵ which are especially prominent in Daniel and the Qumran scrolls. In Dan 8:16, Gabriel is commanded to "make this one understand the vision" (הִבֵּן לְהַלֹּאֵת הַמַּרְאָה), בִּין Hiphil being used to represent the transmission of insight from Gabriel to Daniel. בִּין

⁸³ Esp. John 20:21: καθὼς ἀπέσταλκέν με ὁ πατήρ, καὶ γὰρ πέμπω ὑμᾶς, "just as the Father has sent me, I also send you." Cf. John 5:36, 37, 38; 8:18; 10:36; 17:18, 21; Gal 4:4; 1 John 4:9.

⁸⁴ *1 Clement* 42 refers to the origin, function, and (above all) authority of the apostles, who "are those who received commands from Jesus and have been granted a resurrection appearance. They speak God's word and appear under the aegis of the Holy Spirit" (John Howard Schütz, *Paul and the Anatomy of Apostolic Authority* [SNTSMS 26; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975], 5).

⁸⁵ Nili Shupak places words deriving from both these roots in the category of "words with a higher frequency in wisdom literature than in other genres" (*Where Can Wisdom Be Found? The Sage's Language in the Bible and in Ancient Egyptian Literature* [OBO 130; Fribourg: University Press, 1993], 339-340; cf. pp. 337-338). On the importance of שָׁלַח in the Hebrew and Aramaic sections of Daniel cf. Frederick F. Bruce, "The Book of Daniel and the Qumran Community," in *Neotestamentica et Semitica: Studies in Honour of Matthew Black* (ed. E. E. Ellis and M. Wilcox; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1969), 227-228.

Hiphil is used in Dan 8:27 to refer to Daniel's lack of understanding (אֵין מִבִּין), but in Dan 9:22-23 following Gabriel's command "understand the vision" (הִבֵּן בַּמַּרְאָה) שכל Hiphil is used in a similar way. In Dan 9:22 Gabriel says to Daniel "I have come to teach you understanding" (וְצִאתִי לְהַשְׁכִּילָךְ בִּינָה), שכל Hiphil being used to represent the transmission of insight from Gabriel to Daniel. These two roots are not only used of transmission from a heavenly being to a seer. In Dan 11:33 "those of the people who understand" are מְשַׁכְּלֵי עַם, and "will instruct" (יְבַיֵּן) the many. Here, שכל and בין are used in collocation to refer to a teaching process that, because of the terminology used, is linked with the process of revealing heavenly insight earlier.

5. Thesis statement

The three parts of this study may be read independently, but are connected to one another by a number of factors. First, the theme of understanding is central to our study of the Qumran scrolls, the Synoptics, and the Epistles. Second, each part focuses on the idea of transmission. In each corpus, previously hidden heavenly secrets are transmitted, and each corpus attests different stages of development from the mediation of recent revelation to the transmission of a concretised deposit of tradition. Third, the nature and origins of the language used for understanding and the mediation and transmission of revelation and tradition in the three corpora is significant. Fourth, the phenomenon of apocalyptic, outlined briefly in part two,⁸⁶ constitutes part of the context out of which all three corpora emerged.

Part one investigates sapiential language in the Qumran scrolls, which are closely linked, conceptually and linguistically, with Daniel. Four groups of scrolls provide the focus, all officially published relatively recently: 4Q380 and 4Q381, 4QInstruction, the

⁸⁶ Part two, §3.

⁸⁷ In this way the present study responds to James H. Charlesworth and Brent A. Strawn's remark that "the role of the Maskil is another topic that deserves in-depth research in light of the 4QS fragments" ("Reflections on the Text of *Serek ha-Yahad* found in Cave IV," *RevQ* 17 (1996): 413 n. 45.

4QS fragments, and the 4QD fragments. 4Q380 and 4Q381 are non-sectarian and may thus be read alongside Daniel as evidence for language and concepts current within the Palestinian Judaisms of the late Second Temple period. The possible sectarian origin of 4QInstruction is more disputed. The focus is on the transmission of revealed insight with special reference to the tradent, a **מְשַׁכִּיל**, and the recipient of instruction, a **מְבִין**. The 4QS manuscripts are examined alongside the use of **בִּין** in 1QS. The phrase **מִדְרַשׁ לְמִשְׁכִּיל** (4QS^b IX, 1; 4QS^d I, 1) is central, the aim being to establish what this phrase implies about the role of the **מְשַׁכִּיל**.⁸⁷ Finally, the 4QD manuscripts are read alongside the 4QS manuscripts against the background of the HB (particularly Daniel) with the aim of understanding the concept of the revelation of heavenly insight in these texts and the sociological implications of this concept.

Part two examines understanding (and incomprehension) in the Synoptics. Luke's Gospel provides the framework, and texts using *σύνεσις* or *συνίημι* provide the focus. This section begins with a discussion of the relationship between Luke's infancy narrative and the book of Daniel, establishing that Luke is to be understood partly against the background of this apocalyptic work. The figure of Gabriel is examined in a series of Jewish and Christian documents, establishing the correctness of reading Luke against a Jewish background and foregrounding the transmission of revelation in Luke through the mediation of heavenly figures (Gabriel and the risen Jesus himself). Various approaches to the definition of "apocalyptic" are discussed, the revelation of heavenly mysteries being understood as characteristic of this phenomenon. The disciples in Mark's Gospel are read against the background of the **מְשַׁכִּילִים** of Daniel, and Jesus is understood here against the background of the LXX as a heavenly revealer acting in the place of God. The disciples' incomprehension is focused on the identity of Jesus. In Matthew, the disciples are again modelled on Daniel's **מְשַׁכִּילִים** and Jesus is again a heavenly mediator, though here the disciples' *comprehension* is focused on Jesus' identity. In Luke, *συνίημι* is used as a link word in different parts of the Gospel to foreground the initial incomprehension of the

disciples and their ultimate reception of insight from the risen revealer, Jesus. Jesus in Luke is modelled on a Jewish pattern of divine agency which surfaces elsewhere in traditions about the exalted Enoch. The transfiguration and resurrection narratives are read alongside Jewish and Judaeo-Christian texts as indicating that Jesus is a figure exalted to heavenly status, whose function is to reveal.

Part three begins by placing the Epistles in the context of the apocalyptic emphasis on revealed wisdom and by surveying the concepts of revelation and mystery in the *corpus Paulinum*, the centrality of the Damascus christophany for the origin of Paul's gospel, the centrality of Christ's glorification in Paul's Christology, and the mediatorial role of the apostle. Texts in which Paul uses *termini technici* for tradition are surveyed in light of Greek analogies and it is demonstrated that Paul stresses the heavenly origin of the gospel and the traditions which give it expression (an idea rooted in Jewish apocalyptic), while using language current in Greek to express the idea. Moving beyond the *corpus Paulinum*, Heb 2:1-4 is examined in connection with the angelic mediation of the law, and it is concluded that this text, too, is dependent on apocalyptic. It shares with Pauline texts the idea that what is transmitted among Christians originated in heaven and was passed on in an authoritative chain of transmission. Finally, 2 Tim 2:1-7 is examined. While this passage shares with the generally accepted Paulines a concept of tradition in which what is transmitted originated in heaven and is given to the apostle and passed on in an authoritative chain, the language used is different (that of "teaching" and "deposit") and there is no direct connection with the revelation of wisdom in 2:7, despite the fact that both this and the tradition are rooted in apocalyptic concepts.

6. Concluding remarks

This introduction has sought to sketch the background to the material treated in the thesis proper, and to offer a brief thesis statement. Many ancient authors have not been given detailed treatment in this study, essentially because that would have unduly lengthened the

thesis. Philo, Josephus, Ben Sira, and the Wisdom of Solomon only feature in this study in passing, and no detailed treatment is offered of rabbinic or patristic works. That is not to say that such studies would not be possible, even fruitful. Furthermore, some explanation is needed for the absence of a *Forschungsbericht* as such. The nature of the topic and the material selected for discussion is such that a history of research pertaining to the totality of the present work would be impossible. The Qumran texts discussed were published so recently that this is, I believe, the first study to tackle this material in this way. In the case of the Gospels, the present work draws on several strands of recent research rather than developing just one. Again, to the best of my knowledge this study marks a new departure. The discussion of the epistles also draws on several strands in recent research. Consequently, instead of a single history of research at the outset, individual surveys of research on specific points are given at various points.

What is the contribution of this study to our understanding of ancient Judaism and Christianity? On the surface, this study aims to illuminate the revelation and transmission of heavenly insight in the Jewish and Judaeo-Christian literature of the late Second Temple period. It seeks to contribute primarily to research on early Judaism and its literature, and tangentially to the study of the later books of the HB and the literature of nascent Christianity. A deeper purpose is to defend a particular way of reading this literature. Comparative studies of ancient texts are often concerned with the question of influence, William Hallo's "vertical" or "intertextual" dimension, seeking to establish whether John's Gospel is dependent upon Essenism, or whether Paul's language of tradition is to be explained by reference to Hellenistic or rabbinic sources. Such questions are valid, but adequate answers cannot be gained without exploring the relevant literature in all its vastness and complexity, reading individual texts as individual texts whilst paying due attention to their wider literary and social contexts (Hallo's "horizontal" dimension). The question of whether "influence" may be detected is not always appropriate. Texts may be meaningfully read alongside one another without even asking whether there is a direct relationship of dependence.

Part One

THE QUMRAN SCROLLS

1. Introduction

This chapter explores the revelation and transmission of wisdom in the Qumran scrolls by means of a detailed analysis of certain Semitic roots connected with intellection in a group of recently published scrolls: 4Q380 and 4Q381, 4QInstruction, the 4QS fragments, and the 4QD fragments. Although the concept of wisdom in the Qumran scrolls has long been the focus of scholarly attention, the process of its transmission has not. The importance of wisdom in the Qumran scrolls was stressed by John Edward Worrell in 1968 when he wrote, with reference to the wisdom tradition, that “due to the pervasive implications of the topic, hardly any area of Qumran studies—nor indeed of the study of content in the Old Testament, New Testament or ancient Judaica—is exempt from some connection to it.”¹ For Sarah Jane Tanzer, whose study is a thorough investigation of wisdom elements in the *Hodayot*, wisdom is a pervasive element of the Qumran scrolls as a corpus.² In his survey of “the theology of early Essenism,”³ Martin Hengel highlights the significance for Essene theology and later religious development of the concepts of knowledge, insight, and wisdom,⁴ commenting that

Knowledge about the deeper connections in creation and history, about the greatness and misery of man, come from [God] alone, and the only wise man is the one to whom God has revealed the mysteries of his knowledge through his spirit.⁵

¹ John E. Worrell, “Concepts of Wisdom in the Dead Sea Scrolls” (Ph.D. diss., The Claremont Graduate School, 1968), ii.

² Tanzer comments that “[t]he appropriation of wisdom elements by this particular community reflects a shift from wisdom literature as primarily secular literature, as in ancient Israel, to the use of wisdom language in diverse literary genres (such as hymns, benedictions, and bible commentaries) to express the religious thought and values of the community” (“The Sages at Qumran: Wisdom in the ‘Hodayot’” [Ph.D. diss., Harvard University, 1986], 1).

³ Martin Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in their Encounter in Palestine during the Early Hellenistic Period* (trans. J. Bowden; vol. 1; London: SCM, 1974; repr., London: Xpress Reprints, 1996), 218-224.

⁴ Hengel, *Judaism*, 221-223.

⁵ Hengel, *Judaism*, 222.

Hengel's understanding of this aspect of Essene theology is that knowledge, insight, and wisdom belong with God, and must be revealed to humans for them to become known. This is echoed by W. Lowndes Lipscomb and James A. Sanders,⁶ and Christopher Morray-Jones, who understands the idea of knowledge as a revelatory gift from God to be common to wisdom,⁷ apocalyptic,⁸ and the Qumran scrolls.⁹ Christopher Rowland, similarly, notes that "[k]nowledge of the divine secrets formed an important part of the doctrinal convictions of the Qumran sect."¹⁰ More recently, Daniel Harrington has noted that the most striking contribution of Qumran wisdom texts may be their emphasis on wisdom as a gift from God and the need to understand what is called the **רזן נהיה**.¹¹

Of particular importance among previous studies is a 1956 study by Friedrich Nötscher, who offered his explorations as an attempt to contribute to the clarification of selected religious terms and concepts significant for Qumran, leaving room for later supplementation, refinement, or correction on the basis of new, yet to be disclosed material.¹² With regard to the idea of wisdom as originating with God, Nötscher cites the divine appellations **אל הדעות**,¹³ "God of knowledge" and **מקור דעת**,¹⁴ "source of knowledge" as evidence for this idea at Qumran.¹⁵ He suggests that this concept follows

⁶ W. Lowndes Lipscomb and James A. Sanders, "Wisdom at Qumran," in *Israelite Wisdom: Theological and Literary Essays in Honor of Samuel Terrien* (ed. J. G. Gammie, W. A. Brueggemann, W. L. Humphreys, and J. M. Ward; Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1978), 277.

⁷ Christopher R. A. Morray-Jones, "Merkabah Mysticism and Talmudic Tradition: A Study of the Traditions concerning *hammerkabah* and *ma'aseh merkabah* in Tannaitic and Amoraic Sources" (Ph.D. diss., University of Cambridge, 1988), 165.

⁸ Morray-Jones, "Merkabah Mysticism," 170-174.

⁹ Morray-Jones, "Merkabah Mysticism," 175.

¹⁰ Rowland, *Open Heaven*, 115.

¹¹ Harrington, *Wisdom Texts*, 83; "Ten Reasons why the Qumran Wisdom Texts are Important," *DSD* 4 (1997): 250-251.

¹² Friedrich Nötscher, *Zur Theologischen Terminologie der Qumran-Texte* (BBB 10; Bonn: Peter Hanstein, 1956), 9-10. Nötscher rightly notes that it is necessary to be conversant with all the texts in order to reach definite conclusions (*Terminologie*, 9).

¹³ 1QS III, 15; 1QH^a IX, 26; XX, 10; XX^{bot}, 15. Cf. 1 Sam 2:3; 1QH^a XXV^{bot}, 8-9; Mas1k I, 2 (par. 4Q402 4 12); 4Q400 1 II, 1; 2 8; 4Q401 11 2; 4Q403 1 I, 31, 38; 4Q404 4 7; 4Q405 23 I, 8; 23 II, 12. In the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice, **אלוהי דעת** seems to refer to the God of knowledge, whereas **אלי דעת** (cf. **רומי דעת**: 4Q405 3 II, 4) appear to refer to angels who possess knowledge, affirming the idea that knowledge, wisdom, and insight are of heavenly origin. Cf. Mach, *Entwicklungsstadien*, 139.

¹⁴ 1QS X, 12; XI, 3 (**מקור דעתו**, "the source of his knowledge"); 1QH^a XX, 29.

¹⁵ Nötscher, *Terminologie*, 40.

from the belief that God is the cause of everything in the physical and moral spheres and the belief that an individual's fate and way of life depend on his will.¹⁶ Nötscher deals with several terms relating to knowledge and understanding, beginning with **דע**.¹⁷ He discerns several senses, including secular knowledge¹⁸ and sexual knowledge.¹⁹ A particularly significant meaning for **דע** is connected with knowledge not to be divulged, perhaps community resolutions, which a member excluded as a law-breaker should not learn.²⁰ It is used for making known the difference between holy and profane.²¹ The sum of personal knowledge and understanding of every sort is combined in the term **דעת**, which a candidate must bring into the community.²²

Nötscher examines the term **משכיל**, which he renders “wisdom teacher” (*Weisheitslehrer*).²³ True knowledge (**דעת אמת**), which has a predominantly religious content and purpose, must, along with just judgement (**משפט צדק**), be possessed by the **משכיל**.²⁴ The **משכיל** is to teach the “chosen of the way” (novices or community members), lead them in knowledge, and teach them concerning the wonderful and true mysteries among the men of the community so that they may each walk in “perfection of way in all that has been revealed to them.”²⁵ The withholding of knowledge is punishment for sin,²⁶ and in his anger against the inhabitants of the land God has ordered their knowledge to return.²⁷ The apprentices within the community, however, are “men of knowledge” (**אנשי דעות**),²⁸ the earthly counterpart to the God of knowledge and the spirits

¹⁶ Nötscher, *Terminologie*, 40.

¹⁷ Nötscher, *Terminologie*, 44-46.

¹⁸ CD IX, 11, 17-22.

¹⁹ 1QSa I, 10.

²⁰ 1QS VIII, 18.

²¹ CD XII, 20. Cf. 4QInstruction^c 1 I, 8, 17-18.

²² 1QS I, 11-12; III, 2.

²³ Nötscher, *Terminologie*, 46-47, 56-57.

²⁴ In connection with the **משכיל**, Nötscher cites 1QS III, 13; IX, 12, 21; CD XII, 21. For his possession of **דעת אמת** and **משפט צדק**, see 1QS IX, 17.

²⁵ 1QS IX, 17-19.

²⁶ 1QH^a XIII, 26.

²⁷ CD X, 9-10.

²⁸ CD XX, 4-5.

of knowledge (רוחות דעת).²⁹ The implication of this, which Nötscher does not make explicit, is that God, the spirits of knowledge and the earthly men of knowledge share a divine attribute. Those within the community share this through the mediation of their teacher, the מַשְׁכִּיל, and they receive it within a chain of transmission.

Nötscher includes sections on בִּין³⁰ and שִׁכֵּל,³¹ synonyms for understanding and knowledge. The devout man seeks insight (בִּינָה),³² which Nötscher understands to be insight, understanding, and comprehension of ordinary and extraordinary, mysterious things, which manifests itself mainly in practical action.³³ It should govern the whole life of the community member. בִּינָה is a gift from God,³⁴ received directly from him or through the spirit of truth.³⁵ בִּינָה is not given to all, but only to those who are receptive to it, who were known as “understanding ones” (מְבִינִים).³⁶ Nötscher reads CD II, 14-16 as indicating that the teacher of righteousness transmitted בִּינָה within the community, though the possibility that 4QD^a began לַמַּשְׁכִּיל means that it may be better to think of a מַשְׁכִּיל as mediator of בִּינָה in the Damascus Document, thus recalling 1QS IX, 12-21.³⁷ Mediatorial “offices” (*Ämter*) within the community are identified by Nötscher.³⁸ The מְבַקֵּר is to instruct (יְשִׁיל) the many concerning God’s works,³⁹ make them understand (יְבִינֵם) God’s powerful acts of wonder,⁴⁰ and teach (יְהַבִּינוּ) the interpretation of Torah.⁴¹ It is incumbent upon the מַשְׁכִּיל, identified by Nötscher with the figure called פִּקֵּיד, to teach (יְהַבִּינֵם) and instruct (לְלַמֵּד) the sons of light.⁴² He is also to teach (יְהַבִּינֵם) newcomers

²⁹ 1QH^a XI, 22-23.

³⁰ Nötscher, *Terminologie*, 54-55.

³¹ Nötscher, *Terminologie*, 55-58.

³² 1QH^a VI, 3.

³³ Nötscher, *Terminologie*, 54.

³⁴ Cf. Conzelmann, *TDNT* 7:891.

³⁵ 1QS IV, 3, 22; Dan 2:21.

³⁶ 1QH^a X, 17-18. In connection with this group, see further below, §3.4.

³⁷ Since the scrolls with which we are principally concerned do not appear to relate to the teacher of righteousness, no detailed discussion of his role as mediator of divine revelation will be offered (but cf. part three, §2.5 below).

³⁸ Nötscher, *Terminologie*, 55.

³⁹ CD XIII, 7-8.

⁴⁰ CD XIII, 8.

⁴¹ CD XIII, 5-6.

⁴² 1QS III, 13.

all the rulings of the community.⁴³ Nötscher's analysis thus highlights the presence at Qumran of the idea that wisdom is from God, and notes social structures within which wisdom and insight are passed on, and special terminology, representing both insight itself and its transmission.

Nötscher notes that the phrase **שכל דעה להבין בנפלאותיה**, "understanding of knowledge to understand your wonders" in 1QH^a XIX, 28 indicates that three terms for insight, knowledge, and understanding (**שכל**, **ידע**, **בין**) belong together. **שכל** chiefly indicates theoretical knowledge or understanding which is required for an office in the community and with which a member has identified himself by his inclusion.⁴⁴ A member's insight is examined alongside his property, skills, and moral quality,⁴⁵ and someone is qualified and classified according to rank according to his insight and deeds,⁴⁶ that is, his insight and perfection of way.⁴⁷ The phrase **בתורה** in 1QS V, 21; VI, 18 makes it clear that knowledge of and obedience to the law are of prime importance, and reading and studying the law, one of the main duties of members, promotes insight.⁴⁸ The **משכיל** doubtless owes his name to the promotion of **שכל** in the community, though he has other functions, perhaps liturgical,⁴⁹ than that of "wisdom teacher."⁵⁰ This figure is not to be equated with the **משכילים** of Daniel without further ado, though the Qumran **משכיל** doubtless takes them as his example.⁵¹ He is to learn all wisdom found according to the

⁴³ 1QS VI, 15; cf. 1QSa I, 5.

⁴⁴ 1QS V, 24.

⁴⁵ CD XIII, 11.

⁴⁶ 1QS V, 21, 23; VI, 14, 18.

⁴⁷ 1QS V, 24. Cf. IX, 15; 1QSa I, 17; 1QH^a III^{bot}, 4; VII, 5; Prov 12:8.

⁴⁸ 1QS VI, 6-8. Members are also to become acquainted with community regulations (1QS VI, 15).

⁴⁹ Nötscher cites 1Qsb I, 1; III, 22; V, 20 in this connection, though the rubrics to the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice and 1QH^a XXV^{bot}, 10 should now be associated with this category. See Mas1k I, 8 (reconstructed); 4Q400 1 I, 1 (reconstructed); 3 II + 5 8; 4Q401 1-2 1; 4Q403 1 I, 30; 1 II, 18; 4Q404 2 + 3AB 12 (reconstructed); 4Q405 8-9 1 (reconstructed); 20 II-21-22 6; 4Q406 1 4.

⁵⁰ 1QS III, 13; IX, 12, 21; CD XII, 21; 1QH^a XX, 20.

⁵¹ Nötscher, *Terminologie*, 56; Alfred Mertens, *Das Buch Daniel im Lichte der Texte vom Toten Meer* (SBM 12; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1971), 64. Cf. Bruce, "Daniel," 227-230; Ellis, "'Wisdom,'" 93-94. Bruce makes the important and incisive comment with reference to the **משכיל** in the *Serekh* and the *Hodayot* that "the *maskil* here, as in Daniel, is one who, having received from God understanding in his hidden purpose, is thus in a position to impart that understanding to others" ("Daniel," 229).

times,⁵² find up-to-date rulings, and form an opinion concerning the sons of Zadok.⁵³ There are laws and rulings which he must follow with all the living.⁵⁴ **השכיל** is used to indicate his teaching.⁵⁵ The **משכיל**'s role is not confined to teaching practical rules of conduct, but also involves teaching "the mysteries of wonder and truth" (**ברזי פלאומה**).⁵⁶ His role is thus similar to the **מבקר** in the Damascus Document.⁵⁷ Nötscher concludes that **שכל** also is a gift which comes from God.⁵⁸ The "flesh" of man is too weak to possess **שכל** on its own.⁵⁹ God's **שכל** conceals secrets in itself⁶⁰ that will be fully revealed to the upright at the eschaton. For sincere community members **שכל** is a preparation for eschatological salvation, or is itself possession of salvation (*Heilsgut*).

Nötscher's study is important for our purposes because it foregrounds sapiential terminology. It also stresses the divine origin of the concepts represented by such terminology and highlights the role of the **משכיל** in transmitting insight to the rest of the community. It is chiefly the study of *Serekh ha-Yahad*, the Damascus Document, and the *Hodayot* on which Nötscher's work is based. Consequently these texts as preserved in the Cairo manuscripts of the Damascus Document, the 1Q manuscript of the *Serekh*, and 1QH^a will not be dealt with below in detail. Rather, Nötscher's findings will be presupposed and this study will focus on more recently published material.

⁵² 1QS IX, 13.

⁵³ 1QS IX, 14.

⁵⁴ 1QS IX, 12; CD XII, 21.

⁵⁵ 1QS IX, 18, 20; CD XIII, 7. Cf. 1QS IV, 22; XI, 1; 1QH^a X, 4, 7; XXV^{top}, 11. Nötscher notes (*Terminologie*, 57 n. 102) that the causative sense of **שכל** Hiphil belongs to LBH, whereas in older Hebrew **שכל** Hiphil usually indicated "understand," as in 1QS XI, 18. **בין** Hiphil behaves in a similar way, meaning "understand" (1QH^a IV, 21) or "teach" (1QS IV, 22; CD XIII, 8; cf. Dan 11:33).

⁵⁶ 1QS IX, 18.

⁵⁷ Cf. CD XIII, 7-8.

⁵⁸ 1QS IV, 3; 1QH^a VI, 27; 1QH^a XVIII, 7.

⁵⁹ 1QH^a VII, 24; XVIII, 6-7; XX, 33.

⁶⁰ 1QS IV, 18 (**רזי שכלו**, "the mysteries of his insight"); 1QH^a V, 19; XX, 13 (**רזי שכלכה**, "the mysteries of your insight").

2. Sapiential terminology in 4Q380 and 4Q381

In 1986 a study by Eileen Schuller was published which deals with two fragmentary texts made up of psalmic compositions, 4Q380 and 4Q381,⁶¹ which have not generally been read as “sectarian,”⁶² but which are characterised by wisdom vocabulary.⁶³ 4Q380 and 4Q381 contain the remains of a collection, or two collections⁶⁴ of extra-canonical psalms. Schuller uses “psalms” as a working definition for the compositions found in these manuscripts,⁶⁵ which in form and content exhibit a number of similarities to the compositions known from the masoretic Psalter.⁶⁶ The designation תהלה occurs three

⁶¹ Eileen M. Schuller, *Non-Canonical Psalms from Qumran: A Pseudepigraphic Collection* (HSS 28; Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1986).

⁶² In reference to the possible Essene origin of 4Q380 and 4Q381, Schuller comments that [T]here is nothing in the psalms of 4Q380 and 4Q381 which necessarily or convincingly points to the Qumran community as the place of composition. Admittedly, there are many words and phrases common to Qumran texts, especially 1QH, but these are general and stereotypical expressions, often found also in biblical material; in fact, it would be difficult to write psalmic works without using such words as אספרה, נפלאות, בשחתי, פשעי, ישעך, פשעי. Much more to the point is the fact that specifically sectarian vocabulary (words such as משכיל, בני חשך, בני אור, להתנרב, יחד, מבקר, בני אור) and theology (e.g., views on dualism, eschatology, predestination, community, pesharim-type biblical exegesis) are missing in our compositions. An especially significant factor are those words which have a specialized sense at Qumran, but are used in a different sense in our fragments (e.g., 4Q381 76-77 גורל 7, 1 2 פתאים, 79 3 פתאים) (Schuller, *Non-Canonical Psalms*, 22-23).

Cf. Eileen M. Schuller, “4Q380 and 4Q381: Non-Canonical Psalms from Qumran,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research* (ed. D. Dimant and U. Rappaport; STDJ 10; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 97; “Qumran Pseudepigraphic Psalms (4Q380 and 4Q381),” in *Pseudepigraphic and Non-Masoretic Psalms and Prayers* (ed. J. H. Charlesworth and H. W. L. Rietz; vol. 4A of *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations*; ed. J. H. Charlesworth; PTSDSSP; Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox, 1997), 2; Esther Eshel, Hanan Eshel, Carol A. Newsom, Bilhah Nitzan, Eileen M. Schuller, and Ada Yardeni, in consultation with James C. VanderKam and Monica Brady, *Qumran Cave 4 VI* (DJD 11; Oxford: Clarendon, 1998), 78, 90; Florentino García Martínez, “Estudios Qumránicos 1975-1985: Panorama Crítico,” *EstBib* 47 (1989): 101; Geza Vermes, review of E. M. Schuller, *Non-Canonical Psalms from Qumran: A Pseudepigraphic Collection*, *JJS* 40 (1989): 115. See also Emanuel Tov, “The Orthography and Language of the Hebrew Scrolls found at Qumran and the Origin of these Scrolls,” *Text* 13 (1986): 56. Tov places 4Q380 and 4Q381 into the category “b. Non-Biblical scrolls” within his group 2, texts which lack “Qumran” orthography.

⁶³ Schuller, *Non-Canonical Psalms*, 13, 23-24; *Qumran Cave 4 VI*, 77, 91.

⁶⁴ 4Q380 and 4Q381 are written in two different hands, but both have been dated palaeographically by Schuller to the Middle to Late Hasmonean period (*Non-Canonical Psalms*, 65, 243; *Qumran Cave 4 VI*, 76, 88; “4Q380 and 4Q381,” 90). There is no overlap between the two manuscripts. However, it is not certain whether each manuscript belongs to a different collection or whether they are two different copies of the same collection.

⁶⁵ Schuller, *Non-Canonical Psalms*, 2.

⁶⁶ Schuller, *Non-Canonical Psalms*, 1-2.

times⁶⁷ and the designation תפלה once.⁶⁸ There are also three occurrences of the term סלה.⁶⁹ Schuller dates the collection to the Persian period or the early Hellenistic period on the basis of four factors: (1) linguistic features characteristic of LBH, QH, and MH; (2) the use of biblical language and dependence upon texts already familiar from the HB; (3) the frequent use of the tetragrammaton; and (4) similarity to other psalmic texts dating from the Persian or Hellenistic periods.⁷⁰ Characteristic of the compositions in 4Q380 and 4Q381 is their attribution to various figures known from the HB, prompting Florentino García Martínez to describe the collection as “una compilación de salmos atribuidos a distintas figuras del Antiguo Testamento.”⁷¹ However, it is not certain what the link is between the individuals referred to. It is possible that the compositions found in 4Q381 are all attributed to royal figures, including Manasseh. If this is the case, then 4Q380 must contain a different collection, since one composition is attributed to Obadiah, who is either the prophet to whom the biblical book is attributed, or the prophet who saved a hundred prophets from the wrath of Jezebel (1 Kgs 18:2-16), but definitely not a royal figure. However, there is a strong possibility that the phrase אישהאלהים in 4Q381 24a + b 4 refers to Moses.⁷² If this is the case, then it is possible that both 4Q380 and 4Q381 are

⁶⁷ 4Q380 1 II, 8 (תהלה לעבדיה); 4 1 (תהלה ל); 4Q381 24a + b 4 (תהלה לאיש האל[הים]). In 4Q380 1 I, 8 there is a fourth occurrence of תהלה, but it is not a psalm designation. It occurs in the phrase כל תהלת[ו] “all [his] praise.”

⁶⁸ 4Q381 33 + 35 8 reads תפלה למנשה מלך יהודה בכלו אתו מלך אשור “Prayer of Manasseh, king of Judah, when the king of Assyria imprisoned him” (cf. 2 Chr 33:11-13). This is the only complete psalm superscription preserved in the two manuscripts. Schuller tentatively proposes that תפלה be reconstructed in 4Q381 31 4, whilst admitting that תהלה is equally possible (*Non-Canonical Psalms*, 138; *Qumran Cave 4 VI*, 120).

⁶⁹ This term occurs without any context preserved in 4Q381 21 2. It also occurs in 4Q381 24a + b 3, with very little context, but the *vacat* which follows confirms that סלה concluded a composition. This is also the case with 4Q381 33 + 35 6. Hartmut Stegemann proposes to reconstruct סלה also in 4Q381 15 11 and 4Q381 69 10 (Schuller, *Non-Canonical Psalms*, 58 n. 43, 279, 281).

⁷⁰ Schuller, *Non-Canonical Psalms*, 22; “4Q380 and 4Q381,” 96-97; *Qumran Cave 4 VI*, 78, 90. Florentino García Martínez, whilst admitting that it is impossible to date the collection precisely within the broad span of the post-exilic period, finds no serious reasons to exclude the possibility that the work was composed later than the beginning of the Hellenistic period, even in the second century B.C.E. (“Estudios,” 100). He understands 4Q381 33 + 35 8-11 to be dependent upon 2 Chronicles 33, and sees this as an element in the dating process (*pace* Schuller, *Non-Canonical Psalms*, 162).

⁷¹ García Martínez, “Estudios,” 95.

⁷² Schuller, *Non-Canonical Psalms*, 28-29; “4Q380 and 4Q381,” 96; *Qumran Cave 4 VI*, 111; García Martínez, “Estudios,” 95.

copies of the same collection of compositions attributed to both royal and non-royal figures.⁷³

Given the fragmentary state of 4Q380 and 4Q381, these issues are unlikely ever to be conclusively resolved. However, enough remains for us to be able to identify a significant sapiential component. An examination of the sapiential terminology found in these manuscripts gives us insight into the thought world in which the remaining works were composed. Five roots are significant: **בִּין**, **חכם**, **ידע**, **למד**, and **שכל**. Morray-Jones notes, in reference to *Serekh ha-Yahad*, that the secret knowledge of the Qumran sect is associated with four words that frequently occur in combination: **שכל**, **בינה**, **חכמה**, and **דעת**.⁷⁴ Sapiential terminology thus seems common to 4Q380 and 4Q381 and a text usually situated at the heart of the “sectarian” corpus. Wisdom elements, including sapiential terminology, are a significant feature of much of post-exilic psalmody, as Schuller has noted,⁷⁵ and this may be the context within which 4Q380 and 4Q381 are best understood. However, the fundamental question is: how did these texts and the ideas to which they bear witness function within the Qumran corpus?

2.1. **בִּין**

The root **בִּין** occurs ten times in 4Q380 and 4Q381 as a verb,⁷⁶ and twice as the noun **בינה**.⁷⁷ The form **יִתְבוֹנֵן** occurs in 4Q380 7 II, 2 at the beginning of the second preserved column of a tiny fragment.⁷⁸ It is followed by **ב** with the construct singular **גְּבוֹרֶת**, yielding the translation “he will

⁷³ Schuller comments that “4Q380 and 4Q381 could be multiple (and non-overlapping) copies of a single collection of psalms attributed to both kings and prophets. In what is preserved at least, it is an entirely non-Davidic collection, perhaps intended as a supplement to the biblical psalter which by this time was more and more considered as totally the work of David” (“4Q380 and 4Q381,” 96).

⁷⁴ Morray-Jones, “Merkabah Mysticism,” 175. Millar Burrows draws a comparison between the use of these terms in the scrolls and the vocabulary of the Book of Proverbs (*The Dead Sea Scrolls* [London: Secker & Warburg, 1956] 255; cf. Lowndes Lipscomb and Sanders, “Wisdom,” 277).

⁷⁵ Schuller, *Non-Canonical Psalms*, 13.

⁷⁶ 4Q380 7 II, 2; 4Q381 1 2; 15 7; 31 5; 45a + b 1 (twice); 47 3; 49 2; 76 + 77 8; 85 1.

⁷⁷ 4Q381 31 6; 76 + 77 13.

⁷⁸ The **י** is missing, but restored by Schuller on the basis that **י** is more likely to fit into the missing portion than **ס** or **נ** (Schuller, *Non-Canonical Psalms*, 264; *Qumran Cave 4 VI*, 85).

ponder the strength of.”⁷⁹ **בִּין** followed by **ב** is a fairly common construction at Qumran, though rare in the MT.⁸⁰ 1QS XI, 19-20 is similar: **לְהַתְּבוֹנֵן בְּכֹל נִפְלְאוֹתֶיכָה עִם כּוֹחַ גְּבוּרַתְכָה**,⁸¹ “to ponder all your wonders with the might of your strength.” In the *Hodayot* we read **מָה הוּא אִישׁ תְּהוּ וּבַעַל הַבַּל לְהַתְּבוֹנֵן בְּמַעֲשֵׂי פֶלֶאך**, “what is a man of emptiness or a master of vanity to understand your wondrous deeds” (1QH^a XV, 32),⁸² and **לֹא יִתְבוֹנֵן כּוֹל בַּחוּכְךָ [מַתְּכָה]**,⁸³ “no-one understands [your] wisdo[m]” (1QH^a XVIII, 2).⁸³ In 4QInstruction^b 2 III, 14 the speaker says **הַתְּבוֹנֵן בְּכָל דְּרָכֵי אֱמֶת**, “understand all truthful ways.”⁸⁴ 4Q380 7 II, 2 may be read alongside such texts within the Qumran corpus.

The puzzling phrase **לִפְתָּאִים וַיְבִינוּ וְלֵאמֹן לֵב יִדְעוּן** occurs in 4Q381 1 2. Schuller translates “to the simple that they may understand; and to those without understanding, (that) they may know.”⁸⁵ In this phrase, **יִבְנוּ** and **יִדְעוּן** are parallel,⁸⁶ and **יִבְנוּ** is therefore probably Qal rather than Hiphil (i.e. not causative).⁸⁷ The Hiphil is often causative,⁸⁸ a usage Nötscher identifies with LBH.⁸⁹ Although **הִבֵּן** in 4Q381 85 1 is clearly a Hiphil imperative, there is no real context and further comment is thus impossible.

⁷⁹ Schuller initially restored **חֲכָמָה** as the absolute noun following **גְּבוּרַת** (“he will understand the strength of wisdom;” cf. *Non-Canonical Psalms*, 263-264), but there is very little to be seen on the photograph (PAM 43.362) beyond the **ח**, and in DJD XI no reconstruction is attempted (*Qumran Cave 4 VI*, 84-85).

⁸⁰ Schuller, *Non-Canonical Psalms*, 264; *Qumran Cave 4 VI*, 85. In the MT, see Jer 23:20; 30:24; Job 30:20. Job 30:20 contains the phrase **עָמַדְתִּי וְתַתְּכֵנִי בִּי** “I stand and you consider me.” There is no evidence for reading **וְתַתְּכֵנִי**: “I stand, and you establish yourself against me.” Jer 23:20; 30:24 are a doublet, and look forward to the “end of days” (**אַחֲרֵית הַיָּמִים**) when “[u]nteachable by the word of Yahweh they will be taught by the undeniable logic of events” and “[a] hard lesson will open the eyes of the understanding” (William McKane, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Jeremiah* [2 vols.; ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1986-1996], 583).

⁸¹ **לְהַתְּבוֹנֵן** is not preserved in 4QSj.

⁸² **לְהַתְּבוֹנֵן** is not preserved in 1QH^b 1 I, 7.

⁸³ The parallel in this line between **בִּין** Hithpoel and **נִבְט** Hiphil recalls 1QS XI, 19.

⁸⁴ **הַתְּבוֹנֵן** is not preserved in 4QInstruction^d 9 15. There are other occurrences of **בִּין** Hithpoel followed by **ב** in: 1QMyst 1 I, 3 (par. 4Q300 3 3 [reconstructed]); 4QMMT^c 11-13 6; 4QInstruction^c 1 I, 11-12 (par. 4QInstruction^d 43, 44, 45 I, 9-10 [reconstructed]); 238 3 (reconstructed); 4QBark Nafshi^e B 1 I, 2-3; 4QDibHam^a 6 3.

⁸⁵ Schuller, *Qumran Cave 4 VI*, 94.

⁸⁶ Schuller, *Non-Canonical Psalms*, 77-78; *Qumran Cave 4 VI*, 94.

⁸⁷ See, however, Mic 4:12, where **יִדְעוּ** (Qal) is parallel with **יִבְנוּ** (Hiphil).

⁸⁸ Cf. Joüon §81d.

⁸⁹ Nötscher, *Terminologie*, 57 n. 102.

The roots **בין**, **ידע**, and **שכל** may be dealt with together in 4Q381 15 7-8, since they are connected. In line 7, the phrase **ואני משיחך אתבננתי** occurs, which Schuller translates “And I, your anointed, understand.”⁹⁰ In line 8 there are two Hiphil (causative) verbs. Schuller’s most recent reconstruction reads **כי הודעתני והשכיל כי השכלתני** [מד]עך, “[knowle]dge of you because you instructed me,⁹¹ and insight because you taught me.”⁹² Schuller here understands **השכיל** to be infinitive absolute. This precise form occurs twice in the MT, in Jer 3:15 and Job 34:35. In Jer 3:15 YHWH foretells a time when he would give his people “shepherds according to my heart, and they will tend you with knowledge and understanding.”⁹³ The infinitive absolute **השכיל** parallels the noun **דעה**.⁹⁴ The language of 4Q381 15 8 explicitly attributes the speaker’s knowledge to his having been taught by God. If we take the causative nuance of the two Hiphils seriously, we have a text which presupposes the idea that insight and knowledge belong with God, and may only be possessed by humans if bestowed by him. Given the proximity of the three wisdom roots, it seems that they are all linked with this idea. The speaker understands because God has allowed him to.⁹⁵

בין Hiphil (possibly Qal) first occurs in 4Q381 in 31 5, where we read **מה שבתוך מי יבין להמא**, “your [thoug]hts, who can understand them?” Schuller is probably right to say that this rhetorical question is concerned with understanding God’s thoughts rather than teaching them, given that the motif of human inability to comprehend divine thoughts is so well-attested.⁹⁶ However, the construction **ל הבין** may mean both “to understand (something)” and “to

⁹⁰ Schuller, *Qumran Cave 4 VI*, 103. Schuller had previously translated this phrase “As for me, I have gained understanding from your discourse” (*Non-Canonical Psalms*, 97).

⁹¹ Schuller understands **הודעתני** to be formally parallel with **השכלתני**. This requires that the ך of the first person common singular object suffix dropped out through haplography (*Non-Canonical Psalms*, 102; *Qumran Cave 4 VI*, 104).

⁹² For the text and translation, see Schuller, *Qumran Cave 4 VI*, 102-103. In her earlier work she reconstructed the first word **עך** [אודי], “I will make you known,” taking this verb to be formally parallel with **השכיל**, and taking **השכיל** to be a first person singular imperfect Hiphil in which ה has replaced א (*Non-Canonical Psalms*, 102).

⁹³ MT: **ונתתי לכם רעים כלבי ורעו אתכם דעה והשכיל**

⁹⁴ **השכיל** is parallel with **דעת** in Job 34:35 (cf. Prov 1:2-6).

⁹⁵ Compare these words of Morray-Jones in reference to “knowledge” in wisdom, apocalyptic and the Dead Sea Scrolls: “[k]nowledge ... is not the outcome of human discovery, but comes from God as a gift to those who obey his will” (“Merkabah Mysticism,” 170-171; cf. p. 175).

⁹⁶ Schuller, *Non-Canonical Psalms*, 139; *Qumran Cave 4 VI*, 120. Cf. Isa 55:8-9; Mic 4:12 (here **מהשבות** is the object of **ידע** Qal which is parallel with **בין** Hiphil); Ps 139:6, 17-18; Wisd 9:13-18; Sir 18:1-7; *I En.* 93:11-14; *2 Bar.* 14:8-11. The theme of divine ineffability is especially significant in the Book of Job:

teach (something)” in the Qumran scrolls.⁹⁷ In the HB both senses are characteristic of late books or late passages.⁹⁸ The problem of deciding whether the Hiphil is causative or not surfaces in relation to **אבינא** and **אשכיל** in 4Q381 45a + b 1, an exceptionally difficult line to read with certainty.⁹⁹ What remains reads **ואבינא ואין מבין אשכיל ולו**, for which Schuller offers several possibilities.¹⁰⁰ Although the fragmentary state of this line makes dividing it into cola very difficult, it does seem that **אשכיל** is parallel with **אבינא**, and that **לו** may be parallel with **אין**.¹⁰¹ We might expect a parallel with **מבין** that derives from the root **שכל**, since both **אבינא** and **מבין** derive from **בין**. **משכיל** is the likeliest possibility: “I teach, but there is no-one who understands; I instruct, but there is no-one who is wise.” This is only conjecture, however, and it is not clear that the traces of letters after **לו** would support this reading. What should be clear is that sapiential language is central to the way the speaker wishes to express himself. He sees himself as a transmitter of insight.

4Q381 47 3 is very fragmentary. Schuller reads **מביןך ואשכילה**, and translates “those who understand you, and I will teach.” An alternative for **מביןך** would be “your wise ones,” presupposing the masculine plural participle Hiphil of **בין** with the second person masculine singular possessive (rather than object) suffix. “I will teach” and “I will understand” are both possibilities for **אשכילה**. It should be clear, moreover, that Hiphil forms of **בין** and **שכל** are found characteristically in collocation. They occur in collocation again in 4Q381 76-77: **ותשכילו לחכמה מפי תצא ותבין** [ו]¹⁰² “attend to the wisdom that comes out of my mouth and

Job 5:9 (Eliphaz); 9:10 (Job); 11:1-12 (Zophar); 26:14 (Job or Bildad; cf. Norman C. Habel, *The Book of Job: A Commentary* [OTL; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1985], 366-368); 36:26; 37:23-24 (Elihu); 38:1-40:2; 40:6-41:26 (God). See also the Akkadian text “A Dialogue about Human Misery”: “The mind of a god, like the center of the heavens, is remote; his knowledge is difficult, men cannot understand it”; and “Let him know (that) people cannot understand what the counsel of a god is” (translated by Robert H. Pfeiffer [ANET, 438-440]).

⁹⁷ Y. Thorion, “The Use of Prepositions in 1QSerek,” *RevQ* 10 (1981): 420. For the sense “to understand (something)” see 1QS XI, 22 (par. 4QSⁱ 10). For the sense “to teach (something)” see 4Q504 1-2 II, 17 where it seems to be God who imparts instruction.

⁹⁸ Thorion, “Use,” 420. For the sense “to understand” for **ל הבין** see Deut 32:29; Ps 73:17; 139:2; Job 13:1. For the sense “instruct/teach” see Dan 11:32; 2 Chr 35:3.

⁹⁹ Schuller comments “[t]he exact sense is difficult to determine because of the uncertainty about so many of the readings, the lack of context, and the multiple nuances of both verbs **הבין** and **השכיל**” (*Qumran Cave 4 VI*, 133; cf. *Non-Canonical Psalms*, 173).

¹⁰⁰ Schuller, *Non-Canonical Psalms*, 172-173; *Qumran Cave 4 VI*, 133.

¹⁰¹ For the use of **לא** in nominal clauses, see Joüon §160b.

¹⁰² The construction **ל השכיל** has the sense “contemplate (something)” in Prov 21:12. The phrase **משכיל צדיק לבית רשע** appears to mean “a righteous man contemplates a wicked man’s house.” A

you will understand[ing].” The two Hiphil verbs are clearly connected, but it is not clear whether they are parallel or in sequence. Should this be translated “attend to the wisdom that comes out of my mouth so that you may understand”? Another possibility is to read the last word [תבונה],¹⁰³ parallel with חכמה, yielding the translation “attend to the wisdom that comes out of my mouth and the understand[ing]....” In any case, it is clear that the speaker is identifying himself as one who imparts wisdom. God may be the speaker, though elsewhere in these fragments God is referred to in the third person. It may be what the speaker is saying about the character of God that is signified by חכמה (and possibly תבונה). The speaker is exhorting his hearers to understand the wisdom that he is imparting.

In line 13, the phrase היש בינה תלמוד occurs (“is there understanding that you may learn?”). This links למד and בין. It is not clear whether תלמוד is Qal (“you will learn”) or Piel (“you will teach”). However, the link between בין and למד is familiar from 1QS III, 13; 1QH^a X, 17. In 1QS III, 13 בין Hiphil is parallel with למד Piel: למשכיל להבין וללמד את כול בני אור, “for the wise teacher, to instruct and teach all the sons of light.”¹⁰⁴ Causative *binyanim* of בין, למד, and שכל are here used explicitly to refer to instruction within a community. 1QH^a X, 17 reads גבר אשר הכינותה בפיו ותלמודו¹⁰⁵ בינה, “a man in whose mouth you have established and taught understanding.” The hymnist is using גבר to refer obliquely to himself. God is the subject of both verbs. We thus have a text which presupposes that בינה is imparted by God. If 4Q381 76-77 13 is

causative meaning for this construction (“cause to understand/instruct”) is not impossible, though less likely. Proverbs 21:11 (MT) reads וְהַשְׁכִּיל לְחָכְמָה יִקְחֶנָּה “and when someone gives understanding to a wise man he receives knowledge.” However, the LXX reads σοφὸν δὲ σοφὸς δέξεται γνῶσιν, “and a wise man who understands will receive knowledge.” Crawford H. Toy (*A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Proverbs* [ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1899], 407) and J. Fichtner (*BHS*) regard the ל before חָכְמָה as dittography, the ל of הַשְׁכִּיל being repeated. I have found no occurrence of this construction in the Qumran scrolls where the Hiphil is causative. Thus the Hiphil verb in 4Q381 76-77 8 is unlikely to be causative.

¹⁰³ Schuller, *Non-Canonical Psalms*, 221; *Qumran Cave 4 VI*, 158.

¹⁰⁴ No parallels to this rubric are preserved in the 4QS fragments.

¹⁰⁵ This word is very difficult. As it stands it is a second person masculine plural imperfect Qal or Piel, but who is the subject? The hymnist is addressing God, who is the subject of הכינותה. Kuhn corrects this to ותלמדני (“and you have taught me”), but believes the text to be corrupt, and suggests that this word originally read תלמד. This would yield the translation “You have established instruction and understanding.” Kuhn’s correction ignores the fact that the referent of an object suffix here should be third person (גבר), though the speaker is, in fact, referring to himself obliquely in the third person. Eduard Lohse reads ותלמדנו (*Die Texte aus Qumran: Hebräisch und Deutsch* [Munich: Kösel, 1964], 116).

read alongside the two “sectarian” texts mentioned, **בִּינָה** in this text may be understood as something which may be learned by humans but is taught by God.¹⁰⁶

The use of **בִּי** in 4Q380 and 4Q381 is thus comparable with other Qumran texts and later portions of the HB. This helps to date these texts in the Persian or Hellenistic periods, and may even support García Martínez’s suggestion that these texts could date from as late as the second century B.C.E..¹⁰⁷ There is often uncertainty as to whether a given example of the verb is Qal and the Hiphil, and it is not always clear whether or not a Hiphil is causative. **בִּי** may be used in collocation with **יָדַע**, **לָמַד**, and especially **שָׁכַל**. The occurrences of **בִּי** in these texts reflect the apocalyptic idea that wisdom belongs with God and must be revealed by him. When 4Q381 is read alongside *Serekh ha-Yahad* and the *Hodayot* it could be argued that the speaker perceives himself not simply as a recipient of insight but as a transmitter of it.

2.2. חכמה

The root **חכ** occurs three times in 4Q380 and 4Q381, once as the Hiphil verb **הִחֲכִים** and twice as the noun **חֲכֻמָּה**.¹⁰⁸ Each occurrence is in a very fragmentary portion of text. In 4Q380 4 3, the Hiphil form **הִחֲכִים** occurs, though there is no way of knowing who the subject is. The only occurrence of **חכ** Hiphil in the MT is in a wisdom psalm, in Ps 19:8.¹⁰⁹ In Ps 19:8, the form **מְחַכֶּמֶת**, the construct of the feminine singular Hiphil participle, occurs in the phrase **עֲדוּת יְהוָה**,¹¹⁰ “the testimony of **מְחַכֶּמֶת פִּתִּי**, “making wise one who is simple.” The subject is **עֲדוּת יְהוָה**,¹¹⁰ “the testimony of

¹⁰⁶ In 4Q381 49 2, the phrase **וְהָיָה לָכֵן**, “understand, and let it be to you,” is all that remains. The phrase **לִידְעֵי בִינָה** in 4Q381 31 6 will be discussed below (§2.3).

¹⁰⁷ García Martínez, “Estudios,” 100.

¹⁰⁸ Schuller initially restored **חֲכֻמָּה** in 4Q380 7 II, 2, but only **ח** is clearly visible on PAM 43.362.

¹⁰⁹ Schuller, *Non-Canonical Psalms*, 261; *Qumran Cave 4 VI*, 83.

¹¹⁰ Compare 4Q Apocryphon of Joshua^b 18 6: **וּבְעֲדוּתָן עֲלִיּוֹן הַשְׁכֵּלֶת**, “and by the testimon[ies]/decree[s] of the Most High you have become wise/imparted insight.” This text is very fragmentary, but shares the link between the decree of YHWH and the giving of wisdom/insight with Ps 19:8. Given the link between this text and Joshua, the occurrence of **שָׁכַל** Hiphil is probably to be explained because in Josh 1:7-8 Joshua is twice the subject of **שָׁכַל** Hiphil. In Josh 1 it would be difficult to read the **שָׁכַל** Hiphil as causative, which should probably make us wary of reading **הַשְׁכֵּלֶת** in 4Q379 18 6 as causative.

YHWH" (parallel with תורת יהוה, "the law/instruction of YHWH"). If the ל¹¹¹ that follows in 4Q380 4 3 is a preposition, and not the first letter of a noun such as לב¹¹², then the construction ל + החכים would be equivalent to ל + הבין in 4QDibHam^a 1-2 II, 17; Job 6:24; Dan 8:16, or ל + השכיל in Prov 21:11.

The form חכמתו occurs in 4Q380 6 2. There is no context, so the referent of the suffix cannot be known. Is the referent of the suffix the same as the subject of נחל in line 1, for example? Further, the uncertainty over the identity of the word which follows ואת in line 2 is tantalising. Schuller tentatively reconstructs [ו]דעת¹¹³ which would be parallel with חכמתו. However, the first letter could be מ and the second א. דעתו would make sense in parallel with חכמתו, but the reading is uncertain.

4Q381 76-77 8 was discussed above. In this text the speaker, a human, claims that wisdom comes out of his mouth. If, as seems likely, this text assumes that wisdom belongs in heaven and must be revealed, the speaker is identifying himself as a mediator of wisdom. It is true that God could be the speaker, but elsewhere in this fragment God is referred to in the third person. This text recalls Isa 55:11: ריקם לא ישוב אלי דברי, "so shall my word be, that goes out of my mouth; it shall not return to me in unfulfilled."¹¹⁴ God is the speaker. דברי echoes דברי in 4Q381 76-77 8, though in the Qumran fragment חכמה is the subject of תצא. Perhaps the Qumran fragment merely reflects Isaianic language: there is a possible allusion to Isa 55:8-9 in 4Q381 31 5. Alternatively, the speaker may be deliberately using language that is used for God in Isaiah to

¹¹¹ The top of the vertical stroke of the ל is visible on PAM 43.362.

¹¹² Cf. Schuller, *Non-Canonical Psalms*, 261.

¹¹³ Schuller, *Non-Canonical Psalms*, 263; *Qumran Cave 4 VI*, 84.

¹¹⁴ Isa 55:11 is cited in 3 En. 48C:10. There, Metatron, who is God's agent in 3 En. 48C, is understood to be the subject of עשה in Isa 55:11ba: Metatron carries out the will of God, taking the role of God's word (דברי), mentioned in Isa 55:11aa. What is particularly interesting, however, is that 3 En. 48C:9-10 places Isa 55:11 alongside Dan 2:21. In Dan 2:20-23 Daniel blesses the God of the heavens (אלה שמיא), who "gives wisdom to those who are wise and knowledge to those who know insight" (יהיב חכמתא לחכמיא ומנדעא לידעי בינה). In 3 En. 48C:9 it is Metatron who fulfils this function. Hebrew Enoch 48C is a late (post-Talmudic?) example of a text which attributes to a figure less than God himself the actions of God. It is possible that in our Qumran fragment we have a human claiming to fulfil functions normally attributed to God, though as a human mediator, not as an exalted revealer such as Enoch-Metatron.

emphasise his own role as a mediator, making known the attributes of God. However, vital portions of this fragment are missing, and a full understanding of this text may never be achieved.

We can determine very little for certain about the use of חכם in 4Q380 and 4Q381. We can begin to situate these texts in their wider literary context, but they are so fragmentary that firm conclusions cannot be drawn.¹¹⁵ At most there is nothing here to disturb our previous conclusion, that these texts bear witness to the idea that wisdom belongs in heaven, is revealed by God, and may be transmitted by a human.

2.3. ידע¹¹⁶

Although the root ידע is extremely common in the Qumran corpus, there are only six certain occurrences in 4Q380 and 4Q381.¹¹⁷ The Qal form תדע occurs in parallel with the Hiphil תכיר in the phrase י תדע כ]י, “will you not recognise and will you not know th[at]” in 4Q381 13 2. The parallel between the ידע Qal and נכר Hiphil is familiar from the HB,¹¹⁸ and occurs at Qumran in 1QH^a XV, 13. 4Q381 13 2 is closer to Deut 33:9; Isa 63:16, where the sentiments are negative. In both texts, humans neither “know” nor “recognise.” However, in 1QH^a XV, 13 it is God who knows every inclination of a creature and discerns every answer of a tongue (אתה ידעתה כול יצר מעשה וכול מענה לשון הכרתה). It belongs to God to know¹¹⁹ and discern; humans are incapable of knowing and discerning. This recalls the idea of the ineffability of God’s thoughts and ways familiar from Isa 55:8-9 and related texts.¹²⁰

ידע Niphal occurs in 4Q381 48 7, apparently in a citation of Ps 76:2:¹²¹

[ונודעה אלהים ביהו]דה, “and God is known in Judah.” Again we have evidence that the use of

¹¹⁵ As James C. VanderKam notes with reference to 4Q381, “enough survives to whet the appetite but not enough to satisfy it” (review of E. M. Schuller, *Non-Canonical Psalms from Qumran*, CBQ 50 [1988]: 336).

¹¹⁶ 4Q381 1 2 and 15 8 were discussed above (§2.1).

¹¹⁷ The reading דעת]ן in 4Q380 6 2 and the reading אודי]עך in 4Q381 15 8 are uncertain.

¹¹⁸ Deut 33:9 (cf. 4Q175 16); Isa 63:16. Both texts, and both Qumran texts mentioned, are verse rather than prose.

¹¹⁹ Compare 4Q381 31 5, where the psalmist says “my adversaries are many before you; you know them” (רבו צררי נגדך אתה ידעתם).

¹²⁰ Cf. n. 96 above.

¹²¹ Schuller, *Non-Canonical Psalms*, 189; *Qumran Cave 4 VI*, 140.

sapiential terminology in these texts may be inspired by passages familiar from earlier, perhaps authoritative texts. This is particularly true of 4Q381 31 6, which not only echoes a number of “scriptural” texts but also “sectarian” texts. The phrase **לך יהודה** [מ] in line 4 seems to be an attribution of authorship in a superscription, Schuller restoring **ל תפלה** in the lacuna.¹²² Thereafter, God is addressed by the unidentified king of Judah. In line 6 we read **לך תכחד עוני לידעי בינה ואתה להם תשחט**,¹²³ “you will [not] hide my sins¹²⁴ from those who know understanding, but you will slaughter them.” The phrase **ידעי בינה** occurs in the HB in 1 Chr 12:33, where some of the sons of Issachar are described as “those who have insight with regard to the times, to know what Israel should do” (**יודעי בינה לעתים לדעת מה יעשה ישראל**).¹²⁵ However, the participle **ידעי** qualifies **בני יששכר** and does not seem to be a designation for a group, as it does in 4Q381 31 6. In 2 Chr 2:11, Hiram king of Tyre describes Solomon as “a wise son who knows discernment and insight” (**בן חכם יודע שקל ובינה**),¹²⁶ and promises to send him “a wise man who knows insight” (**איש חכם יודע בינה**), to help Solomon build the temple. In both cases the Chronicler is using sapiential terminology characteristic of texts dating from the Persian and Hellenistic periods.¹²⁷

¹²² Schuller, *Non-Canonical Psalms*, 128, 138; *Qumran Cave 4 VI*, 116, 117, 120.

¹²³ For the reconstruction, see Schuller, *Non-Canonical Psalms*, 128, 140; *Qumran Cave 4 VI*, 116, 120.

¹²⁴ Assuming **עוני** may be pointed **עוני**, in accordance with the characteristically “defective” orthography of this ms. Cf. Schuller, *Non-Canonical Psalms*, 140.

¹²⁵ LXX: καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσασαχαρ γινώσκοντες σύνεσιν εἰς τοὺς καιρούς, γινώσκοντες τί ποιήσαι Ἰσραηλ. The Greek noun σύνεσις translates the Hebrew noun **בינה**.

¹²⁶ In the LXX, in 2 Chr 2:11 Hiram (Χιραμ) blesses the Lord, Israel’s God, “who gave king David a wise son, who knows discernment and insight” (ὃς ἔδωκεν τῷ Δαυιδ τῷ βασιλεῖ υἱὸν σοφὸν καὶ ἐπιστάμενον σύνεσιν καὶ ἐπιστήμην). Here, ἐπίσταμαι translates **ידע**, σύνεσις translates **שקל**, and ἐπιστήμη translates **בינה**. In the following verse Hiram says “I have sent you a wise man who knows discernment” (ἀπέσταλκά σοι ἄνδρα σοφὸν εἰδότα σύνεσιν). Here, εἶδω translates **ידע** but σύνεσις translates **בינה**, as in 1 Chr 12:33.

¹²⁷ In the case of 2 Chr 2:12, at least, the Chronicler is using “sapiential” terms in the sense of practical skill. However, the terminology is especially characteristic of texts written in LBH, a point which is emphasised by the fact that in the parallel to 2 Chr 2:11 in 1 Kgs 5:21 **בינה**, **ידע**, and **שקל** do not occur. Further, Hiram in 2 Chronicles attributes **שקל** and **בינה** to Solomon just as David in 1 Chr 22:12 predicted that YHWH would give these gifts to him (cf. Sara Japhet, *I & II Chronicles: A Commentary* [OTL; Louisville, Ky: Westminster John Knox, 1993], 544). The idea of God bestowing **שקל** and **בינה** is present here, a combination which we are beginning to see is characteristic of texts written in the Persian period and later.

This is supported by Daniel's prayer (in Aramaic) in Dan 2:20-23. In verse 21, Daniel praises the God of the heavens as one who "gives wisdom to those who are wise, and knowledge to those who know insight" (יְהִיב חֲכָמָתָא לְחַכְיָמִין וּמִנְדָּעָא לְיָדְעֵי בִינָה).¹²⁸ In verse 20, Daniel says that "wisdom and strength belong to him" (חֲכָמָתָא וְגִבּוֹרָתָא דִּי לֵה־הִיא),¹²⁹ and in verse 22 God is a "revealer of deep and hidden things" (גִּלָּא עֲמִיקָתָא וּמִסְתָּרָתָא), thus linking this prayer with the idea that wisdom and insight belong in heaven and must be revealed for humans to know them.¹³⁰ Moreover, Daniel is identifying himself with those who know insight.¹³¹ This recalls Dan 1:4, in which all five of the roots with which we are concerned occur (שכל, למד, ידע, חכם, בין). Three significant phrases occur in parallel which describe Daniel and his companions: (1) "having insight into all wisdom" (מִשְׁפָּילִים בְּכָל־חֲכָמָה); (2) "knowing discernment" (יָדְעֵי דַעַת); and (3) "understanding all knowledge" (מְבִינֵי מְדָע). Compare also 4QD^c 1 9.¹³² "And now, listen to me, all who know justice. Understand the deed[s] of God." Doubtless יודעי צדק is intended to recall Isa 51:7,¹³⁴ but it is the link with בין that is interesting here. Those who "know" are also to "understand." Finally, 4Q511 2 I, 2, part of the introductory exhortation of a psalm which begins למשכיל שיר, "of the Maskil, a song," includes the words כול יודעי followed by a lacuna. The construct form requires an absolute noun to follow, but it is by no means clear that we should follow 4QD^a 1 9 (par.) in reconstructing [צדק] כול יודעי.¹³⁵ Maurice Baillet's suggests,¹³⁶ followed by Schuller,¹³⁷ that the phrase could be reconstructed [בינה] כול יודעי. This is supported by 4Q511 18 II, 8 in which

¹²⁸ Θ reads διδοὺς σοφίαν τοῖς σοφοῖς καὶ φρόνησιν τοῖς εἰδόσιν σύνεσιν. Again, εἶδω translates ידע and σύνεσις translates בִּינָה. The OG differs slightly: διδοὺς σοφοῖς σοφίαν καὶ σύνεσιν τοῖς ἐν ἐπιστήμῃ οὖσιν. This is more paraphrastic than Θ. Here, σύνεσις translates מִנְדָּעָא, but the whole phrase ἐν ἐπιστήμῃ οὖσιν translates the Aramaic יָדְעֵי בִינָה.

¹²⁹ Theodotion reads ἡ σοφία καὶ ἡ σύνεσις αὐτοῦ ἐστίν, σύνεσις presumably (and oddly) translating גִּבּוֹרָתָא. The OG, however, literally translates גִּבּוֹרָתָא with μεγαλowsύνη.

¹³⁰ Cf. John E. Goldingay, *Daniel* (WBC 30; Dallas, Tex.: Word Books, 1989), 48; Collins, *Daniel*, 160.

¹³¹ Cf. Dan 2:19, 23.

¹³² Par. 4QD^a 2 I, 6-7; CD I, 1-2.

¹³³ In 4QD^c לֵא is written in palaeo-Hebrew characters.

¹³⁴ In the HB construct chains in which ידעי or יודעי occur as *nomen regens* are relatively frequent. Cf. "ידע," DCH 4:107.

¹³⁵ Cf. DCH 4:107; Florentino García Martínez, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated: The Qumran Texts in English* (trans. W. G. E. Watson; 2d ed.; Leiden: Brill, 1996), 372; Geza Vermes, *The Dead Sea Scrolls in English* (4th ed.; London: Penguin, 1995), 283; *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English* (London:

the *משכיל* says that “God made the knowledge of insight shine in my heart” (האיר אלהים דעת בינה בלבי). He may therefore be said to “know” *בינה*. The phrase *ידעת בינה* also occurs in Prov 4:1, in an exhortation not unlike 4QD^c 1 9par.¹³⁸

Schuller is correct to say with reference to 4Q381 31 6 that “[n]one of these passages seem to be of much specific help in determining who the *ידעי בינה* might be in our psalm.”¹³⁹ Neither can we be certain what the function of the *ידעי בינה* in 4Q381 31 6 is. Are they the object of *תשחט*?¹⁴⁰ But why should *ידעי בינה*, always a positive designation elsewhere, indicate a group who will be slaughtered by God?¹⁴¹ Perhaps the referent of *להם* was originally written in what is now a lacuna. Alternatively, it is not impossible that the speaker’s sins are the referent.

The most that may be said about *ידע* in 4Q380 and 4Q381 is that scriptural and Qumran texts help to place the use of *ידע* in general, and the phrase *ידעי בינה* in particular, in their wider literary context. Such texts also demonstrate that the sapiential terminology found in 4Q380 and 4Q381 strongly recalls texts written in LBH or QH.

2.4. למד

The root *למד* occurs three times in 4Q381. Virtually nothing remains of 4Q381 42, and the reading *למד בניך*,¹⁴² “you will teach your sons,” is uncertain. More may be said about 4Q381 69 4 and 4Q381 76-77 13.¹⁴³

Penguin, 1997), 421; Michael O. Wise, Martin G. Abegg, and Edward M. Cook, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Translation* (London: Harper Collins, 1996), 415.

¹³⁶ Maurice Baillet, *Qumrân Grotte 4 III (4Q482-4Q520)* (DJD 7; Oxford: Clarendon, 1982), 222. On p. 221, Baillet does reconstruct the phrase *כול יודעי [צדק]*, but admits (p. 222) that it would be equally possible to reconstruct *שמו* (cf. Jer 48:17: *וְכָל יֹדְעֵי שְׁמוֹ*, “and all who know his [Moab’s] name”; Ps 9:11: *יֹדְעֵי שְׁמֶךָ*, “those who know your [YHWH’s] name”), *דעת* (cf. Dan 1:4: *וְיֹדְעֵי דַעַת*, “and knowing knowledge”), or *בינה* (cf. 1 Chr 12:33: *יֹדְעֵי בִינָה*, “those who know insight”).

¹³⁷ Schuller, *Non-Canonical Psalms*, 141; *Qumran Cave 4 VI*, 120.

¹³⁸ André LaCocque compares this phrase with *ידעי בינה* in Dan 2:21 (*The Book of Daniel* [trans. D. Pellauer; London: SPCK, 1979], 42).

¹³⁹ Schuller, *Non-Canonical Psalms*, 141; *Qumran Cave 4 VI*, 120.

¹⁴⁰ Cf. Schuller, *Qumran Cave 4 VI*, 120.

¹⁴¹ Cf. Schuller, *Non-Canonical Psalms*, 141.

¹⁴² For the reconstruction, see Schuller, *Non-Canonical Psalms*, 167; *Qumran Cave 4 VI*, 130.

¹⁴³ 4Q381 76-77 13 has been discussed above (§2.1).

The relevant passage in 4Q381 69 4 reads וינתם לכם ברוחו נביאים להשכיל וללמד אתכם, “and he gave them to you by his spirit, prophets to make you wise and to teach you.” This passage has resonances in both the HB and the Qumran corpus. 4Q381 69 appears to include a historical narration spoken by an individual to a group referring, according to Schuller, to the time of the wilderness wanderings and the conquest period.¹⁴⁴ In line 4, the tasks God gave the prophets are “to make wise/instruct” and “to teach.” These verbs are causative, שכל Hiphil being parallel with ללמד Piel, both being followed by the direct object marker.¹⁴⁵ Schuller compares the use of ללמד with the deuteronomistic presentation of the role of Moses.¹⁴⁶ This should be explored further in connection with line 5^{sup}. In line 4, נביאים is the subject of both infinitives, whereas in line 5^{sup} God seems to be the subject of השכיל. The text there reads מן שמים ירד וידבר עמכם להשכיל אתכם, “from heaven he came down and spoke¹⁴⁷ with you.” God has done two things: (1) given his people prophets to instruct and teach them; and (2) come down himself to instruct them. The prophets are therefore God’s representatives. The causative Hiphil of שכל thus represents the mediation of divine instruction. This is supported by Neh 9:20, which refers back to the wilderness wanderings, in which God is said to have given his good spirit to instruct the Israelites (רוחך הטובה נתת להשכילם). God’s spirit acts on his behalf with his people, instructing them.

Let us reconsider ללמד in line 4. Moses is the subject of ללמד Piel in eight (possibly nine)¹⁴⁸ texts from the HB, Ben Sira, and Qumran. Moreover, he was understood to have been a prophet,¹⁴⁹ and a prophet’s role, according to Deuteronomy, was to mediate between YHWH and his people.¹⁵⁰ This is clear from Deut 18:18b: “I will put my words into his mouth and he shall speak

¹⁴⁴ Schuller, *Non-Canonical Psalms*, 204, 206, 212; *Qumran Cave 4 VI*, 150-151.

¹⁴⁵ Compare 1QSa I, 7: רבית בחוקין יומיו ישכילוהו בספר ההגי וכפי יומיו ישכילוהו בחוקין רבית, “[to te]ach him the book of HGY, and according to his age they shall instruct him in the statute[s] of the covenant.”

¹⁴⁶ Schuller, *Non-Canonical Psalms*, 206; *Qumran Cave 4 VI*, 151.

¹⁴⁷ This appears to be a vav-consecutive, occurring in a late text. Presumably its occurrence is due to “biblicising” style.

¹⁴⁸ Cf. *DCH* 4:549. The ninth is 1QM X, 2. There Moses is almost certainly the subject of ילמדנו, “he taught us” since the text goes on to cite Deut 20:2-5 as the content of what was taught. Moses is mentioned by name in 1QM X, 6.

¹⁴⁹ Deut 18:15, 18; 34:10.

¹⁵⁰ Cf. Robert R. Wilson, *Prophecy and Society in Ancient Israel* (Philadelphia, Pa.: Fortress, 1980), 157-166.

to you everything I command him” (וְנִתַּתִּי דְבָרִי בְּפִיו וְדִבֶּר אֲלֵיהֶם אֶת כָּל־אֲשֶׁר אֶצְוֶנּוּ). In Deut 4:1, 5, 14, Moses is a teacher of statutes (חֻקִּים) and rulings (מִשְׁפָּטִים). Moses teaches because YHWH had commanded (צוה Piel) him to do so, placing him in the position of mediator. If the Israelites keep these statutes and rulings they will have wisdom (חִכְמָה) and insight (בִּינָה), and will be a “wise and discerning people” (עַם־חָכָם וְנָבוֹן).¹⁵¹ In Deut 5:31, YHWH tells Moses he will speak (דבר Piel) to him the whole commandment, the statutes and the rulings that he is to teach (למד Piel) the people. In Deut 6:1, Moses is the subject of the infinitive construct Piel of למד, as the prophets are in 4Q381 69 4.¹⁵² Moses is again the subject of the infinitive construct in Sir 45:5:

וישם בידו מצוה תורת חיים ותבונה

ללמד ביעקב חקיו ועדותיו ומשפטיו לישראל

And he placed a commandment into his hand, the law of life and insight

To teach Jacob his statutes, his counsels and rulings to Israel.

Aaron is the subject of למד Piel in Sir 45:17. In terms of 4Q381 69 4, the prophets who instructed and taught the Israelites seem to have been Moses and Aaron, since they are both prophets and both the subject of למד Piel. Thus 4Q381 69 is aligned with the language and thought of Deuteronomy and Ben Sira.

This has implications for the way we read other Qumran texts. The parallel between the causative Hiphil of שכל and למד Piel in 4Q381 69 4 recalls 1QS III, 13. In the phrase למשכיל להבין וללמד את כול בני אור, the role of the משכיל is to “instruct” (בין Hiphil) and “teach” (למד Piel). The fact that משכיל is a Hiphil participle raises the question of whether the משכיל is taking the prophetic, mediatorial role of Moses in the wilderness. This is made more likely when 1QS IV, 22 is taken into account, where it is God who will “instruct the upright in the knowledge of the Most High and make the perfect of way understand the wisdom of the sons of the heavens” (להבין ישרים בדעת עליון וחכמת בני שמים להשכיל תמימי דרך). 4Q381 69 4 seems to preserve language referring to the wilderness wanderings which demonstrates the influence of

¹⁵¹ Deut 4:6.

¹⁵² In Deut 31:19, 22, Moses is to teach (למד Piel) the song preserved in Deut 32 to the Israelites.

deuteronomic language and thought on late Second Temple psalmody, raising the question of whether the *משכיל* of the *Serekh* is a mediator patterned on Moses.¹⁵³

A further angle on this is provided by 1QS VIII, 12b-16a; 1QS IX, 19b-21a. In the latter, the “time to prepare a way to the wilderness” (עת פנות הדרך למדבר), based on the quotation of Isa 40:3 in 1QS VIII, 14, is a time when the *משכיל* of 1QS IX, 12 is “to teach everything that has been found” (ולהשכילם כול הנמצא).¹⁵⁴ Moreover, the process of preparing a way to the wilderness is identified in 1QS VIII, 15 with the study of the law, commanded by God through the hand of Moses, the result of which is acting in compliance with what “the prophets revealed by means of his Holy Spirit” (גלו הנביאים ברוח קודשו). There is a clear connection between the *משכיל*’s instruction, preparing a way to the wilderness, and revelation given through the prophets. Surely the *משכיל*’s instruction is modelled on the instruction of Moses in the tradition found in 4Q381 69 4 and the revelation given through the prophets in 1QS VIII, 16a.

Our study of *למד* further establishes the presence in 4Q380 and 4Q381 of the idea that God imparts his wisdom to humans. It also highlights the fact that sapiential vocabulary is used to represent the process of transmitting such wisdom within a human chain of transmission, by means of prophets such as Moses and Aaron or, in the case of the *Serekh*, by means of the *משכיל*.

2.5. שכל

There are thirteen occurrences of the root *שכל* in 4Q381, of which several have been dealt with.¹⁵⁵ The remainder will now be discussed.

¹⁵³ Could this be compared with Josephus’s account of the Essenes, in which the name of Moses, the lawgiver (νομοθέτης), is second only to God in their estimation (*J.W.* 2.8.9)? Patterning the role of the *משכיל* on that of Moses could have been a means of expressing their regard for the lawgiver, whose pattern of instruction was normative.

¹⁵⁴ Cf. George J. Brooke, “Isaiah 40:3 and the Wilderness Community,” in *New Qumran Texts and Studies: Proceedings of the International Organisation for Qumran Studies, Paris, 1992* (ed. G. J. Brooke and F. García Martínez; STDJ 15; Leiden: Brill, 1994), 125.

¹⁵⁵ 4Q381 15 8, 45a + b 1, 47 3, 76-77 8 have been discussed in §2.1. 4Q381 69 4, 69 5^{sup} have been discussed in §2.4.

In 4Q381 24a + b 11, both the Hiphil form **השכיל** and the noun **שכל** (**שְׁכָל**) appear. The context is unfortunately fragmentary. What remains reads **השכיל ושכל**. The wider context is a psalm attributed to “the man of God,” but it is unclear to whom this refers.¹⁵⁶ **השכיל** seems to be a 3rd masc. sing. perfect Hiphil, “he instructed.” God appears to be the subject of **גאל**, “he redeemed” in line 5. The psalmist addresses God in line 7. Although fragmentary, lines 8-10 appear to refer to God in the third person. God could therefore be the subject of **השכיל**.¹⁵⁷ It is possible that **השכיל** is a Hiphil infinitive absolute followed by an imperfect, **ישכל**.¹⁵⁸ It is also possible that the preformative **ה** of **השכיל** is an example of orthographic confusion, and that we should read **אשכיל**, “I will instruct.”¹⁵⁹

In 4Q381 44 4, the probability of reconstructing **אין כמ[וד]**,¹⁶⁰ referring to God, makes it probable also that God is the subject of **תשכילה**. He is also the subject, it seems, of **הגברת** (line 2), and the referent of the suffix in **קויד** (line 3). The problem is the final **ה**. If this is a 3rd fem. sing. object suffix, what is the referent? If not, why should there be a **ה** at the end of a 2nd person imperfect? Final **ה** on 3rd fem. sing. imperfects is not unknown in BH,¹⁶¹ but who or what would be the subject if this were a feminine form? I would suggest that God is the subject of **תשכילה**, and that the **ה** is comparable with first and second person imperfects ending in **ה**.¹⁶² The following **כו** indicates the thing taught.¹⁶³ A possible parallel is in 2 Sam 7:22, where David’s exclamation “there is none like you” (**אין כְּמוֹךָ**) follows his affirmation that YHWH has “revealed” (**ידע** Hiphil)¹⁶⁴ to

¹⁵⁶ On the phrase **איש האלהים**, and the possible identification of this figure with David, Moses, a prophetic figure, or simply an anonymous holy man, see Schuller, *Non-Canonical Psalms*, 28-29; *Qumran Cave 4 VI*, 111-112.

¹⁵⁷ Cf. 4Q381 69 5^{sup}.

¹⁵⁸ Cf. Schuller, *Non-Canonical Psalms*, 121.

¹⁵⁹ Cf. Schuller, *Non-Canonical Psalms*, 121; *Qumran Cave 4 VI*, 112.

¹⁶⁰ Cf. 2 Sam 7:22; Jer 10:6; Ps 86:8; 4Q381 76-77 14; Schuller, *Non-Canonical Psalms*, 170; *Qumran Cave 4 VI*, 132.

¹⁶¹ E.g. **הָבִיאָה** (Isa 5:19); **וַתַּעֲבֹדָה** (Ezek 23:16[Qr], 20); cf. Schuller, *Non-Canonical Psalms*, 170.

¹⁶² Pace Schuller, *Qumran Cave 4 VI*, 132; but cf. *Non-Canonical Psalms*, 170. Compare the 1st person Hiphil imperfects of **שכל** with affirmative **ה** in 4Q381 47 3; Ps 101:2.

¹⁶³ Cf. Thorion, “Use,” 408, 413, 418; Schuller, *Non-Canonical Psalms*, 170; *Qumran Cave 4 VI*, 132.

¹⁶⁴ Compare verse 27, where the idiom **גלה + אין** is used to refer to God revealing to David that he would build a house for him. This idiom occurs in 1QH^a XXV^{top}, 10 in parallel with the **ידע** Hiphil (1QH^a XXV^{top}, 9 [reconstructed]) and the **שכל** Hiphil (1QH^a XXV^{top}, 11). God is the subject in each case.

him.¹⁶⁵ Furthermore, the Hiphil of ידע and שכל in 1QH^a XV, 26, God being the subject of both, are followed by מי כמוכה¹⁶⁶ in line 28. Perhaps 4Q381 44 4 reflects a common literary connection between affirmations of God as revealer and affirmations of his uniqueness.

The Hiphil infinitive construct להשכיל occurs in 4Q381 69 7: להשכיל בכם אם תהיו לוא, “to consider among yourselves, if you will be his.”¹⁶⁷ In the Qumran scrolls, ב following השכיל often precedes the thing taught. In 1QS IX, 18¹⁶⁸ we read להשכילם ברזי פלא,¹⁶⁹ “to instruct them in the wondrous mysteries.” In 4QS^b XVIII, 3 and 4QS^d VIII, 4 we read להשכילם בכל הנמצא, “by instructing¹⁷⁰ them in all that has been found.”¹⁷¹ In 1QS XI, 1 we read להשכיל רוכנים בלקח, “to instruct those who complain in learning.” In these cases, the Hiphil is causative.¹⁷² The construction ב + השכיל may also mean “to consider/ponder.”¹⁷³ In Dan 9:13, for example, להשכיל באמתך means “to consider your truth.” In Ps 101:2 we read אשכילך בדרך תמים, “I shall consider the way of those who are perfect.”¹⁷⁴ Of the two options for translating ב + השכיל, neither seems particularly appropriate. If God is the subject,¹⁷⁵ we should translate “to consider you.” If not, we should perhaps follow

¹⁶⁵ The ידע Hiphil is parallel with שכל Hiphil in 1QH^a XV, 26; XVIII, 4-5; XIX, 4, 9-10; XXV^{top}, 9-11. In each case, God is the subject of both verbs. See also 11QPs^a XVIII, 4-5 (Ps 154:7 [Syr.]), though here God is not the subject.

¹⁶⁶ Compare זולתכה אין in line 32.

¹⁶⁷ Translation: Schuller, *Non-Canonical Psalms*, 203; cf. *Qumran Cave 4 VI*, 150.

¹⁶⁸ Par. 4QS^b XVIII, 1-2 (reconstructed); 4QS^d VIII, 3; 4QS^e III, 17 (reconstructed).

¹⁶⁹ Compare 1QH^a XV, 26-27: השכלתני באמתכה וברזי פלאכה הודעתני, “You have instructed me in your truth, and made known to me your wondrous mysteries.” If the משכיל of 1QS IX, 12-20 (par.) is to be compared with the משכיל of 1QH^a XX, 11 (par. 4QH^a 2 + 3 II, 12), and if a משכיל is speaking in 1QH^a XV, 26-27, then the role of משכיל is to be understood as mediatorial. God teaches the משכיל insight, which belongs with him in the heavens (cf. 1QH^a XIX, 27-28; par. 4QH^b 8 I, 4-5 [reconstructed]), and the משכיל passes it on to others.

¹⁷⁰ For this translation, cf. Philip S. Alexander and Geza Vermes, *Qumran Cave 4 XIX: Serekh ha-Yahad and Two Related Texts* (DJD 26; Oxford: Clarendon, 1998), 117, 118.

¹⁷¹ In the parallel in 1QS IX, 20 ב does not occur. However, להשכילם בכול is preserved in 4QS^e III, 19. Cf. Alexander and Vermes, *Qumran Cave 4 XIX*, 59, 118.

¹⁷² Thorion, “Use,” 418. See also 1QS^a I, 7; 1QH^a XV, 26-27; XVIII, 4; XIX, 4, 10.

¹⁷³ Schuller, *Non-Canonical Psalms*, 207.

¹⁷⁴ See also 1QS XI, 18-19 (par. 4QS^j 6). 1QH^a XX, 20 the verb is probably not causative, and means “to understand/consider all your mysteries” rather than “to teach all your mysteries.” However, the text is fragmentary and certainty is impossible. Schuller also cites 4Q381 44 4 (*Non-Canonical Psalms*, 207), but according to our argument above the Hiphil in this text is causative.

¹⁷⁵ Cf. line 5^{sup}.

Schuller's suggestion and take כ to mean "among," translating "to consider among yourselves."¹⁷⁶

The two other occurrences of שכל Hiphil in this fragment are causative, but the fact that כ is followed by person and not thing taught indicates that this is unlikely to be causative, making Schuller's suggestion probable. If so, this fragment demonstrates that two nuances of שכל Hiphil may be used in the same context, presumably without confusion to the first hearers or readers. Furthermore, considering in line 7 is closely related to the hearers' relationship with God: "consider among yourselves whether you will belong to him." This is related to lines 4 and 5^{sup}, in which the hearers are taught (שכל Hiphil). שכל Hiphil is fundamental to the literary presentation of God's relationship with his people in this text.

שכל Hiphil occurs in two further fragmentary texts, 4Q381 79 5; 80 1. 4Q381 79 5 reads תעוואת להשכיל ל, "errors to instruct," and 4Q381 80 1 reads לשכיל אלי, "to give instruction to." In the latter, לשכיל is the Hiphil infinitive construct from which the preformative ה has been omitted, presumably by mistake.

שכל is a problematic root in 4Q380 and 4Q381 in that it is difficult to pin down a fundamental meaning which applies generally. It occurs not simply in collocation but in parallel with בין Hiphil, ידע Hiphil, and למד Piel. Both God and humans may be the subject. Its sense may be intransitive or causative. However, two things are clear. First, שכל is characteristic of 4Q380 and 4Q381, occurring in this non-sectarian work in contexts which recall both biblical and Qumran texts. The technical language for the revelation and transmission of wisdom found in Daniel extended way beyond Daniel, influencing those who gave birth to the Qumran scrolls. Second, one idea which is at the heart of the use of שכל in 4Q380 and 4Q381 is that of God revealing wisdom and a human or humans transmitting it.

¹⁷⁶ Schuller, *Non-Canonical Psalms*, 207; cf. *Qumran Cave 4 VI*, 150.

2.6. Summary

Sapiential terminology, particularly the roots **בין**, **חכם**, **ידע**, **למד**, and **שכל**, represents concepts fundamental to the thought of 4Q380 and 4Q381, suggesting a date for the works they contain in the Persian or Hellenistic periods. The presence of this terminology in Daniel suggests a second century B.C.E. date. This terminology is shared with several “sectarian” texts from Qumran. It may be that the extra-canonical material in 4Q380 and 4Q381, which nonetheless shares language and ideas with canonical material, significantly influenced the language and thought of the group which wrote and preserved sectarian texts. Prominent in 4Q380 and 4Q381 is the idea that wisdom belongs with God, and has been revealed by him and transmitted through his prophets, especially Moses and Aaron. The image of the **משכיל** found in the *Serekh* may have been influenced by this thinking about Moses. These texts presume that wisdom must be revealed by God for humans to know it, an idea familiar from wisdom and apocalyptic that is rooted in biblical texts concerned with the ineffability of God and resurfaces in Qumran hymnic texts such as the *Hodayot*. 4Q380 and 4Q381 thus represent literature which shaped the thinking of the community which preserved the Qumran scrolls.

3. 4QInstruction

4QInstruction, known publically since 1956,¹⁷⁷ was only published officially in 1999. Part of one copy of this text was found in cave 1¹⁷⁸ and edited by Józef Milik.¹⁷⁹ Torleif

¹⁷⁷ The cave 4 manuscripts first came to light in 1956, when John Strugnell wrote: “[l]e texte de l’ouvrage sapientiel connu comme 1Q26 est également accru de façon considérable par les fragments d’un ms. de 4Q. En outre, il pourrait bien être identique à un ouvrage représenté par quatre mss., dont le plus considérable, qui occupe 7 sous-verre, est probablement aussi le ms. non biblique de 4Q qui est le plus largement conservé; pourtant l’identité de ce groupe avec n’est encore qu’une possibilité. Le texte a certaines particularités de vocabulaire et de doctrine qui suggèrent que nous pouvons avoir ici une composition sapientielle de la secte même de Qumrân, capable de nous aider à reconstruire sa théologie morale” (John M. Allegro, Maurice Baillet, Frank M. Cross, C.-H. Hunzinger, Józef T. Milik, Patrick W. Skehan, Jean Starcky, and John Strugnell, “Le Travail d’Édition des Fragments Manuscrits de Qumrân,” *RB* 63 [1956]: 64).

¹⁷⁸ Torleif Elgvin takes the discovery of this manuscript, 1Q26, as evidence for the importance of this text for the Qumran community (“Wisdom, Revelation, and Eschatology in an Early Essene Writing,” *SBL 1995 Seminar Papers* [Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1995], 440; “The Reconstruction of Sapiential Work

Elgvin's re-edition of this text appears in DJD 34.¹⁸⁰ Fragments of six further manuscripts were found in cave 4.¹⁸¹ An earlier "edition" appeared in fascicle 2 of Ben-Zion Wacholder and Martin Abegg's *A Preliminary Edition of the Unpublished Dead Sea Scrolls*,¹⁸² and a number of excerpts from the Hebrew text have appeared in scholarly articles.

Initial work was done in the early 1950's by Józef Milik and Frank Moore Cross on grouping together the large fragments of 4Q418. John Allegro was simultaneously working on grouping fragments of 4Q416, then part of his allotment, though frg. 2 of 4Q416 had not yet been purchased.¹⁸³ The extant fragments of 4QInstruction were assigned to Strugnell, and from then until the early 1990's very little on this text appeared in the scholarly literature. It was referred to by Max Küchler in his monumental work on early Jewish wisdom traditions, 1Q26 and 4QInstruction being placed alongside the Prayer of Nabonidus (4Q242), 4Q485, 4Q487, and the summary of David's compositions (11QPs^a XXVII, 2-11) in a category loosely entitled "[a]ndere Weisheitsschriften belehrender Art."¹⁸⁴ Küchler did not have access to the fragments themselves, merely referring to Strugnell's summary.¹⁸⁵ Nor had Klaus Berger seen the fragments by 1989: André Caquot

A," *RevQ* 16 [1995]: 559; "Early Essene Eschatology: Judgment and Salvation according to *Sapiential Work A*," in *Current Research and Technological Developments on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Conference on the Texts from the Judean Desert, Jerusalem, 30 April 1995* [ed. D. W. Parry and S. D. Ricks; STDJ 20; Leiden: Brill, 1996], 127). Here Elgvin is following Hartmut Stegemann's suggestion that only the most important books were hidden in cave 1 (Hartmut Stegemann, *Die Essener, Qumran, Johannes der Täufer und Jesus: Ein Sachbuch* [Freiburg: Herder, 1993], 89-90; cf. Daniel J. Harrington, "Ten Reasons why the Qumran Wisdom Texts are Important," *DSD* 4 [1997]: 245-246).

¹⁸⁰ John Strugnell, Daniel J. Harrington, and Torleif Elgvin, in consultation with Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *Qumran Cave 4 XXIV: Sapiential Texts, Part 2: 4QInstruction (Mûsar L^eMevîn): 4Q415ff. with a Re-edition of 1Q26* (DJD 34; Oxford: Clarendon, 1999), 535-539.

¹⁸¹ See further Strugnell et al., *Qumran Cave 4 XXIV*, 1-2. Following the lead of the *editio princeps*, 4Q415, 416, 417, 418, 418a, 4Q418c, and 423 will be understood to be manuscripts of this text. The manuscripts from the fourth cave will be referred to as 4QInstruction^a (4Q415), 4QInstruction^b (4Q416), 4QInstruction^c (4Q417), 4QInstruction^d (4Q418), 4QInstruction^e (4Q418a), 4QInstruction^f? (4Q418c), and 4QInstruction^g (4Q423).

¹⁸² Ben-Zion Wacholder and Martin G. Abegg, *A Preliminary Edition of the Unpublished Dead Sea Scrolls: The Hebrew and Aramaic Texts from Cave Four* (vol. 2; Washington, D.C.: Biblical Archaeology Society, 1992), 54-154, 166-173.

¹⁸³ Strugnell et al., *Qumran Cave 4 XXIV*, xiii.

¹⁸⁴ Max Küchler, *Frühjüdische Weisheitstraditionen: Zum Fortgang weisheitlichen Denkens im Bereich des frühjüdischen Jahweglaubens* (OBO 26; Freiburg: Universitätsverlag, 1979), 106-107.

¹⁸⁵ See above, n. 177; Küchler, *Weisheitstraditionen*, 107. Küchler sees no connection, therefore, between 4QInstruction and 1Q26, which he briefly summarises (*Weisheitstraditionen*, 106).

understood Berger to have manuscripts of our text in mind when he referred to extensive, still unedited wisdom texts from Qumran kept carefully under lock and key.¹⁸⁶ In the last decade, however, a number of important articles on 4QInstruction have been published, notably by Daniel Harrington,¹⁸⁷ John Strugnell,¹⁸⁸ Armin Lange,¹⁸⁹ and Torleif Elgvin.¹⁹⁰ Now that the official edition is in the public domain, scholarly discussion of this important text can begin in earnest.

Of the roots connected with intellection scrutinised in §2 **בין**, **חכם**, **ידע**, and **שכל** all appear in 4QInstruction. **למד** does not occur in the remaining portions of this text. The focus of this section is not, however, on sapiential terminology as a whole but on two specific terms: **משכיל** and **מבין**. Derived from **שכל** and **בין**, these terms, roughly translatable as “instructor” and “learner” respectively, refer to two figures related to one another within a chain of transmission. We have in 4QInstruction a development from what we found in 4Q380 and 4Q381: here a social context is implied in which wisdom is not just revealed by God but passed on by an instructor to a learner. In 4QInstruction sapiential terminology, the notion that wisdom is revealed by God, and a social reality in which such wisdom is transmitted converge.

¹⁸⁶ Klaus Berger, *Die Weisheitsschrift aus der Kairoer Geniza: Erstedition, Kommentar und Übersetzung* (TANZ 1; Tübingen: Francke, 1989), 61; André Caquot, “Les Textes de Sagesse de Qoumrân (Aperçu préliminaire),” *RHPR* 76 (1996): 1.

¹⁸⁷ See esp. Daniel J. Harrington and John Strugnell, “Critical Note: Qumran Cave 4 Texts: A New Publication,” *JBL* 112 (1993): 491-499; Daniel J. Harrington, “Two Early Jewish Approaches to Wisdom: Sirach and Qumran Sapiential Work A,” *SBL Seminar Papers*, 1996 (Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1996), 123-132; “The *râz nihyeh* in a Qumran Wisdom Text,” *RevQ* 17 (1996): 549-553; “Ten Reasons.” See also Harrington, *Wisdom Texts*; James E. Harding, review of D. J. Harrington, *Wisdom Texts from Qumran*, *DSD* 5 (1998): 237-245.

¹⁸⁸ See esp. John Strugnell, “The Sapiential Work 4Q415ff and Pre-Qumranic Works from Qumran: Lexical Considerations,” in *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues* (ed. D. W. Parry and E. Ulrich; STDJ 30; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 595-618.

¹⁸⁹ Armin Lange, “Wisdom and Predestination in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” *DSD* 2 (1995): 340-354. This is a summary of Lange’s detailed book *Weisheit und Prädestination: Weisheitliche Urordnung und Prädestination in den Textfunden von Qumran* (STDJ 18; Leiden: Brill, 1995). See also: “Kognitives *lqh* in Sap A, im T^enak und Sir,” *ZAH* 9 (1996): 190-195.

¹⁹⁰ See esp. Torleif Elgvin, “Admonition Texts from Qumran Cave 4,” in *Methods of Investigation of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Khirbet Qumran Site: Present Realities and Future Prospects* (ed. M. O. Wise et al.; ANYAS 722; New York: New York Academy of Sciences, 1994), 179-196; “Wisdom, Revelation, and Eschatology”; “Reconstruction”; “Early Essene Eschatology.” See also his thorough dissertation, which includes material published earlier in these articles: “An Analysis of 4QInstruction” (Ph.D. diss., Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1997).

3.1. משכיל in 4QInstruction

4QInstruction is chiefly made up of admonitions addressed to a figure consistently designated מבין.¹⁹¹ The editors suggest that the title given the teacher may have been משכיל,¹⁹² which jars somewhat with their insistence that this is not a sectarian work:¹⁹³ משכיל as “instructor” is chiefly a Qumranic usage.¹⁹⁴ It is not really attested in this sense even in Daniel: in Dan 11:33 although the משפילים give instruction this role is inherent in the verb יבנינו but not necessarily implied by the term משפילים itself.¹⁹⁵ משכיל occurs four times in 4QInstruction,¹⁹⁶ but the editors’ comments are problematic. With reference to 4QInstruction^d 21 2,¹⁹⁷ they suggest that “משכיל is very frequent in this work,” and that the combination עבד משכיל “seems unique.”¹⁹⁸ This assertion is incorrect, since עבד משכיל occurs twice each in Proverbs and Sirach.¹⁹⁹ They note that “[i]t is hard to determine to what office משכיל relates in 4Q415 ff.”²⁰⁰ which assumes that this term indicates an office, and makes the possibility that בן משכיל is synonymous with בן מבין, which they cautiously suggest,²⁰¹ harder to support: if the two are synonymous then

¹⁹¹ In terms of genre, 4QInstruction is therefore closest to the instruction, though this does not account for all aspects of this complex and enigmatic work. For the understanding of this work as instruction, see Harrington, *Wisdom Texts*, 40; Elgvin, “Analysis,” 31; Strugnell et al., *Qumran Cave 4 XXIV*, 17.

¹⁹² Strugnell et al., *Qumran Cave 4 XXIV*, 3, 19.

¹⁹³ Strugnell et al., *Qumran Cave 4 XXIV*, 21-31, 33-34, 36.

¹⁹⁴ Hans Kosmala, “Maskil,” *JANESCU* 5 (1973): 240; Strugnell et al., *Qumran Cave 4 XXIV*, 448.

¹⁹⁵ Pace Kosmala, “Maskil,” 240.

¹⁹⁶ That is, if occurrences of the same phrase in parallel manuscripts are not counted separately. The four occurrences are: (1) 4QInstruction^b 2 II, 15 (reconstructed); par. 4QInstruction^c 2 II, 19 (reconstructed); 4QInstruction^d 21 2 (= 8 15); 4QInstruction^e 19 2 (reconstructed); (2) 4QInstruction^c 1 I, 25; (3) 4QInstruction^d 81 + 81a 17; (4) 4QInstruction^d 238 1.

¹⁹⁷ Par. 4QInstruction^b 2 II, 15; 4QInstruction^c 2 II, 19?

¹⁹⁸ Strugnell et al., *Qumran Cave 4 XXIV*, 244. Is four times “very frequent” in a text which may have been composed of 23 columns (Elgvin, “Reconstruction,” 563, 579-580; Strugnell et al., *Qumran Cave 4 XXIV*, 18), or even thirty (Steudel-Lucassen)?

¹⁹⁹ Prov 14:35; 17:2; Sir 7:21; 10:25. Moshe Segal cites Prov 17:2 in connection with Sir 7:21 (מזח, ספר בן סירא השלם [2d ed.; Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1958]).

²⁰⁰ Strugnell et al., *Qumran Cave 4 XXIV*, 168.

²⁰¹ Strugnell, et al., *Qumran Cave 4 XXIV*, 168, on 4QInstruction^c 1 I, 25. Armin Lange translates משכיל “Unterweiser” at this point (*Weisheit*, 53; cf. his translation of משכיל in 1QS III, 13: *Weisheit*, 137), and reads כי rather than בן (*Weisheit*, 51; cf. Caquot, “Textes,” 18). Lange sees 4QInstruction^c 1 I, 25 (his 4Q417 2 I, 25) as a reference to the meaning “instructor” for משכיל outside the *Yahad* (*Weisheit*, 144 n. 99). Lange therefore offers a completely different understanding of this passage to the editors. For Lange, משכיל is the subject of התבונן, making the verb 3rd. masc. sing. Perfect: “for the instructor has

משכיל refers to the same “office” or function as מבין. They are right to note that 4QInstruction knows two different senses of משכיל, “acting intelligently”²⁰² and “making someone intelligent,”²⁰³ but contradict this in their remarks on 4QInstruction^d 238 1: “[i]n 4Q415ff. (four times) and in the 1-11Q texts (thirty times), משכיל occurs only in the sense of ‘instructor’ (so in Biblical Hebrew but rarely).”²⁰⁴ This confusion surrounding the interpretation of משכיל in 4QInstruction needs to be clarified. 4QInstruction^d 238 1 is too fragmentary to permit meaningful discussion. However, the other three occurrences of משכיל in 4QInstruction deserve comment. This term occurs in the phrase עבד משכיל, probably in the phrase בן משכיל and with the object suffix כה—.

3.1.1. עבד משכיל

The phrase לעבד משכיל, “as a wise servant,” may be fairly certainly restored in 4QInstruction^d 21 2, which Eibert Tigchelaar, followed by the editors, has placed with 4QInstruction^d 8.²⁰⁵ 4QInstruction^d 21 2 parallels 4QInstruction^b 2 II, 15 (in which only ל of משכיל remains) and 4QInstruction^c 2 II + 23 19 (in which only לעב remains). The restored phrase reads דמה לו לעבד משכיל [ואתה], “[and you], be like a wise servant to him.”²⁰⁶

acquired insight into your secrets” (*Weisheit*, 53). For the editors, the בן משכיל is the addressee and therefore the subject of התבונן, which is thus taken as imperative: “O sage child, get understanding about all the mysteries *concerning thee*” (Strugnell et al., *Qumran Cave 4 XXIV*, 155, italics original; cf. Florentino García Martínez and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* [2 vols; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2000], 2:859: “wise son, understand your mysteries”). García Martínez’s earlier translation, “for with intelligence they will understand your secrets” (*DSST* 387), does not reflect the Hebrew כִּי בֶן מִשְׁכִּיל הַתְּבוּנוֹן בְּרוּיָכָה. The verb is not third person plural and it would be odd to translate משכיל adverbially.

²⁰² 4QInstruction^d 21 2 par.

²⁰³ 4QInstruction^d 81 + 81a 17. This meaning is confirmed by the object suffix כה—. See Strugnell et al., *Qumran Cave 4 XXIV*, 310.

²⁰⁴ Strugnell et al., *Qumran Cave 4 XXIV*, 448.

²⁰⁵ Strugnell et al., *Qumran Cave 4 XXIV*, 232, 244.

²⁰⁶ Elgvin apparently does not notice that the three fragments overlap to the extent that this phrase may be reconstructed. He reconstructs 4QInstruction^b 2 II, 15 לו לעבד בכו[ל?] לו, “[Then you would be his servant in all thi]ngs(?)” (“Analysis,” 210, 212).

Who is the 3rd masc. sing. referent? In 4QInstruction^b 2 II, 1-2²⁰⁷ God appears to be the subject of פתח and יקפון in light of Ps 111:5.²⁰⁸ In 4QInstruction^c 2 II, 3, the phrase [לתת טרף לכ[ול חי], “to give food to eve[ry living creature]” recalls Ps 111:5, where YHWH “has given food to those who fear him” (טַרְףַּ נָתַן לַיִרְאָיו).²⁰⁹ In Ps 111:4, YHWH is described as חַנּוּן וְרַחוּם, “gracious and merciful,” anticipating the idea of God releasing his mercies in 4QInstruction^b 2 II, 1.²¹⁰ God provides for every living creature and “if he shuts his hand, the spirit of all flesh will be gathered” (יקפון ידו ונאספה רוח כול בשר). The combination יד + קפן occurs in Deut 15:7 where the Israelite is commanded not to close his hand against his poor brother at the year of remission. The addressee is related to the 3rd masc. sing. referent in 4QInstruction^b 2 II, 1-3 in the same way the poor brother is related to the addressee in Deut 15:1-11. Interestingly, אָבִיּוֹן occurs 6 times in Deut 15:1-11²¹¹ and at least 3 times in reference to the addressee in 4QInstruction.²¹² The speaker seems to be using the language of Deut 15 to express the addressee’s relationship with God. The idea of YHWH providing for “every living creature” is familiar from Ps 145,²¹³ confirming that God is the 3 masc. sing. referent at this point.

In 4QInstruction^b 2 II, 4-7 the subject matter is the relationship between the addressee and a human creditor, which might suggest that a human superior is in mind in line 15, the 3rd masc. sing.

²⁰⁷ Par. 4QInstruction^c 2 II, 2-4; 4QInstruction^d 7b 14-8a 1. Although ך and ם may frequently be confused in 4QInstruction^d (Strugnell et al., *Qumran Cave 4 XXIV*, 215), it is not impossible that the Hiphil קפין rather than the Qal יקפון should be read in 4QInstruction^d 8a 1. However, this would require a meaning “cause to close” for קפין Hiphil rather than the usual “cause to leap” (Jastrow, 1403).

²⁰⁸ Strugnell et al., *Qumran Cave 4 XXIV*, 94.

²⁰⁹ The editors also cite Prov 31:15, in which a woman of strength (Prov 31:10: אִשְׁת־הִיל) is said to have given food to her household (וַתִּתֶּן טַרְףָּ לְבֵיתָהּ).

²¹⁰ Par. 4QInstruction^c 2 II, 2.

²¹¹ Deut 15:4, 7 (2t), 9, 11 (2t).

²¹² (1) 4QInstruction^a 6 2; (2) 4QInstruction^b 2 III, 8 (par. 4QInstruction^d 9,9a-c 6); (3) 4QInstruction^b 2 III, 12 (par. 4QInstruction^d 9,9a-c 13). אָבִיּוֹן could be restored in 4QInstruction^d 168 3; 249 3. In 4QInstruction^c 2 I, 17 אָבִיּוֹן stands at the beginning of a line at the end of a stich, as the following וְאַתָּה, which begins the following stich, indicates. The vacat at the end of line 16 may only be reconstructed tentatively (for a possible reconstruction, see Strugnell et al., *Qumran Cave 4 XXIV*, 173, 185). It is unclear whether אָבִיּוֹן refers to the addressee at this point.

²¹³ Ps 145:15 (MT) יְעִינֵי-כָל אֱלֹהִים וְיִשְׁבְּרוּ וְיִתְּנוּ לָהֶם אֶת-אֲכָלָם בְּעֵתוֹ, “the eyes of all wait for you and you give them their food in its proper time.” The phrase כָּל-בָּשָׂר in Ps 145:21 recalls 4QInstruction^b 2 II, 2-3 (reconstructed).

referent now being human rather than divine. If so, *אתה דמה לו לעבד משכיל* is a command to relate to a human superior as a wise servant should. This places 4QInstruction^b 2 II, 15 in the context of other occurrences of *עבד משכיל* in the Hebrew wisdom corpus. Prov 14:35 reads *רצון מלך לעבד משכיל*, “a king’s favour is towards a wise servant,” and Prov 17:2 reads *עבד משכיל ימשל בן מביש*²¹⁴ וּבְתוֹךְ אֶחָיו יַחְלֹק נַחֲלָה, “a wise servant rules over a son who brings shame and divides (his) inheritance among (his) brothers.” Sir 7:21 is apparently addressed to a superior, ms A reading *כנפש אל תמנע ממנו חפש*²¹⁵ *עבד משכיל חבב*, “love a wise servant as (your) life; do not withhold his freedom from him.” The text of Sir 10:25 is more complex. Ms A reads *עבד משכיל הורם*, “a wise servant will be exalted,”²¹⁶ whereas ms B reads *עבד משכיל חורים יעבדוהו*²¹⁷, “nobles will serve a wise servant.” The paradox of a wise servant being exalted or being served emphasises even more the idea that *עבד משכיל* is someone who is wise in his subservience to a human superior. These references from Proverbs and Sirach were not necessarily in the mind of the author of 4QInstruction, but help to demonstrate that the phrase *עבד משכיל* and the concept it represents were familiar from other parts of the Hebrew wisdom corpus.

The so-called “suffering servant” of Deutero-Isaiah cannot be ignored, either. In Isa 52:13, the phrase *הִנֵּה יִשְׁכִּיל עַבְדִּי* is often taken in the sense “behold, my servant *shall prosper*.”²¹⁸ R. Norman Whybray admits that the normal meaning of *שכל* Hiphil is “understand, be wise or prudent,” but opts for the related meaning “prosper, be successful,” noting that “success was believed to be the normal outcome of the possession of wisdom.”²¹⁹ However, it is the sapiential nuance which struck the LXX translator: *Ἴδου συνήσει ὁ παῖς μου*, “see, my servant²²⁰ shall understand.” Importantly, H. L. Ginsberg has suggested that the author of Dan 11-12 identified the suffering

²¹⁴ *משכיל* and *מביש* are polar opposites in Prov 14:35; 17:2.

²¹⁵ Genizah ms B: *אהוב*.

²¹⁶ *הורם* is a Hophal perfect form. The translation given here is intended to be idiomatic in English: a past sense for the perfect would seem inappropriate here.

²¹⁷ Cf. LXX: *οἱ κλέτῃ σοφῷ ἐλεύθεροι λειτουργήσουσιν*, “freedmen will serve a wise servant.”

²¹⁸ Cf. NJB; NRSV.

²¹⁹ R. Norman Whybray, *Isaiah 40-66* (NCB; London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1975), 169.

²²⁰ Or “son, child.” For the meaning “slave, servant” for *παῖς*, see *παῖς* III (LSJ 1289).

servant of Isa 52:13-53:12 with a group of his own day known as מְשִׁכִּילִים.²²¹ If Isa 52:13 rather than the references in Proverbs and Sirach are in mind, the addressee is surely to relate to God as a wise servant. However, the context seems rather to indicate the relationship between the addressee and a human superior. Isaiah 52:13 certainly echoes references to עֶבֶד מְשִׁכִּיל in the wisdom corpus, but may not be directly relevant to 4QInstruction.²²²

One NT reference should be mentioned. In Matt 24:45 (par. Luke 12:42),²²³ Jesus begins the parable about the “faithful and wise servant” (ὁ πιστὸς δοῦλος καὶ φρόνιμος). Jesus’ addressees are intended to be or become wise and faithful servants.²²⁴ The similarity with 4QInstruction is surprisingly close: in the Qumran text, an instructor exhorts his pupil (מְבִינִי) to be like a wise servant and in Matthew and Luke Jesus tells a parable to his disciples with the intention that they will become like the wise servant of the parable. Both texts may well reflect the use of the phrase עֶבֶד מְשִׁכִּיל in Hebrew wisdom literature, though the vocabulary used by Matthew and Luke is not reflected in the LXX of the texts cited from Proverbs and Sirach.²²⁵

It is significant for our understanding of the place of 4QInstruction in the Hebrew wisdom corpus that these parallels may be adduced for the phrase עֶבֶד מְשִׁכִּיל. However, it seems clear that מְשִׁכִּיל here does not refer to an instructor. Rather, עֶבֶד מְשִׁכִּיל represents the kind of person the addressee should be in relation to his superior. This passage does not help directly in the study of the transmission of revealed wisdom in the Qumran corpus.

²²¹ H. L. Ginsberg, “The Oldest Interpretation of the Suffering Servant,” VT 3 (1953): 402-403.

²²² Isaiah 40:3, also part of Deutero-Isaiah, was a key text for the self-understanding of the community’s self-identity. It is interesting to note that שָׂכַל Hiphil is connected with the “time to prepare the way to the wilderness” in 1QS IX, 19b-20. Although there are lexical connections between 4QInstruction, *Serekh ha-Yahad*, and Deutero-Isaiah, however, it is difficult to see any direct connection between 4QInstruction and the other two at this point.

²²³ Cf. Matt 25:21; par. Luke 19:17.

²²⁴ Cf. Luke 12:41.

²²⁵ Prov 14:35: ὑπηρέτης νοήμων; Prov 17:2: οἰκέτης νοήμων; Sir 7:21: οἰκέτην συνετὸν; Sir 10:25: οἰκέτη σοφῷ.

3.1.2. בן משכיל

In 4QInstruction^c 1 I, 25, the phrase **בן משכיל**, “son of a sage” or “wise son” appears, though the first word is damaged, making it difficult to decide whether this is the correct reading or whether we should in fact read **כי משכיל**, which would change the sense of this passage entirely.²²⁶ Both possibilities will be discussed.

It is difficult to see how **כי משכיל** would fit in this context. The phrase **כי משכיל התבונן ברויכה** would have to mean something like “for a sage has understood your mysteries (viz. the mysteries concerning you?).” A **משכיל** figure does not appear elsewhere in this fragment, unless the speaker is a **משכיל**, in which case the 3rd masc. sing. referent might seem odd: why should a **משכיל** refer to a **משכיל** in the third person in this way? Also, what would it mean for a **משכיל** to understand the mysteries of the **מבין**? The whole emphasis of this passage is on the understanding of the **מבין** himself. While the scant remains of the second letter of this line seem to have more in common with **י**, as in **משכיל** in this line or **כי** in line 15, than with final **נ**, as in **מבין** in line 14 or **זכרון** in line 15, **כי משכיל** would be difficult in this context.²²⁷

בן משכיל, however, would fit perfectly, and would suggest some interesting implications for the literary allusions in this text. Elsewhere in this column, the addressee is characteristically called **מבין**. It is just possible to read **אתה מבין**, “you, understanding one” in line 1.²²⁸ The reading **ואתה מבין** is more likely in lines 13-14 and the reading **ואתה מבין** is certain in line 18. **בן משכיל** is analogous to **בן מבין** in line 18. The Hiphil participles of these two roots occur in parallel in Dan 1:4,²²⁹ increasing the likelihood that the two phrases are synonymous here. If so, then **ואתה** should be reconstructed at the end of line 24. Reading **בן משכיל** would make the addressee the subject of the Hithpoel imperative **התבונן**, which would square with lines 12-13, where the addressee is commanded to “seek these things diligently at all times, and understand [all] their sources”²³⁰

²²⁶ See above, n. 201.

²²⁷ The editors suggest that **כי** or **פי** could be read here (Strugnell et al., *Qumran Cave 4 XXIV*, 168). **פי** would fit the context even less well.

²²⁸ Strugnell et al., *Qumran Cave 4 XXIV*, 151; García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *DSSSE* 2:858.

²²⁹ In Dan 1:4, Daniel and his companions are described as **מְשִׁילִים בְּכָל-חֻקֵּיהֶם**, “those who have insight into all wisdom” and **מְבִינֵי מִדָּע**, “those who understand knowledge.”

²³⁰ Or “outcomes”; see Strugnell et al., *Qumran Cave 4 XXIV*, 155, 160. García Martínez and Tigchelaar give “effects” (*DSSSE* 2:859). Vermes gives “results” (*CDSSE* 409).

(אלה שחר תמיד והתבונן [בכו] ל תוצאותמה). In context, then, it would make more sense to see בן משכיל as the addressee and the subject of an imperative.²³¹

בן משכיל is not unknown in Hebrew wisdom literature. In Prov 10:5a we read בן חכם is synonymous with בן משכיל, “a wise son reaps in the summer.” בן משכיל is synonymous with בן חכם in Prov 10:1a and antonymous with בן מביש in Prov 10:5b. More importantly, בן משכיל is used with reference to Solomon in Sir 47:12. The Hebrew reads בעבורו עמד אחריו בן משכיל שוכן לבטח, “on account of him (viz. David) there arose after him a wise son who lived in security.” This may be an allusion to the words of Hiram in 1 Kgs 5:21,²³² where Solomon is described as בן חכם, “a wise son.”²³³

It is not impossible that בן משכיל is a construct chain: “son of a sage” (בן משכיל). This is possible since David is twice described as משכיל in the MT.²³⁴ Further, in the superscription לְדָוִד מֶשְׁכִּיל to Ps 32 מֶשְׁכִּיל could be understood as in apposition: “of David, (who is) a sage.”²³⁵ בן משכיל in 4QInstruction^c 1 I, 25 could also be a construct chain, an understanding favoured by Edward Cook.²³⁶ בן מבין in 4QInstruction^c 1 I, 18 could also be a construct chain,²³⁷ which would mean that both משכיל and מבין are synonyms indicating a teacher. This usage for משכיל is familiar at Qumran, and may be attested elsewhere for מבין.²³⁸ However, given the use of בן משכיל in the MT to mean “wise son,” and given the use of the analogous phrase בן חכם in the MT with a similar meaning, there is no need for such a usage in 4QInstruction^c 1 I, 18, 25.

The use of בן משכיל for Solomon in Sir 47:12 may suggest that in 4QInstruction^c 1 I, 25 the wisdom of the מבין is modelled on that of Solomon. This recalls Elgvin’s suggestion that in 4QInstruction^d 81 + 81a we encounter a radical reinterpretation of the Solomon tradition, and that the Solomon tradition generally influenced the thought of 4QInstruction.²³⁹ Elgvin compares the language of 4QInstruction^d 81 + 81a with Solomon’s prayer and God’s promise to him in 1 Kgs 3:6-

²³¹ He is the subject of the following imperatives in this column: הִבֵּט lines 2, 3, 18 (4QInstruction^d 43,44,45 I, 14 [reconstructed]); דֹּרֵשׁ (sic) line 6; שִׁחַר line 12; הִתְבּוֹנֵן line 12; דַּע line 18; תּוֹגַע line 23; 4QInstruction^d 43,44,45 I, 4.

²³² Patrick W. Skehan and Alexander A. Di Lella, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira: A New Translation with Notes* (AB 39; New York: Doubleday, 1987), 527).

²³³ The phrases in Sir 47:12; 1 Kgs 5:21 are different in both Hebrew and Greek. The LXX reads *υἱὸν φρόνιμον* in 1 Kgs 5:21 and *υἱὸς ἐπιστήμων* in Sir 47:12.

²³⁴ 1 Sam 18:14, 15.

²³⁵ See also 11QPs^a XXVII, 2-11, where David’s wisdom is extolled and a list of his compositions given.

²³⁶ Edward M. Cook, “*Maskil* and *Mebin* in the Dead Sea Scrolls” (paper presented at the annual meeting of the SBL, Nashville, Tenn., 20 November 2000).

²³⁷ Cf. Lange, *Weisheit*, 53.

²³⁸ Lange, *Weisheit*, 56. Alexander Di Lella translates מבין in Sir 42:21 “counselor” (Skehan and Di Lella, *Wisdom*, 484, 492), but for the same form in Sir 10:1 Patrick Skehan offers “a prudent person” (*Wisdom*, 221).

²³⁹ Elgvin, “Wisdom, Revelation, and Eschatology,” 453; “Analysis,” 270.

14,²⁴⁰ suggesting that this indicates that the wisdom God gave to Solomon is now given to the elect in the community of the eternal planting.²⁴¹ This connects with the idea that wisdom belongs in heaven and is transmitted to humans. That Solomon possessed God's wisdom (חִכְמַת אֱלֹהִים)²⁴² is recognised by the sons of Israel in 1 Kgs 3:28, and it is explicitly stated in 1 Kgs 5:9 that "God gave Solomon wisdom and greatly increased understanding": וַיֵּתֶן אֱלֹהִים חִכְמָה לְשֹׁלֹמֹה וַתִּבְּנֶה הָרָגָה מְאֹד.²⁴³

Thus Hebrew texts referring to Solomon's wisdom helped to shape the ideas found in 4QInstruction. Like Solomon, the מְבִין has been given wisdom from God.²⁴⁴ Like Solomon, he is called בֶּן מִשְׁכִּיל. It is not certain that the author of 4QInstruction was consciously alluding to Sir 47:12 in 4QInstruction^c 1 I, 25, but the phrase בֶּן מִשְׁכִּיל is attested for a wise man in the Hebrew wisdom corpus (Prov 10:5) and is used to refer to Solomon, himself the paradigmatic wise man, in Sirach. However, although our understanding of the term מִשְׁכִּיל itself has expanded, we have learnt little so far about the idea of transmission. It is true that Solomon acts as a transmitter or mediator of wisdom

²⁴⁰ Elgvin, "Wisdom, Revelation, and Eschatology," 453 n. 58; "Analysis," 125-126 n. 8. The following similarities are based on Elgvin's analysis but supplemented by my own observations: (1) חֲסֹד גָּדוֹל, חֲסֹד גָּדוֹל (1 Kgs 3:6) and וּבְחֹסֶד וּבְרַחֲמִים (4QInstruction^d 81 + 81a 8); (2) לְהִבִּין בֵּין-טוֹב לָרַע (1 Kgs 3:9; cf. 2 Sam 14:17) and לְהִבִּין צָדִיק בֵּין טוֹב לָרַע (4QInstruction^d 2,2a-c 7; par. 4QInstruction^b 1 15); [טוֹב לָרַע] (4QInstruction^c 1 I, 8); [טוֹב לָרַע] (4QInstruction^c 1 I, 17-18; par. 4QInstruction^d 43,44,45 I, 13-14 [reconstructed]); [טוֹב לָרַע] (4QInstruction^d 221 5); [טוֹב לָרַע] (4QInstruction^e 5 6; cf. SHRPref line 11: לְהִבִּין הָרַע וְהַטּוֹב); (3) לְהִבִּין (1 Kgs 3:9); וְאַתָּה מְבִין (1 Kgs 3:11); נָבוֹן (1 Kgs 3:12) and וְאַתָּה מְבִין (4QInstruction^d 81 + 81a 15); וְאַתָּה מְבִין (4QInstruction^d 81 + 81a 18; is another possible reading: Strugnell et al., *Qumran Cave 4 XXIV*, 301; García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *DSSSE* 2:872); (4) לֵב שֹׁמֵעַ לְשֹׁפֵט (1 Kgs 3:9); לֵב שֹׁמֵעַ לְשֹׁפֵט (1 Kgs 3:11) and דְּרוֹשׁ מִשְׁפָּטִיו (4QInstruction^d 81 + 81a 7); (5) לֵב חָכָם וְנָבוֹן (1 Kgs 3:12) and וְכֹל חֲכָמֵי לֵב הִשְׁכִּילוּ (4QInstruction^d 81 + 81a 20); (6) נִתְּחִי לָךְ גַּם-עֶשֶׂר גַּם-כָּבוֹד (1 Kgs 3:13) and וְכִבּוּדָהּ הָרַבָּה מִוֹאֲדָה (4QInstruction^d 81 + 81a 5); תִּמְלֹא וְשִׁבַּעְתָּהּ בְּרוּב טוֹב (4QInstruction^d 81 + 81a 6); וְטוֹבִיתִי לָכָה אֶתְּךָ וְאַתָּה לְהִלּוֹא לָכָה טוֹבִי (4QInstruction^d 81 + 81a 19); (7) וְאַתָּה תִּלְךָ בְּדַרְכֵי לְשֹׁמֵר חֻקֵּי וּמִצְוֹתַי (1 Kgs 3:14) and יִתְּחִלְכוּ כֹּל נוֹחֲלֵי אֶרֶץ (4QInstruction^d 81 + 81a 6); וּבְאַמּוֹנִיתִי הִלַּךְ תְּמִיד (4QInstruction^d 81 + 81a 8); וְאַתָּה שָׁכַלְתָּ לָכָה (4QInstruction^d 81 + 81a 14).

²⁴¹ For the phrase "eternal planting" (מִטְעַת עוֹלָם) in 4QInstruction, see 4QInstruction^d 81 + 81a 13.

²⁴² Cf. חִכְמַת מַלְאָךְ הָאֱלֹהִים, "the wisdom of God's angel" (2 Sam 14:20).

²⁴³ Cf. Wis 7:7, 17; 8:21; 9:4, 10, 17.

²⁴⁴ E.g. 4QInstruction^d 81 + 81a 9: וְאַתָּה שָׁכַלְתָּ לָכָה וּבְאַמּוֹנִיתִי הִלַּךְ תְּמִיד, "and you, he has [ope]ned up insight for you, and made you ruler over his treasure house."

revealed to him in the Wisdom of Solomon. In Wis 7:13 we read ἀδόλως τε ἔμαθον ἀφθόνως τε μεταδίδωμι, τὸν πλοῦτόν αὐτῆς οὐκ ἀποκρύπτομαι, “I learnt without guile, I transmit without envy: I do not hide her riches.”²⁴⁵ This text does not illuminate 4QInstruction, however.

3.1.3. משכילכה

We turn our attention now to 4QInstruction^d 81 + 81a 17, where the term משכיל is used in a manner which significantly illuminates our understanding of transmission in this work.

4QInstruction^d 81 + 81a 17 reads התבונן מודה ומיד כול משכילכה הוסף לקח, “seek understanding diligently, and from the hand of all who give you instruction increase learning.” The 2nd masc. sing. imperative Hithpolel of בִּין occurs several times in this work.²⁴⁶ It is followed three times by a form of מְאֹד,²⁴⁷ “exceedingly,”²⁴⁸ probably how מוֹדֶה is to be understood here.²⁴⁹ משכילכה is to be understood as either a participle (“who instructs you”)²⁵⁰ or a noun (“your instructor”), with either a 2nd masc. sing. pronominal suffix or a 2nd masc. sing. verbal (object)

²⁴⁵ Although there is no evidence that the Wisdom of Solomon was known at Qumran, the idea of the transmission of insight that lies behind Wis 7:13 is widespread. Importantly, the verb μεταδίδωμι (Wis 7:13a) and its pair μεταλαμβάνω occur in Josephus, the historian referring to an oath of the Essene novice to faithfully transmit the teachings of the sect. The relevant text reads: πρὸς τούτοις ὁμνυσιν μηδενὶ μὲν μεταδοῦναι τῶν δογμάτων ἑτέρως ἢ ὡς αὐτὸς μετέλαβεν, ἀφέξεσθαι δὲ ληστείας καὶ συντηρήσειν ὁμοίως τὰ τε τῆς αἰρέσεως αὐτῶν βιβλία καὶ τὰ τῶν ἀγγέλων ὀνόματα, “besides, he swears not to transmit the teachings to anyone differently from how he himself received them, to shun robbery and, similarly, to preserve carefully the books of their sect and the names of the angels” (Josephus, *J.W.* 2.8.7).

²⁴⁶ 4QInstruction^a 11 12; 4QInstruction^b 2 III, 14 (par. 4QInstruction^d 9,9a-c 15 [reconstructed]); 4QInstruction^c 1 I, 12, 25; 3 3; 4QInstruction^d 68 5; 81 + 81a 17; 147 5, 6; 4QInstruction^g 5 6; (possibly) 4QInstruction^d 238 3. The 2nd masc. pl. imperfect Hithpolel תבוננו occurs in 4QInstruction^d 221 5.

²⁴⁷ 4QInstruction^a 11 12 (מוֹדֶה); 4QInstruction^c 3 3 (מוֹדֶה); 4QInstruction^d 81 + 81a 17 (מוֹדֶה).

²⁴⁸ Cf. BDB 547.

²⁴⁹ Strugnell et al., *Qumran Cave 4 XXIV*, 301, 310. The form מוֹדֶה is found in 1QS X, 16; 1QH^a XIX, 3; 4QInstruction^d 137 4. The editors rightly reject the possibility of reading מִידֶה, “from her hand,” since this would go against the established usage (known from 4QInstruction^a 11 12; 4QInstruction^c 3 3) and would presume a feminine singular antecedent which would have originally appeared in the lacuna in line 16 (cf. Strugnell et al., *Qumran Cave 4 XXIV*, 310).

²⁵⁰ With כָּל (כול) the participle is usually in the singular, though a plural is meant (cf. Joüon §139i). See, e.g., Jer 18:16: כָּל עוֹבֵר עָלֶיהָ, “all who pass by her.”

suffix.²⁵¹ הוֹסֵף is a 2nd masc. sing. imperative Hiphil from יָסַף (הוֹסֵף), meaning “increase,”²⁵² the subject being the מְבִין.²⁵³ הוֹסֵף and הַתְּבוּנָה are thus parallel. יָסַף is frequently followed by an infinitive with the sense of continuing to do something,²⁵⁴ perhaps suggesting that we should restore לִקְחָה[ת], “(continue) to receive,” though the verb לָקַח does not occur in this construction elsewhere. However, the construction הוֹסֵף + לָקַח (“to increase instruction”) occurs in several sapiential texts,²⁵⁵ and the editors are probably correct to understand הוֹסֵף לִקְחָה in that sense here.²⁵⁶

This line contains the most explicit hint of a *Sitz im Leben* for 4QInstruction. Two complementary social roles are referred to, מְשָׁכִיל and מְבִין. The addressee is called מְבִין in line 15, and exhorted to increase learning from the hand of all those who give him insight in line 17. The implication is that there is a group of wise men who are ranked above the מְבִין and are in a position to give him instruction. The speaker himself may be part of this group. The rationale for the implied hierarchy is that the מְשָׁכִיל is wise and in a position to instruct on account of his wisdom. The מְבִין is in need of instruction.²⁵⁷

²⁵¹ מְשָׁכִיל, which is singular, may take either kind of suffix, though a singular participle would usually have a pronominal suffix (Joüon §66). In the 2nd masc. sing. it would be impossible to distinguish between the two in any case.

²⁵² For the Hiphil imperative of יָסַף, see also 4QcryptA 3-4 II, 5 (reconstructed), 6, 7. The Hiphil imperative of יָסַף does not occur in the MT.

²⁵³ The section in which 4QInstruction^d 81 + 81a 17 occurs begins with an address to the מְבִין in line 15.

²⁵⁴ Joüon §177b. For references see DCH 4:238.

²⁵⁵ Prov 1:5; 9:9; 16:21, 23; 4Q298 3-4 II, 5 (reconstructed: see Menachem Kister, “Commentary to 4Q298,” *JQR* 85 [1994]: 243; Stephen J. Pfann, “4Q298: The Maskîl’s Address to All Sons of Dawn,” *JQR* 85 [1994]: 229-230; DCH 4:575; García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *DSSSE* 2:656); 4Q436 1 I, 2 (4QBarkî Nafshi^c). David Rolph Seely prefers to see 4QBarkî Nafshi^c as a “sectarian text with wisdom elements” rather than a sapiential text *per se* (“The Barkî Nafshi Texts (4Q434-439),” in *Current Research and Technological Developments on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Conference on the Texts from the Judean Desert, Jerusalem, 30 April 1995* [ed. D. W. Parry and S. D. Ricks; STDJ 20; Leiden: Brill, 1996], 202). However, this distinction is both dubious and unimportant for present purposes. In Prov 16:21 the phrase יָסַף לָקַח occurs in collocation with the phrase הָכֵם לֵב and in Prov 16:23 the same phrase occurs in collocation with לֵב הָכֵם. This is to be compared with חֲכָמִי לֵב in 4QInstruction^d 81 + 81a 20. Interestingly, מְשָׁכִיל occurs in Prov 16:20. It is possible, therefore, that the vocabulary of 4QInstruction^d 81 + 81a is intended to recall these admonitions from Proverbs. Elgvin also cites Sir 8:8 (“Analysis,” 274), where לָקַח is the object of לָמַד (Qal).

²⁵⁶ Strugnell et al., *Qumran Cave 4 XXIV*, 310; DCH 4:575.

²⁵⁷ Elgvin does not explore this possibility, but believes that מְשָׁכִילָה refers to fellow community members: “[t]he addressee shall obtain insight with the help of ‘your wise ones’, probably other members of the community” (“Analysis,” 274). This cannot be sustained: when this text is read alongside texts relating

This may be clarified by looking at texts in which שכל Hiphil is used with a verbal (object) suffix.²⁵⁸ In these texts the Hiphil is unquestionably used causatively. In Psalm 32:8 YHWH says to the psalmist אֶשְׁכִּילְךָ וְאֶדְרֹךְ בְּדֶרֶךְ-זוֹ תֵּלֵךְ, “I shall instruct you and teach you the path in which you should walk.” God gives wisdom from which the psalmist will benefit. In Dan 9:22, Gabriel’s mission is to give wisdom to Daniel: יָצָאתִי לְהַשְׁכִּילְךָ בִּינָה, “I came forth to bring wisdom to you.” In Neh 9:20 God has given his spirit to instruct his people in the wilderness: וָרוּחְךָ הַטּוֹבָה נָתַתָּ לְהַשְׁכִּילָם, “and you gave your spirit to instruct them.” These texts all refer to instruction from a heavenly source. In Dan 9:22; Neh 9:20 it is mediated through an agent acting on God’s behalf.

There are several occurrences in the Qumran scrolls of שכל Hiphil with a verbal (object) suffix.²⁵⁹ In 1QS IX, 18²⁶⁰ the מַשְׁכִּיל, who is “to learn all the wisdom found in accordance with the times” (לְמוֹד אֶת כּוֹל הַשְּׁכֵל הַמִּנְצָא לְפִי הָעֵתִים),²⁶¹ and part of whose role is to bring each man near according to his wisdom (וּלְפִי שְׁכָלוֹ לְהַגִּישׁוֹ),²⁶² is to instruct the chosen of the way in the mysteries of wonder and truth (לְהַשְׁכִּילָם בְּרוֹזֵי פֶלֶא וְאִמְתָּ). In 1QS IX, 20²⁶³ he is “to teach them everything that has been found” (לְהַשְׁכִּילָם כּוֹל הַנִּמְצָא). In 1QSa I, 7, it is presumably the “sons of Zadok, the priests, and the men of their covenant”²⁶⁴ who will “[te]ach him (viz. the native Israelite youth)²⁶⁵ the book of HGY and according to his days instruct him in the statute[s] of the covenant” (בְּחֻקַּי [י] הַבְּרִית [לל] מִדְּהוּ בַסֵּפֶר הַהִגִּי וּכְפִי יוֹמָיו יִשְׁכִּילוּהוּ).²⁶⁶ In 11QMelch II, 20 the eschatological prophet is the one who instructs: “to [in]struct them in all the ages of the world”²⁶⁷ (ל[ה] שְׁכִילְמָה בְּכוֹל קְצֵי הָעוֹלָם).

to the מַשְׁכִּיל from elsewhere in the Qumran corpus, it becomes clear that 4QInstruction bears witness to social roles within a recognised hierarchy.

²⁵⁸ This appears to be the only occurrence in Classical Hebrew of the Hiphil participle of שכל with a verbal (object) suffix.

²⁵⁹ 4Q381 15 8 has already been discussed (§2.1 above).

²⁶⁰ Par. 4QS^b XVIII, 1-2 (reconstructed); 4QS^d VIII, 3; 4QS^e III, 17 (reconstructed).

²⁶¹ 1QS IX, 13; par. 4QS^e III, 9 (reconstructed).

²⁶² 1QS IX, 15-16; par. 4QS^d VIII, 1; 4QS^e III, 12-13 (reconstructed).

²⁶³ Par. 4QS^b XVIII, 3; 4QS^d VIII, 4; 4QS^e III, 19-4:1 (reconstructed).

²⁶⁴ 1QSa I, 2: בְּנֵי צְדוֹק הַכֹּהֲנִים וְאֲנֹשֵׁי בְרִיתָם

²⁶⁵ Cf. 1QSa I, 6-7 (reconstructed).

²⁶⁶ Note that שכל Hiphil and לָמַד Piel are parallel here. See also לְהַבִּינָם (line 5).

²⁶⁷ Translation: García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *DSSSE* 2:1209.

In 1QH^a XV, 26, the hymnist, who elsewhere identifies himself as *משכיל*,²⁶⁸ proclaims “You (viz. God) have instructed me in your truth” (*השכלתני באמתכה*).²⁶⁹ In 1QH^a XVIII, 4 the hymnist proclaims that God has taught man²⁷⁰ “wonders like these” (*תשכילנו בנפלאות כאלה*), and in line 7 he asks God the rhetorical question: “How shall I answer unless you instruct me?” (*ואיכה אשיב בלוא השכלתני*). In 1QH^a XIX, 9-10 we read “and your (viz. God’s) compassion to all the sons of your pleasure, for you have taught them the secret of your truth and in your wonderful mysteries you have instructed them” (*ורחמיכה לכול בני רצונכה כי הודעתם*). This appears to refer to God instructing a group of his elect (*בסוד אמתכה וברזי פלאכה השכלתם*).²⁷¹ An important text is 1QH^a XX, 33, which evidences a similar process to that found in 4QInstruction^d 81 + 81a: *ואיכה אבין כיא אם השכלתני*, “and how shall I understand unless you (viz. God) teach me?” The hymnist’s ability to understand (*בין* Hiphil) is preceded by instruction from God (*שכל* Hiphil). This is suggestive of a technical language in which the process of instruction is represented by these two verbs in collocation. By extension, the one instructed could be termed *מבין* (non-causative Hiphil) and the instructor termed *משכיל* (causative Hiphil). In the *Hodayot*, the hymnist himself is a *משכיל*.

In summary, where *שכל* Hiphil is used with a verbal (object) suffix in the Qumran scrolls, the subject is frequently God (cf. Ps 32:8). The occurrences in the *Hodayot* fall into this category. There are several instances where a human (or group of humans) is the subject. The occurrences in *Serekh ha-Yahad* and 1QSa fall into this category. There is one instance where an eschatological figure is the subject. There is no instance where an angel is the subject. Although there are clearly verbal and conceptual connections between the *Hodayot* and 4QInstruction, we are dealing in 4QInstruction^d 81 + 81a 17 with a human

²⁶⁸ 1QH^a XX, 4 (reconstructed; par. 4QH^a 2 + 3 II, 5), 11 (par. 4QH^a 2 + 3 II, 12 [reconstructed]); XXV^{bot}, 10.

²⁶⁹ Cf. 1QH^a XIX, 4: *ותשכילני במעשי פלאכה*, “and you have instructed me in the your wonderful deeds.”

²⁷⁰ *אדם* (1QH^a XVIII, 3).

²⁷¹ This phrase surely refers to the same group as *אנשי רצון* in 4QInstruction^d 81 + 81a 10, where it is in the power of the *מבין* to turn wrath away from the men of pleasure (*ובידכה להשיב אף מאשני רצון*). This phrase may be compared with the Luke 2:14: *ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς εἰρήνη καὶ ἀγαθή*, “upon earth peace among men of pleasure.”

chain of transmission rather than a reference to divine revelation. In terms of *Sitz im Leben*, therefore, the model and language of instruction in the *Statutes for a Maskil* (1QS IX, 12-20par.)²⁷² and 1QSa constitute the closest parallels to 4QInstruction^d 81 + 81a 17. Thus *Serekh ha-Yahad*, 1QSa, and 4QInstruction share both a common language for instruction and a common perception of the social roles of the instructor and pupil. These texts may have emerged from the same community, though it is perfectly reasonable at this stage to suppose that they were written at different points in the evolution of the community, and quite possibly for different groups within the broader movement to which the Qumran sect belonged.

3.1.4. Summary

The phrase עבד משכיל refers to the addressee's attitude to a human superior, recalling Prov 14:35, 17:2; Sir 7:21; 10:25; Matt 24:45 (par. Luke 12:42). There is a more distant connection with Isa 52:13. This phrase does not help to illuminate the issue of the transmission of wisdom; nor does בן משכיל, which recalls Prov 10:5; Sir 47:12, and suggests that the addressee is to some extent modelled on Solomon. משכילכה in 4QInstruction^d 81 + 81a 17 is more helpful: reference is being made to a class of people who have received insight from God and whose role it is to transmit this insight to the addressee. The closest parallels to this are found in 1QS IX, 12-20par. and 1QSa.

3.2. מבין in 4QInstruction

Having clarified the role of the משכיל in 4QInstruction, it is now necessary to clarify the role of the מבין. The addressee in 4QInstruction is generally called מבין, though in 4QInstruction^c 1 II, 10 מבין probably refers to God.²⁷³ Three basic categories of usage for מבין may be discerned:

²⁷² Cf. the title of this section: אלה החוקים למשכיל (1QS IX, 12).

²⁷³ Cf. Strugnell et al., *Qumran Cave 4 XXIV*, 170, 171. God (אל) is mentioned in line 9. The phrase וברצונו היו והוה מבין probably means "and by his will they came into being; and he gives understanding." Thus, as in 1QS III, 13; VI, 15; 1QSa I, 5 בין Hiphil has a causative sense. See Sir 6:37,

1. מִבִּין is the title of the addressee in the phrase וְאַתָּה מִבִּין, “and you, understanding one,” which frequently begins new sections.²⁷⁴
2. When used verbally it indicates the addressee’s act of understanding. It is sometimes difficult to distinguish which of these two categories is meant, though the first is perhaps more frequent.²⁷⁵
3. The plural מִבִּינִים perhaps refers to the group to which the addressee belongs: “those who understand.”

The first two categories will be examined in this section, the third in the next.

In 4QInstruction^b 4 3 (וְאַתָּה מִבִּין שְׂמַחָה בְּנַחֲלַת אֱמֶת), “and you, understanding one, rejoice in the inheritance of truth”), מִבִּין is the addressee’s title and is followed by an imperative, as often in 4QInstruction. A recipient of instruction is מִבִּין. In 4QInstruction^c 1 I, 1 the reading [ו] אַתָּה מִבִּין is uncertain and because there is no context it is difficult to decide whether this means “and you, understanding one” or “and you are understanding.” Lange (“[d]u bist Ratgeb[e]r”)²⁷⁶ adopts the first possibility, whereas Caquot (“tu discernes”)²⁷⁷ adopts the second. 4QInstruction^c 1 I, 13-14 is similarly problematic. Does וְאַתָּה מִבִּין רוּשׁ פְּעֻלָּתְכָה mean “and you, understanding one, inherit²⁷⁸ your reward” or, reading רוּשׁ for רוּשׁ, “and you understand: your work/reward is poor?”²⁷⁹ The editors argue, against Lange, that a consistent understanding of such phrases as vocatives is preferable, since at Qumran a nominal sentence would normally require אַתָּה to follow מִבִּין.²⁸⁰ This

where God causes the mind of the one being instructed to understand: וְהוּא יְבִין לְבָבְךָ, “and he will cause your mind to understand” (cf. Luke 24:45).

²⁷⁴ Strugnell et al., *Qumran Cave 4 XXIV*, 309.

²⁷⁵ Cf. Strugnell et al., *Qumran Cave 4 XXIV*, 156, 391.

²⁷⁶ Lange, *Weisheit*, 52.

²⁷⁷ Caquot, “Textes,” 17.

²⁷⁸ Assuming רוּשׁ to be a unique *u*-form of the imperative of יָרַשׁ (Strugnell et al., *Qumran Cave 4 XXIV*, 161-162).

²⁷⁹ Cf. Lange, *Weisheit*, 53.

²⁸⁰ Strugnell et al., *Qumran Cave 4 XXIV*, 161, 483. The order מִבִּין אַתָּה, “you are understanding” occurs in 4QInstruction^e 7 2 (and possibly 7 3), where it is analogous to אַבְיוֹן אַתָּה, “you are poor” (4QInstruction^a 6 2; 4QInstruction^b 2 III, 8 [par. 4QInstruction^d 9,9a-c 6-7], 12 [par. 4QInstruction^d 9,9a-c 13 (reconstructed)]). See also אַל תֹּאמַר רָשׁ אֲנִי, “do not say ‘I am poor’” (4QInstruction^b 2 III, 12 [par.

approach has the advantage of adopting a consistent interpretation of a consistent formula in 4QInstruction, though it does require an explanation of רוש as a previously unattested imperative. However, a meaning where the מבין is to inherit his reward would fit in well with the rest of 4QInstruction.

4QInstruction^c 1 I, 18 also raises difficulties. Lange translates ואתה בן מבין הבט ברו נהיה “[u]nd du, der du der Schüler eines Lehrers bist, betrachte das Geheimnis des Werdens.”²⁸¹ This translation understands בן מבין on analogy with the phrases בְּנֵי הַנְּבִיאִים²⁸² and בְּנֵי-חֲכָמִים²⁸³ in the HB. For Lange, 4QInstruction^c 1 I, 18 demonstrates that מבין can indicate an office in this text, in this case a “teacher.”²⁸⁴ According to Lange, מבין in 4QInstruction indicates an institutionalised teacher or advisory figure, who is in charge of the capability to understand and teach revealed knowledge.²⁸⁵ This interpretation of בן מבין is problematic. Given that בן משכיל in line 25 is grammatically analogous, and that בִּין Hiphil and שָׁל Hiphil are often synonymous, would it not be better to see the two phrases as parallel? Thus lines 18 and 25 include exhortations addressed to the same figure, a “son” who understands. There is, then, no practical difference between מבין and בן מבין. A similar situation obtains in Ps 72:1, where בְּנֵי-מֶלֶךְ and מֶלֶךְ are parallel. Perhaps royal descent is implied by בְּנֵי-מֶלֶךְ, but on the level of the text they are synonymous.

4QInstruction^c 1 I helps to expand our understanding of sapiential language in this work, since מבין is the subject of several verbs. The following, which fall within the semantic field of understanding (broadly defined), occur in the 2nd masc. sing. imperative: בִּין Hiphil, “understand” (line 20 [reconstructed]); בִּין Hithpolel, “understand” (lines 12 and 25); דַּרַּשׁ Qal, “investigate” (line 6); הִגֵּה Qal, “meditate” (line 6); יָדַע Qal, “know” (lines 18 and 22); נָבַט Niphal, “ponder” (lines 2,

4QInstruction^d 9,9a-c 13]), רַשׁ אַתָּה, “you are poor” (4QInstruction^b 2 III, 19), and רַשׁ הוּא “he is poor” (4QInstruction^d 249 3).

²⁸¹ Lange, *Weisheit*, 53.

²⁸² 1 Kgs 20:35; 2 Kgs 2:3, 5, 7, 15; 4:1, 38 (2t); 5:22; 6:1; 9:1.

²⁸³ Isa 19:11.

²⁸⁴ Lange, *Weisheit*, 56.

²⁸⁵ Lange, *Weisheit*, 56-57: “בִּין bezeichnet somit in 4QSap A eine institutionalisierte Lehrer- bzw. Ratgeberpersönlichkeit, die über die Fähigkeit verfügt, offenbartes Wissen zu verstehen und zu lehren.”

3 and 18); שחר Piel, “seek diligently” (line 12); שכל Hiphil, “understand” (line 2).²⁸⁶ The following occurs in the 2nd masc. sing. imperfect: ידע Qal, “know” (lines 6, 8 and 13). Within this group, שכל, ידע, and בין are already familiar.

ואתה מבין appears again in 4QInstruction^d 81 +81a 15: ומשכילכה “and you, who understands, if he has given you dominion over manual skill”²⁸⁷ (or less likely: “and you, understand whether he has given you dominion over manual skill”). The editors take חכמת ידים to mean “artisanship,”²⁸⁸ because in Sir 9:17 חכמי ידים refers to artisans. They thus read this text as referring to God elevating the sage above manual labour.²⁸⁹ The important point is that מבין occurs in close proximity to משכילכה. The מבין is subordinate to those called משכיל: it is from them that the מבין will increase understanding. He is to understand, being the subject of התבונן (line 17). God has “opened insight” for him (line 9: [פ]תח לכה). Thus the מבין receives שכל as a gift from God, is to seek understanding, and is to be instructed by those called משכיל. Insight belongs with God and is revealed by him to an instructor, called משכיל, who imparts teaching to a pupil, called מבין.

In 4QInstruction^d 123 II, 5 we read אתה מבין בהביטכה בכול אלה, “you, understanding one, when you ponder all these things.” The editors suggest this forms the conclusion to a paraenetic section. If so, כול אלה refers to what precedes, and the infinitive construct Hiphil of נבט refers to the action of the מבין: he is to “ponder.” Second Timothy 2:7 offers an interesting parallel:

²⁸⁶ Reconstructed: cf. 4QInstruction^d 43,44,45 I, 1.

²⁸⁷ Cf. Caquot, “Textes,” 23.

²⁸⁸ Cf. Caquot, “Textes,” 23; García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *DSSSE* 2:873. Edward Cook offers the strange translation “he has made you rule over the skill of his hands” (Wise, Abegg, and Cook, *DSSNT*, 387). ידים has no pronominal suffix, and it would be strange to think of ruling over God’s hands.

²⁸⁹ Strugnell et al., *Qumran Cave 4 XXIV*, 309. This recalls wisdom texts which deride manual labour in favour of intellectual insight. See Sir 38:24-39:11 and the Egyptian Instruction of Duauf (*ANET*, 432-434). The phrase בחכמת ידיכה, “by your manual skill” occurs in 4QInstruction^d 81 + 81a 19, and the phrase מיד כול חכמת ידיכה, “by means of all your manual skill” in 4QInstruction^d 102a + b 3. The latter follows the phrase מבין באמת [ואתה], “[and you] who understand truth.” This could be a variation on the familiar introductory formula, the understanding addressee now receiving the appellation “one who understands truth.”

1. Νόει is comparable with הבטכה because both refer to pondering what has been taught. Νοέω does not translate נבט Hiphil in the LXX, but it does translate בין Qal, Hiphil, and Hithpolel, and שכל Hiphil.²⁹⁰ Given the breadth of sapiential vocabulary used in 4QInstruction it is not difficult to see νοέω and נבט Hiphil as comparable.
2. Reference is made in both texts to what is taught: $\delta \lambdaέγω$ in 2 Tim 2:7, כול אלה in 4QInstruction^d 123 II, 5.
3. Both 2 Tim 2:7 and 4QInstruction understand insight as a gift from God.
4. In both the addressee is to receive insight: Timothy in 2 Timothy, the מבין in 4QInstruction.
5. Both bear witness to a social relationship involving a teacher (Paul and the speaker in 4QInstruction, probably a משכיל) and a pupil (Timothy and the מבין).

It would be inappropriate to posit a direct relationship between these texts; rather, both 4QInstruction and 2 Timothy owe their system of thought, at least in part, to the Jewish wisdom tradition of the Second Temple period.

In 4QInstruction^d 158 4 מבין במעשיכה presumably means “[you] understand your deeds,” unless another verb of intellection followed במעשיכה . However, the frequency with which בין Hiphil is followed by ב suggests the former.²⁹¹ Fragment 158 clearly reflects wisdom concerns, as שכל (line 6) makes clear. In 4QInstruction^d 168 4, it seems certain that אתה מבין should be read, but the context is fragmentary.²⁹² In 4QInstruction^d 176 3 we encounter the peculiar phrase $\text{תה מבין בהוות מדהבה}$ [א]. Since no imperative is preserved it must be assumed that מבין is either imperatival or the equivalent of the present tense (“you understand”). The editors translate “O th]ou who hast understanding of the calamities of *tax-collection* (?),” following Symmachus’ and Theodotion’s renderings of מדהבה in Isa 14:4.²⁹³

²⁹⁰ Hatch-Redpath 946a.

²⁹¹ Cf. Strugnell et al., *Qumran Cave 4 XXIV*, 381-382.

²⁹² 4QInstruction^d 227 1; 273 1 are similarly fragmentary.

²⁹³ Strugnell et al., *Qumran Cave 4 XXIV*, 400.

In summary, **מבין** in 4QInstruction is a *terminus technicus* for the recipient of instruction. Similarly, the *terminus technicus* for the instructor is **משכיל**. **מבין** always, *pace* Lange, refers to the recipient of instruction. 4QInstruction uses several terms within the semantic field of understanding, thus deepening our knowledge of the language of late Second Temple Jewish wisdom. The **מבין** receives insight from God, which connects this text with 4Q380 and 4Q381. 4QInstruction implies a social context in which a **משכיל** instructs a **מבין** in material previously revealed to the **משכיל**, recalling 2 Tim 2:7. Our quest to understand the revelation and transmission of wisdom at Qumran must thus consider sociological as well as linguistic factors: 4QInstruction derives from a real context in which the revelation and transmission of wisdom were of fundamental importance.

3.3. **מבינים** in 4QInstruction and related texts

The plural of **מבין** also occurs in 4QInstruction,²⁹⁴ and must now be examined.

In reference to 4QInstruction^d 123 II, 4 the editors note “[**מבינים**] may denote either a loose category or a group strictly defined sociologically,”²⁹⁵ and remark tentatively in reference to 4QInstruction^d 221 3 that “the occurrences of **מבינים** in 4Q415ff. seem disproportionately frequent in comparison with those in the 1-11Q texts.”²⁹⁶ Elsewhere in the Qumran scrolls, the plural occurs in 1QH^a X, 18, where the hymnist claims, referring obliquely to himself, that “You (viz. God) have put into his heart to open a fountain of knowledge to all those who understand” (**שמחה בלבבו לפתוח מקור דעת לכול מבינים**). The hymnist elsewhere claims to be a **משכיל** (1QH^a XX, 4 (reconstructed; par. 4QH^a 2 + 3 II, 5), 11 (par. 4QH^a 2 + 3 II, 12 [reconstructed]); XXV^{bot}, 10). We have here, then, the idea of a **משכיל** imparting knowledge to a group of **מבינים**. It may be suggested that behind the *Hodayot* and 4QInstruction there existed a social context in which a **משכיל**, one of a class of **משכילים**,²⁹⁷ would instruct a **מבין**, one of a group of **מבינים**.

²⁹⁴ 4QInstruction^a 11 5; 4QInstruction^b 1 16 (par. 4QInstruction^d 2,2a-c 8); 4QInstruction^d 123 II, 4; 221 3.

²⁹⁵ Strugnell et al., *Qumran Cave 4 XXIV*, 348.

²⁹⁶ Strugnell et al., *Qumran Cave 4 XXIV*, 436.

²⁹⁷ Cf. Charlesworth and Strawn, “Reflections,” 413 n. 45.

Another important, though fragmentary text is 4QMeditation on Creation A 1, which begins with the exhortation מְבִינִים שִׁמְעוּ, “understanding ones, hear!” This recalls the following exhortations: CD I, 1; II, 14; 4QCrypt A I, 1-4; III, 3-10; 4QBéat 2 II + 3 12; 10 3; 13 6; 24 II, 2. Indeed, 4QBéat is at least partly addressed to a מְבִין.²⁹⁸

In the HB מְבִינִים is unique to the post-exilic books. In 2 Chr 35:3 (Qr) we read about the Levites “who had understanding for²⁹⁹ all Israel, who were sacred to YHWH” (הַמְבִינִים לְכָל־יִשְׂרָאֵל הַקְדוּשִׁים לַיהוָה). Here those described as מְבִינִים are an inner group within the wider community of Israel. Their understanding is, in part, what sets them apart from the wider community. The preposition ל might suggest that the participle is an indicator of the accusative, particularly since ל as indicator of the determinate object is common to the Chronicler.³⁰⁰ Thus not only would their understanding set them apart, but their role as teachers also. Joseph Blenkinsopp takes the Hiphil participle of בִּין in the Chronicler’s history to indicate a person with a special skill, and specifically someone who teaches others.³⁰¹ This is his interpretation of מְבִינִים in Ezr 8:16 and is clearly the correct interpretation of Neh 8:7, 9, where the Levites cause the people to understand the law. In Neh 8:7, 9 we have a causative sense for בִּין Hiphil, though that is not the case in Neh 8:8: וַיִּבְיִנוּ בְּמִקְרָא, “and they understood the reading.” A causative sense is less obvious in Neh 8:3, where הַמְבִינִים simply appears to mean “those who could understand (the law).” Finally, Daniel and his companions are מְבִינֵי מְדָע, “understanding all knowledge” in Dan 1:4. What is common to all these texts is that the possession of understanding, which may qualify a person to teach others, sets people apart.

The use of מְבִינִים to describe a group is clearly a post-exilic development. Whether the references in the Qumran scrolls are deliberately meant to echo references to the Levites in the Chronicler’s work cannot be conclusively determined, nor is it certain whether Daniel

²⁹⁸ 4QBéat 14 II, 18: ועתה מְבִין שִׁמְעָה לִי וְשִׁים לִבְכָּה לִי, “and now, understanding one, listen to me and set your heart to”

²⁹⁹ Cf. NJB. The preposition is thus understood as a kind of *dativus commodi*.

³⁰⁰ Joüon, §125k. Cf. Japhet, *I & II Chronicles*, 1038: “And he said to the Levites who taught all Israel”; see also NRSV.

³⁰¹ Joseph Blenkinsopp, *Ezra-Nehemiah: A Commentary* (OTL; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1988), 165.

and his companions are in mind. It is also unclear whether *מבין* in the Qumran scrolls is regularly causative. What is clear is that in the Qumran scrolls, a social setting is reflected whereby a *משכיל*, a recipient of divine revelation and one of a class of *משכילים*, instructs a *מבין* or a group of *מבינים*. The language used recalls the book of Daniel. It may be that the Qumran scrolls developed within the same broad community as Daniel, using language in a similar way and reflecting similar concepts. This is likely since in both Daniel and the Qumran scrolls the semantic field of understanding is used with a sociological nuance: it is used to define the insider group and its teachers.

3.4. Summary

Sapiential language abounds in 4QInstruction, and this work also assumes that wisdom is revealed by God. This idea is shared with 4Q380 and 4Q381. Wisdom is passed on by a *משכיל* in a chain of transmission. He gives instruction to a pupil, called *מבין*. Behind the use of *משכיל* lie several passages in the Hebrew wisdom tradition, especially texts relating to Solomon. On the basis of similarities between 4QInstruction and sectarian works, the likeliest *Sitz im Leben* is that which lies behind the *Serekh* and the *Hodayot*. The *מבין* owes his designation to his membership of a group called *מבינים*. *מבינים* defines this group sociologically, as in Daniel, 2 Chronicles, and Ezra-Nehemiah.

4. *Serekh ha-Yahad*

Having demonstrated that in 4QInstruction there is evidence of a social context in which a *משכיל* passed on revealed insight to a *מבין*, and having suggested that the closest parallel is to be found in *Serekh ha-Yahad* and 1QSa, a study of the instruction process attested in the extant mss of the *Serekh* is essential.

4.1. **בִּין** in *Serekh ha-Yahad*

Some of the relevant occurrences of **שָׁכַל** Hiphil in *Serekh ha-Yahad* have already been mentioned,³⁰² so a separate analysis of them is unnecessary, though it is worth summarising the evidence. In 1QS IV, 22 it is God who will instruct. The occurrences in 1QS IX, 18, 20; XI, 1 refer to the **מִשְׁכִּיל**'s act of instruction: he is to transmit insight, which he has received from God, to others in the community. In 1QS XI, 19 **שָׁכַל** Hiphil is not causative and does not illuminate the question of transmission directly. In this section, then, we shall focus on texts which include **בִּין**.

4.1.1. 1QS III, 13

The Hiphil infinitive construct **לְהִבִּין**, “to understand,” occurs in the rubric to the *Teaching on the Two Spirits* (1QS III, 13-IV, 26),³⁰³ where it indicates part of the **מִשְׁכִּיל**'s role. It is parallel with the Piel infinitive construct **לְלַמֵּד**, “to teach.” Since **לְלַמֵּד** is causative **לְהִבִּין** is probably causative also. In 1QS IX, 13 the **מִשְׁכִּיל** is the subject of the Qal infinitive construct of **לָמַד**, “to learn.” **לָמַד** Qal (1QS IX, 13) and **לָמַד** Piel (1QS III, 13) represent a process of learning and teaching: 1QS III, 13 presupposes that the **מִשְׁכִּיל** has previously acquired insight. The idea is that the **מִשְׁכִּיל** will learn all the insight (**הַשְׁכָּל**) found according to the times (1QS IX, 13) and then teach all the sons of light (1QS III, 13). This is a complementary use of different stems of the same root to represent the transmission of insight.

The object of both infinitives in 1QS III, 13 is **כּוֹל בְּנֵי אֹר**, “all sons of light.” The parallelism of the two verbs, recalling Isa 40:14,³⁰⁴ suggests they are synonymous. The **מִשְׁכִּיל** is

³⁰² See §3.1.3 above.

³⁰³ Cf. 4QpapS^c 5.

³⁰⁴ **בִּין** Hiphil and **לָמַד** Piel are synonymous here (cf. *DCH* 4:550). The other references listed in the *Dictionary of Classical Hebrew* for **ב** + **לָמַד** Piel are Qumran texts: 1QS III, 13; 1QSa I, 7; 4QS^z I, 5. The occurrence of **שָׁכַל** Hiphil in 1QSa I, 7, probably parallel with **לָמַד** Piel, confirms that in QH **לָמַד** Piel, **בִּין** Hiphil, and **שָׁכַל** Hiphil are synonymous. In 1QSa I, 7, Jacob Licht reads **יִשְׁכִּילֵהוּ** (3rd masc. sing.) rather than **יִשְׁכִּילוּהוּ** (3rd masc. pl.) to preserve the parallel with the reconstructed **יִלְמְדֵהוּ** earlier in the line, and explains the absence of an indication of the subject of these verbs on the basis that verbs

the subject of both, and they refer to what follows in 1QS III, 15-IV, 26, a passage whose genre is defined in 1QS III, 13-15a.³⁰⁵ The **משכיל** is bound up with the ideas of acquiring and imparting understanding. Eugene Roop suggests that the **משכיל** acquired his title because he possessed **שכל**, “insight,”³⁰⁶ but the reason is slightly more complex. In 1QS IX, 13, 20 the title is justified because the **משכיל** stands at the centre of a chain of transmission. He has learned **שכל**, possibly through the **מדרש תורה** procedure³⁰⁷ or directly from God (cf. 1QS IV, 22) and passed it on. The term **משכיל** contains the ideas both of receiving insight and of transmitting it to others. The term in 1QS III, 13 is more closely linked with **שכל** in 1QS IX, 13 than with **משכיל** in 1QS IX, 12, since 1QS IX, 13 tells us that the **משכיל** is qualified to teach on the basis of the fact that he has first learned. The fact that the **משכיל** has acquired insight qualifies him to transmit the doctrines of 1QS III, 13-IV, 26. All three occurrences of **שכל** are interconnected.³⁰⁸

The **משכיל** stands at the centre of a process of transmission: he receives insight and transmits it to others. His qualification for passing on insight is the fact that he has first acquired it, and his title derives from his role in this process of transmission.

4.1.2. 1QS IV, 22

1QS IV, 22 connects this section (1QS IV, 15-26) of the *Teaching on the Two Spirits* with the rubric. Here, the Hiphil infinitives **להבין** and **להשכיל** are parallel. The subject of both is God (1QS IV, 18, 20) though the spirit of truth (1QS IV, 21) may be his agent. **הבין** is followed by two objects: **ישרים** (“upright ones”) and **דעת עליון** (“knowledge of the Most High”). **השכיל** also has two objects: **תמימי דרך** (“the perfect of way”) parallel with **ישרים**; and **חכמת בני שמים** (“the wisdom of the sons of heaven”) parallel with **דעת עליון**.

with indefinite subject are not infrequent in *Serekh ha-Yahad* (מגילת הסרכים ממגילות מדבר יהודה) [Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1965], 41, 256).

³⁰⁵ Eugene F. Roop, “A Form-Critical Study of the Society Rule (1QS) at Qumran” (Ph.D. diss., The Claremont Graduate School, 1972), 127-130. Roop understands 1QS III, 14-15a to be a “[s]ummary of contents” (“Form-Critical Study,” 127).

³⁰⁶ Roop, “Form-Critical Study,” 259; cf. Nötscher, *Terminologie*, 56.

³⁰⁷ This complex issue is explored in detail below: §4.2.2.

³⁰⁸ Cf. Sarianna Metso, *The Textual Development of the Qumran Community Rule* (STDJ 21; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 137.

1QS IV, 22 demonstrates that the *משכיל* participates in a divine activity: *השכיל* and *הבין* refer to activities which originate with God, which means that the *משכיל*, by virtue of his title and the fact that he is the subject of *הבין* in 1QS III, 13, participates in the divine giving of insight. He is God's human intermediary, transmitting insight originating with God. Since the *משכיל* is to learn insight in 1QS IX, 13, 1QS IV, 22 implicitly identifies the *משכיל* with those receiving insight. The *משכיל* is thus one of the *ישרים* and one of the *תמימי דרך*. *כול בני אור*, *ישרים*, and *תמימי דרך* all refer to the same group. Within this group, the *משכיל* is the instrument of God's activity. *עליון* and *בני שמים* link the wisdom and knowledge mentioned in this line with heavenly beings, placing the *משכיל* in a chain of revelation of heavenly wisdom.

This recalls the use of *משכיל* in Daniel. The angel Gabriel commands Daniel to understand in Dan 8:17 and Daniel is described as *משכיל* in Dan 1:4. He acquires *שכל* from God in Dan 1:17. He is *משכיל* because he possesses insight (*שכל*) into heavenly secrets. The implication in Dan 11:33 is that the *משכילים* also have insight into heavenly secrets after the pattern of Daniel. This gives them authority to "give understanding to the many" (*יבינו לרבים*). For Alfred Mertens, instruction is the particular function of the *משכילים* in Daniel and is a clear point of connection between them and the *משכיל* of the *Serekh*.³⁰⁹ If the Qumran *משכילים* also sought to follow the pattern of Daniel, identifying themselves with the *משכילים* of Dan 11:33-35; 12:3, 10 we might have a good reason why a "Daniel cycle" was preserved at Qumran.³¹⁰ Alternatively, both the Qumran scrolls and Daniel may reflect common social relationships and a common language to describe them.

1QS IV, 22 suggests that the *משכיל* is a member of the group referred to as "the upright ones" and "the perfect of the way." He is God's intermediary among them, transmitting the insight he has previously received from God. The closest parallel to this is

³⁰⁹ Mertens, *Daniel*, 63. For Mertens, the difference between the *משכילים* of Daniel and the *משכיל* of Qumran lies in the fact that what originated as a separate, free initiative during the Maccabean struggle in the course of time and above all within the Qumran community became institutionalised to a certain extent (*Daniel*, 64).

³¹⁰ Cf. Peter W. Flint, "The Daniel Tradition at Qumran," in *Eschatology, Messianism and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. C. A. Evans and P. W. Flint; SDSSRL 1; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1997), 60.

in Daniel, making a direct or indirect connection between Daniel and Qumran at this point the logical conclusion.

4.1.3. 1QS VI, 15

1QS VI, 15 raises the issue of the relationship between the פקיד, “one who is in charge” and the משכיל in the *Serekh*. In 1QS VI, 14, the subject of יבינהו, “he shall instruct him” is האיש הפקיד בראש הרבים, “the one in charge at the head of the many.” The object is כול המתנדב מישראל, “everyone from Israel who devotes himself” (1QS VI, 14). The פקיד has the same role as the משכיל in 1QS III, 13: to instruct. The content of the instruction is כול משפטי היחד, “all the rulings of the community,”³¹¹ though whether these rulings are synonymous with דעת עליון in 1QS IV, 22 or תולדות כול בני איש, “the generations of all the sons of man” is doubtful. It is more likely that כול משפטי היחד refers to specific rulings of the community and תולדות כול בני איש refers only to the *Teaching on the Two Spirits*. דעת עליון may refer generally to heavenly knowledge, of which both the rulings of the community and the *Teaching on the Two Spirits* are manifestations.

1QS VI, 13³¹² is linked with the משכיל, since the Hithpael participle of נדב appears in a משכיל text, 4QS^d I, 1 (par. 1QS V, 1). Further, the root שוב appears in both 1QS V, 1 and 1QS VI, 15. 4QS^b IX and 4QS^d are related to 1QS VI, 13b-16b, since they contain material addressed to the משכיל. Given that the פקיד of 1QS VI, 14 and the משכיל of 1QS III, 13 have basically the same role, we might suggest that a משכיל is called פקיד in 1QS VI, 14.³¹³ Perhaps the פקיד would be one of a class of משכילים³¹⁴ taught in the community and now proficient to impart the teaching in a chain of transmission. Maybe, then, למשכיל in rubrics at Qumran should be pointed לַמְשָׁכִיל, “for a Maskil” rather than לַמְשָׁכִיל, “for the Maskil.”

³¹¹ Cf. 1QSa I, 7-8.

³¹² Par. 4QS^b XI, 8 (reconstructed).

³¹³ Cf. Vermes, *CDSSE*, 29.

³¹⁴ See further below, §5.2.5.

The process of instruction in 1QS VI, 15, represented by **בין** Hiphil, is parallel to that in 1QS III, 13, suggesting that the one who instructs in 1QS VI, 15, the **פקיד**, is an official in the community, one of a class of **משכילים**, charged with the instruction of new members. This identification is supported by the fact that a text containing community rulings (4QS^d) is addressed to (or designated as belonging to" or "for the use of") a **משכיל**. There is no mention in 1QS VI, 15 of a heavenly origin for the teachings transmitted, however: it is simply that one who is already steeped in "all the rulings of the community" transmits them within a fixed social setting.

4.1.4. 1QS XI, 19

1QS XI, 19 helps to determine the semantic field to which **בין** belongs since **בין** Hithpoel occurs in parallel with two other roots. Corrado Martone sets out the text in poetic form, so that the parallelism between **להשכיל**, "to have insight," **להביט**, "to contemplate," and **להתבונן**, "to understand" becomes clear.³¹⁵ He translates both **להשכיל** and **להתבונן** "per comprendere."³¹⁶ Although **להשכיל** in 1QS IV, 22 should be understood as "to give insight," the same form occurs parallel with the intransitive Hithpoel of **בין**, meaning "to understand" in 1QS XI, 19. **שכל** Hiphil may be used with different nuances (i.e. causative and non-causative) in the *Serekh*.

Three parallel phrases occur as objects of these infinitives: (1) **כול מחשבת קודשכה**: "every holy design of yours"; (2) **עומק רזיכה**, "the depth of your mysteries"; (3) **נבט, שכל, כול נפלאותיכה עם כוח גבורתכה**, "all your wonders, with your mighty strength." **שכל**, **נבט**, and **בין** are thus linked with the perception of God's thoughts, mysteries, and wonders. Whilst perception as a real possibility is denied, a concept of the perception of the workings of the divine is present. This text shows us that these three roots are linked with the language of divine thought (**מחשבה**), divine mysteries (**עומק רזיכה**), and displays of divine activity (**כוח גבורתכה**, **נפלאותכה**).

³¹⁵ Corrado Martone, *La "Regola della Comunità": Edizione critica* (QdH 8; Turin: Silvio Zamorani, 1995), 114.

³¹⁶ Martone, "Regola della Comunità", 136.

נבט is itself an important sapiential root at Qumran, most occurrences being in the *Hodayot* and other sapiential texts, including 4QInstruction.³¹⁷ In the *Hodayot* there is a process in which God's revelation precedes human contemplation and understanding, which in turn is a prerequisite for teaching.³¹⁸ In the *Serekh*, נבט occurs in 1QS III, 3, 7 (par. 4QpapSc III, 5, 10 [reconstructed]) and three times in the final hymn (1QS XI, 3, 6, 19). In 1QS III, 7 contemplating the light of life results from the atonement of sin. Unatoned sins render contemplation impossible. This recalls 1QS XI, 19, where the sinful hymnist complains that no-one except God can contemplate the depth of his mysteries. The link between atonement and the opposition between purity and impurity is expounded in 1QS XI, 14-15 (cf. 1QH^a XIX, 10). In 1QS III, 3, one who does not enter the community has a polarised perception of the cosmos: instead of contemplating the light of life, "he contemplates darkness as ways of light" (חושך יביט לדרכי אור), and he is proclaimed unclean (טמא) in 1QS III, 5. Whoever achieves a state which allows him to contemplate the light of life is pure, as confirmed by the repetition of טהר Hithpael in lines 4, 5, 7 and 8.

The thought of 1QS III, 3, 7 is presupposed in 1QS XI, 3, 6. A משכיל is speaking, because the hymn is added to the *Statutes for a Maskil* (1QS IX, 12-21) and the phrase להשכיל רוגנים בלקח, "to teach murmurers instruction" recalls 1QS IX, 18, 21 in its use of שכל Hiphil. The collocation of שכל Hiphil and לקח links this text with 4QInstruction^d 81 + 81a 17,

³¹⁷ Contemplation is at the heart of the מבין's role in 4QInstruction. The root נבט occurs in the following texts: 4QInstruction^b 2 I, 5 (par. 4QInstruction^c 2 I, 10 [reconstructed]); 4QInstruction^b 2 III, 14-15 (par. 4QInstruction^d 9 + 9a-c 15-16); 4QInstruction^c 1 I, 2, 3, 18; 4QInstruction^d 123 II, 5. See also: 4QcryptA 1-2 I, 5 (part of a text preserving a משכיל's message: 4QcryptA 1-2 I, 1); 3-4 II, 10 (here נבט Hiphil and בין Hiphil are parallel); 4QMyst^b 1 II, 1-3; 4QBéat 5 13.

³¹⁸ 1QH^a IV, 27; XII, 11; XVIII, 2-3 (נבט Hiphil and בין Hithpoel are parallel), 20-21 (the Hiphil imperatives הביטי and הביני are parallel); XIX, 10, 17; XXI, 4; XXIV^{bot}, 8. The themes of light and revelation appear in 1QH^a XII, linking this text with 1QS XI. There is a sequence in 1QH^a XVIII, 20-21. The hymnist's contemplation of the glory of God prompts him to recount (ספר Piel) God's wonders. Recounting the wonders of God is results from contemplation, but is also part of the pedagogic process. In 1QH^a XIX, 10, שכל Hiphil has רזי פלאכה as its object (preceded by כ), employing language of mystery in common with 1QS XI, 19. Indeed, שכל has the same function as נבט in 1QS XI, 3: in both רז is the object of a sapiential verb. In 1QH^a XIX, 17 another sequence or process may be discerned: God's revelation (גלה Qal) to the hymnist precedes the hymnist's contemplation (נבט Hiphil), which precedes the hymnist's knowing (ידע Qal). In 1QH^a XXIV^{bot} the idea of revealing mysteries (רזיכה גליחה) occurs in line 5, and the phrase כול מביט in line 8. Is מביט analogous to מבין in 4QInstruction?

and may reinforce the connection between 4QInstruction and the *Serekh*, specifically the relationship between the מַשְׁכִּיל and his subordinates. Contemplation is something the hymnist's eyes (עֵינַי) do; it is preceded by revelation from God, using the language of opening.³¹⁹

1QS XI, 19, then offers a different angle on the transmission process at Qumran. First, this text contributes to our knowledge of the semantic field of understanding, as does 4QInstruction^c 1 I:³²⁰ parallelism implies בִּין Hithpoel and שָׁכַל Hiphil (non-causative) are virtually synonymous with נִבֵּט Hiphil. Second, this semantic field is connected with language relating to “mysteries,” and the thoughts and wonderful deeds of God. Third, when 1QS XI, 1, 3, 6, 19 are read together, alongside the *Hodayot*, it seems that almost mystical contemplation occupies the figure whose role it is to instruct: God acts and reveals, the human ponders, and then instructs.

4.1.5. Summary

It is wise to take stock before proceeding. The non-sectarian 4Q380 and 4Q381 use specific sapiential terms to represent the revelation and transmission of heavenly insight. These texts and the language they use seem to have influenced those who wrote other texts from Qumran, including 4QInstruction, *Serekh ha-Yahad*, and the *Hodayot*. 4QInstruction is replete with sapiential language, and uses this to represent the revelation and transmission

³¹⁹ Cf. Helmer Ringgren, “מִמְקוֹר נִבֵּט,” *ThWAT* 5:139. Line 3 reads מִמְקוֹר דַּעְתּוֹ פָּתַח אֹרֹן, “from the fountain of his knowledge he has opened his light.” The phrase אֹרֶת לִבִּי, “the light of my heart” also appears. Mystery language is linked with contemplation here, as in line 19. The phrase רִזְנָהּ recalls 4QInstruction, and mystery language also recalls Daniel and 1Q/4QMysteries. In line 5, מִמְקוֹר צְדָקָתוֹ מִמְשַׁפֵּי, “my justice is from the fountain of his righteousness,” is linked to lines 3-4 through the theme of revelation, which also precedes understanding and contemplation in 1QS XI, 19. Line 6 recalls line 3 in that עֵינַי is the subject of הִבִּיטָהּ. הִיָּה also links lines 4 and 6 (assuming נָהִיָּה and הִוִּיָּה belong to the same root). הִוִּיָּה אֵלֶּם and רִזְנָהּ are identical conceptually. The phrase which follows links the concept these phrases represent with hidden wisdom (תּוֹשִׁיָּה אֲשֶׁר נִסְתָּרָה), a prominent theme in the Mysteries texts. Wisdom is hidden from humans, but revealed to those God has chosen. This recalls the thought of the *Teaching on the Two Spirits* and the *Statutes for a Maskil*. In 1QS IV, 22, those God has chosen are to be instructed (שָׁכַל Hiphil and בִּין Hiphil), and this group are surely those called בּוֹחֲרֵי דֶרֶךְ in 1QS IX, 17, who again are to be instructed by a מַשְׁכִּיל. In 1QS IX, 17 the בּוֹחֲרֵי דֶרֶךְ are contrasted with אֲנָשֵׁי הָעוֹלָם, “the men of injustice,” from whom the מַשְׁכִּיל is to hide (סָתַר) the counsel of the law.

³²⁰ See §3.2 above.

of insight as well as the general activity of the pupil being addressed. A social setting is assumed in which an instructor (משכיל) transmits teaching to a pupil (תלמיד). This model is similar to that found in *Serekh ha-Yahad*. Here, wisdom belongs in heaven and is revealed by God to his elect (1QS IV, 22). The agent through whom instruction is transmitted is the משכיל (1QS III, 13; IX, 12, 18, 20, 21; XI, 1). The משכיל seems to be one of a class of משכילים, perhaps either modelled on, or directly connected with the group of the same appellation in Daniel. Among this group was an official called פקיד, whose role it was to instruct novices in “all the rulings of the community” (1QS VI, 15). Finally, the משכיל was occupied with contemplating God’s mysteries and designs. Following the revelatory act of God, this figure contemplated God’s mysteries and designs and instructed members of the community. A pattern emerges from these texts: revealed wisdom is transmitted through a משכיל. Further attention must be paid to this figure. Our focus shifts to the recently published 4Q manuscripts of the *Serekh*, two of which contain rubrics including the phrase למשכיל.

4.2. מדרש למשכיל in 4QS^b IX, 1 and 4QS^d I, 1

4QS^b and 4QS^d have identical rubrics, which include the phrase מדרש למשכיל. Both date palaeographically to the period 30-1 B.C.E.,³²¹ and are assigned by Sarianna Metso to her recension B.³²² מדרש למשכיל is part of the opening rubric of 4QS^d, and even in 4QS^b IX, 1 מדרש למשכיל is clearly a new departure. Roop regards rubrics in 1QS which include the phrase למשכיל (including 1QS I, 1) as the major structural seams in the document.³²³

1QS I, 1; III, 13; IX, 12 thus constitute the major seams, leading to Roop’s designation of

³²¹ Alexander and Vermes, *Qumran Cave 4 XIX*, 45, 89-90.

³²² See the table in Metso, *Textual Development*, 147. Metso’s recension B has three characteristics: (1) a shorter version of 1QS V-IX; (2) the inclusion of a loose parallel to 1QS VIII, 15b-IX, 11; (3) the inclusion of a final psalm (=1QS X-XI) in place of 4QOtot. Metso argues that in the earliest stage, a parallel to 1QS I-IV was absent, as in 4QS^d, whereas at a later stage it was combined with the parallel to 1QS V-XI, as in 4QS^b. However, it is also possible that 4QS^b and 4QS^d served different purposes. Metso (*Textual Development*, 143-149) offers a thorough account of what she perceives to have been the redaction history of *Serekh ha-Yahad*, a proper discussion of which is beyond the scope of the present study. Milik originally dated 4QS^b to the period 50-25 B.C.E. (“Numérotation des Feuilles des Rouleaux dans le Scriptorium de Qumrân,” *Sem* 27 [1977]: 78).

³²³ Roop, “Form-Critical Study,” 48-49.

1QS as “Instructions for the Instructor.”³²⁴ Without referring to Roop, Philip Alexander and Geza Vermes draw a similar conclusion, taking 1QS as “a manual to guide the Maskil in his duties as the spiritual head of the Community.”³²⁵

In both 4QS^b and 4QS^d the term **משכיל** is undamaged,³²⁶ unlike 1QS I, 1, though **למשכיל** is commonly accepted as the correct reconstruction of 1QS I, 1.³²⁷ Thus 4QS^b and 4QS^d are **משכיל** texts, linked with a figure whose role in the transmission of wisdom has been discussed. Furthermore, there is a link between **שכל** and **דרש** in 1QS VI, 14-15:³²⁸ in 1QS VI both people and judgements are the focus of **דרש**, and the assessment of insight (**שכל**) falls within the sphere of **דרש**. If the **פקיד** is the one who investigates, there is a link between **שכל** and **דרש**, since the **פקיד** is almost certainly a **משכיל**. Finally, the phrase **מדרש למשכיל** seems to indicate both the genre and the addressee of part of 4QS^b and all of 4QS^d.

³²⁴ Roop, “Form-Critical Study,” 313. Roop understands the **ו** of **וזה** at the beginning of 1QS V, 1 as conjunctive, binding the rule (**סדר**) that follows to the preceding section, headed **למשכיל** (1QS III, 13). This is the case because 4QS^b and 4QS^d are addressed to the **משכיל**, the wording of the introductory rubric being altered in 1QS V, 1 so that the document as a whole might read in a smoother and more integrated manner (“Form-Critical Study,” 161 n. 10). Consequently, the 4Q parallels to 1QS V, 1ff are still addressed to the **משכיל** in 1QS, as is the whole section 1QS III, 13-IX, 11, defined “Further Instructions” by Roop (“Form-Critical Study,” 311). Roop’s arguments are persuasive, but he accepts the chronological priority of 4QS^b and 4QS^d without question. This cannot be supported on palaeographic grounds, and does not admit the possibility that, while containing parallel texts to parts of 1QS, these 4Q manuscripts may have had a different function to 1QS. Roop did not, admittedly, have access to full details concerning the 4QS material.

³²⁵ Alexander and Vermes, *Qumran Cave 4 XIX*, 10.

³²⁶ In 4QS^b IX, 1 the text breaks off after **למשכיל**. The 4QS^d parallel is intact and was used by Metso to reconstruct the missing material from 4QS^b (*Textual Development*, 27 n. 42).

³²⁷ A. R. C. Leane, *The Rule of Qumran and Its Meaning: Introduction, Translation and Commentary* (NTL; London: SCM, 1966), 118; Wise, Abegg, and Cook, *DSSNT*, 126; Vermes, *CDSSE*, 98 (cf. *CDSSE*, 29); García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *DSSSE* I:70. Licht suggests the restoration **לכול הנדבים**, “to [each person who devotes himself]” (**מגילת סרכים**, 59), on account of the occurrence of **הנדבים** in 1QS I, 7 and **המתנדבים** in 1QS V, 1. However, this ignores the Hiphil infinitive **להבי** in 1QS I, 7: the instruction in this column is for someone who will “bring all those who devote themselves to do God’s commandments in a merciful covenant” (**אל בברית חסד להבי את כול הנדבים לעשות חוקי**). In light of 4QS^d I, 1 such a person would be a **משכיל**. Licht’s suggested reconstruction is thus not satisfactory. Lohse (*Texte*, 4) offers no reconstruction, and Moraldi’s translation makes no reference to the **משכיל** (*I Manoscritti di Qumrân* [2d ed.; Turin: Unione Tipografico-Editrice Torinese, 1986], 131).

³²⁸ See §4.1.3 above.

4QSD I, 1 reads: **מדרש למשכיל על אנשי התורה**, “*midrash* for the/an instructor concerning the men of the law.” Because this phrase occurs at the start of the ms, it is crucial for determining the genre and function of this document and for our understanding of the role of the **משכיל**. The first problem is **מדרש**, apparently a significant term in the scrolls, though it does not seem to be used elsewhere in the same sense.³²⁹ Johann Maier has studied this term at Qumran in detail.³³⁰ Maier is keen to distance both the verb **דרש** and the noun **מדרש** in early Jewish literature from the idea of “study,”³³¹ familiar from rabbinic literature and retained by Lawrence Schiffman.³³² To achieve an informed understanding, the term **מדרש** and the root **דרש** in general at Qumran must be studied.

4.2.1. **מדרש** in 1QS VI, 24³³³

In 1QS VI, 24 we read: **ואלה המשפטים אשר ישפטו בהם במדרש יחד על פי הדברים**, “and these are the rulings by which they shall legislate in the community *midrash*, according to the words.” **מדרש** modifies **ישפטו**, which is linked to the noun **משפטים**. It is unclear whether **יחד** is *nomen rectum* in a construct chain (“a midrash of [the] community”)³³⁴ or an adverb (“by which they shall judge together in a midrash”). Alexander and Vermes even note the possibility of taking **מדרש יחד** as a compound noun (“at a *midrash-yahad*”).³³⁵ The noun **משפטים** seems to indicate the genre of the individual rulings which follow, which means that **מדרש** here indicates a context in which judgements or rulings (**משפטים**) would be made or discerned. The verb **דרש** does not occur again in 1QS VI, 24-VII, 25, though it is important earlier in 1QS VI. 1QS VI, 7 includes the phrase

³²⁹ Cf. Geza Vermes, “Preliminary Remarks on Unpublished Fragments of the Community Rule from Qumran Cave 4,” *JJS* 42 (1991): 254. For **מדרש** as “instruction,” see Charlesworth and Strawn, “Reflections,” 410.

³³⁰ Johann Maier, “Early Jewish Biblical Interpretation in the Qumran Literature,” in *Hebrew Bible/Old Testament: The History of Its Interpretation* (ed. M. Sæbø; vol. 1/1; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996), 113-120.

³³¹ Maier, “Early Jewish Biblical Interpretation,” 113-114.

³³² Lawrence H. Schiffman, *The Halakhah at Qumran* (SJLA 16; Leiden: Brill, 1975), 3.

³³³ This text is not paralleled in 4QSD. The phrase **במדרש יחד** appear to have been absent from 4QSG 3 2.

³³⁴ Lohse, *Texte*, 25; Leaney, *Rule*, 197; García Martínez, *DSST*, 10; Wise, Abegg, and Cook, *DSSNT*, 135; Vermes, *CDSSE*, 107; García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *DSSSE* I:85.

³³⁵ Alexander and Vermes, *Qumran Cave 4 XIX*, 178.

לדרוש משפט, “to investigate judgement,”³³⁶ one of the activities of the רבנים during the night watch.³³⁷ Thus משפט is something to be investigated, and the משפטים collected in 1QS VI, 24-VII, 25 are the result of a procedure known as מדרש. מדרש thus designates a procedure rather than a genre here:³³⁸ 1QS VI, 24 may therefore be a reference back to the activity mentioned in 1QS VI, 7.

מדרש in 1QS VI, 24 refers to an activity of the community, during which rulings known as משפטים were discerned. 1QS VI, 24 does not bear directly on the interpretation of 4QS^d I, 1.

4.2.2. מדרש התורה in 1QS VIII, 15, CD XX, 6, and 4QD^e 7 II, 15

1QS VIII, 15, CD XX, 6, and 4QD^e 7 II, 15 will be dealt with together since they all contain the phrase מדרש התורה.³³⁹

P. Wernberg-Møller³⁴⁰ refers to Ezr 7:10 for the concept which this phrase implies, and it is

clear that the Ezra passage underpins much of the material we are discussing.³⁴¹ The construction

³³⁶ Cf. 4QHalakhah A 1-2 5: לדרוש ולקרא בספר ב[שבת], “to study and read in the book on [Shabb]at.” The editors of 4QHalakhah A (E. Larson, M. R. Lehmann, and L. H. Schiffman) cite 1QS VI, 7 in connection with this text (J. Baumgarten et al., *Qumran Cave 4 XXV: Halakhic Texts* [DJD 35; Oxford: Clarendon, 1999], 30).

³³⁷ 1QS VI, 6 mentions איש דורש בתורה, “a man who investigates in the law.” Schiffman (*Halakhah*, 33) understands 1QS VI, 7 as indicating that the purpose of reading the book was to expound the law (לדרוש משפט). However, it is not clear that the three activities mentioned in this line are intended to indicate a sequence, nor is it clear that לדרוש means “to expound.”

³³⁸ It is interesting to read the juxtaposition of משפט and מדרש in 1QS VI, 24 alongside *b. Ketub.* 49a: זה מדרש דרש רבי אלעזר בן עזריה, “This is a *midrash* which Rabbi Eleazar ben Azariah promulgated.” Here, מדרש seems to have the connotations which משפט has in 1QS VI, 7, 24: מדרש in *b. Ketub.* 49a is a ruling rather than the context in which that ruling should be made or discerned. מדרש may have developed by metonymy from meaning a context in which rulings might be discovered to the ruling itself. In *m. Sheqal.* VI, 6, chronologically closer to the Qumran scrolls than *b. Ketub.*, the same construction occurs: זה מדרש דרש יהוידע כהן גדול, “This is a *midrash* which the high priest Jehoiada promulgated.” In this passage מדרש is parallel to כלל, meaning “general rule, principle” (Jastrow, 644).

³³⁹ Cf. CD VI, 14: פרוש התורה. It is worth noting here the dispute recorded in *b. Qidd.* 49a between R. Meir and R. Judah concerning the definition of משנה, and the subsequent definition of תורה given by R. Judah. R. Meir defined משנה as הלכות (cf. *m. =Abot* 1:17), whereas R. Judah defined it as מדרש. R. Judah then defines תורה as מדרש תורה. Thus, as Jastrow notes (Jastrow, 735), תורה is defined as not simply the Torah itself, but the traditions of its interpretation (i.e. וסיפרי ותוספתא [*b. Qidd.* 49b]). M. Gertner sees the phrase מדרש תורה (the notional plural equivalent would be more accurate) behind Claudius Lysias’ phrase ἑρμηνείαι τοῦ νόμου (thus “interpretations of the law”) in Acts 23:29: “Terms of Scriptural Interpretation: A Study in Hebrew Semantics,” *BSOAS* 25 (1962):12-13.

infinitive + ל characterises the passages Roop terms “da^{at}.”³⁴² In particular, the infinitives שרש, עשות, and למד are crucial to the texts which deal with the role of the משכיל in the *Serekh*,³⁴³ the phrase לעשות משפטו, “to enact his judgement” occurring in 1QS IX, 15. However, the specific phrase in question is not directly illuminated by Ezr 7:10. 1QS VIII, 15 does define the phrase מדרש התורה, and we must begin with this definition.³⁴⁴

מדרש in 1QS VIII, 15 refers to the מסלה, “highway,” and possibly the דרך, “way” of Isa 40:3, quoted in line 14.³⁴⁵ The term seems to refer to a procedure. Gertner notes that in the later midrashic literature, this noun stands for both the act of interpretation and the interpretation itself.³⁴⁶ It seems that this holds also for the Qumran evidence. Gertner also suggests that midrashic interpretation is meant in 1QS VIII, 15,³⁴⁷ though the evidence is not conclusive. It is not clear whether רצוה ביד מושה א[ש], “wh[ic]h he commanded by the hand of Moses” refers back to מדרש or תורה. The latter is more probable, since the *Serekh* nowhere suggests that the *interpretation* of תורה ultimately derives from Moses. *M. =Abot* 1:1 indicates that in later Judaism it is not simply written תורה which derives from Moses,³⁴⁸ and *b. Qidd.* 49b discusses a wider concept of תורה which is actually מדרש תורה itself, though R. Judah does not mention Moses in connection with מדרש תורה. Although in 2 Chr 13:22;³⁴⁹ 24:27³⁵⁰ מדרש occurs as *nomen*

³⁴⁰ P. Wernberg-Møller, *The Manual of Discipline: Translated and Annotated with an Introduction* (STDJ 1; Leiden: Brill, 1971), 129 (following William Brownlee). Wernberg-Møller’s citation of Brownlee is incomplete, and I have been unable to trace the latter’s original reference. For an early translation, with notes, of 1QS, see William H. Brownlee, *The Dead Sea Manual of Discipline: Translation and Notes* (BASORSup 10-12; New Haven, Conn.: American Schools of Oriental Research, 1951).

³⁴¹ M. Gertner regards Ezr 7:10 as a turning point in the history of שרש, when this verb was applied to the Torah as the object of inquiry for the first time (cf. Isa 34:16). For Gertner, this signalled the beginning of midrashic interpretation, though the verb does not yet signify this form of interpretation; it simply means “study penetratingly” (“Terms,” 5-6, 8).

³⁴² Roop, *Form-Critical Study*, 114-116.

³⁴³ 1QS I, 2, 5; III, 13; IX, 13, 15.

³⁴⁴ Metso’s recension A (=4QS^e) almost certainly included the phrase מדרש התורה (4QS^e III, 6 [reconstructed; Metso, *Textual Development*, 53]), but *not* the elucidation of the phrase found in 1QS VIII, 15b-19 (cf. Metso, *Textual Development*, 54).

³⁴⁵ Cf. Gertner, “Terms,” 12; Leaney, *Rule*, 222.

³⁴⁶ Gertner, “Terms,” 2, 9.

³⁴⁷ Gertner, “Terms,” 12.

³⁴⁸ For the view that the concept of תורה שבעל פה was unknown at Qumran, see Schiffman, *Halakhah*, 20.

³⁴⁹ 2 Chr 13:22: וְיִתֵּר דְּבָרֵי אֲבִיָּה וְדַרְכָּיו וְדַבָּרָיו כְּתוּבִים בְּמִדְרַשׁ הַנְּבִיא עֲדֹ, “and the rest of the acts of Abijah, his ways and deeds, are written in the *midrash* of the prophet Iddo.”

regens, it is not part of the phrase מדרש התורה. Although לעשות in 1QS VIII, 15 seems to refer back to צוה, the sense of this unit appears to be that acting “according to everything revealed from time to time and as the prophets revealed through his Holy Spirit” occurs as a result of the מדרש התורה procedure. Furthermore, the משפט contained in lines 16b-19 also seems to result from this procedure.³⁵¹ There is a clear verbal link with the preceding sentence, כול המצוה referring back to צוה in line 15.

It seems probable that CD XX, 6 is dependent on this passage in 1QS, since the terminology and concepts found in CD XX, 6 appear to presuppose those found in 1QS VIII, 15-19.³⁵² The phrase וכמשפט הזה, “and according to this judgement” (CD XX, 8) refers to what precedes as a משפט, as in 1QS VIII, 19. Furthermore, in CD XX, 6-7 מדרש התורה is something “in which the men of perfect holiness will walk” (אשר יתהלכו בו אנשי תמים הקדש), recalling the group designation אנשי הקודש, “men of holiness” (1QS VIII, 17)³⁵³ and the phrase להלך בתמים דרך, “to walk in perfection of way” (1QS VIII, 18).³⁵⁴ It relates back to אנשי תמים קדש in CD XX, 5.³⁵⁵ This attribute of מדרש התורה suggests that it is an umbrella term for a system of interpretation which contains the specific rulings for the life of the group mentioned. CD XX, 6 differs from 1QS VIII, 15: it indicates a specific collection of rulings rather than the procedure which might result in such a collection. In fact, if this is the correct interpretation of מדרש התורה in CD XX, 6 it might relate closely to the term מדרש in 4QS^b IX, 1; 4QS^d I, 1, in which מדרש points to the rulings for the life of the community found in Metso’s rec. B. In CD XX, 6 מדרש התורה is something according

³⁵⁰ 2 Chr 24:27: הָנֻם כְּתוּבִים עַל-מִדְרָשׁ סֵפֶר הַמְּלָכִים, “they are written on the *midrash* of the book of the kings.” Apart from 2 Chr 13:22; 24:27, the noun מדרש does not occur in the HB. Gertner understands this as a term coined by the Chronicler, meaning “narrative” or “account” (“Terms,” 10-11).

³⁵¹ Cf. 1QS VI, 24. This משפט is absent from 4QS^e.

³⁵² Philip R. Davies, *The Damascus Covenant: An Interpretation of the “Damascus Document”* (JSOTSup 25; Sheffield: JSOT, 1983), 181-182. A discussion of whether or not CD XX, 1b-8 is an interpolation would serve no purpose in the present study. Regardless of the composition histories of *Serekh ha-Yahad* and the Damascus Document both 1QS VIII, 15-19 and CD XX, 1b-8 function within their present contexts and it is as part of the two larger works that these passages are now to be read.

³⁵³ Cf. 1QS VIII, 20, 23.

³⁵⁴ Cf. 1QS VIII, 21, 25; 4QD^a 2 I, 4 (par. 4QD^c 1 6-7); 2 II, 15-16 (reconstructed; par. CD II, 15); CD I, 20-21. Cf. Elgvin, “Admonition Texts,” 185.

³⁵⁵ Cf. CD VII, 4-5.

to which deeds would be made manifest.³⁵⁶ Again, this could refer to a collection of rulings, which may be how the term was understood by the author of CD XX, 1b-8.

4QD^c 7 II, 15,³⁵⁷ though not paralleled in CD, is related to CD XX, 6. It reads “see, everything is wr[itten] according to the latest³⁵⁸ *midrash* of [the] law” (הנה הכול כ[תוב] על מדרש[ה] תורה האחרון). Although מדרש[ה] תורה may not itself refer to a written text, the text that precedes concerns מדרש התורה. The unit, which serves as a summation of what precedes,³⁵⁹ begins after the *vacat* in line 12 with the phrase זה פרוש המשפטים,³⁶⁰ “this is the exact interpretation of the rulings,” referring to the rulings which precede. The passage is an interpretation of משפטים, which derive from the מדרש procedure. This is supported by the point made by Joseph Baumgarten that in 4QD^c 7 II, 15 the phrase מדרש התורה is preceded by על, meaning “in accordance with” or “as the result of.”³⁶¹ Thus מדרש refers neither to a written text, nor to a procedure, but to the interpretation which *results* from the מדרש procedure.

Although none of these texts *require* that מדרש be taken as a reference to a written text, it is almost certain that in 2 Chr 13:22; 24:27; 4QS^b IX, 1; 4QS^d I, 1 we have evidence that the earliest attestations of the noun מדרש refer to written material.³⁶² In 2 Chr 13:22; 24:27 כתובים confirms this. This is supported by the early versions. Second Chronicles 13:22 (LXX) reads γεγραμμένοι ἐπὶ βιβλίῳ τοῦ προφήτου Ἀδῶ, “written on the book of the prophet Ado (viz. Iddo),” and 2 Chr 24:27 (LXX) reads γεγραμμένα ἐπὶ τὴν γραφὴν τῶν βασιλέων, “written on the writing of the kings.” Second Chronicles 13:22 (*Tg. Ket.*) translates literally: כתיבין במדרשיה דנביא עדו,

³⁵⁶ Cf. 1QpHab XI, 7.

³⁵⁷ Par. 4QD^a 11 20-21.

³⁵⁸ Baumgarten (“Damascus Document,” 149) takes this as a reference to the latest interpretation within the progressive illumination of the law, ongoing until the advent of the Messiah, thus resisting the idea that this is a reference to the *final* interpretation of the law.

³⁵⁹ Joseph M. Baumgarten, “The Damascus Document Reconsidered,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls at Fifty: Proceedings of the 1997 Society of Biblical Literature Qumran Section Meetings* (ed. R. A. Kugler and E. M. Schuller; SBLEJL 15; Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1999), 149.

³⁶⁰ Par. 4QD^a 11 18.

³⁶¹ Joseph M. Baumgarten, “Corrigenda to the 4Q MSS of the *Damascus Document*,” *RevQ* 19 (1999): 221.

³⁶² Cf. Maier’s category *cdd* (“Early Jewish Biblical Interpretation,” 116); S. Wagner, ‘דַּרָּשׁ, *dârash*; מְדַרָּשׁ, *midhrâsh*,” *TDOT* 3:306.

“written in the *midrash* of the prophet Iddo.” Second Chronicles 24:27 (*Tg. Ket.*) uses the term פתשגן³⁶³ to translate מדרש, clearly referring to a written document: “now they are written in the copy of the book of the kings.” The Vulgate offers *in libro* in both verses.³⁶⁴

In 1QS VIII, 15 מדרש התורה refers to a procedure which involved the study of the law and resulted in acting “according to everything revealed from time to time and as the prophets revealed through his Holy Spirit.” This procedure included the formulation of rulings, משפטים. In CD XX, 6, however, the phrase refers to the result of such a procedure, that is, to the interpretation of the law which ensues. It is not certain, but possible, that a written collection of rulings is meant. מדרש refers to a written document in 2 Chr 13:22; 24:27; 4QS^b IX,1; 4QS^d I, 1.

4.2.3. מדרש in 1QS VIII, 26

1QS VIII, 26³⁶⁵ is related to 1QS VIII, 15, though it is absent from 4QS^e.³⁶⁶ There is a new departure at 1QS VIII, 20, the rubric ואלה המשפטים, “and these are the rulings” introducing the section which includes VIII, 26.³⁶⁷ In 1QS VIII, 20 משפטים is analogous to מדרש in CD XX, 6, because the משפטים are those in which “the men of perfect holiness” (אנשי התמים קודש) are to walk, just as in CD XX, 6 מדרש התורה is something in accordance with which the men of perfect holiness have walked. As in CD XX, 6, perfection of way goes hand-in-hand with מדרש.³⁶⁸

³⁶³ Cf. the MT of Est 3:14; 4:8; 8:13. See also Ezr 7:11; 4QEnGiants^a 8 3, where the noun פרשגן occurs.

³⁶⁴ Cf. Wagner, *TDOT* 3:306.

³⁶⁵ Par. 4QS^d VII, 1.

³⁶⁶ Roop (“Form-Critical Study,” 234-254) regards 1QS VIII, 1-IX, 11 as a unit, concerned with the formation of the original community. Jerome Murphy-O’Connor understands 1QS VIII, 16b-19 + VIII, 20-IX, 2 (stage 2: “La genèse littéraire de la *règle de la communauté*,” *RB* 76 [1969]: 532-533) to be later than 1QS VIII, 1-16a + IX, 3-X, 8a (stage 1: “Genèse,” 529-532). Leaney (*Rule*, 208-233) defines 1QS VIII, 1-IX, 26 as “Model of a Pioneer Community”, VIII, 1-IX, 11 forming the “Constitution of the Pioneer Community” (*Rule*, 208). However, whilst there can be no doubt that 1QS is composite, we must also deal with 1QS as a complete work; at the least the manuscript contains evidence that the original scribe perceived divisions within the text, whether or not they reflect redactional seams or merely structural divisions.

³⁶⁷ Cf. Exod 21:1; Num 36:13; Deut 4:45.

³⁶⁸ Cf. 1QS VIII, 25.

The sense of **שִׁרְר** in 1QS VIII, 24 seems to be “to apply the ruling,” the verb having **מִשְׁפָּט** as its object, and probably referring to the **מִדְרָשׁ** procedure mentioned in 1QS VI, 24. Further, it also points forward to the reference to the same procedure in 1QS VIII, 26. The parallel terms **מוֹשֵׁב**,³⁶⁹ **מִדְרָשׁ**,³⁷⁰ and **עֲצָה**³⁷¹ are procedures or institutions that are the preserve of full members of the community. The verb in 1QS VIII, 24 also indicates that applying rulings is itself the preserve of full members of the community. It is possible, though not certain, that **שִׁרְר** in 1QS VIII, 24 refers to the activity which goes on during the **מִדְרָשׁ** procedure mentioned in 1QS VI, 24; VIII, 26.

In 1QS VIII, 26 **מִדְרָשׁ** refers to a procedure in which full members of the community would take part, as in 1QS VI, 24, and the use of **שִׁרְר** in 1QS VIII, 24 may be a reference to the activity of this procedure.

4.2.4. **מִדְרָשׁ** in 4QFlor 1 I,21,2 14

As in 1QS VIII, 15, **מִדְרָשׁ** is linked in 4QFlor 1 I,21,2 14 with a biblical reference, Ps 1:1. The Hebrew **אִישׁ [הַ] מִדְרָשׁ מֵאֲשֶׁרִי** could be glossed “*midrash* derived from ‘Blessed is [the] man....’”

What follows is a collection of biblical texts followed by interpretations,³⁷² twice introduced by **פֶּשֶׁר**.³⁷³ Maier’s view³⁷⁴ that what follows is **פֶּשֶׁר** rather than **מִדְרָשׁ** in the later, rabbinic sense cannot be sustained. **מִדְרָשׁ** is used here not simply in place of **פֶּשֶׁר** but as an umbrella term for the

collection of texts and interpretations which follows.³⁷⁵ **מִדְרָשׁ** here designates a specific type of

³⁶⁹ Cf. 1QS VI, 8; VII, 12, 15; 4QD^a 5 II, 14.

³⁷⁰ Cf. 1QS VI, 24.

³⁷¹ Cf. 1QS V, 7; VI, 3, 4, 9, 16; VII, 2, 13, 24; VIII, 1, 5, 18, 19, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25; IX, 2.

³⁷² Cf. Schiffman, *Halakhah*, 60. However, in this case the distinction between **מִדְרָשׁ** and **פֶּשֶׁר** is not simply that **מִדְרָשׁ** requires corroborative evidence from other scriptural passages whereas **פֶּשֶׁר** does not (Schiffman); rather, the distinction is that **פֶּשֶׁר** is a technique which expounds the previously hidden interpretation of a single passage, whereas **מִדְרָשׁ** is an umbrella term for a collection of texts combined with interpretations (some using **פֶּשֶׁר**) which together elucidate a single passage.

³⁷³ 4QFlor 1 I,21,2 14, 19.

³⁷⁴ Maier, “Early Jewish Biblical Interpretation,” 116.

³⁷⁵ Maier’s suggestion (“Early Jewish Biblical Interpretation,” 116) that the beginning of 4QFlor 1 I,21,2 14 should be translated “a copy/extract from” would accord with *Tg. Ket.* 2 Chr 24:27, but does not work here: **מִדְרָשׁ** here must, as in 4QS^b IX, 1 and 4QS^d I, 1 function as an indicator of what is to follow, in this case a text which provides an interpretation of a scriptural text by reference to other texts, which in turn bear their own interpretations, explained either typologically (as with Isa 8:11 [4QFlor 1 I,21,2 16]; Ezek 37:21 [4QFlor 1 I,21,2 17]) or by means of **פֶּשֶׁר** (as with Ps 1:1 [4QFlor 1 I,21,2 14]; Ps 2:1 [4QFlor 1 I,21,2 19]).

scriptural interpretation in written form (whether the term could have referred to an oral form of interpretation can no longer be determined).³⁷⁶ Here, מדרש is a collection of פשרים. That מדרש here functions as a technical term, to which פשר is subordinate has been suggested by George Brooke.³⁷⁷ In his thorough form-critical analysis, Brooke notes that it is the introductory formula that helps to determine the extent of the unit we are dealing with: the fact that מדרש is not repeated before the interpretation of Ps 2:1 suggests that מדרש refers to the whole passage.³⁷⁸ Brooke also notes that “[t]he strict consistency within the unit is suggestive of a uniform literary composition,”³⁷⁹ and defends the notion that this passage is analogous to rabbinic *midrashim*.³⁸⁰

מדרש in 4QFlor 1 I,21,2 14 thus refers to written material,³⁸¹ and may be defined as a collection of texts accompanied by פשר-type interpretations. In that it refers to written material, it is related to 2 Chr 13:22; 24:27; 4QS^b IX, 1; 4QS^d I, 1.

4.2.5. Summary

4QS^b IX, 1 and 4QS^d I, 1 are linked with the use of מדרש in 2 Chr 13:22; 24:27, these texts referring to written documents. Linked with this is CD XX, 6, which refers to a body of rulings designated מדרש התורה. The same phrase in 1QS VIII, 15 refers rather to an activity, a procedure within the community, as in 1QS VI, 24; VIII, 26. 4QD^e 7 II, 15 refers not to a procedure, nor to a written text, but to the interpretation of the law which results from the מדרש procedure. 4QFlor 1 I,21,2 14 uses מדרש to refer to a written text which includes scriptural texts accompanied by פשר-type interpretations. 4QS^b and 4QS^d could be linked to the use of פתשגן in *Tg. Ket.* 2 Chr 24:27, and from there to the Hebrew terms פתשגן and פרשגן, meaning that 4QS^b and 4QS^d constitute “copies for a משכיל.”

³⁷⁶ Cf. George J. Brooke, *Exegesis at Qumran: 4QFlorilegium in its Jewish Context* (JSOTSup 29; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985), 156.

³⁷⁷ Brooke, *Exegesis*, 152.

³⁷⁸ Brooke, *Exegesis*, 144.

³⁷⁹ Brooke, *Exegesis*, 145.

³⁸⁰ Brooke, *Exegesis*, 150.

³⁸¹ Wagner (*TDOT* 3:306) does not interpret מדרש here as referring to written material, though he is not wrong to suggest that מדרש here means “exposition.” This could be part of the meaning of the term, though the idea of a written text is still present. It is this idea which seems to dominate at this period, though the S and D materials evidence the beginning of a development away from this meaning.

It may be proposed that at this period **מדרש** referred essentially to a written text. At the same time, a meaning derived from the verbal root **דרש** emerged, meaning “interpretation,” that is, the result of seeking or investigating. This became linked with the interpretation of the law, so that a **מדרש** could be: (1) a procedure during which the law was examined, with a view to creating rulings; (2) the result of the investigation which constituted this procedure; and (3) a written text, embodying either rulings derived from the community investigation of the law, or texts and textual interpretations based on the **פשר**-technique.

4.3. **משכיל** and **מדרש**

Why should a text defined as **מדרש** be addressed to a figure called **משכיל**? Verbal forms related to **דרש** do not appear in the extant portions of 4QS^b and 4QS^d, the only occurrence in the remaining 4QS fragments being in 4QS^e III, 2 (par. 1QS VIII, 11-12).³⁸² This is a key text, not only belonging to the earliest layer postulated by Murphy-O'Connor,³⁸³ but also concerning the discernment and revelation of hidden things. A single, unnamed figure is the focus, who is dubbed **איש הדורש**, “man who seeks.” “Seeking” is presumably correct here, since this text is concerned with things previously hidden being made manifest to this figure. The **איש הדורש** is forbidden to keep the things previously hidden (**אלה**) a secret from the nascent community (identified here simply as **אלה**). 1QS VIII, 12a is followed by a *vacat* and an introductory rubric indicating a new departure. What is not certain is whether the figure is a single figure or anyone who seeks.³⁸⁴

³⁸² Despite the absence of this verb from 4QS^b and 4QS^d, it seems highly probable that originally it did occur: see the reconstructions of 4QS^d VI, 6 in Metso, *Textual Development*, 44, and Alexander and Vermes, *Qumran Cave 4 XIX*, 105.

³⁸³ Murphy-O'Connor, “Genèse,” 529-32. Murphy-O'Connor includes 1QS IX, 3-X, 8a in the first layer, and although it is interesting that the reference we are here concerned with might have been linked with the **משכיל** of 1QS IX, 12-21a and IX, 21bff at the earliest redactional stage of 1QS, it needs to be remembered that the *Statutes for a Maskil* (1QS IX, 12-21a) followed straight on from the parallel to 1QS VIII, 15a (viz. 4QS^e III, 6), thus linking the two sections more closely within concrete textual evidence rather than speculative redactional layers. Charlotte Hempel (“Comments on the Translation of 4QSd I, 1,” *JJS* 44 [1993]: 128) suggests that the prominence of the **משכיל** in the earliest layer of the *Serekh* could lend support to Geza Vermes’ suggestion (“Preliminary Remarks,” 255) that the Cave 4 texts represent an earlier version of the material found in 1QS.

³⁸⁴ Cf. 1QS VI, 6; Leaney, *Rule*, 221; Wernberg-Møller, *Manual of Discipline*, 128.

It is now necessary to undertake a word study of **דרש** in the Qumran scrolls, in order to place the occurrences of **מדרש** and **דורש** in their wider context.

4.3.1. **דרש** in the Qumran scrolls

Occurrences of **דרש** may be loosely divided into two categories: occurrences in the *Serekh* and related texts, and occurrences elsewhere in the Qumran corpus. This categorisation is not meant to imply a sectarian or non-sectarian status for a particular scroll, but to define proximity to the precise concerns of the *Serekh*.

4.3.1.1. **דרש** in *Serekh ha-Yahad* and related texts

In 1QS I, 1 it is uncertain whether the subject of **לדרוש** is the community in general³⁸⁵ or the **משכיל**, but the activity of seeking God³⁸⁶ is given prominence because **לדרוש** is the first in a series of infinitives,³⁸⁷ thus placing 1QS I, 1 along the same trajectory as Exod 18:15;³⁸⁸ 1 Sam 9:9;³⁸⁹ Ps 119:10.³⁹⁰ The phrase **כאשר צוה ביד מושה וביד כול עבדיו הנביאים**, “just as he commanded by the hand of Moses and by the hand of all his servants the prophets” (1QS I, 2-3) recalls the references to the law which “he commanded by the hand of Moses” (**צוה ביד מושה**) and to what “the prophets revealed through his Holy Spirit” (**גלו הנביאים ברוח קודשו**) in 1QS VIII, 15-16, suggesting that **לדרוש אל** in 1QS I, 1-2 refers to the study of the law.³⁹¹

³⁸⁵ So Wernberg-Møller, *Manual of Discipline*, 44; cf. 1QS I, 16.

³⁸⁶ Cf. Wernberg-Møller, *Manual of Discipline*, 44. According to him, **דרש** in the Qumran scrolls usually has the connotation of seeking God by studying the Scriptures.

³⁸⁷ Cf. Roop, “Form-Critical Study,” 66.

³⁸⁸ Exod 18:15b: **יבא אלי העם לדרש אליהם**, “the people come to me to seek God.” It is interesting to speculate on the role of Exod 18:13-27 in the thought of the *Serekh*. In Exod 18:13-27 the result of Moses’ seeking God (Exod 18:15) is his ability to judge (**שפט**: Exod 18:16) and to make known God’s statutes and teaching (**תורתיו**). This sequence (seeking God + making judgements) seems to underlie the texts in which **מדרש** appears in the Qumran scrolls, and the language and thought of the passage resurface in many places throughout the Qumran corpus (cf. Leaney, *Rule*, 176-178).

³⁸⁹ 1 Sam 9:9a: **כֹּה־אָמַר הָאִישׁ בְּלִבָּתוֹ לְדַרֹּשׁ אֱלֹהִים**, “thus would someone say when he went to seek God.”

³⁹⁰ Ps 119:10a: **בְּכָל־לִבִּי דִרְשָׁתִּיךָ**, “with all my heart (= mind?) I have sought you.” Cf. Wernberg-Møller, *Manual of Discipline*, 44; 4QJub^d I, 14 (= *Jub.* 21:2).

³⁹¹ Cf. Exod 8:16; Ezr 7:10.

This uncovers a link between *משכיל* and *מדרש*. If the material headed *מדרש* in 4QS^b and 4QS^d is understood as a compilation of *משפטים* resulting from the *מדרש התורה* procedure, it may be suggested that since seeking God through the study of the law is central to the *משכיל*'s role in 1QS I, 1-2, and because he has responsibility for teaching (including teaching community regulations, as in 1QS VI, 15) within the community, a compilation called *מדרש*, containing such regulations, would logically be linked with him.

1QS V, 9, 11, 20 need to be considered, none of which are paralleled in 4QS^b and 4QS^d, possibly because the introductory rubric *מדרש למשכיל* links the whole passage with the idea of *דרש*. The vocabulary of 1QS V, 8-10 recalls 1QS I, 1-3, especially the phrase "to return to the law of Moses according to everything he commanded with all the heart and all the soul" (לשוב אל תורת מושה ככול אשר צוה בכול לב ובכול נפש). The phrase *ולהתלך ברצונו*, "and to walk in his will" (1QS V, 10) represents the result of seeking God's will, the preserve of the sons of Zadok (1QS V, 9),³⁹² who are described here as *שומרי הברית*, "those who guard the covenant," and *דורשי ורצונו*, "those who seek his will." The revelation of the law of Moses is a direct result of the process of seeking. Seeking is linked with *גלה*, "reveal," and the revelation/discovery of what was previously hidden.³⁹³ In this passage seeking and receiving revelation are priestly preserves,³⁹⁴ which is not evident in other references we have studied.

דרש is linked with the phenomenon of revelation in 1QS V, 11, where *דרש* is parallel with *בקש* Piel,³⁹⁵ confirming that *דרש* here represents "seeking." Seeking leads to knowing³⁹⁶

³⁹² Cf. 4QInstruction^b 2 III, 12 (par. 4QInstruction^d 9,9a-c 12): *רצונו שחר תמיד*, "always seek his will." On the question of whether a human or divine benefactor is referred to in this passage, see Strugnell et al., *Qumran Cave 4 XXIV*, 118-119.

³⁹³ Cf. 4QD^a 2 I, 5-6 (par. 4QD^c 1 7-8).

³⁹⁴ Cf. Leaney, *Rule*, 164-165. The sons of Zadok, the priests, are described in 1QS V, 9 as *דורשי רצונו*, "those who seek his will."

³⁹⁵ 1QS V, 11: *לוא בקשו ולוא דרשהו בחוקיהו לדעת הנסתרות אשר תעו בהם*, "they have neither sought nor examined him concerning his statutes, to know the hidden things in which they have gone astray."

³⁹⁶ Cf. Exod 18:15-16. In verse 15 the people come to Moses to seek God (*יבא אלי העם לדרש אלהים*). In verse 16, Moses makes known (i.e. reveals) God's statutes and his laws (*הודעתיו את חקי האלהים ואת תורתיו*) in response.

הנסתרות, “the hidden things.” 1QS V, 11-12; VIII, 11-12³⁹⁷ refer to the same process: investigating what is hidden from Israel in order to know. In 1QS V, 20-21 the phrase ודרשו את רוחם “and they shall investigate their spirits” refers to the examination of candidates for full membership in the community.

1QS VI, 6 mentions איש דורש התורה, “a man who investigates the law,” recalling 1QS VIII, 11-12: perhaps 1QS VIII, 11-12 also refers to a man who investigates the law.³⁹⁸ This figure is someone in the *present* who investigates the law in the ongoing life of the community. This passage confirms the link between revelation, law, and seeking. The imparting of knowledge mentioned in 1QS VI, 9 (להשיב איש את מדעו) recalls 1QS V, 11, and the testing of the candidate in VI, 14, 17 recalls 1QS V, 20-21.³⁹⁹ Outside the *Serekh*, the phrase דורש התורה has different resonances. In 4QFlor 1 I,21,2 11, צמח דויד דורש התורה refers to a figure who will rise at the end of days with צמח דויד, “the shoot of David.”⁴⁰⁰ The term מדרש in line 14 is linked with this figure indirectly: the prediction that this figure would arise at the end of days is followed by scriptural justification in the form of a quotation and interpretation of Amos 9:11, followed by a מדרש on Pss 1:1; 2:1. מדרש is crucial to the temporal existence of the community responsible for 4QFlorilegium, but this text looks forward to a time when an ideal דורש will appear. מדרש thus has both temporal and eschatological⁴⁰¹ foci in 4QFlorilegium. A figure entitled דורש התורה also appears in CD VI, 7. דרשוהו in CD VI, 6 refers to seeking God, the same activity mentioned in 1QS I, 1.⁴⁰² This text is a historical review referring to activities which took place in the past and, if the link with 1QS I, 1 is sustained, are linked with the foundation of the community of the *Serekh*. The דורש התורה

³⁹⁷ 1QS VIII, 11-12: “anything hidden from Israel but found by the man who seeks” (כול דבר הנסתר מישראל ונמצאו לאיש הדורש).

³⁹⁸ Wernberg-Møller, *Manual of Discipline*, 128.

³⁹⁹ Cf. 1QSa II, 10; 4QS^d II, 3-4; 4QD^a 8 I, 2 (par. CD XV, 11). Other occurrences of דרש in 1QS have been examined. The verb דרש[הו] in 1QSb III, 20 is a problem, due to its fragmentary context. The grammatical object could conceivably be הון or מקור (1QSb III, 19).

⁴⁰⁰ 4QFlor 1 I,21,2 11-12: [צמח דויד] אשר [ימים] בציון [בא] חרית: “he is the shoot of David who is going to stand with the one who seeks/expounds the law who will [arise] in Zi[on at the en]d of days.”

⁴⁰¹ Cf. John M. Allegro, “Fragments of a Qumran Scroll of Eschatological *Midrasim*,” *JBL* 77 (1958): 350: “[i]t will be seen that the scroll [4QFlorilegium] was apparently devoted to a collection of *midrasim* on certain biblical texts, compiled perhaps for their common eschatological interest.”

⁴⁰² Cf. CD I, 10 (par. 4QD^a 2 I, 14 [reconstructed]; 4QD^c 1 17 [reconstructed]).

mentioned in CD VI, 7 also seems to be a past figure, in contrast to 4QFlorilegium and CD VII, 18,⁴⁰³ where he is eschatological.⁴⁰⁴

The verb [ו]לדורש in 1QSb V, 23 has as its object בריתו, “his covenant,”⁴⁰⁵ recalling the sons of Zadok in 1QS V, 9, who are guardians of the covenant and seekers of his will.⁴⁰⁶

דרש is connected with a complex of ideas involving revelation, particularly the revelation of the law and the rulings which constitute the previously hidden interpretation of the law. Seeking God and his will involves studying the law, which is followed by the revelation of hidden things, resulting in the acquisition of knowledge, formulated and codified in “rulings,” משפטים. The result of investigating the law is the production of rulings codified in a text called a מדרש. A משכיל’s teaching role means that such a text would logically be addressed to him. The seeking process, and the משכיל’s role in it, are part of the process of mediating revelation in the form of rulings derived from the study of the law: this is a different aspect of the transmission process found in 4Q380, 4Q381, and 4QInstruction, because although the basic concept of God imparting revelation through particular human figures is present, it is entirely connected with the study of the law.

⁴⁰³ Par. 4QD^a 3 III, 19.

⁴⁰⁴ CD XIV, 16 seems to be an anomalous use of דרש, אין לו דורש perhaps meaning “no-one who seeks (i.e. cares for) him.”

⁴⁰⁵ Cf. 4QInstruction^d 188 6 (par. 4QInstruction^g 9 2): [מע] שי ברית לוא ידרשו, “they shall not investigate the [wor]ks of the covenant.” The parallel in 4QInstruction^g reads ולא ידורשוהו, “and they shall not seek him.” Note also the editors’ remark that in the 4QInstruction^d parallel, ידרשו should be understood as Niphal (Strugnell et al., *Qumran Cave 4 XXIV*, 413).

⁴⁰⁶ Cf. 1QSb III, 22-23; 1QLiturgy of the Three Tongues of Fire 5-7 2 (ידרוש הכוהן לכול רצונו): “the priest shall explain/examine his whole will”). The phrase דורשי החלקות occurs several times in the Nahum *peshet* (4QpNah 3-4 I, 2, 7; 3-4 II, 2; 3-4 III, 3; 3-4 III, 6-7; cf. 1QH^a X, 15, 32; 4QpIsa^c 23 II, 10; 4QD^a 2 I, 21 [reconstructed; par. CD I, 18]), presumably in reference to the Pharisees. There is thus an opposition between דורשי רצונו and דורשי החלקות. Similarly, the analogous phrase דורשי רמיה in 1QH^a X, 34 (cf. XII, 7) may be an ironic reference to 1QS V, 11, or the language used there, where רמה is used with reference to the group opposite to the בני צדוק, who are דורשי רצונו. This use of irony is typical of many of the sectarian scrolls.

4.3.1.2. שֶׁרֶחַ at Qumran apart from the *Serekh*

The conclusions drawn above about the use of שֶׁרֶחַ in the *Serekh* and related texts must now be placed in the wider context of the Qumran corpus.

In 4Qcrypt A I, 3 (a מִשְׁכִּיל text), those who seek are יֹדְעִים, “those who know”: וְיֹדְעִים דָּרְשׁוּ [א] לְהוֹשִׁיב [וּלְאוֹרָחַ] חַיִּים, “and [those] who know have sou[g]ht [these] things and turne[d to the way of] life.” Other appellations for this group are בְּנֵי שַׁחַר, “sons of dawn” (line 1), כָּל אַנְשֵׁי לֵב, “[a]ll men of heart”⁴⁰⁷ (line 1), רֹדְפֵי צְדָק, “[pur]suers of justice” (line 2), מְבַקְשֵׁי אֱמוּנָה⁴⁰⁸, “seekers of faithfulness” (line 2), and אֲנִשֵּׁי רְצוֹנוֹ, “m[en of] his [good pleasure]” (lines 3-4). The concept of seeking here is not incompatible with seeking God through the study of the law in the *Serekh*, though this is not explicitly mentioned.

In 4QBéat 2 II, 2-3 we read אֲשֶׁר־יְדַרְשֶׁיהָ בְּכֹחַ כַּפַּיִם, “Happy are those who seek her with clean hands,” the 3rd fem. sing. suffix apparently referring to חֹכְמָה, “wisdom,”⁴⁰⁹ which in 4QBéat 2 II, 3-4 is parallel with תּוֹרַת עֲלִיּוֹן, “the law of the Most High.”⁴¹⁰ Again, the connection between seeking and the law is not far removed from the *Serekh*. In 1QH^a IV, 6 שֶׁרֶחַ is collocated with מִשְׁפָּט,⁴¹¹ though there is no direct connection with the *Serekh*. In 1QH^a XII, 6 the speaker seeks God, and his seeking is rewarded by revelation.⁴¹² Although the law is not mentioned, the basic idea of seeking God connects this text with the *Serekh*. The speaker’s opponents also seek (1QH^a XII, 14,

⁴⁰⁷ Or, “understanding.” Cf. Stephen J. Pfann, “The Maskîl’s Address to All Sons of Dawn,” *JQR* 85 (1994): 227.

⁴⁰⁸ Compare Jer 5:1, where Yahweh exhorts people to investigate to find out whether there is anyone who “acts justly” (עֹשֶׂה מִשְׁפָּט) or who “seeks faithfulness” (מְבַקֵּשׁ אֱמוּנָה). The implication in Jeremiah is that there is no-one, but in the Qumran text this is reversed: in contrast, perhaps, to those in Jerusalem (cf. Jer 5:1), the seekers of faithfulness are, indeed, true to their God.

⁴⁰⁹ Cf. 4QBéat 1 I, 2; 2 II, 3.

⁴¹⁰ Note that לְהַשְׁכִּיל occurs in 4QBéat 1 II, 2. God has given “him” wisdom (חֹכְמָה), recalling the underlying theme of the revelation of divine wisdom. God’s giving wisdom is a prelude to a person understanding.

⁴¹¹ 1QH^a IV, 6: [ה] מִשְׁפָּט מֵרוּחַ דּוֹרֶשֶׁכָּה, “judgement from a spirit who seeks yo[u].”

⁴¹² 1QH^a XII, 6: אֲדַרְשְׁכָּה וְכַשְׁחַר נִכּוֹן לְאוֹר [תִּתְּנֵנִי] הוֹפְעָתָה לִּי, “I seek you, and like a sure dawn you have made yourself manifest to me as [perf]ect light.” Cf. 1QH^a XII, 23-24.

15, 16), though in falsehood.⁴¹³ The speaker seeks both God and others (1QH^a XII, 24) in this hymn. In 1QH^a XIII, 9⁴¹⁴ it is a covenant which is sought.⁴¹⁵

4QInstruction contains many occurrences of שׂרשׁ.⁴¹⁶ The addressee is not to seek a delicacy (הענוג) if there is no food (4QInstruction^b 2 II, 19).⁴¹⁷ In 4QInstruction^d 81 18 כול דורשי הפן, “all seekers of pleasure” perhaps refers to people who would object to the exhortation in 4QInstruction^b 2 II, 19.⁴¹⁸ In 4QInstruction^b 2 III, 9⁴¹⁹ the addressee is to investigate “its origins” through the mystery that is to be, so that he will know his/its inheritance. The process of seeking in order to know recalls 1QS V, 11, and is also evident in 4QInstruction^c 1 I, 6. Knowledge (דעת) itself is the object of שׂרשׁ in 4QInstruction^b 2 III, 12-13.⁴²⁰ In 4QInstruction^b 2 III, 14-15⁴²¹ שׂרשׁ is parallel with בִּין Hithpolel and נבט Hiphil with רזנהיה as its object. Seeking, understanding, and contemplating precede knowledge:

(1a) רזנהיה דרוש

(1b) והתבונן בכל דרכי אמת

(1c) שורשי עולה תביט⁴²²

(2) ואז תדע מה מר לאיש ומה מתוק לגבר

(1a) *Investigate the mystery that is to be*

(1b) *And understand all truthful ways*

(1c) *And contemplate all the roots of injustice*

⁴¹³ Cf. 4QD^c 2 I, 10; 4QBéat 5 5.

⁴¹⁴ 1QH^a XIII, 9: סוד אמת אמצתה בלבבי ומוזה ברית לדורשיה, “you established truthful counsel in my heart, thus a covenant for those who seek it.”

⁴¹⁵ Cf. 1QS V, 9.

⁴¹⁶ Cf. Lange, *Weisheit*, 58-59.

⁴¹⁷ Par. 4QInstruction^c 2 II, 24 [reconstructed]. Cf. 4QInstruction^c 28 1.

⁴¹⁸ But cf. Ps 111:2 (Strugnell et al., *Qumran Cave 4 XXIV*, 310. See also 4QInstruction^d 102 4; 126 II, 4, 12; 127 4; 158 3; Sir 35:14 [cf. 4QInstruction^d 81 17]).

⁴¹⁹ Par. 4QInstruction^d 9,9a-c 8-9.

⁴²⁰ Par. 4QInstruction^d 9,9a-c 13.

⁴²¹ 4QInstruction^d 9,9a-c 15-16 (reconstructed).

⁴²² Note that although this verb is 2nd masc. sing. imperfect Hiphil, its force is imperatival because it is parallel with the Qal imperative of שׂרשׁ and the Hithpolel imperative of בִּין: Strugnell et al., *Qumran Cave 4 XXIV*, 120; Joüon §113m.

(2) *Then you shall know what is bitter for a man and what is sweet for a person*

In 4QInstruction^c 1 II, 13 the addressee is to seek “truthfully” (לֵאמֶת).⁴²³ The phrase דֹּרְשֵׁי אֱמֶת, “those who seek truth”⁴²⁴ appears in 4QInstruction^d 69 II, 7⁴²⁵ in a context dealing with judgement (מִשְׁפָּט). In 4QInstruction^d 81 7 the מִבִּין is commanded to “seek his (God’s) judgements” (דְּרוּשׁ מִשְׁפָּטִיו).⁴²⁶ In 4QInstruction^d 88 II, 6 God is the one who seeks, or rather “distinguishes.”

Seeking is an activity associated with the elect group in 4Qcrypt A and a fundamental part of the מִבִּין’s role in 4QInstruction.⁴²⁷ It is part of the dualistic vocabulary of the scrolls, and is also at home in the sapiential context of 4QInstruction. Seeking is part of a process leading to knowledge, an idea shared by the *Serekh* and 4QInstruction. Seeking is not explicitly focused on God or his law, yet the notion of seeking in the majority of the passages discussed here is not alien to the *Serekh*. Indeed, in one case (1QH^a XII, 6) דָּרַשׁ is connected with revelation.

4.3.1.3. Summary

The most prominent aspects of דָּרַשׁ at Qumran must be summarised. First, it is connected with seeking God through the study of the law. Second, it is a precursor to the acquisition of knowledge and the formulation of community rulings. As such, third, it is connected

⁴²³ For an adverbial understanding of the phrase לֵאמֶת, see Strugnell et al., *Qumran Cave 4 XXIV*, 170, 172; Isa 42:3.

⁴²⁴ Cf. 4Q420 1 3, as reconstructed by Elgvin (“Wisdom in the *Yahad*: 4QWays of Righteousness,” *RevQ* 17 [1996]: 212): שֶׁאֱמֶת מִשְׁפָּט וּבִמְחָקֶר צֶדֶק [ידר], “[he shall see]k true judgement, and by searching out righteousness.”

⁴²⁵ 4QInstruction^c 69 II, 7: [דֹּרְשֵׁי אֱמֶת יַעֲזִיבוּ לְמִשְׁפָּטִיכֶם], “those who seek truth shall awake for [yo]ur judgement.”

⁴²⁶ The language of seeking judgement recalls 1QS VI, 7, and also 4Qcrypt A II, 5, which refers to “those who seek judgement” (דֹּרְשֵׁי [י] מִשְׁפָּט). Various appellations, apparently for the same group, appear in this fragment, including “those who know” (יֹדְעִים, line 4), “men of understanding” (אֲנָשֵׁי בִינָה, lines 4-5) and “men of truth” (אֲנָשֵׁי אֱמֶת, lines 6-7). Other appellations originally occurred, but are now in broken contexts. For possible reconstructions, see Pfann, “4Q298,” 229. The 4Qcrypt A text is exceptionally important for reconstructing the dualistic vocabulary of the Qumran scrolls as a corpus, and it is significant that sapiential terminology, including דָּרַשׁ and בִּינָה, is prominent in this text.

⁴²⁷ The context of some references in 4QInstruction is almost impossible to discern because the text is fragmentary. Such references include: 4QInstruction^d 70 4; 96 2; 103 II, 4,5; 107 5; 131 3; 207 5; 239 3 (note מִשְׁפָּט in line 2).

with the revelatory process. Fourth, it is part of both the dualistic and the sapiential aspects of Qumran vocabulary. Because the revelation of hidden things is connected with “seeking” in the form of the study of the law, seeking at Qumran is central to the process of the transmission of revelation. The teaching role of the **משכיל** is central to this process also. It is because of this that a **מדרש** text, made up of community regulations to be taught, must be addressed to this figure.

4.3.2. Summary: **מדרש למשכיל**

This complex sub-section as a whole must now be summarised. **מדרש** indicates written material in 2 Chr 13:22; 24:27; 4QS^b IX,1; 4QS^d I, 1 and also 4QFlor 1 i,21,2 14, in which it indicates a collection of texts accompanied by **פשוט**-type interpretations. In 1QS VI, 24; VIII, 26 **מדרש** refers to a community activity during which rulings (**משפטים**) based on the law were discerned. Similarly, in 1QS VIII, 15 **מדרש התורה** refers to a procedure involving the study of the law. In CD XX, 6 **מדרש התורה** refers to the interpretation of the law resulting from this procedure (as in 4QD^e 7 II, 15), possibly referring to a written collection of rulings.

Why should a **מדרש** be addressed to a **משכיל**? With the possible exception of 1QS I, 1, **משכיל** is not the subject of **דרש**. Furthermore, what exactly is a **מדרש** in 4QS^b IX, 1; 4QS^d I, 1? It was suggested above that **מדרש** often refers to written material, and that the **מדרש** procedure results in the formulation of **משפטים**. Schiffman argues that decisions reached at exegesis sessions were assembled into lists called **סרכים**, “rules,”⁴²⁸ but modifications to this hypothesis are necessary. **סרך** is not simply used at Qumran for a

⁴²⁸ Schiffman, *Halakhah*, 68; Maier, “Early Jewish Biblical Interpretation,” 113.

list of halakic rulings.⁴²⁹ The noun **מדרש** itself could designate a list of **משפטים**, being used for both the **מדרש** procedure and the codified rulings resulting therefrom.⁴³⁰

This is confirmed by the probable reconstruction of CD XIII, 22 and by the term **מדרש** in 4QD^e 7 II, 15. In CD XIII, 22 although we have a difficult text, it seems certain that we should restore **אלה**, “these” and **למשכיל**, “for a/the *maskil*.”⁴³¹ García Martínez and Tigchelaar give **ו[אלה]המ[שפט]ים למשכיל**,⁴³² but it is clear from the photographs in Qimron’s edition that it is impossible to read **מ** as the first letter of the plural noun. It would be equally possible to restore **ואלה השפטים למשכיל**, with no difference in meaning, assuming **שפט** could have this sense in QH.⁴³³ This refers to written rulings. The material in 4QS^b and 4QS^d headed **מדרש למשכיל** should therefore also be understood as written rulings collected together into a single text. **מדרש** in this case is equivalent to **השפטים/משפטים** in CD XIII, 22, and a **מדרש** should thus be understood as a collection of **משפטים**. In the case of 4QS^b and 4QS^d, the rulings relate to a group. Unlike 1QS IX, 12, 21, CD XII, 20-21, and (perhaps) XIII, 22, the rulings do not just relate to the behaviour of a **משכיל**. That is why the **מדרש** is also **על אנשי התורה**, “concerning the men of the law.”⁴³⁴ This adverbial clause identifies the group to which the following rulings are intended to apply, making Charlotte Hempel’s interpretation of the phrase **משכיל על** unlikely.⁴³⁵

⁴²⁹ This appears to be the meaning in 1QS I, 1; V, 1; VI, 8; 1QSa I, 1, 6; CD X, 4; XII, 19, 22; XIII, 7; XIV, 3, 12 (par. 4QD^a 10 I, 5). Cf. 1QM III, 13 (par. 4QM^f IV 10 2 [reconstructed]; cf. possible reconstructions of 1QM I, 1; II, 16); IV, 9; V, 3; VII, 17; VIII, 14; IX, 10; XV, 5; XVI, 1; CD-A VII, 6 (cf. CD-B XIX, 2), 8 (cf. CD-B XIX, 4). However, see also: 1QS I, 16; II, 20, 21; V, 23; VI, 22; 1QSa I, 21, 23; 1QM III, 3; IV, 6, 11; V, 4; VI, 10, 11, 14; VII, 1; XIII, 1; XV, 4; XVIII, 6.

⁴³⁰ This reflects Stegemann’s understanding of **מדרש** at Qumran as a technical term for the interpretation of the biblical writings and at the same time things found, Essene halakah, and thus the totality of standards and rules of conduct which were formulated as interpretations resulting from what was found in the law (*Essener*, 165).

⁴³¹ E.g. Elisha Qimron, “The Text of CDC,” in *The Damascus Document Reconsidered* (ed. M. Broshi; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1992), 35.

⁴³² García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *DSSSE* 1:572.

⁴³³ In 1QS V, 12, **שפטים** appears to refer to punishments, as in 1QM XI, 16; 1QH^a VII, 22.

⁴³⁴ For **על** here meaning “concerning” cf. Charlesworth and Strawn, “Reflections,” 410; Alexander and Vermes, *Qumran Cave 4 XIX*, 54, 95, 96.

⁴³⁵ Hempel suggests that the phrase **מדרש למשכיל על אנשי התורה** in 4QS^d I, 1 should be translated “Midrash for the *maskil* over the men of the law” (“Comments,” 128). She supports her claim by referring

4.4. Summary: transmission in the *Serekh*

These conclusions must be placed in the broader context of our study. 4QS^b IX, 1; 4QS^d I, 1 are essential for an understanding of transmission at Qumran. As *מדרש* texts they incorporate community rulings found through seeking God in the study of the law, a process which involves the revelation of hidden things. The teaching role of the *משכיל*, and the importance to his role of seeking God, explain why these texts are addressed to him. The connection with the *משכיל* is important because this figure is the agent of divine revelation in the community, as our study of *בין* in the *Serekh* demonstrated. In the *Serekh*, wisdom belongs in heaven and is revealed to the elect through the agency of the *משכיל*. In the same way, community rulings are the result of a revelatory process, and in 4QS^b IX, 1; 4QS^d I, 1 they are part of the *משכיל*'s responsibility. Thus while in 4Q380 and 4Q381 we see a technical language used to represent a process by which divine insight is transmitted to humans, and in 4QInstruction we find a similar use of language connected with a social setting in which a *משכיל* transmits revealed teaching to a *מבין*, we find in the *Serekh* two different but complementary presentations of transmission. In the first, sapiential language familiar from Daniel onwards represents the *משכיל*'s role in the revelatory process in a manner analogous to 4QInstruction. In the second, the *משכיל* is connected with preserving and transmitting rulings understood to be revealed through the community study of the law. In all three groups of texts studied so far we have found both a complex of ideas in which heavenly wisdom is transmitted to humans through the mediation of a human agent, and a common use of sapiential language, which is shared with the book of Daniel.

to 1QS VI, 11-12, which refers to *האיש המבקר על הרבים*, “the man who oversees at the head of the many.” In fact, this phrase in 1QS VI, 11-12 is also subject to more than one interpretation. It could be translated “the man who inquires concerning the many.” Charlesworth and Strawn note that “concerning” would refer to the task of the *משכיל*, whereas “over” would refer to his status (“Reflections,” 410 n. 25).

5. The 4QD fragments

Sapiential language in the Damascus Document was studied long before the publication of the 4QD fragments. In 1967 A.-M. Denis published a thorough analysis of terms for knowledge in the Damascus Document,⁴³⁶ and Armin Lange commented in 1995 that “CD II_{2ff.} ist ein Text, in dem weisheitliche Formen, Traditionen und Topoi mit prophetischem, nomistischem und geschichtstheologischem Gedankengut verschmelzen,”⁴³⁷ recognizing the importance of at least formal sapiential elements in that section of D. This section will examine sapiential terminology and the concept of revelation in D. The Cairo Damascus manuscripts will be subordinated to the 4QD fragments since only the 4QD, 5QD, and 6QD fragments are really “Qumran” scrolls *strictu sensu*. The Cairo manuscripts, though in some cases more complete, should be understood as later adaptations of earlier D material.⁴³⁸

5.1. The 4QD fragments and the משכיל

The first task is to clarify the role of the משכיל in the 4QD fragments.

5.1.1. The textual affinities of 4QD^a 1a-b 1

It has been demonstrated that seeking is linked to the משכיל through the rubrics in 4QS^b IX, 1; 4QS^d I, 1. In the 4QD material, in 4QD^e 7 II, 12-15, there is a link between פרוש המשפטים and מדרש התורה. It is thus noteworthy that the rubrics in 4QS^b and 4QS^d have prompted Joseph Baumgarten to reconstruct 4QD^a 1a-b 1 [פרוש המשפטים למשכיל לב]ני אור.⁴³⁹ This reconstruction contains three sections, on analogy with other Qumran rubrics:

⁴³⁶ A.-M. Denis, *Les Thèmes de Connaissance dans Le Document de Damas* (StudHell 15; Louvain: Publications Universitaires de Louvain, 1967).

⁴³⁷ Lange, *Weisheit*, 233.

⁴³⁸ Cf. Lange, *Weisheit*, 233-234.

⁴³⁹ Hartmut Stegemann has suggested reconstructing the opening rubric thus: לכול ב[ני אור] זה מדרש התורה האחרון לכול (Baumgarten, “Corrigenda,” 222). This is based on his belief that מדרש התורה האחרון is the title of the Damascus Document as a whole (*Essener*, 165). As is the case with the book of Jubilees, the Damascus Document would thus begin and end with an indication of the

(1) a statement of the nature of the work: פרוש המשפטים

(2) the title of the teacher: למשכיל

(3) an indication of the intended audience: לבני אור⁴⁴⁰

Certainly Baumgarten's restoration is highly conjectural, a point exploited by Philip Davies, who strongly disapproves of restoring משכיל here on the basis that this is not a common D word.⁴⁴¹ משכיל does occur in CD XII, 21⁴⁴² and 4QD^a 9 III, 15 (par. CD XIII, 22), though it is not as frequent as מבקר. This is not in itself a sound argument against its reconstruction here: בני אור is a phrase characteristic of the *Serekh*, not D, which certainly suggests a connection between this rubric and the *Serekh*. The point here is not to defend Baumgarten's restoration *per se*, but to defend a connection with the *Serekh*, and thus with revelation through the mediation of a משכיל.

The closest parallels to 4QD^a 1a-b 1 are in *Serekh ha-Yahad*. בני אור does not occur in the remaining D material, though the phrase בני שחר, "sons of dawn" does.⁴⁴³ The absence of בני אור from mss A and B may be because this phrase had become

title of the work. Baumgarten ("Corrigenda," 222) suggests, alternatively, that פרוש המשפטים is a more plausible title, but does not suggest reconstructing this at the beginning of the text.

⁴⁴⁰ Baumgarten, *Qumran Cave 4 XIII*, 31-32. Baumgarten translates the beginning of the first line "[The elaboration of the laws by the Sage for the s]ons of light."

⁴⁴¹ Philip R. Davies, "Reflections on DJD XVIII," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls at Fifty: Proceedings of the 1997 Society of Biblical Literature Qumran Section Meetings* (ed. R. A. Kugler and E. M. Schuller; SBLEJL 15; Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1999), 159.

⁴⁴² This reference is ignored by Davies, as noted by Baumgarten ("A Response to the Discussion of DJD XVIII," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls at Fifty: Proceedings of the 1997 Society of Biblical Literature Qumran Section Meetings* [ed. R. A. Kugler and E. M. Schuller; SBLEJL 15; Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1999], 199). It is a crucial reference: unlike CD XIII, 22 the context is well preserved, and the rubric in which משכיל occurs is highly reminiscent of 1QS IX, 12.

⁴⁴³ See CD XIII, 14-15: ואיש מכל באי ברית אל אל ישא ואל יתן לבני השחר כי אם כף לכף, "and none of those who enter God's covenant should receive (from) or give to the sons of dawn, except hand to hand" (cf. 4Qcrypt A I, 1). Cf. Baumgarten, "The 'Sons of Dawn' in CDC 13,14-15 and the Ban on Commerce among the Essenes," *IEJ* 33 (1983): 82-83. Rather than being just a synonym for בני אור (Baumgarten), or a term for candidates for admission to the Qumran sect (Menachem Kister in Torleif Elgvin, Menachem Kister, Timothy H. Lim, Bilhah Nitzan, Stephen J. Pfann, Elisha Qimron, Lawrence H. Schiffman, and Annette Steudel, in consultation with Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *Qumran Cave 4 XV: Sapiential Texts, Part 1* [DJD 20; Oxford: Clarendon, 1997], 21), it is also possible that the term was chosen to deliberately echo the polar opposite, בני השחת (James E. Harding, "The Wordplay between the Roots כשל and שכל in the Literature of the *Yahad*," *RevQ* 19 [1999]: 69). This would not conflict with either Baumgarten's suggestion or Kister's.

inextricably linked with Christian self-identification when they were redacted and copied.⁴⁴⁴

The term does occur in 1QS III, 13 in a rubric addressed to a/the **משכיל**:

(1) the title of the teacher: **למשכיל**

(2) a statement of the nature of the work: **להבין וללמוד**

(3) an indication of the intended audience: **את כול בני אור**

The link between 4QD^a 1a-b 1 and 1QS III, 13-IV, 26 suggests not only that the former is a text addressed to a/the **משכיל**, but that there is a direct connection between the communities of the *Serekh* and 4QD^a.

5.1.2. Separation in 4QD^a 1a-b 1 and related texts

4QD^a and the *Serekh* share the idea that a particular group should be “separated.” In 4QD^a 1a-b 1 the key term is **להנזר**, either a Hiphil infinitive absolute (**לְהִנָּזֵר**: “keep separate”) or a Niphal infinitive construct or absolute (**לְהִנָּזֵר**: “dedicate oneself”) of **נזר**, which occurs most prominently in Num 6.⁴⁴⁵ It is characteristic of D, occurring elsewhere at Qumran only in 4QInstruction and 4QHistorical Work 1 II, 5. In CD VI, 15;⁴⁴⁶ VII, 1;⁴⁴⁷ 4QInstruction^d 81 + 81a 2⁴⁴⁸ **נזר** and **בדל** are apparently synonymous, and it is possible that **להבדל**, “to separate” should be reconstructed in the lacuna in 4QD^a 1a-b 2.⁴⁴⁹ The

⁴⁴⁴ Cf. Luke 16:8; John 12:36; Eph 5:8; 1 Thess 5:5.

⁴⁴⁵ See also Lev 15:31; 22:2; Ezek 14:7; Hos 9:10; Zech 7:3. Ezekiel 14:7 has numerous resonances in 1QS II (cf. Leane, *Rule*, 134; Wernberg-Møller, *Manual of Discipline*, 54). The phrase **גלולי לבו**, “the idols of his heart” in 1QS II, 11 (cf. II, 17) recalls **ויעל גלוליו אל לבו**. The phrase **מכשול עונו ישים** in Ezek 14:7 recurs in 1QS II, 12 and 1QS II, 17 repeats the same phrase without the verb. It could be argued that **ויבדילהו** in 1QS II, 16 is a deliberate rewording of Ezek 14:7, where those in the wrong separate (**נזר**) of from Yahweh. In 1QS II, 16 God separates (**בדל**) the wrongdoer for evil.

⁴⁴⁶ CD VI, 14-15: **להבדל מבני השחת ולהנזר מהון הרשעה הטמא**, “to separate from the sons of the pit and keep apart from wicked, unclean wealth.” Chaim Rabin takes **להנזר** as an interpretation of Lev 22:2-3 (*The Zadokite Documents: I. The Admonition II. The Laws* [2d ed.; Oxford: Clarendon, 1958], 25).

⁴⁴⁷ Compare the use of **בדל** in CD VII, 3, 4; VIII, 8 (par. XIX, 20).

⁴⁴⁸ 4QInstruction^d 81 + 81a 1-2: **הבדילכה בכול רוח בשר ואתה הבדל מכול שנא ונזר מכול**, “he has separated you from every spirit of flesh. And you, keep separate from everything he hates, and keep apart from every abomination of the soul”). 4QInstruction seems to reflect the language and thought of D here, **נזר** and **בדל** again being parallel.

⁴⁴⁹ So Stegemann, who reconstructs thus: **[ולתהלך תמים על פי התורה]**, “[and to walk perfectly according to the Law]” (Baumgarten, “Corrigenda,” 222).

synonymy between נִזָּר and בָּדַל links the 4QD fragments with the *Serekh*, especially with מִשְׁכִּיל texts. The implication is that S and D bear witness to a separatist community which is the context for the revelation and transmission of hidden insight and hidden interpretations of the law.

Separation (בָּדַל, not נִזָּר) is a key concept in the *Serekh*. In 1QS V, 1⁴⁵⁰ separation is part of the vocation of אֲנָשֵׁי הַיְיָחָד, “the men of the community.”⁴⁵¹ In 4QS^d the infinitives may apply to the מִשְׁכִּיל rather than the men of the law. In any case, in 4QS^d the מִשְׁכִּיל is the addressee of a text counselling separation for the group with which he is connected. Baumgarten compares לַהֲנַזֵּר מִדֶּרֶךְ נָכִין, “to separate from the pat[hs of]” with 4QHistorical Work 1 II, 5⁴⁵² but 1QS V, 10-11 is equally comparable.⁴⁵³ Separation is from the path as well as the men of injustice,⁴⁵⁴ as in 4QD^a 1a-b 1. Separation in 1QS VIII, 11⁴⁵⁵ occurs when “these have been established in the foundation of the community for two years, in perfection of way” (בְּהַכִּין אֱלֹהֵי בִיסוֹד הַיְיָחָד שְׁנָתַיִם יָמִים בְּתַמִּים דֶּרֶךְ). דֶּרֶךְ links this text with 4QD^a 1a-b 1; 1QS V, 10. In 1QS V, 18 separation is two-way: those not included in the covenant are also separated.⁴⁵⁶ בָּדַל occurs twice in the *Statutes for a Maskil*. In 1QS IX, 14⁴⁵⁷ the מִשְׁכִּיל is to separate the sons of justice according to their spirits. This recalls 1QH^a XV, 12, where the hymnist is God’s agent in separating the righteous from the wicked.⁴⁵⁸

⁴⁵⁰ Par. 4QS^b IX, 2; 4QS^d I, 2. In 4QS^d I, 2 בָּדַל is Qal or Piel rather than Hiphil, unless it is a scribal error. Separation from עֲדַת אֲנָשֵׁי הָעוֹל, “the counsel of the men of injustice” recalls CD VI, 14-15 (לְהַבְדִּיל מִבְּנֵי הַשְּׁחָת, “to separate from the sons of the pit”).

⁴⁵¹ 4QS^d I, 1: אֲנָשֵׁי הַתּוֹרָה, “the men of the law.”

⁴⁵² Baumgarten, *Qumran Cave 4 XIII*, 32.

⁴⁵³ 1QS V, 10-11: לַהֲבַדֵּל מִכּוֹל אֲנָשֵׁי הָעוֹל הַהוֹלְכִים בְּדֶרֶךְ הָרָשָׁעָה, “to separate from the men of injustice who walk in the wicked path.” Cf. CD II, 2-3.

⁴⁵⁴ This is not evident in 4QS^b IX, 8 or 4QS^d I, 7.

⁴⁵⁵ Par. 4QS^d VI, 5; 4QS^e III, 1 (both reconstructed). Cf. 1QS VIII, 13 (par. 4QS^d VI, 6; 4QS^e III, 3); IX, 5 (par. 4QS^d VII, 6).

⁴⁵⁶ Cf. 1QS VI, 25 (par. 4QS^g 3 3 [reconstructed]); VII, 1, 3, 5, 18; VIII, 24 (par. 4QS^d VII, 1).

⁴⁵⁷ Par. 4QS^e III, 10 (reconstructed).

⁴⁵⁸ Cf. 1QLitPr 3 I, 4-5; 4QInstruction^d 221 4; CD VI, 17 (par. 4QD^a 3 II, 20 [reconstructed]); XII, 19-20 (par. 4QD^a 9 II, 6 [reconstructed]). God may be the subject of בָּדַל in 4QInstruction^d 126 II, 8. In 1QLitPr

The link between separation and the **משכיל** in the *Serekh* may be why 1QS III, 13-15 does not mention separation. The **משכיל** has already separated the sons of light from their opponents and is in a position to teach them the group's doctrines in the context of the separated community. The idea of the separation of the sons of light recurs in 4QD^a 1a-b 1.

5.1.3. Separation and the teaching of hidden things

Since the teachings of 1QS III, 15-IV, 26 belong only within the separated community, a clear link between separation and the teaching of hidden things should now be demonstrated.

5.1.3.1. 1QS V, 10

In 1QS V, 10, the one who enters the community council⁴⁵⁹ is to separate from all men of injustice because:

- (1) they are not reckoned in God's covenant (1QS V, 10, 18).
- (2) they have neither sought nor investigated God's statutes to know the hidden things in which they erred.
- (3) they have treated the revealed things with an arrogant hand (1QS V, 11-12).

All who enter the community council are reckoned in God's covenant and have sought and investigated God's statutes in order to know **נסתרות**, "hidden things." Separation is something done by those willing to investigate God's statutes. This results in knowledge of hidden things.

3 II, 6 God is the subject of **בדל** Hiphil, the object being the people he had chosen. This text thus belongs to the same thought world as the *Serekh* (cf. 1QSb V, 2).

⁴⁵⁹ Cf. 1QS V, 7.

5.1.3.2. 1QS VIII, 11

1QS VIII, 11 is part of a pericope extending from line 10 to line 12, in which the only topics are separation and uncovering what is hidden. Separation indicates a subdivision within a wider community. The subject of **יְבָרְלוּ** seems to be the same as the referent of **אֱלֹהִים** in line 12. Something hidden from “these” found by a man who investigates should no longer be concealed. The imparting of things previously hidden is crucial to the way the inner group works. This relates to the use of **דָּרַשׁ** at Qumran. In the next pericope, beginning in 1QS VIII, 13, separation from **מוֹשֵׁב הַנְּשִׁי הָעוֹל**, “the session of the men of injustice” means going to the wilderness to study **תּוֹרָה** (1QS VIII, 15). **דָּרַשׁ** and **בָּרַל** link the two pericopae. Separation is a prerequisite for the study of **תּוֹרָה**, which is itself a prerequisite for uncovering what is hidden.⁴⁶⁰

5.1.3.3. 1QS IX, 12-21

Separation and revelation are fundamental to the role of the **מִשְׁכִּיל** in 1QS IX, 12-21. In 1QS IX, 13-14 three significant phrases occur in parallel:

- (1) לעשות את רצון אל ככול הנגלה לעת בעת
- (2) ולמוד את כול השכל הנמצא לפי העתים ואת חוק העת
- (3) להבדיל ולשקול בני הצדק לפי רוחם

(1) *to perform God's will according to all that has been revealed from time to time*

(2) *and to learn all insight which has been found according to the times and the statute of the time*

(3) *to separate and weigh the sons of justice according to their spirits*

⁴⁶⁰ The same cluster of terms is used for the separation of a wrongdoer in 1QS VIII, 24. The one who breaks a word of Mosaic law unwittingly will be separated (**הוֹבָרַל**) and they shall apply (**וְדָרְשׁוּ**) the following regulation (**מִשְׁפָּט**) to him.

In line 17 the *משכיל* is responsible for hiding⁴⁶¹ the counsel of the law among the men of injustice, the group from whom the community must separate. 1QS IX, 20 should be read in light of 1QS IX, 13. The *משכיל* is to transmit to others what he has received. He is to transmit revealed insight⁴⁶² as a precursor to separation from all who have not withdrawn their path from all evil.⁴⁶³ The *Serekh* suggests that separation is connected to what is hidden and revealed, and that the *משכיל* is responsible for concealing from outsiders but revealing to insiders. The *משכיל* is at the centre of the process of transmitting what is revealed within a closed community.

5.1.3.4. 4QD^a and 4QD^c⁴⁶⁴

In 4QD^a and 4QD^c there is a discourse which precedes the parallel text in CD,⁴⁶⁵ whose language is related to both the *Serekh* and Dan 2:20-23 (Aramaic). In Dan 2:20-23, Daniel addresses God, praising him for imparting wisdom and power to him and making known to him what he and his companions asked. God is a revealer,⁴⁶⁶ described in Dan 2:22 as *גלִּיָּא עֲמִיקָתָא וּמִסְתָּרָתָא*, “revealer of deep and hidden things.” This language influenced 4QD^a and 4QD^c. *עמקה*⁴⁶⁷ occurs in 4QD^a 1a-b 8, recalling *עֲמִיקָתָא* in Dan 2:22. In Dan 2:21 God changes times and seasons, possibly to be compared with the temporal concerns of 4QD^a 1a-b 2; 2 I, 2-3.

⁴⁶¹ See the discussion of the terms *נסתר*, “hidden” and *נגלה*, “revealed” in Schiffman, *Halakhah*, 22-32. Schiffman understands *נסתר* as the sectarian interpretation of Scripture (*Halakhah*, 32), though our discussion of the relationship between *עמק* and *סתר* below should demonstrate that the biblical background to this term is also related to wisdom texts *via* Daniel.

⁴⁶² This is the sense of *להשכילם כול הנמצא*, which refers back to the language of IX, 13.

⁴⁶³ Cf. 1QS IX, 20-21: *והבדל מכול איש ולוא הסר דרכו מכול עול*, “and to separate from everyone who has not turned his path away from all injustice”.

⁴⁶⁴ A table of overlaps between all D mss is found in Baumgarten, *Qumran Cave 4 XIII*, 3-5. Cf. Lange, *Weisheit*, 248.

⁴⁶⁵ CD I, 1 is paralleled in 4QD^a 2 II, 6; 4QD^c 1 9.

⁴⁶⁶ Cf. Dan 2:19, 28. LaCocque, *Daniel*, 42-43, 45.

⁴⁶⁷ Baumgarten suggests that “[t]his perhaps described the esoteric knowledge of the initiated” (*Qumran Cave 4 XIII*, 33).

In 4QD^a 2 I, 5-6 we read that God “has uncovered their eyes to hidden things and their ears they opened⁴⁶⁸ in order to hear deep things and understand everything that will happen before it comes upon them.”⁴⁶⁹ God is the subject of גלה, as he is the subject of the equivalent Aramaic verb in Dan 2:22, 28. As in Dan 2:22, in 4QD^a and 4QD^c what is revealed was originally hidden and there is in 4QD^a and 4QD^c a connection between “hidden things” and “deep things” deriving from Dan 2:22 and evident in the sequence in the text:

(1) ויגל עיניהם בנסתרות

(2) ואזננם פתחו

(3) וישמעו עמוקות

(4) ויבינו בכול נהיות עד מה יבוא בהם

(1) *And he uncovered their eyes to hidden things*

(2) *and they opened their ears*

(3) *and heard deep things*

(4) *and understood everything that is to happen before it comes upon them*

This sequence, based on Baumgarten’s restoration of the passage in 4QD^a, works like this: God opens their eyes to “hidden things”; in response, they open their ears, which leads to them hearing “deep things”; this results in them understanding everything that is to happen before it comes upon them. Baumgarten’s restoration of the 4QD^c parallel⁴⁷⁰ could be arranged thus:

(1) ויגל עיניהמה בנסתרות

(2) ואזנמה פתח

(3) וישמעו עמוקות

(4) ויבינו בכול נהיות עד מה יבוא במה

⁴⁶⁸ 4QD^c 1 7: פתח, “he (viz. God) opened.”

⁴⁶⁹ Restored text following 4QD^c 1 7-8. Cf. Baumgarten, *Qumran Cave 4 XIII*, 34.

⁴⁷⁰ Cf. Baumgarten, *Qumran Cave 4 XIII*, 119.

The variant פתח alters the structure of this passage. The perfect פתח is parallel with the imperfect + vav-consecutive ויגל. God is the subject of both, which means that the two actions of opening their eyes and opening their ears are parallel and synonymous. They refer to God's revelation. God uncovers their eyes to hidden things *and* opens their ears. Consequently they hear "deep things" and understand what is to happen before it comes upon them. שמע Qal is parallel with בין Hiphil, and thus נהיות is syntactically parallel with עמוקות. In the 4QD^c text, the stress is on divine initiative; in the 4QD^a parallel the stress is on human response.

5.1.3.5. עמק in the Qumran scrolls and the HB

At this point a word study of עמק is required to fill in the background and wider context of this passage and the ideas it contains.

5.1.3.5.1. The Hebrew scrolls

עמק is not particularly common in the Hebrew scrolls from Qumran. However, 1QM X, 11 is clearly linked with 4QD^a 2 I, 5.⁴⁷¹ Israel is described as שומעי עמוקות, "those who hear deep things."⁴⁷² In the previous line, Israel is a people wise with understanding (משכילי בינה), perhaps an allusion to the משכילים of Daniel. The phrase מועדי קודש, "appointed times of holiness" in 1QM X, 15 possibly echoes the reference to time in Dan 2:21.⁴⁷³ In 4QBéat 5 12 we read יכרו דרכיה ובמעמקה, "the prudent dig her paths, and in her depths" The 3rd fem. sing. suffixes presumably refer to Wisdom (חכמה) or law (תורה), making it more likely that "depth" is a metaphor for the hidden riches Wisdom offers. The phrase הולכי תמים, "those who walk perfectly" appears in line 10.⁴⁷⁴ Furthermore, the verbs תדרשוה, "you shall seek her" (line 6 and 7

⁴⁷¹ Par. 4QD^c 1 7.

⁴⁷² Cf. 1QM X, 10: שומעי קול נכבד, "those who hear the glorified voice." The passage in 4QD^a and 4QD^c is also echoed in the phrase מגולי אוזן, "with opened ears(?)" in 1QM X, 11. בינה, עמק, שמע, and מועד all occur in Isa 33:19-20 (cf. Ezek 3:5-6).

⁴⁷³ Cf. Dan 8:19; 11:27, 29, 35; 12:7; 4QD^a 1a-b 2; 2 I, 2 (par. 4QD^c 1 4).

⁴⁷⁴ Cf. 4QD^a 2 I, 4 (par. 4QD^c 1 6-7 [reconstructed]).

[reconstructed]), [י]שכילו, “[they] shall give insight” (line 9), and יביטו, “they shall contemplate” (line 13), and the substantives [חכמים], “sages” (line 8) and נבונים, “those who understand” (line 10) suggest that the context concerns meditation on God’s mysteries. In 4QInstruction^d 119 4, the phrase מעמקי הים, “depths of the sea”, like the noun מצולה, “deep” in lines 2 and 3, seems to refer to the physical actuality of the depths of the sea rather than to esoteric lore that is hidden.⁴⁷⁵

Thus עמק refers to deep or hidden mysteries on three out of four occasions in the Hebrew scrolls from Qumran: 4QDa 2 I, 5; 1QM X, 11; 4QBéat 5 12.

5.1.3.5.2. The Aramaic scrolls

In the Genesis Apocryphon, עמק means “valley.” In 1QapGen XXI, 25;⁴⁷⁶ XXI, 32⁴⁷⁷ the valley of the Siddim (עמקא די סדיא) is mentioned and in 1QapGen XXII, 13-14⁴⁷⁸ the valley of Shaveh (עמק שוא) and the king’s valley (עמק מלכא) are mentioned. In 4QEn^dar 1 II, 5⁴⁷⁹ חלה עמיקה is reconstructed, meaning “deep valley.” There is no parallel in the Aramaic texts from Qumran to עמיקתא in Dan 2:22, nor is there an occurrence of עמק which is not paralleled in a previously known text, in this case Genesis or Ethiopic Enoch.

⁴⁷⁵ In connection with this text the editors cite Isa 51:10; Ezek 27:34; Ps 69:3, 15 (Strugnell et al., *Qumran Cave 4 XXIV*, 343). In Ps 130:1 מעמקים expresses the gulf between worshipper and YHWH. The adjective עמק often simply means physically deep in the HB, one exception being Ps 64:7, referring to the profundity of human thought. Elsewhere it refers to Oholah’s cup (Ezek 23:32) and to aspects of levitical uncleanness connected with skin disease (Lev 13:3, 4, 25, 30, 31, 32, 34). Compare the verb form in Isa 30:33. The Hiphil verb in Isa 31:6 is equivalent to יסף Hiphil, meaning to “deepen/increase (apostasy).”

⁴⁷⁶ Par. Gen 14:3 (MT).

⁴⁷⁷ Par. Gen 14:8 (MT).

⁴⁷⁸ Par. Gen 14:17: (MT).

⁴⁷⁹ Par. 1 En. 26:3.

5.1.3.5.3. Psalm 64

1QM X, 11; 4QBéat 5 12; Dan 2:22 demonstrate that עֲמֹק may refer to profound, hidden things. In Dan 2 the term is equivalent to רָז, “mystery,” since this is what God reveals.⁴⁸⁰ Psalm 64 may hold the key to the connection between סֵתֶר and עֲמֹק.⁴⁸¹ There is an anthropological dualism in this psalm⁴⁸² and God is to hide (סֵתֶר Hiphil) the worshipper from the counsel of the wicked (Ps 64:3). The noun מִסְתָּרִים occurs in verse 5, meaning “secret places.” עֲמֹק occurs in verse 7 in reference to the profundity of human thought. These ideas do not refer to heavenly secrets, but the presence of anthropological dualism, secrecy, hidden things, and the polarity between כֶּשֶׁל and שִׁכְל (which I have discussed elsewhere)⁴⁸³ suggests there are links with Daniel and Qumran.

5.1.3.5.4. Sapiential and prophetic texts

God is revealer in Job 11:6, and עֲמֹק is used in verse 8 to describe the “limit of Shaddai” (תִּכְלִית שִׁדַּי). This is the object of מִצָּא, as is “God’s secret thing” (הַחֲקֵר אֱלֹהִים) in Job 11:7a. The idea of searching what is hidden is therefore in mind. Job 12:22 almost certainly lies behind Dan 2:22-23. In Prov 18:4, מַיִם עֲמֻקִּים, “deep waters” is parallel with נַחַל נִבֵּעַ, “bubbling stream,” which is in turn parallel with מְקוֹר חַכְמָה, “fountain of wisdom,”⁴⁸⁴ linking עֲמֹק explicitly with wisdom. In Prov 20:5 עֵצָה, “counsel,” an important Qumran term, has מַיִם עֲמֻקִּים, “deep waters” as its predicate. Counsel is drawn out by a “man of understanding” (אִישׁ תְּבוּנָה).⁴⁸⁵ God conceals (הִסְתִּיר) in Prov 25:2 and עֲמֹק appears in the following line in reference to the depths of the earth, in contrast to the height of the heavens. In Qoh 7:23-24, עֲמֹק refers to something unknowable. The

⁴⁸⁰ Dan 2:18, 19, 27, 28, 29, 30, 47; 4:6.

⁴⁸¹ Cf. Isa 29:15; Jer 49:7-10, 30.

⁴⁸² Ps 64:2, 11.

⁴⁸³ Harding, “Wordplay,” esp. p. 75.

⁴⁸⁴ Cf. 4QD^e 2 II 3.

⁴⁸⁵ Prov 22:14 describes the mouth of a harlot as a “deep pit” (שׁוֹחָה עֲמֻקָּה, cf. Prov 23:27). In Prov 9:18, those called by the foolish woman are “in the depths of Sheol” (בְּעֲמֻקֵּי שְׁאוֹל). In Hos 5:2, שְׁחָטָה שְׂטִים הָעֲמִיקוּ may mean “those who swerve have fallen deeply into slaughter” (cf. Hos 9:9).

unknowability of deep things contributes to the preacher's sense of futility because wisdom cannot be attained. In Ps 92:6 Yahweh's thoughts are deep⁴⁸⁶ and ידע and בין occur in verse 7. In Isa 7:11, the sign Yahweh asks Ahaz to seek from him was to be as deep as Sheol (עִמְקֵי שְׁאֵלָה). Isaiah's exhortation in verse 13 echoes CD I, 1.⁴⁸⁷ Sirach 39:2 should also be mentioned: "he guards the thought of men of renown, and enters the depths of metaphors" (שיחת אנשי שם ישמר ובעמקי מליצות יבוא). Here, עמק clearly belongs to the semantic domain of wisdom. In summary, although עמק can indicate physical depth, as in "deep waters," it is frequently used metaphorically in sapiential and prophetic texts to refer to "deep things" that must be searched out.

5.1.3.5.5. Summary

The link between סתר and עמק derives from the HB and the use of עמק in 4QD^a and 4QD^c stands in the tradition of the wisdom literature inherited by Jews of the late Second Temple period. This is also true Dan 2:20-23. The D material thus reflects the inheriting of a metaphorical meaning for these two roots, together with their use in collocation, from the HB.

5.1.4. The מַשְׁכִּיל and revelation

We must now consider the relationship between hidden things, deep things, the מַשְׁכִּיל, and the phrase כּוֹל נְהִיּוֹת, "everything that is to happen" (4QD^c 1 8). Reading the book of Daniel as a whole a relationship emerges between the revelation of deep and hidden things and the מַשְׁכִּיל.

5.1.4.1. The book of Daniel

In Dan 1:4, Daniel and his companions are described as מַשְׁכִּילִים בְּכָל-חֵכְמָה, "having insight into all wisdom." They were to be taught (למד Piel), recalling 1QS IX,13; III, 13,

⁴⁸⁶ Cf. 4QD^a 1 5.

⁴⁸⁷ Par. 4QD^a 2 I, 6; 4QD^c 1 9; cf. 4QD^e 2 II, 19.

where the *משכיל* learns (למד Qal) and then teaches (למד Piel). In Dan 1:17 God has given them insight (השכל) and wisdom (חכמה). As with the *משכיל* of the *Serekh*, the reason they are *משכילים* is because they have received insight (שכל). Dan 2:4b demonstrates they are willing to transmit things previously hidden. In verse 18, what Nebuchadnezzar had asked of them is described as “this mystery” (רְזָה דְּנִנְה) and the revelation granted to Daniel is related in the language of mystery and revelation (Dan 2:19: רְזָה גְּלִי, “the mystery was revealed”). In verse 22, what God reveals is עֲמִיקְתָּא וּמִסְתָּרָתָא. This suggests that deep and hidden things constitute a closer definition of the revealed mystery. The light-darkness dualism of this verse, mirrored in the secrecy-revelation motif, suggests that this text would have been meaningful to a group for whom appellations such as בני אור, “sons of light” and בני השחר, “sons of the dawn,” and the ideas of 1QS III, 13-IV, 26 were important.

5.1.4.2. 4QD^a 2 II, 5-6 (par. 4QD^c 1 7-8)

The idea of God as “revealer of mysteries” (cf. Dan 2:29b) is presupposed in 4QD^a 2 I, 5.⁴⁸⁸ Furthermore, the phrase גְּלִי אֲרִיָא הוֹדַעַךְ מַה־דִּי לְהוֹא, “the one who reveals mysteries has made known to you what will be” in Dan 2:29b includes a phrase that is strikingly similar to כּוּל נְהִיּוּת, “everything that will be” in the 4QD fragments. In both, a form of the verb “to be”⁴⁸⁹ is used to refer to what is going to happen.

When the phrase גְּלִי אֲרִיָא הוֹדַעַךְ מַה־דִּי לְהוֹא in Dan 2:29b is analysed, the same idea occurs twice. גְּלִי, “reveal” is comparable semantically with ידע Haphel. אֲרִיָא, “mysteries” and מַה־דִּי לְהוֹא, “what will be” are also comparable. Both are revealed by God, the latter being one of the mysteries he reveals. When mapped onto our 4QD passage, כּוּל נְהִיּוּת becomes one of the אֲרִיָא that God reveals: כּוּל נְהִיּוּת is analogous to מַה־דִּי לְהוֹא in Dan 2:29, which in turn is one of the אֲרִיָא God reveals. The parallelism in

⁴⁸⁸ Par. 4QD^c 1 7-8.

⁴⁸⁹ Hebrew: Niphal participle from היה; Aramaic: Peal imperfect from הוה.

4QD^a 2 I, 5-6 suggests that עמוקות and כולנהיות are parallel, just as the phrases גלא עמיקתא in Dan 2:22 and גלא רזיא in Dan 2:29 are parallel. Because גלא עמיקתא is equivalent to רזיא, כולנהיות is also equivalent to both עמוקות and נסתרות, and by extension to רזיא. The following table illustrates this situation:

Term for Mysteries	Verb of Intellection	Verb of Revelation	
רזיא		גלא	Daniel
מהדי להוא		הודעך	
נסתרות		ויגל	4QD
		פתח	
עמוקות	ישמעו		
כולנהיות	ויבינו		

This draws us towards the Qumran concept רזנהיה. In Daniel, what is revealed is a mystery in the singular (Dan 2:18-19; 4:6), suggesting that, although נהיות is a plural participle, what is implied in 4QD^a 2 I, 5-6 is a mystery in the singular. In other words the things (plural) that are going to happen are the content of a mystery.

5.1.4.3. The רזנהיה

Having established that what is implied in 4QD^a 2 I, 5-6 is the concept of mystery, and that the concept of mystery is connected with נהיות, the phrase רזנהיה may now be understood as a construct chain (cf. כולנהיות). רז is *nomen regens* and the fem. sing. Niphal participle נהיה, “what is to come” is used substantively and is *nomen rectum*. This conclusion is reached because נהיות is a feminine participle used substantively. If this conclusion is correct, it is possible that the רזנהיה, “the mystery of what is going to happen” is the concept which lies behind 4QD^a 2 I, 5-6. In fact, it is equally

possible that the 4QD fragments influenced the formulation of the *רִנְהִיָּה* concept itself. The background to this concept lies within or behind the Aramaic of Dan 2.

5.1.4.4. 1QS X-XI

The points made above are confirmed by 1QS X-XI. The link between the final hymn of 1QS and the *Statutes for a Maskil* in 1QS IX, 12-21 establishes that columns X and XI of 1QS are directly connected with the *משכיל*.⁴⁹⁰ If 4QD^a and 4QD^c are *משכיל* texts, as Baumgarten suggests and as seems likely, are we to understand the phrase *צדקות אל תספר לשוני תמיד*, “my tongue shall continually recount the righteous acts of God” in 1QS X, 23 in connection with the admonitions of the D material? Certainly these admonitions could be understood as recalling the righteous acts of God. The *משכיל* hymnist of 1QS X-XI “hides” (אסתר) knowledge in 1QS X, 24⁴⁹¹ and “instructs” (להשכל) in 1QS XI, 1. The phrase *תום דרכי*, “perfection of my way” occurs in 1QS XI, 2 and *רִנְהִיָּה* in 1QS XI, 3-4. *רִנְהִיָּה* appears again in 1QS XI, 5, and the fem. sing. Niphal participle *נסתרה* in 1QS XI, 6, referring to *תושיה*, “prudence,” *דעה*, “knowledge,” *מקוה גבורה*, “well of power,” *מקור צדקה*, “spring of justice,” *מזמת ערמה*, “prudent discretion,” *מעין כבוד*, “fount of glory.” *נְהִיָּה* appears again in 1QS XI, 11, 18, and God himself is the subject of *שכל* Hiphil in XI, 18. This raises the issue of whether the *משכיל* represents God here, just as he participates in a divine activity in 1QS III, 13-IV, 26. If the language of 1QS is pressed, then the root *שכל* links the activity of God with that of the *משכיל*. God instructs (*שכל* Hiphil: 1QS IV, 22; XI, 18), the *משכיל* learns insight that has been found (*השכל הנמצא*) and instructs others (*שכל* Hiphil: 1QS III, 13; IX, 12, 18, 20, 21; XI, 1). The *משכיל* is the link in a chain of transmission which begins with God and continues through the *משכיל* himself to the community of the sons of light.

⁴⁹⁰ Cf. Roop, *Form-Critical Study*, 285.

⁴⁹¹ Note, however, that אסתר is corrected here to אספר, “I shall recount” (cf. K. G. Kuhn, ed., *Konkordanz zu den Qumrantexten* [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1960], 153 n. 2).

The link between עומק and רז is confirmed by 1QS XI, 19, in which the phrase עומק רזיכה, “the depth of your mysteries” occurs.

5.1.5. Summary

A number of points should be made in summary. It seems clear that 4QD^a 1a-b 1 is connected with the *Serekh*, because of the appellation “sons of light” and the motif of separation. Both S and D bear witness to a separatist community in which hidden insight and hidden interpretations of the law were revealed and transmitted. This does not mean, of course, that they belong to the same *branch* of that community, though we should be wary of making too great a distinction between the origins of the *Serekh* and of D. Separation and hidden things are fundamentally connected. The study of Torah presupposes separation, and forms the basis for the revelation of what is hidden. Within the separated community, the מַשְׁכִּיל, who plays a role in the extant portions of both S and D, transmits what is revealed, concealing these things from outsiders. He thus represents God, mediating on behalf of the “revealer of mysteries.” The metaphor “deep” is used to represent hidden things, being drawn largely from the Hebrew sapiential tradition, possibly *via* Daniel. The language of “deep” and “hidden” things, in both Daniel and Qumran, is connected with the phenomenon of the revealed mystery. A comparison of the opening discourse in 4QD^a and 4QD^c with Dan 2 yields the conclusion that the Qumran concept of רזנהיה is based on ideas found in Daniel. This concept either lies behind, or was developed under the influence of the opening discourse of D.

5.2. Sapiential terminology and community context in the 4QD fragments

5.2.1. 4QD^a 1a-b 21, 24

The first occurrences of בִּינִי in the 4QD fragments are in the admonition to the sons of light in 4QD^a 1a-b 21, 24. The phrase הוֹדִיעֵנוּנָא, “make known to us” occurs in line 19, but as Baumgarten notes, “[t]his appears to be a request addressed to God, but the context of the

following lines is obscure.”⁴⁹² In lines 21 and 24, תתבונן and התבונן[נה] ⁴⁹³ are addressed to an individual, recalling the מביין of 4QInstruction, who is frequently the subject of ביי Hithpolel.⁴⁹⁴ However, it is not always an individual that is addressed in this fragment. It is not clear to whom the sing. verbs of line 21 are addressed. God cannot be ruled out as the subject, since he is the subject of יבן in 4QD^a 2 I, 14 (par. CD I, 10). More importantly, here is a connection with the *Teaching on the Two Spirits*: both involve instruction⁴⁹⁵ and both are addressed to the sons of light. How should this link be construed? 4QD^a is written, at least from line 5 onwards,⁴⁹⁶ in direct speech, whereas the *Teaching on the Two Spirits* is a third person discourse. Given that both S and D texts were found in abundance in one particular cave, cave four, it seems likely that both 4QD^a and the *Teaching on the Two Spirits* functioned in the same social context, or at least within the same ideological group, whose self-designation was “sons of light.” The former, from line 5 of frg. 1a-b onwards, is a direct address to the sons of light. The latter is a written record of doctrines underpinning the belief system of the sons of light. If Baumgarten’s reconstruction of 4QD^a 1a-b 1 is correct, the משכיל is another link between them. Perhaps 4QD^a is a written text recording instruction such as that referred to in 1QS III, 13. Thus, whereas 1QS III, 13-IV, 26 elaborates the doctrine which is the basis of the משכיל’s teaching, 4QD^a preserves the actual teaching of a משכיל.

5.2.2. 4QD^a 2 I, 4-6⁴⁹⁷

4QD^a 2 i 4-6 contains a sequence of actions involving God’s plan and the revelation of his secrets. It is crucial to our understanding of the link between the semantic field of wisdom

⁴⁹² Baumgarten, *Qumran Cave 4 XIII*, 33. Those for whom God has ordained a period of wrath (קצ חרון; par. 4QD^c 1 5: קצי חרון), “periods of wrath”) have no knowledge of God (4QD^a 2 I, 3; cf. 1QS I, 1-2; IV, 22), implying that those who do know God accept the speaker’s teaching.

⁴⁹³ In the parallel to line 24 in 4QD^b 1 6 the verb is Hiphil (הבינותה) rather than Hithpolel.

⁴⁹⁴ See §3.1.3 and n. 246 above.

⁴⁹⁵ See esp. 1QS III, 13; IV, 22.

⁴⁹⁶ Note that לכם in line 5 presupposes an audience of more than one, and הודיענו in line 19 presupposes a group context. The author is speaking or writing on behalf of a group, who presumably identify themselves as “sons of light.”

⁴⁹⁷ Par. 4QD^c 1 6-8 (Baumgarten, *Qumran Cave 4 XIII*, 119).

and revelation and the concept of divine revelation. This section immediately precedes the parallel to CD I, 1. The sequence is as follows:⁴⁹⁸

- (1) וְהָאֵלֹהִים חָקוֹק קֶצַח לְעַם לֹא יָדְעָהוּ
- (2) וְהוּא חָכִין מוֹעֲדֵי רִצּוֹן לְדוֹרֵשׁ יִמְצוּתוֹ וְלַחֲלָכִים בְּתַמִּים דֶּרֶךְ
- (3) וַיִּגַּל עֵינֵיהֶם בְּנִסְתָּרוֹת
- (4) וְאוֹזְנָם פָּתַח
- (5) וַיִּשְׁמְעוּ עֲמוּקוֹת
- (6) וַיִּבִּינוּ בְּכֹל נִהְיֹת עַד מָה יִבּוֹא בָּם

- (1) God has ordained periods of wrath for those who do not know him.⁴⁹⁹
- (2) God has established times of favour for those who seek his commandments and walk in perfection of way.⁵⁰⁰
- (3) God has opened their eyes to hidden things.⁵⁰¹
- (4) They opened their ears.⁵⁰²
- (5) They heard deep things.⁵⁰³
- (6) They understood everything that is to happen before it comes upon them.⁵⁰⁴

This section is based on an anthropological dualism: those who know God versus those who do not, and those who seek his commands versus those who do not. In the *Serekh*, knowledge of God and seeking him and his commands are fundamental.⁵⁰⁵ The process in this text begins with God's revelation, leads to the elect group hearing, and ends with them understanding what will come upon them. This connects this section to what follows. The

⁴⁹⁸ The Hebrew text given here is based on the reconstructed text in Baumgarten, *Qumran Cave 4 XIII*, 34. With the exception of נ[ל] in line 4 I have not indicated where there are lacuna in the text, for which see Baumgarten, *Qumran Cave 4 XIII*, 34. The glosses given below are not translations; they are glosses intended to illuminate the sequence of thought in the text.

⁴⁹⁹ 4QD^a 2 I, 3; par. 4QD^c 1 5.

⁵⁰⁰ 4QD^a 2 I, 4; par. 4QD^c 1 6-7.

⁵⁰¹ 4QD^a 2 I, 5 (reconstructed); par. 4QD^c 1 7.

⁵⁰² 4QD^a 2 I, 5; cf. 4QD^c 1 7.

⁵⁰³ 4QD^a 2 I, 5; par. 4QD^c 1 7 (reconstructed).

⁵⁰⁴ 4QD^a 2 I, 5-6; par. 4QD^c 1 8.

⁵⁰⁵ Cf. 1QS I, 1-2; IV, 22.

sequence of hearing and understanding points forward to the admonition to “hear” and “understand.”⁵⁰⁶ The speaker, in the admonition, identifies himself as God’s intermediary because he commands his hearers to do the hearing and understanding mentioned in the closing lines of the *Vorspann*, where it is *God* who initiates the process of hearing and understanding. The speaker stands between God and his hearers.

Furthermore, in CD II, 2 (par. 4QD^a 2 II, 2) the speaker says he is going to open the ears of his hearers. This mirrors the activity of God in 4QD^a 2 I, 5. The admonitions represent the earthly actuality of what is described in the introduction. The *Vorspann* acts as a kind of overture, anticipating the admonitions which follow. The earthly actuality is that a mediator figure initiates the process of understanding, the ultimate origin of which is God. This seems to suggest that we *are* dealing with a מִשְׁכִּיל text. We have already seen that the מִשְׁכִּיל of the *Serekh* is a mediator of divine revelation. Surely the same figure is presupposed by the 4QD fragments, together with the admonitions which follow, and the *Teaching on the Two Spirits*. Using similar vocabulary, but different literary genres, both presume a situation in which divine revelation is transmitted to an elect group, the sons of light, through the mediation of a מִשְׁכִּיל. Behind the *Serekh* and the 4QD fragments, therefore, we must suppose the same ideological group, without necessarily denying that within that group S and D may reflect different branches or sub-groups. More importantly, we are surely now able to assert that both S and D reflect a community context in which a מִשְׁכִּיל is the mediator of divine revelation.

5.2.3. 4QD^e 2 II, 19-21

4QD^e 2 II, 19-21 begins with an exhortation to those who know righteousness to listen him.⁵⁰⁷ The instruction involves knowing dualistic principles,⁵⁰⁸ in this case the opposition between דְּרָכֵי חַיִּים, “ways of life” and נְתִיבוֹת שְׁחָת, “paths of destruction.” The key to

⁵⁰⁶ 4QD^a 2 I, 6-7; par. 4QD^c 1 9; CD I, 1.

⁵⁰⁷ 4QD^e 2 II, 19-21: ועתה שמעו לי כל יודעי צדק, “and now, listen to me, all who know justice.”

⁵⁰⁸ Cf. CD II, 15.

leading a life characteristic of the elect group is understanding the deeds of each generation (4QD^c 2 II, 21). Lack of understanding characterises those who are not part of the elect group.⁵⁰⁹ Deeds are to be understood in D. Perhaps this sheds new light on the terms שכל, “insight, understanding” and מעשה, “deed” in the *Serekh*. Correct deeds in the present result from understanding the deeds of previous generations.

5.2.4. 4QD^a 2 I, 14

In 4QD^a 2 I, 14, understanding is a divine activity. In 4QD^a 2 I, 7⁵¹⁰ those who know righteousness are commanded to listen to the speaker and then to understand the deeds of God.⁵¹¹ In CD II, 14 להבין is parallel with לראות, “to see” and again the deeds of God are the object. There, the speaker has said he will open the eyes of his hearers to see and understand, itself a divine act (4QD^c 1 7). In CD I, 8 (par. 4QD^c 1 15) the Israelite remnant has understood (יבינו) its sin, and known (ידעו) its guilt. This contrasts with the people of Israel formerly, who were a people without understanding.⁵¹² בין forms a link with God’s act in line 10, in that he has understood (יבין) their deeds. In their act of understanding, the Israelites have participated in a divine activity. In CD I, 1-2, the speaker exhorts his hearers to act in a God-like manner by understanding his deeds. Lines 1-2 and 10 contain parallel activities:

(1) בינו במעשי אל

(2) ויבן אל אל מעשיהם

(1) CD I, 1-2: the addressees should understand God’s deeds.

(2) CD I, 10: God understands the deeds of the addressees.

⁵⁰⁹ Cf. CD VIII, 12; XIX, 24.

⁵¹⁰ Reconstructed. Par. 4QD^c 1 9; CD I, 1.

⁵¹¹ Par. 4QD^c 1 9; CD I, 1. Denis concludes that in the Qumran scrolls God’s deeds include creation (especially humans) and the activities in which God is made known (*Thèmes*, 15).

⁵¹² CD V, 16 (par. 4QD^a 3 II, 4). See Isa 6:9-10; 27:11; CD V, 17 (cf. Deut 32:28).

God understands or discerns their deeds because they sought him (דַּרְשׁוּהוּ),⁵¹³ linking this text with 1QS I, 1-2 and the use of שָׁרַר in the *Serekh*, and with CD VI, 2-7.⁵¹⁴ Furthermore, this admonition is connected with the *Vorspann* in the 4QD fragments through the use of סָתַר. In 4QD^a 2 I, 8,⁵¹⁵ God is said to have “hidden” his face from Israel and his temple. 4QD^a 2 I, 5 (par. 4QD^c 1 7) includes the term נִסְתָּרוֹת, “hidden things.” One of the things which was hidden was God’s face. It would be difficult to suggest that God’s face as such is ever revealed in the Qumran scrolls, but in a *metaphorical* sense this could be so.⁵¹⁶ How does this relate to the contemplation of the “light of life” in 1QS III, 7? We should bear in mind that the language of this passage in D hints at a form of mysticism, as does 1QS III, 7. The sons of light are privileged to receive revelations of heavenly secrets, and the metaphorical revelation of God’s face may be implicit in their understanding his deeds, which make him known. God is no longer separated from the Israelite remnant. In understanding their sin and God’s deeds, and in seeking God, they are no longer separated from his presence. Furthermore, in God’s presence wisdom (חִכְמָה), insight (תְּוִשְׁיָה), prudence (עֲרֻמָּה), and knowledge (דַּעַת) are to be found (CD II, 3-4).

In summary, בִּיִּן signifies the contact between God and the Israelite remnant. When both God and the remnant are the subject of בִּיִּן, both participate in an activity which opens the channels of communication between them. This may contradict the apophaticism of 1QS XI, 19, but that text is a different genre entirely and reflects the personal self-abasement of the hymnist before his God. D offers something closer to a belief which is to be taught and accepted. The exhortations in CD I, 1; II, 2, 14 are calls to accept authoritative teachings

⁵¹³ Davies translates this passage “*that* they sought him with a perfect heart” (italics mine; *Damascus Covenant*, 233). If בִּיִּן is translated “because,” God has understood their deeds in response to their seeking him. If בִּיִּן is translated “that,” it elaborates on the phrase מַעֲשֵׂיהֶם. Either interpretation is feasible.

⁵¹⁴ Par. 4QD^a 3 II, 10-14; 4QD^b 2 7-14.

⁵¹⁵ Par. 4QD^c 1 11; CD I, 3.

⁵¹⁶ CD III, 14-16 offers a definition of what constituted נִסְתָּרוֹת: his holy sabbaths, his glorious festivals, his righteous testimonies, his true ways, and the pleasures of his will, which humans should do and live by (cf. Davies, *Damascus Covenant*, 239, 241).

about the deeds of God in the *Heilsgeschichte* of Israel which ultimately derive from God's own inspiration and are being transmitted through the mediation of a **משכיל**. This idea is stated in CD II, 12-13 and also lies behind 1QS III, 13-IV, 26. The teachings of that passage are to be accepted by the sons of light because they derive from God (1QS IV, 22) and are transmitted through the mediation of an inspired teacher, a **משכיל**.⁵¹⁷

5.2.5. CD XIII, 2-8 (par. 4QD^a 9 II, 18): **משכיל** and **מבקר**

This section of D differs from the texts examined above chiefly in genre: it is a third person account of the proper actions of a priest and a **מבקר** rather than a second person exhortation. Recalling 1QSa I, 7; CD X, 6 the book of meditation (CD XIII, 2: **ספר הזהג**) is what the priest should understand (1QSa I, 7: **למד** Piel; CD X, 6; XIII, 2: **בין** Hithpoel). The book of meditation would seem to contain authoritative teaching, understanding of which is characteristic of the elect group. In CD XIII, 2 being learned in this book is what gives a priest authority.⁵¹⁸ A priest who has this learning is necessary to a "place of ten" (**מקום עשרה**).⁵¹⁹ In lines 5-6, a figure entitled **מבקר**, "one who seeks" is to instruct (**בין** Hiphil) a priest in the correct interpretation of the law. Again, transmitting and receiving understanding is central to the life of the elect. This passage recalls 1QS VI, 13b-16a. In the *Serekh*, however, the **פקיד**, presumably a **משכיל**, teaches a single volunteer. The **פקיד** has a specific role regarding entrants into the community of the *Serekh*.⁵²⁰ In the D text, it is a priest, someone with status in the community, who is instructed. In the *Serekh*, all the community rulings are given in instruction, whereas in D one specific legal interpretation is to be given. The **מבקר** has a role regarding established members of the community, but the **פקיד**'s role only concerns entrants. The distinction in D between the priest and the **מבקר** raises the long dormant question of the lay status of the

⁵¹⁷ 1QS III, 13. Cf. 1QS IX, 18, 20.

⁵¹⁸ Cf. 4QD^b 9 V, 12; CD XIV, 7.

⁵¹⁹ The **ן** looks like a **פ** (cf. Qimron, "Text," 35 n. 1; Rabin, *Zadokite Documents*, 65).

⁵²⁰ See §4.1.3 above.

משכיל. If both פקיד and מבקר were משכילים, the משכיל in CD XIII, 6 is probably not a priest. Why else should a distinction be made between כהן and מבקר?

Lines 7-8 confirm that the מבקר is a משכיל.⁵²¹ He is the subject of ישכיל, “he will instruct” and יבינם, “he will give them understanding.”⁵²² The רבים are mentioned in line 7, recalling Dan 11:33⁵²³ and perhaps implicitly identifying the מבקר with one of the משכילים in Daniel. The מבקר is linked with the speaker in CD I, 1-2; CD II, 14-15 since he gives the many insight into God’s deeds. If the speaker in those lines is the משכיל conjectured in 4QD^a 1a-b 1, we have a further link between מבקר and משכיל.

In summary, it seems most logical to understand the מבקר as someone with status in the D community who is a משכיל, one of a class of wise men common to the communities of S and D. That the משכיל is not an isolated individual but a member of a class of משכילים, analogous with the משכילים of Daniel and possibly based on their example, is also the logical conclusion of 4QInstruction^d 81 + 81a 17, which implies that more than one משכיל instructed the מבין. In terms of community organisation, we need to ask why משכיל is common to both S and D whereas מבקר is unique to D and פקיד is unique to S. The transmission of revealed teaching is common to all three. An educated guess may be offered here. All three give instruction, so all three may be משכילים, belonging to a class of figures who instruct in their community. The פקיד has a specific role with respect to entrants to the S community: presumably his specific role is not necessary to the D community. Similarly, the מבקר has a specific role in the individual “camps” inhabited by members of the D community, which is nevertheless connected to the S community. Assuming that the S community inhabited one site only (Qumran?), there would be no need for a מבקר. Thus while מבקר and פקיד refer to functionaries with

⁵²¹ Cf. CD XIII, 22.

⁵²² The מבקר is also the subject of בין in 4QD^a 9 III, 5. The importance of understanding is stressed again, apparently, in 4QD^b 5 III, 3 (reconstructed by Baumgarten, *Qumran Cave 4 XIII*, 102).

⁵²³ Rabin, *Zadokite Documents*, 65.

specific roles, **משכיל** is a more general designation for a figure whose role is to guard and transmit revealed doctrines.

5.2.6. Summary

The *Vorspann* to D, attested in two 4QD fragments, contains instruction intended for a group known as “sons of light,” familiar from 1QS III, 13. It is, in part, a direct address to the sons of light and may record the actual teaching of a **משכיל**, though the reconstruction of the opening rubric is uncertain. The speaker in the *Vorspann* and the admonitions is God’s intermediary in the process of revealing divinely inspired teaching. Clear connections between S and D establish that both reflect a community context, in which a **משכיל** mediates divine revelation. When the sons of light understand, they draw closer to God and participate in a divine activity, as does the **משכיל** when he imparts understanding. In terms of community organisation, S and D reflect discrete communities within the same ideological group. Within this group there was a class of **משכילים**. In the S community, one of these, a **פקיד**, was responsible for instructing entrants, whereas there was also at least one **משכיל** figure responsible more generally for the transmission of doctrine. Each of the camps of the D community had a figure called **מבקר**, also a **משכיל**, who also had responsibility for instructing.

5.3. Summary

Our study of the 4QD material as a whole needs to be summarised. S and D bear witness to the same ideological group, whose self-designation was “sons of light.” Within this separatist group, hidden doctrines were transmitted through the mediation of a figure called **משכיל**. The language used to signify these hidden doctrines is drawn from the HB, especially the sapiential tradition and Daniel. This is particularly true of the **רז נהיה**.

6. Synthesis and conclusions

Having examined a number of texts in detail, the results of our investigation must be summarised, beginning with 4Q380 and 4Q381. These texts share with sectarian works from Qumran a number of sapiential roots (שכל, למד, ידע, חכם, בִּין), together with the concepts they represent. The fact that this language is shared with Daniel not only helps to date these non-sectarian works, but enables us to draw conclusions about the nature of QH. The discussions in this chapter help to confirm Elisha Qimron's conclusion that

The language of the DSS springs from the BH of the Second Temple period. In grammar, vocabulary, and even style it is very close to the language of the biblical books written in this period. The fact that DSS Hebrew is especially close to the language of the late biblical books proves that it is not an imitation of BH but rather a continuation of it.⁵²⁴

The concepts found in both Daniel and 4Q380 and 4Q381 exercised a profound influence on those responsible for sectarian works. In particular, the idea that wisdom belongs with God and must be revealed to become known was influential, as was the concept of transmission in 4Q380 and 4Q381. Human mediators in the form of prophets such as Moses and Aaron transmitted divine teaching, probably providing the model for the מַשְׁכִּיל in the sectarian works.

4QInstruction shares its use of sapiential language and probably its community of origin with sectarian works such as the *Serekh* and the *Hodayot*. 4QInstruction^d 81 + 81a 17 is the key text. Insight, which belongs with God, is revealed and transmitted through the mediation of a מַשְׁכִּיל. He belongs to a group of מַשְׁכִּילִים, and transmits what has been revealed to him to a pupil designated מַבִּין. The pupil belongs to a group designated מַבִּינִים and attested elsewhere at Qumran. The use of sapiential terminology to designate these figures is important: this terminology is used in a highly positive sense to describe the elect group in a dualistic context. It seems clear that the community which lies behind 4QInstruction also lies behind sectarian works such as the *Serekh*.

⁵²⁴ Elisha Qimron, *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (HSS 29; Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1986), 116.

Thus, in the *Serekh* we find a world view in which wisdom belongs in heaven and is revealed by God to his elect, among whom a figure called **משכיל** transmits this wisdom. He is one of a class of **משכילים**, who either have the **משכילים** of Daniel as their example or belong to the group from which Daniel arose. Among this group is a **פקיד**, who reveals community instructions to new entrants into the community. 4QS^b IX, 1; 4QS^d I, 1 are also important for our understanding of transmission at Qumran. These texts contain community rulings found through seeking God by means of the study of the law (**מדרש התורה**). These rulings are revealed through this process, and are guarded and transmitted by the **משכיל** to whom these texts are addressed. Two presentations of transmission are found in the *Serekh*: one in which sapiential language is used to represent the instruction of the **משכיל**, and one in which this figure is involved in the process of transmitting community rulings revealed through the study of the law. The 4QD texts share the concept of transmission found in 4QInstruction and the *Serekh*. S and D represent different parts of the same ideological group, the “sons of light.” This group is separatist and enclosed. Within it heavenly revelations are transmitted through a **משכיל**. In the camps, instruction is also given through the **מבקר**, one of the **משכילים**. The heavenly mysteries transmitted in this context are represented using terminology derived from the HB, especially sapiential texts and Daniel.

The process of transmission at Qumran has been illuminated, accounting for one major strand of early Palestinian Judaism. There are certain characteristics which should be noted as sources of comparison with other corpora of literature. First, sapiential terminology at Qumran has achieved the status of a technical language, used to designate both the positive group in a dualistic context and the concepts held by that group. Second, the idea that wisdom belongs with God and is revealed to an elect group is characteristic of the Qumran scrolls. Even the non-sectarian 4Q380 and 4Q381 have wisdom revealed to elect Israel. The possession of this wisdom is an identifying mark of the elect group. Third, this wisdom is not revealed directly, but through a mediator. It is always a human mediator at Qumran, though other forms of mediation should be considered possible beyond the

boundaries of the Qumran corpus. Fourth, already at Qumran direct revelation mediated through a particular figure has become tied to the law, which means that tradition is beginning to take shape as a major category of Jewish thought at Qumran. The study of the law yields revelations which are codified, guarded, and transmitted. Specific figures appear in the structure of the S and D communities whose roles are defined by their part in this process. The fact that S and D seem to bear witness to a more advanced stage in the stratification of the community of the “sons of light” than does 4QInstruction perhaps helps to situate the latter at an earlier point in the development of that community.

Part Two

THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS

1. Introduction

Our attention now shifts to texts which originated among the early Christians, whose literary heritage overlapped to a significant extent with that of the Qumran community. This section focuses on the concept of insight in the synoptic tradition¹ (excluding Q).² The Synoptic Gospels are read in light of comparative texts written in various ancient languages, principally Hebrew, Aramaic, Greek, and Latin: the complexity of the issues at hand means that a methodologically sound approach must draw on a very broad range of comparative literature.³ The focus for part two is provided by occurrences in the synoptic tradition of sapiential language, specifically σύνεσις, “insight” and συνίημι, “understand.” From the study of this linguistic evidence are abstracted concepts rooted in Second Temple Judaism pertaining to the divine imparting of wisdom.

¹ Norman Perrin and Dennis C. Duling understand the “synoptic tradition” to be “the traditional material used by three synoptic evangelists” (*The New Testament: an Introduction: Proclamation and Parenthesis, Myth and History* [2d ed.: New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1982], 234). Similarly, Adela Yarbro Collins remarks that “[t]he synoptic tradition is a diverse body of oral and written material centering on the life and teaching of Jesus that circulated in Christian circles in the first two centuries C.E. It is known primarily from the Synoptic Gospels, Mark, Matthew, and Luke, but also from several early apocryphal gospels” (“Apocalypses and Apocalypticism: Early Christian,” *ABD* 1:289). The phrase is used here to indicate not simply the material on which the synoptic evangelists drew but the ensuing literary products, the gospels of Matthew, Mark, and Luke. It thus indicates both traditional pre-gospel material and its subsequent literary transmission. Prejudice is here given to the canonical Synoptic Gospels, while acknowledging the importance of the broader oral and written tradition.

² Detailed considerations of Wisdom Christology and the sapiential form and character of Q cannot be undertaken within the limitations of the present study. On Q as the result of redaction geared to the sapientialisation of various Jewish traditions, see Ben Witherington, *Jesus the Sage: the Pilgrimage of Wisdom* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994), 211-236.

³ Such an approach reflects the sheer complexity of the socio-cultural background of the communities in which early Christianity developed, and of the texts which originated within them. As Larry Hurtado notes, in response to Wilhelm Bousset and his followers, “[i]t is clear that, though influences stemming from the OT, from rabbinic and Jewish-sectarian groups, as well as from Greek sources can be detected in the culture of first-century Palestine, these influences were all simultaneously at work making the cultural background of the earliest Christians far too complex to reduce into rigid categories of ‘Jewish’ and ‘Hellenistic’” (“New Testament Christology: A Critique of Bousset’s Influence,” *TS* 40 [1979]: 308).

Luke's gospel provides the framework for our discussion, for two reasons. First, σύνεσις and συνίημι appear in Luke in both pericopae paralleled in the other Synoptic Gospels and in the Lukan *Sondergut*. Since they occur in texts relating to different stages in Jesus' life and ministry, it is possible that the occurrences of σύνεσις and συνίημι link the different parts of Luke's presentation of Jesus together, culminating in the revelation of the risen Jesus.⁴ They are as significant for the framework of the Gospel as the three periods of Jesus' earthly ministry in Luke isolated by Hans Conzelmann.⁵ There are five pertinent references:

- (1) Luke 2:47: ἐξίσταντο δὲ πάντες οἱ ἀκούοντες αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τῇ συνέσει καὶ ταῖς ἀποκρίσεσιν αὐτοῦ, "and all who were listening to him were astonished on account of his insight and his answers."
- (2) Luke 2:51: καὶ αὐτοὶ οὐ συνῆκαν τὸ ῥῆμα ὃ ἐλάλησεν αὐτοῖς, "and they did not understand the word which he had spoken to them."
- (3) Luke 8:10 (par. Matt 3:13; Mark 4:12): ὑμῖν δέδοται γνῶναι τὰ μυστήρια τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ, τοῖς δὲ λοιποῖς ἐν παραβολαῖς, ἵνα βλέποντες μὴ βλέπωσιν καὶ ἀκούοντες μὴ συνιῶσιν, "to you it has been granted to know the mysteries of

⁴ Geoffrey F. Nuttall suggests that Luke intentionally put his Gospel in a frame, Luke 2:41-52 sharing with the story of the disciples on the road to Emmaus (Luke 24:13-35, thematically connected with Luke 24:45) the same failure to understand what had to be, the same sense of something surprising tugging at the heart, and the same astonishment in the moment of recognition (*The Moment of Recognition: Luke as Story-Teller* [London: Athlone, 1978], 13-14). J. K. Elliott understands both Luke 2:41-52 and the transfiguration narrative as anticipating Jesus' passion and resurrection, noting in particular that the lack of understanding of Jesus' parents is connected in Luke with the disciples' lack of understanding after the second and third passion predictions (Luke 9:45; 18:34; "Does Luke 2⁴¹⁻⁵² Anticipate the Resurrection?" *ExpTim* 83 [1971-72]: 88). The reference to three days in Luke 2:46 points forward to the resurrection (Elliott, "Luke 2⁴¹⁻⁵²," 88, 89; rejected by I. Howard Marshall: *The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text* [NIGTC; Exeter: Paternoster, 1978], 127), and the temple represents the heavenly temple to which Jesus has risen. As the transfiguration represents Jesus superseding the law (Moses) and the Prophets (Elijah), so he moves beyond the teachers of the law in this passage. The vocabulary of Luke 2:41-52 is connected with the passion, though Elliott fails to note the verbal link provided by συνίημι (cf. Luke 18:34; 24:45). The theme of passover also links Luke 2:41-52 and the passion. For Daniélou, it is the phrase ἐν τοῖς τοῦ πατρὸς μου δεῖ εἶναί με which points forward to the passion and resurrection (cf. Luke 13:33; 24:26, 44; *The Infancy Narratives* [trans. R. Sheed; London: Burns & Oates, 1968], 122).

⁵ Hans Conzelmann, *The Theology of St. Luke* (trans. G. Buswell; London: Faber & Faber, 1960), 17: (1) Period of the gathering of "witnesses" in Galilee, beginning with the proclamation of Jesus as Son of God; (2) Journey to the temple, beginning with the passage which includes the first passion prediction and the transfiguration; (3) Teaching in the temple and Jesus' passion, beginning with the triumphal entry and closing with the resurrection and ascension, which signify the dawn of a new epoch of salvation.

God's kingdom, but to the rest in parables, so that though they see they might not see and though they hear they might not understand."

(4) Luke 18:34: καὶ αὐτοὶ οὐδὲν τούτων συνῆκαν καὶ ἦν τὸ ῥῆμα τοῦτο κεκρυμμένον ἀπ' αὐτῶν καὶ οὐκ ἐγίνωσκον τὰ λεγόμενα, "and they did not understand any of these things, this word was hidden from them, and they did not comprehend the things that had been said."

(5) Luke 24:45: τότε διήνοιξεν αὐτῶν τὸν νοῦν τοῦ συνιέναι τὰς γραφάς,⁶ "then he opened their mind to understand the Scriptures."

The context of Luke 2:47; 2:51 is the finding in the temple, which links the infancy narrative (Luke 1:5-2:52) with the rest of the gospel. Luke 8:10, a citation from Isa 6, is connected to the interpretation of the parable of the sower (Luke 8:11-15) in the parables chapter, part of his presentation of Jesus' Galilean ministry. Luke 18:34 is not paralleled in Matthew or Mark, though it follows the third prediction of the passion (Luke 18:31-33), which *is* attested in the other two Synoptics (Matt 20:17-19; Mark 10:32-34). The context of Luke 24:45 is the resurrection narrative (Luke 24:1-53), which is markedly different in Luke from the other Gospels. By focusing on συνίημι and its cognates, this study challenges the conclusion of Hans Conzelmann, who remarks in general that "[t]he word group did not become theologically significant,"⁷ and with specific reference to Luke that apart from Luke's use of συνίημι in connection with his alteration of the Markan messianic secret to a passion secret,⁸ "[t]here are no other special features in Luke."⁹

The second reason for using Luke's gospel is the amount of material in that

⁶ One ninth century uncial ms (Λ 039) omits τὸν νοῦν τοῦ συνιέναι.

⁷ Conzelmann, *TDNT* 7:893. Contrast René Laurentin, *Jésus au temple: Mystère de paques et foi de Marie en Luc 2, 48-50* (EBib; Paris: Gabalda, 1966), 80 and n. 135. Laurentin notes the characteristic use of συνίημι in connection with the incomprehension of the meaning of parables in Matthew and Mark, and, additionally, with the incomprehension of the Passion predictions in Luke.

⁸ See Luke 18:34. Conzelmann, *Theology*, 56, 197-198.

⁹ Conzelmann, *TDNT* 7:894 n. 54.

Gospel which invites comparison with Jewish texts. Crispin Fletcher-Louis remarks that Luke-Acts “(a) is thoroughly Jewish in theology and culture; (b) has a high Christology; and (c) is at home in the world of Jewish apocalyptic (and mystical) speculation.”¹⁰ Passages in Luke which contain *σύνεσις* or *συνήμι* also inform the debate, to which Fletcher-Louis is a contributor, on the “angelomorphic” character of Luke’s presentation of Jesus,¹¹ since the theme of insight in Luke’s gospel points towards an identification of the Lukan Jesus as a mediator of divine revelation with characteristics attributed in Jewish apocalyptic and mystical texts to angels and exalted patriarchs. Our discussion thus touches on the work of what Martin Hengel has called a “new *Religionsgeschichtliche Schule*,”¹² which seeks to understand early christologies in light of Jewish patterns of divine mediation.¹³ Special consideration will be given to the influence of Jewish “exalted patriarch” traditions.¹⁴

¹⁰ Crispin H. T. Fletcher-Louis, “Angelomorphic Categories, Early Christology and Discipleship, with Special Reference to Luke-Acts,” *TynBul* 48 (1997): 183.

¹¹ Jean Daniélou is usually regarded as the first scholar to use the phrase “angelomorphic Christology.” Daniélou discusses the use of the vocabulary of angelology to designate the Word and the Spirit, and concludes: “[t]hese then are the strictly Jewish conceptions of angelomorphic Christology, those which have been borrowed from the angelology of later Judaism, and in which Christ and the Holy Spirit are represented in their eternal nature, and not simply in their mission, by means of the imagery of various angelic beings” (*The Theology of Jewish Christianity* [vol. 1 of *The Development of Christian Doctrine before the Council of Nicaea*; trans. J. A. Baker; London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1964], 146). Compare his reference to the “angelomorphic theology of the Jewish Christians” (*Theology*, 129).

¹² Hengel’s comment was printed on the back cover of the American (Fortress Press) edition of Larry W. Hurtado’s book *One God, One Lord: Early Christian Devotion and Ancient Jewish Monotheism*. See Jarl E. Fossum, “The New *Religionsgeschichtliche Schule*,” *SBL Seminar papers, 1991* (Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1991), 638; Loren T. Stuckenbruck, *Angel Veneration and Christology: A Study in Early Judaism and in the Christology of the Apocalypse of John* (WUNT 2/70; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1995), 4 n. 3; Fletcher-Louis, *Luke-Acts*, 1; Darren L. Bock, review of C. H. T. Fletcher-Louis, *Luke-Acts: Angels, Christology and Soteriology*, *BSac* 155 (1998): 245; Hurtado, *One God, One Lord: Early Christian Devotion and Ancient Jewish Monotheism* (2d ed.; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998), xix.

¹³ On the concerns of the new history of religions school, see the survey of recent research in the second edition of Hurtado, *One God*, vii-xxii; Stuckenbruck, *Angel Veneration*, 5-14; cf. pp. 15-21. For surveys of research on angel christology and angelomorphic christology, see Charles A. Gieschen, “Angelomorphic Christology: Antecedents and Early Evidence” (Ph.D. diss., University of Michigan, 1995), 8-31; Darrell D. Hannah, *Michael and Christ: Michael Traditions and Angel Christology in Early Christianity* (WUNT 2/109; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999), 1-13. Hannah (*Michael*, 12-13) draws an important distinction between “angelic Christology” (referring to all christologies influenced by angelological ideas), “angel Christology” (referring to the identification of Christ with an angel), “angelomorphic Christology” (in the strictest sense, referring to visual portrayals of Christ in the form of an angel without necessarily implying that Christ is actually an angel), and “theophanic angel Christology” (referring to the patristic identification of Christ with the “angel of YHWH” of the OT). In the present work, references to an angelomorphic christology refer to the third of these.

¹⁴ See Hurtado, *One God*, 51-69; Gieschen, “Angelomorphic Christology,” 171-181.

By focusing the discussion in these ways, it should be possible to discern how language relating to understanding is used in Luke and the other Synoptics, and how understanding which is supernatural or heavenly in origin is mediated to humans.

2. The wisdom of the child Jesus

We begin with Luke 2:41-52, a pericope that is found only in Luke. The only occurrence of σύνεσις in Luke is in Luke 2:47, where it refers to an attribute of the adolescent Jesus.¹⁵ The only occurrence of σύνεσις in the Gospel is in connection with Jesus as a youngster who can amaze teachers whose own insight and answers should be greater than his. Jesus' extraordinary insight perhaps justifies his position as a teacher of disciples later in the Gospel.¹⁶ François Bovon usefully highlights the role of σύνεσις in this pericope. He notes that in the LXX, and especially in the sapiential literature, σύνεσις often designates the aptness of views nourished by faith and almost becomes the synonym of wisdom,¹⁷ and stresses that in this literature, humans cannot possess wisdom by themselves, but receive it when they model themselves on the divine will. Moreover, education and wisdom are more prominent in Hellenistic Judaism than revelation and prophecy. In this pericope, Jesus is the model of the wisdom of faith.¹⁸

The first occurrence of συνέημι in Luke is in Luke 2:50,¹⁹ where we read that

¹⁵ Rudolf Bultmann saw a double point behind the finding in the temple in Luke, the first being the outstanding wisdom of the child Jesus, and the second being the revelation of Jesus' religious destiny, manifested in his remaining behind in the temple (*The History of the Synoptic Tradition* [trans. J. Marsh; Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1963], 300; cf. Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke: Introduction, Translation, and Notes* [AB 28; New York: Doubleday, 1981], 436).

¹⁶ Compare Paul Winter's remark that "what the writer of Lc 2 41-51a is out to prove is that Jesus himself had the makings of a διδάσκαλος, a title painstakingly avoided in references by the disciples to Jesus in the body of the Third Gospel, and therefore not characteristic of the appreciation held of Jesus' person by the community and generation to which the Third Evangelist belonged" ("Lc 2 49 and Targum Yerushalmi," *ZNW* 45 [1954]: 178-179).

¹⁷ François Bovon, *L'Évangile selon Saint Luc 1-9* (CNT 2/3a; Geneva: Labor et fides, 1991), 155: "σύνεσις désigne souvent la justesse de vues nourrie par la foi et devient presque le synonyme de sagesse."

¹⁸ Bovon, *Saint Luc 1-9*, 156.

¹⁹ There is an irony in the use of συνέημι in this verse, in that Jesus' role is to bring understanding to others (cf. Luke 24:45) yet they do not understand. If we press the parallels between Daniel, Zechariah, and Mary, the two appearances of Gabriel in the infancy narrative have the function of bringing heavenly revelations to the visionaries. Zechariah doubts the words of Gabriel, and as a result implicitly fails to understand the angel's message. The theme of lack of understanding is made explicit in the ignorance of Jesus' parents in

Jesus' parents did not understand (οὐ συνῆκαν) the word he had spoken to them. Luke foregrounds the incomprehension of those around Jesus, setting Jesus' possession of insight in opposition to his parents' lack of it.²⁰ Their lack of understanding also anticipates the disciples' later incomprehension of what must take place.²¹ For Bovon, knowledge is central to this pericope. The theme of knowledge is not the antinomy of understanding and ignorance but the alternative between a good and a superior good. There is a confrontation here between the wisdom of the Jews and the wisdom made known by the revelation of the Christians: the lack of understanding of Jesus' parents reflects the underlying question of whether they will adhere to the new thing manifested in their son or not.²²

Although Bovon may be incorrect in denying the importance of the antinomy of understanding and ignorance in Luke, he is correct first to place this pericope against the background of the LXX and Hellenistic Judaism and to emphasise the importance of knowledge here. The purpose of this section is to read the infancy narrative, including Luke 2:41-52,²³ against the background of Daniel and other early Jewish and Hellenistic

Luke 2:50. The ignorance shown by Zechariah, Joseph, and Mary recalls Daniel's ignorance in Dan 8:27; 12:8. The irony is that their ignorance not only stands in contrast to Jesus' understanding, but also to Gabriel's vocation to cause them to understand in the first place. The Lukan theme of the ignorance of those around Jesus, it should be noted, begins with the annunciation to Zechariah (Luke 1:8-20).

²⁰ Cf. Fitzmyer, *Luke (I-IX)*, 444. Howard Marshall notes that Jesus' interest in the temple indicates a consciousness on his part of a filial relationship with God, thus setting Jesus' earthly parents in contrast with his Father in heaven (*Luke*, 125; cf. pp. 128-129).

²¹ Nuttall, *Moment*, 13-14; Robert C. Tannehill, *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts: A Literary Interpretation: Volume One: The Gospel according to Luke* (Philadelphia, Pa: Fortress, 1986), 54. See Luke 9:44-45; 18:31-35; 24:25-26.

²² Bovon, *Saint Luc 1-9*, 156.

²³ The relationship between Luke 2:41-52 and the Lukan infancy narrative is by no means clear, but for the purposes of this study Luke 2:41-52 will be taken as a link between the infancy narrative and the rest of the Gospel: Bovon understands Luke 2:41-52 as the conclusion of the infancy gospel and as the transition between the nativity and the public appearance of the Messiah; he sees no allusion here to the resurrection (*Saint Luc 1-9*, 153). For him, this passage is an integral part of the infancy gospel (*Saint Luc 1-9*, 150). Elliott suggests that Luke 2:41-52 was inserted by Luke at this point "to provide a link between the period of Jesus' birth and the time of his ministry" ("Luke 2⁴¹⁻⁵²," 87). Marshall understands Luke 2:41-52 as the climax of the birth story (*Luke*, 125), and takes Luke 1-2 as the prologue and Luke 3:1-4:13 as preliminaries to Jesus' ministry (*Luke*, 131). In Luke 2:40, 47, 50 we find Jesus growing in wisdom and demonstrating his insight in matters (presumably) relating to the law, demonstrating his fitness to be regarded as a teacher of authority: cf. Winter, "Lc 2 49," 178-179. Raymond Brown suggests that Luke 2:40, 52 should be regarded as "growth statements" transitional to Jesus' ministry (*The Birth of the Messiah: a Commentary on the Infancy Narratives in the Gospels of Matthew and Luke* [2d ed.; ABRL; New York: Doubleday, 1993], 252;

texts. It is not simply the wisdom of Jesus that is important,²⁴ but the figure of Gabriel, the *angelus interpres par excellence*. Gabriel and Jesus are both figures who are bestowed with divine insight which they must transmit to others. It is in these mediatorial figures that Luke works out the process of revealing the divine will.

Scholars are not unanimous in the view that this pericope is part of the Lukan infancy narrative,²⁵ but on the assumption that Luke 1:5-2:52 as a whole contains ideas and motifs crucial to Luke's overall conception, the finding in the temple will be understood to be organically linked with what precedes.

2.1. The book of Daniel and the Lukan infancy narrative

We begin the relationship between Daniel and the Lukan infancy narrative. It is important to begin here, because it is in Daniel above all that common ground exists between the material known to the synoptic evangelists and that known to those responsible for the Qumran texts examined in part one. Scholars have not ignored the relationship between Daniel and Luke, René Laurentin, Frans Neirynck,²⁶ and Raymond Brown all making significant contributions to its elucidation. Their studies, which overlap considerably, should be summarised.

cf. 469 n. 72). Consequently, this pericope is both the culmination of Jesus' upbringing and the basis for his future ministry.

²⁴ According to Daniélou, wisdom was, for Luke, the essential character of the early years of Christ's life, thus partially explaining the presence of this pericope in the Gospel (*Infancy Narratives*, 124-125).

²⁵ Cf. n. 23 above. Six theories concerning the structure of Luke 1-2 are summarised in tabular form in Brown, *Birth*, 248-249 (Table IX). See also Fitzmyer's more recent proposal (*Luke (I-IX)*, 313-314). In terms of Gospel composition, Brown's view is that the infancy narrative ended at 2:40, Luke 2:41-52 being added at a secondary stage of composition (*Birth*, 247, 252, 468 n. 70). Brown justified this view by suggesting that the pericope in question cannot be fitted into the diptych structure of the Lukan infancy narrative (cf. Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, 16). Brown's view is problematic when the whole of the Gospel of Luke is taken into account. Insight is a key concept which occurs in all parts of the Gospel proper, the infancy narrative, the Galilean ministry, the journey to Jerusalem and the post-resurrection episodes. Luke 2:41-52 may be seen as a culmination of Jesus' early life and basis for his ministry, and thus as a vital part of the development of Luke's account of Jesus without recourse to suggestions of the late incorporation of the pericope as if this passage were simply an afterthought and not an integral part of Luke's literary product. The view that Luke 2:41-52 is the culmination of Jesus' early life echoes René Laurentin's view that the presentation in the temple (Luke 2:22-38) is the locus of the fulfilment to which the infancy narrative points (*Structure et théologie de Luc I-II [EBib]*; Paris: Gabalda, 1957], 44 and n. 6).

²⁶ Frans Neirynck, *L'Évangile de Noël selon S. Luc* (Paris: La Pensée Catholique, 1960).

2.1.1. Previous research

Many similarities have been noted between Daniel and the Lukan infancy narrative. In both Luke 1 and Dan 8-9, Gabriel is named twice and appears twice,²⁷ the two appearances in Luke having close links with Daniel-OG.²⁸ The annunciation to Zechariah and the introduction to the vision in Dan 10 exhibit a number of similarities:²⁹ a visionary sees, fear falls upon him,³⁰ and the angel commands him not to fear.³¹ Zechariah and Daniel see a vision,³² both are struck dumb,³³ and similar terms are used for their recovery of speech.³⁴ In Luke 1:64, Zechariah's silence ends when he gives a name to his child, which for Neiryck recalls Daniel's recovery of speech in Dan 10:15-16.³⁵ The similarities between the closing chapters of Daniel and the annunciation to Zechariah are such that Neiryck can conclude that

Ce n'est pas une apparition angélique du type des apparitions que nous trouvons dans les vieux récits de l'Ancien Testament, qui contiennent, eux aussi, des récits de naissance, mais bien une vision spécifiquement apocalyptique, de sorte que nous pouvons parler d'une «Apocalypse de Zacharie».³⁶

By denying that the literary affiliations of this passage are primarily with OT angelophanies, and by asserting that the annunciation to Zechariah is an apocalypse in terms of genre, Neiryck establishes a vital connection between the Lukan infancy

²⁷ Dan 8:16; 9:21; Luke 1:19, 26; Laurentin, *Structure*, 46 n. 1.

²⁸ The Septuagint of Daniel is abbreviated "LXX" by Laurentin, but it is abbreviated "OG" here to distinguish it from the Greek translation of the Torah. Cf. Robert A. Kraft, "Septuagint," *IDBSup* 811; Collins, *Daniel*, 4.

²⁹ Neiryck notes that Dan 10 in particular may be placed in parallel with Luke 1 (*L'Évangile*, 24), and that although both the annunciation to Zechariah and the annunciation to Mary belong to the same genre of literature (apocalyptic) the similarities are more obvious between Daniel and the annunciation to Zechariah (*L'Évangile*, 26).

³⁰ Neiryck, *L'Évangile*, 24-25. See Dan 10:7-9; cf. 8:17-18; Luke 1:12. In Dan 10:7, fear falls upon Daniel's companions, but Daniel himself, the putative narrator, is the only person to see the vision and the only one present in verse 12. Cf. Laurentin, *Structure*, 46 n. 2.

³¹ Laurentin, *Structure*, 46. See Dan 10:12; Luke 1:13; cf. 2 *En.* 21:3.

³² Dan 10:8; Luke 1:22.

³³ Neiryck, *L'Évangile*, 25. See Dan 10:15-16; Luke 1:20.

³⁴ Dan 10:16-17; Luke 1:64-65. In both the OG and Θ, the Greek reads καὶ ἥνοιξα τὸ στόμα μου καὶ ἐλάλησα in Dan 10:16. In Luke 1:64 we read ἀνεψύχθη δὲ τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ ... καὶ ἐλάλει.

³⁵ Neiryck, *L'Évangile*, 25.

³⁶ Neiryck, *L'Évangile*, 26.

narrative and a major strand of Second Temple Jewish literature.³⁷ Luke (or his source) is not simply drawing on the typologies of ancient Jewish literature but is himself penning an apocalypse.

Daniel is also echoed in the annunciation to Mary. In Dan 9:21-24; Luke 1:26-29, Gabriel's interlocutor enjoys God's favour, and Gabriel announces the appearance of one who will be holy.³⁸ Neirynck likens the adjective κεχαριτωμένη, "blessed" in Luke 1:28 to the phrase "man of favour" used of Daniel in Dan 9:23; 10:11; 10:19.³⁹ Laurentin emphasises the similarities between the appearances of Gabriel in Daniel and Luke 1-2, commenting that "Gabriel donne le signal de l'avènement des temps messianiques,"⁴⁰ and suggesting that Luke reinterpreted the 70 weeks of Dan 9:24 to refer to the time between Gabriel's first appearance in the temple and the presentation of Jesus in the temple, which, according to Laurentin's chronology, is 490 days, or 70 weeks.⁴¹ Brown, however, suggests that by situating Zechariah's vision against the background of Dan 9, Luke identifies the annunciation of John the Baptist's birth as the inauguration of the period *after* the end of the seventy weeks of years of Dan 9:24.⁴² Laurentin notes verbal similarities between Daniel and Luke,⁴³ and also similarities between Mary and Daniel:⁴⁴

³⁷ See further §3 below (on apocalyptic).

³⁸ In Daniel, however, קדש קדשים surely refers to the temple rather than to the Messiah, in contrast with Hippolytus and the Peshitta. Cf. Collins, *Daniel*, 354; Goldingay, *Daniel*, 260. André Lacocque, on the other hand, has advanced a persuasive argument in support of a messianic reference at the end of Dan 9:24 (*Daniel*, 193-195).

³⁹ Neirynck, *L'Évangile*, 26; cf. Daniélou, *Infancy Narratives*, 27-28. This is not a linguistic similarity. In Dan 9:23, the Hebrew reads מְדַבֵּר, W. Baumgartner suggesting on the basis of Dan 10:11, 19 that שִׁי should precede it as *nomen regens* (BHS, note b). Goldingay notes this as a valid possibility, but following GKC §141c he prefers to see מְדַבֵּר itself as the predicate of the noun clause (*Daniel*, 228). Θ reads ἀνὴρ ἐπιθυμιῶν in all three verses. The OG has ἐλεεινός alone in Dan 9:23, but ἄνθρωπος ἐλεεινός in Dan 10:11, 19, matching the Hebrew מְדַבֵּר שִׁי in both cases.

⁴⁰ Laurentin, *Structure*, 48. Cf. Daniélou, *Infancy Narratives*, 27.

⁴¹ Laurentin, *Structure*, 48-49. Cf. Daniélou, *Infancy Narratives*, 28-29.

⁴² Brown, *Birth*, 271. Cf. Fitzmyer (*Luke (I-IX)*, 315-316, 320, 324-325, 327-328, 337), who also notes (p. 316) allusions to Mal 2:6 (Luke 1:16); 3:1, 23-24 (Luke 1:16, 17, 76). On the allusions to Malachi, see Laurentin, *Structure*, 56-63. Laurentin regards Dan 9 and Mal 3 as "comme le tremplin d'où part tout l'élan de la composition" (*Structure*, 45).

⁴³ Laurentin, *Structure*, 46, 47-48 n. 6: (1) Dan 2:13 (Θ) and Luke 2:1; (2) Dan 2:19-20 and Luke 2:28; (3) Dan 9:10 and Luke 1:70; (4) Dan 9:11 and Luke 2:22; (5) Dan 9:20-22 and Luke 1:19; (6) Dan 9:22 and

(1) the refrain found in Luke 2:19, 51 echoes Dan 7:28; (2) both Daniel and Mary reflect on a revelation and seek to understand (Dan 8:15; Luke 1:29);⁴⁵ (3) both Daniel and Mary fail to understand (Dan 8:27; Luke 2:50). With reference to the Daniel passages, Laurentin concludes that “[s]ans plagiat, ni exploitation systématique, ces passages ont servi de modèle littéraire pour décrire une situation analogue.”⁴⁶

Neiryck, without referring to Laurentin’s study, focuses on the “apocalypse of Zechariah” (Luke 1:5-22).⁴⁷ For Neiryck, the words “I am Gabriel” (Luke 1:19: ἐγὼ εἰμι Γαβριήλ) recall Daniel because it is only there in the Bible that Gabriel is named.⁴⁸ In Luke 1:19, Gabriel describes himself in his double function of angelic announcer and angelic minister before God’s throne. Neiryck sees a similar double function for Gabriel in Daniel: in Dan 9:22; 10:11 Gabriel’s role is to speak to Daniel, and in Dan 7:16, the angel who gives the explanation to Daniel is one of those standing by, apparently one of those in Dan 7:10 who serve the Ancient of Days.⁴⁹ Although it is not stated in Luke 1:10 that Zechariah himself was in prayer prior to his vision, Luke 1:13 presents the vision as a response to his prayer, recalling Dan 10:12.⁵⁰ Also, in Luke 1:10 the presence of the crowd indicates that the vision took place at the time of the evening sacrifice.⁵¹

In Luke 1:21 we read that the people were waiting outside for Zechariah. Neiryck compares this with Dan 10:7, because in both, the visionary is alone when the

Luke 1:77; and (7) Dan 9:25 and Luke 2:11. Laurentin’s references to Daniel are to the OG unless otherwise indicated.

⁴⁴ Laurentin, *Structure*, 48.

⁴⁵ Cf. Neiryck, *L’Évangile*, 26-27.

⁴⁶ Laurentin, *Structure*, 48.

⁴⁷ Neiryck, *L’Évangile*, 23-27.

⁴⁸ Neiryck, *L’Évangile*, 23; cf. Daniélou, *Infancy Narratives*, 28. This contrasts with Matthew, where the announcing angel is simply (ὁ) ἄγγελος κυρίου (Matt 1:20, 24; 2:13, 19; cf. Luke 1:11; 2:9).

⁴⁹ Neiryck, *L’Évangile*, 25. Neiryck also cites Tob 12:14-15, where Raphael has not only been sent to Tobit and Sarah, but is one of the seven angels who stand ready and enter before the glory of the Lord (S). Like Gabriel in Luke 1:19, Raphael introduces himself with the words ἐγὼ εἰμι Ραφαήλ. Luke 1:19 therefore parallels Tob 12:14-15 in three ways: (1) the angel’s introductory words; (2) the vocation of the angel as one sent to humans; and (3) the identity of the angel as one who stands before the Lord. The third of these is presented slightly differently in the two texts, but the parallel remains.

⁵⁰ Cf. Dan 9:21, 23. Neiryck, *L’Évangile*, 24.

⁵¹ Cf. Dan 9:21. Laurentin, *Structure*, 46; Neiryck, *L’Évangile*, 24; Daniélou, *Infancy Narratives*, 29.

vision occurs. Although Neiryck compares Luke 1:21; Dan 10:7 with the vision and commission of Saul of Tarsus (Acts 9:1-19; 22:6-16; 26:12-18), he does not explore these texts from Acts further. It is worthwhile to do so.⁵² Acts 9:7 reads οἱ δὲ ἄνδρες οἱ συνοδεύοντες αὐτῷ εἰστήκεισαν ἐνεοί, ἀκούοντες μὲν τῆς φωνῆς μηδένα δὲ θεωροῦντες, “the men travelling with him stood speechless, neither hearing the voice nor seeing anything.” The phrase οἱ δὲ ἄνδρες οἱ συνοδεύοντες αὐτῷ parallels οἱ ἄνθρωποι οἱ ὄντες μετ’ ἐμοῦ, “the men who were with me” (Dan 10:7 [OG]).⁵³ No mention is made in Daniel of the visionary’s companions being struck dumb but in Acts 9:7; Dan 10:7 the visionary alone sees the vision.⁵⁴ In Acts 22:9 οἱ δὲ σὺν ἐμοὶ ὄντες, “those who were with me” parallels Dan 10:7. More important are the words of the ascended Jesus. Recalling Tob 12:15; Luke 1:19 Jesus says in Acts 9:4 ἐγώ εἰμι Ἰησοῦς, “I am Jesus,” in Acts 22:8 ἐγώ εἰμι Ἰησοῦς ὁ Ναζωραῖος, “I am Jesus the Nazarene,” and in Acts 26:15 ἐγώ εἰμι Ἰησοῦς ὃν σὺ διώκεις, “I am Jesus, whom you are pursuing.” Jesus identifies himself using words of greeting characteristic of an angel once he has assumed his heavenly identity after the resurrection and ascension. We are dealing with an angelomorphic Christ.⁵⁵

Neiryck’s last point is the use of ὀπτασία in Luke 1:22.⁵⁶ This noun is relatively rare, but occurs six times in Daniel-Θ 9-10 (Dan 9:23; 10:1, 7 [2t], 8, 16) and three times in the NT. Neiryck notes its use in relation to the appearance of angels to the women

⁵² C. K. Barrett attributes the agreements between the three Acts accounts in part to their use of motifs common to theophanies. Barrett cites 2 Macc 3 and *Jos. Asen.* 10:15; 14 in this connection, but suggests that OT prophetic call narratives, notably Isa 6:1-13 and Jer 1:4-10 (cf. Gal 1:15) are of more relevance (*A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles* [2 vols; ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994-1998], 441-442). The connection with 2 Macc 3 has often been noted: cf. Ernst Haenchen, *The Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary* (trans. B. Noble, G. Shinn, and R. McL. Wilson; Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1971), 321 and n. 6, 326-327.

⁵³ Θ: οἱ ἄνδρες οἱ μετ’ ἐμοῦ.

⁵⁴ Cf. Barrett, *Acts*, 452.

⁵⁵ Furthermore, the motif of the visionary falling to the ground is common to Acts 9:4 and theophanies and angelophanies: see Ezek 1:28; Dan 8:17 (MT; OG; Θ), 18 (Θ); Rev 1:17; Barrett, *Acts*, 449. On the relationship between the narratives of Paul’s commissioning in Acts and Ezekiel’s commissioning, see Walther Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1: A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Ezekiel, Chapters 1-24* (ed. F. M. Cross and K. Baltzer, with the assistance of L. J. Greenspoon; trans. R. E. Clements; Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979), 100.

⁵⁶ Neiryck, *L’Évangile*, 26; Brown, *Birth*, 270.

after Jesus' resurrection (Luke 24:23) and by Paul in relation to his Damascus road vision (Acts 26:19), but does not note its use in 2 Cor 12:1 in the plural, in parallel with ἀποκαλύψεις, "revelations." There it refers to Paul's vision of paradise.⁵⁷ Ὀπτασία is used in Daniel (Θ), Luke-Acts, and 2 Corinthians only in reference to visions of the heavenly realm or heavenly beings (Gabriel and the exalted Christ).

Brown notes seven points shared by Daniel and Luke,⁵⁸ though his work is largely dependent upon Laurentin and Neirynck: (1) ὀπτασία appears in Luke 1:22 and in Daniel-Θ 9-10; (2) Gabriel appears at the time of liturgical prayer in Luke 1:10-11; Dan 9:20-21; (3) Gabriel appears to Zechariah and Daniel when they had been praying in distress (Dan 9:20; Luke 1:13); (4) Gabriel's appearance occasions fear in Luke 1:12; Dan 8:17; 10:7; (5) Gabriel's words ἀπεστάλην λαλῆσαι πρὸς σέ, "I was sent to speak to you" (Luke 1:19) echo Dan 10:11, where the unnamed angel, presumably Gabriel,⁵⁹ refers to "the words which I am speaking to you"; (6) In Luke 1:13; Dan 10:12 Gabriel commands the visionary not to fear; (7) in Luke 1:20-22; Dan 10:15 the visionary is struck mute.

These studies demonstrate that a literary relationship exists between Greek Daniel and the Lukan infancy narrative: Luke, or his source, draws on a form of Greek Daniel. The similarities between Luke and Daniel fall into two categories: linguistic and typological. One linguistic similarity not explored by Laurentin, Neirynck, or Brown is the common, almost technical use of συνίημι.⁶⁰ The typological similarities between the Gabriel of Luke and the Gabriel of Jewish tradition (connected with but not necessarily rooted in Daniel) also need to be explored more deeply.

⁵⁷ Cf. 2 Cor 12:4.

⁵⁸ Brown, *Birth*, 270-271.

⁵⁹ Cf. Brown, *Birth*, 271 n. 24.

⁶⁰ Laurentin notes the occurrence of συνίημι in Dan 8:27 (Θ); Luke 2:50 (*Structure*, 48 n. 2) but does not expand on its significance, nor on the link between συνίημι and the appearances of Gabriel. Following Delitzsch, Laurentin postulates that the Hebrew root יָדַע might underlie the Lukan text as well as Θ.

2.1.2. The verb συνίημι in Greek Daniel

The use of σύνεσις in Luke 2:47, and the use of συνίημι in Luke 2:50 (and Luke 8:10; 18:34; 24:45) should be considered against the background of Daniel. In his literary comparison of the MT (Aramaic) and OG of Dan 2-7 T. J. Meadowcroft also compares the MT with the OG of Daniel 1; 8-12, and considers the translations of שכל in the OG and Θ.⁶¹ He notes that Θ normally translates both nominal and verbal forms of שכל with the verb συνίημι and the noun σύνεσις, with two exceptions (Dan 1:17; 9:22). Θ also uses these words to translate forms of בין. The OG consistently translates forms of בין with forms of διανοέομαι, but the translator makes no distinction between συνίημι and διανοέομαι when translating שכל. The following table lays out the translation equivalents in the OG and Θ of שכל and בין where they occur in Hebrew and Aramaic, in both nominal and verbal forms:

Reference	MT	OG	Θ
Dan 1:4	שכל Hiph.	ἐπιστήμων	συνίημι
Dan 1:4	בין Hiph.	συνετός ⁶²	διανοέομαι
Dan 1:17	שכל Hiph.	σύνεσις ⁶³	φρόνησις ⁶⁴
Dan 1:17	בין Hiph.	δίδωμι + σύνεσις	συνίημι ⁶⁵
Dan 1:20	בִּינָה	παιδεία ⁶⁶	ἐπιστήμη
Dan 2:21	בִּינָה	ἐπιστήμη ⁶⁷	σύνεσις ⁶⁸
Dan 5:11	שכל תנו		σύνεσις ⁶⁹

⁶¹ T. J. Meadowcroft, *Aramaic Daniel and Greek Daniel: A Literary Comparison* (JSOTSup 198; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 252.

⁶² The Greek paraphrases; it does not match the MT precisely.

⁶³ The Greek is not absolutely literal: מַדְעָה וְהַשְׂכִּיל is matched by ἐπιστήμην καὶ σύνεσιν καὶ φρόνησιν.

⁶⁴ Σύνεσις is here used to translate מַדְעָה.

⁶⁵ The ambiguity of בין Hiphil (whether it is causative or not) is reflected in the two Greek versions. The OG understands בִּינָה to be causative: ἔδωκε σύνεσιν, “He gave insight.” Θ: συνῆκεν, “he understood.”

⁶⁶ The OG here translates בִּינָה with σύνεσις. The MT reads בִּינָה וְחָכְמָה, a construct chain meaning something like “insightful wisdom.” However, both the OG and Θ reflect two synonymous absolute nouns, בִּינָה וְחָכְמָה (cf. *BHS* note).

⁶⁷ The OG does not offer a literal translation; σύνεσις translates חָכְמָה.

⁶⁸ Θ translates חָכְמָה with φρόνησις. The collocation of φρόνησις and σύνεσις not uncommon in Θ.

Dan 5:12	שָׂכַלְתָּנוּ		σύνεσις
Dan 5:14	שָׂכַלְתָּנוּ		σύνεσις
Dan 7:8	שָׂכַל Hithpa.		προσνοέω
Dan 8:5	בִּין Hiph.	διανοέομαι	συνίημι
Dan 8:15	בִּינָה	διανοέομαι ⁷⁰	σύνεσις
Dan 8:16	בִּין Hiph.	συνετίζω	συνετίζω
Dan 8:17	בִּין Hiph.	διανοέομαι	συνίημι
Dan 8:23	בִּין Hiph.	διανοέομαι	συνίημι
Dan 8:25	שָׂכַל ⁷¹	διανόημα	
Dan 8:27	בִּין Hiph.	διανοέομαι	συνίημι
Dan 9:2	בִּין Qal	διανοέομαι	συνίημι
Dan 9:13	שָׂכַל Hiph.	διανοέομαι	συνίημι
Dan 9:22	בִּין Hiph.	προσέρχομαι ⁷²	συνετίζω
Dan 9:22	שָׂכַל Hiph.	ὑποδείκνυμι	συμβιβάζω ⁷³
Dan 9:22	בִּינָה	διάνοια	σύνεσις
Dan 9:23	בִּין Qal	διανοέομαι ⁷⁴	ἐννοέω
Dan 9:23	בִּין Hiph.	συνίημι	
Dan 9:25	שָׂכַל Hiph.	διανοέομαι	συνίημι
Dan 10:1	בִּין Qal	διανοέομαι ⁷⁵	
Dan 10:1	בִּינָה	διανοέομαι ⁷⁶	σύνεσις ⁷⁷

⁶⁹ Σύνεσις seems to match שָׂכַלְתָּנוּ and γρηγόρησις seems to match וְיָרָה (cf. verse 14). The OG is different from the MT: ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἦν καὶ σοφός, “the man was knowledgeable and wise.”

⁷⁰ MT: וְאֶבְקַשָּׁה בִּינָה “and I was seeking understanding” (converted imperfect + noun). OG: ἐζήτουν διανοηθῆναι, “I was seeking to understand” (imperfect + infinitive). Did the *Vorlage* of the OG read וְאֶבְקַשָּׁה לְהָבִין?

⁷¹ Dan 8:25 (Θ) does not reflect the Hebrew עַל-שָׂכָלוֹ. The Greek ὁ ζυγὸς τοῦ κλοιοῦ κατευθυνεῖ, “the yoke of his collar makes straight” suggests that instead of עַל “on account of” the translator understood עַל “yoke” (cf. Collins, *Daniel*, 327).

⁷² MT: וַיִּבֶן, “and he gave understanding.” The OG and the Peshitta read וַיָּבֵא, “and he came” at this point (cf. *BHS* note; LaCocque, *Daniel*, 188; Goldingay, *Daniel*, 228; Collins, *Daniel*, 345).

⁷³ In both the OG and Θ the causative nuance of הָשִׁיבָה לְךָ is explicit. OG: ὑποδείξαί σοι διάνοιαν, “to show you understanding”; Θ: συμβιβάσαι σε σύνεσιν, “to teach you insight.”

⁷⁴ The OG contains no parallel to the second half of Gabriel’s command (וְהָבִין בְּמַרְאֵה), reading simply διανοήθητι τὸ πρόσταγμα, “understand the ordinance.”

⁷⁵ Cf. Origen; Aquila reads συνήσει, echoing the general tendency of Θ.

⁷⁶ OG: διενοήθηεν αὐτὸ ἐν ὁράματι, “he understood it in a/the vision” (αὐτὸ refers back to πρόσταγμα = דְּבַר).

⁷⁷ Θ ignores וְהָבִין בְּמַרְאֵה, translating וְהָבִין לוֹ בְּמַרְאֵה with καὶ σύνεσις ἐδόθη αὐτῷ ἐν τῇ ὁπτασίᾳ, “and insight was given to him in the vision.” The Hebrew *Vorlage* of Θ may have differed from the MT. Alternatively, perhaps Θ is emphasising that Daniel could not gain σύνεσις on his own, because it is a

Dan 10:11	בִּין Hiph.	διανοέομαι	συνίημι
Dan 10:12	בִּין Hiph.	διανοέομαι	συνίημι
Dan 10:14	בִּין Hiph.	ὑποδείκνυμι	συνετίζω
Dan 11:30	בִּין Qal	διανοέομαι	συνίημι
Dan 11:33	שָׁל Hiph.	ἐννοέω	συνετός
Dan 11:33	בִּין Hiph.	συνίημι	συνίημι
Dan 11:35	שָׁל Hiph.	συνίημι	συνίημι
Dan 11:37	בִּין Qal/Hiph. (2t)	προνοέω (2t)	συνίημι (2t)
Dan 12:3	שָׁל Hiph.	συνίημι	συνίημι
Dan 12:8	בִּין Qal/Hiph.	διανοέομαι	συνίημι
Dan 12:10	בִּין Qal/Hiph.	διανοέομαι	συνίημι
Dan 12:10	שָׁל Hiph.	διανοέομαι	νοήμων
Dan 12:10	בִּין Qal/Hiph.	προσέχω	συνίημι

Συνίημι is clearly characteristic of Daniel-Θ.⁷⁸ Morton Smith implies that ἀποκαλύπτω, “reveal” is characteristic of Θ also.⁷⁹ Thus, as συνίημι and its cognates characteristically render שָׁל and בִּין in Daniel-Θ, so ἀποκαλύπτω characteristically renders גְּלוּתִי.

The Θ translator was probably keen to produce a translation that was both faithful to the original and consistent. The consistency of Θ may also be a deliberate reflection of the characteristic terminology of the original, the translator perceiving a technical language in the Hebrew-Aramaic and creating a parallel terminology in Greek. Alternatively, Daniel-Θ may reflect terminology used by Greek Jews which mirrors a characteristic terminology which existed in Hebrew and Aramaic and is evidenced in Daniel and Qumran. What is clear is that the Hebrew-Aramaic of Daniel reflects characteristic

heavenly gift and had to be transmitted to him by Gabriel. וְבִין אֶת־הַדָּבָר implies that Daniel needed no intermediary.

⁷⁸ This is not to deny that this verb and its cognates have an important function in the OG, where it refers to the wise and their behaviour (Dan 1:20; 11:33,35; 12:3; cf. Wis 3:9). The noun σύνεσις is also significant (Dan 1:20; 2:21), as is the adjective συνετός (Dan 1:4). Cf. F. Raurell, “The DOXA of the Seer in Dan-LXX 12,13,” in *The Book of Daniel in the Light of New Findings* (ed. A. S. van der Woude; BETL 106; Louvain: Presses Universitaires de Louvain, 1993), 526 n. 22, 527 n. 26.

⁷⁹ Morton Smith, “On the History of ΑΠΟΚΑΛΥΠΤΩ and ΑΠΟΚΑΛΥΨΙΣ,” in *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East: Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Apocalypticism, Uppsala, August 12-17, 1979* (ed. D. Hellholm; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1983), 19. Cf. Markus N. A. Bockmuehl, *Revelation and Mystery in Ancient Judaism and Pauline Christianity* (WUNT 36; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1990; repr., Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1997), 101. See Dan 2:19, 22, 28, 29, 30, 47 (2t); 10:1; 11:35.

sapiential terminology current in the Second Temple period and familiar from Qumran, and that Daniel-Θ reflects this terminology fairly faithfully. *Συνήμυ* and its cognates may be regarded as recognised equivalents for *שכל* and *בין* and their cognates in Jewish texts of the late Second Temple period.

This has important consequences: if the technical language found in Daniel-MT and Qumran is reflected by *σύνεσις* and its cognates in Daniel-Θ, it may be argued that by using *σύνεσις* and its cognates to express specific theological and christological points, Luke and the other synoptic evangelists are either themselves (consciously or unconsciously) using this technical language or are dependent on Daniel-Θ or a form of Greek Daniel very close to it (these options are not mutually exclusive).

2.1.3. The angel Gabriel

Gabriel is significant not only as an indicator of connections between Luke and Jewish angelological speculation, but as an example of the transmission of heavenly secrets. In Luke's Gospel the two figures who act as mediators of heavenly secrets are Gabriel and Jesus himself. This links Gabriel directly with our broader discussion of the revelation and transmission of heavenly wisdom.

2.1.3.1. Jewish and Christian Gabriel traditions

Athough Luke seems to be dependent on Daniel, his knowledge of Daniel traditions probably included more than the canonical book. The verbal overlaps between Luke 1:32-35 and 4QAramaic Apocalypse⁸⁰ demonstrate this, though it is not certain that Luke

⁸⁰ See (*inter alia*): Joseph A. Fitzmyer, "4Q246: The "Son of God" Document from Qumran," *Bib* 74 (1993): 174; "New Documents: Qumran and Gnostic Writings," in *American Bible Society Symposium Papers on the Bible in the 21st Century* (ed. H. C. Kee; Philadelphia, Pa.: Trinity Press International, 1993), 18-19; "The Aramaic "Son of God" Text from Qumran Cave 4," in *Methods of Investigation of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Khirbet Qumran Site: Present Realities and Future Prospects* (ed. M. O. Wise, N. Golb, J. J. Collins, and D. G. Pardee; ANYAS 722; New York: New York Academy of Sciences, 1994), 175; J. J. Collins, *The Scepter and the Star: The Messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Ancient Literature* (ABRL; New York: Doubleday, 1995), 155; Craig A. Evans, "Jesus and the Dead Sea Scrolls from Qumran Cave 4," in *Eschatology, Messianism and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. C. A. Evans and P. W. Flint; SDSSRL 1; Cambridge, UK: Eerdmans, 1997), 92-94.

knew 4QAramaic Apocalypse itself. Laurentin refers in passing to extra-canonical references to Gabriel but dismisses them without discussion, commenting that “[c]es textes non bibliques n’offrent pas d’éclairage significatif à *Luc 1-2*.”⁸¹ Although Laurentin aimed specifically at the elucidation of Luke 1-2, this comment nevertheless assumes that non-biblical texts are worth discussing only if they shed light directly on the biblical text, whereas it is more proper to place the biblical text alongside a wide variety of comparative material in order to use all this information without prejudice to build up a picture of the development of the ideas to which the traditions as a whole bear witness. This entails drawing on a wide variety of Jewish, Judaeo-Christian, and Christian texts from the late Second Temple period onwards.

On the basis that Gabriel is the angel who explains visions to Daniel (Dan 8:15; 9:21), John Day identifies the unnamed attendant in Dan 7:16 as Gabriel,⁸² disagreeing with Ziony Zevit, who identifies the *כְּבִיר אֱנִיִּשׁ* in Dan 7:13 as Gabriel.⁸³ Day’s conclusion is preferable since it maintains the consistent view of Daniel that Gabriel’s primary function is to help the visionary understand, whereas that of Michael is to do battle in heaven on behalf of the earthly Israel. This is transparent in Dan 10:13-14, where Gabriel, who was being opposed by the prince of the kingdom of Persia, leaves Michael with the opposing prince so that he can go and bring insight to Daniel. This is supported

⁸¹ Laurentin, *Structure*, 45-46 n. 2.

⁸² John Day, *God’s Conflict with the Dragon and the Sea: Echoes of a Canaanite Myth in the Old Testament* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), 172; cf. Collins, *Daniel*, 311; Goldingay, *Daniel*, 172; Gieschen, “Angelomorphic Christology,” 143. Day identifies Michael as the “one like a human being” (*God’s Conflict*, 167-178). See also Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature* (2d ed.; BRS; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1998), 106.

⁸³ Ziony Zevit, “The Structure and Individual Elements of Daniel 7,” *ZAW* 80 (1968): 385-396 (esp. pp. 395-396); “The Exegetical Implications of Daniel VIII 1, IX 21,” *VT* 28 (1978): 488-491. See also Jarl E. Fossum, *The Name of God and the Angel of the Lord: Samaritan and Jewish Concepts of Intermediation and the Origins of Gnosticism* (WUNT 36; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1985), 279 n. 61. Zevit suggests that the vision in which Daniel had previously seen Gabriel (cf. Dan 9:21) was that of Dan 7. Zevit’s argument in his second article that the description of the vision only lasts from 7:2 to 7:14 takes no account of the fact that the account of Daniel’s first vision does not end until verse 28, which refers to *סוּפֵּא דִּי־מִלְתָּא*, “the end of the account.” On this basis we may follow Day in identifying *כְּבִיר אֱנִיִּשׁ* with Michael (cf. Rowland, *Open Heaven*, 181-182), and *חַד מִן־קְדָּאִיִּמָּא* (Dan 7:16) as Gabriel, since this allows Gabriel to appear in Daniel’s first vision and to retain his consistent role as *angelus interpres*.

by Collins, who notes that “[t]he primary function of Gabriel is that of revealer.”⁸⁴ Collins suggests that in Luke Gabriel takes over the role of the מלאך יהוה of the HB in announcing the births of John the Baptist and Jesus.⁸⁵ Certainly a comparison may be drawn with the annunciation of the birth of Samson (Judg 13),⁸⁶ but it would be more accurate to say that Luke draws on the revelatory function of the מלאך יהוה in the HB generally and of Gabriel in Daniel specifically.

Paul Winter makes numerous comparisons between the Lukan infancy narrative and extant Jewish texts, placing Gabriel’s greeting in Luke 1:19 in the context of Jewish ideas about the “angel of the presence.”⁸⁷ Winter traces the idea of angels of the presence back to Ezek 9:2 (where seven men, including the man clothed with linen, stand near the bronze altar) and Isa 63:9 (מַלְאֲכֵי הַיְיָ הוֹשִׁיעָם: “the angel of his presence saved them”), also citing *Jub.* 1:27; *T. Levi* 18:5; Tob 12:15; Rev 1:4; 8:2 (in which Gabriel is not named), together with Dan 8:16; 9:21, where he is named.⁸⁸ Winter also notes *Tg. Ps.-J.* Gen 37:15 (which identifies Gabriel as the unnamed מַלְאֲכֵי הַיְיָ who finds Joseph in the MT),⁸⁹ *Tg. Ps.-J.* Exod 24:10 (in which the pavement is apparently fashioned by Gabriel), and *Tg. Ket.* Ps 137:7,⁹⁰ concluding that “[t]he author of Luke I 19 lived and

⁸⁴ Collins, “Gabriel גבריאל,” *DDD* 641; cf. Gieschen, “Angelomorphic Christology,” 142-143.

⁸⁵ Collins, “Gabriel גבריאל,” *DDD* 641.

⁸⁶ Cf. Paul Winter, “Some Observations on the Language in the Birth and Infancy Stories of the Third Gospel,” *NTS* 1 (1954-1955): 111. See §2.2.3.3 below.

⁸⁷ See Paul Winter, “The Cultural Background of the Narrative in Luke I and II,” *JQR* 45 (1955): 236-237; cf. Marshall, *Luke*, 60.

⁸⁸ Winter, “Cultural Background,” 237. Cf. Saul M. Olyan, *A Thousand Thousands Served Him: Exegesis and the Naming of Angels in Ancient Judaism* (TSAJ 36; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1993), 108. Winter incorrectly states that in Dan 8:16; 9:21 Gabriel is named as angel of the presence: he is not.

⁸⁹ This passage is connected with the ancient idea of Gabriel as mediator of heavenly secrets. In *Tg. Ps.-J.* Gen 37:17 we read that Gabriel “heard from behind the curtain that from this day the Egyptian servitude has begun”: שמעית מבחר פרגודא דהא אישתרי מן יומא דין שעבוד מצראי.

⁹⁰ I.e. *Tg. Ket.* Ps 137:8: *Tg. Ket.* Ps 137:7 refers to Michael. Verses 7-8 read (ed. Lagarde):

(7) אמר מיכאל רבה דירושלם אידכר יהוה לעמא דאדומא דאחריבו ירושלם דאמרין צדו צדו עד דשיתאסא בה

(8) אמר גבריאל רבה דציון לאומא בבליתא בוזיתא טב ליה די שלם לך ית ומליך (=גמולריך?) ביש די מלת לנא

(7) Michael, great one of Jerusalem, said “Remind, O YHWH, the people of Edom, who destroyed Jerusalem, saying ‘Destroy it, destroy it to its foundation!’”

moved in a world of ideas indigenous to late Judaism.”⁹¹ Whilst we concur on this point, Winter does not problematise the date of these targumic traditions;⁹² the Targum to the Psalms at least is very late. Collins cites *Tg. Ps.-J. Deut 34:6* (in which Michael and Gabriel make preparations for Moses’ burial)⁹³ and *Tg. Ket. 2 Chr 32:21* (in which Gabriel is sent to destroy Sennacherib’s armies)⁹⁴ in addition to these texts.

These targumic traditions are doubtless late developments, but they do reflect trajectories connected with Gabriel rooted in Second Temple Jewish literature. Gabriel features in several angelic lists from this period.⁹⁵ In *1 En. 9:1* he appears alongside Michael, the ms tradition attesting different names for the other angels accompanying them. These angels observe evil on earth and bring the cries of souls before the Most High, thus discharging priestly, mediatorial functions. In *1 En. 40:9* Gabriel is one of the

(8) Gabriel, great one of Zion, said to the Babylonian people, the plunderer, “Happy is he who repays you the evil deed you dealt out to us.”

⁹¹ Winter, “Cultural Background,” 237.

⁹² On the question of early targums, see Martin McNamara, *Targum and Testament: Aramaic Paraphrases of the Hebrew Bible: A Light on the New Testament* (Shannon: Irish University Press, 1972), 63-68. For an early dating of the material in the Palestinian Targum to the Pentateuch, see: McNamara, *Targum*, 86-89 (cf. pp. 179-180, 204-205). For a consideration of criteria for dating targumic material, see Philip S. Alexander, “Jewish Aramaic Translations of Hebrew Scriptures,” in *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity* (ed. J. Mulder and H. Sysling; CRINT 2/1; Assen and Maastricht: Van Gorcum, 1988), 243-247.

⁹³ Cf. *Apoc. Mos. 40:2-6*, in which Michael, Gabriel, Uriel, and Raphael prepare Adam and Abel’s bodies for burial.

⁹⁴ Collins, “Gabriel,” 642. *Tg. Ket. 2 Chr 32:21* (ed. Sperber):

ושדר מימרא דיהוה מיכאל גבריאל מלאכא ושיצי בליליא דפסחא באשא מנחבא ואוקיד נשמתהון
בגויהין

“And the memra of YHWH sent Michael Gabriel the angel, and on the night of the Passover he destroyed (them) with molten fire and burned their souls within their bodies.”

Gabriel is identified with the unnamed מלאך of 2 Chr 32:21 (MT). The role of Gabriel here is intended to recall YHWH’s destruction of the first-born of the Egyptians at Passover (Exod 12:12). *Tg. Neof. Exod 12:12* identifies YHWH’s memra as his agent in the destruction of the Egyptians: בלילי פסחא הדין ואעבר בממרי בארעא דמצרים, “and I shall pass over the land of Egypt in my memra on this night of Passover.” This recalls the identification between Gabriel and the Word found in certain texts (see below).

⁹⁵ Note also *Pesiq. Rab Kah. 12:22*, where Gabriel appears alongside the other “canonical” named angels: “[u]pon the heart of each and every angel there is a tablet with the name of the Holy One as a part of the name of the angel: ‘Micha-El, Gabri-El, Rapha-El’” (William G. Braude and I. J. Kapstein, *Pesikta de-Rab Kahana: R. Kahana’s Compilation of Discourses for Sabbaths and Festival Days* [Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1975], 245). Braude and Kapstein date the *Pesikta of Rab Kahana* to the fifth century C. E. (*Pesikta de-Rab Kahana*, xxviii; cf. Günter Stemberger, *Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash* [trans. and ed. M. N. A. Bockmuehl; 2d ed.; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1996], 295).

four angels of the Lord of spirits (alongside Michael, Raphael, and Phanuel) and intercedes for those on earth.⁹⁶ Charles Gieschen notes that Gabriel became known as the revealing angel who imparts revelation in response to prayer. Gabriel's intercessory role in Ethiopic Enoch is thus connected with Gabriel's response to Daniel's prayer in Dan 9.⁹⁷ Michael, Raphael, Gabriel, and Phanuel are listed in *1 En.* 54:6 as destroying angels, whose task is described in terms reminiscent of *Tg. Ket.* 2 Chr 32:21. This recalls 1QM IX, 14-16, in which the names of Michael, Gabriel, Sariel, and Raphael are to be written on the shields of the towers (מַגְנֵי הַמִּגְדָּלוֹת) in the eschatological battle. In *1 En.* 71:8, 9, 13 the same four encircle⁹⁸ the crystal structure in the heaven of heavens. In the book of Watchers, Gabriel also appears in lists of seven angels: in *1 En.* 20:7 he oversees the garden of Eden, the serpents and the cherubim. Gabriel appears also in *Ep. Apos.* 13, where Michael, Gabriel, Uriel, and Raphael are listed.

Hebrew Enoch represents a considerable development of these ideas. In *3 En.* 17,⁹⁹ we are given a list¹⁰⁰ of the "princes" appointed over the seven firmaments.¹⁰¹ Michael is appointed over the uppermost firmament (the seventh) and is the only "prince" described as שַׂר הַגְּדוֹל, "the great prince" (cf. Dan 12:1; *b. Hag.* 12b). The others (including Gabriel, appointed over the sixth firmament) are described as שַׂר הַצֶּבֶא, "the prince of the host." The names and functions of the "princes who guide the world" (V228: שְׂרָיִם/ש' שְׂמַנְהִיגִין אֶת הָעֶלְיוֹן) are given in *3 En.* 14 (*Synopse*, §§18, 899),

⁹⁶ *1 En.* 40:6. In verse 9 Gabriel is "set over all exercise of strength" ("1 [Ethiopic Apocalypse of] Enoch," translated by E. Isaac [OTP 1:32]). The Semitic root *gbr*, from which the name Gabriel derives, is connected with strength and power. Cf. *Ep. Apos.* 15, where Jesus says "I will send my power in the form of mine angel Gabriel" (Montague Rhodes James, *The Apocryphal New Testament* [2d ed.; Oxford: Clarendon, 1953], 490). Gabriel is here identified with the ἀγγελος κυριου of Acts 12:7.

⁹⁷ Gieschen, "Angelomorphic Christology," 144-145.

⁹⁸ In connection with *1 En.* 71:7-9, compare Isa 6:2 (LXX): καὶ σεραφὶν εἰστήκεισαν κύκλῳ αὐτοῦ, "and seraphim stood around it," which contains the idea of heavenly beings surrounding the throne rather than standing above (MT: מַמְעַל) it.

⁹⁹ This reference follows the system established by Hugo Odeberg (*3 Enoch or the Hebrew Book of Enoch* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1928]). Hebrew Enoch 17 = M40 fol. 117b (Schäfer, *Synopse*, §§21, 857); V228 fol. 49b (*Synopse*, §21).

¹⁰⁰ This list is revealed to R. Ishmael by the angel Metatron, described as מַלְאָךְ שַׂר הַפְּנִים הַדֶּר מְרוֹם כּוֹל, "angel, prince of the presence, glory of the whole height."

¹⁰¹ Cf. *b. Hag.* 12b, in which the seven firmaments are named.

where Gabriel is described as “angel of the fire” (מלאך האש). Gabriel’s function does not reflect the etymology of his name, as Baradiel’s control over hail reflects the etymology of his.¹⁰² We are clearly dealing with the Gabriel known from Ethiopic Enoch, though the name גבריאל is sometimes used in the *hekhalot* literature to refer to a different figure.¹⁰³ Gabriel is placed high in lists of heavenly beings, in the case of *3 En.* 17:3 in a list of seven heavenly princes. Although the names of the heavenly princes differ from those given in *1 En.* 20, it is to that chapter that the concept of a list of seven named angels is to be traced, though as Winter notes it is to Ezek 9 that the idea of seven angels of the presence is ultimately to be traced.

Jean Daniélou has examined traditions in early Judaeo-Christian literature which link Gabriel with the Holy Spirit and with the Word,¹⁰⁴ identifying the “angel of the Holy Spirit” in the Ascension of Isaiah with Gabriel, citing *Ascen. Isa.* 3:15-16, in which “the angel of the Holy Spirit and Michael ruler of the holy angels” are to open the grave of Christ on the third day.¹⁰⁵ The Greek contains a lacuna before ὁ ἄγγελος τοῦ Πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου, which B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt restore with the name Γαβριήλ.¹⁰⁶ This may be compared with *Gos. Pet.* 35-41, in which two men descend

¹⁰² ברדיאל derives from the Hebrew בָּרַד, “hail” and אֱל, “god.” In *b. Pesah.* 118a, the prince of hail (שר הברד) is named יורקמו and appears conversing with Gabriel as to who should go down to rescue Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-Nego from the fiery furnace.

¹⁰³ In *Hekh. Rabb.* 17:6 (Schäfer, *Synopse*, §211), Gabriel is listed as one of “those who guard the gate of the fifth palace” (M40: שומרי פתח היכל החמישי; D436: ש'פ'ה' החמישי; N8128, O1531, and M22 read וגריאל; V228 and B238 read וגריאל. The only occurrence of גבריאל in *Sepher ha-Razim* is in reference to one of the angels of the fourth firmament who lead the sun during the day: surely not the Gabriel of Daniel.

¹⁰⁴ Daniélou, *Theology*, 127-134. Cf. Hannah, *Michael*, 195-196.

¹⁰⁵ Daniélou, *Theology*, 127-128, following the Greek (Charles' G²); Gieschen, “Angelomorphic Christology,” 259-260.

¹⁰⁶ B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt, *The Amherst Papyri* (Part 1; London: Henry Frowde, 1900), 6. Robert H. Charles (*The Ascension of Isaiah* [London: A & C Black, 1900], 19-20) concurs, and compares the phrase ὁ ἄγγελος τοῦ Πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου with ὁ ἄγγελος τοῦ προφητικοῦ πνεύματος in Hermas, *Mand.* 11.9. Grenfell and Hunt note that if their restoration KA[I] in col. 9 line 27 is correct, the word lost at the end of the line must belong to the succeeding, not the preceding sentence (*Amherst Papyri*, 21). Γαβριήλ should be restored to correspond with Μιχαήλ in col. 10 line 2 (cf. *Ascen. Isa.* 3:16).

from heaven to take the body of Jesus,¹⁰⁷ and with Luke 24:4; John 20:12, in which two angels appear after the resurrection.¹⁰⁸ The frequent role of Gabriel in bringing people to heaven is used by Daniélou to support his identification,¹⁰⁹ and the Jewish idea of Gabriel seated on the left hand of God confirms that the angel of the Holy Spirit seated there in *Ascen. Isa.* 9:36; 11:33 is Gabriel.¹¹⁰ Slavonic Enoch 24:1 helps to verify this.¹¹¹ Finally, *Ascen. Isa.* 11:4 links the angel of the Holy Spirit with the appearance of the Angel of the Lord to Joseph,¹¹² again suggesting an identification with Gabriel.

Daniélou's analysis is persuasive, but the identification of Gabriel with the angel of the Holy Spirit in the Ascension of Isaiah surely depends on Luke 1:35, where Gabriel foretells the coming of the Holy Spirit on Mary.¹¹³ Furthermore, although *Gos. Pet.* 35-41 is relevant to the discussion of Gabriel's presence at Jesus' tomb in *Ascen. Isa.* 3:15-16, a more pertinent text is *Tg. Ps.-J.* Deut 34:6, where Michael and Gabriel prepare the burial of Moses. In addition, Gieschen makes the important point that if Gabriel is to be linked with the angel of the Holy Spirit in the Ascension of Isaiah, the fact that Gabriel is *angelus interpres* for Daniel helps to clarify the role of the angel of the Holy Spirit as *angelus interpres* for Isaiah.¹¹⁴

Daniélou also finds evidence for identifying Gabriel with the Word, that is, the second person of the Trinity.¹¹⁵ In *Ep. Apos.* 14 Jesus himself claims to have taken the

¹⁰⁷ Grenfell and Hunt, *Amherst Papyri*, 21; Charles, *Ascension*, 20; Daniélou, *Theology*, 128. Cf. 2 *En.* 1:4-8; 67:2.

¹⁰⁸ Grenfell and Hunt, *Amherst Papyri*, 21; Charles, *Ascension*, 20. H. B. Swete compares this passage in the Gospel of Peter with Luke 24:4 (*The Akhmîm Fragment of the Apocryphal Gospel of Peter* [London: Macmillan, 1893], 17). John 20:12 describes the two figures as "angels" (ἄγγέλους), whereas Luke 24:4 describes them as "men" (ἄνδρες).

¹⁰⁹ See *Ascen. Isa.* 7:23; Daniélou, *Theology*, 128; Gieschen, "Angelomorphic Christology," 259.

¹¹⁰ Daniélou, *Theology*, 129.

¹¹¹ Daniélou, *Theology*, 130; Gieschen, "Angelomorphic Christology," 259.

¹¹² Daniélou, *Theology*, 130-131; Gieschen, "Angelomorphic Christology," 260; Hannah, *Michael*, 195. Cf. Matt 1:20-21.

¹¹³ Cf. Gieschen, "Angelomorphic Christology," 260.

¹¹⁴ Gieschen, "Angelomorphic Christology," 263.

¹¹⁵ Daniélou, *Theology*, 131-132.

form of the angel Gabriel (cf. *Sib. Or.* 8:456-462).¹¹⁶ This tradition is significant on several counts: (1) it develops from the tradition which identifies Gabriel as revealer; (2) it presupposes that Jesus, having been exalted to heaven, was either in the form of or could take the form of an angel; (3) by linking¹¹⁷ Jesus with the angel who characteristically takes the role of revealer, especially at the annunciation, this tradition connects Jesus with the role of heavenly revealer. This is particularly significant since Daniel and Luke belong to the context which nurtured the traditions embodied in *Epistula apostolorum* and book eight of the Sibylline Oracles.

In summary, Gabriel appears in connection with different angelic functions. He is, first, connected with traditions about angels of the presence (and thus with Ezek 9), and, second, he is one of four (or seven) archangels. These two trajectories developed in the Second Temple period, as Ethiopic Enoch confirms. Other traditions identify Gabriel as a destroying angel or as an angel who prepares the burial of a renowned figure from Israel's past. The function of mediating divine revelation is not unique to Gabriel, being attributed to different angels, including Michael,¹¹⁸ Uriel, Phanuel, Vrevoil, and Metatron. However, the Lukan infancy narrative is only aware of traditions linking the revelatory function with the מַלְאָכִים/ἄγγελοι κυρίου and Gabriel. It seems that Luke (or his source) linked the two. Luke is keenly aware of the revelatory function of heavenly figures.

Excursus: Isa 6 and Dan 9:21 (Θ)

It is worth looking at another aspect of the Gabriel-as-revealer trajectory. There is a connection between Gabriel bringing understanding in Daniel and the seraph in Isa 6. This is important, Isa 6 being fundamental to Jesus' own vocation to bring understanding in Matt 13; Mark 4; Luke 8.

¹¹⁶ See also Gieschen, "Angelomorphic Christology," 260 n. 12; Hannah, *Michael*, 196-197.

¹¹⁷ Hannah rightly notes that Christ is not identified with Gabriel in *Ep. Apos.* 14 (*Michael*, 196-197). He is a distinct figure who takes the form of another distinct figure, Gabriel.

¹¹⁸ Hannah, *Michael*, 47-48.

We begin with Dan 9:21, which contains a significant textual problem. Gabriel appears to Daniel at the time of the evening sacrifice, but what does $\text{מְעַלְּמֵי גַבְרִיֵּל}$ mean in the MT? John Goldingay suggests, following Keil, that the phrase refers to Daniel and means “wearied with weariness.”¹¹⁹ If so, מְעַלְּמֵי is a Hophal participle from עָלָה and $\text{מְעַלְּמֵי גַבְרִיֵּל}$ is the preposition בְּ followed by the hapax legomenon מְעַלְּמֵי .¹²⁰ LaCocque, however, translates “by a swift flight,”¹²¹ setting the idea of angels flying in the context of Isa 6 and Ezek 1.¹²² In similar fashion, L. H. Brockington emends to מְעַלְּמֵי עָלָה .¹²³

Although the MT apparently refers to different heavenly beings in Isa 6; Ezek 1; Dan 9, an intertextual reading of Dan 9:21 (Θ) and Isa 6 is illuminating. Regardless of the original meaning of the Hebrew, the most literal renderings of Dan 9:21 (Θ; Peshitta) suggest that Gabriel flew. There are thus two major points of contact with Isa 6: (1) heavenly beings flying; (2) heavenly beings physically touching humans. In Isa 6:2, the seraphim who stand around¹²⁴ the seated Lord have six wings.¹²⁵ With two they covered (or hid) their face,¹²⁶ with two they covered their feet, and with two they flew ($\text{וַיָּעוֹפִיִּם יְעוֹפִיִּם}$).¹²⁷ The LXX reads $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \tau\alpha\iota\varsigma\ \delta\upsilon\sigma\iota\nu\ \xi\pi\acute{\epsilon}\tau\alpha\nu\tau\omicron$. Thus Isa 6:2 (LXX) and Dan 9:21 (Θ) are linked by $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\tau\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$. In Isa 6:6, one of the seraphs flies down to Isaiah after he has confessed his unworthiness, recalling Dan 9:21; Luke 1:8-11 where Gabriel appears at a time of

¹¹⁹ Goldingay, *Daniel*, 225, 228. Cf. Carl Friedrich Keil, *The Book of the Prophet Daniel* (trans. M. G. Easton; 1872; repr., Carl Friedrich Keil and Franz Delitzsch, *Commentary on the Old Testament in Ten Volumes*; vol. 9: *Ezekiel, Daniel*; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1980), 335.

¹²⁰ So BDB 419, which links this phrase with Gabriel rather than Daniel.

¹²¹ LaCocque, *Daniel*, 187.

¹²² LaCocque, *Daniel*, 190. LaCocque wrongly states that angels are seen flying in those passages. Isa 6:2 refers to מְעַלְּמֵי and Ezek 1:6 refers to the four יָתִידִים of verses 5 and 14 (cf. Collins, *Daniel*, 352).

¹²³ L. H. Brockington, *The Hebrew Text of the Old Testament: the Readings adopted by the Translators of the New English Bible* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973), 243.

¹²⁴ So the LXX: the translator seems to have been uncomfortable with the idea of creatures standing “above” the Lord (MT).

¹²⁵ Cf. 2 *En.* 11:4. In Slavonic Enoch, there are six-winged heavenly creatures in the fourth heaven, which in *b. Hag.* 12b is said to contain the heavenly Jerusalem and the temple, echoing the temple scene in Isa 6.

¹²⁶ Compare the representation of Jacob’s dream at Bethel in the Sarajevo Haggadah (fol. 10 [recto]), where the angels ascending and descending the ladder cover their faces. $\text{מְלַאֲכֵי אֱלֹהִים}$ (Gen 28:12) is thus understood to be synonymous with מְעַלְּמֵי (Isa 6:2). Cf. Eugen Werber, *The Sarajevo Haggadah* (Belgrade: Prosveta, 1985), 27-28 (Eng.), 8 (Heb.).

¹²⁷ The verb יָעוֹפִיִּם derives from the root עָוַף . In the MT, the verbs and pronominal suffixes are 3rd masc. sing., though they surely refer to each individual seraph, not to אֲרָנָי .

prayer. All three texts are linked with temple worship.¹²⁸ In the LXX (though not the MT) the seraph is “sent” (ἀπεστάλη) to Isaiah, as Gabriel is “sent” in Dan 10:11; Luke 1:19,¹²⁹ recalling later Mandaean texts in which Gabriel is ܠܫܝܬܐ, “apostle.”¹³⁰ “Touching” is common to Isaiah and Daniel and precedes the seers’ understanding. In Isa 6:7, the seraph touches Isaiah on the lips with a burning coal. The MT’s וַיִּלֹּךְ and the LXX’s ἤψατο are exactly paralleled in Dan 9:21 (Θ).¹³¹ Finally, both Isa 6 and Dan 9 are concerned with understanding.

In Isa 6, direct contact between the heavenly beings and the visionary is symbolised by touching.¹³² This is linked with the remission of the visionary’s sin and his prophetic call. Isa 6:10 suggests that the Lord is giving Isaiah control over the people’s understanding. Similarly, Daniel is given control over who will understand, as Dan 8:26; 12:4 demonstrate. In the final vision, the angel predicts that the wise will impart understanding (Dan 11:33), using the same language used for Daniel’s understanding. However, what the angel predicts will not occur until the time immediately preceding the end, when what has been given to Daniel in secret will be revealed.

Gabriel’s function in Daniel thus parallels that of the seraph in Isa 6:6-7.

2.1.3.2. Gabriel and Ezekiel’s visions

Remembering that *b. Hag.* 13a-14a reflects a rabbinic idea that Isa 6; Ezek ; Dan 7 are parallel visions of God’s glory,¹³³ the first two of Ezekiel’s four visions (Ezek 1:1-3:15;

¹²⁸ Cf. Ronald E. Clements, *Isaiah 1-39* (NCB; London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1980), 71, 73-75.

¹²⁹ Cf. the shepherd in Herm. Vis. 5, who is the “angel of repentance” (Vis. 5.7: ὁ ἄγγελος τῆς μετανοίας). The shepherd says in Vis. 5.2 that he was “sent by the most revered angel” (ἀπεστάλην ὑπὸ τοῦ σεμνοτάτου ἀγγέλου), and in Vis. 5.5 we read “he said, ‘For I was sent to show you again all the things which you saw before’” (ἀπεστάλην γάρ, φησὶν, ἵνα ἂ εἶδες πρότερον πάντα σοι πάλιν δείξω). The shepherd is an angelic revealer who has been sent. Gabriel is “sent” (ܠܫܝܬܐ) by the memra of YHWH to destroy Sennacherib’s armies in *Tg. Ket.* 2 Chr 32:21.

¹³⁰ See further Fossum, *The Name of God*, 259-266.

¹³¹ OG: προσήγγισέ. Similarly, Collins (*Daniel*, 351) suggests that “[t]he meaning “approached” is required if the phrase מַעַף בִּיעַף is understood as referring to flying.” Isaiah 6 provides evidence that this is not the case. The link between the appearance of Gabriel and touching is also found in Dan 8:18 (MT; OG; Θ) and 10:11 (MT; Θ).

¹³² Cf. LaCocque, *Daniel*, 211.

¹³³ See especially *b. Hag.* 13a: יחזקאל ראה כול שראה יחזקאל ראה, “Raba said, ‘Isaiah saw everything Ezekiel saw.’”

8-11)¹³⁴ should be discussed. A passage in the *Hekhalot Zutarti* section of N8128¹³⁵ describes the appearance of the divine throne, naming Michael and Gabriel as two among twelve heavenly beings who stand around the four sides of the throne.¹³⁶ Although twelve figures are mentioned, this recalls the throne above the four *חַיִּוֹת* in Ezek 1:26. These winged creatures are called *כְּרָבִים*¹³⁷ in Ezek 10.¹³⁸ In later tradition, then, Gabriel is linked with the heavenly realm presented using imagery drawn from Ezekiel's visions.

However, the unnamed *הָאִישׁ לְבָשׁ הַבְּרִים* in Ezekiel is closer in appearance to angels in Daniel than are Ezekiel's *חַיִּוֹת*.¹³⁹ This is reinforced by the fact that in Ezek 9:2 (LXX) this figure is *ἐνδεδυκὼς ποδήρη*, "clothed with a long robe," a phrase used to describe the angelomorphic figure in Rev 1:13.¹⁴⁰ This figure may be linked with Gabriel in tradition (cf. Dan 12:7): he is commanded to take fire (*אֵשׁ*) from the midst of

¹³⁴ The other visions are Ezek 37:1-14; 40-48. In general on the visions, see Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1*, 27-28.

¹³⁵ Schäfer, *Synopse*, §372. This is N8128 *Sondergut*, occasioning debate as to whether this is really *Hekhalot Zutarti* material at all. The extreme complexity of the *Hekhalot* makes such a question not only impossible to solve but, in Schäfer's view, potentially irrelevant. In relation to the textual character of the *Hekhalot* in general, Schäfer comments "[d]ie Suche nach einem »Urtext« ist jedenfalls hier wie in anderen Bereichen der frühen jüdischen Literatur nicht nur hoffnunglos, sondern auch methodisch verfehlt" (*Synopse*, V n. 2). If there can be no *Urtext*, we have no right to assume that a passage belongs or does not belong to a particular "text"; Schäfer further comments "[n]ach welchen Kriterien gehören welche Partien zu HZ und welche nicht?" (*Synopse*, XIII). For our purposes, we need only note that in N8128, this section is part of a continuous text which later has parallels in O1531, M40, M22, and D436, and is embedded in a section usually considered to be *Hekhalot Zutarti* material (cf. Schäfer, *Synopse*, XII).

¹³⁶ Compare N8128 fol. 22a line 5 (Schäfer, *Synopse*, §401), which is also N8128 *Sondergut*, and begins *שִׁלּוֹ שְׁנַיִם עָשָׂר שִׁישׁ לוֹ כְּנֹגַד שְׁנַיִם עָשָׂר שְׁבַטֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל*, "These are the twelve who are his on behalf of the twelve tribes of Israel." Gabriel is then described as *הַשֵּׁר גַּבְרִיאֵל עֹבֵד הַנְּקָרָא עַל שֵׁם רַבּוֹ*, "The prince Gabriel, a servant called by the great name." The phrase *גַּבְרִיאֵל יְהוּה* appears in N8128 fol. 10a lines 33, 34 (*Hekh. Rabb.* 19:4; Schäfer, *Synopse*, §222), where seals of two angels, *גַּבְרִיאֵל יְהוּה* and *שֵׁר הַפְּנִים*, are used to secure the traveller safe passage through to the gate of the fifth palace. The name Gabriel does not appear in the parallels in O1531, M40, M22, D436, V228, and B238, but throughout this section the seal to be shown to those who stand on the right is of an angel whose name ends *יְהוּה*, and the seal shown to those who stand on the left is of an angel whose name ends *שֵׁר הַפְּנִים*.

¹³⁷ Ezek 10:2, 3, 4 (sing.; LXX pl.: *χερουβιν*), 5, 6, 7 (sing. once; pl. twice), 8, 9 (sing. twice; pl. once), 14 (sing.), 15, 16 (2t), 18, 19, 20.

¹³⁸ The identification is made in Ezek 10:20. Cf. Olyan, *A Thousand Thousands Served Him*, 32 and n. 5. Zimmerli attributes this identification to a later editorial hand (*Ezekiel 1*, 120, 256), noting that Ezek 1 studiously avoids any further identification of the throne-bearing creatures (*Ezekiel 1*, 120).

¹³⁹ Cf. Dan 12:7.

¹⁴⁰ Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1*, 224.

the גלגל (wheelwork) in Ezek 10:6, possibly indicating the origin of Gabriel's title in 3 *En.* 14 (מלאך האש).¹⁴¹ The man clothed with linen is understood to be Gabriel in *b. Yoma* 77a,¹⁴² presumably due to an intertextual reading of Dan 10 and Ezekiel's vision. Two separate trajectories thus developed from Ezekiel's visions in relation to Gabriel, one identifying him with the man clothed in linen (which influenced Daniel) and another identifying him with heavenly beings surrounding the divine throne (which influenced *Hekhalot Zutarti*). The first of these, which links Gabriel with a scribal figure,¹⁴³ contributed to the Gabriel as revealer trajectory.

The vision accounts in Isaiah, Ezekiel, and Daniel share the idea of a theophany or angelophany preceding a call. Zimmerli places Ezek 1:1-3:15 against the background of 1 Kgs 22:19-21; Isa 6:1-8, seeing all three as reflecting a type of prophetic call narrative in which the prophet's commissioning occurred through a theophany in the form of a throne vision.¹⁴⁴ Daniel is indebted to this type of commissioning account, though the vision in Dan 9 is an angelophany and Daniel is not a prophet as such.¹⁴⁵ Although Ezek 2 does

¹⁴¹ Schäfer, *Synopse*, §§18, 899. Philip Alexander only cites *b. Pesah.* 118a in connection with 3 *En.* 14:4 ("3 [Hebrew Apocalypse of] Enoch" [OTP 1:267]). In *b. Pesah.* 118a, in a *darash* of R. Shimon the Shilonite, Gabriel describes himself as שר של אש, identifying himself as the angel who rescued Hananiah, Mishael, and Azariah from the fire of Nebuchadnezzar's furnace (Dan 3:25, 28). In Dan 3:25 the unnamed fourth figure in the furnace is described as like a "child of the gods" in appearance (כְּיֶלֶד בְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים). Dan 3:28 recalls the idea of Gabriel being "sent": Nebuchadnezzar says that the God of Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-Nego had "sent his angel" (שָׁלַח מַלְאָכָה) to rescue his servants. In Pseudo-Philo, *L.A.B.* 38:3, an angel called Nathaniel is the angel in charge of fire. This is an otherwise unknown tradition. One tradition (π) omits the angel's name here (C. Perrot, P.-M. Bogaert, and Daniel J. Harrington, *Pseudo-Philon: Les Antiquités bibliques* [Vol. 2; SC 230; Paris: Cerf, 1976], 185). Perrot and Bogaert mention, without textual references, the Jewish tradition which knows Gabriel as the angel of fire (*Pseudo-Philon*, 185). A Nathaniel (נחנאל) appears in *Sepher haRazim* as one of the angels of the first firmament who serve אורפניאל. Furthermore, 2 *En.* 29:1-3 recounts how God fashioned for the heavenly host a nature akin to fire (cf. 2 *En.* 1:5; 30:1; 42:1, 4; 47:5; 3 *En.* 1:7; 2:1; 6:2; 7:1; 14:3; 15:1-2). However, although Slavonic Enoch mentions Gabriel (2 *En.* 21:3, 5; 24:1), he is not named here. This passage recalls the late text *Midrash gedullat Mosheh*, in which angels are described by their very nature as "princes of fire" (שרי אש).

¹⁴² Cf. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1*, 251.

¹⁴³ Cf. Vrevoil in 2 *En.* 22:10-23:6.

¹⁴⁴ Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1*, 97-100. For Zimmerli, it is primarily the throne vision that distinguishes the commissioning of Ezekiel, Isaiah, and Micaiah ben Imlah from that of Jeremiah (Jer 1:4-10), Moses (Exod 3:1-4:17; 6:2-12; 7:1-7), Gideon (Judg 6:11-24), and Saul (1 Sam 9:15-21).

¹⁴⁵ But cf. 4QFlor 1-3 II, 3; Matt 24:15.

not identify the figure whose voice the visionary hears, Ezek 2:2 recalls Dan 8:18; 10:10, where a heavenly figure establishes contact with a visionary and the visionary is lifted up. Ezekiel 2:8-3:3 sees a heavenly figure with a hand give a scroll to Ezekiel, surely linked with the idea of the man clothed in linen being a scribe in Ezek 9:2, 11. If these passages are read together, we can discern a link between such visions and a call or commission (prophetic in Isaiah and Ezekiel).

In summary, speculation about Gabriel developed in connection with speculation about both the heavenly throne and the man clothed with linen in Ezekiel's visions. The second of these is connected with the idea of Gabriel as revealer, found in Daniel and Luke.

2.1.3.3. Summary

Traditions about the figure of Gabriel are many and varied in both Jewish and Christian texts. The Lukan infancy narrative is an early manifestation of such traditions, as are Daniel, Ethiopic Enoch, and the Qumran scrolls. The traditions preserved in Luke, while belonging to this world of speculation, are perhaps best understood as developments influenced directly by Greek Daniel. Gabriel traditions continued to proliferate in Christianity and Judaism. Gabriel is consistently a mediatorial figure, but Luke's focus is on his specifically revelatory function. *Epistula apostolorum* and *Sibylline Oracles* book eight see Gabriel as a manifestation of Jesus himself at the annunciation, connecting Jesus with angelic revelation. The traditions about Gabriel are important because they demonstrate Luke's knowledge of speculation about angelic revelation. This allows us to assume that Luke's portrait of Jesus may also owe much to speculation about heavenly revealer figures.

2.2. Greek and Latin texts relating to Luke 2:41-52

Having demonstrated that the traditions found in Luke's infancy narrative are at home in

the context of Second Temple Judaism, we now turn to Greek and Latin texts, of both Jewish and non-Jewish provenance, connected indirectly with Luke 2:41-52. So far we have concentrated on the infancy narrative as a whole and the image of supernatural revelation found therein. Now we are more concerned with the heavenly insight possessed by Jesus, and the wider context in which the story of the finding in the temple is to be read. This will lead us beyond the blurred boundaries of Judaism.

Bultmann notes several parallels,¹⁴⁶ of which only Plutarch's *Life of Alexander* and Philostratus' *Life of Apollonius of Tyana* among non-Jewish works will be discussed, since they contain the greatest number of literary affinities with Luke 2:41-52. Three Jewish texts will be discussed, all dealing with the birth of Moses: Josephus' *Jewish Antiquities*, Philo's *On the Life of Moses* 1, and Pseudo-Philo's *Liber antiquitatum biblicarum*.

2.2.1. Plutarch: *Life of Alexander*

The Matthean and Lukan infancy narratives both contain similarities to Plutarch's account of the birth of Alexander. In *Alex.* 2.3-6, Philip and Olympias have dreams which foretell Alexander's birth.¹⁴⁷ The noun ὄψις refers to Philip's dream in *Alex.* 2.5, recalling the use of ὀπτασία in Luke 1:22.¹⁴⁸ Alexander's birth coincided with the burning of the temple of Ephesian Artemis according to *Alex.* 3.5; in that this is an omen (as the Magi believe: *Alex.* 3.7) it is comparable with the appearance of the star in Matt 2:2. Alexander's education is treated in *Alex.* 5.7-8; 7. The difference between Luke's Jesus and Plutarch's Alexander is that whereas Jesus' education is not mentioned, heightening the amazement of his hearers (Luke 2:47), Alexander receives expert tuition, first from Lysander and then from Aristotle. The verb used in *Alex.* 7.5 for Alexander's receiving instruction is παραλαμβάνω, used by Paul for receiving revealed teaching.

¹⁴⁶ Bultmann, *History*, 300.

¹⁴⁷ Cf. Matt 1:18-23; Herodotus, *Hist.* 1.107-108.

¹⁴⁸ Φάσμα is used in *Alex.* 3.1.

More importantly, a distinction is made between esoteric and exoteric teachings:

ἔοικε δὲ Ἀλέξανδρος οὐ μόνον τὸν ἠθικὸν καὶ πολιτικὸν παραλαβεῖν λόγον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν ἀπορρήτων καὶ βαθυτέρων διδασκαλίων, ἃς οἱ ἄνδρες ἰδίως ἀκροαματικὰς καὶ ἐποπτικὰς προσαγορεύοντες οὐκ ἐξέφερον εἰς πολλούς, μετασχεῖν.

It also seems that Alexander received not only ethical and political doctrine, but also shared in some of the secret and deeper teachings, which men specially designate “for hearing only” and “for the initiated,” and do not disclose to many.

This distinction between hidden and known teachings was, of course, current in certain strands of Judaism in the late Second Temple period. At Qumran and in 1 Corinthians, the concept of “hidden wisdom” appears,¹⁴⁹ 1 Cor 2:10 mentioning τὰ βάθη τοῦ θεοῦ, “the deep things of God” (cf. βαθυτέρων διδασκαλίων: *Alex.* 7.5).¹⁵⁰

The esoteric-exoteric distinction, known also from Luke 8:10par in the Synoptics, relates to philosophy and mystery cults outside Judaism, and appears in Jewish documents from Qumran. Its attestation in Christian documents reflects the dependence of early Christian authors on a huge variety of traditions. The importance of this particular text for the present study is three-fold: (1) Alexander’s education extends beyond the ordinary: his subsequent knowledge is comparable with Jesus’ insight in Luke 2:47; (2) Alexander’s knowledge is received in a closed chain of transmission, echoing some NT chains of transmission, and the concept of transmission at Qumran; (3) the esoteric-exoteric distinction is important in the synoptic parables chapter and at Qumran.

2.2.2. Philostratus: *Life of Apollonius of Tyana*

The similarities between Jesus and Apollonius have long been recognised.¹⁵¹ F. C.

¹⁴⁹ 4QMyst^b 1 II, 4-5; 5 5 (תדבדבנכחחח); 1 Cor 2:7 (λαλοῦμεν θεοῦ σοφίαν ἐν μυστηρίῳ τὴν ἀποκεκρυμμένην, “we speak God’s wisdom, hidden in a mystery”). Bockmuehl notes, with reference to the τέλειοι of 1 Cor 2:6, that the idea of secret divine wisdom being the preserve of those who were properly qualified was “a commonplace of both pagan and Jewish religion in antiquity” (*Revelation*, 159).

¹⁵⁰ Cf. also the sapiential use of פִּלְסוּפִּי at Qumran.

¹⁵¹ E.g., F. C. Conybeare, *The Life of Apollonius of Tyana, the Epistles of Apollonius and the Treatise of Eusebius* (Vol. 1; LCL; London: William Heinemann, 1912), xi-xiv.

Conybeare dates Philostratus' *Life of Apollonius* after 217 C.E.¹⁵² and Apollonius' birth "towards the beginning of the Christian era."¹⁵³ It is possible that Apollonius was set up as a rival to Jesus, though Conybeare's objection remains strong.¹⁵⁴ *Vit. Apoll.* 1 recalls Plutarch, *Alex.* 7, Philostratus relating that Pythagoras' followers had imposed silence upon themselves, having heard "many divine and secret things."¹⁵⁵ They were insiders, like Alexander and Jesus' disciples. The way of Pythagoras' teaching is described as "this wisdom" (τὴν σοφίαν ταύτην). The beginning of *Vit. Apoll.* 2 mentions Apollonius' pursuit of σοφία, recalling Luke 2:40, 52, though Philostratus is not dealing with Apollonius' adolescence. *Vit. Apoll.* 3 mentions Damis, who sought Apollonius in order to study wisdom (οὗτος τῷ Ἀπολλωνίῳ προσφιλοσοφήσας).

In *Vit. Apoll.* 4, Proteus appears to Apollonius' mother, predicting she would bear a child like him (i.e., wise). The parallel with the annunciation to Mary is striking. There, Gabriel, a heavenly revealer, appears to Mary. Here, a supernatural figure¹⁵⁶ renowned for wisdom appears to Apollonius' mother. In both the birth of an extraordinary child is predicted. Proteus likens Apollonius to himself,¹⁵⁷ suggesting that we should ask whether Gabriel understands Jesus to be like himself,¹⁵⁸ since both Gabriel and Jesus are figures who possess and teach heavenly wisdom. *Vit. Apoll.* 5 recounts Apollonius' miraculous birth, and he is called παῖδα τοῦ Διὸς, "child of Zeus" by the people of Tyana in *Vit. Apoll.* 6.¹⁵⁹ In *Vit. Apoll.* 7 we read of Apollonius' education, and of the temple of

¹⁵² Conybeare, *Apollonius* 1:vii.

¹⁵³ Conybeare, *Apollonius* 1:ix.

¹⁵⁴ "The best scholars of the present generation are opposed to this view, for they realise that demoniac possession was a common feature in the ancient landscape, and that the exorcist driving demons out of afflicted human beings by use of threats and invocations of mysterious names was as familiar a figure in old Pagan society as he was in the early church" (Conybeare, *Apollonius* 1:xiii).

¹⁵⁵ Πολλὰ γὰρ θεῖά τε καὶ ἀπόρρητα ἤκουον, "I heard many divine and secret things."

¹⁵⁶ Proteus describes himself as ὁ Αἰγύπτιος θεός, "the Egyptian god."

¹⁵⁷ When asked by Apollonius' mother what sort of child she would bear, Proteus simply replies ἐμέ. Apollonius is said to be ἀγχοῦ θεῶν, "near the gods," in *Vit. Apoll.* 5.

¹⁵⁸ Cf. *Ep. Apos.* 14; *Sib. Or.* 8:456-462.

¹⁵⁹ Cf. Luke 1:32, 35; 4QAramaic Apocalypse II, 1.

Asclepius at Aegae, where Asclepius was revealed to humans.¹⁶⁰ This recalls the temple scenes in Isa 6; Luke 1, where God himself, seraphim, and Gabriel appear to visionaries. Apollonius is linked directly with this temple in *Vit. Apoll.* 9. Those around the temple of Asclepius were “amazed” (ἐκπεπληγμένων) at Apollonius, recalling the use of ἐκπλήσσω in Luke 2:48 (ἐξεπλάγησαν). The most significant similarity is in *Vit. Apoll.* 11: πολλὰ τοιαῦτα ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ ἐφιλοσόφει ἐν ἐφήβῳ ἔτι, “he [Apollonius] taught many such things in the temple, while still in his youth.” The similarity with Luke 2:46 is striking.

These texts are important since they offer parallels to both Gabriel’s role as revealer and the extraordinary insight of Jesus.

2.2.3. The child Moses

Raymond Brown explores the Moses-Jesus parallel, discussing in particular Josephus’ *Jewish Antiquities* and Philo’s *On the Life of Moses* 1.¹⁶¹ Although Brown is particularly concerned with the Matthean infancy narrative, our interest remains with that of Luke.

2.2.3.1. Josephus: *Jewish Antiquities*

Josephus notes that Moses possessed insight at an early age, remarking that his insight was “not according to his stature” (*Ant.* 2.230: σύνεσις δὲ οὐ κατὰ τὴν ἡλικίαν).¹⁶² He also regards him as a “child divine in form” (*Ant.* 2.232: παῖδα μορφῇ ... θεῖον). Josephus’ account is important in part because of his use of σύνεσις. God appears to Amram in a dream prior to Moses’ birth. In common with Dan 9; Luke 1, Amram’s vision occurs in connection with prayer: “God had mercy on him and appeared on

¹⁶⁰ Ὁ Ἀσκληπιὸς αὐτὸς ἐπίδηλος τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, “Asclepius himself was manifest to humans.”

¹⁶¹ Brown, *Birth*, 112-116.

¹⁶² Brown (*Birth*, 482 n. 13) notes that in this passage Josephus refers to Moses’ growth in both σύνεσις and ἡλικία, which is true, but on closer inspection Josephus’ emphasis is on the fact that Moses acquired *insight* far more quickly than expected. Luke stresses Jesus’ growth in both together, whereas Josephus refers to Moses’ growth in σύνεσις before he refers to his growth in ἡλικία. Cf. *Josephus* (trans. H. St. J. Thackeray; vol. 4; LCL; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1930), 264 n. b.

account of the supplication he had made” (*Ant.* 2.212: ὁ δὲ θεὸς ἐλέησας αὐτὸν καὶ πρὸς τὴν ἱκεσίαν ἐπικλασθεὶς ἐφίσταται). Josephus understands Moses’ being protected after being abandoned on the river in a papyrus cradle as an example of God demonstrating the inferiority of human insight (*Ant.* 2.222). The phrase ἀνθρωπίνην σύνεσιν, “human insight,” implies a contrast with *divine* insight, which God manifests by protecting Moses.¹⁶³ Thus *Ant.* 2.222 suggests that σύνεσις may be a divine attribute, implying that in *Ant.* 2.230, in possessing σύνεσις, Moses is sharing in a superhuman quality. Moses’ σύνεσις is something of worth which sets him apart from other humans, particularly of his age, and is special (implicitly) due to God’s intervention. The reference to Moses’ σύνεσις here recalls the later reference to the “wisdom of Moses” (חכמתו של משה) in *Mek. Bahodesh* 9, line 82.

2.2.3.2. Philo: *On the Life of Moses* 1

In *Moses* 1.4, Philo does not use σύνεσις, though highlighting Moses’ wisdom (σοφία).¹⁶⁴ Philo mentions Moses’ prodigious intellect in *Moses* 1.5, referring also to his “stature” (ἡλικία) and his “sense” (φρόνησις). Φρόνησις is used in Luke 1:17 by Gabriel to refer to the good sense of the righteous to which John the Baptist would convert the disobedient. This noun occurs in parallel with σοφία in Eph 1:8: Ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ καὶ φρονήσει γνωρίσας ἡμῖν τὸ μυστήριον τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ, “having made known to us the mystery of [God’s] will in all wisdom and insight.” It also occurs in Diodorus of Sicily’s account of the origins of the Jewish nation, based on the earlier work of Hecataeus of Abdera,¹⁶⁵ in which Moses “stands out on account of his insight and great manliness” (*Bibl. Hist.* 40.3.3: φρονήσει τε καὶ ἀνδρεία πολὺ διαφέρων). Although Philo does not suggest that Moses’ φρόνησις is divine, this noun does belong to the semantic

¹⁶³ Cf. Philo, *Moses* 1.12.

¹⁶⁴ Philo refers to the Pentateuch as θαυμάσια μνημεῖα τῆς αὐτοῦ σοφίας, “wonderful memorials of this man’s wisdom.” Cf. *Mek. Bahodesh* 9, line 82, and the σοφία of Jesus in Luke 2:40, 52.

¹⁶⁵ Cf. Diodorus Siculus, *Bibl. Hist.* 40.3.8.

field of divine wisdom.¹⁶⁶ Furthermore, Luke 2:47-48 may be echoed in *Moses* 1.6, where those around Moses are astonished at his intellect. Philo uses καταπλήττω (καταπληττόμενοι) and Luke uses ἐκπλήσσω (ἐξεπλάγησαν), but both are similar in etymology and meaning.

2.2.3.3. Pseudo-Philo: *Liber antiquitatum biblicarum*

In the *Liber antiquitatum biblicarum* of Pseudo-Philo,¹⁶⁷ the annunciation of Moses' birth is closer to the Lukan infancy narrative than the Matthean,¹⁶⁸ and must be considered. *L.A.B.* 9:10 reads:¹⁶⁹

Et spiritus Dei incidit in Mariam nocte, et vidit somnium et enarravit parentibus suis mane dicens: Vidi in hac nocte, et ecce vir stabat in veste b[y]ssina¹⁷⁰ et dixit mihi: Vade et dic parentibus tuis: Ecce quod nascetur de vobis in aquam proicietur, quomodo per eum aqua siccabitur. Et faciam per eum et salvabo populum meum, et ipse ducatum eius aget semper. Et cum enarresset Maria somnium suum, non crediderunt ei parentes eius.

Two aspects must be analysed: literary similarities with the annunciation to Mary and the ideas behind the text, especially the identity and role of the "man" (vir).

¹⁶⁶ Despite the fact that φρόνησις only occurs twice in the NT, it is listed in two different semantic domains in the Louw-Nida *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament Based on Semantic Domains*. Eph 1:8 refers to "the ability to understand, as the result of insight and wisdom" (L&N 1:384; Domain 32: "Understand"), whereas Luke 1:17 refers to "the psychological faculty of thoughtful planning, often with the implication of being wise and provident" (L&N 1:325; Domain 26: "Psychological Faculties"). This is a rather fine distinction. If both verses refer to the understanding of humans, surely the same sense is meant: insight which is characteristic of a morally elite group. However, it is not impossible that divine insight is referred to in Eph 1:8, since it is connected so closely with the revelation of a divine mystery.

¹⁶⁷ The title *Philonis Iudaei Antiquitatum Biblicarum Liber* is found in S. Gryphe's 1552 edition of J. Sichardus' *editio princeps*. The title *Liber antiquitatum biblicarum* is adopted here (cf. Perrot, Bogaert, and Harrington, *Pseudo-Philon* 2:10). The attribution of this work to Philo is accidental, due to its transmission with Philo's authentic works (Perrot, Bogaert, and Harrington, *Pseudo-Philon* 2:10; Montague Rhodes James, *The Biblical Antiquities of Philo* [TEDS 1; London: SPCK, 1917], 7, 27).

¹⁶⁸ Harrington initially noted only the similarities between *L.A.B.* 9:9-10 and the *Matthean* infancy narrative ("Pseudo-Philo," *OTP* 2:316; cf. Brown, *Birth*, 114 n. 42), but explores similarities to the Lukan infancy narrative in a later study ("Birth Narratives in Pseudo-Philo's Biblical Antiquities and the Gospels," in *To Touch the Text: Biblical and Related Studies in Honor of Joseph A. Fitzmyer, S. J.* [ed. M. P. Horgan and P. J. Kobelski; New York: Crossroad, 1989], 316-324). Brown notes similarities with both infancy narratives (*Birth*, 116 n. 45, 600 n. 77).

¹⁶⁹ Latin text: Harrington and Cazeaux, *Pseudo-Philon* 1:110, 112.

¹⁷⁰ "Byssinus" is a Greek loan-word, representing βύσσινος (James, *Biblical Antiquities*, 270; Peter G. W. Glare, ed., *Oxford Latin Dictionary* [Oxford: Clarendon, 1982], 246). "Bissina" is given in Harrington and Cazeaux, *Pseudo-Philon*.

There is a similarity between “[e]t spiritus Dei incidit in Mariam” and “spiritus sanctus superveniet in te” (Luke 1:35; Gk: πνεῦμα ἅγιον ἐπελεύσεται ἐπὶ σέ). However, “spiritus Dei” refers to Miriam’s dream, whereas “spiritus sanctus” refers to Mary’s future conception of Jesus while being overshadowed by the Holy Spirit.¹⁷¹ In *L.A.B.*, Miriam has a dream under the influence of God’s spirit, whereas in Luke the Holy Spirit is the agent by whom Mary conceives. Luke 1:35 belongs to Luke’s developed pneumatology, of which Pseudo-Philo knows nothing. The two annunciations are parallel, however, because both refer to the future character of the figure whose birth is heralded:¹⁷²

Pseudo-Philo: Ecce quod nascetur de vobis in aquam proicietur, quomodo per eum aqua siccabitur. Et faciam per eum signa et salvabo populum meum, et ipse ducatum eius aget semper.

Luke 1:32-33 (Vulg): Hic erit magnus, et filius altissimi vocabitur, et dabit illi dominus deus sedem David, patris eius; et regnabit in domo Jacob in aeternum, et regni eius non erit finis.¹⁷³

The purpose of each is to reveal the role the figure whose birth is heralded will play in God’s plan. Mary explicitly, and Miriam implicitly accept the heavenly visitor’s words. Amram and Jochebed do not believe in *L.A.B.*, echoing Zechariah’s unbelief in Luke.

“Ecce vir” in *L.A.B.* 9:10 echoes Pilate’s “ecce homo” in John 19:5 (Vulg.; Gk: ἰδοὺ ὁ ἄνθρωπος), which includes a description of the royal garments with which Jesus had been clothed by the soldiers. In *L.A.B.* 9:10, we have a description of the heavenly visitor’s clothing: that his apparel is mentioned implies that it is significant. “Dixit mihi” introduces his words: his purpose is to speak, recalling Gabriel’s purpose in

¹⁷¹ Harrington notes that although in Luke 1:35 the Holy Spirit is the agent in Jesus’ birth, the references to the Holy Spirit in the birth of Moses in *L.A.B.* and in the birth of John the Baptist in Luke 1:15 are “considerably weaker” (“Birth Narratives,” 323).

¹⁷² Cf. Harrington, “Birth Narratives,” 323.

¹⁷³ Gk: οὗτος ἔσται μέγας καὶ υἱὸς ὑψίστου κληθήσεται καὶ δώσει αὐτῷ κύριος ὁ θεὸς τὸν θρόνον Δαυὶδ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ, καὶ βασιλεύσει ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον Ἰακώβ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας καὶ τῆς βασιλείας αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἔσται τέλος.

Daniel and Luke, his message being a description of Moses' role in God's plan. This figure has a revelatory function, revealing to a human what had previously been hidden in the counsels of the divine. Perrot and Bogaert suggest that this figure appears to be Gabriel.¹⁷⁴ L. H. Feldman suggests that the angels Ingethel (*L.A.B.* 27:10), Cervihel (*L.A.B.* 61:5), Zeruel (*L.A.B.* 27:10), Nathaniel (*L.A.B.* 38:3), and Fadahel (*L.A.B.* 42:10) are all Gabriel with different appellations, because they carry out actions attributed to Gabriel in Jewish tradition.¹⁷⁵ Perrot urges caution here, while commenting "[s]i l'on refuse cette identification, il faut alors expliquer l'étrange silence de l'auteur à l'endroit des anges les plus fameux à son époque."¹⁷⁶ Perrot's solution is that the author had no need to emphasise the names and activities of more well-known angels such as Gabriel, accounting for the absence of the name Gabriel in *LAB* 9:10. Rather, the author meticulously picks out the names of less well-known angels.¹⁷⁷ For example, *L.A.B.* 42:10 reads "angelus autem qui venerat dicebatur Fadahel," whereas in Judg 13:18 the angel deliberately avoids revealing his name to Manoah: "cur quaeris nomen meum, quod est mirabile? (Vulg.)"¹⁷⁸

¹⁷⁴ Perrot, Bogaert, and Harrington, *Pseudo-Philon* 2:106.

¹⁷⁵ Cited in Perrot, Bogaert, and Harrington, *Pseudo-Philon* 2:61.

¹⁷⁶ Perrot, Bogaert, and Harrington, *Pseudo-Philon* 2:61.

¹⁷⁷ Perrot, Bogaert, and Harrington, *Pseudo-Philon* 2:62.

¹⁷⁸ In Judg 13:3-7, the angel does not reveal his name to Manoah's wife. It may be that Pseudo-Philo, in the annunciation of Moses' birth (though not that of Samson), connects with this. It is also worth considering whether Judg 13 is the origin of the rabbinic idea of Gabriel as *שר של אש*. In Dan 3, alluded to in *b. Pesah.* 118a, Nebuchadnezzar understands the fourth figure in the furnace to be a messenger of the God of Hananiah, Mishael, and Azariah, likening his appearance to that of a son of the gods (*וַיֵּהָיֶה דִּי רַבִּיעָא דְּמַחָה לְבַר־אַלְהִין*) in verse 25. Similarly, Manoah's wife describes the appearance of the *אִישׁ הָאֱלֹהִים* as "like the appearance of God's angel" (*מִמָּדָהוּ כִּמְדָּהוּ מִלְאָךְ הָאֱלֹהִים*) in Judg 13:6. In Manoah's prayer in Judg 13:8, the *אִישׁ הָאֱלֹהִים* is understood to have been "sent" (*אֲשֶׁר שְׁלָחָהּ*), and Manoah wishes him to "teach" (*יְרֶה* Hiph.) them what to do for their future child. Most importantly, in Judg 13:20 the angel ascends to heaven in the flame of the altar (*וַיַּעַל מִלְאָךְ יְהוָה בְּלַהֲב הַמִּזְבֵּחַ*), and Manoah and his wife respond by falling to the ground on their faces (*וַיִּפְּלוּ עַל־פְּנֵיהֶם אֶרְצָה*). The angel heralds the birth of one who would be involved in the salvation of Israel, announces the birth to the mother, and is linked with fire. The most likely explanation is that in the tradition linked with *b. Pesah.* 118a and 3 *En.* 14:4 Gabriel was understood to be the angel in Judg 13 and Dan 3. Pseudo-Philo either represents a different tradition, identifying the angel of Judg 13 with Nathaniel (Perrot), or the same tradition with a different name for Gabriel (Feldman). The use of different names for the same angelic figure was characteristic of angelological speculation in the early centuries of the Christian era.

Perrot's hypothesis implies that the author expected readers to know precisely who this figure was: the combination of being clothed in linen and revealing part of God's plan would immediately suggest Gabriel. The book of Daniel confirms this. "Vir" is used in Dan 8:15 (Vulg.) to refer to Gabriel. "Ecce vir Gabriel" in Dan 9:21 (Vulg.) recalls the "ecce vir" of *L.A.B.* 9:10. Gabriel is the subject of "dixit" in Dan 9:22 (Vulg.) just as the man clothed in linen is the subject of "dixit" in *L.A.B.* 9:10. "Ecce vir" occurs again in Dan 10:5 (Vulg.), where the figure is described as "vir unus vestitus lineis,"¹⁷⁹ recalling "in veste b[y]ssina," though the vocabulary is not identical. It is worth noting, in addition, that the etymology of the name גַּבְרִיאֵל is connected with a Hebrew word meaning "man": גִּבּוֹר.

Perrot and Bogaert cite Ezek 10:2 in connection with the man clothed with linen.¹⁸⁰ We concluded earlier that the man clothed in linen in Daniel recalls a figure in Ezekiel.¹⁸¹ This requires further elucidation. In Ezek 9:2, the figure described in the MT as לְבִשׁ בְּדִים has a "scribe's ink-pot"¹⁸² in his belt (קֶסֶת הַסֹּפֵר בְּמִתְנָיו). Consequently, John W. Wevers describes him as the "scribe."¹⁸³ This figure is a man "qui indutus erat lineis" in Ezek 9:3 (Vulg.), a phrase which recurs verbatim in Dan 12:7 (Vulg.).¹⁸⁴ He accompanies six others who approach from the upper North gate. This is the root of the tradition of seven angels appointed to execute divine judgement, which appears in the book of Revelation.¹⁸⁵ In Rev 15:6 the seven angels are

¹⁷⁹ Cf. Dan 12:6-7.

¹⁸⁰ Perrot and Bogaert, *Pseudo-Philon*, I.106.

¹⁸¹ Above, §2.1.3.3.

¹⁸² So the NJB, following the Vulgate, which has "atramentarium scriptoris" ("a clerk's ink-pot"). Wevers suggests that קֶסֶת is an Egyptian loan-word, meaning "a small case carrying writing implements and the materials for making ink": *Ezekiel* (NCB; London: Nelson, 1969), 71; cf. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1*, 224, 246-247.

¹⁸³ Wevers, *Ezekiel*, 70-72.

¹⁸⁴ Cf. Dan 12:6 (Vulg.): "qui erat indutus lineis."

¹⁸⁵ Rev 8:2, 6; 15:6-8; 16. Wevers, *Ezekiel*, 71; Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1*, 246. Wevers also cites Tob 12:15, in which Raphael identifies himself as one of the seven angels who stand by and go in before the glory of the Lord. No reference is made in Tobit to these angels as angels who execute God's judgement, though the reference to the glory of the Lord (S; BA: "of the holy one") surely does link this text with Ezek 9. Revelation 8:2 is clearly linked with Tob 12:15 through the phrase τοὺς ἑπτὰ ἀγγέλους οἱ ἐνώπιον τοῦ

ἐνδεδυμένοι λίνον,¹⁸⁶ suggesting that the man clothed in linen in Ezekiel is angelic. The similarities between this Ezekiel passage and the Passover story in Exod 12 have also not gone unnoticed.¹⁸⁷ In particular, Exod 12:23 mentions תִּתִּי שְׁמַיִל, “the destroyer,” apparently a heavenly being appointed to destroy those whose lintels and doorposts are not marked with the blood of the paschal victim.¹⁸⁸ The seven of Ezek 9 must show similar discrimination.

Thus the image of a man clothed in linen, from Ezekiel onwards, suggests a particular angel, identified in Daniel as Gabriel. In the book of Revelation, angels are generally described as clothed in linen. However, we have not yet made a lexical connection with *L.A.B.* 9:10. A word study of βύσσινος, the Greek noun from which the Latin “byssinus” is derived, should make this possible. In Gen 41:42, Pharaoh clothes Joseph with a linen robe (LXX: στολήν βυσσίνη; Vulg.: stola byssina), honouring Joseph thus because God gave him knowledge into the meaning of Pharaoh’s dreams (Gen 41:39): like Gabriel, and Daniel through Gabriel’s mediation, Joseph knows the hidden things of God. Being clothed with linen is a symbol of the priesthood,¹⁸⁹ David wearing a linen garment while bringing the ark to Jerusalem (1 Chr 15:27; LXX: στολή βυσσίνη; Vulg.: stola byssina). In 2 Chr 5:12, the levitical singers wear linen garments (LXX: στολὰς βυσσίνας; Vulg.: vestiti byssinis) as they worship in the temple. Here, when the priests exit the holy of holies and the levitical singers begin to worship, the glory of the Lord descends in a cloud. There is a link between the priestly caste offering worship and the presence of the glory of the Lord, paralleled in heaven by angels in priestly apparel offering perpetual worship to the Lord. This is why Gabriel appears in priestly apparel: he stands before the Lord offering worship in heaven, paralleling

θεοῦ ἐστήκασιν. The notion of offering up the prayers of the holy ones in Rev 8:4 also recalls Tob 12:15 (BA).

¹⁸⁶ Vulg.: “vestiti lino.”

¹⁸⁷ Wevers, *Ezekiel*, 71; Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1*, 246.

¹⁸⁸ Cf. 2 Sam 24:16-17 (par. 1 Chr 21:15); 2 Kgs 19:35 (cf. Jer 22:7). Wevers, *Ezekiel*, 71; Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1*, 246.

¹⁸⁹ Exod 28:39; 36:35; Josephus, *Ant.* 3.152, 153-154. Cf. Wevers, *Ezekiel*, 71.

priestly worship in the temple.¹⁹⁰ A linen head-dress symbolises wisdom in 1 Esd 3:6, where it is to be given to the wisest speaker at Darius' grand reception, echoing both the linen garment given by Pharaoh to Joseph on account of his wisdom, and Esth 6:8 (LXX), in which *στολὴν βυσσίνην* symbolises royal favour.¹⁹¹ In Esth 1:6 (LXX), linen hangings (*σχοινίοις βυσσίνοις*) indicate opulence.¹⁹²

The most important references are in Daniel. In Dan 10:5 (OG), ἐνδεδυμένος βύσσινα translates לְבוֹשׁ בְּרִי, whereas Θ reads ἐνδεδυμένος βαδδιν, the translator being unable to render בְּרִי: Dan 12:6-7 (OG) has τὰ βύσσινα twice for בְּרִי, Θ giving τὰ βαδδιν. Remembering that scholars have generally accepted L. Cohn's suggestion that *L.A.B.* reflects a Greek *Vorlage* based on a Hebrew original,¹⁹³ the hypothesis may be advanced that "in veste byssina" reflects Gk ἐνδεδυμένος βύσσινα, which in turn reflects Heb. לְבוֹשׁ בְּרִי. Thus on both lexical and typological grounds, the heavenly visitor in *L.A.B.* 9:10 should be identified with Gabriel.

In the NT, βύσσινος only appears in the book of Revelation. In Rev 18:12, 16, it refers to fine goods traded with “Babylon,” recalling Isa 3:23; Ezek 16:13. However, in Rev 19:8 βύσσινον λαμπρὸν καθαρὸν refers to the apparel of the bride of the Lamb, made up of the righteous deeds of the holy ones. In Rev 19:14, the heavenly armies are ἐνδεδυμένοι βύσσινον λευκὸν καθαρὸν, i.e., they are angelomorphic. *L.A.B.* 9:10, Daniel, and Revelation therefore reflect a common notion as to the appearance of angels, traceable to Ezekiel. Angels are heaven’s priests, and are clothed accordingly.

¹⁹⁰ Cf. Moshe Greenberg, *Ezekiel 1-20: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 22; New York: Doubleday, 1983), 176; Mach, *Entwicklungsstadien*, 58 n. 126; Greenberg notes that the seventh figure in Ezek 9:2 is dressed in linen like ordinary priests (cf. Exod 28:29-42; Wevers, *Ezekiel*, 71), and that priests and angels are linked because they have their ministry to God in common. A similar homology between the heavenly and earthly worlds is identified by John Collins in Dan 7:18, where the “Holy Ones of the Most High” (קְדִישֵׁי עֲלִיוֹן) may refer to both the angelic host and persecuted Jews (*Apocalyptic Imagination*, 104-107; cf. p. 110).

191 Cf. Esth 8:15.

¹⁹² Cf. Isa 3:23; Ezek 16:13.

¹⁹³ Cf. James, *Biblical Antiquities*, 28; Harrington, "Pseudo-Philo," 298-299; "Birth Narratives," 317; Perrot, Bogaert, and Harrington, *Pseudo-Philon* 2:75-77.

2.3. Summary and conclusions

Previous research has established clear linguistic and typological connections between Luke 1:5-2:52 and Daniel. Luke is clearly dependent on Daniel in Greek. In terms of language, Luke's use of *σύνεσις* and *συνίημι* is comparable with Daniel, Daniel-Θ characteristically using them to render *בִּין* and *לְכַל*, which generally refer to understanding heavenly secrets. With regard to Gabriel, although Gabriel becomes connected with many roles and functions, Luke is primarily aware of Gabriel as revealer. Both Daniel and Luke know Gabriel in this role. The discussion of Gabriel establishes that Jewish texts provide a rich resource for understanding Luke's literary work, particularly his understanding of heavenly mediator figures. Plutarch's *Life of Alexander* and Philostratus' *Life of Apollonius of Tyana* demonstrate that themes found in Luke 1:5-2:52, and Luke 2:40-52 in particular, belong to a broad literary context with which Luke was familiar. In the case of legends about Moses' early life, the prominence of Moses' wisdom (Josephus; Philo) and the angelic annunciation of his birth (Pseudo-Philo) suggest that Luke's (or his source's) knowledge of Jewish precedents is strong: they may even constitute for him types anticipating Jesus.

Thus both the angelic revealer Gabriel and the extraordinary wisdom of the adolescent Jesus in Luke reflect a variety of traditions, but particularly those found in Daniel and in Jewish extra-canonical texts dealing with Moses. We should therefore expect that the primary source of Luke's understanding of divine wisdom and heavenly revelation in general is Jewish, regardless of Hellenistic affiliations. In particular, Daniel and *L.A.B.* 9:10 are manifestations of themes and motifs associated with the phenomenon of Jewish apocalyptic. This brings us to an important point: having established that the Lukan infancy narrative in general and the finding in the temple in particular, while sharing certain themes with non-Jewish material, are to be read in a thoroughly Jewish context, it is possible to identify that context more precisely in the form of Jewish apocalyptic. As apocalyptic provides a framework for reading the

Qumran scrolls, so it provides the framework for reading the Synoptics. Apocalyptic must thus be examined more closely.

3. The apocalyptic context of the Synoptic Gospels

The study of the Synoptic Gospels in relation to apocalyptic has gained momentum in recent years, Fletcher-Louis commenting that "there is material common to the synoptic tradition which is indisputably apocalyptic,"¹⁹⁴ citing the baptism¹⁹⁵ and transfiguration of Jesus as examples. The book of Daniel, in particular, has been studied in relation to the Synoptics,¹⁹⁶ special attention being devoted to the Son of Man question.¹⁹⁷ However, much broader issues are involved. In an important study of Mark's Gospel, Howard Clark Kee concludes that "Mark has been influenced directly by Daniel in his representation of the career and intention of Jesus,"¹⁹⁸ arguing persuasively that Mark is rooted in Jewish

¹⁹⁴ Fletcher-Louis, *Luke-Acts*, 27.

¹⁹⁵ Cf. Vincent Taylor, *The Gospel according to St. Mark* (London: Macmillan, 1959), 160; Rowland, *Open Heaven*, 358-363; Perrin and Duling, *New Testament*, 237; John Nolland, *Luke 1-9:20* (WBC 35A; Dallas: Word Books, 1989), 160. Rowland compares Mark's language of the heavens being rent open (Mark 1:10) with Ezek 1:1 and comparable texts elsewhere in the NT and early Jewish tradition: *Open Heaven*, 359; cf. C. E. B. Cranfield, *The Gospel according to Saint Mark* (CGTC; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959), 53; Hugh Anderson, *The Gospel of Mark* (NCB; London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1976), 77. However, Mark's use of the passive of *σχιζω* seems considerably more dramatic than the passive of *ἀνοίγω* in the LXX of Ezekiel. Zimmerli (*Ezekiel 1*, 116) notes that the result of heaven opening is that humans on earth "can see directly into the heavenly mystery" and that a heavenly figure can leave heaven to encounter a human, as in Ezek 1. For comparable uses of *ἀνοίγω*, see Isa 63:19 (LXX); 3 Macc 6:18; Matt 3:16; Luke 3:21; John 1:51; Epiphanius, *Pan.* 30.13.7-8; Acts 10:11; Rev 4:1; 11:19; 19:11; *Gos. Pet.* 36, 44; *T. Levi* 2:6; 5:1; 18:6; *T. Jud.* 24:2. See also Acts 7:56 (*διανοίγω*); 2 *Bar.* 22:1 (ⲙⲟⲩⲉⲩⲏⲥ); *Ep. Apos.* 51; *Apoc. Ab.* 19:4.

¹⁹⁶ See the survey of the pertinent issues in Adela Yarbro Collins, "The Influence of Daniel on the New Testament," in Collins, *Daniel*, 90-112, esp. pp. 90-100.

¹⁹⁷ Lars Hartman, *Prophecy Interpreted: The Formation of Some Jewish Apocalyptic Texts and of the Eschatological Discourse Mark 13 Par.* (trans. N. Tomkinson with the assistance of J. Gray; ConBNT 1; Lund: Gleerup, 1966), 156-159, 165-167; Perrin and Duling, *New Testament*, 28; Yarbro Collins, "Influence," 90-105.

¹⁹⁸ Howard Clark Kee, *Community of the New Age: Studies in Mark's Gospel* (NTL; London: SCM, 1977), 45. Kee acknowledges the influence of Daniel on the "apocalypse" of Mark 13, but also notes that in the portrayal of Jesus' career as a whole, Daniel is a formative influence. Both Daniel and Mark begin with miracle stories, and move through the issue of martyrdom (Mark 8:31-33) to personal (Mark 9:2-8; Dan 10) and cosmic revelations (Mark 13; Dan 7; 9). The transfiguration (Mark 9:2-8) and the end of the Gospel (Mark 16:8) are related verbally and in narrative detail to Daniel's vision in Dan 10. Mark 13:22 draws on both Deut 13 and Dan 11:36-45. The climax of the apocalypse (Mark 13:26) draws directly on Dan 7:13-14 (*Community*, 45-46).

apocalyptic.¹⁹⁹ Similarly, according to Adela Yarbro Collins, “[w]ith Mark the gospel tradition reaches its apocalyptic peak.”²⁰⁰ Perrin and Duling regard early Palestinian Christianity as “an apocalyptic sect within Judaism,”²⁰¹ and Mark’s gospel as an “apocalyptic drama,”²⁰² the product of a community which “reflects Christian apocalyptic sectarianism.”²⁰³ In terms of genre, they understand Mark 13 (par. Matt 24; Luke 21) to resemble the literary forms of apocalyptic, in particular discourses revealing the events of the approaching eschaton.²⁰⁴ This reflects the earlier work of Lars Hartman, who suggested that the main part of the eschatological discourse in Mark 13par. was based on an exposition of or meditation on Danielic texts referring to the last things.²⁰⁵ The exposition that underlies the eschatological discourse is a *midrash* which links the Danielic texts used with a number of other eschatological texts from the Jewish scriptures and incorporates at least some of the parenesis now present in Mark 13.²⁰⁶

This trend in Markan studies, which reads this gospel against the background of Jewish apocalyptic and especially the book of Daniel, may be extended to the study of the other Synoptics,²⁰⁷ but it is necessary first of all to establish what is distinctive about apocalyptic. For Günther Bornkamm, “[t]he disclosure of divine secrets is the true theme

¹⁹⁹ Kee, *Community*, 65; cf. Joel Marcus, *The Mystery of the Kingdom of God* (SBLDS 90; Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1986), 7-11, 62-64. Kee suggests that Mark “was produced by an apocalyptic community” (*Community*, 176). See also Perrin and Duling, *New Testament*, 77.

²⁰⁰ Yarbro Collins, “Apocalypses and Apocalypticism: Early Christian,” 289.

²⁰¹ Perrin and Duling, *New Testament*, 74.

²⁰² See esp. Perrin and Duling, *New Testament*, 237-239, 243-244. For Perrin and Duling, Mark thinks in a manner characteristic of apocalyptic writers, in terms of a drama which began in the past, continues in the present and will reach its consummation at a point in the future. Mark’s drama has three acts, each involving persons who “preach” and are “delivered up”: (1) John the Baptist preached (κηρύσσω: Mark 1:7) and was delivered up (παραδίδωμι: Mark 1:14); (2) Jesus preached (κηρύσσω: Mark 1:14, 39, 45) and was delivered up (παραδίδωμι: Mark 9:31; 10:33; 14:21, 41, 42). (3) Jesus’ followers then preach (Mark 3:14; cf. 1:1; 13:10) and are delivered up (παραδίδωμι: Mark 13:9, 11, 12). This third act of Mark’s cosmic drama will attain its future consummation when the Son of Man comes on the clouds (Mark 13:26).

²⁰³ Perrin and Duling, *New Testament*, 77. Mark’s Gospel, and the “apocalyptic discourse” (Mark 13:3-37) in particular, are understood to be aimed at readers awaiting the imminent return of Jesus the Son of Man in the period following the fall of Jerusalem (*New Testament*, 241-242).

²⁰⁴ Perrin and Duling, *New Testament*, 107-111.

²⁰⁵ Hartman, *Prophecy*, 158-159, 167.

²⁰⁶ Hartman, *Prophecy*, 174-177.

²⁰⁷ Yarbro Collins, “Apocalypses and Apocalypticism: Early Christian,” 290.

of later Jewish apocalyptic.”²⁰⁸ These secrets are concerned with an eschatological cosmic revelation, but it is the revelation of these secrets rather than the eschatological events themselves that characterises apocalyptic.²⁰⁹ A number of scholars have emphasised instead the role of a particular kind of eschatology in apocalyptic texts. D. S. Russell remarks that “eschatology in one aspect or another is the prevailing pre-occupation of almost every apocalyptic writer.”²¹⁰ Ernst Käsemann considers primitive Christian apocalyptic “to denote the expectation of an imminent Parousia.”²¹¹ Paul D. Hanson, also, takes the view that “apocalyptic eschatology is at the heart of the major apocalyptic works.”²¹² Lars Hartman, however, notes the ambiguous use of the terms “eschatology” and “apocalyptic” in scholarly literature. He comments with reference to apocalyptic that

This word was formed from the Greek ἀποκάλυψις (“revelation”),²¹³ and is used, on the one hand, to denote a form of literature in which secrets are revealed to selected persons. These secrets may be concerned with history or parts of history, particularly the final phase, with the cosmos, its origin and characteristics or with divine mysteries. On the other hand, the word may be used of the content of this kind of literature, which is sometimes quite imaginative and often gives detailed descriptions,

²⁰⁸ Günther Bornkamm, “μυστήριον, μνέω,” *TDNT* 4:815. William Adler opines that it would be extreme to follow Bornkamm in characterising apocalyptic in this way, while noting that the concept of secret wisdom may have been regarded as a defining feature of Jewish apocalypses by the Christian communities who transmitted them (“Introduction,” in *The Jewish Apocalyptic Heritage of Early Christianity* [ed. J. C. VanderKam and W. Adler; CRINT 3/4; Assen: Van Gorcum, 1996], 12).

²⁰⁹ Bornkamm, *TDNT* 4:815-816.

²¹⁰ D. S. Russell, *The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic: 200 BC-AD 100* (OTL; London: SCM, 1964), 20.

²¹¹ Ernst Käsemann, *New Testament Questions of Today* (trans. W. J. Montague; NTL; London: SCM, 1969), 109 n. 1.

²¹² Paul D. Hanson, *The Dawn of Apocalyptic* (Philadelphia, Pa.: Fortress, 1975), 8.

²¹³ See Rev 1:1: Ἀποκάλυψις Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἣν ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ ὁ θεὸς δεῖξαι τοῖς δούλοις αὐτοῦ ἃ δεῖ γενέσθαι ἐν τάχει, “Revelation of Jesus Christ which God gave to him to show his servants the things which must shortly take place.” Cf. e.g. Russell, *Method*, 36; Klaus Koch, *The Rediscovery of Apocalyptic: A Polemical Work on a Neglected Area of Biblical Studies and Its Damaging Effects on Theology and Philosophy* (trans. M. Kohl; SBT 2/22; London: SCM, 1972), 18; Philipp Vielhauer, “Apocalypses and Related Subjects,” in *New Testament Apocrypha*, by E. Hennecke and W. Schneemelcher (ed. R. McL. Wilson; trans. D. Hill; vol. 2; London: SCM, 1974), 582; Paul D. Hanson, “Apocalypse, Genre,” *IDBSup* 27; “Apocalypticism,” *IDBSup* 29; “Apocalypses and Apocalypticism: The Genre,” *ABD* 1:279; Rowland, *Open Heaven*, 11; Michael A. Knibb, “Prophecy and the Emergence of the Jewish Apocalypses,” in *Israel’s Prophetic Tradition: Essays in Honour of Peter R. Ackroyd* (eds. R. Coggins, A. Phillips, and M. A. Knibb; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), 156; John J. Collins, “Introduction: Towards the Morphology of a Genre,” in *Apocalypse: the Morphology of a Genre* (ed. J. J. Collins; *Semeia* 14 [1979]), 2, 16; “Apocalypses and Apocalypticism: Early Jewish Apocalypticism,” *ABD* 1:282-283; Stephen L. Cook, *Prophecy & Apocalypticism: The Postexilic Social Setting* (Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress, 1995), 21; VanderKam and Adler, *Heritage*, XI; Adler, “Introduction,” 8.

especially of catastrophes which are to occur at the end of time. A similar content may be found in texts which are not apocalypses in the formal sense.²¹⁴

Hartman's own use of apocalyptic is in connection with texts in which secrets are revealed, and especially the contents of texts alluding to the last things,²¹⁵ implying a fundamental connection between the revelatory and eschatological aspects of apocalyptic and suggesting that apocalyptic may refer both to texts and to their contents. J. C. G. Greig also understands the apocalyptic tradition to have an eschatological emphasis, though he does note that this tradition included the idea of a hidden eschatological figure (such as the Enochic Son of Man) and of divine secrets to be revealed to the righteous.²¹⁶ Philipp Vielhauer takes apocalyptic to designate "first of all the literary genre of the Apocalypses, i.e. revelatory writings which disclose the secrets of the beyond and especially of the end of time, and then secondly, the realm of ideas from which this literature originates."²¹⁷ In terms of content, apocalyptic is essentially characterised by an eschatological dualism in which there is a radical contrast between the present, corrupt, and perishing era, and the imminent blessed and eternal era.²¹⁸ For Vielhauer, then, apocalyptic refers to texts which are revelatory, and to a worldview shaped by a particular brand of eschatological expectation.

William Adler has recently stressed that the current disarray in scholarly research on apocalyptic literature may be traced to the work of scholars such as Vielhauer, whose understanding of apocalyptic comprehended three distinct but overlapping categories: (1) the literary genre apocalyptic; (2) the theological outlook that is apocalyptic eschatology; and (3) apocalypticism as the ideology of a discrete socio-religious movement.²¹⁹ A

²¹⁴ Hartman, *Prophecy*, 16.

²¹⁵ Hartman, *Prophecy*, 17; cf. Russell, *Method*, 37.

²¹⁶ J. C. G. Greig, introduction to *The Messianic Secret*, by William Wrede (trans. J. C. G. Greig; Cambridge: James Clarke, 1971), xvi.

²¹⁷ Vielhauer, "Apocalypses," 582.

²¹⁸ Vielhauer, "Apocalypses," 588-589. See, e.g., Dan 2:44; 7:11-14, 18; *1 En.* 45:3-6; 72:1; 91:16-17; 2 *Bar.* 31:5-32:7; 4 *Ezra* 7:49-61; Rev 21:1-4.

²¹⁹ Adler, "Introduction," 2-8, esp. p. 5. Dissatisfaction with this three-fold distinction was also voiced by John Collins in 1979 ("Introduction," 3).

three-fold distinction such as this is advocated by Paul D. Hanson,²²⁰ but questioned by Michael Knibb, who, noting the confusion caused by the lack of a single use of the term apocalyptic,²²¹ prefers a simple two-fold distinction between the apocalypses and apocalyptic eschatology, because in his view it is impossible to approach apocalypticism apart from the apocalypses themselves.²²² Stephen Cook offers a slightly more nuanced three-fold distinction,²²³ distinguishing between apocalyptic as a literary phenomenon,²²⁴ as a worldview or type of religious thinking,²²⁵ and as a social phenomenon.²²⁶

Apocalyptic as a literary phenomenon has received particular attention from the Apocalypse Group of the Society of Biblical Literature Genre Project. Delimiting relevant primary material to particular revelatory literature composed around the Eastern Mediterranean between 250 B.C.E. and 250 C.E.,²²⁷ Collins offers a “master-paradigm” for the structure of an apocalypse²²⁸ and, while categorising apocalypses into six sub-types,²²⁹ he offers the following broad 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 transcendent reality which is both temporal, insofar as it envisages eschatological salvation, and spatial insofar as it involves another, supernatural

²²⁰ Hanson, “Apocalypse, Genre,” 27-28; “Apocalypticism,” 29-31; “Apocalypses and Apocalypticism: Introductory Overview,” *ABD* 1:280-281; VanderKam, *Enoch*, 2; Greg Carey, “Introduction: Apocalyptic Discourse, Apocalyptic Rhetoric,” in *Vision and Persuasion: Rhetorical Dimensions of Apocalyptic Discourse* (eds. G. Carey and L. G. Bloomquist; St. Louis, Mo.: Chalice, 1999), 8-9. On the development from “prophetic eschatology” to “apocalyptic eschatology,” see Hanson, *Dawn*, 1-31.

²²¹ Knibb, “Prophecy,” 156, 164.

²²² Knibb, “Prophecy,” 161, 164.

²²³ Cook, *Prophecy*, 21.

²²⁴ Cook, *Prophecy*, 22-25. Rather than trying to describe precisely what features are characteristic of an apocalypse, Cook adopts Ludwig Wittgenstein’s concept of family resemblances, noting that in general, dualistic language and a futuristic but imminent eschatology are major features of apocalyptic as a literary phenomenon, secondary elements including numerology, pseudonymity, visionary manner of revelation, exotic imagery, determinism, predestination, angelology, demonology, and an emphasis on a messiah.

²²⁵ Cook, *Prophecy*, 25-29.

²²⁶ Cook, *Prophecy*, 29-34.

²²⁷ Collins, “Introduction,” 5.

²²⁸ Collins, “Introduction,” 6-8. For an earlier, more preliminary attempt at a form-critical analysis of the extant apocalypses, see Koch, *Rediscovery*, 23-28.

²²⁹ Collins, “Introduction,” 13-15.

world.²³⁰

From this definition the emphasis on revelation of supernatural realities through the mediation of a heavenly figure is most significant.

Dissatisfaction with the overly broad use of the term "apocalyptic" was voiced in a 1976 essay by Michael Stone. Stone suggests that a state of confusion exists on a semantic level revolving around the relationship between "apocalyptic" and "apocalypses."²³¹ On the basis of the apparent disjunction between apocalypticism as a movement and the content of the apocalypses, Stone argues that the two should be considered separately. Indeed, the terms "apocalyptic" and "apocalypticism" should be abandoned.²³² A major characteristic of a number of apocalypses is revealed knowledge, as represented by lists of revealed things.²³³ These lists are "catalogues of the subject matter of apocalyptic speculation,"²³⁴ covering subjects including astronomy, meteorology, uranography, cosmology, and the secrets of nature. These lists are essentially declarative, but there are other, related lists which are interrogative,²³⁵ whose origin is to be found in wisdom passages such as Job 38; Sir 1:2-6 that stress the limitations of human knowledge (in comparison with the omniscience of God).²³⁶ One item found in several apocalyptic lists is counting stars or recording their names,²³⁷ an item linked with biblical passages which refer to God counting or calling the stars by name²³⁸ and indicative of the "special status or role of the one who knows."²³⁹

²³⁰ Collins, "Introduction," 9.

²³¹ Michael E. Stone, "Lists of Revealed Things in the Apocalyptic Literature," in *Magnalia Dei: The Mighty Acts of God: Essays on the Bible and Archaeology in Memory of G. Ernest Wright* (ed. F. M. Cross, W. E. Lemke, and P. D. Miller; New York: Doubleday, 1976), 439.

²³² Stone, "Lists," 443.

²³³ Stone, "Lists," 442-443. See 2 Bar. 59:5-11 (cf. 4 Ezra 4:5-8; 5:36-37); 1 En. 41:1-7; 43:1-3; 60:11-13, 14-22; 2 En. 23:1-2; 40:1-13; L.A.B. 19:10. Cf. Hanson, *Dawn*, 380-381, on Zech 14:6-9.

²³⁴ Stone, "Lists," 414; cf. p. 435.

²³⁵ E.g. 4 Ezra 4:5-8; 2 Bar. 14:8-9 (cf. 4 Ezra 4:10-11); 1 En. 93:11-14.

²³⁶ Cf. Wis 9:13-18; Sir 18:4-5.

²³⁷ See 1 En. 43:1-4; 60:12; 72-82; 82:9-20; 93:14; 2 En. 11:3; 40:2-3.

²³⁸ See Ps 147:4-5; Isa 40:26; Bar 3:34-35 (cf. 1 En. 43:1; 69:21); cf. L.A.B. 21:2.

Moreover, in *1 En.* 43:4 a comparison is made between the righteous and the stars shown to Enoch, apparently on the basis that the righteous should imitate the obedience of the stars to their maker.²⁴⁰ The comparison between the righteous and the stars is known from a number of other texts,²⁴¹ and it seems possible to discern a relationship between the righteous, angels, and the stars.²⁴² Pre-apocalyptic wisdom sources are probably the origin of part of the speculative concern of apocalyptic lists, though a broader consideration of the syncretistic context in which the apocalypses developed is necessary to provide a fuller explanation. Stone concludes his essay by emphasising that the speculative concerns represented by the lists are central to the apocalypses and the world-view of which they are an expression.

Stone's contribution is fundamental for a number of reasons. First, his essay initiated a paradigm shift in the study of apocalyptic literature away from eschatology. Second, by highlighting the role of revealed knowledge attributed in earlier wisdom texts to God alone, Stone's essay throws the role of the seer into relief. The seers, particularly Enoch (in the Ethiopic and Slavonic books of Enoch) and Moses (in *2 Baruch* and Pseudo-Philo), are mediators of special revelations, knowledge previously hidden with God. If this trajectory through the apocalypses is stressed rather than eschatological concerns, it is possible to explore not only revelation and what is revealed but the relationship between the mediator and later tradents of revealed material transmitted through him.

²³⁹ Stone, "Lists," 427. Stone notes that the vast number of stars is a Hebrew idiom for a very large number or number beyond human knowledge ("Lists," 428), citing Gen 15:5; 22:17; Jer 33:22. To suggest that a seer such as Enoch has been given knowledge of the number of the stars is to make a very far-reaching claim for the status, authority, or role of that seer.

²⁴⁰ Stone, "Lists," 430. Cf. *1 En.* 2:1-5:3; 41:5; 69:16-25; *T. Naph.* 3:2; Sir 16:26-28.

²⁴¹ See Dan 12:3; *4 Ezra* 7:97, 125; *4 Macc* 17:5; *As. Mos.* 10:9; *1 En.* 104:1-6; *2 Bar.* 51:1-15; 1QM XVII, 7-8? Stone ("Lists," 431) cites *Tg. Isa.* 14:13. Where the Targum reads עֵיל מִן עַמִּיהָ דְאֵלֹהָא, "above the people of God," the MT reads מִמַּעַל לְכוֹכְבֵי יְיָ, "above the stars of God." The people of God are thus understood in the Targum to be stars.

²⁴² Stone, "Lists," 431: "[s]ince the stars stand in a clear relationship to the angels, and at the same time a number of passages indicate also that the blessed righteous are compared to and occasionally even transformed to the likeness of angels, a clear relationship appears to exist between these three."

This approach to apocalyptic texts characterises Christopher Rowland's work. In a 1979 article, Rowland criticised the trend, particularly in NT study, of concentrating on eschatological elements in apocalyptic literature rather appreciating the apocalyptic phenomenon in its entirety.²⁴³ Rowland advocates a view of apocalyptic based on a concern with the secrets of the heavenly world:

It seems to be the case that we are so used to thinking of apocalyptic in terms of the imminent winding up of the present world-order and the establishment of a new age that we miss the repeated emphasis in much apocalyptic literature on the revelation of things *as they actually are* in the heavenly world. Hence in certain parts of apocalyptic it is not so much the description of the last stages of the historical process which is to the fore but a mystical insight into another world and the perception of its secrets. Such elements point to apocalyptic being not merely a movement which was concerned primarily with the future of the world but with the world above, its secrets and its glory.²⁴⁴

This approach shaped Rowland's fundamental study *The Open Heaven*. Here Rowland identifies the disclosure of divine mysteries as the unifying factor between Daniel and Revelation,²⁴⁵ using this to define several other texts as apocalyptic writings.²⁴⁶ He responds to those who stress the eschatological aspects of apocalyptic texts by asserting that although eschatology is a significant aspect of apocalyptic texts, it is not their most distinctive feature,²⁴⁷ and the apocalyptic mode of revelation is independent of any eschatological system.²⁴⁸

Murray-Jones,²⁴⁹ Philip Davis,²⁵⁰ and Fletcher-Louis²⁵¹ have all followed

²⁴³ Christopher C. Rowland, "The Visions of God in Apocalyptic Literature," *JSJ* 10 (1979): 137.

²⁴⁴ Rowland, "Visions," 138. Rowland examines *1 Enoch* 14, the *merkabah* vision in the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice, Rev 4, and *Apoc. Ab.* 17-19 against the background of the development of Jewish mysticism from meditation on Ezekiel's *merkabah* vision (Ezek 1) in the late Second Temple period to the more developed *merkabah* mysticism of the *hekhalot* literature.

²⁴⁵ Rowland, *Open Heaven*, 9-22; cf. Rev 1:1.

²⁴⁶ *1 Enoch*; *2 Enoch*; *Jubilees*; *2 Baruch*; *3 Baruch*; *4 Ezra*; *Apocalypse of Abraham*; *Testament of Abraham*; *Testament of Levi*; *Testament of Naphtali*; *Mart. Ascen. Isa.* 6-11; *Shepherd of Hermas*; *3 Enoch*; Rowland, *Open Heaven*, 15. Russell offers a slightly different list (*Method*, 37).

²⁴⁷ Rowland, *Open Heaven*, 23-29.

²⁴⁸ Rowland, *Open Heaven*, 47. The relationship between apocalyptic and eschatology is discussed in detail in Rowland, *Open Heaven*, 23-48.

²⁴⁹ Murray-Jones, "Merkabah Mysticism," 172.

²⁵⁰ Philip G. Davis, "Divine Agents, Mediators, and New Testament Christology," *JTS* 45 (1994): 486.

²⁵¹ Fletcher-Louis, *Luke-Acts*, 27.

Rowland's lead in understanding apocalyptic literature as primarily recording revelations of divine mysteries.²⁵² The revelation of Wisdom to the elect falls perfectly within this understanding, since Wisdom is, in effect, one of the mysteries revealed. This ties in with Hans-Peter Müller's refinement of von Rad's understanding of the origin of apocalyptic;²⁵³ the background of apocalyptic is in the wisdom tradition as represented by Daniel, that is, the tradition of mantic wisdom.

This approach to apocalyptic will be adopted here, and in what follows the revelatory aspect will be foregrounded in the Synoptic portraits of Jesus.

4. The Gospel of Mark

The influence of Daniel on the Lukan infancy narrative has been explored, and the question of apocalyptic influence on the Synoptics has been raised. One way to explore this in more depth is to examine the relationship between the מַשְׁכִּילִים of Daniel and the disciples in Mark's Gospel. This is important because it will allow us to explore linguistic connections between Mark and Daniel with respect to the theme of understanding, and to see how far the presentation of this theme in Mark is dependent on Daniel and the apocalyptic strand of Second Temple Palestinian Judaism.

4.1. The מַשְׁכִּילִים of Daniel and the disciples in Mark's Gospel

Seán Freyne's comparison of the מַשְׁכִּילִים and the disciples in Mark should be read in the context of the scholarly interest in the relationship between Mark and apocalyptic texts.²⁵⁴ Before turning to Freyne's study, however, it is necessary to clarify the identity of the מַשְׁכִּילִים in Daniel.

²⁵² Compare also Peter Tomson's understanding of μυστήριον in 1 Cor 15:51 as "an apocalyptic concept denoting the revelation of a hidden insight into the process of redemption" (*Paul and the Jewish Law: Halakha in the Letters of the Apostle to the Gentiles* [CRINT III/1; Assen: Van Gorcum, 1990], 80).

²⁵³ Hans-Peter Müller, "Mantische Weisheit und Apokalyptik," in *Congress Volume: Uppsala 1971* (ed. G. W. Anderson, P. A. H. de Boer, G. R. Castellino, H. Cazelles, J. A. Emerton, E. Nielsen, H. G. May, and W. Zimmerli; VTSup 22; Leiden: Brill, 1972), 268-293.

²⁵⁴ Cf. Seán V. Freyne, "The Disciples in Mark and the MASKILIM in Daniel: A Comparison," *JSNT* 16 (1982): 7-8, 22 nn. 3, 5.

4.1.1. The מְשַׁכְּלִים

Many scholars take הַמְּשַׁכְּלִים (Dan 11:33, 35; 12:3, 10) to refer to a specific group behind the book of Daniel. Alfred Mertens suggests that because מְשַׁכְּלִים is absolute, with no object, it has the stereotypical tone of a title.²⁵⁵ H. L. Ginsberg argues that the author of Dan 11-12 identified the so-called suffering servant of Isa 52:13-53:12 with a group of his own day known as the מְשַׁכְּלִים.²⁵⁶ Martin Hengel understands מְשַׁכְּלִים as a “fixed term for a group which proved itself as teachers and martyrs in the [Antiochene] persecution.”²⁵⁷ John Collins takes the מְשַׁכְּלִים in Dan 11-12 to be a quietist movement, claiming Michael as their heavenly patron, and distinct from the more militant group responsible for Ethiopic Enoch.²⁵⁸ The activism of the מְשַׁכְּלִים lies, rather, in making the רַבִּים understand.²⁵⁹ Collins understands מְשַׁכְּלִי עַם in Dan 11:33 to refer to “a party of faithful Jews” among the יְדַעֵי אֱלֹהֵיוֹ of verse 32.²⁶⁰ The visionary associates himself with the מְשַׁכְּלִים, who were distinguished from others by their knowledge²⁶¹ and active as teachers in Jerusalem.²⁶² The מְשַׁכְּלִים could withstand the Antiochene persecution on account of their wisdom,²⁶³ their resistance being inspired by allegiance to a heavenly kingdom.²⁶⁴

²⁵⁵ Mertens, *Daniel*, 64.

²⁵⁶ Ginsberg, “Oldest Interpretation,” 402-403. Cf. Bruce, “Daniel,” 228 n. 17.

²⁵⁷ Hengel, *Judaism* 2:120 n. 490; cf. *Judaism* 1:196, 208.

²⁵⁸ Collins, “Apocalypses and Apocalypticism: Early Jewish Apocalypticism,” 286. Cf. Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination*, 112; P. M. Venter, “Daniel and Enoch — Two Different Reactions,” *HvTSt* 53 (1997): 68-91.

²⁵⁹ Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination*, 111.

²⁶⁰ Collins, *The Apocalyptic Vision in the Book of Daniel* (HSM 16; Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1977), 167-168, 211; cf. Kosmala, “Maskil,” 239-240. See also: Collins, “The Court-Tales in Daniel and the Development of Apocalyptic,” *JBL* 94 (1975): 231-234; “Daniel and his Social World,” *Int* 39 (1985): 132. In his *Apocalyptic Vision*, Collins seems to imply that מְשַׁכְּלִי עַם are synonymous with יְדַעֵי אֱלֹהֵיוֹ, but in his later commentary he suggests that the latter is a wider category which simply included the former (*Daniel*, 66).

²⁶¹ Collins, *Apocalyptic Vision*, 168, 212.

²⁶² Collins, “Social World,” 137.

²⁶³ Collins, *Apocalyptic Vision*, 210; cf. Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination*, 111; Kee, *Community*, 66.

²⁶⁴ Collins, *Apocalyptic Vision*, 211.

John Goldingay is rightly cautious in attempting to identify the circles which produced Daniel, but also concludes that the מְשִׁבֵּי לֵי of Dan 11:33-35 are probably those responsible for the book.²⁶⁵ Philip Davies, similarly, sees in the מְשִׁבֵּי לֵי the authors of Daniel.²⁶⁶ This recalls Nötscher's view, cited approvingly by Mertens, that with the מְשִׁבֵּי לֵי we appear to have an extreme eschatological trend within the Hasidic movement in which the author of Daniel included himself: in them he saw the true Israel embodied.²⁶⁷

It is uncertain, however, whether either the OG or Θ understood מְשִׁבֵּי לֵי to indicate a specific group. Daniel-OG uses three different verbs to translate מְשִׁבֵּי לֵי.²⁶⁸ Daniel-Θ is more consistent. Συνίημι is used in Dan 11:35; 12:3, the cognate adjective συνετός in Dan 11:33. The adjective νοήμων is used in Dan 12:10, but this may be explained by the collocation of שָׂכַל and בֵּין. The translator may have thought using συνίημι to translate both the participle and the verb of which the participle is the subject tautologous, preferring to use συνίημι for בֵּין rather than שָׂכַל. Admittedly a comparable collocation occurs in Dan 11:33, where συνετός translates the participle of שָׂכַל and συνίημι (used transitively) translates בֵּין Hiphil. This implies either that Daniel-Θ also does not understand the מְשִׁבֵּי לֵי to be a distinct group, or that Daniel-Θ does not understand Dan 11:33; 12:10 to be referring to the same group. However the Hebrew was understood by later readers and translators, in Θ συνίημι, συνετός, and σύνεσις are prominent, and readers of Daniel-Θ would have found that the group referred to in Dan

²⁶⁵ Goldingay, *Daniel*, 329. Goldingay describes the מְשִׁבֵּי לֵי as "conservative leaders who possess that wisdom which consists in awed submission to Yahweh, that understanding which has reflected deeply on his ways in history, and that insight which perceives how his cause will ultimately triumph" (*Daniel*, 303). I do not understand, therefore, why Meadowcroft believes that Goldingay prefers a more generalised interpretation of the מְשִׁבֵּי לֵי (*Aramaic Daniel*, 252 n. 12).

²⁶⁶ Philip R. Davies, *Daniel* (OTG; Sheffield: JSOT, 1985), 121. The idea that the מְשִׁבֵּי לֵי are responsible for the book of Daniel is presupposed by Davies in his later article "Reading Daniel Sociologically," in *The Book of Daniel in the Light of New Findings* (ed. A. S. van der Woude; BETL 106; Louvain: Presses Universitaires de Louvain, 1993), 345-361. See now his "The Scribal School of Daniel," in *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception* (ed. J. J. Collins and P. W. Flint, with the assistance of C. VanEpps; vol. 1; Leiden: Brill, 2001), 247-265.

²⁶⁷ Mertens, *Daniel*, 63.

²⁶⁸ ἔννοέω (Dan 11:33); διανοέομαι (Dan 12:10); συνίημι (Dan 11:35; 12:3).

11:33; 12:3 is designated οἱ συνιέντες. Daniel-Θ does not reflect the relationship between בִּין and שָׂכַל in the Hebrew, but emphasises strongly the theme of wisdom, respresented by συνίημι and its cognates. This makes Daniel-Θ, or a form of Greek Daniel very close to it, a more likely source of influence on the NT's use of συνίημι and its cognates than the OG. The OG's favourite verb of intellection, διανοέομαι, occurs in no NT text.

Those designated “the wise” (חֲשִׁבִּיּוֹנִים; οἱ συνιέντες) in Daniel may be seen, typologically and linguistically, as a model for groups similarly designated in the NT.

4.1.2. Previous research: Seán Freyne

Freyne divides his comparison into three categories: (1) The special knowledge of the חֲשִׁבִּיּוֹנִים and the disciples; (2) the mode of revelation and its content; and (3) the function of the revelatory experience in the end-time struggle.²⁶⁹ Freyne argues that Mark echoes Daniel in envisaging three groups or circles around the central figure, Jesus. In Dan 11:32-33, there are (1) those who have violated the covenant; (2) the חֲשִׁבִּיּוֹנִים; and (3) a group instructed by the חֲשִׁבִּיּוֹנִים called the “many” (רַבִּים) and the “people” (עָם).²⁷⁰ In Mark, the three groups are (1) Jesus' opponents; (2) his disciples; and (3) the crowd, who correspond to the רַבִּים of Dan 11:33 in that they also need instruction.²⁷¹ The term חֲשִׁבִּיּוֹנִים links the חֲשִׁבִּיּוֹנִים with Daniel himself (Dan 1:4),²⁷² and Mark uses κηρύσσω as a comparable technical term linking Jesus with the disciples: Jesus comes to preach (Mark 1:14; cf. 1:39, 45), and his disciples are likewise commissioned to preach (Mark 3:14). The way individuals are singled out as recipients of special revelation in Mark²⁷³ is comparable with the pattern of Daniel and his companions representing the

²⁶⁹ Freyne, “Disciples,” 8.

²⁷⁰ Cf. Collins, “Social World,” 139.

²⁷¹ Freyne, “Disciples,” 10.

²⁷² Freyne, “Disciples,” 10, 18. Cf. Collins, “Court-Tales,” 231; “Social World,” 134-135; *Apocalyptic Imagination*, 90.

²⁷³ See especially Mark 9:2; par. Matt 17:1; Luke 9:28.

מְשַׁכְּלִים as a whole.²⁷⁴ Mark's transfiguration narrative recalls Daniel's vision of the man clothed with linen,²⁷⁵ and the command to silence (Mark 9:9), similar to others elsewhere in the Gospel (Mark 1:44; 5:43; 7:36; 8:26, 30), echoes the secrecy motif in Daniel.²⁷⁶ Referring to Mark 4, Freyne suggests that "the parabolic mystery that is entrusted to the disciples is rather like the wisdom of the *maskilim* — for others, but they must first understand that mystery before they can begin to disclose it."²⁷⁷

In terms of broader themes, Daniel and Mark share the mythic pattern of a cosmic struggle between good and evil, and of the role of the elect therein.²⁷⁸ Freyne concludes by cautiously suggesting that his comparison might support the hypothesis that Mark was directly influenced by Daniel,²⁷⁹ remarking that "the evangelist has given literary expression to the [Markan community's] self-understanding by means of a model drawn from the literary world of Jewish apocalyptic."²⁸⁰

Freyne's analysis is persuasive, though it does not draw substantially on the linguistic evidence of Mark's Gospel. In Mark 4, two verbal links with Daniel may be noted. First, μυστήριον occurs only here (Mark 4:11)²⁸¹ in Mark but often in the OG and Θ of Daniel, translating the Aramaic ܡܫܟܠܐ.²⁸² Second, συνήμι occurs 5 or 7 times in Mark, and has been conclusively demonstrated to be characteristic of the vocabulary of Daniel-Θ.

²⁷⁴ Freyne, "Disciples," 12.

²⁷⁵ Dan 10:1-8; Freyne, "Disciples," 15; cf. Kee, *Community*, 46.

²⁷⁶ Freyne, "Disciples," 14, 17-18.

²⁷⁷ Freyne, "Disciples," 16.

²⁷⁸ Freyne, "Disciples," 19-20.

²⁷⁹ Freyne, "Disciples," 20.

²⁸⁰ Freyne, "Disciples," 21.

²⁸¹ Par. Matt 13:11; Luke 8:10.

²⁸² Cf. HRCS 937c; Bornkamm, *TDNT* 4:814; Raymond E. Brown, *The Semitic Background of the Term "Mystery" in the New Testament* (FBBS 21; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1968), 7. See Dan 2:18, 19, 27, 28, 29, 30, 47; 4:9 (Θ) = 4:6 (MT).

4.1.3. Μυστήριον (Mark 4:11)

Robert Guelich notes that “μυστήριον functions as a part of the language of revelation,”²⁸³ and if we accept that “[t]he disclosure of divine secrets is the true theme of later Jewish apocalyptic”²⁸⁴ then we are dealing in Mark 4:11 with a concept rooted in Jewish apocalyptic: the giving of a mystery.²⁸⁵ Although Sirach is often considered uninterested in apocalyptic,²⁸⁶ this concept appears in Sir 3:19: **כִּי רַבִּים רַחֲמֵי אֱלֹהִים וּלְעֲנֻיִם יִגְלֶה סוֹדוֹ**, “for God’s mercies are many, and to the poor he reveals his counsel.” Sinaiticus *suppletor* reads πολλοί εἰσιν ὑψηλοὶ καὶ ἐπίδοξοι, ἀλλὰ πράεσιν ἀποκαλύπτει τὰ μυστήρια αὐτοῦ, “the proud and glorious are many, but he reveals his mysteries to the gentle.”²⁸⁷ Μυστήριον occurs four more times in Sirach (Sir 22:22;²⁸⁸ 27:16, 17, 21), though in each case the usage is secular.²⁸⁹ In Wis 2:22, μυστήρια θεοῦ occurs in a context which, like Sir 3:19; Mark 4:11, expounds an anthropological dualism. The “impious” (Wis 1:16: ἀσεβεῖς) do not know God’s mysteries, whereas the “just man” (Wis 2:10, 12, 18: ὁ δίκαιος) claims to have “knowledge of God” (γινῶσιν θεοῦ) and calls himself “a child of the Lord” (Wis 2:13: παῖδα κυρίου). Wisd 6:22 presents Solomon as a revealer of mysteries. Μυστήρια in

²⁸³ Robert A. Guelich, *Mark 1-8:26* (WBC 34A; Dallas, Tex.: Word Books, 1989), 206. Thus, as Harald Riesenfeld notes, “[t]he preaching of Jesus before the Palestinian crowds was revelation, the announcement of a divine secret, μυστήριον” (*The Gospel Tradition* [trans. E. M. Rowley and R. A. Kraft; Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1970], 23).

²⁸⁴ Bornkamm, *TDNT* 4:815.

²⁸⁵ Cf. Joel Marcus, *The Mystery of the Kingdom of God* (SBLDS 90; Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1986), 43-47. Wrede notes in reference to Mark 4:11 that the secret can only be “given” (*Messianic Secret*, 78): the contents of the secret are beyond the power of human thought. As such Wrede cites Mark 4:11 alongside Peter’s confession in Matt 16:16 (par. Mark 8:29; Luke 9:20), noting that “Peter can speak in this way only in virtue of a supernaturally bestowed knowledge” (Wrede, *Messianic Secret*; cf. Matt 16:17). Wrede’s remarks approximate to the apocalyptic idea of the revelation of divine mysteries, particularly to the *cognoscenti* (cf. *1 En.* 5:8; *4 Ezra* 14:13).

²⁸⁶ Harrington, “Early Jewish Approaches,” 127, 131.

²⁸⁷ A similar reading is found in the Syriac, which Moshe Zvi Segal retroverts thus: **יִגְלֶה סוֹדוֹתָיו רַבִּים רַחֲמֵים וּמַהֲלָלִים וְלְעֲנֻיִם יִגְלֶה סוֹדוֹתָיו**. For the Greek τὰ μυστήρια αὐτοῦ he suggests **יִגְלֶה סוֹדוֹתָיו**, understanding **רַחֲמֵים מַהֲלָלִים** as a corruption of **רַחֲמֵים אֱלֹהִים** (יז, בן סירא).

²⁸⁸ In Sir 22:22, where μυστηρίου ἀποκαλύψεως translates **סוֹדָא חֲסִי**, the laying bare of a secret refers to betrayal. Perhaps this mundane use of the Greek phrase was adopted and adapted for use in the context of the revelation of heavenly secrets.

²⁸⁹ Bornkamm, *TDNT* 4:814.

Wisd 14:15, 23 refers to mystery cults.²⁹⁰

The plural *μυστήρια* in Sir 3:19; Wis 2:22 may be reflected by the plural in Matt 13:11 (*τὰ μυστήρια τῆς βασιλείας τῶν οὐρανῶν*, “the mysteries of the kingdom of the heavens”) and Luke 8:10 (*τὰ μυστήρια τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ*, “the mysteries of the kingdom of God”)²⁹¹ more closely than by the singular in Mark 4:11, though all these texts presuppose the idea that mysteries are revealed, and those to whom they are revealed are singled out as the positive group in a dualistic anthropology. Mark is not necessarily directly dependent on these texts, though this possibility should not be discounted. Rather, a theme common to both sapiential and apocalyptic texts of this period appears in Mark 4:11. What does this say about the relationship between Jesus and his disciples? For Freyne, Jesus has the role of *angelus interpres*.²⁹² If this is the case, *δέδοται* being understood as a divine passive, then Jesus, like the revealing angel in Dan 10, is God’s intermediary. Dan 10:1 (Θ) reads *σύνεσις ἐδόθη αὐτῷ ἐν τῇ ὄπτασίᾳ*, “insight was given to him in the vision,”²⁹³ the passive of *δίδωμι* being used in Mark 4:11; Dan 10:1 (Θ) to refer to a revelation involving God’s intermediary.

However, Jesus also takes the role of a Danielic *מְשַׁכֵּל*. As Daniel the *מְשַׁכֵּל* interprets Nebuchadnezzar’s dream, so Jesus interprets the parable of the sower,²⁹⁴ and as the *מְשַׁכֵּלִים* instruct, so Jesus instructs. The instruction of the *מְשַׁכֵּלִים* of Daniel, it should be noted, is based typologically on the instruction of the revealing angel.

This recalls the preaching of the disciples, based typologically on the preaching of

²⁹⁰ Bornkamm, *TDNT* 4:813; Brown, *Semitic Background*, 11; David Winston, *The Wisdom of Solomon: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 43; New York: Doubleday, 1979), 274-277, 279-280; Bockmuehl, *Revelation*, 66 n. 57.

²⁹¹ Cf. also the plural in 1 Cor 4:1, where the apostles are to be reckoned “stewards of God’s mysteries” (*ὥς ... οἰκονόμους μυστηρίων θεοῦ*).

²⁹² Freyne, “Disciples,” 16.

²⁹³ Cf. Wis 7:7: *εὐξάμην, καὶ φρόνησις ἐδόθη μοι*, “I prayed, and insight was given to me.” It is not suggested that Solomon’s wisdom was given through an intermediary.

²⁹⁴ Cf. Marcus, *Mystery*, 45-46.

Jesus.²⁹⁵ Jesus' role is fundamentally to preach (Mark 1:14, 38, 39, 45), as the phrase εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ ἐξῆλθον, "for this I came" in Mark 1:38 makes clear. Jesus sends his disciples to preach in Mark 3:14; 16:15²⁹⁶ and a healed demoniac preaches in the Decapolis in Mark 5:20,²⁹⁷ having been commanded by Jesus to proclaim what his Lord had done for him. Transmission is present here, in that Jesus preaches, and having called his disciples to preach also, they pass on the message that Jesus had earlier preached to them.²⁹⁸ The parallel with the מְשִׁכִּילִים of Daniel is that the מְשִׁכִּילִים both receive insight, as Daniel the מְשִׁכִּיל *par excellence* had done, and pass it on to others (Dan 11:33). The disciples hear the good news preached by Jesus, receive the mystery of God's kingdom, and pass on what they have heard to others.

4.1.4. Συνίημι

The verb συνίημι appears in Mark 4:12 in a citation of Isa 6:9-10. It also appears in Mark 4:9 (D): οὗς ἐχὺ ὠτὰ ἀκοῦειν ἀκούετω καὶ ὁ συνειὼν συνειετω, "let the one who has ears to hear, hear, and the one who understands, understand." The collocation of ἀκούω and συνίημι may derive from the collocation of the two verbs in Isa 6:9-10, though the same collocation occurs in Mark 7:14.²⁹⁹

The citation of Isa 6:9-10 in Mark 4:12 reads βλέποντες βλέπωσιν καὶ μὴ ἴδωσιν, καὶ ἀκούοντες ἀκούουσιν καὶ μὴ συνιῶσιν, μήποτε ἐπιστρέψωσιν καὶ ἀφεθῇ αὐτοῖς, "looking they look but do not see, and hearing they hear but do not understand, lest they turn and it be forgiven them." Mark's citation is much shorter than Matthew's (Matt

²⁹⁵ Cf. Freyne, "Disciples," 10-11.

²⁹⁶ Cf. Mark 6:12; 16:20. See also Mark 13:10; 14:9, where κηρύσσω is passive.

²⁹⁷ Cf. Mark 7:36, in which the crowd (apparently) preach following the healing a deaf man with a speech impediment, despite being commanded by Jesus to tell no-one.

²⁹⁸ Cf. *Ep. Apos.* 23, 40, in which the preaching of the disciples is dependent on them first having learnt from Jesus.

²⁹⁹ Par. Matt 15:10. For analogous exhortations linking hearing and gaining insight, see Wis 6:1; CD I, 1 (par. 4QD^a 2 I, 7 [reconstructed]; 4QD^c 1 9); II, 14-15 (par. 4QD^a 2 II, 13-14 [reconstructed]); 4QcryptA III, 4-10. Cf. 2 Esd 18:2 (LXX; = Neh 8:2 [MT]); Sir 6:33; Isa 40:21, 28.

13:14-15), which reflects Isa 6:9-10 (LXX) more closely.³⁰⁰ Joachim Gnilka follows Thomas W. Manson in suggesting the dependence of Mark on a form of *Tg. Isa. 6:9-10*.³⁰¹ Whereas Isa 6:10b β (MT) reads לְיָפֵאֵם לֵה, “and it will be healing for him,” and the LXX reads καὶ ἰάσομαι αὐτούς, “and I shall heal them,” Mark 4:12 reads καὶ ἀφεθῇ αὐτοῖς, “and it will be forgiven them.”³⁰² Mark’s text is thus similar to *Tg. Isa. 6:10: וישתביק להון*, “and it will be forgiven them,” שביק Ithpeel matching the passive of ἀφίημι. The parallel form in Syriac occurs in the Peshitta of Isa 6:10:³⁰³ ܡܕܠܝܢܐ ܕܝܫܬܒܝܩܐ, “and it shall be forgiven him” (ܡܕܠܝܢܐ Ethpeel matching שביק Ithpeel in the Targum).³⁰⁴ Mark shares the sense of the verb with both the Targum and the Peshitta.

Manson suggests that the Targum and Mark reflect a version of Isa 6:10 accepted in the synagogue which was later incorporated into the Targum itself,³⁰⁵ and that the Targum is a close reflection of the original words of Jesus. Where the Targum has the relative particle ܐܝܢ in Isa 6:9 Mark misinterpreted, understanding ܐܝܢ as introducing a final clause rather than as the relative particle.³⁰⁶ Mark’s citation therefore begins with ἵνα + subjunctive, implying that those outside are given parables *so that* they will not perceive or understand, whereas originally the relative particle (“who”) preceded the quote from Isa 6:9-10, identifying “those outside” with the obstinate people in Isaiah.

Matthew Black rejects Manson’s thesis with respect to Mark, applying it rather to

³⁰⁰ See the synoptic presentation of the MT, LXX, Targum of Jonathan, Matt 13:14-15, Acts 28:26-28, Mark 4:12, Matt 13:13, and Luke 8:10 in Joachim Gnilka, *Die Verstockung Israels: Isaias 6,9-10 in der Theologie der Synoptiker* (SANT 3; Munich: Kösel, 1961), 14-15. On the interpretation of Isa 6:9-10 in the early versions, the NT, the rabbis, and the Fathers, see Craig A. Evans, *To See and Not Perceive: Isaiah 6.9-10 in Early Jewish and Christian Interpretation* (JSOTSup 64; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989).

³⁰¹ Thomas W. Manson, *The Teaching of Jesus: Studies of Its Form and Content* (2d ed.; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1935), 77-80; Gnilka, *Verstockung*, 13 n. 3.

³⁰² On Mark’s interpretation of Isa 6:9-10, see Evans, *To See and Not Perceive*, 91-106.

³⁰³ Cf. Matthew Black, *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts* (3rd ed.; Oxford: Clarendon, 1967), 215 n. 1.

³⁰⁴ Evans, *To See and Not Perceive*, 78.

³⁰⁵ Manson, *Teaching*, 77.

³⁰⁶ For a study of texts in the Gospels and Acts which may reflect originals including the Aramaic particle ܐܝܢ, see Black, *Aramaic Approach*, 70-81.

the Matthean and Lukan versions. For Black, the μήποτε clause in Mark 4:12 is logically dependent on the ἵνα clause which precedes.³⁰⁷ However, Mark's μήποτε clause is lacking in Luke 8:10, making it entirely possible that ἵνα in the Lukan version reflects the Aramaic relative ܐܝܢܐ.³⁰⁸ Similarly, in Matt 13:13 ὅτι seems to reflect ܐܝܢܐ. If ὅτι is taken to mean "because," Matthew's text may appear perplexing: "*because* seeing they do not see, and hearing they neither hear nor understand." If, however, ὅτι reflects the relative ܐܝܢܐ, this difficulty is removed:³⁰⁹ "*who*, though they see, do not see, and though they hear, they neither hear nor understand."

This debate is not decisive for the present study, but Black's conclusions may help to clarify the anthropological dualism of this passage. Black argues that Matthew and Luke are drawing on Q, which includes the saying cited by Matthew in Matt 13:16, immediately after he cites Isa 6: ὑμῶν δέ μακάριοι οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ ὅτι βλέπουσιν καὶ τὰ ὦτα ὑμῶν ὅτι ἀκούουσιν, "and blessed are your eyes because they see and your ears because they hear." He suggests that the shorter Lukan version, μακάριοι οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ οἱ βλέποντες ἃ βλέπετε, "blessed are the eyes which see what you see" is more original,³¹⁰ the Greek relative οἱ reflecting the Aramaic ܐܝܢܐ. If ܐܝܢܐ lies behind ὅτι in Matt 13:13 and ἵνα in Luke 8:10, there is a contrast between the crowds who see and hear but do not understand, and the disciples, who are blessed because they see with their eyes and do understand.³¹¹

The anthropological dualism partly hinges around συνίημι. Mark 4:11 makes a division between οἱ περὶ αὐτὸν σὺν τοῖς δώδεκα, "those around him with the Twelve to whom the mystery of God's kingdom is given, and those who are ἔξω, "outside" to whom

³⁰⁷ Black, *Aramaic Approach*, 212-213; cf. Marcus, *Mystery*, 120. However, Black does accept that a Targum quotation lies behind the Markan text, which would explain καὶ ἀφεθῇ αὐτοῖς (*Aramaic Approach*, 215).

³⁰⁸ Black, *Aramaic Approach*, 213.

³⁰⁹ Black, *Aramaic Approach*, 213.

³¹⁰ Black, *Aramaic Approach*, 70-71.

³¹¹ Black, *Aramaic Approach*, 215-216.

all things come in parables (cf. Mark 4:33-34). The implication for the outsiders is that they will not understand. The implication for those who are insiders is that they do understand, because the mystery of God's kingdom is given to them. The picture is of: (1) a figure imparting a heavenly mystery (Jesus), whose role is thus mediatorial; (2) a group of insiders, including the Twelve, who are chosen to understand; and (3) those on the outside, who do not understand.

This reflects another pattern in Daniel. In Dan 12:10 there is an anthropological dualism between the wicked and the wise (cf. Dan 12:2-3), which is linked with understanding. Daniel-Θ reads: καὶ οὐ συνήσουσιν πάντες ἄνομοι, καὶ οἱ νοήμονες συνήσουσιν, "and no lawless people will understand, but the wise will understand." This is proclaimed to Daniel by a man clothed in linen (Dan 12:7), presumably the *angelus interpres*, Gabriel. If this is transposed onto Mark's narrative, we find Jesus in the role of Gabriel and a division between the wise who understand and those who do not understand (equivalent to the wicked in Daniel). In the former group stand the twelve disciples and those around them. In the latter stand those on the outside in Mark 4:11. It is not certain that Mark has Daniel in mind, but it certainly seems that both Mark and Daniel reflect a common pattern of (1) a mediator revealing heavenly mysteries; and (2) a division between those who understand these mysteries and those who do not.

If the link with Isa 6 is pressed, Jesus takes the position of the prophet Isaiah, who acts as a (human) mediator between YHWH and his host and the people of Israel. However, the anthropological dualism of Dan 12 is not present in Isa 6: the people simply do not understand.

4.1.5. Summary

The scholarly consensus is that in the מְשִׁכִּילִים of Dan 11:33, 35; 12:3, 10 we see the group responsible for the canonical Hebrew-Aramaic book of Daniel. Unlike Daniel-OG, Daniel-Θ renders this οἱ συνιέντες in Dan 11:33; 12:3, suggesting that, as in the Hebrew,

a specific group was understood. This group in Daniel is the pattern, both typologically and linguistically, for the disciples in Mark. In addition to the arguments adduced by Freyne, the concept of the revelation of heavenly mysteries is shared by Daniel and Mark, as is the concept of the transmission of such mysteries. The use of *συνίημι* in Mark 4:9 (D), 12 points also to the fact that Daniel and Mark share the common pattern of a mediator revealing heavenly mysteries (Gabriel, Jesus) and a division between those who understand heavenly mysteries and those who do not. While it is tempting to suppose dependence on Daniel on the part of Mark, a shared dependence on common apocalyptic language and themes might also explain this situation.

So far, then, we have been able to suggest that Luke 1:5-2:52 and Mark 4 reflect Jewish (especially Danielic) ideas in their understanding of the mediation of revelation and in their use of sapiential language. It is now necessary to enquire more deeply into the theme of understanding in Mark.

4.2. Lack of understanding in Mark³¹²

Elsewhere in Mark's Gospel, it is significant that the disciples do not understand, though Jesus commands them to listen and understand (Mark 7:14; par. Matt 15:10), and implies that they are meant to understand.³¹³ The disciples' lack of understanding is central to the debate about the so-called "messianic secret"³¹⁴ in Mark. In this connection, Wrede does not confine himself to Mark, seeking to illuminate this theme throughout the Four

³¹² On *συνίημι* as a recurring link-word in Mark, suggesting that Mark 4:(9), 12; 6:52; 7:14 (cf. 7:18); 8:17, 21 point to a larger redactional pattern in the Gospel, see Quentin Quesnell, *The Mind of Mark: Interpretation and Method through the Exegesis of Mark 6,52* (AnBib 38; Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1969), 70-71.

³¹³ Guelich notes the tension in the portrait of the disciples between their involvement in Jesus' ministry as insiders and the Markan motif of their failure to understand, which appears first in Mark 4:13 and climaxes in Mark 8:17-21 (*Mark 1-8:26*, 353; cf. p. 220).

³¹⁴ Cf. Conzelmann, *TDNT* 7:894. This term is rightly regarded by Heikki Räisänen as imprecise. He prefers "the secret of the person of Jesus" while retaining the term "messianic secret" because it has become fixed in the discussion (*The 'Messianic Secret' in Mark* [trans. C. M. Tuckett; SNTIW; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1990], 48). Räisänen's distinction is even more significant for the study of Luke, since in Luke's Gospel, although Jesus is revealed after the resurrection as the Messiah (cf. Luke 24:46), Jesus' heavenly character *in its broadest sense* is what is hidden from the disciples.

Gospels and Acts based on his understanding of the resurrection and giving of the Holy Spirit in Luke-Acts and John.³¹⁵ Joseph Tyson challenges the idea that the disciples' incomprehension is part of the messianic secret motif.³¹⁶ Like Tyson, Theodore Weeden connects Mark's polemic against the disciples with a christological controversy, suggesting that there are three successive stages in the relationship between Jesus and the disciples: (1) Mark 1:16-8:26: the disciples do not comprehend Jesus' identity;³¹⁷ (2) Mark 8:27-14:9: the disciples misunderstand Jesus' messiahship; (3) Mark 14:10-72: the disciples reject Jesus.³¹⁸ For Weeden there are two conflicting christologies in Mark, a θεῖος ἀνὴρ christology (preceding the Petrine confession)³¹⁹ and a suffering christology, reflecting a controversy in Mark's community.³²⁰ David J. Hawkin also sees the disciples' incomprehension as fundamental to the structure of Mark, sections of material being built around this motif.³²¹ Scholars such as Wrede, Tyson, Weeden, and Hawkin have addressed themselves to the redaction-critical question of the overall purpose of the

³¹⁵ Wrede sees in the disciples' lack of understanding their reflection on the role of the resurrection in their understanding of Jesus as Messiah. The disciples acquired a new understanding of Jesus because of the resurrection, the theme of their lack of understanding reflecting their belief that prior to the resurrection they did not truly understand Jesus' messiahship. Wrede takes Mark 9:9 as the key to this idea. The transfiguration anticipates the resurrection (*Messianic Secret*, 67), and Jesus' command in verse 9 points to the resurrection as the event after which his messiahship could be revealed outside the inner circle of disciples (*Messianic Secret*, 68). The content of the new knowledge the disciples received because of the resurrection was the essential idea that Jesus was the Messiah, something they had earlier failed to realise (*Messianic Secret*, 231-236).

³¹⁶ Joseph B. Tyson, "The Blindness of the Disciples in Mark," *JBL* 80 (1961): 261. For Tyson, Mark is critical of the disciples for have too narrow a view of Jesus' messiahship involving an inflated understanding of their own position, and for not having a profound enough understanding of the death of Jesus ("Blindness," 268). They understood neither the necessity of Jesus' sufferings nor their own position in the church: rather than a suffering messiahship they, followed by the Jerusalem church (whose christology Mark is challenging: "Blindness," 267), comprehended a royal messiahship which would issue in benefits for themselves ("Blindness," 262).

³¹⁷ See esp. Mark 4:10-13, 38-41; 6:52; 7:17-19; 8:4, 14-21.

³¹⁸ Theodore J. Weeden, "The Heresy that Necessitated Mark's Gospel," *ZNW* 59 (1968): 145-147.

³¹⁹ Mark 8:29. Weeden, "Heresy," 148.

³²⁰ For Weeden Mark was thus trying to combat a heresy in his community whereby, rejecting a suffering christology and the expectation of the return of Christ, some believed themselves to be manifesting Christ's powers in the present. Such people are reflected in the πολλοί who claim ἐγὼ εἰμὶ in Mark 13:6 (Weeden, "Heresy," 154).

³²¹ Thus Mark 6:34-8:21 concerns the disciples' incomprehension of Jesus' universal significance and Mark 8:22-10:52 concerns their misunderstanding of his suffering messiahship: David J. Hawkin, "The Incomprehension of the Disciples in the Marcan Redaction," *JBL* 91 (1972): 496. The disciples' incomprehension highlights the fact that the reader is to grasp what the disciples could not: Jesus' universal significance and the mystery of Jesus' suffering messiahship ("Incomprehension," 500).

motif of incomprehension in Mark's overall conception.³²² While this is crucially important, it is not central to our purposes.

Mark 6:52 reads: οὐ γὰρ συνῆκαν ἐπὶ τοῖς ἄρτοις, ἀλλ' ἦν αὐτῶν ἡ καρδιά πεπωρωμένη, "for they did not understand on the basis of the loaves,³²³ but their hearts were hardened."³²⁴ This follows the pericope in which Jesus walks on water, paralleled in Matthew and John (Mark 6:45-51; Matt 14:22-33; John 6:16-21).³²⁵ The disciples' lack of understanding is unique to Mark,³²⁶ and elaborates on the disciples' response of confusion (ἐξίσταντο, "they were astounded") to the abating of the wind upon Jesus' arrival (Mark 6:51).³²⁷ In Mark 7:18, Jesus asks the disciples οὕτως καὶ ὑμεῖς ἀσύνετοί ἐστε, "thus do you, too, lack understanding?" In Mark 8:17 Jesus asks the disciples "Do you still neither perceive nor understand? Are your hearts hardened?"³²⁸ This is followed by a further question, recalling Mark 4:12: "Though you have eyes do you not see, and though you have ears do you not hear?"³²⁹ An apocopated form of the question in Mark

³²² It is worth noting that Hawkin's emphasis on the centrality of the incomprehension motif to the structure of Mark's Gospel reflects our own concern to see the ultimately resolved incomprehension of those around Jesus as central to the structure of *Luke's* Gospel.

³²³ For this understanding of ἐπὶ τοῖς ἄρτοις, see: J. P. Heil, *Jesus Walking on the Sea: Meaning and Gospel Functions of Matt 14:22-33, Mark 6:45-52 and John 6:15b-21* (AnBib 14; Rome: Biblical Institute, 1981), 5-6; also the amplified rendering in BAG 287: "they did not arrive at an understanding (of it) (by reflecting) on (the miracle of) the loaves." Ἐπί + dative is here taken to denote "the basis for a state of being, action, or result" (BDF §235.2). Although no object is expressed for συνῆκαν, Heil suggests that the implied (but unexpressed) object of this verb is the identity of Jesus as manifested in particular in his walking on water and the feeding of the five thousand (*Jesus*, 74 n. 108).

³²⁴ A hardened heart "becomes insensitive and inflexible" (Hans Walter Wolff, *Anthropology of the Old Testament* [trans. M. Kohl; London: SCM, 1974], 52); it cannot understand, whereas a heart that is open can understand.

³²⁵ Compare Jesus' command over the sea in Mark 4:35-41; par. Matt 8:23-27; Luke 8:22-25.

³²⁶ Cf. Heil, *Jesus*, 7.

³²⁷ In Matt 14:33, the response of the disciples is of worship: "Those who were in the boat worshipped him, saying 'Truly you are a son of God'" (οἱ δὲ ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ προσεκύνησαν αὐτῷ λέγοντες· ἀληθῶς θεοῦ υἱὸς εἶ).

³²⁸ Mark 8:17: οὐπω νοεῖτε οὐδὲ συνίετε; πεπωρωμένην ἔχετε τὴν καρδίαν ὑμῶν; Matthew's parallel only includes οὐπω νοεῖτε (Matt 16:9).

³²⁹ Mark 8:18: ὀφθαλμοὺς ἔχοντες οὐ βλέπετε καὶ ὦτα ἔχοντες οὐκ ἀκούετε; (no parallels). Cf. Isa 6:9-10; 42:20; 43:8; Jer 5:21 (LXX: ὀφθαλμοὶ αὐτοῖς καὶ οὐ βλέπουσιν, ὦτα αὐτοῖς καὶ οὐκ ἀκούουσιν); Ezek 12:2 (LXX: οἱ ἔχουσιν ὀφθαλμοὺς τοῦ βλέπειν καὶ οὐ βλέπουσιν καὶ ὦτα ἔχουσιν τοῦ ἀκούειν καὶ οὐκ ἀκούουσιν). Though Jer 5:21 and Ezek 12:2 recall Isa 6:9-10, neither refers to a lack of understanding on the part of those condemned. In Deut 29:3 (LXX) οἶδα is used to refer to understanding, rather than συνίημι: οὐκ ἔδωκεν κύριος ὁ θεὸς ὑμῖν καρδίαν εἰδέναι καὶ ὀφθαλμοὺς βλέπειν καὶ ὦτα ἀκούειν ἕως τῆς ἡμέρας ταύτης, "the Lord God has not given you a heart to know, eyes to see and ears to hear until this day."

8:17 concludes this pericope in 8:21: “Do you not yet understand?” (οὐπω συνίετε).³³⁰

Let us begin by identifying a trajectory through the OT concerned with the lack of understanding.

4.2.1. Lack of understanding in Mark in light of the OT

A trajectory may be traced from Isaiah (including Deutero-Isaiah), Jeremiah, and Ezekiel through Daniel to these passages in Mark’s Gospel.³³¹ Edwin Good,³³² followed by Ronald Clements,³³³ has recognised that Isa 6:9-10 is ironic, in that YHWH calls the prophet to do the opposite of what a prophet should do. Rather than bringing understanding to the recipients of his message, Isaiah is called to fatten their hearts and dull their ears lest they see, hear, and understand. A different kind of irony is present in the LXX: despite the prophet’s proclamation, the peoples’ eyes are blind even though they should see, they are deaf even though their ears should hear, and their hearts do not understand, even though they should.³³⁴

The LXX shares its understanding of Isa 6:9-10 to an extent with Deutero-Isaiah, where the deaf are commanded to hear and the blind to see (Isa 42:18-20; cf. 42:16),³³⁵ and where the people have eyes but cannot see and ears but cannot hear (Isa 43:8).³³⁶ In

³³⁰ The parallel in Matt 16:11 reads πῶς οὐ νοεῖτε ὅτι οὐ περὶ ἄρτων εἶπον ὑμῖν; (“How is it that you do not perceive that I was not speaking to you about loaves?”). In the following verse the disciples’ lack of understanding is resolved, συνίημι rather than νοέω (cf. Matt 16:9, 11) being used to refer to understanding: τότε συνῆκαν ὅτι οὐκ εἶπεν προσέχειν ἀπὸ τῆς ζύμης τῶν ἄρτων ἀλλὰ ἀπὸ τῆς διδαχῆς τῶν Φαρισαίων καὶ Σαδδουκαίων (“Then they understood that he had not told them to be on their guard against the leaven of the loaves, but against the teaching of the Pharisees and Sadducees”). No such resolution occurs at the end of the pericope in Mark.

³³¹ Commenting on Mark 3:5, Robert Guelich notes that the hardness of heart of those around Jesus recalls Israel’s response to the prophets message in the OT (*Mark 1-8:26*, 137; cf. p. 424).

³³² Edwin Good, *Irony in the Old Testament* (2d ed.; Sheffield: Almond, 1981), 136-137.

³³³ Clements, *Isaiah 1-39*, 77.

³³⁴ According to Good’s understanding, this kind of irony is the juxtaposition of the “is” and the “ought” (*Irony*, 31): the prophet *should* bring understanding, but he does not; the hearts of the people *should* understand, but they do not. For the idea that the LXX translator intended to soften the harshness of the MT, see Evans, *To See and Not Perceive*, 61-68.

³³⁵ Here the irony is based on incongruity (cf. Good, *Irony*, 30-31). The incongruity is that those who *cannot* see are commanded to see, and those who *cannot* hear are commanded to hear.

³³⁶ Isa 43:8. Note that the irony in the MT of Isa 6:9-10 revolves around the paradoxical role of the prophet, whereas in the LXX of Isa 6:9-10 and in the MT of Isa 42:18-20 and 43:8 the irony revolves

Isa 44:18, Israel's blindness and deafness are understood to have given rise to the idolatry discussed in Isa 44:9-20.³³⁷ Ronald Clements argues that the themes of blindness and deafness found in Isa 6:9-10 are taken up and developed in later portions of Isaiah. This accounts for Isa 42:16, 18-19; 43:8; 44:18. It also accounts for later passages which develop these themes further, namely Isa 35:5; 29:18.³³⁸ A later development on the basis of earlier prophecies seems likely, and in this case Isa 43:10 points to a resolution of Isa 6:9-10.³³⁹ Though the people are blind and deaf, YHWH will restore their understanding: "You are my witnesses (an oracle of YHWH), and my servant whom I have chosen; so that you may know and believe me, and understand that I am he" (MT). YHWH's irruption into the lives of his people resolves the incongruity between the blindness, deafness, and hardness of heart they have cultivated and the faculties of understanding, seeing, and hearing that were his gift to them (cf. Deut 29:3).³⁴⁰

Isaiah 43:10 (LXX) reads γένεσθέ μοι μάρτυρες, καὶ γὰρ μάρτυς, λέγει κύριος ὁ θεός, καὶ ὁ παῖς, ὃν ἐξελεξάμην, ἵνα γνῶτε καὶ πιστεύσητε καὶ συνῆτε³⁴¹ ὅτι ἐγὼ εἰμι, "Become witnesses for me, and I, too, a witness, says the Lord God, and my servant, whom I have chosen, so that you may know, believe, and understand that I AM." The conflict between hardness of heart and understanding is resolved by YHWH's

around the incongruity between blindness and seeing, deafness and hearing, hardness of heart and understanding. In Isa 6:9-10 the hearers have their faculties but cannot use them. In Deutero-Isaiah, the people, now blind, deaf, and without understanding, are paradoxically commanded to see and hear.

³³⁷ Ronald E. Clements, "Beyond Tradition-History: Deutero-Isaianic Development of First Isaiah's Themes," in *The Prophets: A Sheffield Reader* (ed. P. R. Davies; BibSem 42; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996), 137; repr. from *JSOT* 31 (1985).

³³⁸ Clements, "Deutero-Isaianic Development," 136-138. Clements summarises his argument thus ("Deutero-Isaianic Development," 138): [I]f we can reconstruct the chronology of the development of this theme in the book of Isaiah we arrive at the following picture. First Isaiah's call account used the imagery of Israel's blindness and deafness to signify the refusal of the people to listen and respond to the prophet's message. In chs. 42 and 43 the unknown exilic prophet has taken up this imagery to affirm that it describes a condition which still prevails, but in spite of it God's salvation will quickly come. Further development of the imagery in 35.5 and 29.18 then uses the idea that the ending of (physical) blindness and deafness will characterize the coming great era of salvation.

³³⁹ Compare the way in which Isa 44:26 resolves the threatened and fulfilled catastrophe announced in Isa 6:11, declaring that since the terms of Isaiah's initial commission are fulfilled, the time for restoration may begin (Clements, "Deutero-Isaianic Development," 142-143).

³⁴⁰ Cf. Isa 41:20, where the people see (רָאוּ), know (יָדְעוּ), and understand (שָׂכְלוּ Hiphil) that the hand of YHWH has acted.

³⁴¹ Συνῆτε translates שָׂכְלוּ, recalling the connection between συνέημι and שָׂכַל characteristic of Daniel-Θ.

intervention and, importantly, the focus of understanding is the identity of YHWH himself. This recalls Jer 5:21, where YHWH exhorts “a people foolish and mindless” (עַם סָכָל וְאֵין לֵב) to listen, though they have eyes but do not see and ears but do not hear.³⁴² In Jer 5:22 YHWH asks “do you not fear me?” (הֲאֹתִי לֹא-תִירָאוּ). This implies that an absence of fear of YHWH accompanies blindness, deafness, lack of understanding, and hardness of heart. Fear of YHWH, on the other hand, accompanies seeing, hearing, and understanding. Thus in Isa 42-43, seeing, hearing, and understanding are linked with recognising YHWH, whereas the absence of these faculties is synonymous with not recognising him. Ezek 12:2 also picks up the theme found in Isa 6:9-10, but as in Jer 5:21 the resolution involves YHWH bringing destruction on his obstinate people rather than bringing understanding to them. Jeremiah 5 and Ezek 12, like Isa 6, reflect the proximity of destruction rather than the proximity of redemption reflected in Isa 43.

The next stage in the trajectory is Dan 8-12. Although Daniel is מְשִׁכִּיל, he does not at first understand what is revealed to him. In Dan 8:15 he “sought understanding,”³⁴³ prompting Gabriel to interpret the vision. Nevertheless, Daniel was “perplexed on account of the vision, not understanding.”³⁴⁴ Daniel’s confession follows (Dan 9:4b-19), in which we hear that the disobedience of the people caused the exile (Dan 9:13). In Dan 9:13, Daniel laments that the people have not turned “to understand your (viz. God’s) truth,” which in Θ reads τοῦ συνιέναι ἐν πάσῃ ἀληθείᾳ σου, “to understand all your truth.”³⁴⁵ Daniel owes his understanding to Gabriel (Dan 9:21-23, 25; 10:1, 11-12), but his understanding is only made possible by his decision to seek understanding. The

³⁴² Mark 8:18 and Matt 13:13 allude directly to Jer 5:21 and Ezek 12:2. Cf. Taylor, *Mark*, 367; Cranfield, *Mark*, 262; W. L. Lane, *The Gospel According to Mark: the English Texts with Introduction, Exposition and Notes* (NICNT 2; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1974), 279 n. 35, 282; Anderson, *Mark*, 202; Guelich, *Mark 1-8:26*, 425.

³⁴³ MT: וְאַבְקֶשָׁה בִּינָה; OG: ἐζήτουν διανοηθῆναι; Θ: ἐζήτουν σύνεσιν.

³⁴⁴ MT: וְאַשְׁתּוּמָם עַל-הַמִּרְאָה וְאֵין מִבֵּין; OG: καὶ ἐξελυόμην ἐπὶ τῷ ὁράματι, καὶ οὐδεὶς ἦν ὁ διανοούμενος; Θ: καὶ ἐθαύμαζον τὴν ὄρασιν, καὶ οὐκ ἦν ὁ συνίων.

³⁴⁵ MT: לְהַשְׁכִּיל בְּאַמְתְּךָ; OG: διανοηθῆναι τὴν δικαιοσύνην σου, κύριε, “to understand your righteousness, O Lord.”

language used is of setting the heart to understand (Dan 10:12).³⁴⁶ In Dan 12:8, Daniel again does not understand,³⁴⁷ though his lack of understanding is resolved through the angel's interpretation (Dan 12:9-13).

The book of Daniel thus develops a number of themes found in Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel. The obstinacy of God's people is a common denominator. All four link divine retribution with the people's failure to respond to his gift of a heart to understand, eyes to see, and ears to hear (Deut 29:3). In Deutero-Isaiah, YHWH himself intervenes to enable people to understand.³⁴⁸ In Daniel, Daniel takes the initiative through his prayer of confession. In resolving to confess Daniel showed his willingness to seek understanding, and he is rewarded with the gift of understanding through Gabriel's mediation.

Mark is connected with this trajectory. The disciples' lack of understanding in Mark 6:52 is deeply ironic when read in light of Isa 43:10.³⁴⁹ Mark 6:52 occurs in close proximity to a phrase in which Jesus reveals an aspect of his identity. In Mark 6:50 he says θαρσεῖτε, ἐγὼ εἰμι· μὴ φοβεῖσθε, "be brave, I AM; do not be afraid."³⁵⁰ Reading

³⁴⁶ MT: לִבְךָ לְהַבִּין; OG: ἔδωκας τὸ πρόσωπόν σου διανοηθῆναι; Θ: ἔδωκας τὴν καρδίαν σου τοῦ συνιέναι. Cf. Isa 42:25; 4 Ezra 14:8; §6.2.1 below.

³⁴⁷ MT: לֹא אָבִין; OG: οὐ διανοήθην; Θ: οὐ συνῆκα.

³⁴⁸ Cf. also Isa 42:16.

³⁴⁹ Eugene E. Lemcio understands Mark 4:1-20, which he reads in light of passages in Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel relating to the moral blindness and deafness of Israel, as ironic. Although Mark 4:10-11 distinguishes between the status of insiders, to whom the mystery of God's kingdom had been given, and that of outsiders, for whom things occur in parables to prevent their repentance, the disciples' query (Mark 4:10) and Jesus' rejoinder (Mark 4:13) indicate that despite the difference in status between insiders and outsiders their response is similar. Lemcio notes "[t]he great irony in all this is that those who have been granted the ability to perceive the rule of God in the mystery and ambiguity of its historical manifestation and reception are in danger of finding themselves among the casualties if they fail to realize that their status carries with it awesome, moral obligations" ("External Evidence for the Structure and Function of Mark iv. 1-20, vii. 14-23 and viii. 14-21," *JTS* 29 [1978]: 334).

³⁵⁰ Mach notes that the motif of fear, present in both theophanies and angelophanies in the OT, is transferred to christophanies in the NT (*Entwicklungsstadien*, 57-58; see Matt 14:27 [par. Mark 6:50]; 17:6-7 [par. Luke 9:34]; 28:10 [cf. 28:5]; Luke 5:4-11; Acts 18:9; Rev 1:17). For Mach, the parallel between theophanies and angelophanies in this case indicates an ambivalence between God and angels, a point which is strengthened by the Christian transference of the fear-motif to appearances of Jesus (*Entwicklungsstadien*, 58). This ambivalence makes the application of passages about YHWH in Deutero-Isaiah to Jesus in the Gospels comprehensible. See further: John 6:20; *Ep. Apos.* 11; 2 *En.* 1:8; 21:3; 22:5; *Apoc. Ab.* 16:3-4.

this passage backwards, the disciples' lack of understanding derives from their confusion at the abating of the wind (Mark 6:51),³⁵¹ which had occurred when Jesus got into the boat immediately following his revelatory words: "I AM; do not be afraid." Isaiah 43:10 (LXX) reads πιστεύσητε καὶ συνῆτε ὅτι ἐγὼ εἰμι, "you shall believe and understand that I AM."³⁵² Although YHWH is the speaker in Isa 43:10, understanding in the Markan passage is linked with the revelation of the identity of Jesus, and the fact that ἐγὼ εἰμι is used by Jesus to refer to himself recalls both God's self-revelation³⁵³ and the self-identification of other heavenly beings. This is also true of Jesus' command μὴ φοβεῖσθε.³⁵⁴

In the case of the influence of Daniel, the fact that Daniel cannot understand on his own is a type for the disciples' lack of understanding in Mark. Neither the book of Daniel nor Mark explicitly state that lack of understanding is resolved, though Dan 12:9-13; Mark 8:29³⁵⁵ may imply this. The מְשִׁכִּי לֵים are patterned on the understanding Daniel of the court tales rather than the Daniel of chapters 8-12: they are not patterned on a figure who *doesn't* understand.

This discussion demonstrates that the motif of incomprehension in Mark 6:52 must be read against the background of a trajectory beginning with Isa 6:9-10 and developing through Deutero-Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Daniel. Deutero-Isaiah is especially significant: the connection with Mark suggests that understanding must be focused on the (heavenly) identity of Jesus, which is simultaneously the content of the revelation Jesus' ministry is intended to impart.

³⁵¹ For the idea that the disciples' amazement betrays their lack of understanding about the identity of Jesus, see Guelich, *Mark 1-8:26*, 352.

³⁵² MT: תִּאֱמִינוּ לִי וְתֵבִינוּ כִּי־אֲנִי הוּא, "you will believe me and understand that I am he."

³⁵³ Lane notes that the Markan text uses the language of theophany familiar from the LXX (*Mark*, 236-237, 238-239). Cf. Guelich, *Mark 1-8:26*, 351.

³⁵⁴ See above, n. 346. Lane, *Mark*, 237; Heil, *Jesus*, 12.

³⁵⁵ However, Mark 8:32 implies that Peter at least still did not understand (cf. 9:6, 32), prompting Jesus' rebuke in verse 33.

4.2.2. Isaiah 42-43 and understanding Jesus' identity

To elaborate on this point, we must explore the influence of Isa 42-43 further, beginning with J. C. Coetzee's work on the relationship between the absolute ἐγώ εἰμι utterances of John 8-9, Isa 42-43, and Exod 3:13-17.³⁵⁶

Coetzee notes, first, that in Isa 42-43 there is an accumulation of "I AM" sayings with YHWH as the subject,³⁵⁷ and that in John 8-9 there is an accumulation of "I AM" sayings with Jesus as the subject.³⁵⁸ Second, Jesus' self-identification as light of the world (John 8:12; 9:5) recalls YHWH's servant as a light to the nations (Isa 42:4, 6-7, 16).³⁵⁹ Third, both Isa 43:9-12 and John 8:13-18 are formulated as lawsuits, within which, fourth, YHWH witnesses to his own person (Isa 43:10) and his saving activity (Isa 43:3, 11), and Jesus witnesses to his own person (John 8:24, 28) and his saving activity (John 8:24, 32, 36). Fifth, their witness must be acknowledged and believed (Isa 43:10b [LXX]; John 8:24, 28). Sixth, there are direct parallels between YHWH's servant in Isa 42-43 and

³⁵⁶ See the synopsis given in J. C. Coetzee, "Jesus' Revelation in the *EGO EIMI* Sayings in Jn 8 and 9," in *A South African Perspective on the New Testament: Essays by South African New Testament Scholars Presented to Bruce Manning Metzger during his Visit to South Africa in 1985* (ed. J. H. Petzer and P. J. Hartin; Leiden: Brill, 1986), 171-173. Coetzee's presentation of the evidence is thorough and systematic, though he is not alone in making the connection with Isa 42-43 and Exod 3:13-17. C. K. Barrett suggests that ἐγώ εἰμι indicates the eternal being of Jesus and places Jesus on a level with God, noting that Isa 43:10 (LXX), which may, along with comparable passages in Isaiah (e.g. Isa 41:4; 43:13; 46:4; 48:12; cf. Deut 32:39), be influenced by Exod 3:14-16, is a close parallel of John 8:24 (*The Gospel According to St. John: An Introduction with Commentary and Notes on the Greek Text* [London: SPCK, 1958], 283; cf. pp. 242, 275). Christopher Morray-Jones notes that "[t]he *ego eimi* sayings of Jesus suggest that he claimed to be an embodiment of the divine Name or, at least, that his followers made this claim" ("Transformational Mysticism in the Apocalyptic-Merkabah Tradition," *JJS* 43 [1992]: 14-15). See also Raymond E. Brown, *The Gospel According to John I-XII* (AB 29; New York: Doubleday, 1966), 535-538; G. R. Beasley-Murray, *John* (WBC 36; Waco, Tex.: Word Books, 1987), 130-131, 139-140; Martin Scott, *Sophia and the Johannine Jesus* (JSNTSup 71; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992), 116, 131. D. M. Ball offers a useful survey of the parallels that have been adduced to the ἐγώ εἰμι sayings in John ('*I Am*' in *John's Gospel: Literary Function, Background and Theological Implications* [JSNTSup 124; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996], 23-45). On the possible background to these sayings in the Jewish wisdom tradition, see: Scott, *Sophia*, 116-131.

³⁵⁷ Coetzee, "Jesus' Revelation," 171. See: Isa 42:8; 43:3, 10, 11, 12, 15.

³⁵⁸ John 8:12 (cf. 9:5), 18, 24, 28, 58. John 8:24, 28, 58 belong to Brown's first category of ἐγώ εἰμι sayings (absolute use with no predicate): cf. John 13:19. John 8:12; 9:5 belong in his third category (use with a predicate nominative): cf. John 6:35, 51; 10:7, 9, 11, 14; 11:25; 14:6; 15:1, 5. See Brown, *John I-XII*, 533-535.

³⁵⁹ Brown compares John 9:5 with Isa 49:6, where the servant is a light to the nations (*John I-XII*, 372).

Jesus in John 8-9.³⁶⁰ Coetzee concludes that Jesus “uses the absolute *EGO EIMI* as a technical term which carries exclusive claims with regard to both his own person and his messianic work,”³⁶¹ claims unique unity with YHWH, and identifies himself to be the servant of YHWH of Deutero-Isaiah.³⁶² Jesus’ unique unity with YHWH is expressed by his explicit allusion to YHWH’s self-disclosure to Moses in Exod 3:13-17 in John 8:58.³⁶³

David Mark Ball argues that John 8:18 is dependent on Isa 43:10 (LXX). The phrase ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ μαρτυρῶν περὶ ἐμαυτοῦ takes its content from the opening words of that verse.³⁶⁴ Jesus takes the role of the Isaianic servant who acts as a witness,³⁶⁵ and the description of Jesus as the one who bears witnesses speaks of both his role and his identity.³⁶⁶ John 8:24, 28 refer to Jesus’ identity, and both depend on Isa 43:10 (LXX).³⁶⁷ The purpose of bringing witnesses in Isa 43:10 is ἵνα γνῶτε καὶ πιστεύσητε καὶ συνῆτε ὅτι ἐγὼ εἰμι, “that you may know, believe and understand that I AM,” recalled in John 8:24 through the words ἐὰν γὰρ μὴ πιστεύσητε ὅτι ἐγὼ εἰμι, “for if you do not believe that I AM,” and in John 8:28 through the words τότε γνώσεσθε ὅτι ἐγὼ εἰμι, “then you will know that I AM.”³⁶⁸ By applying the words of Isa 43:10 to himself, the Johannine Jesus is claiming for himself an “exclusive soteriological function that in

³⁶⁰ (1) YHWH calls his servant as covenant for his people and light for the nations (Isa 42:6), and Jesus claims to be light of the world (John 8:12; 9:5); (2) The servant will primarily operate in the midst of the blind and a blindness-stricken people (Isa 42:7, 16, 18-20; 43:8), and Jesus operates as the light with the man born blind (John 9:1) and over against an unbelieving, spiritually blind Pharisaism (John 9:39-41); (3) The servant will open the eyes of the blind (Isa 42:7), and Jesus confirms that he is the servant who can really heal the blind (John 9:5-7, 25-26, 39); (4) The servant will lead people out of darkness into the light (Isa 42:16; cf. 42:7), and Jesus declares himself light of the world, who leads people out of darkness into the light of life (John 8:12). Coetzee, “Jesus’ Revelation,” 173.

³⁶¹ Coetzee, “Jesus’ Revelation,” 173.

³⁶² Coetzee, “Jesus’ Revelation,” 174.

³⁶³ Coetzee, “Jesus’ Revelation,” 174-176.

³⁶⁴ Ball, ‘I Am’, 186.

³⁶⁵ Ball, ‘I Am’, 186-187.

³⁶⁶ Ball, ‘I Am’, 188.

³⁶⁷ Ball, ‘I Am’, 188-189.

³⁶⁸ Ball, ‘I Am’, 189.

Isaiah was reserved for God alone.”³⁶⁹

The link with Isa 43:10 points towards Jesus’ identification with the Father, ἐγὼ εἰμι identifying Jesus not only with YHWH’s saving action but with YHWH himself. John 8:24, 28 thus refer specifically to Jesus’ identity. There is also a connection between John 8:58 and Isa 43:10 (LXX). In the phrase πρὶν Ἀβραὰμ γενέσθαι ἐγὼ εἰμί, “before Abraham came to be, I AM,” there are contrasts between γίνομαι and εἰμί and between the aorist γενέσθαι and the present εἰμί. This is linked with Isa 43:10 because in the phrase ἵνα ... συνῆτε ὅτι ἐγὼ εἰμι, ἔμπροσθέν μου οὐκ ἐγένετο ἄλλος θεός, “that ... you may understand that I AM, before me no other god came to be,” there are again contrasts between γίνομαι and εἰμι and between the aorist ἐγένετο and the present εἰμι.³⁷⁰ Moreover, *Tg. Isa.* 43:10-13 mentions Abraham,³⁷¹ suggesting that John is not only dependent upon Isa 43:10 (LXX) but knew a tradition, later embodied in *Targum Isaiah*, relating this passage with Abraham. In John 8:58, which is the culmination of a debate about Jesus’ identity,³⁷² Jesus identifies himself with the nature of God.³⁷³ In John 13:16-19 there are further points of contact with Isa 43:10 (LXX): ἐξελεξάμην in John 13:18 recalls the same form in Isa 43:10, and the phrase ἵνα πιστεύσητε ὅταν γένηται ὅτι ἐγὼ εἰμι, “that you may believe when it happens that I AM” recalls ἵνα γνῶτε καὶ πιστεύσητε καὶ συνῆτε ὅτι ἐγὼ εἰμι in the Isaiah passage.³⁷⁴ In choosing his disciples, Jesus identifies himself with YHWH, who chooses his servant.

4.2.3. Mark 6:50, 52

Coetzee and Ball make strong cases for understanding Isa 42-43 as the background to the absolute ἐγὼ εἰμι sayings in John. Ball’s study is important for our purposes because it

³⁶⁹ Ball, ‘I Am’, 190.

³⁷⁰ Ball, ‘I Am’, 195.

³⁷¹ Ball, ‘I Am’, 197-198.

³⁷² Ball, ‘I Am’, 195.

³⁷³ Ball, ‘I Am’, 198.

³⁷⁴ Ball, ‘I Am’, 199.

stresses that in alluding to Isa 43:10 (LXX), the Johannine Jesus is making a significant statement about his identity.

It is also possible to read Mark 6:50³⁷⁵ in light of Isa 42-43, Jesus' ἐγώ εἰμι identifying him with YHWH in the Isaianic passage. Furthermore, it is incumbent upon the disciples to "understand that I AM." In Mark 6:52, however, they *do not* understand. Understanding in this passage is focused on Jesus' identity, which remains hidden because the disciples do not "understand that I AM." Jesus' command μὴ φοβεῖσθε also recalls the LXX of Deutero-Isaiah, in which YHWH repeats the command μὴ φοβοῦ on several occasions (Isa 41:10, 13-14; 43:1, 5; 44:2; 54:4). Ball also lists several OT commands not to fear, which are accompanied by ἐγώ εἰμι and placed in the mouth of God.³⁷⁶ John Paul Heil reads the story of Jesus walking on water as an epiphany, defining this literary genre as

A disposition of literary motifs narrating a sudden and unexpected manifestation of a divine or heavenly being experienced by certain selected persons, in which the divine being reveals a divine attribute, action or message. The essential characteristic of an epiphany is that it reveals some aspect of God's salvific dealings with his people. An epiphany thus presents or offers a particular revelation to certain people, who are then free to accept or reject it.³⁷⁷

Heil notes in relation to Matt 14:27 that the background for ἐγώ εἰμι and μὴ φοβεῖσθε is in Isa 43:1-13, thus concurring with our conclusions in relation to Mark 6:50. The ἐγώ εἰμι, for Heil, "signifies the self-identification of Jesus as the revealer of Yahweh." By coming to his disciples' rescue, Jesus is revealing his character by performing a characteristic saving action of Yahweh.³⁷⁸

Heil's conclusions inform this study in two ways: (1) Heil explains the

³⁷⁵ Cf. Mark 13:6; 14:62.

³⁷⁶ Ball, '*I Am*', 182.

³⁷⁷ Heil, *Jesus*, 8.

³⁷⁸ Heil, *Jesus*, 59.

background of the story of Jesus walking on water in terms of Isa 43; (2) by identifying this story as an epiphany Heil acknowledges that Jesus is a heavenly figure. Thus οὐ συνῆκαν in Mark 6:52 refers to the disciples' failure to understand Jesus' character as a heavenly being acting on behalf of YHWH. This is precisely the opposite of Isa 43:10 (LXX), in which συνῆτε refers to God's peoples' future understanding of YHWH. Ironically, Jesus' identity is *known* to an unclean spirit in Mark 1:24, the first being to respond to Jesus in the world.³⁷⁹

M. Eugene Boring compares Mark's description of Jesus walking on water in Mark 6:48 with OT language for God, and while rejecting the notion that ἐγώ εἰμι in Mark 6:50 identifies Jesus with YHWH he affirms that the phrase is suggestive of a high Christology.³⁸⁰ Boring argues that although Mark does not use specific God-language of Jesus, and holds neither an incarnational nor an adoptionist Christology, he tells a story about Jesus which is simultaneously a story about God.³⁸¹ Jesus is affirmed as the "functional equivalent of God" without compromising either Jesus' humanity or the one God's uniqueness.³⁸² Boring does not explore the theme of incomprehension, but by asserting that Jesus is the functional equivalent of God he helps to establish that what is not comprehended is connected with the actions of the divine. The disciples do not comprehend that Jesus is here revealed as one who acts in the place of God.

In conclusion, the collocation of ἐγώ εἰμι, a command not to fear, and συνίημι suggests dependence upon the LXX of Deutero-Isaiah (esp. Isa 43:10). The link with the absolute ἐγώ εἰμι sayings in John suggests that in the pre-Gospel traditions Isa 43:10 (LXX) was already connected with the identity of Jesus. John and Mark bear witness to this independently. Furthermore, as Isa 43:10 (LXX) makes the person of YHWH the

³⁷⁹ Cf. M. Eugene Boring, "Markan Christology: God-Language for Jesus?" *NTS* 45 (1999): 466.

³⁸⁰ Boring, "Markan Christology," 467. See Exod 33:22; 1 Kgs 19:11; Job 9:8; Isa 43:16; cf. Gen 18:3.

³⁸¹ Boring, "Markan Christology," 470-471.

³⁸² Boring, "Markan Christology," 463. Boring examines the following texts to justify this view: Mark 1:2-3, 11, 16-20, 24, 23-27; 2:1-12; 4:35-41; 5:6; 6:48, 50; 7:1-23; 9:2-8, 37; 12:1-11, 35-37; 13:6, 13, 31; 14:60-64; 15:39.

focus of understanding, Mark 6:50, 52 make the person of Jesus the focus of understanding. The connection with Isa 43:10 (LXX) suggests that Jesus is a figure who acts in the place of God. He is a revealer figure since his actions are intended to reveal his identity either as a heavenly figure in his own right or as an exceptional human acting in the place of God.

4.2.4. Mark 8:17, 21

This should be extended to Mark 8:17, 21, which are linked with Mark 6:50, 52 through the use of *συνίημι* and the proximity of a feeding miracle. Norman A. Beck goes one step further, placing both Mark 6:45-52 and Mark 8:14-21 within a section of eucharistic teaching texts (Mark 6:30-8:21).³⁸³ In Mark 8:17, 21, the disciples have failed to understand the significance of the feeding of the four thousand (Mark 8:1-10; par. Matt 15:32-39). In Mark 6:52 the disciples' lack of understanding is linked with the feeding of the five thousand (Mark 6:32-44; par. Matt 14:22-33; Luke 9:10b-17; John 6:1-15). The latter occurs in John, where it precedes both the account of Jesus walking on water (John 6:16-21; par. Mark 6:45-52; Matt 14:22-33) and the revelation of Jesus as the bread of life.³⁸⁴ It is probable that in both the canonical Gospels and the pre-Gospel tradition the feeding miracles and the walking on water were understood as revealing Jesus' identity. On the level of Mark, William Lane suggests that the two feeding miracles "indicate that Jesus' mighty works as well as his teaching were parabolic in the sense that they pointed beyond themselves to the secret of his own person,"³⁸⁵ and that the disciples and the Christian audience of the Gospel should understand the secret that Jesus is the Messiah and the Lord.³⁸⁶ For Jindrich Mánek incomprehension is also connected with Jesus'

³⁸³ Norman A. Beck, "Reclaiming a Biblical Text: The Mark 8:14-21 Discussion about Bread in a Boat," *CBQ* 43 (1981): 52. Mark 6:30-8:21 then belongs to a section of emphasis on Jesus teaching his followers (Mark 6:7-9:50), part of the section dealing with the Galilean ministry of Jesus (Mark 1:14-9:50).

³⁸⁴ John 6:35: *ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ ἄρτος τῆς ζωῆς*. Jindrich Mánek takes *ἄρτος* in Mark 8:14 as symbolic of Jesus the bread of life, suggesting also that this was the impulse for John's symbolic use of *ἄρτος* in John 6:35, the first of the *ἐγὼ εἰμι* sayings: "Mark viii 14-21," *NovT* 7 (1964): 11-12.

³⁸⁵ Lane, *Mark*, 282.

³⁸⁶ Lane, *Mark*, 283.

identity: in discussing about the loaves in Mark 8:16 the disciples fail to understand that the bread of life is with them in the boat.³⁸⁷ For Guelich the disciples in Mark 8:14-21 fail to understand what the miracles say about the person and work of Jesus.³⁸⁸ It is thus safe to conclude that Mark 8:17, 21 are concerned with the disciples not understanding Jesus' identity.

It is important to take account of literary precedents for the pericope in which Mark 8:17, 21 occur. Eugene Lemcio analyses Mark 4:1-20; 7:14-23; 8:14-21 as examples of the dialogue form,³⁸⁹ for which there are OT precedents.³⁹⁰ In Ezek 12:1-16 there is a connection between a diatribe³⁹¹ and parabolic action. The prophet symbolises the exile through parabolic action (Ezek 12:7), is met with a request for explanation (Ezek 12:9), and explains his action to his audience (Ezek 12:10-16). These elements are also found in Mark 4:1-20; 8:14-20.³⁹² The pattern consists of the following elements: (1) A points to ambiguous phenomena or makes an ambiguous statement; (2) B fails to understand, this either being expressed clearly or implied by (3) a surprised or critical rejoinder from A to B's lack of understanding, and (4) an explanation given by A.³⁹³ Lemcio compares Mark 4:1-20 with Ezek 17:1-24³⁹⁴ and Zech 4:10³⁹⁵ in light of this pattern, also drawing on apocalyptic texts (*1 En.* 24-25;³⁹⁶ *2 Bar.* 13-15).³⁹⁷

³⁸⁷ Mánek, "Mark viii 14-21," 13.

³⁸⁸ Guelich, *Mark 1-8*:26, 427.

³⁸⁹ Matt 13:36-43 may also be read against the background of this form. In Matt 13:24-30, Jesus relates a parable to the crowd. The words of the disciples in Matt 13:36 imply that the disciples do not understand at this point, and Matt 13:34-35, read alongside Matt 13:10-17, implies that the crowds certainly do not understand. There is no critical rejoinder on the part of Jesus, but in Matt 13:37-43 he explains the parable of the tares privately (cf. Matt 13:36) to his disciples. Here, Jesus' role is analogous to the *angelus interpretes*.

³⁹⁰ See in particular the table given in Lemcio, "External Evidence," 330, comparing the individual elements of these three pericopae synoptically against the individual elements of the dialogue form.

³⁹¹ Ezek 12:2; cf. Mark 4:12; Isa 6:9-10.

³⁹² Lemcio, "External Evidence," 325.

³⁹³ Lemcio, "External Evidence," 326.

³⁹⁴ Lemcio, "External Evidence," 326.

³⁹⁵ Lemcio, "External Evidence," 327.

³⁹⁶ Lemcio, "External Evidence," 328.

³⁹⁷ Lemcio, "External Evidence," 329.

In the case of Mark 8:14-21 it is possible to identify a number of individual elements of the dialogue form on the basis of Lemcio's analysis.³⁹⁸ Jesus' admonitory allusion to Isa 6:9-10; Jer 5:21; Ezek 12:2 in Mark 8:18 may be understood as a diatribe.³⁹⁹ Mark 8:1-10, 15, together with Mark 6:34-44, should be understood as parabolic.⁴⁰⁰ The motif of incomprehension occurs in Mark 8:16-17,⁴⁰¹ followed by Jesus' critical rejoinder in Mark 8:17-18.⁴⁰² Jesus' explanation follows in Mark 8:19-21,⁴⁰³ though here it takes the form of questions asked by Jesus and it is not clear in Mark 8:21 that the disciples have actually grasped anything.

While Lemcio's approach is illuminating, it is necessary to move beyond his basic results in order to evaluate their significance for the present work. What does the use of the dialogue form in the case of Mark 4:1-20; 7:14-23; 8:14-21, alongside the direct allusion to a specific OT dialogue (Ezek 12:1-16) tell us about the identity of Jesus and the significance of the disciples' incomprehension? The fact that in each case Jesus either performs a parabolic act (a feeding miracle) or utters a parable and then gives the explanation places him in an analogous position to Ezekiel, the unnamed *angelus interpres* in Zechariah, Michael in *1 En.* 24-25, and the Lord in *2 Bar.* 13-15. As in Mark 6:45-52, he acts as a mediatorial figure on behalf of God. Mark 4:1-20; 7:14-23; 8:14-21 are not only connected in terms of structure but also thematically and linguistically: they are all concerned with the fact that the disciples are supposed to understand what Jesus teaches them and with the disciples' incomprehension, and they all use *συνίημι*.⁴⁰⁴

³⁹⁸ For this analysis, cf. Lemcio, "External Evidence," 330.

³⁹⁹ Cf. Mark 4:12.

⁴⁰⁰ Cf. Mark 4:3-8; 7:15.

⁴⁰¹ Cf. Mark 4:10; 7:17.

⁴⁰² Cf. Mark 4:13; 7:18.

⁴⁰³ Cf. Mark 4:14-20; 7:19-23.

⁴⁰⁴ See Mark 4:9 (D), 12; 7:14; 8:17, 21. See also Mark 7:18 (par. Matt 15:16), where Jesus asks the disciples whether they are also *ἀσύνετοί* and the verb *νοεῖτε* is used (cf. Matt 15:17). The same verb occurs in parallel with *συνίετε* in Mark 8:17.

4.2.5. Summary

The disciples' incomprehension in Mark 6:52 is to be read against the background of the OT, especially Deutero-Isaiah. This, along with the parallel influence of Deutero-Isaiah on John's Gospel, makes it clear that what the disciples fail to understand is Jesus's heavenly identity and the fact that he acts in the place of God. This is clear in Mark 6:50, 52 but also in 8:17, 21, where Jesus is to be understood as a mediator of revelation on account of the intertextual relationship between this pericope and a number of analogous passages in the OT and apocalyptic literature.

4.3. Summary

To summarise: in Mark, the theme of understanding is fundamental to the evangelist's portrayal of Jesus and his disciples. The disciples in Mark are modelled on the מְשִׁילִים of Daniel. They are called to understand both the mystery of God's kingdom and the identity of Jesus, which Jesus, as mediator, reveals to them. They prove to be incapable of understanding either, recalling OT texts that refer to the obstinacy and incomprehension of God's people. Jesus' identity is constructed by Mark and John in light of the LXX of Deutero-Isaiah, especially Isa 43:10 (LXX), which is crucial to Mark's presentation of the incomprehension of Jesus' disciples. Jesus is thus a figure acting in the place of God as revealer, charged with bringing the disciples understanding of God's kingdom and his identity.

5. Συνίημι in Matthew

In Matthew συνίημι serves a different purpose, Mark's motif of the disciples' incomprehension being absent. In Matt 13:13, 14, 15 συνίημι occurs as part of Matthew's citation of Isa 6:9-10. There is a more pronounced anthropological dualism than in Mark 4. In Matt 13:10, the disciples ask διὰ τί ἐν παραβολαῖς λαλεῖς αὐτοῖς; "why are you

speaking to them in parables?" This creates a clear division between the disciples and "them," which is explained further in Matt 13:11, when Jesus says ὑμῖν δέδοται γνῶναι τὰ μυστήρια τῆς βασιλείας τῶν οὐρανῶν, ἐκείνοις δὲ οὐ δέδοται, "to you it has been granted to know the mysteries of the kingdom of the heavens, but to *them* it has not been given." The disciples' insider status derives from their privileged knowledge of hidden mysteries. In Matt 13:14, Jesus says ἀναπληροῦνται αὐτοῖς ἡ προφητεία Ἡσαΐου, "the prophecy of Isaiah is fulfilled by them" (referring to Isa 6:9-10), linking incomprehension directly with the outsiders. Because the outsiders do not understand the disciples implicitly do understand (cf. Matt 13:16; par. Luke 10:23). Their understanding is equivalent to their knowledge of the mysteries of the kingdom of the heavens in Matt 13:11. The resulting link between συνίημι and μυστήρια recalls the connection between sapiential language and knowledge of mysteries familiar from Qumran.

In Matt 13:19, 23 συνίημι is unique to Matthew, reinforcing both the idea that outsiders are uncomprehending and his portrayal of the disciples as those who understand. Is there a connection with the מְשִׁיבֵי לַיִם of Daniel, as in Mark? If the disciples are linked with the righteous of Matt 13:43, they are linked also with the מְשִׁיבֵי לַיִם of Dan 12:3.⁴⁰⁵ In Matt 13:52, the evangelist's characterisation of the disciples as those who understand is made explicit. Jesus asks συνήκατε ταῦτα πάντα; "have you understood all these things?" The disciples reply in the affirmative,⁴⁰⁶ and the reader has no reason to doubt their response until Matt 15:16-17.

In Matt 15:10 (par. Mark 7:14) Jesus says ἀκούετε καὶ συνίετε, "listen and understand." It is implied in Matt 15:16-17 (par. Mark 7:18) that the disciples are

⁴⁰⁵ Again, Daniel-Θ provides the most pertinent text: καὶ οἱ συνιέντες ἐκλάμπουσιν ὡς ἡ λαμπρότης τοῦ στερεώματος καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν δικαίων τῶν πολλῶν ὡς ἀστέρες εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας καὶ ἔτι, "and those who understand will shine like the splendour of the firmament, and those from the many righteous ones (or, righteous ones of the many) like the stars forever and ever." Cf. W. D. Davies and Dale C. Allison, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to Saint Matthew* (vol. 2; ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1991), 431.

⁴⁰⁶ Cf. *Ep. Apos.* 45. In this work, the reader is given no reason at all to doubt the apostles' understanding after their response to Jesus.

ἀσύνετοί, “without understanding,” but ἀκμὴν, “even now,” unique to Matthew, implies that the disciples are meant to understand and will eventually gain understanding. When read alongside Matt 14:33; 16:12 and in light of Mark 6:52; 8:21 an important trend emerges. In Matt 14:33, which concludes the Matthean account of Jesus walking on the sea, the evangelist records the response of the disciples to the abating of the wind: οἱ δὲ ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ προσεκύνησαν αὐτῷ λέγοντες· ἀληθῶς θεοῦ υἱὸς εἶ, “and those in the boat paid homage to him, saying ‘Truly you are a son of God.’” The disciples therefore understand what this epiphany tells them about the identity of Jesus. This contrasts starkly with Mark.⁴⁰⁷ Similarly, in Mark 8:21 we are not told that the disciples understand Jesus’ reference to the leaven of the Pharisees and Herodians: it may be implied that they remain uncomprehending. In Matthew, however, although Jesus rebukes his disciples for their lack of understanding in Matt 16:9, 11, we read in Matt 16:12 that they do understand. The ambiguous saying of Jesus in Matt 13:6; Mark 8:15 is not a veiled reference to the identity of Jesus, but this passage does inform us about the evangelists’ understanding of Jesus and his disciples. In Mark, the disciples remain uncomprehending, but in Matthew they have finally understood. The disciples, then, are those who understand. Moreover, they do not understand of their own accord: understanding comes because Jesus causes them to understand by explaining his parabolic words, thus performing the function of an *angelus interpres* (if the reference to his heavenly identity in Matt 14:33 is pressed).

As a teacher on earth who implicitly already understands the parables he expounds he may also be performing the function of מְשַׁכֵּל in the sense evidenced in Dan 11:33, 4QInstruction, the *Serekh*, and D. Perhaps behind the Matthean presentation is an understanding of Jesus and the disciples which approximates to the מְשַׁכֵּל — מְבִין relationship. There is also the idea of Jesus explaining parables after the manner of OT prophets such as Ezekiel. The tradition developed towards an understanding of Jesus

⁴⁰⁷ See §4.2.3 above.

which was closer to the idea of *angelus interpretes* (itself connected with prophets as mouthpieces of God explaining parables or parabolic acts).

The use of *συνίημι* in Matt 17:13 recalls Matt 16:12. Again, Matthew portrays the disciples as those who understand. It is worth returning to Lemcio's study. In examining the dialogue form in apocalyptic literature, Lemcio notes that one component of this form, the critical rejoinder, differs from that in the OT passages he cites.⁴⁰⁸ Furthermore, in Matthew's account of the parable of the Sower Jesus' critical rejoinder is omitted.⁴⁰⁹ This may be understood as a creative adaptation of the dialogue form on Matthew's part. Jesus' critical rejoinder sometimes remains in Matthew.⁴¹⁰ The evangelist preserves the rejoinder to throw Jesus' explanations and the disciples' subsequent understanding into relief. In the case of dialogues which have no rejoinder, such as Matt 17:10-13, the disciples are portrayed as understanding despite Jesus' parabolic speech. There is thus a gradual process in Matthew whereby the disciples are portrayed as destined to understand, but have to be brought to the point of truly understanding by Jesus, who is thus portrayed as a figure whose role is to impart the meaning of hidden mysteries after the example of *angeli interpretes*.

In summary, Matthew's use of *συνίημι* is significant, contributing to the portrayal of the disciples patterned on "those who understand" in Daniel. There is a dualism in Matthew between the disciples (called to understand) and those outside the group of Jesus' disciples (who will not understand). The disciples in Matthew understand what Jesus teaches and his identity, though their understanding is gradual.⁴¹¹ They do not understand initially, only after further explanation from Jesus. The disciples' understanding stems entirely from Jesus, who may thus be understood as a heavenly

⁴⁰⁸ Lemcio, "External Evidence," 328.

⁴⁰⁹ Lemcio, "External Evidence," 329.

⁴¹⁰ Matt 15:16-17; 16:8-11.

⁴¹¹ Cf. Conzelmann, *TDNT* 7:894-895: "[t]he disciples' lack of understanding, which in Mark can be overcome only by the resurrection, is not so basic here; it is only momentary, cf. 13:34 with 13:51."

figure who imparts understanding of hidden things, a figure akin to an *angelus interpres*.

6. Understanding in Luke and the identity of Jesus

Although the incomprehension (Mark) or understanding (Matthew) of the disciples points towards Jesus' identity, it is the portrayal of the disciples which is primarily affected. In Luke, *συνίημι* and its cognates are significant for the portrayals of both the disciples and Jesus. Jesus' understanding is contrasted with the incomprehension of those around him and the theme of incomprehension (and its ultimate resolution) is bound up with the movement towards the conclusive revelation of Jesus' heavenly identity at the resurrection. There is thus a structural issue: Luke reserves the resolution of the disciples' incomprehension for the resurrection, at which point the disciples understand Jesus' true identity, which was beyond their understanding during his earthly ministry.⁴¹² Three related trajectories through Luke's gospel may be identified: (1) the use of *συνίημι* and its cognates; (2) the incomprehension of the disciples in connection with the three passion predictions; (3) the gradual revelation of the identity of Jesus.

The first connects Luke 2:47, 50; 8:10; 18:34; 24:45. Luke 2:47, 50 have already been mentioned.⁴¹³ Jesus is marked out as a figure who possesses heavenly insight. Moreover, by stating that Jesus' parents *οὐ συνῆκαν τὸ ῥῆμα ὃ ἐλάλησεν αὐτοῖς* the evangelist is doing two things: (1) he is contrasting Jesus' insight with his parents' (present) lack of it; (2) he is establishing Jesus as a figure whose identity is hidden behind parabolic sayings and acts. The phrase *οὐκ ᾔδειτε ὅτι ἐν τοῖς τοῦ πατρός μου δεῖ εἶναι με* is to be understood, on analogy with Mark 8:15, as a parabolic saying that is not understood by those who hear it. Presumably the reason no explanation is offered by

⁴¹² Daniélou, *Infancy Narratives*, 123. Cf. Quesnell, *Mind*, 187; J. Christiaan Beker, *Paul the Apostle: The Triumph of God in Life and Thought* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1980), 5. Quesnell sees the identity of Jesus, as manifested in the breaking of bread, as the focus of the disciples' understanding in the Lukan resurrection narrative (cf. Mark 6:45-52; *Mind*, 261-264).

⁴¹³ Cf. §2 above.

Jesus is so that Luke can keep his identity hidden. The citation from Isa 6 in Luke 8:10 implies an outsider group who do not understand⁴¹⁴ that is contrasted with the disciples, to whom the mysteries of God's kingdom are given. No contradiction exists between the disciples' comprehension here and their incomprehension elsewhere. Here, their understanding relates to Jesus' teaching about God's kingdom. Elsewhere their incomprehension concerns his identity.⁴¹⁵ The next occurrence of συνίημι is in Luke 18:34. Following the third passion prediction (Luke 18:31-33; par. Mark 10:32-34; Matt 20:17-19) we read καὶ αὐτοὶ οὐδὲν τούτων συνῆκαν καὶ ἦν τὸ ῥῆμα τοῦτο κεκρυμμένον ἀπ' αὐτῶν καὶ οὐκ ἐγίνωσκον τὰ λεγόμενα, "and they did not understand any of these things, this word was hidden from them, and they did not comprehend the things that had been said." Although the pericope which is concluded by this comment appears in the other Synoptics the comment itself does not. Luke 18:34 recalls Luke 2:50, where it is Jesus' parents whose incomprehension is contrasted with his insight. Here it is the disciples whose incomprehension is foregrounded. Συνίημι links them, as does ῥῆμα. In both τὸ ῥῆμα refers to a parabolic saying, which in Luke 18:34 comes in the preceding two verses.⁴¹⁶ In both the parabolic saying conceals the identity of Jesus. Luke 18:31 describes what Jesus foretells about the suffering of the Son of Man as πάντα γεγραμμένα διὰ τῶν προφητῶν τῷ υἱῷ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, "everything written by⁴¹⁷ the prophets regarding the Son of Man." Jesus' ῥῆμα is thus his true interpretation of Scripture, which the disciples fail to understand. Luke 18:34 thus points forward to Luke 24:25-27, 31-32, 44-45, when the risen Jesus expounds Scripture and finally brings

⁴¹⁴ Luke 8:9-10: ἐπηρώτων δὲ αὐτὸν οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ τίς αὕτη εἴη ἡ παραβολή. ὁ δὲ εἶπεν· ὑμῖν δέδοται γνῶναι τὰ μυστήρια τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ, τοῖς δὲ λοιποῖς ἐν παραβολαῖς, ἵνα βλέποντες μὴ βλέπωσιν καὶ ἀκούοντες μὴ συνιῶσιν, "his disciples were asking him what this parable might be. He said, 'To you it has been granted to know the mysteries of God's kingdom, but to the rest in parables, so that *though they see they might not see and though they hear they might not understand.*'"

⁴¹⁵ Cf. Laurentin, *Jésus*, 107. Laurentin notes that the theme of incomprehension refers less to the parables than to the difficulty of understanding in advance the mystery of the death and resurrection of Jesus (cf. Luke 18:34; 24:25).

⁴¹⁶ Luke 18:32-33: παραδοθήσεται γὰρ τοῖς ἔθνεσιν καὶ ἐμπαιχθήσεται καὶ ὑβρισθήσεται καὶ ἐμπτυσθήσεται καὶ μαστιγώσαντες ἀποκτενοῦσιν αὐτόν, καὶ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ τρίτῃ ἀναστήσεται, "for [the Son of Man] will be handed over to the gentiles, and will be mocked, insulted and spat upon, and when they have scourged him they will kill him, but he will rise on the third day."

⁴¹⁷ Διὰ + genitive is understood here to indicate agency.

understanding to his disciples. Luke 24:45 resolves the incomprehension of the disciples and reveals the identity of Jesus. The disciples' incomprehension is resolved because the risen Jesus causes them to understand. The focus of understanding is given as "the Scriptures"; however, verse 44 confirms that it is specifically the Scriptures as they pertain to the identity of Jesus that the disciples are made to understand.

The three trajectories intersect at Luke 18:34. The first passion prediction apparently does not occasion miscomprehension on the disciples' part. However, it is preceded by Peter's confession (Luke 9:20; par. Mark 8:29; Matt 16:16), after which Jesus commands his disciples not to make his identity known (Luke 9:21; par. Mark 8:30; Matt 16:20). What follows, up to Luke 9:36, is primarily concerned with the identity of Jesus. Luke 9:36 contains a second command to silence, following the transfiguration (Luke 9:28-36; par. Mark 9:2-10; Matt 17:1-9). This second command to silence is not paralleled in the other Synoptics. Luke 9:43-45 (par. Mark 9:30-32; Matt 17:22-23) contains the second passion prediction. In Matthew, no remark is made about the disciples' incomprehension, presumably because their incomprehension had been resolved in Matt 16:12. Mark's theme of the disciples' inability to perceive the identity of Jesus is continued, however, in Mark 9:32: οἱ δὲ ἠγνόουν τὸ ῥῆμα, καὶ ἐφοβοῦντο αὐτὸν ἐπερωτῆσαι, "but [his disciples] did not understand the word and were afraid to ask him." The Lukan parallel is more elaborate, and closely connected with Luke 18:34. Again, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου μέλλει παραδίδοσθαι εἰς χεῖρας ἀνθρώπων, "the Son of Man is about to be given over into the hands of men," is a parabolic saying to which ῥῆμα in verse 45 refers.⁴¹⁸

Luke 18:34 belongs in all three trajectories, and all three are resolved in Luke 24:45. Συνίημι is used, alongside other verbs (ἄγνοέω, αἰσθάνομαι, γινώσκω), to refer to

⁴¹⁸ Importantly, as Laurentin notes (*Jésus*, 107), incomprehension is not culpable in Luke. As in the case of Mary's incomprehension in 2:41-52, incomprehension is seen in a positive light: see 2:51 and 9:45, where what Jesus says is beyond human understanding for the present, but is to be guarded and understood fully at a later date.

the perception of esoteric knowledge. There is an anthropological dualism between the disciples (called to understand) and outsiders (not called to understand). The fact that resolution comes when the risen Jesus opens the disciples' minds to understand connects Luke's use of *συνίημι* with Daniel: *συνίημι* is connected with revelation by a heavenly figure. As Daniel does not understand without the divine gift of insight, bestowed directly or through Gabriel's mediation, so the disciples only understand Jesus's identity when he grants them insight.

We need now to establish more firmly the heavenly identity of Jesus in Luke. In order to do this it is necessary to examine the Lukan transfiguration narrative.

6.1. The transfiguration

Luke's transfiguration narrative is placed in a context which concerns Jesus' identity.⁴¹⁹ Luke 9:18-22 records the first passion prediction. Luke 9:23-27 looks forward to the coming of the "Son of Man" (ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου) in "his glory and that of the Father and the holy angels" (ἐν τῇ δόξῃ αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τῶν ἁγίων ἀγγέλων). The transfiguration narrative follows in Luke 9:28-36, in which reference is made to the "glory" (δόξα) of the transfigured Jesus (pointing back to Luke 9:26)⁴²⁰ and to Jesus' "departure" (ἐξοδος), which points forward to his passion, death, resurrection, and (above all) ascension.⁴²¹ In Luke 9:36 we read that the disciples told no-one what they had seen during those days. This assumes that Luke 9:28-36 revealed the identity of Jesus, which

⁴¹⁹ For Conzelmann, the purpose of this passage is the announcement of the passion (*Theology*, 57; cf. page 196). Whilst this is certainly partly true within the context of the whole of Luke's narrative, the transfiguration itself, together with the predictions of the passion point towards the fundamental heavenly identity of Jesus. There is thus more than one layer to the significance of the account.

⁴²⁰ In the same way, G. H. Boobyer takes Mark 9:3 as a reference back to the prediction of the Parousia in Mark 8:38 (*St. Mark and the Transfiguration Story* [Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1942], 67). On this basis, Boobyer understands the transfiguration in Mark as "vision given beforehand of Jesus as he will be at the second advent" (*St. Mark*, 69; cf. pp. 64-69).

⁴²¹ Cf. Luke 9:51. A. M. Ramsey, *The Glory of God and the Transfiguration of Christ* (London: Longman, Green, and Co., 1949), 123; Conzelmann, *Theology*, 59; E. Franklin, "The Ascension and the Eschatology of Luke-Acts," *SJT* 23 (1970): 193; John Nolland, *Luke 9:21-18:34* (WBC 35B; Dallas, Tex.: Word Books, 1993), 500; A. W. Zwiep, *The Ascension of the Messiah in Lukan Christology* (NovTSup 87; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 16, 85-86. On the Markan transfiguration narrative as pointing towards the resurrection, see Marcus, *Mystery*, 52 and n. 134.

was not to be made known “during those days” (ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις). During the account of the healing which follows (Luke 9:37-43), Jesus exclaims ὦ γενεὰ ἄπιστος καὶ διεστραμμένη, ἕως πότε ἔσομαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς καὶ ἀνέξομαι ὑμῶν; “O faithless and perverted generation! How long shall I be with you and endure you?” This points towards a time when Jesus will have endured enough of this generation and will be taken away.⁴²² The pericope which follows (Luke 9:43-45) is the second passion prediction, which culminates in a statement about the disciples’ incomprehension. Around the transfiguration, therefore, there is a cluster of texts relating to Jesus’ identity, suggesting that the transfiguration itself holds the key to the identity of Jesus. In addition, on several levels this identity remains hidden. This is explicit in Luke 9:36, 45 but implicit in the fact that Jesus must be transformed in order for his true identity to become known.

Before examining the transfiguration, a parallel must be drawn to the idea of Jesus’ identity being hidden or misunderstood in connection with transformation. Such a parallel is found in the Ascension of Isaiah.

6.1.1. The Ascension of Isaiah

The Ascension of Isaiah is a post-apostolic⁴²³ Christian apocalypse which draws upon earlier Jewish extra-canonical traditions about Isaiah. A Syrian provenance for this work and a date of ca. 120 C.E. have been offered by Jonathan Knight,⁴²⁴ who notes its dependence on NT texts⁴²⁵ and stresses its importance for the study of the history of the NT period and the formation of Christian doctrine.⁴²⁶ On this point we enthusiastically concur: the Ascension of Isaiah at least bears witnesses to concepts which developed in parallel with those found in NT texts. The Ascension of Isaiah is of particular importance

⁴²² Compare 3 En. 4:3, in which Enoch is taken up to heaven during the evil generation of the flood (cf. 3 En. 6:3). See further §6.1.5.1.1 below.

⁴²³ See *Ascen. Isa.* 3:21.

⁴²⁴ Jonathan Knight, *Disciples of the Beloved One: The Christology, Social Setting and Theological Context of the Ascension of Isaiah* (JSPSup 18; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996), 39.

⁴²⁵ Knight, *Disciples*, 11-12.

⁴²⁶ Knight, *Disciples*, 13.

for the study of early christologies. The figure who becomes incarnate as Jesus dwells in the seventh heaven in this text and bears the name "Beloved One." Knight comments that

The Beloved One in the *Ascension of Isaiah* is a divine being who appears on earth as Jesus (3.13-18; 11.2-22). The work's Christology rests on the belief that Jesus is the temporary epiphany of the heavenly mediator in this way. The hidden descent is thus made a key theme in the apocalypse. This represents a development of the earlier christological tradition.⁴²⁷

This links in with two aspects of our discussion so far: the heavenly identity of Jesus and the hiddenness of his identity.

In *Ascen. Isa.* 3:13 we read that Beliar was angry with Isaiah for making known the transformation, descent, and incarnation of the Beloved:

For Beliar was in great wrath against Isaiah by reason of the vision, and because of the exposure wherewith he had exposed Sammael, and because through him the going forth of the Beloved from the seventh heaven had been made known, and His transformation and His descent and the likeness into which He should be transformed (that is) the likeness of man, and the persecution wherewith He should be persecuted, and the tortures wherewith the children of Israel should torture Him, and the coming of His twelve disciples, and the teaching, and that He should before the Sabbath be crucified together with wicked men, and that He should be buried in the sepulchre.⁴²⁸

The identity of the beloved is hidden and must be revealed through the mediation of the prophet Isaiah. Moreover, the beloved is pre-existent and dwells in the seventh heaven. This text refers not only to the incarnation, but to the passion and death of the beloved, thus paralleling to some extent the "passion secret" of Luke. Furthermore, the term used for "transformation" in the Greek is μεταμόρφωσις, and the verb "to be transformed" is μεταμορφόομαι. Μεταμορφόομαι is used with reference to the transfiguration of Jesus in Mark 9:2; Matt 17:2, though not in Luke.

In *Ascen. Isa.* 9:14, those who crucify Jesus do not know who he is:

And the god of that world will stretch forth his hand against the Son, and they will crucify Him on a tree, and will slay Him not knowing who He is.⁴²⁹

⁴²⁷ Knight, *Disciples*, 15 n. 14.

⁴²⁸ Translation: Robert H. Charles, *The Ascension of Isaiah* (London: A & C Black, 1900), 18-19.

⁴²⁹ Charles, *Ascension of Isaiah*, 62; cf. *Ascen. Isa.* 11:19; Luke 23:34; 1 Cor 2:8.

Similarly, *Ascen. Isa.* 9:15 tells us that:

His descent, as you will see, will be hidden even from the heavens, so that it will not be known who He is.⁴³⁰

During his descent, the beloved is to be transformed into the glory of those who are in each of the heavens. This means gradually assuming a lesser glory.⁴³¹ Those angels who have denied God will not know

... that Thou [viz. the Beloved] art Lord with Me of the seven heavens and of their angels. And they shall not know that Thou art with Me, till with a loud voice I have called (to) the heavens, and their angels and their lights, (even) unto the sixth heaven, in order that Thou mayest judge and destroy the princes and angels and gods of that world, and the world that is dominated by them.⁴³²

During his descent, the beloved's identity is intentionally concealed when he gives the password to the gatekeepers of the third heaven (*Ascen. Isa.* 10:24):

And those who kept the gate of the (third) heaven demanded the password, and the Lord gave (it) to them in order that He should not be recognized. And when they saw Him, they did not praise or laud Him; for His form was like unto their form.

In *Ascen. Isa.* 11:14, the inhabitants of Bethlehem are unaware of the heavenly origin of Mary's child:

And they were all blinded respecting Him and they all knew regarding Him, though they knew not whence He was.⁴³³

Finally, in *Ascen. Isa.* 11:17 the beloved conceals his heavenly identity by behaving like a human child. This passage, like *Ascen. Isa.* 9:13,⁴³⁴ betrays a deeply docetic outlook:

And I saw: In Nazareth He sucked the breast as a babe as is customary in order that He might not be recognised.

⁴³⁰ Charles, *Ascension of Isaiah*, 62.

⁴³¹ In surveying ancient speculation on the enumeration of the heavens (W. R. Morfill and R. H. Charles, *The Book of the Secrets of Enoch* [Oxford: Clarendon, 1896], xxx-xlvii), R. H. Charles notes that in the *Ascension of Isaiah* "the inhabitants of one heaven differ from those of another merely in possessing greater degrees of glory and knowledge" (Morfill and Charles, *Secrets*, xlii).

⁴³² *Ascen. Isa.* 10:11-12. Charles, *Ascension of Isaiah*, 70-71.

⁴³³ Charles, *Ascension of Isaiah*, 77. Cf. Luke 2:50.

⁴³⁴ Cf. *Ascen. Isa.* 11:1, 19 (Lat2; cf. Slav): "Et vidi similem filii hominis, et cum hominibus habitare et in mundo. Et non cognoverunt eum" (Charles, *Ascension of Isaiah*, 133, 135).

The Ascension of Isaiah illuminates our discussion on a number of levels. First, understanding is linked with recognising the true identity of Christ and must be revealed by a mediatorial figure. The identity of Christ is a mystery which must be disclosed. The *angelus interpres* commands Isaiah to “understand” in *Ascen. Isa.* 11:1, 22. Second, when the beloved descends he is transformed, which recalls the synoptic transfiguration narratives. Third, the beloved is a heavenly figure. These last two points lead to two related lines of enquiry: Jewish texts relating to transformation and texts bearing witness to Jewish divine agency speculation.

6.1.2. Transformation

In his study of angelomorphic traditions in Luke-Acts Fletcher-Louis examines the Lukan transfiguration narrative in the context of Jewish traditions relating to the transformation of an individual, traditions which have been examined in detail in a fundamental article by Morray-Jones.⁴³⁵ Fletcher-Louis’ observations should be noted here; Morray-Jones’s observations will be dealt with in due course.

Fletcher-Louis takes Luke 5:1-11; 9:28-36 as indicative of an angelomorphic view of the earthly Christ.⁴³⁶ In Luke 5:8-10, which is not to be read as a misplaced resurrection account,⁴³⁷ Jesus is presented as more than human (i.e., epiphanic or divine). Peter’s wonder and posture at Jesus’ knees is appropriate before a divinity⁴³⁸ and $\mu\eta\ \phi\omicron\beta\omicron\upsilon$ is elsewhere used by God or his agents when encountered by mortals.⁴³⁹ Peter’s

⁴³⁵ Morray-Jones, “Transformational Mysticism.” See below, §6.1.4.

⁴³⁶ Fletcher-Louis, *Luke-Acts*, 34.

⁴³⁷ Cf. John 21. Fletcher-Louis, *Luke-Acts*, 36.

⁴³⁸ In response to this Darren Bock rightly questions whether it is possible to distinguish between ontology and authority derived from God: does Peter’s posture reflect Jesus’ anthropomorphic identity or Peter’s recognition that he is in the presence of a representative of God (Jesus), whose divinely bestowed insight from the Father enabled him to perform the miracle (review of C. H. T. Fletcher-Louis, *Luke-Acts: Angels, Christology and Soteriology*, *BSac* 155 (1998): 245-246)? Bock’s question could be illustrated with reference to 1 Kgs 17:18, where the widow of Zarephath recognises Elijah’s superiority as a representative of God. Fletcher-Louis wrongly cites this passage in a list of texts illustrating fear and trembling in the presence of a divine being (*Luke-Acts*, 36 n. 14). Elijah is not a divine being.

⁴³⁹ Fletcher-Louis, *Luke-Acts*, 34-35.

confession of unworthiness is commensurate with fear and trembling characteristic of humans in the presence of a divine being.⁴⁴⁰

There are numerous points of contact between Luke 9:28-36 and Jewish apocalyptic texts. The language of light, whiteness, and iridescence is widely used in apocalyptic descriptions of heavenly realities.⁴⁴¹ Luke is familiar with -ασράπτων language for heavenly beings,⁴⁴² terminology which is connected in Luke 17:24 with the Son of Man.⁴⁴³ Λευκός, used in 9:29 of Jesus' garment, is used in descriptions of angels and heavenly beings in the NT.⁴⁴⁴ The change in Jesus' face recalls *1 En.* 38:4; *4 Ezra* 7:97. There are specific connections with traditions about Enoch and Moses. In Slavonic Enoch we find, first, a patriarch taken up to heaven, transformed, returned to earth, and finally assumed into heaven. This recalls Jesus' ascent of the mountain, transfiguration, journey to Jerusalem, and ultimate ascension.⁴⁴⁵ Second, in *2 En.* 36 God refers to Enoch's future life on earth and subsequent ascension, recalling Jesus' discussion of his ἔξοδος with Moses and Elijah.⁴⁴⁶ The close relationship between the later Enoch-Metatron tradition and the Enochic Son of Man of the Similitudes of Enoch (esp. *1 En.* 71) suggests that the transfiguration is a manifestation of Jesus' identity as the Son of Man, particularly given the proximity of Luke 9:23-27.

Fletcher-Louis's observations must be taken a step further, since they bear directly on the issue of the revelation of heavenly insight in Luke and the other synoptics. This is because Fletcher-Louis connects the Lukan transfiguration with Jewish traditions about Enoch, who was himself understood as mediator figure and a figure of great wisdom. If it

⁴⁴⁰ Fletcher-Louis, *Luke-Acts*, 36-37. See Judg 6:22; 13:22; Isa 6:5; Job 42:5-6.

⁴⁴¹ Fletcher-Louis, *Luke-Acts*, 40.

⁴⁴² Fletcher-Louis, *Luke-Acts*, 40. See Luke 10:18; 24:4; Acts 9:3. Cf. Ezek 1:4, 7; Dan 10:6 (OG and Θ); *1 En.* 14:8, 11, 17 (Gk). See also §6.1.3.1 below.

⁴⁴³ Cf. Fletcher-Louis, *Luke-Acts*, 46.

⁴⁴⁴ Mark 16:5; Acts 1:10; Rev 1:14; 6:11.

⁴⁴⁵ Cf. Fletcher-Louis, *Luke-Acts*, 44-45.

⁴⁴⁶ Fletcher-Louis, *Luke-Acts*, 45. See Luke 9:31.

can be shown that a parallel exists between the transfiguration and Jewish traditions about heavenly mediators on the level of language and imagery, a further parallel may be demonstrated between the mediatorial function of Jesus and the function of exalted mediatorial figures in Jewish speculation.

We must now examine the intertextual resonances of the language and imagery of the Lukan transfiguration narrative. Then the phenomenon of transformational mysticism must be outlined before the figure of Enoch is examined directly in the context of Jewish divine agency speculation.

6.1.3. Intertextual resonances in Luke's transfiguration narrative

The language used by Luke in his account of the transfiguration recalls a number of texts, in particular passages from the Greek Scriptures. The clearest verbal examples are: *ἐξαστράπτω*, *δόξα*, *νεφέλη*, and *φοβέομαι*.

6.1.3.1. *ἐξαστράπτω*

The verb *ἐξαστράπτω*, meaning "flash or gleam like lightning,"⁴⁴⁷ only occurs in Luke 9:29 in the NT, where it is used to describe the appearance of Jesus' clothes as he is transformed.⁴⁴⁸ There are four occurrences in the LXX (Nah 3:3; Ezek 1:4, 7; Dan 10:6), three of which are directly relevant.

In Ezek 1:4, Ezekiel describes "a great cloud with light all around it and fire flashing like lightning" (*νεφέλη μεγάλη ... καὶ φέγγος κύκλῳ αὐτοῦ καὶ πῦρ ἐξαστράπτον*).⁴⁴⁹ In Ezek 1:7, in Ezekiel's description of the four living creatures, there is a reference to "sparks like gleaming bronze" (*σπινθήρες ὡς ἐξαστράπτων χαλκός*). This clearly influenced the description of the *angelus*

⁴⁴⁷ BAG 273.

⁴⁴⁸ In the Matthean version (Matt 17:2) Jesus' garments become "white as the light" (*λευκὰ ὡς τὸ φῶς*) and in the Markan version (Mark 9:3) they were "shining exceedingly white" (*στίλβοντα λευκὰ λίαν*). On the motif of radiant clothing in reference to God, angels, and Christ see Mach, *Entwicklungsstadien*, 58-59. Cf. Fletcher-Louis, *Luke-Acts*, 40.

⁴⁴⁹ Cf. *T. Ab.* 12:4 (rec. A).

*interpre*s in Dan 10,⁴⁵⁰ and is part of a passage in Ezekiel which, according to Rowland, strongly influenced the development of an “exalted angel” tradition in Judaism.⁴⁵¹ In Dan 10:6 the feet of the angel are like gleaming bronze (οἱ πόδες αὐτοῦ ὥσεὶ χαλκεὸς ἐξαστράπτων). There seems to be a trajectory from Ezek 1:7 through Dan 10:6 to Luke 9:29,⁴⁵² indicating that Luke is offering an angelomorphic presentation of Jesus. The verb ἐξαστράπτω is etymologically linked with the noun ἀστραπή, “lightning,” and the verb ἀστράπτω, “flash, gleam.”⁴⁵³ The verb ἀστράπτω occurs twice in the NT, both times in Luke. The first is Luke 17:24, where Jesus says “as lightning flashes and lights up heaven from one end to the other, so will the Son of Man be” (ὥσπερ γὰρ ἡ ἀστραπή ἀστράπτουσα ἐκ τῆς ὑπὸ τὸν οὐρανὸν εἰς τὴν ὑπ’ οὐρανὸν λάμπει, οὕτως ἔσται ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου), thus comparing the Son of Man with lightning. The second is Luke 24:4 in the account of the empty tomb: “two men appeared to them in flashing garments” (ἄνδρες δύο ἐπέστησαν αὐταῖς ἐν ἐσθήτι ἀστραπτύσει). In the parallel in Matt 28:3, the appearance of the Angel of the Lord is described as “like lightning” (ὡς ἀστραπή)⁴⁵⁴ and his garment is “white like snow” (λευκὸν ὡς χιών), recalling the whiteness of Jesus’ garments in Matt 17:2; Mark 9:3; Luke 9:29. The noun ἀστραπή is found in Ezekiel’s first *merkabah* vision and Daniel’s vision of the revealing angel. In Ezek 1:13 lightning goes out from the fire in the midst of the four living creatures (ἐκ τοῦ πυρὸς ἐξεπορεύετο ἀστραπή) and in Dan 10:6 (OG and Θ) the angel’s face is “like a vision of lightning” (ὥσεὶ ὄρασις ἀστραπῆς). Further illustrations may be drawn from the book of Revelation. The links between Ezek 1 and Rev 4 have long been recognised.⁴⁵⁵ Flashes of lightning go out from the

⁴⁵⁰ Cf. Rowland, *Open Heaven*, 98-100; “A Man Clothed In Linen: Daniel 10:6ff. and Jewish Angelology,” *JSNT* 24 (1985): 100; Mach, *Entwicklungsstadien*, 58.

⁴⁵¹ Rowland, *Open Heaven*, 94-113.

⁴⁵² Gilles Quispel notes the similarities between Ezekiel’s first *merkabah* vision and Luke’s account of Paul’s Damascus road vision, but comments that “nowhere else in his Gospel or Acts does Luke show any familiarity with the vision of Ezekiel” (“Ezekiel 1:26,” 8). While the link between Luke 9:28-36 and Ezekiel’s vision may be indirect, via Dan 10, we cannot be certain that Luke himself was unfamiliar with the book of Ezekiel. For example, the resemblances between Ezekiel’s vision and Acts 26:12-18 are very close: cf. Haenchen, *Acts*, 686; Johannes Munck, *Paul and the Salvation of Mankind* (trans. F. Clarke; London: SCM, 1959), 27-28 n. 5. In addition to the resemblances cited by Quispel, surely the participle ἐξαιρούμενός (from ἐξαιρέω, “remove”) in Acts 26:17 is intended to recall through wordplay the verb ἐξῆρπέν (from ἐξάίρω, “lift up”) in Ezek 2:2 (LXX).

⁴⁵³ BAG 118.

⁴⁵⁴ Cf. *Jos. Asen.* 14:9.

⁴⁵⁵ E. g., Rowland, “Visions,” 145-150; *Open Heaven*, 59-60.

celestial throne in Rev 4:5 (ἐκ τοῦ θρόνου ἐκπορεύονται ἀστραπαί). In Rev 11:19, there are flashes of lightning when John sees the ark of the covenant revealed in God's heavenly temple.⁴⁵⁶ In Rev 8:5; 16:18 lightning seems to be associated with judgement, recalling the link between lightning and the Son of Man in Matt 24:27; Luke 17:24. These references in Revelation recall the use of ἀστραπή in the Greek of *I En.* 14:11, 17 and διαστραπή in *I En.* 14:8.

What unites these texts is speculation on heavenly realities, with which lightning is associated. Exod 20:18 should be noted, since the Sinai theophany, which is accompanied by thunder, lightning, and the fear-motif, is fundamentally a revelatory experience. So also is the transfiguration, which is replete with imagery drawn from Exodus. The image of Jesus' clothes flashing like lightning suggests he has entered the presence of the divine and points towards his heavenly identity.

6.1.3.2. δόξα⁴⁵⁷

The noun δόξα, "glory" is common in both the NT and the LXX. A δόξα body, which is what is referred to here, "was the sort of body generally supposed to belong to heavenly beings, both by later Judaism and the New Testament."⁴⁵⁸ Δόξα will only be examined here in relation to the concept of the "glory of the Lord."⁴⁵⁹ Δόξα appears twice in Luke's transfiguration narrative. In Luke 9:31 we read that Moses and Elijah appeared in glory (οἱ ὀφθέντες ἐν δόξῃ) and in Luke 9:32 Peter and his companions see the glory of Jesus (εἶδον τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ). In both verses δόξα refers to the heavenly glory of

⁴⁵⁶ We read in Rev 11:19 that "the ark of his covenant *appeared* in his temple" (ᾤφθη ἡ κιβωτὸς τῆς διαθήκης αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ ναῷ αὐτοῦ). Mach notes several occurrences of נִפְּלָה Niphal/ᾤφθη in theophanies and angelophanies in the OT (*Entwicklungsstadien*, 57). The presence of ᾤφθη in Matt 17:3 (par. Mark 9:4) should therefore not be ignored.

⁴⁵⁷ On Paul's Christology of glory, see part three, §2.4.

⁴⁵⁸ Boobyer, *St. Mark*, 23. Cf. Rev 18:1; 21:23.

⁴⁵⁹ For this and comparable phrases, see Exod 16:7, 10; 24:16, 17; 29:43; 33:18-23; 40:34, 35; Lev 9:6, 23; Num 12:8 (LXX); 14:10, 21; 16:19; 17:7; 20:6; Deut 5:24; 1 Kgs 8:11 (par. 2 Chr 5:14); Isa 6:3; 35:2; 40:5; 58:8; 60:1; Ezek 1:28; 3:12, 23; 8:4; 9:3; 10:4 (2t), 18, 19; 11:22, 23; 43:2, 4, 5; 44:4; Hab 2:14; Ps 16:15 (LXX); 19:2; 26:8; 29:3; 104:31; 138:5; Prov 25:2; 2 Chr 7:1, 2, 3; Luke 2:9; Acts 7:55; Rev 21:23. Cf. *I En.* 14:20, 21; 25:3, 7; 47:3; 102:3; *T. Levi* 3:4; *Ascen. Isa.* 11:32. The phrase "the power" (נִסְיָאָה/ἡ δύναμις) is comparable: Mark 14:62 (par. Matt 26:64; Luke 22:69; cf. Acts 7:55-56). Cf. *Let. Aris.* 132, 157. On these and related terms, see Morray-Jones, "Transformational Mysticism," 2-5.

transformed humans: Moses, Elijah, and Jesus. Δόξα also occurs in Luke 24:26, linking the post-resurrection glory of Jesus with his glory at his transfiguration.⁴⁶⁰ Importantly, δόξα does not occur in either Matt 17:1-9 or Mark 9:2-10,⁴⁶¹ suggesting that by using this term Luke has a particular point to make.

Two points should be made. First, Moses, Elijah, and Jesus all appear in glory because they are in the presence of God. Second, they have been transformed into a bodily form more closely resembling the visible manifestation of God, the *קַבְוֹד־יְהוָה*.⁴⁶² Michael Ramsey asserts that “there seems to be good evidence that the early church thought of Jesus as Himself the manifestation of the Glory of God.”⁴⁶³ Fletcher-Louis reads the transfiguration as evidence of an angelophanic christology in Luke,⁴⁶⁴ though I suspect the truth is more complex. What angels and exalted humans such as Moses, Elijah, and Jesus have in common is that they are all conformed to some degree to the likeness of the glory of YHWH. This is connected with Paul’s concept of transformation (2 Cor 3:18), in which humans are gradually transformed from one degree of glory into another as they more closely approximate the glory of the Lord.⁴⁶⁵ The underlying notion is that the glory of YHWH is fundamentally anthropomorphic.⁴⁶⁶ Thus whilst the Lukan Jesus does, as Fletcher-Louis argues, have much in common with Jewish portrayals of angels, in fact both Jesus and angels are heavenly figures which conform to the glory of God to a greater or lesser degree. In turn, portrayals of God’s glory are essentially of a glorified anthropoid figure. As the Ascension of Isaiah shows, there is in early Judaism the idea that between God and humans there are various gradations of glory,⁴⁶⁷ but the underlying notion is anthropomorphic.⁴⁶⁸

⁴⁶⁰ Cf. Fletcher-Louis, *Luke-Acts*, 8 n. 37.

⁴⁶¹ Cf. Boobyer, *St. Mark*, 65.

⁴⁶² On the *קַבְוֹד־יְהוָה* as the visible manifestation of God, see: Morray-Jones, “Merkabah Mysticism,” 110.

⁴⁶³ Ramsey, *Glory of God*, 150.

⁴⁶⁴ Fletcher-Louis, “Angelomorphic Categories,” 183-184.

⁴⁶⁵ Cf. Morray-Jones, “Merkabah Mysticism,” 113; Carey C. Newman, *Paul’s Glory-Christology: Tradition and Rhetoric* (NovTSup 49; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 210-211. On 2 Cor 3:18 in particular, see Newman, *Paul’s Glory-Christology*, 227-228.

⁴⁶⁶ Cf. Ezek. Trag. 70.

⁴⁶⁷ Cf. the resurrection transformation of the righteous through the various gradations of angelic glory in 2 Bar. 51:1-3, 5, 10, 12 (cf. 51:16).

This idea is already present in the book of Exodus. In Exod 33:18, Moses says to the YHWH, “show me your glory.”⁴⁶⁹ In Exod 33:20 (MT) YHWH replies: “you are not able to see my face, for no human sees me and lives”: **לֹא תוּכַל לִרְאוֹת אֶת-פָּנַי כִּי לֹא יִרְאֶנִּי הָאָדָם וְחָי**. It is implied that the glory of YHWH is potentially visible, even if, as in Ezek 1:26-28, it is sometimes only visible to a prophet in ecstasy⁴⁷⁰ rather than to the general populace. This is confirmed in verses 22-23 by references to YHWH’s hands (**יָדַי**), back (**אֶחָד**), and face (**פָּנַי**). Although it would be difficult to convincingly distinguish between YHWH himself and the glory of YHWH here, the imagery is unequivocally anthropomorphic.⁴⁷¹ This holds true also of Ezek 1:26-28, in which Ezekiel’s vision of an enthroned anthropomorphic figure is dubbed “the vision of the likeness of the glory of YHWH.”⁴⁷² Gilles Quispel affirms that the glory of YHWH, the visible manifestation of the invisible God, is anthropomorphic, remarking that “[e]verywhere in the Old Testament the *kabod* has the distinctive features of a human form, though of divine majesty.”⁴⁷³

Luke refers to the glory of the Son of Man, which relates to these texts. Luke 9:26 occurs in close proximity to the transfiguration, and refers to “when [the Son of Man] comes in his glory and that of his father and the holy angels” (**ὅταν ἔλθῃ ἐν τῇ δόξῃ αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τῶν ἁγίων ἀγγέλων**). **Δόξα** here relates to God himself, the heavenly Son of Man, and the holy angels, all of whom are heavenly figures. This applies to Luke 21:27 also. In Luke 24:26 Jesus says to two disciples on the road to Emmaus “was it not necessary for the Messiah to suffer these things and

⁴⁶⁸ For a thorough investigation of anthropomorphic presentations of the archangelic hypostasis of the invisible God, with reference to Greek, Jewish, gnostic, and Christian texts from the NT onwards, see Gedaliahu G. Stroumsa, “Form(s) of God: Some Notes on Metatron and Christ,” *HTR* 76 (1983): 269-288. Stroumsa concludes that Christians and gnostics adopted and transformed Jewish speculation about the cosmic size of the archangelic hypostatic form of God (“Form(s),” 287-288). Importantly, Stroumsa suggests that Phil 2:6-11 and Col 1:15-20 reflect Jewish *Shiur Komah* speculation, Christ being associated with the macrocosmic form of the invisible God (“Form(s),” 282-284). Speculation about both Metatron and Christ is associated with this; it seems clear that notions about transformation and glorification belong in the same sphere of speculation.

⁴⁶⁹ MT: **וְיָרְאֶנִּי אֶת-כְּבוֹדְךָ**; LXX: **δείξόν μοι τὴν σεαυτοῦ δόξαν**.

⁴⁷⁰ Quispel, “Ezekiel 1:26,” 1. See also Isa 40:5.

⁴⁷¹ Morray-Jones, “Transformational Mysticism,” 3 n. 12.

⁴⁷² MT: **וְרָאָה דְּמִוְתָּא כְּבוֹדֵי יְהוָה**; LXX: **ἡ ὄρασις ὁμοιώματος δόξης κυρίου**. Cf. *Apoc. Ab.* 10:4.

⁴⁷³ Quispel, “Ezekiel 1:26,” 2. Quispel develops this idea in connection with Phil 2:6-11, suggesting that in describing Christ as “in the form of God” (**ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ**) the hymn is dependent on Ezekiel’s vision and assumes that God’s image in man is to be found “in the outward bodily appearance of the human male” (“Ezekiel 1:26,” 8-9). See also Col 2:9 (Quispel, “Ezekiel 1:26,” 11).

enter into his glory?" (οὐχὶ ταῦτα ἔδει παθεῖν τὸν χριστὸν καὶ εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ)
 Here, Jesus' post-resurrection heavenly identity is meant. Post-resurrection glory will also be received by Daniel in Dan 12:13 (OG), though in that passage Daniel's resurrection is an eschatological event.⁴⁷⁴ In Acts 7:55 there is a clear distinction between the glory of God and Jesus, who is standing at the right hand of God in Stephen's vision, but δόξα is still understood to refer to heavenly realities. Although Isa 52:14 (LXX) refers to the δόξα of the Lord's servant, it does not seem to refer to heavenly glory and seems not to be directly connected with Luke-Acts.

On the basis of the LXX and the NT δόξα, as well as ἐξαστράπτω, points towards heavenly realities, reinforcing the probability that the Lukan transfiguration account is intended to point towards the heavenly identity of Jesus.

6.1.3.3. νεφέλη

The Greek noun νεφέλη, "cloud" occurs in all three transfiguration narratives (Matt 17:5; Mark 9:7; Luke 9:34, 35). Usages of νεφέλη in the NT fall into eight categories: (1) the coming of the Son of Man (Matt 24:30; 26:64; Mark 13:26; 14:62; Luke 21:27; Rev 1:7; 14:14);⁴⁷⁵ (2) the transfiguration (Matt 17:5; Mark 9:7; Luke 9:34, 35); (3) angels (Rev 10:1; 14:15-16); (4) the exodus (1 Cor 10:1-2); (5) the ascension (Acts 1:9); (6) the assumption of two prophets (Rev 11:12); (7) a meteorological phenomenon (Luke 12:54); (8) "waterless clouds" (νεφέλαι ἄνυδροι), referring to immoral people (Jude 12).

The references to the Son of Man, the transfiguration, angels, the ascension, and the assumption of the two prophets most clearly pertain to heavenly realities. This noun is invested in the NT with strong theological significance. 1 Cor 10:1-2 is most significant because, when read alongside Luke 9:28-36, we can see a strong connection with the closing verses of the book of Exodus. In Exod 40:34-38 (LXX), νεφέλη occurs six times (Exod 40:34, 35, 36, 37 [2t], 38). The cloud signifies the presence of the hidden God, as it does on the mount of transfiguration. The noun σκηνή, referring to

⁴⁷⁴ Cf. Isa 26:10 (LXX); Wis 10:14; 1QS IV, 6-8; 1QH^a IV, 15; CD III, 20; Raurell, "DOXA," 530-532.

⁴⁷⁵ Fletcher-Louis, *Luke-Acts*, 41-42.

the tent of meeting, also occurs six times (Exod 40:34 [2t], 35 [2t], 36, 38), and occurs again in Luke 9:33 (par. Matt 17:4; Mark 9:5), when Peter offers to make three tents. The noun δόξα occurs twice in the phrase “the glory of the Lord” (Exod 40:34, 35). The cloud and the glory of the Lord are inextricably linked. Finally, the verb ἐπισκιάζω occurs in Exod 40:35 in reference to the cloud overshadowing the tent of meeting, as the cloud overshadows Jesus, Moses, and Elijah in Luke 9:34 (par. Matt 17:5; Mark 9:7).⁴⁷⁶

A direct connection between the transfiguration and Exod 40 cannot be denied. The implication is that when Jesus, Moses, and Elijah enter the cloud they are entering the presence of God. For this reason they must be transformed into a form more closely approximating the glory of the Lord. For this reason also it is unlikely that the three disciples entered the cloud, but like Ezekiel in Ezek 1:28 they hear a voice speaking. This voice reveals an aspect of the identity of Jesus, his divine sonship (Luke 9:35; par. Matt 17:5; Mark 9:7): it is to be remembered that the presence of God is the place where authoritative revelations take place, a point thoroughly understood by the authors of the Second Temple apocalypses and the later *hekhalot* tracts.

The noun νεφέλη connects the transfiguration with the end of the book of Exodus. The cloud represents the presence of God, and those entering the presence of God must be transformed. The use of this noun in the transfiguration narrative both points to the presence of God and supports Luke’s presentation of the heavenly identity of Jesus.

6.1.3.4. φοβέομαι

The fear motif is common to all three transfiguration accounts. In Mark 9:6, Peter “did not know how he should answer, for they were terrified” (οὐ γὰρ ᾔδει τί ἀποκριθῇ, ἔκφοβοι γὰρ ἐγένοντο).⁴⁷⁷ The disciples’ fear is connected here with the transformation of Jesus and the appearance of Moses and Elijah. In Matthew their fear results from hearing the voice speak from the cloud (Matt 17:6). In Luke 9:34 their fear is connected

⁴⁷⁶ Cf. Ramsey, *Glory of God*, 39.

⁴⁷⁷ Cf. Mark 16:8.

with Jesus, Moses, and Elijah entering the cloud. Fear is a characteristic response of humans in the presence of heavenly figures in biblical and early Jewish literature. In his overview of terms and traditions common to angels and God,⁴⁷⁸ Mach notes that both theophanies and angelophanies contain this motif, the one who appears often opening his speech with “Fear not!”⁴⁷⁹ In the NT, this motif was transferred to christophanies,⁴⁸⁰ which belong, of course, to the same category. Mach notes that there is an ambivalence between God, angels, and Christ, as Judg 13:22 suggests; in light of this, it is significant that in Luke-Acts only angels (Luke 1:13, 30; 2:10; Acts 27:24) and Jesus himself (Luke 5:10; Acts 18:9) command people not to fear. This surely suggests that Jesus and angels share the same ontological state.

6.1.3.5. Summary

This survey of the intertextual resonances of the language and imagery of the Lukan transfiguration demonstrates that Luke’s intent, as Fletcher-Louis suggests, is to portray Jesus as a heavenly figure. The language of Luke’s transfiguration narrative is intended to remind readers and hearers of texts relating to the presence of God and the “glory of the Lord,” especially in Exodus, and to suggest the idea of decisive revelation. Luke’s use of ἐξαστράπτω recalls Ezekiel’s first *merkabah* vision and Daniel’s vision of the angel in Dan 10, as well as other biblical and pseudepigraphic texts dealing with heavenly realities. His use of δόξα relates ultimately to the idea of the “glory of the Lord,” and to the idea that angels and humans who draw near to the presence of God are more or less conformed to this visible manifestation of God. This is confirmed by νεφέλη, which recalls the cloud in Exodus which represents the presence of God. Entering the cloud means entering the presence of God, and drawing near to God’s presence necessitates

⁴⁷⁸ Mach, *Entwicklungsstadien*, 56-60.

⁴⁷⁹ Mach, *Entwicklungsstadien*, 57 (cf. n. 347 above). See the following: Gen 28:13 (LXX); Judg 6:23; Dan 10:19; Tob 12:16, 17; 2 Macc 3:24, 25; 3 Macc 6:18-20; 4 Ezra 6:33; 1 En. 15:1; 21:9; 60:3; Jos. Asen. 14:11; Matt 28:4, 5; Luke 1:13, 30; 2:9, 10; 24:5; Acts 10:4; 27:24; cf. Matt 1:20.

⁴⁸⁰ Mach, *Entwicklungsstadien*, 58. See the following: Matt 14:27 (par. Mark 6:50); 17:6; 28:10; Mark 9:6; Luke 5:9, 10; 9:34; 24:37; Acts 18:9; 22:9 (D E Ψ 1739); Rev 1:17.

transformation into a closer approximation of the anthropomorphic glory of God. Finally, φοβέομαι and the fear-motif generally are characteristic of theophanies, angelophanies, and christophanies in our literature. The fact that in Luke only Jesus and angels command people not to fear suggests that both share a common ontological state. In other words, the identity of both is heavenly.

In terms of our quest to understand the transmission of insight in early Judaism, this discussion is important because it helps us to comprehend the identity of the Lukan Jesus and his status as a heavenly figure who transmits insight. There is a connection in early Jewish literature between figures who are transformed and the mediation of heavenly mysteries. This brings us back to the question of transformation.

6.1.4. Transformation: Morray-Jones, "Transformational Mysticism in the Apocalyptic-Merkabah Tradition"

Although he does not discuss the transfiguration in his 1991 article,⁴⁸¹ Morray-Jones does explore the concept of the transformation of humans as they ascend to heaven. In relation to the ascent passages in the *hekhalot* tracts he comments that "of central importance is the transformation of the visionary himself into an angelic likeness of the divine, in which capacity he performs a mediatorial and atoning function."⁴⁸² This statement highlights the connection between transformation and mediation which is fundamental to the connection between transformation and the mediation of heavenly mysteries in the case of the Lukan Jesus. Morray-Jones argues that certain rabbis of the first two centuries C.E. tried to suppress an early tradition, perpetuated in esoteric circles, concerning the heavenly ascent of an exceptionally righteous human or humans who received the divine name and became associated or identified with the Angel of the Lord or the form of God as the enthroned Logos-Power-Glory.⁴⁸³ Since historical figures such

⁴⁸¹ But cf. Morray-Jones, "Merkabah Mysticism," 120.

⁴⁸² Morray-Jones, "Merkabah Mysticism," 28.

⁴⁸³ Morray-Jones, "Transformational Mysticism," 9-10, 14.

as Mani, Elchasai, and Simon Magus claimed such an identification, he suggests that a goal of the mystical endeavour was transformation into the likeness of God.⁴⁸⁴ That the vision of God entails the transformation of the visionary into an angelic or supra-angelic being is not uncommon in apocalyptic literature,⁴⁸⁵ such transformation being described in terms of robing, coronation, anointing, enthronement, and transformation into fire or light.⁴⁸⁶ In visionary-mystical circles, there existed the notion that exceptionally righteous humans could be transformed into the likeness of the glory of God just like heroes of heavenly-ascent narratives (Enoch,⁴⁸⁷ Christ,⁴⁸⁸ Moses⁴⁸⁹) and the righteous of the world to come.⁴⁹⁰ Those thus transformed perform a mediatorial function:⁴⁹¹ endowed with extraordinary insight and power, they intercede between the divine and human worlds, having been conformed to the glory of God and vested with the name of God.⁴⁹²

Of interest to us are the idea of transformation into the likeness of God, the specific terms in which such transformation is described, and the mediatorial function performed by the transformed individual. A prominent example explored by Morray-Jones is the transformation of Enoch.⁴⁹³ In Hebrew Enoch, the supra-angelic being Metatron is portrayed as the transformed and exalted patriarch Enoch. At his ascension, Enoch's body is vastly expanded (3 *En.* 9:2-3), he is enthroned (3 *En.* 10:1-2), clothed

⁴⁸⁴ Morray-Jones, "Transformational Mysticism," 15, 26.

⁴⁸⁵ See: 1 *En.* 71; 2 *En.* 22; *T. Levi* 8:1-10; *Ascen. Isa.* 9. Morray-Jones, "Transformational Mysticism," 22.

⁴⁸⁶ Morray-Jones, "Transformational Mysticism," 22-25.

⁴⁸⁷ Morray-Jones, "Transformational Mysticism," 8, 10-11. Texts connected with the ascension of Enoch include: *Gen* 5:21-24; *Jub.* 4:23; 1 *En.* 14:8-36:4; 70-71; 2 *En.* 1:12; 3:1-38:1; 55:2; 56:1; 57:1; 67:1-3; 68:1, 3, 5; 3 *En.* 4:3, 5, 7, 8; 6:1-3; 7-15; *Ascen. Isa.* 9:9; Josephus, *Ant.* 1.85.

⁴⁸⁸ Morray-Jones, "Transformational Mysticism," 11-12.

⁴⁸⁹ Morray-Jones, "Transformational Mysticism," 13-14. Cf. Ezek. Trag. 68-82; Philo, *Moses* 1.158; *Moses* 2.288. Contrast Josephus, *Ant.* 3.96; 4.326.

⁴⁹⁰ Morray-Jones, "Transformational Mysticism," 20; cf. pp. 24-27.

⁴⁹¹ Morray-Jones, "Transformational Mysticism," 20-22.

⁴⁹² Morray-Jones, "Transformational Mysticism," 26-27.

⁴⁹³ Morray-Jones, "Transformational Mysticism," 8, 10-11. Cf. Philip S. Alexander, "The Historical Setting of the Hebrew Book of Enoch," *JJS* 28 (1977): 160-161.

with a magnificent robe (3 *En.* 12:1-2), crowned (3 *En.* 12:3-5), endowed with the divine name (3 *En.* 12:5), and transformed into a fiery being (3 *En.* 15:1-2).⁴⁹⁴ Morray-Jones comments, "this seems to be a theologically sanitized version of a tradition according to which the ascending hero becomes identified with the *kabod*,"⁴⁹⁵ comparing this with the Pauline and Johannine identifications of Christ with the glory and with Heb 1:2-4,⁴⁹⁶ citing also traditions identifying the primordial Adam with the divine *קְבוֹד*.⁴⁹⁷ The motif of robing the ascended figure with a heavenly garment is fairly frequent in apocalyptic literature,⁴⁹⁸ with which Hebrew Enoch is to be associated.⁴⁹⁹

There are clearly points of contact with the Lukan transfiguration. First, the motif of Jesus' garments flashing like lightning recalls the robing of those ascending to the presence of God.⁵⁰⁰ Second, the appearance of Jesus, Moses, and Elijah *ἐν δόξῃ* suggests the glorification of those in or entering the presence of God: Moses and Elijah are already glorified in the presence of God, and in order for Jesus in human form to enter God's presence he, too, must assume a glorious body as to enter in human form would be far too dangerous. This hints at the notion of "dangerous sacrality," rooted in Israelite belief and developed considerably in both orthodox and heterodox quarters of later Judaism in connection with ascending (or descending) to behold the *merkabah*.⁵⁰¹ Jesus'

⁴⁹⁴ In 2 *En.* 22:8 Enoch is also anointed on his ascension: cf. Joseph P. Schultz, "Angelic Opposition to the Ascension of Moses and the Revelation of the Law," *JQR* 61 (1970-1971): 292.

⁴⁹⁵ Morray-Jones, "Transformational Mysticism," 11.

⁴⁹⁶ Cf. John 1:1; 7:39; 8:54; 17:5, 24; 2 Cor 4:4, 6; Col 1:15; 2:9 (cf. 1:19). Morray-Jones, "Transformational Mysticism," 11.

⁴⁹⁷ Morray-Jones, "Transformational Mysticism," 15-18.

⁴⁹⁸ Fletcher-Louis, *Luke-Acts*, 44-46. See: 2 *En.* 22:8-9; 3 *En.* 12:1-2; *Ascen. Isa.* 8:14-15; 9:9; *T. Levi* 8:4-5; Schultz, "Angelic Opposition," 291-292; Morray-Jones, "Transformational Mysticism," 12 n. 61. In 1 *En.* 62:15-16, *Apoc. Ab.* 13:14, and Rev 3:5 heavenly garments are associated with immortality (Schultz, "Angelic Opposition," 291). Radiant clothing is possessed by God (Ps 104:1-2; Dan 7:9) and angels (1 *En.* 71:1; 90:31; 2 *En.* 22:8, 10; *T. Levi* 8:2); Mach, *Entwicklungsstadien*, 58-59.

⁴⁹⁹ Cf. Morray-Jones, "Transformational Mysticism," 24.

⁵⁰⁰ Fletcher-Louis, *Luke-Acts*, 40.

⁵⁰¹ This dangerous qualities of the holy are reflected in the people's response to Moses in Exod 20:19 and especially in the demise of Uzzah and consequent reluctance of David to take the ark into his care in 2 Sam 6:6-11; David L. Petersen, *The Roles of Israel's Prophets* (JSOTSup 17; Sheffield: JSOT, 1981), 46. Compare Mircea Eliade's discussion of the taboo and the ambivalence of the sacred (*Patterns in Comparative Religion* [trans. R. Sheed; London: Sheed and Ward, 1958], 14-19). This idea may originate in the experience of "awefulness" before what Rudolf Otto terms *mysterium tremendum* (cf. *The Idea of the*

glorification here perhaps anticipates his future resurrection and ascension, but also reveals his present, previously hidden heavenly identity, which the disciples before the resurrection fail to understand. It is later traditions concerning the ascension of Isaiah and the glorification of Enoch which enable us to conclude this. It remains to make the connection conclusively between transformation and status as heavenly revealer. Again, Enoch traditions are helpful here, and it to these that we shall turn next, after placing these traditions in the context of Jewish divine agency speculation.

6.1.5. Divine agency speculation in ancient Judaism

Larry Hurtado suggests that, broadly speaking, there are three types of divine agency speculation in ancient Judaism: (1) interest in divine attributes and powers, such as Wisdom or Philo's Logos; (2) interest in exalted patriarchs, such as Moses and Enoch; (3) interest in principal angels, such as Michael, Yahoel,⁵⁰² and possibly the Melchizedek of 11QMelchizedek.⁵⁰³ These agents have two distinguishing features: (1) They are heavenly in origin or exalted to heavenly status, thus resembling the status attributed in the early church to the risen Jesus more closely than earthly mediatorial figures such as prophets, priests, kings, and Messiah(s); (2) They are described as representing God in a unique capacity, standing in a role second only to God himself. They are thus distinct from all other servants and agents of God.⁵⁰⁴

In an article written in response to Hurtado's book, Paul Rainbow questions the validity of treating personified divine attributes alongside exalted patriarchs and principal

Holy: An Inquiry into the Non-Rational Factor in the Idea of the Divine and its Relation to the Rational [trans. J. W. Harvey; 2d ed.; London: Oxford University Press, 1950], 13-19). Indeed, Otto refers to the "wrath of YHWH" in connection with this idea (*Idea*, 18-19). Cf. 2 Sam 6:7 (MT). Philip Alexander notes the theological problem created by the idea of heavenly ascent into the divine presence, and how it was dealt with in the Enochic corpus: "From Son of Adam to Second God: Transformations of the Biblical Enoch," in *Biblical Figures Outside the Bible* (ed. M. E. Stone and T. A. Bergren; Harrisburg, Pa.: Trinity Press International, 1998), 102-104, 106. He summarises the issue succinctly: "descent from heaven involved 'incarnation,' ascent from earth 'deification'" ("From Son of Adam," 103).

⁵⁰² The angel who is sent to Abraham in *Apoc. Ab.* 10:1-17.

⁵⁰³ Hurtado, *One God*, 17-18.

⁵⁰⁴ Hurtado, *One God*, 18.

angels. Rainbow cites 2 *En.* 22:6-10 as evidence for a blurring of the boundary between exalted patriarchs and principal angels,⁵⁰⁵ Enoch being transformed into the likeness of one of God's glorious ones (2 *En.* 22:10). He suggests that there was a line in the ancient Jewish mind between personified divine attributes and actual personal, created beings. Consequently there is no blurring of the boundary between personified divine attributes and created beings falling into Hurtado's categories (2) and (3), and the umbrella term "divine agency" is more confusing than illuminating.⁵⁰⁶

Philip Davis, similarly, criticises the breadth of the category "divine agency," advocating a more refined approach which takes account of the function of particular mediatorial figures rather than their status.⁵⁰⁷ Building on E. P. Sanders' emphasis on "patterns of religion" rather than individual motifs in the comparative study of religions,⁵⁰⁸ Davis proposes three patterns of mediation in ancient Judaism which invite comparison with aspects of early Christology, based on the specific time (past, present, or future) when the mediator acted or was expected to act: (1) The "legacy" pattern, in which the past work of an individual mediator, such as Abraham or David, remained in force for later generations;⁵⁰⁹ (2) The "intervention" pattern, in which a figure, usually an angel such as Gabriel or Raphael, enables interaction between God and living human beings;⁵¹⁰ (3) The "consummation" pattern, in which a figure such as Elijah or the Son of David in *Pss. Sol.* 17:21 is expected to play a mediatorial role in the future.⁵¹¹ For Davis, Paul, Matthew, Luke, and John each exhibit all three of these patterns in their presentation of Jesus.⁵¹² Mark exhibits the legacy and consummation patterns. The

⁵⁰⁵ Paul A. Rainbow, "Jewish Monotheism as the Matrix for New Testament Christology: A Review Article," *NovT* 33 (1991): 84.

⁵⁰⁶ Rainbow, "Jewish Monotheism," 84-85.

⁵⁰⁷ Davis, "Divine Agents," 481.

⁵⁰⁸ See E. P. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion* (London: SCM, 1977), 12-18.

⁵⁰⁹ Davis, "Divine Agents," 483-484.

⁵¹⁰ Davis, "Divine Agents," 484-486.

⁵¹¹ Davis, "Divine Agents," 486-487.

⁵¹² Davis, "Divine Agents," 488-489.

intervention pattern is less obvious, but is still present in, for example, Mark's use of the title "Son of Man"⁵¹³ (if the conclusions of the present study are correct, then the fact that Jesus is portrayed to some extent as a heavenly revealer acting on behalf of YHWH in Mark provides additional support for the intervention pattern in Mark). Within Judaism, a triple pattern of mediation is evidenced for Michael⁵¹⁴ and the Qumran angel of light⁵¹⁵ among angelic beings. Among exalted patriarchs, the significance of Moses as mediator is limited to the legacy pattern,⁵¹⁶ but all three patterns are evidenced in traditions about Enoch: his role as a channel of revelation belongs to the legacy pattern,⁵¹⁷ his mediatorial role after his exaltation belongs to the intervention pattern,⁵¹⁸ and his role in the eschatological judgement belongs to the consummation pattern. Davis concludes

In Enoch, then, we have a figure who is arguably the nearest analogue in Jewish literature to the Christ of the New Testament. In both cases, a triple pattern of mediation is ascribed to a particular human being. Indeed, to be more specific, we can say that each of these individuals is presented as a decisive revealer, making known to humanity all the requirements of righteousness and the coming eschatological events; each is said to have been removed from the world in miraculous freedom from death; each is taken to be in a position to intercede actively with God; and each is to have a decisive influence on the last day.⁵¹⁹

The traditions about Enoch thus require further exploration.

6.1.5.1. Enoch

In contrast to the paucity of material in the HB relating to Enoch,⁵²⁰ a remarkable series

⁵¹³ Davis, "Divine Agents," 489-490.

⁵¹⁴ Davis, "Divine Agents," 491-492.

⁵¹⁵ Davis, "Divine Agents," 492.

⁵¹⁶ Davis, "Divine Agents," 493-494. On Moses, see Hurtado, *One God*, 56-63.

⁵¹⁷ Davis, "Divine Agents," 495. The following texts purport to derive from Enoch: *1 En.* 1:2; 12:3; 72:1; 83:1; 91:1; 92:1; 106:1; 107:1; 4QEnGiants^a 8 4. In particular, *1 En.* 92:1 is a clear reference to the importance of what is transmitted by Enoch for later generations (cf. *1 En.* 1:2). Slavonic Enoch is largely written in the first person. *Jub.* 4:17-19 records that Enoch was the first to learn writing, knowledge, and wisdom, which he passed on to others. Compare *Sir* 44:16, where Enoch is a "sign of knowledge for each generation" (אֹת דַעַת לְדוֹר וָדוֹר).

⁵¹⁸ *1 En.* 12-16; cf. *Jub.* 4:22; 4QpsJub^c 2 1-6; *1 En.* 106:7-19.

⁵¹⁹ Davis, "Divine Agents," 496. Cf. *Jub.* 4:23; 10:17; *1 En.* 12:4; 15:1; 71:14; *2 En.* 50:1; 64:5.

⁵²⁰ *Gen* 5:18-19, 21-24.

of traditions relating to this figure developed in Second Temple Judaism and beyond. In particular, three large apocalyptic works, preserved in Ethiopic (with portions preserved in Aramaic and Greek), Slavonic, and Hebrew, in addition to fragments of a further work in Aramaic from Qumran (4QEnGiants), attest to these traditions.⁵²¹ In addition to being considered exceptionally righteous (cf. Gen 5:22, 24), Enoch came to be seen as a figure of extraordinary wisdom. In Ethiopic Enoch this wisdom concerns the secrets of heaven and future mysteries, and is disclosed to him through visions, dreams, and heavenly journeys, often through angelic mediation.⁵²² Enoch then transmits teaching to his son Methuselah at the command of the “seven holy ones” (*1 En.* 81:5).⁵²³ He is also a prophet (cf. Jude 14), preaching moral rectitude and warning of impending divine judgement.⁵²⁴ In certain traditions he has a priestly role.⁵²⁵ The Enoch of Ethiopic Enoch is developed further in Slavonic Enoch, in which the additional elements of his bodily ascension into heaven and transformation into angelic form appear.⁵²⁶ This tradition is developed radically in Hebrew Enoch, which deals with the transformation of Enoch into Metatron, and with the role of Metatron himself.⁵²⁷ In part, this reflects the (possible) transformation of Enoch into the heavenly Son of Man in *1 En.* 71:14.

While Enoch’s transformation is a significant point of comparison with the transfiguration and the heavenly identity of Jesus, his role as a recipient and transmitter of revealed wisdom is equally noteworthy. In a section devoted to angelic wisdom,⁵²⁸ Mach discusses Enoch’s possession of such insight, beginning with the reference in Pseudo-

⁵²¹ See also *Jub.* 4:15-26; Ps.-Eup.: Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* 9.17.8-9.

⁵²² Alexander, “From Son of Adam,” 88-89; cf. pp. 92-93, 94-96.

⁵²³ Alexander, “From Son of Adam,” 90.

⁵²⁴ Alexander, “From Son of Adam,” 91, 94. The combination of the sapiential and the prophetic in the figure of Enoch recalls the comparable combination of these aspects in the figure of Jesus.

⁵²⁵ *Jub.* 4:25; *3 En.* 15B. VanderKam, *Enoch*, 185-186; Alexander, “From Son of Adam,” 100, 105 and n. 24.

⁵²⁶ *2 En.* 22. Alexander, “From Son of Adam,” 102-103; below, §6.1.5.1.2.

⁵²⁷ Alexander, “From Son of Adam,” 104-107; below, §6.1.5.1.1.

⁵²⁸ “Der Weisheit der Engel”: Mach, *Entwicklungsstadien*, 133-142. Mach suggests that the biblical reference to the wisdom of the heavenly household became an attribute of angels and thus the foundation of the religious knowledge of those circles that developed angelology (*Entwicklungsstadien*, 133).

Eupolemus to the identification of Enoch with Atlas as founder of astrology (Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* 9.17.8-9) and Methuselah's receiving knowledge from angels and passing it on (*Praep. ev.* 9.17.9).⁵²⁹ However, it may only be inferred from Pseudo-Eupolemus that Enoch received his knowledge from an angelic source, Ethiopic Enoch providing more certain evidence for this idea.⁵³⁰ Enoch's relationship with the angels (perhaps implied by וַיְתֵּן ה' לְהֵנֹךְ אֶת-אֱלֹהִים in Gen 5:22, 24)⁵³¹ precedes and is the source of his special knowledge.⁵³² In Slavonic Enoch, it is more explicit that the wisdom of the angels has been bestowed.⁵³³ In Hebrew Enoch, Metatron is granted divine wisdom and understanding (3 *En.* 48C:4).⁵³⁴

The upshot of this is that at first, Enoch was a figure who, as a human, received and transmitted heavenly wisdom. Second, as an exalted patriarch, he himself possessed the heavenly wisdom consonant with his status. His heavenly identity was accompanied by the possession of extraordinary insight. This lays a basis for comparing this figure with Jesus further. Philip Alexander notes the importance of the Enochic tradition for early Christianity.⁵³⁵ Davis also explores the importance for early Christology of the Enoch tradition, particularly as attested in Sirach, Wisdom, *Jubilees*, 4QEnGiants, and Ethiopic Enoch.⁵³⁶ Importantly, he emphasises Enoch's role as a medium of revelation:⁵³⁷ his revelations are the necessary foundation of a righteous life and thus a key soteriological factor in the relevant literature, and Enoch himself is portrayed as the sole medium through which divine mysteries are transmitted to humans. Important though Davis's work is, by confining himself to material known to precede the advent of Christianity he

⁵²⁹ Mach, *Entwicklungsstadien*, 134.

⁵³⁰ Mach, *Entwicklungsstadien*, 135. Cf. 1 *En.* 106:7 (cf. 106:19).

⁵³¹ VanderKam, *Enoch*, 31; Alexander, "From Son of Adam," 92-93.

⁵³² Mach, *Entwicklungsstadien*, 135. E.g., 1 *En.* 1:2; 12:2; *Jub.* 4:21.

⁵³³ Mach, *Entwicklungsstadien*, 137. Enoch is granted wisdom not even bestowed upon angels: cf. 2 *En.* 24:3; 40:2-3.

⁵³⁴ Mach, *Entwicklungsstadien*, 138.

⁵³⁵ Alexander, "From Son of Adam," 101, 110, 114-115.

⁵³⁶ Philip G. Davis, "The Mythic Enoch: New Light on Early Christology," *SR* 13 (1984): 335-343.

⁵³⁷ Davis, "Mythic Enoch," 337-340, and in connection with Jesus, pp. 343.

excludes texts which, though of later date, utilise themes, motifs, and terminology attested at an earlier period and thus provide further material for comparison, within a strict methodological framework.⁵³⁸ Thus we should now proceed to a comparison of the Lukan Jesus with the Enoch of the Hebrew and Slavonic works which concern him.

6.1.5.1.1. *Hebrew Enoch*

Comparing Hebrew Enoch to any NT text is controversial because this text seems to date at least from the Amoraic period.⁵³⁹ The complexity of the textual tradition compounds the problem.⁵⁴⁰ This work records the ascent of Rabbi Ishmael to the seventh heavenly palace, where he receives revelations from Metatron. In *3 En.* 4:3 Metatron identifies himself to Rabbi Ishmael as Enoch, son of Jared. The tradition that when Enoch was assumed into heaven he became Metatron is found in *Tg. Ps.-J. Gen* 5:24: “Enoch worshipped in truth before the Lord, and behold he was not with the inhabitants of the earth because he was taken away and he ascended to the firmament at the command of the Lord, and he was called Metatron, the Great Scribe.”⁵⁴¹ It is in Hebrew Enoch, however, that we find the fullest exposition of the identification between Enoch and Metatron. Four issues may be isolated: the generation of the flood and the removal of the *shekhinah* (*3 En.* 4-7; 48C:1); the ascension of Enoch after the pattern of Elijah (*3 En.* 6:1); the transformation of Enoch and the glory of Metatron (*3 En.* 7-15; 48C:5-7); Enoch as one who knows and reveals mysteries (*3 En.* 8; 10:5; 11; 48C:4, 9; 48D).

3 En. 4-7 refers roughly to the time from Enosh to the ascent of Enoch. The *shekhinah* had dwelt in the garden of Eden from the time Adam was banished, but the period from Enosh to the flood was so evil that the *shekhinah* (*3 En.* 5:14) and Enoch shortly thereafter (*3 En.* 6:1) were assumed into heaven. Enoch is the only human to find

⁵³⁸ Davis admits the necessity of such research: “Mythic Enoch,” 342.

⁵³⁹ Cf. Fletcher-Louis, *Luke-Acts*, 156. Alexander dates the composition of the core of the work (*3 En.* 3-15) to between ca. 450 C.E. and ca. 850 C.E. (“Historical Setting,” 165).

⁵⁴⁰ Cf. Alexander, “Historical Setting,” 156-158.

⁵⁴¹ Michael J. Maher, *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan: Genesis* (ArBib 1B; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1992), 37.

favour with God. In *3 En.* 6:3, God says of Enoch וזה שנשילתי בחיר בעולם, “and the one whom I have raised up is [my?] chosen in the world.” The use of בחיר recalls Isa 42:1. Enoch is God’s only reward from his world under heaven. In *3 En.* 16:1, Metatron is the enthroned judge of the heavenly potentates, recalling the Son of Man in the Similitudes of Enoch, who is a heavenly judge and possibly identified in *1 En.* 71:14 with Enoch himself. In the Synoptics, the generation of Noah is connected with the coming of the Son of Man (Matt 24:37-38; par. Luke 17:26-27). The evil people who lived before the flood came under judgement, just as the evil generation about whom Jesus is speaking will come under the judgement of the Son of Man. Every reference to Noah in the NT places him in the context of an evil generation that was condemned (Matt 24:37-38; par. Luke 17:26-27; Heb 11:7; 1 Pet 3:20; 2 Pet 2:5). In the pericope immediately following the transfiguration, Jesus exclaims ὦ γενεὰ ἄπιστος καὶ διαστραμμένη, ἕως πότε ἔσομαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς καὶ ἀνέξομαι ὑμῶν; “O faithless and perverted generation! How much longer must I be with you and endure you?” (Luke 9:41; par. Mark 9:19; Matt 17:17) The central idea is that the present generation is wicked, possibly too wicked for the righteous Jesus to continue to put up with it; and of course, ultimately he is taken away.⁵⁴² It is no coincidence that Jesus’ cry occurs in proximity to references to his departure (Luke 9:31, 44). The parallel with the perverseness of those living before the flood, and the departure of the *shekhinah* and the righteous Enoch is striking.

Both *3 En.* 6:1 and Luke 9:30, 33 (par. Matt 17:3-4; Mark 9:4-5) link a figure who enters the presence of God with the exaltation of Elijah. In Hebrew Enoch this is implicit, whereas in the Synoptics it is explicit. Philo also makes the connection: Enoch, Moses, and Elijah are three “worthy and holy men” who ascended to heaven.⁵⁴³ In *3 En.* 6:1, 2 Kgs 2:11 is clearly in mind when Metatron says to Rabbi Ishmael

⁵⁴² Compare the rejection of John the Baptist and Jesus by the present generation in Q (Matt 11:16-19; par. Luke 7:31-35; cf. Luke 9:22; 17:25). Jesus is explicitly identified with Wisdom for the first time in Matt 11:19 (par. Luke 7:35). The rejection and ultimate departure of Jesus-Wisdom recalls not only the departure of the *shekhinah* with Enoch but the rejection and departure of Wisdom in *1 En.* 42:1-2.

⁵⁴³ Philo, *QG* 1.86.

When the Holy One, blessed be he, sought to bring me to the height at the beginning, he sent Anafiel YYY the prince, and raised me up from among them before their eyes and led me in great glory on a chariot of fire and with horses of fire, servants of glory, and brought me up with the *shekhinah* to the heavenly height.

The two occurrences of כבוד in this passage recall δόξα in Luke 9:31, 32 and the כבוד-יהוה traditions in the HB. The use of כבוד also brings us back to the idea of transformation. Enoch's earthly body, like those of Moses, Elijah, and Jesus, could not withstand entering the heavenly height and had to be glorified. In 3 En. 4:1, Metatron's glory is seen by Rabbi Ishmael to be greater than that of any other heavenly figure apart from God. In light of the idea of the glory of YHWH, Metatron is more closely conformed to the anthropomorphic manifestation of God than any other.

The idea of Metatron as revealer of heavenly mysteries needs to be mentioned. In 3 En. 8:1-2; 10:6; 11:1-3, God reveals, *inter alia*, wisdom, knowledge, and Torah to Metatron. In 3 En. 48D, Metatron is prince of wisdom and prince of the law (שר תורה). Moreover, it is Metatron who reveals to Moses the Torah, which is then transmitted in a chain of tradition. In 3 En. 48C:9, Metatron is God's agent, controlling the processions of times and seasons, making and overthrowing kings, giving wisdom to the wise and understanding to those who understand. This is a clear allusion to Dan 2:21, in which God himself does these things. Similarly, Jesus is characteristically a revealer. Not only is this his role in Luke 24:44-45, but in Luke 8:10 it is through his mediation that the mysteries of God's kingdom are given. In 1 Cor 2:10 Paul alludes to Dan 2:22, though it is not explicit that Jesus is the revealer of the deep things of God. However, in *Acts Thom.* §10 Dan 2:22, 29 seem to be applied to Jesus: "Thou art the discloser of hidden secrets, and the revealer of mysterious sayings."⁵⁴⁴ What were originally attributes of God have become attributes of Christ and Metatron.

⁵⁴⁴ Translation: Albertus F. J. Klijn, *The Acts of Thomas: Introduction-Text-Commentary* (NovTSup 5; Leiden: Brill, 1962), 69.

6.1.5.1.2. Slavonic Enoch

Fletcher-Louis rightly notes that Slavonic Enoch⁵⁴⁵ is perhaps the closest parallel to the Lukan Jesus, despite the fact that the date, provenance, and tradition history of this work are extremely difficult to establish.⁵⁴⁶ Enoch ascends to heaven and returns before his final ascension, and in Luke Jesus is transfigured and enters the presence of God before returning to fulfil his mission.⁵⁴⁷ Enoch is transformed into the likeness of one of God's glorious ones in 2 *En.* 22:10, and he is clothed by Michael in heavenly garments. The Lord commands Michael to "put him into the clothes of my glory" (rec. J).⁵⁴⁸ In ms J, at least, it is recognised that transformation takes place to conform the one entering God's presence more closely to the glory of the Lord.

A survey of relevant passages is appropriate. In 2 *En.* 1a:1 Enoch is described as "a wise man" and it is said that "[the Lord] loved him so that he might see the highest realms" (J).⁵⁴⁹ In 2 *En.* 1:4-9 two huge men appear to Enoch to transport him to heaven. The description of the two men recalls that of the angel in Dan 10. In 2 *En.* 8:4 the fallen angels in the second heaven beg Enoch to intercede for them. The glorious archangel Gabriel appears in the seventh heaven and guides Enoch into the tenth heaven, where he is transformed and brought by Michael into the presence of God (2 *En.* 22). God instructs Enoch in 2 *En.* 24-35, and in 2 *En.* 33:6, 8 God instructs him to pass on what he has learnt to those on earth. In 2 *En.* 33:9 it is suggested that Enoch's children will pass on the books they receive from their father from generation to generation in a chain of transmission, the implication being that the revelations Enoch receives and transmits are in some sense normative. In 2 *En.* 36 God foretells Enoch's ascension, giving him 30 days in which to instruct his household about God. In 2 *En.* 37:1 one of God's angels

⁵⁴⁵ Already in 1896 Charles preferred the terms "Ethiopic" and "Slavonic" Enoch (Morfill and Charles, *Secrets*, xi).

⁵⁴⁶ Cf. Alexander, "From Son of Adam," 101.

⁵⁴⁷ Fletcher-Louis, *Luke-Acts*, 44-45.

⁵⁴⁸ "2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch," translated by F. I. Andersen (*OTP*, 1:138).

⁵⁴⁹ Andersen, *OTP*, 1:102.

chills Enoch's face, effectively transforming him so that he may live an earthly existence again. This recalls the transformation of the beloved as he descends in the Ascension of Isaiah. In 2 *En.* 37:2 the Lord says "Enoch, if your face had not been chilled here, no human being would be able to look at your face" (J).⁵⁵⁰ Two angels descend with Enoch in 2 *En.* 38:1.⁵⁵¹ Fulfilling the Lord's command, Enoch instructs his children in 2 *En.* 39-54. In 2 *En.* 55:1-2 Enoch announces his imminent ascension, giving his imminent departure as the rationale for instructing his children at that time (2 *En.* 55:3). According to 2 *En.* 56:2 Enoch's first ascension had the effect of preventing Enoch from being able to eat earthly food. Enoch blesses his sons in 2 *En.* 57:2 and gives his "testament" in 2 *En.* 58-66. Finally, Enoch ascends to heaven in 2 *En.* 67:

And when Enoch had spoken to his people, [the LORD] sent the gloom onto the earth, and it became dark and covered the men who were standing and talking with Enoch. And the angels hurried and grasped Enoch and carried him up to the highest heaven, where the LORD received him and made him stand in front of his face for eternity. Then the darkness departed from the earth, and it became light. And the people looked, but they could not figure out how Enoch had been taken away. And they glorified God. (J)⁵⁵²

The mention of two men transporting Enoch to heaven recalls the designation of Moses and Elijah as *ἄνδρες δύο* in Luke 9:30 and the mention of *ἄνδρες δύο* after the ascension of Jesus in Acts 1:10. The notion of Enoch having a mediatorial role between fallen angels and God is reflected in the attribution of this role to Jesus in 1 Pet 3:18-20.⁵⁵³ This idea is already present in 1 *En.* 12-13. The presence of Gabriel in Slavonic Enoch recalls Daniel and Luke to a limited degree, though in Slavonic Enoch he does not have the function of revealer that is so prominent in the biblical works. The normativity of the Enochic revelations recalls Jesus' teaching in the Synoptics. Enoch's announcement of his imminent ascension perhaps recalls the predictions of the passion in the Gospels. Above all, the idea of Jesus as mediator of revelation is paralleled by Enoch's role as a

⁵⁵⁰ Andersen, *OTP*, 1:160.

⁵⁵¹ Cf. 1 *En.* 81:5, in which seven holy ones transport Enoch back to earth.

⁵⁵² Andersen, *OTP*, 1:194.

⁵⁵³ Cf. Barnabas Lindars, "Enoch and Christology," *ExpTim* 92 (1980-1981): 298-299; Alexander, "From Son of Adam," 101.

mediator of revelation.

The chief difference between Enoch and Jesus is that Enoch cannot eat earthly food after his first ascent into heaven. That is manifestly not the case with Jesus, who eats with his disciples even after his resurrection, in Luke 24:41-43. It may be wondered whether the Jesus traditions manifested in Luke developed in conscious opposition to the ideas about Enoch preserved in Slavonic Enoch (or even *vice versa*). It is curious that despite the existence of material relating to Enoch's ascent to heaven in the first century, at Qumran, in Ethiopic Enoch, and in Philo, Luke gives no hint of these in the account of the transfiguration. The three believed at this period to have ascended to heaven are Enoch, Moses, and Elijah. If it is true that Mosaic and Enochic Judaism were in conflict in the first century, is this reflected in the synoptic transfiguration narratives? Could Moses (or even Jesus) be a conscious replacement for Enoch?⁵⁵⁴

6.1.5.1.3. Summary

A number of different traditions have been preserved concerning Enoch which offer a source of comparison with the Lukan Jesus. Most significant are those traditions which portray Enoch exalted to the heights and transformed into a heavenly being with authority and knowledge to impart divine mysteries. The most fruitful sources of comparison with Luke are found in the Hebrew and Slavonic books of Enoch, notwithstanding the intractable problems concerning the dating of those works. They help to explain the significance of Jesus's transfiguration, the presentation of Jesus as a heavenly figure, and his role as revealer of mysteries. It may be suggested that, rather than postulating interdependence between these traditions in the first century, it is more appropriate to suppose that the traditions about Enoch and Jesus developed independently on the basis of a common pool of themes and motifs associated in Palestinian Judaism with humans exalted to heaven.

⁵⁵⁴ There may have been an intense dialectic in later speculation between the figures of Metatron and Christ. Cf. Alexander, "From Son of Adam," 114 and n. 47.

6.1.6. Summary

This section has explored a range of material connected directly or indirectly with the Lukan transfiguration narrative. It is necessary to draw this together and suggest ways in which this material contributes to the present study overall. Fundamentally, the transfiguration is a revelatory event concerned with the identity of Jesus, which is consistently misunderstood by those around him. By revealing the heavenly identity of Jesus the transfiguration gives us insight into what the disciples could not understand, but also gives us a basis for understanding Jesus as a heavenly mediator figure. The Ascension of Isaiah is an important parallel because it, too, combines understanding with the identity of Jesus, which is a divine mystery that must be disclosed. Also, the beloved in this text undergoes transformation, as does the synoptic Jesus. Luke and the Ascension of Isaiah are probably not linked directly, but both draw on themes and motifs present in first century Judaism to explore the identity of Christ. In particular, the phenomenon of transformation in a wide range of early Jewish texts was indubitably known to both Christian authors. On a linguistic level, the language of particular LXX (esp. Exodus and Ezekiel) and apocalyptic texts confirms that Luke presents Jesus as one transformed into an angelomorphic, heavenly form in the presence of God. As such Luke's Jesus may be compared with transformed individuals in Judaism who, in their glorified state, perform mediatorial functions such as transmitting revelations. Enoch provides the closest parallel and it seems clear that both Enoch and Jesus are to be read together in the context of Jewish speculation about exalted patriarch figures.

How does this contribute to our overall picture of the revelation and transmission of insight in late Second Temple Judaism and the NT? We are now able to place Luke's Jesus alongside other heavenly mediators, particularly Gabriel and the exalted Enoch, in the context of apocalyptic and nascent *merkabah* speculation. In Luke, and to an extent in the other Synoptics, we have a model of transmission that is rooted in the apocalyptic theme of the revelation of divine mysteries and involves a heavenly figure acting in the

place of God and mediating divine mysteries to humans. Jesus's earthly teaching (in part) and his post-resurrection bestowal of insight (in especial) are to be read in this context.

6.2. The resurrection

It is necessary to round off this stage of our investigation by exploring the close of Luke's Gospel, particularly Luke 24:45. At the end of the Gospel the Lukan theme of the disciples' incomprehension is resolved,⁵⁵⁵ Luke 24:45 holding the key to the Lukan concept of insight. We begin by exploring the linguistic and literary affinities of this verse, particularly its Semitic background.

6.2.1. Luke 24:45 and the Greek and Hebrew Scriptures

Luke 24:45 is closely linked to verse 44. Now that the disciples were in the presence of the risen Jesus, the barrier to their understanding of his identity was removed. It is not the fact of the resurrection which makes this so, but what the resurrection implies. In Luke 8:10; 9:45; 18:34, the disciples could not truly understand Jesus' identity because the meaning of what Jesus said was hidden from them. To their eyes, Jesus was a mortal, but the resurrection revealed Jesus' immortality. His ascension, which ends the Gospel, establishes forever the heavenly character of Jesus' identity. Jesus' heavenly existence linked him with other heavenly figures such as Gabriel, and also with attributes and virtues of heavenly origin, notably σύνεσις. Jesus could bestow understanding because it belonged with him in the heavens.

Jesus first of all explains what had been written about him in the three divisions of Scripture known to Luke, and then opens the hearts of his disciples to understand the

⁵⁵⁵ Nuttall compares the resolution in Luke 24: 31 with ἀναγνώρισις, with περιπέτεια one of two important elements in the emotional effect of tragedy discussed in Aristotle, *Poet.* 6.17; 11.1-8 (*Moment*, 9). Ἀναγνώρισις is most effective when it coincides with περιπέτεια (*Poet.* 11.5). F. L. Lucas defines περιπέτεια as the "tragic effect of human effort producing exactly the opposite result to its intention" (*Tragedy: Serious Drama in Relation to Aristotle's Poetics* [Rev. ed.; London: Hogarth, 1957], 113), and ἀναγνώρισις as "the realization of the truth, the opening of the eyes, the sudden lightning-flash in the darkness" (*Tragedy*, 114). In relation to Luke, the ironic incomprehension of Zechariah, Jesus' parents, and the disciples would, on Nuttall's understanding, be περιπέτεια; the disciples' post-Easter comprehension would be ἀναγνώρισις.

Scriptures.⁵⁵⁶ In bringing understanding to the disciples in this way, Jesus acts like Gabriel in Dan 7-12 (and thus, by extension, like Gabriel in Luke 1). Consider Dan 10:11-12 (Θ):

Καὶ εἶπε πρὸς με Δανιηλ ἀνὴρ ἐπιθυμιῶν, σύνες ἐν τοῖς λόγοις, οἷς ἐγὼ λαλῶ πρὸς σέ, καὶ στῆθι ἐπὶ τῇ στάσει σου, ὅτι νῦν ἀπεστάλην πρὸς σέ. καὶ ἐν τῷ λαλῆσαι αὐτὸν πρὸς με τὸν λόγον τοῦτον ἀνέστην ἔντρομος. καὶ εἶπε πρὸς με Μὴ φοβοῦ, Δανιηλ· ὅτι ἀπὸ τῆς πρώτης ἡμέρας, ἧς ἔδωκας τὴν καρδίαν σου τοῦ συνιέναι καὶ κακωθῆναι ἐναντίον τοῦ θεοῦ σου, ἠκούσθησαν οἱ λόγοι σου, καὶ ἐγὼ ἦλθον ἐν τοῖς λόγοις σου.

Both Dan 10:11 (Θ) and Luke 24:45 refer to understanding something which is revealed. In Dan 10:11 (Θ), Gabriel's words are what should be understood. In Luke 24:45, Holy Scriptures, particular passages referring to Jesus's destiny, should be understood. This recalls *Ascen. Isa.* 4:21-22, where the Scriptures, inspired by the angel of the spirit (probably Gabriel), are understood to bear witness to the beloved. Both Dan 10:11 (Θ) and Luke 24:45 use the verb συνίημι. The second occurrence of this verb in Dan 10:11-12 (Θ) is an infinitive, as in Luke 24:45. Furthermore, Dan 10:12 (Θ) closely parallels Luke 24:45. Compare the following:

Dan 10:12 (Θ): ἔδωκας τὴν καρδίαν σου τοῦ συνιέναι

Luke 24:45: διήνοιξεν αὐτῶν τὸν νοῦν τοῦ συνιέναι

In both, the recipients of revelation are to "understand." In Dan 10:12 (Θ) Daniel himself takes the initiative, whereas in Luke 24:45 Jesus takes the initiative in making the disciples understand. The author of Daniel emphasises Daniel's piety and understanding, whereas Luke emphasises the disciples' former incomprehension and the function of Jesus as revealer. Both texts identify the heart as the seat of understanding. P. M.-J.

⁵⁵⁶ Conzelmann suggests that a true understanding of Scripture can only exist in light of the resurrection (*Theology*, 162).

Lagrange notes with reference to Luke 24:45 that according to Hebraic usage, to open the heart is to cause to understand,⁵⁵⁷ though he cites no Hebrew texts in support. From the LXX he cites 2 Macc 1:4: καὶ διανοίξαι τὴν καρδίαν ὑμῶν ἐν τῷ νόμῳ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐν τοῖς προστάγμασιν καὶ εἰρήνην ποιήσαι, “and (may God) open your hearts to his law and his ordinances and make peace.”⁵⁵⁸ It is for God to open the heart, which means that in Luke 24:45 Jesus is taking the role of God, acting as a mediator in opening his disciples’ hearts.⁵⁵⁹ This is the case also in Acts 16:14, the other text cited by Lagrange, in which the Lord opened Lydia’s heart to attend to what was said by Paul (ὁ κύριος διήνοιξεν τὴν καρδίαν προσέχειν τοῖς λαλουμένοις ὑπὸ τοῦ Παύλου).

In the LXX, Isa 6:10 contains the phrase τῇ καρδίᾳ συνῶσιν, identifying the heart as the seat of intellection.⁵⁶⁰ The linguistic similarity between Dan 10:12 (Θ) and Isa 6:10 (LXX) is clear, but the link with Luke 24:45 is less clear because of Luke’s use of νοῦς rather than καρδία. The underlying Hebrew term in Isaiah is לִבּוֹ,⁵⁶¹ “his heart,” and in Daniel לִבְךָ, “your heart.” However, in Luke 24:45 νοῦς is synonymous with καρδία, equivalent to לִבּ or לֵב.⁵⁶² Νοῦς is frequently used in the LXX for לֵב and לִבּ⁵⁶³ and may thus represent the concept represented by לֵב and לִבּ. Διανοίγω should also

⁵⁵⁷ P. M.-J. Lagrange, *Évangile selon Saint Luc* (EBib; Paris: Gabalda, 1921), 614. Cf. Marshall, *Luke*, 905.

⁵⁵⁸ Note: 2 Macc 1:4 does not explicitly link opening the heart with *understanding*.

⁵⁵⁹ In the Shepherd of Hermas, the maiden (παρθένος), representing the church, says to the visionary “you opened your heart to the Lord”: τὴν καρδίαν σου ἡνοιξας πρὸς τὸν κύριον (Herm. Vis. 4.2.4). However, this refers to the visionary’s trust in the Lord in the face of adversity rather than the receiving of insight.

⁵⁶⁰ In the HB (and apocalyptic) the heart is frequently the seat of understanding. See: Russell, *Method*, 397; Wolff, *Anthropology*, 40-58, esp. pp. 46-51; Clements, *Isaiah 1-39*, 77; Shupak, *Where Can Wisdom Be Found?* 299-302; DCH 4:498, 506. Cf. 1 En. 14:2.

⁵⁶¹ 1QIsa^a reads בִּלְבָבוֹ, emphasising that the heart is the *instrument* of understanding (cf. Apoc. Mos. 13:6), as the eyes are the instrument of seeing and the ears the instrument of hearing (cf. Deut 29:3; Job 29:11; see further Wolff, *Anthropology*, 46-51). The preposition בְּ only occurs before יָיִן and יָיִן in Isa 6:10 (MT).

⁵⁶² Louw and Nida place the idioms διανοίγω τὸν νοῦν (Luke 24:45) and διανοίγω τὴν καρδίαν (Acts 16:14) in the same sub-domain (E: “Be Willing to Learn,” 27.48-27.54) of the semantic domain “Learn” (Domain 27). They have clearly understood the two passages to contain parallel idioms.

⁵⁶³ Cf. H.-J. Fabry, “לֵב *leb*, לִבּ *lebab*,” TDOT 7:410. See Exod 7:23; Josh 14:7; Isa 10:7 (both ψυχή and νοῦς render לִבּ), 12; 41:22 (cf. Job 7:20 [LXX]; Diodorus of Sicily, *Bibl. Hist.* 12.1); Job 7:17.

be considered. This verb frequently occurs in the LXX in relation to Hebrew פתח,⁵⁶⁴ though never in connection with νοῦς. However, in Hos 2:17 (LXX), the phrase διανοῖξαι σύνεσιν occurs, which scarcely reflects the Hebrew לַפְתַּח תִּקְוָה but links σύνεσις with the language of “opening.” Wisdom and “opening” are linked in Prov 31:26 (MT = 31:25 [LXX]).

Thus νοῦς may reflect the same concept as לֵב and לִבָּב. Διανοίγω reflects the same concept as פתח. It became clear earlier that the roots בִּין and שָׁכַל may both be represented by συνίημι.⁵⁶⁵ Thus τοῦ συνιέναι in Luke 24:45 may represent an idea that in Hebrew would be conveyed by לִהְיוֹת בִּין. In Dan 9:2, Daniel “perceived in the books” (MT: בִּינְתִי בַסְפָּרִים; Θ: συνῆκα ἐν ταῖς βύβλοις). The use of בִּין and συνίημι for insight into the meaning of sacred texts recalls Luke 24:45. Daniel understands of his own accord in Dan 9:2, but in Luke 24:45 Jesus makes the disciples understand the Scriptures.

לֵב may also be the object of בִּין Hiphil used causatively, exhibiting a meaning similar to Luke 24:45. Psalm 10:17 (MT) reads תִּשְׁמַעַתְּ יְהוָה הַכִּין לִבָּם תִּקְשִׁיב אָזְנוֹךָ, “you have heard, YHWH, the desires of the poor; you shall establish their heart, you shall bring your ear near.” Since in ancient manuscripts כ and ב were easily confused, it is not surprising that a variant reading for הַכִּין is תִּבְיִן: “you shall make their hearts understand.” Psalm 78:8bα (MT) laments the disobedience of a former generation who “did not establish their heart” (דֹּר לֹא־הִכִּין לִבּוֹ). Again, there is textual evidence for תִּבְיִן (probably not causative): “a generation whose heart did not understand.” Finally, Prov 8:5 (MT) reads הִבִּינוּ פְתָאִים עֲרֻמָּה וְכִסִּילִים הִבִּינוּ לֵב, “simple ones, understand prudence, and fools, make your heart understand!”

There can be little doubt that the concepts found in Luke 24:45 are rooted in the

⁵⁶⁴ Ezek 3:2; 21:27; 24:27; Nah 2:7; Zech 11:1; 13:1; Job 29:19; Prov 31:25 (LXX). Ἀπεκαλύφθη renders Hebrew גִּלְתִּיה in Nah 2:8, the LXX employing the language of revelation (contrast MT).

⁵⁶⁵ See above, §2.1.2.

HB. However, the precise idea of “opening the heart” is found outside the canon, in Sirach, Qumran, and later Jewish magic. These texts inform the study of Luke 24:45 in a number of ways, primarily linguistic but also in terms of the implications of Jesus himself opening the disciples’ hearts.

6.2.2. “Opening the heart” in Hebrew texts outside the canon

Sir 8:19 reads **לכל בשר אל תגל לבך ואל תדיח מעליך טובה**, “do not uncover your heart to all flesh nor thrust what is good away from you.” Although **גלה + לב** Piel represents the concept of opening the heart, it refers to openness with other people, not to revelation from God or a heavenly mediator. A more pertinent reference is Sir 6:37: **תבוננת ביראת עליון ובמצותו והגה תמיד והוא יבין לבך ואשר איותה יחכראמך ויה**, “attend to the fear of the Most High⁵⁶⁶ and always meditate on his commandments; he will make your heart wise and give you the wisdom you desire.” Although opening the heart is not present here, God is the one who causes the heart to understand and who gives wisdom to someone who desires it.

At Qumran we find a greater profusion of language relating to opening the heart. A very close parallel to the language and thought of Luke 24:45 is found in 1QS XI, 15-16: **ברוך אתה אלי הפותח לדעה לב עבדכה**, “blessed are you, my God, who opens your servant’s heart to knowledge.” This is not dissimilar to 1QH^a VI, 8: **הנותן בלב עבדנך בינה ברוך אתה אדוני**, “[blessed are you], my Lord, who puts understanding into the heart of [your] servant.” Similarly, 1QH^a XX, 13 reads **פתחתה לתוכי דעת ברז שכלכה**, “you have [op]ened within me knowledge into the mystery of your insight.” 1QH^a XXII^b 1,12 reads **פתחתה לבבי לבינתכה ותגל אונוני**, “you have opened my heart to your understanding and uncovered [my e]ars” Opening the heart is present in a slightly

⁵⁶⁶ This relates to the idea that “the fear of YHWH is the beginning of wisdom.” Cf. Ps 111:10; Prov 1:7; 9:10; 15:33; Job 28:28; Sir 1:14.

adapted form in 1QH^a XIII, 32-33:⁵⁶⁷ ואת אלי מרחב פתחתה בלבי “you, my God, have opened a broad place within my heart.” There is a broadly similar phrase in 1QH^a XVIII, 31-32: ומשענתי מעוז מרום ולבי נפתח למקור עולם “my heart has been opened to an eternal fountain and the refuge of the height⁵⁶⁸ is my support.” In 1QH^a XX, 32-34 three phrases occur in parallel in the context of a series of rhetorical questions designed to stress the utter dependence of the hymnist on God:

ומה אדבר כִּי־אִם פתחתה פִּי
ואיכה אבִּין כִּי־אִם השכלתני
ומה אוןמר[בלוא גליתתה⁵⁶⁹ לבי

What can I say unless you open my mouth?

How can I understand unless you give me insight?

What can I s[ay] without you uncovering my heart?

Uncovering the heart is clearly connected with divine revelation and the acquisition of insight. A more fragmentary text is 1QH^a XXI^{top}, 9: ותגלה לב עפר להשמר “you have opened a heart of dust to observe”

In summary, at Qumran opening the heart is connected with the reception of insight. God is the one who characteristically opens the heart and thus bestows insight. All the Qumran texts cited, together with 2 Macc 1:4, attribute to God the act of opening the heart. This means that in Luke 24:45 Jesus acts in a way which is unquestionably characteristic of God in the religious literature of this period. The link between the idea of opening the heart and the revelation of heavenly insight is not unique to the late Second Temple period. The following text was discovered in the Cairo genizah, and thus belongs to medieval Judaism.

⁵⁶⁷ Par. 4QHod^c 1 IV, 5-6.

⁵⁶⁸ מרום refers to heaven. מעוז מרום is thus a circumlocution for God.

⁵⁶⁹ For ἀνοίγω as a translation equivalent for גלה see 1 Chr 17:25; Job 38:17.

6.2.2.1. Taylor-Schechter Box K1.117⁵⁷⁰

פתיחת⁵⁷¹ לב: אמור על כסא דהבדלה
 ג' פעמים ושתה אותו אדרנוס אברינוס
 חיקקאל פתחאל חיקקאל דחקק אל
 באוריתא פתחאל דפתח מילי אוריתא
 פתחון לבי אנאפ' בן פ' לתורה לחוכמה ולבינה
 וכל מה שאשמע אלמד במהרה וכל שאלמד
 לא אשכח לעולם ברוך אתה יי למדני חוקך

Opening of heart: say three times over the havdalah cup and drink it: 'drnws, 'brynws, hyqq'l, pthy'l, hyqqy'l, whom God engraved in the law. Petahiel, who opened the words of the law: Open my heart, I, N son of N, to law, Wisdom, and insight, so that I may learn whatever I hear speedily and never forget anything I learn. Blessed are you, Lord, teach me your statutes.

There are a number of similarities between this invocation of Petahiel, whose name means “gate of God,”⁵⁷² and Luke 24:45. The phrase פתחון לבי ... לתורה לחוכמה ולבינה recalls διήνοιξεν αὐτοῦ τὸν νοῦν τοῦ συνιέναι. The parallelism between בינה, חוכמה, and תורה is rooted in the HB, בינה and חוכמה representing concepts equivalent to σοφία and σύνεσις in Luke 2:40, 47, 52. תורה recalls the mention of the Mosaic law in Luke 24:44. Luke 24:44-45 and T-S K1.117 contain the same collocation of ideas. Both bear witness to the idea that a heavenly mediator figure opens the heart of a human to understand things which originate

⁵⁷⁰ Text: Michael D. Swartz, *Scholastic Magic: Ritual and Revelation in Early Jewish Mysticism* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1996), 44. The translation is my own, but cf. Swartz's translation (*Scholastic Magic*, 45).

⁵⁷¹ פתיחה is used here in a sense only indirectly related to midrashic petihah: W. G. Braude and I. J. Kapstein suggest that פתיחה in that sense may mean “the opening or beginning of a discourse” or “the opening, the disclosing, of meaning not readily apparent” (*Pesikta de-Rab Kahana: R. Kahana's Compilation of Discourses for Sabbath and Festival Days* [Philadelphia, Pa: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1975], x n. 6).

⁵⁷² The name פתחאל reflects the idea of “opening,” and is reminiscent of the name Ptahil, found in Mandaean texts. Ptahil is the usual name of the Mandaean demiurge, but one of his hidden names is Gabriel. See Fossum, *Name of God*, 261-263.

in heaven. There is thus a “parallel” between the risen Jesus and Petahiel.⁵⁷³ The idea of Petahiel opening words of the law recalls Luke 24:32, in which the two travelling on the road to Emmaus remembered how Jesus had “opened the Scriptures” to them (ὡς διήνοιγεν ἡμῖν τὰς γραφάς). The participle διανοίγων is used in Acts 17:3 for Paul explaining the messianic message of the Scriptures in the synagogue at Thessalonica. More interesting still is Acts 16:14, in which the Lord opened Lydia’s heart to attend to what was said by Paul.⁵⁷⁴

The major differences relate to genre and context. T-S K1.117 is a conjuration written from the perspective of the person who seeks enlightenment and relates to a ritual known as *petihat lev*.⁵⁷⁵ The Greek texts mentioned above belong in narrative contexts. Luke 24:45; Acts 16:14; 17:3 are related in the third person, Luke 24:32 citing words attributed to eye-witnesses of the risen Jesus. Most important is the question of date. T-S K1.117 was discovered in the Cairo genizah, and is medieval, certainly not earlier than the ninth century. It seems difficult to deny, however, that the texts cited bear witness independently to the same complex of ideas within early Judaism.

6.2.2.2. Taylor-Schechter Box K 21.95 C fol. 2b⁵⁷⁶

34 ובעבדיו והיה נאה לו. אמר רבי ישמעאל עידות זו אני מיעיד לדורות

שכיון שהיזכרתי שם שר זה

35 אהוב ועבד נחמד והשבעתי בו שלשה השרים חביריו שהן כתובין בדבר

שרים הכתוב בספר השרים

⁵⁷³ The term “parallel” is being used here in the same sense as it is used by Daniel Harrington in his comparison of the Gospel infancy narratives and infancy narratives in Pseudo-Philo (Harrington, “Birth Narratives,” 323-324). Harrington understands parallels as “independent developments” (“Birth Narratives,” 323) and uses the definition of parallel lines in Euclidean geometry, concluding that “[p]arallels by definition never meet. In a literary study such as this one, parallels tell us what was ‘in the air,’ i.e., literary forms, expressions, motifs, devices, etc. available to writers of the time” (“Birth Narratives,” 324). Thus Jesus and Petahiel are independent developments of the same complex of ideas, separated chronologically by several centuries.

⁵⁷⁴ Cf. §6.2.1 above.

⁵⁷⁵ On this ritual see Swartz, *Scholastic Magic*, 43-47.

⁵⁷⁶ Text: Peter Schäfer, ed., *Geniza Fragmente zur Hekhalot-Literatur* (TSAJ 6; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1984), 105. Another English translation (with discussion) is found in Swartz, *Scholastic Magic*, 126-130.

36 מִיד יִשְׁבְּתִי וְצִיפִיתִי וְרֵאִיתִי בְּמִדְרַשׁ וּבִהְלָכוֹת וּבְשִׁמוּעָה וּבְפִתְרוֹן הַלֵּכָה (ו)ת
וּדְרָשְׁתִּי וְסִלְסַלְתִּי תוֹרָה נְבִיאִים

37 ? כְּתוּבִים בְּשָׁנָה וַחֲצִיָּה בְּמֵאמֶר בַּעַל פְּרִישׁוֹת וְאֶדוֹן נִפְלְאוֹת אוֹזְהִיָּה⁵⁷⁷

and his servants, and it is fitting for him. Rabbi Ishmael said: "I am designating this testimony for the generations, that as soon as I had recited the name of this beloved prince and desired servant and adjured him, the three princes his companions, who are written in the chronicle of the princes in the book of the princes, straight away I sat down, contemplated and looked into midrash, legal rulings, tradition, and the interpretation of legal rulings. I expounded and exalted Torah, Prophets, and Writings for a year and a half, by the command of the master of wonderful deeds and lord of wonders, Oz-hayah."

This text is not directly related to the *petihat lev* ritual, but is connected with the *sar torah* traditions of medieval Jewish mysticism.

Excursus: sar torah

Until relatively recently, the importance of texts among the *hekhalot* tracts relating to the *sar torah* had been underestimated. Gershom Scholem referred to them only in passing in *Major Trends*, remarking with reference to the adjuration of the *sar torah* that

The revelation sought through the performance of such rites is identical with that of the Merkabah vision. The "Prince of the Torah" reveals the same mysteries as the voice which speaks from the throne of fire: the secret of heaven and earth, the dimensions of the demiurge, and the secret names the knowledge of which gives power over all things. It is true that in addition these magical practices also hold out a promise of other things, e.g. a more comprehensive knowledge of the Torah, chiefly reflected in the fact that the adept can no longer forget anything he has learned.⁵⁷⁸

More recently, the work of scholars such as Ithamar Gruenwald, Peter Schäfer, David Halperin, and Michael Swartz has highlighted the importance of the *sar torah* traditions for our understanding of the *hekhalot* tracts. Gruenwald remarks:

Generally speaking, the three main subjects dealt with in the *Hekhalot* literature are: heavenly ascensions, the revelation of cosmological and other secrets, and the special secret method of studying and memorizing the Torah. From the point of view of literary genre, the *Hekhalot* literature falls into two types: the description of heavenly ascensions and the description of the

⁵⁷⁷ This name occurs again in 3 *En.* 48D:1 as one of the seventy names of Metatron. Odeberg's text, based on Oxford MS 1656 (Neubauer), reads אֱוִיָּהוּ. Metatron is called שֶׁר הַתּוֹרָה in 3 *En.* 48D:6, along with many other epithets. In 3 *En.* 48D:4 a figure named יִפְפִּיָּה is named שֶׁרָה שֶׁל תּוֹרָה.

⁵⁷⁸ Gershom G. Scholem, *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism* (3d ed.; New York: Schocken, 1961), 77-78.

appearance on earth of angels who reveal secrets.⁵⁷⁹

In a 1980 article, Schäfer analyses the *hekhalot* tracts in terms of the “theme-complexes” (*Themenkomplexe*) which they contain. This approach was adopted instead of an analysis of specific *hekhalot* compositions due to the enormous complexity of the textual tradition.⁵⁸⁰ Schäfer isolates four theme-complexes: the heavenly journey (*Himmelsreise*), the adjuration (*Beschwörung*), rivalry (*Rivalität*), and transformation (*Verwandlung*),⁵⁸¹ suggesting that the goal of both the heavenly journey and the adjurations was knowledge (*Erkenntnis*). In the case of adjurations, the practitioner was to both acquire knowledge of the Torah and be unable to forget what he had learnt. By undertaking a rigorous regime of preparation, including fasting and ritual purifications, the practitioner could become ready to call down an angel named Yofiel, the *sar torah*, whom God had given permission to bring the secrets of torah to men.⁵⁸² This echoes texts such as Dan 10:2-3, in which a visionary undertakes a penance before an angelophany. The difference is that in Dan 10, Gabriel’s appearance is the result of God’s initiative, whereas in the case of one adjuring the *sar torah*, the initiative is the practitioner’s. In Daniel, the visionary’s prayer does not explicitly have the aim of bringing Gabriel down from heaven. Nevertheless, in both cases an angel has been appointed to reveal heavenly secrets to a human. Schäfer’s article demonstrates that the heavenly journey is not the only characteristic of the *hekhalot* texts: several theme-complexes have to be considered in connection with one another. With the publication of Schäfer’s *Synopse zur Hekhalot Literatur* in 1981, described by Halperin as “the single most important publication ever to appear in the field of *Hekhalot* research,”⁵⁸³ scholars were able to examine the textual tradition in all its complexity. This work has influenced all research on the *hekhalot* tracts since its publication. Halperin has translated and analysed several pertinent texts and Swartz has recently subjected all the major *sar torah* materials to thorough examination. The result is that *sar torah* materials have been resituated at the heart of the literature known as the *hekhalot*. This material is of immense importance for understanding the development of Jewish patterns of divine mediation. A thorough investigation cannot be undertaken here: suffice it to say that scholars need, in future, to attend more closely to the parallel post-biblical developments of traditions relating to figures such as Enoch and Jesus in connection with the *sar torah*.

The extract cited above from T-S K 21.95 C fol. 2b is part of a text appended to an ascent

⁵⁷⁹ Ithamar Gruenwald, *Apocalyptic and Merkavah Mysticism* (AGJU 14; Leiden: Brill, 1980), 98-99.

⁵⁸⁰ Peter Schäfer, “Engel und Menschen in der Hekhalot-Literatur,” *Kairós* 22 (1980): 201-202.

⁵⁸¹ Cf. §6.1 above?

⁵⁸² Schäfer, “Engel,” 212-213.

⁵⁸³ David J. Halperin, *The Faces of the Chariot: Early Jewish Responses to Ezekiel’s Vision* (TSAJ 16; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1988), 569.

text and entitled שר תורה דילה, “The *sar torah* which belongs to it.”⁵⁸⁴ In both Daniel and the *hekhalot*, שר primarily refers to an angelic figure, not an earthly ruler (Michael is השׁר הגדול in Dan 12:1 and Gabriel is שר הצבא in Hebrew Enoch). This text involves the adjuration of an angel to procure deep insight into the Scriptures, recalling the *petihat lev* ritual explored above. Equally striking is the explicit reference to a threefold division of the Scriptures in lines 36-37. The Lukan reference does not refer to “Writings,” but rather to “psalms.” The difference is due to these texts reflecting different stages of the development of the canon. The essential point to note is that Luke 24:45 and both Hebrew texts mentioned involve a supernatural figure giving humans insight into sacred writings. Luke is thus close to a Jewish matrix of ideas which later gave rise to the *petihat lev* ritual and the *sar torah* texts.

6.2.2.3. Summary

Clear light is shed on Luke 24:44-45 when this passage is read in the context of Semitic texts from the Second Temple period and early medieval Judaism. The idea of God causing the heart to understand is present in Sir 6:37, but it is in the Qumran scrolls that the idea of God bestowing insight and opening the heart, and the connection between these two actions, are primarily found. When Luke is read alongside the relevant Qumran texts, Jesus is seen once again to be acting in the place of God, as a heavenly mediator figure. Later Jewish mystical speculation developed these ideas further, perhaps alongside developments in Enoch-Metatron speculation. Ultimately we are presented with the *petihat lev* ritual, in which an angel may be conjured in order to open the adept’s heart to understand, and with the *sar torah*, an angelic figure who mediates insight into Holy Scriptures to the adept. Luke, no less than those who preserved *petihat lev* and *sar torah* traditions, owes a very great deal to Second Temple Palestinian Judaism.

⁵⁸⁴ On the meaning of this phrase, see Swartz, *Scholastic Magic*, 127.

6.2.3. Summary

Without doubt Luke 24:44-45 is most profitably read against the background of the Greek Scriptures and alongside extra-canonical Jewish texts (preserved in Hebrew). If νοῦς is taken to represent לֵב or לִבָּ then the idea is of Jesus opening the disciples' hearts to understand, the heart being the seat of intellection in Semitic (and Egyptian) thought. Although the HB and Greek Scriptures shed light on the idea of the heart as the seat of intellection, the precise idea of "opening" the heart to cause intellection is not found in Hebrew literature before the Qumran scrolls. There it is God who opens the heart to bestow insight. This idea is found in later Judaism, where an angelic mediator carries out this action on God's behalf. This, too, is what is found in Luke 24:44-45: Jesus is a heavenly mediator acting on behalf of God to bestow insight on the disciples.

6.3. Summary

In Luke, συνίημι and σύνεσις are intimately connected with the revelation and comprehension of the identity of Jesus. The use of these terms forms a trajectory through the Gospel; other trajectories concern the incomprehension by the disciples of the necessity of Jesus's passion and the gradual revelation of the identity of Jesus. The theme of understanding is used by Luke to contrast the extraordinary insight of Jesus with the incomprehension of those around him. Luke's use of συνίημι and σύνεσις connects his work directly with the bestowal of divine insight by a heavenly mediator, Gabriel, in Greek Daniel. Jesus' status as a heavenly mediator is established through an examination of intertextual allusions and parallels in the transfiguration narrative and an exploration of Semitic analogues to Jesus opening the disciples' hearts to understand the Scriptures in Luke 24:44-45. Jesus' role here is connected directly with the transmission of divine insight in Second Temple Jewish texts.

7. Conclusions

Part two began with the aim of examining the theme of understanding in the synoptic tradition, using σύνεσις and συνίημι as the focus and Luke's gospel as the framework. Several aspects of the gospels have been explored in this connection and a very substantial body of comparative material marshalled in evidence. It is necessary to summarise our findings, draw preliminary conclusions, and tease out some implications for the present study as a whole.

7.1. Summary of results

(1) On a linguistic level, σύνεσις and συνίημι are clearly significant in each of the Synoptics, though in different ways. This word group is significant in Daniel-Θ, where it represents both בִּין and שָׂכַל consistently; it is even possible to speak of a technical language. The significance of these (Hebrew) roots in the Qumran scrolls may thus be placed alongside the significance of (Greek) comprehension language in the Synoptics. Such language is used at Qumran and in Daniel in connection with understanding heavenly secrets. In the Synoptics, the hidden identity of Jesus is to be understood as such a secret or mystery. It is significant that in Mark and Luke especially such language is used in this connection. In Luke, there is a structural issue: occurrences of συνίημι and σύνεσις connect the infancy narrative, the Galilean ministry, the journey to Jerusalem, and the resurrection, and point towards Jesus' decisive revelation of the meaning of the Scriptures in relation to his heavenly identity at the resurrection.

Clearly this word group alone does not exhaust the theme of understanding in the Synoptics: understanding and incomprehension as themes are fundamental. In Mark, the theme of incomprehension (and the language that represents it) is drawn from the OT. The disciples' incomprehension is focused on the heavenly identity of Jesus. In Matthew the disciples' *comprehension* is focused on the identity of Jesus. Furthermore, it is Jesus himself, as mediator of divine secrets, who imparts the mystery of his identity in the first

Gospel. Luke foregrounds the incomprehension of those around Jesus throughout the Gospel in contrast to Jesus's possession of extraordinary insight. The disciples' incomprehension is connected with the three passion predictions and is resolved when Jesus, as heavenly mediator, brings understanding to them after the resurrection.

(2) In terms of the context in which the language and concepts examined in the Synoptics are to be read, clearly the situation is most complex. Direct influence of a form of Greek Daniel akin to Daniel-Θ seems undeniable on all three Synoptic Gospels. In Luke, the divine will is revealed through the heavenly mediators Gabriel and Jesus. This is surely to be understood as a direct continuation of the *Heilsgeschichte* initiated in Daniel itself, in which Gabriel is present as revealer. This is not to deny that there are significant (direct and indirect) connections, especially in the infancy narrative, the transfiguration, and the resurrection with both Jewish and Graeco-Roman texts and traditions. In particular, apocalyptic texts, which characteristically pertain to the revelation of divine mysteries, constitute a decisive aspect of the context in which the synoptic tradition developed.

(3) In terms of what reading the Synoptics in light of apocalyptic achieves for us, the following may be said. Mark has often been read in light of apocalyptic. The disciples are modelled on the מְשִׁכִּי לֵאמֹר of Daniel, typologically and linguistically, and Jesus is a heavenly figure who acts in a revelatory manner in behalf of God. This is yet more true of the disciples in Matthew, who closely resemble the מְשִׁכִּי לֵאמֹר, possibly on the basis of their presentation in Greek Daniel. In Luke most of all the heavenly identity of Jesus is stressed, and while the disciples are at first uncomprehending they are privileged to receive understanding from the risen Jesus. In the case of the transfiguration, apocalyptic and heterodox rabbinic texts pertaining to transformation provide analogies for Jesus's transformation as he enters the divine presence. Qumran texts, together with early medieval mystical and magical texts provide analogies for Jesus opening the hearts of the disciples to understand the Scriptures.

7.2. Retrospect and prospect

How do the results of our investigation in part two fit into the overall context of this study? To begin with, the Synoptics and the Qumran scrolls share a common background in Second Temple Jewish apocalyptic. In both, the revelation of divine insight is fundamental, not least because it is sociologically significant. The possession of divine insight privileges the Qumran group over outsiders, as the disciples are so privileged in the Synoptics. Both corpora bear witness to the use of special language for divine insight, which is shared with, and possibly derived from Daniel. In the Qumran scrolls, divine insight is mediated through a human tradent within the community. While Jesus and the disciples on a human level may reflect the process of transmission from a מַשְׁכִּיל to מַבְיֵן, the Synoptics ultimately portray Jesus as a heavenly figure mediating insight. He thus has more in common with Gabriel (in Daniel and Luke) and Enoch (esp. in the Hebrew and Slavonic traditions) than with the Qumran מַשְׁכִּיל. It seems clear that there is no direct connection between the Synoptics and Qumran: these similarities may be satisfactorily explained on the basis that these corpora share a common background, to a significant extent, in Second Temple Palestinian Judaism, especially in its apocalyptic manifestations (particularly Daniel).

Looking ahead, in what ways do our conclusions lay a basis for examining the revelation and transmission of divine insight in the Epistles? The picture of Jesus that emerges from the Synoptics but especially from Luke is of a heavenly mediator figure who, in his earthly life, proclaimed the gospel of the imminence of God's kingdom and as a heavenly figure transmitted divine insight to his disciples. It is this exalted figure that is the focus of the Christology of Acts; it is also this exalted figure who stands behind the revelation of the Gospel and the transmission of apostolic tradition. To anticipate: the Epistles share with Luke the idea that behind what is revealed stands the exalted Christ. They share (to some degree) with the Qumran scrolls the idea that what is revealed must pass through an authoritative human mediator. All three corpora share an emphasis on

revelation with Jewish apocalyptic.

Part three

THE EPISTLES OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

1. Introduction

So far, two models of transmission have been isolated. The first, found in the Qumran scrolls, is based on models of revelation and transmission attested in Second Temple Jewish texts such as Daniel and, presupposing that wisdom is revealed by God, involves a social context in which a wise teacher passes on revealed insight to learners in a chain of transmission. Here there is a specific social context in which revealed teaching is passed on. The second model is also rooted in Second Temple Judaism, including Daniel, but draws more broadly on Jewish divine agency speculation. Again, revelation (including wisdom and hidden mysteries) is of heavenly origin, but a supra-human, heavenly mediator (Jesus) transmits what is revealed. It is against this background that chains of transmission in the NT epistolary corpus may be read. Here, the heavenly post-ascension identity of Christ, together with his mediatorial role, is assumed, but the social context in which a wise teacher transmits traditional material¹ to a learner is also present. Again, as technical language for understanding and the transmission of insight guided our examination of Qumran and the Synoptics, language will be significant to the discussion which follows.

A preliminary survey, briefly outlining the Pauline concept of revelation (in connection with the idea of mystery), Pauline Christology, and Paul's apostolic vocation lays a foundation for further discussion. Use of language remains significant, and Pauline texts using the *termini technici* παραλαμβάνω and παραδίδωμι provide the first case study.² The issues here are: where did this use of language originate? How we are to

¹ We are not concerned here with the background, origin, and development of possible *Traditionstücke* such as Rom 1:3-4 or 1 Thess 1:9-10; rather, the issue is the origin of apostolic tradition *in se* and the process of its transmission.

² See esp. 1 Cor 11:2, 23; 15:1, 3; Gal 1:9, 11-12; Phil 4:9; 1 Thess 2:13; 4:1; 2 Thess 2:15; 3:6.

construe the likeliest context in which Paul's understanding of tradition developed? How did Paul perceive the origin of the tradition(s) he transmitted? Greek and Jewish texts provide the primary source material for comparison. Subsequently, 2 Tim 2:1-7 is examined. This late development in the understanding of revelation and tradition helps to demonstrate the movement from tradition as supernatural revelation to tradition as deposit. Finally, the chain of transmission in Heb 2:1-4 is examined, in connection with the revelation of Torah through angelic mediation as an analogy for the revelation and transmission of the gospel message.³

2. Preliminary survey

We must begin by establishing a common denominator between the texts central to this section and those discussed in parts one and two. The Qumran scrolls are rooted in Jewish apocalyptic, as their concern with revealed insight and heavenly mysteries makes clear. This also holds true for the Synoptics.⁴ If we continue to follow Bornkamm, Stone, and Rowland in identifying the revelation of heavenly mysteries as the key characteristic of apocalyptic, then we have isolated one aspect of the context behind works generally considered Pauline *homologoumena*, Hebrews, and the Pastorals.

2.1. Apocalyptic context: the theme of revealed wisdom

It is indisputable that "apocalyptic" constitutes a major category in the interpretation of Paul.⁵ Beker, for example, places apocalyptic at the very heart of Pauline theology: "[t]he coherent center of Paul's gospel is constituted by the apocalyptic interpretation of the

³ 2 Tim 2:2 and Heb 2:1-4 are late texts which bear witness to a situation in which tradition has been severed, historically, from its source, and is now being passed on as a deposit of faith. Cf. Yves M.-J. Congar, *Tradition and Traditions: An Historical and a Theological Essay* (trans. M. Naseby and T. Rainborough; London: Burns & Oates, 1966), 20.

⁴ See esp. part two, §3.

⁵ Cf. Hans Joachim Schoeps, *Paul: The Theology of the Apostle in the Light of Jewish Religious History* (trans. H. Knight; London: Lutterworth, 1961), 40-46. For a useful summary and assessment of research to 1989, see E. Elizabeth Johnson, *The Function of Apocalyptic and Wisdom Traditions in Romans 9-11* (SBLDS 109; Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1989), 6-23.

Christ-event;"⁶ "[a]pocalyptic is not a peripheral curiosity for Paul but the central climate and focus of his thought, as it was for most early Christian thinkers."⁷ However, it also seems clear that the relevance for the study of Paul of apocalyptic has been determined by an over-emphasis on eschatology:⁸ if, however, the revelation of present heavenly realities is understood as the defining factor in early Jewish apocalyptic, a different spin may be put on Pauline adaptations and appropriations of this phenomenon.

This study opened with verses from the Pastoral Epistles, which form the starting point for this survey. Markus Bockmuehl sums up his brief discussion of the Pastorals thus:

On the whole, then, while the stylistic and conceptual character of the Pastoral Epistles tends to differ from the accepted letters of Paul, various aspects of the apostle's treatment of the "revealed mystery" theme survive intact. Chief among these is the notion that in Christ God's saving purpose has been manifested, and that Paul's divinely appointed ministry is instrumental in its proclamation.⁹

Bockmuehl thus identifies something revealed (God's saving purpose) with a human mediator transmitting what is revealed (Paul). Focusing on *μυστήριον*, he cites 1 Tim 3:9, 16, noting that in 1 Tim 3:16 "the mystery of godliness" (*τὸ τῆς εὐσεβείας μυστήριον*), which has a christological definition, is expressed in terms familiar from Jewish apocalyptic.¹⁰ The "mystery of the faith" (1 Tim 3:9: *τὸ μυστήριον τῆς*

⁶ Beker, *Paul*, 135. Beginning from the works of Vielhauer (in part) and Koch (in particular), Beker suggests that apocalyptic revolves around three ideas: historical dualism; universal cosmic expectation; and the imminent end of the world (*Paul*, 136; cf. p. 138). Cf. Koch, *Rediscovery*, 28-33. Koch distinguishes eight groups of motifs common to apocalyptic writings: urgent expectation of the impending overthrow of all earthly conditions in the immediate future; cosmic eschatological catastrophe; periodisation of history; angels and demons; new salvation beyond the impending catastrophe; catastrophe issues from the throne of God and results in the appearance of his kingdom on earth; eschatological appearance of a mediator with royal functions; the catchword "glory" in connection with the state of affairs at the eschaton.

⁷ Beker, *Paul*, 144. Beker notes, however, that apocalyptic is modified by Paul. The temporal dualism of apocalyptic is absent from Paul's language and the idea that preceding the eschaton there will be an escalation in the forces of evil is modified. Terms such as "the kingdom of God" and "the day of the Lord" are used rarely. The age to come is already irrupting into the present by virtue of the Christ-event: this determines the modification of all other aspects of apocalyptic. Beker, *Paul*, 145-146. For Gal 1:4 as evidence of the apocalyptic idea of two ages (*das apokalyptische Zwei-Äonen-Schema*) cf. Lührmann, *Offenbarungsverständnis*, 89.

⁸ E.g., Schoeps, *Paul*, 88-125.

⁹ Bockmuehl, *Revelation*, 214.

¹⁰ Bockmuehl, *Revelation*, 211.

πίστεως) thus refers to the content and substance of the faith, echoing passages where Paul speaks of the Gospel as a mystery.¹¹ Second Timothy 1:9-11 attests the idea of the former giving (δίδωμι) of divine grace and the making it known (φανερώω) through the appearance of Christ, as well as the entrusting of this to Paul for propagation.¹² This is reflected in Titus 1:2-3 also.¹³ Finally, Bockmuehl asserts that the reward of the heavenly “crown of righteousness” (ὁ τῆς δικαιοσύνης στέφανος) in 2 Tim 4:8 is a motif familiar from apocalyptic.¹⁴ Thus the Pastorals exhibit a slight connection with apocalyptic motifs and presuppose the idea that God reveals and a human mediates what is revealed. Though not discussed by Bockmuehl, 2 Tim 2:7 fits in with the idea of God revealing (in this case σύνεσις) and 2 Tim 2:2 fits in with Paul mediating what has been entrusted to him. These texts are thus connected with the same thought world as Qumran and the Synoptics.

The use of σύνεσις in 2 Tim 2:7 is comparable with its use elsewhere in the Epistles (1 Cor 1:19; Eph 3:4; Col 1:9; 2:2). In 1 Cor 1:19, σύνεσις is parallel with σοφία in a citation from Isa 29:14. Although Paul is arguing that the God will nullify “the insight of the insightful,” it is the wisdom and insight of this world that is meant (cf. 1 Cor 1:20): in 1 Cor 2:6-7 Paul affirms that he and Sosthenes do impart a wisdom of God, hidden in a mystery, among the perfect. This passage thus shares the idea of God imparting wisdom (σοφία and σύνεσις are synonymous)¹⁵ with 2 Tim 2:7. In Eph 3:4, Paul himself claims to possess σύνεσις. His insight is “into the mystery of Christ” (ἐν τῷ μυστηρίῳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ), presumably synonymous with the mystery made known to

¹¹ Bockmuehl, *Revelation*, 211-212. Cf. 1 Cor 2:1 (reading μυστήριον rather than μαρτύριον); Eph 3:3-6; 6:19; Col 4:3.

¹² Bockmuehl, *Revelation*, 212-213.

¹³ Bockmuehl, *Revelation*, 213. Cf. Rom 16:25-27; Titus 2:11-13; 3:4.

¹⁴ Bockmuehl, *Revelation*, 213. Cf. Isa 28:5; Ezek 28:12 (LXX); Wis 5:16; 1 Cor 9:25; Phil 3:12-14; Jas 1:12; 1 Pet 5:4; Rev 2:10; 3:10-11; 22:12 (cf. Isa 40:10; 62:11); 1QH^a XVII, 25; *Ascen. Isa.* 7:22; 9:24-26; *Odes Sol.* 9:8-11; *T. Benj.* 4:1.

¹⁵ Cf. Isa 29:14 (LXX); Luke 2:47 with vv. 40, 52; 1 Cor 1:19; Col 1:9.

him by revelation (Eph 3:3).¹⁶ The context concerns the revelation of a mystery, and thus Paul's insight is into something revealed to him. These themes are very much at home in Ephesians. Eph 1:8-9 speaks of God having "revealed the mystery of his will to us in all wisdom and insight" (*ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ καὶ φρονήσῃ, γνωρίσας ἡμῖν τὸ μυστήριον τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ*). In Eph 1:17 Paul refers to his prayers that God might give the saints in Ephesus (cf. Eph 1:1) a "spirit of wisdom and revelation in knowledge of him" (*δῶῃ ὑμῖν πνεῦμα σοφίας καὶ ἀποκαλύψεως ἐν ἐπιγνώσει αὐτοῦ*). Paul's role of bringing to light "the plan of the mystery hidden for ages in God" (*ἡ οἰκονομία τοῦ μυστηρίου τοῦ ἀποκεκρυμμένου ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων ἐν τῷ θεῷ*) is mentioned in Eph 3:9, Eph 3:10 referring to the revelation of God's manifold wisdom (*ἡ πολυποίκιλος σοφία τοῦ θεοῦ*) to the rulers and powers in heaven. The connection between the gentiles' ignorance and their hardness of heart in Eph 4:18 recalls the cause of the disciples' incomprehension in Mark. In Eph 5:17 the saints in Ephesus are exhorted to "understand what the will of the Lord is" (*συνίετε τί τὸ θέλημα τοῦ κυρίου*). They are to be "wise" (*σοφοί*). Finally, in Eph 6:19 Paul is to "make known the mystery of the Gospel with confidence" (*ἐν παρρησίᾳ γνωρίσαι τὸ μυστήριον τοῦ εὐαγγελίου*). Thus in Ephesians wisdom, understanding, and the revealed mystery are interrelated.

According to Col 1:9 Paul and his companions have been praying that the saints and faithful brothers in Colossae (cf. Col 1:1) would be filled with the knowledge of God's will "in all spiritual wisdom and understanding" (*ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ καὶ συνέσει*). The assumption is that wisdom and understanding of this sort are heavenly gifts.¹⁷ Colossians 2:2 refers to "all the riches of the full assurance of understanding" (*πᾶν πλοῦτος τῆς πληροφορίας τῆς συνέσεως*). The fact that Col 2:3 refers to the

¹⁶ This passage may be dependent on Col 1:26-27: cf. Rudolf Schnackenburg, *The Epistle to the Ephesians: A Commentary* (trans. H. Heron; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1991), 27.

¹⁷ Eduard Lohse, *Colossians and Philemon: A Commentary on the Epistles to the Colossians and Philemon* (ed. H. Koester; trans. W. R. Poehlmann and R. J. Karris; Hermeneia; Philadelphia, Pa.: Fortress, 1971), 25-27. Lohse reads this passage against the background of the divine bestowal of wisdom, knowledge, and insight in the Qumran scrolls, suggesting that *ἐπίγνωσις*, *σοφία*, and *σύνεσις* in Col 1:9 are equivalent to *שכל*, *בינה*, and *חכמת גבורה* in 1QS IV, 3.

treasuries of wisdom (*σοφία*) and knowledge (*γνῶσις*) being hidden in Christ, implying not only that these, but *σύνεσις* too are gifts to be bestowed from a heavenly source.¹⁸

The heavenly origin of wisdom, understanding, and mystery in these texts betrays apocalyptic influence. These ideas, however, are at home in a broader category of thought within the Pauline tradition, concerned with revelation and mystery. This should briefly be outlined for the sake of clarity: an exhaustive treatment is neither desirable nor necessary in light of other adequate studies.¹⁹

2.2. Revelation and mystery in the *corpus Paulinum*

Bockmuehl analyses revelation in Paul as taking place in three temporal dimensions (past, present, and future),²⁰ the key to Paul's understanding of revelation being the gospel of Jesus Christ.²¹ To the first dimension belongs above all the recent revelation of Jesus Christ and the gospel,²² but also the specific revelation granted to Paul.²³ The past dimension "prompts an ongoing divine disclosure in the apostolic mission,"²⁴ connecting the apostolate directly with the present mediation of ongoing revelation. In the present God's righteousness and wrath are revealed in the gospel;²⁵ in addition, divine revelation

¹⁸ Cf. Lohse, *Colossians*, 82-83. Lohse finds a parallel in the concealment and revelation of things hidden in treasures in Jewish apocalyptic, e.g. *1 En.* 46:3 (Lohse, *Colossians*, 82-83 n. 118).

¹⁹ E.g., Lührmann, *Offenbarungsverständnis*; Bockmuehl, *Revelation*.

²⁰ Bockmuehl, *Revelation*, 133.

²¹ Bockmuehl, *Revelation*, 147. Cf. Beker, *Paul*, 120-121: Beker notes that for Paul, Christ is the key to Scripture.

²² Rom 3:21-26; Gal 3:23-25 (cf. 4:1-7); Bockmuehl, *Revelation*, 133-135. Bockmuehl places the revelation of eschatological mysteries alongside the revelation of Christ/the gospel in opposition to *τὸ μυστήριον τῆς δυνάμεως* of 2 Thess 2:7. The gospel was once hidden in heaven and has now been decisively revealed to the apostles (though its consummation at the parousia is awaited); the apostles preach it to everyone and equip believers to become *τέλειοι* (*Revelation*, 198).

²³ 1 Cor 9:1; 15:1-8; 2 Cor 4:6; Gal 1:11-12, 13-17; Phil 3:12; Bockmuehl, *Revelation*, 135-137.

²⁴ Bockmuehl, *Revelation*, 137. In George Eldon Ladd's words, "[t]he past lives in the present through proclamation" ("Revelation and Tradition in Paul," in *Apostolic History and the Gospel: Biblical and Historical Essays presented to F. F. Bruce on his 60th Birthday* [ed. W. Ward Gasque and R. P. Martin; Exeter: Paternoster, 1970], 224).

²⁵ Rom 1:16-18. Cf. Rom 2:16; 1 Cor 3:13; 2 Cor 2:15-16; 1 Thess 1:9-10. Bockmuehl, *Revelation*, 138-141.

is ongoing in the preaching of the gospel and especially in the apostolic ministry.²⁶ Several references are made by Paul to occasional revelations.²⁷ However, revelation remains incomplete, pending its future consummation: the eschatological revelation of Jesus Christ is still awaited.²⁸ Bockmuehl examines a number of pertinent passages pertaining to the revelation of mysteries, beginning with 1 Cor 2:6-10.²⁹ Here Paul (among the apostles and prophets)³⁰ has received revelation of divine mysteries and communicates God's wisdom to the "mature" (τέλειοι), "those who manifest a spiritual rather than a carnal disposition and way of life,"³¹ who are ethically blameless.³² Paul's mediatorial role as apostle is present in 1 Cor 4:1,³³ where the apostles are to be reckoned as "servants of Christ and stewards of God's mysteries," receiving and imparting the mysteries of God.

In his discussion of Colossians, which he regards as authentically Pauline,³⁴ Bockmuehl focuses on Col 1:24-2:5, noting the close link in Col 1:27 between the particular mystery in question and the gospel.³⁵ This suggests that *μυστήριον* here may overlap with Paul's use of this noun to designate the content of his preaching (cf. Col

²⁶ Cf. 2 Cor 2:14-15; 3:2-3; 5:20; 13:3. Bockmuehl, *Revelation*, 142-144. On Paul in 2 Cor 13:3 as mediator of revelations from Christ, patterned on OT prophets (esp. Moses), see Bockmuehl, *Revelation*, 143.

²⁷ 1 Cor 12:7-11; 14:6, 24-25, 26, 30; 2 Cor 12:1-4; Gal 2:2 (cf. Acts 11:28-30); Phil 3:15. Bockmuehl, *Revelation*, 144-145 (on 2 Cor 12:1-4 see pp. 175-177).

²⁸ Cf. Rom 2:5-6; 8:18-19; 1 Cor 1:7; 4:5; Col 3:4; 2 Thess 1:7. Bockmuehl, *Revelation*, 145-147.

²⁹ Bockmuehl, *Revelation*, 157-166. See also 1 Cor 13:2 (p. 167); 14:2 (pp. 168-170); 15:50-55; Rom 11:25-27 (cf. 1 Thess 4:13-17; pp. 170-175).

³⁰ See the (probable) apostolic "we" in 1 Cor 2:10 (cf. 2:1-5; 4:1): *ἡμῖν*. Bockmuehl, *Revelation*, 164 and n. 35.

³¹ Bockmuehl, *Revelation*, 158 (cf. pp. 165, 186).

³² Cf. Matt 5:48; 19:21; Rom 12:1-2; 1 Cor 14:20; Phil 3:15; Col 1:28; 4:12.

³³ 1 Cor 4:1: *οὕτως ἡμᾶς λογιζέσθω ἄνθρωπος ὡς ὑπηρετάς Χριστοῦ καὶ οἰκονόμους μυστηρίων θεοῦ*. Bockmuehl, *Revelation*, 166-167.

³⁴ Bockmuehl, *Revelation*, 178-179.

³⁵ Identifying *Χριστός ἐν ὑμῖν* as referring to the proclamation of Christ among the Gentiles, based on the functional interchangeability of *Χριστός* and *εὐαγγέλιον*. Bockmuehl, *Revelation*, 182 and n. 21, 183, 185-186, 187-188. Cf. 1 Cor 1:23; 15:12; Gal 2:2; Phil 1:15; Col 1:23. This interpretation, which rejects the idea that *Χριστός ἐν ὑμῖν* refers to the Christ dwelling mystically in the heart of believers, is likewise upheld by Lohse (*Colossians*, 76), for whom *μυστήριον* here differs from the mysteries of Jewish apocalyptic that often concern the divine plan for the eschaton, since it refers to one revealed mystery: Christ, the hope of glory.

4:3;³⁶ 1 Cor 2:1).³⁷ This is developed in Col 4:3-4 (cf. 1 Cor 2:1; Eph 6:19-20).³⁸ Here, Paul wishes to speak and manifest the mystery of Christ (i.e. Christ's work of redemption announced in the Gospel), which reflects his understanding of his apostolic ministry elsewhere (Rom 16:25-26; Eph 3:1-13;³⁹ Col 1:28).⁴⁰ Paul is an instrument of God's revelation.⁴¹ Bockmuehl places the Pauline concept of mystery firmly in the context of his understanding of revelation. For our purposes, two aspects of his analysis are important: the past revelation of the gospel (together with the particular revelation to Paul) and the function of the apostolic ministry in receiving and transmitting the gospel. This leads into the following areas of inquiry: Paul's understanding of the origin of his gospel; his understanding of the Christ who reveals and is revealed in the gospel; and the function of the apostolic office. These have all been extensively researched: only a brief treatment is possible or necessary here.

2.3. The origin of Paul's gospel: the work of Seyoon Kim

The apostolic *κηρύγμα* is itself a revelation from God disclosed through apostles and prophets.⁴² In Rom 16:25, *τὸ κήρυγμα Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ* is parallel with *τὸ εὐαγγέλιον μου*,⁴³ and both accord with the revelation of a mystery kept silent but now revealed. The gospel is a mystery (Eph 6:19) and is of divine origin (Rom 1:1; 1 Thess 2:2). *Κηρύγμα, εὐαγγέλιον, μυστήριον*: these are of heavenly origin and have recently been revealed. This points to the very root of Paul's theology and perception of his vocation, taking us

³⁶ Cf. Lohse, *Colossians*, 165.

³⁷ Bockmuehl, *Revelation*, 182.

³⁸ Bockmuehl, *Revelation*, 205.

³⁹ However, note Bockmuehl's cautious denial of the authenticity of Ephesians: *Revelation*, 194 n. 1; cf. pp. 199-205.

⁴⁰ Bockmuehl, *Revelation*, 191.

⁴¹ Bockmuehl, *Revelation*, 191-193 (cf. pp. 133-156).

⁴² Rom 16:25-26; cf. Eph 3:5. Ladd, "Revelation," 223.

⁴³ *Κηρύγμα* and *εὐαγγέλιον* are practically synonymous. Cf. William Baird, "What is the Kerygma? A Study of 1 Cor 15 3-8 and Gal 1 11-17," *JBL* 76 (1957): 184.

back to the point of Paul's initial commission.⁴⁴ For Philippe Menoud, Paul's theology is dependent on the Damascus road revelation.⁴⁵ This relates to the central thesis of Seyoon Kim, *The Origin of Paul's Gospel*,⁴⁶ that for Paul, the origin of his gospel was his experience on the Damascus road. Kim's argument should be summarised briefly, emphasising the points that are of particular import for the present study.

Kim's thesis is developed in conscious opposition to approaches which reduce explanations of Paul to particular aspects of his supposed background (e.g., Palestinian or Hellenistic Judaism, mystery cults, Gnosticism).⁴⁷ Rather, Paul's own testimony is to be taken seriously, that he received the gospel through a revelation of Jesus Christ (Gal 1:12).⁴⁸ In his letters, Paul refers or alludes to his conversion and call on a number of occasions,⁴⁹ reminding churches of the Damascus event to stress the divine origin and authenticity of his gospel and apostleship.⁵⁰ Indeed, "[t]he Damascus event is the basis both of his theology and his existence as an apostle."⁵¹ Kim reads the motifs of light and

⁴⁴ The question of whether Paul's experience on the Damascus road amounts to a conversion or a commission has excited many a scholarly imagination and cannot be dealt with here. It may be appropriate, however, to bear Alan Segal's words in mind: "[f]rom the viewpoint of mission Paul is commissioned, but from the viewpoint of religious experience Paul is a convert" (*Paul the Convert: The Apostolate and Apostasy of Saul the Pharisee* [New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1990], 6).

⁴⁵ Philippe H. Menoud, "Revelation and Tradition: The Influence of Paul's Conversion on his Theology," *Int* 7 (1953): 134-137.

⁴⁶ Seyoon Kim, *The Origin of Paul's Gospel* (WUNT 2/4; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1981).

⁴⁷ Kim, *Origin*, 1-2. Cf. Schoeps, *Paul*, 14-15; Newman, *Paul's Glory-Christology*, 183.

⁴⁸ Kim, *Origin*, 2. Cf. Baird, "What is the Kerygma?" 191; Newman, *Paul's Glory-Christology*, 198 (on Gal 1:11-12): "[a]s a revelatory event, δι' ἀποκαλύψεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ is a homologation for εὐαγγέλιον of verse 11." Kim is responding to Bornkamm, who strongly denies that the Damascus road experience is central for Paul. Rather, for Bornkamm, Paul's giving up of the law as a means of salvation and receiving of the gospel are central: *Paul* (trans. D. M. G. Stalker; London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1971), 16-17.

⁴⁹ Kim, *Origin*, 3-31. Cf. Munck, *Paul*, 34; Segal, *Paul*, 12; Newman, *Paul's Glory-Christology*, 164-166. Explicit references: 1 Cor 9:1; 15:8-10; Gal 1:13-17; Phil 3:4-11. Allusions: Rom 10:2-4; 1 Cor 9:16-17; 2 Cor 3:4-4:6; 5:16; Eph 3:1-13; Col 1:23c-29. In addition, Paul's call is alluded to using certain aorist verbs: cf. Rom 1:5; 12:3; 15:15; 1 Cor 1:17; 3:10; 2 Cor 3:6; 4:1; 5:18; 10:8; 13:10; Gal 2:7, 8, 9; Eph 3:2, 7, 8; Col 1:25; 1 Thess 2:4 (cf. 1 Tim 1:11; Titus 1:3). The opening verses of the *Hauptbriefe*, Ephesians, and Colossians should also be understood as alluding to Paul's apostolic commission. The Damascus event formed part of Paul's preaching and catechetical tradition, accounting for its presence in 1 Tim 1:11-14 (if deutero-Pauline); Acts 9:1-9; 22:3-16; 26:4-18. Munck doubts that 2 Cor 4:6 should be connected with the Damascus christophany: *Paul*, 34.

⁵⁰ Kim, *Origin*, 29; thus explaining why many of Paul's allusions to his call are in the context of defending his gospel and apostleship: *Origins*, 31. Cf. Bornkamm, *Paul*, 16 (his allusions to his conversion and call are in the context of expositions of the gospel).

⁵¹ Kim, *Origin*, 31. Cf. Schoeps, *Paul*, 53-55.

glory in 2 Cor 4:6 as referring to his vision of the glorified Christ on the Damascus Road.⁵² Moreover, the statement of purpose⁵³ indicates that Paul's apostolic office is the instrument through which God's light shines to others.⁵⁴ Paul is referring to the Damascus experience in terms of *both* conversion and his call to the apostolic office (cf. Gal 1:11-16).⁵⁵ This is also the case in Eph 3:1-13; Col 1:23c-29. The formula *χάρις* + aor. pass. *δίδωμι* + *μοι* (Eph 3:2, 7; cf. v. 8)⁵⁶ indicates God's call of Paul to apostleship, which includes the revelation of the gospel (Eph 3:3-6) and the commission to proclaim it (Eph 3:7-10; cf. Gal 1:15-16).⁵⁷ The *μυστήριον* of Eph 3:3, 4, 9 stands for the *εὐαγγέλιον* of Gal 1:11, 16.⁵⁸ In the Damascus christophany Paul received both the call to Gentile mission and the gospel.⁵⁹ It is the former that dominates his descriptions of the christophany,⁶⁰ his call being interpreted in light of the call of OT prophets.⁶¹ Importantly, he sees no contradiction between Gal 1:11-12 and the transmission of tradition in 1 Cor 15: the gospel can only be unfolded through the narration of the facts about Jesus Christ, which are the object of the tradition. Thus "Paul received from others and transmitted to others the tradition as his gospel because it thus brings his gospel to expression."⁶² His use of *ἀποκαλύπτω* and *ἀποκάλυψις* in Gal 1 and the collocation of *ἀποκάλυψις* and *μυστήριον* in Eph 3:3 establish that Paul is using apocalyptic language

⁵² Kim, *Origin*, 5-13; Schoeps, *Paul*, 54. Cf. Acts 9:3; 22:6, 11; 26:13; 1 Cor 15:43 (cf. 2 Bar. 50-51); Phil 3:21.

⁵³ I.e., *πρὸς φωτισμὸν τῆς γνώσεως τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν προσώπῳ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*, "for the illumination of the knowledge of God's glory in the face of Jesus Christ." Cf. 2 Cor 4:4. On 4:6, see Kim, *Origin*, 9-11.

⁵⁴ Referring to their conversion, which is God's new creation: Kim, *Origin*, 8-9.

⁵⁵ Kim, *Origin*, 10.

⁵⁶ Cf. n. 49 above.

⁵⁷ Kim, *Origin*, 22.

⁵⁸ Kim, *Origin*, 23. Paul applies the concept of mystery to Christ and the gospel: *Origin*, 75.

⁵⁹ Kim, *Origin*, 65.

⁶⁰ Cf. Rom 1:1, 5; 15:15-16; 1 Cor 1:17; Gal 2:7; 1 Thess 2:4. Kim, *Origin*, 56-58.

⁶¹ Gal 1:15-16. Cf. Isa 6; 49:1-6; Jer 1:5-10; Ezek 1:4-3:11; Acts 13:47; 26:16-18. Kim, *Origin*, 60; cf. pp. 91-99; Munck, *Paul*, 24-33; Beker, *Paul*, 115-118; Frederick F. Bruce, *The Epistle of Paul to the Galatians: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC; Exeter: Paternoster, 1982), 92-93; Segal, *Paul*, 9, 13-14; Newman, *Paul's Glory-Christology*, 204-207.

⁶² Kim, *Origin*, 70.

to refer to his Damascus experience.⁶³ Where *ἀποκαλύπτω* is used in 1 Cor 2:10, the meaning is that hidden wisdom was revealed to Paul in the Damascus christophany.⁶⁴ 1 Corinthians 2:6-10 shares three common elements with Eph 3:1-13 and Col 1:23c-19: (1) the revelation-schema (the mystery which existed from eternity in concealment is now revealed); (2) the recipients of the revelation of the mystery are, first, Paul and his colleagues, and then Christians who receive the mystery through their preaching; (3) the mystery designates Christ and God's plan of salvation that Christ embodies.

Kim's analysis, only selectively summarised above, is important for our purposes for several reasons. First, although Kim problematically relies on the future focus of some manifestations of apocalyptic for his understanding of the phenomenon, he is correct to read Paul's presentation of the origin of his gospel in the context of apocalyptic. An approach which sees the revelation of present heavenly realities as the defining aspect of this phenomenon would find the revelation of the gospel in Gal 1:11-12 and the revelation of hidden wisdom in 1 Cor 2:10 more fundamentally apocalyptic. Second, by seeing the revelation of the gospel and the transmission of tradition as fundamentally interconnected Kim allows us to place the latter, also, in the context of apocalyptic. As the revelation and transmission of insight at Qumran and the bestowal of insight in the Synoptics are apocalyptic, so are the revelation and transmission of the gospel in Paul. Third, having established the heavenly identity of the Lukan Jesus in part two in the context of OT and apocalyptic analogies, Kim's emphasis on the connections between Paul's retellings of the Damascus christophany and OT theophanic call narratives allows us to read both the Lukan Jesus and the Pauline Christ together in the context of Jewish patterns of intermediation.⁶⁵ Fourth, the authoritative aspect of Paul's retellings of the

⁶³ Kim, *Origin*, 71 and n. 2. Cf. Dan 2:19, 28, 30, 48; cf. v. 22; 1 En. 16:3; 61:5; 106:19; 4 Ezra 10:38; 2 Bar. 48:3.

⁶⁴ Kim, *Origin*, 78-79.

⁶⁵ Cf. esp. part two, §6.1. E. Earle Ellis notes that in 1 Cor 1-4 (esp. 2:6-16) Christ is portrayed as God's wisdom in two ways: (1) the work of Christ; (2) the exalted Christ mediates hidden wisdom to God's people ("Wisdom", 95). This is close to the Lukan Jesus as revealer of insight and the Pauline Christ as mediator of the gospel and author of tradition (see further §2.4 below).

christophany recalls the authoritative aspect of the revealed insight transmitted at Qumran and of ancient wisdom teaching and apocalyptic revelations in general. Finally, the notion of the apostolic office as one which performs the mediatorial function of receiving and transmitting the gospel strongly recalls the role of the *משכיל* at Qumran.⁶⁶ the difference lies in the fact that apostles (but specifically Paul) are charged with proclaiming to all, the *משכיל* is charged with transmitting insight only within a closed community.

2.4. The glorified Christ

It is necessary now to unravel briefly the christological implications of the previous two sections. In the summary to §2.3 above it was noted that both the Lukan Jesus and the Pauline Christ may be read together in the context of Jewish patterns of intermediation. In part two⁶⁷ the use of *δόξα* in the Lukan transfiguration narrative was shown to relate to OT and apocalyptic texts and to point to the heavenly identity of Jesus,⁶⁸ which is continued in the exalted, glorified Christ of Acts.⁶⁹ This picture of Christ may be extended to Pauline texts.⁷⁰

Kim's emphasis on the centrality of the Damascus road christophany points to a christology in which glorification is fundamental. Thus when Paul refers to Christ in 1 Cor 2:8 as "the Lord of glory" (*τὸν κύριον τῆς δόξης*) passages in which he alludes to

⁶⁶ Cf. Ellis's remark: "[i]n sum, the *maskilim* at Qumran are recipients and transmitters of divine mysteries, possessors of wisdom, interpreters of knowledge, guides to a mature life, and discerners of spirits. As such, they not only reflect their kinship with the earlier prophets but also bear a striking resemblance to the pneumatics in the Pauline community." Ellis, "'Wisdom'," 95; cf. pp. 97-98. However, where Ellis compares the pneumatics at Corinth (among whom Paul is included) with the *משכיל*, our suggestion is that the apostolic office itself bears comparison with these figures. See §2.5 below.

⁶⁷ See esp. §§6.1.3.2; 6.1.4; 6.1.5.1.1; 6.1.5.1.2.

⁶⁸ Cf. Newman, *Paul's Glory-Christology*, 173-174 n. 26. Newman suggests a possible connection between Paul's identification of the exalted Christ with glory traditions and the earliest Christian preaching, citing a number of texts from the Gospels and Acts, including the synoptic transfiguration accounts, in support. In light of Acts 7 he suggests that "Paul could well have known of the close association (even identification) of Jesus as the heavenly Son of Man with *δόξα*" (*Paul's Glory-Christology*, 174 n. 26; cf. pp. 188-189, 192-193).

⁶⁹ On the Christology of Acts, see Haenchen, *Acts*, 91-92.

⁷⁰ I.e., it is the exalted Christ rather than the historical Jesus that is central for Paul. Cf. Schoeps, *Paul*, 55-59.

his Damascus experience are recalled.⁷¹ This title is unique to 1 Corinthians and Ethiopic Enoch,⁷² though this, for Kim, does not imply that Paul has taken the title from the latter work or the Jewish apocalyptic tradition it represents. The title “the Lord of glory” is appropriate to a context in which the Damascus experience is connected with God’s glory.⁷³ Kim suggests that Paul may have coined the title independently of Ethiopic Enoch⁷⁴ in light of the Damascus experience, though the fact that the title already existed in first century Judaism should make us wary of denying influence from that quarter outright.⁷⁵

Kim’s conclusion is reflected in the work of Carey Newman, who states that “the Damascus Christophany is the interpretive ‘origin’ of Paul’s *δόξα*-Christology. That is, the vision of the resurrected and exalted Jesus, the Christophany, was the catalyst for the apostle’s designation of Christ as *δόξα*.”⁷⁶ Newman’s study begins with a survey of Paul’s use of *δόξα* as a christological term.⁷⁷ Newman regards *δόξα* as “one of Paul’s apocalyptic surface symbols,” relating this aspect of Pauline Christology to an apocalyptic context.⁷⁸ Paul interpreted the christophany using the common language of mystical-apocalyptic Judaism.⁷⁹ Further, the christophany is to be understood (identifying *ἀποκάλυψις* in Gal 1:12; 2 Cor 12:1 as pointing to parallel ecstatic experiences)⁸⁰ as a *merkabah* vision parallel with heavenly ascents in apocalyptic texts.

⁷¹ Kim, *Origins*, 79. See further, Newman, *Paul’s Glory-Christology*, 235-240.

⁷² *1 En.* 22:14; 25:3 (cf. 25:7: “the God of Glory”); 27:4, 5; 63:2; cf. 75:3 (“the Lord, God of eternal glory”).

⁷³ Kim, *Origin*, 80. Cf. 2 Cor 3:18; 4:4-6; Acts 9:3-5; 22:6, 11; 26:13; Phil 3:21.

⁷⁴ N. B. the only mss of this work dateable to the Second Temple period are written in Aramaic.

⁷⁵ Influence from the Enochic corpus is assumed by Newman: *Paul’s Glory-Christology*, 237.

⁷⁶ Newman, *Paul’s Glory-Christology*, 164. Cf. Segal’s comparison of the Lukan accounts of Paul’s Damascus road experience with Ezekiel’s call (*Paul*, 8-11). Segal raises the question whether Paul’s Christianity is rooted in the identification of Jesus with the divine *קְבוֹרָה* (*Paul*, 11; cf. Newman, *Paul’s Glory-Christology*, 10). Newman offers a useful account and assessment of previous research on the relative significance of the Damascus christophany for Paul’s theology and self-understanding: *Paul’s Glory-Christology*, 164-183.

⁷⁷ Newman, *Paul’s Glory-Christology*, 4-7; cf. pp. 3-16.

⁷⁸ Newman, *Paul’s Glory-Christology*, 11.

⁷⁹ Newman, *Paul’s Glory-Christology*, 183.

⁸⁰ Newman, *Paul’s Glory-Christology*, 201-203.

In connection with the reference to Paul's apostleship in 1 Cor 9:1-2, Newman notes that Paul's apostolic freedom is rooted in the christophany;⁸¹ indeed, Paul's authority to engage in apostolic ministry among the nations derived from the it.⁸² The reference to the christophany in 1 Cor 15:8 not only connects Paul's experience with other resurrection appearances but establishes that Paul's apostolic mission is a constitutive part of the gospel.⁸³ Paul's use of *ᾠφθῆ* in 1 Cor 15:8 links his christophany with Gospel accounts of the resurrection⁸⁴ and thus with the motif of glory, which is connected with both the risen Jesus and the eschatological manifestation of the Son of Man.⁸⁵ The phrase *κατὰ τὰς γραφὰς* in 1 Cor 15:3, read in connection with *ᾠφθῆ* in 15:8, links the christophany with OT theophanies and references to the future manifestation of the divine glory.⁸⁶ Jesus is identified as the divine glory, and in him the promises of the eschatological revelation of the glory are proleptically inaugurated.⁸⁷ In reference to Gal 1:11-16, Newman concludes that the use of *ἀποκαλύψαι* (1:16) defines the christophany as a revelatory event which mediated to Paul Jesus' identity as the exalted Lord.⁸⁸ In his apostolate, Paul's suffered and at the same time manifested the divine glory, after the pattern of the servant of Deutero-Isaiah.⁸⁹ In 2 Cor 4:3-4 (cf. 4:6) the gospel itself is understood as a revelation of the divine glory.⁹⁰ As the reference to the christophany in Gal 1:11-16 is meant to substantiate the legitimacy of Paul's apostolate, the allusions in 2 Cor 3:4-4:6 to the revelation of the glory in Christ at the christophany are intended to

⁸¹ The christophany is signified here by *ἐόρακα*. See Newman, *Paul's Glory-Christology*, 186; cf. pp. 186-196.

⁸² Newman, *Paul's Glory-Christology*, 196-197.

⁸³ Newman, *Paul's Glory-Christology*, 187-188.

⁸⁴ Cf. Luke 24:34.

⁸⁵ E.g., Matt 19:28; Mark 8:38 (par. Matt 16:27; Luke 9:26); 10:37; 13:26 (par. Matt 24:30; Luke 21:27); 1 Tim 3:16; Heb 1:3; 1 Pet 1:21. Newman, *Paul's Glory-Christology*, 188-190.

⁸⁶ Newman, *Paul's Glory-Christology*, 190-192.

⁸⁷ Newman, *Paul's Glory-Christology*, 192.

⁸⁸ Newman, *Paul's Glory-Christology*, 204; cf. pp. 196-207.

⁸⁹ Newman, *Paul's Glory-Christology*, 204-207.

⁹⁰ Newman, *Paul's Glory-Christology*, 219-225; cf. p. 234.

defend his apostolic authority.⁹¹ Newman's conclusion is that the christophany consisted in a revelation of God's glory.⁹²

How does this contribute to our discussion? The identification of the exalted Christ with the divine glory ties in with the discussion of the heavenly identity of the Lukan Jesus in part two. It also places Christ in the divine presence and gives him a potentially revelatory, mediatorial role. It certainly establishes the dependence of the Pauline model on an apocalyptic worldview. The heavenly origin of the gospel is intimately connected with the christophany. Paul's mediation of the gospel is also rooted in the christophany. There is thus a model of transmission here reminiscent of texts discussed in parts one and two: a mystery is revealed from a heavenly source through an exalted human, now associated with the divine glory, to a chosen human mediator, whose role is to pass this mystery (i.e., the gospel and its constitutive traditions) on in a chain of transmission.

2.5. Apostle as mediator⁹³

A few words of clarification are required in connection with the mediatorial role of the apostle. In his survey of revelation in the Qumran scrolls,⁹⁴ Bockmuehl draws on the work of Svend Holm-Nielsen on the *Hodayot* in identifying the Teacher of Righteousness as a mediator of divine revelation.⁹⁵ He also notes the work of Jose Maria Casciaro

⁹¹ Newman, *Paul's Glory-Christology*, 229-235. Paul's argument is that the revelation of the divine glory at the christophany that legitimises his apostolate is superior to the revelation of the divine glory at Sinai, the basis of his opponents' claims to authority.

⁹² Newman, *Paul's Glory-Christology*, 246-247.

⁹³ It would be impossible given the specific concerns and limitations of this study to critique the vast wealth of material written on the issue of apostleship. Rather, this section seeks to relate Paul's apostleship specifically to revelation, transmission, and the ancient Jewish context outlined in part one of this study.

⁹⁴ Bockmuehl, *Revelation*, 42-56.

⁹⁵ Bockmuehl, *Revelation*, 49; Svend Holm-Nielsen, *Hodayot: Psalms from Qumran* (ATDan 2; Aarhus: Universitetsforlaget i Aarhus, 1960), 285, 288. Holm-Nielsen refers to the "I" of the *Hodayot* where Bockmuehl understands the Teacher of Righteousness, down-playing the significance of the identity of the speaker: "[t]he reason why I consider this matter less important is not only that it is barely possible to say anything at all decisive about the actual authorship, but also, and especially, that this attitude to the problem tends to obscure the pertinent question of what the purpose was in composing such psalms" (*Hodayot*, 316). On the vexed question of the literary origin of the *Hodayot*, see Holm-Nielsen, *Hodayot*, 316-331. It should

Ramirez, who sees this function of the author of the *Hodayot* as a precedent for Paul's self-understanding as mediator of revelation.⁹⁶ With reference to 1QH^a XIII, 11-12, 25; XVII, 24 Casciaro Ramirez comments

Como puede apreciarse en estos tres pasajes, el autor del himno se considera instrumento providencial de la acción divina para mantener escondidos la ley, el misterio y la verdad a los hombres y después revelarlos. Los pasajes son, pues, interesantes como precedentes literarios y temáticos de la fraseología paulina del secreto y revelación del misterio salvífico (cfr., entre otros textos, Rom 16,25-26; Col 1, 25-27; Eph 3,5-11; 2 Tim 1,9-11).⁹⁷

This model, of a figure who receives and guards heavenly mysteries (including wisdom),⁹⁸ and then transmits them, is precisely that of the מִשְׁכִּיל, as we found in part one above; the fact that the "I" of the *Hodayot* is in 1QH^a XX, 4 (reconstructed; par. 4QH^a 2 + 3 II, 5), 11 (par. 4QH^a 2 + 3 II, 12 [reconstructed]); XXV^{bot}, 10 dubbed מִשְׁכִּיל suggests that it is this figure rather than the Teacher of Righteousness that offers a parallel to Paul's self-understanding as apostle. Paul is a mediator of divine revelation comparable with the Qumran מִשְׁכִּיל, the key distinction being that Paul is to transmit the gospel to the Gentiles whereas the מִשְׁכִּיל is to transmit insight with a closed community. Transmission from a heavenly source to human recipients is the basis of comparison.

A survey of pertinent texts is apposite. In Eph 3:1-7 Paul, as ἀπόστολος, has had "the mystery" (τὸ μυστήριον) revealed to him, and he has transmitted it to Gentiles.⁹⁹ An ἀπόστολος is therefore part of a chain of divine revelation. In 1 Cor 4:1 Paul refers to himself and his fellow apostles as "stewards of God's mysteries" (οἰκονόμους

be stressed that the evidence connecting the Teacher of Righteousness with the psalmist of the *Hodayot* is entirely circumstantial.

⁹⁶ Bockmuehl, *Revelation*, 49 n. 41; Jose Maria Casciaro Ramirez, "Los 'Himnos' de Qumran y el 'Misterio' Paulino," *ScrTh* 8 (1976): 34. Casciaro Ramirez also, unnecessarily, takes the author of the *Hodayot* to be the Teacher of Righteousness.

⁹⁷ Casciaro Ramirez, "'Himnos'," 34.

⁹⁸ Cf. Casciaro Ramirez, "'Himnos'," 33.

⁹⁹ Cf. Andrew T. Lincoln, *Ephesians* (WBC 42; Dallas, Tex.: Word Books, 1990), 174. Ms B Ambrosiaster omits ἀποστόλους, Lincoln suggesting that this is to conform with the wording of Col 1:26 (*Ephesians*, 167).

μυστηρίων θεοῦ). If we understand “mysteries” to refer to “secret knowledge of God’s purpose,”¹⁰⁰ then the idea that the apostles have been made privy to divine secrets and are therefore part of a chain of revelation may be inferred.¹⁰¹ In Galatians, Paul emphasises his role as part of a chain of revelation in defending his right to the appellation “apostle” (Gal 1:1, 12),¹⁰² inferring in Gal 1:16 that the purpose of his receiving a revelation of God’s son was to preach the Gospel among the nations.¹⁰³ In Titus 1:1-4 Paul is entrusted with a proclamation which has been revealed by God and Paul’s proclamation in 1 Cor 9:27 stems from his obligation as apostle.¹⁰⁴ Col 1:24-28 is also significant. In Col 1:1 Παῦλος ἀπόστολος Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ διὰ θελήματος θεοῦ, identical to 2 Tim 1:1, suggests Paul is writing as apostle and is to be regarded as the agent of the revelation of the hidden mystery in Col 1:26-27 (cf. 4:3-4). Paul and Timothy together teach “in all wisdom” (ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ) in Col 2:28 and proclaim Christ. 2 Cor 1:19¹⁰⁵ echoes this, in that Paul, Silvanus, and Timothy have all proclaimed Christ amongst the Christians of Corinth and Achaia.

We therefore have a pattern emerging: Paul, as an apostle, is a divinely commissioned mediator of revelation.¹⁰⁶

2.6. Summary

The theme of revelation, which suggests strong connections with early Jewish apocalyptic, is a fundamental aspect of Paul’s understanding of the origin of his gospel. In particular, the past revelation of the gospel and Paul’s Damascus road christophany are

¹⁰⁰ C. K. Barrett, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (BNTC; London: A & C Black, 1971), 100.

¹⁰¹ This recalls Raymond Brown’s view that *οἰκονόμους* here means “servants of Christ dispensing to other servants the mysteries of the Gospel” (*Semitic Background*, 44).

¹⁰² Cf. 2 Cor 12:12; 13:3?

¹⁰³ Cf. Gal 1:23; 2:2. Bockmuehl cites 1 Cor 9:1; 15:1-8; 2 Cor 4:6; Phil 3:12 in connection with Paul’s validation as *ἀπόστολος*, suggesting that these texts refer back to the Damascus road experience (*Revelation*, 136-137). Cf. §2.3 above.

¹⁰⁴ Cf. 1 Cor 9:1-2, 16.

¹⁰⁵ Cf. 2 Cor 4:5.

¹⁰⁶ Cf. Bockmuehl, *Revelation*, 142-144.

significant: for Paul, the christophany was the origin of his gospel. The christophany reveals, through apocalyptic motifs and language, the glorified Christ as mediator of revelation. Paul's apostolate is defined in relation to the christophany and the heavenly origin of his gospel. The role of apostle is, in part, that of transmitting revealed mysteries. This category of thought must be extended to encompass the concept of tradition. This connection is anticipated by Beker: "Paul interprets the tradition in accordance with his apostolic call and immediate revelation from God."¹⁰⁷ Tradition and gospel are inseparable and the now exalted Christ is the origin of both. Tradition in the *corpus Paulinum* belongs within the same category of thought as revelation, gospel, mystery, and *κηρύγμα*. The next stage in our investigation must involve the language and concept of tradition in the *corpus Paulinum*.

3. Paul's language of transmission

Several texts in the *corpus Paulinum* use technical vocabulary to represent the transmission of teaching and reflect a model closely paralleled, apparently, in the transmission of *תורה שבעל פה* in *m. ḤAbot* 1:1. These texts must be examined in relation to Greek and Hebrew texts which employ a similar vocabulary.

3.1. Survey of pertinent references

We begin with 1 Cor 11:23. At the beginning of his teaching about the Eucharist, Paul writes *ἐγὼ γὰρ παρέλαβον ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου, ὃ καὶ παρέδωκα ὑμῖν*, "for I received from the Lord what I have also passed on to you." Paul uses *παραλαμβάνω* to refer to the reception of what is transmitted and *παραδίδωμι* to refer to the process of transmitting it. Three people or groups are implied:

- (1) The Lord, the originator of the teaching Paul is transmitting.
- (2) Paul himself, who has received teaching (ultimately) from the Lord and has

¹⁰⁷ Beker, *Paul*, 128.

transmitted it.

(3) The Corinthian church, who receive the tradition.

By mentioning only that the tradition originated in the Lord and passed through himself,¹⁰⁸ Paul is making a statement about the authenticity of the tradition and his authenticity as apostle and tradent.

Many scholars have noted that *παράδωμι* and *παραλαμβάνω* in 1 Cor 11:23 correspond to rabbinic usage. It is often argued that *παράδωμι* corresponds to *מָסַר לְ*, “hand on to” and *παραλαμβάνω* corresponds to *קָבַל מִן*, “receive from,”¹⁰⁹ though C. K. Barrett stresses that both verbs were used in this sense in Greek long before they were influenced by rabbinic usage.¹¹⁰ Gordon Fee, on the other hand, defends the notion of rabbinic influence most strongly on the grounds that Paul’s training was rabbinical.¹¹¹ Similarly, Tomson criticises Conzelmann for adducing Greek parallels on the basis that in his view they “are more remote.”¹¹² The issue raised by Barrett is whether we should ascribe Paul’s use of these verbs to Jewish or to Greek influence, and, by extension, whether Paul is using a Hellenistic or a Jewish model of transmission. This reflects the

¹⁰⁸ Although Birger Gerhardsson is correct to note that by mentioning the first and last links in the chain of transmission, the Lord and himself, Paul is stressing his elevated position as a recognized doctrinal authority, he is not correct to state that “Paul mentions only the first and last links in the chain of transmission” (*Memory and Manuscript: Oral Tradition and Written Transmission in Rabbinic Judaism and Early Christianity* [trans. E. J. Sharpe; ASNU 22; Uppsala: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1961], 322), referring to *ἐγώ* and *ὁ κύριος*. The third and last link is the Corinthian church.

¹⁰⁹ W. D. Davies, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism: Some Rabbinic Elements in Pauline Theology* (2d ed.; London: SPCK, 1955), 248; Oscar Cullmann, “The Tradition: The Exegetical, Historical and Theological Problem,” in *The Early Church* (ed. A. J. B. Higgins; London: SCM, 1956), 63; B. Rigaux, *Saint Paul: Les Épîtres Thessaloniens* (EBib; Paris: Gabalda, 1956), 438, 688; Gerhardsson, *Memory*, 288; R. P. C. Hanson, *Tradition in the Early Church* (Library of History and Doctrine; London: SCM, 1962), 12; Klaus Wegenast, *Das Verständnis der Tradition bei Paulus und in den Deuteropaulinen* (WMANT 8; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1962), 95; Ladd, “Revelation,” 225; Riesenfeld, *Gospel Tradition*, 16; Barrett, *Corinthians*, 265; Hans Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians: A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians* (trans. J. W. Leitch; Hermeneia; Philadelphia, Pa.: Fortress, 1975), 196; Beker, *Paul*, 122; Kim, *Origin*, 67; Gordon D. Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (NICNT; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1987), 548 n. 16; Segal, *Paul*, 27; Tomson, *Paul*, 146. Cf. Oepke, *Galater*, 29. Lührmann notes that while *παραλαμβάνω* and *παράδωμι* represent the Hebrew *קָבַל* and *מָסַר*, a rabbinic understanding of tradition is nevertheless not intended by Paul here (*Offenbarungsverständnis*, 90).

¹¹⁰ Barrett, *Corinthians*, 265.

¹¹¹ Fee, *Corinthians*, 548 n. 15; cf. Cullmann, “Tradition,” 63.

¹¹² Tomson, *Paul*, 146 n. 279. The fact that Tomson offers no substantive justification for his view seriously weakens his criticism of Conzelmann.

methodological problem posed by the fact that regardless of the nature of Paul's Jewish background, and regardless of whether or not he knew Hebrew and/or Aramaic, his letters are written in Greek to audiences whose mother tongue and thought world were Greek.¹¹³ Given that we have been dealing with primarily Jewish models in this study, against the background of Jewish apocalyptic, this doubt over the origin of Paul's language and concepts needs to be explored.

It is crucial to remember that the use of קבל and מסר in collocation to represent the transmission of tradition is post-biblical.¹¹⁴ It may thus be suggested that in 1 Cor 11:23; 15:3 Paul uses παραδίδωμι and παραλαμβάνω in the sense in which the rabbis used מסר and קבל,¹¹⁵ but that Greek influence shaped *both* Pauline *and* rabbinic usage independently. Paul would almost certainly have been familiar with both rabbinic and Hellenistic models of transmission, but Paul's language primarily reflects Greek usage. There are two possibilities: (1) technical terms existed in both Greek and Hebrew for the transmission of tradition. Paul, having primarily the rabbinic social model in mind, chose Greek terms which reflected parallel Hebrew terms and would have reminded his audience of a comparable Hellenistic social model; (2) at the time Paul was writing no technical terminology was available in Hebrew for the concepts expressed in Greek by

¹¹³ Cf. Bockmuehl's comment that Paul's use of Greek "creates no insurmountable problems, but as in many Jewish writings it does call for sensitivity to the possible use of Greek philosophical or religious idiom. Obviously the crucial question ... is to distinguish ... between a genuine fusion or revision of basic concepts and the mere clothing of Jewish belief in a more cosmopolitan *façon de parler*" (*Revelation*, 129).

¹¹⁴ The only occurrence of מסר Qal in the HB is in Num 31:16, though the Latin "dederuntque" in Num 31:5 implies the Qal [מסרו] (active) rather than the Niphal (passive) of the MT (cf. *BHS*, n. a). The sense of Num 31:16 seems to be that certain women caused Israel to "offer up a treacherous act against YHWH" (למסר-מעל ביהוה). However, the LXX, Peshitta, and Vulgate do not appear to read מסר here. The Niphal occurs in Num 31:5 in reference to the conscription of troops from the tribes of Israel (וַיִּמְסְרוּ מֵאֶלֶף יִשְׂרָאֵל אֶלֶף לַמָּוֶת), "and a thousand per tribe were conscripted from the thousands of Israel"). קבל Pael occurs three times in Aramaic Daniel with the sense "receive" (Dan 2:6; 6:1; 7:18). BDB (p. 867) takes the Hebrew קבל to be an Aramaic loan-word, the Piel occurring several times in the Hebrew in the senses "take" (1 Chr 21:11; 2 Chr 29:16, 22), "receive" (Job 2:10, 10; Prov 19:20), or "accept" (Est 4:4; 9:23, 27; Ezr 8:30; 1 Chr 12:19). Παραλαμβάνω is not used for the Hebrew קבל in the LXX, but is used for the Aramaic קבל in both the LXX and Θ (Dan 6:1; 7:18).

¹¹⁵ In relation to 1 Thess 2:13, E. Best advances the possibility that "Paul took over the Greek word [παραλαμβάνω] for a process somewhat akin to one to which he was accustomed in Judaism" (*Thessalonians*, 111). That is, Paul is familiar not only with a Jewish concept, but with Hellenistic concepts also, and uses his knowledge of both to find an appropriate translation equivalent.

παράδωμι and *παραλαμβάνω*. Paul, though familiar with the rabbinic model of teaching in practice, knew only Greek terms for this social phenomenon. Comparable terms existed by the time the Mishnah was written. *קבל* and *מסר* would, according to this scenario, be Hebrew translation equivalents for Greek terms in use in the Greek-speaking synagogue.¹¹⁶ This second scenario should not be dismissed: in the HB and the Qumran scrolls *קבל* and *מסר* are not used for the transmission of teaching.

In 1 Corinthians itself there are other chains of transmission. In 1 Cor 11:2 Paul writes *ἐπαινῶ δὲ ὑμᾶς ὅτι πάντα μου μέμνησθε καὶ, καθὼς παρέδωκα ὑμῖν, τὰς παραδόσεις κατέχετε*, “I praise you, because you have remembered me in all things and hold fast to the traditions just as I handed them on to you.” Tomson identifies three sources of authority in 1 Cor 11:¹¹⁷

(1) Apostolic tradition, including Jesus traditions, indicated by the “transmission terms” *παράδοσις*, *παράδωμι*, and *παραλαμβάνω*, and by reference to the custom (*συνήθεια*) of the churches of God (1 Cor 11:16).

(2) Reason and the evidence of nature (1 Cor 11:13-15).

(3) An implicit reference to the Torah (1 Cor 11:8-9).¹¹⁸

Paul uses *παράδωμι* to refer to the process of transmitting teaching, using the cognate noun *παράδοσις* to refer to what is transmitted. Although the Lord is not mentioned, the language of 1 Cor 11:2 is similar to verse 23.¹¹⁹ Presumably the same process is referred

¹¹⁶ Cf. Gerhardsson, *Memory*, 288. Gerhardsson notes that “[i]n the New Testament documents as a whole, in the Gospels in particular, and in the Gospel of Mark most of all, we can observe the terms which were used in the *Greek-speaking* synagogue and Church to refer to the oral Torah of the Jews, its transmission and maintenance” (italics original).

¹¹⁷ Tomson, *Paul*, 78. Tomson divides Paul’s sources of authority in 1 Corinthians into two categories (*Paul*, 81): formal sources of authority (Scripture, apostolic tradition, and Paul’s own apostolic teaching) and informal authority sources (Jewish tradition, popular Hellenistic wisdom, and informal elements of Christian tradition). See the tables given by Tomson in *Paul*, 82-85.

¹¹⁸ Cf. Gen 2:18, 22-23.

¹¹⁹ Cf. Barrett, *Corinthians*, 247; Fee, *Corinthians*, 499 n. 29. Barrett remarks in relation to this verse that “[t]he language was probably formulated in Corinth, but Paul uses it himself” (*Corinthians*, 247). This is in line with his preference for seeking the background to Paul’s use of *παράδωμι* and *παραλαμβάνω* in Greek rather than Jewish literature (cf. *Corinthians*, 265), and stands in contradistinction to Fee’s belief that the term *παράδοσις* is “a technical term in Judaism for the oral transmission of religious instruction”

to. In verse 2 there are two in the chain: Paul and the Corinthians. Paul is responsible for passing on sound teaching on to the Corinthians, and is the guarantor of the authenticity of the tradition. In Gerhardsson's words, "[w]hen Paul in this way exhorts his congregations to receive and hold fast the sacred authoritative tradition in all its forms and aspects, he demonstrates that he is well aware of his exalted standing as a doctrinal authority."¹²⁰ In 1 Cor 15 Paul refers to a chain of tradition in relation to teaching he is about to give on the resurrection. The parallel with 1 Cor 11:23 is in verse 3:

1 Cor 11:23: *ἐγὼ γὰρ παρέλαβον ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου, ὃ καὶ παρέδωκα ὑμῖν*

1 Cor 15:3: *παρέδωκα γὰρ ὑμῖν ἐν πρώτοις, ὃ καὶ παρέλαβον*

The same figures are implied in the chain of transmission. In 1 Cor 15:3, *παρέλαβον* has Paul as its subject, but we are not told from whom he has received the teaching. It might seem logical to suggest that *ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου* could be assumed (cf. 1 Cor 11:23), though the concept of tradition in 1 Corinthians has occasioned disagreement among scholars who cannot agree as to the origin of the material Paul is passing on. Did he receive it directly from the Lord, or from the Lord through humans?¹²¹ First Corinthians 15:1 is also relevant, though slightly different vocabulary is used: *γνωρίζω δὲ ὑμῖν, ἀδελφοί, τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ὃ εὐηγγελισάμην, ὃ καὶ παρελάβετε*, "I make known to you, brothers, the good news which I proclaimed to you, which you also received." Paul is referring to transmission between himself and the Corinthians, and using *παραλαμβάνω* to recall language of transmission. His use of *εὐαγγέλιον* and *εὐαγγελίζομαι* together with *παραλαμβάνω* recalls Gal 1:11-12.¹²² *Παρέλαβον* anticipates 1 Cor 11:2, 23; 15:1,

(*Corinthians*, 499 n. 29; cf. Ernest Best, *The First and Second Epistles to the Thessalonians* [BNTC; London: A & C Black, 1972], 317).

¹²⁰ Gerhardsson, *Memory*, 294; cf. p. 322. Cf. Beker, *Paul*, 112. Beker notes that Paul, in 1 Cor 15, establishes the unique authority of his apostolic interpretation of the tradition.

¹²¹ For Gerhardsson, the material passed on in 1 Cor 15 was fixed by the college of apostles in Jerusalem, and was neither transmitted to Paul by means of a revelation nor handed on to him by "the Hellenistic Community" (*Memory*, 296-297). See also his comments on 1 Cor 11 (*Memory*, 320-321). See further §3.2 below.

¹²² It is possible to argue that 1 Cor 15:1-8 and Gal 1:11-17 both refer to the gospel since the wording in 1 Cor 15:1 and Gal 1:11 is so similar: Baird, "What is the Kerygma?" 186; cf. pp. 189-191.

3, εὐαγγέλιον and εὐαγγελισθέν anticipating 1 Cor 15:1. Jesus Christ transmitted the good news to Paul, who transmitted it to the Galatians. Moreover, the preposition διὰ in the phrase δι' ἀποκαλύψεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ recalls the use of the same preposition in the phrase δι' ἀγγέλων in Gal 3:19; Heb 2:2; Josephus, *Ant.* 15.5.3.¹²³ The "revelation of Jesus Christ" performs a parallel function to revealing angels. We are dealing in Gal 1:11-12 with a statement of authority: Paul's authority derives from the fact that what he passes on has been mediated to him from a heavenly source.¹²⁴ Herman Ridderbos stresses the issue of authority in connection with Paul's use of the concepts of tradition. Assuming that Paul is adopting a Jewish model, Ridderbos notes that for Paul the gospel is a "clearly delimited authoritative tradition, of which certain qualified persons are the authorized bearers and conveyors." The tradents are apostles called and authorized by Christ to this authoritative tradition.¹²⁵

A number of other chains of transmission need to be mentioned.¹²⁶ Παράδοσις and παραλαμβάνω appear in 2 Thess 2:15;¹²⁷ 3:6. In 2 Thess 2:15 κρατεῖτε τὰς παραδόσεις recalls τὰς παραδόσεις κατέχετε in 1 Cor 11:2. Moreover, ἐδιδάχθητε

¹²³ See below, §§4.2; 4.3.

¹²⁴ "Paul's apostolic calling now gives him an immediate access to the truth ..., that is, pneumatic immediacy ..., because it disallows human mediation ..., human criteria, or human criticism ..." (Beker, *Paul*, 114). Cf. Schoeps, *Paul*, 57-58; Newman, *Paul's Glory-Christology*, 182. Paul is, of course, defending his apostolate and his gospel against the charge that it is other than divine, being in conflict with Galatian opponents who were challenging the independence of his apostolate and gospel from the Jerusalem church: Schoeps, *Paul*, 72; cf. pp. 70-74; Oepke, *Galater*, 28-29; Kim, *Origin*, 59, 67 and n. 2; Bruce, *Galatians*, 25-27; cf. pp. 15-32 (on the issue of the opponents in general); Bockmuehl, *Revelation*, 136.

¹²⁵ Herman Ridderbos, *Paul: An Outline of His Theology* (trans. J. R. de Witt; London: SPCK, 1975), 240. Cf. p. 436. The issue of the authority of the tradition touches upon the importance of oral (vs. written) transmission. Loveday Alexander notes the view of the second century C.E. physician Galen to the effect that, in the school tradition, live transmission carried a guarantee of authenticity ("The Living Voice: Scepticism towards the Written Word in Early Christian and in Graeco-Roman Texts," in *The Bible in Three Dimensions: Essays in Celebration of Forty Years of Biblical Studies in the University of Sheffield* [ed. D. J. A. Clines, S. E. Fowl, and S. E. Porter; JSOTSup 87; Sheffield: JSOT, 1990], 233, 236).

¹²⁶ See Eduard Norden, *Agnostos Theos: Untersuchungen zur Formengeschichte religiöser Rede* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1913), 289 n. 1. Norden cites 2 Thess 2:15; 3:6 (cf. 2 Pet 2:21; Jude 3); Gal 1:9, 12; Phil 4:9; Col 2:6; 1 Thess 2:13; 4:2 (sic; i.e., 4:1). Cf. Gerhardsson, *Memory*, 290; Lührmann, *Offenbarungsverständnis*, 90 n. 4; Best, *Thessalonians*, 110.

¹²⁷ 2 Thess 2:15: στήκετε καὶ κρατεῖτε τὰς παραδόσεις ἃς ἐδιδάχθητε εἴτε διὰ λόγου εἴτε δι' ἐπιστολῆς ἡμῶν, "stand firm and hold fast to the traditions which you were taught, either by our word or by our letter."

gives a teaching role to Paul, Silvanus, and Timothy, and is a reminder of the relationship between tradition and teaching implied in certain passages from the Pastoral Epistles.¹²⁸ The chain involves Paul, Silvanus, and Timothy, who imparted the traditions, and the Thessalonians, who were the recipients (cf. 2 Thess 3:4). No mention is made of the origin of the traditions, but Paul, Silvanus, and Timothy are guarantors of their authenticity. The same pattern is evident in 2 Thess 3:6, in which the Thessalonians are to “withdraw from every brother who walks idly and not according to the tradition they received from us” (στέλλεσθαι ὑμᾶς ἀπὸ παντὸς ἀδελφοῦ ἀτάκτως περιπατοῦντος καὶ μὴ κατὰ τὴν παράδοσιν ἣν παρελάβοσαν¹²⁹ παρ’ ἡμῶν). The use of *παράδοσις* is interesting because it is related to *παραδίδωμι* and occurs in 2 Thess 2:15. In relation to 2 Thess 3:6, Norden cites 2 Pet 2:21; Jude 3. 2 Pet 2:21 refers to a group turning away from “the holy commandment which was passed on to them” (ὑποστρέψαι ἐκ τῆς παραδοθείσης αὐτοῖς ἀγίας ἐντολῆς), using *παραδίδωμι* to refer to the process of transmitting the holy commandment. In Jude 3, the author writes to encourage his readers to “contend for the faith passed on to those who are holy once for all” (ἐπαγωνίζεσθαι τῇ ἀπαξ παραδοθείσῃ τοῖς ἀγίοις πίστει). No agent is given for the passive participle *παραδοθείση*. The whole phrase seeks to deal with the issue of authority. The faith in question is authentic because it was passed on through “those who are holy.” The passive participle presumably has either God or Jesus as its assumed agent. It is possible to understand this as a divine passive, comparable with *ἐγήγερται* in 1 Cor 15:4.¹³⁰

¹²⁸ See below, §4.2.3. The verb *ἐδιδάχθητε* also recalls Gal 1:12, in which Paul’s use of the verb *ἐδιδάχθην* implies a process of teaching from a human teacher to a disciple.

¹²⁹ A number of witnesses, including Codex Vaticanus, read *παρελάβετε*, “you received” at this point, which would make the subject of the verb the same as that of *ἐδιδάχθητε* in 2 Thess 2:15. Either reading would be plausible: *παρελάβοσαν* refers back to “believers who walk idly” earlier in 3:6, and makes the verb stress that the believers in question walk idly in spite of the fact that they had received the tradition from Paul, Silvanus, and Timothy, whereas *παρελάβετε* implies that all the Thessalonian Christians have received the tradition. It seems likely that *παρελάβοσαν* is the earlier reading, since it is surely the most credible scenario that the scribe expected the second person plural, given the occurrence of *παρελάβετε* in 1 Thess 4:1 and of *ἐδιδάχθητε* in 2 Thess 2:15, and therefore made an error.

¹³⁰ Cf. BDF §342 (1); Joachim Jeremias, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus* (trans. N. Perrin; London: SCM, 1966), 102.

Often *παραλαμβάνω* alone appears.¹³¹ In the phrase “if anyone proclaims to you a gospel contrary to that which you received” (*εἴ τις ὑμᾶς εὐαγγελίζεται παρ’ ὃ παρελάβετε*) in Gal 1:9, the gospel received by the Galatians came through the agency of Paul. In Gal 1:12 *οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐγὼ παρὰ ἀνθρώπου παρέλαβον αὐτὸ* reinforces the point that Paul’s gospel is of heavenly origin. In Phil 4:9 the Philippians are commanded to imitate Paul’s example.¹³² Three verbs occur in parallel: *ἐμάθετε* (“you learned”), *παραλάβετε* (“you received”), and *ἠκούσατε* (“you heard”). Teaching has been passed on orally by Paul and Timothy¹³³ to the Philippians.¹³⁴ In 1 Thess 2:13, *παραλαμβάνω* refers to the Thessalonians’ receiving the word of God from Paul, Silvanus, and Timothy.¹³⁵ The chain consists of Paul, Silvanus, and Timothy in the transmitting group and the Thessalonians as recipients; the emphasis is on the *origin* of the word. It is stressed that the Thessalonians “received not a word of humans but, as it truly is, God’s word” (*ἐδέξασθε οὐ λόγον ἀνθρώπων ἀλλὰ καθὼς ἐστὶν ἀληθῶς λόγον θεοῦ*).¹³⁶ The transmission of moral¹³⁷ teaching is in view in 1 Thess 4:1, where the Thessalonians are subject of *παραλάβετε*. They have received “how one must walk and please God” (*παραλάβετε παρ’ ἡμῶν τὸ πῶς δεῖ ὑμᾶς περιπατεῖν καὶ ἀρέσκειν θεῷ*). Col 2:6 is slightly different: “you received Christ Jesus the Lord” (*παραλάβετε τὸν Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν τὸν κύριον*). It is Christ Jesus himself who is received, not the teaching of Paul, though it is possible that Cullmann and Gerhardsson are correct to infer that doctrinal

¹³¹ Cf. Norden, *Agnostos Theos*, 289 n. 1.

¹³² Gerhardsson cites Phil 4:9; 1 Thess 2:15 in support of the idea that “Paul treats all he says, writes or does for a congregation as a kind of transmission: the passing on of revelation, of the message of joy, of teachings, recommendations and authoritative directions — all from God” (*Memory*, 292-293).

¹³³ Cf. Phil 1:1.

¹³⁴ A fourth verb, *εἶδετε* (“you saw”), also appears, but unlike the previous three it is to be taken with the words *ἐν ἐμοί* (“in me”) which follow. This verb refers to learning from Paul’s example, whereas the others refer to his oral teaching.

¹³⁵ In reference to this verb, Best remarks that “it is suggestive of the action of a Rabbi transmitting material to a pupil” (*Thessalonians*, 110).

¹³⁶ Beker distinguishes the process of receiving the word in the chain of transmission with the acceptance of it in faith; thus two moments in the process of coming to faith are present in this verse: *Paul*, 123.

¹³⁷ Rigaux notes that in this passage we are dealing with *παραλαμβάνω* in the derived sense of receiving a spiritual, intellectual, moral, or mystical possession, and that this presupposes a tradition, a *παράδοσις* (*Saint Paul*, 497).

material is referred to.¹³⁸

What emerges is a particular concept of tradition matched by a technical language.¹³⁹ Paul understands himself to be the guarantor of the traditions he has handed on. However, the crucial point is that Paul frequently stresses that the origin of what he has transmitted is the Lord (1 Cor 11:23; Gal 1:11-12; 1 Thess 2:13).¹⁴⁰ 1 Cor 11:23 refers to a particular issue, the Eucharist, whereas Gal 1:11-12 (and possibly 1 Thess 2:13) refer to the Gospel in general. However, the common factor is a concern to emphasise the ultimate origin of what is passed on. Paul's thinking parallels Heb 2:3, where the message of salvation comes through the Lord and is transmitted by humans.¹⁴¹ In *m. ʔAbot* 1:1 the chain of transmission also exists to emphasise not only that the tradition has been transmitted within an authoritative chain of transmission, and is therefore authentic and undefiled,¹⁴² but to emphasise the ultimate origin of that tradition. The phrase *משה קבל תורה מסיני* is not just a statement of Moses' receiving of the law, but an assertion of the heavenly origin of the law. When Moses received the law on Sinai, he received it from God, accompanied by angels.¹⁴³ Wilhelm Bacher asserted this in 1914, amplifying "Moses received the Torah from Sinai" with "that is, from God at Sinai."¹⁴⁴ When we consider Paul's understanding of tradition, we must wonder whether Jesus' teaching parallels that Moses: the origin of both is in heaven.

¹³⁸ Cullmann, "Tradition," 68; Gerhardsson, *Memory*, 301. Cf. Ridderbos, *Paul*, 241. In connection with Col 2:6 Ladd suggests that to receive tradition means to receive Jesus Christ as Lord: "Revelation," 226.

¹³⁹ Best notes that Paul does not always use rabbinic terminology to refer to his concept of tradition (*Thessalonians*, 317). See Rom 6:17; 16:17; 1 Cor 4:17; Phil 4:9; Col 1:7; 1 Thess 4:11.

¹⁴⁰ Cf. Gerhardsson, *Memory*, 295-296.

¹⁴¹ See §5 below.

¹⁴² "The authenticity of the unwritten Law delivered by Moses could be assured only by an uninterrupted and trustworthy transmission from generation to generation down to the schools of the first century of our era": George Foot Moore, *Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era: The Age of the Tannaim* (vol. 1; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1927), 255.

¹⁴³ Neither God nor angels are mentioned in *m. ʔAbot* 1:1 in relation to the giving of the law. *מסיני* refers to the Sinai event as such rather than to the specifics of what occurred.

¹⁴⁴ Wilhelm Bacher, *Tradition und Tradenten in den Schulen Palästinas und Babyloniens: Studien und Materiellen zur Entstehungsgeschichte des Talmuds* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1914), 1: "[Moses] die Thora vom Sinai, d. h. von Gott am Sinai, empfangen und sie dem Josua überliefert habe" (italics mine). Cf. Riesenfeld, *Gospel Tradition*, 15.

3.2. Paul's understanding of the origin of the tradition

M. Abot 1:1 is not simply an account of the chain of transmission of תורה שבעל פה, but a statement of its divine origin. תורה שבעל פה was mediated by humans, but ultimately its origin was divine. It is appropriate to look at Gerhardsson's idea that early Christianity had its own counterpart to oral Torah.¹⁴⁵ Gerhardsson suggests that Paul is familiar with and passes on another tradition, having broken with the tradition of the elders, commenting that "[a]longside the Scriptures [Paul] has an authoritative doctrinal substance which we must regard, although with certain reservations, as being the equivalent of the oral Torah."¹⁴⁶ The key issue is the origin of this tradition. For Gerhardsson, Jesus is Paul's doctrinal authority,¹⁴⁷ but this is not to say that Paul's doctrines were transmitted directly from Jesus to the apostle. With reference to the phrase ἐγὼ γὰρ παρέλαβον ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου in 1 Cor 11:23, Gerhardsson notes three possibilities.¹⁴⁸ The first, that Paul is here referring to something he had received as a revelation, is rejected in the strongest terms.¹⁴⁹ The second is that Paul received the tradition of the institution of the Eucharist from the "Hellenistic Community," though Gerhardsson rejects this also, on the grounds that it is extremely unlikely that Paul would

¹⁴⁵ Gerhardsson, *Memory*, 257. Gerhardsson agrees with Cullmann, who comments that "for Paul the *paradosis*, in so far as it refers to the confession of faith and to the words and deeds of Jesus, is really Church tradition which has a parallel in the Jewish *paradosis*" ("Tradition," 62). Cf. Rigaux, *Saint Paul*, 498.

¹⁴⁶ Gerhardsson, *Memory*, 290.

¹⁴⁷ Gerhardsson, *Memory*, 311. This is to be compared with Rigaux's understanding, which is that Paul had three sources of authority: the OT, which is God's revelation; Jesus, whom he did not know in the flesh but whom he had seen and who gave him special revelations; and the teaching of the early church, in relation to which Rigaux cites 1 Cor 11:23; 15:3. In Rigaux's words, "Dieu, le Christ, l'enseignement apostolique, ce sont les autorités qui règlent la vie des hommes" (*Saint Paul*, 498).

¹⁴⁸ Gerhardsson, *Memory*, 321.

¹⁴⁹ Gerhardsson, *Memory*, 321. cf. Cullmann, "Tradition," 62. Gerhardsson is correct to raise the issue of the relationship between the synoptic versions of the institution of the Last Supper and that of Paul as a reason for rejecting the idea that ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου refers to a revelation or a vision (cf. Cullmann, "Tradition," 64). However, his remark that "[t]his possibility can be entertained only as a result of an active belief in miracles, or in an extremely peculiar development in early Christianity, crediting Paul with having received a revelation of what happened 'in the night when the Lord Jesus was delivered (to death)'" (*Memory*, 321) betrays a serious anachronism. Gerhardsson is imposing his own prejudices on an ancient text. Paul surely *did* believe in miracles, as did those around him. He believed in the revelation on the road to Damascus. He also believed that the law originated through a theophany. It may be difficult for a twenty-first century reader to entertain a revelation of the very words spoken at the Last Supper, but we should not impose this on Paul.

have believed this community capable of formulating and promulgating authoritative tradition on what happened on the night of Jesus' betrayal. Indeed, such an idea is not reflected at all in the text of 1 Cor 11 and requires a deep mistrust of Paul's words in order to be accepted. Gerhardsson is drawn to a third possibility, that in 1 Cor 11 Paul is reproducing a tradition he understood to derive from the Lord through the mediation of the apostles in Jerusalem.¹⁵⁰ Whilst this would make good sense, in that both this scenario and the scenario in *m. Ḥabot* 1:1 involve a human chain of authentic tradition and the presupposition of divine origin for the tradition, it should be remembered that aside from Gal 1:18-19; 2:1-10 Paul mentions no intermediary between the Lord and himself.

Oscar Cullmann had earlier arrived at a broadly similar conclusion, though with a crucial and interesting difference. In an important article published in English in 1956, Cullmann attempted to show that "the New Testament regards the Lord exalted to the right hand of God as the direct author of the tradition of the apostles, because he himself is at work in the apostolic transmission of his works and deeds."¹⁵¹ He regards previous scholarship on the origin of the tradition in 1 Cor 11:23 as divided broadly into two categories. The first includes scholars who do not believe that tradition in the "usual Jewish sense," which would involve a chain of successive human intermediaries, is meant in this passage, but that Paul received the account of the Last Supper directly in a vision, as in Gal 1:12.¹⁵² The second includes a majority of scholars who take 1 Cor 11:23 to refer to the transmission of the tradition about the Eucharist through human intermediaries within the church after the rabbinic pattern.¹⁵³ Cullmann himself tends

¹⁵⁰ Schoeps refers to "the words of institution of the Eucharist, as handed down to him by common church instruction" (*Paul*, 56).

¹⁵¹ Cullmann, "Tradition," 59. Cullmann's position has been adopted by Beker, for whom the phrase *ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου* in 1 Cor 11:23 (cf. 1 Thess 4:15) is decisive. Receiving may take place on a "horizontal" level, within a human chain of transmission, or on a "vertical" level, directly from a heavenly source. For Paul, receiving tradition is entirely bound up with the vertical dimension: the phrase *ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου* equates receiving the tradition with receiving the gospel through revelation, and thus "the risen Lord stands behind the tradition as Paul's direct source of the gospel" (*Paul*, 123).

¹⁵² Cullmann, "Tradition," 60.

¹⁵³ Cullmann, "Tradition," 61.

towards the latter view,¹⁵⁴ but understands the additional phrase ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου to indicate not only an origin for the tradition with the historical Jesus, but a direct link with the exalted Lord, whom he regards as “the real author of the whole tradition developing itself within the apostolic church.”¹⁵⁵ There is no contradiction for Cullmann between Gal 1:11-12, which implies direct revelation, and passages such as 1 Cor 11:23; 15:3, in which Paul has received traditions from the Lord through human mediation.¹⁵⁶ In 1 Cor 7:10 Paul writes “and to those who are married I command, not I but the Lord” (τοῖς δὲ γεγαμηκόσιν παραγγέλλω, οὐκ ἐγὼ ἀλλὰ ὁ κύριος), “the Lord” being the grammatical subject of a verb in the present tense. For Cullmann this means that the exalted Lord, in the present, proclaims what he had taught his disciples during his earthly life through the tradition.¹⁵⁷ Christ is at directly at work both in his revelation to Paul on the road to Damascus and in the tradition.¹⁵⁸ Furthermore, Cullmann argues that in 2 Cor 3:4-18, the Holy Spirit, who in 3:17 is the Lord (ὁ δὲ κύριος πνεῦμά ἐστιν), takes the place of the tradition of the law. Thus the Lord, as the Spirit, is present in the tradition Paul received.¹⁵⁹

There are a number of problems with this scenario (it should be remembered that Cullmann was writing within the context of a theological debate on the relationship between Scripture and tradition). Cullmann’s view that the Lord, as Spirit, replaces the

¹⁵⁴ Cullmann, “Tradition,” 62-66.

¹⁵⁵ Cullmann, “Tradition,” 62. Ladd notes, in similar vein, that when the κύριος who originated the tradition is mentioned in 1 Cor 11:23, the Jesus of history who is now the exalted Lord is meant (“Revelation,” 226).

¹⁵⁶ Cullmann, “Tradition,” 66-69. A slightly different resolution to this possible contradiction is offered by Menoud. He suggests that the Gospel is for Paul both revelation (received on the Damascus Road and the foundation for his theology) and tradition (which originated before Paul became a believer and was recognised by him as the normal rule of faith and order in the church), commenting that “[t]he very greatness of Paul the apostle is due to the fact that he was able to unite both revelation and tradition in his thought and work” (“Revelation,” 141). For Kim, the distinction is between the *essence* (Gal 1:12) and the *form or formal expression* of the gospel (1 Cor 15): *Origin*, 69-70 and above, §2.3; cf. Baird, “What is the Kerygma?” 190-191; Bruce, *Galatians*, 88.

¹⁵⁷ Cullmann, “Tradition,” 68. Riesenfeld does not go this far, simply assuming the teaching of the earthly Jesus is in mind: “[d]oubtless the apostle is appealing here to the words of Jesus on marriage transmitted, e.g., in Mark 10” (*Gospel Tradition*, 12).

¹⁵⁸ Cullmann, “Tradition,” 69.

¹⁵⁹ Cullmann, “Tradition,” 71.

παράδοσις of the law, and as such is present in the apostolic tradition is a tempting one, in that it resolves the problem of whether Paul meant that he received the narrative of the Eucharist directly from the Lord. The problem is one of emphasis. If we go looking for the human tradition behind Paul's words in this passage, we will find it, because we feel obliged to impose a rationally plausible scenario on Paul. The human intermediaries who may have passed tradition on to Paul are not referred to by him, which means that the interpreter is free to reconstruct a background for the passage in question. However, this reconstruction cannot be done on Paul's terms. The important thing for Paul is that he received the tradition *from the Lord*: whatever intermediaries there may have been, and for the sake of argument, scholars such as Cullmann and Gerhardsson are probably right to say that there were such intermediaries, the important thing for Paul is that the tradition originated with the Lord, who continues to command humans (1 Cor 7:10), though he is no longer bodily present on earth.

Klaus Wegenast, writing after both Cullmann and Gerhardsson but only able to take account of Cullmann, divided earlier scholarship into three categories: "die alle drei je origineller Art und Weise den Widerspruch zwischen der Tatsache, daß wir es in den Versen 23ff. mit einer Tradition zu tun haben, und der Behauptung des Paulus *παρέλαβον ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου* aufzulösen versuchten."¹⁶⁰ Wegenast's first two groups correspond to the two mentioned by Cullmann. Wegenast rejects the idea that Paul received the tradition about the Eucharist in a revelation, on the basis that the phrase *παρέλαβον ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου* can scarcely be identified with *παρέλαβον ... δι' ἀποκαλύψεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ* in Gal 1:12.¹⁶¹ Wegenast's second group advocates the idea that Paul is using the rabbinic model of tradition, together with its attendant terminology.¹⁶² Wegenast's third group¹⁶³ is characterised by the idea, also advanced by Cullmann, that the exalted

¹⁶⁰ Wegenast, *Verständnis*, 94.

¹⁶¹ Wegenast, *Verständnis*, 95.

¹⁶² Wegenast, *Verständnis*, 95-96.

¹⁶³ Wegenast, *Verständnis*, 96-97. Cf. Conzelmann, *Corinthians*, 196 n. 35.

Lord is the origin of the tradition. This idea, as Wegenast notes,¹⁶⁴ removes the problem of the apparent contradiction between the idea of tradition and the phrase *ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου*.

The conclusion we are arriving at is a slight development of that advanced by Cullmann. It may be confirmed with reference to Josephus, *Ant.* 15.5.3. In this passage *δι' ἀγγέλων* refers not to humans but to angels.¹⁶⁵ If so, we have in this passage an implied chain of transmission involving three persons or groups. The first is God, from whom "the greatest of the teachings and most holy things in the laws" derive. The second is the angels, the intermediaries through whom the law was transmitted. Finally, there are the Jewish people with whom Herod is identifying himself. The ultimate origin of the teachings of the law is God ("from God" = *παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ*). The preposition is interesting: in 1 Cor 11:23, Codex Bezae reads *παρὰ κυρίου*,¹⁶⁶ and two ninth century manuscripts (F and G) give *ἀπὸ θεοῦ*. This variation may suggest that the scribe of Codex Bezae deliberately altered the preposition to indicate *direct* transmission rather than the *ultimate origin* of the tradition; on the other hand, it may suggest that little may be read into the difference between *παρὰ* and *ἀπὸ*, and that we should therefore follow Cullmann,¹⁶⁷ and, to a lesser extent Wegenast¹⁶⁸ in regarding the difference as not fundamental. In principle, *παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ* in *Ant.* 15.5.3 is parallel with *ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου* (and variants) in 1 Cor 11:23, because in both cases the origin of what is transmitted is

¹⁶⁴ Wegenast, *Verständnis*, 97.

¹⁶⁵ See below, §§5.2; 5.3.

¹⁶⁶ Cf. Conzelmann, *Corinthians*, 192 n. 5.

¹⁶⁷ Cullmann, "Tradition," 67.

¹⁶⁸ Wegenast's concern is with the question of whether it can be confirmed that Paul is using the Jewish technical terminology of tradition, and he suggests that to resolve this question, it must be demonstrated first of all that in 1 Cor 11:23ff. Paul is adopting foreign linguistic usage, and, secondly, that *ἀπὸ* here is interchangeable with *παρὰ* with the genitive. The fundamental idea is that *παρὰ* would indicate that the tradition was given directly, whereas *ἀπὸ* would leave some room for doubt. Wegenast concludes that since in Hellenistic Greek *ἀπὸ* infringes on the spheres of meaning of *ἐξ* and *ὑπό*, and particularly *παρὰ* with the genitive as an indicator of the origin, creator or motive for something, it is not possible to claim on the basis of *ἀπὸ* alone that Paul is either using a Jewish model or not (*Verständnis*, 96). Wegenast therefore regards the difference as *in theory* fundamental, but in practice not so since the four prepositions he cites overlap in meaning.

indicated. Moreover, it is crucial to note that in *Ant.* 15.5.3 no human intermediaries are mentioned. Even if δι' ἀγγέλων were taken to refer to humans, no humans are mentioned by name, least of all Moses. There is no human chain of transmission, even though neither Herod nor Josephus would not have doubted that one existed, beginning with Moses and proceeding through Joshua and his successors. The same situation obtains with 1 Cor 11:23. It is not the links in the chain who are important, but the originator. In both cases, the originator is a heavenly figure, God in the case of *Ant.* 15.5.3 and the Lord (i.e., Jesus) in the case of the Pauline tradition. The fact that Jesus was human, and gave the words of institution as a human does not alter the fact that he became an exalted figure, having ascended into heaven. Our suggestion here differs from Cullmann's in that the question of whether a quasi-rabbinic chain of transmission between the Lord and Paul existed is regarded as irrelevant for Paul, and should not be regarded as important to us.

In conclusion, it may be possible to reconstruct a quasi-rabbinic model of transmission between the Lord and Paul, but the evidence for this must be drawn from outside the *corpus Paulinum* and it does no justice to Paul to reconstruct such a chain of transmission. The parallel with the rabbinic model of a human chain of transmission is significant not for the relationship between the Lord and Paul, but for the relationship between Paul and, first, his individual "disciples" (such as Timothy) and second, the churches evangelised by Paul and his companions. The relationship between the Lord and Paul is illuminated rather by Josephus, *Ant.* 15.5.3. It is not the human intermediaries but the fact that the law and the Pauline tradition originate with a heavenly figure that are important. This relates to the rabbinic model in that although the human links in the chain of transmission are significant in that they establish that the oral Torah has been preserved from contamination, the ultimate guarantor of the authenticity of the oral Torah is its heavenly origin: משה קבל תורה מסיני. There is a parallel between Moses and Paul,¹⁶⁹ but it is not simply that Paul is a minister of the new covenant:¹⁷⁰ it is that Paul,

¹⁶⁹ Cf. Bockmuehl, *Revelation*, 143.

¹⁷⁰ 2 Cor 3:6. Cf. Cullmann, "Tradition," 70.

like Moses, has received material from a heavenly figure which he passes on. Moses received the oral and written Torah at Sinai, Paul received the Christian equivalent, the tradition, from the once human but now exalted Lord. The human intermediaries in Paul's case need not be mentioned, since the tradition is understood to be identical to that which was originally spoken by the Lord, just as the Torah remained unchanged as it passed through the chain of transmission.

3.3 The verbs *παράδωμι* and *παραλαμβάνω* in Greek and Jewish literature

To illuminate the context of the Pauline concept of tradition further, it is necessary to examine a number of Greek texts which use the same language for transmission as Paul. Conzelmann has collated a number of texts which use *παράδοσις*, *παράδωμι*, and *παραλαμβάνω* in a manner broadly comparable to Paul.¹⁷¹ While the fact that these texts have already been gathered might suggest further treatment is superfluous, a re-reading is desirable. Several texts are cited and translated below, with very brief elaborative comments, in order to present the pertinent evidence directly.¹⁷²

Conzelmann notes that *παράδοσις* is used as a technical term in the school tradition, in relation to esoteric teaching in general, and in Gnosticism.¹⁷³ The verbs *παράδωμι* and *παραλαμβάνω* are used in both the Greek and Jewish worlds,¹⁷⁴ the evidence from the Greek world relating to the school tradition,¹⁷⁵ the mysteries,¹⁷⁶ and

¹⁷¹ Conzelmann, *Corinthians*, 182-183, 195-196.

¹⁷² The use of *παράδωμι* (tradere) and *παράδοσις* (traditio) by the fathers (cf. Congar, *Tradition*, 23) lies beyond the limits of the present study.

¹⁷³ Conzelmann, *Corinthians*, 183.

¹⁷⁴ Conzelmann, *Corinthians*, 195.

¹⁷⁵ In this section it is principally the language of tradition rather than its social context that concerns us. However, the social reality behind the texts should never be ignored. Loveday Alexander advocates an approach to the study of Paul in his Hellenistic context which moves beyond "the amassing of parallels towards a more concerted 'compare and contrast' exercise with both Hellenistic and rabbinic schools" ("Paul and the Hellenistic Schools: The Evidence of Galen," in *Paul in His Hellenistic Context* [ed. T. Engberg-Pedersen; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994], 82-83). Alexander cites Galen, who (derogatorily) compares adherents of medical and philosophical schools with followers of Moses and Christ on the basis that they place greater store by received dogma than reason ("Paul," 64-68). Christians could thus, to an outsider, be seen as adherents of a school ("Paul," 82). In terms of structure and behaviour, Hellenistic schools were comparable with the early church, the former functioning in the social matrix of the *πόλις* and the latter being forced to form its adherents into a new *πολιτεία* ("Paul," 79-80, 82).

Gnosticism.¹⁷⁷ In her discussion of Luke 1:2, Loveday Alexander also notes that “[*παράδωμι*] and its cognate noun are found frequently in scientific prefaces, together with the correlative *παραλαμβάνω*.”¹⁷⁸ This section is intended to be representative rather than exhaustive, and is confined to occurrences of *παράδωμι* and *παραλαμβάνω* which may be regarded as implying a chain of transmission.

3.3.1. Josephus, *C. Ap.* 1.60

Contra Apionem 1.60 refers to the receiving of the law by the Jewish people. For Conzelmann, this passage, along with Wis 14:15, is evidence for a convergence of Hellenistic and Jewish usage.¹⁷⁹ This is certainly true for *C. Ap.* 1.60 but Wis 14:15 more probably reflects the Hellenistic use of *παράδωμι* rather than the Jewish use of either *παράδωμι* or קבל (though it will be argued below that this passage alludes ironically to the transmission of the Jewish law whilst using characteristic Greek language for the transmission of tradition).¹⁸⁰

μάλιστα δὴ πάντων περὶ παιδοτροφίαν φιλοκαλοῦντες καὶ τὸ φυλάττειν
τοὺς νόμους καὶ τὴν κατὰ τούτους παραδεδομένην εὐσέβειαν ἔργον
ἀναγκαιότατον παντὸς τοῦ βίου πεποιημένοι

*most of all [we] are enthusiastic about the education of children, and consider the
most necessary task of our whole life to observe the laws and the godliness handed on
[to us] that is in accordance with them.*

Παραδεδομένην indicates that Josephus is referring to a tradition, but it does not refer to

¹⁷⁶ Cf. F. Büchsel, “*δίδωμι, κτλ.*,” *TDNT* 2:171 and n. 19; Norden, *Agnostos Theos*, 289. This is perhaps most pertinent with respect to 1 Cor 11, in reference to which Schoeps notes: “Paul remoulded the Jewish tradition of the Messianic feast, which we also meet as a firm factor in the Qumran literature, in such a way that it became a cultic feast in the style of the mystery religions” (*Paul*, 118).

¹⁷⁷ Conzelmann, *Corinthians*, 195-196.

¹⁷⁸ Loveday C. A. Alexander, *The Preface to Luke's Gospel* (SNTSMS 78; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 118.

¹⁷⁹ Conzelmann, *Corinthians*, 196.

¹⁸⁰ See §3.3.2.

“the laws”: it refers to the “godliness which is in accordance with them,” presumably traditional *halakhot* or the behaviour that they promote. It is tempting to suppose that the distinction made between “the laws” and “the godliness which is in accordance with them” indicates that Josephus is distinguishing between written and oral manifestations of torah. If so, the use of *παράδωμι* may have been a deliberate allusion to orally transmitted *παράδοσις*. It is difficult to decide, however, whether Josephus is using *παράδωμι* because he is familiar with the verb in its Hellenistic usage, because he is familiar with its parallel usage in the Hellenistic synagogue, or because he has chosen this verb as a translation equivalent for the Hebrew קָבַל or his native Aramaic קָבַל.

3.3.2. Wis 14:15

The use of *παράδωμι* in Wisd 14:15 is extremely interesting, the situation with this passage being more complex than Conzelmann suggests.

Ἀώρῳ γὰρ πένθει τρυχόμενος πατήρ τοῦ ταχέως ἀφαιρεθέντος τέκνου
εἰκόνα ποιήσας τόν ποτε νεκρόν ἄνθρωπον νῦν ὡς θεόν ἐτίμησεν καὶ
παρέδωκεν τοῖς ὑποχειρίοις μυστήρια καὶ τελετάς· εἴτα ἐν χρόνῳ
κρατυνθέν τὸ ἀσεβὲς ἔθος ὡς νόμος ἐφυλάχθη.

For a father, consumed by untimely grief, made an image of the child suddenly taken away [from him] and the one who once was dead he now honoured as a god, and handed on to those under [his] control mysteries and initiatory rites. Then the godless custom, strengthened through time, was kept as a law.

This is an ironic critique of non-Jewish mystery cults. The phrase τόν ποτε νεκρόν ἄνθρωπον νῦν ὡς θεόν ἐτίμησεν is derisory. The child is still dead and the father is deluded into honouring a non-existent god. This relates to the wider context of Wis 13:10-15:13 and the anti-Egyptian polemic which follows. The verb *παρέδωκεν* is best read in relation to non-Jewish cults, since *μυστήρια* and *τελετάς* are technical terms used

in connection with pagan mysteries (cf. Wis 14:23). In his passage on the Samothracian mysteries (*Bibl. Hist.* 5.47-49), for example, Diodorus of Sicily refers to “the initiatory rite of the mysteries” (τὴν τῶν μυστηρίων τελετὴν: *Bibl. Hist.* 5.48.4) and notes that “it seems [Iasion] was the first to initiate strangers, and because of this make the initiatory rite highly reputable” (δοκεῖ δ’ οὗτος πρῶτος ξένους μυῆσαι καὶ τὴν τελετὴν διὰ τοῦτο ἔνδοξον ποιῆσαι, *Bibl. Hist.* 5.48.5). If we relate παρέδωκεν to pagan mysteries, however, we must not ignore the allusions in this verse to the Jewish law. The phrase τὸ ἀσεβὲς ἔθος ὡς νόμος ἐφυλάχθη relates to a false custom and a false law, implying a contrast with the true law of the Jews. In particular, the use of φυλάσσω recalls *C. Ap.* 1.60, in which Josephus uses the Attic form φυλάττειν in reference to the observance of the Jewish law. Both *C. Ap.* 1.60 and Wis 14:15 recall Lev 18:26 (LXX): φυλάξεσθε πάντα τὰ νόμιμά μου καὶ πάντα τὰ προστάγματά μου καὶ οὐ ποιήσετε ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν βδελυγμάτων τούτων, “keep all my laws and all my commands and do not do any of these abominations.” They also recall Deut 5:1 (LXX), in which Moses tells Israel that they will “learn” (μαθήσεσθε) and “keep” (φυλάξεσθε) the decrees and ordinances he is speaking to them. Deuteronomy 5:8 outlaws the making of idols, suggesting that Wis 14:15 is alluding to this passage in the Torah.¹⁸¹ Παρέδωκεν is also ironic: the father transmits a false cult which becomes a false law, whereas the Jews have transmitted a true law. The irony hinges around παραδίδωμι, which is used here in relation to the mysteries, but which is assumed to be usable in relation to the transmission of the Jewish law.

Wisdom 14:15 and *C. Ap.* 1.60 use παραδίδωμι but not παραλαμβάνω. Paul uses the two verbs in conjunction, just as *m. ᾠAbot* 1:1, *3 En.* 48D:10, the preface to *Sepher ha-Razim*, and the beginning of *Avot of Rabbi Nathan* use קבל and מסר in conjunction. The simple use of one of these verbs in relation to the transmission of tradition would not

¹⁸¹ Wis 14:15 uses the noun εἰκών whereas Deut 5:8 (LXX) uses εἰδωλον, but the idea is the same. In a sense, the image of the dead child is an εἰκών that becomes an εἰδωλον through the father's worship of the child.

really be surprising, but the collocation of the two is another matter. Two Greek texts that use *παράδιδωμι* and *παραλαμβάνω* in conjunction should be discussed, both of which pre-date Paul.

3.3.3. Plato, *Theaet.* 198A-B¹⁸²

The first is from Plato, *Theaetetus*. This dialogue concerns the nature of knowledge (*ἐπιστήμη*) and Socrates is using the acquisition of birds for an aviary as an analogy for the acquisition and later use of knowledge. In *Theaet.* 198B Socrates says to Theaetetus, in reference to the transmission of the sciences of numbers (*τὰς ἐπιστήμας τῶν ἀριθμῶν*):

καὶ καλοῦμέν γε παραδιδόντα μὲν διδάσκειν, παραλαμβάνοντα δὲ μανθάνειν, ἔχοντα δὲ δὴ τῷ κεκτῆσθαι ἐν τῷ περιστερεῶνι ἐκείνῳ ἐπίστασθαι.

And we say someone who transmits them teaches, anyone who receives them learns, and having thus acquired them, knows them, since he has them in that aviary.

First, this passage establishes that the transmission of knowledge may be represented using *παράδιδωμι* and *παραλαμβάνω*. The assumption is that the *παραλαμβάνων* will become the *παραδιδούς* in his turn. In his previous statement, Socrates had remarked that “by this art [of arithmetic] someone has the sciences of numbers under his control, and the one who hands it on hands it on to someone else” (*ταύτῃ ... τῇ τέχνῃ αὐτός τε ὑποχειρίους τὰς ἐπιστήμας τῶν ἀριθμῶν ἔχει καὶ ἄλλῳ παραδίδωσιν ὁ παραδιδούς*). In the next proposition, *ἐπίστασθαι* refers to the recipient, not to the transmitter. He has received knowledge from someone who already knows. Second, *παράδιδωμι* is synonymous with *διδάσκω*, “to teach.” Similarly, *παραλαμβάνω* is synonymous with *μανθάνω*, “to learn.”¹⁸³ The result of the teaching-transmission process

¹⁸² Rigaux cites *Theaet.* 198B in connection with 1 Thess 2:13, stating without further discussion that the master is the *παραδιδούς* and the disciple is the *παραλαμβάνων* (*Saint Paul*, 438).

¹⁸³ Cf. Plato, *Phileb.* 16E; §3.3.5 below.

is ἐπιστήμη, “knowledge.”

This has implications for our understanding of the language of transmission. Teaching language is characteristic of the Pastoral Epistles, διδάσκω being used in 2 Tim 2:2 to refer to the relationship between the faithful people to whom Timothy is to entrust what he has heard from Paul and the “others” whom they are to teach in their turn. The process in 2 Tim 2:2 may thus be directly compared with (e.g.) 1 Cor 11:23. The difference lies in the fact that in 1 Corinthians and elsewhere, Paul has chosen to use language of *transmission* to evoke a particular model of handing on tradition, whereas in the Pastorals language of *teaching* is used to highlight the fact that both Paul and Timothy are διδάσκαλοι.¹⁸⁴ The language of tradition in the Pastorals is analogous to that in 1 Corinthians regardless of surface differences. *Theaetetus* 198B suggests that the use of different language in different NT epistles to refer to transmission is to be explained on the basis of the specific choices of one author responding to particular audiences and exploring particular concerns.¹⁸⁵

3.3.4. Diodorus of Sicily, *Bibl. Hist.* 5.2.3

In *Bibl. Hist.* 5.2.3 Diodorus is writing about the island of Sicily and makes the following comment:

Οἱ ταύτην οὖν κατοικοῦντες Σικελιῶται παρειλήφασι παρὰ τῶν προγόνων, αἰεὶ τῆς φήμης ἐξ αἰῶνος παραδεδομένης τοῖς ἐκγόνοις ἱερὰν ὑπάρχειν τὴν νῆσον Δῆμητρος καὶ Κόρης· ἔνιοι δὲ τῶν ποιητῶν μυθολογοῦσι κατὰ τὸν τοῦ Πλούτωνος καὶ Φερσεφόνης γάμον ὑπὸ Διὸς ἀνακάλυπτρα τῇ νύμφῃ

¹⁸⁴ Cf. §§3.2.2; 3.2.3 below.

¹⁸⁵ We should therefore follow Louw-Nida in placing διδάσκω, παραδίδωμι, and παραλαμβάνω within the sub-domain “Teach,” part of the domain of “Communication” (L&N 33.224, 237, 238; pp. 413b-414a, 415b). Their comment that “[t]he meanings in the subdomain *Teach* may be regarded as relating to a process of ‘causing someone to learn or know’ and hence overlapping with Domain 27 *Learn* and Domain 28 *Know*, but the meanings in the Subdomain *Teach* involve a more continuous process of formal and informal instruction” (L&N 413b n. 44) is a succinct summary of the semantic relationships between the terms we are dealing with.

δεδοσθαι ταύτην τὴν νῆσον.

The Siceliotai who inhabit this [island] have received from [their] ancestors, the report having always been transmitted from a generation to [its] descendants, that the island is sacred to Demeter and Core; however, some of the poets relate the myth that at the marriage of Pluton and Persephone Zeus gave this island to the bride as a gift at the festival of unveiling.

Παραλαμβάνω refers to the reception of an ancestral tradition. Παραδίδωμι refers to its transmission. The cognate verb δίδωμι is also used, but in the sense of someone giving a gift. The distinction between παραδίδωμι and δίδωμι in the same passage throws the “traditional” use of παραδίδωμι into relief. A chain of transmission is evident, the recipients being the inhabitants of Sicily. The ultimate origin of the tradition is not explicit, though the “ancestors” of the Siceliotai are the ones from whom the tradition is received. The use of παρά in this connection has been encountered before, in Josephus, *Ant.* 15.5.3; 1 Cor 11:23 (mss). Παρὰ τῶν προγόνων is thus an indicator of the immediate origin of the tradition, though the meanings of prepositions should not be overpressed. Should this indicate the ultimate origin of the tradition, “ancestors” might be replaced by “founding fathers,” a clearer indicator that the tradition originated among the earliest Siceliotai. We are dealing not only with a description of the tradition, but a statement of authority. Two (albeit conflicting) authorities are mentioned, the founding fathers of the Siceliotai and “the poets.”¹⁸⁶ The phrase ἀεὶ τῆς φήμης ἐξ αἰῶνος παραδεδομένης τοῖς ἐκγόνοις tells us that the agents of the tradition were the succeeding generations of Siceliotai. Most importantly, the tradition in question is not any old tradition: it is a tradition about the sacredness of the island in which the Siceliotai lived, toiled, and worshipped, and was a *sacred* tradition which had significance for the religious identity of the Siceliotai. As in the case of Paul and the rabbis, the tradition was

¹⁸⁶ Homer is cited as “the most distinguished of the poets” (τὸν ἐπιφανέστατον τῶν ποιητῶν) in *Bibl. Hist.* 5.2.4.

also a means of shaping the communal identity of those who bore it and received it.

Thus tradition not only has certain terms associated with it, but is understood to be passed down from generation to generation from a period that might almost be described as “prehistoric.”¹⁸⁷ The founding fathers also symbolise the antiquity and authenticity of the tradition. The tradition is also a crucial aspect of how Diodorus understood the identity of the Siceliotai.

3.3.5. Plato, *Phileb.* 16C

In *Phileb.* 16C we read Socrates’ description of the road he believes will lead his interlocutors to the goal of the argument:

θεῶν μὲν εἰς ἀνθρώπους δόσις, ὥς γε καταφαίνεται ἐμοί, ποθὲν ἐκ θεῶν ἐρρίφη διὰ τινος Προμηθέως ἅμα φανοτάτῳ τινὶ πυρί· καὶ οἱ μὲν παλαιοί, κρείττονες ἡμῶν καὶ ἐγγυτέρω θεῶν οἰκοῦντες, ταύτην φήμην παρέδοσαν.

A gift of gods to humans, as it appears to me, was thrown down from the gods through a certain Prometheus, together with the brightest fire; and the ancients, greater than us and living nearer the gods, handed down this divine utterance.

It would not be inappropriate to think in terms of a chain of transmission. The origin of what Socrates is talking about is the gods. Prometheus is a mediatorial figure, as *διὰ* makes plain. The reference to *οἱ παλαιοί* emphasises the authority of what is transmitted, and is comparable with the mention of the founding fathers of the Siceliotai and the authorities mentioned in *m.* ²*Abot* 1:1. *Παρέδοσαν* is the familiar verb for transmission. Socrates’ recapitulation of this idea appears in *Phileb.* 16E: *οἱ μὲν οὖν θεοί, ὅπερ εἶπον, οὕτως ἡμῖν παρέδοσαν σκοπεῖν καὶ μανθάνειν καὶ διδάσκειν ἀλλήλους*, “thus the gods, as I said, passed down to us how to examine, learn, and teach one another.” The key thing is the divine origin of what Socrates is expounding, the

¹⁸⁷ Compare the transmission of the law from the period of Moses.

intermediaries (Prometheus and the ancients) being absent. Interestingly, *οἱ θεοί* are the grammatical subject of *παρέδοσαν*. It is also noteworthy that the tradition transmitted here relates to examining, learning, and teaching (cf. *Theaet.* 198B). Finally, in *Phileb.* 17D Socrates refers to the human tradition of handing down knowledge about music, referring to “those before us” who “handed them down to us who follow them” (*οἱ πρόσθεν παρέδοσαν ἡμῖν τοῖς ἐπομένοις*). Shared with the NT and early Jewish texts referred to earlier are the idea of transmitting what has been revealed from a heavenly source and the use of *παραδίδωμι*.

3.3.6. Diodorus of Sicily, *Bibl. Hist.* 12.12-19

In *Bibl. Hist.* 12.12-19, Diodorus writes about Charondas, the lawgiver of the city of Thurii. In his praise of letters in *Bibl. Hist.* 12.13 he writes:

καθόλου δὲ τὰς χαριεστάτας τῶν φρονίμων ἀνδρῶν ἀποφάσεις καὶ θεῶν χρησμούς, ἔτι δὲ φιλοσοφίαν καὶ πᾶσαν παιδείαν μόνη τηρεῖ καὶ τοῖς ἐπιγινομένοις δεῖ παραδίδωσιν εἰς ἅπαντα τὸν αἰῶνα.

In general, [writing] alone preserves the most beautiful sentences of wise men and oracles of gods, as well as philosophy and all instruction, and transmits them to those who are to be born, to every generation forever.

Although we are not dealing here with oral tradition but with writing as a vehicle for transmission, the principle is the same (cf. 2 Thess 2:15). Transmission is signified by *παραδίδωμι* and occurs from generation to generation. What is transmitted may be wise sayings of humans or divine oracles. In the latter case, *παραδίδωμι* is again used to refer to the transmission of material of divine origin.

3.3.7. Corpus hermeticum

There are a number of texts, to which Conzelmann refers (somewhat inaccurately) as

gnostic,¹⁸⁸ in which *παραδίδωμι* occurs. In *Corp. herm.* 1:32 we read *εὐλογητὸς εἶ, πάτερ· ὁ σὸς ἄνθρωπος συναγιάζειν σοι βούλεται, καθὼς παρέδωκας αὐτῷ τὴν πᾶσαν ἐξουσίαν*, “Blessed are you, father; your man wishes to share holiness with you, just as you have handed over all authority to him.” This text refers to the transmission of authority rather than tradition, and has more in common with Matt 11:25-27; 28:18 than with Paul.¹⁸⁹ *Corpus hermeticum* 13:1-3 is of more relevance. Here Tat entreats his father Hermes to teach him the doctrine of rebirth (*παλιγγενεσία*). Here *παραδίδωμι* and *διδάσκω* are synonymous, and although *παραλαμβάνω* does not appear *μανθάνω* does. Tat is inquiring in order to learn the teaching about rebirth (*πυθομένου τὸν τῆς παλιγγενεσίας λόγον μαθεῖν*), but Hermes has said that he would transmit it to him when Tat is likely to be estranged from the world (*ὅταν μέλλης κόσμου ἀπαλλοτριοῦσθαι, παραδιδόναι μοι*). Tat claims he is now ready, and asks Hermes to complete what is lacking in him, Hermes having proposed to transmit, out loud or secretly, the teaching about rebirth (*εἴφης μοι παλιγγενεσίας παραδοῦναι προθέμενος ἐκ φωνῆς ἢ κρυβήν*). In *Corp. herm.* 13:2, Hermes comments in reference to the nature of the one to be born that “this kind of thing, O son, is not taught, but when he wishes it will be called to mind by God” (*τοῦτο τὸ γένος, ὃ τέκνον, οὐ διδάσκεται, ἀλλ’ ὅταν θέλῃ, ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ ἀναμιμνήσκεται*). In *Corp. herm.* 13:3, Hermes says “this matter is not taught” (*τὸ πρᾶγμα τοῦτο οὐ διδάσκεται*).

Παραδίδωμι is used twice in *Corp. herm.* 13:1-3 to refer to the process of transmitting teaching from Hermes to Tat. *Διδάσκω* is used twice and *μανθάνω* once to refer to the same process. We therefore have evidence of the process of transmitting teaching and of three terms used for the process. In *Corp. herm.* 13:15 we read of the relationship between Poimandres and Hermes: *ὁ Ποιμάνδρες, ὁ τῆς αὐθεντίας νοῦς*,

¹⁸⁸ Conzelmann, *Corinthians*, 196 n. 30.

¹⁸⁹ In the phrase *ἐδόθη μοι πᾶσα ἐξουσία ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς*, “all authority in heaven and earth has been given to me” (Matt 28:18) *δίδωμι* rather than *παραδίδωμι* is used to signify transmission. However, in Matt 11:27 (*πάντα μοι παρέδοθη ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς μου*, “all things have been handed over to me by my father”) *παραδίδωμι* is used. On the relationship between this passage and *Corp. herm.* 1:32, see Norden, *Agnostos Theos*, 292-293.

πλέον μοι τῶν ἐγγεγραμμένων οὐ παρέδωκεν, “Poimandres, the mind of the authority, did not hand down to me more than is written.” Again, *παραδίδωμι* represents the transmission of teaching. The cognate noun *παράδοσις* is used in *Corp. herm.* 13:22 in the phrase “the tradition of rebirth” (τῆς παλιγγενεσίας τὴν παράδοσιν), recalling the use of *παραδίδωμι* elsewhere.¹⁹⁰

3.3.8. Greek Magical Papyri

In the Greek Magical Papyri there is an invocation which refers to mysteries which have been handed down (*PGM* IV. 475), though it is not clear whether they have been handed down from a divine source or from another human privy to secret conjurations and invocations. It is also unclear of what these mysteries consist, though the invocation which begins at *PGM* IV. 488 is a likely candidate. The relevant section reads: Ἰλαθί μοι, Πρόνοια καὶ Ψυχὴ, τάδε γράφοντι τὰ ἄπρατα, παραδοτὰ μυστήρια, “be gracious to me, Foreknowledge and Psyche, as I write these unprostituted mysteries that have been handed down.” That mysteries are said to have been handed down is suggestive of the esoteric use of *παραδίδωμι* in the context of a closed chain of transmission.

3.3.9. Plutarch, *Is. Os.* 352C

Conzelmann cites Plutarch, *Is. Os.* 352C in connection with the use of *παραλαμβάνω* in reference to the school tradition.¹⁹¹ However, it is not a philosopher who is the subject but the priest of Isis (Ἰσιακός), suggesting that it is the reception of tradition in the context of Isis cult that is in question, not the school tradition. The Ἰσιακός is the subject of *φιλοσοφείω*, but it is not in this connection that *παραλαμβάνω* is used.

¹⁹⁰ In *Corp. herm.* 13:22 Hermes describes himself as ὁ λέγων, “the speaker” and describes Tat as ὁ ἀκούων, “the listener.” This emphasises that the putative context of the dialogue in *Corp. Herm.* 13 is oral, and draws the verbs λέγω and ἀκούω into the group of binary terms used to describe transmitting and receiving teaching. The verbs in question here are hardly surprising choices, but it is interesting to find the two participles used substantively in collocation.

¹⁹¹ Conzelmann, *Corinthians*, 195 n. 28.

Οὔτε γὰρ φιλοσόφους πωγωνοτροφῆαι, ὧ Κλέα, καὶ τριβωνοφορέαι ποιοῦσιν, οὔτ' Ἰσιακοὺς αἰ λινοστολῆαι καὶ ξυρήσεις· ἀλλ' Ἰσιακός ἐστιν ὡς ἀληθῶς ὁ τὰ δεικνύμενα καὶ δρώμενα περὶ τοὺς θεοὺς τούτους, ὅταν νόμῳ παραλάβῃ λόγῳ ζητῶν καὶ φιλοσοφῶν περὶ τῆς ἐν αὐτοῖς ἀληθείας.

For neither growing the beard nor wearing a threadbare cloak makes philosophers, O Clea, nor does wearing linen and shaving make a priest of Isis. Rather, the priest of Isis is truly someone who, when he has legitimately received what is set forth and practised in connection with these gods, seeks and studies using reason concerning the truth contained therein.

The object of παραλάβῃ is τὰ δεικνύμενα καὶ δρώμενα (περὶ τοὺς θεοὺς τούτους), which means that what is received is material transmitted in connection with the Isis cult. Παραλαμβάνω, then, may be used alone for the reception of religious tradition.

3.3.10. Epictetus, *Diatr.* 2.23.40

Παράδοσις occurs twice in Epictetus, *Diatr.* 2.23.40. “Tradition” would not be a good English equivalent in either case, though its use is not unlike 1 Cor 11:2. In the first case the Greek reads: ἐπεὶ διὰ λόγου καὶ τοιαύτης παραδόσεως ἐλθεῖν ἐπὶ τὸ τέλειον δεῖ, “since it is necessary to come to perfection by means of the spoken word and instruction¹⁹² such as this.” The second occurrence refers to the manner in which the παράδοσις is given, and reads ἀνάγκη δὲ τὴν παράδοσιν γίνεσθαι διὰ τινων θεωρημάτων καὶ διὰ λέξεως ποιᾶς καὶ μετὰ τινος ποικιλίας καὶ δριμύτητος τῶν θεωρημάτων, ὑπ’ αὐτῶν τινες τούτων ἀλίσκόμενοι καταμένουσιν αὐτοῦ, “it is a necessity for the instruction to be given by means of certain rules, a certain style and with a certain diversity and eagerness with respect to the rules, some succumbing to these continue exactly where they are.” Here παράδοσις does not appear to indicate a fixed body of teachings, though the idea of material being transmitted is present.

¹⁹² Cf. Oldfather, LCL.

3.3.11. Summary

In summary, Plato, *Theaet.* 198B, Diodorus of Sicily, *Bibl. Hist.* 5.2.3, and *Corp. herm.* 13:1-3 establish that *παράδωμι* and *παραλαμβάνω* may be used together to refer to the transmission and reception of tradition. *Παράδωμι* characteristically indicates the transmission of traditional material. Its use in the school tradition and in connection with cults helps us to understand the Greek background to Paul's language of tradition. Importantly, regardless of rabbinic texts such as *m. ʔAbot* 1:1, the extant corpus of Greek literature offers ample material illustrating Greek language for tradition parallel with that of Paul. Certainly there is a characteristic vocabulary of tradition, possibly even a technical language. The terms discussed would have been familiar to Thessalonian, Galatian, and Corinthian audiences, which surely decided Paul's choice of terminology. Josephus, *C. Ap.* 1.60 suggests that *παράδωμι* had a parallel use in the Hellenistic synagogue, which Paul may have had in mind, though Josephus, Paul and the author of the *Wisdom of Solomon* all use Greek terms characteristic of descriptions of tradition and its transmission. It is unnecessary to suppose that simply because they were Jewish and thus (probably) familiar with a rabbinic model of transmission they were translating Hebrew terms into Greek in each case. Indeed, there is a very strong case for suggesting that קבל and מסר are in fact Hebrew renderings of the Greek terms *παραλαμβάνω* and *παράδωμι* respectively, rather than *vice versa*. This fits in very nicely with Elias Bickerman's research: Bickerman reads the rabbinic chain of tradition in the context of analogies drawn from the Greek world, and understands early rabbinic "houses" such as בית הלל and בית שמאי in light of Hellenistic schools.¹⁹³ Our conclusions thus connect Bickerman's results with linguistic evidence. Finally, Greek language of transmission is not confined to *παράδωμι* and *παραλαμβάνω*, but certainly encompassed *διδάσκω*, *μανθάνω*, and (apparently) *λέγω* and *ἀκούω*. To some extent these were interchangeable, and in the *corpus Paulinum* we find all of them used in contexts of transmission.

¹⁹³ Bickerman, "Chaine."

3.4. Summary

This section may be concluded by saying that in terms of the origin of the tradition, Paul understood the once human but now exalted Lord as the originator. To postulate a quasi-rabbinic chain of transmission between Jesus and Paul ignores the point that Paul is trying to make in defence of the authenticity of his apostolate and the tradition he transmits as apostle. In terms of language, clearly Paul is using a technical language for transmission, though a very different one from that found in Daniel and Qumran. His transmission language derives from Greek tradition and would have been familiar to his audiences. There is no need to see Hebrew *termini technici* behind Paul's Greek, particularly since these probably reflect Greek usage themselves in any case.

4. 2 Tim 2:1-7

We return now to the pericope with which we began. Specific aspects of 2 Tim 2:1-7 must be examined, as an exhaustive exegesis is neither advisable nor necessary. It is necessary to establish the literary affinities of parts of this section, to comprehend the self-understanding of the putative author, and to grasp the understanding of teaching and tradition present in this epistle. The discussion will focus on the commands *ἐνδυναμοῦ* (2 Tim 2:1), *παράθου* (2 Tim 2:2), and *νόει* (2 Tim 2:7).¹⁹⁴

4.1. Ἐνδυναμοῦ (2 Tim 2:1)

Timothy must be strong in the grace which is in Christ Jesus. Preachers and teachers must take care of their own faith before teaching others, thus setting an example.¹⁹⁵ Michael

¹⁹⁴ On the use of both the vocative and direct commands as hortatory devices in the Pastorals, see Benjamin Fiore, *The Function of Personal Example in the Socratic and Pastoral Epistles* (AnBib 105; Rome: Biblical Institute, 1986), 17.

¹⁹⁵ Example, according to Fiore, is one of the hortatory features characteristic of the Pastorals (alongside antithesis: *Function*, 24; see further pp. 21, 22-25). Teaching by example (cf. 1 Tim 1:3-20; 4:12; Titus 2:6-8), prominent in 2 Timothy (cf. 2 Tim 1:3-18; 2:24-26; 3:1-4:8), is connected with the self-examination of the philosopher, which justifies the philosopher's position as a teacher of others. Cf. Abraham J. Malherbe,

Wolter also suggests a connection with the appointment of a successor after the manner of Moses' appointment of Joshua, noting that the concept of "strengthening" in the OT and Jewish tradition has a limited reference to the adoption of a role or the beginning of an office, insofar as the person in question thereby receives a share in God's power (*δύναμις*).¹⁹⁶ This idea may be combined with the concept of succession found in Sirach, which is bound up with the phenomenon of transmission. 2 Timothy 2:1 thus relates directly to Timothy not simply being part of a chain of transmission but being appointed as Paul's successor after the pattern of Moses and Joshua in the OT. In that Timothy is addressed as Paul's son, there is a possible connection with the testamentary literature, in which the literary fiction of patriarchs addressing their sons is found.¹⁹⁷

4.2. Παράθου (2 Tim 2:2)

On this command¹⁹⁸ hinges our understanding of the relationship between Paul and Timothy. Five persons or groups are present:

(1) Paul. He began the process of transmission, though as apostle what Paul transmitted originated in heaven.¹⁹⁹ The phrase *ἀ ἡκουσας παρ' ἐμοῦ*, "those things which you

Moral Exhortation: A Greco-Roman Sourcebook (LEC; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1986), 34-38. The importance of a role model is frequently stressed in classical texts relating exhortation and instruction (see Malherbe, *Moral Exhortation*, 135-138). Martin Dibelius and Hans Conzelmann also hint at the idea of Timothy following Paul's example here (*The Pastoral Epistles: A Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles* [trans. P. Buttolph and A. Yarbro; Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1972], 107). Cf. Wegenast, *Verständnis*, 140.

¹⁹⁶ Michael Wolter, *Die Pastoralbriefe als Paulustradition* (FRLANT 146; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1988), 216-217. See Exod 4:13 (LXX); 1 Chr 9:13 (LXX); 1QSa I, 17; L.A.B. 39:8; Josephus, *Ant.* 2.12.3, 4.

¹⁹⁷ Compare Wolter, *Pastoralbriefe*, 203, who remarks with reference to 2 Tim 1:8, 12, 15, 16; 2:9; 4:6-8, 10, 16 that "on the basis above all of these autobiographical passages 2. Tim is generally regarded in the exegetical literature as a literary testament or farewell letter of the pastoral Paul." Compare also the father-son address in wisdom literature and contrast the examples of both Greek philosophers and the rabbinic chain of tradition: "[c]omme la philosophie des Grecs, la *Tora* des Pharisiens fut transmise de maîtres à disciples et non pas de père en fils" (Bickerman, "Chaine," 54).

¹⁹⁸ On the hortatory features of the Pastorals, including the use of direct commands in quick succession, see Fiore, *Function*, 10-21, esp. pp. 14-16. Παράθου is cited: *Function*, 15 n. 33; cf. p. 17 n. 42.

¹⁹⁹ Note that Paul's apostolate is God-given: 1 Tim 1:1; 2:7; 2 Tim 1:1, 11; cf. Titus 1:3. Cf. Fiore, *Function*, 19 n. 60.

heard from me” refers to what is transmitted.²⁰⁰

(2) “Many witnesses,” through whom Timothy received teaching originally given by Paul. W. Hendriksen understands *διὰ πολλῶν μαρτύρων* to mean “among many witnesses,”²⁰¹ though this would surely be closer to *ἐν* + dative than *διὰ* + genitive.²⁰² Marshall notes that “the usual sense of *διὰ* with gen. of person is ‘through the agency of.’”²⁰³ Spicq discusses several possible meanings for *διὰ*,²⁰⁴ suggesting that Timothy was not only instructed in the faith through contact with Paul, but through listening to other witnesses of Christ.²⁰⁵ However, if *διὰ* indicates agency, then the specific teachings referred to in 2 Tim 2:2 were not given to Timothy directly by Paul, but by many witnesses. This verse refers throughout to figures through whom Paul’s teaching has been transmitted, and to whom it should be transmitted.

(3) Timothy himself, who is both a recipient and a transmitter of teaching.

(4) “Faithful men,” to whom Timothy is to transmit what he has received.

(5) “Others,” to be taught by the faithful men. *Διδάξαι*, “to teach” informs us about the roles of those involved: all are involved in teaching. What 2 Tim 2:2 presents is the process of transmitting sound teaching, thus echoing 1 Cor 11:2, 23; 15:1-3; 1 Thess 2:13.²⁰⁶ The idea of learning is present, since those who hear Timothy’s message, transmitted from Paul, will become teachers themselves. This is paralleled in Jewish literature. The Qumran *למשכיל* learns *למד* (Qal: 1QS IX, 13) in order to teach *למד*

²⁰⁰ According to Fiore, by recollecting what the addressee has heard from him, the author may elicit agreement and reaffirm teacher and addressee, and between them and the tradition they share in common: *Function*, 18; for examples, cf. *Function*, 18 n. 54.

²⁰¹ W. Hendriksen, *I & II Thessalonians, I & II Timothy & Titus* (Edinburgh: Banner of Truth Trust, 1972), 245-246, 247 n. 126.

²⁰² Cf. C. F. D. Moule, *An Idiom-Book of New Testament Greek* (2d ed.; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959), 55-58.

²⁰³ Marshall, *Pastoral Epistles*, 725.

²⁰⁴ Spicq, *Épîtres Pastorales*, 341.

²⁰⁵ Spicq, *Épîtres Pastorales*, 341.

²⁰⁶ Cf. Marshall, *Pastoral Epistles*, 724-725: “[t]he reference is a general one to Paul’s teaching, which is regarded as in effect a tradition to be handed on.”

Piel: 1QS III, 13; IX, 18, 20), and in *m. ḤAbot* 6:6 we read הלומד על נח ללמד: “one who learns in order to teach.”²⁰⁷ This recalls the saying of R. Ishmael son of R. Yohanan ben Beroqa in *m. ḤAbot* 4:5: הלומד לומד על מנת ללמד מספיקין בידו למוד וללמד, “whoever learns in order to teach is enabled to learn and to teach.”

Dibelius and Conzelmann cite *1 Clem.* 42:1-4 in connection with 2 Tim 2:2, alongside which we might place the model found in *m. ḤAbot* 1:1. In *1 Clem.* 42 the gospel is of divine origin, mediated to apostles through Jesus. In response to revelation, the apostles preach.²⁰⁸ Although this precise model is not found in *m. ḤAbot*, a chain of transmission is.²⁰⁹ Although the precise contents of 2 Tim 2:2, *1 Clem.* 42:1-2, and *m. ḤAbot* 1:1 are different, all three exhibit a similar model of transmission. In that *m. ḤAbot* 1:1 refers to the oral law, it is closer to 2 Tim 2:2, which refers to the oral transmission of teaching.²¹⁰ This is implied by ᾧ ἤκουσας παρ’ ἐμοῦ, “the things which you heard from me.”²¹¹ 2 Timothy and *1 Clement* are both Christian texts, and 2 Timothy may well have formed part of the literary heritage of the author(s)²¹² of *1 Clement*. Both hold a broadly similar understanding of apostleship and the transmission of teaching. Tractate *Avot* presents a similar model which would at least have been known to the Lukan Paul, who sat at the feet of Gamaliel.²¹³ Acts 22:3; 2 Tim 2:2 offer similar models, derived from the

²⁰⁷ In this process, ללמד Qal precedes ללמד Piel once more.

²⁰⁸ Marshall contrasts this passage with 2 Tim 2:2 (*Pastoral Epistles*, 726), suggesting that *1 Clem.* 42 is only concerned with the appointment of overseers and deacons by apostles, showing less interest in the preservation of the message. However, this does not affect the conclusion that both texts presuppose the same model of transmission, whatever their individual aims may be. The origin of the tradition is in heaven and must be passed on within a chain of transmission.

²⁰⁹ See also *m. ḤAbot* 1:1 1:3, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12; 2:8. R. Eleazar ben Shammua is credited with a saying which advocates equating respect for one’s teacher with respect for heaven, which may presuppose the hierarchical model with which we are dealing (*m. ḤAbot* 4:12). Compare also the phrase לידע להודיע ולהודיע, “to know and to make known, so that it may be known” in *m. ḤAbot* 4:22.

²¹⁰ Marshall, *Pastoral Epistles*, 725.

²¹¹ Cf. 2 Tim 1:13; Acts 1:4.

²¹² On the basis of the salutation (Ἡ ἐκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ ἡ παροικοῦσα Ῥώμην τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ τῇ παροικούσῃ Κόρινθον), and the title given at the end of the Coptic version (*The Apostolic Fathers* [trans. Kirsopp Lake; vol. 1; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1912], 120-121), *1 Clement* is to be understood as a communal letter from Rome to Corinth, rather than a letter from a single author, Clement.

²¹³ Cf. Acts 5:34; 22:3; *m. ḤAbot* 1:4, 16.

Jewish model reflected in *Avot*. First Clement reflects the adoption of a Jewish model.

To further explicate the meaning of this passage, attention must be paid to the self-understanding of the putative author and the language of teaching and tradition.

4.2.1. Paul's self-understanding in 2 Timothy

Paul uses several terms to describe himself in 2 Timothy. In 2 Tim 1:1, he introduces himself as *ἀπόστολος Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ*, “apostle of Christ Jesus,”²¹⁴ though this does not fully indicate the capacity in which he is writing. Paul uses his apostleship as an identifying mark.²¹⁵ Paul gives a fuller indication of his calling in 2 Tim 1:11, in which he describes himself as *κῆρυξ* (“herald”), *ἀπόστολος* (“apostle”), and *διδάσκαλος* (“teacher”).²¹⁶ *Ἀπόστολος* precedes *διδάσκαλος* in order, recalling the lists of divine appointments in 1 Cor 12:28; Eph 4:11.²¹⁷ Apostleship and teaching are divine gifts in those texts,²¹⁸ as in 1 Tim 1:1-2 apostolic authority derives from God.²¹⁹ In 2 Tim 1:8,²²⁰ Paul describes himself as the Lord's prisoner, and 1:12 implies that his suffering as a prisoner is bound up with his calling as herald, apostle, and teacher. Furthermore, Timothy is to join him in suffering (2 Tim 1:8), which suggests Timothy's calling is

²¹⁴ Cf. 1 Tim 1:1; Tit 1:1.

²¹⁵ The situation is more complex if 2 Timothy is a pseudepigraphon. For Norbert Brox, the emphasis on Paul's apostleship is conspicuous in a letter claiming to be a private writing to Paul's intimate assistant (*Die Pastoralbriefe: Timotheus I Timotheus II Titus: Übersetzt und erklärt* [RNT 7.2; Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet, 1969], 223). For him a later ecclesiastical writer is safeguarding the effective authority of the church of the Pastorals as the word of Paul (*Pastoralbriefe*, 98-99). For Wegenast the term “apostle” is used as part of the author's polemic against his opponents (*Verständnis*, 139).

²¹⁶ Cf. 1 Tim 2:7.

²¹⁷ *Κῆρυξ* does not appear in either of these texts. In both, *ἀποστόλους* has priority. In 1 Cor 12:28, “teachers” (*διδασκάλους*) are third in order after “prophets” (*προφῆτας*). In Eph 4:11 they are fifth in order after “prophets,” “evangelists” (*εὐαγγελιστάς*), and “shepherds” (*ποιμένες*).

²¹⁸ In 1 Cor 12:28; 1 Tim 2:7, this is indicated by *τίθῃμι*. In 1 Cor 12:28, God is the subject of *ἔθετο*, and in 1 Tim 2:7 Paul is the subject of the passive *ἐτέθην*. God is presumably the unmentioned agent. In Eph 4:11, *ἔδωκεν* indicates that apostleship is a divine gift. Gordon Fee notes that the phrase *διὰ θελήματος θεοῦ*, “by God's will” in 1 Cor 1:1 indicates that Paul is emphasising “the divine origin of his apostleship” (*Corinthians*, 29). The fact that this phrase recurs in 2 Tim 1:1 suggests that the same emphasis should be read into 2 Timothy. Marshall comments with reference to 2 Tim 1:1 that “Paul owes his position in the church to specific appointment by God” (*Pastoral Epistles*, 685).

²¹⁹ Thus guarding against the idea that ecclesiastical authority rests on human merit or individual power: Brox, *Pastoralbriefe*, 98.

²²⁰ Cf. Eph 3:1; Col 4:18; Philem 1.

similar to Paul's own.²²¹

Paul's self-understanding is evident in other ways. Paul expects Timothy to follow his example.²²² Paul's teaching appears first in a list of his activities and qualities,²²³ suggesting this is of primary importance. Paul's emphasis in 2 Tim 4:17 is on the proclamation of the message to the Gentiles, which relates to his calling as preacher (κῆρυξ). Paul therefore writes as an apostle, addressing Timothy as a teacher, and emphasising his calling as preacher.²²⁴

4.2.2. Teaching and apostleship in 2 Timothy

Teaching is fundamental to the Pastorals,²²⁵ διδάσκαλος occurring three times. It is fundamentally connected to apostleship: as tradition and the gospel are connected with Paul's apostolate in 1 Corinthians and Galatians, so teaching is connected with apostleship in the Pastorals.²²⁶ As in these epistles, apostolic authority is used as a weapon in the response to opponents.²²⁷

In 1 Tim 2:7, Paul refers not only to his appointment as preacher and apostle,²²⁸ but also to his appointment as διδάσκαλος ἐθνῶν ἐν πίστει καὶ ἀληθείᾳ, "teacher of the nations in faith and truth." Martin Dibelius and Hans Conzelmann cite Eph 3:7 in

²²¹ Spicq comments that "[l]a formulation du verset semble vouloir insister sur le parallèle entre la situation et la charge de Paul et celles de Timothée" (*Épîtres Pastorales*, 317).

²²² See n. 268 above.

²²³ 2 Tim 3:10.

²²⁴ Paul is also referred to as κῆρυξ in 1 Clem. 5:6: Dibelius and Conzelmann, *Pastoral Epistles*, 43.

²²⁵ Rejecting the idea that the purpose of the Pastorals is either polemic defence or ecclesiastical discipline and advocating the idea that their main purpose is traditional instruction, Fiore suggests that the approach he adopts takes teaching as its point of departure, responding to false teaching by recalling the authority on which true teaching is based: God and Jesus, the Scriptures (cf. 2 Tim 3:16-17), the deposit (παραθήκη), and Paul: *Function*, 6.

²²⁶ This accords with Fiore's note that if the purpose of the Pastorals is understood to be traditional instruction, the figure of the apostle is highlighted as "the divinely appointed teacher and the very type and model of the teaching": Fiore, *Function*, 6. On this understanding Paul's teaching office is transmitted wholesale to his associates (loc. cit.).

²²⁷ Wegenast, *Verständnis*, 138-139.

²²⁸ The status of apostle is closely related to preaching and teaching, and, at least in Colossians, both Paul and Timothy are preachers and teachers.

comparison,²²⁹ though they make no mention of *ἀπόστολος* in Eph 3:5 to indicate a medium of divine revelation.²³⁰ Dibelius and Conzelmann suggest that no general concept of the apostle is developed in the Pastorals.²³¹ In response, it should be said that a particular model of the apostle seems to be *assumed* in the Pastorals,²³² one which relates closely to that found in 1 Corinthians, Ephesians, and Colossians.²³³ Paul is a divinely commissioned mediator of heavenly mysteries: the *κηρύγμα* was entrusted to him,²³⁴ he was appointed for the gospel,²³⁵ he was appointed apostle by Christ himself and continues as such by Christ's command,²³⁶ and he proclaims the gospel. Moreover, he is its guarantor.²³⁷

Within 2 Timothy *διδάσκαλος* appears twice, in reference to Paul (2 Tim 1:11) and false teachers (2 Tim 4:3). Their teaching is contrasted with Timothy's, which is represented by *ὑγιαίνουσας διδασκαλίας* ("healthy teaching") in 4:2. The contrast between sound and unsound teaching occurs several times in Paul's exhortations in the Pastorals. That Timothy is commanded to preach in all patience and teaching suggests a close link between preaching and teaching, and suggests also that Timothy is to act in the place of Paul, whose place it is to preach and teach (2 Tim 1:11). Here, then, there is a model of apostleship shared with earlier epistles in the *corpus Paulinum* and a model of transmission in which Timothy is faithfully to take up Paul's mantle on several levels.

²²⁹ Dibelius and Conzelmann, *Pastoral Epistles*, 43.

²³⁰ For this understanding of apostleship, see §2.5 above.

²³¹ Dibelius and Conzelmann, *Pastoral Epistles*, 108.

²³² As Wegenast notes (*Verständnis*, 139), in the Pastorals, unlike in Acts (cf. Acts 1:21-26), the apostolate is not the object of consideration as a phenomenon; nor is the apostolate defined in terms of a fixed number of members on the basis of specific requirements, as in Acts 1:21-26.

²³³ A connection of some sort exists between the Pastorals and these epistles, even if on the level of literary dependence. For example, in Col 1:1, the phrase Παῦλος ἀπόστολος Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ διὰ θελήματος θεοῦ is identical to 2 Tim 1:1, and Timothy himself is mentioned.

²³⁴ Titus 1:3; cf. Eph 3:7; Col 1:25. The phrase "[with] which I have been entrusted" (δ ἐπιστεύθην ἐγώ) places Paul in the role of trustee; πιστεύω echoes 2 Macc 3:12, 22; 2 Tim 1:12. The *κηρύγμα* has been entrusted to Paul, and he is to guard it (cf. Hendriksen, *1 & 2 Thessalonians*, 211, 236 n. 121, 237). See also §3.2.3.1 below.

²³⁵ 1 Tim 2:6-7; 2 Tim 1:11.

²³⁶ 1 Tim 1:1; 2 Tim 1:1; Titus 1:1.

²³⁷ Cf. 1 Tim 1:11; Titus 1:3. See Wegenast, *Verständnis*, 139.

4.2.3. Παραθήκη and διδασκαλία in the Pastorals

Παραθήκη, “deposit” and διδασκαλία, “teaching” may be considered together, since they are closely related in the Pastorals. They are related to παρατίθημι and διδάσκω, which occur in 2 Tim 2:2. Παραθήκη is the subject of παρετέθη in Lev 5:23 (LXX) and in Tob 10:13 (Σ) Edna entrusts (παρατίθημι) her daughter to Tobias “in deposit” (ἐν παραθήκη).²³⁸ If παρατίθημι and παραθήκη are read together in 2 Timothy also, Timothy is both to guard and to “pass on” (παράθου) the deposit, which he has received from Paul. Similarly, Timothy and his heirs in the chain of transmission are to “teach” sound teaching. The deposit is the content of what Paul and his successors teach.

Only 1 and 2 Timothy in the NT attest παραθήκη. Timothy is exhorted to “guard” (φύλαξον) the deposit in 1 Tim 6:20; 2 Tim 1:14, as he will guard “these things” (ταῦτα) in 1 Tim 5:21. The deposit is understood to be precisely definable. 2 Tim 1:12 differs slightly in that Paul refers to τὴν παραθήκην μου, “my deposit.” It seems to be God who will guard the deposit,²³⁹ whereas in Exod 22:9-10 (LXX) and elsewhere in the Pastorals a deposit is to be guarded by humans. Is the deposit here something different from what Timothy is exhorted to guard? Dibelius and Conzelmann translate this passage “he has power to guard the deposit entrusted to me until that day!”²⁴⁰ and suggest that the παραθήκη here means faith entrusted to the church in the form of the tradition,²⁴¹ synonymous with the “sound words” (ὑγιαίνοντων λόγων) of 2 Tim 1:13.²⁴² The link between παραθήκη and ὑγιαίνοντων λόγων in 2 Tim 1:13 also suggests a link with ὑγιαίνουσης διδασκαλίας in 2 Tim 4:3.²⁴³ These all relate to “the apostolic traditions

²³⁸ A and B read ἐν παρακαταθήκη where Σ reads ἐν παραθήκη, thus using the “real Attic form” (BAG 623; cf. p. 621) attested in 1 Tim 6:20 (TR); 2 Tim 1:14 (TR). Cf. 2 Macc 3:15.

²³⁹ Cf. 2 Macc 3:15, 22.

²⁴⁰ Dibelius and Conzelmann, *Pastoral Epistles*, 97. Cf. Spicq, *Épîtres Pastorales*, 327: “le dépôt à moi confié.”

²⁴¹ Dibelius and Conzelmann, *Pastoral Epistles*, 105.

²⁴² Dibelius and Conzelmann, *Pastoral Epistles*, 105 n. 59.

²⁴³ Cf. Hendriksen, *1 & 2 Thessalonians*, 236.

which 'Timothy' has received in order to transmit them."²⁴⁴

The difficulties with understanding *παραθήκη* here in the same sense as in 1 Tim 6:20; 2 Tim 1:14 are demonstrated by Hendriksen,²⁴⁵ who takes *παραθήκη* in 1 Tim 6:20; 2 Tim 1:14 to refer to the gospel.²⁴⁶ While containing some truth, this is misleading. In the Pastorals sound teaching is the *παραθήκη*, which is to be guarded within the church, the context in which teaching takes place. The gospel is what Paul suffers for (2 Tim 1:8) and what Timothy is to remember (2 Tim 2:8), but the gospel and the *παραθήκη* are not explicitly linked. Those who teach and those who are taught have already heard and accepted the gospel, which is Jesus Christ raised from the dead, of David's seed (2 Tim 2:8). In 1 Tim 1:11, sound teaching is *in accordance with* (*κατά*) the glorious gospel of the blessed God but not synonymous with it.

Spicq offers two possibilities for 2 Tim 1:12: (1) I know in whom I have had faith and I am convinced that he has the power to guard the deposit entrusted to me until that day; (2) I know in whom I have put my trust, I know him as a faithful guardian and I have full assurance that he is able to guard the deposit which I have delivered to him.²⁴⁷ He adopts the first, arguing that the context and the occurrences of *παραθήκη* in 1 Tim 6:20; 2 Tim 1:14 (especially the latter) make it more likely that Paul is referring to his fidelity. In the face of persecution, only Christ Jesus had the power to ensure Paul's perseverance and faithfulness to the deposit with which he had been entrusted.²⁴⁸ However, it seems more faithful to the Greek to reject Spicq and Dibelius and Conzelmann and to follow Hendriksen. Two different deposits are referred to. Given that there are only three occurrences of *παραθήκη* in the NT, to support this argument by appealing to the other two references is untenable, when they share a common difference from 2 Tim 1:12. In 1

²⁴⁴ Dibelius and Conzelmann, *Pastoral Epistles*, 92.

²⁴⁵ Hendriksen, *1 & 2 Thessalonians*, 235-236 and n. 121.

²⁴⁶ Hendriksen, *1 & 2 Thessalonians*, 211, 236 n. 121, 237.

²⁴⁷ Spicq, *Épîtres Pastorales*, 327.

²⁴⁸ Cf. Spicq, *Épîtres Pastorales*, 328.

Tim 6:12; 2 Tim 1:14, it is Timothy who is to guard the deposit, the same person who is to transmit it in 2 Tim 2:2 (the deposit is synonymous with *ἡ ἡκουσας παρ' ἐμοῦ*). This is clearly different from the *παραθήκη* of 2 Tim 1:12, which is Paul's property, which he entrusts not to another human, but to Christ Jesus.

Exodus 22; 2 Macc 3 may be read as metaphors of what Paul envisages in 2 Tim 1:12. In 2 Tim 1:12 *πιστεύω* recalls the function of the temple in 2 Macc 3:12, 22.²⁴⁹ Paul is in the position of one who has entrusted his property to another, in this case Christ Jesus. If *παραθήκη* is understood here to refer to Paul's own life,²⁵⁰ then the Lord, the owner of Paul's life²⁵¹ is known to have the power to guard it, as the faithful hoped he would guard the deposits of widows and orphans in 2 Macc 3:15, 22. Moreover, Paul is drawing on the language of property law in Exod 22 for his metaphor. Paul has entrusted his property (his life) to Jesus, who will guard it.²⁵² Paul has been captured in 2 Timothy (cf. 2 Tim 1:8),²⁵³ and as a result is in a similar position to stolen property in Exod 22. He is a prisoner, but he belongs to the Lord,²⁵⁴ and restitution will be made to the Lord.²⁵⁵ On the other hand, a human captor cannot prevent the Lord from guarding what is his own. The Lord will guard what has been entrusted to him, that is, the life of Paul.

Exodus 22 may have influenced Paul's thinking here. The model of entrusting property to another that appears in 1 Tim 6:20; 2 Tim 1:12, 14; 2 Tim 2:2 also appears in Tob 10 (N) and 2 Macc 3. In 2 Tim 1:12, Paul is not referring to the same *παραθήκη* as in the other references in the Pastorals. The link between *παρατίθημι* and *παραθήκη* means that we may interpret 2 Tim 2:2 alongside 1 Tim 6:20; 2 Tim 1:14. Timothy is to guard

²⁴⁹ Cf. also Acts 27:24-25; Phil 1:6; 2:24 (Spicq, *Épîtres Pastorales*, 328 n. 3).

²⁵⁰ Cf. Hendriksen (*1 & 2 Thessalonians*, 235), who understands *τὴν παραθήκην μου* to be Paul's self and complete salvation.

²⁵¹ Cf. Exod 22:7, 9-10 (LXX).

²⁵² Cf. Exod 22:9 (LXX); 2 Tim 3:11. Spicq (*Épîtres Pastorales*, 327) cites Acts 14:23 in this connection. The model is that of disciples' lives being entrusted to the Lord, and is thus a question of property.

²⁵³ Spicq (*Épîtres Pastorales*, 327) refers to Paul's captivity, but not in connection with the law of stolen property.

²⁵⁴ Cf. Ignatius, *Polycarp* 7:3.

²⁵⁵ Cf. Exod 22:11 (LXX).

something he is also to pass on. The *παραθήκη* is synonymous with the object of *παρατίθημι* in 2 Tim 2:2, that is, “the things which you heard from me through many witnesses.” It is essential that the recipients of the deposit are faithful, so that they, too, may be trusted to guard it. In 2 Tim 2:2, *παράθου* and *διδάξαι* are syntactically parallel, which means that transmitting and teaching are practically synonymous. The content of the teaching is identical with the content of the deposit.

This necessitates a demonstration of how *παραθήκη* and *διδασκαλία* function together in the Pastorals. *Διδασκαλία* occurs three times in 2 Timothy. In 2 Tim 3:10, it is Paul’s teaching which Timothy has faithfully followed.²⁵⁶ In 2 Tim 3:16 Timothy’s teaching will make use of the “sacred writings,” as Paul’s has done. 2 Timothy 3:14 is an appeal to Timothy to remain in what he has learnt, knowing from whom he learnt it (Paul).²⁵⁷ *Μανθάνω* links Timothy with the *μαθητής*, who would be under a *διδάσκαλος* (Paul). That a *μαθητής* will become a *διδάσκαλος* implied by *διδασκαλία*. In 2 Tim 4:3, “teachers according to their own desires” oppose Paul, Timothy, and their tradition, dubbed “healthy teaching” (*ὑγιαίνουσας διδασκαλίας*). There is an anthropological dualism²⁵⁸ that places Pauline teaching in opposition to that of others. In 2 Timothy *διδασκαλία* always refers to Pauline teaching, which is also referred to as “the good deposit” (2 Tim 1:14), “the things you have heard from me” (2 Tim 2:2), and “those things which you have learnt” (2 Tim 3:14). The concern with sound and false teaching appears in 1 Tim 1:3 (cf. 4:1; 6:3; 2 Tim 4:3; Titus 1:11, 13; 2:2, 8) and is fundamental to Paul’s exhortations in that epistle. 1 Tim 4:6 anticipates 2 Tim 3:10, both referring to teaching transmitted by Paul. 1 Tim 4:7-10 contains an example of sound teaching: this is what Paul exhorts Timothy to teach in 4:11 (cf. 1 Tim 6:2). 1 Timothy 4:13 implies that

²⁵⁶ Paul’s teaching, “which the apostle’s pupils have transmitted, is the basis, the substance, and the norm of all future proclamation in the church” (Wegenast, *Verständnis*, 140). Wegenast notes that *τὸν λόγον τῆς ἀληθείας* (2 Tim 2:15), *ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ* (Titus 2:5; cf. 1 Tim 4:5), and *τὸν λόγον* (2 Tim 4:2) are synonymous with the *διδασκαλία* (*Verständnis*, 140 n. 2).

²⁵⁷ Dibelius and Conzelmann (*Pastoral Epistles*, 118-119) note that 2 Tim 3:14-17 is concerned with “the role of the tradition,” which they rightly regard as one of the key ideas of the epistle as a whole.

²⁵⁸ Cf. Dibelius and Conzelmann, *Pastoral Epistles*, 87 (in reference to 1 Tim 6:11-16).

Timothy is to be a teacher in Paul's stead. Turning one's mind to teaching is part of fulfilling one's ministry (cf. 2 Tim 4:5). The command in 1 Tim 4:16 to "take pains with yourself and with teaching" (*ἐπεχε σεαυτῷ καὶ τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ*) in a sense reiterates 4:13. Tit 2:1, 7 emphasise Titus' role as a teacher in Crete: he must teach by example. In 1 Tim 5:17 the *πρεσβύτεροι* who labour in teaching are equivalent to the "faithful people" (*πιστοῖς ἀνθρώποις*) of 2 Tim 2:2 standing within the Pauline tradition. We are not told that they were taught by Timothy himself, but, like him, they are insiders within the Pauline tradition. Titus 1:5-9 is another representation of the Pauline chain of transmission. Elders and overseers are to be appointed by Paul's "son" according to ethical standards which Paul has laid down as necessary for exhorting with the sound teaching.

In 1 Tim 6:1 (cf. Titus 2:5), the rhetoric of guarding teaching from blasphemy recalls *m. ʔAbot* 1:1. The men of the great assembly said *ועשו סיג לתורה*, "make a fence for the Torah," after their exhortation to "raise up many disciples" (*והעמידו תלמידים הרבה*). These two exhortations are addressed to those who would teach disciples and guard the law. Timothy was in a parallel position, guarding a particular tradition, described using the metaphor of "deposit." He was also to assume a teaching role in the place of Paul. *Avot of Rabbi Nathan* records that the school of Shammai limited the circle of those whom a master should teach to those who are wise, humble, of good parentage and wealthy (*שב' ש' אומרים אל ישנה אדם אלא למי*), *ʔAbot R. Nat.* 19a). At least in principle we have a similar model of inclusion and exclusion.

Finally, Titus 2:10 offers the clearest indication of the importance of teaching within the Pauline tradition: *ἵνα τὴν διδασκαλίαν τὴν τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν θεοῦ κοσμῶσιν ἐν παντί*, "so that they may do credit to the teaching, which is God our saviour's in all things." If *διδασκαλία* is understood consistently throughout the Pastorals, this verse offers the key to its importance and confirms that the *παραθήκη* of 1 Tim 6:20;

2 Tim 1:14 is synonymous with *διδασκαλία*. The *διδασκαλία* is God's property, which has been entrusted to Paul, and is entrusted by Paul to Timothy, who in turn is to entrust it to faithful men, who will teach it. The teaching is held in trust by those within the Pauline tradition. The metaphor of the *παραθήκη* emphasises the importance of guarding what has been entrusted to the bearers of the tradition by God.

Διδάσκω occurs five times in the Pastorals, most importantly in 2 Tim 2:2, which provides us with a picture of how teaching was transmitted. Having established that in 2 Timothy Paul is a teacher, we may assert, on the basis of 2 Tim 4:2-3, that Timothy is also a teacher, and that his position as such is dependent upon his relationship with Paul. In 2 Tim 2:1, Timothy is commanded, as Paul's son (*τέκνον*),²⁵⁹ to be strong in the grace which is in Christ Jesus, and then to pass on what he has heard from Paul in a chain of transmission.

4.3. *Νόει* (2 Tim 2:7)

In order for Timothy to receive insight from the Lord, he must muse on what Paul says. This restricts the transmission of sound doctrine, and especially the acquisition of divine insight, to the teacher-disciple relationship. Specific people, in this case an apostle and teacher, are vessels for God to pass on his insight by revelation to humans, and the teacher-disciple relationship is the context in which this revelation occurs. The relationship in which such revelation occurs appears elsewhere also in the guise of patriarchs instructing their sons.²⁶⁰ It is the Lord who gives *σύνεσις*, but the disciple cannot receive this virtue without a link with his "father," in this case Paul.

Several Jewish texts bear witness to the concept present in 2 Tim 2:7.²⁶¹ 2

²⁵⁹ Cf. Phil 2:22.

²⁶⁰ Cf. Dibelius and Conzelmann, *Pastoral Epistles*, 107, where the similarity between the paraenesis of 2 Timothy and testamentary literature is noted.

²⁶¹ Cf. part one, §3.2 above. Eighty years ago J. Rendel Harris attempted to demonstrate that 2 Tim 2:7 is an adapted citation from Pindar. He wanted to restore behind this verse the proverbial form *σύνεξ δ σοι λέγω*, his argument contributing to his view that "[i]t is becoming constantly clearer that in the study of the New Testament we are dealing, in the main, with a fundamentally Hellenized product, and that, as regards

Timothy 2:7 may allude to a Greek rendering of Prov 2:6.²⁶² However, the concept present here surfaces elsewhere, for example in Dan 1:17 (OG): *καὶ τοῖς νεανίσκοις ἔδωκεν ὁ κύριος ἐπιστήμην καὶ σύνεσιν καὶ φρόνησιν ἐν πάσῃ γραμματικῇ τέχνῃ· καὶ τῷ Δανιηλ ἔδωκε σύνεσιν ἐν παντὶ ῥήματι καὶ ὁράματι καὶ ἐνυπνίοις καὶ ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ*, “and to these youths the Lord gave insight, understanding, and perception in every aspect of learning, and to Daniel he gave²⁶³ insight into every word, vision, and dream,²⁶⁴ and into all wisdom.”²⁶⁵ Marshall does not cite Dan 1:17, but does note several other texts. In 1 Kgs 3:9 (LXX) we read: *καὶ δώσεις τῷ δούλῳ σου καρδίαν ἀκούειν καὶ διακρίνειν τὸν λαόν σου ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ τοῦ συνέιν ἀνὰ μέσον ἀγαθοῦ καὶ κακοῦ*, “and you shall give your servant (viz. Solomon) a heart to listen and to judge your people in righteousness, to distinguish (συνίημι) between good and evil.” Daniel 2:21 (OG) reads: *διδούς σοφοῖς σοφίαν καὶ σύνεσιν τοῖς ἐν ἐπιστήμῃ οὖσιν*, “(God) gives wisdom to the wise and understanding to those who are in insight.” *Testament of Levi* 18:7, alluding to Isa 11:2, refers to a “spirit of understanding”: *καὶ δόξα ὑψίστου ἐπ’ αὐτὸν ῥηθήσεται, καὶ πνεῦμα συνέσεως καὶ ἀγιασμοῦ καταπαύσει ἐπ’ αὐτὸν ἐν τῷ ὕδατι*, “and the glory of the

St. Paul in particular, neither his philosophy nor his language will be finally intelligible to us until we have taken off from him his Rabbinic robe, and moved him away from the feet of Gamaliel. He has been in that position of affected Semitism long enough” (“Pindar and St. Paul,” *ExpTim* 33 (1921-1922): 456). In light of the wealth of research conducted since then, including the present study, these words ring hollow indeed. Even if Harris is correct to connect 2 Tim 2:7 with Pindar, he ignores the essential element: the Lord will give Timothy understanding. This is a notion corroborated by a great wealth of Jewish material.

²⁶² NA²⁷. Marshall, *Pastoral Epistles*, 731. 2 Tim 2:7 is not a verbatim allusion to Prov 2:6 (LXX), which reads: *ὅτι κύριος δίδωσιν σοφίαν, καὶ ἀπὸ προσώπου αὐτοῦ γνώσις καὶ σύνεσις*, “for the Lord gives wisdom, and from his face knowledge and insight.” The MT reads: *כִּי יְהוָה יִתֵּן חָכְמָה מִפִּי דְעַת וְתְבוּנָה*, “for YHWH will give wisdom, from his mouth knowledge and insight.” The LXX shares *δίδωμι*, *κύριος*, and *σύνεσις* with 2 Tim 2:7.

²⁶³ The OG has *δίδωμι* + *σύνεσις* in both halves of the verse, *ὁ κύριος* being the subject in both cases. Daniel in Dan 1:17 (OG) is therefore parallel with Timothy in 2 Tim 2:7. Θ differs: where the OG has *τῷ Δανιηλ ἔδωκε σύνεσιν* (“to Daniel he gave insight”), Theodotion has *Δανιηλ συνήκεν* (“Daniel possessed insight”). Both reflect *יָרַח* (MT).

²⁶⁴ *ῥήματι* and *ὁράματι* are dative singular, but *ἐνυπνίοις* is dative plural. All three are translated in the singular here for the sake of rendering the Greek into idiomatic English.

²⁶⁵ “Into all wisdom” (*ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ*) should be compared with Col 1:9: *διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ἡμεῖς, ἀφ’ ἧς ἡμέρας ἠκούσαμεν, οὐ παύομεθα ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν προσευχόμενοι καὶ αἰτούμενοι, ἵνα πληρωθῇτε τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ καὶ συνέσει πνευματικῇ*, “because of this we too, from the day we heard, have not stopped praying and interceding for you, that in all spiritual wisdom and understanding you may reach a full knowledge of his will.”

Most High shall be proclaimed upon him, and a spirit of understanding shall rest upon him in the water.”²⁶⁶ 1 Chronicles 22:12 (LXX) should also be mentioned:²⁶⁷ δώη σοι σοφίαν καὶ σύνεσιν κύριος καὶ κατισχύσαι ἐπὶ Ἰσραηλ, “may the Lord give you (viz. Solomon) wisdom and insight,²⁶⁸ and may he make you strong over Israel.”

Although σύνεσις does not occur in Jas 1:5, the idea of God bestowing wisdom (σοφία) does. God’s gift of wisdom to Solomon is surely in mind. This may also be the case in Herm. *Mand.* 4.2.1-2, where Hermas, who lacks understanding because his heart has been hardened by his former deeds (οὐ συνίω οὐδέν καὶ ἡ καρδία μου πεπώρωται ἀπὸ τῶν προτέρων μου πράξεων), begs for understanding and is rewarded as a result of his repentance: ἐγώ, φησίν, ἐπὶ τῆς μετανόας εἰμι καὶ πᾶσιν τοῖς μετανοοῦσιν σύνεσιν δίδωμι, “he said, ‘I am over repentance, and I give understanding to all those who repent.’” However, this more clearly recalls Isa 43:10 (LXX) and the Synoptics, where incomprehension is the result of hardness of heart but is resolved through the intervention of either God or Jesus.²⁶⁹

The chain of transmission in 2 Tim 2:2 and the comment that the Lord will give insight to Timothy in 2 Tim 2:7 are not directly linked, but since Timothy is to pass on what he has heard from Paul and to consider what Paul is saying as a precursor to the Lord giving him wisdom, the two texts belong together. They are certainly both at home in the apocalyptic-influenced epistolary corpus.

²⁶⁶ Although it is not explicit that insight is a gift from God in *T. Levi* 18:7, the verbal similarities between *T. Levi* 18:7, Prov 2:6-7, and Isa 11:2 suggest that this is implicit.

²⁶⁷ Cf. Conzelmann, *TDNT* 7:896.

²⁶⁸ MT: יִתֵּן־לְךָ יְהוָה שִׁכְל וּבִינָה, “may YHWH give you insight and understanding.”

²⁶⁹ Marshall (*Pastoral Epistles*, 731 n. 28) also cites *T. Reub.* 6:4: ὅτι ἡ πορνεία οὔτε σύνεσιν οὔτε εὐσέβειαν ἔχει ἐν ἑαυτῇ, καὶ πᾶς ζῆλος κατοικεῖ ἐν τῇ ἐπιθυμίᾳ αὐτῆς, “for fornication has neither insight nor piety in herself, and every jealousy dwells in the desire for her” (taking αὐτῆς as an objective genitive). This is the only occurrence of σύνεσις in the *Testament of Reuben*, and the idea here is that fornication does not contain insight, and although it may be implied that insight is a divine gift, that is not made explicit.

4.4. Summary

2 Timothy 2:1 refers to Timothy's appointment as successor both in transmitting the deposit and in Paul's teaching and preaching office. Teaching through example is present, perhaps reflecting the influence of Hellenistic philosophy. The chain of transmission in 2 Tim 2:2 is parallel with tradition texts in 1 Corinthians and 1 Thessalonians, but is more clearly based on Qumran and proto-rabbinic models. Jewish parallels are also to be sought for the revelation of wisdom in 2 Tim 2:7. As in the epistles generally considered authentically Pauline, the apostolate is understood to be mediatorial in role. In the Pastorals, teaching is inseparable from the apostolate. Παραθήκη is used to indicate Paul's life in 2 Tim 1:12, but the occurrences of this noun in 1 Tim 6:20; 2 Tim 1:14 are synonymous with ἀ ἡκουσας παρ' ἐμοῦ and διδασκαλία, referring to the sound teaching Timothy is to guard and transmit. Although it is language of "deposit" and "teaching" that is used in the Pastorals, Plato, *Theaet.* 198A-B demonstrates that there is no fundamental difference in meaning between tradition language and teaching language. The reason the latter is used in the Pastorals is to emphasise the teaching aspect of Timothy's role: there is no fundamental distinction between this and chains of transmission in 1 Corinthians.

5. Hebrews 2:1-4

Our attention now moves to an important chain of transmission in Heb 2:1-4. Although Hebrews does not begin with an opening greeting and naming of sender and addressees, it is regarded as an epistle because, in common with other NT epistles, it incorporates exposition and exhortation and ends with a characteristic epistolary conclusion (Heb 13:20-25). The question of the genre of the epistle is not vital to our discussion,²⁷⁰ and is

²⁷⁰ The complex issue of the genre of Hebrews cannot be entered into here, nor can the question of the authenticity of the final chapter of the epistle. See, e.g.: Frederick F. Bruce, *The Epistle to the Hebrews: The English Text with Introduction, Exposition and Notes* (NICNT; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1964),

only significant insofar as it clarifies the appropriateness of reading Heb 2:1-4 alongside chains of transmission in other epistles.²⁷¹ Similarly, the question of the epistle's authorship is not vital to our enquiry. For the sake of clarity, however, the view that Hebrews is not Pauline will be assumed. In fact, a strong case can be made against Pauline authorship from the very passage with which we are concerned. In Heb 2:3, the author places himself alongside his addressees at one stage removed from the origin of the message transmitted. He thus claims no authority for himself,²⁷² and emphasises rather both the (message of) salvation and the agents who transmitted it.

5.1. Overview

In the phrase *ἥτις λαβοῦσα λαλεῖσθαι διὰ τοῦ κυρίου ὑπὸ τῶν ἀκουσάντων εἰς ἡμᾶς ἐβεβαιώθη*, there are three figures or groups:

- (1) "The Lord," the agent of the passive *λαλεῖσθαι*.
- (2) "Those who heard," the link between the Lord and the third group.
- (3) "Us."

The passives *λαλεῖσθαι* and *ἐβεβαιώθη* point towards the agencies of the Lord and his hearers. However, *ἀκουσάντων* emphasises the hearers' active role in receiving the (message of) salvation. The fact that the author places himself among the third group, "us," contrasts strongly with, for example, 1 Cor 11:23; Gal 1:12. In 1 Cor 11:23, Paul himself is the link between the Lord and the Corinthians, as the phrase "for I received

xxiii, xlvii-liv, 386-387; Harold W. Attridge, *The Epistle to the Hebrews: A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia, Pa.: Fortress, 1989), 13-14; Paul Ellingworth, *The Epistle to the Hebrews: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC; Carlisle: Paternoster, 1993), 59-62.

²⁷¹ As Ellingworth notes, "[t]he main purpose of seeking to place a particular writing within its appropriate literary genre is to understand its general character by comparison with comparable texts, and its distinctive features by contrast with other documents in the same group" (*Hebrews*, 59).

²⁷² Ellingworth, *Hebrews*, 141. The author's lack of direct contact with the Lord in Heb 2:3 points to non-Pauline authorship. Attridge notes with reference to Heb 2:3 that "[i]t recalls ... the chains of tradition that appear in Paul's letters, although the phrase as a whole contrasts sharply with what Paul says of his own gospel and constitutes a major reason for rejecting Pauline authorship" (*Hebrews*, 67). Attridge also cites Gal 1:1, 17-20 in relation to Paul's emphasis on his direct commissioning by the risen Christ (*Hebrews*, 67 n. 56).

from the Lord" (Ἐγὼ γὰρ παρέλαβον ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου) makes clear. Gal 1:12 is a firm rebuttal of the suggestion that Paul is part of a purely human chain of transmission. He received the Gospel "by a revelation of Jesus Christ" (δι' ἀποκαλύψεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ).

Heb 2:1-4 suggests a chain of tradition parallel with the transmission of the law in early Judaism. For Ellingworth, Heb 2:1-3 "implies a chain of oral tradition stretching from Jesus to the author and his readers."²⁷³ Attridge notes the similarity of the phrase τοῖς ἀκουσθεῖσιν to other texts which refer to the whole Christian message as what has been heard.²⁷⁴ It is debatable²⁷⁵ whether τοῖς ἀκουσθεῖσιν refers to a particular series of scriptural readings, what has just been heard in Heb 1, or to an attentive Christian re-reading of the Scriptures, such as appears in Heb 1:5-13.²⁷⁶ The best solution seems to be to follow Ellingworth in understanding τοῖς ἀκουσθεῖσιν in relation to Heb 2:3. The phrase refers "to what we have heard, indirectly from Christ and directly from earlier Christian witnesses."²⁷⁷ Verses 2 and 3 are parallel on a number of levels; by exploring this parallelism we may learn about the author's understanding of the origin of what is transmitted:

(1) Verse 2: ὁ δι' ἀγγέλων λαληθεὶς λόγος²⁷⁸

²⁷³ Ellingworth, *Hebrews*, 134.

²⁷⁴ Attridge, *Hebrews*, 64 n. 18. Cf. 2 Tim 1:13; 2:2; Heb 13:7. Strictly speaking, Heb 13:7 does not refer to what has been heard, but to those who *spoke* the word of God to the addressees of the epistle (οἵτινες ἐλάλησαν ὑμῖν τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ). Furthermore, it is not clear that any of the passages in question refer to what Attridge has rather loosely termed "the whole Christian message." In 2 Timothy Paul refers in 1:13; 2:2 to what Timothy has heard from him, which in the first case is specified as "sound words" (ὑγιαίνοντων λόγων). In Heb 13:7 the reference is to the word of God, the content of which is not specified. In Heb 2:3, the reference is to the (message of) salvation. What Attridge means by "the whole Christian message" is not clear, but it seems inappropriate to use such a general term for four rather different passages. In 2 Timothy Paul is referring to material passed from him to his "son," but not necessarily to the Gospel preached to the church in Ephesus where Timothy is. However, the Hebrews passages do refer to material preached to the whole community.

²⁷⁵ Cf. Ellingworth, *Hebrews*, 136.

²⁷⁶ Ellingworth, *Hebrews*, 136.

²⁷⁷ Ellingworth, *Hebrews*, 136; Attridge, *Hebrews*, 64.

²⁷⁸ The noun λόγος presumably refers to the law given on Sinai, as the ideas present in verse 2 are paralleled in Gal 3:19. C. Spicq, *L'Épître aux Hébreux* (vol. 2; *EBib*; Paris: Gabalda, 1953), 26; Morton Smith, review of W. D. Davies, *Torah in the Messianic Age and/or the Age to Come*, *JBL* 72 (1953): 192; Hugo W. Montefiore, *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews* (BNTC; London: A & C Black, 1964), 52; Attridge, *Hebrews*, 65 n. 29; Ellingworth, *Hebrews*, 138.

Verse 3: ἥτις ἀρχὴν λαβοῦσα λαλεῖσθαι διὰ τοῦ κυρίου

(2) Verse 2: δι' ἀγγέλων

Verse 3: διὰ τοῦ κυρίου

As the *ἄγγελοι* are intermediaries for the giving of the law, so the Lord is the intermediary for the giving of the message of salvation. There may be a deeper parallel relating to when the message of salvation was spoken by the Lord. For Spicq, the aorist participle *λαβοῦσα* refers to the beginning of Jesus' ministry, whereas the present infinitive *λαλεῖσθαι* includes its entire duration. The phrase *εἰς ἡμᾶς ἐβεβαίωθη* then refers to preaching to contemporary Christians by Jesus' original hearers.²⁷⁹ Ellingworth notes three possibilities: (1) Heb 2:3 refers to Christ's preaching during his earthly ministry;²⁸⁰ (2) in common with Ignatius, *Eph.* 19:3, this verse might refer to Christ's incarnation;²⁸¹ (3) since the wider context is concerned with Christ's exaltation, Heb 2:3 is more likely to refer to traditions about Christ's preaching after his resurrection.²⁸²

There is another possibility, related to Ellingworth's third. The message of salvation was preached by the Lord from the beginning of his ministry and it may be that it is only the earthly, pre-ascension ministry that is inferred. The phrase *ὑπὸ τῶν ἀκουσάντων εἰς ἡμᾶς ἐβεβαίωθη* implies that from this period the message was carried on within a human chain of tradition. However, the emphasis remains on the exalted Christ. The agent of the message of salvation was once ministering on earth but is now exalted at the right hand of the majesty in the heights, having become greater than the angels (Heb 1:4). If *δι' ἀγγέλων* refers to angels, the parallel is that both the law and the message of salvation were given through the agency of heavenly figures. The message of salvation, however, was given by one who has become greater than the angels who

²⁷⁹ Spicq, *Hébreux*, 2:27.

²⁸⁰ Cf. Mark 1:14; Matt 4:17; Luke 4:14-15; Acts 1:1-2. Ellingworth, *Hebrews*, 140; Spicq, *Hébreux*, 2:27.

²⁸¹ Ellingworth, *Hebrews*, 140. Ellingworth correctly notes that this is not really a likely option. Ign. *Eph* 19:3 contains the phrase *ἀρχὴν ... ἐλάμβανειν* (cf. *ἀρχὴν λαβοῦσα*), but there is no reference to the Lord as the agent of the message of salvation.

²⁸² Cf. Mark 16:19-20. Ellingworth, *Hebrews*, 140.

transmitted the law. Although both the *ἄγγελοι* who transmitted the law and Jesus are heavenly figures, Jesus is greater than the *ἄγγελοι*.²⁸³ This makes sense of the *a minori ad maius*²⁸⁴ argument, which asks how, if the law was given through angels and sanctioned just punishment against transgression, we may flee from a salvation which was spoken not by mere angels but by the Lord.²⁸⁵

Furthermore, *βέβαιος*²⁸⁶ in 2:2 is linked with the aorist passive *ἐβεβαιώθη* in 2:3. Implicitly, both the law in verse 2 and the message of salvation in verse 3 are “valid” or “effective.” In both cases, the transmission of the material is significant. The law came from the heavens, and is therefore invested with authority and is valid.²⁸⁷ The message of salvation has been transmitted from the Lord via the first hearers of the message,²⁸⁸ and is therefore valid. Both the heavenly origin and the chain of transmission itself guarantee the validity and effectiveness of the message of salvation. Heb 2:1-4 allows us to conclude that the author is working with a model of transmission in which the message to be revealed originates in heaven, is mediated to humans through a heavenly mediator, and is then passed down in an authoritative chain of transmission.

5.2. The angelic mediation of the revealed message

We must now look at the idea of the transmission of the law through heavenly mediators, an issue that has stimulated considerable debate, particularly in relation to Gal 3:19-

²⁸³ Cf. Bruce, *Hebrews*, xix, lii, 8-9, 29; T. Callan, “Pauline Midrash: The Exegetical Background of Gal 3:19b,” *JBL* 99 (1980): 553.

²⁸⁴ Cf. Bruce, *Hebrews*, 29.

²⁸⁵ In the same way, Heikki Räisänen notes that in Heb 2:2 the mention of angels as law-givers “serves to put the even greater significance of the Gospel into relief” (*Paul and the Law* [WUNT 29; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1983], 139). Cf. 2 Cor 3:7-11.

²⁸⁶ Cf. Philo, *Moses* 1.14; Spicq, *Hébreux*, 26; Ellingworth, *Hebrews*, 138.

²⁸⁷ In verse 2 *καί* appears to separate *ἐγένετο βέβαιος* from what follows. Ellingworth suggests that *βέβαιος* is more likely to mean “effective” on the basis of what follows (*Hebrews*, 138), but this logic could be inverted. It is *because* the law was valid that every transgression and act of disobedience received its just punishment. Of course, both ideas could be implied.

²⁸⁸ Cf. Luke 1:2. Spicq, *Hébreux*, 26.

20.²⁸⁹ This idea is absent from the narratives of the Sinai revelation in the HB²⁹⁰ but is often thought to be found in the literature of Second Temple Judaism, and most clearly in the NT in Gal 3:19-20. Apart from Heb 2:2, the idea also appears in Stephen's speech in Acts 7:38, 53. In Acts 7:38, a chain of transmission is evident. Moses is the one with whom the angel spoke on Mount Sinai and who received living oracles to give to the people with whom Stephen identifies himself. The law is mediated through the angel to Moses and from Moses to the Jewish people. In Acts 7:53 Stephen's hearers are said to have received the law as commandments of angels but not kept it. The phrase *διαταγὰς ἀγγέλων* recalls *διατάσσω* in Gal 3:19.²⁹¹ The preposition *διὰ* also appears in connection with mediation through angels in the NT in Gal 3:19; Heb 2:2.

Outside the NT a number of texts should be mentioned. The virtually unintelligible Hebrew of Deut 33:2 (MT) is rendered in the LXX in a way that assumes the presence of angels at Sinai.²⁹² However, it does not give a mediatorial role to the angels,²⁹³ but merely states that they were with the Lord at his right side (*ἐκ δεξιῶν αὐτοῦ ἄγγελοι μετ' αὐτοῦ*). Indeed, Mach argues that the connection between angels and the bestowal of Torah is entirely absent from Deut 33:2 (LXX): God appears, but no reason is given for his appearance (there is no explicit reference to the bestowal of

²⁸⁹ Albert Vanhoye felt able to comment at the beginning of a 1978 article on Gal 3:19-20 that "[i]l est sans doute naïf ou présomptueux de penser apporter quelque chose de nouveau au sujet d'un texte qui a déjà suscité, dit-on, plus de 400 interprétations" ("Un médiateur des anges en Ga 3,19-20," *Bib* 59 [1978]: 403). Cf. Bruce, *Galatians*, 178. A detailed examination of previous research on this passage, including the precise definition of the problematic term *μεσίτης*, lies well beyond the scope of the present study.

²⁹⁰ Attridge, *Hebrews*, 64; Hans Dieter Betz, *Galatians: A Commentary on Paul's Letter to the Churches in Galatia* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia, Pa.: Fortress, 1979), 168-169 and n. 60; Bruce, *Galatians*, 176. See Exod 19:9, 16-25; 24:15-18; Deut 4:11-12; 5:22-27. Betz also cites 4 Ezra 3:17-19 (*Galatians*, 169 n. 60). In 4 Ezra 3:19 "gloria tua" is described moving through four gates of fire, earthquake, wind, and ice before God gave the law to Jacob's descendants. God is the subject of the subjunctive "dares" but this is preceded by "ut" at the start of a purpose clause, implying that God's gift of the law could not happen without the movement of his glory. It is not entirely clear that there is a separation between God and the glory of God here, which could suggest that "gloria tua" has a mediatorial role. Nevertheless, 4 Ezra 3:17-19 is not as clear cut an example of the absence of heavenly mediators at Sinai as the other examples cited by Betz.

²⁹¹ Here the law is "ordained through angels" (*διαταγείς δι' ἀγγέλων*). On the link between Acts 7:53; Gal 3:19; Heb 2:2 cf. Bruce, *Galatians*, 176.

²⁹² Betz, *Galatians*, 169 and n. 62; Ellingworth, *Hebrews*, 138; Räisänen, *Paul*, 133 n. 29.

²⁹³ Bruce, *Hebrews*, 28; Lou H. Silberman, "Prophets/Angels: LXX and Qumran Psalm 151 and the Epistle to the Hebrews," in *Standing before God: Studies on Prayer in Scriptures and Tradition with Essays in Honor of John M. Oesterreicher* (ed. A. Finkel and L. Frizzel; New York: Ktav, 1981), 94.

Torah). Thus the theophany in the company of angels is detached from the motif-context in which it appear in later Jewish interpretation.²⁹⁴ A text frequently cited in discussions about the angelic mediation of the law is Josephus, *Ant.* 15.5.3,²⁹⁵ in which Herod seems to refer to the transmission of the law through angels sent from God: *ἡμῶν δὲ τὰ κάλλιστα τῶν δογμάτων καὶ τὰ ὁσιώτατα τῶν ἐν τοῖς νόμοις δι' ἀγγέλων παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ μαθόντων*, “and we have learned the greatest of the teachings and the holiest things in the laws through angels from God.” The phrase *δι' ἀγγέλων* also appears in Gal 3:19; Heb 2:2, a fact which alone should suggest these three texts refer to the same idea.

The book of Jubilees, from *Jub.* 1:27 onwards, is an account of a revelation to Moses through the mediation of the “angel of the presence” (cf. *Jub* 1:27, 29; 2:1; 6:22; 30:12, 21; 50:1-2, 6, 13). In *Jub.* 30:21, the angel of the presence says to Moses

I have commanded you to speak to the children of Israel that they might not commit sin or transgress the ordinances or break the covenant which was ordained for them so that they might do it and be written down as friends.²⁹⁶

Here there is the idea of the angel of the presence as a heavenly mediator, and of Moses as an earthly mediator, transmitting laws from the angel to the people of Israel. However, it does not appear to be Torah that is revealed. In *T. Dan* 6:2, reference is made to an unnamed angel, possibly Michael, whose role is to mediate between Israel and God. No reference is made to the angelic transmission of the law. Dan commands his sons to “draw near to God and to the angel who intercedes for you” (*ἐγγίζετε δὲ τῷ θεῷ καὶ τῷ ἀγγέλῳ τῷ παραιτουμένῳ ὑμᾶς*), and describes this angel as “the mediator between God and men for the peace of Israel” (*μεσίτης θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπων ἐπὶ τῆς εἰρήνης Ἰσραήλ*). The description of this figure as *μεσίτης* links *T. Dan* 6:2 with Gal

²⁹⁴ Mach, *Entwicklungsstadien*, 84.

²⁹⁵ E.g., Attridge, *Hebrews*, 65 n. 28; Betz, *Galatians*, 169 and n. 63; Ellingworth, *Hebrews*, 138; Räisänen, *Paul and the Law*, 130 n. 15, 133 n. 29.

²⁹⁶ Translation: “Jubilees,” translated by O. S. Wintermute (*OTP*, 2:113-114).

3:19-20.²⁹⁷ The noun *μεσίτης* also occurs in the NT in 1 Tim 2:5; Heb 8:6, 9:15; 12:24. The archangel Michael is understood to have taught the law to Moses in the preface to the Greek Apocalypse of Moses. The text which follows the preface is a form of the Life of Adam and Eve, “which was revealed by God to Moses his servant when he received the tablets of the law from his hand, after he had been taught by the archangel Michael” (*ἀποκαλυφθεῖσα παρὰ θεοῦ Μωυσῇ τῷ θεράποντι αὐτοῦ ὅτε τὰς πλάκας τοῦ νόμου ἐκ χειρὸς αὐτοῦ ἐδέξατο διδαχθεὶς παρὰ τοῦ ἀρχαγγέλου Μιχαήλ*).²⁹⁸ In Herm. Sim. 8.3.3 Michael is “the one who gave the law to them, into the hearts of those who believe” (*οὗτος γάρ ἐστιν ὁ διδοὺς αὐτοῖς τὸν νόμον εἰς τὰς καρδίας τῶν πιστευόντων*).²⁹⁹

Philo offers a definition of the role of angels in *Abraham* 23, describing *ἄγγελοι* as “holy and divine beings” (*ἱεραὶ καὶ θεῖαι φύσεις*) and “underservants and lieutenants of the foremost God” (*ὑποδιάκονοι καὶ ὑπαρχοὶ τοῦ πρώτου θεοῦ*). Their role is to announce predictions which God wishes to make to the Jewish people and as such they are “ambassadors.” In the phrase *δι’ ὧν οἱ πρεσβευτῶν ὅσα ἂν θελήσῃ τῷ γένει ἡμῶν προθεσπίσαι διαγγέλλει, δι’ ὧν*, which is to be taken with *πρεσβευτῶν* (“through which ambassadors”) parallels *δι’ ἄγγέλων* in Gal 3:19; Heb 2:2; Josephus, *Ant.* 15.5.3 and identifies angels as intermediaries through whom the divine will is to be made known to humans. Again, the revelation of the law is not mentioned; it is alluded to obliquely in *Dreams* 1.143,³⁰⁰ part of Philo’s allegorical interpretation of Jacob’s dream in Gen 28:10-17. Earlier in this passage, Philo interprets the role of the angels in ascending and descending the ladder as reporting God’s exhortations to his

²⁹⁷ Cf. Bruce, *Galatians*, 177.

²⁹⁸ Text: Gary A. Anderson and Michael E. Stone, eds., *A Synopsis of the Books of Adam and Eve* (SBLEJL 5; Atlanta, Ga: Scholars Press, 1994), 1.

²⁹⁹ In the same passage, Michael is described as *ὁ ... ἄγγελος ὁ μέγας*, a Greek rendering of the familiar Hebrew title for Michael, מִיכָאֵל (e.g., 3 En. 17:3; cf. Dan 12:1).

³⁰⁰ Cited by Bruce: *Galatians*, 177.

children and the children's needs to God, their father.³⁰¹ In *Dreams* 1.142 the participle *μηνυσόντων*, from *μηνύω*, "disclose what is secret, reveal"³⁰² is used in reference to angels and it said that humans rather than God have need of such figures. In the same passage *μεσίτης* is used of angels. Humans need mediators because their mortality makes them shudder at the awesome power of God's sovereignty.³⁰³ Philo relates this concept to the theophany at Sinai, suggesting that the children of Israel expressed their need for a mediator in their words to Moses in Exod 20:19. The Israelites are said to have addressed *τινος τῶν μεσιτῶν*, "one of the mediators" at Sinai. In context, it could be said that Philo believed that "one of the mediators" referred back to the heavenly mediators mentioned in *Dreams* 1.142. However, both the LXX (which Philo appears to be citing)³⁰⁴ and the MT state unambiguously that the Israelites spoke to Moses asking him, not God, to speak with them. It seems to be evidence of Philo's exalted view of

³⁰¹ Philo, *Dreams* 1.141-142: *καὶ γὰρ τὰς τοῦ πατρὸς ἐπικελεύσεις τοῖς ἐγγόνοις καὶ τὰς τῶν ἐγγόνων χρείας τῷ πατρὶ διαγγέλλουσι*, "for they report the exhortations of the father to the children, and the needs of the children to the father." This passage has the verb *διαγγέλλω* in common with *Abraham* 23. The role of the angels in *Dreams* 1.141 has been compared with their role in *Giants* 16 (*Philo in Ten Volumes* [trans. F. H. Colson and G. H. Whitaker; vol. 5; LCL; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1958], 373 n. b). In *Giants* 16 angels are described as *πρεσβευτὰς τίνες ἀνθρώπων πρὸς θεὸν καὶ θεοῦ πρὸς ἀνθρώπους*, similar to *Abraham* 23 in that it describes angels as "ambassadors" (the noun *πρεσβευτής* is used in both), and to *Dreams* 1.141 in that angels are pictured as intermediaries between God and humans, conveying messages in both directions. This conception of the role of angels has been compared with the understanding of the power of a *δαιμόνιον* in Plato, *Symp.* 202e (*Philo in Ten Volumes* [trans. F. H. Colson and G. H. Whitaker; vol. 2; LCL; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1929], 452-453 n. a, 502). *Symposium* 202e.3-7 (text: Kenneth J. Dover, *Plato: Symposium* [CGLC; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980], 52) reads *ἐρμηνεῦον καὶ διαπορθμεῦον θεοῖς τὰ παρ' ἀνθρώπων καὶ ἀνθρώποις τὰ παρὰ θεῶν, τῶν μὲν τὰς δεήσεις καὶ θυσίας, τῶν δὲ τὰς ἐπιτάξεις τε καὶ ἀμοιβὰς τῶν θυσίων, ἐν μέσῳ δὲ δυνάμει ἀμφοτέρων συμπληροῖ, ὥστε τὸ πᾶν αὐτὸ αὐτῷ συνδεδέσθαι*, "explaining and transmitting to gods things from humans and to humans things from gods, supplications and sacrifices on the one hand and commands and repayments for sacrifices on the other, being between both filling them completely, so that the whole may be bound up together." There can be no doubt that the *δαιμόνιον* has a mediatorial role between divine beings and humans, a role paralleled in the descriptions of the role of angels in Philo, *On the Life of Abraham*, *On Dreams*, and *On Giants*.

³⁰² LSJ 1128.

³⁰³ God is omnipresent and does not need anyone to act as revealer to him. On the other hand, humans need such figures, because "to us, mortals, it is profitable to make use of mediators and *logoi* who arbitrate, since we are astonished and shudder at the Lord of all and the exceptional might of his sovereignty" (*Dreams* 1.142: *ὅτι τοῖς ἐπικήροις ἡμῖν συνέφερε μεσίταις καὶ διαιτηταῖς λόγοις χρῆσθαι διὰ τὸ τεθηπέναι καὶ πεφρικέναι τὸν παμπρύτανιν καὶ τὸ μέγιστον ἀρχῆς αὐτοῦ κράτος*).

³⁰⁴ *On Dreams* 1.143: *ἀλλήσον σὺ ἡμῖν, καὶ μὴ λαλείτω πρὸς ἡμᾶς ὁ θεός, μή ποτε ἀποθάνωμεν*. Exodus 20:19 (LXX): *ἀλλήσον σὺ ἡμῖν, καὶ μὴ λαλείτω πρὸς ἡμᾶς ὁ θεός, μήποτε ἀποθάνωμεν*.

Moses that he is regarded in *Dreams* 1.143 as a μεσίτης between God and humans.³⁰⁵ We may conclude that Philo understood angels to be mediators between God and humans, once using μεσίτης to refer to them. The revelation of the law by means of angels is not discussed, but Moses is described as τινος τῶν μεσιτῶν in *Dreams* 1.143,³⁰⁶ indicating that Philo understood the law to have been mediated to humans, not given directly. This is his interpretation of Exod 20:19.

The idea that angels were present at Sinai reappears in later Judaism, for example in *Midrash Psalms* 68:18. As in the related passage in *Pesiq. Rab.* 21³⁰⁷ angels do not strictly speaking act as intermediaries. There are myriads of angels present, but their role is not to transmit the law. The transmission of the law through angels is perhaps implied in Ulmer, §20: “two myriads and thousands of angels came down with the Holy One on Mount Sinai to give the law to Israel” (ms Parma 173a: תרתין ריבוון ואלפין דמלכים). However, if “the Holy One” is the subject of יתן, the angels are probably attendants but not intermediaries.³⁰⁸ Indeed, earlier in this *pisqa* Michael and Gabriel are said to have expected that they would have been called upon to explain the words of the law, but realised when the Lord said אנכי that *he himself* would give the law to Israel (Ulmer, §10).³⁰⁹ In this passage, the roles of

³⁰⁵ Moses is not referred to as a “mediator” in the MT or the LXX (cf. T. Callan, “Pauline Midrash: The Exegetical Background of Gal 3:19b,” *JBL* 99 [1980]: 550).

³⁰⁶ Cf. Callan, “Pauline Midrash,” 555.

³⁰⁷ The date of *Pesiqta Rabbati* is in dispute. Indeed, Rivka Ulmer has recently questioned the methodological appropriateness of attempting to date *Pesiqta Rabbati* as a whole, suggesting that the individual homilies be dated instead (*Pesiqta Rabbati: A Synoptic Edition of Pesiqta Rabbati Based upon All Extant Manuscripts* [vol. 1; South Florida Studies in the History of Judaism; Atlanta, Ga: Scholars Press, 1997], xvi). The question of the date of this text has hinged more or less around a phrase in *Pesiq. Rab.* 1 (Ulmer, §4), only occurring in the *editio princeps*, which gives a date 777 years after the destruction of the temple, together with a gloss giving a date for the text 1151 years after the destruction of the temple. L. Zunz used the former to date *Pesiqta Rabbati* to 845 C.E., but considered *Pesiq. Rab.* 21-24, with which we are concerned, not even to belong to *Pesiqta Rabbati* (Ulmer, *Pesiqta Rabbati*, xvii). There is no need to enter into these debates here, except to cast doubt on the idea of taking such an ideal figure as 777 as a genuine date and to concur with Ulmer that the attempt to date such a complex text as *Pesiqta Rabbati* is methodologically suspect. Ulmer notes that “*Pesiqta Rabbati* does not present itself as a definable work with a strong redactional identity” (*Pesiqta Rabbati*, xxvi).

³⁰⁸ Cf. Silberman, “Prophets/Angels,” 97-98. Betz (*Galatians*, 169 n. 63) apparently assumes that in this passage the angels do have a mediatorial role. The Hebrew makes such a conclusion unlikely.

³⁰⁹ W. G. Braude suggests that the parable of R. Abbahu in which this story is related thus has an anti-gnostic or anti-Christian slant (*Pesikta Rabbati: Discourses for Feasts, Fasts, and Special Sabbaths* [2 vols;

Michael and Gabriel as figures who pass on revealed material to humans is removed and God himself reveals the law without mediation.

5.3. The law not revealed through angels?

We must also take account of the work of scholars who have denied that Josephus, *Ant.* 15.5.3 refers to angels. Following a suggestion by Ralph Marcus,³¹⁰ W. D. Davies makes five points against an angelic interpretation: (1) the context deals with ambassadors who could be slain, suggesting that a reference to angels would not be appropriate whereas a reference to prophets as human ambassadors who might suffer violence and death would;³¹¹ (2) in his account of the giving of the law to Moses,³¹² Josephus makes no mention of angelic mediation;³¹³ (3) in *C. Ap.* 1.37 prophets rather than angels transmit what they have learned from God. The phrase *κατὰ τὴν ἐπίπνοιαν τὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ μαθόντων*, “according to the inspiration which they learned from God (*C. Ap.* 1.37) is parallel with *δι’ ἀγγέλων παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ μαθόντων* in *Ant.* 15.5.3;³¹⁴ (4) Josephus elsewhere shows no interest in speculation about angels, often rationalising the term *ἄγγελος*;³¹⁵ (5) most importantly, the LXX sometimes uses *ἄγγελος* to refer to prophets and priests.³¹⁶

The texts mentioned by Davies should be cited. In Hag 1:12, Haggai is described as a “prophet” in the MT (נָבִיא יְהוָה) and the LXX (*Ἀγγαίου τοῦ προφήτου*), but in Hag 1:13 he is described as “YHWH’s messenger” (מַלְאָךְ יְהוָה *ἄγγελος κυρίου*). In

Yale Judaica Series 18; 420 n. 19), but this is not clear to me. It may have been an attempt to reassert the idea that God gave the law without intermediaries in the face of alternative viewpoints within Judaism itself.

³¹⁰ W. D. Davies, “A Note on Josephus, Antiquities 15:136,” *HTR* 47 (1954): 135; cf. *Josephus* (trans. R. Marcus; vol. 8; LCL; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1929), 66-67 fn. a.

³¹¹ Davies, “Note,” 136; Silberman, “Prophets/Angels,” 95.

³¹² Josephus, *Ant.* 3.5.1-3.7.7.

³¹³ Davies, “Note,” 136-137.

³¹⁴ Davies, “Note,” 137.

³¹⁵ Davies, “Note,” 137-138.

³¹⁶ Davies, “Note,” 138-139.

Isa 44:26, the MT reads **מִקִּים דְּבַר עֲבָדוֹ וַעֲצַת מַלְאָכָיו יִשְׁלֶם**, “(I am YHWH)³¹⁷ who establishes the word of his servant and brings the plan of his messengers to completion.” In the LXX, the second phrase is rendered *τὴν βουλήν τῶν ἀγγέλων αὐτοῦ ἀληθεύων*, “who proves the counsel of his messengers true.” Davies takes this as a reference to prophets.³¹⁸ Malachi 2:7³¹⁹ is part of the prophet’s polemic against the religious establishment of his day and describes the proper function of a priest acceptable to God: **כִּי־שִׁפְתָי כִּהְיוּ יִשְׁמְרוּ־דַעַת וְתוֹרָה יִבְקְשׁוּ מִפִּי־הוֹי כִּי מַלְאָךְ יְהוָה־צִבְאוֹת הוּא**, “for a priest’s lips should guard knowledge, and they should seek instruction from his mouth, for he is a messenger of YHWH of Hosts” (MT). In the LXX the priest is *ἄγγελος κυρίου παντοκράτορος*, “messenger (angel) of the almighty Lord.” Thus *ἄγγελος*, rendering **מַלְאָךְ**, may refer to a priest. Davies notes, finally, that in applying Isa 40:3 (LXX) to John the Baptist, the synoptic evangelists are taking him to be God’s (human) *ἄγγελος*.³²⁰

A number of objections may be brought against Davies’s arguments, though it should be remembered that Davies draws only tentative conclusions from his analysis.³²¹ Against his first point it should be noted that In *Abr.* §115 Philo describes angels (*ἄγγελοι*) as “ambassadors” (*πρεσβεύται*). They are not human and thus not susceptible to human persecution, but the Josephus passage may be drawing a parallel between the *status* of human ambassadors and those who mediated the law, not their shared susceptibility to persecution and murder. Furthermore, Herod in Josephus is remarking on the elevated status of the law; he is not necessarily remarking on the susceptibility of its mediators to persecution. In response to Davies’ third point, *C. Ap.* 1.37 refers to humans receiving inspiration from God to write the Scriptures. The prophets are not called

³¹⁷ See Isa 44:24.

³¹⁸ Davies, “Note,” 138; cf. Whybray, *Isaiah 40-66*, 104.

³¹⁹ Cf. Davies, “Note,” 139.

³²⁰ Davies, “Note,” 139. See Matt 11:10; Mark 1:2; Luke 7:27.

³²¹ Cf. Davies, “Note,” 136, 139.

ἄγγελοι, and although angels are not mentioned as mediators between God and the prophets the idea of the angelic mediation of the law is not contradicted. In response to his fourth point, it may cautiously be suggested that Josephus is citing a third party (Herod) rather than recounting his own views on the mediation of the law (though this objection is admittedly not weighty). Finally, the passages cited from the LXX are very problematic. It cannot be denied that they all refer to humans, that is prophets or priests, but in each case *ἄγγελοι* merely reflects the Hebrew *Vorlage*, not the ideology of the translator. Furthermore, in all three passages the *ἄγγελοι* in question are elsewhere described using a human appellation such as *προφήτης* or *ιερεύς*. This is not the case with the Josephus passage. Thus while the points made by Davies are interesting and well stated, they do not demand that an angelic interpretation of that passage be abandoned.

Francis Walton has developed Davies' work in light of a passage in Diodorus of Sicily, based on a passage of Hecataeus of Abdera cited by Photius. The relevant passage is from *Bibl. Hist.* 40.3.5,³²² which states with reference to the man appointed ruler over the Jews on account of his insight and virtue that "(the Jews) call him 'high priest,' and believe him to be a messenger of God's ordinances for them" (*τοῦτον δὲ προσαγορεύουσιν ἀρχιερέα, καὶ νομίζουσιν αὐτοῖς ἄγγελον γίνεσθαι τῶν τοῦ θεοῦ προσταγμάτων*). Walton concludes

But while [Hecataeus'] words cannot, certainly, be pressed as evidence for Jewish attitudes or practices of the late fourth century B. C., it is at least interesting and perhaps significant that he gives no hint of a doctrine of angels, and knows of no intermediary between God and the Jewish nation other than the man to whom has fallen the sacred office of High Priest.³²³

This is true, but the precise significance of Hecataeus at this point needs to be understood. First, if Walton is correct in asserting that Photius (and thus Diodorus) preserves Hecataeus' work faithfully at this point,³²⁴ we are working with material from the Egypt

³²² F. R. Walton, "The Messenger of God in Hecataeus of Abdera," *HTR* 48 (1955): 255.

³²³ Walton, "Messenger," 257.

³²⁴ Walton, "Messenger," 256.

of Ptolemy I Soter (323-283 B.C.E.),³²⁵ predating both the LXX and Josephus, who draws on Hecataeus himself.³²⁶ In all probability this passage reflects the same idea as Mal 2:7 (LXX), that a priest may be *ἄγγελος*, thus providing evidence for the link between *ἄγγελος* and the priesthood. Hecataeus may also predate the earliest reference to the angelic mediation of the law by almost four centuries, if Jubilees is not so interpreted. In addition, as a non-Jewish work cited at third hand, Hecataeus is of only incidental relevance to the debate on the angelic mediation of the law. Furthermore, in common with the three relevant passages from the LXX and *in contradistinction to* Josephus, *Ant.* 15.5.3 Hecataeus uses *ἄγγελος* only in connection with another noun, *ἀρχιερεύς*, which indubitably represents a human figure. Walton's article is thus very significant, but for our understanding of the background of the LXX, not the background of Josephus. With reference to the passage in Josephus, it should be noted that the phrase *παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ* sets it apart from Hecataeus of Abdera and the LXX of Mal 2:7 and strongly suggests that Herod in Josephus is referring to the transmission of the law from heaven through the mediation of angels.³²⁷ We should be wary, then, of accepting Ginzberg's contention that the mediation of the law through angels (in Gal 3:19) is "not Jewish, but rather anti-Jewish."³²⁸

A thorough but ultimately unconvincing contribution is made by Lou Silberman, whose analysis begins with the Hebrew of Psalm 151, known only from 11QPs^a XXVIII, 3-12. Psalm 151:4 (LXX) reads *αὐτὸς ἐξαπέστειλεν τὸν ἄγγελον αὐτοῦ*, "he sent his messenger." The Hebrew, of which the LXX is not a mere translation,³²⁹ reads

³²⁵ Walton, "Messenger," 256. Cf. H. Jagersma, *A History of Israel from Alexander the Great to Bar Kochba* (trans. J. Bowden; London: SCM, 1985), 18, 199.

³²⁶ Cf. Jagersma, *History*, 18.

³²⁷ The phrase *παρὰ θεοῦ* occurs in the introduction to the Greek Assumption of Moses. The life and citizenship of Adam and Eve the first-born was revealed to Moses by God (*ἀποκαλυφθεῖσα παρὰ θεοῦ*). It is then suggested that Moses had already received the tablets of the law from God, having been taught by the archangel Michael.

³²⁸ L. Ginzberg, *The Legends of the Jews* (vol. 6; Philadelphia, Pa.: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1946), 47.

³²⁹ J. A. Sanders, *The Psalms Scroll of Qumrân Cave 11 (11QPs^a)* (DJDJ 4; Oxford: Clarendon, 1965), 58.

שלח נביאו למושחני את שמואל לגדלני, “he sent his prophet to anoint me (viz. David), Samuel to exalt me.”³³⁰ If the *Vorlage* of Ps 151:4 (LXX) is faithfully reflected at this point, this would seem to be the only occurrence of *ἄγγελος* as a translation equivalent for נְבִיאָה.³³¹ Importantly, the Syriac has ܡܠܬܝܬܐ, “his messenger” here, though whether this indicates that the Syriac is dependent on the LXX, or that a Hebrew version of this psalm with מַלְאָכָה rather than נְבִיאָה lies behind both the Greek and the Syriac is difficult to decide. Silberman cites *Lev. Rab.* 1:1, in which R. Tanhum b. Hanilai understands מַלְאָכָה in Ps 103:20 to refer to human messengers and R. Johanan cites Hag 1:13 as a reference to a prophet as מַלְאָךְ, and suggests that the equation מַלְאָךְ = *ἄγγελος* in Ps 151:4 (LXX) may represent an early midrashic tradition.³³² This tradition is reflected in Heb 1:2; 2:2. Προφῆταις and ἀγγέλων are synonymous, the theme of the whole section being God’s speaking to the fathers.³³³ The shift from προφήτης to ἀγγελοι occurred due to the intervening discussion of the superiority of the Son over ἀγγελοι: this theme was introduced because the author wished to emphasise the superiority of the Son and his message over earlier messengers and their message. Only texts involving *ἄγγελος/ἀγγελοι* could be used to prove this midrashically.

In order to understand ἀγγέλων in Heb 2:2 as human messengers, the existence in first century C.E. Judaism of the idea that the law was mediated by angels needs to be disproved.³³⁴ Silberman suggests that taken in the context of Jubilees as a whole, references to the angel of the presence in that work do not serve as evidence for the angelic mediation of Torah,³³⁵ and as we have already noted, Deut 33:2 (LXX) does not refer to angelic mediation.³³⁶ Silberman follows Davies’ interpretation of Josephus, *Ant.*

³³⁰ 11QPs^a 28:8-9.

³³¹ Silberman, “Prophets/Angels,” 91.

³³² Silberman, “Prophets/Angels,” 92.

³³³ Silberman, “Prophets/Angels,” 92. Cf. Heb 1:1; 2:2.

³³⁴ Silberman, “Prophets/Angels,” 93.

³³⁵ Silberman, “Prophets/Angels,” 94. Jub 1:4-6 says God himself taught Moses.

³³⁶ Silberman, “Prophets/Angels,” 94.

5.5.3 and in *Pesiq. Rab.* 21; *Pesiq. Rab Kah.* 12:22; *Mek. bahodesh* 9 lines 44-61 (on Exod 20:18); *b. Shabb.* 88a he finds the idea that angels were present at Sinai but not as mediators.³³⁷ In the case of *Pesiq. Rab.* 21, Silberman concludes, as we did above, that the minstering angels are unlikely to be the subject of ״ן, though the passage is ambiguous and could bear this meaning. The only text in which he finds the idea of angelic mediation of Torah is *Cant. Rab.* 1:2, in which R. Johanan links it with the phrase ״שקני מנשיקות פיהו״.

Silberman has advanced a persuasive argument with respect to Jub 1:27, Deut 33:2 (LXX), and particular rabbinic texts. His adherence to Davies's analysis of Josephus, *Ant.* 15.5.3 cannot be sustained, for the reasons given above in response to Davies' article. The major weakness of Silberman's analysis is his treatment of Hebrews. He understands the structure of Hebrews 1:1-2:4 as follows:

- (1) God's word was transmitted by messengers in the past (Heb 1:1-2).
- (2) These messengers are inferior to the Son, whom the midrash in Heb 1:5-14 proves is the ultimate messenger.
- (3) Thus the Son's message is the true means of salvation, displacing the message of earlier messengers (Heb 2:1-4).³³⁸

Silberman is right to say that the major interest of the author is the definitive message given through Jesus,³³⁹ but not to play down the importance of the author's concern to prove that Jesus is greater than the angels. The midrash in Heb 1:5-14 relates not to the Son's superiority over the prophets in Heb 1:1-2, but to the fact that he has "taken his seat at the right hand of the majesty on high" (ἐκάθισεν ἐν δεξιᾷ τῆς μεγαλωσύνης ἐν ὑψηλοῖς) in Heb 1:3. He is physically elevated above the angels, and is thus superior to them, recalling the elevation of Enoch in Hebrew Enoch. The reference to ἀγγελοι as

³³⁷ Silberman, "Prophets/Angels," 96-97.

³³⁸ Silberman, "Prophets/Angels," 93.

³³⁹ Silberman, "Prophets/Angels," 93.

“ministering spirits” (λειτουργικὰ πνεύματα) in Heb 1:14 refers back to the ἄγγελοι mentioned in Heb 1:5-13, who can certainly not be prophets. Heb 2:1-4 is linked with what precedes by διὰ τοῦτο, which means that δι’ ἀγγέλων in Heb 2:2 is to be taken logically with what precedes from Heb 1:5 onwards, not with Heb 1:1-2. Furthermore, the connection between Heb 1:1-2 and Heb 2:2-3 is not precise:

Heb 1:1-2: Πολυμερῶς καὶ πολυτρόπως πάλαι ὁ θεὸς λαλήσας τοῖς πατράσιν
ἐν τοῖς προφήταις ἐπ’ ἐσχάτου τῶν ἡμερῶν τούτων ἐλάλησεν ἡμῖν ἐν υἱῷ

Heb 2:2: ὁ δι’ ἀγγέλων λαληθείς λόγος

Heb 2:3: ἥτις ἀρχὴν λαβοῦσα λαλεῖσθαι διὰ τοῦ κυρίου ὑπὸ τῶν ἀκουσάντων

Heb 1:1-2 refers to the giving of the message through essentially human intermediaries: prophets and the Son during his earthly ministry. Heb 2:2-3 refers to the giving of the message through heavenly intermediaries: angels and the once human but now exalted Lord. Whereas Heb 2:2 almost certainly refers to the giving of the law, there is no need to understand Heb 1:1 as referring to the giving of the law. There is also no contradiction between references to the earthly and the heavenly Christ: as the earthly Son was greater than the prophets, so the now exalted Lord is greater than the angels. Silberman’s analysis, therefore, cannot be sustained.

In conclusion, although there is only scanty and late evidence within Jewish literature for the mediation of the law through angels, this remains the most likely candidate for the reference in Heb 2:2 (and thus the reference Gal 3:19). The fact that Torah was understood to have originated in heaven at a time when many believed that heavenly revelations could be given through the mediation of angels surely suggests that a convergence of the two ideas was inevitable. It also explains why traditions relating to the transmission of the law converged with traditions about angelic mediation in 3 En. 48D:10 and the *sar torah* texts. The paucity of evidence within the rabbinic corpus for the

angelic mediation of the law could be a reaction against the Christian belittlement of the law on the basis of its angelic mediation³⁴⁰ or the appropriation of this idea among those responsible for texts such as the Metatron passage in 3 *En.* 48D.

5.4. Summary

In Heb 2:1-4 there is a chain of transmission which to some extent parallels certain Jewish understandings of the origin of the law. The exalted Christ stands behind the transmission of the message of salvation which is revealed to humans and passed on faithfully to later generations. This is argued to be superior to the law given by angels, the angels being lower in rank than the exalted Christ. In common with 1 Cor 11; 15 is the idea that although the message was given by the human Jesus it is the exalted Christ who stands behind its transmission. In contradistinction to the Pauline *homologoumena*, Greek *termini technici* are not used in Heb 2, unless *λαλέω*, *λαμβάνω*, and *ἀκούω* are placed in that category. It may be concluded that, language apart, the *corpus Paulinum* and Hebrews share a model of transmission which is rooted in the Jewish apocalyptic understanding of revelation.

6. Summary of results

Paul's understanding of the origin of his gospel and thus his understanding of revelation are fundamentally apocalyptic, providing a basis for comparison with models of revelation and transmission found at Qumran and in the Synoptics. The exalted Christ is the originator of the gospel and author of tradition; Paul the apostle is their mediator. Paul derives his authority as apostle from the fact that Christ is the origin of both the gospel and the tradition, both of which he (Paul) mediates. Paul's understanding of tradition is to be read in an apocalyptic context; yet his language for tradition betrays a more complex

³⁴⁰ Cf. Davies, "Note," 140 n. 11.

situation. Rabbinic terminology is not an adequate source of comparison, since Hebrew terms used by the rabbis for tradition are themselves translation equivalents for Greek terms (not *vice versa*). Paul stresses that the exalted Lord is the originator of the tradition, which means that the possible intermediaries between the earthly Jesus and Paul are irrelevant: it is the fact that behind the ongoing transmission of the tradition stands a heavenly mediator that is significant.

There is essentially no difference between the model of transmission found in the Pastorals and that found in 1 Corinthians. The obvious difference is linguistic, but the teaching language of the Pastorals is essentially synonymous with the tradition language of 1 Corinthians: it is simply a question of the emphasis on sound teaching in the former that is decisive. The command to Timothy to be strong, the chain of transmission, and the idea of the revelation of wisdom may all be explicated on the basis of Jewish sources. Although the deposit (the tradition of sound teaching) is assumed to be of heavenly origin, this is not emphasised (as in 1 Corinthians and 1 Thessalonians); rather the inherent authority of the chain of transmission is emphasised.

A different tradition of early Christianity, more clearly related to Jewish speculation, is represented by Heb 2:1-4. Here the giving of the message of salvation is parallel with the transmission of the law. The law was bestowed through the agency of heavenly beings, in this case angels. The message of salvation was given by the Lord, who, though in human form when he gave the message is now exalted far above the angels who transmitted the law. There is a chain of transmission here in which a heavenly mystery (the message of salvation) is revealed through the mediation of a heavenly figure and is transmitted faithfully from one generation to the next.

It should be said in conclusion that while each group of texts examined here presents different nuances, the same basic model of transmission is present: material originating from a heavenly source is bestowed upon a chosen human (in Galatians, 1 Corinthians, and the Pastorals the apostolic status of this figure is emphasised), who

transmits it within an authoritative chain of transmission. The parallel with Qumran should be clear, though in that corpus sapiential language represents the process, whereas in the Epistles traditional or didactic language predominates. The connection with the Synoptics is that the glorified and exalted Christ stands at the head of the revelatory process. The heavenly identity of Jesus Christ and his role as revealer are explored in the Synoptics and assumed in the Epistles: the earlier date of the latter suggests that this expression of christological belief lies at the heart of the beliefs of the earliest Christians and were developed throughout the first century.

Conclusion

Synthesis and prospect

The purpose of the following remarks is not to recapitulate the results of particular sections of this study, which may be read at the appropriate points. It is rather to synthesise these results and suggest ways in which the scholarly community may develop its explorations on the basis of them.

(1) First and foremost, this thesis demonstrates the significance of apocalyptic (properly understood) for the study of Qumran, the Synoptics, and the epistolary corpus. At Qumran, wisdom is revealed to and transmitted among the elect, reflecting a key apocalyptic concept. This is true also of the Synoptics, where Jesus, in addition, functions as a heavenly mediator transmitting insight to his disciples. The Christology that is assumed here is related to the glory-Christology of Paul, which is integrally connected to his view of revelation, mystery, gospel, and tradition. These aspects of Pauline thought reflect the basic apocalyptic concern for the revelation of divine mysteries, but tradition texts employ Greek *termini technici*, which suggests not simply that Paul is presenting Jewish ideas in Hellenistic dress but that these Jewish ideas themselves overlap with Greek ideas. The results obtained here derive from examinations of three corpora in themselves rather than a piecemeal comparison of specific parallels (though the latter approach has been necessary on occasions). This is the only responsible way to approach comparative studies of early Jewish, Hellenistic, and early Christian documents. Further, the centrality of one specific aspect of apocalyptic to all three corpora examined is perhaps further evidence in favour of a de-emphasis on the eschatological aspect of that phenomenon. The revelation of divine mysteries not only unites Qumran, the Synoptics, and the Epistles with one another but demonstrates that they all reflect a theme that developed from the ancient Near Eastern sapiential traditions through apocalyptic to the first century C.E..

(2) The demonstrable prominence of Jewish apocalyptic here helps to justify the approach of the new *religionsgeschichtliche Schule*. It is primarily Jewish patterns of divine mediation which explain the early Christian presentation of the earthly and exalted modes of Christ's being. This should not be downplayed in any reading of the Gospels and Epistles. In terms of method, the late date of a particular text should not prevent us reading it as evidence for earlier ideas. Dating a text must never be confused with dating the traditions it embodies. This is not to advocate the indiscriminate use of all manner of texts in identifying "parallels": rather, it is to advocate reading comparable texts (such as Luke 9:28-36 and Slavonic Enoch) alongside one another in order to identify parallel developments from earlier patterns of thought belonging to the common background shared by the traditions embodied in each text.

(3) Subtle use of language may exist in texts such as those examined above but elude even the most careful and erudite twenty-first century western student on a first reading. Technical languages are present in our texts. Paul's use of traditional language has long been known and often studied, and characteristic uses of language have been noted in Daniel and Qumran. It has become clear that the Qumran scrolls are pervaded by sapiential language, used to represent the revelation and transmission of divine insight, and shared with Daniel. It is also clear that the use of such language in Daniel was recognised and adopted in an early Greek version and thence taken up, perhaps unconsciously, by the Synoptic evangelists. These evangelists possessed a familiarity with Greek Scriptures that is quite extraordinary and is evident throughout their works in ways which may even suggest an unconscious adoption of particular trajectories and uses of language. The significance of sapiential language in the NT cannot be appreciated without a deep familiarity on the part of the exegete with the Scriptures in Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek, as well as near-contemporary extra-canonical works in those languages. This obtains also in the case of Paul's language of tradition, which cannot be understood without a thorough knowledge of extant Greek, Hebrew, and Aramaic

material. This is a warning against *a priori* assumptions that Paul *must* be using rabbinic terminology because his training was rabbinic. In any case, greater attention needs to be paid by students of all three corpora studied to subtle (especially quasi-technical) uses of language.

(4) In connection with this it should be said that despite differences in uses of language between sapiential (Qumran, Daniel, and the Synoptics), traditional (Pauline *homologoumena*), language of deposit and teaching (Pastorals), and the language of Heb 2:1-4, the basic model of transmission is shared by all of them, with slightly different nuances. This demonstrates that the revelation and transmission of divine insight (as it encompasses wisdom, mysteries, the gospel, tradition) in these works are rooted in the matrix of early Palestinian Judaism. There are affinities outside this matrix, which may be variously explained, but this matrix is the home of the basic model.

(5) Further detailed research is necessary in a number of areas. Sapiential language in Greek literature pre-dating our texts has not been studied, but must be re-examined in light of the results drawn here in order for a full understanding to be reached. Only three limited corpora, with a number of additional bodies of material have been examined here; Philo, Josephus, the rabbinic corpus, and the patristic writings have only been barely touched upon, but this is not to deny that these areas may contain rich seams of evidence bearing on divine insight, revelation, and transmission and the language which represents these things. Historical criticism *strictu sensu* has been eschewed here, leaving the possible historical actualities behind the material studied to others as far as possible. Brief suggestions may be made here, pending further research on the part of others. In the case of Qumran a historical reconstruction has been suggested, the actual role of the מִשְׁכִּיל and the מִבְּיָן appearing transparent in certain texts. The context in which the traditions found in the Gospels developed can only be guessed at: certainly individuals and communities familiar with the central notions of apocalyptic and steeped in the Scriptures

and contemporary Jewish conceptions must be assumed, especially in the case of Luke. Most interesting, however, is the connection between the exalted Christ of Luke and the parallel figure in Paul, revealed to him on the Damascus road. The fact that both authors' conceptions are rooted in Jewish apocalyptic speculation in connection with angels and exalted patriarchs suggests not parallel developments but a single strand of tradition. On chronological grounds (regardless of whether Luke in fact knew Paul) the line of development would run from Paul to Luke. This makes the connections made by Paul between the christophany, the revelation of the gospel, and the transmission of tradition within the context of Jewish apocalyptic expectation the lynchpin of most if not all early Christian christological speculation. It should not be forgotten that the christologies of Matthew, Hebrews, and Revelation especially are largely incomprehensible outside the Jewish apocalyptic matrix.

Bibliographies

Section 1: Lexical and grammatical aids

Bauer, Walter, William F. Arndt, and F. Wilbur Gingrich. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. 4th ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957.

Blass, F., A. Debrunner, and Robert W. Funk. *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1961.

Brown, Francis, Samuel R. Driver, and Charles A. Briggs. *The New Brown-Driver-Briggs-Gesenius Hebrew and English Lexicon with an Appendix containing the Biblical Aramaic*. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1979.

Clines, David J. A., and John F. Elwolde, eds. *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993-.

Gesenius, Wilhelm. *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*. Edited by E. Kautzsch. Translated by A. E. Cowley. 2d ed. Oxford: Clarendon, 1910.

Dalman, Gustaf. *Aramäisch-Neuhebräisches Handwörterbuch zu Targum, Talmud und Midrasch*. 2d ed. Frankfurt: J. Kauffmann, 1922.

Glare, Peter G. W., ed. *Oxford Latin Dictionary*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1982.

Goodwin, William W. *A Greek Grammar*. Rev. ed. London: Macmillan & Co., 1883.

Jastrow, Marcus. *A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature*. 2 vols. 2d ed. New York: Judaica, 1903.

Joüon, Paul. *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*. Translated and revised by T. Muraoka. 2 vols. Subsidia biblica 14/1-2. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1991.

Liddell, Henry G., Robert Scott, Henry S. Jones, and Roderick McKenzie. *A Greek-English Lexicon*. 9th ed. with revised supplement. Oxford: Clarendon, 1996.

Louw, J. P., E. A. Nida, R. B. Smith, and K. A. Munson, eds. *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament based on Semantic Domains*. 2 vols. 2d ed. New York: United Bible Societies, 1989.

- Moule, Charles F. D. *An Idiom Book of New Testament Greek*. 2d ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959.
- Moulton, James H., Wilbert F. Howard, and Nigel Turner. *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*. 4 vols. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1906-1976.
- Payne Smith, J., ed. *A Compendious Syriac Dictionary founded upon the Thesaurus Syriacus of R. Payne Smith, D. D.* Oxford: Clarendon, 1903.
- Qimron, Elisha. *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Harvard Semitic Studies 29. Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1986.
- Rosenthal, Franz. *A Grammar of Biblical Aramaic*. Porta linguarum orientalium. New Series 5. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1961.
- Stevenson, William B. *Grammar of Palestinian Jewish Aramaic*. 2d ed. Oxford: Clarendon, 1962.

Section 2: Concordances

- Even-Shoshan, Abraham, ed. *A New Concordance of the Bible: Thesaurus of the Language of the Bible: Hebrew and Aramaic Roots, Words, Proper Names, Phrases and Synonyms*. Jerusalem: Kiryat Sefer, 1998.
- Hatch, Edwin, and Henry A. Redpath. *A Concordance to the Septuagint*. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon, 1897.
- Kuhn, K. G., ed. *Konkordanz zu den Qumrantexten*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1960.
- Lisowsky, Gerhard, ed. *Kondordanz zum hebräischen Alten Testament nach dem von Paul Kahle in der Biblia Hebraica edidit R. Kittel besorgten masoretischen Text*. Stuttgart: Privileg. Württ. Bibelanstalt, 1958.
- Moulton, William F., Alfred S. Geden, and Harold K. Moulton, eds. *A Concordance to the Greek Testament According to the Texts of Westcott and Hort, Tischendorf and the English Revisers*. 5th ed. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1978.
- Schäfer, Peter, ed. *Konkordanz zur Hekhalot-Literatur*. Vol. 1. Texte und Studien zum

antiken Judentum 12. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1986.

—, ed. *Konkordanz zur Hekhalot-Literatur*. Vol. 2. Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum 13. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1988.

Wacholder, Ben-Zion, Martin G. Abegg, and James Bowley. *A Preliminary Edition of the Unpublished Dead Sea Scrolls: The Hebrew and Aramaic Texts from Cave Four*. Vol. 4. Washington, D.C.: Biblical Archaeology Society, 1996.

Section 3: Primary sources

Academy of the Hebrew Language. *The Book of Ben Sira: Text, Concordance and an Analysis of the Vocabulary*. The Historical Dictionary of the Hebrew Language. Jerusalem: The Academy of the Hebrew Language and the Shrine of the Book, 1973.

Aland, Kurt., ed. *Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum*. 15th ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1996.

—, Barbara Aland, Johannes Karavidopoulos, Carlo M. Martini, and Bruce M. Metzger, eds. *Novum Testamentum Graece post Eberhard et Erwin Nestle*. 27th ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1993.

Alexander, Philip S., and Geza Vermes. *Qumran Cave 4 XIX: Serekh ha-Yahad and Two Related Texts*. Discoveries in the Judaean Desert 26. Oxford: Clarendon, 1998.

Anderson, Gary A. and Michael E. Stone, eds. *A Synopsis of the Books of Adam and Eve*. Society of Biblical Literature Early Judaism and Its Literature 5. Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1994.

The Apostolic Fathers. Translated by Kirsopp Lake. 2 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1912-1913.

Aristotle. *The Poetics*. Translated by W. Hamilton Fyfe. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1927.

Baillet, Maurice. *Qumrân Grotte 4 III (4Q482-4Q520)*. Discoveries in the Judaean Desert 7. Oxford: Clarendon, 1982.

Baumgarten, Joseph. *Qumran Cave 4 XIII: The Damascus Document (4Q266-273)*.

- Discoveries in the Judaean Desert 18. Oxford: Clarendon, 1996.
- , Torleif Elgvin, Esther Eshel, E. Larson, Manfred R. Lehmann, Stephen J. Pfann, and Lawrence H. Schiffman. *Qumran Cave 4 XXV: Halakhic Texts*. Discoveries in the Judaean Desert 35. Oxford: Clarendon, 1999.
- Beattie, D. R. G., and J. Stanley McIvor. *The Targums of Ruth and Chronicles*. The Aramaic Bible 19. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994.
- Berger, Klaus. *Die Weisheitsschrift aus der Kairoer Geniza: Erstedition, Kommentar und Übersetzung*. Texte und Arbeiten zum neutestamentlichen Zeitalter 1. Tübingen: Francke, 1989.
- Betz, Hans Dieter. *The Greek Magical Papyri in Translation, Including the Demotic Spells*. 2d ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996.
- Black, Matthew, ed. *Apocalypsis Henochi Graece*. Pseudepigrapha Veteris Testamenti Graece 3. Leiden: Brill, 1970.
- Blackman, Philip, ed. *Mishnayot*. 7 vols. 2d ed. New York: Judaica, 1963-64.
- Braude, William G. *Pesikta Rabbati: Discourses for Feasts, Fasts, and Special Sabbaths*. 2 vols. Yale Judaica Series 18. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1968.
- , and I. J. Kapstein. *Pesikta de-Rab Kahana: R. Kahana's Compilation of Discourses for Sabbaths and Festival Days*. Philadelphia, Pa.: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1975.
- Charles, Robert H. *The Ascension of Isaiah*. London: A & C Black, 1900.
- Charlesworth, James H., ed. *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. 2 vols. Anchor Bible Reference Library. New York: Doubleday, 1983-1985.
- , and Henry W. L. Rietz, eds., with Peter W. Flint, Dennis T. Olson, James A. Sanders, Eileen M. Schuller, and Richard E. Whitaker. *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations*. Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project 4A. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997.
- Chazon, Esther, Torleif Elgvin, Esther Eshel, Daniel Falk, Bilhah Nitzan, Elisha Qimron, Eileen M. Schuller, David R. Seely, Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, and Moshe Weinfeld, in

- consultation with James C. VanderKam and Monica Brady. *Qumran Cave 4 XX: Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part 2*. DJD 29. Oxford: Clarendon, 1999.
- Chilton, Bruce D. *The Isaiah Targum: Introduction, Translation, Apparatus and Notes*. Aramaic Bible 11. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1987.
- Clarke, Ernest G. *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan: Deuteronomy*. Aramaic Bible 5B. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998.
- Cowley, A. E., ed. *Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B.C.* Oxford: Clarendon, 1923.
- De Jonge, M, in co-operation with H. W. Hollander, H. J. de Jonge, and Th. Korteweg. *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Critical Edition of the Greek Text . Pseudepigrapha Veteris Testamenti Graece 1/2*. Leiden: Brill, 1978.
- Díez Macho, Alejandro, ed. *Neophyti I: Targum Palestinense MS de la Biblioteca Vaticana*. Vol. 2. Textos y Estudios 8. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1970.
- , ed. *Biblia Polyglotta Matritensia Series IV: Targum Palaestinense in Pentateuchum Additur Targum Pseudojonatan ejusque Hispanica Versio*. Vol. 2. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1980.
- , ed. *Biblia Polyglotta Matritensia Series IV: Targum Palaestinense in Pentateuchum Additur Targum Pseudojonatan ejusque Hispanica Versio*. Vol. 5. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1980.
- , ed. *Biblia Polyglotta Matritensia Series IV: Targum Palaestinense in Pentateuchum Additur Targum Pseudojonatan ejusque Hispanica Versio*. Vol. 1. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1988.
- Diodorus of Sicily*. Translated by C. H. Oldfather, Charles L. Sherman, C. Bradford Welles, Russell M. Geer, and Francis R. Walton. 12 vols. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1933-1967.
- Dover, Kenneth J., ed. *Plato: Symposium*. Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980.
- Eisenman, Robert H., and Michael Wise. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Uncovered: The First*

Complete Translation and Interpretation of 50 Key Documents Withheld for Over 35 Years. London: Penguin, 1992.

Elgvin, Torleif, Menachem Kister, Timothy H. Lim, Bilhah Nitzan, Stephen J. Pfann, Elisha Qimron, Lawrence H. Schiffman, and Annette Steudel, in consultation with Joseph A. Fitzmyer. *Qumran Cave 4 XV: Sapiential Texts, Part 1.* Discoveries in the Judaean Desert 20. Oxford: Clarendon, 1997.

Elliger, K., and W. Rudolph, eds. *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia.* 4th rev. ed. Stuttgart: Deutsch Bibelgesellschaft, 1967-1977.

Elliott, J. K. *The Apocryphal New Testament: A Collection of Apocryphal Christian Literature in an English Translation.* Oxford: Clarendon, 1993.

Epictetus. Translated by W. A. Oldfather. 2 vols. London: William Heinemann, 1926-1928.

Eshel, Esther, Hanan Eshel, Carol A. Newsom, Bilhah Nitzan, Eileen M. Schuller, and Ada Yardeni, in consultation with James C. VanderKam and Monica Brady. *Qumran Cave 4 VI.* Discoveries in the Judaean Desert 11. Oxford: Clarendon, 1998.

García Martínez, Florentino. *Textos de Qumrán.* Madrid: Editorial Trotta, 1992.

—. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated: The Qumran Texts in English.* 2d ed. Translated by W. G. E. Watson. Leiden: Brill, 1996.

—, and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, eds. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition.* 2 Vols. Leiden: Brill, 2000.

Gibson, John C. L. *Canaanite Myths and Legends.* 2d ed. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1977.

Grenfell, B. P., and A. S. Hunt. *The Amherst Papyri.* Part 1. London: Henry Frowde, 1900.

Hallo, William W, K. Lawson Younger, and David E. Orton, eds. *Canonical Compositions from the Biblical World.* Vol. 1 of *The Context of Scripture: Canonical Compositions, Monumental Inscriptions, and Archival Document from the Biblical World.* Leiden: Brill, 1997-

Harrington, Daniel J., and J. Cazeaux. *Pseudo-Philon: Les Antiquités Bibliques.* Vol. 1. Sources chrétiennes 229. Paris: Cerf, 1976.

Hennecke, E. and W. Schneemelcher. *New Testament Apocrypha.* Edited by R. McL.

- Wilson. Translated by E. Best, D. Hill, G. Ogg, G. C. Stead, and R. McL. Wilson. Vol. 2. London: SCM, 1974.
- Herodotus*. Translated by A. D. Godley. 4 vols. Loeb Classical Library. London: William Heinemann, 1920-1925.
- Israelstam, J., and J. J. Slotki. *Midrash Rabbah IV: Leviticus*. London: Soncino, 1939.
- James, Montague Rhodes. *The Biblical Antiquities of Philo*. Translations of Early Documents Series. London: SPCK, 1917.
- . *The Apocryphal New Testament*. 2d ed. Oxford: Clarendon, 1953.
- Josephus*. Translated by H. St. J. Thackeray et al. 10 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1926-1965.
- Klijn, Albertus F. J. *The Acts of Thomas: Introduction-Text-Commentary*. Supplements to Novum Testamentum 5. Leiden: Brill, 1962.
- Lagarde, Paul A. de, ed. *Hagiographa chaldaice*. Leipzig: Teubner, 1873.
- Lambert, W. G. *Babylonian Wisdom Literature*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1960.
- Lauterbach, J. Z. *Mekilta de Rabbi Ishmael: A Critical Edition on the Basis of the Manuscripts and Early Editions with an English Translation, Introduction and Notes*. 3 vols. JPS Library of Jewish Classics. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1933-1935.
- Licht, Jacob. מגילת ההודיות ממגילות מדבר יהודה. Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1957.
- , מגילת הסרכים ממגילות מדבר יהודה, Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1965.
- Lohse, Eduard. *Die Texte aus Qumran: Hebräisch und Deutsch*. Munich: Kösel, 1964.
- Maher, Michael J. *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan: Genesis*. Aramaic Bible 1B. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1992.
- Malherbe, Abraham J. *Moral Exhortation: A Greco-Roman Sourcebook*. Library of Early Christianity. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1986.
- Margalioth, Mordecai. ספר הרזים הוא ספר כשפים מתקופת התלמוד. Jerusalem: Yediot Aharonot, 1966.
- Martone, Corrado. *La "Regola della Comunità": Edizione critica*. Quaterni di Henoch 8.

- Turin: Silvio Zamorani, 1995.
- McNamara, Martin, R. Hayward, and Michael J. Maher. *Targum Neofiti I and Pseudo-Jonathan: Exodus Aramaic Bible 2*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994.
- Milik, Józef T., ed., with the collaboration of M. Black *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumrân Cave 4*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1976.
- Moraldi, L. *I Manoscritti di Qumrân*. 2d ed. Turin: Unione Tipografico-Editrice Torinese, 1986.
- Morfill, W. R., and Robert H. Charles. *The Book of the Secrets of Enoch*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1896.
- Morgan, Michael A. *Sepher ha-Razim: The Book of the Mysteries*. Texts and Translations 25. Pseudepigrapha Series 11. Chico, Ca: Society of Biblical Literature, 1983.
- Müller, F. M., ed. *The Sacred Books of the East*. Vol. 5. Translated by E. W. West. Oxford: Clarendon, 1880.
- , ed. *The Sacred Books of the East*. Vol. 21. Translated by L. H. Mills. Oxford: Clarendon, 1887.
- Nock, Arthur D., and A. J. Festugière. *Corpus Hermeticum*. Vol. 1. Paris: Société d'Édition «Les Belles Lettres», 1978.
- Odeberg, Hugo. *3 Enoch or The Hebrew Book of Enoch*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1928.
- Perrot, C., P.-M. Bogaert, and Daniel J. Harrington. *Pseudo-Philon: Les Antiquités Bibliques*. Vol. 2. Sources chrétiennes 230. Paris: Cerf, 1976.
- Peshitta: The Old Testament in Syriac according to the Peshitta Version*. Edited by the Peshitta Institute. Vol. 4/6: *Canticles or Odes – Prayer of Manasseh – Apocryphal Psalms – Psalms of Solomon – Tobit – 1 (3) Esdras*. Leiden: Brill, 1972.
- Peshitta: The Old Testament in Syriac according to the Peshitta Version*. Edited by the Peshitta Institute. Vol. 4/3: *Apocalypse of Baruch – 4 Esdras*. Leiden: Brill, 1973.
- Peshitta: The Old Testament in Syriac according to the Peshitta Version*. Edited by the Peshitta Institute. Vol. 3/1: *Isaiah*. Leiden: Brill, 1987.

- Philo*. Translated by F. H. Colson and G. H. Whitaker. 10 vols. Loeb Classical Library. London: William Heinemann, 1929-1962.
- Philonenko, Marc. *Joseph et Aséneth: Introduction, Texte Critique, Traduction et Notes*. Studia Post-biblica 13. Leiden: Brill, 1968.
- Philostratus. *The Life of Apollonius of Tyana, the Epistles of Apollonius and the Treatise of Eusebius*. 2 vols. Loeb Classical Library. London: William Heinemann, 1912.
- Plato. *Theaetetus, Sophist*. Translated by H. N. Fowler. Loeb Classical Library. London: William Heinemann, 1921.
- . *The Statesman, Philebus, Ion*. Translated by H. N. Fowler and W. R. M. Lamb. Loeb Classical Library. London: William Heinemann, 1925.
- Plutarch. *Moralia*. Translated by F. C. Babbitt, W. C. Helmbold, P. A. Clement, H. B. Hoffleit, E. L. Minar, H. N. Fowler, L. Pearson, F. H. Sandbach, H. Cherniss, B. Einarson, and P. H. de Lacy. 15 vols. Loeb Classical Library. London: William Heinemann, 1927-1969.
- Preisendanz, K., ed. *Papyri Graecae Magicae: Die Griechischen Zauberpapyri*. 2d rev. ed. Edited by A. Henrichs. 2 vols. Stuttgart: Teubner, 1973.
- Pritchard, James B., ed. *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*. 3rd ed. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1969.
- Qimron, Elisha. "The Text of CDC." Pages 9-49 in *The Damascus Document Reconsidered*. Edited by M. Broshi. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1992.
- Rabin, Chaim. *The Zadokite Documents: I. The Admonition II. The Laws*. 2d ed. Oxford: Clarendon, 1958.
- , Shemaryahu Talmon, and Emanuel Tov, eds. *The Book of Jeremiah*. Hebrew University Bible Project. Jerusalem: Magnes, 1997.
- Rahlfs, Alfred, ed. *Septuaginta: id est Vetus testamentum graece iuxta LXX interpretes*. 2 vols. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1935.
- Sanders, James A. *The Psalms Scroll of Qumrân Cave 11 (11QPs^a)*. Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan 4. Oxford: Clarendon, 1965.

- Schäfer, Peter, ed. *Synopse zur Hekhalot-Literatur*. Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum 2. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1981.
- , ed. *Geniza Fragmente zur Hekhalot-Literatur*. Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum 6. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1984.
- Schuller, Eileen M. *Non-Canonical Psalms from Qumran*. Harvard Semitic Studies 28. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986.
- Scott, W. *Hermetica: The Ancient Greek and Latin Writings which Contain Religious or Philosophic Teachings ascribed to Hermes Trismegistus*. Vol. 1. Oxford: Clarendon, 1924.
- Scrivener, F. H., ed. *Bezae Codex Cantabrigensis*. Cambridge: Deighton, Bell, and Co., 1864.
- Segal, Moshe Z. ספר בן סירא השלם 2d ed. Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1958.
- Simon, M. *Midrash Rabbah IX: Esther and Song of Songs*. London: Soncino, 1939.
- Sparks, Hedley F. D., ed. *The Apocryphal Old Testament*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1984.
- Sperber, A., ed. *The Bible in Aramaic based on Old Manuscripts and Printed Texts*. Vol. 3. Leiden: Brill, 1962.
- , ed. *The Bible in Aramaic based on Old Manuscripts and Printed Texts*. Leiden: Brill, 1968.
- Strugnell, John, Daniel J. Harrington, and Torleif Elgvin, in consultation with Joseph A. Fitzmyer. *Qumran Cave 4 XXIV: Sapiential Texts, Part 2: 4QInstruction (Mûsar LeMevîn): 4Q415ff. with a Re-edition of 1Q26*. Discoveries in the Judaean Desert 34. Oxford: Clarendon, 1999.
- Swanson, Reuben J., ed. *New Testament Greek Manuscripts: Variant Readings Arranged in Horizontal Lines Against Codex Vaticanus: Luke*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.
- Swete, H. B. *The Akhmîm Fragment of the Apocryphal Gospel of St. Peter*. London: Macmillan, 1893.
- Tanasijevi-Popovic, N., and Ninic, I., eds. *The Sarajevo Haggadah*. Belgrade: Prosveta,

1985.

Throckmorton, Burton H., ed. *Gospel Parallels: A Comparison of the Synoptic Gospels*. 5th ed. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1992.

Ulmer, Rivka. *Pesiqta Rabbati: A Synoptic Edition of Pesiqta Rabbati Based upon All Extant Manuscripts and the Editio Princeps*. Vol. 1. South Florida Studies in the History of Judaism 155. Atlanta, Ga: Scholars Press, 1997.

Vermes, Geza. *The Dead Sea Scrolls in English*. 4th ed. London: Penguin, 1995.

—. *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English*. London: Penguin, 1997.

Wacholder, Ben-Zion, and Martin G. Abegg. *A Preliminary Edition of the Unpublished Dead Sea Scrolls: The Hebrew and Aramaic Texts from Cave Four*. Vol. 2. Washington, D.C.: Biblical Archaeology Society, 1992.

Wansborough, H., ed. *The New Jerusalem Bible Study Edition*. London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1994.

West, M. L. *Hesiod: Works and Days*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1978.

Wise, Michael O., Martin G. Abegg, and Edward M. Cook. *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Translation*. London: Harper Collins, 1996.

Ziegler, Joseph, ed. *Susanna: Daniel: Bel et Draco*. Septuaginta: vetus testamentum graecum auctoritate societatis litterarum Gottingensis editum 16. Part 2. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1954.

Section 4: Other works of reference

Botterweck, G. Johannes, and Helmer Ringgren, eds. *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1970-.

—. Helmer Ringgren, and Heinz-Josef Fabry, eds. *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*. Translated by J. T. Willis, G. W. Bromiley, and D. E. Green. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1974-.

Crim, Keith, Lloyd Richard Bailey, Victor Paul Furnish, and Emory Stevens Bucke, eds. *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible: Supplementary Volume*. Nashville, Tenn.: Abingdon,

1976.

Freedman, David Noel, Gary A. Herion, David F. Graf, John David Pleins, and Astrid B. Beck, eds. *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*. 6 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1992.

García Martínez, Florentino, and Donald W. Parry. *A Bibliography of the Finds in the Desert of Judah 1970-95*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 19. Leiden: Brill, 1996.

Ginzberg, Louis. *The Legends of the Jews*. 7 vols. Philadelphia, Pa.: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1909-1938.

Kittel, G., and G. Friedrich, eds. *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Translated by G. W. Bromiley. 10 vols. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1964-1976.

Toorn, K. van der, B. Becking, and P. W. van der Horst, eds. *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible (DDD)*. Leiden: Brill, 1995.

Section 5: Articles, essays, monographs, and dissertations cited

Adler, William. "Introduction." Pages 1-31 in *The Jewish Apocalyptic Heritage of Early Christianity*. Edited by J. C. VanderKam and W. Adler. *Compendia rerum iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum* III/4. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1996.

Alexander, Loveday C. A. "The Living Voice: Scepticism towards the Written Word in Early Christian and in Graeco-Roman Texts." Pages 221-247 in *The Bible in Three Dimensions: Essays in Celebration of Forty Years of Biblical Studies in the University of Sheffield*. Edited by D. J. A. Clines, S. E. Fowl, and S. E. Porter. *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series* 87. Sheffield: JSOT, 1990.

—, *The Preface to Luke's Gospel: Literary Convention and Social Context in Luke 1.1-4 and Acts 1.1*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 78. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

—, "Paul and the Hellenistic Schools: The Evidence of Galen." Pages 60-83 in *Paul in His Hellenistic Context*. Edited by T. Engberg-Pedersen. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994.

Alexander, Philip S. "The Historical Setting of the Hebrew Book of Enoch." *Journal of*

- Jewish Studies* 28 (1977): 156-180.
- , “Jewish Aramaic Translations of Hebrew Scriptures.” Pages 217-253 in *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*. Edited by J. Mulder and H. Sysling. *Compendia rerum iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum* 2/1. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1988.
- , “From Son of Adam to Second God: Transformations of the Biblical Enoch.” Pages 87-122 in *Biblical Figures Outside the Bible*. Edited by M. E. Stone and T. A. Bergren. Harrisburg, Pa.: Trinity Press International, 1998.
- Allegro, John M., Maurice Baillet, Frank Moore Cross, C.-H. Hunzinger, Józef T. Milik, Patrick W. Skehan, Jean Starcky, and John Strugnell. “Le Travail d’Édition des Fragments Manuscrits de Qumrân.” *Revue biblique* 63 (1956): 49-67.
- , “Fragments of a Qumran Scroll of Eschatological *Midrasîm*.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 77 (1958): 350-354.
- Anderson, Hugh. *The Gospel of Mark*. New Century Bible. London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1976.
- Attridge, Harold W. *The Epistle to the Hebrews: A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*. Hermeneia. Philadelphia, Pa.: Fortress, 1989.
- Bacher, Wilhelm. *Tradition und Tradenten in den Schulen Palästinas und Babylonien: Studien und Materialien zur Entstehungsgeschichte des Talmuds*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1914.
- Baird, William. “What is the Kerygma? A Study of 1 Cor 15 3-8 and Gal 1 11-17.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 76 (1957): 181-191.
- Ball, David M. ‘I Am’ in John’s Gospel: *Literary Function, Background and Theological Implications*. *Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series* 124. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996.
- Barrett, C. K. *The Gospel According to St. John: An Introduction with Commentary and Notes on the Greek Text*. London: SPCK, 1958.
- . *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*. 2d ed. Black’s New Testament Commentaries.

London: A & C Black, 1971.

—. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles*. 2 vols. International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994-1998.

Baumgarten, Joseph M. "The 'Sons of Dawn' in CDC 13,14-15 and the Ban on Commerce Among the Essenes." *Israel Exploration Journal* 33 (1983): 81-85.

—. "Corrigenda to the 4Q MSS of the *Damascus Document*." *Revue de Qumran* 19 (1999): 217-225.

—. "The Damascus Document Reconsidered." Pages 149-150 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls at Fifty: Proceedings of the 1997 Society of Biblical Literature Qumran Section Meetings*. Edited by R. A. Kugler and E. M. Schuller. Society of Biblical Literature Early Judaism and Its Literature 15. Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1999.

—. "A Response to the Discussion of DJD XVIII." Pages 199-201 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls at Fifty: Proceedings of the 1997 Society of Biblical Literature Qumran Section Meetings*. Edited by R. A. Kugler and E. M. Schuller. Society of Biblical Literature Early Judaism and Its Literature 15. Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1999.

Beasley-Murray, G. R. *John*. Word Biblical Commentary 36. Waco, Tex.: Word Books, 1987.

Beck, Norman A. "Reclaiming a Biblical Text: The Mark 8:14-21 Discussion about Bread in a Boat." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 43 (1981): 49-56.

Beker, J. Christiaan. *Paul the Apostle: The Triumph of God in Life and Thought*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1980.

Best, Ernest. *The First and Second Epistles to the Thessalonians*. Black's New Testament Commentaries. London: A & C Black, 1972.

Betz, Hans Dieter. *Galatians: A Commentary on Paul's Letter to the Churches in Galatia*. Hermeneia. Philadelphia, Pa.: Fortress, 1979.

Bickermann, Elias. "La chaîne de la tradition pharissienne." *Revue biblique* 59 (1952): 44-54.

Black, Matthew. *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts*. 3d ed. Oxford: Clarendon,

1967.

—, in consultation with James C. VanderKam. *The Book of Enoch or I Enoch: A New English Edition with Commentary and Textual Notes*. *Studia in Veteris Testamenti pseudepigraphica* 7. Leiden: Brill, 1985.

Blenkinsopp, Joseph. *Ezra-Nehemiah: A Commentary*. Old Testament Library. Philadelphia, Pa.: Westminster, 1988.

Bock, Darren L. Review of Crispin H. T. Fletcher-Louis, *Luke-Acts: Angels, Christology and Soteriology*. *Bibliotheca sacra* 155 (1998): 245-246.

Bockmuehl, Markus N. A. *Revelation and Mystery in Ancient Judaism and Pauline Christianity*. *Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament. Second Series* 36. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1990. Repr., Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1997.

Boobyer, G. H. *St. Mark and the Transfiguration Story*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1942.

Boring, M. Eugene. "Markan Christology: God-Language for Jesus?" *New Testament Studies* 45 (1999): 451-471.

Bornkamm, Günther. *Paul*. Translated by D. M. G. Stalker. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1971.

Bovon, François. *L'Évangile selon Saint Luc 1-9*. *Commentaire du Nouveau Testament IIIa*. Geneva: Labor et Fides, 1991.

Brockington, L. H. *The Hebrew Text of the Old Testament: The Readings Adopted by the Translators of the New English Bible*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973.

Brooke, George J. *Exegesis at Qumran: 4QFlorilegium in its Jewish Context*. *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series* 29. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985.

—. "Isaiah 40:3 and the Wilderness Community." Pages 117-132 in *New Qumran Texts and Studies: Proceedings of the First Meeting of the International Organisation for Qumran Studies, Paris, 1992*. Edited by G. J. Brooke and F. García Martínez. *Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah* 15. Leiden: Brill, 1994.

Broshi, Magen, ed. *The Damascus Document Reconsidered*. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1992.

- Brownlee, William H. *The Dead Sea Manual of Discipline: Translation and Notes*. Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research: Supplement Series 10-12. New Haven, Conn.: American Schools of Oriental Research, 1951.
- Brox, Norbert. *Die Pastoralbriefe: Timotheus I Timotheus II Titus: Übersetzt und erklärt*. Regensburger Neues Testament 7.2. Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet, 1969.
- Brown, Raymond E. *The Semitic Background of the Term "Mystery" in the New Testament*. Facet Books Biblical Series 21. Philadelphia, Pa.: Fortress, 1968.
- , *The Gospel According to John I-XII*. Anchor Bible 29. New York: Doubleday, 1966.
- , *The Birth of the Messiah: A Commentary on the Infancy Narratives in the Gospels of Matthew and Luke*. 2d ed. Anchor Bible Reference Library. New York: Doubleday, 1993.
- Bruce, Frederick F. *The Epistle to the Hebrews: The English Text with Introduction, Exposition and Notes*. New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1964.
- , "The Book of Daniel and the Qumran Community." Pages 221-235 in *Neotestamentica et Semitica: Studies in Honour of Matthew Black*. Edited by E. E. Ellis and M. Wilcox. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1969.
- , *The Epistle of Paul to the Galatians: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. New International Greek Testament Commentary. Exeter: Paternoster, 1982.
- Bultmann, Rudolf. *The History of the Synoptic Tradition*. Translated by J. Marsh. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1963.
- Burrows, Millar. *The Dead Sea Scrolls*. London: Secker & Warburg, 1956.
- Callan, T. "Pauline Midrash: The Exegetical Background of Gal 3:19b." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 99 (1980): 549-567.
- Caquot, André. "Les Textes de Sagesse de Qoumrân (Aperçu préliminaire)." *Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses* 76 (1996): 1-34.
- Carey, Greg. "Introduction: Apocalyptic Discourse, Apocalyptic Rhetoric." Pages 1-17 in *Vision and Persuasion: Rhetorical Dimensions of Apocalyptic Discourse*. Edited by G. Carey and L. G. Bloomquist. St. Louis, Mo.: Chalice, 1999.

- Casciaro Ramirez, Jose Maria. "Los 'Himnos' de Qumran y el 'Misterio' Paulino." *Scripta theologica* 8 (1976): 9-56.
- Cazelles, Henri. "Ahiqar, Ummân, and Amun, and Biblical Wisdom Texts." Pages 45-55 in *Solving Riddles and Untying Knots: Biblical, Epigraphic, and Semitic Studies in Honor of Jonas C. Greenfield*. Edited by Z. Zevit, S. Gitin, and M. Sokoloff. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1995.
- Charlesworth, James H., and Brent A. Strawn. "Reflections on the Text of *Serek ha-Yahad* found in Cave IV." *Revue de Qumran* 17 (1996): 403-435.
- Clements, Ronald E. *Isaiah 1-39*. New Century Bible. London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1980.
- , "Beyond Tradition-History: Deutero-Isaianic Development of First Isaiah's Themes." Pages 128-146 in *The Prophets: A Sheffield Reader*. Edited by P. R. Davies. Biblical Seminar 42. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996. Repr. from *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 31 (1985): 95-113.
- Clifford, Richard J. *Proverbs: A Commentary*. Old Testament Library. Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox, 1999.
- Coetzee, J. C. "Jesus' Revelation in the *EGO EIMI* Sayings in Jn 8 and 9." Pages 170-177 in *A South African Perspective on the New Testament: Essays by South African New Testament Scholars Presented to Bruce Manning Metzger during his Visit to South Africa in 1985*. Edited by J. H. Petzer and P. J. Hartin. Leiden: Brill, 1986.
- Collins, John J. "The Court-Tales in Daniel and the Development of Apocalyptic." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 94 (1975): 218-234.
- . *The Apocalyptic Vision in the Book of Daniel*. Harvard Semitic Monographs 16. Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1977.
- . "Introduction: Towards the Morphology of a Genre." In *Apocalypse: The Morphology of a Genre*. Edited by J. J. Collins. *Semeia* 14 (1979): 1-20.
- . "Daniel and his Social World." *Interpretation* 39 (1985): 131-143.
- . "Apocalypses and Apocalypticism: Early Jewish Apocalypticism." Pages 282-288 in

- vol. 1 of *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Edited by D. N. Freedman, G. A. Herion, D. F. Graf, J. D. Pleins, and A. B. Beck. 6 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
- . *Daniel: A Commentary on the Book of Daniel*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress, 1993.
- . *The Scepter and the Star: The Messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Ancient Literature*. Anchor Bible Reference Library. New York: Doubleday, 1995.
- . “Gabriel גַּבְרִיאֵל.” Pages 640-642 in *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible*. Edited by K. van der Toorn, B. Becking, and P. W. van der Horst. Leiden: Brill, 1995.
- . *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Literature of the Dead Sea Scrolls. London: Routledge, 1997.
- . *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature*. 2d ed. Biblical Resource Series. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1998.
- Congar, Yves M.-J. *Tradition and Traditions: An Historical and a Theological Essay*. Translated by M. Naseby and T. Rainborough. London: Burns & Oates, 1966.
- Conzelmann, Hans. *The Theology of St. Luke*. Translated by G. Buswell. London: Faber & Faber, 1960.
- . *1 Corinthians: A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*. Translated by J. W. Leitch. Hermeneia. Philadelphia, Pa.: Fortress, 1975.
- Cook, Edward M. “*Maskil* and *Mebin* in the Dead Sea Scrolls.” Paper presented at the annual meeting of the SBL. Nashville, Tenn., November 20, 2000.
- Cook, Stephen L. *Prophecy & Apocalypticism: The Postexilic Social Setting*. Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress, 1995.
- Cranfield, C. E. B. *The Gospel According to Saint Mark*. Cambridge Greek Testament Commentary. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959.
- Crenshaw, James L. “Method in Determining Wisdom Influence upon ‘Historical’ Literature.” Pages 312-25 in *Urgent Advice and Probing Questions: Collected Writings on Old Testament Wisdom*. Macon, Ga.: Mercer University Press, 1995. Repr. from *Journal of Biblical Literature* 88 (1969): 129-42.

- . *Prophetic Conflict: Its Effect upon Israelite Religion*. Beiheft zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 124. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1971.
- . *Old Testament Wisdom: An Introduction*. Atlanta, Ga.: John Knox, 1981.
- . *Ecclesiastes: A Commentary*. Old Testament Library. Philadelphia, Pa.: Westminster, 1987.
- . "Wisdom." Pages 45-77 in Pages 225-64 in *Urgent Advice and Probing Questions: Collected Writings on Old Testament Wisdom*. Macon, Ga.: Mercer University Press, 1995. Repr. from *Old Testament Form Criticism*. Edited by J. Hayes. San Antonio, Tex.: Trinity University Press, 1974.
- Cullmann, Oscar. "The Tradition: The Exegetical, Historical and Theological Problem." Pages 59-99 in *The Early Church*. Edited by A. J. B. Higgins. London: SCM, 1956.
- Daniélou, Jean. *The Theology of Jewish Christianity*. Vol. 1 of *The Development of Christian Doctrine before the Council of Nicaea*. Translated by J. A. Baker. London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1964.
- . *The Infancy Narratives*. Translated by R. Sheed. London: Burns & Oates, 1968.
- Davies, Philip R. *The Damascus Covenant: An Interpretation of the "Damascus Document"*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 25. Sheffield: JSOT, 1983.
- . *Daniel*. Old Testament Guides. Sheffield: JSOT, 1985.
- . "Reading Daniel Sociologically." Pages 345-361 in *The Book of Daniel in the Light of New Findings*. Edited by A. S. van der Woude. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium 106. Louvain: Presses Universitaires de Louvain, 1993.
- . "Reflections on DJD XVIII." Pages 151-165 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls at Fifty: Proceedings of the 1997 Society of Biblical Literature Qumran Section Meetings*. Edited by R. A. Kugler and E. M. Schuller. Society of Biblical Literature Early Judaism and Its Literature 15. Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1999.
- . "The Scribal School of Daniel." Pages 247-265 in *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception*. Edited by J. J. Collins and P. W. Flint, with the assistance of C. VanEpps.

Vol. 1. Leiden: Brill, 2001.

Davies, W. D. "A Note on Josephus, Antiquities 15:136." *Harvard Theological Review* 47 (1954): 135-140.

—. *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism: Some Rabbinic Elements in Pauline Theology*. 2d ed. London: SPCK, 1955.

—, and Dale C. Allison. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on The Gospel According to Saint Matthew*. Vol. 2. International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1991.

Davis, Philip G. "The Mythic Enoch: New Light on Early Christology." *Studies in Religion* 13 (1984): 335-343.

—. "Divine Agents, Mediators, and New Testament Christology." *Journal of Theological Studies* 45 (1994): 479-503.

Day, John. *God's Conflict with the Dragon and the Sea: Echoes of a Canaanite Myth in the Old Testament*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.

Dell, Katharine. *'Get Wisdom, Get Insight': An Introduction to Israel's Wisdom Literature*. London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 2000.

Denis, A.-M. *Les Thèmes de Connaissance dans Le Document de Damas*. Studia Hellenistica 15. Louvain: Publications Universitaires de Louvain, 1967.

Dibelius, Martin and Hans Conzelmann. *The Pastoral Epistles: A Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles*. Translated by P. Buttolph and A. Yarbro. Hermeneia. Philadelphia, Pa.: Fortress, 1972.

Eichrodt, Walter. *Theology of the Old Testament*. Translated by J. A. Baker. 2 vols. Old Testament Library. Philadelphia, Pa.: Westminster, 1961-1967.

Elgvin, Torleif. "Admonition Texts from Qumran Cave 4." Pages 179-196 in *Methods of Investigation of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Khirbet Qumran Site: Present Realities and Future Prospects*. Edited by Michael O. Wise, John J. Collins, Dennis G. Pardee, and Norman Golb. Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences 722. New York: New York Academy of Sciences, 1994.

- . "Wisdom, Revelation, and Eschatology in an Early Essene Writing." Pages 440-463 in *SBL 1995 Seminar Papers*. Atlanta, Ga: Scholars Press, 1995.
- . "The Reconstruction of Sapiential Work A." *Revue de Qumran* 16 (1995): 559-580.
- . "Wisdom in the Yahad: 4QWays of Righteousness." *Revue de Qumran* 17 (1996): 205-232.
- . "Early Essene Eschatology: Judgment and Salvation according to *Sapiential Work A*." Pages 126-165 in *Current Research and Technological Developments on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Conference on the Texts from the Judean Desert, Jerusalem, 30 April 1995*. Edited by D. W. Parry and S. D. Ricks. *Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah* 20. Leiden: Brill, 1996.
- . "An Analysis of 4QInstruction." Ph.D. diss., Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1997.
- Eliade, Mircea. *Patterns in Comparative Religion*. Translated by R. Sheed. London: Sheed and Ward, 1958.
- Ellingworth, Paul. *The Epistle to the Hebrews: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. New International Greek Testament Commentary. Carlisle: Paternoster, 1993.
- Elliott, J. K. "Does Luke 24¹⁻⁵² Anticipate the Resurrection?" *Expository Times* 83 (1971-72): 87-89.
- Ellis, E. Earle. "'Wisdom' and 'Knowledge' in 1 Corinthians." *Tyndale Bulletin* 25 (1974): 82-98.
- Evans, Craig A. *To See and Not Perceive: Isaiah 6.9-10 in Early Jewish and Christian Interpretation*. *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series* 64. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989.
- . "Jesus and the Dead Sea Scrolls from Qumran Cave 4." Pages 91-100 in *Eschatology, Messianism and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by C. A. Evans and P. W. Flint. *Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature* 1. Cambridge: Eerdmans 1997.
- Fee, Gordon D. *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*. New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1987.
- Fiore, Benjamin. *The Function of Personal Example in the Socratic and Pastoral Epistles*.

Analecta biblica 105. Rome: Biblical Institute, 1986.

Fitzmyer, Joseph A. *The Gospel According to Luke (I-IX): Introduction, Translation, and Notes*. Anchor Bible 28. New York: Doubleday, 1981.

—. "4Q246: The "Son of God" Document from Qumran." *Biblica* 74 (1993): 153-174.

—. "New Documents: Qumran and Gnostic Writings." Pages 7-25 in *American Bible Society Symposium Papers on the Bible in the 21st Century*. Edited by H. C. Kee. Philadelphia, Pa.: Trinity Press International, 1993.

—. "The Aramaic 'Son of God' Text from Qumran Cave 4." Pages 163-175 in *Methods of Investigation of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Khirbet Qumran Site: Present Realities and Future Prospects*. Edited by M. O. Wise, N. Golb, J. J. Collins, and D. G. Pardee. Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences 722. New York: New York Academy of Sciences, 1994.

Fletcher-Louis, Crispin H. T. "Angelomorphic Categories, Early Christology and Discipleship, with Special Reference to Luke-Acts." *Tyndale Bulletin* 48 (1997): 183-186.

—. *Luke-Acts: Angels, Christology and Soteriology*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament. Second Series 94. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997.

Flint, Peter W. "The Daniel Tradition at Qumran." Pages 41-60 in *Eschatology, Messianism and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by C. A. Evans and P. W. Flint. Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature 1. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1997.

Fossum, Jarl E. *The Name of God and the Angel of the Lord: Samaritan and Jewish Concepts of Intermediation and the Origins of Gnosticism*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 36. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1985.

—. "The New Religionsgeschichtliche Schule: The Quest for Jewish Christology." Pages 638-646 in *SBL Seminar Papers, 1991*. Edited by E. H. Lovering. Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1991.

Fox, Michael V. *Proverbs 1-9: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Anchor Bible 18A. New York: Doubleday, 2000.

- Franklin, E. "The Ascension and the Eschatology of Luke-Acts." *Scottish Journal of Theology* 23 (1970): 191-200.
- Freyne, Seán V. "The Disciples in Mark and the *MAŠKILIM* in Daniel: A Comparison." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 16 (1982): 7-23.
- García Martínez, Florentino. "Estudios Qumránicos 1975-1985: Panorama Crítico." *Estudios bíblicos* 47 (1989): 93-118.
- Gerhardsson, Birger. *Memory and Manuscript: Oral Tradition and Written Transmission in Rabbinic Judaism and Early Christianity*. Translated by E. J. Sharpe. Acta seminarii neotestamentici upsaliensis 22. Uppsala: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1961.
- Gertner, M. "Terms of Scriptural Interpretation: A Study in Hebrew Semantics." *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 25 (1962): 1-27.
- Gieschen, Charles A. "Angelomorphic Christology: Antecedents and Early Evidence." PhD diss., University of Michigan, 1995.
- Ginsberg, H. L. "The Oldest Interpretation of the Suffering Servant." *Vetus Testamentum* 3 (1953): 400-404.
- Gnilka, Joachim. *Die Verstockung Israels: Isaias 6,9-10 in der Theologie der Synoptiker*. Studien zum Alten und Neuen Testaments 3. Munich: Kösel, 1961.
- Goldingay, John E., *Daniel*. Word Biblical Commentary 30. Dallas, Tex.: Word Books, 1989.
- Good, E. M. *Irony in the Old Testament*. 2d ed. Sheffield: Almond, 1981.
- Greenberg, Moshe. *Ezekiel 1-20: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Anchor Bible 22. New York: Doubleday 1983.
- Gruenwald, Ithamar. *Apocalyptic and Merkavah Mysticism*. Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums 14. Leiden: Brill, 1980.
- Guelich, Robert A. *Mark 1-8:26*. Word Biblical Commentary 34A. Dallas, Tex.: Word Books, 1989.
- Habel, Norman C. *The Book of Job: A Commentary*. Old Testament Library. Philadelphia, Pa.: Westminster, 1985.

- Haenchen, Ernst. *The Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary*. Translated by B. Noble, G. Shinn, and R. McL. Wilson. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1971.
- Hallo, William W. "Introduction: Ancient Near Eastern Texts and Their Relevance for Biblical Exegesis." Introduction to *Canonical Compositions from the Biblical World*. Vol. 1 of *The Context of Scripture: Canonical Compositions, Monumental Inscriptions, and Archival Documents from the Biblical World*. Edited by William W. Hallo, K. Lawson Younger, and David E. Orton. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- Halperin, David J. *The Faces of the Chariot: Early Jewish Responses to Ezekiel's Vision*. Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum 16. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1988.
- Hannah, Darrell D. *Michael and Christ: Michael Traditions and Angel Christology in Early Christianity*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament. Second Series 109. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999.
- Hanson, Paul D. *The Dawn of Apocalyptic*. Philadelphia, Pa.: Fortress, 1975.
- . "Apocalypse, Genre." Pages 27-28 in *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible: Supplementary Volume*. Edited by K. Crim, L. R. Bailey, V. P. Furnish, and E. S. Bucke. Nashville, Tenn.: Abingdon, 1976.
- . "Apocalypticism." Pages 28-34 in *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible: Supplementary Volume*. Edited by K. Crim, L. R. Bailey, V. P. Furnish, and E. S. Bucke. Nashville, Tenn.: Abingdon, 1976.
- . "Apocalypses and Apocalypticism: The Genre." Pages 279-280 in vol. 1 of *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Edited by D. N. Freedman, G. A. Herion, D. F. Graf, J. D. Pleins, and A. B. Beck. 6 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
- . "Apocalypses and Apocalypticism: Introductory Overview." Pages 280-282 in vol. 1 of *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Edited by D. N. Freedman, G. A. Herion, D. F. Graf, J. D. Pleins, and A. B. Beck. 6 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
- Hanson, R. P. C. *Tradition in the Early Church*. Library of History and Doctrine. London: SCM, 1962.
- Harding, James E. Review of D. J. Harrington, *Wisdom Texts from Qumran. Dead Sea*

Discoveries 5 (1998): 237-245.

—. "The Wordplay between the Roots כשל and של in the Literature of the *Yahad*."

Revue de Qumran 19 (1999): 69-82.

Harrington, Daniel J. "Birth Narratives in Pseudo-Philo's Biblical Antiquities and the Gospels." Pages 316-324 in *To Touch the Text: Biblical and Related Studies in Honor of Joseph A. Fitzmyer, S. J.* Edited by M. P. Horgan and P. J. Kobelski. New York: Crossroad, 1989.

—, and John Strugnell. "Critical Note: Qumran Cave 4 Texts: A New Publication." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 112 (1993): 491-499.

—. "Two Early Jewish Approaches to Wisdom: Sirach and Qumran Sapiential Work A." Pages 123-132 in the *SBL Seminar Papers, 1996*. Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1996.

—. "The *râz nihyeh* in a Qumran Wisdom Text." *Revue de Qumran* 17 (1996): 549-553.

—. *Wisdom Texts from Qumran*. Literature of the Dead Sea Scrolls. London: Routledge, 1996.

—. "Ten Reasons why the Qumran Wisdom Texts are Important." *Dead Sea Discoveries* 4 (1997): 245-254.

Harris, J. Rendel. "Pindar and St. Paul." *Expository Times* 33 (1921-1922): 456-457.

Hartman, Lars. *Prophecy Interpreted: The Formation of Some Jewish Apocalyptic Texts and of the Eschatological Discourse Mark 13 Par.* Translated by N. Tomkinson with the assistance of J. Gray. Coniectanea biblica: New Testament Series 1. Lund: Gleerup, 1966.

Hawkin, David J. "The Incomprehension of the Disciples in the Marcan Redaction." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 91 (1972): 491-500.

Hayman, A. Peter. "Qohelet and the Book of Creation." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 50 (1991): 93-111.

Heil, John Paul. *Jesus Walking on the Sea: Meaning and Gospel Functions of Matt 14:22-33, Mark 6:45-52 and John 6:15b-21*. Analecta biblica 87. Rome: Biblical Institute, 1981.

Hempel, Charlotte. "Comments on the Translation of 4QSD I, 1." *Journal of Jewish*

Studies 44 (1993): 127-128.

Hendriksen, W. *I & II Thessalonians, I & II Timothy & Titus*. Edinburgh: Banner of Truth Trust, 1972.

Hengel, Martin. *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in their Encounter in Palestine during the Early Hellenistic Period*. Translated by J. Bowden. 2 vols. London: SCM, 1974. Repr., London: Xpress Reprints, 1996.

Holm-Nielsen, Svend. *Hodayot: Psalms from Qumran*. Acta theologica danica 2. Aarhus: Universitetsforlaget i Aarhus, 1960.

Holtzmann, Heinrich J. *Die Pastoralbriefe, kritisch und exegetisch behandelt*. Leipzig: Wilhelm Engelmann, 1880.

Hurtado, Larry W. "New Testament Christology: A Critique of Bousset's Influence." *Theological Studies* 40 (1979): 306-317.

—. *One God, One Lord: Early Christian Devotion and Ancient Jewish Monotheism*. 2d ed. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998.

Jagersma, H. *A History of Israel from Alexander the Great to Bar Kochba*. Translated by J. Bowden. London: SCM, 1985.

Japhet, Sara. *I & II Chronicles: A Commentary*. Old Testament Library. Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox, 1993.

Jeremias, Joachim. *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*. Translated by N. Perrin. London: SCM, 1966.

Johnson, E. Elizabeth. *The Function of Apocalyptic and Wisdom Traditions in Romans 9-11*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 109. Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1989.

Käsemann, Ernst. *New Testament Questions of Today*. Translated by W. J. Montague. New Testament Library. London: SCM, 1969.

Kee, Howard Clark. *Community of the New Age: Studies in Mark's Gospel*. New Testament Library. London: SCM, 1977.

Keil, Carl Friedrich. *The Book of the Prophet Daniel*. Translated by M. G. Easton. 1872.

- Repr., Carl Friedrich Keil and Franz Delitzsch. *Commentary on the Old Testament in Ten Volumes*. Vol. 9: *Ezekiel, Daniel*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1980.
- Kim, Seyoon. *The Origin of Paul's Gospel*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament. Second series 4. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1981.
- Kister, Menachem. "Commentary to 4Q298." *Jewish Quarterly Review* 85 (1994): 237-249.
- Kloppenborg, John S. *The Formation of Q: Trajectories in Ancient Wisdom Collections*. Studies in Antiquity and Christianity. Philadelphia, Pa.: Fortress, 1987.
- Knibb, Michael A. "Prophecy and the Emergence of the Jewish Apocalypses." Pages 155-180 in *Israel's Prophetic Tradition: Essays in Honour of Peter R. Ackroyd*. Edited by R. Coggins, A. Phillips, and M. A. Knibb. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.
- Knight, George W. *The Pastoral Epistles: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. New International Greek Testament Commentary. Carlisle: Paternoster, 1992.
- Knight, Jonathan. *Disciples of the Beloved One: The Christology, Social Setting and Theological Context of the Ascension of Isaiah*. Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha: Supplement Series 18. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996.
- Koch, Klaus. *The Rediscovery of Apocalyptic: A Polemical Work on a Neglected Area of Biblical Studies and Its Damaging Effects on Theology and Philosophy*. Translated by M. Kohl. Studies in Biblical Theology. Second Series 22. London: SCM, 1972.
- Kosmala, Hans. "Maskil." *Journal of the Ancient Near Eastern Society of Columbia University* 5 (1973): 235-241.
- Kraft, Robert A. "Septuagint." Pages 807-815 in *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible: Supplementary Volume*. Edited by K. Crim, L. R. Bailey, V. P. Furnish, and E. S. Bucke. Nashville, Tenn.: Abingdon, 1976.
- Küchler, Max. *Frühjüdische Weisheitstraditionen: Zum Fortgang weisheitlichen Denkens im Bereich des frühjüdischen Jahweglaubens*. Orbis biblicus et orientalis 26. Freiburg: Universitätsverlag, 1979.
- LaCocque, André. *The Book of Daniel*. Translated by D. Pellauer. London: SPCK, 1979.

- Ladd, George Eldon. "Revelation and Tradition in Paul." Pages 223-230 in *Apostolic History and the Gospel: Biblical and Historical Essays presented to F. F. Bruce on his 60th Birthday*. Edited by W. Ward Gasque and R. P. Martin. Exeter: Paternoster, 1970.
- Lagrange, P. M.-J. *Évangile selon Saint Luc*. Études bibliques. Paris: Gabalda, 1921.
- Lane, W. L. *The Gospel According to Mark: The English Text with Introduction, Exposition and Notes*. New International Commentary on the New Testament 2. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1974.
- Lange, Armin. "Wisdom and Predestination in the Dead Sea Scrolls." *Dead Sea Discoveries* 2 (1995): 340-354.
- . *Weisheit und Prädestination: Weisheitliche Urordnung und Prädestination in den Textfunden von Qumran*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 18. Leiden: Brill, 1995.
- . "Kognitives *lqh* in Sap A, im T^enak und Sir." *Zeitschrift für Althebräistik* 9 (1996): 190-195.
- Laurentin, René. *Structure et théologie de Luc I-II*. Études bibliques. Paris: Gabalda, 1957.
- . *Jésus au temple: Mystère de paques et foi de Maries en Luc 2, 48-50*. Études bibliques. Paris: Gabalda, 1966.
- Leaney, A. R. C. *The Rule of Qumran and Its Meaning: Introduction, Translation and Commentary*. New Testament Library. London: SCM, 1966.
- Lemcio, Eugene E. "External Evidence for the Structure and Function of Mark iv. 1-20, vii. 14-23 and viii. 14-21." *Journal of Theological Studies* 29 (1978): 323-338.
- Lichtheim, Miriam. *Late Egyptian Wisdom Literature in the International Context: A Study of Demotic Instructions*. Orbis biblicus et orientalis 52. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1983.
- Lincoln, Andrew T. *Ephesians*. Word Biblical Commentary 42. Dallas, Tex.: Word Books, 1990.
- Lindars, Barnabas. "Enoch and Christology." *Expository Times* 92 (1980-1981): 295-299.
- Lindenberger, James M. "The Gods of Ahikar." *Ugarit-Forschungen* 14 (1982): 105-117.

- . *The Aramaic Proverbs of Ahiqar*. John Hopkins Near Eastern Studies. Baltimore, Md.: John Hopkins University Press, 1983.
- Lohse, Eduard. *Colossians and Philemon: A Commentary on the Epistles to the Colossians and Philemon*. Edited by Helmut Koester. Translated by W. R. Poehlmann and R. J. Karris. Hermeneia. Philadelphia, Pa.: Fortress, 1971.
- Lowndes Lipscomb, W., and James A. Sanders. "Wisdom at Qumran." Pages 277-285 in *Israelite Wisdom: Theological and Literary Essays in Honor of Samuel Terrien*. Edited by J. G. Gammie, W. A. Brueggemann, W. L. Humphreys, and J. M. Ward. Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1978.
- Lucas, F. L. *Tragedy: Serious Drama in Relation to Aristotle's Poetics*. Rev. ed. London: Hogarth, 1957.
- Lührmann, Dieter. *Das Offenbarungsverständnis bei Paulus und in paulinischen Gemeinden*. Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament 16. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1965.
- Mach, Michael. *Entwicklungsstadien des jüdischen Engelglaubens in vorrabbinischer Zeit*. Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum 34. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1992.
- Maier, Johann. "Early Jewish Biblical Interpretation in the Qumran Literature." Pages 108-129 in *Hebrew Bible/Old Testament: The History of Its Interpretation*. Edited by M. Sæbø. Vol. 1/1. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996.
- Mánek, Jindrich. "Mark viii 14-21." *Novum Testamentum* 7 (1964): 10-14.
- Manson, Thomas W. *The Teaching of Jesus: Studies of Its Form and Content*. 2d ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1935.
- Marcus, Joel. *The Mystery of the Kingdom of God*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 90. Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1986.
- Marshall, I. Howard. *The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. New International Greek Testament Commentary. Exeter: Paternoster, 1978.
- . *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles*. International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1999.

- Mayes, Andrew D. H. *Deuteronomy*. New Century Bible. London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1979.
- McKane, William. *Proverbs: A New Approach*. Old Testament Library. London: SCM, 1970.
- . *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Jeremiah*. 2 vols. International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1986-1996.
- McNamara, Martin. *Targum and Testament: Aramaic Paraphrases of the Hebrew Bible: A Light on the New Testament*. Shannon: Irish University Press, 1972.
- Meadowcroft, T. J. *Aramaic Daniel and Greek Daniel: A Literary Comparison*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 198. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.
- Menoud, Philippe H. "Revelation and Tradition: The Influence of Paul's Conversion on His Theology." *Interpretation* 7 (1953): 131-141.
- Mertens, Alfred. *Das Buch Daniel im Lichte der Texte vom Toten Meer*. Stuttgarter biblische Monographien 12. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1971.
- Metso, Sarianna. *The Textual Development of the Qumran Community Rule*. Studies on the Texts from the Desert of Judah 21. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- Milik, Józef T. "Numérotation des Feuilles des Rouleaux dans le Scriptorium de Qumrân." *Semitica* 27 (1977): 75-81.
- Montefiore, Hugo W. *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*. Black's New Testament Commentaries. London: A & C Black, 1964.
- Moore, George F. *Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era: The Age of the Tannaim*. Vol. 1. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1927.
- Morray-Jones, Christopher R. A. "Merkabah Mysticism and Talmudic Tradition: A Study of the Traditions concerning *hammerkabah* and *ma'aseh merkabah* in Tannaitic and Amoraic Sources." Ph.D. diss., University of Cambridge, 1988.
- . "Transformational Mysticism in the Apocalyptic-Merkabah Tradition." *Journal of Jewish Studies* 43 (1992): 1-31.

- Müller, Hans-Peter. "Mantische Weisheit und Apokalyptik." Pages 268-293 in *Congress Volume: Uppsala 1971*. Edited by G. W. Anderson, P. A. H. de Boer, G. R. Castellino, Henry Cazelles, J. A. Emerton, E. Nielsen, H. G. May, and W. Zimmerli. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 22. Leiden: Brill, 1972.
- Munck, Johannes. *Paul and the Salvation of Mankind*. Translated by F. Clarke. London: SCM, 1959.
- Murphy-O'Connor, Jerome. "La genèse littéraire de la règle de la communauté." *Revue biblique* 76 (1969): 528-549.
- Neiryneck, Frans. *L'Evangile de Noël selon S. Luc*. Paris: La Pensée Catholique, 1960.
- Newman, Carey C. *Paul's Glory-Christology: Tradition and Rhetoric*. Supplements to Novum Testamentum 49. Leiden: Brill, 1992.
- Nolland, John. *Luke 1-9:20*. Word Biblical Commentary 35A. Dallas, Tex.: Word Books, 1989.
- . *Luke 9:21-18:34*. Word Biblical Commentary 35B. Dallas, Tex.: Word Books, 1993.
- Norden, Eduard. *Agnostos Theos: Untersuchungen zur Formengeschichte religiöser Rede*. Leipzig: Teubner, 1913.
- Nötscher, Friedrich. *Zur Theologischen Terminologie der Qumran-Texte*. Bonner biblische Beiträge 10. Bonn: Peter Hanstein, 1956.
- Nuttall, Geoffrey N. *The Moment of Recognition: Luke as Story-Teller*. London: Athlone, 1978.
- Oepke, Albrecht. *Der Brief des Paulus an die Galater*. Theologischer Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament 9. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1964.
- Oesterley, W. O. E. *The Wisdom of Egypt & the Old Testament in Light of the Newly Discovered 'Teaching of Amen-em-ope.'* London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1927.
- Olyan, Saul M. *A Thousand Thousands Served Him: Exegesis and the Naming of Angels in Ancient Judaism*. Texte und Studien zum Antiken Judentum 36. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1993.

- Otto, Rudolf. *The Idea of the Holy: An Inquiry into the Non-Rational Factor in the Idea of the Divine and its Relation to the Rational*. Translated by J. W. Harvey. 2d ed. London: Oxford University Press, 1950.
- Perrin, Norman and Dennis C. Duling. *The New Testament: An Introduction: Proclamation and Parenthesis, Myth and History*. 2d ed. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1982.
- Petersen, David L. *The Roles of Israel's Prophets*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 17. Sheffield: JSOT, 1981.
- Pfann, Stephen J. "4Q298: The Maskîl's Address to All Sons of Dawn." *Jewish Quarterly Review* 85 (1994): 203-235.
- Quesnell, Quentin. *The Mind of Mark: Interpretation and Method through the Exegesis of Mark 6,52*. Analecta biblica 38. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1969.
- Quispel, Gilles. "Ezekiel 1:26 in Jewish Mysticism and Gnosis." *Vigiliae christianae* 34 (1980): 1-13.
- Rad, Gerhard von. *Wisdom in Israel*. Translated by J. D. Martin. London: SCM, 1972.
- Rainbow, Paul A. "Jewish Monotheism as the Matrix for New Testament Christology: A Review Article." *Novum Testamentum* 33 (1991): 78-91.
- Räsänen, Heikki. *The 'Messianic Secret' in Mark*. Translated by C. M. Tuckett. Studies in the New Testament and Its World. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1990.
- . *Paul and the Law*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 29. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1983.
- Ramsey, A. Michael. *The Glory of God and the Transfiguration of Christ*. London: Longman, Green, and Co., 1949.
- Raurell, F. "The *DOXA* of the Seer in Dan-LXX 12,13." Pages 520-532 in *The Book of Daniel in the Light of New Findings*. Edited by A. S. van der Woude. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologiarum lovaniensium 106. Louvain: Presses Universitaires de Louvain, 1993.
- Ridderbos, Herman. *Paul: An Outline of His Theology*. Translated by J. R. de Witt.

London: SPCK, 1975.

Riesenfeld, Harald. *The Gospel Tradition*. Translated by E. M. Rowley and R. A. Kraft. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1970.

Rigaux, B. *Saint Paul: Les Épîtres Thessaloniens*. Études bibliques. Paris: Gabalda, 1956.

Roop, Eugene F. "A Form-Critical Study of the Society Rule (1QS) at Qumran." Ph.D. diss., The Claremont Graduate School, 1972.

Roth, Wolfgang. "On the Gnostic-Discursive Wisdom of Jesus ben Sirach." *Semeia* 17 (1980): 59-79.

Rowland, Christopher C. "The Visions of God in Apocalyptic Literature." *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic, and Roman Periods* 10 (1979): 137-154.

—. *The Open Heaven: A Study of Apocalyptic in Judaism and Early Christianity*. London: SPCK, 1982.

—. "A Man Clothed In Linen: Daniel 10:6ff. and Jewish Angelology." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 24 (1985): 99-110.

Russell, D. S. *The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic: 200 BC-AD 100*. Old Testament Library. London: SCM, 1964.

Sanders, E. P. *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion*. London: SCM, 1977.

Schäfer, Peter. "Engel und Menschen in der Hekhalot-Literatur." *Kairós* 22 (1980): 201-225.

—. "Tradition and Redaction in Hekhalot Literature." *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic, and Roman Periods* 14 (1983): 172-181.

Schiffman, Lawrence H. *The Halakhah at Qumran*. Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity 16. Leiden: Brill, 1975.

Schnackenburg, Rudolf. *The Epistle to the Ephesians: A Commentary*. Translated by H. Heron. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1991.

Schoeps, Hans Joachim. *Paul: The Theology of the Apostle in the Light of Jewish Religious History*. Translated by H. Knight. London: Lutterworth, 1961.

- Scholem, Gershom G. *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism*. 3d ed. New York: Schocken, 1961.
- . "Revelation and Tradition as Religious Categories in Judaism." Pages 282-303 in *The Messianic Idea in Judaism and other Essays on Jewish Spirituality*. New York: Schocken, 1971.
- Schuller, Eileen M. "4Q380 and 4Q381: Non-Canonical Psalms from Qumran." Pages 90-100 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research*. Edited by D. Dimant and U. Rappaport. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 10. Leiden: Brill, 1992.
- Schultz, Joseph P. "Angelic Opposition to the Ascension of Moses and the Revelation of the Law." *Jewish Quarterly Review* 61 (1970-1971): 282-307.
- Schütz, John Howard. *Paul and the Anatomy of Apostolic Authority*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 26. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975.
- Scott, Martin. *Sophia and the Johannine Jesus*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 71. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992.
- Seely, David R. "The *Barki Nafshi* Texts (4Q434-439)." Pages 194-214 in *Current Research and Technological Developments on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Conference on the Texts from the Judean Desert, Jerusalem, 30 April 1995*. Edited by D. W. Parry and S. D. Ricks. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 20. Leiden: Brill, 1996.
- Segal, Alan F. *Paul the Convert: The Apostolate and Apostasy of Saul the Pharisee*. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1990.
- Shupak, Nili. *Where Can Wisdom Be Found? The Sage's Language in the Bible and in Ancient Egyptian Literature*. Orbis biblicus et orientalis 130. Fribourg: University Press, 1993.
- Silberman, Lou H. "Prophets/Angels: LXX and Qumran Psalm 151 and the Epistle to the Hebrews." Pages 91-101 in *Standing before God: Studies on Prayer in Scriptures and Tradition with Essays in Honor of John M. Oesterreicher*. Edited by A. Finkel and L. Frizzel. New York: Ktav, 1981.
- Skehan, Patrick W. and Alexander A. Di Lella. *The Wisdom of Ben Sira: A New*

- Translation with Notes*. Anchor Bible 39. New York: Doubleday, 1987.
- Smith, Morton. Review of W. D. Davies, *Torah in the Messianic Age and/or the Age to Come*. *Journal of Biblical Literature* 72 (1953): 192-194.
- . "Observations on Hekhalot Rabbati." Pages 142-160 in *Biblical and Other Studies*. Edited by A. Altmann. Philip W. Lown Institute of Advanced Judaic Studies: Studies and Texts 1. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1963).
- . "On the History of ΑΠΟΚΑΛΥΠΤΩ and ΑΠΟΚΑΛΥΨΙΣ." Pages 9-20 in *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East: Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Apocalypticism, Uppsala, August 12-17, 1979*. Edited by D. Hellholm. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1983.
- Spicq, C. *Saint Paul: Les Épîtres Pastorales*. Études bibliques. Paris: Gabalda, 1947.
- . *L'Épître aux Hébreux*. Vol. 2. Études bibliques. Paris: Gabalda, 1953.
- Stegemann, Hartmut. *Die Essener, Qumran, Johannes der Täufer und Jesus: Ein Sachbuch*. Freiburg: Herder, 1993.
- Stemberger, Günter. *Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash*. Translated and edited by M. N. A. Bockmuehl. 2d ed. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1996.
- Stone, Michael E. "Lists of Revealed Things in the Apocalyptic Literature." Pages 414-452 in *Magnalia Dei: The Mighty Acts of God: Essays on the Bible and Archaeology in Memory of G. Ernest Wright*. Edited by F. M. Cross, W. E. Lemke, and P. D. Miller. New York: Doubleday, 1976.
- Stroumsa, Gedaliahu G. "Form(s) of God: Some Notes on Metatron and Christ." *Harvard Theological Review* 76 (1983): 269-288.
- Strugnell, John. "The Sapiential Work 4Q415ff and Pre-Qumranic Works from Qumran." Pages 595-618 in *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues*. Edited by D. W. Parry and E. Ulrich. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 30. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- Stuckenbruck, Loren T. *Angel Veneration and Christology: A Study in Early Judaism and the Christology of the Apocalypse of John*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum

- Neuen Testament . Second Series 70. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1995.
- Swartz, Michael D. *Scholastic Magic: Ritual and Revelation in Early Jewish Mysticism*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1996.
- Tannehill, Robert C. *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts: A Literary Interpretation: Volume One: The Gospel according to Luke*. Philadelphia, Pa: Fortress, 1986.
- Tanzer, Sarah J. "The Sages at Qumran: Wisdom in the 'Hodayot.'" Ph.D. diss., Harvard University, 1986.
- Taylor, Vincent. *The Gospel According to St. Mark*. London: Macmillan, 1959.
- Thorion, Y. "The Use of Prepositions in 1QSerek." *Revue de Qumran* 10 (1981): 405-433.
- Tomson, P. J. *Paul and the Jewish Law: Halakha in the Letters of the Apostle to the Gentiles*. *Compendia rerum iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum* III/1. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1990.
- Tov, Emanuel. "The Orthography and Language of the Hebrew Scrolls found at Qumran and the Origin of these Scrolls." *Textus* 13 (1986): 31-57.
- Toy, Crawford H. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Proverbs*. International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1899.
- Tyson, Joseph B. "The Blindness of the Disciples in Mark." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 80 (1961): 261-268.
- VanderKam, James C., *Enoch and the Growth of an Apocalyptic Tradition*. Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series 16. Washington, D.C.: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1984.
- . Review of Eileen M. Schuller, *Non-Canonical Psalms from Qumran: A Pseudepigraphic Collection*. *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 50 (1988): 335-336.
- Vanhoye, Albert. "Un médiateur des anges en Ga 3,19-20." *Biblica* 59 (1978): 403-411.
- Venter, P. M. "Daniel and Enoch — Two Different Reactions." *Hervormde teologiese studies* 53 (1997): 68-91.
- Vermes, Geza. Review of Eileen M. Schuller, *Non-Canonical Psalms from Qumran: A*

- Pseudepigraphic Collection. Journal of Jewish Studies* 40 (1989): 115-116.
- . "Preliminary Remarks on Unpublished Fragments of the Community Rule from Qumran Cave 4." *Journal of Jewish Studies* 42 (1991): 250-255.
- Vielhauer, Philipp. "Apocalypses and Related Subjects." Pages 579-607 in *New Testament Apocrypha*, by E. Hennecke and W. Schneemelcher. Edited by R. McL. Wilson. Translated by D. Hill. Vol. 2. London: SCM, 1974.
- Walton, F. R. "The Messenger of God in Hecataeus of Abdera." *Harvard Theological Review* 48 (1955): 255-257.
- Weeden, Theodore J. "The Heresy that Necessitated Mark's Gospel." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* 59 (1968): 145-158.
- Weeks, Stuart. *Early Israelite Wisdom*. Oxford Theological Monographs. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994.
- Wegenast, Klaus. *Das Verständnis der Tradition bei Paulus und in den Deuteropaulinen*. Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament 8. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1962.
- Werber, Eugen. *The Sarajevo Haggadah*. Belgrade: Prosveta, 1985.
- Wernberg-Møller, P. *The Manual of Discipline: Translated and Annotated with an Introduction*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 1. Leiden: Brill, 1957.
- Westermann, Claus. *Roots of Wisdom: The Oldest Proverbs of Israel and Other Peoples*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1995.
- Wevers, John W. *Ezekiel*. New Century Bible. London: Nelson, 1969.
- Whybray, R. Norman. *Isaiah 40-66*. New Century Bible. London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1975.
- Williams, James G. *Those Who Ponder Proverbs: Aphoristic Thinking and Biblical Literature*. Bible and Literature Series 2. Sheffield: Almond, 1981.
- Wilson, Robert R. *Prophecy and Society in Ancient Israel*. Philadelphia, Pa.: Fortress, 1980.
- Winston, David. *The Wisdom of Solomon: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Anchor Bible 43. New York: Doubleday, 1979.

- Winter, Paul. "Lc 2 49 and Targum Yerushalmi." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* 45 (1954): 145-179.
- . "Some Observations on the Language in the Birth and Infancy Stories of the Third Gospel." *New Testament Studies* 1 (1954-1955): 111-121.
- . "The Cultural Background of the Narrative in Luke I and II." *Jewish Quarterly Review* 45 (1955): 159-167, 230-242.
- Witherington, Ben. *Jesus the Sage: the Pilgrimage of Wisdom*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994.
- Wolff, Hans W. *Anthropology of the Old Testament*. Translated by M. Kohl. London: SCM, 1974.
- Wolter, Michael. *Die Pastoralbriefe als Paulustradition*. Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments 146. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1988.
- Worrell, John E. "Concepts of Wisdom in the Dead Sea Scrolls." Ph.D. diss., The Claremont Graduate School, 1968.
- Wrede, W. *The Messianic Secret*. Translated by J. C. G. Greig. Cambridge: James Clarke, 1971.
- Yarbro Collins, Adela. "Apocalypses and Apocalypticism: Early Christian." Pages 288-292 in vol. 1 of *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Edited by D. N. Freedman, G. A. Herion, D. F. Graf, J. D. Pleins, and A. B. Beck. 6 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
- . "The Influence of Daniel on the New Testament." Pages 90-112 in *Daniel: A Commentary on the Book of Daniel*. By J. J. Collins. Hermeneia. Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress, 1993.
- Zevit, Ziony. "The Structure and Individual Elements of Daniel 7." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 80 (1968): 385-396.
- . "The Exegetical Implications of Daniel VIII 1, IX 21." *Vetus Testamentum* 28 (1978): 488-491.
- Zimmerli, Walther. *Ezekiel 1: A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Ezekiel, Chapters*

1-24. Edited by F. M. Cross and K. Baltzer with the assistance of L. J. Greenspoon.

Translated by R. E. Clements. Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979.

Zwierp, A. W. *The Ascension of the Messiah in Lukan Christology*. Supplements to Novum Testamentum 87. Leiden: Brill, 1997.