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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 מֶשֶל הָאֱלֹהִים's instruction to a pupil (מֶשֶל הָאֱלֹהִים מֵאָד). In Serekh ha-Yahad sapiential language represents a מֶשֶל הָאֱלֹהִים'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 σῆμα and αὐτήν 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 מֶשֶל הָאֱלֹהִים, 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.
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### Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Codex Sinaiticus</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Codex Alexandrinus</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anchor Bible</td>
<td>AB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anchor Bible Reference Library</td>
<td>ABRL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums</td>
<td>AGJU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analecta Biblica</td>
<td>AnBib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences</td>
<td>ANYAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aorist</td>
<td>aor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Aramaic Bible</td>
<td>ArBib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acta seminarii neotestamentici upsaliensis</td>
<td>ASNU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acta theologica danica</td>
<td>ATDan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Codex Vaticanus</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ms Budapest 238, in Synopse zur Hekhalot-Literatur (ed. P. Schäfer; TSAJ 2; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1981)</td>
<td>B238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BASORSup</td>
<td>Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research: Supplement Series</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEIL</td>
<td>Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bib</td>
<td><em>Biblica</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSac</td>
<td><em>Bibliotheca sacra</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BBB</td>
<td>Bonner biblische Beiträge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.C.E.</td>
<td>before the Common Era</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BH</td>
<td>Biblical Hebrew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BibSem</td>
<td>The Biblical Seminar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLS</td>
<td>Bible and Literature Series</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRS</td>
<td>Biblical Resource Series</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSOAS</td>
<td><em>Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BZAW</td>
<td>Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ca.</td>
<td>circa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBQ</td>
<td><em>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBQMS</td>
<td>Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.E.</td>
<td>Common Era</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CGLC</td>
<td>Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CGTC</td>
<td>Cambridge Greek Testament Commentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNT</td>
<td>Commentaire du Nouveau Testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ConBNT</td>
<td>Coniectanea biblica: New Testament Series</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRINT</td>
<td>Compendia rerum iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Codex Bezae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D436</td>
<td>ms Dropsie 436, in <em>Synopse zur Hekhalot-Literatur</em> (ed. P. Schäfer; TSAJ 2; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1981)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCH</td>
<td><em>Dictionary of Classical Hebrew</em>. Edited by D. J. A. Clines and J. F. Elwolde. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DJD</td>
<td>Discoveries in the Judaean Desert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DJDJ</td>
<td>Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSD</td>
<td><em>Dead Sea Discoveries</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| DSSNT        | Wise, M. O., M. G. Abegg, and E. M. Cook. *The Dead

DSST

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

HB
Hebrew Bible

Heb.
Hebrew

Hiph.
Hiphil conjugation (Hebrew)

Hithpa.
Hithpašal conjugation (Aramaic)

HRCS

HSM
Harvard Semitic Monographs

HSS
Harvard Semitic Studies
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HTR</td>
<td>Harvard Theological Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUBP</td>
<td>Hebrew University Bible Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HvTSt</td>
<td>Hervormde teologiese studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICC</td>
<td>International Critical Commentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEJ</td>
<td>Israel Exploration Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperf.</td>
<td>Imperfect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inf. abs.</td>
<td>Infinitive absolute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int</td>
<td>Interpretation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JANESCO</td>
<td>Journal of the Ancient Near Eastern Society of Columbia University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jastrow</td>
<td>Jastrow, M. A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature. 2d ed. New York: Judaica, 1903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JBL</td>
<td>Journal of Biblical Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JHNES</td>
<td>John Hopkins Near Eastern Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JJS</td>
<td>Journal of Jewish Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JPS</td>
<td>Jewish Publication Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JQR</td>
<td>Jewish Quarterly Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSJ</td>
<td>Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic and Roman Periods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSNT</td>
<td>Journal for the Study of the New Testament</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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
JTS Journal of Theological Studies
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
LXX Septuagint
M22, M40 mss Munich 22 and 40, in Synopse zur Hekhalot-Literatur (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 *Synopse zur Hekhalot-Literatur* (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

*NovT* *Novum Testamentum*

NovTSup Supplements to Novum Testamentum

NRSV New Revised Standard Version

NT New Testament

NTL New Testament Library

O1531 ms Oxford 1531, in *Synopse zur Hekhalot-Literatur* (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


PAM Palestine Archaeological Museum

pass. passive

PFES Proceedings of the Finnish Exegetical Society

Pl. Plural
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PLO</td>
<td>Porta Linguarum Orientalium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRS</td>
<td>Pittsburgh Reprints Series</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTSDSSP</td>
<td>Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PVTG</td>
<td>Pseudepigrapha Veteris Testamenti Graece</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QdiH</td>
<td>Quatemi di Henoch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QH</td>
<td>Qumran Hebrew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qr</td>
<td>Qere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RB</td>
<td>Revue biblique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rec.</td>
<td>recension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RevQ</td>
<td>Revue de Qumran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHPR</td>
<td>Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RNT</td>
<td>Regensburger Neues Testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>Codex Sinaiticus (Tobit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAC</td>
<td>Studies in Antiquity and Christianity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANT</td>
<td>Studien zum Alten und Neuen Testaments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBL</td>
<td>Society of Biblical Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBLDS</td>
<td>Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBM</td>
<td>Stuttgarter biblische Monographien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ScrTh</td>
<td>Scripta theologica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDSSRL</td>
<td>Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sem</td>
<td>Semitica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHR</td>
<td>Sepher ha-Razim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHRPref</td>
<td>Preface to Sepher ha-Razim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sing.</td>
<td>Singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJLA</td>
<td>Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slav</td>
<td>Slavonic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SPCK  Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge
StudHell  Studia Hellenistica
SubBi  Subsidia biblica
SBLEJL  Society of Biblical Literature Early Judaism and Its Literature
SBLSP  Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers
SBM  Stuttgart biblische Monographien
SC  Sources chrétiennes. Paris: Cerf, 1943-
SJLA  Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity
SJT  Scottish Journal of Theology
SNTSMS  Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series
SR  Studies in Religion
STDJ  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
TEDS  Translations of Early Documents Series
Text  Textus
Θ  Theodotion (Daniel)
THKNT  Theologischer Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament
ThWAT  Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament.
Edited by G. J. Botterweck and H. Ringgren. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1970-

TR  Textus Receptus

TS  Theological Studies

TSAJ  Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum

TynBul  Tyndale Bulletin

UF  Ugarit-Forschungen

V228  ms Vatican 228, in Synopse zur Hekhalot-Literatur (ed. P. Schäfer; TSAJ 2; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1981)

VC  Vigiliae christianae

VT  Vetus Testamentum

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

ZAH  Zeitschrift für Althebräistik

ZAW  Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft

ZNW  Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche
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.” 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, the major exception being the column and line numbers for 1QHa. 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. Translations of

---

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. 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.
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James E. Harding
Introduction

1. Preliminary remarks

The title of this study derives from 2 Tim 2:7, in which Paul writes νῶετε δὲ λέγω· διώσει γάρ οὑτὶ κύριος σύνεσιν ἐν πάσιν, "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 Father or Jesus, 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 understanding 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 Épîtres Pastorales [EBib; Paris: Gabalda, 1947], XII). However, the problem of the authorship of the Pastoral Epistles 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): δεῖ δύναται σοφίαν, καὶ ἀπὸ προσώπου αὐτοῦ γνῶσιν καὶ σύνεσιν, "because [the] Lord gives wisdom, and from his face knowledge and understanding." George W. Knight understands δόγας 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 οὗτος here refers to Jesus, since anarthrous κύριος refers to God and arthrous κύριος refers to Jesus in the Pastors (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 arthrous 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 ἀκούσας παρ' ἐμοί διὰ πολλῶν μαρτύρων, ταῦτα παράθου πιστοῖς ἄνθρωποις, οἳ οὖν ἐσονταὶ καὶ ἐτέρους διδάξατε, "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, 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: קֶסֶם, הָעֵינָי, נֶצֶר, מִלְשָׁן, מַעֲבָדָה, מָכָה, מֶלֶשֶׁר, and מְשָׁמִיר (Michael V. Fox, Proverbs 1-9: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary [AB 18A; New York: Doubleday, 2000], 69 n. 63).

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).


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, Egypt, Anatolia, Syria, 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. It is this ancient Near Eastern milieu which provided the context in which the wisdom traditions of the ancient Israelites emerged, together with the texts which bear witness to those traditions. 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

---


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 literature 20 (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 (יוֹסֵד); 22 (2) riddle (מִלָּה); (3) fable and allegory; (4) hymn and prayer; (5) dialogue (בְּֽקָם); (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


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 סֵדֶד. 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. Kloppenberg, 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.

wisdom. 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. 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. 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.

Wisdom as a concept is often understood as heavenly in origin, as in 2 Tim 2:7. This idea is rooted in the ancient Near East. The Babylonian god Marduk is described in Enuma Elish as “the wisest of gods,” or “sage of the gods,” and in another text he is “the lord of wisdom.” In the Egyptian Instruction of Any we read “Tell the god who gave you wisdom: ‘Set them on your path!’” 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

26 Cf. Sir 24; Bar 4:1-4; 4 Macc 1:16-18; m. Abot 1:1.
wise, your wisdom is everlasting." A similar idea is found in the Words of Ahiqar, saying 13, which glorifies wisdom’s divine origin and her benefits to both gods and men, and designates wisdom as the special province of Baal Shamayn, one of the high gods of the Arameans, in the same way that the Israelites considered wisdom a special attribute of YHWH. This appears to be a case, otherwise unique outside the HB, of personified wisdom in an ancient Near Eastern text.

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” (ךלמך את עתי), “to discern good and evil” (למשת את אחרים), 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” (ךכומך את עתי ואת אלוהים את אחרים ואת עתי ואת אשתיך ואת אשתיך). 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. When Eliphaz asks in Job 15:8 “Have you listened to the council of God, and have you thus appropriated wisdom?” 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. Lindenerberger, The Aramaic Proverbs of Ahiqar (JHNES; Baltimore, Md.: John Hopkins University Press, 1983), 68. Wisdom (יאניבה) is referred to in col. 7 line 94, and would provide an appropriate antecedent for the feminine singular adjective ידיד, “precious,” the personal pronoun י, “she,” and the feminine singular passive participle ידיד, “placed, set, appointed.” Cowley’s suggestion that this “is probably the continuation of 1.94” (Aramaic Papyri, 236) is thus plausible.
35 On the identification of הלל קריש in saying 13 (col. 7 line 95), see Lindenerberger, “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: μόνιμα σοφία θεία, διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, διὰ αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῦ διδόκος, αμήν, “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.
23:18, Jeremiah similarly derides the lying prophets: “For who has stood in the council of YHWH and seen, or listened to his message?” (קֶרֶם נַפְשׁוֹת כִּסֹּד יְהוֹוָה יְהוָה). 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” (ךְּפַר פִּשְׁנָם), 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: נַפְשׁוֹת כִּסֹּד יְהוָה יְהוָה).

Mach suggests that in these ideas lies the possible origin of the apocalyptic angelus interpres 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 ummanu, 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 ummanu as the background for the curious term יְהוָה יְהוָה 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, ὠνύτιμος, ὀνύτισις, ὀνύτις, ὀνύτιτος, ὀνύτιτος, 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.

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" (בְּנֵי חֹדֶשׁ), whom YHWH has filled with the "spirit of wisdom" (רוֹעֵב נְדָב).\(^{47}\) Similarly, YHWH gives Solomon a "wise and discerning heart" (1 Kgs 3:12: בֵּית בָּלָה).\(^{48}\) In Ezr 7:25, Artaxerxes refers to "the wisdom of your (viz. Ezra's) God, which is in your hand" (יוֹדֵעַ הַחֵפֶץ בַּעֲלֵיהֶם). 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 group\(^{49}\) 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: יְהוָה יְסָפֵר לְיַעַסְיָא יִסְפָּר לְיִשְׂרָאֵל בֵּית בָּלָה). 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: "I (Ethiopic Apocalypse of) Enoch," translated by E. Isaac (*OTP*, 1:15).


\(^{51}\) 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: דֵּבָרֶיךָ מַלְאֹךְ מְלָאךְ מָלָאָךְ יַעֲשֵׂה יַעֲשֵׂהוֹ, “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

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 8 XXVII, 2-4 it is significant that not only is David “a wise man and a light like the sun” (הַבָּר מַלְאָךְ יַעֲשֵׂהוֹ), he has been given an “understanding and enlightening spirit” (רָאָה הַבָּר מַלְאָךְ יַעֲשֵׂהוֹ) 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 material 63 and attribution to a renowned figure 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.
62 Ezek 14:14 refers to Noah, Daniel, and Job as three men who could save their own souls “by their righteousness” (מְרִמְשַׁקְוֹ). They are extraordinary figures in the folklore behind Ezekiel, though their wisdom, which did become legendary, is not referred to.
64 Crenshaw, Prophetic Conflict, 107.
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 over 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:

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:

67 LXX: ἀναστραφήσεται.
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 understanding\(^{68}\) 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. *Abot* 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

---

69 Cf. 1 Kgs 3:6-9; 2 Chr 1:8-10; Dan 9:3-19.
70 Ms B from the Cairo Genizah reads ר"ע מ at this point: Joshua was the "attendant of Moses in prophecy" (חצרת מלשון בכבדות).
Dieter Lührmann as “the classic formulation of the rabbinic understanding of tradition,” is therefore grounded in the idea of the revelation and transmission of heavenly wisdom:

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. 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. Using the framework of the chain of transmission in m. Ḥabbakuk 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.
76 Lines 1-2: 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 Methuselah, son of Kenan, son of Enosh, son of Seth, son of Adam, from the mouth of Raziel the angel. Text: Moedcai Margalioth (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. 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; 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.” For in them is the spring of understanding, the fountain of
wisdom, and the river of knowledge.” And I did so.

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. 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 interpres. 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. The
apostles “were evangelised” (εὐθυγγελισθησαν) 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.
81 Ascen. Isa. 7:1; cf. 8:24; 11:16, 36-37.
82 1 Clement 42:1-2: οἱ ἀπόστολοι ἦμιν εὐθυγγελισθησαν ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, Ἰησοῦς ὁ
Χριστός ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ ἔξεπεμφήθη, ὁ Χριστός 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, but a model of transmission evidenced in the NT. 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 παρέδωκα ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου, δὲ 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 παράδεισώμε, “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 παράδεισώμε 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 יָד and שֶׁלֶש, which are especially prominent in Daniel and the Qumran scrolls. In Dan 8:16, Gabriel is commanded to “make this one understand the vision” (יָד לְוָא אָלָמִיס יָד), יָד Hiphil being used to represent the transmission of insight from Gabriel to Daniel.

---

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).
Hiphil is used in Dan 8:27 to refer to Daniel's lack of understanding (בָּרוּךְ), but in Dan 9:22-23 following Gabriel's command "understand the vision" (לְבָרֹךְ וְקָפָרָה), Hiphil is used in a similar way. In Dan 9:22 Gabriel says to Daniel "I have come to teach you understanding" (וַיִּפְרֹץ אֱלֹהִים לְבָרֹךְ), 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 בָּרוּךְ and "will instruct" (בָּרֹךְ) the many. Here, בָּרוּךְ and בָּרֹךְ 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, 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 מַגְזֵר, and the recipient of instruction, a מָשָׁלָה. The 4QS manuscripts are examined alongside the use of בֵּינֵן in 1QS. The phrase (4QSb IX, 1; 4QSc I, 1) is central, the aim being to establish what this phrase implies about the role of the מַשָּׁלָה. 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 σονεος or συντημι 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 מַלְאָךְ מַלְאָכִים 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 מַלְאָךְ מַלְאָכִים and Jesus is again a heavenly mediator, though here the disciples’ comprehension is focused on Jesus’ identity. In Luke, σωπνιμι 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.
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 Essenum,"\(^3\) 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).
\(^4\) 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, and Christopher Morray-Jones, who understands the idea of knowledge as a revelatory gift from God to be common to wisdom, apocalyptic, and the Qumran scrolls. Christopher Rowland, similarly, notes that “[k]nowledge of the divine secrets formed an important part of the doctrinal convictions of the Qumran sect.” 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 הсрע תדמה.

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. With regard to the idea of wisdom as originating with God, Nötscher cites the divine appellations אַהֲרָן, "God of knowledge" and מִצְלַח, "source of knowledge" as evidence for this idea at Qumran. He suggests that this concept follows.

---

10 Rowland, Open Heaven, 115.
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 IQS III, 15; 1QHb IX, 26; XX, 10; XXb1, 15. Cf. 1 Sam 2:3; 1QHb XXVb1, 8-9; Mas1k I, 2 (par. 4Q402 4 12); 4Q400 1 I1, 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, אלָדָד תִּדְמוּת seems to refer to the God of knowledge, whereas אַהֲרָן (cf. 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 IQS X, 12; XI, 3 (גִּבֹא רֵי לְמַעְלָת, “the source of his knowledge”); 1QHb 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 נכו.\(^{17}\) He discerns several senses, including secular knowledge\(^{18}\) and sexual knowledge.\(^{19}\) A particularly significant meaning for נכו 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 ידוע, which a candidate must bring into the community.\(^{22}\)

Nötscher examines the term נטנש, which he renders “wisdom teacher” (Weisheitslehrer).\(^{23}\) True knowledge (다가 נזון), which has a predominantly religious content and purpose, must, along with just judgement (מדרש לוד), be possessed by the נטנש.\(^{24}\) The נטנש 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” (נן 인정),\(^{28}\) 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 1 I, 8, 17-18.
\(^{22}\) 1QS I, 11-12; III, 2.
\(^{23}\) Nötscher, Terminologie, 46-47, 56-57.
\(^{24}\) In connection with the הנש, Nötscher cites 1QS III, 13; IX, 12, 21; CD XII, 21. For his possession of הנש and מדרש לוד, see 1QS IX, 17.
\(^{25}\) 1QS IX, 17-19.
\(^{26}\) 1QHb XIII, 26.
\(^{27}\) CD X, 9-10.
\(^{28}\) CD XX, 4-5.
of knowledge (תורנוהכדרע). 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 נומניל, and they receive it within a chain of transmission.

Nötscher includes sections on בֵּין and סְלַל, synonyms for understanding and knowledge. The devout man seeks insight (בֵּין), which Nötscher understands to be insight, understanding, and comprehension of ordinary and extraordinary, mysterious things, which manifests itself mainly in practical action. It should govern the whole life of the community member. הבנ is a gift from God, received directly from him or through the spirit of truth. הבנ is not given to all, but only to those who are receptive to it, who were known as “understanding ones” (בֵּין). Nötscher reads CD II, 14-16 as indicating that the teacher of righteousness transmitted הבנ within the community, though the possibility that 4QD began means that it may be better to think of a יָמֵשָׁל as mediator of הבנ in the Damascus Document, thus recalling 1QS IX, 12-21. Mediatorial “offices” (אמטר) within the community are identified by Nötscher. The is to instruct (יָמֵשָׁל) the many concerning God’s works, make them understand (בֵּין) God’s powerful acts of wonder, and teach (דָּבָר) the interpretation of Torah. It is incumbent upon the יָמֵשָׁל, identified by Nötscher with the figure called דָּבָר, to teach (לָעֲבָר) and instruct (לָעֲבָר) the sons of light. He is also to teach (לָעֲבָר) newcomers

29 1QHa XI, 22-23.
30 Nötscher, Terminologie, 54-55.
31 Nötscher, Terminologie, 55-58.
32 1QHa VI, 3.
33 Nötscher, Terminologie, 54.
34 Cf. Conzelmann, TDNT 7:891.
35 1QS IV, 3, 22; Dan 2:21.
36 1QHa 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. 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 שָׁלֵל דָּעָה לְחֵבִי מְפֶלֶךְ וְזוּרֵבוּתָה ("understanding of knowledge to understand your wonders") in 1QH² XIX, 28 indicates that three terms for insight, knowledge, and understanding (שָׁלֵל, רוּת, כֶּרֶם) belong together. שָׁלֵל 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. A member’s insight is examined alongside his property, skills, and moral quality, and someone is qualified and classified according to rank according to his insight and deeds, that is, his insight and perfection of way. The phrase רָבָע 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. The doubtless owes his name to the promotion of שָׁלֵל in the community, though he has other functions, perhaps liturgical, than that of "wisdom teacher." This figure is not to be equated with the מַשְׁלֵי of Daniel without further ado, though the Qumran doubtless takes them as his example. He is to learn all wisdom found accord; 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; 1QH² IIIbot, 4; VII, 5; Prov 12:8.
48 1QS VI, 1-8. 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 1QH² XXVbot, 10 should now be associated with this category. See Masl 1, 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; 1QH² 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 מַשְׁלֵי 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, find up-to-date rulings, and form an opinion concerning the sons of Zadok. There are laws and rulings which he must follow with all the living. The הַמָּשָׁלִיל's role is not confined to teaching practical rules of conduct, but also involves teaching "the mysteries of wonder and truth" (דברי פלא ואמתו). His role is thus similar to the הַמָּשָׁלִיל in the Damascus Document. Nötscher concludes that also is a gift which comes from God. The "flesh" of man is too weak to possess on its own. God's הַמָּשָׁלִיל conceals secrets in itself that will be fully revealed to the upright at the eschaton. For sincere community members 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 הַמָּשָׁלִיל 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 1QHα 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.

1QS IX, 13.
1QS IX, 14.
1QS IX, 12; CD XII, 21.
1QS IX, 18, 20; CD XIII, 7. Cf. 1QS IV, 22; XI, 1; 1QHα X, 4, 7; XXVtop, 11. Nötscher notes (Terminologie, 57 n. 102) that the causative sense of הַמָּשָׁלִיל Hiphil belongs to LBH, whereas in older Hebrew הַמָּשָׁלִיל Hiphil usually indicated "understand," as in 1QS XI, 18. הַמָּשָׁלִיל Hiphil behaves in a similar way, meaning "understand" (1QHα IV, 21) or "teach" (1QS IV, 22; CD XIII, 8; cf. Dan 11:33).
1QS IX, 18.
Cf. CD XIII, 7-8.
1QS IV, 3; 1QHα VI, 27; 1QHα XVIII, 7.
1QHα VII, 24; XVIII, 6-7; XX, 33.
1QIV, 18 ("the mysteries of your insight"); 1QHα V, 19; XX, 13 ("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, which have not generally been read as "sectarian," but which are characterised by wisdom vocabulary. 4Q380 and 4Q381 contain the remains of a collection, or two collections of extra-canonical psalms. Schuller uses "psalms" as a working definition for the compositions found in these manuscripts, which in form and content exhibit a number of similarities to the compositions known from the masoretic Psalter. The designation "דֶּבָּלָה" occurs three times in the compositions of 4Q380 and 4Q381.

---


62 In reference to the possible Essene origin of 4Q380 and 4Q381, Schuller comments that "there 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 מִשׁאָלָה, בְּנֵי חֲוִית, מַשְׁכִלִים, לַהֲמוֹנָרִים, מְכִפרִים, בֵּינֵי אֲרֵרִים. Much more to the point is the fact that specifically sectarian vocabulary (words such as מִשְׁאָלָה, מַשְׁכִלִים, לַהֲמוֹנָרִים, מְכִפרִים, בֵּינֵי אֲרֵרִים) 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 7 מַשְׁכִלִים, יִזְרָא, מְכִפרִים, בֵּינֵי אֲרֵרִים)" (Schuller, *Non-Canonical Psalms*, 22-23).


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.


times\textsuperscript{67} and the designation יִשָּׁמָּל once.\textsuperscript{68} There are also three occurrences of the term יִשָּׁמָּל.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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.”\textsuperscript{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 יִשָּׁמָּל in 4Q381 24a + b 4 refers to Moses.\textsuperscript{72} If this is the case, then it is possible that both 4Q380 and 4Q381 are

\textsuperscript{67} 4Q380 1 II, 8 (תַּחַלּותִּים לְעַבְרֵי תַּחַלּות); 4 Q380 24a + b 4 (תַּחַלּות לְעַבְרֵי תַּחַלּות). In 4Q380 1 I, 8 there is a fourth occurrence of תַּחַלּות, but it is not a psalm designation. It occurs in the phrase [1]כָּל תַּחַלּות, “all [his] praise.”

\textsuperscript{68} 4Q381 33 + 35 8 reads “[יִשָּׁמָּל לֶּשֶׁת מָלָךְ יָוֵשָׁב הַבּוּל וְיָוֵשָׁב מָלָךְ יָוֵשָׁב] אָבָרִים, 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 יִשָּׁמָּל be reconstructed in 4Q381 31 4, whilst admitting that יִשָּׁמָּל is equally possible (Non-Canonical Psalms, 138; Qumran Cave 4 VI, 120).

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 יִשָּׁמָּל concluded a composition. This is also the case with 4Q381 33 + 35 6. Hartmut Stegemann proposes to reconstruct יִשָּׁמָּל also in 4Q381 15 11 and 4Q381 69 10 (Schuller, Non-Canonical Psalms, 58 n. 43, 279, 281).

\textsuperscript{69} 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).

\textsuperscript{70} García Martínez, “Estudios,” 95.

\textsuperscript{71} García Martínez, “Estudios,” 95.

\textsuperscript{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.  

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: מִזְמוֹר, יִרְדֵּן, חָכִים, בֵּן, מְרַע. 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: דָּבָשׁ, בְּנֵיהוּ, שַׁלֵּמֶל, and מַרְאוֹת. 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, 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. מֵרַע

The root מֵרַע occurs ten times in 4Q380 and 4Q381 as a verb, and twice as the noun מֵרַע. The form מֵרַע appears in 4Q380 7 II, 2 at the beginning of the second preserved column of a tiny fragment. It is followed by מֵרַע with the construct singular מֵרַע, 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).


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 * is missing, but restored by Schuller on the basis that * is more likely to fit into the missing portion than נ or נ (Schuller, Non-Canonical Psalms, 264; Qumran Cave 4 VI, 85).
ponder the strength of:“ ponder all your wonders with the might of your strength.” In the Hodayot we read, “what is a man of emptiness or a master of vanity to understand your wondrous deeds” (IQHa XV, 32), and “no-one understands [your] wisdom” (IQHa XVI, 2). In 4QInstructionb 211,14 the speaker says “understand all truthful ways.” 4Q380 7 II, 2 may be read alongside such texts within the Qumran corpus.

The puzzling phrase יָנָה יְנֵי וּלָכֵךְ יָנָה יְנֵי occurs in 4Q381 12. Schuller translates “to the simple that they may understand; and to those without understanding, (that) they may know.” In this phrase, יָנָה and יְנֵי are parallel, and therefore probably Qal rather than Hiphil (i.e. not causative). The Hiphil is often causative, a usage Nötscher identifies with LBH. Although יָנָה is not preserved in 4Q381 85 1 is clearly a Hiphil imperative, there is no real context and further comment is thus impossible.

Schuller initially restored יָנָה as the absolute noun following יָנָה (“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 יָנָה, and in DJD XI no reconstruction is attempted (Qumran Cave 4 VI, 84-85).

In the MT, see Jer 23:20; 30:24; Job 30:20. Job 30:20 contains the phrase יָנָה יְנֵי “I stand and you consider me.” There is ms evidence for reading יָנָה יְנֵי: “I stand, and you establish yourself against me.” Jer 23:20; 30:24 are a doublet, and look forward to the “end of days” (יָנָה יְנֵי) 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).

The parallel in this line between יָנָה יְנֵי Hithpolel and יָנָה יְנֵי Hiphil recalls 1QS XI, 19.

The parallel is not preserved in 4QInstructiond 9 15. There are other occurrences of יָנָה יְנֵי Hithpolel followed by יָנָה יְנֵי Hiphil in: 1QMyst I 1, 3 (par. 4Q300 3 3 [reconstructed]); 4QMMTe 1 11-13 6; 4QInstructiond 1 1, 11-12 (par. 4QInstructiond 43, 44, 45 I, 9-10 [reconstructed]); 238 3 (reconstructed); 4QBarki Nafshi 1 1, 2-3; 4QDibHam 6 3.

Schuller, Qumran Cave 4 VI, 94.

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

See, however, Mic 4:12, where יָנָה יְנֵי (Qal) is parallel with יָנָה יְנֵי (Hiphil).

Cf. Jotson §81d.

Nötscher, Terminologie, 57 n. 102.
The roots ישב, ידע, and ישכל may be dealt with together in 4Q381 15 7-8, since they are connected. In line 7, the phrase 'And I, your anointed, understand' occurs, which Schuller translates "And I, your anointed, understand." In line 8 there are two Hiphil (causative) verbs. Schuller's most recent reconstruction reads העציב תודעתי וידעתי because you instructed me, and insight because you taught me. Schuller here understands העציב 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." The infinitive absolute העציב parallels the noun העצם. 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.

The Hiphil (possibly Qal) first occurs in 4Q381 in 31 5, where we read חותרתיך, מי יבין לנהמה. "your [thoughts, 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. However, the construction יבין ל Nah 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 I to be formally parallel with ידוע. This requires that the I 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 "I will make you known," taking this verb to be formally parallel with ידוע, and taking ידוע to be a first person singular imperfect Hiphil in which י has replaced ה (Non-Canonical Psalms, 102).
93 MT: ידוע וידעתי וידעתי וידעתי רצון אמונה וידעתי וידעתי (Non-Canonical Psalms, 102).
94 ידוע is parallel with ידוע 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: "Knowledge ... 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 VI, 120. Cf. Isa 55:8-9; Mic 4:12 (here ידוע is the object of יבין Qal which is parallel with יבין Hiphil); Ps 139:6, 17-18; Wisd 9:13-18; Sir 18:1-7; 1 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 אָבִיא פני in 4Q381 45a + b 1, an exceptionally difficult line to read with certainty.99 What remains reads את אֲבִיא פִּנּי מָצֵּא חֶסֶל, 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 אָבִיא פִּנּי is parallel with אָבִיא פִּנּי מָצֵּא חֶסֶל, and that לוּ יִתְּנֶה may be parallel with לוּ יִתְּנֶה.101 We might expect a parallel with מְשַׁבְּלָה בֵּין מָצֵּא and מָצֵּא בֵּין מְשַׁבְּלָה, since both מָצֵּא חֶסֶל and מָצֵּא חֶסֶל are 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 יִתְּנֶה 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 מַבְּנִי יְשֵׁבֵהלָה, and translates “those who understand you, and I will teach.” An alternative for מַבְּנִי would be “your wise ones,” presupposing the masculine plural participle Hiphil of בֵּין מָצֵּא with the second person masculine singular possessive (rather than object) suffix. “I will teach” and “I will understand” are both possibilities for מָשַּׁבֶלָה. It should be clear, moreover, that Hiphil forms of מַבְּנִי and מָשַּׁבֶלָה are found characteristically in collocation. They occur in collocation again in 4Q381 76-77:

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. 4Q51 10). For the sense “to teach (something)” see 4QS04 1-2 II, 17 where it seems to be God who imparts instruction.

98 Thorion, “Use,” 420. For the sense “to understand” for לוּ יִתְּנֶה 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 הדסי and מָצֵּא” (*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 אָבִיא in nominal clauses, see Joüon §160b.

102 The construction לְ and מָשַּׁבֶלָה has the sense “contemplate (something)” in Prov 21:12. The phrase מַבְּנִי אֲרֹם לְפִי רַעַשָּׁה appears to mean “a righteous man contemplates a wicked man’s house.” A
you will understand." 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 [ז] parallel with [ב], yielding the translation "attend to the wisdom that comes out of my mouth and the understanding...." 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 [ז] (and possibly [ב]). The speaker is exhorting his hearers to understand the wisdom that he is imparting.

In line 13, the phrase "is there understanding that you may learn?" occurs ("is there understanding that you may learn?"). This links למד ומכ. It is not clear whether למד is Qal ("you will learn") or Piel ("you will teach"). However, the link between ומכ and למד is familiar from 1QS III, 13; 1QH X, 17. In 1QS III, 13 Hiphil is parallel with למד ב Kurds, "for the wise teacher, to instruct and teach all the sons of light." Causative binyanim of למד, ב, למד, and כשר are here used explicitly to refer to instruction within a community. 1QH X, 17 reads \(\text{כשר ומכ} \), "a man in whose mouth you have established and taught understanding." The hymnist is using כשר to refer obliquely to himself. God is the subject of both verbs. We thus have a text which presupposes that למד 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 "and when someone gives understanding to a wise man he receives knowledge." However, the LXX reads "\(\text{καὶ εὐδοκεῖ μοι ἡ γνῶσις, καὶ ἐποιήσατε} \)" and J. Fichtner (BHS) regard the before הַיּֽהְפִּיקֵּם as dittography, the of הַיּֽהְפִּיקֵּם 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.

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

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

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 הַיּֽהְפִּיקֵּם. Kuhn corrects this to הַיּֽהְפִּיקֵּם ("and you have taught me"), but believes the text to be corrupt, and suggests that this word originally read למד. 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 (רָבָר), though the speaker is, in fact, referring to himself obliquely in the third person. Eduard Lohse reads (Die Texte aus Qumran: Hebräisch und Deutsch [Munich: Kösel, 1964], 116).
read alongside the two “sectarian” texts mentioned, מֵעִי in this text may be understood as something which may be learned by humans but is taught by God.\textsuperscript{106}

The use of מֵעִי 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.\textsuperscript{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. מֵעִי may be used in collocation with לַמַּלְאָן, מַרְאָה, and especially מַעֲלָה. The occurrences of מֵעִי 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. מְכֻבָּה

The root מֵכִיב occurs three times in 4Q380 and 4Q381, once as the Hiphil verb מְכַבֵּה and twice as the noun מְכֻבָּה.\textsuperscript{108} Each occurrence is in a very fragmentary portion of text. In 4Q380 4 3, the Hiphil form מְכַבֵּה occurs, though there is no way of knowing who the subject is. The only occurrence of מְכַבֵּה Hiphil in the MT is in a wisdom psalm, in Ps 19:8.\textsuperscript{109} In Ps 19:8, the form מְכִיבֵה, the construct of the feminine singular Hiphil participle, occurs in the phrase מְכִיבֵה, מַעֲלָה, מַעֲלָה, “making wise one who is simple.” The subject is מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה, מַעֲלָה, “the testimony of

\textsuperscript{106}In 4Q381 49 2, the phrase מְכַבֵּה מְכֻבָּה מְכֻבָּה, “understand, and let it be to you,” is all that remains. The phrase מְכַבֵּה מְכֻבָּה מְכֻבָּה in 4Q381 31 6 will be discussed below (§2.3).

\textsuperscript{107}García Martínez, “Estudios,” 100.

\textsuperscript{108}Schuller initially restored מְכַבֵּה in 4Q380 7 II, 2, but only מְכַבֵּה is clearly visible on PAM 43.362.

\textsuperscript{109}Schuller, Non-Canonical Psalms, 261; Qumran Cave 4 VI, 83.

\textsuperscript{110}Compare 4Q Apocryphon of Joshuab 18 6: הַמְּכַבֵּה מְכֻבָּה, וְכַלַּה יְהוָה וְהָעִלָּה, “and by the testimonies 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 מְכַבֵּה Hiphil is probably to be explained because in Josh 1:7-8 Joshua is twice the subject of מְכַבֵּה Hiphil. In Josh 1 it would be difficult to read the מְכַבֵּה Hiphil as causative, which should probably make us wary of reading מְכַבֵּה in 4Q379 18 6 as causative.
YHWH” (parallel with ר"י הנד תדנ, “the law/instruction of YHWH”). If the ליע"ל that follows in 4Q380 4.3 is a preposition, and not the first letter of a noun such as הפל"ל, then the construction ליע"ל + הדבוש + הדבוש would be equivalent to ליע"ל + הדבוש in 4QDibHam* 1-2 II, 17; Job 6:24; Dan 8:16, or ליע"ל + הדבוש in Prov 21:11.

The form הדבוש 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 הדבוש in line 1, for example? Further, the uncertainty over the identity of the word which follows הדבוש in line 2 is tantalising. Schuller tentatively reconstructs [ד] הנד, which would be parallel with הדבוש. However, the first letter could be נ and the second ר. הדבוש would make sense in parallel with הדבוש, 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: ‘ויהי יד רכזיר א>About דא מיסב אול רכזיר אול רכזיר isי יד רכזיר א"ו يّهد `

4Q381 76-77 8 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 מטatron in Isa 55:11a: Metatron carries out the will of God, taking the role of God’s word (esterday), mentioned in Isa 55:11a. 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 (ויהי יד רכזיר א"ו יד רכזיר א"ו יד רכזיר א"ו יד רכזיר א"ו יד רכזיר א"ו יד רכזיר א"ו יד רכזיר א"ו יד רכזיר א"ו יד רכזיר א"ו יד רכזיר א"ו יד רכזיר א"ו יד רכזיר א"ו יד רכזיר א"ו יד רכזיר א"ו יד רכזיר א"ו יד רכזיר א"ו יד רכזיר א"ו יד רכזיר א"ו יד רכזיר א"ו يّهد `

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

Cf. Schuller, Non-Canonical Psalms, 261.

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

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 מטatron in Isa 55:11a: Metatron carries out the will of God, taking the role of God’s word ( textStyle="normal"

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 הָוָה 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. 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. דִּ֖רֶח

Although the root דִּ֖רֶח is extremely common in the Qumran corpus, there are only six certain occurrences in 4Q380 and 4Q381. The Qal form דִּ֖רֶח occurs in parallel with the Hiphil דִּ֖רֶח in the phrase דִּ֖רֶח נַבֵּר, “will you not recognise and will you not know that” in 4Q381 13 2. The parallel between the דִּ֖רֶח Qal and נַבֵּר Hiphil is familiar from the HB, and occurs at Qumran in 1QHa 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 1QHa XV, 13 it is God who knows every inclination of a creature and discerns every answer of a tongue (ואֲנִ֣ה יְדַעְתִּ֣י, לכל מִצְרָדֶךָ וְיָדַעְתִּי כל מִצְרָדֶךָ). It belongs to God to know 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.

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

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 דִּ֖רֶח in 4Q380 6 2 and the reading דִּ֖רֶח 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” (רֶהוּ בְּפָנֶיךָ עֲדֵה נַפְּרֵד אֲנִ֣ה יְדַעְתִּ֣י). Compare n. 96 above.
120 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 הָאָלָהֲכָה יִשְׂרָאֵל “in line 4 seems to be an attribution of authorship in a superscription, Schuller restoring אֶלְהָכֵּה יִשְׂרָאֵל in the lacuna.122 Thereafter, God is addressed by the unidentified king of Judah. In line 6 we read נַחֲלָה “you will [not] hide my sins124 from those who know understanding, but you will slaughter them.” The phrase מַעֲבֹר יִשְׂרָאֵל 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” (וְזֶרָה בְּעֹדֵהוֹ לְמִשְׂרָאֵל וְנִשְׂרוּ בְּמִשְׂרָאֵל יִשְׂרָאֵל).

However, the participle מַעֲבֹר qualifies יִשְׂרָאֵל 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” (מִלְחָמָה יָדָן יִשְׂרָאֵל, יִשְׂרָאֵל),126 and promises to send him “a wise man who knows insight” (מִלְחָמָה יָדָן יִשְׂרָאֵל), 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.
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” (וַיהי אֱלֹהֵי תָאֵרִים לִמְדוֹת וְלִינְשָׁפֹת לָמָּה לָמָה נָנִים). In verse 20, Daniel says that “wisdom and strength belong to him” (וַיהי אֱלֹהֵי תָאֵרִים לִמְדוֹת וְלִינְשָׁפֹת לָמָּה לָמָה נָנִים). In verse 22 God is a “ revealer of deep and hidden things” (וַיהי אֱלֹהֵי תָאֵרִים לִמְדוֹת וְלִינְשָׁפֹת לָמָּה לָמָה נָנִים), thus linking this prayer with the idea that wisdom and insight belong in heaven and must be revealed for humans to know them. Moreover, Daniel is identifying himself with those who know insight. This recalls Dan 1:4, in which all five of the roots with which we are concerned occur (שכלי, למד, ידוע, תבנית, וי). Three significant phrases occur in parallel which describe Daniel and his companions: (1) “having insight into all wisdom” (וַיהי אֱלֹהֵי תָאֵרִים לִמְדוֹת וְלִינְשָׁפֹת לָמָּה לָמָה נָנִים); (2) “knowing discernment” (וַיהי אֱלֹהֵי תָאֵרִים לִמְדוֹת וְלִינְשָׁפֹת לָמָּה לָמָה נָנִים); and (3) “understanding all knowledge” (וַיהי אֱלֹהֵי תָאֵרִים לִמְדוֹת וְלִינְשָׁפֹת לָמָּה לָמָּה נָנִים). Compare also 4QDc 1 9: “Now, listen to me, all who know justice. Understand the deed[s] of God.” Doubtless מַעְרָך הָאֱלֹהִים is intended to recall Isa 51:7, but it is the link with מַעְרָך הָאֱלֹהִים 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 לה룹ו the Maskil, a song,” includes the words חֵלֶם יְרוּשָׁלְעָם followed by a lacuna. The construct form requires an absolute noun to follow, but it is by no means clear that we should follow 4QDc 1 9 (par.) in reconstructing [בִּא מַעְרָך הָאֱלֹהִים. 4Q511 2 I, 2 is written in palaeo-Hebrew characters. Finally, Maurice Baillet’s suggests, followed by Schuller, that the phrase could be reconstructed [בִּא מַעְרָך הָאֱלֹהִים. This is supported by 4Q511 18 II, 8 in which

---

128 "θ reads διδόσ τοις σοφοῖς τοις σοφοῖς καὶ ψυχαίς τοῖς εἰδοῖς σώφαις. Again, εἴδω translates ἔννοια and σώφα translates Νομον. The OG differs slightly: διδόσ τοις σοφοῖς καὶ ψυχαίς τοῖς εἰδοῖς σῶφαις. This is more paraphrastic than θ. Here, σώφα translates Νομον, but the whole phrase ἔννοια σώφα translates the Aramaic נוֹמָה וֹנוֹמָה. The OG, however, literally translates נוֹמָה וֹנוֹמָה with μεγαλακωστία.

129 Theodotion reads ὃ σοφα καὶ ὃ σώφας αὐτοῖς ἐστιν, σώφαις presumably (and oddly) translating בִּא מַעְרָך הָאֱלֹהִים. The OG, however, literally translates נוֹמָה וֹנוֹמָה with μεγαλακωστία.


131 Cf. Dan 2:19, 23.

132 Par. 4QDa 2 I, 6-7; CD I, 1-2.

133 In 4QDc 18 I is written in palaeo-Hebrew characters.

134 In the HB construct chains in which ידוע or ידוע occur as nomen regens are relatively frequent. Cf. מַעְרָך, DCH 4:107.

the יִדּּוּד says that “God made the knowledge of insight shine in my heart” (בְּנֵהוּ). He may therefore be said to “know” יִדּּוּד. The phrase יִדּוּד also occurs in Prov 4:1, in an exhortation not unlike 4QDc 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 יִדּּוּד בָּנָה might be in our psalm.”139 Neither can we be certain what the function of the יִדּּוּד in 4Q381 31 6 is. Are they the object of יִדּּוּד?140 But why should יִדּּוּד, always a positive designation elsewhere, indicate a group who will be slaughtered by God?141 Perhaps the referent of יִדּּוּד 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 יִדּּוּד in 4Q380 and 4Q381 is that scriptural and Qumran texts help to place the use of יִדּּוּד in general, and the phrase יִדּּוּד בָּנָה 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. לְבָנָה

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


136 Maurice Baillet, Qumran Grotte 4 III (4Q482-4Q520) (DJD 7; Oxford: Clarendon, 1982), 222. On p. 221, Baillet does reconstruct the phrase [ךִּלּוּ לָוָה | צָרְךָ], but admits (p. 222) that it would be equally possible to reconstruct [ךִּלּוּ לָוָה | צָרְךָ], “and all who know his [Moab’s] name”; Ps 48:17: [ךִּלּוּ לָוָה | צָרְךָ], “and all who know his [Moab’s] name”; Ps 9:11: [ךִּלּוּ לָוָה | צָרְךָ], “those who know your [YHWH’s] name”), (ךִּלּוּ לָוָה | צָרְךָ], “and knowing knowledge”), or (ךִּלּוּ לָוָה | צָרְךָ], “those who know insight”).

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


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 ידך הלך ברכתו נגיבים להשכיתו עלולך, “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. In line 4, the tasks God gave the prophets are “to make wise/instruct” and “to teach.” These verbs are causative, הבש both being followed by the direct object marker. Schuller compares the use of הבש with the deuteronomistic presentation of the role of Moses. This should be explored further in connection with line 5SUP. In line 4, הבש is the subject of both infinitives, whereas in line 5SUP God seems to be the subject of הבש. The text there reads מִן שְׁמֵם يִרְדִּיבָם לָהֶשכֶאת אָחָכָם, “from heaven he came down and spoke 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 הבש 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 (תִּנְפֵּקְנָה וְנַפְּלָה לָהֶשכֶאת לָאָחָכָם). God’s spirit acts on his behalf with his people, instructing them.

Let us reconsider הבש in line 4. Moses is the subject of הבש Piel in eight (possibly nine) texts from the HB, Ben Sira, and Qumran. Moreover, he was understood to have been a prophet, and a prophet’s role, according to Deuteronomy, was to mediate between YHWH and his people. 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 1, 7: [תִּנְפֵּקְנָה וְנַפְּלָה לָהֶשכֶאת לָאָחָכָם], “to teach 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 הבש, “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.
to you everything I command him.” In Deut 4:1, 5, 14, Moses is a teacher of statutes and rulings. Moses teaches because YHWH had commanded him to do so, placing him in the position of mediator. If the Israelites keep these statutes and rulings they will have wisdom and insight, and will be a “wise and discerning people.” In Deut 5:31, YHWH tells Moses he will speak to him the whole commandment, the statutes and the rulings that he is to teach the people. In Deut 6:1, Moses is the subject of the infinitive construct Piel of לֵאמֶר, as the prophets are in 4Q381 69 4. Moses is again the subject of the infinitive construct in Sir 45:5:

וּרֶשֶׁם כָּרָה מֵעַצְיוֹ הַיִּרְשָׁה וְתוֹרָה וְתוֹרָה וְתוֹרָה וְתוֹרָה וְתוֹרָה וְתוֹרָה וְתוֹרָה וְתוֹרָה וְתוֹרָה וְתוֹרָה וְתוֹרָה וְתוֹרָה וְתוֹרָה וְתוֹרָה וְתוֹרָה וְתוֹרָה וְתוֹרָה וְתוֹרָה וְתוֹרָה וְתוֹרָ�ה וְתוֹרָה וְプログラム וְプログラム וְ.getOrElseי וְ.getOrElseי וְgetOrElseי וְgetOrElseי וְ.getOrElseי וְgetOrElseי וְgetOrElseי VIM MI IV I1D*). 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 (לֵאמֶר 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 נמשלל of the Serekh is a mediator patterned on Moses.  

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” (ננה פעם ווחרץ لمורא), based on the quotation of Isa 40:3 in 1QS VIII, 14, is a time when the משלל of 1QS IX, 12 is “to teach everything that has been found” (רחלספיכים וכל הנמצא). 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” (נול הנביאים ברוח קדושה). There is a clear connection between the משלל’s instruction, preparing a way to the wilderness, and revelation given through the prophets. Surely the משלל’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 משלל 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 נשמשל.

2.5. נשמשל

There are thirteen occurrences of the root נשמשל in 4Q381, of which several have been dealt with. 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 (יווובותע), is second only to God in their estimation (J.W. 2.8.9)? Patterning the role of the נשמשל on that of Moses could have been a means of expressing their regard for the lawgiver, whose pattern of instruction was normative.


155 4Q381 15 8, 45a + b 1, 47 3, 76-77 8 have been discussed in §2.1. 4Q381 69 4, 69 5sup have been discussed in §2.4.
In 4Q381 24a + b 11, both the Hiphil form נָשָׁללֶנ (nasal) and the noun נָשָׂא (nasal) appear. The context is unfortunately fragmentary. What remains reads נָשָׁלכֵל וָנָשָׂא. The wider context is a psalm attributed to “the man of God,” but it is unclear to whom this refers. It seems to be a 3rd masc. sing. perfect Hiphil, “he instructed.” God appears to be the subject of נָשָׁלכֵל, “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 נָשָׂא. It is possible that נָשָׂא is a Hiphil infinitive absolute followed by an imperfect. It is also possible that the preformative נ of נָשָׂא is an example of orthographic confusion, and that we should read נָשָׁלכֵל. “I will instruct.”

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

---

156 On the phrase נָשָׁלכֵל נָשָׂא, 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 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. נָשָׂא (Isa 5:19); נָשָׂא נָשָׁל (Ezek 23:16[Qt], 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 imperf. of נָשָׁל with afformative נָשָׂא 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 נָשָׂא + נָשָׁל is used to refer to God revealing to David that he would build a house for him. This idiom occurs in IQHa XXV TOP, 10 in parallel with the נָשָׂא Hiphil (IQHa XXV TOP, 9 [reconstructed]) and the נָשָׁל Hiphil (IQHa XXV TOP, 11). God is the subject in each case.
him. Furthermore, the Hiphils of ד"ע and ד"ע in 1QHa XV, 26, God being the subject of both, are followed by ד"ע in line 28. Perhaps 4Q381-44 reflects a common literary connection between affirmations of God as revealer and affirmations of his uniqueness.

The Hiphil infinitive construct לָדוֹמֵּת occurs in 4Q381-69:7:

לָדוֹמֵּת לְךָּוֹיִם אֶל הָרוֹמְדוֹת לְךָּ, "to consider among yourselves, if you will be his." In the Qumran scrolls, ד"ע often precedes the thing taught. In IQS IX, 18 we read לָדוֹמֵּת לְךָּוֹיִם, "to instruct them in the wondrous mysteries." In 4QSb XVIII, 3 and 4QSd VIII, 4 we read לָדוֹמֵּת, "by instructing them in all that has been found." In IQS XI, 1 we read לָדוֹמֵּת לְךָּוֹיִם, "to instruct those who complain in learning." In these cases, the Hiphil is causative. The construction בּ + לָדוֹמֵּת may also mean "to consider/ponder." In Dan 9:13, for example, לָדוֹמֵּת לְךָּוֹיִם means "to consider your truth." In Ps 101:2 we read לָדוֹמֵּת לְךָּוֹיִם, "I shall consider the way of those who are perfect." Of the two options for translating בּ + לָדוֹמֵּת, neither seems particularly appropriate. If God is the subject, we should translate "to consider you." If not, we should perhaps follow

165 The ד"ע Hiphil is parallel with לָדוֹמֵּת Hiphil in 1QHa XV, 26; XVIII, 4-5; XIX, 4, 9-10; XXVIII, 9-11. In each case, God is the subject of both verbs. See also 11QPsa XVIII, 4-5 (Ps 154:7 [Syr.]), though here God is not the subject.

166 Compare לָדוֹמֵּת in line 32.

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

168 Par. 4QSb XVIII, 1-2 (reconstructed); 4QSd VIII, 3; 4QSe 111,17 (reconstructed).

169 Compare 1QHa XV, 26-27: "You have instructed me in your truth, and made known to me your wondrous mysteries." If the לָדוֹמֵּת of IQS IX, 12-20 (par.) is to be compared with the לָדוֹמֵּת of 1QHa XX, 11 (par. 4QHb 2 + 3 II, 12), and if מַכְשִׁית is speaking in 1QHa XV, 26-27, then the role of מַכְשִׁית is to be understood as mediatorial. God teaches the מַכְשִׁית, which belongs with him in the heavens (cf. 1QHa XIX, 27-28; par. 4QHb 8 I, 4-5 [reconstructed]), and the מַכְשִׁית passes it on to others.


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

172 Thorion, "Use," 418. See also 1QSa I, 7; 1QHa XV, 26-27; XVIII, 4; XIX, 4, 10.

173 Schuller, Non-Canonical Psalms, 207.

174 See also 1QS XI, 18-19 (par. 4QSe 6). 1QHa 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 (Non- Canonical Psalms, 207), but according to our argument above the Hiphil in this text is causative.

175 Cf. line 5\

Schuller's suggestion and take ב to mean "among," translating "to consider among yourselves." 176 The two other occurrences of חָכָם Hiphil in this fragment are causative, but the fact that ב 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 חָכָם 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 5sup, in which the hearers are taught (חָכָם Hiphil). חָכָם Hiphil is fundamental to the literary presentation of God's relationship with his people in this text.

חָכָם Hiphil occurs in two further fragmentary texts, 4Q381 79 5; 80 1. 4Q381 79 5 reads חָכָם, "errors to instruct," and 4Q381 80 1 reads חָכָם אֲלֵּי, "to give instruction to." In the latter, חָכָם is the Hiphil infinitive construct from which the preformative ב has been omitted, presumably by mistake.

חָכָם 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 חָכָם Hiphil, חָכָם Hiphil, and חָכָם Piel. Both God and humans may be the subject. Its sense may be intransitive or causative. However, two things are clear. First, חָכָם 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 חָכָם 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 לומד, יהוד, והב, and נهى, 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 מַעָלֶהַ 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, was only published officially in 1999. Part of one copy of this text was found in cave 1 and edited by Józef Milik. 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.\footnote{180} Fragments of six further manuscripts were found in cave 4.\footnote{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,\footnote{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.\footnote{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 (1IQPs\footnote{184} XXVII, 2-11) in a category loosely entitled “[a]ndere Weisheitsschriften belehrender Art.” Küchler did not have access to the fragments themselves, merely referring to Strugnell’s summary.\footnote{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).

\cite{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\footnote{182} (4Q415), 4QInstruction\footnote{183} (4Q416), 4QInstruction\footnote{184} (4Q417), 4QInstruction\footnote{185} (4Q418), 4QInstruction\footnote{186} (4Q418a), and 4QInstruction\footnote{187} (4Q423).

\cite{180} 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. In the last decade, however, a number of important articles on 4QInstruction have been published, notably by Daniel Harrington, John Strugnell, Armin Lange, and Torleif Elgvin. 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 מז, מז, מז, מז, מז all appear in 4QInstruction. 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: מז and מז. Derived from מז and מז, 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.


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


196 That is, if occurrences of the same phrase in parallel manuscripts are not counted separately. The four occurrences are: (1) 4QInstructionb 2 11,15 (reconstructed); par. 4QInstructionc 2 11,19 (reconstructed); 4QInstructiond 21 2 (= 8 15); 4QInstructionc 19 2 (reconstructed); (2) 4QInstructiond 81 + 81 a 17; (3) 4QInstructiond 81 + 81 a 17; (4) 4QInstructiond 238 1.

197 Par. 4QInstructionb 2 11,15; 4QInstructionc 2 11,19.

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)?


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

201 Strugnell, et al., *Qumran Cave 4 XXIV*, 168, on 4QInstructionc 1 I, 25. Armin Lange translates מֶשֶל “Unterweiser” at this point (*Weisheit*, 53; cf. his translation of מֶשֶל in 1QS III, 13: *Weisheit*, 137), and reads מֶשֶל rather than מֶשֶל (*Weisheit*, 51; cf. Caquot, “Textes,” 18). Lange sees 4QInstructionc 1 I, 25 (his 4Q417 2 I, 25) as a reference to the meaning “instructor” for מֶשֶל outside the Yahad (*Weisheit*, 144 n. 99). Lange therefore offers a completely different understanding of this passage to the editors. For Lange, מֶשֶל is the subject of מֶשֶל, making the verb 3rd. masc. sing. Perfect: “for the instructor has
refers to the same “office” or function as מַמְשָׁכִיל. They are right to note that 4QInstruction knows two different senses of מַמְשָׁכִיל, “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), מַמְשָׁכִיל occurs only in the sense of ‘instructor’ (so in Biblical Hebrew but rarely).” \(^{204}\) This confusion surrounding the interpretation of מַמְשָׁכִיל in 4QInstruction needs to be clarified. 4QInstruction\(^d\) 238 1 is too fragmentary to permit meaningful discussion. However, the other three occurrences of מַמְשָׁכִיל in 4QInstruction deserve comment. This term occurs in the phrase מַמְשָׁכִיל, probably in the phrase מַמְשָׁכִיל and with the object suffix מַמְשָׁכִיל.

3.1.1. מַמְשָׁכִיל

The phrase מַמְשָׁכִיל, “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 מַמְשָׁכִיל remains) and 4QInstruction\(^c\) 2 II + 23 19 (in which only מַמְשָׁכִיל remains). The restored phrase reads מַמְשָׁכִיל, “[and you], be like a wise servant to him.” \(^{206}\)

\[ \text{acquired insight into your secrets} \] (Weisheit, 53). For the editors, the מַמְשָׁכִיל is the addressee and therefore the subject of מַמְשָׁכִיל, 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 מַמְשָׁכִיל יָודְעָה יָדְעֵךְ נְתָנָהוּ. The verb is not third person plural and it would be odd to translate מַמְשָׁכִיל adverbially.

\(^{202}\) 4QInstruction\(^d\) 21 2 par.

\(^{203}\) 4QInstruction\(^d\) 81 + 81a 17. This meaning is confirmed by the object suffix מַמְשָׁכִיל. 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 מַמְשָׁכִיל, “[Then you would be his servant in all things(?)” (“Analysis,” 210, 212).
Who is the 3rd masc. sing. referent? In 4QInstructionb 2 II, 1-2 God appears to be the subject of הַשְׁמָעַת and כְּרוּם in light of Ps 111:5. In 4QInstructionc 2 II, 3, the phrase לֹא חָמַת מְרַחֲקָה לְלֹא חָמָת, "to give food to every living creature" recalls Ps 111:5, where YHWH "has given food to those who fear him." In Ps 111:4, YHWH is described as gracious and merciful, anticipating the idea of God releasing his mercies in 4QInstructionb 2 II, 1. God provides for every living creature and "if he shuts his hand, the spirit of all flesh will be gathered" (מַעָלָן דַּעַן וּכְרַעֲנֵהוּ דַּעַן בָּאַל). The combination מַעָלָן + דַּעַן 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 4QInstructionb 2 II, 1-3 in the same way the poor brother is related to the addressee in Deut 15:1-11. Interestingly, מַעָלָן occurs 6 times in Deut 15:1-11 and at least 3 times in reference to the addressee in 4QInstruction. 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 145:9 confirming that God is the 3 masc. sing. referent at this point.

In 4QInstructionb 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. 4QInstructionc 2 II, 2-4; 4QInstructiond 7b 14-8a 1. Although 1 and כְּרוּם may frequently be confused in 4QInstructiond (Strugnell et al., Qumran Cave 4 XXIV, 215), it is not impossible that the Hiphil כְּרוּם rather than the Qal כְּרוּם should be read in 4QInstructiond 8a 1. However, this would require a meaning "cause to close" for כְּרוּם 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: מָוֵת מַעָלָן) is said to have given food to her household (מַעָלָן נֹמַץ). 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 מַעָלָן refers to the addressee at this point.

213 Ps 145:15 (MT) יָדַע יָדַע לָא בָּאַל לָא דַּעַן לָא בָּאַל הַשְּׁמָעַת נַפְשֵׁי בָּאַל וּכְרַעֲנֵהוּ בָּאַל תָּבְא לָא בָּאַל. The phrase מַעָלָן דַּעַן in Ps 145:21 recalls 4QInstructionb 2 II, 2-3 (reconstructed).
referent now being human rather than divine. If so, \textit{IDVM} is a command to relate to a human superior as a wise servant should. This places 4QInstruction\textsuperscript{b} II, 15 in the context of other occurrences of \textit{IDVM} in the Hebrew wisdom corpus. Prov 14:35 reads \begin{quote}
"a king's favour is towards a wise servant," \end{quote} and Prov 17:2 reads \begin{quote}
"a wise servant rules over a son who brings shame and divides (his) inheritance among (his) brothers." \end{quote} Sir 7:21 is apparently addressed to a superior, ms A reading \begin{quote}
"love a wise servant as (your) life; do not withhold his freedom from him." \end{quote} The text of Sir 10:25 is more complex. Ms A reads \begin{quote}
"a wise servant will be exalted,"\end{quote} whereas ms B reads \begin{quote}
"nobles will serve a wise servant."\end{quote} The paradox of a wise servant being exalted or being served emphasises even more the idea that \textit{IDVM} 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 \textit{IDVM} 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 \textit{IDVM} is often taken in the sense “behold, my servant shall prosper.”\textsuperscript{218} R. Norman Whybray admits that the normal meaning of \textit{IDVM} 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.”\textsuperscript{219} However, it is the sapiential nuance which struck the LXX translator: \begin{quote}
"see, my servant shall understand." \end{quote} Importantly, H. L. Ginsberg has suggested that the author of Dan 11-12 identified the suffering

\textsuperscript{214} and \textit{IDVM} are polar opposites in Prov 14:35; 17:2.
\textsuperscript{215} Genizah ms B: \textit{IDVM}.
\textsuperscript{216} \textit{IDVM} 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.
\textsuperscript{217} Cf. LXX: \textit{οἱ ἄπαχοι τῆς ἀνθρώπου μετατρέπουσιν}, “freedmen will serve a wise servant.”
\textsuperscript{218} Cf. NJB; NRSV.
\textsuperscript{220} Or “son, child.” For the meaning “slave, servant” for \textit{παῖς}, see \textit{παῖς} III (LSJ 1289).
servant of Isa 52:13-53:12 with a group of his own day known as נֵבֶרּ הַמַּשָּׁכְלָה. 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 נֵבֶרּ הַמַּשָּׁכְלָה in the wisdom corpus, but may not be directly relevant to 4QInstruction.

One NT reference should be mentioned. In Matt 24:45 (par. Luke 12:42), Jesus begins the parable about the “faithful and wise servant” (ὁ πιστὸς δοῦλος καὶ φρονίμος). Jesus’ addressees are intended to be or become wise and faithful servants. The similarity with 4QInstruction is surprisingly close: in the Qumran text, an instructor exhorts his pupil (נֵבֶרּ הַמַּשָּׁכְלָה) 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 נֵבֶרּ הַמַּשָּׁכְלָה 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.

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 נֵבֶרּ הַמַּשָּׁכְלָה. However, it seems clear that נֵבֶרּ הַמַּשָּׁכְלָה here does not refer to an instructor. Rather, נֵבֶרּ הַמַּשָּׁכְלָה 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.

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 נבֶרּ הַמַּשָּׁכְלָה Hiphil is connected with the “time to prepare the way to the wilderness” in IQS 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.
In 4QInstructionc 1 I. 25, the phrase כְּמַשָּׂאֵלָל, “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 כְּמַשָּׂאֵלָל, which would change the sense of this passage entirely. Both possibilities will be discussed.

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

מי מַשָּׂאֵלָל, 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 מי מַשָּׂאֵלָל. It is just possible to read מי מַשָּׂאֵלָל, “you, understanding one” in line 1. The reading מי מַשָּׂאֵלָל is more likely in lines 13-14 and the reading מי מַשָּׂאֵלָל, “and you, understanding one, contemplate the mystery that is to be” is certain in line 18. מי מַשָּׂאֵלָל is analogous to מי מַשָּׂאֵלָל in line 18. The Hiphil participles of these two roots occur in parallel in Dan 1:4, increasing the likelihood that the two phrases are synonymous here. If so, then מי מַשָּׂאֵלָל should be reconstructed at the end of line 24. Reading מי מַשָּׂאֵלָל would make the addressee the subject of the Hithpolel imperative מי מַשָּׂאֵלָל, 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.”

---

226 See above, n. 201.
227 The editors suggest that ככ or ככ could be read here (Strugnell et al., *Qumran Cave 4 XXIV*, 168). ככ 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 מי י снова את המקぺל, “those who have insight into all wisdom” and מי י снова את המקぺל, “those who understand knowledge.”
It is not impossible that רֵאֵב (יִשְׂחָכֵיל) is a construct chain: "son of a sage." This is possible since David is twice described as יִשְׂחָכֵיל in the MT. Further, in the superscription יִשְׂחָכֵיל to Ps 32 יָאִים יִשְׂחָכֵיל could be understood as in apposition: "of David, (who is) a sage." רֵאֵב יִשְׂחָכֵיל in 4QInstruction י I, 25 could also be a construct chain, an understanding favoured by Edward Cook. רֵאֵב יִשְׂחָכֵיל in 4QInstruction י I, 18 could also be a construct chain, which would mean that both יִשְׂחָכֵיל and רֵאֵב are synonyms indicating a teacher. This usage for יִשְׂחָכֵיל is familiar at Qumran, and may be attested elsewhere for יִשְׂחָכֵיל. However, given the use of יִשְׂחָכֵיל in the MT to mean "wise son," and given the use of the analogous phrase יִשְׂחָכֵיל in 4QInstruction י I, 18, 25. The use of יִשְׂחָכֵיל for Solomon in Sir 47:12 may suggest that in 4QInstruction י I, 25 the wisdom of the יִשְׂחָכֵיל is modelled on that of Solomon. This recalls Elgvin's suggestion that in 4QInstruction י 81 + 81a we encounter a radical reinterpretation of the Solomon tradition, and that the Solomon tradition generally influenced the thought of 4QInstruction. Elgvin compares the language of 4QInstruction י 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: הדָּס lines 2, 3, 18 (4QInstruction י 43,44,45 I, 14 [reconstructed]); רָדָר (sic) line 6; שָׂרָר line 12; דָּתָר line 12; אֶל רְהָנִים line 18; רָדָר 4QInstruction י 43,44,45 I, 4.


233 The phrases in Sir 47:12; 1 Kgs 5:21 are different in both Hebrew and Greek. The LXX reads υἱὸν φρονίμου in 1 Kgs 5:21 and υἱὸν θεοστρατου in Sir 47:12.

234 1 Sam 18:14, 15.

235 See also 11QPs י יג-יג, 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 מָכָר 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).

suggesting that this indicates that the wisdom God gave to Solomon is now given to the elect in the community of the eternal planting. This connects with the idea that wisdom belongs in heaven and is transmitted to humans. That Solomon possessed God’s wisdom 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”. Thus Hebrew texts referring to Solomon’s wisdom helped to shape the ideas found in 4QInstruction. Like Solomon, the has been given wisdom from God. Like Solomon, he is called יאשכ. It is not certain that the author of 4QInstruction was consciously alluding to Sir 47:12 in 4QInstruction but the phrase יאשכ 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 יאשכ 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) יאשכ יאשכ יאשכ יאשכ (1 Kgs 3:6) and יאשכ יאשכ יאשכ יאשכ (1 Kgs 3:9; cf. 2 Sam 14:17) and יאשכ יאשכ יאשכ יאשכ (4QInstructiond 221 5); (2) יאשכ יאשכ יאשכ יאשכ (1 Kgs 3:9) and יאשכ יאשכ יאשכ יאשכ (4QInstructiond 81 + 81a 8); (3) יאשכ יאשכ יאשכ יאשכ (1 Kgs 3:9) and יאשכ יאשכ יאשכ יאשכ (4QInstructiond 221 5); par. 4QInstructionb 1; (4) יאשכ יאשכ יאשכ יאשכ (1 Kgs 3:9; cf. 2 Sam 14:17) and יאשכ יאשכ יאשכ יאשכ (4QInstructiond 81 + 81a 7); (5) יאשכ יאשכ יאשכ יאשכ (1 Kgs 3:12) and יאשכ יאשכ יאשכ יאשכ (4QInstructiond 81 + 81a 6); (6) יאשכ יאשכ יאשכ יאשכ (4QInstructiond 81 + 81a 20); (7) יאשכ יאשכ יאשכ יאשכ (4QInstructiond 81 + 81a 5). 241 For the phrase “eternal planting” מְלַכְתּה לֶבַחְלָה in 4QInstruction, see 4QInstructiond 81 + 81a 13.

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

243 E.g. 4QInstructiond 81 + 81a 9: “and you, he has [opened] 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 ἐμαθὼν ἀφθόνως τε μεταδίδωμι, τὸν πλοῦτον αὐτῆς οὐκ ἀποκρύπτομαι, “I learnt without guile, I transmit without envy: I do not hide her riches.” This text does not illuminate 4QInstruction, however.

We turn our attention now to 4QInstructiond 81 + 81a 17, where the term_meshālēh_ is used in a manner which significantly illuminates our understanding of transmission in this work.

4QInstructiond 81 + 81a 17 reads γινόμενον καθ' ἑαυτόν κόλας μεταδίδεις τὸ σημείον τῆς κλήσεως, “seek understanding diligently, and from the hand of all who give you instruction increase learning.” The

2nd masc. sing. imperative Hithpolel of ἴματον occurs several times in this work. It is followed three times by a form of ἴματον, exceedingly, probably how ἴματον is to be understood here.

Meshālēh is to be understood as either a participle (“who instructs you”) or a noun (“your instructor”), with either a 2nd masc. sing. pronominal suffix or a 2nd masc. sing. verbal (object)
suffix. The 2nd masc. sing. imperative Hiphil form רָאָה (רָאוּיתָה), meaning “increase,” is frequently followed by an infinitive with the sense of continuing to do something, perhaps suggesting that we should restore יָלֵךְ, “(continue) to receive,” though the verb יָלֵךְ does not occur in this construction elsewhere. However, the construction וַיִּתְנֶה + רָאָה (“to increase instruction”) occurs in several sapiential texts, and the editors are probably correct to understand יָלֵךְ in that sense here.

This line contains the most explicit hint of a Sitz im Leben for 4QInstruction. Two complementary social roles are referred to, מַעֲלֵיה and מַעֲלִים. The addressee is called מַעֲלֵי 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 מַעֲלֵי 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 מַעֲלֵי is wise and in a position to instruct on account of his wisdom. The הָלָכַם is in need of instruction.

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

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

253 The section in which 4QInstructiond 81 + 81a 17 occurs begins with an address to the מַעֲלֵי in line 15.

254 Jolton §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 Maskil’s Address to All Sons of Dawn,” JQR 85 [1994]: 229-230; DCH 4:575; Garcia Martínez and Tigchelaar, DSSSE 2:656); 4Q436 1 1, 2 (4QBarki Nafshi). David Rolph Seely prefers to see 4QBarki Nafshi as a “sectarian text with wisdom elements” rather than a sapiential text per se (“The Barki 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 יָלֵךְ מַעֲלֵי occurs in collocation with the phrase שְׁנֵי מַעֲלִים and in Prov 16:23 the same phrase occurs in collocation with עַל מַעֲלִים. This is to be compared with עַל מַעֲלִים in 4QInstructiond 81 + 81a 20. Interestingly, the vocabulary of 4QInstructiond 81 + 81a is intended to recall these admonitions from Proverbs. Elgvin also cites Sir 8:8 (“Analysis,” 274), where יָלֵךְ is the object of לִמּוֹד (Qal).

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

257 Elgvin does not explore this possibility, but believes that רָאָה מַעֲלֵי 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 שבל 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 אָנוּ חַכָּם הַגָּדוֹל וְאִשָּׁתִי, “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: יָאָמֶר אֵלַי מִלָּה וְזָכֶרָה יְשׁוּפָי, “I came forth to bring wisdom to you.” In Neh 9:20 God has given his spirit to instruct his people in the wilderness: וְרָצוּת הָאָiareָה נִתֶּנָה לְךָ, “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 שבל Hiphil with a verbal (object) suffix.\(^{259}\) In 1QS IX, 18\(^{260}\) the משבילי, who is “to learn all the wisdom found in accordance with the times” (לְמָלֵא אַל כָּל הָשָׁלム המִצְנָה לֵפָי הָעָתִים),\(^{261}\) and part of whose role is to bring each man near according to his wisdom (לְמָלוֹק שֶבֶל וְלְחָי מָשְׁלֶיהָ),\(^{262}\) is to instruct the chosen of the way in the mysteries of wonder and truth (לְהַשְׁכִּילֵם בַּרְיֵי פָּלָם וְאָמוֹת). In 1QS IX, 20\(^{263}\) he is “to teach them everything that has been found” (לְהַשְׁכִּילֵם כָּל הָנְמוֹצָה). 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” (כִּבְחֵרֵיה [לִלְו] מֵאָדוֹר הָסֶפַר הָיִתְו הֵמֶּשׁוֹף וְיִמְּשֶׁרֶת).\(^{266}\) In 11QMelch II, 20 the eschatological prophet is the one who instructs: “to [in]struct them in all the ages of the world”\(^{267}\) (לְלָשְׁכִּילוּם בָּאוֹל כִּיַּמָּה [לֵשֶׁם] מְשַׁלְּכָם בָּאוֹל כִּיַּמָּה [לֵשֶׁם].)

\(^{258}\) This appears to be the only occurrence in Classical Hebrew of the Hiphil participle of שבל with a verbal (object) suffix.

\(^{259}\) 4Q381 1S 8 has already been discussed (§2.1 above).

\(^{260}\) Par. 4QSb XVIII, 1-2 (reconstructed); 4QSd VIII, 3; 4QS\(s\) III, 17 (reconstructed).

\(^{261}\) 1QS IX, 13; par. 4QS\(s\) III, 9 (reconstructed).

\(^{262}\) 1QS IX, 15-16; par. 4QS\(s\) VIII, 1; 4QS\(s\) III, 12-13 (reconstructed).

\(^{263}\) Par. 4QSb XVIII, 3; 4QS\(s\) VIII, 4; 4QS\(s\) III, 19-4:1 (reconstructed).

\(^{264}\) 1QSa I, 2: בְּנֵי זָרָּה הָבָרָד הַבֶּלֶת מֵאָדוֹר בְּרִיתוֹ (line 5).

\(^{265}\) Cf. 1QSa I, 6-7 (reconstructed).

\(^{266}\) Note that Hiphil and לֹבָדָכֶם Piel are parallel here. See also לֹבָדָכֶם (line 5).

\(^{267}\) Translation: Garcfa Martínez and Tigchelaar, DSSSE 2:1209.
In 1QHa XV, 26, the hymnist, who elsewhere identifies himself as 'משכיל' (משכיל כעמתך), proclaims "You (viz. God) have instructed me in your truth" (משכיל כעמתך). In 1QHa XVIII, 4, the hymnist proclaims that God has taught man "wonders like these" (משכיל כעמתך), and in line 7 he asks God the rhetorical question: "How shall I answer unless you instruct me?" (משכיל כעמתך). In 1QHa 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" (ורשקו שלום זה רצונך כי חזרתם כעמתך והנאתו ו🧵 אධידיה וThreads השכלתם). This appears to refer to God instructing a group of his elect (כעמתך). An important text is 1QHa XX, 33, which evidences a similar process to that found in 4QInstructiond 81 + 81a: "and how shall I understand unless you (viz. God) teach me?" The hymnist's ability to understand (משכיל) is preceded by instruction from God (משכיל כעמתך). 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 'משכיל' (non-causative Hiphil) and the instructor termed 'משכיל' (causative Hiphil). In the Hodayot, the hymnist himself is a 'משכיל'.

In summary, where 'משכיל' 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 4QInstructiond 81 + 81a 17 with a human subject.
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.)\textsuperscript{272} and 1QSa constitute the closest parallels to 4QInstruction\textsuperscript{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 יִֽהְמָרְטַנֶּל 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 יִֽהְמָרְטַנֶּל, which recalls Prov 10:5; Sir 47:12, and suggests that the addressee is to some extent modelled on Solomon. מָשְכִּילִּוה in 4QInstruction\textsuperscript{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. יִֽהְמָרְט in 4QInstruction

Having clarified the role of the מָשְכִּיל in 4QInstruction, it is now necessary to clarify the role of the יִֽהְמָרְט. The addressee in 4QInstruction is generally called יִֽהְמָרְט, though in 4QInstruction\textsuperscript{e} 1 II, 10 יִֽהְמָרְט probably refers to God.\textsuperscript{273} Three basic categories of usage for יִֽהְמָרְט may be discerned:

\textsuperscript{272} Cf. the title of this section: יִֽהְמָרְט לְמָשְכִּיל (1QS IX, 12).

\textsuperscript{273} Cf. Strugnell et al., Qumran Cave 4 XXIV, 170, 171. God (דָּאָל) is mentioned in line 9. The phrase יִֽהְמָרְט 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 יִֽהְמָרְט Hiphil has a causative sense. See Sir 6:37,
1. The title מבל is the title of the addressee in the phrase מבל, “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 מבל 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 4QInstructionb 43 (ומתא מבל שמהת נותא אמה, “and you, understanding one, rejoice in the inheritance of truth”), מבל is the addressee’s title and is followed by an imperative, as often in 4QInstruction. A recipient of instruction is מבל. In 4QInstructionc 1 I, 1 the reading מבל 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. 4QInstructionc 1 I, 13-14 is similarly problematic. Does מבל mean “and you, understanding one, inherit your reward” or, reading כ for מ, “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 מבל to follow מבל.280 This

where God causes the mind of the one being instructed to understand: מיבל לבר, “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.


277 Caquot, “Textes,” 17.

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


280 Strugnell et al., *Qumran Cave 4 XXIV*, 161, 482. The order מבל, “you are understanding” occurs in 4QInstructione 7 2 (and possibly 7 3), where it is analogous to מבל, “you are poor” (4QInstructionb 2 II, 8 [par. 4QInstructiond 9,9a-c 6-7], 12 [par. 4QInstructiond 9,9a-c 13 (reconstructed)]). See also מבל, “do not say ‘I am poor’” (4QInstructiona 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 מַלְכִּי as a previously unattested imperative. However, a meaning where the מַלְכִּי is to inherit his reward would fit in well with the rest of 4QInstruction.

4QInstructionc 1 I, 18 also raises difficulties. Lange translates "[u]nd du, der du der Schüler eines Lehrers bist, betrachte das Geheimnis des Werdens." This translation understands בְּנֵי מַלְכִּי on analogy with the phrases בְּנֵי הַיָּדִים מַשָּׁלְכָה and בְּנֵי הַדִּקְנָיָאִים in the HB. For Lange, 4QInstructionc 1 I, 18 demonstrates that מַלְכִּי can indicate an office in this text, in this case a "teacher." According to Lange, מַלְכִּי in 4QInstruction indicates an institutionalised teacher or advisory figure, who is in charge of the capability to understand and teach revealed knowledge. This interpretation of מַלְכִּי is problematic. Given that בְּנֵי מַלְכִּי in line 25 is grammatically analogous, and that מַלְכִּי מַשָּׁלְכָה and מַלְכִּי הַדִּקְנָיָאִים 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 מַלְכִּי מַשָּׁלְכָה and מַלְכִּי הַדִּקְנָיָאִים. A similar situation obtains in Ps 72:1, where מַלְכִּי מַשָּׁלְכָה and מַלְכִּי הַדִּקְנָיָאִים are parallel. Perhaps royal descent is implied by מַלְכִּי מַשָּׁלְכָה, but on the level of the text they are synonymous.

4QInstructionc 1 I helps to expand our understanding of sapiential language in this work, since מַלְכִּי 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: מַלְכִּי Hiphil, "understand" (line 20 [reconstructed]); מַלְכִּי Hithpolel, "understand" (lines 12 and 25); מַלְכִּי Qal, "investigate" (line 6); מַלְכִּי Qal, "meditate" (line 6); מַלְכִּי Qal, "know" (lines 18 and 22); מַלְכִּי Niphal, "ponder" (lines 2,

4QInstructiond 9,9a-c 13), "you are poor" (4QInstructionb 2 III, 19), and מַלְכִּי Qal, "he is poor" (4QInstructiond 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: "מַלְכִּי bezeichnet somit in 4QSap A eine institutionalisierte Lehrer- bzw. Ratgeberpersönlichkeit, die über die Fähigkeit verfügt, offenbartes Wissen zu verstehen und zu lehren."
“IMV Piet, “seek diligently” (line 12); שבל, Hiphil, “understand” (line 2). The following occurs in the 2nd masc. sing. imperfect: ד-יומ, Qal, “know” (lines 6, 8 and 13). Within this group, ירות, לשכל, and לבן are already familiar.

The term מפקח appears again in 4QInstructiond 81 +81a 15: אנא המחט, “and you, who understands, if he has given you dominion over manual skill” (or less likely: “and you, understand whether he has given you dominion over manual skill”). The editors take ד-יומ to mean “artisanship,” because in Sir 9:17 מק helicopt refers to artisans. They thus read this text as referring to God elevating the sage above manual labour. The important point is that מפקח occurs in close proximity to מפקח: it is from them that the מפקח will increase understanding. He is to understand, being the subject of מפקח (line 17). God has “opened insight” for him (line 9: מפקח שלל הלוה). Thus the מפקח receives מפקח as a gift from God, is to seek understanding, and is to be instructed by those called מפקח. Insight belongs with God and is revealed by him to an instructor, called מפקח, who imparts teaching to a pupil, called מפקח.

In 4QInstructiond 123 II, 5 we read אנא המחט בもちים בכרול אלוה, “you, understanding one, when you ponder all these things.” The editors suggest this forms the conclusion to a paraenetic section. If so, מפקח refers to what precedes, and the infinitive construct Hiphil of מפקח refers to the action of the מפקח: he is to “ponder.” Second Timothy 2:7 offers an interesting parallel:

288 Cf. Caquot, “Textes;” Garcia 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). ד-יומ 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 ד-יומ, “by your manual skill” occurs in 4QInstructiond 81 + 81a 19, and the phrase מפקח 돌 המכתה יד-יומ, “by means of all your manual skill” in 4QInstructiond 102a + b 3. The latter follows the phrase מפקח מפקח, “[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. Noēi is comparable with μετέχεται because both refer to pondering what has been taught. Νοέω does not translate מַמְתָּסַה Hiphil in the LXX, but is does translate בָּנֹי Qal, Hiphil, and Hitpael, and שלח Hiphil.²⁹⁰ Given the breadth of sapiential vocabulary used in 4QInstruction it is not difficult to see νοέω and מַמְתָּסַה Hiphil as comparable.

2. Reference is made in both texts to what is taught: δ ἀγνω in 2 Tim 2:7, נְהַלָּל in 4QInstruction² 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 מַמְתָּסַה in 4QInstruction.

5. Both bear witness to a social relationship involving a teacher (Paul and the speaker in 4QInstruction, probably מַמְתָּסַה) and a pupil (Timothy and the מַמְתָּסַה).

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 4QInstruction² 158 4 מַמְתָּסַה presumably means "[you] understand your deeds," unless another verb of intellection followed מַמְתָּסַה. However, the frequency with which בָּנֹי Hiphil is followed by ב suggests the former.²⁹¹ Fragment 158 clearly reflects wisdom concerns, as מַמְתָּסַה (line 6) makes clear. In 4QInstruction² 168 4, it seems certain that מַמְתָּסַה should be read, but the context is fragmentary.²⁹² In 4QInstruction² 176 3 we encounter the peculiar phrase מַמְתָּסַה מִכְלָה מַבָּהֵמָת מֵהֶלֶבֶּחַ. Since no imperative is preserved it must be assumed that מַמְתָּסַה is either imperative 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 מַבָּהֵמָת in Isa 14:4.²⁹³

²⁹⁰ Hatch-Redpath 946a.
²⁹¹ Cf. Strugnell et al., Qumran Cave 4 XXIV, 381-382.
²⁹² 4QInstruction² 227 1; 273 1 are similarly fragmentary.
²⁹³ Strugnell et al., Qumran Cave 4 XXIV, 400.
In summary, מַבָּלִין in 4QInstruction is a *terminus technicus* for the recipient of instruction. Similarly, the *terminus technicus* for the instructor is מַבָּלִין 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 מַבָּלִין receives insight from God, which connects this text with 4Q380 and 4Q381. 4QInstruction implies a social context in which a מַבָּלִין instructs a מַבָּלִין in material previously revealed to the מַבָּלִין, 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. מַבָּלִין in 4QInstruction and related texts

The plural of מַבָּלִין also occurs in 4QInstruction, and must now be examined.

In reference to 4QInstruction, the editors note “[מַבָּלִין] may denote either a loose category or a group strictly defined sociologically,” and remark tentatively in reference to 4QInstruction that “the occurrences of מַבָּלִין in 4Q415ff. seem disproportionately frequent in comparison with those in the 1-11Q texts.” Elsewhere in the Qumran scrolls, the plural occurs in 1QHa 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” (משהילל, לשלבך, ואתברך אתא לברך מובלי). The hymnist elsewhere claims to be a מַבָּלִין (1QHa XX, 4 (reconstructed; par. 4QHa 2 + 3 II, 5), 11 (par. 4QHa 2 + 3 II, 12 [reconstructed]); XXVb 10). We have here, then, the idea of a מַבָּלִין imparting knowledge to a group of מַבָּלִין.

It may be suggested that behind the *Hodayot* and 4QInstruction there existed a social context in which מַבָּלִין, one of a class of מַבָּלִין, would instruct a מַבָּלִין, one of a group of מַבָּלִין.

---

294 4QInstruction 115; 4QInstruction 1 16 (par. 4QInstruction 2,2a-c 8); 4QInstruction 123 II, 4; 221

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

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

Another important, though fragmentary text is 4QMeditation on Creation A 1, which begins with the exhortation: "understanding ones, hear!" This recalls the following exhortations: CD I, I; 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 מִלּוּךְ.

In the HB מֶלֶכְים is unique to the post-exilic books. In 2 Chr 35:3 (Qr) we read about the Levites "who had understanding for all Israel, who were sacred to YHWH" מֶלֶכְים לְכָלִּים הָעֲשָׂרֵהַ לְיִהוֹวָה. Here those described as מֶלֶכְים 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. Thus not only would their understanding set them apart, but their role as teachers also. Joseph Blenkinsopp takes the Hiphil participle of מִלָּה in the Chronicler’s history to indicate a person with a special skill, and specifically someone who teaches others. This is his interpretation of מֶלֶכְים 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 מִלָּה Hiphil, though that is not the case in Neh 8:8: מִלָּה מֶלֶכְים, "and they understood the reading." A causative sense is less obvious in Neh 8:3, where מֶלֶכְים simply appears to mean "those who could understand (the law)." Finally, Daniel and his companions are מֶלֶכְים, "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 מֶלֶכְים 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: "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 Jotun, §125K. Cf. Japhet, I & II Chronicles, 1038: “And he said to the Levites who taught all Israel”; see also NRSV.

and his companions are in mind. It is also unclear whether מְפִּל in the Qumran scrolls is regularly causative. What is clear is that in the Qumran scrolls, a social setting is reflected whereby a מְשָׁכַל, a recipient of divine revelation and one of a class of מְשָׁכֲלִים מְפִּל or a group of מְפִּילים מְפִּל. 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 מְשָׁכַל in a chain of transmission. He gives instruction to a pupil, called מְפִּל. Behind the use of מְשָׁכַל 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 מְפִּל owes his designation to his membership of a group called מְשָׁכֲלִים מְפִּיל which 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 מְשָׁכַל passed on revealed insight to a מְפִּל, 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. ב' 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 מְשָׁכַל's act of instruction: he is to transmit insight, which he has received from God, to others in the community. In 1QS XI, 19 שבלי Hiphil is not causative and does not illuminate the question of transmission directly. In this section, then, we shall focus on texts which include ב'.

4.1.1. 1QS III, 13

The Hiphil infinitive construct מְשָׁכַל, "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 מְשָׁכַל's role. It is parallel with the Piel infinitive construct מְשָׁכַל, "to teach." Since מְשָׁכַל is causative מְשָׁכַל is probably causative also. In 1QS IX, 13 the מְשָׁכַל is the subject of the Qal infinitive construct of תָּהַב, "to learn." The Qal (1QS IX, 13) and Piel (1QS III, 13) represent a process of learning and teaching: 1QS III, 13 presupposes that the מְשָׁכַל has previously acquired insight. The idea is that the מְשָׁכַל will learn all the insight תָּהַב 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 כל בָּנוּי אוֹר, "all sons of light." The parallelism of the two verbs, recalling Isa 40:14,304 suggests they are synonymous. The מְשָׁכַל is

302 See §3.1.3 above.
303 Cf. 4QpapS° 5.
304 Cf. 4QpapS° 5. Hiphil and Piel are synonymous here (cf. DCH 4:550). The other references listed in the Dictionary of Classical Hebrew for בָּנוּי מְשָׁכַל Piel are Qumran texts: 1QS III, 13; 1QSa I, 7; 4QS I, 5. The occurrence of מְשָׁכַל Hiphil in 1QSa I, 7, probably parallel with מְשָׁכַל Piel, confirms that in QH מְשָׁכַל Piel, מְשָׁכַל, and מְשָׁכַל Hiphil are synonymous. In 1QSa I, 7, Jacob Licht reads יִשֶּׁכַל (3rd masc. sing.) rather than יִשֶּׁכַל (3rd masc. pl.) to preserve the parallel with the reconstructed לָנוֹר 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.\(^\text{305}\) The מַשָּׁכִּיל is bound up with the ideas of acquiring and imparting
understanding. Eugene Roop suggests that the מַשָּׁכִּיל acquired his title because he possessed
"insight,"\(^\text{306}\) but the reason is slightly more complex. In 1QS IX, 13, 20 the title is justified because
the מַשָּׁכִּיל stands at the centre of a chain of transmission. He has learned מַשָּׁכִּיל, possibly through the
מַשָּׁכִּיל מְדִירָן והודוּ, process\(^\text{307}\) or directly from God (cf. 1QS IV, 22) and passed it on. The term מַשָּׁכִּיל contains the ideas both of receiving insight and of transmitting it to others. The term in 1QS III, 13
is more closely linked with מַשָּׁכִּיל in 1QS IX, 13 than with מַשָּׁכִּיל in 1QS IX, 12, since 1QS IX, 13
tells us that the מַשָּׁכִּיל is qualified to teach on the basis of the fact that he has first learned. The fact
that the מַשָּׁכִּיל has acquired insight qualifies him to transmit the doctrines of 1QS III, 13-IV, 26. All
three occurrences of מַשָּׁכִּיל are interconnected.\(^\text{308}\)

The מַשָּׁכִּיל 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 לַחֶסֶבָהָ לַחֶסֶבָה and מַשָּׁכִּיל מַשָּׁכִּיל are parallel. The subject of both is God
(1QS IV, 18, 20) though the spirit of truth (1QS IV, 21) may be his agent. מַשָּׁכִּיל is followed by two
objects: רַדְּנַה גְּלֶלַעֲלִית (“upright ones”) and יָדָא עַלְּהַרוּ (“knowledge of the Most High”). מַשָּׁכִּיל also has
two objects: דָּמִיר רוּדְּנ (“the perfect of way”) parallel with יָדָא עַלְּהַרוּ and יָדָא עַלְּהַרוּ (“the
wisdom of the sons of heaven”) parallel with דָּמִיר רוּדְּנ.
IQS IV, 22 demonstrates that the יבשאול כיון and יבשאול 참עך refer to activities which originate with God, which means that the יבשאול דוד in IQS III, 13, participates in the divine giving of insight. He is God’s human intermediary, transmitting insight originating with God. Since the יבשאול דוד is to learn insight in IQS IX, 13, IQS IV, 22 implicitly identifies the יבשאול דוד with those receiving insight. The יבשאול דוד is thus one of the יבשאול דוד and one of the יבשאול דוד and יבשאול דוד all refer to the same group. Within this group, the יבשאול דוד is the instrument of God’s activity. יבשאול דוד and יבשאול דוד link the wisdom and knowledge mentioned in this line with heavenly beings, placing the יבשאול דוד in a chain of revelation of heavenly wisdom.

This recalls the use of יבשאול דוד in Daniel. The angel Gabriel commands Daniel to understand in Dan 8:17 and Daniel is described as יבשאול דוד in Dan 1:4. He acquires יבשאול דוד from God in Dan 1:17. He is יבשאול דוד because he possesses insight (שכל) into heavenly secrets. The implication in Dan 11:33 is that the יבשאול דוד also have insight into heavenly secrets after the pattern of Daniel. This gives them authority to “give understanding to the many” (יְרֵאוֹן לַעֲרֵבִים). For Alfred Mertens, instruction is the particular function of the יבשאול דוד in Daniel and is a clear point of connection between them and the יבשאול דוד of the Serekh.309 If the Qumran יבשאול דוד also sought to follow the pattern of Daniel, identifying themselves with the יבשאול דוד 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.

IQS IV, 22 suggests that the יבשאול דוד 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 יבשאול דוד of Daniel and the יבשאול דוד 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).
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 ספקר, "one who is in charge" and the נשאכר in the Serekh. In 1QS VI, 14, the subject of יבגיהו, "he shall instruct him" is הדארו והספקר ברארה ורביה, "the one in charge at the head of the many." The object is_FINAL_ כל המוסתר פורחאל, "everyone from Israel who devotes himself" (1QS VI, 14). The ספקר has the same role as the נשאכר in 1QS III, 13: to instruct. The content of the instruction is כל המשכריiders, "all the rulings of the community," though whether these rulings are synonymous with המולodelist בול ביאים in 1QS IV, 22 or בראש יציאור in 1QS IV, 22 or בראש יציאור, "the generations of all the sons of man" is doubtful. It is more likely that כל המשכריiders refers to specific rulings of the community and המלודיסט בול ביאים refers only to the Teaching on the Two Spirits. ידית יציאור 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, 13 is linked with the נשאכר, since the Hithpael participle of נדבר appears in a נשאכר text, 4QSa 1,1 (par. 1QS V, 1). Further, the root שבר appears in both 1QS V, 1 and 1QS VI, 15. 4QSn IX and 4QSn are related to 1QS VI, 13b-16b, since they contain material addressed to the נשאכר. Given that the ספקר of 1QS VI, 14 and the נשאכר of 1QS III, 13 have basically the same role, we might suggest that a נשאכר is called ספקר in 1QS VI, 14. Perhaps the נשאכר would be one of a class of נשאכר taught in the community and now proficient to impart the teaching in a chain of transmission. Maybe, then, נשאכר in rubrics at Qumran should be pointed with ידית, "for a Maskil" rather than נשאכר, "for the Maskil."

---

311 Cf. 1QSa I, 7-8.
312 Par. 4QSn 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 בָּלָה Hiphil, is parallel to that in 1QS III, 13, suggesting that the one who instructs in 1QS VI, 15, the מְפַקֵּד, is an official in the community, one of a class of מַשָּׂכְלֵי, charged with the instruction of new members. This identification is supported by the fact that a text containing community rulings (4QSd) is addressed to (or designated as belonging to” or “for the use of”) a מַשָּׂכְלֵי. 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 תָּשָׁכֻּל belongs since בחיה Hithpolel occurs in parallel with two other roots. Corrado Martone sets out the text in poetic form, so that the parallelism between לַשָּׂכְל and לַשָּׂכְל, “to have insight,” לַזָּכִים, “to contemplate,” and לַזָּכָר, “to understand” becomes clear.315 He translates both תָּשָׁכֻּל and לַזָּכָר as "per comprendere."316 Although לַשָּׂכְל in 1QS IV, 22 should be understood as "to give insight," the same form occurs parallel with the intransitive Hithpolel of בָּל, meaning “to understand” in 1QS XI, 19. The בָּל 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)第三节 מַשָּׂכְל: “every holy design of yours”; (2) וַנְּפָרֵך, “the depth of your mysteries”; (3) וַנַּעֲמֶך, “all your wonders, with your mighty strength.” לַשָּׂכְל, מַשָּׂכְל, and בָּל 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 ( cloudy, divine mysteries ( cloudy), and displays of divine activity ( cloudy).  

315 Corrado Martone, La “Regola della Comunità”: Edizione critica (QdiH 8; Turin: Silvio Zamorani, 1995), 114.
COMI is itself an important sapiential root at Qumran, most occurrences being in the *Hodayot* and other sapiential texts, including 4QInstruction. 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. In the *Serekh*, COMI occurs in IQS III, 3, 7 (par. 4QpapSC III, 5, 10 [reconstructed]) and three times in the final hymn (IQS XI, 3, 6, 19). In IQS III, 7 contemplating the light of life results from the atonement of sin. Unatoned sins render contemplation impossible. This recalls IQS 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 IQS XI, 14-15 (cf. 1QHb XIX, 10). In IQS 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” (דאשא תיב ל"ר"א א"א), and he is proclaimed unclean (רמ"פ) in IQS III, 5. Whoever achieves a state which allows him to contemplate the light of life is pure, as confirmed by the repetition of COMI Hithpael in lines 4, 5, 7 and 8.

The thought of IQS III, 3, 7 is presupposed in IQS XI, 3, 6. A מ"כ is speaking, because the hymn is added to the *Statutes for a Maskil* (IQS IX, 12-21) and the phrase שלכ הנוס יתנ"ס "to teach murmurers instruction" recalls IQS IX, 18, 21 in its use of מ"כ Hiphil. The collocation of מ"כ Hiphil and מ"כ ל"ף links this text with 4QInstructiond 81 + 81a 17,
and may reinforce the connection between 4QInstruction and the Serekh, specifically the relationship between the וְשֵׁ֣רֵךְ and his subordinates. Contemplation is something the hymnist’s eyes (לֵינֵ֣י) 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 1 I. 320 parallelism implies יִתְנַה יְבֵן שָׁלֵל Hithpolel and שלל Hiphil (non-causative) are virtually synonymous with נֶבֶם 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, "נֵבֶם נַת" ThWAT 5:139. Line 3 reads מֶׁ֣מֶּר וְתִבְּרָ֣ה וְתָבְרָ֣ה הָֽעָרֶץ, "from the fountain of his knowledge he has opened his light." The phrase רַאוֹרָת לְבָנֵ֣י "the light of my heart" also appears. Mystery language is linked with contemplation here, as in line 19. The phrase וְרֹאָנְתָּ תָּעַרְּבָּר הָֽעָרֶץ recalls 4QInstruction, and mystery language also recalls Daniel and 1Q/4QMysteries. In line 5, מֶׁ֣מֶּר וְתִבְּרָ֣ה מֶׁ֣מֶּר הָֽעָרֶץ. "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 יִתְנַה עִלַּ֔יִם is the subject of הָֽעָרֶץ. יִתְנַה also links lines 4 and 6 (assuming -il“ הָֽעָרֶץ and הָֽעָרֶץ belong to the same root). The phrase which follows links the concept these phrases represent with hidden wisdom (רָוָּא תָּעַרְּבָּר נַתְּרָעָּרְבָּר), 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 (םֶׁ֣מֶּר הָֽעָרֶץ), this group are surely those called בָּרֵד וְרֹאָן in 1QS IX, 17, who again are to be instructed by a מֶׁ֣מֶּר הָֽעָרֶץ. In 1QS IX, 17 the מֶׁ֣מֶּר הָֽעָרֶץ are contrasted with בָּרֵד וְרֹאָן, “the men of injustice,” from whom 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 (משהכ) transmits teaching to a pupil (מnote). 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 (1QS III, 13; IX, 12, 18, 20, 21; XI, 1). The seems to be one of a class of model, perhaps either modelled on, or directly connected with the group of the same appellation in Daniel. Among this group was an official called ספך, whose role it was to instruct novices in “all the rulings of the community” (1QS VI, 15). Finally, the (משהכ) 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 . 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 ממשהכ.

4.2. מדרש למשהכ in 4QSb IX, 1 and 4Qsd I, 1

4QSb and 4Qsd have identical rubrics, which include the phrase מדרש למשהכ. Both date palaeographically to the period 30-1 B.C.E., and are assigned by Sarianna Metso to her recension B. is part of the opening rubric of 4Qsd, and even in 4QSb IX, 1 מדרש למשהכ is clearly a new departure. Roop regards rubrics in 1QS which include the phrase מדרש למשהכ (including 1QS I, 1) as the major structural seams in the document. 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 4Qsd, whereas at a later stage it was combined with the parallel to 1QS V-XI, as in 4QSb. However, it is also possible that 4QSb and 4Qsd 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 4QSb 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." 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."

In both 4QSb and 4Qsd the term מְשָׁכַל is undamaged, unlike 1QS I, 1, though לְמָשָׁכַל is commonly accepted as the correct reconstruction of 1QS I, 1. Thus 4QSb and 4Qsd are לְמָשָׁכַל texts, linked with a figure whose role in the transmission of wisdom has been discussed. Furthermore, there is a link between לְמָשָׁכַל and רְשֵׁי in 1QS VI, 14-15.

In 1QS VI both people and judgements are the focus of רְשֵׁי מְפִּיק. If the one who investigates, ומְשָׁכַל, since the ומְשָׁכַל is almost certainly a מְשָׁכַל. Finally, the phrase seems to indicate both the genre and the addressee of part of 4QSb and all of 4Qsd.

---

324 Roop, "Form-Critical Study," 313. Roop understands the לְמָשָׁכַל at the beginning of 1QS V, 1 as conjunctive, binding the rule (לְמָשָׁכַל) that follows to the preceding section, headed לְמָשָׁכַל (1QS III, 13). This is the case because 4QSb and 4Qsd are addressed to the לְמָשָׁכַל, 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 לְמָשָׁכַל 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 4QSb and 4Qsd 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 4QSb IX, 1 the text breaks off after לְמָשָׁכַל. The 4Qsd parallel is intact and was used by Metso to reconstruct the missing material from 4QSb (Textual Development, 27 n. 42).

327 A. R. C. Leaney, 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); Garcia Martinez and Tigchelaar, DSSSE 1:70. Licht suggests the restoration [רְשֵׁי מְפִּיק], "to [each person who devotes himself]" (CDSSE, 59), on account of the occurrence of רְשֵׁי מְפִּיק in 1QS I, 7 and מְפִּיקוֹנִים in 1QS V, 1. However, this ignores the Hiphil infinitive לְמָשָׁכַל 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" (אַלּוֹדֶךָ נַחֲרָה הָעָרָה אֲשֶׁר מִלְבֶּדֶךָ לְמָשָׁכַל). In light of 4Qsd I, 1 such a person would be a מְשָׁכַל. Licht's suggested reconstruction is thus not satisfactory. Lohse (Texte, 4) offers no reconstruction, and Moraldi's translation makes no reference to the לְמָשָׁכַל (I Manoscritti di Qumràn [2d ed.; Turin: Unione Tipografico-Editrice Torinense, 1986], 131).

328 See §4.1.3 above.
4QSd I, 1 reads: "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 תרומת, apparently a significant term in the scrolls, though it does not seem to be used elsewhere in the same sense.\(^3\) Johann Maier has studied this term at Qumran in detail.\(^3\) Maier is keen to distance both the verb דָּרָשׁ and the noun מְדִרשׁ in early Jewish literature from the idea of "study," familiar from rabbinic literature and retained by Lawrence Schiffman.\(^3\) To achieve an informed understanding, the term מְדִרשׁ and the root דָּרָשׁ in general at Qumran must be studied.

4.2.1. מְדִרשׁ in 1QS VI, 24\(^3\)

In 1QS VI, 24 we read: "and these are the rulings by which they shall legislate in the community midrash, according to the words." מְדִרשׁ modifies מַעַשְׂמוֹ, which is linked to the noun מְדִישׁ. It is unclear whether מְדִישׁ is nomen rectum in a construct chain ("a midrash of [the] community")\(^3\) or an adverb ("by which they shall judge together in a midrash"). Alexander and Vermes even note the possibility of taking מְדִישׁ as a compound noun ("at a midrash-yahad").\(^3\) The noun מַעַשְׂמוֹ seems to indicate the genre of the individual rulings which follow, which means that מְדִישׁ here indicates a context in which judgements or rulings would be made or discerned. The verb דָּרָשׁ does not occur again in 1QS VI, 24-VII, 25, though it is important earlier in 1QS VI. 1QS VI, 7 includes the phrase

---


331 Maier, "Early Jewish Biblical Interpretation," 113-114.


333 This text is not paralleled in 4QSd. The phrase מְדִישׁ appears to have been absent from 4QSd 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 1:85.

335 Alexander and Vermes, Qumran Cave 4 XIX, 178.
"to investigate judgment," one of the activities of the community during the night watch. Thus is something to be investigated, and the collected in 1QS VI, 24-VII, 25 are the result of a procedure known as . Thus designates a procedure rather than a genre here: 1QS VI, 24 may therefore be a reference back to the activity mentioned in 1QS VI, 7.

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

4.2.2. in 1QS VIII, 15, CD XX, 6, and 4QDe 7 II, 15

1QS VIII, 15, CD XX, 6, and 4QDe 7 II, 15 will be dealt with together since they all contain the phrase .

P. Wernberg-Moller 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. The construction


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

338 It is interesting to read the juxtaposition of in 1QS VI, 24 alongside b. Ketub. 49a: . Here, seems to have the connotations which has in 1QS VI, 24: . In b. Ketub. 49a is a ruling rather than the context in which that ruling should be made or discerned. It 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: , “This is a midrash which the high priest Jehoiada promulgated.” In this passage is parallel to the interpretation, meaning “general rule, principle” (Jastrow, 644).

339 Cf. CD VI, 14: . It is worth noting here the dispute recorded in b. Qidd. 49a between R. Meir and R. Judah concerning the definition of , and the subsequent definition given by R. Judah. R. Meir defined as , whereas R. Judah defined it as . R. Judah then defines as being the context in which rulings might be discovered to the ruling itself. Thus, as Jastrow notes (Jastrow, 735), is defined as not simply the Torah itself, but the traditions of its interpretation (i.e. ). M. Gertner sees the phrase (the notional plural equivalent would be more accurate) behind Claudius Lysias’ phrase (thus “interpretations of the law”) in Acts 23:29: “Terms of Scriptural Interpretation: A Study in Hebrew Semantics,” BSOAS 25 (1962):12-13.
 infinitive + מ"ל characterises the passages Roop terms “דאַת.” In particular, the infinitives מ"ל, מ"ד, and מ"ל are crucial to the texts which deal with the role of the מ"ל in the Serekh, the phrase מ"ל מ"ד מ"ל, “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 מ"ל ו"ד מ"ד, and we must begin with this definition.

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. It seems that this holds also for the Qumran evidence. Gertner also suggests that midrashic interpretation is meant in 1QS VIII, 15, though the evidence is not conclusive. It is not clear whether מ"ל מ"ד מ"ל מ"ד מ"d
rengs, it is not part of the phrase הָנִּימֶנָא. Although הָנִּימֶנָא in 1QS VIII, 15 seems to refer back to הָנִּימֶנָא, 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 הָנִּימֶנָא procedure. Furthermore, the הָנִּימֶנָא contained in lines 16b-19 also seems to result from this procedure. There is a clear verbal link with the preceding sentence, הָנִּימֶנָא referring back to הָנִּימֶנָא 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. The phrase מְדַעְשֵׁה, "and according to this judgement" (CD XX, 8) refers to what precedes as a מְדַעְשֵׁה, as in 1QS VIII, 19. Furthermore, in CD XX, 6-7 מְדַעְשֵׁה הָנִּימֶנָא is something "in which the men of perfect holiness will walk" (אֱמוּרֵי יְהוָה לְבִית יְהוָה). The phrase מְדַעְשֵׁה מְדַעְשֵׁה, "men of holiness" (1QS VIII, 17) and the phrase מְדַעְשֵׁה מְדַעְשֵׁה, "to walk in perfection of way" (1QS VIII, 18). It relates back to מְדַעְשֵׁה in CD XX, 5. This attribute of מְדַעְשֵׁה 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 מְדַעְשֵׁה in CD XX, 6 it might relate closely to the term מְדַעְשֵׁה in 4QSa IX, 1; 4QSa I, 1, in which מְדַעְשֵׁה points to the rulings for the life of the community found in Metso’s rec. B. In CD XX, 6 מְדַעְשֵׁה is something according

---

350 2 Chr 24:27: מְדַעְשֵׁה, "they are written on the midrash of the book of the kings." Apart from 2 Chr 13:22; 24:27, the noun מְדַעְשֵׁה does not occur in the HB. Gertner understands this term coined by the Chronicler, meaning "narrative" or "account" ("Terms," 10-11).
351 Cf. 1QS VI, 24. This מְדַעְשֵׁה is absent from 4QSa.
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.
355 Cf. CD VII, 4-5.
to which deeds would be made manifest.\textsuperscript{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.

4QDe 7 II, 15,\textsuperscript{357} though not paralleled in CD, is related to CD XX, 6. It reads “see, everything is written according to the latest\textsuperscript{358} midrash of [the] law” (הנה תובולו מ[ת公开发行] על מ[러]חרה [.destroyAllWindows]). Although מ[러]חרה may not itself refer to a written text, the text that precedes concerns מ[러]חרה. The unit, which serves as a summation of what precedes,\textsuperscript{359} begins after the vacat in line 12 with the phrase יד ה[ו]ו, “this is the exact interpretation of the rulings,” referring to the rulings which precede. The passage is an interpretation of מ[러]חרה, which derive from the מ[러]חרה procedure. This is supported by the point made by Joseph Baumgarten that in 4QDe 7 II, 15 the phrase מ[러]חרה is preceded by יד, meaning “in accordance with” or “as the result of.”\textsuperscript{360} Thus מ[러]חרה refers neither to a written text, nor to a procedure, but to the interpretation which results from the מ[러]חרה procedure.

Although none of these texts require מ[러]חרה to be taken as a reference to a written text, it is almost certain that in 2 Chr 13:22; 24:27; 4QS\textsuperscript{b} IX, 1; 4QS\textsuperscript{d} I, 1 we have evidence that the earliest attestations of the noun מ[러]חרה refer to written material.\textsuperscript{361} In 2 Chr 13:22; 24:27 מ[러]חרה confirms this. This is supported by the early versions. Second Chronicles 13:22 (LXX) reads γεγραμμένον ἐν βιβλίῳ τοῦ προφήτη του' Άδω, “written on the book of the prophet Ado (viz. Iddo),” and 2 Chr 24:27 (LXX) reads γεγραμμένα ἐν τῇ γραφῇ τῶν βασιλέων, “written on the writing of the kings.” Second Chronicles 13:22 (Tg. Ket.) translates literally: המ内马 בומראשתה ובייו עדרי, which

\textsuperscript{356} Cf. 1QpHab XI, 7.

\textsuperscript{357} Par. 4QDe\textsuperscript{a} 11 20-21.

\textsuperscript{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.


\textsuperscript{360} Par. 4QDa 11 18.


\textsuperscript{362} Cf. Maier’s category odd (“Early Jewish Biblical Interpretation,” 116); S. Wagner, מִדְרָשׁ, dârâsh; מִדְרָשׁ, midrâsh, TDOT 3:306.
In 1QS VIII, 15 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, מַסָּמֶרֶתָּה. 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. מַרְאֵה refers to a written document in 2 Chr 13:22; 24:27; 4Qṣb IX, I; 4Qṣd I, I.

4.2.3. מַרְאֵה in 1QS VIII, 26

1QS VIII, 26 is related to 1QS VIII, 15, though it is absent from 4Qṣe. There is a new departure at 1QS VIII, 20, the rubric מַרְאֵה הַמְּסָמֶרֶתָּה, “and these are the rulings” introducing the section which includes VIII, 26. In 1QS VIII, 20 מַרְאֵה is analogous to מַרְאֵה in CD XX, 6, because the מַסָּמֶרֶתָּה are those in which “the men of perfect holiness” are to walk, just as in CD XX, 6 מַרְאֵה דָּרֶשׁ 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 מַרְאֵה.

363 Cf. the MT of Est 3:14; 4:8; 8:13. See also Ezr 7:11; 4QEnGiants 8 3, where the noun מַרְאֵה occurs.
365 Par. 4Qṣd VII, I.
366 Roop (“Form-Critical Study,” 234-254) regards 1QS VIII, I-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 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 מְדַבֵּר in IQS VIII, 24 seems to be “to apply the ruling,” the verb having מְדַבֶּר as its object, and probably referring to the מְדַבֵּר procedure mentioned in IQS VI, 24. Further, it also points forward to the reference to the same procedure in IQS VIII, 26. The parallel terms מְדַבֵּר and מְדַבֶּר are procedures or institutions that are the preserve of full members of the community. The verb in IQS VIII, 24 also indicates that applying rulings is itself the preserve of full members of the community. It is possible, though not certain, that מְדַבֵּר in IQS VIII, 24 refers to the activity which goes on during the מְדַבֵּר procedure mentioned in IQS VI, 24; VIII, 26.

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

4.2.4. מְדַבֵּר in 4QFlor 1 I,21,2 14

As in IQS VIII, 15, מְדַבֵּר is linked in 4QFlor 1 I,21,2 14 with a biblical reference, Ps 1:1. The Hebrew מְדַבֵּר could be glossed “midrash derived from ‘Blessed is [the] man....’” What follows is a collection of biblical texts followed by interpretations, twice introduced by מְדַבֵּר. Maier’s view that what follows is מְדַבֵּר rather than מְדַבֵּר in the later, rabbinc sense cannot be sustained. מְדַבֵּר is used here not simply in place of מְדַבֵּר but as an umbrella term for the collection of texts and interpretations which follows. Here מְדַבֵּר here designates a specific type of

---

369 Cf. IQS VI, 8; VII, 12, 15; 4QDa 5 II, 14.
370 Cf. IQS VI, 24.
371 Cf. IQS 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 מְדַבֵּר and מְדַבֵּר is not simply that מְדַבֵּר requires corroborative evidence from other scriptural passages whereas מְדַבֵּר does not (Schiffman); rather, the distinction is that מְדַבֵּר is a technique which expounds the previously hidden interpretation of a single passage, whereas מְדַבֵּר is an umbrella term for a collection of texts combined with interpretations (some using מְדַבֵּר) which together elucidate a single passage.
373 4QFlor 1 I,21,2 14, 19.
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: מְדַבֵּר here must, as in 4QSa IX, 1 and 4QSa 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 מְדַבֵּר (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). Here, "VEMIM" is a collection of "VEMTSIM." That "NEM" here functions as a technical term, to which "NEM" is subordinate has been suggested by George Brooke. 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 "NEM" is not repeated before the interpretation of Ps 2:1 suggests that "NEM" refers to the whole passage. Brooke also notes that "[t]he strict consistency within the unit is suggestive of a uniform literary composition," and defends the notion that this passage is analogous to rabbinic midrashim.

In 4QFlor 1 I,21,2 14 thus refers to written material, and may be defined as a collection of texts accompanied by "MVEM"-type interpretations. In that it refers to written material, it is related to 2 Chr 13:22; 24:27; 4QSb IX, 1; 4Qsd I, 1.

4.2.5. Summary

4QSb IX, 1 and 4Qsd I, 1 are linked with the use of "NEM" 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 "NEMTSIM." The same phrase in 1QS VIII, 15 refers rather to an activity, a procedure within the community, as in 1QS VI, 24; VIII, 26. 4QDe 7 II, 15 refers not to a procedure, nor to a written text, but to the interpretation of the law which results from the "NEM" procedure. 4QFlor 1 I,21,2 14 uses "NEM" to refer to a written text which includes scriptural texts accompanied by "MVEM"-type interpretations. 4QSb and 4Qsd could be linked to the use of "NEM" in Tg. Ket. 2 Chr 24:27, and from there to the Hebrew terms "MVEM" and "MVEMT" in 1QS VIII, 26, meaning that 4QSb and 4Qsd constitute “copies for a law book.”

---

378 Brooke, *Exegesis*, 144.
380 Brooke, *Exegesis*, 150.
381 Wagner (TDOT 3:306) does not interpret "NEM" here as referring to written material, though he is not wrong to suggest that "NEM" 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 מִלְּתָן referred essentially to a written text. At the same time, a meaning derived from the verbal root מִלְּתָן emerged, meaning “interpretation,” that is, the result of seeking or investigating. This became linked with the interpretation of the law, so that מִלְּתָן 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 מִשְׁלָה-technique.

4.3. מִשְׁלָה לְמִלְּתָן

Why should a text defined as מִלְּתָן be addressed to a figure called מִשְׁלָה לְמִלְּתָן? Verbal forms related to מִלְּתָן do not appear in the extant portions of 4QSb and 4QSc, the only occurrence in the remaining 4QS fragments being in 4QSe III, 2 (par. 1QS VIII, 11-12). This is a key text, not only belonging to the earliest layer postulated by Murphy-O’Connor, but also concerning the discernment and revelation of hidden things. A single, unnamed figure is the focus, who is dubbed מִלְּתָן, “man who seeks.” “Seeking” is presumably correct here, since this text is concerned with things previously hidden being made manifest to this figure. The מִלְּתָן is forbidden to keep the things previously hidden מִלְּתָן a secret from the nascent community (identified here simply as מִלְּתָן).

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.

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

383 Murphy-O’Connor, “Genesis,” 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 מִלְּתָן 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. 4QSc 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 4QSc I, 1,” JJS 44 [1993]: 128) suggests that the prominence of the מִלְּתָן 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 דָּרָשׁ in the Qumran scrolls, in order to place the occurrences of דָּרָשׁ and דָּרָשׁ וַדָּרָשׁ in their wider context.

4.3.1. דָּרָשׁ in the Qumran scrolls

Occurrences of דָּרָשׁ 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. דָּרָשׁ in Serekh ha-Yahad and related texts

In 1QS I, 1 it is uncertain whether the subject of דָּרָשׁ is the community in general or the מִשְׁפָּט, but the activity of seeking God is given prominence because דָּרָשׁ is the first in a series of infinitives, thus placing 1QS I, 1 along the same trajectory as Exod 18:15; 1 Sam 9:9; Ps 119:10. The phrase כִּי מִלְּחַדֵּם מִגְבָּרָה חַכְּיִיָּם וַיַּעַנְוִי לָכֵּם "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" ((cf. וַיְבָא בְּרֹאשׁ) and to what "the prophets revealed through his Holy Spirit" (1QS VIII, 15-16, suggesting that דָּרָשׁ אלֹהִים in 1QS I, 1-2 refers to the study of the law.

---

385 So Wernberg-Møller, Manual of Discipline, 44; cf. 1QS I, 16.
386 Cf. Wernberg-Møller, Manual of Discipline, 44. According to him, דָּרָשׁ in the Qumran scrolls usually has the connotation of seeking God by studying the Scriptures.
388 Exod 18:15b: כִּי מִלְּחַדֵּם מִגְבָּרָה חַכְּיִיָּם "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 (טַבְּעָה: Exod18:16) and to make known God's statutes and teaching. This sequence (seeking God + making judgements) seems to underlie the texts in which דָּרָשׁ 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: כִּי מִלְּחַדֵּם מִגְבָּרָה חַכְּיִיָּם "thus would someone say when he went to seek God."
390 Ps 119:10a: "with all my heart (= mind?) I have sought you." Cf. Wernberg-Møller, Manual of Discipline, 44; 4QJub 14 (= Jub. 21:2).
391 Cf. Exod 8:16; Ezr 7:10.
This uncovers a link between מַדְרָשׁ and מַשֶּכֶל. If the material headed מַדְרָשׁ in 4QSB and 4QSD is understood as a compilation of מַשֶּכֶל resulting from the מִסְפָּר procedure, it may be suggested that since seeking God through the study of the law is central to the מַדְרָשׁ'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 מַדְרָשׁ, containing such regulations, would logically be linked with him.

1QS V, 9, 11, 20 need to be considered, none of which are paralleled in 4QSB and 4QSD, possibly because the introductory rubric מַדְרָשׁ מַשֶּכֶל links the whole passage with the idea of מַדְרָשׁ. 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” (לִשְׁבוּ יְהוָה וְשַׁמְּשֵׁהוּ וְכָל כָּלָיו יְהוָה וְכָל כָּלָיו נָשְׁבוּ). The phrase “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), who are described here as those who guard the covenant,” and “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 מַדְרָשׁ, “reveal,” and the revelation/discovery of what was previously hidden. In this passage seeking and receiving revelation are priestly preserves, which is not evident in other references we have studied.

This is linked with the phenomenon of revelation in 1QS V, 11, where מַדְרָשׁ is parallel with בָּכֶס Piel, confirming that מַדְרָשׁ here represents “seeking.” Seeking leads to knowing.

392 Cf. 4QInstructionb 2 III, 12 (par. 4QInstructiond 9,9a-c 12): רַבּוֹנֵי מִשְׁפַּר, “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. 4QD4a 2 I, 5-6 (par. 4QD4 1 7-8).
394 Cf. Leaney, Rule, 164-165. The sons of Zadok, the priests, are described in 1QS V, 9 as מַדְרָשׁ רוֹדְשֵׁה, “those who seek his will.”
395 1QS V, 11: לֹא בְּקַשׁ וְלֹא רוֹדְשֵׁה בְּחַכְּרוֹת לְדָעְתָּה לְדָעְתָּה לְדָעְתָּה לְדָעְתָּה לְדָעְתָּה לְדָעְתָּה לְדָעְתָּה לְדָעְתָּה לְדָעְתָּה לְדָעְתָּה לְדָעְתָּה לְדָעְתָּה לְדָעְתָּה לְדָעְתָּה לְדָעְתָּה לְדָעְתָּה לְדָעְתָּה לְדָעְתָּה לְדָעְתָּה לְדָעְתָּה לְדָעְתָּה לְדָעְתָּה לְדָעְתָּה לְדָעְתָּה L מַדְרָשׁ רוֹדְשֵׁה, “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 (וְלֹא בְּקַשׁ וְלֹא רוֹדְשֵׁה בְּחַכְּרוֹת לְדָעְתָּה לְדָעְתָּה L מַדְרָשׁ רוֹדְשֵׁה) in response.
“the hidden things.” IQS V, 11-12; VIII, 11-12 refer to the same process: investigating what is hidden from Israel in order to know. In IQS V, 20-21 the phrase “and they shall investigate their spirits” refers to the examination of candidates for full membership in the community.

IQS VI, 6 mentions דוד הנושה, “a man who investigates the law,” recalling IQS VIII, 11-12: perhaps IQS VIII, 11-12 also refers to a man who investigates the law. 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 IQS VI, 9 (לavra א rotary את המיטה) recalls IQS V, 11, and the testing of the candidate in VI, 14, 17 recalls IQS V, 20-21. Outside the Serekh, the phrase דוד הנושה has different resonances. In 4QFlor 1 I 21.2, 11, דוד הנושה refers to a figure who will rise at the end of days with צמח בר ודר, “the shoot of David.” The term בדד 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 Ps 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 דוד הנושה will appear. מדרש thus has both temporal and eschatological foci in 4QFlorilegium. A figure entitled דוד הנושה also appears in CD VI, 7. דוד הנושה in CD VI, 6 refers to seeking God, the same activity mentioned in IQS I, 1. This text is a historical review referring to activities which took place in the past and, if the link with IQS I, 1 is sustained, are linked with the foundation of the community of the Serekh. The

397 IQS VIII, 11-12: “anything hidden from Israel but found by the man who seeks” (הלל בר דוד הנושה מייסר את המיטה לארץ יהודים).


399 Cf. I QSa II, 10; 4QSd II, 3-4; 4QDa 8 I, 2 (par. CD XV, 11). Other occurrences of דוד הנושה in I QS have been examined. The verb דוד הנושה in I QSb III, 20 is a problem, due to its fragmentary context. The grammatical object could conceivably be בדד or בדד (I QSb III, 19).

400 4QFlor 1 I 21.2, 11-12: כלים או דוד הנושה עב דוד הנושה הנורה ( ////// ) ( ////// ) “he is the shoot of David who is going to stand with the one who seeks/interprets the law who will arise in Zi(on at the end 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. 4QDa 2 I, 14 [reconstructed]; 4QDC 1 17 [reconstructed]).
mentioned in CD VI, 7 also seems to be a past figure, in contrast to 4Q Florilegium and CD VII, where he is eschatological.

The verb בְּרֵיתוֹ in 1QSb V, 23 has as its object בְּרֵיתוֹ, "his covenant," recalling the sons of Zadok in 1QS V, 9, who are guardians of the covenant and seekers of his will.

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." The result of investigating the law is the production of rulings codified in a text called a מִשָּׁבֵית. A מִשָּׁבֵית's teaching role means that such a text would logically be addressed to him. The seeking process, and the מִשָּׁבֵית'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.

Par. 4QDa 3 III, 19.

CD XIV, 16 seems to be an anomalous use of בְּרֵיתוֹ, perhaps meaning "no-one who seeks (i.e. cares for) him."

Cf. 4QInstructiond 188 6 (par. 4QInstructiong 9 2): "they shall not investigate the [wor]ks of the covenant." The parallel in 4QInstructiong reads מֵא דְיָרוֹשׁ מוֹדֵעָה, "and they shall not seek him." Note also the editors' remark that in the 4QInstructiond parallel, בְּרֵיתוֹ should be understood as Niphal (Strugnell et al., Qumran Cave 4 XXIV, 413).

Cf. 1QSb III, 22-23; 1Q Liturgy of the Three Tongues of Fire 5-7 2 ("the priest shall explain/examine his whole will"). The phrase מִשָּׁבֵית occurs several times in the Nahum pesher (4QpNah 3-4 I, 2, 7; 3-4 II, 2; 3-4 III, 3; 3-4 III, 6-7; cf. 1QHa X, 15, 32; 4QpIsa6 23 II, 10; 4QD of 2 I, 21 [reconstructed; par. CD I, 18]), presumably in reference to the Pharisees. There is thus an opposition between בְּרֵיתוֹ מִשָּׁבֵית and מִשָּׁבֵית רַפָּאִים. Similarly, the analogous phrase מִשָּׁבֵית in 1QHb X, 34 (cf. XII, 7) may be an ironic reference to 1QS V, 11, or the language used there, where חָרַם is used with reference to the group opposite to the מִשָּׁבֵית, who are מִשָּׁבֵית. This use of irony is typical of many of the sectarian scrolls.
4.3.1.2. Suche at Qumran apart from the Serekh

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

In 4Qcrypt A I, 3 (a משביל text), those who seek are "those who know": ווֹהוֹי דְּרִים וְ[רָהִים]; "and [those] who know have sou[ght] these things and turned to the way of life." Other appellations for this group are בני שחר, "sons of dawn" (line 1),_upper_corp "all men of heart" 407 (line 1), דוד[ד], "[pursuers of justice" (line 2), 408 "seekers of faithfulness" (line 2), and מ[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 4QB6at 2 II, 2-3 we read_upper_corp "Happy are those who seek her with clean hands," the 3rd fem. sing. suffix apparently referring to חכמה, "wisdom," 409 which in 4QB6at 2 II, 3-4 is parallel with אורי, "the law of the Most High." 410 Again, the connection between seeking and the law is not far removed from the Serekh. In 1QHa IV, 6 דרש is collocated with מְשָׁפָט, "judgement from a spirit who seeks you." 411 though there is no direct connection with the Serekh. In 1QHa 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 (1QHa XII, 14,_upper_corp

---

408 Compare Jer 5:1, where Yahweh exhorts people to investigate to find out whether there is anyone who "acts justly" ('אָכָל מְשָׁפָט) or who "seeks faithfulness" ('נֹחַ מְשָׁפָט). 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. 4QB6at 1 1, 2; 2 II, 3.
410 Note that Suche occurs in 4QB6at 1 2. God has given "him" wisdom (واءבה), recalling the underlying theme of the revelation of divine wisdom. God's giving wisdom is a prelude to a person understanding.
411 1QHa IV, 6: מְשָׁפָט מַרְאוֹת רֹבֶשֶׁך; "judgement from a spirit who seeks yo[u]."
412 1QHa XII, 6: "I seek you, and like a sure dawn you have made yourself manifest to me as [perfect] light." Cf. 1QHa XII, 23-24.
15, 16), though in falsehood.\textsuperscript{413} The speaker seeks both God and others (1QH\textsuperscript{a} XII, 24) in this hymn. In 1QH\textsuperscript{a} XIII, 9\textsuperscript{414} it is a covenant which is sought.\textsuperscript{415}

\textbf{4QInstruction contains many occurrences of רָדָשׁ.}\textsuperscript{416} The addressee is not to seek a delicacy (רָדָשׁ) if there is no food (4QInstruction\textsuperscript{b} 2 II, 19).\textsuperscript{417} In 4QInstruction\textsuperscript{d} 81 18-19, “all seekers of pleasure” perhaps refers to people who would object to the exhortation in 4QInstruction\textsuperscript{b} 2 II, 19.\textsuperscript{418} In 4QInstruction\textsuperscript{b} 2 III, 9\textsuperscript{419} 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\textsuperscript{e} 1 I, 6. Knowledge (רָדָשׁ) itself is the object of רָדָשׁ in 4QInstruction\textsuperscript{b} 2 III, 12-13.\textsuperscript{420} In 4QInstruction\textsuperscript{b} 2 III, 14-15\textsuperscript{421} רָדָשׁ is parallel with רָדָשׁ בֶּן חַי and Hithpolel and Hiphil with רָדָשׁ as its object. Seeking, understanding, and contemplating precede knowledge:

(1a) \begin{align*}
\text{מְדָעַת לְכָל דִּרְכֵי אָמַת} \\
\text{מְדָעַת לְכָל דִּרְכֵי עֵד} \\
\text{מְדָעַת לְכָל דִּרְכֵי הָנָּל} \\
\text{מְדָעַת לְכָל דִּרְכֵי הָנָּל} \\
\end{align*}

(1b) \begin{align*}
\text{מְדָעַת לְכָל דִּרְכֵי עֵד} \\
\text{מְדָעַת לְכָל דִּרְכֵי הָנָּל} \\
\text{מְדָעַת לְכָל דִּרְכֵי הָנָּל} \\
\text{מְדָעַת לְכָל דִּרְכֵי הָנָּל} \\
\end{align*}

(1c) \begin{align*}
\text{מְדָעַת לְכָל דִּרְכֵי עֵד} \\
\text{מְדָעַת לְכָל דִּרְכֵי הָנָּל} \\
\text{מְדָעַת לְכָל דִּרְכֵי הָנָּל} \\
\text{מְדָעַת לְכָל דִּרְכֵי הָנָּל} \\
\end{align*}

(2) \begin{align*}
\text{מְדָעַת לְכָל דִּרְכֵי עֵד} \\
\text{מְדָעַת לְכָל דִּרְכֵי הָנָּל} \\
\text{מְדָעַת לְכָל דִּרְכֵי הָנָּל} \\
\text{מְדָעַת לְכָל דִּרְכֵי הָנָּל} \\
\end{align*}

\textbf{4QInstruction contains many occurrences of רָדָשׁ.}\textsuperscript{416} The addressee is not to seek a delicacy (רָדָשׁ) if there is no food (4QInstruction\textsuperscript{b} 2 II, 19).\textsuperscript{417} In 4QInstruction\textsuperscript{d} 81 18-19, “all seekers of pleasure” perhaps refers to people who would object to the exhortation in 4QInstruction\textsuperscript{b} 2 II, 19.\textsuperscript{418} In 4QInstruction\textsuperscript{b} 2 III, 9\textsuperscript{419} 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\textsuperscript{e} 1 I, 6. Knowledge (רָדָשׁ) itself is the object of רָדָשׁ in 4QInstruction\textsuperscript{b} 2 III, 12-13.\textsuperscript{420} In 4QInstruction\textsuperscript{b} 2 III, 14-15\textsuperscript{421} רָדָשׁ is parallel with רָדָשׁ בֶּן חַי and Hithpolel and Hiphil with רָדָשׁ as its object. Seeking, understanding, and contemplating precede knowledge:

\begin{align*}
\text{(1a) Investigate the mystery that is to be} \\
\text{(1b) And understand all truthful ways} \\
\text{(1c) And contemplate all the roots of injustice} \\
\end{align*}

\textsuperscript{413} Cf. 4QDe 2L 10; 4QBéat 5 5.
\textsuperscript{414} 1QH\textsuperscript{a} XIII, 9: "you established truthful counsel in my heart, thus a covenant for those who seek it."
\textsuperscript{415} Cf. 1QS V, 9.
\textsuperscript{416} Cf. Lange, Weisheit, 58-59.
\textsuperscript{417} Par. 4QInstruction\textsuperscript{e} 2 II, 24 [reconstructed]). Cf. 4QInstruction\textsuperscript{e} 28 1.
\textsuperscript{418} But cf. Ps 111:2 (Strugnell et al., Qumran Cave 4 XXIV, 310. See also 4QInstruction\textsuperscript{d} 102 4; 126 II, 4, 12; 127 4; 158 3; Sir 35:14 [cf. 4QInstruction\textsuperscript{d} 81 17]).
\textsuperscript{419} Par. 4QInstruction\textsuperscript{d} 9,9a-c 8-9.
\textsuperscript{420} Par. 4QInstruction\textsuperscript{d} 9,9a-c 13.
\textsuperscript{421} 4QInstruction\textsuperscript{d} 9,9a-c 15-16 (reconstructed).
\textsuperscript{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 ישור and the Hithpolel imperative of עָנֵי: Strugnell et al., Qumran Cave 4 XXIV, 120; Jotson §113m.
(2) Then you shall know what is bitter for a man and what is sweet for a person

In 4QInstruction, the addressee is to seek “truthfully” (דבורה אתון). The phrase “those who seek truth” appears in 4QInstruction in a context dealing with judgement (ברשא ספת). In 4QInstruction, the I’V3 is commanded to “seek his (God’s) judgements” (ברשא משלס). In 4QInstruction, 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 ינבר’s role in 4QInstruction. 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 (1QHa XII, 6) is connected with revelation.

4.3.1.3. Summary

The most prominent aspects of וריה 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 דבורה אתון, see Strugnell et al., Qumran Cave 4 XXIV, 170, 172; Isa 42:3.

424 Cf. 4Q420 13, as reconstructed by Elgvin (“Wisdom in the Yahad: 4QWays of Righteousness,” RevQ 17 [1996]: 212): ידוה [אתון וספת וספת] זכרו [רפי], “[he shall seek] true judgement, and by searching out righteousness.”

425 4QInstruction, 69 II, 7: ידוה אתון ינבר וספת וספת, “those who seek truth shall awake for your judgement.”

426 The language of seeking judgement recalls 1QS VI, 7, and also 4Qcrypt A II, 5, which refers to “those who seek judgement” (ברשא ספת). Various appellations, apparent for the same group, appear in this fragment, including “those who know” (ברשא, line 4), “men of understanding” (ברשא ספת, lines 4-5) and “men of truth” (ברשא ספת, 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 וספת and ינבר, 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 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 מְשָכְכָל is central to this process also. It is because of this that a נָדְרָש text, made up of community regulations to be taught, must be addressed to this figure.

4.3.2. Summary: נָדְרָש לְמְשָכָל

This complex sub-section as a whole must now be summarised. V-1′M indicates written material in 2 Chr 13:22; 24:27; 4QSh IX,1; 4QSd I, 1 and also 4QFlor 1 i,21,2 14, in which it indicates a collection of texts accompanied by שְׁלֵם-type interpretations. In 1QS VI, 24; VIII, 26 VIM refers to a community activity during which rulings (משכילים) based on the law were discerned. Similarly, in 1QS VIII, 15 T11MMU"1 in refers to a procedure involving the study of the law. In CD XX, 6 מְשָכְכָל refers to the interpretation of the law resulting from this procedure (as in 4QDe 7 II, 15), possibly referring to a written collection of rulings.

Why should a נָדְרָש be addressed to a מְשָכָל? With the possible exception of 1QS I, 1. מְשָכָל is not the subject of נָדְרָש. Furthermore, what exactly is a מְשָכָל in 4QSh IX, 1; 4QSd I, 1? It was suggested above that מְשָכָל often refers to written material, and that the procedure results in the formulation of מְשכילים. Schiffman argues that decisions reached at exegesis sessions were assembled into lists called מַלְכִים, “rules,” but modifications to this hypothesis are necessary. מַלְכִים is not simply used at Qumran for a

428 Schiffman, Halakhah, 68; Maier, “Early Jewish Biblical Interpretation,” 113.
list of halakic rulings. The noun נַדַּרְשָׁם itself could designate a list of נַדַּרְשָׁם, being used for both the נַדַּרְשָׁם procedure and the codified rulings resulting therefrom.

This is confirmed by the probable reconstruction of CD XIII, 22 and by the term נַדַּרְשָׁם in 4QDe 7 II, 15. In CD XIII, 22 although we have a difficult text, it seems certain that we should restore נַדַּרְשָׁם, "these" and נַדַּרְשָׁם, "for a/the maskil." Garcfa Martínez and Tigchelaar give נַדַּרְשָׁם [ץ] נַדַּרְשָׁם, but it is clear from the photographs in Qimron’s edition that it is impossible to read נ as the first letter of the plural noun. It would be equally possible to restore נַדַּרְשָׁם, with no difference in meaning, assuming נַדַּרְשָׁם could have this sense in QH. This refers to written rulings. The material in 4QSb and 4QSe headed נַדַּרְשָׁם should therefore also be understood as written rulings collected together into a single text. נַדַּרְשָׁם in this case is equivalent to נַדַּרְשָׁם in CD XIII, 22, and a נַדַּרְשָׁם should thus be understood as a collection of נַדַּרְשָׁם. In the case of 4QSb and 4QSe, 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 נַדַּרְשָׁם, but נַדַּרְשָׁם, "concerning the men of the law." This adverbial clause identifies the group to which the following rulings are intended to apply, making Charlotte Hempel’s interpretation of the phrase נַדַּרְשָׁם unlikely.

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. 4QDa 10 I, 5). Cf. 1QM III, 13 (par. 4QM IV 10 2 [reconstructed]; cf. possible reconstructions of 1QM I, 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, 14; IV, 6, 11; V, 4; VI, 10, 11, 14; VII, 1; XII, 1; XV, 4; XVIII, 6.
430 This reflects Stegemann’s understanding of נַדַּרְשָׁם 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).
432 Garcfa Martínez and Tigchelaar, DSSSE 1:572.
433 In 1QS V, 12, נַדַּרְשָׁם appears to refer to punishments, as in 1QM XI, 16; 1QH VII, 22.
434 For נַדַּרְשָׁם 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 נַדַּרְשָׁם in 4QSe I, 1 should be translated "Midrash for the maskil over the men of the law" (“Comments,” 128).
4.4. Summary: transmission in the Serekh

These conclusions must be placed in the broader context of our study. 4QSa IX, 1; 4QSc 1, 1 are essential for an understanding of transmission at Qumran. As Vý'Vln 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 מושלי, and the importance to his role of seeking God, explain why these texts are addressed to him. The connection with the המ.selectAll is important because this figure is the agent of divine revelation in the community, as our study of ב in the Serekh demonstrated. In the Serekh, wisdom belongs in heaven and is revealed to the elect through the agency of the מושלי. In the same way, community rulings are the result of a revelatory process, and in 4QSa IX, 1; 4QSc 1, 1 they are part of the המ_SELECT'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 המ_SELECT transmits revealed teaching to a משל, we find in the Serekh two different but complementary presentations of transmission. In the first, sapiential language familiar from Daniel onwards represents the המ_SELECT's role in the revelatory process in a manner analogous to 4QInstruction. In the second, the המ_SELECT 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 המ_Selectעל זכרון, "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 המ_SELECT, 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,\textsuperscript{436} and Armin Lange commented in 1995 that “CD II\textsubscript{2}ff. ist ein Text, in dem weisheitliche Formen, Traditionen und Topoi mit prophetischem, nomistischem und geschichts theologischem Gedankengut verschmelzen,” 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 \textit{strictu sensu}. The Cairo manuscripts, though in some cases more complete, should be understood as later adaptations of earlier D material.\textsuperscript{438}

5.1. The 4QD fragments and the \(\text{יָתָמִּים} \text{כַּשֵּׁלִים}\)

The first task is to clarify the role of the \(\text{יָתָמִּים} \text{כַּשֵּׁלִים}\) in the 4QD fragments.

5.1.1. The textual affinities of 4QD\textsuperscript{a} 1a-b 1

It has been demonstrated that seeking is linked to the \(\text{יָתָמִּים} \text{כַּשֵּׁלִים}\) through the rubrics in 4QS\textsuperscript{b} IX, 1; 4QS\textsuperscript{d} I, 1. In the 4QD material, in 4QD\textsuperscript{c} 7 II, 12-15, there is a link between מְאֹרֶשׁ הָוֹדַרְתֶּם פְּרָשֲׁתֵּשָׁפִים and מְאֹרֶשׁ הָוֹדַרְתֶּם פְּרָשֲׁתֵּשָׁפִים. It is thus noteworthy that the rubrics in 4QS\textsuperscript{b} and 4QS\textsuperscript{d} have prompted Joseph Baumgarten to reconstruct 4QD\textsuperscript{a} 1a-b 1 מְאֹרֶשׁ הָוֹדַרְתֶּם פְּרָשֲׁתֵּשָׁפִים לָאָשָׁר לֵבֵן אָרָו.\textsuperscript{439} This reconstruction contains three sections, on analogy with other Qumran rubrics:

\textsuperscript{437} Lange, \textit{Weisheit}, 233.
\textsuperscript{438} Cf. Lange, \textit{Weisheit}, 233-234.
\textsuperscript{439} Hartmut Stegemann has suggested reconstructing the opening rubric thus: מְאֹרֶשׁ הָוֹדַרְתֶּם פְּרָשֲׁתֵּשָׁפִים (Baumgarten, “Corrigenda,” 222). This is based on his belief that מְאֹרֶשׁ הָוֹדַרְתֶּם פְּרָשֲׁתֵּשָׁפִים 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...
Certainly Baumgarten’s restoration is highly conjectural, a point exploited by Philip Davies, who strongly disapproves of restoring מַשְׁלַכֶל here on the basis that this is not a common D word. 441 does occur in CD XII, 21 442 and 4QDa 9 III, 15 (par. CD XIII, 22), though it is not as frequent as מַבָּקֶר. This is not in itself a sound argument against its reconstruction here: מַבָּקֶר בֵּין אָוֹר 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 מַשְׁלַכֶל.

The closest parallels to 4QDa 1a-b 1 are in Serekh ha-Yahad. מַבָּקֶר does not occur in the remaining D material, though the phrase מַבָּקֶר, “sons of dawn” does. 443 The absence of מַבָּקֶר from mss A and B may be because this phrase had become

---

442 This reference is ignored by Davies, as noted by Baumgarten (“A Response to the Discussion of DJD XVIII,” in 77ze Dead Sea Scrolls at Fifty: Proceedings of the 1997 Society of Biblical Literature Qumran Section Meetings [ed. R. A. Kugler and E. M. Schuller; SBLJEL 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 מַבָּקֶר occurs is highly reminiscent of 1QS IX, 12.
443 See CD XIII, 14-15: qזג 9ז מַר, z nrnvrnnzý 1n, `; Ni hu, `; N `; R nnnmz i; = rtti, -, “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 מַבָּקֶר (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 Steuvel, in consultation with Joseph A. Fitzmyer, Qumran Cave 4 XV: Sapiential Texts, Part I [DJD 20; Oxford: Clarendon, 1997], 21), it is also possible that the term was chosen to deliberately echo the polar opposite, מַבָּקֶר מַבָּקֶר 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.\textsuperscript{444} The term does occur in 1QS III, 13 in a rubric addressed to a/the ולなどが:

(1) the title of the teacher: ולなどが
(2) a statement of the nature of the work: להביש ולעדת
(3) an indication of the intended audience: אשה חול ביני יאוד

The link between 4QDa I a-b I and 1QS III, 13-IV, 26 suggests not only that the former is a text addressed to a/the ולなどが, but that there is a direct connection between the communities of the Serekh and 4QDa.

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

4QDa and the Serekh share the idea that a particular group should be “separated.” In 4QDa I a-b I the key term is ולなどが, either a Hiphil infinitive absolute (לָנוֹז: “keep separate”) or a Niphal infinitive construct or absolute (לָנוֹז: “dedicate oneself”) of וֹז, which occurs most prominently in Num 6.\textsuperscript{445} It is characteristic of D, occurring elsewhere at Qumran only in 4QInstruction and 4QHistorical Work 1 II, 5. In CD VI, 15;\textsuperscript{446} VII, 1;\textsuperscript{447} 4QInstruction\textsuperscript{d} 81 + 81a 2\textsuperscript{448} וֹז and נָוַל are apparently synonymous, and it is possible that ולなどが, “to separate” should be reconstructed in the lacuna in 4QDa 1a-b 2.\textsuperscript{449} The

\textsuperscript{444} Cf. Luke 16:8; John 12:36; Eph 5:8; 1 Thess 5:5.

\textsuperscript{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. Leaney, Rule, 134; Wernberg-Möller, Manual of Discipline, 54). The phrase וֹז לָנוֹז, “the idols of his heart” in 1QS II, 11 (cf. II, 17) recalls וֹז לָנוֹז אֶל־לָבּוֹר. The phrase וֹז לָנוֹז 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 רִיבְרִי־לָנוֹז in 1QS II, 16 is a deliberate rewording of Ezek 14:7, where those in the wrong separate (‘ע) of from Yahweh. In 1QS II, 16 God separates (בעד) the wrongdoer for evil.


\textsuperscript{447} Compare the use of וֹז in CD VII, 3, 4; VIII, 8 (par. XIX, 20).

\textsuperscript{448} 4QInstruction\textsuperscript{d} 81 + 81a 1-2: וֹז לָנוֹז, "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, וֹז and נָוַל again being parallel.

\textsuperscript{449} So Stegemann, who reconstructs thus: [וֹז לָנוֹז], “(and to walk perfectly according to the Law)” (Baumgarten, “Corrigenda,” 222).
synonymy between נור and בדל links the 4QD fragments with the Serekh, especially with משלכין 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 (בדל, not נור) is a key concept in the Serekh. In 1QS V, 1 the infinitives may apply to the rather than the men of the law. In any case, in 4QSd the is the addressee of a text counselling separation for the group with which he is connected. Baumgarten compares [לַאֲנָוָה מָרָד] with 4QHistorical Work 1 II, 5 but 1QS V, 10-11 is equally comparable. Separation is from the path as well as the men of injustice, as in 4QDa 1a-b 1. Separation in 1QS VIII, occurs when “these have been established in the foundation of the community for two years, in perfection of way” links this text with 4QDa 1a-b 1; 1QS V, 10. In 1QS V, 18 separation is two-way: those not included in the covenant are also separated. 4QSd 1,1: מילillery IVIR, “the men of the law.”

450 Par. 4QSb IX, 2; 4QSd I, 2. In 4QSd I, 2 בדל is Qal or Piel rather than Hiphil, unless it is a scribal error. Separation from ולגרי negócio השבת, “the counsel of the men of injustice” recalls CD VI, 14-15 (לָהֳבַרַל מקנני השותה, “to separate from the sons of the pit”).

451 4QSd I, 1: אַנְשֵׁי הָדוֹר, “the men of the law.”

452 Baumgarten, Qumran Cave 4 XIII, 32.

453 1QS V, 10-11: וַלִּבְרַלְמִלְרָל אֲנָוָה הַגָּזָת הַסְּרָקָה, “to separate from the men of injustice who walk in the wicked path.” Cf. CD II, 2-3.

454 This is not evident in 4QSb IX, 8 or 4QSd I, 7.

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

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

457 Par. 4QSe III, 10 (reconstructed).

458 Cf. 1QLitPr 3 I, 4-5; 4QInstructiond 221 4; CD VI, 17 (par. 4QDa 3 II, 20 [reconstructed]); XII, 19-20 (par. 4QDa 9 II, 6 [reconstructed]). God may be the subject of בדלי in 4QInstructiond 126 II, 8. In 1QLitPr
The link between separation and the נשלטים in the Serekh may be why 1QS III, 13-15 does not mention separation. The נשלטים 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 4QDa 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 הידראות, “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 ברי 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 יבּדַל seems to be the same as the referent of אֲגָלוּ 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 דִּרְשׁ at Qumran. In the next pericope, beginning in 1QS VIII, 13, separation from נָשָׁב הָנָה, “the session of the men of injustice” means going to the wilderness to study חוֹר (1QS VIII, 15). בְּכוֹר and link the two pericopae. Separation is a prerequisite for the study of חוֹר, 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 מָשָׁכִיל in 1QS IX, 12-21. In 1QS IX, 13-14 three significant phrases occur in parallel:

(1) לֶ楽しめる וַאֲנָיאָא רֶצֶּנִי אַל כִּבְלוּ כְּפִלָּתַת לֶ🚅וֹבַת
(2) וַלְבֶזֶר אַל כִּבְלוּ חֶשֶּךָ הַכְּבֵלָהָא לֶ𬶮ֹוֹת הָבֵּה
(3) לַחֲבָרִי הַלֶּשָּׁכַל מֵנִי הָמֵרָק לֵפֶל רָזוּה

(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 (-hooks) and they shall apply (דודר) the following regulation (משים) to him.
In line 17 the נשלל 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 נשלת 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 נשלת is responsible for concealing from outsiders but revealing to insiders. The נשלת is at the centre of the process of transmitting what is revealed within a closed community.

5.1.3.4. 4QDa and 4QDc⁴⁶⁴

In 4QDa and 4QDc 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 נְשֵׁר מִתְכָּנָה נְשֵׁר הָאָדָם, “revealer of deep and hidden things.” This language influenced 4QDa and 4QDc.⁴⁶⁷ occurs in 4QDa 1a-b 8, recalling מִתְכָּנָה in Dan 2:22. In Dan 2:21 God changes times and seasons, possibly to be compared with the temporal concerns of 4QDa 1a-b 2; 2 I, 2-3.

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

⁴⁶² This is the sense of מַשְׁלֹה יָדַּע, which refers back to the language of IX, 13.

⁴⁶³ Cf. 1QS IX, 20-21: מִתְכָּנָה יְדַע, "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 4QDa 2 II, 6; 4QDc 1 9.


⁴⁶⁷ Baumgarten suggests that "[t]his perhaps described the esoteric knowledge of the initiated" (Qumran Cave 4 XIII, 33).
In 4QDa 2 1, 5-6 we read that God "has uncovered their eyes to hidden things and their ears they opened" in order to hear deep things and understand everything that will happen before it comes upon them." God is the subject of the equivalent Aramaic verb in Dan 2:22, 28. As in Dan 2:22, in 4QDa and 4QDc what is revealed was originally hidden and there is in 4QDa and 4QDc a connection between "hidden things" and "deep things" deriving from Dan 2:22 and evident in the sequence in the text:

(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 4QDa, 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 4QDc parallel could be arranged thus:

(1) 위해 עינייהם נמחתרות
(2) והם פתחו דלתות
(3) ושמנו עמקות
(4) ויבינו כלם מהותו עֵד מַה יָּכוֹן

468 4QDc 1 7: חוֹד, “he (viz. God) opened.”
The variant הוהי alters the structure of this passage. The perfect הוהי is parallel with the imperfect + vav-consecutive והי. 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. Qal is parallel with היפhip Hiphil, and thus והיה is syntactically parallel with התוהיה. In the 4QDe text, the stress is on divine initiative; in the 4QDa parallel the stress is on human response.

5.1.3.5. עבדים in the Qumran scrolls and the HB

At this point a word study of עבדים 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

עבדים is not particularly common in the Hebrew scrolls from Qumran. However, 1QM X, 11 is clearly linked with 4QDa 2 I, 5.471 Israel is described as נ consc. והיה, “those who hear deep things.”472 In the previous line, Israel is a people wise with understanding (משהילו), perhaps an allusion to the משיחים of Daniel. The phrase מعزيز קדוש, “appointed times of holiness” in 1QM X, 15 possibly echoes the reference to time in Dan 2:21.473 In 4QB6at 5 12 we read נ爁ים יראדיכית ושמותמקה, “the prudent dig her paths, and in her depths ....” The 3rd fem. sing. suffixes presumably refer to Wisdom (WISE) or law (סוד), making it more likely that “depth” is a metaphor for the hidden riches Wisdom offers. The phrase דודים ותומם, “those who walk perfectly” appears in line 10.474 Furthermore, the verbs תבריה והיה, “you shall seek her” (line 6 and 7

471 Par. 4QDe 1 7.
472 Cf. 1QM X, 10:ím שמהפי וקול מבכר, “those who hear the glorified voice.” The passage in 4QDa and 4QDe is also echoed in the phraseהנו לוכד אתן, “with opened ears?” in 1QM X, 11. בינה, נזכקי, פסמה, and כלולים all occur in Isa 33:19-20 (cf. Ezek 3:5-6).
473 Cf. Dan 8:19; 11:27, 29, 35; 12:7; 4QDa 1a-b 2; 2 I, 2 (par. 4QDe 1 4).
474 Cf. 4QDa 2 I, 4 (par. 4QDe 1 6-7 [reconstructed]).
[reconstructed]), ת"ש[ו], “[they] shall give insight” (line 9), and יבשות, “they shall contemplate” (line 13), and the substantives [דבעון], “sages” (line 8) and בכורים, “those who understand” (line 10) suggest that the context concerns meditation on God’s mysteries. In 4QInstruction 119 4, the phrase מים", “deepest of the sea”, like the noun מים", “deep” in lines 2 and 3, seems to refer to the physical actuality of the deeps of the sea rather than to esoteric lore that is hidden. 475

Thus מים", 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; 4QBėat 5 12.

5.1.3.5.2. The Aramaic scrolls

In the Genesis Apocryphon, מים", means “valley.” In 1QapGen XXI, 25; 476 XXI, 32 477 the valley of the Siddim (לעביד דרוי) is mentioned and in 1QapGen XXII, 13-14 478 the valley of Shaveh (לעביד שלמה) and the king’s valley (לעביד שלמה) are mentioned. In 4QEnar I 11, 5 479 מים", is reconstructed, meaning “deep valley.” There is no parallel in the Aramaic texts from Qumran to מים", in Dan 2: 22, nor is there an occurrence of מים", 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 מים", expresses the gulf between worshipper and YHWH. The adjective מים", 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 מים", 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. I En. 26:3.
Psalm 64 may hold the key to the connection between between... and God to hide (וֹתֵר הַפִּיל הַשָּׁבָּט) the worshipper from the counsel of the wicked (Ps 64:3). The noun בְּלָעֵל occurs in verse 5, meaning “secret places.” בְּלָעֵל 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 ברֹא and ברֹא (which I have discussed elsewhere) suggests there are links with Daniel and Qumran.

Sapiential and prophetic texts

God is revealer in Job 11:6, and בְּלָעֵל is used in verse 8 to describe the “limit of Shaddai” (בְּלָעֵל). This is the object of בְּלָעֵל, as is “God’s secret thing” (בְּלָעֵל) 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, בְּלָעֵל, “deep waters” is parallel with בְּלָעֵל, “bubbling stream,” which is in turn parallel with בְּלָעֵל, “fountain of wisdom,” linking בְּלָעֵל explicitly with wisdom. In Prov 20:5 בְּלָעֵל, “counsel,” an important Qumran term, has בְּלָעֵל, “deep waters” as its predicate. Counsel is drawn out by a “man of understanding” (בְּלָעֵל) in Prov 25:2 and בְּלָעֵל 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, בְּלָעֵל refers to something unknowable. The
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 deep\textsuperscript{486} and בֵּין and בֵּין בֵּין occur in verse 7. In Isa 7:11, the sign Yahweh asks Ahaz to seek from him was to be as deep as Sheol (נַעֲלָם). Isaiah’s exhortation in verse 13 echoes CD I, 1.\textsuperscript{487} Sirach 39:2 should also be mentioned: “he guards the thought of men of renown, and enters the depths of metaphors” (נַעֲלָם). Here, נַעֲלָם clearly belongs to the semantic domain of wisdom. In summary, although נַעֲלָם 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 הנשך and נַעֲלָם derives from the HB and the use of נַעֲלָם in 4Q\textsuperscript{Da} and 4Q\textsuperscript{Dc} 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 הנשך and revelation

We must now consider the relationship between hidden things, deep things, the הנשך, and the phrase כלָלֶה נוֹרוֹת “everything that is to happen” (4Q\textsuperscript{Dc} 18). Reading the book of Daniel as a whole a relationship emerges between the revelation of deep and hidden things and the הנשך.

5.1.4.1. The book of Daniel

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

\textsuperscript{486} Cf. 4Q\textsuperscript{Da} 15.

\textsuperscript{487} Par. 4Q\textsuperscript{Da} 2 I, 6; 4Q\textsuperscript{Dc} 19; cf. 4Q\textsuperscript{Dc} 2 II, 19.
where the learns (לַמָּעַל Qal) and then teaches (לַמָּעַל Piel). In Dan 1:17 God has given them insight (משכָּל) and wisdom (בְּמֶשֶׁכָּל). As with the of the Serekh, the reason they are is because they have received insight (משכָּל). 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” (רש ה) and the revelation granted to Daniel is related in the language of mystery and revelation (Dan 2:19: רְאוּ ה, “the mystery was revealed”). In verse 22, what God reveals is . 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. 4QDa 2 1-5, 6 (par. 4QDc 1 7-8)

The idea of God as “ revealer of mysteries” (cf. Dan 2:29b) is presupposed in 4QDa 2 1, 5. Furthermore, the phrase רְאוּ ה, “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 כל ידוע, “everything that will be” in the 4QD fragments. In both, a form of the verb “to be” is used to refer to what is going to happen.

When the phrase רְאוּ ה in Dan 2:29b is analysed, the same idea occurs twice. רְאוּ, “reveal” is comparable semantically with Haphel. רְאוּ, “mysteries” and נַעֲדָה, “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, becomes one of the that God reveals: וכל ידוע that God reveals. The parallelism in

488 Par. 4QDc 1 7-8.
489 Hebrew: Niphal participle from הָיוֹה; Aramaic: Peal imperfect from הָיוָה.
4QDa 2 1, 5-6 suggests that and are parallel, just as the phrases and in Dan 2:22 and in Dan 2:29 are parallel. Because is equivalent to is also equivalent to both and, and by extension to . The following table illustrates this situation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term for</th>
<th>Verb of</th>
<th>Verb of</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mysteries</td>
<td>Intellection</td>
<td>Revelation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>רד</td>
<td>נלע</td>
<td>או</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>לק indicating לַע</td>
<td>נלע</td>
<td>או</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>הנחת</td>
<td>נלע</td>
<td>או</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>הנות</td>
<td>נלע</td>
<td>או</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ומכּות</td>
<td>נלע</td>
<td>או</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מְלָכָה</td>
<td>נלע</td>
<td>או</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This draws us towards the Qumran concept . In Daniel, what is revealed is a mystery in the singular (Dan 2:18-19; 4:6), suggesting that, although is a plural participle, what is implied in 4QDa 2 1, 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 רד

Having established that what is implied in 4QDa 2 1, 5-6 is the concept of mystery, and that the concept of mystery is connected with , the phrase may now be understood as a construct chain (cf. ). is nomen regens and the fem. sing. Niphal participle , “what is to come” is used substantively and is nomen rectum. This conclusion is reached because is a feminine participle used substantively. If this conclusion is correct, it is possible that the , “the mystery of what is going to happen” is the concept which lies behind 4QDa 2 1, 5-6. In fact, it is equally
possible that the 4QD fragments influenced the formulation of the 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 texts, as Baumgarten suggests and as seems likely, are we to understand the phrase, “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 hymnist of 1QS X-XI “hides” (מקרא) knowledge in 1QS X, 24 and “instructs” (הלדות) in 1QS XI, 1. The phrase, “perfection of my way” occurs in 1QS XI, 2 andדר צד , in 1QS XI, 3-4. etc. and appears again in 1QS XI, 5, and the fem. sing. Niphal participle דר צד in 1QS XI, 6, referring to דר צד , “prudence,” “knowledge,” etc. and דר צד , “prudent discretion,” etc. God himself is the subject of דר צד Hiphil in XI, 18. This raises the issue of whether the 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 דר צד links the activity of God with that of the. God instructs (דר צד Hiphil: 1QS IV, 22; XI, 18), the learns insight that has been found (דר צד הכתוב) and instructs others (דר צד Hiphil: 1QS III, 13; IX, 12, 18, 20, 21; XI, 1). The is the link in a chain of transmission which begins with God and continues through the himself to the community of the sons of light.

491 Note, however, that דר צד is corrected here to דר צד, “I shall recount” (cf. K. G. Kuhn, ed., Konkordanz zu den Qumrantexten [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1960], 153 n. 2).
The link between נָדָם and נַעֲמָּה is confirmed by 1QS XI, 19, in which the phrase נַעֲמָּה רְאוּמִּית, “the depth of your mysteries” occurs.

5.1.5. Summary

A number of points should be made in summary. It seems clear that 4QDa la-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 ובשכיב, 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 “revealers 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 4QDa and 4QDc with Dan 2 yields the conclusion that the Qumran concept of הנ養וֹדִּיא 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. 4QDa 1a-b 21, 24

The first occurrences of הננ in the 4QD fragments are in the admonition to the sons of light in 4QDa 1a-b 21, 24. The phrase חַדְרֵינוֹת נָלַגְּנוּ, “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." In lines 21 and 24, הָאָדָם and מַהְוֹת ( paradoxical) are addressed to an individual, recalling the מַהְוֹת of 4QInstruction, who is frequently the subject of מַעֲלָהוֹת Hithpolel. 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 מַעֲלָהוֹת in 4QDa 2 I, 14 (par. CD I, 10).

More importantly, here is a connection with the Teaching on the Two Spirits: both involve instruction and both are addressed to the sons of light. How should this link be construed? 4QDa is written, at least from line 5 onwards, 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 4QDa 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 4QDa 1a-b 1 is correct, the מַעֲלָהוֹת is another link between them. Perhaps 4QDa 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 מַעֲלָהוֹת’s teaching, 4QDa preserves the actual teaching of a מַעֲלָהוֹת.

5.2.2. 4QDa 2 I, 4-6

4QDa 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 (্লক্ষ) par. 4QDc 1:5: [ן]לוק (ך)י של בנה, “periods of wrath”) have no knowledge of God (4QDa 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 4QDc 1:6 the verb is Hiphil (ן)לוק) rather than Hithpolel.

494 See §3.1.3 and n. 246 above.

495 See esp. 1QS III, 13; IV, 22.

496 Note that מַעֲלָהוֹת in line 5 presupposes an audience of more than one, and מַעֲלָהוֹת 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. 4QDc 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:

(1) God has ordained periods of wrath for those who do not know him.  
(2) God has established times of favour for those who seek his commandments and walk in perfection of way.  
(3) God has opened their eyes to hidden things.  
(4) They opened their ears.  
(5) They heard deep things.  
(6) They understood everything that is to happen before it comes upon them.

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. 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 נַחַל 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 4QDa 2 I, 3; par. 4QDc 1 5.

500 4QDa 2 I, 4; par. 4QDc 1 6-7.

501 4QDa 2 I, 5 (reconstructed); par. 4QDc 1 7.

502 4QDa 2 I, 5; cf. 4QDc 1 7.

503 4QDa 2 I, 5; par. 4QDc 1 7 (reconstructed).

504 4QDa 2 I, 5-6; par. 4QDc 1 8.

505 Cf. 1QS I, 1-2; IV, 22.
sequence of hearing and understanding points forward to the admonition to “hear” and “understand.” 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. 4QDą 2 II, 2) the speaker says he is going to open the ears of his hearers. This mirrors the activity of God in 4QDą 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 נְשָאֵל text. We have already seen that the נְשָאֵל 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 נְשָאֵל. 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 נְשָאֵל is the mediator of divine revelation.

5.2.3. 4QDe 2 II, 19-21

4QDe 2 II, 19-21 begins with an exhortation to those who know righteousness to listen to him. The instruction involves knowing dualistic principles, in this case the opposition between נְדוֹרֵי דָּוִד, “ways of life” and נְדוֹרֵי זָרִים, “paths of destruction.” The key to

506 4QDą 2 I, 6-7; par. 4QDe 1 9; CD I, 1.
507 4QDę 2 II, 19-21: נְהַוָה שֶׁמֶנֶה לְךָ וְרוּחִי צָרִים, “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 (4QDe 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 light on the terms שֶׁלֶחָל, "insight, understanding" and הָעֲשָׂה, "deed" in the Serekh. Correct deeds in the present result from understanding the deeds of previous generations.

5.2.4. 4QDa 2 I, 14

In 4QDa 2 I, 14, understanding is a divine activity. In 4QDa 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 לָאָלֶת is parallel with אֶלַּר, "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 (4QDa 1 7). In CD I, 8 (par. 4QDe 1 15) the Israelite remnant has understood (וּרְבִּי) its sin, and known (דְּלֵת) its guilt. This contrasts with the people of Israel formerly, who were a people without understanding.512 בִּין forms a link with God's act in line 10, in that he has understood (וּרְבִּי) 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) 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. 4QDe 1 9; CD I, 1.
511 Par. 4QDe 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).
God understands or discerns their deeds because they sought him linking this text with 1QS I, 1-2 and the use of in the Serekh, and with CD VI, 2-7. Furthermore, this admonition is connected with the Vorspann in the 4QD fragments through the use of . In 4QDa 2 I, 8, God is said to have "hidden" his face from Israel and his temple. 4QDa 2 I, 5 (par. 4QDc 1 7) includes the term , "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. 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 (), insight (), prudence (), and knowledge () are to be found (CD II, 3-4).

In summary, signifies the contact between God and the Israelite remnant. When both God and the remnant are the subject of , 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 is translated "because," God has understood their deeds in response to their seeking him. If is translated "that," it elaborates on the phrase . Either interpretation is feasible.

514 Par. 4QDa 3 II, 10-14; 4QDb 2 7-14.

515 Par. 4QDc 1 11; CD I, 3.

516 CD III, 14-16 offers a definition of what constituted 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 מָשָׁכֵל. 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 מָשָׁכֵל.517

5.2.5. CD XIII, 2-8 (par. 4QDa 9 II, 18): מָשָׁכֵל קֹדֶס and מַהֲנֵר

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 מַהֲנֵר rather than a second person exhortation. Recalling 1QSa I, 7; CD X, 6 the book of meditation (CD XIII, 2: חָסַר הָדוֹת) is what the priest should understand (1QSa I, 7: לֹא הָדוֹת; CD X, 6; XIII, 2: בּ הָדוֹת Hithpolel). 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” (מֵאֲבִוּם עַשֵּׂר).519 In lines 5-6, a figure entitled מַהֲנֵר, “one who seeks” is to instruct (יִלַּד 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 מֵאֲבִוּם, presumably a מֵאֲבִוּם, teaches a single volunteer. The מֵאֲבִוּם 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 מַהֲנֵר has a role regarding established members of the community, but the מֵאֲבִוּם’s role only concerns entrants. The distinction in D between the priest and the מַהֲנֵר raises the long dormant question of the lay status of the

517 1QS III, 13. Cf. 1QS IX, 18, 20.
518 Cf. 4QD 9 V, 12; CD XIV, 7.
519 The מַהֲנֵר looks like a מַהֲנֵר (cf. Qimron, “Text,” 35 n. 1; Rabin, Zadokite Documents, 65).
520 See §4.1.3 above.
If both משלכילים and McCabe were the in CD XIII, 6 is probably not a priest. Why else should a distinction be made between McCabe and McCabe?

Lines 7-8 confirm that the McCabe is a He is the subject of "he will instruct" and McCabe, "he will give them understanding." The McCabe are mentioned in line 7, recalling Dan 11:33 and perhaps implicitly identifying the McCabe with one of the משלכילים in Daniel. The McCabe 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 conjectured in 4QDa la-b 1, we have a further link between McCabe and McCabe.

In summary, it seems most logical to understand the McCabe McCabe as someone with status in the D community who is a משלכיל, one of a class of wise men common to the communities of S and D. That the McCabe is not an isolated individual but a member of a class of משלכילים, analogous with the משלכילים of Daniel and possibly based on their example, is also the logical conclusion of 4QInstruction 81 + 81a 17, which implies that more than one McCabe instructed the McCabe McCabe. In terms of community organisation, we need to ask why McCabe is common to both S and D whereas McCabe is unique to D and McCabe 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 McCabe, belonging to a class of figures who instruct in their community. The McCabe McCabe 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 McCabe McCabe 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 McCabe. Thus while McCabe McCabe and McCabe McCabe refer to functionaries with

521 Cf. CD XIII, 22.
522 The McCabe is also the subject of McCabe in 4QDa 9 III, 5. The importance of understanding is stressed again, apparently, in 4QD 5 III, 3 (reconstructed by Baumgarten, Qumran Cave 4 XIII, 102).
523 Rabin, Zadokite Documents, 65.
specific roles, משליכי 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 משליך, 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 משליך mediates divine revelation. When the sons of light understand, they draw closer to God and participate in a divine activity, as does the משליך 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 משליכים. In the S community, one of these, a משליך, was responsible for instructing entrants, whereas there was also at least one משליך figure responsible more generally for the transmission of doctrine. Each of the camps of the D community had a figure called משליך, also a משליך, 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 משליך. 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 משליך.
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 (שכטלא, ל одном יומ, חצאמ, בק), 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.\textsuperscript{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 mediators 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\textsuperscript{d} 81 + 81a 17 is the key text. Insight, which belongs with God, is revealed and transmitted through the mediation of a מָשָׁבָלָח, and transmits what has been revealed to him to a pupil designated מָשָׁבָלָח. The pupil belongs to a group designated מָשָׁבָלָח 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.

\textsuperscript{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 משלכילים transmits this wisdom. He is one of a class of משלכילים, who either have the משלכילים of Daniel as their example or belong to the group from which Daniel arose. Among this group is a רוקח, who reveals community instructions to new entrants into the community. 4QSc IX, 1; 4QScd 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 (מזרה ותור). These rulings are revealed through this process, and are guarded and transmitted by the משלכילים 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 משלכילים, 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 משלכילים. In the camps, instruction is also given through the ממקרא, one of the משלכילים. 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 tradition\(^1\) (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 σοφίας, "insight" and σουηδία, "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 Pareasis, 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 Bouset and his followers, "[i]t is clear that, though influences stemming from the OT, from rabbinc 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 Bouset's Influence," TS 40 [1979]: 308).
Luke’s gospel provides the framework for our discussion, for two reasons. First, σύνεσις and συνήµιο 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 συνήµιο link the different parts of Luke’s presentation of Jesus together, culminating in the revelation of the risen Jesus. They are as significant for the framework of the Gospel as the three periods of Jesus' earthly ministry in Luke isolated by Hans Conzelmann. There are five pertinent references:

(1) Luke 2:47: ἐξίσταντο δὲ πάντες οἱ ἀκούοντες αὐτοῦ ἐν 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 αὐτός ὁ συνήκαν τὸ ρήμα ὅ 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, ἔνα βλέποντες μὴ βλέπωσιν καὶ ἀκούοντες μὴ συνίωσιν, “to you it has been granted to know the mysteries of


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 αὐτὸς οὐδὲν τούτων συνήκαν καὶ ἦν τὸ ρήμα τούτο κεκρυμμένον ἀπ' αὐτῶν καὶ οὐκ ἔγνωσκον 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 διηνοίξειν αὐτῶν τὸν νοῦν τοῦ συνιέναι τὰς γραφάς, "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 συνήμι 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,” and with specific reference to Luke that apart from Luke’s use of συνήμι in connection with his alteration of the Markan messianic secret to a passion secret, “[t]here are no other special features in Luke.”

The second reason for using Luke’s gospel is the amount of material in that

---

6 One ninth century uncial ms (A 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 συνήμι 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.
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.”

Passages in Luke which contain οὐνεὼς or οὐνιήμενο also inform the debate, to which Fletcher-Louis is a contributor, on the “angelomorphic” character of Luke’s presentation of Jesus, 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,” which seeks to understand early christologies in light of Jewish patterns of divine mediation. Special consideration will be given to the influence of Jewish “exalted patriarch” traditions.

---


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).


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 “theopanic 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.

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. 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. 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, 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.

The first occurrence of σωφρόνει in Luke is in Luke 2:50, where we read that

---

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 διδακτικος, 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 σωφρόνει 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 (οὗ συνήκαν) the word he had spoken to them. Luke foregrounds the in comprehens ion of those around Jesus, setting Jesus' possession of insight in opposition to his parents' lack of it.\textsuperscript{20} Their lack of understanding also anticipates the disciples' later incomprehension of what must take place.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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,\textsuperscript{23} against the background of Daniel and other early Jewish and Hellenistic

\footnotesize{
\begin{itemize}
  \item 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).
  \item \textsuperscript{22} Bovon, \textit{Saint Luc 1-9}, 156.
texts. It is not simply the wisdom of Jesus that is important, 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, 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, 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-IIX)*, 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).

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, the two appearances in Luke having close links with Daniel-OG. The annunciation to Zechariah and the introduction to the vision in Dan 10 exhibit a number of similarities: a visionary sees, fear falls upon him, and the angel commands him not to fear. Zechariah and Daniel see a vision, both are struck dumb, and similar terms are used for their recovery of speech. In Luke 1:64, Zechariah’s silence ends when he gives a name to his child, which for Neirynck recalls Daniel’s recovery of speech in Dan 10:15-16. The similarities between the closing chapters of Daniel and the annunciation to Zechariah are such that Neirynck 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».

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, Neirynck 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 Neirynck 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 Neirynck, 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.
34 Dan 10:16-17; Luke 1:64-65. In both the OG and Θ, the Greek reads καὶ ἤνωξε τὸ στόμα μου καὶ ἔλαξεν in Dan 10:16. In Luke 1:64 we read ἀνεύσχη δὲ τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ ... καὶ ἔλαξεν.
35 Neirynck, L’Évangile, 25.
36 Neirynck, L’Évangile, 26.
narrative and a major strand of Second Temple Jewish literature. 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 announcement 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. Neirynck likens the adjective καθαρτωμένη, “blessed” in Luke 1:28 to the phrase “man of favour” used of Daniel in Dan 9:23; 10:11; 10:19. 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,” 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. Brown, however, suggests that by situating Zechariah’s vision against the background of Dan 9, Luke identifies the announcement 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. Laurentin notes verbal similarities between Daniel and Luke, and also similarities between Mary and Daniel:

37 See further §3 below (on apocalyptic).
38 In Daniel, however, 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 ניינר, W. Baumgartner suggesting on the basis of Dan 10:11, 19 that should precede it as nomen regens (BHS, note b). Goldingay notes this as a valid possibility, but following GK §141c he prefers to see itself as the predicate of the noun clause (Daniel, 228). Θ readsάνηρ επιθυμιάν in all three verses. The OG has ἔλεενος alone in Dan 9:23, but ἔνθωτος ἔλεενος in Dan 10:11, 19, matching the Hebrew ניינר in both cases.
(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); (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

Neirynck, without referring to Laurentin’s study, focuses on the “apocalypse of Zechariah” (Luke 1:5-22). 47 For Neirynck, the words “I am Gabriel” (Luke 1:19: ἐγώ εἶμι 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. Neirynck 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. Neirynck compares this with Dan 10:7, because in both, the visionary is alone when the
vision occurs. Although Neirynck 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.\textsuperscript{52} Acts 9:7 reads οἱ δὲ ἄνδρες οἱ συνοδεύοντες αὐτῷ εἰστήκεισαν ἐνεοὶ, ἀκούοντες μὲν τὴς 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 ἀνθρωποὶ οἱ ὄντες μετ’ ἐμοῦ, “the men who were with me” (Dan 10:7 [OG]).\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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 ἐγὼ ἐμὴ Ἰησοῦς, “I am Jesus,” in Acts 22:8 ἐγὼ ἐμὴ Ἰησοῦς ὁ Ναζαρηνός, “I am Jesus the Nazarene,” and in Acts 26:15 ἐγὼ ἐμὴ Ἰησοῦς δὲ 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.\textsuperscript{55}

Neirynck’s last point is the use of ὄπτασία in Luke 1:22.\textsuperscript{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. Neirynck notes its use in relation to the appearance of angels to the women


\textsuperscript{53} Θ: οἱ ἄνδρες οἱ μετ’ ἐμοῦ.

\textsuperscript{54} Cf. Barrett, Acts, 452.

\textsuperscript{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.

\textsuperscript{56} Neirynck, 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.\(^{57}\) Ὑπαραγήθαι 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) Ὑπαραγήθαι 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 ἀνετάλην λαλήσατε πρὸς σὲ, “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 ὅψευς.\(^{60}\) 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.


\(^{60}\) Laurentin notes the occurrence of ὅψευς in Dan 8:27 (Θ); Luke 2:50 (Structure, 48 n. 2) but does not expand on its significance, nor on the link between ὅψευς and the appearances of Gabriel. Following Delitzsch, Laurentin postulates that the Hebrew root ג ו might underlie the Lukan text as well as Θ.
2.1.2. The verb σωνήμα in Greek Daniel

The use of σωνήμα in Luke 2:47, and the use of σωνήμα 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 חָלֵך in the OG and Θ. He notes that Θ normally translates both nominal and verbal forms of חָלֵך with the verb σωνήμα and the noun σώνεις, with two exceptions (Dan 1:17; 9:22). Θ also uses these words to translate forms of יְרֵך. The OG consistently translates forms of יְרֵך with forms of διανοεόμαι, but the translator makes no distinction between σωνήμα and διανοεόμαι when translating חָלֵך. The following table lays out the translation equivalents in the OG and Θ of חָלֵך and יְרֵך where they occur in Hebrew and Aramaic, in both nominal and verbal forms:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>MT</th>
<th>OG</th>
<th>Θ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dan 1:4</td>
<td>לָשֶׁל Hiph.</td>
<td>ἐπιστήμων</td>
<td>σωνήμα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan 1:4</td>
<td>יַרְבוּ Hiph.</td>
<td>σωνέως</td>
<td>διανοεόμαι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan 1:17</td>
<td>לָשֶׁל Hiph.</td>
<td>σῶνεις</td>
<td>φρόνησις</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan 1:17</td>
<td>יַרְבוּ Hiph.</td>
<td>διδωμι + σῶνεις</td>
<td>σωνήμα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan 1:20</td>
<td>נַעָב</td>
<td>παιδεία</td>
<td>σωνέως</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan 2:21</td>
<td>לָשֶׁל</td>
<td>ἐπιστήμη</td>
<td>σωνέως</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan 5:11</td>
<td>לָשֶׁל</td>
<td>σῶνεις</td>
<td>σωνήμα</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

62 The Greek paraphrases; it does not match the MT precisely.
63 The Greek is not absolutely literal: חָלֵך is matched by ἐπιστήμην καὶ σῶνεις καὶ φρόνησις.
64 סְוֹנְאִיס is here used to translate יְרֵך.
65 The ambiguity of יְרֵך Hiphil (whether it is causative or not) is reflected in the two Greek versions. The OG understands יְרֵך to be causative: ἔδωκε σωνέως, "He gave insight." Θ: σωνήσες, "he understood."
66 The OG here translates יְרֵך פָּקַנ with σῶνεις. The MT reads נַעָב תַּמְכָּנָה a construct chain meaning something like "insightful wisdom." However, both the OG and Θ reflect two synonymous absolute nouns, נַעָב תַּמְכָּנָה (cf. BHS note).
67 The OG does not offer a literal translation; σῶνεις translates נַעָב פָּקַנ.
68 Θ translates נַעָב פָּקַנ with φρόνησις. The collocation of φρόνησις and σῶνεις not uncommon in Θ.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dan 5:12</td>
<td>יִשְׂרָאֵל</td>
<td>σύνεσις</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan 5:14</td>
<td>יִשְׂרָאֵל</td>
<td>σύνεσις</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan 7:8</td>
<td>צְפִּים</td>
<td>προσνοέω</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan 8:5</td>
<td>יִשְׂרָאֵל</td>
<td>διανοεομαί</td>
<td>συνίστημι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan 8:15</td>
<td>יִשְׂרָאֵל</td>
<td>διανοεομαί</td>
<td>συνίστημι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan 8:16</td>
<td>יִשְׂרָאֵל</td>
<td>συνετίζω</td>
<td>συνετίζω</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan 8:17</td>
<td>יִשְׂרָאֵל</td>
<td>διανοεομαί</td>
<td>συνίστημι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan 8:23</td>
<td>יִשְׂרָאֵל</td>
<td>διανοεομαί</td>
<td>συνίστημι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan 8:25</td>
<td>יִשְׂרָאֵל</td>
<td>διανοημα</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan 8:27</td>
<td>יִשְׂרָאֵל</td>
<td>διανοεομαί</td>
<td>συνίστημι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan 9:2</td>
<td>יִשְׂרָאֵל</td>
<td>διανοεομαί</td>
<td>συνίστημι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan 9:13</td>
<td>יִשְׂרָאֵל</td>
<td>διανοεομαί</td>
<td>συνίστημι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan 9:22</td>
<td>יִשְׂרָאֵל</td>
<td>προσέρχομαί</td>
<td>συνετίζω</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan 9:22</td>
<td>יִשְׂרָאֵל</td>
<td>υποτελέκνυμι</td>
<td>συμβεβάζω</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan 9:22</td>
<td>יִשְׂרָאֵל</td>
<td>διάνοια</td>
<td>σύνεσις</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan 9:23</td>
<td>יִשְׂרָאֵל</td>
<td>διανοεομαί</td>
<td>συνίστημι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan 9:23</td>
<td>יִשְׂרָאֵל</td>
<td>συνίστημι</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan 9:25</td>
<td>יִשְׂרָאֵל</td>
<td>διανοεομαί</td>
<td>συνίστημι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan 10:1</td>
<td>יִשְׂרָאֵל</td>
<td>διανοεομαί</td>
<td>σύνεσις</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

69 σύνεσις seems to match רָאֵשׁ and γρηγόρης seems to match ἐπιτίθημι (cf. verse 14). The OG is different from the MT: ὁ ἀνυπότοτος ήν καὶ σοφός, “the man was knowledgeable and wise.”

70 MT: ἀνυπότοτος and I was seeking understanding” (converted imperfect + noun). OG: έλεγεν διανοηθήναι, “I was seeking to understand” (imperfect + infinitive). Did the Vorlage of the OG read ἀνυπότοτος?

71 Dan 8:25 (Θ) does not reflect the Hebrew יִשְׂרָאֵל. The Greek δ ζυγός του κλοιοῦ κατεδυνεῖ, “the yoke of his collar makes straight” suggests that instead of על "on account of" the translator understood "yoke" (cf. Collins, Daniel, 327).

72 MT: καὶ, “and he gave understanding.” The OG and the Peshitta read נַבִּינָי, “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 פְּרָשַׁת is explicit. OG: υποδείξαλ σοι διάνοιαν, “to show you understanding”; Θ: συμβεβάζει ο σο συνίστημι, “to teach you insight.”

74 The OG contains no parallel to the second half of Gabriel’s command (ποιμήν ἡμών Ἰσραήλ), reading simply διανοηθήτη το πρόσταγμα, “understand the ordinance.”

75 Cf. Origen; Aquila reads συνίστης, echoing the general tendency of Θ.

76 OG: διανοηθήνησεν αὐτὸ ἐν ὀράματι, “he understood it in a/the vision” (αὐτὸ refers back to πρόσταγμα = רָאֵשׁ).

77 Θ ignores רָאֵשׁ, translating פְּרָשַׁת לְךָ נַבִּינָי, with καὶ σύνεσις εδώθη αὐτῷ ἐν τῇ ὀπτασίᾳ, “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
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Greek Word</th>
<th>Aramaic Word</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dan 10:11</td>
<td>Hiph.</td>
<td>διανοεόμαι</td>
<td>סענְיהָם</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan 10:12</td>
<td>Hiph.</td>
<td>διανοεόμαι</td>
<td>סענְיהָם</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan 10:14</td>
<td>Hiph.</td>
<td>ὑποδείκνυμι</td>
<td>סענְיהָם</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan 11:30</td>
<td>Qal</td>
<td>διανοεόμαι</td>
<td>סענְיהָם</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan 11:33</td>
<td>Hiph.</td>
<td>ἐννοεῖ</td>
<td>סענְיהָם</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan 11:33</td>
<td>Hiph.</td>
<td>סענְיהָם</td>
<td>סענְיהָם</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan 11:35</td>
<td>Hiph.</td>
<td>סענְיהָם</td>
<td>סענְיהָם</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan 11:37</td>
<td>Qal/Hiph. (2t)</td>
<td>προοέω (2t)</td>
<td>סענְיהָם (2t)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan 12:3</td>
<td>Hiph.</td>
<td>סענְיהָם</td>
<td>סענְיהָם</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan 12:8</td>
<td>Qal/Hiph.</td>
<td>διανοεόμαι</td>
<td>סענְיהָם</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan 12:10</td>
<td>Qal/Hiph.</td>
<td>διανοεόμαι</td>
<td>סענְיהָם</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan 12:10</td>
<td>Hiph.</td>
<td>διανοεόμαι</td>
<td>νοήμων</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Συνείμα is clearly characteristic of Daniel-Θ. Morton Smith implies that ἀποκαλύπτω, "reveal" is characteristic of Θ also. Thus, as סענְיהָם and its cognates characteristically render בָּשָׁלָם and בָּשָׁלָם in Daniel-Θ, so ἀποκαλύπτω characteristically renders יֵלָלָם. 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. ְָּלְָנָב 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 σύνεις 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.

sapiential terminology current in the Second Temple period and familiar from Qumran, and that Daniel-θ reflects this terminology fairly faithfully. Σωφίας and its cognates may be regarded as recognised equivalents for בְּלָשׁ and גָּ רִי 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 σοφίας and its cognates in Daniel-θ, it may be argued that by using σοφίας 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

Although 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

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." 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, disagreeing with Ziony Zevit, who identifies the מֹעַט מֹעַט in Dan 7:13 as Gabriel. 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.
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 מֹעַט מֹעַט, “the end of the account.” On this basis we may follow Day in identifying מֹעַט מֹעַט with Michael (cf. Rowland, Open Heaven, 181-182), and מֹעַט מֹעַט (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.”®
Collins suggests that in Luke Gabriel takes over the role of the הוהי כלאל of the HB in
announcing the births of John the Baptist and Jesus.® Certainly a comparison may be
drawn with the announcement of the birth of Samson (Judg 13), but it would be more
accurate to say that Luke draws on the revelatory function of the הוהי כלאל 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.” 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 (כלי עליון הוא: “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.® Winter also notes Tg.
Ps.-J. Gen 37:15 (which identifies Gabriel as the unnamed שְָנָא who finds Joseph in the
MT), Tg. Ps.-J. Exod 24:10 (in which the pavement is apparently fashioned by
Gabriel), and Tg. Ket. Ps 137:7, concluding that “[t]he author of Luke I 19 lived and

Gospel,” NTS 1 (1954-1955): 111. See §2.2.3.3 below.
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.
® 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”: שְמָעָה מִכְּבַר פְּרָנָה רַבָּתָא דַּרְאָא אֲשֶׁר מִלתָּא דַּרְאָא מִלָּו מְעַזִּירוּ מְרָא.
(7) אמר פְּרָנָה רַבָּה דַּרְאָא אֲשֶׁר מִלתָּא דַּרְאָא מִלָּו מְעַזִּירוּ מְרָא
(8) נָלַת לֶא
(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 I 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 I En. 40:9 Gabriel is one of the

---

\(^{91}\) Winter, “Cultural Background,” 237.


\(^{93}\) Cf. Apoc. Mos. 40:2-6, in which Michael, Gabriel, Uriel, and Raphael prepare Adam and Abel’s bodies for burial.


> וְשֵׁרֶר מִמְרָאֵי רְדָחוֹת מַכָּאָלוֹ נְבֵי רֲאוּאָל מַשְׁרֵי בָּלְעָלִים דְּפָסוֹא דְּפָסוֹא בָּאָса מַתְּחָא אֲוֶאֶד שָׁמוֹא לֵבָא

> "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 מִמְרָאֵי 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:

> כְּלֵילִי פָּסָחוּ אָוֶאֶד נְבֵי רֲאוּאָל מַשְׁרֵי בָּאָса מַתְּחָא אֲוֶאֶד שָׁמוֹא לֵבָא

> "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).

four angels of the Lord of spirits (alongside Michael, Raphael, and Phanuel) and intercedes for those on earth. 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. 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 (עמלקי מלאכי) in the eschatological battle. In 1 En. 71:8, 9, 13 the same four encircle 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, we are given a list of the “princes” appointed over the seven firmaments. Michael is appointed over the uppermost firmament (the seventh) and is the only “prince” described as ד"ו"ו "הגדול", “the great prince” (cf. Dan 12:1; b. Hag. 12b). The others (including Gabriel, appointed over the sixth firmament) are described as מ"ו "החיים", “the prince of the host.” The names and functions of the “princes who guide the world” (V228: שריים בהמות נבשתוaramel) are given in 3 En. 14 (Synopse, §§18, 899),

98 In connection with I En. 71:7-9, compare Isa 6:2 (LXX): και οραφαν εισεχουν κυκλω αυτου, “and seraphim stood around it,” which contains the idea of heavenly beings surrounding the throne rather than standing above (MT: מלכסל) 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 asملאך יד הפסים והגרים מחרים מלאך, “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” (מַסֵּא לָה). 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 ברדייל 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 ο δαγγελος του Πνευματος του άγιου, 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 1MITIM derives from the Hebrew 71M, “hail” and הָלַךְ, “god.” In b. Pesah. 118a, the prince of hail רוֹרֵד (פַּרְקָדָה) is named רוֹרֵד (שָׁלוֹם חָיָה חָיָה חָיָה) 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: שָׁלֹם חָיָה חָיָה חָיָה; D436: 플ַּפַּף חָיָה חָיָה חָיָה). N8128, O1531, and M22 read מַרְגָּפָא; V228 and B238 read מַרְגָּפָא. The only occurrence of מַרְגָּפָא 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.


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 δαγγελος του Πνευματος του άγιου with δαγγελος του προφητικου Πνευματος 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, and with Luke 24:4; John 20:12, in which two angels appear after the resurrection. The frequent role of Gabriel in bringing people to heaven is used by Daniélou to support his identification, 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. Slavonic Enoch 24:1 helps to verify this. Finally, Ascen. Isa. 11:4 links the angel of the Holy Spirit with the appearance of the Angel of the Lord to Joseph, 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. 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 isangelus interpres for Daniel helps to clarify the role of the angel of the Holy Spirit asangelus interpres for Isaiah.

Daniélou also finds evidence for identifying Gabriel with the Word, that is, the second person of the Trinity. 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.
110 Daniélou, Theology, 129.
111 Daniélou, Theology, 130; Gieschen, “Angelomorphic Christology,” 259.
114 Gieschen, “Angelomorphic Christology,” 263.
115 Daniélou, Theology, 131-132.
form of the angel Gabriel (cf. *Sib. Or.* 8:456-462). 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 linking 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, Uriel, Phanuel, Vrevoil, and Metatron. However, the Lukan infancy narrative is only aware of traditions linking the revelatory function with the άρπαγηκύνειος κυπέλλω 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.

---

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.
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 הָיוֹן בְּכָנָנָה mean in the MT? John Goldingay suggests, following Keil, that the phrase refers to Daniel and means “wearied with weariness.” If so, הָיוֹן is a Hophal participle from הָיֹן and הָיוֹן בְּכָנָנָה is the preposition ב followed by the hapax legomenon בְּכָנָה. LaCocque, however, translates “by a swift flight,” setting the idea of angels flying in the context of Isa 6 and Ezek 1. In similar fashion, L. H. Brockington emends to בְּכָנָה וְלֹא. Although the MT apparently refers to different heavenly beings in Isa 6; Ezek 1; Dan 9, an intertextual reading of Dan 9:21 (א) and Isa 6 is illuminating. Regardless of the original meaning of the Hebrew, the most literal renderings of Dan 9:21 (א; 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 around the seated Lord have six wings. With two they covered (or hid) their face, with two they covered their feet, and with two they flew (בְּכָנָה). The LXX reads καὶ τὰς ἄγγελους ζοστατοῦντο. Thus Isa 6:2 (LXX) and Dan 9:21 (א) are linked by תֶּפֶנְתוֹת. 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 

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 שַׁלמָּה and Ezek 1:6 refers to the four נִמְצָא of verses 5 and 14 (cf. Collins, Daniel, 352).
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. מַלְאָךְ (Gen 28:12) is thus understood to be synonymous with מַלְאָךְ (Isa 6:2). Cf. Eugen Werber, The Sarajevo Haggadah (Belgrade: Prosveta, 1985), 27-28 (Eng.), 8 (Heb.).
127 The verb מַלְאָךְ derives from the root מַלָּשׁ. In the MT, the verbs and pronominal suffixes are 3rd masc. sing., though they surely refer to each individual seraph, not to מַלְאָךְ.
prayer. All three texts are linked with temple worship. 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, recalling later Mandaean texts in which Gabriel is ἀπεστάλης, “apostle.” “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 ה‘ and the LXX’s ἁφατο are exactly paralleled in Dan 9:21 (Θ). 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. 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, the first two of Ezekiel’s four visions (Ezek 1:1-3:15; 8:1-12:4; 10:17-12:13; 11:25-12:16), 133

---

129 Cf. the shepherd in Herm. Vis. 5, who is the “angel of repentance” (Vis. 5.7: ο ἀγγέλος τῆς μετανοιας). The shepherd says in Vis. 5.2 that he was “sent by the most revered angel” (ἀπεστάλην ὑπὸ τοῦ σεμνότατου ἄγγελου), 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, φησίν, Ἴνα ἄ εἶδες πρότερον τάντα σοι πάλιν θείων). The shepherd is an angelic revealer who has been sent. Gabriel is “sent” (שַלָ) 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: προσήγνως. Similarly, Collins (Daniel, 351) suggests that “[t]he meaning “approached” is required if the phrase מגלות כים_iff ’ 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: ἀναμένει πάντα ἃ ζητάσαν ἡ Ἰωάννα καὶ ἡ Σοφία λέγει λέγει, “Raba said, ‘Isaiah saw everything Ezekiel saw.’”
8-11) should be discussed. A passage in the *Hekhalot Zutarti* section of *N8128* 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. Although twelve figures are mentioned, this recalls the throne above the four ποταμοί in Ezek 1:26. These winged creatures are called מְלֵאךְ כּוֹרָסָה in Ezek 10. In later tradition, then, Gabriel is linked with the heavenly realm presented using imagery drawn from Ezekiel’s visions.

However, the unnamed מְלֵאךְ הָעַרְבָּא in Ezekiel is closer in appearance to angels in Daniel than are Ezekiel’s ποταμοί. This is reinforced by the fact that in Ezek 9:2 (LXX) this figure is κοσμουκτος ποταμη, “clothed with a long robe,” a phrase used to describe the angelomorphic figure in Rev 1:13. This figure may be linked with Gabriel in tradition (cf. Dan 12:7): he is commanded to take fire (נהエリア) from the midst of...
the (wheelwork) in Ezek 10:6, possibly indicating the origin of Gabriel’s title in 3 En. 14 (רומא), The man clothed with linen is understood to be Gabriel in b. Yoma 77a, 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, 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. 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. 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 יושב שׁלומך, 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 (ลาน כותל). 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” (לאו מָלֵאך) to rescue his servants. In Pseudo-Philo, LA.B. 38:3, an angel called Nathaniel is the angel in charge of fire. This is an otherwise unknown tradition. One tradition (n) 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 (נַחֲנָתִיא) appears in Sepher haRazim as one of the angels of the first firmament who serve רחים. 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” (תֹרֵן יִשְׂרָאֵל).

142 Cf. Zimmerli, Ezekiel 1, 251.


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 ἐστίς refers to Philip’s dream in *Alex.* 2.5, recalling the use of ἔστια 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.
\[148\] Φάσμα is used in *Alex.* 3.1.
More importantly, a distinction is made between esoteric and exoteric teachings:

*Éoíke dé Ἀλέξανδρος οὖς μόνον τὸν ἑσικὸν καὶ πολιτικὸν παραλαβένιν λόγον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸν ἀπορρήτων καὶ βαθύτερων διδασκαλίαν, δέ κι ἄνδρες ἰδίως ἄκροαματικальн καὶ ἕποπτικάς προσαγορεύοντες οὐκ ἐξέφερον εἰς πολλούς, μετασχέιν.َ

*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 βαθὺ τοῦ θεοῦ, “the deep things of God” (cf. βαθύτερων 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 4QMystb 1 II, 4-5; 5 5 (Ῥωμαίων Κεντρον); 1 Cor 2:7 (καλοῦμεν θεοῦ σοφίαν ἐν μυστηρίῳ τὴν ἀποκρυμμένην, “we speak God’s wisdom, hidden in a mystery”). Bockmuehl notes, with reference to the τέλειον 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 προφήτη at Qumran.

Conybeare dates Philostratus’ Life of Apollonius after 217 C.E. Conybeare dates Philostratus’ Life of Apollonius after 217 C.E. It is possible that Apollonius was set up as a rival to Jesus, though Conybeare’s objection remains strong. Vit. Apoll. 1 recalls Plutarch, Alex. 7, Philostratus relating that Pythagoras’ followers had imposed silence upon themselves, having heard “many divine and secret things.” 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 Ἀπόλλωνι ὑπὲρ σοφιλοσοφήσαται).

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 figure renowned for wisdom appears to Apollonius’ mother. In both the birth of an extraordinary child is predicted. Proteus likens Apollonius to himself, suggesting that we should ask whether Gabriel understands Jesus to be like himself, since both Gabriel and Jesus are figures who possess and teach heavenly wisdom. Vit. Apoll. 5 recounts Apollonius’ miraculous birth, and he is called παῖς τοῦ Διός, “child of Zeus” by the people of Tyana in Vit. Apoll. 6. In Vit. Apoll. 7 we read of Apollonius’ education, and of the temple of

---

152 Conybeare, Apollonius 1:vi.
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 Πολλᾶ γὰρ θεϊά τε καὶ ἀπόρρητα ἥκουσαν, “I heard many divine and secret things.”
156 Proteus describes himself as ὁ Αιγύπτιος τεός, “the Egyptian god.”
157 When asked by Apollonius’ mother what sort of child she would bear, Proteus simply replies ξυ. Apollonius is said to be ἄγαθος θεῶν, “near the gods,” in Vit. Apoll. 5.
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 ξερῷ ἐφιλοσωφεῖ ἐν ἐφήβω ἔτε, “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: παιδα μορφῇ ... θεον). 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

\(^{160}\) Ο ’Ασκληπιός αὐτὸς ἐπὶ δήλος 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 ἔλεησας αὐτὸν καὶ πρὸς τὴν ἱκεσίαν ἐπικλασθεῖς ἐφώτισε). 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” (חכמה 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 πάση σοφίᾳ καὶ φρόνησις γνωρίσας ἣμῖν 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: φρόνησις τε καὶ ἀνθρεία 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.
165 Cf. Diodorus Siculus, Bibl. Hist. 40.3.8.
field of divine wisdom. Furthermore, Luke 2:47-48 may be echoed in Moses 1.6, where those around Moses are astonished at his intellect. Philo uses καταπληττω (καταπληττόμενοι) and Luke uses ἐκπλήσσω (ἐκπλάγγοναν), 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, the annunciation of Moses' birth is closer to the Lukan infancy narrative than the Matthean, and must be considered. L.A.B. 9:10 reads:

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 byssina170 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 enarrasset 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 φρόνης 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).


There is a similarity between “[e]t spiritus Dei incidit in Mariam” and “spiritus sanctus superveniet in te” (Luke 1:35; Gk: πνεῦμα ἄγιον ἐπελεύσεται ἐν σε). 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. 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:

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.


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 ἀνθρώπος), 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


173 Gk: οὗτος ἐσται μέγας καὶ υἱὸς δικαιοσύνης κληθήσεται καὶ δώσει αὐτῷ κύριος ὁ θεός τῶν θρόνων Δαυὶδ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ, καὶ βασιλεύσει ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον Ἰακώβ εἷς τοῦ αἰῶνα 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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{175} Perrot urges caution here, while commenting “[s]i l’on refuse cette identification, il faut alors expliquer l’extraordinaire silence de l’auteur à l’endroit des anges les plus fameux à son époque.”\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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.)”\textsuperscript{178}

\textsuperscript{174} Perrot, Bogaert, and Harrington, \textit{Pseudo-Philon} 2:106.
\textsuperscript{175} Cited in Perrot, Bogaert, and Harrington, \textit{Pseudo-Philon} 2:61.
\textsuperscript{176} Perrot, Bogaert, and Harrington, \textit{Pseudo-Philon} 2:61.
\textsuperscript{177} Perrot, Bogaert, and Harrington, \textit{Pseudo-Philon} 2:62.
\textsuperscript{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 announcement 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 \textit{שֵׁלָם} רַשֶׁה in Dan 3, alluded to in \textit{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 (כֹּל בֵּית וַיִּתְנַח מִלָּה זְכָרָיו). In verse 25. Similarly, Manoah’s wife describes the appearance of the angel in Judg 13:6 as “like the appearance of God’s angel” (כֹּל בֵּית וַיִּתְנַח מִלָּה זְכָרָיו) in Judg 13:6. In Manoah’s prayer in Judg 13:8, the \textit{שֵׁלָם} רַשֶׁה is understood to have been “sent” (כֹּל בֵּית וַיִּתְנַח מִלָּה זְכָרָיו), and Manoah wishes him to “teach” (כֹּל בֵּית וַיִּתְנַח מִלָּה זְכָרָיו) 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 (כֹּל בֵּית וַיִּתְנַח מִלָּה זְכָרָיו), and Manoah and his wife respond by falling to the ground on their faces (כֹּל בֵּית וַיִּתְנַח מִלָּה זְכָרָיו). 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 \textit{b. Pesah.} 118a and 3 \textit{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[ys]sina,” though the vocabulary is not identical. It is worth noting, in addition, that the etymology of the name יִשרֵא is connected with a Hebrew word meaning “man”: יִשְׂרָא.

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 יִשְׂרֵא הָבִישׁי has a “scribe’s ink-pot”182 in his belt (מְסִרֲרֵתָה בְּרִיבָר). 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

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 מְסִירֲרֵתָה בְּרִיבָר 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, 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 τῶν ἁγγέλων τῶν.
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. In particular, Exod 12:23 mentions נְתַנָּה שָׁמַיִם, “the destroyer,” apparently a heavenly being appointed to destroy those whose lintels and doorposts are not marked with the blood of the paschal victim. 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: στολὴ 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, David wearing a linen garment while bringing the ark to Jerusalem (1 Chr 15:27; LXX: στολὴ 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...
priestly worship in the temple. 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 βουσοίνην symbolises royal favour. In Esth 1:6 (LXX), linen hangings (σχοινίοις βουσοίνης) indicate opulence. The most important references are in Daniel. In Dan 10:5 (OG), ενδεδυμένος βύσσινα translates ἔνθιςεν ἐν βύσσινα, whereas Θ reads ενδεδυμένος βαδδίν, the translator being unable to render βύσσινα: Dan 12:6-7 (OG) has τὰ βύσσινα twice for ἡμῖν ἐπὶ, Θ giving τὰ βαδίν. Remembering that scholars have generally accepted L. Cohn's suggestion that L.A.B. reflects a Greek Vorlage based on a Hebrew original, the hypothesis may be advanced that "in veste byssind" reflects Gk ενδεδυμένος βύσσινα, which in turn reflects Heb. לובָשׁ איש. 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 λαμπρὰν καθαρόν 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 ενδεδυμένοι βύσσινον λευκὰν καθαρόν, 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" (יִשְׂרָאֵל וּמֶשֶׁחַ) may refer to both the angelic host and persecuted Jews (Apocalyptic Imagination, 104-107; cf. p. 110).

191 Cf. Esth 8:15.


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 σύνεκτις and συνέφημα is comparable with Daniel, Daniel-Θ characteristically using them to render יְבָנָי and בַּכָּשׁ, 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,” citing the baptism and transfiguration of Jesus as examples. The book of Daniel, in particular, has been studied in relation to the Synoptics, special attention being devoted to the Son of Man question. 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,” arguing persuasively that Mark is rooted in Jewish

---

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. Similarly, according to Adela Yarbro Collins, "[w]ith Mark the gospel tradition reaches its apocalyptic peak." Perrin and Duling regard early Palestinian Christianity as "an apocalyptic sect within Judaism," and Mark’s gospel as an "apocalyptic drama," the product of a community which "reflects Christian apocalyptic sectarianism." 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. 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. 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.

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, 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.
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 (κηρύσσων: Mark 1:7) and was delivered up (παραδίδομαι: Mark 1:14); (2) Jesus preached (κηρύσσων: Mark 1:14, 39, 45) and was delivered up (παραδίδομαι: 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 (παραδίδομαι: 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.
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, μυσέων," *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).


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.\textsuperscript{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,\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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."\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{219} A

\textsuperscript{214} Hartman, Prophecy, 16.
\textsuperscript{215} Hartman, Prophecy, 17; cf. Russell, Method, 37.
\textsuperscript{217} Vielhauer, “Apocalypses,” 582.
\textsuperscript{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, but questioned by Michael Knibb, who, noting the confusion caused by the lack of a single use of the term apocalyptic, 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. Stephen Cook offers a slightly more nuanced three-fold distinction, distinguishing between apocalyptic as a literary phenomenon, as a worldview or type of religious thinking, and as a social phenomenon.

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., Collins offers a "master-paradigm" for the structure of an apocalypse and, while categorising apocalypses into six sub-types, 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

---


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.


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." 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. A major characteristic of a number of apocalypses is revealed knowledge, as represented by lists of revealed things. These lists are "catalogues of the subject matter of apocalyptic speculation," 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, 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). One item found in several apocalyptic lists is counting stars or recording their names, an item linked with biblical passages which refer to God counting or calling the stars by name and indicative of the "special status or role of the one who knows."
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. The comparison between the righteous and the stars is known from a number of other texts, and it seems possible to discern a relationship between the righteous, angels, and the stars. 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 worldview 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.


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. 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.

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, using this to define several other texts as apocalyptic writings. 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, and the apocalyptic mode of revelation is independent of any eschatological system.

Murray-Jones, Philip Davis, and Fletcher-Louis have all followed

---

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.
246 *1 Enoch; 2 Enoch; Jubilees; 2 Baruch; 3 Baruch; 4 Ezra; Apocalypse of Abraham; Testament of Abraham; Testament of Levi; Testament of Naphthali; Mart. Ascen. Isa. 6-11; Shepherd of Hermas; 3 Enoch; Rowland, Open Heaven, 15. Russell offers a slightly different list (Method, 37).
Rowland's lead in understanding apocalyptic literature as primarily recording revelations of divine mysteries. 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; 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 מַשָּׂעַ הָעֵדֶּשׁ 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 מַשָּׂעַ הָעֵדֶּשׁ of Daniel and the disciples in Mark's Gospel

Seán Freyne's comparison of the מַשָּׂעַ הָעֵדֶּשׁ and the disciples in Mark should be read in the context of the scholarly interest in the relationship between Mark and apocalyptic texts. Before turning to Freyne's study, however, it is necessary to clarify the identity of the מַשָּׂעַ הָעֵדֶּשׁ in Daniel.

\[\text{Compare also Peter Tomson's understanding of } \mu\nu\sigma\tau\iota\rho\omicron\nu \text{ 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).}
4.1.1. The Młý

Many scholars take מַלְכֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל (Dan 11:33, 35; 12:3, 10) to refer to a specific group behind the book of Daniel. Alfred Mertens suggests that because מַלְכֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל is absolute, with no object, it has the stereotypical tone of a title. 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 מַלְכֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל. Martin Hengel understands מַלְכֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל as a “fixed term for a group which proved itself as teachers and martyrs in the [Antiochene] persecution.” John Collins takes the מַלְכֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל 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. The activism of the מַלְכֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל lies, rather, in making theVISIONARİES understand. Collins understands מַלְכֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל in Dan 11:33 to refer to “a party of faithful Jews” among the מַלְכֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל of verse 32. The visionary associates himself with the מַלְכֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל, who were distinguished from others by their knowledge and active as teachers in Jerusalem. The could withstand the Antiochene persecution on account of their wisdom, their resistance being inspired by allegiance to a heavenly kingdom.

255 Mertens, Daniel, 64.
259 Collins, Apocalyptic Imagination, 111.
261 Collins, Apocalyptic Vision, 168, 212.
264 Collins, Apocalyptic Vision, 211.
John Goldingay is rightly cautious in attempting to identify the circles which produced Daniel, but also concludes that the אבִּיתָם לְדָנִיאֶל of Dan 11:33-35 are probably those responsible for the book. 265 Philip Davies, similarly, sees in the אבִּיתָם לְדָנִיאֶל the authors of Daniel. 266 This recalls Nötscher's view, cited approvingly by Mertens, that with the אבִּיתָם לְדָנִיאֶל 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 אבִּיתָם לְדָנִיאֶל to indicate a specific group. Daniel-OG uses three different verbs to translate אבִּיתָם לְדָנִיאֶל. 268 Daniel-Θ is more consistent. Συνήμετα is used in Dan 11:35; 12:3, the cognate adjective οὐσίωτος in Dan 11:33. The adjective νοημων is used in Dan 12:10, but this may be explained by the collocation of יִרֵך and ב' תּוֹ. The translator may have thought using Συνήμετα to translate both the participle and the verb of which the participle is the subject tautologous, preferring to use Συνήμετα for יִרֵך rather than יִרֵך. Admittedly a comparable collocation occurs in Dan 11:33, where οὐσίωτος translates the participle of יִרֵך and Συνήμετα (used transitively) translates יִרֵך Hiphil. This implies either that Daniel-Θ also does not understand the אבִּיתָם לְדָנִיאֶל 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 Συνήμετα, οὐσίωτος, and Συνήμετα are prominent, and readers of Daniel-Θ would have found that the group referred to in Dan

265 Goldingay, Daniel, 329. Goldingay describes the אבִּיתָם לְדָנִיאֶל 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 Aramaic Daniel, 252 n. 12).


267 Mertens, Daniel, 63.

268 Συνήμετα (Dan 11:33); διανοηματ (Dan 12:10); Συνήμετα (Dan 11:35; 12:3).
11:33; 12:3 is designated οἱ σοφοὶ τῆς σοφίας. Daniel-Θ does not reflect the relationship between יִצְוָה and שַׁבְרִל in the Hebrew, but emphasises strongly the theme of wisdom, represented by σοφία 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 σοφία and its cognates than the OG. The OG’s favourite verb of intellection, δινοεομαι, occurs in no NT text.

Those designated “the wise” (השכיבים; οἱ σοφοὶ τῆς σοφίας) 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 מְשָׁכֵי-לְיִז and the disciples; (2) the mode of revelation and its content; and (3) the function of the revelatory experience in the end-time struggle. 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 מְשָׁכֵי-לְיִז; and (3) a group instructed by the מְשָׁכֵי-לְיִז called the “many” (רְקִים) and the “people” (לְוֵי). In Mark, the three groups are (1) Jesus’ opponents; (2) his disciples; and (3) the crowd, who correspond to the מְשָׁכֵי-לְיִז of Dan 11:33 in that they also need instruction. The term מְשָׁכֵי-לְיִז links the מְשָׁכֵי-לְיִז with Daniel himself (Dan 1:4), 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 Mark is comparable with the pattern of Daniel and his companions representing the

Mark's transfiguration narrative recalls Daniel's vision of the man clothed with linen, 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. 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."

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. Freyne concludes by cautiously suggesting that his comparison might support the hypothesis that Mark was directly influenced by Daniel, 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."

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, *μορφήν* occurs only here (Mark 4:11) in Mark but often in the OG and *θ* of Daniel, translating the Aramaic _damage. Second, *οὐ κρίνον* 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.
277 Freyne, "Disciples," 16.
4.1.3. Μυστήριον (Mark 4:11)

Robert Guelich notes that "μυστήριον functions as a part of the language of revelation," then if we accept that "[t]he disclosure of divine secrets is the true theme of later Jewish apocalyptic" then we are dealing in Mark 4:11 with a concept rooted in Jewish apocalyptic: the giving of a mystery. Although Sirach is often considered uninterested in apocalyptic, this concept appears in Sir 3:19: "for God’s mercies are many, and to the poor he reveals his counsel." Sinaiticus suppletor reads πολλοὶ έλον ύψηλοι καὶ ἐπίδοξοι, ἀλλὰ πράσειν ἀποκαλύπτει τὰ μυστήρια αὐτοῦ, “the proud and glorious are many, but he reveals his mysteries to the gentle.”

Sinaiticus suppletor occurs four more times in Sirach (Sir 22:22; 27:16, 17, 21), though in each case the usage is secular. 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: δικαιοίς) claims to have “knowledge of God” (γνώσει θεοῦ) and calls himself “a child of the Lord” (Wis 2:13: παῖς κυρίου). Wisd 6:22 presents Solomon as a revealer of mysteries. Μυστήριον in

---


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).


287 A similar reading is found in the Syriac, which Moshe Zvi Segal retroverts thus: רכיבי אבימי אלוהים, לזרענו ילב יסד, understanding מנסים as a corruption of נס (Aramaic, נס). Μυστήριον as a part of the language of revelation.

288 Bornkamm, TDNT 4:814.
Wisd 14:15, 23 refers to mystery cults.\footnote{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.}

The plural ὑποτήρια in Sir 3:19; Wis 2:22 may be reflected by the plural in Matt 13:11 (τὰ ὑποτήρια τῆς βασιλείας τῶν οὐρανῶν, “the mysteries of the kingdom of the heavens”) and Luke 8:10 (τὰ ὑποτήρια τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ, “the mysteries of the kingdom of God”)\footnote{Cf. also the plural in 1 Cor 4:1, where the apostles are to be reckoned “stewards of God’s mysteries” (ός ... οἰκονόμους μυστηρίων θεοῦ).} 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.\footnote{Freyne, “Disciples,” 16.} If this is the case, δέδωκαί 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 ἔδωκεν ἀντίθεν τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ, “insight was given to him in the vision,”\footnote{Cf. Wis 7:7: εἴδομαι, καὶ φῶνεις ἔδωκα μοι, “I prayed, and insight was given to me.” It is not suggested that Solomon’s wisdom was given through an intermediary.} the passive of δέδωκαί 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 הֵלֶלֶלֶלֶלֶלֶלֶלֶלֶלֶלֶלֶלֶלֶלֶלֶלֶלֶלֶלֶלֶלֶלֶלֶלֶלֶלֶלֶלֶלֶלֶלֶלֶl טבּיִבִּבִּבִּb. As Daniel the interpret Nebuchadnezzar’s dream, so Jesus interprets the parable of the sower,\footnote{Cf. Marcus, Mystery, 45-46.} and as the הֵלֶלֶלֶלֶלֶl the instruct, so Jesus instructs. The instruction of the הֵלֶלֶl 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
Jesus’ role is fundamentally to preach (Mark 1:14, 38, 39, 45), as the phrase εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ εἶναιν, “for this I came” in Mark 1:38 makes clear. Jesus sends his disciples to preach in Mark 3:14; 16:15 and a healed demoniac preaches in the Decapolis in Mark 5:20, 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. The parallel with the προφανεία of Daniel is that the both receive insight, as Daniel the 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. Συνήμητι

The verb συνήμητι appears in Mark 4:12 in a citation of Isa 6:9-10. It also appears in Mark 4:9 (D): ὁς ἔχει ὑπάρχειν ἀκούειν ἀκούειν καὶ ὁ συνώνυμος συνειδεῖ, “let the one who has ears to hear, hear, and the one who understands, understand.” The collocation of ἀκούειν and συνήμητι may derive from the collocation of the two verbs in Isa 6:9-10, though the same collocation occurs in Mark 7:14.

The citation of Isa 6:9-10 in Mark 4:12 reads βλέποντες βλέπωσιν καὶ μὴ ἰδοῦσιν, καὶ ἀκούοντες ἀκούοσιν καὶ μὴ συνιέισιν, μὴ ποτὲ ἐπιστρέφωσιν 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

296 Cf. Mark 6:12; 16:20. See also Mark 13:10; 14:9, where καὶ ἔτη 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. 4QDα 2 I, 7 [reconstructed]; 4QD∞ 1 9); II, 14-15 (par. 4QDα 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. Joachim Gnilka follows Thomas W. Manson in suggesting the dependence of Mark on a form of Tg. Isa. 6:9-10. Whereas Isa 6:10b (MT) reads לָטִּיָּהוּ, "and it will be healing for him," and the LXX reads καὶ ηὐαίσημα αὐτοῖς, "and I shall heal them," Mark 4:12 reads καὶ ἀφεῖσθαι αὐτοῖς, "and it will be forgiven them." Mark's text is thus similar to Tg. Isa. 6:10: אֲשֶׁר יַחַל לְיהוָה, "and it will be forgiven them," יָשָׁב יִתְחַלֶּה Ithpeel matching the passive of ḥוָל. The parallel form in Syriac occurs in the Peshitta of Isa 6:10: יִשָּׁב יִתְחַלֶּה, "and it shall be forgiven him" (דְּחַל Ethpeel matching יִתְחַלֶּה Ithpeel in the Targum). 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, and that the Targum is a close reflection of the original words of Jesus. Where the Targum has the relative particle in Isa 6:9 Mark misinterpreted, understanding as introducing a final clause rather than as the relative particle. Mark's citation therefore begins with וַיֶּאֱמַנְתָּה + 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

---


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.


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 "י, see Black, Aramaic Approach, 70-81.
the Matthean and Lukan versions. For Black, the μὴ ποτε clause in Mark 4:12 is logically dependent on the ἵνα clause which precedes.\(^{307}\) However, Mark’s μὴ ποτε clause is lacking in Luke 8:10, making it entirely possible that ἵνα in the Lukan version reflects the Aramaic relative “\(\text{T}\).\(^{308}\) Similarly, in Matt 13:13 ὅτι seems to reflect “\(\text{T}\). 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 “\(\text{T}\), 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: ὑμῖν δὲ μακάριος οἱ ὄφθαλμοι ὅτι βλέπουσιν καὶ τὰ ὅτα ὑμῖν ὅτι ἀκούονταί, “and blessed are your eyes because they see and your ears because they hear.” He suggests that the shorter Lukan version, μακάριος οἱ ὄφθαλμοι οἱ βλέποντες ὁ βλέπετε, “blessed are the eyes which see what you see” is more original,\(^{310}\) the Greek relative οἱ reflecting the Aramaic “\(\text{T}\). If “\(\text{T}\) 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 οὐνέμι. Mark 4:11 makes a division between οἱ περὶ αὐτῶν 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 ἄφετον αὐτοῖς (*Aramaic Approach*, 215).

\(^{308}\) Black, *Aramaic Approach*, 213.


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: ὃλος ἡμῖν πάντες ἄνωμοι, καὶ οἱ νοὴμονες γνώσεσθαι, "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 מַעְלָרָה 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 συνέντευξι 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 οὐνύημι 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 Mark

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. The disciples’ lack of understanding is central to the debate about the so-called “messianic secret” in Mark. In this connection, Wrede does not confine himself to Mark, seeking to illuminate this theme throughout the Four

---
312 On οὐνύημι 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.\textsuperscript{315} Joseph Tyson challenges the idea that the disciples' incomprehension is part of the messianic secret motif.\textsuperscript{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;\textsuperscript{317} (2) Mark 8:27-14:9: the disciples misunderstand Jesus' messiahship; (3) Mark 14:10-72: the disciples reject Jesus.\textsuperscript{318} For Weeden there are two conflicting christologies in Mark, a θεος ἀνήρ christology (preceding the Petrine confession)\textsuperscript{319} and a suffering christology, reflecting a controversy in Mark's community.\textsuperscript{320} David J. Hawkin also sees the disciples' incomprehension as fundamental to the structure of Mark, sections of material being built around this motif.\textsuperscript{321} Scholars such as Wrede, Tyson, Weeden, and Hawkin have addressed themselves to the redaction-critical question of the overall purpose of the

\textsuperscript{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).

\textsuperscript{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 nesessity 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).


\textsuperscript{319} Mark 8:29. Weeden, "Heresy," 148.

\textsuperscript{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 θυγατέρα in Mark 13:6 (Weeden, "Heresy," 154).

\textsuperscript{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. 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 ἢ καρδία πεπωρωμένη, "for they did not understand on the basis of the loaves," but their hearts were hardened. 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). The disciples' lack of understanding is unique to Mark, and elaborates on the disciples' response of confusion (ἐξίσταντο, "they were astounded") to the abating of the wind upon Jesus' arrival (Mark 6:51). 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?" 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?" An apocopated form of the question in Mark

---

322 It is worth noting that Hawk'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." ἐπὶ + 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.


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 τῇ πλοίῳ προσεκύνησαν αὐτῷ λέγοντες ἀληθῶς θεοῦ υἱὸς εἶ). It is not clear whether they understood Jesus' identity here.

328 Mark 8:17: οὕτω νοεῖτε οὐδὲ συνίητε; πεπωρωμένην ἔχετε τὴν καρδίαν ὑμῶν; Matthew's parallel only includes οὕτω νοεῖτε (Matt 16:9).

329 Mark 8:18: ὁφθαλμόις ἑξοντες οὐ βλέπετε καὶ ὑμῖν καρδίαν ὑμῶν; Matthew's parallel only includes ἑξοντες (Matt 16:9).

330 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 τῇ πλοίῳ προσεκύνησαν αὐτῷ λέγοντες ἀληθῶς θεοῦ υἱὸς εἶ). It is not clear whether they understood Jesus' identity here.

331 Mark 8:17: οὕτω νοεῖτε οὐδὲ συνίητε; πεπωρωμένην ἔχετε τὴν καρδίαν ὑμῶν; Matthew's parallel only includes οὕτω νοεῖτε (Matt 16:9).

332 Mark 8:18: ὁφθαλμόις ἑξοντες οὐ βλέπετε καὶ ὑμῖν καρδίαν ὑμῶν; Matthew's parallel only includes ἑξοντες (Matt 16:9).

333 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 τῇ πλοίῳ προσεκύνησαν αὐτῷ λέγοντες ἀληθῶς θεοῦ υἱὸς εἶ). It is not clear whether they understood Jesus' identity here.

334 Mark 8:17: οὕτω νοεῖτε οὐδὲ συνίητε; πεπωρωμένην ἔχετε τὴν καρδίαν ὑμῶν; Matthew's parallel only includes οὕτω νοεῖτε (Matt 16:9).

335 Mark 8:18: ὁφθαλμόις ἑξοντες οὐ βλέπετε καὶ ὑμῖν καρδίαν ὑμῶν; Matthew's parallel only includes ἑξοντες (Matt 16:9).
8:17 concludes this pericope in 8:21: “Do you not yet understand?” (οὐπώ συνίετε).

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. Edwin Good, followed by Ronald Clements, 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.

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), and where the people have eyes but cannot see and ears but cannot hear (Isa 43:8).

---

330 The parallel in Matt 16:11 reads πῶς οὐ νοεῖτε δότε οὐ περὶ ἄρτων ἀλλὰ ὡμίς (“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 νοεῖ (cf. Matt 16:9, 11) being used to refer to understanding: τότε συνήκαν ἵνα οὐκ ἔτεκνε τὸ προοίμιον ἀπὸ τῆς ζύμης τῶν ἄρτων ἀλλὰ ἀπὸ τῆς διδασκαλίας 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).


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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{It also accounts for later passages which develop these themes further, namely Isa 35:5; 29:18.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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).\textsuperscript{340}

Isaiah 43:10 (LXX) reads γένωθε μοι μάρτυρες, κάγω μάρτυς, λέγει κύριος ο θεός, καὶ ὁ παῖς, δεν ἐξελεξάμην, ἵνα γνώτε καὶ πιστεύσητε καὶ συνήτευτε ὅτι εγὼ 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

---


\textsuperscript{338} Clements, “Deutero-Isaianic Development,” 136-138. Clements summarises his argument thus (“Deutero-Isaianic Development,” 138):[J]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.

\textsuperscript{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).

\textsuperscript{340} Cf. Isa 41:20, where the people see (πιστεύειν), know (σωφρονείσθαι), and understand (συνήτευτε Hiphil) that the hand of YHWH has acted.

\textsuperscript{341} Συνήτευτε translates συνέθη, recalling the connection between συνήθισε and χαρακτήριστο 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” (יָּאָרָה יִנְּשָׁן) to listen, though they have eyes but do not see and ears but do not hear. In Jer 5:22 YHWH asks “do you not fear me?” (לֹא יִחְפָּסֵךְ אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל). 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 יִשְׂרָאֵל, he does not at first understand what is revealed to him. In Dan 8:15 he “sought understanding,” prompting Gabriel to interpret the vision. Nevertheless, Daniel was “perplexed on account of the vision, not understanding.” 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 reads τοῦ συνιέναι ἐν πάσῃ πάσῃ διδοκείσα σου, “to understand all your truth.” 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

---


343 MT: יִשְׂרָאֵל; OG: ξείτου διανοηθήναι; Θ: ξείτου σύνεσιν.

344 MT: יִשְׂרָאֵל; OG: καὶ εξελυόμενη ἐπὶ τῇ ὁμοίᾳ, καὶ οὐδέπερ ἦν ὁ διανοούμενος; Θ: καὶ θαύμασαν τὴν ὁμοια, καὶ οὐκ ἦν ὁ συνόν.

345 MT: יִשְׂרָאֵל; OG: διανοηθήναι τὴν διεκατούρνη σου, κύριε, “to understand your righteousness, Ο Λόρδος.”
language used is of setting the heart to understand (Dan 10:12). In Dan 12:8, Daniel again does not understand, 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. 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. 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 ἀρετε, ἐγὼ εἶμι μὴ φοβεῖσθε, “be brave, I AM; do not be afraid.” Reading


347 MT: οὐ κατακαίνεις; OG: οὐ διανοήσης; 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),\textsuperscript{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 συνήτε ὅτι ἐγὼ εἰμὶ, “you shall believe and understand that I AM.”\textsuperscript{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 εἰμὶ is used by Jesus to refer to himself recalls both God’s self-revelation\textsuperscript{353} and the self-identification of other heavenly beings. This is also true of Jesus’ command μὴ φοβεῖσθε.\textsuperscript{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 8:29\textsuperscript{355} may imply this. The Daniel of the court tales rather than the Daniel of chapters 8-12: they are not patterned on a figure who does 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.

\textsuperscript{351} For the idea that the disciples’ amazement betrays their lack of understanding about the identity of Jesus, see Guelich, Mark I-8:26, 352.

\textsuperscript{352} MT: ἀπανθημένῳ αὐτῷ ἐκτὸς ἄνω ἐκτὸς ἀνάγκης, “you will believe me and understand that I am he.”

\textsuperscript{353} Lane notes that the Markan text uses the language of theophany familiar from the LXX (Mark, 236-237, 238-239). Cf. Guelich, Mark I-8:26, 351.

\textsuperscript{354} See above, n. 346. Lane, Mark, 237; Heil, Jesus, 12.

\textsuperscript{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 εἶμι 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

---


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. 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," claims unique unity with YHWH, and identifies himself to be the servant of YHWH of Deutero-Isaiah. 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.

David Mark Ball argues that John 8:18 is dependent on Isa 43:10 (LXX). The phrase ἐγὼ εἶμι δό μαρτυρῶν περὶ ἐμαυτοῦ takes its content from the opening words of that verse. Jesus takes the role of the Isaianic servant who acts as a witness, and the description of Jesus as the one who bears witnesses speaks of both his role and his identity. John 8:24, 28 refer to Jesus' identity, and both depend on Isa 43:10 (LXX). The purpose of bringing witnesses in Isa 43:10 is ἔνα γνῶτε καὶ πιστεύσητε καὶ συνήτε ὅτε ἐγὼ εἶμι, "that you may know, believe and understand that I AM," recalled in John 8:24 through the words ἐὰν γὰρ μὴ πιστεύσητε ὅτε ἐγὼ εἶμι, "for if you do not believe that I AM," and in John 8:28 through the words τότε γνώσεσθε ὅτε ἐγὼ εἶμι, "then you will know that I AM." 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.
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."

The link with Isa 43:10 points towards Jesus' identification with the Father, εγώ είμι 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 Ἄβραμ γενέσθαι εγώ είμι, "before Abraham came to be, I AM," there are contrasts between γίνομαι and είμι and between the aorist γενέσθαι and the present είμι. This is linked with Isa 43:10 because in the phrase ἵνα ... συνήτε ὅτι εγώ είμι, ἐμπροσθέν μου οὐκ εγένετο ἄλλος θεὸς, "that ... you may understand that I AM, before me no other god came to be," there are again contrasts between γίνομαι and είμι and between the aorist εγένετο and the present είμι. Moreover, Tg. Isa. 43:10-13 mentions Abraham, 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, Jesus identifies himself with the nature of God. In John 13:16-19 there are further points of contact with Isa 43:10 (LXX): ἔξελεξάμην in John 13:18 recalls the same form in Isa 43:10, and the phrase ἵνα πιστεύσῃ ὅταν γένηται ὅτι εγώ είμι, "that you may believe when it happens that I AM" recalls ἵνα γνώτε καὶ πιστεύσητε καὶ συνήτε ὅτι εγώ είμι in the Isaiah passage. 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 εγώ είμι 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 6:50\(^{375}\) in light of Isa 42-43, Jesus’ ἐγώ εἶμι 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 εἶμι 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 εἶμι and μὴ φοβεῖσθε is in Isa 43:1-13, thus concurring with our conclusions in relation to Mark 6:50. The ἐγώ εἶμι, 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

---

\(^{376}\) 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 σωνinium 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 σωνητε 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 ἐγὼ ἐμί 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 ἐγὼ ἐμί, a command not to fear, and σωνημι suggests dependence upon the LXX of Deutero-Isaiah (esp. Isa 43:10). The link with the absolute ἐγὼ ἐμί 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

381 Boring, "Markan Christology," 470-471.
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). 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. 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," and that the disciples and the Christian audience of the Gospel should understand the secret that Jesus is the Messiah and the Lord. For Jindrich Mánek incomprehension is also connected with Jesus'

---


384 John 6:35: τύψ ἐλμ ὅ ἄρωος τῆς ζωῆς. Jindrich Mánek takes ἄρωος 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 ἄρωος in John 6:35, the first of the τυψ ἐλμ 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. For Guelich the disciples in Mark 8:14-21 fail to understand what the miracles say about the person and work of Jesus. 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, for which there are OT precedents. In Ezek 12:1-16 there is a connection between a diatribe 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. 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. Lemcio compares Mark 4:1-20 with Ezek 17:1-24 and Zech 4:10 in light of this pattern, also drawing on apocalyptic texts (1 En. 24-25; 2 Bar. 13-15).

---

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 interpres.
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.
393 Lemcio, "External Evidence," 326.
395 Lemcio, "External Evidence," 327.
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. Jesus’ admonitory allusion to Isa 6:9-10; Jer 5:21; Ezek 12:2 in Mark 8:18 may be understood as a diatribe. Mark 8:1-10, 15, together with Mark 6:34-44, should be understood as parabolic. The motif of incomprehension occurs in Mark 8:16-17, followed by Jesus’ critical rejoinder in Mark 8:17-18. Jesus’ explanation follows in Mark 8:19-21, 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 οὐνίμωτος.  

---

399 Cf. Mark 4:12.
400 Cf. Mark 4:3-8; 7:15.
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 δούλοιν and the verb νοεῖν is used (cf. Matt 15:17). The same verb occurs in parallel with οὐνίμωτος 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 הַמֶּאֱוָה 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. Ἐννέαμ in Matthew

In Matthew Ἐννέαμ serves a different purpose, Mark's motif of the disciples' incomprehension being absent. In Matt 13:13, 14, 15 Ἐννέαμ 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 ύμιν δέδωται γνῶναι τὰ μυστήρια τῆς βασιλείας τῶν οὐρανῶν, ἐκείνοις δὲ οὐ δέδωται, “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 ἀναπληροῦται αὐτοῖς ἡ πρόφητελα Ἰσαάκου, “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 לְמוֹעֵן of Daniel, as in Mark? If the disciples are linked with the righteous of Matt 13:43, they are linked also with the לְמוֹעֵן 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 συνίησατε 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 συνίηστε, “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 συνίηστες ἐκλάμψουσιν ὡς ἡ λαμπρότης τοῦ στερεώματος καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν δικαίων τῶν πολλῶν ὡς ἀστέρες εἰς τοὺς αἰωνὸς καὶ ἐτί, “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.
“without understanding,” but ἀκμῆν, “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 πλοῖῳ προσεκύνησαν αὐτῷ λέγοντες· ἀληθῶς θεὸς γίνεται, “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. 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 מַשְׁכֵּל 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 מַשְׁכֵּל—משכיל 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 interpres* (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, διάφως από τον θεό in the OT passages he cites. Furthermore, in Matthew’s account of the parable of the Sower Jesus’ critical rejoinder is omitted. This may be understood as a creative adaptation of the dialogue form on Matthew’s part. Jesus’ critical rejoinder sometimes remains in Matthew. 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. 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

---

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*.


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, οὐνείματι 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. Three related trajectories through Luke's gospel may be identified: (1) the use of οὐνείματι 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. Jesus is marked out as a figure who possesses heavenly insight. Moreover, by stating that Jesus' parents οὐ συνείματι τὸ βήμα δὲ ἐκλάησεν 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 ἠδειτε ὅτι ἐν τοῖς τοῦ πατρὸς μου δεί εἶναι με is to be understood, on analogy with Mark 8:15, as a parable saying that is not understood by those who hear it. Presumably the reason no explanation is offered by

---


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 understand\textsuperscript{414} 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.\textsuperscript{415} The next occurrence of συνέμη 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 αὐτὸς οὐδὲν τούτων συνήκαν καὶ ἴν τὸ ἡμῖν τοῦτο κεκρυμμένον ἀπ’ αὐτῶν καὶ οὐκ ἐγνώσκον 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. Συνέμη links them, as does ἡμῖν. In both τὸ ἡμῖν refers to a parabolic saying, which in Luke 18:34 comes in the preceding two verses.\textsuperscript{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 by \textsuperscript{417} the prophets regarding the Son of Man.” Jesus’ ἡμῖν 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

\textsuperscript{414} Luke 8:9-10: ἐπηρώτων δὲ αὐτὸν οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ τίς αὐτὴ εἶ ἡ παραβολή. ὁ δὲ ἐλέησεν υἷν δέδοται γινώσκει τὰ μυστήρια τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ, τοίς δὲ λοιποῖς ἐν παραβολαῖς, ἵνα βλέποντες μὴ βλέπωσιν καὶ ἀκούοντες μὴ σκιώσωσιν, “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.’”

\textsuperscript{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).

\textsuperscript{416} Luke 18:32-33: παραδοθῆται γὰρ τοῖς ξύνεσιν καὶ ἐμπαιχθῆται καὶ ὑβρισθῆται καὶ ἐμπτυσθῆται καὶ μαστίγωσθαι καὶ ἀποκτενοῦσιν αὐτῶν, καὶ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ τρίτῃ ἀναστησόνται, “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.”

\textsuperscript{417} άκτι + 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: τι εἶ δὲ ἡγυνώσουν τὸ ῥῆμα, καὶ ἐφοβοῦντο αὐτῶν ἐπερωτήσας, "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 εἷς χειρας 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. Συνέήμα is used, alongside other verbs (ἀγνοεῖν, ἀλογάνομαι, 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 συνέπεμα with Daniel: συνέπεμα 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. 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 ἁγγέλων). 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) and to Jesus' "departure" (ἔξοδος), which points forward to his passion, death, resurrection, and (above all) ascension. 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).

was not to be made known “during those days” (ἐν ἑκέναις ταῖς ἡμέραις). During the account of the healing which follows (Luke 9:37-43), Jesus exclaims ἡ γενεὰ ἀπιστος καὶ διεστραμμένη, ἐς 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-apostolic 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.
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 μεταμορφωσις, and the verb “to be transformed” is
μεταμορφομαι. Μεταμορφομαι 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.
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.


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 μὴ φοβοῦ is elsewhere used by God or his agents when encountered by mortals.439 Peter’s

---

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.
confession of unworthiness is commensurate with fear and trembling characteristic of humans in the presence of a divine being.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{441} Luke is familiar with \(-\alpha\sigma\rho\alpha\pi\tau\omega\nu\) language for heavenly beings,\textsuperscript{442} terminology which is connected in Luke 17:24 with the Son of Man.\textsuperscript{443} \(\Lambda\epsilon\nu\kappa\omicron\varsigma\), used in 9:29 of Jesus' garment, is used in descriptions of angels and heavenly beings in the NT.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{445} Second, in 2 En. 36 God refers to Enoch's future life on earth and subsequent ascension, recalling Jesus' discussion of his \(\xi\xi\omicron\delta\omicron\varsigma\) with Moses and Elijah.\textsuperscript{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

\textsuperscript{444} Mark 16:5; Acts 1:10; Rev 1:14; 6:11.
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 φωβέομαι.

6.1.3.1. ἐξαστράπτω

The verb ἐξαστράπτω, meaning “flash or gleam like lightning,” only occurs in Luke 9:29 in the NT, where it is used to describe the appearance of Jesus’ clothes as he is transformed. 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 ἐξαστράπτων). 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 λάμαν). On the motif of radiant clothing in reference to God, angels, and Christ see Mach, Entwicklungsstadien, 58-59. Cf. Fletcher-Louis, Luke-Acts, 40.
interpres in Dan 10,\textsuperscript{450} and is part of a passage in Ezekiel which, according to Rowland, strongly influenced the development of an “exalted angel” tradition in Judaism.\textsuperscript{451} In Dan 10:6 the feet of the angel are like gleaming bronze (οἱ πόδες αὐτοῦ ὄστε χαλκεός τοῖς ἄστραπτων). There seems to be a trajectory from Ezek 1:7 through Dan 10:6 to Luke 9:29,\textsuperscript{452} indicating that Luke is offering an angelomorphic presentation of Jesus. The verb ἄστραπτω is etymologically linked with the noun ἄστραπῃ, “lightning,” and the verb ἄστραπτω, “flash, gleam.”\textsuperscript{453} The verb ἄστραπτω 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” (δόξης γὰρ ἡ ἄστραπῃ ἄστραπτουσα ἐκ τῆς ὑπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ εἰς τὴν ὑπὸ οὐρανοῦ λάμπει, οὕτως ἐσται 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 ἐκπέσησαν αὐτὰς ἐν ἐσθήται ἄστραπτουσα). In the parallel in Matt 28:3, the appearance of the Angel of the Lord is described as “like lightning” (ὡς ἄστραπη)\textsuperscript{454} and his garment is “white like snow” (λευκὸν ὡς χιόν), recalling the whiteness of Jesus’ garments in Matt 17:2; Mark 9:3; Luke 9:29. The noun ἄστραπη 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 ἄστροφευτο ἄστραπη) and in Dan 10:6 (ΟΓ and Θ) the angel’s face is “like a vision of lightning” (ὡς ὁ δρακόν ἄστραπῆς). Further illustrations may be drawn from the book of Revelation. The links between Ezek 1 and Rev 4 have long been recognised.\textsuperscript{455} Flashes of lightning go out from the


\textsuperscript{451} Rowland, Open Heaven, 94-113.

\textsuperscript{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 ἐξαιρούμενος (from ἐξαιρέω, “remove”) in Acts 26:17 is intended to recall through wordplay the verb ἐξαρόν (from ἐξάρω, “lift up”) in Ezek 2:2 (LXX).

\textsuperscript{453} BAG 118.


\textsuperscript{455} E. g., Rowland, “Visions,” 145-150; Open Heaven, 59-60.
celestial throne in Rev 4:5 (εὐ κ τοῦ θρονοῦ εὐκορευόνται διατραπαλ). 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 διατραπαλ in the Greek of I En. 14:11, 17 and διατραπαλ 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’ clothing flashing like lightning suggests he has entered the presence of the divine and points towards his heavenly identity.

6.1.3.2. δόξα\(^{457}\)

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 (αὐτοῦ τῆς δόξας και σωφός) 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” (ὡφθη καὶ κατετομεν τῆς διατραπῆς αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ ναῷ αὐτοῦ). Mach notes several occurrences of ΤΗΝ Niphal/ὤφθη in theophanies and angelophanies in the OT (Entwicklungsstadien, 57). The presence of ὤφθη 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.


transformed humans: Moses, Elijah, and Jesus. δώδεκα also occurs in Luke 24:26, linking the post-resurrection glory of Jesus with his glory at his transfiguration. 460 Importantly, δώδεκα 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 ὁ θεὸς. 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

461 Cf. Boobyer, St. Mark, 65.
462 On the ὁ θεὸς as the visible manifestation of God, see: Morray-Jones, “Merkabah Mysticism,” 110.
463 Ramsey, Glory of God, 150.
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.”  

In Exod 33:20 (MT) YHWH replies: “you are not able to see my face, for no human sees me and lives”. 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 ecstasy rather than to the general populace. This is confirmed in verses 22-23 by references to YHWH’s hands (חַיָּם), back (חֶצֶם), and face (עָנָן). Although it would be difficult to convincingly distinguish between YHWH himself and the glory of YHWH here, the imagery is unequivocally anthropomorphic. 

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.” 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.”

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” (δόξα γινεῖται τινάκα αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τῶν ἁγίων ἄγγελων). 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: יְהֹוָה יֵבִלְסֵי; LXX: δεσίδον γοὺς τὴν καταρτισμὸν δοξᾶν.

470 Quispel, “Ezekiel 1:26,” 1. See also Isa 40:5.


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 εἶσελθεῖν 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. 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); (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 ἀνυδροι), 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 ὁμήρη, referring to

---

474 Cf. Isa 26:10 (LXX); Wis 10:14; 1QS IV, 6-8; 1QHb IV, 15; CD III, 20; Raurell, "DOXA," 530-532.
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 ἐποικίζει 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).

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 ἤδει τὴν ἀποκριθή, ἐκφοβος γὰρ ἐγένοντο). 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

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, Mach notes that both theophanies and angelophanies contain this motif, the one who appears often opening his speech with "Fear not!" In the NT, this motif was transferred to christophanies, 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 ἐστρατιφέω 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 ἱερός 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.
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.


Although he does not discuss the transfiguration in his 1991 article, 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.” 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. Since historical figures such

---

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,\[^{488}\] Moses\[^{489}\] 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

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). 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," comparing this with the Pauline and Johannine identifications of Christ with the glory and with Heb 1:2-4, citing also traditions identifying the primordial Adam with the divine רוח הרוחות. The motif of robing the ascended figure with a heavenly garment is fairly frequent in apocalyptic literature, with which Hebrew Enoch is to be associated.

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. 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. Jesus'

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, and possibly the Melchizedek of 11QMelchizedek. 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.

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


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, 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.

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. Building on E. P. Sanders' emphasis on "patterns of religion" rather than individual motifs in the comparative study of religions, 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; (2) The "intervention" pattern, in which a figure, usually an angel such as Gabriel or Raphael, enables interaction between God and living human beings; (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. For Davis, Paul, Matthew, Luke, and John each exhibit all three of these patterns in their presentation of Jesus. Mark exhibits the legacy and consummation patterns. The

507 Davis, "Divine Agents," 481.
509 Davis, "Divine Agents," 483-484.
intervention pattern is less obvious, but is still present in, for example, Mark’s use of the title "Son of Man" (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 Michael and the Qumran angel of light among angelic beings. Among exalted patriarchs, the significance of Moses as mediator is limited to the legacy pattern, but all three patterns are evidenced in traditions about Enoch: his role as a channel of revelation belongs to the legacy pattern, his mediatorial role after his exaltation belongs to the intervention pattern, 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.

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, a remarkable series

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; 4QEnGiantsa 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” (אנת הידיעת לדוריו ודוריו).
518 1 En. 12-16; cf. Jub. 4:22; 4QpsJubc 2 1-6; 1 En. 106:7-19.
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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{522} Enoch then transmits teaching to his son Methuselah at the command of the “seven holy ones” (1 En. 81:5).\textsuperscript{523} He is also a prophet (cf. Jude 14), preaching moral rectitude and warning of impending divine judgement.\textsuperscript{524} In certain traditions he has a priestly role.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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,\textsuperscript{528} Mach discusses Enoch’s possession of such insight, beginning with the reference in Pseudo-

\textsuperscript{521} See also Jub. 4:15-26; Ps.-Eup.: Eusebius, Praep. ev. 9.17.8-9.
\textsuperscript{522} Alexander, “From Son of Adam,” 88-89; cf. pp. 92-93, 94-96.
\textsuperscript{523} Alexander, “From Son of Adam,” 90.
\textsuperscript{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.
\textsuperscript{525} Jub. 4:25; 3 En. 15B. VanderKam, Enoch, 185-186; Alexander, “From Son of Adam,” 100, 105 and n. 24.
\textsuperscript{526} 2 En. 22. Alexander, “From Son of Adam,” 102-103; below, §6.1.5.1.2.
\textsuperscript{527} Alexander, “From Son of Adam,” 104-107; below, §6.1.5.1.1.
\textsuperscript{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*). 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. Enoch’s relationship with the angels (perhaps implied by יְהֹוָה אֱלֹהִים יִתְנָהָ נָּהָי in Gen 5:22, 24) precedes and is the source of his special knowledge. In Slavonic Enoch, it is more explicit that the wisdom of the angels has been bestowed. In Hebrew Enoch, Metatron is granted divine wisdom and understanding (*3 En. 48C:4*).

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. Davis also explores the importance for early Christology of the Enoch tradition, particularly as attested in Sirach, Wisdom, *Jubilees*, *4QEnGiants*, and Ethiopic Enoch. Importantly, he emphasises Enoch’s role as a medium of revelation: 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

---

532 Mach, *Entwicklungsstadien*, 135. E.g., *1 En. 1:2*, 12:2; *Jub. 4:21*.
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.


favour with God. In 3 En. 6:3, God says of Enoch, "and the one whom I have raised up is [my?] chosen in the world." The use of בהדרי 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 ὡ γενεὰ ἄπιστος καὶ διαστραμμένη, ἐως πότε ξομαὶ πρὸς ὑμᾶς καὶ ἄνεξομαι 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. 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. In 3 En. 6:1, 2 Kgs 2:11 is clearly in mind when Metatron says to Rabbi Ishmael

---


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 בְּנֵרֵד in this passage recall δόξα in Luke 9:31, 32 and the כבודוּ traditions in the HB. The use of כבודוּ 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 ( valida

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.”

What were originally attributes of God have become attributes of Christ and Metatron.

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 fulfill 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).
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 ἀνδρείς δύο in Luke 9:30 and the mention of ἀνδρείς 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.
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 Judaisms 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, 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.
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):

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 συνιέναι. The second occurrence of this verb in Dan 10:12 (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): έδωκας τὴν καρδιὰν σου τοῦ συνιέναι
Luke 24:45: δείηνοιξαν αὐτῶν τὸν νόημα 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.

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 προστάγμαις καὶ εἰρήνην ποιῆσαι, “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 λαλομένοις ὑπὸ τοῦ Παύλου).

In the LXX, Isa 6:10 contains the phrase τῇ καρδίᾳ συνόδον, identifying the heart as the seat of intellction.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 נְבוֹת (נְבֹת),561 “his heart,” and in Daniel נְבֹת, “your heart.” However, in Luke 24:45 νοῦς is synonymous with καρδία, equivalent to נְבֹת or נבֹת.562 Νοῦς is frequently used in the LXX for בֵּנוֹת and נבֹת and may thus represent the concept represented by בֵּנוֹת and נבֹת. Διανοίγω should also

---

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”: τῇ καρδίᾳ σου ἡ νοοεια 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 1QIsaa reads נבֹת, 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 פ merely occurs before נבֹת and נבֹת in Isa 6:10 (MT).
562 Louw and Nida place the idioms διανοίγω τον νοον (Luke 24:45) and διανοίγω την καρδιαν (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.
be considered. This verb frequently occurs in the LXX in relation to Hebrew חָפָּץ, though never in connection with נְכָּז. However, in Hos 2:17 (LXX), the phrase διανοιξων τούς απεξεῖν occurs, which scarcely reflects the Hebrew הנחיה התחיה but links σύνεσαι with the language of “opening.” Wisdom and “opening” are linked in Prov 31:26 (MT = 31:25 [LXX]).

Thus נְכָּז may reflect the same concept as בַּל and בַּלְּבֵל. Διανοιγω reflects the same concept as חָפָּץ. It became clear earlier that the roots חָפָּץ and נְכָּז may both be represented by σύνεσις. Thus τοῦ συνιέναι in Luke 24:45 may represent an idea that in Hebrew would be conveyed by חָפָּץ. In Dan 9:2, Daniel “perceived in the books” (MT: פָּתַּח בִּיטְרִים; Θ: συνήκα εν ταῖς βιβλίοις). The use of נְכָּז and σύνεσις 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.

בל may also be the object of נְכָּז Hiphil used causatively, exhibiting a meaning similar to Luke 24:45. Psalm 10:17 (MT) reads נאֹץ אֲנָחַת נַעֲשֵׁת הוֹדוּ הָלֵבָם לֹא קשֵׁים יַעֲצֵּב, “you have heard, YHWH, the desires of the poor; you shall establish their heart, you shall bring your ear near.” Since in ancient manuscripts נ and ל were easily confused, it is not surprising that a variant reading for נַעֲשֵׁת is בָּלָל: “you shall make their hearts understand.” Psalm 78:8α (MT) laments the disobedience of a former generation who “did not establish their heart” (דָּוָּר לָא רְחָמִים). Again, there is textual evidence for נַעֲשֵׁת (probably not causative): “a generation whose heart did not understand.” Finally, Prov 8:5 (MT) reads נַעֲשֵׁת שֵׁפָהָה אֲנָחַת הָכֵסָרִים לְבֵל, “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). Απεκαλύφθη renders Hebrew חָפָּץ 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 מִלְּכֶל בָּשָׂר אַל תַּנַּל לְבָךָ אֲשֶׁר תְּרִיק מְעַלֵּיךָ וַחֲוֹבָה, “do not uncover your heart to all flesh nor thrust what is good away from you.” Although לֶכֶת מִלָּה + לֵב 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: תָּכְבָּה בֶּרֶךְ צַלְעֵי עְלֵיוֹן וְכַמְצַוָּה וּזְגוֹ מְבֵּית וּבָּאָר יִבְשָׂר וְאִשָּׁר אָרוֹבָה יִתְכַּרְאִים “attend to the fear of the Most High 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: בְּרָוִי אֲשֶׁר אֵלֶּה הָפָאת לָדוּ הַל עַבְרֵכָה, “blessed are you, my God, who opens your servant’s heart to knowledge.” This is not dissimilar to 1QHα VI, 8: הָנוֹתִי בֹּלֶב טְבוּרָה בָּיֶה בֵּרוֹכָּה אֵלֶּה, “[blessed are you], my Lord, who puts understanding into the heart of [your] servant.” Similarly, 1QHα XX, 13 reads מַחֲתַתָּה לְכוֹרִי דְּנַה בֵּרָה שָׁלָלֶךָ, “you have [op]ened within me knowledge into the mystery of your insight.” 1QHα XXII b 0, 12 reads מַחֲתַתָּה לְבָךְ לֶבֶנָהָה וּזְגוֹלַת אָותִיוֹן, “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\textsuperscript{a} XIII, 32-33: \textsuperscript{567} \text{"you, my God, have opened a broad place within my heart."} There is a broadly similar phrase in 1QH\textsuperscript{a} XVIII, 31-32: \text{"my heart has been opened to an eternal fountain and the refuge of the height\textsuperscript{568} is my support."} In 1QH\textsuperscript{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:

What can I say unless you open my mouth?
How can I understand unless you give me insight?
What can I [say] 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\textsuperscript{a} XXI\textsuperscript{top}, 9: \text\{"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.

\textsuperscript{567} Par. 4QHod\textsuperscript{a} 1 IV, 5-6.
\textsuperscript{568} מַשְׁמַע מִית is thus a circumlocution for God.
\textsuperscript{569} For \textit{d الموjw as a translation equivalent for לְהֵב see 1 Chr 17:25; Job 38:17.}
6.2.2.1. Taylor-Schechter Box K1.117

Opening of heart: say three times over the havdalah cup and drink it: 'drnws, 'brynws, hyqq'lk, pthy'lk, hyqqyl', 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,” and Luke 24:45. The phrase פתתוי על כל סבדיה recalls התיות שהא אתו אבגט אתו סקטייאק. The parallelism between מִבְנַה, and מִבְנַה representing concepts equivalent to σοφία and συνέσεις in Luke 2:40, 47, 52. מִבְנַה 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

---


571 פתתוי is used here in a sense only indirectly related to midrashic petihah: W. G. Braude and I. J. Kapstein suggest that מִבְנַה 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 Sabbatha and Festival Days [Philadelphia, Pa: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1975], x n. 6).

572 The name פתתוי reflects the idea of “opening,” and is reminiscent of the name Ptahil, found in Mandean texts. Ptahil is the usual name of the Mandean 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. 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 διηνοτευ εν τας γραφας). The participle διανοιγων 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.

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. 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. 2b

673 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.

674 Cf. §6.2.1 above.

675 On this ritual see Swartz, Scholastic Magic, 43-47.

676 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.
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 מַעֲרַדֶּתֶּר. Metatron is called מְאָטָרֵן in 3 En. 48D:6, along with many other epithets. In 3 En. 48D:4 a figure named מַעֲרַדֶּתֶּר is named מַעֲרַדֶּתֶּר שָׁלֹחַ הָרֹאשׁ.

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. Schäfer isolates four theme-complexes: the heavenly journey (*Himmelsreise*), the adjuration (*Beschwörung*), rivalry (*Rivalität*), and transformation (*Verwandlung*), 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. 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,” 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.

---

581 Cf. §6.1 above?
text and entitled ירדה ירדה רימל, "The sar torah which belongs to it." In both Daniel and the ḥekhalot, ירדה primarily refers to an angelic figure, not an earthly ruler (Michael is ירדה in Dan 12:1 and Gabriel is ירדה 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 לְבָנָה or לְבַנִּית 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, συνένημι 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 συνένημι 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 συνίστημι 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 συνίστημι are clearly significant in each of the Synoptics, though in different ways. This word group is significant in Daniel-0, where it represents both יָבַשָׁה and לֶבַשׁ 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 συνίστημι 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 נְאָשָׁרְרָאֹ 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 נְאָשָׁרְרָאֹל, 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 מַשָּׁאֵל to מַשָּׁאֵל, 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 מַשָּׁאֵל. 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 material 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. 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 Bomkamm, 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.

Christ-event;"¹⁶ "[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."¹⁷ 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 εὐσεβελας 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 erupting 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-Aonen-Schema) cf. Lührmann, Offenbarungsverständnis, 89.

⁸ E.g., Schoeps, Paul, 88-125.

⁹ Bockmuehl, Revelation, 214.

¹⁰ Bockmuehl, Revelation, 211.
Thus refers to the content and substance of the faith, echoing passages where Paul speaks of the Gospel as a mystery.\footnote{Bockmuehl, Revelation, 211-212. Cf. 1 Cor 2:1 (reading μυστήριον rather than μαρτύριον); Eph 3:3-6; 6:19; Col 4:3.} Second Timothy 1:9-11 attests the idea of the former giving (δισωμι) of divine grace and the making it known (φανερώ) through the appearance of Christ, as well as the entrusting of this to Paul for propagation.\footnote{Bockmuehl, Revelation, 212-213.} This is reflected in Titus 1:2-3 also.\footnote{Bockmuehl, Revelation, 213. Cf. Rom 16:25-27; Titus 2:11-13; 3:4.} 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.\footnote{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\textsuperscript{a} XVII, 25; Ascen. Isa. 7:22; 9:24-26; Odes Sol. 9:8-11; T. Benj. 4:1.} 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 σώνεσις) 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 σώνεσις 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, σώνεσις 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 σώνεσις are synonymous)\footnote{Cf. Isa 29:14 (LXX); Luke 2:47 with vv. 40, 52; 1 Cor 1:19; Col 1:9.} with 2 Tim 2:7. In Eph 3:4, Paul himself claims to possess σώνεσις. His insight is “into the mystery of Christ” (ἐν τῇ μυστηρίῳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ), presumably synonymous with the mystery made known to
him by revelation (Eph 3:3).\textsuperscript{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 φρονήσει, 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" (δόξῃ ὑμῖν πνεῦμα σοφίας μαί ἀποκάλυψες 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 πολυπολιτικός 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" (συνιεῖτε τῇ τῷ θελήμα 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 παρασήμα 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.\textsuperscript{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

\textsuperscript{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.

\textsuperscript{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 ἐπιγνώσας, σοφία, and σύνεσις in Col 1:9 are equivalent to וַיְרַבֵּם הָעֵת, and בְּלִי, in 1QS IV, 3.
treasuries of wisdom (σοφία) and knowledge (γνώσις) being hidden in Christ, implying not only that these, but σιωπής 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 treasuries 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 δικαιοσύνης 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 ἀποστόλοι (Revelation, 138).
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.
is ongoing in the preaching of the gospel and especially in the apostolic ministry. Several references are made by Paul to occasional revelations. However, revelation remains incomplete, pending its future consummation: the eschatological revelation of Jesus Christ is still awaited. Bockmuehl examines a number of pertinent passages pertaining to the revelation of mysteries, beginning with 1 Cor 2:6-10. Here Paul (among the apostles and prophets) 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," who are ethically blameless. Paul's mediatorial role as apostle is present in 1 Cor 4:1,3 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, 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. 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).


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 λογίζεσθαι διέργασιν τοῦ ὑπηρέτας Χριστοῦ καὶ οἰκουμόνως μυστηρίως 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.
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; Col 1:28). Paul is an instrument of God’s revelation. 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. In Rom 16:25, τὸ κήρυγμα Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ is parallel with τὸ εὐαγγέλιον μου, 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.
back to the point of Paul’s initial commission. For Philippe Menoud, Paul’s theology is dependent on the Damascus road revelation. This relates to the central thesis of Seyoon Kim, *The Origin of Paul’s Gospel*, 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). Rather, Paul’s own testimony is to be taken seriously, that he received the gospel through a revelation of Jesus Christ (Gal 1:12). In his letters, Paul refers or alludes to his conversion and call on a number of occasions, reminding churches of the Damascus event to stress the divine origin and authenticity of his gospel and apostleship. Indeed, “[t]he Damascus event is the basis both of his theology and his existence as an apostle.”

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: “From 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).


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).

glory in 2 Cor 4:6 as referring to his vision of the glorified Christ on the Damascus Road. Moreover, the statement of purpose indicates that Paul’s apostolic office is the instrument through which God’s light shines to others. Paul is referring to the Damascus experience in terms of both conversion and his call to the apostolic office (cf. Gal 1:11-16). This is also the case in Eph 3:1-13; Col 1:23c-29. The formula χάρις + aor. pass. διδωμί + μοι (Eph 3:2, 7; cf. v. 8) 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). The μυστήριον of Eph 3:3, 4, 9 stands for the εὐαγγέλιον of Gal 1:11, 16. In the Damascus christophany Paul received both the call to Gentile mission and the gospel. It is the former that dominates his descriptions of the christophany, his calling being interpreted in light of the call of OT prophets. 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.” His use of διηκαλύπτω and διηκαλύψεις in Gal 1 and the collocation of διηκαλύψεις and μυστήριον in Eph 3:3 establish that Paul is using apocalyptic language...

53 Ι.e., πρὸς φωτισμὸν τῆς γνώσεως τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν προσώπῳ 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.
62 Kim, Origin, 70.
to refer to his Damascus experience. Where \( \delta \pi \omega \kappa \alpha \lambda \upsilon \tau \omega \) is used in 1 Cor 2:10, the meaning is that hidden wisdom was revealed to Paul in the Damascus christophany.

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. 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 מַשְׁכֵּיל at Qumran. the difference lies in the fact that apostles (but specifically Paul) are charged with proclaiming to all, the מַשְׁכֵּיל 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 two 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, which is continued in the exalted, glorified Christ of Acts. This picture of Christ may be extended to Pauline texts.

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: "In 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 מַשְׁכֵּיל, 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).


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. This title is unique to 1 Corinthians and Ethiopic Enoch, 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. Kim suggests that Paul may have coined the title independently of Ethiopic Enoch 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.

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.” Newman’s study begins with a survey of Paul’s use of δόξα as a christological term. Newman regards δόξα as “one of Paul’s apocalyptic surface symbols,” relating this aspect of Pauline Christology to an apocalyptic context. Paul interpreted the christophany using the common language of mystical-apocalyptic Judaism. Further, the christophany is to be understood (identifying διακτί νεφελών in Gal 1:12; 2 Cor 12:1 as pointing to parallel ecstatic experiences) as a merkabah vision parallel with heavenly ascents in apocalyptic texts.

---

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”).
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.
77 Newman, Paul’s Glory-Christology, 4-7; cf. pp. 3-16.
78 Newman, Paul’s Glory-Christology, 11.
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 \(\alpha\phi\theta\eta\) in 1 Cor 15:8 links his christophany with Gospel accounts of the resurrection\(^84\) 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 \(\kappa\alpha\tau\delta\varepsilon\ \tau\acute{a}z\ \gamma\rho\alpha\phi\acute{a}z\) in 1 Cor 15:3, read in connection with \(\alpha\phi\theta\eta\) 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 \(\delta\nu\kappa\alpha\lambda\upsilon\phi\alpha\iota\) (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 \(\varepsilon\delta\rho\alpha\kappa\alpha\). See Newman, *Paul’s Glory-Christology*, 186; cf. pp. 186-196.


\(^{84}\) Cf. Luke 24:34.


defend his apostolic authority. Newman’s conclusion is that the christophany consisted in a revelation of God’s glory.

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 mediator

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, Bockmuehl draws on the work of Svend Holm-Nielsen on the Hodayot in identifying the Teacher of Righteousness as a mediator of divine revelation. 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 legitimates his apostolate is superior to the revelation of the divine glory at Sinai, the basis of his opponents’ claims to authority.


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.


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. With reference to 1QH<sup>a</sup> 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).

This model, of a figure who receives and guards heavenly mysteries (including wisdom), and then transmits them, is precisely that of the משלך, as we found in part one above; the fact that the “I” of the *Hodayot* is in 1QH<sup>a</sup> XX, 4 (reconstructed; par. 4QH<sup>a</sup> 2 + 3 II, 5), 11 (par. 4QH<sup>a</sup> 2 + 3 II, 12 [reconstructed]); XXV<sup>b</sup>ot, 10 dubbed משלך 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 משלך, the key distinction being that Paul is to transmit the gospel to the Gentiles whereas the משלך 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 διστατολος, has had “the mystery” (τὸ μυστήριον) revealed to him, and he has transmitted it to Gentiles.<sup>99</sup> An διστατολος 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” (ολκονύμων:

---

<sup>96</sup> 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.

<sup>97</sup> Casciaro Ramirez, “‘Himnos’,” 34.

<sup>98</sup> Cf. Casciaro Ramirez, “‘Himnos’,” 33.

<sup>99</sup> Cf. Andrew T. Lincoln, *Ephesians* (WBC 42; Dallas, Tex.: Word Books, 1990), 174. Ms B Ambrosiaster omits διστατολος, 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,” 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. 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), 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. 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. 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 1:19 echoes this, in that Paul, Silvanus, and Timothy have all proclaimed Christ amongst the Christians of Corinth and Achaea.

We therefore have a pattern emerging: Paul, as an apostle, is a divinely commissioned mediator of revelation.

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

101 This recalls Raymond Brown’s view that ἀλκονέμων 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 διάστολος, 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 רעיה שביעי כה in m. Abot 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 παρέδωσα απὸ τοῦ κυρίου, δὲ 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,\textsuperscript{108} Paul is making a statement about the authenticity of the tradition and his authenticity as apostle and tradent.

Many scholars have noted that παραδήλωμι and παραλαμβάνω in 1 Cor 11:23 correspond to rabbinic usage. It is often argued that παραδήλωμι corresponds to ἔφέσκω, “hand on to” and παραλαμβάνω corresponds to ἔλαβεν, “receive from.”\textsuperscript{109} though C. K. Barrett stresses that both verbs were used in this sense in Greek long before they were influenced by rabbinic usage.\textsuperscript{110} Gordon Fee, on the other hand, defends the notion of rabbinic influence most strongly on the grounds that Paul’s training was rabbinical.\textsuperscript{111} Similarly, Tomson criticises Conzelmann for adducing Greek parallels on the basis that in his view they “are more remote.”\textsuperscript{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

\textsuperscript{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 ἐφέσκω and ἔλαβεν. The third and last link is the Corinthian church.


\textsuperscript{110} Barrett, Corinthians, 265.

\textsuperscript{111} Fee, Corinthians, 548 n. 15; cf. Cullmann, “Tradition,” 63.

\textsuperscript{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. 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 קֵֽלָּ֖ל and מָרָֽל in collocation to represent the transmission of tradition is post-biblical. It may thus be suggested that in 1 Cor 11:23; 15:3 Paul uses παραβλέωμι and παραλαμβάνω in the sense in which the rabbis used מָרָל and קֵֽלָּ֖ל, 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 מָרָל Qal in the HB is in Num 31:16, though the Latin "dederuntque" in Num 31:5 implies the Qal 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" (לְקַל לעם). However, the LXX, Peshitta, and Vulgate do not appear to read מָרָל here. The Niphal occurs in Num 31:5 in reference to the conscription of troops from the tribes of Israel (וַיָּקָּחָהּ מִקְרָא הַמַּעֲמָׂנָּה אֶת-הָעֲמָּיִם, "and a thousand per tribe were conscripted from the thousands of Israel"). קֵֽלָּ֖ל Pael occurs three times in Aramaic Daniel with the sense "receive" (Dan 2:6; 6:1; 7:18). BDB (p. 867) takes the Hebrew קֵֽלָּ֖ל 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 קֵֽלָּ֖ל in the LXX, but is used for the Aramaic קֵֽלָ֖ל 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.
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. לְבֵל and רְשָׁם would, according to this scenario, be Hebrew translation equivalents for Greek terms in use in the Greek-speaking synagogue. This second scenario should not be dismissed: in the HB and the Qumran scrolls לְבֵל and רְשָׁם 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 ἐπανύνω δὲ ὑμᾶς δț 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:

1. Apostolic tradition, including Jesus traditions, indicated by the “transmission terms” παραδόσεις, παραδίδωμι, and παραλαμβάνω, and by reference to the custom (συνεργεία) of the churches of God (1 Cor 11:16).
3. An implicit reference to the Torah (1 Cor 11:8-9).

Paul uses παραδίδωμι to refer to the process of transmitting teaching, using the cognate noun παραδόσεις to refer to what is transmitted. Although the Lord is not mentioned, the language of 1 Cor 11:2 is similar to verse 23. Presumably the same process is referred to.
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, "when 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: ἐγώ γὰρ παρέδωκα ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου, δὲ καὶ παρέδωκα ὑμῖν
1 Cor 15:3: παρέδωκα γὰρ ὑμῖν ἐν πρώτοις, δὲ καὶ παρέδωκα

The same figures are implied in the chain of transmission. In 1 Cor 15:3, παρέδωκα 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 δὲ εὐηγελισμην, δὲ καὶ παρέδωκα, "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 Παρέδωκα anticipates 1 Cor 11:2, 23; 15:1,
3, εὐαγγέλιον and εὐαγγελισθέν anticipates 1 Cor 15:1. Jesus Christ transmitted the good news to Paul, who transmitted it to the Galatians. Moreover, the preposition δι' in the phrase δι' ἀποκαλύφθηκεν 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. 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. 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.

A number of other chains of transmission need to be mentioned. Παράδοσις and παράλαμβάνω appear in 2 Thess 2:15; 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; Oepeke, Galater, 28-29; Kim, Origien, 59, 67 and n. 2; Bruce, Galatians, 25-27; cf. pp. 15-32 (on the issue of the opponents in general); Bockmuehl, Revelation, 136.
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 ἐν ἑδιδάχθητε ἐν τῷ λόγῳ ἐν τῷ 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.\footnote{See below, §4.2.3. The verb ἔδιδαχον also recalls Gal 1:12, in which Paul’s use of the verb ἔδιδαχον implies a process of teaching from a human teacher to a disciple.} 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 ὑμῖς ἀπὸ παντὸς αδελφοῦ ἀτάκτως περιπατοῦντος καὶ μὴ κατὰ τὴν παράδοσιν ἢν παρέλαβοσαν\footnote{A number of witnesses, including Codex Vaticanus, read παρέλαβετε, “you received” at this point, which would make the subject of the verb the same as that of ἔδιδαχον in 2 Thess 2:15. Either reading would be plausible: παρέλαβοσαν 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 παρέλαβετε implies that all the Thessalonian Christians has received the tradition. It seems likely that παρέλαβοσαν is the earlier reading, since it is surely the most credible scenario that the scribe expected the second person plural, given the occurrence of παρέλαβετε in 1 Thess 4:1 and of ἔδιδαχον in 2 Thess 2:15, and therefore made an error.} 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” (ὤποστρέψατε ἐκ τῆς παραδοθεσίας αὐτῶς ἁγίας 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” (ἐπαγωγεῖσθαι τῇ ἀπαξ παραδοθεσίᾳ τοῖς ἁγίοις πιστεί). No agent is given for the passive participle παραδοθεσία. 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 ἐνηγερταί in 1 Cor 15:4.\footnote{Cf. BDF §342 (1); Joachim Jeremias, The Eucharistic Words of Jesus (trans. N. Perrin; London: SCM, 1966), 102.}
Often παραλαμβάνω alone appears. In the phrase “if anyone proclaims to you a gospel contrary to that which you received” (εἰ τις ὑμᾶς ἐναγγελίζεται παρ' ὦ παρελθέτε) in Gal 1:9, the gospel received by the Galatians came through the agency of Paul. In Gal 1:12 οὐδὲ γάρ εἶπ ὁ παπάς ἀνθρώπων παρέλαβον αὐτῷ reinforces the point that Paul’s gospel is of heavenly origin. In Phil 4:9 the Philippians are commanded to imitate Paul’s example. Three verbs occur in parallel: εὖμάθετε (“you learned”), παρελθέτε (“you received”), and ἰκονίσατε (“you heard”). Teaching has been passed on orally by Paul and Timothy to the Philippians. In 1 Thess 2:13, παραλαμβάνω refers to the Thessalonians’ receiving the word of God from Paul, Silvanus, and Timothy. 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 οὖν λόγου ἀνθρώπων ἀλλὰ καθὼς ἐστιν δηθῶς λόγου θεοῦ). The transmission of moral teaching is in view in 1 Thess 4:1, where the Thessalonians are subject of παρελθέτε. They have received “how one must walk and please God” (παρελθέτε παρ’ ἡμῶν τό πῶς δὲι ὑμᾶς περιπατεῖν καὶ δρέασειν θεῷ). Col 2:6 is slightly different: “you received Christ Jesus the Lord” (παρελθέτε τῶν Χριστῶν Ἄγγελον τῶν κύριου). 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
What emerges is a particular concept of tradition matched by a technical language. 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). 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. In m. Ḳebṭṭ 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, but to emphasise the ultimate origin of that tradition. The phrase מָשָׁא לְהַרְוָדָה מַסֵּי 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. Wilhelm Bacher asserted this in 1914, amplifying “Moses received the Torah from Sinai” with “that is, from God at Sinai.” When we consider Paul’s understanding of tradition, we must wonder whether Jesus’ teaching parallels that Moses: the origin of both is in heaven.

---

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. Ḳebṭṭ 1:1 in relation to the giving of the law. מָשָׁא refers to the Sinai event as such rather than to the specifics of what occurred.
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 קורין, but a statement of its divine origin. קורין 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. 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.” The key issue is the origin of this tradition. For Gerhardsson, Jesus is Paul’s doctrinal authority, but this is not to say that Paul’s doctrines were transmitted directly from Jesus to the apostle. With reference to the phrase ἐπι τῇ παρέλασθεν ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου in 1 Cor 11:23, Gerhardsson notes three possibilities. The first, that Paul is here referring to something he had received as a revelation, is rejected in the strongest terms. 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. Ἐβρ. Ἀβών 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 δῶ δῶ κυπλοῦ 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 δῶ δῶ κυπλοῦ 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.
towards the latter view, 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." 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. In 1 Cor 7:10 Paul writes "and to those who are married I command, not I but the Lord" (τις δὲ γεγαμηκόσιν παραγγέλλω, οὐκ ἐγὼ δλλα δ 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. Christ is at directly at work both in his revelation to Paul on the road to Damascus and in the tradition. Furthermore, Cullmann argues that in 2 Cor 3:4-18, the Holy Spirit, who in 3:17 is the Lord (ὁ δὲ κύριος πνεῦμα ἐστιν), takes the place of the tradition of the law. Thus the Lord, as the Spirit, is present in the tradition Paul received.

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

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).
159 Cullmann, "Tradition," 71.
παρδιδοσις 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’ ἀποκάλυψις Ἡσυχής 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.
Lord is the origin of the tradition. This idea, as Wegenast notes,\(^\text{164}\) removes the problem of the apparent contradiction between the idea of tradition and the phrase \(d\pi\delta \ \tau\omicron\omicron\ \kappa\omicron\rho\omicron\omicron\omicron\). 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 \(d\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\omicron\omicron\) refers not to humans but to angels.\(^\text{165}\) 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" = \(\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\delta \ \tau\omicron\omicron\ \theta\omicron\omicron\omicron\)). The preposition is interesting: in 1 Cor 11:23, Codex Bezae reads \(\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\delta \ \kappa\omicron\rho\omicron\omicron\omicron\),\(^\text{166}\) and two ninth century manuscripts (F and G) give \(d\pi\delta \ \theta\omicron\omicron\omicron\). 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 \(\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\delta\) and \(d\pi\delta\), and that we should therefore follow Cullmann,\(^\text{167}\) and, to a lesser extent Wegenast\(^\text{168}\) in regarding the difference as not fundamental. In principle, \(\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\delta \ \tau\omicron\omicron\ \theta\omicron\omicron\omicron\) in *Ant.* 15.5.3 is parallel with \(d\pi\delta \ \tau\omicron\omicron\ \kappa\omicron\rho\omicron\omicron\omicron\) (and variants) in 1 Cor 11:23, because in both cases the origin of what is transmitted is

---

\(^{164}\) Wegenast, *Verståndnis*, 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 \(d\pi\delta\) here is interchangeable with \(\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\delta\) with the genitive. The fundamental idea is that \(\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\delta\) would indicate that the tradition was given directly, whereas \(d\pi\delta\) would leave some room for doubt. Wegenast concludes that since in Hellenistic Greek \(d\pi\delta\) infringes on the spheres of meaning of \(\epsilon\omicron\) and \(b\pi\delta\), and particularly \(\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\delta\) with the genitive as an indicator of the origin, creator or motive for something, it is not possible to claim on the basis of \(d\pi\delta\) alone that Paul is either using a Jewish model or not (*Verståndnis*, 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' ἀνθρώπων 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: מַעֲשָׂה קָבֵל וַחֲרֵדָה מָסִינִי. There is a parallel between Moses and Paul, but it is not simply that Paul is a minister of the new covenant: it is that Paul,\footnote{Cf. Bockmuehl, Revelation, 143.}

\footnote{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 παραδίδωμι 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 παρδθοσις, παραδίδωμι, and παραλαμβάνω in a manner broadly comparable to Paul. 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.

Conzelmann notes that παρδθοσις is used as a technical term in the school tradition, in relation to esoteric teaching in general, and in Gnosticism. The verbs παραδίδωμι and παραλαμβάνω are used in both the Greek and Jewish worlds, the evidence from the Greek world relating to the school tradition, the mysteries, and

172 The use of παραδίδωμι (tradere) and παρδθοσις (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 πολέμα and the latter being forced to form its adherents into a new πολετα (“Paul,” 79-80, 82).
Gnosticism. In her discussion of Luke 1:2, Loveday Alexander also notes that “[παραδίδωμι] and its cognate noun are found frequently in scientific prefaces, together with the correlative παραλαμβάνω.” This section is intended to be representative rather than exhaustive, and is confined to occurrences of παραδίδωμι 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. This is certainly true for C. Ap. 1.60 but Wis 14:15 more probably reflects the Hellenistic use of παραδίδωμι rather than the Jewish use of either παραδίδωμι or ἔλεγξ (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).

\[
\mu \delta i s t a \, d \eta \, \pi a n t o w \, \pi e \pi \, \pi a i d o t r o f l a v \, \phi i l o k a l o u n t e c \, k a i \, t o \, \phi u l a t t e i n \\
\tau o u c \, \nu o m o u c \, k a i \, t h n \, k a t a \, t o u t o u c \, \pi a r a d e d o m e \epsilon n \nu \, e u s e b e i a n \, \epsilon r g o n \\
\a n a g k a i o t a t o u \, \p a n t o c \, \tau o u b \, \p e p o i h m e n o i
\]

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, “διδωμι, 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.
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 παραδίδωμι may have been a deliberate allusion to orally transmitted παραδοσις. It is difficult to decide, however, whether Josephus is using παραδίδωμι 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 לְלִי or his native Aramaic לָלֶךְ.

3.3.2. Wis 14:15

The use of παραδίδωμι in Wisd 14:15 is extremely interesting, the situation with this passage being more complex than Conzelmann suggests.

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 τὸν θεὸν ἐν ἡμῖν διδομένην 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’ οὖν τὸ πρῶτος ξένους μυησαί καὶ τὴν τελετὴν διὰ τούτο ἐνδοξὸν ποιήσαι, 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 ἕθες ὡς νόμος εὐφλάκθη 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 νόμιμα μου καὶ πάντα τὰ προστάγματα 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” (μαθησεσθε) 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. 

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 παραδιδομι, 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 παραδιδομι but not παραλαμβάνω. Paul uses the two verbs in conjunction, just as m. Abot 1:1, 3 En. 48D:10, the preface to Sepher ha-Razim, and the beginning of Avot of Rabbi Nathan use ה BigInteger andPel 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 elκαν whereas Deut 5:8 (LXX) uses elδωλου, but the idea is the same. In a sense, the image of the dead child is an ελκαν that becomes an ελδωλον 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 καπαδίωμι and παραλαμβάνω in conjunction should be discussed, both of which pre-date Paul.

3.3.3. Plato, Theaet. 198A-B

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 (τάς ἐπιστήμας τῶν δριθμῶν):

καὶ καλοῦμέν γε παραδίδοντα μὲν διδάσκειν, παραλαμβάνοντα δὲ μανθάνειν, ἔχοντα δὲ δὴ τῷ κεκτήσατι ἐν τῷ περιστερεόν ἐκεῖνῳ ἐπιστασάται.

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 καπαδίωμι and παραλαμβάνω. The assumption is that the παραλαμβάνων will become the παραδίδοντες 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” (ταύτη ... τῇ τέχνῃ αὐτὸς τε ὑποχειρίσει τάς ἐπιστήμας τῶν δριθμῶν ἔχει καὶ ἀλλῳ παραδίδωσιν ὁ παραδίδοντες). In the next proposition, ἐπιστασάται refers to the recipient, not to the transmitter. He has received knowledge from someone who already knows. Second, παραδίωμι is synonymous with διδάσκω, “to teach.” Similarly, παραλαμβάνω is synonymous with μανθάνω, “to learn.”

182 Rigaux cites Theaet. 198B in connection with 1 Thess 2:13, stating without further discussion that the master is the παραδίδοντες and the disciple is the παραλαμβάνων (Saint Paul, 438).
183 Cf. Plato, Phileb. 16E; §3.3.5 below.
is ἐμπνεῦμα, "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. 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.

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 Σικελίωται παρειλήφασι παρὰ τῶν προγόνων, άγιοι δὲ τῆς φύσεως ἐξ αἰῶνος παραδεδομένης τῶις ἐκγόνοις λεγών ὑπάρχειν τὴν νήσου Δημήτριος καὶ Κόρης· ἐνοι δὲ τῶν ποιητῶν μυθολογοῦσι κατὰ τὸν τοῦ Πλούτωνος καὶ Φερσεφόνης γάμον ὑπὸ Διὸς ἀνακάλυπτα τῇ νύμφῃ

184 Cf. §§3.2.2; 3.2.3 below.

185 We should therefore follow Louw-Nida in placing διδάσκω, παραδίδωμι, and παραδομέω 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.
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). Παρά 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.” The phrase δεῖ τῆς φημῆς ἐξ αἰῶνος παραδεδομένης τοῖς ἐγγόνοις 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” (τῶν 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."\textsuperscript{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, \textit{Phileb. 16C}

In \textit{Phileb. 16C} we read Socrates' description of the road he believes will lead his interlocutors to the goal of the argument:

\begin{quote}
\begin{center}
θεῷν μὲν εἷς ἀνθρώποις δόσις, ὡς γε καταφαίνεται ἐμοί, ποθὲν ἐκ θεῶν ἔρρηφη διὰ τινὸς Προμηθέως ἄμα φανοτάτῳ τινὶ πυρὶ καὶ οἶ μὲν παλαιὸλ, κρείττονες ἡμῶν καὶ ἐγγυτέρω θεῶν οἰκοῦντες, ταὐτὴν φήμην παρέδοσαν.
\end{center}
\end{quote}

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 \textit{did} makes plain. The reference to \textit{οἶ παλαιὸι} 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 \textit{m. Αbôt 1:1}. \textit{Παρέδοσαν} is the familiar verb for transmission. Socrates' recapitulation of this idea appears in \textit{Phileb. 16E}: \textit{οἶ μὲν οὖν θεῷ, διπέρ εἶπον, οὕτως ἡμῖν παρέδοσαν σκοπεῖν καὶ μανθάνειν καὶ διδάσκειν ἀλληλοὺς, \textit{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

\textsuperscript{187}Compare the transmission of the law from the period of Moses.
intermediaries (Prometheus and the ancients) being absent. Interestingly, \textit{ol }\textit{theol} are the grammatical subject of \textit{παρέδοσαν}. It is also noteworthy that the tradition transmitted here relates to examining, learning, and teaching (cf. \textit{Theaet.} 198B). Finally, in \textit{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” (\textit{ol }\textit{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 \textit{παραδίδωμι}.


In \textit{Bibl. Hist. 12.12-19}, Diodorus writes about Charondas, the lawgiver of the city of Thurii. In his praise of letters in \textit{Bibl. Hist. 12.13} he writes:

\begin{quote}
καθόλου δὲ τὰς χαριστάτας τῶν φρονίμων ἀνδρῶν ἀποφάσεις καὶ θεῶν
χρησμοὺς, ἕτε δὲ φιλοσοφίαν καὶ πᾶσαν παιδείαν μόνη τηρεῖ καὶ τοῖς
ἐπιγυμνομένοις δεὶ παραδίδωσιν εἷς ἀπαντα τῶν αἰώνα.
\end{quote}

\textit{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 \textit{παραδίδωμι} and occurs from generation to generation. What is transmitted may be wise sayings of humans or divine oracles. In the latter case, \textit{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, in which παραδίδωμι occurs. In Corp. herm. 1:32 we read 
εὐλογητὸς εἷ, πάτερ· ὁ σὸς ἀνθρωπὸς συναγιδέειν σοι βούλεται, καθὼς παρέδωκας οὑτῷ τὴν 
pᾶσαν ἔξουσίαν, “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. 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 λόγου μαθεῖν), but Hermes has said that he would transmit it to him 
when Tat is likely to be estranged from the world (ἐὰν μέλλῃς κόσμου ἰπαλλοτριοῦσθαι, παραδίδοναι 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 (ἐφῆς μοι παλιγγενεσίας παραδοθῶν προθέμενοι ἐκ φωνῆς ἢ κρυπῆν). 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” (τὸῦτο τῷ γένος, ὃ τέκνων, οὗ 
διδασκεται, ἀλλ' ἐὰν θέλῃ, ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ ἀναμμηνήσκεται). In Corp. herm. 13:3, 
Hermes says “this matter is not taught” (τὸ πράγμα τοῦτο οὗ διδασκεται).

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 Ποιμανδρέας, ὁ τῆς αὐθεντικῆς νοῦς,

188 Conzelmann, Corinthians, 196 n. 30.
189 In the phrase ἐδόθη μοι πᾶσα ἔξουσία ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς, “all authority in heaven and earth 
has been given to me” (Matt 28:18) διδομένωμεί rather than παραδίδωμι is used to signify transmission. 
However, in Matt 11:27 (πάντα μοι παρέδωκεν ἕπω 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 τῆν 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: Ἰλαθή μοι, Πρόνοια καὶ Ψυχή, τάδε γράφοντι τά ἀπρατα, παραδότα 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 φιλοσοφέω, 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.
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 παραλαβὴ is τὰ δεικτύμενα 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 παράδοσεως ἐλθέων ἐπὶ τὸ τέλειον δὲ ἢ, “since it is necessary to come to perfection by means of the spoken word and instruction such as this.” The second occurrence refers to the manner in which the παράδοσις is given, and reads ἀνάγκη δὲ τὴν παράδοσιν γίνεσθαι διὰ τινῶν θεωρημάτων καὶ διὰ λέξεως ποιῶς καὶ μετὰ τινὸς ποικιλίας καὶ δριμύτητος τῶν θεωρημάτων, ὥστε αὐτῶν τινὲς τούτων ἁλισκόμενοι 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 παραδίδωμι and παραλαμβάνω may be used together to refer to the transmission and reception of tradition. Παραδίδωμι 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. Aboth 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 παραδίδωμι 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 כי בל and מﻒ are in fact Hebrew renderings of the Greek terms παραλαμβάνω and παραδίδωμι 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 בינא and מיא 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 παραδίδωμι 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 *ἐνθεώραμω* (2 Tim 2:1), *παράδειγμα* (2 Tim 2:2), and *νόει* (2 Tim 2:7). 194

4.1. *Ἐνθεώραμω* (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

---

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). 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.

4.2. Παρδθου (2 Tim 2:2)

On this command 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. The phrase δι' ἡκουσας παρ' ἐμοί, “those things which you
heard from me” refers to what is transmitted.  

(2) “Many witnesses,” through whom Timothy received teaching originally given by Paul. W. Hendriksen understands διδ πολλῶν μαρτύρων to mean “among many witnesses,”  

though this would surely be closer to εν + dative than διδ + genitive.  

Marshall notes that “the usual sense of διδ with gen. of person is ‘through the agency of.’”  

Spicq discusses several possible meanings for διδ, suggesting that Timothy was not only instructed in the faith through contact with Paul, but through listening to other witnesses of Christ. However, if διδ 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. Διδάξεια, “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. 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 learns (Lamed Qal: 1QS IX, 13) in order to teach (Lamed)

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.


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. אבót 6:6 we read: “one who learns in order to teach.” This recalls the saying of R. Ishmael son of R. Yohanan ben Beroqa in m. אבót 4:5: י臾ון מנהל辽宁省ראה ‘ית ודעון ‘יםי, “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. אבót 1:1. In 1 Clem. 42 the gospel is of divine origin, mediated to apostles through Jesus. In response to revelation, the apostles preach. Although this precise model is not found in m. אבót, a chain of transmission is. Although the precise contents of 2 Tim 2:2, 1 Clem. 42:1-2, and m. אבót 1:1 are different, all three exhibit a similar model of transmission. In that m. אבót 1:1 refers to the oral law, it is closer to 2 Tim 2:2, which refers to the oral transmission of teaching. This is implied by זיוקסאא פאר’ ἐμοῖ, “the things which you heard from me.” 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) of 1 Clement. Both hold a broadly similar understanding of apostleship and the transmission of teaching. Tractate אבות presents a similar model which would at least have been known to the Lukan Paul, who sat at the feet of Gamaliel. Acts 22:3; 2 Tim 2:2 offer similar models, derived from the

207 In this process, דל לולא הילמ Qal precedes 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. אבót 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. אבót 4:12). Compare also the phrase דל לולא הילמ עביהי עביהי, “to know and to make known, so that it may be known” in m. אבót 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 παροικία σα) Ρέμιμ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ τῇ παροικίᾳ Κωνσταντινουπόλεως), 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. אבót 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 διστολος Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ, “apostle of Christ Jesus,” though this does not fully indicate the capacity in which he is writing. Paul uses his apostleship as an identifying mark. Paul gives a fuller indication of his calling in 2 Tim 1:11, in which he describes himself as κηρυκτρας (“herald”), διστολος (“apostle”), and διδασκαλος (“teacher”). 'Αποστολος precedes διδασκαλος in order, recalling the lists of divine appointments in 1 Cor 12:28; Eph 4:11. Apostleship and teaching are divine gifts in those texts, as in 1 Tim 1:1-2 apostolic authority derives from God. In 2 Tim 1:8, 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 Pastoral 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 Κηρυκτρας does not appear in either of these texts. In both, διστολος has priority. In 1 Cor 12:28, “teachers” (διδασκαλους) are third in order after “prophets” (προφητας). In Eph 4:11 they are fifth in order after “prophets,” “evangelists” (ευαγγελιστας), and “shepherds” (ποιμενας).
218 In 1 Cor 12:28; 1 Tim 2:7, this is indicated by τθημι. In 1 Cor 12:28, God is the subject of θεος, and in 1 Tim 2:7 Paul is the subject of the passive θεος. God is presumably the unmentioned agent. In Eph 4:11, θεοεικην indicates that apostleship is a divine gift. Gordon Fee notes that the phrase διδ θελιματος θεου, “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; Phil 1.
similar to Paul’s own.\textsuperscript{221}

Paul’s self-understanding is evident in other ways. Paul expects Timothy to follow his example.\textsuperscript{222} Paul’s teaching appears first in a list of his activities and qualities,\textsuperscript{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 ($\kappa\eta\rho\upsilon\varepsilon$). Paul therefore writes as an apostle, addressing Timothy as a teacher, and emphasising his calling as preacher.\textsuperscript{224}

4.2.2. Teaching and apostleship in 2 Timothy

Teaching is fundamental to the Pastoral\textsuperscript{s}, $\delta\iota\delta\alpha\varsigma\kappa\alpha\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ 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.\textsuperscript{226} As in these epistles, apostolic authority is used as a weapon in the response to opponents.\textsuperscript{227}

In 1 Tim 2:7, Paul refers not only to his appointment as preacher and apostle,\textsuperscript{228} but also to his appointment as $\delta\iota\delta\alpha\varsigma\kappa\alpha\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ $\varepsilon\theta\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu$ $e\nu$ $\pi\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\iota$ $k\alpha\lambda$ $d\lambda\eta\theta\epsilon\iota\gamma\alpha$, “teacher of the nations in faith and truth.” Martin Dibelius and Hans Conzelmann cite Eph 3:7 in

\begin{itemize}
\item[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” (Épitres Pastorales, 317).
\item[222] See n. 268 above.
\item[223] 2 Tim 3:10.
\item[224] Paul is also referred to as $\kappa\eta\rho\upsilon\varepsilon$ in 1 Clem. 5:6: Dibelius and Conzelmann, Pastoral Epistles, 43.
\item[225] Rejecting the idea that the purpose of the Pastoral\textsuperscript{s} 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 ($\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\delta\delta\gamma\eta\kappa\eta$), and Paul: Function, 6.
\item[226] This accords with Fiore’s note that if the purpose of the Pastoral\textsuperscript{s} 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.).
\item[227] Wegenast, Verständnis, 138-139.
\item[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.
\end{itemize}
comparison,²²⁹ though they make no mention of ἅπαστολος 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 διδασκαλος 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 νομισματική διδασκαλία (“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 Πάντως δπόστολος Χριστοῦ ἔν ησοφ διαθελήματος διεθετήθη 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" (↕ ἐπιστευθην ἐγω) places Paul in the role of trustee; πιστεω echoes 2 Mace 3:12, 22; 2 Tim 1:12. The κηρύγμα has been entrusted to Paul, and he is to guard it (cf. Hendriksen, I & 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 παρατήθημι 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 (N) Edna entrusts (παρατήθημι) her daughter to Tobias "in deposit" (ἐν παραθήκῃ). If παρατήθημι and παραθήκη are read together in 2 Timothy also, Timothy is both to guard and to "pass on" (παράδον) 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" (φύλαξεν) 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, 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!" and suggest that the παραθήκη here means faith entrusted to the church in the form of the tradition, synonymous with the "sound words" (υἱονοντων λόγων) of 2 Tim 1:13. The link between παραθήκη and υἱονοντων λόγων in 2 Tim 1:13 also suggests a link with υἱονοντης διδασκαλίας in 2 Tim 4:3. These all relate to "the apostolic traditions

---

238 A and B read ἐν παρακαταθήκῃ where N reads ἐν παραθήκῃ, 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.
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.”

The difficulties with understanding παραθήκη here in the same sense as in 1 Tim 6:20; 2 Tim 1:14 are demonstrated by Hendriksen, who takes παραθήκη in 1 Tim 6:20; 2 Tim 1:14 to refer to the gospel. 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 (καρδ) 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. 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. 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, I & 2 Thessalonians, 235-236 and n. 121.
246 Hendriksen, I & 2 Thessalonians, 211, 236 n. 121, 237.
247 Spicq, Épitres Pastorales, 327.
248 Cf. Spicq, Épitres 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 ἐκουσάς παρ' ἐμοῦ). This is clearly different from the παράθηκη 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. Paul is in the position of one who has entrusted his property to another, in this case Christ Jesus. If παράθηκη is understood here to refer to Paul’s own life, then the Lord, the owner of Paul’s life 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. Paul has been captured in 2 Timothy (cf. 2 Tim 1:8), 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, and restitution will be made to the Lord. 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 παράθηκη as in the other references in the Pastorals. The link between παρατίθημι and παράθηκη 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, Épitres Pastorales, 328 n. 3).
250 Cf. Hendriksen (1 & 2 Thessalonians, 235), who understands τὴν παράθηκην μου to be Paul’s self and complete salvation.
252 Cf. Exod 22:9 (LXX); 2 Tim 3:11. Spicq (Épitres 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 (Épitres Pastorales, 327) refers to Paul’s captivity, but not in connection with the law of stolen property.
254 Cf. Ignatius, Polycarp 7:3.
something he is also to pass on. The \( \text{παραθήκη} \) is synonymous with the object of \( \text{παρατίθημι} \) 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, \( \text{παράδοσαι} \) and \( \text{διδάξαι} \) 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 \( \text{παραθήκη} \) and \( \text{διδασκαλία} \) function together in the Pastorals. \( \text{Διδασκαλία} \) 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).\(^{257}\) \( \text{Μανθάνω} \) links Timothy with the \( \text{μαθήτης} \), who would be under a \( \text{διδασκάλος} \) (Paul). That a \( \text{μαθήτης} \) will become a \( \text{διδασκάλος} \) implied by \( \text{διδασκαλία} \). In 2 Tim 4:3, “teachers according to their own desires” oppose Paul, Timothy, and their tradition, dubbed “healthy teaching” (\( \text{υγιαίνοντας} \ \text{διδασκαλίας} \)). There is an anthropological dualism\(^{258}\) that places Pauline teaching in opposition to that of others. In 2 Timothy \( \text{διδασκαλία} \) 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, \text{Verständnis}, 140). Wegenast notes that \( \text{τὸν λόγον τῆς διηθέλας} \) (2 Tim 2:15), \( \text{ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ} \) (Titus 2:2; cf. 1 Tim 4:5), and \( \text{τὸν λόγον} \) (2 Tim 4:2) are synonymous with the \( \text{διδασκαλία} \) (\text{Verständnis}, 140 n. 2).

\(^{257}\)Dibelius and Conzelmann (\text{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, \text{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” (ἐπεξε σεαυτῷ καὶ τῷ 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” (πιστοὶς αὐθάδων) 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. Ἀβότ 1:1. The men of the great assembly said ὁ ἐν τοῖς αὐτοῖς, “make a fence for the Torah,” after their exhortation to “raise up many disciples” (ὁ ἐν τοῖς αὐτοῖς ἁπλοίμενοι ἀπορθημένοι). 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 Shammi limited the circle of those whom a master should teach to those who are wise, humble, of good parentage and wealthy (םב שיאמר משה אלו ישנה אדום אלו לם אליהם שדוהו חכמה ויעני בון אבורה ומעיר), ᾽Αβότ Ὁ. Ἡ. 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: Ἰνα τὴν διδασκαλίαν τὴν τοῦ σωτήρος ἡμῶν θεοῦ κοσμῶσιν ἐν πάσιν, “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.

Διδόσκω 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 (τέκνου), 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. Νοετ (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. 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. 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 σώζεις δ' σου 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. However, the concept present here surfaces elsewhere, for example in Dan 1:17 (OG): "καὶ τῶν νεανίσκων ἐδώκεν ὁ κύριος ἑπιστήμην καὶ σύνεσιν καὶ φρόνησιν ἐν πάσῃ γραμματικῇ τέχνῃ καὶ τῷ Δανιὴλ ἐδώκεσα σύνεσιν ἐν παντὶ ἡμιατι καὶ ὀράματι καὶ ἐνυπνίους καὶ ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ, "and to these youths the Lord gave insight, understanding, and perception in every aspect of learning, and to Daniel he gave insight into every word, vision, and dream, and into all wisdom." Marshall does not cite Dan 1:17, but does note several other texts. In 1 Kgs 3:9 (LXX) we read: "καὶ δόσεις τῷ δούλῳ σου καρδίαν ἀκούειν καὶ διακρίνειν τὸν λαὸν σου ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ τοῦ σώλειν ἀνδρὸς ἀγαθοῦ καὶ κακοῦ, “and you shall give your servant (viz. Solomon) a heart to listen and to judge your people in righteousness, to distinguish (συνήμι) between good and evil.” Daniel 2:21 (OG) reads: "διὸ δοθήσεται καὶ σύνεσιν τοῖς ἐν ἑπιστήμῃ ὁσίου, “(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 ἔδωκεν ὑψίστου ἐπ’ αὐτὸν ἡμιατι, καὶ πνεῦμα συνεσεως καὶ ἀγίασμον καταπαύσει ἐπ’ αὐτὸν ἐν τῷ βδατι, “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: "διὸ κύριος δίδωσιν σοφίαν καὶ ἀπὸ προσώπου αὐτοῦ γνῶσις καὶ σύνεσις, "for the Lord gives wisdom, and from his face knowledge and insight." The MT reads: "for YHWH will give wisdom, from his mouth knowledge and insight.” The LXX shares διδομένως, 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 Δανιὴλ ἐδώκεσαι σύνεσιν ("to Daniel he gave insight"), Theodotion has Δανιὴλ συνήκειν ("Daniel possessed insight"). Both reflect τῇ ἐπιστήμῃ τοῦ δείκνυται 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." Most High shall be proclaimed upon him, and a spirit of understanding shall rest upon him in the water." 1 Chronicles 22:12 (LXX) should also be mentioned: δοθῇ σοι σοφίαν καὶ σύνεσιν κύριος καὶ κατασχύσαι ἐπὶ Ισραήλ, "may the Lord give you (viz. Solomon) wisdom and insight," 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 (συνένωσις οὐδὲν καὶ ἡ καρδία μου πεπώρωται ἀπὸ τῶν προτέρων μου πράξεων), begs for understanding and is rewarded as a result of his repentance: ἐγὼ, φησίν, ἐπὶ τῆς μετανοιάς εἶμι 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.

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: כְּריָתוּנ. "may YHWH give you insight and understanding."

269 Marshall (Pastoral Epistles, 731 n. 28) also cites T. Reub. 6:4: διὶ ἡ πορεία ὁδῷ σύνεσιν ὁδῷ εὐσεβείᾳν ἔχει ἐν ἑαυτῷ, 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 ἡκονσει παρ’ ἐμοὶ 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, 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. 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, and emphasises rather both the (message of) salvation and the agents who transmitted it.

5.1. Overview

In the phrase ἡτίς λαβοῦσα λαλεῖσθαι διὰ τοῦ κυρίου ὑπὸ τῶν ἀκονδαντῶν εἰς ἡμᾶς ἐβεβαιώθη, there are three figures or groups:

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, ἀκονδαντῶν 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...
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' ἀποκάλυψεως 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.” Attridge notes the similarity of the phrase τοῖς ἀκουσθείσιν to other texts which refer to the whole Christian message as what has been heard. It is debatable whether τοῖς ἀκουσθείσιν 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. The best solution seems to be to follow Ellingworth in understanding τοῖς ἀκουσθείσιν in relation to Heb 2:3. The phrase refers “to what we have heard, indirectly from Christ and directly from earlier Christian witnesses.” 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: δι' ἀγγέλων λαληθές λόγος

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 (ὁ πατὴρ ἐλάθησαν ἐνυν τῶν λόγων 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” (ἀγαθῶν λόγων). In Heb 1:7 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.
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’Épitre 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: ἡτὶς ἀρχὴν λαβοῦσα λαλεῖσθαι διὰ τοῦ κυρίου

(2) Verse 2: δι' ἀγγέλων

Verse 3: διὰ τοῦ κυρίου

As the ἀγγέλων 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 ἀκούσαντῶν 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.
281 Ellingworth, Hebrews, 140. Ellingworth correctly notes that this is not really a likely option. Ign. Eph 19:3 contains the phrase ἀρχὴν ... ἐκλάμβανεν (cf. ἀρχὴν λαβοῦσα), but there is no reference to the Lord as the agent of the message of salvation.
transmitted the law. Although both the διδασκόντες who transmitted the law and Jesus are
heavenly figures, Jesus is greater than the διδασκόντες.\footnote{283} This makes sense of the a minori
ad maius 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.\footnote{285}

Furthermore, βασιλεύω in 2:2 is linked with the aorist passive βασιλεύω 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.\footnote{287} The message of
salvation has been transmitted from the Lord via the first hearers of the message,\footnote{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-

\footnote{283} Cf. Bruce, Hebrews, xix, lii, 8-9, 29; T. Callan, “Pauline Midrash: The Exegetical Background of Gal
\footnote{284} Cf. Bruce, Hebrews, 29.
\footnote{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.
\footnote{286} Cf. Philo, Moses 1.14; Spicq, Hébreux, 26; Ellingworth, Hebrews, 138.
\footnote{287} In verse 2 καὶ appears to separate διδασκόντες βασιλεύω from what follows. Ellingworth suggests that
βασιλεύω 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.
This idea is absent from the narratives of the Sinai revelation in the HB 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 διανεμοὺν recalls διατάσσω in Gal 3:19. 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. However, it does not give a mediatorial role to the angels, but merely states that they were with the Lord at his right side (ἐκ δὲ εἰῶν αὐτῶν διανεμοὺ). 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” (διαταγῆς δι’ διανεμοὺ). 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.

Torah). Thus the theophany in the company of angels is detached from the motif-context in which it appear in later Jewish interpretation. A text frequently cited in discussions about the angelic mediation of the law is Josephus, *Ant.* 15.5.3, in which Herod seems to refer to the transmission of the law through angels sent from God: ἡμῶν δὲ τὰ καλλιστὰ τῶν δογμάτων καὶ τὰ δοσιμάτα τῶν ἐν τοῖς νόμοις δι’ ἄγγελων 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’ ἄγγελων 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.

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 ἄγγελῳ τῷ παρατομένῳ ὑμᾶς), and describes this angel as “the mediator between God and men for the peace of Israel” (μεσίτης θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπων ἐπὶ τῆς εἱρήνης Ἰσραήλ). The description of this figure as μεσίτης links *T. Dan* 6:2 with Gal

The noun μετήνθες 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” (ἀποκαλυφθείσα παρά θεοῦ Μωϋσῆς τῷ θεράποντι αὐτοῦ διὰ τὰς πλάκας τοῦ νόμου ἐκ χειρὸς αὐτοῦ ἐδέξατο διδαχθεῖς παρά τοῦ ἀρχαγγέλου Μιχαήλ). In Herm. Sim. 8.3.3 Michael is “the one who gave the law to them, into the hearts of those who believe” (οὗτος γὰρ ἐστὶν ὁ διδώκει αὐτῶς τῶν νόμων εἷς τὰς καρδίας τῶν πιστεύοντων).

Philo offers a definition of the role of angels in Abraham 23, describing ἄγγελοι as “holy and divine beings” (λεπάλ καὶ θεταὶ φύσεις) and “underservants and lieutenants of the foremost God” (ὑποδιδάκτοι 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’ ὄν οἷα πρεσβευτῶν δόσα δι’ θελήσῃ τῷ γένει ἡμῶν προβεσπίσαι διαγγέλλει, δι’ ὄν, which is to be taken with πρεσβευτῶν (“through which ambassadors”) parallels δι’ ἄγγελον 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, 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
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297 Cf. Bruce, Galatians, 177.
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. In *Dreams* 1.142 the participle εὐκελέως, from εὐγνώνω, “disclose what is secret, reveal” 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. 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 πίνος 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) 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 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 λογίαi who arbitrate, since we are astonished and shudder at the Lord of all and the exceptional might of his sovereignty” (Dreams 1.142: διὰ τῶν ἐπικριτῶν ἤματι συνεφέρει μεσίταις καὶ διαιτητές λόγους χρήθησαν διὰ τὸ τεθηνέα ἐν παραπτώμα τὸ μέγιστον ἀρχής αὐτοῦ κράτος).

Moses that he is regarded in *Dreams* 1.143 as a μεσιτής between God and humans.\(^{305}\) We may conclude that Philo understood angels to be mediators between God and humans, once using μεσιτής 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.* 21\(^{307}\) 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: מַרְבַּעַת רְבִיאוֹלָא דֵּלָלָס יַרְדֹּר טֵם חֶפֶל עַל הָר סִינָי לָא לָתִי יָרְדֹּר גְּלֶשֶׁת). However, if “the Holy One” is the subject of סְלָל, 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 מַלָּכָה that he himself would give the law to Israel (Ulmer, §10).\(^{309}\) In this passage, the roles of
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\(^{305}\) 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 ἐπιτυχον 'τὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ
μαθῶντων, “according to the inspiration which they learned from God (*C. Ap.* 1.37) is
parallel with δι' ἀγγέλων παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ μαθῶντων in *Ant.* 15.5.3;314 (4) Josephus
elsewhere shows no interest in speculation about angels, often rationalising the term
ἀγγέλους;315 (5) most importantly, the LXX sometimes uses ἀγγέλος 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 (םִלְתָּן תִּשְׁבָּה) and the LXX (Ἄγγαίου τοῦ προφητήτου), but in
Hag 1:13 he is described as “YHWH’s messenger” (יְהוָה שְׁבַעַר תַּעֹל יָדָא דָּגָנֶל וְאֶת הָוָה מֱשֹר). In
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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.
316 Davies, “Note,” 138-139.
Isa 44:26, the MT reads מַכְיָם הָבָרָה עַבְרָה נַעֲשֵׂה מַלְאַכְּךָ יִשְׁלָלַיְם. “(I am YHWH) 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 βουλὴν τῶν ἄγγελων αὐτοῦ διήκειν, “who proves the counsel of his messengers true.” Davies takes this as a reference to prophets. Malachi 2:7 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: γείτονας καθιστάνει τῷ Κυρίῳ καὶ ἰδιαίτερας ἠδρασμένας αὐτῷ, “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.

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. Against his first point it should be noted that In Abr. §115 Philo describes angels (ἄγγελοι) as “ambassadors” (πρεσβευταὶ). 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
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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.
dγγελοι, 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 dγγελοι merely reflects the Hebrew Vorlage, not the ideology of the translator. Furthermore, in all three passages the dγγελοι in question are elsewhere described using a human appellation such as προφητὴς or λεηφυς. 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 προσαγορεύονσιν δρχιερά, καὶ νομίζουσιν αὐτῶις δγγελον γινεσθαι 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

324 Walton, "Messenger," 256.
of Ptolemy I Soter (323-283 B.C.E.),\textsuperscript{325} predating both the LXX and Josephus, who draws on Hecataeus himself.\textsuperscript{326} In all probability this passage reflects the same idea as Mal 2:7 (LXX), that a priest may be $\gamma\gamma\varepsilon\lambda\omicron$ς, thus providing evidence for the link between $\gamma\gamma\varepsilon\lambda\omicron$ς 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, \textit{Ant.} 15.5.3 Hecataeus uses $\gamma\gamma\varepsilon\lambda\omicron$ς only in connection with another noun, $\delta\chi\iota\varepsilon\varphi\iota\kappa\epsilon\varsigma$, 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 $\pi\alpha\rho\delta\; \tau\omicron\upsilon\; \theta\varepsilon\omicron\upsilon$ 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.\textsuperscript{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.”\textsuperscript{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\textsuperscript{a} XXVIII, 3-12. Psalm 151:4 (LXX) reads $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma\; \varepsilon\varsigma\alpha\pi\epsilon\sigma\tau\epsilon\iota\ell\epsilon\nu\varsigma\; \tau\omicron\upsilon\; \alpha\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\omicron\nu\; \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$, “he sent his messenger.” The Hebrew, of which the LXX is not a mere translation,\textsuperscript{329} reads

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item\textsuperscript{326} Cf. Jagersma, \textit{History}, 18.
\item\textsuperscript{327} The phrase $\pi\alpha\rho\delta\; \theta\varepsilon\omicron\upsilon$ 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 ($\delta\pi\omicron\kappa\alpha\lambda\upsilon\phi\theta\epsilon\iota\sigma\sigma\alpha\; \pi\alpha\rho\delta\; \theta\varepsilon\omicron\upsilon$). It is then suggested that Moses had already received the tablets of the law from God, having been taught by the archangel Michael.
\item\textsuperscript{328} L. Ginzberg, \textit{The Legends of the Jews} (vol. 6; Philadelphia, Pa.: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1946), 47.
\item\textsuperscript{329} J. A. Sanders, \textit{The Psalms Scroll of Qumrân Cave 11 (11QPs\textsuperscript{a})} (DJDJ 4; Oxford: Clarendon, 1965), 58.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
If the Vorlage of Ps 151:4 (LXX) is faithfully reflected at this point, this would seem to be the only occurrence of δυγγελος as a translation equivalent for נבש המלך, “his messenger” here, though whether this indicates that the Syriac is dependent on the LXX, or that a Hebrew version of this psalm with rather than מלך 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 מלי כ in Ps 103:20 to refer to human messengers and R. Johanan cites Hag 1:13 as a reference to a prophet as מלי כ, and suggests that the equation מלי כ = δυγγελος in Ps 151:4 (LXX) may represent an early midrashic tradition. This tradition is reflected in Heb 1:2; 2:2. Προφηταις and δυγγελοι are synonymous, the theme of the whole section being God’s speaking to the fathers. The shift from προφηταις to δυγγελοι occurred due to the intervening discussion of the superiority of the Son over δυγγελοι: 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 δυγγελοι could be used to prove this midrashically.

In order to understand δυγγελοι 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. 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, and as we have already noted, Deut 33:2 (LXX) does not refer to angelic mediation. Silberman follows Davies’ interpretation of Josephus, Ant.
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. In the case of *Pesiq. Rab.* 21, Silberman concludes, as we did above, that the minstering angels are unlikely to be the subject of וְיִתְנָשָׁה, 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 יִשְׁרַיִם מַעֲרָֽשָׁהְוֹת פִּיוֹתָה.

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).

Silberman is right to say that the major interest of the author is the definitive message given through Jesus, 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 ἄγγελοι as
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337 Silberman, “Prophets/Angels,” 96-97.
338 Silberman, “Prophets/Angels,” 93.
339 Silberman, “Prophets/Angels,” 93.
“ministering spirits” (λειτουργικά 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 τῶν, which means that δι’ ἄγγελον 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 ἐν' ἐσχάτοι τῶν ἡμερῶν τούτων ἐλάλησεν ἡμῖν ἐν νῷ ἔσχ.

Heb 2:2: δι’ ἄγγελον λαλήθεις λόγος

Heb 2:3: ἤτεις αρχὴν λαβοῦσα λαλεῖσθαι διὰ τοῦ κυρίου ὑπὸ τῶν ἄκουσάντων

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 mediation 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 διοικέω 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 מִשְׁלֵי and the מִשְׁלֵי 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.
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