

The Scepter and the Star

*Messianism in Light of
the Dead Sea Scrolls*

• •

SECOND EDITION

John J. Collins

WILLIAM B. EERDMANS PUBLISHING COMPANY
GRAND RAPIDS, MICHIGAN / CAMBRIDGE, U.K.

Contents

<i>Preface to the Second Edition</i>	viii
<i>Preface to the First Edition</i>	ix
<i>Dürer's Illustration of Christ Messiah</i>	xii
<i>Map of Palestine: Location of Qumran Caves</i>	xiii
1. Messianism and the Scrolls	1
A Common Jewish Hope?	3
The Dead Sea Scrolls	6
The Terminological Issue	16
2. The Fallen Booth of David:	
Messianism and the Hebrew Bible	21
The Emergence of a Canon	21
The Royal Ideology	24
Predictions of an Ideal King	26
A Gentile "Messiah"	32
A Messianic Movement in the Persian Period?	34
The Absence of Messianism in the Second Temple Period	37
The Transformation of Messianism in Daniel	42
The Savior King in Egyptian Judaism	46
Conclusion	50

CONTENTS

3. A Shoot from the Stump of Jesse	52
The <i>Psalms of Solomon</i>	52
The Political Context	54
The Davidic Hope	57
The Davidic Messiah in the Scrolls	61
The <i>Peshar</i> on Isaiah	62
The Messiah in the War Rule	64
Diverse Titles of the Messiah	68
Star and Scepter in the Damascus Document	71
Exegetical Traditions	73
The Character and Role of the Davidic Messiah	77
4. The Messiahs of Aaron and Israel	79
One or Two Messiahs?	79
Theories of Development	84
EXCURSUS: The Damascus Document, Col. 7	87
The Origins of Priestly Messianism	92
<i>Jubilees</i>	93
Aramaic Levi	96
The <i>Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs</i>	101
The Development of the Levi Tradition	105
Conclusion	108
5. Teacher, Priest and Prophet	110
The Teacher at the End of Days	110
The Understanding of the End of Days	113
EXCURSUS: The Sanctuary of Men	116
The Temple Scroll and the End of Days	119
The Teacher and the End of Days	122
Teacher and Prophet	123
Teacher and Priest	126
The Eschatological Prophet	128
4Q521	131
Conclusion	141
EXCURSUS: The Suffering Servant at Qumran?	141

Contents

6. A Throne in the Heavens	149
The Textual Evidence	149
The Relation to the Hymnic Material	154
The Identity of the Individual	155
Ascent to Heaven?	160
Conclusion	163
EXCURSUS: Israel Knohl's <i>Messiah Before Jesus</i>	164
7. The Messiah as the Son of God	171
Proposed Interpretations	173
The Literary Context	176
A Negative Figure?	179
The Collective Interpretation	181
The Angelic Interpretation	181
The Messianic Interpretation	183
EXCURSUS: Other Possible "Son of God" Passages	185
The Role and Nature of the Son of God	189
8. The Danielic Son of Man	191
Daniel 7	193
The <i>Similitudes of Enoch</i>	196
<i>Fourth Ezra</i>	205
Common Assumptions	210
9. Messianic Dreams in Action	215
Prophetic Movements	216
Royal Pretenders	219
Jesus and the Davidic Messiah	229
Conclusion	237
<i>Bibliography</i>	238
<i>Chronological Table</i>	274
<i>Abbreviations</i>	276
<i>Index of Authors</i>	280
<i>Index of Scriptural Citations</i>	287
<i>Index of Ancient Sources</i>	291

1

Messianism and the Scrolls

“Any discussion of the problems relating to Messianism is a delicate matter, for it is here that the essential conflict between Judaism and Christianity has developed and continues to exist.”¹ With these words Gershom Scholem began his famous study, *The Messianic Idea in Judaism*. According to Scholem, “a totally different concept of redemption determines the attitude to Messianism in Judaism and Christianity.” Judaism “has always maintained a concept of redemption as an event which takes place publicly, on the stage of history, and within the community.” Christianity, in contrast, locates redemption in “the spiritual and unseen realm, . . . in the private world of each individual.”² To be sure, the contrast is overdrawn. Christianity has known its share of millenarian movements that expected a new earth as well as a new heaven, and Judaism has its traditions of inward spirituality. As a broad generalization, however, the contrast has merit, in underlining a dominant characteristic of each religion.³

1. Gershom Scholem, *The Messianic Idea in Judaism and Other Essays on Jewish Spirituality* (New York: Schocken, 1971) 1. Compare, recently, Amy-Jill Levine, *The Misunderstood Jew* (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 2006) 17: “Belief in Jesus as the Christ — the Messiah — separates church and synagogue, Christians and Jews.”

2. Ibid.

3. Scholem has been criticized by William Scott Green, “Introduction: Messiah in Judaism: Rethinking the Question,” in J. Neusner, W. S. Green and E. S. Frerichs, eds., *Judaisms and Their Messiahs* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987) 1-2. It does not seem to me that Scholem “assumes the constant centrality of the messiah in the morphology and history of Judaism and in the Jewish-Christian argument,” as Green claims, or that Scholem is discussing the morphology of Judaism in this essay at all. He is making a broad generalization about the root cause of the differences between Judaism and Christianity. Green him-

Scholem was not concerned with the origin of messianism in antiquity, but with “the varying perspectives by which it became an effective force after its crystallization in historical Judaism.”⁴ By historical Judaism, he meant the religion codified by the rabbis, beginning in the late second century CE, and carrying on down to modern times. The “essential conflict” between Judaism and Christianity, however, was rooted more deeply than this, in the very origins of the Christian movement and its emergence from Judaism in the first century CE. For Christianity takes its name from Jesus Christ, and whether Christ be regarded as a title or, as it soon became, a proper name, it expresses the confession that Jesus of Nazareth was the messiah. In this confession lay the seed of the essential and continuing conflict that Scholem perceived between Judaism and Christianity. If we are to understand the roots of this conflict, it is essential to understand what a messiah was supposed to be, and why some fundamental differences in interpretation were possible in the first century CE.

Both the Jewish and the Christian understandings of messiah have been subjects of controversy in recent years. On the Christian side, we have had the astonishing claim that Paul, the earliest Christian writer, did not regard Jesus as the messiah.⁵ The ecumenical intentions of such a claim are transparent and honorable, but also misguided, since the claim is so plainly false. Jesus is called *Christos*, anointed, the Greek equivalent of messiah, 270 times in the Pauline corpus.⁶ If this is not ample testimony that Paul regarded Jesus as messiah, then words have no meaning.⁷ There is plenty of room for debate as to how various New Testament authors un-

self recognizes that the use of the word *christos* in the Gospels was “pivotal in shaping later understanding” (p. 4).

4. Scholem, *The Messianic Idea in Judaism*, 2.

5. John G. Gager, *The Origins of Anti-Semitism. Attitudes Towards Judaism in Pagan and Christian Antiquity* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1983) 201, summarizing the views of Lloyd Gaston, which were expressed in a series of articles, most notably “Paul and the Torah,” in A. Davies, ed., *Anti-Semitism and the Foundations of Christianity* (New York: Paulist, 1979) 48-71.

6. See Martin Hengel, “Jesus, der Messias Israels,” in I. Gruenwald, S. Shaked and G. G. Stroumsa, eds., *Messiah and Christos. Studies in the Jewish Origins of Christianity Presented to David Flusser* (Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1992) 155.

7. Note also the clear messianic resonance of Romans 1:3-4: “the gospel according to his Son, who was descended from David according to the flesh and was declared to be Son of God with power according to the spirit of holiness by resurrection from the dead.” See now Adela Yarbro Collins, “Jesus as Messiah and Son of God in the Letters of Paul,” in Adela Yarbro Collins and John J. Collins, *King and Messiah as Son of God* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008) 101-22.

derstood the messiahship of Jesus,⁸ but that his messiahship was foundational for the Christian movement is beyond dispute.

Messianism has a more important place in the study of Christianity than in a comprehensive description of ancient Judaism. The Torah, rather than the messiah, is central to traditional Judaism, and one might argue that Paul's rejection of the Law precipitated the separation of Christianity from Judaism.⁹ But the Christian abrogation of the Law was based on the belief that Jesus, as messiah, had ushered in a new age, so the issue comes back to messianism. Acceptance of a messiah was not in itself a heresy in Judaism. Rabbi Akiba allegedly hailed Bar Kochba as messiah, and is none the less venerated in Jewish tradition. In the case of Jesus of Nazareth, the issue was not just the claim of messiahship, but the understanding of what it entailed, especially with regard to divinity. As a broad generalization, however, Scholem's dictum stands. The separation of Christianity from Judaism, and the problematic relations between the two religions over the centuries, are rooted in Christian claims about Jesus as the Christ or messiah, which are unacceptable to Jews.

A Common Jewish Hope?

My concern in this book, however, is primarily with Jewish messianism, both as an interesting phenomenon in the history of religion in its own right and as the context in which the earliest acclamation of Jesus as messiah must be understood. Jewish messianism, too, has been a subject of controversy in recent years. The traditional assumption, at least in Christian circles, has been that messianic expectation was ubiquitous and had a consistent form. Consequently, the question of whether Jesus was the messiah admitted of a clearcut answer. There has been a growing recognition in recent years that this view of the matter is heavily influenced by Christian theology. The Gospels portrayed Jesus as the fulfillment of Old Testa-

8. See George MacRae, "Messiah and Gospel," in Neusner et al., eds., *Judaisms and Their Messiahs*, 169-85; Yarbrow Collins in *King and Messiah*, 123-203.

9. The separation of Christianity from Judaism is a complex issue. See James D. G. Dunn, *The Partings of the Ways: Between Christianity and Judaism and Their Significance for the Character of Christianity* (Philadelphia: Trinity Press International, 1991), and the ensuing discussion in Adam H. Becker and Annette Yoshiko Reed, *The Ways That Never Parted: Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003).

ment prophecy.¹⁰ Those who did not perceive the correspondences were “foolish and slow of heart” (Luke 24:25). Traditional Christianity construed Judaism as a religion in waiting, and this construing of the relationship between Judaism and Christianity has had long-lasting repercussions in Christian scholarship.¹¹ Its influence can still be seen in major scholarly, historical works in this century.

The classic scholarly view of these matters is presented in the handbooks of Emil Schürer and George Foot Moore.¹² Both Schürer and Moore proceeded on the assumption that there was a uniform system of messianic expectation in ancient Judaism. This approach is still in evidence in the revised edition of Schürer’s classic, which provides “a systematic outline of messianism.”¹³ The system, however, is inevitably constructed from late sources. Moore’s discussion is primarily a description of the rabbinic sources.¹⁴ The account in the revised Schürer is “based on all the intertestamental sources, including the Dead Sea Scrolls, but presented according to the pattern emerging from the apocalypses of *Baruch* and *Ezra* since it is in these two late compositions that eschatological expectation is most fully developed.”¹⁵ The apocalypses in question, *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch*, were written at the end of the first century CE. It is obviously problematic to infer from them the pattern of messianic belief throughout the so-called intertestamental period. Yet the sources available to (the original) Schürer and Moore included little other evidence of messianism in this period. Only two other documents in the Jewish Pseudepigrapha refer to a messiah. One, the *Psalms of Solomon*, written after Pompey’s conquest of Jerusalem in 63 BCE, resembles *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch* insofar as it speaks of a royal, Davidic, messiah. The other, the *Similitudes of Enoch*, is very different, and only uses the term “messiah” incidentally to refer to a preexistent,

10. This point is made lucidly by Green, “Introduction,” 5.

11. It is an intriguing question, implied in Green’s critique of Scholem, whether *Jewish* scholarship has also been distorted by the prevalent Christian stereotypes. Cf. Scholem’s statement that “in Judaism the Messianic idea has compelled a life lived in deferment” (*The Messianic Idea*, 35).

12. Emil Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ* (rev. and ed. by G. Vermes, F. Millar and M. Black; 3 vols.; Edinburgh: Clark, 1973-87); G. F. Moore, *Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era* (2 vols.; New York: Schocken, 1971, original copyright, 1927). See my essay, “Early Judaism in Modern Scholarship,” in John J. Collins and Daniel Harlow, eds., *The Dictionary of Early Judaism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010).

13. Schürer, *The History*, 2.514.

14. G. F. Moore, *Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era*, 2.323-76.

15. Schürer, *The History*, 3.514.

heavenly figure who is primarily patterned on the “one like a son of man” in Daniel 7.¹⁶

In recent years there has been a sweeping reaction against the kind of synthesis presented by Schürer and Moore. James Charlesworth reports that “No member of the Princeton Symposium on the Messiah holds that a critical historian can refer to a common Jewish messianic hope during the time of Jesus. . . .”¹⁷ J. D. G. Dunn discerns “four pillars of Second Temple Judaism,” monotheism, election, covenant, and land. Future hope does not rank with the pillars, much less messianism.¹⁸ E. P. Sanders provides an outline of the future hopes of “common Judaism,” but he emphasizes that “the expectation of a messiah was not the rule.”¹⁹ Burton Mack warns that it is wrong “to think of Judaism in general as determined by messianism, the desire for a king.”²⁰ Even the editors of a volume on messiahs find “powerful reasons to ditch” the established consensus, and emphasize instead the diversity of “Judaisms and their Messiahs.”²¹ The distinguished German scholar Johann Maier goes so far as to ban the words “messiah,” “messianic” etc. from the discussion of the Scrolls, on the grounds that they entail a projection of Christian interests onto the material. He would speak instead of “anointed” figures.²²

Several factors have contributed to this rather dramatic shift in the as-

16. See the review by J. H. Charlesworth, “The Messiah in the Pseudepigrapha,” in H. Temporini and W. Haase, eds., *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1979) II.19.1 188-218. Charlesworth includes 3 *Enoch* as a further Jewish pseudepigraphon, but this comes from a much later period.

17. J. H. Charlesworth, “From Messianology to Christology: Problems and Prospects,” in J. H. Charlesworth, ed., *The Messiah* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992) 5.

18. Dunn, *The Partings of the Ways*, 18-36. Dunn freely admits that he is not attempting a complete taxonomy of early Judaism.

19. E. P. Sanders, *Judaism. Practice and Belief. 63 BCE–66 CE* (Philadelphia: Trinity Press International, 1992) 295.

20. B. L. Mack, *A Myth of Innocence. Mark and Christian Origins* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988) 36.

21. Green, “Introduction,” 10.

22. Johann Maier, “Messias oder Gesalbter? Zu einem übersetzungs- und Deutungsproblem in den Qumrantexten,” *Revue de Qumran* 17 (1996) 585-612. See my critique of Maier in my essay “What Was Distinctive about Messianic Expectation at Qumran?” in James H. Charlesworth, ed., *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls. The Princeton Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Waco, TX: Baylor, 2006) 71-92 (specifically 73-76); also Albert A. Hogeterp, *Expectations of the End. A Comparative Traditio-Historical Study of Eschatological, Apocalyptic and Messianic Ideas in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament* (STDJ 83; Leiden: Brill, 2009) 430.

assessment of Jewish messianism around the turn of the era. Jews and Christians alike have been sensitized to the theological distortions of past generations. Liberal Christians are eager to avoid anything that might smack of supersessionism. Moreover, messianism, and eschatology in general, have become something of an embarrassment in modern culture. They conjure up images of David Koresh and the Branch Davidians, or, on a more respectable level, the Lubavitcher Rebbe and his followers. But there are also serious scholarly reasons for the shift. Our documentation for Judaism around the turn of the era is spotty, and explicit documentation of messianic expectation is relatively rare. Nonetheless, there are reasons to believe that the pendulum of scholarly opinion has swung too far.

The Dead Sea Scrolls

The primary reason for a reassessment of Jewish messianism at this time is the availability of new evidence from the Dead Sea Scrolls. To be sure, much of the evidence has been available now for sixty years, but it has not been well integrated into the discussion. In the revised edition of Schürer's *History*, the Qumran evidence is still fitted into a pattern derived from *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch*. More often the various corpora, such as the Pseudepigrapha and the Dead Sea Scrolls, are studied separately, and not integrated with each other.²³ Moreover, the full corpus of Dead Sea Scrolls was only made generally available in Fall 1991, and a number of important texts have been published since then. These could not be taken into account in such syntheses as the revision of Schürer's history, volume 2 (1979), or the Princeton symposium on the messiah (1987).

The failure to integrate the Scrolls into the discussion of Second Temple Judaism is bound up with a wider debate as to just what the Scrolls represent. Many scholars have regarded them as the writings of a secluded sect, which might then be deemed rather atypical of the Judaism of the time. This view, however, has become harder to maintain in view of the extent and diversity of the fragmentary remains from Qumran Cave 4, which have only recently come into public view.

The view that the Dead Sea Scrolls were the library of an Essene settlement at Khirbet Qumran, by the Dead Sea south of Jericho, took hold

23. Consequently Charlesworth's study of "The Messiah in the Pseudepigrapha" gives a misleading impression of the extent of messianic expectation in "intertestamental" Judaism.

Messianism and the Scrolls

within a few years of the first discoveries in 1947 and has remained the dominant hypothesis.²⁴ Two factors are fundamental to that hypothesis. First, the Roman writer Pliny, who died in the eruption of Vesuvius in 79 CE, refers to an Essene settlement between Jericho and En-Gedi.²⁵ No other plausible site for Pliny's reference has been identified.²⁶ Second, the first batch of discoveries in Qumran Cave 1 included a *Community Rule* (1QS), which has several points of resemblance to the description of the Essenes by Josephus and Philo.²⁷ The caves where the Scrolls were found are in close proximity to the ruins of a settlement. The original excavator of the site, Roland de Vaux, argued that these ruins reflected a quasi-monastic settlement, and that the Scrolls were the library of that settlement, hidden in the caves at the time of the Jewish war against Rome.²⁸ The fact that pottery found at Qumran matched the jars in which the

24. See the classic discussion of F. M. Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical Studies* (Garden City: Doubleday, 1961) 51-196; G. Vermes, *The Dead Sea Scrolls. Qumran in Perspective* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977) 116-36; J. J. Collins, "Essenes," in David N. Freedman, ed., *The Anchor Bible Dictionary* (6 vols.; New York: Doubleday, 1992) 2.619-26. The Essenes were mentioned already in the initial press release by Millar Burrows in April, 1948, and discussed by W. H. Brownlee, "A Comparison of the Covenanters of the Dead Sea Scrolls with Pre-Christian Jewish Sects," *Biblical Archeologist* 13 (1950) 50-72, and A. Dupont-Sommer, *Aperçus préliminaires sur les manuscrits de la Mer Morte* (Paris: Maisonneuve, 1950). The identification has recently been reaffirmed by Émile Puech, *La Croyance des Esséniens en la Vie Future: Immortalité, Résurrection, Vie Éternelle?* (Études Bibliques 21; Paris: Gabalda, 1993) 14-20, and James C. VanderKam, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1994) Chapter Three. See now John J. Collins, *Beyond the Qumran Community. The Sectarian Movement of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010) chapter 4, on the Essenes.

25. Pliny, *Natural History* 5.15.73.

26. Yitzhar Hirschfeld, "A Settlement of Hermits above 'En Gedi,'" *Tel Aviv* 27 (2000) 103-55, proposed a site in the hills above and west of En Gedi, but this appears to consist of agricultural installations rather than a settlement. See Jodi Magness, *The Archaeology of Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002) 41.

27. Josephus, *Jewish War* 2.8.2-13 §119-61, *Antiquities* 18.1.5 §18-22; Philo, *Quod omnis probus liber sit*, 75-91, *Hypothetica* 11.1-18. See also Hippolytus, *Refutation of All Heresies* 9.18-28. The parallels with the Scrolls are discussed by T. S. Beall, *Josephus' Description of the Essenes Illustrated by the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas Monograph Series 58; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), and much more briefly by Collins, "Essenes," in *The Anchor Bible Dictionary* 2.619-26, and by Geza Vermes and Martin D. Goodman, *The Essenes According to the Classical Sources* (Sheffield: Journal for the Study of the Old Testament, 1989).

28. R. de Vaux, *Archaeology and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (London: Oxford University Press, 1973) 91-138.

Scrolls were hidden has usually been taken as confirmation of that view. It is clear from the archeological evidence that Qumran was destroyed by the Roman army during the First Jewish Revolt (66-70 CE), probably in 68 CE. The beginning of the settlement is often put close to the middle of the second century BCE, but the evidence of the coins would seem to favor a date closer to 100 BCE. (143 coins were found from the reign of Alexander Jannaeus, 103-76 BCE, while only one was found from that of John Hyrcanus, 135-104 BCE.)²⁹ The settlement was apparently in existence for more than a century and a half around the turn of the era.³⁰

The use of such terms as “sect” or “sectarian” with reference to the Scrolls arises in part from the usual translation of the term *hairesis*, which Josephus uses to categorize the Essenes, Pharisees and Sadducees (*Ant* 13.171-72).³¹ It is reinforced by the regulations of the Community Rule, and to a lesser extent the Damascus Document (CD), which was originally published from manuscripts found in the Cairo Geniza in 1910,³² and which has been found in several fragmentary copies at Qumran.³³ Both the Community Rule and the Damascus Document posit an organization with its own procedures of admission, and which distinguishes itself from the rest of Judaism. Another important document known as the

29. See now Magness, *The Archaeology of Qumran*, 66: “there is at present no good evidence for dating the establishment of the sectarian settlement at Qumran earlier than ca. 100 B.C.E.” She dates the establishment of the settlement somewhere between 100 and 50 BCE.

30. De Vaux argued that the site was abandoned after an earthquake in 31 BCE and not reoccupied until 4 BCE, at the end of Herod’s reign. Magen Broshi, in a postscript to de Vaux’s article “Qumran, Khirbet and Ein Feshka,” in E. Stern, ed., *The New Encyclopedia of Archaeological Excavations in the Holy Land* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1993) 4.1235-41, expresses doubt that the site was abandoned for more than a few years. So also Magness, *The Archaeology of Qumran*, 67-68, who suggests that the site was abandoned for no more than a few years, around the turn of the era.

31. For a concise discussion of the category “sect” with reference to Judaism in this period see Anthony J. Saldarini, *Pharisees, Scribes and Sadducees in Palestinian Society. A Sociological Approach* (Wilmington: Glazier, 1988) 70-73. Saldarini draws on the typology of Bryan Wilson, *Magic and the Millennium* (London: Heinemann, 1973) 16-26. See now further Albert I. Baumgarten, *The Flourishing of Jewish Sects in the Maccabean Era: An Interpretation* (JSJSup 55; Leiden: Brill, 1997); Jutta Jokiranta, “‘Sectarianism’ of the Qumran ‘Sect’: Sociological Notes,” *RevQ* 20 (2001) 223-239; Eyal Regev, *Sectarianism in Qumran. A Cross-Cultural Perspective* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2007) 33-93.

32. Solomon Schechter, *Fragments of a Zadokite Work* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1910).

33. Joseph M. Baumgarten, *The Damascus Document (4Q266-273): Qumran Cave 4, XIII* (DJD 18; Oxford: Clarendon, 1966).

Halakhic Letter (4QMMT), formally published in 1994, also makes clear that it comes from a community that has separated itself from the rest of Judaism. It declares explicitly that “we have separated ourselves from the majority of the people . . .] from intermingling in these matters and from participating with them in these [matters].”³⁴ The view that the Scrolls are a sectarian collection assumes that the rule books and 4QMMT relate to the same movement (not necessarily to a single community) and that the other books were collected (though not all produced) by members of that movement. In this volume, I will use the words “sect” and “sectarian” with reference to this movement that had separated itself from the rest of Judaism.

In recent years, however, the consensus about the origin of the Scrolls has come into question. The most comprehensive challenge to the consensus has been formulated by Norman Golb, who disputes not only the character of the site and the Essene identification, but whether the Scrolls can be characterized as sectarian at all, and do not rather represent a random sampling of the Jewish literature of the period.³⁵

Two factors weigh heavily against the view that the Qumran library was not sectarian. First, certain kinds of books are conspicuously absent from the caves. There are no writings that could be described as Pharisaic, or that conform to the teachings of the later Tannaim, who compiled the rabbinic corpus.³⁶ Even the *Psalms of Solomon*, which have often been characterized as Pharisaic, are unattested at Qumran. Equally there are no writings that reflect the views of the Maccabees, or their successors in the Hasmonean dynasty. There are no copies of 1 Maccabees, which surely existed in Hebrew, or of Judith, which is often thought to be pro-Hasmonean. One fragmentary document, 4Q448, which mentions “Jonathan the King,” has been interpreted as a prayer for Alexander Jannaeus,³⁷

34. E. Qimron and J. Strugnell, *Qumran Cave 4. V. Miqsat Ma'aseh Ha-Torah* (DJD 10; Oxford: Clarendon, 1994) 59.

35. Norman Golb, *Who Wrote the Dead Sea Scrolls? The Search for the Secret of Qumran* (New York: Scribner, 1995).

36. F. García Martínez and A. van der Woude, “A Groningen Hypothesis of Qumran Origins,” *Revue de Qumran* 14 (1990) 535.

37. E. and H. Eshel and A. Yardeni, “A Scroll from Qumran Which Includes Part of Psalm 154 and a Prayer for King Jonathan and His Kingdom,” (Hebrew) *Tarbiz* 60 (1991) 295-324; (English) *Israel Exploration Journal* 42 (1992) 199-229. R. H. Eisenman and M. Wise, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Uncovered. The First Complete Translation and Interpretation of 50 Key Documents Withheld for Over 35 Years* (Rockport, MA: Element, 1992) 273, claim that this text “completely disproves the Essene theory of Qumran origins at least as classically conceived.”

but the interpretation is disputed³⁸ and, in any case, it would constitute only a single exception out of some eight hundred documents. The paucity of pro-Hasmonean literature among the Scrolls remains striking. The omission of whole categories of writings cannot be dismissed as fortuitous. It is far more plausible that the people who collected the Scrolls had a quarrel with both the Hasmoneans and the Pharisees. In contrast, some of the most distinctively sectarian books are preserved in multiple copies. There are eleven copies of the sectarian Community Rule, seven copies of the Damascus Document, and six copies of the avowedly separatist Halakhic Letter (4QMMT).³⁹ Why should multiple copies of such sectarian works be preserved in a Jerusalem library? The view that the Scrolls represent a sectarian collection remains overwhelmingly probable.

Whether the sect in question should be identified as the Essenes, and whether they had a settlement at Qumran, are less pressing questions for our present purposes. The Community Rule and Damascus Document show more similarities to the Essenes than to any other known group.⁴⁰ It

38. D. J. Harrington and J. Strugnell, "Qumran Cave 4 Texts: A New Publication," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 112 (1993) 491-99, read "Rise up, O Holy One, against King Jonathan" (p. 498). Compare Emmanuelle Main, "For King Jonathan or Against? The Use of the Bible in 4Q448," in Michael E. Stone and Esther G. Chazon, eds., *Biblical Perspectives: Early Use and Interpretation of the Bible in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (STDJ 28; Leiden: Brill, 1998) 113-35. Geza Vermes, "Brother James's heirs? The Community at Qumran and its relations to the first Christians," *Times Literary Supplement* 4 December 1992, 6-7, questions the reading "Jonathan." In a more recent study, "The So-Called King Jonathan Fragment (4Q448)," *Journal of Jewish Studies* 44 (1993) 294-300, he accepts the reading but suggests that the reference is to Jonathan Maccabee, although he never bears the title king in the ancient sources. These readings seem to be rather desperate attempts to avoid the reference to Jannaeus. On the problems presented by the syntax of the fragment, see the comments of P. S. Alexander, "A Note on the Syntax of 4Q448," *Journal of Jewish Studies* 44 (1993) 301-2.

39. Carol A. Newsom, "'Sectually Explicit' Literature from Qumran," in W. H. Propp, B. Halpern and D. N. Freedman, eds., *The Hebrew Bible and its Interpreters* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990) 170. The pattern of multiple copies is more significant than the percentage of the entire collection that can be considered sectarian.

40. See my article, "Essenes," in D. N. Freedman, ed., *The Anchor Bible Dictionary* 2.619-26 and Beall, *Josephus' Description of the Essenes*. Some scholars who have studied the halakah of the Scrolls, especially that of 4QMMT, have argued that it corresponds most closely to that of the Sadducees (Y. Sussman, "The History of the Halakha and the Dead Sea Scrolls: Preliminary Observations on the Miqsat Ma'ase Ha-Torah," *Tarbiz* 59 [1990] 11-76 [Hebrew]; L. H. Schiffman, "The Sadducean Origins of the Dead Sea Scroll Sect," in H. Shanks, ed., *Understanding the Dead Sea Scrolls* [New York: Random House, 1992] 35-49). This suggestion faces considerable difficulties, in view of the conspicuously non-Sadducean character of many of the Scrolls (note e.g. the prominence of angels and of deterministic notions). See

must be readily admitted that the correspondences are not complete. Josephus and Philo give no indication that the Essenes had any interest in messianism, or in a dualistic view of the world. There is also a discrepancy in the matter of celibacy, which is never required in the Scrolls.⁴¹ It is possible, even probable, that the Greek accounts distorted the Essenes, by interpreting them in the light of Greek interests. In that case, however, these accounts cannot be regarded as reliable sources, and the Scrolls should not be assimilated to them in any way. While I think the Essene identification is highly probable, I do not intend to press it. The Scrolls must be studied in their own right in any case.

The connection of the Scrolls with the Qumran site also seems to me very probable.⁴² There is a cemetery of over a thousand graves at Qumran. This can hardly be explained if Qumran was a military outpost, still less if it was a private residence of some sort. Pliny's reference to an Essene settlement in the area must still be taken into account. No one has yet identified a more plausible site for this settlement than Qumran. If the collection of Scrolls is indeed sectarian, then their proximity to Qumran can hardly be coincidental. Here again we do not need to press the point. The interpretation of the Scrolls seldom depends on the connection with the site, and some reservation is necessary in any case, pending the final archaeological publications.

While the sectarian origin of the Scrolls remains highly probable, Golb must be credited with some significant observations. The Qumran library is strangely lacking in primary documents, such as legal memoranda, personal letters, and records of transactions.⁴³ This would be surprising if

the critique of the Sadducean hypothesis by J. C. VanderKam, "The People of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Essenes or Sadducees?" in Shanks, ed., *Understanding the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 50-62.

41. See, however, the interesting argument of J. M. Baumgarten, "The Qumran-Essene Restraints on Marriage," in L. H. Schiffman, ed., *Archaeology and History in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Sheffield: Journal for the Study of the Old Testament, 1990) 13-24, who argues that the provision for marriage in CD 7:6-7 ("But if they live in camps according to the rule of the land, marrying and begetting children . . .") implies that some members of the sect did not marry. For my assessment of this debate, see *Beyond the Qumran Community*, chapter 4.

42. See *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis*, chapter 5; Magness, *The Archaeology of Qumran*. For a sampling of dissident views see Katharina Galor, Jean-Baptiste Humbert, and Jürgen Zangenberg, eds., *Qumran. The Site of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Archaeological Interpretations and Debates. Proceedings of a Conference Held at Brown University, November 17-19, 2002* (STDJ 57. Leiden: Brill, 2006).

43. A small number of such documents have been found in Cave 4. See 4Q341-59, E. Tov, *The Dead Sea Scrolls on Microfiche, Companion Volume* (Leiden: Brill, 1993) 40-41;

Qumran were the administrative center of a sect, as has often been supposed,⁴⁴ but it remains puzzling regardless of the provenance of the Scrolls.⁴⁵ There evidently was a settlement at Qumran, and it presumably had records, which either did not survive or have not been discovered. A more significant observation concerns the lack of autograph manuscripts among the Scrolls. Even the *pesharim*, of which only single copies have been found, contain evidence of copying errors.⁴⁶ This observation raises questions as to whether Qumran was the scene of intense scribal activity. De Vaux had identified a collapsed upper room as a “scriptorium,” on the basis of three tables and two inkwells found in the debris. In antiquity, however, scribes did not sit at tables,⁴⁷ and in any case two inkwells provide a very slim basis for identifying a scriptorium. Pauline Donceel-Voûte, one of the archeologists engaged in completing the publication of de Vaux’s excavations, has argued that the table came from a *triclinium* or dining room.⁴⁸ The disappearance of the scriptorium raises further questions about the extent of scribal activity at Qumran. These questions are intensified by the fact that several hundred different scribal hands can be detected in the Scrolls. Moreover, the ongoing publication of the Scrolls has made clear that the Scrolls include texts that are not sectarian in character (e.g. some wisdom texts; apocryphal psalms) and others that have sectarian tendencies but are considerably older than the settlement at Qumran (e.g. parts of *1 Enoch*). It is certain that some of the manuscripts

Armin Lange and Ulrike Mittmann-Richert, “Annotated List of the Texts from the Judaean Desert Classified by Content and Genre,” in Emanuel Tov, ed., *The Texts from the Judaean Desert. Indices and an Introduction to the Discoveries in the Judaean Desert Series* (DJD 39; Oxford: Clarendon, 2002) 145.

44. De Vaux, *Archaeology and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 113, used the term “mother-house.” So also Vermes, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 108.

45. García Martínez and van der Woude, “A Groningen Hypothesis,” 530: “if the absence of documentary records can be an objection to the MSS coming from a library, the objection must equally apply to its coming from another library, from the temple library or from unspecified libraries of Jerusalem.” The Jerusalem archives were destroyed during factional strife in 66 CE (Josephus, *Jewish War* 2.427-28) but it is scarcely possible that all primary documents were destroyed while only literary works survived.

46. M. Horgan, *Pesharim: Qumran Interpretations of Biblical Books* (Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series 8; Washington, D.C.: Catholic Biblical Association, 1979) 3-4.

47. B. Metzger, “The Furniture of the Scriptorium at Qumran,” *Revue de Qumran* 1 (1959) 509-15.

48. Pauline Donceel-Voûte, “‘Coenaculum.’ La Salle à l’Étage du Locus 30 à Khirbet Qumrân sur la Mer Morte,” in *Banquets d’Orient. Res Orientales* 4 (1992) 61-84.

were copied elsewhere; it is questionable whether any were actually written at Qumran. None of this is incompatible with the Essene hypothesis, but it shows that the Scrolls cannot be conceived as the product of a community sealed off from the outside world.

Scholars have always recognized that some of the books found at Qumran had been composed elsewhere, at an earlier time. Obviously, the biblical books are not sectarian. Some of the copies found at Qumran date from the third century BCE, long before the settlement at the site.⁴⁹ Some nonbiblical compositions, such as the books of *Enoch* and *Jubilees*, have also been assumed to antedate the Qumran community. There is no doubt, however, that our consciousness of non-sectarian works at Qumran has increased considerably in recent years. If this was a sectarian library, the sectarians were widely read, even though they rejected certain kinds of literature. The library, then, may give us a wider sample of the Judaism of the time than has been generally supposed. This much, indeed, might have been inferred from the sheer size of the corpus. The collection included such books as Tobit and Sirach, which had wide currency but were not objectionable to the sect in the way 1 Maccabees probably was. The Psalms Scroll, which has been the focus of extended debate about the formation of the canon,⁵⁰ is significant precisely because it contains “noncanonical” psalms, some of which were known before the Dead Sea discoveries, and which show no sectarian traits. The sect also had its own literature, some of which may well have been esoteric, and which remained, as far as we can tell, unknown outside sectarian circles. It is now clear, however, that not all previously unknown works were specifically sectarian.

Moreover, even if the collection is a sectarian library, it is not necessarily the case that it was specifically the library of the Qumran settlement. We have seen that the evidence for a scriptorium at Qumran has been severely questioned. Besides, the Community Rule is not the only description of a sectarian community found in the Scrolls. There are also seven copies of the Damascus Document, which is clearly related to the Community Rule but also differs from it in significant ways. The most important difference for our purposes is that the Damascus Document contains explicit provision for those who “live in camps according to the rule of the

49. Cross, *The Ancient Library*, 42.

50. See Peter W. Flint, *The Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls and the Book of Psalms* (STDJ 17; Leiden: Brill 1997). For a review of the older debate see G. H. Wilson, “The Qumran Psalms Scroll Reconsidered: Analysis of the Debate,” *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 47 (1985) 624-42.

Land . . . marrying and begetting children” (CD 7:6-7). This provision has often been compared to Josephus’ account of the second order of Essenes, who were also said to marry (*Jewish War* 2.160). The way in which the provision is introduced, “and if they live in camps . . .” strongly suggests that not all members of the “new covenant” did so.⁵¹ It is apparent that the sect allowed for some variety in lifestyle. The laws of the Damascus Document also provide for contact with Gentiles, which is not envisaged in the Community Rule. We must assume that the members of this movement were not isolated from other Jews either. It would seem, then, that the members of the sect were spread throughout the land and this, too, is in accordance with what Josephus says about the Essenes.⁵² Indeed it is clear from 1QS 6:2-7 that even the *yaḥad* (דח״) was not confined to a single community, but was rather distributed in multiple places of residence, with a quorum of ten.⁵³

It is at least possible that the collection of scrolls found near Qumran was not just the library of the Qumran community but had been brought there from various sectarian “camps” at the time of the war.⁵⁴ This would explain the multiple copies of the rule books, and might also help explain the diversity of the collection. On this hypothesis, then, we might expect to find in the Scrolls not only the distinctive compositions of the sect and “outside writings” that antedated its formation, but also diverse writings that had come into the possession of sectarians at any time prior to the Jewish war. There is still a principle of exclusion, which stamps the collection as sectarian, but this is by no means a principle of isolation. We should expect the Scrolls to reflect some notions that were widespread in the Judaism of their day, as well as those that were peculiar to the sect itself.

51. Baumgarten, “The Qumran-Essene Restraints on Marriage,” 19.

52. Josephus, *Jewish War* 2.124: “They are not in one town only, but in every town several of them form a colony.” Similarly Philo says that “they live in a number of towns in Judaea, and also in many villages and large groups” (Philo, *Hypothetica*, in Eusebius, *Praeparatio Evangelica* 8.6-7).

53. See my essay “The Yaḥad and ‘The Qumran Community,’” in Charlotte Hempel and Judith M. Lieu, eds., *Biblical Traditions in Transmission: Essays in Honour of Michael A. Knibb*. JSJSup 111. Leiden: Brill, 2005) 81-96, and *Beyond the Qumran Community*, chapter 1.

54. This was suggested orally by Michael O. Wise in the early nineties. See now also Alison Schofield, “Rereading S: A New Model of Textual Development in Light of the Cave 4 Serekh Copies,” *DSD* 15 (2008): 96-120, and eadem, *From Qumran to the Yaḥad: A New Paradigm of Textual Development for The Community Rule* (STDJ 77. Leiden: Brill, 2009), who suggests that the divergent copies of the rule books at Qumran may be explained on this hypothesis.

Much scholarship on the Scrolls has proceeded on the assumption that if a nonbiblical document was found at Qumran “its presence in the Essene library suggests that it was written by an Essene.”⁵⁵ This assumption is obviously no longer tenable. Carol Newsom has suggested even that it should be reversed, and that the burden of proof always falls on whoever wants to posit sectarian provenance.⁵⁶ Newsom and Hartmut Stegemann have advanced some criteria for distinguishing sectarian compositions.⁵⁷ Stegemann cites recognition of the authority of the Teacher of Righteousness, or of the rule books, and formal or terminological connections with explicitly sectarian texts. Newsom also cites terminological relationships; e.g. 4Q502, dubbed a “marriage ritual” by its editor,⁵⁸ is not conspicuously sectarian but appears to cite 1QS 4:4-6, and so belongs in the orbit of the sect. A text that follows the solar, 364-day calendar is also likely to be sectarian, but it is admitted that a book like *Jubilees*, which attaches great importance to this calendar, is older than the Qumran sect.

Both Newsom and Stegemann readily admit the limited value of these criteria. It is easy enough to arrive at a core group of sectarian texts: the Damascus Document (CD), the Community Rule (1QS), the so-called Messianic Rule (1QSa), the Scroll of Blessings (1QSB), the Thanksgiving Hymns or *Hodayot*, the biblical commentaries or *pesharim*, the Rule for the War of the Sons of Light against the Sons of Darkness (1QM, 4QM), the Halakhic Letter (4QMMT). There is a large grey area, however, of texts that bear some terminological relationship to these core texts, but the terms in question are not always distinctive, and it is difficult to draw a line or determine what degree of correspondence is required. Members of the community (𐤇𐤍𐤅) described in the Community Rule, or of the covenant described in the Damascus Document, still shared a wide range of traditions and observances with other Jews. We cannot expect even their own compositions always to display distinctive sectarian features.

In the matter of messianism, our objective here is not to isolate dis-

55. So A. Dupont-Sommer, *The Essene Writings from Qumran* (Gloucester, MA: Smith, 1973) 306.

56. Newsom, “‘Sectually Explicit’ Literature,” 177.

57. H. Stegemann, “Die Bedeutung der Qumranfunde für die Erforschung der Apokalypitik,” in D. Hellholm, ed., *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East* (Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1983) 511.

58. M. Baillet, *Qumrân Grotte 4:3 (4Q482-4Q520)* (Discoveries in the Judaean Desert 7; Oxford: Clarendon, 1982) 81-105; cf. J. M. Baumgarten, “4Q502, Marriage or Golden Age Ritual?” *Journal of Jewish Studies* 34 (1983) 125-35.

tinctively sectarian ideas, but rather to get a sense of the popularity and distribution of certain ideas in Judaism around the turn of the era. To this end, we will look not only for correspondences among the Scrolls, but also for their relation to other Jewish texts of the time. Parallels between the Scrolls and texts *not* found at Qumran, such as the *Psalms of Solomon*, are of particular interest. Such parallels may show not whether a text is sectarian, but whether an idea was current across sectarian boundaries and might be considered part of a common Jewish tradition of the time.

The discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls considerably expanded the corpus of literature relevant to the study of messianism. The number of occurrences of משיח, messiah, in its various forms is not great, but it illustrates well the range of reference of the term. One of the first scrolls published, the Community Rule, refers to the coming of “the prophet and the messiahs of Aaron and Israel” (1QS 9:2), and so testifies to the expectation of at least two messiahs, one priestly and one royal.⁵⁹ Since משיח is also used in the plural with reference to prophets (CD 2:9; 1QM 11:7), and the Melchizedek scroll (11QMelchizedek) identifies the “herald” of Isa 52:7 as “the anointed of the spirit” (משיח הרוח, cf. CD 2:9), it is possible that the prophet may be a messianic figure, too. The Scrolls, then, indicate a greater diversity of messianic expectations in Judaism around the turn of the era than was apparent before their discovery.⁶⁰

The Terminological Issue

The degree of diversity is inevitably bound up with the question of terminology. In modern parlance, the word “messiah” refers at the minimum to a figure who will play an authoritative role in the end time, usually the eschatological king. The Hebrew word משיח, however, means simply “anointed” and does not necessarily refer to an eschatological figure at all.⁶¹ While it refers to a royal figure some thirty times in the Hebrew Bible, it can also refer to other figures, most notably the anointed High Priest.⁶²

59. The extent of this “bi-messianism” in the Scrolls has been much disputed. We will return to it in a later chapter.

60. A point noted by Morton Smith, “What Is Implied by the Variety of Messianic Figures?” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 78 (1959) 66-72.

61. As noted repeatedly by Joseph A. Fitzmyer, S.J., *The One Who Is to Come* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007) 8-25.

62. F. Hesse, “Chriō, etc.,” G. Friedrich, ed., *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*

The association of the term with an ideal Davidic king derives from Ps 2:2, which speaks of the subjugation of all the peoples to God's anointed. In the postexilic period, when there was no longer a king in Jerusalem, we occasionally find the hope for an ideal king of the future. Jer 23:5 can be read in this context: "The days are coming, says the Lord, when I will raise up for David a righteous Branch, and he shall reign as king and deal wisely, and he shall execute justice and righteousness in the land." The use of the term משיח, messiah, for such a future king is not attested in the biblical period. In the late apocalyptic Book of Daniel, the only uses of משיח refer to High Priests (Dan 9:25, 26).

It is not helpful, however, to restrict the discussion of messianism too narrowly to occurrences of משיח or its translation equivalents (*christos*, *unctus*, etc.).⁶³ On the one hand, since the term "messiah" is commonly used in later tradition for the ideal Davidic king of the future, passages such as Jer 23:5-6, which clearly refer to such a figure, may reasonably be dubbed "messianic," even though the specific term does not occur. On the other hand, it is best to reserve the English term "messiah" for figures who have important roles in the future hope of the people. Even though historical High Priests are called משיח in Daniel 9, they are not "messiahs" in the eschatological, futurist, sense of the term.⁶⁴ The term "messiah" may be used legitimately, however, for the High Priest in an eschatological context, and for other eschatological figures, such as the Enochic Son of Man, who are *sometimes* designated as משיח or its translation equivalents. The term cannot be extended at will. Many reviews of Jewish messianism include sections on such writings as the *Testament of Moses*, which have no provision for a messiah by any name.⁶⁵ In short, a messiah is an eschatological

(Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974) 9.501-9. Gerbern S. Oegema, *The Anointed and His People: Messianic Expectations from the Maccabees to Bar Kochba* (JSPSup 27; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 23-27, lists several definitions of messiah that have been proposed.

63. Pace Fitzmyer, *The One Who Is to Come*, 1-7, who focuses obsessively on the use of the Hebrew word משיח. The need for a broader basis is recognized by most scholars. See James C. VanderKam, "Messianism and Apocalypticism," in John J. Collins, ed., *The Encyclopedia of Apocalypticism*. Vol. 1. *The Origins of Apocalypticism in Judaism and Christianity* (New York: Continuum, 1998) 193-228, especially 195; Hogeterp, *Expectations of the End*, 428-29.

64. It is somewhat bizarre that Fitzmyer, for all his rigor, regards Daniel 9 as evidence that "messianism truly emerged in pre-Christian Palestinian Judaism" (*The One Who Is to Come*, 64). He is led to this conclusion quite mechanically, by the fact that the noun משיח is used with a verb in the future tense.

65. Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People*, 2.506; J. Klausner, *The Messianic Idea in Israel* (London: Allen and Unwin, 1956) 325-29.

figure who sometimes, but not necessarily always, is designated as a משיח in the ancient sources.

It should be clear from these remarks, however, that “messiah,” even as an eschatological term, can refer to different kinds of figures, and that to speak of “the messiah” without further qualification is to speak ambiguously. This is the valid insight that underlies the recent denials of any common messianism in ancient Judaism. One could, arguably, give a satisfactory account of Jewish future hope without using the word “messiah” at all.⁶⁶ What matters is the expectation of a Davidic king, of an ideal priest, of an eschatological prophet. Besides, there was no Jewish orthodoxy in the matter of messianic expectation, and so we should expect some variation.

We shall argue, however, that the variation was limited, and that some forms of messianic expectation were widely shared. To be sure, we cannot go back to the single pattern of messianic expectation described by Schürer and Moore. We shall find four basic messianic paradigms (king, priest, prophet, and heavenly messiah), and they were not equally widespread.⁶⁷ (Admittedly, the “heavenly messiah” paradigm is somewhat different from the others, since it is not defined by function, and can overlap with the other paradigms.⁶⁸) We cannot be sure just how widespread messianic expectation was. Our sources do not permit us to speak with confidence about the majority of the Jewish people. It is possible, however, to show that some ideas had wide distribution and were current across sectarian lines. If we may accept E. P. Sanders’s notion of a common Judaism, in the sense of what was typical, though not necessarily normative, in the period 100 BCE–100 CE, the expectation of a Davidic messiah was surely part of it.⁶⁹

The history of Judaism in the Roman era is marked by a series of abor-

66. Compare Géza G. Xeravits, *King, Priest, Prophet. Positive Eschatological Protagonists of the Qumran Library* (STDJ 47; Leiden: Brill, 2003).

67. Compare F. García Martínez, “Messianische Erwartungen in den Qumranschriften,” *Jahrbuch für Biblische Theologie* 8 (1993) 171–208.

68. As noted by Al Wolters, “The Messiah in the Qumran Documents,” in Stanley E. Porter, ed., *The Messiah in the Old and New Testaments* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007) 75–89, specifically 81. Hogeterp, *Expectations of the End*, 429, objects to the fourth category, on the grounds that different earthly types may incorporate heavenly dimensions.

69. Compare the remarks of Geza Vermes, *Jesus the Jew* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1973) 134. Sanders’s notion of common Judaism is spelled out in his book *Judaism, Practice and Belief 63 BCE–66 CE* (Philadelphia: Trinity Press International, 1992).

tive movements led by individuals who claimed or aspired to be king.⁷⁰ The most conspicuous of these were Jesus of Nazareth, who was crucified as “King of the Jews” and was known to his followers as *Christos*, Greek for anointed one or messiah, at least after his death, and Simon Bar Kosiba, who was hailed by Rabbi Akiba as Bar Kochba, son of the star. The messianic character of some of the other pretenders is not explicit in the sources, but then our main source, Josephus, was not very sympathetic to failed uprisings. It is true, in a sense, that such movements were “not the rule,” but neither can they be dismissed as aberrations. We should rather think of them as the tips of icebergs. Open rebellion only takes place when passions have built up to the point where they cannot be suppressed. It would be foolish to assume that only those who joined in messianic movements were familiar with and entertained messianic expectations.

It is unfortunate that we have no writings from the hands of messianic pretenders, or even from their followers, which would illuminate their ideology.⁷¹ Only in the case of Jesus of Nazareth do we have extended narratives, and the multiplicity of these narratives is a problem in itself. Jesus is, moreover, an anomaly. Although the claim that he is the Davidic messiah is ubiquitous in the New Testament, he does not fit the typical profile of the Davidic messiah. This messiah was, first of all, a warrior prince, who was to defeat the enemies of Israel. The discrepancy between Jewish expectation and Christian fulfillment on this point has long been recognized. Sigmund Mowinckel went so far as to assert that “the Jewish Messianic idea was the temptation of Satan, which he had to reject.”⁷² Nonetheless, Jesus is hailed precisely as the messiah of Israel in the New Testament, and so the discrepancy poses a problem for any attempt to apply a schema of promise and fulfillment to the subject of messianism.

There were other paradigms of messianism besides the Davidic one, and some elements of these were found to be applicable to the Christian messiah. Attempts to find precedents in the Scrolls for a suffering or dying messiah have, I believe, been misguided. There are, however, significant precedents for the prophetic activity attributed to Jesus in the Gospels. We

70. See R. A. Horsley and J. S. Hanson, *Bandits, Prophets, and Messiahs. Popular Movements at the Time of Jesus* (Minneapolis: Winston, 1985) 110-31.

71. The letters of Bar Kosiba throw only a little light on his aims and self-understanding. See M. O. Wise, “Bar Kochba Letters,” *The Anchor Bible Dictionary* 1.601-6.

72. S. Mowinckel, *He That Cometh. The Messiah Concept in the Old Testament and in Later Judaism*, with a foreword by John J. Collins (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005; original English publication: Nashville: Abingdon, 1955) 450.

shall find, also, texts that envisage exaltation and enthronement in heaven and texts that apply certain attributes of divinity to a messianic figure. The statement attributed to the Jewish partner in Justin Martyr's *Dialogue with Trypho* 49.1, that "we all expect the messiah to be born a human being from human beings,"⁷³ holds true in most cases that we shall examine, but not in all. The messianic paradigm that was applied most successfully to Jesus in the Gospels was that of the heavenly messiah or Son of Man, if only because his manifestation still awaits eschatological verification.

We shall return to the question of messianic movements, and to the messianic claims concerning Jesus of Nazareth, in the closing chapter. Our main purpose, however, is to fill in the picture of Jewish messianism at the turn of the era, with special attention to the newly available evidence. In so doing we will endeavor to strike a balance between the extreme positions of modern scholarship, by giving due attention not only to the rich diversity of the trees but also the distinct contours of the forest.

73. See A. J. B. Higgins, "Jewish Messianic Belief in Justin Martyr's *Dialogue with Trypho*," in Leo Landman, ed., *Messianism in the Talmudic Era* (New York: Ktav, 1979) 183.