

JÖRG FREY

Qumran, Early Judaism, and New Testament Interpretation

Edited by
JACOB CERONE

*Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen
zum Neuen Testament
424*

Mohr Siebeck

Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament

Herausgeber / Editor

Jörg Frey (Zürich)

Mitherausgeber / Associate Editors

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

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

J. Ross Wagner (Durham, NC)

424



Jörg Frey

Qumran, Early Judaism, and New Testament Interpretation

Kleine Schriften III

edited by

Jacob N. Cerone

Mohr Siebeck

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

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

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

DOI 10.1628/978-3-16-158167-0

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

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

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

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

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

Printed in Germany.

M. E. G.

Preface

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

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

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

Table of Contents

Preface	VII
Abbreviations	XV

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

I. Introductory Essays

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

II. Qumran and Early Jewish Texts

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Abbreviations

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Introduction: Qumran, Ancient Judaism, and the New Testament

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

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

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

A. My Story with Qumran

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

⁸ The lecture was published in German in 1999: J. Frey, “Die paulinische Antithese von ‘Fleisch’ und ‘Geist’ und die palästinisch-jüdische Weisheitstradition,” *ZNW* 90 (1999): 45–77; cf. also the slightly shortened English conference paper (presented at the meeting of the IOQS in Oslo in 1998, under the title “The Notion of ‘Flesh’ in 4QInstruction and the Background of Pauline Usage,” in *Poetical, Liturgical, and Sapiential Texts: Proceedings of the Third Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Oslo, 1998* (ed. D. K. Falk, F. García Martínez, and E. M. Schuller; STDJ 35; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 197–226, and the more extensive presentation from a Tübingen conference: “Flesh and Spirit in the Palestinian Jewish Sapiential Tradition and in the Qumran Texts: An Inquiry into the Background of Pauline Usage,” in *The Wisdom Texts from Qumran and the Development of Sapiential Thought: Studies in Wisdom at Qumran and Its Relationship to Sapiential Thought in the Ancient Near East, the Hebrew Bible, Ancient Judaism, and the New Testament* (ed. C. Hempel, A. Lange, and H. Lichtenberger; BETL 159; Leuven: Peeters, 2002), 367–404, republished in this volume 701–741.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Second Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Cambridge 1995: Published in Honour of Joseph M. Baumgarten (ed. M. Bernstein, F. García Martínez, and J. Kampen; STDJ 23; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 275–335 (in this volume, 243–299).

¹⁴ J. Frey, “Licht aus den Höhlen? Der ‘Johanneische Dualismus’ und die Texte von Qumran,” in *Kontexte des Johannesevangeliums: Das vierte Evangelium in religions- und traditionsgeschichtlicher Perspektive* (ed. J. Frey and U. Schnelle, in collaboration with J. Schlegel; WUNT 175; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004), 117–203, where the widespread assumptions of a close relationship between Qumran and the Gospel of John are thoroughly questioned, and idem, “Zu Hintergrund und Funktion des johanneischen Dualismus,” in *Paulus und Johannes: Exegetische Studien zur paulinischen und johanneischen Theologie und Literatur* (ed. D. Sänger and U. Mell; WUNT 198; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006), 3–73 (English translation: “Johannine Dualism: Reflections on Its Background and Function,” in idem, *The Glory of the Crucified One: Theology and Christology in the Fourth Gospel* (trans. W. Coppins and C. Heilig; BMSEC; Waco, Tx.: Baylor University Press, 2018), 101–167. See also the shorter presentation: idem, “Recent Perspectives on Johannine Dualism and its Background,” in *Text, Thought, and Practice in Qumran and Early Christianity* (ed. R. A. Clements and D. Schwartz; Leiden: Brill, 2009), 127–57 (in this volume, 763–790), and idem, “Dualism and the World in the Gospel and Letters of John,” in *The Oxford Handbook of Johannine Studies* (ed. J. M. Lieu and M. C. de Boer; Oxford: OUP, 2018), 274–291.

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

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

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

¹⁶ J. Frey, “Die Bedeutung der Qumran-Funde für das Verständnis des Neuen Testaments,” in *Qumran – die Schriftrollen vom Toten Meer: Vorträge des St. Galler Qumran-Symposiums vom 2./3. Juli 1999* (ed. M. Fieger, K. Schmid, and P. Schwagmeier; NTOA 47; Freiburg [Switzerland]: Universitätsverlag and Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2001), 129–208.

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

¹⁸ Cf. my contribution to that sounding conference in Jerusalem: J. Frey, “On the Character and Background of Mt 5:25–26: A Case Study for the Value of Qumran Literature in New Testament Interpretation,” in *The Sermon on the Mount and Its Jewish Setting* (ed. H.-J. Becker and S. Ruzer; Cahiers de la Revue Biblique 60; Paris: Gabalda, 2005), 3–39, republished in this volume 649–676.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

B. Insights and Aims

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

C. The Present Volume

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I. Introductory Overviews

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

A. Problems: The Perception of Judaism in Christian Exegesis

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

¹¹ In the fifth of his discourses entitled “On Religion: Speeches to Its Cultured Despisers” (F. D. E. Schleiermacher, “Über die Religion. Reden an die Gebildeten unter ihren Verächtern,” in *Kritische Gesamtausgabe, Vol 1.2. Schriften aus der Berliner Zeit 1769–1799* [ed. G. Meckenstock; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1984], 185–326, here 314), Schleiermacher describes Judaism, in its post-biblical existence, as “a dead religion” and an “incorporeal mummy”; see also Waubke, *Pharisäer*, 43, 336; also Gerdmar, *Roots*, 61–76.

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

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

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

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

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

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

¹⁶ Schürer, *Lehrbuch*, 498.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1. The Qumran Discoveries and the Image of Contemporary Judaism

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

III. The Qumran Discoveries and Jesus Research

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

⁴⁴ Stuckenbruck, "Dead Sea Scrolls," 152.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

⁴⁸ Cf. Kuhn, “Jesus,” 1263.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

IV. The Qumran Discoveries and the Beginnings of Christology

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

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

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

⁵⁸ B. L. Mack, "The Kingdom Sayings in Mark" *Forum* 3.1 (1987): 3–47), 16; for a critical response, see C. A. Evans, "Jesus and the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years. A Comprehensive Assessment* (ed. P. W. Flint and J. C. VanderKam; Leiden et al.: Brill, 1999), 2:573–598, here 2:575–578.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

⁶⁸ Thus in the difficult to interpret *Self Enthronement Hymn* of 4Q491 II 1.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

2. Qumran: An Overview^{*}

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

A. Location and Archaeology

I. The Location

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

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

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

II. The Archeological Discoveries

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

¹⁰ Stegemann, *Essener*, 59–62.

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

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

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

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

III. The Interpretation of the Compound

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

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

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

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

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

¹⁵ Stegemann, *Essener*, 56.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

²² Stegemann, *Essener*, 77–82.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

²⁸ Röhrer-Ertl, “Gräberfelder.”

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

B. The Textual Discoveries

I. Textual Discoveries in Antiquity

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

II. The Inventory of Text Discoveries in Overview

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

III. Biblical Texts

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

IV. Deuterocanonical/Apocryphal Texts and Pseudepigrapha

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

V. Exegetical Texts

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

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

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

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

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

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

VI. Halakic Texts and Rule Texts

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

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

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

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

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

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

⁵⁷ Stegemann, *Essener*, 149–151.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

⁶⁴ Frey, "Patterns."

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

VII. Calendrical Texts

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

VIII. Poetic and Liturgical Texts

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

⁷⁰ Sukenik, *Scrolls*.

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

⁷² Stegemann, *Essener*, 152.

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

IX. Wisdom Texts

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

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

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

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

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

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

X. Other Texts

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

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

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

XI. "Sectarian" and "Non-Sectarian"

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

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

⁷⁸ Stegemann, *Essener*, 188.

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

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

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

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

I. The “Essene Hypothesis” and its Implications

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

⁸⁶ Taylor, “Sources,” 174.

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

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

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

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

⁸⁸ Taylor, “Sources,” 175.

⁸⁹ Taylor, “Sources,” 177.

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

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

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

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

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

III. The *Yaḥad*

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

D. The Textual Discoveries and their Significance for Early Christianity

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

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

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

⁹⁵ Metso, *Development*.

⁹⁶ Collins, “*Yaḥad*,” 85–86.

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